UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 111—PART 13

JULY 19, 1965, TO JULY 27, 1965
(PAGES 17175 TO 18496)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1965

J
11
.R5
1964
pt. 3

BY THE
OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 19, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture: Joshua 3: 4: *Ye have not passed this way heretofore.*

Eternal God, whose days are throughout all generations, humbly as we dwell in this house of time, we turn to Thee in prayer for light and love, beseeching Thee that we may be wiser and more trustful on each succeeding day.

Let us not miss what might be done with the gift of a new day or fail of the good that might be made of it.

Teach us to see clearly, to walk uprightly, to endure patiently and ever to accept life as a great gift, a grand opportunity, and a capacity for heroic endeavor.

May we be blessed with insight, with judgment, and a sense of values, and may we always take counsel of the mind of the Master as to how best to advance humanity.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 15, 1965, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5768. An act to extend for an additional temporary period the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of yarn of silk; and

H.R. 7984. An act to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION ACT, 1966

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8775) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1 through 36 inclusive and amendments Nos. 42 and 43.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

SENATE

Compensation of the Vice President and Senators, mileage of the President of the Senate and Senators, and expense allowances of the Vice President and leaders of the Senate

Compensation of the Vice President and Senators

For compensation of the Vice President and Senators of the United States, $3,285,985.

Mileage of President of the Senate and of Senators

For the mileage of the President of the Senate and of Senators, $58,370.

Expense Allowances of the Vice President, and Majority and Minority Leaders

For expense allowance of the Vice President, $10,000; Majority Leader of the Senate, $2,000; and Minority Leader of the Senate, $2,000; in all, $14,000.

Salaries, officers and employees

For compensation of officers, employees, clerks, to Senators, and others as authorized by law, including agency contributions and longevity compensation as authorized, which shall be paid from the appropriation without regard to the below limitations, as follows:

Office of the Vice President

For clerical assistance to the Vice President, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him in basic multiples of $5 per month, $155,440.

Chaplain

Chaplain of the Senate, $15,000.

Office of the Secretary

For office of the Secretary, $1,323,000, including $145,000 required for the purposes specified and authorized by section 74b of title 2, United States Code: *Provided,* That effective July 1, 1965, the Secretary may employ one chief reporter of debates at $24,024.40 gross per annum, seven reporters of debates at $8,880 basic per annum each, one assistant reporter of debates at $6,120 basic per annum, two clerks at $4,200 basic per annum each, and six expert transcribers at $3,900 basic per annum each: *Provided further,* That the Secretary is hereafter authorized to obtain, by contract or otherwise, emergency reporters and transcribers as may be necessary, payments therefor to be made from the contingent fund of the Senate, and that Senate Resolution 196, agreed to August 21, 1961, and Senate Resolution 170, agreed to July 15, 1963, are hereby repealed: *Provided further,* That effective July 1, 1965, the basic compensation of the assistant to the Majority and the assistant to the Minority may be fixed by the Majority and Minority Leaders, respectively, at not to exceed $8,160 per annum each.

Committee Employees

For professional and clerical assistance to standing committees and the Select Committee on Small Business, $3,236,145.

Conference Committees

For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Majority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, $95,980.

For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Minority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, $95,980.

Administrative and Clerical Assistants to Senators

For administrative and clerical assistants and messenger service for Senators, $15,653,785.

Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper

For office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, $3,051,230: *Provided,* That effective July 1, 1965, the basic per annum compensation of the foreman of skilled laborers shall be $2,340 in lieu of $2,100; the basic per annum compensation of two skilled laborers shall be $2,100 each in lieu of $1,920 each; and the Sergeant at Arms may employ six additional laborers at $1,680 basic per annum each.

Offices of the Secretaries for the Majority and the Minority

For the offices of the secretary for the majority and the secretary for the minority, $160,885: *Provided:* That effective July 1, 1965, the respective secretaries may fix the basic compensation of the assistant secretary for the majority and the assistant secretary for the minority at not to exceed $8,820 per annum each.

Offices of the Majority and Minority Whips

For four clerical assistants, two for the majority whip and two for the minority whip, at rates of compensation to be fixed in basic multiples of $60 per annum by the respective whips, $17,815 each; in all, $35,630.

Office of the legislative counsel of the Senate

For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, $308,000.

Senate procedure

For compiling, preparing, and editing "Senate Procedure", 1964 edition, $4,000, of which amount $2,000 shall be paid to Charles L. Watkins, Parliamentarian Emeritus of the Senate, and $2,000 shall be paid to Floyd M. Riddick, Parliamentarian of the Senate.

Contingent expenses of the Senate

Senate Policy Committees

For salaries and expenses of the Majority Policy Committee and the Minority Policy Committee, $197,525 for each such committee; in all, $395,050.

Automobiles and Maintenance

For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of four automobiles, one for the Vice President, one for the President pro tempore, one for the majority leader, and one for the minority leader, $42,540.

Furniture

For service and materials in cleaning and repairing furniture, and for the purchase of furniture, $31,190: *Provided*, That the furniture purchased is not available from other agencies of the Government.

Inquiries and Investigations

For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate or conducted pursuant to section 134(a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, including $392,000 for the Committee on Appropriations, to be available also for the purposes mentioned in Senate Resolution Numbered 193, agreed to October 14, 1943, $4,777,390.

Folding Documents

For the employment of personnel for folding speeches and pamphlets at a gross rate of not exceeding $2.17 per hour per person, $39,300.

Mail Transportation

For maintaining, exchanging, and equipping motor vehicles for carrying the mails and for official use of the offices of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, $16,560.

Miscellaneous Items

For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, $3,222,755 including $246,000, for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 4 of Public Law 87–82, approved July 6, 1961.

Postage Stamps

For postage stamps for the offices of the Secretaries for the Majority and Minority, $140; and for air-mail and special delivery stamps for office of the Secretary, $160; office of the Sergeant at Arms, $125; Senators and the President of the Senate, as authorized by law, $90,400, and the maximum allowance per capita of $610 is increased to $800 for the fiscal year 1966 and thereafter: *Provided*, That Senators from States partially or wholly west of the Mississippi River shall be allowed an additional $200 each fiscal year; in all, $90,825.

Stationery (Revolving Fund)

For stationery for Senators and the President of the Senate, $242,400; and for stationery for committees and officers of the Senate, $13,200; in all, $255,000, to remain available until expended.

Communications

For an amount for communications which may be expended interchangeably for payment, in accordance with such limitations and restrictions as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration, of charges on official telegrams and long-distance telephone calls made by or on behalf of Senators or the President of the Senate, such telephone calls to be in addition to those authorized by the provisions of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 392; 2 U.S.C. 46c, 46d, 46e), as amended, and the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949 (63 Stat. 77; 2 U.S.C. 46d–1), $15,150.

Administrative Provisions

Effective July 1, 1965, the paragraph relating to official long-distance telephone calls to and from Washington, District of Columbia, under the heading "Contingent Expenses of the Senate" in Public Law 479, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended (2 U.S.C. 46c), is amended to read as follows:

"There shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, toll charges on not to exceed twenty-four hundred strictly official long distance telephone calls to and from Washington, District of Columbia, aggregating not more than twelve thousand minutes each fiscal year for each Senator and the Vice President of the United States: *Provided*, That not more than twelve hundred calls aggregating not more than six thousand minutes made in the first six months of each fiscal year shall be paid for under this sentence. The toll charges on an additional twelve hundred such calls aggregating not more than six thousand minutes each fiscal year for each Senator from any State having a population of ten million or more inhabitants shall also be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate: *Provided*, That not more than six hundred calls aggregating not more than three thousand minutes made in the first six months of each fiscal year shall be paid for under this sentence."

Effective July 1, 1965, the paragraph relating to payment of toll charges on official long-distance telephone calls, originating and terminating outside of Washington, District of Columbia, under the heading "Contingent Expenses of the Senate" in Public Law 479, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended (2 U.S.C. 46d), is amended by striking out "$1,800" where it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,200".

Any Senator may have the Sergeant at Arms compute his total maximum long-distance telephone allowance. The minutes and calls allowance shall be computed on a formula at the maximum rate with all calls considered as being person-to-person from Washington, District of Columbia, and terminating within the Senator's State. Any Senator or group of Senators may then request the Sergeant at Arms to contract for flat-rate long-distance telephone service such as wide area telephone service. All such contract costs shall be charged against their respective telephone allowances, and in no event shall the total cost of any contract service exceed the allowance of the Senator, or the group of Senators sharing any such service; any excess costs to be billed to the Senator. No change from the original form of the allowances or from any contract service shall become effective except upon the first of a month.

The third paragraph under the heading "Administrative Provisions" in the appropriations for the Senate in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1959, as amended (2 U.S.C. 43b), is amended by striking out "two" where it first appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "six".

Effective July 1, 1965, the second paragraph under the heading "Administrative Provisions" contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1962 (Public Law 87–130, approved August 10, 1961; 2 U.S.C. 127) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "Two additional mileage payments each fiscal year may be made, under the foregoing, to employees in the offices of Senators from States having a population of ten million or more inhabitants."

Effective July 1, 1965, the third paragraph under the heading "Administrative Provisions" contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957 (Public Law 624, Eighty-fourth Congress; 2 U.S.C. 53), is amended by striking out "$150" where it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$300".

The legislative subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations is hereby directed to study the manner in which stationary allowances are utilized, including the commutation thereof, and to make a report on its findings and recommendations to the Standing Committee on Appropriations no later than February 1, 1966.

Senate Office Buildings

For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, including furniture, furnishings, and equipment, and for labor and material incident thereto, and repairs thereof; for purchase of waterproof wearing apparel, and for personal and other services; including eight attendants at $1,800 each; for the care and operation of the Senate Office Buildings; including the subway and subway transportation systems connecting the Senate Office Buildings with the Capitol; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol; in all, $2,458,700.

Senate Garage

For maintenance, repairs, alterations, personal and other services, and all other necessary expenses, $53,800.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee briefly explain the procedure we are going to follow on this conference?

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REIFEL. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, my request conforms to the routine followed in such matters in the past. It has been traditional for the Senate to write in its own so-called housekeeping items, and the House does the same for its housekeeping functions. The House, as the gentleman knows, omits the Senate housekeeping items when it first considers the legislative appropriation bill.

The amendments to which we have asked agreement relate solely to the Senate.

It has been traditional for the Senate and the House to decide their respective provisions for housekeeping purposes.

For instance, as I understand it, one of the amendments here increases the annual airmail stamp allowance for the Senators from the present $610 to $1,000 in the 24 States west of the Mississippi River. It increases the amount for stamps from $610 to $800 for those from States east of the Mississippi.

Another of these provisions inserted by the Senate has to do with long-distance telephone calls outside the District of Columbia. The present allowance is $1,800. Under the pending amendment the Senators have increased that amount to $2,200.

The allowance for official trips back home by Senators has been increased from the present allowance of 2 per year to 6 per year.

There are one or two others. They are all set out in the bill and explained in the committee report.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REIFEL. Under the rule of comity, the other body may decide what its expenditures will be and propose them in this bill, and we are also permitted to do the same thing here in the House. Is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. That has been the practice in these annual legislative appropriation bills, I might say to the gentleman.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, there is one significant difference in the procedure of handling the so-called housekeeping bill on the part of the other body and the House. The House lays before the other body its requests and asks them to approve, but we seldom on this side have an opportunity to know what the other body is doing. Yet we are called upon to put our stamp of approval upon what they do. Insofar as the House is concerned and what we do, they have this laid out before them.

While I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Alabama has given us some insight into what the other body is doing, I still hope that somehow or other, at some distant day in the future, we may have the opportunity really to go into what the other body presents to us and which they ask us to approve.

Insofar as the rule of comity is concerned, I have looked long and hard in the rule book to find the rule of comity, and I do not believe it exists, certainly not under that title.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments referred to were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House disagree to the remainder of the amendments of the Senate to the bill H.R. 8775 and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. George W. Andrews, Steed, Kirwan, Slack, Flynt, Mahon, Langen, Reifel, and Jonas.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8775

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House on the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H.R. 8775) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

SALINE WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 24, to expand, extend, and accelerate the saline water conversion program conducted by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Aspinall, O'Brien, Rogers of Texas, Saylor, and Reinecke.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 7984, to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Patman, Multer, Barrett, Mrs. Sullivan, and Messrs. Reuss, Ashley, Widnall, Fino, and Mrs. Dwyer.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4 OF SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 4 of the Small Business Committee have permission to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There is no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary have permission to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is that the Committee on Immigration?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AMENDING TITLES 10 AND 14, UNITED STATES CODE, AND THE MILITARY PERSONNEL AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES' CLAIMS ACT OF 1964, WITH RESPECT TO THE SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES BY MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES AND CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES FOR DAMAGE TO, OR LOSS OF, PERSONAL PROPERTY INCIDENT TO THEIR SERVICE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5024) to amend titles 10 and 14, United States Code, and the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, with respect to the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING THAT THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR SHALL CONVEY CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3433) to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall convey certain real property to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the colloquy last week, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING LANGUAGE TRAINING FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5519) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize language training to be given to a dependent of a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps under certain circumstances.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5519

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 101 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) By adding the following new section:

"§ 2002. Dependents of members of Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps: language training

"(a) Notwithstanding section 1041 of title 22 or any other provision of law, and under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, language training may be provided in—

"(1) a facility of the Department of Defense;

"(2) a facility of the Foreign Service Institute established under section 1041 of title 22; or

"(3) a civilian educational institution;

to a dependent of a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps in anticipation of the member's assignment to permanent duty outside the United States or while the dependent is accompanying the member outside the United States as a result of the member's assignment to that duty.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, the word 'dependent' has the same meaning that it has under section 401 of title 37".

(2) By inserting the following item in the analysis:

"2002. Dependents of members of Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps: language training."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes language training to the dependents of members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in anticipation of their sponsors' assignment to permanent duty outside the United States, or while they are accompanying members outside the United States as a result of the members' assignment to such duty.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Dependents of members of our military forces perform an important role in projecting a true image of the United States abroad. Their ability to speak the language of the country increases the effectiveness of their military sponsors and generates inestimable good will for the United States.

Congress recognized the contributions wives can make when it amended section 701 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U.S.C. 1041) to permit the Secretary of State to provide appropriate orientation and language training to members of the families of officers and employees of the Government in anticipation of their sponsors' assignment abroad or while abroad.

Although section 701 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 specifically established the Foreign Service Institute and as amended authorizes language training for dependents of military personnel, it limits such training to that which is accomplished at the Foreign Service Institute of the Department of State. The facilities of the Foreign Service Institute, in the United States, are located only in Washington, D.C. On the other hand, facilities of the Department of Defense are located in various places in the United States including the Defense Language Institute West Coast Branch at Monterey, Calif., and at other Department of Defense education centers. These facilities provide language training to members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in anticipation of their assignment to duty outside the United States. So far as the Department of Defense is concerned, the requirement that dependents may be provided training only at the Foreign Service Institute would cause greater transportation costs than those resulting from having a number of locations, including the Foreign Service Institute, to which members and their dependents may go for training.

In those instances in which it may not be possible to provide language training to dependents in the United States, but in which such training is desirable, the proposed legislation would authorize the training to be given outside of the United States.

COST

In providing foreign language training under the proposed legislation, priority will be accorded to the wives of attaches, military assistance advisory group and mission personnel, and the personnel of international headquarters. It is estimated that the average annual input into this program will be 750 trainees. The first year cost of operation will be approximately $200,000, and it is considered that the annual recurring cost will not exceed this amount.

DEPARTMENTAL POSITION

The Department of Defense recommends enactment of this legislation.

COMMITTEE POSITION

The House Armed Services Committee unanimously approved this legislation.

I am pleased that the House has enacted this measure.

SALE OF UNIFORM CLOTHING TO THE NAVAL SEA CADET CORPS AND STATE AND FEDERAL MARITIME ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1856) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell uniform clothing to the Naval Sea Cadet Corps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1856

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 647 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting the following new section after section 7541:

"§ 7541a. Uniform clothing: sale to Naval Sea Cadet Corps

"Subject to regulations under section 486 of title 40, the Secretary of the Navy, under regulations prescribed by him, may sell any item of enlisted naval uniform clothing that may be spared, at a price representing its fair value, to the Naval Sea Cadet Corps for the sea cadets. The cost of transportation and delivery of items sold under this section shall be charged to the Naval Sea Cadet Corps."; and

(2) by inserting the following new item in the analysis:

"7541a. Uniform clothing: sale to Naval Sea Cadet Corps."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, insert after the word "cadets" the following words: "and to any Federal or State maritime academy having a department of naval science for the maritime cadets and midshipmen".

Page 2, line 3, insert after the word "Corps" the following words: " and to such Federal and State maritime academies".

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CITY OF CLINTON BRIDGE COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3788) to revive and reenact as amended the act entitled "An act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.," approved December 21, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire if this is the customary commission agreed to on any navigable stream between the two States involved?

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. The gentleman from Missouri asks if this is customary?

Mr. HALL. Is this the regular and established precedent for such commissions, which must be established?

Mr. BLATNIK. In this instance it is. This bill is identical with the bill passed by this body last year. This is necessary. The original authorization was back in 1944, and a subsequent bill was passed in 1946, the General Bridge Act of 1946.

Mr. HALL. This will merely continue the same Commission?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. It is without any authorization or appropriation or expense to the Government, but merely authorizes this and establishes the Commission therefor?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct. It extends the life of the Commission.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This likely will be a toll bridge, is that not correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act approved December 21, 1944, authorizing the City of Clinton Bridge Commission to acquire, construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges, including approaches thereto, across the Mississippi River at or near the cities of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Illinois, as heretofore amended, be, and the same is hereby revived and reenacted: *Provided,* That this Act shall be null and void insofar as it authorizes the construction of a bridge or bridges unless actual construction thereof be commenced within three years and completed within five years from the date of approval of this Act.

SEC. 2. That section 5 of said Act, as heretofore amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. The commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to provide for the payment of the cost of such bridge, or bridges as may be acquired, reconstructed, or constructed, as herein provided, and approaches (including the approach highways, which, in the judgment of the commission, it is necessary or advisable to construct or cause to be constructed to provide suitable and adequate connections with existing improved highways) and the necessary land easements and appurtenances thereto, by an issue or issues of negotiable bonds of the commission, bearing interest, payable semiannually, at the rate of not more than 6 per centum per annum, the principal and interest of which bonds shall be payable solely from the funds provided in accordance with this Act, and such payments may be further secured by mortgage of the bridge or bridges. All such bonds may be registrable as to principal alone or both principal and interest, shall be payable as to principal within not to exceed twenty-five years from the date thereof, shall be in such denominations, shall be executed in such manner, and shall be payable in such medium and at such place or places as the commission may determine, and the face amount thereof shall be so calculated as to produce, at the price of their sale, the cost of the bridge or bridges, acquired or constructed, and approaches and the land easements, and appurtenances used in connection therewith, when added to any other funds made available to the commission for the use of said purposes. The commission may reserve the right to redeem any or all of said bonds before maturity in such manner and at such price or prices not exceeding 105 and accrued interest as may be fixed by the commission prior to the issuance of the bonds. Subject to the provisions of any prior contracts or obligations the commission may disburse any available bridge revenues or other funds or borrow money and issue its negotiable interest-bearing notes in evidence thereof to defray the cost of designing, engineering, and planning a new bridge or bridges under this Act and acquire lands for the location and approaches thereto, provided that all notes evidencing the funds so borrowed, if not previously paid from such bridge revenues, shall be repaid from the proceeds of the bonds of the commission when issued for account of such new bridge or bridges. In the event the commission issues notes as hereinbefore in this section provided and said notes have not been otherwise paid and a new bridge or bridges are not built, said notes shall be paid from revenues derived from the operation of any other bridge or bridges owned by the commission, subject to the obligation of payment of all outstanding indebtedness for which said revenues have been theretofore pledged. The commission when it deems it advisable may issue refunding bonds to refinance any outstanding bonds, and to pay any other indebtedness of the commission, at maturity or before maturity when called for redemption, and may include, as a part of an issue of bonds to provide for the cost of a bridge to be constructed under this Act, sufficient additional bonds bearing interest at a rate or rates not exceeding 6 per centum per annum to refinance any outstanding bonds and notes at maturity or before maturity when called for redemption. The commission may enter into an agreement with any bank or trust company in the United States as trustee having the power to make such agreement, setting forth the duties of the commission in respect to the acquisition, construction, maintenance, operation, repair, and insurance of the bridge or bridges, the conservation and application of all funds, the security for the payment of the bonds, the safeguarding of money on hand or on deposit, and the rights and remedies of said trustee and the holders of the bonds, restricting the individual right of action of the bondholders as is customary in trust agreements respecting bonds of corporations. Such trust agreement may contain such provisions for protecting and enforcing the rights and remedies of the trustee and the bondholders as may be reasonable and proper and not inconsistent with the law.

"Said bonds may be sold at not less than par after public advertisement for bids to be opened publicly at the time and place stated in such advertisement and at the price bid which will yield the greatest return to the commission for the bonds to be sold. Such advertisement for bids shall be published at least once each week for at least two consecutive weeks in a newspaper or financial journal having recognized circulation among bidders for bonds of the type and character offered. The price to be paid for the bridge or bridges acquired hereunder shall not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by the commission at the time of acquisition. The cost of the bridge to be constructed as provided herein, together with the approaches and approach highways, shall be deemed to include interest during construction of the bridge and for twelve months thereafter, and all engineering, legal, financing, architectural, traffic surveying, condemnation, and other expenses incident to the bridge and the acquisition of the necessary property, including the cost of acquiring existing franchises and riparian rights relating to the bridge, as well as the cost of abandonment or dismantlement of any existing bridge to be replaced thereby. If the proceeds of the bonds shall exceed the cost as finally determined, the excess shall be placed in the fund hereafter provided to pay the principal and interest of such bonds. Prior to the preparation of definitive bonds the commission may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or interim certificates without coupons, of any denomination whatsoever, exchangeable for definitive bonds when such bonds that have been executed are available for delivery."

SEC. 3. Subsection (a) of section 8 of such Act of December 21, 1944, as amended, is amended by striking out "the bonds and interest," and inserting in lieu thereof: "the bonds, the notes issued under section 5 of this Act, and the interest,".

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

EMERGENCY HIGHWAY RELIEF

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6790) to increase the limitation on emergency relief for the repair or reconstruction of highways under section 125 of title 23, United States Code, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the last proviso of subsection (f) of section 120 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after "park roads and trails," the following: "parkways, public lands highways, public lands development roads and trails,".

(b) Subsection (c) of section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after "park roads and trails," the following: "parkways, public lands highways, public lands development roads and trails,".

SEC. 2. The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows: "Subject to the following limitations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to establish the fund authorized by this section and to replenish it on an annual basis: (1) not more than $50,000,000 is authorized to be expended in any one fiscal year to carry out this section, except that if in any fiscal year the total of all expenditures under this section is less than $50,000,000, the unexpended balance of such amount shall remain available for expenditure during the next two succeeding fiscal years in addition to amounts otherwise available to carry out this section in such years, and (2) 60 per centum of the expenditures under this section for any fiscal year are authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund and the remaining 40 per centum of such expenditures are authorized to be appropriated only from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect July 1, 1966.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 6790. This is needed and necessary legislation. It has the full support of the Committee on Public Works and was reported unanimously by the committee.

H.R. 6790 amends title 23 of the United States Code to provide additional funds for the use of the Bureau of Public Roads in repairing and reconstructing Federal aid and other highways or bridges damaged by storms, floods, earthquakes, or other similar disasters. It also makes eligible for relief under section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code "parkways, public lands highways and public lands development roads and and trails." These three systems of roads are not covered under the existing law at the present time. There is absolutely no reason for their exclusion from this program and, for that reason, the committee amended the existing law to include them under benefits of this program.

At the present time there is authorized an annual expenditure of $30 million to be used by the Bureau of Public Roads to repair Federal aid roads which have suffered the damage I have described above.

The experience of the Bureau of Public Roads in administering this program in the last few years clearly indicates there is a need for the additional money authorized by this bill.

The Committee on Public Works is well aware of this fact. In the past 6 months three special subcommittees of the Committee on Public Works have made field trips to investigate at first-hand flood damages in the Pacific Northwest, the Mississippi Valley States, and in the States of Colorado and Kansas. The subcommittee making the trip to the States of Colorado and Kansas just returned from that flood damaged area and is now in the process of writing a report of its findings. However, their verbal report to me, as well as reports of the two previous subcommittees indicates quite clearly that one of the heaviest sufferers of any flood are the highways in the local areas. We are all well aware of the part roads of all types play in our daily life. They are essential to all phases of the national well-being. It is therefore quite logical that they should be repaired as soon as possible, once a natural disaster occurs, so that they can play their vital role in restoring the economy and well-being of any stricken area.

The administration is well aware of this problem and earlier in this session, in an executive communication to the Speaker of the House, recommended legislation along the lines of that which is before us today. Part of their recommendation has been taken care of in a previous bill which the Congress only recently passed and which has been enacted into law. This is the Pacific Northwest disaster bill, and in that legislation the Congress provided an additional $50 million for this program for fiscal year 1965 and an additional $20 million for fiscal year 1966.

H.R. 6790 contains the balance of the recommendation of the administration with necessary changes made by the Committee on Public Works which the committee believes will implement the operation of this program. Beginning with fiscal year 1967 the $30 million under section 125 of title 23, United States Code, is increased to $50 million annually. Sixty percent of the funds that will be used under H.R. 6790 will come from the highway trust fund, and the balance of 40 percent from the general funds of the Treasury. Under present law the $30 million is an annual expenditure allocated to the Bureau of Public Roads and expires at the end of any one year.

This approach is inconsistent with the normal Federal aid highway program authorization of funds, for under that program funds are available for a 3-year period. The committee believes that the money to be used under this program should be available in like manner and has made the necessary change in the law to see that beginning in fiscal year 1967 any funds not used in a particular year will be available for the next succeeding 2 years.

This legislation affects each and every one of our 50 States. It is a program that we hope will not need to be used, but if the need arises, the money should be there at once. For this reason the increase of money authorized under H.R. 6790 is a necessary one.

I strongly urge this body to pass H.R. 6790.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland has given a correct and adequate explanation generally of the legislation. This is a bill concerning which the committee has no controversy. There is no difference of opinion. We all recognize and acknowledge the fact that properly financed disaster relief must be provided for highways. There must be adequate authorization and financing should be on an orderly and planned basis. At the present time the procedure is inadequate. The funds are initially expended from any appropriations that are available for expenditure under title 23, United States Code, and then at a subsequent date these appropriations are reimbursed. Reimbursement for repairing Federal aid highways come from the highway trust fund, and uncertainty exists as to how, and from what sources, reimbursement should be made for the several classes of Federal domain roads which are also covered by section 125 of title 23, United States Code. This does not make sense.

This bill, thus, provides an orderly procedure, with a fixed percentage of the funds for reimbursement coming out of the trust fund—60 percent, of $50 million, or up to $30 million annually, which equals the amount presently coming out of the trust fund. The additional $20 million will come out of the general funds of the Treasury. In order to provide for an orderly procedure, the Public Works Committee amended this bill to provide that all funds expended under authority of section 125 of title 23 shall be reimbursed, 30 percent from the highway trust fund and 20 percent from the general fund, meaning that all the money will not be expended out of one fund or the other. The objective is that the 60- to 40-percent formula shall apply to all funds expended. So this bill attempts to get orderly procedure into this emergency financing, which admittedly is needed, particularly—and this is on a nationwide basis—in view of the ravages of nature in the northwest flood disaster area, in the Upper Mississippi River Valley, and in Colorado and Kansas, where the committee sent special subcommittees to investigate recently. This bill provides for nationwide expenditure authorizations for emergency highway reconstruction throughout the Nation at an increased rate, from $30 to $50 million annually, starting with fiscal year 1967, it being realized, of course, that the Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of this year provided for an increase from $30 to $80 million for the fiscal year 1965, and from $30 to $50 million for 1966, because of the several bad floods throughout the Nation. This bill also promotes careful planning and orderly procedures in the repair and reconstruction of highways damaged by natural disasters by making the annual expenditure authority of $50 million available not only for the fiscal year authorized but for the following 2 fiscal years also.

So, Mr. Speaker, this means a $50 million annual expenditure authority hereafter, which is consistent with what we did in the Pacific Northwestern Disaster Relief Act of 1965.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], in that he has instituted a procedure which I wholeheartedly endorse of sending committee members out into the fields to investigate the damages of these acts of nature where they occur, to evaluate them, and to make an on-site, on-the-spot inspection of them so that our committee will be wholly knowledgeable of them.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful—and I understand this is the case—that the chairman likewise will authorize committee members sometime in the future to look into some of the public works projects, particularly multipurpose water resource projects, which have such an impact on the economy and the well-being of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. It is one that should be supported unanimously, and I recommend its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Maryland that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 6790.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill as amended was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND SECTION 302(c) OF THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 482, Rept. No. 625) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 482

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1153) to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit employer contributions for joint industry promotion of products in certain instances or a joint committee or joint board empowered to interpret provisions of collective bargaining agreements. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

TO CORRECT INEQUITIES WITH RESPECT TO THE BASIC COMPENSATION OF TEACHERS AND TEACHING POSITIONS UNDER THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT OVERSEAS TEACHERS PAY AND PERSONNEL PRACTICES ACT

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, filed the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 483, Rept. No. 626) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. Res. 483

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6845) to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

UNIFORMED SERVICES PAY ACT OF 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 470 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 470

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9075) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 470 provides an open rule with 3 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 9075, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the military services.

H.R. 9075 will, first, provide a much needed increase in the basic pay authorized all uniformed services personnel; second, authorize the payment of a variable reenlistment bonus; and third, establish a statutory requirement for an annual Presidential review of the adequacy of military pay and allowances and a corresponding quadrennial review in respect to the principles and concepts of military compensation.

The gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman Rivers, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman Bates, and the members of the Armed Services Committee are to be commended for the many days and weeks they have devoted to the hearings and work involved in presenting this complicated pay increase bill for the various commissions and grades provided for in our Military Establishment.

Secretary of Defense McNamara, along with the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, all appeared before the Armed Services Committee and outlined in detail their recommendations and the necessity for a substantial increase for the enlisted personnel of our Defense Establishment. The critical shortage of capable personnel in the Navy Department is serious on account of the particularly low wage scale. Representatives of the Navy informed the Armed Services Committee that they now have a shortage of more than 40,000 petty officers. In the electronic equipment repair category, they are now operating on a shortage of approximately 20,000. A relative shortage of career petty officers also exists in the Navy Establishment.

Witnesses appeared from the Department of the Army and set out that in 5 years' time the enlisted personnel has been reduced from 41 to 37 percent. More than two-thirds of the enlisted personnel on active duty with the Army today have less than 4 years' experience.

The Secretary of the Air Force testified before the committee that the present inadequate military pay presents great difficulty in the retention of highly qualified officers and enlisted personnel. Secretary Zuckert said that since 1959 the proportion of ROTC graduates with engineering and scientific background has decreased from 47 to 33 percent.

The comparison of the military pay and the civilian pay in commercial and industrial establishments throughout the United States is astounding. In 1964 the average wage or salary in civilian life was $445 per month. A recruit in the existing military structure receives only $78 per month, which is 17.5 percent of the average monthly wage or salary in the United States.

Chairman Rivers and Congressman Bates appeared before the Rules Committee last week and outlined in detail figures and facts in behalf of the pending bill so convincingly that I do hope this legislation, as recommended by the Armed Services Committee, is passed without amendments.

Chairman Rivers gave an outstanding and lengthy detailed explanation of all phases of military personnel compensation when he appeared before the Rules Committee last week. I do hope that the Members will remain on the floor and listen to his detailed analysis of all angles concerning our inadequate policy toward ample compensation of our Military Establishment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 470.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 192]

Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashley
Bingham
Bolling
Bonner
Bow
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Cederberg
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Conte
Conyers
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Farnum
Fino
Flynt
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Grabowski
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Halleck
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Holland
Johnson, Pa.
Kelly
Keogh
King, N.Y.
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Lindsay
Long, Md.
McDade
McDowell
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Mackay
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
May
Michel
Mosher
Murphy, Ill.
Murray
Nix
Passman
Pelly
Powell
Pucinski
Reid, N.Y.
Reinecke
Resnick
Rivers, Alaska
Ronan
Roncalio
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Ryan
Schisler
Scott
Shipley
Stephens
Teague, Calif.
Toll
Vanik
Waggonner
Watkins
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
Widnall
Wydler
Yates
Young

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 334 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

UNIFORMED SERVICES PAY ACT OF 1965

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 470 will permit the consideration of H.R. 9075, a bill authorizing an increase in the compensation of uniformed services personnel. It is an open rule providing for 3 hours of general debate.

H.R. 9075 would authorize an increase in uniformed services compensation which would result in an increased annual expenditure of approximately $1 billion. The pay increase as recommended by the administration is less than one-half of the amount recommended by the Committee on Armed Services. It is interesting to note that the committee recommendation is particularly directed toward enlisted personnel. Actually, 88 percent of the total difference between the pay increases recommended by the Committee on Armed Services and those recommended by the Folsom Panel for active military personnel is found in the recommended salary for enlisted personnel. In other words, the Committee on

Armed Services has attempted to provide realistic pay increases for enlisted personnel, while the increases recommended by the Folsom Panel are believed inadequate.

As emphasized in the committee report, enlisted personnel with under 2 years of service have not received a pay increase since 1952—a period of 13 years. During this same span of time, the consumer price index has increased 16.9 percent. Yet, the increase recommended by the Folsom Panel was a mere 2.7 percent. On the other hand, the Committee on Armed Services provides an average 17.3 percent increase for enlisted personnel with less than 2 years of service.

Mr. Speaker, I am mindful that the cost is a substantial amount of money. But I am personally convinced that this increased expenditure is essential to the proper maintenance of our Military Establishment.

When we consider that for fiscal year 1966 the administration has requested approval of legislation which would permit the support of foreign aid programs of one kind or another costing an excess of $3.3 billion, it is difficult for me to understand why the administration refuses to endorse an appropriate military compensation increase costing less than one-third of this amount. I firmly believe that we should take better care of our own deserving citizens and not waste so much money by way of foreign aid. In fact, I have heard statements indicating that some of our foreign aid money may be used to pay servicemen in other countries more money per month than we pay our own servicemen. If this is true, it seems hard to believe.

The uniformed services personnel are the men and women who are committed to the responsibility of guarding our way of life. They should be adequately compensated. Tomorrow we will start on the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965, with the request for an authorization of some $1.895 billion. In my opinion, that program could be done away with, and in so doing, we would have the necessary $1 billion to take care of this increase and would save almost another $1 billion, which could be used for essential expenditures rather than wasting it on a dream program like the war on poverty.

I commend the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. RIVERS], on his forthright stand in demanding that the uniformed services personnel be adequately compensated, and I commend the members of the Committee on Armed Services for their action. Minority views are set forth in the committee report by the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 9075. It was unanimous in the Rules Committee. I know of no objection to the rule and urge its adoption.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the passage of H.R. 9075 by the Congress is dictated if we are to have our servicemen and their families live as first-class citizens. The revelations that were made in the course of the hearings before the Armed Services Committee were shocking.

Since 1952, the adjustments made in military pay have been grossly inadequate; they have failed to keep pace with the pay adjustments for civil service personnel in business and industry.

President Johnson has said:

> There can be no class system separating the men and women who are committed to the service of their fellow men or to the defense of their country.

It is our President's announced intention to "take what ever steps both human equity and national defense require to enhance the standing and morale of those who defend us."

Failure of this Congress to enact H.R. 9075 must be interpreted by our servicemen as indifference to their plight and as a willingness to consign them and their families to the ranks of second-class citizens.

It is a shame and disgrace when we permit the economic plight of our military to sink to the point where some enlisted families receive pay below what has been estimated as the poverty level, some have actually had to take relief, and many were eligible for relief but were too proud to accept it. It is a shame and disgrace when almost one in every five servicemen must "moonlight" and many service wives must work to provide the necessities for their families.

Those who suffer most from low military pay—and those who will benefit most from this bill—are the enlisted men.

It is nothing less than a national disgrace to find that we pay unemployed, unskilled youths in the Job Corps more than we do the three lowest grades of the services, or when a third-class petty officer on active duty with 4 years of service receives less pay than the compensation paid to the unemployed in New York City, or when a messenger makes more than a military pilot.

The increases contained in H.R. 9075 will provide a decent wage that will give our service people and their families a just standard of living.

I support the bill. My conscience would not let me oppose it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9075) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 9075, with Mr. BURKE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, it gives me the greatest possible pleasure to recommend to this body approval of H.R. 9075, a bill which has been conceived and developed in its entirety by your Committee on Armed Services.

This bill will provide a critically needed increase in basic pay for more than 2.6 million uniformed services personnel.

H.R. 9075 has three fundamental objectives:

First. It will provide a much needed increase in the basic pay authorized all uniformed services personnel.

Second. It will authorize the payment of a variable reenlistment bonus.

Third. It will establish a statutory requirement for an annual Presidential review of the adequacy of military pay and allowances and a corresponding quadrennial review in respect to the principles and concepts of military compensation.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Enactment of this legislation is necessary to insure that all uniformed services personnel will, now and in the future, be provided a level of compensation comparable to that enjoyed by other workers in our economy.

The failure of military pay levels to keep pace with wage adjustments provided Federal civilian employees and workers in the private sector of our economy has contributed significantly to the inability of the military departments to attract and retain adequate numbers of truly qualified career personnel.

This inability of the military departments to attract and retain adequate numbers of qualified career personnel has, in turn, created serious personnel manning problems in all the military departments. Consequently, to insure the maintenance of our full military operational capabilities it is absolutely essential, in the judgment of the Committee on Armed Services, that we provide military personnel with a substantial increase in compensation.

In addition to the military requirement for an immediate pay increase, simple equity demands that Congress act promptly to restore to military personnel the relative comparability in wage levels which previously prevailed with respect to other Federal employees.

Our committee hearings indicated that since 1952 military pay increases have amounted to 33.9 percent, while during an equivalent period Federal civilian pay increases have amounted to 46.3 percent. Thus, there is reflected in these statistics an overall short-fall in military pay increases of approximately 12.4 percent. It is this discrepancy in the general level of military pay as contrasted to pay levels enjoyed by other Federal workers that requires immediate correction.

In summary, this adjustment to military pay as recommended in H.R. 9075 is necessary to provide our military personnel with reasonable comparability in pay levels with their civilian contemporaries.

Our military personnel cannot lobby for a pay increase. They cannot go on strike. They cannot bargain with their employer. They cannot, as do other workers, threaten to transfer to a competitor of their employer.

None of the persuasive ordinary bargaining devices are available to military personnel. In short, once committed to a military career, these personnel become victims of the system and can look only to Congress for equitable pay treatment.

Congress, and particularly the Committee on Armed Services, has been given this responsibility under article I, section 8, of the Constitution which states, among other things, that Congress alone shall have the power "To raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a Navy, to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

I sincerely believe that this bill, H.R. 9075, fully and fairly meets this constitutional responsibility.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The bill proposed by the Committee on Armed Services would provide an average 10.6 percent increase in the basic pay of uniformed services personnel. The cost of this bill for active duty Defense Department personnel is $824 million annually. With the addition of personnel of the other uniformed services, that is, Coast Guard, Public Health Service, Coast and Geodetic Survey and other related costs, the total annual cost of this legislation is $996 million.

Under the terms of the bill, every member of the uniformed services on active duty would receive an increase in pay. Thus, the bill affects all of the 2.6 million members of the Armed Forces presently on active duty, as well as more than 4 million military dependents who look to their military sponsors for financial support. In other words, this bill will have a direct effect on the financial future of almost 7 million Americans.

In order to understand the proposed pay increase for military personnel incorporated in H.R. 9075, it is necessary to analyze separately the changes recommended for personnel with over 2 years of service and those changes recommended for personnel with less than 2 years of service.

In the case of personnel with over 2 years of service, officers would be given an average increase of 6.4 percent and enlisted personnel would be given an increase of 11.1 percent in basic pay.

On the other hand, in the case of personnel with less than 2 years of service, officers would be given an average increase of 22 percent and enlisted personnel would be given an average increase of 17.3 percent.

Enlisted personnel with less than 2 years of service have been given substantially larger percentage increases than their contemporaries since this group of enlisted personnel has had no increase in compensation since 1952. Thus, for example, the average increase of 17.3 percent in the basic pay of enlisted personnel with less than 2 years of service will, generally speaking, simply compensate for the rise in the consumer price index during the same interval which is 16.9 percent.

The increase for officer personnel with under 2 years of service similarly attempts to provide for the substantial increase in the consumer price index since 1952 and also would include an incremental increase to insure that the entry pay for junior officers at the ensign and second lieutenant level will be comparable to that provided as entry salaries for college graduates entering Federal civilian employment.

The proposed increases in basic pay for typical officers and enlisted personnel in the military departments are set out on pages 27 and 28 of the committee report and reflect monthly increases in basic pay for officers ranging from $162—8.9 percent—for a general officer—O-10—to $23—5 percent—a month for a first lieutenant—O-2—with 4 years of service.

In the case of enlisted personnel, the increases in monthly basic pay range from a high of $58 a month—15.3 percent—for a sergeant first class—E-7—to a $10 a month increase—13 percent—in basic pay for a recruit with less than 4 months of service.

FOLSOM PANEL AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATIONS

As Members of the House are aware, the President's Panel on Federal Salaries, chaired by the Honorable Marion Folsom, recommended a substantially smaller increase in pay for military personnel. The recommendation made by the Folsom Panel would have provided an average compensation increase of 4.8 percent for all uniformed personnel except enlisted personnel with under 2 years of service who would receive a 2.7 percent increase in basic pay as a cost of living increase.

The Folsom Panel apparently reached its conclusions as to the size of the required pay increase on the basis of assumptions and evidence which, in the opinion of the Committee on Armed Services, are completely invalid.

The Panel stated:

> Congressional action in 1962, 1963, and 1964 placed military compensation at a level, in relation to civilian pay levels, sufficient to attract, and retain adequate numbers and quality of personnel in the Armed Forces.

The printed committee hearings on these military pay increase recommendations completely refute this statement by the Folsom Panel.

It is significant to note that not a single witness who appeared before the committee accepted the Panel's conclusions that there was no retention problem in the military departments. The evidence developed by the committee completely contradicted the Panel's contention in this regard.

The mere fact that the Department of Defense included in its pay recommendation a request for authority to allow the use of a new and additional flexible reenlistment bonus "to retain people in skills that are in short supply" clearly establishes the existence of a "retention problem" in the military departments.

In this connection, it is important to note that this retention problem which would presumably be partially corrected by the variable reenlistment bonus affects almost one-half of the total enlisted grade structure.

The Panel reportedly reviewed the Armed Services Committee recommendations on Military pay but rejected the committee's recommendation because of its view that the military departments had no retention problem. Consequently the Panel was of the opinion that current military wage levels required only a minor adjustment comparable to that recommended for civilian employees of the Federal Government. Thus, the Panel recommended an adjustment to military pay that apparently was designed to match the 3-percent increase recommended for civilian employees of the Federal Government.

Stated another way, the Panel was of the view that in 1963 military wage levels were sufficiently high to attract and retain adequate numbers of highly qualified military personnel and, therefore, 1963 was the base year from which any adjustments in military pay were to be made in the future.

SELECTION OF BASE YEAR

The Committee on Armed Services maintains that it would be a serious error to use 1963 as a base year for making future adjustments to military pay since it would simply perpetuate the present and existing disparity between military wage levels and those provided other Federal civilian workers and workers in our economy.

Stated very simply, therefore, the essential difference between the Folsom Panel recommendations and those made by the Committee on Armed Services arises from the unwillingness of the Folsom Panel to recognize that there does exist a significant disparity in military wages as contrasted to those provided Federal civilian workers. Therefore, if the Panel had used 1952 as a base year from which to begin a statistically sound comparison of wage increases provided military personnel as contrasted to those provided Federal civilian workers, it, too, would have come up with the same general conclusions as those developed by the Committee on Armed Services.

At this point it is worthy of note that Secretary of Defense McNamara disagreed with the statistical analysis of previous wage increases utilized by the Committee on Armed Services and offered his own set of statistics to prove that military personnel, particularly officers, had fared better than their Federal civilian contemporaries in congressionally approved wage increases since 1952. The committee took issue with the Secretary in this regard and, therefore, accepted his recommendation that the committee hire an "outstanding actuary" to determine the validity of the statistics used by the Secretary.

The committee report contains the complete actuarial study made in this connection by one of the leading actuarial firms in the country. Very simply, the actuaries advised the committee that the statistical analysis developed by the Department of Defense of previous wage increases was invalid and overstated the percentage increase in compensation received by military personnel since 1949 by 28 percent for officers and 15 percent for enlisted personnel.

The Folsom Panel unfortunately utilized these Department of Defense supplied statistics to reach its conclusion on its military pay recommendations.

Despite the fact that I totally disagreed with the Folsom Panel recommendations, I introduced the legislative proposal sent to the Congress by the administration. The bill H.R. 8714, therefore represented the Panel's pay recommendations.

The committee conducted hearings on both the Folsom Panel pay recommendations embodied in H.R. 8714 and the committee recommendations initially developed in H.R. 5725. At the conclusion of these hearings, 34 members of the Committee on Armed Services were firmly convinced that the original committee recommendations were valid and consequently endorsed the bill you have before you today, H.R. 9075.

The committee report provides a detailed comparative analysis of the two bills as they affect all active duty military personnel. This analysis of comparative cost is reflected on page 40 of the committee report. It indicates that the Folsom Panel recommendations would cost an estimated $369 million, while the committee's recommendation would cost an estimated $825 million—a difference of approximately $455 million.

Also reflected on page 44 of the committee report is an analysis of the comparative cost of the Folsom Panel recommendations and the committee recommendations in respect to personnel with less than 2 years service.

A review of the cited tables indicates that there is relatively little difference in the two pay proposals as they affect officer personnel.

The committee proposal would raise all officer personnel an average of 7.2 percent at an estimated annual cost of approximately $174 million.

The Panel's proposal would raise all officer personnel an average of 5 percent with an estimated annual cost of approximately $120 million.

Thus, the difference between the two proposals, as they affect officer personnel, is only $54 million. This amount in relation to the total $1 billion cost of the bill is, therefore, relatively small.

On the other hand, a review of the tables relating to the proposed increases for enlisted personnel indicates that 88 percent of the $455 million difference in the two pay proposals is found in the enlisted grade structure. Thus, the bulk of the savings reflected in the Folsom Panel proposal is the $401 million which the Panel would deny to enlisted personnel.

It is worthy of note that every statistic available to the committee, including those provided by departmental witnesses, indicated a very serious short-fall in the enlisted pay structure as compared to their contemporaries in both Federal civil service and the private sector of our economy.

Yet, despite these statistics, both the Folsom Panel and the Department of Defense stubbornly refused to recommend adequate adjustments in the enlisted pay structure. Perhaps the clearest indication of the inadequacy of the proposed increases for enlisted personnel as recommended by the Folsom Panel is reflected in the comparison of the overall percentage of dollar increases.

The Folsom Panel recommends an average of 4.6 percent in compensation for all enlisted personnel which amounts to an average of $8.98 monthly. On the other hand, the committee, in H.R. 9075, recommends an average increase of 12.1 percent in enlisted compensation which results in an average monthly increase of $23.48.

Let us make the issue clear. This is a bill for enlisted personnel—the Folsom Panel recommendations largely ignored our enlisted personnel. My committee refuses to buy this type of recommendation, and therefore we recommend for House approval H.R. 9075.

In addition to the change in basic pay for Uniformed Services personnel, this bill would also provide authority to the Secretary of Defense to pay a so-called variable reenlistment bonus. This variable reenlistment bonus would be paid at the time of first enlistment only and is designed, as explained by the Secretary of Defense, to provide a critically needed monetary incentive so as to permit the military departments to retain experienced military personnel in critical skills. The Secretary testified that this additional management device would cost an estimated $21 million during fiscal year 1968 and would affect approximately 19,000 personnel. The variable reenlistment bonus would permit the departments to pay an additional amount over and above the regular reenlistment bonus not to exceed four times the amount of the basic reenlistment bonus authorized the service member upon his first reenlistment. The committee felt that this administrative device might be of particular assistance to the Department of the Navy and therefore granted the Secretary's request in this regard.

PRESIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING FUTURE ADJUSTMENTS AND CHANGES IN PAY AND ALLOWANCES

The bill recommended by the Department of Defense and the President included a provision which would authorize the President to make annual adjustments to military pay and allowances without the necessity of legislative action by the Congress.

The provision recommended by the President's Special Panel on Federal Salaries would authorize the President to increase the pay of uniformed services personnel whenever he "determined that the rates of any pay or allowances" are inadequate.

The committee wholeheartedly endorses the concept of an annual review of the adequacy of military pay and allowances, together with a report concerning possible adjustments to military pay and allowances. However, it does not subscribe to the concept that these adjustments to military pay and allowances would become law unless either body of the Congress, within a 60-day period, passed a resolution vetoing such a recommended adjustment.

The committee is of the strongest conviction that the recommended change in the law would constitute an abdication by the Congress of its legislative responsibility in this area. Consequently, the committee modified the language so as to require an annual review by the President of the adequacy of military pay and allowances, together with a report to the Congress. However, the normal legislative process would continue to apply in order to effect a change in the rates of pays and allowances authorized uniformed services personnel.

The committee also incorporated in its legislative language a provision requiring a quadrennial review of the principles and concepts of military compensation. This broad review of the principles and concepts of the compensation system of uniformed personnel would be conducted by the President whenever he considered it appropriate, but in no event later than January 1, 1967, and not less than once each 4 years thereafter. This legislative provision, therefore, adopts the general concept recommended by both the President and the Folsom Panel.

This then, in brief, explains the provisions of H.R. 9075. It is a very carefully developed legislative recommendation which I hope and know will receive the unanimous approved of this body.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for an observation?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding to me for this observation, which is one I assure you that is not perfunctory nor idle but which I believe is demanded at this particular time. The only hesitancy I have in making the observation is because of the known affection which I have for the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, my colleague of almost a quarter of a century. Further, I believe it proper and fitting at this time, Mr. Chairman, that this House should recognize what is taking place at this particular moment.

Mr. Chairman, standing in the well of the House is the gentleman who has distinguished himself for almost 25 years in the cause of his country and in the cause of his own constituency.

Mr. Chairman, since the day he came to this Congress and since the day he first found himself on the old Naval Affairs Committee, the welfare of the individual man in uniform has been his mission in the Congress and in his life. His entire career has been dotted with legislation lending and tending to benefit that man in uniform. Calling to mind at the moment is the creation of the Dental Corps for the military which I believe is one of the finest pieces of legislation ever enacted in this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, it was he who in the last pay bill led the fight for readjustment of salaries of men in uniform. At that time he advocated, and he is advocating today, and only reluctantly submitted to the wisdom of his chairman and the desire of his chairman at that time, by indicating that at the first opportunity he would bring up the subject matter again. Today he finds himself in that position.

Today, Mr. Chairman, Members of this body witness here legislation in its purest form. Since the gentleman from South Carolina became the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services he has stood before you on two major pieces of legislation, both of which had his stamp and the stamp of his committee, but both were initiated in the manner of legislative business by the Defense Department.

Here today, my colleagues, stands the gentleman from South Carolina offering to us legislation to which he himself gave birth, which he himself nourished, which he himself persuaded the members of his committee, with few exceptions, to join him in presenting to this body, for he himself found his courage tested in a crucible which tests the mettle of any courageous man.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, on behalf of the Committee on Armed Services of the House I pause in this observation to pay a most sincere tribute to the leadership which has been demonstrated by the gentleman from South Carolina. Of course, critics may come and critics may go. But I believe that in the ultimate, leadership that has been demonstrated will continue to be demonstrated by the gentleman from South Carolina and will see these critics fade away into a pale insignificance, while his deeds and his actions remain.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from South Carolina, my dear friend for whom I have the deepest affection—and I believe expressing the sentiments and the feelings of every member of the House Committee on Armed Services, the joy that we feel today in seeing him here presenting to this House his first original major piece of legislation as chairman of the committee and thereby demonstrating so vigorously and so energetically his ability and his justification in leading us.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Of course I am deeply touched by the sentiments expressed by my dear colleague with whom I have labored for 25 years. But let me say, Mr. Chairman, in my time in this body I have not had a more dedicated group with which to work or a more indefatigable and tireless group of men motivated by only one thing—the service of our country—and to carry out the mandates of this body.

I have not asked this committee to do one thing which they have failed to do. We have worked days and nights on our legislation; even the new Members, Mr. Chairman, have worked. Everyone has responded, and by example they have inspired us who are charged with this responsibility.

I thank the gentleman from Louisiana from the very bottom of my heart.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my distinguished chairman, although I am not on the committee, we are proud of you in South Carolina, and throughout the Nation. People everywhere I go ask me what can be done to strengthen the military position of the United States of America in these critical days through which we are passing? I think the gentleman, my beloved colleague from South Carolina, and his great committee are answering that question here in the well of the House today.

We are committed in the Vietnam war, we are in South Vietnam in the monsoons and quagmires of southeast Asia to stop the aggressor in his tracks. We are on the road to Berlin, we are in Santo Domingo, we are committed all over the world. The gentleman and his great committee is giving that ruthless group the answer today.

You are strengthening the morale of our Armed Forces committed throughout the world.

I want to thank the gentleman and tell him that the American people are behind you and your great committee. This is the answer to those who would subvert and destroy our way of life.

This is a good bill, it is a fair bill, it is a psychologically important bill. We cannot stand idly by and see our Armed Forces drained of its power. This is the time to act, not react.

I commend the people for acting on behalf of the Armed Forces of our country committed throughout the world.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to join with those to whom the distinguished chairman of our committee yielded in paying due respect to a man who has performed nobly, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. His leadership has been exemplary.

May I say that he is an arduous worker. There was a time early in January when our committee met at 10 o'clock, then in February at 9 o'clock, then in March we started to meet at 8 o'clock. In April and May we came in at 7:30 o'clock. Now we even have meetings at 7 o'clock in the morning. I hope the gentleman from South Carolina will not hold meetings sooner than this fairly early hour.

Mr. Chairman, I fully concur in the remarks made by my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, in outlining the action of the Committee on Armed Services on H.R. 9075.

The members of the committee on my side of the aisle unanimously approve and endorse the bill as reported by the full Committee on Armed Services.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of this legislation. Its enactment is absolutely essential to the proper maintenance of our military forces. Our military leaders, and indeed our civilian Secretaries, have advised the Committee on Armed Services that they are faced with a constantly expanding problem in their efforts to attract and retain competent career personnel.

The pay increase for uniformed services personnel recommended by the Committee on Armed Services in H.R. 9075 averages 10.6 percent at a total cost approximating almost $1 billion annually.

Now, the Members of this House might very well say, "Did you not provide a substantial increase for military pay in 1963 and a minor adjustment in 1964, and was this not enough?"

The simple answer is—it was not enough.

My chairman has mentioned some of the background relating to the 1963 Pay Act. It was pointed out that the pay recommendations developed by the Department of Defense in the 1963 Pay Act were based upon studies made by the Department of all pay increases provided military personnel since 1952.

The studies made by the Department indicated there was indeed a wide disparity in the pay increases provided military personnel and Federal civilian personnel during the period. Unfortunately, the pay increases recommended by the Department, together with reductions forced upon the Committee on Armed Services because of budgetary limitations, resulted in a pay increase at that time which did not bridge the gap.

I have reference to the committee report at that time which stated:

> Even with the increases recommended in the proposed legislation, the average increase in total compensation for members of the uniformed services since 1952 will still be substantially less than the increases obtained by workers in the private economy and civil service employees (p. 2 of H. Rept. No. 208, 88th Cong., 1st sess., in H.R. 5555).

I was a member of the subcommittee which initially recommended a substantially higher pay increase for military personnel in 1963 than was reported by the full committee. The members of the subcommittee reluctantly accepted the action of the full committee since to do otherwise would have risked the possibility of a Presidential veto.

In short, we did not think the 1963 Pay Act would do the job. It is evident that it has not. Reenlistment and retention rates have simply continued to fall.

The committee report, on page 3, outlines the declining performance of the military departments in the recruitment and retention of enlisted personnel. This decline has been steady since 1962.

As a former paymaster in the Navy and as a Member of Congress I have been dealing with compensation problems for military personnel for over 25 years. I am convinced that the failure of the military departments to attract and retain the type personnel they desire is largely due to the inadequacy of their pay.

In 1962, the reenlistment rates for first term and career enlisted personnel in the entire Department of Defense were 57.3 percent.

In 1963, they declined to 53.1 percent.

In 1964, they declined to 50 percent.

In the first 6 months of 1965, they declined further to 48.2 percent.

The military departments had similar difficulty in attracting and retaining the type of officer personnel that they desire. For example, General Johnson, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, in his appearance before the Committee on Armed Services, stated:

> The Army's experience with the retention of junior officers for the fiscal years 1961–65 is as follows: * * * In fiscal year 1965 it is projected that only 2,523 will elect to stay on active duty compared to our minimum requirement of 3,616 from the total number eligible of 10,216. Failure to retain an adequate number of trained, experienced personnel is a serious handicap to the maintenance of operational readiness in our tactical units.

The Navy and the Air Force are also experiencing the same difficulty in retaining junior officer personnel. I am deeply concerned by the significant inability of the military departments to exercise the proper selectivity in the personnel who they accept as career officers and enlisted military personnel. It is inevitable that in the absence of any genuine opportunity for selectivity our military departments will be confronted with the inevitable development of mediocrity in both the commissioned and noncommissioned officers who are responsible for safeguarding our national security.

We cannot accept even the slightest possibility that our nuclear Navy—our supersonic Air Force—or our mobile Army—will be directed by mediocre commanders in the future. Therefore, a realistic increase in military compensation must be effected now.

The disparity between civil service and military compensation was graphically brought to the attention of the Committee on Armed Services during its hearings on the various military pay proposals. On page 2714 and 2715 of the printed hearings, General Johnson, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, identified the compensation differential provided an officer and enlisted man in South Vietnam as compared to a civil service employee.

Those figures indicate that an Army lieutenant colonel engaged in combat in South Vietnam with over 18 years of service receives a total annual compensation which is $6,000 less than a GS–14 with whom he is usually compared. On the same basis, an E–7 enlisted man with 18 years of service, receives $2,000 less than his counterpart, a GS–7. This difference is due to the allowances provided civilians in that area.

Is it any wonder, therefore, that the military departments are having difficulty retaining career military personnel?

The pay bill recommended by the Committee on Armed Services would provide an average increase of 10.6 percent in pay. However, this average does not tell the entire story. Actually, the committee's recommendations for increases are on a selective basis and, therefore, the percentage increases vary substantially. For example, officers with over 2 years of service would receive an average 6.4 percent increase in basic pay, while officers with less than 2 years of service would receive a 22-percent increase in basic pay.

Enlisted personnel with over 2 years of service would receive an average 11.1-percent increase in basic pay, while those with under 2 years of service would receive an average increase of 17.3 percent.

Now, I would like briefly to examine some of the rationale used by the committee in establishing the percentage increases recommended in H.R. 9075.

In the case of enlisted personnel with under 2 years of service the committee was aware that they had not received an increase in basic pay since 1952. During this interval the consumer price index had risen approximately 16.9 percent. Therefore, the committee provided an increase in basic pay for this group of personnel which would approximate the rise in the consumer price index. This increase, therefore, averaged 17.3 percent.

In the case of junior officer personnel the committee attempted to provide an entry salary for these personnel equivalent to the lowest salary paid college graduates who enter Federal civilian employment. College graduates who enter Federal civilian employment enter at the grade GS–7, which provides annual compensation amounting to $6,050. The increase in basic pay recommended by the committee for individuals entering military service as commissioned officers was 22 percent, which therefor permitted these individuals to enjoy annual compensation approximating $6,000 a year, which is equivalent to a grade GS–7.

Now, some may question the increases provided flag and general officers in this pay bill. Let me point out that in the Military Pay Act of 1963 flag and general officers received only a 5-percent increase in basic pay. This represented an average increase of less than 1 percent a year when prorated over the period since the 1963 pay increase. To illustrate the cumulative long-term effect of such increases, it is in order to point out that the basic compensation of one- and two-star officers has been increased since 1952 by 42.7 and 41.3 percent, respectively; whereas the salary increases which employees of the classified civil service in comparable grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18—the so-called supergrades—have been increased over the same period 63.8, 69.6, and 65.5 percent, respectively.

The effect of the increases provided these officers in H.R. 9075 is, therefore, simply to reduce such imbalances and to restore a more reasonable relationship in the pay increases provided for military and civilian personnel of roughly comparable levels of responsibility.

Now, why did not the Folsom panel reach the same conclusion concerning these disparities in military pay as arrived at by the Committee on Armed Services? The answer, as was briefly given to you by the chairman, is that they have failed to use the proper base year from which to begin their comparison and also the fact that the statistics provided them by the Department of Defense concerning previous military pay increases were unfortunately inaccurate.

The statistical evaluation of previous military pay increases utilized by the Folsom panel was analyzed by an independent actuary employed by the Committee on Armed Services. This actuary, whose report appears in its entirety as an appendix to the committee report on this bill, states categorically that the Department had overstated the percentage increase in compensation received by military personnel since 1949 by 28 percent for officers and 15 percent for enlisted personnel.

In view of the misinformation upon which the Folsom panel had based its recommendations, it is not surprising that the pay increases proposed for military personnel are grossly inadequate. However, it is interesting to note in passing that even if the Department of Defense statistics regarding base pay increases were utilized, enlisted personnel would require a wage adjustment comparable to that recommended by the committee in H.R. 9075 to make them whole.

For example, the index utilized by Secretary of Defense McNamara, measuring the increases in enlisted compensation since 1949, indicated that enlisted personnel had received compensation increases amounting to 65.6 percent, while at the same time, Classification Act clerical and technical personnel had received percentage wage increases amounting to 72.1 percent. These figures indicate a substantial shortfall in military pay adjustments. Using these same indexes, which overstate previous military pay increases, the increase recommended by the committee in H.R. 9075 would only raise these indexes for enlisted personnel to 73.5 percent, thus, for practical purposes, equating them to kindred workers in the Federal family of employees.

This illustrates further my inability to comprehend the Department of Defense's reluctance to support the military pay adjustments recommended by the Committee on Armed Services.

I could go on indefinitely to recount to the Members of this House the tremendous amount of evidence compiled by the committee supporting this pay adjustment. However, in the last analysis, we do not need a lot of fancy formulas to develop an appropriate wage increase. The only real test is whether the wage we are providing is getting the job done.

It is obvious to me, and I am certain to all of you, that we are not getting the job done. Let us get on with it and provide this increase to see whether it will accomplish our purpose. If it does not, obviously we will have to be back again and ask for more. Certainly, we cannot ask for less. Those fighting today in Vietnam are inspired patriots and others in the Armed Services are dedicated Americans as well. They are constantly reminded of the obligations of citizenship—let us remember that they have families to support.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN] as much time as he may require.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, we have too long indulged ourselves in false economy in the treatment of the military pay problem. We have broken faith with our service personnel. As our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, just pointed out, we have permitted pay scales to be increased far more in other segments of our economy than to those who have dedicated themselves to the service of our country. Quite apart from keeping faith with our people in uniform, however, the cold economic facts show that this failure to provide fair and equitable compensation is a gross practice of false economy.

Using the Air Force training costs as an example, the investment in training costs for an Air Force pilot is $96,000. It costs some $268,000 to train an F–1 pilot and $600,000 to train an F–105 pilot and more than $1 million to train a B–52 commander. The total investment cost of training just one electronics specialist is $23,000, one ballistic missiles launch officer $49,140.

The services in this complex missile-space age have an ever increasing requirement for officers trained in science and engineering. Likewise, the greatest requirement for enlisted personnel is in the technical fields.

It is in these very fields that the costs of training are the highest.

The Air Force alone spends $1,207 million to train replacements for the skilled men who leave.

Confronted with these figures, it takes no great venture in mathematics to prove that the failure to provide adequate compensation is false economy.

The existing military pay scale, in addition to creating problems in numbers of personnel, encourages mediocrity in quality. To use the Air Force as an example again, the inability to recruit adequate scientific and engineering officer personnel has led that service to reduce its standards. In 1959, 47 percent of the total officers entering the Air Force from ROTC were in the scientific and engineering category. By 1964, this percentage was reduced to 33. There has been a corresponding drop in the quality of officer candidates for the Air Force ROTC. In 1957, the average percentile score for entrance into the program was 63, but by 1962 this average had been reduced to 52.

Taking into account these staggering costs, we can readily see how foolhardy it is to maintain a pay scale that will neither attract nor retain skilled manpower.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the enactment of H.R. 9075 will enable the services to compete in the marketplace for qualified personnel. Comparing the costs of this pay bill with the staggering costs of training replacement personnel, the passage of H.R. 9075 is just plain economic commonsense.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to add my words of commendation to those expressed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] in applauding the actions and performance of the chairman of our great Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. Truer words were never spoken than those of the gentleman from Louisiana. In the short period since January, our chairman has demonstrated very clearly his ability to lead this great Armed Services Committee and do the kind of a job that we independently think should be done in the interest of our national security.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] the ranking member of our committee, has likewise made a great contribution in behalf of our committee and I applaud both of them for the actions they have taken and the leadership displayed.

As I stand here I note with interest that a former Member of Congress is in our midst, who at one time was chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Dewey Short, of Missouri. Dewey Short did a splendid job as chairman of our committee when he was with us. I wish, Mr. Chairman, there was some way we could permit the gentleman from Missouri to now speak for 10 minutes so that he might in his own way emphasize to the House his support and loyalty to the Armed Services of our country. His presence here indicates his continuing interest to that end.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask all my colleagues, in preparing to vote on this most vital piece of legislation, to keep their eyes on the doughnut and not the hole. There has been emphasis here, naturally enough, on the disagreement with the executive branch and the dollar differences.

But let us keep in mind the agreements. And let us keep in mind where the differences lie.

Everyone agrees a military pay raise is needed. The committee agrees to that, the pay panel agrees to that, the Defense Department agrees to that—an even our prodigal son, the gentleman from New York, who filed a minority report agrees to that.

Everyone agrees that there should be an attempt at comparability of military pay with pay of civil servants and pay in private industry.

Everyone agrees there should be a variable reenlistment bonus to spur retention of enlisted men in critical skills.

Everyone agrees there should be an annual pay review to assure that the military does not again fall seriously behind other groups.

Everyone agrees that the pay of draftees, of enlisted men with less than 2 years service, should be raised for the first time in 13 years. And the prodigal son from New York is with the committee all the way on that one.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is no disagreement that there should be a pay bill. The question is: How much?

Now, where do the differences lie?

The administration feels that following annual review it should have authority to increase salaries automatically, subject to a 60-day veto period for Congress. The committee feels that the responsibility of deciding whether or not there will be a pay raise lies with the Congress and in all cases requires legislation. I do not think this House is going to have much difficulty deciding its constitutional responsibilities on this point.

The committee believes there should be a decent raise for men with less than 2 years service who have not had a pay increase since 1952. The administration proposed only a 2.7 percent increase for them. The difference in cost is approximately $150 million. Let me just point out two facts about the Department of Defense position on this point: In 1963, Defense recommended pay increases ranging from 9 to 30.8 percent for men with less than 2 years service. No increases were approved by Congress. There were no increases for enlisted men with less than 2 years service in 1964. But this year, the Defense Department came back and recommended only 2.7 percent for the under 2-year men. Secretary McNamara frankly told the committee that the 2.7 percent represents the increase in cost of living since 1963. They just forgot the cost of living increase from 1952 to 1965.

Where is the rest of the difference? You have probably heard it mentioned already that 88 percent of the difference is in the pay of enlisted personnel. Let us look more closely.

For officers with more than 2 years service, the difference between the administration proposal and the bill reported by the committee is only $31 million.

For enlisted men with over 2 years service, the career enlisted men, the difference is $374 million. This is where the big difference lies—in the pay of the career enlisted ranks.

Leaving out the top two enlisted grades, E–9 and E–8, which account for only about $11 million of the difference, the enlisted pay raises range from about $15 to $57 a month under the committee bill for the bulk of career men, from $5 to $18 a month under the administration proposal.

Your committee found that the President's Pay Panel based its low pay raise proposal for this group of career enlisted men on the erroneous assumption that there is no retention problem in the enlisted ranks. We found a serious retention problem, attested to by the leaders of all services, attested to by Defense's own request for special reenlistment bonuses.

Your committee found the President's Panel based its recommendations on the erroneous assumption that pay legislation in 1963 brought these men up to comparability with civil servants. The panel took no cognizance of how military pay had fallen behind since 1952.

Military pay stood still from 1958 to late 1963, while civil servants received raises in 1960, 1962, and at the beginning of 1964.

Mr. Chairman, it comes down to a simple question. Is this House going to turn its back on the career enlisted man?

I do not think it will.

When the vote comes tomorrow, I hope the bill will pass unanimously, but if not unanimous—then almost so. This is indeed a good, objective legislative proposal.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the President's Pay Panel report states that "in recent years the armed services have met with increasing success in attracting and retaining high quality military personnel." I am certain that every person in this Chamber wishes that were true. I am equally certain that the facts are almost directly opposite. Time after time discussions with high ranking witnesses on the military appropriations bill told of the serious retention problems which are now being experienced. Secretary McNamara, Secretary Zuckert, Secretary Nitze, Secretary Ailes, all told of the increasing difficulties of the services in keeping the type of trained personnel who are needed. In an effort to encourage enlistments, there has been a lowering of voluntary enlistment standards—something which always is done with reluctance.

The present turnover in personnel is much higher than that in any private business. This is clearly an indication that military careers are not as attractive as they should be. As a result, the Government is paying out $3.5 billion a year in costs of procuring and retraining replacements, largely for those who drop out of the military services. I think it obvious that retention of trained persons is the No. 1 problem throughout the Department of Defense. If the bill now before the House should reduce by one-third the cost of securing and training new personnel, the Government would have to make a profit on the pay raise which is proposed.

There is another side to this question which disturbs me very much. For a long time we have been concerned with competition by industry for military personnel. There is now a new problem—that of competition for personnel by the economic opportunity program—the poverty program. There are cases where it is more advantageous financially to join the poverty program than it is to join the military services, and, in addition, it is safer and less exacting. For them, there are no Vietcong bullets. To join the military a man must meet basic requirements of mental and physical competence that the average Job Corps enrollee would fail. But, if the Job Corps enrollee uses his training as a way to qualify for enlistment, he will have to take a pay cut to join the military service.

This is not a matter to be taken lightly. We cannot afford a decline in armed services enlistment. Yet enlistments are down. And now there is competition at both ends of the line for the men who are needed in uniform. A sense of high value is imperative in the training of our youth. We are not encouraging this sense of values when we place a premium on nonachievement.

Even unemployment compensation in some States pays more than military service. Unemployment compensation in New York State pays an unemployed person $50 per week for no productive work, and it is tax free. This totals $216 per month for no hours of work. A Polaris submarine 3d class petty officer, with submarine pay, base pay, and all allowances, working 70 to 80 hours a week at sea—on station for America—earns $192.10 per month and pays taxes as well.

The director of the laboratories in the New York Naval Shipyard is a captain earning less than $12,000 per year. His civilian assistant, a GS-16 earns $24,175 per year. The captain also has 150 other civilian employees who earn more than he does. Something is wrong.

There is still another side. American servicemen are exposed to mounting dangers all over the world. There is for America a new responsibility for carrying forward the torch of freedom. No longer do the British, the French, the Dutch, or other world powers bear the brunt of conflict when fighting is required. The American serviceman is the one who must stand guard over freedom's portals and the casualty lists are mounting. This is only the beginning.

How do you pay a man for this? What kind of value do you place on the life of a man in uniform? Can you compensate him for the dangers he must incur for you and for America? Do you really think for a moment you are compensating him properly even in those instances when he is only required to stand ready to incur the risks of war? No one can say what tomorrow may bring. Isn't it time that we make his life and that of his family a little better and a little happier? Now—while there is time.

Approval of the Rivers bill—it is the same bill that I and many others have introduced—with an immediate effective date, will be a long step forward in improving the attractiveness of career military service. The Nation owes a big debt of gratitude to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, for his courageous and worthy fight for America's servicemen. He is helping to reestablish also the image of a strong and respected Congress.

I congratulate him and I congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished minority leader of the committee, who also has done outstanding work. I congratulate the Committee on Armed Services that so ably and effectively backs their work for a stronger defense—for a stronger America and for a stronger free world.

Please remember, my colleagues, the military man has no lobby to speak for him. He has to wait and hope that injustice and inequities will be eliminated or eased. Here is our chance to place a new premium on the picture of career military service. Here today is a way to reward those who are safeguarding the safety of our Nation in these times of continuing peril.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentleman of the House, at the very outset I want to state I consider it a distinct privilege and honor to serve on the committee that is led and chairmaned by so distinguished a gentleman as the gentleman from South Carolina. I am most proud and happy to serve on the committee with him. When the Nation's history is written it will be written that the gentleman from South Carolina is without a doubt the greatest chairman that the GI's have ever had in the history of the Congress of the United States.

Let us consider the income level set by the authorities in our Government as income needed to support a family of four so as not to be classified as at a poverty level. That is $3,000. Using that as a standard of income, I believe it is a tragedy when we pause to reflect that nearly one-third of the members of our Armed Forces are living in a state of poverty. We have a condition in this country under which one-third of the members of our Armed Forces are forced to moonlight—that is, to hold a second or even a third or even a fourth job—in order to support their families, or they must send their wives out to work so that they can pay their bills while in the Armed Forces trying to defend our country, or they must sponge or borrow or get money in some other manner from parents, sisters, brothers, or in-laws in order to remain in service so that they can serve their country, merely to pay their bills.

When a condition such as that prevails I believe it is high time for the Congress of the United States to pause and reflect on the condition.

Our great martyred President, in his inaugural address, stated:

> Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask instead what you can do for your country.

I should like to elaborate a little more fully on this and to give you more specific details on the point brought out by the gentleman from Florida. There is a condition prevailing in this country under which those who are doing something for their country—doing the supreme, offering their lives—are paid less than those who are letting the country do something for them. I refer to the condition which exists in regard to our poverty program.

When the Defense Department authorities appeared before our committee I brought out the point that a dropout or a juvenile delinquent can actually get more pay from the Government than a member of the Armed Forces who is drafted into the service. The members of the Defense Department denied those figures. They said, "That is not true."

I should like to document those figures and put them in the Record, to show this is actually true and that a juvenile delinquent or a dropout who joins the Job Corps receives more.

I know of a case of two brothers. One was a valedictorian of his class. He is now in the Armed Forces. His brother, who was 1 year younger, was a juvenile delinquent who beat up his mother, beat up his teacher, and even tried to beat up the sheriff. That juvenile delinquent in the Job Corps today is getting more money than his brother who was drafted into the Armed Forces.

When a condition like that prevails I believe the Congress of the United States ought to do something about it. This bill proposes to do something about it.

I should like to answer the material which was put into the RECORD, whereby the Defense Department authorities stated it was not true that the juvenile delinquents are getting more money than the enlisted people in our Armed Forces, particularly those with 1 year of service.

I should like to clarify this once and for all and to put this into the RECORD, so that Members may examine it.

During the course of committee hearings on the proposed pay increase for military personnel, a great deal of discussion was had concerning the comparative pays of enrollees in the Job Corps as contrasted to that provided recruits in the military departments.

Defense Department witnesses, in response to a question concerning this comparison, included in the record on pages 2567–8 a comparative breakdown on compensation paid these personnel. On the basis of the comparison presented by the Secretary of Defense one might well receive the impression that entrants into military service do, in fact, receive greater compensation than that provided Job Corps enrollees.

Unfortunately, when one inspects these figures with a critical eye, it is evident that this is not the case.

Let us examine the first comparative table used by Defense Department witnesses on page 2567. Here we find that in the first 12 months a typical soldier will receive a total annual compensation of $1,875.40, whereas a typical enrollee for the same period will receive $1,871.78. Now the first basic error in this comparison is that in the case of the typical soldier the Department has moved him from pay grade E–1 to pay grades E–2 and E–3 within the 12-month period. However, for some strange reason the Department has failed to move the typical enrollee beyond his original classification as an enrollee. Now, if we are speaking of a typical enrollee, as we are a typical soldier, certainly we expect him to receive the additional increase in compensation which is available to him after 3 months of training, $10 a month. and 2 months later another additional increase of $10 a month—20 percent of Job Corps enrollees eligible for promotion to assistant leader after 3 months and 10 percent eligible for promotion to leader after a total of 5 months. Unfortunately the comparison does not reflect these increases for the typical enrollee.

Another important deficiency in the comparison provided the committee by the Defense Department is the failure to include, except as a footnote, the supplementary payment of $25 a month that is provided Job Corpsmen. This amounts to $300 a year, which will thus raise the annual compensation of a typical Job Corps enrollee to $2,171.78. Thus, this omission alone results in a $300 short-fall in the pay of a typical soldier as compared to a typical enrollee—60 percent executive allotment.

It is also interesting to note that the Defense Department charges every typical soldier with an annual retirement accrual cost of $53.69, whereas no similar charge for retirement or disability benefits is provided for the Job Corpsman. However, section 106(c)(1) of Public Law 88–452 specifically provides that Job Corps enrollees will be covered for disability and death compensation under the provisions of the Federal Employees Compensation Act at an assumed pay of $150 monthly. Now, since the Defense Department is so anxious to identify every cost for a typical soldier, I would imagine that he would be similarly interested in identifying the comparable cost for a Job Corps enrollee. Again, unfortunately, the computer overlooked this part of a Job Corps enrollee's compensation.

It is inconceivable to me that today a young recruit who meets the high standards of the armed services will receive less pay than that provided a dropout recruited by the Job Corps. To use the terms of the late President Kennedy, we are paying less to the one who is doing something for his country than to the one who is letting his country do something for him.

The bill before you today, H.R. 9075, will provide a substantial increase in compensation to the recruit entering the military. On the basis of the advancement of a typical recruit in the military as indicated by the Department of Defense, the annual dollar increase in pay for the typical soldier under H.R. 9075 will be $260.52. Thus, after enactment of the bill, a typical soldier will, in the first 12 months, receive compensation amounting to $2,135.92 rather than the $1,875.40 presently payable to him.

I urge your support of this bill.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, support H.R. 9075. The Committee on Armed Services has worked hard. It has come up with a fair and equitable bill and I think the House can approve it without change and with good conscience.

I would like particularly to emphasize one aspect of this bill which has not received much attention. That is simply the fact that members of the Reserve and the National Guard share on an equal basis in the benefits of this bill. Military reserve pay, both for active duty training and for weekly drills, is based on present active duty rates. This will continue to be so under H.R. 9075.

Mr. Chairman, it is extremely difficult for the Congress to get across to the Secretary of Defense that we want fair and equitable treatment for our military reservists. In its proposed pay bill of 1963, the Defense Department excluded reservists and national guardsmen from the raise. The Armed Service Committee and, subsequently, the Congress revised the bill so that reservists were included as they had always been in the past. The Congress made clear it supports the principle of basing reserve pay on the latest active duty rates.

In 1964, when the Defense Department submitted its 2½-percent military pay raise bill, it excluded reservists. The Congress again rejected that approach and included reservists in the bill. But again this year in submitting the pay proposals, the Defense Department tried once more to exclude reservists. Our distinguished chairman, in his colorful way, said during our hearings that "there is no education in the second kick from a mule."

It would appear that for the Department of Defense there is no education at all on principles laid down by the Congress.

The members of the Reserve components have been buffeted around quite a bit by the present leadership of the Pentagon. They seem to have an almost fierce passion for reorganizing, reducing, and underpaying reservists. The cost savings that would be affected by leaving Reserve drill pay out of the pay bill would be miniscule.

Mr. Chairman, I can think of no way to more effectively damage the readiness of our Reserve units than to tell them that they are not important enough to share in the latest pay increases. I know of no quicker way to create second-class status for the reservists than to tell them they are second class and pay them second-class rates.

Just recently, a distinguished Senator of high rank on the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees urged the Secretary of Defense to make an immediate review of the Defense budget to see if significant additions are not required—the Senator suggested that the Defense Secretary request a supplemental appropriation of some $1 billion—because of our additional worldwide commitments, notably in Vietnam and Santo Domingo. Who of us can say what our military requirements will be a year from now if the world situation moves closer toward that black future which some predict? Who of us can say that within that year we may not have to call some of our Reserve units back to active duty again? In such a world, many of us believe it is foolhardy to greatly reduce the size of our Reserve, as the Defense Department planned to do. I hope all of us will agree that it would be doubly foolhardy to reduce the pay, and therefore the morale and readiness, of the remaining Reserve units we do have. Let us make it crystal clear to the Department of Defense that the Congress wants to continue the historic practice of basing Reserve pay on present active duty pay scales.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, our colleagues on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee are now considering the proposed pay increases for our Federal civil service employees, as recommended to us by the President, based on the report of his Panel on Federal Pay. I am not knowledgeable as to the details of the current deliberations by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. However, I do know that the members of the committee will do their usual thorough and comprehensive job. The President has initiated a strong program to insure that our Federal civil service is an attractive and rewarding career which will draw topflight people. I give my full support to this program of the President. I am sure that the Congress will support, as a minimum, the civilian pay increases currently recommended by the President. The Congress has done so frequently in the past 20 years.

Unfortunately, in my opinion, we have not been quite as munificient with our military personnel as we have with our Federal civil service. The administration maintains that its proposed civilian and military pay increases which we are now considering will continue an already achieved comparability between the two and with the civilian economy. The detailed hearings recently concluded by our Armed Services Committee have proved that this is just not so. Our own actuarial studies support this conclusion.

Notwithstanding the claims of the administration, compensation for our military personnel has fallen behind that of our Federal civilians, and markedly behind that of their contemporaries throughout the American business and industrial community. If the Congress approves the civilian and military compensation levels now proposed by the committee, we will be going a long way toward eliminating the now existing disparity between military and civilian compensation.

I believe that the military pay scales recommended by our committee are the very minimum required to put our military personnel of all grades and ranks on a par with their civilian contemporaries. I also believe that, through our own fault, we have allowed this disparity to develop and to be maintained. We have therefore incorporated provisions into our bill which will prevent such an unfortunate situation in the future. The requirement for annual study and recommended adjustments, and for quadrennial comprehensive review and recommendations by the administration, will restore military compensation to the place it rightfully deserves.

Mr. Chairman, I join with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services in recommending unanimous approval of this legislation without amendment.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, according to the Bible, it is reported that there is more rejoicing in Heaven for one sheep who is lost and is found again than for the 90 and 9 who never strayed from the fold in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether this admonition applies as well to the distinguished Committee on the Armed Services, but I take this time, Mr. Chairman, to advise the Members of the House that as the one member of the committee who voted against reporting this legislation from the committee to the House, I rise now to indicate my intention to vote for this measure and to support it.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to lead in the rejoicing of the return of this sheep back into the fold.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Hallelujah.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank my friend from Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, Members are aware of the fact that at the time the vote was taken in the committee I drafted certain minority views and circulated these views to the membership of the House. Those views are also contained at the present time in the committee report on page 63.

Mr. Chairman, because these views are set forth in some detail and because they have already been circulated, I do not believe there is any particular point in reiterating them at this time, except to emphasize, first of all, the point that I made in those views; namely, that as a member of the committee and as one who has spent some time in the armed services myself, I am not opposed and was not opposed to a pay increase. The only question that seemed to be before our committee and before the House of Representatives this year was simply the question as to what kind of a pay increase we were going to give and how much that increase would be.

Mr. Chairman, very frankly I felt that the alternative offered by the President was a better approach, that it was fairer in the long run to the members of the services and fairer to the taxpayer as well. Therefore, I cast the lone vote against the committee bill simply because I felt if the administration itself and the leadership of the House desired to have an opportunity to fight for the President's position, they should have that opportunity. I felt that the President's proposal deserved to be fairly and fully considered by the House. But I said very clearly then that if the decision was made not to make that fight, then because I was after all in favor of an increase, I intended to support the Rivers bill, H.R. 9075.

That, of course, is the situation that has now developed. There is no intention on the part of the leadership, I am informed, to fight for the administration alternative. The intention instead will be to have the bill go over to the other body. Presumably there will be some adjustment in the resulting conference that will bring the final measure somewhat closer to the President's position, and I think it is entirely likely to predict that there will be an increase of 7 or 8 percent in military pay. That figure would be fair to our people, and it would be a compromise between the committee and the President. It is also a figure I would gladly support. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I will support the bill and intend to make no effort to amend it or defeat it.

There are two other reasons for my action I might indicate. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] indicated one of them a moment ago. The first reason is that with the stepped-up fighting in Vietnam, the increase in draft calls and the possibility of a callup of our Reserves, I think it would be somewhat unseemly at this time to quibble over the pay of our armed services.

The second point is, as the gentleman from Illinois has pointed out, there are increasing indications that some kind of a compromise is being worked out in the field of pay for civil service and postal employees, so that this year their pay would be increased about 5 percent with a further commitment for one or two additional increases in subsequent years.

One of the points which the committee made, and one on which I have always been in agreement, is that there is a lag between military pay and civil service pay. Certainly it would be unfair to support an increase in military pay which would be exactly the same as that now being proposed for civil service personnel. Therefore, if the civil service pay is going to go up by 5 percent, we certainly ought to support a still larger boost for the military, because of this past lag.

I am still somewhat unhappy about the way in which we handle various pay bills here in Congress, both in the military and the civilian fields. Our experience this year has well demonstrated the need for us to put pay on a regular, predictable, and rational basis, so that we can move in a scientific fashion from year to year to provide those regular increases that may be necessary to keep Government pay in line with civilian pay on the outside.

The committee has incorporated into H.R. 9075 a number of features recommended by the President that would move us in this direction. In adopting this legislation today I hope these features will help us move more quickly toward the day when pay matters can be handled on this regular, predictable, and rational basis, so that the members of the armed services, and for that matter the civilian employees of the Government too will not have to live on a feast or famine basis.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude by paying tribute to the chairman of our committee for his fairness and courtesy in having had to bear over these past months with one lost sheep in the herd. He has given me every opportunity to express my views and to make my position known to the committee though my position was diverged from his. I respect his courtesy and his fairness. I do not think he has ever had any doubt, and certainly I never had any doubt, that when it comes to the basic issue behind this bill, namely, the desire to build a strong, effective and successful military force in this country, we are all united together.

I feel sure that this bill will contribute toward this objective, and for this reason I intend to support it.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am very happy to yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for his change of point of view and his decision to support this legislation. Neither I nor any member of the committee has ever questioned the high motives of the gentleman. Nobody ever accused him of doing anything but having arrived at his own convictions and conclusions in a most laudatory and commendable manner. I thank him for his statement. I want to say to him neither I nor any member of the committee has ever had any disagreement with him because he had the temerity to disagree. Surely, I hope he can disagree with me and I do not have to be disagreeable to him. We welcome you aboard and thank you for your statement. I do not regard the gentleman as a lost sheep. I think he is as white as the driven snow and we welcome you home. Now stay with us, for our committee has use for unanimity and we do not feel good when anybody is not with us. We welcome you back. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for his very generous remarks. It has been and continues to be an honor to serve under his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] 5 minutes.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to associate myself with the remarks made earlier by our distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] concerning our chairman. Not only is he the champion of servicemen, but it is fortunate for our committee and it is fortunate for the Congress and it is fortunate for the country to have him as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services during these trying times. He is a tireless worker. He is strong in his zeal to build the best possible Defense Establishment. He is strong in his zeal not only to safeguard the prerogatives of the Congress but to see that the Congress properly and effectively carries out its responsibilities to the Nation with respect to our Military Establishment.

Mr. Chairman, I am really happy and pleased to be working closely with our distinguished chairman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 9075, represents the carefully considered judgment of the committee—taking into full account the views of the administration. It is, we believe, as equitable an adjustment of military pay scales as can be worked out at this time.

In President Johnson's message to the Congress of May 12, 1965, transmitting his proposed pay legislation for Federal civilian employees and uniformed members, he said:

> We do not have two standards of what makes a good employer in the United States, one standard for private enterprise and another for the Government. A double standard which puts the Government employee at a comparative disadvantage is shortsighted; in the long run it costs more.

H.R. 9075 provides a basic pay increase averaging twice that which the President recommended for military personnel, the difference is soundly justified the committee believes—even by the administration's ground rules. The recent history of civil service pay increases reflects an average increase of 46 percent since 1952. The two raises in the calendar year 1964, amounted to more than 8 percent.

Perhaps studies now going on may show that wage rates in private employment suggest the present need for additional adjustments in civil service pay rates and retirement benefits, but without regard to this, to even approach comparability, we must enact the bill before us.

Our servicemen have received an average 34-percent increase since 1952. The last pay increase for the military in 1964 was only 2.5 percent of base pay in comparison to over 8 percent granted civil employees that same year. These figures speak for themselves. H.R. 9075 is needed simply to restore comparable pay to the 1964 level.

The President stated that we have not achieved full comparability by the standards adopted by the Congress in 1962 and this is supported in detail in the Folsom Panel report. This is a time when high morale in the military services is most important—and high morale will contribute to higher reenlistment rates and thereby reduce training costs. And you can be sure that morale will get a boost from a pay raise that will put the military personnel on a comparable basis with civilian personnel, the average salary of the classified civil service employee after his 1964 pay raise is $7,368 annually. The average military salary equivalent, including his food and housing and whatever tax advantage exists, is $4,477 annually. These figures directly reflect the extent of difference in the buying power between civilian and military personnel. The proposed increase for our serviceman will raise his average annual salary equivalent by $314 to a total of $4,791. Certainly no one can consider this an extravagant increase.

I urge your support for H.R. 9075.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, like the other members of the House Committee on Armed Services, I would like to say what a pleasure it is to serve with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] as chairman of this great committee. I feel that I have been exposed to more of the decisionmaking process which produces military policy under his regime than in my entire 13 years as a Member of the Congress. I deeply appreciate this and I am proud that the Committee on Armed Services is fulfilling the legislative function which the Constitution of the United States intends that it should have. And in this age there is great need for a Congress which fulfills its constitutional responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, this is the age of the statistician. The eyes no longer have it. We are not to believe our eyes and the evidence of our senses, but only what the statisticians tell us.

Listening to Secretary McNamara and his minions testifying before our committee on this pay bill, I found myself thinking of the story of Pat, the Irishman, who was hit by a truck. And, as he lay in the road, the doctor came and examined him and pronounced him dead. Pat opened his eyes and said, "By all the Saints in Ireland I'm not dead." The doctor examined him again and said, "This man is dead." Pat looked at his friend, Mike, and said, "Mike, tell them I'm not dead." And Mike said, "Pat, my boy, lie down, the doctor knows best."

Secretary McNamara presented a string of statistics to prove to enlisted men that they are not underpaid. Of course they all know they are underpaid and, particularly, their wives know they are underpaid. And that is why the well-trained ones are not reenlisting. You can fool some of the people some of the time, but Secretary McNamara cannot fool the good wives of our servicemen with his statistical pyrotechnics.

It has been said that a statistician is a man who determines that if you have one hand in the fire and the other hand in a pitcher of iced water, on the whole you should be reasonably comfortable. Secretary McNamara's statisticians go through the exercise of telling enlisted men that because they are going to get retired pay 20 or more years from now, and because they will get all sorts of benefits if they die, they are therefore reasonably comfortable while they are living right now.

Mr. Chairman, there is a sentence in the report of the Wyatt Co.—the actuaries who analyzed Defense's statistics for our committee— which should be tattooed on the forehead of all the employees on Secretary McNamara's staff. It reads as follows:

> In any case mature judgment need not take a back seat to any arcane actuarial formulas. The appropriateness of the military compensation levels will continue to be measured in the long run by their ability to attract new recruits and retain the best military personnel in service within the framework of any budget limitations on aggregate compensation and any estimated military manpower requirements.

Mr. Chairman, it is remarkable how often the people, some members of the press, and even some Members of the Congress, are overawed by the razzle-dazzle of statistics. It is dismaying how often the newspapers will quote statistics on cost savings and other programs without analyzing them to see if they are valid. The Members of this House do not have to deny the evidence of their senses. The Members of this House know there is a retention problem. The Members of this House know that servicemen are underpaid. You all know enlisted men from your home districts. You all know parents of enlisted men in your home districts. You all know that you and your constituents have always realized that these enlisted men are on the low rung of the economic ladder.

We have had cases in the last 2 years of enlisted families being eligible for relief or surplus food program. We know that a high percentage of enlisted men "moonlight" and that a high percentage of service wives work. We know that the average boys in our district who come home from service soon make a good deal more money than they made in service and rarely show any desire to go back into service. We all know that our draftees have not had a pay raise since 1952. We all know that we could probably not name another section of the economy that has gone that long without an increase in pay. We all know that both the cost of living and the American standard of living have gone up markedly since 1952. We know from figures presented to our committee that the number of hardship discharges has increased about 25 percent over the last 2 years. We have all been besieged with letters from servicemen about a pay raise. The President's Pay Panel invited opinions from servicemen and got something on the order of 35,000 letters—which in many cases they did not even read. We know the Secretary of the Navy recently put out a special plea asking all officers and enlisted men to extend their periods of active duty. We have had testimony from the military and civilian heads of all departments that they had a retention problem. We have the draft. We found that just a discussion of the possibility of ending the draft seriously hurt recruiting in all services. We have had the frank admission by Defense Department people themselves that the cost of ending the draft would be something on the order of $5 billion additional every year. We have the Defense Department's request for an additional reenlistment bonus to spur retention.

We know all these things, and yet we have the Secretary of Defense with a lot of statistical razzle-dazzle telling our committee that the average serviceman is not underpaid.

We have all this evidence before our eyes and yet we have the President's Pay Panel telling us there is no retention problem.

They do it all with mirrors. The President's Pay Panel, made up largely of high-level Federal civilian officials who have no responsibility for, or knowledge of, the running of the military departments, attempted to prove there is no retention problem with a set of statistics showing that the mental level of enlisted men and the percentage of high school graduates in enlisted ranks had improved and that the percentage of officers with college degrees had risen. Gen. Omar N. Bradley—who was the only military man to get within earshot of the Pay Panel—and whom, I suspect, knows a good deal more about what the Army needs than the Postmaster General or the Secretary of Labor—demolished the Panel's ridiculous reasoning in one paragraph. He pointed out that the Army had raised the mental standards in 1960—a step necessitated, incidentally, by the increasing complexity of military weapons. The Panel had said that 87 percent of enlisted men were in the top three mental groups during the 1960 to 1964 period, compared with only 78.2 percent in the 1952 to 1959 period. As General Bradley explained, they did not bother to point out that the Army had stopped taking the lowest category mental group in 1960. The Panel said that the percentage of enlisted men who were high school graduates increased from 55 percent in 1956 to 72 percent in 1963. General Bradley pointed out that in the population as a whole between those years the total of high school graduating classes rose 37 percent. The Panel tried to show improvement in officer quality by stating that the percentage of college graduates in the officer corps rose from 55 percent in 1956 to over 70 percent today. General Bradley merely pointed out that in 1956 there were still many officers who had been called up during World War II or Korea, most of whom have since been replaced by recent college graduates.

The President's Pay Panel made this flat statement:

> Congressional action in 1962, 1963, and 1964 placed military compensation at a level in relation to civilian pay level sufficient to attract and retain adequate numbers and quality of personnel in the Armed Forces.

They made no effort to support this statement except to present the education figures I have just mentioned.

Mr. Chairman, this is a beautiful example of doublethink. If pay levels are sufficient to attract adequate numbers and quality of personnel, why do we need the draft? Why does the President propose a variable reenlistment bonus which would pay up to four times additional bonus to men with scarce skills? Why does the Defense Department, in urging this special bonus, say "in these skills, additional reenlistment incentives are clearly needed"? Why have requests for hardship discharges increased? Why did the Secretary of the Navy plead with people to extend their enlistments? Why did the heads of all the services submit figures during our committee's annual posture hearings which illustrated their retention problems? War is peace, freedom is slavery, ignorance is strength, the draft is voluntary. Doublethink all the way. But they did have a pretty set of statistics—and so they believed them.

It has been pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that a Job Corps enrollee gets more pay than a private or seaman recruit in the service. In his testimony before our committee, the Secretary of Defense said no, this was not so. His analysis, and his figures, showed that the serivceman actually got more. And he included a set of statistics to prove it. As usual, of course, the figures included all conceivable benefits, such as death benefits, but that is not point. When Mr. McNamara added up all of his figures, assuming they were justified, what did they show? They showed a total annual income for the military enlistee of $1,875.40 and a total annual income for the Job Corps lad of $1,871.78—a difference of $3.62. Now, what is remarkable is that Mr. McNamara's people felt they had disproved the point and that everything was fine because they had shown statistically that a draftee had a total annual income greater than the Job Corps enrollee. But what had they actually shown? They had shown that the draftee—who was brought into service by compulsion, who may be ordered to Vietnam where he would get shot at, who has to be physically fit, who has to be above the category IV mental group, who may have been otherwise capable of getting himself a well-paying job—this draftee is getting exactly $3.62 more a year than the Job Corps enrollee who is probably a high school dropout and is experiencing adjustment problems.

Mr. Chairman, this is an example of how thoroughly intelligent men can lose themselves in statistics, and of how a passion for figures can block out a concern for equitable treatment of human beings.

Beyond that, Mr. Chairman, there is also the question of how valid the figures are. They tell the story of the mountaineer who came down to the village and went to the grocery store to pay his monthly bill. When the grocer read it to him, he said, "That is too much." And the grocer said, "Well, look at the books. Figures do not lie." And the mountaineer said, "Figures do not lie, but liars sure do figure." In making his equation comparing Job Corps enrollees and draftees, the Secretary of Defense left out of the totals the optional allotment that the Job Corps boy can make to his parents. This allotment would add $300 to the annual cost of the enrollee. About 60 percent of the enrollees make the allotment.

In arriving at his conclusion that enlisted men are paid as much as the average male high school graduate, the Secretary of Defense used the system which takes in all compensation; that is, fringe benefits as well as base pay. For the civilians, they added a flat percentage on to the base pay, using a figure that the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Social Security Administration say are the national average. For the military, the Secretary included the actual cost of all fringe and special benefits of military personnel—in effect taking the total cost and dividing it by the number of people in the service. Is this equitable? Does this statistical approach give a true picture of what the man gets? Well, in the first place, Mr. Chairman, it should be mentioned that out of the total compensation cost figure of $16 million which is used to get average military income, only $7.8 billion is basic pay. So, to strike an average all are being credited with pay that only a few get. Proficiency pay, for example, only goes to a small percentage of enlisted men. Not all men get hazardous duty pay or sea pay or hostile-fire pay or family separation allowances. Thus, here is a real question as to whether an average figure has any meaning. Of course, we can understand the Secretary was trying to strike an average and that these were benefits for which men were eligible. And, admittedly, in the civilian economy too the cost of fringe benefits includes some things that are not reflected in actual income, such as cost of insurance. However, the Secretary's list for military men has an unusually large number of items that do not accrue to the average individual. In addition, the use of some items in the equation is very questionable indeed. For example, all men are credited with a small amount of income because of the annual expense of burial costs. Suppose a man is assigned to Vietnam and gets killed. Can you picture an official explaining to a serviceman's widow that his active duty pay was reduced while he was alive, by however a small amount, because of the burial cost or because of the cost of the death gratuity that the Government pays to his widow after his death in combat?

The most expensive element by far in the supplemental benefits is military retirement. Leaving aside that 90 percent of the men who go through military service never stay until retirement, and leaving aside such considerations as the fact that a man cannot possibly get both retirement and a burial though some reduction is made in his pay, for both, there are fundamental questions as to how to credit retirement in computing the value of a man's pay. The members of our committee, simple folk that we are, made a reduction equivalent to a 6½-percent contribution because we wanted to put the man on par with the civil servant who contributes 6½ percent and we wanted to be fair to the individual. On this point the Secretary of Defense engaged in his most remarkable statistical gyrations. I would hold up his equation for computing retired costs for you, but I'm afraid the Chamber is not wide enough to show it all.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who were raised in happier times, when two and two still equaled four, do not pretend to understand the Secretary's algebraic acrobatics. But it seemed to us the retirement factor that he had arrived at was extraordinarily high. For example, all servicemen suffer a reduction in their active duty pay because of the amounts cranked into the retirement factor to pay for disability retirements. By contrast, disabilities of civil service employees are paid under the Federal Employees Compensation Act, or other workmen's compensation laws, and are not charged to the civil service retirement system.

Secretary McNamara, himself, suggested that if we did not accept his figures we get our own actuary. So, we did. And what did our actuaries find? They found that the Secretary's system was not valid. I hope all of my colleagues will take the time to read this report which has the unique distinction of being written in understandable English. Let me read you this one part:

> The application of the retirement adjustment factors had the general effect of allocating an aggregate increase in pension cost back to the individual members, present and future, in the form of a uniform discount on their pay increase. There are inequities inherent in this aggregate process that are hard to justify. For example, the individual who retires a month after the pay increase and who thus adds most heavily to the past service pension cost, receives the lower increase in basic pay for the shortest period of time. On the other hand, the new entrant who adds the least in pension cost—and nothing to the increase in past service cost—ends up paying the most by receiving lower basic pay for the longest period of time. At any rate, an obscure factor such as the retirement adjustment factor must not only be better understood, it must be recognized by the individual whose pay it affects as being both necessary and right. As actuaries, we have serious misgivings on both counts.

The report points out that in equating military retirement to civil service retirement the Defense Department adopted a basic hypothesis that is contrary to fact. It assumed that the actuarial liability for past service of civilian employees is fully funded, although in point of fact the funds actually available in the civil service fund are only enough to pay for benefits of employees already retired. The report then makes this interesting observation on how the Defense Department builds a conclusion on this contrary-to-fact hypothesis:

> On this contrary-to-fact basis it then becomes reasonable to require that the increase in past service liability due to an across-the-board pay increase must also be funded in a limited number of years. The general value of conclusions drawn from any such contrary-to-fact hypothesis may be illustrated by consideration of Dingle's query—first posed by the British Astronomer-Philosopher Herbert Dingle—which asks, "What would be the color of an elephant's eggs if an elephant laid eggs?" While, under certain circumstances, such contrary-to-fact hypothesis may result in valuable insights, the conclusions are generally used as a reason for changing the condition contrary to the hypothesis and not as a basis for reasonable action to be taken while that condition remains unchanged.

This quotation merely summarizes what the Secretary of Defense has spent a good deal of time doing, deciding what the color of elephant's eggs would be if elephants could lay eggs.

Mr. Chairman, in presenting the case for an inadequate military pay raise either the Secretary of Defense, or his Univac has laid an egg.

Let us not join him. Let us do what we all know in our hearts is right and provide the pay rates for our Armed Forces that are necessary and that are part of our moral responsibility to provide.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlemen from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER].

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to thank the chairman of the Armed Services Committee for his courtesy in yielding me time, and, secondly, to congratulate him and the committee for producing a much better bill than that suggested to them by the administration.

Yet, for all the work of the committee I must in some particulars disagree with it for I think H.R. 9075 is inadequate.

Mr. Chairman, many of us, after last year's pay raise and the pay raise of the year before for the armed services, felt that 1965 should be the year for the dogface, the recruit, the new man. It has turned out to be somewhat less than this.

Mr. Chairman, we here today have heard about poverty levels. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] pointed out how it compared with another program. Indeed, if there are poverty levels, and I believe there are in the armed services, this bill does not extinguish them.

Mr. Chairman, we are also interested in getting rid of moonlighting in the armed services. Must this go on? This is another question, I believe, the bill does not answer.

Mr. Chairman, I do think that the pay review and enlistment bonus features of the committee bill are excellent and ought to be preserved. While we have heard of the increases in pay for enlisted personnel in terms of percentages, in real dollars, there is something else. We are not talking about a bill which some of us had hoped might be able to ultimately enable the country to do away with the draft. The Members will recall that the Republican nominee for President last fall, and many in the administration, indicated interest in how we might be able in time to phase out the draft system. But let us face the facts. We will be unable to do that so long as the pay at the bottom of the scale is inadequate.

Mr. Chairman, how has the recruit fared since 1946? There have been six pay raises.

On October 1, 1949, he got no increase from the $75 which he was receiving.

On May 1, 1952, he got a $3 pay increase.

On April 1, 1955, he got nothing.

On June 1, 1958, he got nothing.

On October 2, 1963, and August 12, 1964, he got nothing.

Mr. Chairman, he does get something in this bill, $9.90. But if there is to be a bill for the bottom end of the scale of the military service, let us examine how it does with respect to others.

Under the committee bill a lieutenant colonel with 16 years' service receives an increase of $53.10, an individual who has also been given six increases in pay over a period of time during which the recruit has received $3.

Let us look at a major general with 26 years of service. Is he given a monthly increase of $9.90? No. He is given an increase of $171.60.

So, Mr. Chairman, for whom is the bill designed? In this respect I would like to refer to the committee hearings and to the testimony of Secretary McNamara which appears on page 2535. The Secretary having given a table says:

> As you can see from this table, the earnings of the average military officer substantially match or exceed those of the average college graduate, even those in the engineering or scientific professions.
>
> This tables indicates that military officers in the period of 3 to 27 years of service have salary aggregates in excess of engineers, natural scientists, and all aggregates at every level.

Notwithstanding this testimony perhaps our officers do need an increase. But if we are to increase them can we honestly say that we should increase our recruits only $9.90 a month or $10.30?

Will this take them out of the poverty classification? My answer, Mr. Chairman, is "No."

Mr. Chairman, I do have an amendment which I shall offer which I believe will alleviate this condition somewhat and I will urge its adoption.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I join in support of H.R. 9075. The members of the Armed Services Committee were faced with a difficult but crucial choice between two bills. One, introduced by the chairman himself and cosponsored by a most impressive majority of the members of the committee, proposed to provide a substantial increase in the basic pay of all uniformed personnel. The other bill emanated from the President's Pay Panel. The latter bill, H.R. 8714, proposed modest adjustments of the basic pay of uniformed personnel with over 2 years' service, similar increases to officers with less than 2 years' service, and barely perceptible increases to enlisted men with less than 2 years' service.

I would like to direct my remarks to what we are proposing to do for our enlisted men, particularly those with less than 2 years of service.

My information is that slightly over 789,000 enlisted men have less than 2 years' service. This group, some of whom are now under fire, and whose grade ranges from private through sergeant, would have received an average increase in pay of $2.51 a month under the administration's bill. About 48,000 of this group are, in fact, corporals and sergeants, or their equivalent. The average increase contemplated in H.R. 8714 for these corporals was $3.40 per month and for the sergeants $3.86 per month. Expressed on an annual basis, the increase would have raised the sergeant's—pay grade E–5—annual salary by slightly over $46.

What would H.R. 9075 do for these boys with less than 2 years of service? Well, take a look at page 44 of the report and you will note, for example, that under the Rivers bill, the corporal—pay grade E–4—would get an annual increase of $494—or $41.20 per month; the sergeant—pay grade E–5—would get an annual raise of $586—or $48.86 per month. This is something more than a few packs of chewing gum. This is a raise that can be understood—that has some meaning.

Now, who are these men who make corporal and sergeant during their first 2 years of service? In most cases, of course, they are the more outstanding men, the men with a little something extra on the ball. They are also the men we would most like to keep in service. Of course, we are not going to keep them in service with a raise of less than a dollar a week.

I know it will be pointed out that after 2 years, a man's pay jumps a bit. But how would you like to explain this bill to one of our young soldiers now fighting in Vietnam? Think of being in that one, unique group where pay is so low, where there hasn't been a raise in 13 years and where service is by compulsion. Then think of being told that you are getting a raise of $3.86.

It is basically unfair. And the more intelligent enlisted man who makes sergeant in his first 2 years is going to know it is unfair and is going to turn sour on the service.

We have to treat men fairly from the beginning if we are to encourage the best type of manhood to choose a career in the military services. The competition for good men is getting harder. Our services must be competitive too, or our services will deteriorate.

Because our servicemen should be compensated on a par with those in what is called the private sector, and because we have neglected our responsibility to adjust the pay of our servicemen, I support the provision of the bill calling for annual pay reviews and a major structural analysis every 4 years.

I could not, however, support the administration's version of the provision which would have made raises automatic if not vetoed by Congress in 60 days. I will oppose any such proposal, however well intended, which has the effect of diminishing congressional control. The responsibility of the Congress for maintaining the Armed Forces is founded on the Constitution and I am one of those people who does not think we have a right to set aside the Constitution. This is our job. It is up to us to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I was one of those who joined with our chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, in sponsoring this legislation, and I want to commend him for his leadership to provide adequate pay for the servicemen and women of our country. I supported this bill before our special subcommittee went to South Vietnam last month, but after seeing what our boys are up against out there my support is even greater. I wish that every Member of this Congress could have had the opportunity to learn firsthand of the efforts of our soldiers and sailors in this red-hot war. I would like to know how those who feel this bill is too generous with our servicemen would explain their position to the chaps I saw in the hospital in Saigon, or on the beachhead at Chu Lai, or with the Marines at DaNang, or for that matter, any of our some 75,000 chaps who are now committed to the protection of our interests in that troubled area of the world where war is so real.

While none of us may like it, it is our responsibility to request some of the prime years of the lives of our boys of service age, but it is also our responsibility to see that these young men are treatd fairly. This H.R. 9075 would do. I urge that you support this legislation.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, we are discussing today a matter of vital concern to the security of this Nation. While the loyalty of our servicemen is not dependent upon a pay raise, the economy and efficiency of our fighting forces will be best promoted by the retention in the service of trained personnel. Further, the morale of the career man will be lifted if he is assured that he will be compensated in a manner comparable to other employment.

This is an age of advanced weaponry. Long periods of study, plus on-the-job training, are required before our troops can properly service and use the complicated machines and systems upon which our defense is built. If we are to lose these technicians to industry as soon as we train them, then the service will remain a training school never acquiring the level of competency which is required. Even a brief tour of any military installation will demonstrate the significance of this statement. The loss of these skilled persons has plagued each of the services for a long time. Everyone acquainted with the situation admits the seriousness of the problem and the necessity for prompt corrective action.

The Armed Services Committee feels a great responsibility to the servicemen and to the Nation. The measure passed in 1964 did not reflect our best judgment as to the action required. It was merely a gesture of recognition, a stop-gap effort. Now we are committed to doing the job right. We are ashamed that men in uniform are expected to give their all, if necessary, while being compensated close to so-called poverty levels. We are determined to do something about it and to do it now.

The bill which you are asked to support will cost $996 million. The administration proposal was less than half that sum. Why the larger amount? Certainly most of my colleagues on the committee have not established any records as spenders. The reason that they were so nearly unanimous in the reporting of H.R. 9075 is because they honestly feel that halfway measures will not suffice particularly as to the pay of enlisted personnel. Therefore, sound economy requires us to deal adequately with the problem without further delay. Our fighting forces will be more efficient at a lower cost if we can retain a substantially higher percentage of men in uniform beyond their period of obligated service. We believe this bill will move decisively in this direction.

Our committee, under the leadership of its distinguished chairman the gentleman from South Carolina, studied the problem with great objectivity and determination. It concluded that the President's Pay Panel had not properly evaluated all aspects of military compensation. It submitted the analysis of the Secretary of Defense to an independent actuarial firm and received advice that the Secretary had greatly overvalued one key element of military compensation, namely, retirement provisions. Since the Pay Panel had used the Secretary's figures without adjustment, it inevitably understated the amount of raise needed to bring military men to a scale of comparability.

Our chairman has presented a most forceful and detailed explanation of H.R. 9075. His dedicated determination to correctly solve this problem has been an inspiration to the entire committee. We sense that world conditions make this decision more than academic. It is vital and urgent. The peace, and indeed the safety, of the free world may well depend upon the morale and competency of our men in uniform. Yes, at this very hour they are being tested in distant lands. We are counting on them not to fail us. We will not fail them.

Therefore, I ask my colleagues to support this measure. Your action today can encourage career acceptance of the service. Men who are devoted to their work and to their country will feel that their service will not deprive their families of acceptable standards of living. In other words, although we rely upon the loyalty and patriotism of our servicemen, we will not exact a penalty for that attitude. If anything, it should be rewarded. Yet, this bill does not go that far. It is not special treatment but it is an effort to provide fair treatment. I hope this House overwhelmingly will approve and likewise the other body.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. Mink].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for this opportunity to rise in support of H.R. 9075, the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1965.

Mr. Chairman, the morale and the quality of our military forces may be the principal reason for the importance of this measure we are considering today. However, my reason for rising today to add my comments to this debate in support of this bill, is to place emphasis upon the families and children of our servicemen for whom this pay increase will be of immense help.

Mr. Chairman, my State of Hawaii has long been privileged to have large numbers of men from the various branches of our military organization stationed within our shores. With these men have come their wives and their children. We in Hawaii have had the opportunity to see firsthand some of the difficult conditions under which these families often must live. We know of the problem of servicemen having to moonlight. We know of the problem of some of our enlisted personnel having to receive public assistance help; and many whose children qualify under programs sponsored for the poor under the Economic Opportunity Act. I know of so many personally who are having a difficult time making ends meet. I believe that these families deserve a break and that is why I am supporting this bill.

I have received scores of letters from individuals, some telling me of their personal hardship, and all urging me to speak on their behalf. Five military wives organizations in Hawaii, the Schofield Barracks NCO Wives Club, the Hui O Na Wahine Officers' Wives Club, the Submarine Officers' Wives Club, the Navy Wives Club Aloha Chapter No. 28, and the NCO Wives Club at Hickam Air Force Base have all written urging that I speak on their behalf, in support of this measure.

Hawaii's deep concern for the welfare of the military families presently in Hawaii is reflected in Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 55 of the third State legislature which was adopted on April 6 of this year by the State senate and on April 24 by the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii. This resolution strongly supports the pay increases recommended in this bill and urges its passage.

I believe that we have a great responsibility to our service personnel and his dependents. Statistics presented to the Armed Services Committee indicate clearly that a career in the Armed Forces today is a married man's career. Therefore, when we vote for this bill today, we are not only voting for an adequate standard of living for the 2.6 million men in the Armed Forces, but we are also voting for the improvement in the lives of more than 4 million dependents as well.

In the last decade the number of dependents for each military man has almost doubled, according to Defense Department figures. In 1954 we had 3,127,366 persons on active duty and they had a total of 2,591,777 dependents. Today, we have 2,645,964 persons on active duty, and they have 4,009,487 dependents. While our active duty force has dropped by a half million, our number of dependents has increased by about a million and a half.

The population explosion has affected our military families as it has affected the general population, and these families need this increased pay to maintain an adequate, decent standard of living. Devotion and dedication to the service and defense of our country should not have to include their sacrifice of the well-being of their families but rather insure their ability backed by the resources of this Nation to maintain a decent life for their loved ones. Just as we are working to improve the welfare of all families across America, I believe that we must give full consideration to the special needs and difficulties of the military families. This indeed is our obligation.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Stafford].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1965, H.R. 9075.

Mr. Chairman, ever since the earliest of times, man has been rewarded according to his effort and responsibility. Today, throughout the free world, American men and women in uniform are protecting our freedom. Yet, despite their effort and responsibility, these servicemen are receiving salaries that make them second-class citizens here at home.

For example, a young American who enters the service and accepts the hardships and risks of military life receives only $78 a month in salary. However, at the same time, another young American joins the Job Corps here at home where he receives the same lodging, clothing, food, and medical care plus a total monthly salary of $105.

It seems slightly ridiculous that many defenders of our country are receiving 25 percent less than a Job Corps trainee. Either the Job Corps trainees are overpaid or our servicemen are grossly underpaid.

The fact of the matter is that the pay scale for servicemen with less than 2 years of service has not been increased in 13 years. Can you think of any other field of employment in the United States today that has not received a pay increase in 13 years? This bill before us now will provide the greatest percentage increase in salary to servicemen with less than 2 years of active duty.

If one looks at this proposed military pay increase realistically, he is forced to the conclusion that the proposed increase is actually an economy measure. Presently, because of the low military pay, the vast majority of highly skilled men leave the service at the earliest opportunity resulting in a constant turnover in military personnel.

Each year we are, in a sense, wasting more than $3 billion spent training draftees and first enlistment men who leave after serving only the minimum term of duty. One of the basic reasons for this mass exodus from the military is the poor pay scale. Men filled with pride and patriotism for their country leave the service because more money, shorter hours, and a higher standard of living is easily found in civilian life.

We cannot pay the men and women of our Armed Forces salaries that make them second-class citizens and expect to attract either the best that our country has to offer or retain those who have been trained at great expense. We must pay on a scale that induces young men to enter the armed services. We must pay on a scale that encourages men to remain in the military and to regard it as a profession so that the cost of their training will not be lost and their skills will be available to promote the security of the United States.

The military pay bill that I am supporting today will put our servicemen on a level more nearly comparable to civil service employees in the United States and thus make a military career more attractive to the youth of America. It is a significant step toward a volunteer Army and the end of the draft.

If Congress fails to support this necessary adjustment in military compensation, it could be interpreted by America's fighting men as evidence of public indifference to the future of our national security. I urge wholehearted bipartisan support of this important legislation.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Schweiker].

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of this military pay legislation and a member of the Armed Services Committee, I want to emphasize the importance of passing H.R. 9075 as reported by our committee.

In Vietnam, in the Dominican Republic and throughout the world, American troops are on active duty. Our defenses must be commensurate with this increased responsibility. The men in the armed services are willing to sacrifice their lives and family for their country. This pay bill will bring them a portion of the improved standard of living that our civilian work force now enjoys but which they have been denied. We must assure them treatment as first-class citizens.

Today there are more than a million members of the Armed Forces who fall within President Johnson's poverty category with annual incomes of less than $3,000—including their allowance for food, clothing, and shelter. The military has not been apprised of or affected by the Great Society's war on poverty. A young man is paid more for joining the Job Corps than he is for enlisting in the Armed Forces, without the risks and hardships that accompany his military tenure.

President Johnson has said that he wants "our uniformed citizens to be first-class citizens in every respect." But he has failed by his actions to give meaning to his words. This pay bill fulfills the President's unkept promise. It gives the military a base pay it does not have to be ashamed of.

The bill reported by the Armed Services Committee provides a 10.7 percent increase in basic pay for all uniformed servicemen. The $825 million annual cost will benefit 2,723,000 personnel on full-time active duty. The increase in pay for enlisted personnel with less than 2 years of service ranges from 13 to 33 percent, or an average of $16 a month. For enlisted men with over 2 years of service, the average increase would be 11.2 percent, or $28 a month. Officers with under 2 years of service would receive an average increase of 22 percent, or $55 a month. And officers with over 2 years of service would receive an average increase of 6.4 percent, or $42 a month.

Defeat of this bill would deflate the military's morale. No paltry substitute measure will halt the widespread moonlighting by Armed Forces personnel. If we are to end the low retention rates that forced the Secretary of the Navy recently to request all active duty Navy personnel to extend their service for 3 to 6 months to allow our fleets to meet their readiness requirements, we must pass a bill that grants a substantial military pay increase.

I am especially pleased that this pay bill includes a sizable increase for the 844,000 enlisted men with less than 2 years service. In 1949 recruits received food, shelter, and clothing, plus $75 a month. Today they receive $3 more a month. Every other Federal payee, military and civilian, has had between four and six raises since 1952. Enlisted men with less than 2 years service have received nothing. Military pay has increased an average of 39 percent, civil service pay, 51 percent, factory workers, 44 percent, and truckdrivers, 70 percent. There is no reason that the current recruit should be in a worse comparative position than his counterpart of 13 years ago. His increase in this bill is deserved and long overdue.

Last year the Armed Services Committee voted to table my motion by a vote of 21 to 9 to include draftees and enlistees with less than 2 years of service in the 1964 military pay bill. And the President and Department of Defense still oppose anything more than a token increase.

The future of this country could well depend on the morale and quality of its fighting men. We cannot tolerate the administration's archaic and ill-conceived notion that enlisted men with less than 2 years service are trainees and should receive apprentices' pay reminiscent of the medieval guilds. With industry and the Armed Forces in competition for the Nation's manpower and brainpower, we must provide incentives from the period of first indoctrination through retirement to attract good men to the services.

I am grateful, however, to the chairman of this year's Armed Services Committee. Last year the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] gave me a commitment that any new pay bill would include an increase for the enlisted man with less than 2 years service. That this bill contains the necessary increase is testimony to the support I received from Mr. RIVERS.

There is no doubt that some military pay raise is warranted. Both the Department of Defense and the House Armed Services Committee agree on the need for an increase. The issue is merely how big that increase should be.

The President's Panel on Military Pay and the Department of Defense advocate a 2.7 percent increase for personnel with less than 2 years service and a 4.8 percent increase for personnel with service for more than 2 years.

Secretary of Defense McNamara testified for the administration before the Armed Services Committee that the proposed increase was so meager in order to save the taxpayer money. The administration's contention is a conspicuous example of penny wise, pound foolish shortsightedness. The plan to deprive the military of its fair share of the Nation's prosperity will ultimately cost us more than the equitable pay increase this bill provides. No one benefits from paying the military as little as possible. And no one loses more than America. We cannot afford to sap the military of its morale and efficiency. We must assure it the ability to attract and retain the best personnel it can find.

Lengthy committee hearings have convinced me that the military man's preference is for an increase in basic pay—not for discretionary and selective increases that he has no assurance of receiving. He knows that the shortfall in military to civilian pay for the period 1952–64 is about 12.4 percent, and he wants a return to the parity he had with the Federal civilian employee of 13 years ago. He wants and deserves equality now. This military pay increase will provide that equality.

Passage of this bill will not only benefit the military but also the taxpayer. Implementing this bill will cost $825 million a year. Pay and maintenance of our 2.7 million men in the Armed Forces is about $15 billion a year. The cost of training one Air Force radar electronic specialist is $23,000; a ballistic missile launch officer, $49,140. Presently, in the Air Force alone, between 60 and 70 percent of all skilled enlisted men leave at the end of their first 4-year enlistment. And 54 percent of the officers leave as soon as they can.

The pay raise will help retain trained personnel. And if, by retaining more experienced men, the total manpower requirement could be reduced by 10 percent—together with wholesale slashes in training costs—resulting savings would exceed the pay raise by far.

The military and the Nation require passage of the pay bill as approved by the Armed Services Committee. Only the substantial pay raise provided by this bill will eliminate our paupers in uniform. Nothing less will suffice. I urge passage of this bill as reported to the House.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, there was a man who went into a seafood restaurant and ordered lobster, but when the lobster came it only had one claw. When the man complained to the waiter, the waiter said it had lost its other claw in a fight. To that the gentleman replied, "All right, then bring me the winner."

Mr. Chairman, there were two military pay bills before the Armed Services Committee this year and we have brought you the winner.

It won in our committee by a vote of 33 to 1.

I suspect if a vote were taken among the members of the armed services the percentage in favor of our bill would be a good deal better than 33 to 1. The opinion of the people affected, of course, is too obvious a piece of evidence for any cost effectiveness expert to accept. You have to turn in your slide rule if you do that. But it is remarkable to me how often military people are told that the smaller raises proposed by the Defense Department would be better for them in the long run. If this is true, why do not the people in the services realize it? If the present approach is retaining sufficient numbers of qualified personnel, as the President's Pay Panel claims, why are not those qualified personnel able to accept the wisdom of the Department of Defense approach?

We have been told that the Department of Defense proposal for a major structural review 2 years hence and a modest raise now will, in the long run, be "the most encouraging development of all to our military career people."

Mr. Chairman, I know those who say this are sincere. We appreciate their trying to improve our understanding as we are trying so hard to improve theirs. Like the father in Luke 15:11:

> We ever keep the fatted calf prepared in hopes that our prodigal boy will return.

But I submit to you that a bird in the hand is a much more encouraging development than two in the bush. And I submit to you that our qualified military personnel have figured that out.

I think they have figured out a few other things—things that go to the heart of the retention problem.

Mr. Chairman, the dialog on this pay bill was a little like a bullfight in which all of the matadors were getting into the bull's terrain. The committee moved into the whiz kids' terrain when it ordered its own actuarial study; we found the ground not quite as dangerous as the aficionados had warned us. Others were not as lucky when they moved out of their own terrain. I think the Secretary of Defense, so brilliant and so capable in so many areas, was moving out of his terrain when he got engrossed in the personnel field. It happens to be an area where our committee is uniquely equipped with experts. The Pay Panel members are brilliant men all. Given a year of actually working with the military pay system, they might have made more stirring contributions than any of us. But their time was brief. They were generalists moving into the specialists' terrain—and, oh, did they get gored.

When the Pay Panel discourses on the question of retention, they remind me of that ditty:

> Last night I saw upon the stair
> A little man who wasn't there.
> He wasn't there again today,
> Oh, how I wish he'd go away.

You can prove anything with statistics. You can prove on paper that there is no retention problem. I suppose if you try hard enough you can prove on paper that the sun rises in the west and sets in the east. It is a fact that in my native New Orleans the sun rises on the west bank of the Mississippi River and sets on the east bank. But the sun rises in the east and there is a retention problem. The evidence of a retention problem is being delineated here by other committee members—and you all know about it anyhow. But I would like to speak briefly to the retention problem of the future. Without being at all facetious, and not wishing in any way to be disparaging of the individual members of the Pay Panel, I think that the Panel created more of a retention problem than it solved. I think the nature of the Panel, and the manner of its functioning, is part of an approach which is in itself acerbating The retention problem. Whenever anyone mentions the military retirement system, the Pentagon's cost effectiveness statisticians go through more gyrations than a teenager doing the frug. There are endless analyses of the future costs and the alleged future value of retirement benefits and of the long-range effect on the taxpayer. The actuaries hired by the committee proved that the Department of Defense statisticians had overstated and incorrectly computed the value of the retirement system.

But independent of that, think of the effect on retention, the long-range effect on the military individual, of the use of the Defense Department's method and the continual publicity that method receives. You just cannot measure the value of human beings with the same set of slide rules with which you determine the durability of cold steel or the fire power of a weapons system. I said before that I think the military personnel had figured out a few things that go to the heart of the retention problem. I think they have figured out that in the passion for scientific methods someone is forgetting the things you cannot measure with a computer, things like moral commitment and tradition and keeping promises and the place of the human heart in service to one's country. When men come up with statistical absurdities, it is because they have followed the slide rules to the point where they have forgotten beings. An example is the Pay Panel's bland conclusion that there is not any retention problem. That is not the first time this has happened. In 1962, when the Defense Department presented its quarters allowance increase bill to our committee, a statistical analysis worked up by representatives of seven executive branch agencies working together concluded that an E-4, that is, a corporal or lowest grade sergeant, needed $17 a month less in quarters allowance than he was receiving, although quarters allowances had not been increased for 10 years up to that point.

Nobody knows better than the Members of the Congress that we have to be concerned with cost. But we also have to be concerned with commitment. And the way we honor our past commitment will affect our future cost as much as anything that can be reduced to numbers and put in a computer. DOD statisticians talk endlessly of future accrued costs but they never mention the importance of keeping promises made. The compensation and benefits supplied military people, however high, are not going to solve the retention problems unless the military man can feel assured his benefits will survive the next study committee. The constant changing of systems is in itself something that can hurt retention if men begin to doubt the Government will live up to past promises.

The Secretary of Defense talks now of ending 20-year retirement. I am sure he will save a lot of retirement cost doing so. But I am sure we will spend as much and more in active duty pay to hold career men in service. When you break your promise to someone one time, how do you get them to believe you the next time?

Mr. Chairman, this is landmark legislation. It marks the point where the Pentagon statistical pinball machines rang "tilt." It marks the beginning of pay equity for the military men. Let it also be a landmark of the Congress' determination not to be afraid to trust the heart more than the computer.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, under the able and respected leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], a very strong case has been made out in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9075.

Coldly looking at the pay bill before us today, the basic question is whether it will provide the means for our services to attract and retain sufficient numbers of qualified personnel to enable our military services to carry out their assigned missions.

President Johnson, in his state of the Union message, pointed out the vital importance of our military personnel when he stated:

> The success of all our policies depends upon our ability to attract, develop fully, utilize and retain the talents of outstanding men and women in the military services.

I am in full accord with this view and with the President's conclusion:

> Our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines, from whom we ask so much, are the cornerstone of our military might.

We in the Armed Services Committee were startled and shocked to realize that our pay structure in the military had deteriorated to the point where so dedicated and loyal a soldier-statesman as Gen. Omar Bradley was obligated to say to our committee that if a young man were to ask him to recommend that he enter the military service as a career, the best that he could do in good conscience would be to change the subject.

The security of our Nation today rests on highly complex weapons systems. The security of our Nation in the years ahead will depend on even more complex weapons systems. The jobs involved in the procurement, operation and maintenance of these complex systems involve highly technical skills which call for extensive education and experience. Each year the systems become more complex; the training required for personnel who man these systems becomes more extensive and more expensive.

Some 15 or 20 noncommissioned officer specialists are engaged in the complex systems of armament, engines, hydraulics, electrical and electronics of one aircraft, the F-105.

Despite this need, in the past 13 years service personnel have received increases in compensation totaling only some 34 percent, while classified civil service personnel have received increases averaging 46 percent, production workers in private industry have had increases of some 53 percent, and professional and technical workers some 56 percent.

What has happened?

Resignations in the Air Force in the past 5 years have increased 150 percent; the ratio of scientific and engineering officer personnel coming into the Air Force from ROTC has decreased from 47 percent in 1959 to 33 percent in 1964; the retention rate for engineering and scientific personnel in the Air Force is only 34 percent; and the reenlistment rate for certain enlisted Air Force technical personnel is only 12 percent. I use Air Force figures here, but let me point out that according to statistics given our committee attrition generally was better in the Air Force than the other services.

The military services are providing the training ground for technical personnel only to lose them to industry at the very time they become productive.

The members of the Armed Services Committee have so overwhelmingly endorsed the provisions of H.R. 9075 because we believe that it will provide the necessary incentive to attract and retain qualified personnel, and at the same time restore to our service personnel the first-class citizen status they so richly deserve.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to join the Armed Services Committee in a special kind of war on poverty. I invite the other Members of the House to join this campaign. It is at least as worthy as other notable wars on poverty and it is demonstrably less costly.

I am referring, of course, Mr. Chairman, to the poverty that afflicts the GI, the enlisted man in today's Armed Forces. Like his father and his brother before him, the GI of today is again being called upon to fight for freedom in combat. We may shortly learn that the combat will involve large numbers of American troops.

The GI of today is different from those who have gone before him in one important respect. He has to be smarter and quicker. He requires a technical skill and an ability to learn a technical skill that many of his predecessors never dreamed of.

He is like the GI of old, however, in one respect: He is grossly underpaid. Someone has figured out that the enlisted man in today's Armed Forces is paid slightly over 49 cents an hour. This is assuming a 40-hour week which, of course, is unknown to the great majority of enlisted men, particularly the young draftees. It is a fact, Mr. Chairman, that the enlisted man with less than 2 years service today is worse off than his counterpart of 1940, who received $21 a month. In 1940, when the new enlisted man received $21 a month, the average wage in the United States was $108 a month. So, the enlisted man got 19.4 percent of the average wage. Today, the average wage is $445 a month, and a recruit receives $78 or 17.5 percent of the average monthly wage.

I hope I may be excused for saying that I am proud that last March I became a coauthor of the military pay bill that is now before the House today.

I am not going to repeat what has already been stated here by members of the committee with respect to our seriously low retention rates and the loss of skilled personnel. Those facts speak for themselves.

We cannot afford to be second in the race for survial. We can afford nothing less than the best Armed Forces in the world. And one way of assuring that we are the best is to pass H.R. 9075.

In spite of the results that you might see from some of our computers—in spite of the promise of better things to come in the years ahead—the fact remains that a serviceman cannot cash a promise in a grocery store; he cannot pay a landlord with the promise of a pay raise that may become effective in a couple of years.

H.R. 9075 provides a badly needed, richly deserved, and vitally important pay raise for members of our Armed Forces now—and even now is not any too soon.

Like most Members of the House, I recognize the need for increases in all grades. But I am particularly impressed with the wisdom of the pay scales that have been proposed in H.R. 9075, as they pertain to enlisted personnel.

It is interesting to note that while the Special Panel on Federal Salaries, known as the Folsom Panel, recommended an average increase of 4.8 percent for all uniformed personnel, they made an exception for personnel with under 2 years of service. Enlisted personnel with under 2 years of service have not received any increase since 1952, were only to receive a 2.7-percent increase, based on the cost of living since 1963.

The controversial issue between the Folsom report and the committee's position is a very simple one. The Folsom Panel felt that 1963 was the proper base from which to make adjustments. The committee felt that the 1963 pay increase only partially solved the problem.

It is interesting to note, however, that the Committee on Armed Services in 1965 and the Department of Defense in 1963 used 1952 as the base year from which to make adjustments.

The bill before us today provides an average increase of 10.6 percent for all military personnel, but that is only part of the story. The increases recommended for officers in the Folsom study are reasonably close to those recommended by the Committee on Armed Services, except for the officers with under 2 years of service. Under the committee proposal, all officers would receive an average 7.2-percent increase, while the Folsom Panel recommended an average increase of 5 percent.

The committee's proposal with respect to officers would involve an annual cost of $174 million. The Folsom Panel cost for officers was about $120 million, so the difference was only $54 million.

So, there is relatively little difference between the committee's proposal and the Panel's proposal insofar as officers are concerned.

But let us look at the pay scales as they affect enlisted personnel. The committee recommends an annual increase for enlisted personnel of $650 million. The Department's proposal would cost $248 million annually. The difference between the committee's proposal and the Department's proposal is $401 million.

Now, the difference between the committee proposal and the departmental proposal for all personnel is $455 million, and out of this amount the Department would reduce enlisted personnel by $401 million, or 88 percent of the total difference.

If we are going to start practicing economy, I assure you as far as I am concerned, it will not be at the expense of our enlisted personnel who are fighting in Vietnam, or who stand ready to go wherever they are needed in defense of our freedom.

If we can provide huge sums of money for recruits in the Job Corps program; and we can encourage dropouts to receive handouts that exceed the pay of a private, then it is time we increased the pay of every member of our armed services and particularly our enlisted personnel.

There is something wrong with a philosophy that puts a higher premium on failure than it does on success and patriotism.

The total cost of the basic pay raise for active duty personnel is $824 million. The administration asks that much just for a beginning, experimental program in its war on poverty and it is already planning expenditures far above that amount. However worthy these programs may be, if we can afford to end poverty of high school dropouts, we can certainly afford to end the poverty in the ranks of our fighting men.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members of the House to keep one more very interesting comparison in mind. The cost of the foreign aid bill this year will be something over $3 billion, approximately four times the cost of this military pay bill. Yet, some of our allies, including some who are receiving or have received aid from us, give their enlisted men higher basic pay than we do. I do not see how anybody could defend such a situation or how anybody could deny the need for a substantial pay raise for our GI's. I urge all of the Members of the House to join this noble war on poverty, poverty of our own creation, by voting for the Armed Services Committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, I fully endorse H.R. 9075. I am proud of the fact that I was one of the original cosponsors of this proposal, and I hope that it will receive not just overwhelming approval, but the unanimous support of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may require to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD].

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from South Carolina, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, for his work in conceiving and giving birth to and nourishing and bringing this bill to its maturity, ultimately reaching the House floor.

Mr. Chairman, no man who is called upon to exercise judgment is invariably right, but as for me I would rather suffer some of his honest mistakes than have him blindly follow a course which he feels in his own mind to be wrong. On this matter I thought that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services was right and that the Secretary of Defense was wrong. Personally I would like to see a little more of this kind of work in the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, it is with great pride that I take the floor today in support of H.R. 9075, possibly the most equitable pay raise to come before us for our men in uniform in recent years. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, and the great majority of the members of the committee have been the target of attack, from the executive branch of Government and from various sections of the Nation's press. We have been portrayed as congressional powerseekers because we dare exercise our constitutional responsibilities, review, and judgment. It takes a bit of courage to stand up and be counted, to practice your principles and to follow your conscience. The gentleman from South Carolina, particularly, has endured personal slanders, character malignments, and political disfavor to speak and act according to the dictates of his conscience. There, of course, was never any doubt about his courage but for the courage he has shown it is with great pride that I point to him as my chairman and my friend. No man who is called upon to exercise judgment is invariably right but as for me, I would rather suffer a few of his honest errors than to have him blindly follow a course of action laid down for him by others about which he harbors secret reservations. To often the Members of the Congress choose to delegate their enacting authority and responsibility to the other branches of Government. Our system of checks and balances is slowly eroding. The legislative branch too willingly submits to executive pressure. When a Member of Congress promotes a program or an idea that finds its roots in the Congress or among the people he is criticized and admonished. It is too readily assumed that all legislation conceived in the executive branch is by its nature, good and representative of the peoples' will. Ladies and gentlemen, there exists nowhere in this land a group of individuals more truly representative of the peoples' will than this Congress.

The Armed Services Committee has taken its stand. We believe our bill is just. We believe it is necessary. We believe it is right. These judgments were made, not in haste, but after many long months of reflective study and research.

The primary concern with any legislation of this type is the maintenance of our national security through efficient, mobile, and effective Armed Forces. The simple harsh fact of the matter is this: We are losing highly skilled and highly trained military men due to unreasonably low rates of financial remuneration. When a man with 8 or 10 years of active service chooses to reenter the private sector, foregoing his much talked-about retirement pay, it is almost invariably because he cannot adequately exist, not live in luxury, but merely exist adequately, on the almost token salary we bestow upon him. For the most part he wants a military career but as a human being he needs to be a good provider for his family and in many cases his family lives in poverty. In fact, one-half million service people are, by our own standards, living in poverty. One of every four has an income level below the mark set by this Government as poverty status. He is grossly underpaid as an American citizen. What is worse, he has no recourse. He has no union. He cannot quit before the end of his term. He has no voice in where he works, the hours he works, whom he works for, and how much he is paid. He must depend solely on the wisdom and sense of justice of an already heavily burdened Congress. In effect, we are his employer. If any other employer in this land were to impose such working conditions and such inadequate remuneration on a citizen, the Congress and the Executive would literally pounce upon that employer and demand he change his evil ways. We have done so, in the mines, in the factories, and in the stores. Must we continue to practice this immoral double standard when judging our servicemen?

We spend our $50 billion per year to keep this Nation strong and secure and we dare not risk this fantastic investment because we fail to recognize the needs of those who nobly and ably don their uniforms to defend our interests wherever and whenever necessary.

I will not cite to you the statistics regarding the low pay and the resulting decline in reenlistment rates. I will not cite the statistics proving the gradual elimination of selectivity and the resulting creeping mediocrity among our fighting forces. It is all before you in the committee report and has been eloquently articulated by those distinguished Members preceding this speaker. I will merely say, we must face this problem head on. We must not explain away the issues. The problem will not go away.

As long as there are men in this world who wish to destroy our way of life, we must maintain the finest Armed Forces in the world and we can maintain such a team only by providing for them the means to live in reasonable comfort and security without undue economic deprivation. The men who wait to fight and die deserve at least this position.

I strongly urge the immediate passage of this measure.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I enthusiastically support H.R. 9075. For my part, I have no reservations or questions about the merits of this measure. Beyond that, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of those who have paid tribute to our distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and particularly with one of my fellow Members from the minority side of the aisle who observed that when history is written in future years the gentleman from South Carolina, will have earned the description as the greatest champion of the GI that ever served on the House Armed Services Committee.

If called upon to cite the two paramount objectives of H.R. 9075, I would set them out as being first, to do justice to our service personnel and second, to strengthen the security of our country. Both objectives are important.

There have been military pay increase bills within the past few years but they have all fallen short of the concept of comparability which means the relation of the pay in the military with pay of their counterparts in civilian life.

Because former pay measures have been inadequate and lacking as to comparability, there has been a failure to attract and retain high-caliber personnel with the ability to perform at a high level of proficiency in our modern Army of today. A very different and a much better soldier is needed today than in the past. Weapons are more complex and sophisticated than ever before and will become increasingly complex in the years ahead.

There has been no doubt but what Congress has been remiss and neglectful in its concern or consideration of the pay for the fighting men of this country in the past. The Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1965 seeks to redress these omissions. Beyond the matter of immediate redress this same bill, H.R. 9075, which amends title 37 of the United States Code provides for adjustments in pay and allowances for future years. This bill provides that the President conduct an annual review of adequacies of pay allowances authorized by title 37 for uniformed personnel. It provides that not later than March 31 of each year the President will submit to Congress a detailed report summarizing the results of his annual review together with any recommendations for adjustment. Then, not less than once every 4 years thereafter, the President shall direct that there be made a complete and thorough review of the principles and concepts of the compensation system of all uniformed personnel. It is important to note that while the Secretary of Defense, may have advanced similar proposals, Mr. McNamara proposed that the executive branch would submit to the Congress certain changes which would become effective unless the Congress exercised a veto within 60 days. It has been appropriately observed that the Secretary had the horse and cart in the wrong position while provisions of H.R. 9075 providing that the Congress itself would act following the annual or quadrennial review put the horse in front of the cart where it properly belongs, by making provision for Congress to exercise its constitutional powers concerning the pay for members of the uniformed services.

It seems to me that one of the best ways for a Member to determine whether this is a good or bad bill is to assess this pay raise in the light of the principle of comparability. You do not have to search very far to find that the Committee on Armed Services has very carefully considered this principle.

On page eight of the report which accompanies the bill, there is a chart which documents quite convincingly the fact military pay increases have not kept pace with others. The chart covers the years from 1952 to 1964 and points out that during these 12 years, military officers and enlisted personnel with over 2 years of service received pay increases totaling 36.6 percent. Compare with the following: Civilians in civil service 46.3 percent, production workers in manufacturing industries 52.7 percent members of the profession or those with technical training 54.2 percent, clerical and kindred work 62.1 percent, personnel subject to the Army-Air Force Wage Board—civilians—66.7 percent and finally motor truckdrivers 70.4 percent. To my mind this is proof convincing that the compensation of our military personnel has consistently lagged behind the compensation in occupations requiring similar skilled levels.

The President's Special Panel on Federal Salaries sometimes known as the Folsom Panel was supported by Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, who is a member of the Panel. For some strange and almost incomprehensible reason that Panel concluded that the uniformed services have no retention problem. Apparently their conclusions were based upon the premise that congressional action on military compensation in 1962, 1963, and 1964 placed military compensation at a level in relation to civilian pay level sufficiently to attract and retain adequate numbers of high-quality personnel in the Armed Forces. May I emphasize and reemphasize the words of our own report which accompanied H.R. 9075, which characterized this conclusion by the Folsom Panel with these words—"simply not true." All of the testimony before our committee refuted the Folsom conclusion. All testimony contradicted the Panel's contentions. So far as I know our committee did not go into the method of study used by the Panel. It is my understanding they sent out a questionnaire. It is hearsay and I have no way of knowing how reliable my information may be when it is reported that out of the 35,000 questionnaires returned only about 3 percent were opened. Is it any wonder that our great soldier, Gen. Omar Bradley, took such sharp disagreement with the findings of the Folsom Panel? No, there should be no wonderment when one learns not one single officer or enlisted man ever testified or was questioned by this panel and the sole representative of any of the military to be heard was the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara who happened to be a member of the Panel himself.

This measure will cost money. It is estimated it will have an annual cost of $825 million. If there are Members who happen to be worrying about this cost, they should recall there was no great concern here in the Congress when we enacted a short time ago our annual foreign aid bill, which included money for military assistance to our friends and allies in the world. In some instances, it provided for the payment to these foreign troops at a higher rate of pay than we pay our own soldiers. Think of that. Then if there may be those who are worrying about voting such a great expenditure in one single measure, I would suggest that instead of regarding this as a spending measure, it could quite properly be regarded as an economy measure. Why is this so? I will not take the time to indulge in a lot of statistics but I will say that if we defeat this bill as being an extravagance we are engaging in false economy. Do you realize it takes $23,000 to train an electronic specialist and $49,000 to train a ballistic launch officer? In the years immediately past we have spent an estimated total of $1,200 million upon training military personnel who have now left the service because we did not make the military service attractive enough in comparison with civilian occupations.

The truth is that the present military pay scales encourage mediocrity in the quality of our personnel which can neither attract nor retain the best people. Viewed in this light, H.R. 9075 is not a spending bill but really an economy measure which makes just plain ordinary commonsense. During the hearings I think it was brought out that just about everybody is in agreement that our uniform services should have a pay increase. The Folsom Panel agrees this is so, the Department of Defense was in agreement with the Folsom Panel.

The differences between the two estimates of need for military pay increases may be attributed chiefly to the different assumptions made by the Folsom Panel in criticizing the Rivers proposal.

Central to these differences are the estimates made by the two groups about the current degree of comparability between civilian and military pay within the Federal Government.

The committee has taken the position that if it was fair to use the base year 1952 in comparing civil servants with military personnel for purposes of drafting the 1963 Pay Act, then it is eminently reasonable to use the same base period in discussing further differences among the two groups of Federal employees.

The Pay Panel, on the other hand, insists that the 1963 Military Pay Act was such a perfect piece of legislation that civilian and military pay scales were brought into line with each other and any percentage comparison of increases in the two pay scales ought to proceed from that date as if the two were in equilibrium. Moreover, they take the patently ludicrous position that the military services are having no problems attracting and retaining qualified career personnel.

As a matter of fact, it is even hard to reconcile the pay differences between civilian and military employees within the Department of Defense itself. Even excluding servicemen with under 2 years of service from our consideration, an adequate committee proposal would have had to reflect a 19.6-percent shortfall in pay increases since 1952 between enlisted officers and professional and technical workers in the DOD, or the 30.1-percent shortfall between officers and the Army-Air Force Wage Board, or the 33.8-percent shortfall between officers and motor truckdrivers.

Unlike civilians, the military man has no lobby. He has only the choice to wait and hope that the injustice he has to suffer and the inequities he must endure will somehow, sometime be reduced or eliminated by the Congress. We have been careful to provide for increases for those in the civil service, but we have not been very munificent to our military. Our military should and must be put on a par with their civilian contemporaries. As the matter now stands, the enlisted man with less than 2 years of service is on the very lowest rung of the economic level. I have little doubt but the families of some of these service personnel would be eligible in some of our States to be placed upon the relief rolls. Perhaps that is the reason the number of hardship discharges has increased to about one-quarter in the last 2 years.

At the time of the last increase in pay for enlisted men with short-term service, we were just coming out of the Korean war. Now, after more than a decade of relatively inactive cold war, we are once more sending large numbers of enlisted men to battle.

Keeping in mind Napolean's dictum that morale is to materiel as 10 to 1, in this present time of pending international crisis, there could be no more appropriate occasion for us to increase the basic compensation of enlisted men and officers.

In closing, I should like to quote our President's own words before the National War College a year ago in August:

> I very much want our uniformed citizens to be first-class citizens in every respect. I want their wives and children to know only first-class lives.

Mr. Chairman, that is a commendable, if seemingly unattainable objective. I respectfully submit that H.R. 9075 comes far closer to the spirit of the President's own words than the proposal by the President's own Special Panel on Federal Salaries.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI].

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for H.R. 9075.

Mr. Chairman, the lopsided vote to report H.R. 9075 should not be interpreted to mean that the bill has virtually unanimous support in the committee nor that those who voted affirmatively had wholly unmixed feelings about it.

I am one of those who voted in favor of H.R. 9075. I did so because I wanted the record clear that I strongly favor a pay increase for our Armed Forces this year. The evidence is quite plain, I think, that without an increase, military pay will lag the gains being made in the private economy and in the civilian sector of the Federal Establishment.

But I voted to report H.R. 9075 with considerable mental reservations, for I believe the bill has substantial defects. The most basic of these is its helter-skelter approach. I would like to emphasize, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] did in his minority view, that we have a duty to balance the needs of military personnel against our other obligations—in other sectors of our economy. It is not a question, as the testimony before the committee amply made clear, of whether our defense posture is in danger of imminent collapse. Everyone agrees that our personnel are capable and devoted. Everyone agrees also that a pay increase is needed to maintain military pay at levels relative to civilian earnings which will enable us to maintain a largely quite satisfactory military personnel situation. The issue is rather to whom the increase should be given and how much it should be. The defects of H.R. 9075 are that it raises pay more than necessary in some areas and it allocates increases among the various grades in the wrong proportions.

The committee's calculation of how much of an increase should go to which grades had no basis in science whatsoever. The development of the proposed pay scales was based on two highly questionable and totally unrelated assumptions: First, that it is possible to compare military and civilian jobs sufficiently to link them for pay purposes; and, second, that the traditional relationship—by which is meant 1952 relationship—between the pay levels of various military grades is the correct one which ought to be restored.

I know of no study, public or private, which has successfully linked military and civil service, that has successfully identified which jobs required equal work so that they could be given equal pay. The committee disclaimed attempts to do this, but it nevertheless did exactly that in selecting so-called anchor points at which pay levels were to be equated. No one knows if these anchor points have any validity whatsoever.

Taking off from this very shaky foundation, the committee next attempted to adjust military pay to take account of fringe benefits. This adjustment, which certainly must, in the very nature of things, be enormously complex, was no problem to the committee. It simply charged the military individual a 6½-percent imputed contribution to retirement. Now it is certainly true, as both Secretary of Defense McNamara and the actuarial firm which the committee consulted on this point have said, that it is entirely appropriate to take into account the existence of retirement benefits in setting pay levels. But the proper calculation would take into account what the Nation contributes to the benefit. The Defense Department presented testimony that the Government contribution to support military retirement is not the 6½ percent used by the committee, but over 24 percent.

In addition to the pseudoscientific linkage upon which the committee's pay structure is based, another serious defect is its reversion to 1952 to determine the appropriate relationships of military pay grades with one another. What relevance the scales of 13 years ago have to today's military forces completely escapes me. In 1963, the Defense Department and the Congress came up with a set of pay scales that was attuned as nearly as humanly possible to the needs of our modern forces. These scales were arrived at after a year of intensive study. The committee would disregard the effort made in the 1963 Pay Act. Certainly, there is nothing sacrosanct about the structure established in 1963. But I am satisfied that it ought not to be changed capriciously and before proper careful study has been made.

I conclude, therefore, that H.R. 9075 is the wrong kind of a pay raise because, with no justification provided by the committee, it significantly revises the pay structure established in 1963. H.R. 9075 is also too costly. According to the committee report, the total increase in expenditures on a 12-month basis would be $996 million—just under $1 billion.

But this total is expenditures, not total costs. When we raise pay we increase our liability as a Nation to pay retirement benefits. These costs are real, even though they do not appear in this year's budget. We have to pay them eventually, and we are fooling only ourselves if we ignore them. The expected increase in retirement liabilities on an annual basis is $557 million. Thus, the true annual cost of the committee proposal is more than $1.5 billion. In fairness to the taxpayer, and in keeping with our responsibility to hold down the costs of Government, I do not believe we should incur such large costs without a very strong assurance that the Nation will derive a maximum benefit from this huge expenditure. I am not persuaded that H.R. 9075 does this. I intend to vote for this bill because I feel strongly that there is an immediate need for an increase in military pay and I recognize the realities of the likelihood of success in attempting, at this time, to offer alternative methods of providing for it.

I have criticized the serious weaknesses in H.R. 9075. It has two features which I enthusiastically commend. The first, provision for a variable reenlistment bonus focuses directly on the most serious personnel problem the services have. Each of the Secretaries and the uniformed Chiefs emphasized the problem in specialized skills, where the costs of training are high and the opportunities in civil life are most attractive. The problem is that we are most likely to lose qualified people in just those skills where we can least afford it. The bonus would channel additional pay into these specialties. It offers the incentive toward career service at just the time that it will be most effective, when an individual decides whether or not to reenlist. Because it is variable, the service can pay more in those skills where it needs more reenlistment. For the same cost, a flat across-the-board pay increase will be nowhere near as effective in getting the right kind of reenlistments.

The other feature of the bill which I strongly support is the procedure for annual review and quadrennial major study. This is, it seems to me, and orderly and rational way to go about making pay changes. Once every 4 years the whole structure of military pay would be examined in depth. The appropriate level for two-star generals can be addressed; the relation of sergeants to corporals to privates pay can be studied; possible changes in the multitude of special pays and allowances can be examined, to see if they are meeting the specific needs for which they were designed. The major question which would be answered would be this: Is pay at a level sufficient to provide and retain the quality of people necessary to man our Armed Forces? And then, when appropriate revisions were made, we would not concern ourselves with such questions for another 4 years. In the meantime, the annual reviews would keep us posted on the changes occurring in the private sector of the economy and on the civilian side of Government employment. If and as necessary, upward shifts in military pay would be made to match upward movements in the wage level.

This procedure is valuable for two reasons: first, it makes it unnecessary to examine the entire pay structure in great detail and make extensive changes every time a pay bill is proposed. From the serviceman's viewpoint, its great value lies in the prevention of lags in the adjustment of pay. The longer pay increases are deferred, the larger the amounts required to keep pay equitable and the greater the reluctance of Congress to approve them. The systematic procedure provided in H.R. 9075 avoids problems for the committee, this House, and the individual serviceman, and it should be approved.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may require to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. EVANS].

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9075. I would like to say at the beginning, knowing the responsibilities that our chairman has had in taking over this committee this year, I want to thank him personally for taking the time and showing the patience to extend to all persons on this committee the chance to participate in all of these deliberations.

Mr. Chairman, I join in wholeheartedly supporting H.R. 9075. This bill was drafted by the Armed Services Committee after the most searching review of economic factors and the most diligent attempt to get a full evaluation of military compensation that I am aware of. As you have heard, this included the hiring of a firm of professional actuaries. I would like to speak in my brief time, however, to one point of great importance that has not been extensively covered. This is the provision for annual review of the adequacy of the pay system.

The bill provides for an annual survey of pay rates and also a searching reanalysis every 4 years of the principles and concept underlying the whole military pay structure. The first such broad review would be made not later than January 1, 1967.

This provision is in a way similar to what is provided for in the civil service system for which an annual comparability review is now required. Please notice that our bill does not just permit this review of military pay, it requires it.

The executive branch proposed that it be given automatic power to put pay increases into effect following annual reviews. Under this proposal, the Congress historic authority to initiate would become merely a negative power to veto. That is, unless the Congress specifically repudiated the increases within 60 days, they would automatically go into effect.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to review some of the reasons why I think this recommendation of the President was unfortunate and why I think the committee was wise in rejecting it. First, it has already been pointed out perhaps that this would be an abdication of Congress power under the Constitution. I think there is a serious question as to whether the Constitution would permit us to do this even if we wanted to. Since the Constitution says that Congress shall "raise and support armies," obviously, it is part of the duties of the Congress to determine the level at which they will be supported.

Beyond that, however, think of the confusion that could be caused by such a system. Having the administration determine that a certain pay raise is required and then initiating a 60-day waiting period to see whether or not the Congress vetoes such a raise would, in effect, be playing a game of "who's who?" Who is the Executive and who is the legislature.

Even if Congress did not veto the automatic raise in the 60-day period, funds would still have to be appropriated to pay for the raise. This would merely transfer the onus from the Armed Services to the Appropriations Committee. Now, if we determined that because this raise had not been vetoed in 60 days the Appropriations Committee would have to appropriate money for the raise, we would then have the absolute triumph of Executive spending over even the House Appropriations Committee. The Committee on Appropriations would be yielding up to the Executive its strongest power under the Constitution, its control of the Federal purse strings.

Further, think of the sheer chaos involved if the Appropriations Committee did not concede that it had to honor an executive branch decision to raise pay merely because the legislative committees had not vetoed the action within 60 days. Suppose, for example, that in January the executive branch finds that a pay raise of $400 million is required. The Armed Services and Civil Service Committees do not pass a negative resolution by the end of March. The administration then puts the raise into effect. In June, the Appropriations Committee reports appropriations bills which deny the $400 million for the pay raise. Where are we then? If you say the Appropriations Committee cannot do this, then you are saying it has surrendered its power to the executive branch. Such a situation would make the Bureau of Labor Statistics a much more powerful unit of the Federal Government than the House Appropriations Committee. But if the committee can do this, and does do this, you have sheer chaos: An Executive order to pay military salaries which the Appropriations Committee will not fund.

One final point. Remember that the undertaking of review often creates the desire for positive results. The simple fact of the executive branch conducting an annual pay review tends to increase the recommendations for pay increases. While annual reviews are desirable for purposes of equity, there could be a tendency to overstate pay needs which the Congress has the responsibility to guard against. It needs more than a negative authority to properly do this. It needs the sole power to initiate a pay raise.

In summary, turning over the function of increasing Federal pay to the executive branch along the lines recommended by the administration would be unworkable, confusing, destructive of morale, possibly in violation of the Constitution, and certainly an unwarranted reduction in the power of the Congress.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, Mr. MACHEN.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9075. A significant raise in military pay was an important issue in my campaign last fall. I feel very fortunate that as a member of the Armed Services Committee I was able to offer my support to legislation introduced by the able chairman by introducing an identical bill providing for a raise of nearly 11 percent.

I have received letters from all over the country in support of this legislation. This is an issue that cuts across all partisan and geographical lines. From as far away as Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, and as close as my neighborhood in Hyattsville, men and women have written asking for a substantial raise, not just a token increase.

There are many reasons to justify an across-the-board pay boost at this time. Besides the distressing situation in Vietnam, we have our servicemen and their families here at home living in conditions not dissimilar from those being attacked by the war on poverty.

It would be harsh to say that our Federal Government has been fostering poverty in its Armed Forces. But studies show that thousands of servicemen receive less than the $3,000 a year poverty level set by the Office of Economic Opportunity. I believe that it is absurd for the Government to concentrate on a program of wiping out poverty among civilians when large numbers of our military employees cannot earn a decent living.

Statistics show also that while general military compensation has increased 34 percent since 1952, civil servants have averaged more than 46-percent pay increases since then. At the same time, pay for truck drivers has jumped 70 percent since 1952.

Another distressing factor is the tremendous loss to the Government of trained military personnel who leave the service because of the inequitable pay. It has been pointed out that an enlisted man tending a nuclear reactor on a naval ship earns less than one-half of what his civilian counterpart receives.

Chairman RIVERS placed the whole issue in perspective when he said:

> If Congress and the American public fail to give their wholehearted support to this necessary adjustment in military compensation, the results could be catastrophic since it could only be interpreted by America's fighting men as evidence of public indifference to the future of our national security.

I am in complete agreement with this attitude.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT].

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I think with respect to the pending legislation, we have to recognize some simple facts. The Great Society, including a better standard of living and a freer exercise of civil rights, the right to live, the right to work and to recreate where a citizen might desire—these things are just the antithesis of military life. In the latter, you work and you play where you are told. You are told where you may bring your wife, where you may go and live, whether you are to live in a stockade or outside one, what kind of allowance will be provided for you for living and eating, when you are going to eat and what you are going to eat and where you are going to eat. They are also told how to fight, and where to fight and when to fight. You are given rights to express yourself under the regulations, but we were presented with a case before our committee where an airman attempted to express himself on this very important legislation only to find himself censured under the regulations as interpreted by one of our commanders. That was true at least at that time in the western part of the United States.

In days gone by, we have poked fun at the man who worked for a lifetime and received a watch on his retirement. The watch presentation, of course, is very comical and, I think with the spiraling increase in the cost of living today, even the retirement as being the great panacea for a successful and happy life is coming into disrepute.

I would also point out that when Secretary Nitze testified before our committee he pointed out that there were four factors which caused several hundred million dollars' worth of technically trained manpower to leave the military service and that caused poor morale. One of those was poor pay. The second was poor housing. The third was poor recognition and the fourth was being away from home too much.

I wonder how the concept of being away from home for 6 months in a Polaris submarine shapes up with our Great Society.

The passage of the pending bill which I can now report, on receiving my colleague's, Congressman STRATTON's report, that he supports this legislation, I am pleased to say is unanimously supported by our Armed Services Committee, is an important step in restoring equity in everyday American life. Today, military men are among the most poorly paid of our Federal employees. This imbalance has increased with every military pay raise, because it has failed to keep pace with the raises given to other Federal employees.

The pending legislation is aimed at removing the disparity between the military men and other Federal employees and employees on the outside.

Mr. Chairman, the pay raises proposed in this legislation would lift military incomes to a level closely correlated with the present pay of other Federal employees performing comparable services with full consideration given to the so-called fringe benefits enjoyed by the military.

This legislation then is aimed solely at making into law the fundamental American dedication to equal reward for services rendered. It will serve to correct the course of our neglect during the past decade.

Mr. Chairman, for those who would say that we are perhaps being a little overly generous with our military through this legislation, I would suggest that they look at the testimony of the Secretary of Defense when he appeared before our committee. In that testimony he showed that with respect to our officer personnel there was a lag of something like 11 years, from 1952 to 1963, where we did very little if anything for this class of personnel and the enlisted also. Also, that during that period of time they were allowed to get better than 20 percent out of balance with competitive professional and technical personnel on the outside, or an average imbalance of better than 10 percent per year for that 11-year period.

Mr. Chairman, when one considers that in our defense effort we expend yearly on the average about $15 billion and if we save 10 percent of that yearly for an 11-year period, it is readily apparent that we have saved $1.5 billion a year or $16.5 billion out of the hide of the American serviceman for the past 11 years.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the pending bill is an effort to restore some equity to this imbalance. I believe that certainly our servicemen deserve the support of the Members of this Congress and I am pleased to see that there has been very little argument about that on the floor of the House here today.

Mr. Chairman, we recognize that servicemen themselves cannot come here and express their plight. Certainly their future rests on the paternalism and foresight of the American Congress.

The administration has taken a positive approach to the plight of the military man and my objections to the administration's proposed military pay raise are entirely quantitative. The administration's proposed pay raise scale is simply not enough. Recent surveys conducted by the individual armed services have produced grim statistics concerning the low living standards of American military men and their families. According to an Air Force survey, approximately 71,000 members of the Air Force supplement their military pay with outside jobs and another survey reports that 32 percent of all marines have outside jobs. Perhaps the most striking finding of all is the fact that almost one out of every four men in the Air Force receives a basic pay below the poverty levels set by the Government. It is truly ironic that the Government's poverty program is in part a response to a situation the Government itself has created.

The lot of the American servicemen as revealed by these figures is quite shocking and borders on national disgrace, for our servicemen are the very defenders of the nations. In time of constant international unrest made dangerous by powerful enemies our military strength is necessary for the preservation of the free world. Indeed, the keystone of the foreign policy of the present administration is that military strength and national preparedness are the surest source of safety in an unsure world. In order to meet our political and economic responsibilities around the world today a strong Military Establishment is a vital necessity. In caution, I hasten to point out that this commitment to a powerful military can in now way be equated with militarism or offensive preparation on our part. This military posture is simply our only course in a divided and dangerous world not of our own making and pending further international agreements. This legislation is designed to strengthen our Armed Forces. Not only does it propose higher pay for all men in uniform but is specifically structured to reward excellence through the variable reenlistment bonus. With this device the Defense Department can offer men reenlisting in the service a bonus up to four times the present bonus rates. Perhaps with the passage of this legislation a military career will take on a new appeal to talented young men looking for a career in Government service. It is only by such incentive of selective reward that the armed services will be able to attract and keep the high quality of performance that is necessary for the Nation's defenses.

The effect of the passage of this bill upon local and national economic conditions is obvious. For example, in my constituency, the Fourth District of California, where approximately 15 percent of the population lives under the military payroll either as servicemen or their dependents, a military pay raise would have a significant influence upon the general economy. And the legislation would have like results in many similar communities around the country.

The implications of this bill, however, extend beyond purely economic considerations. My support of the bill is based primarily upon its value to national security. The military, for a while at least, is here to stay. In view of this essential role played by the armed services we should make a determined effort to build a military system composed of men of high caliber. In this military pay raise bill I see a constructive first step toward this new kind of military structure. For not only would it make first-class citizens of the Nation's defenders but also do much to assure that the Nation retains first-class defenders.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of a pay raise for the Armed Forces of the United States. It has been made unmistakably clear to me by facts brought out at the hearings before the Armed Services Committee that our military personnel need more money. There is really no job in civilian life with which to adequately compare the duties, the disciplines, and the enforced sacrifices of the military man. But we underpay our servicemen even by any general standard of comparison, leaving out the extra burdens of military life.

We read and hear daily of horrors, indignities, casualties and deaths suffered worldwide by our service personnel in the defense of our country's commitments and ideals. Yet, we pay the soldier or sailor when entering the service less than we pay the high school dropout who joins the Job Corps. We pay many of the lower enlisted grades less to take care of themselves and their families than they could get on State relief or unemployment rolls. We pay the higher ranks insufficient money to keep them from accepting the monetary lures of private industry.

There is a serious retention problem. The enlisted and junior officer grades are far below subsistence levels of income and we must remedy this situation that presents problems not conducive to the retention of our skilled and trained personnel.

This Congress is obligated to increase the pay for our military personnel. Our uniformed men and women are defending democracy at outposts throughout the world and for this commitment we are obliged to adequately compensate those who defend us, commensurate with the inherent risks and responsibility of their task.

Since World War II our freedom as a Nation, as well as individual freedom, has come under serious attack resulting in a substantial diminution of national freedom and individual rights. The Congress of the United States has not hesitated in calling upon our military people to defend our remaining rights from Communist aggression, from threats to our national security and to defend our free enterprise system. We must not hesitate now.

In advocating the committee's military pay bill, I am not advocating a program authorizing hugh sums of money for a pilot study; it is not a new or untried program; it is not a gamble, nor is it conjecture; but it is a program with approximately 189 years of experience and success behind it and the wealth of experience has taught that we must provide for our military personnel an income expectation suitable to support himself and his dependents.

I am personally convinced that the facts brought out in the recent hearings before the House Armed Services Committee fully support the need for the committee's bill. I am equally convinced that the administration's bill is inadequate because it is based on faulty statistics provided the Presidential Pay Panel by the Defense Department.

I hope Members who are in doubt will read the hearings before our committee.

I feel sure, Mr. Chairman, that had the President time to consider this matter in detail he would agree with the committee's bill as he so wholeheartedly backed our servicemen during his time in Congress. Obviously, the President was unaware of the statistical inaccuracies in the DOD presentation to the Pay Panel. These inaccurances were brought out in our hearings. This is what congressional hearings are for, to get at the truth. We have done our job. I pray the House will do its job and support this bill.

I ask that the House of Representatives support the Military Pay Act offered by the House Armed Services Committee, thus fulfilling congressional responsibility to our Armed Forces.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I wish my name to be listed among those calling for an increase in pay for the men and women of the Armed Forces. But to my colleagues who are pained by budgetary consideration, I would like to point out that we might refer to this pay bill as the last of the big ones.

Now, why do I say that?

It is no mystery as to why a military pay bill is required and why a big one is required this year.

Historically, military men had markedly lower pay but this was made up for by a high level of fringe benefits—a very good retirement system, medical care, including medical care in retirement, tax-free housing and subsistence allowances, post exchanges and commissaries, reduced recreational expenses, travel, and others.

What has happened in the period since World War II? The civilian economy has overtaken the fringe benefits program of the Government. Free or largely paid for medical and life insurance benefits are common in private industry today. Industry spends an increasing portion of its personnel dollar for such things as company funded retirement systems, sick leave, long vacation periods, in many cases free meals and the privilege of buying goods at reduced costs. It is not commonly realized, but we have reached the point where industry's percentage of payroll going for fringe benefits is virtually the same as the percentage in the Government.

It should be noted that in addition private enterprise has many benefits that are not and cannot be given to military personnel, such as stock options, large cash bonuses, et cetera. Let us also note that there are not in private industry the time-in-grade requirements that slow promotion for even the best men in the military services.

While there has been a steady rise in fringe benefits in private industry and for civil servants, what has been the situation for military personnel? Military fringe benefits have actually gone down somewhat. The only new substantial benefits military people have obtained over the last 15 years are the family separation allowance—which merely provides small additional funds to cover added expenses when the serviceman is away from his family—and the Dependent Medical Care Act, which provides care in civilian hospitals for military dependents. Military dependents, however, had always gotten most of their care in military hospitals.

While these two benefits were being added over this period, the services have lost fringe benefits. Dependent dental care has practically ceased. Prices in the commissaries and exchanges have been increased for the individual serviceman and items available in exchanges have been severely limited. With the loss of recomputation—that is, the right to recompute retired pay on the latest pay scales—military retirement benefits have been reduced. In addition, temporarily at least, the serviceman has lost the traditional benefit of medical care in retirement.

Now, while the civilian fringe benefits were catching up and passing the military fringe benefits, military pay did not make any great leap forward to catch up with civilian pay. In fact, military pay fell far behind civil service pay in the years since 1952 at a time when civil service pay was gradually being brought up to a level with private industry. The reason for this is very simple. Congress voted a lot more raises for the civilian employees than for its military personnel. Up until 1958, it was traditional that the serviceman got a pay raise in the same Congress, generally in the same year, as civil servants did. This was true in 1952, 1955, and 1958.

In 1960, civil servants broke the sound barrier when they got a pay raise passed over the President's veto. Civil servants got another pay raise in 1962—in two increments, the first in October 1962, and the second in January 1964. Civil servants also got another pay raise in October of 1964, which saw very large increases for the upper classes. And the honeymoon is not over yet, as we shall find out in a few weeks.

During most of this time, the military stood still. In 1963, the military services got a large pay raise costing over $1 billion. And in 1964, they got a very small pay raise, averaging about 2½ percent.

The President's pay panel, in making their recommendations this year, assumed that the 1963 pay raise had put military personnel at a proper comparable level in relation to civil servants and that this year's bill merely would have to maintain them at the 1963 level.

Mr. Chairman, this is the crux of the problem. The 1963 pay raise only closed a little more than half of the gap that had opened between civil service and military scales since 1958. Four or five small raises are better than one big one. As a matter of fact, as we all know, four 5 percent raises are better than one 20 percent raise. Roughly speaking, this is what has happened. The military got one big percentage raise in 1963, but the civil servants by them had gotten a series of raises that cumulatively added up to a higher percentage.

The great virtue of H.R. 9075, the bill brought forth today by the Armed Services Committee, is that it would finally close the gap. We are not, of course, making up for what the military man has lost over the years, but we are seeing that he will be on a par from now on. That is why I say, Mr. Chairman, that this can be considered the last of the big ones. Once this bill is passed, we will in the future require only more moderate adjustments in line with rising living costs, such as is now contemplated for civil servants. Therefore, I urge all of my colleagues, in the strongest possible terms, to vote for this bill and to assure, in the words of our highly esteemed and distinguished chairman, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, that the members of our Armed Forces have "a standard of living at least as good as the standard of living they are defending."

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LOVE].

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, may I first state how proud I am to be associated with such a fine committee under such a dedicated and knowledgeable chairman and to work with individuals who approach the problems of national defense on a bipartisan basis. The gentlemen on the other side of the aisle must be complimented for their dedication in placing the national interest above political consideration.

I am pleased to be associated with the remarks of my chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, with those of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable WILLIAM H. BATES, and others on both sides of the aisle who support the bill for the reason that it takes some intestinal fortitude to make an objective analysis of the problems of military pay which in some of its aspects are contrary to those of the administration as set forth by the President's Folsom Pay Panel.

I believe it was Branch Rickey, of baseball fame, who once said, "Never accept the negative without exploring the positive." What pleased me the most was the Armed Services Committee's positive approach to this serious problem. We would not be denied.

I am in such complete agreement with my fellow members of the committee on their conclusion on the matter of a military pay raise, that I introduced a bill identical to my chairman's bill, now under consideration in this Chamber.

The need for the enactment of H.R. 9075 is disclosed by a careful reading of the committee's report. At last the members of the armed services will be compensated at a level comparable to civilians in our economy.

The Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1965 will provide the first increase in 13 years of enlisted members with 2 years or less of service. Passage of this proposal would also provide an adequate adjustment for the 1963 pay bill which gave the first increase since 1952 for officers with under 2 years of service. Although the administration's proposal has many good points, it does overlook the needs of these two groups in favor of those with longer service. However, the time has come when we must assure these members with less than 2 years of service that they will be able to adequately provide for their families. If these men must resort to "moonlighting," heavy debt, or help from their parents, how can their Government ever expect them to reenlist when their initial tenure is completed?

I believe the testimony of Gen. Omar N. Bradley, retired, of the Folsom Pay Panel, best describes the problem—the retention problem:

> I would like to emphasize that my remarks in no way imply that our top service leadership today is mediocre. These men were committed to the services before the present discrepancies in pay arose. I am concerned about our ability to continue to attract men who will become our leaders of the future.
>
> I believe that your present hearing will bring out the following facts:
>
> 1. Now that many industries send recruiting teams into the principal colleges and universities to interview the members of the graduating classes, the services are not geting their share of the outstanding men.
>
> 2. That the salaries and other benefits offered as far in excess of those offered by the services.
>
> 3. That we are losing many of our best potential leaders after they have served their obligatory service.
>
> 4. That our training programs are very expensive and are made so because of the large turnover in personnel.
>
> 5. That the lifetime total compensation of our leaders who reach the top positions, compares very unfavorably with that of those who reach top positions in other walks of life.
>
> 6. That in many cases, the commissioned officer in charge of the project, and who is responsible for its success, receives less pay than some of the Civil Service employees in his office.
>
> 7. That commutation of quarters is usually less than what the service member is required to pay for rent. Frequent changes of station and separation of families because of foreign service, add to housing costs.
>
> I would like to make one more point. That is, the effect of the whole compensation system on the continuing morale of the services. Of course, morale is not dependent

on pay alone, but adequate compensation is undoubtedly one of the elements.

Our committee report does, in fact, show that General Bradley's seven points summarize the basic problems of the various branches of the armed services today. A vast amount of testimony, tables, and statistics point to one obvious conclusion: An adequate pay raise is needed to bring all military personnel's total compensation up to levels equal to their civilian counterparts.

In the last analysis, the future of the military rests in the hands of the public. If we give servicemen secondary treatment, we tamper with the innermost fabric of military security as well as our own. If, through neglect, we lose the ablest and most skilled servicemen in the country, then the free world's future is truly in question.

I sincerely hope my colleagues will join me in voting for H.R. 9075.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, out where I come from a critter roped and hogtied, you do not roll all the meat off him before you send him to market.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9075, and, of the chairman and Members who believe and defend the constitutional concept that the Congress shall raise, provide for, and establish policy in the military services.

Our able chairman of the Armed Services Committee has succinctly and with great force spelled out the need and justification for this pay increase for our military personnel. I should like to add my voice in urging the adoption of this legislation.

We live today in a world of crisis.

In this world, we have come to expect a complete dedication of our military personnel. We think nothing of asking them to live in and walk in space, to fight and die for their country in far-flung places such as the dense, rain-soaked, dangerous, and disease-ridden jungles of Vietnam, to be uprooted with their families at frequent intervals by station transfers, to be separated from their families for long periods of time because of foreign or sea duty, or to commit themselves to 24-hour-a-day call in tedious technical, but vital, tasks.

We have asked much—we have received from them even more than we have asked. They have given of themselves unstintingly. This is our Nation's tradition.

It is past time that this Nation reward that constant dedication.

I agreed with Secretary McNamara when he stated before our committee:

> We cannot compensate the man in uniform for the unique hazards of the military profession, but we can and should see to it that he at least shares with the civilian population the rising standard of living.

But I disagree that a 2.7- or 4.8-percent increase in service pay will permit our men in uniform to share with the civilian population the rising standard of living. The evidence before our committee conclusively established the contrary.

The evidence garnered by our committee showed that a 10.6-percent increase will be a big step forward. It will not compensate the man in uniform for the unique hazards of the military profession; but it will, to some extent, permit him to share "with the civilian population the rising standard of living."

As Gen. Omar Bradley so ably told our committee:

> Unlimited liability is inherent in the mandate from the people of the United States charging each person in uniform to stand ready to defend this Nation, when necessary, at the risk of his life. This charge exists for no other walk of life, profession or calling.

It is incongruous that these same men are being asked to do this much on a pauper's wage. The minimum wage rates in this country are $1.25 per hour. Is the House aware that, in order to make this minimum wage, the typical serviceman must be at least a corporal or a third-class petty officer? This includes his housing and food allowance. It is gross injustice to provide Job Corps candidates a starting wage equal to or exceeding that of our servicemen. A "delinquent" who enters the Job Corps is as well provided for as a military recruit. Perhaps true equity in pay plus the training the military services are famed for, is the beginning of the end of need for the peacetime "draft."

H.R. 9075 would at least restore the serviceman's starting pay to a higher plateau than some of our youth welfare programs. The recruit's basic pay sponsored in this bill is $87.90, an increase of $9.90 per month. Remember, our draftee must serve 24 months, compared to other nations' 12 months "callups." This proposal represents the first serious step in 13 years to improve the pay of a recruit. As conservative as this increase appears, it will do much toward improving the lot of the serviceman and will, in my opinion, provide an impetus toward increased attractiveness of military service, and retention of technically qualified and needed personnel therein.

The increases proposed for the higher enlisted and officer grades are entirely justified. You have only to review the salary trends in the Federal civil service in the past few years to recognize the need.

The average increases in civil service pay since 1952 have been approximately 46 percent. The military increase in that same time has been 36.6 percent for those personnel with over 2 years service. If we include those men serving obligated service, the average military increase has been less than 34 percent. With these standards in mind, the bill before you proposes an average pay increase of 10.6 percent, and is designed solely to provide our military men and women parity with increases already provided to Federal civilians. The committee has accepted many good ideas and portions from the departmental bill. You can, in good conscience, provide no less, for those who serve.

Our military is no less deserving than any other faction in our economy to share in the wealth and productivity of this Nation. I urge each of you to lend your support to H.R. 9075.

I shall ask, Mr. Chairman, when we are back in the Whole House, permission to revise and extend my remarks; and include a statement on this bill H.R. 9075, I made for the Seventh Missouri Congressional District on June 8, 1965.

This week, the House Armed Services Committee, on which I serve, began hearings on legislation to provide a pay increase for members of the armed services. One of these proposals, originated within the committee, is cosponsored by 34 of its members, including myself, and our chairman, the Honorable MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina. The committee-backed bill would provide an average increase of approximately 11 percent in basic pay for all members of the uniformed services. The bill, sponsored by the administration, provides for a 5-percent increase for military personnel with over 2 years service, with a 3-percent base pay increase for those with less than 2 years service.

Although there is a very definite difference in the recommendations emanating from the executive and legislative branches, the fact is that both branches agree that a military pay increase is justified. The question, therefore, is, "How large an increase is justified, and where should these increases be placed in the military pay structure?" One of the first factors to be resolved is a comparison of pay structures for civil employees of the Federal Government with those in the military services. At one time, the job security afforded members of the military services was considered an additional benefit beyond those available to civil employees, and, therefore, a factor to be considered in setting pay scales. However, this is no longer true, since under civil service, civilian employees have virtually the same retirement and greater assurance of job security than those in the military. In some instances, they have even greater security than many military officers who may be involuntarily discharged because of age in grade, poor efficiency, or physical disqualification.

In 1949, the average annual pay of a classified civilian employee of the Federal Government was $4,620. At that time, the average annual military pay—including quarters and subsistence allowances, amounted to $3,846—a difference of approximately $774. Today, this dollar differential has increased to $1,676. The average pay of classified Civil Service personnel is now $7,369, while average military pay, including all allowances, is only $5,692. To restore the same relationship that previously existed with civilian Federal pay levels would require an 11.6 percent increase in military base pay. The year 1949 was selected as a starting point because it was at that time when the military compensation system was completely overhauled by the Congress in the Career Compensation Act of 1949. From these comparisons, it is quite evident that even in the "catching up process" military pay increases have lagged behind those provided civilian employees of the Federal Government.

But statistics alone do not fully portray the inadequacy of our present military pay structure. Today, 76,000 American soldiers, marines, sailors, and airmen are facing hazards of war in Vietnam. In every corner of the globe, the members of the uniformed services represent our only sure line of defense against communism, subversion, and aggression. In addition, those who man battle stations around the world must often endure the hardship of long separation from family and loved ones, a sacrifice which few civilian employees are called upon to make. As our committee considers these many aspects (not to mention the question of locating sources of revenue to carry out these adjustments), one thought must remain uppermost in our minds: In 1945, America's first Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal, was watching our forces prepare to land in Iwo Jima. As he saw many of those Americans going to what was to be a final resting place, he was moved to say:

"In the last analysis, it's the man with the rifle and the machine gun who wins the wars and who pays the penalty to preserve our liberty."

I know our committee will consider the Nation's debt to those who serve in time of crisis, as it undertakes to make needed pay adjustments for the members of our uniformed services. I hope we will also appreciate their willingness, devotion, and dedication.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CALLAWAY].

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, many times I have been before this body to speak for economy, for a balanced budget, and for reductions in runaway Federal spending. Today I find myself here in support of an additional spending program, yet one that differs from others and that is every way consistent with the goals of those who favor sane Government spending. Today I rise in support of a pay raise for our military men and women, a measure badly needed, Mr. Chairman, and one that I can truly feel is at last worthy of that catchall phrase "in the national interest." For I firmly believe that the adequate maintenance of our military is in the proper realm of Government spending, and the highest maintenance of our Nation's defense is the proper role of the Federal Government. When a man pays his taxes, Mr. Chairman, this is the sort of thing he wants to buy. He may not want to pay his neighbor's rent, but he wants to share in the cost of protecting himself, his family and his Nation.

Therefore, to scrimp on the pay of those who are serving in our Nation's defense would indeed be false economy. There can be no justification for compromising any area of our Nation's defense, and there can certainly be no justification for spending more on a high school dropout in the Job Corps than on a boy fighting for all of us in Vietnam. President Kennedy said:

> Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country.

Let us then do justice to those who are not asking, but who are doing.

But beyond this, Mr. Chairman, are overwhelming practical considerations in favor of this bill. Today our military departments are faced with the problem of attracting and maintaining adequate personnel. This fact was brought out in testimony after testimony by our military leaders. Surely the loss of qualified military men is not in the interest of the Nation's defense, and surely the cost of constant turnover and retraining is not in the interest of national economy. A pay raise, therefore, to keep our well-trained men in the services is not only the fair thing to do, but it is also the practical thing to do.

To the distinguished committee that guided and fostered this necessary legislation, I think that all Americans owe a debt of thanks. This committee knows, as we all know, that our country has a military force of which we can all be proud. I have seen our men in action in Vietnam, and I frequently see them at Fort Benning and Robins Air Force Base in my district, as I did on an inspection tour just this past weekend. As they have throughout this Nation's history, Mr. Chairman, our armed services are doing a magnificent job. Their traditions, their victories, and their record is testimony to greatness that has never failed America. I only ask that America not fail them today.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9075. First, I would like to congratulate the distinguished chairman and ranking minority member, and the entire Committee on Armed Services for bringing to the Congress this foresighted proposal to increase the compensation of the members of the armed services.

This afternoon, we have discussed enough the humanitarian aspects of this bill and, in my opinion, not enough the basic management concept of this proposal.

For the past 10 years it has been my privilege to serve on the Advisory Board to the Air Training Command of the U.S. Air Force. This Board has been dedicated to the study of manpower development in the Air Force and toward the solution of other problems which burden this greatest of all educational institutions; namely, the Air Training Command.

Repeatedly, it has come to the attention of this Board that an increased investment on the part of our Government in the compensation of military personnel will unquestionably reap great rewards in terms of the quality of our people in the armed services.

I predict that shortly after this bill is enacted into law and the new pay schedule is enforced, we will begin to see the tangible results of this bill in terms of economy. I believe that the career motivation that will be generated among the hard core elements, specifically the highly technically trained people throughout the services, will more than make up in actual dollars saved for the cost of the legislation. Our failure to retain good people today is one of the biggest cost items of the military service budget.

Therefore, not only as a Member of this House, but as a taxpayer, I feel this bill not only is needed from a humanitarian point of view but is needed as part of sound management.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9075, but before I do that I would like to pay genuine and well deserved tribute to our chairman, MENDELL RIVERS, for the excellence of his leadership, his courage, and his devotion to the adequate defense of our country.

I would like particularly to point out an important feature of this bill regarding enlisted men. Our distinguished chairman has already stressed that the big bulk of the cost of this bill goes to enlisted men. In addition, we have added to the bill a special feature called "the variable reenlistment bonus." What this means is that on top of the traditional reenlistment bonus additional sums can be paid, the amounts varying according to the retention needs of the various enlisted rates.

The Secretary of Defense told our committee that the retention problem was not uniform throughout the services and that in some rates the retention rate was more than adequate. But in about 40 percent of the total enlistment strength, additional reenlistments are needed to achieve proper service manning objectives. Generally speaking, of course, this 40 percent are the more critical rates where training time is extensive—electronics specialties, for example. The Defense Department advised our committee that in a few of the more critically undermanned specialties—making up about 5 percent of our enlisted strength—losses of $10,000 or more occur whenever a first-termer fails to reenlist and operational capability suffers because of severe shortages of careerists.

Mr. Chairman, the variable reenlistment bonus, concentrating at the critical career decision points, is the answer to the retention needs in critical ratings. It is just plain good personnel planning to provide a $4,000 bonus to encourage reenlistment rather than to pay $10,000 to train a replacement.

The present reenlistment bonus, while being a longstanding traditional enlistment benefit which should be maintained, does not discriminate among skills and so does not help solve the selective retention problem.

To illustrate how the variable reenlistment provision for first-term reenlistees works, the present bonus for an E-4 or E-5 runs between $800 and $1,000. The variable bonus could add from about $3,000 to almost $4,000 to this amount. Thus, the maximum total bonus for a 4-year reenlistment could run between $4,000 and $4,950.

In using the Defense Department's recommendation for the variable reenlistment bonus, the committee provided that it would be paid in yearly increments rather than one lump sum. This lessens the tax bite on the enlisted man. It will probably make for more sound financial planning for the individual concerned. And it reminds him annually of one of the real benefits of career service.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to mention briefly two other aspects which are not included in the bill but which bear directly on the matter of enlisted retention.

First, there is the question of proficiency pay, first authorized by the Congress in 1958, for enlisted personnel. Proficiency pay was designed to serve the same purpose as the variable reenlistment bonus, to provide additional pay on a selective basis for the outstanding man without having to raise the pay of each individual. The Congress authorized proficiency pay up to $150 per month and contemplated that it would go to approximately 15 percent of the enlisted force. The committee found, however, that it has been going to only 8.6 percent of enlisted personnel and that Defense has never allowed the full $150 a month. The committee heard that each service had repeatedly requested additional funds for pro pay only to be denied its use by the Department of Defense. While there has been much criticism of proficiency pay by some enlisted elements, it might have been a more effective tool for retention if the Defense Department had allowed it to be fully used.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would merely like to point out the unnecessary problem the Army is having with enlisted insignia. Ever since the Pay Act of 1958, which provided the additional grades of E–8 and E–9, the Army has, for some strange reason, had trouble deciding the insignia to be used for enlisted ranks. Mr. Chairman, enlisted men wear their stripes, the symbol of their military rank, on their sleeve. To have to remove a stripe, for whatever reason, is an unpleasant experience which hurts the enlisted man's morale and which is very difficult for him to explain to his civilian friends. The Army's stripes plan would require over 40,000 noncommissioned officers to remove stripes. The flood of letters to service papers and Members of Congress makes it clear that this is having an adverse effect on retention and is making many enlisted men so disgusted with Army procedure that they are ready to leave the service. What makes the Army approach particularly objectionable is that in many cases the Army enlisted man would have one less stripe than the enlisted man of identical rank in the other services. You can imagine the difficulty an Army noncommissioned officer would have trying to explain that to his family or to a potential Army recruit. The committee has asked for a formal report from the Army on the matter and I sincerely hope the Army personnel planners will be big enough to admit a mistake and do what is best for the enlisted men.

Before closing I would like to quote from a few letters I have received on the question of sergeant's stripes legislation.

One enlisted man wrote:

> The Department of Army stripe change effective in September is a terrible blow to the spirit and morale which have characterized our NCO ranks throughout American military history.

Another wrote:

> There are many NCO's who have held their rank much longer than I who will be even more hurt. Even more important though is the fact that this is hurting reenlistment of the younger men.

Another wrote:

> It is another example of how the U.S. Army defeats its own efforts to retain men in the service. My advice to young men considering the Army as a career—as a result of this latest directive by the Army to change enlisted grade insignia—don't stay in the Army, go Navy or Air Force, but get out of the Army.

Another wrote:

> I have served as a recruiter and am now serving as a career counselor and know firsthand the damaging effect on morale and retention of good quality personnel that the new stripe policy will have.

Another wrote:

> Up until the change was announced we were reenlisting more than 50 percent of first-term RA's but for the last 2 months we have lost about 80 percent, and one of the remarks is they have no security and no respect for an organization that will demote personnel without reason.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON].

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, it was my great pleasure to support this legislation in committee and it is a greater pleasure today to support it on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I, too, would like to commend the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], the ranking minority member of the committee and all the members of the committee who have worked so long and so hard to bring this measure to the floor.

I think one could venture the assertion today that much of the legislation that is passed in this Chamber does not meet with general public approval. I believe it could safely be said and even assumed that the passage of this legislation today will meet the commendation and approval of a preponderant majority of American citizens because it does provide an equitable basic pay scale for our military personnel.

It was my pleasure recently to visit in a military hospital where one floor was occupied by casualties from both South Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. I wish every citizen of this country and particularly the Members of this Congress could have been with me as I talked to those young men individually and caught some of their enthusiasm and some of their love and affection for this country of ours.

There were young men there, who were asked, "How are you getting along, old fellow? How are you making out?" The answers were, "Well, I will be on this bed, they say, for 6 months. I will be on crutches for perhaps another 6 months, or perhaps another 18 months, but I will be back in the fighting lines someday."

That is the feeling I found. That is the response from the young men who are dying in Vietnam and who died in the Dominican Republic, and those in our hospitals today. It is a far cry from some of the expressions we hear in the intellectual-collegiate circles of America. It is a far cry from what we hear from some of the leadership in some of the movements going on in America today—that we ought to get out of Vietnam, that we ought to find a method and means to compromise our situation there.

What we are doing here today, in my humble judgment, Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, is bringing inspiration to the American people that at long last the Congress of the United States is meeting its responsibility in the well-defined areas of responsibility and authority of the Federal Government by doing something for men all over the world who are making freedom possible for us here.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Chairman, in any legislation dealing with military pay and allowances, we must give full consideration to two basic factors.

One is the adequacy of present pay scales for uniformed personnel in comparison to civilian pay. Since the end of the Korean war there has been a continuous exodus of the kind of servicemen we need to maintain our Military Establishment. Many of our skilled, highly trained military technicians are leaving the service after fulfilling their obligations, in search of higher pay and better living conditions in civilian life.

Another factor which we must fully consider is that of maintaining a pay scale which is sufficient to attract men to serve in the military on a career basis. Present military pay scales are not, obviously, sufficient to attract and retain qualified personnel. Statistics available to the Department of Defense indicate a steady decline since 1960 in the number of career personnel in the military. Likewise, the levels of compensation paid the military have consistently lagged behind the wage adjustments paid other workers in the economy. The military wage levels today are more than 10 percent behind the levels of compensation presently provided other Federal employees.

I do not believe there is any question that the men and women of the Armed Services are entitled to and require an increase in pay. Neither is there any question that such an increase is needed in order to make military service more attractive to prospective servicemen and to those already serving.

I fully intend to support H.R. 9075 as I believe the bill will not only help to correct present inequities but will result, through increased reenlistment, in substantial savings to the country. The costs of training new men are much higher than those involved in retraining experienced men now in the service.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, no issue facing this Nation today should bring greater concern to this body than that of adequate pay for our military personnel. This issue has attracted the attention of our Nation's leaders and have given cause to voluminous testimony, both written and verbal.

For many years the serviceman has been in many respects the forgotten man. We call on him and lionize him in our times of most desperate need, then tend to forget him when the shooting stops. Yet it often is his very presence in uniform which keeps hostilities from flaring up anew on an ever-widening scale.

The time has come to pay something more than a Fourth of July type of patriotic tribute to our military. I am as conscious as any of the need for fiscal responsibility in Government. Yet I am convinced that we have engaged in false economy in the matter of military pay.

Military salaries will never be absolutely competitive with those of their civilian counterparts. It takes a highly motivated individual. We could never, of course, put a proper price tag on serving in Vietnam, on circling the earth in a spacecraft, or standing guard on the edge of rebel-held territory in Santo Domingo.

No longer can we deal primarily in numbers as regards our military posture, for this Nation is not one which possesses an inexhaustible supply of manpower. When we realize the overpowering numerical legion of men readily available in Red China and the Soviet Union, quickly we recognize the need to concern ourselves with perfecting and relying on brain power as well as brawn power. We simply do not have the brute strength in numbers nor was this Nation founded as—nor God willing will it ever become—an essentially militaristic power.

At a time of unprecedented national prosperity, considerable numbers of our military citizens are unable to keep their heads above the level of the financially disadvantaged. Those of us who have taken a good hard look at the military pay structure cannot experience less than a sense of shame toward the financial plight of many of the men who protect our country.

In the Air Force alone, of the 884,000 on active duty, some 153,730 are required to moonlight—to work full time on an extra job, if you please—in order to supplement their income. An additional 180,000 Air Force wives also must work in order for their families to survive financially.

These figures do not take into account those who would like to work after hours if they could do so. Many are stationed near small communities which offer no outside job opportunities; others work many overtime hours at their regular military tasks, precluding any extra work. And of course, in some cases regulations prevent moonlighting by military personnel where it would be in competition with local workers.

It has been stated that anyone making under $3,000 a year is financially disadvantaged. In the Air Force alone, 169,000 receive basic pay below $3,000 per year. Additionally, 5,000 Air Force men this past year lined up in front of local welfare agencies to receive relief benefits in the form of surplus food commodities. This fact should be a point of shame to the Congress. Approximately 55,000 more were technically eligible for such relief but far too proud to accept it.

The fiscal authorization contained in this bill admittedly is a lot of money. But in terms of the numbers of highly skilled, well trained, and carefully educated military individuals who annually leave the service to support their families at better pay on the outside, this figure is a veritable bargain. Consider the following figures. The total investment cost of training just one radar electronics specialist is $23,000; for training a ballistic missile launch officer, $49,140; for a B–52 commander, $1,400,000, and for his crew another $2 million. When these men are forced to quit, all that investment goes down the drain.

Between 60 and 70 percent of all skilled enlisted men leave at the end of their first 4-year term. An average of 54 percent of the officers separate at the earliest permitted date. In the past 5 years, Army resignations have increased by more than 50 percent, and Air Force resignations by more than 137 percent Just recently the Secretary of the Navy publicly pleaded with his personnel to extend their enlistments so that the Navy could retain adequate numbers of experienced personnel to cope with the world situation.

It costs $1 billion to buy unit equipment for a B–52 wing of 45 aircraft and operate them with their required tankers for 5 years. It costs $1 billion to buy 40 B–58's and operate them with their required tankers for 5 years. It costs $1 billion to buy 6 Polaris submarines with a total of 96 missiles and operate them for 5 years.

Yet, no matter how much we talk about the wonder of new weapons systems, the common denominator is and always will be the men who make them work. Military service more and more requires intensive technical training. It requires a steady and dependable supply of men educated in the traditions of national service and trained to the ready acceptance of great responsibilities and to the discipline which such responsibility places on them.

As new and evermore sophisticated weapons systems and techniques emerge, the military must have the education necessary to assimilate the required training for these weapons systems and techniques. Today 94 percent of our commissioned officers have some college credit. Sixty-five percent have a college degree or higher. And 90 percent of all enlisted personnel have a high school diploma or better. In 1948, only 24.7 percent of all officers had degrees and in 1958, 48.4 percent had them. Times have changed, and the military brainpower requirements grow ever greater.

All this points up the fact that the present inadequate pay scale does not attract and retain sufficient numbers of qualified career personnel. Hardship discharges increased from 9,533 in fiscal 1963 to 12,668 in fiscal year 1965. In 1964, among personnel leaving the Navy, over 21,600 were men possessing critical skills in such crucial fields as electronics which require a vast amount of training and intelligence.

It is significant that, whereas our basic military trainee is paid $78 a month upon entering his military service, an enrollee in the Job Corps receives $80 a month and $105 monthly if he possesses a dependent.

In my home State it is tragic but true that an airman second class—or corporal, if you please—with over 2 years service draws only $10 a month more in pay than does an unemployed civilian. If this serviceman could obtain permission for discharge by his commander and if he were a legal resident of Texas, he could remove himself to a bench on the courthouse square and whittle away his time with a pay cut of only $10 a month.

We talk of missiles in space and sophisticated weaponry unheard of just a decade ago; yet along with the inadequate service pay is coupled a subsistence allowance dating back before the Civil War. I wonder how many realize that an officer receives $47.88 a month to eat on and an enlisted man $31.50. Let me hastily add that these figures apply to both a single man and one with a large family as well.

Inadequate housing allowances also offer no relief for retention of our military. An airman first class draws $83 quarters allowance from the Government, and for a man with a family it is a rare community, indeed, that affords him any type of housing for this amount.

Yes, to raise military pay will cost money. But compared to the billions of dollars a year wasted in unnecessary turnover and the incalculable threat to our protective strength and the safety of our country, it is a small price, indeed. I think it is easily demonstrable that this bill can more than pay for itself by the savings it will bring about in the high extra training costs caused by this inordinately high turnover.

Today our military are in danger of becoming forgotten men. The economy is leaving them so far behind that it is small wonder they are becoming disillusioned and embittered, unwilling to put up any longer with the status of second-class citizenship.

The military pay raise before this House will show these almost-forgotten men that we do value and cherish their service. The annual review of military pay each year will help motivate them to a military career, and the payment of additional moneys for critical skills will in many ways be the prevailing factor in retaining these individuals within the service. The similar increase for our Reserve and National Guard units is especially paramount at this time when many face possible recall to active service.

Many years ago, the following poem was scrawled on a sentry box. It is as fitting today as it was then:

God and the soldier all men adore
In time of trouble and no more:
For when war is over and all things righted,
God is neglected; the soldier slighted.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I heartily support the military pay raise, bill, H.R. 9075, now pending. This bill authorizes much-needed increases in basic pay averaging 10.6 percent for all members of the uniformed military services. Providing the first pay increase since 1952 for enlisted personnel with 2 or less years of service, H.R. 9075 allows these servicemen an average pay increase of 17.3 percent. It authorizes an average increase of 11.1 percent for enlistees with over 2 years of service, a 22-percent average increase for officers with less than 2 years of service and an overall pay increase of 6.4 percent for officers with over 2 years of service.

In addition to raising pay, H.R. 9075, permits the Defense Department to pay a person, having a critical skill, an additional amount up to four times the bonus to which he is currently entitled upon reenlisting. Furthermore, it establishes a procedure to require the President to review the adequacy of the military pay system each year and report to Congress.

From the standpoint of the individual servicemen, H.R. 9075 authorizes necessary salary increases. I have received countless letters from constituents, servicemen, many of them servicemen's wives, who are finding it increasingly difficult to manage their households under the present military salary system.

On the other hand, if the armed services are to attract and retain the well-trained and qualified personnel vital to our defense system, it must offer salaries at least comparable to the compensation received in other vocations and by Federal civilian employees. The drop in reenlistment rates, the loss of qualified career personnel to higher paying vocations, costs the taxpayer many millions of dollars, as training costs of each new inductee vary from $4,000 to $5,000. The additional bonus provided in the bill will serve to retain the trained career personnel.

The House Armed Services Committee conducted a thorough and comprehensive study of the present military pay system and then reported H.R. 9075 favorably with a 34 to 1 vote. The only dissenting vote cast to allow even greater pay increases. The committee has recommended a thoughtful approach to much-needed revision of the military pay system and I urge House approval of H.R. 9075.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9075, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services.

Enactment of this legislation is necessary to insure that all uniformed services personnel will, now, and in the future, be provided a level of compensation comparable to that enjoyed by other workers in our economy.

The failure of military pay levels to keep pace with wage adjustments provided Federal civilian employees and workers in the private section of economy has contributed significantly to the inability of the military departments to attract and retain adequate numbers of qualified career personnel. This fact is evident in that among the various reasons given by personnel who elect not to continue their military careers is, invariably, the inadequacy of military compensation.

The inability to attract and retain adequate numbers of highly qualified career personnel is shared by all the military departments. While the problem is particularly acute in the Department of the Navy, as evidenced publicly by the recent plea made by the Secretary of the Navy in which he requested both enlisted and officer personnel who had completed their obligated service to voluntarily extend their period of service so as to enable the Navy to properly meet its operational commitments, it is nevertheless a problem faced by all the services.

Recent recruiting experience of the military departments also reflects the growing recruitment problem. For example, since July 1964 enlistments of new recruits have fallen below corresponding 1963 levels by as much as 18 percent.

It is significant to note at this point that the Department of Defense has strongly recommended early enactment of a variable reenlistment bonus to help correct the career retention problem. Secretary McNamara, in his statement to the Committee on Armed Services, said authority for the variable reenlistment bonus was desired "to allow the use of the reenlistment bonus as a flexible device in helping to retain people in skills that are in short supply."

Information provided the Committee on Armed Services by Secretary McNamara indicated that additional reenlistments are needed in specialties accounting for about 41 percent of the total enlisted force strength in order to achieve all of services' manning objectives. In other words, the military departments are experiencing serious retention problems in almost half of the enlisted ranks, rates, and skills in the total structure. On the other hand, it does not mean that all is well with the remaining 59 percent since it is axiomatic that an actual excess in retention is required so as to permit the military departments reasonable opportunity for "selectivity" in the retention of the best qualified personnel.

The inability of the military departments to obtain selectivity in connection with the reenlistment of personnel has often resulted in the necessity to reenlist poor performers and borderline disciplinary cases in order to maintain force levels. Thus, when these marginal enlistees are retained there is an inevitable downgrading of the personnel capability of the military unit with the result that the remaining good men are required to carry a heavier load. This extra workload forced upon personnel because of poor performers again inevitably detracts from the desire of these competent personnel to continue their military careers.

During the past year, the press has carried numerous accounts of the large number of military personnel who were required to hold an extra job in order to insure additional financial income. The press referred to this second job activity as "moonlighting."

Testimony received by the committee confirmed the fact that an unfortunately large percentage of military personnel are forced to obtain a second job so as to provide their families with an adequate standard of living. Departmental statistics indicate that during calendar year 1964 approximately 34 percent of all enlisted personnel in the continental United States, at one time or another, engaged in moonlighting activities.

Since uniformed personnel are part of the Federal family of workers, and since significant efforts have recently been made by both the Congress and the administration to place Federal civilian employee wage levels on a basis comparable to that of workers in the private sector of our economy, the Armed Services Committee initiated a study to determine the relative changes which have occurred in military and Federal civilian pay scales.

This effort was designed to measure the relative change in pay of these two groups of Federal workers over a given period of time. Its primary objective, therefore, was to determine to what degree the salary relationship of all military and Federal civilian employees had been altered by pay changes in the respective personnel systems.

In order to accomplish this objective, it was necessary for the committee to identify the various elements of military compensation and the comparable elements of Federal civilian compensation.

The committee hearings contain a complete documentation of this study, the net result of which indicates that since 1952 military pay increases have amounted to 33.9 percent while during an equivalent period Federal civilian pay increases have amounted to 46.3 percent.

The compensation of enlisted military personnel has consistently lagged behind the percentage pay increase provided other workers in occupations requiring similar skill levels.

Mr. Chairman, none can question the need for a highly competent and dedicated personnel in our uniformed services. This is a time when that need is acutely apparent. Ironically, the present military pay structure places many of our military men within the poverty formula as established by the administration. Such an inadequate pay scale is a critical matter, particularly the compensation for men with less than 2 years service. Our Nation has been strangely stingy with its military people.

I commend the work of Chairman Rivers and his entire committee. They have handled a somewhat delicate and highly technical matter with both dispatch and clarity. I join the committee in urging the passage of this legislation—not just for the sake of our military personnel—but for the sake of our Nation.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to enthusiastically support the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1965.

In this connection, it is my firm conviction that Chairman Rivers of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, and the members of this important committee, are to be highly commended for their detailed study, and their dedicated work in bringing this most urgent legislation to the floor of the House this afternoon.

During these uncertain times of international tensions, it is fitting and proper that the U.S. Congress pass this bill, H.R. 9075, without amendment. This is the one way that we can reassure the members of the armed services—upon whom we are completely dependent for the protection of our way of life—that their sacrifices, which they are making for us today, are recognized and deeply appreciated by a grateful Nation.

It is absolutely essential that America maintain skilled, qualified men and women of superior abilities in the hazardous task of being truly our first line of defense—our first line of protection.

These men and women are subject to the most hazardous duties, and their services are needed 24 hours a day and 7 days a week. Therefore, it is only proper that the U.S. Congress authorize this very equitable and fair increase in their compensation, in order that our American people may benefit by their retention in our Armed Forces.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I strongly feel that we all owe a deep debt of gratitude to Chairman Rivers for his leadership and, by passing the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1965 without amendment, our military forces, particularly those serving in combat today, will be reassured that the people of the United States fully realize the unsurpassed contribution that they are now making in preserving our way of life.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strongly support the Uniformed Services Pay Act, H.R. 9075. I think we all agree that an increase in military compensation is urgently required. Certainly those of us who heard the testimony and studied the statistics compiled during the committee hearings on the proposal are convinced of a clear and present need for a substantial upward adjustment in military pay levels.

I joined our distinguished chairman in introducing this legislation because of my conviction that the recommended increases, averaging 10.7 percent, are equitable and necessary.

The need for adjustments in Armed Forces pay has been surveyed in great detail. Although there is disagreement between the committee and the administration as to how much of an increase is in order at the present time, there seems to be unanimity in the conviction that present pay scales are inadequate to attract and retain the caliber of people necessary to meet current requirements.

In addition to the average increase in pay of 10.7 percent, the bill before us provides for both an annual and a quadrennial review of military pay, and a variable enlistment bonus designed to meet the specialized personnel retention problems currently being experienced by the services.

It is imperative that we provide a strong reenlistment incentive to first-term enlisted personnel whose skills are critically required by the military departments. The variable reenlistment bonus authorized by this bill offers a good approach which should aid us in retaining personnel possessing skills in short supply.

I am in complete agreement with the concept of an annual review of the adequacy of military pay and allowances and the mandatory quadrennial review of the principles and concepts of military compensation.

The Government cannot afford to pay its military personnel poorly. The exodus of good, skilled men from our Armed Forces must be stemmed in the interest of national defense. This is particularly true in the troubled and dangerous world in which we now live when we are engaged in a difficult struggle in South Vietnam, the outcome of which is most important for the future of the free world.

Seventy thousand U.S. troops are reported to be in Vietnam now, and it is expected that our strength there will be built up rapidly to between 100,000 and 150,000 men. We are even told it might be necessary to increase our troop strength in Vietnam to 300,000 by the end of the year.

Clearly our daily needs for well-trained, brave and dedicated military men are increasing as the situation in Vietnam goes from bad to worse.

A young man entering military service knows that he will be required to make frequent moves, that he will often be separated from his family; that he may have to serve in isolated, unpleasant, and dangerous places far from home. He must forgo the relative stability and higher pay of civilian pursuits. All these factors contribute to the growing recruitment problem. In view of the many sacrifices that are inextricably linked to military service, we must at least not add financial sacrifice when this is a drawback of current military service that we have the ability to correct.

The bill now under consideration authorizes three necessary steps in the right direction and deserves the support of all of us. It is the very least we can do for the men and women who are doing so much for us.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Chairman, the Armed Services Committee has given us a bill to provide our Armed Forces with a pay increase adequate to keep pace with the cost of living and which will recognize the need to obtain and retain competent personnel for the security of our country. I wish to go on the record in strong support of H.R. 9075 recommended by the committee.

We are told that it costs from $4,000 to $5,000 to train each man who enters the service. We are also informed that hardship discharges are increasing each year and that recruits are relatively more poorly paid than were the draftees of World War II. Where is the economy then in cutting corners, rather than granting a meaningful pay increase for the men and women who are responsible for our defense?

Many other areas come to mind where this Congress could practice economy with a great deal more justification. We are spending billions of dollars for hastily conceived domestic programs and will be asked to send good money after bad to continue programs where gross waste and mismanagement have already come to light. Should it be more profitable to be a "school dropout" eligible for the Job Corps in the "war on poverty" than it is to be a lower grade enlisted man in the Armed Forces?

H.R. 9075 also provides for annual review by the President to insure that military pay is in balance with civilian scales so that servicemen are protected against in the future being compensated at a rate below that which the administration defines as the poverty level. Another step in the direction of a more efficient defense effort is the provision for a variable reenlistment bonus in order to retain specialists whose skills are increasingly necessary to the function of the modern Military Establishment.

We are facing the need to commit increasing numbers of military personnel to the war in Vietnam. At few junctures in recent history when we were not actually at war has the United States asked so much of its armed services, and provided so few incentives for service in any branch. It is no time for this Congress to turn suddenly tightfisted, neglecting the opportunity to provide American servicemen with compensation comparable to that which they could obtain in civilian life.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9075, a bill to increase the rates of basic pay for members of our armed services.

The evidence is convincing that our Committee on Armed Services, under the able chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers], has investigated exhaustively the question of granting pay raises for military personnel. I am satisfied that our committee's inquiry was carried to all facets of the question and covered it completely in depth as well as breadth. I am prepared to accept the committee's considered judgment in favor of a 10.6-percent average increase in basic pay for all military personnel, although I personally would have greatly favored the inclusion, in the reported bill, of the dependents' allowance concept which is found in H.R. 8779, a bill which I have introduced.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased nevertheless that the committee has decided to provide, in the bill we are now considering, a more sizable pay increase for service personnel with less than 2 years' service. In this category, of course, are found our junior officers and our enlisted men in the lowest grades.

It is accepted fact that no private employer in the United States would expect any man to work for $78 a month plus board and barracks for the first 4 months of his employment, and then at $83 a month for the following 20 months. But the Federal Government expects the enlisted man in pay grade E–1 to do so.

No private employer in this Nation would expect any man to provide for a family of four, on a monthly salary of $167.10, but curiously enough if a man is in uniform we expect him to do so.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the turnover among military personnel has been such as to constitute a serious item of cost in maintaining our Armed Forces. It is also not surprising to find that an unfortunately large percentage of military personnel are forced to obtain a second job so as to provide their families with an adequate standard of living. Department of Defense statistics show that during calendar year 1964 approximately 34 percent of all enlisted personnel in the continental United States, at one time or another, engaged in this second job activity which is often referred to as moonlighting.

The record with regard to Army draftees during fiscal year 1963–64 indicates a staggering 58.2 percent turnover per year; to maintain an average draftee strength of 187,202, it was necessary to replace 210,791 losses of inductees with 225,000 gains, or an average yearly turnover of 108,967.

The Regular Army, as distinguished from the draftees, has a 50.1 overall reenlistment rate. Only 12.9 percent of the inductees, 22.5 percent of the first-term enlistees, and 84.5 percent of the career men reenlist.

The Department of the Army estimates that, based on actual experience through March 1965, and programed change thereafter, there will be a 14.4 percent officer personnel turnover of 16,000 out of 111,000 officers. There will also be a 25.6 percent enlisted personnel turnover based on losses—excluding reenlistments—of 231,100 and gains—excluding reenlistments—of 204,200.

Based on fiscal year 1964 data, the total costs of bringing an enlisted man through basic combat training and a common specialist skill during the first 21 to 25 weeks of his service will average $3,269. This is the minimum training required for a first duty assignment in an operational unit.

If the man is given basic combat training in a technical specialty, the total costs of his first 21 to 31 weeks in the Army, will average $5,486.

While I do not have comparable figures for the Navy and Air Force, the per man cost of turnover must necessarily be as high or higher, due to the highly technical nature of the training required in those services.

It is probable that we do not save any money at all through our present penurious military pay scale. On the contrary, it appears that creating this pocket of poverty creates an additional financial burden for the Federal Government.

It is indeed a sad commentary that the U.S. Government has through the low pay scales for members of its armed services made it necessary for them to resort to moonlighting and created a pocket of poverty for more than 3 million military dependents.

The proposed pay increases are essential if we are to lift our military personnel and their dependents from this pocket of poverty and to raise them to an economic level which approaches that of first-class citizens.

These pay raises are indeed just and equitable. For example, for officers with 2 or less years' service, of whom about 50 percent have families, the proposed average increase of 22 percent means that a second lieutenant or an ensign will receive additional pay in the amount of $53.40 a month. When we recall that during the past 13 years officers in this grade have received only one basic pay increase of $18.90 a month, there is certainly no necessity to present arguments to justify the proposed increase.

It is evident that our Committee on Armed Services has appropriately examined with great care the ancillary problems of comparability, retirement adjustment factors, and pension costs, in making its recommendation.

Mr. Chairman, in urging a favorable vote for H.R. 9075, I should like to quote General of the Army Omar N. Bradley who before the Folsom Panel testified in part as follows:

> Substantial increase in current pay at this time appears to be the simplest, most effective, and in the long run, cheapest solution if the services are to retain the hard-core professionals which the Nation so desperately needs.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9075. I wish to emphatically endorse this most important piece of legislation. Enactment is absolutely essential to insure that all members of the armed services will now—and in the future—receive compensation comparable to that enjoyed by other workers in our economy.

The failure of military pay to keep pace with wage adjustments of other Federal civilian employees is unpardonable. As has been pointed out in the debate this afternoon, there are even instances of recipients of welfare, and various programs under the so-called war on poverty, receiving more compensation than certain grades of enlisted men who are serving and dying for their country.

It is high time we give these adjustments to our active service personnel and reservists.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, as representative of a community with the Nation's second largest naval establishment, I suppose it is not surprising that I speak in support of a military pay raise. A boost in the spending power of service families would of course stimulate the general economy of my district, and would help offset the effect of protracted unemployment.

However, if it were to stop there, I concede that my argument would lack force. The case for this pay increase must stand or fall not on the benefits it promises my district or any other Member's district, but on its importance to the security of the United States.

Measured on this scale, the legislation can be as vital to Hutchinson, Kans., as to San Diego, Calif.

The facts, Mr. Chairman, are that the Navy is experiencing a critical manpower shortage. It was necessary, this spring, to enlist 38,000 men—just to keep up with the rate of discharges.

And in the Pacific fleet, as of today, 10,000 men are needed to bring our forces there to a normal manning level. A step-up of operations against North Vietnam could accentuate that need.

The answer by no means lies in new enlistment alone.

As was pointed out recently by Pentagon Correspondent Less Bell, of the Copley News Service, the costliest drop in manpower has been at the level of junior officers and petty officers—trained men who, as in a business organization, carry the load of leadership below the command level.

A number of solutions have been proposed. Congress might be asked to extend present enlistments, or call up reserves. I do not need to explain the acute political sensitivity of such steps as these.

Another suggestion has been to transfer manpower from other areas to the Pacific Fleet. What, then, if new troubles should develop in the Caribbean, the Mediterranean, or elsewhere? Obviously, this is no solution either.

Shore establishments already have been strained to provide replacements at sea. And overseas tours have been stretched, with crews on some vessels working 12-hour watches. The carrier *Ranger* recently operated for 70 consecutive days without touching port.

Men of the Navy have never minded sacrifices like these, if satisfied they are necessary. The patience and understanding of Navy wives, too, are a constant source of inspiration.

But human endurance has its limits. All of us long to be appreciated. And there is one very practical way to demonstrate to servicemen and service families that we share their determination and sacrifice—that we want them to stay at their post.

A substantial boost in pay levels is the answer, Mr. Chairman. I hope this committee will send to the floor a bill that addresses itself not to the query, "Can we afford to pass it?" but to the more challenging question, "Can we afford not to?"

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9075, legislation I consider essential to restore financial security to our servicemen in uniform. The Committee on Armed Services has held extensive hearings and has conducted research to determine the disparity of compensation to members of the Armed Forces as compared with civilian employment. During the past 12 years it was discovered that the pay of military personnel has increased an average of 33.9 percent; Federal civilian employment pay, 46.3 percent; and wages in private industry 60 percent.

On the average, a graduate engineer will begin his career in civilian life at a salary of $7,152, while a first lieutenant in the military would receive approximately $3,500. This same military pay deficiency may be found in any step of military classification when it is compared to a similar position outside the service.

The proposal now before us would increase the wages of members of the armed services 10.6 percent; with officers receiving an average 7.2 percent, and enlisted men, 12.1 percent. The pay of the first lieutenant I mentioned earlier would be increased nearly $1,000 under this plan.

In the light of our apparently increased commitment in Vietnam, it is absolutely essential to our national security that this country be able to maintain at the highest possible level, an experienced, well-trained military force. And yet the committee report clearly shows that under present pay scales it has become increasingly difficult to induce servicemen to reenlist. In 1962, 20.1 percent of all Army inductees reenlisted upon completion of their obligation. By 1964 the reenlistement figure had dropped to 3.6 percent. These are men in whom we have invested thousands of dollars worth of training, and as the committee points out: "It is evident that this continued drop in the reenlistment rate of inductees is costing the taxpayers of America many millions of dollars." Figures show that the same unhappy situation prevails in the Navy, Marines, and Air Force.

The minority report points out that the retention problem differs among the various services. In particular, the report cites the problem of the Navy where skills are more marketable than in the other services. This, however, is no argument against the across-the-board pay increase. The situation is specifically dealt with by the variable reenlistment bonus proposed by the President and adopted by the committee. Indeed, the committee has improved upon the recommendation by providing that the bonus be spread over the term of reenlistment thus softening the tax blow. Certainly this variable reenlistment bonus gives the services the needed flexibility to allow each service to tailor bonuses to their individual needs.

The proposal also allows for an annual review by the President of the entire military pay scale, and for a comprehensive review every 4 years. These reviews are necessary to avoid any future substantial lag in the military pay structure.

Mr. Chairman, I represent the First District of New Hampshire. In that district we have servicemen of the Air Force, Navy, and Marines at bases in the seacoast area. Many of them and their families have written me and discussed personally, the hardships they encountered as servicemen, both enlisted men and officers, in the face of the spiraling cost of living. It is no secret that in many parts of the Nation members of the Armed Forces require relief food in order that their families might subsist.

I cannot stress too strongly, the importance of this legislation. Our military need for trained personnel are higher now than for any period since the Korean conflict. It is absolutely necessary that we take every step to insure that we are able to maintain the high level of skills necessary to meet our commitments in Vietnam and throughout the world.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9075 and I commend the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the ranking minority member as well as the other members of the committee for their legislative efforts.

There can be little argument that the men and women serving in the military are entitled to and should receive an increase in pay. It is due them by reason of their service for our country, particularly at a time when crisis challenges and confronts us. It is also due them because, in almost no other industry in this Nation do so many people do so much for so little.

A private who may be called upon to risk his life in battle receives no more than someone working in the poverty program here at home.

In fact, a private in our Army does not even receive $1.25 an hour, the minimum wage scale across the United States.

The increase called for in H.R. 9075 will raise the pay of our military to a more reasonable level. It will help bring pay scales more in line with the present cost of living. It will help establish a pay scale which will help keep competent trained men and women in the military.

It is good legislation, it is needed legislation, and it is legislation which I am pleased to support. Our military deserve no less than what they will receive as a result of its passage and indeed it can be argued that they are deserving of a good deal more.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my support of H.R. 9075, the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1965. The issue raised by this bill is not a limited one of concern to only a small group, but rather one which will affect all Americans. At stake is the defense of the United States and the entire free world and on trial is our willingness to bear the burdens which this task involves.

We have spent, and will continue to spend, vast sums of money for the development and production of new guns, planes, ships, and missiles. But dedicated and capable personnel are no less important than the weapons they employ for the defense of ourselves and our allies, and the deterrence of would-be aggressors. Thus, just as we have been prepared to bear heavy expense for new armaments, so must we be realistic in our appraisal of the expenses which must be borne if our Armed Forces are to attract and retain men and women of the caliber required by a modern military force-in-readiness. The advance of modern technology does not lessen this need; on the contrary, it increases it. There is little hope of attracting skilled and specialized personnel if salaries of the Armed Forces are held below those for comparable civilian jobs, or if increases in military pay lag behind the yearly increase in the demand for such qualification, or behind the rise in the cost of living.

While this bill entails an increased Federal expenditure, in the long run it will lead to considerable saving, for it will help reduce the waste involved when the armed services spend large sums of money in training personnel who subsequently leave the forces because of inadequate salaries.

During the last century, we have fought two world wars, expended hundreds of billions of dollars on defense, and suffered huge numbers of casualties in the cold war, all for the preservation of our freedom and our way of life. At this very moment, in South Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, our fellow Americans are risking their lives for the preservation of our liberty.

The expenses entailed by the bill I am supporting are negligible compared with the losses which would be involved if, by an immoderate desire for economy, we jeopardized all that we seek to preserve. We cannot buy a 20th century defense with 19th century wages.

Passage of this bill is not only crucial to the national interest, but is essential if we are to give fair and equitable treatment to those serving in our Armed Forces. The bill seeks to do no more than give them wages comparable with those which they would receive for their skills in civilian life. In view of the greater risks, responsibilities and importance of the military jobs which they hold, this criterion of comparability is a moderate one indeed. Let us give a fair salary today to those who may give their lives tomorrow.

We cannot juggle the books with our national security, for they will be mercilessly audited by the Communist aggressors. We must not shrink from the burden which both justice and self-interest demand we bear. Eternal vigilance, the condition of liberty, means Armed Forces composed of capable men receiving just compensation.

Passage of this bill is demanded by our responsibilities to our fellow citizens, and by our obligations to those Americans who are bearing and will continue to bear arms in the common defense.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer my wholehearted support for H.R. 9075, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the U.S. uniformed services.

My only objection to this bill is that it does not, in my opinion, give sufficient increases to the lower pay grades, to the men who are the bones and sinew of our military machine.

The need for pay increases is graphically shown in reenlistment figures for recent years. Each of our military departments has shown a steady and consistent downward trend in the number and percentage of men who have reenlisted after completing their required service.

The greatest weakness of our Armed Forces is their inability to attract and retain adequate numbers of qualified career personnel. We can solve this problem only by offering compensation which compares with that offered by private industry.

Our Nation's defense efforts have definitely been hampered by our failure to raise military pay. Because many of the best qualified men leave the armed service, it has been necessary to reenlist second-rate personnel and borderline disciplinary cases in order to maintain force levels. This has put an extra burden on the remaining qualified men, and has been another factor in the decision of competent personnel to quit the service.

The Army reports that more than two-thirds of all enlisted men on duty today have less than 4 years of experience. The Navy has reported a shortage of more than 40,000 petty officers. The reenlistment rate among first-rate Air Force personnel has dropped to 25 percent.

There are other indications of the need for military pay raises. In the past year, the Nation's press has carried many accounts of the large number of military personnel who are forced to obtain second jobs to provide their families with adequate standards of living. It has been estimated that, during 1964, 34 percent of all enlisted personnel in the continental United States had outside employment at one time or another.

Another telling factor is the number of hardship discharges granted to military personnel. The figures rose from 9,533 in 1963 to 10,924 last year, and it is expected to reach 12,600 this year.

A significant provision in H.R. 9075 is the variable reenlistment bonus plan, which will provide the armed services with a flexible device to help retain personnel with needed skills.

This bill also will establish an annual Presidential review of the military pay situation, and a review each 4 years of the entire concept of military compensation.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that an increase in military pay is urgently needed, and I strongly urge adoption of this bill as a vital tool in our national defense program.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 203(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The rates of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services within each pay grade are set forth in the following tables:

"Commissioned officers

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-10 [1]	$1,417.80	$1,467.60	$1,467.60	$1,467.60	$1,467.60	$1,523.70	$1,523.70	$1,631.00	$1,641.00	$1,757.70	$1,757.70	$1,875.00	$1,875.00	$1,992.30	$1,992.30
O-9	1,266.60	1,299.60	1,328.10	1,328.10	1,328.10	1,361.70	1,361.70	1,417.80	1,417.80	1,536.30	1,536.30	1,654.50	1,654.50	1,772.40	1,772.40
O-8	1,168.50	1,203.30	1,231.80	1,231.80	1,231.80	1,323.30	1,323.30	1,386.30	1,386.30	1,443.90	1.506.90	1,564.20	1,627.20	1,627.20	1,627.20
O-7	974.70	1,041.60	1,041.60	1,041.60	1,087.80	1,087.80	1,151.10	1,151.10	1,208.70	1,329.30	1,421.70	1,421.70	1,421.70	1,421.70	1,421.70
O-6	739.50	770.10	820.20	820.20	820.20	820.20	820.20	820.20	848.40	982.20	1,032.30	1,054.80	1,116.30	1,210.80	1,210.80
O-5	591.60	644.70	688.50	688.50	688.50	688.50	710.10	748.20	797.40	857.70	906.90	933.90	966.90	966.90	966.90
O-4	526.50	562.80	600.90	600.90	611.70	639.00	682.50	720.90	753.90	786.60	808.20	808.20	808.20	808.20	808.20
O-3 [2]	427.80	473.40	505.80	559.50	586.50	607.80	640.20	672.30	688.80	688.80	688.80	688.80	688.80	688.80	688.80
O-2 [2]	342.60	403.50	484.20	500.40	511.20	511.20	511.20	511.20	511.20	511.20	511.20	511.20	511.20	511.20	511.20
O-1 [2]	294.60	330.00	412.50	412.50	412.50	412.50	412.50	412.50	412.50	412.50	412.50	412.50	412.50	412.50	412.50

[1] While serving as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or Commandant of the Marine Corps, basic pay for this grade is $2,140.20 regardless of cumulative years of service computed under section 205 of this title.

[2] Does not apply to commissioned officers who have been credited with over 4 years' active service as an enlisted member.

"Commissioned officers who have been credited with over 4 years' active service as an enlisted member

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205											
	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-3	$559.50	$586.50	$607.80	$640.20	$672.30	$699.60	$699.60	$699.60	$699.60	$699.60	$699.60	$699.60
O-2	500.40	511.20	527.10	554.40	575.70	591.60	591.60	591.60	591.60	591.60	591.60	591.60
O-1	412.50	440.40	456.60	473.10	489.60	511.80	511.80	511.80	511.80	511.80	511.80	511.80

"Warrant officers

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
W-4	$435.60	$507.00	$507.00	$518.70	$542.70	$566.10	$589.50	$631.20	$660.20	$684.30	$701.70	$725.40	$749.10	$807.90	$807.90
W-3	396.00	468.90	468.90	474.60	480.60	516.00	546,00	563.70	581.40	599.10	617.10	640.80	664.50	688.50	688.50
W-2	346.50	388.50	388.50	399.90	422.10	444.90	461.70	478.50	495.30	512.40	529.20	546.30	568.50	568.50	568.50
W-1	288.90	347.70	347.70	376.50	393.60	410.40	427.50	444.90	462.00	479.10	495.90	513.30	513.30	513.30	513.30

"Enlisted members

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
E-9	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	$492.00	$503.40	$514.80	$526.20	$537.30	$548.70	$577.20	$633.30	$633.30
E-8	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	$406.80	417.90	429.00	440.40	451.50	462.60	473.70	501.90	557.40	557.40
E-7	$261.00	$324.90	$336.90	$348.60	$360.30	372.00	383.70	396.00	413.40	425.40	437.10	442.80	472.80	531.90	531.90
E-6	225.00	276.30	287.70	299.40	311.10	322.50	333.90	351.30	362.70	374.10	380.10	380.10	380.10	380.10	380.10
E-5	194.10	242.10	253.50	264.90	282.00	293.70	305.10	316.80	322.50	322.50	322.50	322.50	322.50	322.50	322.50
E-4	163.50	200.70	211.80	228.30	239.70	239.70	239.70	239.70	239.70	239.70	239.70	239.70	239.70	239.70	239.70
E-3	117.90	160.20	171.60	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70
E-2	97.50	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60
E-1	93.90	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80."
E-1 (under 4 months)	87.90	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

SEC. 2. The enactment of this Act does not reduce—

(1) the rate of dependency and indemnity compensation under section 411 of title 38, United States Code, that any person was receiving on the day before the effective date of this Act or which thereafter becomes payable for that day by reason of a subsequent determination; or

(2) the basic pay or the retired pay or retainer pay to which a member or former member of a uniformed service was entitled on the day before the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) Chapter 19, title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 1008. Presidential recommendations concerning adjustments and changes in pay and allowances

"(a) The President shall direct an annual review of the adequacy of the pays and allowances authorized by this title for uniformed personnel. Upon completion of this review, but not later than March 31 of each year, the President shall submit to Congress a detailed report summarizing the results of such annual review together with any recommendations for adjustments in the rates of pay and allowances authorized by this title.

"(b) Whenever the President considers it appropriate, but in no event later than January 1, 1967, and not less than once each four years thereafter, he shall direct a complete review of the principles and concepts of the compensation system of all uniformed personnel. Upon completion of such review he shall submit a detailed report to the Congress summarizing the results of such review together with any recommendations he may have proposing changes in the statutory salary system and other elements of the compensation structure provided members of the uniformed services."

(b) The chapter analysis of chapter 19, title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new item:

"§ 1008. Presidential recommendations concerning adjustments and changes in pay and allowances."

Sec. 4. Section 308 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding the following:

"(g) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, a member who is designated as having a critical military skill and who is entitled to a bonus computed under subsection (a) of this section upon his first reenlistment may be paid an additional amount not more than four times the amount of that bonus. The additional amount shall be paid in equal yearly installments in each year of the reenlistment period. However, in meritorious cases the additional amount may be paid in fewer installments if the Secretary concerned determines it to be in the best interests of the member. An amount paid under this subsection does not count against the limitation prescribed by subsection (c) of this section on the total amount that may be paid under this section."

Sec. 5. This Act becomes effective on the first day of the first calendar month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the Record and considered as open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KASTENMEIER

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Kastenmeier: On page 2, strike out tables beginning after line 2 through tables on page 3 down to line 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"*Commissioned officers*

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205						
	3 or less	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12
O-10 [1]	$1,500.90	$1,502.10	$1,503.00	$1,503.90	$1,504.80	$1,506.00	$1,506.90
O-9	1,382.10	1,384.20	1,386.30	1,388.40	1,390.80	1,392.90	1,395.00
O-8	1,272.30	1,274.70	1,277.10	1,279.50	1,281.90	1,284.30	1,286.70
O-7	1,162.80	1,165.50	1,167.90	1,170.60	1,173.30	1,176.00	1,178.40
O-6	774.00	774.90	775.50	776.40	777.00	777.60	778.50
O-5	680.40	684.00	687.60	691.20	694.80	698.40	702.00
O-4	583.80	587.70	591.90	595.80	599.70	640.50	676.50
O-3 [2]	473.10	481.80	533.10	558.60	579.00	609.90	640.50
O-2 [2]	424.20	461.40	476.70	486.90	502.20	528.00	548.40
O-1 [2]	366.30	384.30	384.30	410.10	425.40	440.70	456.00

"Pay	Years of service computed under section 205						
	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-10 [1]	$1,506.90	$1,614.30	$1,614.30	$1,722.00	$1,722.00	$1,829.70	$1,829.70
O-9	1,397.10	1,399.20	1,399.20	1,506.90	1,506.90	1,614.30	1,614.30
O-8	1,289.10	1,291.50	1,347.90	1,399.20	1,455.60	1,455.60	1,455.60
O-7	1,181.10	1,183.80	1,266.00	1,266.00	1,266.00	1,266.00	1,266.00
O-6	779.10	902.10	948.00	968.70	1,025.10	1,112.10	1,112.10
O-5	748.20	804.60	850.80	876.30	907.20	907.20	907.20
O-4	707.40	738.00	758.40	758.40	758.40	758.40	758.40
O-3 [2]	666.30	666.30	666.30	666.30	666.30	666.30	666.30
O-2 [2]	563.70	563.70	563.70	563.70	563.70	563.70	563.70
O-1 [2]	476.70	476.70	476.70	476.70	476.70	476.70	476.70

"[1] While serving as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staffs, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or Commandant of the Marine Corps, basic pay for this grade is $2,019.30 regardless of cumulative years of service computed under section 205 of this title.

"[2] Does not apply to commissioned officers who have been credited with over 4 years active service as an enlisted member.

"*Commissioned officers who have been credited with over 4 years' active service as an enlisted member*

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205					
	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 15
O-3	$533.10	$588.60	$579.00	$609.90	$640.50	$666.30
O-2	476.70	486.90	502.20	528.00	548.40	563.70
O-1	384.30	410.10	425.40	440.70	456.00	476.70

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under sec. 205					
	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-3	$666.30	$666.30	$666.30	$666.30	$666.30	$666.30
O-2	563.70	563.70	563.70	563.70	563.70	563.70
O-1	476.70	476.70	476.70	476.70	476.70	476.70

"*Warrant officers*

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205						
	3 or less	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12
W-4	$581.40	$583.20	$584.70	$586.50	$588.00	$589.80	$591.30
W-3	465.30	466.50	468.00	469.20	470.40	471.60	486.90
W-2	408.30	410.70	413.10	415.50	417.90	420.30	435.60
W-1	349.50	351.00	352.20	353.70	369.00	384.30	399.90

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205						
	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
W-4	$593.10	$594.60	$609.90	$630.30	$651.00	$702.00	$702.00
W-3	502.20	517.50	533.10	553.50	573.90	594.60	594.60
W-2	450.90	466.50	481.80	497.10	517.50	517.50	517.50
W-1	514.20	430.50	445.80	461.40	461.40	461.40	461.40

"*Enlisted members*

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205						
	3 or less	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12
E-9	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	$492.00	$503.40
E-8	--------	--------	--------	--------	$406.80	417.90	429.00
E-7	$324.90	$336.90	$348.60	$360.30	372.00	383.70	396.00
E-6	276.30	287.70	299.40	311.10	322.50	333.90	351.30
E-5	242.10	253.50	264.90	282.00	293.70	305.10	316.80
E-4	200.70	211.80	228.30	239.70	239.70	239.70	239.70
E-3	160.20	171.60	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70
E-2	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60
E-1	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80
E-1 (under 4 months)	102.00	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205						
	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
E-9	$514.80	$526.20	$537.30	$548.70	$577.20	$633.30	$633.30
E-8	440.40	451.50	462.60	473.70	501.90	557.40	557.40
E-7	413.40	425.40	437.10	442.80	472.80	531.90	531.90
E-6	362.70	374.10	380.10	380.10	380.10	380.10	380.10
E-5	322.50	322.50	322.50	322.50	322.50	322.50	322.50
E-4	239.70	239.70	239.70	239.70	239.70	239.70	239.70
E-3	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70
E-2	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60
E-1	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80."

Mr. KASTENMEIER (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support my amendment with the feeling which has been expressed already today, that there is a considerable sense of unanimity, certainly among the members of the committee, in support of the committee bill.

I believe, however, there is still an issue, and the eloquent statement made by the gentleman from North Carolina, who immediately preceded me, tends to underline this issue—it is whether, in fact, this bill is an illusion for men with 2 years of service or less, whether $9.90 or $10.70 a month for men who have had only one raise in 19 years is adequate.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, it is not. I submit that if raises are to be curtailed that ought to be at other levels. It ought to be for the major general with 26 years of service, who has had six raises in 19 years, and who under this bill will get $171 a month more.

For those of us who voted ourselves last year a $625-a-month raise, it seems ill becoming to applaud our efforts to raise these men $9.90 or $10.70.

Briefly, Mr. Chairman, my amendment would go at least somewhat further in the direction of making this more equitable for those with less than 2 years' service.

The committee bill would raise a recruit from $78 to $87.90. My proposal would raise the recruit's pay to $102, to start with, for men with less than 4 months' service.

The committee bill would raise the E–1's, at the bottom of the scale, with less than 2 years' service, from $83.60 to $93.90, or $10.30.

My bill would strike out the 2-year distinction and such men would immediately qualify for $121.80 or receive a raise of $38.60. This is substantial, perhaps, but when one considers the other levels of Federal service and considers the 19 years that these people have subsisted on a $3 raise, I think it is scarcely adequate in and of itself. The balance of the enlisted section would be the same as the committee bill.

The officers section in my amendment is taken from a bill submitted by the junior Senator from Wisconsin which would raise officers with under 2 years of service and would raise the officers immediately above them in terms of years of service in order to compensate somewhat for the difference but would keep high-ranking officers at a standstill level. We do that because it is certainly felt by the gentleman in the well of this House that until the men at the bottom of the scale are properly taken care of by this Congress the others can afford to wait.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The instincts of the gentleman from Wisconsin are good, but I am afraid his knowledge of the military compensation system is not.

Under the proposed amendment, as I understand it, military pay scales would no longer differentiate in terms of service or longevity until after military personnel had completed more than 3 years of service. Thus, the longevity principle, which is inherent in all statutory pay systems for both Federal civilian and military employees, would be abandoned.

Under the Federal civilian pay systems, pay differentials are provided in each of the first 3 years of service. That is, there are three pay steps, 1 year apart, for all civil service grades below GS–18.

The military system similarly provides these longevity increases since they are designed to recognize and encourage improved performance within the grade concerned.

Under the proposed amendment this concept would be abandoned.

If the proposed change were effected in our military pay scales, a second function of this longevity principle would be lost. This function is to provide creditable financial incentives in terms of pay increases for those who reenlist.

For example, the effect of the amendment would be to reduce the pay differential between those enlisted members having 3 years' service and those with over 3 years' service to about $11 a month. This amount would obviously be inadequate as an incentive to reenlist.

It, therefore, in effect, compresses the military pay scales and would require a substantial further upward adjustment at all points in the pay scale to maintain a necessary, desired pattern of adequate pay differentials among and between the various pay grades.

Obviously, I cannot comment precisely on the cost of such an additional adjustment in military pay scales, but I am certain that it would exceed a billion dollars.

Now, I am thoroughly in sympathy with the gentleman from Wisconsin in attempting to provide more realistic pay scales for military personnel with under 2 years of service. I think we have done that in H.R. 9075.

For example, we are increasing the average pay scales of enlisted personnel with under 2 years of service 17.3 percent.

We are also increasing the pay scales of officers with less than 2 years of service an average of 22 percent.

In establishing these pay increases the committee was not unmindful of the fact that in the enlisted pay structure, promotion to pay grade E–3, with accompanying pay increases, is quite rapid in all the services.

For example, in the Army, which is the only service presently using inductees, the average total time in active service for military personnel promoted to pay grade E–3 is only 9 months.

Under H.R. 9075, the average young man who moves from pay grade E–1 to E–2 to E–3 in a total of 9 months would receive a rate of basic pay about 34 percent greater than his original entry basic pay. While the dollar amounts, as such, are relatively modest, the percentage of pay increase over the 9-month period is substantial and provides a rate of pay more closely in line with the remainder of the enlisted pay structure.

For example under existing law an E–3 with less than 2 years of service is paid $99.37. Under the provisions of H.R. 9075, his basic pay would be increased to $117.90 per month. This is an 18.7 percent increase in basic pay.

Now, since our recruit can and does achieve this pay grade within 9 months, the pay increases proposed for him in H.R. 9075 not only include the basic pay increase for a recruit at pay grade E–1—from $78 to $87.90—but also the pay increases which he is almost certainly going to enjoy by virtue of his ultimate promotion to pay grade E–3 within 9 months.

Thus, an inductee who enters the service today will receive basic pay of $78 a month, but if this bill, H.R. 9075, is enacted into law, he will, within 9 months, be receiving basic bay at the E–3 level of $117.90 a month. Therefore, his pay increases after enactment of this bill will approximate $40 per month in basic pay.

This increase in his pay will still permit a reasonable differential to encourage him to reenlist upon completion of 2 years of service, since at this point he would again receive a longevity increase in base pay of $42.30 a month. Under the gentleman's proposed amendment, this reenlistment incentive would be completely lost.

The gentleman from Wisconsin provided the Committee on Armed Services with his recommendations during committee hearings on these proposed changes in military pay. However, for the reasons I have indicated they were rejected.

Furthermore, the gentleman in his statement before the committee indicated that one of his purposes in recommending this change in the pay structure was hopefully the first step toward eliminating the draft.

Neither the rates of pay in H.R. 9075, nor those proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin, could be expected to achieve in any substantial measure the goal of elimination of the draft and the substitution of a completely voluntary military procurement system.

The Department of Defense has made a study in this regard, and although the details of this study are not as yet available, it appears that a decision to go to an all voluntary military force would require increases in military pay scales amounting to more than $4 billion a year.

I am deeply grateful to the gentleman from Wisconsin for expressing in concrete terms his desire and effort to improve the lot of our men and women in uniform. Therefore, I am hopeful that he will continue to support H.R. 9075 after the House rejects his amendment.

For the reasons I have indicated, and since this amendment would increase the annual cost of H.R. 9075 more than one-third of a billion dollars, I recommend that the House not accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, does not my distinguished friend have considerable concern about the probability that this proposed increase of another one-third of a billion dollars in the cost of the bill, which is almost as much as the administration's entire proposal, would very substantially increase the prospect of a veto so that no one would benefit by an increase in pay at this time, if the amendment were adopted and the bill were vetoed?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I wonder whether he has described fully what my amendment proposes to do?

It strikes but one category and that is the category of "2 years and under." It does not destroy the whole concept of longevity, just one category. It merges the "under 2" and the "between 2 and 3" into one category. There is no other connection. It does not destroy the principle of longevity. In fact it is a complete reiteration of that principle in all other respects of the committee bill.

May I say to the gentleman from South Carolina that as far as the cost of the bill is concerned it is true that it will cost in the order of $323 million more than the committee bill which, incidentially, is less than the committee bill costs more than the administration bill which the gentleman from South Carolina and others saw fit to make changes in.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We are doing very well today on this bill. We have taken pretty good care of the G.I.

I have a letter here which I received the other day from the boys in Saigon. It says:

> SIR: We the professional fighting men in Vietnam appreciate the hard work your committee has done and which you have expended toward the probability of a new realistic pay increase.

Mr. Chairman, these boys are for this. There are a lot of names listed on this letter. I am told there are 2,000 signatures on this list. They are for this bill.

Mr. Chairman, we have an opportunity to get this bill through. Let us not muddy the water and give someone, somewhere an opportunity to ask the President to veto this bill. Let us take care of these boys while the time remains.

They have a lot of loved ones here today and I do not want to start a man off at E–3. Let us let him do all he can for his country for that 9 months and merit this increase in pay.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] would not permit this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] may be granted permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I do want to make it clear that in the event my amendment fails I shall of course support the bill, because I feel that even $9.90 or $10.70 must mean something to these poverty-stricken men. So I want to make the record clear on that. But I think we can do a lot better than the committee has done for this category of serviceman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. In our bill, Mr. Chairman, we require the President to make a realistic appraisal of not less than every 4 years and report to the Congress and review it every year—make a report of the basic change not less than every 4 years. So we have got a very good bill. The G.I. wants it. Let us get behind this and not try to change the basic structures which have been so orderly arrived at.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, will my distinguished chairman yield to me at this point?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LENNON. The gentleman from South Carolina a few minutes ago referred to the fact that in the course of 9 months the inductee, whether he be a draftee or an enlistee, usually would move from an E–1 to an E–3 in approximately 9 months.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. About 90 percent of them do.

Mr. LENNON. If the gentleman will yield further, I was anxious to have the gentleman get that in the RECORD because that in substance answers the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I for one appreciate the concern of the gentleman but having heard this matter discussed in committee many times, about 90 percent of the young men who go into service at the E–1 rating move to the E–3 rating within a period of 9 months.

Based upon my way of thinking, it does answer the objective which the gentleman from Wisconsin seeks to accomplish to an appreciable degree.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I say to the gentleman from North Carolina that it does not. You must realize that an E–3 under the committee bill gets $117.90 a month. He does not get as much as the E–1 would get under the committee bill when he serves 3 years.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Then, when he gets over 2 years, the E–3 receives $160 and over 3 years an E–3 gets $171.60. Our bill is loaded with incentives and let us not disturb it. We have a fine bill and it can pass. I am not in any mood to compromise it at this time. Let us stick with what we have. We have an awful lot of support because we have an awful lot of good sense and a good bill.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I want to say that the gentleman and his committee have done an excellent job on this bill, recognizing the difficulties and the necessities of our servicemen.

I want to congratulate him and tell him that I am in full support of the bill.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear from the discussion that has thus far taken place that it is impossible to write a pay bill on the floor. That is the reason why we bring a tax bill on the floor under a closed rule. I am sure the spirit that has motivated the gentleman from Wisconsin is a noble one, but we believe we have done as well as we can. This bill is some $450 million more than the President recommended. In this particular area our increase is 17.3 compared to that recommended by the President of 2.7 percent. No one knows exactly how much this amendment will cost. Even within the last 15 minutes we have had figures appear that vary between $300 million and a billion dollars. This has not been fully analyzed.

One more thought, Mr. Chairman, and that is during the first few months or the first few years of the service of an enlisted man in many cases this is the first time he has been away from home. The rigors that many of these people experience are difficult, therefore morale is of vital importance. There is nothing more significant, there is nothing more uplifting to these men than to have an increase in pay during this period. But if we should bring them all in and say from this time until 3 years henceforth you all shall get the same pay it seems to me would not be proper.

Here is an opportunity for men to improve their position, and to get more pay for the services rendered. I believe that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin would have a deleterious effect on the morale of the people in the armed services rather than actually helping them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The subject of draftees has been mentioned throughout this afternoon, and other issues in connection with this bill. I would like to ask the gentleman as to the period of service of the draftees of our foreign friends, whether anywhere in the world among these so-called friends they draft for 24 months?

Mr. BATES. I would be more interested in how many troops they are going to commit to Vietnam. As I understand it, some have 6 months, some 1½ years, and some 2 or 3 years: I am dealing here today with the problem of the American enlisted man.

Mr. GROSS. I understand perfectly, but the problem of the American serviceman ought to be wrapped up in their period of obligated service and it should be wrapped up with the fact we are getting no help or practically no help from our so-called friends around the world in Vietnam.

Mr. BATES. That is all the more reason why we should look after their welfare.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman, but I do not think it is out of line to raise the issue today why, with Communist aggression being carried on in Vietnam, that we are getting no help from anybody around the world.

Mr. BATES. I know the concern which the gentleman has in this area, and which he has expressed many times, and I share his sentiments.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to have those whose hearts are bleeding for our foreign friends tell some of us why we are getting no help from those who ought to be giving us help in the containing of communism around the world.

Mr. BATES. May I say in conclusion, I hope this amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KASTENMEIER) there were—ayes 9, noes 83.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BURKE, Chairman of of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9075) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, pursuant to House Resolution 470, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from South Carolina rise?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings in the consideration of the bill be suspended until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the pending bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

U.S. CAPITOL PAGE ACT OF 1965

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the system that the Congress uses in educating, supervising, and housing its pages is archaic, cumbersome, wasteful, and, in many respects, detrimental to the young men it purports to benefit.

The system should be phased out and replaced with a new U.S. Capitol page system for college students who need financial assistance to continue or complete their education.

I am today introducing legislation, captioned the U.S. Capitol Page Act of 1965, to accomplish this change.

Under the present arrangement, youngsters between the ages of 14 and 18 years are set adrift, far from home and removed from proper supervision, in a large and fast-paced metropolis.

They are grossly overpaid. Pages earn more money than some commissioned officers of the U.S. Army fighting in Vietnam.

Their schooling, stuffed into a 3-hour period between 6.30 a.m. and 9:30 a.m. is of debatable long-range value. They attend the Capitol Page School, an institution unique in that it cannot refuse to accept students who are deficient scholastically and cannot dismiss students once they are enrolled, no matter how poor their scholastic performance. This criticism in no way reflects on the ability and dedication of the school's staff; the school is the victim of the system, and so are the pages.

Capitol pages, once in Washington, are largely left to their own devices in finding housing and eating wholesome meals.

An evaluating committee of the Middle Atlantic Association for Secondary Schools summed up the situation very appropriately when it noted that—

> It is one thing for a page to live at home or in the home of his sponsor, where he can be a part of normal family living so necessary at this stage in growth. It is something else again to give these youngsters the great opportunity to be of direct service to their Government, and at the same time, deprive them of the basic protections to which they are entitled at this stage in their development.

Clearly, this present system has some built-in dynamite which could explode in our faces at any time.

My bill provides that a page serving in the U.S. Senate, House of Representatives, or the Supreme Court shall be at least 18 years of age and less than 24 and shall have completed at least 1 year of college. They must be financially needy, and there are certainly many such students.

Eminent political science professors have noted that—

> A college student is more likely to benefit from the experience of being a page than a high school student, and the problems of their leisure hours is likely to be of less concern.

Prof. Robert L. Peabody of Johns Hopkins University pointed out that such a system "could be developed into a congressional internship program for college undergraduates which would have rich benefits in the training of the Nation's future political leaders and informed citizenry."

In the 89th Congress, newly appointed pages are paid $4,600 a year while returning pages receive the salary of $5,050. For youngsters whose duties principally involve delivering documents and answering telephones, these princely sinecures are totally unrealistic. The salary received by some 15-year-old pages this year exceeds the total income in 1963 of more than 45 percent of this Nation's families.

Under my bill, page salaries would be reduced to about $3,640 a year. With the savings effected, additional pages could be appointed and hours of page service staggered in such a way as to prevent interference with the college schedules of the pages.

Enactment of my bill would eliminate the need for the proposed construction, at great expense, of a new Capitol Page School and Residence. It would, in fact, eventually do away with the school entirely.

In establishing a program of benefit to deserving college students, my bill also would end the dubious practice of the Congress in employing high school students on a full-time basis. Almost no one else in the Nation could get away with such a system.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics states that not more than five States would permit boys to attend school and engage in general employment to the extent of 40 work hours a week.

In any job subject to the Federal child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, it would be illegal for boys of 14 and 15 to maintain the work schedule of a congressional page. Under these provisions, employment of 14- and 15-year-old boys is limited to not more than 3 hours on a schoolday and 18 hours in a school week, and not after 7 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], chairman of the Select Committee on the Welfare and Education of Congressional Pages, and her committee associates, for their pioneer work in investigating the page system and exploring avenues for its improvement.

This system cries out for reform and my bill would provide it.

Text of the bill follows:

H.R. 9912

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "United States Capitol Page Act of 1965."

SEC. 2. Effective the day after the date of the enactment of this Act, a United States Capitol Page shall be appointed to serve in the United States Senate, the United States House of Representatives, or the United States Supreme Court, only if he or she:

(a) is at least 18 years of age and less than 24 years of age; and

(b) has completed the equivalent of at least one year or 30 semester hours at a college, university, or other institution of higher education accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purposes by the United States Commissioner of Education; and

(c) is determined by his or her sponsor, and certified by the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, or the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, as appropriate, to be in need of financial assistance in order to complete his or her requirements for a degree of bachelor of arts or science, or its equivalent, at a college, university, or other institution of higher education accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purposes by the United States Commissioner of Education.

SEC. 3. Subject to the qualifications of section 2 of this Act, appointments of United States Capitol pages:

(a) to serve in the Senate shall be made by Members of the Senate;

(b) to serve in the House of Representatives shall be made by Members of the House of Representatives;

(c) to serve in the Supreme Court shall be made by the Marshal of the Supreme Court.

SEC. 4. (a) Thirty-two pages may be appointed by Members of the Senate to serve in the Senate.

(b) Sixty-five pages may be appointed by Members of the House of Representatives to serve in the House of Representatives.

(c) Five pages may be appointed by the Marshal of the Supreme Court to serve in the Supreme Court.

SEC. 5. All appointments of United States Capitol pages shall be made without regard to race, religion, or sex.

SEC. 6. Appointments of United States Capitol pages shall be made for not less than one semester and not more than one calendar year.

SEC. 7. United States Capitol pages appointed under this Act shall perform their duties as pages:

(a) in the Senate during those periods in which the Senate is in session, with at least sixteen Senate pages on duty at any time that the Senate is in session;

(b) in the House of Representatives during those periods in which the House of Representatives is in session, with at least thirty-three House pages on duty at any time the House of Representatives is in session;

(c) in the Supreme Court during those periods in which the Supreme Court is in session, with at least three Court pages on duty at any time that the Supreme Court is in session.

SEC. 8. United States Capitol pages appointed under this Act shall enroll at any college, university, or other institution of higher education of their choice in or around Washington, D.C., which has been accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purposes by the United States Commissioner of Education, in courses that will be accepted for full or partial credit by their college, university, or other institution of higher education of origin.

SEC. 9. United States Capitol pages appointed under this Act shall receive compensation for their services as pages at the basic annual rate of one thousand one hundred and forty dollars.

SEC. 10. This Act shall not apply to chief pages.

SEC. 11. Section 88 of title 2 of the United States Code (Mar. 3, 1901, ch. 830, sec. 1, 31 Stat. 968) relating to the limit of age of pages in House of Representatives, is hereby repealed.

MILITARY WITNESSES BRAND FEDERAL SERVICES FINANCE CORP. AS "VICIOUS"

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee has been investigating the operations of Federal Services Finance Corp., a worldwide lending organization that is primarily engaged in the business of making automobile and personal loans to servicemen.

During these hearings it was brought out that Federal Services is being investigated not only by the Domestic Finance Subcommittee, but also by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Labor, the Internal Revenue Service, and the German tax authorities. Only a casual look at the operations of this company makes it clear why it is subject to so many investigations.

In light of the tactics that Federal Services uses to abuse servicemen, such as charges of nonexistent insurance, refusal to refund overpayments, mishandling of repossessions, excess interest charges, and numerous other sharp practices, it is my feeling that Federal Services should not be allowed to continue to take advantage of our servicemen.

Shortly the Congress will be asked to consider legislation increasing the pay of servicemen; but what good will it do to increase the pay of servicemen, if, at the same time, we allow companies such as Federal Services to take advantage of them and to flaunt military regulations.

Recently, I wrote to the Honorable Norman Paul, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, regarding Federal Services. Mr. Paul testified before the subcommittee in regard to Federal Services. He stated that the Department of Defense would look into the charges directed at Federal Services. I suggested in my letter that while this investigation was being conducted, that Federal Services be placed off limits to military personnel. A continuation of the subcommittee hearings on Federal Services has reaffirmed my belief that the company should be placed off limits.

Testifying at the latest hearing were Lt. Col. Clyde L. Griffith, judge advocate at Fort Myer; Va.; Lt. Col. Daniel Ghent, judge advocate at Fort Gordon, Ga.; as well as Mr. Paul Zurkowski, former judge advocate at Fort Irwin, Calif., and now an aid to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER].

I want to emphasize that both Colonel Griffith and Colonel Ghent are active-duty military officers, and Colonel Ghent has recently been promoted to head the Army's legal assistance program. Both of these colonels, as well as Mr. Zurkowski, told the subcommittee in response to my question that Federal Services should be placed off limits. Colonel Griffith categorized the lending and automobile financing practices of Federal Services as "unethical and vicious." Colonel Ghent testified that certain practices of Federal Services were, in his opinion, "extortion—pure and simple." Mr. Zurkowski branded the company as "camp followers" who prey on servicemen.

I asked all three of these gentlemen if they would be willing to finance a car through Federal Services. Without hesitation they all replied they would not finance a car with this company.

I have come before you today because I feel it is important to protect our servicemen from fast-buck operators. I am extremely upset that the Department of Defense has not taken action to make certain that Federal Services does not continue to victimize servicemen. I might add at this point that out of a 12-man board of directors of Federal Services, 8 are retired admirals or generals. I am informed that one of the reasons for the Department of Defense's lack of action in this matter is that Federal Services' operations are no worse than other finance companies that prey on servicemen. I will not take issue with that statement, except to wonder aloud if this is so, why has the Department of Defense not done something a long time ago about these other companies that are as bad in their operations as Federal Services.

The Department of Defense's reason for inactivity rings as hollow as an empty barrel. The Department of Defense must act quickly in this matter so that a warning can be issued to finance companies that do not wish to play according to the rules when dealing with servicemen. It must be made clear to these companies that unless they are willing to operate in an honest, decent, and legal manner, they will no longer be allowed to deal with servicemen. There is no reason, either in law or logic, why Federal Services should not be placed off limits.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include for the RECORD a copy of the letter I sent to Secretary Paul on July 6, as well as a press release from my office concerning the letter. In addition, I am placing in the RECORD a story from the Washington Daily News of July 15, written by Rice Odell, entitled "Witness Blasts District of Columbia Finance Firm as 'Vicious.'"

I suggest that it is time the top brass of the Department of Defense take notice of what the field officers of the military have to say about Federal Services. In describing the Department of Defense's reluctance to place Federal Services off limits, we can use the old axiom, "Everyone is out of step, except John." Could it be that the Domestic Finance Subcommittee, the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Labor, the Internal Revenue Service, the German tax authorities, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation are out of step and Federal Services and the Department of Defense are in step?

The material follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 6, 1965.

Hon. NORMAN PAUL,
Assistant Secretary of Defense, Manpower, Department of Defense, the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PAUL: When you testified before the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance on June 17, I suggested to you that during the period that the Department of Defense was conducting its investigation into the operations of Federal Services Finance Corp. that the company be placed off limits to members of the military services.

I am fully convinced that this company should not be allowed to continue the abuses uncovered by the Domestic Finance Subcommittee and the easiest way to see that this is carried out is to prohibit Armed Forces personnel from dealing with the company. It will serve no logical purpose to investigate this company if at the same time the abuses that should be corrected are allowed to continue.

I would appreciate it if you would inform me as to the action taken by your office with regard to my suggestion of placing the company off limits while the investigation is being conducted. I would further appreciate it if you would provide a progress report on the "interservice committee" which you mentioned during your testimony. It is my understanding that this committee has been considering remedial measures to deal with companies that extend credit to our Armed Forces.

I would appreciate your early reply.

Sincerely,

FRANK ANNUNZIO,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO ASKS DEFENSE DEPARTMENT FOR FOLLOWUP ON DECLARING FEDERAL SERVICES FINANCE CORPORATION OFF LIMITS

Congressman FRANK ANNUNZIO, Democrat, of Illinois, has asked the Department of Defense for information concerning his request that Federal Services Finance Corp. be placed off limits to military personnel while the Department is investigating the company.

The Illinois Democrat's request was contained in a letter dated July 6 to Norman Paul, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower). In releasing the letter, Congressman ANNUNZIO explained that, "I am fully convinced that Federal Services should not be allowed to deal with members of the Armed Forces until they have cleaned up their operation."

Representative ANNUNZIO is a member of the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee which has been investigating the operations of Federal Services, a worldwide finance company engaged primarily in the business of making automobile loans to members of the military forces. The subcommittee has turned up hundreds of cases in which servicemen have been victimized by the company whose officers and directors include many former admirals and generals.

"I will say in all fairness," Representative ANNUNZIO remarked, "that most of the members of the Department of Defense and the three services have shown a willingness to cooperate in this investigation and to take the necessary action. However, there has been a reluctancy to give more than fleeting consideration to the possibility of declaring Federal Services off limits. I can see no reason in law or in logic for not taking this action. It is in the best interests of the servicemen and the services. To continue to allow the abuse of our servicemen is only in the interest of Federal Services."

Congressman ANNUNZIO also asked Secretary Paul for a progress report on an interservice committee which Paul testified is currently considering remedial measures concerning companies that extend financing to servicemen. One of the proposals being studied by the committee would require finance companies to secure a seal of approval from the Department of Defense before they could deal with servicemen.

Congress ANNUNZIO concluded: "I have been assured by Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN, who heads both the subcommittee and the parent committee, that the investigation of Federal Services would not be closed until a full accounting has been made of the company's actions. Both Chairman PATMAN and I are in full agreement that the Department of Defense must make full use of its powers to insure that servicemen are protected from companies that engage in sharp practices."

WITNESS BLASTS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FINANCE FIRM AS "VICIOUS"

(By Rice Odell)

The judge advocate of Fort Myer testified yesterday that he considers the lending and auto financing practices of Federal Services Finance Corp. to be "unethical and vicious."

Lt. Col. Clyde Griffith was joined by two other witnesses before a House Banking and Currency Subcommittee in saying they think such a company should be placed off limits to military personnel.

The possibility of such action against the Washington-based enterprise, whose clientele is largely servicemen in this country and overseas, is currently being studied by a special Defense Department committee.

EXTORTION

Colonel Griffith appeared before the subcommittee with Lt. Col. Daniel Ghent, judge advocate of Fort Gordon, Ga., and Paul Zurkowski, former judge advocate at Fort Irwin, Calif., and now an aide to Representative ROBERT KASTENMEIER, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

Colonel Ghent said he wrote higher authority 2 years ago that, in his opinion, cases showed there was a "deliberate attempt" by Federal Services to obtain money from servicemen in derogation of their own contracts.

"This is extortion pure and simple," he said he wrote.

Mr. Zurkowski said he would characterize the company as a "camp follower operation" in which soldiers are normally mystified at how they could owe so much money.

LEGALITY

The three witnesses generally agree that at least most of the firm's practices are legal, and also that they are generally followed by other firms in the field. These include small refunds when insurance policies are rewritten, the sale of unnecessary insurance, high interest rates, unwarranted late charges, etc.

Colonel Griffith said that, with limited income and plagued by such problems, it becomes very difficult for a man to be a good soldier. In addition to a number of specific cases cited by the witnesses, he described this hypothetical but typical example:

A soldier buys a $600 car from a dealer, and has to finance it over a 2- or 3-year period. Since some States allow interest of up to 4 percent a month (and there are no restrictions overseas), he might well end up paying double the amount.

After adding insurance, which is usually sold at a high price, and other items, he said, say the soldier has to borrow a total of $1,200 to buy the $600 car.

Then perhaps he encounters financial problems due to illness at home or having another child, and so in all honesty he says that he can't pay for the car and asks that it be repossessed.

But the seller of the car meanwhile transfers the $1,200 note to a second company, which becomes a legal holder in due course, even though its agent might be sitting at the desk next to the seller.

Then suppose the car is repossessed after 4 months, and $200 has been paid on it. It'll probably be sold at a forced sale, perhaps with only one bidder. It might go for $200, which is credited to the soldier's account, giving him a total of $400 against the $1,200.

So there's still $800 unpaid on the note, even though the soldier no longer has a car and the insurance is of no value to him. Yet because the note is held by that second company, it can sue to recover the whole amount, and the soldier can't do anything about it.

"Obviously this is done intentionally so they can sue on the note and not on the contract," he said. If the military inquires about the unused insurance, for example, "they write back and say 'We don't know anything about that—all we have is a note.'

"This is where the vicious part begins," Colonel Griffith said. The company starts a long campaign with the first sergeant and company commander, reminding them that their soldier is subject to court-martial for willful failure to pay a just debt.

"They write and ask, 'Why haven't you court-martialed this man?'

BUSINESS

"They play on this question of the soldier's integrity. If he's a good soldier at all, integrity is one of the most vital things he has." (And if they don't get anywhere with a particular first sergeant or commander, they may salt the file away for years until a soldier is transferred to another post, where they may have more luck collecting, he said.)

In most cases, he said, the soldier doesn't argue—he just pays up. "For every one that bubbles to the top, there must be at least 20 that never get there."

Meanwhile, Federal Services reported that for the 9 months ending June 30, its volume of business was almost $61.4 million compared to about $49.7 million for the same period a year before. Net income, however, went down from $699,889 to $525,344, which President Clayton Norris said was due to higher taxes on income and higher expenses.

THE WISDOM OF CONGRESS IN CONSTRUCTING THE CHERRY CREEK RESERVOIR

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last week a special subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works completed a 2-day inspection of flood damage in a two-State area where a major flood disaster recently occurred. The committee brought back a report of tremendous heroism on the part of the local people in fighting the devastation of the South Platte River and its tributaries and the Arkansas River in the States of Colorado and Kansas.

But, Mr. Speaker, I believe one of the most interesting observations was of a reservoir known as Cherry Creek Reservoir, an Army Engineer's structure which had been authorized and built by this Congress a number of years ago and which has been subject for a number of years to continuous criticism as a major boondoggle and an example of wastefulness by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the flood which devastated a good part of Denver last month, Cherry Creek Reservoir, which cost a little over $14 million to build, prevented damages in excess of $130 million in one single flood, demonstrating very well the fact that while it may take a while to pay off on some of these flood control reservoirs, the payoff can be very great indeed when disaster strikes.

SMOKESCREENS THAT SOMEHOW SEEM TO OBSCURE THE RIGHT-TO-WORK ISSUE

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to an article that appeared in this morning's Washington Post, written by Mr. Hobart Rowen, dealing with the matter of the many smoke screens that somehow seem to obscure the right-to-work issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am in complete agreement with Mr. Rowen's observation that both sides of interest in connection with the consideration of the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act are dealing in gross emotionalism that has prevented the general public from really acquiring a real understanding of the basic issue that underlies the question.

As a Member of the 89th Congress, it is my intention to support repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, for I am sincere in the belief that these so-called right-to-work laws have invited union harassment and have contributed greatly to the promotion of unrest on the American industrial scene.

As this article suggests, men of management of real industrial maturity do understand the advantages of the union shop under legitimate direction.

As the Congressman at Large for the State of Ohio, I am particularly in agreement with Mr. Rowen's timely observation that these so-called right-to-work States seem to be engaged in an emotional campaign to keep wages low by keeping the union out; and these same people freely advertise and solicit industry on that basis.

I urge every Member of the House of Representatives to dwell on the thoughts expressed in Mr. Rowen's article, which follows:

ECONOMIC IMPACT: SMOKESCREENS OBSCURE RIGHT-TO-WORK ISSUE

(By Hobart Rowen)

The battle over repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act—those unfortunate few words that allow an individual State to ban the union shop—is about to be resumed, this time on the House floor. The public will thus be treated again to an appalling amount of hokum and buncombe on this issue.

Those individuals and organizations that want to preserve the right-to-work laws permitted by section 14(b) ought to quit shadowboxing, and say forthrightly that they're against the whole idea of labor unions.

Right or wrong, at least that position would end the pretense that they are losing valuable sleep over the question of individual liberty.

At the present time, 19 States have taken advantage of section 14(b) by prohibiting any agreement between an employer and a union specifying membership in a union as a condition of employment. Even if a company and a union should desire a union shop, it would be illegal in these 19 States.

But while the chamber of commerce and others weep crocodile tears about the loss of liberty in the other 31 States, the basic motive of the right-to-work crowd is to attract industry with the promise of cheap, nonunion labor.

And as the AFL–CIO has ably documented, the less respectable of the antiunion band have a close alliance with ultraright-wing John Birch types, whose bias on this score is merely one aspect of a longer record of antiquated, antisocial, 19th century prejudices.

Organizations like the chamber, which are eminently respectable, if behind the times, fail to see the inconsistency between their avowed support of the principle of collective bargaining and their demand for continuance of section 14(b).

They are saying, in effect, that an employer should have to bargain with his workers (that's what collective bargaining means)—provided they haven't formed an effective union. If one can make sense out of the chamber position, it is that employers should strive to return to that nostalgic era when they could deal with their employees individually.

Well, maybe it would be nice—the way some people look at it—to do without unions. But the chamber better forget it, and take a look at the calendar. It is 1965.

Most of the really influential leaders of American industry have taken a more sophisticated approach. They know that the "individual freedom" propaganda is just that—a line created by the same imaginative public relations men who thought up the misleading "right to work" phrase.

Actually, the real leaders of American industry couldn't care less about repeal of section 14(b). Some, it is true, wish that President Johnson had staved off AFL–CIO President George Meany's request. But policymakers in the U.S. business community deal regularly with unions and the union shop.

By and large, they'd be panicked if they weren't assured of well-organized, responsible labor unions to provide a steady flow of manpower for them.

One of L.B.J.'s Texas aids confides: "When a big national company comes in down home, they generally ask: 'Where's the union?' If it's not there, they're disappointed. They want one right on tap."

But the local "wheels" are generally nervous. They are skeptical of union organizers, who are equated to "invaders," men who want to up-end previous States rights. Above all, the local men, often pillars of smalltime chambers of commerce, feel they can keep wages low if the union is kept out. They freely advertise and solicit on that basis.

The unions have floated their share of baloney, too. Repeal of section 14(b) is not a do-or-die proposition for union organization, because they can and do survive in the right-to-work States.

And despite denials, it is true that the notion of a union shop involves a certain element of compulsion. This ought to be freely admitted, because the compulsion is justifiable. Where collective bargaining is the law of the land, a man who is deriving benefits from union representation ought to join the union. At least, he ought to pay dues, which is all the law requires.

The unions want to do away with section 14(b) because it is "a bone in the throat." The Wagner Act established the principle of collective bargaining, and then the Taft-Hartley Act partially reneged. For 18 years this has invited antiunion harassment. Both management and labor could turn their attention to more useful and productive endeavors if section 14(b) were scrapped.

STUDY BEING UNDERTAKEN BY OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING CONCERNING RELIEVING RESIDUAL OIL CONTROLS

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a letter I have dispatched to Gov. Buford Ellington, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, which deals with a study being undertaken by that Office concerning relieving residual oil import controls.

Mr. Speaker, these controls, if relieved, would have a disastrous economic impact on the economy of the great State of Ohio and would, in effect, destroy the coal industry, which plays such an important role in our overall economy.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope and trust that the distinguished Governor Ellington and his study group would, with great dispatch, end the speculation concerning this proposal to relieve oil import controls and reject forthrightly the entire idea.

The letter follows:

HON. BUFORD ELLINGTON,
Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR ELLINGTON: As Congressman at Large for the State of Ohio, I am deeply interested in study being undertaken by your Office of the residual oil import control program. I am interested in the continuance of the existing program of residual oil import controls as I feel that these controls are essential to the national security and military defense of the United States. I am equally disturbed about the adverse effect upon the economy of my State, were these controls lessened or relieved.

At present, coal is the principal source of primary energy for conversion to electrical energy and accounts for over half the total electricity generated. Since the end of World War II, there has been a decline in the coal industry, but yet coal continues to play a major role in the Nation's economy.

The coal industry means $201,889,672 annually to Ohio. Many of our southern and eastern counties are coal-producing areas, and there are 17,029 Ohioans employed in the industry, earning $104,379,893 annually. These coal wages are spent in Ohio as follows:

Food	$29, 330, 750
Housing	28, 391, 331
Clothing	8, 454, 771
Transportation	12, 212, 447
Medical care	6, 054, 034
Recreation	5, 740, 984

Individual coal wage earners pay taxes amounting to $10,416,237.

As congressional spokesman for those dependent upon the coal industry for their livelihood, I wish to indicate my opposition to any effort to eliminate controls on the importation of competing oil fuel products, which would have a tremendously adverse effect upon our local economy.

I am certain that you are mindful of the fact that section 202(c) of the Trade Expansion Act establishes the criteria layed down by the Congress, which should be considered before import controls are relieved. One of those criteria is whether or not the import control would tend to threaten or impair the national security and adversely affect the national economy of that region of the United States.

As you know, the 89th Congress has been seriously concerned with the problems regarding the rejuvenation of the economy in the 11-State region known as Appalachia. I happen to be a member of the special ad hoc committee which wrote that legislation, and I can assure you that any policy to relieve import controls on residual oil fuels would most certainly undermine the national effort to revive the economy in the Appalachian counties of my State.

It is difficult for me to understand how the United States could seriously relieve import controls which would completely disrupt the coal transportation capabilities of the railroads in the eastern half of the United States that are highly dependent upon coal traffic, and encourage the elimination of coal as a primary fuel. To alter oil import controls would put this Nation in the position of absolute dependency to Venezuela and other oil-producing countries which have demonstrated varying degrees of friendliness and stability toward this country.

I am deeply concerned with the suggestion that the United States of America embark upon policies which would place us in the position of being excessively dependent upon foreign sources of energy, especially oil. The matter of the possible undermining of the coal industry, which so basically affects the citizens of my State, is one of deep concern to me and I wish to register with your office my strenuous recommendation that the idea of suggesting alteration of our import control policy be rejected.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. SWEENEY,
Member of Congress.

THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the three most dangerous individuals you can possibly find would be an alcoholic with a bottle of whisky, an arsonist with a box of matches, and a Postmaster General who likes to experiment all the time.

We have the ZIP code, in spite of the fact that presumably the schools have taught the students the names of the 50 States of the Union, the postal clerks now have to learn 50,000 Zip numbers. Everything has been replaced by a number. It used to take a letter overnight to come from Ohio to Washington. Now it takes up to 4 days.

We find now that the Post Office Department has done violence to the legal abbreviations of the various States. The Post Office Department has come up with a new abbreviation for Ohio, for instance, changing the abbreviation "O" to a new abbreviation "Oh." Heaven knows what happens in some other cases.

I do not know what this is going to lead to, but it does seem to me in a country of almost 200 million people we ought to find one fellow who would like to run and could run the post office with just plain commonsense.

CHASE MANHATTAN NATIONAL BANK

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, last week a surprise hit the banking community when Chase Manhattan, the Nation's largest State bank, announced its imminent conversion to national status.

This conversion to national status is part of a trend which has accelerated in recent months, and which commenced shortly after the present Comptroller of the Currency took office in 1962.

During the previous several years, there was no tendency for State banks to convert to national banks. The present trend has developed since the Comptroller has engaged the State regulatory authorities in a "competition in laxity," as Governor Robertson has termed it.

The reaction of Frank Wille, New York superintendent of banks, is pertinent. He was quoted as follows:

> I regret the action initiated today by Chase Manhattan Bank to surrender the special charter of the Bank of the Manhattan Co * * * I will do all I can to secure changes at the Federal level which would substantially equalize the situation for State-chartered commercial banks.

By clear implication, Mr. Wille fears that unless regulations of State banks are further relaxed, our dual banking system will be threatened. It is pertinent, in this connection, to note that Chase National chose a State charter in 1955, when it merged with the Bank of the Manhattan Co. Changes in attitudes of the Federal regulatory authorities make it now reverse its earlier decision.

The distinguished chairman of our Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, has introduced H.R. 6885, which attempts to eliminate the fragmentation of supervisory authority over all banks which are federally insured. I am hopeful that in the course of these hearings the full implications of Chase Manhattan's decision upon the dual banking system can be explored, and fully related to the trends in the field of banking and their impact upon our economic life.

THE GOLD SITUATION

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the gold situation of the United States has been of general concern to governmental, financial, and political circles for the past several years. Of particular concern has been the fact that severe drains had been made on the U.S. gold stock, especially since 1960.

Since 1933, Americans have not been permitted to redeem their dollars in gold. At that time, by Executive order, and subsequently by the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, the domestic redemption of dollars for gold was suspended indefinitely. The holding of gold by Americans—even outside the United States since 1961—except for limited numismatic, industrial, professional, or artistic uses, is forbidden.

U.S. dollars owned by foreign governments, however, are directly redeemable in U.S. gold, and in recent years some foreign governments have redeemed so many dollars for U.S. gold that the question of whether the United States may have a gold shortage has been raised.

One of the assigned functions of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations is to evaluate the efficiency and economy with which the Federal monetary agencies operate. In the performance of that obligation the subcommittee undertook study of the coin shortage situation which, in varying degrees, has plagued the country for the past half dozen years.

Contemporaneous with the subcommittee's inquiries into the coin shortage, news items and comments about drains on the country's gold stock through international transactions were being reported. Also communications received by the subcommittee indicated the considerable concern on the part of many citizens that the U.S. gold supply was being drained away, and that adverse effects were inevitable. Quite often the communications indicated that there was confusion and lack of understanding of the technicalities and even the nomenclature employed by the experts and technicians who deal with the problems.

The fact that the Treasury is fast running out of our other precious monetary metal, silver, undoubtedly heightened the public interest in the country's gold stock.

Because of this large public interest in the subject, as chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, I am today announcing the release of a report which results from study of the gold situation of the United States. The report is entitled "The Gold Situation," and objectively and in nontechnical terms examines the U.S. gold stock, in the light of international demands.

Over the past 8 years about $8½ billion worth of gold has been drained from the U.S. gold stock. The gold now in the Treasury, somewhat less than $14 billion, is the smallest amount the United States has had since 1938.

By giving, lending, and spending more abroad than it has been receiving in payments from foreigners, the United States has been running deficits in its international payments balances since 1957. This has caused some countries to acquire more dollars than they need, many of which they redeem for U.S. gold. U.S. efforts to reverse the deficit trend of its payments balances are meeting with considerable success, as is indicated by the second quarter, 1965, results.

The United States now, in the second quarter of 1965, has had its first balance-of-payments surplus in 8 years. Although that surplus arose only in the second quarter of 1965, it augurs well for the future, for further favorable gains are expected. Foreign governments, therefore, should be left with fewer dollars that are surplus to their needs, with consequent reduction in conversions of such dollars into gold.

Lessening the flow of dollars going abroad, however, poses the threats of restricting the availability of capital in many foreign financial markets, reducing international trade and hampering development in some foreign countries. As stated in "The Gold Situation," these possibilities point up the necessity for the free world to further seek long-term solutions to international monetary problems.

The time to do so is right now. If the United States had sought international conferences for that purpose even a short while ago, foreign governments might have misconstrued its actions as efforts to bail itself out of a pay payment balances situation. The nations now, however, face the possibility of an international liquidity squeeze, through the drying up of dollar availability. These prospects involve not only the United States, but the entire free world. Certainly the nations should jointly study the possibilities of modifying existing systems, to avoid any such disruptive effects.

President Johnson's recent action in authorizing the United States to participate in conferences to seek substantial improvements in international monetary arrangements is therefore a timely and very important step.

Many of the suggestions which have been advanced by leading economists for improving the international monetary system are discussed in the report.

In the course of its study the subcommittee received suggestions that speculation in gold could be minimized if the United States would announce that although it will continue to sell gold at $35 per ounce, it will reduce its minimum buying price of $35 per ounce by successive steps according to an announced schedule, thus appreciating, rather than devaluing, the dollar in terms of gold. A simpler version would have the United States continue to redeem dollars in gold—that is, to continue selling gold—at $35 per ounce, but abandon the guarantee to buy it from foreigners at the minimum price of $35 per ounce. Advocates of the suggestion say that although it is important that the United States support the international value of the dollar in terms of gold, by continuing to redeem dollars with gold at $35 per ounce, there appears to be little reason for the United States to continue to support the world price of gold in terms of dollars. The pros and cons of these suggestions are quite fully treated in "The Gold Situation."

The suggestion has been made that it is the strength of the U.S. economy rather than the convertibility of dollars into gold which makes the dollar the world's major reserve currency; and that the dollar would be as strong as it is even if the United States had no gold whatsoever.

That suggestion also is examined in "The Gold Situation."

In rather recent times chronic deficits in U.S. balances of international payments, coupled with increased accumulations of dollars by many foreign governments have led to some rumors that the United States might be forced to devalue, that is, to cheapen it or to cause it to lose value in relation to gold. In fact, a noted French economist suggested that the United States should devalue the dollar by one-half, thus raising the price of gold from $35 to $70 an ounce, and doubling the dollar value of the U.S. gold stock to almost $30 billion. The history of the 1933 devaluation of the dollar, and the arguments for and against devaluation are contained in "The Gold Situation."

The report contains factual data on U.S. gold holdings, and their diminutions. It discusses the role of gold in international monetary arrangements, the determination of the United States to maintain the strength of the dollar, and the balance of international payments problem. Steps presently being taken to reverse our longstanding deficits balances are discussed, together with a review of the measures which were earlier taken, and the cumulative effects of such measures.

Because of the general public interest in the subject of gold I have sent a copy of "The Gold Situation" to every Member of the House and of the other body. Should any additional copies be desired, they are available from the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, or the House Committee on Government Operations.

It is my hope, as chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, that the report will fulfill a need which was reflected in inquiries received by the subcommittee for a better general public comprehension of the U.S. gold situation.

AN OUNCE OF COMPASSION

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House and the people of our Nation have had occasion—without count—to have a great sense of pride in the leadership and compassion of our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

The following editorial appearing in the July 18, 1965, issue of the Washington Post brings to our attention another manifestation of the deep and abiding humanitarian drives which guide the leader of this august body.

I should like to include in the RECORD, at this point, the following editorial:

AN OUNCE OF COMPASSION

The dignity and prestige of the House of Representatives were enhanced, not diminished, by Speaker McCORMACK's forbearance on Wednesday in dropping charges against 10 Mississippians on trial for illegal entry at the U.S. Capitol. The 10, members of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, were arrested a month ago for refusing to leave a corridor outside the office of the Clerk of the House after the Capitol closed for the day.

No doubt these demonstrators were wrong to sit in at the Capitol. It appeared at their trial, however, that they had had considerable provocation. They had gone to the Capitol to keep a written appointment with the Clerk who acknowledged that he failed to keep the appointment because he "didn't see any point in talking to them." Listening to this testimony, freshman Congressman JOHN CONYERS, Jr., of Michigan, relayed an account of it to the Speaker who promptly asked Assistant U.S. Attorney Tim Murphy to intervene at the trial. Mr. Murphy told the court that in Mr. McCORMACK's judgment "the defendants were acting in good faith and belief that they had a right to be there to see the Clerk of the House at the time" and "were not in open defiance of the law."

We think that Mr. CONYERS, Mr. McCORMACK, and Mr. Murphy acted with great good sense as well as with magnanimity. The Mississippi demonstrators were bent upon no mischief and no disrespect for the House of Representatives; their errand at the Capitol was a lawful and proper one, and their response to the contemptuous brushoff they received from the Clerk of the House was, if not wise, at least thoroughly understandable.

It would have been unjust and unbecoming to the House of Representatives to have applied the letter of the law to these people. No purpose could have been served by punishing them. The compassion they encountered is much more likely than punishment to deter them from any future misconduct. We hope, in addition, that the Speaker will have a word or two to say to the Clerk.

A LIAR WITH SECURITY CLEARANCE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has released another report today and it is shocking to learn that although William Wieland, a former high-ranking Latin American expert, lied about his contacts with Fidel Castro he has been given security clearance by the State Department.

Testifying under oath before the subcommittee, Otto Otepka, the State Department's chief security officer, states that there is a transcript of the Wieland testimony which shows that Wieland insisted he had only one meeting with the Cuban Communist dictator when Castro was in Washington.

Otepka testified he has evidence that Wieland met with Castro on at least six occasions.

This is but one of the lies or misrepresentations by Wieland on material matters. He failed to list his former name of William A. Montenegro on his Government information and application forms. He misrepresented and gave evasive testimony to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee when questioned about the omission of this material, and the committee transcript was sent to the Justice Department to study for possible prosecution for perjury.

It is incredible, in view of the report made today by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, that the State Department now employs Wieland in the office of the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration at a salary of more than $24,000 and, according to newspaper accounts, he is being elevated to a high diplomatic post in Australia.

Meanwhile, William Crockett, the Deputy Under Secretary, is doing his utmost to fire Chief Security Officer Otepka because the latter has given full and truthful testimony in response to the questions of the Senate committee.

The Wieland case demonstrates clearly and forcibly the bungling and worse that is taking place in the State Department with respect to security matters and the necessity for a full-scale overhauling in that Department of the Government.

TATTERED FLAG FLYING OVER HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, this morning when I looked out my window to my great amazement I noted the flag flying over the Rayburn House Office Building was almost completely torn to shreads—enough so, Mr. Speaker, to constitute a disgrace to the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, this led me to ask two questions. First, was the flag left flying during the storm last night; and, secondly, if not why was it raised in such a condition this morning?

Laws and certain customs have been decreed to insure proper respect for the Stars and Stripes. I quote, Mr. Speaker, from House Document No. 104 of the 88th Congress, 1st session, which says on page 22:

> When the flag is in such a condition, through wear or damage, that it is no longer a fitting emblem for display, it should be destroyed in a dignified way, preferably by burning.

In getting back to my first question, was the flag left flying during the storm last night? It is my understanding that the flag can only be flown legally 24 hours a day in three places in this Nation, and the House Office Building is not one of those places.

These three legal places are Flag House Square in Baltimore, Md., Fort McHenry National Monument, Baltimore, Md., and Iwo Jima Memorial, Arlington, Va. By custom over the Capitol Building itself but not, as I understand, over Capitol office building, or at least that is the way it should be.

Mr. Speaker, precautions should be taken to insure that no reoccurrence of this type should ever again happen.

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the reduction of nonessential expenditures of the Federal Government is a cause dear to all of our hearts. Recently the Secretary of Defense briefed the press and others on his cost reduction program. I would like to assist in the Secretary's cost reduction efforts by suggesting that next year he refrain from indulging in the printing of an expensive booklet proclaiming his efforts. Forty thousand copies of a booklet, printed on expensive paper and using costly color transparencies were prepared at a cost of at least $50,000. The delivery schedule was such that a considerable amount of overtime work was required. The booklet was sent by mail to Members of Congress in a White House envelope bearing 40 cents in postage while the Federal Government maintains a small army of messengers in Washington. If my suggestion is accepted, the Secretary will have a head start on next year's cost reduction program.

MORE ON TEACH-INS

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, recently I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an evaluation by John Evarts Horner, Director of Public Services at the State Department, of the teach-ins on college campuses with respect to our policy in Vietnam.

In his evaluation, Mr. Horner referred to the teach-in at UCLA as being "little more than a circus." This statement was challenged by Mr. Chandler Harris, public information officer at UCLA, who telephoned Mr. Horner to point out that he—Mr. Horner—should have referred to the teach-in at the Berkeley campus of the University of California, rather than to the teach-in at UCLA. Mr. Harris told Mr. Horner that the teach-in at UCLA was conducted in an entirely satisfactory and unbiased manner.

In all fairness to the students and faculty at UCLA, I want to correct any false assumption which may have been made because of this slight error in Mr. Horner's evaluation. The record stands corrected on this point.

Dr. James McCain, president of Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans., read Mr. Horner's statement on the teach-ins and its specific reference to Kansas State University, and wrote me to give me his own evaluation.

Dr. McCain's statement is most pertinent and I feel that it is worthy of the attention of my colleagues. Dr. McCain's letter follows:

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY,
Manhattan, Kan., July 8, 1965.

The Hon. CHESTER L. MIZE,
House of Representatives,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHET: I found your letter of June 29 and the clippings from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on my desk when I returned yesterday from a 2-weeks' vacation. I am especially pleased that you called my attention to the letter by Mr. Horner in which he comments on his visit to Kansas State University. Unfortunately, I was not on the campus at the time of his visit and did not get to see him personally.

I find it distressing that so many people assume that most university students and faculty members share the views of the tiny minority who make the headlines. I think it safe to assume that more than 90 percent of our college teachers and students support our policy in Vietnam and not more than 2 or 3 percent vigorously oppose it. Some of our Kansas State students, for example, decided to picket our spring ROTC review as a protest against Vietnam. They were able to enlist only eight pickets from our own student body of 10,000 and imported 12 from a higher institution nearby. At Colorado State University last spring the student council unanimously passed a resolution supporting the policy in Vietnam, although vigorous opposition to our policy by splinter groups had been previously given widespread publicity.

Certainly, we can all take satisfaction from the growing interest of our students in foreign policy and public affairs generally. Public discussion in these areas should make for more enlightened citizenship. However, the inevitable tendency to play up to more sensational aspects of such discussion gives a distorted impression of university attitudes.

I appreciate your interest very much, CHET, and will welcome an opportunity to talk this over with you the next time we are together.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES A. MCCAIN,
President.

RIGHTS OF THE MOB VERSUS THE RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a perceptive letter from Mr. J. P. Humphreys, president of Tamko, Inc., of Joplin, Mo. The letter reflects the views of an individual citizen who is becoming increasingly concerned with the direction of Government at the Federal level. I believe it deserves consideration by those responsible for governing our Nation.

Therefore, I insert the letter at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

JULY 7, 1965.

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL,
U.S. Representative from Missouri,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: I write you today because I am greatly disturbed by the direction taken by the leaders of Government at the State and National level. The key decisions being made and being amplified in the State capitols and in Washington I would describe as being concerned primarily with "the rights of the mob versus the rights of the individual."

The direction began as a snowball might have been carelessly thrown down a hill. Today the avalanche thus created is roaring out of control into the abyss of human degradation. Yet, seemingly unaware of the roar of doom, Congressmen, Senators, Supreme Court Justices, Governors, and Presidents are throwing ever larger snowballs in the same direction and with the same effect. We have uncountable Pontius Pilates who seemingly cannot wait to give the mob what they want as long as Pontius can remain in the exalted position of authority over the mob. Thus concerned, I write my thoughts to you.

First, I wish to consider "the rights of the individual." The first and key question that must be answered in this definitive is—"What is the nature of man?" For unless we first answer this question there is no guide, no goal, no direction.

The Bible gives one of the most concise answers to this question, "What is the nature of man?" in the allegory of Adam and Eve. In this Biblical writing, man was, or became early in time, different from other animals created by God. Man had, or was given, the faculty of reason. This faculty of reason permitted man the means of choice, of alternatives, of evaluations, of goals. No other living creature was given such faculties. Shakespeare said, "To be or not to be, that is the question." This is still the question when man has the freedom of choice. My point is that if man's faculty of choice is removed from him by the castration of coercion then he ceases to be a man. Man has an inner power of choice that has to be kept alive or he ceases to live as man.

To be or not to be what? What are the choices of man that are so important? Essentially, man has only two choices, which are—to be moral or not to be moral. Morality, or moral law, must be defined as the objective principles founded on truth which glorify, amplify, and exalt the life of man, the individual. Morality is behavior in accord with the order in the universe. The observance and selection of objective moral standards by man leads to peace and life. The rejection of objective moral standards by man leads to conflict and death. Truth includes the objective laws of man as well as the objective laws of nature. Cicero said, "True law [morality] is right reason in agreement with nature; it is of universal value, unchanging and everlasting. It is a sin to alter the law." Man must have the right of choice before he can be moral. Man may not choose the moral, but he must continually have the freedom of choice or he degenerates into an animal.

If man continually has the freedom to choose the moral, he will increasingly choose the moral since experience and history will increasingly point to the error of the nonmoral (the false). The observance of moral law by man is in his ultimate long range self-interest. Man will choose the moral selfishly as he rids himself of ignorance. Thus the freedom to choose the moral gives the greatest impetus possible to the selection by man of peace and life (the end results of morality.)

The alternative to "the rights of man" is "the rights of the mob." The "rights of the mob" can be defined more easily by defining socialism since the two are synonomous.

Socialism is defined by the phrase, "might makes right." Socialism is the law of the jungle where the strong coerce or eliminate the weak. Socialism is the art of coercion. The term "socialism," can be used interchangeably with fascism, communism, welfare statism, collectivism, or majority (or minority) rule without moral standards. These systems hold that man's life belongs to society (the mob), that society (the mob) can dispose of him in any way it pleases, and that any freedom he enjoys is his only by favor, by the permission of society, which may be revoked at any time.

The "rights of the mob" preclude selection of the moral since individual choice itself is coerced and prevented. The greater the "rights of the mob," the greater the coercion to the "rights of man" the less chance there is to select truth. Ultimately, the "rights of the mob" are translated into complete moral degradation of the individual.

Only criminals and governments stand between man and freedom. Government is a more dangerous threat to man's freedom than the criminal. Government, by definition, holds the monopoly of coercion against its citizens. The question arises then as to how government should use this force—in the interest of the individual—or in the interest of society (the mob)? In the interest of the individual, government should use coercion negatively. In the interest of the mob, government uses the monopoly of coercion positively. The negative use of coercion is moral—defending the rights of man against criminals. The positive use of coercion is immoral—seeking "legitimate ends" for those in "need" by coercive means against the individual. Let me point out here that the end result of an action, and the action itself, cannot be separated. If either is immoral (the result of coercion), both are immoral. Moral ends cannot be obtained by immoral means. End values resulting from coercion are immoral.

Freedom means the opportunity to face life, not the right to be protected from it. Freedom is the activating device by which man's potential for good is exploded into a fusion of energy. Freedom removes the roadblock to the massive flow of available human energy. The key to morality, or truth, is freedom. For a man to be free means to be uncoerced by other men except as he violates their (and his) God-given freedom. To be free means that man must pursue his own self-interest except to the detriment of another man's freedom. To be free means that man owns his own life and the fruits of his labor, which he may exchange voluntarily for the fruits of the labor of other men without coercion in either his buying or his selling. That man was born to be free is part of objective truth. Only by coercing, or being coerced, can man lose his freedom.

The Founding Fathers of this country uniquely understood the proper relationship of the individual to government. They uniquely understood the immorality of positive coercion as used by government. In the beginning, the most profound achievement of the United States of America was the subordination of society (the mob) to moral law.

Using the foregoing as a base, as a set of principles, it is now possible to evaluate the relative merit of each piece of legislation by simply asking the following question:

1. Whom does this legislation benefit?

(a) At whose expense?

If society (the mob) is to benefit at man's (the individual's) expense, how do you justify this immorality?

To be more specific, how can you justify a vote in favor of the repeal of 14(B) of the Taft-Hartley Act when the predetermined result of such action by you is to coerce man from exercising his freedom of choice.

The problem posed to many men concerned with freedom in this country today is that they expect their representatives to the Congress, their President, and the Supreme Court to act in an area within the confines of the Constitution of the United States which is a set of moral principles guiding the art of government. To their anguish and frustration free men find that their representatives, their President, and the keepers of the faith, the Supreme Court, seem to be more interested in the needs of the mob, than they are in determining the morality of an issue. Is one man never right against the mob?

If this concerns you and if you have any suggestions, I would appreciate hearing from you.

With best regards,

J. P. Humphreys,
President.

INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, as announced in the New York Times, a highway seminar is being held in Washington starting today to evaluate the Interstate System progress and problems.

I am unalterably opposed to the administration approach to the problem of additional money needed to complete the Interstate System which is to require a stretchout of the program so that it will not be completed until a year after the present completion date of 1972.

This evidences a deplorable lack of leadership on the part of the administration relating to one of the most vital programs in the Nation—completion of the Interstate System—particularly when evidence indicates that some 41,000 people are dying on our highways annually—largely because of lack of adequate highways. This system when completed would save 8,000 lives annually, and $11 billion on travel costs annually. I am deeply disturbed that the administration is taking the easy and in my opinion the irresponsible way out of this problem—just refuse to request funding of the $2.7 billion deficit—and thus stretch out the completion of the program another year. I call upon the administration to provide leadership to back up the Public Works Committee of the House that voted the needed authorization increases initially to complete the system by 1972. Instead the administration has recommended a $700 million shortage in authorization for 1967; thus, the completion program will be $700 million short in 1967 of completion by 1972.

Leadership is needed here badly.

Conference To Assay Progress on $46.8 Billion Highway Project—Construction Nears Midpoint in Drive for 16-Year Goal

(By David R. Jones)

Washington, July 18.—More than 250 of the Nation's leading highway proponents, ranging from Congressmen and State officials to contractors and their suppliers, will gather here tomorrow for a 2-day conference to celebrate the nearing of the "halfway point" in the contraction of the $46.8 billion National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

There is good reason to celebrate the interstate road program, which has been described as history's biggest public works project.

The Federal-aid program has unsnarled considerable automobile traffic, has enhanced the influence of its proponents, and has poured over $10 billion into the pockets of contractors since it began in 1956.

This week's celebration, called by the Associated General Contractors of America, is manned by the fact that the 41,000-mile Interstate System is not half-completed, even though 9 years of the 16-year plan have passed.

Highway authorities are increasingly coming to the conclusion that the program will miss its 1972 deadline, perhaps by 3 or 4 years.

COST OF DELAY

Each year the program costs the public over $3 billion a year in State and Federal taxes. Any delay would mean an extension and possible increase in that tax load.

Also, some economists expect the roads to have as great an impact on the Nation as the railroad-building boom of the 19th century.

The status of the Interstate System is particularly pertinent right now because the Johnson administration is seeking congressional approval for increased truck taxes and a 5-month stretchout of the tax period to help finance a $5.8 billion cost rise.

However, key members of the House Ways and Means Committee have shown a decided lack of enthusiasm about the prospect. Many have voiced doubt that the committee will act on the legislation before 1966. This would delay the program.

The powerful road lobby is already planning to convince Congress to continue Federal aid to highway building and to maintain related taxes at least at the present level—and possibly higher—through 1985.

This is coming at a time when there is increasing talk here that the Johnson administration is groping for a unified transportation policy, which could conflict somewhat with the road lobby's interests.

PLAGUED FROM THE OUTSET

The Interstate System has been plagued from the outset by political bickering and corruption in several States. Federal investigators may disclose more evidence of scandal early in 1966.

The problem the system faces at the moment is keeping on schedule, particularly in face of mounting criticism from the public in urban areas where new roads are upsetting neighborhood patterns.

The interstate program was begun in mid-1956 to improve transportation, aid defense readiness, and buoy the economy.

By the time the vast project is completed, contractors will have excavated enough material to cover Connecticut knee deep in dirt. Enough concrete will have been poured to build six sidewalks to the moon.

The Bureau of Public Roads supervises the program, with private contractors doing the work under direction of State highway departments. The Federal Government pays 90 percent of the cost, and the States pay the remaining 10 percent.

SCOPE OF PROJECT

The road complex will link 90 percent of U.S. cities having 50,000 or more population with wide ribbons of limited-access highway, thereby sharply reducing travel time.

The Bureau estimates that the completed system will save 8,000 lives and $11 billion in travel costs annually, and will carry nearly 25 percent of all highway traffic on less than 1.5 percent of the Nation's road and street mileage.

The Interstate System was originally expected to cost $27.6 billion. But that estimate has risen steadily to the present $46.8 billion figure, and most experts expect the bill to run at least $3 billion higher before it is completed.

The Federal share is financed by the highway trust fund, which pays for the program on a pay-as-you-go basis from a batch of highway-user taxes due to expire October 1, 1972.

This infusion of Federal funds into the Interstate System has raised total spending for highways and streets in the United States above $14 billion a year, from $9 billion in 1957. The total is expected to rise to $18 billion by the 1970's.

UNEVEN DEVELOPMENT

Work appears to have been moving along at an impressive pace, mainly because ambitious States have moved aggressively ahead of normal schedules and consumed appropriations left unclaimed by laggard States.

Also, much of the work done to date has been concentrated in rural areas, where costs are lower and the building is faster.

The ability to divert money from laggard States to ambitious ones is being diminished as the latter States near completion of their programs.

Much work remains to be done in the urban areas, which will consume nearly half of the program's money and present more of a building obstacle. Militant antiroad groups have snarled progress in several key cities.

Rex M. Whitton, the Federal Highway Administrator, says the interstate program is "substantially" on schedule and will be completed by its 1972 deadline. But he adds that he is "not naive enough to think there may not be a mile or two uncompleted in 1972 in some urban area."

The Bureau estimates that about 19,470 miles, or nearly 48 percent of the 41,000-mile system, was open to traffic at June 30. This seems close to the halfway mark, but it includes over 5,200 miles of toll roads and other highways that for the most part do not meet present interstate standards.

This means that only about one-third of the mileage has been completed to full and acceptable standards in 9 years.

TASKS TO BE COMPLETED

The interstate mileage completed to full standard has averaged less than 2,500 miles annually since 1956. There remain 26,600 miles to finish to full standards by 1972.

The completion rate for the next 7 years would have to run 50 percent faster to hit the 1972 goal.

Most highway experts doubt this can be done because much of the work that remains is in such troublesome urban areas as New York, San Francisco, Baltimore, and Washington, D.C.

Less than 15 percent of the interstate mileage will lie in urban areas, but these roads will carry 41 percent of the system's traffic and represent 47 percent of its cost.

One Bureau official estimates it will take more than 5 years to build some urban highways after locations have been fixed.

Edward H. Holmes, the Bureau's director of planning, says he expects more rural sections and circumferential highways around major cities to be completed by 1972. He suggests it would be wrong to consider the system unfinished merely because some roads through the hearts of these cities had not been completed.

But Lowell K. Bridwell, Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, disputes this.

"You build a highway system to meet the traffic requirements, and half of the national traffic requirements are in the urban areas," he says. "So merely supplying a superior highway facility to the edge of the city does not, in my opinion, meet the requirements of most of the people using the system."

Bureau officials report that, on average, the States have already obligated an average of 41 percent of their interstate highway funds for fiscal 1966, which began last July 1.

The figure is buoyed by several States—such as Texas, Florida, Missouri, Connecticut, Oregon, Ohio, and New York—which have actively pursued their goals.

But about 13 States are lagging in obligations, with New Jersey having obligated only 4 percent of fiscal 1965 funds, and Maryland, only 52 percent of fiscal 1964 funds.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962 made it mandatory for cities seeking Federal highway money after the start of this month to have a comprehensive transportation planning process assuring cooperation between State and local interests. Fifteen cities covered by the interstate system have not yet complied.

Mr. Holmes says that where an interstate road needs only a bridge or small connection for completion, the Bureau will provide aid even though there is no planning process.

ROADBLOCKS FOR STATES

But he predicts significant delays, and perhaps complete suspension of interstate road money, for any city that seeks new funds without such a plan. Those cities affected include New York, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Omaha, Shreveport, and San Francisco.

The Bureau has estimated that the program will cost $5.8 billion more than the $41 billion previously forecast. Increased revenues will bring in an added $2 billion to the trust fund through 1972, the Bureau says, but an additional $3 billion in Federal money is needed to meet increased costs.

Because interstate systems costs are already outstripping revenues, the quarterly apportionment set by the Bureau for the States last August was not released until last month, 3 months behind schedule.

Should the House Ways and Means Committee fail to enact legislation increasing taxes for the program until 1966, another 3-month delay in appropriations could result. This is slowing work in some of the more advanced States.

The House committee, which may hold hearings on the matter later this month, is reported reluctant to raise truck taxes.

Highway sources report that the committee might propose a patchwork tax program, including an extension of the tax period and use of 1 percent of the automobile excise tax to finance the added costs.

STRETCHOUT OF PROGRAM

Alfred E. Johnson, executive secretary of the American Association of State Highway Officials, estimates that failure to obtain the $3 billion in added money would amount to a 1-year program stretchout.

The prospect of a stretched-out interstate program does not appeal to State highway officials and contractors, who would face layoffs and reduced operations. They want to keep the project going full blast, and to follow it up with another massive road program.

Most experts agree future spending should be concentrated in urban areas. There is also considerable sentiment for standardizing the Federal share of Federal-aid highway projects at around 65 to 70 percent of costs.

The Government's share of federally aided road programs normally was 50 percent before the interstate project, and the Government continues to spend only 50 percent on most of its non-interstate road programs.

JOHNSON APPROACH

There are serious misgivings within the Johnson administration, however, about the propriety of this approach to determining transportation needs. Some transportation experts within the administration favor a comprehensive study of the proper balance of funds that should go into all modes of transportation.

Most transportation experts here believe that Alan S. Boyd, named last month as Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, has been given a mandate by President Johnson to put transportation spending on a more rational basis.

Such a move, in the view of most economists, would include cost-benefit studies, which weigh spending against the value derived from it.

"I can assure you that we're going to build roads on the basis of cost-benefit studies, which I hope will be the logical and rational approach to it," Mr. Boyd has stated.

Most sources believe President Johnson to be an ardent Interstate System supporter. They doubt that he would shape any policy to bring about a sharp dispute with the strong petroleum, automobile, trucking, and construction interests in the road lobby.

NAM CIVIC AFFAIRS STUDY PROGRAM GIVES BUSINESS LEADERS BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE LAWMAKING PROCESS

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, recently several of my colleagues and I were privileged to participate in a new program instituted by the National Association of Manufacturers, the civic affairs study program, organized and developed by Robert D. Buehler, director of public affairs for the National Association of Manufacturers.

Because of the significance of the undertaking, I wanted to bring such to the attention of all Members of Congress.

The National Association of Manufacturers describes the public affairs endeavor as a 4-day, live laboratory study of the Federal Government process. The purpose is to give middle and top management of NAM member companies a firsthand practical and constructive observation and understanding of the three branches of Government. As Bob Buehler says:

> Obviously, the participants cannot learn everything about Government in this program, but we are able to provide them with a realistic bird's-eye view and a better appreciation of the Federal Government process.

In order to acquaint the participants with the working environment, some sessions of the program were conducted in the Federal Government departments or on Capitol Hill. I am advised that the Department of Commerce was especially cooperative in its presentation at the Commerce Building. Presentations were given by Members of Congress of both parties, congressional staff personnel, White House aids, and Federal executive officers. Also, Washington business representatives lectured on the role of the business representative working with Government.

As I stated, it was my privilege to talk to a score of executives who participated in the program held June 13–17, 1965. I was impressed with the genuine interest and desire on the part of the businessmen to take advantage of this program to learn and gain a better understanding of the Federal process.

Those who participated were W. Scott Allan, assistant vice president and manager, public relations department, Liberty Mutual Insurance Co., Boston, Mass.; Philip L. Baden, coordinator of citizenship activities, Detroit Edison Co., Detroit, Mich.; Russell M. Braga, vice president of finance, Standard Pressed Steel, Jenkintown, Pa.; Raymond M. Crockett, vice president, United Utilities, Inc., Kansas City, Mo.; James F. Dudley, vice president, engineering and public affairs, Commercial Solvents Corp., New York City; Richard C. Eaton, director, public relations, Ralston Purina Co., St. Louis, Mo.; E. B. Falk, director of advertising and public relations, Twin Disc Clutch Co., Racine, Wis.; Clement E. Gardiner, manager of public relations, the Potomac Edison Co., Hagerstown, Md.; Fred M. Ginsberg, president, American Steel Corp., Detroit, Mich.; J. Whitfield King, Jr., assistant to vice president, Chemstrand Division, Monsanto Co., Decatur, Ala.; Robert M. Kurtz, Jr., vice president of public relations and advertising, Kurtz Bros., Clearfield, Pa.; J. B. McMains, administrative assistant, Northern States Power Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; L. C. Michelon, director of public affairs, Republic Steel Corp., Cleveland, Ohio; A. W. Prenovost, Jr., senior tax consultant, Arizona Public Service Co., Phoenix; J. Robert Roe, special staff assistant to the senior vice president of Litton Industries, Beverly Hills, Calif.; Charles E. Stutenroth, assistant to the vice president, personnel and public relations, director of public relations, Armco Steel Corp., Middletown, Ohio; J. H. Tinsley, staff assistant to the director of industrial relations, the Warner & Swasey Co., Cleveland, Ohio; Gerald W. Vaughan, director of public affairs, Union Bag-Camp Paper Corp., New York City; John H. Welsh, Jr., assistant to the president, Texas Gas Transmission Corp., Owensboro, Ky.; and Charles G. Yeager, administrative assistant to the vice president and director of finance, Champion Spark Plug Co., Toledo, Ohio.

These participants were presented a highly condensed program. Each day they heard speakers at breakfast, lunch, and dinner in addition to the presentations given throughout the day. Before each session, the participants were briefed as to what to expect from the speaker. These business executives were encouraged to ask questions of each speaker after his presentation. The presentations were off the record to facilitate a free flow of ideas. The number of participants was kept purposely low so that each would have ample opportunity to ask the questions.

The program was strictly nonpartisan. Public issues and pending legislation were not discussed; rather, the presentations pertained to the mechanics, or "nuts and bolts," of how Government and those connected with it work.

Here is a list of some of the areas covered: "The Legislative Process," "The Role of Party Leadership in the House," "The Role of the Bureau of the Budget," "The Work of the Supreme Court," "Politics for the First Time," "The Congressional Committee Process," "Facing the Realities of Political and Economic Life," "The Operation of Congressional Offices," "The Job of the Congressional Liaison Official for Executive Departments," "The Current Challenges Facing Members of Congress," "The Work of the Department of Commerce," "Helping Business in Science and Technology," "Services for the Business Community," "Economic Data for Policy Determination," "The Development of Policy and Party Position on Legislative Issues," "The Role of the Independent Regulatory Agency as It Relates to the Legislative and Executive Branches," "The Responsibility of the News Media as It Relates to the Government Process," "The Work of the White House Staff," and "The Role of the Washington Business Representative as It Relates to His Company and to the Legislative and Executive Branches."

One of the best ways to measure the success of the program in increasing management's knowledge and understanding of the Government process is to relate specific quotes made by the participants themselves:

> It was very interesting to observe the reaction of the 21 businessmen participating in the program. During the first couple of sessions, they were obviously skeptical, had a relatively low opinion of both legislators and Government agency personnel and were obviously thinking that Government was not "in the same ball park" with American business. As the sessions continued, however, their attitude began to undergo a very real change, in the sense that the parade of competent speakers from all branches of the Federal Government began to demonstrate forcibly the sophistication and the caliber of Government personnel and of the legislators whom we send to Washington. More than that, there began to evolve a much clearer realization of the inherent problems of Government (which are not so dissimilar to those of business) and an appreciation of why it is increasingly necessary for business executives to know how to work with Government.

Other quotes follow:

> A special opportunity not readily available to us as individual citizens to get a brief but revealing glimpse at the process of Government at the national level.
>
> The program makes an excellent contribution to the necessary background of a non-Washingtonian who wishes to increase his potential as an effective spokesman for his company at the Federal level.

Mr. Speaker, I played a very minor part in this study program but I was grateful for the opportunity to participate and assist these businessmen in getting firsthand information about the Federal process as I know it from my particular vantage point.

The National Association of Manufacturers and Robert Buehler, the director of public affairs, are to be commended for launching this worthwhile program. I feel certain that the NAM will get requests to arrange other study programs of this nature and it goes without saying that they will find Members of Congress and Government officials more than happy to cooperate in exchanging views and information which will make the governmental process more understandable and more responsive to the needs of the people it serves.

JUSTICE AND LOGIC DEMAND THE REPEAL OF 14(b)

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, early in May, after 4 months of careful study and analysis, I publicly announced my decision to support President Johnson and the 1964 Democratic Party platform by voting for the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I am fully aware that my decision is neither politically expedient nor popular with some people. Yet any other course would be an act of moral dishonesty, because I firmly believe that 14(b) is a bad law and should be stricken from the record.

Several powerful pressure groups in Arizona have already begun firing away with a barrage of letters, telegrams, and telephone calls. Most of these come from narrow interests who apparently have taken it upon themselves to speak for our working men and women who are directly affected by the so-called right-to-work laws.

IS "RIGHT-TO-WORK" A MAJORITY OPINION?

Arizonans voted on November 5, 1946, and again on November 2, 1948, to implement 14(b) by prohibiting employers and employees from freely contracting with each other and reaching collective security agreements.

Because of these votes I have been repeatedly accused of defying majority opinion. There is no truth to this accusation.

Supporters of the "right-to-work" law have argued that Arizonans clearly expressed their views in 1946, 1948, and again last year when the Full Crew Train Law (so-called featherbedding) was repealed by a vote of 199,650 to 178,762. In other words, the people reaffirmed their belief in "right to work" by knocking out the Full Crew Train Law 8 short months ago.

If we carry this logic to its conclusion, then my position on 14(b) was actually dictated at the polls last November by the people of the Third Congressional District. The simple fact is that they voted against repealing the Full Crew Train Law 27,660 to 21,553. In short, a majority of the voters of the Third Congressional District expressed their support for the workingman.

It is further interesting to note that only 5 of Arizona's 14 counties favored repeal, and that it was a 30,000 vote majority chalked up in Maricopa County that made the difference.

"RIGHT-TO-WORK" LAWS DESTROY FREEDOM

The controversy over repeal of 14(b) has aroused such bitterly emotional opinions that the facts either are ignored or are distorted to serve as a crutch for faulty arguments.

Stripped of all emotional coloration, the principal issue involved here is freedom of choice—the freedom of employees to vote on whether their interests would best be served by a collective bargaining agency. It is as simple as that. Section 14(b) permits the individual States to take away that freedom and 19 States—including Arizona—have done so.

Viewed calmly and rationally, the full significance of 14(b) can be more clearly understood by visualizing its application to the Voting Rights Bill of 1965.

Supposing that when Congress enacts the Voting Rights Bill of 1965, which guarantees the right of every qualified citizen to register, to cast his ballot, and to have it properly counted, it also inserts a short paragraph permitting each State to make its own overriding laws on this subject.

The repeal of 14(b) will not, as some have suggested, automatically lead to the establishment of a union. It will not in itself force anyone to join a union. It is essentially a proposal that permits the employer and employees who are bargaining in a particular case to settle this matter as they deem mutually satisfactory.

Union security agreements, where they now exist, are the result of free and voluntary negotiation between the employer and the employees, and are not a condition imposed by law. Where State "right-to-work" laws are erased by the repeal of 14(b), no employee could be compelled to join a collective bargaining unit unless his employer voluntarily agrees to such a contract provision with the collective bargaining agent which has been democratically chosen by a majority of the employees.

"RIGHT-TO-WORK"—A MISLEADING SLOGAN

At this point let us dispose of the myth inherent in the phrase "right-to-work." James Mitchell, who served as Secretary of Labor under President Eisenhower, said:

> They call these right-to-work laws, but that is not what they really are. In the first place, they do not create any jobs at all. In the second place, they result in undesirable and unnecessary limitations upon the freedom of working men and women and their employers to bargain collectively and agree upon the conditions of work. I oppose such laws categorically.

During hearings on legislation calling for repeal of 14(b) 2 months ago, present Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, declared:

> The real issue has been submerged beneath a phrase about right-to-work although no such right is either recognized or advocated by those who lean on this phrase. The issue has also been cast falsely in terms of individual liberties—when what is involved is only the effect which any group decision has on the position of a member who disagrees with it.

OPPOSITION TO REPEAL OF 14(b) IS ON SHAKY GROUND

There are three major arguments advanced again and again by those who do not want 14(b) repealed. Whatever disguise they may be wrapped in from time to time, the basic arguments have remained unchanged for 18 years and more.

Before examining these arguments, however, perhaps it would be fruitful to briefly review some aspects of legislation pertinent to 14(b).

The Constitution grants Congress the power to regulate interstate commerce. In 1935, Congress passed the Fair Labor Standards Act and assumed substantial jurisdiction to stop abuses on the part of both labor and management as they affect interstate commerce.

Then 12 years later in 1947, the Taft-Hartley Act became law. Generally speaking, this legislation imposed varying restrictions upon union activities. It banned the closed union shop. But the law also permitted the employer and the employees to enter into an agreement concerning collective security. It must be emphasized that such agreements can only be reached after a majority of the employees have accepted an individual or a union as their bargaining agent.

Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, however, permits the individual States to prohibit all forms of employee's security agreements, even if the employer and 100 percent of his employees have agreed to such security agreements. Section 14(b) gave legal authority to the "right-to-work" laws now in effect in Arizona and 18 other States. Five States have repealed their "right-to-work" laws, and nine others have defeated efforts to have such laws enacted.

Section 14(b) is a contradiction in a national law. But it has an even more unattractive feature. Employees in the "right-to-work" States can work in an industry where the majority of the employees has decided, by a secret ballot, that it wants to be represented by a collective bargaining agency, but they do not have to contribute 1 cent to the costs of the collective bargaining process. Yet the Taft-Hartley Act requires each bargaining agent to represent every employee equally and without exception—in regard to working conditions, grievances, wages, hours of employment, and so forth.

Let us examine the arguments against the repeal of 14(b) and in favor of retaining the "right-to-work" laws.

First. Repeal of 14(b) would violate individual freedom and individual rights by making union membership compulsory.

Answer. This is simply not true. It is obvious that in those 31 States which have not prohibited collective security agreements, the right to work without joining a union freely exists. In fact, the overwhelming majority of nonagricultural workers in this Nation are not union members.

In Illinois, the most highly unionized State in the country, 64.2 percent of the working force is nonunion. New York is 68.1 percent nonunion; California 73.2 percent; Pennsylvania 66.2 percent; Michigan 67.2 percent. These employees have the right to work without joining a union but do not have the power to restrict the right to work of those who do want a union security agreement—source of above statistics: U.S. Department of Labor.

Just how much freedom is actually involved? In those States which do not have right-to-work laws a man can work in a nonunion shop, an agency shop, or a shop with a union security agreement. If he works in a shop with a union security agreement, he may be an active union member, or a person who simply pays his union fees and dues for services rendered. In a "right-to-work" State, however, he has no choice but to work in a compulsory open shop. I ask you, where does the greater freedom lie?

Second. Repeal of 14(b) would be an invasion of States rights.

Answer. This is a particularly deceptive argument, but one that has no merit for a number of reasons.

The Constitution of the United States specifically states:

> Congress shall have the Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among

> the several States, and with the Indian Tribes (art. 1, sec. 8).

It is Congress that has the constitutional prerogative to legislate in the field of interstate commerce. In pursuance of the national public interest and under the powers granted it by the Constitution, Congress has passed a number of acts, among them the Taft-Hartley Act, the National Railway Labor Act, and the Transportation Act of 1958. These acts provide uniform regulations concerning interstate commerce relations and help promote the industrial tranquillity and prosperity of the Nation. If these acts are to be effective and nondiscriminatory they must apply to all States uniformly. Yet section 14(b) is the one clause in a piece of national legislation where national uniformity and unity is completely abandoned.

The National Railway Labor Act was amended in 1951 to permit employers and employees under the act's jurisdiction to reach a collective security agreement. Five years later, in *Railway Employees Department* v. *Hanson*, 351 U.S. 225 (1956), the Supreme Court of the United States held that labor-management relations came under the legislative power of Congress by virtue of the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution. It held, also, that Federal law was controlling in this area and that a State could not ban any employer-employee agreement arrived at under the provisions of the National Railway Labor Act, as amended in 1951.

Finally, and I am not arguing for organized labor but to point out certain inconsistencies, it seems to me that if those who argue for States rights were really concerned about achieving States rights on the issue of compulsory union membership, they would demand that 14(b) be amended—not only to prohibit all forms of compulsory union membership—but to permit all forms of compulsory membership, including the closed shop. That would make 14(b) a two-way street with no limitation on the power of the State to act in either direction.

DO RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS FOSTER ECONOMIC GROWTH?

Proponents of "right-to-work" laws argue that these laws promote industrial growth and they cite statistics to prove their claim. On the other hand, the advocates of repeal of 14(b) can cite just as many figures supporting the claim that "right-to-work" laws do not help a State's economic growth.

In order to get an unbiased opinion, a group of Congressmen asked the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service to make a study answering this question: "Have right-to-work laws promoted economic growth?" This study reports that the growth of "right-to-work" States "reflects more the location of many of the States in rapidly growing areas of the Southeast and Southwest than any peculiarity of the right-to-work laws."

The significant conclusion of the Legislative Reference Service study is that no definite claims can be made for or against right-to-work laws, insofar as economic growth is concerned.

On the subject of per capita personal income, "the analysis has not isolated any effect of a State's having a right-to-work law on its total or per capita income."

Correlating a State's income as a share of national income, the study found that "there is no clear trend either way."

Its final conclusions are simple:

> Efforts to measure economic effects of right-to-work laws in the various States were inconclusive. No consistent effects were found, either immediately after passage or over a period of time.

ARIZONA AND 14(B)

One of the arguments frequently heard in Arizona to justify retention of 14(b) is that new industry has been drawn there by the right-to-work law. This has extremely unfortunate connotations because it implies the presence of an antilabor climate with attendant low wage scales. On the surface, Arizona's almost phenomenal growth since 1948 would tend to bear out this argument.

But appearances are deceiving, and I believe that the facts do not support this spurious argument.

In attempting to arrive at the truth, I developed a questionnaire and distributed it to 73 of Arizona's largest manufacturing firms several weeks ago. Collectively they employ approximately 50,000 people. The great majority of these established operations in Arizona after 1948.

The first question asked was:

> What major factors induced your firm to establish operations in Arizona?

Significantly, only two companies listed the "right-to-work law" as a factor. At the same time, they also emphasized that the removal of the manufacturers inventory tax in 1950—a State law—had an impact on their decision to move to Arizona.

Altogether, 37 percent declared that repeal of the manufacturers inventory tax helped persuade them to select Arizona; 37.9 percent stated that the tax repeal motivated them to expand their operations; 20.7 percent asserted that the removal of the tax on sales to the Federal Government in 1956 had had a great influence in determining their Arizona location and activities.

The numbers game is an interesting one, but not always of merit since anyone can make figures do virtually whatever he pleases. Yet there is one particular area in which statistics seem enlightening: the economic growth in Arizona stands below the national average in terms of per capita personal income. Not only is it below national average, but it is falling farther behind.

Arizona, in 1948, was $178 below the national average. In 1963, the State's per capita personal income was $298 below the national average—source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Precisely how sincere are the motives of those who claim they want Arizona's "right-to-work" laws retained because it benefits the working people? It is curious that in their protective zeal they have somehow failed to fight for a minimum wage law for Arizona.

To date, there have been only two Wage Board orders guaranteeing to experienced employees the tremendous salary of $18.72 a week, or 52 cents per hour, in laundries; $21.60 a week, or 60 cents per hour, in drycleaning plants; and $24.60 a week, or 55 cents per hour, in retail trades. There is no State law covering employees other than those doing manual or mechanical work for the State government.

In the final analysis, there is no way of knowing what the economic status of Arizona might have been without the right-to-work laws. We can arrive at some conclusions based on the lagging per capita personal income, but they would be assumption at best. The same applies to Arizona's great growth, which to a greater or lesser extent may well have been stimulated by the billions of dollars which were spent by the Federal Government in road construction and defense contracts.

The overriding issue in "right-to-work" and 14(b) is and remains freedom of choice and the will of the majority. These can only be accomplished by the repeal of 14(b).

I believe that the employee is the best judge of his own interests. I believe he should be permitted, through democratic processes, to determine for himself whether his interest will be best served by the establishment of union security or by no union at all. The repeal of 14(b) would give the employee this right of self-determination. Repeal of 14(b), by eliminating State "right-to-work" laws which deny this right, would return to the employees and their employer the right to determine, by the process of a secret ballot and negotiations, which arrangement they prefer in their particular situation. In good conscience, therefore, I have no alternative but to support the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN STATE LEGISLATURE ON UNIFORM DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin State Legislature in a joint resolution petitioned the Wisconsin congressional delegation to seek Federal legislation on uniform daylight saving time periods.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that the full text of Wisconsin Senate Joint Resolution 38 be included in the RECORD at this point.

The joint resolution referred to follows:

STATE OF WISCONSIN SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 38

> Whereas the present crazy quilt pattern whereby each State determines whether or not it will institute daylight saving time and the period for which daylight saving time will be effective in that state results in a nonsensical jumble of varying times, inconvenient to travelers, business operations and the public in general; and

Whereas, the great progressive State of Wisconsin has an opportunity to pioneer again by seeking to bring order out of the chaos resulting from this lack of uniformity; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate, the assembly concurring, That the legislature petitions Wisconsin's 10 Congressmen and 2 Senators to seek the enactment of Federal legislation to make the institution of daylight saving time and the periods for which effective standard throughout the United States; and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each Member of the Wisconsin delegation to Congress.

Patrick Gluy,
President of the Senate.
William P. Nugent,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
Robert T. Huber,
Speaker of the Assembly.
James P. Buckley,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

PRESIDENT SHOULD CLARIFY FACTS ON "SPY PLANE" CHARGE

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the French Government has charged that a U.S. reconnaissance plane last Friday took 175 photographs of a secret French uranium plant.

President Johnson should immediately clarify the facts. The charge is a most serious one, and if a "spy plane" flight was actually undertaken it was an affront to France and a foreign-policy blunder of shocking proportions.

The U.S. Government should face the fact that France is a nuclear power, and drop our hostile and suspicious attitude.

We are treating our friends and allies, especially France, as if they were irresponsible children.

If we have actually sent a "spy plane" over France's uranium plant, then we have added insult to injury. Up to now we have reserved this type of operation for Castro's Cuba, the Soviet Union, and other hostile territory.

President Johnson should immediately explain to the American people, and to the French, the full facts on the alleged incident.

He should also take steps to improve U.S. nuclear policy toward France.

Instead of blocking French weapons development, the United States should be helping. The United States and France should be partners.

As the House Republican fact-finding mission on NATO recently recommended, we must find a way to bring together the vast scientific and technological resources of the entire Atlantic community, including France.

Present policies deprive the United States of the talent and achievements of many brilliant scientists in France, just as they deprive France of U.S. talent and achievement.

The alleged incident makes especially urgent and timely the Republican mission's recommendation. The United States should take full advantage of any discretionary provisions of our Atomic Energy Act, and if need be amend it so that the nuclear capabilities of France and the United States may be fully coordinated.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS TO VETERANS OF SERVICE IN VIETNAM

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Shriver] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will authorize educational assistance on the same basis as that provided for World War II and Korean war veterans to any veteran who served for 10 or more days in Vietnam.

American servicemen who have fought in this area, are now fighting, or will fight there, face the same hazards as did their brothers-in-arms who served in World War II and Korea. Indeed, in many instances, their lot is more difficult and demanding.

The President recently designated Vietnam and certain waters adjacent thereto as combat areas for the purpose of income tax relief for persons serving therein. My bill establishes the same geographical boundaries and the same time limitations as the President's Executive order for entitlement.

This legislation will provide 1½ days of education for each day of military service performed between January 1, 1964, and the date Vietnam is no longer designated as a combat area to any veteran who served at least 10 days in Vietnam during this period.

The men and women of the U.S. armed services are making great sacrifices in behalf of freedom and they are entitled to share in the same benefits accorded the veterans of World War II and Korea.

I respectfully urge the support and early consideration of this bill by my colleagues.

THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PORK BARREL

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Springer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has shortchanged the Midwest in the award of job-creating research and development contracts.

This is a matter of serious concern in our region because economic growth often goes hand-in-hand with research and development activities.

The administration now is asking us to vote huge sums to create employment opportunities in depressed areas. At the same time, through concentration of research and development funds in a few favored locations, it is actually retarding economic growth in much of the rest of the country, particularly the Midwest.

This situation is succinctly described in an editorial titled "The Research and Development Pork Barrel" in the July 2, 1965, issue of Science, a publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

As aptly stated in this editorial, "some regions of this country not receiving large research and development contracts seem on the road to becoming new Appalachias."

The editorial points out that one-half of the 50 States received 96.8 percent of all Federal research and development funds in 1963.

The significance of this is underscored by the fact that almost $21 billion—3.2 percent of the gross national product—will be spent this year for research and development in the United States, of which two-thirds will come from the Federal Government.

In the past the administration has excused the maldistribution of research and development funds on the ground that the contracts went where the scientific and technical expertise in such fields as nuclear energy, space exploration, and electronics were concentrated, particularly the Boston area, Texas, and California.

But this reasoning, plausible as it may sound, cannot explain the administration's choice of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation. MIT, deservedly famous for its work in other research fields, has no special expertise in the field of transportation. In fact, most research in railroad transportation has been done in the Midwest although there also has been important development work done by railroads and car manufacturers in the Pittsburgh area, Philadelphia, and West Virginia. The Association of American Railroads research center on the campus of the Illinois Institute of Technology in Chicago is world renowned. AAR's vice president in charge of research, William M. Kessler, informs me that visitors from almost every country in the world travel to the center "to see what research we are doing." A few miles away, in La Grange, Ill., is General Motors' Electromotive Division which pioneered development of the diesel engine. Also in the Chicago area is Northwestern University's Transportation Center, which has done valuable research work in railroad economics. Important research in various phases of railroad transportation has been carried on at such Midwestern institutions as the University of Illinois, in my own congressional district; Purdue University in Indiana, Ohio State University, the Battelle Memorial Institute in Columbus, and in the research facilities of such companies as Pullman Standard, American Steel Foundry, and American Car & Foundry.

With all this railroad research expertise available in the Midwest it does seem strange to see MIT on the inside track to the millions of dollars in research and development contracts that are sure to flow from the administration's ground transportation bill. True, the bill designates no institution and no contracts have been awarded. The legislation is still pending before our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. However, the preliminary studies on which the administration proposal was based were carried on at MIT with the financial support of the Department of Commerce. William W. Seifer, MIT assistant dean of engineering and director of its Project Transport, testified before our committee that he has had about 40 faculty members and 25 graduate students working in this research field since September 1964. It does not require much imagination to foresee that MIT is likely to emerge with the lion's share, if not all, of the $10 million in research and development funds to be authorized for the first year alone.

I bring these facts to the attention of my colleagues, particularly those from the Midwest, in the hope that we can do something before it is too late to secure for our area its fair share of research and development funds. We are justly proud of our great educational institutions. The States where the Big Ten universities are located produce 40 percent of all scientists and engineers with advanced degrees. But most of them, after getting their master's degrees or doctorates, must look elsewhere for research jobs because the jobs go along with the big Government contracts.

Following is the science editorial which I referred to earlier:

THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PORK BARREL

Distribution of research and development funds is becoming a major political issue. One reason is that present distribution is very uneven. In 1963 one-half of the 50 States received 96.8 percent of all Federal research and development funds while the other 25 divided the remaining 3.2 percent. The 50 Senators from the have-not States may be expected to attempt to improve their States' share. This tendency will be reinforced by a growing general awareness of the role of science and technology in our changing civilization.

The extent of the beneficial effects of Federal funds is not clear, though in some instances the economic stimulus has seemed disproportionately large. In other instances benefits were nominal. However, many of the States whose economies have grown rapidly are recipients of large sums of Federal research and development funds. In contrast, some regions of this country not receiving large research and development contracts seem on the road to becoming new Appalachias.

In a recent speech at a Midwest Governors' conference, Charles Kimball, president of the Midwest Research Institute, outlined problems of one such area. His institute had made a study of a 6-State region, including Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma. During the decade 1950-60 the number of jobs in the area had increased only 2.3 percent as against 14.5 percent for the Nation. The average family income is now much below the national figure. At the same time more than a million people moved to other parts of the country. Although total population increased slightly, the increase was much less than the national average.

Contributing to discontent over uneven distribution of research and development funds is growing frustration over a Middle West "brain drain." For instance, in Iowa the two major universities estimate that from 55 to 75 percent of the graduates leave the State for their first jobs. The States in which the Big Ten universities are located produce about 40 percent of all scientists and engineers with advanced degrees, but this region receives only a small fraction of Federal research and development funds. To apply their training many of the scientists must migrate; their migration represents an economic loss to a region which yearly spends huge sums on higher education.

Some of the frustration felt in the Midwest was expressed recently by President Harrington of the University of Wisconsin, who said:

"Failure to provide for geographical spread of Federal defense and space contracts has brought our Nation face to face with a most serious kind of overconcentration:

"Overconcentration of our working scientists and engineers by region;

"Overconcentration of our industrial and defense strengths by region.

"If these tendencies continue in the award of Federal research, development, and production contracts, we are on the road to manpower chaos, economic chaos, social chaos, defense chaos."

The feelings expressed by President Harrington are not unrelated to pressures now evident with respect to the proposed new 200-Bev. accelerator. Major midwestern universities have agreed to support whatever midwestern site appears to be most in the running after initial screenings. If the region exerts its maximum potential pressure, Washington will find it difficult to place the facility elsewhere. Whatever the outcome, politics is destined to be a crucial factor, and an important precedent will be established. The influence of political and geographical considerations on the allocation of research funds is certain to increase.

PHILIP H. ABELSON.

TRIBUTE FOR THE LATE HONORABLE T. A. THOMPSON

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in a tribute to my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, the late T. ASHTON THOMPSON.

It was my privilege to serve on the Subcommittee for Fish and Wildlife of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, which Mr. THOMPSON so ably chaired.

The shock of his death affected us all. His love of the out of doors, his great interest in migratory waterfowl, contributed much to the accomplishment of his subcommittee.

To his family, to his many associates and friends in the Seventh District of Louisiana, I offer my sincerest sympathy.

THE SUBVERSION OF PACEM IN TERRIS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to read a report of the Veritas Committee on Pacem in Terris. Headed by such illustrious Americans as Robert Morris and Phyllis Schlafly, this committee has shown in a scholarly manner the effort at subverting the meaning of Pope John XXIII's encyclical Pacem in Terris. I commend this article to those who are interested in a penetrating analysis of this subject:

THE SUBVERSION OF PACEM IN TERRIS

The Communists know there are just two important obstacles to their goal of world conquest:[1]

1. The spiritual strength of the Catholic Church; and

2. The military strength of the United States of America.

In 1958, having already made enormous geographic gains, the Communists mapped their strategy to paralyze or neutralize these two major obstacles.[2] The principal purpose of Khrushchev's visit to the United States and the United Nations in 1959 was to persuade the United States to unilaterally dismantle its military strength. Great quantities of Communist literature and numerous Communist fronts worked strenuously toward this goal. By 1963 the Communists were openly baiting Catholics and advertising that "religious beliefs (of Catholics) should not be regarded as an obstacle to their joining the (Communist) party."[3]

Soon after, the Communist commissars of psychological warfare came up with a diabolical plan. They decided upon the use of a single weapon to paralyze both the Catholic and the military obstacles to their conquest of the world. It was a scheme that staggered the imagination by its very boldness. The Communists planned to misuse and distort, in effect, to steal Pope John XXIII's great encyclical, "Pacem in Terris," from Catholics and use it as an instrument to promote—

---

[1] The primary objective of communism is world conquest. This remains the goal of Soviet Communists as well as Chinese Reds, of "fat" Communists as well as hungry ones. Neither the death of Stalin, nor the industrialization of the U.S.S.R., nor the negotiations and agreements with the West, has brought about the abondonment or even the postponement of this paramount objective. This has recently been reconfirmed by a scholarly and authoritative study by the Center for Strategic Studies of Georgetown University the renowned Jesuit institution in Washington, D.C. The conclusion of this objective and comprehensive analysis of more than 500 Communist documents was published in 1964 by the American Bar Association Standing Committee on Education Against Communism under the title "Peaceful Coexistence: A Communist Blueprint for Victory."

[2] Information on the Communist line is taken from Communist publications: Political Affairs, the Worker, New World Review, World Marxist Review, International Affairs, and New Times.

[3] World Marxist Review, March 1963, p. 49. "The Beginnings of a Catholic Left," the Worker, Jan. 6, 1963, p. 5. "The Myth of Catholic Communism," the Red Line, Oct. 31, 1963. "Comrades Wooing Catholics for Socialism" by Louis F. Budenz, the Tablet, May 2, 1963.

1. A split in the Catholic Church in America by using the Marxist class-war concept to turn Catholics against Catholics;
2. The unilateral dismantling of American military strength; and
3. The withdrawal of the United States from its commitments to defend the free world from communism, beginning specifically with U.S. withdrawal from southeast Asia.

Every knowledgeable Catholic knows that "Pacem in Terris" did not say, and that Pope John did not intend anything remotely like this. The daring Communist strategy was based on—

1. The time-tested Communist weapon of semantic sabotage;
2. American ignorance of Communist tactics and objectives; and
3. American readiness to accept anything clothed in religious words without looking beneath the surface.

Lenin, the master Communist, believed that words are weapons, more powerful than bullets. To train agents in the science of word warfare, the Communists founded the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow, and other psychological warfare schools in Prague and Peiping. Graduates of these schools are highly skilled in semantic sabotage—the Red technique of using words with one meaning for the West and a different meaning for the Communists.

The most potent explosive in the arsenal of these Communist word warriors is the word "peace." Recognizing peace as an ideal for which all men yearn, the Communists use "peace" to lure unsuspecting people into their web as the spider lures the fly. An official U.S. Government report called the Communist "peace" offensive "The most dangerous hoax ever devised by the international Communist conspiracy." [4] Communists deliberately use the word "peace" knowing it means one thing to the free world, while to the Communists it means Communist conquest—the "peace" of Katyn Forest, the "peace" of Vorkuta, the "peace" of Budapest.

In spite of America's great achievements in transportation and communications, the average American citizen remains exceedingly ignorant about Communism. Courses on this subject in colleges and high schools are rare exceptions. The American Bar Association reported "The greatest asset the Communists have at the present time is not the hydrogen bomb, certainly not Soviet satellites, but world ignorance of their tactics, strategy and objectives." [5]

Furthermore, most Americans do not understand the Communist dialectic, the Marxist-Leninist instrument which enables the Communists to progress toward their goal by a series of retreats and advances like the hammering of a nail. Use of the dialectic enables the Communists to use religion in order to establish atheism. Petr S. Deriabian, an officer of the Soviet NKVD from 1944 to 1954 who later defected to the West, gave sworn testimony showing how the Communists use religion—instead of fighting it—to achieve total control over the minds of men.[6] Castro deliberately used rosaries, missals and requests for chaplains to aid in his conquest of Cuba.[7] Americans are susceptible to this kind of propaganda because (unlike some Western nations with an anticlerical tradition) they have a predisposition to accept ideas and causes wrapped in religious words.

COMMUNIST ATTACK

When "Pacem in Terris" was released by Pope John, it was greeted by immediate and loud acclaim in the Communist press all over the world.[8] This was not due to the content of the encyclical, which was seldom quoted, but primarily to the title of the encyclical. The Communists recognized in the word "peace" a handle they could seize to twist the encyclical into the context of their worldwide "peace" offensive against the West. Leading U.S. Communist Gus Hall issued this directive: "We must utilize this encyclical to the utmost in the struggle for peace." [9]

Communist propaganda about "Pacem in Terris" deliberately attempted to turn Catholics against Catholics, and to isolate Pope John XXIII from his predecessors and successors, on the age-old tactic of divide and conquer. The Communist press purported to "prove" that a "Pacem in Terris" espouses views completely different from every other encyclical in history.[10] Communist writers promoted this divisive tactic by saying the effect of "Pacem in Terris" was "within Catholic ranks * * * to sharpen the struggle." [11]

After the Vatican issued clarifying statements repelling the Communists from their arrogant frontal assault on "Pacem in Terris," the Reds realized they had taken a counterproductive approach. In a typical dialectical maneuver, they took one step back and two steps forward in a well-planned propaganda campaign to come in an unguarded side door in America.

It obviously would take money, ingenuity, and massive propaganda to transform "Pacem in Terris" into a Communist military weapon to destroy America's national defense. The catalyst selected for this task was the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, a wealthy organization that had been an influential factor in persuading the U.S. Supreme Court to banish prayer from the public schools, thus ending an American custom dating from the adoption of the U.S. Constitution.[12] The center was selected to play the same role to influence U.S. military policy that the notorious Institute of Pacific Relations had played in the 1940's in persuading the U.S. State Department to assist the Communists to take over China.[13]

The chairman of the board of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions is William O. Douglas, thrice-married Supreme Court Justice who advocates recognition of Red China and nonrecognition of God in our public life and public schools. The President is Robert M. Hutchins who, when asked by an official State legislative investigating committee how much he knew about communism, replied under oath: "I am not instructed on the subject." [14] In 1964 Hutchins advocated the election of Norman Thomas as President of the United States.[15]

An objective reading of the published writings of the staff and consultants for the Center for Democratic Institutions led one distinguished reporter to the conclusion that the center is advocating: "Destruction of the first-strike nuclear capability of the United States; unilateral U.S. disarmament; and a better-Red-than-dead U.S. foreign policy," and abolition of U.S. internal defenses against communism including the FBI and congressional investigating committees.[16]

A POLITICAL MEETING

The coup by which the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions planned to steal the encyclical from Catholics was called a convocation on "Pacem in Terris" held February 18–20, 1965, at the Hilton Hotel in New York City.

For a year in advance, planning sessions took place and "position papers" were written to prepare for this convocation.[17] These preliminaries determined that the encyclical would not be presented with any theological foundations.[18] They clearly reveal the distortions in the name of the encyclical and the quotations out of context—exactly what Pope Paul VI warned against in "Ecclesiam Suam": "the perversion of discussion, so that the latter is not made use of to seek and express objective truth but only to serve predetermined utilitarian ends."

When the convocation itself took place, it was a duplication of the ideas expressed in the "position papers." [19] Robert Hutchins candidly admitted: "This is a political meeting." Representatives from 20 nations, in-including Communists, attempting to talk about "Pacem in Terris" after censoring God out of it.[20] Delegates ignored the admonition Pope Paul VI sent to the convocation: "Such solutions, of course, if based on the admirable doctrine of that Papal document, will exclude every ostensible remedy which ignores the existence and rights of the Creator."

Informed Catholic observers at the convocation reported that its message could be fairly summed up as urging the unilateral dismantling of American military strength and the abandonment of southeast Asia.[21] These informed Catholics recognized the basic contradictions of the convocation, and reported that quite a few of the famous speakers either misrepresented Pope John XXIII or used him to spread strange theories.[22] For example, Linus Pauling called on the 2,000 conferees "to obey the exhortation of Pope John" to get out of Vietnam.[23]

Communist jubilation about the convocation was revealed in many articles in the Worker, leading off with a front page story which stated: "The conference reflected about as high a level of authoritative influence on U.S. foreign affairs as could be expected under nongovernment offices." The conference demonstrated that "Pacem in Terris" has drawn Catholics more actively into the movement for peace. Also in the audience among the invited was Gus Hall, chief spokesman of the Communist Party."[24] Again, we must remember, when the Communists speak of the movement for peace, they mean a Communist-imposed "peace."

---

[4] U.S. House Committee on Un-American Activities, "The Communist Peace Offensive: A Campaign to Disarm and Defeat the United States," Apr. 1, 1951.

[5] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 1, 1962.

[6] U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, "Communist Controls on Religious Activity," Testimony of Petr S. Deriabian, May 5, 1959.

[7] "Cuban Communism and the United States," by Rev. John J. Kelly, O.S.A., Mindszenty report, May 1965.

[8] "Gus Hall Greets Pope's Message as Aid to World Peace," "A Voice for Peace," "Pope Urges Basis for Coexistence," and "What Pope Said About Nuclear War," the Worker, Apr. 21, 1963. "Why Comrades Twist Pope's Peace Plea," by Louis F. Budenz, the Tablet, Apr. 25, 1963. "Red Designs on Catholics" by Louis F. Budenz, the Tablet, Sept. 26, 1963.

[9] "Catholics and Communists: Elements of a Dialogue," a Political Affairs pamphlet, June 1964, p. 11, Political Affairs Publishers, 23 West 26th St., New York, N.Y., 10010.

[10] "The Pope's Encyclical," Political Affairs, June 1963, pp. 34–35.

[11] "Catholics and Communists: Elements of a Dialogue," op. cit., p. 9.

[12] "Verdict First, Case Later," by Alice Widener, U.S.A., Sept. 21, 1962.

[13] "How The Far East Was Lost: American Policy and the Creation of Communist China," 1941–49, by Dr. Anthony Kubek, Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, 1963.

[14] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 99, pt. 8, p. 10023.

[15] Chicago Daily News, June 22, 1964.

[16] "Fund for the Republic in Focus" by Alice Widener, U.S.A., Feb. 8, 1963, p. 4.

[17] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 9, pp. 11557–11565.

[18] "The Organized Subversion of Pope John's 'Pacem In Terris," by Laurene K. Conner, Wanderer reprint, Feb. 18, 1965.

[19] Printed copies of speeches made at the convocation distributed by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

[20] "Pope John Without God" by Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J., Our Sunday Visitor, May 16, 1965, p. 2.

[21] "Convocation on 'Pacem In Terris,'" Mindszenty Report, Apr. 15, 1965.

[22] "A Post Mortem on the 'Pacem In Terris' Meeting" by Laurene K. Conner, Wanderer reprint, Mar. 4, 1965.

[23] "2,000 at Parley Unite on Coexistence Theme," the Worker, Feb. 28, 1965.

One group of American Catholics who were not taken in by the Communist misuse of "Pacem in Terris" is composed of Catholic trade union leaders such as George Meany, head of the AFL–CIO, Joseph Curran, head of the National Maritime Union, and officers of the International Longshoremen's Association. The Communist Worker moaned: "Conspicuously absent (from the convocation) was the trade union leadership."[25] Because of their firsthand experience with the Communists in the 1930's, labor leaders are seldom deceived by Communist propaganda and tactics.

The convocation succeeded in its objective: to escalate the convocation on "Pacem in Terris" into a military weapon to strike at the heart of U.S. national defense. The gathering of 2,000 people in New York was only the beginning. Elaborate plans have been made by the center to make—not the encyclical—but the convocation a continuing influence. The entire proceedings have been video-taped and are now being shown to the public on 90 educational television channels.[26] The papers and speeches are being published and distributed widely in both Catholic and non-Catholic channels. The Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions is making an organized, well-financed, and widespread effort to promote the message—not of the encyclical—but of appeasement and unilateral disarmament.

Unfortunately, some Catholic publications and organizations have been used by the center as conduits for convocation propaganda. If these well-meaning Catholics would examine the facts, they would discover that the center has simply wrapped the mantle of Pope John around an ideological package based on a repudiation of the core of his encyclical. The Communists are already using clergy of all faiths to pressure the United States to surrender the Catholics of South Vietnam; if they succeed, the Philippines will inevitably fall under Communist domination, and another Catholic nation will be lost.

CONVOCATION INFLUENCE

Has the convocation influenced American policy? Since the Communists began to use "Pacem in Terris" as a military weapon, here is what has happened to U.S. military strength.

1. No superbombs: The United States is not building the superbombs which are the decisive weapons of the future. The Soviets have built and tested 100-megaton bombs, 1,000 percent more powerful than the best U.S. bombs. On August 15, 1963, the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff officially told the U.S. Senate that "the U.S.S.R. is ahead of the United States in the high-yield technology (the super-megaton weapons), in weapons-effect knowledge derived from high-yield nuclear devices, and in the yield/weight ratios of high-yield devices"; and that the Moscow test ban treaty would freeze the United States in second-place position. The Joint Chiefs thus served notice that the Soviet Union has supremacy in the weapons capable of destroying the United States and the free world.

2. Retreat from bases: Several years ago the United States had important military bases close to Soviet borders, and the Soviet Union had none close to the United States. Today the balance of world power is dramatically altered. The United States has abandoned its missile and bomber bases in Turkey, Italy, north Africa, and other points close to the Soviet Union; and the Soviets have a base in Cuba, 90 miles off the American coast. Cuba today is heavily fortified with the latest missiles and the second largest army in the Western Hemisphere.

3. Drastic cutback in bombers: The United States is cutting back its strategic bomber force from more than 2,000 bombers to only 678,[27] and has not built a single new bomber in the last 4 years. The design of our latest bomber, the B–58, is 10 years old. During World War II, the United States conducted single bombing raids using 2,000 bombers. The man most responsible for the safety and liberty of every man, woman, and child in the Western World for the last 7 years, Gen. Thomas Power, Chief of the U.S. Strategic Bomber and Missile Command, states in his new book, "Design for Survival," that it is the U.S. bombers with their nuclear weapons which have kept the Communists out of Europe and the Middle East.

4. Weapons scrapped[28]: The United States has abandoned and declassified many important new weapons systems after spending millions for their development, such as (a) the Skybolt missile (which gives a plane the capability of hitting enemy targets without flying over enemy soil), (b) the Pluto missile (low altitude nuclear warhead guided missile capable of going around the world), (c) the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile, and (d) mobile Minuteman long-range missiles mounted on moving trains and surface ships so our deterrent force could not be wiped out by a surprise attack.

5. Research stopped: The United States has stopped research on many weapons of the future, such as the atomic-powered airplane. It takes 5 years or more to bring a new weapon from the drawing board to the production line. This means that the United States will fall farther behind the Soviet Union every year because the Soviets are racing ahead in superbombs, antimissile missile, atomic airplanes, and chemical warfare weapons.[29] We are doing nothing to develop the neutron bomb, requested by Catholic Senator THOMAS DODD and many other patriots, or offensive and defensive chemical warfare weapons, or adequate civil defense. Another neglected new weapon is the spaceship equipped with superbombs which would maintain a position over enemy targets just as the Early Bird satellite maintains its position over the mid-Atlantic.

All this unilateral disarmament is not directly attributable to misuse of "Pacem in Terris." But the misuse of "Pacem in Terris" is a major factor in creating the climate which calls for the unilateral dismantling of U.S. strength, and persuades the American people to accept status as a second-rate power, no longer able to defend the free world.[30]

The great St. Thomas Aquinas stated: "And as the care of the common weal is committed to those who are in authority, it is their business to watch over the common weal of the city, kingdom, or province subject to them. And just as it is lawful for them to have recourse to the sword in defending that common weal against internal disturbances, when they punish evildoers, according to the words of the Apostle (Rom. viii 4): 'He beareth not the sword in vain: for he is God's minister, an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil'; so too it is their business to have recourse to the sword of war in defending the common weal against external enemies."[31]

THE TASK AHEAD

Most Catholics are cognizant of the evil of Communism. What they do not realize is the imminent danger of Communism[32] and that this threat arises chiefly because of our failure to understand and refute the diabolical Communist propaganda. There is urgent need for affirmative action to—

1. Expose the misuse of "Pacem in Terris" and refute the Communist propaganda that calls for the unilateral dismantling of U.S. military strength, and the surrender of Vietnam and other free-world outposts to the Communists; and

2. Encourage every Catholic diocese, parish, and family to study how to combat the diabolical propaganda of atheistic Communism which threatens the destruction of the free world.

The Communists have an educational plan to subvert the free world; 109,000-word-warriors have graduated from the Castro College of Communist Subversion in Cuba[33] and are organizing Red revolutions throughout Latin America. Thousands more graduate each year from the Soviet, Prague, and Chinese word-warfare schools.

Catholics must start an educational program on the techniques of communism. Jesus promised that "the truth shall make you free." Cuba fell because the Catholics, who comprised more than 90 percent of the population, were not told the truth about the diabolical propaganda on behalf of Fidel and Raul Castro and Che Guevara. Because of the diabolical propaganda against anti-Communists in southeast Asia, Laos was lost (despite the heroic labors of Catholic Dr. Thomas Dooley), and Catholic President Diem of Vietnam was murdered. John F. Kennedy, the first Catholic President of the United States, was murdered by a Communist who was recruited into the conspiracy by the diabolical propaganda. The fate of the Catholic Church and of the free world depends on exposing and refuting the diabolical propaganda of communism before it is too late.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION BY COMMUNISTS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 12, the House joined with the Senate in passing a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Soviet Union and the Eastern

---

[24] Idem.

[25] Idem.

[26] Chicago Daily News, Mar. 9, 1965.

[27] U.S. News & World Report, Apr. 12, 1965, p. 53.

[28] U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 1, 1965, p. 39.

[29] See Soviet Army magazine Red Star, January 1965 and speech by Soviet Marshall Sokolovsky, Feb. 17, 1965.

[30] "Pacem in Terris Convocation" by Arnold Johnson, Political Affairs, May 1965, pp. 47–54.

[31] Summa Theologica, vol. 2, p. 1359.

[32] See the masterful and unrefuted exposition of the military danger to the United States and the free world from Soviet strategy: "The New Myths and Old Realities of Nuclear War" by Rear Adm. Chester Ward, USN (Ret.) in Orbis, summer 1964, vol. VIII, No. 2, published by the Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania. Also see various Washington Reports of the American Security Council, 123 North Wacker Drive, Chicago 6, Ill.

[33] Christian Economics, May 4, 1965, p. 2.

European countries should be urged to permit the free exercise of religion. I supported this resolution although I felt it to be rather weakly worded. The record is so full of the persecution of religious groups and individuals by the Soviet Union that our action should have been much sooner in coming and more forceful. It is unfortunate that we are so apathetic to the fate of our brothers behind the Iron Curtain. I sometimes wonder if our religious denominations in this Nation recognize our responsibility to those behind the Iron Curtain who are denied freedom of religion.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs held hearings on May 10, 11, and 12 and issued a report on "Antireligious Activities in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe." The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary has four excellent reports on discrimination and religious persecution by Communist regimes. All of these reports indicate that churches in the Soviet Union have been systematically annihilated with the exception of the Russian Orthodox Church which reached a truce with the Soviet Government during World War II. Showcase churches are allowed in Moscow which visitors are urged to see. These publications give a detailed account of antireligious activities in the Soviet Union. These volumes are entitled "Church and State Under Communism" and I certainly recommend them to anyone who wants to learn more about the fate of our fellow man under the yoke of communism.

Volume III deals with Yugoslavia and is particularly interesting because it is fashionable these days to allege that Tito has a different brand of communism in that country. Quite the opposite; religious persecution has been as brutal in Yugoslavia as in the U.S.S.R. In his foreword, Senator DODD outlines the pattern of oppression and brutality which has been directed at religious activities behind the Iron Curtain.

He notes that the various churches in Yugoslavia "are governed by commissions for religious affairs, headed up by members of the Communist Party who have received special ideological training for combating religion." He observes that—

> Those clergymen, both Orthodox and Catholic, who resisted or denounced the encroachments of the state, were imprisoned or executed.

The foreword indicates that within a year after communism took over in Yugoslavia, the Catholic Church, which had a total of 2,700 Croat priests, lost 400 priests by execution, 200 who fled abroad and several hundred imprisoned.

Three Roman Catholic cardinals have felt the reprisal which communism directs at religious groups who operate independently of state dictation. Cardinal Mindszenty is still in the safe sanctuary of the American Embassy in Budapest where he has been since the Hungarian uprising in 1956, a fugitive in his own land because he will not bow to the will of the Communist masters. The late Cardinal Stepinac felt the oppression of the Yugoslav dictator, Tito, as did Cardinal Wyszynski in Communist Poland.

It is a necessary tenet of any religious faith, particularly the Christian, to believe that the heart can be moved and human nature can change. This can and should be hoped for, prayed for by those of us who wish freedom to flourish again in Eastern Europe and for possibly a first time in Russia. By the same token, there is no virtue to color blindness or refusal to take into true account what is happening behind the Iron Curtain. Many so-called liberal theologians seem to see some Christian witness in seeking accommodation with a regime built on terror and suppression. I disagree with them most vehemently and will not agree to sell any of my brothers into slavery and depravity.

A great philosopher once stated that the beginning of wisdom is in calling things by their right name. Communism is a totalitarian doctrine built on terror and control of all matters, public, social, religious, private. The Congress has served a great purpose in exposing this shallow doctrine and documenting their bloody record of persecution of religious activities behind the Iron Curtain. It is now for the public, particularly the clergy, to acquaint themselves with the details of this godless crusade by the men of the Kremlin and their satellites so they will know them by their right name.

The concurrent resolution which passed last week is as follows:

> Whereas the Congress of the United States deeply believes in freedom of religion for all people and is opposed to infringement of this freedom anywhere in the world; and
>
> Whereas the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations declares that everyone has the right to freedom of thought and religion and the right to manifest his religion or belief in public or in private through teaching, practice, worship, and observance; and
>
> Whereas articles 124 and 125 of the Constitution of the Soviet Union, and the existing constitutions of other Eastern European countries, guarantee their citizens freedom of conscience and religious worship; and
>
> Whereas abundant evidence has made clear that the Government of the Soviet Union and the governments of other countries of Eastern Europe are persecuting, in varying degrees of intensity, elements of their Christian, Jewish, and Muslim citizens and infringing upon their freedom of religion through confiscatory taxation and closing of religious institutions, deliberate suppression of religious education, interference with religious and related cultural practices, denial of regular contacts between religious bodies in their countries with similar bodies in other parts of the world, and through persistent discrimination against persons professing and practicing their religions by state, party, Communist youth, police, labor, and public organizations; and
>
> Whereas there is also abundant evidence that Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union are being singled out for extreme punishment for alleged economic offenses and oppressed in the free exercise of their faith through the closing of synagogues and cemeteries, curtailment of religious observances, discrimination in cultural activities and access to higher education, imposition of restrictions that prevent the reuniting of Jews with their families in other lands, and the arrest of rabbis and lay religious leaders; and
>
> Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union and the governments of other Eastern European countries have a clear opportunity to match the words of their constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion with specific and appropriate actions: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that the persecution of any persons because of their religion by the Government of the Soviet Union and the governments of other Eastern European countries be condemned, and that such governments be urged to cease such persecution and to permit full and free exercise of religion and related cultural pursuits by all persons within their countries.
>
> SEC. 2. It is further the sense of the Congress that the attention of the United Nations should be drawn to this resolution and that the United Nations should continue in its efforts on behalf of freedom of religion.

ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I speak today as a Member of Congress, as an Illinoisan, and as an American, and join my colleagues and the world in paying tribute to Adlai Ewing Stevenson—lawyer, politician, statesman. A man the President described as "America's most eloquent spirit, its finest voice"; a man praised by the Governor of Illinois as "a public servant of the highest order"; a man termed "irreplaceable—one of our great contemporary men" by Senator Minority Leader DIRKSEN. And so the tributes continue, recalling one after another the many memorable qualities of this unusual man, his sparkling wit, his basic human decency, his dedicated leadership, his strong sense of duty.

Adlai Stevenson was a distinguished Princeton alumnus. The Princeton University class of 1954, of which I was a member, was privileged to have Mr. Stevenson as our senior banquet speaker, more than 11 years ago. I have to this day kept copies of that speech—one of the most stirring, one of the most idealistic, and, yet, one of the most realistic speeches it has ever been my privilege to hear. Over the years, I have found myself rereading his remarks, calling it to the attention of others, and quoting portions of it in public addresses. Without question this speech did much to increase my interest in public service and to lead me to a career in government. That evening in 1954 he gave a glimpse of the man as he said:

> If those * * * Americans who have the advantage of education, perspective, and self-discipline do not participate to the fullest extent of their ability, America will stumble, and if America stumbles, the world falls.

He gave advice which, I am convinced, was not merely the product of a brilliant mind, but the practical expression of a personal philosophy:

> Face the problems of your time you must, deal with them you must. But do not allow the alarms and excursions and partisanship of our politicial scene to distract you, do not

> let even the awful problems of the atomic age claim all your attention. Dare, rather, to live your lives fully, boldly; dare to study and to learn, to cultivate the mind and the spirit.

He cast a bright light on politics as a profession and did much to change the impression of the politician from a sinister figure in the smoke-filled room to a man of dedication and eloquence in public life. He put in proper focus the significance of the political process under our system of government, saying:

> The power, for good or evil, of this American political organization, is virtually beyond measurement. The decisions which it makes, the uses to which it devotes its immense resources, the leadership which it provides on moral as well as material questions, all appear likely to determine the fate of the modern world.
>
> All this is to say that your power is virtually beyond measurement. For it is to you, to your enlightened attention, that American Government must look for the sources of its power. You dare not, if I may say so, withhold your attention.

Such words are stirring to a young man, and the thoughts behind them did, in fact, move Governor Stevenson. Even as he counseled to look ahead, he, too, was looking ahead, it would now seem, when he said 11 years ago:

> There is in the moiling masses of Asia a tremendous power, potentially the greatest power on earth, and today our enemies conspire to gain the mastery of this power. They have at their disposal, as we all know, a powerful weapon, for communism is a perversion of the dream of justice. And while we see its leading attributes as the perversion, the illiterate, the toiling masses still have their eyes fixed on the dream.
>
> We too have a powerful weapon, truth, and we gain our strength from our thoughtful citizenry, which seeks and holds the truth with both its heart and its mind. The question is, however, whether we have come to decisive responsibility too early, before we were ready, before we had matured sufficiently. No man can say with certainty. Personally, I am optimistic and confident, but this question will not be answered tomorrow; it will be answered in your lifetime, and it will be answered in large part by you.

He presented an insight into the hearts of those who make the decision to seek public office when he said:

> It becomes increasingly hard to attract good men to government, and no wonder. Thoughtful men do not enjoy living in an atmosphere of constant guerrilla warfare and suspicion.
>
> I would suggest to you, then, that it is the duty of an educated man in America today to work actively to put good men into public office, and to defend them there against abuse and the ugly inclination we as human beings have to believe the worse. I would suggest that it is not enough merely to vote but that we, all of us, have the further obligation to think, and to maintain steadfastly the rights of all men to think freely.

Adlai Stevenson did not win his Nation's highest office, although he sought it twice. He did not live to complete the fight for freedom which he helped wage in the far corners of the earth. He did not finally have that opportunity to "sit in the afternoon sun and watch the people dance." And yet out of these disappointments, he emerged a winner, and we all share in his successes and his contributions.

Adlai Stevenson will be remembered for the career he chose, for the things that he did, for the wisdom which he imparted, for the humor which characterized his speeches, for the optimism which he carried with him constantly, for the deep faith he held in the cause of freedom. He was a man who made his fellow citizens of Illinois, America, and the world proud to claim him as one of their own.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the address given by Adlai E. Stevenson to the senior class banquet at Princeton University on March 22, 1954:

AN ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ADLAI E. STEVENSON, 1922, TO THE PRINCETON CLASS OF 1954, MARCH 22, 1954, UPON THE OCCASION OF THE SENIOR CLASS BANQUET

I have a number of preliminary things I should like to say. In the first place, I am informed that this senior class banquet is being held at the expense of your accumulated reserves. This is a very perilous thing that you are doing by inviting me here because certainly within a few hours the Republicans will ask for equivalent time.

I was delighted to witness, a moment ago, your emphatic approval of my program for Princeton some 32 years ago—unlimited cuts, noncompulsory chapel, and student firing of the dean. I have always considered almost from infancy that it was wise in politics to have—shall we say—a popular program. The trouble is that when I went into politics, it appears that I changed my views.

I wonder, President Dodds, if you would like to be excused now. Leave me alone with these young gentlemen. It is really a very inhibiting circumstance to find myself sitting at the wrong side of the president of Princeton, my old and esteemed friend. I have heard him speak many times. I have always found what I have heard both enlightening and profitable. I am afraid there will be no reciprocity tonight. I've been at a loss as to what to say to you, and having just read over what I have prepared rather hastily, I have concluded that I have resolved my uncertainty by saying nothing. This will take me approximately 40 minutes.

Someone asked me today when I was walking about the campus why I was here, in view of the fact that I had declined or been unable to come on numerous previous occasions when the university or groups were good enough to invite me. I explained that I had come this time only because I had wanted to come and that I need not have an excuse to come. I think it was perhaps an unwise and intemperate thing to do, and had I continued in my earlier resolve, would be better off. There are too many people hereabouts who know me too well. I was thinking on the way over here about the unwisdom of speaking sometimes and the wisdom of restraining oneself. You will perhaps recall—I am sure President Dodds does—the wonderful remark of Disraeli when a callow, young member of the House of Commons came to him—the leader of his party—and said, "Now, Mr. Prime Minister, I've just come to the House; do you think it would be well if I participated actively in debate?" And the Prime Minister looked at him appraisingly for a moment and said, "No, I think it would be better if you did not. I think it would be better if the House wondered why you didn't speak rather than why you did."

I daresay it will be under those circumstances that I shall leave here this evening. In all events, I am deeply grateful for your invitation, and for the opportunity which you have afforded me not only to come back to this place I love so well but to impose on your time and your patience. There is another one, which you will remember, Harold. President Coolidge said, "It is sometimes better to keep still and be thought a fool than it is to speak and remove all doubt."

I feel as though I were opening the hunting season on college seniors. From now until mid-June, college seniors are fair game for all of us uplifters, viewers with alarm, chautaqua-style orators, even for occasional unemployed politicians. From now until mid-June college seniors are to be repeatedly reminded how fortunate they are and what they should do with their hard-won educational disciplines; they are to be warned repeatedly that the old order is changing, that the sky is overcast, visibility low; and they are to be urged and goaded and implored to accept the challenge to remake the future.

Thirty-two years ago—and I might say quite a number of pounds and a good many inches around the waist ago—when I graduated I believe I listened to these same challenges flung down by orators whose names I have completely forgotten. Now it is my turn to be forgotten. In doing my homework this morning on this evening's oration, I not only let my mind run back to the state of the world 32 years ago when I graduated from Princeton but I also glanced at the Nassau Herald of 1922 in the hope that I could find something about myself that would impress you. Well, I must say, in the long corridor of retrospect, I don't look as important as I thought I was. I discovered that when my senior class voted to bestow the sobriquet of biggest politician upon one of its members I received only eight votes—but when it voted on "thinks he is biggest politician" I won second place, and that was due to a conspiracy among my roommates. For the title of "most likely to succeed," I received the impressive total of two votes—I don't know yet who the other fellow was.

Thirty-two years ago my classmates and I graduated into a world that was quite different from the one you enter in 1954. Before settling down to the business of trying to earn a living, I did some more traveling. It was a happier, more hopeful world than the one I saw on a recent journey around the globe. A terrible war to make the world safe for democracy had just ended victoriously. A noble concept, the League of Nations, had emerged from the chaotic aftermath of that elemental struggle. It was the twilight of kings, the dawn of worldwide democracy. Optimism was boundless and people proclaimed that we were on the threshold of the new era of universal and perpetual peace and prosperity.

It didn't turn out that way. It wasn't a threshold after all. A bitter young man, an author, soon wrote, "I was always embarrassed by the words 'sacred,' 'glorious,' and 'sacrifice' and the expression 'in vain.' We heard them, sometimes standing in the rain almost out of earshot, so that only the shouted words came through, and had read them, and proclamations that were slapped up by billposters over other proclamations, and I had seen nothing sacred, and the things that were glorious had no glory and the sacrifices were like the stockyards at Chicago, if nothing was done with the meat except to bury it."

But I don't need to tell you, a generation that was born and nurtured in the depths of depression and came to consciousness in war and to maturity in the confusion of world revolution—I don't need to tell you that your elders have made something of a mess of things. Things didn't turn out as we had thought they would in 1922, and somehow the hope and the easy confidence we felt dissolved as more and more the articulate and vocal among us doubted their beliefs and believed their doubts.

Nor do I need to enumerate for you in sepulchral tones the problems that you face. You know them only too well. Perhaps you can solve them. I would not presume to tell you how to do it. This university has given you the tools with which to try. Moreover, even if I would guide you, I could not. What a man knows at 50 that he did not know at 20 is, for the most part, incommunicable. The laws, the aphorisms, the generalizations, the universal truths, the parables and the old saws—all of the observations about life which can be communicated handily in ready, verbal packages—are as well known to a man at 20 who has been attentive as to a man at 50. He has been told them all, he has read them all, and he has probably repeated them all before he graduates from college; but he has not lived them all.

What he knows at 50 that he did not know at 20 boils down to something like this: The knowledge he has acquired with age is not the knowledge of formulas, or forms of words, but of people, places, actions—a knowledge not gained by words but by touch, sight, sound, victories, failures, sleeplessness, devotion, love—the human experiences and emotions of this earth and of oneself and other men; and perhaps, too, a little faith, and a little reverence for things you cannot see.

Nonetheless, I would speak to you not of the past, when my generation held its hopes so high—a time when even I received two votes as the most likely to succeed—but rather I would speak to you of the future, of your future. And if I cannot advise you on how to solve the momentous problems of your future, perhaps I can venture to suggest some duties and, if you please, some rules of conduct that, it seems to me, devolve upon the educated man because that is what you are about to be. I would speak to you briefly, then, about the educated man and his government, and about the educated man and his university.

The political organization that goes by the name of the United States of America consists of no fewer than 155,000 governing units, school boards, conservation districts, municipalities, States, the Nation, etc. It is operated by some 1 million elected officials, ranging from mosquito district trustee to President, and by some 6 million full-time employees. Our government is so large and so complicated that few understand it well and others barely understand it at all. Yet we must try to understand it and to make it function better.

For the power, for good or evil, of this American political organization is virtually beyond measurement. The decisions which it makes, the uses to which it devotes its immense resources, the leadership which it provides on moral as well as material questions, all appear likely to determine the fate of the modern world.

All this is to say that your power is virtually beyond measurement. For it is to you, to your enlightened attention, that American government must look for the sources of its power. You dare not, if I may say so, withhold your attention. For if you do, if those young Americans who have the advantage of education, perspective, and self-discipline do not participate to the fullest extent of their ability, America will stumble, and if America stumbles the world falls.

You know that our record as citizens in recent years has been something less than perfect. Too often our citizens have ignored their duty to their government. Too often they have not even bothered to vote. But this is not all. Participating in government in a democracy does not mean merely casting a ballot on election day. It means much more than that. It means an attitude, a moral view, and a willingness to assume a day-to-day responsibility for the good conduct of your government. How many times have you heard the good citizen demand for example that the gambling laws be enforced without fear or favor—except, of course, for the slot machines in his own country club? How many good citizens do you know who constantly deplore waste, inefficiency, and corruption in government, and who also go out and ring doorbells for candidates they believe in? Not very many. Far more say politics is dirty—and that is about their only protest about the quality of government, and far more use the word politician as a term of approbrium, disrespect and dishonor—and this in the land of Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln. How many respectable citizens do you know who protest loudly about lawlessness and venality but don't hesitate to fix a traffic ticket? And then there are the unscrupulous for whom anything goes if it is within the letter of the law, or at least not too far outside; the numerous kind for whom legality and morality are synonyms. The fix has become endemic in our political life.

I would remind you of an axiom of political science: People get the kind of government they deserve. Your public servants serve you right. Our American government may be defined perhaps, as the government that really cares about the people. Just so, our government demands, it depends upon, the care and the devotion of the people.

Now it is sadly true that there are corrupt officials that don't get caught, if not as many perhaps as the cynical suspect. It is also true that there are at every level of our Government able, patient, patriotic, devoted public servants—yes, and Army officers too—but all too often their reward is ingratitude, contumely, and lately even investigation. In years gone by we required only of our career servants, upon whom the successful operation of this huge mechanism of government depends, that they serve at a financial sacrifice and that they serve with little glory or public recognition. Increasingly, it appears, we also require them to run the risk of being branded as "subversive," "undesirable," as "security risks." It becomes increasingly hard to attract good men to government, and no wonder. Thoughtful men do not enjoy living in an atmosphere of constant guerilla warfare and suspicion.

You who have spent 4 years on this campus know better than most people that your greatest satisfactions, your greatest rewards, resulted from the free interplay of ideas. You know that your most penetrating insights resulted from the exchange and the interchange and clash of ideas. And I would remind you that just as a great university cannot operate in any but an atmosphere of intellectual freedom, neither can a great government. It is the function of the democratic form of government to nurture freedom. No less does the democratic form of government require freedom as the condition in which it can function at all.

I would suggest to you, then, that it is the duty of an educated man in America today to work actively to put good men into public office—and to defend them there against abuse and the ugly inclination we as human beings have to believe the worst. I would suggest that it is not enough merely to vote but that we, all of us, have the further obligation to think, and to maintain steadfastly the rights of all men to think freely.

It is always true that when the citizens of a democracy become apathetic, a power vacuum is created, and corrupt men, or incompetents or worse rush in to fill it. But today our situation is even more dangerous than that. In ordinary times the corrupt or the incompetent can be suffered for a while and then ejected. But these are no ordinary times. The world's fate now hangs upon how well or how ill we in America conduct our affairs. And if a bad man is elected trustee of a sanitary district, or if an able man in Washington is left to shift for himself in the face of unjustified attack, then our Government is diminished by that much—and even more because others will lose heart from his example. So you as educated, privileged people have a broad responsibility to protect and improve what you have inherited and what you would die to preserve—the concept of government by consent of the governed as the only tolerable way of life.

We in our country have, indeed, placed all of our faith, we have placed all of our hope, upon the education, the intelligence and the understanding of our people. We have said that ours is a Government conducted by its citizens and from this it follows that the Government will be better conducted if its citizens are educated. It's as simple as that. We believe that the people will find their way to the right solutions, given sufficient information. We believe with Lincoln, "Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people?" (although I must confess to having entertained certain private fleeting doubts upon occasion). We have bet all our chips, if you please, on the intellectual improvement of our people. This is a magnificent gamble—but it is a gamble, for it raises the question whether we have reached the awesome pinnacle of world power we now occupy too soon, before we have sufficiently elevated our national mind to lead the world wisely. Only the educated man entertains doubts, and doubt is the beginning of wisdom; but doubt is not wisdom's fulfillment, and in a time of crisis the man who doubts may fall prey to the strong dumb brute—to the man on horseback.

There is in the moiling masses of Asia a tremendous power, potentially the greatest power on earth, and today our enemies conspire to gain the mastery of this power. They have at their disposal, as we all know, a powerful weapon, for communism is a perversion of the dream of justice. And while we see its leading attribute as the perversion, the illiterate, the toiling masses still have their eyes fixed on the dream.

We too have a powerful weapon, truth, and we gain our strength from our thoughtful citizenry, which seeks and holds the truth with both its heart and its mind. The question is, however, whether we have come to decisive responsibility too early, before we were ready, before we had matured sufficiently. No man can say with certainty. Personally I am optimistic and confident, but this question will not be answered tomorrow; it will be answered in your lifetime, and it will be answered in large part by you, the privileged American.

If I have made your tasks and your responsibilities sound formidable, which indeed they are, may I also remind you that this is what makes the prospect of your careers so exciting. There is a wonderful passage in Emerson—and happily I couldn't lay my hands on it—I'll spare you from it. I hope sometime you will read that essay. It says the time to live is not when everything is serene, but when all is tumult—when the old admits being compared with the new. This is the time of early morning, when it is fresh and exciting. I think this is your generation, I cannot be sure. Change is the order of life and difficulties its meat. You live in a time of historic change and of infinite difficulty. But do not let the difficulties distract you. Face the problems of your time you must, deal with them you must. But do not allow the alarms and excursions and partisanship of our political scene to distract you, do not let even the awful problems of the atomic age claim all your attention. Dare, rather, to live your lives fully, boldly; dare to study and to learn, to cultivate the mind and the spirit, even though it isn't fashionable in your community. For though our people become prosperous as never before and though our foreign policy triumphs, these things are but instruments of the proper purpose, the higher purpose, of western man—the cultivation of the mind and of the spirit.

It would be presumptuous, and out of character for me to lecture you about your spirit. That I must leave to the wiser, and to better men. But perhaps you'll forgive me if I draw on my own haphazard, desultory experience—I have not always been an unemployed politician, you know—to say a word about intelligence and experience as attributes of the good judgment you will need—the good sense, if you please.

Don't be afraid to learn; to read, to study, to work, to try to know, because at the very best you can know very little. And don't, above all things—and I am sure President Dodds will agree with me—be afraid to think for yourself. Nothing has been, in my judgment, more disheartening about the contemporary scene the last several years in America than the growth of the popularity of unreason—of anti-intellectualism. One thinks of those chanting, screaming crowds that walked over precipices in Germany—and not so long ago. The conformists—unreason and anti-intellectualism—abominate thought. Thinking implies disagreement and disagreement implies nonconformity and nonconformity implies heresy and heresy implies disloyalty. So obviously thinking must be stopped. This is the routine. But I say to you that bawling is not a substitute for thinking and that reason is not subversion but the salvation of freedom. And don't be afraid of unpopular positions, of driving upstream. All progress has resulted from people who took unpopular positions. All change is the result of a change in the contemporary state of mind. Do you remember—and here again I shall tap a resourceless memory—some words of Materlinck, who was writing about the Spanish Inquisition and said that in those times to the conservative they should not kill so many and to the radical they should not kill any. Don't be afraid of being out of tune with your environment, and above all pray God that you are not afraid to live, to live hard and fast. To my way of thinking it is not the years in your life but the life in your years that count in the long run. You'll have more fun, you'll do more and you'll get more, you'll give more satisfaction the more you know, the more you have worked and the more you have lived. For yours is a great adventure at a stirring time in the annals of men.

You have a better chance than many people to give a lot and, therefore, to take a lot of life. If we can't look to people like you for this leadership, for good judgment, for wise directions for ourselves and for the convictions of our society, then where can we look? For here at Princeton, which for more than two centuries has transmitted from one generation to the next the riches of Western civilization, you have gotten some grasp of the basic principles on which our culture is founded—the concept of the supremacy of the individual, the worth of a human being, and the necessity for a climate of freedom in which these values may find means of expression.

And before you depart from this campus that you and I have known and loved, stay a moment, my young friends, and think a bit, inquire—these halls, this campus, our university, what do they mean? "University" is a proud, a noble and ancient word. Around it cluster all of the values and the traditions which civilized people have for centuries prized most highly. The idea which underlies this university—any university—is greater than any of its physical manifestations; its classrooms, its laboratories, its clubs, its athletic plant, even the particular groups of faculty and students who make up its human element as of any given time. What is this idea? It is that the highest condition of man in this mysterious universe is the freedom of the spirit. And it is only truth that can set the spirit free.

The function of a university is, then, the search for truth and its communication to succeeding generations. Only as that function is performed steadfastly, conscientiously, and without interference, does the university realize its underlying purpose. Only so does the university keep faith with the great humanist tradition of which it is a part. Only so does it merit the honorable name that it bears.

When you depart, think occasionally upon your university's inherent ideas and purposes, as its outward trappings recede. Don't forget that Princeton is a university, as well as your university; and that it has obligations to the whole of mankind, not just to you—obligations which it can neither ignore nor shirk, and which cannot, consistently with its honorable name and its place in the community of scholarship, be sacrificed to passing passions and prejudices. As members of the alumni family I trust you will be alert to its needs; they are imperative, and you can meet them if you will as many of your predecessors are today, but keep, I beg you, always in the forefront of your mind the realization that the single greatest need of any university, as of any seeker after the truth, is not just the money, not expensive libraries and laboratories, but this freedom, this thing that seems so inchoate to you now, freedom to do its work, to pursue its inquiries, to conduct its discussion, to extend the limits of learning.

The right to the serene pursuit of truth did not descend like manna from heaven; it was won by hard fighting, and the fight goes on and on to the end of time—even as the struggle between good and evil. See to it then, that no one, for whatever reason or in the service of whatever interest, diverts this university from its classic objective. As its graduates, as individuals who have made in it an investment of the golden, irretrievable years of your lives, you cannot, I suggest, do less. And carry away with you some of the wise serenity of the timeless courage, the unhurried objectivity which is the atmosphere of Princeton and which represents the collective imprint of its founders, students and teachers who have gone before you.

The university in America is the archive of the Western mind, it is the keeper of Western culture, and the foundation of Western culture is freedom. Princeton, or any other university, great or small, has the obligation of transmitting from one generation to the next that heritage. The faculty and administrators of a university can do that only if they are free. I think we believe with Gladstone that it is liberty alone that fits men for liberty.

I came here last night in darkness, after not having been here for some 4 or 5 years. I came with an old friend and an old classmate. We drove a little through the campus, after dusk. It was soft, the air fresh, the beginning of spring. I thought of some words that I read here long ago, written by an English poet, Alfred Noyes, who stayed on the Princeton campus for a few years. They went something like this if I am not mistaken:

"Now lamp-lit gardens in the blue dusk shine
  Through dog-wood red and white,
And round the gray quadrangles, line by line,
  The windows fill with light,
Where Princeton calls to Magdalen, tower to tower,
  Twin lanthorns of the law,
And those cream-white magnolia boughs embower
  The halls of old Nassau."

Sentimental? Yes. Nostalgic, childish? Perhaps. Yet lovely, beautiful, true. Your days are short here; this is the last of your springs. And now in the serenity and quiet of this lovely place, touch the depths of truth, feel the hem. You will go away with old, good friends. Don't forget when you leave why you came.

THE WONDERS OF THE "WUNDEES"

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, there remain a few of us in the Congress who foresee nightmarish consequences to some of the far-out proposals of this administration, such as the subsidized rent program. We can only presume James J. Kilpatrick was faithfully chronicling just such a nightmare in his recent column for the Washington Evening Star. For the benefit of our Freudian friends, we submit it for the RECORD:

THE WONDERS OF THE "WUNDEES"

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Winston and Sally Belle Smith were married in the spring of 1966, a few weeks after he had been booted out of his third Job Corps encampment and she had been sent home from the girls' school in Florida. They had grown up together, more or less, in the same public housing project; they had dropped out of school together. They had the same ambition, which was to stay well fed without really working, so it was natural to find them at last man and wife.

Winston worked part time in a service station and Sally Belle worked part time in a barbeque and grill, but these were merely avocations. Their real job, which occupied them increasingly as the years went on, was simply to stay poor within the P. and R. It was a lot of work, what with all the forms and things.

The "P. & R.," of course, were the procedures and regulations established by the Administrator. These had first been established in the summer of 1965, 9 months or so before the young couple were married, but by 1966 they had become a way of life. Rent supplements, it will be recalled, were only the beginning. "The amount of the annual payment with respect to any dwelling unit shall not exceed the amount by which the fair market rental of such unit exceeds one-fourth of the tenant's income as determined by the Administrator pursuant to procedures and regulations established by him." That was the way the law first read, in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

Winston and Sally Belle qualified at once for a rent supplemental. They were among the 300,000 who came in the one-oh-one-one-dee's, soon shortened to the Wundees, a diminutive taken from the act's definition under the so-called Stephens amendment of those eligible for help on their rent. This made the supplemental available to any family whose income was within established levels for public housing, provided that such a family, under section 101(1)(D) were then occupying "substandard housing." Winston and Sally Belle were living in an ordinary walk up flat, not too good, not too bad, but after Sally Belle broke out the windows with a beer bottle, they were officially substandard; so they went down and signed up.

By the summer of 1968, when the time came for the first recertification of income under the P. & R. the Smiths were a little uneasy. They had been earning $3,200 between them when they moved into the new apartment in the co-op, where the fair market rental was $125 a month or $1,500 a year. The taxpayers had been kicking in $700 a year as the difference between one-fourth of their income and the fair rent, but lately the Smiths accidently had been earning a little more and they were afraid the P. & R. man would catch up with the situation.

As it turned out, they didn't need to worry, for that same summer—the summer of 1968—Congress added another section at the President's request. This brought Winston and Sally Belle into the wonderful world of the one-oh-one-one-ee's, or Wunnys as they were called, in which rent supplementals were extended to any persons "socially or culturally disadvantaged." The Wunnys were permitted to qualify if they earned as much as 50 percent above the maximum permitted for occupants of public housing, and with all that Job Corps background, there was no question of Winston's making good. He had only to keep failing.

It wasn't easy, for money somehow kept coming Winston's way, but Sally Belle helped by leaving the bar-b-q and devoting her full time to the P. & R. The amendments of 1970 spread the principle of supplementals to clothing, transportation, and food. That year Winston took in $6,000—he couldn't seem to help it—and while this naturally left him safely poor under the P. & R., it complicated the bookkeeping. The trigger points were 25 percent on rent, 20 percent on food, 15 percent on transportation, and 8.3 percent on clothes, and Sally Belle never could learn to multiply by 8.3 percent. She had determination, though, and after a while, what with further amendments of the law, they were getting $1,000 toward rent, and $800 toward food, and $500 toward payments on the two cars, and the P. & R. had been revised to cover a coat of imitation mink. What with Sally Belle's unemployment compensation, it all added up.

Winston retired in 1980, at the age of 34, his active working life behind him. Thereafter the Smiths earned no income, by which they qualified for 100 percent supplementals including a swimming pool not to exceed 20 by 40 feet. Here the poor fellow drowned, 4 years later on a cold afternoon in April when the clocks were striking 13. The coffin supplemental, under the P. & R. covered the full expense.

THERE IS NO PLACE IN THE GREAT SOCIETY FOR VETERANS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Harsha] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, apparently there is no place in the Great Society for our veterans.

I am asking today that the House Veterans' Affairs Committee conduct an investigation, and halt the practice of admitting and treating Job Corps trainees, a segment of the poverty program, at Veterans' Administration hospitals, in preference to veterans. The action of the Administration in giving preference to members of the Job Corps at Veterans' Administration hospitals over veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean and Vietnam conflicts is incredible.

There are approximately 15,000 veterans awaiting admission to VA hospitals and while these veterans are forced to wait for much needed and deserved hospitalization, Job Corps men are obtaining hospitalization at VA hospitals. Never before to my knowledge has a group been hospitalized categorically without regard to the origin of their disabilities, or the responsibility for treatment of such condition, and to give them preference over veterans who have served this Nation with honor and distinction is reprehensible.

Every day I receive mail from qualified veterans in dire need of hospitalization, who simply cannot get into these facilities, yet these Job Corps men, most of whom never served in the Nation's Armed Forces, are being admitted.

Every admission of a Job Corps man takes a bed away from a veteran. This compounds the error recently made by the Administration in closing certain VA hospitals in the Nation. An investigation into this order is needed, and corrective action should be taken immediately by the Congress to halt this unconscionable practice.

I am today calling upon the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to rescind this order.

THE LATE HONORABLE T. A. THOMPSON

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this time has been requested and granted in order that the colleagues of Ashton Thompson may have the opportunity of paying him a final tribute here today.

As Members will recall, our colleague was the victim of a traffic accident in North Carolina some 2 weeks ago. Today we come together to pay our final tribute and our final respect to his memory.

I shall be pleased to yield to any Member of this body who desires to pay tribute.

At this particular time let me preface the recognition of those Members desiring recognition by recalling the colleague who lived among us. He was a dynamic man. He was a man who enjoyed the dramatic and reveled in living the life he lived in this body.

I believe that on occasions of this nature there are some symbols and some things more far-reaching, more expansive, more significant than the final tribute we pay a departed colleague. We respect his memory at a moment when we recall the memory and the respect we owe all colleagues who have left this body.

In these aisles have walked the great of history. In the Speaker's chair have sat men who have written American history, whose voices are now stilled but whose memory remains alive.

This Nation is a nation founded under God.

This Nation is a nation believing in the concept we now read over the Speaker's chair—"In God we trust." Each time we pay tribute to the memory of a departed colleague, we restate that concept and reexpress our belief. We declare to the world that we reject a godless ideology and draw again close to us the ideology of eternity and of immortality. If we did not, we would not appear here today to speak in memory of those who have departed. Hollow would it be to recall the greatness and the contributions of those who have left us if we did not believe in the immortal soul and in life eternal.

So we rise here today to speak again of our most recently departed colleague. In speaking of him and renewing that bond between this earth and that which is before us, we speak also to those others who have left and who dedicated their lives.

May I recount and recall at this moment the words which I believe suit Ashton Thompson more than anything else, the words in that great fraternal order which so aptly say: "The faults of our brothers we write upon the sands; their virtues on tablets of love and memory."

So be it with Ashton Thompson.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we express our grief today for the tragic loss of Representative T. Ashton Thompson, of Louisiana.

Before he came to the House of Representatives in 1952 he had had extensive experience in the accounting and budget field of the government of the State of Louisiana. He served with distinction in the Air Force during World War II, and later was an able and dedicated leader of veterans organizations.

While serving as Louisiana's budget officer and as financial adviser to the State legislature, he drafted legislation for Louisiana's employees' retirement system and then ably served as chairman of the system's board of trustees for 8 years.

He brought his experience in government and his insight into men and issues with him to the Congress. Only 3 short years ago he summed up for his brothers in this Chamber his feelings and beliefs after a decade of distinguished service in the House.

He said at that time:

> I have received every kind of consideration and help from the membership of this body. I want to thank my colleagues in the House for their friendship and cooperation in the accomplishment of so much for the people of my district and State. When I was elected to Congress in 1952, I resolved then that I would to the best of my ability represent the people of the Seventh Congressional District of Louisiana in such manner that they would not regret the confidence they had placed in me by electing me as their Representative.

Today we thank him for his friendship, for his courtesy, for his unfailing kindness and consideration. We testify that he fulfilled the resolution that he took to his constituents that they would never regret electing him their Representative.

That they will regret his passing we know full well. In this House his colleagues have lost a friend and valued counselor. We mourn his loss and extend our deepest sympathies to Mrs. Thompson and her loved ones. They have much to be proud of in his record of achievement for his State, his district, and his country.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the day after his passing away, I expressed on the floor of the House my great shock and loss over the death of our colleague, Congressman T. A. THOMPSON, of the Seventh Congressional District of Louisiana; I outlined my personal friendship for him and extended my heartfelt sympathy to his devoted wife and children, to his dear mother and the other members of his family.

Today I express the hope that T. A. may have a special place in the house of many mansions. In doing so I draw again on an article I called to the attention of my colleagues once before.

Coming back to Washington from Louisiana on a plane a number of years ago I clipped from a newspaper a passage of great beauty and comfort from the "Wisdom of Solomon," a part of the apocryphal books.

I think you will read many books and go a long way in life before you ever find anything more inspiring, for sheer beauty of phrase and majesty of thought. I have kept this passage in my purse ever since, and I now read from it:

> The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God
> And no torments will ever touch them.
> In the eyes of the foolish they seem to have died
> And their departure was thought to be an affliction,
> And their going from us to be their destruction;
> But they are at peace.
> For though in the sight of men they were punished, their hope was full of immortality.
> Having been disciplined a little, they will receive great good.
> Because God tested them and found them worthy of himself.

I humbly pray that T. A. is at peace and that having been disciplined a little, he will receive great good, "because God tested him and found him worthy of himself."

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, it was one of the saddest days of my life when I learned with deep shock and regret of the tragic death of our friend and colleague, T. A. THOMPSON.

T. A. THOMPSON was one of my very closest friends. He could not have been closer had he been my own brother.

Ours was a friendship forged throughout many years of hardship and triumph, heartache and exhilaration, failure and success. In a man's lifetime he can deem himself fortunate if he has even one friend as close and steadfast as T. A. THOMPSON was to me. It is thus with the profoundest sense of personal loss which I speak today, for when one loses a friend he loses part of his life.

T. A. THOMPSON was a Congressman's Congressman. He performed his duties with a dedicated devotion and diligence which I have seldom seen matched here in Congress. He was a man deeply in love with his job, a man with a great sense of responsibility to his district. He was not so concerned with headlines as he was with results. He was the type of man who carefully considered all sides of an issue, quietly laid a solid foundation for legislation through careful research, and then bulldoggedly pressed his colleagues for favorable consideration. He had an unusually large measure of success, and, more important, his achievements have been solid and lasting because of the firm foundations he built so carefully.

His career in service to his people has been a long and distinguished one. His entire adult life has been spent in government work. During the depression years he worked for the State of Louisiana as a fiscal expert. After serving in World War II he returned to his State and again performed yeoman service in revamping and modernizing the accounting system of the State and leading the drive for an adequate retirement plan for State employees. In 1953 he was elected to Congress. We are all familiar with the phenomenal work he has done in his all too brief career here on Capitol Hill. He was an outstanding champion of wildlife conservation and has probably done more than any other single Congressman to see that this precious national heritage is preserved. As a senior member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Public Works Committee and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, he was in an unparalleled position to effect these goals.

The entire country owes a debt to T. A. THOMPSON for his devoted service, but the greatest loss is inevitably felt in the Seventh District of Louisiana which he represented so devotedly and well. As you know, the problems which flow daily into a congressional office are many and varied. None of us worked harder to see that all the people of his district received the representation they deserved.

No problem was too big, no person too small to receive the single-minded attention of T. A. THOMPSON. He did not close his ear to any segment of his district. He was the champion of all, and all benefited.

But this is just the measure of T. A. THOMPSON as a public servant. The measure of T. A. THOMPSON as a man is far more important in the final assessment of his life. The humanity of T. A. THOMPSON was even more imposing than his impressive physical stature. He was always there with a helping hand, always the first to offer encouragement, always careful with the feelings of others. I have seen him time and time again give unstintingly of his time to help a colleague with a personal problem, to patiently explain the minute intricacies of an involved bill, to help teach fledgling Congressmen the mysteries of this august body, or just to be present for moral support in times of stress or personal hardship. It is these acts of personal kindness which when added up made him a big man—a man who was a model for so many of us.

In addition to the ever-widening circle of friends he made in this House, he likewise gained in stature in his home district, where his fellow citizens saw fit to elect him seven consecutive times as their Representative.

Several months ago, I had the opportunity to participate in a huge testimonial dinner held by the friends and supporters of our former colleague, T. ASHTON THOMPSON, an unprecedented event for his district. On that occasion the outpouring of praise and commendation formulated a ringing endorsement of this man's desire to help his constituency on every possible occasion. No other official had ever been honored in such a gigantic fashion.

It is a difficult task for me to properly and completely describe and portray to my distinguished colleagues here today the confidence, love, and affection that I shared with T. ASHTON THOMPSON. To me he was like a brother. I grew to admire and respect this man, and to value his sentiment and his inspiring dedication to the job of being an outstanding Representative for his people.

I could cite instance after instance of his dedication to the people of his district, I could illustrate his service to the country in World War II as a member of the Air Corps, I could speak at great length on the contributions he made to the establishment of good government in the great State of Louisiana. However, I feel all these things somehow become dim in our minds as we who knew him remember the spirit, the personality, and the lovable person that was T. ASHTON THOMPSON. I know that I shall always miss this bold, noble, and wonderful man; and I join with my colleagues here today in humbly expressing my deep sorrow of his untimely passing.

Mr. Speaker, our dear colleague and friend, T. A. THOMPSON, taken from us with tragic suddenness, was above all a man of fine character and a loyal and true friend. He was a dedicated public servant—dedicated to the advancement of the people of his district, his State, and Nation. He was one of Louisiana's ablest advocates, who worked tirelessly for the people and interests which he represented. He was admired by Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, and he will be missed by all of them whose friendship he earned and kept from the beginning of his long tenure here.

Upon his return to Louisiana after World War II service, he concentrated his efforts on refining the fiscal processes of Louisiana's government, and the legacy he leaves us includes a complete accounting system for all the State agencies which he designed and installed, along with legislation for the Louisiana State employees retirement system, and subsequently he was elected twice to 4-year terms as chairman of the board of trustees of that system.

In these "Halls," Mr. Speaker, he has served the House ably and productively since January 1953, as a member of both the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Public Works Committee. One of his principal fields of interest and accomplishment was the proper conservation and utilization of our Nation's natural resources. He served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife. For his good work in this field, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, in May 1964, gave T. A. Thompson a great tribute.

T. A. Thompson was an exemplary Congressman. He understood his duty to represent his constituency to the best of his ability. And he understood the challenges and responsibilities that a changing nation can place on its leaders.

Mr. Speaker, T. A. Thompson did not hesitate to speak out when he saw a wrong. The cause of good government has lost a valuable voice.

Mr. Speaker, my life has been made richer for having known T. Ashton Thompson. I am sure that I can speak for the entire Louisiana delegation in addition to everyone who has had the good fortune to know T. A. Thompson, when I say that it was a privilege to know such a fine man as T. Ashton Thompson.

T. A. Thompson was a friendly man. He kept busy. He was always helping people. He worked unceasingly for the people of his Seventh District. He helped many students attend college, though this was not his responsibility as a Federal Representative, because he would often help a deserving student get a spare job which made college possible. He aided the small businessman. He untangled the problems of veterans. He worked for people in all walks of life. The people of his district knew that they had an advocate and a friend in Washington with their T. A. Thompson.

T. A. Thompson worked to bring a better life to his constituents. He worked on the Public Works Committee to improve the port and water facilities of his district. He worked to bring new industries to his district.

Mr. Speaker, when you take a look at Congressman Thompson's district, you will find that his district is one of the most progressive, most unusual, and one of the most colorful districts in the whole land. He was so proud of his district. He used to talk about it in very descriptive terms. He would describe an oil field derrick that came up from the ground in a swamp, with moss covered trees as something that made a beautiful picture; and there were thousands and thousands of acres of cotton in full bloom, like a white cloud close to the ground; the golden rice fields laden with the fruit of their seed ending in full production which he could portray with color and fantasy in many words. As my distinguished colleague Ed Willis from the adjoining district has said, his country was known as the Cajun Country, a very colorful country. He pointed with pride to the fact that he was Congressman Thompson's neighbor on the east and on the south. I, likewise, was Congressman Thompson's neighbor to the east. In that great and wonderous land Ashton Thompson was so proud of, with all the zest and zeal of a person in full life, he would describe his district as a place where people worked hard, played hard and enjoyed life, that they created the finest kind of life itself. He eloquently spoke of his people, whom he loved so well and knew so well and of whose life he was a part, with great pride, saying that they made a success out of life itself. He was certainly not only a representative of his people but he was a part of his people, and a very forceful and a very amazing part of his people, because as they lived, so he lived, no matter whether he was in the midst of the district where he lived or whether he was 1,200 miles away here in this august Chamber, or whether he was in some other part of the world. No matter where, he never seemed to get away from his home town of Ville Platte or his home district which, as he referred to it on many occasions, was the Cajun District.

Many people who heard him on occasions would say that he never could seem to get away from the Ville Platte or the Cajun country. Whereas many people in his shoes might have thought that they were making him provincial, I believe he took that as a great compliment. I think that so typified him that with the opportunity which he had to be a Congressman and be their representative and be able to work for them and be able to share their problems, their successes, and their everyday life, even though he was away many miles in distance, was an opportunity he never forgot. He never could, in spirit, get too far from the land that he loved, and I think he demonstrated on all occasions that to have the high honor of representing them in this office was the top pinnacle of his life.

So, Mr. Speaker, he served his district with honor and distinction. I think he went a lot further afield than was his duty or that which was required of him, in order to give his people the proper representation that they deserved. In so doing I think he demonstrated that he was perhaps one of the most generous men that has ever served in this body. He was not only generous from the standpoint of his life, his ability, and in what he gave to his people back home, but in the little things in the everyday life here in this Chamber. There was never an opportunity that he did not try when someone asked him—and sometimes without their requesting it—to do something to help someone regardless of whether they were a fellow Member or whether they were a person in the average walk of life or even a person who may have come here to visit who might not have been necessarily from his district.

Mr. Speaker, I believe with the record that he made in so completely serving his people, that they perhaps are realizing each day the greatness and the depth of their loss.

Mr. Speaker, Ashton Thompson was a rather humble man and did a lot of things, perhaps, that many of us never had an opportunity to observe. On the other hand, many of his distinguished accomplishments are monuments which will live on and will be monuments always.

I do not think that any place in this land of ours has, as the result of the efforts of anyone, any more projects than Congressman T. A. Thompson could point to and say, "I not only helped to get this, but I labored long and hard, and whether others joined me or not, I did my best to secure all the help or whatever was necessary in order to get the job done."

And as he used to artfully say, there is room as far as credit is concerned for everyone that will help my district or my State or my Nation, and let us get the job done first and then worry about the credit, as to who shall share in it.

Then when you consider that perhaps no other Congressman has ever accomplished the feat, up to the present time than T. A. Thompson. Since the very inception of the House of Representatives, discharge petitions are few and far between and many have tried but very few were ever successful; Congressman T. A. Thompson not only was successful on one discharge petition of which he was the author but maybe he set an all-time congressional record in that he was successful on two discharge petitions. There again that was a great feat and an unusual feat. Perhaps no other Congressman in our lifetime may ever come to equal that record.

But there again that was typical of T. A. Thompson. He not only thought he should represent the people necessarily who could vote for him, but he went far, far beyond that. I have seen him go to all kinds of trouble and take a tremendous amount of time putting what seemed to be an endless amount of energy getting the people of his district, young boys and girls, and bringing them here to the Nation's Capital to take part in something that he was so proud of when he could bring them here to Washington. He would say that as far as the Mardi Gras is concerned, where you have the queens and the kings and where you have all the pageantry—that is a way of life where I come from; it is wonderful to have the opportunity to bring them to the Nation's Capital and show everyone just exactly how that pageantry takes place—not as something that was promoted at the moment in his district but something that was there before he was born and perhaps will be there for generations to come.

But the very fact that he went to all this great effort to bring these beautiful young ladies from his district, of whom he was so proud, to show off the agricultural products of his district—as the queen of rice or the queen of the oil festival or the queen of the cotton festival or the queen of the sweetpotato festival—of all the agricultural products in his district—that got top billing with him was what he called a beautiful queen of the Cajun country. So in his life, the life he lived every day, and lived with great feeling that perhaps he was one of the most fortunate people in the world, as T. A. Thompson would tell me, that I serve in a democracy, that I serve in the Nation's Capital, that I serve in Washington, D.C., that I serve and am one of 435 Members of the Congress—he did not look upon that, as if it was a chore in doing his daily work here. He did not look upon it as a chore to go back home and be reelected. He looked at it as the greatest opportunity and the greatest privilege and certainly his privilege for him to be able to do that.

He was a man from a large family. Besides his mother he had many aunts and uncles, many brothers and sisters, nieces and nephews and endless numbers of cousins. But at no time did he ever fail to look forward to an opportunity to serve any and all of his relatives in the position that he had reached and which in the eyes of his family was the most exalted position so far as they were concerned in all the world. Never at any time did he ever fail to look at it as doing something that was an honor and a privilege to do to help one of his relatives. He looked upon it as one of the most wonderful and joyful opportunities in the world to be able to help any relative or anyone else for that matter. I do not believe he ever stopped thinking that other people besides those who were blood relations of his, were likewise his relatives. I think he felt the same way about every constituent and every family in his entire district. I think he lived that way and proved it by his everyday actions. He proved he felt all the people were his people and that he was just related to one great big family that happened to live in the Seventh Congressional District of Louisiana.

I have seen him when people would bitterly attack him in his district. I have seen him when people would come up to him personally in his district and do that. Frankly, I was always amazed at the way he could produce that smile after such an attack. He would say to me that he had told that person, "Well there is only one problem as I see it. If you had just been in my shoes you would understand it. But since you have not had that opportunity, maybe that is the reason you feel the way you do and if I had the opportunity of being in your shoes, I would feel like you do."

I have seen him on such occasions when such people would go far beyond merely making a protest and yet T.A. would tell me after we left a gathering where that might have happened and he would say, "Well, here is the thing about it. You have to know this, Jimmy. I have to look at all these people, I guess, just like a minister or a priest looks on his congregation or the people of his church."

He would say, "You know these people do not mean to be bitter toward me. But I have to understand them and I have to be the person to tell them that their way may be a little wrong and plead with them to go the proper way and not to become people who are against progress and not to be people who are against their neighbor or against any particular individual, but to be the kind of persons who want to live and let live."

He would tell me, "Jimmy, every day when I am in my district I try to teach Christianity and brotherly love because no matter what some of these people may have done to me, I cannot feel that way toward them because they are my people."

When I think of that, of the way he lived and his philosophy of living and the way he felt about all people, I believe that perhaps he left an inspiration, a spirit, a feeling, a life of accomplishment which will not end but will be handed down to generations to come. Certainly he will greatly influence all of those who knew him, for good.

So far as his district is concerned, and in areas many long distances from his district, that spirit, that feeling, that generosity will live on and on.

He has certainly earned the respect and the admiration of the people of his district, and likewise of the Members of this body, with whom he served, from whom he seemed to get such a wonderful and remarkable feeling of comradeship and brotherly love on both sides of the aisle.

This was always with the understanding that no matter what position any Congressman ever took in the well of this House, no matter how much he may have disagreed with what that particular Congressman was saying, whether over this microphone or that microphone, he would always say, when I had the opportunity to hear his comment, "Well, the man believes in what he is doing, to the best of his ability, he is doing the job of representing his people. After all, that is what I am here for."

And he would say, "Jimmy, that is what you are here for." He would add, "No matter what position anyone takes in this House, I have respect for him and I have admiration for him, and when any man or woman who is a Member of this House continues to be reelected, I believe it is natural all of us should have respect for them and should have admiration for them."

That perhaps typified T. A. Thompson. As a person, he was not always trying to get something for himself. I believe he got a great deal for himself, but I believe the secret of what he got for himself lay in the fact that he was always willing to give a lot more and to go a lot further toward the other person's direction than he expected to have anyone come in his direction.

His life typified the saying that it is more blessed to give than to receive. I believe he always put that emphasis on giving. Perhaps no man ever tried to give more than did our distinguished and beloved colleague, T. A. Thompson.

Since T. A. Thompson was so appreciative of the fine work done by his office staff, it would be most appropriate to include the words of his administrative assistant, Mrs. Frances A. Forgy:

> Personally, and in behalf of our entire staff, I wish to thank Congressman Morrison for the opportunity to add a few words of tribute in honor of the man for whom it was our real privilege to work. Each year, all of us on the staff came to appreciate Congressman Thompson more and more and to realize what a truly unique and genuine individual he was.
>
> Louisiana has lost a strong and invaluable member of her congressional delegation. The Seventh District has lost an enlightened and dedicated Representative. But more than this, the world has lost a man in whose veins the milk of human kindness flowed freely. It is a grievous and irreparable loss which we can ill afford.
>
> The tributes which could justly be accorded Congressman Thompson in regard to his generosity and personal traits are unlimited. The enumeration of his most creditable deeds and accomplishments during his tenure of public service would be too lengthy a task. Perhaps we could best indicate all of them at once by saying simply that in a world populated in vast majority by ordinary people with ordinary interests, Congressman Thompson stood out as an extraordinary person with an extraordinary interest in his fellow man. His aim in life was to serve his family, his friends, his district, his State, and his country—and he served them all with rare, unselfish dedication.
>
> We have lost not only our Congressman for whom we had an abiding respect and admiration, but we have lost a close personal friend whose absence we keenly feel and whose memory we shall always cherish.
>
> To the members of his family who have surely suffered the most cruel and devastating loss of all, we extend our heartfelt sympathy.

There were many editorials and stories written about his passing. A few of them follow.

The following editorial appeared in the Monday, July 5, edition of the New Orleans Times-Picayune:

> REPRESENTATIVE T. A. THOMPSON
>
> The death of 49-year-old U.S. Representative T. A. Thompson, of Ville Platte, especially under such tragic circumstances, is sincerely regretted. Representing the Seventh Congressional District for 13 years, he made his presence felt in the House, through energy, initiative, and other qualities. Early in his congressional career, he survived handsomely in his home area an onslaught by dictatorial, State machine forces. As a member of the Public Works and Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committees (chairman of the Wildlife and Fisheries Subcommittee), he found many opportunities to serve his district and the State in matters coming under committee jurisdiction.
>
> Recently he was credited with administrative adoption of a more enlightened management policy respecting wildlife hunting limitations. He was counted on in a struggle now pending to reject or modify an ill-advised new rice-control program embodying in effect a consumers' tax.
>
> En route home for the Fourth of July holidays, near Gastonia, N.C., he became the first prominent victim among their associated highway casualties—his family, likewise, seemingly having a narrow escape. Though circumstances have not been completely defined, it is clear he was an innocent victim. It is somewhat ironic that he, one of the fathers of the gigantic interstate highway program, himself met his death on one of its newer segments, in a freakish pavement-shoulder episode. Our sympathy is extended his family and friends.

The following editorial appeared in the New Orleans States-Item on Saturday, July 3:

> REPRESENTATIVE T. A. THOMPSON
>
> Eulogy, sincerely delivered by colleagues, serves to gage the stature of decreased public servants.
>
> By this criterion Louisiana's Congressman T. A. Thompson, of Ville Platte, killed in a North Carolina highway accident Thursday, measures up well.
>
> One of this State's youngest delegates to the National Legislature, he served on the House Public Works and Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committees and was chairman of the Wildlife and Fisheries Subcommittee.

Of his tragic death, other members of the Louisiana delegation had these remarks:

Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT: "He was one of the most aggressive Members of Congress."

Representative HALE BOGGS: "His death has removed from the national scene one of Louisiana's ablest advocates."

Representative JAMES H. MORRISON: "He earned the respect and admiration of all his colleagues."

Representative JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.: "Louisiana and the Nation have lost a faithful public servant."

Along with their Congressmen, all Louisianians will mourn the tragedy that deprived this State of a capable and dedicated solon.

The following editorial appeared in the Charlotte Observer, Sunday, July 4, 1965:

HIGH COST

The death of T. ASHTON THOMPSON in an accident on Interstate 85 was tragic enough for his family and many friends.

It was made worse by the fact that he was a valued Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. This tall, warm man from Louisiana's cajun country was warmly regarded by President Johnson and his own colleagues. Representative BASIL WHITENER described him as a man of strong loyalties, a quiet but positive individual.

He had a dozen years seniority and was a member of two committees, Public Works, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries. He was the chairman of the Public Buildings and Grounds Subcommittee and of the Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Subcommittee.

Representative THOMPSON was only 49, so he brought considerable experience to bear on his work without the liability of crusty obstructionism.

He was, in short, a contributor; and the Nation never can and never will be able to afford this kind of loss.

In Joseph Young, Star staff writer's column known as "The Federal Spotlight," the following article appeared in the Washington Evening Star:

GREAT LOSS

Federal and postal employee leaders are saddened over the death of Representative T. ASHTON THOMPSON, Democrat, of Louisiana, who was killed last week in a highway accident. THOMPSON was a strong friend of Federal and postal workers. It was he who initiated the successful discharge petitions on two different occasions to pry Government pay-raise legislation out of the House Rules Committee when that group refused to act.

The Seventh Congressional District in so many countless ways is far better and finer because of T. A. THOMPSON.

The people of the State of Louisiana can look back to so many benefits that they would not have had, if it were not for the efforts of T. A. THOMPSON. He did so much, and so willingly, and asked for so little in return that he perhaps stands out as one of the greatest Congressmen that ever served from any district in Louisiana. There is no amount of money that could be paid to one or hundreds of people that could ever accomplish what T. A. THOMPSON accomplished for the Seventh District. By all standards of measurement, no Congressman in modern times ever tried to do more than T. A. THOMPSON.

So we ponder and think how one man could do all this in such a short space of time and then be forced to leave us in the prime of his life. I guess the only answer is that with his departure his spirit will live on for so long, for so many of us. Thus all of us share in this personal tragedy. All of us that were close to him have lost a part of our lives. I can only bid a fond and sad farewell to a great friend.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I shall take only a minute, although it would really require many minutes and many hours to do justice to T. A. THOMPSON.

Let me say that his was a life it is difficult to believe does not exist with us any longer. Everything about him was constructive and forceful. He worked harder than almost any other Member of this body. His service here was admirably suited to his nature and his disposition.

He served on the Public Works Committee, and he was a constructive man. He should have been on that committee. He admirably helped his people and his district and his State, as everybody knows.

He was, as my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], said so ably only a moment ago, persistent and aggressive in behalf of all his people and of his State and of his country. He was effective and articulate. He was compassionate and understanding. He sought friends and he made friends.

I first knew him when he was engaged in a political campaign, on a course opposite to my own. We became friends immediately, and we were friends throughout his career here. We are gathered here in this Chamber to pay tribute to a beloved Member of this House who was a dear friend to so many of us. Now he is gone from our midst, but he has left behind in the minds and hearts of his colleagues the glow of genuine friendship and warmth—that outgoing, engaging personality, that spirit of generosity which was T.A.

I am reminded on this solemn occasion of an immortal verse by the poet John Donne, in which he wrote in part:

> Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind.

The sudden, untimely passing of my dear friend and colleague has diminished me. To so many of us in this House, T. A. THOMPSON was more than "any man"—he had endeared himself to us, sometimes without our being aware of the depth of our bond with him. Only with his passing has the full impact of this loss settled upon us.

The people of the Seventh Congressional District of Louisiana, and of our entire State, have lost a tireless and devoted public servant. So has this House. So many of us who knew him have lost a true and loyal friend, a man of genuine character who was always willing to lend a helping hand to those in need.

On this note of a generous helping hand, T.A. was particularly kind to many young people who needed financial assistance in order to complete their college education. T.A. was never too busy to help young people, to try to provide them with part-time jobs on the Hill, and to give them fatherly advice and counsel on their problems. I know that many young men on the Hill since T.A. joined us in January 1953, are grateful for his kindness and his generosity. T.A. was foresighted enough, was wise enough, to know that the education of our Nation's young citizens is the very foundation upon which the United States will grow and flourish, or perish, in the years ahead. His kindness and generosity to the young is a powerful example of our colleague's Christian spirit.

In his service with us, T.A. was an able, hard working member of the important Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and of the Public Works Committee. His principal field of interest, through his work on both these committees, was the proper conservation and utilization of our Nation's natural resources. He was chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, and in this capacity, he was working, right up to the time of his death, on an extensive program to assure the preservation of those animal species which are now threatened with extinction.

Among his achievements for his district and our State on the Public Works Committee was his obtaining approval for the deepening of Calcasieu Channel, so that the port of Lake Charles could handle the largest oceangoing vessels. Today the port of Lake Charles is growing and thriving, and its progress is due in no small measure to the good works of T. A. THOMPSON. This is one of the many beneficial projects which our colleague brought to the Seventh District of Louisiana.

For the individual constituents of his district, no request to T.A. was too big or too complex for him to tackle with all his energy—and this our colleague did with dedication and patience. He was indefatigable in his efforts for his people, and I know they are most grateful to him. It can truly be said that T.A. was a man who left this world better off for having been here. He gave of himself gladly in the service of others, and no man can do more in the eyes of God.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that the Seventh District of Louisiana, and the State of Louisiana are indebted to T. A. THOMPSON for his long and productive service and his good works. For me and my fellow colleagues who knew him and loved him, we are indebted to him for enriching our lives, for raising our faith and our belief in our fellowman and in our country.

To have known T.A. and to have shared his friendship was to love him. I am proud, Mr. Speaker, on this solemn occesion to salute him for fighting the good fight and keeping the faith; in so doing, he strengthened our character and that of this House.

To Mrs. Thompson and the members of T.A.'s family, we express our sorrow at their loss and the loss to us all. We know that T.A. is looking down on all of his friends here, and urging us, in his friendly and generous way, to carry on. This we shall do for him, and for the likes of him who have gone before. We can do no less for this House which we all so dearly love. We ask God's blessing on those T.A. left behind—his wife and his mother, and all the members of his dear family. May they receive God's grace in this hour of trial.

Finally, let me say, Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is a great institution in many ways. It is great in its legislative achievements and its investigative achievements, but it is also compassionate in respect to the care it takes of its Members to the very end.

Congressman THOMPSON, as all of us know, met death in a very tragic accident. Hardly had the word flashed over the press and radio before, acting under the admirable direction of our dean, Congressman HÉBERT, the House itself went into action. Ken Harding, working with Mr. HÉBERT and other Members, did an admirable job of providing solace and comfort to Mrs. Thompson and to the children and to the other members of our late friend's distinguished family.

I could not let this occasion pass without paying tribute to Congressman HÉBERT and to Ken Harding and also to our colleague from North Carolina, BASIL WHITENER, who happened to be in the immediate vicinity at the time of this accident and, who, with his wife, immediately went to help and to console Mrs. Thompson and the other members of the family on the scene.

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the wonderful things about serving in this institution is that it lends its protection and help even unto the end. All of us who knew T. A. THOMPSON shall miss him, but it is indeed fortunate when a man is able to serve his State and serve his country and at the same time establish for himself and his family countless friends wherein his memory will live for generations yet to come.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, there is not much that I can add to what the other members of the Louisiana delegation have said before me nor too much to what I said the day after the loss of our colleague, Representative T. A. THOMPSON of Louisiana. But I would like to reiterate some of the things I have said previously as well as some of those said by my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, the Seventh Congressional District, indeed his native Louisiana, and the Nation still mourn the untimely and tragic death of my friend and colleague T. ASHTON THOMPSON. We are all filled with a deep sense of personal loss.

Life was not always kind to T. A., but he was truly an honorable, self-sacrificing man of strong conviction and unequalled compassion for his constituents, for fellow Louisianians and for fellow Americans. Because of this deep feeling for people, his time, his talents, and his energies were in great demand and were heavily taxed.

T.A. accepted the duties incumbent upon his office with a driving determination and discharged them with ease and a sincerity that was genuine. He displayed fortitude and integrity in all endeavors.

He was a man who loved life; and enjoyed its daily challenge. He was a warm personality; a friendly, personable and patient man. He was truly enlightened about governmental matters at every level of Government and this knowledge emerged from a burning desire to serve his fellowman.

In his absence from this chamber so full of activity, he would want us to carry on the task of seeking solutions to the problems of our people. He would want the birthright of this Nation protected from those who seek to destroy us; and he would want the foundation of our Republic strengthened, and, moral adherence to a supreme being.

These ideals are the legacy left by T. ASHTON THOMPSON to you, to me, and to the future generations. On this occasion his spirit and his memory is perpetuated in this great chamber and I predict that it shall not have been in vain. T.A. was a great Louisianian and a great American. We shall all miss him.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I recall very well the sense of personal loss which I felt when I learned of the death of T. A. THOMPSON. It was a loss to everyone who knew him. It was a shocking loss to the Congress and to the Nation. I knew him well and I enjoyed his friendship. His was a delightful personality. He was an able man and an able and outstanding Congressman. His principal work was in the area of conservation, which was of particular importance and value to his own State, and my State of Florida, had a similar interest in that same work in the field of conservation. It was equally valuable to many other States. It was work in which he was expert, and his contributions were valuable indeed.

The people he represented, Mr. Speaker, lived better and happier lives because he was here.

I join my colleagues in expressing my deep and earnest sympathy to all the members of his family.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve for 11 years on the House Committee on Public Works with my colleague, T. ASHTON THOMPSON. He rendered great service on that committee, to his State and to his Nation. He was diligent, he was conscientious, he was thorough, and he was a tower of strength on the committee. He made many fine contributions in the way of improving legislation that was processed through our committee.

It was with a deep sense of shock that I heard over the radio that he had met a tragic death in an automobile accident. I join with those who have already spoken in extending my deepest sympathy to his wife and to his children.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries with T. A. THOMPSON since I first joined this distinguished body, now approximately 7 years. T. A. was a strong advocate of his various philosophies, as well as of the legislation that he tried to promote. But he was a strong advocate not without reason. He was always willing to listen to the other man's side. He contributed a great deal to the deliberations of the committee on which we served.

T. A. and I used to ride the same airplane quite frequently. I caught it at Houston and he would board it at New Orleans. We had many delightful flights together. The crew on those planes that we used to fly quite a bit felt that they had not had a good weekend if they did not have T. A. aboard. Whenever he happened to miss the plane I was on, they always inquired about him. They missed him. I am sure that same feeling existed among all who had the pleasure of coming in contact with T. A. THOMPSON.

Mr. Speaker, he was a devoted family man. My wife and I and my youngsters along with other Members of this body, had the privilege of being with him and his lovely wife and 2 children on a recent family trip to the World's Fair in New York. We were all impressed with his devotion to his wife and his children.

So it was indeed with a great feeling of shock, when I was on a 4th of July weekend with my family, that I heard that this fine man had been cut down in the prime of his life, when he seemed to be enjoying life so much and contributing so much, not only to his immediate family and his own constituency but to the country as a whole.

It is indeed with a feeling of loss because of this great tragedy that I say to his lovely wife and his children that their sorrow is being shared, not only by the Members of this body but all who had the privilege to know T. A. THOMPSON.

He was a big man in stature, he was a big man in heart, he was a big man in understanding, and in my opinion he will go down in the history of his community and his country as one who stood out, out of the ordinary, out of the commonplace.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it behooves all of us to realize that we too should strive to do better, for we never know when the good Lord is going to decide that we have finished our course on this earth.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest sympathy to his lovely wife and his children and to the other members of his family, as well as to those who have had the privilege to know him and mourn him in silence.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY].

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our fallen friend, ASHTON THOMPSON.

Mr. Speaker, I was not privileged to serve on either of the two committees with him, but I became acquainted with Ashton Thompson shortly after my arrival in the House of Representatives.

It was a pleasure to know him and to count him as a friend. He was always friendly, cordial, cooperative, and helpful in every way.

Mr. Speaker, I shall always remember his smiling countenance, the good feeling that you had in talking with him, whether it was about the business of the House or whether it was just in passing personal conversation.

His death came, of course, as a great shock to me personally. It came as a great shock to all of us in North Carolina. I feel that it is even more grievous to us, if that is at all possible, because his tragic end came on a highway in our beloved State.

I shall always remember the day I arrived in my hometown, some 120 miles away from this tragedy. I was met at the airport by my wife, who told me that she heard the report of the accident on the radio in the car on the way to the airport. I will never forget how shocked and stunned I was and how dismayed and shocked and grieved the people of my State were upon hearing the word that a Member of Congress—although they knew him little, if at all—had been stricken down in such a manner in our State.

So, Mr. Speaker, I speak for the people of my State in conveying our condolences and sympathies to his fine family, to the members of the Louisiana delegation and to the Members of this entire House.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness and a deep sense of loss that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed colleague and friend, the Honorable T. Ashton Thompson.

News of his untimely passing and the shocking circumstances surrounding his death reached me as I was leaving Washington for Hawaii to speak at a July 4th celebration. I was then reminded of his frequently expressed wish to spend a nice leisurely visit in Hawaii. I deeply regret that his wish was not fulfilled.

We know, of course, that T. A. Thompson was a highly respected State finance officer of Louisiana before answering his country's call in World War II as an Air Force officer. Following his period of service, he returned to Louisiana and continued to render distinguished service as a State fiscal officer. On November 4, 1952, he was elected to the 83d Congress, and was reelected to serve in each of the succeeding Congresses. To all his duties he brought an analytical mind that was tempered with a very human approach.

On May 27, 1965, it was my privilege to appear and testify before T. A. Thompson's Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation with respect to a bill then under consideration. It was a pleasure to watch the hearings progress under his able chairmanship. I was deeply impressed with his fairness, incisiveness, and familiarity with the subject matter at hand.

Truly, T. Ashton Thompson was a dedicated legislator. The Congress and the Nation have suffered a great loss. His home State of Louisiana will sorely miss one of her greatest citizens. We who knew him will forever cherish his warm friendship and understanding which he so willingly shared.

To Mrs. Thompson and members of his family, as dean of the Hawaii delegation and as a friend in grief, I offer my heartfelt sympathy. May the good Lord bless them and give them courage to face the morrow without T. A.'s physical presence, with hope for the future.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I join with other friends and colleagues in taking note of the passing of the late T. Ashton Thompson. The words of tribute which they have offered indicate the high esteem in which he was held in the House of Representatives. Their words of tribute to his life of service can be echoed by countless other voices without overstating the real value of our fallen colleague to his State and Nation.

Ashton Thompson was my friend and congressional neighbor. When we moved to the new Rayburn Office Building the early part of this year, it was my good fortune to have been assigned to an office suite a few doors away from his offices. Because of the proximity of our working quarters, I had an opportunity to become even better acquainted with him than had been possible during the previous terms of our service here together. This association resulted in the acquisition of personal knowledge on my part of the sincere dedication of T. A. Thompson to the important role which he held in national life.

It is not possible for me to express the sense of shock which I experienced on the occasion of the sudden and accidental death of our colleague on July 1, 1965. As I came into the outskirts of my home city, Gastonia, N.C., on that summer afternoon, I was notified by the radio dispatcher from the Gaston County Sheriff's Department that T. A. Thompson had been stricken down within the corporate limits of my home city. It was suggested that I should proceed to the Gaston Memorial Hospital to be present with Mrs. Thompson, the children, and their maid. On arrival at the hospital, I found that many of my fellow citizens had already made their services available and were undertaking to comfort the family as they suffered from the impact of shock of the sudden death of our colleague.

I was proud of the response of hospital officials, law enforcement officers, clergymen, physicians and others who had come to the assistance of this grief-stricken family. Experiences of this kind cause one to realize how wonderful the people of the community really are. I was proud of my home city and her people. I am sure that people of most American communities have the same concern and solicitude for others in a time of suffering and travail.

The shock of this unfortunate incident was more keenly felt by members of the Thompson family than by any other persons. But, Mr. Speaker, I can say to you that there was a deep sense of shock experienced by the thousands of residents of my community when the news of the tragic accident reached them. This was manifested in a very tangible way by telephone calls tendering assistance and in innumerable other ways in which our people sought to be of service to the family of our departed colleague.

T. A. Thompson is now gone from this earthly scene. We are deprived of further association with him in the Congress of the United States. But, we are not deprived of the leadership which he gave to so many worthwhile causes in his community, State and Nation. His good works will be of lasting and eternal value to all of us. His contributions in so many ways to improving the lot of mankind will not be lost to us or to succeeding generations.

The loss which the members of his family have sustained is immeasurable. We can only hope that in their grief they will understand that many of us have a deep understanding and sympathy for them. His wonderful mother, his wife and children and his several brothers and sisters are especially in our minds as we reflect upon this great tragedy which has come to their family and to the Congress of the United States.

Mrs. Whitener joins me in this expression of appreciation for the life and works of T. A. Thompson and in conveying to members of his family our sentiments of sincere sympathy.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, during my 10½ years in Congress I have found myself facing difficult problems. This moment brings me face to face with total inadequacy. Trying to find the proper words to express my feelings at the loss of such a dear friend and colleague as T. A. Thompson is impossible. I owe my very life to him. While visiting Central America in 1955 I was stricken with food poisoning and T.A. actually carried me out of the jungles of Guatemala on his back, boarded an airplane with me and brought me to New Orleans to a hospital cutting short his trip by a week. From that day forward I knew what a great individual Ashton Thompson was. He was a fine and conscientious legislator, a great friend to every one with whom he came in contact, but above all, he was a real gentleman at all times.

Just a few days before his untimely death he and Mrs. Thompson spent a few hours on my boat with other friends and every one remarked about what a good time they had visiting with the Thompsons. This was typical of T.A. and his penetrating personality.

Life is so uncertain and death is so certain yet it is difficult indeed to understand how the life of such a promising individual could be taken from us. In our efforts to understand this terrible tragedy and loss I know we will take comfort in the fact that all of us are better off because T.A. came our way. I want to join the leadership in Congress, the Louisiana delegation, and all of my colleagues and friends both Democratic and Republican in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Thompson, the children, his loving mother, brothers and sisters during this sad time in bereavement.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the tragic, accidental death of our colleague, T. ASHTON THOMPSON, shocked all of us and I know we all feel a deep sense of personal loss.

ASHTON THOMPSON, Mr. Speaker, was a great man and a great Congressman with a brilliant future. His recent death has removed from the scene a dedicated public servant, the type of public servant that we should all strive to emulate.

ASHTON THOMPSON has been a power for good in each Congress in which he has served since he was first elected to the 83d Congress on November 4, 1952. In the law-making process, he was a strong man, while being sensitive and reasonable in debate. He was a man of high principles and never, in my years of association with him, did he ever consider compromising those principles.

I worked side by side for many years with Congressman THOMPSON on the Committee on Public Works and all of us on the committee are deeply aware of his manifold contributions to the deliberations and actions of the committee. I know, too, of his fine record as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and of his service as chairman of the Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, ASHTON THOMPSON was a solid pillar of the Public Works Committee. At the time of his death, he was the fourth ranking member of the committee, and he sat on four important subcommittees. Last January he became chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

ASHTON THOMPSON was a driving force within the committee. He was hardworking and thorough, had a tremendous knowledge of the subject under consideration, and was always willing and able to declare himself in committee councils. He was a skillful advocate and a splendid parliamentarian and never, to my knowledge, did he fail to take part in basic decisions of the committee.

He was extremely active in our work on the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 and the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

He was chiefly responsible for many of the great development programs in the lower Mississippi Valley, was a foremost advocate of the Interstate Highway Act of 1956, and a leader and authority in the field of water pollution and wildlife conservation.

At the age of 49, when tragedy befell him, ASHTON THOMPSON had a sparkling future in this House. He had proved his ability, dedication, and courage and he had won the respect and friendship of all of us. He possessed the caliber that would have enhanced any area of the public service.

He could be tough and unrelenting in pursuit of a goal which he believed to be right and just for his fellow citizens. Indeed, there was granite in his nature. But at the same time there was an exquisite tenderness in his soul.

Mr. Speaker, in the death of ASHTON THOMPSON this legislative body suffered an irreparable loss. And each of us has lost a good and true friend.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, we pay tribute today to a warm, openhearted friend who was an able and effective representative of his people.

T. A. THOMPSON was a man who had deep roots in the soil of his beloved Louisiana, and who won the hearts of all who served with him and came to know him.

He was a man of great force and influence on the Committee on Public Works, where he served with honor and effectiveness for many years.

It was a privilege and a genuine pleasure to know this big, quiet American, who contributed so much to the strength and progress of his country during his congressional service.

My wife joins me in this expression of our sympathy to the wife and family of our beloved colleague.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of our late departed colleague, the Honorable T. ASHTON THOMPSON of Louisiana. On the day of the fatal accident, I was on my way by automobile to my home in Southside, Va., when the distressing news came over the radio at about 5 p.m. I am unable to find words in which to express fully the shock and the distress which came over me.

I had the privilege of becoming acquainted with Congressman THOMPSON in April 1953, when I was inducted as a new Member of the Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of Virginia. He was then in the first few months of his service. We formed a friendship which increased and became more binding as the years passed. During the 89th Congress, we occupied offices in the Rayburn Building which were adjoining.

ASHTON THOMPSON was a man of fine character. He exuded good fellowship and it always lifted one's spirits to be in his presence. I had the privilege of conferring with him on several occasions the week before he passed away, and I found him, as always, cooperative and desirous of being of help to his fellow Members in this body.

The family, no doubt, has lost a dear and devoted husband and father. We, as Members of the Congress, have lost a warmhearted colleague and the country has lost a faithful servant, whose heart and mind were attuned to the highest public good.

I shall ever cherish the memory of our association, and I take this means of extending to his constituents and to his family and his many friends my deep sympathy in the loss which they have sustained.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, we, the Members of the House of Representatives, have sustained a great loss in the tragic passing of T. ASHTON THOMPSON, of Louisiana.

He was a man among men.

His was the true Christian philosophy—he loved his fellow man above all else.

I knew "TOMMY" THOMPSON well. It was my privilege to sit beside him on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for many years. Ours was generally a common cause. He gave without stint to help his fellow legislators, yet he never demanded anything in return.

He was a good man—a man who loved his family, devoted to his fine wife and children.

Verily, T. ASHTON THOMPSON met the rigid standards set by the poet in his definition of a man: "He could walk with kings, yet keep the common touch."

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my last respects to our beloved colleague, T. ASHTON THOMPSON, who lost his life in a highway mishap, a most untimely and tragic event, at a time in his life when he had reached the peak of his mature knowledge, talents, and experience. I join with his host of friends and admirers in expressing sadness at his passing, and extending my deepest sympathy to his wife and children and other members of his family.

I will never forget the friendly glance and gracious greeting of the fine and able gentleman from Louisiana, who sat in the row immediately behind me in the Committee on Public Works, nor will I cease to admire the excellent grasp and wisdom which he manifested in regard to the complicated subject matter handled by that committee, and his dedicated efforts to get the job done. I am proud to have known T. ASHTON THOMPSON, and hereby wholeheartedly extend this parting salute.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in tribute to the late T. ASHTON THOMPSON. Before Congressman THOMPSON'S untimely death, I had the privilege of working with him on the Watershed Development Subcommittee which he had chaired. Through my association with him as a member of the full Committee on Public Works, I had come to know Mr. THOMPSON as a warm individual who took to heart the welfare of our great Nation. I had the greatest admiration for T. ASHTON THOMPSON—one of the most able, conscientious and dedicated Members of this body.

I want to extend my sympathy to the people of the State of Louisiana who have lost their able Representative, and most of all, I extend my deepest sympathy to the Thompson family in the loss of their loved one. We all share in their sorrow.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, words are wholly inadequate to express my grief and shock when I learned of the tragic death of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable T. ASHTON THOMPSON. His passing is a distinct loss, not only to his family and friends, but to the Seventh District, the State of Louisiana, and to the entire Nation. I numbered T. ASHTON among my good friends and my feeling of personal loss is indeed great.

ASHTON THOMPSON was a man of integrity and character. He was an honest, conscientious, and dedicated legislator. He loved his country and was continually alert to every opportunity to uphold and defend those principles which have made this a great country.

It was my privilege to serve with him and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Committee and I was often impressed by his keen desire to serve the best interests of the people of the entire Nation as well as the people of Louisiana whom he loved so well.

As president of the Lower Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, it was an unusual privilege to have ASHTON THOMPSON serve as vice president. His contributions to the work of the association were invaluable and will continue to bear fruits for years to come.

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to the members of his family.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing sorrow and a real sense of loss at the tragic accident which took the life of Representative T. A. THOMPSON, of Louisiana. To his family I extend my sincere sympathy. In the midst of their great sadness, they can take pride in his lifelong service to his State and to his country. To the people of Louisiana his absence from Congress will be keenly felt for he was an honest and aggressive Representative of his district. The tragedy which took this man in the prime of his legislative career can only dismay. But the work of T. A. THOMPSON will live and ever bring credit to his memory, his family, and his State.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for a brief spell Congressmen ASHTON THOMPSON was my dear neighbor on the fourth floor of the Rayburn Building, and I had looked forward to a long neighborly association with one whose great charm and ability cloaked with modesty had placed him high in the esteem and affection of his colleagues. That he was fated to be the first called to his Maker of the tenants of the new building opened for occupancy only a few months ago no one could have foreseen. He was relatively young and in robust health. When I passed the door of his offices draped with black I could but wonder at the uncertainties of life, and so wondering I gave expression to my meditations and my grief in a silent prayer for the repose of the soul of one who on earth radiated gentleness and sweetness, the optimism of the human reach upward. He was an able and dedicated Member of the Congress. He served with us and among us well and faithfully. A wartime flier, he never lost his interest in and concern for the welfare of the Nation's veterans and always his name will be remembered by the members of the AMVETS as the author of the first budget and accounting system of that fine organization. To the members of his family I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join with my colleagues from Louisiana and others in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of our colleague and friend, T. A. THOMPSON of Louisiana.

T. A. THOMPSON was a great American. Much more could be said but these three words summarize his life and his achievements. I knew T. A. THOMPSON as a dedicated man, an able colleague, a leader who served the people of his district and State with great sincerity and effectiveness. He combined the qualities of a true legislator and he felt the compassion and needs of the people he served. He gave his all to his country and to the people of his district and State and Nation. His passing has left a vacancy in our midst that will be difficult to fill.

I extend to Mrs. Thompson and the members of his family an expression of deepest sympathy in their loss and bereavement.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a tremendous degree of sadness that I join with my colleagues in the House to speak a word of tribute on behalf of our very dear friend, the late Honorable T. ASHTON THOMPSON of the 7th Congressional District of Louisiana.

It was my privilege to meet Congressman THOMPSON for the first time during his service in the 83rd Congress. Through the years, I have had an opportunity to observe the diligent manner in which he represented the residents of his congressional district.

As a freshman Member of the House, I had the good fortune to be assigned to the Public Works Committee of the House, on which Congressman THOMPSON was a senior member. During this period of time, I had the honor of serving under his chairmanship on the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, as well as serving with him on the Subcommittee on Flood Control, of which he was the ranking member to the chairman.

This association taught me the value of Congressman THOMPSON's service to his district, his State and to our Nation. His experience over the years cannot be replaced.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, because we have all lost a respected and dedicated friend, I particularly extend my deepest sympathy to his widow and children.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, T. ASHTON THOMPSON truly was a man dedicated to providing anything which promised to contribute to the better life for our American people. What marked his personality especially for me was his concern for the welfare of our country in our debates on the proposals for monumental public works; but more than anything else, he evaluated every one of them in terms of how they would benefit the individual citizen.

I served with him on the Public Works Committee for some years, and never did he do anything but helpful, kind things for all of us and the Louisiana people who looked to him for counsels and helps in Washington.

T. ASHTON THOMPSON came to the House after a long and notable apprenticeship in his State in its government and had acquired wide knowledge, especially in the highway and conservation fields. Coupled with his skills was an ability to envision the high plateaus and horizons ahead for our country and our people. Endowed with great gifts, he was far up the ladder of accomplishment as a legislator. The tragedy of his death is that it cut short a brilliant career of even higher service and value.

We all know of his important contributions as a member of the Public Works Committee and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds. He commanded respect and admiration in the Congress, and I know there is a universal sense of loss among us by his going.

T. ASHTON THOMPSON needs no monument, because they are spread around the United States in great highways, public buildings, flood control, and other water use projects, and better harbors.

My sincere sympathy goes out to his family and the Louisiana people. I hope that the memory of what enormous good he accomplished during his shortened life will help assuage their grief.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness and a deep sense of loss that I join my collegaues in paying tribute to a departed colleague and friend, the Honorable T. A. THOMPSON.

Mr. Speaker, I had come to count T. A. among my close friends; we came to Congress together, and we served together on the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife, he as chairman and I as ranking minority member. I can only say that this dedicated legislator will be sorely missed in the Halls of Congress.

I join in offering my sympathies to his wife and children during this terrible ordeal through which they are now passing.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in the Congress in expressing my deep sense of shock and a personal loss by the tragic death of T. ASHTON THOMPSON.

His accidential death was a tragedy for his family, his State of Louisiana, and the Congress. It was a shocking end to a career which continued to advance in skill and effectiveness, which held promise for him of national leadership. His passing is a genuine loss to me and other members of the House Public Works Committee, where his experience and counsel were truly valuable.

Upon his coming to the House in 1953, it was evident that Mr. THOMPSON had those personal gifts and qualities which contribute to leadership and development of legislative talents. He was regarded unanimously by his colleagues as a comer who was destined to attain congressional leadership and national eminence.

T. A. THOMPSON brought wide experience and needed skills to the House and especially to the Public Works Committee. As auditor for the Louisiana State Highway Commission for 7 years, his counsel was invaluable to us when we were considering the proposals for the Interstate Highway System. Mr. THOMPSON was a nationally recognized authority on governmental budget systems and a trustee of the National Finance Committee on Government Accounting.

He was a dedicated overseer of the public purse and spending. The American taxpayers owed him more than they were aware. Mr. THOMPSON was devoted also to the cause of natural resources conservation. Because public works does much to alter our national landscape and natural sites, his advice on how to preserve natural animal and plant areas, beauty spots and recreational areas had deep effect in the country at large.

Louisiana people and Americans everywhere have been deprived of the services of a good and faithful public servant. Coupled with great ability and dedication was a reluctance to have his accomplishments publicized.

After the shock of his tragic passing abates, his family and friends can take comfort in remembering that his shortened life was one of splendid service which benefited multitudes of Americans.

Mr. WAGGONNER. God bless you, ASHTON.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed colleague, the Honorable T. A. THOMPSON. It is with a heavy heart that I do so, for he was more than a colleague; a fellow Member representing our State of Louisiana. He was my friend.

He sought me out when I first came to this body. I felt that he understood the uncertainty and the frustration a new Member feels when first he comes here. He offered me his assistance and I took it. He helped me over some of the rough spots and I was grateful. He offered me his friendship and I welcomed it.

By his life and his labor he enriched the world. He was a servant of his people, and there is no higher standard any Member can set for himself.

I enjoyed his friendship. I am stronger for it and I shall cherish the moments we shared together throughout the remaining days of my life.

God rest you, ASHTON.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I learned with profound shock and deep regret about the untimely death of our colleague, Hon. T. A. THOMPSON, shortly after I had arrived in Louisiana for consultations with my personal doctor.

The loss of our colleague, T. ASHTON THOMPSON, at the youthful age of 49 again brings to our attention the uncertainty of life and the fact that our time on earth is controlled by the great Supreme Architect of the Universe and not by our wishes or by the electorate back home.

My friendship for and association with T. A. doubtless predate those of any other of his colleagues because we campaigned together on a State basis before he decided to come to the U.S. Congress.

Our colleague was a dedicated public official who always supported his principles. The problems and welfare of his constituents of the Seventh Congressional District were always foremost in his mind. The tragic death of this skilled legislator and public servant is a great loss to all who were privileged to know him, to the Congress, to the country, and especially to his constituency.

I join with my colleagues in paying homage to the memory of our colleague and in extending my profound sympathies to the members of his family.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked when I learned of the untimely passing of my good friend and colleague, T. ASHTON THOMPSON. I considered him to be a real personal friend and a warm friendship grew as a result of our close association for many years on the House Committee on Public Works and the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. He was a fine American and a dedicated legislator. I shall miss his friendship, and my deepest sympathy goes to his family.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness and a real sense of loss that I rise to say a few words in memory of our beloved colleague, T. ASHTON THOMPSON, who was tragically torn from among us a short time ago.

We served together as members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries during these past 13 years.

You all know that committee service gives the best opportunity to take the measure of a man in this great body.

T. A. THOMPSON was a man. He was a man of conviction, understanding and sincerity. He was a man of diligence and ability. He was a man devoted to the public service of his district, his State, and, above all, his Nation. He was a social man—that is to say, a warm and friendly man, without sham or pretense and always a joy to be with.

In the absence of HERBERT BONNER, our committee chairman, who was necessarily absent on official leave, the Speaker asked me to serve as a member of the congressional delegation attending the services for Mr. THOMPSON in his hometown of Ville Platte, La., on Saturday July 3, 1965.

It was a sad occasion.

But it was also heartwarming to see the love and devotion which he inspired in his thousands of friends in his district. I was honored to join with the Louisiana delegation, other Members of Congress and the many, many others who came to pay their last respects to a dear friend, colleague and distinguished public servant whose life of past fulfillment and greater promise, was lost through a cruel trick of fate.

I consider myself fortunate to have known and felt the wise and friendly presence of our beloved colleague, T. A. THOMPSON.

Mr. Speaker, T. A. THOMPSON was an able, active, and deeply interested member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries during all his years in the Congress. He has served as subcommittee chairman on several important special matters over the years. At the time of his death, he was chairman of our standing Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation.

During the relatively brief term of his chairmanship of the subcommittee, it produced an outstanding record of important legislation considered and enacted.

In his memory as a beloved person, friend and colleague, and as a hard working, effective member of the committee, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries adopted a resolution to be spread upon our permanent record and to send to his beloved wife who has suffered the most irreparable loss of all.

At the direction of our committee, Mr. Speaker I would like to insert the committee resolution in the RECORD at this point.

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Resolved, That the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives hereby express their profound sorrow and grief upon the tragic and untimely death of our beloved colleague and committee associate, the Honorable T. ASHTON THOMPSON, and order the clerk of the committee to spread upon our permanent records this heartfelt resolution to his memory.

Mr. THOMPSON was first elected to Congress in 1952 where he faithfully and ably served his district, his native State of Louisiana and his Nation in all the ensuing years of his life.

In appreciation of the vital importance, to his State and to the Nation, of ocean transportation, commercial and sport fishing, and wildlife conservation, he requested election to our committee, where he served with distinction and devotion to duty as member and as subcommittee chairman in the consideration of many and varied important and difficult assignments. His service in recent years as chairman of our Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation was outstanding.

The passing of T. ASHTON THOMPSON is a serious and grievous loss to our committee. He will be mourned for many years and the product of his efforts will be undying.

T. A. THOMPSON was a warm and friendly man. His genuine sincerity, coupled with deep-seated honest convictions, endeared him to all who knew him whatever may have been their station or walk of life, or political conviction.

T. ASHTON THOMPSON represented the highest embodiment of the true public servant. He served in this great body of the House of Representatives for nearly 13 years before his Master called him to a still higher service. But this does not tell the story. His public career began with the government of his beloved State of Louisiana, to whose purposes he devoted himself with increasing distinction until he was chosen to come to Congress. He gave nearly 4 years of his life to the Armed Forces of the United States, having served in the U.S. Air Force in World War II. Afterwards he continued to work diligently in behalf of our veterans, civil defense, and many other public causes, above and beyond the call of the responsibilities of his job as representative of his congressional district.

We are fortunate to have been privileged to serve with ASHTON THOMPSON. Our lives are richer thereby.

The committee wishes to extend their sincerest condolence to his beloved wife, Leatrice and their two fine children, Christine and Ted.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Mrs. Thompson.

Mr. Speaker, as further testimony to the mark which T. ASHTON THOMPSON made during his congressional career, I also ask leave to insert in the RECORD a number of communications addressed to the chairman of the committee, expressing grief and condolence at his untimely loss. The communications are as follows:

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE,
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1965.

Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BONNER: Conservationists throughout the Nation were shocked to hear of the untimely death of Congressman T. A. THOMPSON of Louisiana in that unfortunate roadside mishap.

Many of us had an opportunity to become acquainted with Mr. THOMPSON during the years that he was a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. As we listened to him during committee hearings and when we discussed various projects with him from time to time, the conservationists became more deeply impressed with his personal interest in the welfare of this country's fish and wildlife resources. During the all-too-brief time that Mr. THOMPSON was the chairman of the Wildlife and Fisheries Subcommittee, we had an opportunity to see this interest further manifested in his strong leadership to authorize and expand essential programs for restoring and protecting fish and wildlife resources.

Mr. THOMPSON's leadership will be missed in the years ahead. Mrs. Thompson, the members of his family, and his colleagues on the committee and in the Congress should take comfort in realizing that the results of his labors will benefit generations to come.

Sincerely,

C. R. GUTERMUTH,
Vice President.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1965.

The Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We understand that the Congress will soon set aside a day to commemorate the memory of the late T. ASHTON THOMPSON, Member of the House from Louisiana's Seventh District. Because of his long interest in wildlife conservation affairs, we would very much appreciate having the following statement inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if and when such tributes are in order.

The National Wildlife Federation joins Members of the Congress and conservationists throughout the Nation in this commemoration of the late T. ASHTON THOMPSON. Representative THOMPSON's tragic death brought to a most untimely end a long period of service to the people of Louisiana, as well as sportsmen and conservationists throughout our Nation. Since his election to the Congress in 1952, Mr. Thompson's interest in wildlife conservation and especially the management of this continent's waterfowl resource was demonstrated by word and deed on many occasions. He ably represented the people of Louisiana and his loss is felt with a deep sense of sadness and regret by members of our organization.

Sincerely,

THOMAS L. KIMBALL,
Executive Director.

SPORT FISHING INSTITUTE,
Washington, D.C., July 16, 1965.

Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman, Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BONNER: The Sport Fishing Institute is deeply grieved by the loss of one of your valued committee members, Congressman T. ASHTON THOMPSON of Louisiana. His more recent tenure as chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation is evidence of the respect held for him by his committee members. His record on this committee, dealing with fish and wildlife conservation measures, is well known. Various acts involved furtherance of fishery research, which the Sport Fishing Institute believes is an important key to providing improved future fishing opportunity.

Beginning in 1954, Congressman THOMPSON played important roles in the passage of the North Pacific Fisheries Act, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (as amended in 1958), and the Marine Game Fish Research Act of 1959. Always interested in the more outstanding problems affecting fish and wildlife resources, he urged congressional action authorizing continuing studies of the effects of pesticides. The 1960 act, providing for authorization of the State university cooperative fishery units, was strongly sponsored by Congressman THOMPSON.

Beginning in 1964, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, Congressman THOMPSON was instrumental in stimulating additional research and development of fisheries by the individual States. The Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act provided significant grants-in-aid to the States for marine and inland fishery resources study. Many other actions by this conservation-minded Member of the Congress helped stimulate programs and actions needed to conserve our aquatic renewable natural resources.

We think it would be an altogether fitting legislative memorial if the Congress would promptly consider Mr. THOMPSON's bill, H.R. 9424—"To provide for the conservation, protection, and propagation of native species of fish and wildlife, including migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction * * *" with appropriate hearings designed to secure its early enactment, possibly with some minor clarifications.

Most sincerely,

PHILIP A. DOUGLAS,
Executive Secretary.

CHAS. E. JACKSON & ASSOCIATES,
Washington, D.C., July 16, 1965.

The Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman, Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It was with deep sorrow that I learned of the untimely death of Representative T. ASHTON THOMPSON of Louisiana. I wish to comment particularly on his service as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation. He conducted his committee meetings in an absolutely fair and impartial manner and developed the best possible information for the record. As you know, I have long represented many phases of the fishing industry, and I am confident I express the industry's view when I say the leadership demonstrated by Representative THOMPSON is deeply appreciated.

We grieve with you and members of the committee over Representative THOMPSON's tragic passing.

Sincerely,

CHAS. E. JACKSON.

STATE OF LOUISIANA, WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES COMMISSION,
New Orleans, July 15, 1965.

Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BONNER: We are advised that early next week the House of Representatives will pay tribute to the late Congressman T. A. THOMPSON, who was killed during the 4th of July holidays.

I am attaching resolution, signed by the members of the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission and trust that you will incorporate it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of the House of Representatives proceedings in connection with the tribute to our late Congressman.

Sincerely yours,

J. D. HAIR, Jr.,
Director.

RESOLUTION BY THE MEMBERS OF THE LOUISIANA WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES COMMISSION

Whereas the late T. ASHTON THOMPSON, Member of Congress, representing the Seventh Louisiana Congressional District since 1952, was killed in a freakish automobile accident over the Fourth of July holidays while en route with his family to his home in Ville Platte; and

Whereas during the 13 years which he served as a Member of the House of Representatives, he demonstrated vital interest in both State and National wildlife and fisheries resources, and worked tirelessly to bring about a grassroots realization of the interdependence of conservation and utilization of the Nation's fish and wildlife resources; and

Whereas as chairman of the important Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, he worked untiringly to bring about full understanding of the economic and recreational value of fish and wildlife resources and the need to foster national legislation to conserve those forms of vanishing wildlife, as well as to increase present populations of game birds to meet ever-increasing pressure from sportsmen seeking more and more outdoor recreation in the form of hunting; and

Whereas he was deeply respected by conservationists and sportsmen, not only in Louisiana but throughout the country, for his devotion to the fundamental principles of sound conservation and wise use of all wildlife and fisheries; and

Whereas in Louisiana he was known throughout the State as a man who enjoyed hunting and fishing, and was determined to do everything in his power to perpetuate the resources necessary for those sports; and

Whereas his untimely death represents a great loss to the State of Louisiana and to the Nation: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission, representing conservationists and sportsmen of the State of Louisiana, does hereby gratefully and respectfully commend the many accomplishments of the late Honorable T. ASHTON THOMPSON, and respectfully requests that this resolution be incorporated into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the United States to become a permanent record of the United States of America.

JOHN EDWIN KYLE, Jr.,
Chairman.
H. B. FAIRCHILD,
Vice Chairman.
J. D. HAIR, Jr.,
Director.
A. J. BUQUET,
Member.
JOHN PAUL CRAIN,
Member.
HOBSON NORRIS,
Member.
JIMMIE THOMPSON,
Member.
H. CLAY WRIGHT,
Member.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as the House well knows, the beloved chairman of our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, HERBERT BONNER, is necessarily on official leave at this time.

I have recently received a letter from HERB, expressing his shock and grief on the untimely passing of our colleague, T. ASHTON THOMPSON. He asked that I bring to the attention of the House his expressions of respect and condolence.

I ask leave to insert in the RECORD at this point Chairman BONNER's letter of July 9, 1965:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT
MARINE AND FISHERIES,
Washington, D.C., July 9, 1965.

Hon. EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ED: I don't know of anything that has shocked me so much as T. A. THOMPSON's tragic, senseless, and untimely death last weekend, as he was driving home to Louisiana with his family.

I well remember when he first came to Congress in 1953 and requested membership on our committee. Though still a young man, he already had behind him a distinguished record of public service in Louisiana, as well as a fine military record earned in 3½ years with the Air Force in World War II. With this substantial background he naturally matured quickly into the spirit and the ways of our great Congress.

When I became chairman of the committee in 1955, it was my pleasure to name this able Representative to important committee posts, including the chairmanship of our Special Subcommittee on Freight Forwarders, charged with the handling of a most difficult investigatory assignment. He committed himself well. During his 13 years of devoted service to our committee he grew in stature and in breadth of understanding of the varied subjects under our jurisdiction.

Outstanding during his service with the committee was the interest and attention which he devoted to vital matters dealing with our fisheries and wildlife conservation. During the period of his chairmanship of our Fisheries and Wildlife Subcommittee he exhibited the highest standards of leadership and the subcommittee can boast an enviable record of achievement.

He will be sorely missed.

I regret that I will be unable to be present in person to join with you and his many, many friends and admirers to pay tribute to his memory on the floor of the House. May I ask that you be good enough to bring my expressions of respect and condolence to the attention of the House?

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

HERBERT C. BONNER, *Chairman.*

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in expressing my deepest sympathy to the family of T. ASHTON THOMPSON, our colleague from Louisiana, who was taken from this earth so suddenly and so tragically.

T. A. and I came to this Congress together in January of 1953 and we served side by side on the Committee of Merchant Marine and Fisheries these past 13 years.

He was an able legislator and argued his point well on all occasions. I have seen and heard him fight for the things he believed in both in committee and on the House floor.

May God grant him eternal rest and give his family the courage to carry on without him

Mr. FASCELL. The sight of our country's flag flying at half mast over the Capitol on Friday, July 2, signified the end of the life of a good man and a great Member of Congress. It was evidence of the cruel truth that the Congress of the United States had lost one of its most respected Members, T. ASHTON THOMPSON. This untimely tragedy was an irreparable loss to his many friends in the Congress, the State of Louisiana, and the entire Nation.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds and the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife, Representative THOMPSON's concrete legislative service was of tremendous national value. Despite his heavy burden of public service, T. A. THOMPSON was an engaging human being, whose good nature marked his as one of this Chamber's most well-liked individuals. His life demonstrated all the chivalric virtues of public service: a fighting spirit, a devotion to service, a high sense of honor, and a steadfastness of purpose. He possessed a sharp insight into the political process and recognized the genuine scope of his institutional power and personal ability. The words of Edward Everett Hale recall to me the dedication he exhibited:

> I am only one, but still I am one.
> I cannot do everything, but still I can do something;
> And because I cannot do everything, I will not refuse to do the something that I can do.

T. A. THOMPSON was respected and loved by everyone on the Hill who knew him—and most everyone did. Even in the most burdensome of times, he always had a kind word for a colleague, staff member, or elevator boy. He was always available and ready to listen and discuss. To him, everyone was a person in his own right.

Philip Lader, summer intern in my office, for example, recently represented me at a meeting over which Representative THOMPSON presided, and the Congressman took the time to introduce this young man to all those present and brief him thoroughly on the issues being discussed. He then proceeded to ask the student to assume my chair, if he wished, and interrogate the witnesses. For this young man, as well as for me, the memory of T. A. THOMPSON will serve as a testament of the highest personal qualities of American public service.

It was a privilege to know T. ASHTON THOMPSON, and I valued his friendship. I wish to extend my heartfelt sympathy to his family, as I join them in prayer for a fine man whom we all loved so dearly.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, during my three terms in Congress, I have had the privilege of serving with the late T. ASHTON THOMPSON, of Louisiana. I was particularly saddened by the news of T. A. THOMPSON's untimely death a few days ago, for Mr. THOMPSON was a dedicated public servant who always upheld the high ideals of this body.

He represented the people of Louisiana's seventh district faithfully and well. Yet he was not bound by narrow, parochial interests, but acted in the best interests of this great Nation.

His loving family has my deepest sympathy, and I want them to know that all of us here will miss T. A.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, courage, good will, and true ability are qualities which are rarely found together in the person of one man.

Our late colleague, the Honorable T. A. THOMPSON, of Louisiana, was one of these rare men. He was a man of clear and strong conviction. He had almost boundless energy which he devoted to his State, to the House of Representatives, and to his Nation. His contributions in the field of finance are too numerous to mention, but we all know that they had a profound impact on Louisiana and on various organizations with which he was associated.

But the esteem in which he was held by those of us who were his colleagues here in the House was not solely because of these attributes. His warmth of personality and genuine concern for the welfare of others than himself marked him as a wonderful man whose friendship we sought and enjoyed.

I appreciate this opportunity to express my sincerest sympathy to his family and to the State of Louisiana for this great loss of a husband, father, and statesman.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of great shock that I learned of the tragic passing of my dear friend and very esteemed colleague, Congressman T. ASHTON THOMPSON, an outstanding Member of this House.

I was deeply impressed, as I believe our entire membership was, by the genial, friendly, amiable personal qualities of this proud son of Louisiana.

He was approachable, cordial and warm-hearted and had a very lofty concept of his public responsibilities and duties as a Member of the House. He was well trained, well informed, capable and efficient in the performance of his work.

Strong in his convictions, humane in his reactions and sympathetic in his response, he stood steadfastly by the principles and ideals in which he believed, and his outstanding service in the House was marked by adherence to those principles and ideals and his loyal, unfaltering attachment to the many causes of free government in which he believed.

He brought to his work a keen mind and a deep understanding of the great principles of government. He was particularly devoted to his district and his people and his great State and country, and he gave of himself unselfishly to the cause of humanity, freedom, and human betterment.

He was highly esteemed by the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, and he had the respect, admiration, and affection of our membership.

Like everyone else who knew him, I had highest regard for him, and I looked upon him as a valued friend, an able, devoted colleague and an accomplished, faithful representative of the people and a great American. His fine record of achievement in this body will long be remembered.

I am greatly saddened by his sudden and unexpected passing and the shocking tragedy of the circumstances of his demise.

My heart goes out to his bereaved family and all his dear ones to whom he was so deeply devoted, and I extend my most heartfelt sympathy to each and everyone of them for the great sorrow that has come into their lives.

I also express my deep sympathy to his very many friends and constituents whom he had served with such great ability, vitality, and warmth.

I hope that the good Lord will bless them with the spirit of reconciliation to abide by His divine will and will strengthen them to bear the irreparable loss that they have suffered with true spiritual resignation.

A great and distinguished public servant and a dear, esteemed friend has been called to his Heavenly reward.

May he find peace and rest in his eternal home.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic and untimely passing of our beloved colleague, T. A. THOMPSON, came as a great shock to me, my family, and to the people of South Carolina. It is ironic that the tragic accident which took his life occurred on one of the most magnificent and beautiful interstate highways in the Nation. A highway system that, as a member of the Public Works Committee, he helped create. It was my honor to serve on the Public Works Committee with ASHTON THOMPSON that I was privileged to observe firsthand his dedication and devotion to the development and the preservation of the great natural resources of our country. He was an ideal member to serve with on the committee. His word was his bond. He was considerate of the opinions of others and always willing to meet other Members more than halfway in developing legislation in the best interests of the Nation.

ASHTON THOMPSON was a man of great humility. He did not seek headlines or credit but was interested in accomplishments and achievements for his people and his country. The United States today is a more powerful Nation—more united, enjoying more economic opportunity, and a great civilization—because of his outstanding service in the Congress. He was a great leader, a great American, and one of the greatest Louisianians in the history of that great State. He typified and exemplified the traditions, the heritage, and the culture of the Old South. He was a southern gentleman to the core.

Serving with ASHTON THOMPSON will always be to me a pleasant reminiscence. He will be greatly missed. Mrs. Dorn and my family join in extending always to Mrs. Thompson and his lovely children our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy.

ASHTON THOMPSON'S service here and his devotion to his people and the development of our land exemplifies the admonition of Daniel Webster on the walls of the House:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, T. A. THOMPSON in his day rendered his Nation superb service and will be remembered.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of my good friend ASHTON THOMPSON was a shock and a source of great sorrow to me personally. We served on the Merchant Marine Committee together, and he was the very able chairman of our Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation. He always impressed me with his capable manner and his warmth and friendliness.

ASHTON THOMPSON was liked by all who knew him; he was popular among his fellow Members of Congress, and he was a dedicated and able legislator. The Congress has suffered a great loss. We shall miss him sorely, but we shall cherish the memory of our distinguished colleague for years to come. To his bereaved family, I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to join with my colleagues and the people of the State of Louisiana in expressing my grief over the sudden and shocking death of our close friend, Representative T. ASHTON THOMPSON.

Throughout our Nation's history, the State of Louisiana has traditionally sent numerous dedicated and competent men to the Congress of the United States. Representative THOMPSON was indeed a shining example of this tradition.

Having engaged in State government service at a very early age, Representative THOMPSON served in various capacities in his home State until his election to the 83d Congress in 1953. As a Member of Congress, Mr. THOMPSON continually displayed the qualities of a statesman. A humble man, he never forgot the people or the purpose for which they sent him to Congress. His efforts were not only confined to the people of his district, but to any measure that would benefit the vast majority of the American public.

The respect which we have all held for this man stemmed not only from his proven competence in the Congress, but also from his personal character. His devotion to his family and church and his intrinsic belief in God's goodness served as an example to all.

The State of Louisiana and indeed the entire Nation has lost an outstanding public servant whose dedication to his principles and his people will long be remembered.

I wish to extend to Mrs. Thompson and the entire family my prayers and deepest sympathies on this sorrowful occasion.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, a highway tragedy during the Fourth of July weekend took the life of one of the outstanding Members of Congress. The gentleman from Louisiana, T. ASHTON THOMPSON, was taken from us by a strange, incredible, and senseless highway accident in the State of North Carolina.

I knew ASHTON well as a Member of this body, but I knew him best as a distinguished member of the Committee on Public Works, a committee on which he served with distinction and the highest integrity. He was vitally concerned with the area of public works and economic development and had already made a substantial name for himself in the area. The gentleman from Louisiana was the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, a member of the Subcommittee on Roads, a member of the Subcommittee on Watershed Development. But ASHTON had really begun to distinguish himself as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds. He only served for half a year in that position, but during that short time he had quickly grasped the concepts behind the Federal public buildings program and was exercising a firm understanding of the intricate processes. He had presided over a hearing before that subcommittee only a few days before his most untimely and most tragic demise.

ASHTON served his State and Nation well. He entered public service in his State in 1934 at the age of 18, and he soon became involved in the highway programs of the State as an employee of the Louisiana State Highway Commission. He was a financial adviser to the Louisiana Legislature and was the pioneer of a new method of accounting for the State agencies. ASHTON came to the Congress in 1953 and served for a dozen years with distinction. It is a loss to this body and to the Nation that he was not permitted to served for many more years.

Mr. Speaker, there was a geat irony in the death of ASHTON. As I have said, he began his public service in the area of highway activities. He served on the Committee on Public Works when the largest public works program in history—the Interstate and Defense Highway System—was acted upon in 1956 by that committee. His tragic death came on the Interstate and Defense Highway System. It came on Interstate 85 near Gastonia, N.C. The proponent of the Nation's highway programs died upon the highway system he helped to perfect. But his actions and the actions of his committee have made it possible for fewer to meet such a tragic end on our Nation's highways. For this, he is indeed to be commended.

ASHTON was outgoing, helpful, devoted, and an all-around good legislator. He knew his responsibilities and duties to the people of his State and Nation, and he exercised them well.

For both myself and my family, I want to extend our sorrowful regrets and sadness to his wife and children. I know this sorrow is felt by all Members of the Congress. Our Nation has lost a good Congressman and a public-spirited citizen.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, although it was not my good fortune to become personally well-acquainted with Mr. THOMPSON, I was privileged to serve with him on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and I valued his important contributions to that committee's work.

During Mr. THOMPSON'S tenure on the committee, the Congress granted a wide variety of research authority concerning conservation activities. A measure of special interest to many of us from the States bordering the Great Lakes was the Great Lakes Fishery Act of 1956.

Mr. THOMPSON became chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation with the organization of that committee in the 88th Congress. In 1964, under his leadership, the committee was instrumental in stimulating action by the individual States involving the development of fisheries.

Our Nation's conservation programs are much stronger because of efforts put forth by Representative THOMPSON. His dedication has provided us with a solid foundation from which to direct our future conservation policies.

All of us join in the feeling of shock and sadness because of the tragic death of ASHTON THOMPSON, and we on the Merchant Marine Committee will greatly miss him. But I also want to express the very special sense of respect and gratitude and loss which we of the Great

Lakes area feel, because of his leadership role in support of fisheries research measures desperately needed in our area.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late T. Ashton Thompson—statesman, legislator, and good friend. It would be difficult, if not impossible, for me to improve on the tributes which have already been paid. I cannot improve upon what has been said. I rise simply to pay tribute to the memory of a departed friend who always had a kind word to say, who was always most cooperative and thoughtful, a friend who made his mark in the Nation's service.

The record of his attainments will speak for itself and it will speak eloquently. I simply want to speak of him as a friend and pay tribute to his memory and extend sympathy to Mrs. Thompson and other loved ones left behind.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound shock and deep sorrow that I learned of the passing of my good friend, our colleague T. Ashton Thompson. T.A.'s first team was in the 83d Congress as was mine. Our paths crossed frequently. I never knew him to say an unkind word or to make an untrue statement. He was a fine Member of this body, a fine gentleman, and a real credit to his district, his State, and his country.

My deepest sympathy is extended to Mrs. Thompson, the Thompson children, and to T.A.'s constituents who, I am sure, share his loss with all of us.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this Chamber is no longer to benefit from the presence of the Honorable T. Ashton Thompson of Louisiana, who has been taken from us by the cruelest act of fate.

We who worked with him and knew him as a colleague and a friend are equally bereft as his constituents, for whom he gave the utmost of his time and his energy. All who knew him even slightly were stunned at the awful news of his demise in the realization that the people of Louisiana, the Congress, and the Nation itself had lost a fine and gallant leader, capable of noble ideas and high accomplishments.

T. Ashton Thompson entered the public service in the year 1934, as traveling auditor for the Louisiana Highway Commission. From then until the day of his death he worked for no other employer save the government of the State of Louisiana and the Government of the United States, both of which he loved with all his heart and was willing to serve with everything at his command.

Although T. Ashton Thompson was for many years associated with the finances of the State of Louisiana, this was by no means his only area of competence or interest. On the contrary, they ranged far and wide. As an Air Force officer in World War II he became exceedingly knowledgeable in the fields of aeronautics and military strategy. As a longtime State official, he developed a keen awareness of the value of public works programs, and as a citizen of a State bordering on the sea he was all his life familiar with nautical affairs.

In line with these interests T. Ashton Thompson was appointed to the House Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, in both of which bodies he performed with a great enthusiasm matched only by his skill.

Although myself a member of the political party opposed to that of T. Ashton Thompson, I found in him a splendid man and a splendid politician, for he was one of those to whom the word, "compromise," was more than just a word. He was truly concerned for effective, workable legislation, and partisanship was simply not a major part of his nature.

The House of Representatives will miss this man of great ability, almost to the same extent as will his friends and family.

Indeed, he was a tribute to his district, his State, and the Congress, itself.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked when I learned of the untimely passing of my good friend and colleague, T. Ashton Thompson. I considered him to be a real personal friend, and a warm friendship grew as a result of our close association for many years on the House Committee on Public Works and the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. He was a fine American and a dedicated legislator. I shall miss his friendship, and my deepest sympathy goes to his family.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, Ashton Thompson's tragic death was a deep shock to me. It has been my privilege to serve with him on the Public Works Committee and on the Subcommittee on Roads for the past 2½ years. He was a hard-working, considerate legislator whose contributions to the work of the committee and the Congress will long be remembered. His death has cut short a fine career holding much promise for the future. Mrs. Cleveland and I extend our deepest sympathy to his wife and children.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, a sense of profound sadness overcomes us when we realize that T. A. Thompson no longer will be with us in this Chamber.

For some of us who served with the able gentleman from Louisiana on the House Committee on Public Works, our sense of personal loss is compounded by our realization of the great loss which the Nation itself sustains.

Not given to flamboyance or bombastic bursts of oratory, T. A. Thompson labored quietly and effectively in the less glamorous but often infinitely more productive realm of meaningful congressional activity involved with the mundane but highly necessary work of the congressional committees.

Those of us who had the privilege of serving with T. A. Thompson on the Public Works Committee enjoyed a rare opportunity to know a true legislative craftsman at his work. Without fanfare or self-congratulation, the gentleman from Louisiana made many long lasting contributions to the welfare of our Nation. The people of his congressional district have great reason for pride in the service he performed not only for Louisiana, but for the United States as a whole.

With the clear vision given to those who think earnestly of the future, T. A. Thompson many years ago saw the critical need for development and conservation of the Nation's water resources. He was a tireless and efficacious champion of pure, clear water to serve the water needs of this country.

His handiwork is ever apparent to those of us who observed his deep interest in the numerous pieces of landmark legislation which have provided dams and reservoirs throughout the Nation. With a resolute purpose, he worked incessantly for years to improve and strengthen the Nation's fight against pollution of the streams and against other impediments to usage of this most primary resource, such as the water hyacinths which had infested the water surfaces in much of the Southland.

Only this year, his hand was ever evident in the perfecting of workable language for the Water Quality Act of 1965 which will greatly strengthen our efforts to abate pollution.

Coming to the Congress after years of practical experience in the administration of highway programs in his native Louisiana, T. A. Thompson played a prominent part in the enactment of the Interstate Highway Act of 1956 and the subsequent Federal aid highway programs which have saved many thousands of lives and speeded the Nation's commerce across broad ribbons of concrete. How ironic that his own life should have been sacrificed in a highway fatality.

Always considerate of his fellow man, T. A. Thompson was much beloved and appreciated by those who knew him best. We who served with him here day in and day out knew him as a man of infinite patience and reason, blessed with tolerance and understanding.

His shadow will linger long. His good works will continue to bless future generations of Americans. His example will remain with us who knew him.

Words are poor consolation indeed to his bereaved survivors. To them our hearts go out, even in the knowledge that what we say can scarcely solace or comfort them in so grievous a personal loss. Yet we know that there is for them the assurance of faith and the comfort of the knowledge that others would share their grief. There is also the legacy of the good deeds that he performed, the good life that he lived, and the services which endure to bless his fellow man.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, tragedy is always shocking and, when its hand moves in to take away the life of a friend and colleague so recently a cheerful and lively member of our group, it is indeed painful and oppressive. I can recall with vivid recollection the quiet, instantly friendly young man from Louisiana who came to the Congress with me as a freshman in 1953 and remember well our early efforts to learn firsthand the duties of one charged with the responsibility to represent a constituency, a State and a Nation in this great deliberative body. He was immediately popular with all of us because of his genial attitude and, as our responsibilities here mounted, this admiration and respect multiplied manifold for the fine qualities he possessed. It was a great pleasure to have enjoyed his friendship and it has been an honor indeed to serve with him in the House of Representatives. I join his many friends in this House in an expression of anguish over his sudden and untimely passing and extend to Mrs. Thompson, his family, and his loved ones my genuine sympathy.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of our colleague, the Honorable T. A. Thompson, was a grievous loss to this House and to the Congress.

T. A. and I served together on the Public Works Committee. We were usually of the same mind. His devotion to his work was an inspiration to all who knew him. No district has elected a man with more pride in his district and more concern for his people, his constituents. My friend Congressman Thompson loved people. He was compassionate and of good humor. He was a wonderful father and a good husband. Truly few men could better epitomize an American citizen and a Congressman in the finest tradition of our great Nation.

Congressman Thompson was more than a distinguished and conscientious legislator. He was a Christian who attempted to carry his philosophy actively into every minute of his public and private life. His work was not only diligent and constructive, but always sincerely concerned with the well-being of his fellow men. T. A. was both amiable and devoted; steadfast and sympathetic. He had quickly developed invaluable expertness in State finances, public works, economic development, merchant marine, and fisheries. His experience and counsel is as great a loss as his personal ability as mediator and conciliator. His energy and devotion to a cause once illuminated by thorough investigation was ceaseless.

I extend my heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Thompson and her loved ones. We all share her grief, if only in some lesser fashion.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, may I on behalf of the Louisiana delegation in the House of Representatives express our deepest appreciation for the kindness and generosity of the remarks made concerning our late colleague, Ashton Thompson. It is quite fitting that he be remembered in the words that have been uttered here today.

I also want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, in joining my colleague from New Orleans, Congressman Boggs, on behalf of the Louisiana delegation, how much we appreciate the efficient manner in which Ken Harding handled the funeral arrangements. This was a great source of consolation to the family and to the members of the delegation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks a tribute that has been sent to me from the Governor of Louisiana, the Honorable John J. McKeithen.

Eulogy Spoken by the Honorable John J. McKeithen, Governor of Louisiana, Upon the Untimely Death of the Honorable T. A. Thompson

It is given to few men the opportunity to voice a people's aspirations, their hopes and desires. T. A. Thompson was one of the chosen few, and he accepted the duty with honor and humility. Charged by destiny with the leadership of his people as a Member of the Congress of the United States, he acquitted himself admirably in that ancient institution, rising to meet his responsibilities with a deep reverence and respect for the commonwealth we all serve, and bringing honor to the name of his people.

Representative T. A. Thompson passed this way briefly, and we are all the wealthier in the spirit for his sojourn here. That he passed so suddenly and so tragically is the Nation's loss. We feel the heavy weight of sorrow and loneliness his widow and his children know at this sad moment, for he too is our loss. We were bound to him as surely as if by blood or by vows.

We are richer today for having had him serve us. We are better men and women for having known him. Today, though his voice is stilled, though his presence has fled, this land continues a better place in which to live because he labored to increase its abundance, to quieten its hostilities, to perfect its justice.

T. A. Thompson's life was his own greatest tribute. No man can utter better than this: He was called to the service of his people; he harkened to their voice; he served them well. Pray his soul rests now in the bosom of the Father of us all.

Again let me say to the Members of this body and to all those who participated in the ceremony that this was in keeping with what Ashton lived and believed in.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to pay tribute to the life and character of T. A. Thompson, and to include therein any extraneous matter they may desire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2984) entitled "An act to amend the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities by extending the expiration date thereof and providing increased support for the program, to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Hill, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Pell, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Javits, and Mr. Murphy to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 2985) entitled "An act to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Hill, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Pell, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Javits, and Mr. Murphy to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 7984) entitled "An act to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Bennett, and Mr. Tower to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 510) entitled "An act to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes," agrees to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Hill, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Pell, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Javits, and Mr. Murphy to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

GERALD L. K. SMITH FIGHTS ONE MAN, ONE VOTE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, I am deeply disturbed by the drive to use a constitutional amendment as a means of diluting the principle of one man, one vote in our State legislatures. As I have watched this campaign develop, I have been shocked to learn the identity of some of the individuals and groups whose support for such a constitutional amendment is the most strident.

Last Thurday's mail brought the latest in a series of extremist broadsides against the Supreme Court and its decisions in favor of political equality. It consisted of a paragraph from the Cross and the Flag, published by Gerald L. K. Smith. Mr. Smith, who is fond of styling activities with which he disagrees as "Jew conspiracies," was characterized nearly 20 years ago by a group of Members of this House as "America's most raucous purveyor of anti-Semitism and of racial and religious bigotry." What was true 20 years ago is still true today. Mr. Smith reportedly received more than $300,000 in donations last year. He must qualify as the most durable, if not the most successful, extremist in the country.

On page 25 of the July issue of the Cross and the Flag is this comment:

> 11. The Supreme Court edict concerning the reapportionment of the State legislatures of the several States is another dictatorial decision made by our treasonable Supreme Court. This edict destroys geographic representation in the State legislatures and insists that the State senates be elected by population the same as the State representatives. This ruling makes the State senate a fifth wheel and destroys its importance. Most of the States in establishing their legislatures imitated the Congress of the United States insisting that the lower house represent the population while the upper house represent the geography. As things now stand, the great metropolitan centers are about to take over the State governments completely in the States where they are located whether it be New York, Illinois, California, or any one of the several States where big cities constitute the dominant population. The Citizens Congressional Committee has done a lot of work on this problem. It is to be hoped that a movement has been started which will save State sovereignty from this tyrannical edict handed down by the most obnoxious, heady, arrogant, impudent, lawless set of men called judges ever to appear on the public scene in the United States of America. God save America from Earl Warren's (Finkelstein) Supreme Court. I use the word Finkelstein advisedly because Rabbi Finkelstein is the chief intellect of American Jewry, and he has virtually dominated the philosophical thinking of the man who now virtually bosses the Supreme Court of the United States. This abortive personality (Earl Warren) is a tumorous growth on American liberty for which we can thank Dwight David Eisenhower who appointed him to this high position.

As one might have expected, this is not the first Cross and the Flag harangue against the principle of equality at the ballot box, so basic to a democratic form of Government. In the September 1964 issue of the Cross and the Flag, Mr. Smith's comment on the Supreme Court's reapportionment decisions was to proclaim that the Court had driven "a dagger into the back of our constitutional republic" and to warn that "the whole legislative process in the 50 States has been completely altered and virtually wrecked by the pro-Communist membership of the Supreme Court of the United States led by the diabolical traitor to tradition Chief Justice Earl Warren." He went on to urge "a revised campaign to impeach this diabolical Court" and immediate action to amend the Constitution "in such a way as to throw this treasonable decision into discard."

In his efforts to match words with action, Smith has enlisted in his campaign "to throw this treasonable decision into discard" one Charles Winegarner, his nephew by marriage and the author of the comments on reapportionment in the most recent edition of the Cross and the Flag. Mr. Winegarner is listed in an editor's note as "executive secretary of the Citizens Congressional Committee, an auxiliary of the Christian Nationalist Crusade." Last April, Smith described his long-time associate, Winegarner, as one of the "brilliant, loyal, time-tested patriots" who operate the "Citizens Congressional Committee."

The current focus of this particular subsidiary is opposition to any liberalization of the immigration laws, but in earlier years it has also concentrated its fire on the Supreme Court—calling for the impeachment not only of the Chief Justice, but the other members as well.

Smith and Winegarner, however, attach such importance to the passage of a constitutional amendment overturning the one man, one vote decision that they have created a separate front group for the sole purpose of promoting this amendment. Earlier this year, many of us received a letter purporting to come from a group labeled "National Committee—Reapportionment Crisis." Under the headlines urging us to "Save State Government" and to "Save the U.S. Senate," the letter utilized relatively calm language to proclaim sentiments which can only be characterized as extremist. It began with a flat assertion—completely at variance with fact, as any reading of the Supreme Court's decision in Reynolds against Sims should show—that the same logic used by the Court in that decision could also destroy the U.S. Senate. It went on to charge that this abortive edict already threatened State Governments with chaos.

The letter, which asked for an appointment to discuss the issue, was signed by a Charles Winegarner, listed on the letterhead as "executive secretary."

The return address of the committee was given as Post Office Box 27895 in Los Angeles, the same return address used by the Citizens' Congressional Committee and the return address of Gerald L. K. Smith's the Cross and the Flag. I gather that it is quite a large box.

Mr. Speaker, why are bigots like Smith and Winegarner so deeply involved in this campaign to overturn the principle of one man, one vote in our State governments? What is the purpose of their hysterical attacks on the Supreme Court? What is their interest in an amendment to override the Court's decisions on legislative apportionment?

I, for one, suspect that the interest is a simple one: They obviously dislike, mistrust, and oppose the entire democratic process. They seize every opportunity to use the weapons of smear and fear in attacks on our system in an attempt to prove that the system cannot work. They want nothing less than repeal of the 20th century or as much of it as they can get their hands on.

The fact that these extremists want a constitutional amendment to overturn the principle of "one man, one vote" should put us on guard. For myself, Mr. Speaker, finding Smith and Winegarner on the opposite side of an issue is reassuring. At the same time, it reinforces my conviction that this fight to reapportion our State legislatures on a population basis is a vital one.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment and commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] for the information he has just brought to the attention of the House. The activities of Gerald L. K. Smith, the Nation's most vicious racial and religious bigot, in opposition to the principle of one man, one vote are deeply disturbing.

Smith is a notorious enemy of our democratic form of government. The intensity and virulence of his attacks on one man, one vote are clear evidence that this principle will materially strengthen the democratic system which he is dedicated to destroy.

One man, one vote is initiating a new era in the American experiment with freedom. Those forces which have benefited from malapportionment will continue their protests. That is their constitutional right and I do not question it. But I and the people I represent also have a constitutional right to vote and have our vote counted equally with other votes.

The gentleman from Michigan, Congressman O'HARA, has ably led a rapidly growing number of our colleagues who support one man, one vote and oppose the Dirksen amendment. His remarks today have only made more the necessity of defeating the Dirksen amendment more urgent.

PRESSURING THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PEOPLE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when the White House applied what might be described as subtle pressure. It is a part of the American system to advocate causes and urge others to support your programs. On the other hand, it is a subversion of free government to blackjack, arm twist, and play partisan politics with the public welfare. Time and time again during this session we have witnessed a growing tendency for the White House to force its will on a docile Congress by rude threats and arm-twisting tactics. There is no quicker means of perverting the public welfare than through this tactic and it is time that Members of this body, both Democrat and Republican, stand up and call a halt.

The Federal Government spends over $100 billion a year on a variety of programs. The basic reason for these expenditures is to improve the welfare of our citizenry. We can always argue that some programs are wasteful and some unneeded but their basic purpose nonetheless is to serve the needs of the people, whether real or imagined. This administration is more and more looking upon these programs as a means to pressure Congress. "Vote for this program and we will approve your post office or public works project," we hear. Sometimes there is an approach which is closer to blackmail. A New York Democrat told us last year of a visit by Post Office Department officials which he thought to be in regard to new post offices on Long Island. Instead they asked him if he was going to support the farm legislation which was coming up the next week. They made their message unmistakably clear. He was different from most Members of this body; he rose up and protested in indignation.

On the front page of yesterday's New York Times, Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor made no bones about the tactics they plan to use in getting through one of their pet programs. He said:

> It will boil down to how much arm twisting we can do.

This administration is trying to do the same thing to secure passage of their bill which would remove 14(b) from the Taft-Hartley Act. I have talked to a number of Democratic Congressmen who are highly incensed at the highhanded manner which has been used to get them to vote for this controversial proposal. They have been told that there will be no farm program until it is passed. Carl DeBloom, writing in the Columbus Dispatch, on Sunday, July 18—the same day as the Connor statement—told the story in pretty plain language and it should shock many Americans who properly feel that taxpayers' money should be used for the welfare of the people and not for building political power.

Every week we get a reminder of the abuse of power which comes from the one-sided political complexion here in Washington. With more than 2 to 1 majorities in both Houses of Congress, the administration can play politics with the welfare of the farmers or any other group. Representatives of the people should not be pressured with public funds and the best way to stop it is to vote for or against proposals on the basis of the best interest of the public and not in response to what the White House might tell you to do. This Congress is already becoming known as a rubberstamp Congress and we cannot possibly hold the confidence of the people if we continue to cover up the Bobby Baker incidents, submit to executive pressure and put politics first and the public welfare second. A great Democratic Senator from Missouri, Jim Reed, once observed this highhanded pressure during the Court-packing days of the thirties and castigated those "congressional cats who for a little White House cream will sell the interests of their constituents down the river."

Read the Carl DeBloom article which I insert following these remarks and judge for yourself what is happening to the representatives of the people, the last real repository of freedom and self-government. This whole matter crosses party lines. While the power of the Government is undoubtedly tilted a bit to help Democrats at the expense of Republicans, there are numerous occasions where independent-minded Democrats meet the same pressure tactic. I need only point out the different treatment accorded the senior and junior Senators from my own State of Ohio. Patronage is not cleared through the one who steers the more independent course.

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, July 18, 1965]

FARM BLOC TOLD TO BACK BILL—RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW REPEAL IS PUSHED

(By Carl DeBloom)

WASHINGTON.—The Johnson administration has taken the wraps off in its hitherto undercover drive to assure passage of legislation which would nullify so-called right-to-work State laws.

The administration, through Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, bluntly told farm area Members of the House, "You don't have the votes to pass your farm bill this year unless you buy them by your own support of repeal of 14(b)."

Repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is the big goal of the AFL–CIO and the rest of big labor at this session of Congress. Section 14(b) empowers the States to adopt laws outlawing union shops.

Through most of this session of Congress, lobbyists for the White House, AFL–CIO, and liberal farm organizations have been trying to put together a farm-labor coalition which would provide sufficient support for both bills to get them through Congress.

There has been evidence that this move had in the main succeeded, but the new coalition began to fall apart last week in a dispute over whether the farm bill or the labor bill would be called up first in the House.

It was apparent that neither side trusted the other to make good on its promises of support unless its own bill came up first.

It was that situation which the Vice President sought to resolve by his appearance at an unannounced breakfast of southern rural Congressmen at the Congressional Hotel Friday morning.

While the breakfast meeting was held behind closed doors, some lawmakers who were there said that HUMPHREY did not engage in subtlety in laying on the line the administration's demand for support of the section 14(b) repealer.

The Vice President reportedly explained that the labor bill may have enough support to pass both the House and the Senate without "trading" for farm area support, and that at the least, it has close to enough votes for passage.

On the other hand, HUMPHREY was reported to have said, the farm bill stands not a ghost of a chance of passage unless it can get substantial backing from urban and suburban Congressmen who do not really favor it, but who would vote for it to guarantee passage of the 14(b) repealer by a substantial margin.

While HUMPHREY did not come right out and say so, it was implicit in his remarks that the farm bill's rural area supporters should abandon their fight to get their own bill voted on first in the House.

He said in effect that unless the urban area backers of the 14(b) repeal bill had guaranteed delivery of farm area votes for it, they weren't likely to vote for the farm bill.

That seemed to mean, without question, that the labor bill must be voted on first—or the farm bill won't get pro-labor support in advance.

TEACHING PROFESSIONS ACT OF 1965

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following explanation of the Teaching Professions Act of 1965 and a letter from the President:

JULY 17, 1965.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As I announced in my remarks before the National Education Association on July 2, I am proposing legislation to bring the best of our Nation's talent to its schools. This legislation—the Teaching Professions Act of 1965—will:

Create a National Teacher Corps to serve in city slums and areas of rural poverty;

Establish a program of fellowships to prepare students for teaching careers in elementary and secondary education and to help experienced teachers enhance their qualifications;

Aid institutions of higher education to provide better programs for educating teachers.

The National Teacher Corps draws on that spirit of dedication of Americans which has been demonstrated time and again in peace and war, by young and old, at home and abroad. It will provide a challenge and an opportunity for teachers with a sense of mission—those best suited to the momentous tasks this Nation faces in improving education.

The National Teacher Corps can help improve the quality of teaching where quality is most needed and most often in short supply—in city slums and in areas of rural poverty. It will enroll experienced teachers, and, to work with them, students who intend to make teaching a career. They will teach in local schools at the request of local communities and will serve on the same terms as local teachers. They will be local, not Federal, employees.

The fellowships are essential if teaching is to attract a higher proportion of our ablest young people, and if the best teaching is to prevail in the classroom. Students preparing for teaching in these days should have superior graduate training. Teaching is a difficult job at best; the more preparation for it, the better.

The desire of classroom teachers to replenish their skills and knowledge is not only to be applauded but aided. As revolutionary changes take place in all subjects and at all levels of learning, there is a limit to the sacrifice we can ask of our teachers in their efforts to renew their knowledge.

Finally, I propose a program of grants to help institutions of higher education offer first-rate programs to would-be teachers as well as to experienced teachers. This measure, coupled with the fellowship program and the National Teacher Corps, completes a program which is entitled to be called the Teaching Professions Act of 1965.

The Teaching Professions Act of 1965 is a composite of hard thinking about educational problems in the Congress, in the executive branch, and in the teaching profession. It owes much to the proposals of Senators GAYLORD NELSON and EDWARD KENNEDY for a national teacher corps; to Senators WAYNE MORSE and CLIFFORD CASE and Representatives CARL PERKINS and JOHN BRADEMAS for a program of fellowships for teachers; and to Representative PATSY MINK for a program of Federal grants to teachers for sabbatical leaves.

This bill will deepen the meaning and substance of the already impressive work of the 88th and 89th Congresses in the field of education. I have concluded that it is of sufficient urgency to justify action by this session of the Congress. The problems which face us in education do not grow smaller as time goes by; neither should our determination to attack and solve those problems. I commend to you the Teaching Professions Act of 1965, and hope that you will give it speedy consideration.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

TEACHING PROFESSIONS ACT OF 1965

The newly proposed Teaching Professions Act of 1965 would carry out the President's proposals, first announced in his July 2 speech before the National Education Association's convention in New York City, to establish a program of fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel and to create a National Teacher Corps.

The legislation would authorize the Commissioner of Education to support fellowship programs carried out by institutions of higher education for recent baccalaureate recipients, for persons in other careers desiring to pursue a career in elementary or secondary education, and for persons in elementary and secondary education desiring to improve their qualifications or to acquire qualifications in a different aspect of elementary and secondary education.

Fellowships would be awarded for up to 2 years of graduate study in approved high-quality graduate programs which give major emphasis to substantive courses and are designed for persons pursuing careers in elementary and secondary education.

In addition to stipends for fellowship holders, a cost-of-education allowance of $2,500 would be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such fellowship holder is studying for each academic year of study.

The Commissioner of Education would also be authorized to pay to institutions of higher education part of the cost of developing or strengthening high quality graduate and undergraduate programs for the training of personnel for elementary and secondary education, for the purpose of obtaining an appropriate geographical distribution of such programs.

The bill would establish in the Office of Education a National Teacher Corps in which experienced teachers and teacher-interns who have a bachelor's degree but who have had no teaching experience would enroll for periods of up to 2 years. Members of the Teacher Corps would, pursuant to arrangements with State educational agencies and, where appropriate, with institutions of higher education designated by the State educational agency, be furnished to local educational agencies in areas having high concentrations of low-income families to participate in programs and projects approved under title II of Public Law 874 (title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965).

Before undertaking their teaching duties, all members of the Teacher Corps would be provided training under arrangements which the Commissioner of Education would enter into, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education and State educational agencies. The Commissioner would likewise provide, through grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education and State educational agencies, in-service teacher training programs for teacher-interns, who would teach on less than a full-time basis in order to have time for training courses under supervision of an institution of higher education. Such courses would, wherever possible, lead to a graduate degree at the end of the teacher-intern's enrollment in the Teacher Corps.

Teacher-interns joining the Teacher Corps would be assigned in teaching teams which would also include experienced teachers, and the teaching program for teacher-interns would be under the supervision of experienced teachers. Insofar as practicable, such experienced teachers would be teachers who are enrolled in the Teacher Corps.

Arrangements for furnishing Teacher Corps members to local educational agencies must provide that such agency will compensate Teacher Corps members at the rate of pay for a teacher who has similar training and experience and similar teaching duties.

Stipends (including subsistence allowances) would be paid to members of the Teacher Corps by the Commissioner of Education during periods of training when Teacher Corps members are not on assignment with a local educational agency. The Federal Government would pay travel expenses and readjustment allowances before and after Teacher Corps members undertake their duties in the areas where they will be teaching. In addition, the Federal Government could make payments necessary to protect retirement rights, medical insurance, and other employee benefits for an experienced teacher who expects to return to the school, or educational agency or institution where he was employed before joining the Corps.

Members of the Teacher Corps would be utilized by local educational agencies to provide educational services in which children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools can participate, in the manner described in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The legislation guarantees that members of the Teacher Corps would be under the direct supervision and control of local educational agencies to which they are assigned.

While the bill authorizes the furnishing of teachers and teaching teams in the Corps to all local educational agencies with programs for low-income children which State educational agencies approve under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, if the demand for the services of such teachers should exceed the number available from the Teacher Corps, the Commissioner of Education would be directed to allocate them among the States (to the extent practicable) in proportion to the number of low-income children in each State who are counted for State-by-State distribution of basic grants under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The appropriations authorization for both programs is limited to $30 million in this fiscal year (1965–66).

An Advisory Council on Teacher Preparation would be established in the Office of Education to review both the fellowship and Teacher Corps programs, as well as other programs bearing on the improvement of teacher preparation programs in the Nation.

REPEAL OF 14(b)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, because of the important pending debates that will come before this body on the matter of the repeal of 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act and the farm legislation, I think it is important that my colleagues should have brought to their attention an article by Julius Duscha which appeared in the Washington Post of July 15.

[From the Washington Post, July 15, 1965]

FARM, LABOR GROUPS JOCKEY TO SEE WHOSE BILL IS FIRST

(By Julius Duscha)

"If I get some help on the farm bill," said Democratic Representative JOHN R. HANSEN, who is from the rural southwestern part of Iowa, "I'm willing to listen on 14(b)."

"If 14(b) doesn't pass," said another Democratic Representative, JOSEPH E. KARTH, of industrial St. Paul, "I'll take another look at the farm bill."

HANSEN of Iowa, a manufacturer of farm equipment, and KARTH, a former union representative, are two of the many Congressmen caught up in some of the most intensive lobbying of Capitol Hill this year.

Lobbyists for the Agriculture Department and liberal farm organizations like the National Farmers Union have joined with representatives of the AFL–CIO and other labor groups to try to form a farm-labor bloc to pass two of the most controversial bills before Congress.

The bills are farm measures extending cotton, wheat, and feed grain programs, and labor legislation repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, the section that permits States to outlaw the union shop.

As one Johnson administration lobbyist said, "When you get to a farm bill, there's trading all over the place."

This year, Capitol Hill sources pointed out, most of the trading involves the labor legislation.

The labor bill was approved by the House Education and Labor Committee last month, but the House Rules Committee has not yet set a date for a hearing to decide on how many hours the measure should be debated on the House floor.

The farm legislation is expected to be approved by the House Agriculture Committee today.

Tentative plans made by the House leadership call for consideration of the labor bill on the House floor during the week beginning July 26, with the farm legislation to follow some time in August.

But there is considerable debate among influential farm, labor, and administration lobbyists over whether the farm or labor legislation should come up first. Neither side seems to trust the other.

City Congressmen whose arms need to be twisted harder each year to get them to vote on farm legislation maintain that they want to see a labor bill come first for a change.

Representatives from predominantly rural areas are just as adamant in declaring that the farm bill must have priority.

The farm legislation is in particular touble this year not only because of the cost of the programs but also because of the increasing urban complexion of the House and charges that the legislation involves a "bread tax."

About half of the 71 new Democrats elected to the House last year are from districts where farming is still important while the other half are from city and suburban districts.

An administration lobbyist who is familiar with the thinking of the new Congressmen from the cities and suburbs said that many of them do not know whether they owe their election to President Johnson's coattails, the unpopularity of Barry Goldwater or to their own campaign.

So, the lobbyist added, these Representatives are not automatically predisposed to following the President on an issue as unpopular among urban voters as the farm program.

In addition, the new Democratic Representatives from the cities and suburbs do not have close ties built upon past favors owed the rural-dominated hierarchy of the House.

The city and suburban Congressmen are also being bombarded with letters opposing the farm bill. Most of the letters appear to have been inspired by large milling and baking companies that formed the Wheat Users Committee in June to fight the wheat program.

Members of Congress report that many of the letters are from employees of the companies. The two unions that represent bakery employees and the Teamsters Union were among the organizers of the Wheat Users Committee.

ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Margaret Price, Democratic national vice chairman and my long-time personal friend, paid a beautiful tribute to Adlai Stevenson, saying:

> With the death of Adlai Stevenson the world has lost one of the truly great spirits of this century, and I have lost a warm and beloved friend.
>
> I am sure I speak for the Democratic women of America when I recall the grace and dignity with which he wore his many robes in a lifetime of public service. As a great Governor of a great State, as a gallant standard bearer for his party, and as emissary to the United Nations in a time that tested the will of the strongest men and nations, he never failed to meet his own description of Eleanor Roosevelt—"she would rather light a candle than curse the darkness."
>
> The light he shed and the warmth of its glow should be a beacon and a comfort to those of us who share his dream of a world of freemen at peace with each other. He enriched everything he touched and he touched the world.
>
> If his life is to be given a meaning beyond its end, we must, all of us, construct a memorial of the bricks he so lovingly laid and build on the foundation of justice and brotherhood that was his life.
>
> His vision of man's destiny in a world without fear is his legacy. Senator EUGENE McCARTHY once said of him—"* * * this man has made us all proud to be Democrats." To which I would add—"this man has made us all proud to be Americans."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McGRATH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago, the most terrible war ever fought in the history of mankind came to an end. Despite the fact that this war was prosecuted by the United States to assure the continued existence as a free, democratic state of our Nation and of all nations, the sad fact is that today, two decades later, 100 million people in nine European nations are not free.

In Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Romania, these 100 million people live under Moscow-imposed Communist totalitarian regimes, robbed of the right of self-determination.

During this same 20-year period, numerous peoples of Africa and Asia have achieved nationhood, with full freedom of self-determination, and are now represented in the world council, the United Nations. Yet, the millions of formerly free people in the nine captive nations, many of whom still recall living in freedom, live under more oppressive regimes than did many of the African and Asian peoples now enjoying statehood.

It is especially significant that we pause to note the plight of those living under communism in the captive nations at this time, designated by President Johnson as Captive Nations Week. Communist regimes are today seeking by infiltration, subversion, and so-called wars of liberation to force their oppressive system upon still other nations. Yet they shrilly denounce the United States for alleged interference into the affairs of Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

While their denunciations din in our ears, it is well to remember that the captive European nations remain under alien rule, and despite some slight improvements of late, are still denied the enjoyment of fundamental human rights.

Mr. Speaker, it seems altogether fitting that, during Captive Nations Week, the United States rededicate itself to standing firm against any further inroads by communism on the people of the free world, and offer to the enslaved peoples of those captive nations renewed assurance that we are working unceasingly for a world based on freedom, justice, and peace for all people everywhere.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, this week we solemnly observe Captive Nations Week, an annual occasion authorized by Congress in July 1959. This is a time for sober reflection and a rededication to purpose. It is a time when we must renew our pledge to keep alive the ideals of freedom, democracy, and independence which still exist among those valiant people cut off from freedom by the totalitarian Iron Curtain.

Throughout their history, the countries of eastern Europe have suffered under the domination of foreign despots. For centuries, many of them have been partitioned time and time again by foreign authoritarian powers without regard to the feelings and wishes of the people. Following the First World War, these nations finally gained the long-denied right of independent statehood and sovereignty. Yet, only a short time later, they were dealt a cruel blow by having their freedom and independence usurped by the cancerous growth of world communism. The Soviet Union, by the force of arms as well as by conspiracy and subversion, imposed its will on these proud peoples.

Although these nations have been subjugated physically, we cannot but look with respect at their stoic determination to once again regain their freedom. Again and again they have rebelled against tyranny. The world has witnessed the courage and faith which these peoples have shown in the face of Soviet totalitarianism. Although their rebellions—in Poznan, in Budapest, in East Berlin and elsewhere—have been brutally crushed by superior force, they continue to demonstrate their persevering belief in freedom and national unity. Regardless of how hard Moscow has tried to dominate these peoples and to make them helpless pawns in their design, the free spirit of these nations could not be subdued permanently with armed force.

We have viewed with great alarm the steady growth of communism not only in Eastern Europe but in Africa, Asia, and Latin America as well. Mainland China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Cuba have fallen while other nations are increasingly threatened.

Mr. Speaker, not only during this special week but throughout the entire year we must keep the fire of freedom burning in the minds and spirits of the peoples of the captive nations of the world. We must let them know that they have our full moral support, that we shall resist further Communist aggression and at the same time help them to achieve their most cherished goals: freedom and independence.

I feel, however, that force must be given to this moral support and that definite action be taken to make known—clearly and fully—our desire to promote the return of the peoples of Eastern Europe and all other captive nations, to the state whereby they can freely determine their own social, political, and economic institutions. I have, therefore, introduced a resolution—House Resolution 484—which calls upon Congress to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I know how long and hard my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], had worked to make this committee a reality. It is with great pleasure that I join him and others in this great effort.

Among other tasks, this committee would study means by which the United States can assist the captive nations by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedom.

I believe that by this action, the peoples of the captive nations, as well as those of the free world, will fully comprehend our determination to aid all peoples living under fear and oppression.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART CXXXII

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns the effort to revitalize Paterson, N.J., and the lesson that effort contains for New York. It is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis" and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 23, 1965.

The article follows:

HOW BUSINESSMEN REVITALIZED PATERSON—A LESSON FOR NEW YORK CITY?

(By Barrett McGurn)

Paterson is the kind of place where a bar is likely to cover one-quarter of its front with the blunt, brash legend "68° cool inside."

New Jersey's third largest city, it has known family-run "cockroach" textile manufacturing shops, labor, and race riots, two-family frame houses occupied by nine families, boarding houses creeping into the best residential districts and—recently—a 6-percent decline in retail sales.

The latter helped trigger a businessman's revolt which promises to save this community as the hub of northern New Jersey commerce, a rebellion which illustrates what New York City's own businessman Committee of 14—now in formation—may be able to accomplish for a far larger New York City in crisis.

The Paterson fall-off in shop sales occurred between 1958 and 1964. Vast shopping centers had sprung up along the highways on the outskirts. People could park out there. Paint-peeled, skidding Paterson began to slip more rapidly. The English castle which Catholina Lambert had built in 1891 atop Garret Mountain as a monument to his own Paterson silk fortune looked no longer upon a city of bustling hope. Itself now a museum, it seemed as if it were doomed to ponder a town of what once had been.

A DEMOCRATIC BROOM

Then the turn came. One-party (Republican) control of city hall was upset. A Democratic new broom, wielded by young Francis Xavier Graves, Jr., a businessman, began sweeping clean, but everything, at first, was on a scattered project-by-project basis. The State's largest high school went up. Several high rises for the old were planned and, gradually, constructed. A $13 million series of residential towers were built with the help of two-thirds Federal financing. Victor Gruen and associates were hired for $35,000 to redesign the blighted 1-square-mile heart area of Paterson.

It was good, up to a point. But the downtown 77 acres were merely part of the Gruen-studied area. Would it get first priority as the money-generating heart of the city? Some young downtown businessmen were by no means sure of that. They raised an extra $20,000 for the Gruen peoples, and told them to use it just for study of the 77 acres. Whatever came out of it would be a free gift to the city as an amplification of the overall plan, they said.

That did it. The ingenious businessman-conceived tail soon wagged the dog. The city and the Federal Government agreed to take the 77 acres first as a $35 million three-quarter Federal urban renewal project in the core of downtown Paterson.

The businessmen called themselves PLAN (Paterson Looks Ahead Now). The mayor chose to join rather than fight them. He appointed eight of the PLAN group as his special citizens committee to get the $35 million project going. For the past year the eight have been hard put to it, running their own private store, manufacturing and banking businesses, while doing the city's work at the same time. They have had dramatic results.

One job was to convince the Federal Government to give an initial $18 million without a matching $6 million from Paterson. The city's bonding power was nil. Ingenious book juggling convinced Federal examiners that other do-good projects which Paterson has been managing over the years could be considered a $6 million counterpart.

WHICH TO ADMIT

Next it was necessary to get the owners of 15 percent of the 77-acre area to agree to demolition. By plot-switching, that was accomplished.

After that there was the problem of determining which companies and factories to admit to the refurbished central area and to an adjacent industrial park at Bunker Hill. The PLANners figured they would be over their heads handling that. They asked the Ford Foundation for a grant for the hiring of professional city planners, and the foundation gave up with the equivalent. It put the Paterson businessmen on to ACTION, an urban renewal study group, which has just received a Ford Foundation $500,000 allotment for the handling of just such crises. ACTION went to work in Paterson this week and the first of the new wave of businesses will begin getting land assignments August 1.

"Probably the most dramatic moment in the story was when Mayor Graves agreed to let ACTION move in to assign the redevelopment plots," Charles Jacobs, one of the PLANners, says.

"That was the test," he said. "The mayor showed that he was breaking with the old ways, that the project would not be turned over to politicians, that it would be kept in the hands of experts."

Mr. Jacobs, a young dry goods store operator, former Columbia Graduate School of Journalism student, is vice president of the businessmen's Committee of Eight.

With ACTION now getting to work assigning plots at the Bunker Hill industrial park and elsewhere, the Paterson reform is entering the stage of accomplishment. But even now the gradually mounting efforts of businessmen and a reform mayor have begun to show effects. On July 1 the new transcontinental highway 80 will open the section linking Paterson with the George Washington Bridge. It was thanks in large part to an older Paterson business group, known as Forward Paterson, that the 90-percent Federal-financed highway has curved within 5 blocks of the heart of Paterson. Eighty-seven percent of the thoroughfare's traffic along this section is expected to start or stop in this city.

WANTED: A HIGHWAY

Essentially the Gruen 77-acre plan is to refurbish the sick downtown area, providing garages for parking and, possibly, eventually shutting some streets off as pedestrian malls. What was needed as a topper, the businessmen felt, was a 50-mile-an-hour, 2½-mile peripheral highway linking four main arteries which parallel one another in the Paterson area. It would be an extension of New Jersey Route 20 and would run through all or part of 60 small riverbank factories. Estimated cost was $35 million. Earnest talk with the factory operators shifted the planned road slightly this way and that and finally produced an agreement. The first leg will be constructed 6 months from now. The State and Federal Governments are each paying half.

Paterson was a place where nobody invested any more. It was hard to realize that Alexander Hamilton as Secretary of the Treasury in 1791 had picked out this area of Passaic River waterfalls as the site for one of America's first alphabet do-good operations (the SUM, Society for Establishing Useful Manufactures). Textiles and silk had come and gone. There was a question about how long the present small plants and the 20-percent Negro and Puerto Rican population would be able to carry on. Police and fire costs were up. Assessed valuations were down. Even now joblessness is still 5.4 percent.

But the tide seems turned. Charles Jacobs has followed his own good civic example and, wearing his private hat, has invested in an escalator in his dry goods store, first of its kind in Paterson. Martin Sukenick, 48, treasurer of PLAN, and a member of the eight-man citizens group, has helped put an 8,500-foot extension on the bank of which he is vice president. Others are doing the same all around town. And new laws will catch the laggards. Paterson has proved that a crisis city which wishes to do so can help itself.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART CXXXIII

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns the proposed civilian police review board and is part of the series on 'New York City in Crisis." It appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on May 24, 1965.

The article follows:

POVERTY OFFICIAL'S REQUEST: PUT MINORITIES ON POLICE REVIEW BOARD

The head of Mayor Wagner's council against poverty favors a civilian board which would include at least one Negro and one Puerto Rican to hear allegations of police brutality in the city.

Dr. Arthur Courtney Logan, former chairman of HAR-YOU-ACT, said yesterday on the "Page One" show telecast by WABC–TV that any review board "independent of the control of the police department is basically sound." He did not endorse specifically the plan advanced by Representative JOHN LINDSAY last week nor any other of several different proposals.

He told reporters later, however, that something must be done to improve the picture of the police in the minds of most of the Negro and Puerto Rican population. A review board completely divorced from politics or any direct connection with city agencies would go far toward accomplishment of this end, he said.

He agreed that such a body would have to be appointed by the mayor but suggested that any possible "taint" would be removed by the naming of such men as A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

Dr. Logan said also that there is "not enough representation of the poor" on the Council Against Poverty as constituted in the mayor's executive order issued today. He said that he has urged more membership from the "target population" and was confident that the number will increase as time goes on.

He said that he was "firmly convinced" of the city administration's desire that all elements concerned should have a say in the antipoverty program.

Dr. Logan was reminded of widespread criticism of the fact that some 40 percent of all money available for the war against poverty is going for salaries.

He defended this on the ground that most of it is to be paid to "block workers" recruited from among the poor people for whose benefit the program was devised. He pointed out that most of these workers are nonprofessionals. Their own economic status is improved because they are working regularly. At the same time, they are exactly the ones to arouse their neighbors from apathy and convince them that their lot is not hopeless after all.

THE HONORABLE EUGENE M. ZUCKERT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LOVE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay special tribute to the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert who, as Secretary of the Air Force for the past 4½ years, has helped lead our country many steps forward in this age of space.

I know of no man more diligent in his work. He has served longer as Secretary of the Air Force than any other man in history. Since 1961, he has pushed forward a strategic and tactical revolution in our offensive area. There has been a great improvement in missile accuracy as well as a hardening of missiles. Bombers have become more effective due to better disbursement and more flexibility. Our airlift capacity has increased 200 percent since 1961. All this has been accomplished under his leadership.

Secretary Zuckert is best known as a manager. He set up the Designated Systems Management Group in the Air Force which has for its prime objective to spot problems before they develop. Through his management, there has been a great reduction in Air Force expenditures and a greater degree of teamwork with the other services.

For this dedication and leadership, I would like to extend my personal thanks to this outstanding public servant.

MIGRATORY FARM LABOR

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an editorial in the New York Times of July 18, 1965 entitled, "Better Day for the Migrant," which calls attention to a matter in which I am deeply interested; that is, the welfare of the migratory American farm laborer.

The article follows:

BETTER DAY FOR THE MIGRANT

More than a half-year has passed since Congress cut off the mass inflow of foreign labor willing to work at starvation wages to harvest American crops. Despite continued expressions of anguish from many large farmowners, the transition to total reliance on domestic workers has been encouraging. Only 1,500 foreign workers are now engaged in offsetting local labor shortages on American farms, compared with more than 54,000 at the same time last year.

A sterner test may come in September and October; but thus far the evidence is strong that the Nation's food needs can be well met without reopening the flood gates for low-cost labor from Mexico, the West Indies and other areas. Secretary of Labor Wirtz deserves credit for his refusal, under incessant political pressure, to yield to the warnings of disaster with which California growers bombarded him. He stood courageously on the principle that enough domestic labor would be found if wages and living conditions for fieldworkers were brought up to a level of decency.

The interesting fact is not only that he has been proved right on this score but also that fruit and vegetable prices have not skyrocketed as a result of the bettered labor standards. A Labor Department survey over the past 9 weeks indicates that most farm products have been selling in the wholesale market at prices below those of 1964. The spread between what the housewife pays and what it costs to pick most fruits and vegetables is so great that even a doubling of farm wages would have only a slight direct impact on market-basket prices.

The need now is to extend to migratory American farm laborers some of the protections that are basic for virtually all other American workers. Mr. Wirtz has told a Senate subcommittee of his strong personal support for the inclusion of farmworkers under both the Federal minimum wage and the statutory guarantees of freedom to bargain collectively. But he emphasized that there was no official administration position in favor of either of these highly salutary objectives. There ought to be.

A nation dedicated to abolishing poverty cannot continue to neglect the most elementary rights of the most deprived group in its work force.

Mr. Speaker, those who for 15 years have exploited the bracero program under which millions of migratory workers were imported from abroad, still have not given up their fight, although Congress has ruled decisively that the practice must terminate. Corporate agricultural interests cite section 214 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to justify their designs. It is true that this section presents the appearance of a loophole in the legislation, although the intent of Congress is clear. To end this equivocation, I have introduced H.R. 8313, which states:

> Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing the importation of any alien as a nonimmigrant * * * for the purpose of employing the alien in the production of agricultural commodities and products.

I urge the support of my amendment. Unless my amendment is passed, I fear the agricultural interests which seek to exploit foreign labor will not be stilled. Until such exploitation is ended, once and for all, it will be difficult to get on with plans to improve the wages and working conditions of American migratory farmworkers, which is the real objective of Congress.

ADLAI E. STEVENSON

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the entire world, no less than the United States, has lost a great champion in the death of Adlai E. Stevenson.

Adlai Stevenson was the finest embodiment of the American sense of responsibility toward all peoples. He never faltered in the quest for peace. His warm, humanitarian spirit was ever seeking answers to the problems of disease, poverty, illiteracy, and hunger. His long and distinguished career was devoted in the first instance to the citizens of the United States, but Adlai Stevenson never forgot for a moment that Americans are part of a world community. In his service as the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, he won the unparalleled confidence of friend, neutral and foe. Adlai Stevenson, by the force of circumstances, was deprived of giving his fullest capacities to this Nation, but of how many can it truly be said, as it can be of him, that the world is better for his having lived among us?

Adlai Stevenson had qualities of character that the finest eulogist is inadequate to describe. He had intellect and judgment, eloquence and style, kindness and grace. In death he will be missed by us all. I convey my deep sympathy to his family, while noting that he is sincerely mourned everywhere.

TEXANA: ED CLARK DONATES SOUTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY VALUABLE COLLECTION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Edward Clark, Austin, Tex., Ambassador Designate to Australia, is an eminent lawyer and scholar and civic leader. In addition, he is a great book collector, particularly on subjects pertaining to the Southwest.

Recently, Mr. Clark donated his valuable Texana collection of some 2,400 volumes to Southwestern University in Georgetown, Tex., his original alma mater for whom he has done so much over the years. Southwestern University is one of the great Methodist universities in our State.

Recently, a story about this collection of Texana appeared in the Austin American as follows:

[From the Austin American, July 15, 1965]

Texana: Ed Clark Giving Southwestern University Valuable Collection

Edward Clark, the newly appointed U.S. Ambassador to Australia, will give his valuable collection of Texana, more than 2,400 volumes, to Southwestern University in Georgetown.

Clark announced the permanent home of the collection Wednesday through Dr. H. Bailey Carroll, University of Texas history professor and the outstanding authority on books about Texas. Dr. Carroll has advised Clark in the finding and purchase of the volumes.

The Clark collection is one of the two greatest such collections in private hands. The other belongs to Cooper K. Ragan of Houston.

It was about a dozen years ago while Clark's daughter Leila was studying Texas history at UT that Clark became seriously interested in collecting Texana.

Southwestern was chosen by Clark because of his strong emotional ties with the university, extending back to the days when he was an undergraduate there.

The collection will be housed in a room in the new library addition under construction.

Weighing heavily in Clark's decision is Southwestern's strong Texas history studies program.

"The history department at the university in Georgetown is an excellent department, and we are certain both students and faculty will make creative use of these books," said Dr. Carroll.

The Clark home is absolutely full of books, with some volumes resting on the stairways, and a special section of the law offices of Clark, Thomas, Harris, Dennis & Winters in the Capital National Bank Building is devoted to Texas books.

"There isn't a stray in the collection," Dr. Carroll said. "It is absolutely pure—contains nothing but Texana, and each volume was carefully selected."

While no careful appraisal has been made of the value of the books, Dr. Carroll estimates—and he emphasizes that this is a conservative estimate—that the collection is worth more than $50,000.

The Clark Texana collection may weigh a bit heavier in biography than in other fields. It includes a virtually complete gathering of the biographies of the President of the Republic of Texas and Governors.

It also includes the good biographies of other outstanding Texans.

The Ambassador has also been interested in acquiring materials about early peace officers and badmen.

"There is a nice amount of county history," pointed out Dr. Carroll, who added that east Texas, Clark's home country, is more heavily represented. While the serious collection of books by Clark is a recent hobby, his interest in history runs back to his boyhood in San Augustine.

Among the rarest and most expensive items are a group of immigrant guides put out in the various European languages during the peak of the great era of immigration to Texas—during the days of the Swante Palms.

Not only does Clark follow the New York book auctions and the rare book catalogs to pick up missing pieces of Texana, he reads the books.

"He's as interested in reading a book at home as he is in reading a brief at the office," Dr. Carroll said.

Since the Australian appointment came up, Clark has become interested in Australian history and especially in Australia's "Out back"—the Australian frontier, which reminds Clark of his own Texas and American West frontier.

The giving of the collection to Southwestern doesn't end Clark's interest in Texana. He has promised Southwestern that he will continue to add to the collection the rest of his life.

"Book collecting is like a drug," Dr. Carroll summed up. "There's no cure."

THE U.N. AND VIETNAM

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, many of us believe that the United Nations has a constructive role to play in Vietnam.

But before it can play such a role there, or anywhere, it must be put back on its feet. The present deadlock over assessments for past peacekeeping operations which has paralyzed the United Nations must be resolved. This in turn will require that Congress act as soon as possible to amend the concurrent resolution adopted last August which requires the U.S. representative at the United Nations to seek a showdown.

In an article in the current issue of Commonweal magazine, I attempt to set forth why Congress should modify its position on the application of article 19 and seek to create a United Nations presence in Vietnam. The text of the article follows:

The U.N. and Vietnam

Despite the natural tendency to back the Government's policy in times of foreign difficulty, many Americans are troubled about our role in Vietnam. True, few want to pull out and leave the 16 million South Vietnamese to Communist rule by force and terror. Rather, it is the manner in which the United States has engaged itself in Vietnam that produces the uneasiness.

The United States has acted unilaterally. It is a western, and largely white nation, virtually going it alone in southeast Asia in a war which is not manifestly, or wholly, a war against foreign aggression. The United States has placed itself in a position much too reminiscent of the French in their ill-considered effort to recolonize Indo-China after World War II.

Communist China is not directly involved in the conflict, and North Vietnam does its best to disguise and deny its involvement. On the other hand, the growing U.S. participation in what many Asians and others regard as primarily a Vietnamese civil war tends to excite fears of American imperialism and to corroborate China's claim to be the champion of national liberation in Asia.

American leaders have continually pledged devotion to the United Nations as mankind's best hope of preserving peace. Yet we have signally failed to prove this devotion in southeast Asia.

In bypassing the United Nations, we are not only depriving ourselves of an opportunity to strengthen the moral, political, and military basis of our effort to preserve freedom of choice for the South Vietnamese. We are also exhibiting disrespect for the United Nations and are violating the letter as well as the spirit of its charter, thereby undermining the peacekeeping capacity of the United Nations.

The primary purpose of the United Nations, as set forth in article I of the charter, is "to maintain international peace and security, and to that end to take effective collective measures for the preservation and removal of threats to the peace * * *." By ignoring the United Nations in our Vietnam policy, we frustrate this purpose.

More specifically, article 37 of the charter provides that the parties to any dispute which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security "shall refer it to the Security Council" if they fail to settle it by negotiation or other peaceful means. And if a veto blocks action by the Security Council, the General Assembly is empowered to take charge and make recommendations under the "uniting for peace" resolution.

The United Nations has acted honorably and effectively to help restore peace in other international conflicts, notably in Korea, the Middle East, the Congo, and Cyprus.

There are obvious difficulties and limitations for the United Nations in any conflict involving great powers. But great powers are no more exempt from the charter than small nations. In the Korean invasion, the United Nations acted against North Korea, the agent of the Soviet Union. In the Middle East, the world organization embarked on peace-restoring efforts over the opposition of two permanent members of the Security Council, the United Kingdom and France.

But prior to President Johnson's speech at San Francisco on June 25, spokesmen for the administration consistently deprecated all suggestions that the United Nations should play a major peace-restoring rule in southeast Asia. They advanced three main arguments against a United Nations presence.

First, it was said that the U.N. could not play a useful role unless North Vietnam and Communist China agreed. This they obviously were not doing. North Vietnam's denial of the Security Council's competence to consider the Tonkin Gulf incidents last summer, and Peiping radio's condemnation of U.N. meddling were cited as evidence that the two Communist nations would not agree to a U.N. presence.

But the point is that their agreement is unnecessary. The idea that the criminal must assent to being restrained and hauled before the bar is as absurd in international peacekeeping as it would be in domestic law-enforcement. The United Nations did not seek the agreement of the North Korean aggressors before it acted in 1950. The existence or lack of North Vietnamese and Chinese acceptance of a U.N. role affects the manner in which the U.N. can operate, but it surely does not prevent it from operating.

It is equally irrelevant that neither North Vietnam nor Communist China is a member of the U.N. Article 2 of the Charter provides that "The Organization shall insure that states which are not members of the United Nations act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security."

A second argument against bringing the Vietnamese conflict before the United Nations is that to do so might force the Soviet Union into a vigorous defense of North Vietnam and China. Not only might this prevent a possibly useful Soviet role as a behind-the-scenes negotiator in southeast Asia; worse, it might harden up the entire post-Stalin softer Soviet line.

In truth, the Soviet Union has been subjected to very conflicting pressures over Southeast Asia. On the one hand, it has no desire to become involved in the risk of a mutually disastrous nuclear exchange with the United States over South Vietnam. On the other hand, it must publicly take an anti-U.S. position or court further erosion of its leadership position in the Communist world. Most likely, invoking the United Nations in Vietnam would have little effect on the Soviet Union's position. She would continue to fulminate publicly against the United States. But it is by no means clear that she would vote or act against a U.S. position which was genuinely retricted to preventing the subjugation of South Vietnam by force.

A third argument is that if the Vietnam issue were brought before the U.N., U.S. policy would come in for sweeping and damaging criticism. Too many nations, it is said, regard the Vietnman conflict not as aggression but as a conflict among two segments of the Vietnamese people.

The existence of such sentiments among the countries of the free world is, in fact, an argument for taking the Vietnam conflict before the United Nations. The United States should not and need not fear debate or the exposure of the facts. By ignoring the U.N. and avoiding debate, we allow suspicions and doubts about our policies and motives to grow. By going before the U.N., we can make our point that what is at stake is the independence of small nations.

The General Assembly should respond to such an appeal. As Dag Hammarskjold observed, it is not primarily the great powers who have need of the United Nations' capacity to protect national security. They can take care of themselves. It is the small and weak that benefit most. And these nations, I think, if squarely presented with the question, will be unwilling to see the United Nations stand by idly while a small Asian nation is undermined and engulfed.

If the United Nations takes jurisdiction over the threat to world peace which exists in southeast Asia, as the letter of the charter provides, the United States will be better off no matter what the result. We will be better off because we will have shown that our words of devotion to the U.N. are meaningful.

In short, if the United States will adopt in the U.N. a substantive position which stresses that our opposition is to violent change of Government in South Vietnam (not to peaceable change brought about by U.N.-supervised free elections there), and if we present our case plainly and well, we stand to gain from U.N. debate much more than we stand to lose.

For the past year and more, a number of voices in Congress and in the country have been urging that the United Nations be brought into the Vietnam conflict. Senators CHURCH, of Idaho, MORSE, of Oregon, and GRUENING, of Alaska, have spoken up in the Senate. I have taken a similar position in the House. Thoughtful students of international affairs such as Benjamin Cohen, former counselor of the State Department and member of the U.S. delegation to the U.N. have sounded the call for a U.N. presence in Vietnam. Last month the Democratic Party of Wisconsin in its annual convention at Green Bay unanimously adopted a plank urging that "the United Nations be called upon to provide a presence in southeast Asia, in order to pacify the area, conduct free elections, and sponsor its economic development."

Happily, President Johnson appears to have rejected the keep-the-U.N.-out school of thought in his speech commemorating the 20th anniversary of the United Nations on June 25 at San Francisco:

"I put to this world assembly the facts of aggression, the right of a people to be free from attack, the interest of every member in safety against molestation, the duty of this organization to reduce the dangers to peace, and the unhesitating readiness of the United States to find a peaceful solution.

"I call upon this gathering of the nations of the world to use their influence, individually and collectively, to bring to the tables those who seem determined to make war. We will support your efforts, as we will support effective action by any agent or agency of these United Nations."

Those are fine words and a great step forward. But the speech was significant also for what the President did not say.

Two other things must be said, sooner or later: how the paralysis of the United Nations over the financial question can be resolved so that the U.N. can again act for world peace when it is called upon, and how the Vietnamese conflict is to be brought before the world organization.

The real barrier to United Nations action in southeast Asia at this time is the financial question which has turned the General Assembly into a mere debating society, incapable of action and one step ahead of bankruptcy.

The Soviet Union has refused to pay its assessments for the United Nations peacekeeping operations in the Middle East and in the Congo. France has refused to pay anything for the Congo operation, although it supported the Middle East force, even making voluntary contributions.

The Soviet contention is that the assessments are illegal since both operations were authorized by the General Assembly and, in their view, this power is reserved to the Security Council under the charter. The French argue that the General Assembly resolutions on financing are merely recommendatory.

An opinion of the International Court of Justice, which held that the assessments for the two peace-keeping operations were "expenses of the organization" and therefore obligatory, has failed to shake the French and Soviet positions.

By the opening of the 19th General Assembly last December, both France and the Soviet Union owed more than 2 years' assessments and, under article 19, were subject to the loss of their votes in the General Assembly.

The United States was ready to invoke article 19. Congress, with administration encouragement, had passed a concurrent resolution in August 1964, calling on the permanent U.S. delegate to the U.N. to "make every effort to assure invocation of article 19."

Russia threatened to withdraw if deprived of its vote, and there was a good chance that France would do likewise, thus raising the specter of the United Nations going the way of the League of Nations.

The result, during the 19th General Assembly, was paralysis. A clear majority of nations was determined to avoid at all costs a vote that threatened to result in a disastrous showdown. They were afraid either to apply article 19 or not to apply it, afraid of ousting Russia or of grievously offending the United States. So the world organization, set up to be an effective instrument to preserve the peace, dragged along in tragicomedy.

To make an unavoidable decision between two contenders for a seat on the Security Council, the president of the Assembly held "consultations" in his office. "We go into the back room and vote and then say we have not voted," one delegate remarked. But this discreditable device would not work for the long agenda of items from a troubled world before the Assembly.

A special peace-keeping committee set up to solve the problem before the convening of the 20th General Assembly in September has done no better than the Assembly itself in breaking the impasse. A June 15 deadline for some resolution came and went.

By now it should be clear that the United Nations cannot gain by a confrontation that will result either in our defeat or in the withdrawal of the Soviet Union and France from the world organization.

The United States should take the initiative in revitalizing the United Nations, based on the reality that as of today the major sovereign states simply will not be compelled to pay for peace-keeping operations which they consider harmful to their best interests. The United States should support the proposition that future peace-keeping operations be financed by voluntary contributions. In fact, only the Congo and Middle East operations have been financed by the involuntary assessments that are at the center of the current controversy. More than a dozen U.N. peace-keeping operations, including those in Korea and Cyprus, have been financed by other means. As for the past, the United States, while remaining zealous to invoke article 19 against countries in arrears on their regular U.N. dues, should not press article 19 on the Middle East and Congo special assessments.

If the 20th General Assembly is to be saved from the debilitating fate of its predecessor, the United States must act in the few weeks remaining before the Assembly convenes and Congress adjourns. Congress has to clear the way by passing a new resolution modifying Congress' injunction of last August to seek the application of article 19. A new resolution, such as I introduced in April, should provide merely that the United States continue efforts to obtain the payment of arrears by negotiation, with the hope that some scheme of voluntary contributions will prove acceptable once the attempt to require payment is abandoned.

With the United Nations revivified, the way will be open for the Vietnam conflict to be brought before it. President Johnson has already declared our willingness to support any U.N. action. There remains the question of who will initiate the consideration of such action.

I would hope that one of the small powers which have the most to gain from the strengthening of U.N. security operations—an Ireland, Austria, Israel, or Costa Rica—would take the lead. If not, I believe the United States itself must raise the matter before the U.N. A U.N. peacekeeping operation authorized by the General Assembly can be supported by the voluntary contributions of willing members, according to the Korean precedent.

The precise form of the U.N. operation will depend upon the circumstances at the time and the response of the North Vietnamese and their Chinese backers. Action by the United Nations calling for a cease-fire and negotiations, either at a reconvened Geneva conference or in a new setting, is a first step. The United States must assert its willingnes to abide by a properly supervised cease-fire. If the Communists refuse such a cease-fire, a U.N. peacekeeping force should be stationed both on South Vietnam's borders to prevent further infitration of men and arms from the North, and within South Vietnam itself. Undoubtedly, the United States would have to supply the lion's share of the troops and money for the operation, as in Korea. But we would still benefit, since our costs would be less than if we continue to act virtually unilaterally, and since the force would be operating under the moral umbrella of the United Nations.

As pacification of South Vietnam progressed, the United Nations would be in a far better position than the United States to assist in the development of the country without any stigma of colonialism and to supervise an eventual plebiscite in which the people of South Vietnam could freely choose their own form of government. For our part, we would have to announce our readiness to abide by that result even if it might mean the submersion of South Vietnam into North Vietnam.

Bringing the United Nations into Vietnam is not a cure-all or an easy solution. As the mainstay of a U.N. operation, the United States will continue to be confronted with hard tasks in Vietnam. But invoking the

U.N. would strengthen our military, moral, and political posture in southeast Asia and help build the peacekeeping precedents of the U.N.

There is much to be done after San Francisco. But the foundation is laid.

TRIBUTE TO ADLAI STEVENSON BY RICHARD N. GOODWIN, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, these past few days many of us have voiced with heavy hearts our respect and our affection for Adlai E. Stevenson.

A moving tribute to Governor Stevenson and analysis of his role in American life, written by Richard N. Goodwin, Special Assistant to President Johnson, appeared in the Washington Post on July 18, 1965. Mr. Goodwin is himself a splendid example of the generation of young Americans who were inspired by Governor Stevenson to go into public service.

The text of Mr. Goodwin's article follows:

HE NEVER LEARNED TO HIDE HIS SOUL

> "We shall not come again
> We never shall come back again
> But over us all, over us all,
> Over us all is—something."
>
> —THOMAS WOLFE.

(By Richard N. Goodwin)

Twice he had come as close as a man could come to leadership of the American Nation. Yet no one noticed as, for a moment, Adlai Stevenson looked toward the caped statue of Franklin Roosevelt, walked a few hundred yards, grasped the thin steel columns of a sidewalk railing, and died.

Questions of man's survival, of war, and of human progress had very nearly rested on the qualities of his personal mind and will. The destiny of every man and woman he passed that afternoon was almost placed in his hand. Yet no one cheered or waved or even turned to stare.

For he had escaped power. And for a politician, power is the tool which etches out one man's figure from among his companions.

IMPRESSIVE QUALITIES

Would he have been a good leader of his country, or a great one? We will never know. Many deny it. And they give reasons which start to persuade, until we remember that they—or their counterparts in other years—had said the same of past leaders such as John Kennedy and Franklin Roosevelt and, most violently, of Abraham Lincoln.

The fact is no man who has not been President can survive analysis of his capacity for the task. Nor can we predict his qualities until they pass through the purification of power and responsibility. We do know he had more promise than most. We do know the impressive qualities of mind and spirit his career permitted him to reveal. We also know he was ambitious. For you do not run for President unless your ambitions are greater than those of other men.

Was that ambition tinged with self-doubt? It is for every man except the very dangerous. Did he have the courage of decision? His own words, public and in private conversation, cloud judgment. But perhaps they only mask the fact that never in his public life did he fail to decide when it was time to decide; except in 1960 when the shameful prospect of leading his party to a third defeat postponed judgment beyond the reach of action.

Where public issues were concerned he spoke—on the platform and in the meeting room—with a clarity of conviction few had courage to match. And on this question the judgment of those who knew him is disfigured by the tortured musings of a man who had never quite learned the trick of hiding his soul; whose confidence had been twisted and battered by defeat and by the indifference and contempt of lesser men, which finally killed him.

He was not, as some have said, marked by fate for failure. He was the victim of less mystical forces: bad luck; poor timing, unfortunate issues, a party too long in office, and an opponent who could not be defeated. Had 6 percent of American voters switched to him in 1952 then all the hesitation and humility would today be regarded as the skillful genius of a master politician.

So we do not know, and will never know, if Adlai Stevenson would have been a good President of the United States. But we must be reluctant to believe that the judgment of so many who had desired his victory so furiously could have been so wrong.

Great men of affairs are either kings or prophets. Very few are both. And honor comes more reluctantly to prophets because they touch us more deeply. Adlai Stevenson never became a king, but he was a prophet. Death is already beginning to dissolve the masks of public failure and private personality which hide that recognition. It will become clearer as the self-justifying commentaries of those who scorned him in life begin to fade.

SEED ON UNPLOWED GROUND

I knew Adlai Stevenson as a colleague in my work for President Kennedy and, more recently for President Johnson. Both valued him most highly. Both had worked for his election to the office which they, not he, were to hold. Both knew, as others did not, what it took to bare yourself—ambitions and hopes—to the faithful, the indifferent, and the hostile alike.

Many others in Washington, in these years, looked at him with a certain condescension. At times, thankfully only a few times, my own instinct was submerged in the need to be fashionable. But Adlai Stevenson will be mourned more deeply and remembered longer than any of these. It is not that millions loved him and millions more admired him because they did not know him. It is that closeness and ambition, envy and rivalry obscure the heart's truth. Yet that is the truth that finally matters; which selects the man from among the shadows, sadly past the hour when recognition might bring personal joy.

But though I knew him and admired him, opposed him in 1960 and occasionally worked with him thereafter, many can speak far more intimately than I.

I remember best the Adlai Stevenson I never knew, when the world was young and the ringing phrases tumbled like the sowers seed on the unplowed ground.

In the fall of 1952 I was a senior in college in Massachusetts. John Kennedy was a young Congressman I had never met now running for the Senate. And Lyndon Johnson was the uncertainly familiar name of a Senator from Texas.

But Adlai Stevenson was my hero and my leader and my candidate for President of the United States. I never met him or even saw him nor had I read the carefully crafted texts of his speeches. But something was in the air. My tiny world suddenly seemed to widen. Events and the course of history were drifting back within the reach of a man's skill and brains. The pursuit of power, and its use, were not solely the object of greed and "vaulting ambition" but infused with service and nobility and the love of others.

It wasn't that he talked sense or spoke the truth harshly. It was the more profound act of telling us—my generation—what we knew but didn't realize. He revealed a world we already sensed was there, bared challenges we were aching to undertake. The words were the words of sacrifice but the music sang of meaning and purpose to a young man.

As much as any, he was the end of postwar America and the beginning of a time still nameless. We knew and still repeated the old political phrases and the outworn battle cries. But we did not understand them because the lines had been drawn in a different war, and it was not our war. Now finally, there was a language we could understand and make our own.

THE ELEVATED INTELLIGENCE

Eight dreary, near-tragic, years were to pass before that prophesy was to be fulfilled by different men. It is hard to overstate the extent to which he helped shape the dialog, and hence the purposes, of the New Frontier and then the Great Society. He dissolved the old, unserviceable simplicities and taught us to apply to the world the complex wisdom we have used so triumphantly in the affairs of our Nation: We could seek peace while resisting danger. Everyone who was not a friend was not an enemy. Agreement and accommodation could come from self-confidence as well as fear. By helping others we could strengthen ourselves. Particular problems could be resolved, but we must learn to live for generations with a troubled world. The contest was not simply between our system and communism, but between those who found security in dominion and those who found it in a world of strong and diverse lands.

And all these principles, and many more he suffused with another welcome and shining truth: the pursuit of national self-interest was not inconsistent with the desire for justice and dignity and well-being for all the people of the world—that there was no basic unresolvable contradiction between realistic policies and high ideals.

To our domestic problems he brought the same elevated and critical intelligence. He told us our sights were too low, the course we had charted too narrow. In every area of our national life we not only could do more than we were doing but more than we thought. And he taught that wealth was not excellence, power was not greatness, the pursuit of abundance was not the pursuit of happiness.

After he spoke, no leader of his party nor the dialog of democracy itself, would ever sound the same again. He was eloquent and acclaimed for eloquence, but finally it was not how he spoke but what he said that mattered. Others would bring new accents and perhaps even greater powers to leadership. But it had all begun in Springfield, Ill., in that hopeful dawn year of 1952.

CITIZEN-POLITICAN CREATED

The most far-sighted policies molder and dissolve, lose content and direction, in the hands of the mediocre and the indifferent. The Nation rests on the quality of its public men, and they in turn are shaped by the quality of American politics. Adlai Stevenson brought many individuals into government who have enriched the administrations of President Kennedy and President Johnson. But this is the least of it. More than any man, he created the citizen-politician. He told an entire generation there was room for intelligence and idealism in public life, that politics was not just a way to live but a way to live greatly, that each of us might share in the passions of the age.

My first experience in national politics was in an overflowing, chaotic room of the volunteers for Stevenson. Many thousands had the same initiation. Today, the citizens groups, the volunteers, the clubs to discuss issues and the clubs to reform politics, are a force which every politician must confront, and which the best will welcome. Thus, he changed the face of American politics; enriching the democracy, providing a base on which talent could aspire to power, opening a gateway to public life through which many who never heard his voice will someday enter.

All these—ideas and men—are contributions to be remembered. But there was something more to Adlai Stevenson, a quality that resists thought and language alike. For none of this explains the fierce desire millions brought to his cause, the disappointed tears of many who never knew him, the deep impulse which could make even experienced politicians forget commitment and interest alike to be at his side.

It was not the first time we have seen this quality, nor the last. But how rare it is in those who find their way to power.

Part of it was in his lesson. It was not a new lesson. It runs like a vein of light through the dark history of the race. It suffuses the religion and beliefs of every people. It says that man is more than the sum of his needs and desires and fears. It ennobles those who look beyond their own interest to great principle. It acclaims, not wealth and power, but the charity of the spirit and the reach of the heart.

LOVE FELT BY MILLIONS

This is what he wanted for the American people. And although we may never be equal to it, many loved him for thinking we could.

The rest was the man himself. You did not need to know him to feel it, although knowing brought confirmation. There was a gentleness, a spaciousness of sensibility, a love which in unseen ways was felt by millions. He could laugh and be cynical. If he read these words he would joke about them and he would deride this writing with soft self-deprecation. But all the wonderful humor, the urbanity, the captiousness was, in large part, a mask to protect himself from a world which so easily confused humility with weakness, sentiment with unreality, amplitude of understanding with failure of will. Many who met him were fooled. Millions who never met him, knew the truth.

This is the secret of today's mourning and to his place in the play of passion clothed in fact which is history. People return what they receive. They believe in the man who believed in them and thus made them believe in themselves. They love the man who loved them and thus let them love themselves a little more. They honor the leader who told them they were better than they were and, in so doing, made it so.

He has often been compared to Hamlet. And those who make the comparison do so as a metaphor of irresolution. Hamlet is the story of a man who tries to understand and reach for certainty before he strikes. But he does strike; and for justice loses kingship and life while the election lights on a young and valiant captain.

Our judgment must echo Shakespeare's own when the new king stands beside Hamlet's body, saying:

> "Let four captains
> Bear Hamlet, like a soldier, to the stage;
> For he was likely, had he been put on,
> To have prov'd most royally. . . ."

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S TEACHER BILL MESSAGE OF JULY 17, 1965, GIVES BOOST TO TEACHER FELLOWSHIP AND TEACHER CORPS BILLS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased indeed to have been present at the White House last Saturday, July 17, 1965, to hear President Johnson make his eloquent statement urging Congress to enact into law during this session legislation to improve the quality of the elementary and secondary school teachers of our country.

It was of course gratifying to hear the President speak of the efforts of the distinguished chairman of the General Education Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] and my own efforts in drafting and sponsoring legislation to authorize both a teacher fellowship program and a national teacher corps.

Mr. PERKINS has introduced both a teacher fellowship bill (H.R. 7309) and a teacher corps bill (H.R. 9833), and I have introduced a teacher fellowship bill (H.R. 9627). Our General Education Subcommittee has for the last several days been conducting hearings on both these proposals. We have been most encouraged by the strong support which has been evidenced for these measures from many groups and from outstanding educators.

President Johnson's proposed Teaching Professions Act of 1965 contains three major provisions, two of which, the teacher fellowship and teacher corps programs, are directly based on the bills we have been considering in our subcommittee and which, in the Senate, are now under consideration by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee as proposed titles to the Higher Education Act of 1965.

The principal sponsor of the teacher fellowship bill in the other body is the distinguished Senior Senator from Oregon, Senator WAYNE MORSE, while the chief advocates of the national teacher corps bill are the distinguished junior Senators from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, and Wisconsin, Senator NELSON. Indeed, Senator NELSON testified last week on these measures before our General Education Subcommittee.

In order to enable the General Education Subcommittee to continue its consideration of the teacher fellowship and teacher corps proposals on which we have been working, Congressman PERKINS has today introduced the administration version of these measures.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that our subcommittee will be able to blend the best in the President's proposals with the best in ours to develop a bill that will help produce the best possible schoolteachers for America's children.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of President Johnson's White House statement of July 17, 1965. Let me do so with the observation that the President's sense of urgency about the congressional action on this legislation during this session of Congress was demonstrated by his interpolating, with great emphasis, the words, "now—now," toward the end of his prepared remarks so that, as delivered, they read:

> I am calling upon the Congress to make this beginning now—now, even though it is well along in its present session.

The statement by President Johnson, July 17, 1965, follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Like many of my fellow Americans, I believe that this land's most noble enterprise is the work of education; that, in our Nation's classrooms, our future is being built. And I believe that the chief architects of that future are the teachers of America.

Today I have completed work upon a legislative proposal which is a testament to those beliefs: the Teaching Professions Act of 1965. It is now on its way to the Congress.

Today in the United States there are 1,800,000 teachers in elementary and secondary schools. By this fall we will need 193,000 new teachers merely to accommodate growing enrollments and to replace teachers who retire and leave the profession. We will need nearly 2 million new teachers in the next 10 years.

Yet our needs cannot be expressed in numbers. Tomorrow's teachers must not merely be plentiful enough; they must be good enough. They must possess not only the old virtues of energy and dedication, but new knowdelge and new skill. And if we are to have the best available teachers, we must attract to teaching the best available students.

Today almost 5 percent of our teachers—85,000—lack adequate certification. Almost 10 percent have less than a bachelor's degree; only 25 percent have a master's degree.

Our Nation, whose needs are so immense and whose wealth is so great, can do better. We must do better. And this act offers a way to begin.

The Teaching Professions Act of 1965 will establish, first, a National Teacher Corps. Members of the Corps—experienced teachers and students who plan to make teaching a career—would go together to the city slums and to rural areas of poverty to offer what these troubled regions need most: light and learning; help—and hope.

Second, the act will create a program of fellowships to prepare superior students for teaching careers in elementary and secondary schools and to help teachers renew their knowledge and skills. The Federal Government already assists men and women making their careers in college teaching. Now is the time to do the same for those who serve at the elementary and secondary school levels.

Finally, this act will provide direct assistance to institutions of higher learning so that they may develop better programs for teacher education.

The Teaching Professions Act of 1965 is a composite of hard thinking about educational problems in the Congress, in the executive branch, and in the teaching profession. It owes much to the proposals of Senators GAYLORD NELSON and EDWARD KENNEDY for a National Teacher Corps; to Senators WAYNE MORSE and CLIFFORD CASE, and Representatives CARL PERKINS and JOHN

BRADEMAS for a program of fellowships for teachers; and to Representative PATSY MINK for a program of Federal grants to teachers for sabbatical leaves.

I am calling upon the Congress to make this beginning even though it is well along in its present session. The problems confronting us in education do not diminish with the passage of time; neither should our zeal for solving those problems. This act may be just a beginning: but now is the time to begin.

Henry Adams said, "A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops." This act, I believe, will have an eternal influence on this Nation.

A FORMIDABLE FORCE FOR WORLD PEACE WITH FREEDOM AND JUSTICE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. MCDOWELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, each year, in accordance with Public Law 90 of the 86th Congress, Captive Nations Week is observed. This is the week each year during which we in this Nation seek to give appropriate recognition to those formerly free nations which now bear the heavy yoke of Soviet imperialism. We also recognize, as Professior Dobriansky has pointed out:

> Over two dozen captive nations with a population close to a billion people represent a powerful deterrent against overt Soviet Russian and Red Chinese aggression and thus a formidable force for world peace with freedom and justice.

For 25 years the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have not only been denied the basic rights of self-determination, but have been subjugated under the tyranny of the Soviet Government.

The House of Representatives took note of this on June 21 when it adopted without a single dissenting vote House Concurrent Resolution 416, which was sponsored by 70 Members and which was similar to legislation which I have introduced. This resolution was a powerful statement in behalf of freedom of the people of the Baltic States, and was the product of the hearings held by the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. These hearings were a part of the series of hearings held by the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee over a period of several years, and attests to the deep interest of the Congress in the plight of these subjugated people. This resolution stated that:

> All peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States.

The resolution noted that it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence, and that there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people.

Finally, the resolution urged the President of the United States to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of these captive nations in order to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of their basic rights to the Baltic peoples.

It was pointed out during the House debate on the resolution that under the Soviet Constitution the captive people dominated by the U.S.S.R. should have their heritage and rights protected, and that the Soviet Constitution contains a provision that people can leave the U.S.S.R. in case they wish to depart from that governmental structure. This provision has never been used even though it exists. If, finally, during this year, and as a result of the adoption of this resolution by the Congress, the peoples of the captive nations exercise this right to leave the U.S.S.R., the Constitution of the Soviet Union would meet its supreme test. Perhaps this year will see the forces set in motion which will liberate these peoples, if so, it will be a year to be celebrated in the annals of mankind.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BINGHAM, for Monday, July 19, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. SCOTT (at the request of Mr. MORRISON), for the rest of the week, on account of illness.

Messrs. ROOSEVELT and PUCINSKI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of attendance at the Stevenson funeral.

Mr. BONNER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the rest of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. RONCALIO (at the request of Mr. ZABLOCKI) for Monday, July 19 through July 28, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GROSS, for 15 minutes, tomorrow; to revise and extend his remarks and include certain material.

Mr. MILLER, for 30 minutes, on Thursday, July 22.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON), for 20 minutes, on July 20.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON), for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDOWELL (at the request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FARBSTEIN (at the request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana), for 15 minutes, on July 20.

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana), for 30 minutes, on July 20.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HORTON and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona.

Mr. ROBISON.

Mr. HOSMER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LONG, of Louisiana) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CAREY.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. RONCALIO.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

Mr. PURCELL.

Mr. JONES of Missouri.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. MCCORMACK.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 225. An act to amend chapter 1 of title 38, United States Code, and incorporate therein specific statutory authority for the Presidential memorial certificate program; and

H.R. 5242. An act to amend paragraph (10) of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to change the basis for determining whether a proposed unification or acquisition of control comes within the exemption provided for by such paragraph.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2080. An act to provide for the coinage of the United States.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on July 16, 1965, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4526. An act to extend the provisions of title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war risk insurance, for an additional 5 years, ending September 7, 1970;

H.R. 5041. An act to provide for safety regulation of common carriers by pipelines under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6453. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 20, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1343. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting for consideration a draft of proposed legislation to provide fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel, to improve the quality of teacher training programs, and to establish a National Teacher Corps (H. Doc. No. 245); to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed.

1344. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 2, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on an interim survey of Martins Fork Reservoir, Upper Cumberland River Basin, requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted March 19, 1963 and June 19, 1963 (H. Doc. No. 244); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1345. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on a violation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1346. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the shipment, at Government expense, to, from and within the United States and between oversea areas of privately owned vehicles of deceased or missing personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1347. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force at the seat of government, as of the end of the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1965, pursuant to section 8031(c), title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1348. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of proposed disposition of nickel now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to the provisions of section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act, 50 U.S.C. 98b(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1349. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill Act approved September 15, 1964; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1350. A letter from the acting president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and hospitals or similar institutions in the District of Columbia of injuries caused by firearms or other dangerous weapons; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1351. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report on shipments to Yugoslavia insured by the Foreign Credit Insurance Association and the Export-Import Bank under our short-term export credit insurance program for the month of June 1965, pursuant to title III of the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1965, and to the Presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1352. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of questionable grant of corn to the United Arab Republic under title II, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; Agency for International Development, Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1353. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need to strengthen regulatory practices and study certain trading activities relating to commodity future markets, Commodity Exchange Authority, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1354. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of unnecessary interest costs incurred by advancing funds to U.S. air carriers for transporting mail of foreign countries, Post Office Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1355. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of disposal of good serviceable furniture due to inadequate management action, Internal Revenue Service, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1356. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of activities as of June 30, 1965, pursuant to section 1309 of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1357. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting a report of the court's opinion and findings in the case of *Bernhard F. Elmers* v. *The United States*, congressional No. 1–61, pursuant to House Resolution 112, 87th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1358. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report on the valor of American youth, pursuant to the act of August 3, 1950, Stat. 397–398; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1359. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report of grants made during calendar year 1964 to nonprofit institutions and organizations for support of scientific research programs, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 85–934 (72 Stat. 1793; 42 U.S.C. 1891); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1360. A letter from the chairman, New Jersey Tercentenary Celebration Commission, transmitting a report of the activities of the commission; pursuant to Public Law 86–683; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 7813. A bill to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries; without amendment (Rept. No. 624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 482. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 1153, a bill to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit employer contributions for joint industry promotion of products in certain instances or a joint committee or joint board empowered to interpret provisions of collective bargaining agreements; without amendment (Rept. No. 625). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 483. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6845, a bill to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 626). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred to as follows:

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 9910. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to increase to 60,000 miles the total mileage of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9911. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 9912. A bill to establish a U.S. Capitol page system for needy and deserving students of a college, university, or other institution of higher education; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 9913. A bill to provide for the establishment of the St. Croix National Scenic Waterway in the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 9914. A bill to provide for the establishment of the St. Croix National Scenic Waterway in the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 9915. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in Vietnam; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 9916. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 9917. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 9918. A bill to amend the Fire and Casualty Act and the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 9919. A bill to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 9920. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9921. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, as amended by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, in order to provide a minimum payment for certain State administrative expenses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 9922. A bill to authorize a 5-year hydrologic study and investigation of the Delmarva Peninsula; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 9923. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 9924. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 9925. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 9926. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 9927. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 9928. A bill to provide fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel, to improve the quality of teacher training programs and to establish a National Teacher Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 9929. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.J. Res. 581. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to extend through 1966 his proclamation of a period to "See the United States", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 582. Joint resolution providing for the erection of a memorial statue to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of American rocketry; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.J. Res. 583. Joint resolution to establish the fourth Friday in September of every year as American Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. Res. 481. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H. Res. 484. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. Res. 485. Resolution that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that oppression of minorities in Rumania through a systematic plan launched by the Communist regime in control of Rumania be condemned and the President of the United States is requested to take appropriate steps in our relations with the Rumanian Government as are likely to bring relief to the persecuted minorities in the controversial Transylvania region of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

341. By Mr. PEPPER: Senate Memorial No. 917 of the Florida State Legislature, a memorial to the Congress of the United States urging the preservation of the dual banking system and defeat of any measure requiring a State bank to become a member of the Federal Reserve System; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

342. Also, Senate Memorial No. 1182 of the Florida State Legislature, a memorial to the President of the United States of America, urging construction of an urban male Job Corps Training Center at Camp Blanding, Fla.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

343. Also, Senate Memorial No. 1188 of the Florida State Legislature, a memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting a continuation of national policy employing private enterprise to provide goods and services for the space and defense programs which was promulgated by the administration of President Dwight David Eisenhower and continued under the administration of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

344. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to preserving the dual banking system of States and Federal banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

345. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to fulfilling the objectives of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

346. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, requesting the Congress to conduct an investigation of the leadership and the activities of certain civil rights groups; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO (by request):

H.R. 9930. A bill for the relief of Irwin Hensler, Danuta and Edward Hensler and their minor children Olgierd, and Beata Hensler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 9931. A bill for the relief of Jose Cruz Orozoco-Arana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9932. A bill for the relief of Joseph H. Bonduki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9933. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fabiana Hodulich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9934. A bill for the relief of Caterina Iovino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 9935. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Fasulo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 9936. A bill for the relief of Luis Palomares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 9937. A bill for the relief of Nuno Medeiros Franco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9938. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bozenna Czarnecka and her minor daughter, Eva Czarnecka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9939. A bill for the relief of Sebastiano Livoti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9940. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marisa Sordelli LoMagno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 9941. A bill for the relief of Vilma Henson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9942. A bill for the relief of Peter Paul Vella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 9943. A bill for the relief of Elisa Fattorusso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 9944. A bill for the relief of Erman Donald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

246. By the SPEAKER: Petition of St. Landry Parish Police Jury, Opelousas, La., conveying deep sympathy in the loss of Representative T. ASHTON THOMPSON and requesting that the records show that a resolution was adopted as an expression of respect to his memory; to the Committee on House Administration.

247. Also, petition of Washington State Grange, Seattle, Wash., to enact legislation relative to a vacancy in the office of the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

248. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Fishing Bridge Station, Wyo., relative to oil depletion allowances for Federal income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 19, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou before whom the prayers of Thy children go up as incense from contrite souls, speak to our burdened and longing hearts as we lift our lives to Thy searching gaze.

We would test our thoughts, and deeds, and words, not against the faulty background of our fellows but with our eyes upon the transparent glory of the crystal Christ.

In these hard bestead and dangerous days we would find peace in the midst of the storm, and above all cleansing for the baseness of our own hearts. Sober us with a sense of personal responsibility as to what we contribute to our own age and with the realization that Thy call to every one of us is to make available for the world's good his own life, clean, strong, honest, trustworthy, and serviceable.

In the light of this challenge we pray for ourselves that we may not fail our own generation and Thee, that the paganism that afflicts the world may be redeemed into decency, justice, and mercy and into the uniting brotherhood of that One who taught us to pray that His radiant kingdom may come.

We ask it in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 16, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, transmitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2080. An act to provide for the coinage of the United States;

H.R. 225. An act to amend chapter 1 of title 38, United States Code, and incorporate therein specific statutory authority for the Presidential memorial certificate program; and

H.R. 5242. An act to amend paragraph (10) of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to change the basis for determining whether a proposed unification or acquisition of control comes within the exemption provided for by such paragraph.

THE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. INOUYE, and by unanimous consent, the following calendar measures were considered and acted upon as indicated:

ELIZABETH KAM OI HU

The bill (S. 135) for the relief of Elizabeth Kam Oi Hu was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Elizabeth Kam Oi Hu, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of paragraph (5), subsection (a) of section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, may be naturalized by taking, prior to one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, an oath as prescribed by section 337 of such Act. From and after naturalization under this Act, the said Elizabeth Kam Oi Hu shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 434), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to provide for the restoration of U.S. citizenship to Elizabeth Kam Oi Hu which was lost by voting in a foreign election.

ANGEL LAGMAY

The bill (S. 136) for the relief of Angel Lagmay was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Angel Lagmay may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act, and a petition may be filed by Cornelio Lagmay, a citizen of the United States, in behalf of the said Angel Lagmay, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 435), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the entry into the United States in a nonquota status of an alien son adopted by a citizen of the United States.

ROSAURO L. LINDOGAN

The bill (S. 137) for the relief of Rosauro L. Lindogan was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rosauro L. Lindogan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence of such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 436), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Rosauro L. Lindogan. The bill provides for an appropriate quota deduction and for the payment of the required visa fee.

KEVIN DILLON SCHOFIELD

The bill (S. 612) for the relief of Kevin Dillon Schofield was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kevin Dillon Schofield shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence of such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 437), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Kevin Dillon Schofield. The bill provides for an appropriate quota deduction and for the payment of the required visa fee.

KALOYAN D. KALOYANOFF

The bill (S. 870) for the relief of Kaloyan D. Kaloyanoff was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the periods of time Kaloyan D. Kaloyanoff has resided in the United States since his lawful admission for permanent residence on November 10, 1958, shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 438), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary, who was lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on November 10, 1958, to file a petition for naturalization.

FOSTER MASAHIKO GUSHARD

The bill (H.R. 1314) for the relief of Foster Masahiko Gushard was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 439), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the entry into the United States in a nonquota status of an alien child adopted by citizens of the United States.

MRS. ANA CRISTINA RAINFORTH

The bill (H.R. 1322) for the relief of Mrs. Ana Cristina Rainforth was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 440), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to preserve nonquota immigrant status in behalf of the widow of a U.S. citizen.

MAJ. KENNETH F. COYKENDALL

The bill (H.R. 1487) for the relief of Maj. Kenneth F. Coykendall, U.S. Army, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 441), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, is to relieve Maj. Kenneth F. Coykendall, U.S. Army, of all liability to repay $752.38 representing overpayments of active duty pay as a member of the U.S. Army in the period from July 1, 1949, through February 18, 1962, inclusive, which he received as a result of erroneous credit of U.S. merchant marine midshipman service for longevity pay purposes. The bill provides for a refund of amounts repaid or withheld because of the liability.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 1853) for the relief of Giuseppe Delina was announced as next in order.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ALBERT MARKS

The bill (H.R. 1889) for the relief of Albert Marks was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 443), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating to one who has suffered prior attacks of insanity in behalf of the husband of a lawful permanent resident of the United States. The bill provides for the posting of a bond as a guaranty that the beneficiary will not become a public charge.

ALFRED ESTRADA

The bill (H.R. 3625) for the relief of Alfred Estrada was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 444), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable Alfred Estrada to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act, notwithstanding the fact that the continuity of his residence has been broken through employment abroad with an American firm.

ANNA MARIA HEILAND

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 76) for the relief of Anna Maria Heiland which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 8, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That if the said Anna Maria Heiland is not entitled to medical care under the Dependent's Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (3) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anna Maria Heiland may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provision of such Act: *Provided*, That if the said Anna Maria Heiland is not entitled to medical care under the Dependent's Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. This section shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 445), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating to one who has suffered previous attacks of insanity in behalf of the wife of a U.S. citizen member of our Armed Forces. The bill has been amended to provide for the posting of a bond as a guaranty that the beneficiary will not become a public charge in the event she is not eligible for medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act.

PEDRO ANTONIO JULIO SANCHEZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 375) for the relief of Pedro Antonio Julio Sanchez which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 8, after the word "since", to strike out "September 1, 1958" and insert "September 14, 1958", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Pedro Antonio Julio Sanchez may be naturalized upon compliance with all of the requirements of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that no period of residence or physical presence within the United States or any State shall be required, in addition to his residence and physical presence within the United States since September 14, 1958.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 446), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization. The amendment is technical in nature to reflect the precise date of his first entry into the United States.

VASIL LACI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 872) for the relief of Vasil Laci which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504), Vasil Laci shall be held and considered to have been paroled into the United States on the date of the enactment of this Act, as provided for in the said Act of July 14, 1960.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 447), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to provide that Vasil Laci shall be considered to have been paroled into the United States as a refugee on the date of the enactment of this act under the provisions of Public Law 86-648. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents.

KIM SA SUK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 879) for the relief of Kim Sa Suk which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 205(c), relating to the number of petitions which may be approved in behalf of eligible orphans, shall be inapplicable in the case of a petition filed in behalf of Kim Sa Suk by Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Caperna, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 448), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to facilitate the entry into the United States in a nonquota status of an eligible orphan adopted by citizens of the United States, notwithstanding the fact that the prospective adoptive parents have previously had two petitions approved in behalf of eligible orphans. As introduced, the bill would have waived the provision of existing law relating to one who is afflicted with tuberculosis. However, the beneficiary will be eligible for an administrative waiver of the excludable ground upon enactment of the bill.

MRS. HARLEY BREWER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1198) for the relief of Mrs. Harley Brewer which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 3, after the word "Act", to strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Harley Brewer (or, in the event of her death, to her estate) of San Ildefonso Pueblo, New Mexico, the widow of Harley Brewer, the sum of $4,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all the claims of the said Harley Brewer against the United States for compensation authorized to be paid to him by Private Law 88–360, approved October 14, 1964, but which was not so paid to the said Harley Brewer by reason of his death prior to enactment of the said private law: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 449), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill, as amended is to pay to Mrs. Harley Brewer (or, in the event of her death, to her estate) of San Ildefonso Pueblo, N. Mex., the widow of Harley Brewer, the sum of $4,500, in full satisfaction of all the claims of the said Harley Brewer against the United States for compensation authorized to be paid to him by Private Law 88–360, approved October 14, 1964, but which was not so paid by reason of his death prior to the enactment of the private law.

JULIO DUMAS AND HIS WIFE, JOSEPHINE DUMAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1119) for the relief of Julio Dumas and his wife, Josephine Dumas which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "Julio Dumas and Josephine Dumas" and insert "Julio Francisco Dumas y Alcocer and Maria Josefa Dumas"; in line 9, after the word "said", to strike out "Julio Dumas and Josephine Dumas" and insert "Julio Francisco Dumas y Alcocer"; and on page 2, line 3, after the word "to", to strike out "their" and insert "his"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, (a) for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Julio Francisco Dumas y Alcocer and Maria Josefa Dumas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on June 12, 1961, upon payment of the required visa fees.

(b) The said Julio Francisco Dumas y Alcocer may be naturalized upon compliance with all of the requirements of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that no period of residence or physical presence within the United States or any State shall be required, in addition to his residence and physical presence within the United States since June 12, 1961.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Julio Francisco Dumas y Alcocer and Maria Josefa Dumas."

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 450), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Julio Francisco Duma y Alcocer and Maria Josefa Dumas as of June 12, 1961, the date on which they were lawfully admitted as nonimmigrants. The bill also provides that the residence and physical presence in the United States of Julio Francisco Dumas y Alcocer since that date shall be compliance with section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The bill has been amended to delete the name of Maria Josefa Dumas from section (b) of the bill, as it relates to naturalization. The bill has also been amended to correct the spelling of the beneficiaries' names.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6 in 1965, as "National American Legion Baseball Week," was announced as next in order.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CAPT. PAUL W. OBERDORFER

The bill (H.R. 1217) for the relief of Capt. Paul W. Oberdorfer was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 452), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay Capt. Paul W. Oberdorfer the sum of $130.63 in full settlement of his claim for the cost of transporting his wife from New Orleans, La., to San Francisco, Calif.

STATEMENT

The facts in the case are found in House Report No. 74, 89th Congress, 1st session, as follows:

"The Department of the Air Force, in its report indicating that it favors enactment of H.R. 5743, admits that special orders authorizing transportation for the wife of Captain Oberdorfer were issued in error through the fault of U.S. Air Force personnel alone without any fault or responsibility on the part of Captain and Mrs. Oberdorfer. The erroneous orders upon which Mrs. Oberdorfer traveled were in violation of regulations which prohibit the furnishing of transportation at Government expense to a dependent who is serving in Federal military duty on the effective date of the military sponsor's permanent change of station order.

"The facts giving rise to the erroneous transportation orders are that Captain Oberdorfer was issued permanent change of station orders to California, effective February 10, 1962. At that date his wife was on duty as a nurse with the 159th Evacuation Hospital, Louisiana National Guard Unit, at Fort Sill, Okla. As soon as Mrs. Oberdorfer was relieved from her active duty tour, which had extended from January 3, 1962, until August 6, 1962, she proceeded to California in accordance with travel orders issued by the Air Force. The Air Force concedes that Captain Oberdorfer's orders were prepared in such a way that he could easily assume that Mrs. Oberdorfer was authorized transportation to California at Government expense at a later date. While Air Force personnel should have questioned the travel orders for Mrs. Oberdorfer as authorizing movement of a dependent who was herself on active duty at the effective date of the captain's permanent change of station, they failed to do so. Affidavits from the Air Force administrative personnel involved state that they were aware that Mrs. Oberdorfer had been on duty as a nurse, but were under the impression that travel undertaken after her discharge from active duty was proper at Government expense.

"In the light of the admissions of error by the Air Force with no fault on the part of Captain and Mrs. Oberdorfer who relied on assurances that the cost of her transportation was reimbursable, it does not seem fair and equitable that the cost of transportation should be borne by Captain Oberdorfer. Accordingly the committee reports favorably on H.R. 5743 and recommends that the bill do pass."

In agreement with the House the committee recommends favorable enactment.

CWO ELDEN R. COMER

The bill (H.R. 1374) for the relief of CWO Elden R. Comer was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 453), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay to CWO Elden R. Comer, U.S. Navy, retired, the sum of $1,680.62 in full settlement of his claim against the United States for additional retired pay which accrued during the period August 30, 1946, to October 17, 1952, inclusive.

GEORGE A. GRABERT

The bill (H.R. 2881) for the relief of George A. Grabert was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 454), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay George A. Grabert, of Mount Vernon, Ind., $277.26 in full settlement of his claims against the United States for refund of amounts required to be paid by him to the United States on account of salary overpayments resulting from longevity promotions being granted on incorrect dates in connection with his employment with the U.S. Post Office Department during the period beginning July 1, 1950, and ending November 16, 1956.

ADDITIONAL PLACE FOR HOLDING COURT IN THE DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA

The bill (S. 102) to provide an additional place for holding court in the district of North Dakota was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 114 of title 28, United States Code, is amended as follows:

In the second sentence of paragraph (4) after "Minot" insert "and Williston".

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 455), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide that the city of Williston be an additional place for holding court in the district of North Dakota.

STATEMENT

An identical bill, S. 2392, of the 88th Congress, was reported favorably by the committee. All of the facts and justification for this legislation are contained in Senate Report 1391 of the 88th Congress and are as follows:

"The Judicial Conference of the United States, at its meeting on March 16 and 17, 1964, voted to disapprove the legislation due to the fact that it did not have sufficient cases to justify the holding of terms of court at Williston, N. Dak.

"Since that time the committee has received information from the Honorable George S. Register, the chief judge of the district of North Dakota with reference to the legislation. The chief judge supports the legislation as do the commissioners of the city of Williston and the Williston Chamber of Commerce. The chief judge in his comment states that Williston occupies a rather unique position among the cities of the State. He points out that the Garrison Dam project will result in substantial industrialization, great economic growth, and development in that area. Oil has been discovered in the immediate vicinity of Williston and he anticipates that there will also be a substantial oil and mineral development. He further contended that the Williston area of this State has a very promising future and that the developments referred to are in the not distant future. It will mean a substantial and rapid increase in population as well as business. Representatives of the bar association called upon the chief judge urging the legislation and it is understood that a new Federal building is to be built at the site of Williston. If Williston is designated as a place for holding court in the district of North Dakota quarters for court may be provided for in the new Federal building.

"The committee, after a review of the facts surrounding this legislation, takes the view that there are adequately sufficient indications to believe that the city of Williston will be, in the very near future, such a community as would require the sitting of the U.S. district court for that district. In view of these facts the committee recommends that the bill, S. 2392, be considered favorably."

After consideration, the committee adheres to its former recommendation and again recommends that the bill, S. 102, be considered favorably.

SAMUEL L. McCOY

The bill (S. 850) for the relief of Samuel L. McCoy was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Samuel L. McCoy, of Roxbury, Massachusetts, the sum of $760, in full satisfaction of all his claims against the United States for reimbursement of payments made by him in connection with an accident involving personal injuries to the occupant of a house owned by the Veterans' Administration and managed by the said Samuel L. McCoy as management broker for the regional office of the Veterans' Administration: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 456), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide for the payment of $760 to Samuel L. McCoy, Roxbury, Mass., in full satisfaction of all his claims against the United States for reimbursement of payments made by him in connection with an accident involving personal injuries to an occupant of a house owned by the Veterans' Administration and managed by Samuel L. McCoy as management broker.

STATEMENT

The facts of the case are found in the report of the Veterans' Administration addressed to the chairman of the committee, dated June 11, 1965, and are as follows:

"The property involved was located at 93 Devon Street, Dorchester, Mass. It had been acquired by the Veterans' Administration under the veterans' loan guarantee program established by title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (now 38 U.S.C. ch. 37). This property was sold to a Mr. Pinnick in 1957, who, in turn, defaulted. Following the foreclosure of his defaulted mortgage the property was reacquired by the Veterans' Administration on June 29, 1959.

"When a property is acquired by the Veterans' Administration, the services of a management broker are secured to supervise the property and endeavor to accomplish its resale. The duties of such a management broker include the safeguarding and preservation of the property. He is required to inspect the property at least once monthly, for which service he receives a fee of $7.50 per month, and may obligate the Veterans' Administration for the cost of emergency repairs, not to exceed $50 for any one item.

"Mr. Samuel L. McCoy was engaged as a management broker to handle the property for resale. During the period of offering the property for sale, Mr. McCoy rented the house to Mrs. Evelyn Pinnick who had continued in possession after the foreclosure. She failed to make rental payments and Mr. McCoy took eviction action by giving her the 14 days notice to quit the premises as required by the law of Massachusetts. This 14-day period expired on September 1, 1959. Mrs. Pinnick failed to surrender possession of the house to Mr. McCoy and on September 3, 1959,, she was injured in a fall on the front steps.

"Mrs. Pinnick filed suit against Mr. McCoy in the superior court, Suffolk County, Mass., alleging that Mr. McCoy controlled and managed the property and that her injury resulted from his negligence in not maintaining the premises in as good condition as existed on the date when she became a tenant. The suit proceeded to trial and during the course of the trial the matter was settled, Mr. McCoy paying Mrs. Pinnick $210 damages. In addition to paying the $210 damages, Mr. McCoy paid attorney fees amounting to $550 to the attorney whom he had selected to represent him. Under S. 850 the Government would pay this sum of $760 to Mrs. McCoy."

Mrs. Pinnick elected to exercise her right to sue Mr. McCoy instead of the Federal Government. It is the feeling of the committee that this tort action was one properly lying against the Government rather than against the claimant, who was an innocent victim of Mrs. Pinnick's election. Accordingly, the committee recommends favorable enactment.

MRS. HERTHA L. WOHLMUTH

The bill (S. 711) for the relief of Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 32(a) (2) (D) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth of Munich, Bavaria, United States Zone, shall be held and considered to have been a United States citizen at all times since December 7, 1941, and any notice of claim filed under such Act by the said Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth within six months after the enactment of this Act shall be deemed to be timely filed.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 457), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is that, for the purposes of section 32(a) (2) (D) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth, of Munich, Bavaria, U.S. Zone, shall be held and considered to have been a U.S. citizen at all times since December 7, 1941, and any notice of claim filed under such act by the said Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth within 6 months after the enactment of this act shall be deemed to be timely filed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1861) to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster was announced as next in order.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

H.R. 8484

The bill (H.R. 8484) to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of members of the Armed Forces in a change of permanent station was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 460), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The basic objective of this bill is to broaden the authority for the sea transportation at Government expense of automobiles owned by military personnel.

The principal reason for such broadening is to provide relief to members of the Armed Forces ordered to Vietnam from permanent duty stations outside the United States.

EXPLANATION

Under current law a member of the Armed Forces ordered to make a permanent change of station is entitled to have one automobile owned by him and for his personal use shipped to his new station at the expense of the United States. This authority is limited to transportation from the port serving his old station to the port serving his new duty station. In contrast, a member of the Armed Forces is authorized to move his household goods to places other than his new duty station when he is ordered to a permanent change of station.

The restriction in current law on the transportation of automobiles has created hardships for members of the Armed Forces serving in overseas areas such as Hawaii, Okinawa, and the Philippines when they are ordered to an area such as Vietnam where they cannot take their dependents or automobiles. In these cases the dependents and household goods are returned to a location in the United States, but the member now must either sell the automobile or pay the cost of overseas transportation and port handling charges for shipment to a port in the United States. Members of the 1st Marine Brigade who were ordered from Hawaii to Vietnam in May of this year have experienced the problem this bill is intended to relieve.

The bill would amend existing law to provide that the Secretary of the service concerned may authorize the transportation of an automobile owned by the member for this personal use or the use of his dependents to the member's new station or to such other place as the Secretary may authorize. The bill would be retroactive in effect to May 1, 1965, to cover the shipment from Hawaii of motor vehicles owned by members of the 1st Marine Brigade who were transferred to Vietnam.

Use of foreign-flag shipping service

The existing authority for the sea shipment of automobiles owned by members of the Armed Forces is limited to vessels owned, leased, or chartered by the United States, or to privately owned American shipping services. This bill would permit the use of foreign-flag shipping services if shipping services on vessels owned, leased, or chartered by the United States or privately owned American shipping services are not reasonably available. In a few instances members of the Armed Forces are transferred between overseas duty stations not served by U.S. vessels or privately owned American shipping services. Consequently, the shipment of privately owned vehicles is either disapproved or the automobile must be transshipped through an American port to the final destination. If the shipment is denied the member is disadvantaged for reasons beyond his control. If the automobile is first shipped to the United States the costs are greater than if foreign shipping services could be used.

Shipment of a replacement vehicle

Under the law now in effect a member of the Armed Forces whose automobile is lost or destroyed for reasons beyond his control after it has been shipped at Government expense to his permanent duty station is not entitled to have a replacement automobile shipped at Government expense. This law is different from the one applicable to civilian employees, who may have a replacement automobile shipped at Government expense when the head of the department concerned determines that such replacement is necessary for reasons beyond the control of the employee and is in the interest of the Government. This bill would equalize the entitlement of members of the Armed Forces with that of civilian employees in this respect.

The committee expects this authority to be carefully administered. The term "replacement" should be strictly construed so that the transportation of a second automobile at Government expense is authorized only in good-faith cases of hardship.

Definition of the term "change of permanent station"

For the purpose of shipment of automobiles of members of the Armed Forces at Government expense, the bill would define the term "change of permanent station" to include changes from home to first station when called to active duty and from last station to home upon separation or retirement and an authorized change in home yard or home port of a vessel, in addition to transfers or assignments between permanent posts of duty or official stations. The committee was informed that this definition is consistent with the definition applied under the Joint Travel Regulations for the purpose of entitlement to shipment of household effects and that this definition conforms to the practice now being followed with respect to the shipment of automobiles. Hense this definition ratifies the current construction of the phrase "to his new station" in section 2634 of title 10, United States Code.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Yarborough, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 114

"Concurrent resolution calling on the U.S. Congress to investigate the possibilities of Communist activities and infiltration of the so-called civil rights groups now active in street demonstrations throughout the United States

"Whereas for the past several years certain so-called civil rights organizations have demonstrated and picketed throughout the United States; and

"Whereas said organizations have heretofore exerted extreme influence on certain communities and extreme influence on domestic policies of the U.S. Government; and

"Whereas the said civil rights organizations have used the said demonstrations to raise money from certain members of the general public throughout the United States; and

"Whereas said civil rights organizations have injected themselves into the foreign policy of the United States; and

"Whereas certain civil rights organizations have insisted on the withdrawal of the United States from Vietnam; and

"Whereas it has become known that members of the said groups and leaders of the organizations have Communist affiliations and Communist backgrounds: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Mississippi (the House of Representatives concurring therein)*, That the U.S. Congress, through proper committee either in the U.S. Senate or in the U.S. House of Representatives, is hereby requested to conduct an investigation of the leadership and the activities of the so-called civil rights groups; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to furnish copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, and the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate July 8, 1965.

"CLARENCE GASTIN,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives July 8, 1965.

"JAMES A. MORROW, Jr.,
"Acting Speaker of the House of Representatives."

AMENDMENT OF LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION. OF OKLAHOMA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, together with 17 other Senators, I am the sponsor of S. 1648, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act allows Federal agencies to establish new or increased fees for entrance to or use of Federal lakes, parks, and other facilities.

Already, the Department of Agriculture has announced new fees for their facilities in Oklahoma. Fee schedules are expected to be announced soon by the Department of the Interior and by the Corps of Engineers.

The bill I have introduced would prohibit fees being charged for use of or access to Federal lakes and give either House of Congress a veto over any fees established on other Federal installations.

As more and more people throughout the country learn of the establishment of these new fees, I believe they will join the increasing number of citizens who are up in arms about this new practice.

I have contacted the distinguished chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee [Mr. JACKSON], and have urged him to hold immediate public hearings on our bill. I hope this can be done expeditiously, and we can very soon have favorable action on the bill by the committee and by the Senate.

I highly commend the Oklahoma Legislature for its informed recognition of this problem by the passage of a resolution in opposition to the Land and Water Conservation Act, as it is now written. Mr. President, for myself and my senior colleague [Mr. MONRONEY], I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that resolution, authored by State Representatives Connor, Blankenship, G. T., Skeith, Hopkins, Raibourn, Willis, Odom, V. H., Mountford, and Peterson of the house, and State Senators Bartlett, Garrison, Stansberry, Bradley, Gee, Graves, Ham, Hamilton, Horn, Luton, Muldrow, Murphy, Payne, Rhoades, Selman, Smith, Stipe, and Young of the senate, be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, and be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 68

Concurrent resolution expressing opposition to the imposition of user fees for the use of public land and water areas and urging repeal of such legislation; and directing distribution

Whereas the amount of leisure time available to the average citizen has increased greatly in recent years; and

Whereas the constructive and intelligent use of this increased leisure is one of the great challenges of our time; and

Whereas with the growing amount of leisure, our citizens must have proper outlets and opportunities to make wise use of this time; and

Whereas the State parks and recreation areas are provided for the leisure-hour needs of all Oklahoma citizens to enjoy; and

Whereas it has long been the policy of the State of Oklahoma to make available to the people of Oklahoma these parks and recreation areas without charging a fee for their use; and

Whereas the U.S. Congress passed the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 which provides for user fees to be paid by those desiring to use certain land and water areas; and

Whereas these parks and recreation areas should be as accessible to the low income groups as to higher income groups; and

Whereas licenses to fish and to use a boat on these waters are already required of those who would use these areas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 30th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

SECTION 1. That we oppose any measure which tends to discourage or restrict the free use of public land or water recreation areas.

SEC. 2. That we oppose the imposition of user fees for the use of public land or water areas in the State of Oklahoma, provided in the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, and urge that such provision be stricken from the law.

SEC. 3. That duly authenticated copies of this resolution be prepared and forwarded to Senators MIKE MONRONEY and FRED R. HARRIS; Representatives CARL ALBERT, PAGE BELCHER, ED EDMONDSON, JOHN JARMAN, JED JOHNSON, and TOM STEED; the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States; the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; the majority and minority floor leaders of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States; the Secretary of the Department of the Interior; and the Corps of Engineers.

Adopted by the Senate the 25th day of May 1965.

DEWEY F. BARTLETT,
Acting President of the Senate.

Adopted by the House of Representatives the 31st day of May 1965.

J. D. MCCARTY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 1735. A bill relating to the use by the Secretary of the Interior of land at La Jolla, Calif., donated by the University of California for a marine biological research laboratory, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 463).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 8720. An act to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of Guam (Rept. No. 466); and

H.R. 8721. An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of the Virgin Islands (Rept. No. 465).

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS FOR NAVIGATION AND FLOOD CONTROL—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 464)

Mr. MCNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, reported an original bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 2297. A bill to amend the act of September 2, 1964; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CURTIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 2298. A bill for the relief of Iris Marjorie Wareing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2299. A bill to provide for the mandatory retirement of district judges of the United States for permanent physical or mental disability; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LAUSCHE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

S. 2300. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to the above bill when reported by Mr. MCNAMARA, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. FONG:

S. 2301. A bill for the relief of Christine Fung Kee Lee Verhoeff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. Holland):

S.J. Res. 99. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning October 25 in each year as National Parkinson Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF SEPTEMBER 2, 1964, RELATING TO COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN LANDS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in the 88th Congress there was passed Public Law 561. The purpose of the law was to permit the payment of compensation for lands taken for canal purposes in irrigation districts in those instances where compensation was not paid.

Proceeding under that act, in a case in the U.S. district court in Nebraska, a technical problem arose. If seems prudent that there be a clarifying and technical amendment to Public Law 561 of the 88th Congress. Today I am introducing in behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. Hruska] such an amendment. I hope that it can be acted upon early. It would not add to the liability or expenditures on the part of the Government with respect to what was the original intent of the Congress in enacting Public Law 561 in the 88th Congress. It is in the nature of a technical and clarifying amendment; in the opinion of the attorneys it is wise that the proposed action be taken. I therefore send the bill to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Kennedy of New York in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2297) to amend the act of September 2, 1964, introduced by Mr. Curtis (for himself and Mr. Hruska), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MANDATORY RETIREMENT OF DISTRICT JUDGES FOR CERTAIN REASONS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill and ask that it be printed and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2299) to provide for the mandatory retirement of district juges of the United States for permanent physical or mental disability, introduced by Mr. Lausche, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, this bill deals with the judiciary and contemplates compelling the involuntary retirement of a judge who, by a judicial council, has been declared incapable of filling the duties of his office caused either by mental or physical disability.

Under existing constitutional and statutory provisions, if a judge is incompetent because of physical or mental incapacity, a judicial council can make such certification to the President of the United States. When such certification is made, the President can appoint another judge for the district where the incapacitated judge presides. When this procedure is followed, there will be two judges in the district, one newly appointed and the other the incapacitated judge will be allowed to continue to perform his duties.

The bill which I have sent to the desk contemplates making it possible for the President to appoint a new judge, and compels the involuntary retirement with full pay of the judge who is incapacitated.

Mr. President, I yield the floor

COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Case, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Javits, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Miller, Mr. Morton, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Scott, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Tower, Mr. Young of North Dakota, and Mr. Cotton) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, Senate bill 2282, introduced by me on July 13, is being held at the desk for additional cosponsors. I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk through Friday of this week to provide an opportunity for Senators to cosponsor it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 23, 1965, the names of Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Clark, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGovern, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Morse, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Neuberger, Mrs. Smith, and Mr. Talmadge were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2180) to improve the safety of railroad transportation under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, introduced by Mr. McGee (for himself and Mr. Moss) on June 23, 1965.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF A. ROSS ECKLER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, July 22, 1965, at 10 a.m., in room 6202 of the New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of A. Ross Eckler, of New York, to be Director of the Census.

Persons interested in testifying on the nomination may arrange to do so by calling the committee staff, 225-5451.

The hearing will be before the full committee.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 19, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2080) to provide for the coinage of the United States.

DR. ELSIE WIECZOROWSKI, A PEDIATRICIAN FROM ILLINOIS, PART OF THE PROJECT HOPE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is always gratifying to hear that a citizen of the great State of Illinois has rendered great service. Dr. Elsie Wieczorowski, a pediatrician from Illinois, has been part of that magnificent medical-education program, Project HOPE.

Dr. Wieczorowski, as a recent story in the Chicago Tribune explains, was in the new Republic of Guinea for 2 months as a volunteer aboard the SS *Hope*. She is among many from Illinois who have served HOPE during the project's 5 years of operation.

Her dedicated service to humanity in the wards of the great white hospital ship as well as in the clinics throughout the country is depicted in this excellent article by Margaret Mohan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chicago Tribune article of May 23, 1965, be printed at this point in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"Hope" Trip Fascinating, Doctor Says—Learned About Tropical Ills

(By Margaret Mohan)

The word "HOPE" stands for Health Opportunity for People Everywhere, and "everywhere" for the hospital ship SS *Hope* so far has meant Ecuador, Peru, Indonesia, and Guinea West Africa.

On board the big white Navy-loaned ship for part of its 10 months in Guinea was Dr. Elsie Wieczorowski, 932 Wolfram Street, a pediatrician with offices on Diversey Parkway.

"WOULD DO IT AGAIN"

"I learned a lot about tropical medicine and about an emerging nation," Dr. Wieczorowski said. "I would like to do it again."

Besides boning up on tropical diseases for her 2-month tour of duty off the African coast, the doctor did some intensive cramming in French, since the young country had been colonized by France, "only to find the natives don't speak it."

Project HOPE, an activity of the People to People Health Foundation, is a program of cooperation in the field of health between people in the United States and in newly developing countries.

It began in 1958 when former President Eisenhower asked a prominent Washington, D.C., physician to initiate a personal contact program to further international good will.

"HOPE" HAS STAFF OF 100

There is a staff of approximately 100 on the SS *Hope*. Besides the nurses and technicians, four are permanent, salaried doctors The remainder are doctors working without pay, rotating on tours of 2 to 4 months.

"It's a 7-day-a-week job," said Dr. Wieczorowski. "We see about 50 to 75 patients a day, and there is no resident staff of interns to help out.

"The people—Africans, French, Lebanese, Israeli—are wonderful to work with. They are reserved but courteous and appreciative. Most of them were peasants."

Besides treating people who came to the ship, which is anchored in the harbor of Guinea's capital, Conakry, Dr. Wieczorowski traveled by car and bicycle to the clinics set up inland for people who did not need to be hospitalized.

COMPLICATED BY MALNUTRITION

The diseases encountered by the *Hope's* staff—tuberculosis, anemia, malaria, measles, and parasites—while familiar to American doctors, were usually complicated by the peoples' malnutrition. Dr. Wieczorowski saw only children, but even they showed signs of their poor diet.

The SS *Hope* is establishing an immunization program and supplying milk to children. In touring the provinces to help set up these projects, Dr. Wieczorowski and her associates were entertained royally with feasts and dancing.

When not on general call or attending to her patients, the Chicago pediatrician visited other ships in the harbor, read, or saw movies on board.

Conakry, with a population of 80,000 is a quiet town even though it is a port. That's because the Guinea franc has no exchange value outside the country, she said. The country gained its independence 6 years ago.

COUNTRY IS RICH

"I wondered how most of the people lived," the doctor said. "There are few shops and little native industry. They are rich in natural resources—citrus fruits, coffee, aluminum—but because of their franc they have little buying power."

Most everyone grew "patches of this and that" to maintain a subsistence diet, Dr. Wieczorowski said, and some men turned out crude articles on little sewing machines.

Paint, screws, and other articles we take for granted are impossible to get, she said.

One of the most difficult things about getting on the hospital ship, besides making it to the top of the waiting list, is disposing of your own practice at home for those months, Dr. Wieczorowski said.

Notwithstanding all the difficulties, the pediatrician considers it an exciting and educational experience. "It is fascinating to be in on the political and economic growing pains of a country's beginning," she said.

AMERICAN SOLDIERS DESERVE DIGNITY IN DEATH

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the present system of notifying next of kin that a son or husband or father has been killed in action or wounded in action or is missing was instituted in the days when the Western Union Telegraph Co. delivered telegrams to the family home. Furthermore, in days gone by, the necessity for such notifications existed only in time of war, and this method was probably the most practical means of giving the sad information to relatives of servicemen killed in action.

Therefore, it was shocking and astounding to me to learn that today officials of the Western Union Telegraph Co. have adopted a policy of delivering at least some of these telegrams by telephone. This cold, heartless practice is inexcusable and an insult to every American with a loved one in the Armed Forces.

This practice came to my attention when I read a front page editorial in the Lakewood Post of Lakewood, Ohio, on July 15, 1965. The editorial, in the form of an open letter to the President, is entitled "American Soldiers Deserve Dignity in Death," and was written in protest over the fact that the parents of James A. Hall, 19, killed in action in the service of his country in Vietnam, were notified of his death by a telephone call from a stranger. I ask unanimous consent that this moving and eloquent editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT—AMERICAN SOLDIERS DESERVE DIGNITY IN DEATH

President LYNDON JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: In far off Vietnam, a couragious young man from this community was cut down by enemy fire while serving as gunner on an American helicopter.

His Lakewood mother was notified of her son's death by a Defense Department telegram which was read to her over the telephone.

We are shocked and astounded at this.

We believe that the families of young men who make the supreme sacrifice in the service of their country are entitled to a more humane and dignified notification.

The present system of notifying next of kin that a son or husband has been killed in action was instituted in the days when Western Union delivered telegrams to the family doorstep.

Since then, for reasons of economy, Western Union has adopted a policy of delivering most telegrams by telephone.

In our opinion, the information that a vibrant young man in the prime of life has been killed thousands of miles away is tragic enough without adding to the family's anguish by having it delivered routinely and impersonally by an unfamiliar voice on the telephone.

This crude and abrasive method of notifying families of military deaths is probably being used throughout the country.

Very likely, Mr. President, you are unaware of this. With all the grave burdens of responsibility and decision which rest upon your shoulders, you cannot be intimately familiar with every detail of the operations of every arm of the Federal Government.

We call this situation to your attention in the sincere hope that you will take prompt corrective action.

In our opinion, an arrangement should be made whereby the notification is made by sympathetic military personnel—not left to cold commercial channels.

Otherwise, Western Union should be required to make an actual doorstep delivery of such messages—or else the notifications should be sent by special delivery mail.

We would like to note that James A. Hall, 19, killed in action in the service of his country in Vietnam, was one of the young men honored in a "salute to servicemen" in combat zones published by this newspaper a few weeks ago.

Our object in making this "salute" was to drive home the fact that the war in Vietnam is not being fought by nameless people. When American soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen go into action, they are the boy next door, the youngster who used to work at the neighborhood filling station, the boy who was graduating from high school or college only yesterday.

These are the sons and brothers of this community and every community in the Nation.

We believe that they are entitled to the best this country can provide—the most effective military equipment available, the best training possible, the most humane treatment practical.

We also believe that their families are entitled to a dignified and humane notification should they meet the fate which every member of the Armed Forces risks in combat areas.

As this community mourns the courageous death of Jim Hall, we make this request of you, Mr. President:

Would you please look into the Defense Department's notification system, and see if you can devise a less barbarous and shocking method of informing a family of a loved one's death in the line of duty?

Young patriots like Jim Hall are entitled to at least have dignity in death.

Sincerely,
THE LAKEWOOD POST AND THE WEST SHORE POST.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, there is no valid reason why officials of the Defense Department do not insist that upon every telegram of this nature it is plainly stated: "This telegram must be delivered, not read over the telephone." If any telephoning is to be done, certainly the parents or the wife of a young man who gave his all for his country are entitled to receive the telephone call from Washington, from an official of the Defense Department, and I mean a high official, conveying the sorrowful news and the regrets of the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense speaking with sympathy and feeling over the unfortunate necessity of reporting the death.

I denounce officials of the Western Union Telegraph Co. for telephoning an important message of this sort and being the first to convey such sad news in an abrupt, businesslike manner through an anonymous person. The information that a fine young man, perhaps a teenage youngster or in his early twenties, has been killed is so tragic that surely the family's anguish should not be enhanced by receiving the information coldly and impersonally from an unfamiliar voice over the telephone.

Mr. President, a year ago an average of one American serviceman was being killed each day in Vietnam and a number wounded. Today that statistic has risen apparently fourfold. It is the hope of all of us that in the very near future no American lives will be lost on any battlefields anywhere in the world. However, events do not indicate that will be the case for some time. The least we can do is to assure our fighting men and their families that in the event that the worst does occur, they will receive a full measure of dignity in death. Thought and investigation should be given to an arrangement whereby such notifications will be made by sympathetic military personnel and not left to cold commercial channels. I urge that such a study be instituted immediately by the Secretary of Defense.

Unless this practice on the part of the Western Union Telegraph Co. is stopped immediately, I feel that high officials of that corporation are guilty of countenancing a reprehensible practice and also doing a grave disservice to our country.

ONE-MAN, ONE-VOTE PRINCIPLE ENDORSED UNANIMOUSLY BY MIDWEST DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the outstanding regional political organizations in America is the Democratic Midwest Conference, which consists of Democratic leaders from States stretching from the Rocky Mountains to the Alleghenies.

This association met in Chicago late last month and went on record, unanimously, in favor of the one-man, one-vote, apportionment of State legislative bodies. In a resolution which is concise but hardhitting, and is without reservations, the organization specifically affirmed the Supreme Court decision in Reynolds against Sims. I stress the fact that this organization unanimously approved this position.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY DEMOCRATIC MIDWEST CONFERENCE

Whereas the democratic principle of equal representation in State legislative bodies has been eloquently affirmed by the Supreme Court in the case of *Reynolds* v. *Sims*, in which it said that "to the extent that a citizen's right to vote is debased, he is that much less a citizen"; and

Whereas the vast migration of our population has transformed our Nation from a predominantly rural to a largely suburban and urban character, which has brought with it new and different kinds of challenges to our legislative process; and

Whereas the adamant refusal of many State legislatures to reapportion themselves in the face of constitutional mandates has created an indifference to the problems of urban areas and the atrophy of strong State government and State initiative in solving urban problems; and

Whereas the provision of Senate Joint Resolution 2, that "factors other than population" may be used to apportion one house of a State legislature is vague and opens the door to discrimination against groups of voters such as Negroes and the poor, and consequently endangers the gains promised by the Voting Rights Act of 1965: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Midwest Democratic Conference meeting in Chicago, on June 26, 1965, That we oppose any effort to negate the Supreme Court decision on State legislative apportionment and urge all Midwest Congressmen and Senators to oppose and vote against any measure designed to dilute or overturn this historic affirmation of the democratic principle of fair representation.

THE 47TH YEAR OF SERVICE TO CONGRESS BY EUGENE T. KINNALY, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I extend my personal best wishes to Eugene T. Kinnaly, a distinguished son of Massachusetts, as he enters his 47th year of service to the Congress of the United States.

Gene Kinnaly began his career on the Hill in 1918 as secretary to the late Representative James A. Gallivan and 10 years later went on to become administrative assistant to the present Speaker of the House, JOHN W. MCCORMACK. For more than three and a half decades, he has been a tireless and dedicated friend and trusted adviser to Speaker MCCORMACK. What is more, his knowledge of the legislative process and his rational, reassuring, and openminded approach to issues and problems has won him the friendship, respect, and appreciation of countless legislators, regardless of their partisan preference. Here is a man whose record of service is outstanding, not simply because of its duration but because of its enviable quality. For this reason, Mr. President, "thanks," even more than "congratulations" are in order—thanks to a man whose distinctly admirable service has transcended the narrow bounds of partisanship; thanks to a man whose term of service is not only remarkable but exemplary.

Mr. President, what I have said applies to me on a highly personal basis as a Member of Senate for the past 20 years.

ANNUAL MEMORIAL SERVICES BY SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AT GRAVESIDE OF ELBRIDGE GERRY, FOURTH VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on July 5, 1965, the District of Columbia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution held services at the graveside of Elbridge Gerry, fourth Vice President of the United States. Annually they gather at the Congressional Cemetery to pay tribute to this distinguished statesman.

Gerry was born in Marblehead, Mass., graduated from Harvard College in 1762, and joined his family in the mercantile business in a time infused with revolutionary spirit. In May 1772, he began his political career as an elected representative to the General Court of Massachusetts. He was reelected in 1773, and in 1774 was elected to the first Provincial Congress, which appointed him to the executive Committee on Safety. In this position he worked with John Hancock and Samuel Adams making preparations which helped bring about the success at the Battle of Lexington and Concord.

In 1776 he was elected to Congress, where he soon established a reputation for integrity, conscientiousness, industriousness, and implacable opposition to England.

At the Federal Convention of 1787, Gerry was one of the most experienced and active members. As chairman of the committee that prepared the "great compromise," he was instrumental in bringing about final agreement on the Constitution. His own fears that the Constitution would fail to secure liberty, however, prevented him from voicing support for the document until 1789. Again elected to Congress, Gerry was given the opportunity to provide the Constitution with a Bill of Rights, thus satisfying his original doubts about the Constitution.

Although he retired temporarily, Gerry returned to public service in 1797 to accompany Marshall and Pinckney on the "XYZ mission" to France. In 1810 he was elected Governor of Massachusetts, a position he held until 1812, when he was nominated as Vice President on the ticket with James Madison. His long political career came to an end on November 23, 1814, when he was seized by a hemorrhage of the lungs on his way to the Senate Chamber.

In honor of his long career of public service and his consistent respect for integrity, I join the District Sons of the Revolution in paying tribute to Elbridge Gerry—Massachusetts legislator, Massachusetts Governor, U.S. legislator, fourth Vice President of the United States.

IMPROVEMENTS IN THE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION SYSTEM

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am pleased that at a recent meeting of the National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress, the members recommended improvements in the unemployment compensation system and gave general endorsement of the bill which I and several other Senators have introduced in the Senate (S. 1991) and which Representative WILBUR MILLS introduced in the House of Representatives (H.R. 8282).

The National Commission was established by an act of Congress last year. It has been given the responsibility to make a broad assessment of the effects of change and automation on production and employment and also on communities affected by technological change.

The 14 members of the Commission appointed by President Johnson are: Chairman: Dr. Howard R. Bowen, president, University of Iowa; Mr. Joseph A. Beirne, president, Communications Workers of America; Mr. Albert J. Hayes, president, International Association of Machinists; Mr. Whitney Young, executive director, National Urban Leagues; Mr. Robert M. Solow, professor of economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Mr. Daniel Bell, chairman, Sociology Department, Columbia University; Mr. Benjamin Aaron, visiting professor, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University; Mr. Robert H. Ryan, president, Regional Industrial Development Corporation of Southwestern Pennsylvania; Mr. Thomas Watson, chairman of the board, IBM; Mr. Patrick E. Haggerty, president, Texas Instruments, Inc.; Mrs. Anna Rosenberg Hoffman, president, Anna M. Rosenberg Associates; Mr. Edwin Land, president and research director, Polaroid Corp.; Mr. Philip Sporn, chairman, System Development Committee, American Electric

Power Co.; Mr. Walter P. Reuther, president, United Automobile Workers.

The Ways and Means Committee of the House has scheduled hearings on H.R. 8282, to begin in early August. The endorsement of the National Commission is additional evidence of the need for improvement in the basic unemployment insurance law, and I am hopeful that we can accomplish this in the 89th Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the press statement regarding the endorsement of the National Commission be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Commission Endorses Updating of Unemployment Insurance Laws

The National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, meeting here this week, endorsed the essence of S. 1991 and H.R. 8282, which update the unemployment insurance laws.

The Commission, in a resolution passed during its meeting, said: "The Commission endorses wholeheartedly and recommends action by the Congress to provide clearly needed improvements" in the unemployment compensation laws.

The resolution said: "The unemployment insurance system of the Nation has two basic purposes:

"1. It is a primary means of support to the millions of persons displaced each year by the technological and other changes which occur in the economy.

"2. It is an important automatic stabilizer, adding support to both local economies and the national economy whenever business activity slackens."

The National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress is charged by Congress and the President with the duty to assess the impact of technological change and recommend actions to share the costs and help prevent and alleviate the adverse impacts of change on displaced workers.

The Commission heartily recommended congressional action to update the unemployment insurance laws to increase benefit levels; lengthen benefit periods; extend coverage to more jobs; implement Federal standards so that workers will receive adequate protection throughout the Nation.

APPOINTMENT OF LEONARD MARKS AS HEAD OF U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, President Johnson is to be congratulated for his appointment of Leonard Harold Marks as head of the U.S. Information Agency. I have come to know Mr. Marks well, during my years in Washington, and I am sure that he will fulfill his duties with great distinction. I ask unanimous consent to have a biographical sketch of Mr. Marks which appeared in the July 14 issue of the New York Times printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New Voice of the United States—Leonard Harold Marks

Washington, July 13.—In its 12-year history the U.S. Information Agency has been headed by a professional diplomat, a political philosopher, a successful journalist, and a famous broadcaster. Today President Johnson chose as its new Director, charged with the vexing assignment of explaining America to the world, Leonard Harold Marks, a bouncy, brilliant 49-year-old lawyer. "Since the age of 16," Mr. Marks observed today, "I've done nothing else but work in communications."

The fascination with the techniques, economics, and legal problems of amplifying men's thoughts has carried him from Pittsburgh, where he was born March 5, 1916, to Washington, where he combined a variety of public-interest assignments with a highly successful private law practice.

Among his more famous clients was radio-television station KTBC in Austin, Tex., keystone of the broadcasting empire built by Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson and now administered by her trustees.

The relationship between the Marks and Johnson families is an intimate one. Mr. Marks was the President's personal representative in planning the inauguration this year. Mrs. Marks was enlisted by Mrs. Johnson's move from their private residence into the White House in the autumn of 1963.

BOTH MEN GREGARIOUS

The President and his new information chief were compared to each other by a Washington hostess who has entertained both frequently. "They're both gregarious men," she said, "but they're not frivolous. You could look around for Leonard or Lyndon, and they were always off in a corner, talking business."

Information Agency officials, who think access to top policymakers is the key to success for their Director, are hopeful that the closeness of the personal relationship augurs well.

The new Director was graduated from the University of Pittsburgh at 19, received a law degree from its law school 3 years later and taught law there for 4 years.

In 1942, he began a 4-year assignment as assistant to the general counsel to the Federal Communications Commission. In 1946, Mr. Marks and his chief at the agency, Marcus Cohn, founded the law firm of Cohn & Marks, now the largest in Washington dealing exclusively with communications cases. Mrs. Johnson's station was among its first clients.

From his early days on the FCC staff, Mr. Marks had an interest in developing broadcasting by frequency modulation, or FM. More recently he has been involved in obtaining channels and financial support for educational television stations.

President Kennedy named him in 1962 to the founding board of the Communications Satellite Corp.; he was formally elected as a public member of its board of directors in 1964.

Mr. Marks has traveled extensively abroad, as a member and adviser of U.S. delegations to international communications conferences. He has also traveled to India and Pakistan under State Department auspices, explaining American broadcasting techniques and the role and responsibility of a free press.

In 1948, Mr. Marks married the former Dorothy Ames, a onetime reporter for Variety and other newspapers. They have two teenage sons, Stephen and Robert.

The Marks have a home in Georgetown and this summer are renting a small home on the Glen Ora estate at Middleburg, Va., that President Kennedy and his family leased 3 years ago.

An indifferent sportsman who has trouble defeating his wife at table tennis, Mr. Marks is a leading figure in the Potomac Marching Society, a dinner-dance group. A short man, he has been described by one friend as "having the kind of a face that can never look unhappy."

REPORT ON HUMPHREY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, few men who have held the office of Vice President of the United States have served with the energy and ability which have characterized Hubert Humphrey's period as Vice President. Recently, Roscoe Drummond wrote a fine article reporting on the Vice President's many activities and his close working relationship with President Johnson. I ask unanimous consent to have this article, as published in the Washington Post, printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Report on Humphrey: Outlook Is Reassuring

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Hardly a day passes that some commentator does not give us a report on the state of L.B.J. In sophisticated Washington he is sometimes judged only by the style of his actions; in the country he is judged by the substance of his actions; history will judge him by the results of his actions.

For the most part the reports are favorable. The President is feeling well, he is doing well, and is filling his office to the brim and running over.

What about the Vice President? How is Hubert H. Humphrey in the role for which Lyndon Johnson carefully picked him?

It is a critical, crucial, difficult role and Mr. Johnson chose him to be ready to become President if the necessity arose. The President knew how suddenly that necessity could come.

I am not attempting to appraise Humphrey as a possible presidential nominee. There are too many imponderables in that equation to judge. But I want to report two aspects of the vice-presidency that are immensely reassuring:

1. The President is giving Humphrey the largest opportunities ever given a Vice President to be ready to take up the Presidency.

2. Humphrey is responding to these opportunities in ways that reassure those who work with him.

Humphrey is, of course, not making the policies nor the decisions of the Government. No Vice President ever does and no Johnson Vice President would ever think of it. But Humphrey is often a participant in policy formulation and is kept by the President at the center of decisionmaking.

The President constantly uses Humphrey on a wide range of domestic and foreign policy matters. Humphrey is a valuable legislative troubleshooter, he is active in supervising the diverse space program and in coordinating the work of all Federal agencies in carrying out the civil rights laws.

There is no one in Washington today—outside L.B.J. himself—who knows as much about all that the Government is doing, all that the President is thinking and planning, and all he faces, as Hubert Humphrey.

This shows how completely intent Mr. Johnson is in protecting against the worst. It is mighty encouraging when you recall that when Vice President Truman suddenly had everything crash down upon him, he had never once been invited to the White House to talk things over with F.D.R

But what is Humphrey doing with his opportunities? Is he using them well in order to be ready if the need arises? My information is that on the things that count most he is using them exceedingly well. These are the vital matters:

Intelligence: The Vice President is not taking it easy. He puts in an 18-hour day nearly 7 days a week. The light at his bedside never goes out until he has finished studying every scrap of CIA and other intelligence. When the next day starts Hubert is up to date.

Security: The Vice President has deliberately acquainted himself not only with the Joint Chiefs of Staff but with the second and third echelons of the armed services. He respects them. They respect him They knew he is neither soft nor appeasement-mined. They know he knows the Nation's security requirements.

The economy: The Vice President is a political liberal whose views have often found the bitterest opposition in the business community. But Humphrey's liberalism is tempered by experience and responsibility. He will probably never be the hero of the business community, but businessmen now have reasons to know that Humphrey believes profoundly in competitive enterprise and the profit incentive, knows how important risk capital is to growth and jobs, and wants no animus between Government and business.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the position of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade with respect to S. 268 and S. 1118 before the Senate District of Columbia Committee hearings on home rule.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Position of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade With Respect to S. 268 and S. 1118, 89th Congress

(Submitted for the record, Senate District of Columbia hearings on home rule, Mar. 19, 1965)

The District of Columbia form of government and the question of suffrage for District of Columbia residents have received continuous attention in the Board of Trade for more than half a century. Forty-nine years ago, in 1916, the Board adopted a policy favoring national representation for the District of Columbia. We have engaged in extensive activities in furtherance of that objective for many years and continue to do so today. We believe the Board has great competence to comment on the bills under discussion—much more than some of the agencies and organizations and persons currently articulating loudly and frequently about the District of Columbia form of government.

Most business, professional, and recognized civic leaders of Washington since 1889 have been members of the Board of Trade. A large number of community leaders in the Federal City today are members and have served as chairmen of its committees. Our Board of Directors and officers, a list of which is attached, is certainly composed of men of proven ability and judgment as well as men whom you will recognize as having been leaders in many important civic enterprises. We believe the committee will agree that this group of Washingtonians is well qualified to discuss local matters. One additional observation to this point—the presidents, directors, and leaders in the Board of Trade have always been men whose lives have been intimately identified with this community. A large majority of the men who have served as presidents of the Board of Trade have been natives of this community. We believe this is important in that it demonstrates that the Board of Trade may speak from a leadership experience which is preeminent in this city.

So there will be no misunderstanding, let it be recorded that the members of the Board of Trade and the Board of Trade as an organization fully subscribe to the basic American democratic philosophy. We believe that all Americans, including those residing in the Federal City, should have a voice in their government through selecting officials who govern them. This is clearly demonstrated by our active interest in securing for the people of the District a vote for President and Vice President. The Board of Trade was the prime mover in this effort which owes much of its success to the Board's vigorous activity at the time of its adoption and for some years previous.

The Board of Trade in its positive direction, is still seeking for the people of the District representation in the Congress which under the Constitution is and must continue to be the agency invested with the exclusive power to govern the District of Columbia.

We wish to emphatically note—for the committee's information—that the Board's opposition to home rule is not based on racial considerations. We opposed similar home rule proposals a half century ago when the nonwhite population of the District was just over 25 percent. We feel that we would continue to support such a policy even if the nonwhite population were a much lower percentage. This statement is made here in view of the frequent practice by some ardent home rule supporters of maligning the Board of Trade and disparaging its judgment in this matter for being racially motivated.

Now despite our conclusion that home rule as detailed in S. 268, S. 1118, and similar bills should not be enacted, we do wish to record the quite obvious fact that if the Congress does provide a District of Columbia government of this nature, the Board of Trade will energetically lend its efforts to perfecting the organization and operation of such a new government.

Our basic objective is to make of the Nation's Capital the finest community in the world in which to live, work, and raise our families. This we have endeavored to do for 75 years, despite a number of handicapping local conditions, and we will continue to do so to the best of our ability under whatever circumstances prevail.

We and many, many thousands of other District residents as well as countless other Americans who have taken the trouble to thoroughly inform themselves with respect to the unique situation in the Federal City are opposed to the passage of S. 268 and S. 1118 and other bills tagged as "home rule" bills because we conclude that if adopted, they would not produce meaningful "home rule" government and that their enactment would be extremely injurious to the best interests of the Federal City and the United States of America.

Our basic premise respecting the District of Columbia's character is that its primary purpose is to serve as the seat of Government of the United States. It was designed and developed for that purpose and should continue to serve that purpose. This premise, to which we believe the Congress overwhelmingly subscribes, imposes a host of very special and unusual characteristics and requirements not present in other cities.

To get a true picture of Washington and its problems, it is necessary to turn back the pages of history to the early 1790's and trace the city's development through the years. Section 8, article I, of the Constitution of the United States provides that Congress shall exercise exclusive legislation over such district (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of Government of the United States.

An act of Congress of July 16, 1790, accepted the 10-mile square of land lying on both sides of the Potomac River which the States of Maryland and Virginia had ceded for this purpose in 1783 and 1789, respectively. The act further directed the President to appoint three commissioners to survey, limit and locate the city and, prior to the first Monday in December 1800, provide suitable buildings for the accommodation of Congress and the President, and for public offices of the Government of the United States.

An act of Congress, approved April 24, 1800, authorized the President of the United States to direct the removal of various executive departments to the city of Washington from Philadelphia. The first meeting of the Congress in the new Capital was held on November 21, 1800, by which time President John Adams had moved to the White House. By June 16, 1801, all personnel and records had been moved to the new seat of government.

The first government of the city of Washington (then only the central portion of the District) was established after its incorporation by an act of Congress in 1802. The government consisted of a mayor appointed by the President and a 12-member City Council elected by the people of the city. The Council, by vote of its members, was divided into an upper house of seven members and a lower house of five. The right to vote for Federal officeholders ceased in December, 1800.

In 1812, Congress amended the charter of Washington by providing for an elected Board of Aldermen of 8 members and an elected Board of Common Council of 12 members. The Mayor was elected by joint vote of the 2 boards.

Eight years later in 1820, the charter was changed again. This time it provided for the same Board of Aldermen and Board of Common Council but with a Mayor elected by the qualified voters for a term of 2 years. This form of city government continued for 50 years.

By an act of Congress of February 21, 1871, a territorial form of government was provided for the District consisting of a Governor, a Board of Public Works, a Board of Health, and a Legislative Assembly consisting of an 11-member Council and a 22-member House of Delegates. The Board of Public Works consisted of the Governor and four persons, one of which was a civil engineer. The Governor, the Council members, and the Board of Public Works were appointed by the President. The members of the House of Delegates were elected by the qualified voters. There was also an elected Delegate to the House of Representatives of the United States with a right to speak but not to vote.

This form of government which closely resembles one of those advocated again today lasted only 3 years. On June 20, 1874, it was abolished by an act of Congress which established a temporary commissioner form of government and appointed a committee of two Senators and two Representatives to draft "a suitable frame of government for the District of Columbia." Following a report of this committee, the temporary government was abolished by the act of June 11, 1878, which created the present three-commissioner form of government with the Engineer Commissioner appointed from the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army. Our present government, which has survived for 87 years, can be said to have been arrived at by the "trial and error" method since it evolved after rejection by the Congress of the 1802, 1812, 1820, 1871, and 1874 types of government.

So much for history and so much for experience. There are those who will say that things are different now, that this fabulous electronic and space age has created a whole new set of circumstances which make it impossible to measure the present and the future by the past. So, let us enumerate a few of the unique situations in this Federal City which, we believe, discredit the contention that it should have the same form of government as other cities.

1. It is the first city ever to be conceived, born and raised as the Capital City of a major nation with no other reason for existence.

2. At the time of its birth, it was divorced from local political pressures by being located on land ceded from the adjoining States.

3. The Constitution of the United States reserves to the Congress the right to legislate for the "City of the Nation." Regardless of the type of government enjoyed by the local people, its governing officials, whether they be commissioners or a governor or a mayor, can "regulate" only under the overriding legislative control of the Congress.

4. The Federal Government owns 43.1 percent of the taxable land in the District of Columbia.

5. Foreign embassies and tax free organizations (many specifically declared tax free by the Congress) occupy another 7 percent.

6. Since District governmental activities occupy 4.1 percent of the taxable land, the total of these exemptions is 54.2 percent.

7. Our major business—the Federal Government—pays no income tax, sales tax, personal property tax, or real estate tax. Elsewhere business does pay these taxes roughly at the rate of $1 for each $20 of payroll.

8. Our parks are administered by the National Park Service.

9. Our Board of Education, appointed by the the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, is an independent agency reporting to the Commissioners only on budgetary matters.

10. Our judges are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

11. Our Zoning Commission has two ex officio Federal officers on it—the Director of the National Park Service and the Architect of the Capitol.

12. The National Capital Planning Commission with the Engineer Commissioner as an ex officio member is appointed by the President and reports not to the city fathers but to the White House.

13. Our Public Utilities Commission, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, except the Engineer Commissioner who serves ex officio is an independent agency reporting to the Commissioners only on budgetary matters.

14. The Board of Commissioners is charged with preparing an annual balanced budget. The only taxes which can be raised or lowered by them are real estate and tangible personal property taxes.

15. The District of Columbia budget, after review by the Federal Bureau of the Budget, is presented to the Congress by the President in his annual budget message.

16. The District of Columbia government performs all the functions of a city, county, and State. Insofar as the Federal highway aid and most other Federal aid programs are concerned, it is classified as a State and receives its share of interstate money.

17. Its income is deposited in the U.S. Treasury and can be withdrawn only for payment of budget items approved by the Congress.

18. The Corps of Engineers of the Army is responsible for water supply and purification but the distribution is the responsibility of the District government.

19. The District of Columbia National Guard reports directly to the President who is the Commander in Chief. The Federal Government appoints the commanding general and exercises control over the Guard in a manner similar to State governments.

20. Federal Civil Service Commission rules, regulations, and eligibility lists apply equally to many District employees.

21. The District furnishes the Federal Government certain basic municipal services such as fire and police protection and water, sewer and sanitation services.

These 21 items all add up to a complicated Federal-city relationship. Some of these conditions would be changed if any of these so-called home rule bills were enacted into law, but the significant ones would remain as is. Of the 21 points cited just a few—perhaps half a dozen—would be altered through passage of S. 268 or S. 1118 and they are not the most important ones.

The Board of Trade's long experience with Congress on District of Columbia budget and legislative matters has led us to the firm conclusion that the transfer of revenue and budget functions to a locally elected council or legislative assembly would be accompanied by the shrinkage of the presently increasing but still inadequate Federal payment. Support for this conclusion was voiced during the 86th Congress (as it has been many times) during the debate on the floor of the House of Representatives when the District of Columbia budget was being considered.

In response to questions from the floor, Congressman RHODES of Arizona had this to say,

"Personally, as far as home rule is concerned and as it concerns the fiscal position of the city of Washington, I would venture to say that if the city of Washington had home rule, it would be treated the same as any other State in the United States is treated insofar as Federal payments are concerned. In other words, if we are speaking only of the fiscal situation, it would be my thought that probably the city of Washington would lose whatever Federal payment that it now receives except insofar as those payments are for services rendered * * * I doubt very much whether the Congress would be inclined to pay annually to the District of Columbia $22 million, $25 million, or $30 million or whatever figure it might be any more than it would be inclined to pay the city of New York, for instance, payments in lieu of property taxes for the Federal installations."

The District of Columbia cannot be developed, operated, and maintained by those living and doing business within its borders. Only 45.8 percent of the land is taxed; its largest employer, the U.S. Government, is completely tax free. To attempt to levy the total District budget on residents and commercial activities would place an unconscionable burden on the people far in excess of that demanded anywhere else, including Maryland and Virginia. Of even greater practical importance is the fact that neither the tax-paying residents nor businesses could long shoulder such burdens. Consequently, many of them would inevitably remove themselves to other jurisdictions. Thus there would be an acceleration of the outward movement of businesses and residents who pay taxes in excess of municipal expenditures on their behalf, accompanied by a depreciation in property values and a reduction in business volumes. This cycle of deterioration is well understood, hence, the end result is predictable. Through this means would be created exactly the same situation in which Congress found the District of Columbia in the early 1870's and which resulted in the commissioner form of government and the establishment of a fixed Federal payment. The outlook under these "home rule" bills is a distressing fiscal problem which we conclude ardent advocates of this legislation do not recognize.

Many articulate local residents base their support for so-called "home rule" on the contention that our shortage of money problems respecting schools, welfare, public health, and other social matters are a result of inaction of the uninformed or unsympathetic or stingy Congress. They state that "home rule" would solve these problems. We vigorously disagree with such statements. We conclude that these problems would be compounded.

Under the proposed bills the Congress would not adopt District of Columbia budgets. We conclude that this would make the District more dependent on local taxes and that the Federal payment would certainly become a smaller portion of available annual revenues.

We in the Board of Trade and, we believe, most thinking practical people accept the inescapable hard economic fact that no community can develop and be operated properly without a prosperous and solid economic base. Fiscal health is certainly a primary requisite for the Capital of this great Nation.

We foresee that the enactment of any of these bills would result in an intolerable conflict of interest between the local people and the U.S. Government. If one of them is passed, there would be repetitions of the same misunderstandings which characterized the period from 1800 to 1878.

As it did on more than one occasion in that period the Congress would take action on vital issues directly opposed to the action of the counsel or the will of the people.

Though we favor the formula for determining the annual Federal payment included in S. 1118, we seriously doubt that the Congress will enact either it or a reasonable fixed percentage as it did in 1878.

In the absence of a fixed figure or an orderly manner of arriving at an equitable Federal payment, there would result inevitably a situation where the local government would refrain from major public works commitments with the contention that it was a Federal responsibility. The Congress would in many cases refuse to acknowledge such responsibility until conditions became so horrible that they would have to deal with them just as in the case of the water supply and other facilities in the 1800's.

The inevitable result of these situations would be that the local community would be in constant contention with the Congress and that seekers of local political offices would undoubtedly construct their platforms in varying degrees on anti-U.S. Government local issues.

We dislike injecting such conclusions in the record of these hearings but we believe they are sound. We believe the committee should be informed of the thinking of an intensely interested group of leaders in this community and we conclude that the results of the enactment of the legislation under consideration would be so injurious to the Federal city that we would be remiss in our responsibility if we did not review these matters here.

While we will not review the details of the bills under consideration, I do want to refer to one section of S. 268 which, in our opinion, is completely undesirable and which relates to the fiscal situation which we have been discussing.

Section 806 of S. 268 defines qualified electors as "any person (1) who has maintained a domicile or place of abode in the District continuously during the 1-year period ending on the day of the election, (2) who is a citizen of the United States, (3) who is on the day of the election at least 21 years old, (4) who has never been convicted of a felony in the United States, or if he has been so convicted, has been pardoned, (5) who is not mentally incompetent as adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction, and (6) who certificates that he has not within 1 year immediately preceding the election, voted in any election at which candidates for any municipal offices (other than in the District of Columbia) were on the ballot." Then the bill provides that the District may issue bonds of indebtedness provided their issuance receives a favorable vote of the qualified electors.

The Washington Board of Trade has in every hearing on home rule bills vigorously opposed the dual voting provision through which persons residing in the District, though retaining and exercising their right to vote in other jurisdictions, may vote in the District if they have not voted in a municipal election during the preceding year. We hold that it is unfair to those exclusively citizens of the District to permit voters in other jurisdictions, many of whom intend to return to their home in the States next year, the year after, or at some time in the future, to participate in referendums authorizing the creation of large amounts of bonded indebtedness, secure in the knowledge that they will not participate in paying these debts.

Denying the vote only to those who have participated in an election when municipal officials were on the ballot is a principle which is incomprehensible to us. The District of Columbia performs substantially all the functions of a State, county, municipality, and school district. Why then only exclude those voting for municipal officials? Why not also State and county officials? If this were done it would, of course, eliminate as qualified electors in the District all those who voted in other jurisdictions and thus reserve participation in elections including the approval of bond issues to those people who firmly acknowledge the District of Columbia as their permanent home. S. 1118 does not include this objectionable language.

The Board of Trade has steadily maintained that national representation is an essential feature of true "home rule" for residents of the District. Excerpts from the testimony before the House Judiciary Committee in 1928 by Henry Glassie, then Special Assistant to the Attorney General, clearly express our reasoning in support of this statement. Mr. Glassie said:

"What was the claim of the Americans to full participation before the Revolution? Participation in local government? Not at all. They had that. It was participation in that sovereign imperial parliament which made the law.

"We have been reproached with the idea that we do not want local government and therefore do not want self-government. But mark the distinction. Local government may be a mere matter of municipal administration. But what self-government means is that the people who are to obey the laws shall have a share in the making of the laws. You (the Congress) make the law. Under the constitutional provisions you will always make the law. Under the principle that the Federal Government shall be supreme, you must continue to make the law.

"Therefore, when we come to you humbly, and say, 'Admit us to participate; admit us to your councils in the making of this law,' we are asking for local self-government.

"So I say to you, gentlemen, with profound deference, that these things, first from one side and then from the other, which are constantly thrown against us, will hardly bear scrutiny. We do want self-government, and the essence of self-government is the right to send a man from your community into the legislative representative body which can send you to war, tax your property, do what it pleases with your will, control your domestic relations, your relations with your family, your wife and children and do all those things which make a government, a government touching intimately the life of the community. Those are the things that are dearest to you and those are the things which, in your respective States, you insist upon having, and which you will never surrender."

We wish to express to the committee our appreciation for this opportunity to present our views.

WHO'S AN EXTREMIST?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have received a copy of an address given recently in Los Angeles by Alan Cranston, controller of the State of California.

Mr. Cranston spoke on extremism, both of the right and the left. In his address he reviews the history of extremism and cites numerous examples from contemporary society. He emphasizes that the remedy is not in attempting to suppress ideas or in limiting free speech in our society, but to meet the efforts of extremists with truth.

I believe his speech itself is an example of what he recommends at the end of his address:

> The time has come, I think, for all Americans—liberals, moderates and conservatives, the press and the churches, business and labor—to isolate, point out, and reject totally the extremism on both sides of us, the conspiracy theories, the ends-justify-the-means philosophy, the authoritarian contempt for our democracy, the hatred and the bigotry.

I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO'S AN EXTREMIST?

(By State Controller Alan Cranston to Town Hall, Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, on July 13, 1965)

One morning, not too long ago, two bulky pieces of mail landed on my desk in Sacramento.

The first envelope contained a copy of Progressive Labor, a monthly published by the extremely leftwing Progressive Labor Party.

The magazine told me that we Americans live in a Fascist state, that President Johnson and Walter Reuther are among its conspiratorial leaders and stooges, and that President Kennedy was assassinated by the big business, police state machine.

It said that all America would know this, if the press were not controlled.

The second envelope contained a packet of material published by the extremely rightwing John Birch Society.

This material told me that we Americans live in a Communist state, that President Johnson and Walter Reuther are among its conspiratorial leaders and stooges, and that President Kennedy was assassinated by the Communists, for not being a good enough Communist.

It said that all America would know this, if the press were not controlled.

Funny-coincidence department?

I don't think so.

And I'd like to spend the next few minutes exploring why, in some detail.

There is a virus in our land.

Highly contagious, it has existed throughout history, throughout the world—often dormant, sometimes epidemic, and occasionally fatal.

It will always exist to some extent in a free society, where ideas and judgments—even the false and the execrable—may be voiced, with relative impunity.

But these days in America, and especially in California, the virus is severe, far reaching, and menacing.

The virus is extremism.

Very few, to my knowledge, have really attempted to isolate this virus—to define, simply and precisely, just what extremism is, today.

To all too many, I believe, it has not been made sufficiently clear, once and for all, why extremism is essentially wrong and essentially dangerous.

As a foreign correspondent in Mussolini's Italy and Hitler's Germany in the 1930's, I saw extremism close up, both in its budding and in its fullest and ugliest flourishing.

In the mad world of Adolf Hitler, I saw Jews herded off to concentration camps, on the harsh road to the ovens of Auschwitz.

In Ethiopia, I witnessed 20th century slavery—Fascist style. I saw black women flogged for failing to salute white men in black shirts.

Years later, I saw the same hatred and inhumanity in Birmingham, where I walked the streets with Martin Luther King in the dark and bitter winter of 1957, when white men were throwing bombs at black men.

In short, I have long studied the virus of extremism, and I have always been deeply concerned whenever and wherever its symptoms have appeared—especially in America and particularly in California.

Moreover, as I've examined extremist propaganda, left and right, over the years, I've been struck by the many parallels and common characteristics.

In sum, I believe the virus can be isolated.

An extremist is, I think, basically and above all a zealous believer in a fanciful notion that an evil conspiracy controls or is close to controlling our land—our Government, our press, our schools, our churches; indeed, almost every aspect of our lives.

To take some further examples from the hard right:

To the followers of Carl McIntire, a deposed Presbyterian minister and now an anti-Catholic radio star of the far right, our churches are Communist-dominated, the press is "leftist and Vatican controlled," ad infinitum.

To the followers of Dan Smoot, civil defense programing is planned dictatorship, urban renewal a plot toward a Soviet America, and so on and so on.

To the followers of Gerald L. K. Smith and his anti-Semitic Christian Nationalist Crusade, the Supreme Court, the income tax, and the United Nations are only a few of the tools of the Kremlin.

To the followers of the White Citizens Councils, mental health programs, the Ford Foundation, and civil rights laws, among a good deal else, are all Communist cabals.

To the followers of the Minutemen, everything from Martin Luther King to Life, Look, and the Saturday Evening Post is part of the great conspiracy.

To the followers of H. L. Hunt's Life Line Foundation, America's mutual security program was devised by no less than Joseph Stalin—in the 1920's—and Life Line goes on in a very big way from there.

And to the followers of Robert Welch and the John Birch Society, the CIA, NATO, and De Gaulle are just three of thousands of Communist schemes and schemers.

That doesn't leave much of America, or the free world, uncontrolled—except, possibly, the Beatles.

By now, to the followers of the Birch leader, Billy James Hargis, and his own Christian Crusade, now even the Beatles have been revealed as Communist agents, out to brainwash us all via rock 'n roll.

(While, I might add, on the other side of the world, in Sukarno's Indonesia, a man has just been arrested as a subversive—for playing Beatles records.)

All this, I think, is extremist doctrine, pure and simple.

These leaders and groups of the extreme right are only a few of hundreds upon hundreds who are flooding Californians and Americans with their propaganda at an unprecedented rate, through newspapers, via radio, over television, by films, tapes, maps, meetings, brochures, pamphlets, books, fliers, long-playing records, and even bumper strips.

In fact, a partisan of this sort of thing can just about dial the extremist of his choice on radio and television in California, on almost any given day and at almost any given time.

And there are indications, sometimes, that quite a few of the faithful do just that—all day long.

The evidence indicates that more than 3,000 such groups in America are now doing a $30 million a year business in rightwing extremism.

For comparative purposes, Government evidence indicates that the Communist Party, at its peak, never got much further than raising $1 million a year in the United States.

And the Progressive Labor Party, the most vociferous and potentially contagious new voice on the hard left these days, with its Peiping brand of radicalism, has an estimated 500 members, with a treasury, perhaps, commensurate with its size.

In contrast, the Birch Society alone spent an estimated $3 million last year and now is aiming at adding 38,000 new members, just in California. Its leader, Robert Welch, deems the soil of California so fertile that he plans to spend half his time among us.

Still another rightwing extremist, Carl McIntire—the anti-Catholic radio preacher of whom the vast majority of Americans may not yet have heard—grossed an estimated $1.5 million, at least, in 1964. Which puts him far, far ahead of a much better known evangelist of the hard right, Billy James Hargis.

The point is not to belittle the Communist Party or other extreme leftwing splinter groups in America, as long as their support depends, in varying degrees, upon a tremendous and treacherous element not present in the extreme rightwing: Allegiance or subservience to a foreign power.

In a strange way, this element is at one and the same time a source of strength and a cause of weakness for the extremists of the left. Their relationship to the Soviet Union and/or China automatically directs a great deal of unsympathetic attention to their activities. The absence of any such alien and hostile ties on the part of the extremists of the right causes a comparative lack of concern about their doings.

The point is, I think, that inside America, and within the fabric of our own society, the extreme right has by far the more power, prestige, and potential to become a force, rather than a factor, in our land.

But all of this vast propaganda activity, though worthy of our deep concern, is not, to me, the most immediate, serious danger.

I have confidence that the great majority of Americans have the innate good sense to reject flatly the patent silliness from the screwball set, right or left.

One very real danger, I believe, is this:

An extremist believes and practices the philosophy that the ends justify the means.

This follows naturally from extremists doctrine, for if a person believes that our land is in the clutches of an awesome, evil conspiracy, he will feel called upon to take almost any action to fight it—

From hounding librarians and teachers to bullying editors and public officials, to forming cell groups and secret platoons, to boycotting businesses and infiltrating organizations, to breaking up meetings and training in the hills.

Actually, to the extremist, this is simply patriotism of the highest order—well meant, but deadly dangerous.

Another fundamental characteristic of the extremists is their loss of faith, if they ever had it, in the institutions of our Nation and in our democratic processes. They are not legitimate conservatives or liberals in any sense. They can never be. They are prepared to operate wholly outside the bounds of our American tradition.

It's no happenstance that to Robert Welch on the far right—and these are his words—"democracy is merely a deceptive phrase, a weapon of demagoguery, and a perennial fraud."

Or that, to quote again from Welch in his society's Blue Book: "The John Birch Society is to be a monolithic body. * * * The John Birch Society will operate under complete authoritarian control at all levels."

It's no happenstance, either, that, on the far left, the Progressive Labor Party, for example, calls for "a revolutionary dictatorship of armed workers" and considers our American democracy to be a farce. "Fascism" is their word for it.

Genuine conservatives and genuine liberals believe in honest debate over the many sides of an issue and are then willing to leave the decision to the will of the majority—and this is the very essence of our democracy.

But to the extremist, there is no other side. There is nothing to debate. There can be no compromise.

For the other side is not merely the opposition, but the enemy—the evil conspiracy, and hence illegal.

If you're not with the extremist all the way, you must be at worst a traitor, at best a fool.

And so it doesn't matter who our President is—Johnson, Kennedy, Eisenhower. To the extreme right, they are all Communists or pro-Communists, and to the extreme left they are all Fascists or pro-Fascists.

I find it hard to suppress a smile when a Birch member admits to me that Robert Welch may be wrong and just a trifle intemperate in labeling Eisenhower and Dulles and NATO and the CIA as Communist agents, but fervently declares that the society itself is just great.

To me, it's like a Communist saying he thinks Marx was a nut, but that the party is just fine.

The John Birch Society was founded squarely on the premise that Dwight D. Eisenhower was a Communist. Without that notion, Welch would never have formed his society.

I also find it hard to suppress a shudder when I hear a top Birch Society official, John Rousselot, assert that 2,000 of Los Angeles County's peace officers are Birch members.

Whether 2,000 or 200, that frankly disturbs me more than all the reports of Minutemen training in the hills with rifles and bazookas.

Another very real danger, I believe, lies in the fundamental and sometimes frenetic bigotry and hate inherent in extremism.

It's almost necessarily present in extremism, because it's very hard not to hate what you think is evil.

Moreover, it's hardly a secret that, for example, the old Silver Shirter, Gerald L. K. Smith, was vehemently attacking the Supreme Court, integration, the income tax, the United Nations, Eisenhower, et al., as communistic long, long before Robert Welch appeared on the public scene.

Indeed, the only significant difference between the beliefs of Robert Welch and the beliefs of Gerald L. K. Smith is that Welch blames everything in this world on the Communists and Smith blames it on the Communist Jews.

I do not mean to suggest that all extreme rightwingers are bigots. But almost all of the American group founded upon hate are rightwing.

In some organizations, such as the Citizens Councils and the National States Rights Party, the bigotry is overt. In others, it is covert or latent. But it is there, and it is foreboding.

And it is logical that it is there.

For, if you believe that our land is in the grip of such a monstrous conspiracy, it is only a small step further to find Jews, or Negroes, or Catholics, or what-have-you, behind it all.

The danger in all of this, I think, can be summed up by noting just a few words from a leaflet in widespread circulation not very long ago—and I quote:

"Like a giant spider, the Jewish international world stock exchange capital creeps over the people of this earth, gradually sucking their marrow and blood.

"Thousands and thousands of its paid agents are untiringly active in the press and in political parties.

"Three hundred men who know one another dominate the world.

"Where are the political parties and where is the so-called press?"

The time was July 20, 1921. The place was the Zirkus Krone in Germany. The angry speaker was a Herr Adolf Hitler.

I remind you that not many Germans paid much tribute or applause to that newcomer and his conspiracy theories in those early days.

Or attention.

The literature of extremism is highly combustible.

By its very nature, it incites and inflames.

The trouble is that one never knows in what dark corners of society tortured souls may be listening—and believing.

Here are a few more words from still another leaflet:

"Throw the Jews out of commerce, where they damage property and the people's wealth.

"We rescued them from the Germans who dealt more wisely with them.

"Our people is not as it used to be. It has been infected by the Jews."

Sounds like the Ku Klux Klan, doesn't it? But it isn't the Ku Klux Klan.

That particular leaflet was posted, by a group called the "Beat the Jew Committee," on buildings by the hundreds on October 4, 1959—in a Moscow suburb called Malakhovka.

A short time later, the suburb's synagogue was burned down, and the caretaker's wife strangled by unknown assailants.

The Soviet Union has had a long, murderous history of anti-Semitism, especially during the years of Stalin.

Today, under a more moderate but still totalitarian regime, it is as rampant as ever.

This is not surprising.

The Communist Party is also basically anti-Catholic and anti-Protestant. Like any extremist group, it must be opposed to any influence which does not subordinate itself entirely to party doctrine.

The point, however, is not to single out the Soviet Union or Hitler's Germany.

Hate is hate, wherever practiced—in Russia, in Germany, in the United States, anywhere.

There can be no apology for it and no acceptance of it.

I firmly believe that Americans must be ceaselessly alerted to hate, wherever it appears, and shown again and again and again why it is so dangerously ominous—and so dangerously wrong.

Let me make one thing crystal clear: I do not believe the United States of America is in any imminent peril of capture by the extremists, right or left.

So, then, what do we do about it? Anything? Nothing?

First of all, I pray, the one thing we never do is to prohibit the ideas, the thoughts, the trumpetings of any extremist group.

For, if we do, we will no longer be a truly open and free society—and that openness and that freedom is the pillar of our democracy and our greatest strength.

To me, extremism is a virus, not a cancer. If we sought to remove it surgically, the body of America would be badly weakened by the operation and perhaps destroyed.

But I think we should do something—and a very great deal more than we are presently doing.

The extremist today is on the move.

Besides frightening a disturbingly large number of Americans, he tends to monopolize public discussion.

He beclouds concentration on the real issues, by focusing on the unreal.

He daunts the weak and the timorous, especially at the local level.

He incites his neighbors to supplant reason and understanding with emotion and hate.

He divides and degrades America.

As the Los Angeles Times once pointed out so aptly—subversion is subversion, whether from the left or from the right.

It is imperative that the virus of extremism today not be ignored—or allowed to go untreated—at this moment when it seems more virulent, infectious, and menacing than in any recent time.

The prescription, I believe, is massive and constant doses of strong serum of truth.

This is by no means any easy chore.

For the extremist can confound even the well-educated with the scraps of truth, half-truth and wholly imagined "evidence", which he uses to construct his woolly case.

It is a nerve-wracking task, to boot.

For the extremist, once scratched, fights back, employing any and all means.

The task is further complicated because we do not know exactly why the extremist believes and behaves the way he does—except that he dislikes and distrusts the American society in its present form. On the extreme right, he yearns for what he believes was a golden past. On the extreme left, he's captivated by a fool's gold of the future.

But the treatment is, I strongly believe, a necessary one.

The time has come, I think, for all Americans—liberals, moderates, and conservatives, the press and the churches, business and labor—to isolate, point out, and reject totally the extremism on both sides of us, the conspiracy theories, the ends-justify-the-means philosophy, the authoritarian contempt for our democracy, the hatred and the bigotry.

Most viruses become powerful enough to wreak severe damage only when the bodies they seek to infect become weak.

The virus of extremism will be only as strong as we permit it to become.

We know that extremism thrives on fear, hate, and bigotry.

But I suspect that we are not yet fully aware that the greatest ally of extremism is indifference.

Edmund Burke said it best, and I paraphrase the enduring wisdom of his remarks to Parliament in the 18th century: "Evil triumphs only when good men fail to act."

We cannot be indifferent to the strident voices and the sinister tactics of the extremists.

We cannot be indifferent to the dynamic sources of our own strength as responsible Americans.

Fear of extremism is not the answer to today's challenges from the right and the left. Faith in ourselves is.

Where Americans have a firm and active faith in themselves and their system of representative government, extremism will shrivel into inconsequence.

Where the voices of intelligent conservatives, moderates, and liberals speak out clearly and confidently on the issues of our time, the snarls of the extremist right and left will fade into whines.

The good people of this Nation and State—and they form the multitude—must act and speak out against the evils of extremism.

Each of us must express our faith in our society through words and work—in our news media, businesses, clubs; in our neighborhoods, communities, and cities; in all the channels of communications and influence within the structure of our society and our Government.

More of us need to speak out, with positive and active faith in ourselves and our Nation. Silence is not golden, my friends. Silence is darkness. In the darkness, the extremist contrives to tarnish this golden State. And then bend it to his perverted will.

Truth, faith, and the clear voices of good men of many persuasions will spotlight the extremists of the right and left, and reveal them as they really are—feeble and fearful, holding only the weapon of fear and the weapon of hate.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MONRONEY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, a fine article by Bert Mills paying tribute to the work of the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney] appeared in the July edition of National Publisher. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

City Room to Capitol Hill: Meet Mike Monroney

(By Bert Mills)

A former newspaperman and proud of it, Senator A. S. Mike Monroney, Democrat, of Oklahoma, is the new chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. This is perhaps the most important position in Congress in framing postal rate legislation and other laws relating to the postal service.

Senator Monroney talked about his ideas on postal and other matters in an interview at his office soon after his elevation to the postal committee chairmanship. NEA's Ted Serrill and this correspondent supplied the questions and the Oklahoma veteran answered readily. In keeping with his press background, nothing was off the record.

Upon arrival in the Senator's office, the NEA visitors were greeted by Carter Bradley, administrative assistant, a close friend of Ben Blackstock, manager of the Oklahoma Press Association. Bradley is a regular attendant at OPA conventions.

The last thing Chairman Monroney said to the NEA team was: "I have a soft spot in my heart for the little newspaper." As Ted Serrill reminded him, that was demonstrated back when Congress was in the process of passing the 1962 rate increase law.

That was the law that ended the historic free-in-county mail privilege on in-county mailings. In its place, the bill almost ready for passage called for imposition of a one-eighth cent per piece charge the first year and a one-quarter cent rate the second year.

At the request of NEA, Senator Monroney sponsored an amendment to delete the second year increase. This prevailed and is a part of the present law, saving weekly newspapers nearly $1 million in postage annually. Senator Monroney also sponsored another amendment sought by the Oklahoma Press Association and this too became law.

HAS 26 YEARS IN CONGRESS

Now 63 but looking and acting younger, Monroney has been in Congress for more than 26 years. He served in the House for 12 years and has been a Senator for 14. He has been on the postal committee since 1951 and in the recent past has been chairman of its Postal Affairs Subcommittee.

The old Oklahoma News, a Scripps-Howard newspaper then published in Oklahoma City, was his stepping stone to a political career. He began as a boy wrapping singles in the mail room, and recalls driving a horse and wagon to the express office and riding a bicycle to collect for want ads.

While attending high school in his native Oklahoma City, he wrote a weekly column for the News. While at the University of Oklahoma, he edited the campus daily and corresponded for the News and other papers—and won a Phi Beta Kappa key besides

He became a full-time reporter for the News upon graduation and covered the Oklahoma State house. His big break, he recalled, was scoring an 18-hour beat on the retirement plans of U.S. Senator Robert L. Owen. That made him a political writer.

The untimely death of his father drove Monroney out of the newspaper field. He took over the family furniture business and operated it for 10 years. In 1937, he ran for office for the first time, seeking a seat in Congress. He lost, but has never been defeated since. One year later he was elected a U.S. Representative and has been in Congress ever since.

COAUTHORED REORGANIZATION ACT

Representative Monroney made his mark in a hurry in Washington. While only in his fourth term, he won the 1945 Collier's Award for Distinguished Congressional Service. He became a specialist in the organization of Congress and with Senator Robert M. La Follette, Republican, of Wisconsin, coauthored the Reorganization Act of 1946 which streamlined Congress.

Nearly two decades later, the organization of Congress is still a major interest of Monroney. He now serves as cochairman of the Joint Committee on Reorganization of Congress, which is attempting to update the 1946 law and achieve needed reforms. Hearings have been held and prospects are excellent for another enactment.

In 1950, Monroney challenged veteran Senator Elmer Thomas, Democrat, of Oklahoma, for his seat. He beat Thomas in the primary, easily defeated a Republican opponent in the November election, and has been a Senator ever since. His present term does not expire until 1968.

Aviation has been a major legislative interest of Monroney. He was the author of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which established the Federal Aviation Agency. Six other aviation laws are credited to him, and he has been awarded the Wright Brothers Trophy for service to aviation and the Tony Jannus Prize for his contributions to the scheduled airline industry.

His aviation activities have stemmed from his membership on the Senate Commerce Committee, and heading its Aviation Subcommittee. He is also the chairman of the Automotive Marketing Subcommittee and was the author of the Automobile Labeling Act of 1958, requiring window stickers to disclose the factory price of new cars.

Senator Monroney is also a member of the potent Appropriations Committee. He heads its Legislative Subcommittee and serves on five other subcommittees, including the one handling funds for the Post Office Department. Obviously he is a mighty busy legislator, often supposed to be at two or three meetings at the same time.

HAS INDEPENDENT VIEWS

Senator Monroney made it plain during his NEA interview that he will not simply rubberstamp postal legislation sent up to him from downtown. He has a questioning attitude. He does not pretend to know all the answers and he will reserve judgment on some issues until he hears the facts.

Take the ZIP code, for example. He called it "a good effort" but he does not know whether its full-scale use will actually speed mail delivery. He thinks it should be tested for delivery results "after it has been in the woodwork long enough." He has named a subcommittee to study ZIP code.

Soon after Monroney became chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, President Lyndon B. Johnson sent to Congress a Federal pay increase bill. This will be handled by Monroney's committee. He is for a salary raise but against one novel feature of the White House proposal—to allow semiautomatic increases in pay in future years without congressional action.

Publishers concerned about their postage rates will be glad to know that Chairman MONRONEY does not favor combining postal pay and postal rate increases in a single bill. "I think they should be separate," he told NEA.

Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy both linked pay rate increases on the theory that if postal workers got a raise, users of the mails should pay this added cost through higher rates. The last two rate increases have combined a pay and a rate bill. It is good news that Senator MONRONEY objects to this practice, as does NEA and every other mail user group.

DUBIOUS ABOUT PRIORITY MAIL

Postmaster General John A. Gronouski has announced plans to seek legislation to establish a "priority mail" service, combining first class and airmail. Presumably this would mean the end of 5-cent letters and 8-cent airmail, and the substitution of a priority mail rate of 6 or 7 cents. The Post Office would use trains or planes to transport mail, whichever would give better service.

Senator MONRONEY is interested in better service but he is not so sure that ending airmail is the answer. He is not against the Gronouski plan, he just wants the facts laid on the line before he makes a decision. This is a typical attitude for the new head of the postal committee. He is a bearcat for facts and does not jump to conclusions.

Mechanization of the postal service is another subject on which the Oklahoma legislator remains to be convinced. If economical and practical, he is for it but he believes it can be overdone. He cited a personal experience with mailing eight wedding presents, every one of which was broken in the mails. He blamed machine handling for the breakage.

On the other hand, Senator MONRONEY agrees with most mail user groups that the Post Office Department "has been niggardly in asking for research and development funds and Congress has been niggardly in giving research dollars" to the POD. In his position, on the Appropriations Committee, MONRONEY is in a strategic spot to influence Post Office thinking on mechanization.

SEES RATES AS CONTROVERSIAL

Senator MONRONEY is a veteran of the postal rate wars. He knows all the arguments on both sides. He has supported rate increases when he felt they were needed, but at the same time he has exerted his considerable influence for moderation in the amounts. It would be a good guess that this would be his attitude in the future.

He does not know whether the Johnson administration plans to propose a rate increase. He will cross that bridge when he comes to it. But there is one key preliminary he hopes to get out of the way before the next rate bill comes along. He wants an independent cost study made by a top accounting firm. He has discussed this matter with the Postmaster General.

When the 1962 rate increase was on its way through Congress, the Senate Post Office Committee wrote into its report that a full study of costs should be made before another rate increase was considered. MONRONEY regrets this research has not been done and hopes to arrange it in the future. "It should have been done last year," he told NEA.

Serrill raised with Senator MONRONEY the problem of the "dilution of second-class mail"—the granting of second-class entry to publications which do not deserve the privilege. While Senator MONRONEY was unaware that a wall map had been granted second-class entry, he did know of the situation in general and promised to help "clean up second-class mail."

He is concerned about the cut rates for charitable institutions and realizes what a large burden such rates impose on Post Office Department finances. He does not know the answer and is aware of all the controversy which greets every effort to raise charity rates, but he hopes to find a solution.

A DISTINCTIVE TOUCH

Like every other Senator, Chairman MONRONEY has a press secretary. She is Mrs. Beth Short, widow of Joe Short, who was press secretary to President Harry S. Truman. Mrs. Short has a solid newspaper background herself, but her duties are a little different from most Senate press aids.

For one thing, Senator MONRONEY writes his own speeches and press releases. He doesn't just dictate them, he types them himself. Behind his desk there is a typewriter—an ancient L. C. Smith which he dug up and had restored at a cost probably greater than a new electric machine. He is delighted with it.

There may be other Senators who are touch typists but probably Senator MONRONEY is the only one who bats out copy on an old standard model. Mrs. Short sometimes feels like a copy girl as she processes speeches and releases "takes" hot off the boss' typewriter. She indicated that the Senator's private office is not unlike a newsroom as a deadline nears.

If the next postal rate law is written at least in part on that L. C. Smith, newspapermen can at least take comfort that it was done by a city room alumnus who remains at heart a newspaperman.

INCOME TAX LOOPHOLES

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post, Stewart Alsop points out some facts about the loopholes in our tax structure—facts which demonstrate how that structure favors the very rich, particularly those who have amassed their fortunes in certain businesses which enjoy a special tax status. There are many in the Senate, notably the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who have been pointing out the inequity of these loopholes for some time, but I think Mr. Alsop's brief essay is an especially pointed and concise statement of the problem. We must face up to the fact that we did not finish the job with last year's income tax cut and this year's excise tax cut. We still have some unfinished tasks of tax reform facing us. The long-range prospects for our economic system depend, among other things, on the existence of an equitable tax structure. Something is wrong when it turns out that the man who earns $5,000 a year is paying a greater percentage of this income in Federal taxes than the man who earns $5 million annually. And something is even more wrong when it turns out that the man who earns $5,000 a year is actually paying more money in taxes than the man who earns $5 million. These are documented facts. So that others may see Mr. Alsop's remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW BIG RICH—A POSTSCRIPT

(By Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—A good many years ago George Kennan, then chief of the State Department's policy planning staff, suggested that I look up a certain Russian refugee in New York. The man was intelligent, Kennan said; he had been a major Communist functionary in the Soviet Union, and he knew a lot about how the system really worked.

The next time I was in New York I telephoned the Russian, and he asked me to dinner, giving a rich-sounding Park Avenue address. A maid dressed in Mary Petty style ushered me into a handsomely furnished duplex apartment, and I sat down to a memorable meal, with two good wines, followed by a really impressive brandy.

Over the brandy and cigars, the Russian remarked that when he arrived in the United States a few years before, he had only the clothes on his back and one $5 bill. "Then how in the world?" I asked—and finished the question by gesturing at the opulent surroundings.

"Very simple," said the refuge in his heavy accent. "In Communist Russia, way to get ahead is to be a Communist, so naturally I am a Communist. In capitalist America, way to get ahead is to be a capitalist, so naturally I am a capitalist."

So he was. Using a little borrowed money and a lot of foresight, he had acquired for a song an option on some mothballed World War II freighters and started a coal-shipping business. Then, under the Marshall plan, the United States began shipping coal to Europe on a vastly greater scale than ever before—and the Russian's business did so well that, when I saw him, he was worth several million dollars.

In recent months, while working on an article on "America's New Big Rich," which appeared in the last issue of the Post, I often recalled George Kennan's Russian friend. For what he said is quite true. If getting ahead and getting rich are the same thing, then "in capitalist America, the way to get ahead is to be a capitalist."

In a capitalist society there is surely nothing wicked about being a capitalist. Aside from being interesting and original human beings, the six men who were the subjects of my article—who have made an average of $200 million in the last 20 years—created thousands of jobs in the process of enriching themselves. And yet the months I spent on the trail of the new rich raised certain questions in my mind about the tax structure which, in many ways, determines how the American capitalist system really works.

Under the present tax structure there are two ways a man can become a major capitalist. He can invent a useful new product, patent it, market it and enjoy a Government-protected monopoly for the life of his patents. One of the men I wrote about—Dr. Edwin Land, who invented the Polaroid camera—became very rich in this way. A great inventor like Dr. Land has an indisputable right, recognized for generations, to the protection of the patent laws.

The five other men I wrote about became rich in the second, and much more usual, way. They piled up huge fortunes in certain businesses—notably oil, insurance, savings-and-loan and real estate—all of which have one thing in common. They all provide useful tax shelters. These days, in order to build a really big fortune, a man must be what Howard Ahmanson's nephew once called Ahmanson, the immensely rich California savings and loan man—"a genius at tax law." Either that, or he must hire a genius for a tax lawyer. One of the chief secrets of becoming very rich is to avoid—quite legally, of course—paying heavy income taxes, or even, in some cases, any income tax at all.

I did not ask my six rich men what income tax they paid. A man's income tax is his own business—and the business of the Internal Revenue Service—and if I had asked them, they would have told me, quite rightly, to go to hell. But it was not really necessary to ask. Certain statistics compiled by the Treasury Department tell the income tax story of the new big rich, as a class.

These statistics show that the man with an "adjusted gross income" (income after business and other deductions) of $1 million a year pays, on the average, a smaller proportion of his income in taxes than the $50,000-a-year man. The man with an adjusted gross income of $5 million a year, in turn, typically pays a smaller proportion than the $1-million-a-year man.

The Treasury statisticians based their study on the year 1959, when the top income tax rate (which literally nobody paid) was supposedly 91 percent. In the Kennedy-Johnson tax reduction passed by Congress last year, the top bracket was cut back to 70 percent. This was a useful step in the right direction. No man in his senses would risk his capital if he had to absorb all losses, while the Government picked up $9 out of $10 of profit. Thus, if taxes had really been paid at the rates established in the tax tables, the capitalist system would have collapsed.

But even a 70-percent top tax rate puts an enormous premium on finding tax loopholes. A capitalist has a right to expect a reasonable return in "keeping money" for risking his capital. According to experts, if the chief loopholes were closed, the top bracket could be cut to 50 percent without loss of revenue, and 50 percent is surely not confiscatory. Then a genuinely progressive tax system, based on ability to pay, could be restored. But the most important loophole closing reforms were knocked out of the Kennedy-Johnson program by Congress. Our progressive income tax system therefore remains what it has been for years—a myth.

Our loophole ridden tax system as it now operates gives the tax sheltered businesses a big advantage over less favored businesses. It thus has a distorting effect on the national economy. But what is much more important, the system is unfair in human terms.

The man who uses money to make money keeps far more of it than the unfortunate fellow who uses his brains or his talents to earn a salary in a company or a taxable income in one of the professions. But the unfairness does not end there. For example, a very rich man who has inherited his money can put it in tax-free bonds and pay no income tax at all, while a man with two dependents, earning a mere $5,000 a year, has to pay almost a tenth of his income to the Government. This is not only unfair—it is grossly unfair.

Gross unfairness can be very dangerous in a democracy, particularly if the economy runs into real trouble. In that case, the unfairness could endanger the capitalist system itself—a system which, for all its faults, has worked better than any other.

THE DANGERS OF BOMBING HANOI

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Republican calls to bomb Hanoi do not serve the cause of a rational foreign policy for our country in Vietnam. In its July 19 issue Newsweek published a well-reasoned column by Walter Lippmann on this subject. As Mr. Lippmann convincingly warned:

> It is most probable that if the President followed the Laird-Ford line, he would find that the North Vietnamese Army, which is a very good one, intervened not only by infiltration, as now, but in force. It is not improbable, moreover, that if we destroyed the missile sites and the oil tanks and storage depots of North Vietnam, the Soviet Union would step up its aid to make good the important losses. This would bring the President face to face with Moscow and produce a worldwide crisis.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE HARD LESSON

(By Walter Lippmann)

A very substantial majority of the people, upward of 60 percent according to the Gallup and Harris polls, support the President on Vietnam. Yet, the White House and the State Department cannot, I feel sure, fail to be reading into these returns the provisional and conditional nature of the popular support. It rests almost entirely on the hope that the President's policy will succeed, on the belief that the President is in a better position to judge than is anyone else, on dislike of any alternatives thus far proposed, and the patriotic feeling that in time of trouble good citizens should rally around the President.

But while the President's supporters are a large majority, the quality of their support is fragile. To keep it the President must make good in Vietnam itself, and not merely in his arguments with Congressmen and journalists. There are important signs that, as the situation in Vietnam becomes worse, the Republican support of the President is breaking up. Senator Dirksen by himself is no longer able to deliver the Republicans. Congressmen Laird and Ford, following the Goldwater line, are preparing a trap for the President which it will not be easy for him to avoid. Nothing that has come from the liberal opponents has anything like the bite of the Laird-Ford opposition.

FORMULA FOR VICTORY

Messrs. Laird and Ford start from the position which President Johnson has arrived at—that a military victory is impossible, that all we can hope for is a stalemate to be followed by the negotiation of a compromise settlement. If that is the best the President wants, they say, it is not worth the commitment of a large mass of American soldiers and the inevitable casualities of a prolonged guerrilla war. This puts the Republican activists in opposition to a big land war in Asia, which is undoubtedly the real sentiment of the mass of our people. However, while the mass of our people do not want a big land war, they do want something that looks like a victory. Messrs. Laird and Ford offer them a formula for victory. It is to bomb North Vietnam from the air and keep the GI's out of the foxholes.

The Laird-Ford formula is superficially so plausible and so attractive that the President is going to have a hard time refusing to try it. As long as he does not bomb Hanoi and Haiphong, he will be unable to prove to the country that Messrs. Laird and Ford did not have the magic formula for achieving everything we want without paying much of a price for it.

There is, however, no magic formula. There is no reason whatever to think that the destruction of Hanoi and Haiphong would bring the war in South Vietnam to a satisfactory conclusion. For nearly 6 months our bombers have been moving north, and Hanoi has been put on notice that the bombers can do and may do just what Messrs. Laird and Ford now say they should do. There has not been a quiver from Hanoi to suggest that the North Vietnamese would pay even a small price to avoid the bombing. On the contrary, there is much evidence that their will to fight has grown harder.

It is most probable that if the President followed the Laird-Ford line, he would find that the North Vietnamese Army, which is a very good one, intervened not only by infiltration, as now, but in force. It is not improbable, moreover, that if we destroyed the missile sites and the oil tanks and storage depots of North Vietnam, the Soviet Union would step up its aid to make good the important losses. This would bring the President face to face with Moscow and produce a worldwide crisis.

At some point, the President and his advisers are going to have to ask themselves why everything goes wrong—be it under Henry Cabot Lodge or Maxwell Taylor—why over the years all our hopes have been dashed and one plan after another has failed. It is not that we have not tried. It is not that the military and civilian leaders have not been efficient and faithful in their specialties. It is, I believe, that we have set ourselves a task, which, like squaring the circle or perpetual motion or living 200 years, is impossible to do. It is an impossible task for the United States to reach across the Pacific Ocean and to determine what shall be the constitutional foundations of a country in Asia, or by force of American arms to assure a weak country that it will be non-Communist, self-governing and independent of its enormously big neighbor.

To say that something ought to be done does not make it possible to do it. That is a hard lesson to learn. It is a hard conclusion for politicians to admit. But it is one of the lessons every nation, like every individual, has in the course of time to learn.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the fate of the captive nations is the most heart-rending legacy of the last war and one of the heaviest burdens that presses upon the conscience of free world leadership. The tragedy is that today the free world is in no better position to help these nations than at any time during the last 20 years. Their situation poses a great human dilemma, perhaps one of the greatest such dilemmas in modern history.

It is sad that while the free world won a triumphant victory over its deadly Nazi and Fascist foes, more than 100 million people in central and eastern Europe fell under the steamroller of Communist totalitarianism. Deliberately, treacherously, and in flagrant violation of its wartime pledges, the Government of the Soviet Union imposed its iron rule over peoples living in areas from the Baltic to the Black Sea. For two decades these peoples, including 17 million Germans in East Germany, have been separated from the free West.

All the efforts made by the governments of the free world have not brought about any change in the lot of captive nations. But we in this country are firmly determined to do all we can to have these nations freed. We have also resolved to keep the issue before the public by annually observing Captive Nations Week, in pursuance of a joint congressional resolution passed in 1959 and annual Presidential proclamations. I am indeed happy to raise my voice in support of the observance of Captive Nations Week.

CALIFORNIA COTTON

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Commodity Credit Corporation will shortly own 10 million bales of cotton. I am proud to note that very little of this surplus will be California cotton which is efficiently grown and has remained competitive in both the domestic and world markets. Last year only about 1½ percent of California's cotton was taken over by the Government.

Mr. President, I have long been concerned with the declining use of cotton by our textile industry. If cotton is not to be completely replaced by synthetics, there is a need for an encouragement of the production of quality cotton. There is also the need to relieve the already overburdened taxpayer from having to pay for supports on cotton that is not of sufficiently high quality to be used in our high-speed and efficient modern textile mills. That is why I made known my support for the Agricultural Act of 1964 as it pertained to cotton when it was before the Senate in March 1964. There were some provisions in that legislation which I questioned, but I keenly believed that our cotton industry needed an opportunity to revitalize itself so that it could once again become competitive.

The Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives has now reported an omnibus farm bill, H.R. 9811, which contains some useful provisions to encourage the production of quality cotton. I hope my colleagues on the Senate Committee on Agriculture will continue to give this question the deep study which they have been giving it so that at long last quality cotton production may be encouraged in America.

Mr. President, I ask consent that a telegram which I have just received from Mr. John P. Benson, president of the Western Cotton Growers Association, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 19, 1965.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

California cotton has not caused the pileup in carryover and Government-held stocks which has created the crisis in the cotton industry.

It is estimated that on August 1 of this year, the Government's Commodity Credit Corporation will own 10 million bales of cotton. This is one of the largest supplies of cotton ever held or owned by any government or corporation. And practically none of it will be California cotton.

Last year only about 1½ percent of California's cotton was taken over by the Government. The figures for most other States was 50 to 85 percent. This simply means that the American textile mills did not buy all that cotton and the Government had to.

As we pointed out at the Senate hearings, quality is one of the keys both to increased cotton consumption and to the mounting pile of Government-owned cotton. On the one hand, if more quality cotton were produced more cotton as a whole and less synthetics would be used. On the other hand, the production of cotton which the textile mills pass over contributes both to the increase of Government-owned stocks and the increase in the use of synthetics.

I urge you to vigorously present these facts when cotton legislation comes before the Senate for consideration.

Regards,

JOHN P. BENSON,
President, Western Cotton Growers Association.

PROFESSORS SUPPORT VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, a statement strongly supporting the administration's policy in Vietnam has just been issued by 67 professors from various American colleges and universities. Although this document was circulated at the end of the academic year when many instructors had left their campuses, it is signed by a number of distinguished political scientists, historians, economists, and other faculty members.

At this critical period it is reassuring to have this positive assessment by experts in international affairs about the course we are now pursuing. These professors assert that in their opinion—

> U.S. policy in Vietnam is consistent with the realities of the situation, the goals of American foreign policy, and the peace and freedom of South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this statement, together with the list of signers, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM BY POLITICAL SCIENTISTS AND OTHERS

To dispel the notion that any small but active and vocal groups of teachers and students speaks for the entire academic community on the problem of Vietnam, we the undersigned feel it necessary to make clear our support for the policies of President Johnson. We do not believe the U.S. policy in Vietnam has been free from errors, but its infallibility is not at issue. At issue are its relevance, realism, and morality. We believe U.S. policy in Vietnam is consistent with the realities of the situation, the goals of American foreign policy, and the peace and freedom of South Vietnam.

We strongly desire peace in Vietnam and a political settlement of the war achieved through negotiation among responsible parties. We regret the involvement of American troops in a foreign war. We believe the President shares these commitments and regrets. We believe in the good faith of his reiterated desire to seek a political settlement of this war through negotiation, any time, anywhere, with any responsible parties.

We ardently support social, political and economic reform in Vietnam and elsewhere, and welcome all efforts to achieve representative institutions, economic opportunity, personal freedom and a higher standard of living for all. We believe that the present Democratic administration has made clear its dedication to progress in Vietnam by its very substantial development program and its promise of massive assistance when the cessation of hostilities makes possible full concentration of the Vietnamese people on the job of development.

We believe that war is a gruesome travesty on civilized decisionmaking and that the war in Vietnam is a hideous burden on the people of that nation. However, we also know—for this is a matter of evidence, not of opinion—that the war in South Vietnam resulted not from a spontaneous outburst of popular unrest, not from American invasion, but from the deliberate exportation by Hanoi of waves of troops trained in the tactics of terrorism and guerrilla warfare. Aggression from the North is not merely a cliche in a propaganda war; it is combat-ready soldiers, trained and equipped by Hanoi, armed with modern weapons, and Mao's strategy for the subjection of a peasant population. We regard it as exceedingly significant that no major population group in South Vietnam supports, or has supported, the Vietcong.

Confronted with the sharp escalation of Hanoi's aggression against South Vietnam, the U.S. Government had available a limited number of alternatives:

The United States might have sued for peace and met Hanoi's reiterated demand for withdrawal of all American support to South Vietnam. It would thereby have permitted South Vietnam to be integrated into the totalitarian Leviathan to the north, and have abandoned tens of thousands of South Vietnamese who have resisted totalitarian expansion to liquidation as enemies of a new Communist ruling class.

The United States might have done nothing, and permitted its own forces and those of South Vietnam to be defeated by Hanoi's enlarged forces. This course would have added humiliation to withdrawal, would have enhanced the "paper tiger" image of the United States, as well as have consigned South Vietnam to totalitarianism.

The United States might have launched an all-out war against North Vietnam and destroyed that nation's cities and industrial capacity utterly and precipitously.

The United States might have begun a restrained increase of its military effort, designed to escalate the price of aggression and enhance the incentives for peaceful settlement.

Among the unsatisfactory and limiting choices available, we believe the President chose wisely. We support his continued efforts to find a political settlement that will achieve peace and freedom for South Vietnam.

Finally, we reject the bizarre political doctrine that President Johnson or his principal advisors have special obligations to the academic community. Obviously, the administration has obligations to explain its policies to the American people. But to suggest that some group of university professors has a right to a special accounting is as outrageous as to suggest that the corporation executives of America, the plumbers, the small businessmen, or the barbers have special claims on the Government and its principal spokesmen. It is a fundamental principle of democracy that all categories of citizens are equal under law, and that neither wealth, nor class, nor expertise entitles a citizen to preferred treatment by his Government.

Ulrich S. Allers, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Dean Stephen Bailey, Maxwell School of Citizenship, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y.; Comer Clay, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Joseph Cooper, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; George Demetrious, director, Institute for the Comparative Study of Political Systems, Washington, D.C.; Martin Diamond, department of political science, Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif.; Eleanor Lansing Dulles, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Valerie A. Earle, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; John T. Everett, Jr., Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Mark F. Ferber, assistant professor, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers—the State University, New Brunswick, N.J.

Victor C. Ferkiss, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Richard M. Fontera, department of political science, Douglass College, New Brunswick, N.J.; Robert W. Fostor, professor of law, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; Carl Friedrich, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Wayne E. Fuller, professor of history, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Stephen P. Gilbert, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Walter I. Giles, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Joseph B. Graus, department of government, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Richard Greer, executive director, Operations & Policy Research, Inc., 4000 Albemarle Street, NW., Washington, D.C.; Ernest S. Griffith, dean of the School of International Service, American University, Washington, D.C.

George D. Haimbugh, Jr., associate professor of law, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; Morton H. Halperin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; John F. Haltom, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Donald G. Herzberg, professor of political science, director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers, the State University, New Brunswick, N.J.; Samuel Huntington, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Jan Karski, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, Trinity College, Washington, D.C.; James E. Larson, professor of political science, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; J. R. Leguey-Feilleux, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Karl H. Lerny, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

Michael F. M. Lindsay, professor, far eastern studies, American University, Washington, D.C.; Benjamin E. Lippincott, professor of political science, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; Seymour Martin Lipset, professor, political science, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; George A. Lipsky, professor, political science and geography, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.; Kurt L. London, professor, international affairs director, Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.; Charles Burton Marshall, Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research, Washington, D.C.; Neil A. McDonald, professor, political science, Douglass College, New Brunswick, N.J.; John H. McDonough, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Franz Michael, professor, international affairs, associate director, Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Warren Miller, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.; S. D. Myres, professor, department of government, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; William V. O'Brien, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; George R. Osborne, department of political science, Douglass College, New Brunswick, N.J.; Robert E. Osgood, School of Advanced International Studies of the Johns Hopkins University, Washington, D.C.; Roland I. Perusse, associate professor of government, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Charles W. Procter, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Lucian W. Pye, professor, political science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.; George H. Quester, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Charles H. Randall, Jr., professor of law, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.

Emmette Redford, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.; Warren A. Roberts, professor, political science and economics, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.; A. A. Rommer, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Harold W. Rood, department of political science, Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif.; Paul Seabury, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Joseph S. Sebes, S.J., Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Warren Shearer, professor of economics, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.; August O. Spain, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Melvin P. Straus, associate professor of government, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.

Susan Tallman, political analyst, Operations & Policy Research, Inc., Washington, D.C.; Donald Tacheron, associate director, American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.; N. H. Timmons, professor of history, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Procter Thomson, professor, economics and administration, Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif.; Richard L. Walker, director, Institute of International Studies, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; Donald B. Weatherbee, assistant professor, Institute of International Studies, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; Clyde Winfield, chairman, professor of history, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Gerard F. Yates, S.J., Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; I. William Zartman, associate professor, Institute of International Studies, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.

OUR COMMITMENT IN VIETNAM—THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, our stake in Vietnam grows daily. Involved is our Nation's pledge to an ally and the freedom of the free world as well. The times could hardly be more serious.

Against this background, Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to two editorials, one from the Wilmington, Del., Evening Journal and the other from the Christian Science Monitor.

The Evening Journal editorial emphasizes that three Presidents have committed this country to help South Vietnam and "for this Nation to fail to keep such a commitment is not only to insure the condemnation of others, it is to invite a whole series of costly consequences that could end in disaster."

The Christian Science Monitor editorial outlines what it calls "three moral and practical obligations" of the administration; namely, "to explain more convincingly to the American people and the world why Washington believes this war must be fought and won"; "to tell the American people as fully and as frankly as is possible what this war will demand of them"; and "to win that war with the utmost speed consistent with decency and common humanity."

Because they are so timely, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials entitled "Our Word Is at Stake" and "All the Facts on Vietnam" be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Journal, July 15, 1965]

OUR WORD IS AT STAKE

For those who have failed to realize the gravity of the situation in Vietnam, President Johnson's statements at his press conference on Tuesday should be enlightening. We have in mind not only the military position, which has been deteriorating; we are thinking of the nature of this Nation's commitment.

The war has been going against the South Vietnamese forces at an accelerating pace since the start of the monsoon season. Vietcong concentrations of a size not seen until this year have overrun important towns; Government units in battalion strength have been ambushed and virtually wiped out; even in the neighborhood of Saigon troop movements are hazardous. More and more American strength has been thrown into the struggle in order to bolster South Vietnamese resistance.

Meanwhile the bombing of bridges and military installations in North Vietnam by American aircraft, more often without South Vietnamese support than with it, has been intensified. Our planes have been ranging north of Hanoi and not far from the Chinese border. But the damage has not prevented the Vietcong from stepping up their offensive.

Now President Johnson says that new dangers and difficulties in Vietnam and increased aggression from North Vietnam may require a greater American response on the ground. So it is "quite possible that new and serious decisions will be necessary in the near future." If many more troops are to be sent, steps will be required to "insure that our reserves of men and equipment remain entirely adequate for any and all emergencies."

That is, there may be a callup of Reserves. Congress may be asked to appropriate additional sums. Draft calls may be increased. To put it bluntly, this amounts to a partial mobilization—for the purpose of supporting an ally fighting a land war it cannot win alone.

This is a grim prospect. The decisions that may be necessary are unwelcome at best. More and more voices have been asking in recent weeks why the United States is in Vietnam. Some have been calling for withdrawal. For them the President had some sober words to explain why we will do what is necessary.

Three Presidents have undertaken to meet the request of the Government of South Vietnam for help against its enemies, in keeping with our pledge under the SEATO treaty. That is the legal and moral basis of our presence there, and to keep that commitment is now a matter of national honor. Our word is at stake.

Let no one underestimate the import of that statement. Let no one sneer at the President invoking the concept of national honor in justifying a further escalation of this undeclared war. For this Nation to fail to keep such a commitment is not only to insure the condemnation of others; it is to invite a whole series of costly consequences that could end in disaster.

There is only one way for the United States to avoid the hard decisions the President foresees. That is to give the Communists the victory—since they have made it clear that they will settle for nothing less. But would such a surrender purchase peace? We do not believe it. It would only encourage the aggressors to strike again and again. To deter them we must keep our word.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 16, 1965]

ALL THE FACTS ON VIETNAM

Now that the U.S. Government has made it clear that it is determined to achieve in Vietnam those military ends which it believes are right and necessary, Washington faces three moral and practical obligations. The first of these is to explain more convincingly to the American people and the world why Washington believes this war must be fought and won. The second is to tell the American people as fully and as frankly as is possible what this war will demand of them. The third is to win that war with the utmost speed consistent with decency and common humanity.

Although we understand and sympathize with the difficulties, both domestic and foreign, which President Johnson faces over Vietnam, we do not believe that any one of these three obligations are yet being met. Washington's explanations on American involvement in Vietnam have left far too many

Americans—to say nothing of the rest of the world—confused, doubtful, and in many cases even indignant. Washington has deliberately refrained from telling the American people what the White House and the Pentagon well know; the cost of victory will be high, the road to victory hard and probably long. Finally, the present American buildup of troops, bases, and material in Vietnam may not be adequate for even a long-drawn-out effort at victory, to say nothing of a swift and decisive effort to end the conflict.

At any time, anywhere, and under any circumstance war is a heart-rending human tragedy. But once a war is begun, the wisest and most merciful procedure is to win that war as quickly as is consistent with every humane consideration left the warrior.

Nor will anything be gained by failing to be utterly frank with the American people. If Vietnam is to require larger armed forces, a callup of reserve units, new military appropriations, the sooner and more fully the American people are told of this the better. At present, this news is coming out in dribs and drabs, in hints, in leaked stories and in other roundabout ways. It is little wonder that the American people seem uncertain and confused about what is going on.

We believe that the American aims of preserving South Vietnam's independence, of halting outside aggression, and of seeking a negotiated peace with honor and justice are right. But we also believe that these may well require greater sacrifices than Washington has yet admitted. It is high time that the White House made this plain.

A CAMPUS-EYE VIEW OF BUSINESSMEN

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, a year ago this month the University of Utah signed James C. Fletcher, a vice president of Aerojet-General Corp., and chairman of his own Space General Co., to be president of the university. During his first short year, President Fletcher has compiled an excellent record. All of us are proud of him.

I noticed in Nation's Business for July that he also has proferred some sound constructive suggestions for removing existing barriers between educators and businessmen and fostering a greater mutual understanding.

President Fletcher cites the apparent prejudice on the part of many educators toward the profit motive. At the same time he reminds those on campuses that there would be no large public universities without a prosperous business community.

To quote from the article:

> More contact with industry would provide university people with the opportunity of seeing firsthand what the businessman is up against, Dr. Fletcher believes. "If the exposure did nothing more than offset the bias against profitmaking, it would be worth the effort," he adds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CAMPUS-EYE VIEW OF BUSINESSMEN—IT'S OFTEN UNFLATTERING BUT IT CAN BE IMPROVED, SAYS UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT JAMES C. FLETCHER

Businessman James C. Fletcher has learned a great deal since he became president of a major American university 1 year ago this month.

Some of the lessons have been reassuring, others disquieting.

He feels that on far too many college campuses, far too many professors are voicing inaccurate, unflattering, and outdated ideas about businessmen and the profit system, and the misconceptions are being passed along to young people like a low-grade infection.

His observation is neither gratuitous nor casual, but the deliberate expression of one who is as much at home in the world of businessmen as he is in the world of academicians.

Before launching a highly successful electronics enterprise in the 1950's Dr. Fletcher was an instructor in cosmic ray physics at Princeton and Cal Tech. By the time he stepped into the presidency of the University of Utah at Salt Lake City last year he had become a vice president of Aerojet-General Corp. and chairman of his own company, Space General.

He concedes that he, too, had a strong prejudice against the profit motive when he left university life to enter business for the first time.

"I went into business to try it for a year," Dr. Fletcher recalls. "I stayed 15 years. In the process I gained a healthy respect for business, the role of profits in our society, and a new respect for the contribution businessmen make to America. Unfortunately, a lot of people in our colleges and universities have negative views on all of these points—unless, of course, you are talking about those departments of a university specifically geared to business."

On campus, he points out, it is often forgotten that the Nation's prosperity depends on business. "We wouldn't have large public universities if we weren't prosperous," he states, citing his own tax-supported 13,000-student institution as an example.

More often than not, the professorial attitude toward the businessman is equivalent to the portrait of the entrepreneur drawn by George Bernard Shaw in his plays, Dr. Fletcher has found.

"The businessman, as seen by Shaw, is typically hard-nosed, gruff, a 'blast the unions' and 'fire this guy if he's not up to capacity' type. That's the image university people quite often have. To many of them business is undignified and not a really useful pursuit."

To remove the wall of misunderstanding which often separates the educator and the businessman, Dr. Fletcher recommends much greater interchange of ideas. He has in mind two-way traffic because he feels that businessmen themselves are sometimes guilty of looking at higher education through the wrong end of the telescope.

One move that would help, he suggests, is for businessmen to invite more university professors to serve on corporate boards of directors. Doing this, the businessman would hear questions raised and points of view expressed that otherwise are missing in a typical business setting. Some of this thinking could be useful as well as refreshing, the 46-year-old educator asserts.

ADVISORY BOARDS URGED

Another step he recommends is the creation of more industrial advisory boards to universities. Among other things, these boards—comprised of businessmen—would help schools of higher learning bring their curriculums realistically into line with the needs of industry. "This is already being done to some extent," he says, "but there is room for more of the same."

Dr. Fletcher says the curriculum planners have to be especially careful in these days of rapidly changing technology. At his own school the faculty was about to give a course in a certain technical field until a check with industry showed that the field was already obsolete.

More contact with industry would provide university people with the opportunity of seeing firsthand what the businessman is up against, Dr. Fletcher believes. "If the exposure did nothing more than offset the bias against profitmaking it would be worth the effort," he adds.

VICE PRESIDENT SPEAKS ON HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the pros and cons of the establishment of a Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development have received considerable public debate. A recent guest editorial in the Saturday Review magazine provided an informative statement by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY on the subject.

I found the Vice President's remarks deserving of close attention by the Members of Congress, for, as he pointed out, he has been working, at President Johnson's request, with the Nation's mayors, county officials, and city managers in an effort to determine effective programs to meet the urgent demands facing our cities.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD this article, "Making Cities Fit for People," as contained in the July 3, 1965, issue of Saturday Review.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING CITIES FIT FOR PEOPLE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following guest editorial, by the Vice President of the United States, discusses the proposed Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development.)

Robert Herrick said in the 17th century that great cities seldom rest: If there be none to invade from afar, they will find worse foes at home. We know those foes today. They are slums, crime, a lack of playgrounds and parks, overburdened schools, inadequate transportation, crowding, lack of clear air, and inequality of opportunity.

It was only 45 years ago that people in American cities first began to outnumber people on our farms. By 1960 only 11 States had more rural than urban population.

But most of these States will not remain that way very long. The urban population of North Dakota, our most rural State in 1960, jumped 35 percent in the 1950's. Alaska's urban population increased 150 percent, and three other States—Arizona, Florida, and Nevada—more than doubled their urban population during this period.

By 1970 we can expect that three-fourths of our people will be living in towns, cities, and suburbs, compared to 70 percent in 1960. Most of our people will be concentrated in metropolitan areas. At the end of 1964, two-thirds of our population lived in 219 such areas, an increase from 59 percent in 1950. By 1980 that proportion will increase to three-fourths, and by the year 2000 to four-fifths.

There have been several patterns of metropolitan growth. One has been mass migration from farm to city. One has been mass migration of Negroes out of the South—virtually all of it to central cities. Another has been mass migration of middle- and upper-income people from the core city to the suburb. And great growth has come from a higher birthrate and from longer life expectancy.

This growth has imposed new and unprecedented burdens on local government for schools, housing, streets and highways, commercial expansion, transit, and welfare programs.

In the past 10 years, State and local debt has more than doubled, while Federal debt has risen only 15 percent.

State and local government employment jumped from 4,600,000 in 1953, to more than 7 million employees in 1963. During the same decade, State and local public expenditures more than doubled, increasing by 132 percent to $65 billion in 1963. Major among these were expenditures on transportation, education, highways, sanitation, and parks and recreation, with increases from 140 percent to 165 percent during the 10 years. Interstate on State and local public debt jumped by 258 percent.

Along with these sharps rises in costs of public services and facilities, the growth of these urban areas has also created explosive racial and economic pressures.

I remember during my two terms as mayor of Minneapolis, at the close of World War II, the strains placed on our city by changing population patterns. Those strains were small compared to those today. Example: In the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area, nearly three-fourths of the people lived in 1950 within the city limits. Today those cities' populations remain constant, while population in their suburbs has more than doubled. The same pattern is common to nearly all our major metropolitan areas.

The picture is clear: There has been a shift of middle and higher income groups into the suburbs, out of the taxing jurisdictions of the inner city, while too many of the poor and disadvantaged have remained behind or moved in from the poorer rural areas.

Although the suburbs have provided cheaper land and lower cost housing for many middle-income families, as well as for the more prosperous, they have been populated largely by those able to afford better housing. Those at or near the poverty level have remained concentrated in the slums and poorer sections of the central city. Faced with deterioration and decay, the inner city has found itself with greater tasks to undertake and with fewer ready sources of money. At the same time, the suburbanites have had their hands full creating public facilities and services in communities that were open grass fields a few years ago.

Behind the statistics and population patterns have been thousands of personal and community tragedies, many of them created by those of good intention. There are the impersonal housing projects that in many cases have displaced families and destroyed the traditional fabric of neighborhood life. There are the freeways that have torn through people's homes and businesses, cut through parkland, and done no more than add to the noise in our streets and poison in our air. There are the shortsighted zoning decisions that have blighted neighborhoods and reduced property values.

Because of these discouraging experiences, it would be easy to say that many of our metropolitan problems stem from apathetic or inept local government. In a few places this is true. But in most it is not.

I have been working, at President Johnson's request, with the Nation's mayors, county officials, and city managers. Almost without exception I have found these men and women to be dedicated, competent, and deeply concerned with the problems pressing on their constituencies. Most of them have long since initiated constructive programs of their own in an attempt to keep pace with the urgencies facing their cities. But they have been fighting massive problems with dwindling resources. And they have not had any single place to turn for counsel and assistance.

One of their major difficulties, they tell me, is that no one Federal department or agency has had either authority or responsibility to work with mayors and county officials in areas where they need most help. Our mayors and county officials have not, in many instances, been able to get advice or a rapid answer in Washington—much less Federal funds.

In 1963 the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations identified over 40 separate programs of aid for urban development, administered by some 13 Federal departments and agencies. Small wonder that the committee reported that "the effect of inconsistencies is felt most keenly in urban areas where programs of all kinds at all levels of government most frequently come together."

It cited particularly inconsistency and conflict between politics, or lack of them, in relocating people displaced by public activities. While a community plans for the relocation of people displaced from a renewal area, not infrequently still another public project, undertaken with Federal help, displaces additional numbers with no rehousing plan—and may even eliminate some of the housing urgently needed to meet the problem.

Jet airports may be announced in residential growth areas, driving down values of homes financed with Federal mortgage insurance or guarantees. A right-of-way for a federally aided highway may be purchased, cutting through an area that another agency is seeking to acquire and preserve as public parkland.

One test of democratic governments is its ability to respond rapidly to changing conditions.

In 1953 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was created to provide top-level Federal policy and direction in meeting the human and social needs of our citizens. HEW treats, to a large degree, the symptoms of urban disease.

But until recently there has been no similar recognition of the need for a top-level Federal department to help meet the physical and environmental problems of metropolis—in many cases the causes of urban disease.

Today most of the key programs having to do with urban development, improvement, and housing are lodged at a secondary level of Government, in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This independent Agency was created in 1947, under President Truman, to administer the housing programs of the FHA and the Public Housing Administration as continuing peacetime activities. Since that time all manner of programs have been added to HHFA's responsibilities, including urban renewal, urban planning, mortgage supports, public works, college housing, mass transportation, open space, and housing for the elderly. Its broad major responsibilities now cover at least 10 distinct and definable areas of activity. If you add the many special programs administered under the Agency, the number would more than double. Its programs today involve some type of Federal support for more than $70 billion in private and public investment in housing and urban development.

About 77 percent of this—more than $54 billion—is private-housing mortgage investment insured by the FHA. Public housing accounts for about 10 percent—$7 billion—in capital investment by local public bodies, secured by annual contributions pledged by the Federal Government. Federal grants reserved or committed for renewal of our urban areas total about $4.5 billion, and loans for college housing nearly $3 billion. Lesser amounts include loan or grant commitments for such programs as housing for the elderly, public works planning and construction, open space acquisition, urban planning assistance, mass transportation, and mortgage financing support for GI home loans.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency was never intended to fill its present job. It is a loosely knit instrument. According to law, three of its officials are appointed by the President and report directly to him. In a legislative sense, at least, there is no one official in command.

When the President meets with his Cabinet he cannot find out what or how the Federal Government is doing overall in assisting towns, cities, and metropolitan areas. The agency most concerned with these areas is not even represented at the Cabinet table.

In the past several years much has been done through executive cooperation and coordination to mesh various urban-related problems throughout government. Glaring conflicts have been avoided. But this has been done the hard way, through bits and pieces of agreements and consultations among officials and staffs at many levels, in many agencies.

Ad hoc committees and interstaff memorandums are no substitute for executive direction.

In 1961 President Kennedy became the first President to propose creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs. Committees of both the Senate and the House of Representatives reported the bill favorably, but it did not reach the floor in time for action at that session of Congress. When the proposal was resubmitted in 1962 as a reorganization plan, it failed to receive House approval. Much of the opposition expressed, as the record shows, was based on misconception of what the plan would do or considerations unrelated to the merit of the proposal.

Today the reasons advanced for opposing a new Department are: That it would be too costly; that it would mean Federal domination over local communities and States; that it would benefit only the large cities; that the Government is already too big, and this Department would make it bigger.

I disagree with these contentions.

The Department bill would authorize no increase in expenditures; instead, it would simply mean that the Government's money would be better spent. It would add no authority to the Federal Government it does not now exercise. It is important to the larger cities but, if anything, even more so to the smaller communities, less able to cope with their growth problems—indeed, the great proportion of communities using these programs are small towns, down to the village level. And the argument against "big government" gives no considereation to the fact that the country and its urban needs and problems are far bigger than we were able to foresee even a decade ago.

The needs of our urban areas have not diminished; they have become more pressing. President Johnson's proposal for a Department of Housing and Urban Development must be considered in this knowledge.

The President seeks from Congress the authority to bring good management to Federal responsibilities in our metropolitan areas. He asks for coordinated direction of these activities by a single Government department. And he asks for a place at the Cabinet table for the head of that Department.

The bill itself says in part that the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall undertake "maximum coordination of the various Federal activities which have a major effect upon urban, suburban, or metropolitan development," and "the solution of problems of housing and urban development through State, county, town, village, or other local and private action, including promotion of interstate, regional, and metropolitan cooperation."

Are our metropolitan areas important enough to merit top-level consideration in the Federal Government?

The answer is certainly "Yes."

We have long since given Cabinet status to our national concern for our natural resources, our agriculture, our trade and commerce, our labor force, and the social health and educational needs of our citizens.

Surely our cities and metropolitan areas—where three-quarters of us live—are worthy of the same attention.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

PRAYER BY REPRESENTATIVE HARLEY O. STAGGERS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I was present on Sunday, June 2, at the opening session of the third annual National Youth Science Camp at Camp Pocahontas, W. Va., when Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS, of West Virginia, made an eloquent prayer for the spiritual guidance of the fledging young scientists in attendance. This honors camp for the top science-minded students in the Nation, 2 from each of the 50 States, who are entering college this fall, is designed to provide a combined opportunity for work and recreation.

The camp is located in Pocahontas County in West Virginia's Second Congressional District which Congressman STAGGERS has ably and effectively represented for years.

His prayer for God's guidance in the tasks before the intelligent young Americans in the assembly is an eloquent one, and I ask unanimous permission to place it in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Great art Thou, O Lord, and greatly to be praised. Thou hast made a wonderful world and filled it with marvelous materials, both animate and inanimate. Thou has established order and system in the workings of Thy creation, so that all may rely on harmony in the relations of one form of being to another. Then, as the crowning act of creation, Thou hast made man in Thine own image, and breathed into him something more than the simple breath of life. For Thou has endowed him with the faculty we call intelligence, which we understand to be a grasp of the meaning of existence. We believe the gift of intelligence fits us to assume a part in the whole creative task, along with God, so that it is our part in life to help develop a more righteous world which conforms evermore and more fully to Thy purpose and will. In the beginning, Thy instruction to us as men was to take possession of the world, and to govern it. May we go about our assigned task, O God, in full acceptance of our unique relationship to the Creator of all nature.

We thank Thee, O Lord, for this assemblage of young and dedicated intelligence, selected from their fellows all over this great land by superiority of capability and achievement. A profound responsibility rests upon them. They may advance the work of Thy creative benevolence until the day of the new heaven and the new earth is nigh upon us; or they can turn back the clock of civilization almost to primitive chaos. In this congress of minds called by the hopes and the aspirations of the Nation and of this State, they pause to consider the part they may play in life. They have dedicated their energies and their perceptive capacities to the search of truth, which is to say, in search of what Thou wouldst finally will the world to be. May they never forget that the rest of the world, outside man himself, is indifferent to truth. Things have no concern for progress or for retrogression. It is not their responsibility. Only man can direct change upward or downward. So, as they meet here, partly for pleasure and partly for pursuit of their business, may they keep always in the front of that intelligence with which Thou has blessed them the controlling fact that they are God's agents on earth sent to accomplish His will.

So may they enter upon their deliberations here and their activities through all future days with clean hands and pure hearts. And wilt Thou bless them, O Lord, in all their goings and comings, from this day forth, and forever.

TRIBUTE TO ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the inspiration of Adlai Stevenson permeated all levels of American politics, government, and society. I was thrilled and stimulated to follow his leadership in two presidential campaigns. I spoke for him in 1952 and 1956, and have always been proud that he was the leader of the Democratic Party in those years.

Adlai Stevenson voiced the aspirations, sentiments, and the beliefs of the Democratic Party and many of these have subsequently been enacted into law.

Though he did not win these presidential elections, many of his hopes and dreams became law of the land in his own lifetime. This is more than most men live to see.

The struggles of this man were the struggles of our Nation; and the fulfillment of his goals was the fulfillment of the goals of this country.

Just as many of his hopes for America have already become a reality, we will continue to see the image of this eloquent American reflected in the progress of the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several articles in tribute to Adlai Stevenson from the New York Times of July 15, by Mary McGrory in the Washington Star and the Dallas Times-Herald, the Houston Chronicle, two stirring tributes to Adlai Stevenson in the Washington Post of July 18, 1965, one by Richard N. Goodwyn under the title, "He Never Learned To Hide His Soul," and one by Judge Carl McGowan under the title, "His Heritage Was Public Service, So He Ran," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 15, 1965]

STEVENSON'S ELOQUENCE

(NOTE.—Following are excerpts from the speeches, statements, and writings of Adlai E. Stevenson.)

From a speech of farewell to Illinois at the State Fair in Springfield, embarking on his first presidential campaign, August 14, 1952: "I am about to leave you on a long journey, and the route, by the way, won't be a military or political secret. I intend to cover as much ground as time and strength and resources permit."

From a speech in Denver in 1952: "I don't feel like a gift from Providence, and I really don't believe I am. I feel very much like a corn-fed Illinois lawyer who had gotten into the big time unintentionally."

At the funeral of this friend Floyd Lewis, Libertyville, Ill., in 1954: "Friendship is the greatest enrichment that I have found."

From a speech in Fairfield, Ili., in June 1954: "I believe that in 99 cases out of a 100, the American people will make the right decision, if and when they are in possession of the essential facts about any given issue."

From a speech in Chicago in 1952: "A campaign addressed not to men's minds and to their best instincts, but to their passions, emotions, and prejudices, is unworthy at best. Now, with the fate of the Nation at stake, it is unbearable."

From the same speech: "Long ago we asserted a great principle on this continent: that men are, and of right ought to be, free. Now we are called upon to defend that right against the mightiest forces of evil ever assembled under the sun."

From a speech in Flint, Mich., in 1952: "When I was a boy I never had much sympathy for a holiday speaker. He was just a kind of interruption between the hot dogs, a fly in the lemonade."

From a speech to the American Legion in Chicago in 1950: "I sometimes marvel at the extraordinary docility with which Americans submit to speeches."

From a speech in Rubana, Ill., in 1951: "Communism is the corruption of a dream of justice."

From a speech in Hamtramck, Mich., in 1952: "I tell you now that I will never fear to negotiate in good faith with the Soviet Union, for to close the door to the conference is to open a door to war. Man's tragedy has all too often been that he has grown weary in the search for an honorable alternative to war, and, in desperate impatience, has turned to violence."

From a speech while he was Governor of Illinois, delivered in Springfield in 1949: "Ours is a sad, disillusioned world. Too many people on this blood-soaked, battered globe live in constant fear and dread; fear of hunger and want, dread of oppression and slavery. Poverty, starvation, disease, and repression stalk the world and over us all hangs the menace of war like a gloomy shroud. But everywhere people cling to their hope and their faith in freedom, justice, and peace, though fear, anguish, and even death are their daily lot."

From his acceptance speech at the Democratic National Convention in 1952: "We must fight traitors with laws. We already have the laws. We must fight falsehood and evil ideas with truth and better ideas. We have them in plenty. We must not confuse the two. Laws infringing our rights and intimidating unoffending persons without enlarging our security will neither catch subversives nor win converts to our better ideas."

From the same speech: "Let's talk sense to the American people. Let's tell them the truth, that there are no gains without pains, that we are now on the eve of great decisions, not easy decisions, like resistance when you're attacked, but a long, patient, costly struggle which alone can assure triumph over the great enemies of men—war, poverty, and tyranny—and the assaults upon human dignity which are the most grievous consequences of each."

From a campaign speech in Peru, Ill., in 1948: "I don't believe irresponsible promises are good politics. Promise peddling and doubletalk may be expedient and catch some votes from the unwary and innocent, but promises also have a way of coming home to roost."

From a campaign speech in Bakersfield, Calif., in 1952: "If the Republicans stop telling lies about us, we will stop telling the truth about them."

From a campaign speech at Fort Dodge, Iowa, in 1952: "The Republicans have a 'me too' candidate running on a 'yes but' platform, advised by a 'has-been' staff."

From an article in the New York Times magazine in 1949: "The First World War was a shock, but not a lesson."

From a speech in London in 1945: "The will to peace cannot be legislated. It must be developed, and can only be developed by organized, patient effort. The laws and institutions of international cooperation have to evolve out of a combination of the aspirations and experience of the peoples of the world."

From a message to the Illinois Senate explaining his refusal to approve a bill to restrain the movements of cats, on April 23, 1949: "I cannot agree that it should be the declared public policy of Illinois that a cat visiting a neighbor's yard or crossing the highway is a public nuisance. It is in the nature of cats to do a certain amount of unescorted roaming * * * to escort a cat abroad on a leash is against the nature of the owner. Moreover, cats perform useful service, particularly in the rural areas. The problem of the cat versus the bird is as old as time. If we attempt to resolve it by legislation, who knows but what we may be called upon to take sides as well in the age-old problems of dog versus cat, bird versus bird, or even bird versus worm. In my opinion, the State of Illinois and its local governing bodies already have enough to do without trying to control feline delinquency."

At a banquet in 1962, shortly after the Soviet Union removed its missiles from Cuba, when he introduced President Kennedy: "Author, producer, and star of Mr. Khrushchev's new play, 'A Funny Thing Happened to Me on the Way to Cuba.'"

Confronted with the charge that he was an egghead, during the 1952 presidential campaign: "Eggheads unite! You have nothing to lose but your yolks."

From a radio address during the Congo crisis, which was being debated at the United Nations, on March 2, 1961: "And to the Soviet Union I would say: There are laws of history more profound, more inescapable than the laws dreamed up by Marx and Lenin—laws which belong not to class relationships or stages of economic development, but to the nature and the destiny of man himself. Among these laws is the certainty that war follows when new empires thrust into collapsing ruins of the old. So stay your ambitions * * * do not sabotage the only institution which offers an alternative to imperialism."

From a speech at a college reunion on June 8, 1962: "You know the story about the man in the restaurant who complained to the waiter that his broiled lobster had only one claw, and the waiter said it lost the other one in a fight; so the man said, 'All right, then bring me the winner.' Well, the United States is still the winner in the United Nations."

From an address at the United Nations on June 19, 1962: "If communism is a problem for the United Nations, so is the United Nations a problem for communism. The United Nations is a community of tolerance and a community of tolerance is a terrible frustration to the totalitarian mind."

From a statement in a Security Council debate on Aug. 5, 1964: "We are in southeast Asia to help our friends preserve their own opportunity to be free of imported terror, or alien assassination managed by the North Vietnam Communists based in Hanoi and backed by the Chinese Communists from Peiping."

From a commencement address to the Harvard Alumni Association, Cambridge, Mass., on June 17, 1965: "The art of government has grown from its seeds in the tiny city-states of Greece to become the political mode of half the world. So let us dream of a world in which all states, great and small, work together for the peaceful flowering of the republic of man."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, July 15, 1965]

MEMORABLE QUOTES: MASTER SHAPER OF PHRASES

NEW YORK.—Adlai E. Stevenson was a philosopher among politicians—a master of shaping a careful phrase and quick ad lib.

An articulate speaker, he could spellbind an audience in haughty tones with a scholarly treatise and almost instantaneously crack a joke about being called an egghead.

He is remembered best by many for his quotes. Here are some of them:

An eulogy to Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt—"Like so many others I have lost more than a beloved friend. I have lost an inspiration. She would rather light candles than curse the darkness, and her glow has warmed the world."

On party principle—"Who leads us is less important than what leads us—what convictions, what courage, what faith—win or lose. A man doesn't save a century, or a civilization, but a militant party wedded to a principle can."

After months of crisis debate at the United Nations in 1961—"What with Cuba, Congo, Korea, and now Laos, I sometimes yearn for the simple brutalities of bipartisan politics."

During a visit to the Soviet Union in July 1958—"I sometimes think it might be a good idea to declare an international 'Stop—Look—and Listen' day, a day on which politicians, officials, and diplomats everywhere in the world would pause and look and listen with eyes and ears and minds open to the desire of the ordinary people everywhere for peace."

On communism—"Communism resolves no anxieties. It multiplies them. It organizes terror. It is without spiritual content or comfort. It provides no basic security."

On the United Nations (1961)—"There is really only one item on our agenda—the survival of the human race."

Speech to Harvard Alumni Association, June 1965—"I have been picketed, applauded, and abused from right and left and center everywhere from Texas to Toronto for more years than I like to remember. Indeed my honorary degree should have a P.D.—a doctor of pickets."

In July 1959, explaining to British audience why he wanted to avoid running for president—"A presidential candidate has to shave twice a day—and I don't like that."

On politicians—"Politicians are often the most conventional, hidebound fellows in business. Eventually you discover you can do what you think is best and generally it works out all right. You get a bottomless pit if you try to figure out the political consequences of every step."

On speaking—"The relation of the toastmaster to speaker should be the same as that of the fan to the fan dancer. It should call attention to the subject without making any particular effort to cover it."

On public responsibility—"I should like to point out that public officials don't corrupt each other: That behind every bribe taker in government is a bribe giver, behind every fix is a fixer, behind every influence peddler is someone who wants influence, behind every lobbyist is a pressure group. Who are they? Why, they are 'the people.' And sometimes they are not cheaters and scum, but the same 'respectable' people who demand that all officials in a government by the governed should be cleaner than the governed, cleaner than themselves."

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, July 15, 1965]

ADLAI FULL OF QUIPS, MOST OF THEM AIMED AT HIMSELF

Adlai E. Stevenson was a man of enormous wit.

At public appearances, in interviews, with friends, in speeches—it was a rare occasion when Stevenson failed to delight his listeners with his sense of humor. Usually, it was at his own expense.

As Governor of Illinois, he once vetoed a bill prohibiting cats from running at large. He commented:

"It is in the nature of cats to do a certain amount of unescorted roaming. In my opinion, the State of Illinois and its local governing bodies already have enough to do without trying to control feline delinquency."

During the 1952 campaign, Stevenson was frequently called an "egghead." When confronted with the charge, he quipped: "Eggheads unite—You have nothing to lose but your yolks."

Stevenson never lost a chance to joke about his defeats.

Once, when a friend was appointed to a post, Stevenson told him: "Congratulations on your election as president." He added, wryly, "I know from hearsay how satisfying that can be."

After the Soviet Union was forced to remove its missiles from Cuba in 1962, he introduced President Kennedy at a banquet as "author, producer and star of Mr. Khrushchev's new play, 'A Funny Thing Happened to Me on the Way to Cuba.'"

He used the same approach before a Washington audience shortly after he was trounced at the polls by Eisenhower. Said Stevenson: "A funny thing happened to me on the way to the White House."

When President Kennedy kept tapping his Chicago law firm for energetic, young lawyers (such as former Federal Communications Commission Chairman Newton Minow), Stevenson said: "I regret that I have but one law firm to give to my country."

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, July 15, 1965]

"AMERICA'S MOST ELOQUENT SPIRIT"—JOHNSON—MEN IN HIGH PLACES VOICE REGARD FOR ADLAI STEVENSON, STATESMAN

WASHINGTON.—"The flame which illuminated the dreams and expectations of an entire world is now extinguished. Adlai Stevenson of Illinois is dead."

Thus a shocked President Johnson expressed the grief of the Nation.

"It seems such a short time ago that, out of Illinois, came that thoughtful eloquence summoning an entire Nation back from its dangerous drift toward contentment and complacency," he said.

"For an entire generation of Americans, he imparted a nobility to public life and a grandeur to American purpose which has already reshaped the life of the Nation and which will endure for many generations.

"Let us therefore, adversary and friend alike, pause for a moment and weep for one who was a friend and guide to all mankind."

Here in this Capital City, the embodiment of Adlai Stevenson's hopes and dreams in two great presidential campaigns, the news of his death in London sent a wave of shock reverberating through the corridors of power.

NEARLY HALTED LUNCH

The President was informed of the death as he was presiding over a luncheon for the Joint United States-Japan Cabinet Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs.

His face solemn, Mr. Johnson informed his guests: "A few minutes after this lunch began, I received word that Adlai Stevenson had died in London. My immediate reaction was to suggest that we cancel this meeting. But then I knew Adlai Stevenson would not want it that way.

"He would want us to continue because he was first concerned that the works of peace, the works of progress, and the works of understanding go on."

He added, "America has lost its most eloquent spirit, its finest voice. The world of freedom and human dignity has lost its most articulate champion."

Shortly afterward, the President went on nationwide television and radio to pay his formal tribute to the Ambassdor. He announced that Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey would lead a delegation to London, flying on the President's personal plane, to accompany the body home.

FLAGS AT HALF STAFF

He ordered the flag flown at half staff on all Government facilities at home and abroad, and aboard U.S. Navy ships at sea, until the funeral.

Johnson compared Stevenson to another son of Illinois, Abraham Lincoln.

"Like Lincoln, he was a great emancipator," the President said. "It was his gift to help emancipate men from narrowness of mind and the shackles of which selfishness and ignorance place upon the human adventure.

"Like Lincoln, he will be remembered more for what he stood for than the offices he held; more for the ideals he embodied than the positions in which he served. For history honors men more for what they were than who they were.

"And by this standard he holds a permanent place on that tiny roster of those who will be remembered as long as mankind is strong enough to honor greatness."

Both the House and Senate were in session when the news flashed across the wires. In the Senate, it was announced by Paul Douglas, the craggy Illinois Democrat whose own rise to senatorial fame came in the 1948 Illinois election that made Adlai Stevenson Governor of the State.

DIRKSEN LAUDS

The other Senator from Illinois, Everett M. Dirksen, had his own eulogy: "I count this an irreplaceable loss. I thought and I still think Adlai Stevenson was one of our great contemporary men."

House Democratic Leader Carl Albert interrupted debate on a bill to inform the membership: "I have just been informed by the Secretary of State that a great American, Adlai Stevenson, has just passed away in London while on a great and important mission."

There was a brief and quiet pause, and then debate resumed on the silver coinage bill.

At the Organization of American States, the Latin American ambassadors stood in silent homage to Stevenson for 1 minute and then adjourned for the day.

On Capitol Hill, one after another, Senators and Representatives rose to pay tribute—Republicans and Democrats alike. Those who had admired him, and those who had fought him, spoke of his eloquence and his ideals.

One to do so was Senator John Sparkman, of Alabama, Stevenson's vice-presidential running mate in the 1952 election that pitted the little-known Governor of Illinois—and 20 years of Democratic rule in the White House—against war hero, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

SPARKMAN SPEAKS

"He has not solved all the problems of the world at the United Nations, and he would be the first to say so," said Sparkman, "but the equilibrium of the world has been maintained and a great part of that is due to the leadership Adlai Stevenson has shown at the United Nations."

One of the first to comment was Senator Robert F. Kennedy, who, as his brother's campaign manager, had battled the Stevenson forces at the 1960 Democratic Convention which resulted in John F. Kennedy's nomination.

Kennedy was momentarily stunned when told the news. "It is a great, great loss to the world," he said.

Kennedy told the Senate: "The United States, and all the world, can ill afford his loss at this new time of danger."

In New York, a member of her staff relayed Mrs. John F. Kennedy's reaction: "She is terribly, terribly shocked. She will make no public statement because she feels this is a very personal matter."

Mrs. Kennedy and the witty, urbane Stevenson had been close friends, and he had been her escort to several United Nations and other public functions in New York.

WIDOW SHOCKED

Ellen Border Stevenson, who divorced her husband in 1949, issued a statement through her business agent: "I am very much shocked by Mr. Stevenson's death but have no statement to make as I consider this a personal matter."

Out in Kansas City, Harry S. Truman, who had both praised and sometimes deprecated Adlai Stevenson's ability as a practical politician, expressed shock and grief at the news of the death.

"His contribution and services to this Nation and his distinguished record in the field of foreign relations in our quest for peace will be long remembered by a grateful Nation and his friends throughout the world," Truman said.

There was much that was said today about Adlai Stevenson, and these were some of the comments:

Secretary of State Dean Rusk: "America has lost one of her greatest sons. He not only served his country but he stood for the best of it. He not only spoke for his country but he represented the essence of it. Our history, our traditions, our ideals, our aspirations were in his mind, his heart, and his very bones. He never forgot that our Founding Fathers created for all mankind."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 15, 1965]

SYMBOL OF HONOR: STEVENSON, A "PERFECT GENTLE KNIGHT"

(By Mary McGrory)

Adlai Stevenson was a gentleman from Illinois who entered politics late in life, suffered two crushing national defeats and retired gracefully from the scene. He was an incomparable orator and, as a candidate, so diffident, so civil and so mannerly, so insistent on his own values that he might go down as a noble footnote in the history of his times.

But he was more than that. Despite the brevity of that career, it was crucial. He left his mark on American politics. His two successors used the bold ideas he had given them. They put to work the superior breed of men he had attracted to public service.

And all over America, in every political subdivision, there are men and women who lick stamps and ring doorbells and attend grubby meetings because 13 years ago the sound of Stevenson's voice, enunciating precisely a high-minded, high-hearted vision of public life, galvanized them permanently.

There has not been in memory a politician like him. He was unique because he insisted on the ultimate luxury most politicians immediately forgo—that of being completely himself in public.

Stevenson was a contradictory man: troubled yet merry; committed yet detached; idealistic yet rueful. He had a puritan sense of duty without a puritan self-righteousness and a reformer's zeal without the reformer's scourge.

His campaigns were the despair of the professionals and the delight of his followers. No candidate before nomination protested more articulately his own inadequacies. And no candidate spoke with more felicity and fire and wit.

Who would have thought the gently nurtured aristocrat would tread so heavily on the toes of the pressure groups—the American Legion, the labor movement, the Old South?

While his soldier-citizen rival held out the promise of painless peace, Stevenson campaigned on the premise that life is hard and the world is in ferment.

The speeches of the 1952 campaign did not win the White House for Stevenson. But they did win him a place in literature.

He paid a high price. When he might have been gladhanding, he was reworking his phrases. No audience was too small to merit his best.

The memory of him on the platform is of a middle-aged man with a hole in his shoe, up to the moment of introduction frowningly busy with pencil on the script of the address. The English language had no more valiant or perfectionist friend. Stevenson retained to the end his belief in the power of words.

Political power eluded him, at least on the national scene. As Governor of Illinois, he seemed to understand all about it. But he had been brought up in a rigid creed of gentility, and he never could command the fighting excesses which the politician must use. In 1956, when the late Senator Estes Kefauver challenged him for the nomination and defeated him in the Minnesota primary, Stevenson went on the warpath in California, but for him it was a joyless and unpalatable enterprise.

In 1960, he was of two minds. While he characteristically deprecated his own chances, he knew the unalterable loyalty of his partisans. And despite his public manifestations to the contrary, Stevenson always knew his own worth. He would not give his followers the word.

The high point of the Los Angeles convention was the nominating speech of Senator Eugene McCarthy of Minnesota, who, for Stevenson, reached the oratorical heights of the master.

"Do not," he cried, "reject this man who has made us all proud to be called Democrats," and the galleries went mad. "Do not leave this prophet without honor in his own party."

Stevenson, deprived of the great prize a third time, hoped that John F. Kennedy would make him Secretary of State. But Kennedy wanted to be his own Secretary of State and wanted no Cabinet officer with so fierce a personal following. Instead, he asked Stevenson to be Ambassador to the United Nations.

Stevenson had no enthusiasm for the job, but impelled both by the desire to serve and the reluctance to leave public life, which both repelled and attracted him, accepted.

It was a thankless chore, and Stevenson seemed always on the point of giving it up. He used to tell his friends he could not go on—and did. He would say the problems were impossible—and he coped with them.

He was sustained by the near reverence tendered him by the representatives of other countries who found in him a symbol of his own country's honor and integrity and good will.

His hold on the imagination of many Americans never weakened. At the 20th anniversary celebration of the United Nations in San Francisco, there were some who came, not to see President Johnson, but to see Adlai Stevenson, who was to them, as Senator McCarthy said, quoting Chaucer, "a very perfect gentle knight."

[From the New York Times, July 15, 1965]

WORLD LEADERS PAY TRIBUTE TO STEVENSON AS STATESMAN AND CHAMPION OF LIBERTY—U.N. ENVOY CALLED VOICE OF REASON—MANY PRAISE HIS DEVOTION TO PEACE AND COURAGE IN CAUSE OF FREEDOM

U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations, sent the following message to President Johnson: "I was so shocked and grieved to hear of the sudden and tragic death of Ambassador Stevenson. As the representative of the United States of America he had earned the respect, admiration, and affection of all his colleagues at the United Nations for his extraordinary human qualities. I know that you must feel a sense of personal loss on the death of such a distinguished American who was also a member of your official Cabinet. Your grief is shared by all of us at the United Nations."

Harry S. Truman: "I am shocked and saddened at the untimely passing of Adlai Stevenson. His contribution and services to this Nation and his distinguished record in the field of foreign relations in our quest for peace will be long remembered by a grateful Nation and his friends throughout the world."

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower: "The announcement that a public servant of Adlai Stevenson's international stature should be suddenly and finally removed from the world strikes a tragic note for all Americans. As the leader of his party in two presidential campaigns and as our spokesman at the United Nations in recent years, he has won an abiding place in his country's history. Mrs. Eisenhower and I join all others who love freedom in mourning his untimely passing."

Chief Justice Earl Warren: "I'm just shocked. It's a tremendous loss. He performed the most difficult tasks in the United Nations any American had to perform."

Richard M. Nixon: "In the graceful eloquence of his public statements, he had no peers. In two gallant campaigns for the Presidency and as our Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson served his party, his country and the cause of freedom with rare courage, ability, and dignity."

Governor Rockefeller: "His was a life of distinguished public service. He was an articulate spokesman for the cause of human freedom throughout the world."

Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF: "Mr. Stevenson was a man of quality and he chose to use his gifts of brilliance, of compassion, of persuasion in the service of his nation and the individual human spirit.

Senator MIKE MONRONEY: "During these times of tensions, fears and uncertainties, the calm, strong voice of Adlai Stevenson will be sorely missed."

Mayor Wagner: "Adlai Stevenson was a spokesman for humanity. His wisdom, warmth, and courage are a legend that will endure and grow with the years to come. He was one of New York beloved sons who, despite the great burden of his office, gave unstintingly of his time to scores of good causes. All of us in New York City join his millions of friends throughout the world in mourning his death."

Cardinal Spellman: "All the world must mourn the loss of a man so dedicated to the cause of peace as Adlai Stevenson. His death comes at a critical time when his remarkable talents and his tireless efforts for the betterment of mankind are sorely needed. I pray that God will reward his selfless service to others and that his soul may find eternal peace."

Michael Stewart, British Foreign Secretary: "In the sudden death in London today of Mr. Adlai Stevenson the world has lost a great statesman. As an outstanding public figure in his own country, as a candidate for the U.S. Presidency and as Governor of Illinois he showed a liberality of mind and lucidity of expression which brought him universal renown."

Sir. Alec Douglas-Home, former British Prime Minister: "Adlai Stevenson will be mourned by his many friends and admirers in this country."

Lester B. Pearson, Canadian Prime Minister: "It is hard to exaggerate the importance of Adlai Stevenson to the free world or to his country. I can only express deep grief and deep shock at the news."

Jens Otto Krag, Danish Premier: "It was typical of Mr. Stevenson that he was always ready to listen to what was being said by smaller countries. He was attentive not least to the views of the Nordic countries. The aim of his endeavor was a stable and just peace."

Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, former Indian Ambassador to the United States: "He stood for honor and justice among men and nations and his voice was the voice of reason in the United Nations."

The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.: "Our country should bow in reverence for the passing of a bright star from the horizon of world statesmanship. His leadership was a bright interlude in the troubled history of mankind."

Richard J. Hughes, Governor of New Jersey: "I know that the people of New Jersey share my grief on the loss of this conscientious and distinguished leader whose departure will be mourned by freedom-loving people throughout the world."

George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State: "He was one of my closest friends for 30 years. I am very stunned by this. No one ever had a more generous friend. He was a man of very great qualities."

Arthur J. Levitt, State controller: "The world has lost one of its most effective and eloquent spokesmen for peace and one of its great humanitarians."

Abraham D. Beame, city controller: "He was a man of great personal spirit, a man who contributed tremendously to liberal thinking in 20th century America."

Paul R. Screvane, city council president: "We, our city, our country, the world, have suffered a tremendous loss."

Representative WILLIAM F. RYAN: "In him was crystallized the best of a civilization."

Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY: "Adlai Stevenson was the eloquent voice of reasoned liberalism and human rights here in America, and indeed, the voice of America's conscience to the entire world."

Robert Moses: "His was the American image we are proud to show as the symbol of democracy."

Dr. Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University: "His was truly the global point of view, grounded in a profound love of his country and enlightened by compassion for all men.

Bishop Reuben H. Muller, president, National Council of Churches: "As citizens concerned for the promise of man, we mourn the loss of a great champion of man."

Right Rev. John E. Hines, presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church: "His image is that of the cultured, educated mind for whom fear held no decisive victory. He remained the kind of a man only the free world could produce."

Bishop Prince A. Taylor Jr., president of the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church: "He embodied in his life rare idealism and practical realities as only few men could have ever done."

Archbishop Iakovos; Greek Orthodox primate in the United States: "His passing is an irreparable loss."

Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, president, Union of American Hebrew Congregations: "The world has lost one of its most valuable servants."

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald, July 18, 1965]

NAME IN HISTORY, ADLAI STEVENSON EULOGIST ASSERTS

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.—Adlai E. Stevenson, that gentleman of wit and wisdom who gained worldwide renown, was officially honored Saturday by his old home State as an eloquent son—one who had done his task "honorably and well."

Governor Otto Kerner said as he faced Stevenson's coffin resting on a table on which Abraham Lincoln's body was once placed: "His name is written indelibly into our history. His memory and his spirit we shall carry in our hearts."

It was a short, dignified and touching service for the politician-statesman who died of a heart atack in London Wednesday at the age of 65.

Members of his family and 500 State officials and dignitaries gathered in the rotunda of the State capitol where Stevenson once served as Governor.

They heard Kerner use Stevenson's own words to express his affection for this land of fertile soil and rolling prairies.

"My heart will always be here in Illinois," Kerner quoted Stevenson as saying. "Here five generations of my family have lived and prospered. My roots are deep in our prairies and I owe Illinois a great debt. I have tried my best to discharge that debt honorably and well."

"Honorably and well," Kerner said. "How perfectly these words expressed the life and deeds of the 33d Governor of Illinois, the gentleman of wisdom and wit."

Again Kerner turned to Stevenson's own eloquence, saying that what Stevenson said of Lincoln could be said just as well of him.

"Lincoln was more than a writer, a spokesman," Stevenson once said. "What endears him in the minds of all freedom-loving people as the greatest Democrat in our history—or any history—was his own faith in democracy, in the ability of the people to govern themselves * * *."

Continuing his brief eulogy, Kerner said: "We lived in the shadow of greatness, a greatness which somehow seemed to bring to each of us a special feeling, a particularly kind of pride, a sense of satisfaction, that we lived in the world of Adlai Stevenson.

"This is a world that is better because of the life he lived, the deeds he performed, the words he spoke and the examples he set.

"Now he has come home to his Illinois, to take his place with our other heroes."

The Reverend Richard Paul Graebel, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church here which Stevenson attended, in his prayer said of Stevenson: "His spirit is at home in Thy presence."

Stevenson's body has been lying in state day and night in the rotunda, and those who have come to pay their respects have been filing by at the rate of about 1,000 an hour.

Sunday the body will be taken to Bloomington, 61 miles northeast, which Stevenson despite all his wanderings continued to look upon as his hometown.

Final services will be held Monday when Adlai Stevenson will be committed to the soil he always loved.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 18, 1965]

HE NEVER LEARNED TO HIDE HIS SOUL

"We shall not come again
We never shall come back again
But over us all, over us all,
Over us all is—something."
—THOMAS WOLFE.

(By Richard N. Goodwin)

Twice he had come as close as a man could come to leadership of the American Nation. Yet no one noticed as, for a moment, Adlai Stevenson looked toward the caped statue of Franklin Roosevelt, walked a few hundred yards, grasped the thin steel columns of a sidewalk railing, and died.

Questions of man's survival, of war, and of human progress had very nearly rested on the qualities of his personal mind and will. The destiny of every man and woman he passed that afternoon was almost placed in his hand. Yet no one cheered or waved or even turned to stare.

For he had escaped power. And for a politician, power is the tool which etches out one man's figure from among his companions.

IMPRESSIVE QUALITIES

Would he have been a good leader of his country, or a great one? We will never know. Many deny it. And they give reasons which start to persuade, until we remember that they—or their counterparts in other years—had said the same of past leaders such as John Kennedy and Franklin Roosevelt, and, most violently, of Abraham Lincoln.

The fact is no man who has not been President can survive analysis of his capacity for the task. Nor can we predict his qualities until they pass through the purification of power and responsibility. We do know he had more promise than most. We do know the impressive qualities of mind and spirit his career permitted him to reveal. We also know he was ambitious. For you do not run for President unless your ambitions are greater than those of other men.

Was that ambition tinged with self doubt? It is for every man except the very dangerous. Did he have the courage of decision? His own words, public and in private conversation, cloud judgment. But perhaps they only mask the fact that never in his public life did he fail to decide when it was time to decide; except in 1960 when the shameful prospect of leading his party to a third defeat postponed judgment beyond the reach of action.

Where public issues were concerned he spoke—on the platform and in the meeting room—with a clarity of conviction few had courage to match. And on this question the judgment of those who knew him is disfigured by the tortured musings of a man who had never quite learned the trick of hiding his soul; whose confidence had been twisted and battered by defeat and by the indifference and contempt of lesser men, which finally killed him.

He was not, as some have said, marked by fate for failure. He was the victim of less mystical forces: bad luck, poor timing, unfortunate issues, a party too long in office, and an opponent who could not be defeated. Had 6 percent of American voters switched to him in 1952 then all the hesitation and humility would today be regarded as the skillful genius of a master politician.

So we do not know, and will never know, if Adlai Stevenson would have been a good President of the United States. But we must be reluctant to believe that the judgment of so many who had desired his victory so furiously could have been so wrong.

Great men of affairs are either kings or prophets. Very few are both. And honor comes more reluctantly to prophets because they touch us more deeply. Adlai Stevenson never became a king, but he was a prophet. Death is already beginning to dissolve the masks of public failure and private personality which hide that recognition. It will become clearer as the self-justifying commentaries of those who scorned him in life begin to fade.

SEED ON UNPLOWED GROUND

I knew Adlai Stevenson as a colleague in my work for President Kennedy and, more recently for President Johnson. Both valued him most highly. Both had worked for his election to the office which they, not he, were to hold. Both knew, as others did not, what it took to bare yourself—ambitions and hopes—to the faithful, the indifferent and the hostile alike.

Many others in Washington, in these years, looked at him with a certain condescension. At times, thankfully only a few times, my own instinct was submerged in the need to be fashionable. But Adlai Stevenson will be mourned more deeply and remembered longer than any of these. It is not that millions loved him and millions more admired him. It is that closeness and ambition, envy and rivalry obscure the heart's truth. Yet that is the truth that finally matters; which selects the man from among the shadows, sadly past the hour when recognition might bring personal joy.

But though I knew him and admired him, opposed him in 1960 and occasionally worked with him thereafter, many can speak far more intimately than I.

I remember best the Adlai Stevenson I never knew, when the world was young and the ringing phrases tumbled like the sowers seed on the unplowed ground.

In the fall of 1952 I was a senior in college in Massachusetts. John Kennedy was a young Congressman I had never met now running for the Senate. And Lyndon Johnson was the uncertainly familiar name of a Senator from Texas.

But Adlai Stevenson was my hero and my leader and my candidate for President of the United States. I never met him or even saw him nor had I read the carefully drafted texts of his speeches. But something was in the air. My tiny world suddenly seemed to widen. Events and the course of history were drifting back within the reach of a man's skill and brains. The pursuit of power, and its use, were not solely the object of greed and "vaulting ambition" but infused with service and nobility and the love of others.

It wasn't that he talked sense or spoke the truth harshly. It was the more profound act of telling us—my generation—what we knew but didn't realize. He revealed a world we already sensed was there, bared challenges we were aching to undertake. The words were the words of sacrifice but the music sang of meaning and purpose to a young man.

As much as any, he was the end of postwar America and the beginning of a time still nameless. We knew and still repeated the old political phrases and the outworn battle cries. But we did not understand them because the lines had been drawn in a different war, and it was not our war. Now finally, there was a language we could understand and make our own.

THE ELEVATED INTELLIGENCE

Eight dreary, near-tragic, years were to pass before that prophesy was to be fulfilled by different men. It is hard to overstate the extent to which he helped shape the dialog, and hence the purposes, of the New Frontier and then the Great Society. He dissolved the old, unserviceable simplicities and taught us to apply to the world the complex wisdom we have used so triumphantly in the affairs of our Nation: We could seek peace while resisting danger. Everyone who was not a friend was not an enemy. Agreement and accommodation could come from self-confidence as well as fear. By helping others we could strengthen ourselves. Particular problems could be resolved, but we must learn to live for generations with a troubled world. The contest was not simply between our system and communism, but between those who found security in dominion and those who found it in a world of strong and diverse lands.

And all these principles, and many more, he suffused with another welcome and shining truth: the pursuit of national self-interest was not inconsistent with the desire for justice and dignity and well-being for all the people of the world—that there was no basic unresolvable contradiction between realistic policies and high ideals.

To our domestic problems he brought the same elevated and critical intelligence. He told us our sights were too low, the course we had charted too narrow. In every area of our national life we not only could do more than we were doing but more than we thought. And he taught that wealth was not excellence, power was not greatness, the pursuit of abundance was not the pursuit of happiness.

After he spoke, no leader of his party nor the dialogue of democracy itself, would ever sound the same again. He was eloquent and acclaimed for eloquence, but finally it was not how he spoke but what he said that mattered. Others would bring new accents and perhaps even greater powers to leadership. But it had all begun in Springfield, Illinois, in that hopeful dawn-year of 1952.

CITIZEN-POLITICIAN CREATED

The most far-sighted policies molded and dissolve, lose content and direction, in the hands of the mediocre and the indifferent. The Nation rests on the quality of its public men, and they in turn are shaped by the quality of American politics. Adlai Stevenson brought many individuals into government who have enriched the administrations of President Kennedy and President Johnson. But this is the least of it. More than any man, he created the citizen-politician. He told an entire generation there was room for intelligence and idealism in public life, that politics was not just a way to live but a way to live greatly, that each of us might share in the passions of the age.

My first experience in national politics was in an overflowing, chaotic room of the Volunteers for Stevenson. Many thousands had the same initiation. Today, the citizens groups, the volunteers, the clubs to discuss issues and the clubs to reform politics, are a force which every politician must confront, and which the best will welcome. Thus, he changed the face of American politics; enriching the democracy, providing a base on which talent could aspire to power, opening a gateway to public life through which many who never heard his voice will someday enter.

All these—ideas and men—are contributions to be remembered. But there was something more to Adlai Stevenson, a quality that resists thought and language alike. For none of this explains the fierce desire millions brought to his cause, the disappointed tears of many who never knew him, the deep impulse which could make even experienced politicians forget commitment and interest alike to be at his side.

It was not the first time we have seen this quality, nor the last. But how rare it is in those who find their way to power.

Part of it was in his lesson. It was not a new lesson. It runs like a vein of light through the dark history of the race. It suffuses the religion and beliefs of every people. It says that man is more than the sum of his needs and desires and fears. It ennobles those who look beyond their own interest to great principle. It acclaims, not wealth and power, but the charity of the spirit and the reach of the heart.

LOVE FELT BY MILLIONS

This is what he wanted for the American people. And although we may never be equal to it, many loved him for thinking we could.

The rest was the man himself. You didn't need to know him to feel it, although knowing brought confirmation. There was a gentleness, a spaciousness of sensibility, a love which in unseen ways was felt by millions. He could laugh and be cynical. If he read these words he would joke about them, and he would deride this writing with soft self-deprecation. But all the wonderful humor, the urbanity, the captiousness was, in large part, a mask to protect himself from a world which so easily confused humility with weakness, sentiment with unreality, amplitude of understanding with failure of will. Many who met him were fooled. Millions who never met him, knew the truth.

This is the secret of today's mourning and to his place in the play of passion clothed in fact which is history. People return what they receive. They believe in the man who believed in them and thus made them believe in themselves. They love the man who loved them and thus let them love themselves a little more. They honor the leader who told them they were better than they were and, in so doing, made it so.

He has often been compared to Hamlet. And those who make the comparison do so as a metaphor of irresolution. Hamlet is the story of a man who tries to understand and reach for certainty before he strikes. But he does strike—and for justice loses kingship and life while the election lights on a young and valiant captain.

Our judgment must echo Shakespeare's own when the new king stands beside Hamlet's body, saying:

> "Let four captains
> Bear Hamlet, like a soldier, to the stage;
> For he was likely, had he been put on,
> To have prov'd most royally."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 18, 1965]

HIS HERITAGE WAS PUBLIC SERVICE, SO HE RAN

(By Carl McGowan)

(NOTE.—Now a judge of the U.S. court of appeals here, McGowan was a friend of Adlai Stevenson for many years and served as counsel to the Governor of Illinois when Stevenson held that post from 1949 to 1953.)

I have always been a little surprised and puzzled by the recurring question of why Adlai Stevenson went into public life, especially as a seeker of elective office. It was asked by many people during his lifetime and, now that that record is closed, it comes to the fore again. It will continue to be put, I suspect, for a long time in the future. My bafflement derives from the fact that the question always seems to carry with it the unspoken but unmistakable implication of wonderment as to how a man of his literate and sensitive composition could possibly have been induced to intrude himself into the dust and heat of the political environment.

There is really no mystery about it, as he was always the first to say, although his own answers were always received with varying degrees of polite disbelief by those who thought the question significant.

I remember running into him once in 1947 when he was trying to settle down again in his old law firm after his wartime service with Col. Frank Knox at the Navy Department and his postwar service with the Department of State in getting the United Nations underway. In response to my query as to what he was up to, he replied that he seemed to be spending an inordinate amount of his nonlegal hours, to the despair of his friends and family, in going out to the West Side of Chicago to speak to Polish-American American Legion Post No. 80, or to the South Side to the young adults group of the Bethel Baptist Church, or to the North Side to the PTA of Public School No. 346. And then, with that wonderful wryly self-deprecatory smile, he said that he supposed he must either be running for office like mad or kidding himself that he wasn't.

HE KNEW HIMSELF

I thought then, as I think now, that he knew exactly what he was doing. Self-delusion was not one of his notable failings. He knew that he was responding to one of the deepest instincts of his background and being—that for public service. He knew also from his prior Washington experience, as many others have learned the same hard way, that the greatest opportunities for meaningful and effective public service reside in elective office. The shattering disappointments that beset that way of life can also be dissolved and made to seem as nothing in the satisfactions of feeling the reins of political power in one's hands harnessed to what one deeply believes to be good and just ends. The disappointments, as we now know, were to be his in cruel measure. But the satisfactions were his as well. And we need not doubt that he ever looked back with despair or regret at the angle at which the balance was struck.

It should be no cause for wonder that the way he chose was the political way. His family background was intensely political. His grandfather served in the high post of Vice President of the United States, and then philosophically absorbed the disasters of an unsuccessful second race for that office as well as for that of Governor of Illinois.

His father, Lewis Stevenson, although much less well-known, had political interest and acumen in plenty. When the Republican schism in 1912 threw that party into disarray, Illinois elected its first Catholic Governor in the person of Edward F. Dunne. When the secretary of state elected with Dunne suddenly died in office, Lewis Stevenson was appointed to finish the term.

On the ticket in his own right in 1916, he did not survive the flood of returning Republican power, but he did run so far ahead of the rest of the ticket as to make him a ponderable force in Democratic Party circles from that point forward, so much so that he was widely named in the eastern press as a serious possibility for second place on the national ticket in the 1920's. Only his sudden death, in a manner and at an age very similar to that of his son, ended that speculation.

NURTURED AT PRINCETON

The Stevenson family was, thus, saturated in politics at both the National and State levels. We would have more cause for amazement if the scion of the third generation in direct line of descent should have thought that he was above the battle, that what his father and grandfather had done was somehow beneath him. Their influence and their example, it may be surmised, was surely as strong as that of Princeton and La Salle Street.

Princeton, indeed, seems to have nurtured this predisposition and reinforced this family bent. For Adlai was of a generation of Princeton students who thrilled to the recent saga of Woodrow Wilson—that figure in whom the contrasting worlds of the university and the precinct have had their most dramatic confrontation and combination in our history as a nation.

Woodrow Wilson was a Democrat, and the Democrats of Illinois had played a vital role in winning for him the hotly contested nomination at Baltimore in 1912. Stevenson's family in Bloomington followed with the closest attention and the highest hopes the fluctuating fortunes of Wilson in the Presidency. It has been much the fashion to think of Adlai Stevenson as a latter-day analog of Woodrow Wilson. There are, of course, obvious disparities in personality and temperament, but there are many similarities in political style and, above all, in their vision of a just society at home and a peaceful one abroad, to the realization of which political power was to be mobilized and directed.

INFLUENCED BY WILSON

There can be no question that the youthful Stevenson was strongly influenced by this scholar in politics, and it is not idle to suppose that his own ideal of public service was not incompatible with the prospect of the college man asking the rank and file for their votes. As in the case of his immediate forebears, what was good enough for Woodrow Wilson was good enough for Adlai Stevenson.

And who can say that the dream, in terms of a world made safe for democracy, did not in its most secret recesses include a happier ending if the rocky road to political power could only be traversed once more by a man with the same vision and the same purpose to put that power to work in making it a reality?

Adlai Stevenson, far from recoiling from it in personal distaste, enjoyed politics. He savored with genuine relish the infinite variety of the people he met there. He found them, as in all other social and professional and educational and cultural circles in which he moved, to be of all descriptions—good and bad, or, as is more often the case, partly good and partly bad. He had a particular liking for the latter, for he knew that most of us, including himself, fall into that group.

He found that in politics, arguably more than in other human activities, you cannot manage people by the book, if you try to, you will deny yourself some unexpected allies in time of need, and you will also rue some demoralizing failures by those whom you counted upon as allies. He sensed strongly that strain of sheer sentimentality which is just under the surface of political relationships and which binds together in a tacit brotherhood, often bigger than party or ideology, all those who live and die by the ballot box—a phenomenon of which the outsider is unaware and by the outward manifestations of which he is always surprised.

He learned that men in politics will often do what you want because they like you, and not because they like what you want. He brought to this highly emotional environment those qualities which, beneath all the surface toughness and cynicism, it valued the highest—a cheerful lightness of spirit, an artless gift for undemanding friendship, a lack of self-righteousness, a conviction that pigeonholes are for the birds, not fellow politicians perennially worried—and for the most creditable reasons—about the day after election day. He had the good political leader's surest instinct and most useful gift—that of trying to identify what the other fellow's problems and pressures are before writing him off in angry frustration.

It is, I think, one of the emptiest myths of our time that Adlai Stevenson was a political sport—an unhappy and uncomfortable accident in the unlikely milieu of professional politics, ill at ease with others who followed that trade, ineffective in his relationships with them because of his instinctive distaste for them and their way of life.

The error has been that of translating such things as superficial differences in dress and diction and working habits into fundamental hostilities and distrusts. The long-accepted stereotype of journalists and political scientists has been that of the patrician moving in ill-concealed discomfort among the less favored, and it has been the effortless path of least resistance to impose this pattern upon facts which, if looked at more closely, fairly trumpeted the mistake that was being made.

A State capital is, in political terms, surely one of the earthiest places to be found, particularly in a State like Illinois, where the central forces are a big city political machine and a host of shrewd and ever-watchful rural county chairmen. The Springfield story by itself is a thoroughgoing refutation of this myth.

When Governor Stevenson first appeared on the scene, there is no doubt that he presented an appearance that was well beyond the familiar experience of that locale.

During his first year in office, it was common to hear about the halls of the capital and in the hotel bars the bland assumption that he was an accident, a one-termer who would be retired to the lusher pastures of the North Shore without being reslated. By the end of the first year or so, this talk had disappeared completely and, if referred to at all, it was in the homely locution that he could not be beaten for a second term with a baseball bat. Indeed, the party's concern swiftly became of quite a different order, that is to say, would he be left alone by the national leaders to finish his work in Springfield, or would he be summoned to a greater effort on a grander scale?

This change in the prevailing wind in Springfield is, I have always thought, one of the most eloquent of tributes to Stevenson's all-embracing humanity. It came because the politicians found themselves treated as individuals in their own right. They found that, under the Brooks Brothers suit, there was an adroit political leader, as dedicated as any of them to the welfare of the party and as assiduous as any of them in the advancement of its purposes. It was not a welfare which he confused with that of all the people of the State, but he began to demonstrate that the two are far from incompatible, and that there is, in the right hands, some meaning in the old saw that the best government is the best politics. He was, in short, realizing in action the motivations which made him more than ready to expose himself to the electorate in the first place.

The old pros, in the legislature and elsewhere, fairly glowed under his attentions. There was growing respect, of course, because they learned that they could not get all they wanted simply by staging explosive scenes in the privacy of his office. But when they went away empty-handed, as they often did, it was with the rancor reduced to a minimum, and the new formulation that took over in the cocktail lounges was that "you might not agree with everything the man on the second floor wants or asks, but you have to agree that he is a great little guy."

He was not the Pharisee lecturing them about what they ought to want or do. He was the fellow politician who had a big problem of his own in the shape of a responsibility to the entire people of Illinois. He took counsel with them about how his big problem and their smaller ones could somehow be fitted together. And the latter were not always made to yield, especially if there was some element of personal hardship involved for little people. I remember he signed a bill which saved the long-held jobs of six janitors in Chicago who had grown gray in the service of the Cook County organization generally and one veteran ward leader in particular. It violated every principle of the Civil Service Association and the League of Women Voters, and the newspapers were clamoring for a veto. When it was signed, I shall never forget the depth of emotion with which the ward leader expressed himself about this fellow, so unlike himself in every way, who had stuck his neck out for some people who were too old to start a new life and who looked to their oldtime leader for security in their time of trouble.

These are the little things of which political loyalties are compounded, and which can make or break the attainment of larger and infinitely more important programs. It is nonsense to say that the professionals uniformly disliked Stevenson. Two of the greatest of them all, Dave Lawrence of Pittsburgh and Dick Daley of Chicago, have been remarkable in their personal affection and political loyalty. There are many plain dwellings of precinct captains in Chicago where the grief is perhaps more deeply felt at this moment than in many of the drawing rooms farther north.

They liked him not only for his human appeal but because he lifted them up—he made their doorbell ringing seem more important. He communicated to them at least a dim sense of how the little fitted into the big, of how politics is always the handmaiden of public service. For this was his first and abiding principle, embedded in a family tradition and a personal conviction. It was the same spirit that caused his Grandmother Stevenson, when she lived in Washington as second lady of the land, to busy herself with promoting the cause of public education, and, in association with her friend and neighbor, Phoebe Hearst, organizing and launching the parent-teacher association movement. It is the same spirit which has put his oldest boy, Adlai III, into his first term in the Illinois General Assembly.

Why, then, did Adlai Stevenson run for office? The question should rather be: Why would he not have run, when that course would have been untrue to his heritage and in conflict with every fiber of his being?

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, since Adlai Stevenson's sudden and untimely death in London last week, tributes have poured in from all over the world to this great public figure. One of the most eloquent of these was penned by Richard M. Goodwin, special assistant to the President, for the Sunday Outlook section of the Washington Post, July 18, 1965. Mr. Goodwin has written many brilliant lines in recent years, but he is at his best in this tribute to the late Governor Stevenson.

Mr. Goodwin said of Stevenson:

> He told an entire generation there was room for intelligence and idealism in public life, that politics was not just a way to live, but a way to live greatly, that each of us might share in the passions of the age.

I was one of those who, along with Dick Goodwin, heard the call to politics through the words of Adlai Stevenson. Following the 1952 presidential campaign, I resigned a professorship at Dakota Wesleyan University to take on the task of rebuilding the Democratic Party in my State. I did so largely under the inspiration of Mr. Stevenson's stirring campaign of 1952. I think Mr. Goodwin has captured in words better than I ever could the reasons why he and I and millions of other Americans found our first real political inspiration in the late Adlai Stevenson.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Goodwin's article be printed at this point in the RECORD and that following this piece, these additional tributes to Stevenson appear in the RECORD: the text of the eulogy to Mr. Stevenson presented in the National Cathedral at the memorial service of Friday, July 16, by Judge Carl McGowan, as reprinted in the New York Times of July 17; an editorial in the Washington Post of July 15, entitled "Adlai Stevenson," an article by Mary McGrory, entitled "His Politics Had Gentility," appearing in the Washington Star July 15; a feature article entitled "Freedom's Most Dedicated Champion," appearing in the Washington Star of July 18; an article by Betty Beale, entitled "He Left Behind a Marked Page on His Bedside Table," appearing in the Washington Star of July 18; and an editorial entitled "Stevenson's Rich Legacy" in the Sioux Falls, S. Dak, Argus-Leader of July 15, 1965.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
July 18, 1965]

HE NEVER LEARNED TO HIDE HIS SOUL

"We shall not come again
We never shall come back again
But over us all, over us all,
Over us all is—something."
—THOMAS WOLFE.

(By Richard N. Goodwin)

Twice he had come as close as a man could come to leadership of the American Nation. Yet no one noticed as, for a moment, Adlai Stevenson looked toward the caped statue of Franklin Roosevelt, walked a few hundred yards, grasped the thin steel columns of a sidewalk railing, and died.

Questions of man's survival, of war, and of human progress had very nearly rested on the qualities of his personal mind and will. The destiny of every man and woman he passed that afternoon was almost placed in his hand. Yet no one cheered or waved or even turned to stare.

For he had escaped power. And for a politician, power is the tool which etches out one man's figure from among his companions.

IMPRESSIVE QUALITIES

Would he have been a good leader of his country, or a great one? We will never know. Many deny it. And they give reasons which start to persuade, until we remember that they—or their counterparts in other years—had said the same of past leaders such as John Kennedy and Franklin Roosevelt and, most violently, of Abraham Lincoln.

The fact is no man who has not been President can survive analysis of his capacity for the task. Nor can we predict his qualities until they pass through the purification of power and responsibility. We do know he had more promise than most. We do know the impressive qualities of mind and spirit his career permitted him to reveal. We also know he was ambitious. For you do not run for President unless your ambitions are greater than those of other men.

Was that ambition tinged with self-doubt? It is for every man except the very dangerous. Did he have the courage of decision? His own words, public and in private conversation, cloud judgment. But perhaps they only mask the fact that never in his public life did he fail to decide when it was time to decide; except in 1960 when the shameful prospect of leading his party to a third defeat postponed judgment beyond the reach of action.

Where public issues were concerned he spoke—on the platform and in the meeting room—with a clarity of conviction few had courage to match. And on this question the judgment of those who knew him is disfigured by the tortured musings of a man who had never quite learned the trick of hiding his soul; whose confidence had been twisted and battered by defeat and by the indifference and contempt of lesser men, which finally killed him.

He was not, as some have said, marked by fate for failure. He was the victim of less mystical forces: bad luck, poor timing, unfortunate issues, a party too long in office, and an opponent who could not be defeated. Had 6 percent of American voters switched to him in 1952 then all the hesitation and humility would today be regarded as the skillful genius of a master politician.

So we do not know, and will never know, if Adlai Stevenson would have been a good President of the United States. But we must be reluctant to believe that the judgment of so many who had desired his victory so furiously could have been so wrong.

Great men of affairs are either kings or prophets. Very few are both. And honor comes more reluctantly to prophets because they touch us more deeply. Adlai Stevenson never became a king, but he was a prophet. Death is already beginning to dissolve the masks of public failure and private personality which hide that recognition. It will become clearer as the self-justifying commentaries of those who scorned him in life begin to fade.

SEED ON UNPLOWED GROUND

I knew Adlai Stevenson as a colleague in my work for President Kennedy and, more recently for President Johnson. Both valued him most highly. Both had worked for his election to the office which they, not he, were to hold. Both knew, as others did not, what it took to bare yourself—ambitious and hopes—to the faithful, the indifferent and the hostile alike.

Many others in Washington, in these years, looked at him with a certain condescension. At times, thankfully only a few times, my own instinct was submerged in the need to be fashionable. But Adlai Stevenson will be mourned more deeply and remembered longer than any of these. It is not that millions loved him and millions more admired him because they did not know him. It is that closeness and ambition, envy, and rivalry obscure the heart's truth. Yet that is the truth that finally matters, which selects the man from among the shadows, sadly past the hour when recognition might bring personal joy.

But though I knew him and admired him, opposed him in 1960 and occasionally worked with him thereafter, many can speak far more intimately than I.

I remember best the Adlai Stevenson I never knew, when the world was young and the ringing phrases tumbled like the sowers seed on the unplowed ground.

In the fall of 1952 I was a senior in college in Massachusetts. John Kennedy was a young Congressman I had never met now running for the Senate. And Lyndon Johnson was the uncertainly familiar name of a Senator from Texas.

But Adlai Stevenson was my hero and my leader and my candidate for President of the United States. I never met him or even saw him, nor had I read the carefully crafted texts of his speeches. But something was in the air. My tiny world suddenly seemed to widen. Events and the course of history were drifting back within the reach of a man's skill and brains. The pursuit of power, and its use, were not solely the object of greed and vaulting ambition but infused with service and nobility and the love of others.

It wasn't that he talked sense or spoke the truth harshly. It was the more profound act of telling us—my generation—what we knew but didn't realize. He revealed a world we already sensed was there, bared challenges we were aching to undertake. The words were the words of sacrifice but the music sang of meaning and purpose to a young man.

As much as any, he was the end of postwar America and the beginning of a time still nameless. We knew and still repeated the old political phrases and the outworn battle cries. But we did not understand them because the lines had been drawn in a different war, and it was not our war. Now finally, there was a language we could understand and make our own.

THE ELEVATED INTELLIGENCE

Eight dreary, near tragic, years were to pass before that prophesy was to be fulfilled by different men. It is hard to overstate the extent to which he helped shape the dialog, and hence the purposes, of the New Frontier and then the Great Society. He dissolved the old, unserviceable simplicities and taught us to apply to the world the complex wisdom we have used so triumphantly in the affairs of our Nation: We could seek peace while resisting danger. Everyone who was not a friend was not an enemy. Agreement and accommodation could come from self-confidence as well as fear. By helping others we could strengthen ourselves. Particular problems could be resolved, but we must learn to live for generations with a troubled world. The contest was not simply between our system and communism, but between those who found security in dominion and those who found it in a world of strong and diverse lands.

And all these principles, and many more, he suffused with another welcome and shining truth: the pursuit of national self-interest was not inconsistent with the desire for justice and dignity and well-being for all the people of the world—that there was no basic unresolvable contradiction between realistic policies and high ideals.

To our domestic problems he brought the same elevated and critical intelligence. He told us our sights were too low, the course we had charted too narrow. In every area of our national life we not only could do more than we were doing but more than we thought. And he taught that wealth was not excellence, power was not greatness, the pursuit of abundance was not the pursuit of happiness.

After he spoke, no leader of his party nor the dialog of democracy itself, would ever sound the same again. He was eloquent and acclaimed for eloquence, but finally it was not how he spoke but what he said that mattered. Others would bring new accents and perhaps even greater powers to leadership. But it had all begun in Springfield, Ill., in that hopeful dawn year of 1952.

CITIZEN-POLITICIAN CREATED

The most farsighted policies molder and dissolve, lose content and direction, in the hands of the mediocre and the indifferent. The Nation rests on the quality of its public men, and they in turn are shaped by the quality of American politics. Adlai Stevenson brought many individuals into government who have enriched the administrations of President Kennedy and President Johnson. But this is the least of it. More than any man, he created the citizen-politician. He told an entire generation there was room for intelligence and idealism in public life, that politics was not just a way to live but a way to live greatly, that each of us might share in the passions of the age.

My first experience in national politics was in an overflowing, chaotic room of the volunteers for Stevenson. Many thousands had the same initiation. Today, the citizens groups, the volunteers, the clubs to discuss issues and the clubs to reform politics, are a force which every politician must confront, and which the best will welcome. Thus, he changed the face of American politics; enriching the democracy, providing a base on which talent could aspire to power, opening a gateway to public life through which many who never heard his voice will someday enter.

All these—ideas and men—are contributions to be remembered. But there was something more to Adlai Stevenson, a quality that resists thought and language alike. For none of this explains the fierce desire millions brought to his cause, the disappointed tears of many who never knew him, the deep impulse which could make even experienced politicians forget commitment and interest alike to be at his side.

It was not the first time we have seen this quality, nor the last. But how rare it is in those who find their way to power.

Part of it was in his lesson. It was not a new lesson. It runs like a vein of light through the dark history of the race. It suffuses the religion and beliefs of every people. It says that man is more than the sum of his needs and desires and fears. It ennobles those who look beyond their own interest to great principle. It acclaims, not wealth and power, but the charity of the spirit and the reach of the heart.

LOVE FELT BY MILLIONS

This is what he wanted for the American people. And although we may never be equal to it, many loved him for thinking we could.

The rest was the man himself. You didn't need to know him to feel it, although knowing brought confirmation. There was a gentleness, a spaciousness of sensibility, a love which in unseen ways was felt by millions. He could laugh and be cynical. If he read these words he would joke about them, and he would deride this writing with soft self-depreciation. But all the wonderful humor, the urbanity, the captiousness was, in large part, a mask to protect himself from a world which so easily confused humility with weakness, sentiment with unreality, amplitude of understanding with failure of will. Many who met him were fooled. Millions who never met him, knew the truth.

This is the secret of today's mourning and to his place in the play of passion clothed in fact which is history. People return what they receive. They believe in the man who believed in them and thus made them believe in themselves. They love the man who loved them and thus let them love themselves a little more. They honor the leader who told them they were better than they were and, in so doing, made it so.

He has often been compared to Hamlet. And those who make the comparison do so as a metaphor of irresolution. Hamlet is the story of a man who tries to understand and reach for certainty before he strikes. But he does strike: and for justice loses kingship and life while the election lights on a young and valiant captain.

Our judgment must echo Shakespeare's own when the new king stands beside Hamlet's body, saying:

> "Let four captains
> Bear Hamlet, like a soldier, to the stage;
> For he was likely, had he been put on,
> To have prov'd most royally."

[From the New York Times, July 17, 1965]

TEXT OF THE STEVENSON EULOGY

(NOTE.—Following is a transcript of the eulogy of Adlai Stevenson presented yesterday in the National Cathedral, Washington, by Judge Carl McGowan, as recorded by the New York Times.)

We are a vast company, we friends of Adlai Stevenson. Only a few of our total number are met here in Washington today to mourn him. More will come together for the same sad purpose in his homeland in Illinois. But all taken together will be but a very small part of the whole.

This is because in his case the word friend has a staggering sweep. It comprehends those who have had the benison of his personal presence to delight as well as to inspire. But it also includes literally millions in this country and abroad to whom he is only a voice.

It is a voice, however, to which they have listened since he began speaking in the accents of reason to the American people and as he has continued to do to the peoples of the entire world in the United Nations.

These people have in all their sorts and conditions of life, of high and low degree, of varying color and religions, listened to that voice with unabated interest and with undiminished respect. They have heard in it the unmistakable intonations of friendship. They have responded with the gift of their affection to a man most of them have never seen.

They are of our company of friends today, as much as any one of us here. We have all heard the same voice.

ECHOES IN HISTORY

That voice is still now. But its echoes are likely to be sounding down the corridors of history for a long time. For it is the essence of faith to believe that the world in its advancing age will set no less score than have we upon reason, upon intelligence, upon gaiety, upon charity and compassion and grace—all these things and more of and with which this voice has spoken to us so often and so clearly in the past.

We do not need now to be reminded of what we have lost. That hurt is deep and no one of us is too old to cry. We may better, then, give thanks for what we have had and rejoice in our recollections of how our good fortune came to be.

Many have asked how it was that a man of Governor Stevenson's sensibilities could have intruded himself into the dust and heat of politics. We may think, I believe, that it was simply his joyous response to one of his deepest instincts—that for public service.

He knew that the greatest opportunities for effective public service lie in elective office. The shattering disappointments that beset that way of life can also dissolve in the satisfaction of feeling the reins of political power in one's hands harnessed to good and just ends.

The disappointments were his in cruel measure. But the satisfactions were his as well. We need not fear that he ever looked back with despairing regret at the way the final balance was struck.

FAMILY BENT FOR POLITICS

There was a strong family bent for politics and Adlai Stevenson was of a generation of Princeton students who thrilled to the saga of Woodrow Wilson—that figure in our history in whom the contrasting worlds of the university and the precinct have had their most dramatic conjunction.

In this cathedral the spirit of Woodrow Wilson is always very close. Surely it has never been more so than at this moment. The youthful admirer has completed the course with honor and is at rest with the admired.

The two have often been compared; although there are obvious disparities in temperament, there are many similarities in political styles. Above all, they had a common vision of a just society at home and a peaceful one abroad. Both were agreed that the mobilization and direction of political power was a pursuit from which no man should turn away or of which he should be ashamed.

And who can say that the dream of the youthful Stevenson in terms of a world made safe for democracy did not include a happier ending, if only the rocky road to political power could be traversed once more by a man with the same vision.

Adlai Stevenson enjoyed politics. He relished the infinite variety of people he met there. He found them to be, as in other walks of life, of all descriptions, good and bad, and, more frequently, partly good and partly bad.

He had a particular liking for these last, for he knew that most of us, including himself, are in that group. He sensed that strain of sentimentality which is always just under the surface of political relationships and which binds together in a tacit brotherhood all those who live and die by the ballot box.

He brought to this highly emotional environment his own warm responses, shaped by those qualities which, beneath all the surface toughness and cynicism, it valued the highest, a cheerful lightness of spirit, a gift for undemanding friendship, a sympathetic understanding that most politicians have creditable reasons for worrying about the day after election day.

He had the expert political leader's sure instinct for trying to identify the other fellow's problems and pressures before passing judgment upon him. The Stevenson story has now become a legend. The glories of it are many, but none shines more brightly than the sight of him putting to work at the United Nations these very qualities which rocketed him to the foreground of domestic politics.

It was as if he were fated to move through personal disappointment to the very center of the problems that assail all people and upon which depend the survival of civilization itself.

LIFETIME OF PREPARATION

His whole life has been a preparation for events of this scale of importance. And our sense of the fitness of things must be touched by this completely civilized man doing battle for the persistence of the very idea of civilization. For our biggest stake we put forward our best. And he met the challenge, to our and his eternal honor.

If there is reason to be despairing on this day it is because this man has been removed from the important work of war and peace. But he who knew the perils ahead better than most, was undaunted by them.

In virtually the last of his magnificent speeches he gave to the world he said: "For all our desperate dangers I do not believe in the words of Winston Churchill that 'God has despaired of His children.'"

Wherefore, then, are we now to falter and be faint of heart. We have lost a friend; but all the world has lost one. And that friend has left us in the fullness of his powers and secure in what he must have known to be a far-flung respect and affection.

He died as he would have wished, engaged in his country's business, and mankind's.

[From The Washington (D.C.) Post, July 15, 1965]

ADLAI STEVENSON

He was a man without malice in an age in which public enterprise and international affairs were largely disfigured by malice. He was a man of great warmth of spirit and largeness of heart in an era marked by cold calculation and selfishness. He was a man of humor and wit in an interval of national life during which such talents in public men inspired suspicion. He was a man of humility in a season when those with more occasion to have it possessed none of it. He was a man whose utterance, like Jefferson's, was always felicitous and graceful and often beautifully eloquent. He was a man given to introspection and soul searching in an interval of history preempted by men of action.

For these qualities he was idolized by millions of Americans, respected by more and looked upon abroad as an embodiment of the best democratic impulses and values of American life. His death in London yesterday must have had an impact upon most citizens as great as that ordinarily arising from the loss of a head of state. Upon many it inflicted a sense of deprivation like that felt at the loss of a close friend or a member of the family circle.

In his long and controversial public life he was the object of many reproaches but few dared to say, and none could say with justice, that he was not a good man in the sense that he was forever governed in his words and in his acts by the wish to further the good of his country, the well-being of his countrymen, the fair name of his Nation at home and aboard. It is doubtful if there is any man in our history of whom it could be as safely asserted that he never permitted private interest to conflict with what he understood as the public good. And this, when spoken of him, is higher praise than it would be of other men, for he had no capacity for that subtle self-deceit that permits men to identify their own and the public weal.

On this occasion many will regret that he did not achieve the high office which twice he sought. It is easy to imagine small changes in circumstance that would have made him President. But the regret must be tempered. No one knew better than he the anguish of power—and he would have suffered in it, not rejoiced in it. When he addressed the American Society of Newspaper Editors in 1960 he described the search for truth as a "principle" of our national life. He said: "In this striving, it is a matter of experience that some strains are almost too great for human fortitude—and of these strains, none is more testing than that of prolonged and unquestioned power." Probably few candidates for our highest office have had the same awareness of this aspect of the ordeal of public office.

On that occasion he spoke on the role of the opposition in American public life and rightly and wisely declared: "The possibility of alternating the Government, which only the acceptance of opposition secures, is essential to the health of both, to those who govern and to those who would. If succession to power is the consequence of successful criticism, this fact, in itself, should sober the critics, keep their attacks within the limits of the practicable, weight them with the sense of coming responsibility, weaken the pull of the lunatic fringe." That is the kind of opposition leader that he always was.

His public life was capped by his great career at the United Nations. He must have found this an anguishing public service for a man of his sensitive nature, his preference for restrained utterance, his passionate faith in his own country and his contempt for extravagant demogoguery. But he suffered its adversity patiently and without complaint or protest, serving to the end at the task to which he was summoned, however distasteful it was to him.

He was often asked, as men so gifted often are, to speak in praise of others—his colleagues, his President, his friends, his rivals. His gift of eloquent speech was not withheld, but he must have wished in his own wry way, that he could have struck a better bargain and have heard more words in praise of himself. So it is that now there is none to speak of him as eloquently as he would have spoken of others. In this, as in every aspect of his life, he gave more than he received.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, July 15, 1965]

THE PERFECT KNIGHT: HIS POLITICS HAD GENTILITY

(By Mary McGrory)

Adlai Stevenson was a gentleman from Illinois who entered politics late in life, suffered two crushing national defeats, and retired gracefully from the scene. He was an incomparable orator and, as a candidate, so diffident, so civil and so mannerly, so insistent on his own values that he might go down as a noble footnote in the history of his times.

But he was more than that. Despite the brevity of that career, it was crucial. He left his mark on American politics. His two successors used the bold ideas he had given them. They put to work the superior breed of men he had attracted to public service.

And all over America, in every political subdivision, there are men and women who lick stamps and ring doorbells and attend grubby meetings because 13 years ago the sound of Stevenson's voice, enunciating precisely a high-minded, high-hearted vision of public life, galvanized them permanently.

There has not been in memory a politician like him. He was unique because he insisted on the ultimate luxury most politicians immediately forgo—that of being completely himself in public.

Stevenson was a contradictory man: troubled yet merry; committed yet detached; idealistic yet rueful. He had a puritan sense of duty without a puritan self-righteousness and a reformer's zeal without the reformer's scourge.

His campaigns were the despair of the professionals and the delight of his followers. No candidate before nomination protested more articulately his own inadequacies. And no candidate spoke with more felicity and fire and wit.

Who would have thought the gently nurtured aristocrat would tread so heavily on the toes of the pressure groups—the American Legion, the labor movement, the Old South?

While his soldier-citizen rival held out the promise of painless peace, Stevenson campaigned on the premise that life is hard and the world is in ferment.

The speeches of the 1952 campaign did not win the White House for Stevenson. But they did win him a place in literature.

He paid a high price. When he might have been glad handing, he was reworking his phrases. No audience was too small to merit his best.

The memory of him on the platform is of a middle-aged man with a hole in his shoe, up to the moment of introduction frowningly busy with pencil on the script of the address. The English language had no more valiant or perfectionist friend. Stevenson retained to the end his belief in the power of words.

Political power eluded him, at least on the national scene. As Governor of Illinois, he seemed to understand all about it. But he had been brought up in a rigid creed of gentility, and he never could command the fighting excesses which the politician must use. In 1956, when the late Senator Estes Kefauver challenged him for the nomination and defeated him in the Minnesota primary, Stevenson went on the warpath in California, but for him it was a joyless and unpalatable enterprise.

In 1960, he was of two minds. While he characteristically deprecated his own chances, he knew the unalterable loyalty of his partisans. And despite his public manifestations to the contrary, Stevenson always knew his own worth. He would not give his followers the word.

The high point of the Los Angeles convention was the nominating speech of Senator Eugene McCarthy, of Minnesota, who, for Stevenson, reached the oratorical heights of the master.

"Do not," he cried, "reject this man who has made us all proud to be called Democrats," and the galleries went mad. "Do not leave this prophet without honor in his own party."

Stevenson, deprived of the great prize a third time, hoped that John F. Kennedy would make him Secretary of State. But Kennedy wanted to be his own Secretary of State and wanted no Cabinet officer with so fierce a personal following. Instead, he asked Stevenson to be Ambassador to the United Nations.

Stevenson had no enthusiasm for the job, but impelled both by the desire to serve and the reluctance to leave public life, which both repelled and attracted him, accepted.

It was a thankless chore, and Stevenson seemed always on the point of giving it up. He used to tell his friends he could not go on—and did. He would say the problems were impossible—and he coped with them.

He was sustained by the near reverence tendered him by the representatives of other countries who found in him a symbol of his own country's honor and integrity and good will.

His hold on the imagination of many Americans never weakened. At the 20th anniversary celebration of the United Nations in San Francisco, there were some who came, not to see President Johnson but to see Adlai Stevenson, who was to them, as Senator McCarthy said, quoting Chaucer, "a very perfect gentle knight."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, July 18, 1965]

Freedom's Most Dedicated Champion

It was a warm, sunny afternoon in London last Wednesday.

Adlai Stevenson, in England since the previous Saturday on a trip that combined diplomatic business and social pleasure, stepped through the door of the U.S. Embassy on Upper Grosvenor Square. With him was Mrs. Marietta P. Tree, a longtime friend and fellow member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations.

The two strolled slowly along. They neared the International Sportsmen's Club, some 50 yards from the Embassy. Suddenly, Stevenson fell backward to the pavement.

The time was 5:10 p.m., London time.

Mrs. Tree dropped to her hands and knees beside him, calling for help. The doorman from the nearby club ran out, gently lifted Stevenson's head and placed a folded coat beneath it. Mrs. Tree bent down and tried to restore his breathing by mouth-to-mouth resuscitation. A doctor ran up and applied artificial respiration.

Moments later an ambulance arrived. Oxygen was administered on the brief trip to St. Georges Hospital at Hyde Park.

Word of the incident was relayed to the Embassy. An official called the hospital to check on Stevenson's condition. While the official was identifying himself to a nurse, a doctor's voice broke in.

"I have just now signed the death certificate," the doctor said.

The time was 5:25 p.m.

Stevenson's lifetime of dedication to his country and to the cause of freedom had ended in his 66th year. There had been no hint of the massive coronary thrombosis that apparently struck with such blinding swiftness that Stevenson was dead even as he slumped to the pavement.

Word of Stevenson's death was flashed from the Embassy at about 1 p.m. Washington time. And his nation and the world began the inevitable reflect of reevaluating the man who was gone and of estimating the loss that had been suffered.

President Johnson was told of Stevenson's death as he prepared for a state luncheon at the White House for Japanese Cabinet members. He rose from his place to deliver what may have been the most eloquent impromptu statement of his career.

"This is our legacy from Adlai Stevenson—a charge to continue the quest for a decent world, for a better world order, for a life for man that is free of war and destruction and oppression of his spirit.

"So this is our pledge to the memory of this great man * * * a pledge to devote our energies and our talents and our resources and our wills to the cause for which he died.

"We realize that America has lost its foremost advocate and its most eloquent spirit and one of the finest voices for peace in the world. The world of freedom has lost, I think, perhaps its most dedicated champion."

Those near the President reported his eyes were filled with tears.

The body of the man who was twice rejected for the Presidency was flown from London in the Presidential jet, accompanied by the Vice President and by Stevenson's three sons. Expressions of shock and grief poured in from heads of state and from ordinary citizens throughout the world.

Through the night from Thursday to Friday morning, the body lay in the Washington Cathedral. A steady stream of mourners passed slowly by the coffin, paying their final tribute to the man who, in defeat, had elevated American politics and who had inspired a generation of dedicated young men to enter service of their country.

On Saturday, the body was taken to Springfield, Ill., to lie in state in the capitol where Stevenson served as Governor. A private funeral and burial in the family plot in Bloomington, Ill., is scheduled for tomorrow.

And along with the grief and the shock over the sudden death of the witty, articulate, thoughtful, and dedicated man, the Nation and the President were left with a very real void and with the need to fill it promptly and well.

Stevenson had served his country with outstanding ability as Ambassador to the United Nations since 1961. It was known among the friends that he had for some time been considering retirement; as he put it to Columnist Eric Sevareid the Monday before his death, "I'd like to sit in the shade with a glass of wine in my hand and watch the dancers." What stopped him from leaving his post was the realization that the U.N. was in trouble and the fear that his withdrawal might further diminish the organization's sagging prestige.

His death precipitated the crisis he had sought to avoid.

Within minutes of the shocking announcement, the speculation had started as to who Johnson would name to fill the post. For the moment, Francis T. P. Plimpton, Stevenson's second in command, would step up. But the President would have to move soon to name a permanent replacement for the man who had brought so much prestige to the post.

Whoever the choice might fall upon, one thing was certain: The most able advocate of American policies—even those with which he was not in full accord—was lost to his Nation last Wednesday.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, July 18, 1965]

He Left Behind a Marked Page on His Bedside Table

(By Betty Beale)

For those of us who admired and loved Adlai Stevenson it is not easy to say goodby.

He was such a unique, towering figure on the scenes chronicled on these pages. His great vitality of intellect, heart, soul and wit had an electric effect on every gathering he attended.

The picture of him as a lonely, frequently gloomy man, as portrayed in the Ben Shahn sketch on the cover of Time in December 1962, was for his intimate friends a totally false one.

He was a blithe spirit that delighted in so many things—an active useful life, the beauty of art, music and poetic words, humor wherever it might be found, and the kindnesses of people, big and little, scores of whom were so deeply devoted to him he had no time for loneliness.

Indeed, the social demands on his time were so much greater than the possibility of fulfillment he not infrequently became involved in two engagements the same evening in different cities.

His housekeeper, Violet Ready, who served his family during his mother's lifetime and was with him all the time he was U.N. Ambassador, could find no basis for the gloomy portrayal. He loved people, he had them around him all the time, and he kept up a personal correspondence with dozens more. If the tragedies of his personal life or the turn of world events depressed him at times, he quickly rose about them.

Indeed his sense of humor gave him a much gayer outlook on life than the average man's. Nor did his wit depend on speechwriters, as is so often the case with public men. There was that unforgettable time at a party for Lady Astor on her last visit to Washington when she said to him:

"You need me. I'm a rich widow."

And he immediately whipped back:

"I'm looking for somebody more mature."

He could even jest about Russia's hostility, although the strain of continuously coping with it is what really took his life. The night he took Soviet Ambassador and Mrs. Dobrynin to the Bolshoi Ballet opening in New York the Russian envoy was telling how his wife took pictures of sunsets everywhere she went in the United States.

"The picture of dying America, I suppose," was Adlai's amused comment.

Anyone who watched him at social gatherings soon became aware that he had but one manner toward all. It was the manner of grace and ease and warmth, and it came to him as naturally as breathing.

He was never rude or brusque with people, never impatient with boredom, though he was frequently detained by people he would gladly have escaped. He didn't think he was so important he could offend others.

It was perhaps this humility as much as anything that kept him from becoming President. As someone recently said: "You have to have ego to become President"—to think you are better qualified than all other men to run the country.

That is why it took a draft to get him in the race in 1952.

About a year ago he told this writer that Bobby Kennedy had come to him asking for his support of his brother at the Democratic convention in 1960 and offering him the Vice Presidency if he would nominate Jack Kennedy for President.

"I would be President today," he observed thoughtfully, but he had given his word to Johnson, he said, that he would remain neutral and not come out for either candidate.

On the incident of the much discussed selection by Kennedy of a running mate, Stevenson threw this light some time ago.

"Jack Kennedy called me early the morning after his nomination and said he wanted to come and talk to me. I told him that I would come to him and I got dressed and went over right away. He asked me what I thought about Lyndon Johnson for Vice President."

Stevenson told him that he thought it would heal the breach in the Democratic Party, that Johnson would help win the South and that he would be of enormous assistance in dealing with the Congress.

"But," he added, "of course, he won't take it."

He was surprised when Johnson did.

It is hard to believe that Stevenson said, as has been reported, that our Santo Domingo policy was "a massive blunder from beginning to end." Six weeks ago he said only that this country's mistake was in not waiting 24 hours to present our plan to the OAS. The 24-hour wait would not have been detrimental and would have given our position strength and support.

That Stevenson was feeling the strain of a 17-hour day almost every day in the week was apparent in recent months by his comments, not by any evidence of mental fatigue. Associates said that no matter how tired he might be physically, his mind always functioned at top lucidity.

He told the Roosevelt family last January that he would have to resign from the chairmanship of the Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation because it was killing him to try to do a good job with that along with everything else he had to do.

It is nice to know that he had a rare weekend with his grandchildren at his farm in Libertyville 10 days before his passing. After "a whirlpool for months," he called it "a quiet eddy" with "only six children under 14 and underfoot."

When he took off for Geneva he left behind on the bedside table in his New York apartment a printed page that he had marked.

Perhaps it was intended for a commencement address. It was not written by him but that he chose it and saved it for his attention upon his return is indicative of his own thought. It was entitled "Desiderata," and it was found in old St. Paul's Church, Baltimore, dated 1692.

He once said, "You cannot pluck out the mystery of the human heart." But perhaps this gives more insight into the mystery of his:

"Go placidly amid the noise and the haste and learn what peace there may be in silence * * *. Speak your truth quietly and clearly; and listen to others, even the dull and ignorant; they, too, have their story.* * * If you compare yourself with others you may become vain and bitter; for always there will be greater and lesser persons than yourself.

"Enjoy your achievements as well as your plans. Keep interested in your career, however humble; it is a real possession in the changing fortunes of time. Exercise caution in your business affairs; for the world is full of trickery. But let this not blind you to what virtue there is; many persons strive for high ideals; and everywhere life is full of heroism.

"Be yourself. Especially do not feign affection. Neither be cynical about love; for in the face of all aridity and disenchantment it is as perennial as the grass. Take kindly the counsel of the years, gracefully surrendering the things of youth. Nurture strength of spirit to shield you in sudden misfortune. But do not distress yourself with imaginings. Many fears are born of fatigue and loneliness. Beyond a wholesome discipline, be gentle with yourself. You are a child of the universe no less than the trees and the stars; you have a right to be here. And whether or not it is clear to you no doubt the universe is unfolding as it should.

"Therefore, be at peace with God, whatever you conceive Him to be. And whatever your labors and aspirations in the noisy confusion of life keep peace with your soul. With all its sham, drudgery, and broken dreams, it is still a beautiful world."

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader, July 15, 1965]

STEVENSON'S RICH LEGACY

As twice a candidate for the Presidency, Adlai Stevenson never won the majority of the American people. But he did win a warm place in the hearts of the citizens. Even those who disagreed sharply with his policies respected his sincerity, his good purpose and his eager desire to be of service.

He was a man of charm—a gentleman in the real sense of the word. He also was a citizen of integrity and character, able and willing to speak vigorously in defense of that in which he believed.

His life was dedicated in the main to public service both in his home State of Illinois and in the Nation. He became a broad student of world affairs and many in Washington respected deeply his profound understanding of the international problems and his intense and earnest effort to promote peace.

Many of his critics felt he was too much of an idealist, too much of a dreamer. But surely the Nation requires in high places some persons of prominence whose thoughts are unfettered by tradition and who can turn their eyes toward objectives difficult to achieve.

Perhaps Stevenson was too ready to expect extreme accomplishments. Yet all of us were enriched by the program he laid out and the goals he had in mind.

By any and all standards, he is to be remembered as one of America's good citizens—one of the best.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I was out of the country at the Parliamentary Conference in Lima, Peru, when the shocking news of Ambassador Stevenson's death reached me.

I am deeply sorry that I was unable to return in time to attend the memorial services, but on the other hand I feel confident, that he, of all the men I know, would have understood.

American foreign policy was the subject nearest and dearest to his heart. Adlai Stevenson understood the importance of face-to-face meetings such as the one in Lima to the achievement of our goal of improved relations among nations.

He carried his heavy responsibilities with unflagging wit and verve and dedication. Under other circumstances, he would have led this Nation as well as serving as one of the chief exponents of her foreign policy.

But even if he had achieved the supreme gift of office which this country's citizens can bestow upon a man, I doubt that he could have been any more effective an advocate of our Nation's constant goal of a decent peaceful life for all the people of this world.

That he made this case with remarkable skill and clarity is shown by the admiration, and even reverence, in which he is held in other countries.

Like few other statesmen, Adlai Stevenson exemplified to the world the best that is in this country.

He will be sorely missed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT RELATING TO CONSTRUCTION OF HEALTH RESEARCH FACILITIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2984) to amend the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities by extending the expiration date thereof and providing increased support for the program, to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Hill, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Pell, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Javits, and Mr. Murphy conferees on the part of the Senate.

PERSONNEL FOR COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2985) to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Hill, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Pell, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Javits, and Mr. Murphy conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION AND AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 510) to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Community Health Services Extension Amendments of 1965".

IMMUNIZATION PROGRAMS

Sec. 2. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 317 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "and" before "June 30, 1965" and by inserting "and each of the next three fiscal years," immediately after "June 30, 1965,". The second sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out "the fiscal years ending June 30, 1963, and June 30, 1964" and inserting in lieu thereof "any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1968". The third sentence of such subsection is amended by striking "and tetanus" and inserting in lieu thereof "tetanus, and measles", and by striking out "under the age of five years" and inserting in lieu thereof "of preschool age".

(b) Subsection (a) of such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Such grants may also be used to pay similar costs in connection with immunization programs against any other disease of an infectious nature which the Surgeon finds represents a major public health problem in terms of high mortality, morbidity, disability, or epidemic potential and to be susceptible of practical elimination as a public health problem through immunization with vaccines or other preventive agents which may become available in the future."

(c) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out "of limited duration", by striking out "against poliomyelitis, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus" and inserting in lieu thereof "against the diseases referred to in subsection (a)", and by striking out "who are under the age of five years" and inserting in lieu thereof "of preschool age".

(d)(1) Such section is further amended by striking out "intensive community vaccination" wherever it appears in subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "immunization".

(2) The heading of such section is amended by striking out "INTENSIVE VACCINATION" and inserting in lieu thereof "IMMUNIZATION".

MIGRATORY WORKERS HEALTH SERVICES

Sec. 3. Section 310 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof "each fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1968".

GENERAL PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

Sec. 4. The first sentence of subsection (c) of section 314 of such Act is amended by striking out "first five fiscal years ending after June 30, 1961" and inserting in lieu thereof "first six fiscal years ending after June 30, 1961".

SPECIAL PROJECT GRANTS FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES

Sec. 5. The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 316 of such Act is amended by striking out "first five fiscal years ending after June 30, 1961" and inserting in lieu thereof "first six fiscal years ending after June 30, 1961".

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment and request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Hill, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Pell, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Javits, and Mr. Murphy conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 6 it is proposed to strike out line 7, as follows:

"§ 1911. Duration of veteran's education or training

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

"§1910. Entitlement to education or training generally

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have received a letter in support of S. 9 from the State of California, signed by H. E. Summers, chief, bureau of readjustment education, department of education, dated July 14, 1965. It reads as follows:

July 14, 1965.

Hon. Ralph Yarborough,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Yarborough: The following data is submitted for your information to emphasize the urgency and need for the enactment of cold war veterans educational benefits as provided in your Senate bill 9.

Between February 1, 1955, and June 30, 1965, there have been 82,792 inducted into the military service, and 415,497 enlistments or Reserves ordered to active duty for a total of 498,289 cold war service personnel from the State of California. For the same period, February 1, 1955, through June 30, 1965, there have been 530,478 military personnel released from active duty in California.

The California State Department of Employment has indicated that 5 percent of the overall employable population is presently unemployed. The best available figures for the personnel who have been released from military service since February 1, 1955, indicates an unemployment percentage of more than 10 percent. This disproportionate percentage of unemployment for the cold war service personnel is the result of a lack of specific contacts with job possibilities because of their being in the service and away from their home environment for the period of time spent on military duty. Another factor is that persons entering the military service, either voluntarily or by induction, have done so prior to their completing educational or vocational training, and upon their returning to civilian life they are untrained for specific employment and are also financially unable to pursue vocational or educational training in public or private schools. It should be pointed out that many young people are unable to secure employment if they have not completed their military service when eligible for the draft as many employers find it to their disadvantage to hire an individual subject to military duty. The employer feels that it is not economically sound to spend time in training an employee until there is some assurance of his continued employment. This then results in unemployment prior to entering the service as well as a more difficult period of adjustment to civilian life and pursuit of employment after release from military duty.

Service personnel returning to civilian life are seriously handicapped in that they are unable to save enough in the way of finances to continue their education and training and in turn have to compete with those who have remained in civilian life to secure further education or seniority in the labor market.

We trust that the President and the administration are aware this injustice exists and will fully support this legislation. You are to be commended on the interest and persistence that you have shown on behalf of the cold war service personnel. Existing Federal legislation does not provide the necessary assistance to our cold war service personnel and it is urged that educational benefits be enacted.

Very truly yours,
H. E. Summers,
Chief, Bureau of Readjustment Education.

Mr. President, I thank Mr. Summers, Chief of the Bureau of Readjustment

Education of the California State Department of Education, for his concise statement on the bill. I also pay tribute to the great State of California, a State of 18 million people, which will have furnished 530,478 military personnel, who have been released from active duty between January 1, 1955, and June 30, 1965. In that 10-year period more than a half million young men have come back from service. Among those persons the rate of unemployment is nearly twice the rate among young men who did not serve.

Mr. President. many of those called up to serve in this cold war do not go overseas. While Regulars are being sent overseas, many of our Reserves and the National Guard are called to replace them at home. They are taken out of their places of business and their lives are disrupted.

An article appeared on page A-15 of the Washington Post on Friday, July 16, 1965, captioned "Joint Chiefs Want Vietnam Force of 179,000 This Year."

The article names some specific reserves, and states:

> The armed services, it was disclosed, are starting to gear up for such possible muster of guardsmen and reservists.
>
> They have submitted to Defense officials tentative estimates totaling more than 200,000 citizen servicemen.

Those men will be called out of their normal employment for Reserve and National Guard duties to fill in for the 179,000 men of the Regular services going overseas.

This breakdown, as shown by the article, is:

> About 120,000 guardsmen and reservists, including six infantry brigades. Three of these brigades, sources said, probably would be the 187th of Massachusetts, the 157th of Pennsylvania, and the 205th of Minnesota.

Mr. President, if those men are called up to replace the men going overseas, their lives will be disrupted as much as were the lives of those called for action in Korea, Okinawa, or Vietnam, and who did not get there.

This is not a bonus bill for combat. This is a readjustment for servicemen. It enables them to readjust and learn how to earn a living when they get back into civilian life rather than to go on expensive relief rolls of the unemployed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article to which I have referred in the Washington Post of July 16, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT CHIEFS WANT VIETNAM FORCE OF 179,000 THIS YEAR

(By Fred S. Hoffman)

The Nation's military chiefs have recommended unanimously that the strength of U.S. forces in South Vietnam be boosted to 179,000 men by the end of the year, it was learned yesterday.

This would be more than 100,000 above the 75,000-man U.S. force now scheduled to be in South Vietnam.

This recommendation by the Joint Chiefs of Staff will be considered by top U.S. officials in the light of what Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara determines during his weeklong inspection visit to Vietnam. McNamara left Washington Wednesday night.

(In Saigon early Friday, McNamara denied that the Joint Chiefs had unanimously recommended an increase of combat troops—he did not mention other forces—but then added that use of American combat troops was one of the prime reasons of his trip.)

The Associated Press was told the Joint Chiefs would include the remainder of the 1st Infantry division in the new projections for a buildup to meet growing Communist strength. One brigade of that division landed in Vietnam this week after traveling from its home base at Ft. Riley, Kans.

A buildup as big as 179,000 men could well bring at least a limited mobilization of Reservists and National Guardsmen to replace regular troops drawn into the growing conflict in Vietnam.

ARE GEARING UP

The armed services, it was disclosed, are starting to gear up for such possible muster of guardsmen and reservists.

They have submitted to Defense officials tentative estimates totaling more than 200,000 citizen servicemen.

The breakdown:

About 120,000 guardsmen and reservists, including 6 infantry brigades. Three of these brigades, sources said, probably would be the 187th of Massachusetts, the 157th of Pennsylvania and the 205th of Minnesota.

Marines: The 4th Marine Division and its air wing, a total of more than 44,000 reservists.

Navy: About 40,000 reservists who would be summoned as individuals rather than with units.

Air Force: Mostly air transport squadrons manned by some 20,000 reservists and guardsmen.

COULD BE SCALED DOWN

The sources emphasize that the planning for a possible callup is still in the early stages and that the services estimates could be scaled down.

The Chicago Daily News Service reported the total manpower available for a possible callup:

The United States, at present, has a total of 2,600,000 men in its Regular Armed Forces.

If it should prove necessary to call up 250,000 Reserves, there would still be a large reservoir of manpower left. The Ready Reserve Force, which is the first to go, totals 1,700,000 men.

This is composed of 383,000 Army National Guardsmen, 714,000 Army reservists, 329,000 naval reservists, 102,000 Marine Corps reservists, 72,000 Air National Guardsmen, and 182,000 Air Force reservists.

This pool is subject to callup in time of war, in time of a national emergency proclaimed by the President, or in the event of a national emergency proclaimed by Congress.

In addition to the Ready Reserve, there are 463,000 men in the Standby Reserve. They can only be ordered to active duty by action of Congress.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill.

My substitute is printed as S. 520, and it is an amended form, but in substantially the same form as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Senate for Friday, June 16, on page 17128, in the last column, and on the succeeding pages.

I submit my amendment in the nature of a substitute, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed, so that it will be available in the printed form tomorrow, or as soon as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask that it be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll; and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 188 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Ellender
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] are absent on official business.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

THE CONSTITUTION MUST NOT BE AMENDED IN HASTE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, last week the distinguished minority leader had printed in the RECORD the revised text of his constitutional amendment to permit one house of a State legislature to be malapportioned.

This, Mr. President, is the third "official draft" of the so-called Dirksen amendment. In order that the RECORD may conveniently reflect the changes that have been made, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of Senate Joint Resolution 2 as it was introduced.

There being no objection, the text of Senate Joint Resolution 2 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The right and power to determine the composition of the legislature of a State and the apportionment of the membership thereof shall remain in the people of that State. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit the people from apportioning one house of a bicameral legislature upon the basis of factors other than population, or from giving reasonable weight to factors other than population in apportioning a unicameral legislature, if, in either case, such apportionment has been submitted to a vote of the people in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution and has been approved by a majority of those voting on that issue.

SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, at the conclusion of hearings, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, which has held hearings for some weeks and months, reported a revised amendment which reflects substantial changes from the original text of Senate Joint Resolution 2. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the revised amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years of the date of its submission to the Congress:

SECTION 1. The people of a State may apportion one house of a bicameral legislature upon the basis of factors other than population, or give reasonable weight to factors other than population in apportioning a unicameral legislature, if, in either case, such apportionment has been submitted to a vote of the people in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution and has been approved by a majority of those voting on that issue.

SEC. 2. Any State which has approved an apportionment plan under this Article shall resubmit it to a vote of its people at the general election next following the year in which there is commenced any enumeration provided for in section 2 of article I, and upon approval by a majority of those voting on that issue, such plan shall continue in effect until changed in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution. If not so approved, it shall remain in effect for a period of not exceeding two years from that general election or until the earlier adoption of another plan pursuant to section 1.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has now circulated among the members of the full Judiciary Committee yet another revised draft. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the revised draft was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION 1. The people of a State may apportion one house of a bicameral legislature using population, geography, or political subdivisions as factors, giving each factor such weight as they deem appropriate, or giving similar weight to the same factors in apportioning a unicameral legislature, if, in either case, such plan of apportionment has been submitted to a vote of the people in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution and has been approved by a majority of those voting on that issue. When the first plan of apportionment is submitted to a vote of the people under this section there shall also be submitted, at the same election, an alternative plan of apportionment based upon substantial equality of population.

SEC. 2. Any plan of apportionment which has been approved under this article shall be resubmitted to a vote of the people, or, another plan may be submitted under the provisions of section 1, at the November general election held two years following each year in which there is commenced any enumeration provided for in section 2 of article I, and upon approval by a majority of those voting thereon, such plan of apportionment shall continue in effect until changed in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, these three official drafts are only a small portion of the total number of drafts, redrafts, and reredrafts which have been shown to and discussed with interested members of the Judiciary Committee.

I recognize, Mr. President, that the purpose of holding hearings on any bill is to obtain expert and responsible opinion. The purpose of committee executive sessions is to refine and revise bills to meet criticism and objections. Many of the changes that Senator DIRKSEN has made reflect the points that were made in the hearings and by other Senators. Certainly some changes reflect a healthy response to criticism.

The newspapers report, and I have no reason to disagree, that the Judiciary Committee is almost evenly divided on this issue. The reports are that eight members favor an amendment, seven are opposed, and one is undecided. Since nine votes are required to report a bill, assuming the entire membership to be present, the question arises whether recent changes reflect the weight of reasonable criticism at the hearings or the present thinking of the membership of the committee.

I do not criticize compromise. Certainly the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution No. 2 have every right to make such changes as they deem necessary to report an amendment. In a normal bill this is a wholly routine procedure and is to be respected and even applauded.

But this is not a routine bill. This is a constitutional amendment. It is not even a routine constitutional amendment upon which most elements of the society agree. This amendment is hotly disputed. It will undoubtedly work the most far-reaching changes in our Federal system since the 14th amendment was adopted in 1868. This amendment would be the first amendment since the founding of the Republic which would limit the franchise of citizens of the United States.

I do not believe we should effect such far-reaching changes in our system of Government, without full and fair consideration. I do not think we should make fundamental changes in the basic law of our land without adequate hearings. I do not believe that we should be placed in a position to be criticized about the manner in which we draft amendments to the Constitution.

Let there be no mistake. The latest draft of the Dirksen amendment bears little relation to the amendment reported by the subcommittee and even less resemblance to Senate Joint Resolution 2, upon which hearings were held.

The subcommittee made two significant changes in the original text of Senate Joint Resolution 2.

First, it eliminated the opening sentence, which was widely interpreted as denying judicial review.

Second, it included a complex provision for periodic resubmission of any plan previously adopted by referendum.

Senator DIRKSEN has now proposed, without further hearings or subcommittee consideration, additional and substantial changes. These include:

First. The factors other than population that can be considered are now limited to geography and political subdivisions.

Second. These two factors can be accorded such weight as (the people) deem appropriate in both a bicameral and unicameral legislature. The earlier texts both limited the use of nonpopulation factors in apportioning a unicameral legislature to reasonable weight.

Third. The provision for periodic resubmission has been wholly rewritten.

Fourth. The new draft requires that the first malapportionment plan shall be submitted to the people, along with an alternative plan based upon substantial equality of population.

My point is that this is virtually a new amendment. It bears only faint resemblance to Senate Joint Resolution 2, on which hearings were held in the Senate. I submit that, before this new language is considered on the floor of the Senate, further hearings should be held. We need to know what the lawyers, the scholars, the political scientists of this country think about this new language. We need to hear from mayors, Governors, and local political leaders as to what effects the new language can be expected to have.

There are many serious questions to be considered and answered. A few come very quickly to mind.

First. What is "geography" as a factor in apportioning a State legislature? Can a State give greater weight to mountaineers than fishermen? Can it give more seats to deserts than to areas of greater population? Can it give one mountainous area more representation than another mountainous area? Or must it be consistent in applying a geographic factor?

Second. What are "political subdivisions"?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I read recently that the State of Hawaii is interested in acquiring Samoa and Guam as a part of that State. What would be the point of geography in that case?

Mr. TYDINGS. The point made by the Senator from Tennessee is well taken. Can a State legislature make a new town, draw new lines for its sewerage or sanitary districts and then claim to have changed "geography" or to have created a "political subdivision"?

What, I repeat, is a "political subdivision"? Is an unincorporated town or a school district or a sewerage district a "political subdivision"? Is there anything to prevent a State from changing its subdivision boundaries to effect unequal representation?

If, as the Senator from Tennessee suggests, Hawaii annexed Guam, would Guam be a "political subdivision"?

Does this amendment, as now written, overrule the Supreme Court's decision in Gomillion against Lightfoot? Can a State or county gerrymander to exclude from a "political subdivision" Negroes, Jews, migratory workers, or any other group?

Third. Why did the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 2 remove the "reasonable weight" limit as applied to unicameral State legislatures? Under the new, proposed Dirksen amendment, the third draft we have seen, can a State with a single house, a unicameral system, completely ignore population? Is this not an open invitation in some States to change from a bicameral to a unicameral system, in order to be able to malapportion the State legislature?

Fourth. If it makes sense to submit, along with a malapportionment plan, an alternative plan based upon substantial equality of population, why is this requirement limited to the first time a plan is presented? If that is fair one time, it should be fair every time.

Such questions were never discussed in our hearings, but now the distinguished Senator's greatly changed amendment is being circulated to members of the Judiciary Committee. Committee members are expected to vote on the first amendment to limit the franchise since the signing of the Declaration of Independence without benefit of mature deliberation on its current provisions.

My point is that we should not amend the Constitution of the United States in panic or in haste. If the distinguished minority leader has new and better language to propose, it should be taken back to the subcommittee, and hearings should be held on the language. These hearings could be limited in scope to the changes which the Senator has proposed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. This Congress has already submitted to the States one ambiguously drafted constitutional amendment. I hope it will not hastily submit another questionable provision.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. I would dislike for the RECORD to go unchallenged by not inserting the opinion that, though the Senator from Indiana has the greatest respect for his colleague, the Senator from Tennessee, he is still resolute in his disagreement with the Senator from Tennessee regarding the interpretation to be placed on the constitutional amendment which I hope soon will be the 25th amendment, and which has already been ratified by three States, that of the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Nebraska, and the Senator from Wisconsin. It is only the beginning of what we hope will be a long list of State legislatures that do not share the opinion of the Senator from Tennessee. I know reasonable men can disagree, but I feel sure in this instance I am correct.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CASE. In line with the difference as between the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Indiana on the amendment which was adopted a few days ago, I am sure there is no disagreement in this particular matter between the two Senators on this point, and that is on the position of the Senator from Maryland when he urges that the language which has never been considered by committee, offered as a substitute, I am sure in the best of faith, should nevertheless be given the same scrutiny as the original resolution, because nobody is good enough to make language, and no combination of people is good enough to present language, which has not been scrutinized in the committee, and this applies most particularly to an amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator makes the very point I was trying to make. There is no question of the good faith of the distinguished minority leader. Of course not. The point is that in the final draft which he has circulated to members of the Judiciary Committee, he has come up with substitute language for the original Senate Joint Resolution 2, on which hearings were held. He has drafted new language which would permit the legislatures to apportion on factors other than population, but permitting consideration only of geography and political subdivisions. These are extremely broad areas. Their definition requires further study and consideration. It was not before the subcommittee. Occasionally, a question may have been asked in the general area, but the subject was not adequately covered. It was not adequately covered because it is contained in a draft which is entirely different from the resolution on which the subcommittee worked for months, a draft which incorporates basic changes never considered by the subcommittee. I submit that we should not adopt a constitutional amendment, nor ask the people to ratify it, when it is presented in a changed form which has never been adequately considered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. With further reference to the proposed constitutional amendment previously referred to, let the RECORD show that a goodly number of questions have now been asked about it, and some persons are having second thoughts about it. But it is too late. It has been submitted to the States. From the volumes of editorials written across the country, one would gather that serious questions are being entertained about the meaning of the proposed amendment and the advisability of its being ratified.

Let the RECORD show that while three States have ratified, one has declined to ratify. Apart from that fact, it is a mistake we have already made. There was a time when we could have corrected it. The purpose of the Senator from Tennessee was to have the proposal returned to the committee for some study and drafting because the Senate had adopted language to be submitted to the States as a constitutional amendment which had not been considered carefully—indeed, language on which members of the conferees differed in their interpretations as to meaning.

I plead with the Senate Judiciary Committee not to repeat this kind of mistake. This is a precious document with which we are dealing. If we make a mistake and enact a statute, it can be repealed, but stripping something from the Constitution of the United States is quite a different thing. It is a more serious matter with which we deal. I hope that before the Senate Judiciary Committee reports another amendment to the Constitution, it will hold hearings on the exact text upon which the Senate is expected to act.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I dislike to shoot dead soldiers and debate an issue which has already been decided on the floor of the Senate. We are doing a disservice to the decision which has already been made by both Houses of Congress—by the votes which have already been cast by an overwhelming majority of the Senate—to cast reflections now upon the decision which was made.

The Senator from Tennessee is rendering a creditable service to the overall discussion of this matter by clarifying—if, indeed, clarification was necessary—what the legislative intent would be.

I do not like to see an issue discussed again which has already been decided by the Senate.

I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator from Tennessee that the Judiciary Committee and all other committees of Congress should give the closest consideration to a matter as important as a constitutional amendment.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I intend to follow this pattern to the last degree.

I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Maryland in yielding to me.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Barlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7984) to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Patman, Mr. Multer, Mr. Barrett, Mrs. Sullivan, Mr. Reuss, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Widnall, Mr. Fino, and Mrs. Dwyer were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 24) to expand, extend, and accelerate the saline water conversion program conducted by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Aspinall, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Rogers of Texas, Mr. Saylor, and Mr. Reinecke were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had concurred in tne amendments of the Senate numbered 1 through 36, inclusive, and in amendments numbered 42 and 43 to the bill (H.R. 8775) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate numbered 37 through 41, inclusive, and 44 through 49, inclusive, to the bill; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. George W. Andrews, Mr. Steed, Mr. Kirwan, Mr. Slack, Mr. Flynt, Mr. Mahon, Mr. Langen, Mr. Reifel, and Mr. Jonas were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Montoya in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise today to address the Senate in support of Senate bill 9, the cold war GI bill. I was privileged to have sponsored this very necessary and worthwhile legislation on the day it was first introduced in the 89th Congress, January 6, 1965. Not only did I enthusiastically support Senator Yarborough, the distinguished author of this bill, but I also appeared in support of it before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs on February 19, 1965.

I feel especially qualified to sponsor the proposed legislation and vote for its passage today, for I was a beneficiary of one of the previous GI bills. It gave me an opportunity to continue my education following my term of service during the Korean conflict, and enabled me to avoid the unhappy choice between foregoing further education or delaying it still longer in an effort to acquire the resources to gain it.

The same problems of readjustment and economic dislocation that we knew 10 years ago are faced today by thousands of young men returning from service in the Armed Forces. These young Americans have been forced to disrupt their lives and careers to serve in the Armed Forces throughout the world. Then, after completion of their term of service, these men face not only the serious problems of adapting back to civilian life, but also find themselves far, far behind those in their age group who were allowed to continue their schooling and their careers.

Thus, the cold war GI bill has been proposed to balance this situation and to give the veteran who has sacrificed 2, 3, or 4 years of his life an opportunity to catch up with his nonveteran companions whose lives were not disrupted by military service.

One of the main arguments against the bill has been that since the United States is officially at peace, it would be unprecedented and unwarranted to give peacetime servicemen benefits previously extended only to those who faced the hazards of war. However, the distinction as to whether the United States is officially at peace is a meaningless technicality when American servicemen are being killed and wounded in Vietnam and elsewhere. In addition, neither the World War II nor the Korean GI bills made any distinction between those who served in the front lines and those who served in a safe stateside job. The two previous GI bills were not intended as reward for combat duty, and applied to all veterans. Their main purpose was to help veterans readjust to civilian life and catch up to those whose lives were not disrupted by military service. This is also the purpose of the cold war GI bill.

In addition to the matter of fairness to cold war servicemen, the cold war GI bill would also serve the national interest as did the World War II and Korean GI bills.

It has been well established that the Nation reaped tremendous social and economic values from the two previous GI bills, mainly as a result of the educational assistance they provided.

More than 7,800,000 World War II veterans—nearly half of the 16,500,000 U.S. participants—took some form of training under the GI bill.

Of the total enrolled 2,200,000 attended colleges and universities; 3,500,000 went to schools below college level; 1,400,000 underwent on-the-job training; and 700,000 underwent on-the-farm training.

Today we are a far stronger Nation because of the infusion of skilled and professional manpower gained through the GI bill; 450,000 engineers, 180,000 doctors, dentists, nurses, 360,000 schoolteachers, 150,000 scientists, 107,000 lawyers, 243,000 accountants, 36,000 clergymen of all faiths, 17,000 writers and journalists, 711,000 mechanics, 383,000 construction workers, 288,000 metalworkers, 138,000 electricians, 83,000 policemen and firemen, 61,000 printers and typesetters, and 70,000 who trained for business and executive careers.

The total cost of the program was $14.5 billion. Eighty percent of this went directly to the veterans in the form of subsistence allowances. Nearly all the rest was spent on tuition and other training costs and only 5 cents out of every dollar went for administration.

Experts have stated that our present shortages in these and other essential occupations would have been even more critical—perhaps catastrophic—had it not been for the GI bills.

In Minnesota, nearly 200,000 veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict were able to upgrade their education and training as a result of the GI bills. The cold war GI bill would provide the same educational opportunities to about 34,000 more Minnesota veterans during the first 5 years of its operation.

Finally, it has been shown that GI bills are really an investment which eventually pay for themselves. U.S. Census Bureau figures show that World War II veterans alone now pay the Federal Government $1 billion a year in additional taxes because of the increased earning power they attained from their GI schooling.

Altogether, it was the largest program of mass adult education ever undertaken at bargain rates. The $14.5 billion cost has been more than recouped.

The GI bill continues to pay for itself at close to $1 billion a year. The return comes from additional income tax paid by better educated, higher earning GI bill veterans. I am pleased to add my support to the proposed legislation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am grateful for the kind remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. More than that, I am grateful for his support to the 5 million cold war GI veterans. What is important is the right of those young men to go to school, and not be cast among the unemployed. As the letter from the Department of Education of California indicates, 5 percent of the young men in this age bracket are unemployed. Unemployment among veterans in this age bracket, however, is 10 percent. Since the veterans are also included in the 5 percent, it can be readily seen that the percentage of the unemployed among the veterans is well over two times that of nonveterans. The nonveterans have been able to remain at home and go to school, while the veterans, after serving an average of 28 months, come back unprepared for civilian life and walk the streets and remain unemployed. It is a great injustice, and it is a situation which has been created by our Government.

I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for recognizing the situation and speaking out in an effort to correct it.

PROPOSED ANNEXATION BY U.S. OF PACIFIC TRUST TERRITORY

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I rise to speak in behalf of the cold war GI bill. Before doing so, I should like to refer briefly to the topic which was touched upon by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, when he asked the Senator from Maryland what would happen if Hawaii were to annex Saipan and Guam, for example.

I say to the Senator from Tennessee that at the present time a discussion is underway in the Pacific on the possibility or feasibility of Hawaii annexing the trust territory islands.

At the present time the first congress of Micronesia is being held at Saipan. Thirty-three delegates from the trust territory are taking part in the first meeting, and they are exploring the feasibility of setting up self-government for those islands in the Pacific.

There are a number of islands in this area which extend a distance almost equal to the distance across continental United States. The area has a population of approximately 87,000. It covers a vast territory in the Pacific.

These islands are under a United Nations trusteeship, and the United States is administering the islands.

Great concern has been expressed as to what will happen in the future to those islands. It has been suggested that they be annexed by the State of Hawaii. If that should happen, with apologies to the junior Senator from Alaska, it would make Hawaii the largest State in the Union, even larger than Alaska.

About 3 years ago the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] talked with me about the possibility of Hawaii annexing those islands, so that they could become a part of the United States. The islands are now under United Nations trusteeship. Before they could be annexed by the United States and added to the State of Hawaii, we would naturally have to obtain the consent of the United Nations and also the consent of the people who live on the islands.

This topic is being discussed in the Pacific. It is a live topic. There are many pros and cons on the subject. I believe we should give serious thought to the future of those islands.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am very happy that this extremely important subject has come up in the Senate. It is true, as the senior Senator from Hawaii has pointed out, that this idea came to me some years ago. I proposed and discussed the idea with the late Oren Long, of Hawaii, 4 years ago and with Senator Fong and Senator Inouye and with Governor Burns of Hawaii. It seems to me that one of the problems that we as a democracy face is the desire not to have colonies and to act in accordance with such purpose. Colonies are not appropriate to our system of government. Yet with respect to certain areas under our flag, if we could achieve that ideal objective, it would be to give them all the full equality of statehood, just as has now been achieved by the State so ably represented by the Senator from Hawaii and also by my own State. That was the latest action in the validation of our basic principles, by establishing full equality for the Americans of Alaska and of Hawaii. By that action in the 85th and 86th Congresses, we extended the frontiers of democracy to America's farthest north, farthest south, farthest west, and farthest east. It is not generally known that Alaska is not only the farthest north and the farthest west, but also the farthest east extension of the United States, for Alaska extends into the Eastern Hemisphere.

The question naturally comes up with respect to the smaller entities in the Pacific, whose economy and small population would not justify statehood, such as Samoa, Guam, Wake and the multiple islands of the Trust Territories. Yet we must find a practical way of ending their colonial status. Any changes, however, should of course take into consideration the best interests of all the parties concerned. It would seem not impossible to conceive that in the years to come we would ultimately create a great Pacific State, always assuming that the various components themselves desired it as well as the great State of Hawaii, to which the proposal is to annex them at the appropriate time and after full understanding and consent will have been obtained. I remember when we discussed the admission of the State of Hawaii to the Union in the Senate, those who opposed such action raised the objection that the proposed State was separated from the continent of the United States by vast international waters, that it was way out in the Pacific, and that international waters separated Hawaii's various islands. That was raised as an insuperable objection to the admission of Hawaii to statehood. Yet that was not found to be a valid objection. It is no more valid in connection with the whole Pacific area, and the proposed Pacific State, in these days of radio communication, jet transportation and what will, before long, be transportation at supersonic speeds. It is just as conceivable as it now has become in the case of Hawaii, that this vast area will one day be one State with persons living in it sharing equal citizenship with the citizens of our country. What could be a more desirable or more glorious destiny for them?

Therefore, I believe it is very fortunate indeed that this subject has come up for discussion. This proposal will not happen immediately, if it happens at all. Certainly it is a subject that requires discussion, study, and a good deal of thought.

This objective should, of course, not be attempted or achieved without the consent of the various component parts, first the State of Hawaii and the people of Hawaii, and also the people of these various other Pacific areas.

Some of them may not wish to join; some may. It is an extremely important subject. The future of these areas is a matter of our concern and of our responsibility. I am very much gratified the distinguished Senator from Hawaii has brought this up. It is something that we may look forward to. I know from personal contact that the people in these various areas would not desire to achieve anything other than American citizenship. At the present time they have a second-class affiliation and political status. Their hope, I am confident, would be for achieving first-class American citizenship, but that would have to be officially ascertained.

I know of no better way than by this proposal.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska. This is a very exciting idea. It first came from the distinguished Senator from Alaska. I compliment him for bringing forth this great idea.

As a Senator from the State of Hawaii I welcome the idea. I have been working toward the idea of having Hawaii annex those territories which would like to join us, with the consent of the United Nations.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it was my privilege last December to be in the western Pacific. Members of Congress were in the party, including Representative Matsunaga, of Hawaii. We were astonished by the number of Hawaiians among those who came out to see the delegation from the Congress.

In Kwajalein, among the American civilian employees there we found many Hawaiians.

I pay tribute to the people of the State of Hawaii, the State so ably represented by Senator Fong, for their western movement.

Our history is characterized by the western movement of our people. In Alaska, for example, we are referred to as the "South 48."

We were amazed when we from the so-called South 48, reached the western Pacific, to find a large number of Hawaiians who had gone to the smaller islands.

A great number of American citizens from Hawaii have gone to the smaller island in the trust territories. They have created a great deal of good will for all the people of the United States, and they have rendered a unique service for the people of this country.

What we are discussing today is a fine idea, and I pay tribute to all the people of Hawaii for having pioneered as teachers, as farmworkers, and as helpers. Hawaiians are making a unique contribution as Americans to the democratic idea and American liberties. They are carrying democratic principles and ideals of liberty and of freedom forward throughout that vast area.

In another territory, which is recognized as being a part of Japan, Okinawa, there are many Americans from Hawaii.

It will be remembered that when Okinawa was a part of Japan it was considered the poorest prefecture of Japan. Now it has an average standard of living comparing favorably with that of the other prefectures in Japan.

American citizens have done much toward bringing this about, and many of such American citizens come from Hawaii.

I congratulate the Senator and his State and the people of his State on their pioneering spirit.

Mr. FONG. I thank the Senator from Texas for his laudatory and commendatory remarks concerning the contribution of the people of Hawaii in the Pacific Basin.

Just prior to the convening of the Congress of Micronesia, Hawaii sent a delegation to advise, counsel, and help the delegates on how to draft a bill, for example, to hold committee meetings, and other procedures related to our democratic form of government. Many of our people have gone to various parts of the trust territory and to the Orient, especially those who have been connected with the East-West Center.

We have sent quite a number of teams to the various countries in the South Pacific and to Asia. They have done and are doing fine work. The people of Hawaii and the United States should promote this idea and should not be afraid to expand their assistance. They should not be afraid to meet new problems. They should not be afraid to accept new people. That is the way we grow and prosper and that is the way we help others to grow and prosper.

I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a postscript?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I can think of no more ideal circumstances, apart from the compelling geographical aspects, than to have the State of Hawaii father and guide the exploration of this far-reaching project, because Hawaii has presented to the United States long before its admission to statehood, a shining example of ethnic democracy. Indeed the finest under our flag. In my judgment, one of the strongest reasons why Hawaii should have been admitted to statehood long before it was is not merely because of its right to the full equality of statehood and all the other reasons for ending its territorial status, but because it shows the United States, as I have said, an exemplification of racial democracy, of the meeting and mingling of the races of East and West, an entity in which there was less racial prejudice and less discrimination than anywhere else in America, setting the finest example to the rest of the Nation and to the world. For that reason, with the diversity of races in the Pacific, Hawaii offers the ideal location and the most qualified people to father the project, explore it, and see whether or not it may be feasible. The State of Hawaii has already rendered a great contribution to the United States. It has set an example of tolerance for the rest of the States to emulate.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska. I am contemplating offering a resolution in the Senate to obtain the consensus of the Congress in order to determine whether the idea is feasible. If the Congress looks favorably on the idea, I should like then to have the people of Hawaii and the people of the trust territory vote on it and see whether they are favorable to the idea. If they are, we should then present a petition to the United Nations to see whether the United Nations would allow the people of the South Pacific to join the people of Hawaii and this great Nation.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. The project need not be consummated in toto all at once. It might be that some islands out there would like to join, and the State of Hawaii would like to have them join. It would not be necessary to consummate the entire project at one time. In all likelihood, if the idea is deemed feasible, it is something that may be achieved step by step. Certain areas will not be ready for it as soon as others, assuming we could get the consent of the United Nations. There are five or six ethnic groups in the trust territories. They represent different stages of development. I believe that we need not feel that the idea must be accepted in toto immediately, or indeed at any one time. I congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii on his proposal to submit a resolution which would enable us to explore the subject much more fully.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I agree heartily with the distinguished Senator from Alaska that the idea may not be consummated quickly, but we should be working at it promptly, because it is a great idea. It will take time, and I know it will require a great deal of effort. I hope that when I submit the resolution, I shall have the cooperation and support of the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. When that takes place, Alaska might be willing to yield its title as the largest State remembering that even with the proposed Pacific State extending over a larger area, Alaska will still have a larger land mass, because a great deal of the area within the Pacific State would be Pacific Ocean and international domain.

Mr. FONG. I thank the Senator for his generosity.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have found the discussion most interesting and enlightening. I introduced the subject in debate today, not to express approval or disapproval of the suggestion, for I have not studied it sufficiently to reach such a conclusion. My first impression is that the State of Hawaii might very well offer administrative and other advantages to the people of Samoa and Guam, islands of considerable population, which those people do not now enjoy. I am not sure that the same would hold true of the smaller islands of Micronesia, but I shall await the Senator's resolution and am prepared to consider that on its merits.

I raised the point neither to criticize nor to commend. I would be inclined to commend all those who advocate consideration of the question, as I now commend the senior Senator from Hawaii. I raised the question because it has a pertinent bearing on a proposed constitutional amendment on which the Judiciary Committee of this body is about to act. The new version of the Dirksen amendment refers to geography as a means of determining representation. Should Hawaii adopt Kwajalein as a part of her State, would a person living on Kwajalein have more proportionate representation than a citizen living in Honolulu? Would it mean that an Aleut on the extremity of the Aleutians could, under the U.S. Constitution or under the proposed amendment to it, have representation disproportionate to citizens living in Nome, Alaska?

I do not know the answers to those questions, but I say to my able friend the senior Senator from Hawaii that I recently made one mistake with regard to a proposed constitutional amendment. I waited too late to give it the study to which it was entitled, and I waited too late effectively to raise fundamental questions.

Since I referred earlier today, within the hour, to the proposed 25th amendment, another Senator approached me on the floor of the Senate, and said that were the vote to be taken again he would change his position. He has had second thoughts. I would not like to have disturbing second thoughts about still another constitutional amendment proposed and submitted to the States by Congress. I raised this point in respect to the proposal to annex Micronesia, Samoa, Guam, and Saipan into the State of Hawaii as a means of questioning the advisability of the Judiciary Committee's reporting to the Senate a proposed amendment to the Constitution, on the text of which there has been no public hearing.

Mr. FONG. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee did not intend to discuss the merits of this subject. The only reason for his proposing the matter was in connection with the Dirksen amendment. Although I do not see eye to eye with the distinguished Senator from Maryland, nevertheless, his statement that we should look very deeply into the question of reapportionment merits consideration.

COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the measure, I gave my wholehearted support to the cold war veterans GI bill.

It was my privilege to cosponsor the predecessor bill, S. 5, of the last Congress, which was reported favorably to the Senate in July 1963. I deeply regret that the 88th Congress, which compiled an excellent record of enactment in the field of education, did not enact S. 5.

I am delighted that S. 9 has been called up for Senate consideration so soon in this session of Congress.

I hope the Senate will approve this legislation, which is so long overdue.

Before proceeding with my statement, I should like to pay tribute to the senior Senator from Texas, who beginning with the 86th Congress has steadfastly and tirelessly led the struggle for enactment of this vital program.

I commend him for his foresight, for his faith, and for his perseverance.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FONG. I am glad to yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii for his kind remarks and for his stanch support as a coauthor of the measure. I ask him the following question: Is it not a fact that in World War II service in Hawaii was considered overseas service?

Mr. FONG. It was.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. At the present time service in Hawaii is not considered service overseas, so people who served in the war, even though sent from the mainland in World War II, were considered overseas service veterans and received pay and allowance as overseas veterans. But under suggestions made, that is no longer overseas territory, and, under some amendments that I have heard discussed, Hawaiians and Alaskans would have special disability that they did not suffer in World War II.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Hawaii for his leadership in this matter.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas.

I should like to add that I, too, am more convinced than ever of the great need for, and the great value of, this program.

COLD WAR SERVICE

Since the Korean armistice was signed July 27, 1953, our country has been technically at peace, a peace so hazardous and uncertain that it is called the cold war.

American GI's serve all over the globe—in the frigid Arctic, in the steaming jungles of Vietnam, elsewhere in Asia, at the wall in Berlin, in the Dominican Republic, on the seven seas, and in the air.

Our cold war GI's are the Minute Men of our times, on the alert to protect our Nation and to fulfill America's worldwide commitment to peace.

Those who conclude their service in this capacity should be aided in readjusting to civilian life, so that they may qualify for jobs, pursue their vocations, and support their families.

As the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] pointed out last January, 44 percent of the draft-eligible young men serve in the Armed Forces, sacrificing 2 to 4 years of their lives at a crucial age.

Meantime, the other 56 percent of their contemporaries are using this period to further their education and careers. Our Nation should recognize the disadvantage suffered by the 44 percent who serve in uniform. We should help them get over the hump as they return to civilian life to begin a career or to resume a career interrupted.

Senate bill 9 will do this by providing educational assistance and home and farm loan assistance for some 5 million veterans of the cold war.

S. 9 OPPONENTS MISTAKEN

There are some who oppose S. 9 under the mistaken impression that the benefits provided for so-called peacetime veterans are what were provided to veterans of World War II and the Korean war.

The bill, however, recognizes that Congress traditionally has made a distinction between wartime service and peacetime service in providing veterans' programs.

This is why S. 9 doubles the number of active-duty days of service to 180 days as a minimum. World War II and Korean war veterans were permitted GI bill benefits after only 90 days of active duty service.

This is why S. 9 does not contain any mustering-out payments to cold war veterans.

This is why S. 9 does not provide a program of business and insured loans as were provided for veterans of World War II and the Korean war.

Under S. 9, loans for cold war veterans could only be made or guaranteed for their homes or their farms. Moreover, under S. 9 cold war veterans would be required to pay a loan guarantee fee of one-half of 1 percent of the amount of the loan.

This fee was not required of World War II and Korean war veterans. Under those programs, the Federal Government pays the losses. But under S. 9, cold war veterans themselves would in effect be paying for any losses under the home and farm loan program.

AREA-OF-HOSTILITY AMENDMENT TOO RESTRICTIVE

There are some who contend that the education and training benefits of S. 9 and the home and loan assistance should be available only to those who serve in "areas of hostility."

I do not believe it should be confined only to such veterans. The World War II GI bill and the Korean war GI bill were not confined only to those who served in areas of hostility. We know there were many people in these wars who did not serve in actual combat. Some never served outside continental United States. Yet we did not deny them the GI benefits.

The fact is that military personnel go where they are commanded to go. They serve where they are ordered to serve.

I do not believe we should exclude those who do not serve in areas of hostility—for this is a matter beyond their control.

Earlier this year, I joined a number of Senators in legislation which confined these benefits to those serving in areas of hostility. I did so because I recognized the administration is opposed to granting GI bill benefits to all veterans of the cold war, even those who have served as long as 180 days.

I did so because I wanted to serve notice to the administration that the senior Senator from Hawaii believes the very least we should do is to grant educational assistance and home and farm loans for cold war veterans in areas of hostilities, such as Vietnam.

Of the two proposals, however, I believe S. 9 is far preferable. Therefore, I am against the amendment to limit benefits only to those who serve in areas of hostilities.

I shall vote for S. 9, which does not make service in an area of hostility a requirement for eligibility for GI assistance.

I concur in the reasoning of the majority of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which stated in their report:

> The proposal * * * to limit eligibility under this bill to those veterans who have served in "areas of hostilities" as designated by the President was rejected for several reasons.
>
> In the first place, the philosophy and purpose of the GI bills is and has been to give readjustment assistance to the veteran returning to civilian life after substantial military service and not to reward him for the risk that he might have been exposed to.
>
> Secondly, most servicemen are not able to choose the area in which they serve. If this proposal were adopted, one would have in effect the paradoxical situation in which a serviceman could obtain readjustment benefits only when the foreign policy of the United States failed to maintain the peace.
>
> There is even a serious question whether many of the cold war hot spots could be designated as an "area of hostilities," since the U.S. troops are often present in advisory capacities. A Presidential declaration of such a situation as an "area of hostilities" would be an admission of U.S. active military participation in the conflict and would be contrary to the foreign policy of the United States.

Having a choice between S. 9, which would include all cold war veterans with 180 days or more of active duty service, and the amendment, which would limit education and home and farm loan benefits to those who serve in areas of hostilities, I shall vote for S. 9.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS SHOULD NOT BE LOANS

There are some who contend the educational, vocational, and farm training benefits of S. 9 should be put on a loan basis, rather than a grant basis.

I cannot go along with this.

GI benefits for World War II veterans and Korean war veterans were not made on a loan basis. They were outright monthly grants. There is no reason why GI benefits for cold war veterans should be extended on a loan basis.

Indeed, there are additional reasons why these should be grants.

As the committee report on S. 9 points out:

> The allowances recommended by this bill, in terms of actual value, are roughly equal to 70 percent of an identical allowance paid in 1952.

The report further states:

> The post-Korean veteran will pay a much greater proportion of his education allowance for tuition than was the case with a similarly circumstanced Korean veteran enrolled in school in 1952. The post-Korean veteran, according to a research paper prepared by the Library of Congress, can be expected to pay over 50 percent of his educational allow-

> ance for tuition as contrasted to 28 percent of an identical amount paid by the Korean veteran in 1952.

The cost of living has gone up since the World War II and Korean war GI programs, which means the cold war veterans' monthly allowance under S. 9 will not stretch as far as the same allowance did even for the Korean war veteran. And the cost of education has gone up, so that the cold war GI will have to pay a greater portion of his allowance for tuition, leaving less for his subsistence.

As the committee report pointed out:

> The majority of veterans attending school under this bill will have to supplement the educational grant with part-time employment and in many cases the wives of these veterans will also have to work to help pay for their husband's training.

It is estimated that the $110 monthly allowance to a Korean war veteran would have to be raised to $153.68 a month to provide equivalent buying power. Put another way, $110 today will buy only as much as $72 would buy in 1952.

So it is clear that the grants allowed under S. 9 are not the equivalent of grants allowed World War II and Korean war veterans. This is another argument against making cold war GI's repay their educational assistance.

There are other arguments against GI loans for schooling. It will certainly discourage a great many GI's from furthering their education. Seventy percent of veterans have had only some high school training or have completed high school but have no further training. It is doubtful large numbers of them will want to go into debt to undertake college education, and even more doubtful that they would want to go into debt to train in courses below college level.

To put this program on a loan basis will greatly restrict veteran participation in the educational, vocational, and job training benefits of S. 9.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. MURPHY in the chair). The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, if the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts does not prevail, I intend to offer an amendment which would adopt the same scale of benefits proposed by S. 9 but would substitute a system of assistance loans in place of grants.

The argument which has been made by those who have spoken on behalf of S. 9 is that the grants furnished under S. 9 would serve the purpose of readjustment, by providing educational benefits.

Mr. FONG. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. It would not be a bonus.

Mr. FONG. It would not be a bonus.

Mr. COOPER. The bill does not contemplate a bonus.

Mr. FONG. There is no mustering-out pay.

Mr. COOPER. As you have mentioned loans, I shall explain why I intend to propose assistance loans rather than assistance grants.

It is my view that assistance loans would attract those who really desire educational adjustment. It would not attract those who are not interested in education.

That is the basic difference in the philosophical approach of my proposed amendment and S. 9 as reported by the committee.

I served on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in 1959 when the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] sponsored the bill. I pay him tribute for his persistence. However, we split in the committee as between loans and grants. The argument still goes on.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the split in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is not so marked now as it was in 1959. Then the bill passed the Veterans Subcommittee by a majority of 3 to 2. It passed the full committee by a majority of 8 to 7.

In the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs every vote was in favor of this bill, Democratic and Republican. The measure passed the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by a majority of more than 2 to 1. This year, we had a bigger majority for the bill than we have ever had.

The distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii supported this bill and cosponsored the measure. He has voted consistently for veterans on this and other measures.

There will not be any boondoggling under this measure. Under the cold war GI bill of World War II, of 16 million veterans, only 7,800,000 veterans took advantage of the educational provisions of the bill. That would be about 48.5 or 49 percent.

The World War II veterans' bill was far more generous. The Korean veterans were closer to college age than had been the veterans of World War II. When we had 16 million men under arms in World War II, we scraped the manpower barrel. In the Korean conflict, there were 4,750,000 men. However, since benefits were not as generous as they had previously been, only 45 percent of the veterans of the Korean conflict were able to go to school. Eighty percent of those veterans had to borrow money, or they or their wives worked.

Nobody will go to school under this measure for the purpose of getting something free. They must put in their own time or work. One hundred and ten dollars a month will purchase now, as can be seen in the RECORD, as much as $72 would purchase in 1952. That concerns the articles that a student must buy.

In 1952, the Korean veterans could take $72 of their allowance and purchase as much in the way of education as $110 a month would purchase now.

With this restriction, nobody predicts that as many as 45 percent of these veterans will go to school now. The provisions are too hard and restricted.

I wish that there were an allowance for this increase in living cost. However, as a practical matter, we have made it the same as it was in the case of the Korean conflict. We have retained the same dollar limitation. However, this measure would not admit as many veterans to college because the enrollment, tuition, and matriculation costs in American colleges has doubled in private colleges since 1952. It has also doubled in the public and State tax-supported colleges. The private college enrollment and tuition costs are much higher than those of the public tax-supported colleges. Even at their low level, the costs in public tax-supported colleges have doubled since 1952. It is far more difficult for a veteran to go to school on this limited allowance now than it was back in 1952.

It would be impossible under this limited allowance for somebody to go to school without some other source of funds. Furthermore, if the veteran does not pass his courses, he must leave. He would be cut off. The Veterans' Administration maintains a record. A veteran could not boondoggle under this measure.

If the veteran did not pass his courses, his allowance would stop. Under the bill, records would be kept by the Veterans' Administration. There would be an exchange of records between the colleges and the Veterans' Administration. If the veteran flunked his courses, the Veterans' Administration would be notified, and the veteran would be through. The veteran would have to maintain his grades. Under the previous programs, we have found that the veterans have higher grades than the nonveterans.

The college administrators tell us that the veterans are the most dedicated and devoted of all the students. They must be in order to remain there.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Hawaii for his leadership. I thank him for his recognition of the fact that the men now serve and are disadvantaged for 28 months. In the case of the veterans of the Korean conflict, it was 21½ or 22 months.

This is a readjustment bill, as the Senator from Hawaii has so ably pointed out. There would be no mustering-out pay, no bonus, such as there was in the GI bill in World War II.

In this measure, the title is explanatory. It is a readjustment bill and not a bonus bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I want at this time to make clear the difference between the two proposals—the one for grants, and my proposal for loans.

I may say to the Senator from Hawaii and the Senator from Texas that I believe we agree that the men who are serving today an average of 28 months, as the Senator has said, have lost certain educational opportunities in the service. I will not say that their time has been lost because certain great advantages come from serving one's country. But accepting the premise that 28 months have been lost as far as educational and employment opportunities are concerned and that those who have served in the armed service have been placed at a disadvantage in comparison with those who have not served, I believe we are agreed on the second point, that there should be some plan of readjustment. We agree too that education and training benefits are the best means toward readjustment.

On these points we are agreed, but here is the difference. I believe that a generous loan program will offer them great opportunities for education and for training. I believe it would serve the best purposes, because it would be accepted by those who seriously seek education and training.

In my judgment, we will be in the cold war for years to come, and many in our Nation will be serving their country under trying circumstances. So we must seek to establish a program that will be certain to meet these special needs that these veterans will have, with assurance that a growing number will be able to take advantage of it, no matter what other programs might be adopted and funded to meet general needs.

Mr. FONG. Every American owes a duty to serve his country, but we as Members of Congress know that there is a corresponding responsibility on our part to take care of them. Congress has not differentiated between veterans of World War II and veterans of the Korean conflict. We did not make those benefits loans. We made them grants. There is no reason why we should not give to veterans of the cold war grants instead of loans.

The arguments made by the senior Senator from Texas have been quite convincing. He has answered most adequately the arguments presented by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

To continue with my statement, educators who appeared in behalf of S. 9 during the subcommittee hearings on this bill testified that a loan program would not accomplish what needs to be accomplished by a cold war GI bill.

GI BILL PAYS FOR ITSELF

Experience under the World War II and Korean war GI bills is that these bills do pay back their costs.

The Veterans' Administration in a statement on the 20th anniversary of the World War II GI bill said:

> The better educated, higher earning veterans are returning higher taxes to the U.S. coffers at a rate expected to pay back the entire amount twice and possibly thrice over in the course of a lifetime.

Veterans' Administrator John S. Gleason, Jr., wrote in an article last year:

> The $14.5 billion cost has been more than recouped. * * * The GI bill continues to pay for itself at close to $1 billion a year. The return comes from additional income tax paid by better educated, higher earning GI bill veterans.

I believe experience under the cold war GI bill would parallel experience under the World War II bill.

There is no need to require cold war GI's to repay their educational allowances. These costs will be repaid in due time by means of the higher income taxes the GI's will pay as their training qualifies them for higher paying jobs.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING UNDER S. 9

S. 9 provides that cold war veterans honorably discharged after 180 or more days of military service or because of service-connected disability would receive 1½ days of educational assistance for each day of active duty service between January 31, 1955—when Korean war GI aid expired—to July 1, 1967—when the draft law expires.

Up to 36 months of schooling would be allowed, the same period allowed under the Korean GI bill.

Veterans must begin their education or training within 3 years after their separation from service and complete it within 8 years after separation or the enactment of this bill. No allowance would be paid for any period of educational training before September 1, 1965.

Eligible veterans may use their allowances for—

First. School courses, both at college and below college level full time, three-fourths time, one-half time, or less than one-half time.

Second. Cooperative courses, combining school and on-the-job training in alternating cycles, on a full-time basis only.

Third. Correspondence courses and flight training.

Fourth. On-the-job training on a full-time basis only.

Fifth. Institutional on-farm training on a full-time basis only.

ALLOWANCES UNDER S. 9

A monthly cash allowance would be made to eligible veterans to apply toward tuition and expenses at the school of his choice. A single veteran enrolled full time would receive $110 monthly; a married veteran with one dependent, $135 monthly; with more than one dependent, a maximum of $160 a month.

Part-time students would receive proportionately less.

Veterans pursuing full-time educational courses with some on-job training included would receive $90 if single, $110 per month if he has one dependent; and up to $130 a month if more than one dependent.

For veterans receiving apprentice or other on-job training, S. 9 provides $70 monthly if single, on up to $105 if there is more than one dependent. This education and training allowance would be reduced every 4 months under a formula as his work program progresses. Combined GI education allowances and on-job pay could not exceed $310 a month.

On-farm training allowances would range from $95 monthly for single veterans to $130 a month for veterans with more than one dependent. Like on-job allowances, farm training allowances would be progressively reduced as the trainee neared completion of his training.

LOANS UNDER S. 9

S. 9 also provides for direct and Government-guaranteed loans to eligible cold war veterans for buying homes, including farm homes, and for farm lands and livestock to be used by them in farming operations. Again, 180 days of active-duty service are required for eligibility.

This loan program would pay for itself, through repayments on loans and through a small fee—one-half of 1 percent—on the loans to cover any losses. Experience has shown that losses have been less than 1 percent under previous programs.

It is expected some 1 million veterans will be able to purchase homes and farms under this section, of which some 700,000 may be new construction.

The widow of a veteran who died of service-connected disability also is eligible.

Banks or other lenders can make loans with the Government guaranteeing 60 percent, up to $7,500 on residential real estate, and 50 percent, up to $4,000, on nonresidential real estate. Direct loans not exceeding $13,500 may be made to veterans in certain small towns and rural areas when private capital is not available to guarantee loans.

SUMMARY

In summary, this is the situation.

Because of the cold war, our Nation has had to maintain sizable defense forces in Army, Navy, Marines, and the Air Force.

To make sure our Armed Forces have sufficient personnel, Congress has retained the Compulsory Military Training Act.

Actual hostilities in Korea ceased July 27, 1953. Yet the draft law has been on the books ever since and is still effective through June 30, 1967.

Thousands of young Americans are required by the compulsory draft law to serve on active duty in the Armed Forces for a specific period of time.

Following their active duty, which may take them to far distant areas of the globe, these young people are further compelled to perform additional service in the Active Reserve and then they enter the Standby Reserve.

Once entered upon active duty, their total military obligation generally extends over a period of 6 years.

If it were not for the cold war, the majority of these young people would not enter military service. Most would remain in civilian life, pursuing their education, vocations, and careers.

COLD WAR VETS DENIED READJUSTMENT AIDS

As the committee stressed in the report on S. 9, the Federal Government does not offer these young citizens any assistance other than unemployment compensation in coping with the serious problems created by the cold war and their compulsory military service.

They are denied the readjustment aids so vitally needed to help them catch up with their contemporaries who did not have to serve but instead pursued their civilian lives.

PREVIOUS GI BILLS VERY SUCCESSFUL

After World War II and the Korean war, our Nation recognized the problems of readjustment facing veterans. Under the original GI bill and the Korean GI bill, nearly 11 million veterans received education and training which prepared them for employment.

In Hawaii, 17,000 World War II veterans out of 39,000 took GI bill training. Nearly 8,000 Korean war veterans out of 16,000 in Hawaii received educational benefits under the Korean GI bill.

There is no greater testimonial to the worth and value of this program both to the individual veterans and to the Nation as a whole than the outstanding success of these two GI bills.

Nearly 8 million veterans were educated under the World War II GI bill. They earn on the average $2,000 to $3,000 more a year than their nonveteran contemporaries. I do not have the figures for veterans trained under the Korean GI bill, but I am sure they would also average higher pay.

A veteran earning $2,500 more a year than his nonveteran counterpart over a working lifetime—say 30 years—would earn a total of $75,000 more than the average nonveteran.

In addition, the unemployment rate is much lower for veterans educated under the GI bill than for nonveterans of the same age group.

The picture is clear: Veterans educated under these GI bills are more likely to have jobs—at higher pay—and less likely to be unemployed than corresponding nonveterans.

Experience demonstrates GI bill veterans are better off.

Experience also demonstrates the Nation is better off. Because of the World War II and Korean GI bills, our professional and technological resources have been vastly improved. We have 625,000 more engineers, 375,000 more teachers, 220,000 more medical and related personnel, and 165,000 more natural and physical scientists.

This is a priceless return on our Nation's investment in educational and other benefits for veterans.

It is by no means the only return. As I have already mentioned, according to the Internal Revenue Service, veterans who received World War II benefits have already paid back the total cost of the bill through taxes on the higher incomes they earn because of their GI bill training.

By 1970, both the World War II and Korean GI bills will have more than paid the costs.

There is every reason to believe the cold war GI bill would pay for itself, too.

I am confident S. 9 will yield more than enough in the future to pay the costs of the program.

S. 9 is designed to increase the employability of millions of cold war veterans, to give them an opportunity to obtain education and training in civilian fields and to give them an opportunity to buy their homes.

Based on previous GI bill experience, out of an estimated 6,260,000 cold war veterans through fiscal year 1977, about 1,500,000 could be expected to take advantage of GI bill training, including an estimated 6,000 in Hawaii.

The basic purpose of this legislation is in accord with our Nation's drive against poverty.

It is in accord with our Nation's drive to expand educational opportunities for Americans.

It is a program following a format that has been tried and proven successful.

It is a program that will yield quick and substantial returns—both to the cold war veterans and to the progress and well-being of America.

I strongly urge enactment of S. 9 as a vital and necessary cold war measure.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

Mr. FONG. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I congratulate and commend the Senator from Hawaii on his remarks, and express my warmest appreciation to him for his cogent and forcible stand so much needed in support of the bill, which he has cosponsored along with 40 other Senators, both Democratic and Republican.

In my opinion, the Senator from Hawaii has presented a strong case for the bill, and has demonstrated that it should not be crippled by devastating amendments which would tear the heart out of the bill.

I commend the able Senator for his fine leadership on behalf of the veterans of America.

Mr. FONG. I thank the Senator from Texas for his kind remarks.

REMARKABLE ECONOMIC PROGRESS OF REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, on June 30 this year, the Republic of China completed an impressive chapter in its economic success story. On that day President Chiang Kai-shek's Government joined the ranks of nations which graduated themselves out of the class of recipients of U.S. economic assistance.

For 16 years the Republic of China had received our country's help through the AID programs, while struggling for survival and stability on Taiwan. For 16 years the Republic of China had steadily changed Taiwan from an underdeveloped island into a thriving agricultural-industrial economy.

Today Taiwan stands as a shining example of a government and a people who won against overwhelming odds. Their economic victory is especially amazing because of the dire straits in which the free Chinese found themselves after evacuating to Taiwan from the Asian mainland. In that early period, some pessimists, watching from abroad, predicted the worst for the Nationalist Government. They concluded that Taiwan, in time, would either be absorbed by Red China or become a permanent and expensive ward of the United States. Neither has happened.

Instead, we find on Taiwan today a free people with a strong government, powerful military forces, and a vigorous, expanding economy. With America's help, the Republic of China has come a long, long way.

U.S. economic assistance to Taiwan amounted to $1,425 million in the last 16 years. What the Nationalist Government and the people there have achieved with that aid is truly amazing.

The assistance helped to double the real income of the 12 million people now living on Taiwan; increased the country's gross national product by almost 7 percent every year; boosted industrial production to an average rate of 12 percent a year, and agricultural production to almost 5 percent a year; helped to increase foreign investments to $138.7 million, of which $52.4 million came from the United States; and increased exports 140 percent in the decade between 1953 and 1963, giving China a favorable trade balance for the first time last year.

The land reform program has been notably successful in making available more lands to the farmers.

It has been my good fortune to have visited Taiwan on several occasions in recent years. On each visit, I was highly impressed with the vigor and industry of the people and their leaders. They displayed a commendable determination to overcome the difficulties they faced, and to work out their own solutions to the problems.

I had the opportunity on Taiwan to meet with President and Madame Chiang Kai-shek and the late Vice President Cheng Chen and to discuss at length with them many of their hopes and plans for the economic development of their people—plans which have materialized so successfully under their able and inspiring leadership.

Their courage was instilled into all segments of the population—within the government, among business and industrial leaders, in the academic circles, and among the general populace. The result has been the building of a viable, prosperous economy and the active participation of the people in their democratic government.

Now that American economic aid has ceased, the Republic of China is expected to seek needed capital through private conventional sources and also from the World Bank, the Export-Import Bank, and similar institutions in other developed countries. So Taiwan is now launched on a self-generating course of development, even though it will continue to receive military assistance and limited commitments under the food-for-peace program.

I salute President and Madam Chiang Kai-shek and the people of Taiwan for the remarkable economic development that has been achieved in just 16 years. They demonstrated what private enterprise, and imaginative government, hard work, ingenuity, planning, and judicious use of foreign aid can do for a developing country.

As reported by our Agency for International Development, these efforts have built roads, ports, power stations and strengthened or created a great variety of institutions that will continue to serve the people. With trained leadership and a firm capital base, Taiwan is prepared to make further progress on its own.

President and Madame Chiang Kai-shek and the people of the Republic of China have richly earned the general commendation that is being paid to them on the occasion of their economic independence. Theirs is an outstanding example of a modern economic miracle.

I wish to extend to them my sincere tribute and congratulations on having succeeded so well in achieving self-support through self-help and our aid. I am confident that the energy, foresight, diligence, and skills which the free people of the Republic of China and their great enlightened leaders have demonstrated in such an exceptional manner on Taiwan so far will lead them to even greater progress and prosperity in the future.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

Mr. FONG. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I congratulate the Senator from Hawaii on his speech concerning the Republic of China. This is a subject which has been of great interest to me for a considerable period of time, and I wish to associate myself with his comments.

The other day, for a radio station in my own State, I did a small piece on the subject of the Republic of China, in which I noted that while their imports have doubled, their exports have tripled in the short space of 16 years. They have also developed from 7,000 industries to 25,000 industries, and their agricultural products have more than doubled. They have done a perfectly superb job of bringing their country into a position where it is a real, shining light in the hierarchy of southeast Asia.

The Republic of China has come under constant attack because it is still seated in the United Nations. Much debate has taken place on the floor of the Senate regarding the question of what to do with nations which are behind in their assessments to the United Nations.

The Republic of China is completely up to date in paying its regular assessments to the United Nations, based not only on the figure of the population of Taiwan, but also of the entire mainland of China. They are paying their dues for a total of 5 percent of the total United Nations regular budget.

It seems to me that this is a fantastic achievement for a developing country to be able to carry the burden of this kind of expense, by keeping it up to date and living within the obligations of the United Nations Charter.

I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado for his kind remarks. The development of the Republic of China is, indeed, a fabulous story of a dynamic people. It is a miracle, indeed, to rise from what they were 16 years ago to the status of an economically independent nation today.

We are happy to congratulate the leadership and the people of the Republic of China for their very fine work.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

Mr. FONG. I am glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Permit me to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Hawaii on the 16th anniversary of the Republic of China on Taiwan.

The figures the Senator has given, and the remarks of the Senator from Colorado, cannot fail to impress us all regarding the fine achievement of the Republic of China during the past 16 years, under the great leadership of Chiang Kai-shek and the initiative of its citizens.

Madame Chiang Kai-shek was at Wellesley College for 4 years; and she is, therefore, almost a constituent of mine. For that reason, I have followed her career with a great deal of interest.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his contribution to this colloquy. The people of Taiwan, President Chiang Kai-shek, and Madam Chiang Kai-shek will be most pleased with his remarks.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

Mr. FONG. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I commend the Senator from Hawaii for his very kind remarks.

One cannot help but feel impressed by the great advances that have been made economically in Taiwan. Separate and apart from advances by way of material development, I admire Chiang Kai-shek and his associates and the people of Taiwan primarily because of their great character and courage.

Quemoy and Matsu, the islands lying between the mainland of China and Taiwan, became a matter of great concern. Chiang Kai-shek knew that the islands would be bombed. However, he never flinched. The people of Taiwan remained stalwart, stood their ground, and defied the Communist Chinese on the mainland.

I assume that these attributes with respect to courage also reflect themselves in the development of the economy of these people. I have had faith in Chiang Kai-shek. I have had faith in the Taiwanese people. I believe that each passing year has demonstrated that the faith of the U.S. Government in those people has not been misplaced. They are a bulwark and a bastion in the cause of freedom in southeast Asia. I am glad to associate myself with what the distinguished Senator from Hawaii has said on the subject.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am happy to associate myself with the remarks of the able Senator from Hawaii on the Republic of China. I had the pleasure, several years ago, of visiting Taiwan. I was deeply impressed with the outstanding leadership being provided the Republic of China by Chiang Kai-shek. I had the pleasure of talking with him and Madam Chiang Kai-shek. In my opinion they are two of the great world figures today.

Many are of the opinion that Chiang Kai-shek was forced to leave the mainland of China because of the failure of American policy. If we had stood by China under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek, freedom would prevail on the mainland today. I hope that it will not be too many years before Chiang Kai-shek will be back on the mainland. That is where he and all that he stands for belong.

I am proud that he has shown the great courage and foresight that he has in his leadership of the Republic of China, although he has had many handicaps. It is my hope and prayer that the United States will stand solidly with the Republic of China. It is necessary that we do this in order to assure that freedom will prevail in that part of the world. The Republic of China stands shoulder to shoulder with the United States, and it will stand by its pledge to us. It is a pleasure for me to associate myself with the remarks of the able Senator and with the other statements that have been made today.

Mr. FONG. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his remarks. There is no question that we have a great ally in the Republic of China.

COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I offer, as an amendment and as a subsitute for S. 9, a bill printed at page 17128 of the Congressional Record. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the Record and shown as being sponsored by the Senators who sponsored S. 520.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The sponsors of the amendment are, besides myself, Senators Allott, Bennett, Boggs, Carlson, Case, Cooper, Cotton, Curtis, Dirksen, Dominick, Fannin, Fong, Hickenlooper, Hruska, Javits, Jordan of Idaho, Kuchel, Miller, Morton, Mundt, Pearson, Prouty, Scott, Simpson, Thurmond, Tower, and Young of North Dakota.

Mr. President, the only difference between the bill, S. 520, and the amendment as now offered is the printing at length in the bill, of the educational sections, which have become obsolete because the original educational sections of the GI bill expired on January 1, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the Record, is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof, in the nature of a substitute, the following: "That (a) paragraph (11) of section 101 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" '(11) The term "period of war" means (A) the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, (B) the period beginning on the date of any future declaration of war by the Congress and ending on a date prescribed by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, and (C) any period of hostilities.'

"(b) Section 101 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

" '(29) The term "area of hostilities" means any area designated by the President as an area of hostilities pursuant to the authority granted him under section 3111 of this title.

" '(30) The term "period of hostilities" means, with respect to any area of hostilities, the period of time during which such area has been designated an area of hostilities pursuant to section 3111 of this title; but, for the purposes of this title, a veteran shall be considered to have served during a period of hostilities only if such veteran served at some time during such period in an area of hostilities, or if he suffered an injury or contracted a disease in line of duty or aggravated a preexisting injury suffered or disease contracted in line of duty while en route to or return from an area of hostilities.'

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 521(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'or the Korean conflict,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Korean conflict, or a period of hostilities,'.

"(b) Section 521(g) of such title is amended by—

"(1) redesignating clauses (2), (3), and (4) as clauses (3), (4), and (5), respectively, and adding a new clause (2) after clause (1) as follows:

"'(2) for a period of ninety consecutive days or more any part of which was served during a period of hostilities; '; and

"(2) by striking out 'or the Korean conflict,' in clause (3), as redesignated by this subsection, and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Korean conflict, or a period of hostilities,'.

"(c) The catchline of section 521 is amended to read as follows: 'Veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or a period of hostilities'.

"(d) Section 541(a) of such title is amended by striking out 'or the Korean conflict' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Korean conflict, or a period of hostilities'.

"(e) The catchline of section 541 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: ', and widows of veterans of a period of hostilities'.

"(f) Section 542(a) of such title is amended by striking out 'or the Korean conflict' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Korean conflict, or a period of hostilities'.

"(g) The catchline of section 542 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: ', and children of veterans of a period of hostilities'.

"(h) the heading which precedes section 541 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"'WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, THE KOREAN CONFLICT, AND ANY PERIOD OF HOSTILITIES'.

"(i) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 15 of such title is amended by—

"(1) striking out:

"'521. Veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict.'

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'521. Veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or a period of hostilities.';

"(2) striking out the heading which reads:

"'World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict'

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"'World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and any period of hostilities';

"(3) striking out:

"'541. Widows of World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict veterans.

"'542. Children of World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict veterans.'

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"'541. Widows of World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict veterans, and widows of veterans of a period of hostilities.

"'542. Children of World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict veterans, and children of veterans of a period of hostilities.'

"SEC. 3. Section 602 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by—

"(1) striking out 'World War II or of the Korean conflict' and inserting in lieu thereof 'World War II, the Korean conflict, or a period of hostilities'; and

"(2) inserting immediately before 'shall be deemed' the following: 'or within a period of two years following the last day of his service in an area of hostilities in the case of a veteran of a period of hostilities,'.

"SEC. 4. (a) Section 723(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'Any' at the beginning of such section and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'Any veteran of a period of hostilities shall, upon application in writing made within one hundred and twenty days after such veteran's discharge or release from the Armed Forces following his service in an area of hostilities and payment of premium as hereinafter provided, and without medical examination, be issued a policy of permanent plan life insurance or a policy of limited convertible five-year level premium term insurance under this subsection; and any'.

"(b) Section 723(b) of such title is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'Any veteran of a period of hostilities who was discharged or released from the Armed Forces prior to the date of enactment of this sentence shall, upon application made in writing within one hundred and twenty days after the date of enactment of this sentence and payment of premiums, and without medical examination, be issued insurance as provided in this subsection.'

"SEC. 5. Section 1502(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'World War II or the Korean conflict' and inserting in lieu thereof 'World War II, the Korean conflict, or a period of hostilities'.

"SEC. 6. (a) Title 38 of the United States Code is amended by adding after chapter 39 the following new chapter:

"'CHAPTER 40—EDUCATION OF VETERANS WHO SERVED BETWEEN JANUARY 31, 1955, AND JULY 1, 1967

"*Subchapter I—Definitions*

"'Sec.
"'1908. Definitions.

"*'Subchapter II—Eligibility*

"'1910. Entitlement to education or training generally.
"'1911. Duration of veteran's education or training.
"'1912. Commencement; time limitations.
"'1913. Expiration of all education and training.

"*'Subchapter III—Enrollment*

"'1920. Selection of program.
"'1921. Applications; approval.
"'1922. Change of program.
"'1923. Disapproval of enrollment in certain courses.
"'1924. Discontinuance of unsatisfactory progress.
"'1925. Period of operation for approval.
"'1926. Institutions listed by Attorney General.

"*'Subchapter IV—Payments to veterans*

"'1931. Education and training allowance.
"'1932. Computation of education and training allowances.
"'1933. Measurement of courses.
"'1934. Overcharges by educational institutions.

"*'Subchapter V—State approving agencies*

"'1941. Designation.
"'1942. Approval of courses.
"'1943. Cooperation.
"'1944. Use of Office of Education and other Federal agencies.
"'1945. Reimbursement of expenses.

"*'Subchapter VI—Approval of courses of education and training*

"'1951. Apprentice or other training on the job.
"'1952. Institutional on-farm training.
"'1953. Approval of accredited courses.
"'1954. Approval of nonaccredited courses.
"'1955. Notice of approval of courses.
"'1956. Disapproval of courses and discontinuance of allowances.

"*'Subchapter VII–Miscellaneous provisions*

"'Sec.
"'1961. Authority and duties of Administrator.
"'1962. Educational and vocational counseling.
"'1963. Control by agencies of United States.
"'1964. Conflicting interests.
"'1965. Reports by institutions.
"'1966. Overpayments to veterans.
"'1967. Examination of records.
"'1968. False or misleading statements.
"'1969. Information furnished by Federal Trade Commission.
"'1970. Effective date and retroactive allowances.

"*'Subchapter I—Definitions*

"'§ 1908. Definitions

"'(a) For the purpose of this chapter—

"'(1) The term "basic service period" means the period commencing with the veteran's most recent entry, enlistment, or call to active duty prior to his service in an area of hostilities and ending on the date of his first discharge or release from active duty after his service in such area.

"'(2) The term "eligible veteran" means any veteran who is not on active duty and who—

"'(A) served on active duty at any time during a period of hostilities;

"'(B) was discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable; and

"'(C) served on active duty for a period of more than ninety days (exclusive of any period he was assigned by the Armed Forces to a civilian institution for a course of education or training which was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians, or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies), or was discharged or released from a period of active duty, any part of which occurred during a period of hostilities, for an actual service-connected disability.

"'(3) The term "program of education or training" means any single unit course or subject, any curriculum, or any combination of unit courses or subjects, which is generally accepted as necessary to fulfill requirements for the attainment of a predetermined and identified educational, professional, or vocational objective.

"'(4) The term "course" means an organized unit of subject matter in which instruction is offered within a given period of time or which covers a specific amount of related subject matter for which credit toward graduation or certification is usually given.

"'(5) The term "dependent" means—

"'(A) a child of an eligible veteran;

"'(B) a parent of an eligible veteran, if the parent is in fact dependent upon the veteran; and

"'(C) the wife of an eligible veteran, or, in the case of an eligible veteran who is a woman, her husband if he is in fact dependent upon her.

"'(6) The term "educational institution" means any public or private elementary school, secondary school, vocational school, correspondence school, business school, junior college, teachers college, college, normal school, professional school, university, scientific or technical institution, or other institution furnishing education for adults.

"'(7) The term "training establishment" means any business or other establishment providing apprentice or other training on the job, including those under the supervision of a college or university or any State department of education, or any State apprenticeship agency, or any State board of vocational education, or any joint apprentice committee, or the Bureau of Apprenticeship established in accordance with chapter 4C of title 29, or any agency of the Federal Government authorized to supervise such training.

"'(8) The term "State" includes the Canal Zone.

"'(9) The term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education.

"'(b) Benefits shall not be afforded under this chapter to any individual on account of service as a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, or of the Regular or Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service.

"'(c) The Congress of the United States hereby declares that the veterans' education and training program created by this chapter is for the purpose of providing vocational readjustment and restoring lost educational opportunities to those service men and women whose educational or vocational ambitions have been interrupted or impeded by reason of active duty during a period of hostilities and for the purpose of aiding such persons in attaining the educational and training status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained had they not served their country.

"'Subchapter II—Eligibility

"'§ 1910. Entitlement to education or training generally

"'Each eligible veteran shall, subject to the provisions of this chapter, be entitled to the education or training provided under this chapter.

"'§ 1911. Duration of veteran's education or training

"'(a) Each eligible veteran shall be entitled to education or training under this chapter for a period equal to one and a half times the duration of his service on active duty during his basic service period (or to the equivalent thereof in part-time training), except that—

"'(1) in computing the duration of such service, there shall be excluded a period equal to any period he was assigned by the Armed Forces to a civilian institution for a course of education or training which was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians or served as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies:

"'(2) the period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled under this chapter shall not, except as provided in subsection (b), exceed thirty-six months reduced by a period equivalent to any period of educational assistance afforded him under chapter 35 of this title; and

"'(3) the period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled under this chapter together with vocational rehabilitation training received under chapter 31 of this title, and education or training received by virtue of his service during the Korean conflict or under part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1(a), and section 12(a) of the Act enacting this title shall not, except as provided in subsection (b), exceed thirty-six months in the aggregate.

"'(b) Whenever the period of entitlement to education or training under this chapter of an eligible veteran who is enrolled in an educational institution regularly operated on the quarter or semester system ends during a quarter or semester and after a major part of such semester or quarter has expired, such period shall be extended to the termination of such unexpired quarter or semester. In all other courses offered by educational institutions, whenever the period of eligibility ends after a major portion of the course is completed such period may be extended to the end of the course or for nine weeks, whichever is the lesser period.

"'(c) In the case of any eligible veteran who is pursuing any program of education or training exclusively by correspondence, one-fourth of the elapsed time in following such program of education or training shall be charged against the veteran's period of entitlement.

"'§ 1912. Commencement; time limitations

"'(a) No eligible veteran shall be entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter after three years after his discharge or release from active duty or after three years after the date of enactment of this chapter, whichever is later. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, any otherwise eligible veteran whom the Administrator determines to have been prevented from intitiating a program of education or training under this chapter within the period prescribed by the preceding sentence because he had not met the nature of discharge requirements of section 1908(a)(1)(B) of this title before a change, correction, or modification of a discharge or dismissal made pursuant to section 1553 of title 10, the correction of the military records of the proper service department under section 1552 of title 10, or other corrective action by competent authority, shall be permitted to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter within three years after the date of his discharge or dismissal was so changed, corrected, or modified, or within three years after the date of enactment of this chapter, whichever is later.

"'(b) The program of education and training of an eligible veteran under this chapter shall, on and after the delimiting date for the veterans to initiate his program, be pursued continuously until completion, except that an eligible veteran may suspend the pursuit of his program for periods of not more than twelve consecutive months, and may suspend the pursuit of each program for longer periods if the Administrator finds that the suspension of each such period was due to conditions beyond the control of the eligible veteran.

"'(c) For the purposes of computing the three-year period under this section and the eight-year period under section 1913, the date of an eligible veteran's discharge or release shall be the date of his discharge or release from his last period of active duty which began before his service in an area of hostilities.

"'§ 1913. Expiration of all education and training

"'No education or training shall be afforded an eligible veteran under this chapter beyond eight years after his discharge or release from active duty or eight years after the enactment of this chapter, whichever is later, except that any veteran who is eligible to initiate a program of education or training by reason of the second sentence of section 1912(a) of this title shall be permitted to pursue, subject to the other provisions of this chapter, such program for a period of not more than five years after the date of initiation thereof; but in no event shall education or training be afforded under this chapter after June 30, 1972.

"'Subchapter III—Enrollment

"'§ 1920. Selection of program

"'Subject to the provisions of this chapter, each eligible veteran may select a program of education or training to assist him in attaining an educational, professional, or vocational objective at any educational institution or training establishment selected by him, whether or not located in the State in which he resides, which will accept and retain him as a student or trainee in any field or branch of knowledge which such institution or establishment finds him qualified to undertake or pursue. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, an eligible veteran may not pursue a program of education or training at an educational institution or training establishment which is not located in a State, unless such program is pursued at an approved educational institution of higher learning. The Administrator in his discretion may deny or discontinue the enrollment under this chapter of any veteran in a foreign educational institution if he finds that such enrollment is not for the best interest of the veteran or the Government.

"'§ 1921. Applications; approval

"'Any eligible veteran who desires to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter shall submit an application to the Administrator which shall be in such form, and contain such information, as the Administrator shall prescribe. The Administrator shall approve such application unless he finds that such veteran is not eligible for or entitled to the education or training applied for or that his program of education or training fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter, or that the eligible veteran is already qualified, by reason of previous education and training, for the educational, professional, or vocational objective for which the courses of the program of education or training are offered. The Administrator shall notify the eligible veteran of the approval or disapproval of his application.

"'§ 1922. Change of program

"'(a) Subject to the provisions of section 1921 of this title, each eligible veteran (except an eligible veteran whose program has been interrupted or discontinued due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application) may, at any time before the end of the period during which he is entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter, make not more than one change of program of education or training.

"'(b) Each eligible veteran, who has not made a change of program of education or training before the expiration of the period during which he is entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter, may make not more than one change of program of education or training with the approval of the Administrator. The Administrator shall approve such a change if he finds that—

"'(1) the eligible veteran is not making satisfactory progress in his present program and that the failure is not due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application, and if the program, to which the eligible veteran desires to change is more in keeping with his aptitude or previous education and training; or

"'(2) the program to which the eligible veteran desires to change, while not a part of the program currently pursued by him, is a normal progression from such program.

"'(c) As used in this section the term "change of program of education or training" shall not be deemed to include a change from the pursuit of one program to pursuit of another where the first program is prerequisite to, or generally required for, entrance into pursuit of the second.

"'§ 1923. Disapproval of enrollment in certain courses

"'(a) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in any bartending course, dancing course, or personality development course.

"'(b) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran—

"'(1) in any photography course or entertainment course; or

"'(2) in any music course—instrumental or vocal—public speaking course, or course in sports or athletics such as horseback riding, swimming, fishing, skiing, golf, baseball, tennis, bowling, sports officiating, or other sport or athletic courses, except courses of applied music, physical education, or public speaking which are offered by institutions of higher learning for credit as an integral part of a program leading to an educational objective; or

"'(3) in any other type of course which the Administrator finds to be avocational or recreational in character;

unless the eligible veteran submits justification showing that the course will be of bona fide use in the pursuit of his present or contemplated business or occupation.

"'(c) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of any eligible veteran, not already enrolled, in any nonaccredited course below the college level offered by a proprietary profit or proprietary nonprofit educational institution for any period during which the Administrator finds that more than 85 percentum of the students enrolled in the course are having all or any part of their tuition, fees, or other charges paid to or for them by the educational institution or the Veterans' Administration under this chapter, chapter 31 of this title, or section 12(a) of the Act enacting this title.

"'§ 1924. Discontinuance for unsatisfactory progress

"'The Administrator shall discontinue the education and training allowance of an eligible veteran of, at any time, he finds that, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the educational institution or training establishment, the conduct or progress of such veteran is unsatisfactory.

"'§ 1925. Period of operation for approval

"'(a) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in any course offered by an educational institution when such course has been in operation for less than two years.

"'(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to—

"'(1) any course to be pursued in a public or other tax-supported educational institution;

"'(2) any course which is offered by an educational institution which has been in operation for more than two years, if such course is similar in character to the instruction previously given by such institution;

"'(3) any course which has been offered by an institution for a period of more than two years, notwithstanding the institution has moved to another location within the same general locality; or

"'(4) any course which is offered by a nonprofit educational institution of college level and which is recognized for credit toward a standard college degree.

"'§ 1926. Institutions listed by Attorney General.

"'The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of, or payment of an education and training allowance to, any eligible veteran in any course in an educational institution or training establishment while it is listed by the Attorney General under section 3 of part III of Executive Order 9835, as amended.

"'Subchapter IV—Payments to Veterans

"'§ 1931. Education and training allowance

"'(a) The Administrator shall pay to each eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training under this chapter, and who applies therefor, an education and training allowance to meet in part the expenses of his subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books, and equipment.

"'(b) The education and training allowance for an eligible veteran shall be paid, as provided in section 1932 of this title, only for the period of the veterans' enrollment as approved by the Administrator, but no allowance shall be paid—

"'(1) to any veteran enrolled in an institutional course which leads to a standard college degree or a course of institutional on-farm training for any period, when the veteran is not pursuing his course in accordance with the regularly established policies and regulations of the institution and the requirements of this chapter;

"'(2) to any veteran enrolled in an institutional course which does not lead to a standard college degree or in a course of apprentice or other training on the job for any day of absence in excess of thirty days in a twelve-month period, not counting as absences weekends or legal holidays established by Federal or State law during which the institution or establishment is not regularly in session or operation; or

"'(3) to any veteran pursuing his program of education exclusively by correspondence for any period during which no lessons were serviced by the institution.

"'(c) No education and training allowance shall be paid to an eligible veteran for any period until the Administrator shall have received—

"'(1) from the eligible veteran (A) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in an institutional course which leads to a standard college degree or a course of institutional on-farm training, a certification that he was actually enrolled in and pursuing the course as approved by the Administrator, or (B) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in an institutional course which does not lead to a standard college degree or a course of apprentice or other training on the job, a certification as to actual attendance during such period, or (C) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in a program of education or training by correspondence, a certification as to the number of lessons actually completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution; and

"'(2) from the educational institution or training establishment, a certification, or an endorsement on the veteran's certificate, that such veteran was enrolled in and pursuing a course of education or training during such period, and, in the case of an institution furnishing education or training to a veteran exclusively by correspondence, a certification, or an endorsement on the veteran's certificate, as to the number of lessons completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution. Education and training allowances shall, insofar as practicable, be paid within twenty days after receipt by the Administrator of the certifications required by this subsection.

"'§ 1932. Computation of education and training allowances

"'(a) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training in an educational institution and is not entitled to receive an education and training allowance under subsection (b), (c), (d), (e), or (f) shall be computed as follows:

"'(1) If such program is pursued on a full-time basis, such allowance shall be computed at the rate of $110 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of $135 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of $160 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"'(2) If such program is pursued on a three-quarters time basis, such allowance shall be computed at the rate of $80 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of $100 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of $120 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"'(3) If such program is pursued on a half-time basis, such allowance shall be computed at the rate of $50 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of $60 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of $80 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"'(b) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a full-time program of education and training which consists of institutional courses and on-the-job training, with the on-the-job training portion of the program being strictly supplemental to the institutional portion, shall be computed at the rate of (1) $90 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) $110 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) $130 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"'(c) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing apprentice or other training on the job shall be computed at the rate of (1) $70 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) $85 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) $105 per month, if he has more than one dependent; except that his education and training allowance shall be reduced at the end of each four-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to the basic education and training allowance as four months bears to the total duration of his apprentice or other training on the job; but in no case shall the Administrator pay an education and training allowance under this subsection in an amount which, when added to the compensation to be paid to the veteran, in accordance with his approved training program, for productive labor performed as a part of his course, would exceed the rate of $310 per month. For the purpose of computing allowances under this subsection, the duration of the training of an eligible veteran shall be the period specified in the approved application as the period during which he may receive an education and training allowance for such training, plus such additional period, if any, as is necessary to make the number of months of such training a multiple of four.

"'(d) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing institutional on-farm training shall be computed at the rate of (1) $95 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) $110 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) $130 per month, if he has more than one dependent; except that his education and training allowance shall be reduced at the end of the third, and each subsequent, four-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to $65 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or $80 per month, if he has one dependent, or $100 per month, if he has more than one dependent, as four months bears to the total duration of such veteran's institutional on-farm training reduced by eight months. For the purpose of computing allowances under this subsection, the duration of the training of an eligible veteran shall be the period specified in the aprpoved application as the period during which he may receive an education and training allowance for such training, plus such additional period, if any, as is necessary to make the number of such months of such training a multiple of four.

"'(e) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing a program of education or training exclusively by correspondence shall be computed on the basis of the established charges which the institution requires nonveterans to pay for the course or courses pursued by the eligible veteran. Such allowance shall be paid quarterly on a pro rata basis for the lessons completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution, as certified by the institution.

"'(f) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training under this chapter in an educational institution on a less than half-time basis shall be computed at the rate of (1) the established charges for tuition and fees which the institution requires similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same course to pay, or (2) $110 per month for a full-time course, whichever is the lesser.

"'(g) Each eligible veteran who is pursuing an approved course of flight training shall be paid an education and training allowance to be computed at the rate of 75 per centum of the established charge which similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same flight course are required to pay for tuition for the course. If such veteran's program of education or training consists exclusively of flight training, he shall not be paid an education and training allowance under one of the preceding subsections of this section; if his program of education or training consists of flight training and other education or training, the allowance payable under this subsection shall be in addition to any education and training allowance payable to him under one of the preceding subsections of this section for education or training other than flight training. Such allowance shall be paid monthly upon receipt of certification from the eligible veteran and the institution as to the actual flight training received by the veteran. In each such case the eligible veteran's period of entitlement shall be charged (in addition to any charge made against his entitlement by reason of education or training other than flight training) with one day of each $1.25 which is paid to the veteran as an education and training allowance for such course.

"'(h) No eligible veteran shall be paid an education and training allowance under this chapter for any period during which (1) he is enrolled in and pursuing a course of education or training paid for by the United States under any provision of law other than this chapter, where the payment of such allowance would constitute a duplication of benefits paid to the veteran from the Federal Treasury, or (2) he is pursuing a course of apprentice or other training on the job, a course of institutional on-farm training, or a course of education and training described in subsection (b) on a less than full-time basis.

"'§ 1933. Measurement of courses

"'(a) For the purposes of this chapter (1) an institutional trade or technical course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level involving shop practice as an integral part thereof, shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of thirty hours per week of attendance is required with not more than two and one-half hours of rest periods per week allowed, (2) an institutional course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level in which theoretical or classroom instruction predominates shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of twenty-five hours per week net of instruction is required, and (3) an institutional undergraduate course offered by a college or university on a quarter or semester-hour basis for which credit is granted toward a standard college degree shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of fourteen semester hours or its equivalent is required.

"'(b) The Administrator shall define full-time training in the case of all types of courses of education or training other than institutional on-farm training and the types of courses referred to in subsection (a); except that, the Administrator shall not define full-time apprentice training for a particular establishment other than that established as the standard workweek through bona fide collective bargaining between employers and employees.

"'§ 1934. Overcharges by educational institutions

"'The Administrator may, if he finds that an institution has charged or received from any eligible veteran any amount in excess of the established charges for tuition and fees which the institution requires similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same course to pay, disapprove such educational institution for the enrollment of any veteran not already enrolled therein, except that, in the case of a tax-supported public educational institution which does not have established charges for tuition and fees which it requires nonveteran residents to pay, such institution may charge and receive from each eligible veteran who is a resident an amount equal to the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction attributable to such veteran, but in no event to exceed the rate of $10 per month for a full-time course. Any educational institution or training establishment disapproved under this section shall also be disapproved for the enrollment of any veteran not already enrolled therein under chapter 31, or for the enrollment of any eligible person not already enrolled therein under chapter 35.

"'*Subchapter V—State Approving Agencies*

"'§ 1941. Designation

"'(a) Unless otherwise established by the law of the State concerned, the chief executive of each State is requested to create or designate a State department or agency as the "State approving agency" for his State for the purposes of this chapter.

"'(b) (1) If any State fails or declines to create or designate a State approving agency, the provisions of this chapter which refer to the State approving agency shall, with respect to such State, be deemed to refer to the Administrator.

"'(2) In the case of courses subject to approval by the Administrator under section 1942 of this title, the provisions of this chapter which refer to a State approving agency shall be deemed to refer to the Administrator.

"'§ 1942. Approval of courses

"'(a) An eligible veteran shall receive the benefits of this chapter while enrolled in a course of education or training offered by an educational institution or training establishment only if such course is approved by the State approving agency for the State where such educational institution or training establishment is situated or by the Administrator. Approval of courses by State approving agencies shall be in accordance with the provisions of this chapter and such other regulations and policies as the State approving agency may adopt. Each State approving agency shall furnish the Administration with a current list of educational institutions and training establishments, specifying courses which it has approved, and, in addition to such list, it shall furnish such other information to the Administrator as it and the Administrator my determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter. Each state approving agency shall notify the Administrator of the disapproval of any course previously approved and shall set forth the reasons for such disapproval.

"'(b) The Administrator shall be responsible for the approval of courses of education or training offered by any agency of the Federal Government authorized under other laws to supervise such education or training. The Administrator may approve any course in any other educational institution or training establishment in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

"'§ 1943. Cooperation

"'(a) The Administrator and each State approving agency shall take cognizance of the fact that definite duties, functions, and responsibilities are conferred upon the Administrator and each State approving agency under the veterans' educational programs. To assure that such programs are effectively and efficiently administered, the cooperation of the Administrator and the State approving agencies is essential. It is necessary to establish an exchange of information pertaining to activities of educational institutions and training establishments, and particular attention should be given to the enforcement of approval standards, enforcement of wage and income limitations, enforcement of enrollment restrictions, and fraudulent and other criminal activities on the part of persons connected with educational institutions and training establishments in which veterans are enrolled under this chapter.

"'(b) The Administrator will furnish the State approving agencies with copies of such Veterans' Administration informational material as may aid them in carrying out this chapter.

"'§ 1944. Use of Office of Education and other Federal agencies.

"'(a) In carrying out his functions under this chapter, the Administrator may utilize the facilities and services of any other Federal department or agency. The Administrator shall utilize the services of the Office of Education in developing cooperative agreements between the Administrator and State and local agencies relating to the approval of courses of education or training as provided for in section 1945 of this title, in reviewing the plan of operations of State approving agencies under such agreements, and in rendering technical assistance to such State and local agencies in developing and improving policies, standards, and legislation in connection with their duties under this chapter.

"'(b) Any such utilization shall be pursuant to proper agreement with the Federal department or agency concerned; and payment to cover the cost thereof shall (except in the case of the Office of Education) be made either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be provided in such agreement. Funds necessary to enable the Office of Education to carry out its functions under this chapter are authorized to be appropriated directly to such Office.

"'§ 1945. Reimbursement of expenses

"'The Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts or agreements with State and local agencies to pay such State and local agencies for reasonable and necessary expenses of salary and travel incurred by employees of such agencies in (1) rendering necessary services in ascertaining the qualifications of educational institutions and training establishments for furnishing courses of education or training to eligible veterans under this chapter, and in the supervision of such educational institutions and training establishments, and (2) furnishing, at the request of the Administrator, any other services in connection with this chapter. Each such contract or agreement shall be conditioned upon compliance with the standards and provisions of this chapter.

"'*Subchapter VI—Approval of Courses of Education and Training*

"'§ 1951. Apprentice or other training on the job

"'(a) Apprentice or other training on the job shall consist of courses offered by training establishments whenever such courses of training are furnished in accordance with the provisions of this section. Any training establishment desiring to furnish a course of apprentice or other training on the job shall submit to the appropriate State approving agency a written application setting forth the course of training for each job for which an eligible veteran is to be trained. The written application covering the course of training shall include the following:

"'(1) Title and description of the specific job objective for which the eligible veteran is to be trained;

"'(2) The length of the training period;

"'(3) A schedule listing various operations for major kinds of work or tasks to be learned and showing for each, job operations or work, tasks to be performed, and the approximate length of time to be spent on each operation or task;

"'(4) The wage or salary to be paid at the beginning of the course of training, at each successive step in the course, and at the completion of training;

"'(5) The entrance wage or salary paid by the establishment to employees already trained in the kind of work for which the veteran is to be trained; and

"'(6) The number of hours of supplemental related instruction required.

"'(b) The appropriate State approving agency may approve a course of apprentice or other training on the job specified in an application submitted by a training establishment in accordance with subsection (a) if such training establishment is found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

"'(1) The training content of the course is adequate to qualify the eligible veteran for appointment to the job for which he is to be trained.

"'(2) There is reasonable certainty that the job for which the eligible veteran is to be trained will be available to him at the end of the training period.

"'(3) The job is one in which progression and appointment to the next higher classification are based upon skills learned through organized training on the job and not on such factors as length of service and normal turnover.

"'(4) The wages to be paid the eligible veteran for each successive period of training are not less than those customarily paid in the training establishment and in the community to a learner in the same job who is not a veteran.

"'(5) The job customarily requires a period of training of not less than three months and not more than two years of full-time training, except that this provision shall not apply to apprentice training.

"'(6) The length of the training period is no longer than that customarily requested by the training establishment and other training establishments in the community to provide an eligible veteran with the required skills, arrange for the acquiring of job knowledge, technical information, and other facts which the eligible veteran will need to learn in order to become competent on the job for which he is being trained.

"'(7) Provision is made for related instruction for the individual eligible veteran who may need it.

"'(8) There is in the training establishment adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide satisfactory training on the job.

"'(9) Adequate records are kept to show the progress made by each eligible veteran toward his job objective.

"'(10) Appropriate credit is given the eligible veteran for previous training and job experience, whether in the military service or elsewhere, his beginning wage adjusted to the level to which such credit advances him, and his training period shortened, accordingly, and provision is made for certification by the training establishment that such credit has been granted and the beginning wage adjusted accordingly. No course of training will be considered bona fide if given to an eligible veteran who is already qualified by training and experience for the job objective.

"'(11) A signed copy of the training agreement for each eligible veteran, including the training program and wage scale as approved by the State approving agency, is provided to the veteran and to the Administrator and the State approving agency by the employer.

"'(12) Upon completion of the course of training furnished by the training establishment the eligible veteran is given a certificate by the employer indicating the length and type of training provided and that the eligible veteran has completed the course of training on the job satisfactorily.

"'(13) That the course meets such other criteria as may be established by the State approving agency.

"'§ 1952. Institutional on-farm training

"'(a) An eligible veteran shall be entitled to the benefits of this chapter while enrolled in a course of full-time institutional on-farm training which has been approved by the appropriate State approving agency in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"'(b) The State approving agency may approve a course of institutional on-farm training when it satisfies the following requirements:

"'(1) The course combines organized group instruction in agricultural and related subjects of at least two hundred hours per year (and of at least eight hours each month) at an educational institution, with supervised work experience on a farm or other agricultural establishment.

"'(2) The eligible veteran will perform a part of such course on a farm or other agricultural establishment under his control.

"'(3) The course is developed with due consideration to the size and character of the farm or other agricultural establishment on which the eligible veteran will receive his supervised work experience and to the need of such eligible veteran, in the type of farming for which he is training, for proficiency in planning, producing, marketing, farm mechanics, conservation of resources, food conservation, farm financing, farming management, and the keeping of farm and home accounts.

"'(4) The eligible veteran will receive not less than one hundred hours of individual instruction per year, not less than fifty hours of which shall be on such farm or other agricultural establishment (with at least two visits by the instructor to such farm each month). Such individual instruction shall be given by the instructor responsible for the veteran's institutional instruction and shall include instruction and home-study assignments in the preparation of budgets, inventories, and statements showing the production, use on the farm, and sale of crops, livestock, and livestock products.

"'(5) The eligible veteran will be assured of control of such farm or other agricultural establishment (whether by ownership, lease, management, agreement, or other tenure arrangement) until the completion of his course.

"'(6) Such farm or other agricultural establishment shall be of a size and character which (A) will, together with the group-instruction part of the course, occupy the full time of the eligible veteran, (B) will permit instruction in all aspects of the management of the farm or other agricultural establishment of the type for which the eligible veteran is being trained, and will provide the eligible veteran an opportunity to apply to the operation of his farm or other agricultural establishment the major portion of the farm practices taught in the group-instruction part of the course, and (C) will assure him a satisfactory income for a reasonable living under normal conditions at least by the end of his course.

"'(7) Provision shall be made for certification by the institution and the veteran that the training offered does not repeat or duplicate training previously received by the veteran.

"'(8) The institutional on-farm training meets such other fair and reasonable standards as may be established by the State approving agency.

"'§ 1953. Approval of accredited courses

"'(a) A State approving agency may approve the courses offered by an educational institution when—

"'(1) such courses have been accredited and approved by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association;

"'(2) credit for such course is approved by the State department of education for credit toward a high school diploma;

"'(3) such courses are conducted under sections 11–28 of title 20; or

"'(4) such courses are accepted by the State department of education for credit for a teacher's certificate or a teacher's degree. For the purposes of this chapter the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies and associations which he determines to be a reliable authority as to the quality of training offered by an educational institution and the State approving agencies may, upon concurrence, utilize the accreditation of such accrediting associations or agencies for approval of the courses specifically accredited and approved by such accrediting association or agency. In making application for approval, the institution shall transmit to the State approving agency copies of its catalog or bulletin.

"'(b) As a condition to approval under this section, the State approving agency must find that adequate records are kept by the educational institution to show the progress of each eligible veteran. The State approving agency must also find that the educational institution maintains a written record of the previous education and training of the veteran and clearly indicates that appropriate credit has been given by the institution for previous education and training, with the training period shortened proportionately and the veteran and the Administrator so notified.

"'§ 1954. Approval of nonaccredited courses

"'(a) No course of education or training (other than a course of institutional on-farm training) which has not been approved by a State approving agency pursuant to section 1953 of this title, which is offered by a public or private, profit or nonprofit, educational institution shall be approved for the purposes of this chapter unless the educational institution offering such course submits to the appropriate State approving agency a written application for approval of such course in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

"'(b) Such application shall be accompanied by not less than two copies of the current catalog or bulletin which is certified as true and correct in content and policy by an authorized owner or official and includes the following:

"'(1) Identifying data, such as volume number and date of publication;

"'(2) Names of the institution and its governing body, officials, and faculty;

"'(3) A calendar of the institution showing legal holidays, beginning and ending date of each quarter, term, or semester, and other important dates;

"'(4) Institution policy and regulations on enrollment with respect to enrollment dates and specific entrance requirements for each course;

"'(5) Institution policy and regulations relative to leave, absences, class cuts, make-up work, tardiness and interruptions for unsatisfactory attendance;

"'(6) Institution policy and regulations relative to standards of progress required of the student by the institution (this policy will define the grading system of the institution, the minimum grades considered satisfactory, conditions for interruption for unsatisfactory grades or progress and a description of the probationary period, if any, allowed by the institution, and conditions of reentrance for those students dismissed for unsatisfactory progress. A statement will be made regarding progress records kept by the institution and furnished the student);

"'(7) Institution policy and regulations relating to student conduct and conditions for dismissal for unsatisfactory conduct;

"'(8) Detailed schedules of fees, charges for tuition, books, supplies, tools, student activities, laboratory fees, service charges, rentals, deposits, and all other charges;

"'(9) Policy and regulations of the institution relative to the refund of the unused portion of tuition fees, and other charges in the event the student does not enter the course or withdraws or is discontinued therefrom;

"'(10) A description of the available space, facilities, and equipment;

" '(11) A course outline for each course for which approval is requested, showing subjects or units in the course, type of work or skill to be learned, and approximate time and clock hours to be spent on each subject or unit; and

" '(12) Policy and regulations of the institution relative to granting credit for previous educational training.

" '(c) The appropriate State approving agency may approve the application of such institution when the institution and its nonaccredited courses are found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

" '(1) The courses, curriculum, and instruction are consistent with quality, content, and length with similar courses in public schools and other private schools in the State, with recognized accepted standards.

" '(2) There is in the institution adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide training of good quality.

" '(3) Educational and experience qualifications of directors, administrators, and instructors are adequate.

" '(4) The institution maintains a written record of the previous education and training of the veterans and clearly indicates that appropriate credit has been given by the institution for previous education and training, with the training period shortened proportionately and the veteran and the Administrator so notified.

" '(5) A copy of the course outline, schedule of tuition, fees, and other charges, regulations pertaining to absence, grading policy, and rules of operation and conduct will be furnished the veteran upon enrollment.

" '(6) Upon completion of training, the veteran is given a certificate by the institution indicating the approved course and indicating that training was satisfactorily completed.

" '(7) Adequate records as prescribed by the State approving agency are kept to show attendance and progress or grades, and satisfactory standards relating to attendance, progress, and conduct are enforced.

" '(8) The institution complies with all local, city, county, municipal, State, and Federal regulations, such as fire codes, building and sanitation codes. The State approving agency may require such evidence of compliance as is deemed necessary.

" '(9) The institution is financially sound and capable of fulfilling its commitments for training.

" '(10) The institution does not utilize advertising of any type which is erroneous or misleading, either by actual statement, omission, or intimation. The institution shall not be deemed to have met this requirement until the State approving agency (A) has ascertained from the Federal Trade Commission whether the Commission has issued an order to the institution to cease and desist from any act or practice, and (B) has, if such an order has been issued, given due weight to that fact.

" '(11) The institution does not exceed its enrollment limitations as established by the State approving agency.

" '(12) The institution's administrators, directors, owners, and instructors are of good reputation and character.

" '(13) The institution has and maintains a policy for the refund of the unused portion of tuition, fees, and other charges in the event the veteran fails to enter the course or withdraws or is discontinued therefrom at any time prior to completion and such policy must provide that the amount charged to the veteran for tuition, fees, and other charges for a portion of the course shall not exceed the approximate pro rata portion of the total charges for tuition, fees, and other charges that the length of the complete portion of the course bears to its total length.

" '(14) Such additional criteria as may be deemed necessary by the State approving agency.

" '§ 1955. Notice of approval of courses

" 'The State approving agency, upon determining that an educational institution has complied with all the requirements of this chapter, will issue a letter to such institution setting forth the courses which have been approved for the purposes of this chapter, and will furnish an official copy of such letter and any subsequent amendments to the Administrator. The letter of approval shall be accompanied by a copy of the catalog or bulletin of the institution, as approved by the State approving agency, and shall contain the following information:

" '(1) date of letter and effective date of approval of courses;

" '(2) proper address and name of each educational institution or training establishment;

" '(3) authority for approval and conditions of approval, referring specifically to the approved catalog or bulletin published by the educational institution;

" '(4) name of each course approved;

" '(5) where applicable, enrollment limitations such as maximum numbers authorized and student-teacher ratio;

" '(6) signature of responsible official of State approving agency; and

" '(7) such other fair and reasonable provisions as are considered necessary by the appropriate State approving agency.

" '§ 1956. Disapproval of course and discontinuance of allowances.

" '(a) Any course approved for the purposes of this chapter which fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter shall be immediately disapproved by the appropriate State approving agency. An educational institution or training establishment which has its courses disapproved by a State approving agency will be notified of such disapproval by a certified or registered letter of notification and a return receipt secured.

" '(b) The Administrator may discontinue the education and training allowance of any eligible veteran if he finds that the course of education or training in which such veteran is enrolled fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter or if he finds that the educational institution or training establishment offering such course has violated any provisions of this chapter or fails to meet any of its requirements.

" '(c) Each State approving agency shall notify the Administrator of each course which it has disapproved under this section.

" '*Subchapter VII—Miscellaneous Provisions*

" '§ 1961. Authority and duties of Administrator

" 'Payments under this chapter shall be subject to audit and review by the General Accounting Office as provided by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 and the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950.

" '§ 1962. Educational and vocational counseling

" 'The Administrator may arrange for educational and vocational counseling to persons eligible for education and training under this chapter. At such intervals as he deems necessary, he shall make available information respecting the need for general education and for trained personnel in the various crafts, trades, and professions. Facilities of other Federal agencies collecting such information shall be utilized to the extent he deems practicable.

" '§ 1963. Control by agencies of United States

" 'No department, agency, or officer of the United States, in carrying out this chapter, shall exercise any supervision or control, whatsoever, over any State approving agency, State educational agency, or State apprenticeship agency, or any educational institution or training establishment. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prevent any department, agency, or officer of the United States from exercising any supervision or control which such department, agency, or officer is authorized by law to exercise over any Federal educational institution or training establishment, or to prevent the furnishing of education or training under this chapter in any institution or establishment over which supervision or control is exercised by such other department, agency, or officer under authority of existing provisions of law.

" '§ 1964. Conflicting interests

" '(a) Every officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, or of the Office of Education, who has, while such an officer or employee, owned any interest in, or received any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, any educational institution operated for profit in which an eligible veteran was pursuing a course of education or training under this chapter shall be immediately dismissed from his office or employment.

" '(b) If the Administrator finds that any person who is an officer or employee of a State approving agency has, while he was such an officer or employee, owned any interest in, or received any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, an educational institution operated for profit in which an eligible veteran was pursuing a course of education or training under this chapter, he shall discontinue making payments under section 1945 of this title to such State approving agency unless such as may be necessary to terminate the employment of such person and such payments shall not be resumed while such person is an officer or employee of the State approving agency, or State department of veterans affairs or State department of education.

" '(c) A State approving agency shall not approve any course offered by an educational institution operated for profit and, if any such course has been approved, shall disapprove each such course, if it finds that any officer or employee of the Veterans Administration, the Office of Education, or the State approving agency owns an interest in, or receives any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, such institution.

" '(d) The Administrator may, after reasonable notice and public hearings, waive in writing the application of this section in the case of any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, of the Office of Education, or of a State approving agency, if he finds that no detriment will result to the United States or to eligible veterans by reason of such interest or connection of such officer or employee.

" '§ 1965. Reports by institutions

" '(a) Educational institutions and training establishments shall, without delay, report to the Administrator in the form prescribed by him, the enrollment, interruption, and termination of the education or training of each eligible veteran enrolled therein under this chapter.

" '(b) The Administrator shall pay to each educational institution which is required to submit reports and certifications to the Administrator under this chapter, an allowance at the rate of $1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution under the provisions of this chapter to assist the educational institution in defraying the expense of preparing and submitting such reports and certifications. Such allowances shall be paid in such manner and at such times as may be prescribed by the Administrator, except that if any institution fails to submit reports or certifications to the Administrator as required by this chapter, no allowance shall be paid to such institution for the month or months during which such reports or certifications were not submitted as required by the Administrator.

"'§ 1966. Overpayments to veterans

"'Whenever the Administrator finds that an overpayment has been made to a veteran as the result of (1) the willful or negligent failure of the educational institution or training establishment to report, as required by this chapter and applicable regulations, to the Veterans' Administration excessive absences from a course, or discontinuance or interruption of a course by the veteran, or (2) false certification by the educational institution or training establishment, the amount of such overpayment shall constitute a liability of such institution or establishment, and may be recovered in the same manner as any other debt due the United States. Any amount so collected shall be reimbursed if the overpayment is recovered from the veteran. This section shall not preclude the imposition of any civil or criminal liability under this or any other law.

"'§ 1967. Examination of records

"'The records and accounts of educational institutions and training establishments pertaining to eligible veterans who received education or training under this chapter shall be available for examination by duly authorized representatives of the Government.

"'§ 1968. False or misleading statements

"'In each case where the Administrator finds that an educational institution or training establishment has willfully submitted a false or misleading claim, or where a veteran, with the complicity of an educational institution or training establishment, has submitted such a claim, he shall make a complete report of the facts of the case to the appropriate State approving agency and where deemed advisable to the Attorney General of the United States for appropriate action.

"'§ 1969. Information furnished by Federal Trade Commission

"'The Federal Trade Commission shall keep all State approving agencies advised of any information coming to its attention which would be of assistance to such agencies in carrying out their duties under this chapter.

"'§ 1970. Effective date and retroactive allowances

"'The provisions of this chapter shall take effect as of September 1, 1965. In the event this chapter is enacted subsequent to such date, the Administrator shall prescribe regulations for making retroactive payments of education and training allowances, upon application therefor, to eligible veterans for education or training pursued by them on or after September 1, 1965, and prior to the date of the enactment of this chapter.'

"(b) The table of contents at the beginning of such title is amended by inserting immediately after

"'39. Automobiles for Disabled Veterans .... 1901'

the following:

"'40. Education of Veterans Who Serve Between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1967 .... 1908'.

"(c) The table of chapters at the beginning of part III of such title is amended by inserting immediately after

"'39. Automobiles for Disabled Veterans .... 1901'

the following:

"'40. Education of Veterans Who served Between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1967 .... 1908'.

"(d) Such title is further amended—

"(1) by inserting in section 102(a)(2) immediately after 'chapter 33' the following: 'or 40', and by striking out 'chapters 19 and 33' in section 102(b), and inserting in lieu thereof 'chapters 19, 33, and 40';

"(2) by striking out in section 111(a) '33 or 35' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '33, 35, or 40';

"(3) by inserting in section 211(a) after '1761,' the following: '1961,';

"(4) by striking out in section 1662(b) 'chapters 31 and 35' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'chapters 31, 35, and 40';

"(5) by striking out in section 1711(b) 'chapter 31 or 33', and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'chapter 31, 33, or 40';

"(6) by striking out in section 1734(a) 'chapter 31 or 33' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'chapter 31, 33, or 40';

"(7) by striking out in section 3013 'and 35' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '35 and 40';

"(8) by inserting after 'chapter 35' in section 1611(a)(2) the following: 'or education or training under chapter 40'; and

"(9) by inserting in section 1634 immediately before the comma following 'therein' the following: 'under this chapter or chapter 40'.

"SEC. 7. (a) Chapter 37 of title 33, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after section 1817 the following new section:

"'§ 1818. Veterans of a period of hostilities

"'(a) Each veteran who served on active duty during a period of hostilities shall be eligible for the benefits of this chapter, subject to the provisions of this section, if his total service was for a period of ninety days or more, or if he was discharged or released from a period of active duty, any part of which was served during a period of hostilities, for a service-connected disability.

"'(b) No veteran shall be eligible for benefits under this section so long as he is eligible under this chapter for any unused benefits derived from service during World War II or the Korean conflict. Any veteran who is eligible for benefits under this section and who has obtained benefits under this chapter by reason of service during World War II or the Korean conflict shall have his benefits under this section reduced by the amount of any benefits previously obtained under this chapter. Benefits shall not be afforded under this section to any individual on account of service as a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, or the Regular or Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service.

"'(c) Loans may be made or guaranteed under this section in the case of any eligible veteran if made not more than ten years from the date of such veteran's discharge or release from his last period of active duty, any part of which occurred during the period of hostilities on which his eligibility is based, plus an additional period equal to one year for each three months of active duty performed by the veteran in such area of hostilities, except that entitlement shall not continue in any case after January 31, 1985, nor shall entitlement expire in any case prior to January 31, 1975.

"'(d) If a loan report or an application for loan guaranty relating to a loan authorized by this section is received by the Administrator before the date of the expiration of the veteran's entitlement, the loan may be guaranteed or insured pursuant to the provisions of this section after such date; and if a commitment for a direct loan is issued by the Administrator on or before the date of expiration of the veteran's entitlement, the loan may be made after such date.'

"(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 37 of such title is amended by inserting below

"'1817. Release from liability under guaranty.'

the following:

"'1818. Veterans of a period of hostilities.'

"SEC. 8. (a) Section 1901(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'or the Korean conflict' and inserting in lieu thereof ', the Korean conflict, or a period of hostilities.'

"(b) Section 1905 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'In the case of any veteran whose eligibility under this chapter is based upon service performed during a period of hostilities and whose date of discharge or release from active military, naval, or air service preceded the date of enactment of this sentence, the five-year period referred to in the first sentence of this section shall not begin to run until such date of enactment.'

SEC. 9. (a) Section 2101(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after 'Korean conflict' the following: 'or a period of hostilities'."

"(b) Section 2101(b)(1) of such title is amended by striking out 'if he is a commissioned officer,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'if he is a commissioned officer whose eligibility under this chapter is based upon service during the Korean conflict,'.

"(c) Section 2102(a) of such title is amended by—

"(1) striking out 'Mustering-out payment for persons eligible under section 2101 of this title shall be in sums as follows:' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(1) Mustering-out payment for persons whose eligibility under section 2101 of this title is based on service during the Korean conflict shall be in sums as follows:';

"(2) redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively; and

"(3) adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"'(2) Mustering-out payments for persons whose eligibility under section 2101 of this title is based on service during a period of hostilities shall be in the sum of $300.'.

(d) Section 2102(b) of such title is amended by—

"(1) striking out in the first sentence '(a)(1)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(a)(1)(A) or (a)(2)';

"(2) striking out in the second sentence '(a)(2)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(a)(1)(B)'; and

"(3) striking out in the third sentence '(a)(3)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(a)(1)(C)'.

"(e) Section 2104 of such title is amended by—

"(1) striking out in the first sentence 'entitled to mustering-out payment' and inserting in lieu thereof 'entitled to mustering-out payment by virtue of service performed during the Korean conflict and'; and

"(2) inserting after the first sentence a new sentence as follows 'Any member of the Armed Forces entitled to mustering-out payment by virtue of service performed during a period of hostilities and who was discharged or relieved from active duty under honorable conditions prior to the date of enactment of this sentence shall, if application therefor is made within two years after the date of enactment of this sentence, be paid such payment by the Secretary concerned beginning within one month after application has been received and approved.'

"SEC. 10. (a) Chapter 53 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"'§ 3111. Authority of President To Designate Areas of Hostilities

"'In order that certain provisions of this title, applicable only to veterans who perform service during wartime, may be applicable to veterans who have been called upon, during periods when the United States is not engaged in a formally declared war, to serve in areas of the world in which armed conflict or other warlike conditions exist, the President is authorized to designate by Executive order any area of the world outside the United States as an area of hostilities, if he finds (1) that members of the Armed Forces will be called upon to serve in such area, and (2) that while serving in such area members of the Armed Forces are likely to be subjected to armed conflict or similar hazardous, warlike conditions. In designating any area of the world as an area of hostilities the President shall identify such area in geographic terms and shall, for purposes of benefits under this title, specify the date on which such area becomes on area of hostilities, and, at such time as he finds that members of the Armed Forces are no longer serving in such area or that warlike conditions no longer exist in such area, specify the date on which such area ceases to be an area of hostilities. No period prior to February 1, 1955, may be designated, under authority of this section, as a period of hostilities.'

"(b) The table of chapters at the beginning of chapter 53 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'3111. Authority of President To Designate Areas of Hostilities.'

"Amend the title to read as follows: 'A bill to authorize wartime benefits under certain circumstances for peacetime veterans and their dependents.'"

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask that the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CIRCUMVENTION OF THE MALLORY RULE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last Friday I made a speech in the Senate in which I set forth my reasons for objecting to the so-called rules of criminal procedure in the questioning of persons arrested by the Washington, D.C., Police Department.

The RECORD will show that in the course of that speech I said I thought it constituted a scuttling of the Mallory rule.

This morning, in the Washington Post, the lead editorial is entitled "Round Robin Hood's Barn." The first sentence reads:

> The Department of Justice and the U.S. attorney have advised the Metropolitan Police Department to circumvent the Mallory rule instead of trying to overturn it by legislation.

Mr. President, the major points in the editorial involve some of the same points that I covered in my speech on Friday night, although I stated additional reasons why I felt the recommendations of Mr. Acheson and Mr. Clark were unsound. I am sure that the Washington Post wrote its editorial without any knowledge of my speech. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 19, 1965]

ROUND ROBIN HOOD'S BARN

The Department of Justice and the U.S. attorney have advised the Metropolitan Police Department to circumvent the Mallory rule instead of trying to overturn it by legislation. While the advice is undoubtedly well meant, we think it is likely to lead to frustration. Under its terms, the police could detain a suspect in a police station and interrogate him concerning a crime for as much as 3 hours—"exclusive of interruptions." Two clear constitutional objections appear to be raised by this proposal.

Arrest is a very grave matter among free men. The fourth amendment to the Constitution says that it is permissible only when there is probable cause to believe the arrested person guilty of a particular crime. And the existence of probable cause, it follows, is to be determined not by the police in their unchecked discretion but a judicial officer. This is why the law at present requires the police to take an arrested person before a committing magistrate "without unnecessary delay."

To say that the police may hold a suspect in a police station for "investigative purpose" is to permit a return to something uncomfortably reminiscent of the arrests for investigation only recently forbidden by the District Commissioners because they were unconstitutional. The express purpose of Mr. Acheson's recommendation is to enable the police to investigate a crime by questioning a suspect—that is, to obtain, by interrogation, the basis for charging him with a crime and establishing probable cause when he is subsequently taken before a magistrate.

The proposed course seems to us constitutionally indefensible on a second count. In his letter to the Chief of Police, Mr. Acheson wrote: "One under arrest should be permitted to communicate with a lawyer, relative, or friend, and such persons should be given access to him. Such communication or access should not, however, be allowed where there is reason to believe it is sought for the purpose of concealing or destroying evidence or otherwise defeating the ends of justice."

What this seems to say is that an accused person may have the assistance of counsel provided he wants to cooperate with the law; but the Constitution guarantees the assistance of counsel indistinguishably to the innocent and the guilty. If the latter desire a lawyer to "defeat the ends of justice," they are entitled to have him. The burden of proving a crime rests on the prosecution.

Mr. Acheson seems to think that the rights of an arrested person can be met by having a policeman tell him of those rights. He proposes, therefore, that a policeman tell the suspect that he need not answer questions, that he may have a lawyer and that "if you cannot afford a lawyer, one may be appointed for you when you first go to court." What a mockery this would make of the principle of equal justice under law. A rich man could have the help of a lawyer during police interrogation; a poor man could have a lawyer only after he had made damaging admissions and been brought to trial on the basis of them.

In a statement before the Senate District Committee on Thursday, Deputy Attorney General Ramsey Clark, while endorsing the Acheson proposals, made some very sound recommendations for combating crime in the District of Columbia. He urged tightening of the law here relating to the possession of firearms, enlargement of the court of general sessions, better equipment for the Police Department, increased police pay and manpower and similar practical measures for strengthening law enforcement.

At the same time, he urged the committee "to refrain from action in the Mallory area pending a review of experience under the police procedures initiated yesterday." This seems to us extremely good advice. We think, however, that experience with these procedures will lead inevitably to judicial rejection of them as unconstitutional. But this is at least preferable to counseling Congress to enact a law which the courts would be obliged to declare invalid. The right response to the Mallory rule, in our judgment, is to accept it and live with it as implicit in the concept of ordered liberty.

COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee I support the bill sponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas.

This bill would provide men who have served in the Armed Forces over the last 10 years, and those who follow them, direct assistance with the cost of their higher education and loan assistance for the purchases of homes and farms. This type of program has been in existence since 1944. It is accepted throughout the country. Its procedures are well known and, by this time, easy to administer.

Both the GI bills of World War II and the Korean war created educational opportunities that would not otherwise have existed for many young men. As a result, today there are half a million engineers, over 300,000 teachers, 200,000 men in medical sciences, and close to 160,000 physicists, to mention but a few occupational categories, who are in their careers as a result of the GI bill.

This bill helps finance what every man needs to get started: An education and a home. The men who belong to our armed services for the most part would not be able to afford this start on their own. If their families are well enough off to send them to college, chances are they will not have to serve in the military at all. This is a defect of our system—extremely inequitable, but extremely real.

Nor can they expect to finance what they need to get started with the money they make in the service. The highest ranking private in the Army makes less money in a month than the average factory worker makes in a week. A sergeant with 6 years' service makes only $60 a week, which is barely above what has been established as poverty level. The average draftee, even if he put all his pay in the bank and spent nothing, could not save enough in a year to cover the average annual tuition costs at a private university.

This is another defect in our system, which we have been trying to remedy in part by the Military Pay Act before us this year. But even the levels of the new act will not do this job.

I have always been deeply committed to the principle that every young American who is qualified for a college education should receive one. I also deeply believe that the Government should do more to bring homeownership within the reach of more people. We have begun a Federal scholarship program—but it is not large. We have a system of college loans—but they do not begin to cover all qualified students who apply. We have a very successful Federal housing insurance program—but interest rates are too high for persons earning under $6,000 a year to even consider owning their own homes in most of our centers of population.

Until we can broaden these general programs I believe there is a great need for a specific program, like S. 9, which benefits those who have made a contribution through their military service and who also happen to be greatly in need of such assistance. I look on this bill not so much as an expression of gratitude, but as an extension of opportunity, and an investment in young people. I hope that the Senate will listen to the arguments that have been so carefully developed by the senior Senator from Texas and pass this bill.

I express my appreciation to my colleague from Massachusetts for permitting me to make these few remarks in support of the proposed legislation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the senior Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the Senator from Texas without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I commend the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for his cogent, concise, and effective statement. He is an active and effective member of the Veterans' Subcommittee. He took part actively in the hearings, which were extensive. They were the most complete hearings we have ever had. We covered every facet of the proposed legislation, and I believe that we have shown indisputably the great need for it.

The distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts has been a moving force on the bill in the Veterans' Subcommittee, in the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and now on the floor of the Senate. I commend him for his active, continued, and dynamic interest in the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Texas and also his leadership on this important and fundamental undertaking which the Senate is considering today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the pending Saltonstall amendment there be a time limitation of 1 hour, one-half hour to be under the control of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the other half hour to be under the control of the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I find that several other Senators desire to speak. If the majority leader would be willing to modify the time for debate to three-quarters an an hour on each side rather than a half hour, I think that would be satisfactory.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I so modify my unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana, as modified? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have offered my amendment, which is a substitute to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield myself such time as I need.

Mr. President, I have offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which is in substance Senate bill 520, that was filed with a number of sponsors on January 15, 1965. That has been rewritten, and it appears on page 17128 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, July 16, 1965.

First, I pay tribute to the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. He worked diligently and effectively on the measure before us today.

For many years the Senator from Texas led the fight for the measure, despite opposition on the part of President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, President Johnson, the Veterans' Administration, the Defense Department, and the Bureau of the Budget.

He has been an articulate and persistent advocate. I wish that he were on my side of this question.

My amendment in the nature of a substitute differs from S. 9 in one fundamental way. I shall first point out that difference, and then explain some of the other differences.

The amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], S. 9, would apply to every veteran who has been a member of the Armed Forces from 1955 to 1967.

My bill, the substitute, would apply to those who have served in areas of hostilities as declared by the President.

For that reason, the number of persons who would be entitled to benefits under the substitute would be the persons who have served in the area of hostilities, as opposed to every member who served in the armed services. That is the primary difference.

The secondary difference is in the benefits.

Under my proposal those eligible for benefits and their dependents would be eligible for benefits in excess of those provided in S. 9.

These benefits I would provide would be similar to those provided veterans of the Korean conflict.

For example, they include, first, eligibility for non-service-connected disability pensions; second, pensions for widows of veterans killed in service; third, pensions for children of veterans killed in service; fourth, a permanent plan of limited life insurance policies or limited convertible 5-year level premium term policies; fifth, business loans; and sixth, up to $1,600 toward supplying automobile for service-connected disability; seventh, mustering out pay of $300.

In addition, the benefits that are provided by S. 9 and by my bill include home and farm loans, and educational benefits up to $160 a month based on a formula of 1½ times the number of days in active service for up to 36 months.

Those last two benefits are in Senate bill 9, but the other benefits are provided in my bill for men who have served in an area of hostilities.

An argument is made that the President will hesitate to declare an area to be one of hostilities; but that does not apply today to Vietnam and areas adjacent thereto, which have been designated as combat zones for the purpose of giving servicemen in those areas the same kind of tax relief given servicemen during the Korean war. This special tax relief was made retroactive to January 1, 1964. One month and nine days later, the Department of Defense, through directive No. 1340.6, dated June 2, 1965, provided for servicemen in the same area hostile fire pay benefits similar to those extended in the form of combat pay during the earlier conflicts. This order was made effective June 1, 1965. So it is perfectly clear that the areas around Vietnam and in the waters adjacent thereto are today considered hostile areas. These men are actually bearing the brunt of our battle against communism, and their benefits could well be augmented by Congress through providing for them and their dependents on the same basis, and with the same sort of recognition that was given to those who served in World War II.

S. 9, the bill sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Texas, would apply to more than 3 million men today. Its annual cost is estimated to be between $400 and $500 million; or for 5 years, as appears in the report, $1.933 billion. Of course, it is impossible to estimate the cost of the bill with respect to men who are in areas of hostilities, because it is not known how many men will go into such areas. Neither is it known how long they will be there nor what the ultimate situation will be.

The fundamental difference between the two bills is one of giving benefits to men who have served under fire in an area declared by the President to be an area of hostilities, as opposed to giving benefits to every veteran, every member of the armed services, wherever he may have served from 1955 until 1967.

An argument is made that men give up 2 years of their lives when they are asked to serve in the defense of their country. If they are serving in this country, and serving without physical danger to themselves, they can go forward with their educational benefits; they can receive the other benefits to which a man in the service is entitled, including fringe benefits and all other benefits that are provided them. If they are serving in an area of hostilities, they are entitled to more benefits than if they are not serving in such an area.

Furthermore, men who serve in this country receive useful training in the service itself. So when it is said that they are handicapped during 2 years of their lives, or that they give up 2 years of their lives in the service of their country, that is true; but they will also receive benefits in the days to come, after they leave the service.

It is perfectly clear that the Department of Defense has testified against the bill, because it believes it would handicap the Department in keeping men in the service. The Veterans' Administration is against it. I have read in the minority views that the Veterans of Foreign Wars is against it. We know that the Bureau of the Budget is against it. Three administrations have been against the bill.

I hope that we shall grant benefits to those to whom they are due—that is, to those serving in areas of hostilities—and not spread benefits to those who do not serve in such areas, and thus put these latter servicemen in the same class with respect to benefits as men who are risking their lives in areas of hostility.

I hope my amendment may be substituted for the bill introduced by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Are not men who serve in the Defense Establishment subject to being sent into battle at any time?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I assume they are.

Mr. AIKEN. They have nothing to say as to whether they shall go or not, have they?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; but when they got into areas of hostilities, they would become subject to these benefits. When they entered an area which had been declared to be an area of hostilities they would receive the benefits which would come from the risks and hazards of service in that area.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Reserves are called up, and the National Guard is called into service, they will all be subject to being sent into areas of hostilities, will they not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes; and when they get there, they will be eligible to receive these benefits.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator consider the Dominican Republic an area of hostilities?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is subject to a difference of opinion. So far as I know, the Dominican Republic has not been declared by the President to be an area of hostilities.

Mr. AIKEN. Will not that difference of opinion create much controversy, indecision, and possibly injustice in determining which men shall be subject to the benefits of the Saltonstall amendment and which ones will not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would not say so. I would not agree with the Senator from Vermont, for this reason: The declaration would be up to the President. If the President declared the Dominican Republic to be an area of hostilities, the men who are serving there would receive these benefits. If he did not declare the Dominican Republic to be an area of hostilities, the men who were killed there and who compiled other war records would be eligible for consideration in a special bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Would a person who served in Da Nang be eligible to receive such benefits, as compared with one who served in Cambridge, Mass.?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Would there be any differential in pay or benefits as between a person who served in South Vietnam and one who served, let us say, in Cambridge, Mass.?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is a great distinction. It is a distinction, if the distinguished Senator listened to me, that I tried to make earlier in my remarks.

Mr. AIKEN. Do they receive exactly the same pay now?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; they do not receive exactly the same pay now, but those serving in South Vietnam do not get these special benefits either. They receive benefits by reason of serving in a combat zone. They get $50 a month more.

Mr. AIKEN. Has the President ever stated whether he considers the Dominican Republic an area of hostilities?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have not heard that he has; but, if he should do so at a later time, the bill would cover men who served there. If he did not do so at a later time, the dependents of those brave men who have given their lives there should be entitled to special benefits and assistance under a special bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Assuming that half a million men are sent into southeast Asia—and that does not seem to be an unreasonable assumption—will not these men probably be rotated in their service, and will they not all be taking a risk, too?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Certainly. Under my substitute, they would receive the same benefits as those received by veterans who served in Korea, but not the same benefits as those received by men who served in World War II. The difference between Korean War veterans and World War II veterans, as I understand, is that although both classes of veterans received allowances, the Korean war veterans did not receive educational expenses in addition to their allowances.

My amendment provides that those who are serving today in Vietnam would receive the same benefits as those who served in Korea.

Mr. AIKEN. It would be their good luck, perhaps, for those men who are awaiting their turn to serve, if they were not called upon to go to Vietnam.

I am trying to reconcile the situation in my mind. If in doubt, I should prefer to give the benefit to all of them. Perhaps some of them may be called in the Reserves and have to leave their homes. They would have to leave their jobs. Would anything be done to require employers to retain the jobs for these men?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That would not be covered in my proposed measure. I do not believe that it is covered in the bill of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there is some provision for job retention. However, the problem is that the prospective draftee cannot get hired. The employers look at the draft potentials and fear that when they start to train a man or utilize him in the plant, he will be called up.

The prospect is that a draftee will have great difficulty in securing employment today. He is handicapped all the way around.

I point out that the radio reported this morning that a unit of the 1st Division in Vietnam that was under heavy Communist mortar fire consisted of 60 percent draftees. Those men are being drafted and taken from employment. They are the men who are receiving the rough service, whether they are in Vietnam, in training for replacements, or whether they are endangered by being flown overseas with death facing them.

A plane crashed in southern California. Every one of the 72 marines on board was killed. More than a dozen Air Force men were killed.

Two planes collided en route to Vietnam. Would that be in the area of hostilities?

Mr. SALSTONSTALL. Mr. President, when the President declares an area to be an area of hostilities, any man who goes over there, whether he be in an airplane or in a ship, would be in a risk area.

There is a great distinction in my mind between that man and the man who would be receiving educational benefits while serving in a hospital or in a training camp in the United States. The man serving in the United States would receive the benefit of being in the service and in addition, would receive the educational advantages that would accrue to him from the proposed bill. There are many benefits to be realized from serving even though the area of service were not an area of hostilities.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, rather than deny benefits to those who were favored by fate and were not in combat, I should think it would be fair to provide benefits for all and double or triple the benefits for those who go into conflict.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. AIKEN. It would seem to be fair to give the benefits to all of them. They are all subject to the same hazards, depending on the judgment of the President and the generals.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As for those who go into areas of hostility, my amendment would provide seven basic benefits which the bill of the Senator from Texas would not provide.

For instance, any man who goes into these areas, would receive, as do veterans of the Korean conflict:

1. Non-service-connected disability pensions.
2. Pensions for widows of veterans killed in service.
3. Pensions for children of veterans killed in service.
4. Permanent plan life insurance policies or limited convertible 5-year-level premium term policies.
5. Business loans.

6. Up to $1,600 toward buying automobiles for service-connected disabled, and

7. Mustering-out pay of $300.

Those benefits would be provided in my amendment for those who served in an area of hostilities, as opposed to the bill of the Senator from Texas, which would provide for the same educational advantages that my amendment would, except that my amendment would provide for the advantages to be given after 90 days of service and the bill of the Senator from Texas would provide for them to be given after 180 days. Both measures would provide for home and farm loans.

I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, we have heard the differential made as between a man serving his country stateside and a man serving in South Vietnam or in the Dominican Republic.

Would the pending measure include men who are on duty on the early warning line, men who are on duty in Alaska, or men who are tied in with scientific and advanced implementation?

It is my understanding that we are trying to do something to repay the boys who have had their lives disturbed by giving up a period of their lives to the service of their country.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MURPHY. A boy is honored to have the privilege of serving his country. However, his life is disturbed whether he serves in a camp such as Camp Pendleton in California or in South Vietnam. The choice is not the boy's.

I wonder if it would not be unfair to restrict the educational allowance to those who have served in an area of hostility, as provided for in the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

I am in complete agreement with the proposal that veterans receive straight benefits for education. It seems that the deciding factor would be whether the life of the veteran would have been disturbed by this period during which he served in the Armed Forces of his country.

We want to give the man an opportunity to make up for the time that he has lost.

There seem to be two things that concern us. There are many places in which one can serve and experience great danger without going to South Vietnam or the Dominican Republic.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, my amendment would afford the same benefits for education as would the bill of the Senator from Texas, except that my amendment would apply after 90 days of service and the bill of the Senator from Texas would apply after 180 days.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I understood the Senator to say that the benefits contained in his proposal would apply only to those who served in a combat area.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is strictly true. However, there are certain educational benefits and other benefits that are now provided for by law. There is the housing bill which we passed the other day, there is the education bill which we will soon consider, and there is the National Defense Education Act which is already law. The benefits contained in all of those bills would be available to the veterans.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I was merely questioning the differentiation between the giving of education allowances. Whether a man was stationed in South Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, Camp Pendleton in California, on the early warning line, or in Alaska, his life would be interrupted.

It seems to me that he should receive some benefit.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the man who served in Camp Pendleton would receive all the benefits that are offered in the service for bettering his education. Those opportunities are ample, if the Senator will believe me as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. There are ample opportunities afforded to a man in service if he is willing to accept them. They are quite adequate.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

I do not believe it is fair for wartime veterans and peacetime trainees to be given the same advantages and benefits.

There is a great difference between serving in an area in which there is security and serving in an area in which one's life is in constant jeopardy.

The purpose originally, as I understood the World War II and the Korean bill, was to give such benefits to those whose lives were in jeopardy, or who stood to be in jeopardy at a moment's notice in actual combat.

It is an honor for a man to serve his country in peace or in war. I do not look upon one who serves in peacetime as having his life jeopardized to the extent that his country owes him the same consideration given to veterans of World War II or the Korean conflict.

We would not have freedom today if the lives of citizens had not been interrupted and jeopardized in those great and momentous times.

If a young man were to remain in this country, he could attend college in the afternoon and evening or receive training in the service, as so many have done and are doing today. A man serving in an area of hostility could not do that.

I am convinced that the criterion should be whether a man served in an area of hostility. One's life is in jeopardy in an area of hostility. A man can be killed at any moment. However, if a man is back in the States, he can go to school at night. He is not endangered. Why should the man who is serving in the States today receive the same benefits as a man who is fighting in the swamps or in the woods in Vietnam, or the same benefits as soldiers who fought in the Normandy hedgerows in World War II, or in Korea, or in other areas?

It seems to me there is a real distinction that the Congress has recognized up until now in failing to enact the same proposal as is pending now in previous sessions of Congress. I feel that this is wise. I do not say that we ought to follow the same pattern merely because previous administrations have taken similar positions on the proposal, but it is noteworthy that the same plan was advocated during the Eisenhower administration and Congress turned it down. It was advocated during the Kennedy administration and Congress turned it down. It has been turned down so far under the Johnson administration. No action has been taken on it. If the Johnson administration does not favor a bill to spend money, it must be of very dubious merit.

It is my opinion that we ought not pass this bill in its present form. The amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts should be adopted. The bill would cost approximately $1.93 billion the first 5 years—almost $2 billion. The Saltonstall amendment would require outlay of funds substantially lower than this.

The main point, however, is I believe, a question of equity. The Saltonstall amendment offers an approach which is more fair, in the long run, to all.

When a young man goes in the service he does not altogether disrupt his life. He receives training in one or more fields, good medical examinations, and many other benefits. He receives dental care benefits. He is compensated for any inconvenience in many and varied ways which I am sure all Senators are aware.

In my opinion, he receives many benefits that a man who is not in the service does not receive. It is important that a man receive this training. So when he is not being harmed or jeopardized or handicapped by going into an area of hostilities, it is my judgment that the man is greatly benefited, whether he goes overseas or elsewhere.

Mr. President, we cannot pay a man what he is worth. No man is paid what he is worth. He is either overpaid or underpaid, based on someone's judgment. We cannot judge what it is worth, on the basis of dollars and cents, for a man to perform a patriotic duty in serving his country.

I believe the Saltonstall amendment should be adopted. I feel that if the amendment is not adopted, the bill probably will not pass. It is my judgment that the House will not pass the bill unless we adopt the Saltonstall amendment, or possibly the Cooper amendment, which will be offered later if the Saltonstall amendment is not adopted. But the Saltonstall amendment gives us a criterion. If a man is serving in an area of hostilities, his life is jeopardized. He may be killed at any moment. Therefore, he is entitled to greater benefits than is someone who serves back home, whose life is not jeopardized or in danger.

The average serviceman can go to school at night, he can visit his family and his friends and go to picture shows and enjoy other forms of entertainment. That is a vastly different situation from being in an area of hostilities, and should be recognized and treated differently.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment. Some factors have not been brought out so far in the debate which I think should be brought out. First of all, I say with all deference to the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], a sponsor of the major bill, that I have also sat in on a number of hearings, as ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs. I have read the hearings. I admire the tenacity with which the Senator from Texas has supported his thesis. I was happy to vote the bill out of subcommittee so it could be acted upon by the whole committee. But, Mr. President, we have been debating for a couple of days this particular proposal, and on each occasion we keep running up against the statement that we have to do something about the poor young people who have been called into the service against their will and forced into the service. It is interesting that out of the total number of persons on active duty, only 10 percent of them have been drafted. Out of the approximately 2,640,000 in active service, only some 210,000 are draftees. So the large proportion of the persons in the Armed Forces are those who have enlisted voluntarily. They are there to serve their country. They are there to try to do what they can do to support their country and to protect the liberties they think are so worthwhile. Only 10 percent have felt the icy finger of Uncle Sam and have been drafted into the service.

The second question is whether or not we have given them an adequate opportunity to obtain the benefits of educational programs. We are now engaged, in the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in the markup of a higher education bill to supplement the National Defense Education Act and to supplement other educational programs. Three years ago Judge SMITH, chairman of the subcommittee in the House, said he had grave doubt as to whether we should consider in that session any more education bills, because of the fact that he was unable to find out how much money was going out of the Treasury Department into the hands of those who were dispensing the money for purposes of education. If my recollection is correct, it was estimated that there were 24 different types of Federal education programs in existence and that money to the tune of $2 billion a year was going out of the Treasury to pay for these programs.

It is hard for me to see any real logic in the statement that, unless we pass this bill, these men, when they leave the service, are to be deprived of educational opportunities. It is not a fact. Those who serve in areas of hostility are entitled to some recognition and special help.

Let us see what agencies are for and against the bill of the Senator from Texas. It seems to me interesting to look at the record of hearings and see what they contain. What does the Defense Department say?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DOMINICK. May I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Let us see what the Department of Defense said on February 26, 1965.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, what page of the hearings is the Senator reading from?

Mr. DOMINICK. Page 66. I shall not read the whole statement, but only a paragraph:

> The Department of Defense recognizes that S. 9 involves a question of broad national policy beyond the scope of the Department. However, it must be pointed out that proposals of this nature have a very definite effect on the ability of the Armed Forces to retain qualified personnel. Programs of education and vocational assistance encourage personnel to leave military service immediately after accruing the maximum benefits which can be gained. This results in a serious handicap to the Armed Forces in their efforts to attract and retain qualified personnel on a career basis.

The letter continues and gives more reasons, but on an earlier page of the hearings, page 64, this is what the Veterans' Administration said in its report:

> The Veterans' Administration has opposed bills providing peacetime veterans readjustment benefits (such as education and training) on the ground that this type of benefit should be limited to situations where wartime service sharply disrupted career planning and called for special Government aid to ease the transition from wartime service back to civilian life.

This is the kind of program the Senator from Massachusetts is offering in his substitute. It is not the kind of program provided by S. 9. We could go further through the hearing. The veterans organizations themselves are split as to whether it should or should not be passed, but I do not know any veterans organization or any department which is opposed to giving special benefits to those who serve in an area of hostility. This is what the Senator from Massachusetts is trying to do.

At this time, in the areas of hostility already mentioned, and in southeast Asia in particular, we can see the war escalating in front of our eyes. It seems to me, therefore, that this is an appropriate time to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts in lieu of the other amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am not one of those who believe that 2 years of service in the Armed Forces is a drawback physically, mentally, or morally to the average young American. On the contrary, I believe they frequently come out of the service stronger physically and better morally and mentally than when they went in, and rise up to their highest capacity in civil life.

This morning, I asked the Veterans of Foreign Wars, a leading veterans organization confined to helping those who have served in the Armed Forces on foreign soil in defense of the American flag during the war, what its policy was in regard to this matter, and I have received a letter from it, dated today, enclosing a resolution adopted at its 64th national convention in Seattle, Wash., in August 1963, making it clear that it supports the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, S. 520, which is now offered as a substitute.

I ask unanimous consent to have that letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City, Mo., July 19, 1965.

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Veterans of Foreign Wars supports readjustment benefits for cold war veterans who have served in areas of hostilities for which a campaign badge or medal was authorized.

This position was laid down and approved at our 64th National Convention which was held in August of 1963 in Seattle, Wash. A copy of the resolution identified as No. 83, entitled "Support S. 1011—Benefits Cold War Veterans" is enclosed.

The bill referred to, S. 1011, 88th Congress, is practically identical to S. 520, 89th Congress, which bill is now pending in the Finance Committee.

The VFW, therefore, supports the proposal contained in S. 520 which will authorize educational, training and housing loan benefits for those veterans whose service has been in areas designated as "hot spots" since the official ending of the Korean conflict on January 31, 1955.

The underlying philosophy of the resolution is that readjustment benefits which were authorized by the GI bills of World War II and the Korean conflict were for wartime veterans. Such benefits, therefore, should be extended and made available to veterans of the cold war whose service is equivalent to wartime service.

It has been always the official position of the VFW that all campaign and expeditionary service for which a badge or medal is authorized should be elevated to wartime service for the purpose of entitlement to veterans rights and benefits.

S. 520 or its equivalent will help carry out our longstanding position in this regard by elevating to wartime status for entitlement to readjustment benefits all service rendered by cold war veterans since the Korean conflict which has been recognized as wartime service by the authorizing of a campaign badge or medal.

Your favorable consideration of these views in your deliberations will be deeply appreciated by the 1,300,000 members of the VFW.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

Enclosure.

RESOLUTION NO. 83—SUPPORT S. 1011: BENEFITS COLD WAR VETERANS

Whereas American servicemen are daily risking life and limb on numerous cold war fronts throughout the world; and

Whereas veterans who served in West Berlin, Laos, Vietnam, the Quemoy and Matsu Islands are eligible to become members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; and

Whereas veterans who served under the United Nations banner in the Congo, although an act of war was never declared by the United States, are also eligible for the Veterans of Foreign Wars; and

Whereas veterans who served in Korea after July 27, 1954, are presently denied membership in the Veterans of Foreign Wars, despite the fact they were subjected to peril, danger and constantly in fear of a hot war erupting; and

Whereas in many instances the service performed by these men serving in these cold war areas is more hazardous than that performed by many wartime veterans; and

Whereas S. 1011 introduced in the Senate of the United States recognizes the hazardous nature of this service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 64th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we support S. 1011, a bill to provide wartime benefits to veterans and their dependents who serve in an area designated by the President as an area of hostilities during the period of hostilities.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I read from the letter in part as follows:

> S. 520 or its equivalent will help carry out our longstanding position in this regard by elevating to wartime status for entitlement to readjustment benefits all service rendered by cold war veterans since the Korean conflict which has been recognized as wartime service by the authorizing of a campaign badge or medal.
>
> Your favorable consideration of these views in your deliberations will be deeply appreciated by the 1,300,000 members of the VFW.

Mr. President, without laboring the question, I believe that legislation enacted earlier makes it clear that when a man in cold war service is injured, he is entitled to every help that a veteran injured in war is entitled to, either by way of hospitalization or rehabilitation. The same thing applies to his dependents.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Florida.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Florida is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. HOLLAND. We have come a long way to recognize the fact that veterans of cold war service who are incapacitated or injured in any way are as much entitled to benefits from the Government as those who received a similar injury in time of war.

I cannot agree that all the vast number of veterans who come out of war without injury of any kind are now entitled to help from the U.S. Government in the way of special treatment. I am glad to see that the Veterans of Foreign Wars recognizes that principle and requests the Senate to recognize it in passing upon this issue.

I strongly support the substitute measure offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield me 30 seconds to direct a question to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Ohio for that purpose.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the understanding of the Senator from Florida regarding the attitude of the Defense Department, the Veterans' Administration, and the administration itself, on this subject?

Mr. HOLLAND. The letters from the Defense Department and the Veterans' Administration speak for themselves. They are contained in the report. They show that they do not approve the program in the pending bill. This morning, in order to be sure of the position of the White House, I called the White House and asked——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Florida.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Florida is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. HOLLAND. I called the White House and asked what its position was. I was called back and advised that it strongly supported the position of the departments as expressed by the Defense Department, the Veterans' Administration——

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Bureau of the Budget, as already communicated to the committee in the hearings.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I know of no other speakers, unless the Senator from Texas has some remarks to make at this time.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I have some comments at this time, but there is another speaker on our side who is on his way into the Chamber, and is expected to be recognized next.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Who yields time?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and am willing to have the time charged to me.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the time will be charged to the Senator from Texas; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield myself 7 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Texas is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this is not a bonus bill. Men serving overseas receive overseas pay. Soldiers in the shooting zone receive $50 a month and more. I do not mean that that is enough money, but this is not the kind of bill which offers a reward for hazardous service in a war zone. There are laws which do that. This bill has a different purpose.

This is a veterans' readjustment bill, not an active military pay bill. Were I to vote for the amendment offered today, I would be saying to those men fighting frostbite in the polar regions, to those men who so valiantly patrol the 38th parallel to Korea, and to the valiant men now in Berlin, that a vote for the pending amendment would be to tell all those veterans that they did not do enough for their country because they were not shot at.

What about the patrols in Korea? I was out there last December. Hand grenades are being lobbed into their posts, these have killed and wounded several of our men who stood guard around the demilitarized zone. Patrols go out around the demilitarized zone from both sides every day. They do so with tommyguns at the ready, with frail barbed wire fence in the middle of the demilitarized zone, and they walk along that fence with their rifles pointed at the man on the other side of the fence, looking at him eye to eye, and then turning away. That is certainly hazardous. If anyone should be trigger-happy, trouble would erupt at any moment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is there anything in the amendment as proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts to prevent the President from declaring the Korean area an area of hostility, if he felt that it deserved that classification?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. No; that is the fault of the proposed amendment. Has the Dominican Republic been declared an area of hostilities? Does the Senator believe that the President will declare the Dominican Republic an area of hostility, and thereby say we are waging war in Latin America?

This shows one of the fallacies of the amendment. I do not expect the President to declare the Dominican Republic an area of hostility. I am pointing out the difficulty of administering such an amendment.

Has the President declared Berlin a crisis area, or as an area of hostility? What about the Cuban crisis, with its buildup of military forces? Is that an area of hostility?

Ships collide and planes collide. It is inevitable that such things should happen in this military buildup.

Two planes collide by touching wings, one plane goes down and the other does not. What about the persons who survive? Are they to be declared not to have been on hazardous duty?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The two 52's collided over the China Sea in a raid from Guam to Vietnam. Is that in an area of hostility? Some of these planes crash on the ramps and kill the personnel in them.

I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, speaking only for the Senator from Florida, I would expect the President of the United States to declare the Dominican Republic an area of hostility. As to the collision of the two B-52's and the men who were killed, the dependents of those men are completely protected under existing law.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. When ships go down over there and some of the personnel are rescued, that is one thing. Are they declared to be not engaged in hazardous duty?

Are those who were rescued to be declared not to be engaged in hazardous duty, after being in the water for hours?

I cannot feel that we can tell a veteran who has given his time to defend our security that he did not do enough because he was not shot at, or was not facing a rifle at a particular minute.

We did not include such fallacious proposals in past GI bills.

Not once in the history of this country, in connection with these bills, have we told veterans that there is a distinction between those who have been shot at and those who have not been shot at.

Not once in connection with the Korean veterans bill did we say that they did not do enough for us because some of them were not shot at.

A large proportion of our military personnel never goes overseas. In World War II, of the 16 million persons in the armed services, 25 percent in the Army never went overseas; 13 percent of those who served in the Navy never went overseas; 2.9 percent in the Marine Corps during World War II did not go overseas. Untold hundreds of thousands did not go overseas and were never shot at.

Alaska and Hawaii were considered as being overseas in those days. Many areas where there was no shooting war were considered as being overseas.

Everyone was considered a veteran, whether he served in Alaska or Hawaii or in the 48 States on the mainland not contiguous to Alaska. We never placed an artificial geographical limitation in the World War II GI bill. We have never placed an artificial geographical limit on the rights of veterans in any war.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield such time to the Senator from New York as he may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Texas in opposing the attempt of the Senator from Massachusetts to confine the aid available under the bill to those who serve in areas of hostility. This provision will be extremely difficult to administer and could be most embarrassing as a foreign policy matter.

It is primarily on the latter argument that I base my opposition.

What, for example, would be the foreign policy implications if the President were to define the Dominican Republic as an area of American hostility because there has been shooting there? Surely it is this kind of danger which the Senator from Massachusetts has in mind when suggesting that the aid should be given only to those who have performed hazardous duty, and just as surely, it could create great difficulties in the conduct of our foreign policy for the President to designate an area like the Dominican Republic as an area of armed conflict.

The basic purpose of the bill is, in any event, much broader. Its aim is to provide readjustment assistance. Any veteran who has served more than 180 days has given that time out of his life, whether he was sent to an area of hostilities or not. To a large extent, he has no control over where he is sent. The amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Massachusetts thus makes the educational benefits of S. 9 into a roulette wheel sort of opportunity.

As I pointed out in my remarks last Friday, millions of veterans in World War II did not serve in actual areas of hostilities. I believe it would be most unfair if we were to limit the benefits in the way that the Senator from Massachusetts suggests.

I ask: What is an area of hostilities? Should it include any veteran who was ever shot at? How about those who were behind the lines at company headquarters? How about those who manned the ships and planes that brought the troops in? What is the basis for drawing a meaningful line?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my understanding that an area of hostilities includes the whole area of South Vietnam and the waters adjacent thereto, as declared by the President.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether he thinks his amendment would have been applied in the case of the Berlin crisis of 1961, which was described at the time by the President as being a very dangerous situation, and where men were praised for the efforts they were making, and the fact that they were standing on a bastion of freedom. How would the Senator designate it?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the bill became law, it would be the responsibility of the President to declare the Berlin area an area of hostilities, if it were an active danger. The same situation would apply to Lebanon, where our troops landed.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Does the Senator believe that the Berlin crisis of 1961 would have presented any foreign policy problem to the President of the United States if he had been confronted with the question whether to designate Berlin as an area of hostility? Can Berlin be designated an area of hostility when the United States occupies that area under a four-power treaty along with three other ostensibly friendly countries?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I see the possibility of that. I would not be honest if I did not say so. I would say that that would be a possibility. However, I would say that in the present instance of Vietnam, it is clear from two declarations, an executive order by the President and an order by the Defense Department. That situation at the present time is clear.

We must remember that there is no state of war here, whereas in the case of Korea a state of war existed, under the United Nations. Of course, during World War II there was a state of war.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that there is less of a problem with respect to designating Vietnam. But there is a question of how far that area would extend. And I believe that there is a serious problem, which we have not answered, as to the other areas. The mere fact that the President designates areas of danger raises all kinds of serious foreign policy implications.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is some merit in what the Senator has said. I believe that if the bill should become law, the question of what is an area of hostilities will be thought out and decided by the President.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. This is something that we really must consider here. We might specifically write into law an intent covering troops that might serve in Berlin, if that is our intention. But to place that kind of burden or responsibility on the desk of the President really would be asking too much.

With the situation as it is at the present time, I do not believe that it would be a practical possibility for the President of the United States to declare an area such as Berlin an area of hostility.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That question would have to be determined in each instance. I am trying to be fair to the men who are actually risking their lives, as opposed to those who are not risking their lives. The Senator has mentioned a chef in a kitchen. All of those men are in areas of risk. There is a possibility of a bomb dropping on them. We must be as fair to those men as we were to the men who were engaged in Korea and in World War II. That is all I am trying to do.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am in favor of that. We do not have any problem in relation to the men who have actually served in Vietnam. However, I have raised the question of the great risk to men serving in other places. For example, I remember that after October 12, 1961, when the 3,000 American troops came from Germany into Berlin, there was a great deal of attention given to the question of what dangers they faced. That was a difficult assignment for all of those men. Yet it was handled very well. Those men were in great danger.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They were in great danger. If some shooting had occurred, perhaps it would immediately have become an area of hostility. The question is similar to a number of difficult diplomatic questions that arise. It must be answered and answered in a way that will be of benefit to our country.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. If the test should be whether shooting occurred, I should like to point out that shooting did occur during that period of time, not when the 3,000 men came in, but during the period from August to September 1961. Under the Senator's amendment, would the area of Germany and Berlin have then become an area of hostility?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from New York has posed a difficult question. Looking backward, I would be sorry if it had been. However, under the provisions of my amendment, it would be up to the President to decide whether or not it was an area of hostilities for the purposes of additional veterans benefits. I do not believe the Senator from New York or I could answer that question specifically, although the Senator from New York was very close to that situation.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Even if we reached some conclusion as to how the Berlin question would be handled, would that conclusion cover every situation? Even in the Caribbean? In the Caribbean our ships have been shot at. Would the whole Caribbean area become an area of hostility?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not believe so. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] asked me that question when the Senator from New York was not in the Chamber. In the Cuban crisis, while some of our men lost their lives, no declared hostilities occurred. We could always pass a special bill which would cover a situation of that kind. I believe that is an even more difficult question than the question which the Senator posed about Berlin.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. What about South Korea? Would the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts cover South Korea?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. South Korea was declared an area of hostilities. There was a state of war in Korea.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. At the present time would any serviceman who is serving in South Korea be eligible?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would not think so. I would have to look up that question to determine whether we are still in a state of war with North Korea or whether we are in a truce, which would indicate that we were not in a state of war.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. If the Senator uses the criterion of people being shot at, I point out that every week in Korea men are losing their lives. There are instances of that every week.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to answer every question as truthfully as I can.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I know that; the Senator from Massachusetts always does.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am not certain as to whether a state of war still exists in Korea. If it did, the men in Korea would be covered; if it did not, the question would arise as to whether it is an area of hostilities. I do not understand that it is, but I am not sure whether there is a state of war in Korea or not.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I know that the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts would give the President authority to declare as areas of hostility those areas in which the United States is engaged with hostile forces. It would also give the President the power to say when those hostilities had ceased and when such areas ceased to be areas of hostilities.

In my opinion, the proposed amendment is merely a substitute for a declaration of war and the signing of a peace treaty. It would, in effect, give the President authority to establish a war area and commit the United States to a war area; and when a decision had been reached, to declare that the war was over without any other formalities whatsoever. Would not the Senator from New York agree with that interpretation?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is a very dangerous situation.

Mr. AIKEN. Why do we not turn everything over to the President while we are about it? In some respects we seem to be on the way. The amendment might be a good long step in that direction.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I doubt very much that the President of the United States or the executive branch of the Government would desire that kind of power or that kind of responsibility. Although it might be advisable in order to give some of our young men assistance in their education, it might be completely inadvisable from the point of view of our whole foreign policy responsibility. Just think of the implications which the determination envisaged by the Saltonstall amendment would have, for example, for our relationship with the nations of Latin America if that determination were to be made concerning the Dominican Republic; for our relationship with the Soviet Union, France, West Germany, and England, if that determination were to be made with respect to Berlin; and for our relationship with Japan and South Korea, if North Korea or China were to be declared an area of hostilities.

Mr. AIKEN. Would not the amendment almost give to the President power to say to another country with which he might be having a serious disagreement that if that country wished to make something of it, he would declare that country a hostile area? Might that not occur in some of the Latin American countries to which we might be called upon to send troops for emergency purposes? That is vast power to give to the President.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. As I have said, I do not believe that the President would desire that power.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not believe that a President, unless he was a most unusual President, would wish that power.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I yield the floor back to the Senator from Texas.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Who yields time?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I thank the distinguished Senator from New York. I believe that the colloquy between the senior Senator from Massachusetts and the junior Senator from New York, participated in by the able Senator from Vermont, shows the utter unworkability of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts. The colloquy shows that it would make more difficult the formulation of our foreign policy. Most interestingly, the Senator from Massachusetts agreed with the Senator from New York that it would be very difficult to administer and to determine what was an era of hostility. For example, questions arose as to the Dominican Republic and Berlin.

Finally, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts said that he thought Berlin would certainly have been an area of hostilities. In response to a question asked by the distinguished junior Senator from New York as to how far we might go in respect to West Germany, as to whether the amendment would apply to those in supply fields back in France or the supply lines that we had into Berlin, it was shown that the difficulty of administration would be insuperable. Practically all who participated in the colloquy agreed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have yielded myself only 3 minutes. I shall yield in a moment.

The amendment which has been offered is indeed an anomaly, for, on the one hand, it admits to the need for readjustment benefits, but, on the other it sets up a standard that indeed has absolutely no causal connection, rational relation, or bearing at all on the reason why these readjustment benefits should be provided to our cold war veterans.

If a need for readjustment benefits exists for a veteran who has to go into hazardous areas, then it also exists for any veteran.

Were I to vote for this amendment that was offered today, I would be saying to those men who are victims of frostbite in the polar regions, to those soldiers who so valiantly patrol the 38th parallel in Korea, and the valiant men in Berlin—yes, a vote for this amendment tells all these veterans that they just did not do enough for their country because they were not shot at.

I cannot believe that any of us here today are going to tell a veteran who has given of his time to defend our security that he did not do enough because he was not facing the right peril, or perhaps the right rifle was not pointed at him. It has always been my feeling—and, indeed, I think the Department of Defense views it this way—that our entire defense system was a team effort. All of our soldiers had a place in our defense, and we did not set up standards whereby a soldier was not as good as another. Especially when it is based on such unsound reasons that one veteran was not shot at and, therefore, he does not need to fulfill his intellectual capacities. I fail to see the reasoning for such a view. We have not been presented with a sound reason why this bill should be so limited.

Nor did we see such a fallacious proposal adopted in the past under other GI bills. Not once did we tell the veterans of World War II and Korea that they could not have the GI bill benefits because they just did not do enough in our war effort.

In further corroboration of what was stated, there has never been a distinction between veterans who have served overseas and those who have served at home. During the Korean war a great majority of our men in the military services never went overseas. Thirty-four percent of the Army never went overseas in the Korean conflict. Seventy-nine percent of the Navy never went into the combat zone in Korea. Sixty-one percent of the Marine Corps never went there. Sixty-one percent of the Air Force never went there. A majority of all our armed services during the Korean conflict never went to Korea from any branch of the service. Yet we realize that our defense effort was a team effort. We did not cut it in two and say to the half that did not participate in Korea, "You were not a part of this effort." It was a team effort. We did not discriminate on such an artificial basis in relation to the veterans of the Korean war as we would under the proposal of the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

In addition, the actual hostilities in Korea ceased on July 7, 1953, and yet any veteran who entered the service up to and through the 31st of January 1955 was eligible for readjustment benefits—almost a year and a half later. It was not a case of limiting readjustment benefits either to hostile areas, or even to periods of hostility. For about a year and a half after the so-called Korean conflict was absolutely over people who entered the service still drew benefits. It is a misnomer to say that there has been no cold war period in our history when readjustment benefits were granted.

The need for readjustment benefits has no relation to the type of military duty that a man performs. Rising costs of education do not bear a lighter burden on a veteran who has walked beside the Berlin wall than on one who is in Saigon. The bill is not a combat soldiers' pay bill; it is a veterans' readjustment bill. It provides benefits to the veteran after he leaves the armed services.

The purpose of the bill, as is the purpose of all other GI bills, is to allow servicemen to readjust to civilian life, not to reward them for their military duty. It is more than shortsighted to say that only veterans who served in areas of hostility need education; it is a complete avoidance of the purposes of the bill and of our national interest.

The correct way to reward combat is through advantages enjoyed while in the military service. This is being done to ing to give soldiers serving in combat pay and by exempting those men from the income tax. Also, a bill is now pending to give soldiers serving in combat zones special indemnity insurance and to provide them with educational and readjustment benefits, too. But such benefits should not be refused to all other veterans.

What possible logic can be used to say that only veterans of hostile areas need readjustment benefits? If it is the mental strain, why not give benefits to those in military service who have stood guard all night? The argument is no more ludicrous than that offered by this amendment today.

Unless the purpose of the amendment is to cripple readjustment benefits entirely, I suggest that its proponents reexamine the purpose of previous GI bills. Section 1610(c) of title 38 of the United States Code states:

> (c) The Congress of the United States hereby declares that the veterans' education and training program created by this chapter is for the purpose of providing vocational readjustment and restoring lost educational opportunities to those service men and women whose educational or vocational ambitions have been interrupted or impeded by reason of active duty.

This was the purpose of the World War II GI bill; it was the purpose of the Korean war GI bill. It is the purpose of the bill now being considered. "Interruption or impeded" educational or vocational ambitions do not bear relation to where a soldier serves, but to the fact that he or she does serve.

The bill follows our experience with 16 million veterans of World War II and 4,750,000 veterans of the Korean war.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts is indeed not a minor change in the bill, but a complete reversal of purpose. Its proponents are trying to use the bill to reward certain soldiers. I agree that they should be rewarded for their risks, but that should be done in a manner consistent with our defense policies of the past, by combat pay or other means, but not discriminating against other members of our defense team.

The basis of the bill is education; and the American view is that any person should be afforded an opportunity to accomplish his educational goals if he has the capacity. The basis of the amendment is reward—the idea that something extra should be given to soldiers who are engaged in hazardous duties. But the reasoning of the amendment bears no relation to education, for education affects every veteran.

I strongly urge the rejection of the amendment as being inconsistent with the purposes of the bill, which is a veterans' readjustment bill. The amendment would result in the perpetuation of injustice on the majority of veterans. It is not in the national interest to discriminate against veterans who are drafted and who serve where they are sent. Soldiers have no control over where they are ordered to duty.

In answer to the proponents of the amendment, who say that only 10 percent of such veterans were considered drafted, I ask, Where are the draftees in the front lines this morning? Sixty percent of the first division unit under fire were draftees. Every veteran ought to receive benefits, whether he served in a hostile area or not. Many veterans of World War II and the Korean war did not serve in hostile areas; yet readjustment benefits are provided to all those veterans, wherever they served, whether in America or overseas, whether they were shot at or not. The company records do not disclose whether a man was shot at or not. Readjustment benefits should be provided on a basis of the period of service. The pending bill is based on the period of service.

I submit that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts should be rejected.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I share the view of the distinguished sponsor of the bill, which I have supported from the very beginning, that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts would nullify the purpose of the bill. We cannot afford to have two or more classes of veterans, which is precisely what the amendment would create. Once a man is called to the colors, and goes where he is sent, there is no justification whatever for making arbitrary classifications which, as has been pointed out, would be almost impossible to enforce. What would be a combat zone today would cease to be such a zone tomorrow, and vice versa. Therefore, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Alaska for his powers of analysis and for so clearly pointing out the administrative difficulties and the basic unfairness of the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have 3 minutes?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts. I shall do so because I believe that the principle upon which the amendment is built is sound.

I cannot dismiss from my mind the fact that the President, the Department of Defense, and the Veterans' Administration do not support the proposal offered by the Senator from Texas. The President and his Cabinet have uniformly supported practically every measure that has come before this body contemplating the promotion of educational opportunity. I should like to enumerate those programs, but I do not have them immediately at my command. However, I do not know of a single one that has not had the ardent support of the President.

No one can make me believe that if the argument of the proponents of the bill were sound, the bill would not have the support of the White House, the Veterans' Administration, and the Department of Defense.

I am a veteran of World War I. I join in the expressions made on the floor of the Senate that the training received in the military cannot be dismissed as an idle piece of work. I know of no training that I ever had in my life that was of greater help to me than that which I received in the military service. I learned to appreciate the attribute of punctiliousness. I knew what it meant, as a member of the military, to apply myself to my work. I do not want to join those who say that service under the flag of our country is the rendition of something that one ought not to give except upon the receipt of extraordinary compensation. In my judgment, if that were the attitude back in 1776, this country would not exist today.

Moreover, I point out that nations have suffered demise when they reached the point where their youth were unwilling to serve except upon the granting of liberal extraordinary compensation. Take whatever country we will, and we will find that the beginning of the collapse was when it was no longer possible to induce the youth, on a voluntary basis, to stand up in support of the banner of their country.

I am glad to support the amendment. I shall support the granting of every type of aid to those who are engaged in what are called the perilous problems of war. But the bill is intended to give to 2.6 million awards supposedly connected with the rendition of dangerous service, when in fact there are only two areas where such real peril exists.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum. I ask unanimous consent, together with the Senator from Texas, that the time consumed for the quorum call not be charged to either side.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSING ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 7984.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7984) to assist in the provision of housing for low and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Bennett, and Mr. Tower conferees on the part of the Senate.

COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as remains.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, we are all proud of our servicemen. We are proud of the men who are giving their time today in the Armed Forces. However, especially do we need to give special benefits to those who are actively risking their lives.

The situation today is that our servicemen who are serving under warlike conditions are not receiving wartime benefits.

I and my colleagues who join me in sponsoring the substitute measure believe that the situation should be corrected. The fact that members of the armed services are subject to special risks and dangers should be recognized by the law as it is beginning to be recognized by this administration, which recently granted special tax exemption for the men serving in Vietnam and which, by a declaration of the Department of Defense, declared that an area of hostilities existed in that area of the world.

The distinction between my substitute measure and the bill of the Senator from Texas is that the men who are serving in an area of hostilities receive the same benefits as do the men who served in Korea, and almost the same benefits as did the men who served in World War II—not quite the same as the World War II veterans, but the same as the Korean veterans.

In my judgment, the men who serve in an area of hostilities are entitled to those benefits.

That is the simple difference between the two measures.

I hope that my substitute amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the junior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am honored to support the bill introduced and so ably handled by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough]. I am against the pending amendment.

In this chaotic day in which we live, how can it be said that the lives and the bodies of some servicemen in any part of the world are any less in jeopardy than those who are actually engaged in what has been termed hostilities in this amendment? All can be called on a moment's notice to a crisis area.

I believe the United States of America owes the same kind and character of responsibility to all its servicemen, wherever they serve.

I hope that the bill of the Senator from Texas will be passed and that the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts will not be agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd].

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska].

If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller].

If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf].

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff].

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 52, as follows:

[No. 189 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Carlson
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen

Dominick
Ellender
Fannin
Hickenlooper
Holland
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—52

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Clark
Dodd
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Inouye
Jackson
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Russell, S.C.
Smith
Symington
Talmadge
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—12

Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Douglas
Eastland
Ervin
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Metcalf
Miller
Neuberger
Ribicoff
Sparkman

So Mr. SALTONSTALL's amendment was rejected.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in the nature of a substitute will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment in the nature of a substitute be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment in the nature of a substitute will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. DOMINICK, is to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That this Act shall be known as the "Southeast Asia Combat Veterans' Educational Assistance Act".

SEC. 2. (a) Title 38 of the United States Code is amended by adding after chapter 39 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 40—EDUCATION OF VETERANS WHO SERVE IN THE SOUTHEAST ASIA THEATER OF OPERATIONS

"Subchapter I—Definitions

"Sec.
"1908. Definitions.

"Subchapter II—Eligibility

"1910. Entitlement to education or training generally.
"1911. Duration of veteran's education or training.
"1912. Commencement; time limitations.
"1913. Expiration of all education and training.

"Subchapter III—Enrollment

"1920. Selection of program.
"1921. Applications; approval.
"1922. Change of program.
"1923. Disapproval of enrollment in certain courses.
"1924. Discontinuance for unsatisfactory progress.
"1925. Period of operation for approval.
"1926. Institutions listed by Attorney General.

"Subchapter IV—Payments to veterans

"1931. Education and training allowance.
"1932. Computation of education and training allowances.
"1933. Measurement of courses.
"1934. Overcharges by educational institutions.

"Subchapter V—State approving agencies

"1941. Designation.
"1942. Approval of courses.
"1943. Cooperation.
"1944. Use of Office of Education and other Federal agencies.
"1945. Reimbursement of expenses.

"Subchapter VI—Approval of courses of education and training

"1951. Apprentice or other training on the job.
"1952. Institutional on-farm training.
"1953. Approval of accredited courses.
"1954. Approval of nonaccredited courses.
"1955. Notice of approval of courses.
"1956. Disapproval of courses and discontinuance of allowances.

"Subchapter VII—Miscellaneous provisions

"Sec.
"1961. Authority and duties of Administrator.
"1962. Educational and vocational counseling.
"1963. Control by agencies of United States.
"1964. Conflicting interests.
"1965. Reports by institutions.
"1966. Overpayments to veterans.
"1967. Examination of records.
"1968. False or misleading statements.
"1969. Information furnished by Federal Trade Commission.
"1970. Effective date and retroactive allowances.

"Subchapter I—Definitions

"§ 1908. Definitions.

"(a) For the purpose of this chapter—

"(1) The term 'basic service period' means the period beginning on January 1, 1961, and ending on such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress;

"(2) The term 'southeast Asia theater of operations' means any area in southeast Asia in which armed conflict or warlike conditions exist as determined by the President. The geographic description of any such area shall be prescribed by the President from time to time by Executive order. Any change in the geographic limits of any such area by the President shall not affect the eligibility of any veteran who qualified for benefits under this title prior to such change.

"(3) The term 'eligible veteran' means any veteran who is not on active duty and who—

"(A) served on active duty in the southeast Asia theater of operations at any time during the basic service period;

"(B) was discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable; and

"(C) served on active duty for a period of more than one hundred and eighty days (exclusive of any period he was assigned by the Armed Forces to a civilian institution for a course of education or training which was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians, or as cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies), or was discharged or released from a period of active duty, any part of which was performed in the southeast Asia theater of operations during the basic service period, for an actual service-connected disability.

"(4) The term 'program of education or training' means any single unit course or subject, any curriculum, or any combination of unit courses or subjects, which is generally accepted as necessary to fulfill requirements for the attainment of a predetermined and identified educational, professional, or vocational objective.

"(5) The term 'course' means an organized unit subject matter in which instruction is offered within a given period of time or which covers a specific amount of related subject matter for which credit toward graduation or certification is usually given.

"(6) The term 'dependent' means—

"(A) a child of an eligible veteran;

"(B) a parent of an eligible veteran, if the parent is in fact dependent upon the veteran; and

"(C) the wife of an eligible veteran, or, in the case of an eligible veteran who is a woman, her husband if he is in fact dependent upon her.

"(7) The term 'educational institution' means any public or private elementary school, secondary school, vocational school, correspondence school, business school, junior college, teachers college, college, normal school, professional school, university, scientific or technical institution, or other institution furnishing education for adults.

"(8) The term 'training establishment' means any business or other establishment providing apprentice or other training on the job, including those under the supervision of a college or university or any State department of education, or any State apprenticeship agency, or any State board of vocational education, or any joint apprentice committee, or the Bureau of Apprenticeship established in accordance with chapter 4C of title 29, or any agency of the Federal Government authorized to supervise such training.

"(9) The term 'State' includes the Canal Zone.

"(10) The term 'Commissioner' means the United States Commissioner of Education.

"(b) Benefits shall not be afforded under this chapter to any individual on account of service as a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, or of the Regular or Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service.

"(c) The Congress of the United States hereby declares that the veterans' education and training program created by this chapter is for the purpose of providing vocational readjustment and restoring lost educational opportunities to those service men and women whose educational or vocational ambitions have been interrupted or impeded by reason of active duty performed in the southeast Asia theater of operations during the basic service period, and for the purpose of aiding such persons in attaining the educational and training status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained had they not served their country.

"Subchapter II—Eligibility

"§ 1910. Entitlement to education or training generally

"Each eligible veteran shall, subject to the provisions of this chapter, be entitled to the education or training provided under this chapter.

"§ 1911. Duration of veteran's education or training

"(a) Each eligible veteran shall be entitled to education or training under this chapter for a period equal to one and a half times the duration of his service on active duty during his basic service period (or to the equivalent thereof in part-time training), except that—

"(1) in computing the duration of such service, there shall be excluded a period equal to any period he was assigned by the Armed Forces to a civilian institution for a course of education or training which was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians or served as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies;

"(2) the period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled under this chapter shall not, except as provided in subsection (b), exceed thirty-six months reduced by a period equivalent to any period of educational assistance afforded him under chapters 33 and 35 of this title; and

"(3) the period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled under this chapter together with vocational rehabilitation training received under chapter 31 of this title, and education or training received under part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1(a), and section 12(a) of the Act enacting this title shall not, except as provided in subsection (b), exceed thirty-six months in the aggregate.

"(b) Whenever the period of entitlement to education or training under this chapter of an eligible veteran who is enrolled in an educational institutional regularly operated on the quarter or semester system ends during a quarter or semester and after a major part of such semester or quarter has expired, such period shall be extended to the termination of such unexpired quarter or semester. In all other courses offered by educational institutions, whenever the period of eligibility ends after a major portion of the course is completed such period may be extended to the end of the course or for nine weeks, whichever is the lesser period.

"(c) In the case of any eligible veteran who is pursuing any program of education or training exclusively by correspondence, one-fourth of the elapsed time in following such program of education or training shall be charged against the veteran's period of entitlement.

"§ 1912. Commencement; time limitations

"(a) No eligible veteran shall be entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter after three years after his discharge or release from active duty or after three years after the date of enactment of this chapter, whichever is later. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, any otherwise eligible veteran whom the Administrator determines to have been prevented from initiating a program of education or training under this chapter within the period prescribed by the preceding sentence because he had not met the nature of discharge requirements of section 1908(a)(1)(B) of this title before a change, correction, or modification of a discharge or dismissal made pursuant to section 1553 of title 10, the correction of the military records of the proper service department under section 1552 of title 10, or other corrective action by competent authority, shall be permitted to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter within three years the date of his discharge or dismissal was so changed, corrected, or modified, or within three years after the date of enactment of this chapter, whichever is later.

"(b) The program of education and training of an eligible veteran under this chapter shall, on and after the delimiting date for the veteran to initiate his program, be pursued continuously until completion, except that an eligible veteran may suspend the pursuit of his program for periods of not more than twelve consecutive months, and may suspend the pursuit of such program for longer periods if the Administrator finds that the suspension for each such period was due to conditions beyond the control of the eligible veteran.

"§ 1913. Expiration of all education and training

"No education or training shall be afforded an eligible veteran under this chapter beyond eight years after his discharge or release from active duty or eight years after the enactment of this chapter, whichever is later, except that any veteran who is eligible initiate a program of education or training by reason of the second sentence of section 1912 (a) of this title shall be permitted to pursue, subject to the other provisions of this chapter, such program for a period of not more than five years after the date of initiation thereof.

"Subchapter III—Enrollment

"§ 1920. Selection of program

"Subject to the provisions of this chapter, each eligible veteran may select a program of education or training to assist him in attaining an educational, professional, or vocational objective at any educational institution or training establishment selected by him, whether or not located in the State in which he resides, which will accept and retain him as a student or trainee in any field or branch of knowledge which such institution or establishment finds him qualified to undertake or pursue. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, an eligible veteran may not pursue a program of education or training at an educational institution or training establishment which is not located in a State, unless such program is pursued at an approved educational institution of higher learning. The Administrator in his discretion may deny or discontinue the enrollment under this chapter of any veteran in a foreign educational institution if he finds that such enrollment is not for the best interest of the veteran or the Government.

"§ 1921. Applications; approval

"Any eligible veteran who desires to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter shall submit an application to the Administrator which shall be in such form, and contain such information, as the Administrator shall prescribe. The Administrator shall approve such application unless he finds that such veteran is not eligible for or entitled to the education or training applied for or that his program of education or training fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter, or that the eligible veteran is already qualified, by reason of previous education and training, for the educational, professional, or vocational objective for which the courses of the program of education or training are offered. The Administrator shall notify the eligible veteran of the approval or disapproval of his application.

"§ 1922. Change of program

"(a) Subject to the provisions of section 1921 of this title, each eligible veteran (except an eligible veteran whose program has been interrupted or discontinued due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application) may, at any time before the end of the period during which he is entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter, make not more than one change of program of education or training.

"(b) Each eligible veteran, who has not made a change of program of education or training before the expiration of the period during which he is entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter, may make not more than one change of program of education or training with the approval of the Administrator. The Administrator shall approve such a change if he finds that—

"(1) the eligible veteran is not making satisfactory progress in his present program and that the failure is not due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application, and if the program to which the eligible veteran desires to change is more in keeping with his aptitude or previous education and training; or

"(2) the program to which the eligible veteran desires to change, while not a part of the program currently pursued by him, is a normal progression from such program.

"(c) As used in this section the term 'change of program of education or training' shall not be deemed to include a change from the pursuit of one program to pursuit of another where the first program is prerequisite to, or generally required for, entrance into pursuit of the second.

"§ 1923. Disapproval of enrollment in certain courses

"(a) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in any bartending course, dancing course, or personality development course.

"(b) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran—

"(1) in any photography course or entertainment course; or

"(2) in any music course—instrumental or vocal—public speaking course, or course in sports or athletics such as horseback riding, swimming, fishing, skiing, golf, baseball, tennis, bowling, sports officiating, or other sport or athletic courses, except courses of applied music, physical education, or public speaking which are offered by institutions of higher learning for credits as an integral part of a program leading to an educational objective; or

"(3) in any other type of course which the Administrator finds to be avocational or recreational in character:

unless the eligible veteran submits justification showing that the course will be of bona fide use in the pursuit of his present or contemplated business or occupation.

"(c) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of any eligible veteran, not already enrolled, in any nonaccredited course below the college level offered by a proprietary profit or proprietary nonprofit educational institution for any period during which the Administrator finds that more than 85 per centum of the students enrolled in the course are having all or any part of their tuition, fees, or other charges paid to or for them by the educational institution or the Veterans' Administration under this chapter, chapter 31 of this title, or section 12(a) of the Act enacting this title.

"§ 1924. Discontinuance for unsatisfactory progress

"The Administrator shall discontinue the education and training allowance of an eligible veteran if, at any time, he finds that, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the educational institution or training establishment, the conduct or progress of such veteran is unsatisfactory.

"§ 1925. Period of operation for approval

"(a) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in any course offered by an educational institution when such course has been in operation for less than two years.

"(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to—

"(1) any course to be pursued in a public or other tax-supported educational institution;

"(2) any course which is offered by an educational institution which has been in operation for more than two years, if such course is similar in character to the instruction previously given by such institution;

"(3) any course which has been offered by an institution for a period of more than two years, notwithstanding the institution has moved to another location with the same general locality; or

"(4) any course which is offered by a nonprofit educational institution of college level and which is recognized for credit toward a standard college degree.

"§ 1926. Institutions listed by Attorney General

"The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of, or payment of an education and training allowance to, any eligible veteran in any course in an educational institution or training establishment while it is listed by the Attorney General under section 3 of part III of Executive Order 9835, as amended.

"Subchapter IV—Payments to veterans

"§ 1931. Education and training allowance

"(a) The Administrator shall pay to each eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training under this chapter, and who applies therefor, an education and training allowance to meet in part the expenses of his subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books, and equipment.

"(b) The education and training allowance for an eligible veteran shall be paid, as provided in section 1932 of this title, only for the period of the veterans' enrollment as approved by the Administrator, but no allowance shall be paid—

"(1) to any veteran enrolled in an institutional course which leads to a standard college degree or a course of institutional on-farm training for any period when the veteran is not pursuing his course in accordance with the regularly established policies and regulations of the institution and the requirements of this chapter;

"(2) to any veteran enrolled in an institutional course which does not lead to a standard college degree or in a course of apprentice or other training on the job for any day of absence in excess of thirty days in a twelve-month period, not counting as absences weekends or legal holidays established by Federal or State law during which the institution or establishment is not regularly in session or operation; or

"(3) to any veteran pursuing his program of education exclusively by correspondence for any period during which no lessons were serviced by the institution.

"(c) No education and training allowance shall be paid to an eligible veteran for any period until the Administrator shall have received—

"(1) from the eligible veteran (A) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in an institutional course which leads to a standard college degree or a course of institutional on-farm training, a certification that he was actually enrolled in and pursuing the course as approved by the Administrator, or (B) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in an institutional course which does not lead to a standard college degree or a course of apprentice or other training on the job, a certification as to actual attendance during such period, or (C) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in a program of education or training by correspondence, a certification as to the number of lessons actually completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution; and

"(2) from the educational institution or training establishment, a certification, or an endorsement on the veteran's certificate, that such veteran was enrolled in and pursuing a course of education or training during such period, and, in the case of an institution furnishing education or training to a veteran exclusively by correspondence, a certification, or an endorsement on the veteran's certificate, as to the number of lessons completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution.

Education and training allowances shall, insofar as practicable, be paid within twenty days after receipt by the Administrator of the certifications required by this subsection.

"§ 1932. Computation of education and training allowances

"(a) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training in an educational institution and is not entitled to receive an education and training allowance under subsection (b), (c), (d), (e), or (f) shall be computed as follows:

"(1) If such program is pursued on a full-time basis, such allowance shall be computed at the rate of $110 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of $135 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of $160 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(2) If such program is pursued on a three-quarters time basis, such allowance shall be computed at the rate of $80 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of $100 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of $120 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(3) If such program is pursued on a half-time basis, such allowance shall be computed at the rate of $50 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of $60 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of $80 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(b) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a full-time program of education and training which consists of institutional courses and on-the-job training, with the on-the-job training portion of the program being strictly supplemental to the institutional portion, shall be computed at the rate of (1) $90 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) $110 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) $130 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(c) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing apprentice or other training on the job shall be computed at the rate of (1) $70 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) $85 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) $105 per month, if he has more than one dependent; except that his education and training allowance shall be reduced at the end of each four-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to the basic education and training allowance as four months bears to the total duration of his apprentice or other training on the job; but in no case shall the Administrator pay an education and training allowance under this subsection in an amount which, when added to the compensation to be paid to the veteran, in accordance with his approved training program, for productive labor performed as a part of his course, would exceed the rate of $310 per month. For the purpose of computing allowances under this subsection, the duration of the training of an eligible veteran shall be the period specified in the approved application as the period during which he may receive an education and training allowance for such training, plus such additional period, if any, as is necessary to make the number of months of such training a multiple of four.

"(d) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing institutional on-farm training shall be computed at the rate of (1) $95 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) $110 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) $130 per month, if he has more than one dependent; except that his education and training allowance shall be reduced at the end of the third, and each subsequent, four-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to $65 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or $80 per month, is he has one dependent, or $100 per month, if he has more than one dependent, as four months bears to the total duration of such veteran's institutional on-farm training reduced by eight months. For the purpose of computing allowances under this subsection, the duration of the training of an eligible veteran shall be the period specified in the approved application as the period during which he may receive an education and training allowance for such training, plus such additional period, if any, as is necessary to make the number of such months of such training a multiple of four.

"(e) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing a program of education or training exclusively by correspondence shall be computed on the basis of the established charge which the institution requires nonveterans to pay for the course or courses pursued by the eligible veteran. Such allowance shall be paid quarterly on a pro rata basis for the lessons completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution, as certified by the institution.

"(f) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training under this chapter in an educational institution on a less-than-half-time basis shall be computed at the rate of (1) the established charges for tuition and fees which the institution requires similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same course to pay, or (2) $110 per month for a full-time course, whichever is the lesser.

"(g) Each eligible veteran who is pursuing an approved course of flight training shall be paid an education and training allowance to be computed at the rate of 75 per centum of the established charge which similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same flight course are required to pay for tuition for the course. If such veteran's program of education or training consists exclusively of flight training, he shall not be paid an education and training allowance under one of the preceding subsections of this section; if his program of education or training consists of flight training and other education or training, the allowance payable under this subsection shall be in addition to any education and training allowance payable to him under one of the preceding subsections of this section for education or training other than flight training. Such allowance shall be paid monthly upon receipt of certification from the eligible veteran and the institution as to the actual flight training received by the veteran. In each such case the eligible veteran's period of entitlement shall be charged (in addition to any charge made against his entitlement by reason of education or training other than flight training) with one day for each $1.25 which is paid to the veteran as an education and training allowance for such course.

"(h) No eligible veteran shall be paid an education and training allowance under this chapter for any period during which (1) he is enrolled in and pursuing a course of education or training paid for by the United States under any provision of law other than this chapter, where the payment of such allowance would constitute a duplication of benefits paid to the veteran from the Federal Treasury, or (2) he is pursuing a course of apprentice or other training on the job, a course of institutional on-farm training, or a course of education and training described in subsection (b) on a less than full-time basis.

"§ 1933. Measurement of courses

"(a) For the purposes of this chapter (1) an institutional trade or technical course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level involving shop practice as an integral part thereof, shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of thirty hours per week of attendance is required with not more than two and one-half hours of rest periods per week allowed, (2) an institutional course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level in which theoretical or classroom instruction predominates shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of twenty-five hours per week net of instruction is required, and (3) an institutional undergraduate course offered by a college or university on a quarter or semester-hour basis for which credit is granted toward a standard college degree shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of fourteen semester hours or its equivalent is required.

"(b) The Administrator shall define full-time training in the case of all types of courses of education or training other than institutional on-farm training and the types of courses referred to in subsection (a); except that, the Administrator shall not define full-time apprentice training for a particular establishment other than that established as the standard workweek through bona fide collective bargaining between employers and employees.

"§ 1934. Overcharges by educational institutions

"The Administrator may, if he finds that an institution has charged or received from any eligible veteran any amount in excess of the established charges for tuition and fees which the institution requires similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same course to pay, disapprove such educational institution for the enrollment of any veteran not already enrolled therein, except that, in the case of a tax-supported public educational institution which does not have established charges for tuition and fees which it requires nonveteran residents to pay, such institution may charge and receive from each eligible veteran who is a resident an amount equal to the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction attributable to such veteran, but in no event to exceed the rate of $10 per month for a full-time course. Any educational institution or training establishment disapproved under this section shall also be disapproved for the enrollment of any veteran not already enrolled therein under chapter 31, or for the enrollment of any eligible person not already enrolled therein under chapter 35.

"Subchapter V—State approving agencies

"§ 1941. Designation

"(a) Unless otherwise established by the law of the State concerned, the chief executive of each State is requested to create or designate a State department or agency as the 'State approving agency' for his State for the purposes of this chapter.

"(b) (1) If any State fails or declines to create or designate a State approving agency, the provisions of this chapter which refer to the State approving agency shall, with respect to such State, be deemed to refer to the Administrator.

"(2) In the case of courses subject to approval by the Administrator under section 1942 of this title, the provisions of this chapter which refer to a State approving agency shall be deemed to refer to the Administrator.

§ 1942. Approval of courses

"(a) An eligible veteran shall receive the benefits of this chatper while enrolled in a course of education or training offered by an educational institution or training establishment only if such course is approved by the State approving agency for the State where such educational institution or training establishment is situated or by the Administrator. Approval of courses by State approving agencies shall be in accordance with the provisions of this chapter and such other regulations and policies as the State approving agency may adopt. Each State approving agency shall furnish the Administration with a current list of educational institutions and training establishments, specifying courses which it has approved, and, in addition to such list, it shall furnish such other information to the Administrator as it and the Administrator may determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter. Each State approving agency shall notify the Administrator of the disapproval of any course previously approved and shall set forth the reasons for such disapproval.

"(b) The Administrator shall be responsible for the approval of courses of education or training offered by any agency of the Federal Government authorized under other laws to supervise such education or training. The Administrator may approve any course in any other educational institution or training establishment in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

"§ 1943. Cooperation

"(a) The Administrator and each State approving agency shall take cognizance of the fact that definite duties, functions, and responsibilities are conferred upon the Administrator and each State approving agency under the veterans' educational programs. To assure that such programs are effectively and efficiently administered, the cooperation of the Administrator and the State approving agencies is essential. It is necessary to establish an exchange of information pertaining to activities of educational institutions and training establishments, and particular attention should be given to the enforcement of approval standards, enforcement of wage and income limitations, enforcement of enrollment restrictions, and fraudulent and other criminal activities on the part of persons connected with educational institutions and training establishments in which veterans are enrolled under this chapter.

"(b) The Administrator will furnish the State approving agencies with copies of such Veterans' Administration informational material as may aid them in carrying out this chapter.

"§ 1944. Use of Office of Education and other Federal agencies

"(a) In carrying out his functions under this chapter, the Administrator may utilize the facilities and services of any other Federal department or agency. The Administrator shall utilize the services of the Office of Education in developing cooperative agreements between the Administrator and State and local agencies relating to the approval of courses of education or training as provided for in section 1945 of this title, in reviewing the plan of operations of State approving agencies under such agreements, and in rendering technical assistance to such State and local agencies in developing and improving policies, standards, and legislation in connection with their duties under this chapter.

"(b) Any such utilization shall be pursuant to proper agreement with the Federal department or agency concerned; and payment to cover the cost thereof shall (except in the case of the Office of Education) be made either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be provided in such agreement. Funds necessary to enable the Office of Education to carry out its functions under this chapter are authorized to be appropriated directly to such Office.

"§ 1945. Reimbursement of expenses

"The Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts or agreements with State and local agencies to pay such State and local agencies for reasonable and necessary expenses of salary and travel incurred by employees of such agencies in (1) rendering necessary services in ascertaining the qualifications of educational institutions and training establishments for furnishing courses of education or training to eligible veterans under this chapter, and in the supervision of such educational institutions and training establishments, and (2) furnishing, at the request of the Administrator, any other services in connection with this chapter. Each such contract or agreement shall be conditioned upon compliance with the standards and provisions of this chapter.

"Subchapter VI—Approval of courses of education and training

"§ 1951. Apprentice or other training on the job

"(a) Apprentice or other training on the job shall consist of courses offered by training establishments whenever such courses of training are furnished in accordance with the provisions of this section. Any training establishment desiring to furnish a course of apprentice or other training on the job shall submit to the appropriate State approving agency a written application setting forth the course of training for each job for which an eligible veteran is to be trained. The written application covering the course of training shall include the following:

"(1) Title and description of the specific job objective for which the eligible veteran is to be trained;

"(2) The length of the training period;

"(3) A schedule listing various operations for major kinds of work or tasks to be learned and showing for each, job operations or work, tasks to be performed, and the approximate length of time to be spent on each operation or task;

"(4) The wage or salary to be paid at the beginning of the course of training, at each successive step in the course, and at the completion of training;

"(5) The entrance wage or salary paid by the establishment to employees already trained in the kind of work for which the veteran is to be trained; and

"(6) The number of hours of supplemental related instruction required.

"(b) The appropriate State approving agency may approve a course of apprentice or other training on the job specified in an application submitted by a training establishment in accordance with subsection (a) if such training establishment is found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

"(1) The training content of the course is adequate to qualify the eligible veteran for appointment to the job for which he is to be trained.

"(2) There is reasonable certainty that the job for which the eligible veteran is to be trained will be available to him at the end of the training period.

"(3) The job is one in which progression and appointment to the next higher classification are based upon skills learned through organized training on the job and not on such factors as length of service and normal turnover.

"(4) The wages to be paid the eligible veteran for each successive period of training are not less than those customarily paid in the training establishment and in the community to a learner in the same job who is not a veteran.

"(5) The job customarily requires a period of training of not less than three months and not more than two years of full-time training, except that this provision shall not apply to apprentice training.

"(6) The length of the training period is no longer than that customarily required by the training establishment and other training establishments in the community to provide an eligible veteran with the required skills, arrange for the acquiring of job knowledge, technical information, and other facts which the eligible veteran will need to learn in order to become competent on the job for which he is being trained.

"(7) Provision is made for related instruction for the individual eligible veteran who may need it.

"(8) There is in the training establishment adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide satisfactory training on the job.

"(9) Adequate records are kept to show the progress made by each eligible veteran toward his job objective.

"(10) Appropriate credit is given the eligible veteran for previous training and job experience, whether in the military service or elsewhere, his beginning wage adjusted to the level to which such credit advances him, and his training period shortened accordingly, and provision is made for certification by the training establishment that such credit has been granted and the beginning wage adjusted accordingly. No course of training will be considered bona fide if given to an eligible veteran who is already qualified by training and experience for the job objective.

"(11) A signed copy of the training agreement for each eligible veteran, including the training program and wage scale as approved by the State approving agency, is provided to the veteran and to the Administrator and the State approving agency by the employer.

"(12) Upon completion of the course of training furnished by the training establishment the eligible veteran is given a certificate by the employer indicating the length and type of training provided and that the eligible veteran has completed the course of training on the job satisfactorily.

"(13) That the course meets such other criteria as may be established by the State approving agency.

"§ 1952. Institutional on-farm training

"(a) An eligible veteran shall be entitled to the benefits of this chapter while enrolled in a course of full-time institutional on-farm training which has been approved by the appropriate State approving agency in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(b) The State approving agency may approve a course of institutional on-farm training when it satisfies the following requirements:

"(1) The course combines organized group instruction in agricultural and related subjects of at least two hundred hours per year (and of at least eight hours each month) at an educational institution, with supervised work experience on a farm or other agricultural establishment.

"(2) The eligible veteran will perform a part of such course on a farm or other agricultural establishment under his control.

"(3) The course is developed with due consideration to the size and character of the farm or other agricultural establishment on which the eligible veteran will receive his supervised work experience and to the need of such eligible veteran, in the type of farming for which he is training, for proficiency in planning, producing, marketing, farm mechanics, conservation of resources, food conservation, farm financing, farming management, and the keeping of farm and home accounts.

"(4) The eligible veteran will receive not less than one hundred hours of individual instruction per year, not less than fifty hours of which shall be on such farm or other agricultural establishment (with at least two visits by the instructor to such farm each month). Such individual instruction shall be given by the instructor responsible for the veteran's institutional instruction and shall include instruction and home-study assignments in the preparation of budgets, inventories, and statements showing the production, use on the farm, and sale of crops, livestock, and livestock products.

"(5) The eligible veteran will be assured of control of such farm or other agricultural establishment (whether by ownership, lease, management, agreement, or other tenure arrangement) until the completion of his course.

"(6) Such farm or other agricultural establishment shall be of a size and character which (A) will, together with the group-instruction part of the course, occupy the full time of the eligible veteran, (B) will permit instruction in all aspects of the management of the farm or other agricultural establishment of the type for which the eligible veteran is being trained, and will provide the eligible veteran an opportunity to apply to the operation of his farm or other agricultural establishment the major portion of the farm practices taught in the group-instruction part of the course, and (C) will assure him a satisfactory income for a reasonable living under normal conditions at least by the end of his course.

"(7) Provision shall be made for certification by the institution and the veteran that the training offered does not repeat or duplicate training previously received by the veteran.

"(8) The institutional on-farm training meets such other fair and reasonable standards as may be established by the State approving agency.

"§ 1953. Approval of accredited courses

"(a) A State approving agency may approve the courses offered by an educational institution when—

"(1) such courses have been accredited and approved by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association;

"(2) credit for such course is approved by the State department of education for credit toward a high school diploma;

"(3) such courses are conducted under sections 11–28 of title 20; or

"(4) such courses are accepted by the State department of education for credit for a teacher's certificate or a teacher's degree.

For the purposes of this chapter the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies and associations which he determines to be a reliable authority as to the quality of training offered by an educational institution and the State approving agencies may, upon concurrence, utilize the accreditation of such accrediting associations or agencies for approval of the courses specifically accredited and approved by such accrediting association or agency. In making application for approval, the institution shall transmit to the State approving agency copies of its catalog or bulletin.

"(b) As a condition to approval under this section, the State approving agency must find that adequate records are kept by the educational institution to show the progress of each eligible veteran. The State approving agency must also find that the educational institution maintains a written record of the previous education and training of the veteran and clearly indicates that appropriate credit has been given by the institution for previous education and training, with the training period shortened proportionately and the veteran and the Administrator so notified.

"§ 1954. Approval of nonaccredited courses

"(a) No course of education or training (other than a course of institutional on-farm training) which has not been approved by a State approving agency pursuant to section 1953 of this title, which is offered by a public or private, profit or nonprofit, educational institution shall be approved for the purposes of this chapter unless the educational institution offering such course submits to the appropriate State approving agency a written application for approval of such course in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

"(b) Such application shall be accompanied by not less than two copies of the current catalog or bulletin which is certified as true and correct in content and policy by an authorized owner or official and includes the following:

"(1) Identifying data, such as volume number and date of publication;

"(2) Names of the institution and its governing body, officials and faculty;

"(3) A calendar of the institution showing legal holidays, beginning and ending date of each quarter, term, or semester, and other important dates;

"(4) Institution policy and regulations on enrollment with respect to enrollment dates and specific entrance requirements for each course;

"(5) Institution policy and regulations relative to leave, absences, class cuts, make-up work, tardiness and interruptions for unsatisfactory attendance;

"(6) Institution policy and regulations relative to standards of progress required of the student by the institution (this policy will define the grading system of the institution, the minimum grades considered satisfactory, conditions for interruption for unsatisfactory grades or progress and a description of the probationary period, if any, allowed by the institution, and conditions of reentrance for those students dismissed for unsatisfactory progress. A statement will be made regarding progress records kept by the institution and furnished the student);

"(7) Institution policy and regulations relating to student conduct and conditions for dismissal for unsatisfactory conduct;

"(8) Detailed schedules of fees, charges for tuition, books, supplies, tools, student activities, laboratory fees, service charges, rentals, deposits, and all other charges;

"(9) Policy and regulations of the institution relative to the refund of the unused portion of tuition, fees, and other charges in the event the student does not enter the course or withdraws or is discontinued therefrom;

"(10) A description of the available space, facilities, and equipment;

"(11) A course outline for each course for which approval is requested, showing subjects or units in the course, type of work or skill to be learned, and approximate time and clock hours to be spent on each subject or unit; and

"(12) Policy and regulations of the institution relative to granting credit for previous educational training.

"(c) The appropriate State approving agency may approve the application of such institution when the institution and its nonaccredited courses are found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

"(1) The courses, curriculum, and instruction are consistent with quality, content, and length with similar courses in public schools and other private schools in the State, with recognized accepted standards.

"(2) There is in the institution adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide training of good quality.

"(3) Educational and experience qualifications of directors, administrators, and instructors are adequate.

"(4) The institution maintains a written record of the previous education and training of the veteran and clearly indicates that appropriate credit has been given by the institution for previous education and training, with the training period shortened proportionately and the veteran and the Administrator so notified.

"(5) A copy of the course outline, schedule of tuition, fees, and other charges, regulations pertaining to absence, grading policy, and rules of operation and conduct will be furnished the veteran upon enrollment.

"(6) Upon completion of training, the veteran is given a certificate by the institution indicating the approved course and indicating that training was satisfactorily completed.

"(7) Adequate records as prescribed by the State approving agency are kept to show attendance and progress or grades, and satisfactory standards relating to attendance, progress, and conduct are enforced.

"(8) The institution complies with all local, city, county, municipal, State, and Federal regulations, such as fire codes, building and sanitation codes. The State approving agency may require such evidence of compliance as is deemed necessary.

"(9) The institution is financially sound and capable of fulfilling its commitments for training.

"(10) The institution does not utilize advertising of any type which is erroneous or misleading, either by actual statement, omission, or intimation. The institution shall not be deemed to have met this requirement until the State approving agency (A) has ascertained from the Federal Trade Commission whether the Commission has issued an order to the institution to cease and desist from any act or practice, and (B) has, if such an order has been issued, given due weight to that fact.

"(11) The institution does not exceed its enrollment limitations as established by the State approving agency.

"(12) The institution's administrators, directors, owners, and instructors are of good reputation and character.

"(13) The institution has and maintains a policy for the refund of the unused portion of tuition, fees, and other charges in the event the veteran fails to enter the course or withdraws or is discontinued therefrom at any time prior to completion and such policy must provide that the amount charged to the veteran for tuition, fees, and other charges for a portion of the course shall not exceed the approximate pro rata portion of the total charges for tuition, fees, and other charges that the length of the completed portion of the course bears to its total length.

"(14) Such additional criteria as may be deemed necessary by the State approving agency.

"§ 1955. Notice of approval of courses

"The State approving agency, upon determining that an educational institution has complied with all the requirements of this chapter, will issue a letter to such institution setting forth the courses which have been approved for the purposes of this chapter, and will furnish an official copy of such letter and any subsequent amendments to the Administrator. The letter of approval shall be accompanied by a copy of the catalog or bulletin of the institution, as approved by the State approving agency, and shall contain the following information:

"(1) date of letter and effective date of approval of courses;

"(2) proper address and name of each educational institution or training establishment;

"(3) authority for approval and conditions of approval, referring specifically to the approved catalog or bulletin published by the educational institution;

"(4) name of each course approved;

"(5) where applicable, enrollment limitations such as maximum numbers authorized and student-teacher ratio;

"(6) signature of responsible official of State approving agency; and

"(7) such other fair and reasonable provisions as are considered necessary by the appropriate State approving agency.

"§ 1956. Disapproval of courses and discontinuance of allowances

"(a) Any course approved for the purposes of this chapter which fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter shall be immediately disapproved by the appropriate State approving agency. An educational institution or training establishment which has its courses disapproved by a State approving agency will be notified of such disapproval by a certified or registered letter of notification and a return receipt secured.

"(b) The Administrator may discontinue the education and training allowance of any eligible veteran if he finds that the course of education or training in which such veteran is enrolled fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter or if he finds that the educational institution or training establishment offering such course has violated any provisions of this chapter or fails to meet any of its requirements.

"(c) Each State approving agency shall notify the Administrator of each course which it has disapproved under this section.

"Subchapter VII—Miscellaneous provisions

"§ 1961. Authority and duties of Administrator

"Payments under this chapter shall be subject to audit and review by the General Accounting Office as provided by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 and the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950.

"§ 1962. Educational and vocational counseling

"The Administrator may arrange for educational and vocational counseling to persons eligible for education and training under this chapter. At such intervals as he deems necessary, he shall make available information respecting the need for general education and for trained personnel in the various crafts, trades, and professions. Facilities of other Federal agencies collecting such information shall be utilized to the extent he deems practicable.

"§ 1963. Control by agencies of United States

"No department, agency, or officer of the United States, in carrying out this chapter, shall exercise any supervision or control, whatsoever, over any State approving agency, State educational agency, or State apprenticeship agency, or any educational institution or training establishment. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prevent any department, agency, or officer of the United States from exercising any supervision or control which such department, agency, or officer is authorized by law to exercise over any Federal educational institution or training establishment, or to prevent the furnishing of education or training under this chapter in any institution or establishment over which supervision or control is exercised by such other department, agency, or officer under authority of existing provisions of law.

"§ 1964. Conflicting interests

"(a) Every officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, or of the Office of Education, who has, while such an officer or employee, owned any interest in, or received any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, any educational institution operated for profit in which an eligible veteran was pursuing a course of education or training under this chapter shall be immediately dismissed from his office or employment.

"(b) If the Administrator finds that any person who is an officer or employee of a State approving agency has, while he was such an officer or employee, owned any interest in, or received any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, an educational institution operated for profit in which an eligible veteran was pursuing a course of education or training under this chapter, he shall discontinue making payments under section 1945 of this title to such State approving agency unless such agency shall, without delay, take such steps as may be necessary to terminate the employment of such person and such payments shall not be resumed while such person is an officer or employee of the State approving agency, or State department of veterans affairs or State department of education.

"(c) A State approving agency shall not approve any course offered by an educational institution operated for profit and, if any such course has been approved, shall disapprove each such course, if it finds that any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, the Office of Education, or the State approving agency owns an interest in, or receives any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, such institution.

"(d) The Administrator may, after reasonable notice and public hearings, waive in writing the application of this section in the case of any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, of the Office of Education, or of a State approving agency, if he finds that no detriment will result to the United States or to eligible veterans by reason of such interest or connection of such officer or employee.

"§ 1965. Reports by institutions

"(a) Educational institutions and training establishments shall, without delay, report to the Administrator in the form prescribed by him, the enrollment, interruption, and termination of the education or training of each eligible veteran enrolled therein under this chapter.

"(b) The Administrator shall pay to each educational institution which is required to submit reports and certifications to the Administrator under this chapter, an allowance at the rate of $1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution under the provisions of this chapter to assist the educational institution in defraying the expense of preparing and submitting such reports and certifications. Such allowances shall be paid in such manner and at such times as may be prescribed by the Administrator, except that if any institution fails to submit reports or certifications to the Administrator as required by this chapter, no allowance shall be paid to such institution for the month or months during which such reports or certifications were not submitted as required by the Administrator.

"§ 1966. Overpayments to veterans

"Whenever the Administrator finds that an overpayment has been made to a veteran as the result of (1) the willful or negligent failure of the educational institution or training establishment to report as required by this chapter and applicable regulations, to the Veterans' Administration excessive absences from a course, or discontinuance or interruption of a course by the veteran or (2) false certification by the educational institution or training establishment, the amount of such overpayment shall constitute a liability of such institution or establishment, and may be recovered in the same manner as any other debt due the United States. Any amount so collected shall be reimbursed if the overpayment is recovered from the veteran. This section shall not preclude the imposition of any civil or criminal liability under this or any other law.

"§ 1967. Examination of records

"The records and accounts of educational institutions and training establishments pertaining to eligible veterans who received education or training under this chapter shall be available for examination by duly authorized representatives of the Government.

"§ 1968. False or misleading statements

"In each case where the Administrator finds that an educational institution or training establishment has willfully submitted a false or misleading claim, or where a veteran, with the complicity of an educational institution or training establishment, has submitted such a claim, he shall make a complete report of the facts of the case to the appropriate State approving agency and where deemed advisable to the Attorney General of the United States for appropriate action.

"§ 1969. Information furnished by Federal Trade Commission

"The Federal Trade Commission shall keep all State approving agencies advised of any information coming to its attention which would be of assistance to such agencies in carrying out their duties under this chapter.

"§ 1970. Effective date and retroactive allowances

"The provisions of this chapter shall take effect as of January 1, 1965. In the event this chapter is enacted subsequent to such date, the Administrator shall prescribe regulations for making retroactive payments of education and training allowances, upon application therefor, to eligible veterans for education or training pursued by them on or after January 1, 1965, and prior to the date of the enactment of this chapter."

(b) The table of contents at the beginning of such title is amended by inserting immediately after

"39. Automobiles for Disabled Veterans -------------------------- 1091"

the following:

"40. Education of Veterans Who Serve in the Southeast Asia Theater of Operations ---------------- 1908".

(c) The table of chapters at the beginning of part III of such title is amended by inserting immediately after

"39. Automobiles for Disabled Veterans -------------------------- 1901"

the following:

"40. Education of Veterans Who Serve in the Southeast Asia Theater of Operations ---------------- 1908".

(d) Such title is further amended—

(1) by inserting in section 102(a)(2) immediately after "chapter 33" the following: "or 40", and by striking out "chapters 19 and 33" in section 102(b), and inserting in lieu thereof "chapters 19, 33, and 40";

(2) by striking out in section 111(a) "33 or 35", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "33, 35, or 40";

(3) by inserting in section 211(a) after "1761," the following: "1961,";

(4) by striking out in section 1662(b) "chapters 31 and 35" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "chapters 31, 35, and 40";

(5) by striking out in section 1711(b) "chapter 31 or 33", and inserting in lieu thereof the following "chapter 31, 33, or 40";

(6) by striking out in section 1734(a) "chapter 31 or 33" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "chapter 31, 33, or 40";

(7) by striking out in section 3013 "and 35" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "35, and 40";

(8) by inserting after "chapter 35" in section 1611(a)(2) the following "or education or training under chapter 40"; and

(9) by inserting in section 1634 immediately before the comma following "therein" the following: "under this chapter or chapter 40".

SEC. 3. (a) Chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of section 1801(a) the following new paragraphs:

"(3) The term 'basic service period' means the period beginning on January 1, 1961, and ending on such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress.

"(4) The term 'southeast Asia theater of operations' means any area in southeast Asia in which armed conflict or warlike conditions exist as determined by the President. The geographic description of any such area shall be prescribed by the President from time to time by Executive order. Any change in the geographic limits of any such area by the President shall not affect the eligibility of any veteran who qualified for benefits under this title prior to such change."

(b) Chapter 37 of such title is further amended by inserting immediately after section 1817 the following new section:

"§ 1818. Veterans who serve in the southeast Asia theater of operations

"(a) Each veteran who served on active duty in the southeast Asia theater of operations at any time during the basic service period, shall be eligible for the benefits of this chapter (except sections 1813 and 1815, and business loans under section 1814, of this title), subject to the provisions of this section, if his total service was for a period of more than one hundred and eighty days, or if he was discharged or released from a period of active duty, any part of which was performed in the southeast Asia theater of operations during the basic service period, for a service-connected disability.

"(b) No veteran shall be eligible for benefits under this section so long as he is eligible under this chapter for any unused benefits derived from service during World War II or the Korean conflict. Any veteran who is eligible for benefits under this section and who has obtained benefits under this chapter by reason of service during World War II or the Korean conflict shall have his benefits under this section reduced by the amount of any benefits previously obtained under this chapter. Benefits shall not be afforded under this section to any individual on account of service as a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, or the Regular or Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service.

"(c) Loans may be guaranteed under this section if made before the expiration of ten years after the date of discharge or release of the veteran from a period of active duty or any part of which was performed in the southeast Asia theater of operations during the basic service period. If a loan report or application for loan guaranty is received by the Administrator before the expiration of the ten-year period, not to exceed one year will be allowed in addition for the disbursement of the loan and issuance of evidence of guaranty. Direct loans authorized by this section shall not be made after the expiration of ten years after the date of discharge or release of the veteran from a period of active duty any part of which was performed in the southeast Asia theater of operations during the basic service period, except pursuant to commitments issued by the Administrator on or before that date.

"(d) A fee shall be collected from each veteran obtaining a loan guaranteed or made under this section, and no loan shall be guaranteed or made under this section until the fee payable with respect to such loan has been collected and remitted to the Administrator. The amount of the fee shall be established from time to time by the Administrator, but shall in no event exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the total loan amount. The amount of the fee may be included in the loan to the veteran and paid from the proceeds thereof. The administrator shall deposit all fees collected hereunder in the revolving fund established under the provisions of section 1824 of this title."

(c) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 37 of such title is amended by inserting immediately below

"1817. Release from liability under guaranty."

the following:

"1818. Veterans who serve in the southeast Asia theater of operations."

(d) Section 1822(a) of such title is amended by striking out "or 1813", and inserting in lieu thereof "1813, or 1818".

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, if Senators will give me their attention for a few minutes, I do not intend to take very long to explain the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

First, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, in view of the vote on the last amendment, I believe that we can consider the substitute amendment quickly. However, there are some provisions in it which avoid some of the problems contained in the previous amendment. I shall speak for approximately 5 minutes, if Senators will remain in the Chamber, and then we can vote.

I am sorry that the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts did not prevail, because all the arguments offered in support of his amendment apply equally to my amendment in the nature of a substitute.

There is still one important consideration which we must take into account, and it seems to me it should be reemphasized. If we are to obtain any GI bill benefits for our servicemen, we must modify the omnibus cold war bill proposed by the Senator from Texas, which is opposed, as everyone knows, not only by the President but also by the Defense Department, Veterans' Administration, Bureau of the Budget, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and a number of other veterans organizations.

Yet, for some reason wholly unknown to me, it seems to be sailing through the Senate. It is not going to be sailing through the House. It is not going to get anywhere. Accordingly, if we are to try to do something for our servicemen, we had better take the opportunity to do so in the context which I believe makes sense.

What is this context?

Now that the war in South Vietnam is becoming enlarged, we must provide benefits for veterans who have service-connected disabilities in that area, or who have served there for 6 months or more.

My amendment in the nature of a substitute is a simple one. It would provide that educational and readjustment benefits be paid to veterans serving in South Vietnam. I believe that all Senators will agree with me that the war there is escalating, going up and up and up. The Defense Department and the Veterans' Administration both assert that what we need is some incentive for a veteran engaged in hostilities and not for a veteran of peacetime service. Here is one area that we can do it.

One of the arguments made against the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts was the question that it might be diplomatically embarrassing for the President to declare what areas were or were not areas of hostility. My amendment in the nature of a substitute would avoid that. It would merely provide that the southeastern Asian theater is the area where our Armed Forces are serving, and if they are entitled to these benefits, it would completely avoid the embarrassment which was said to be evident so far as what is and what is not an area of hostility is concerned. It also would provide readjustment assistance for veterans of the southeast Asia theater who performed active duty between January 1, 1961, and the termination date of the draft law, which is July 1, 1967. The 1961 beginning date was selected because that marks the beginning of our real buildup in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I should explain in more detail the educational and vocational training assistance which the Vietnam GI bill would provide. Briefly, it is this: Eligibility for educational benefits is conditioned upon more than 6 months of active duty, or upon discharge for service-connected disability. The educational period could not exceed 36 months, and would be computed on the basis of 1½ days of benefit for each day of active duty.

During the educational period, monthly benefit allowances would be $110 for full-time college attendance by a veteran with no dependents; $135 for a veteran with one dependent; and $160 for a veteran with more than one dependent—in other words, practically the same as the pending bill.

It is also worthwhile reporting to the Senate that children of combat dead are eligible for the educational benefits which would have accrued to the father.

I note here that to estimate the amount of benefits granted under the amendment would be difficult. I believe the Senator from Texas has estimated that it would cost $1,900 million. Let me inquire of the Senator if that is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I made no estimate. Such an estimate was made by opponents of the bill.

Mr. DOMINICK. It is in excess of $1½ billion, in any event, for the first year. The estimate in my substitute amendment is approximately $400 million, which is still a great deal of money. Therefore, we are not dealing with something which would be simple to adopt, one way or another. There is a great distinction between the amount of the bill and the amount the Senator from Texas is proposing to spend. We are, in this case, taking care of those who actually serve in the area, where the most danger accrues to a serviceman.

I repeat, because many Senators who are now in the Chamber were not previously on the floor, that the pending bill has been based on the theory that Uncle Sam's icy finger is raised and points to some young man or woman and says, "You are in the service whether you like it or not."

Mr. President, out of 2,600,000 young men and women in our armed services, less than 10 percent are draftees. Therefore, what we are in effect saying is that if we should enact the bill introduced by the Senator from Texas, it would mean we were to give everyone—even though they enlisted in the services—exactly the same treatment as we are the draftees. That does not seem to me to make logical sense.

Second, the veterans organizations, the Defense Department, and the President has said it, too, let me emphasize, that we should be trying to reach the veterans who serve in areas of hostility, and that we should not expand it to general, peacetime services.

Third, on the subject of education, veterans would receive an education when they get out of the service. We have before the Education Subcommittee of the Labor and Welfare Committee at the present time a higher education bill which will vastly increase the National Defense Education Act funds on a loan basis and on a grant basis. It is now in executive markup to go forward at this time. To superimpose a whole new system of education on top of the one we have now does not seem realistic. That is why the bill was not reported at the time of the secondary education bill.

We debated the language we have now before us even before we worked on the higher education bill.

I hold in my hand an estimate of the educational allowances in section 2 of S. 9. It indicates, for the first 5 years, $1,933 million—from page 20 of the report.

Mr. President, I do not believe that I need to speak much longer on this subject. There has been a good deal of debate already on Vietnam and the wisdom of the policy which the United States has been pursuing. A number of persons are saying that we did not think it should be followed through in the way that it is going.

Several of us believe that perhaps we should give more active consideration to the areas that ought to be hit, and the question of bombing; and that we should also try to avoid a ground war in Asia, if possible.

However, no matter what our position may be on this particular aspect of policy, not one of us fails to recognize the fact that the servicemen over there are in an active perilous position. It is perilous to them. It could be disastrous for their families.

It seems to me that this is the type of thing we ought to consider.

Therefore I offer the amendment on behalf of myself and Senator TOWER, Senator ALLOTT, and all the other Senators who sponsored S. 458 as it was originally presented to the Senate. They include Senators BARTLETT, CURTIS, FANNIN, MUNDT, MURPHY, RANDOLPH, PEARSON, and, I am sure, a number of other Senators; also the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Most of the points have been argued already, but, for the sake of reaffirmation and emphasis, this type of proposal, I am sure, would gain the support of the Defense Department, the Veterans' Administration, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The present bill does not have the support of any of those organizations; nor of the President of the United States, nor of the previous President of the United States; nor of President Eisenhower.

This substitute is an amendment for which all of us can vote with considerable confidence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a number of Senators have asked me when the Senate would vote on the amendment. I expect to make my remarks very brief. I hope they will not exceed 2 minutes in time.

In this first place, the amendment we have defeated, the one that had been offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, was fairer to the veterans than the present amendment. The present amendment is much more restrictive than the amendment which has just been rejected. The Senator from Massachusetts agreed with the Senator from New York that Berlin, the Caribbean, and the Dominican Republic were areas of conflict that he thought should be declared areas of hostility.

Under the proposed amendment, the only place that would be considered an area of hostility would be southeast Asia. The amendment practically takes the bill apart. It makes it apply to less than 10 percent of those who are in the armed services. Therefore, having defeated the former amendment, which was a much fairer amendment than the present one, I hope that the Senate will also defeat the present amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. The amendment applies to southeast Asia, and makes that a combat area, not the Dominican Republic.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Senator who preceded the Senator from Colorado stated that the Dominican Republic would be a fair place to which to apply the bill.

My point is that the amendment would be limited to South Vietnam. It could not be applied to the Dominican Republic or any other area. It could not be applied to Berlin, and other areas no matter how dangerous the service may be in other areas of the world. No consideration would be given to persons who serve in other areas, no matter how dangerous they might be.

On the question of the President being opposed, I have no doubt that if the bill were passed, the President would sign it. When the distinguished President served as our majority leader in 1959, he voted for a similar bill. I have before me vote No. 130, of July 31, 1959. That bill was passed by a vote of 57 to 31. Not only did the then majority leader vote for the bill, but he helped us get that big majority behind that vote so that we could pass it by a vote of 57 to 31. He offered invaluable suggestions to us. I have no doubt that if the bill were passed it would be approved by him.

I have discussed the bill with him several times but I shall not reveal the conversations that I had with him on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from

Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay," and the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 53, as follows:

[No. 190 Leg.]

YEAS—31

Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ellender
Fannin
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—53

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Dodd
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Inouye
Jackson
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pell
Proxmire
Russell, Ga.
Russell, S.C.
Smith
Symington
Talmadge
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—16

Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Douglas
Eastland
Ervin
Hayden
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Neuberger
Pastore
Randolph
Ribicoff
Sparkman

So Mr. Dominick's amendment was rejected.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I call up my amendments No. 356 and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Muskie in the chair). The amendments of the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendments.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments offered by Mr. Cooper are as follows:

On page 2, beginning with line 1, strike out all down through line 2 on page 50, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"CHAPTER 40—EDUCATION AND TRAINING LOANS

"Subchapter I—Definitions

"Sec.
"1908. Definitions.

"Subchapter II—Eligibility

"1910. Entitlement to education or training generally.
"1911. Computation of veteran's loan entitlement.
"1912. Commencement; time limitations.
"1913. Expiration of all education and training.

"Subchapter III—Enrollment

"1920. Selection of program.
"1921. Applications; approval.
"1922. Change of program.
"1923. Disapproval of enrollment in certain courses.
"1924. Discontinuance of education and training loans for unsatisfactory progress.
"1925. Period of operation for approval.
"1926. Institutions listed by Attorney General.

"Subchapter IV—Loans to veterans

"1931. Education and training loans.
"1932. Computation of education and training loan.
"1933. Loan requirements.
"1934. Actions to enforce repayment of loans.
"1935. Measurement of courses.
"1936. Overcharges by educational institutions.

"Subchapter V—State approving agencies

"1941. Designation.
"1942. Approval of courses.
"1943. Cooperation.
"1944. Use of Office of Education and other Federal agencies.
"1945. Reimbursement of expenses.

"Subchapter VI—Approval of courses of education and training

"1951. Apprentice or other training on the job.
"1952. Institutional on-farm training.
"1953. Approval of accredited courses.
"1954. Approval of nonaccredited courses.
"1955. Notice of approval of courses.
"1956. Disapproval of courses and discontinuance of allowances.

"Subchapter VII—Miscellaneous provisions

"1961. Authority and duties of Administrator.
"1962. Educational and vocational counseling.
"1963. Control by agencies of United States.
"1964. Conflicting interests.
"1965. Reports by institutions.
"1966. Overpayments to veterans.
"1967. Examination of records.
"1968. False or misleading statements.
"1969. Information furnished by Federal Trade Commission.
"1970. Effective date.

"Subchapter I—Definitions

"§ 1908. Definitions

"(a) For the purpose of this chapter—

"(1) The term 'eligible veteran' means any veteran who is not on active duty and who—

"(A) served on active duty at any time between January 1, 1955, and the day before the date of termination of compulsory military service under the laws of the United States,

"(B) was discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable, and was not given a bad-conduct discharge, or if an officer, did not resign for the good of the service, and

"(C) served on active duty for a period of one hundred and eighty days (exclusive of any period he was assigned by the Armed Forces to a civilian institution for a course of education or training which was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians, or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies), or was discharged or released from a period of active duty, any part of which occurred between January 31, 1955, and the day before the date of termination of compulsory military service under the laws of the United States, for an actual service-connected disability.

"(2) The term 'date of termination of compulsory military service under the laws of the United States' means the day following the last day on which involuntary induction of civilians (other than individuals liable for induction by reason of a prior deferment) into the Armed Forces of the United States is authorized under (A) the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as now in effect or hereafter amended, or (B) any law enacted after the date of enactment of this chapter, if such law is enacted within one hundred and eighty days after the Universal Military Training and Service Act ceases to be effective.

"(3) The term 'program of education or training' means any single unit course or subject, any curriculum, or any combination of unit courses or subjects, which is generally accepted as necessary to fulfill requirements for the attainment of a predetermined and identified educational, professional, or vocational objective.

"(4) The term 'course' means an organized unit of subject matter in which instruction is offered within a given period of time or which covers a specific amount of related subject matter for which credit toward graduation or certification is usually given.

"(5) The term 'dependent' means—

"(A) a child of an eligible veteran;

"(B) a parent of an eligible veteran, if the parent is in fact dependent upon the veteran; and

"(C) the wife of an eligible veteran, or, in the case of an eligible veteran who is a woman, her husband if he is in fact dependent upon her.

"(6) The term 'educational institution' means any public or private elementary school, secondary school, vocational school, correspondence school, business school, junior college, teachers college, college, normal school, professional school, university, scientific or technical institution, or other institution furnishing education for adults.

"(7) The term 'training establishment' means any business or other establishment providing apprentice or other training on the job, including those under the supervision of a college or university or any State department of education, or any State apprenticeship agency, or any State board of vocational education, or any joint apprentice committee, or the Bureau of Apprenticeship established in accordance with chapter 4C of title 29, or any agency of the Federal Government authorized to supervise such training.

"(8) The term 'State' includes the Canal Zone.

"(9) The term 'Commissioner' means the United States Commissioner of Education.

"(b) Benefits shall not be afforded under this chapter to any individual on account of service as a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, or of the Regular or Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service.

"(c) The Congress of the United States hereby declares that the veterans' education and training program created by this chapter is for the purpose of providing vocational readjustment and restoring lost educational opportunities to those service men and women whose educational or vocational ambitions have been interrupted or impeded by reason of active duty between January 31, 1955, and the date of termination of compulsory military service under the laws of the United States and for the purpose of aiding such persons in attaining the educational and training status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained had they not served their country.

"Subchapter II—Eligibility

"§ 1910. Entitlement to education or training generally

"Each eligible veteran shall, subject to the provisions of this chapter, be entitled to an education and training loan for the purpose of assisting him in pursuing a program of education or training. Any such loan made under this chapter shall be repayable by the veteran as hereinafter provided.

"§ 1911. Computation of veteran's loan entitlement

"(a) Each eligible veteran shall be entitled to receive an education and training loan under this title to assist him in obtaining education or training over a period equal to one and one-half times the duration of the active duty performed by him between February 1, 1955, and the date of termination of compulsory military service under the laws of the United States, except that—

"(1) in computing the duration of such service there shall be excluded a period equal to any period he was assigned by the Armed Forces to a civilian institution for a course of education or training which was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians or served as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies;

"(2) the period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled under this chapter shall not, except as provided in subsection (b), exceed thirty-six months reduced by a period equivalent to any period of educational assistance afforded him under chapters 33 and 35 of this title; and

"(3) the period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled under this chapter together with vocational rehabilitation training received under chapter 31 of this title, and education or training received under part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1(a), and section 12(a) of the Act enacting this title shall not, except as provided in subsection (b), exceed thirty-six months in the aggregate.

"(b) Whenever the period of entitlement to education or training under this chapter of an eligible veteran who is enrolled in an educational institution regularly operated on the quarter or semester system ends during a quarter or semester and after a major part of such semester or quarter has expired, such period shall be extended to the termination of such unexpired quarter or semester. In all other courses offered by educational institutions, whenever the period of eligibility ends after a major portion of the course is completed such period may be extended to the end of the course or for nine weeks, whichever is the lesser period.

"(c) In the case of any eligible veteran who is pursuing any program of education or training exclusively by correspondence, one-fourth of the elapsed time in the following such program of education or training shall be charged against the veteran's period of entitlement.

"§ 1912. Commencement; time limitations

"(a) No eligible veteran shall be entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter after three years after his discharge or release from active duty or after three years after the date of enactment of this chapter, whichever is later. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, any otherwise eligible veteran whom the Administrator determines to have been prevented from initiating a program of education or training under this chapter within the period prescribed by the preceding sentence because he had not met the nature of discharge requirements of section 1908(a)(1)(B) of this title before a change, correction, or modification of a discharge or dismissal made pursuant to section 1553 of title 10, the correction of the military records of the proper service department under section 1552 of title 10, or other corrective action by competent authority, shall be premitted to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter within three years after the date of his discharge or dismissal was so changed, corrected, or modified, or within three years after the date of enactment of this chapter, whichever is later.

"(b) The program of education and training of an eligible veteran under this chapter shall, on and after the delimiting date for the veteran to initiate his program, be pursued continuously until completion, except that an eligible veteran may suspend the pursuit of his program for periods of not more than twelve consecutive months, and may suspend the pursuit of such program for longer periods if the Administrator finds that the suspension for each such period was due to conditions beyond the control of the eligible veteran.

"(c) In the event an eligible veteran returns to active service in the Armed Forces prior to the date on which compulsory service under the laws of the United States terminates, his date of discharge or release shall, for the purposes of this section and section 1913, be the date of discharge or release from his last period of active service which began prior to the date of termination of compulsory military service under the laws of the United States.

"§ 1913. Expiration of all education and training

"No education or training shall be afforded an eligible veteran under this chapter beyond eight years after his discharge or release from active duty or eight years after the enactment of this chapter, whichever is later, except that any veteran who is eligible to initiate a program of education or training by reason of the second sentence of section 1912(a) of this title shall be permitted to pursue, subject to the other provisions of this chapter, such program for a period of not more than five years after the date of initiation thereof; but in no event shall education or training be afforded under this chapter more than ten years after the date of termination of compulsory military service under the laws of the United States.

"Subchapter III—Enrollment

"§ 1920. Selection of program

"Subject to the provisions of this chapter, each eligible veteran may select a program of education or training to assist him in attaining an educational, professional, or vocational objective at any educational institution or training establishment selected by him, whether or not located in the State in which he resides, which will accept and retain him as a student or trainee in any field or branch of knowledge which such institution or establishment finds him qualified to undertake or pursue. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, an eligible veteran may not pursue a program of education or training at an educational institution or training establishment which is not located in a State, unless such program is pursued at an approved educational institution of higher learning. The Administrator in his discretion may deny or discontinue the enrollment under this chapter of any veteran in a foreign educational institution if he finds that such enrollment is not for the best interest of the veteran or the Government.

"§ 1921. Applications; approval

"Any eligible veteran who desires to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter shall submit an application to the Administrator which shall be in such form, and contain such information, as the Administrator shall prescribe. The Administrator shall approve such application unless he finds that such veteran is not eligible for or entitled to the education or training applied for or that his program of education or training fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter, or that the eligible veteran is already qualified, by reason of previous education and training, for the educational, professional, or vocational objective for which the courses of the program of education or training are offered. The Administrator shall notify the eligible veteran of the approval or disapproval of his application.

"§ 1922. Change of program

"(a) Subject to the provisions of section 1921 of this title, each eligible veteran (except an eligible veteran whose program has been interrupted or discontinued due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application) may, at any time before the end of the period during which he is entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter, make not more than one change of program of education or training.

"(b) Each eligible veteran, who has not made a change of program of education or training before the expiration of the period during which he is entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter, may make not more than one change of program of education or training with the approval of the Administrator. The Administrator shall approve such a change if he finds that—

"(1) the eligible veteran is not making satisfactory progress in his present program and that the failure is not due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application, and if the program to which the eligible veteran desires to change is more in keeping with his aptitude or previous education and training; or

"(2) the program to which the eligible veteran desires to change, while not a part of the program currently pursued by him, is a normal progression from such program.

"(c) As used in this section the term 'change of program of education or training' shall not be deemed to include a change from the pursuit of one program to pursuit of another where the first program is prerequisite to, or generally required for, entrance into pursuit of the second.

"§ 1923. Disapproval of enrollment in certain courses

"(a) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in any bartending course, dancing course, or personality development course.

"(b) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran—

"(1) in any photography course or entertainment course; or

"(2) in any music course—instrumental or vocal—public speaking course, or course in sports or athletics such as horseback riding, swimming, fishing, skiing, golf, baseball, tennis, bowling, sports officiating, or other sport or athletic course, except courses of applied music, physical education or public speaking which are offered by institutions of higher learning for credit as an integral part of a program leading to an educational objective; or

"(3) in any other type of course which the Administrator finds to be avocational or recreational in character;

unless the eligible veteran submits justification showing that the course will be of bonafide use in the pursuit of his present or contemplated business or occupation.

"(c) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of any eligible veteran, not already enrolled, in any nonaccredited course below the college level offered by a proprietary profit or proprietary nonprofit educational institution for any period during which the Administrator finds that more than eighty-five per centum of the students enrolled in the course are having all or any part of their tuition, fees, or other charges paid to or for them by the educational institution or the Veterans' Administration under this chapter, chapter 31 of this title, or section 12(a) of the Act enacting this title.

"§ 1924. Discontinuance of education and training loans for unsatisfactory progress

"The Administrator shall discontinue the education and training loans of an eligible veteran if, at any time, he finds that, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the educational institution or training establishment, the conduct or progress of such veteran is unsatisfactory.

"§ 1925. Period of operation for approval

"(a) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in any course offered by an educational institution when such course has been in operation for less than two years.

"(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to—

"(1) any course to be pursued in a public or other tax-supported educational institution;

"(2) any course which is offered by an educational institution which has been in operation for more than two years, if such course is similar in character to the instruction previously given by such institution;

"(3) any course which has been offered by an institution for a period of more than two years, notwithstanding the institution has moved to another location within the same general locality; or

"(4) any course which is offered by a nonprofit educational institution of college level and which is recognized for credit toward a standard college degree.

"§ 1926. Institutions listed by Attorney General

"The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of, or payment of an education and training loan to, any eligible veteran in any course in an educational institution or training establishment while it is listed by the Attorney General under section 3 of part III of Executive Order 9835, as amended.

"Subchapter IV—Loans to Veterans

"§ 1931. Education and training loans

"(a) The Administrator shall pay to each eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training under this chapter, and who applies therefor, an education and training loan to meet in part the expenses of his subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books, and equipment.

"(b) The education and training loan for an eligible veteran shall be paid, as provided in section 1932 of this title, only for the period of the veteran's enrollment as approved by the Administrator, but no allowance shall be paid—

"(1) to any veteran enrolled in an institutional course which leads to a standard college degree or a course of institutional on-farm training for any period when the veteran is not pursuing his course in accordance with the regularly established policies and regulations of the institution and the requirements of this chapter;

"(2) to any veteran enrolled in an institutional course which does not lead to a standard college degree or in a course of apprentice or other training on the job for any day of absence in excess of thirty days in a twelve-month period, not counting as absences weekends or legal holidays established by Federal or State law during which the institution or establishment is not regularly in session or operation; or

"(3) to any veteran pursuing his program of education exclusively by correspondence for any period during which no lessons were serviced by the institution.

"(c) No education and training loan shall be paid to an eligible veteran for any period until the Administrator shall have received—

"(1) from the eligible veteran (A) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in an institutional course which leads to a standard college degree or a course of institutional on-farm training, a certification that he was actually enrolled in and pursuing the course as approved by the Administrator, or (B) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in an institutional course which does not lead to a standard college degree or a course of apprentice or other training on the job, a certification as to actual attendance during such period, or (C) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in a program of education or training by correspondence, a certification as to the number of lessons actually completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution; and

"(2) from the educational institution or training establishment, a certification, or an endorsement on the veteran's certificate, that such veteran was enrolled in and pursuing a course of education or training during such period, and, in the case of an institution furnishing education or training to a veteran exclusively by correspondence, a certification, or an endorsement on the veteran's certificate, as to the number of lessons completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution. Education and training loans shall, insofar as practicable, be paid within twenty days after receipt by the Administrator of the certifications required by this subsection.

"§ 1932. Computation of education and training loan

"(a) The education and training loan of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training in an educational institution and is not entitled to receive an education and training loan under subsection (b), (c), (d), (e), or (f) shall be computed as follows:

"(1) If such program is pursued on a full-time basis, such loan shall be computed at the rate of $110 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of $135 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of $160 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(2) If such program is pursued on a three-quarters time basis, such loan shall be computed at the rate of $80 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of $100 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of $120 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(3) If such program is pursued on a half-time basis, such loan shall be computed at the rate of $50 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of $60 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of $80 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(b) The education and training loan of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a full-time program of education and training which consists of institutional courses and on-the-job training, with the on-the-job training portion of the program being strictly supplemental to the institutional portion, shall be computed at the rate of (1) $90 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) $110 per month if he has one dependent, or (3) $130 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(c) The education and training loan of an eligible veteran pursuing apprenticeship or other training on the job shall be computed at the rate of (1) $70 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) $85 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) $105 per month, if he has more than one dependent; except that his education and training loan shall be reduced at the end of each four-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to the basic education and training loan as four months bears to the total duration of his apprentice or other training on the job; but in no case shall the Administrator provide an education and training loan under this subsection in an amount which, when added to the compensation to be paid to the veteran, in accordance with his approved training program, for productive labor performed as a part of his course, would exceed the rate of $310 per month. For the purpose of computing loans under this subsection, the duration of the training of an eligible veteran shall be the period specified in the approved application as the period during which he may receive an education and training loan for such training, plus such additional period, if any, as is necessary to make the number of months of such training a multiple of four.

"(d) The education and training loan of an eligible veteran pursuing institutional on-farm training shall be computed at the rate of (1) $95 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) $110 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) $130 per month, if he has more than one dependent; except that his education and training loan shall be reduced at the end of the third, and each subsequent, four-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to $65 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or $80 per month, if he has one dependent, or $100 per month, if he has more than one dependent, as four months bears to the total duration of such veteran's institutional on-farm training reduced by eight months. For the purpose of computing loans under this subsection, the duration of the training of an eligible veteran shall be the period specified in the approved application as the period during which he may receive an education and training loan for such training, plus such additional period, if any, as is necessary to make the number of such months of such training a multiple of four.

"(e) The education and training loan of an eligible veteran pursuing a program of education or training exclusively by correspondence shall be computed on the basis of the established charge which the institution requires nonveterans to pay for the course or courses pursued by the eligible veteran. Such loan shall be disbursed quarterly on a pro rata basis for the lessons completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution as certified by the institution.

"(f) The education and training loan of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training under this chapter in an educational institution on a less-than-half-time basis shall be computed at the rate of (1) the established charges for tuition and fees which the institution requires similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same course to pay, or (2) $110 per month for a full-time course, whichever is the lesser.

"(g) Each eligible veteran who is pursuing an approved course of flight training shall be paid an education and training loan to be computed at the rate of 75 per centum of the established charge which similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same flight course are required to pay for tuition for the course. If such veteran's program of education or training consists exclusively of flight training he shall not be provided an education and training loan under one of the preceding subsections of this section; if his program of education or training consists of flight training and other education or training, the loan provided under this subsection shall be in addition to any education and training loan provided to him under one of the preceding subsections of this section for education or training other than flight training. Such loan shall be disbursed monthly upon receipt of certification from the eligible veteran and the institution as to the actual flight training, he shall not be provided an each such case the eligible veteran's period of entitlement shall be charged (in addition to any charge made against his entitlement by reason of education or training other than flight training) with one day for each $1.25 which is provided to the veteran as an education and training loan for such course.

"(h) No eligible veteran shall be provided an education and training loan under this chapter for any period during which (1) he is enrolled in and pursuing a course of education or training paid for by the United States under any provision of law, where the payment of such loan would constitute a duplication of benefits provided to the veteran from the Federal Treasury, or (2) he is pursuing a course of apprentice or other training on the job, a course of institutional on-farm training, or a course of education and training described in subsection (b) on a less than full-time basis.

"§ 1933. Loan requirements

"Education and training loans made under the provisions of this title—

"(1) shall be made without security, except that the veteran shall execute a promissory note, or notes, payable to the United States;

"(2) shall be repaid in equal or graduated periodic installments, in accordance with such schedules as may be approved by the Administrator over such period of time as the Administrator shall prescribe, not exceeding twelve years, beginning one year after the date on which the veteran ceases to pursue his program of education or training, except that—

"(A) periodic installments may be readjusted in the case of any veteran if the Administrator finds that a readjustment would be in the best interest of the veteran and the Government, and

"(B) periodic installments need not be paid during any period (i) in which the veteran is pursuing a full-time program of education or training, or (ii) during which the veteran is a member of the Armed Forces, if such veteran is recalled to active duty and is in a pay grade which makes repayment an undue burden, as determined by the Administrator; and

"(3) shall be interest free, except that if such loan is not repaid within the period prescribed by the Administrator interest shall accrue on the unpaid principal, beginning on the day following the date on which the last payment is due, at a rate of 2 per centum per annum. If a veteran fails to make payments in accordance with the schedule of repayment prescribed for him by the Administrator, and the Administrator determines that adherence to the prescribed schedule would not constitute an undue hardship on the veteran, the Administrator shall declare the entire remaining amount of such loan due, and interest shall accrue on the unpaid principal of such loan at the rate of 2 per centum per annum from the date of such declaration;

"(4) shall be canceled upon the death of the veteran, or if he becomes permanently and totally disabled as determined in accordance with regulations of the Administrator;

"(5) shall be subject to such additional terms, conditions, and requirements as the Administrator may determine to be necessary to protect the financial interests of the United States and to carry out the purpose of this chapter.

"§ 1934. Actions to enforce repayment of loans

"(a) In addition to any legal action brought to recover a loan made under this chapter, the Administrator is authorized to utilize all other resources to effect recovery of such loans, including setoffs of such loans against veteran benefits, national service life insurance dividends, or any other Federal funds otherwise payable to the veteran.

"(b) If an education and training loan provided under this chapter is not repaid, it shall be lawful for the Administrator or his delegate to collect such indebtedness in the same manner, and to the same extent, insofar as applicable, as the Secretary of the Treasury may collect a tax under the provisions of section 6331 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(c) In addition to any State court of competent jurisdiction, any United States district court for any district wherein the veteran resides or was resident at any time shall have jurisdiction of any action brought by or on behalf of the Federal Government to recover any amount payable under any promissory note executed to evidence a loan made under this chapter. No legal service of any kind shall be required to be made upon the veteran other than notice of the institution of such action stating the date of entry and name of court; such notice shall be sent by registered mail to the last-known address of such veteran as indicated in the records of the Veterans' Administration.

"(d) In any action by or on behalf of the Federal Government to recover any amount payable under any promissory note executed to evidence a loan made under this chapter, the fact that the veteran was an infant at the time of signing such promissory note shall not be a defense.

"§ 1935. Measurement of courses

"(a) For the purposes of this chapter (1) an institutional trade or technical course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level, involving shop practice as an integral part thereof, shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of thirty hours per week of attendance is required with not more than two and one-half hours of rest periods per week allowed, (2) an institutional course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level in which theoretical or classroom instruction predominates shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of twenty-five hours per week net of instruction is required, and (3) an institutional undergraduate course offered by a college or university on a quarter or semester-hour basis for which credit is granted toward a standard college degree shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of fourteen semester hours or its equivalent is required.

"(b) The Administrator shall define full-time training in the case of all types of courses of education or training other than institutional on-farm training and the types of courses referred to in subsection (a); except that, the Administrator shall not define full-time apprentice training for a particular establishment other than that established as the standard workweek through bona fide collective bargaining between employers and employees.

"§ 1936. Overcharges by educational institutions

"The Administrator may, if he finds that an institution has charged or received from any eligible veteran any amount in excess of the established charges for tuition and fees which the institution requires similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same course to pay, disapprove such educational institution for the enrollment of any veteran not already enrolled therein, except that, in the case of a tax-supported public educational institution which does not have established charges for tuition and fees which it requires nonveteran residents to pay, such institution may charge and receive from each eligible veteran who is a resident an amount equal to the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction attributable to such veteran, but in no event to exceed the rate of $10 per month for a full-time course. Any educational institution or training establishment disapproved under this section shall also be disapproved for the enrollment of any veteran not already enrolled therein under chapter 31, or for the enrollment of any eligible person not already enrolled therein under chapter 35.

"Subchapter V—State approving agencies

"§ 1941. Designation

"(a) Unless otherwise established by the law of the State concerned, the chief executive of each State is requested to create or designate a State department or agency as the 'State approving agency' for his State for the purposes of this chapter.

"(b)(1) If any State fails or declines to create or designate a State approving agency, the provisions of this chapter which refer to the State approving agency shall, with respect to such State, be deemed to refer to the Administrator.

"(2) In the case of courses subject to approval by the Administrator under section 1942 of this title, the provisions of this chapter which refer to a State approving agency shall be deemed to refer to the Administrator.

"§ 1942. Approval of courses

"(a) An eligible veteran shall receive the benefits of this chapter while enrolled in a course of education or training offered by an educational institution or training establishment only if such course is approved by the State approving agency for the State where such educational institution or training establishment is situated or by the Administrator. Approval of courses by State approving agencies shall be in accordance with the provisions of this chapter and such other regulations and policies as the State approving agency may adopt. Each State approving agency shall furnish the Administrator with a current list of educational institutions and training establishments, specifying courses which it has approved, and, in addition to such list, it shall furnish such other information to the Administrator as it and the Administrator may determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter. Each State approving agency shall notify the Administrator of the disapproval of any course previously approved and shall set forth the reasons for such disapproval.

"(b) The Administrator shall be responsible for the approval of courses of education or training offered by any agency of the Federal Government authorized under other laws to supervise such education or training. The Administrator may approve any course in any other educational institution or training establishment in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

"§ 1943. Cooperation

"(a) The Administrator and each State approving agency shall take cognizance of the fact that definite duties, functions, and responsibilities are conferred upon the Administrator and each State approving agency under the veterans' educational programs. To assure that such programs are effectively and efficiently administered, the cooperation of the Administrator and the State approving agencies is essential. It is necessary to establish an exchange of information pertaining to activities of educational institutions and training establishments, and particular attention should be given to the enforcement of approval standards, enforcement of wage and income limitations, enforcement of enrollment restrictions, and fraudulent and other criminal activities on the part of persons connected with educational institutions and training establishments in which veterans are enrolled under this chapter.

"(b) The Administrator will furnish the State approving agencies with copies of such Veterans' Administration informational material as may aid them in carrying out this chapter.

"§ 1944. Use of Office of Education and other Federal agencies

"(a) In carrying out his functions under this chapter, the Administrator may utilize the facilities and services of any other Federal department or agency. The Administrator shall utilize the services of the Office of Education in developing cooperative agreements between the Administrator and State and local agencies relating to the approval of courses of education or training as provided for in section 1945 of this title, in reviewing the plan of operations of State approving agencies under such agreements, and in rendering technical assistance to such State and local agencies in developing and improving policies, standards, and legislation in connection with their duties under this chapter.

"(b) Any such utilization shall be pursuant to proper agreement with the Federal department or agency concerned; and payment to cover the cost thereof shall (except in the case of the Office of Education) be made either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be provided in such agreement. Funds necessary to enable the Office of Education to carry out its functions under this chapter are authorized to be appropriated directly to such Office.

"§ 1945. Reimbursement of expenses

"The Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts or agreements with State and local agencies to pay such State and local agencies for reasonable and necessary expenses of salary and travel incurred by employees of such agencies in (1) rendering necessary services in ascertaining the qualifications of educational institutions and training establishments for furnishing courses of education or training to eligible veterans under this chapter, and in the supervision of such educational institutions and training establishments, and (2) furnishing, at the request of the Administrator, any other services in connection with this chapter. Each such contract or agreement shall be conditioned upon compliance with the standards and provisions of this chapter.

"Subchapter VI—Approval of courses of education and training

"§ 1951. Apprentice or other training on the job

"(a) Apprentice or other training on the job shall consist of courses offered by training establishments whenever such courses of training are furnished in accordance with the provisions of this section. Any training establishment desiring to furnish a course of apprentice or other training on the job shall submit to the appropriate State approving agency a written application setting forth the course of training for each job for which an eligible veteran is to be trained. The written application covering the course of training shall include the following:

"(1) Title and description of the specific job objective for which the eligible veteran is to be trained;

"(2) The length of the training period;

"(3) A schedule listing various operations for major kinds of work or tasks to be learned and showing for each, job operations or work, tasks to be performed, and the approximate length of time to be spent on each operation or task;

"(4) The wage or salary to be paid at the beginning of the course of training, at each successive step in the course, and at the completion of training;

"(5) The entrance wage or salary paid by the establishment to employees already trained in the kind of work for which the veteran is to be trained; and

"(6) The number of hours of supplemental related instruction required.

"(b) The appropriate State approving agency may approve a course of apprentice or other training on the job specified in an application submitted by a training establishment in accordance with subsection (a) if such training establishment is found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

"(1) The training content of the course is adequate to qualify the eligible veteran for appointment to the job for which he is to be trained.

"(2) There is reasonable certainty that the job for which the eligible veteran is to be trained will be available to him at the end of the training period.

"(3) The job is one in which progression and appointment to the next higher classification are based upon skills learned through organized training on the job and not on such factors as length of service and normal turnover.

"(4) The wages to be paid the eligible veteran for each successive period of training are not less than those customarily paid in the training establishment and in the community to a learner in the same job who is not a veteran.

"(5) The job customarily requires a period of training of not less than three months and not more than two years of full-time training, except that this provision shall not apply to apprentice training.

"(6) The length of the training period is no longer than that customarily required by the training establishment and other training establishments in the community to provide an eligible veteran with the required skills, arrange for the acquiring of job knowledge, technical information, and other facts which the eligible veteran will need to learn in order to become competent on the job for which he is being trained.

"(7) Provision is made for related instruction for the individual eligible veteran who may need it.

"(8) There is in the training establishment adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide satisfactory training on the job.

"(9) Adequate records are kept to show the progress made by each eligible veteran toward his job objective.

"(10) Appropriate credit is given the eligible veteran for previous training and job experience, whether in the military service or elsewhere, his beginning wage adjusted to the level to which such credit advances him, and his training period shortened accordingly, and provision is made for certification by the training establishment that such credit has been granted and the beginning wage adjusted accordingly. No course of training will be considered bona fide if given to an eligible veteran who is already qualified by training and experience for the job objective.

"(11) A signed copy of the training agreement for each eligible veteran, including the training program and wage scale as approved by the State approving agency, is provided to the veteran and to the Administrator and the State approving agency by the employer.

"(12) Upon completion of the course of training furnished by the training establishment, the eligible veteran is given a certificate by the employer indicating the length and type of training provided and that the eligible veteran has completed the course of training on the job satisfactorily.

"(13) That the course meets such other criteria as may be established by the State approving agency.

"§ 1952. Institutional on-farm training

"(a) An eligible veteran shall be entitled to the benefits of this chapter while enrolled in a course of full-time institutional on-farm training which has been approved by the appropriate State approving agency in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(b) The State approving agency may approve a course of institutional on-farm training when it satisfies the following requirements:

"(1) The course combines organized group instruction in agricultural and related subjects of at least two hundred hours per year (and of at least eight hours each month) at an educational institution, with supervised work experience on a farm or other agricultural establishment.

"(2) The eligible veteran will perform a part of such course on a farm or other agricultural establishment under his control.

"(3) The course is developed with due consideration to the size and character of the farm or other agricultural establishment on which the eligible veteran will receive his supervised work experience and to the need of such eligible veteran, in the type of farming for which he is training, for proficiency in planning, producing, marketing, farm mechanics, conservation of resources, food conservation, farm financing, farming management, and the keeping of farm and home accounts.

"(4) The eligible veteran will receive not less than one hundred hours of individual instruction per year, not less than fifty hours of which shall be on such farm or other agricultural establishment (with at least two visits by the instructor to such farm each month). Such individual instruction shall be given by the instructor responsible for the veteran's institutional instruction and shall include instruction and home-study assignments in the preparation of budgets, inventories, and statements showing the production, use on the farm, and sale of crops, livestock, and livestock products.

"(5) The eligible veteran will be assured of control of such farm or other agricultural establishment (whether by ownership, lease, management, agreement, or other tenure arrangement) until the completion of his course.

"(6) Such farm or other agricultural establishment shall be of a size and character which (A) will, together with the group-instruction part of the course, occupy the full time of the eligible veteran, (B) will permit instruction in all aspects of the management of the farm or other agricultural establishment of the type for which the eligible veteran is being trained, and will provide the eligible veteran an opportunity to apply to the operation of his farm or other agricultural establishment the major portion of the farm practices taught in the group-instruction part of the course, and (C) will assure him a satisfactory income for a reasonable living under normal conditions at least by the end of his course.

(7) Provision shall be made for certification by the institution and the veteran that

the training offered does not repeat or duplicate training previously received by the veteran.

"(8) The institutional on-farm training meets such other fair and reasonable standards as may be established by the State approving agency.

"§ 1953. Approval of accredited courses

"(a) A State approving agency may approve the courses offered by an educational institution when—

"(1) such courses have been accredited and approved by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association;

"(2) credit for such course is approved by the State department of education for credit toward a high school diploma;

"(3) such courses are conducted under sections 11–28 of title 20; or

"(4) such courses are accepted by the State department of education for credit for a teacher's certificate or a teacher's degree.

For the purposes of this chapter the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies and associations which he determines to be a reliable authority as to the quality of training offered by an educational institution and the State approving agencies may, upon concurrence, utilize the accreditation of such accrediting associations or agencies for approval of the courses specifically accredited and approved by such accrediting association or agency. In making application for approval, the institution shall transmit to the State approving agency copies of its catalog or bulletin.

"(b) As a condition to approval under this section, the State approving agency must find that adequate records are kept by the educational institution to show the progress of each eligible veteran. The State approving agency must also find that the educational institution maintains a written record of the previous education and training of the veteran and clearly indicates that appropriate credit has been given by the institution for previous education and training, with the training period shortened proportionately and the veteran and the Administrator so notified.

"§ 1954. Approval of nonaccredited courses

"(a) No course of education or training (other than a course of institutional on-farm training) which has not been approved by a State approving agency pursuant to section 1953 of this title, which is offered by a public or private, profit or nonprofit, educational institution shall be approved for the purposes of this chapter unless the educational institution offering such course submits to the appropriate State approving agency a written application for approval of such course in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

"(b) Such application shall be accompanied by not less than two copies of the current catalog or bulletin which is certified as true and correct in content and policy by an authorized owner or official and includes the following:

"(1) Identifying data, such as volume number and date of publication;

"(2) Names of the institution and its governing body, officials, and faculty;

"(3) A calendar of the institution showing legal holidays, beginning and ending date of each quarter, term, or semester, and other important dates;

"(4) Institution policy and regulations on enrollment with respect to enrollment dates and specific entrance requirements for each course;

"(5) Institution policy and regulations relative to leave, absences, class cuts, make-up work, tardiness, and interruptions for unsatisfactory attendance;

"(6) Institution policy and regulations relative to standards of progress required of the student by the institution (this policy will define the grading system of the institution, the minimum grades considered satisfactory, conditions for interruption for unsatisfactory grades or progress and a description of the probationary period, if any, allowed by the institution, and conditions of reentrance for those students dismissed for unsatisfactory progress. A statement will be made regarding progress records kept by the institution and furnished the student);

"(7) Institution policy and regulations relating to student conduct and conditions for dismissal for unsatisfactory conduct;

"(8) Detailed schedules of fees, charges for tuition, books, supplies, tools, student activities, laboratory fees, service charges, rentals, deposits, and all other charges;

"(9) Policy and regulations of the institution relative to the refund of the unused portion of tuition, fees, and other charges in the event the student does not enter the course or withdraws or is discontinued therefrom;

"(10) A description of the available space, facilities, and equipment;

"(11) A course outline for each course for which approval is requested, showing subjects or units in the course, type of work or skill to be learned, and approximate time and clock hours to be spent on each subject or unit; and

"(12) Policy and regulations of the institution relative to granting credit for previous educational training.

"(c) The appropriate State approving agency may approve the application of such institution when the institution and its nonaccredited courses are found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

"(1) The courses, curriculum, and instruction are consistent in quality, content, and length with similar courses in public schools and other private schools in the State, with recognized accepted standards.

"(2) There is in the institution adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide training of good quality.

"(3) Educational and experience qualifications of directors, administrators, and instructors are adequate.

"(4) The institution maintains a written record of the previous education and training of the veteran and clearly indicates that appropriate credit has been given by the institution for previous education and training, with the training period shortened proportionately and the veteran and the Administrator so notified.

"(5) A copy of the course outline, schedule of tuition, fees, and other charges, regulations pertaining to absence, grading policy, and rules of operation and conduct will be furnished the veteran upon enrollment.

"(6) Upon completion of training, the veteran is given a certificate by the institution indicating the approved course and indicating that training was satisfactorily completed.

"(7) Adequate records as prescribed by the State approving agency are kept to show attendance and progress or grades, and satisfactory standards relating to attendance, progress, and conduct are enforced.

"(8) The institution complies with all local, city, county, municipal, State, and Federal regulations, such as fire codes, building and sanitation codes. The State approving agency may require such evidence of compliance as is deemed necessary.

"(9) The institution is financially sound and capable of fulfilling its commitments for training.

"(10) The institution does not utilize advertising of any type which is erroneous or misleading, either by actual statement, omission, or intimation. The institution shall not be deemed to have met this requirement until the State approving agency (A) has ascertained from the Federal Trade Commission whether the Commission has issued an order to the institution to cease and desist from any act or practice, and (B) has, if such an order has been issued, given due weight to that fact.

"(11) The institution does not exceed its enrollment limitations as established by the State approving agency.

"(12) The institution's administrators, directors, owners, and instructors are of good reputation and character.

"(13) The institution has and maintains a policy for the refund of the unused portion of tuition, fees, and other charges in the event the veteran fails to enter the course or withdraws or is discontinued therefrom at any time prior to completion and such policy must provide that the amount charged to the veteran for tuition, fees, and other charges for a portion of the course shall not exceed the approximate pro rata portion of the total charges for tuition, fees, and other charges that the length of the completed portion of the course bears to its total length.

"(14) Such additional criteria as may be deemed necessary by the State approving agency.

"§ 1955. Notice of approval of courses

"The State approving agency, upon determining that an educational institution has complied with all the requirements of this chapter, will issue a letter to such institution setting forth the courses which have been approved for the purposes of this chapter, and will furnish an official copy of such letter and any subsequent amendments to the Administrator. The letter of approval shall be accompanied by a copy of the catalog or bulletin of the institution, as approved by the State approving agency, and shall contain the following information:

"(1) date of letter and effective date of approval of courses;

"(2) proper address and name of each educational institution or training establishment;

"(3) authority for approval and conditions of approval, referring specifically to the approved catalog or bulletin published by the educational institution;

"(4) name of each course approved;

"(5) where applicable enrollment limitations such as maximum numbers authorized and student-teacher ratio;

"(6) signature of responsible official of State approving agency; and

"(7) such other fair and reasonable provisions as are considered necessary by the appropriate State approving agency.

"§ 1956. Disapproval of courses and discontinuance of allowances

"(a) Any course approved for the purposes of this chapter which fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter shall be immediately disapproved by the appropriate State approving agency. An educational institution or training establishment which has its courses disapproved by a State approving agency will be notified of such disapproval by a certified or registered letter of notification and a return receipt secured.

"(b) The Administrator may discontinue the education and training loan of any eligible veteran if he finds that the course of education or training in which such veteran is enrolled fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter or if he finds that the educational institution or training establishment offering such course has violated any provisions of this chapter or fails to meet any of its requirements.

"(c) Each State approving agency shall notify the Administrator of each course which it has disapproved under this section.

"Subchapter VII—Miscellaneous provisions

"§ 1961. Authority and duties of Administrator

"Education and training loans under this chapter shall be subject to audit and review by the General Accounting Office as provided by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 and the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950.

"§ 1962. Educational and vocational counseling

"The Administrator may arrange for educational and vocational counseling to persons eligible for education and training loans under this chapter. At such intervals as he deems necessary, he shall make available information respecting the need for general education and for trained personnel in the various crafts, trades, and professions. Facilities of other Federal agencies collecting such information shall be utilized to the extent he deems practicable.

"§ 1963. Control by agencies of United States

"No department, agency, or officer of the United States, in carrying out this chapter, shall exercise any supervision or control, whatsoever, over any State approving agency, State educational agency, or State apprenticeship agency, or any educational institution or training establishment. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prevent any department, agency, or officer of the United States from exercising any supervision or control which such department, agency, or officer is authorized by law to exercise over any Federal educational institution or training establishment, or to prevent the furnishing of education or training under this chapter in any institution or establishment over which supervision or control is exercised by such other department, agency, or officer under authority of existing provisions of law.

"§ 1964. Conflicting interests

"(a) Every officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, or of the Office of Education, who has, while such an officer or employee, owned any interest in, or received any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, any educational institution operated for profit in which an eligible veteran was pursuing a course of education or training under this chapter shall be immediately dismissed from his office or employment.

"(b) If the Administrator finds that any person who is an officer or employee of a State approving agency has, while he was such an officer or employee, owned any interest in, or received any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, an educational institution operated for profit in which an eligible veteran was pursuing a course of education or training under this chapter, he shall discontinue making payments under section 1945 of this title to such State approving agency unless such agency shall, without delay, take such steps as may be necessary to terminate the employment of such person and such payments shall not be resumed while such person is an officer or employee of the State approving agency, or State Department of Veterans Affairs or State Department of Education.

"(c) A State approving agency shall not approve any course offered by an educational institution operated for profit and, if any such course has been approved, shall disapprove each such course, if it finds that any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, the Office of Education, or the State approving agency owns an interest in, or receives any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, such institution.

"(d) The Administrator may, after reasonable notice and public hearings, waive in writing the application of this section in the case of any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, of the Office of Education, or of a State approving agency, if he finds that no detriment will result to the United States or to eligible veterans by reason of such interest or connection of such officer or employee.

"§ 1965. Reports by institutions

"(a) Educational institutions and training establishments shall, without delay, report to the Administrator in the form prescribed by him, the enrollment, interruption, and termination of the education or training of each eligible veteran enrolled therein under this chapter.

"(b) The Administrator shall pay to each educational institution which is required to submit reports and certifications to the Administrator under this chapter, an allowance at the rate of $1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution under the provisions of this chapter to assist the educational institution in defraying the expense of preparing and submitting such reports and certifications. Such allowances shall be paid in such manner and at such times as may be prescribed by the Administrator, except that if any institution fails to submit reports or certifications to the Administrator as required by this chapter, no allowance shall be paid to such institution for the month or months during which such reports or certifications were not submitted as required by the Administrator.

"§ 1966. Overpayments to veterans

"In any case where it is found by the Administrator that a loan or an excessive amount of an otherwise proper loan has been made to a veteran as the result of (1) the willful or negligent failure of the educational institution or training establishment to report, as required by this chapter and applicable regulations, to the Veterans' Administration excessive absences from a course, or discontinuance or interruption of a course by the veteran or (2) false certification by the educational institution or training establishment, the amount of such overpayment shall constitute a liability of such institution or establishment, and may be recovered in the same manner as any other debt due the United States. Any amount so collected shall be reimbursed if the overpayment is recovered from the veteran. This section shall not preclude the imposition of any civil or criminal liability under this or any other law.

"§ 1967. Examination of records

"The records and accounts of educational institutions and training establishments pertaining to eligible veterans who received education or training under this chapter shall be available for examination by duly authorized representatives of the Government.

"§ 1968. False or misleading statements

"The Administrator shall not make any payments under this chapter to any person found by him to have willfully submitted any false or misleading claims. In each case where the Administrator finds that an educational institution or training establishment has willfully submitted a false or misleading claim, or where a veteran, with the complicity of an educational institution or training establishment, has submitted such a claim, he shall make a complete report of the facts of the case to the appropriate State approving agency and where deemed advisable to the Attorney General of the United States for appropriate action.

"§ 1969. Information furnished by Federal Trade Commission

"The Federal Trade Commission shall keep all State approving agencies advised of any information coming to its attention which would be of assistance to such agencies in carrying out their duties under this chapter.

"§ 1970. Effective date

"This chapter shall take effect on the date of its enactment, but no education and training loan shall be made for any period prior to the first day of the first month which begins more than thirty days after the date of enactment of this chapter."

On page 50, strike out the material between lines 5 and 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"40. Education and training loans... 1908".

On page 50, strike out the material between lines 8 and 9, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"40. Education and training loans... 1908".

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, my amendment may be the last amendment to the bill. I have discussed the amendment on previous occasions when the bill was before the Senate. I shall not be long.

The amendment which I offer would not change the benefits which would be provided veterans under S. 9.

It differs from S. 9 in one major respect. S. 9 provides a system of grants to veterans for educational benefits and for training benefits.

My amendment would substitute a system of loans, and it would not change in any other respect the terms of the bill.

The loans which would be made available to veterans under my amendment would be on very easy terms, as arranged between the Veterans' Administration and the veterans.

The loans would be repayable over a term of 12 years. The veteran would sign a note, but no security or surety would be required. No payment would be required until one year after the veteran's education or training had ended. The notes would bear no interest unless payments were in default, and in that event the interest would be 2 percent.

The administrator would be given the authority to waive payment of principal or interest upon a finding based upon equity, justice, or conscience.

I would interpret this to mean that if the administrator should find that a veteran was unable to pay because of sickness, unemployment, family demands, or special reasons beyond his control, the administrator would have wide latitude to suspend, waive, or forgive payment of all or part of the indebtedness of the veteran. These are certainly very reasonable terms.

From my detailing of the liberal loan provision, it is obvious that any veteran who meets the eligibility requirements of S. 9—and they would be the same under my amendment—would find the loan provisions of the amendment not only reasonable, but very generous if he or she had the desire to secure an education or secure training.

The reasoning behind the bill of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is that those who are called into service are placed at a disadvantage against those who are not called into service, and they deserve some means of readjustment when they return to civilian life.

The amendment which I offer follows the same reasoning. We agree also that educational and training benefits provide the best method of readjustment. But the difference is that my amendment would demand a greater incentive on the part of the veteran.

Those who will take advantage of the loans will seriously want to obtain the educational and training benefits that will be available to them.

On the other hand, those who do not really wish to secure education or training benefits for their readjustment might take the grants which are offered by S. 9, but would not be interested in the loans. In this context it is reasonable to consider cost.

The Senator from Texas has stated that the bill would cost almost $2 billion over a period of 5 years. But we know that the draft will continue. We know that if we do not get into a real war, it is unlikely that we shall soon escape the conditions which cause a continuance of the cold war. The report shows that by 1970, 6 million persons will be serving in the Armed Forces, so it can be estimated that the actual cost of S. 9 will reach $5 billion.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Not having had the opportunity to read the Senator's amendment, does it, in substituting loans for grants, draw any distinction between persons who have served in combat areas and those who have served in this country?

Mr. COOPER. No; it draws no distinction, for this reason: The logic, the gravamen, the philosophy of S. 9, as expounded by the Senator from Texas, is that it is needed because young men, and some young women, are drawn from their normal lives and occupations at a time when they might be ready to go to school, and that as compared with their fellows, they are placed at some disadvantage. For 2 years, they are not able to proceed with their school or college education; they are not able to go ahead in the occupations they might have entered. It is argued that because of these circumstances they deserve adjustment benefits.

If we accept this proposition, then it is correct to say that whether a person is serving in the United States or in Vietnam, he has postponed for 2 years or whatever term of service he gives to the country, his education or employment.

Although I do not know that this thesis would be entirely accepted, I voted for the two amendments which have just been rejected.

The thinking behind my amendment is that if it is the purpose of S. 9 to provide educational benefits, we ought to write a bill which would provide incentive for those who actually want an education. Otherwise, the bill takes on the characteristics of a bonus.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is any distinction made between a member of the armed services who serves, let us say, 6 months and one who serves 3 or 4 years, so far as the amount of benefits is concerned? Would one who served only 6 months receive more benefits and readjustments than a person who served 3 or 4 years?

Mr. COOPER. My amendment follows S. 9. In the first place, 6-month veterans are not covered in the bill. The minimum service is 180 days.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is approximately 6 months.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct. But those who select 6 months as their choice of a period of service are not covered by the bill. But if one entered the service for a longer term but for some reason could serve only 6 months, he would be covered by the bill.

The Senator from Iowa will recall that among the choices that are available to those who enter the Armed Forces, a 6-month period of training is available and that after that the person is required to take a certain amount of Reserve training.

S. 9 does not provide benefits for those who make the 6-month service choice. However, if one enlisted or was inducted for a longer period, but for some reason could serve only a lesser period, such as 6 months, he would be covered by the bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Suppose he served 2 years. Would he receive more benefits than one who served 6 months?

Mr. COOPER. Yes. For every day of service——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Day and one-half.

Mr. COOPER. For every day of service over 6 months, under the terms of my amendment, as in S. 9, he would be able to secure a day and a half of school, college, or training unit benefits. That is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is correct. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for clarifying that point. The veteran would receive 1½ day's training for each day in service, not to exceed 36 months. No one could go to school, under the bill, for more than 36 months. His schooling would depend on the length of his service.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator's amendment would provide a loan at a low rate of interest for the veteran who really wanted to get an education. If he did not want to get an education, he would not ask for a loan.

Mr. COOPER. Yes. It is possible that some would take a grant and go to school, perhaps not with the intention of completing their education or training.

But by providing for a loan this possibility is diminished. Those who were really interested in education would, I believe, be willing to take a loan.

I believe that the effect of the bill on the educational attainments of the veterans would be enhanced.

Again—and this may sound old-fashioned—I do not believe there is anything wrong in asking that those who receive benefits make an effort of their own. Thousands have done so in the past; thousands will do so in the future. It will not harm any veteran who has spent an average of 28 months in the armed services.

We are caught in a cold war. Unless there is some change in the attitude of the Communist countries, or some accommodation between the Communist countries and our country, the cold war will continue and thousands, hundreds of thousands, millions of young men will serve. It is a duty and an honor to serve.

It is not a happy circumstance which calls young men into the service. It is not a circumstance which is pleasing to the families, wives, and children of these young men. We are not happy about it. But the duty must be discharged. I believe we should make provisions for them as they return to civilian life.

It is my belief that a loan program would be a generous and reasonable program.

I offer this amendment as a reasonable amendment and one which I believe has merit. I hope very much that the Senate will agree to the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I oppose the Cooper amendment.

We know of the important record which the GI bill made in the field of education. The GI bill, in one sense, represented a loan of the people of this country to the future expansion and wealth of this Nation. The GI beneficiaries of the bill received their college degrees, and their vocational training under it. They now earn so much more income than they would have earned if they had not received their college degrees or their post secondary training, that they are now paying additional taxes to the Treasury over what they would have otherwise paid. They have done so for more than a decade. The increased taxes paid by those veterans have wiped out and will continue to wipe out time and again the so-called original investment in the GI bill.

I do not know how we can better justify than in the way this measure attempts to do, or compensate for the dislocation of the economic well-being that occurs to our GI's when they are taken into service. After this bill is enacted into law, veterans who take advantage of the opportunities which will be accorded by the bill will pay in the future additional tax dollars that they would otherwise never have been able to pay.

It is at least parsimonious for us to take the position that we will let them go to college if they borrow the money, but that we will not recognize that we have an obligation to see that they have the opportunity to go to college if they so choose and then repay the investment by way of additional tax dollars on the money they would earn by virtue of their education.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, after World War II, 60 percent of the veterans decided not to go to school because the allowance was not sufficient. After the Korean war, only 45 percent of the veterans went to school. The other veterans did not go because they would have had to borrow money, or their wives would have had to work.

This measure is not a bonus. It would not permit any boondoggling. This measure would not provide enough money to keep the veterans in school.

Mr. President, in order to save time, I ask unanimous consent that the explanation which has been placed on the desks of Senators be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPER LOAN AMENDMENT WOULD BE INEFFECTIVE AND WOULD NOT HAVE THE ADVANTAGES CLAIMED FOR IT

The amounts of money provided by S. 9 are not intended to be sufficient to cover all the costs of the veteran's education. As the committee report points out on page 18, "The majority of veterans attending school under this bill will have to supplement the educational grant with part-time employment and in many cases the wives of these veterans will also have to work to help pay for their husbands' training."

The average charge for tuition and required fees in institutions of higher education in 1963 was $576.80. The median charge for dormitory rooms was $207.45. The median charge for board rates was $398.80. These three basic college expense figures add to $1,183.35. S. 9 will provide only $990 for a 9-month college course to an unmarried veteran. Thus there is already a discrepancy for basic expenses alone of $193.35. To these basic expenses must be added those for other necessities such as books, clothes, and medical care. With these figures in mind it does not take too much imagination to see a picture of the typical veteran going to school under the GI bill. He works part time. He is forced to go into debt to borrow money. When he isn't working he is studying or going to class. He has no time for any of the luxuries or enjoyments of life.

This picture is a far cry from the one which some people would paint of a veteran growing fat and lazy because of undue largess from the Government. It is still going to be a struggle with the small grant authorized in S. 9, but at least this grant will provide the nucleus of a stake in civilian life for the discharged veteran, around which he can, if he works hard and has the ability, build a future of hope rather than despair, for himself.

If we provide loans, instead of an educational allowance, the great majority of young men will not choose to avail themselves of the program. Four years of borrowing under a loan program would put a student $3,960 in debt. If you add this to the other debts he would run up, since this figure doesn't cover the total costs of his education, one can only conclude that a loan program alone would be worth little in assisting young men to continue their education. A young man is not going to want to go that deeply into debt at the beginning of his adult life, when he has no financial experience. The gains to be derived from further education will be so far away in terms of years and so unclear and ill-defined in terms of the impact that they make upon a young man's mind, that he will be unwilling to go deeply into debt on the chance that perhaps 4 years later he may be able to make extra money sufficient to pay the loan back. He will instead decide to go right to work, with no more education. The result is a loss both to himself and to society.

The argument that the loan program will be cheaper does not stand up under analysis. The World War II GI bill continues to pay for itself at a rate of close to $1 billion a year. The GI's who went to school under the bill became more productive members of society, which was reflected in higher incomes that produced additional income taxes. The additional taxes that will be paid by the massive numbers of veterans who will go to college under S. 9 will result in far more money being paid into the National Treasury than would the additional taxes plus the repayment of loans that would be produced by the adoption of a loan program, because of the greatly diminished number of veterans who would participate in a loan program. Thus in the long run the program set up by S. 9, the same type of program which proved so successful in the World War II and Korean GI bills, would put money into the Public Treasury, not take it out. Furthermore, it would add much more revenue than would a loan program.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a GI could not go to school on this modest allowance, if he did not have sufficient money to go to school in the first place.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, thousands of boys and girls in the United States are going to school and working their way through on less money than this measure would provide. Under the National Defense Education Act, the scale would be less than this amount.

Thousands of boys and girls who have the will to go to school are going. I ask that we give the veterans the same opportunity.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as the record shows, of the veterans of the Korean conflict who went to school, 80 percent worked, or their wives worked, or they borrowed money. There was no record of those who borrowed money outside the college.

The record shows that in 1952, $72 would buy as much as $110 would buy today. The record also shows that the tuition in private and public colleges has doubled since 1952.

These allowances have not gone up 1 percent. This would be a more restrictive bill than existed for the Korean veteran. One measure would provide 60 days rather than 90 days in which the veteran would have to make a decision.

The able Senator is very fair. I commend the distinguished Senator from Kentucky for his fairness. The Senator said he would cut expenses more than this. Surely he would. We are trying to let the veteran have a readjustment period to learn how to make a living before he would come back.

The letter from California that was printed in the RECORD earlier today shows that, of the veterans returning from the cold war, over 10 percent in California are unemployed. The unemployment rate in California is 5 percent. These veterans make up part of that percentage. Therefore, the veterans who served in the cold war have an unemployment rate three times as high as those who did not.

If a man had sufficient credit on which he can borrow money to go to college, he would not have to go to Vietnam.

The radio reported today that 60 percent of the unit on which the Communists opened mortar fire yesterday were drafted. They were drafted because they did not have the money to go to college. Those men have given up an average of 28 months to the service. It is a gross unfairness to say, "We will let you borrow money, as others borrow money under the NDEA," when those who borrowed under the NDEA did not have to go to war. Such a provision would not make up for the loss of time.

This bill would provide a minimum amount. It would not be sufficient to keep them in college. However, if they have the incentive, they can take this money and get a job on the side or their wives can go to work. However, they must have the incentive to go to college and make good. It takes more than this allowance to put a man through college.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment which has been proposed by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. The purpose of S. 9 just cannot be realized if it is turned into a loan program.

Realize the situation which the returned GI faces. He has served for 2 or more years on a pay scale which we all know does not allow him to save any money. He faces a serious readjustment problem. He is behind his contemporaries in his education and his employability. S. 9 would give his just $110 a month for an education. This amount is too small to give him any kind of free ride. After the Korean war, 80 percent of those who took advantage of the GI bill had to get outside help either by working or getting a loan. Thus, the veteran will have to work or get loans to supplement the amount which S. 9 offers to him. If the initial program, the purpose of which is to provide an incentive for the veteran to go to school, turns out to be just a loan, it could not possibly ever accomplish its purpose.

The average age of returning GI's today is 22.3. To ask such a man to start out his life at that age—when he already has or very soon will have a wife and children—with a loan hanging over his head, is just asking too much. It will be too hard on the returning veteran, and the consequence will simply be that he will not obtain the education which he needs and deserves.

Our young men who serve make a special contribution—they deserve special recognition. Realistic assistance for readjustment requires that S. 9 not be confined to a loan program. Thirty-five percent of our returning veterans have not finished high school. It is simply unreasonable to expect these young men to complete their education if they have to saddle themselves with a loan before they can even start doing so.

I hope the Senate will not defeat the purpose of S. 9. I urge the Senate to reject the Cooper amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Kentucky. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 65, as follows:

[No. 191 Leg.]

YEAS—20

Bennett
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Fannin
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Morton
Murphy
Saltonstall
Simpson
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—65

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Ellender
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Russell, S.C.
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—15

Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Eastland
Ervin
Hayden
Jordan, N.C.
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Neuberger
Pastore
Randolph
Ribicoff
Sparkman
Tydings

So Mr. Cooper's substitute amendment was rejected.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I will support the pending bill on passage, not because I think the cold war approach is best, but because I want the House of Representatives to have a prompt opportunity to consider the general problem involved.

I know that the House has in the past wisely refused to accept the cold war, omnibus approach. I also know that many distinguished Members of the House have expressed concern about the need to provide now for Vietnam veterans.

I expect the House Veterans' Committee to consider this situation with its customary thoroughness, and I hope that the House experts will revise S. 9 into the Vietnam GI bill which we so badly need.

In the meantime, Mr. President, I shall do all I can to urge the Senate to write a Vietnam GI bill into law as a part of the coming higher education bill.

I therefore will vote "aye" on final passage today because of our acute responsibility to the more than 70,000 men in Vietnam and their supporting forces; and because I hope that the omnibus bill can be made the vehicle in the House for the emergence of a "Vietnam GI bill."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, after long years of effort, the cold war GI bill of rights has reached the Senate floor for debate.

The many other Members of this body who have cosponsored this legislation and I owe a great debt to the leadership, preseverance, and untiring zeal of the senior Senator from Texas who has fought so long and valiantly for this legislation. I salute him on this occasion, even as I join him in urging passage of this bill.

The Cold War Veterans Readjustment Act, as the bill is formally known, is intended to extend the benefits of readjustment assistance to veterans of the cold war who have served their country since 1955. It will continue the salutary benefits of the World War II and Korean war GI bills. Justice to our citizen soldiers demands the enactment of this bill, and recent developments in southeast Asia have once again demonstrated vividly that the cold war is no less dangerous and harrowing than many a hot war. It has disrupted the lives of millions of young Americans who have selflessly contributed their service to the defense of freedom all across the globe. I need not labor this point further with my distinguished colleagues for the unhappy facts of the world situation are too well known to all in this body.

I would take only a few minutes more of the Senate's time to point out the importance of the effects this legislation will have. It has been the recent history of our industrial society that 30 percent or more of our unemployed are below age 25. The majority of these jobseekers, until the recent implementation of President Johnson's war on poverty, had little hope of discovering a permanent solution to their dilemma. The very rapid forward thrust of automation and the constant threat of foreign competition, along with increasing numbers in the employment market, will require continuing and intensive efforts to solve the problems of employment for our youth. The enactment of this legislation would entitle a large segment of our younger citizens to the training necessary to develop employment skills which are so critically needed in our increasingly complex civilization.

As many of my distinguished colleagues will recall, I have often spoken on this floor of the growing need for greater scientific competence in our job market. This legislation would, in large degree, provide a means for filling that need. For that reason, as well as because of the basic considerations of justice and equity, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this landmark legislation.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, more than 2 years ago I appeared to testify before the subcommitee chaired by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas. My testimony—the first I had given on a piece of major legislation since becoming a Member of this august body—urged passage of S. 9, the cold war GI bill.

The passage of time has, if anything, reinforced my early belief that the enactment of this legislation is direly needed.

We need this bill. Its passage is demanded by a sense of justice toward our service veterans and by a sound, hardheaded evaluation of the general benefits that would result from its enactment.

For good and sound reasons, the Congress has seen fit to require that tens of thousands of our young men serve in the military. We have required that they leave their homes at a time when most of them would be starting on a career or receiving the training which would prepare them for a career. From this demand which we place on our youth evolve certain responsibilities which, I submit, the Congress must assume.

I would like to point out, Mr. President, that our demands on America's young men are not made uniformly. The very promising student who is able to obtain outside financial assistance in the form of a college scholarship is able to postpone his being drafted—if not permanently, then at least until he has completed his college training.

The somewhat less promising youth who is unable to obtain a scholarship—but whose family can nonetheless afford to send him to college—is similarly able to avoid the draft at least temporarily.

In many cases, the chief difference between the student who goes on to college and the student who does not—and is subsequently drafted—is simply having or not having sufficient money.

Thus, the young man who begins the productive period of his life at a financial disadvantage finds himself still further disadvantaged, through no fault of his own, by being taken away from family, friends and occupation so that he may serve his Nation in the Armed Forces. He may be drafted or, knowing that the call to military service is imminent, he may enlist. Either way, when this young man completes his military obligation after several years at low pay, he may—or he may not—have acquired training and skills that will enable him to qualify for a specific vocation. The relevance of many military skills to civilian life is often minimal.

If he does not acquire usable skills, the youth who was drawn into the service initially because he was financially handicapped finds himself still further behind because he has been out of touch for several years with the opportunities of civilian life. This may well result in a permanent personal disadvantage.

I should like to point out, Mr. President, that our servicemen today and over the past decade have had to prepare to meet any possible contingency of military confrontation. It takes as much skill and courage to put down so-called brushfires in an attempt to keep the general peace as it does on a battlefield at a time of general war. In Vietnam, in the Dominican Republic, in Berlin, in Laos, in other corners of the world, our military men often face peril and many of them are injured or killed in the line of duty. Wherever they are stationed, at home or abroad, their mission is the same—to play their individual roles in maintaining peace or, if necessary, to be this Nation's bulwark against foreign aggression. They are prepared to fulfill this mission, and for this we owe them much.

Add to this obligation, Mr. President, the fact that S. 9 would be a sound national investment and you have a second compelling—if less personal—argument for its adoption.

The two previous acts of this kind taught us that by providing veterans with academic and vocational training, we more than recover our expenditures through the development of the individual's skills and, hence, his increased income and contribution to the general welfare through increased buying power and tax payments.

Under past GI bills, we trained for the Nation 205,000 doctors, dentists, and nurses; 150,000 physical and research scientists; 500,000 engineers; and 350,000 schoolteachers. Additional tax revenues generated by these veterans as a result of their education easily have offset the cost of the previous GI bills.

Since 1955, our Nation's total expenditures on national defense has been nearly $500 billion. The almost negligible fraction of that amount which we would spend to provide benefits for cold war veterans should be considered as part of our obligation to keep our Nation militarily and economically strong. The individual veteran will benefit—and so will the entire Nation.

When we think of our obligation toward our military men, we call to mind the words of John Mason Brown when he described eloquently the American GI:

> Death re-creates an individual out of someone who has fallen singly from the ranks. In his loneliness by a foreign roadside, this man * * * ceases to be Government issue, a mass commodity produced by a mass response out of a mass need and hope. He once again becomes man's issue, and woman's, too.

Yes, Mr. President, we must remember that the American GI is an individual—an individual with hopes and dreams, an individual ready to give his life to defend us all and the land which we cherish and in which freedom prospers. To this individual, this Congress today must say "thank you."

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I am delighted that the cold war GI bill has finally come before the U.S. Senate. As one who has joined him in sponsoring this measure in each of the last three Congresses, I wish to commend the able and distinguished senior Senator from Texas for his determination and tireless efforts on behalf of this Nation's veterans. I support this bill because I believe it rectifies an injustice to the young men who have served this Nation's defenses since the end of the Korean war but who have not had the opportunities for education and other assistance given to veterans of prior service under the GI bill. Yet, since the end of Korea, these young men have felt the same disruption of lives and ambitions, and have been trained and maintained for battle and run the same risks of injury and death in conflict as veterans of prior years. They face the same problems of readjustment, as those men did. By failing, up to this time, to enact legislation such as this, we have in effect failed to treat them as equals with veterans who served before them. This general inequality was brought home to me in a letter I received from a constituent during the last Congress, who wrote:

> The oldest boy, who is now 31, was drafted during the Korean "police action" even though married, and served 2 years in the Army within the United States. After discharge, he availed himself of the opportunities in the GI bill. By dint of hard work and the help of the Government he will in a few weeks be an electrical engineer, a training which he could never afford, nor could I with my responsibilities be able to give him. In addition, he was able to buy a home under the GI bill.
>
> It is quite different with the other two. They both enlisted immediately out of high school for 2 years, one in the Marine Corps, and the other in the Army. The boy in the Army spent most of his time on the borders of East Germany. The Marine was better off—he spent most of his time at Camp Pendleton.
>
> Now the point is this—the two younger boys do not have the benefits that the older one enjoyed even though they did as much for their country as the older one.

Mr. President, I believe that these two young men deserve the same treatment and the benefits we gave their brother. I believe the same should apply to our men in Vietnam, in Berlin, in the Dominican Republic and in the camps and bases throughout this Nation and abroad. For a very large number of these men, the cold war GI bill represents their only hope for an education and for the kind of life which they and thousands like them have helped to protect and defend. I join the cosponsors of this bill in urging the Senate to approve this most important measure.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am most pleased to have this opportunity to express once again my strong support for the cold war GI bill.

This legislation has commanded my strong support ever since I first came to the U.S. Senate. On April 4, 1963, in a statement which I made before the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on behalf of S. 5, I noted that around the world today tens of thousands of young Americans, called from the familiar routine of family, school, and career, are guarding the lives and safety of 185 million of their fellow citizens.

Many of these young men and women, who have served their country so well, face a possible handicap in their future careers. The Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1965, now S. 9, is designed to make educational assistance and home loan guarantees available to the 5 million veterans of the cold war similar to that made available to the veterans of World War II and Korea. Justice demands that we enact this legislation during this session of Congress. The proposed bill has always enjoyed strong public support. The need for it has never been greater.

In 1963 when I first testified on this legislation I quoted from a letter written me by an ex-serviceman and young constituent. This young man brought home the meaning of the sacrifices of these cold war servicemen when he wrote: "Although servicemen of today are not engaged in an active shooting war, the demands placed upon them are very similar to those of active conflict. Soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines around the world are daily giving their lives in service to their country. At remote stations in every corner of the globe, the tremendous task of guarding our freedom is being accomplished. In the Berlin crisis and again in the Cuban crisis, our servicemen have demonstrated their ability and willingness to serve the country and deter aggression. Must our Nation become involved in open conflict before recognition, in the form of passage of the cold war GI bill, is given to these men?"

How impressive these remarks appear today in the light of the heavy U.S. commitments in southeast Asia. The total of American dead and wounded rises every day in South Vietnam. It is certainly an injustice to the thousands of young American military men engaged in the conflict there to deny them the same benefits which have been accorded to veterans of the Korean conflict. When these young men return home from southeast Asia they will face similar problems of securing education and employment. The situation is particularly severe for the soldiers of today because of the increased automation which makes finding employment that much more difficult.

I especially wish to support the provisions of this bill for home and farm loan assistance. Loans will be made for the purchase of farm homes, farm lands, and livestock to be used by veterans in farming operations. Direct loans not exceeding $13,500 may be made to veterans in certain small towns and rural areas when private capital is not available for guarantee loans. A system of institutional onfarm training is established under section 1952 of the bill. Under this authority, many young people from rural farm areas will be afforded the opportunity to attend an institution of higher learning who otherwise would not be able to get a college education. As President Johnson has said, the Great Society cannot be achieved until an adequate higher education is made available to all who desire it.

These farm provisions in particular will be of great benefit to the cold-war veterans of my State. Thousands of South Dakotans are engaged in farming. With the current low levels of farm income it is especially difficult for young families to become successfully established in the business of farming. The provisions of this bill may well mean the difference between success and failure for many of the young farmers in my State.

S. 9 is very much in the national interest. I earnestly hope that my colleagues in the Senate and House will join in the effort to enact this bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of S. 9, proposing the establishment of a Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act, I wish to urge immediate passage of this legislation.

During the 86th Congress I cosponsored similar legislation, S. 1138, a cold war GI bill, which passed the Senate but failed of House passage. I cosponsored S. 349 during the 87th Congress, a bill to provide educational benefits for post-Korean conflict draftees and volunteers who served for 6 months since January 31, 1955.

It is my sincere hope that the 88th Congress will see fit to enact S. 9, which the Senate is now debating, so that our Government may provide some of the same equitable and fully deserved readjustment assistance to our cold war veterans as was wisely extended to our American servicemen of World War II and the Korean conflict.

The present bill, S. 9, proposes a cutoff date of July 1, 1967, for the effective period of eligibility for benefits, with the induction period, as defined by the bill, beginning on January 31, 1955. Eligibility for the educational and vocational training assistance and the guaranty and direct loan assistance, as incorporated in the bill, is predicated on discharge from active service under conditions other than dishonorable.

I have on occasion pointed out to the citizens of my State of West Virginia that the funds which the Federal Government has expended in veterans' benefits through education have been among our Nation's wisest and shrewdest investments. Indeed, the tremendous benefits which have accrued to the United States as a result of the enactment of the original GI bill, with all of its provisions for veterans' benefits, have far exceeded the expectations of the original passers of that legislation.

Veterans who have benefited from the GI bill's provisions have substantially raised the economic level of our country and its taxpaying citizenry. In proof of this, the 1960 census showed that nearly 17 million American families were headed by war veterans, and that these families, on a nationwide basis, had a median income of $6,469 a year, nearly $1,000 more than the median for the total 45 million U.S. families. And these better educated, higher earning, taxpaying veterans are now funneling approximately $1 billion annually in income taxes into the Federal Treasury.

In addition to the financial practicalities of the bill, there is the inherent obligation on the part of our Federal Government to deal justly and equitably with all of its citizens.

Young Americans entering military service since January 31, 1955, have made personal sacrifices in meeting their military obligations. Equity is due them.

Draftees and enlistees now serving in Vietnam's jungles are no less deserving of fair treatment by our Nation than those who served in tropical jungles in World War II.

And how may we expect to explain to those reservists and draftees, who may be at any moment called up to active duty to meet rising demands for U.S. military forces in Vietnam and elsewhere, that we do not feel their service is as deserving as that of those who have been called to our Nation's defense in the past, for this would be what Congress would be saying, in effect, if no action is taken to more nearly equalize by Federal statutes the entitlement of veterans to educational and loan benefits.

In good conscience, last week's headlines, "Joint Chiefs Want Vietnam Force of 179,000 This Year," should be matched in the early future by the headline, "Congress Passes Cold War Veterans' Benefits Bill."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to be a cosponsor of the Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act, the cold war GI bill.

In my opinion this bill meets a vital need, a need whose urgency is reinforced by every new headline about trouble spots around the world. These headlines emphasize, if any reemphasis is needed, that the cold war is not just an expression, but a somber fact of life.

The cold war GI bill will provide much needed educational and vocational training assistance for veterans of the post-Korean war period. Those eligible will receive monthly allowances for up to 36 months of education or training, based on the length of their time in service.

There would also be vocational rehabilitation training for disabled veterans, and home and farm loan assistance.

I speak today in favor of a program which has already proven itself. The success of the World War II and Korean GI programs is well known. The education features of those programs were particularly important, and made an invaluable contribution to the national welfare.

Nearly 8 million veterans of World War II received training under the first GI bill. Of this total some 450,000 went into communications; 380,000 into highly technical construction work; 100,000 became lawyers; 63,000 physicians; 75,800 farmers; 180,000 mechanics; 238,000 schoolteachers; and 145,000 engineers. Without assistance provided by the original GI bill of rights, many of these men would have been eligible only for low-skill, poorly paid positions. Many would have drifted into unemployment.

In the words of the Bradley Commission:

> The veterans' education program was a major contribution to the national welfare, and the country would be weaker educationally, economically, and in terms of national defense if educators, veterans' organizations, the President, and the Congress had not seen fit to embark upon this new and momentous educational enterprise.

Some 5 million post-Korean war veterans will be eligible for assistance under the proposed bill. This includes the most able-bodied, and potentially some of the most productive men in the Nation. Their economic futures and their ability to adjust to the new industrial technology are, I believe, dependent largely upon this bill.

I do not agree with those who say that GI benefits should not be available to so-called peacetime veterans.

We all know that we live in perilous times, when a precarious state of half-war seems to be forever with us. The cold war GI bill is simply a recognition of the present state of the world—when obscure events on distant shores can swiftly transform the garrison soldier into a guarantor of the peace, and the adviser into an active combatant.

Mr. President, I should like here to pay tribute to the work of the able and distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the author of this bill, for his vigorous and effective leadership in the effort to provide readjustment assistance for veterans of military service. I am proud to be part of this effort.

Thomas Jefferson once remarked that we cannot expect freedom and ignorance to coexist together. The men to be eligible for assistance under this bill have contributed mightly to our freedom, and they are daily being called upon to contribute further.

Let us now contribute to their freedom by passing this bill and thus enabling our veterans to better equip themselves for the great challenges that lie ahead.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the Senate has before it one of the most important and far-reaching education measures that it has considered in some years.

The cold war GI bill is a readjustment act. It is intended to set out a balanced program of readjustment assistance for post-Korean veterans. It contains both education and vocational training assistance, as well as guarantee and direct-loan assistance for the purchase of homes and farmlands.

Recent events, such as the conflicts in Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, the Cuban missile crisis and the Berlin callup, have dictated the continuing need for a large, well-trained military force. We have committed this military force to the preservation of a free Vietnam and Dominican Republic. We have lost men in these conflicts; men who are willingly serving the cause of democracy.

Now we have the opportunity to establish a program that will enable our veterans to more easily readjust from their tour of military duty. The sound economics of this program have been well documented. This country has benefited immeasurably from the World War II and Korean GI bills, in a better-educated and more productive citizenry. And to be very practical, the GI's who took advantage of these opportunities increased their income potential and contributed more in tax revenues than they would have otherwise.

The prospects of another callup of the Reserves and perhaps an extension of military duty for those now in the Armed Forces, confronts us now. Many will be inconvenienced, some will make the ultimate contribution, should this occur.

We must, Mr. President, be prepared to provide a broad readjustment program for these men and women. We must be willing to show that this Government is concerned with the welfare of its veterans. We must recognize that inequities exist in our selective service process, and provide some balance to even them out.

We have that opportunity now by passing S. 9, and if we are successful I hope that our colleagues in the House will support our efforts.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, America finds itself today in a twilight zone. We are at peace; yet we are not. Our young men are being asked to sacrifice by going into military service by volunteering in large numbers or through the draft in increasing numbers.

We have been told that the President is considering calling some reservists to active duty.

All this is because of international obligations unknown to America and Americans for 160 years. In the period following World War II, we have been thrust into the leadership of a free world whose very foundations are under attack.

We are in a period during which the Trojan horse of sabotage is within every free nation of the world, in which spying and revolutionary plotting has become a way of life by our adversaries. We are in a period when infiltration and attack in so-called wars of liberation have become a way of life in all the backward and emerging nations of the globe.

Our Nation has been drafted into the leadership of the free world—politically, economically and militarily. It is the price we pay collectively for freedom and prosperity, indeed, for our way of life.

Following World War II, the Congress recognized that, for the first time in our history, we had uprooted a vast majority of our young men and women and pressed them into military service. Rather than a handout or pension or bonus, a wise Congress provided for these men and women special benefits to enable them to recoup part of the months and years they have lost in defense of our Nation and its freedom and institutions. Thus, the GI bill put education and homeownership within reach of the average person among the 10 million or so who answered the call.

We, who pioneered free education for all, thus pioneered a new concept—that of college, university, trade school, and special training for all who served their Nation in its Armed Forces. There was, without question, a social and educational revolution in this country which might never have come about.

The same thing is true of home and farm ownership, made easier by the GI bill.

The Korean war brought America the first of its peacetime conflicts in which we sought to honor a commitment to a tiny partner in freedom threatened by invasion, in which we sought to halt the march of communism in Asia.

Since then we have been in the twilight zone about which I have spoken. We draft men. We maintain large armed services. We seek to help defend the honor of freemen all over the globe. Our men and materiel have been offered to the cause in the Congo, in Berlin, in Vietnam. Our men sail in the NATO fleet. They man outposts in all corners of the earth.

The need for the fire department of our armed services is no less today than it was during the Korean war. Nor will the need be diminished at any early date.

What shall we say to these firemen for freedom?

The GI bill now is applicable to those who served prior to January 31, 1955. What of the lives disrupted since?

In equity a grateful nation should provide GI bill benefits to its lukewarm war veterans. This is why I have joined with others in the sponsorship of S. 9 and why I urge its overwhelming passage.

IMMEDIATE ENACTMENT OF COLD WAR GI BILL IS IMPERATIVE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, events of recent months and the prediction of greater escalation of the undeclared war in Vietnam make it even more imperative than ever that the cold war GI bill, S. 9, of which I am cosponsor, be enacted without delay.

The record should be clear that when the cold war GI bill is enacted into law—and I am more convinced than ever that it is only a matter of time before it is enacted because the need for it grows greater day by day—my colleague, the able and distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] will deserve the appreciation of the many cold war GI's who will benefit from this bill for his untiring and persevering efforts to secure for them this much needed protection.

When Senator YARBOROUGH first introduced this bill in 1957, it could rightly be called the cold war bill of rights. When the bill was passed in 1959 by the Senate, the appellation was still correct.

However, times have changed since then.

We are now involved in a shooting war in Vietnam which seems to be escalating into a ground war as fierce and as destructive of human life as the Korean conflict. Surely if those who fought in the Korean conflict were entitled to the benefits of a GI bill of rights, those who are fighting in Vietnam should be entitled to readjustment assistance, educational and vocational training assistance and loan assistance upon their discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.

By the same token, since any person serving in the armed services during this period could have been sent to Vietnam and, his not being sent is only happenchance, these benefits should be made available to all serving in the armed services since the termination of the Korean conflict.

I strongly support the early enactment of the now no longer accurately named cold war GI bill of rights. It has the strong endorsement of the AFL-CIO, the American Federation of Teachers, the National Farmers Union, and many veterans' organizations.

As we call upon the Reserves, the National Guard units, and the draftees to fight in Vietnam in ever-increasing numbers, it would be reassuring to them to know that there is on the statute books a GI bill of rights providing benefits to them when they return.

As I understand the opposition of the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense to this proposed legislation, both these agencies feel that postservice educational programs are likely to lure men from the services. The Reserve units, the National Guard units, and the draftees now being sent to fight in Vietnam cannot be placed in the class of volunteers so that this argument is no longer applicable.

We cannot long delay the enactment of this measure without seriously injuring the morale of those being called up.

Mr. President, I have warmly supported this important legislation from the time of its introduction by Senator YARBOROUGH in past Congresses. I ask unanimous consent that my testimony before this Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare earlier this year be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ERNEST GRUENING, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF ALASKA

Senator GRUENING. Mr. Chairman, whenever I have the opportunity to express my belief that the veterans of this Nation may justifiably be proud of the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, I do. Certainly no other person has worked and continues to work harder to make certain that the men and women who have served or are serving in the armed services of the United States of America receive fair treatment.

Veterans have confidence in this subcommittee; they should. It has been tireless in its quest for the enactment of the cold war GI bill. I concur in its opinion that our veterans should have the opportunity, if they wish, to continue their education which too many times is interrupted by a call to military service.

So once again I urge enactment of the Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act. I have cosponsored similar bills in the 86th, 87th, 88th, and 89th Congress. Regrettably, with the passing of each year more men and women returning to private life are deprived of the opportunity to advance themselves educationally, professionally, and financially.

The veteran serving in the cold war is discriminated against. He can be drafted under the Universal Military Training and Service Act, an act I consider neither adequate nor fair for in its application it has become dangerously outmoded and discriminatory. Worse, since 1951, it has assumed the status of the "undiscussed sacred cow."

Perhaps we will have the opportunity to modernize our procedures or to abolish this draft entirely. You will recall that on April 18, 1964, President Johnson announced that Secretary of Defense McNamara would undertake a comprehensive review of the military draft. The review was to take 1 year. The time is approaching for a statement of findings, and I hope the 1-year study by the Department of Defense will reveal that the draft can be eliminated and our military forces retained at proper strength with volunteers.

We are not wedded to the Universal Military Training and Service Act, yet each year a large number of our American youth enter military service and give from 2 or more years of their lives to the defense of their country.

Regrettably, only 44 percent of our draft-eligible young men ever serve their country in uniform. These are the men who sacrfice those 2 to 4 years of their lives at the time they would otherwise be in college or beginning their business careers. When they return to civilian life, they are for the most part unskilled, uneducated, and unemployed. I know of no civilian firms which seek as regular employees men with the special skills learned in the jungles of South Vietnam, for example.

Cold wars, as we know, can be very hot. Today's servicemen have no assurance that their tomorrow will come. Already our American dead in South Vietnam exceed 350 and the number of injured is far larger.

The GI bills of earlier years helped more than 10 million veterans, and of that vast number 3,450,000 entered institutions of higher learning; 4,364,000 entered schools below the college level; and 2,656,000 learned skills in on-the-job and on-the-farm training programs. Our Nation, consequently, is far stronger; our economy much improved.

We do grave disservice to our servicemen of today. The bill before the committee is designed to train veterans to enable them to stay off unemployment rolls.

I was disturbed, Mr. Chairman, to learn in reading your article entitled "A Fair Deal for the Cold War Soldier" which appeared in Harper's magazine, that unemployment among veterans discharged since the Korean GI bill lapsed on January 31, 1955, is increasing. More than 2½ million men have been discharged from active duty since January 31, 1955. They deserve better treatment.

More than 210,000 veterans received unemployment compensation in excess of $96 million. Their unemployment is shocking. Obviously men must be trained if they are to prosper and if they are to contribute to—not detract from—our national economy.

The language of S. 9 will help our veterans. It proposes that veterans receive 1½ days of educational assistance for each day of service, not to exceed 36 months of schooling. The veteran enrolling fulltime in college would be aided by a monthly cash allowance of $110 if single, $135 per month if he has one dependent, or $160 per month if he has more than one dependent. Under terms of the bill, reduced allowances are suggested for part-time schooling or on-the-job or on-the-farm and apprentice training.

The bill offers assistance to young veterans who wish to purchase homes in the city or in the country. I consider this to be desirable, for such a program will bolster many sectors of our economy. Banks or other lenders make loans with Government guaranteeing 60 percent, up to $7,500, on residential real estate, and 50 percent, up to $4,000, on nonresidential real estate. Direct loans not exceeding $13,500 may be made to veterans in certain small towns and rural areas when private capital is not available for guarantee loans.

Estimates vary as to the number of new homes which could be constructed were the cold war GI bill to become law, but the figure of 1 million appears conservative. As our population explodes, as our national housing needs increase, we would do well to utilize the tools contained in S. 9.

The cost of the cold war GI bill varies, depending on who is making the estimate; but whether the cost is $1.5 billion or twice that amount, the investment we make cannot be computed solely in dollars or cents.

In his January 12, 1965, education message to the Congress, President Johnson declared:

"Nothing matters more to the future of our country: not our military preparedness—for armed might is worthless if we lack the brainpower to build a world of peace; not our productive economy—for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower; not our democratic system of government—for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant."

The President pointedly said:

"Nearly half the youths rejected by Selective Service for educational deficiency have fathers who are unemployed or else working in unskilled and low-income jobs."

In my message as Governor of Alaska to the special session of the 17th Assembly of the Alaska Territorial Legislature in 1946, I discussed educational provisions for returning veterans. Part of my message is particularly pertinent today.

I said:

"It is true that it is late. We should have started planning for this some time ago. It will be difficult to get any sort of program in operation with the speed necessary to meet the situation fully, but the longer we delay, the longer we are inactive, the worse will become our dilemma and that of our returning students."

And so today—two decades later—the problem confronts a nation, and it is late.

Back in 1786 Thomas Jefferson in writing to George Wythe discussed the diffusion of knowledge. Jefferson said:

"The most important bill in our whole (Virginia) code is that for the diffusion of knowledge among the people. No other sure foundation can be devised for the preservation of freedom and happiness."

Mr. Chairman, I support S. 9 and urge that this subcommittee report it favorably. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, as a sponsor of Senate bill 9, the cold war GI bill, I am pleased to address the Senate today in support of this needed legislation. I was privileged earlier, during February 1965, to appear in behalf of this bill before the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

This bill helps thousands of our young servicemen readjust to civilian life upon returning from military service. It allows them to complete their college education or vocational training which enables them to earn a better living.

The bill provides up to 36 months of education and vocational assistance in cash allowances, $110 a month for single veterans; $165 for those with dependents. In addition, the program provides for farm and home loan assistance. Veterans with more than 180 days of active service or service-connected disabilities, would be eligible for the program.

Some 3 million cold war veterans would be eligible for assistance under this bill.

All too often, young veterans are untrained and uneducated for a competitive position in an economy which continually demands more and more education and more skills of its workers. This inequity is even harsher when we consider the fact that selective service regulations which permit deferment for college education make it more likely for youths from low income backgrounds to be drafted. Thus, it is often the already disadvantaged who are further penalized by disruption of their lives without any restoration of lost opportunities. Then, upon their return, they find themselves far behind those in their age group who were allowed to continue their schooling and their careers.

This cold war GI bill in effect provides equality of opportunity to the veteran. The veteran who has sacrificed 2, 3, or 4 years of his life is given an opportunity to catch up with his nonveteran companions whose lives were not disrupted by military service.

Senate bill 9, like the two previous GI bills, is not intended as a bonus bill for combat duty. Neither the World War II nor the Korean GI bills made any distinction between those veterans who served in the front lines and those who served in noncombat stateside jobs. Further, the distinction as to whether the United States is officially at peace is meaningless when American servicemen are being killed and wounded in Vietnam and elsewhere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from

Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 17, as follows:

[No. 192 Leg.]

YEAS—69

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Dodd
Douglas
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Russell, Ga.
Russell, S.C.
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—17

Bennett
Carlson
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ellender
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Lausche
Morton
Robertson
Saltonstall
Simpson
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—14

Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Eastland
Ervin
Hayden
Jordan, N.C.
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Neuberger
Pastore
Randolph
Ribicoff
Sparkman

So the bill (S. 9) as amended, was passed.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I express my thanks, first, to the members of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs who so patiently and diligently came to the long and thorough hearings which were held upon the bill. This applies to the four majority members and to the minority, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Fannin], both of Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, to the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I also express my deep gratitude to the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], who helped us at every stage of the proceedings in the subcommittee to schedule hearings and to schedule executive meetings, and in the full committee, so that we could report the bill in time to the Senate in order that adequate opportunity would be afforded to enact the bill this year.

I also express my appreciation to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] for the courtesy with which he presented his amendment, and for his fairness and objectivity.

Let me also express my special personal thanks, appreciation, and admiration, to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], for the thoroughness with which he examined and cross-examined witnesses during the hearings on the bill. He showed the complete untenability of the position of those opposed to the bill. As a lawyer with 25 years' practice, I take off my hat to him for his masterly handling of the hearings. He went directly to the point. He did a fine job. I also express my thanks to him for his fine cooperation on the floor during debate on the bill.

I express my thanks and appreciation to the 5 million veterans for their cooperation, as well as to the 41 cosponsors of the bill and to many other Senators who supported the bill after it was printed and after it was too late to have their names appear as cosponsors.

I also express my thanks to the overwhelming 2-to-1 majority in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], to the Senator from Michigan, who are on the floor, and to many others.

I express my appreciation also to the junior Senator from Massachusetts, who was active both in the subcommittee and on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I express my thanks also to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], who so patiently waited with his amendment in order to expedite all the votes and the passage of the bill. He agreed with the leadership to condense his arguments. He presented those arguments effectively, concisely, and forcefully, and he cooperated with everyone in the final vote today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I congratulate the Senator from Texas on his masterful handling of the bill through the hearings in the subcommittee and on the floor. This is one of the most democratic education bills that we could possibly have passed.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Most of all, Mr. President, I wish to thank the majority leader and his official staff, who have helped us at all times, and have been so diligent in helping us work out accommodations for Senators, some of whom were coming in on planes and some of whom were leaving today. They were helpful in working out unanimous-consent agreements on amendments, in that way saving as much time as could possibly be saved. They have aided the passage of the bill very greatly.

I congratulate them on their skill and cooperation. They have been uniformly courteous and kind to Senators on both sides of the question.

And last but not least, I wish to express my deep personal thanks to the devoted and detailed work of the staff of the Veterans' Subcommittee and of my own legislative staff. These office staffs have furnished me information, done research, and prepared innumerable reports, memorandums and suggestions. Without their help this bill could not possibly have progressed this far in this period of time.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] on the way in which he handled the Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act and on the work that went into it.

One of the joys of our service as Senators in achieving an objective is taking part in the translation of ideas into events.

Over many years the Senator from Texas has worked on an idea and developed it, and watered and nourished it, and then today saw it translated into an actual flowering and accomplishment. What he has achieved today will be of inestimable benefit to millions of our young men.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Texas on the fine work he did in managing the bill from beginning to end. It was a pleasure to sit with him as he presided over the hearings and developed the record which was instrumental in moving the bill through committee, to the present floor action.

It was a pleasure to participate in floor debate with him and to watch him demonstrate his mastery of the issues as he answered all questions put to him. It was a pleasure to support him in this entire effort. He deserves the appreciation of all of us today.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator from New York for his kind remarks.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the passage of S. 9, the so-called cold war GI bill, represents the culmination of many years of effort in this field by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough]. His handling of this bill has been masterful; his arguments succinct as well as persuasive.

In like manner I wish to commend the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], and the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] whose constructive criticism of this bill was presented in their amendments. The cooperation of these Members as well as the Senate as a whole renews my growing optimism that we may complete our work by Labor Day.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for his generous remarks and for the tremendous assistance which he rendered during the consideration of the bill.

THE SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, today I issued a press release on our recent policy in the Dominican Republic. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Congressional Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

After hearing the testimony this morning in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Wayne Morse, of Oregon, said of our recent policy in the Dominican Republic:

"The major impression I have formed to date from the hearings on the Dominican Republic crisis is that the United States can be counted upon to continue its mistaken policy of supporting military juntas in Latin America.

"I am afraid that any attempt on the part of the masses of the people in any Latin American country where conflict exists between military leaders who wish to enlarge their military power, and civilian leaders who are seeking greater self-government by the people, will result in the United States being found on the side of the military.

"The propaganda alibi will be that our course of action is necessary to put down communism. I want to see communism defeated, too, but it must be done through our helping the people develop economic freedom and not through our support of military dictatorships.

"Bullets will not defeat communism, but bread will."

TEACHING PROFESSIONS ACT OF 1965—INTRODUCTION OF BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that tonight on my own behalf and for the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], and the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], that I introduce the Teaching Professions Act of 1965 which the President of the United States on July 17 recommended to the Congress for consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the President dated July 17, 1965, the text of the letter to the President of the Senate, dated July 17, 1965, an explanation of provisions and the text of the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, statement, letter, and explanation will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2302) to provide fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel, to improve the quality of teacher training programs, and to establish a National Teacher Corps, introduced by Mr. Morse (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2302

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Teaching Professions Act of 1965."

PART A—FELLOWSHIPS AND TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL PERSONNEL

Award of fellowships authorized

Sec. 2. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to support fellowship programs for persons who have recently received a bachelor's degree or its equivalent and who desire to pursue a career in elementary or secondary education, for persons in another career or activity who desire to enter or re-enter upon a career in elementary or secondary education, and for persons who are pursuing a career in elementary or secondary education but who desire to improve their qualifications or to acquire qualifications in a different aspect of elementary or secondary education. These fellowships may be awarded for graduate study in any field which has as its purpose assisting or improving elementary or secondary education. Fellowships awarded under this part shall be for periods of study not in excess of two calendar years and shall be awarded only for the use of persons who have been accepted into programs approved pursuant to section 3(a).

(b) In supporting fellowship programs under the provisions of this part, the Commissioner shall endeavor to provide an equitable distribution of such fellowships throughout the States, except that after consultation with the Advisory Council on Teacher Preparation he may establish priorities which take into consideration particular qualifications of persons who may receive fellowships, their proposed field of study, and the nature of the service they intend to provide in elementary or secondary education.

Approval of programs; grants

Sec. 3. (a) The Commissioner shall approve a graduate program of an institution of higher education only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding—

(1) that such program will substantially further the objective of improving the quality of education of persons who are pursuing or intend to pursue a career in elementary or secondary education,

(2) that such program gives major emphasis to high-quality substantive courses,

(3) that such program is of high quality and either is in effect or will be attainable as a result of granting fellowships under this part for study in the program, and

(4) that only persons who demonstrate a serious intent to pursue or to continue to pursue a career in elementary or secondary education will be accepted for study in the program.

(b) For the purpose of obtaining an appropriate geographical distribution of high-quality programs for the training of personnel for elementary and secondary education, the Commissioner is authorized, on such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, to make grants to and contracts with institutions of higher education to pay part of the cost of developing or strengthening graduate programs which meet the requirements of subsection (a) and of developing or strengthening high-quality undergraduate programs for the training of such personnel. The Commissioner may employ experts and consultants, as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), to advise him with respect to the making of grants and contracts under this subsection, and he shall set forth in regulations the standards and priorities which will be utilized in approving such grants and contracts. Experts and consultants employed pursuant to this subsection may be compensated while so employed at rates not in excess of $100 per diem, including travel time, and may be allowed, while away from their homes or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Fellowship stipends; conditions

Sec. 4. (a) The Commissioner shall pay to persons awarded fellowships under this part such stipends (including allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such members and their dependents) as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs.

(b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a), the Commissioner shall pay to the institution of higher education at which such person is pursuing his course of study $2,500 per academic year or its equivalent (as determined under regulations of the Commissioner), less any amount charged such person for tuition.

(c) A person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this part shall continue to receive the payments provided in subsection (a) only during such periods as the institution he is attending finds that he is maintaining saitsfactory proficiency in, and devoting essentially full time to study or research in a program approved pursuant to section 3(a), and is not engaging in gainful employment other than incidental employment by such institution in teaching, research, or similar activities which are considered a part of his training.

(d) No fellowship shall be awarded under this part for study at a school or department of divinity. For the purposes of this subsection, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution or department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

PART B—NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

Statement of purpose

Sec. 10. The purpose of this part is to strengthen the educational opportunities available to children in areas having high contractions of low-income families by making available to local educational agencies teachers who are qualified to participate in programs and projects approved under title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, and to encourage more highly trained and broadly prepared persons to pursue careers in elementary and secondary education by—

(1) attracting and training experienced and qualified teachers who will be made available to local educational agencies to participate in such programs and projects; and

(2) attracting and training inexperienced teacher-interns who will be made available to participate in such programs and projects in teams led by an experienced teacher.

Establishment of National Teacher Corps

Sec. 11. In order to carry out the purposes of this part, there is hereby established in the Office of Education, for the benefit of the several States, a National Teacher Corps, hereafter in this part referred to as the "Teacher Corps."

Teacher Corps program

Sec. 12. (a) For the purpose of carrying out this part, the Commissioner is authorized to—

(1) establish procedures for the recruitment, selection, and enrollment of experienced teachers, and teacher-interns who have a bachelor's degree or its equivalent but who have no experience as teachers, in the Teacher Corps for periods of up to two years;

(2) enter into arrangements, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education and with State educational agencies to provide members of the Teacher Corps with appropriate training before they undertake their teaching duties under this part;

(3) enter into arrangements, including the payment of the administrative costs of such arrangements, with State educational agencies and, where appropriate, with participating institutions of higher education designated for this purpose by the State educational agency, to furnish members of the Teacher Corps to local educational agencies, for participation during regular or summer

sessions, or both, in programs and projects approved under title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended; and

(4) employ experts and consultants or organizations thereof to assist the Commissioner in carrying out his functions under this part, as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and to compensate individuals while so employed at rates not in excess of $100 per diem, including travel time, and allow them, while away from their homes or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner determines that the demand for the services of experienced teachers or of teaching teams furnished pursuant to clause (3) of subsection (a) exceeds the number of experienced teachers or teaching teams available from the Teacher Corps, the Commissioner shall, to the extent practicable, allocate experienced teachers or teaching teams, as the case may be, from the Teacher Corps among the States in proportion to the number of children in each State counted for making basic grants under title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, for the fiscal year for which the allocation is made.

(c) To the extent consistent with law, a local educational agency shall utilize members of the Teacher Corps assigned to it in providing, on an equitable basis and in the manner described in section 205(a)(2) of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, educational services in which children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools can participate.

Teacher-interns

SEC. 13. (a) Teacher-interns who serve in the Teacher Corps shall be assigned in teaching teams, each team consisting of teacher-interns and one or more experienced teachers who so far as practicable shall also be members of the Teacher Corps. The Commissioners shall provide, through grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education and State educational agencies, programs of teacher training for all such teacher-interns. Such programs shall offer to teacher-interns one or more courses of training each of which shall be under the supervision of an institution of higher education and shall, wherever possible, lead to a graduate degree at the end of the teacher-intern's enrollment in the Teacher Corps. Such programs shall involve teaching, on less than a full-time basis and under the supervision of experienced teachers who are, so far as is practicable, enrolled in the Teacher Corps, in programs or projects approved under title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended.

(b) The Commissioner shall enroll as teacher-interns only applicants who indicate in writing an intention to serve in elementary or secondary education for a period of at least two years after the termination of their enrollment in the Teacher Corps.

Compensation; stipends

SEC. 14. (a) An arrangement made with a local educational agency pursuant to clause (3) of section 12(a) shall provide for compensation by such agency of Teacher Corps members at a rate which is equal to the rate paid by such agency for a teacher who has similar training and experience and who has been assigned similar teaching duties.

(b) For any period of training under this part the Commissioner shall pay to members of the Teacher Corps such stipends (including allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such members and their dependents) as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable Federally supported training programs.

(c) The Commissioner shall pay the necessary travel expenses of members of the Teacher Corps and their dependents, necessary expenses for the transportation of the household goods and personal effects of such members and their dependents, and such other necessary expenses of members as are directly related to their service in the Corps, including readjustment allowances proportionate to service.

(d) The Commissioner is authorized to make such arrangements as may be possible, including the payment of any costs incident thereto, to protect the tenure, retirement rights, participation in a medical insurance program, and such other similar employee benefits as the Commissioner deems appropriate, of a member of the Teacher Corps who participates in any program under this part and who indicates his intention to return to the school, or educational agency or institution, by which he was employed immediately prior to his service under this part.

Application of provisions of Federal law

SEC. 15. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this section, a member of the Teacher Corps shall not, solely because he is such a member, be deemed to be a Federal employee or be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

(b)(1) During periods of full-time training, such members shall, for the purposes of the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 751 et seq.), be deemed to be civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term "employee" as defined in section 40 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 790) and the provisions thereof shall apply except as hereinafter provided.

(2) For purposes of this subsection:

(A) the term "performance of duty" in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall not include any act of a member of the Teacher Corps—

(i) while on authorized leave; or

(ii) while absent from his assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity authorized by or under the direction or supervision of the Commissioner; and

(B) in computing compensation benefits for disability or death under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the monthly pay of a member of the Teacher Corps shall be deemed to be his actual pay or that received under the entrance salary for grade 6 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, whichever is greater.

(c) During periods of full-time training, such members shall be deemed to be employees of the Government for the purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions of title 28, United States Code.

Local control preserved

SEC. 16. Members of the Teachers Corps shall be under the direct supervision of the appropriate officials of the local educational agencies to which they are assigned. Except as otherwise provided in section 13, such agencies shall retain the authority to—

(1) assign such members within their systems;

(2) make transfers within their systems;

(3) determine the subject matter to be taught;

(4) determine the term and continuance of the assignment of such members within their systems.

PART C—GENERAL

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 20. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the four succeeding fiscal years.

Advisory Council on Teacher Preparation

SEC. 21. (a) The Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education an Advisory Council on Teacher Preparation for the purpose of reviewing the administration and operation of the programs carried out under this Act and of all other Federal programs for complementary purposes. This review shall pay particular attention to the effectiveness of these programs in attracting, preparing, and retaining highly qualified elementary and secondary school teachers, and it shall include recommendations for the improvement of these programs. The Council shall consist of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and twelve members appointed for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Such twelve members shall include persons knowledgeable with respect to teacher preparation and the needs of urban and rural schools, and representatives of the general public.

(b) Members of such Advisory Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while attending meetings or conferences of such Council or otherwise engaged on business of such Council, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including traveltime, and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(c) The Council may appoint an Executive Secretary and such other employees as the Council deems necessary to carry out its functions under this part.

Federal administration

SEC. 22. (a) The Commissioner may delegate any of his functions under this Act except the making of regulations to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

(b) In administering the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

Method of payment

SEC. 23. Payments under this Act to any person, to any State or Federal agency, to any institution of higher education, or to any other organization, pursuant to a grant, contract, or other arrangement may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustment on account of overpayments or underpayments.

Federal control of education prohibited

SEC. 24. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

Limitation on payments under this Act

SEC. 25. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment under this Act for religious worship or instruction.

Definitions

SEC. 26. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(b) The term "elementary school" means a school which provides elementary education including education below grade 1, as determined under State law.

(c) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or that recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association approved by the Commissioner for this purpose or, if not so accredited, (A) is an institution with respect to which the Commissioner has determined that there is satisfactory assurance, considering the resources available to the institution, the period of time (if any) during which it has operated, the effort it is making to meet accreditation standards, and the purpose for which this determination is being made, that the institution will meet the accreditation standards of such an agency or association within a reasonable time, or (B) is an institution whose credits are accepted on transfer by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

(d) The term "local educational agency" means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary schools. Such term also includes any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school.

(e) The term "nonprofit" as applied to a school means a school owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(f) The term "secondary school" means a school which provides secondary education, as determined under State law, except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12.

(g) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(h) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands.

(i) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law.

The statement, letter, and explanation presented by Mr. Morse are as follows:

Statement by the President

Like many of my fellow Americans, I believe that this land's most noble enterprise is the work of education; that, in our Nation's classrooms, our future is being built. And I believe that the chief architects of that future are the teachers of America.

Today I have completed work upon a legislative proposal which is a testament to those beliefs: the Teaching Professions Act of 1965. It is now on its way to the Congress.

Today in the United States there are 1,800,000 teachers in elementary and secondary schools. By this fall we will need 193,000 new teachers merely to accommodate growing enrollments and to replace teachers who retire and leave the profession. We will need nearly 2 million new teachers in the next 10 years.

Yet our needs cannot be expressed in numbers. Tomorrow's teachers must not merely be plentiful enough; they must be good enough. They must possess not only the old virtues of energy and dedication, but new knowledge and new skill. And if we are to have the best available teachers, we must attract to teaching the best available students.

Today almost 5 percent of our teachers—85,000—lack adequate certification. Almost 10 percent have less than a bachelor's degree; only 25 percent have a master's degree.

Our Nation, whose needs are so immense and whose wealth is so great, can do better. We must do better. And this act offers a way to begin.

The Teaching Professions Act of 1965 will establish, first, a National Teachers Corps. Members of the Corps—experienced teachers and students who plan to make teaching a career—would go together to the city slums and to rural areas of poverty to offer what these troubled regions need most: light and learning; help—and hope.

Second, the act will create a program of fellowships to prepare superior students for teaching careers in elementary and secondary schools and to help teachers renew their knowledge and skills. The Federal Government already assists men and women making their careers in college teaching. Now is the time to do the same for those who serve at the elementary and secondary school levels.

Finally, this act will provide direct assistance to institutions of higher learning so that they may develop better programs for teacher education. The Teaching Professions Act of 1965 is a composite of hard thinking about educational problems in the Congress, in the executive branch, and in the teaching profession. It owes much to the proposals of Senators Gaylord Nelson and Edward Kennedy for a National Teachers Corps; to Senators Wayne Morse and Clifford Case and Representatives Carl Perkins and John Brademas for a program of fellowships for teachers; and to Representative Patsy Mink for a program of Federal grants to teachers for sabbatical leaves.

I am calling upon the Congress to make this beginning even though it is well along in its present session. The problems confronting us in education do not diminish with the passage of time; neither should our zeal for solving those problems. This act may be just a beginning; but now is the time to begin.

Henry Adams said, "A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops." This act, I believe, will have an eternal influence on this Nation.

July 17, 1965.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.
Hon. John W. McCormack,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: As I announced in my remarks before the National Education Association on July 2, I am proposing legislation to bring the best of our Nation's talent to its schools. This legislation—the Teaching Professions Act of 1965—will:

Create a National Teacher Corps to serve in city slums and areas of rural poverty;

Establish a program of fellowships to prepare students for teaching careers in elementary and secondary education and to help experienced teachers enhance their qualifications;

Aid institutions of higher education to provide better programs for educating teachers.

The National Teacher Corps draws on that spirit of dedication of Americans which has been demonstrated time and again in peace and war, by young and old, at home and abroad. It will provide a challenge and an opportunity for teachers with a sense of mission—those best suited to the momentous tasks this Nation faces in improving education.

The National Teacher Corps can help improve the quality of teaching where quality is most needed and most often in short supply—in city slums and in areas of rural poverty. It will enroll experienced teachers, and, to work with them, students who intend to make teaching a career. They will teach in local schools at the request of local communities and will serve on the same terms as local teachers. They will be local, not Federal, employees.

The fellowships are essential if teaching is to attract a higher proportion of our ablest young people, and if the best teaching is to prevail in the classroom. Students preparing for teaching in these days should have superior graduate training. Teaching is a difficult job at best; the more preparation for it, the better.

The desire of classroom teachers to replenish their skills and knowledge is not only to be applauded but aided. As revolutionary changes take place in all subjects and at all levels of learning, there is a limit to the sacrifice we can ask of our teachers in their efforts to renew their knowledge.

Finally, I propose a program of grants to help institutions of higher education offer first-rate programs to would-be teachers as well as to experienced teachers. This measure, coupled with the fellowship program and the National Teacher Corps, completes a program which is entitled to be called the Teaching Professions Act of 1965.

The Teaching Professions Act of 1965 is a composite of hard thinking about educational problems in the Congress, in the executive branch, and in the teaching profession. It owes much to the proposals of Senators Gaylord Nelson and Edward Kennedy for a national teacher corps; to Senators Wayne Morse and Clifford Case and Representatives Carl Perkins and John Brademas for a program of fellowships for teachers; and to Representative Patsy Mink for a program of Federal grants to teachers for sabbatical leaves.

This bill will deepen the meaning and substance of the already impressive work of the 88th and 89th Congresses in the field of education. I have concluded that it is of sufficient urgency to justify action by this session of the Congress. The problems which face us in education do not grow smaller as time goes by; neither should our determination to attack and solve those problems. I commend to you the Teaching Professions Act of 1965, and hope that you will give it speedy consideration.

Sincerely,

Lyndon B. Johnson.

Outline of Provisions of the Teaching Professions Act of 1965

The newly proposed "Teaching Professions Act of 1965 would carry out the President's proposals, first announced in his July 2 speech before the National Education Association's Convention in New York City, to establish a program of fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel and to create a National Teacher Corps.

The legislation would authorize the Commissioner of Education to support fellowship programs carried out by institutions of higher education for recent baccalaureate recipients, for persons in other careers desiring to pursue a career in elementary or secondary education, and for persons in elementary and secondary education desiring to improve their qualifications or to acquire qualifications in a different aspect of elementary and secondary education.

Fellowships would be awarded for up to 2 years of graduate study in approved high-quality graduate programs which give major emphasis to substantive courses and are designed for persons pursuing careers in elementary and secondary education.

In addition to stipends for fellowship holders, a cost-of-education allowance of $2,500 would be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such fellowship holder is studying.

The Commissioner of Education would also be authorized to pay to institutions of higher education part of the cost of developing or strengthening high quality graduate and undergraduate programs for the training of personnel for elementary and secondary education, for the purpose of obtaining an appropriate geographical distribution of such programs.

The bill would establish in the Office of Education a National Teacher Corps in which experienced teachers and teacher-interns who have a bachelor's degree but who have had no teaching experience would enroll for periods of up to 2 years. Members of the Teacher Corps would, pursuant to arrangements with State educational agencies and, where appropriate, with institutions of higher education designated by the State educational agency, be furnished to local educational agencies in areas having high concentrations of low-income families to participate in programs and projects approved under title II of Public Law 874 (title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965).

Before undertaking their teaching duties, all members of the Teacher Corps would be provided training under arrangements which the Commissioner of Education would enter into, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education and with State educational agencies. The Commissioner would likewise provide, through grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education and State educational agencies, in-service teachers training programs for teacher-interns, who would teach on less than a full-time basis in order to have time for training courses under the supervision of an institution of higher education. Such courees would, wherever possible, lead to a graduate degree at the end of the teacher-intern's enrollment in the Teacher Corps.

Teacher-interns joining the Teacher Corps would be assigned in teaching teams which would also include experienced teachers, and the teaching program for teacher-interns would be under the supervision of experienced teachers. Insofar as practicable, such experienced teachers would be teachers who are enrolled in the Teacher Corps.

Arrangements for furnishing Teacher Corps members to local educational agencies must provide that such agency will compensate Teacher Corps members at the rate of pay for a teacher who has similar training and experience and similar teaching duties.

Stipends (including substance allowances) would be paid to members of the Teacher Corps by the Commissioner of Education during periods of training when Teacher Corps members are not on assignment with a local educational agency. The Federal Government would pay travel expenses and readjustment allowances before and after Teacher Corps members undertake their duties in the areas where they will be teaching. In addition, the Federal Government could make payments necessary to protect retirement rights, medical insurance, and other employee benefits for experienced teachers who expect to return to the schools where they were employed before joining the corps.

Members of the Teacher Corps could be utilized by local educational agencies to provide educational services in which children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools can participate, in the manner described in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The legislation guarantees that members of the Teacher Corps would be under the direct supervision and control of local educational agencies to which they are assigned.

While the bill authorizes the furnishing of teachers and teaching teams in the corps to all local educational agencies with programs for low-income children which State educational agencies approve under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, if the demand for the services of such teachers should exceed the number available from the Teacher Corps, the Commissioner of Education would be directed to allocate them among the States (to the extent practicable) in proportion to the number of low-income children in each State which are counted for State-by-State distribution of basic grants under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The appropriations authorization for both programs is limited to $30 million in this fiscal year (1965–66).

An Advisory Council on Teacher Preparation would be established in the Office of Education to review both the fellowship and Teacher Corps programs, as well as other programs bearing on the improvement of teacher preparation programs in the Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have asked that the material be spread upon the RECORD in order that all Senators may have the opportunity to review the details outlined in the draft bill so that they may, if they wish, join with me and my distinguished colleagues on the committee in cosponsoring the measure.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill I am introducing lie at the desk until the close of business, Friday, July 23, to enable Senators who wish to do so to add their names.

Mr. President, I wish again to express my delight that the administration is in support of the basic concepts, both the teaching corps and the followship components, which many of us have for some time been advocating. Hearings on the concepts have been held by the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on June 11 so that there is a strong body of evidence in our hearings record which can be utilized in the evaluation of the specifics both of the bill being introduced and the amendments to S. 600 which were introduced by Senator NELSON for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and myself Friday last.

In our executive sessions in this week we can now have before us the thinking of the administration as well as that of the Senatorial cosponsors on the mechanism through which the concepts can operate. I feel sure that none of us is wedded to the language either of this bill or of our previously introduced amendments. Our objective, however, remains now as it was earlier, to do the best job we can in drafting language which can best carry out the purpose and trust of the Teaching Professions Act of 1965. It is my hope that we can incorporate these concepts as a separate title of S. 600.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

NOMINATION OF DR. ROBERT M. WHITE TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I was pleased and proud to learn that President Johnson has nominated Dr. Robert M. White to be the first Administrator of the newly created Environmental Science Services Administration.

Dr. White brings to his new position a wealth of experience in the field of the environmental sciences. As Chief of the Weather Bureau and as president of the Travelers Research Center in Hartford, Conn., he has proven himself to be both an able administrator and an eminent scientist.

The ESSA will serve a real need in consolidating in one service the efforts of the Weather Bureau and the Coast and Geodetic Survey. It will focus attention on the long-overdue acknowledgment of the essential unity of the environmental sciences.

As we make spectacular breakthroughs in our space efforts, there will be very important new developments in our knowledge of the physical world in which we live, the oceans around us, and the space above us. It is good to know that a man of Dr. White's energy and talent will be directing for the benefit of our people the application of this new knowledge.

And so, I salute the President for this very fine nomination and I congratulate Dr. White for this well-deserved recognition of his talent and for his dedication to his science and to his country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent article from the New York Times describing Dr. White's distinguished career.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 13, 1965]

TOP U.S. WEATHERMAN: ROBERT MAYER WHITE

WASHINGTON, July 12—A friend who knew Dr. Robert M. White, the Nation's top weatherman, as a boy in Boston said his most vivid memory is of someone "energetically striding up the street." Dr. White has not slowed down since, even when he wrote a thesis for his doctorate of science at Massachusetts Institute of Technology entitled "Global Energy Balance." A reporter who interviewed him in his Weather Bureau office a few moments ago said:

"He was moving rapidly all the time he was talking."

Now the Weather Bureau was merged today with the Coast and Geodetic Survey and an atmospheric radio laboratory into the new Environmental Science Services Administration—largely a creature of Dr. White's own making.

HAS A QUIET MANNER

Dr. White is 42 years old, a dark-haired, brown-eyed man of medium height with a quiet manner and a quick smile. His most outstanding characteristic, other than giving the impression of perpetual motion, seems to be the ability to make others want to work with him.

He took over the Weather Bureau on October 1, 1963, following a man who had directed it for more than 24 years. Since then he has reorganized the Bureau and conceived and shepherded the plan for the new agency through a governmental process that he once called "far more complex than I had thought."

Like Dr. White's thesis and his approach to the physical sciences that govern the weather, the new agency will be global in its outlook.

He has been quoted as saying that meteorology "is on threshold of a revolution"—largely a technological one made possible by statistical methods, computers and satellites that have revolutionized man's ability to observe the atmosphere.

Dr. White has grown up with this revolution. His early interest in geology shifted to meteorology when he was assigned as a weather observer by the Air Force in 1962.

He received a bachelor of arts degree from Harvard University in geology in 1944, left the service in July, and took a detour into jouralism and advertising until 1948.

Then he entered MIT earning a master of science degree in meteorology in 1949 and his doctorate the next year.

From 1950 until 1959 he studied large-scale circulations of the atmosphere as a civilian scientist for the Air Force's Cambridge Research Center near Boston. It was here that he developed the administrative talents that led a fellow scientist to call him "one of the best administrators in Government."

Dr. White returned to MIT briefly as a research associate in 1959 and then became head of the new Travelers Weather Research Center at Hartford.

The center was established by the Travelers Insurance Co. to find ways to predict and warn of storms and hurricanes.

This interest has carried over into a desire to give the new agency what President Johnson called an ability to develop an adequate warning system for the severe hazards of nature—for hurricanes, tornados, floods, earthquakes and seismic sea waves, which have proved so disastrous to the Nation in recent years.

Dr. White also has a strong interest in weather modification, an old dream that now holds some promise of coming true.

TEN-HOUR-A-DAY MAN

He is a 10-hour-a-day man at the office and sometimes a two briefcase man when he takes work home. He lived in apartments until he moved to a house in Connecticut, but there he discovered a love for flower gardening.

Dr. White is married to the former Mavis Seagle, and they have two children, Richard, 7, and Edwina, 5. They live now in a Maryland suburb of Washington. One of his two brothers is Theodore H. White, the author.

In Dr. White's whirlwind approach, very little time is left for raising gladioluses and dahlias, but he takes every opportunity he can.

"He just goes ahead when he has time," Mrs. White said. "When he gets wet, he gets wet. He doesn't take much notice of the weather."

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF DISNEYLAND

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I rise in tribute to a great American—and a close personal friend of many Members of this body—who yesterday celebrated the 10th anniversary of an accomplishment which has endeared him to all America and to millions of our friends around the world as well.

That man is Walt Disney—and the accomplishment is Disneyland in my home State of California.

Yesterday brought the total number of visitors to Disneyland to almost 50 million. Kings and queens, 23 presidents, premiers, and other heads of state plus 25 royal princes and princesses have visited Disneyland making it one of the most popular attractions in the history of the world.

It is more than a park—more than a collection of clever amusements created and welded together from the genius of Walt Disney. It is Americana—from Frontier Land, down Main Street and into Fantasy Land and Tomorrow Land.

Regardless of age, visitors are more than entertained at Disneyland. They are awed, educated, and inspired. They learn about history, art, geography, space, and industry.

It is comforting to know that in an age of concern for moral erosion, the popularity and success of Disneyland serves to prove that creativeness, cleanliness, and courtesy still promise overwhelming success.

Walt Disney has also given his great talents to the Government of the United States graciously and effectively in fairs, exhibits, and, of course, in films and television. He has been for many years one of the best known and highly respected and honored Americans of all time. He has been honored by 21 foreign governments.

I know that the distinguished Members of the U.S. Senate join with me in saluting Walt Disney and Disneyland—two great American institutions.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am delighted to join my friend and colleague from California in saluting a unique American genius, Walt Disney, whose magic has delighted the whole world.

My hometown is Anaheim. I was born there, and I have lived there all my life.

When I say to my friends in the east that I live in Anaheim, and they do not quite understand, I say, "That is where Disneyland is located." Then they do know where my home is.

This is a unique undertaking that Walt Disney has created. Therefore, the 50 million people who have come to see the Disney magic are an indication of many more millions who will come there in the future.

I am glad to join my colleague from California in saluting a wonderful and great man, Walt Disney.

STATE TECHNICAL SERVICES ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 406, S. 949.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill S. 949 to promote the economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments on page 1, line 5, after the word "in", to insert "business, commerce, and"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "American", to strike out "business and enterprise." and insert "business, enterprise, commerce, and industrial establishments."; in line 9, after the word "established", to insert "business, commerce, and industrial establishments."; in line 19, after the word "enable", to strike out "businesses and industries" and insert "businesses, commerce, and industrial establishments"; on page 3, line 11, after the word "Designated", to strike out "institution" and insert "agency"; in line 25, after the word "this", to strike out "Act," and insert "subsection"; on page 4, line 23, after "Sec. 3.", to strike out "Any" and insert "The Governor or other competent authority of any"; on page 5, line 5, after the word "Act.", to strike out:

> If the institution or agency designated by each State is not a State university or land-grant college entitled to benefits under the Act approved July 2, 1862, or the Act of August 30, 1890, and Acts amendatory and supplementary thereto (7 U.S.C. 301, 329), the Governor or other competent State authority shall furnish the Secretary a written statement of his reasons for designating such other institution or agency.

In line 13, after the word "designated", to strike out "institution" and insert "agency"; in line 19, after the word "region", to strike out "its industry," and insert "business, commerce,"; on page 6, line 18, after the word "designated", to strike out "institution" and insert "agency"; on page 7, line 4, after the word "designated", to strike out "institution" and insert "agency"; in line 11, after the word "State", to insert "other"; in line 13, after the word "service", to strike out "performed" and insert "that is now available or could be made available"; in line 18, after the word "company", to insert "public work or other capital project"; in line 20, after the word "the", to insert "industry and commerce of the"; on page 8, line 5, after the word "designated", to strike out "institution" and insert "agency"; on page 9, at the beginning of the line, strike out "SEC. 9" and insert "SEC. 9(a)"; after line 14, to insert:

> (b) The right to alter, amend, or repeal this section, or any consent granted pursuant to this section, is expressly reserved.

In line 19, after the word "designated", to strike out "institution" and insert "agency"; in line 20, after the word "shall", to strike out "establish" and insert "appoint"; on page 10, line 3, after the word "designated", to strike out "institution" and insert "agency"; after line 6, to strike out:

> SEC. 11. There is authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be needed to carry out the purposes set forth in this section.

And insert in lieu thereof:

SEC. 11. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this Act, $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; and $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

In line 18, after the word "designated", to strike out "institution" and insert "agency"; on page 11, line 1, after "(2)", to strike out "commerce," and insert "commercial,"; in line 7, after the word "designated", to insert "agency"; in line 24, after the word "designated", to strike out "institution" and insert "agency"; on page 12, line 14, after the word "Act.", to strike out:

There is authorized to be appropriated each fiscal year such amount as may be necessary to provide the services authorized in this section.

On page 13, at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "SEC. 16." and insert "SEC. 16(a)", and in the same line, after the word "designated", to strike out "institution" and insert "agency"; on page 14, after line 2, to insert:

(b) The Secretary shall make a complete report with respect to the administration of this Act to the President and the Congress not later than January 31 following the end of each fiscal year for which amounts are appropriated pursuant to this Act.

In line 10, after the word "any", to insert "agency or"; in line 12, after the word "the", to insert "agency or"; in line 16, after the word "the", to insert "agency or"; in line 20, after the word "such", to insert "agency or"; in line 24, after the word "such", to insert "agency or"; on page 15, line 3, after the word "any", to insert "agency or"; in line 6, after the word "such", to insert "agency or"; at the beginning of line 8, to insert "agency or"; and to amend the title so as to read: "A bill to promote commerce and encourage economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. That Congress finds that wider diffusion and more effective application of science and technology in business, commerce, and industry are essential to the growth of the economy, to higher levels of employment, and to the competitive position of United States products in world markets. The Congress also finds that the benefits of federally financed research, as well as other research, must be placed more effectively in the hands of American business, enterprise, commerce, and industrial establishments. The Congress further finds that the several States through cooperation with universities, communities, and industries can contribute significantly to these purposes by providing technical services designed to encourage a more effective application of science and technology to both new and established business, commerce, and industrial establishments. The Congress, therefore, declares that the purpose of this Act is to provide a national program of incentives and support for the several States individually and in cooperation with each other in their establishing and maintaining State and regional technical service programs designed to achieve these ends.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) "Technical services" means activities or programs designed to enable businesses, commerce, and industrial establishments to acquire and use scientific and engineering information more effectively through such means as—

(1) analyzing problems of the regions and industries to determine new opportunities for applying technology;

(2) preparing and disseminating technical reports, abstracts, computer tapes, microfilm, reviews, and similar scientific or engineering information, including the establishment of State or regional technical information centers for this purpose;

(3) providing a reference service to identify sources of engineering and other scientific expertise; and

(4) sponsoring industrial workshop, seminars, training programs, extension courses, demonstrations, and field visits designed to encourage the more effective application of scientific and engineering information.

(b) "Designated agency" means the institution or agency in each participating State, which has been designated as administrator of the program for such State under section 3 of this Act.

(c) "Qualified institution" means (1) an institution of higher learning with a program leading to degrees in engineering or business administration which is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association to be listed by the United States Commissioner of Education, or such an institution which is listed separately after evaluation by the United States Commissioner of Education pursuant to this subsection; or (2) a State agency or a private, nonprofit institution which meets criteria of competence established by the Secretary of Commerce and published in the Federal Register. For the purpose of this subsection the United States Commissioner of Education shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of engineering or business education or training offered. When the Commissioner determines that there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit such programs, he shall publish a list of institutions he finds qualified after prior evaluation by an advisory committee, composed of persons he determines to be specially qualified to evaluate the training provided under such programs.

(d) "Participating institution" means each qualified institution in a State, which participates in the administration or execution of the State technical services program as provided by this Act.

(e) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce or the official to whom the Secretary has delegated all or part of the authority in this Act.

(f) "State" means one of the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

PLANS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 3. The Governor or other competent authority of any State which wishes to receive Federal payments under this Act in support of its existing or planned technical services program shall designate, under appropriate State laws and regulations, an institution or agency to administer and coordinate that program and to prepare and submit plans and programs to the Secretary of Commerce for approval under this Act.

SEC. 4. The designated agency shall prepare and submit to the Secretary in accordance with such regulations as he may publish—

(a) At the beginning of each five-year period, a five-year plan which may be revised annually and which shall: (1) outline the technological and economic conditions of the State, taking into account its region, business, commerce, and its industrial potential and identify the major regional and industrial problems; (2) identify the general approaches and methods to be used in the solution of these problems and outline the means for measuring the impact of such assistance on the State or regional economy; and (3) explain the methods to be used in administering and coordinating the program.

(b) An annual technical services program which shall (1) identify specific methods, which may include contracts, for accomplishing particular goals and outline the likely impact of these methods in terms of the five-year plan; (2) contain a detailed budget, together with procedures for adequate fiscal control, fund accounting, and auditing, to assure proper disbursement for funds paid to the State under this Act; and (3) indicate the specific responsibilities assigned to each participating institution in the State.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall not accept a five-year plan for review and approval under this Act unless the Governor of the State or his designee determines and certifies that the plan is consistent with State policies and objectives; and the Secretary shall not accept an annual technical services program for review and approval under this Act unless the designated agency has, as certified thereto by the Governor or his designee—

(a) invited all qualified institutions in the State to submit proposals for providing technical services under the Act;

(b) coordinated its programs with other States and with other publicly supported activities within the State, as appropriate;

(c) established adequate rules to insure with no officer or employee of the State, the designated agency or any participating institution, shall receive compensation for technical services for which funds are provided under this Act from sources other than his employer and shall not otherwise maintain any private interest in conflict with his public responsibility;

(d) determined that matching funds will be available from State or other non-Federal sources;

(e) determined that such technical services program does not provide a service that is now available or could be made available as practicably by private technical services, profesional consultants, or private institutions:

(f) planned no services specially related to a particular firm or company, public work, or other capital project except insofar as the services are of general concern to the industry and commerce of the community, State, or region;

(g) provided for making public all reports prepared in the course of furnishing technical services supported under this Act or for making them available at cost to any person on request.

APPROVAL BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall review each five-year plan and each annual program submitted by the designated agency under section 4, or by the regional or interstate institution under section 7, and shall approve only those which (1) bear the certification required by the Governor or his designee under section 5; (2) comply with regulations and meet criteria that the Secretary shall promulgate and publish in the Federal Register; and (3) otherwise accomplish the purposes of this Act.

REGIONAL OR INTERSTATE PROGRAMS

SEC. 7. Two or more States may cooperate in administering and coordinating their plans and programs supported under this Act, in which event all or part of the sums authorized and payable under section 11 to all of the cooperating States may be paid to the institutions or persons authorized to receive them under the terms of the agreement between the cooperating States. When the cooperative agreement designates as regional or interstate institution to act on behalf of all of the cooperating States, it shall submit to the Secretary for review and approval under section 6 a regional or interstate five-year plan and annual regional or interstate technical services program which, as nearly as practicable, shall meet the requirements of section 4 and section 5.

SEC. 8. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 11, the Secretary is authorized to increase by 10 per centum the amount which he approves for any regional or interstate technical services program submitted under section 7. Such additional amount may be paid without requiring matching funds from State or non-Federal sources.

SEC. 9. (a) The consent of the Congress is given to any two or more States to enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law of the United States, for cooperative efforts and mutual assistance in establishing regional or interstate institutions under section 7 for accomplishing the purposes of this Act.

(b) The right to alter, amend, or repeal this section, or any consent granted pursuant to this section, is expressly reserved.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 10. Each designated agency and each regional or interstate institution shall appoint an advisory council for technical services, the members of which shall represent broad community interests and shall be qualified to evaluate programs submitted under section 4. The advisory council shall review each annual program, evaluate its relation to the purposes of this Act, and report its findings to the designated agency and the Governor or his designee. Each report of the advisory council shall be available to the Secretary on request.

ADMINISTRATION AND PAYMENTS

SEC. 11. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this Act, $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; and $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

(a) From these amounts, the Secretary is authorized to make an annual payment to each designated agency, regional or interstate institution, or person authorized to receive payments in support of each approved technical services program. Maximum amounts which may be paid to the States under this subsection shall be fixed in accordance with regulations which the Secretary shall promulgate and publish in the Federal Register from time to time, considering (1) population according to the last decennial census; (2) business, commercial, industrial and economic development and productive efficiency; and (3) technical resources.

(b) The Secretary may reserve an amount equal to not more than 20 per centum of the total amount appropriated each year under this section and is authorized to make payments to any designated agency or participating institution for technical services programs which he determines have special merit or to any qualified institution for additional programs which he determines are necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act, under criteria and regulations that he shall promulgate and publish in the Federal Register.

(c) An amount equal to not more than 5 per centum of the total amount appropriated each year under this section shall be available to the Secretary for the direct expenses of administering this Act.

(d) No amount paid under subsection (a) shall exceed one-half of the cost of the approved annual technical services program of the State, and for each dollar paid under subsections (a) and (b) there shall be available for expenditure on each approved program at least $1 from State or other non-Federal sources: *Provided*, That the Secretary may pay an amount not to exceed $25,000 a year for each of the first three fiscal years to each designated agency to assist in the preparation of the first five-year plan and the initial annual technical services programs, without regard to any requirement of this section.

(e) At the end of each fiscal year, all remaining amounts which are appropriated for payments to the States under subsection (a) and which have not been obligated for payments to the States at that time, shall be available to the Secretary for payments under subsection (b), until expended.

SEC. 12. The Secretary is authorized and directed to aid the States and regions in carrying out their technical services programs by providing reference services which a State or region may use to obtain scientific, technical, and engineering information from sources outside the State or region, for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 13. The Secretary is authorized to establish such policies, standards, criteria, and procedures and to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or appropriate for the administration of this Act.

LIMITATIONS

SEC. 14. (a) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as authorizing a department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or conditions with respect to the personnel, curriculum, methods of instructions, or administration of any educational institution.

(b) Nothing contained in this Act shall be deemed to affect the functions or responsibilities under law of any other department or agency of the United States.

EVALUATION

SEC. 15. Within five years from the date of the approval of this Act, and prior to the end of each five-year period thereafter, the Secretary shall appoint a public committee, none of the members of which shall have been directly concerned with the preparation of plans, administration of programs or participation in programs under this Act. The Committee shall evaluate the significance and impact of the program under this Act and make recommendations concerning the program. A report shall be transmitted to the Secretary within sixty days after the end of each five-year period.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 16. (a) Each designated agency or regional or interstate institution shall make an annual report to the Secretary on or before the first day of September of each year on the work accomplished under the technical services program and the status of current services, together with a detailed statement of the amounts received under any of the provisions of this Act during the preceding fiscal year, and of their disbursement.

(b) The Secretary shall make a complete report with respect to the administration of this Act to the President and the Congress not later than January 31 following the end of each fiscal year for which amounts are appropriated pursuant to this Act.

TERMINATION

SEC. 17. Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to any agency or institution receiving funds under this Act finds that—

(a) the agency or institution is not complying substantially with the provisions of this Act, with the regulations promulgated by the Secretary or with the approved annual technical services program; or

(b) any funds paid to the agency or institution under the provisions of this Act have been lost, misapplied, or otherwise diverted from the purposes for which they were paid or furnished—

the Secretary shall notify such agency or institution that no further payments will be made under the provisions of this Act until he is satisfied that there is substantial compliance or the diversion has been corrected or, if compliance or correction is impossible, until such agency or institution repays or arranges for the repayment of Federal funds which have been diverted or improperly expended.

SEC. 18. Upon notice by the Secretary to any agency or institution that no further payments will be made pending substantial compliance correction or repayment under section 17, any funds which may have been paid to such agency or institution under this Act and which are not expended by the agency or institution on the date of such notice, shall be repaid to the Secretary and be deposited to the account of the appropriations from which they originally were paid.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 19. This Act may be cited as the "State Technical Services Act of 1965".

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to promote commerce and encourage economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise."

Mr. MAGNUSON. On February 2 I had the privilege of introducing S. 949, the proposed State Technical Services Act of 1965, at the request of the Secretary of Commerce. Its purpose is to authorize Federal grants to States in a cooperative program to spread the findings of science and technology throughout American business, commerce, and industry. Its objective is to use all of our scientific and technical knowledge to enhance the economy of the Nation as a whole.

This bill and S. 2083, a similar measure introduced by Senator SCOTT, were considered at length in hearings before the Committee on Commerce to which they were referred. The Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] graciously chaired the hearings and developed a record of unqualified support for this very vital program for using science for economic growth.

The Commerce Committee has unanimously reported S. 949 to the floor with amendments and, together with Senators RIBICOFF, BYRD of West Virginia, MCGOVERN, and DOUGLAS, 16 members of the Commerce Committee have added their names as cosponsors of the bill as reported.

So I take great satisfaction and pride in supporting this bill which uniquely treats the results of science as a national resource, to be diffused more efficiently by State and regional action. We all know of the imbalances that exist today in scientific activity throughout the United States—among industries and among firms within industries. We must remember that of the $15 billion or so of annual Federal research and development product, a relatively small portion finds its way to stimulate the civilian sector of the economy.

I do not mean to suggest that scientific advances paid for by peace, defense, and atomic research cannot be converted to civilian industrial uses. What I do suggest is that no national effort has been marshaled to take the results of this federally financed research and development, as well as other significant scientific findings, and put them to use effectively by those who comprehend local needs: by the local businesses, by the industries of States and regions, by local chambers of commerce, by labor, by the universities, and by responsible State and local officials.

The bill before us today is the first measure of its kind aimed at putting the responsibility for using the results of science and technology directly upon those who will most directly benefit from it. While the Federal Government will give grants under prescribed conditions, the entire planning and program activities will be carried out by the States through the responsible State agencies and institutions of the State.

It will work along the following lines. The Governor of each State will designate an agency to draw up plans and administer the program for the State. The designated agency will draw up long-term economic and technical plans for the State to identify the State's potential for using science and technology to enhance the industry and commerce of the State. Yearly technical services programs will be prepared with the assistance of all qualified institutions in the State—which are mainly universities, but may also be competent nonprofit organizations. The plans and programs are submitted to the Secretary of Commerce under criteria set forth in the bill. The Secretary, upon approval, may grant up to one-half of the amount of the yearly program. The remainder can come from State or other non-Federal sources. Each State will be authorized under regulations set by the Secretary of Commerce to receive up to a maximum amount each year. The Secretary of Commerce has stated that the largest amount authorized for a single State would be no more than $2 million and the smallest amount allocated to a State would be no less than $150,000.

The Department of Commerce will make annual reports to the Congress. There will be a 5-year review by a public committee.

The committee amendment limits the authorization for appropriations to a 5-year period. The total amount authorized for the 5-year period will be $140 million, beginning with $10 million for fiscal year 1966 and increasing to $40 million by 1969 and 1970. After fiscal year 1970, further authorization will be required by the Congress.

I think this legislation is farsighted, creative and will be recognized by future generations as a dynamic model of what President Johnson has called creative federalism. It places responsibility where the exercise of responsibility will produce the surest return for the Nation as a whole. It will diffuse the vast reservoir of technology that is accumulating in this country throughout the whole of the country.

Mr. President, I am proud that this bill has strong bipartisan support by members of my committee. Such support demonstrates that our free institutions and Government can take far-reaching and sophisticated steps toward applying science and technology to our economic problems for the betterment of mankind without impairing individual creativity and initiative. This bill now before you is long overdue. I am confident that it will be enacted promptly so that its benefits may begin throughout the country without delay.

I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the committee report which explains the purpose, need, and description of the technical services program be printed at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 949

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

S. 949 would authorize a 5-year program of matching grants to the States in a cooperative effort to promote the wider diffusion and more effective application of the findings of science and technology throughout American commerce and industry. The technical services program would draw upon the resources of universities, nonprofit research organizations and State and local agencies, in locally planned and administered technical services designed to place these findings usefully in the hands of local businesses and enterprises.

NEED FOR THE TECHNICAL SERVICES PROGRAM

A close examination of the modern American economy reveals a number of recurring themes—all of them related in some degree to the importance of having effective mechanisms for introducing the results of science and technology into commercial use; for example, the competition we face in both domestic and world markets is increasingly based on a high level of technology, not solely on lower labor costs.

The most successful competitors, whether at an international level, industrywide, or among individual companies, are those who have learned to use new technology effectively.

The cost of new technology, in the form of technical manpower and equipment, has been rapidly rising.

Opportunities to participate in benefits of technology have not been equally available in the various regions of the United States.

Substantial expenditures for specialized research and development in support of national defense and space missions have not met the full range of industrial needs for technology.

The vast increase in the Nation's total research and development effort has not eradicated long-term unemployment and economic decline in many parts of the country.

Technology cannot be effectively diffused merely by giving information to a potential user. There must be means for active interchange between those using and those furnishing information.

There are many factors involved in complete solutions to the broad problems outlined above. Common to all of them, however, is the need for institutions and mechanisms at the local level, specifically designed to bridge the gap between the most advanced technology, wherever it exists, and the industrial practices of the local region.

Through the technical services program and with the cooperation of universities, communities, and industries, three objectives will be served: (1) strengthening the Nation's economy by upgrading industries through the utilization of advanced technology, thereby generally expanding the industrial base; (2) increasing employment by facilitating industrial use of technology and the manufacturing of new products which result; and (3) enhancing the competitive position of U.S. products in world markets.

DESCRIPTION OF THE TECHNICAL SERVICES PROGRAM

A State wishing to participate in the program would designate an agency (generally a State university or land-grant college) to administer and coordinate the State's technical services program.

The designated agency would prepare a 5-year plan, outlining the technological and economic situation in the State, the major regional and industrial problems, and the means to be used in assisting in their solution.

The designated agency would also prepare an annual technical services program, covering the objectives for the first year, the budget, and the responsibilities assigned to each qualified institution participating in the program. Up to $25,000 per year for each of the first 3 years may be paid to the designated agency to assist in preparing the first 5-year plan and the initial annual programs.

An advisory council would be established by the designated agency to evaluate and report on the 5-year plan and the annual technical service program.

The 5-year plan and the annual program would be submitted to the Secretary of Commerce. Federal matching funds would be made available to the designated agency to support those programs found by the Secretary to meet legal requirements and to further the purposes of the act. The maximum annual payment in support of any State program will be limited by a formula to be established by the Secretary, taking into consideration these criteria: (1) Population according to the last census, (2) industrial and economic development.

All funds made available to States for technical services, except regional incentives, would be matched at least equally by non-Federal funds. Direct Federal expenditures would be limited to expenditures for administration, to be held to less than 5 percent of the cost of the program, and for reference services to aid the States and regions in collecting and processing technical information for dissemination to industry under the act.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the able Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and I have long worked on this subject. We are very pleased now to be privileged to bring it before the Senate, and to urge its passage.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Senate Commerce Committee today voted unanimously to report the proposed State Technical Services Act of 1965, S. 949, to the Senate, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman, announced today.

The bill, as reported, combines the provisions of S. 949, introduced by Senator MAGNUSON, and S. 2083, introduced by Senator SCOTT. It would authorize $140 million of matching Federal grants to the States over a 5-year period in a cooperative program to spread the findings of science and technology throughout American business and industry.

The technical services program was strongly supported during the 3 days of committee hearings by a wide range of public and private witnesses, including representatives of State governments, State universities, land-grant colleges, professional engineers, and profit and nonprofit research organizations.

As the committee completed final action on the bill, several committee members added their names as sponsors to the bill. In addition to Senators MAGNUSON and SCOTT, these include Senators PASTORE, LAUSCHE, BARTLETT, MCGEE, HART, CANNON, and DOMINICK.

Mr. President, I appreciate this opportunity to express my support of legislation to enable the Federal Government to join the States in close partnership with universities and other educational institutions to establish technical services programs designed to put into the hands of local business and industry the latest and most useful findings of science and technology. The purpose of this program is to promote industrial modernization and economic growth and thereby to improve the competitive position of American business and industry in world markets. It can result in the development of new products, an indispensable ingredient for spurring the expansion of a company's sales. It can develop new technologies to aid in the revival of declining industries.

The program to be established by this legislation would be a great help to the industrial complex of Pennsylvania. Surveys could be made to determine what the needs are for particular types or groups of industries. Then, the participating educational institutions in my Commonwealth could set up appropriate technical services programs, either through specialists or by the normal educational processes for those persons in industries who could benefit from this work.

Under the enlightened leadership of Governor Scranton, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, through such organizations as the Governor's Council of Business and Industry, the Committee of 100,000 and the Governor's Council on Science and Technology, has developed a mutually beneficial liaison between Government, industry, and the academy to spur Pennsylvania's industrial expansion and economic growth. A technical services program can improve this growing relationship.

I think that this legislation can make a real contribution to the industrial and economic growth of Pennsylvania and other States and regions of this Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read a third time, and passed.

COLLEGE STUDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965—INTRODUCTION OF BILL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today I am offering for myself and Senators MCCARTHY and WILLIAMS of New Jersey, a bill entitled the College Students' Assistance Act of 1965. It is a very simple bill whose effect would be to undergird students faced with the costs of attending college by providing for them, following completion of academic work in good standing, $100 at the end of each semester, or a pro rata portion if the school is on some other calendar system.

Mr. President, while the returns from investments in higher education are most attractive economically, the cost of the investment to the average American family is prohibitive at worst and a tremendous burden at best. The result is a great loss of potential college-qualified youth to the overcrowded job market at lower levels.

In testimony last year before the Education Subcommittee, Commissioner Francis Keppel of the Office of Education noted the annual cost of attending college in public institutions—less expensive than private colleges—has risen from a low of $730 in 1930 to $1,480 today and a projected $2,400 in 1980. The 1962–63 average direct cost in private institutions already reaches $2,240. In comparing these average cost figures with the annual median family income of $5,700, Dr. Keppel points out that college education is an "extremely large outlay for most American families," second only to the purchase of a home. For a family of three children such an expenditure may amount to $18,000 in public institutions over a period of 8 years, while in private institutions the figure would climb to $27,000.

Such heavy expenditures are doubtless responsible for many of the 100,000 to 200,000 high-aptitude students who do not finish their education. Considerable numbers of interested and able students find college beyond their means, and thus, never begin higher education work. The result is a restricted range of job opportunities for them and a serious failure to maximize our greatest natural resource—an educated populace.

What particularly concerns me, Mr. President, is not alone the lost potential to these individuals and our Nation, but also the severe financial strain on families which do manage to send their children to college. Years of sacrifice are often required by the entire family. The student, if not the family, is often saddled with educational debts once he has completed his training.

In recent years we have become cognizant of these problems and heedful of some of these needs. However, efforts have been considerably limited. Effort has primarily been directed to the excellent student while we have failed to scrutinize the potential and needs of the average college student.

Last year I introduced S. 2490, a multiphase package program designed to aid larger numbers of our youth. The bill was favorably reported out by the committee with amendments as S. 3140 and remained on the calendar at the time of adjournment. With some alteration I again introduced this bill as S. 5 last January and its basic provisions are also contained in the administration's omnibus bill, S. 600.

In 1960 the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics brought to our attention some startling estimates for this decade concerning the changing job mix. Within the labor force the biggest percentage increases are expected in the skilled labor group. Clerical and proprietary groups likewise are to witness remarkable increases of 24 percent. The most revealing figure, however, is the estimated 41 percent increase in the professional and technical occupations, a growth rate more than double that of the labor force as a whole. The report is only one example to show that job opportunities and job requirements are clearly tied to educational experience beyond the secondary level.

In economic terms, investment in higher education provides significant returns for both the individual and for the national economy. We now recognize the vast potential of an educated populace as a natural resource. The requirements of defense and the exigencies of the space race have most poignantly brought this to our attention; and we are beginning to shift from the past popular view of education as a cost and a burden to a realistic understanding of education as an investment providing returns of significant proportions. Dr. T. W. Schultz, of the University of Chicago, for example, has calculated that for each dollar spent in all education there is a return of 17 cents each year—that is, a 17-percent return. Prof. Arthur Mauch, of the University of Michigan, discussed the same proposition in aggregate terms in the February 1964 issue of the Journal of the American Bankers' Association. He said in part:

> Our gross national product is in the neighborhood of $600 billion a year. If we credited the effects of education to only 10 percent of this, instead of the 20 percent or more that studies indicate would be justified, it would not seem out of line to invest up to $60 billion. Only about $25 billion, or less than 5 percent, is being spent by educational institutions from kindergarten through university, both public and private.

In light of these figures the United States is seriously lagging in investment in an area of high return.

Investment in higher education has significant meaning likewise for the individual. Figures for 1961 incomes show that the college graduate's income average more than 50 percent above that of the high school graduate. It is not surprising, moreover, that the 20 percent who attended college hold more than 70 percent of the jobs that pay above $5,000 per year.

The bill I introduce today is presented by myself and Senator MCCARTHY not as a substitute but as a complement to S. 5. Mr. President, we feel that we should now make an annual stipend to all interested students who maintain a full-time load at a satisfactory level in an accredited institution. Consequently, this bill calls for the Commissioner of Education to convey $200 annually to such students for the purpose of defraying educational expenses. This stipend will be a much needed stimulus to students who otherwise find college costs prohibitive and a much needed relief for families strained by these expenses. This stipend is intended to help keep higher education within the financial range of the average American family. To be sure, there will yet be many who will require additional help, and it is precisely here that such programs as S. 5 become pertinent.

Mr. President, in order that others may consider the bill and join in its sponsorship, I ask that the complete text may appear in the RECORD at the close of my remarks, and that the bill lie on the table until the close of business July 28.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 2303) to authorize payments to college students for satisfactory undergraduate work, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. MCCARTHY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2303

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "College Students' Assistance Act of 1965".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) the term "State" means a State, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands;

(b) the term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or other non-profit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited, and for the purposes of this clause, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered; and

(c) the term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

PAYMENTS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 3. The Commissioner shall make payments to citizens and permanent residents of the United States for maintaining satisfactory standing in carrying a normal full-time academic undergraduate workload in an institution of higher education. Such payments shall be made—

(1) upon application therefor at such times and including such proof as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, including a certification of satisfactory standing and the carrying of a normal workload by the institution attended, determined by such institution in accordance with standards established by the Commissioner;

(2) at the termination of each semester or other division of the academic year if semesters are not used;

(3) at the rate of $200 per academic year or its equivalent as defined by the Commissioner; and

(4) for semesters or such other divisions of the academic year beginning after June 30, 1965.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

STATEMENT OF UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY ON FIREARMS CONTROL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of Senator DODD's firearms control bill, S. 1592, I have followed with interest the hearings and the arguments surrounding the question.

In addition to the consideration being given in the Senate, the House Ways and Means Committee has been holding hearings on the question as posed by H.R. 6628 and H.R. 6783. Among those who have given testimony there is the Honorable Joseph W. Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury.

I ask unanimous consent that the testimony of Mr. Barr may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH W. BARR, UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON PROPOSALS RELATING TO FIREARMS CONTROL, JULY 12, 1965

Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity to appear in support of the enactment of the administration's bills introduced by Mr. MURPHY and Mr. MULTER, which I deem to be of great importance to the welfare of this country and its citizens. Mr. Sheldon S. Cohen, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is here with me. He will discuss in more detail aspects of the administration's proposals which I will cover in a general way.

The bill which would amend the Federal Firearms Act regulating interstate and foreign commerce in firearms is designed to implement the recommendations which the President set forth with respect to firearms control in his message to the Congress of March 8, 1965, relating to law enforcement and the administration of justice.

The President, in that message, described crime as "a malignant enemy in America's midst" of such extent and seriousness that the problem is now one "of great national concern." The President also stated, and I quote from his message, "The time has come now, to check that growth, to contain its spread, and to reduce its toll of lives and property."

As an integral part of the war against the spread of lawlessness, the President urged the enactment of more effective firearms control legislation, and cited as a significant factor in the rise of violent crime in the United States "the ease with which any person can acquire firearms."

The President recognized the necessity for State and local action, as well as Federal action, in this area and he urged "the Governors of our States and mayors and other local public officials to review their existing legislation in this critical field with a view to keeping lethal weapons out of the wrong hands." However, the President also clearly recognized in his message that effective State and local regulation of firearms is not feasible unless we strengthen at the Federal level controls over the importation of firearms and over the interstate shipment of firearms. The President advised that he was proposing draft legislation to accomplish these aims, and stated, and I quote, "I recommend this legislation to the Congress as a sensible use of Federal authority to assist local authorities in coping with an undeniable menace to law and order and to the lives of innocent people." H.R. 6628, introduced by Mr. MURPHY, and H.R. 6783, introduced by Mr. MULTER, reflect the legislation amending the Federal Firearms Act, to which the President referred.

I should like now briefly to state my understanding of what the administration bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act would do and, in order to eliminate misconceptions, what it would not do.

Among other things, the bill would:

(1) Prohibit the shipment of firearms in interstate commerce, except between federally licensed manufacturers, dealers, and importers; the purpose of this is to control the distribution of firearms interstate so that States may more effectively control the traffic intrastate.

(2) Prohibit sales of firearms by Federal licensees to persons under 21 years of age, except that sales of sporting rifles and shotguns could continue to be made to persons of 18 years of age;

(3) Prohibit a Federal licensee from selling a firearm (other than a rifle or shotgun) to any person who is not a resident of the State where the licensee is doing business;

(4) Curb the flow into the United States of surplus military weapons and other firearms not suitable for sporting purposes;

(5) Bring under effective Federal control the importation and interstate shipment of large caliber weapons such as bazookas and antitank guns, and other destructive devices; and

(6) Revise the licensing provisions of the Federal Firearms Act, including increases in license fees, so as to assure that licenses will be issued only to responsible persons actually engaging in business as importers, manufacturers, and dealers.

What the bill does is to institute Federal controls in areas where the Federal Government can and should operate, and where the State governments cannot, the areas of interstate and foreign commerce. Under our Federal constitutional system, the responsibility for maintaining public health and safety is left to the State governments under their police powers. Basically, it is the province of the State governments to determine the conditions under which their citizens may acquire and use firearms. I certainly hope that in those States where there is not now adequate regulation of the acquisition of firearms, steps will soon be taken to institute controls complementing the steps taken in this bill in order to deal effectively with this serious menace.

I am particularly anxious that the changes proposed in the bill with respect to the issuance of licenses to manufacture, import and deal in firearms be adopted. Under existing law, anyone other than a felon can, upon the mere allegation that he is a dealer and payment of a fee of $1, demand and obtain a license. Some 50 or 60 thousand people have done this, some of them merely to put themselves in a position to obtain personal guns at wholesale. The situation is wide open for the obtaining of licenses by irresponsible elements, thus facilitating the acquisition of these weapons by criminals and other undesirables. The bill before you, by increasing license fees and imposing standards for obtaining licenses, will go a long way toward rectifying this situation. Mr. Cohen, whose organization is responsible for the administration of the Federal Firearms Act will discuss this aspect in more detail.

One misconception about the administration's bill to amend the Federal Firearms

Act which has been widely publicized is that it will make it possible for the Treasury Department to exercise, through the regulatory authority expressed in the bill, such arbitrary power as to be virtually dictatorial, and so potentially restrictive as to permit the elimination of private ownership of guns at the whim of the Secretary. This misunderstanding has been fostered by certain national gun, and wildlife conservation, organizations whose representatives, in testifying at Senate hearings on a companion bill, have pointed with alarm to seven places in the bill where regulatory authority is granted to the Secretary of the Treasury.

You and I know that it is customary for the Congress to vest discretionary powers in a Government officer to implement legislation through the issuance of regulations. Such regulations are necessary to provide flexibility and to take care of problems which may be unforeseen by the lawmakers. This flexibility, within the guidelines of standards and policies laid down by the Congress, inures to the benefit of the citizen affected as well as to Government. Moreover, a grant of regulatory authority is not, and cannot in any sense be, a dictatorial fiat. Surely no rational, intelligent individual can seriously maintain that the Secretary of the Treasury would issue regulations under this proposed legislation so arbitrary or capricious or so complicated or impracticable or so burdensome that they would make impossible the private ownership of guns. There is nothing in the bill that would authorize this and if any attempt were made to do so there is abundant opportunity for appeal to the courts, the top administrative machinery, or to the Congress.

Any allegation of this nature, which attempts to obscure the merits of the bill by raising imaginary fears of possible maladministration, ignores completely the Treasury Department's past administrative record as well as the statutory and Constitutional limitations on executive authority. The Secretary of the Treasury has for 27 years exercised regulatory authority under the Federal Firearms Act in many of the seven areas pointed to by critics of the bill where details or procedures are to be prescribed by regulations. In fact, section 907 of the present law provides "the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this chapter." The term, "this chapter," incidentally, includes the entire Federal Firearms Act. During these years there has been no regulatory abuse which can be cited. I do not believe that there is a single provision of existing regulations (26 CFR Pt. 177) which can be said to be unreasonable or beyond the intent of Congress and in the 27-year history of this act no regulation issued under it has been held invalid by the courts.

Irresponsible allegations to the contrary, the bill does not, and regulations under it can not, seriously interfere with the acquisition, ownership or use of firearms for sporting purposes, or any other legitimate use. Sportsmen will continue to be able to obtain rifles and shotguns from licensed dealers and manufacturers subject only to the requirements of their respective State laws. Indeed, they can travel to another State and purchase a rifle or shotgun from a licensed dealer there and bring it home with them without interference. Only two minor inconveniences may occur for the sportsmen of this country. They will not be able to travel to another State and purchase a pistol or concealable weapon, and they will not be able to obtain a mail-order shipment from another State of any type of firearm. On this latter point, the inconvenience is more apparent than real because the large mail-order houses have retail outlets and the bill will permit intrastate mail-order shipments to individual citizens from these outlets.

Such minor inconveniences cannot be avoided if the legislation is to make it possible for the States to regulate effectively the acquisition and possession of firearms. Obviously, State authorities cannot control the acquisition and possession of firearms if they have no way of knowing or ascertaining what firearms are coming in to their States through the mails or, in the case of concealable weapons, by personally being carried across State lines.

Mr. Chairman, there are many other points which could be made with respect to the administration's bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act. For example, I think it is self-evident that minors should not have access to pistols, other concealable firearms and weapons of vast destructive power, and that minors under the age of 18 should not have access to rifles or shotguns.

Today, the people of the United States are living under the most ideal conditions which have ever existed for any peoples anywhere on earth. Yet much of this is threatened by the spreading cancer of crime and juvenile delinquency. It is absolutely essential that steps such as those proposed in this bill be taken to bring under control one of the main elements in the spread of this cancer, the indiscriminate acquisition of weapons of destruction.

The ease with which any person can acquire firearms (including criminals, juveniles without the knowledge or consent of their parents or guardians, narcotic addicts, mental defectives, armed groups who would supplant duly constituted public authorities, and others whose possession of firearms is similarly contrary to the public interest) is a matter of serious national concern.

The existing Federal controls over interstate and foreign commerce are not sufficient to enable the States to effectively cope with the firearms traffic within their own borders through the exercise of their police power. Only through adequate Federal control over interstate and foreign commerce in firearms, and over all persons engaging in the business of importing, manufacturing, or dealing in firearms, can this problem be dealt with, and effective State and local regulation of the firearms traffic be made possible.

The Department's experience with the existing Federal Firearms Act has resulted in a feeling of frustration since the controls provided by it are so obviously inadequate. In drafting the administration's bill we have had in mind these inadequacies and now have, we believe, a bill which, when enacted, will provide effective controls without jeopardizing or interfering with the freedom of law-abiding citizens to own firearms for legitimate purposes.

As to the administration's bill which would amend the National Firearms Act, H.R. 6629 introduced by Mr. MURPHY and H.R. 6782 introduced by Mr. MULTER, there seems to be a general recognition of its need and no serious opposition to its objectives.

The National Firearms Act now provides for Federal controls, under the taxing power, with respect to gangster-type weapons such as machineguns and sawed-off shotguns. It has long been felt that similar controls are needed for highly destructive weapons such as grenades, rockets, missiles, and large-bore military-type ordnance in the nature of antitank guns, mortars, and grenade launchers. Although it is difficult to conceive of any valid reason for their private ownership, such devices are frequently available for purchase at stores specializing in military surplus and there is presently no Federal law effectively regulating their sale or ownership. They have found their way into the hands of lawless and irresponsible elements such as armed groups who would supplant duly constituted public authorities and those who recently fired on the United Nations building. The administration's bill to amend the National Firearms Act is designed to regulate, by taxing, the dealing in and transfer of these highly destructive devices.

There appears to be no doubt that Federal controls are needed in this area. The Secretary of the Army stressed the need for effective controls over these weapons in expressing, to the Director of the Budget, the position of the Department of Defense on proposed firearms legislation. The National Rifle Association in an April 3, 1965, release declared that "it would support properly drawn legislation to outlaw dangerous devices such as bazookas, bombs, antitank guns and other military-type weapons which have found their way into trade channels across America." A trade association of firearms manufacturers, Small Arms Manufacturers Institute, has also indicated approval of such controls, in testimony by its representative, Dr. Hadley, before the Senate Subcommittee Hearings on S. 1591 (the companion bill to H.R. 6629 and 6782). The only opposition to controls over these destructive devices seems to stem from that irresponsible faction which opposes, on principle, controls of any nature with respect to firearms or self-appointed "defenders of America" who have formed para-military organizations.

The bill would also increase to twice the present rate all of the rates of tax in the National Firearms Act. The principal rates have not been changed since the original enactment of the act in 1934. Therefore, it is necessary to increase the rates in order to carry out the regulatory purposes of the act.

It is recognized that some perfecting changes within the intent and purpose of the bill to amend the national act may be desirable. Commissioner Cohen, whose testimony follows mine, will discuss specific proposals to effect changes in both this bill and the administration's bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act.

Enactment of the administration's bills to amend the Federal Firearms Act and the National Firearms Act is needed now to augment existing controls to keep firearms out of the wrong hands. These bills are an essential and integral part of the President's program to combat crime. Therefore, I strongly urge that this committee report these bills to the House of Representatives at an early date.

LAOTIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a few weeks ago we celebrated July 4th with the pride and enthusiasm that has characterized our traditional appreciation for national independence and liberty.

Today, Mr. President, the Kingdom of Laos is celebrating her day of independence. During the postwar period her struggle for liberty was rewarded with total independence, and now she speaks for herself in the United Nations.

Lodged at the periphery of the Communist bloc where national independence and security are always precarious, this constitutional monarchy must continually face external pressures that would rend her asunder and deprive her of the fruits of liberty. But her resistance and resiliency to these pressures is determined.

Internally her Government seeks to bind together her peoples in meeting the challenges of economic and political development. The task is trying and the future is not sure, but we trust that this nation which has known the agonies of foreign domination will vigorously pursue the course of national amalgamation and independence. We can appreciate her challenges and her spirit; for, while our forefathers were not so plagued by foreign intrigue, they nevertheless had to forge a nation.

Her efforts for liberty and independence may be assured of American support. We joined the Geneva agreements in 1962 for a neutral and independent Laos; and we stand by those agreements today.

I join well-wishers throughout the world in saluting the Kingdom of Laos on her day of national independence.

EXEMPTION OF OCEANOGRAPHIC VESSELS FROM APPLICATION OF CERTAIN VESSEL INSPECTION LAWS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 627) to exempt oceanographic research vessels from the application of certain vessel inspection laws, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, line 6, after "is" strike out "operated in the public interest by being employed exclusively in scientific research, or instruction in oceanography or limnology, or both; and", and insert "being employed exclusively in instruction in oceanography or limnology, or both, or exclusively in oceanographic research, including, but not limited to, such studies pertaining to the sea as seismic, gravity meter and magnetic exploration, and other marine geophysical or geological surveys, atmosphere research, and biological research."

On page 2, after line 1, insert:

> Sec. 3. An oceanographic research vessel shall not be deemed to be engaged in trade or commerce.

On page 2, line 8, strike out "Sec. 3." and insert "Sec. 4."; on page 2, line 12, strike out "Sec. 4." and insert "Sec. 5."; and on page 2, line 17, strike out "the public interest," and insert "the performance of the mission of the vessel,".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

ELECTED MAYOR, CITY COUNCIL, AND NONVOTING DELEGATE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 368, Senate bill 1118.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1118) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment.

THE DEVELOPING MONOPOLY OF AIRLINE SERVICE BETWEEN BOSTON, NEW YORK, AND WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of the Congress a matter which has been of particular concern to me for some time, and one which I feel deserves immediate investigation. I refer to the development over the past few years of virtual monopoly control by one airline—Eastern—over the major air commuter routes between Boston and New York, and between New York and Washington, and the pattern of substantially increased commuter fares without any significant improvement in equipment and quality of service. This pattern of monopoly has apparently developed despite the fact that there are at least three other certificated carriers on these routes to provide competitive service.

My special interest here is with the airline passenger—the commuter, the businessman, the visitor, the student—who must be assured of the benefits of competition in receiving the lowest possible fares and the highest and most modern quality of service. It is for the public interest that I raise these warnings today—that the developing airline monopoly on these routes is something of direct and far-reaching consumer interest.

The two major airline commuter markets referred to above are the second and third largest—by passenger volume—in the world. They are of the highest passenger density. They involve an annual traffic load of over 3.3 million passengers, providing more than $55 million in annual revenue. Indeed, it is in these very markets where competition should be keenest, and prices and quality of service should be in the best interests of the public.

When we compare the above east coast situation with the world's largest air passenger market—San Francisco-Los Angeles—the issue becomes even more striking. There, the market has been one of intensive competition, with no single carrier reaching more than 45 percent of the traffic in 1964, and with some four carriers actively competing. The pattern for this route has been one of consistently decreasing commuter fares, and constant upgrading of equipment and quality of service with modern jet prop and jet aircraft being used exclusively.

Mr. President, I would like to state for the Record some of the facts which have been submitted to me by the Civil Aeronautics Board and others at my request, so that we can get a more detailed picture of the serious situation which has developed—see attachments I, II, and V.

For the year 1964—the latest official figures submitted—between Boston and New York, Eastern Airlines carried almost 76 percent of local and connecting passengers; Northeast Airlines carried 17 percent; American Airlines carried only 2 percent; and the other carriers certificated together accounted for some 5 percent. Total passengers carried over the route were 1,814,550.

For the same year between New York and Washington, Eastern's market share reached almost 80 percent; American had slightly less than 9 percent of the traffic; National Airlines accounted for 6 percent; and the remaining carriers aggregated 5 percent. For this route total passengers reached 1,495,370.

It is interesting to note that in 1960, Eastern and American each controlled about a third of these two major markets, and Northeast averaged around 20 percent. In 1961, in the very month when Northeast filed for renewal of its Florida route, Eastern inaugurated its special shuttle service at reduced rates and guaranteed seats.

The original fare between New York and Boston was $10.91, without tax. Between New York and Washington, it was $12.73.

Within 8 months, Eastern had increased its passenger traffic in each of these markets by some 35 percent, and shuttle fares were jumped to $11.82 and $13.64, respectively.

By the end of 1962, Eastern's share in each of the above markets exceeded 54 percent, and it raised its fares again, this time to $12.38 for the Boston-New York run, and to $14.29 for the New York-Washington route. By this time, Northeast had suffered a decrease of 50 percent of its traffic on this latter route.

By the end of 1963, Eastern Airlines had increased its share of these markets to approximately 77 percent, and thereafter on January 8, 1964, it raised its fares once again, to $13.33 and $15.24, respectively. American's traffic decreased between New York and Washington by some 37 percent for this year. However, more significant is American's 66 percent decrease in traffic between New York and Boston.

After sustaining this very large market share during 1964, Eastern once more increased its shuttle prices to $15.24 for the Boston-New York market, and $17.14 for the New York-Washington route. This is its current fare level.

Thus in the 52 months since the inauguration of the shuttle, Eastern has increased its share of the subject markets from 33 percent to almost 80 percent, and during this period it has jumped its fares four times, by more than 40 percent. At the same time, this carrier has continued to use superannuated piston aircraft DC-7's and Constellations on its commuter routes, much of which equipment is at least 10 years in age, uncomfortable and crowded in its seating, unattractive in its interior, is noisy and is given to substantial vibration. This equipment appears to be largely castoff aircraft from Eastern's other routes which have now received the newer jet prop and jet equipment.

I might say that with respect to the equipment situation, Eastern has recently announced that it expects to put jet prop Electras on its commuter routes by October. This, indeed, is welcome news, but it comes rather late in the game, especially when we observe that the San Francisco-Los Angeles market has had both jet prop and pure jet equipment for some time. Furthermore, I am told that Eastern has been considering a seating configuration of six seats abreast, thus again providing a crowded airplane; in contrast to the equipment provided on the west coast commuter run.

Now let us compare the west coast commuter route. There we find new equipment, as I have mentioned, and fares nearly one-half those of the two major eastern commuter markets for comparable mileage. On the western route, the yield per seat mile averages about 3.4 cents, while for Eastern Airlines, between Boston and New York, it is 8.3 cents, and between New York and Washington, it is 8 cents. I cite these figures not with the intention of drawing any definite conclusions, but with the belief that they present substantial justification for investigation into the reasonableness of price and service in the eastern commuter markets—see attachments III and IV.

Let us look at the rate comparisons with the western route. Between Los Angeles and San Francisco, a distance of 125 miles longer than the route from New York to Washington, the commuter fare is $11.43 for jet-prop Electras, and $13.50 for modern jet aircraft. This is to be contrasted with the New York-Washington shuttle fare of $17.14 for piston-engine Constellations.

For the 109-mile run from Los Angeles to San Diego, the fare is $6.35 for prop jet service, while on the 184-mile run between Boston and New York, the current shuttle fare is $15.24 for piston engine aircraft.

Mr. President, in the light of the facts and issues presented, I should like to raise some questions. I make no pretense to knowing the answers to these questions; however, I feel that they can be helpful in analyzing this problem in the best interests of the airline passenger.

Thus, what is the true relationship between the Eastern shuttle and rapidly decreasing market positions of Northeast and American? Was this new service a loss leader calculated to eliminate or at least discourage competitors? If the shuttle was not a losing proposition, then why were the continuing fare hikes allowed? Has the overwhelming market dominance of Eastern given it the opportunity to charge what the market will bear, with no need to be concerned about the quality of equipment and service?

How seriously has the Board analyzed the competitive impact of Eastern's policy of service saturation upon the other competitive carriers? I am informed that the Board has declined to make any full investigation of this matter, and that there have been no hearings on it, despite a formal request by Northeast that it do so.

How deeply has the Board gone into each of these price rises in determining their cost justification? An opportunity for investigation and hearings was presented in connection with recent fare increases, but the Board rejected the opportunity. What was the policy behind this? Are we to be plagued by further price increases, and a continuing lack of competition?

Finally, even assuming that the concept of the shuttle is a good one, and that Eastern's growth was "thrust upon" it, what has the Board done to encourage Eastern's rival to compete with the shuttle? To what extent has the Board inquired into the reasons why American Airlines—the second largest trunkline carrier in the Nation—has declined to compete with Eastern? What can be done to stimulate competition on these Eastern routes, comparable to that on the west coast?

By this statement, I do not wish in any way to disparage the basic idea of a low-price, commuter-type service. We have seen this service working well in the San Francisco-Los Angeles market with attractive fares and good equipment. We have seen it operating there among competitive carriers. The idea of having a commuter plane available at appointed times without reservation during a substantial portion of the day is an excellent one. What bothers me is that when one carrier comes in with a service which saturates the market and discourages competitors, so that it can raise its fares and continue to provide unimproved quality of service without the check of competition, something is wrong. I am worried that Eastern's monopoly may already have jeopardized the public interest.

The Civil Aeronautics Board had the opportunity to fully investigate the monopoly and increased fare problem posed by Eastern's operation when docket 15713 was before it last November, but it declined to do so. This was the document that was referred to earlier, in which the fares of Northeast, Eastern, and Braniff were considered—see attachment IV.

Squarely before the Board was the question of whether—at the close of a record-breaking year for all airlines—additional tolls should be exacted from air travelers in short-haul markets without a meaningful investigation to determine the compelling justification for them. Dissent of Murphy, Vice Chairman, and Minetti, member, order No. E-21637, January 4, 1965. However, the Board let the increased fares go forward without any hearing or searching inquiry.

It is significant to note that those members dissenting in the above action by the Board estimated that Eastern's price hike would amount to approximately $6 million in 1965 for additional cost to commuters on the shuttle. In concluding their dissent, these members stated:

> It is interesting to note * * * that Eastern has achieved a practical monopoly position in the Boston-New York and the New York-Washington markets and enjoys a most sizable share in the Boston-Washington market. In contrast, on the west coast, in the Los Angeles-San Diego-San Francisco shuttle market where competitive carriers offer shuttle services with equipment which includes Electras, the charge to the traveler is substantially less for an even greater length of journey.

I am particularly mindful that Congress has given a mandate to the Civil Aeronautics Board to promote competition for the "sound development" of our air transportation system. I am also mindful that the Board in numerous decisions has recognized that a competitively balanced air market—where traffic can sustain it—assures necessary comparisons in cost and operations, and provides incentives for innovation in pricing, services, and the solicitation of new business. This represents an economic philosophy which underlies our national antitrust laws, and which has for years been a basic ingredient of our private enterprise system, including, I might say, that part of our economic system under Federal regulation.

The problem with which we are dealing here is not merely a public interest problem concerning increasing rates and inadequacy of service. It is an antitrust matter of the first order. It involves the elimination of necessary competition and a tremendous concentration of economic power in a regulated industry.

Accordingly, I am today asking the Civil Aeronautics Board to investigate the rising imbalance of competition, and the reasons behind it, on the Boston-New York and the New York-Washington routes, and to take such measures as it has at its disposal for improving this serious situation. If the law is not adequate to cope with this problem, I am asking that the Board recommend such new legislation as may be necessary. I am also requesting that the CAB reconsider an investigation of the reasonableness of present shuttle fares of Eastern Airlines, especially in the light of the above comparison with commuter fares being charged in the competitive San Francisco-Los Angeles market.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have requested the chairman of the subcommittee, the very able junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], that the committee staff make a preliminary inquiry into the antitrust issues involved, including a study of Eastern's economic power in the subject air markets. Senator HART has assured me that such an inquiry will be initiated as soon as possible.

Mr. President, the Civil Aeronautics Board has just acquired a new Chairman, Mr. Charles S. Murphy, who acquired a reputation for fairness during his years of Government service for President Truman and President Kennedy. I think that as a new appointee he is in a position to apply a fresh approach to these problems. He and the rest of the Board now have an opportunity to strike a real blow on behalf of the traveling public.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that exhibits 1 through 5, containing some underlying data concerning the problem presented, be set forth following these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXHIBIT 1

Passenger traffic statistics

NEW YORK TO WASHINGTON

Year	Total		Eastern Air Lines		Northeast Airlines		American Airlines		Others	
	Passengers	Percent change prior year	Passengers	Percent change prior year	Passengers	Percent change prior year	Passengers	Percent change prior year	Passengers	Percent change prior year
1960	831,840		282,300		155,660		276,280		117,700	
1961	934,000	12.3	380,060	34.6	180,590	16.0	250,840	−9.2	122,510	−4.1
1962	1,122,830	20.2	614,710	61.7	89,670	−50.4	233,530	−6.9	184,920	51.0
1963	1,342,910	19.6	1,019,120	67.4	2,330	−97.4	145,750	−37.6	165,730	−10.4
1964	1,495,370	11.5	1,184,450	15.1	270	−88.4	132,480	−9.1	178,170	7.5
Market share (percent):										
1960			33.90		18.70		33.20		14.20	
1961			40.70		19.30		26.90		13.10	
1962			54.70		8.00		20.80		16.50	
1963			76.60		.20		10.90		12.30	
1964			79.21		.02		8.86		11.91	

NEW YORK TO BOSTON

Year	Total		Eastern Air Lines		Northeast Airlines		American Airlines		Others	
	Passengers	Percent change prior year	Passengers	Percent change prior year	Passengers	Percent change prior year	Passengers	Percent change prior year	Passengers	Percent change prior year
1960	1,051,730		343,930		245,750		394,940		67,110	
1961	1,089,300	3.60	462,780	34.6	248,600	1.2	299,040	−24.3	78,880	17.5
1962	1,289,810	18.40	754,740	63.1	227,660	−8.4	213,200	−28.7	94,210	19.4
1963	1,659,400	28.70	1,291,450	71.1	231,980	1.9	72,020	−66.2	63,950	−32.1
1964	1,814,550	9.40	1,375,590	6.5	306,160	32.0	43,900	−39.1	88,900	39.0
MARKET SHARE										
1960			32.70		23.40		37.50		6.40	
1961			42.40		22.80		27.50		7.30	
1962			58.50		17.70		16.50		7.30	
1963			77.80		14.00		4.30		3.90	
1964			75.81		16.87		2.42		4.90	

Source: From Civil Aeronautics Board statistics.

EXHIBIT 2

History of Eastern Air Lines' shuttle fares [1]

FARES SHOWN ARE 1-WAY (EXCLUDING TAX)—ROUND-TRIP FARE IS TWICE THE 1-WAY FARE

Date	Federal tax (percent)	Applicable	New York to Washington	New York to Boston	Boston to Washington	Comment
Apr. 16, 1961	10	All times	$12.73	$10.91	(2)	Inaugural.
Dec. 2. 1961	10	do	13.64	11.82		Increase.
Feb. 1, 1962	10	do [1]	13.64	11.82	$24.55	Inaugural.
Aug. 30, 1962	10	do	14.55	12.73	24.55	Increase (part).
Nov. 16, 1962	5	do	14.29	12.38	23.81	Tax decrease, fare decrease.
Dec. 21, 1962	5	Peak	14.29	12.38	23.81	No change.
		Offpeak	11.43	9.52	20.95	Start of offpeak.
June 1, 1963	5	All times	14.29	12.38		Canceled offpeak in part.
		Peak			23.81	
		Offpeak			20.95	
June 10, 1963	5	All times	14.29			Added offpeak in part.
		Peak		12.38	23.81	
		Offpeak		11.43	20.95	
Jan. 8, 1964	5	All times	15.24			Increase in part.
		Peak		13.33	23.81	
		Offpeak		11.43	20.95	
Oct. 1, 1964	5	Executive shuttle			24.76	Inaugural.
Jan. 15, 1965	5	All times	17.14			Fare increases.
		Peak		15.24	25.71	
		Offpeak	(3)	13.33	22.86	
		Executive	(4)		26,67	

	Applicable	New York to Washington	New York to Boston	Boston to Washington	Comment
Current fares (including tax).	All times	$18.00		No shuttle	Current fares including tax.
	Peak		$16.00		
	Offpeak		14.00		

[1] Children under 2, no charge; 2 to 12 years of age, half fare.

[2] Shuttle service (Boston to Washington) discontinued Apr. 24. 1965.

[3] Applies to flights (New York City to Boston) departing between 10:45 a.m. and 2:45 p.m., Monday through Thursdays and all day Saturday.

[4] Executive shuttle fares canceled, effective May 20. 1965.

Source: Civil Aeronautics Board.

EXHIBIT 3

COMMUTER FARES STABILIZED AFTER NEW WEST COAST FILINGS

Commuter fares on the west coast appeared to be settling down to a permanent pattern after the latest round of traiff changes.

United Air Lines and Trans World Airlines lowered their one-way jet commuter rates between Los Angeles and San Francisco/Oakland from $14.50 to $13.50, while Western Air Lines increased its shuttle rate to the same level from $11.43, following its replacement of DC–6B aircraft with 146-passenger Boeing 720B fanjets. Pacific Southwest Airlines set an $11.43 LAX–SFO rate on Lockheed Electras and a $13.50 rate on its new Boeing 727's.

Western unsuccessfully sought to have CAB suspend TWA's $13.50 tariff as ambiguous because it allegedly did not detail what service a jet commuter passenger is entitled to as compared to a coach passenger. The six-abreast jet commuter accommodations are in the forward section of the coach compartment on TWA's Boeing 707's and 727's. Family discounts do not apply on commuter fares and no meals are served.

Western also failed to stop a TWA cut in jet coach fares between LAX and SFO, from $23.70 to $15.50.

The Board rejected WAL's complaint but upheld the carrier's objections to a United filing in another hotly contested market, Los Angeles-Las Vegas. UAL had applied for a DC–6 propeller fare of $11.43 to match Western's DC–6B "Thriftair" commuter rate. The board noted that UAL would have offered four-abreast seating for 69 passengers whereas Western offers five-abreast seating for 87.

Suspending the United tariff, CAB said it does not look with favor on a proposal which upgrades service while matching fares, where the economic basis of the low-fare proposal would then be undermined.

LAX-SFO TRAFFIC BATTLE HOTTER THAN EVER

The battle for top position in movement of traffic over the busy Los Angeles/Burbank-San Francisco/Oakland air corridor has in recent weeks become hotter than ever.

The two major contenders—Western Air Lines and Pacific Southwest Airlines—are fighting it out along slightly different lines, and neither carrier seems ready to give any quarter.

Western is placing its blue chips on new equipment—four-engine Boeing 720B fanjets—and an unprecedented marketing campaign tied to that equipment and its one-way jet commuter fare of $13.50 between LAX and SFO.

PSA also has new jets on the route, three-engine 727's, and its competitive gambits are heavy scheduling and an even lower fare on turboprop flights.

APRIL STEP-UP

Always an aggressive operator, PSA used its first 727 on supplemental service during the Easter holiday period and then put the 122-passenger jets into regular service on April 20, when the intrastate carrier increased its weekly schedules from 358 to 426 flights.

PSA's new fare move—a cut in the San Francisco-Los Angeles/Burbank fare from $13.50 to $11.43—took effect on the same date but is applicable only on flights operated with Electra equipment. A similar fare between Oakland and Los Angeles/Burbank went into effect last January 5.

Western, for its part, accompanied its inauguration of fanjet commuter service on the "world's busiest air route" with an intensive 3-month marketing campaign stressing those features designed to appeal most to the "briefcase traveler"—frequent, convenient schedules; fast and efficient ticketing and baggage handling; quality inflight service; travel comfort; and low fares.

It also sought to stress the fact that it flies the four-engine 720B—"the jet with the extra engine"—whereas tri-jet 727's are used in United Air Lines' jet commuter service and PSA's service on the same route.

Other features emphasized in WAL's sales "blitz," a campaign in which 30 salesmen fanned out to cover some 10,000 business offices in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Oakland and the peninsula area, were: new "contour comfort" seats; fast, express ticketing through use of pre-prepared tickets; curbside check-in facilities to cut baggage time; four stewardesses on each flight; and provision of such cabin service "extras" as electric shavers and dictating machines.

ADS SUPPORT DRIVE

Backing up the personal sales calls were extensive newspaper advertising, wide use of TV and radio commercials, and the placing of much billboard advertising.

Western apparently expects that the combination of its new equipment and its sales drive will "clobber" the competition, but its competitors, particularly PSA, are not easily intimidated and have demonstrated that they are rather formidable competitors in their own right.

Meanwhile, as is often the case when airlines get into a competitive battle, it's the air traveler who gets the break.

EXHIBIT 4

[Docket 15713—Order No. E-21637]

ORDER DISMISSING COMPLAINT ADOPTED BY THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD AT ITS OFFICE IN WASHINGTON, D.C., ON THE 4TH DAY OF JANUARY 1965

Passenger fares proposed by Eastern Air Lines, Inc., Northeast Airlines, Inc., Braniff Airways, Inc.

By tariff revisions[1] filed November 10, 1964, marked to become effective January 15, 1965, Eastern Air Lines, Inc., proposes: (1) a general passenger fare revision for all its regular domestic first-class and coach fares, and (2) an increase of approximately $1.90 per ticket for its individual, executive, and group shuttle fares between Boston, New York/Newark, and Washington. Eastern proposes to reduce all regular fares presently greater than $50 and increase all fares that are now less than $50. The revised regular fares have been computed under a formula whereby each existing fare is adjusted so as to reflect the combination of a 5-percent decrease and a $2.50 increase. Thus, a current fare of $100 would be reduced to $97.50, a fare of $30 would be increased to $31, and a $50 fare would remain unchanged. The shuttle fares would be increased by an amount which, including 5-percent transportation tax, will result in a fare increase of $2 for each air-shuttle ticket. Braniff Airways, Inc., has filed tariff revisions proposing fare reductions in eight markets to match Eastern's revised fares.[2] Northeast Airlines, Inc., has also filed tariff revisions[3] proposing to increase its individual standby propeller fares by approximately $1.90 ($2 including tax) in the Boston-New York and Boston-Washington markets, and to cancel its New York-Washington fare for standby service.

National Airlines, Inc., has filed a complaint requesting suspension and investigation of Eastern's proposed fares. The complaint states that National neither opposes nor supports the proposed increase in short-haul fares under $50; that Eastern's short-haul problem stems in large part from the commuter markets where shuttle service is operated; and that the carrier's commuter service appears underpriced. National contends that the reductions of long-haul fares are small; that they would not increase traffic but would decrease revenues for all carriers; and that Eastern has not proved that the long-haul fares are unreasonable or that such fares are related to short-haul fares. Mohawk has filed a letter supporting Eastern's proposal, and Eastern and the Southern Florida Hotel and Motel Association have filed answers to the National complaint. American and TWA have filed letters commenting on Eastern's proposal. In their letters, the two carriers point out that they do not endorse Eastern's proposal; that such a proposal is not a mandate to the industry to make similar fare adjustments; and contend that if Eastern wishes to increase its short-haul fares, it can do so without upsetting the fare structure of other carriers.

In support of its proposal and in answer to National's complaint, Eastern indicates that the objective of its revised passenger fare structure is to more equitably relate fares to expenses; that it has concluded from its studies that its average fare yield is insufficient to cover average cost, primarily because of its extensive short-haul obligations; and that Eastern's average passenger travels a shorter distance (488 miles) on its route than on any other trunk carrier, excepting Northeast. Eastern asserts that the existing fare structure favors the long-haul carriers and the short-haul passengers; that both long-haul and short-haul carriers should have equal earning opportunities; and that Eastern's proposal is designed to do so. The carrier also contends that the suggestion of National and American that Eastern should increase its short-haul fares without tampering with the fare structure of other carriers misses its basic objective of improving the economics of short-haul travel, and that such unilateral action by Eastern could raise issues of discrimination.

Upon consideration of the tariff proposals, the allegations in the complaint and answers and of other matters noticed herein, the Board finds that the complaint of National against the proposed fare reductions of Eastern does not state facts which warrant investigation of the Eastern tariff. The request for investigation, and accordingly the request for suspension, will be denied and the complaint dismissed. The proposed fare reductions, in the range of 1 to 3 percent, do not appear outside the range of reasonableness, nor has any showing been made which would indicate that the reduced fares would be unlawful or that they are a threat to the financial stability of competing carriers. Further, we note that the fare reductions would be applicable in the Florida markets where the present level of regular fares is generally higher than in other domestic markets of comparable length.

The Board has reviewed the proposed increases of Eastern and Northeast to their shuttle and standby fares, as well as Eastern's proposed increases to its regular fare service and has determined to permit them to become effective without investigation. The formula presented by Eastern would increase fares in the short-haul markets where units costs are higher. The increased air-shuttle fares of Eastern and the standby fares of Northeast are within the range of present jet and propeller day coach fares and Eastern has provided backup aircraft and flight personnel to provide extra sections and thus assure accommodations to overflow passengers. In these circumstances we will allow Eastern and Northeast the opportunity to increase their revenues and thus have a better opportunity to cover the operating expenses incurred providing air transportation. This action is consistent with our recent action permitting Southern and Eastern to increase certain fares.[4]

Accordingly, pursuant to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, and particularly sections 204(a), 403, 404, and 1002 thereof,

It is ordered that:

1. The complaint of National Airlines, Inc., in Docket No. 15713, is dismissed; and

2. Copies of this order be served upon National Airlines, Inc., Northeast Airlines, Inc., Eastern Air Lines, Inc., and Braniff Airways, Inc.

By the Civil Aeronautics Board:

[SEAL] HAROLD R. SANDERSON,
Secretary.

Murphy, Vice Chairman, and Minetti, member, filed the attached joint concurrence and dissent.

---

[1] Revisions to Agent C. C. Squire's CAB No. 44, and Eastern's Air-Shuttle Tariffs Nos. 83, 102, 160, and 161, bearing a posting date of Nov. 10, 1964.

[2] Revisions to Agent C. C. Squire's CAB No. 44, filed Dec. 16, 1964, effective Jan. 15, 1965.

[3] Revisions to Northeast's standby tariffs CAB Nos. 39 and 46, filed Dec. 7, 1964, effective Jan. 15, 1965.

[4] Effective October 1, 1964, Southern proposed a general increase in its first class propeller fares averaging about 2 percent. Subsequently, American, Delta, Eastern, National, Trans World, and United proposed to match Southern's increases in markets where competitive with Southern. The Board permitted Southern's and Eastern's higher fares to become effective in recognition of a need for increased revenue; Southern because of an impending reduction in subsidy, and Eastern, because of the systemwide operating losses it has been and still is experiencing. However, the Board suspended the fare increases proposed by the other carriers since those carriers had not shown the need for the additional revenues, which the selective fare increases would produce without corresponding downward adjustments of other fares, and because those carriers were in fact realizing a rising trend of domestic system earnings that were on the whole not inadequate. (Orders WE-21290, September 17, 1964, and E-21529, November 23, 1964.)

MURPHY, VICE CHAIRMAN, AND MINETTI, MEMBER, CONCURRING AND DISSENTING

Eastern's tariff revisions pose substantial public interest questions affecting a great cross section of our traveling public. Accordingly, we would suspend and investigate them.[5]

It is singularly incongruous that at the close of a recordbreaking year for all airlines and on the threshold of what promises to be an even better year—the greatest in aviation history—additional tolls should be exacted from air travelers in short-haul markets without a meaningful investigation to determine the compelling justification for them. If comparable tariff charges were to be exacted on an industrywide level it would appear that $23 million or more of additional charges would be imposed upon the American traveling public in the year 1965.[6] It would seem to us that the present record levels of economic growth and prosperity dictate a wise and prudent course in holding the line against inflationary escalation of charges to the public for air transportation as well as other needed services and products. Eastern's proposed tariff changes are not the product of the study submitted but rather were derived by empirical management judgments and we do not understand the majority of the Board to adopt Eastern's formula as a valid rate structure approach.

The rule of ratemaking as laid down by our governing statute requires the board to consider the need in the public interest of adequate and efficient service at the lowest cost consistent with furnishing such service and the need of each carrier for revenue sufficient, under honest, economic and efficient management, to provide adequate and efficient service. This means, in the instant case, that critical analysis of Eastern's revenue "need" is required before permitting substantial price increases to take effect on the basis that the carrier has demonstrated such a need in the filings herein which make no reference whatever to its dramatic improvement in 1964 or to its own forecast of a solidly profitable operation in 1965. The vigorous management effort to restore Eastern to a profitable position has achieved a measure of great success and is a fact upon which management should be complimented. Eastern's figures show that its operating profit is improving, traffic is growing, load factor is improving and that the gap between costs and revenue per ton-mile is rapidly closing.[7]

Eastern's tariff changes have already triggered price increases throughout the system of Allegheny Airlines, including increases not related to competitive markets. These price increases which represent the third price hike by Allegheny since May 1964, we would likewise suspend and investigate.

In terms of added cost to the users, Eastern's price hike will amount to approximately $6 million in 1965 for the shuttle services alone. (It is interesting to note in this connection that Eastern has achieved a practical monopoly position in the Boston-New York and New York-Washington markets and enjoys a most sizable share of the Boston-Washington market. In contrast, on the West Coast, in the Los Angeles-San Diego-San Francisco shuttle market where competitive carriers offer shuttle services with equipment which includes Electras, the charge to the traveler is substantially less for an even greater length of journey.)[8]

Accordingly, pursuant to section 1002 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, we would suspend and investigate all the related tariffs.

ROBERT T. MURPHY.
G. JOSEPH MINETTI.

---

[5] While we would prefer to suspend and investigate the entire Eastern proposal we are constrained not to oppose the modest reductions in long-haul fares.

[6] The formula proposed by Eastern would increase fares in its major short-haul markets by 10 to 15 percent while reducing fares in its long-haul markets by 1 to 3 percent. Since almost two-thirds of total airline trips are less than 700 miles the principal result, if generally applied by all carriers, would be a substantial fare increase for the great majority of airline passengers. The possible adverse impact on traffic growth, therefore, is a matter for serious reflection.

[7] Specifically, carrier reports show that Eastern's domestic revenue ton-miles are increasing. Overall revenue load factor is at the highest level since 1960. Eastern's revenue passenger-miles for November 1964 increased 13.5 percent over November 1963 and revenue passenger-miles for the 12 months ended November 30, 1964 were 17.4 percent over the previous year, both increases above the big four and domestic trunkline averages. Even higher percentage increases were experienced in October when Eastern, along with a number of other trunkline carriers reached its all-time traffic peak.

Eastern's November 1964 revenue passenger load factor of 54.4 percent was three points above the big four and domestic trunkline averages and its load factor for the 12 months ended November 30, 1964 of 55 percent was only slightly below the big four and domestic trunkline average load factor. Load factors have been consistently moving upward and are higher now than in 1959, a profitable year.

With more jets in service, Eastern will experience the same highly favorable cost-revenue ratios which the other trunks presently enjoy.

In 1964 Eastern stock moved from a 26⅛ low to a 46 high and closed out the year at 42¾.

[8] The shuttle fare increases are high in relative terms:

	Peak	Off peak
Shuttle price increases:	*Percent*	*Percent*
Boston to New York	14.33	16.62
Boston to Washington	7.98	9.12
New York to Washington	12.47	12.47

	Fare	Mileage	Yield (cents)
East coast shuttle fares:			
Boston to New York	$15.24	184	8.28
Boston to Washington	25.71	399	6.44
New York to Washington	17.14	215	7.97
West coast shuttle fares:			
Los Angeles to San Francisco	11.43	340	3.36
Los Angeles to San Diego	6.35	109	5.83
San Francisco to San Diego	19.85	449	4.42

EXHIBIT 5.—*Reports of local and connecting passenger traffic submitted by Civil Aeronautics Board*

Boston to New York—Local and connecting passengers (100 percent)

	Year				Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963	
Northeast	245,750	248,600	227,660	231,980	271,900
Eastern	343,930	462,780	754,740	1,291,450	1,425,990
American	394,940	299,040	213,200	72,020	43,330
Allegheny	2,480	9,950	17,200	2,860	3,040
National	22,080	39,940	48,730	30,360	32,250
TWA	26,340	14,090	21,360	25,510	42,310
United	13,510	8,630	1,480	1,450	780
Others	2,700	6,270	5,440	3,770	3,790
All carriers	1,051,730	1,089,300	1,289,810	1,659,400	1,823,390

	4th quarter 1963	1st quarter 1964	2d quarter 1964	3d quarter 1964	Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
Northeast	52,980	59,330	81,400	78,190	271,900
Eastern	373,040	329,700	370,690	352,560	1,425,990
American	12,500	9,460	11,840	9,530	43,330
Allegheny	610	760	1,150	520	3,040
National	7,240	6,410	6,900	11,700	32,250
TWA	8,300	9,720	11,210	13,080	42,510
United	290	90	220	180	780
Others	950	870	1,230	740	3,790
All carriers	455,910	416,340	484,640	466,500	1,823,390

NOTE.—See Boston-Washington table for source.

New York to Washington—Local and connecting passengers (100 percent)

	Year				Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963	
Northeast	155,660	180,590	89,670	2,330	280
Eastern	282,300	380,060	614,710	1,029,120	1,159,560
American	276,280	250,840	233,530	145,730	131,180
Braniff	17,270	18,650	32,790	17,290	19,600
National	33,800	53,960	90,600	91,320	90,340
TWA	14,470	7,780	16,430	19,890	28,810
United	19,840	23,690	36,540	29,200	26,040
Capital [1]	28,370	[1] 11,690			
Others	3,950	6,740	8,560	8,030	7,500
All carriers	831,840	934,000	1,122,830	1,342,910	1,463,310

	4th quarter, 1963	1st quarter, 1964	2d quarter, 1964	3d quarter, 1964	Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
Northeast	50	30	50	150	280
Eastern	298,550	243,060	331,060	286,890	1,159,560
American	32,410	30,860	37,470	30,440	131,180
Braniff	4,440	3,850	5,270	6,040	19,600
National	19,590	16,740	26,760	27,250	90,340
TWA	4,540	4,580	8,940	10,750	28,810
United	6,510	6,200	7,880	5,450	26,040
Others	1,780	1,800	2,270	1,650	7,500
All carriers	367,870	307,120	419,700	368,620	1,463,310

[1] Capital merged with United, June 1, 1961.

EXHIBIT 5.—*Reports of local and connecting passenger traffic submitted by Civil Aeronautics Board*—Continued

On-line origin and destination passenger traffic in both directions between New York and Boston and between New York and Washington, calendar year 1964

	Passengers (local and connecting) [1]	Carrier's share of market (percent)
New York to Boston:		
All carriers	1,814,550	100.00
American Airlines	43,900	2.42
Allegheny Airlines	2,920	.16
Eastern Air Lines	1,365,590	75.81
Mohawk Airlines	1,610	.09
National Airlines	34,440	1.90
Northeast Airlines	306,160	16.87
Trans World Airlines	47,020	2.59
United Air Lines	900	.05
UK	2,010	.11
New York to Washington:		
All carriers	1,495,370	100.00
American Airlines	132,480	8.86
Allegheny Airlines	1,980	.13
Braniff International Airways	19,330	1.29
Delta Air Lines	2,190	.15
Eastern Air Lines	1,184,450	79.21
National Airlines	96,350	6.44
Northeast Airlines	270	.02
Northwest Orient Airlines	50	(2)
Trans World Airlines	30,270	2.02
United Air Lines	24,910	1.67
UK	3,090	.21

[1] 10 percent sample expanded to estimate total.

[2] Less than 0.005 percent.

Source: "Competition Among Domestic Air Carriers."

Boston to Washington—Local and connecting passengers (100 percent)

Carrier	Year				Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963	
Northeast	123,880	169,760	180,490	161,120	178,950
Eastern	23,480	28,140	41,430	166,790	170,510
American	47,160	25,040	35,320	8,750	30,650
All others	10,430	2,880	4,270	4,670	3,730
All carriers	204,950	225,820	261,510	341,330	383,840
Share of market (percent):					
Northeast	60.4	75.2	69.0	47.2	46.6
Eastern	11.5	12.4	15.9	48.9	44.4
American	23.0	11.1	13.5	2.5	8.0
Others	5.1	1.3	1.6	1.4	1.0
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	4th quarter, 1963	1st quarter, 1964	2d quarter, 1964	3d quarter, 1964	Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
Northeast	40,440	41,770	53,520	43,220	178,950
Eastern	53,950	40,530	41,060	34,970	170,510
American	250	150	12,970	17,280	30,650
Others	970	790	1,060	910	3,730
All	95,610	83,240	108,610	96,380	383,840
Share of market (percent):					
Northeast	42.3	50.2	49.3	44.8	----------
Eastern	56.4	48.7	37.8	36.3	----------
American	.3	.2	11.9	17.9	----------
Others	1.0	.9	1.0	1.0	----------
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	----------

Source: CAB, "Competition Among Domestic Air Carriers" (10-percent sample), published quarterly and annually. Data has been expanded to show 100 percent in the tables above.

Boston to Philadelphia—Local and connecting passengers (100 percent)

	Year				Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963	
Northeast	89,230	94,910	114,950	104,660	96,730
Eastern	33,120	57,100	42,980	84,530	106,610
American	21,340	550	3,890	1,760	190
Allegheny	6,930	14,050	20,170	6,950	5,560
Others	2,440	1,900	4,450	6,340	12,270
All carriers	153,060	168,510	186,440	203,880	221,360

Boston to Philadelphia—Local and connecting passengers (100 percent)—Continued

	4th quarter 1963	1st quarter 1964	2d quarter 1964	3d quarter 1964	Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
Northeast	21,550	22,280	27,740	25,160	96,730
Eastern	32,840	25,840	26,570	21,360	106,610
American	60	60	40	30	190
Allegeheny	620	1,180	1,430	2,330	5,560
Others	2,420	2,140	3,500	4,210	12,270
All carriers	57,490	51,500	59,280	53,090	221,360

San Francisco to Los Angeles—Local and connecting passengers (100 percent)

[NOTE.—United inaugurated jet commuter service on Sept. 27, 1964. During the first 4 months of operation (to Jan. 30, 1965) United carried 251,876 passengers on this service.]

	Year				Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963	
United	627,680	676,110	494,520	394,530	301,170
Western	275,030	222,710	[1] 314,580	561,270	799,180
TWA	81,820	74,530	67,030	86,070	91,920
Pacific	8,640	6,380	6,990	5,330	5,870
Others	770	2,110	2,630	2,240	2,640
Subtotal [2]	993,940	981,840	885,750	1,049,440	1,200,780
PSA [3]	385,000	473,000	732,000	943,000	1,100,000
Total	1,378,940	1,454,840	1,617,750	1,992,440	2,300,780

	4th quarter 1963	1st quarter 1964	2d quarter 1964	3d quarter 1964	Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
United	84,940	71,890	72,200	72,140	301,170
Western	176,530	184,310	200,210	238,130	799,180
TWA	22,170	19,340	24,160	26,250	91,920
Pacific	1,380	1,230	1,440	1,820	5,870
Others	500	680	700	760	2,640
Subtotal	285,520	277,450	298,710	339,100	1,200,780
PSA	246,000	257,000	285,000	312,000	1,100,000
Total	531,520	534,450	583,710	651,100	2,300,780

[1] Thriftair service inaugurated June 1, 1962.

[2] Source: Certificated Carriers—CAB's "Competition Among Domestic Air Carriers.'

[3] Source: PSA: 1960 (estimated); 1961–64 (California State Public Utilities Commission).

NOTE.—PSA's 4th quarter 1964 dropped to 218,000 (United started jet commuter Sept. 27, 1964).

Los Angeles to San Diego—Local and connecting passengers (100 percent)

	Year				Year ended Sept. 30 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963	
United	176,630	164,230	121,330	139,100	141,220
American	50,680	43,040	39,350	35,590	37,220
Western	39,770	31,920	38,600	51,330	59,970
Bonanza	4,750	5,040	4,270	6,760	7,320
Others	70	2,640	8,850	17,450	29,010
Subtotal	271,900	246,870	212,400	250,230	274,740
PSA [1]	97,000	93,000	128,000	162,000	192,000
Total	368,900	339,870	340,400	412,230	466,740

	4th quarter 1963	1st quarter 1964	2d quarter 1964	3d quarter 1964	Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
United	35,860	33,340	37,290	34,730	141,220
American	8,330	7,840	10,230	10,820	37,220
Western	9,840	11,120	17,520	21,490	59,970
Bonanza	2,160	1,940	1,570	1,650	7,320
Others	4,530	5,230	8,890	10,360	29,010
Subtotal	60,720	59,470	75,500	79,050	274,740
PSA	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Total	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

[1] Sources: 1960 estimated. 1961–64 California State Public Utilities Commission.

EXHIBIT 5.—*Reports of local and connecting passenger traffic submitted by Civil Aeronautics Board*—Continued

San Francisco to San Diego—Local and connecting passengers (100 percent)

	Year				Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963	
United	50,120	52,820	30,380	17,200	14,210
Western	4,690	4,740	13,100	34,340	38,430
Others	60	190	680	590	670
Subtotal	54,870	57,750	44,160	52,130	53,310
PSA [1]	139,000	132,000	170,000	200,000	228,000
Total	193,870	189,750	214,160	252,130	281,310

San Francisco to San Diego—Local and connecting passengers (100 percent)—Continued

	4th quarter, 1963	1st quarter, 1964	2d quarter, 1964	3d quarter, 1964	Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
United	3,980	3,560	2,920	3,750	14,210
Western	7,410	8,580	10,420	12,020	38,430
Others	140	150	120	260	670
Subtotal	11,530	12,290	13,460	16,030	53,310
PSA	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Total	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

[1] Sources: 1960, estimated. 1961–64, California State Public Utilities Commission.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I have been aware for some time of the interest of the Senator from Massachusetts in the problems of the regulated industries, especially transportation. Today that interest has produced for our serious consideration an informative statement that raises questions about the possible growth of monopoly in one of the country's major transport markets. The implications contained in his remarks are important to the traveler, of course. But they are also of real consequence to those concerned with the role of competition in our economy. They deserve our most thoughtful attention.

What must be remembered is that competition can be as important in a regulated industry, such as air transport, as it is in a manufacturing industry such as steel. Many think that because an industry is regulated by an administrative agency, the question of competition in the industry—or in markets within it—is of no public concern. This simply is not true. Fundamentally, it is the rivalry between firms in an industry that determine its performance, not the fact of regulation.

The critical importance of competition in a regulated context is no better illustrated than in air transport. Although supervised and monitored by the Civil Aeronautics Board, all of the factors influencing the character of air transportation are determined by the interplay of competition between competing airlines operating along any given route.

Take airline fares as an example. Often it is said that fares are "fixed" or "set" by the CAB. This is not correct. The Board passes only upon fares that are proposed by the airlines. It does not itself establish fares; rather, it depends on the usual market process to keep fares at a reasonable level. Experience shows that where there is active competition between air carriers on a route, almost invariably fares are lower and service better. The Los Angeles-San Francisco market, to which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has referred is an excellent illustration of the public benefits which are generated by intense competition between aggressive rival carriers.

By contrast, where there is no competition—where a single carrier dominates a route—it may be found that fares are significantly higher, schedules less convenient, flight equipment slower and of lower quality. I should emphasize that these are not mere theoretical speculations. Students of the industry have cited many instances where competition has led to lower fares, improved equipment, and better service to the traveler. And in a number of opinions the CAB itself has recognized that competition is really the best instrument of regulation.

Because competition is so important to the effective functioning of a regulated industry like air transport, this is a matter of concern to the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, on which the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts serves so ably.

I assure the Senator that it will receive our close attention.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts on the statement he has made. Recently he appeared before the Commerce Committee, of which I am a member, while we were holding hearings on the inadequacy of air service. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] made a great contribution in this field.

I invite attention to the middle paragraph on page 7 of the statement which the Senator is making in which he says:

> The problem with which we are dealing here is not just a public interest problem concerning increasing rates and inadequacy of service; it is an antitrust matter of the first order. It involves the elimination of necessary competition and a tremendous concentration of economic power in a regulated industry.

This problem, of course, which the Senator from Massachusetts specifically relates, is one dealing with Eastern Air Lines and the shuttle service primarily.

However, as the Senator knows, having attended the hearings of the Commerce Committee, it is a national problem, one dealing with the entire service to the intermediate cities throughout the Nation.

This is a problem the trunklines create for themselves by their failure to provide adequate service to the small nonmetropolitan areas of the Nation, and they are building a monopoly, to which the Senator from Massachusetts refers, by failing to carry out the service for which they were certificated.

We believe that the public interests must be served, and with the assistance of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and many others interested in this problem, we shall endeavor to see that it is. Eventually, if it is not served, the certificate should be changed and service provided. I believe the Senator agrees that the major trunk lines are now ignoring their responsibility to the public interests.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator has stated quite accurately and cogently one of the principal problems with which we are confronted with a number of the large trunklines. As the Senator has observed, in our region, particularly in New England, we have seen a decrease in their ability to service a number of the different communities. That is a subject of considerable concern to me, and to many other legislators in New England. As the Senator from Tennessee has pointed out, when trunklines receive choice routes, they have a responsibility to provide good, efficient, and effective transportation service to the people in the geographical areas served by the airline. In many instances they have not only been reluctant, but remiss in their duties and responsibilities to fulfill this obligation.

I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Tennessee, who although he represents a different section of the country, nevertheless is equally concerned about the future of the transportation crisis.

Mr. BASS. I appreciate the Senator's comments. As he is well aware, the taxpayers have more than $2 billion in direct subsidies invested in the development of the air transport service of the Nation. The carriers owe it to the American people to provide the service that is necessary. As the Senator has said, air travel is no longer a luxury; it is an important factor in the business of everyone who has to travel. I appreciate the interest of the Senator from Massachusetts.

What he is saying applies not only to New England, but to the South and the rest of the Nation, as well. The problem affects in particular, every city east of the Mississippi having a population above 100,000. Because of the vast areas of the West, the carriers are in a position to provide better service in that region. So the situation is not so acute west of the Mississippi. But east of the river, the problem is acute, and something should be done to alleviate it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Tennessee, who serves as a member of the Committee on Commerce. He has a background of experience with this problem. The problem is of deep interest not only to the members of his committee but to all of us who are interested in providing better service to the people of our respective States and areas.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **KENNEDY** of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Mr. President, the Senator has made a highly significant and important statement. The two of us have been concerned for some time about the inadequacy of the air service to New England—I, especially with respect to northern New England, and he with respect to his native State of Massachusetts.

We have been very much concerned about the instability and inadequacy of the present service and the uncertainty of future prospects.

I believe that the questions which the Senator has raised in his speech are highly significant and relevant as we undertake to develop public policy and to develop air service which would better serve the future of New England. I believe that these questions are directly related to the public interest. They need to be asked. They need to be answered.

I emphasize the fact that the Senator indicates that he does not disparage the basic idea of low-price commuter-type service. However, I share his belief that that service ought not to be inconsistent with the quality of adequate service for our area of the country.

I believe that it is an indication of the failure of our policy in this field that service to this heavily-populated and important industrial segment of our country should be shrouded in such doubt and uncertainty at the present time.

I compliment the Senator on his speech. There are undoubtedly other questions which have a bearing upon air service to New England, many of which he and I have explored together in the past and will in the future. However, I believe that the questions the Senator has raised today are among the questions that ought to be asked and examined by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. **KENNEDY** of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maine for his comments and for his support.

As the Senator from Maine has mentioned, he has been concerned, during the time that I have been a Senator, with the provision for good, effective, efficient, and frequent service not only to his State of Maine but to the other New England States.

The comments of the Senator from Maine have been constructive. He is most helpful. I feel that his interest in the questions which we have raised in order to protect the commuters in the many cities in New England has been of significant assistance in placing a real emphasis on this problem.

It is obvious that other parts of the country have enjoyed effective competition, and efficient service. I believe that New England should be entitled to similar competitive service.

Mr. **PELL**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **KENNEDY** of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. **PELL**. I congratulate the able junior Senator from Massachusetts on his close pursuit of and expression of concern for the public interest. Exploitation of monopoly situations has long been the subject of close scrutiny by the Congress, and Senator KENNEDY's concern is in this great tradition.

I am particularly interested in my colleague's remarks because they touch on an area of personal involvement for me. I speak of the problems of transportation in the northeast megalopolis. Senator KENNEDY has joined with me in seeking both short- and long-term solutions to this problem, in the hope of achieving some competitive balance between the various transportation modes which would be consistent with national transportation policy.

The public interest requires some exploration of the shuttle situation, and I applaud the junior Senator from Massachusetts for his bringing it to our attention.

Speaking to the broader picture in a broader context—one of my regrets is that we have not arrived at some form of coordinating transportation planning. Such planning is greatly needed.

I hope that as the various irregularities which exist in the transportation situation of today become eliminated and more efficient travel becomes feasible, and the need for such a planning becomes self-evident, that the administration will press ahead to achieve some general overall policy.

It is of particular interest in the megalopolis in which the Senator from Massachusetts and I live, that, whereas in most areas of the country, approximately 90 percent of the intercity travel is by road, and the other 10 percent by competing modes, in megalopolis it is about 60 percent by road and the other 40 percent by the competing modes of transportation—such as air, railroad, and bus.

We depend a great deal more on the common carrier type of transportation in the Northeast than do the people in other parts of the country. For this reason, I doubly applaud the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. **KENNEDY** of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Rhode Island. The Senator has initiated support for, fought for, and continues to fight for rapid transit service connecting many of the great centers between Boston, New York, and Washington.

The Senator from Rhode Island has shown a sensitivity to the question of transportation which makes every Senator obligated to him. He has stressed rapid commuter service in which he deeply believes. We are indebted to the Senator for his great interest and concern with commuter service and the matter of public policy, and his great effort in trying to find the responsive, accurate, and true answers to many of these questions. I know that this bill guarantees to the commuters who travel in these areas the most efficient, effective, and comfortable service at the lowest price. We are in desperate need of this service.

I appreciate the comments of the Senator.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following additional reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. MOSS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1764. A bill to authorize the acquisition of certain lands within the boundaries of the Uinta National Forest in the State of Utah, by the Secretary of Agriculture (Rept. No. 467).

By Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1988. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Maryland (Rept. No. 468).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Harry R. Anderson, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 2302. A bill to provide fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel, to improve the quality of teacher training programs, and to establish a National Teacher Corps; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. McCARTHY):

S. 2303. A bill to authorize payments to college students for satisfactory undergraduate work; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. **McCARTHY**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] be added to the list of cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 85, the measure I introduced proposing a constitutional amendment relating to equal rights of men and women, and that his name be listed among the sponsors at its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] be added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 311 to S. 600, the Higher Education Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 20, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, July 19, 1965:

THE JUDICIARY

Robert E. Maxwell, of West Virginia, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of West Virginia vice Charles F. Paul, deceased.

Luther B. Eubanks, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Oklahoma to fill an additional position created pursuant to the provisions of title 28, section 372(b) of the United States Code.

Aubrey E. Robinson, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia for the term of 10 years, vice Marjorie McKenzie Lawson, resigning.

NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD

The following-named persons to be members of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for terms expiring May 10, 1970:

Dr. Mary I. Bunting, of Massachusetts.

Harvey Picker, of New York.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Section 14(b) Serves as a Restraint Upon the Ruthless, Unscrupulous Labor Leaders and Protects the Individual Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, early this year I stated that I was opposed to the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, and that as a matter of principle I would vote against any bill which seeks to repeal this section of the law. Many people, including no doubt a majority of the members of the several unions operating in the 10th District, cannot understand why I have taken this position inasmuch as Missouri does not have a right-to-work law. In responding to letters, from union members, urging me to change my position, I have prepared the following form letter, which sets forth briefly why I have taken this position. Incidentally, I have had many letters and calls from captive members, stating that while they cannot publicly express their views, due to fears of reprisal from their union leaders, they are in accord with my views, as set forth herewith:

DEAR FRIENDS: This will acknowledge your communication, asking that I support the repeal of section 14(b).

Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is the last remaining restraint upon those labor leaders, some of whom have demonstrated their desire to exercise dictatorial powers over the members of their unions. This section does provide protection to the individual member, and while this section has no direct effect on union members in Missouri, the fact that it does remain in the law and is effective in some 19 States, serves as a protection to all workers in Missouri.

As I have stated repeatedly, the union worker in Missouri is not adversely affected by section 14(b), but if it is repealed, it is my opinion that not only he, but the entire public would be adversely affected; the unscrupulous union leader would be unleashed and the rights of the individual union member would be further jeopardized. Good unions which are being fairly operated in the best interests of their members do not need the repeal of section 14(b), and the others should continue to be restrained by this section, if for no other reason than to protect the interests of the individual members of the union, many of whom are captive members who do not condone or approve of many of the tactics used by irresponsible leaders who use coercive methods in extracting dues and other payments which are not necessary in the operation of the legitimate union.

In closing may I state again that I believe I am representing the views of a majority of my constituents in opposing the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, and this includes many members, if not a majority of the members of the several unions in the 10th District.

Respectfully yours,

PAUL C. JONES,
Member of Congress.

Rural Mail Car Leasing: An Impractical Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to establish a car-leasing program for the rural mail carriers of America is impractical and unsound.

As a representative of a rural district—the great Fourth District of Tennessee—I want to go on record now as saying that the proposal is ill-conceived and impractical. It is not responsive to the circumstances that govern and control rural carrier operations.

It is fiscally irresponsible.

It is a reflection on the rural carrier system as now constituted.

It would be a great mistake to implement this concept.

Here are some of the effects it would have:

The local economies would suffer because the sale of cars would be reduced, insurance business would suffer, general repair shops would have their volume reduced, and tire dealers would be denied the patronage of the rural carriers.

There would be substantial losses in State gas taxes and car license proceeds.

There would be losses in Federal gas taxes.

There would be loss of standby vehicles for route emergencies.

Administrative costs for record keeping on the proposed new arrangement would be excessive. There would be many other disadvantages, to the Government and the public should this ill-conceived proposal materialize.

This proposal, Mr. Speaker, should be defeated.

Day of Trinity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, July 16, was the 20th anniversary of the first successful explosion of an atomic bomb.

July 16, 1945, marked the culmination of an extensive program begun even before the assault on Pearl Harbor. The program brought many of the finest military, scientific, and administrative men in America to work together in close contact and cooperation, for this was the beginning of the intimate alliance between our Government and the leaders of industry and science, to guide and promote the use of atomic energy.

Lansing Lamont presents the factual history of that atomic bomb program in his book "The Day of Trinity." But even more, he has captured the drama and uncertainty that pervaded this period, where mankind stepped up to a new plateau of greater self-potential and self-destruction.

Mr. Lamont has worked the thousands of day-by-day steps in the development of the atomic bomb into a story of emotion, hope, and humor. This is indeed an historical work of the highest merit. It reveals the characters of the men involved, the complexities of the problem they faced, and the decisions they made.

On this 20th anniversary of the occasion when man first unleashed the power of the atom on the lonely desert in New Mexico, Lansing Lamont deserves high acclaim. He has recorded the story of the atomic bomb for the readers of this generation and future generations. "The Day of Trinity," I am sure, will soon be recognized as one of the finest books of the year.

The Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Sunday, July 18, I had the signal honor, along with my colleague from New York, the Honorable FRANK J. HORTON, to receive a plaque honoring an unknown fighter lost in the continuing struggle against the forces of communism. Congressman HORTON and myself were entrusted by the Assembly of Captive European Nations in ceremonies at United Nations Plaza in the city of New York with the bronze plaque which will be placed in a national shrine in the United States for eventual transfer to the capital of the first captive nation to be freed from Soviet domination.

At a time when the forces of freedom are once again heavily engaged in another struggle with communism, I think my colleague's remarks particularly succinct and relevant, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include them in the RECORD:

Certain signs point with promise to a new era of understanding between our Nation and the Soviet Union. Yet, the fulfillment of that promise never can occur unless and until the Kremlin masters redress the grievances of those millions of people—your national kin—who are enslaved by the most oppressive colonial system ever to occur in human history.

The American conscience is troubled by what we see and what we know to exist in the once free nations of Eastern Europe. Freedom and independence are fundamental to our life and to our belief in the rights of man. Where these essentials have been destroyed by the actions of aggressors, we have a duty to democracy to help gain their restoration.

That is why we observe this Captive Nations Week. It is an official expression of the U.S. Government and the people of this liberty-loving land. It publishes to the world—free and slave alike—that the revolutionary spirit of our country lives today as strongly as ever and that it is dedicated to regaining the rights of those who still are subjected by communism.

But, the message of this Captive Nations Week must be put into meaning beyond a statement of belief. Our vital contemporary mission is to convince the Communist leaders that no meaningful nor realistic relaxation of the tensions that divide the world is possible without full and final freedom for Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, the Ukraine, and on through the roster of nations that had ripped from them by the vicious claw of the Russian Bear all that they held near and dear.

It must be stated, restated, and repeated as many times as necessary that the United States of America will demand the return of national independence and the restoration of individual liberties in any negotiation with Moscow. Soviet slavery is the key issue, and our total effort must insist on Russia's breaking the bondage which holds captive millions of people in Eastern Europe.

A world based on freedom and justice is the only hope for peace. It is the abiding desire of Americans and the fervent goal of the captive peoples. In recognition of its imperative, let us continue with renewed strength and dedication our mission in behalf of peace.

I applaud what you and your organizations are doing to win victory in this offensive. Because you know deep within your hearts the justice of your cause and because you have the support and sponsorship of millions of your fellow Americans, including many of us in the U.S. Congress, triumph will result.

Shoulder to shoulder and heart to heart, we are joined in the struggle and fight for the sacred right of the captive peoples to a new and free life. We shall win.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, when the last war was over, many millions of people, who had suffered the terrors of war for more than 5 years, had thought that their freedom was in sight. Many other millions who had sacrificed much and had prayed for the quick conclusion of the war had also hoped that peoples enslaved under totalitarian tyranny would regain their richly deserved freedom. That was the one general expectation in the West, and it was naturally hoped that the Government of the Soviet Union would help its wartime allies to restore freedom to the peoples in eastern and central Europe. But as we all learned the hard way, and as we rue over wartime events, the Soviet Union not only failed to aid and assist the oppressed peoples to regain their freedom, but it deliberately brought these peoples under its monolithic rule, and then imposed upon them Communist totalitarian tyranny.

That is the unfortunate and the almost unbelievably sad situation today in all central and east European countries. From the Baltic to the Black Sea, the Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, Czechoslovaks, Hungarians, Bulgarians, and Rumanians, and Germans in East Germany, constitute the captive nations of Europe.

The fate of these unhappy peoples has been the most serious concern of the West. The West's statesmen have tried to regain their freedom through peaceful means, and our Government has done its utmost to that end. In order to assure the people of this country that we are in earnest in this matter, the Government has designated the third week of July as Captive Nations Week. We have been observing it since 1959. We have always felt and still feel, that the cause of the captive nations is a righteous cause, one of freedom and humanity. I am happy that the Captive Nations Week is thus officially observed throughout the land, and I gladly associate myself with the observance of Captive Nations Week.

Talks by Senator George Smathers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 1965, the Honorable GEORGE A. SMATHERS, U.S. Senator from the State of Florida, delivered an address to newly commissioned officers of the Armed Forces, all of them about to become graduates of Yale University.

Included among those commissioned were a son of Senator SMATHERS and my own son. The remarks made by the Senator were so appropriate that I include them in the RECORD, under unanimous consent, so that all Members may have the opportunity to read them.

Senator SMATHERS' address follows:

TALK BY SENATOR GEORGE A. SMATHERS AT YALE UNIVERSITY

Captain Jones, Officers of the United States, ladies and gentlemen, I appear here this morning with mixed emotions, much like the man who saw his mother-in-law drive over the cliff in his new Cadillac. At once, both happy and sad.

I feel that every parent in this audience this morning is both happy and sad, but all—extremely proud. We are proud that our sons are among these outstanding young men who will shortly be commissioned officers in the Armed Forces of the United States of America.

Mixed with that pride, however, is genuine concern. For, while these young men have chosen the highest road of leadership, the acceptance of the responsibility of service to their country in the uniform of their country, the mission upon which they are about to embark is as hazardous, challenging, and uncertain as it has ever been before.

These are the quiet youths, not the self-styled angry young men, who fight so insistently for headlines and pictures in newspapers. Baggy trousers, sandals, and unwashed beards do not assure the wearer of a bond with peace. How easy it is to be righteously indignant when you have no responsibility.

In fact, there is an old saying that "War hath no fury like a noncombatant."

You young men here this morning might have pursued your fortunes in 100 other ways. But you have chosen to commit your immediate future, and possibly all that you have, for the well-being of your country and those in the world who seek freedom.

We don't have to look very far to see how much America and the free world needs such young men as you—for human misery and war cast their long shadows into the far corners of the earth today, as they have in the past.

Regrettably, at this time of challenge some of our citizens, though well-intentioned they may be, go about the country sowing seeds of doubt, disunity, and distrust.

To them, our military efforts are unworthy, all military sacrifices in vain.

These peace-marchers find safety in slogans but remain blind to the ancient saying: "It is madness for the sheep to talk peace with a wolf."

Let's take a very brief look at some history.

Were it not for the military power of America generously given in 1941 through 1945 we would not be living today as free men; and those who talk so glibly of disarmament and peace would lack the freedom to speak at all.

The same can be said of 1917 when the Kaiser was overwhelming Europe—until the day came when the men of the United States answered the call of those who sought liberty.

Down through the years, time and again, as diplomacy has broken down and the desires of some men to rule and dominate others has led them to the use of force, it has been a responding force that has preserved the freedom of us all.

Were it not for our military power today, does anyone doubt that the Communists would now control all South Vietnam? Cambodia? Thailand? Malaysia? Indeed, all the 600 million people in southeast Asia?

Were it not for our Armed Forces, how long would the Communist allow Berlin to remain even half free, or how much freedom would there be in Western Europe?

What knowledgeable and fair-minded person doubts that, had it not been for President Johnson's quick decision and fast action, Santo Domingo would at this moment be another Cuba?

He who has eyes, should see. He who has ears, should listen, and he who has a mind, should understand that the forces of communism still threaten the freedom of mankind today just as much as they did in 1941 or 1950 or 1962.

Of course, everyone craves peace, but when tigers are prowling, it is no time to be passing out leaflets.

The United States of America was born in a citizens' military revolution.

Six times in our history tyranny has threatened to destroy us. Six times, young men have answered the call.

And the good that has resulted from six victories is attested by there being more freedom, better education, more prosperity, better health, and higher standards of living for all in the United States, as well as in the free world.

Today, once again, freedom rests upon the military strength and the moral commitments of America.

But we are at present under heavy indictment, accused by our enemies, and more regrettably by some of our friends, of pursuing an ill-fated jingoistic course.

Yet facts show we have sought, and are seeking now with every available means, every possible way to bring these confrontations to the conference table.

For surely, Americans seek no new territory, no domain, no dominion, no rule, no authority, over any other lands nor any other people.

But for a certainty, we seek now and will in the future a peace—but always a worthy peace, a peace with honor.

Over the course of recent generations, we have learned that to gain these precious goals we must first respect our own contracts, our own commitments. And then those who would destroy freedom must be made to understand that in respecting our commitments, we will once again follow the steps of our forefathers—we will fight for freedom. We will not quit under pressure, nor surrender under attack.

To you young men, I would say that you have assumed enormous responsibility, for you have taken on the task of leadership, and you do it at a time of danger and uncertainty.

But the sum of your responsibility is the hope and strength of America—and in fact the free world.

You can be proud of the course you will follow. Men of courage and determination have preceded you. You walk in the spirit of every revolutionary whose name is emblazoned on the pages of time.

Horton Salutes Opening of Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week is being observed in our Nation this week. It marks the U.S. commitment to full and final freedom for the enslaved peoples of Eastern Europe and others held in human bondage by ruthless Communist masters.

Just yesterday, I had the honor to participate in a ceremony that heralded the opening of Captive Nations Week. It was a program held across from the United Nations Plaza in New York City and sponsored by the Assembly of Captive European Nations.

At the start of the ceremony, the flags of nine nations—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania—were raised to half-staff in token of the subservience of these once free countries to the Kremlin. Americans whose national ancestry ties are to the captive nations and exiles of these countries were among those gathered for the ceremony, and native costumes were worn by some of those present. As each flag was raised, the national anthem of the captive country was performed.

Those assembled then heard from Vasil Germenji, chairman of the Assembly of Captive European Nations. I am pleased to include his statement with my remarks at this point in the Record:

ADDRESS BY VASIL GERMENJI, CHAIRMAN, ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS, AT THE FLAG-RAISING CEREMONY, AT ACEN HOUSE, ON SUNDAY, JULY 18, 1965

We are assembled here to inaugurate the seventh Captive Nations Week—a symbol of free people's solidarity with their captive allies.

This year marks the 20th anniversary since the end of the war and the signing of the United Nations Charter. But the continued captivity of East-Central Europe is a solemn reminder that today's peace is not genuine and that the world organization has failed in one of its paramount duties.

Our captive peoples fully subscribed to the ideas and principles that animated the founding of the United Nations 20 years ago. We have supported the world organization's struggle against colonialism and have welcomed the emergence of new states. But we must raise our voice in protest against the persistence of foreign imposed rule in our countries. We must repeat that the men who claim to represent our nations across the street are mere imposters—and the United Nations cannot afford imposters at a time of crisis.

Today our first thoughts go to those who during the dark decades of oppression have nurtured the flame of liberty in captive Europe. That is why we dedicate this year's Captive Nations Week to the unknown political fighter and unveil a plaque honoring him. The plaque reads:

"IN MEMORY OF THE UNKNOWN FIGHTER AGAINST COMMUNISM

"One of the millions who have died resisting Communist aggression and tyranny.

"One of the countless who have perished in East-Central European and Siberian labor camps, the victims of Soviet genocide in the Baltic States, those who have fought gallantly in the hills of Korea, the marshes of South Vietnam, and the streets of Budapest and East Berlin.

"Assembly of Captive European Nations.

"New York City, Captive Nations Week, 1965."

To memorialize the undying spirit of the unknown fighter against communism, the assembly of Captive European Nations also announces the setting up of a scholarship, beginning with the school year 1966–67. The recipient of the scholarship will be selected from among the immediate families of those who have died fighting Communist imperialism. The scholarship will not be restricted to East-Central Europeans, the family members of all who qualify under the wording of the plaque will be eligible.

I have the honor to present the plaque to the two Congressmen who are with us today as elected representatives of the American people. We ask you to keep it in trust by placing it at one of the U.S. national shrines until such time when it can find a permanent home in the first East-European capital to regain its freedom and independence.

Mr. Speaker, another eloquent participant in yesterday's gathering in New York City on the opening of Captive Nations Week was Msgr. John Balkunas, president of the Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent.

With Chairman Germenji and Christopher Emmett, chairman of the American Friends of the Captive Nations; Monsignor Balkunas has authored a Captive Nations Week manifesto that should have the attention of all people who desire the liberation of those held in slavery by the Soviet Union and other Communist captors. This meaningful and moving expression also is included with my remarks at this point:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK MANIFESTO, 1965

The undersigned organizations dedicated to the restoration of freedom in the captive nations, call attention to Public Law 86–90, unanimously adopted in 1959 by the Congress of the United States, by which the third week of July of each year was designated as Captive Nations Week.

In our manifesto last year, we deplored the tendency in the West to exaggerate the changes which have occurred in some of the captive nations, and to misinterpret their cause. We warned that despite some relaxation of police state rule, some increase in consumer goods and some indications of increased independence, there had been as yet no basic political change in Eastern Europe or elsewhere in the Communist world.

This remains true today. None of the fundamental political rights for which mankind has struggled through the ages has yet been restored to any of the captive peoples, including those within the Soviet and Chinese borders. We welcome such gains as there are because they reduce the immediate sufferings of the people, but the gains could disappear overnight.

During the past year, overoptimism in the West has increased in regard to Eastern Europe. It is now often assumed that the trend toward freedom and independence in Eastern Europe has been clearly established and has become irreversible. Many talks as if the return of freedom to the captive peoples is assured without further effort in the free world to protest the violation of solemn treaties, or press for the restoration of human rights. The same Communist satellite leaders who helped betray their countries to Soviet rule are now often pictured as patriots and nationalists who deserve our support.

Instead of continuing an economic and political policy of pressure on the Soviet Union and the Communist governments of Eastern Europe to live up to their agreements, including the U.N. Charter, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, more and more Western countries are extending long-term credits without political conditions. Such a policy ignores the historical fact that it was outside pressure, coupled with the resistance of the captive peoples, and the continuing economic, and especially agricultural difficulties, which Communist rule produced which forced the Communist regimes to grant the much lauded concessions to their peoples.

Long-term credits are a form of foreign aid. Whatever their immediate purpose, they help to finance economic development in Communist-ruled countries geared overwhelmingly to a rapid growth of the power sector at the expense of the consumer goods output. Thus, unless credits from the West are conditioned upon further concessions to the peoples of the Communist-ruled lands, they will serve to strengthen the peoples' chains, and simultaneously augment the threat to the security of the West. If the credits the Communist governments are seeking are granted without conditions, what incentive is there for the Communist regimes to make political concessions or to substitute for policies geared to the accumulation of power, policies aimed at the welfare of their subjects?

The unconditional long-term credits granted by some European countries direct to the U.S.S.R. are even less defensible, since they increase the ability of the Kremlin to finance its arms race with the free world as well as its worldwide subversion and "wars of liberation." We applaud the fact that the U.S. Government is opposed to such credits, and we earnestly hope that it will vigorously maintain this stand.

It has also become fashionable to assume that the split between the Soviet Union and Communist China makes China the Kremlin's No. 1 enemy; hence, the danger of Soviet aggression toward the West is over, at least for the present. This assumption has helped to further the complacency which has contributed to the division and decay of NATO.

It also encouraged the belief that the Soviets would restrain, rather than abet the aggression of Hanoi and Peking in Vietnam. But events have proved otherwise. It is now clear that the Russians are trying to prove that they are more effective instigators of worldwide subversion than the Red Chinese themselves.

As for the satellites, only one country, Romania, has made even a gesture of political independence from Moscow in matters of foreign policy, which is what most concerns us. In the others, support of Soviet foreign policy has been just as slavish as in the past, and the denunciations of the United States in connection with Vietnam and the Dominican Republic have been even more vicious.

The satellite governments, which we are now urged to trust with credits, continue their support of the Cuban economy in partnership with the Soviet Union. They continue to contribute to the training and arming of Latin American subversives, for whom Cuba is the base.

In Poland, the bitter protest of Cardinal Wyszinski and the Polish intellectuals, testify to the further erosion of the limited freedoms won in 1956. The clock has been turned back and the supposed "trend" reversed. In Russia itself, Stalin has been partly rehabilitated, anti-semitism has been stepped up, and the quarrel with Red China has been softened.

In these circumstances, we must repeat our appeal to the governments of the West to stand by their solemn promises to defend freedom where it still exists, and to extend it wherever possible. We call for no wars of liberation, but we do call for an unyielding military defense, plus a political and moral offensive to compel the Communists to uphold their treaty obligations and keep their promises of self-determination to the captive peoples.

We express our warm support for President Johnson's courageous stand in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic. Only by an absolutely firm military defense against the expansion of communism by force, combined with a political offensive on behalf of freedom, can we encourage the resistance by the captive peoples within the Soviet and Chinese empires, and by the threatened peoples along their borders.

In commemoration of Captive Nations Week:

We accuse the Soviet Union of violating its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nine nations made captive after World War II—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania;

We further accuse the Government of the U.S.S.R. of forcibly depriving the captive non-Russian peoples within its own borders of the promised rights of self-determination and of destroying the formerly independent states of Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, and others:

We urge that the Hungarian question be retained on the United Nations agenda until the U.N. resolution on Hungary have been complied with.

We urge the Governments of the United States and its allies:

(1) To declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries, adopted by the United Nations on October 14, 1960, their support of the right of self-determination of all peoples held in captivity by the Communist imperial system and, consequently, make this issue the permanent concern of the United Nations;

(2) To recognize that any relaxation of tensions can only follow, not precede, the realization of self-determination through free elections in these captive nations; that there can be no end to the cold war as long as an Iron Curtain divides Europe;

(3) To refuse to sign any nonaggression pact based on the present status quo, because this would legitimize and perpetuate the present injustices, and would be interpreted by the captive peoples as their final abandonment by the West;

(4) To be always mindful of the proven fact that the Soviet Union and the satellite regimes seek to draw as much of the Western economic strength as they can from trading with the West. Accordingly, the West should use the tremendous bargaining power their economic strength provides in order to exact meaningful political concessions for the captive peoples and for the entire free world.

We appeal to the people of the United States of America, during Captive Nations Week, July 18–24, 1965, to manifest their awareness of the importance of their silent allies in the Soviet-subjugated lands to the worldwide conflict between the forces of liberty and Communist tyranny, and to pledge themselves to help them in their struggle for freedom and independence.

CHRISTOPHER EMMETT,
Chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations.
VASIL GERMENJI,
Chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations.
Msgr. JOHN BALKUNAS,
President, Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent.
JUNE 21, 1965.

Mr. Speaker, another highlight of yesterday's events in New York City for the opening of Captive Nations Week was the solemn high mass which was celebrated by His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman at St. Patrick's Cathedral. I had the pleasure of visiting with Cardinal Spellman after this moving service and learned from personal discussion of his devotion to the cause of freedom for those in the captive countries.

At the flag-raising ceremony on the U.N. Plaza, I was joined by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF], and, together we accepted from Chairman Germenji, the plaque which his remarks described. Both of us, I can assure the House of Representatives, regard our having been entrusted with this plaque as a matter of utmost importance and additional inspiration to work for a permanent place of honor for this plaque in the capital of a now-captive nation.

All Members of the House would have been proud of Mr. WOLFF's presentation and the dignity which he represented the Congress. I take pleasure in sharing his speech with the Members of the House:

MY FELLOW FIGHTERS FOR FREEDOM

Tyranny is as old as man's struggle for freedom. Few nations have been spared the curse of invasion and subjugation. There have always been captive nations.

Yet, when the spirit of freedom remains unquenched in peoples who have known repression and captivity for decades, it is fitting that we salute the sacrifice and inspiration these peoples give to the entire free world.

We come here today to raise a flag to fly over a land that has known the blessings of liberty for almost two centuries. Yet, we must note with sorrow, that such flags of freedom do not fly everywhere on this divided globe.

We are here today to honor those whose freedom was wrested from them by murder subversion, terror, and political opportunism, yet whose steadfast hopes and efforts toward eventual freedom from bondage command the respect and support of all of us fortunate enough to live in a country where the will of the people still governs.

The prevailing wind of human progress has been toward individual liberty. The political history of the modern world, despite setbacks, has shown a gradual increase in man's freedom of choice.

Unfortunately, that spirit of human progress received a crushing blow when the repressive, terroristic forces of communism, smoldering for decades, finally burst upon the world, in the chaos of World War I. We honor today those peoples whom that despotic force has consigned to a life of bondage and oppression. And pledge that we will continue to fight that they, too, shall someday be free.

We must remember that the Russian people themselves were the first victims of communism, the first captive nation of the Bolsheviks, the first people to feel the heavy heel of Communist tyranny.

After World War II, during which period another form of tyranny was finally scourged from the earth, an avalanche of oppression descended over Eastern Europe as the Communist menace (Soviet Union), by terror and subversion, gained control over the peoples of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania.

A great champion of freedom, Winston Churchill, summed up the situation well, and forecast the Communist pattern for the emerging cold war. "The Soviets do not want war," he said. "They want to benefit from the fruits of war."

The scavengers of international communism does not dare to risk global war against the combined might of the free world, yet they still seek to benefit from the fruits of war, wars of stealth and subversion, so-called wars of national liberation they provoke in peaceful countries, wars like the conflict going on today in Vietnam.

We meet here today as yet another free nation is engaged in deadly combat with an enemy who would crush that freedom as ruthlessly as the freedom of the captive nations was crushed by the Soviets.

I know that you, my friends, do not mistake the nature of the struggle in Vietnam. It is a frontline battle in the decades-old conflict between communism and the various other forms of government based upon the theory that the people, the individuals, not the state, are supreme.

The free world lost the brave nations of Eastern Europe to the Communists 20 years ago. We must not let another free country slip into the Communist orbit of oppression. For surely we have learned that such appetites feed upon success.

Nor is the Communist effort directed alone at political control—they also seek to crush the cultural and spiritual traditions from the nationalities they dominate. All of us here have good reason to know of the cruel repression of religion in countries under the Soviet boot.

America's responsibilities to the captive nations is clear. As a chief guardian of liberty, with strong family ties to the people of Eastern Europe, we must continue to support the hope of the captive nations and encourage their faith that the future holds out the substance of freedom and national independence.

This responsibility goes beyond an annual celebration of Captive Nations Week. It goes beyond the passing of freedom resolutions and the making of stirring speeches. One effort I have made was to introduce in the House of Representatives in January of this year a resolution to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The purpose of this committee will be to explore those means by which the United States could assist the captive peoples in their aspirations to regain their freedom and national independence. I will continue to work untiringly on behalf of our friends who are unjustly imprisoned in their own countries.

Last Wednesday, an eloquent voice, ever raised in defense of the freedom of all men, was forever stilled. Adlai Stevenson knew communism, knew what it conspires to do to the human spirit. He was optimistic about the eventual triumph of freedom over tyranny. The curtain will never come down upon the spirit of freedom Adlai Stevenson articulated. His words will live forever as a monument to liberty.

The right of national self-determination is an established principle of international justice. It is the cornerstone of America's foreign policy. Throughout our history we have opposed the domination of one country by another. Observance of Captive Nations Week is yet another manifestation of that opposition. By keeping alive the concept of freedom in the hearts and minds of men everywhere, America is fulfilling a small part of her great obligation as a leader of freedom, liberty, and justice in the world. Let us carry forth the torch of freedom together.

Profiles of Wyoming Greatness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of the 75th anniversary of the statehood of Wyoming, I am presenting the second in a series of portraits featuring outstanding Wyoming citizens who made vital contributions to the welfare and progress of Wyoming.

FIRST WYOMING GOVERNOR

Francis Emroy Warren, the first Governor of Wyoming and one of its first U.S. Senators, was born in Hinsdale, Mass., June 20, 1844. Senator Warren was reared on a farm and educated in common schools and an academy. When he was 18 he enlisted in the Federal forces of the Civil War and at the siege of Port Hudson distinguished himself in action. His bravery was recognized by an award of the Congressional Medal of Honor. But Senator Warren would not talk war for publication. Some of his closest friends in the sunset years of his life were Confederate veterans.

BUILDS HIS CAREER

From the day he arrived in Cheyenne in 1868, a young New Englander in search of fortune and adventure on the Indian frontier, Mr. Warren was an outstanding figure in public affairs. Through his incorporated holdings he probably was the State's largest owner of real estate, both urban and rural, and its largest livestock owner. His capital supported scores of important developmental enterprise. Most likely, he was Wyoming's first millionaire. He invested his fortune where he made it—in Wyoming. Warren money did more than any other to build Cheyenne.

At 29, Senator Warren became president of the Wyoming Legislature, serving a 2-year term. He served the Council of Cheyenne as a member for two terms and then became mayor. He was appointed Governor of the Territory by President Arthur in 1885, serving through 1886. He was reappointed by President Harrison in 1889, serving until Wyoming acquired statehood, when he was elected the first Governor.

He was a member of the Wyoming delegation to the Republican National Convention in 1889 and was chairman of the Wyoming delegation at four others. He was elected as one of the first Senators from the State and took his seat on December 1, 1890. The only break in his senatorial service since that time occurred between 1893 and 1895, when a deadlock in the State legislature caused the seat to be vacant.

It has been said of Wyoming that with Mr. Warren and his Democratic colleague John B. Kendrick, it was, in the Senate, the best represented State in the Union.

During the last 8 years of his life, Senator Warren was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, which, under his guidance, supervised the expenditure of about $40 billion. With Senator Warren's direction this committee became the one great nonpartisan committee in Congress, as bills reported out of Appropriations usually had clear sailing.

Senator Warren was an orthodox Republican but during World War I he threw the weight of his influence behind President Wilson. He made a strong fight in the Senate for irrigation and reclamation of western lands. He also devoted his attention to projects for bettering livestock and the conditions of packinghouses. Recalling his own service as a private and corporal in the 49th Regiment, Massachusetts Militia, in the Civil War, Senator Warren supported the selective service wartime act. He also was among the earliest supporters of equal suffrage for women.

WYOMING FRONTIERSMAN

Senator Warren was the physical marvel of Washington. Though born in Massachusetts he looked every inch the western mountaineer. There was not a wrinkle in his face. His snowy white hair, the big bristling white mustache, the bowlegs that came from a life in the saddle, the springy step, made him a prominent figure signifying the strength of the frontiersman. To his last day in the Senate it was his habit to walk up the steps, sometimes almost taking them on the run, to the Senate floor.

Senator Warren married, on January 26, 1871, Miss Helen Marie Smith of Middlefield, Conn., who died on March 28, 1902. One of their children married Gen. John J. Pershing. Mrs. Pershing died, with three of her children, in the fire at the Presidio, San Francisco, in 1915. The Senator married again on June 28, 1911, his bride being Miss Clara LaBaron Morgan, of Groton, Conn., a niece of former Justice Brown of the U.S. Supreme Court.

DEAN OF THE SENATE

At the time of his death, he had served in the Senate longer than any other man in American history and was the last Union survivor of the Civil War in Congress. The span of his service in the Senate totaled 38 years, 11 months, and 22 days. He was known to his colleagues as the "Dean of the Senate" and the "Father of the Senate." On his 85th birthday, June 20, 1929, he was accorded a nonpartisan demonstration with every Member of the Senate participating. Every President from Cleveland to Hoover was his friend.

The news of Senator Warren's death on November 24, 1929, dazed Wyoming, according to the New York Times:

> The tenor of telegrams of regret, pouring into the Capital from ever section of the State, is that there is no one who can adequately take Senator Warren's place, and that no matter what the future history of the State may be, there never will be another Wyoming citizen looming so large in the affairs of the Nation.

As soon as he was informed that the Nestor of the Senate had died, President Hoover expressed his sorrow; Hoover said of Warren:

> Mayor of his city, Governor of his State, Senator for nearly 40 years, every stage of his life was marked by devotion to national welfare. His span of life covers a generation fast passing, among whose leaders he played a great part, and to whom we of this generation owe much of our splendid inheritance.

Wyoming is indeed fortunate to have been served by such men as Senator Francis E. Warren whose courage, physical strength, business sense, and bipartisan devotion to public welfare have inspired Wyoming's citizens through 75 years of statehood.

Citation for Distinguished Service Given to Mr. Orlando Garcia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Interior recently conferred the highest honor of the Department of the Interior on one of its outstanding employees, Mr. Orlando Garcia.

Mr. Garcia's distinguished record compiled during his 40 years of outstanding service with the Bureau of Indian Affairs certainly entitles him to the honor which he has received. I include herewith, Mr. Speaker, the citation signed by the Honorable Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, which accompanied this award:

> Citation for Distinguished Service: Orlando Garcia in Recognition of 40 Years of Exceptional Service With the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Development of the Interior
>
> Mr. Garcia has served with the Bureau continuously since January 1924, when he was appointed financial clerk at Haskell Institute. He progressed to positions of increasing administrative and supervisory responsibility at the Pawnee, Papago, and Colorado River Agencies, and since June 1957 has been area field representative at the Riverside Area Field Office in California. He retired on February 29, 1964. He was a highly qualified administrator, and an exemplary employee. He always strived to protect the rights and interests of the various Indian groups with whom he worked. His definitiveness in approach, ability to make decisions, initiative, resourcefulness, and ability to promote harmony have been of inestimable value. He helped establish the Colorado River Tribal Office and the Fort Mohave Tribal organization. He made important contributions to the formulation of local policies in such fields as Navajo colonization, farming leases and assignments, Indian employment, tribal investments, and attorney representation. Under extremely difficult conditions, he made remarkable progress in improving relations between the Bureau and the 30 separate bands of Indians in the Mission Area of California. Through his exceptional leadership, some of the groups have adopted organization documents and enrollment regulations. He also rendered valuable assistance in meetings relating to the proposed settlement agreement of cases pending before the Indian Claims Commission. For his long career of outstanding service as an administrator with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Mr. Garcia is granted the highest honor of the Department of the Interior, its Distinguished Service Award.
>
> Stewart L. Udall,
> *Secretary of the Interior.*

Trade Expansion Act Needs Overhauling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I have long had misgivings about our foreign trade policy and particularly about the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. This act was run through Congress as a result of promises, pressures, and deals, without proper consideration of the contents of the act itself.

As we all know, the new legislation was to mark a new departure by providing adjustment assistance for the industries and labor elements that have been or will be injured by tariff reductions. This was the part of the legislation that would make it palatable to labor. In fact, leaders of labor based their support of the legislation on the promise of relief contained in the adjustment assistance provision.

By now we know that the promise of adjustment assistance was a vacuum. In a succession of 17 cases filed before the Tariff Commission subject to the new law none survived the steep exactions of the law. Each applicant was under the need to prove a chain of cause and effect much more stringent than was called for in the preceding escape clause that was discarded by the act. Instead of making relief more readily available to injured industries or labor groups, the door was shut tight. It is fair to say that today there is no remedy for injury suffered by a domestic industry or its workers from import competition. What was described as a relaxation of requirements for a remedy was in fact a shutout.

I myself was not in favor of adjustment assistance and do not favor it now. In my judgment it is inexcusable policy to set out to hurt our economic enterprises through the operation of a law that should not have been passed in the first place and then coming to the rescue with the resources of the National Treasury. However, having adopted such a law on a promise of relief while in fact closing the door completely does not add up to acceptable practice.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the act of 1962 is in urgent need of amendment. The present tariff cutting negotiations now underway in Geneva, although lagging just now, should be prevented from inflicting heavy damage on more of our industries. The legislation that I propose together with other Members would introduce some degree of caution in proceedings that otherwise would produce incalculable harm. I say this because the tariff negotiations, while not yet very far advanced, are proceeding on the basis of a 50-percent tariff cut across the board, with a mere handful of exceptions. I do not say that there are not some products that could perhaps stand such a cut without being compelled as a matter of survival to resort to very drastic cost-reducing steps that in turn will be bad for the economy, especially employment, or moving more of their operations abroad, or both. Others—some that could perhaps withstand a cut of 20 or 30 percent—would become overexposed if they were cut the full 50 percent. It was this possibility that led Congress in 1962 to provide for extensive public hearings before the actual negotiations began.

The bill that I am joining in introducing would do what we apparently did not do explicitly enough in 1962. It would establish criteria to guide our negotiators in Geneva. It is not too late to plug this loophole. It would make it possible to prevent further tariff reductions in all instances in which imports have reached a height equal to at least 7½ percent of domestic production, provided that the imports had increased at least 75 percent since 1958, which was the year in which the last preceding tariff-cutting act was passed.

When I say that it would make it possible to prevent additional tariff reductions I mean that any industry or labor group would be eligible under the proposed amendments to apply to the Tariff Commission for certification to the effect that imports of a product or products produced by them did in fact meet one or more of the criteria laid down in the bill. Upon an affirmative finding by the Tariff Commission it would so certify to the President. He would then remove the product from the list offered for tariff negotiation.

It was never intended by Congress that all products indiscriminately should be offered for a 50-percent cut. The law dos not say so. As I have just said, it made provision for public hearings on a list supplied to the Tariff Commission by the President. It did not say that these hearings were to be a mere formality; nor did it say the President's special representative for trade negotiations was empowered to set aside the purpose of the hearings in deference to some approach that was more agreeable to the GATT countries, but that would nullify the integrity of the hearings.

A considerable number of the Members of this Chamber and of the other body appeared before the Tariff Commission and the Committee for Trade Information during the 4 months of public hearings that were indeed held. I understand that altogether more than 800 witnesses were heard, representing besides Congress numerous representatives of industries, agricultural pursuits and workers.

I should think that such a massive preparation for an international tariff conference would have signified something. Upward of 5,000 items were examined. What a shocking surprise then to learn that our national spokesman, the President's special representative, agreed as long ago as May 1963 with other GATT representatives to wholesale tariff cuts of 50 percent—with exceptions described by a phrase that is due to be heard more and more—namely, "a bare minimum of exceptions."

Evidently the public hearings were indeed held to signify something; but I am sorry to say that they established a new high in contempt not only of Congress but of the many citizens who responded to the notice of hearings and were entitled to believe that the hearings were sincere and for the purpose implied in the law. I do not blame the Tariff Commission. I am sure that it performed as conscientiously as possible. It did not participate in the GATT agreement that reduced the hearings to a farce. In fact, the subsequent agreement that produced this effect was a slap at the dignity and standing of the Commission itself.

Mr. Speaker, the executive branch by thus treating the Tariff Commission, which is a creature of Congress, established to do some of the work of Congress, with what amounts to contempt merely illustrates how far that branch has moved toward virtual autonomy in regulating the foreign commerce of this country. Although this is a clear and undisputed constitutional function of the Congress, the executive branch has become increasingly high-handed in its usurpation of this power. The nullification of the hearings held by the Tariff Commission in carrying out the preparatory steps set forth in the law as a guide to the negotiators, represents only the last of a long series of abuses of power by the executive branch in this field.

Unfortunately this high-handedness is a matter of the most serious concern to many of our industries. The self-justification of the executive branch in this instance can only rest on the theoretical assumption, so widely made by doctrinaire economists, that American industry and agriculture are able to compete with foreign producers with only a fringe of exceptions. These exceptions are regarded as inefficient domestic producers or manufacturers and are therefore not entitled to protection. They are merely to be helped to get out of their present lines of production into something else—something that is never specified and never indicated even vaguely because no one knows what it is.

As the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING], said not many days ago, there is no place for producers of livestock such as sheep, goats, and cattle to go except to the cities if they are driven out of business by imports. These are among the leading pursuits in my own district. Only a year ago meat imports had risen so sharply that many cattle producers were in distress. If a halt had not been called on the imports, ruin on a broad scale would have descended over the ranching areas of the Southwest and West.

Mr. Speaker, it is more than tiresome to hear from the mouths of economists the accusation of inefficiency whenever a domestic industry is unable to compete with imports. The accusation is singularly inept, lacking in sympathy for domestic enterprise and smacking of outright sadism. The very ones who exhibit this attitude are often those who purport to give their support to high wages, collective bargaining, and social benefits of all kinds, while deploring unemployment.

Yet the fact is that this country led the world in productivity per man-hour, both in our factories and mills and in our agricultural pursuits. It was not inefficiency that put us at a disadvantage in wool growing or animal husbandry. It was the same factor that puts our merchant marine at a disadvantage in competition with foreign-flag vessels; the same factor that has called for a subsidy to cotton and wheat growers and that has led to the great increase in foreign investment by scores of our great industries. In other words, it was higher costs traceable directly to higher wages.

While foreign countries were relatively backward in the technology and methods of production we were able, with the help of the tariff, to compete because of our generally higher productivity. Now our tariff protection has been greatly lowered, thanks to the Trade Agreement program, and the technology of other countries, especially the leading industrial countries has been vastly improved. With our tariff affording much less protection and with the higher productivity of other countries pressing us, our previous competitive capacity has been lowered.

It is often said that wages abroad have risen sharply; and that is true, especially in Europe and Japan; but that does not mean that they have overtaken us. Far from it. Let us keep in mind that our own wages have not stood still. In one year's time our average industrial wages have increased 9 cents per hour. They moved from $2.53 per hour in June 1964 to $2.62 per hour in June 1965. This was an increase of 3.4 percent; but in Japan a 9-cent increase would be in the order of a 25-percent increase and in Europe one of 10 to 15 percent. The big increases we hear of from aborad are in percentages, not in actual cents. At the rate of difference in wage rises in the past few years between foreign countries and the United States it will be many years before they come to parity with us. Meantime, because of the escalation of productivity abroad, benefited greatly by their access of our technology, we will remain at a competitive advantage in many lines; and we may expect these instances to increase.

Should we then reduce our wages? Is that what is implied by those who are so impatient over our inability to compete cost wise? Presumably we should let our merchant marine disappear from the high seas. Yet, can anyone possibly believe that we are less efficient shipbuilders and ship operators than other other countries? How is it then that those of our ships that transfer to foreign flags are able to compete? The argument is transparent. It is not inefficiency of either shipbuilding or ship operation that is at fault. It is our wage and our living standards. What is true of our merchant marine, with respect to which construction and operating subsidies take the place of a tariff, is true of numerous others of our industries.

Should we listen to those who would throw all our industries that cannot compete with imports into the ashcan, we should embark on the most severe wage-cutting campaign ever practiced in the history of man. This is the force of the critics' counsel, and yet these critics of our industries pose as friends of labor. Their counsel, if followed much longer, will do more to damage American wage standards than any right-to-work law would ever produce.

If I were opposed to the American wage level I would say, by all means, take down the tariff and expose our industries and agriculture to the onslaught of foreign low-wage competition. A 50-percent reduction such as is contemplated under the so-called Kennedy round would not go all the way, but it would go a long way to throttle the American wage standard. If we wish to level the American economy down to the level of our competitors, or to impose on it a standstill until they come abreast of us, that would be the way to do it.

I am not in favor of inflationary wage increases in our own economy but I do not believe in measuring our industrial efficiency by our inability to compete with imports; and I am not in favor of reducing wages in order to become competitive with imports. Those who would impose a handicap on our competitiveness to the point of demanding that we must be two or three or five times as productive, which is to say that many times as efficient, as foreign industries, may be intricate economic thinkers, but they are hardly offering a formula for continuing American prosperity and American industrial leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation offered by myself and others would remove a considerable part of the intemperate element of the oncoming tariff reductions and would at the same time open the way for reasonable regulation of imports by quotas if import competition reaches certain specified levels. I think it would be a calamity to allow the intent to lower our tariffs another 50 percent across the board to be carried out—and I mean a calamity. We should instead be thinking about how to face the rising competitive capacity of the fast-rising industrial economies of the world. It is too late to think of beating them technologically; especially since higher machine installation means fewer workers in our factories and more awaiting poverty treatment.

I urge a complete rethinking of the thinking that produced the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. It is obsolete. The Ways and Means Committee would do well to face up to this fact.

While it is too late to maintain our former technological lead it is not too late to prevent the effects of the foreign technical advancement from upsetting our system, as it will if steps such as those proposed in this legislation are not taken.

New York Times Endorses Labor Secretary Wirtz on Effort To Improve Status of Domestic Farmworkers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, a nation dedicated to abolishing poverty cannot continue to neglect the most elementary rights of the most deprived group in its work force.

In these strong and unequivocal terms, the New York Times yesterday editorially endorsed the magnificient effort of Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz to improve the working conditions, raise the standard of living, and upgrade the status of America's long-neglected and long-suffering domestic farmworkers.

That the Secretary's efforts have met with success is indicated by the fact that U.S. citizens today have jobs, and are performing the work that last year at this time employed more than 65,000 foreign nationals on farms across the country.

In fact, in my home State of California alone, where last year there were over 36,000 foreign agricultural workers, last month there were fewer than 2,000, and today I understand there are none.

This means that job opportunities for our own men and women have greatly increased as a result of Congress' refusal to renew the foreign agricultural labor importation program under the now-expired Public Law 78, and Secretary Wirtz' untiring effort to fill the gap by providing outstanding leadership in this year's Federal-State-local program to attract a sufficient number of skilled and dependable U.S. fieldhands to meet critical harvest-time needs.

Secretary Wirtz gave a fine example of this leadership, and at the same time, furnished an excellent outline of his proposed new domestic farm labor program in his recent address before the Los Angeles "Town Hall."

Here the Secretary noted that the "encouraging lesson" learned so far this year in the transition from the use of foreign agricultural labor to U.S. farmworkers "is that the laws of economics, of supply and demand, supplemented by special recruitment efforts, do work in the agricultural industry just as in any other. Workers are available if the prices and conditions are right."

Mr. Wirtz also outlined his three-point proposal for a permanent solution to the farm labor problem.

First. "Agricultural employment must be recognized—departing from some stubborn myths—as being essentially like other kinds of employment," and that agricultural workers, like other workers, should be paid fair wages and be protected by State and Federal laws regarding minimum wages, health and sanitation, unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, and collective bargaining;

Second. A great deal more can and must be done to develop substantially year-round employment opportunity for agricultural workers. Until this is done, efforts to bring decency into the lives of these laborers and their families, and stability into the farm labor supply situation will be essentially futile.

Third. There must be a more effective mobilization of public opinion regarding the farm labor situation.

Mr. Speaker, I was also deeply impressed by Secretary Wirtz' "Town Hall" comments on how the currently developing political situation in the United States should be of real assistance in improving the status of our domestic farmworkers.

On this somewhat controversial subject, Mr. Wirtz declared:

> So far as the specific matter of the labor laws are concerned, the exemptions of farm labor are undoubtedly an anachronistic carryover from the period of disproportionate political influence by rural voters, especially propertied voters.
>
> The national acceptance of the principle of one man, one vote, foretells the end of the exclusion of agricultural employment from the coverage of State and Federal laws regarding minimum wages, health, and sanitation, employment insurance, workmen's compensation, and collective bargaining. Farm machinery is paid for at rates comparable to those for factory machinery. So should farmworkers be paid at comparable rates, and accorded comparable working conditions.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point yesterday's New York Times editorial entitled "Better Day for the Migrant," as well as the text of Secretary Wirtz' June 30 "Town Hall" speech:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 18, 1965]

BETTER DAY FOR THE MIGRANT

More than a half year has passed since Congress cut off the mass inflow of foreign labor willing to work at starvation wages to harvest American crops. Despite continued expressions of anguish from many large farmowners, the transition to total reliance on domestic workers has been encouraging. Only 1,500 foreign workers are now engaged in offsetting local labor shortages on American farms, compared with more than 54,000 at the same time last year.

A sterner test may come in September and October; but thus far the evidence is strong that the Nation's food needs can be well met without reopening the floodgates for low-cost labor from Mexico, the West Indies, and other areas. Secretary of Labor Wirtz deserves credit for his refusal, under incessant political pressure, to yield to the warnings of disaster with which California growers bombarded him. He stood courageously on the principle that enough domestic labor would be found if wages and living conditions for fieldworkers were brought up to a level of decency.

The interesting fact is not only that he has been proved right on this score but also that fruit and vegetable prices have not skyrocketed as a result of the bettered labor standards. A Labor Department survey over the past 9 weeks indicates that most farm products have been selling in the wholesale market at prices below those of 1964. The spread between what the housewife pays and what it costs to pick most fruits and vegetables is so great that even a doubling of farm wages would have only a slight direct impact on market-basket prices.

The need now is to extend to migratory American farm laborers some of the protections that are basic for virtually all other American workers. Mr. Wirtz has told a Senate subcommittee of his strong personal support for the inclusion of farmworkers under both the Federal minimum wage and the statutory guarantees of freedom to bargain collectively. But he emphasized that there was no official administration position in favor of either of these highly salutary objectives. There ought to be.

A nation dedicated to abolishing poverty cannot continue to neglect the most elementary rights of the most deprived group in its work force.

THE MARCH OF TRUTH

(Address by Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz before the "Town Hall," Los Angeles, Calif., June 31, 1965)

My first visit to "Town Hall" was in 1952 when I came here with the speaker of the day, a candidate at the time for the national Presidency. Those of you who are veterans of this distinguished forum may recall that he opened his remarks by referring to a still earlier speech made here in 1942 by Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox. The 1952 speaker, explaining that he had been working, 10 years before, in Secretary Knox's office, advised you that his would be a better speech than the Secretary's had been. He should know, he said, because he had written both of them.

Today, it is once more the Cabinet's turn. But I must warn you that my speech will not measure up to the one you heard here during the 1952 campaign; and I should know, for I wrote both of them.

You will question the good judgment of my coming here to discuss the California farm labor situation. So do I. Having walked last March through the Central and Imperial Valleys of the shadow of disaster, and having developed cauliflower telephone ears and protective callouses of one sort or another fighting this issue out in Washington, I can only think, in explanation of coming here now, of Washington Irving's advice: "I have found," he said, "in traveling in a stagecoach, that it is often a comfort to shift one's position and be bruised in a new place."

Perhaps, too, Mr. Murphy is right—accidentally—in his perceptive observation, applying the accumulated wisdoms of years in the theater to California agriculture, that—as he puts it: "people are never so happy as when you tell them they are ruined." I refer, of course, to the 18th century British actor and playwright, Arthur Murphy.

Enough of that. If anything said here this noon seems personal, it will not have been so intended; with two exceptions:

I want to thank the members of the California working press for the fairness and the competence with which they have covered this developing story during the past 6 months. If there has been a predominantly critical position taken by the editorial writers, that is what the editorial pages are for; and I suspect the Republic is safer whenever the power of the press is alined against the power of government.

It is also appropriate to mention, in personal terms, the three Californians who have served so faithfully and independently on the California Farm Labor Advisory Panel—Benjamin Aaron, Daniel Aldrich, and Arthur Ross. Facing a seemingly impossible job, it has been part of their strength that they had absolutely no idea it couldn't be done—so they have done it.

The present situation can best be summarized briefly, with the thought of getting on quickly to what lies ahead.

At this time last year there were 36,300 foreign nationals working on California farms, under the terms of Public Laws 78 and 414. Today there are 1,964.

In the country as a whole, there were, on June 30, 1964, 65,218 such foreign farmworkers. Today there are 2,587.

By this time last year, Mexican nationals who had come in under Public Law 78 were working in 13 States. This year, none have been used in any State except California.

There are today Public Law 414 foreign farmworkers in only two other States: 452 British West Indies nationals in Connecticut and 171 in Massachusetts.

I want to interject here a heartfelt expression of appreciation and admiration for the position taken throughout this transition period by the Government of Mexico. Its representatives have cooperated in every way and sometimes under very difficult circumstances. I hope and believe that when this changeover is completed it will prove to have resulted in the removal of weaknesses—in long-range terms—in both Mexico's labor use and our own.

The rest of this year's story, so far, is one of very substantially increased use in California and U.S. agriculture of domestic workers; of greatly enlarged work opportunities this summer for high school and college students; of millions of dollars staying in this country, and being spent here to create still other jobs; of some temporary crises in labor supply situations, but no serious shortages; of some small crop losses, responsibility for which a more objective judge would have to assess to growers, governments, or God; of a significant increase in worker earnings, and better working and living conditions; of larger than normal gross and net profits per acre this year on most crops.

A special word is appropriate about prices, for it appears now that one of the still unresolved aspects of this changeover is what kind of bill is going to be presented for it to the consumers of fruits and vegetables.

It would be futile to argue about whether increases in farm labor costs resulting from increased wages and improved working conditions could be absorbed out of profits. They won't be.

Neither is it possible to suggest any precise price tag which could be considered legitimate, so far as consumer prices are concerned, for bringing the terms and conditions of seasonal farm labor in this country up to generally established standards of equity and decency. Time will have to work out this answer, with confident reliance in the long run on the proven good sense of the American housewife.

In the shorter run, however, there is already evidence of the possibility of exploitation of this situation, and of attempts to blame on changed labor policy price increases for which there are other reasons—or none at all.

Lettuce prices went up recently in east coast grocery stores to 49 cents, or about 20 cents above normal. The reasons for this, which included a temporary shortage of lettuce because of the effects of weather on the various growing areas, became evident when the price dropped back to normal two or three weeks later.

In the meantime, however, there was a widespread and obviously planned program of propaganda designed to persuade people that the increase was because of a labor shortage and higher labor prices resulting from the cutting off of the bracero program. The 20 cents increase, it was implied, was going into the domestic worker's pocket.

My first reaction was to think of one of President Johnson's favorite stories, about the minister who was approached by an Internal Revenue agent and told that one of the church elders had reported, for tax purposes, that he had contributed $500 to the church. "Has he?" the agent asked. "I don't know," the minister answered slowly, "but I can tell you this: If he hasn't, he will."

The facts never catch up with a lie. The facts are that the field laborers got, this spring, 1 to 1½ cents per head for picking lettuce; that every lettuce grower in the country has had at all times this year all of the labor he could use; and that the harvest has been—except for these 2 or 3 weeks—above normal.

In general, prices this year for fruits and vegetables have not risen or fluctuated any more for crops which braceros used to pick than they have for other food prices.

If there should be any more of this tampering with the truth about fruit and vegetable prices, or evidence that prices are being raised unduly, the public is going to be fully and quickly advised. It has a right to know.

In the meantime, I suggest this as a guide to the purchasers of fruit and vegetables: The cost of bringing seasonal agricultural wages up to the $1.25 to $1.40 an hour level is equal to, in very rough terms, about 1 cent per unit for most vegetables and fruits—per pound or per dozen or per head or whatever the ordinary unit may be. (This is higher in the case of strawberries—about 6 cents a pint—and asparagus—about 4 cents per pound.) If retail prices go up more than that and if the increase is blamed on rising labor costs in the fields, the American housewife is being denied her right to have the truth.

Now of the future of the farm labor situation.

So far as California is concerned, there will have to be unrelenting attention to the labor supply situation throughout the next 4 months.

The prospects right now are good; but that could be as deceptive as April's more forbidding prospects proved to be.

July and August should present no serious problems. We are more dependent than usual on the high school and college boys who have gone into the fields. There are 10,000 more of them this year than last. This will be a tough summer for some of them, with its full rewards coming in the future. The evidence is clear, however, that they are proving themselves as responsible citizens and good workers. The A-team and other similar programs are experiments in both economics and democracy, and we have a great deal riding on them.

September will bring the special demands of the tomato harvest. California's total seasonal farm labor needs jumped last year from 129,200 in August to 160,800 in September. Over 27,000 more braceros were here in September than in August.

The tomato growers and canners and the other producers with September and October harvests acted with confidence in putting aside their doubts at planting time about the harvest labor supply. They have given full evidence of good faith assumption of primary responsibility for obtaining that supply, to the maximum possible extent from domestic sources. There will be full cooperation from State and Federal employment agencies and from the various private groups who have been so helpful. Watchful attention will be paid the developing situation to assure, so far as this is possible, that if supplementary labor is needed, despite maximum efforts, it will be available.

What is most worth thinking and talking about is the longer range future of this situation.

This year's assignment was to make the transition from foreign to domestic workers. This was and it remains a major operation: not because of the different nationality of the workers or their alleged propensities for stooping over to work (especially in those date palm trees in the Coachella Valley); but because what was involved here was a basic changeover from a situation of a virtually Government guaranteed—and relatively fixed cost—seasonal farm labor supply to a situation in which labor has to be obtained in this industry the same way it is in all others.

The encouraging lesson of the year is that the laws of economics, of supply and demand, supplemented by special recruitment efforts, do work in the agricultural industry just as in any other. Workers are available if the prices and conditions are right.

But this is only the start of it. Using domestic instead of foreign workers isn't the point or anything like the ultimate purpose. What is the goal is to develop an agricultural labor situation which will serve all the interests of the growers, the workers, and the public.

The title of these remarks today reflects the deep conviction that this broader goal is now attainable, that where once the grapes of wrath were stored, the truth—His truth—is now marching on.

But even the truth needs a battle plan if it is to carry the day—or the decade.

I suggest a three-point approach to the migratory, or seasonal, farm labor problem. It proceeds from moral commitment, without stopping to moralize about what is obvious, to what I think are the essential economic and political dynamics of the matter.

First, agricultural employment must be recognized—departing from some stubborn myths—as being essentially like other kinds of employment.

Every industry is different from every other industry. But there are basic similarities, and the time for denying this as far as agriculture is concerned is passed. There may have been sounder reasons in some earlier period for the arguments that agriculture deserves, for some unidentified reason, a Government guaranteed foreign labor supply—that normal personnel policies don't apply here—that the farm produce market won't support fair wages—that farm employment must be excluded from the coverage of laws regarding employment generally. But if there were once good reasons for these attitudes, they are now covered deep with history's dust.

So far as the specific matter of the labor laws are concerned, the exemptions of farm labor are undoubtedly an anachronistic carryover from the period of disproportionate political influence by rural voters, especially propertied voters. The national acceptance of the principle of one man, one vote foretells the end of the exclusion of agricultural employment from the coverage of State and Federal laws regarding minimum wages, health and sanitation, unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation and collective bargaining.

If this means readjustments in the prices of food, it must be the national consensus—if it matches the national conscience—that the price will be paid. Farm machinery is paid for at rates comparable to those for factory machinery. So should farmworkers be paid at comparable rates, and accorded comparable working conditions.

It will be suggested that agricultural employment is different because it is so largely seasonal. So are a great many other industries. And this is no reason for charging the price of this to those who harvest, or hoe, the crops.

My second point is that a great deal can and must be done to develop substantially year-round employment opportunity for agricultural workers. Until this is done, efforts to bring decency into the lives of these laborers and their families, and stability into the farm labor supply situation, will be essentially futile.

A very substantial part, perhaps as much as half, of the unemployment problem in this country involves seasonal or part-time work. A good many different kinds of labor demand are for services during only part of the year, or part of the week, or even part of the day. There is this in common between migratory farmworkers, domestic day help in large cities, building and construction trades workers, maritime workers, musicians, and other seemingly unrelated groups. Each of these situations involves the fact of a person's being needed only part of the time. Each of them has presented special unemployment and wage rate problems. Some of them have been worked out reasonably satisfactorily, I think, for example, of the decasualization of longshore employment. Others, including seasonal farmwork, have not been.

What starts out as a private and economic difficulty becomes also a public and social problem. An employer needs a man for 7 months, but cannot use him the other 5. He pays him what may be a fair hourly rate. But the man's annual earnings leave him below the level of self-sufficiency, especially if he heads a family. So he pays no taxes and he and his family may become part of the local welfare burden. The children must go to the local schools.

Frankness compels recognition that the attraction of the bracero program lay not only in the fact that the men were easy to get but in the additional facts that they came without their families and could be sent away as quickly as they had been called. The farm communities shared, understandably, the growers' preferences.

These problems are not easily met. Yet not to meet them would mean that the termination of Public Law 78 was at best a pyrrhic victory and at worst a tragic half step across a deep chasm.

It is essential to develop year-round work opportunities for all those who are needed to farm the Nation's produce. This can be done either by working out year-round work programs for workers who will "follow the crops," or by developing industry in the farm areas which will occupy, off season, the men and women who will come to the fields when the local crops need help.

There is increasing evidence of both developments.

A few individual, but unusually large, growers have already developed plans for moving their workers, with the seasons, to their farms in different geographical and climatic areas.

There is enough variation in the crop seasons in California that the growers could well consider an organization of their efforts which would result in the more efficient movement of workers from one area to another. There are obvious possibilities of expansion of the State government's labor and employment services in this connection.

The opportunities for national development—either private or, if need be, public—of year-round farm employment programs for individual workers have been explored so far in only a timid, tentative way. A little has been done by some of the private, not-for-profit organizations who are concerned principally with reducing the human misery of migratory labor. The annual worker plan developed by the Department of Labor through its Bureau of Employment Security is on the right track but hasn't a full head of steam up yet. We work each year with hundreds of growers and with now almost 200,000 workers, matching together the needs of growers in various States and the movement of migrant workers. The results are encouraging but still meager compared with the need.

Perhaps it only illustrates the possibilities, and lacks practicality, to conjecture about whether it would work at all to set up a large-scale national employing corporation which would hire farmworkers, arrange for their transportation (with their families) from one area to another, and for their housing; and then contract with growers to supply their services. Yet this is, at least in part, what the small-scale labor contractor does—often very badly. And such an operation would be not unlike, either in nature or scope, what was done under Public Law 78 with Mexican workers.

The better way, though, to whatever extent it is practical, would be to remove the migratory element as largely as possible from the picture. This, more than anything else, perpetuates the worst human frailties of the migrant population, for it deprives their children of the roots they need to put down someplace if they are to grow properly. Surely it is a proper charge on any community which depends upon having workers there part of the year to try to develop industries which could use them the rest of the year.

This second point obviously proceeds from a recognition of the importance not only of the American farmworker but from the importance of his family. It will be a test of the sincerity of our intentions whether, as we move back to the fuller use of domestic farm laborers, we make provision for the decent living of their families. The first order of business must be the development of family housing adequate to meet the needs of farmworkers who want to live, as the rest of us do, where there is at least love and human affection.

Third, and finally, there must be a more effective mobilization of public opinion regarding the farm labor situation.

Books and television documentaries won't do this job. John Steinbeck's barely fictionalized "Grapes of Wrath" and Edward R. Murrow's "Harvest of Shame" pricked the Nation's conscience. But it went back to sleep. The people who read and watched developed a strong feeling about an obviously serious moral issue, but no idea of what to do about it. The lesson of experience is plain: that so long as the migratory labor problem is conceived of primarily in moral terms, not much, not nearly enough, will be done about it.

Perhaps there is encouragement in the ending of the bracero program. It has been noted in the California press that:

"The departure of these people will imply a new domestic policy for many of the farmers and fruit raisers of this State. They have depended mainly on the [foreign workers], who readily move, like armies, come when called for, and depart when their mission is accomplished. Farmers must now look to a normal population * * *. The change should not be viewed as a calamity. It may be inconvenient at first, but after a few years no doubt the places now held by the [foreign workers] will be filled by a more desirable laboring population."

But this comment appeared in the Pacific Rural Press. The foreign workers referred to were Chinese, soon to be barred under the Chinese Exclusion Act. The date was 1882.

There is reasonable basis, nevertheless, for the conviction that despite the sobering lesson of history, the public will express itself this time in significant action.

The adoption of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 reflected a new determination to write the dictates of individual consciences into the laws of the Nation. The declaration of a national war on poverty, and the almost unbelievable advances which have already been made on that front, mark the adoption of the Golden Rule as not just a personal but a national ethic. America's ideals are finding their muscles, and their hands and their feet.

The farm labor problem will not, however, be resolved in Washington. To the extent that this problem—like almost everything else—is largest in California, it is vastly important that Californians take a great and increasing pride in this State. My mail has reflected in unmistakable terms the fact that the agricultural labor situation has chronically troubled California consciences. A recent letter from a businessman in an agricultural community reported a common local concern that the publicly owned farm labor camps, which were built in the 1930's to get the migrant workers off the ditch banks, have been permitted to deteriorate so badly that they are themselves a problem.

This sentiment needs a catalyst. It must come from local and State leadership. I don't presume to suggest its particular form. I am asking the members of the California Farm Labor Panel, set up to advise me in connection with the administration of Public Law 414, to turn their attention to the broader aspects of this matter and to make whatever suggestions are appropriate regarding possible future cooperation on the part of the Department of Labor.

I note, in conclusion, what seems to me the central element in the development of an effective public opinion regarding farm labor or any other matter.

There are two views of man's role in the determination of his own future. One is summarized in the phrase "the inevitability of progress." That is a horrible phrase. It deadens the purpose to even try to make things better. It includes the attitude that there is nothing an individual can do about something like the disgrace, the human disaster, of migratory farmworkers living below the surface of decency.

Another, very different view, was suggested by Mr. Justice Holmes in his essays, published in 1915, entitled "Ideas and Doubts":

"The mode in which the inevitable comes to pass is through effort. Consciously or unconsciously we all strive to make the kind of world we like. And although with Spinoza we may regard criticism of the past as futile, there is every reason for doing all that we can to make a future such as we desire. There is every reason also for trying to make our desires intelligent."

This is the view which commends itself to those who prefer to believe that the perfectability of life is within the human competence, and that this is not heresy but rather the fullest reverence. It is the view which finds the present farm labor situation man's fault, and therefore within man's capacity to cure.

Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, during this third week in July we commemorate the great tragedy of our times for we recognize, formally, that over one billion of our fellow men are enslaved. How ironic it is that an era marked by the war to end all despotism must be characterized by an even greater enslavement of the minds and hearts of men. How sad it is that so many millions must live a colorless life under governments of men and not of law, where conformity is the rule and there are no exceptions, where all blessings come not by the will of God but from the hand of the state, and where the truth is variable and fear is constant.

It is altogether appropriate, as our brothers' keeper and as the first champion of the right of self-determination, that we bring to the attention of men everywhere the facts of 20th century life for over one billion of their brothers, for no nation has a lifetime guarantee of freedom, and ignorance of their plight invites disaster.

We must observe Captive Nations Week because, as heirs of that first great revolution, we would betray it by condoning oppression. Furthermore, a desire for freedom and a love of liberty cannot spring eternally in the enslaved human breast. They must be nurtured by the knowledge that these captive peoples are not alone in their dark hours of tyranny, and that much of the world is actively engaged in efforts to hasten the day when all that has passed is but a dim memory of a distant nightmare. We must reaffirm our commitment to this end.

Finally, we should take the opportunity of this observance to give thanks for the blessings of liberty and for the opportunity afforded us to live under a government of laws and not men, where those who make and enforce the laws are responsible to the people and responsive to their wishes, where a man's grasp can exceed his reach, and where each is free to chart his own path to the stars.

Vietnam: Four Steps to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on June 23, 1965, Hon. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, delivered an important and informative address, entitled "Vietnam: Four Steps to Peace", before the American Foreign Service Association at Washington, D.C.

Secretary Rusk's address clearly states the justifiable reason for our policy and our presence in South Vietnam and in southeast Asia. His address is an effective presentation of our justification in terms of our national interest and in the furtherance of world peace.

Secretary's Rusk's address is also an answer to appeasers, those filled with fear and to the many people who are living in a dream world of hope—like countless of millions here and in other countries, when Hitler galloped across the horizon of world history, leaving in his wake the terrible experiences of World War II. Firm leadership in certain European countries at that time might have averted World War II but such leadership did not exist.

And firm leadership now might avert another terrible and even more destructive world conflict.

And among other things, Secretary Rusk well said:

> Those who worry about bridges and barracks and ammunition dumps would do well to give their sympathy instead to the daily victims of terror in South Vietnam.

In my remarks I include the splendid address made by Secretary Rusk.

VIETNAM: FOUR STEPS TO PEACE

It is a very great pleasure for me to be here. It is a privilege for me to salute my colleagues, present and retired, of the Foreign Service and to express to you the gratitude of President Johnson and the American people for a service which is marked by so much competence, dedication, and personal commitment.

Two and a half months ago President Johnson spoke to the world about Vietnam at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. Today I wish to talk to you on the same subject—to you who know that such problems have deep roots, to you who have lived through and worked upon such problems before, and to you who know that such matters can gravely affect the future of our Nation and the prospects for general peace.

The struggle in Vietnam has continued since April and indeed has grown the more severe. The harsh resistance of the Communists to any form of discussions or negotiation continues. The effort to destroy the freedom of Vietnam has been expanded. The trial by fire of the people of Vietnam goes on. Their own resistance has been courageous, but the need for American resolution and for American action has increased.

AGGRESSION FROM THE NORTH

The root of the trouble in Vietnam is today just what it was in April and has been at least since 1960—a cruel and sustained attack by North Vietnam upon the people of South Vietnam. Now, as then, it is a brutal war—marked by terror and sneak attack, and by the killing of women and children in the night. This campaign of terror has continued throughout the spring.

Those of us who have not served in Vietnam may find it hard to understand just how ugly this war of aggression has been. From 1961 to the present date the South Vietnamese armed forces have lost some 25,000 dead and 51,000 wounded. In proportion to population, these South Vietnamese losses are 10 times as great as those suffered by Americans in the Korean war, and larger than our losses in World War II.

Even more terrible than these military losses are the cruelties of assassination and kidnapping among civilian officials and ordinary citizens. In the last 18 months, for example, more than 2,000 local officials and civilians have been murdered. When an official is not found at home, often his wife and children are slain in his place. It is as if in our own country some 35,000 civic leaders or their families were to be killed at night by stealth and terror.

These are the methods of the Vietcong. This is the test to which the people of Vietnam have gallantly responded.

Meanwhile, from the north, heavy infiltration has continued. Intelligence now shows that some 40,000 had come down before the end of 1964. Toward the end of that year—well before the beginning of our own air operations against North Vietnam—the infiltration of regular North Vietnamese army units was begun, and important elements of that army are now known to be in place in South Vietnam and Laos, where they have no right to be.

And so we face a deliberate and long-matured decision by a persistent aggressor to raise the stakes of war. Apparently this was their answer to our own repeated affirmation that we ourselves did not wish a larger war. Apparently a totalitarian regime has once again misunderstood the desire of democratic peoples for peace and has made the mistake of thinking that they can have a larger war without risks to themselves. And hence the airstrikes against military targets in North Vietnam.

These actions have made infiltration harder. They have increased the cost of aggression. Without them South Vietnam today would face still stronger forces from the North.

These measured air operations have done what we expected them to do—neither more nor less. For air attack alone cannot bring peace. I cannot agree with those who think it wrong to hit the logistics of aggression. It is the aggression itself that is the wrong. Those who worry about bridges and barracks and ammunition dumps would do well to give their sympathy instead to the daily victims of terror in South Vietnam.

EFFORTS TO NEGOTIATE

The other side is obviously not yet ready for peace. In these last months, the friends of peace in many lands have sought to move this dangerous matter to the conference table. But one proposal after another has been contemptuously rejected.

We and others, for example, have sought to clear a way for a conference on Laos, and a conference on Cambodia—two neighboring countries where progress toward peace might be reflected in Vietnam itself. But these efforts have been blocked by North Vietnam and by Communist China.

Twice there has been an effort at discussions through the United Nations—first in the Security Council after the August attacks in the Tonkin Gulf, and later this April, when Secretary General U Thant considered visits to Hanoi and Peiping to explore the possibilities of peace. But in August there was a refusal by Hanoi to come to the Security Council. And in April both Hanoi and Peiping made it clear that they would not receive U Thant, and both regimes made plain their view that the United Nations is not competent to deal with that matter.

Repeatedly our friends in Britain, as a cochairman of the Geneva conference, have sought a path to settlement—first by working toward a new conference in Geneva and then by a visit of a senior British statesman. But the effort for a conference in Geneva was blocked, and the distinguished British traveler was told that he should stay away from Peiping and Hanoi.

Twice in April we made additional efforts of our own. In Baltimore the President offered unconditional discussions with the governments concerned. Hanoi and Peiping call this offer a "hoax." At that time the 17 nonalined nations had appealed for a peaceful solution, by negotiations without preconditions. This proposal was accepted on our side. It was rejected by Hanoi and by Peiping. And some of its authors were labeled "monsters and freaks."

The President of India made constructive proposals—for an end of hostilities and an Afro-Asian patrol force. To us this proposal was full of interest and hope. But by Hanoi and Red China it was rejected as a betrayal.

Our own Government and the Government of South Vietnam, in May, suspended air attacks on North Vietnam. This action was made known to the other side to see if there would be a response in kind. This special effort for peace was denounced in Hanoi as a "wornout trick" and denounced in Peiping as a swindle. To those who complain that that so-called "pause" was not long enough, I would simply report that the harsh reaction of the other side was fully known before the attacks were resumed. And I would also recall that we held our hand for more than 4 years while tens of thousands of armed men invaded the South and every attempt at peaceful settlement failed.

HANOI'S RESPONSE

Reports in the first half of June have confirmed that all these violent rejections are in fact what they appear to be—clear proof that what is wanted today in Hanoi is a military victory, not peace, and that Hanoi is not even prepared for discussions unless it is accepted in advance that there will be a Communist-dominated government in Saigon, and unless too—so far as we can determine—American forces are withdrawn in advance.

So this record is clear. And there is substance in Senator Fulbright's conclusion that "It seems clear that the Communist powers still hope to achieve a complete victory in South Vietnam and for this reason are at present uninterested in negotiations for a peaceful settlement." For the simple truth is that there is no lack of diplomatic procedures, machinery or process by which a desire for peace can be registered—that there is no procedural miracle through which peace can be obtained if one side is determined to continue the war.

As I have said, Hanoi is presently adamant against negotiation or any avenue to peace. Peiping is even more so, and one can plainly read the declared doctrine and purpose of the Chinese Communists. They are looking beyond the current conflict to the hope of domination in all of southeast Asia—and indeed beyond.

But one finds it harder to understand Hanoi's aversion to discussion. More immediately than the Chinese, the North Vietnamese face the costs and dangers of conflict. They, too, must fear the ambitions of Communist China in southeast Asia. Yet they are still on the path of violence, insisting upon the forceful communization of South Vietnam and refusing to let their brothers in the South work out their own destiny in peace.

In recent weeks, after 2 months of reduced activity, the enemy has sharply quickened the tempo of his military action in the South. Since early May, major Vietcong units have returned to the battlefield, and already a series of sharp engagements has shown us that the fighting through the summer may be hard. Setbacks have occurred and serious defeats have been avoided only by the combination of continuing Vietnamese bravery and effective air and other types of support.

Losses on both sides have been heavy. From April first to date, we have had confirmed reports of almost 5,000 Vietcong dead, almost 3,000 South Vietnamese, and almost 100 Americans. We must expect these losses to continue—and our own losses may increase.

ROLE OF U.S. FORCES

Since March we have deployed nine battalions of fighting men to South Vietnam. Six more are on their way. For as the President said in April, "We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. * * * We will do everything necessary * * * and we will do only what is * * * necessary."

Our own battalions in South Vietnam have three related tasks. Their first assignment was and is to guard such major installations as the airfield at Da Nang. A second and closely related task is that of active patrol in nearby areas. And the third is to join in combat support of Vietnamese forces—when such help is requested and when our commander, General Westmoreland, believes it should be given.

American forces so committed will carry with them the determined support of our people. These men know, as all our people know, that what they do is done for freedom and peace, in Vietnam, in other continents, and here at home.

SUPPORT FOR U.S. ACTION

In authorizing combat missions for our ground forces in Vietnam, the President acted to meet his constitutional responsibilities as Commander in Chief. He has recognized the obligations of this Nation under the Southeast Asia Treaty, which the Senate approved by a vote of 82 to 1. He has acted under the joint resolution of August 1964, which passed the Senate by a vote of 88 to 2—and passed the House with no opposing vote. This resolution expresses our national readiness—as the President determines—"to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States" and "all necessary steps, including the use of armed force" to help Vietnam and southeast Asian members of the SEATO who ask for help to preserve their freedom.

The President has acted on the unanimous advice of the American leaders in Saigon and his senior civil and military advisers in Washington.

He has acted in full consultation with the Government of South Vietnam.

And he has acted on his own considered judgment of what is necessary at this time to stop aggression.

This decision—like all of our decisions in Vietnam—is open to review by Members of the Congress and open to reversal if it does not have their support. But the leaders of the Congress have been kept in close touch with the situation, and no such prospect should stimulate the hopes of enemies or the fears of friends. For America is not divided in her determination nor weak in her will.

In Vietnam today we face one more challenge in the long line of dangers we have, unhappily, had to meet and master for a generation. We have had to show both strength and restraint—courage and coolness—for Iran and for Greece, for Berlin, and for Korea, in the Formosa Strait, and in the Cuban missile crisis. We mean to show the same determination and coolness now.

In 1954 President Eisenhower pledged our support to the Government of Vietnam, to assist that Government, as he put it, "in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." And this determination was reaffirmed again and again by President Kennedy. "We are going to stay here," he said. "We are not going to withdraw from that effort." And that is our position still.

FIRMNESS AND RESTRAINT

Now, as in April, as the President put it, "We will use our power with restraint and with all the wisdom that we can command." For it is others, and not we, who have increased the scale of fighting. It is others, and not we, who have made threats of gravely widened conflict. The firmness with which we resist aggression is matched by the firmness with which we will refrain from ill-advised adventure.

A few—a very few—may believe that unlimited war can take the place of the sustained and steady effort in which we are engaged, just as there may be a few—a very few—who think we should pull out and leave a friendly people to their fate. But the American people want neither rashness nor surrender. They want firmness and restraint. They expect courage and care. They threaten no one. And they are not moved by the threats by others.

ROLE OF SOUTH VIETNAM

This contest centers in the defense of freedom for the people who live in South Vietnam. The sustained and increasing infiltration from North Vietnam has required the measured use of air attack on military targets in the north. We alone cannot determine the future—could we do so there would be a prompt peace. The other side, too, must decide about the future. And we must hope they know—as we do—that increased aggression would be costly far beyond the worth to the aggressor.

The political turmoil in South Vietnam has continued. It is easy to be impatient with our friends in Saigon as they struggle to establish and sustain a stable government under the stress of war. We see there the ferment of a society still learning to be free, even while under attack from beyond their borders.

We must remember that this ancient people is young in its independence, restless in its hopes, divided in its religions, and varied in its regions. The turmoil of Vietnam needs the steadfastness of America. Our friends in Vietnam know, and we know, that our people and our troops must work and fight together. Neither of us can do the work of the other. And the main responsibility must always be with, and is fully accepted by, the South Vietnamese. Yet neither of us can "go it alone." We would not be there without the urgent request for assistance from those whose land this happens to be. We have a tested faith in the enduring bravery of the people of Vietnam, and they, in turn, can count on us with equal certainty.

FORMULA FOR PEACE

The people of Vietnam long for peace. And the way to peace is clear. Yesterday the Foreign Minister of South Vietnam set forth the fundamental principles that can provide a just and enduring peace. Those principles, in summary, are:

An end to aggression and subversion.

Freedom for South Vietnam to choose and shape for itself its own destiny in conformity with democratic principles and without any foreign interference from whatever sources.

As soon as aggression has ceased, the ending of the military measures now necessary by the Government of South Vietnam and the nations that have come to its aid to defend South Vietnam; and the removal of foreign military forces from South Vietnam.

And effective guarantees for the independence and freedom of the people of South Vietnam.

Now these are the fundamental steps. This is what the arguing and the fighting is all about. When they are carried out, we can look forward, as we have stated previously many times, to the day when relations between North Vietnam and South Vietnam can be worked out by peaceful means. And this would include the question of a free decision by the peoples of North and South Vietnam on the matter of reunification.

This forthright and simple program meets the hopes of all and attacks the interests of none. It would replace the threat of conquest by the hope of free and peaceful choice.

A LOOK TO THE FUTURE

And even while these hopes of peace are blocked for now by aggression, we on our side and other nations have reaffirmed our deep commitment to the peaceful progress of Vietnam and southeast Asia as a whole. In April the President proposed to the nations of Asia and to the United Nations that there be constructed a new program of support for Asian efforts and called upon Mr. Eugene Black to assist them. Now in June this work is underway. The Mekong River project has been given new life. A new dam is ready to rise in Laos. A billion-dollar bank is in the making for the development of southeast Asia. And in Vietnam itself new impetus has been given to programs of development and education and health.

So let us call again on other nations—including the Soviet Union—to join in turning this great region of the world away from the waste and violence of a brutal war. For the hope of Asia is not in relentless pressure for conquest. It is in unremitting hope for progress—a progress in which rice production could be multiplied manyfold, where the expectation of life could be doubled, the education of the young could be tenfold what it is today, and there could be an end of cholera and tuberculosis and intestinal parasites and other human afflictions.

In April the President offered determination against aggression, discussion for peace, and development for the human hopes of all. And in June we reaffirm that threefold policy.

Aggression has increased, so that determination must be greater than ever.

Discussion is rejected, but our efforts to find a path to peace will not be stopped. We have welcomed the new initiative of Prime Minister Wilson and the Commonwealth conference and regret that it has received so little reception on the other side.

Beyond the terror of the aggressor and the firmness of our defense, we must, nevertheless, look to the day in which many new dams will be built, and many new schools opened, and fresh opportunities opened to the peoples of southeast Asia. For we must look beyond the battle to peace, past fear to hope, and over the hard path of resistance to the broad plain of progress which must lie ahead for the peoples of southeast Asia.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 20, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love Thee and worthily magnify Thy Holy Name. Grant, we beseech Thee, to these chosen servants of the commonwealth clear vision, true insight, and pure hearts as, facing perplexing tasks and carrying the burden of great responsibilities, they ascend this holy hill of the Nation's life.

In these fateful days, for whose decisions the future will judge us, by Thine enabling might may we maintain our integrity, unsullied by animosities, prejudices, or personal ambitions, regarding always the stewardship of public office as a sacred trust.

We ask it in that Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 19, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, submitting a nomination, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1856) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell uniform clothing to the Naval Sea Cadet Corps, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3788. An act to revive and reenact as amended the act entitled "An act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.," approved December 21, 1944;

H.R. 5519. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize language training to be given to a dependent of a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps under certain circumstances; and

H.R. 6790. An act to increase the limitation on emergency relief for the repair or reconstruction of highways under section 125 of title 23, United States Code.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3788. An act to revise and reenact as amended the act entitled "An act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.," approved December 21, 1944; and

H.R. 6790. An act to increase the limitation on emergency relief for the repair or reconstruction of highways under section 125 of title 23, United States Code; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 5519. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize language training to be given to a dependent of a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Permanent Investigations and the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Operations; and the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency and the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Committee on the Judiciary, were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT TO THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 445, Senate bill 1148.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1148) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to utilize its employees more effectively and to improve its administrative efficiency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments on page 2, line 7, after the word "following:", to strike out "The following" and insert "In cases where such matters are assigned to individual employees of the Commission, any order or requirement of such individual employee shall be subject to the same provisions with respect to reargument and reconsideration, with respect to reversal or modification, with respect to stay or postponement pending disposition of the matter by the Commission or appellate division, and with respect to suits to enforce, enjoin, suspend, or set aside such order or requirement in whole or in part, as are contained in paragraphs (6), (7), (8), and (9) of this section with respect to orders or requirements of a board. The following"; in line 21, after the word "directors,", to insert "deputy directors,"; and in line 22, after the word "of", to insert "offices and"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 17(2) of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 17(2)) is amended—

(1) by inserting immediately after the second parenthetical expression therein the following: ", and the Commission may also assign or refer those matters which have not involved the taking of testimony at a public hearing or the submission of evidence by opposing parties in the form of affidavits to eligible individual employees of the Commission,"

(2) by striking the second sentence and substituting in lieu thereof the following: "In cases where such matters are assigned to individual employees of the Commission, any order or requirement of such individual employee shall be subject to the same provisions with respect to reargument and reconsideration, with respect to reversal or modification, with respect to stay or postponement pending disposition of the matter by the Commission or appellate division, and with respect to suits to enforce, enjoin, suspend, or set aside such order or requirement in whole or in part, as are contained in paragraphs (6), (7), (8), and (9) of this section with respect to orders or requirements of a board. The following classes of employees shall be eligible for designation by the Commission to serve on such boards, or to receive individual delegations: directors, deputy directors, or assistant directors of offices and bureaus, examiners, chiefs and assistant chiefs of sections, chiefs and assistant chiefs of branches, attorneys, accountants, transportation economists and special-

ists, and such other qualified persons as the Commission may designate."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, has the bill been cleared on both sides of the aisle?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; the bill has been cleared all around; it has the approval of the minority.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 461), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

S. 1148 would permit the Commission to assign or refer to individual employees those matters which have not involved the taking of testimony at a public hearing or the submission of evidence by opposing parties in the form of affidavits. The employees eligible for such delegation would include directors, deputy directors, or assistant directors of offices and bureaus, examiners, chiefs and assistant chiefs of sections, chiefs and assistant chiefs of branches, attorneys, accountants, and transportation economists and specialists.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation would allow individual Commission employees to process administrative matters, that is, those which have not involved the taking of testimony at a public hearing or the submission of evidence by opposing parties in the form of affidavits. Examples of the type of matter that would be referred to individual employees are: the extension of dates for the filing of pleadings, the postponement of dates, the approval of changes in the form of tariffs or annual reports, and the approval of special permission tariff applications.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has advised the committee that it does not intend to delegate to individual employees any matter which would require an employee to decide the merits of a formal proceeding or any part of such a proceeding. Furthermore, although the matters that would be delegated are relatively routine and generally noncontroversial, the committee has added an amendment to the bill specifically preserving the right of appeal from any employee action under this bill.

The Commission indicated that enactment of S. 1148 would improve its overall administrative efficiency by allowing as many as 22,000 matters of a routine or specialized nature to be handled each year by qualified Commission employees.

Public Law 87-247, approved September 14, 1961, which allowed the Commission to authorize the delegation of certain duties to employee boards, has been quite helpful to the Commission in coping with an increasing caseload. The proposed legislation would similarly be of assistance by relieving Commissioners of the necessity of handling numerous matters of a relatively routine and specialized nature.

Hearings on this measure were conducted by the Surface Transportation Subcommittee starting on May 10, 1965. The Interstate Commerce Commission and the Department of Commerce testified in favor of the measure. The measure was also supported by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. As amended, and with the Commission's expression that it does not intend to delegate decisions as to the merits of proceedings, there appears to be no opposition to the measure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the committee amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting the nomination of Arthur J. Goldberg, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

James P. Coleman, of Mississippi, to the U.S. circuit judge for the fifth circuit;

James F. Gordon, of Kentucky, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Kentucky;

Donald H. Fraser, of Georgia, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Georgia; and

Thomas B. Mason, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Virginia.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development;

Dr. Albert H. Moseman, of New York, to be Assistant Administrator for Technical Cooperation and Research, Agency for International Development;

David M. Bane, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Gabon Republic;

Edward Clark, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Australia;

George J. Feldman, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Malta;

Parker T. Hart, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Turkey;

John D. Jernegan, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria;

David D. Newsom, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Libya;

Hugh H. Smythe, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Syrian Arab Republic; and

Leonard H. Marks, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

By Mr. Magnuson, from the Committee on Commerce:

Robert M. White, of Connecticut, to be Administrator, Environmental Science Services Administration; and

H. Arnold Karo, of Nebraska, to be Deputy Administrator, Environmental Science Services Administration, and to have the rank, pay, and allowances of a a vice admiral while holding such office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry R. Anderson, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

The Teaching Professions Act of 1965

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel, to improve the quality of teacher training programs, and to establish a National Teacher Corps (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Report on Overobligation of an Appropriation

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation within that Department; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Number of Officers Assigned or Detailed to Permanent Duty at the Seat of Government

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that as of June 30, 1965, there was an aggregate of 2,190 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force, at the seat of Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

and development for the human hopes of all. And in June we reaffirm that threefold policy.

Aggression has increased, so that determination must be greater than ever.

Discussion is rejected, but our efforts to find a path to peace will not be stopped. We have welcomed the new initiative of Prime Minister Wilson and the Commonwealth conference and regret that it has received so little reception on the other side.

Beyond the terror of the aggressor and the firmness of our defense, we must, nevertheless, look to the day in which many new dams will be built, and many new schools opened, and fresh opportunities opened to the peoples of southeast Asia. For we must look beyond the battle to peace, past fear to hope, and over the hard path of resistance to the broad plain of progress which must lie ahead for the peoples of southeast Asia.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 20, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love Thee and worthily magnify Thy Holy Name. Grant, we beseech Thee, to these chosen servants of the commonwealth clear vision, true insight, and pure hearts as, facing perplexing tasks and carrying the burden of great responsibilities, they ascend this holy hill of the Nation's life.

In these fateful days, for whose decisions the future will judge us, by Thine enabling might may we maintain our integrity, unsullied by animosities, prejudices, or personal ambitions, regarding always the stewardship of public office as a sacred trust.

We ask it in that Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 19, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, submitting a nomination, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1856) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell uniform clothing to the Naval Sea Cadet Corps, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3788. An act to revive and reenact as amended the act entitled "An act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.," approved December 21, 1944;

H.R. 5519. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize language training to be given to a dependent of a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps under certain circumstances; and

H.R. 6790. An act to increase the limitation on emergency relief for the repair or reconstruction of highways under section 125 of title 23, United States Code.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3788. An act to revise and reenact as amended the act entitled "An act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.," approved December 21, 1944; and

H.R. 6790. An act to increase the limitation on emergency relief for the repair or reconstruction of highways under section 125 of title 23, United States Code; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 5519. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize language training to be given to a dependent of a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Permanent Investigations and the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Operations; and the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency and the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Committee on the Judiciary, were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT TO THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 445, Senate bill 1148.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1148) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to utilize its employees more effectively and to improve its administrative efficiency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments on page 2, line 7, after the word "following:", to strike out "The following" and insert "In cases where such matters are assigned to individual employees of the Commission, any order or requirement of such individual employee shall be subject to the same provisions with respect to reargument and reconsideration, with respect to reversal or modification, with respect to stay or postponement pending disposition of the matter by the Commission or appellate division, and with respect to suits to enforce, enjoin, suspend, or set aside such order or requirement in whole or in part, as are contained in paragraphs (6), (7), (8), and (9) of this section with respect to orders or requirements of a board. The following"; in line 21, after the word "directors,", to insert "deputy directors,"; and in line 22, after the word "of", to insert "offices and"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 17(2) of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 17(2)) is amended—

(1) by inserting immediately after the second parenthetical expression therein the following: ", and the Commission may also assign or refer those matters which have not involved the taking of testimony at a public hearing or the submission of evidence by opposing parties in the form of affidavits to eligible individual employees of the Commission,"

(2) by striking the second sentence and substituting in lieu thereof the following: "In cases where such matters are assigned to individual employees of the Commission, any order or requirement of such individual employee shall be subject to the same provisions with respect to reargument and reconsideration, with respect to reversal or modification, with respect to stay or postponement pending disposition of the matter by the Commission or appellate division, and with respect to suits to enforce, enjoin, suspend, or set aside such order or requirement in whole or in part, as are contained in paragraphs (6), (7), (8), and (9) of this section with respect to orders or requirements of a board. The following classes of employees shall be eligible for designation by the Commission to serve on such boards, or to receive individual delegations: directors, deputy directors, or assistant directors of offices and bureaus, examiners, chiefs and assistant chiefs of sections, chiefs and assistant chiefs of branches, attorneys, accountants, transportation economists and special-

ists, and such other qualified persons as the Commission may designate."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, has the bill been cleared on both sides of the aisle?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; the bill has been cleared all around; it has the approval of the minority.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 461), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

S. 1148 would permit the Commission to assign or refer to individual employees those matters which have not involved the taking of testimony at a public hearing or the submission of evidence by opposing parties in the form of affidavits. The employees eligible for such delegation would include directors, deputy directors, or assistant directors of offices and bureaus, examiners, chiefs and assistant chiefs of sections, chiefs and assistant chiefs of branches, attorneys, accountants, and transportation economists and specialists.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation would allow individual Commission employees to process administrative matters, that is, those which have not involved the taking of testimony at a public hearing or the submission of evidence by opposing parties in the form of affidavits. Examples of the type of matter that would be referred to individual employees are: the extension of dates for the filing of pleadings, the postponement of dates, the approval of changes in the form of tariffs or annual reports, and the approval of special permission tariff applications.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has advised the committee that it does not intend to delegate to individual employees any matter which would require an employee to decide the merits of a formal proceeding or any part of such a proceeding. Furthermore, although the matters that would be delegated are relatively routine and generally noncontroversial, the committee has added an amendment to the bill specifically preserving the right of appeal from any employee action under this bill.

The Commission indicated that enactment of S. 1148 would improve its overall administrative efficiency by allowing as many as 22,000 matters of a routine or specialized nature to be handled each year by qualified Commission employees.

Public Law 87–247, approved September 14, 1961, which allowed the Commission to authorize the delegation of certain duties to employee boards, has been quite helpful to the Commission in coping with an increasing caseload. The proposed legislation would similarly be of assistance by relieving Commissioners of the necessity of handling numerous matters of a relatively routine and specialized nature.

Hearings on this measure were conducted by the Surface Transportation Subcommittee starting on May 10, 1965. The Interstate Commerce Commission and the Department of Commerce testified in favor of the measure. The measure was also supported by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. As amended, and with the Commission's expression that it does not intend to delegate decisions as to the merits of proceedings, there appears to be no opposition to the measure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the committee amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting the nomination of Arthur J. Goldberg, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

James P. Coleman, of Mississippi, to the U.S. circuit judge for the fifth circuit;

James F. Gordon, of Kentucky, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Kentucky;

Donald H. Fraser, of Georgia, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Georgia; and

Thomas B. Mason, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Virginia.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development;

Dr. Albert H. Moseman, of New York, to be Assistant Administrator for Technical Cooperation and Research, Agency for International Development;

David M. Bane, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Gabon Republic;

Edward Clark, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Australia;

George J. Feldman, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Malta;

Parker T. Hart, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Turkey;

John D. Jernegan, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria;

David D. Newsom, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Libya;

Hugh H. Smythe, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Syrian Arab Republic; and

Leonard H. Marks, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Robert M. White, of Connecticut, to be Administrator, Environmental Science Services Administration; and

H. Arnold Karo, of Nebraska, to be Deputy Administrator, Environmental Science Services Administration, and to have the rank, pay, and allowances of a a vice admiral while holding such office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry R. Anderson, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

THE TEACHING PROFESSIONS ACT OF 1965

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel, to improve the quality of teacher training programs, and to establish a National Teacher Corps (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation within that Department; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ASSIGNED OR DETAILED TO PERMANENT DUTY AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that as of June 30, 1965, there was an aggregate of 2,190 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force, at the seat of Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Publication of Notice of Proposed Disposition of Certain Nickel

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 224,194,097 pounds of nickel now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Provision of Aviation War Risk Insurance

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of aviation war risk insurance, as of June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Grants Made to Nonprofit Institutions and Organizations for Support of Scientific Research Programs

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on grants made to nonprofit institutions and organizations for support of scientific research programs, during the calendar year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Award of Young American Medals for Bravery and Service

A letter from the Attorney General, reporting, pursuant to law, on the award of Young American Medals for Bravery and Service, for the year 1963; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Reports on Petitions To Accord First Preference Status to Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on petitions to accord first preference status to certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

H.R. 8862. An act to amend the act of August 7, 1935, to increase the authorized annual share of the United States as an adhering member of the International Council of Scientific Unions and Associated Unions (Rept. No. 469).

By Mr. METCALF, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 70. An act to provide for the conveyance of approximately 80 acres of land to the heirs of Adam Jones, Creek Indian not enrolled (Rept. No. 493);

H.R. 5860. An act to amend the law relating to the final disposition of the property of the Choctaw Tribe (Rept. No. 494); and

H.R. 9041. An act to restore to the heirs of the Indian grantor certain tribal land of the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma (Rept. No. 495).

By Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 34. A bill to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior (Rept. No. 470).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1938. A bill to amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act (Rept. No. 491).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1904. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the Pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for school or administrative purposes (Rept. No. 492).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1413. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Confederated Tribes of Colville Indians located in the State of Washington and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 490).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 192. A bill for the relief of Maria Liberty Burnett (Rept. No. 472);

S. 245. A bill for the relief of Athanasia Nikolopoulos and Soterios Nikolopoulos (Rept. No. 473);

S. 1273. A bill for the relief of Ana Folja (Rept. No. 474);

S. 1325. A bill for the relief of Dr. Oton Socarraz (Rept. No. 475);

H.R. 1987. An act for the relief of Nabhane M. Nickley (Nabhane M. Karam) (Rept. No. 476);

H.R. 1989. An act for the relief of Krystyna Stella Hancock (Rept. No. 477);

H.R. 2012. An act for the relief of Dr. Ignace D. Liu (Rept. No. 478);

H.R. 2351. An act for the relief of Teresita Centeno Valdez (Rept. No. 479);

H.R. 2360. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio R. Perez (Rept. No. 480);

H.R. 2499. An act for the relief of Remedios Ocampo (Rept. No. 481);

H.R. 2913. An act for the relief of Lt. Thomas A. Ferrell, U.S. Navy, and others (Rept. No. 482); and

H.R. 4131. An act for the relief of Mrs. Phoebe Thompson Neesham (Rept. No. 483).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1389. A bill for the relief of Dr. Angel Fernando Golderos (Rept. No. 484);

S. 1449. A bill for the relief of Dr. Enrique Ramon Ducassi (Rept. No. 485); and

H.R. 2305. An act for the relief of Zenaida Quijano Lazaro (Rept. No. 486).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1137. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael P. Martinez (Rept. No. 487);

S. 1170. A bill for the relief of Chung J. Clark and her daughter, Anna Maria Clark (Rept. No. 488); and

S. 1186. A bill for the relief of Michiko Uehara (Rept. No. 489).

By Mr. FONG, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H.R. 1908. An act for the relief of Chester (Abramczyk) Hill (Rept. No. 471).

By Mr. GRUENING, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1190. A bill to provide that certain limitations shall not apply to certain land patented to the State of Alaska for the use and benefit of the University of Alaska (Rept. No. 496).

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, to those who live in States where private ownership and management of land according to the wishes and best interests of the owner are taken for granted, it is difficult to comprehend the obstacles and niggling complications besetting those who would own property in public land States such as Alaska. In Alaska the Federal Government owns and exercises plenary authority over nearly the entire land area of the State. The Federal Government, in fact, owns more than 99 percent of Alaska.

The consequences of this state of affairs is that private ownership of land can, in general, only be attained by the grace of special dispensation from the controlling Federal agencies. It can be acquired only by painstaking and patient compliance with the requirements of myriad laws and regulations under which the public lands are administered.

Once acquired, even then, the owner may be required to comply strictly with Federal rules, regulations, policies and laws governing property transactions at such time as it may be desirable to transfer land.

So, in the case of the University of Alaska, the university is the beneficiary of a grant of 100,000 acres from the Federal Government—a conveyance intended to provide the school with resources necessary to support it.

While the Federal Government displayed welcome generosity in transferring 100,000 acres of its land to the University of Alaska, it tied strings to the gift in the form of restrictions on conveyance that have frustrated the purposes of the grant by presenting serious obstacles to free use of the land by the university.

The purpose of S. 1190 is to solve a particular problem arising from the university's inability to dispose of its land freely and without restrictions imposed by the terms of the land grant.

The land involved in S. 1190 is a tract of approximately 153 acres included in the grant to the school. After the land had been clear listed by the Department of the Interior for patent to the university, the Klukwan Iron Ore Corp. protested the transfer on grounds it held valid mining claims in the land. The Secretary of the Interior denied the protest of Klukwan, holding that once the land was clear listed, the Department had no further interest, hence no jurisdiction over the property. However, the United States retains, under the act granting the lands, jurisdiction to enforce its conveyance by the university in accordance with terms of the law.

After the final decision of the Interior Department, Klukwan Iron Ore Corp. sued in the State of Alaska Supreme Court to quiet title in itself to the property involved in S. 1190. Before conclusion of the litigation, Klukwan and the university agreed to settle the matter privately.

The parties have agreed on a negotiated disposal of the land of Klukwan Iron Ore on terms found mutually beneficial. The agreement cannot be consummated, however, without amendment of the granting act. That law, which is enforcible by the Department of Justice, requires lease or sale of university lands only on a competitive basis and forbids a negotiated transaction of the kind desired.

Accordingly, in order to carry out the basic purposes of the act under which the land was granted—which are to establish and promote the welfare of a State university—it is necessary to remove the Federal restriction for the limited purpose of this transaction.

Early passage of S. 1190 will remove a troublesome problem for the University of Alaska and place it in a stronger position than before to make its incomparable contribution to the education of young Alaskans.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2304. A bill for the relief of Saudi Rihan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2305. A bill to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote travel in the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2306. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal Power Commission to issue licenses for facilities for the obstruction, diversion and reentry of water in navigable waters of the United States for cooling, condensing or other purposes connected with the operation of any existing or proposed installation or plant generating electricity by means other than hydroelectric generation; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. Magnuson):

S. 2307. A bill for the relief of certain civilian employees and former civilian employees of the Bureau of Reclamation at the Columbia Basin Project, Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jackson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Morse, and Mrs. Neuberger):

S. 2308. A bill for the relief of the Beasley Engineering Co., Inc., Emeryville, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jackson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. Gruening):

S. 2309. A bill to promote the economic development of the State of Alaska by providing for U.S. participation in the statewide exposition to be held in Alaska during 1967; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bartlett when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. Magnuson):

S. 2310. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to determine that certain costs of operating and maintaining Banks Lake on the Columbia Basin project for recreational purposes are nonreimbursable; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2311. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for deduction of certain education expenses of teachers; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scott when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL POWER ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Power Act, relating to the issuance of certain licenses. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a section-by-section analysis of the bill, be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Harris in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2306) to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal Power Commission to issue licenses for facilities for the obstruction, diversion and reentry of water in navigable waters of the United States for cooling, condensing or other purposes connected with the operation of any existing or proposed installation or plant generating electricity by means other than hydroelectric generation, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. Magnuson, are as follows:

Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D.C., July 2, 1965.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: The Commission transmits for consideration 20 copies of a draft bill to amend the Federal Power Act. Included is a section-by-section analysis of the proposal.

At present the Commission's licensing jurisdiction under part I of the Federal Power Act is limited to projects for the generation of hydroelectric power. Increasingly in recent years diversion dams have been required in navigable waters of the United States to provide sufficient cooling water for steam-electric generating stations built adjacent to navigable streams. Under existing law such projects involving dams in navigable waters have required special authorizing legislation by Congress. This bill would authorize the Commission to issue licenses for the construction and maintenance of such water diversion facilities in or along any navigable waters of the United States.

The Federal Power Commission has administered a licensing program for water power projects for more than 40 years, applying the statutory standard of whether the proposed project or facility is in the public interest and consistent with the comprehensive development of the river basin. It is believed that such determinations concerning diversion facilities for steamplants are not of such a policy character as to require individual attention by the Congress. On the contrary the reasons which prompted Congress to delegate to the Commission its present licensing functions—the need for prompt and efficient handling by a single agency familiar with the complex technical problems involved, and qualified to weigh, choose among, or reconcile conflicting use patterns—are equally applicable to diversion dams.

Three points about the draft bill should be noted. First, the steamplants are not made subject to license. Second, the proposed bill does not purport to impose some of the controls applicable to major hydroelectric projects since such controls are not necessary in order to assure that diversion facilities are compatible with comprehensive river development. Third, the draft bill would include provisions to protect the United States from liability for damages to the licensed facilities which might result from subsequent water resource developments. Similar provisions have been included by Congress in the special laws which authorized particular projects.

The Commission believes that the additional licensing authority proposed in the draft bill will centralize the responsibility for the licensing of facilities in navigable waters used or useful in generating electric energy, will lighten the existing special burden upon Congress in passing on each water diversion authorization and thereby reduce the entailed delay, and will assist in the comprehensive development of navigable waters in the national interest.

Respectfully,

Joseph C. Swidler,
Chairman.

Enclosure No. 5929.

Section-by-Section Analysis of Draft Bill To License Water Diversion Facilities of Steam-Electric and Other Electric Generating Plants

General: The bill would add to the Federal Power Act a new part IV, comprising sections 401 through 408, to provide for the licensing of water diversion facilities for electric generating plants in or along navigable waters of the United States. The facilities are more precisely described in section 402. Since the provisions of part I of the Federal Power Act would be made applicable to part IV, with certain exceptions specified in section 403, the meaning of a number of general terms, such as person, corporation, State, or municipality, would be ascertained by reference to the definitions in section 3 of part I, and licensing would follow those procedures and standards of part I, as modified by sections 403 through 408.

Section 401 would make it unlawful for any person, corporation, municipality or State, to construct, operate, or maintain a water diversion facility without a Federal Power Commission license.

Section 402 defines a water diversion facility. The term covers principally dams across, along, or in navigable waters of the United States which divert, and reservoirs incidental thereto which store, water from such streams for cooling, condensing, or other purposes connected with the operation of steam-electric and other electric generating plants such as atomic powerplants. The definition would not apply to the electric generating plants that derive their source of energy from the power of falling water, which are already subject to license under part I of the Federal Power Act. The licensed facilities would also include any facilities incidental to the diversion dam which provide for the reentry of the diverted waters into the navigable stream.

Section 403 authorizes the Commission to issue licenses for water diversion facilities when in the public interest, and provides that licensing shall follow, and licenses shall be subject to, section 4(e) of the Federal Power Act and the other provisions of part I applicable to licenses or licensees under section 4(e), with certain enumerated exceptions.

In general, part IV licenses would be subject to the conditioning powers of the Commission under sections 4(e) and 10(a) of the act for improving or developing waterways for beneficial public uses, including the conservation of fish and other wildlife resources and the development of recreation; but would not be subject to a number of the hydroelectric licensing controls of part I which do not appear necessary to assure that water diversion facilities are compatible with comprehensive river development, such as the preliminary permit requirements of sections 4(f) and 5, the governmental preferences or Federal development determinations of section 7, or the recapture provisions of section 14. Specifically, under part IV licenses would not be subject to sections 4(f) and 5—preliminary permits; 7(a)—preference clause; 7(b)—Federal development; 10 (d)—20-year amortization reserves; 14—recapture; 15—new licenses (a subject covered in section 405); 19 and 20—regulation of rates and services (covered for interstate operations of public utilities by sections 205 and 207); 22—contracts extending beyond license terms; 23—"grandfather" clause (covered in proposed section 404), and declaration of intent procedure for projects in nonnavigable waters.

Section 404 is a grandfather clause designed to protect existing rights in water-diversion facilities previously authorized by statute, provided that application for a Commission license is made within 12 months after part IV becomes law. In such cases, the Commission would issue licenses for the existing facilities without the necessity for making findings or applying conditions otherwise required by sections 4(e) and 10(a) of the Federal Power Act, and without requiring the licensee to alter its existing facilities to provide various navigational facilities which might otherwise be required under sections 11, 12, or 18 of the act.

Section 405 is a provision for the issuance of a new license upon the expiration of a license issued under section 403 or 404. Under section 6 of the act, part IV licenses like part I licenses would be issued for a period not exceeding 50 years. Section 405 makes provision for further licensing at the end of the initial license period, similar to the provisions of section 15 of the act, but omitting reference to possible recapture by the United States to which the part IV licensee is not subject.

Section 406 is an adaptation of provisions in acts of Congress which have authorized construction of specific water-diversion facilities. Section 406 is intended to protect the United States against liability for damage to licensed facilities which might result from subsequent water resource developments.

Section 407 corresponds to section 14 of the Federal Power Act, and expressly reserves the right of the United States, or any State or municipality, to condemn facilities licensed under part IV upon payment of just compensation.

Section 408, like section 28 in the case of part I, reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal part IV without adversely affecting outstanding licenses.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES AND FORMER EMPLOYEES OF BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of my senior colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and myself, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of several employees and former employees of the Bureau of Reclamation at the Columbia Basin project in Washington.

These employees, wholly without fault or responsibility on their part, received certain overpayments of salary. Such overpayments are described by the Commissioner of Reclamation, who is the head of the Bureau, as "administrative errors," and he agrees these employees should not be required to make restitution, in the circumstances.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Commissioner Dominy respecting this matter be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks along with the text of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2307) for the relief of certain civilian employees and former civilian employees of the Bureau of Reclamation at the Columbia Basin project, Washington, introduced by Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) each of the following employees, former employees, and estates of deceased employees of the Bureau of Reclamation at the Columbia Basin Project, Washington, who received the overpayment of compensation listed opposite his name for the period from July 16, 1951, through April 24, 1965, inclusive, or any portion or portions of such period, which overpayment resulted from administrative error, is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the amount of such overpayment:

Name:	*Overpayment*
Adams, Harley G	$35.84
Atlee, William E	2,090.46
Avery, Clifford W	19.20
Baumann, Florence I	4.00
Bean, Jerome H	112.53
Bishop, Fae C	3.27
Carpenter, Doris N	180.89
Carter, Helen L	508.72
Click, Oliver L	18.40
Cole, Charles B., Jr	28.00
Culp, Mary A	8.00
Dennis, William E	12.63
Deurbrouck, Robert L	7.20
Dixon, Lloyd E	1,518.56
Drittenbass, Florence A	4.00
Dull, Leah K	4.00
Eaton, Joseph L	690.10
Edyvean, Frances G	487.40
Ernest, John L	680.12
Farwell, Ruth	102.65
Fees, John N	125.01
Ferguson, Roy	19.73
Fretwell, Lloyd G	120.00
Gardner, Ray R	5.60
Gardner, Roy A	5.60
German, Gilbert A	705.60
Gilbert, Forrest J	41.60
Gimlin, Dorothy F	296.87
Greenwood, Walter P	1,201.29
Gilbert, Forrest J	41.60
Guffey, Clifford W	24.96
Hay, Bill N	67.20
Howe, Oran J	25.84
Indreland, Rasmus E	6.40
Kammayer, Walter R	1,448.00
Kidston, George W	134.40
King, Everett L	41.60
Long, Cecil I	218.40
Mackey, Robert W	6.40
Mowery, Orville A	583.38
Myers, Esther G	129.80
Neilson, Vernal J	250.48
O'Brien, Harvey P	237.44
Oliver, Floyd E	19.20
Osborn, Betty F	8.00
Parker, Margie E	944.92
Paul, Edward T	284.80
Pearl, Dean D	20.00
Pontsler, Dean S	654.40
Pryor, Rick L	8.00
Robbins, Esther	$330.27
Rohwein, Theodore P	6.40
Romary, Charles E	34.48
Rorvik, Joseph	481.91
Rose, Anthony	1,094.65
Roudebush, Charles D	26.80
Schmidt, Alfred	4.00
Shay, Harold	798.19
Sheck, Ethel P	39.20
Smith, Russell D	11.20
Spencer, Jesse L	88.48
Stevens, Bob J	25.28
Straalsund, George H	908.80
Tellinghuisen, John W	610.38
White, Doris N	8.80
Williams, Glenn D	13.26
Winn, Charles L	5.60

Each such employee or former employee who has at any time made any repayment to the United States on account of any such overpayments made to him (or, in the event of his death, the person who would be entitled thereto under the first section of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 61f)), shall be entitled to have an amount equal to all such repayments made by him refunded if application is made to the Project Manager, Columbia Basin Project, within two years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) For purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, each overpayment for which liability is relieved by subsection (a) of this section shall be deemed to have been a valid payment.

SEC. 2. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for any amounts for which liability is relieved by the first section of this Act.

The letter presented by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D.C., June 4, 1965.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: On March 31, 1965, we acknowledged your inquiries concerning salary overpayments to several employees of the Columbia Basin project. We have now made a complete study of the situation, including a comprehensive audit of all personnel and payroll records. Our findings are outlined below.

Of the 1,123 classified employees who are now serving or who have served on the Columbia Basin project since January 1960, 66 were found to have received salary overpayments. Eleven of these cases can be traced to a misinterpretation of personnel and pay regulations that developed during a routine audit conducted by the General Accounting Office in June 1960. The others were caused by further misinterpretations of applicable civil service regulations. These errors developed as a result of inadequate supervision at all levels of this Bureau.

Of the 66 overpayments, 38 resulted from miscalculations of the time-in-grade requirements for periodic step increases; 18 from erroneous credit given toward time requirements for longevity step increases; 4 from incorrect selection of salary step upon promotion to a higher grade; 3 were from misinterpretation of instructions for salary adjustments under one of the Federal employee pay acts; 1 from a promotion in violation of the time-in-grade requirement; 1 from an erroneous lump-sum payment for leave not available because of less than 90 days' service; and 1 from granting an engineering technician a salary rate available only to professional engineers. These errors occurred between the period July 16, 1951, through April 24, 1965, inclusive.

In recognition of the fact that the overpayments resulted from administrative errors and the employees were in no way responsible, we do not believe they should be required to make restitution. Although we have temporarily suspended action to collect the overpayments, we are without legal authority to relieve the employees of responsibility for repayment. Legislation will be necessary if this is to be done. In accordance with your request, a draft bill for that purpose will be sent to you by the Department's legislative counsel.

A list of the employees involved showing the amount of overpayment made to each is enclosed. All but 15 are still employed on the project. Of those who are gone, six resigned; three transferred within the Bureau; four retired with one of these having since deceased; and two are employed by other agencies of the Federal Government.

The above information is also being furnished to Senator MAGNUSON and Congresswoman MAY, who have written to us concerning this matter.

Our audit also disclosed several instances of employees who have been underpaid. These will be corrected promptly by administrative actions which are within our authority.

We view this entire situation with utmost gravity and are taking immediate steps to insure that there will be no recurrence of such errors in the future.

We appreciate your interest in the Bureau of Reclamation and its employees. Please let us know if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

FLOYD E. DOMINY,
Commissioner.

Enclosure.

Personnel-payroll audit of Columbia Basin project, April 1965

OVERPAYMENTS

	Gross amount of overpayment
Adams, Harley G., GS–459–5	$35.84
Atlee, William E., GS–810–7	2,090.46
Avey, Clifford W., GS–081–6	19.20
Baumann, Florence I., GS–312–3	4.00
Bean, Jerome H., GS–818–4	112.53
Bishop, Fae C., GS–318–4	3.27
Carpenter, Doris N., GS–525–6	180.89
Carter, Helen L., GS–318–6	508.72
Click, Oliver L., GS–450–9	18.40
Cole, Charles B., Jr., GS–201–11	28.00
Culp, Mary A., GS–322–3	8.00
Dennis, William E., ungraded	12.63
Deurbrouck, Robert L., GS–341–9	7.20
Dixon, Lloyd E., GS–809–7	1,518.56
Drittenbass, Florence A., GS–301–4	4.00
Dull, Leah K., GS–312–3	4.00
Eaton, Joseph L., GS–459–9	690.10
Edyvean, Frances G., GS–2040–3	487.40
Ernest, John L., GS–802–11	680.12
Farwell, Ruth, GS–501–5	102.65
Fees, John N., GS–307–4	125.01
Ferguson, Roy, GS–459–7	19.73
Fretwell, Lloyd G., GS–810–11	120.00
Gardner, Ray R., GS–802–4	5.60
Gardner, Roy A., GS–459–4	5.60
German, Gilbert A., GS–817–7	705.60
Gilbert, Forrest J., GS–362–11	41.60
Gimlin, Dorothy F., GS–525–6	296.87
Greenwood, Walter P., GS–850–11	1,201.29
Guffey, Clifford W., GS–459–5	24.96
Hay, Bill N., GS–301–9	67.20
Howe, Oran J., GS–459–5	25.84
Indreland, Rasmus E., GS–471–9	6.40
Kammeyer, Walter R., GS–802–7	1,448.00
Kidston, George W., GS–813–9	134.40
King, Everett L., GS–1810–11	41.60
Long, Cecil I., GS–802–4	218.40
Mackey, Robert W., GS–816–7	6.40
Mowery, Orville A., GS–459–8	583.38
Myers, Esther G., GS–305–4	129.80
Neilson, Vernal J., GS–459–9	250.48
O'Brien, Harvey P., GS–813–9	237.44
Oliver, Floyd E., GS–471–9	$19.20
Osborn, Betty F., GS–322–3	8.00
Parker, Margie E., GS–341–9	944.92
Paul, Edward T., GS–802–9	284.80
Pearl, Dean D., GS–459–5	20.00
Pontsler, Dean S., GS–1670–7	654.40
Pryor, Rick L., ungraded	8.00
Robbins, Esther, GS–203–4	330.27
Rohwein, Theodore P., GS–1371–5	6.40
Romary, Charles E., GS–459–5	34.48
Rorvik, Joseph, GS–301–5	481.91
Rose, Anthony, GS–809–7	1,094.65
Roudebush, Charles D., GS–890–7	26.80
Schmidt, Alfred, GS–802–5	4.00
Shay, Harold, GS–459–5	798.19
Sheck, Ethel P., GS–305–3	39.20
Smith, Russell D., GS–810–11	11.20
Spencer, Jesse L., GS–301–5	88.48
Stevens, Bob J., GS–459–5	25.28
Straalsund, George H., GS–810–11	908.80
Tellinghuisen, John W., GS–459–7	610.38
White, Doris N., GS–312–3	8.80
Williams, Glenn D., GS–301–5	13.26
Winn, Charles L., GS–510–11	5.60
Total gross overpayment	18,638.59

BEASLEY ENGINEERING CO., INC.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill I am introducing for myself and Senators MAGNUSON, MORSE, and NEUBERGER, for the specific purpose of granting relief to the Beasley Engineering Co., Inc. The company incurred expenses without recourse while repairing, reconstructing, and restoring a portion of The Dalles irrigation works which were damaged by an act of God—severe floods and high waters.

The sponsors of this proposed relief legislation are convinced that the company has an equitable case, and we commend it to the attention of the appropriate committees and the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2308) for the relief of the Beasley Engineering Co., Inc., Emeryville, Calif., introduced by Mr. JACKSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Beasley Engineering Company, Incorporated, whose permanent legal address is 1265 Sixty-fifth Street, Emeryville, California, the expenses reasonably incurred by the Beasley Engineering Company, Incorporated, in repairing, reconstructing, and restoring portions of The Dalles irrigation works being constructed under Bureau of Reclamation contract No. 14–06–D–4014, Specifications No. DC–6004, which were damaged or destroyed as a result of floods and high waters during December 1964 and January 1965: *Provided,* That such expenses shall not in any case exceed the sum of $155,000. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to review and approve the contractor's justification of costs, prior to payment by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant thereto.

A GREAT PAST, A GREATER FUTURE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in 1867 the United States purchased from Russia a territory which was to become its 49th and largest State.

In modern parlance, that purchase was a good deal, ranking among the top buys of all time.

For $7.2 million, the United States purchased a territory rich in natural resources and strategically situated for the military defense of the Nation. Even the most farsighted of the solons arguing for the purchase in 1867 grossly underestimated the value of Alaska to the United States. The Alaska purchase has proved to be more than a good deal. History has shown the transaction to be of historic national and international importance.

The 100th anniversary of the purchase will occur in 1967. Plans are afoot to commemorate the historic transaction. The State of Alaska and local communities are preparing for the observance. Already 21 projects are in the works and a State-local matching program has been approved by the legislature. Alaska officials have been in contact with the U.S. Department of State to develop cultural exchange programs with the Soviet Union. Other nations which have played a part in the history of Alaska will be invited to take part in the observance.

Mr. President, it is important to note that the purpose of the observance is more than temporary exhibits. In keeping with suggestions outlined by the U.S. Department of Commerce, the projects are designed to aid the development of Alaska.

The missing partner in this plan is the Federal Government.

Today the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and I introduce a bill authorizing Federal participation in the program.

Taking its cue from the purchase price of Alaska, the bill would authorize $7.2 million for development projects. The Federal share would never be greater than 50 percent of the cost of any project. Industrial, agricultural, educational, research and commercial facilities would qualify for Federal funds, as would certain permanent tourist attractions.

The chairman of the Federal Field Committee for Development in Planning in Alaska would approve projects for Federal funds. A State department, to be designated by the Governor, would coordinate and approve all State and local plans.

The bill also authorizes $600,000 for Federal exhibits throughout the State. The chairman of the Federal Field Committee would have full control of these funds to be spent on displays and exhibits commemorating the vital role the Federal Government played in the first 100 years of Alaska history under the U.S. flag.

Mr. President, the purchase of Alaska was a transaction of national and international importance. The Federal Government should take part in the observance, particularly in light of the fact that the thrust of the plans is for permanent development in the State.

A successful observance will aid the Nation as a whole as did the historic good deal of 1867.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2309) to promote the economic development of the State of Alaska by providing for U.S. participation in the statewide exposition to be held in Alaska during 1967, introduced by Mr. Bartlett (for himself and Mr. Gruening), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2309

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in recognition of the national and international significance of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia in 1867, the Congress hereby declares that it is the purpose of this Act to provide for appropriate United States participation in the 1967 exposition, jointly with the State of Alaska, through economic development projects such as industrial, agricultural, educational, research or commercial facilities, or facilities which serve as permanent tourist attractions or otherwise assist in the creation of long-term employment opportunities in Alaska.

Sec. 2. (a) Upon application approved and submitted by the Department of the State of Alaska designated by the Governor of Alaska, (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Department") on behalf of the State of Alaska or any political subdivision of the State or its exposition committee, the Chairman of the Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Chairman") is authorized to make grants upon approval by the Department, to the State, or political subdivision, to provide for economic development projects within the area of the political subdivision for which a grant is requested. Included under these projects, the State of Alaska, or any political subdivision or its exposition committee, may erect buildings and other structures which can be used for ceremonies and exhibits as part of the exposition.

Sec. 2. (b) The amount of any project grant shall not exceed the applicable percentage of the aggregate cost (excluding administrative costs) of the project but in no event shall the non-Federal share of the aggregate cost be less than fifty per centum of such cost.

Sec. 2. (c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section not to exceed $7,200,000.

Sec. 3. Applications for grants under section 2 shall be eligible for approval by the Chairman only after—

(1) the Chairman has received from the Department approval of the project request together with detailed plans including a statement of estimated cost (excluding administrative costs) with the amount to be financed from non-Federal sources; and

(2) the Chairman receives assurances that (A) there will be proper and efficient administration in carrying out the project, (B) such records as the Chairman shall prescribe will be kept, including records which fully disclose the amount and nature of that portion of the total cost of each of such projects, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of each of such projects furnished by non-Federal sources, and (C) such records will be made available for audit with respect to such grants.

Sec. 4. (a) The Chairman may provide for appropriate participation by the United States in ceremonies and exhibits which are a part of the exposition, whenever the national or international significance of any event of the exposition will be enhanced by such United States participation.

(b) In carrying out the purposes of this section, the Chairman may—

(1) provide for the display of Federal exhibits at one or more sites in the State of Alaska in buildings or structures furnished to the United States, during the period of the exposition, except that the Chairman may utilize United States owned mobile geodesic-domed exhibition buildings or structures erected on land owned by the State of Alaska or any political subdivision thereof and furnished to the United States, without cost, during the period of the exposition;

(2) incur such expenses as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, including but not limited to expenditures involved in the selection, purchase, rental, construction, and other acquisition of exhibits and materials and equipment therefor and the actual display thereof, and including but not limited to related expenditures for costs of landscaping, transportation, insurance, installation, safekeeping, maintenance and operation, and dismantling;

(3) enter into such constructs as may be necessary to provide for United States participation in appropriate ceremonies and exhibits which are a part of the exposition;

(4) appoint, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, such persons as he deems to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, except that no person appointed under this paragraph shall receive compensation from the United States at a rate in excess of that received by persons under the Classification Act of 1949 for performing comparable duties;

(5) procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem; and

(6) accept any gifts, donations, or devises, or loans other than of money, to be used in carrying out the purposes of this section.

(c) In determining the exhibits to be installed by the United States during the exposition and in selecting the site or sites in the State of Alaska for such exhibits, the Chairman shall consult with the Alaska State Centennial Commission.

(d) The head of each department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government is authorized—

(1) to cooperate with the Chairman with respect to United States participation in the ceremonial aspects of the exposition, and

(2) to make available to the Chairman from time to time, such personnel as may be necessary to assist the Chairman in carrying out his functions under this section.

(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section not to exceed $600,000.

Sec. 6. The Chairman shall report to the Congress within six months after the date of the official close of the exposition concerning the activities of the Federal Government pursuant to this Act, including a detailed statement of expenditures. Upon transmission of such report to the Congress, all appointments made under this Act shall terminate.

Mr. GRUENING subsequently said: Mr. President, I am most pleased to join with my able and distinguished colleague [Mr. Bartlett] in sponsoring S. 2309, a bill designed to promote the economic development of the State of Alaska by providing for U.S. participation in the statewide exposition to be held in Alaska during 1967.

This legislation is a result of a study made by the Department of Commerce pursuant to authority contained in Public Law 88–610, which, as S. 49, I introduced, with the cosponsorship of Senator Bartlett, on January 14, 1963, to "provide for the establishment of the Alaska Centennial Commission, to cooperate with the State of Alaska to study and report on the manner and extent to which the United States shall participate in the celebration in 1967 of the centennial anniversary of the purchase of the Territory of Alaska." This bill, as passed and becoming Public Law 88–610, authorized the Department of Commerce to report to the Congress on the extent to which the Federal Government should participate in Alaska's centennial.

The year 1967 marks the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska from Russia.

The State of Alaska is moving steadily ahead with its local and State planning efforts to take due note of this event. Two years ago, in April 1963, a State centennial commission was established.

The Department of Commerce, in its report of May 27, 1965, as a result of its study, recommended Federal participation in the 1967 Alaska Centennial. It also recommended consideration by the Congress of the advisability of providing "appropriate Federal assistance in addition to that available under existing [Federal] programs."

It was also recommended by the Department of Commerce that "while the Federal Government should participate in such observances as ceremonials and exhibits, it should place primary emphasis on participation in programs contributing to the long-range development of Alaska."

The further recommendation is made by the Department of Commerce that the "State of Alaska should have the basic responsibility for planning and execution of all centennial-related programs and projects, and the Federal contribution should be generally commensurate with local efforts."

The bill, S. 2309, is designed to carry out these recommendations. As the preamble to the bill states, the purpose of the bill is to "provide for appropriate U.S. participation in the 1967 exposition, jointly with the State of Alaska, through economic development projects such as industrial, agricultural, educational, research or commercial facilities, or facilities which serve as permanent tourist attractions or otherwise assist in the creation of long-term employment opportunities in Alaska."

To insure that the Federal effort will be commensurate with that of the State and local effort the authorized amount of Federal funds—$7,200,000—will be made available on a matching basis with at least 50 percent to be State and local funds.

It is entirely fitting that the Federal Government should participate actively in the celebration of this important event—as will, I hope, other nations such as Britain, France, Spain, and Russia which have, in one way or another, had a role in Alaska's past.

With the purchase of Alaska in 1867, the thrust of the United States turned east. That thrust is illustrated best by recent events in Alaska in its ever-growing trade with Japan.

The international significance of the purchase of Alaska can in no way be better illustrated than in the growing importance of Alaska as the international air crossroads of the world. Flights across the pole, stopping over in Alaska, are constantly growing in numbers so that more and more people from foreign climes are beholding the majestic beauties in Alaska.

While the amount of Federal funds requested for participation in the Alaska exposition by this bill is not large as such sums go, the event to be marked is of great significance. For those who doubt that statement, I would ask them to consider the present strategic situation of the "lower 48" States if Alaska had remained under the Russian flag until today.

Therefore, the people of the United States have much to celebrate in 1967 when they participate in the celebration of the centennial of Alaska's purchase.

DEDUCTION OF CERTAIN EDUCATION EXPENSES OF TEACHERS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for deduction of certain education expenses of teachers.

The purpose of this legislation is to correct an inequitable situation arising from existing regulations of the Internal Revenue Service. Under these regulations, a teacher can deduct educational expenses only if the additional education is necessary for him to maintain his current position. Teachers who return to college to become better qualified teachers cannot deduct their educational expenses. If, however, his supervisor threatens him with loss of certification unless he returns to college, he can then deduct these same expenses. Initiative for self-improvement and advancement of skills is thus stifled, whereas the teacher who returns to college only under the threat of losing his job may deduct his expenses. Thus lethargy receives a tax benefit while initiative is penalized.

I propose to correct this confusing situation by providing that deductions by teachers for educational expenses be based directly on the Internal Revenue Code. Accordingly, my bill defines deductible education expenses as first, tuition and fees; second, directly related travel expenses; and third, up to $100 annually for books and related materials. Such deductions could be claimed by full-time or part-time teachers who undertake academic training in accredited institutions of higher learning.

Teachers would benefit from my bill in three ways:

First, they would be encouraged to upgrade their skills voluntarily and thereby advance themselves in their profession by making it easier for them to acquire the necessary additional academic training.

Second, graduate students working as part-time teachers of undergraduate courses would benefit from the extension of the allowance of deduction to part-time teachers.

Third, allowance of a deduction for travel necessary in connection with a course of study or work on an academic degree would help the teacher working on a thesis or dissertation which requires experimentation and field research away from the school.

I believe that this bill can make a significant contribution toward the promotion of excellence in education by upgrading the skills of our school system's most important component, its teachers.

Mr. President, I urge its early consideration.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2311) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for deduction of certain education expenses of teachers introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

THE JUNK AUTO AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 359

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, today I am resubmitting my proposal to get rid of those unsightly automobile graveyards which are littered across our country.

The Senate approved an amendment I offered to the excise tax reduction bill which would have diverted 1 percent of the tax on new cars into a special fund to be used for disposing of junked autos. The House bill would have eliminated the entire tax by 1969. When the bill went to conference we did manage to save the 1-percent tax, but the language authorizing the use of the revenues to dispose of junk autos was stricken from the bill. So although we have the revenues, they go into the general fund where they can be used for any purpose whatsoever. As King Pyrrhus sadly observed after his costly defeat of the Roman army at Asculum in 279 B.C., "One more such victory over the Romans and we are utterly undone."

Apparently the House managers felt that the excise tax bill was not a proper vehicle for enacting a new program into law. The claim was made that the proposal should have been considered instead by the Public Works Committees.

I believe our action was proper but since we did not prevail I am willing to follow the procedure suggested by our learned colleagues in the other body. I therefore send to the desk the same proposal in the form of an amendment to the administration's highway beautification bill which has been referred to the Committee on Public Works. I ask that this amendment be printed and I am hopeful that it will be considered by the Committee on Public Works along with the President's recommendations on highway beautification.

BACKGROUND TO THE JUNK CAR PROBLEM

For those who are interested in the background to the junk auto problem, let me refer them to a speech I made which appears on page 11338 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 24 and a fact sheet on page 13638 of the RECORD for June 15.

In brief, the basic problem of how to dispose of junked automobiles is economic. A few years ago, most junked cars were processed into scrap and used by the steel mills in making new steel. However, the supply of junked cars is rapidly increasing, and due to technological developments in the steel industry, the demand for scrap steel made from old cars is decreasing. As a result, the price of scrap has fallen and does not always cover the cost of converting an old car into usable steel scrap. It is often cheaper to let an old auto rust away on a junk heap. It is also frequently cheaper to leave a brokendown wreck upon a highway or street than it is to tow it to a junkyard. Each year our cities are forced to cart away thousands of abandoned cars—some as many as 25,000.

There are about 15,000 auto junkyards scattered across the country, and estimates of the number of junked cars range from 10 to 40 million. Whatever the precise number, it is clear that each year the number of junk cars increases.

In addition to their inherent ugliness, junked autos also represent a waste of natural resources. Every ton of scrap used in making new steel saves 3 tons of valuable raw materials such as iron ore, coke, and limestone.

WHAT THE JUNK AUTO AMENDMENT WOULD DO

The amendment I have submitted would do two things:

First, it would authorize a program for disposing of junk cars. Some of the ways this may be done include direct subsidy payments to facilitate the processing of old cars into usable scrap, price supports to create a better market for scrap made from junk cars, grants to States which have developed their own program of junk auto disposal, and research into better processing methods and alternative uses of scrap.

The amendment establishes an appropriation ceiling of $25 million during the first year in order to provide experience for a full-scale program. In subsequent years the bill would authorize whatever funds were necessary to carry out the purposes of the act.

Second, the amendment would establish a special Automotive User Fund in the Treasury into which the revenues from the existing 1-percent excise tax on autos would be deposited. This fund would be available to finance the cost of the junk car disposal program as well as other programs associated with the use of autos which the Congress may, from time to time, designate. It may very well be that the entire 1-percent tax will not be needed for disposing of old cars and Congress may wish to designate other programs to be financed from the fund. In any event, all funds not appropriated will ultimately be transferred to the general fund.

Mr. President, I first made this proposal nearly 2 months ago. Since that time it has gathered a large amount of support including that of the White House Conference on Natural Beauty, the Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel, the United Auto Workers, the U.S. conference of mayors, and many others. Many mayors and Governors have written expressing their support. The administration endorsed the provision when it was part of the Senate passed excise bill, and when President Johnson signed the bill he said he hoped some of the revenues from the 1-percent auto excise tax could be used for getting rid of auto graveyards.

Mr. President, I cannot think of a single action which would beautify America more than getting rid of our unsightly scrap heaps of junked automobiles. Every year, millions of old wrecks are tossed upon the junk pile and if we continue this indiscriminate waste of resources, we will soon run out of space. Why not solve the problem now before it escalates into a crisis. Let us get rid of these rusting auto corpses that are a disgrace to America. Let us make our country a more beautiful place in which to live.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this amendment be printed in the Record following my remarks, together with several letters I have received from State and local officials.

Additional letters in support of this proposal may be found on pages 13463–13465, and 13638 of the Congressional Record.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendments and letters will be printed in the Record.

The amendments (No. 359) were referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

On page 9, after line 3, add the following new title:

"TITLE V

"Short title

"Sec. 501. This title may be cited as the 'Junked Auto Disposal Act of 1965'.

"Disposal of junked automobiles

"Sec. 502. (a) When duly appropriated therefor, moneys covered into the fund established under section 503 of this title shall be available for expenditure by the President for carrying out a program to alleviate the blight caused by the ever-increasing number of aged or wrecked motor vehicles which have been abandoned or relegated to scrap or salvage. In pursuance of such program, the President may make payments to individuals, to corporations or other business entities, and to public bodies or instrumentalities to carry out approved programs for the alleviation of such blight. In carrying out the authority conferred upon him by this subsection, the President—

"(1) shall take into consideration the effect of any action taken pursuant to such program on the market for iron and steel scrap;

"(2) may prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section; and

"(3) may delegate any power or authority conferred upon him by this section to one or more officers or agencies of the Government.

"(b) The authority conferred upon the President by this section shall include the following:

"(1) to make payments to individuals, corporations or other business entities, upon application therefor, pursuant to such regulations as he may prescribe, to develop and facilitate the processing of old and wrecked automobiles into usable scrap for the making of steel;

"(2) to increase the market for iron and steel scrap by initiating a program for the purchase, storage, and resale of the usable scrap processed from old and wrecked automobiles upon such terms and conditions, including resale at a loss, as the President determines will carry out the purposes of this section;

"(3) to initiate and conduct research and development programs for improved processing techniques for such scrap, and for alternative uses of such scrap: *Provided*, That not to exceed 5 per centum of the moneys appropriated pursuant to this section may be expended for such research and development projects; and

"(4) to make grants to any State or locality, upon application therefor, for the payment of part of the cost of practical programs for the disposal of old or wrecked automobiles if he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

"(A) the program will initiate a feasible and economic method for such automobile disposal or significantly expand and improve such a program already in existence;

"(B) the program will include adequate provisions for the screening or the relocation of automobile junkyards located along non-Federally aided highways;

"(C) the program will provide adequate public supervision of such program submitted; and

"(D) the program will provide such fiscal control and accounting procedures as he deems necessary.

"(5) The grants made under paragraph (4) above shall be subject to the following conditions:

"(A) Distribution of assistance among the several States shall be as equitable as practical;

"(B) No payments made shall exceed 90 per centum of the cost of such program; and

"(C) The term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"Establishment of automotive user fund

"Sec. 503. (a) In order to finance programs associated with the use of automobiles including the disposition of aged or wrecked motor vehicles as specified in section 502 of this title, there is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States an Automotive User Fund (hereinafter referred to as the 'Fund'), into which shall be covered for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1965, amounts equivalent to so much of the taxes received by the Treasury after such date under section 4061(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on passenger automobiles and trailers) as is attributable to so much of the tax imposed on articles taxable under such section as does not exceed a rate of one per centum. For purposes of the preceding sentence, amounts received during the fiscal year ending on June 30, 1966, shall be taken into account only to the extent attributable to liability incurred after June 30, 1965.

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time transfer from such Fund to the general funds of the Treasury amounts equal to the amounts of credits or refunds (or the proper portion thereof) of the taxes under such section 4061(a)(2) allowed or paid under such Code.

"Appropriations

"Sec. 504. (a) Moneys covered into the Fund shall be available for expenditure for carrying out the provisions of section 502 (and for other programs relating to the use of automobiles which Congress may, from time to time designate) only when appropriated therefor. Such appropriations may be made without fiscal year limitation. Moneys covered into this Fund not subsequently appropriated by the Congress within two fiscal years following the fiscal year in which such moneys had been credited to the Fund, shall be transferred to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from such Fund such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of section 502 of this title: *Provided*, That appropriations for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965 shall not exceed $25,000,000.

"Reports

"Sec. 505. The President shall prepare and submit to the Congress at least once in each fiscal year a comprehensive and detailed report on the administration of this title.

"Effective date

"Sec. 506. This title shall take effect on July 1, 1965."

On page 1, line 4, strike out "That section" and insert in lieu thereof "Section 101. Section".

On page 4, line 20, strike out "That chapter" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 201. Chapter".

On page 6, line 20, strike out "Sec. 2." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 202."

On page 7, line 2, strike out "That section" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 301. Section".

On page 7, line 21, strike out "Sec. 2." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 302.".

On page 8, line 5, strike out "Sec. 3." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 303.".

On page 8, line 14, strike out "That section" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 401. Section".

The letters presented by Mr. Douglas are as follows:

City of Albuquerque,
Albuquerque, N. Mex., July 2, 1965.

The Honorable Paul H. Douglas,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Douglas: Thank you for your letter of June 4 and the enclosed material in regard to the problem of disposing of junked automobiles. We certainly agree with your idea of saving a portion of the existing excise tax on automobiles to help eliminate unsightly auto junkpiles.

We are concerned not only with the unsightly auto salvage yards but are also trying to prevent the open-fire burning of these car bodies which contributes to the air pollution problem in our area. It is our understanding that the scrap metal dealers will not accept a car body unless it is free of all contamination such as upholstery, wood and asphaltic material. Consequently, the most practical solution for the salvage yards is to burn these car bodies prior to delivery to the scrap metal dealers.

We would like to suggest the possibility of using a portion of this special fund to assist a city in constructing and operating an auto-body incinerator. These junked car bodies could be collected by the city or delivered by the salvage yards to a conveniently located incinerator. Such an auto-body incinerator might consist of a crane, hammermill, natural gas-fired cylindrical furnace and a final quencher. Auto bodies from which engine blocks, camshafts, glass, fiber, wood, etc., have been removed are sent into a crusher then to the mill which shreds the metal and then into the furnace. Essentially all of the wood, fiber and other residual organics would be burned off leaving pieces of metal varying in size and weighing 1 to 2 pounds. An operation such as this would reduce very substantially air pollution emissions as compared to the present practice of the open-fire burning of car bodies. An alternate method or process might be to burn several whole auto bodies simultaneously and then bale or press this body tin into compact cubes. We estimate that there are approximately 40 auto salvage yards in our metropolitan area with an average size of about 2 acres per yard. The present inventory of wrecked vehicles in our junk yards is approximately 10,000 and we estimate that 30,000 car bodies are junked in our metropolitan area per year. The estimated cost for the construction of an approved auto-body incinerator to process the car bodies for a metropolitan area of our size would vary from $50,000 to $100,000. We might also mention that some of these salvage yards contain not only junked car bodies but also discarded hot water heaters, washing machines, refrigerators, etc.

We are very much interested in your idea of eliminating unsightly auto junkpiles and certainly hope for the successful passage of your bill.

Very truly yours,

ARCHIE WESTFALL,
Chairman, Albuquerque City Commission.

EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH,
Baton Rouge, La., June 18, 1965.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senator, Vice Chairman, Joint Economic Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOUGLAS: Your letter of June 4, 1965, addressed to Mayor-President Woodrow W. Dumas, and having reference to a bill which you have introduced designed to deal with the junk automobile problem, has been referred to this office for consideration and reply.

There is no question but that the junk automobile problem is one which requires immediate and serious attention, and we share with you your concern in developing a solution to it. In the Baton Rouge area we have attempted through the use of zoning regulations to restrict the junk automobile business to limited areas of the community, and have further provided regulations designed to improve the appearance of these businesses, even where permitted. However, the policing of these regulations is most difficult, and we have not obtained satisfactory results from our efforts.

We believe, therefore, as do you, that the disposition of junk automobiles can only be handled under a national policy which includes a means of disposing of these automobiles without depending upon the scrap demand to do so. Such a plan as yours would permit this, and we hope that your proposal, or some modification of it, will receive favorable consideration at an early date.

Very truly yours,

R. GORDON KEAN, Jr.,
Parish Attorney.

CITY OF CHICAGO,
June 16, 1965.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senator, Joint Economic Committee, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PAUL: This is the first opportunity I have had to acknowledge your letter of June 4 and to thank you for sending on a copy of the bill you introduced which could bring about a great forward step in solving the national problem of automobile junkpiles.

I think this legislation is good and could achieve positive results in eliminating the junkpiles and unsightly conditions which I have long been trying to eradicate in the city of Chicago.

Commissioner Smith of the building department, has some statistical information, such as you requested, and I have asked him to send it on to you.

Regards and good wishes.

Sincerely,

RICHARD J. DALEY,
Mayor.

CITY OF CLEVELAND, *July 7, 1965.*

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Your efforts toward the elimination of the "junk car" nuisance are commendable and have my full support. These derelict autos are an eyesore, a hazard, and a blight upon our Nation. They are a real headache for the police, other motorists, and even pedestrians, since they are hiding spots for street thugs and purse snatchers.

We have given this problem serious attention through our police tow truck division. Since January 1, 1964, our police have removed 8,300 junk or abandoned cars from our streets. Owners have reclaimed about 1,300 of these vehicles, and the rest have been sold to junk operators on condition that these cars be junked, baled, and sold as scrap metal only. They are not to be resold for use on city streets or to stand idle in the junkyards.

If the police first can find the owner, he is fined and made to haul the car away at his own expense. Most abandoned cars, however, cannot be traced, forcing the police to haul them away to a nearby lot. These lots, in turn, become cluttered with cars and create another community eyesore and hazard. Towing these cars off the streets is only one step in the elimination of these eyesores. It seems to me that the auto manufacturers, who turn out millions of these cars yearly, must concern themselves directly with this problem. They make these cars; certainly they can help in a program of reclamation or reprocessing them when they are of no further use.

We will be happy to assist you in any way possible in the passage of your bill aimed at eliminating this national nuisance.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

RALPH S. LOCHER,
Mayor.

CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER,
Denver, Colo., June 17, 1965.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Congress of the United States,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Thank you for your recent letter concerning the bill you are introducing in the U.S. Senate which would reserve a portion of the existing excise tax on automobiles for disposal of autos when they are junked. Denver, like all other heavily populated areas, has a junk automobile disposal problem.

We are able to get the majority of junk cars in the city and county of Denver removed from streets, alleys, or land owned by a governmental agency. There are many problems involved in getting them removed from private property. However, all junkers still wind up in a junkyard and create an esthetic problem, since there is no practical method of disposing of them.

Presently, our Intercounty Regional Planning Commission is making a detailed and analytical study of the volume of junk cars, how they are disposed of, new methods of disposal, etc. This committee has just had two meetings and has no completed reports as yet. We have representatives on this committee, as do all the surrounding counties. Health and air pollution agencies, city managers, trash and garbage collection personnel, automobile junkyard dealers, also have representation. I will be most happy to forward reports of this committee to you.

It is possible that the price of scrap metal may go up to the point that junk car dealers can economically afford to process a junk car and sell the body for a reasonable price. This seems to be one of the prime reasons for the huge stockpiling now going on. Either a price rise or a revolutionary cheap way to dispose of junk car bodies is needed to eliminate the problem.

We heartily agree with you that these junk car graveyards are eyesores and are a national problem. Perhaps we can do something about getting the areas fenced within the city and county of Denver, so that they are not so obvious.

Sincerely yours,

TOM CURRIGAN,
Mayor.

ERIE, PA.,
June 14, 1965.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Congress of the United States,
Joint Economic Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: I appreciate your thoughtfulness in sending me the substance of your bill which will help us get rid of the auto junkpiles. The situation in the vicinity of Erie is very likely about the same as it is in any urban area of approximately 200,000 population and we, unfortunately, have done very little about the problem. We are contemplating some local legislation which may alleviate the problem in the city of Erie, but would be very grateful for any aid which would be provided by Federal legislation and action.

Sincerely,

CHARLES B. WILLIAMSON,
Mayor.

FRESNO, CALIF.,
June 25, 1965.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: I was very much interested to receive your recent letter enclosing a copy of the bill which would help finance the elimination of unsightly automobile junkyards.

You may be interested to know that in the Fresno metropolitan area there are some 60 auto wrecking operations. This is one wrecking yard for each 5,000 population. As the city expands into the areas where the auto wrecking yards exist on the fringes, the adverse effect on the city increases.

I hope these comments are of some use to you. Please be assured that I support your objective very strongly.

Sincerely,

FLOYD H. HYDE,
Mayor.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
June 17, 1965.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Vice Chairman, Senate Joint Economic Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: This is in reply to your letter of June 4, 1965, addressed to Mayor Neal S. Blaisdell and relating to the problem of providing for the orderly disposal of derelict automobiles.

Senate bill 2019 could possibly provide the necessary financing so much needed for the disposal of junked automobiles by hundreds of communities in the United States. In fact, a local tax on automobiles upon first registration has been suggested but not as yet presented to the State legislature in the form of a bill.

The problem in this city and county is similar to that being experienced by all communities in our country. We are extremely aware of esthetic values in Hawaii and have been carrying on a continuous beautification program for years. For example, billboards and oversized and obnoxious commercial signs are prohibited or ruled out by popular opinion. However, it is incongruous but a fact nevertheless, that automobile "graveyards" are located off the main highway to Honolulu International Airport and at otherwise scenic areas along the highway around the island.

In 1964 registered cars in the city and county totaled 215,000. Transfers of ownership totaled 105,000 and new cars registered for the first time numbered 20,888. It is estimated that as many as 8,000 vehicles may be abandoned and junked annually on this island (Oahu). The police department is preparing to auction approximately 100 cars towed in off the highways and if they cannot be sold they will be disposed of by the refuse division. A report dated June 3, 1965, shows that 48 derelict cars were removed by the police from the highways and 19 from private property in a period of 3 weeks. For the first 5 days of June, 10 derelict cars were hauled away by the police.

Local dealers sell scrapped and baled automobiles to the local steel mill, or ship the scrap to the mainland or Japan. Disposal depends a great deal on the price of steel. The situation here is complicated because burning is generally prohibited to prevent air pollution. The cost of an incinerator meeting fire department standards is very high and none for the purpose of processing scrapped automobiles has been purchased by any of the local salvage concerns.

We are currently making a complete review of our situation with plans to eliminate all junkyards from the proximity of principal highways and to provide for the orderly and continuous disposal of derelict vehicles to prevent any future unsightly accumulation of said material.

We are 100 percent behind the national beautification program.

Sincerely,

Robert F. Ellis,
Acting Mayor.

City of Houston, Tex.,
June 16, 1965.

Hon. Paul H. Douglas,
U.S. Senator, Illinois,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Douglas: Mayor Louie Welch is on vacation and he has asked me to reply to your letter of June 4, 1965, regarding auto junkyards.

The city of Houston, as you perhaps know, has no zoning laws and there are no citywide regulations governing the operation of auto junkyards in the city; therefore there are no reliable statistics available as to how many there are within the city limits. From observation, however, it appears that most of the larger junkyards operate outside the city limits for the reason that most of them make a practice of burning autos and this is forbidden within the city limits.

The mayor agrees with you that junkyards are unsightly and mar the beauty of the landscape in many areas. He is always in favor of legislation that will encourage natural beauty. Your bill has a laudable purpose, and there does not appear to be any reason why it will not work. However, the mayor believes that we must keep in mind that the scrap metal industry and the auto parts industry fulfill a vital role in our economy and their rights must be considered in legislation adopted in this field. Your bill will appear to make provision for the protection of these industries and would likewise appear to provide for local control of this problem. That being true, the mayor is in favor of the legislation as it is presently drafted.

Very truly yours,

Bud Hadfield,
Executive Assistant to the Mayor.

City of Louisville, Ky.,
June 22, 1965.

Senator Paul H. Douglas,
Vice Chairman, Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Douglas: I think your bill concerning junkyards would be helpful in many ways to improve the appearance of our countryside. However, Louisville does not have a particular problem in this regard. There are 23 such businesses in this city, located in places where they do not create a blemish or unsightly scene. According to our police department, the owners of these establishments are most cooperative in that they submit a record on every wrecked car purchased. The police also feel that it is an advantage to have them purchase many automobiles which might otherwise be abandoned on the street.

I hope this bit of information is of some help to you.

Sincerely,

William O. Cowger,
Mayor.

Milwaukee, Wis.,
June 25, 1965.

Hon. Paul H. Douglas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Douglas: Thank you very much for your letter of June 4, 1965, and the attached bill, S. 2019, which would divert a portion of the existing excise tax on automobiles into a special fund to help get rid of the growing number of unsightly auto junkpiles scattered across our country.

May I say first that I categorically and wholly support the objectives embodied in President Johnson's urban and rural beautification programs of which your proposal seems to be a necessary extension.

Here in Milwaukee the problem of junkyards is probably not as severe as in many other places. This unquestionably is attributable to the effectiveness of our zoning ordinance which severely restricts and, in some cases, prohibits the establishment of junkyards for the storage, sale, handling, baling, reclaiming, remaking of scrap iron or other materials, bottles, rags, rubber or other secondhand materials, or the dismantling of motor vehicles and the storage of used motor vehicle parts. Wherever such uses are permitted, it is required that they be completely enclosed and obstructed from view by means of an approved opaque fence at least 8 feet in height.

Our department of city development informs me that in the city of Milwaukee proper there are 46 junk or salvage yards covering a total area of approximately 70 acres. In addition, there are eight automobile salvage yards with a total area of 6.4 acres. Four junkyards covering less than one-half acre are operating as nonconforming uses because they were established prior to zoning controls. Thus, the junk and salvage problem in Milwaukee is reasonably well regulated. But while I do not have any statistics to give you, inspection reveals that in the suburbs and nearby rural areas the problem is not being dealt with nearly as effectively.

The remedy seems to be in two directions.

The first is to require complete and effective screening of all junk and salvage yards to neutralize visual offensiveness.

Secondly, an approach such as you are suggesting in your bill, S. 2019, appears timely and relevant.

In the implementation of such legislation it might be useful to consider municipally operated incinerators which, to use your own terminology, would have an appetite not only for metal but also for glass, plastic, and other impurities which need to be cremated.

Many communities are finding it an increasingly difficult problem to dispose of domestic waste and are, therefore, engaged in construction of new public incineration facilities. Milwaukee is in this position and expects to very substantially increase incineration. It might be possible to design these new incinerators to accept industrial junk, including old cars, provided the city could be reimbursed, financially, for providing such services.

At any rate, the problem is a serious one and the solutions are not easy. Bill S. 2019 takes a long step in the right direction. I am heartily in favor of it and equally interested in its effective implementation.

Sincerely yours,

Henry W. Maier,
Mayor.

Nashville, Tenn.,
June 21, 1965.

Hon. Paul H. Douglas,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: After receiving your letter of June 4 relative to junk automobiles, I called upon my Department of Codes Administration to give me the information called for in your letter. I am enclosing herewith a copy of their report to me and we will be glad to give any further details you think desirable.

We appreciate your efforts in behalf of our communities and we will follow up anything that we might do to assist you.

With best wishes, I am

Most sincerely,

Beverly Briley,
Mayor.

Memorandum

June 10, 1965.

To: Mayor Beverly Briley.
From: Department of Codes Administration.
Subject: Junked Automobile Graveyards.

In January of 1959, the zoning regulations of Davidson County were amended to prohibit automobile junkyards from being located within 500 feet of any public road, park, school, church, hospital, etc., within the unclassified areas of Davidson County, at which time a survey was made of all the junkyards within the county, which is now the general services area. Thirty-six junkyards were found at different locations, consisting of several thousand junked automobiles, comprising a total of 169 acres that were committed for such a use, all of which exist at the present time, with several thousand additional junked automobiles having been added to these yards since that time.

Within the urban services district there now exist six large automobile junkyards, consisting of several thousand junked automobiles.

From January 1, 1964, through May 31, 1965, the department has written 472 zoning violation letters to various property owners pertaining to the storage of junked and abandoned automobiles that were stored in the backyards of homes on private property, involving some 2,184 junked and abandoned automobiles. Of the number of letters written during this period, all but 25 have complied with the zoning regulations.

In making the investigations of these violations, it was found that in the majority of the cases the owners of the old cars stated that the junkyards did not want them and, in most cases, when they did take the old cars the owners would have to pay the junkyards to come and get them as most of the cars had already been stripped of their usable parts. The owners of junkyards claim if the old cars do not have usable parts it costs them more to process the old cars than they realize from the sale of the metal. We often found 1 to 10 such old cars in many of the backyards.

As you probably know, the demand for used automobile parts in the past and at the present time is great, and is a big business within this area and bordering States. We think that there should be a place provided for legitimate junkyards within our community. With proper control and supervision and properly located, they would not be too undesirable to other uses within the area.

We think that Mr. Douglas' bill is a good bill and hope that it becomes law, and, if such a bill becomes law, we think that most of the existing junkyards can be eliminated, along with the elimination of zoning violations on backyard storage of junked and wrecked automobiles on private property.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.,
June 14, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Your proposal to create an automobile burial and beautification fund is a constructive new idea to solve a growing national problem. At present, municipalities—indeed, entire metropolitan areas—can only protect themselves against the worst nuisances of junkyards, without making any genuine progress in solving the problem.

Automobile junkyards are also a serious blight on our national beauty, as you are well aware. Their impact on the view from interstate highways is every bit as serious as the impact of billboards, as we in New Haven can testify from experience.

My administration has worked primarily to prevent junkyards from blighting residential neighborhoods. Zoning changes enacted in 1958 and 1963 prohibit the operation of junkyards in any but heavy industrial zones. By the end of this year all such businesses will be removed from residential areas, where they contribute to rapid deterioration and decline of neighborhoods.

There are about 50 junkyards in New Haven, slightly fewer than in 1960. Aside from the overall unsightliness, the two biggest problems that auto junkyards cause are air pollution from the burning of car bodies and mosquito breeding in stagnant water. We require that these operations be enclosed by a solid fence, at least 8 feet high or as high as the highest pile of material. The city of New Haven, as part of its open spaces and beautification program, is using the licensing and regulatory powers of the city to screen junkyards from highways.

Your bill would be an important tool in the control of junkyards, and I hope it receives favorable attention from other Members in the Congress. If there is anything I can do to aid in its passage, please feel free to call on me.

My very best wishes.

Sincerely,

RICHARD C. LEE,
Mayor.

OKLAHOMA CITY,
July 7, 1965.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Vice Chairman, Joint Economic Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Mayor George H. Shirk referred your letter to me concerning your bill on wrecking yards. We in Oklahoma City realize what a problem salvage yards are, and we realize how hard it is to try to improve them once they are allowed to start operations.

Unfortunately, most of these wrecking and junkyards are located where they can be seen from State and Federal highways and other major entrances to our city. In Oklahoma City we have, at the present time, 30 auto salvage yards in addition to 11 operations that could, at best, be considered as junkyards. Of the 30 auto salvage yards, only 2 could be considered of good appearance, and 3 of fair appearance. The other 25 have received a rating of poor by our staff. Of the junkyards, one is considered good, one fair, and the other nine poor.

In order that you might inform your colleagues in the U.S. Congress of this situation in Oklahoma City, we have prepared a map of the locations of these auto salvage yards and junkyards. This map, which is enclosed, shows quite clearly that most of these operations are located very close to Interstate Highways. On the map we have also noted numbers which refer to the enclosed photographs of some of these operations.

We hope that this information will be helpful to you in winning support in Congress for your much needed legislation. If you desire further information, please contact either myself or Mr. Ray Patton, our planning director.

Sincerely,

JOHN FRANK MARTIN,
Chairman, Oklahoma City Planning Commission.

OKLAHOMA CITY,
June 10, 1965.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: It was very good of you to write me your letter of June 4; and I was very glad to hear of S. 2019.

As in other urban communities, particularly with the advent of the crosstown expressways and other 90–10 urban roads, undoubtedly automobile graveyards have become more and more of a problem.

Our present zoning ordinances require screening but unfortunately the major offenders were in business prior to the ordinance and thus constitute nonconforming use.

I am turning your letter to the chairman of our planning commission; and I am sure he will write to you further.

Sincerely,

GEORGE H. SHIRK,
Mayor.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
July 12, 1965.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senator From Illinois,
Old U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: It was nice to hear from you again when I received your recent letter, relative to your suggested bill in the U.S. Senate, which would earmark a portion of the existing excise tax on automobiles for the disposal of wornout automobiles. Such a suggestion for meeting this critical problem that is plaguing, not only major cities across the United States, but smaller cities in rural areas, has a great deal of merit. Certainly, as one mayor of a major city, I wholeheartedly support your proposal, and will forward copies of this communication to you to Senator NEUBERGER, Senator MORSE and our congressional delegation in the House.

At the recent meeting of the U.S. conference of mayors held in St. Louis the last of May and the first part of June, the subject of disposal of solid wastes and more particularly scrap metal was one of the major subjects of discussion. Speakers participated from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as well as the Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel. Of course, the most critical problem facing all of the cities was the disposal of discarded automobiles.

I submitted a copy of your bill, together with your remarks on this subject to our city planning commission for their study and comments. A copy of their report is attached hereto, for your information and file.

The city of Portland, being a major seaport, does ship a good deal of scrap metal to Japan; however, local scrap iron dealers and processors are now having a great deal of problems processing automobiles for such compacting and shipment because of our air quality control act which prevents burning the old car bodies out as was formerly practiced. To remove the upholstery, glass, and other undesirable items, including wiring, by hand is an extremely expensive process. Consequently, the population of abandoned automobiles has rapidly increased in our entire metropolitan area. At St. Louis, the Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel showed films of newer processes whereby through a grinding process and a recovery through magnets, the usable scrap steel was separated from the waste. The steel was then placed in cars for delivery to domestic steel mills and/or compacted for overseas shipment. The process was quite intriguing but the capital investment is apparently so large that few scrap dealers in their present conditions can afford these installations. It is entirely possible that some thought should be given for providing out of the excise tax that you propose to earmark, a means of partially helping to subsidize such installations on a regional basis. It would then be possible to possibly ship autos from a considerable area to such a processing plant.

Apparently, one of the problems facing the scrap industry is the one that you pointed out in one of your comments in the Senate, whereby the domestic mills are using less scrap metal in the construction of steel. If means can be devised of encouraging domestic steel mills to use a larger quantity of scrap metal in their production, this would not only serve a useful purpose of creating an additional demand, but would tend to conserve our supply of raw domestic ore for the use of future generations.

During the past week, I toured much of the eastern part of this beautiful State. Most of my time was spent in the Second District of this State, which is represented by Congressman AL ULLMAN, who I am sure you have worked closely with for the last several years. It was most discouraging to note in and about many of the cities that I visited large numbers of discarded and scrapped automobiles. It was additionally disheartening to note the number of these abandoned vehicles in some of our rural areas, along some of our beautiful streams, and on some of our smaller farms. Certainly, these abandoned vehicles are offensive to those who love the beautiful scenery of our mountains, parks, and countryside. An answer to this problem must be found.

Here in the city of Portland we have a backlog of some 300 or 400 abandoned vehicles on our streets and on private property. We are removing them as rapidly as possible, but our storage facilities and our disposal facilities for most of these are limited and operating to full capacity.

I am happy that the President is concerned about this problem and is encouraging Congress to take steps to meet the problem. Certainly, as one local public official, I commend you for taking the leadership in seeking such a solution. I am forwarding a copy of this letter to you to Mr. John Gunther, executive director of the U.S. conference of mayors, for his information and file.

It was good to hear from you again, and I trust that you will soon be visiting us here in the city of Portland and the State of Oregon.

Best regards.

Yours truly,

TERRY D. SCHRUNK,
Mayor.

CITY OF PROVIDENCE,
June 22, 1965.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Congress of the United States,
Joint Economic Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: I support enthusiastically the principle underlying S. 2019. In our city of Providence we are painfully aware of the ever-increasing problem occasioned by junk automobiles. Not more than 1 month ago I indicated an interest in beginning a new program which would authorize the city to remove abandoned vehicles from both private and public property. I am happy to inform you that our program officially began yesterday with the removal of the first junked automobile.

I cannot say, at this time, whether payment incentives or support loans and grants are necessary. I hope for the present to be able to rid our city of this condition through the combined effort of the government and the people of our city. I can appreciate that it may become impossible for local scrap dealers to store junked vehicles in any quantity and that a proposal, like that suggested by you, may become necessary. For the present, however, I would like to reserve my decision until we have had greater experience in this area.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.,
Mayor of Providence.

SANTA FE, N. MEX.,
June 22, 1965.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: I am in the process of appointing a committee which will be statewide in nature and will be concerned with the kind of thing you refer to in your recent letter.

I regretted to see that your suggestion for retaining a portion of the excise tax on automobiles for their eventual disposal failed to pass Congress. Hopefully there are other alternatives to the problem that will be more favorably received by Congress.

Please keep me informed on your progress in this field.

I have asked the New Mexico Auto Wreckers Association for an estimate on the number of junked autos in the State but as of the moment have had no response. Consequently, I am late in responding to your earlier letter.

Best regards.

Sincerely,

JACK M. CAMPBELL,
Governor.

CITY OF SEATTLE,
June 8, 1965.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: This will acknowledge your letter of June 4, together with the enclosure of Senate bill 2019 and your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning this bill. Your courtesy in sending this material to me is much appreciated, since we of course are all vitally interested in the problem you raise.

Being a little farther away from the more congested areas of the country, the full impact of this problem may not be quite as apparent here as it is in some other parts of the country. Up to this point, most of the old automobiles have been utilized for junking in the production of scrap metal for the steel mills of this area.

At the present time the principal problem involved is how to economically reduce these old automobiles to usable metal, without doing violence to the efforts under various air pollution control programs to maintain clean air.

We have had a number of meetings here in Seattle with the producers of scrap metal of this type to see what can be done to develop a system whereby they can continue to supply the raw material to the mill without going through the process of burning, which seems to be the most economical one but which is becoming totally unacceptable from the concept of air pollution.

I am wondering whether the proceeds of the portion of the automobile excise tax which might be retained under your bill could be used in some manner to subsidize the very expensive installations necessary for pollution-free burning, shredding, or otherwise preparing these automobiles. If this were the case, I believe that at least here in this area, and for the foreseeable future, the old automobiles can find their way back into industry as a usable product. However, as clearly stated in your remarks, it is quite apparent that the reduction of these old vehicles by current methods (particularly if it's necessary to apply the costly technical procedures to eliminate air pollution) make the operation totally uneconomic.

Just offhand, it would appear to me that your bill and your efforts merit support from local officials. However, it would be helpful if we knew a little more specifically how the funds made available would be used to actually meet the problems inherent to the disposal of the old cars.

Anything that you can give me along this line will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

J. D. BRAMAN,
Mayor.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.,
June 25, 1965.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Thank you very much for your letter and informative material on your proposed bill to extend the auto excise tax for the purpose of providing for the disposal of junkyard automobiles.

In the city of Springfield, the matter of junkyards is handled in our zoning ordinance with provisions for fencing in of junkyards. Abandoned automobiles on private property are assessed by the tax assessors as personal property, and those which are deemed a menace to public health and safety are towed from the streets under orders from the local health department.

We, unfortunately, cannot present any statistical information on the problem at this time. We do consider your proposal to be a worthwhile one and wish for its success.

Sincerely,

CHARLES V. RYAN, Jr.,
Mayor.

TACOMA, WASH.,
June 28, 1965.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Vice Chairman, Joint Economic Committee,
Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: I am replying to the letter which you mailed to Mayor Harold Tollefson earlier in the month concerning ways and means to eliminate unsightly auto junkpiles scattered across the United States. Incidentally, I am particularly pleased to transmit my views to you on this subject since I was one of your former students at the University of Chicago, having received my master's degree in political science and public administration in 1940.

Senate bill 2019, in my opinion, seems to be an excellent start to combat the problem of auto junkpiles, which have been of increasing concern to Tacoma and Pierce County during the last several years. As you have stated, the rapid growth of the total number of automobiles, coupled with a decline in the demand for auto scrap, has posed a serious problem. With junkyard dealers becoming more selective, abandoned autos are "popping up" throughout the community, and many are just left in yards by their owners since they have no way to dispose of them, which certainly causes a blight in the neighborhood. Junkyard dealers within the city cause problems too, since the burning of the junked autos create an air pollution problem.

In Pierce County, in which Tacoma is situated, auto junk piles are almost entirely located in suburban locations. About 40 percent of the existing junkyards are adjacent to Federal or State highways; another 30 percent along county arterials; and the remaining 30 percent in isolated rural locations, which in many cases are becoming suburban residential areas. In 1960, there were approximately 85 such junkyards in the county. At the present there are approximately 112 such operations, which represent an increase of 32 percent since 1960. These yards take up a considerable amount of land area and of course are a great deterrent to surrounding land development.

While there are some technological innovations to be overcome and perhaps further research and development in implementing your proposal, I do think your program is a giant step in the right direction and deserves serious consideration by the Congress. I might suggest you encompass the problems of air pollution and a research program for better auto safety devices as a part of the overall auto excise tax field.

The efforts being made to solve this particularly annoying problem are just one more reason why there should be an even greater degree of coordination and cooperation between the Federal Government and local communities in solving urban problems. At a recent urban seminar which was held in Washington, D.C., I was one of approximately 115 city managers from all over the United States who met with Vice President HUMPHREY and many Federal officials to discuss all aspects of the many urban problems that need to be solved. A joint letter was presented to Vice President HUMPHREY from the presidents of the International City Managers Association, the National League of Cities, and the National Association of Counties suggesting means for identifying and using for urban needs the scientific, technical, and system management capabilities that have been developed in the atomic energy, defense, space, and other programs. The letter to the Vice President cited such examples for using advanced technology to meet urban needs as dealing with problems of waste management, transportation, mental health, opportunities for increasing efficiency, and effectiveness in reducing costs of such activities as providing police and fire protection, reducing environmental pollution, constructing public facilities, and similar activities.

I also want you to know that I deeply appreciated the excellent cooperation which our own two fine Senators from the State of Washington, Senator WARREN MAGNUSON and Senator HENRY JACKSON, have given to legislation which has provided funds to help Tacoma and the other cities in the State of Washington to solve these pressing problems. Congressman FLOYD HICKS, who is the congressional Representative in the district in which Tacoma is located, has also been cognizant of the necessity of providing the cities in these United States with the necessary financial assistance to try to remedy the problems which contribute to urban blight.

I certainly trust that Senate bill 2019 will receive the approval of both Houses of the Congress.

Finally, I hope that I will have the opportunity to meet with you personally on my next visit to Washington, D.C.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID D. ROWLANDS,
City Manager.

TOLEDO, OHIO,
June 18, 1965.

Hon. PAUL DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senator, Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Thank you for your recent letter and copy of your bill which you introduced in the U.S. Senate entitled "Automobile Burial and Beautification Fund."

Toledo, like every other major metropolitan center and even our rural area, is faced with the growing problem of disposing of our old automobiles. I think the principle of your bill is well taken, and I would be pleased to render my support to it. Thank you for advising me of this bill.

We in Toledo who had the pleasure to meet you several years ago also extend our best personal regards.

Very truly yours,

JOHN W. POTTER,
Mayor.

WILMINGTON, DEL.,
June 24, 1965.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Our biggest problem, which only effects the city indirectly, concerns the difficulty our contractor, who tows away illegally parked and abandoned cars, in disposing of the thousands of unclaimed automobiles he has towed from the city streets over the past 7 years. His inability to even break even on the cost of towing, storing, and disposing of these vehicles makes him hesitant to tow more abandoned cars.

Your proposed legislation would, as I understand it, provide funds to compensate such a private contractor for the losses sustained in disposing of these junked cars. This would, as far as we are concerned, serve a twofold purpose. It would provide an incentive for the removal of all junked cars from the contractors property and also make it economical for him to remove every abandoned car from the city streets when requested by the police department.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. BABIARZ,
Mayor.

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO,
June 22, 1965.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: I have perused the copy of your bill and statements made by you relative to the problem of auto junk piles, facing us in this Nation today.

You are to be commended for attempting to do something about a very serious problem which is rapidly growing in size daily.

Perhaps we in the Youngstown area are not as unfortunate as others are in other parts of the country. To a certain extent, our steel mills locally, are able to absorb much of the scrap represented by these wrecked automobiles.

True, when the scrap market is down, a large accumulation of these wrecks does occur and it is true that modern steelmaking methods require the use of less scrap than in years gone by and as a result, although scrap autos do not pose a serious threat to us locally, at present, it is conceivable that in the near future they will pose such a problem.

We have attempted locally, to ask scrap dealers to install high fences of a solid nature so as to close off from view these unsightly junk piles, but compliance is a voluntary matter.

Of late, I have noted that junk piles have been taken to the outskirts of town in rural areas by some scrap dealers. Perhaps this is because of the lack of zoning laws prohibiting same in these areas.

If we were to wait for State laws to solve this problem, I am afraid it would result in only a spotty kind of effectiveness.

Your method is not only worthwhile, but has great validity to it, and I wish to again commend you for attempting to solve a growing national problem.

Very truly yours,

ANTHONY B. FLASK,
Mayor.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Wethersfield, June 16, 1965.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. DOUGLAS: This is in reply to your letter of June 2, 1965, forwarded to me by Gov. John N. Dempsey. The situation in the State of Connecticut, relative to motor vehicle junkyards, is well portrayed in your speech to the Senate on S. 2019. I feel that your legislation is at last a positive step in the right direction toward relieving this difficult situation which confronts every State in this Nation today.

In Connecticut, a situation exists that can only be described as unusual, in that every year the number of active junkyards decreases, even though two or three new licenses to operate motor vehicle junkyards are issued by this department. Statistical figures for the past 5 years are:

Motor vehicle junkyard licenses issued:

1961	210
1962	204
1963	197
1964	199
1965	192

These figures bear testimony to the fallaciousness of the popular belief that the motor vehicle junkyard business is a lucrative one, for if that were so this decrease would not be experienced.

Of the State's currently licensed junkyards, 53 are located on State highways. These locations can best be described as "bulging at the seams," caused by the difficulty and expenses of the operators' attempts to dispose of the stripped carcasses. Each time a licensed location terminates, the remaining yards must absorb the debris from these defunct locations, even though the material received is not wanted and completely unwelcomed.

The motor vehicles department, in the State of Connecticut, also licenses all persons engaged in the business of dealing in and repairing motor vehicles; locations that are vulnerable to the accumulation of unwanted derelicts of the road, through the towing of disabled motor vehicles and through the deliberate abandonment by the owners of vehicles, no longer wanted, that have become too costly to repair; too costly to even own.

Continuous pressure is applied by inspectors of this department to have these vehicles removed to licensed junkyards; to yards whose operators have no apparent desire or room for these vehicles; to yards that at times assess a fee before the vehicle will be received. In the near future we will be faced with the cold fact that there is no place to which these vehicles can be removed that would not have an adverse effect on the esthetic values of other persons' property.

I wish you every success with this legislation and trust that the much needed assistance will be forthcoming in the near future.

Very truly yours,

JOHN J. TYNAN,
Commissioner of Motor Vehicles.

HARTFORD, CONN.,
June 7, 1965.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Thank you very much for your letter of recent date enclosing a copy of your speech before the Senate on S. 2019.

I am asking Motor Vehicles Commissioner John J. Tynan, to whom I am sending a copy of your letter and the enclosure, to write directly to you sending you the information you request.

Sincerely,

JOHN DEMPSEY,
Governor.

HONOLULU,
June 25, 1965.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate, Vice Chairman, Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Thank you for bringing to my attention S. 2019 which you introduced in the U.S. Senate. I have read the bill carefully and have given it much thought. There is much merit in your proposal.

The problem of unsightly auto junk piles and abandoned autos is a concern of all Americans, for the problem is widespread and no American can for long escape its ugliness. Your timely and urgent statements before the U.S. Senate on this matter are most encouraging. I believe all America is awakening to the need for positive action on this national problem. There can be no doubt that the natural beauty of our Nation is at stake.

Here in Hawaii, we are richly endowed with natural beauty of the first order. Of this, we can be justly proud and humbly thankful. But like any modern, mobile community, we have our share of rusting autos that deface the landscape, enrage the observant, and devalue the worth of a very precious heritage.

The auto junk problem in Hawaii is probably not as extensive as the problem faced by many other communities throughout the country. However, with nearly 300,000 registered automobiles in the State, and with a rapidly growing population, the appearance of more and more rusting eyesores is a very real threat to a people so accustomed to a pleasant tropical environment.

What problems we have with auto junks are largely confined to Honolulu and its outskirts on the island of Oahu, for nearly 80 percent of the State's population reside and commute on Oahu. One problem is that our commercial auto wrecking facilities are too small to handle the increasing volume of auto wrecks and junks on a profitable basis. None of the dozen or so auto wreckers in operation has an incinerator large enough to burn the upholstery, glass, and paint before the "tin" can be baled and sold. As a result, most dealers salvage the auto parts and leave the bodies to rust.

We have a fairly large commercial baling facility with the capacity to squash one car a minute but the automatic baler is underfed for the price of a ton of auto scrap allows scarcely enough profit to make it worthwhile for an auto junk dealer to deliver a burned-out auto.

The Hawaiian Western Steel Co. operates an electric arc furnace which melts down 36,000 island autos a year. But according to the company's head melter, the furnace could use all the auto bales and scrap delivered to it. This company turns out 1 percent of the Nation's production of reinforcing steel rods.

Thus, one of the problems is business economics. We have the capacity to bale and melt down auto scraps into useful reinforcing rods but the income after towing, stripping, and burning out the nonmetallic parts of auto junks is scarcely above the cost.

There is also a problem of a legal nature. Our State laws require every auto to be registered. Hence, as long as legal registration is on file, no one can legally dispose of an abandoned junk without showing ownership. While the police are authorized to remove autos abandoned on public property, they are now powerless to touch a junk sitting on private property. These personal collections of private auto junks are doing more harm to the beauty of the island than the commercial yards which are restricted to industrial zones. Much of our problem, therefore, is abandoned cars on private property which have been stripped down until it is no longer profitable to haul them to the scrap market.

Citizen and community response in the State for an immediate attack on this ugly problem has been very inspiring. Our daily newspapers have done much to awaken the people of Hawaii to the encroachment of derelict autos upon their living environment. One photograph of ugliness is indeed worth a thousand adjectives.

The city and county of Honolulu is at this very moment actively carrying out a city beautification program under the leadership of Mayor Neal Blaisdell and with the support of a citizens' action beautification committee. The police department is making a concerted drive to rid Oahu of derelict autos on public and private property. Within a month of this drive more than 100 abandoned autos on public property have been removed. The police are also taking an inventory of abandoned autos on private property; and the corporation counsel of the city and county is working on a method for legally removing abandoned cars from private property. The State attorney general is working closely with him in this area.

It might be of interest to you that the State fish and game division has been experimenting with the use of auto junks to create artificial shoals at sea. Old auto bodies would seem to make fine refuges and breeding sites for fish but the results of this experiment are as yet inconclusive. One problem which would need to be overcome is the cost of hauling the junks out to sea on barges.

In the final analysis, I believe the answer is to direct sufficient resources into the auto junk problem to insure the final disposal of a product which has lost all its usefulness and value to society. The cost of disposing of the mounting number of junks should be borne by every American, for who can say in this day and age that he has not contributed to the problem.

I wish you every success in your endeavor to place S. 2019 into law. I am sure Hawaii's representation in the Senate and House of Representatives will give this proposal serious and favorable consideration.

Warmest regards. May the Almighty be with you and yours always.

Sincerely,

John A. Burns,
Governor.

Topeka, Kans., *July 6, 1965.*

Hon. Paul H. Douglas,
U.S. Senate,
Joint Economic Committee,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Douglas: Last month I received a request from you as to the extent of the automobile junk problem in Kansas. I am enclosing a copy of a letter I have received from the director of highways for Kansas which contains this information.

If I can be of any further assistance to you, please let me know.

Yours very truly,

Wm. H. Avery,
Governor.

Topeka, Kans.,
July 17, 1965.

The Honorable William H. Avery,
Governor of Kansas,
State House, Topeka, Kans.

Dear Governor: This is in reply to your memorandum of June 14, with attached letter from Senator Paul H. Douglas, concerning excise taxes on automobiles and junkyards.

The State Highway Commission of Kansas has been working in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads in making a survey of existing automobile salvage and junkyards on the State highway system and considering plans for possible screening of such installations.

We find that there is a total of 310 such places on the 10,000-mile State highway system. Some of these can be screened for a reasonable expenditure of money, and others cannot. We are planning to do some screening work as funds are available at locations where it appears to be most feasible. The solution suggested in the bill introduced by Senator Douglas might be the ultimate answer.

Sincerely,

Addison H. Meschke,
Director of Highways.

Frankfort, Ky.,
June 15, 1965.

Hon. Paul H. Douglas,
Vice Chairman, Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Douglas: In reply to your request of June 2, 1962, relating to S. 2019, which you introduced in the Senate, I am pleased to inform you that I think this bill is a step in the right direction. Kentucky passed a junkyard law in 1962 which requires a junkyard as defined therein to be screened from the view of motorists using the roads if such junkyard is within 2,000 feet of a county, State, or Federal road. Because of court proceedings, the enforcement of this law was delayed until July 1, 1964, and in the 11 months since that date, 479 permits have been issued after suitable screening has been provided. These permits represent 63 percent of the total of 758 junkyards still coming under the provisions of the law. In addition to the 758 junkyards still in existence, another 800 to 900 have been cleaned up as part of the enforcement of this law. However, it is my belief that a screening law is not the long run answer to the problem, but that, as your bill contemplates, some way must be found to dispose of the hulls of these dismantled vehicles.

I am enclosing a copy of Kentucky's junkyard law and, also, a copy of the report of the department of highways, whose responsibility it is to enforce this law.

If I can be of any further help to you, please call on me.

Sincerely,

Edward T. Breathitt,
Governor.

Baton Rouge, La.,
June 9, 1965.

Hon. Paul H. Douglas,
Congress of the United States, Joint Economic Committee, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Douglas: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter with reference to S. 2019.

The problem which you mentioned is one which, frankly, never occurred to me. But now that you mentioned it, I find myself noticing the unsightly automobile junkpiles which you mentioned. Unfortunately, I have no reliable information as to the extent of the automobile junkpile problem in Louisiana. However, I will welcome your program and will be happy to cooperate in any manner.

Sincerely,

John J. McKeithen,
Governor, State of Louisiana.

St. Paul, Minn.,
June 17, 1965.

Hon. Paul H. Douglas,
Congress of the United States, Joint Economic Committee, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Douglas: Thank you for the copy and details of S. 209 which would divert into a special fund to help obliterate auto junkyards, a portion of the existing excise tax on automobiles. Such action, like any designed to provide new approaches to the task of screening or eliminating unsightly auto graveyards is to be highly commended.

Minnesota, like all other States, lists auto junkyards as one of the deterrents to its heritage of outdoor beauty. We have 408 such blights on our landscape and are moving on a number of fronts to combat this as well as other litter problems.

Our legislature passed, and I signed into law May 24, 1965, legislation designed to screen agricultural or construction machinery junkyards so as effectively to conceal such from the view of motorists using our highways. A copy of this act is attached for your information.

My concern for Minnesota's outdoor beauty led me, in December of last year, to appoint a committee to develop proposals for a formalized program. As a result of their recommendations, a statewide Governor's conference was held May 21 in St. Paul which resulted in establishment of "Keep Minnesota Clean & Scenic, Inc." This nonprofit organization is dedicated to stimulate, develop and coordinate a continuing educational program in Minnesota to cultivate individual interest and pride in cleaner, healthier, and more attractive surroundings.

I have every confidence that this new organization, working closely with our State and Federal agencies, schools, private industry and various groups, organizations and key individuals will be of great help to us in warring against ugliness in Minnesota.

Rest assured that we in Minnesota most warmly welcome such assistance that may enhance our local efforts through Federal legislation such as S.F. No. 1025.

With warmest personal regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

Karl F. Rolvaag,
Governor.

Concord, N.H.,
June 22, 1965.

Hon. Paul H. Douglas,
Vice Chairman, Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Douglas: Thank you for your letter of June 2 outlining your plans to eliminate the eyesore of automobile junkyards.

This ever-increasing problem certainly justifies immediate action and your proposal diverting a portion of the existing excise tax on automobiles providing a special fund to combat the problem has my complete support. I do hope, however, that the word "burial" will be described in more detail. While this method would temporarily take care of the problem above ground it might ultimately create a larger one below. I would hope that by means of this special fund, the committee could investigate more absolute means of permanent disposal.

The steady rise of automobile junkyards here in New Hampshire, 72 at present, and those abandoned in streets and fields gives me increased cause for alarm. Existing laws and new legislation recently introduced, however strict, fall short of solving the entire problem.

In line with President Johnson's emphasis on beautification at the recent White House Conference, I am appointing a New Hampshire Committee on Natural Beauty whose responsibility it will be to study existing problems and find effective means with which to combat them. Automobile graveyards being one of their primary targets, it is most heartening to read of your endeavors.

To inform our representatives in Washington of my feelings on this matter, I am forwarding a copy of this letter to members of the New Hampshire congressional delegation.

Thank you for the opportunity to express the view of New Hampshire.

JOHN W. KING,
Governor.

BISMARCK, N. DAK.,
June 15, 1965.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: S. 2019 may not be the bill which ultimately controls the disposal of junk automobiles, but certainly it does point up the rapidly growing need to do something.

We notice the junk automobiles most dramatically on our Indian reservations. It has been said that, on one of our reservations, a person could almost walk from one side to the other by simply stepping from one junked automobile to the next.

There is absolutely nothing esthetic about an automobile which has lost its status and, therefore, its usability. The quicker we learn how to keep control of our own surroundings, the longer it will be before we must all wallow in the remnants of a questionable affluence.

I hope your bill receives serious consideration.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM L. GUY,
Governor.

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS,
Oklahoma City, Okla., June 17, 1965.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senator, Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Your recent letter to Governor Bellmon concerning your proposal to eliminate auto junkyards has been referred to this office for reply.

The Oklahoma State Legislature has before it a bill for the screening of junkyards adjacent to highways. This bill was introduced in the house, passed that body and was sent to the senate. Several amendments were added by the senate. The bill is now in committee. The original proposal called for the location of all junkyards at least 50 feet back of the right-of-way line and required that they be screened from view. The final passage is doubtful at this time.

The idea of screening junkyards is strongly supported in most areas of the State; however, the means of implementing such legislation has been a subject of much discussion. Recent inventories show 612 such locations subject to screening on the Federal aid portions of our State highway system.

The department is unable to support this proposal in its present form since no provisions are made to finance the program. We estimate the cost of screening existing locations in excess of $650,000. We certainly recognize the desirability of such measures; however, we feel that a workable means of implementation must be included in any legislation bearing on the problem. This should include a practical method of funding and handling that would not present an added administrative or financial burden to highway agencies.

Your proposal has merit in this direction. If the administrative and financial problems can be reduced to a practical level by means of such legislation, we would have no hesitation in supporting such a measure.

Sincerely,

F. D. LYONS,
Director.

GREENSBORO, N.C.,
July 2, 1965.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senator From Illinois, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: I appreciate your letter with which you enclosed a copy of a bill which you have introduced in the U.S. Senate to move against the growing number of auto junk piles across the face of our Nation.

While I do not feel qualified to suggest the method of financing such a program, I am heartily in favor of such a program.

It appears to me that a really effective program must be approached from the national level, and must provide for actual disposal or reclamation of junk. From our own experience and that of other cities in growing urban areas, zoning regulations or "moving the junk elsewhere" just do not work. The new location is soon the site of further urban development and the problem only recurs.

While the automobile junk problem is not particularly a problem within our present corporate limits, you can leave Greensboro in any direction and very quickly spot mammouth piles of such junk. I have no idea as to statistical volume of the problem but it certainly is sizable and I commend you for your efforts to cope with this on a national scale.

Very truly yours,

W. L. TROTTER, Jr.,
Mayor.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHARTER ACT

AMENDMENT NO. 360

Mr. MORSE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1118) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 361

Mr. DOMINICK proposed an amendment to Senate bill 1118, supra, which is pending.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 12, 1965, the names of Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DODD, and Mr. MCCARTHY were added as additional cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 128) establishing a Commission for a Stronger Atlantic Union, submitted by Mr. CHURCH on July 12, 1965.

TOMORROW'S WITNESSES AT HEARING ON POPULATION CONTROL

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures will continue hearings on the population explosion tomorrow at 10 a.m. in room 4200, New Senate Office Building. The hearing is open to the public, and I am certain that the witnesses scheduled to testify will have valuable contributions to make to the population dialog which is receiving increasingly serious attention.

Appearing before the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures Wednesday will be a former colleague of ours, former U.S. Senator Kenneth Keating who now is the national chairman of the Population Crisis Committee.

The subcommittee will also hear from two Michigan residents: the Honorable John Martin of Grand Rapids, a former State senator and auditor general of that beautiful State, who has a long and continuing interest in solving the population crisis; and

Congressman JOHN CONYERS, of Michigan's First Congressional District, who has introduced H.R. 8430, a bill identical to S. 1676, on which the subcommittee is holding hearings. The purpose of S. 1676 is to coordinate and disseminate birth control information upon request.

Tomorrow will be a busy day for the subcommittee.

Mr. George Hecht of New York City, editor of Parents magazine and president of the American Parents Committee, will describe the growing needs of the schools, needs which multiply as the population explodes.

Dr. Gertrude S. Friedman of Washington, D.C., will appear as a witness of the Unitarian Universalist Association. Dr. Friedman will describe the work of the association overseas.

And I have just learned that it will be possible for Mrs. Gladys A. Tillett, of Charlotte, N.C., to testify tomorrow. Mrs. Tillett is well known for her outstanding work as the U.S. representative to the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women. She has asked the subcommittee for time to read into the hearing record on S. 1676 the text of an historic resolution on family planning which was passed by the Commission without dissent when it met in Tehran, Iran, last March. The subcommittee hopes that Mrs. Tillett with also have time to describe the importance of the resolution to women throughout the world.

In succeeding hearings the subcommittee will explore further the problems of education and resources. We will hear from distinguished members of the business community and the world of public affairs. We intend to learn from them and from demographers and theologians. We welcome all interested persons and hope they can join us in learning.

The hearing tomorrow starts at 10 a.m. The subcommittee will meet in room 4200, New Senate Office Building.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Address by Hon. Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, commemorating 50th anniversary of Cook County Forest Preserve, delivered at Chicago Zoological Park on June 27, 1965.

By Mr. SCOTT:

Statement by him; an editorial published in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin; and also a statement by Colin W. Bell, executive secretary of the American Friends Service Committee, dealing with an undocumented charge against American Friends Service Committee.

BANKER OFF BASE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, when Senators and Representatives voted for the $4 billion excise tax cut they did so with the understanding that manufacturers and merchants would pass this savings on to consumers. In his message to the Congress requesting this tax cut, President Johnson said:

> To insure that the excise tax reductions make the maximum contribution to continued price stability and balanced prosperity, I call on American business to translate lower excise taxes promptly into lower retail prices for consumers.
>
> Business will share fully in the benefits of excise tax cuts through the larger sales volume they will generate. Rising volume will boost profits and create more jobs.

It was felt at the time that American industrialists and businessmen could be trusted to comply with the President's request without troublesome Federal supervision of a formal nature. Businessmen and manufacturers would prosper with increased sales and profits as a result of more money in the pockets of American working men and women.

These excise taxes or sales taxes were regressive in their impact. Those who spent more of their income on consumer goods—generally those in the lower income bracket—paid the largest portion of these taxes.

It is now possible to examine to some degree whether the pledges made by leading businessmen and trade associations have been fulfilled. In many instances it has been proven that the tax cut has not been passed on to customers, although most manufacturers and merchants have either willingly or through the pressure of competition done so.

Those who have not have usually thought up one reason or another for evading a direct admission of that fact, unfortunately it took a cold-blooded banker from Ohio to announce violation of this moral obligation. A constituent recently sent me the following notice sent to him by Frank G. Anger, president of the Winters National Bank & Trust Co. of Dayton, Ohio. The notice reads as follows:

> DEAR CUSTOMER: You will find that your bill for safety deposit rent is the same as last year.
>
> Although the Government has removed the excise tax on your box, we have increased the cost of your box by an amount equal to the tax. Thus you will pay no more or less than last year.
>
> We have taken this step because of increased personnel and operating costs and with the hope that it will inconvenience you less than an across-the-board increase.
>
> Cordially yours,
>
> FRANK G. ANGER, *President*.
> WINTERS NATIONAL BANK & TRUST CO.
>
> JULY 1, 1965.

I suspect that if this banker donated a pint of blood to the Red Cross, the patient who received it would freeze to death.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that a banker in Ohio or any banker should stoop to violate a moral obligation and the expressed intent of Congress for additional profits for his bank. To me, this seems a greedy and unconscionable act. Evidently, officials of the Winters National Bank & Trust Co. believe that it is more important to make more dollars from rental to safety deposit box holders than to cooperate with their Government and with other businessmen in strengthening the economy of our Nation. It was also reported to me that this bank increased its assets by $18 million during the past 6 months of this year, this according to its statement of June 30, 1965.

Mr. President, if private business does not see fit to pass these savings on to the customer, consideration should be given to legislation which would require rebates to customers at least until the excise tax cuts have had the opportunity to stimulate the economy as was intended when they were enacted into law.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. **DOMINICK**. Mr. President, last week I had the opportunity of appearing before a conference in Denver to celebrate or to help celebrate Captive Nations Week.

"Captive nations" can sometimes be a misleading term. As Senators know, it refers to those people who formerly had their own form of government, and whose nations have been taken over through aggressive force by the Communists. It applies not only to the Soviet bloc in Eastern Europe but also to many of the subterritories of what is commonly known as Russia itself; it applies to the Cubans and to a good number of Asians who have been taken over by the Red Communists.

The main speaker at the meeting was my distinguished colleague from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who delivered a stirring, graphic address on the subject of the tremendous force which the captive people make to the free world, showing clearly that, time and again, they are one of our great bulwarks against continued aggression by Communists, and that they are still fighting and will continue to fight for their own self-determination and individual freedom.

Because I thought this was a moving speech, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by Senator ALLOTT to the Captive Nations Council of Colorado, in Denver, on July 11, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR GORDON ALLOTT

America's recent hallowed holiday commemorating the signing of our Declaration of Independence has reaffirmed, as always, our belief in the innate dignity of all men. On that day we proudly proclaimed our dedication to the preservation of that most sacred of all quests, the quest for human freedom. With an appropriate note of nostalgia, eloquent orators inspired in every American both the pride and the humility that becomes a people whose forefathers founded a way of life which has become the symbol and the hope of all human aspirations. It was affirmed that man was the creator of the state, not its creature; that our forefathers, in the name of human liberty, had created a society which has endured for almost two centuries and which reveals the unlimited potential and grandeur of man.

However, did we become so hypnotized by the eloquent oratory that we forgot other men, with an equally fervent desire for human freedom, who are still laboring under the yoke of totalitarian slavery? Did we forget that Communist imperialism, with atrocities unprecedented in the annals of human history, has remorselessly and cruelly torn down the walls of law and human value painfully erected by man to protect his dignity and freedom?

Communism is the last inheritor and practitioner of a rule fully in the tradition of the Inquisition.

These ruthless despots—inheritors of the old order—can only perpetuate their existence by regimentation, tyranny, and control of every facet of every individual's life. They use terror like a weapon and stalk the world with that weapon. Nowhere has the use of this terrifying device been more apparent, more tragic, than in the history and cruel fate of the heroic peoples of the captive nations.

Twenty-five years ago, in a plot with Hitler's Germany, and behind the facade of a mutual defense assistance pact, Russian imperialism began to work its evil will upon the captive nations. The powerful Red Army quickly assumed control and followed that with an unprecedented policy of economic exploitation and slave labor. This was accompanied by a wholesale suppression of basic human rights and fundamental freedoms. By a cruelly cunning policy of selective slaughter, the process of denationalization was accelerated by seeking out the most courageous, educated, and industrious elements of society. By the elimination of such "elite" elements of each enslaved nation, the Communist "masters" were able to lower the morale and organizational capability in each case and start to work their will.

Yet, despite the cruel slaughter and the subsequent ringing down of the Iron Curtain, the light of freedom still burns. Time and time again the bankruptcy of the imperialist program has been proven by the courage and determination of both those within and those outside the boundaries of the captive nations. This costly, but courageous resistance is never-ending. The Russian failure to win any measurable support among the youth of the captive countries, despite 25 years of indoctrination clearly exposes a modern-day trojan-horse of ideology. More importantly, the ever-flowing current of national identity that courses through the veins of all the captive nations flows stronger than ever.

All the hopeful signs continue to attest to the success of this fight for human dignity within the enslaved nations. The publicity and wide approval of the program of the assembly of captive European nations, annually climaxed by the heartening events of Captive Nations Week strikes a powerful blow for freedom.

The Soviet Union's indignant outrage at our yearly rededication to the cause of human freedom in these enslaved countries vividly illustrates the effectiveness of such a crusade. By continuing to provide ammunition for the moral rearmament of over a hundred million enslaved people in an area encompassing over half a million square miles, the captive nations program capitalizes on an invincible weapon in the cold war, man's inherent desire for freedom and a nation's equally fervent desire for the right of self-determination.

In essence, then, our most powerful weapon against the world's last colonial empire is the idea of freedom and the independence that pervades the heart of every man and every nation.

Let me outline a few of the reasons that both morally and strategically dictate that we must continue—indeed, speedup—our verbal and political commitment to the freedom and the right of self-determination for the enslaved, oppressed peoples of central and eastern Europe. And to those who, like the masters of the Kremlin, maintain that the annual week which constitutes the week of captive nations is an empty, idealistic ritual—let me answer that a deep and abiding commitment to a noble purpose is productive of far-reaching effects, as witnessed by the actions and events generated by the Declaration of Independence.

The Declaration of Independence started a new age. Its example set off a wave of revolutions which swept across Europe and into Imperial Russia. It excited the minds of all mankind. Today, even the Communist propagandists—no matter how cleverly distorted their definitions of freedom—are forced to use the language of our Declaration of Independence and of our Constitution. Let us remember that, for all the very real need for a strong defense and workable foreign policy, the real battle will be fought, not on land, sea, or air, or even space, but in the hearts and minds of men. In the immortal words of Abraham Lincoln: "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

Our duty, as I understand it, is to press forward toward the fulfillment of national independence, self-determination, and freedom for all men and all nations. When I, like millions of freemen everywhere in World War II, fought for freedom, I did not take the principles or commitments of the four freedoms or the Atlantic Charter lightly. Yet, the four freedoms and all other international agreements to which the Russians were a part, were soon made a mockery by tyrannical action on the part of the Communist regime. And, the captive peoples freedom, purchased at the cost of untold blood and sacrifice, flickered but a brief moment before it was swallowed by the ravenous Russian bear. Freedom was replaced by murder, mass arrests, and cruel persecutions. Russia's treacherous and brutal treatment of these brave peoples horrified all of us. Yet the Russian treachery does not, nor will it ever, absolve us of the free world's obligation to these heroic people. The captivity of these freedomless peoples must lie heavily upon the conscience of every freedom-loving American. We cannot ignore our historic commitment to over a hundred million people who have proven, time and again, their deep commitment to the very principles we cherish.

Yet there have been certain vocal elements of foreign policy who would have us believe that the Soviet policy toward the enslaved nations has "mellowed and liberalized." Adherents to such a soft line toward the Communists would have us tone down, by silence if nothing else, the intensity and volume of the support to the captive nations. Such silence would be but another form of acceptance of the status quo of central and eastern Europe. Silence is exactly what the Russians want.

Communism is a remorseless, crude, brutal, and dedicated enemy and will not be defeated, nor diminished, by silence. It will not crumble, nor collapse. It must be crushed; its intellectual and spiritual bankruptcy must be shown to all the world, and there is no better place to start than in the lands of the captive nations.

Because of their democratic heritage and the ever-burning light of freedom in their hearts, the captive nations constitute an "Achilles heel" in the anatomy of the Russian goliath.

We are all aware of the forces of disunity at work in the Soviet Empire. Russia is desperately trying to consolidate its teetering empire through a policy of economic interdependence and military acceleration. Moreover, Russia is trying, by subtle means, to play on the misuse the nationalistic desires of the captive nations. Yet not even the Russian propaganda mill has been able to significantly divert the course of true patriotic sentiment in the captive nations.

This genuine patriotism presents the Soviets with such a deep-seated problem, that despite all public disclaimers to the contrary, the Russians found it necessary to liquidate two Ukrainian nationalist leaders in exile. Now, by cloaking administrative changes in the garb of real liberalization policies she hopes to hoodwink both the captive nations and the outside world. This is the last in a long line of Russian deceptions. The intent of such Russian propaganda was aptly captured many years ago by Rudyard Kipling when he said:

> "When he stands up as if pleading in wavering, manbrute guise;
> When he veils the hate and cunning in his little swinish eyes;
> When he shows as seeking quarter, with paws like hands in prayer;
> That is the time of peril—the time of the Truce of the Bear."

The real truth is that the peoples of these enslaved countries remain captive while their unchosen rulers remain in power only under sanction of Soviet military might.

The result is a dissatisfied, and still intensely nationalistic population. And, it is one, of course, the Russians would hope to keep from the eyes of the world. The catastrophic results of socialism are obvious to even the casual observer. The once beautiful city of Prague, ornate with centuries-old Gothic and Baroque cathedrals, castles, and buildings is in shabby condition.

The sidewalks are broken, streets go unrepaired, cracked building walls expose masonry. Rubble is piled everywhere. In the midst of such decay, the people are turning away from Russian dominance and spiritual bankruptcy and seeking ties with the West with its abundance of material and spiritual sustenance. The picture of Prague is the picture of all the captive nations.

We cannot, in good conscience, remain silent and thereby guarantee the status quo of slavery for over 100 million freedom-loving people. We must not let Eastern Europe remain merely a long-range moral problem to be discussed abstractly by ivory tower intellectuals.

Instead, we must bring the denial of the right of self-determination of these 100 million people to the agenda of the United Nations. And, when it is there, we must not let the Soviet Union paralyze action. If we demand freedom from Portugal for Angola, from North Vietnam aggression for South Vietnam, we should do exactly the same thing for Europe. We should support a single standard for freedom throughout the world.

The painfully obvious capitivity of the Central and Eastern European nations, and the facts of their enslavement—is an embarrassment to the Soviet Union and, understandably, they prefer not to talk about them. Just as understandably, we should prefer to discuss them.

It is time to take the offensive. Moscow has a profound fear of growing free world knowledge and interest in the captive nations. Such interest and information helps to expose the current myth of Soviet mellowing. It also illuminates the depths of imperial totalitarianism and economic colonialism that characterize the Red Russian Empire. Only our most powerful weapon—truths, facts, and ideas—can counter effectively and defeat the Moscow worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America.

Aided by U.S. insistence, the Western Powers have complied with the majority wishes and have practically relinquished all of their control over Africa and other areas of former colonial influence. Into the immediate vacuum which follows, the Communist empire steps in to devour the new nations and thus turns the whole idea of freedom into a mockery. This is nothing new, I might add, for the Soviets have broken 50 of the 52 international agreements they have entered into since World War II.

Like a plague, Red imperialism, with unprecedented severity, continues its search for victims. Yet, if the United Nations could help to reveal that the terrible conditions in the captive nations continue unabated, despite the moral condemnation of the world, it would clearly illuminate for all to see that the Communist bloc, not the United States and the Western allies, are the real forces of imperialism.

As the specter of colonialism gradually evaporates under the intense heat of the rising suns of the new, emerging Afro-Asian nations, the grim shadow of Soviet imperialism in Central and Eastern Europe assumes an even more sinister hue. The regaining and maintenance of the initiative is indeed important. Since 1945 the Communists have succeeded in their efforts to confine, on the whole, the cold war to what they call the "war zone"—the non-Communist world—while keeping their so-called peace zone—the Communist bloc—virtually closed to Western intervention; and incidentally, closed to the ministrations of the United Nations. Thus the West, when it has won, has only maintained the status quo. The Communists, on the other hand, when they won, gained access to ground previously closed to them. Complementing the war zone—peace zone area of conflict has been the Communist propaganda effort. Thus they have managed to conjure up an image that somewhat resembles Dante's version of heaven and hell. An image that pictures the non-Communist world as the neither world of international conflict and colonialism, with the Communist world aglow with stability and peace. Thus the Communists have subverted freely into the West's zone while remaining untouchable in their so-called zone of peace.

The Hungarian revolt and its consequences is the most tragic acknowledgment of this sad state of affairs. By foisting upon the world the false notion that only those international disputes which originate in the relations of the West to the colonial areas are of worldwide interest, they have managed to manipulate the United Nations as a lever against the non-Communist world.

The logic behind such devious efforts is plain to see. By diverting the West's attention from the Soviet's shaky position in Eastern Europe to the underdeveloped and uncommitted nations where the swelling currents of anticolonialism and nationalism are, by their very nature, against the Western nations, the Communists cover up their "Achilles heel" of Eastern Europe. They are afraid to even discuss the Eastern Europe situation in an international forum because of the disastrous effects it might have in the satellite countries. They know full well that the captive nations' heritage and aspirations lie with the free world.

I deeply believe that now is the time to publicly proclaim that the Soviet efforts to forge its subject peoples into an united empire have failed.

Let us, through various means at different political, psychological, and moral levels, feed the forces of national identity and the quest for freedom that have bravely resisted the Communist oppression.

Let the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe increase the scope and tone of its message to the captive peoples.

Let us bring this blatant example of unprincipled imperialism before the United Nations and demand action based upon the principles to which that great organization is dedicated.

Yet, our words paying just tribute to these heroic peoples, must not outrun our deeds. Let us, by moral and political commitment, help to rekindle the flame of freedom that burns so brightly in our own Declaration of Independence. Our eternal quest for freedom—not only for ourselves, but for all the peoples of the world must not merely endure, but rather must prevail.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, we can have no more pointed reminder of our own freedoms and liberties than the brutal subjugation of lands which gave us so many of our most outstanding citizens.

In observing Captive Nations Week we in the United States salute the gallant peoples of these oppressed lands and pledge our enduring support of their efforts to rid themselves of the Soviet yoke.

These captive peoples possess their own customs, languages, and cultures. Through the centuries wars have raged across their lands and their territories have been partitioned and parceled, first by one and then another tyrannical authority. Their resources and their populations have been drained but despite all oppressions, the fierce desire for freedom has not been dimmed.

The ingrained longing for liberty often has led to dramatic—and perilous—individual efforts to flee the captors. Millions have fled for freedom from behind the Iron Curtain. Frequently, such flight is tragically prevented.

The Communist conquerors aim for more than conquest over the lands of these captive peoples; they seek also to break the spirit and consume the minds of the citizenry. Earlier tyrants were content with submissive actions, but the Communists demand servile minds.

Although their lands are occupied and their borders sealed off, the citizens of these captive nations are restive. To their courageous countrymen who have successfully escaped Soviet bondage, those still enslaved look for leadership in their struggle for freedom. We can do no less than lend our own encouragement to this effort. We must not abandon them.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the annual observance of the third week of July as Captive Nations Week serves to remind the world of the totalitarian yoke which the Soviet Union has imposed on the central and east European countries from the Baltic to the Black Sea.

As Americans living in freedom it is fitting that we should be especially sensitive to the plight of the Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, Czechoslovaks, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Rumanians, and East Germans living under tyranny. We should continue to do everything we can to see that their nations are returned to the status of free and independent countries. Admittedly progress has been slow, but the situation is far from hopeless as long as we exert all possible pressure to loosen their bonds of captivity.

Observance of Captive Nations Week is one important way of focusing attention on the situation in these countries, and the unhappy reaction of the Soviet Union to the designation of this week is evidence of the aptness of our action.

We wish we could do more, but at least we can do this, and I am sure all Americans share with me the hope that soon the observance of a Captive Nations Week will no longer be necessary.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have been saddened by the recent death of my friend and former colleague in the House of Representatives, Cleveland M. Bailey of West Virginia.

I am glad that he lived to see Congress pass the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, because it was legislation of this nature that he worked for many years to bring to reality. His dedicated and persistent efforts to provide greater educational opportunities to our Nation's schoolchildren had their roots in his own life.

Born on a farm near St. Marys in Pleasants County, W. Va., on July 15, 1886, he attended public schools within the Mountain State, studied at West Liberty State College, and eventually continued his college studies and received his degree from Geneva College at Beaver Falls, Pa. He returned to teach school in West Virginia, subsequently moving up to serve as high school principal in Clarksburg. Later he became a district supervisor of schools in that area; and, in 1921, he first served the people of his State in public office, having become a city councilman for Clarksburg. Among other positions which he held, he was an assistant editor on a Clarksburg newspaper, he was an assistant State auditor, and he served as State budget director during World War II.

He was elected as a Democratic Representative to the 79th Congress; and, although he failed of reelection to the 80th Congress, he was elected to the House of Representatives in the 81st Congress, and, subsequently, to each of five succeeding Congresses.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, he continually exerted his influence toward more and better education for American students. In talking with a newspaper reporter earlier this year, he pointed out that the Secondary and Elementary Educational Act of 1965, as passed by the House, "is almost an exact replica of a bill which I introduced in 1940."

Congressman Bailey has been, justly, called the father of the impacted areas school program. In a recent letter to him, I wrote to congratulate him on having an elementary school in Midwest City, Okla., named for him—a school which had benefited from the Federal educational provisions set up for impacted areas.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article from the May 11 edition of the Fairmont, W. Va., Times reporting on his trip to Oklahoma to be present for the dedication of this school which is located in proximity to Tinker Air Force Base.

There being no objection, it was ordered that the newspaper article be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times, May 11, 1965]

BAILEY HONORED BY OKLAHOMA SCHOOL

MIDWEST CITY, OKLA.—An elementary school named in honor of former West Virginia Congressman Cleveland Bailey will be dedicated here next Sunday, and Bailey will be on hand for the event.

Bailey, who once headed the House Education Committee, helped write legislation 15 years ago that provided Federal aid to school districts whose population is increased by reason of Federal employees stationed nearby.

Tinker Air Force Base is located here.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, many Americans will, in the future, be better educated, more productive citizens, because of the efforts of Cleveland M. Bailey toward having the Federal Government provide greater educational opportunities to the youth of our Nation.

THE SIXTH ANNUAL OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in 1959 I introduced on the floor of the Senate a resolution to designate the third week in July as Captive Nations Week. In the 6 years since then Americans increasingly have become aware of the millions of people held in bondage behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. In eastern Europe, southeast Asia, and most recently in Cuba, men, women, and children once free like ourselves are denied the free exercise of constitutional and civil rights, the right to labor productively for themselves and their children, and the right to rejoice in a unique national heritage. I do not believe, however, that the people of the captive nations have lost their dedication to the ideals of freedom or their desire to see their own nations free and proud once more. We Americans should take it upon ourselves to see that the hope of eventual liberation is never abandoned by these captive peoples. This week, during the sixth anniversary of Captive Nations Week all of us should reaffirm our belief in the principles of freedom and renew the hope of eventually seeing the blessings of liberty secured for all mankind.

In recent years world history has been characterized by the rapid decline of colonialism and the emergence of new and independent nations. Under bold leadership these nations have taken their rightful place in the community of nations. But even as the ghost of colonialism was being laid in its grave, a greater menace arose to threaten the peoples of the world. The aggressive policies of the Soviet Union and of Communist China are now the greatest challenge to world freedom.

All over the world Communists have struck at free nations that have allowed their vigilance to relax. Using well-practiced techniques of direct military action and personal intimidation the Soviet Union has extended its control over once-free nations of eastern Europe, until today the U.S.S.R. has become the most powerful imperialist nation on earth. Russian armies have captured and enslaved the three Baltic countries, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria, and they exert a powerful influence over many other countries. Similarly, the Red Chinese are obviously on the march, and have their eyes on all of southeast Asia and possibly on India as well. Cuba and Vietnam are the most recent examples of Communist expansion.

On the occasion of Captive Nations Week, however, Americans should not only recognize their duty to promote the cause of freedom within the captive nations, but should also be mindful of the contributions of the captive peoples to our own way of life. The greatness of the United States is founded on the talents of people of the most diverse racial, religious, and national backgrounds. Our country has been greatly enriched by the labor, skill, and culture of people who have come from now captive nations. Thus, Captive Nations Week renews our spiritual ties with the peoples of eastern and central Europe.

The observance of Captive Nations Week should also bring to mind other American responsibilities. We must do all that we can to foster the ultimate liberation of those people already enslaved, but we must also be on guard against further encroachments by the Communist powers.

The free nations of the world which look to the United States for leadership in the struggle against communism should know that our country stands firmly behind all nations that cherish freedom. If we slacken our stand against the Communist usurpation of power or recognize the present Communist domination as either permanent or right, we really deny both our heritage and our ideals. If we abandon the fight against tyranny, we also unwillingly betray the newly free and developing nations in Africa and Asia which will themselves have to stand firm against the encroachments of the Communist empire. The United States must continue her policy of helping and protecting young nations in their efforts to remain free and independent.

Our system of personal freedom and private initiative has made the United States the greatest nation on earth. The same powerful human aspirations that built our country are at work in the hearts and minds of the people of both the captive and newly independent nations. We must always remember that these people would never willingly choose slavery.

During Captive Nations Week the people of the United States should once again fully recognize and commit themselves to their responsibilities. Under no circumstances must we offer assistance or encouragement to governments that unjustly deny to the people their basic rights. We ought to do all we can, subject to responsible direction, to ease the sufferings of the unfortunate peoples of the captive nations and assist them in their just aspirations toward a better life. Our service can be invaluable also in providing food, clothing, and medical care, education, and eventually refuge and citizenship to the refugees from tyrannous Communist governments.

Our goal of freedom for the captive nations has at times seemed remote. Yet if other free nations join with the United States in pressing for action to aid the captive peoples, freedom may not be so far distant a goal.

To the end of gaining freedom and self-determination for all peoples under constitutional government and a life of liberty and self-fulfillment for all the citizens of the world, I am proud to join in the 6th annual observation of Captive Nations Week.

WIRETAPPING AND EAVESDROPPING

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, recently, the President of the United States publicly stated his very strong opposition to wiretapping and eavesdropping. Needless to say, his support has been extremely helpful to the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure which is investigating these subjects.

In this connection, the New York Times on Monday, July 19, 1965, printed a most illuminating editorial. I think it should be brought to the attention of all of my colleagues and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 19, 1965]

NO FEDERAL WIRETAPS

The corruption of values that goes with wiretapping and other forms of electronic eavesdropping is reflected in the reaction of some ranking Washington officials to the disclosure that Internal Revenue Service agents have been using illegal wiretaps to gather information for the Government's drive against organized crime.

Instead of deploring these breaches of law, the prevailing attitude among many top law enforcers seems to be one of irritation that a Senate investigation caused the Nation to learn of their use of outlaw methods to ferret out outlaws. "This will kill us," one high Justice Department official complained.

In the light of this strange unconcern for legal procedure by some whose sworn duty it is to foster respect for law, it is well that President Johnson has issued a ban against all wiretapping by Federal employees, except where national security is involved. Even this may prove too broad an exemption, despite the President's requirement that the specific approval of the Attorney General be obtained before any telephones are tapped for security reasons.

Apparently Mr. Johnson made known his opposition to wiretapping shortly after he took office in 1963. The country will hope that his present directive is taken more seriously than the one he issued then. Whether any form of electronic eavesdropping is not an unconstitutional invasion of privacy has become a very real question in the light of recent Supreme Court decisions. But, whatever doubts may persist on this score, the use of tactics that run directly counter to the prohibitions of the Federal Communications Act breeds contempt for law and thus undermines the interests of society.

FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY—COMMENCEMENT DAY ADDRESS BY HARLLEE BRANCH AT HOWARD COLLEGE, BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, at a time when crime is increasing at an alarming rate and when in many areas of the country there has been a virtual breakdown of law and order, it becomes more and more imperative that the American people take serious stock of the situation and rededicate themselves to the principle that with freedom goes responsibility and respect for constituted authority.

I have just had occasion to read an address delivered by Harllee Branch, Jr., of Atlanta, president of the Southern Co., in commencement exercises at Howard College at Birmingham, Ala., which eloquently and forcefully calls attention to this timely problem.

Mr. Branch, cautioning against the ill-advised counsel of those who would decide which laws should be obeyed and which should not, properly warns that "if each man becomes the judge of which laws he will obey, only the strongest will remain free."

Because of the timeliness of his remarks and because he has so ably stated a problem with which the American people must come to grips if the present trend of lawlessness and disrespect for authority is to be reversed, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Branch's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY

(By Harllee Branch, Jr.)

A friend of mine hearing that I was to be honored with a degree from this fine institution, sent me a jingle which goes:

"There was a Baptist divine named Tweedle
Who declined a doctor's degree.
He didn't mind being a Tweedle,
But he couldn't take Tweedle DD."

Well, I have no such concern. My only feeling is one of gratitude and humility for the honorary degree conferred upon me by the faculty and trustees of Howard College.

As I stand before you tonight, I am thinking of the late great William H. Brantley, one of my dearest and most esteemed friends—himself a devoted trustee and honorary alumnus of this institution. I learned much from that brilliant man, as did all who came in contact with him; and I have taken as the basic theme of my remarks tonight a comment he made to me shortly before his untimely death. He said to me, "The trouble with freedom is that everyone wants it but few understand what it means. Men talk incessantly of their rights in a free land. Few ever stop to think of their responsibilities."

I want to speak to you of freedom and responsibility.

One looks about him in this turbulent world, takes note of the disorderly and irresponsible conduct of men who profess to be devotees of freedom, and exclaims with Madam Roland—herself the guillotined victim of popular excesses she helped to inspire:

"O Liberty: What crimes are committed in thy name?"

Why will men not learn from history? How many governments must fall, how many civilizations crumble, how much human delusion must be endured before men will comprehend that lawlessness is the vehicle of anarchy, not of freedom?

"The freedom of some," said Edmund Burke, "is the freedom of the herd of swine that ran violently down a steep place into the sea and were drowned."

And he added: "The only liberty that is valuable is a liberty connected with order; that not only exists with order and virtue, but which cannot exist at all without them. It inheres in good and steady government, as in its substance and vital principles."

The right of dissent is a vital part of our American heritage, and indispensable to social progress. So also are the rights of petition and protest. But dissent, petition and protest must be responsible and they must be orderly. Otherwise they degenerate into lawlessness. In a civilized society defiance is not a valid substitute for debate. Civil disobedience—frivolously resorted to as a means of mocking and undermining the very situations which freemen have established for the redress of injury and the attainment of justice—is the handmaiden of revolt, not of orderly reform. It should be recognized for what it is and it ought not to be equated either with courage or with conscience merely because it professes a lofty purpose or because it makes a pretense of nonviolence. Orderly government can be destroyed by defiance and paralysis as surely as by armed rebellion.

The businessman who violates duly enacted statutes and regulations, though he considers them unjust, is not a friend of free enterprise.

The union boss who incites his followers to violence and vandalism or who encourages them to defy police regulations and court decrees to achieve goals he deems humane is not a friend of free labor.

The civil rights leader who urges defiance of one law to compel compliance with another; and the supporter of the status quo who takes the law into his own hands in order to maintain customs he believes to be wise—both are guilty of lawlessness and are enemies of freedom.

And the politicians, the judges, the clergymen, the professors, the journalists, and the timid citizens who condone disobedience of law—they, too, are guilty of crimes against human liberty.

The president of the American Bar Association has properly warned that "civil disobedience is a threat to the freedom of all men; and no end, however worthy, can ever justify reverting to unlawful means."

The courts and the legislative halls, he reminds us, must be the places where differences are reconciled and individual rights are protected. Mass disobedience as a form of protest, whatever the justification, is self-defeating and imperils human freedom. If each man becomes the judge of which laws he will obey, only the strongest will remain free.

I repeat: civil disobedience leads to anarchy and anarchy is the destroyer, not the promoter of freedom. For, as Carlyle observed, "anarchy is the choking, sweltering, deadly, and killing rule of no rule; the consecration of cupidity and the braying of folly, stupidity, and baseness in the affairs of men."

It is sheer sophistry, in my opinion, to argue as some have done that the precedent for the wave of civil disobedience now sweeping our country is to be found in the Boston Tea Party. One might as well seek justification in the pillage of the Versailles Palace or in the storming of the Bastille, for in each of those instances men were engaged in a last-ditch revolt against governments which had shown themselves to be unconcerned with and unresponsive to the rights and welfare of the rebels. There is no such barrier to legislative and judicial relief in this country. Indeed the very persons who have most frequently resorted to civil disobedience in our land are those whose petitions have been most generously received and most assiduously upheld by the Congress and the courts.

Those who refuse to yield to a lawfully established authority of which they disapprove, or who disobey valid laws and decrees merely because they consider them unjust, invite others to resort to similar defiance. Such defiance leads backward to the chaos of the jungle where men, though free from what they call the yoke of civil institutions, are nevertheless bound by other and more degrading chains.

The recent spread of defiance, disorder, and irresponsibility to college and university campuses should be a matter of especial concern to this audience.

I agree with Dr. Clifford Lord, newly inaugurated president of Hofstra University, that to the extent that the current campus unrest, is in truth, attributable to the students' sense of being machine processed—to their sense of facelessness, loss of identity, and lack of individuality—and to the extent that this unrest serves to restore the primacy of teaching and to refocus attention where it always should have been, namely, on the importance of the individual student, the unrest may not be without value.

But there is evidence that student revolt may not always be so wholesomely purposed. A leading periodical has asserted that Marxist-oriented radical groups—some of them so militant and so far to the left that even the American Communist Party disowns and deplores them—have established chapters on scores of American campuses. "The program of these groups is protest," says the aforementioned publication, "and they joy in tangling with the police." Graduate students, serving as teaching assistants, are leaders of radical organizations, some of which openly advocate civil disobedience and are reported to have even given instructions in violence to their members.

A youthful exile from one of these groups has confessed that some of his former associates "secretly plan to launch a reign of terror" in this country and to that end have joined in campus protests designed to translate every student grievance into a student demonstration. According to him, student strikes, rallies, sit-ins, and picketing are promoted as means "to get the students into a mood in which they can be led into a campus riot." Every issue, no matter how trivial, is used to stir up trouble, he says; the philosophy of the group leaders being that "any young person can be made into a revolutionary if he is led into a fracas with some authority symbol, especially the police."

A leadership thus committed to disorder and revolution is interested in friction, not in freedom, in the creation of confusion, not the achievement of conciliation, in the alienation, not the advancement, of mankind. Its cynical purpose is to take idealistic, humane, honest young men and women with "stars in their eyes" and, by exploiting their concerns and frustrations, convert them into undisciplined, irresponsible, and revolutionary robots defiant of even the most minimal of educational, social, and moral restraints.

A leading Negro educator, Dr. James M. Nabrit, Jr., of Washington, D.C., has warned his students to beware of radicals of the extreme left who seek to "cloak themselves in the mantle of civil righters and who plot and plan in secret to disrupt the fight for justice and full citizenship."

"These plotters," says Dr. Nabrit, "do not care about the Negro people. They do not love the university. They do not believe in civil rights for anyone. They thrive on dissension. They create mythical evils and invent issues but do not want solutions to problems. They are children of lawlessness and disciples of destruction. They must be unmasked for the frauds they are. They must be fought in every arena and they must not be permitted to prevail."

The young men and young women in this audience, and their counterparts on the campuses of other universities and colleges, have a right to be fed up with the affluence, the apathy, and the phony pretensions of many of their elders. They have a right to be disturbed by and disenchanted with the tawdriness, the superficiality, the callousness, the conformity, the senseless competitiveness, and the absence of true commitment which they encounter in so much of modern life. We, their parents and educators, should encourage them in their efforts to discover the real meaning of existence and in their questing for a truly compelling authority which will make freedom meaningful. However, it is up to us to see that their integrity is not compromised and that their idealism is not subverted by those who confuse license with liberty and revolution and anarchy with reform.

And how shall we go about that task? First, by giving them the opportunity to discuss their concerns and probe their aspirations with us. This they cannot do with a parent who reads only the market reports and the sports pages in the daily newspaper and whose only reaction to changing social pressures is a visceral reaction based on maintenance of the status quo; or with a teacher—no matter how brilliant—whom they see only in the formal environs of the lecture hall or the laboratory or on his way to the airport to fill an engagement with his publisher, or his TV or radio sponsor, or with a governmental agency or an industrial concern which has preempted his time and talents.

Secondly, we must see that these young men and young women have the opportunity to engage in free inquiry and in free expression not only on the campus but in society at large, so long as they exercise these freedoms for constructive purposes and in a responsible manner. I repeat what I said earlier: controversy is of the essence of freedom. Freedom to question, freedom to disagree and to defend that disagreement without let or hindrance—these are not only the inescapable requirements of academic life but indispensable attributes of the democratic society in which our youth hopefully will spend their lives.

To give our youth opportunities to train themselves in the arts of freedom does not mean that administrators and faculty should turn over to them the running of our colleges and universities; to permit them to engage in licentious, illegal and fanatical conduct—irrespective of whether their fanaticism is of the right-wing or left-wing variety. "No demagog wears a halo," says one thoughtful educator, "merely because he has not yet graduated from a university—or even because he has."

Dr. Buell Gallagher, of City College of New York, has properly pointed out that in encouraging freedom of inquiry and freedom of expression, we should distinguish between eristic and heuristic controversy. In eristic controversy, the arguer aims at victory rather than truth, he uses data not as material to be examined but as selected weapons of disputation. To the eristic arguer, persons cease to be individuals clothed in dignity; they become objects of personal attack and character assassination, because the eristic arguer makes the opponent his target. Heuristic controversy, on the other hand rests on mutual respect of the contending parties, never substitutes personal ridicule and vulgarities for frank statements of examined truth, is indifferent to the winning or losing of the argument, if only truth is served. Arrogance characterizes the eristic, while humility marks the heuristic. Where the eristic strikes a pose, takes a position and arrogantly defends it against all comers, the heuristic examines hypotheses, listens attentively to opposing views and is quite undisturbed if the results of the discussion bring him to a changed position. Heuristic controversy is the very essence of academic freedom, eristic controversy is its enemy and hence ought not to be tolerated in any segment of Academe—either among trustees, administrators, faculty, or students.

Finally, the elders of the Nation should set for our youth an example of concern and involvement. All that is needed for evil and extremism and injustice to gain the upper hand in a democracy such as ours is for decent and responsible citizens to remain silent and acquiescent. If parents and teachers are apathetic about the state of society—if they timidly retire to the sidelines or to their storm shelters while great social issues are being debated, they should not be surprised if their more concerned and idealistic sons and daughters are attracted by demagogs or revolutionaries. In the face of social crisis, apathy is as irresponsible as extremism.

I conclude with a simple plea: Let us, young and old alike, remember that freedom requires authority and demands responsibility; that true social and political progress cannot be achieved by defiant mobs whose only objective is to prevail or to paralyze, nor by revolutionaries who seek to tear down social, political, and educational institutions for which they have devised no adequate or superior substitutes. Let us constantly remind ourselves that the man or woman mature enough to deserve freedom must also be mature enough to exercise the self-discipline which is freedom's essential ingredient.

HAWAII PREPARES FOR VISITORS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the outstanding record of the 89th Congress is too well known in this august Chamber for me to review its achievements at this time.

My distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle have toiled diligently through the cold of winter, a nonexistent spring, and the boiler-room heat of a Washington summer without complaint.

There will be many such days before our task is done for 1965, but surely that final day will eventually be ours to savor. The thoughts of many of my colleagues will then wistfully turn to distant lands where legions of citizens devote their lifetimes ministrating to the needs and comforts of visitors from near and afar.

Hawaii has prepared well for these days ahead. Even now some 64 new resorts and hotels are now in various stages of building or planning. The July 23 issue of Time generously details the lengths to which Hawaii is going to make its new visitors happy. I earnestly hope that many of my colleagues will go there when the final gravel sounds and sample the wonders of our islands.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD in its entirety.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESORTS—BUILDER'S PARADISE

Since Hawaii achieved statehood in 1959, the waves of tourism that wash its many beaches have reached almost tidal proportions. Visitors have increased by 75 percent in the past 6 years, and developers have rushed to capitalize on the bonanza. On four of Hawaii's major islands, some 64 resorts and hotels are now in various stages of building or planning. This week one of the biggest names in the resort business in another ocean makes his Pacific bow: Laurance Rockefeller will open his $15 million-plus Mauna Kea Beach Hotel complex on the big island of Hawaii.

$100,000 PER ROOM

A rare blend of innkeeper and conservationist, Rockefeller has until now specialized in the Caribbean, building quiet, out-of-the-way resorts on Bali-Ha'i beaches with 24-carat accommodations—Caneel Bay on St. John's, Little Dix Bay on Virgin Gorda, Dorado Beach in Puerto Rico. Mauna Kea may prove his biggest resort investment so far. Designed by Skidmore, Ownings & Merrill, the hotel is a tiered, four-story structure whose 154 rooms surround palm-filled inner courtyards. Guests with rooms facing west gaze out on a beach with sand the consistency of powdered sugar and water that has never known seaweed. Those to the east look out over an 18-hole golf course designed by Robert Trent Jones that Jack Nicklaus has described as "more fun to play than any course I know." Farther to the east stands Mauna Kea itself, whose 13,825-foot snow-capped crest makes it the tallest island mountain in the world.

The interiors are almost as spectacular. Not one to pinch pennies on the extras that make the difference, Rockefeller lined lobbies, corridors and courtyards with $90,000 worth of art objects, ranging from a 13th century Buddha head to colorful Hawaiian quilts. Although modest in size, the guest rooms ($28 to $48 a day) are sumptuously outfitted. All feature willow headboards from Milan, teak bedside tables, Thai bedspreads and framed collections of seashells, plus spacious balconies to sun on. Bathrooms have mirror walls, marble sink counters, built-in ice cube makers and overhead infrared lamps. A trilevel restaurant affords virtually every table a front-row view of the ocean. Rockefeller's total costs come to an astronomical $100,000 per room—a handsome bet on the hope that intelligent and affluent tourists will spend the extra effort to get to his faraway paradise rather than stop short at Waikiki Beach.

OTHER PLACES, OTHER BUILDERS

South of Rockefeller's Mauna Kea, California oil millionaire Johnno M. Jackson is opening Kona Village in September, which will consist of 130 cottages spread around a lagoon, each decorated and designed in Malayan, Fijian, Samoan or Tahitian style. Public facilities will be housed in an authentic long house built over the ruins of an old meeting house. Because a tortuous, 7-mile trail is all that connects the village with public highways and commercial airports, guests will have to be ferried in by private plane or boat.

All of the outer islands, which 10 years ago had only one hotel room for every four on Waikiki Beach, are bustling. On Kauai, the Sheraton Corp. of America is about to start spadework on a 200-room luxury hotel, and the foundations were recently begun for the 250-room Royale Gardens Hotel that will look out over the island's east coast. On Maui, the first 160 rooms of Kaanapali Hotel recently opened. Eventually, the hotel will cost $60 million and provide 2,500 rooms, three 18-hole golf courses, a shopping center, and convention facilities. Kapalua Beach north of Kaanapali is slated for four new 200- to 400-room resort hotels, one to be built by Hilton.

MORE ALOHA

Oahu developers are not sitting on their lanais. Five miles east of Waikiki the Hilton chain two winters ago opened a ten-story, 300-room monument to the American tourist. From its 2,500-pound crystal chandelier in the lobby to its cabana-rimmed oval swimming pool (60 feet from the ocean), it is a midsummer night's dream of opulence. Higher priced suites feature divided his and hers bathrooms, hers sporting an oversized bathtub, his a stall shower. Outside, porpoises frolic in a large garden pool shaded by trellises loaded down with bougainvillaea. As a finishing touch, the Kahala Hilton has opened its own heliport, which cuts the hops to Honolulu's airport from 40 to 10 minutes.

Equally lavish is the new 30-story Ilikai Hotel, which looms over Waikiki Beach. This towering, supercalifragilisticexpialidocious structure (Julie Andrews is now in residence) was built by Hawaiian Tycoon Chinn Ho and is described by him as having "more aloha per cubic foot than any other hotel in the world." It houses 509 condominium apartments and 506 hotel rooms, each of which commands a matchless view of Diamond Head or Koolau Range, and has its own kitchenette, complete with refrigerator, toaster, and coffeemaker.

Guests can come and go to their rooms via a glass-walled elevator suspended outside the building or sit by a musical fountain whose waters dance and change colors in harmony with piped-in music. Next project on Ho's agenda is a 5,000-acre development along the northwestern Makaha Beach (famed for its 30-foot surfing waves). When finished, it will comprise 4,000 hotel rooms, 5,000 homes, and a 36-hole golf course.

If the tourist estimates hold up and the new resorts pay off, thousands of Hawaiians will find themselves with a lot of cash on their hands. What will they do with it? Probably spend their vacation in Tokyo or New York City, just to get away from it all.

TED KENNEDY: COMING UP STRONG IN THE SENATE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, few Senators have made such an important contribution to the Senate as has the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. An excellent article by Joseph Roddy documenting Senator KENNEDY's attributes appeared in the July 13 issue of Look magazine. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Look, July 13, 1965]

TED KENNEDY ON HIS OWN: COMING UP STRONG IN THE SENATE

(By Joseph Roddy)

When he was sworn in as a U.S. Senator from Massachusetts for the 2 years of an unexpired term placed in family surplus, EDWARD MOORE KENNEDY was 30 years old. He was hardly less qualified than his two older brothers seemed when they took on the jobs they held then in Washington, D.C. John F. Kennedy had come into the White House over the objections of two living ex-Presidents and a retiring one, who said he was either too young for the job or would never be right for it. When he prevailed over their advice by the slenderest of margins, he disenchanted even close friends by appointing his brother ROBERT, an untried lawyer, to be the Nation's chief counsel. This familial back scratch he had the grace to top off with the quip that he only did it to give BOBBY some legal experience before he went into private practice. Yet 2 years later, when it was time for TEDDY, the youngest brother in Boston, to be transformed into the youngest Senator in Washington, ROBERT KENNEDY was looking like about the best, and certainly the most combative, Attorney General in the last 35 years. And John F. Kennedy was well on his way to establishing himself as the President who so honored intelligence and taste and the just uses of power in Government that every Chief Executive for years to come will expect to be measured beside him.

With that as the track history of unqualified Kennedys, the young Senator might easily have entered the Capitol's upper Chamber wrapped in the self-assurance that he could do more for the U.S. Senate than it was in any position to do for him. He was, however, spared that chance by an opinion bruited about Capitol Hill long before he arrived, that neither the Attorney General nor the President was as anxious to welcome another sibling to Washington as their father had been to see another of his progeny installed there.

All who expected the worst from him were disappointed. As freshman lawmakers go, Kennedy behaved impeccably. He answered quorum calls as if they were dinner bells, and he seldom interrupted distinguished solons in midoration. He was the model child of the Senate family, seen but not heard, and plainly anxious to learn the trade. Young men of his stripe in the Senate are expected to spend a lot of time there, presiding over the routine parliamentary moves by sitting in for the Vice President. Kennedy was doing exactly that for Lyndon B. Johnson on a Friday afternoon in November the year before last when the very least of what happened was that the support was cut from under his career in the Senate.

A certain lassitude of the soul attended him in the bleak months that followed. There was his grief, to be sure, yet it could hardly have exceeded the Nation's, and much of the world's. But it was his singular torture to live with the idea that he was a Senator now only because there had been a President who was his brother. If it seemed unlikely that his lot in life could ever be worse, it soon was. Seven months later, he was pulled out of a demolished airplane about as close to dead as the living ever get. Once his survival was sure, the prospect of 6 months in Boston's New England Baptist Hospital drove Ted Kennedy to find out what he wanted most to do with his time. A long stretch in a hospital years before had been the germinal stage for John Kennedy's Presidential campaign. The youngest Kennedy's choice was to fit himself in every possible way he could for the Senate job he already had. Professors he had done little to impress with his scholarliness when he was a Harvard man 10 years before were now his hospital guests, pressing books and ideas on him as they often had on the late President. The problem of getting reelected for a full 6-year term had to be coped with, and Kennedy did all his running for that office from the inside of a Stryker frame. Without getting out of bed, he won with 1,130,000 votes, or three for himself to every one of his opponent's, which is the closest a Senate election in the State has ever come to unanimity. He was out of the hospital and made it with a cane to the first session of the 89th Congress on January 4 of this year.

Around Washington, the theorists divide on why the young man from Massachusetts seems so much more of a Senator now than he was in the last session. Some see a simple family obligation to make every possible power play to legislate the country into the shape John Kennedy envisioned it. Others extract from that general view the more precise notion that the New Frontier President's view of things to come included the fine day, or days, when one of his younger brothers, or both, would take the inaugural oath on the Capitol steps. In fitting that dynastic view of the Presidency to the Irish line of succession, the Kennedy brother up next would be Robert, the junior Senator from New York. But years of campaign-managing and emergency path-clearing for his older brother have left Bobby unloved in places where feelings of guilt for that block are easily dissolved by affection for Ted. When professionals in the dark arts of electioneering expound on this, they fall into an argot that joins the holy inquisition with show biz, and one of them probably spoke for many when he said, Bobby's still anathema to the polls. They say, 'This new kid's the kid.' "

It could be, of course, that this new kid is much less concerned about his manifest destiny. He may be just showing his strength in the Senate now, one of his close friends feels, for a reason all younger brothers understand—namely, their universal determination, just for the brotherly fun of it, to spook the siblings who beat them into the world. Bobby has a 7-year lead in life on Teddy, but Teddy is Bobby's senior by 2 years in the Senate. Teddy is bigger, but Bobby is better known. When a crowd of schoolgirls surrounds Teddy, the man under siege in the center of it all can usually hear girls at the edge shrieking "Bobby" at him. To counter rebuffs of that sort takes cunning. When Bobby was exhausted on the top of his first mountain, his Senate senior felt moved to congratulate the beginning climber in a statement for the press devoted mostly to an account of how Teddy had climbed a much higher mountain years before. Probably neither of the brothers opens his head about anything substantial without first consulting the other. But because Bobby is on the move a lot more than Teddy, who is still on a cane, the junior Senator from Massachusetts likes to suggest that the junior Senator from New York is usually at the ballet, or the opera, or somebody's discotheque whenever he needs him most. Yet Teddy pays for such asides. One night a while back, he was making his way with a noticeable limp across the street outside the Capitol when that voice he has known all his life called out from behind: "You mean you can walk that well and you're still hauling around with that phony cane?"

But a little of his Gallagher played to Bobby's Shean goes a long way for a young man as serious about his work as Ted Kennedy is nowadays. Since the first of the year, he has introduced a bill to establish a West Point-like academy for the training of lawyers to defend and prosecute in criminal-law cases; he has pressed to abolish the national-origins quotas, which make it impossible for more than 308 Greeks, for one example, to immigrate to the United States in any year; he has proposed the establishment of a Teacher Corps to send seasoned instructors on Government salaries into areas of educational blight in the United States, and he is calling for Federal aid in redeveloping New England industry with a plan called Appalachia Northeast by critics in the Southwest.

Kennedy's principal accomplishment has been managed from his new and very junior membership on the Senate Judiciary Committee, which has tugged and hauled in the past weeks at the provisions of the latest voting-rights bill. Over the objections inside the committee of its chairman, Senator James O. Eastland, of Mississippi, and against the ever so clearly expressed urgings of the Senate Democratic Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, of Montana, the Republican minority leader, Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, of Illinois, the new Attorney General Nicholas deBelleville Katzenbach and the White House, Kennedy and a bipartisan majority of judiciary members set out to stiffen the voting rights bill by fitting it with the Kennedy amendment, an outright ban on the poll tax as a voting qualification in State and local elections.

Kennedy's opponents in the Senate made the strangest consortium of bedfellows. Some solid voices of the Old South simply liked the poll tax and all it stood for, and were opposing the bill with or without the Kennedy amendment. Some, claiming to oppose poll taxes as ardently as Kennedy did, held that a congressional ban at the local level was unconstitutional so long as article I empowers the States to set their own voting qualifications, and the 24th amendment forbids poll taxes only for Federal elections. Others claimed to be persuaded by the Attorney General's claim that the best way to have done altogether with the poll tax was to prove in the courts that it was still being used to deprive voters of their constitutional rights in the four States of Virginia, Mississippi, Alabama, and, perhaps most troublesomely, Texas, so dear to White House hearts.

In the weeks preceding, Lyndon Johnson had come down squarely on both sides of the argument. He told the Nation on TV that the poll tax should be banned, and he stood solidly behind his Attorney General, who was solidly opposed to Kennedy's kind of ban. Texas Senator Ralph Yarborough was won over to the ban after a long talk with the Senator from Massachusetts, but Texas Senator John Tower stayed opposed. Democratic liberal Senator Eugene McCarthy, of Minnesota, opposed the amendment for the reasons the Attorney General advanced. Republican liberal Senator John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, opposed it on constitutional grounds. Seventy-five lawyers and law professors, including the head of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission and Paul Freund of the Harvard Law School, backed Kennedy's contention that Congress had the right to exact the law and that the Supreme Court would uphold it. That is the way Martin Luther King, Jr., saw it, too.

One of the unforeseeable benefits of the youngest Kennedy's past courtesies to Senate seniors was that he might never have got as far as he did with his legislative fight if it had not been for the help of one of the poll tax's most intractable defenders, North Carolina's segregationist Senator Sam Ervin, Jr. When Ervin could not make one of the immigration committee hearings some weeks earlier, Kennedy undertook to confront a witness with an assortment of leading questions turned the way Ervin would have loaded them. Some weeks later, with the Judiciary in executive session and Eastland in a position to exercise some parliamentary legerdemain that would have plowed under Kennedy's voting strength, it was Ervin who came to the young Senator's support precisely when it would have been advantageous to remain silent.

Yet for all his senatorial courtesy, Ervin's help was not to count. While Kennedy and his cohorts were gathering their voting strength for the bill including the poll-tax ban, Dirksen, Mansfield, and Katzenbach simply wrote an altogether new bill, variously termed the Dirksenbach bill, or the Ev, Mike, and Nick substitute. It again omitted the poll-tax ban Kennedy and his supporters had had the committee votes to command. The only tactic left for them was to carry the quarrel to the Senate floor, where Kennedy was the spokesman for a pack of some 40 Senators, about 35 of them Democrats, who refused to follow the Democratic majority leader's lead. They called instead for passage of the Kennedy amendment banning poll taxes at every level, and even in the President's Texas. Seven more votes than the ones he already had promised to him were all Kennedy needed to pull off the best Washington defiance act in years. He had a week to work over the few Senators open to argument, and it all began to seem like an assignment he had in California 5 years before, hustling for his brother's campaign. Out there, he failed by a close count to deliver Richard Nixon's home State to John Kennedy, but in the Senate, he came even closer for his own cause.

A few days before the vote, and just for the sake of giving his friend Hubert Humphrey a restless night, Kennedy assured him that a Senate tie was likely and that Humphrey's own vote would be the deciding one. The choice Humphrey would have had on his hands, in the unlikely event Kennedy actually managed the tie, is the sort of choice every politician likes to avoid as much as a tax increase in election year. The inelegant option before Humphrey then would be between voting against the Kennedy amendment, which would be taken as a vote for the poll tax, or voting for the amendment, which would be a vote against Lyndon Johnson. Either way, Humphrey would lose. Either way, Kennedy would win. Either he would be the Senator who floor-managed the final banning of the poll tax, or the one who put the administration on record as defending it. White House legislative aids could see that fate before them just as well as KENNEDY seemed not to notice anything of the sort. "If we were really just trying to buck the White House," one of his friends noted, "We wouldn't have 10 votes." "On the contrary," another said, "if he were not crossing the administration on this, he wouldn't have all these Senators with him."

At 7 in the morning the day of the vote, HUMPHREY was on the phone with a Washington lawyer friend, urging him to sound out KENNEDY on the long-term advantages of withdrawing the amendment, instead of going down to defeat with it. By 10, KENNEDY had canvassed all the precincts and found that he was two votes short of the tie that was the best he hoped for.

At such times, the case for withdrawal or compromise can be a valid one. EVERETT DIRKSEN had told the young Senator earlier that his hard line on the poll tax might jeopardize the entire voting rights bill. But then the civil rights expert on the scene that morning felt that any Senator who voted against the amendment was not a friend of the Negro movement. One of the Senators supporting KENNEDY kept repeating that the case for compromise was that he found it very hard to feel like a winner when the vote showed him on the losing side. A lawyer with lines out all over Washington was sure the Supreme Court was ready to pounce on the poll tax the first chance it got, and that being the case, the Katzenbach theory was sound, and the compromise made sense. Churchmen on hand could see it both ways.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts could see it both ways, too, and probably even a third way that few others could manage. John Kennedy had a talent for conciliatory moves at the right moments when he was in the Senate, and he made some on the way to the White House as well as in it. At that late hour, TED KENNEDY could see that there were immediate and long-term advantages even for him in avoiding any vote that could ever be cited to make Senate liberals seem to be enemies of the civil rights movement. A young Senator not at all unaware that his name is mentioned every time presidential prospects are discussed would not like to put any of his friends in that fix. Their help would be nice to have when he wanted it most.

Nobody in KENNEDY's office that morning was sure of what he was going to do when he rushed off with Michigan's Senator PHIL HART to the majority leader's office a half hour before the Senate met to vote. He may not even have been sure himself. And he need not have been, in fact, because MANSFIELD said it was too late to avoid the vote. Before it was taken, and while his brother sat as the Presiding Officer in the Senate, and his wife, a sister and a sister-in-law watched from the gallery, KENNEDY made a last call for converts to his cause.

On the Senate floor, it moved not one vote his way. Forty-five Senators stood by KENNEDY. Forty-nine stood against him. But probably every one of them was now sure that the KENNEDY they had never counted on for much before would have to be reckoned with from now on. A few days later, the Speaker of the House, 73-year-old JOHN MCCORMACK, dissociated himself from the administration's stand and endorsed the poll tax ban. If his view prevails, the House could force the Senate to suffer over the issue once again. If KENNEDY wins the second time around, he will have to thank the Speaker, the proud old uncle of Edward McCormack, Jr., in Boston, who wanted to be the Senator from Massachusetts in 1962 and who said KENNEDY was unfit for the job.

Even before he cut a new and arresting figure in Washington, EDWARD KENNEDY found himself being introduced at a fundraising dinner for the Kennedy Library as a future President of the United States. There seems to be no possible acknowledgment to that that he can make in public. He recognizes it as a tribute to his brother, whom he never speaks of except as "The President." But he still cannot find it in his heart to say that he does not wish to be the President himself someday. Until that matter comes to a vote, he walks in the large shadow of the brother who was his godfather and who once gave him a gift inscribed "the last shall be first."

The last will be doing a lot of handshaking in the meantime. The Senator's almost fixed state of cheeriness is a condition he seems on the edge of abandoning only when talk of "The President" goes on in his hearing. At a judiciary session one day, a witness tried to support the case for segregation with a passage from "Profiles in Courage." KENNEDY turned dark, but said nothing. The last days of debate on the KENNEDY amendment brought one Senator around to a defense of the poll tax because he felt that one dollar was not too much to pay for the privilege of voting. "I believe," he said, "we should always remember that it is not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

"I am familiar with those words," KENNEDY said, dark again. The way he said it suggested he would not expect to hear them that way again.

TRIBUTE TO ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the man who followed the ideal of Abraham Lincoln has been laid to rest in the heart of Lincoln land, in Bloomington, Ill. As the world pays its last tributes of homage to this outstanding statesman, Adlai Stevenson has been returned to the place of his forebears. Illinois paid loving tribute to her great son, led by Governor Otto Kerner.

It is fitting destiny that the man who had risen beyond his birthplace to become a universal citizen, admired in the far reaches of the world and respected on every frontier, has now been laid to rest in the place from which he had come to grace the world. And it is proper that these records of the tributes paid him be recorded forever in the permanent archives of the Senate which confirmed him as Ambassador to the United Nations, and over which his grandfather Adlai E. Stevenson, Vice President, presided as President of the Senate.

As we join the citizens of the State of Illinois, and America, and the freedom-loving peoples throughout the world in honoring Adlai Stevenson in these final rites on earth, I ask unanimous consent that the accounts of these last services from the Washington Evening Star of July 19, the Washington Post of July 20, and the New York Times of July 20, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

In addition I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Post, of July 17, 1965, describing the services held here in Washington, and the article from the New York Times of Sunday, July 18, reviewing the news of the week under the title "Adlai Stevenson" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 20, 1965]

STEVENSON IS BURIED IN ILLINOIS CEREMONY

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

BLOOMINGTON, ILL., July 19.—Adlai E. Stevenson was buried here today near the graves of three generations of forebears who had played leading parts in the community since its beginning.

Standing by his graveside were his sons, his sister, old and loved friends, and the highest officers of the Nation he served—President Johnson, Vice President Humphrey, and Chief Justice Earl Warren.

The service in the Unitarian Church here was the third since the body of Ambassador Stevenson was brought back to the United States after his sudden death in London last Wednesday. On Friday there was a national service in the Washington Cathedral. On Saturday a state service was held in the rotunda of the State Capitol at Springfield, where Mr. Stevenson had served as the State's 33d Governor.

President and Mrs. Johnson flew here from Washington this morning. The Presidential jet landed at Chanute Air Force Base at Rantoul, 50 miles to the east of Bloomington. Then the President's party flew in three helicopters to the small airport here.

GREETED BY GOVERNOR

In the plane with the President and his wife were their daughter Luci; John Steinbeck, the novelist, and his wife; Justice and Mrs. Arthur J. Goldberg; Representative and Mrs. James Roosevelt, and three White House assistants—Jack Valenti, Richard Goodwin, and Horace Busby. The Steinbecks, friends of Mr. Stevenson, had been weekend guests of the President at Camp David, Md.

Gov. Otto Kerner, of Illinois, and W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor and an old friend of Mr. Stevenson, met the Presidential party at Chanute Field.

At the Bloomington Airport the President was met by Adlai E. Stevenson 3d, the eldest son of the U.S. Represenative at the United Nations and twice Democratic presidential candidate.

Vice President and Mrs. Humphrey flew in from his home State of Minnesota, where they had spent the weekend.

Several hundred persons had gathered at the Bloomington Airport. Hundreds more lined the roadsides into town. There was a smattering of applause at some points as the President passed.

The Presidential party drove directly to the old Stevenson home at 1316 East Washington Street, which is now maintained by Mrs. Stevenson's sister and her husband, Ernest Ives.

NEIGHBORS WATCH

The home where Adlai Stevenson and his sister grew up is a large, three-story frame house of cream-colored stucco with dark brown trim. It is set back from the street behind old maples, a large pine tree and several firs. On one wall is stained-glass stairway window, which was customary in the homes of the well-to-do at the turn of the century.

The President and Mrs. Johnson, Vice President and Mrs. Humphrey and Justices Warren and Goldberg were greeted on the porch by the Ives', and then signed the mourners' book.

Across the street hundreds of neighbors watched the Presidential party drive up. Again there was a smattering of applause, which visibly disturbed the President. Small boys were gathered on porch roofs the better to see the procession.

Although the arrival of the President's party with the attendant Secret Service agents and State troopers inevitably transformed the occasion from a private to a public one, there were still reminders of the old neighborly ways of a small town in time of sorrow.

For example, while the Presidential party was being escorted into the house, a couple in their 30's—William and Barbara Price—ducked through the shrubbery at the side of the house and in the back door, carrying a tray of relishes for the buffet to be served after the funeral.

THE DRIVE TO THE CHURCH

Just before 11 o'clock, Central daylight saving time, the Stevenson family and the President's party got into their cars for the drive to the church.

The Unitarian Church, a small modern edifice, is on the edge of town, just where fields of corn and soybeans are yielding to suburbia. It stands on a rise of ground with a view of the town.

The sanctuary, which seats only 150, is formed on one long side by a curved wall of old, rose-colored brick. The opposite side is of wood paneling, surmounted by slats of glass in which blue, green, red and yellow panes have been set at intervals. In the morning light, these panes throw splotches of soft color on the brick wall opposite.

At the entrance of the church is a free-form, welded metal statue by Edward McCollough titled "Epiphany" and representing "the miracle of every moment."

The President and Mrs. Johnson, the Vice President and Mrs. Humphrey, and Chief Justice Warren sat in the front row on the left of the aisle; the Stevenson family sat on the right side. Luci Johnson, who appeared to be indisposed, sat in the next to the last row.

The Rev. Dr. Robert Reed, pastor of the church, read the call to worship—"In time of trouble the Lord shall hide Thee in His pavilion."

BIBLE VERSES READ

Then 21 selected members of the Children's Choir of the First Unitarian Church of Chicago, dressed in red robes, sang without accompaniment "O God, Our Help in Ages Past."

The Rev. Dr. Martin D. Hardin, a cousin of Mr. Stevenson, who is associate minister of the Presbyterian Church of Buffalo, read Biblical verses so often heard at funerals. These were the sixth chapter of Micah and the 90th, 130th and 23d Psalms, from the Old Testament were read. From the New Testament were read I Corinthians, xv, Romans, viii, II Corinthians, iv, Revelation, xxi-xxii, and John, xiv.

Dr. Reed then read brief selections from Mr. Stevenson's writings, including one from his last speech.

Dr. Dana McLean Greeley, president of the Unitarian Universalist Association, then read a tribute. He said that the mind of Mr. Stevenson was "extraordinarily free from prejudice;" that he realized that "change is not the great enemy of man, but violence is that enemy"; that Mr. Stevenson was "always the universal citizen" who was "not cowed by complexity."

The Children's Choir, which was made up of several races and nationalities, sang "The Parliament of Man," Tennyson's famous poem, set to a theme from Beethoven's Ninth Symphony.

The President appeared deeply moved by the service and when he and his wife came out of the sanctuary after the Stevenson family, there were tears in his eyes.

During the service the crowd of several hundred across the street from the church was decorous. There was no applause as the President got in his car and the cortege started for the cemetery.

The 3-mile route from the church to Evergreen Cemetery goes through the heart of the town. Thousands lined the way, and many took snapshots of the President's car.

At one point cars from a shopping center cut in front of the limousine carrying Governor Kerner, Mayor Richard Daley of Chicago, and Mrs. Ronald Tree, and old friend of Mr. Stevenson and one of his deputies in the U.S. delegation to the United Nations.

SIREN TURNED ON

The car was held up so long that the Governor had to order the siren turned on. The car leaped over a curb, swung around obstructing traffic and sped 50 miles an hour to catch up with the cortege at the entrance to the cemetery.

Several hundred townspeople were at the gates and several hundred more were inside but kept more than 100 yards from the grave.

Two peaked maroon canopies had been erected over the grave itself and about 50 folding chairs. Besides the family and the President's party, there were many friends of the family and government officials who had come in two buses.

The family sat in the front row facing the grave. The President sat immediately behind Mrs. Ives on the far right. In front of Mrs. Johnson on the President's left was Mr. Stevenson's son Borden and beside him the two other Stevenson sons—Adlai 3d, and John Fell—and their wives.

The day was hot and humid, but a faint breeze was stirring in the old maples and the locust trees.

Dr. Reed read a prayer of St. Francis of Assisi—a favorite of Mr. Stevenson—beginning "Lord, make me an instrument of Your peace."

THE FLAG IS FOLDED

He then led the mourners in the Lord's Prayer. Just before the coffin was lowered into the grave, the military pallbearers folded the flag ceremonially and handed it to a Negro captain. He handed it to a white lieutenant colonel, who carried it about 20 yards to Mrs. Ives. After receiving it, she sat down and wept quietly, then turned and gave it to Borden.

After the burial, the Presidential party—except for the Humphreys, who had to leave earlier—returned to the Stevenson home for a cold buffet. Again the sidewalks were crowded all along the way and in front of the house but now there was no clapping. In all it was estimated that 54,000 saw the funeral procession and the President's arrival and departure.

The President and those returning on his plane to Washington left just before 2 o'clock.

Among the other dignitaries at the funeral were Senator and Mrs. Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Governor and Mrs. Edmund G. Brown, of California; Governor and Mrs. Karl Rolvaag, of Minnesota; Bill Mauldin, the cartoonist, and Mrs. Mauldin; Representative and Mrs. Sidney Yates, of Illinois; Ambassador and Mrs. William Blair; Newton Minow, former Federal Communications Commissioner, and Mrs. Minow.

The President's other daughter, Lynda Bird Johnson, and Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and Mrs. Freeman, had planned to fly from Minnesota but were fogbound.

JOHNSONS RETURN

WASHINGTON, July 19.—President and Mrs. Johnson returned to the White House this afternoon. The White House plane touched down at Andrews Air Force Base at 4:54 p.m. The 15-mile trip to the White House was made by helicopter.

A MEMORIAL SERVICE

(By Austin C. Wehrwein)

NORMAL, ILL., July 19.—Adlai E. Stevenson and Dag Hammarskjold shared a deep personal religion that in the words of Mr. Hammarskjold was expressed as "We have all within us a center of stillness surrounded by silence." This statement was made today by the President of Illinois State University.

The educator, Dr. Richard Browne, an old friend and tennis partner of Mr. Stevenson, spoke at a memorial service in Horton Field House, attended by 4,000.

Dr. Browne recalled that Mr. Hammarskjold, the late Secretary General of the United Nations, had urged this principle: "To say yes to life is at one and the same time to say yes to oneself."

Dr. Browne continued:

"These are the words of Adlai Stevenson's friend—Dag Hammarskjold, whose life, he wrote, had meaning because he had said yes to the call to public service, to the service of mankind."

Dr. Browne said Mr. Stevenson had also said "yes" to public service and to the United Nations in the "endless, almost hopeless, search for peace."

And, he went on, Mr. Stevenson said "yes" to the calls of this community, to the university, and to education everywhere.

Normal is the twin city of Bloomington, and it had special meaning to Mr. Stevenson, his friends said. They recalled that Mr. Stevenson's great-grandfather, Jesse Fell, was a founder of what was then Illinois State Normal University. It was the first State university and it was founded in 1857. Later what became the city of Normal was chartered, and it has been celebrating its centennial the last few days.

"Adlai Stevenson's affection for this community never wavered," Dr. Browne said, even though he was a statesman for all the world. The educator continued:

"Speaking once in Bloomington, he responded to his introduction by saying, 'There has been a lot of flattering talk on the theme of "hometown boy makes good." It ought to be the other way around—"good hometown makes boy." ' "

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 19, 1965]

JOHNSONS, HUMPHREYS ATTEND STEVENSON RITES

(By Paul Hope)

BLOOMINGTON, ILL.—Final rites for Adlai E. Stevenson were held here today in the hometown of his boyhood, attended by home folks and national dignitaries.

President Johnson flew in this morning from Washington to attend rites at the Unitarian Church where Stevenson was a member. The President and Vice President HUMPHREY also were at the graveside services, at the request of the family.

Thousands lined the street as a presidential motorcade moved from Bloomington's airport to the home in which Stevenson used to live and which is now occupied by his sister and her husband, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest Ives.

The President met with members of the family for a few minutes at the home and then went in a motorcade to the Unitarian Church where several hundred pressed against fences and ropes put up by police to keep spectators off the churchyard.

Stevenson, 65, twice the Democratic nominee for President, died of a heart attack Wednesday in London.

Accompanying the President was Mrs. Johnson and their daughter, Luci, Mrs. Humphrey, and several others, including Author and Mrs. John Steinbeck, who spent the weekend with the Johnsons at Camp David in Maryland.

Supreme Court Justice and Mrs. Arthur Goldberg, several White House staffers, and Representative and Mrs. James Roosevelt, Democrat, of California, also flew to Illinois with the President.

Among other dignitaries present were Supreme Court Chief Justice Earl Warren, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, and U.S. Court of Appeals Judge Carl McGowan of the District of Columbia, a close friend who gave the eulogy at National Cathedral services Friday.

At the entrance to the Unitarian Church was a sign containing a Stevenson quotation: "Freedom * * * is a plant which grows only from knowledge. It must be watered with faith."

At the airport earlier to greet President and Mrs. Johnson were Adlai Stevenson, III, eldest son of the Ambassador, and his brother, Borden.

Inside the church, Johnson sat in a front row along with Mrs. Johnson, Mrs. Humphrey and the Vice President.

The Stevenson family sat on the opposite side of the aisle. In front was the casket, draped with the U.S. flag.

Ten or twelve floral pieces were at the front of the sanctuary, including a wreath from the Johnsons.

Although the church was small, invitations were so strictly limited that there were a few empty seats, including a completely empty pew. It was a warm, humid day in Bloomington and the inside of the church was hot and steamy.

Mourners in the severely simple chancel of the church and in an adjoining room included Mayor Richard J. Daley, of Chicago, Gov. Otto Kerner, of Illinois, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman, and Justice Arthur Goldberg, and Stevenson's longtime friend William McCormick Blair, now Ambassador to the Philippines.

Stevenson was buried in the family plot amid the towering trees of Evergreen Park Cemetery.

His family and friends and national figures headed by President Johnson stood under two maroon tents that had been erected over the plot.

Thousands of men, women, and children stood—some for hours—in the heat and humidity while waiting to catch a glimpse of the cortege and the notables who rode in it.

Police Lt. Harold Bosshart estimated that 60,000 persons saw the procession at the Unitarian Church or somewhere along the 2-mile route between there and the 112-year-old burial ground.

The Bloomington Daily Pantagraph paid tribute to Stevenson today in an editorial and said that even though he was a principal owner of the paper he never attempted to exercise editorial control over it.

"He took every precaution to insure the integrity and independence of the newspaper," the editorial said. "Not once during his entire public life did Mr. Stevenson ask for editorial support or for special treatment in the news columns of this newspaper."

"He neither sought to control nor did he control the paper's policies, which at times were at variance with his own views."

The Pantagraph did not endorse him in 1952 for presidency, but it did support him in 1956.

"While deeply hurt that it remained neutral and did not endorse him in 1952, Mr. Stevenson kept his peace," the editorial said.

It noted that in 1948, when Stevenson was running for Governor of Illinois, the Pantagraph opposed the election of Democrat PAUL DOUGLAS to the Senate. Stevenson wrote a letter to the editor stating his disagreement with the paper's opposition to DOUGLAS and the letter was duly printed along with others in the letters to the editor column.

Some stores in Blomington shut during the morning so employees could attend a community service in the Horton Fieldhouse of Illinois State University, which was enlarged to accommodate 9,000.

"VOICE OF REASON"

Dr. Richard Browne, executive director of the Illinois board of higher education, told the crowd there that Stevenson was a "statesman for all the world."

As the Ambassador to the United Nations, he said, "he became not only the spokesman of this country but the voice of peace and reason for all the peoples of the world."

Jerald Johnson, of Ottawa, Ill., president of the university student senate, brought a youthful note to the community service. He said Stevenson never stopped trying to reach the "goals of youthful idealism."

"All his life he kept growing." He praised Stevenson for setting an example "for my generation."

Police blocked off streets along the route from the church to 112-year-old Evergreen Memorial Cemetery.

[From the Washington Post, July 20, 1965]

PRESIDENT AND DIGNITARIES MOURN AT STEVENSON'S HOMETOWN BURIAL

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

BLOOMINGTON, ILL., July 19.—Adlai E. Stevenson was buried here today near his childhood home after final religion services in the Bloomington Unitarian Church.

Led by the President and Mrs. Johnson, the mourners followed Stevenson's body to the Stevenson family plot in Evergreen Memorial Cemetery for the last rites.

The former Governor of Illinois, who was Ambassador to the United Nations when he died last week, was laid to rest in the Illinois prairies near his grandfather, for whom he was named and who was Vice President of the United States under Grover Cleveland.

FINAL TRIBUTE

"Here in the community and church of his childhood and of lifelong associations, we pay to Governor Stevenson our most intimate and final tribute, in a time of lasting bereavement for all mankind," the Reverend Dr. Danna McLean Greely, president of the Unitarian Universalist Association, said in a eulogy at the church.

The President and his wife flew here this morning from Washington. On arrival, they drove to the Stevenson home, where Stevenson's sister, Mrs. Ernest Ives and her husband now live.

He returned to the home to lunch with the family, at Mrs. Ives' invitation, before starting the trip back to the Nation's Capital.

The UPI reported that Mr. Johnson dabbed at his eyes on his arrival at the home where Stevenson grew up. He was distressed at applause for him from children and others gathered around the home and, before returning after the burial, sent word asking that there be no applause.

Vice President and Mrs. Hubert H. Humphrey and Chief Justice Earl Warren also attended the services with members of the family and made the call at the Ives' home.

Among the others here for services were Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz; Gov. Otto Kerner, of Illinois; Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois; Mayor Richard J. Daley, of Chicago, Gov. Edmund G. Brown, of California; and Gov. Karl Rolvaag, of Minnesota; Justice and Mrs. Arthur Goldberg; Representative and Mrs. James Roosevelt; Mr. and Mrs. John Steinbeck; and Marietta Tree, Ambassador to the U.S. Trusteeship Council.

Stevenson's body was brought here yesterday from the State capitol in Springfield. Thousands of persons turned out to watch the procession today and to catch a glimpse of the President.

FUNERAL SERVICES

The Reverend Robert Reed, pastor of the Unitarian Church, conducted the funeral services. He was assisted by Dr. Greeley and the Reverend Martin D. Hardin, associate minister of the Westminister Presbyterian Church in Buffalo, N.Y. The latter is a relative of Stevenson.

There were about 150 persons crowded into the church for the services. Another 200 were in adjoining rooms.

Stevenson spent his youth in Bloomington and attended public schools here. His father, Lewis Green Stevenson, was an executive of Hearst newspapers and owned extensive farmlands in this rich farm State.

The former U.N. Ambassador and twice candidate for President was the principal stockholder in the Bloomington Daily Pantagraph, a Republican newspaper that refused to support him in 1952.

Today's Daily Pantagraph, for which Stevenson worked as a youth, offered an explanation of its action in 1952, which created nationwide attention at the time.

Stevenson was a "principal owner" but he did not hold a majority of the stock, the Pantagraph said.

"He was for years a director and vice president of the corporation," it said. "Voluntarily he removed himself from both positions when he began to make public life his career. He took every precaution to ensure the integrity and independence of the newspaper.

"Not once during his entire public life did Mr. Stevenson ask for editorial support or for special treatment in the news columns of this newspaper.

"The Pantagraph enthusiastically endorsed Mr. Stevenson for Governor in 1948. While deeply hurt that it remained neutral and did not endorse him in 1952, Mr. Stevenson kept his peace."

In his eulogy, Dr. Greeley called Stevenson "the universal citizen." He said:

"We salute him for his modesty and his ambition, for his ability and his affability, for his wisdom and his wit, and for his failures and his successes.

"His mind was extraordinarily free from prejudice and subservient to the truth. If at times he seemed to take longer to make decisions it was because he sought the moral context for the workable answer."

After the graveside service, the flag that had covered Stevenson's casket was handed to Mrs. Ives.

RETURN TO WASHINGTON

Following the funeral, according to the Associated Press, the Johnsons left Bloomington at 2:10 CDT for their return to Washington. A helicopter took them on the 50-mile flight from Bloomington to Chanute Air Force Base in Rantoul, Ill.

At Rantoul the Johnsons transferred to a jet plane for the trip to the Capital.

[The White House plane touched down at Andrews Air Force Base at 4:54 p.m. EDT.]

[From the Washington Post, July 17, 1965]

NOTABLES FROM ACROSS THE WORLD PAY HOMAGE TO STEVENSON HERE

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

President and Mrs. Johnson and representatives of almost every nation in the world paid homage to Adlai E. Stevenson yesterday at services in Washington Cathedral.

With the great church crowded with Mr. Stevenson's friends, Judge Carl McGowan, an old friend who is now on the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, concluded the eulogy with these words:

"He died as he would have wished, engaged in his country's business and mankind's.

"We are a vast company—we friends of Adlai Stevenson," McGowan said. "In his case, the word 'friend' has a staggering sweep."

Many who never met the Illinois leader thought of him as a friend, and many of these passed his coffin Thursday night and Friday morning as it rested in the cathedral's Bethlehem chapel.

Before the 11 a.m. services began, the flag-draped coffin was taken to the nave of the cathedral, where it remained during the simple Presbyterian service.

The Reverend Richard Paul Graebel, pastor of First Presbyterian Church of Springfield, Ill., another old friend, officiated. He was assisted by the Reverend Dr. Duncan Howlett, minister of All Souls' Unitarian Church here, and Chicago attorney Edward D. McDougal, Jr. They read Bible selections.

The 65-year-old Stevenson, twice a candidate for the Presidency, once Governor of his

State, and most recently his country's Ambassador to the United Nations and a member of the Cabinet, died in London Wednesday of an unexpected and massive heart attack.

His body was flown to Washington Thursday on President Johnson's plane with Vice President Humphrey leading the official delegation accompanying it.

After the services here, the body was flown to Springfield, Ill., where it will lie in the Illinois statehouse. A private burial will be held Monday in Bloomington.

Vice President Humphrey, who attended the services with his wife, accompanied the body to Andrews Air Force Base for the flight to Illinois.

It was announced later that the Vice President would attend the final services in Bloomington Monday.

In London, the American Embassy said that a coroner's report confirmed that Mr. Stevenson died of a coronary thrombosis—a blockage of the arteries of the heart.

Members of the Stevenson family at the services included Mr. and Mrs. Adlai E. Stevenson, Jr., Borden Stevenson, Mr. and Mrs. John Fell Stevenson, Mr. and Mrs. Timothy Ives, a sister, and Lady Spear, an aunt.

William Blair, Ambassador to the Philippines and a former law partner of Ambassador Stevenson, flew from Manila for the services.

A large number of Ambassadors to the United Nations came from New York for the funeral services.

Republicans and Democrats from House and Senate attended, as did members of Washington's diplomatic corps, members of the Cabinet, leaders of the armed services, and a host of friends of the eloquent Stevenson.

Early this year, Ambassador Stevenson had last visited the cathedral to deliver a eulogy for another great leader, Sir Winston Churchill.

"OUR WORLD IS POORER"

At that time, he expressed the country's sadness over the death of the great Englishman in these words:

"We shall hear no longer the remembered eloquence and wit, the courage and defiance, the robust serenity of indomitable faith. Our world is thus poorer, our political dialog is diminished, and the sources of public inspiration run more thinly for all of us."

During the services the cathedral choir sang Ralph Vaughan Williams' "Let Us Now Praise Famous Men."

The congregation joined in singing two of Stevenson's favorite hymns: "O God Our Help in Ages Past," and "The Battle Hymn of the Republic."

President and Mrs. Johnson sat in the front row during the services with their daughter Luci and Vice President and Mrs. Humphrey.

After the benediction, the congregation sang the national anthem, and the casket was carried from the church as the Bourdon bell tolled.

Members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff led the procession, and the President, the Vice President, members of the Stevenson family, members of the Cabinet and close friends followed.

FEW FLORAL PIECES DISPLAYED

While eight servicemen placed the coffin in the Arlington Cemetery hearse, the President and other leaders stood at the top of the first row of steps beneath the north transept.

There were only a few floral pieces on display. These were from the President, the Chief Justice and Mrs. Earl Warren, the Princeton Club of Washington, the mayor and city council of Miami Beach, the officers and enlisted men of the U.S. Coast Guard, the Permanent Mission of Senegal, the Roosevelt family, and Sadruddin Aga Khan.

In the eulogy, McGowan said that the hurt of his friend's death "is deep—and no one of us is too old to cry."

That was a reminder of Governor Stevenson's comment after his defeat in 1952. At that time, the Democratic candidate for President recalled Lincoln's story of the boy who stubbed his toe in the dark and said he was too old to cry but that it hurt too much to laugh.

"NOW A LEGEND"

"Many have asked how it was that a man of Governor Stevenson's sensibilities could have intruded himself into the dust and heat of politics," McGowan said. "We may think, I believe, that it was simply his joyous response to one of his deepest instincts—that for public service.

"He knew that the greatest opportunities for effective public service lie in elective office."

McGowan said that the Stevenson story "has now become a legend. The glories of it are many, but none shines more brightly than the sight of him putting to work at the United Nations the very qualities which rocketed him to the foreground of domestic politics.

"It was as if he were fated to move through personal disappointment to the very center of the problems that assail all people, and upon which depend the survival of civilization itself."

McGowan recalled that in one of the last of his "magnificent speeches" Mr. Stevenson said: "for all our desperate dangers, I do not believe, in the words of Winston Churchill, 'that God has despaired of His children'."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 18, 1965]

Adlai Stevenson

He had said he would "rather not" be President. But when the Democratic Party's nomination in 1952 was thrust on him from the convention floor, Adlai Ewing Stevenson accepted it with a pledge to "talk sense to the American people * * tell them [that] there are no gains without pains, that we are now on the eve of great decisions, not easy decisions. * * *"

He did so in his campaign, with a candor on sensitive topics that probably cost him votes, and he threw in wit as well. ("If the Republicans stop telling lies about us, we will stop telling the truth about them.") He lost—some said because he was too urbane for the masses, but mainly, observers agreed, because his war-hero opponent, Dwight D. Eisenhower, was a shoo-in.

"I am content," said the defeated Mr. Stevenson. "I have said what I meant and meant what I said. * * * No man can do more and you are entitled to no less." Then came the humorous twist that was part of his style. He felt, he told a television audience, like the little boy in one of Abraham Lincoln's stories "who had stubbed his toe in the dark. He said he was too old to cry, but it hurt too much to laugh."

Nominated by the Democrats again in 1956, and defeated by President Eisenhower by an even wider margin, he told a group of Stevenson volunteers to "be of good cheer. Remember * * * that a wise man said 'A merry heart doeth good like a medicine but a broken spirit dryeth the bones.'"

Adlai Stevenson, former Governor of Illinois, grandson and namesake of a Vice President of the United States (who held the office in Grover Cleveland's second administration), and descendant of a family with roots in the Revolutionary War, returned to the practice of law, a national figure grown great in defeat. His admirers felt he had brought a new sense of purpose and dedication to the U.S. political scene, and stood in the world at large for the idealistic and visionary qualities in the American character that the world liked best.

But when some in the party wanted to make him the Democratic standard bearer again in 1960, he vacillated until it was too late, and the post of Secretary of State which he wanted in the Kennedy Cabinet (more than he wanted the Presidency, some said) was denied him. He accepted the position of chief U.S. delegate to the United Nations instead.

There he spoke for the United States—gracefully, often eloquently, sometimes dramatically. Yet, almost from the outset, there were reports that he was not completely happy with his U.N. job.

"I have sometimes been a little restless," he conceded in an interview earlier this year, "in this role of executing and articulating the policies of others." Rumor was that the restlessness involved reservations over some of the policies—the Bay of Pigs invasion, when he was misled by his own Government into denying any U.S. responsibility in the attack, and some aspects of President Johnson's actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

He talked privately to friends about resigning. Some gained the impressions that he was serving more out of patriotism than conviction, fearing that his resignation would be interpreted as a disavowal of Johnson policies that could hurt the President in his search for the hard answers in Asia and Latin America.

In London last week on a visit, Mr. Stevenson denied that he disagreed with Mr. Johnson on Vietnam. "There has been a great deal of pressure on me in the United States from many sources to take a position inconsistent with that of my Government," he said in a taped interview with the BBC. "Actually I do not agree with those protestants." Those were his last public words. Walking not far from the U.S. Embassy Wednesday afternoon with Mrs. Marietta P. Tree, an old friend and a member of his U.N. delegation, he suddenly fell, the back of his head striking the pavement hard. He was dead, presumably from a heart attack. He was 65.

"The flame which illuminated the dreams and expectations of an entire world is now extinguished," President Johnson said on television with tears in his eyes, and there were other tributes the world over. Among them were two from a former adversary and a present one. General Eisenhower called his death "a tragic note for all Americans." And at the U.N. a Cuban delegate said, "Politically, he was the enemy, but he was an honorable enemy, a human being, and a great gentleman."

A Government delegation headed by Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey and Mr. Stevenson's three sons flew to London to bring the body back. Mourners filed in thousands past the catafalque in Washington's National Cathedral. Yesterday Mr. Stevenson's body lay in state in the capitol in Springfield, Ill., where as Governor he enjoyed what he later called the best years of his life. From there the coffin is to be removed today for burial in a family plot in Bloomington, Ill., the Stevensons' prairie home.

Stevenson Given Illinois Tribute—State Bids Moving Farewell to Its Former Governor

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

Springfield, Ill., July 17.—The State of Illinois said a last farewell to Adlai E. Stevenson today.

It was a short, simple and deeply moving farewell in the rotunda of the old State Capitol, where from 1949 to 1952, Governor Stevenson earned the reputation that was to bring him the Democratic nomination for President.

The flag-draped coffin rested beneath the outstretched arms of a bronze statue of a woman (variously represented as a tribute to the women of Illinois and a symbolic rendering of "Illinois Welcoming the World").

The coffin was flanked by the National and State flags, and an honor guard of enlisted men from the services was silently changed every 15 minutes.

The city was baked in prairie heat, in contrast to the dim, air-conditioned coolness of the old rococo capitol.

MUCH BLACK, MANY FLOWERS

The two balconies ringing the rotunda and the supporting pilasters were swathed in black cloth, and a stairway leading to the second balcony was filled with flowers. Some had streamers attached with the sender's name in gold letters—"Aga Khan," "The Permanent Mission of Senegal to the United Nations" but most of the sprays were unidentified.

While waiting for the memorial service to begin, officeholders, politicians, members of the bench and bar and old family friends chatted about State business or renewed acquaintances. Though the heads of foreign consular offices in Chicago were in the front circle in the rotunda, the occasion seemed less an affair of State than a combination family reunion-political gathering.

A few minutes before 10 a.m., the immediate family of Governor Stevenson came through the crowd and took seats facing the coffin. There were his two married sons, Adlai 3d and John Fell, and their wives; his unmarried son, Borden; his older sister, Elizabeth (whom the family calls "Buffie"), and her husband, Ernest L. Ives.

The University of Illinois choir—out of sight on the second balcony—sang "Things Shall Be." Gov. Otto Kerner spoke briefly. The choir sang the State song ("By the Rivers Gently Flowing, Illinois, Illinois"), and there was a prayer by the Rev. Dr. Richard Paul Graebel, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church here, an old friend of Mr. Stevenson.

PASTOR QUOTES LINES

Dr. Graebel quoted lines of Arthur Guiterman that had impressed Mr. Stevenson when he was Governor and heard the pastor speak them at a funeral.

The lines were:

Friend, whom I loved to name,
  Know, would you mourn for me.
I that was not became,
  I that am not, shall be.

Then the choir softly sang "America, the Beautiful," a sweet tenor voice carrying the line "And crown thy good with brotherhood," and the service was over.

In his tribute, Governor Kerner recalled that Mr. Stevenson had once said:

"Shameless and sentimentally, my heart will always be here in Illinois. Here five generations of my family have lived and prospered. My roots are deep in our prairies, and I owe Illinois a great debt."

Mr. Kerner also recalled the relationship between an ancestor of Mr. Stevenson's and Abraham Lincoln, whose body was brought back to Springfield for burial 100 years ago.

Mr. Stevenson's great-grandfather, Jesse W. Fell, who first proposed Lincoln for the Presidency and suggested the Lincoln-Douglas debates. The greatest of those debates, in which Lincoln gave "The House Divided" speech, took place at the Sangammon County Courthouse here, which still stands.

In her book "My Brother Adlai," Mrs. Ives described how Mr. Stevenson, 4 days after his nomination for the Presidency in 1952, "slipped out of the mansion by a side door, through the bushes and down the side street to Lincoln's house and there, with the astonished caretaker's permission, he sat for an hour in the darkened living room."

She wrote, "It was his last quiet hour."

THE OLD AND THE YOUNG

All last night, persons from Springfield and the surrounding towns and countryside passed through the rotunda to pay their respects. There were old men and women, some old enough to remember Mr. Stevenson's grandfather, Adlai, who was Vice President in Grover Cleveland's second term. There were young men in overalls and sweaty T-shirts, and their wives with babies in their arms.

At midnight one young farmer with two small children stood in the shadows looking at the lighted coffin. He crossed himself and whispered to his children to do likewise. Then he tried to explain to them who Mr. Stevenson was and why they were there. But it all seemed too much and far away, and he let it go.

By noon today, 27,485 people had walked past the bier. The body will remain in the rotunda until 10 a.m. tomorrow, and then will be taken to Bloomington, Mr. Stevenson's boyhood home, for a final service in the Unitarian Church. The burial in the family plot at the Evergreen Memorial Cemetery will be Monday.

RABBIS PAY TRIBUTE

Rabbis in the New York area paid tribute to Adlai E. Stevenson in a number of Sabbath sermons yesterday.

Dr. Kurt Klappholz of the Congregation Tifereth Israel at 2025 64th Street, Brooklyn, said that Mr. Stevenson had "represented the noblest aspects of the American character—a passionate love for freedom, liberty, and justice."

He noted that the name "Adlai" appears in the First Book of Chronicles and in Hebrew means "justice of God." Mr. Stevenson "lived up to this name and bore it with nobility and dignity," said Rabbi Klappholz.

Rabbi Louis I. Newman, speaking in Temple Rodeph Sholom, at 7 West 83d Street, called Mr. Stevenson "a luminous thinker and writer, who, at the same time, was willing to undertake the responsibilities of pragmatic statesmanship."

The "tragedy" of Mr. Stevenson in recent years, he said, "lay in the fact that through a high sense of patriotism, he was ready to articulate a program amid crises which he did not materially help to fashion."

Rabbi Newman continued, "If he had been give a freer rein, he might have shaped the currents of our times in a constructive fashion whereby the tensions of the hour might have been materially alleviated."

Rabbi William F. Rosenblum told the congregation of Temple Israel in Manhatten that Mr. Stevenson would become "one of the immortals of our time."

HONORS AWARDED TO GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, The George Washington University, located in the Nation's Capital, has been rapidly developing into one of our country's topflight universities. I am proud to be one of its alumni.

It has recently come to my attention that the university has received a number of distinguished awards in the publications field.

GW: The George Washington University magazine and other publications of the university have received seven top national awards from three organizations: the American College Public Relations Association, the American Alumni Council, and the Educational Press Association of America.

The university magazine, which will next month feature a group of stories on the Congress of the United States, was honored for format and typography, improvement, and for an individual article, written by John J. Ford, a George Washington alumnus and a staff member of the Subcommittee for Special Investigation, House Armed Services Committee.

The Educational Press Association of America, meeting in New York, presented their first-place award for excellence in format and typography to Margaret Davis, GW editor, and Neil McKnight, alumnus of the university and staff member of McIver Art & Publications, Washington, D.C.

The American Alumni Council, meeting in Atlantic City, presented awards to Warren Gould, assistant vice president of the university for resources, for winning the Time-Life Distinctive Merit Award for improvement in alumni publications; and for winning first place in a direct mail drive for annual giving funds to help support the university and an honorable mention for one mailing piece used in this campaign.

In addition, Mr. Gould accepted for Mr. Ford a special recognition citation for his story, "The Withering of the Caladiums," a takeoff on a Walter Lippmann column. Mr. Ford's story had been reprinted in the National Press Club Record, December 1964, and in the Tucson, Ariz., Star, December 20, 1964.

Two certificates of special merit were presented to Mr. Richard Berg, director of public relations, at the American College Public Relations Association meetings in Cincinnati, Ohio, for overall publications improvement and in recognition of a special publication used in student recruitment.

GW: The George Washington University magazine, is a quarterly magazine designed to share the ideas and findings of faculty, graduate students, and alumni on old and new issues. Its annual Federal Issue, published in late August, recognizes its many students and alumni engaged in public service. Sixteen reprints from last year's Federal Issue appeared in a variety of trade and professional publications, in newspapers, and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S POLICY TOWARD VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, "there is no backing out of Vietnam, for it will follow us everywhere we go." These words were written by an American soldier to his wife. Two days later he gave his life for his country. These are also the words that the American people are saying and believing.

President Johnson's policy toward Vietnam is now being accepted by his most unyielding critics. The reason for this change is that the opposition can give no alternative policy than the one being used now to solve the Vietnam war. They have cried for 5 months for us to withdraw from South Vietnam, but now they realize if we do, we will lose all of southeast Asia to the Communists.

Roscoe Drummond wrote in the Washington Post:

> The verdict is in. By now President Johnson knows he can count on the decisive support of Congress and the country behind his decision to defend South Vietnam.

I believe the Communists will soon learn that this country is behind the President, will not withdraw, will not grow tired, and will not be defeated.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have Roscoe Drummond's column of July 7, 1965, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 7, 1965]

DEBATE CONCLUDED: DEFENSE OF VIETNAM SUPPORTED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The debate is over. The verdict is in. By now President Johnson knows he can count on the decisive support of Congress and the country behind his decision to defend South Vietnam.

For a time it looked like touch and go and many thought that the President's public backing was crumbling. The professorial teach-ins crying, "Get out of Vietnam" were contagious. Poets writing L.B.J. about how wrong he was seemed to be getting a better hearing than Rusk and McNamara.

But it was the opposition to the defense of Vietnam that was crumbling, not the support. Although there has been no formal referendum, the national decision is amply clear. Here is the evidence:

Top Republican spokesmen—Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN and Representative GERALD FORD, the minority leaders in Congress, who have given Mr. Johnson strong support over Vietnam from the beginning, have just renewed their bipartisan backing.

Democratic leaders in Congress—like Senators J. W. FULBRIGHT and FRANK CHURCH—who have been sharply critical of the President's course in Vietnam, are now agreeing that for the United States to withdraw or give up would be disastrous.

The public critics of the Government—like Hans Morgenthau of the University of Chicago, the leading professional teach-in—have talked so much and said so little that the country could not fail to see that they had no constructive alternative.

This undermined their criticism so badly with the public that Professor Morgenthau had to shift his stance and say he was against withdrawal.

Some sincerely say, "Lets negotiate." The United States has offered unconditional discussions, the Communists have refused and you can't negotiate at an empty table.

Some sincerely say, "Quit escalating the war." The fact is that U.S. military power is being used with care and measure. It is the Vietcong who are raising the level of terror and escalating the fighting.

Some sincerely say, "The real struggle in Vietnam is economic, not military." It is both, and Vietnam cannot begin to make real economic progress until the aggression is ended and the fighting stopped. At which time, as the President has announced, the United States will provide general aid.

And what next? There is no certain answer. We don't know how long it will be before the aggressor has had enough. But there is no reason to think that the Vietcong are going to overrun South Vietnam if we are prepared to stay the course. I give you the words—and the faith—of Capt. James Spruill, U.S. Army, written to his wife in the United States a few days before he gave his life in Vietnam.

"I feel there is too much talk of despair. Above all, this is a war of mind and spirit. For us to despair would be a great victory for the enemy. We must stand strong and unafraid and give heart to an embattled and confused people. At the moment my heart is big enough to sustain those around me. Please do not let them, back where you are, sell me down the river with talk of despair and defeat. Talk instead of steadfastness, loyalty, and of victory—for we must and can win here.

"There is no backing out of Vietnam, for it will follow us everywhere we go."

Another American has said: "We will not withdraw. We will not grow tired. We will not be defeated."

That was the President of the United States. It is evident by now that his goal is the goal of most Americans.

TRIBUTE TO ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, an outstanding tribute to Adlai Stevenson was made by Murray Kempton in the Washington Daily News July 17. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LONG DISTANCE RUNNER

(By Murray Kempton)

We were all of us young, young and gay, and so for awhile was he. That was 13 years ago and it lasted only a few months. So the sad thoughts about Adlai Stevenson began a long way back. Today's are the saddest of all, but they are not sadder than so many of the others.

He died, of course, in a public place. So many times, when the worst thing had happened, he had to endure it in a public place. He seemed always lonely and never given the release of being alone.

Most of us saw him first in the convention which nominated him, with the band playing "Chicago, that toddling town," the wild, vulgar, tawdry, demented scene in which the Democrats are used to winding up their business. Yet even that night he quieted us and made us listen, for the quiet voice in the noisy room was the only one he trusted.

"Let's face it," he said that night. "Let's talk sense to the American people. Let's tell them the truth, that there are no gains without pains."

He went on from there to the only political campaign in the memory where to stand with a candidate was not for one moment to risk your pride in him.

He told the Polish-Americans in Hamtramck that he would not tell them that he could free Poland. He told the South in Richmond that he would carry out the civil rights planks in the Democratic platform. He talked to the American Legion about freedom of the mind. At the end, he looked back and said that he thought he had kept faith with himself and that he thanked all Americans for their infinite courtesy and their heartening friendliness.

We can remember that campaign now and see that it saved the Democrats, and that Adlai Stevenson was the only politician in his party who was the loser for it. For the quiet voice in the noisy room spoke to the young who had not before thought of politics with hope. Through 8 years, his memory and his presence sustained them; he gave them faith even though his own faith had been terribly damaged.

Yet the shadow of that election hung over him for the rest of his life, and he would never be gay again. The Republicans had asked us to trust a man; he had asked us instead to trust ourselves. And he had been not just defeated but overwhelmed. He ran again in 1956, but it could never again be the pure and simple faith the first time had been for him. He had been wounded in his dignity and the scar would always show. In 1960 the young came to Los Angeles from everywhere with the illusion that they need only cry out their dreams to capture the Democratic Convention for him once more; but it was too late; and the young were never to see him as we had in that far-off time when he was absolutely his own man, and honor and courage had no limits.

The remainder was the United Nations. There will be stories that he was unhappy at the end; there is already a story that he thought that what we had done in Santo Domingo was a fearful mistake. I do not know what use such revelations can have now; are we to think at the end of Adlai Stevenson as only lawyer for client?

There was talk that he might resign. His private answer was that he had been there when the United Nations began, that he had returned when it was healthy, and that he would not leave it now when it was sick.

That first campaign laid upon Adlai Stevenson a burden he could never put down. For all of us who remembered him from the moment he captured us, he was not a public man but a personal possession, the embodiment of our own honor. He was the only public man of whom we demanded that, when he was ordered to lie, he must refuse.

But he did not belong to us; he belonged to his country. He would have stayed the course. "Patriotism is not short, frenzied outbursts of emotion," he told the American Legion in 1952, "but the tranquil and steady dedication of a lifetime." We have lost a long-distance runner.

WIRTZ AND NEW JERSEY SENATOR CHAMPION CAUSE OF THE MIGRANT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, of which I am a member, recently held 3 days of hearings on proposed legislation which would improve the wages and working conditions of our Nation's migratory farmworkers.

The July 11 St. Louis Post Dispatch, in an article entitled "Wirtz and New Jersey Senator Champion Cause of the Migrant," calls attention to the unfortunate conditions under which so many migratory workers live and labor and gives factual support of the need for remedial legislation. The St. Louis Post Dispatch story also acknowledges the efforts being made by Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz and my colleague, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], Chairman of the Migratory Labor Subcommittee in attempting to better the lives of our migratory farmworkers.

I believe the Senate should have the benefit of this article and, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WIRTZ AND NEW JERSEY SENATOR CHAMPION CAUSE OF THE MIGRANT

(By James C. Millstone)

WASHINGTON, July 10.—Two powerful and determined men have pledged their help to the Nation's migrant farmworkers, whose plight has been labeled "a national disgrace."

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz and Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, have taken up the cause of what has been a friendless group of wanderers called variously "the poorest of the poor" and "the excluded Americans."

WILLIAMS has prodded Congress to action through his chairmanship of the 6-year-old Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor. Wirtz has forcefully administered laws intended to help the migrants and has developed a program aimed at relieving the miserable conditions of their existence.

The two are working together to achieve further gains. At a hearing before Williams' subcommittee this week, both men placed great stress on the need to make the public more aware and more concerned about what Wirtz called "the iniquities and the inequities" of the life of the migrant.

Wirtz came armed with facts and figures, but none of his ammunition had the effect of a halting statement to the subcommittee by a migrant worker named Fidel Esquivel of San Antonio, Tex.

"I work on farm all my life," Esquivel said in Mexican-accented phrases. "Most time I am looking for job. Pay no good, maybe 75 cents an hour. We have no protection. Sometimes me and my family (of five children) sleep on floor. In winter when no work, I stay in San Antonio, cut wood for ranches to make living until summer."

Esquivel is one of about 360,000 members of a leaderless army who take to the road each year to help harvest perishable fruits and vegetables. With their families, they number 2 million.

Some start in southern Florida and work north along the Atlantic coast into New England. Others go from southern Texas to the Rocky Mountains and then to the North-Central States. A third group streams into California and the Pacific Northwest.

Last year migrants worked in 47 of the 50 States. In 1963, the latest year for which figures are available, the average migrant found farmwork for 110 days and scrounged another 17 days of nonfarm work. His total earnings for the year were $868, placing him at the lowest level of any group of workers in the Nation's economy.

But despite the rigors of his work, the ceaseless nature of his quest, and his abject poverty, the migrant worker lacks any of the protections afforded most working men and women.

Father Alfred Miller, a Catholic priest working with migrants in Erie, Mich., described the desperation of their plight in these words:

"Most are members of minority groups; poorly educated; outside the protections of minimum wage, unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation; denied the use of health and educational facilities in many of the communities through which they pass; moving long distances to obtain short-term jobs.

"The migrant wanders loosely on the fringe of responsibility, one of the few American citizens without recourse."

A recent report by the Williams subcommittee said:

"The domestic agricultural migrant has been largely excluded from these social advances which the rest of the Nation takes for granted: the minimum wage, adequate child labor protection, unemployment insurance, full workmen's compensation and social security coverage, and federally protected rights to organize and bargain collectively.

"In addition, he is subject to special problems in the areas of housing and sanitation, transportation, education, health and child care, voting requirements, job placement, and job instability.

"Because of residence requirements, the migrant family frequently cannot even obtain public welfare assistance in times of need."

Testimony before the subcommittee developed information that some migrants in Texas work for as little as 45 cents an hour, that one-third of the migrants over 25 years old are functionally illiterate, that many of their children attend school only a few weeks a semester.

Over the years, the conditions of migrant farmworkers have drawn sympathetic and occasionally outraged attention, but even the wide influence of John Steinbeck's "The Grapes of Wrath" had little effect on permanently altering the misery of those lives.

The Williams subcommittee stepped in to fill that gap.

Backed by church, labor and welfare organizations, the subcommittee began to develop legislation that would help. Williams submitted bill after bill setting a minimum wage, regulating child employment, providing educational facilities for children of migrants, providing grants for housing, establishing health care centers and many others.

At first, Congress balked. The first success came in 1962 with passage of the Migrant Health Act providing Federal grants for clinics to service migrant families. To date, 60 projects in 29 States and Puerto Rico have received grants.

Williams achieved his first real breakthrough last year when Congress took three significant actions:

(1) Four programs Williams had been pushing were included in the administration's Economic Opportunity Act to finance the war on poverty. The act authorizes grants for housing for migrants and their families, day care centers where children of migrants can receive good care while their parents are working, special educational facilities for children and adults and sanitation systems in their communities. The antipoverty program also incorporates the volunteers in service to America, some of whom are being trained to work among farm migrants.

To date, the OEO has awarded 52 grants totaling $14,912,000 for programs to help migrants in 25 States. The agency hopes to spend twice as much for migrants in the new fiscal year.

(2) A law was passed requiring registration of farm labor contractors who organize and lead migrant crews from State to State. Until now, these men have operated without regulation and often have exploited and cheated the migrants.

Under the new law, they will have to register with the Federal Government and file reports of their activities.

(3) Public Law 78 which permitted thousands of Mexican braceros to harvest crops in this country since 1951, was terminated at the end of the year. The effects of that action are still being argued, but friends of the migrants insist that the step had to be taken before any permanent solution to the migrant problem could be developed.

In the late 1950's, as many as 400,000 braceros were admitted to this country annually. Last year the number was 178,000. Growers have said that the braceros were a necessity because the domestic labor market could not supply enough workers to do the kind of "stoop labor" necessary to harvest certain crops.

Wirtz has strongly supported Williams in the braceros fight. In a 4-day inspection trip of the California farming industry in March, Wirtz declared he would not authorize extension of the braceros program. He said farmers would have to obtain American workers by offering wages and working conditions competitive with other types of industry in the Nation.

The philosophy underlying Wirtz' policy, as he expressed it in a speech last week, is:

"The laws of economics, of supply and demand, do work in the agricultural industry just as in any other. Workers are available if the prices and conditions are right."

The braceros provided a cheap alternative to cost-conscious American growers, took jobs away from Americans and contributed to continuing low standards for American workers.

Given the inexhaustible supply of braceros and the lack of protection in wages and working conditions of American farm laborers, growers were able to depend more and more on the foreign field hands, who offered an added incentive by arriving without their families.

Meanwhile, unemployment grew among American farm laborers, striking hardest at the downtrodden migrants.

Testifying before the Williams subcommittee this week, Wirtz said the braceros cutoff has been successful, that American farm labor is available to meet the Nation's needs, that the crops are getting picked, and that consumer costs have been affected only minimally by the change.

The Williams-Wirtz team now is pushing for legislation that would establish a minimum wage for farmworkers, prohibit hiring out of farm children under 14 years old, extend collective bargaining rights to farmworkers, develop a system of recruiting and transporting farmworkers under Federal auspices, and set up a national council to advise the President on migratory labor problems and policies.

The administration's housing bill, which has passed the House, contains a provision authorizing $50 million in grants over a 5-year period for low-cost housing for migrants and others, and Williams has introduced a separate bill to give tax advantages in building migrant housing.

Wirtz said that most support for alleviating the migrant problem has been based on moral considerations but that a deeper understanding is needed.

"There is a moral problem here," said Wirtz, "as ugly a moral problem as I have ever encountered. But there is now roughly a century of toughening realization that viewing it exclusively in moralistic terms is not going to cure it."

The answer, he said, is to get across to the Nation a realization that economic factors are at the root of the human problem. The economic facts of farm life, he said, are that much farm production requires labor for only part of the year.

"It is essential," Wirtz went on, "to develop substantially year-round work opportunities for all those who are needed to farm the Nation's produce. This can be done either by working out year-round work programs for workers who will follow the crops or by developing industry in the farm areas which will occupy off season the men and women who will come to the fields when the local crops need help.

"Until this is done, efforts to bring decency into the lives of these laborers and their families, and stability into the farm labor supply situation, will be essentially futile."

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE CITATION TO LEONARD M. BERLIN

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, last week the distinguished service citation of the Department of the Interior was awarded to Leonard M. Berlin, an Alaskan, a civil servant, and a long-time personal friend.

The citation was presented by Secretary Udall upon the occasion of Mr. Berlin's retirement "after completion of 33 years of superior military and Federal service." Mr. Berlin's career has been more than superior. It has been remarkable. He has explored and surveyed new lands not only in the Arctic but the Antarctic. He was awarded a medal by the Congress for his work as part of the expedition to the Antarctic under Adm. Richard E. Byrd. He served 2 years in the Antarctic before World War II and there is even now a mountain named after him in that vast continent.

Leonard Berlin may be retiring from Government service but this is certainly not the end of his career, for such ability and judgment will always be needed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary's citation for this award may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

Leonard M. Berlin, upon retirement after completion of 33 years of superior Federal and military service, more than 24 of which were with the Department of the Interior.

As an outstanding survey engineer, Mr. Berlin's Government career was characterized by superior execution of duties and his unique contributions to the defense, security, and welfare of the Nation. His temporary assignments began in June 1925 with the Public Survey Office and the General Land Office, now known as the Bureau of Land Management. Mr. Berlin became an engineering assistant in August 1933 with the Alaska Road Commission. The next year marked the beginning of his professional career in the Bureau's survey of the public lands in the territory of Alaska, now the country's largest State. Most significant was his role in the survey in 1936 of the hazardous northwesterly and southwesterly boundaries of Mount McKinley National Park. Mr. Berlin distinguished himself also from 1939 until 1941 as part of the expedition to the Antarctic under Adm. Richard E. Byrd. He was awarded a special medal by the Congress for his outstanding work in gathering scientific information and geographical data with the expedition. Mount Berlin, a peak rising 11,439 feet, was named for him and appears on all recent Antarctic maps. As a lieutenant commander during World War II, Mr. Berlin served as Arctic adviser to the U.S. Navy. He returned to the Bureau of Land Management after the war as regional chief of Cadastral Engineering at Juneau, Alaska, and in 1956 became Supervisory Cadastral Surveyor in the area 1 office at Portland, Oreg. At the time of his retirement on June 28, 1963, he served as chief of engineering at the Bureau's California State Office in Sacramento. As a tribute to his notable career of many years, the Department of the Interior grants to Mr. Berlin its highest honor, the Distinguished Service Award.

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

A REPORT ON THE PEACE CORPS BY A MEMBER FROM HAWAII

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, Hawaii has a number of volunteers in the Peace Corps, and we are proud of their record of accomplishments.

One of the most interesting reports of the work of the Peace Corps in Africa was recently written by Mr. Edward A. Oshiro, 24, of Wahiawa, Hawaii, a Peace Corps volunteer, who recently returned from Ghana.

Mr. Oshiro's report, published by the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and Advertiser, once again underlines the effectiveness of the Peace Corps program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE CORPS ALLAYS PREJUDICE, SUSPICION IN GHANA

(By Edward A. Oshiro)

Now that my 2 years' tour with the Peace Corps in Ghana, Africa, is terminated, I am taking this opportunity to reflect upon the role of the Peace Corps in Ghana. Because of our excellent 2 months' training at UCLA, we were not surprised at the development and the modern living conditions of Ghana when we first arrived in Accra. However, we did not expect to see Shell service stations and billboards advertising Coca-Cola and Fanta (It Refreshivates!) cluttering the landscape.

The first Peace Corps volunteers who taught in Ghana in 1962 were the very first volunteers to enter a foreign country. The hundreds of Ghanaians, who met the Peace Corps volunteers at the airport were suspicious of those "CIA spies" but when the first volunteer greeted the people with, "Wo hon te den"—How do you do—and then sang the nostalgic Ashanti song, "Yen Ara Asaase Ni" in Twi, the curtain of prejudice and enmity was swept away in seconds.

Many sang softly, with tears in their eyes, along with the Americans who had come to teach and to learn. Thwarted, the pro-left newspapers and some of the government officials accelerated their anti-Peace Corps vituperation and to this day, we are still addressed as "CIA spies," "Cowboy imperialists," "Misfits," "Spivs," and "Women corrupters." I must emphasize that this sentiment is not professed by the people and we have never experienced any anti-Peace Corps actions.

About 100 of the 130 Peace Corps volunteers are science and math teachers and the rest are geologists. As science master in a newly established British oriented government secondary school, in Sunyani, I taught general science, biology, health science, and first aid.

My other duties consisted of library master, duty master, dormitory master, sports master, and first aid administerer.

The first Peace Corps volunteers built a library with 2,000 books donated by a high school in New Jersey. Later, we cataloged the books and trained about 25 students to become librarians so the library eventually became independent of Peace Corps volunteers.

SET UP FIRST AID PROGRAM

With 375 students on one compound and a minimum of medical care, I found it vital to establish a first aid program and dispensary. The Peace Corps and the Ghana Government provided the equipment and medicine for the dispensary and I taught 15 students the intricacies of first aid. Most of them took and passed the international first aid examination so today, the dispensary and the first aid program are self-sufficient.

The national sport in Ghana is soccer; my knowledge in this field was nil. Nevertheless, the students enthusiastically picked up softball, volleyball, basketball, and track. I also introduced judo to the students but they were disinclined to take a part in a sport entailing body contact so that program flopped.

Thus far, the two generations of Peace Corps volunteers at my school have accomplished the following programs: Built and stocked a general library, science library, a biology lab, a dispensary; created a five-acre taro and palm nut oil farm, a science club, a debating club, a first aid club, and a work shop.

These tasks are only subordinate for the real work came with organizing and teaching the subjects and reaching out to the people. In 1963, there were only five Americans who could speak Twi and although we tried to learn that language, the full-time job at the school made it impossible for us to learn it fluently. However, most of us learned enough to have an appreciable knowledge of Twi.

In 2 years, we were allowed 60 days of vacation and the rest of our free time was spent on work projects. One Christmas vacation seven of us decided to build a classroom block in a remote village, hoping to have the villagers help themselves by helping us and eventually finish the construction when we left.

Ghana Government and Peace Corps provided the funds and we stormed the village enthusiastically. After a few days of digging and making mud bricks, we became aware of a number of sentiments by the villagers. The only white person to have visited this village was a German geologist, who 30 years ago, was carried on a wicker chair so the people were stupefied to see white men, and Americans at that, working with picks and shovels.

Another reaction, especially among the younger, more educated people, was that we were stupid to do hard physical work for no pay. The third reaction was most important and needs to be considered more deeply in the future. A lot of men in the village were unemployed and they became infuriated to see us working instead of them. They could not believe that we were volunteers who worked for nothing, so we alienated a significant segment of the village. These are some of the problems with which we were constantly faced. In East Africa, some of the Peace Corps volunteers built a classroom block but the people would not use it because girls worked on the construction of that building. It currently remains unused.

RUSS SEND PEACE CORPS

In the beginning, the Russian press and radio carried a vicious campaign against the Peace Corps but realizing the futility, decided to join us. In 1964, 20 young Russian Peace Corps volunteers arrived in Ghana to teach alongside of us. Last year, 100 joined the first group. Most of them could not speak English well so we coached them in English and they taught us Russian.

There is a tremendous rapport among the volunteers from the various countries represented in Ghana—United States, Canada, England and Russia. We have a common understanding and it is not uncommon to see Russian, American, Canadian and British volunteers enjoying lunch together at the YWCA.

Living conditions in Ghana are comfortable and modern. Clean running water, 3 hours of electricity at night, Western type of flush toilet, and kerosene refrigerator and stove made life physically comfortable for us. Matter of fact, my bungalow in Sunyani was better than the apartments I rented while attending the university in Colorado.

During the vacations, I traveled throughout west Africa, South Africa, and east Africa. Last summer, I hiked up Mount Kilimanjaro and met dozens of Peace Corps volunteers either ascending or descending the mountain. On my trip to Timbuktu, Mali, I again met Peace Corps volunteers paddling canoes and rafts up and down the Niger River.

While in the Congo during the rebellion, I kept encountering Peace Corps volunteers hitchhiking around that country attempting to find out what the war was about. The 5 Peace Corps girls who hitchhiked across the Sahara Desert caused none of us to raise an eyebrow for they were not the first volunteers, nor the last, to accomplish that feat.

Today, there are few corners in Africa that have escaped the scrutiny of Peace Corps volunteers. One of our favorites is the trek to Lambarene', Gabon, where Dr. Albert

Schweitzer operates his hospital. Traveling is one of the benefits of Peace Corps duty.

Most of us assigned in Africa are teachers but there are also geologists, doctors, engineers, farmers, nurses, economists, administrators, and in Sierra Leone, a television producer and technician who singlehandedly, runs the TV station in Freetown.

Reflecting on the 2 years spent in Africa, I believe that the Peace Corps has accomplished more than President Kennedy envisaged. Those 2 years were years of frustration and loneliness but I would not hesitate to do it again.

Did we make an impact upon the people? Some of the Peace Corps volunteers have been given land in Ghana by the people so there would always be something they could return to. The people in Sunyani offered me a wife to entice me to live there.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. **FANNIN**. Mr. President, hearings on legislation to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act were concluded recently before the Labor Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Among the witnesses who appeared on behalf of repeal was the Honorable W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor.

In his testimony on June 22, Mr. Wirtz quoted statistics relating to the 46,146 elections conducted between 1947 and 1951 by the National Labor Relations Board on the union shop question.

According to Mr. Wirtz, over 97 percent of these elections went in favor of the union shop and 91 percent of the votes cast favored the union shop. I might add that the identical figures were quoted by several spokesmen for organized labor.

Taken at face value, this testimony would appear to indicate that employee sentiment throughout the country was virtually unanimous in support of the union shop, which is prohibited by law in 19 of our States.

However, a closer look at the same statistics reveals that the size of the majorities was not as impressive as they might appear at first glance.

While it is true that only 7.6 percent of the 6½ million eligible employees voted against the union shop during that period, it is also true that another 15.2 percent did not vote at all. Thus the majority of all eligible workers who favored the union shop actually was no more than 77 percent.

Moreover, it has been pointed out that many of the workers who voted in these elections thought they were voting on basic issues of unionism itself and not specifically on the union shop question.

An analysis of this information regarding union shop elections is contained in Senate Document No. 32, compiled by the Economic Division of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress and published in May of this year. Entitled "National Labor Policy," this document is an excellent bibliography on the public interest in labor-management relations.

Mr. President, I submit that nearly one-fourth is a substantial minority in any case, and I believe these facts should be brought out, in order that Mr. Wirtz' arguments in favor of repealing section 14(b) might be placed in proper perspective.

I ask unanimous consent to have the pertinent section of Senate Document No. 32 appear in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOLUNTARY RECRUITMENT AND THE UNION-SHOP POLLS

Political symbols are often important to men, and for them men may sacrifice much, possibly even life. Whether the cash contributions of businesslike Teamster leaders to defeat right-to-work proposals and of business-minded General Electric officers to enact the proposals, for example, were intended to secure merely political satisfaction is doubtful. The director of industrial relations of a large firm active in the 1958 campaign told the writer that he did not intend to give in to the demands for a union shop in his plant because "We don't want that money from nonmembers going into the union treasury." He was convinced that bargaining with unions would be much easier if fewer firms in the industry had granted union shops or if right to work were generally in effect.

Union leaders can very well have the same conviction—that the more widespread right-to-work laws, the more advantageous will be management's bargaining position. Their experience with American workers gives them good reason to believe that a union shop is not only a convenience, but that it is also a substantial prop to effective, stable collective bargaining. Right-to-work laws strike at unions' main resource, dues. If all workers within a bargaining unit always sought membership and willingly paid their dues, right-to-work laws could have little significance for collective bargaining. American workers have not been noted, however, for their wholehearted devotion to, and voluntary support of, unions. Even craft workers, who have appeared to be devoted union members—so devoted they would sell their tools to pay union dues if need be—were responding to the inescapable fact of their union's control of employment opportunities.

American workers have often displayed little or no initiative in taking out union membership. If they could avoid signing up they did, taking out a union card and paying dues only when constantly dunned by shop stewards. In the absence of union or closed shops, unions have always been able to increase their membership by signing up workers whom they already represented and for whom they bargained. For example, in 1941 the United Auto Workers enrolled only three-quarters of the workers it represented. As late as March 1948, the United Auto Workers was able to recruit among the workers then in the bargaining unit over 25,000 new members in General Motors, a firm that had been organized for over a decade. The new members amounted to about 10 percent of all the represented workers in company plants. Two years later when the union secured a modified union shop from General Motors, a checkoff from Chrysler, and union shops from a number of other plants, union officials estimated that approximately 50,000 new members would be added to union rolls, an increase of over 5 percent in the international's total membership.

The Taft-Hartley provision for free and secret union shop votes a few years ago gave union leaders an opportunity to find out how strong worker support was for the union shop. Although the votes were generally favorable, they were hardly overwhelming demonstrations of support. They must have strengthened the belief among union leaders that compulsory membership is a valuable and substantial aid in the shop and at the bargaining table. As reported by the unions, workers voted impressively for the union shop. Union newspapers and labor spokesmen proudly and loudly touted the results of the NLRB-conducted, union shop elections. They pointed out that 97 percent of the 46,146 elections held between 1947 and 1951 favored the union shop and that 91 percent of those voting cast their ballots for the union shop.

The elections did demonstrate that a majority of organized workers liked the union shop—or at least unions. A close observer of many of these elections, Sanford Cohen, reported that many workers thought they were voting on the more basic issue of unionism itself, but the size of the majorities was not as impressive as unionists would have us believe. While the majorities were large enough to get the union shop, they were certainly not large enough to make the union shop unnecessary. Enough workers voted "No" or did not bother to vote at all, so that only an unperceptive union leader could have viewed the election results as signs of an irresistible enthusiasm for unionism.

Though only about 7 percent of the 6,545,001 eligible workers voted against the union shop between August 1947 and October 1951, 15 percent did not choose to vote, with the result that the majority of eligible workers favoring the union shop was no more than 77 percent. A noticeably smaller portion of eligible workers among large, mass-production plants supported the union shop than did workers in small plants. In 1948, about 83 percent of eligible workers, mostly in small craft shops, voted for the union shop, 5 percent against, with 12 percent not voting. By 1951, when the number of elections held in plants of over 1,000 workers had greatly increased since 1948, only 72 percent of the eligible workers voted for union shops, 10 percent against, with 18 percent not voting. In the larger plants, the vote against doubled and the proportion of those not voting increased by half.

The results of the vote in the following firms suggests that several large unions found the union shop a useful and even necessary device for recruiting many workers whose voluntary and eager support may have been lacking. In General Motors plants in early 1950, the United Auto Workers won support for a union shop from about 75 percent of those eligible to vote, was rebuffed by 9½ percent, and could not get about 13½ percent to the polls. In late 1950, the United Steelworkers mounted an intense campaign in 162 steel plants to get out the vote and to produce an "overwhelming demonstration" that steelworkers really wanted a union shop. While the final outcome must have been gratifying, since the union shop won in 153 plants and lost in only 9, the size of the vote must have been a bit disappointing to union leaders in view of their ardent campaign. Two-thirds of the eligible workers voted for the union shop, a surprisingly large 14 percent voted against it, and 20 percent did not vote. Still later, in early 1951, the Machinists asked for a union shop election at Boeing in Seattle. Slightly less than two-thirds, 64 percent, of the eligible workers voted "yes," 12 percent voted "no," and nearly one-quarter cast no ballot. The accompanying table shows the votes in these and a few other plants.

In some plants the vote gave evidence that outright opposition might decline where workers had had some experience with the union shop. After more than 6½ years under union shop, from late 1941 to July 1948, only 1.2 percent of Ford workers voted against the union shop and 7½ percent did not vote. In one of the biggest majorities in union shop elections in any auto plant, 90 percent of the eligible Ford workers voted for the union shop.

Percent of eligible workers voting "No" or not voting in NLRB conducted union-shop elections [1]

	Voted "No"	Did not vote	Total
Total NLRB elections, 1947-51	7.6	15.2	22.8
Small plants, 1948-49	5.1	12.0	17.1
Large plants, 1950-51	12.1	18.6	30.7
General Motors (without Briggs)	7.0	13.3	20.3
Briggs	4.1	c.13.7	c.17.0
Ford	1.2	7.5	8.7
162 steel plants	14.2	19.6	33.8
Boeing Aircraft	11.6	24.2	35.8
Curtis-Wright	8.7	5.6	14.3
Local 131, UAW	7.1	7.8	14.9
Local 644, UAW	9.5	4.1	13.6

[1] Data calculated from election figures given in 17th Annual Report, NLRB, 1952, p. 302; Monthly Labor Review, August 1953, p. 837; Business Week, Mar. 3, 1951, pp. 125-126, Oct. 8, 1955, pp. 127-128; and union newspapers between 1947 and 1951.

PROGRESS REPORT ON FIRST CONGRESS OF MICRONESIA

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, a week ago, on July 12, the first Congress of Micronesia was convened on Saipan in the trust territory of the Pacific Islands. I called the attention of my colleagues at that time to the significance of this event—the longest step yet taken toward the political development by the people in this vast Pacific region administered by the United States under a 1947 trusteeship agreement between the United States and the United Nations Security Council.

Since our country has jurisdiction over those farflung Micronesian islands, we also have the responsibility for their development politically, economically, socially, and educationally. As the people achieve more progress in these areas, we are naturally concerned with their eventual political status, just as the people of the trust territory themselves are.

A most useful discussion on this subject took place on the floor of this Chamber yesterday. I appreciate the remarks of my colleagues who participated in the colloquy with me. I am especially grateful for the valuable contribution made by the junior Senator from the State of Alaska [Mr. Gruening].

His proposal, made several years ago, that consideration be given to the creation of a great Pacific State, with various Pacific islands annexed to the State of Hawaii, deserves the thought and deliberation of all parties concerned. I will do all I can to stimulate active discussion of the subject in the Congress.

As I indicated yesterday, I will offer a resolution in the Senate to obtain the consensus of the Congress in order to determine whether the idea of annexing the Pacific trust territory to Hawaii is feasible and desirable.

In order that all concerned might be benefited by having more adequate information available on the trust territory, I am submitting three timely articles dealing with the first Congress of Micronesia now in session in Saipan. They are informative and enlightening. I offer them as recommended reading for anyone who desires to become acquainted with the background and latest political developments in the trust territory.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record these articles on the Micronesian Congress which appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin on July 17, 1965.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, July 17, 1965]

LEADERS CHOSEN BY MICRONESIA CONGRESS

(By Byron Baker)

Saipan.—The 12-member House of Delegates of the first Congress of Micronesia broke a 2-day deadlock over leadership Wednesday when it named Toshiwo Nakayama of Truk District as President.

Nakayama, who has been a member of the trust territory delegation to the United Nations Trusteeship Council, was elected by a single vote on the fourth ballot.

The delegates, who compromise the upper house of the new Congress, had been deadlocked since the opening day of the Congress, Monday, when they voted down a motion to elect Delegate John Ngiraked of Palau as permanent president.

Ngiraked had been the pre-Congress caucus choice for president.

The leadership fight was delayed by and intertwined with a fight over the seating of one delegate, Jose B. Cruz of Saipan, a Ngiraked supporter.

Saipan's Popular Party contested his election on the grounds Cruz was ineligible because of a felony conviction in the United States.

Trust territory courts had refused to hear the case against Cruz and the Saipan district commissioner declared him elected.

The upper house credentials committee supported this position but only after a delay until Tuesday that some members thought was intended to keep Cruz out of the initial leadership voting, since he was a backer of Ngiraked.

Maneuvers to stop Ngiraked were begun by Chief Petrus Mailo, the highest chief of the Truk District, when he hosted members of the Congress at a Sunday evening party. Mailo is a member of the lower house.

The chief, who uses an interpreter but understands English, called delegates from Yap and the Marshalls to his side during speechmaking at the dinner and apparently wooed their support for Nakayama.

On Monday, it appeared the chief had moved successfully because the motion to make Ngiraked permanent president was defeated on a secret ballot, 6–5.

After Nakayama's election on Wednesday, Delegate Bailey Olter, who represented Micronesians in the trust territory's 1964 delegation to the United Nations Trusteeship Council this May, was elected vice president of the house of delegates.

Committee chairmen chosen are: Ways and means, Amata Kabua, Marshall Islands; resources and development, Olympio Borja, Marianas Islands; health, education, and social matters, Roman Tmetuchl, Palau; and judiciary and government relations, Jose R. Cruz, Marianas Islands.

LOWER HOUSE ORGANIZES EASILY

The 21-member lower house of the congress had none of the organizational troubles of the house of delegates.

The assembly chose its speaker, Dwight Heine of the Marshall Islands, and passed four congratulatory resolutions Monday.

Petrus Mailo, the Trukese chief who had figured in the upper house maneuvers, was elected vice speaker of the lower house. Bethwel Henry, of Ponape, became legislative secretary.

In succeeding days the assembly established five standing committees: Appropriations, headed by Juan Sablan of the Marianas District, formerly budget officer for the trust territory administration; ways and means, chaired by Lazarus Salii, of Palau; resources and development, headed by Jacob Sawaichi, of Palau; education, health and social matters, headed by Olter Paul, of Ponape; and judiciary and government relations, headed by Luke Tman, of Yap.

Among the first legislation offered in the lower house are proposals for a $1 an hour minimum wage (triple present minimums), and for more local review of appointments and budgets proposed by trust territory officials.

The house of delegates was offered a joint resolution request that the congress be allowed two 30-day sessions a year instead of one.

A bill offered to the upper house would set up a preferential policy for Micronesian businesses competing for government contracts, and require that they be chosen unless they are unable to provide the needed services.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, July 17, 1965]

NEW LEADERSHIP IN TRUST TERRITORY

Saipan, Mariana Islands.—If any one man offers a good example of the type of leadership now developing in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands it is Dwight Heine.

Heine, 44, was chosen this week as the first Speaker of the General Assembly in the Congress of Micronesia—in other words leader of the lower house which has 21 members.

Like many of the other members, he is a college graduate (University of Hawaii, 1959), a moderate, and has taken part in top level conferences related to the United Nations.

Heine became a political leader in the Marshall Islands when he helped fight the case of the Rongelap residents after they were hit by fallout from a nuclear bomb test.

He and Amata Kabua (now a Marshallese member of the upper house of the new Congress) paid their own way to the Mainland.

MADE LECTURE TOUR

There, Heine went on a lecture tour to let people know that the Rongelapese wanted compensation for their suffering.

Heine also participated in the decision of the Marshalls District Legislature several years ago to purchase polio vaccine for the people of the district without authorization. District doctors had diagnosed the disease as polio, but tests had not been completed, and the Trust Territory administration refused to give the Marshallese a go-ahead until they had an expert opinion from Hawaii.

The subsequent epidemic brought 103 Marshallese down, and their rehabilitation is a major problem for the District now. But Heine and his colleagues are credited with having nipped the epidemic early and having saved numerous lives.

Heine says this is the sort of action which allows a person to become a successful politician in the Marshalls. It is thought unseemly to campaign for yourself there, according to Heine, but those who have exhibited their ability will be supported by friends who want them elected.

This is how Heine was able to win his seat in the new Congress by a healthy majority, even though he was in Saipan at an educational conference throughout the campaign.

Heine, who describes himself as a middle-of-the-roader, says the Congress contains three distinct groups. Hereditary island royalty wants to retain the status quo to prevent further erosion of their power, while the youngest of the new Congressmen cherish grudges against the administration and are anxious to try to force rapid development and an end to the old ways.

"I stand for an evolutionary change into the modern age," Heine says, noting that the other members of his own delegation, all in the royal line, do not agree with him. But he says the Marshallese definitely do stand unanimously for the unity of Micronesia.

Heine is pleased with the new Congress and says it is most important that the Congressmen organize and establish the machinery for governing the Trust Territory.

"Get it started, let it go," Heine says, "When you are too ambitious, you stifle growth."

UNABLE TO PREDICT

As to the eventual political disposition of the Trust Territory, Heine said, "I cannot predict the future—only 10 years ago I did not dream that there would be a Congress of Micronesia."

But Heine thinks that whatever happens, it will be under the American flag. He noted the suggestion of Governor John A. Burns of Hawaii that Micronesia might become a part of Hawaii. He said that this is a possibility. "Maybe it will be some new arrangement under the American flag," he said.

"We have American ideas," he said. "All our education is American; the tools of Government with which we work are American."

Heine is the son of a Marshallese mother and a half-Polynesian father. His grandfather on his father's side came to the Marshalls from Sydney as a copra trader, and later turned to the Congregationalist ministry.

From his parents and grandfather, young Heine received an excellent if informal education on the island of Jaluit, then under Japanese occupation.

At a mission school taught by Americans he learned Marshallese, Japanese, and English, in addition to other subjects. He also "studied American" via periodicals from Honolulu and Sydney.

After 4 years of schooling, his grandfather made him a teacher but the Japanese in 1938 recruited Heine and his pupils to go to work loading coal and building fortifications.

When war broke, Heine's parents and grandfather were interned but he remained free under surveillance, and was made an air raid warden.

The elder Heines were beheaded by the Japanese when the American invasion of the Marshall started. Dwight made contact with the U.S. Marines and served out the war as interpreter for the military governor of the Marshalls.

He also trained a corps of 30 young men as Marshallese-English interpreters and these people later became key figures on the staff of the trust territory.

After the war he became superintendent of schools for the Marshalls, even though his own education was far from rounded.

In 1948, he enrolled at the University of Hawaii but under a trust territory policy had to return to the Marshall's after 2 years. In 1957 he returned to complete his studies and got his degree in 1959, then returned to the Marshalls as district director of education.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, July 17, 1965]

A Legislature Is Born

(By Dr. Norman Meller, professor of political science, University of Hawaii)

How does a legislature start? This is the problem the members elect of the Congress of Micronesia wrestled with for 2 weeks before their formal beginning this week.

In January of this year the 88,000 people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands elected 33 members to their first territorial legislature. Twelve members sit in their house of delegates, 21 in the general assembly.

Each of the territory's six districts contributed two delegates to the upper house. In the lower house, district population differences resulted in Yap having but two assemblymen, while populous Truk sent a delegation of five.

Present-day legislatures all tend to have had some antecedent. Hawaii's State Legislature merely continued the old territorial body. And the territorial body had the legislatures of the Republic and the Hawaiian monarchy as predecessors.

The Congress of Micronesia is much like the Hawaiian Legislature which met for the first time under the old 1840 Kamehameha constitution.

Without precedence, and lacking previous legislative experience, the members elect faced a back-breaking task. Somehow they had to establish a formal organization and rules to run the legislature.

But they also had to establish an informal power structure which identified their key members to fill the officer posts and man the committee chairmanships fixed by the rules.

The Secretary of the Interior order which directed the establishment of the Congress of Micronesia fixed few limitations on the structure and internal organization of the two houses.

Unintentionally, this made the job of organizing even harder. Somehow the Congress of Micronesia had to choose among various alternatives that organization and set of procedures which best fitted the needs of the people of Micronesia.

Starting on June 28, the congressmen met for a week in presession conference. They considered legislative structure, parliamentary procedure, and the multitude of things essential to running a legislature.

They were aided by a team sent from the Institute of Technical Interchange of the East-West Center. Former Representative Tom Gill, Tom Dinell of the University of Hawaii's Legislative Reference Bureau, and I stressed both the academics and the practicalities of legislative life.

By the end of the first week the congressmen were ready to direct the drawing of the first drafts of their house rules.

During the second week, while the congressmen were meeting with Trust Territory administrators to hear about the various problems of the area, each house's rules were prepared, discussed, and finally adopted.

The conference's last act was for each house to agree to meet in caucus.

Last Saturday the assemblymen-elect briskly set to work and smoothly chose their officers and distributed themselves among the assembly's five standing committees. The house of delegates caucused most of the day, and only with great difficulty succeeded in putting together a slate of officers that later was reshuffled.

On Monday, at the convening of the first Congress of Micronesia, each house was ready. In 2 short weeks the members of the Congress of Micronesia had licked the problem of how to start a legislature.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE DR. SYNGMAN RHEE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, a great patriot of Korean independence, the indomitable Syngman Rhee, has passed away at the age of 90 in Honolulu. Death came yesterday to the first President of the Republic of Korea in Maunalani Hospital—a peaceful end to a stormy life dedicated to Korean freedom and unification.

No other name in Korean history stands out so vividly in the cause of independence for that country. During his embattled life, Dr. Rhee fought the Korean monarchy, the Japanese militarists, and finally the North Korean and Chinese Communists.

He suffered imprisonment, torture, and exile, yet he never relented in his fierce struggle to win independence for Korea.

Once this ambition was realized, he fought still another struggle—to unify his divided country—only to have this dream remain unfulfilled during his lifetime. He spent his last few years in Hawaii, exiled by his own countrymen who rebelled against his regime after the Korean war.

Many years before, during an earlier self-imposed exile in Hawaii, he nurtured his struggle for Korean independence and kept alive the nationalist movement among Koreans outside their country.

He became director of the Korean Christian Institute and founder of the Korean Methodist Church in Honolulu.

There, among friends whose admiration he earned during a lifetime of patriotic dedication to his homeland, Dr. Rhee will be paid tribute in services in Honolulu tomorrow. Then his body will be flown to Korea for burial and fitting honors in a country for whose survival he fought so valiantly for so long.

I knew Dr. Rhee well during his long residence in Hawaii, which was his second home.

I first became acquainted with him prior to 1945, when he returned to Korea to help establish the Republic and to become its first President in 1948.

In 1959, during a tour of the Far East, it was my pleasure to meet with him in Seoul. Shortly afterward, when he came back to Honolulu for the last time, I renewed my friendship with him.

I knew him as a warm, friendly person. The traits which distinguished him above all else, however, were his indomitable spirit, his dynamic drive, and his militant dedication to the cause of Korean independence and nationalism.

Although there was controversy over his leadership while he was alive, there is only respect and sadness now, for in Dr. Rhee's death, Korea lost its greatest patriot. More than any other single individual, he had kept burning the flickering flame of Korean nationalism and independence, during its darkest days.

On this sad occasion, I share the mourning of the Korean people in his native land and of his friends abroad. We extend our heartfelt sympathy to his wife and son during their bereavement.

FLOOD DAMAGE IN THE MIDWEST

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, based on news reports this afternoon that floodwater is running 15 feet deep in the main street of Smithville, Mo., a full-page advertisement published by Mr. Leon Morton, Sr., owner of Morton's Department Store at Smithville, in the local weekly newspaper, the Democrat-Herald, on Thursday, July 9, may have been too late.

Mr. Morton headed his advertisement, "Thanksgiving Flood Sale." He then told his customers:

> It was just a year ago that the muddy waters of the Little Platte River were swirling through the streets of Smithville and through our store and it was just a week ago that we had another scare when a deluge of rain hit this area and we are thankful that we were spared this devastating flood. In order to be more able to handle our stock in case of emergency, we are having this sale

to clear our store and warehouses and reduce our stocks as quickly as possible.

The advertisement continued:

> Store and warehouse clearance sale, July 8 through July 17—all merchandise in our store and warehouses including dry goods, ladies' ready to wear, sportswear, and so forth. * * * Everything in our store except food and related items—20 percent discount.

We hope Mr. Morton's sale was a success, but we are sure that he and all other businessmen on Main Street in this town of 1,254—just 20 miles from the heart of Kansas City—have suffered irreparable economic losses in the record flood today.

In the last 32 years, prior to 1965, there have been 30 floods in the Platte River Basin, the greatest occurring in June 1947, when losses were $7.5 million. Losses in June 1964, were $2.6 million, one-half million in Smithville alone. But all records are being broken today.

Far more serious is the loss of life, however, in a flood that could have been controlled had the planned flood protection works been constructed instead of just on paper.

My office has received reports of the possible loss of 10 lives as a result of the heavy rains yesterday, last night, and today in northwest and west central Missouri. As many as five persons may have lost their lives in Smithville alone.

Lower in the Platte Basin, a trailer was swept away by flood waters in the town of Riverside, a suburb of Kansas City. A car was washed off a bridge on U.S. Highway 169, near Smithville. A woman was drowned at Faucett. Her son was rescued from the swirling waters, all of this as a result of the flooding of the Platte River.

In an adjoining river basin, that of the Fishing River, similar flooding was taking place. Excelsior Springs had reported estimates of damage of $1.5 million early this morning and the rains were still continuing. Some 300 people were being evacuated from the nearby community of Mosby.

In the last 2 days, according to unofficial reports, 21½ inches of rain have fallen in Rock Port in Atchison County. Damage there is estimated at more than $4 million.

The Governor of Missouri, Hon. Warren E. Hearnes, has wired the President asking for emergency assistance. We have been assured by the Office of Emergency Planning that the Regional Director for Missouri and Kansas, Mr. Harold Knott, is already in the area and the first report as to the extent of damage has been received from him. The present estimate is that total loss in the State may exceed $25 million, almost as much as the estimated cost of recommended flood protection works in the Platte and Fishing River Basins.

We would hope that action by the Congress this year will pave the way for prevention of recurrences of these flood damages. Flood protection proposals for both these basins are now being processed by Government agencies.

The Office of the Chief of the Army Engineers is completing its work on the Platte report for submission to the Secretary of the Army and Bureau of the Budget. We have been assured that this will be done within the next few days.

The proposal for flood protection on the Fishing River has received all approval necessary prior to submission to the Bureau of the Budget, with one exception, the Department of the Interior. We have been assured that report will be forthcoming promptly so that this proposal can be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget and in turn to the Congress for inclusion in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill when that bill goes to the House of Representatives later this month.

The omnibus bill already includes approval by the Senate Public Works Committee of flood protection plans for the Grand and Chariton River basins in North Missouri.

By the time the Congress takes its final action this year on this bill, S. 2300, we hope that authorization will be included for all of these badly needed flood protection works so that in years to come, other merchants in other towns and cities in Missouri will not have to run ads "in order to be more able to handle—their—stock in case of flood emergency," and so that unnecessary loss of life may be prevented.

STATEMENT ON LETTERS TO MAYORS—REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, several weeks ago I wrote to the mayors of our Nation's larger cities and asked them to inform President Johnson of their views on the Dirksen reapportion amendment. Many of them have since written to express vigorous opposition to any amendment that would allow a State to depart from the rule of "one man-one vote" in apportioning its legislature. Their letters voice the fear that such an amendment would produce legislatures unresponsive to the needs of the people. I share the fear of these mayors. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the letters I have received be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,
July 1, 1965.

Senator JOSEPH T. TYDINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: Thank you for your recent letter and Senate speech on this vital issue of representation in our State legislatures. I agree that we must strongly oppose any constitutional amendments which would perpetuate malapportionment in our legislatures.

As you may know, I did make my views known to the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments in April. Furthermore, I introduced a resolution calling for apportionment of State legislatures on a population basis only for consideration at the annual meeting of the U.S. Conference of Mayors. This resolution was unanimously approved at the meeting in St. Louis a few weeks ago.

A similar resolution has been submitted to the National League of Cities for consideration at their annual meeting in Detroit late in July. Although we expect some opposition, I am confident that the league will finally approve this basic principle of representative government.

I will continue to use every opportunity to express such views on this matter and also welcome any information or recommendations you may have.

With all good wishes and kindest regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. J. TATE,
Mayor.

CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
June 30, 1965.

Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I am enclosing a copy of a letter I have written today to the President urging that everything possible be done to defeat the Dirksen amendment.

I testified on this matter before the House Judiciary Subcommittee approximately a year ago, and if my testimony could be of any use to you with reference to this matter, it is on record.

With kindest personal regards.

Very truly yours,

HERMAN W. GOLDNER,
Mayor.

CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
June 30, 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The administration has made great strides in protecting the right to vote by all of its citizens. This right, however, is not limited to the civil rights aspects so currently in the forefront of the news, but must also be considered in terms of the geographic location of the citizen and the weight of his vote.

Reapportionment, a problem in the State of Florida, where 14½ percent of the people control the majority of the State senate and 24 percent of the people control the house of representatives, has limited the progress of our State for years. It has also made direct relationships between the municipal and Federal Government virtually mandatory because of the failure of the State to face urban problems.

The proposed Dirksen amendment would impede the progress of reapportionment made since recent rulings of the U.S. Supreme Court. You may recall that I raised this question at the briefing of the mayors of major American cities at the White House, and the Attorney General in his answer to the question indicated an awareness of this problem.

I sincerely urge that the administration take a firm position in this matter for the purpose of defeating the current movement in the Congress of the United States supporting the Dirksen amendment. Should this amendment pass, it is my honest feeling that the necessary progress toward finding reasonable solutions for urban problems will be impeded and the necessary reforms for the purpose of making more effective State legislatures will never come about.

I deeply and sincerely urge a firm administrative position supporting the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the Supreme Court in its one-man one-vote position.

Very respectfully yours,

HERMAN W. GOLDNER,
Mayor.

CITY OF PROVIDENCE,
Providence, R.I., June 30, 1965.

Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: The apportionment of our State legislature is an issue which is of great concern to me. Since the decision of *Baker* v. *Carr* our State legislature has grappled with the issue without solution. At its most recent session the legislature appropriated $250,000 to conduct a State census which will be used as the basis of our apportionment plan.

The Dirksen amendment, as I understand it, is directed to upsetting the *Baker* v. *Carr* decision. I find it difficult to lend support to any legislation which would perpetuate the disproportion which exists in many State legislatures. In fact, I have spoken against it and have pledged a municipal reapportionment to realine the city of Providence's ward lines.

In summation I would like to point out that our State legislature is moving with due haste to apportion before the 1966 elections, and I have no doubt that the passage of the Dirksen amendment would seriously delay reapportionment to the detriment of our democratic system.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.,
Mayor of Providence.

Copies to: Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL, Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE, Hon. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, and Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY.

CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER,
June 30, 1965.

Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: Thank you for your letter of June 25 and the copy of your speech in opposition to the proposed constitutional amendment on legislative apportionment.

I heartily concur with your views, and am again informing our congressional delegation of them.

You may rest assured that I will do everything possible to make known the fallacies espoused by Senator DIRKSEN in his proposed amendment.

Cordially yours,

TOM CURRIGAN,
Mayor.

CITY OF NEW YORK,
New York, N.Y., July 12, 1965.

Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: The mayor has asked me to acknowledge and thank you for your recent letter with respect to State legislative apportionment. The mayor read your remarks with interest, and of course subscribes to your views.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL E. BRAGDON.

CITY OF DULUTH,
July 6, 1965.

Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I am deeply disturbed about the possibility of passage of the so-called Dirksen amendment to the Constitution of the United States for reasons that I am sure you are familiar with and which need not be belabored here.

However, I do want to go on record, along with thousands of other persons interested in municipal government, against the Dirksen amendment which, I am informed, does have a chance of passage by Congress.

Sincerely,

GEORGE D. JOHNSON,
Mayor.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Los Angeles, Calif., July 6, 1965.

Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: Mayor Yorty is out of the city, but your letter urging opposition to the Dirksen amendment will be brought to the mayor's attention upon his return. As a supporter of reapportionment of State legislatures on the principle of "one man, one vote," Mayor Yorty will be most interested in your suggestions.

In the meantime, the city of Los Angeles probably will be represented at hearings on the amendment by Principal Assistant City Attorney James A. Doherty and the Honorable Paul Lamport, member of the city council.

Very truly yours,

DOROTHY L. MOORE,
Secretary to the Mayor.

CITY OF PITTSBURGH, PA.,
July 3, 1965.

Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I have your letter of June 25, together with your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I could not agree with you more thoroughly. I have expressed my views on this in many public speeches, and would be more than happy to appear, at any time, before a committee in the Senate or House in opposition to the Dirksen amendment.

I appreciate your writing me.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH M. BARR.

THE CITY OF WATERBURY, CONN.,
July 7, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As the mayor of a growing industrial city, with populous suburbs, in a State which has long suffered from legislative malapportionment, I respectfully urge you to use the influence of your office to defeat the proposed constitutional amendment offered by Senator DIRKSEN.

After a century and a half of disportionate rural influence in our State legislature, Connecticut currently has in session a Constitutional convention, called by order of the Federal Courts, which will act to write into our constitution the "one man, one vote" principle enunciated by the Supreme Court. Our general assembly, under prodding by the U.S. district court, has already voted to establish new assembly districts set up on a population basis.

Adoption of the Dirksen amendment, allowing one house of a State legislature to be apportioned on some basis other than population, would mean a return of the discredited old system which gave the same representation in the State house of representatives to a town with 383 residents as it did to the largest city.

Dissatisfaction with a Supreme Court decision offers a questionable foundation for an effort to amend the Constitution of the United States.

I am asking our Senators and Representatives also to oppose the Dirksen amendment.

Yours sincerely,

JOSEPH F. MCNELLIS,
Mayor.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
CITY OF NEW HAVEN, CONN.,
July 1, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: Let me congratulate you on your outstanding speech concerning the Dirksen amendment. I can say without exaggeration that yours is one of the finest congressional presentations that I have ever read.

As you may know, a constitutional convention has been convened in Connecticut to reapportion our State legislature. There seem to be grounds for reasonable confidence that the convention will handle its job effectively and that the malapportionment which has plagued our State for most of this century will be eliminated. The results of the convention are by no means certain, of course, but those of us who are concerned with fair representation and with the problems of cities and metropolitan areas are cautiously optomistic.

I believe we can also be confident that the entire Connecticut congressional delegation—Senate and House—will oppose the Dirksen amendment when it comes to a vote, and there is no need for me to intercede with the delegation. I will, however, indicate my opposition to the Dirksen amendment to Vice President HUMPHREY and you may also be sure that I will strongly oppose it whenever appropriate opportunities for effective action present themselves.

Again, my thanks for your letter and my congratulations on your fine address.

Sincerely,

DICK LEE.

METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF
NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY,
Nashville, Tenn., July 6, 1965.

Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
U.S. Senator from Maryland, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am in receipt of your letter of June 25 relative to a statement in connection with the Dirksen amendment.

I am enclosing a copy of statement that I have heretofore filed with the chairman of the House committee on the subject, for your information and use in any form that you might think proper. I will likewise send copies of it to our Tennessee delegation.

Thanking you for calling this to my attention, I am

Most sincerely,

BEVERLY BRILEY, *Mayor.*

METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF
NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY,
Nashville, Tenn., June 30, 1965.

Representative EMMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As the mayor of metropolitan Nashville and Davidson County, Tenn., I would like to bring certain facts to your attention as you evaluate the proposed constitutional amendment relative to the manner in which legislatures may apportion themselves. Nashville and Davidson County have had long historic interests and experience in the problems arising out of inequitable representation of the State legislature in Tennessee. It is from this background of experience and concern that we would like to point up certain considerations relating to the reapportionment issues presently before your committee.

We are firm believers that government at all levels should be responsible and responsive to its citizens. We feel that the State government should be strengthened and made more responsible to the problems arising from the urban centers within States. We firmly believe that a truly representative State government will pass legislation dealing with urban problems; thereby equipping States to perform the functions and services in urban centers within their own limits, or in delegating authority to their local units of government, in order that many problems presently pressing upon the Federal Government will be resolved at the local level. We would deplore any hasty action which might cripple the State's ability, knowledge, or desire to make significant contributions toward the resolving of growing urban problems.

With these thoughts in mind, we would like to raise the following points in regard to this proposed constitutional amendment:

1. We would resist any attempt to make this matter nonadjudicable. Matters concerning such a basic right as the vote must

always have a judicial remedy to insure the continuation of democratic institutions.

2. This amendment should only be adopted by referendum in each State and not by the legislatures whose members may well have a vested self-interest in preserving an unfair system of representation.

3. This amendment should list those factors other than population which are legitimate factors in determining representation. Failure to do this will put the entire matter back in the courts to determine what factors may be used. If the amendment is adopted, we believe it should define the factors which may be used rather than leaving the factors unclear.

4. The amendment would undoubtedly raise many legal problems because its relation with the 14th and 1st amendments remains unclear. It would appear to act as, at least, a partial repeal of these basic amendments.

5. Finally, we believe that the "one-man-one-vote" principle should be given a chance to prove itself in strengthening State governments and in making them responsive to growing urban problems.

Sincerely,

Beverly Briley,
Mayor.

City of Albany,
July 1, 1965.

Hon. Joseph D. Tydings,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Tydings: Thank you very much indeed for you letter of June 25. I certainly agree with you on this matter, and will do everything I can to help.

Sincerely yours,

Erastus Corning, 2d,
Mayor.

City of Louisville, Ky.,
July 2, 1965.

Senator Joseph D. Tydings,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Tydings: I have received your letter of June 25, 1965, and I agree with your belief in the philosophy of "one man—one vote." I have expressed this feeling to my good friends, Senator John Sherman Cooper and Senator Thruston B. Morton.

Thanking you for your interest, I am

Sincerely yours,

William O. Cowger.

Office of the Mayor
of Milwaukee,
July 14, 1965.

Hon. Joseph D. Tydings,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Tydings: There is attached a copy of a communication I have sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, relative to the Dirksen amendment.

Please be assured of my continued interest in this subject. I have repeatedly mentioned this matter in public statements and hope that you will be successful in your fight against this proposal.

Very truly yours,

Henry W. Maier,
Mayor.

Office of the Mayor of Milwaukee,
July 6, 1965.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear President Johnson: This is to register with you my personal and official opposition to the Dirksen amendment which would provide for nonrepresentative government in the several States. This great leap backward is a violation of the spirit of democracy and runs counter to the fight you have successfully made to extend equal voting rights to all of our population.

If State legislatures can gerrymander their separate States so as to disenfranchise various elements of the population on one excuse or another, the right of the individual to his ballot can be made meaningless.

I have long fought for fair apportionment of legislative representation. After the 1950 census when I was in the Wisconsin Senate, I led the fight for fair apportionment in the State of Wisconsin. It was in that fight that I coined the word, "areacrat," to describe those who would disenfranchise our urban dwellers through geographic legerdemain.

I also wish to register my opposition to this amendment in my capacity as the mayor of the largest city in the State of Wisconsin and as president of the National League of Cities. Most American cities find that the major cause of their current fiscal and social difficulties stem from inadequate support and assistance received from their State capitals. These injustices can be rectified only through action at the State level. And this action can be achieved only if city dwellers are fairly represented in their State legislatures.

Although I realize that this matter is still in the Senate and is not subject to your veto, I hope that you will find it possible to use your influence against this iniquitous amendment so as to assure its rejection by that body.

Respectfully,

Henry W. Maier,
Mayor.

THE CASE FOR ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the case for needed congressional study and action to amend the process of our electoral college system continue to mount with each passing day. While there is no unanimity of opinion as to what should be done to update our electoral college system, there is at least recognition among political and judicial leaders of the country that reform there must be. All agree that the Supreme Court decision espousing the "one man, one vote" concept will require that Congress approve the necessary constitutional amendment to meet this criteria in our electoral college procedures.

Mr. President, at the annual meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General, held this year at the end of June in San Antonio, Tex., there was a discussion session on electoral college reform. The five-man panel, moderated by Attorney General David P. Buckson, of Delaware, included spokesmen for the three approaches to the electoral college problem: First, a constitutional amendment proposed by Congress; second, a Constitutional Convention to propose an electoral reform amendment to the Constition; and third, an original jurisdiction suit in the U.S. Supreme Court by Delaware to put a stop to the practice in 45 States of electing statewide their electoral college members who correspond to Members of the House of Representatives.

I ask unanimous consent that the papers presented by the five members of the panel be printed in the Record. The panelists, in the order of their presentations, were: Dr. Robert G. Dixon, Jr., professor of law, the George Washington University Law School and Graduate School of Public Law; J. Harvie Williams, secretary, American Good Government Society, Washington, D.C.; James C. Kirby, Jr., professor of law, Northwestern University, and formerly chief counsel to the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments; the Honorable Cecil H. Underwood, former Governor of West Virginia; and John A. Gosnell, general counsel, National Small Business Association, Washington, D.C.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE IMPACT OF "ONE MAN-ONE VOTE" ON STATE LEGISLATURES, CONGRESS, PRESIDENCY

(By Dr. Robert G. Dixon, Jr., professor of law, George Washington University Law School and Graduate School of Public Law)

It is both a pleasure and a challenge to be asked to make some brief remarks to this distinguished group of chief State legal officials on a topic as broad and fascinating as "one man-one vote." By now most of you have been drawn deep into the political thicket of State legislative reapportionment and congressional redistricting, and electoral college suits may lie ahead for some of you. Your badge of office, perhaps, should be a crown of thorns.

We have come a long way since H. L. Mencken penned these lines in 1928: "The yokels hang on because old apportionments give them unfair advantages. The vote of a malarious peasant on the lower Eastern Shore counts as much as the votes of 12 Baltimoreans."

But it is a tribute to the wonderful complexity of apportionment, districting, and practical politics, and a warning against oversimplification, to point out that in Mencken's Maryland by the 1950's these so-called malarious peasants and these supposedly virtuous Baltimore burghers had worked out a very comfortable accommodation in State legislative politics.

They combined to hold in thralldom the postwar expanding population areas—the suburban counties—where the major portion of Maryland's civic and community leaders reside.

In similar vein to Mencken's comment I have heard recently a paraphrase of Lord Acton's famous aphorism about power. It goes like this: "Power corrupts, but the prospect of being out of power corrupts absolutely." Would that it were this simple, with all the good guys on one side of the line and all of the bad guys on the other. In this field it is true—almost tragically true—that it is easier to be cute than acute.

ONE YEAR FROM REYNOLDS AGAINST SIMS

A year after the Supreme Court mandated drastic change in legislative apportionments, far fewer than half of the States had succeeded in accomplishing change, although there has been furious activity in virtually every State. Even in the steadily increasing number of States with new apportionment plans and new congressional districts, there is no assurance of ultimate constitutionality because of continued uncertainty concerning the Supreme Court's eventual standards for fair representation and "substantial" population equality among legislative districts.

For example, one figure commonly considered is the maximum percentage deviation from average of ideal district. In regard to congressional districts the House of Representatives passed and sent to the Senate a bill permitting 15-percent leeway. One Federal district court (Georgia) in April 1965, also spoke favorably of a 15-percent leeway for the State legislative districts. But at least one of the new congressional districts in 4 of the first 10 States to redistrict after *Wesberry* v. *Sanders* exceed a 15-percent deviation. And it may be some time before the Supreme Court rules on whether even a 15-percent deviation yields substantial equality. It could be argued—and the Supreme Court has hinted as much—that the allowable percentage deviation for the national House of Representatives should be less than for State legislatures, because only half of Congress is apportioned on a population basis whereas both houses of State legislatures are to be apportioned substantially on a population basis.

Some of the newly reapportioned State legislatures show major variations in terms of maximum deviation percentage points. Under the new Colorado plan, which was sustained in the Supreme Court in January, 1965, 17 of the 65 House districts and 5 of the 35 Senate districts exceed a 15-percent deviation, ranging up to 30 percent for the House and 20 percent for the Senate. But neither in the lower court nor the Supreme Court were these deviations specifically challenged.

Deviations in Washington run to 20 percent, and in New York to 11 percent (both approved by lower Federal courts. But Michigan's deviations of under 1 percent for the Senate and under 3 percent for the House are being challenged. It is being urged that the price of this allegedly unnecessary strictness was a major cutting of county lines, ignoring of community-of-interest factors, gerrymandering, and violation of parts of the Michigan constitution deemed not to be intrinsically in conflict with a substantial population equality rule.

FROM A CONCERN FOR "MALAPPORTIONMENT OF PEOPLE" TO A CONCERN FOR "MALREPRESENTATION OF INTERESTS"

Looking to the future, I think it is critically important that we begin to move from our present rather narrow concern over malapportionment of people (which Justice Stewart has characterized as applying 6th grade arithmetic to bare census data), to a concern for malrepresentation of interests."

Political scientists have known for years that a district system of legislative election is a very inexact method for taking the popular pulse and representing the popular will. All district systems of electing legislators—including equal population district systems—may yield unequal and distorted representation. District lines frequently carve up and submerge identifiable interests, sometimes unavoidably. The balance-of-power position of better organized interests frequently leads to exaggeration of their influence. Those interests which constitute a locked-in minority in a series of districts will, realistically speaking, get no effective representation. (See appendix for some examples of the inadequacy of a simple mathematical approach toward reapportionment.)

As Morris Ernst puts it in a letter in this month's ABA Journal—commenting favorably, I am pleased to say, on my article in the April issue—the "right to be heard" is a proper concern along with the "right to vote," and lies beyond the "one man-one vote" concept. For this reason he has suggested to newly formed nations a formula that minority parties might get in toto one-third of the votes (legislative seats), a figure insufficient to express power but sufficient to give people that "tender and essential feeling of having a spokesman of their own choosing in the halls of the mighty."

In short, we need to talk "one man-one vote" a little less, for it is only a slogan, and talk political equity a little more. We need to realize the full dimension of the opportunity that lies before us to improve radically the imprecision of our traditional, cumbersome, representation system.

I predict, therefore, that disputes over "gerrymandering," in the broadest sense of that term, may come to be even more important than disputes over population percentage points as the reapportionment crisis unfolds in the next few years. The Supreme Court itself seemed to invite this argument in an opinion handed down in January of this year in a Georgia case (*Fortson* v. *Dorsey*) which challenged the at large (winner take all) election of seven State senators from Fulton County (Atlanta). Although the Court refused to disturb the at-large system on the record presented, Justice Brennan did say, in his opinion for the Court, that a system might be suspect if it operated "to minimize or cancel out the voting strength of racial or political elements of the voting population."

The force of this statement, although made in a State legislative apportionment case involving at-large voting a multimember county, seems equally applicable to the construction of congressional districts. Its essence seems to be to identify a "political equity" or "racial equity" interest as a further out-reach of the "one man one vote" concept. On this basis a system of equal population districts which was so constructed as to prevent the weaker political party from capturing a share of seats roughly proportional to its share of the popular vote would be suspect, and perhaps unconstitutional. Also suspect would be all "malrepresentation of interests" systems.

This dictum of Justice Brennan in the *Dorsey* case could turn out to be the most significant statement in the recently concluded Supreme Court term.

NEW FRONTIERS FOR "ONE MAN, ONE VOTE"

In my article in the April issue of ABA Journal, I listed a number of remaining "one man, one vote" issues, such a gerrymandering which I have just alluded to, "how equal is equal," single-member versus multimember districts, weighted voting and fractional voting, the role of political subdivisions in districting, etc. Raising our sights further, there are some additional frontiers.

Consider, for example, the hidden policy choices which are unavoidably present in districting, whether consciously recognized or not. These policy choices include the following: Should we create the maximum number of swing districts; or the maximum number of safe districts, allocated hopefully on an equitable basis? Should we make a conscious attempt to create safe Negro districts; or just focus on population and spread Negroes as a minority over several districts where they may or may not have major influence as a balance of power within the Democratic Party? Should we make a conscious effort to create homogeneous suburban districts; or mix suburbs with central city by using wedge-shaped districts? And in general, do we seek homegeneity or heterogeneity in districting regarding such factors as economic base, education, family income, etc. Bear in mind that every line drawn on a map, even by a blindfolded, neutral draftsman (and only a blindfolded draftsman can be neutral) inevitably makes one or more of the above policy choices.

From a different perspective, I would suggest that "one man-one vote," when applied to the legislative arena as a whole, puts in question the whole range of antimajoritarian rules and practices in Congress and State legislatures. As Chief Justice Warren said in one of his opinions in the reapportionment decisions of June 1964, the ultimate goal is fair and effective representation. Any device which impedes or thwarts effectuation of the dominant represented view should therefore be suspect. It shortweights the representative function. Viewed thusly, a number of legislative practices are challengeable under a "one-man-one-vote" concept, functionally viewed. They would include, at the very least, the following: (1) the filibuster; (2) seniority rule in electing committee chairman; (3) seniority rule in committee assignments; (4) powers of committee chairman to delay or block action; (5) all extraordinary majority requirements in legislative voting; (6) inequitable staffing for committees and for legislators individually.

The proposed reapportionment amendment, and the possibility of a "one-man-one-vote" attack on the electoral college system of choosing our President, also must be mentioned as part of the continued fallout of last June's decisions. Others on the panel will amplify the issue of a possible Federal constitutional amendment to authorize the direct democracy device of popular referendum to place one house of a bicameral legislature on a mixed representation basis. Let me just say that the two essential elements for such an amendment would be: (1) a provision for placing before the people, either automatically or by petition, the question of placing one house on a mixed representation system without need for approval of the sitting legislature, however it be apportioned; (2) provision for decennial popular review of the representation question, either automatically or by petition.

The proposed electoral college suit to break up the winner-take-all system of allocating the electoral vote inside each State, and to shift possibly to a system of making the electoral vote of each party proportional to its popular vote, poses difficult questions in regard to jurisdiction, standing, justiciability, and substantive rights. Others on the panel will amplify these questions. Let me say this. The remedy of nationwide popular election of the President lies beyond judicial review—although such a remedy would be the analog of the remedy ordered by the Court in the Georgia county unit case (*Gray* v. *Sanders*). The argument for the halfway house of proportionalizing the electoral vote in each State, according to the split in popular vote, would be that "wasted votes" would be minimized. In the present general ticket or "State unit" system (and also in the suggested election of electors from individual districts), all votes cast for the losing candidate are wasted.

THE ROLE OF THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

The offices of the State attorneys general can play a most significant role in the next decade or two in moving the United States toward fairer and more accurate representation systems. And representation, of course, is the heart of any system of democratic government.

I should like to call on you to be responsive to the "political equity" overtones of the recent *Fortson* v. *Dorsey* dictum of Justice Brennan; to be sophisticated in your analysis of representation issues, being ever mindful of the problem of gerrymandering and of locked-in minorities in some election districts; to be more adventurous in suggesting remedies, including such devices as Illinois' former cumulative voting system; to be alert to the hidden policy choices in construction of districts as listed earlier; and to be alert also to the outreach of "one man-one vote" into new areas.

APPENDIX

EXAMPLES OF INADEQUACY OF A SIMPLE "ONE MAN-ONE VOTE" APPROACH

Considerations of "fair and effective representation" may not be satisfied merely by playing with census counts. For example, an at-large election satisfies the mathematics of one man-one vote, but yields no representation at all for the minority, no matter how large. Consider also the following more detailed illustrations:

ILLUSTRATION A

"Majority rule" in a one-city State: State population, 1,000,000; central city and suburbs, 550,000; rest of State, 450,000.

If split, central city and suburbs: X, 290,000; Y, 260,000; rest of State, if split, Y, 275,000; X, 175,000.

Then statewide total would be X 465,000 and Y 535,000.

In this situation one could expect that a proposal to apportion both legislative houses in a "one man-one vote" equal population district principle would be defeated on a "one man-one vote" statewide referendum. The Y party members in both parts of the State could be expected to prefer some population imbalance in favor of the area outside the central city and suburbs in order to obtain political equity for Y party in the legislature as a whole.

ILLUSTRATION B

Possible representation result of a population equalizing reapportionment:

	Party X	Party Y	Total population	Seats before reapportionment	Seats after "equalizing" reapportionment
County A___	5,000	20,000	25,000	1	1
County B___	55,000	45,000	100,000	1	4

Before reapportionment: Each party, one seat. Party votes split 60,000 to 65,000.

After reapportionment: Party X, 60,000 votes, four seats; party Y, 65,000 votes, one seat.

The Electoral College in Our Constitutional Structure

(Remarks by J. Harvie Williams, executive secretary, American Good Government Society, Washington, D.C.)

The electoral system by which we select the President of the United States—the so-called electoral college—is the least understood and most misunderstood of our political institutions.

How did this seemingly complicated but simple system come into being? Why was it necessary? Is it still necessary? What is the defect in the present system?

First, let me remind you that at that time there were no organized political parties as we know them today. During that civil war which we call the "American Revolution," more accurately described as the "War for American Independence," there were two sides—patriots and Tories. After the Constitution was written and submitted to the States for ratification, two parties did develop—Federalists and anti-Federalists—a division that lasted through the eighth presidential election in 1816.

The war had been fought under the direction of the Continental Congress which first met on October 14, 1774. This body adopted the Declaration of Independence and wrote the Articles of Confederation which became effective on March 1, 1781, when the signing by Maryland's Delegates made their adoption unanimous.

Throughout the 15-year life of the Continental Congress, the 13 States were equal—with one vote each—regardless of size or population. In the Constitutional Convention the States were equal with one vote each. In the ratifications of the Constitution they were also equal. In the Senate today, the States continue to be equal, but with two votes each.

Under the Confederation, things went from bad to worse. The Continental Congress then called the Convention of States which which wrote the Constitution. This Constitution was ratified by special conventions of the people in the several States, hence the opening phrase, "We the people of the United States."

These ratifications were the points of transfer by the States to the new Government, of a part of the sovereign power ceded to them by the British Crown in the Treaty of Paris in 1783.

Besides this constitutional delegation of power to the new government, a major change in structure was achieved. This was the establishment of the House of Representatives, based on principles of representation entirely different from those of the Senate. The Representatives were apportioned among the States according to their respective numbers of people, as these Federal numbers were defined.

This structure of the Congress is the result of what is often called "the great compromise" of the Constitutional Convention, a compromise necessary to get the Constitution written, submitted to the States, and ratified.

If we raise our sights a little, I think we can call it "the great discovery." Necessity being the mother of invention, the Founding Fathers discovered how separately organized political societies could be brought together under one national roof. I suggest that this combination of these two different principles of representation in bicameral legislatures, national or State, is our greatest contribution to the art of statecraft.

Having solved the problem of a proper basis of representation for the legislative power, the convention was faced with the problem of establishing a proper basis for the executive power, and without violating the cardinal principle of separation of powers. This was acomplished in this provision for the election of the President:

"Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: but no Senator or Representative, or Person holding an office of Trust or Profit under the United States, shall be appointed an Elector."

This provision establishes for the executive power exactly the same basis of representation as that established for the legislative power, with a single difference. That difference is that the members of the presidential elector body vote as though members of one House. How this came to be is put best by the historian George Bancroft:

"And now the whole line of march to the mode of the election of the President can be surveyed. The Convention at first reluctantly conferred that office on the National Legislature, and to prevent the possibility of failure by a negative vote of one House or the other, to the Legislature voting in joint ballot. Then to escape from the danger of cabal and corruption, it next transferred the full and final power of choice to an electoral college that should be the exact counterpart of the two Houses in the representation of the States as units as well as population of the States, and should meet at the seat of government. Then fearing that so large a number of men would not travel to the seat of government for that single purpose or might be hindered on the way, they most reluctantly went back to the choice of the two Houses in joint convention. At this moment the thought arose that the electors might cast their votes in their own States, and transmit the certificates of their ballots to the seat of government. Accordingly, the work of electing the President was divided: the Convention removed the act of voting from the joint session of the two Houses to electoral colleges in the several States, the act of voting to be followed by the transmission of authenticated certificates of the vote to a branch of the General Legislature at the seat of government; and then it restored to the two Houses in the presence of each other the same office of counting the collected certificates which they would have performed had the choice remained within the two Houses of the Legislature."

Here we must remember that the Founding Fathers were anxious to establish a "more perfect union," to establish a limited Constitution of government for the United States. Wisely, in order to get it accepted, they were unwilling to overload their wagon. They established the basis for the body of presidential electors, but left to the judgment of the State legislatures the manner of their appointment. We also must remember that the States were previously established political societies.

In the early days of the Republic the State legislatures generally followed one of three methods of appointing presidential electors: (1) election by the legislature itself; (2) election by the people in districts; and (3) election by the people on a statewide general ticket.

At the time of the fourth presidential election in 1800 the two-party system was clearly established. Each party, in the States where it was the majority, quickly took advantage of the general ticket system as a means of capturing the entire electoral vote of the State for its presidential candidates.

By 1836, the 13th presidential election, the general ticket system was in use in every one of the then 26 States, except South Carolina, where the legislature continued to choose the electors through 1860.

From what I have said, it should be obvious that the electoral college is necessary to our constitutional structure.

In conclusion, it is clear to me that the only defect in the electoral college system is the long-established policy of the States—the policy of appointing by popular election on a statewide general ticket those presidential electors who correspond to their Members of the House of Representatives.

In order to place the separated legislative and executive powers on the same foundations in the electorate, as required by the structure of the Constitution, Members of the House of Representatives and their counterpart members of the Electoral College should be chosen in the same way.

Personally, I agree with John Quincy Adams, a former Senator and former President, who as chairman of a select committee of the House reported in July 1842: "The representation of the people by single districts is undoubtedly the only mode by which the principle of representation in proportion to numbers, can be carried into execution."

Unless this defect in the Constitution, this lack of a fair and just system of representation in the election of the President, is corrected, I fear that our Federal union of States, our limited Constitution of Government, our unique political structure and system reared by the Founding Fathers will disappear beneath the waters of the earth, as did Atlantis.

Current Proposals for Electoral College Reform by Constitutional Amendment

(Summary of statement of James C. Kirby, Jr., professor of law, Northwestern University and formerly Chief Counsel to U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments)

There is general agreement on two points:

1. The individual members of the electoral college should either be completely eliminated or should be deprived of their power to vote independently for someone other than the choice of the people.

2. To change the little-used provision for election by the House of Representatives when no candidate has a majority of the electoral vote. Each State now has one vote. Most proposals would substitute election by majority vote of a joint session of Congress, a numerical counterpart of the electoral college in the representation of States.

Here the consensus ends.

President Johnson has proposed an amendment which would eliminate electors, but preserve the system of weighted State electoral votes. They would be cast automatically for the candidate who wins the popular vote of a State. This would freeze into the Constitution the present winner-take-all or State unit system under which the minority candidates' popular votes are completely lost. Even though the winner has only 50.1 percent of the State's popular votes, he receives 100 percent of its electoral vote.

It is a little-known fact that the winner-take-all system is not presently required by the U.S. Constitution. It results solely from the laws of the 50 States.

Those who would change the winner-take-all rule are sharply divided into three camps, behind three different proposals:

1. Proportional division of a State's electoral vote according to the split of the popular vote. This passed the Senate in 1950.
2. A district system, by which each State would elect one individual elector from each congressional district and two from the State at large. This has strong conservative support.
3. Elimination of both the college of electors and the electoral votes and substitution of direct national popular election. This would apply the one-voter, one-vote principle to presidential elections. But it has little support. Many liberals who support this principle for all other elections, draw the line here. Most formed their positions when rural, conservative interests were overrepresented in State legislatures and the House. The State unit system had come to compensate for this by overrepresenting large urbanized States and pivotal urban voting groups in the presidential election. Supreme Court decisions requiring reapportionment and redistricting have removed this objection, and in fairness, these elements should give up their advantage in presidential elections.

Others say that direct national election would violate our Federal principle by ignoring States as electoral units.

I doubt this. It depends on one's view of contemporary federalism. Unquestionably, in the eyes of the American public, the President has come to be the representative of all the people in their collective national interest. The Senate represents them in their State interests and the House of Representatives in their local or district interests. I predict that if, or when, a President again assumes office although a majority of voting Americans rejected him, the public outrage will be so great that the next President will be elected under a new constitutional provision requiring direct national election and majority rule in such elections.

Two significant developments may produce action: (1) Reapportionment and redistricting mean the elimination of the main political justification for the present system as a compensation for underrepresentation of certain interests; (2) President Johnson's active support of a proposal. No other President has done this in recent years. Senator BAYH has introduced the administration bill and it is the next order of business for Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments.

The present system should not be frozen into the Constitution without a great national debate. Preferrably, a limited national constitutional convention should be elected, composed of delegates who have been elected after campaigns disclosing their positions on the basic issues.

But something should be done. We have an oxcart method for electing space age Presidents. We risk serious trouble by continuing it. It's a loaded pistol with which we play Russian roulette every 4 years. Let's stop it before it's too late.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE CECIL H. UNDERWOOD, FORMER GOVERNOR OF WEST VIRGINIA

The National Electoral Reform Committee was organized prior to the 1963 sessions of the State legislatures to voice the interests of the States in changing our electoral system. Three distinguished Americans provide the leadership of this Committee: Edwin C. Johnson, Chairman (U.S. Senator, Colorado, 1937–55; Governor of Colorado, 1932–37 and 1955–56; Denver, Colo.); David F. Maxwell, member (president, American Bar Association, 1956–57; Philadelphia, Pa.); Ed Gossett, member (U.S. House of Representatives, 1939–51; Dallas, Tex.).

The Committee advocates electoral reform through the medium of State action—as provided in the U.S. Constitution. Twelve States of the thirty-four needed—already have passed a concurrent resolution proposed by the Committee. This resolution petitions Congress, under article V of the U.S. Constitution:

"For the calling of a Convention to propose an Article of Amendment to the Constitution providing for a fair and just division of the electoral votes within the States in the election of the President and Vice President."

The resolution contains a second important clause: "That if and when Congress shall have proposed such an Article of Amendment this application for a Convention shall be deemed withdrawn and shall be no longer of any force and effect;"

Thus, the Electoral Reform Committee follows the precedent established early in this century when the Federal Constitution was amended to provide for the direct election of U.S. Senators. For several years, the House of Representatives had sought to change the election of Senators from the State legislatures to the popular vote of the State. House efforts were consistently rebuffed by the U.S. Senate. The deadlock was broken when nearly 30 State legislatures petitioned Congress to call a convention to draw up a direct-election amendment. The Senate then joined the House of Representatives in the adoption of a direct-election amendment, which subsequently was ratified by the States.

The proposed concurrent resolution does not specify any reform measure. Its language, however, is limited to two plans: (1) the proportional plan; (2) the district plan.

The proportional plan would divide the electoral votes of every State among the top presidential and vice-presidential candidates in proportion directly to the popular votes cast in the respective States. This plan makes no changes in the present system of allocating electoral votes to the States. It does abolish the electoral college as a political institution. This plan would need to include safeguards to discourage the growth of a multiparty system.

Under the proportional plan, obviously, it no longer would be possible for a presidential candidate to receive up to 49 percent plus of the popular vote in a State without winning any electoral votes. He would receive his proportional share of electoral votes in all the States. Every State would become a genuine area of contest in presidential elections. This situation would commend a real two-party campaign in each State.

The district plan provides that the States select presidential electors in the same manner as they elect U.S. Senators and Representatives. Thus, two electors, corresponding to the two U.S. Senators, would be elected by statewide popular vote. The State's remaining electors, corresponding to its number of U.S. Representatives, would be elected in electoral districts. State legislatures would establish such districts independently or possibly in conformity with existing congressional districts.

Under the district plan, every American voter—no matter in what State he lived—would vote for three electors. Today, a citizen may vote for any number of electors ranging from 43 down to 3, depending in what State he lives. This plan retains the electoral college as well as the present system of electoral allocation. While calling for relatively little basic change in the U.S. Constitution, it would eliminate the winner-take-all basis of the general ticket system.

Either of these plans appears to satisfy the advocates of electoral reform at the State level. The National Electoral Reform Committee is pledged to support whichever plan Congress should adopt.

LITIGATION APPROACHES TO ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

(By John A. Gosnell, general counsel, National Small Business Association, Washington, D.C.)

We now come to consideration of feasible approaches to electoral college reform under various theories of litigation suggested by Baker and sequent cases. The foregoing discussions have delineated the areas in which the electoral college, as it now operates, fails to provide political equity and fair representation in presidential elections. Although the rule of "one voter, one vote" may fall short of assuring full political equity and fair representation in some situations, the thrust of the decisions in Baker and related cases is in this direction and there is a strong implication that the State unit vote which dominates the operation of the electoral college does not meet the newly embraced constitutional requirements of equal protection and due process.

This opens the door, of course, to the prospect of seeking electoral college reform through litigation rather than by the extended and tortuous path of constitutional amendment. It is probably axiomatic that no State, political party, or representative body which enjoys an advantage under the status quo will volunteer support for any electoral college reform which destroys that advantage.

The practical solution is to provide judicial compulsion if possible, and a year of study has focused attention on two feasible theories of approach. It should be noted that litigation does not eliminate the need for a constitutional amendment. The ideal objective of the litigation would be to establish the unconstitutionality of the State-unit system. The ultimate solution would remain political in nature and the States would be forced to embrace one of several acceptable choices. One possibility is a suit by citizens against their own State complaining that appropriation of their minority vote under the winner-take-all system had consistently defeated their right to participate on an equal basis in presidential elections in violation of their rights under the 14th amendment and other relevant provisions of the Constitution. The recent cases would seem to exclude likelihood of any problem as to jurisdiction or standing in such a case. And it would be difficult for the court to fall back on justiciability at least without exposure to a charge of gross inconsistency because of the close analogy to the apportionment precedents.

It is probable that a majority of the Supreme Court agree with the opinion of the Chief Justice in Reynolds that "Undeniably the Constitution of the United States protects the right of all qualified citizens to vote in State as well as in Federal elections. * * * And the right of suffrage can be denied by a debasement or dilution of the weight of a citizen's vote just as effectively as by wholly prohibiting the free exercise of the franchise."

Although the repressive effects of the general ticket as applied to the electoral college do not fit the usual pattern of debasement or dilution by apportionment schemes, the Supreme Court in the Dorsey case acknowledged the possibile unconstitutionality of a "multimember apportionment scheme," which would operate to minimize or cancel out the voting strength of racial or political elements of the voting population. The precise issue was not before the Court which is somewhat astonishing because all of the necessary elements were available to the case. Although presidential electors are not representative in the deliberative sense the Court might be persuaded that they are no less importantly representative in the exercise of the presidential franchise.

It is apparent of course that a suit brought by individual voters against a State would have to be cast in "terms of proximate equality" (Dixon) because of the State weighting of the electoral college to fit the pattern of the Federal system. It would appear also that the "political inequity of the winner-take-all outcome of the general ticket system in each State is more startling, and easier to prove than political party imbalance in a State legislature resulting from apportionment and district practices" (Dixon).

A second approach to litigation would be a suit brought by a small State against a larger State under an extension of the parens patriae doctrine seeking to protect the political interests of its citizens. Although there is no direct precedent for this application of parens patriae it may be submitted that the general political interests of the citizens is not less important than their general economic welfare and their interest in the free flow of commerce, which have been successfully protected under the parens patriae doctrine in interstate litigation.

Although it would probably be somewhat easier to articulate the Federal right in the individual voter suit, the parens patriae suit would better serve to focus on the shortcomings of the electoral college mechanism as a whole—particularly the repression of minority political interests State by State irrespective of party affiliation. The plaintiff State would be seeking a general but definitive voter rights to participate in Federal elections without being handicapped either because of his residence in a particular State vis-a-vis other States, or because of the treatment of minority votes in his own State.

Now that the "political thickets" have been breached and the Supreme Court is broadly dedicated to protection of the unimpaired right to participate equally in State and Federal elections it would appear that well-pled suits clearly focused on the new concepts of political equity and fair representation are not only to be summarily dismissed via the judicial escape hatches of justiciability and standing.

It would appear also that Baker et al have dispelled the idea mentioned in *McPherson* v. *Blacker* that the constitutional grant of power to the States to appoint presidential electors is plenary in nature. In the light of what has transpired it would be sacrilege of a high order to hold that a provision of the Constitution permits arbitrary manipulation of suffrage in a manner inconsistent with one of the fundamental purposes of that document.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, during the week of July 18–24, the seventh annual Captive Nations Week is observed. Under Public Law 86–90 passed by Congress in July 1959, the third week of July is set aside in which by Presidential proclamation the American people are invited to participate by holding appropriate patriotic ceremonies and activities throughout our free country.

We annually proclaim the observance in order to keep alive the hopes and aspirations of over 120 million people subjugated to Soviet tyranny.

Approximately 35 percent of the world's population is denied the right of self-determination. This 35 percent looks to us for help, not just token sympathy. As a nation dedicated to the principles of a democratic constitution, the United States must assert itself in this fight for freedom.

The spirit and content of Public Law 86–90 call for this yearly renewal until all the captive nations of the world have achieved independence and freedom. Hope must live. The Communist regime cannot have the opportunity to use broken spirits for its own malicious propaganda purposes.

We cannot permit the existing situation to remain as it is. These peoples must be assured of the interest and concern of the United States. It is for us to bring this distressing issue to the attention of the world.

Mr. President, Congress can act during this Captive Nations Week. In January of this year, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] submitted a concurrent resolution calling upon the President to take before the United Nations the degrading condition of these peoples behind the Iron Curtain. At this point, Mr. President, I subscribe my endorsement to Senate Concurrent Resolution 10.

It is my express hope that this resolution now before the Committee on Foreign Relations shall meet with favorable approval. The passage of this resolution would exhibit to the captive nations that the United States is determined that the walls of Communist imprisonment will be removed and that they will enjoy peace and freedom in this present generation.

Not only would passage of this resolution bolster the morale and spirit of these unfortunate peoples, but it will also show them that we are not trying to appease the Soviet Union by mere accommodation. The Russian regime has not ceased in its hostility toward the West no matter what some national policymakers contend. To cite a few examples: Russia still continues to give economic aid to Castro's Cuba; Soviet missile sites are presently being set up in North Vietnam.

As a result of the passage of this resolution, the United Nations, on the motion of the United States, would then confront the Communists with their guilt, that of causing the existing blight on world peace. Unless the truth about this sorry state is brought before the world, the situation will become more permanent. We know that there is a global contest going on in the world between freedom and communism. Every day we see the U.S.S.R. capitalizing on our failure to seek restoration of the right of self-determination for captive peoples.

The passage of the concurrent resolution would show the leaders of the Red world that we do not recognize their imperialistic enterprises. This could act as a deterrent to further aggression for it would proclaim our absolute determination that all men and all peoples shall live under the flag of freedom.

For too long action has not proceeded beyond empty talk. It is our duty as the stronghold of freedom to ask for Soviet withdrawal from the impressed countries, the return of prisoners from Siberian exile, and free elections in the eastern European countries. We do not condone Soviet aggression.

The Russian image is strengthened by our failure in the United Nations to demand Soviet payment of debts. Let the observance of Captive Nations Week serve as a reminder to the nationalistic, neutral countries who have exhibited as of late their friendliness toward the Communist camp that they are playing a dangerous game—a game that could well place them in the same position as those nations whose loss of freedom we observe this week.

The longer we fail to take action, the more entrenched becomes the tragic condition. George Santayana once said, "Those who will not learn from the past are destined to repeat it." We will not repeat it.

During Captive Nations Week, we should rededicate ourselves to those 120 million suffering members of the human family who live under the yoke of oppression and exploitation. The Congress can give meaning to this dedication by its approval of the Dirksen resolution.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHARTER ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1118) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MAJOR U.S. TOURISM EFFORT ESSENTIAL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send a bill to the desk to expand the U.S. Travel Service in order to increase domestic travel, and to make it the focal point for all U.S. activities related to the expansion of domestic and international travel. It will be remembered that the U.S. Travel Service is confined to encouraging foreign travelers to travel in the United States.

I wish to pay tribute to the Vice President of the United States, who has taken an extraordinary leadership in this matter and brought about an arrangement for voluntary private action, through the "See the USA" program, providing $500,000 from private enterprise, in the so-called Discover America project which is to develop a nationwide campaign to publicize travel within the United States.

The reason for introducing the bill is that it is very clear to me that the problem is very much greater than this voluntary effort, standing alone, would develop, and it needs action, at a far greater increase in terms of time and on a broader scale than would be the result of the efforts for which the Vice President has been responsible to date.

The bill is necessary because:

First. The present U.S. effort to close the so-called travel gap, which adversely affects our balance of payments to the extent of an estimated $1.6 billion annually is not adequate; foreign visitors here do not find the advanced facilities for foreign guests that are available in practically all major travel centers of the world.

Second. Funds now being spent by a dozen agencies of the Government for the encouragement and promotion of tourism within the United States are not coordinated sufficiently.

Third. There is a great need for a national inventory of domestic travel and tourism needs, and for the development of plans for the future development of this, the third largest industry in the Nation.

Fourth. Extensive State and local efforts in the field of domestic travel and tourism need to be coordinated and facilitated.

The bill introduced today would:

First. Provide for an expanded U.S. Travel Service with a director appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and responsible directly to the Secretary of Commerce. The director would have two deputies, one responsible for the promotion of foreign travel to the United States, and the other responsible for the administration of the domestic travel program. The functions of the new domestic travel program would be to develop a coherent national travel policy; to coordinate present Federal travel-related activities; to encourage construction of new tourist facilities within the United States and, to coordinate and act as the Federal Government's liaison with State and private tourist organizations.

Second. Increase funds for the national travel program to $15 million; $10 million to be allocated to encourage foreign tourists to visit the United States and $5 million to begin the proposed domestic travel program.

Third. Authorize a national inventory of domestic travel resources to lay the groundwork for a long-term national travel program. The bill calls for the creation of a 15-member National Tourism Resources Review Commission to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce among private citizens knowledgeable and experienced in the travel field.

I hope very much the administration and my congressional colleagues will study this bill with the greatest care, and will support it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill out of order. I ask also that the bill lie at the desk for a week to permit other Members of the Senate an opportunity to cosponsor it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie at the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 2305) to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote travel in the United States, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have a few brief remarks on this subject. One of the big problems facing our country is the problem of the balance of payments. I have addressed myself to that problem many times. One of the biggest efforts we can make to reduce our balance-of-payments deficit is to reduce the difference between what the United States earns from and what it pays out for international travel, which in 1964 added $1.6 billion to that deficit. This is the so-called travel gap. That imbalance of payments, though we are not undergoing it at the present time, will soon show up again, according to expectations and probabilities.

The time has now come to mount a major national effort with an eye on the overall aspects of tourism, both as it pertains to the effort of attracting foreign tourists to our shores and as it touches upon a need, which is becoming clearer every day; namely, to gear up this Nation for increasing travel by Americans in America.

The travel industry has hardly touched its potential: 80 percent of our people have never been in an airplane; 80 million Americans took no trip anywhere last year; and more than half of our people have never been more than 200 miles from home.

The U.S. travel industry, composed of thousands of hotels, motels, resorts, airlines, national parks and forests, gas stations, seashores, restaurants, is one of our most important national resources. It is a $30 billion industry, ranking as third largest behind manufacturing and agriculture. It is vitally important as an employer of 6 million individuals, 3 million directly and an additional 3 million indirectly, many of them unskilled and semiskilled; as a source of profits to investors and owners, as a source of tax revenue both to the States and the Federal Government. A vigorous domestic travel industry is also vital as the most effective means of dealing with the so-called tourism gap—the difference between money spent by U.S. tourists overseas and foreign tourists in the United States.

By promoting foreign and domestic travel effectively at the National, State, and local levels, we will be in a much better position to attract foreign tourists, confident, for example, that when they arrive they will be able to convert their currency easily at points of entry and in the larger cities, that they will be able to find officials and employees in the hotel and transportation field capable of speaking their language, that the natural and manmade wonders of our country will be made available to them with the least possible difficulty. In short, that they will find facilities awaiting them, similar to the facilities and services available to foreign visitors in Europe for the last half century.

The responsibility to own, invest in, and to promote and manage our travel industry belongs to the private sector. The responsibility to encourage, assist, and act as a catalyst and spearhead for our travel industry rests with the National, State, and local governments in cooperation with private industry.

Since the end of World War II, European countries, Canada, and Japan, as well as developing countries, have embarked on large-scale efforts to increase foreign travel to their countries, as well as to increase travel within their borders. They realized early the enormous earnings potential of travel and as a source of employment and tax revenues. With this realization in mind, budgets for travel promotion have risen each year.

A few statistics will demonstrate what is at stake here: In 1963, international travel accounted for $8.355 billion in the flow of world trade, of which U.S. tourism generated $3.19 billion, Western Europe, $4.05 billion and the rest of the globe $1.015 billion. Close to 8 million Americans spent this $3.19 billion in Canada, Mexico and to a lesser extent in Europe and the Mediterranean. Some 90 million foreign visitor arrivals were recorded by 68 countries in 1963, including 6 million in the United States earning for the United States $1.05 billion in that year. Here it must be noted that of the 8 million Americans traveling abroad, 6 million traveled in Canada; and of the 6 million visitors here, 5 million were Canadians.

The United States is a late starter in the competition for the foreign traveler. It was not until the creation of USTS in June 1961 that the United States Government seriously started to promote foreign travel to our shores. This effort has been extremely successful as is demonstrated by the steep rise in foreign travel to the United States since the USTS went to work. On a budget that has reached $3 million only in the current fiscal year, the USTS has succeeded in increasing foreign travel to the United States by 17 percent in 1962, 22 percent in 1963, and by over 30 percent in 1964.

According to information supplied by John Black, the director of the USTS, to the House Banking and Currency Committee on November 30, 1964, the estimated number of foreigners whose income level would permit a visit to the United States is 3.5 to 4 million as compared to the 1 million or so who have visited this country from overseas, excluding Canada. It is therefore quite clear that the USTS budget should be sharply increased if an effective travel promotion campaign is to be mounted by the United States.

It is rather obvious that before an effective national effort can be mounted to fully exploit the potential of travel in the United States there must be developed a focal point within the Federal Government to orchestrate the activities of the Government in travel and tourism.

If anyone today attempts to discuss the problem of improving our American travel resources with official Washington he would find it impossible to find any one agency involved with the broad aspect of travel. There is an agency to promote foreign travel to this country, another to encourage outdoor recreation. The Agriculture Department is encouraging farmers to build campsites. Interior is helping Indian reservations to create tourist attractions. ARA is lending money for tourist development in distressed areas. Interior has National Parks, and Agriculture, National Forests. The Commerce Department established transportation policy and so do a number of independent agencies.

More than a dozen Federal departments and agencies spend millions of dollars on travel and tourism functions. Departments or agencies not already named include the Forest Service, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Bureau of Public Roads and the Armed Forces. The need is obviously great for a central coordinating body which can at least think about the overall state of the American travel industry.

Providing the specialized facilities and services needed by foreign and domestic visitors must also be considered. There is a great need for taking a national inventory of our national travel resources and assessing its adequacy over the next decade. A new initiative must be taken to establish a close relationship between our national efforts to promote domestic and foreign travel in the United States and the efforts of the States.

Such an inventory would be the responsibility of the National Tourism Resources Review Commission which is authorized by the bill I introduce today. The Commission, whose members would be experienced in the tourism and travel industries, would bring into focus our current resources and facilities and help draft long-range plans for the future.

Under my bill, the Commission would be provided with a budget of $2.5 million and would be ordered to report to the President and the Congress within 2 years. The staff of the U.S. Travel Service would be authorized to assist the Commission, but expert consultant hire would also be authorized.

Among the problems that should be considered by the Commission in the course of its study are two which are of vital interest to the travel industry itself: Whether a separate Federal agency should be created to consolidate and coordinate the tourism research, planning and development now handled by many different departments, offices, and agencies; and whether it would be practical to establish a matching-fund program to assist the States in developing their own promotion and facilities improvement programs.

The administration has recently started to deal with this problem in earnest. In March 1965, President Johnson appointed Vice President HUMPHREY as Chairman of a special Cabinet task force on travel to develop a positive program to encourage foreign travelers to come to the United States and to stimulate greater travel by our own citizens. The task force supported an increase in the budget of U.S. Travel Service from $3 million to $3.5 million. The House cut this request to $3 million, and U.S. Travel service is now attempting to get $500,000 restored in the Senate. It also supported legislation to reduce from $100 to $50 the duty allowance of returning travelers. I believe that this piece of legislation was uncalled for, would have been of little consequence in balance-of-payments terms, but could have caused great harm to international travel. As a result of strong opposition in both the House and the Senate—in which I played an active part—the duty-free allowance of returning travelers was left at $100 retail and the law was made permanent.

Congress also authorized the President in August 1964 to appoint an unpaid national chairman to coordinate the efforts of private industry in carrying out the purpose of the "See the U.S.A." program. The chairman of the program, Robert Short of Minneapolis, was appointed in May and with strong support from the Vice President mounted the Discover America, Inc. project which will publicize travel within the United States with $500,000 in contributions obtained from key segments of the travel industry.

Efforts by private organizations to cope with this enormous and complex industry have been commendable but successful only in a limited area—public relations, advertising, and publicity within the United States. This is a job which under our constitutional form of government should be left in private hands. This is how objectives of the U.S. Travel Service are carried out and this is how "See the U.S.A." program is implemented.

At the same time I want to make it entirely and unmistakably clear that I do not think that public relations jobs financed with $500,000 in private contributions can ever solve our travel problems nor could it provide for an adequate national travel program. This is a job which calls for Federal initiative and financial support. It is a job that calls for an inventory of our travel resources and needs so that our private travel industry can invest and make its own plans with a clear idea of where the opportunities lie in the decade ahead.

This, I feel the bill I am introducing today will do, and I urge that it receive the closest attention of the Congress.

I am offering this measure as a result of a longstanding interest, for I cosponsored, with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Commerce Committee, the bill to establish the U.S. Travel Service in 1961. It followed a longtime effort in which I had been engaged in since 1953, when I was chairman of a subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives on international economic cooperation, which developed the whole aspect of travel as a major element in our international financial affairs in respect to foreign policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that various exhibits relating to this matter be made a part of my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

Travel promotion expenditures of 20 countries as compared to their gross national product and gross earnings from travel [1]

Country	Travel promotion expenditures	GNP	Gross earnings from travel
Austria	$892, 000	$7, 666, 000, 000	$503, 000, 000
Belgium	2, 000, 000	13, 900, 000, 000	(2)
Canada	3, 700, 000	15, 375, 000, 000	609, 000, 000
Denmark	600, 000	7, 970, 000, 000	164, 000, 000
Finland	700, 000	5, 810, 000, 000	(2)
France	4, 500, 000	79, 360, 000, 000	808, 000, 000
Germany	1, 500, 000	94, 200, 000, 000	688, 000, 000
Great Britain	7, 000, 000	84, 170, 000, 000	619, 000, 000
Greece	[3] 12, 400, 000	4, 367, 000, 000	91, 000, 000
Ireland	3, 100, 000	2, 265, 000, 000	165, 000, 000
Italy	2, 900, 000	45, 100, 000, 000	1, 000, 000, 000
Luxembourg	92, 000	525, 000, 000	(2)
Mexico	4, 500, 000	15, 375, 000, 000	656, 000, 000
Netherlands	870, 000	14, 400, 000, 000	(2)
Norway	360, 000	5, 638, 000, 000	78, 000, 000
Spain	2, 000, 000	14, 970, 000, 000	939, 000, 000
Sweden	481, 000	15, 560, 000, 000	(2)
Switzerland	2, 000, 000	11, 630, 000, 000	560, 000, 000
Turkey	2, 000, 000	6, 975, 000, 000	8, 300, 000
United States	3, 400, 000	583, 900, 000, 000	1, 005, 000, 000

[1] Information as pertains to the year 1963.
[2] Not available.
[3] Including hotel maintenance costs.

Source: OECD report, 1964, U.S. Travel Service.

EXHIBIT 2

Budgets of Federal agencies dealing with some aspects of travel, fiscal year 1966[1]

Fish and Wildlife Service	$52,169,500
Bureau of Indian Affairs	206,264,000
Bureau of Land Management	64,236,000
National Park Service	119,668,000
Bureau of Reclamation (estimate)	327,883,000
Army Corps of Engineers civil works program, fiscal year 1965	1,253,748,200
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation	128,398,000
Area Development Administration	73,200,000
Forest Service	360,000,000

[1] Funds available for travel promotion or facilities used by travelers are contained within these budgets.

EXHIBIT 3

Expenditures of State governments for travel promotion, 1964

State	Biennial budget	Annual budget
Alabama		$355,500
Alaska		389,600
Arizona		150,880
Arkansas		640,227
California		None
Colorado		305,692
Connecticut	$60,000	30,000
Delaware		30,000
Florida		1,000,000
Georgia		475,211
Hawaii		[1] 1,100,000
Idaho		[2] 157,344
Illinois	500,000	250,000
Indiana		(3)
Iowa		50,000
Kansas		[2] 273,000
Kentucky		680,000
Louisiana		[2, 4] 230,000
Maine		325,123
Maryland		177,264
Massachusetts		100,000
Michigan		691,096
Minnesota		[4] 183,847
Mississippi		377,850
Missouri	192,621	96,310
Montana		126,000
Nebraska	125,000	64,500
Nevada		50,000
New Hampshire		274,500
New Jersey		149,000
New Mexico		216,639
New York		720,635
North Carolina		450,000
North Dakota	125,000	64,500
Ohio		None
Oklahoma		402,000
Oregon		600,000
Pennsylvania		526,000
Rhode Island		123,070
South Carolina		225,000
South Dakota		408,000
Tennessee		375,000
Texas:		
Texas Tourist Development Agency		126,146
Texas Highway Department, Travel Information Division		310,000
Utah		150,000
Vermont		213,639
Virginia	1,193,495	596,747
Washington	692,234	346,117
West Virginia		161,000
Wisconsin		420,000
Wyoming	402,288	201,144
Total		15,368,581

[1] Paid by State to Hawaii Visitors Bureau.
[2] For advertising and promotion.
[3] No budget.
[4] Approximate.

Source: "1964 Development Advertising Reports," edited by Ruth H. Long.

EXHIBIT 4

PARTIAL LIST OF PRIVATE TRAVEL ORGANIZATIONS PROVIDING PRIMARY TRAVEL INDUSTRY FUNCTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

American Automobile Association (A.A.A.).

American Hotel & Motel Association (A.H. & M.A.).

American Motor Hotel Association (A.M.H.A.).

American Petroleum Institute (A.P.I.).

Air Transport Association of America (A.T.A.).

Hotel Sales Managers Association (H.S.M.A.).

National Association of Motor Bus Owners (N.A.M.B.O.).

National Association of Travel Organizations (N.A.T.O.).

Rail Travel Promotion Agency (R.T.P.A.).

Trans-Atlantic Passenger Steamship Conference.

Trans-Pacific Passenger Conference (steamship).

EXHIBIT 5

U.S. Travel Service budget and staff

Fiscal year	Budget	Size of staff in District of Columbia	Overseas	Number of offices
1962	$2,500,000	26	20	7
1963	3,350,000	28	44	9
1964	2,600,000	27	43	9
1965	3,000,000	31	42	9
1966:				
House allowance	3,000,000	30	50	11
Senate appeal	3,345,000	30	50	11

Source: U.S. Travel Service.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may also be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2305) is as follows:

S. 2305

(A bill to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote travel in the United States)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the International Travel Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2121–2126) is amended—

(1) by striking out the first and second sections and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"That it is the purpose of this Act to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally, and by otherwise encouraging and facilitating travel within the United States (including its possessions for the purpose of this Act).

"SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purpose of this Act the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the 'Secretary') shall—

"(1) formulate for the United States a comprehensive policy with respect to domestic travel;

"(2) develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program designed to stimulate and encourage travel to and within the United States for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities and as a means of promoting friendly understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and the United States;

"(3) encourage the development of tourist facilities, low cost unit tours, and other arrangements within the United States for meeting the requirements of all travelers;

"(4) foster and encourage the widest possible distribution of the benefits of travel at the cheapest rates between foreign countries and the United States and within the United States consistent with sound economic principles;

"(5) encourage the simplification, reduction, or elimination of barriers to travel, and the facilitation of travel to and within the United States generally;

"(6) collect, publish, and provide for the exchange of statistics and technical information, including schedules of meetings, fairs, and other attractions, relating to travel and tourism; and

"(7) establish an office to be known as the Office of Travel Program Coordination, which shall assist the Secretary in carrying out his responsibilities under this Act for the purpose of (A) achieving maximum coordination of the programs of the various departments and agencies of the United States Government to promote the purposes of this Act, (B) consulting with appropriate officers and agencies of State and local governments, and with private organizations and agencies, with respect to programs undertaken pursuant to this Act, and (C) achieving the effective cooperation of Federal, State, and local governmental agencies, and of private organizations and agencies, concerned with such programs.";

(2) by inserting before the period at the end of section 3(b) the following: "and shall not otherwise compete with the activities of other public or private agencies";

(3) by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 4", and by inserting at the end of such section 4 a new subsection as follows:

"(b) The Secretary may appoint two assistant directors for the purpose of this Act. Such assistant directors shall be compensated at the rate provided for GS–18 in the Classification Act of 1949.";

(4) by redesignating sections 5, 6, and 7 as sections 6, 7, and 8, respectively, and by inserting after section 4 a new section as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary shall establish a National Tourism Resources Review Commission. Such Commission shall be compose of 15 members appointed by the Secretary from among persons who are informed about and concerned with the improvement, development, and promotion of the United States tourism resources and opportunities or who are otherwise experienced in tourism research, promotion, or planning. The Secretary shall appoint a chairman from among such members. The Commission shall meet at the call of the Secretary.

"(b) The Commission shall make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of—

"(1) determining the domestic travel needs of the people of the United States and of visitors from other lands at the present time and to the year 1980;

"(2) determining the travel resources of the Nation available to satisfy such needs now and to the year 1980;

"(3) determining policies and programs which will insure that the domestic travel needs of the present and the future are adequately and efficiently met;

"(4) determining a recommended program of Federal assistance to the States in promoting domestic travel; and

"(5) determining whether a separate agency of the Government should be established to consolidate and coordinate tourism research, planning, and development activities presently performed by different existing agencies of the Government.

"The Commission shall report the results of such investigation and study to the Secretary not later than two years after the effective date of this section. The Secretary shall submit such report, together with his recommendations with respect thereto, to the President and the Congress.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be necessary to assist the Commission, and the Secretary shall in addition, make available to the Commission such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Commerce as the Commission may require to carry out its functions.

"(d) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(e) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $2,500,000 for the purpose of this section."

(5) by striking out "$4,700,000" in the section redesignated as section 7 and inserting in lieu thereof "$15,000,000"; and

(6) by striking out "International Travel Act of 1961" in the section redesignated as section 8 and inserting in lieu thereof "International and Domestic Travel Act".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his great consideration in allowing me to interrupt a quorum call so that I might present this matter.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHARTER ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1118) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. BIBLE obtained the floor.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is S. 1118.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada will state it.

Mr. BIBLE. Is the amendment as reported by the committee to be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment to the bill is in the nature of a substitute for the bill. Both the matter proposed to be inserted and the matter proposed to be stricken out are treated as original text for the purpose of amendment and are open to amendment in two degrees, with amendments to the part to be stricken out taking precedence over amendments to the part to be inserted.

Once the amendment in the nature of a substitute is agreed to, no further amendment will be in order.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the presiding officer for the explanation of the parliamentary situation.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a series of technical amendments to the committee amendment, which I ask the unanimous consent to have considered en bloc. The amendments involve changes in punctuation, corrections of typographical errors, and so on, and are of a clarifying nature. The amendments do not include any substantive changes in the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments to the committee amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendments to the committee amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendments to the committee amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendments to the committee amendment offered by Mr. BIBLE are as follows:

S. 1118

On page 99, line 11, strike out "tranferred" and insert in lieu thereof "transferred".

On page 101, strike out line 6.

On page 113, strike out line 20 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "son authorized by it, shall have power to investigate any".

On page 114, strike out line 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "son conducting the investigation shall have power to refer".

On page 118, line 15, strike out "benfits" and insert in lieu thereof "benefits".

On page 122, line 18, strike out "or" and insert in lieu thereof "of".

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the technical and clarifying amendments to the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, my task today in presenting to the Senate a District of Columbia home rule bill is a happy one, because I believe that the climate in this Congress, in this city, and in this country more nearly assures success for this longtime endeavor.

Legislation to establish self-government for the District of Columbia is not new to the Senate. I have had numerous illustrious predecessors stand at this desk urging congressional enactment over the last 16 years. Five times since 1949 the Senate has passed such a bill, on May 31, 1949, on January 22, 1952, on June 29, 1955, on August 6, 1958, and on July 15, 1959. In each instance, the proposed legislation failed of final enactment.

Mr. President, the bill before the Senate today will provide for:

First. A Mayor, a 19-member Legislative Council with minority party representation assured thereon, a nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and a 14-member Board of Education, all elected by the people.

Second. A specific formula for annual payment by the Federal Government of its share of the expenses of the District government. As the President stated in his message to the Congress, the formula is "designed to reflect the amount the Federal Government is to pay toward the general governmental expenses of the District if it were a taxable entity."

Third. Full protection of the Federal interest by (a) specific retention by Congress of its full legislative powers over the District, including the origination of legislation or modification or repeal of enactments by the local council; (b) authority for the President to veto any act of the locally elected council; (c) authority for the General Accounting Office to maintain supervision of the District's fiscal affairs with reports thereon to be made to the Congress.

The President of the United States is an active supporter of this legislation and added the prestige of his office to this crusade for self-government in the Nation's Capital City by submitting a special message to the Congress on February 3, 1965, wherein he said, in part: "Restoration of home rule to the citizens of the District of Columbia must no longer be delayed, for this represents the fundamental right of self-government."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President's message submitted to the Congress on this proposed charter act, be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the President's message to the Congress was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The restoration of home rule to the citizens of the District of Columbia must no longer be delayed.

Our Federal, State, and local governments rest on the principle of democratic representation—the people elect those who govern them. We cherish the credo declared by our forefathers: No taxation without representation. We know full well that men and women give the most of themselves when they are permitted to attack problems which directly affect them.

Yet the citizens of the District of Columbia, at the very seat of the government created by our Constitution, have no vote in the government of their city. They are taxed without representation. They are asked to assume the responsibilities of citizenship while denied one of its basic rights. No major capital in the free world is in a comparable condition of disenfranchisement.

The denial of home rule to the District creates serious practical difficulties. The District is the ninth largest city in the United States—more populous than 11 of the States. Its government must handle the same problems which press with increasing urgency on the legislative, executive, and judicial arms of city governments throughout the Nation, and it must perform as well many of the functions of State and county governments. Under the present system these duties fall upon busy Members of the Senate and the House who—in addition to their congressional responsibilities—must serve as State representatives, county supervisors, and city councilmen for Washington.

Self-government for the District would not be an innovation. It is a return to the views of the Founding Fathers and to the practice of the early days of the Nation. James Madison wrote in the Federalist that the inhabitants of the Nation's Capital "will have had their voice in the election of the government which is to exercise authority over them; as a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will of course be allowed them; * * *"

Such a municipal legislature was established in 1802 under President Jefferson. It was strengthened in 1812 under President Madison, and in 1820, under President Monroe, it was enlarged to include an elected mayor.

Had it not been for the tragedy of the Civil War, local government would have continued. In 1871 the people of the District, deep in the problems of the Reconstruction period and urgently needing a program of public works, acquiesced in a change to a territorial form of government under which they lost the right to elect their chief executive. The program of public works was badly executed and the territorial government was soon in virtual bankruptcy. In 1874 Congress withdrew the voting franchise entirely and substituted a commission form of government. The intent was to make the change temporary—a receivership which would be replaced by self-government as soon as the fiscal affairs of the city were on a sound basis. But this receivership has now lingered on for 90 years.

There is a fundamental Federal interest in the National Capital. The Constitution wisely delegates to the Congress supreme legislative power over "the seat of the Government of the United States." The Congress can, however, delegate to a municipal legislature all the powers necessary for local self-government, and at the same time preserve fully its ultimate power and the interests of the Federal Government.

The District of Columbia Charter Act which I am transmitting to the Congress today will relieve the Congress, to the maximum practical extent, of detailed legislative direction of District affairs while retaining essential control in the Congress. The bill—

(1) Creates a representative local government for the District,

(2) Provides a link between the Congress and the local government in the form of an elected delegate to the House of Representatives, and

(3) Preserves intact the powers of the Congress and the President by (a) an express provision that the Congress is in no way deprived of its power to legislate for the District, and may repeal or modify any act of the local council; (b) a provision for an absolute veto by the President of any act of the local council; and (c) provisions for supervision of the fiscal affairs of the District by the General Accounting Office.

Home rule for the District has been unfinished business for far too long a time. Presidents of both parties—Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy—have urged it. Measures to provide it were passed by the Senate in the 81st, 82d, 84th, and 86th Congresses.

The people of the District are ready and eager to join fully in the democratic process. In the presidential election of 1964, more than 90 percent of the registered voters went to the polls.

I urge the Congress to approve at the earliest possible date the legislation which will grant them the fundamental American right of self-government.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 2, 1965.*

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the pending bill, as reported by our committee, won the unanimous support of all committee members on both sides of the aisle. At public hearings, testimony was received from 17 witnesses. Written statements and communications were submitted from more than 35 organizations and individuals. In my years as a member and as chairman of this committee, I have never seen closer study given to any bill by the membership of the Senate District Committee. I believe that the amendments adopted by the committee, primarily assuring minority party representation on the city council and an elected school board, and others, have strengthened the bill substantially. It represents the product of many years of continuing study by this committee and the Senate directed toward formulating some workable form of local self-government for the people of the District of Columbia that the Congress can vote to accept and that will be a good servant for the citizens of Washington.

Home rule would not be an innovation for the Nation's Capital City. From 1802 to 1871, Washington, D.C., had some form of local self-government.

I shall not detain the Senate with a detailed analysis of this bill. But Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a portion of the report on this bill, submitted from the Committee on the District of Columbia, setting forth the history of the legislation, the purpose of the bill, and a section-by-section analysis.

There being no objection, the section-by-section analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

History of legislation

Two legislative measures were considered by the committee on the subject of home rule for the District of Columbia. These included two bills—S. 1118, submitted to Congress by President Johnson; and S. 268, sponsored by Senator MORSE. Public hearings were held by the committee in connection with the two measures on March 9–10, 1965, at which testimony was received from 17 witnesses. In addition, written statements and communications were received from more than 35 other persons or organizations.

The bill, as amended, was supported by a unanimous vote of every member of the committee when it was ordered to be reported to the Senate by the committee on June 16, 1965.

The committee in reporting S. 1118 to the Senate made several clarifying and conforming amendments, as well as several that were substantive in nature. The various amendments adopted by the committee are discussed in detail in a summary of the bill by title later in this report.

S. 1118, as amended, embodies many of the provisions of S. 268. The latter bill represents the product of many years of continuing study by this committee directed toward formulating some workable form of local self-government for the people of the District of Columbia.

Legislation to provide some form of local government for the District of Columbia was initiated with the introduction of H.R. 3545 of the 43d Congress of June 1, 1874. Since that time through the 89th Congress, more than 40 home rule bills have been placed before biennial sessions of the Congress. The Senate on five separate occasions in the 81st, 82d, 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses enacted self-government legislation. However, all of these bills failed of enactment in the House.

The first government of the city of Washington consisted of a mayor, appointed by the President, and a city council, elected by the people of the city. This was in 1802. In 1812, the city council was permitted to elect the mayor of Washington, and in 1820 and thereafter the mayor was elected by the people. This government continued until 1871.

By an act of Congress, February 21, 1871, the corporation of Washington and of Georgetown were abolished and a territorial form of government, consisting of a governor and board of public works, and a legislative assembly, was set up. The legislative assembly consisted of a council of 11 members, and a house of delegates of 22 members. The Governor, the Board of Public Works, and the Council were appointed by the President. The 22 members of the house of delegates were elected by the people. The District of Columbia had a delegate in the House of Representatives until 1875.

This form of government lasted 3 years, or until June 20, 1874, when Congress provided that the District of Columbia should be governed by three commissioners, appointed by the President. This was known as a temporary form of government, and lasted until July 1, 1878, when the present permanent commission government was set up. In the creation of the temporary commission form of government in 1874, and the permanent form in 1878, no provision was made for the franchise and so, for the first time in three-quarters of a century, no part of the District exercised the right of suffrage.

In 1878, the expense of the Federal City was borne jointly by the District and the United States, on a 50–50 basis. In 1922, this was changed to a 60–40 ratio, and in 1938 the share of the United States was changed by a statute to a lump sum, which today is approximately 13 percent of the general fund.

S. 1118, as amended, would convey in some large measure permissible municipal home rule to the residents of the National Capital, thus restoring the powers of local self-government suspended in 1874. This grant is a delegation of the powers of the Congress contained in article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution of the United States, which pertains only to those matters municipal as distinguished from those national in scope. Such constitutional provision states:

"Congress shall have power * * * To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, * * *."

The delegation of permissible home rule to the residents of the District is given with the express reservation that the Congress may at any time revoke or modify the delegation in whole or in part, and further, that the Congress may take such action as, in its wisdom, it deems desirable with respect to any municipal action taken by the people or the government of the municipality under the authority of the charter. The Congress would continue to initiate local legislation should it so desire. Thus, the Congress, under the terms of this bill, retains full residual, ultimate and exclusive legislative jurisdiction over the District in conformity with the constitutional mandate. In addition, the bill makes provision for a veto by the President of any act of the local government where such act adversely affects a Federal interest.

Structure of government

The bill would establish the District of Columbia as a body politic and corporate in perpetuity which would be the successor of the present commission form of government. Provision is made for an elected mayor and an elected 19-member District Council, 5 of whom are to be elected at large, to exercise the municipal authorities conveyed to the District. Also, a nonpartisan elected school board of 14 members is provided. The mayor and council would take over the functions of the present Board of Commissioners which would be abolished. The District Council would be endowed with local legislative power, including taxing and borrowing power, subject to certain enumerated restrictions and to the overriding power of Congress to repeal, amend, or initiate local legislation and to modify or revoke the charter itself. This endowment of local power to a council and mayor would relieve the Congress of the detail of District affairs, as has been done in the case of the territories. The bill also gives legislative power to the qualified voters by initiative. However, there is provision for a Presidential veto where legislation enacted through the initiative adversely affects the Federal interest.

In addition, the office of a nonvoting elected Delegate to the House of Representatives is incorporated in the bill in order that the Congress may be kept currently informed as to the needs of the District which cannot be met through the local instrumentalities. His duties, powers, and privileges are those accorded a Delegate from a Territory.

The bill provides authority for a regular annual payment by the Federal Government to the District of Columbia, to be computed by means of a flexible formula which the committee believes will more fairly represent the Federal Government's fiscal responsibility to the government of the District, in lieu of a lump-sum Federal payment as is presently authorized.

It is the committee's view that a formula method would result in a better basis for measuring the Federal responsibility to the Nation's Capital because it provides a built-in incentive to utilize local taxes to meet local needs. Local residents, at the same time, are assured that the Federal Government will automatically recognize its obligation to provide additional revenues needed to meet legitimate increased expenditure requirements.

The formula contained in this bill provides for the computation of a permanent, indefinite Federal payment appropriation (not merely an authorization) to be paid to the District each year based on the computations under the formula without further legislative action by the Congress. The committee felt that only through such an automatic payment method could the District be assured of a proper measure of independence to govern its own affairs.

The committee, in favorably reporting this legislation, requests that the Congress receive periodic reports from the local government in order that it can be kept completely informed about the activities of the new municipal government, including its legislative program. Such reports should be made by the mayor and the council to the Committees on the District of Columbia of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

Contains definitions of principal terms used in the bill.

TITLE II—STATUS

Provides the District shall remain and continue a body corporate, and said corporation shall continue to be charged with all the duties, obligations, responsibilities, and to be vested with all the powers, rights, privileges, immunities, and assets imposed upon and vested in said corporation, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

All of the territory constituting the permanent seat of the government of the United States shall continue to be designated as the District of Columbia, and the boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia remains unchanged.

TITLE III—THE DISTRICT COUNCIL

S. 1118 originally provided for a District Council of 15 members. The committee amended the bill so as to provide for a 19-member council, 5 of whom would be elected at large and the other 14 elected, 1 from each of 14 wards. The committee amendment also increases from 2 to 4 years the term of office for District councilmen. In so doing, the committee provided for the terms of the councilmen to be staggered. Such would be accomplished by electing 7 of the 14 ward councilmen for a period of 2 years in the initial election following acceptance of the charter by the District voters. The committee, in adopting this amendment was of the view that it would secure for a part of the Council the broader basis of citywide representation and greater sensitivity to problems of the city as a whole that at-large Council members offer, and to assure minority party representation on the Council as provided in section 805(a)(2) hereafter detailed. In increasing the term of office to 4 years, the committee felt such term would lessen the time required for candidates to campaign for office and thereby permit the councilmen to devote more time to the duties of the elected office.

The qualifications for membership on the Council are set forth as follows: (1) A qualified voter; (2) is domiciled in the District and resides in the ward from which he is nominated; (3) has, during the 3 years next preceding his nomination, resided and been domiciled in the District; (4) has for 1 year preceding his nomination resided and been domiciled in the ward from which he is nominated; (5) holds no other elective public office; (6) holds no position as an officer or employee of the municipal government of the District of Columbia or any appointive office, for which compensation is provided out of District funds, and (7) holds no office to which he was appointed by the President of the United States and for which compensation is provided out of Federal or District funds. A member of the Council shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this section.

The compensation for such members is fixed at $10,000 per annum for the Chairman and $9,000 for members.

The bill provides for election from its members of a Chairman and a Vice Chairman of the Council, the appointment of a secretary as its chief administrative officer with duties as specified in the bill, and such assistants and clerical personnel as may be necessary, the calling of the first and regular meetings, the establishment of committees, the scope and form of acts and resolutions, the procedure for the adoption and passage of zoning acts, and the enactment of general legislation. The procedures relating to the veto powers of the mayor and the President are also defined.

The Council is empowered to conduct investigations and to issue and enforce subpenas.

The qualified voters and the Council are prohibited from passing any act inconsistent with or contrary to any provision of any act of Congress as it specifically pertains to any duty, authority, and responsibility of the National Capital Planning Commission.

The bill makes explicit the constitutional power of Congress to legislate at any time with respect to the District of Columbia.

The powers of the present Board of Commissioners are transferred to the Council, except those conferred on the mayor and the Board of Commissioners are abolished.

The Zoning Commission, the Public Service Commission, the Recreation Board, the Board of Zoning Adjustment, and Zoning Advisory Council are abolished and their functions transferred to the Council. Powers of the Council and the qualified electors, and the limitations on those powers are spelled out. The Commission on Mental Health, the National Zoological Park, the Washington aqueduct, the National Guard of the District of Columbia, or any Federal agency are specifically excluded from the authority of the District government.

Jurisidiction over the municipal courts shall vest with the Council. Any person to be appointed or elected after the date of enactment of this act shall hold office for a term of not less than 10 years and receive a salary of not less than the amount payable to an associate judge of the municipal court on the effective date of this act.

The committee amended section 324 of the bill by adding a new subsection. The amendment makes certain that nothing in section 324 is to be construed as barring the Council from vesting in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals certain powers to review administrative decisions of the District government regarding licenses, their issuance and their revocation.

TITLE IV—MAYOR

Creates the office of mayor to be elected as provided in title VIII. The qualifications for holding the office of mayor are as follows: (1) A qualified voter; (2) is domiciled and resides in the District; (3) has during the 3 years next preceding his nomination been resident in and domiciled in the District; (4) holds no other elective public office; and (5) holds no position as an officer or employee of the municipal government of the District of Columbia or any appointive office, for which compensation is provided out of District funds; and (6) holds no office to which he was appointed by the President of the United States and for which compensation is provided out of Federal or District funds. The mayor shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this section.

His salary is to be $27,500 annually, with an allowance for official expenses of not more than $2,500 annually. The executive power of the District shall be vested in the mayor who shall be the chief executive officer of the District government. He shall be responsible for the proper administration of the affairs of the District coming under his jurisdiction or control. The bill confers on him usual administrative powers and duties, including the power to appoint personnel in the executive branch of the city government and to remove such personnel in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. The mayor would have full authority to execute the powers and duties imposed upon him by law, including the authority to redelegate functions to subordinate officials as he deems necessary. The mayor shall keep the Council advised of the financial condition and future needs of the District and make such recommendations to the Council as may seem to him desirable. The mayor is empowered to veto acts of the Council; but such acts may be passed over his veto by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the Council.

The committee amended section 402 of the bill so as to provide a city administrator as principal managerial aid of the mayor to perform duties assigned to him by the mayor.

The committee was of the view that a city administrator would in some measure free the mayor from a large part of the day-to-day administrative routine so that he might better perform the more important policymaking and political functions of the executive office, as well as carry out his ceremonial duties. The administrator would be appointed, and subject to removal, by the mayor.

Also, under the bill, as amended, the mayor administers the personnel functions of the District covering employees of District departments and agencies.

Under the provisions of S. 1118, as introduced, subsection (4) of section 402 provides in pertinent part that personnel legislation (relating to promotions, pay, retirement benefits, etc.) enacted by Congress prior to or after the effective date of this section shall continue to be applicable until such time as the Council shall provide similar or comparable coverage under a District government merit system or systems.

The committee in adopting this amendment was of the view that it would help to preserve all employee benefits, rights and investments in their current system of employment and carry these benefits, rights, and investments over in full to the new merit system which the District government is authorized to establish under home rule.

Also, other minor amendments were made to the wording of the subsection so as (1) to assure government employees, including police and firemen, the retention of employee benefits issued by regulation pursuant to congressional legislation; and (2) to preserve an employee's rights, during the transition to a new employment system, to appeal a separation from service.

TITLE V—THE DISTRICT BUDGET

The fiscal year of the District of Columbia is fixed by the bill, and the preparation and adoption of the budget is provided for. The Council is empowered to rescind previously appropriated funds then available for expenditure, or to appropriate additional funds.

TITLE VI—BORROWING

The District is authorized to incur indebtedness by issuing its bonds in either coupon or registered form to fund or refund indebtedness of the District at any time outstanding and to pay the cost of constructing or acquiring any capital projects requiring an expenditure greater than the amount of taxes or other revenues allowed for such capital projects by the annual budget, with a restriction that the aggregate debt, including debt owed to the Treasury of the United States, is not to exceed 12 percent of the average assessed value of the taxable real and tangible personal property of the District as of the 1st day of July of the 10 most recent fiscal years for which such assessed values are available. The assessed values of the property involved includes in accordance with section 741, real and personal property tax loss incident to United States owning real and personal property in the District for the purpose of providing Federal governmental services or functions. The bill provides that new debt would have to be approved by the voters except that, within the 12-percent limitation, debt up to 2 percent (in the aggregate) of the assessed valuation of taxable real and personal property could be authorized by the Council without approval of the voters. Only bonds on self-liquidating capital projects and those issued for the construction of highways, transit systems, water and sanitary sewers and the like may exceed 6 percent of such average assessed value. All others are restricted to a 6-percent limitation. The Council shall make provision for the payment of any bonds issued pursuant to this title, and the bill sets forth the provisions which must be contained in an act authorizing the issuing of bonds.

The Council is authorized to issue supplemental notes in a total amount not to exceed 5 percent of the total appropriations for the current fiscal year if there are no appropriated funds available to meet supplemental appropriations. Such notes and renewals thereof shall be paid not later than the close of the fiscal year following that in which such act becomes effective. Short-term notes may be issued in anticipation of revenues in an amount not to exceed 20 percent of the total anticipated revenue for the current fiscal year.

Bond acts of the District shall, where necessary, provide for the levy annually of a special tax without limitation of rate or amount upon all taxable real and personal tangible property in the District in amounts, which, together with other revenues of the District available and applicable for such purposes, will be sufficient to pay principal and interest as these fall due. In addition, the full faith and credits of the District for the payment of the principal and interest on all bonds and notes is pledged.

Bonds and notes issued by the Council and the interest thereon would be exempt from all Federal and District taxation except estate, inheritance, and gift taxes.

The bill would permit national banks, Federal building and loan associations, and Federal savings and loan associations and banks, trust companies, building and loan associations, and savings and loan associations domiciled in the District of Columbia, to underwrite and trade in public bonds or notes of the District issued pursuant to this title.

Fiduciaries are not excused from the exercise of due care when investing in District obligations.

TITLE VII—FINANCIAL AFFAIRS OF THE DISTRICT

This title provides for the bonding of employees of the District, and the mayor is charged with the administration of the financial affairs of the District. He must prepare and submit the annual budget estimates and budget message; supervise and be responsible for all financial transactions; maintain systems of accounting and internal control; submit to the Council a monthly financial statement, by appropriation and department; prepare at the end of each fiscal year a complete financial statement; supervise and be responsible for the assessment of all property subject to assessment within the District; supervise and be responsible for the assessment and collection of all taxes, special assessments, license fees, and other revenues; have custody over all public funds belonging to or under the control of the District; and have custody of all investments and invested funds for the District.

The Council may provide for the transfer during the budget year of any appropriation balance then available for one item of appropriation to another item of appropriation, and the allocation to new items of funds appropriated for contingent expenditure.

The bill provides for an independent audit by the General Accounting Office. Such audit reports as the Comptroller General deems necessary shall be submitted to the Congress, the mayor, and the Council. The mayor, with the advice and consent of the Council, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget are given power to enter into agreements concerning the manner and method by which amounts owed by the District to the United States, or by the United States to the District, shall be ascertained and paid.

The Federal Payment

The formula for a Federal payment to the District of Columbia established by this bill would be an amount equal to the sum of—

1. The real estate taxes the District would receive if property owned and used by the Federal Government and property exempted by special act of Congress, were taxable;

2. The personal property taxes it would receive if tangible federally owned personal property, with certain exclusions, were taxable; and

3. The business income and related taxes which it could reasonably expect to receive if the Federal Government were a private business with an equivalent number of employees.

The Federal payment would be subject to certification by the Administrator of General Services that payment is based upon a reasonable and fair assessment of real and personal property of the United States and a proper and accurate computation of the specified factors incorporated in the formula.

Under the formula proposal, it is estimated that the Federal payment to the District would be $57 million for fiscal year 1966, with a projected increase to $71.2 million by 1970. This is contrasted with the present annual Federal payment authorization of $50 million.

The committee was of the opinion that the present system of legislating from time to time a new authorization ceiling toward which the appropriations grow from year to year would be neither adequate nor appropriate to the needs of an otherwise independent local government.

It was the committee's judgment that as time passed, a fixed amount would tend to become unreasonably small. The Federal Government's relation to the local economy changes. The city's needs change. The purchasing power of the dollar changes. It was the committee's belief that the relationships once deemed appropriate in establishing the lump-sum authorization no longer reflect the realities of the situation.

A formula method of measuring the Federal responsibility to the District tends to overcome these shortcomings of the lump-sum method and at the same time facilitates long-term fiscal planning. The Federal payment to the District would vary with changes in the size of the Federal establishment within the District and with changes in local taxes.

The committee believes that a formula method would result in a better basis for measuring the Federal responsibility to the Nation's Capital because it would provide a built-in incentive to utilize local taxes to meet local needs. Local residents, at the same time, would be assured that the Federal Government will automatically recognize its obligation to provide additional revenues needed to meet legitimate increased expenditure requirements.

The formula contained in this bill provides for the computation of a permanent, indefinite Federal payment appropriation (not merely an authorization) to be paid to the District each year based on the computations under the formula without further legislative action by the Congress. The committee felt that only through such an automatic payment method could the District be assured of a proper measure of independence to govern its own affairs.

In forwarding Federal payment formula legislation to the Congress in April 1965, President Johnson stated that enactment of such legislation "is essential to the proper assignment between the Federal Government and the local citizens of the responsibility of providing the necessary funds."

The committee concurs wholeheartedly in this view and believes that the proposed legislation will provide an orderly basis for determining each year the appropriate level of Federal contribution to the District. The formula method of computation provides considerable flexibility in arriving at the authorized Federal payment. Equally important, it relates more directly the District's needs and local resources. The proposed formula provides a standard for Federal payments to the District which, in the judgment of the committee, is fair to all parties concerned.

One question frequently raised in discussions of the payment formula proposal is whether its enactment would establish a precedent for payments in lieu of taxes in other jurisdictions in which the Federal Government owns property. There are many reasons why this would not be the case.

The Federal Government has unique responsibilities for the financial well-being of the Nation's Capital. For more than 75 years Congress has recognized that responsibility by appropriating a share of the funds needed for the operation of the government of the District.

Moreover, the Federal Government plays a larger part in the planning and development of the District of Columbia than it does anywhere else in the Nation. The location and types of buildings in certain areas are almost solely dependent upon approval by the Federal Government.

The Federal Government, through condemnation, if necessary, determines where its own numerous buildings and activities will be located. There are other restrictions, including limitation on the height of all buildings within the District. All this obviously places serious limitations on the development of industry and businesses in a city essentially geared to the functioning of the headquarters of the Federal Government. Such restrictions caused by the presence of Federal activities are not nearly so far reaching in any other city in the Nation.

Hence, the issue is not in any sense whether the Federal Government should contribute to the expense of the government in the District, but only what measure can best be used to determine its fair share of the District's financial needs.

Questions were raised at the committee hearings as to whether the Federal payment authorization-appropriation is an unconstitutional delegation of taxing powers vested in the U.S. Government within the District of Columbia and/or an unconstitutional delegation of appropriation procedures of the Congress of the United States. The Department of Justice concluded in a letter and memorandum set forth fully on pages 125 through 130 and pages 268 through 272 of the committee hearings, that the Federal payment provision (sec. 741) "does not authorize the District of Columbia to tax Federal property and, therefore does not raise a constitutional question in this regard. Further, we have concluded that section 741 is not an unconstitutional delegation of the appropriation power of Congress."

The Justice Department's constitutionality opinion makes comparisons between the Federal payment formula proposal with the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 and the Columbia River Basin Project Act. Both the latter authorize payments from proceeds of leases rather than from general funds of the U.S. Treasury as the District of Columbia Federal payment proposal would do. The Justice Department claims a closer analogy is the Atomic Energy Community Facilities Act of 1955 providing annual payments by the AEC to the Government-owned towns of Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Richland, Wash., and based upon Federal property exempt from taxation, etc.

In conclusion, Justice Department claimed Federal payment to the District would not "satisfy any tax obligation imposed by the District government, but pursuant to a direction of Congress, a direction which Congress is at any time free to change."

In essence, on the question of whether money can be drawn from the Treasury except "in consequence of appropriations made by law" (art. I, sec. 9, clause 7 of the Constitution), the Justice Department held (pp. 129 and 272 of the printed hearings):

"As long as the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia is authorized by an act of Congress, is computed on the basis which Congress itself established, is certified in accordance with law, and remains subject to legislative control, it would appear to comply with the requirement that all payments of public funds be made 'in consequence of appropriations made by law.' "

A formula approach based on the valuation of tax-exempt property of the Federal Government located in the District of Columbia tax-exempt property of foreign governments, and others exempted by special acts of Congress, is not a new idea. It must be remembered that the House Appropriations Committee in its Report No. 211 of the 1st session, 86th Congress, filed on March 13, 1959, made reference to tax-exempt properties in computing its recommendations on the Federal payment appropriation for the 1960 fiscal year. The report states in part:

"In arriving at the recommended figure of $25 million as the Federal payment to the general fund which is a 25-percent increase above the $20 million appropriated to date for fiscal year 1959, the committee has taken into consideration the following data submitted by the Commissioners from the table on page 17 of the hearings:

"Federal Government property, if taxable	$22,241,125
"Foreign governments (embassies, etc.), if taxable	434,496
"Miscellaneous (properties exempted by acts of Congress)	396,332
"Total	23,071,953

"If the committee were to apply the same average increase of 9 percent in real property taxes which will result from the reassessment program, the figure noted above would be $25,148,428, or approximately the same as the $25 million recommended in the bill."

Likewise, the Senate approved H.R. 6177 in July 22, 1963, containing a Federal payment formula proposal as a provision in legislation authorizing an increase in Federal participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City. This was a formula authorization concept with appropriations remaining with the Congress.

Further, history also provides authority for a Federal payment percentage approach. From 1879 through 1920, the Federal payment to the District of Columbia was a flat 50 percent of the "General fund" appropriation. In other words, of each dollar appropriated to operate and maintain the District, the local taxpayer paid 50 cents with the remaining 50 cents being paid by the Federal Government.

In 1921 the Congress discontinued its 50-percent formula. Since that time the percentage of costs borne by the Federal Government has fluctuated from a high of 39.5 percent on "General fund" appropriations in 1924, to a low of 8.5 percent in 1954. Since 1956, the Federal payment has been slightly over 12 percent. The $37½ million Federal payment voted to the District by Congress last year is approximately 13 percent of the general fund estimate of a $297.4 million appropriation for the 1965 fiscal year to operate the District government.

It is the committee's view that a formula approach for Federal payment authorization represents a forward-looking, businesslike method. It takes into consideration the Federal Government's proper obligation to the local District of Columbia government and provides a basis for Congress to alter the formula by legislative action at any subsequent time should such formula appear excessive or inadequate.

On the amount of income taxes that would be paid if the Federal Government were a business, the Federal Government would make a payment approximately that which a business or industry of comparable size would pay in taxes. If the rate of taxation on real or personal property or on business franchises were increased or decreased, the Federal payment would be increased or decreased.

It is the committee's conclusion that enactment of the Federal payment authorization formula would be the most significant contribution to Federal-District fiscal relationships in the last half century in meeting the many problems unique to the federally controlled and congressionally governed city.

Moreover, the Federal payment formula provision represents what might be called the heart of the entire home rule proposal. It is generally considered to be a maxim that the "party holding the purse strings also is the party holding the power." Therefore, if home rule in the true sense is to be accorded to the Capital City of this Nation, its citizenry should have the vital assistance that the Federal payment formula would give while the interest of the Federal Government would remain adequately protected by the continuing ability of the Congress to amend the formula at any time it saw fit.

TITLE VIII—ELECTIONS IN THE DISTRICT

The bill continues the Board of Elections as established by the District Primary Act. Successors to the present Board after their terms have expired, would be appointed by the mayor, by and with the advice and consent of the Council, for a term of 3 years. The Board is charged with maintaining a permanent registry; conducting registrations and elections; determining appeals; provide for recording and counting votes by means of ballots or machines or both, dividing the District into 14 wards as nearly equal as possible in population and of geographic proportions as nearly regular as possible; establishing voting precincts; operating polling places, certifying election results, and other duties. The Board is given authority to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for the purposes of the act, and the salary of each member is fixed at the rate of $1,500 per annum. Present law provides compensation for Board members at $25 per day while performing duties.

The Board of Elections, in addition to elections conducted pursuant to the District Election Act of 1955, shall conduct—

1. A primary election to be held on the first Tuesday in May of each even-numbered calendar year commencing after this title takes effect.

2. A general election, to be held on the first Tuesday following the first Monday in November in each even-numbered calendar year commencing after this title takes effect.

3. Special elections and referendum elections held pursuant to sections 335(c), 602, 806, 812(b), or 812(c).

The offices to be filled by partisan election are members of the Council, the mayor, and the District Delegate. Members of the Council shall be elected for 4-year terms beginning on January 2 of the odd-numbered year following such election.

The mayor shall be elected for a 4-year term beginning on January 2 of the odd-numbered year following such election. The District Delegate shall be elected for 2 years beginning on January 3 of the odd-numbered year following such election. Members of the Board of Education would have 4-year terms.

Vacancies would be handled as follows—

(a) Delegate: By the mayor, with the advice and consent of the Council.

(b) Mayor: Filled at the next general election and before such election, the successor will be filled by appointment by the District Council.

(c) Council member: Appointment by the mayor with the advice and consent of the Council; except that any vacancy in any at-large Council seat, must be a member of the same political party of the person who vacated the office.

(d) Board of Education: Appointment by the mayor, without regard to political affiliation, with the advice and consent of the Council.

At primary elections, the candidate of each party receiving the highest vote, would be declared the winner and his name placed on the general election ballot as the candidate of his party. An exception would be in the councilmen at large contests where three candidates of each party receiving the highest vote shall be declared winners and their names placed on the general election ballot as their party's candidates for councilman at large. No political party shall be permitted to have more than three persons as candidates to fill the five councilmen at large seats, thus assuring that not more than three members of any one political party shall hold office of the five councilmen at large to be elected.

Staggered terms of office are provided for all members of the council except the five councilmen at large, who shall be elected for

4-year terms every 4th year. Seven members of the 14 ward councilmen will be elected for 4-year terms at general elections to be held every 2 years.

Thereby the concept of minority party representation is carried out together with the advantages to be gained from having the electorate speak every 2 years.

A committee amendment to the bill provides a procedure for the recall of any elective officer of the District of Columbia by the qualified electors of the District in lieu of only the office of mayor as provided in the original bill. The petition to be filed demanding the recall by such qualified electors of any elective officer must be signed by not less than 25 percent of the number of qualified electors voting at the last preceding general election. The petition must set forth the reasons for such demand, and be filed with the secretary of the Council.

On the ballot at such election shall be printed in not more than 200 words the reason for demanding the recall of any elective officer, and in not more than 200 words, the officer's justification or answer to such demands. No petition demanding the recall of any officer shall be circulated until he has held office for a period of 6 months.

The Board of Elections is authorized to prescribed such regulations as may be necessary with respect to the form, filing, examination, amendment, and certification of petition for recall, and with respect to the conduct of any special election held for this purpose.

A qualified voter shall be a person (1) who has maintained a domicile or place of abode in the District continuously during the 6-month period ending on the day of the election; (2) who is a citizen of the United States; (3) who is on the day of the election at least 18 years old; (4) who has never been convicted of a felony in the United States, or, if he has been so convicted, has been pardoned; (5) who is not mentally incompetent, as adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction; and (6) who certifies that he has not, within 6 months immediately preceding the election, claimed the right to vote or voted in any election in any State or territory of the United States (other than in the District).

The bill provides that no person shall be registered unless he shall be able to qualify otherwise as a voter on the day of the next election; he executes a registration affidavit on a form prescribed by the Board of Elections showing that he will meet on election day all the requirements of a qualified voter, and if he desires to vote in a primary election, such form shall show his political party affiliation. The bill provides that the Board shall accept as evidence of registration a Federal post card application for an absentee ballot prescribed under the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955. If a person is not permitted to register, such person, or any qualified candidate, may appeal to the Board of Elections, but not later than 3 days after the registry is closed for the next election. The Board shall decide within 7 days after the appeal is perfected whether the challenged voter is entitled to register. If the appeal is denied the appellant may, within 3 days after such denial, appeal to the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions. The court shall decide the issue not later than 18 days before the day of the election. The decision of such court shall be final and not appealable. If the appeal is upheld by either the Board or the Court, the appeal is pending on election day, the challenged voter may cast a ballot marked "Challenged," as provided in section 811.

The bill provides for two methods of nominations: Nomination of a candidate to be included on the ballot for a primary election shall take place when the Board of Elections receives a declaration of candidacy, accompanied by the filing fee in the required amount: *Provided, however,* That the candidate is duly registered as affiliated with the political party for which the nomination is sought and otherwise meets the qualifications for holding the office for which he seeks nomination. Nomination of any independent candidate who desires to have his name on the ballot in the general election shall take place when the Board of Elections receives a petition signed by the required number of registered voters and accompanied by a filing fee in the appropriate amount.

Petitions nominating an independent candidate for District Delegate or Mayor shall be signed by not less than 500 qualified voters registered in the District. The registration fee for these offices is $200. Petitions nominating a candidate for the District Council shall be signed by not less than 100 qualified voters registered in the ward from which nomination is sought. The registration fee for Council is $50. No person shall be barred from nomination as an independent candidate in the general election because he was a candidate for nomination in a primary election. No person shall be a candidate for more than one office in any election. If a person is nominated for more than one office, he shall within 3 days after the last day on which nominations may be made, notify the Board of Elections, in writing, for which office he elects to run.

Elections for all offices shall be partisan except for members of the Board of Education whose candidacies will be nonpartisan. The ballot is to show the wards from which each candidate, other than the District Delegate and Mayor, has been nominated. Each voter is entitled to vote for one candidate from the ward in which the voter is a resident and also vote for five councilmen at large, and one candidate for District Delegate, and one candidate for Mayor. Absentee voting will be permitted under regulations adopted by the Board of Elections.

The bill makes inapplicable to District elections that section of the Hatch Act which prohibits officers or employees of the executive branch of the Federal Government from taking an active part in political management or campaigns. Section 16 of the Hatch Act gave the Civil Service Commission power to permit certain political activity in the National Capital area by Federal employees where special or unusual circumstances warranted such permission.

The committee felt that the District represents a striking example of the "unusual circumstances" anticipated in the Hatch Act. The proportion of its total population who are Federal employees is estimated to be from 10 to 15 percent. The percentage of District residents 18 or over who are Federal employees would be about 20 percent, and of eligible electors, probably something substantially greater—possibly as high as 35 percent. Thus, to foreclose participation of such a large proportion of the population from political activity would be to deny the District one of its major civic resources and deny participation by a substantial percentage of the District's populace in its government.

Provision for challenging voters and for appeals to the Board of Elections are made. Poll watchers are authorized, and a procedure is set up pertaining to recounts parallel to that of the District Primary Act with a modification to take care of referendums. The petitioner must deposit a sum of $20 for each precinct to be recounted. The fee is refunded if the election result is changed by the recount. The petition is to the Board of Elections, and is filed by qualified candidates in the elections. In the case of referendums, since there are no candidates in a referendum, any person who voted in any election is eligible to petition the Board for a recount of votes cast on a referendum question.

Violations of any provision of this title or regulations published under its authority are declared misdemeanors and penalties are provided.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS

Except where the terms of intergovernmental contracts are prescribed by other provisions of law, the District and Federal Governments are authorized to contract with each other for the rendition services in order to prevent duplication of effort and to otherwise promote efficiency and economy. Such contracts are to be negotiated by the Federal and District authorities concerned and be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and by the mayor, by and with the advice and consent of the Council. Such contracts will provide for payment for the actual cost of furnishing such services.

The costs to each Federal officer and agency in furnishing services to the District pursuant to any such contract is to be paid out of appropriations made by the Council to the District officers and agencies to which they are furnished.

The costs to each District officer and agency in furnishing services to the Federal Government pursuant to any such contract shall be paid from appropriations made by the Congress to such Federal officers and agencies.

No member of the Council and no other officer or employee of the District shall have any financial interest direct or indirect in any contract or sale to which the District is a party.

Except for the qualifications already enumerated, no person is ineligible to serve or to receive compensation as a member of the Council or the Board of Elections because he occupies another office or position or receives compensation from another source. The right of a person to another office under the laws of the United States shall not be abridged by the fact of his service as a member of the Council or the Board of Elections if such service does not interfere with the discharge of his duties in the other office.

The U.S. Civil Service Commission is authorized to render advice and assistance to the new government in the development of a merit system.

TITLE X—SUCCESSION IN GOVERNMENT

Whenever the functions of any existing agency or officer are transferred under the bill, the personnel (except the members of Boards or Commissions abolished by the bill), property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations which relate to the functions are also transferred. Provision is made for the settling of disputes which may arise out of such transfers.

Any statute, regulation, or other action relating to any officer or agency from which any function is transferred by the bill shall, except to the extent modified or made inapplicable by or under authority of law, continue in effect as if such transfer had not been made. No pending judicial or administrative action shall abate by reason of the provisions of the bill becoming effective, but such actions shall continue with appropriate substitutions of parties.

The purpose underlying this title is to provide continuity in the transfer of existing personnel, property, and funds; to continue in effect present statutes and regulations; and to provide for orderly disposition of pending actions and proceedings.

TITLE XI—SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

This title provides that, should a part of the act be held invalid, the remainder of its provisions shall not be affected thereby.

TITLE XII—TEMPORARY PROVISIONS

The President of the United States is authorized and requested to take such action during the transition period between the enactment of the bill and the first meeting of the Council as he deems necessary to enable the Board of Elections properly to perform its functions. The sum of $750,000 is authorized to be appropriated to the District to pay the expenses of the Board of Elections and in otherwise carrying into effect the provisions of the bill. The full amount of expenditures made under this authorization shall be reimbursable by the District to the United States without interest, during the second fiscal year which begins after the effective date of title V.

TITLE XIII—EFFECTIVE DATES

The charter (titles I to XI, inclusive, and titles XV, XVI, XVII, and XVIII) shall take effect on the day following the date on which it is accepted in the charter referendum provided by title XIV, except as provided in section 1406. (Pt. 2 of title III provides that certain agencies abolished by the act may continue to operate for a period of 180 days after the effective date of this title unless within such period the District Council shall otherwise direct.)

TITLE XIV—SUBMISSION OF CHARTER FOR REFERENDUM

The bill provides that on a date to be fixed by the Board of Elections not more than 4 months after the enactment of the act, a referendum shall be conducted to determine whether the registered qualified voters of the District accept the charter. The Board of Elections established under the District Election Act of 1955, is charged with conducting the charter referendum and certifying the results thereof. Provision is made for the form of ballot to be used in the referendum and for the method of voting. If a majority of the registered qualified electors voting in the charter referendum vote for the charter, the charter shall be accepted as of the time the Board of Elections certifies the result of the charter referendum to the President. Also, the Board of Elections within 30 days after the date of the charter referendum, shall certify the result of the charter referendum to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

TITLE XV—DELEGATE

The bill provides for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives. He shall have the right of debate, may make any motion, except to reconsider, shall be a member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, but may not vote, which is the same status as the Territorial Delegate. His term of office shall be for 2 years. No person shall hold the office of District Delegate unless he (1) is a qualified voter; (2) is at least 25 years old; (3) holds no other public office; and (4) is domiciled and resides in the District, and during the 3 years next preceding his nomination (a) has been a resident in and domiciled in the District, and (b) has not voted in any election (other than in the District) for any candidate for public office. The bill amends several statutes relating to a Territorial Delegate and the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, to make them applicable to the District Delegate. The Delegate is to be elected as provided in title VIII.

TITLE XVI—BOARD OF EDUCATION

S. 1118, as it was introduced, abolished the Board of Education, and thereby provided the District Council complete discretion in determining the future organization of the Board. The committee approved an amendment to S. 1118 which provides for the Board of Education to be elected directly by the people.

Under the amendment, as approved, elections for members of the Board of Education would be nonpartisan. The Board would consist of 14 members, with 1 member elected from each of the 14 wards, for terms of 4 years each. As provided in section 803(e), seven members would be elected every 2 years, thus assuring continuity—of experience on the Board of attentiveness to the wishes of the electorate. The amendment, as approved by the committee, does not provide the Board of Education with any independent taxing or borrowing authority. The Board would be required to seek approval of its budget from the District Council as in the case of any other municipal agency.

It was the intent of the committee that the public school system of the District of Columbia shall continue to be under the control of the Board of Education as under prior law. It was the further intent of the committee that the Board of Education shall continue to exercise its control in accordance with the provisions of laws applicable to the school system which existed immediately prior to the date of enactment of this act until such time as such laws are changed by the District Council, the qualified voters, or the Congress, in which case the Board of Education shall exercise its control in accordance with such laws as changed.

The purpose of this amendment is to secure the direct responsiveness of the electorate on matters of educational policy that the direct election of individual school board members would achieve.

TITLE XVII—INITIATIVE

The committee amended the bill to provide initiative powers. Subject to the provisions of section 324 of the bill, the qualified voters are given the power, independent of the Mayor and Council, to propose and enact legislation relating to the District with respect to all rightful subjects of legislation not inconsistent with the Constitution or with the laws of the United States which are applicable but not confined to the District.

In exercising the power of initiative, not more than 10 percent of the number of qualified voters voting in the last preceding general election shall be required to propose any measure by initiative petition. The method for holding elections under the initiative procedure is set forth in this title.

TITLE XVIII—TITLE OF ACT

Provides that this act, divided into titles and sections according to the table of contents, and including the declaration of congressional policy, which is a part of such act, may be cited as the "District of Columbia Charter Act."

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I believe it essential that I outline the main legislative provisions not heretofore covered.

The bill provides:

First. An elected mayor and an elected 19-member City Council, 5 to be elected at large with not more than 3 thereof to be a member of the same political party, and the other 14 elected, 1 from each of 14 wards. Councilmen's terms will be 4 years with terms to be staggered on a 2-year basis.

Second. An elected nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives to have the same powers as those now granted to a territorial delegate.

Third. The Council to be vested with local legisative power, including taxing and borrowing authority, subject to certain enumerated restrictions and to the overriding power of the Congress—to which I have previously alluded—to repeal, amend, or initiate local legislation and to modify or revoke the charter itself; the Council to assume functions presently carried out by the Board of Commissioners, which would be abolished. The Council to control the city's financial affairs, to borrow for capital improvements, prepare and approve an annual budget, and provide for the payment of bonds and notes, an so forth.

Fourth. A provision for a Federal payment by the Congress to the District of Columbia annually, with such to provide an automatic authorization and appropriation by means of a flexible formula which the committee believes will more fairly represent the Federal Government's fiscal responsibility to the District of Columbia than the present in-lieu-of-tax, lump-sum Federal payment.

Fifth. Partisan elections for all officeholders except members of the Board of Education, who shall be elected on a nonpartisan basis.

Sixth. Full participation by all District residents, including Federal and District government employees, in election campaigns.

Seventh. Initiative and recall to permit the electorate to propose legislation and to recall any elected officer of the District.

Eighth. A 14-member Board of Education elected, 1 each from the 14 wards, to exercise control over the public school system of the District of Columbia, with such control equal to that presently exercised by the appointive Board of Education. Under the bill, the Board of Education would not have independent taxing or borrowing authority. It would be required to seek approval of its budget from the District council, similar to any other municipal agency.

Ninth. A charter referendum whereby the District's qualified voters must choose within 4 months of the bill's enactment whether District residents do or do not want self-government.

Mr. President, it must be borne clearly in mind that by adoption of this home rule legislation, Congress does not lose its power over the District of Columbia in any way. Congress only delegates the housekeeping chores to a municipal, elected council, but the Congress, under the Constitution, must retain ultimate power over the District of Columbia as set forth in article I, section 8 of the Constitution, which provides:

> Congress shall have power * * * To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, there is one aspect of this home rule bill which I believe deserves greater explanation because, as the Committee report sets out, the Federal payment formula provision represents what might be called the heart of the entire home rule proposal.

Since the District was established in 1879, the Federal Government has, in each year, made an in-lieu-of-tax payment to the District of Columbia government. The primary purpose of the payment has been to compensate for the fact that the Federal Government, as the principal employer and the owner of almost 50 percent of the District's land area, is tax exempt, thus depriving the city of a major source of tax revenue always available to other cities.

From 1879 to 1920 the Federal payment was 50 percent of the general fund appropriation; that is to say, for every dollar of operating costs, 50 cents was paid by local taxpayers and 50 cents was paid from the Federal Treasury. The percentage has fallen over the years from the earlier fixed formula. For the 1965 fiscal year, the percentage paid by the Federal Government amounted to 13 cents out of each dollar of operating costs.

Under the formula concept, as proposed in this bill, the Federal payment would be set at an amount equal to the sum of, first, the real estate taxes the District would receive if property owned and used by the Federal Government and property exempted by special act of Congress, were taxable; second, the personal property taxes it would receive if tangible federally owned personal property, with certain exclusions, were taxable; and, third, the business income and related taxes which it could reasonably expect to receive if the Federal Government were a private business with an equivalent number of employees.

The Federal payment would be subject to certification by the Administrator of General Services Administration that payment is based upon a reasonable and fair assessment of real and personal property of the United States and a proper and accurate computation of the specified factors incorporated in the formula. Under the formula, it is estimated that the Federal payment to the District would be $57 million for fiscal year 1966, contrasted with the present annual Federal payment authorization of $50 million and an appropriation of $43 million.

It was the committee's belief that a local government, if it is to operate successfully, must be reasonably assured that the Federal Government will automatically recognize its obligation to provide additional revenues from the locally assessed taxes that are needed to meet legitimate increased expenditure requirements.

In forwarding Federal payment formula legislation to the Congress this year, President Johnson stated that enactment of such legislation—"is essential to the proper assignment between the Federal Government and the local citizens of the responsibility of providing the necessary funds."

The committee believes that the formula provision will assure an orderly basis for determining each year the appropriate level of Federal contribution to the District. It takes into consideration the Federal Government's proper obligation to the District government; it provides a basis for Congress to alter the formula by legislative action at any subsequent time should such formula appear excessive or inadequate.

Certainly, if Congress believes home rule is proper and right for the Capital City of this Nation, then its citizenry should have the vital assistance that the Federal payment formula would give to the stability of a local government while the interest of the Federal Government remains adequately protected by the continuing ability of the Congress to amend the formula at any time it sees fit.

In my years as chairman and as a member of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, I believe I have learned something about this great city whose problems are multiplied by the inability of its residents to govern themselves.

Washington, D.C., has two distinct roles. First and foremost, it is the seat of our Federal Government, a symbol of our great Republic, reflecting the spirit, history, and personality of our country.

Second, Washington is a great American city, with all the problems, increasing as they are, that New York City, Chicago, or Los Angeles has. The influx of record populations into urban centers, such as Washington, and the accompanying social upheavals that flow from this urbanization are dramatic evidences of increasingly critical situations.

It is my best judgment that the District of Columbia cannot continue to meet its growing needs by the present system of half-way government where all of its housekeeping and municipal legislative problems are weighed on the national scale by a Congress whose concern should not be focused on the city's daily activity but on those of the Nation and the world.

I am not wedded to any rigid concept of home rule for the District. However, I do believe that a Congress which seeks to help the world solve its ills is capable of bending itself to fashion some form of self-government for the three-quarters of a million people who live here.

Today, 87 cents out of every dollar of the $300 million—plus, annual District of Columbia budget are taxes paid by local residents who have no voice on how their dollars are collected or spent.

This Nation was founded 185 years ago on a successful crusade against taxation without representation. Is the crusade any less right or proper today?

Mr. President, I submit that the 89th Congress should restore self-government to Washington, D.C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, before I submit any amendments, I should like to make some comments for the purpose of the RECORD and for the benefit of those of our colleagues who are present.

First of all, I have thoroughly enjoyed my tenure on the District of Columbia Committee under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. He has been most fair. He has dedicated himself to the work of the District of Columbia and the problems that are inherent in this Capital City. I believe that with the aid and cooperation of other members of the committee we have probably developed a far better home rule bill this year than had previously been submitted to the Senate.

I personally wish that we had gone further and faster with our improvement on the crime bill. However, I must say, in all fairness, that the chairman has done a very fine job in keeping us working on these other problems, in trying to develop remedial legislation which will be helpful to everyone who resides in the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, despite the fact that I shall offer some amendments, I believe I should make it clear for the record that I was the one who moved that the bill be reported from the committee. I make that statement because I do not want anyone to get the impression that I am against a home rule bill for the District of Columbia. I am not.

In reviewing what we had done, it seemed to me that there were some glaring defects in the bill that should be pointed out and should be argued as a matter of policy before the Senate itself.

The committee adopted several amendments which in my opinion strengthen the bill.

First, as the chairman has stated, we have adopted a provision for a separate school board, which would be elected. Furthermore, we have stated that the members of the board would be elected on staggered terms, so that there would be some continuity of effort in the school system in the District of Columbia.

I do not believe there is any Senator who is acquainted with the problems of the District of Columbia who is not aware at the present time of the great and crying need of the school system in the District of Columbia.

I was happy to see that we would have staggered terms and elections for the council, although that provision would apply only to the 14 members and, of course, not to those who are elected at large.

The chairman made reference to the fact that there would be a certain degree of minority representation on the council under the bill.

I should make it very clear that this so-called minority representation is quite illusory. It would apply only to the five persons who would be elected at large. It would not apply to any of the 14 members elected from the wards.

It is conceivable that there would be 17 members of one political party controlling the council, and 2 members attempting to put the other viewpoint forward, at least for discussion.

I believe we made a vast improvement in the bill in the recall and initiative provisions.

These particular provisions would be most valuable. They are incorporated in almost all the State constitutions in the Western States, and in many of the ordinances establishing a city council in areas throughout the country.

But there are some provisions in the bill which I believe cause concern, and I would like to discuss them one after another.

First, I wish to deal with the school system. On March 4 I introduced a bill to establish an independent school board in the District of Columbia, which would be another governmental entity operating within the geographic boundaries of the District of Columbia. It would have autonomous authority over schools, teachers, and construction, and would consist of elected members. It would be dedicated to school purposes and school purposes only, and would have the ability to cause the District to raise such funds as it might deem necessary for school purposes.

I offered this proposal as an amendment in committee. It was upon that proposal and the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], which merely provided for a separate school board, that we had considerable discussion. Portions of the suggestions of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] were adopted and portions of mine were adopted.

None of the financing features would be included in the bill.

While I am most familiar with Denver, Colo., there are a number of States in which cities have separate school boards with separate means of financing. That system has worked extremely well.

This separate financing takes the school board out of political pressure, and the school board is not so completely at the mercy of the city council in Denver for reasonable financing for the schools. This prevents a regression in school activities and it provides a mechanism by which the best school experts in an area can be brought to work on the problems in that district.

I believe that perhaps the bill would cut out the heart of the proposal that I have heretofore advanced. I believe it would cut out the heart because I do not believe any school board in the District of Columbia or elsewhere could possibly operate efficiently unless it had the assurance of adequate funds to fulfill the plans that it was formulating.

At the appropriate time, I plan to offer an amendment for discussion, which would restore to the bill the opportunity for a school board to cause to be levied taxes in such a manner that the school board would have sufficient funds to go forward with its program for the school district in this great area.

The second thing that bothered me and bothered a number of the rest of us on the committee was the question of partisanship in elections. The difficulties are inherent in the fact that we would have minority representation in the five members who would be elected at large on the theory that the elective process within the District would be partisan.

In the hearings we tried to develop a statistical situation to determine whether a majority of cities have partisan or nonpartisan elections.

I am frank to say that until I came to Washington, D.C., I had never heard of partisan municipal elections. In the State of Colorado we have nothing but nonpartisan elections. I believe this is true in the State of Nevada; is it not?

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. It is true in most of the Western States, as far as I am aware, and it is true in a number of the Eastern States.

Where we are dealing with a municipality and you are trying to get as many qualified people as possible to serve in offices which can often be most disagreeable, certainly troublesome, and full of problems, we can do the work more effectively if we have elections on a nonpartisan basis.

We can call the parties anything we wish. They would not be affiliated directly with either the Democratic Party on the Republican Party. They could be Progressives or almost anything we can think of. We would get away from the political parties which so often control a number of votes, regardless of what party we might be talking about, and whether or not the candidate himself appears to be the most adept or apt for the particular job sought.

That question bothered me, and we discussed it at considerable length. The vote in the committee on the question was extremely close. I believe there was a difference of only one vote.

In the process of that debate we had another discussion concerning a provision in the bill which has not been mentioned, so far as I know.

We have eliminated the application of the Hatch Act. We did so in the city which is the center of the greatest number of Federal employees of any municipality in the country. Suddenly we decided that the Hatch Act should not apply in this area. Why? The report will show that we took that action because we thought there were a great number of highly qualified Federal employees who would be perfectly capable of holding an office in a municipality of this kind, as it is envisaged, without jeopardizing their position, and without being subject to pressure.

I completely concur that there are a great number of highly qualified and able people who would probably like to serve in elective or even appointive offices of one kind or another, but that would be a major change.

It would be a major change in the application of the Hatch Act which, it seems to me, should not be inserted as a part of a home rule bill which, heaven knows, will get past the other body only with difficulty.

I have had called to my attention S. 1474, which is a bill to create a bipartisan committee to study Federal laws limiting political activity by officers and employees of the Federal Government. The measure has been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration without amendment. It would create a commission to study the proposal that we are supposed to be acting on in the bill.

I cannot conceive of the reasoning in a situation in which a new law is initiated for self-government in the District of Columbia, and while so doing a major change is proposed in one of the fundamental acts that has been on the statute books of the country for a long time, an act to prevent improper activities by virtue of political pressures regardless of party.

It strikes me that we should withhold action on this proposal until such time as an opportunity has been afforded a committee to study the effectiveness of the Hatch Act, and determine whether in some instances it should be modified so as to permit Federal employees to hold local office and serve and participate in local elections.

The third, and perhaps most important, of all the defects, as I read the bill, is the Federal payment, which was discussed at some length by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. Congress is the body that has been designated by the Constitution to levy taxes. The Constitution and rules of our system require that all revenue-raising bills shall originate in the other body. That principle has been applied not only to revenue-raising bills but also to general appropriations bills. I do not intend to enter into a discussion as to whether appropriations actually fall within that constitutional requirement; nevertheless, the procedure, for as long as I can remember, has been that all appropriation bills originate in the House of Representatives.

What is proposed by the bill? The bill provides a system whereby Congress would grant to an elective council the right to withdraw funds from the Federal Treasury without any review, without any veto, and without any other action by Congress, unless Congress passed a law to prohibit a particular appropriation. The procedure to be followed would merely be a statement that the council could levy taxes on Federal property in the entire District of Columbia on the basis of its assessed valuation. The council would determine what the assessed valuation would be. Once that had been certified, and the new levy imposed by the council, the amount would automatically be submitted to the Treasury for automatic payment without any other procedure.

This is a highly important subject. Not only does it put in question the reasonableness of the valuations on Federal property; it also has the inherent danger of removing from Congress the responsibility which the Constitution by its very wording has placed in that body.

For example, to be somewhat dramatic, what valuation would be placed on the U.S. Capitol, the building in which we are now sitting? Who would determine the basis on which the valuation would be placed? Who would decide whether it was $1 or $1 billion? Under the bill, the proposed District of Columbia Council would decide, not those who authorize the maintenance of the building, not those who appropriate funds for its maintenance, not the historians who are seeking to have it restored to the beautiful condition which was originally envisaged. It would be the District of Columbia, which is interested in providing funds for its own governmental services and its own school board.

Who would decide the valuation of the Senate Office Buildings? The National Archives? The Treasury? The White House? Who would say what the valuations on those structures should be?

If perchance a valuation could be put on them—and I frankly say that I have difficulty in determining how a valuation could be put on any of those buildings—who would determine whether it was reasonable or not?

It strikes me that the bill should contain more safeguards than it does. The bill contains a right of veto, in effect, by the Administrator of General Services. I believe that is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. But that does not give Congress any right of its own to determine whether a valuation placed on

Federal buildings is anywhere near reasonable.

At a later date, I shall propose an amendment that when a certification is made and a valuation has been approved by the General Services Administration and submitted to the Treasury the amount of the funds proposed by such certification shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations in the general appropriations process, so that Members of Congress will know the amount being asked, why the funds are sought, and whether the amount that is proposed is based on a reasonable assessment.

To me, this is extremely important. I shall offer an amendment on this subject, and at the appropriate time I shall ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

Other factors are involved in the Federal payment problem. One is the question of in-lieu taxes. In every public lands State, whether it be the State of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the State of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the State of the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the President pro tempore, or any other State in which public lands are situated, if Congress were to start to let one governmental entity impose taxes upon another, where would the practice stop? Shall we say that we will allow the District of Columbia to impose taxes on the Federal Government, but that we will not let California do so; that we will not let Nevada do so; that we will not let Colorado or Oklahoma do so?

It may be said that because of the particular nature of this proposal, no precedent of any kind would be set, but that we are merely providing, by practical means, for the financing of the District of Columbia government. That can be said, but it will not hold. All over the country, the people of the States will be saying, "If that can be done in the District of Columbia, it can be done elsewhere." If once it can be said that a city can impose a tax on the Federal Government, or that a State can impose a tax on the Federal Government, why cannot a city impose a tax on State property, or a State impose a tax on city property? One governmental unit after another would be imposing taxes on one another—all the taxes being paid, let us not forget, by the general taxpayer.

It strikes me that Congress would be creating a grave danger if the bill were passed in its present form.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. The junior Senator from Colorado has made a remarkably constructive address with respect to the proposed legislation. Advocacy of home rule legislation for the District of Columbia is not a new position for the Senator from California to take.

I voted for legislation to provide home rule every time it has been pending here. The comments which my able colleague, the Senator from Colorado, has made concerning the problems facing the School Board of this Capital City strike me as requiring a thorough discussion on the floor of the Senate. There is great merit in the problems he has outlined here.

I recall the problems which we have had in the Senate in dealing with the broad-gage question of in-lieu payments. I believe that the Senator from Colorado has performed a service in bringing this problem before us. I look forward to a discussion on that problem before the Senate proceeds to vote on amendments. Congress has a direct interest in making this beautiful city an outstanding world capital. We must understand our responsibilities and discharge them.

I rise particularly to congratulate my friend the Senator from Colorado, however, on his comments concerning nonpartisan government in the Capital City of the United States.

My State of California has enjoyed municipal and county government free from party politics, completely unfettered by the traditional, historic municipal ward heeling ever since the early days of this century. It is not unique in the great cities of California, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Sacramento, Fresno, San Diego, or my own home city of Anaheim, any of them, to find public-spirited citizens from all walks of life—businessmen, laborers, and farmers from both parties—coming together to determine how best they can elect representatives to municipal government dedicated to giving the people in that municipality simply clean, honest, decent, forward-looking municipal government without any irrelevant, unnecessary overlay of party politics.

I shall support, without any hesitation whatsoever, the amendment which the Senator from Colorado intends to offer. I hope that under the managerial capabilities of my friend, the able Senator from Nevada, the Senate will approve the home rule bill and that at long last the other body will do the same. However, I must, and do, tell the Senate what a great thing it would be for the cause of good government, not party politics, if the amendment of the Senator from Colorado were to be agreed to.

I am a Republican, but I want to say I object to party politics in local government. Why should we exacerbate the problems of home rule in the District of Columbia by superimposing party politics on top of all the other questions that this city must solve? It does not belong here. Aside from a few Senators, perhaps on both sides, U.S. Senators would say, "Let us make the government of the District of Columbia—and this is its charter—responsible to the people, all the people, the rich people and the poor people, white and black, big and little. Let us give to the people of the District of Columbia for the first time in history their long overdue right to cast a franchise based solely and only on whether they believe that the men running for the council and for mayor of this city are qualified as decent, honest, potential public servants. Let us not make people hesitate on the basis of party politics."

I am glad to recall that the municipal government of California has been good government.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, Mr. Healy, who is executive director of the National League of Cities, formerly the American Municipal Association, testified at the hearings that both nonpartisan and partisan councils are members of their league.

On page 187, Mr. Healy testified as follows in answer to a question from the chairman:

> Mr. HEALY. Detroit is nonpartisan, Los Angeles and San Francisco are nonpartisan. I think Philadelphia and New York are partisan, but I might comment here that in the opinion of a great many students of government, the local governments in California, the cities, are perhaps outstanding in the entire United States in their government, in their operation, their caliber of people that are attracted into the local government. The League of California Cities attributes this, among other things, to the fact that they have nonpartisan government out there. It is all nonpartisan, throughout the State of California, and I am going to have to say that they are outstanding as city government goes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, I can forthrightly tell my able friend the Senator in charge of the bill that we have honest municipal government in California. When a bad apple occasionally comes along, the law enforcement authority can deal with that situation. I used to participate in city government. In my younger days as a lawyer, I was city attorney for a municipality in my State. We never had the problem of someone getting in the back room and talking over either Republican or Democratic politics.

They were interested in how the new schools were going to be constructed, how the new parks were to be created, whether they could give the taxpayer a better break on the ad valorem tax that he was required to pay. They were interested in governing all people, with no problem of party politics superimposed.

I have said enough. I repeat my earnest and enthusiastic congratulations to the Senator from Colorado for offering a constructive amendment that ought to be accepted wholeheartedly, in my judgment, by Members of Congress from both political parties. We could then demonstrate that no politics is contained in the bill that would disfranchise second-class citizens politically in the District of Columbia, but that they could look forward to an opportunity to work together as citizens of the District and to the elective offices of the District by a majority of the people determining the competence, credibility, and capability of the candidiates.

I look forward to voting in favor of the amendment. I most earnestly hope that my able friend the Senator in charge of the bill will give serious consideration to the problem.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I sincerely appreciate the very powerful dialogue that we have had. It is extremely important.

In the statement which was presented by the National League of Cities, it is interesting to note that for cities of over 25,000 population, 157 cities have partisan elections for councils. However, 414 are nonpartisan.

There is almost a 3-to-1 majority.

This is something that we ought to accomplish in the District of Columbia. As the Senator from California has so ably stated, we are starting a landmark type of legislation for this city. In the entire history of the country, the District of Columbia has never had such a provision. Why should we clutter it up with the possibility of partisan fighting? This would not necessarily be for the benefit of our own political party, because we have guaranteed to us at least 2 of the 19 members of the council. If we were to eliminate partisan politics, we might not get that. I do not know how the problem would be worked out. But it seems to me to be important. As a result I shall press on that one as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of both my distinguished western colleagues. The question of partisan versus nonpartisan elections was thoroughly and exhaustively and at length discussed in committee, and there were very close votes on some of these questions. There were 4-to-3 votes. When there is a 7-member committee, it sometimes comes out that way.

It might also be said that the support and the record indicate, as we took the facts before our committee, that where there are partisan elections it is rather clear that there is a tendency to have a much larger turnout than when there are nonpartisan elections.

The executive director of the U.S. Conference of Mayors appeared before our committee, as did Mr. Healy, representing the National League of Cities, and they presented a contrary viewpoint. This might be a rather appropriate place to mention their views on this particular subject.

The executive director of the U.S. Conference of Mayors has stated his view in this way:

> Politics should not be taken out of government. Indeed, it is a misconception of both politics and government when there is an attempt to so sterilize the local situation. As an observer of elections in large cities, it is readily apparent that the party affiliation of the individual candidates is generally known and often plays an important role. Indeed, often the candidate for mayor of a large city in a nonpartisan election has in the past held partisan office as a member of the State legislature, a county official, or a Member of Congress, so that the nonpartisan nature of the election is more fiction than a reality.
>
> On the other hand, the pretense of nonpartisanship often weakens the city executive in relation to the political machinery of his State and the Nation. It would seem particularly appropriate that in a strong mayor council system that partisan elections would be desirable. In such a system the mayor needs to be a political leader, and particularly here in the District of Columbia in many matters the mayor would be dealing directly with State Governors and nonpartisanship is not a characteristic of Governors.

That is a contrary viewpoint to those who support partisan elections. I am frank to admit that there are differences of opinion. There are nonpartisan elections in my State. It is certainly demonstrably true that the turnouts at nonpartisan elections are low. I do not know whether that pattern follows in the Nation as a whole, but it is true in my State. A smaller percentage of those qualified to vote and registered to vote participate in nonpartisan elections.

It is also interesting to note that of the cities having a population of one-half to 1 million, 6 have partisan elections, and 10 have nonpartisan elections.

I am sure we shall get into further discussion of this point as the bill reaches the amendment stage.

I yield now to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH].

APPOINTMENT OF ARTHUR GOLDBERG AS UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am sure that all Americans share my pleasure upon hearing that President Johnson has appointed Justice Arthur Goldberg as U.S. representative to the United Nations. A man of highly developed intellect, incisive will, and humane concern for others, Mr. Goldberg will represent his country with great distinction.

Of course, it will be difficult for any man to take Adlai Stevenson's place at the United Nations, but Arthur Goldberg, much like Stevenson in temperament and compassion, is as fine a choice as could be made.

It is a sacrifice, rarely assumed, for a Justice to leave the Supreme Court. Arthur Goldberg deserves our thanks for taking on the U.N. assignment. Knowing how important the position is for the United States, especially in this time of troubles, Justice Goldberg has once again placed his duty to his country first.

Arthur Goldberg has had a very illustrious career. The possessor of the degree of doctorate of jurisprudence, he had an outstanding record as a lawyer and labor mediator before being appointed to the position of Secretary of Labor by President Kennedy in 1961. Mr. Goldberg has made outstanding speeches on U.N. affairs while serving on the Supreme Court, and is familiar with the problems of the United Nations Organization. His gracious wife, Dorothy, is a woman of great cultural attainment and social concern, and will be of much help to her husband in representing the United States at the United Nations.

I am certain that Mr. Goldberg will be speedily confirmed by the Senate. We all wish him well.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Announcement of the appointment of Justice Arthur Goldberg as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nation is welcome news to this Senator and, I feel assured to the people of the Nation. I have had the pleasure of knowing Ambassador-designate Goldberg during the past several years, both officially and personally. I know something of his record. His is the story of a splendid American, born of humble parents, learning the ageless values of his family's faith, acquiring, with honor, a legal education and an impeccable reputation. As a lawyer and as a judge, he brought to the practice of law, to the Presidential Cabinet, and then to our highest court a superb intellectual competence and legal ability, reflected in his history as a practitioner and public servant, and then in the judicial opinions he rendered on our highest bench.

I know our new U.N. Ambassador as a highly articulate advocate and persuasive debater. Surely the representatives of countries on the other side of what Sir Winston Churchill aptly called the Iron Curtain, when they arise to inveigh against the cause of freedom and against the Government of the United States, they will have met their master. Arthur Goldberg does not deal in polemics. His is the shield of logic and the rule of law. Americans may be assured that, at the town meeting of the world, their representative will speak with telling force. He will bring to the United Nations a renowned background and an unyielding devotion to our Republic and to the cause of peace with justice.

I am glad to rise and say that the nomination of Ambassador-designate Goldberg is welcome news. His nomination will be speedily confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator for his comments.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I would not want this opportunity to pass by without associating myself with the remarks of both the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from California. In the nomination of Justice Goldberg, the President of the United States has chosen a man who has demonstrated an ability to get along with people, to meet problems, and to serve well in legal capacities in Government positions, as Secretary of one of the Departments, and more recently as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. He is a highly articulate, brilliant, and capable man. The United States is fortunate to have the President of the United States designate a man of his proven capabilities to be the spokesman for this country before the United Nations.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I am highly pleased with the appointment of Arthur Goldberg as our representative in the United Nations. He has served with great distinction in the labor movement and with great honesty and integrity. Then, as Secretary of Labor under President Kennedy, his counsel and advice were sought not only on subjects dealing with the labor-management field, but also on other subjects. He was frequently called into consultation on foreign affairs, and his counsel was highly regarded.

I do not believe that there is anyone who enjoys as much confidence in both the labor and management field and with the general public as does Arthur Goldberg.

It is highly important that our representative in the United Nations should enjoy that confidence, and that those who represent other countries should have confidence in the integrity and idealism of the individual who represents us in that organization.

That was the unique role that Adlai Stevenson played. No one can fill Adlai Stevenson's shoes better than Arthur Goldberg.

I compliment President Johnson on his appointment of Arthur Goldberg and also wish Justice Goldberg well.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I join in the Senator's expression of satisfaction on the selection of Mr. Justice Goldberg. Not only will he be an able advocate, which is needed, but his personality is one which will lend itself to the establishment of the personal equation with the delegates and representatives from many countries in the world. That will be very useful.

Only those who have been close students of the work of the United Nations can realize, perhaps, the extent to which the equation between the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations and ambassadors and representatives from other countries plays an important part.

To begin with, Arthur Goldberg possesses the integrity of which the Senator spoke. He has had long experience in work dealing with the United States. He is steeped in the traditions of our democracy. He has a wonderful affability, which enables him to establish relationships which I know will be very helpful.

I, too, congratulate President Johnson on this selection. Adlai Stevenson's shoes are unique. They hardly fit any living person. But Arthur Goldberg is unique in his own way, too, and will bring to this high office the integrity and ability and personality which will serve our country well.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 9075) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 9075) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHARTER ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1118) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I compliment the able chairman of the District Committee on the persuasive and articulate statement he has given in support of home rule for the District of Columbia. Without his intelligent guidance and patient leadership, as S. 1118 was being considered in committee, it would not have emerged in the improved and amended form which is before the Senate today. The Senator from Nevada has done an outstanding job for the cause of home rule. I hope the Senate will follow his lead and pass the bill in its present form, so that we can fulfill our responsibilities and finally restore home rule to the Capital City.

There is little need to dwell either on the case for home rule or its importance. We have allowed a classic situation of taxation without representation to persist on our very doorstep for far too long.

The ramifications of this are enormous. It is not just a question of the District resident having no say in how much he is taxed and in what manner, although that is certainly important. The critical thing is that he has no elected official to turn to—no one to whom he can say, "I and others like me won't reelect you unless you are more responsive to our needs."

Under the circumstances, the District Commissioners, working together with Congress, have done the best they could. But the limitations have been crippling. The Commissioners can take no major action without turning to Congress, and most Members of Congress, with some justification, act first in response to the place where the votes come from. The District resident, despite powerful advocacy on his behalf by a handful of interested Senators and Congressmen, always ends up at the end of the line.

This is really a national disgrace. Washington is the ninth largest city in the country. More people live here than in 11 of our States. These 750,000-plus people have no elected official to turn to for installation of a traffic signal on the corner, or better trash collection. When someone comes along with a plan to put a freeway through their neighborhood, they do not have an elected representative to speak on their behalf. When an urban renewal project is proposed for their area, they have no one to ask the right questions and insure that it has been properly planned and located. They have no spokesman for better playgrounds, better schools, and better treatment at the hands of various local officials.

It is time we ended this outrage. And let no one forget that history is on our side. The District had home rule for three-quarters of a century before the conjunction of financial crisis and racial fear caused it to be taken away in the 1870's. I hope this will be the year in which we finally give it back.

I would like to turn, if I may, to one issue which, it appears, will be the major item at issue on the Senate floor this afternoon. That is the question of the annual Federal payment to the District, which is provided for in section 741 of the bill.

Those who would change this provision would not deny Federal funds to the District. Nor do they oppose the idea of home rule.

But we should not be misled. Removing the automatic Federal payment and replacing it with the annual ritual of consideration and approval by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees cuts to the heart of the home rule concept. The very autonomy that S. 1118 seeks to create is thereby subverted. A major purpose of S. 1118 is to get us in Congress out of the business of analyzing the specific needs and problems of the District as though were were the rightful occupants of city hall. As written, S. 1118 would leave us ample supervisory power while relieving us of the need for day-to-day supervision of the operations of the District's local government. We certainly have a few other things to do.

Changing the automatic Federal payment back to the status quo would subvert these purposes. And the arguments against the automatic Federal payment are, in my judgment, without substance.

First, it is argued that the assessed value of Federal, real, and personal property in the District is difficult to determine, and that the District assessor is in a position to act arbitrarily in making such determinations. Actually, the Senator from Colorado took whatever steam there was out of this argument with his successful amendment in committee. This amendment fully clarifies the strong position of the Administrator of GSA in being able to disagree with the computations of District officials, both on technical grounds, and on grounds of reasonableness and propriety. The GSA Administrator is fully empowered to prevent unreasonable claims by the District.

And I am somewhat surprised at the worry that we in the Congress will be hard put to overturn an unreasonable assessment. We have retained the power to change the formula, and I can't imagine our having any difficulty in doing that if it became clear that it needed doing. I have a basic faith that District officials will act responsibly in operating under the Federal payment. Our very presence a few blocks away should insure that, even if it were not otherwise assured. But apart from that, Congress is not as hard to move as the Senator seems to suggest. If there are shenanigans, we can act to correct them.

Second, it is argued that guaranteeing an annual payment will discourage the utilization of local taxes. I would suggest that not guaranteeing an annual payment disrupts orderly metropolitan planning. If the city cannot chart its own financial course, its entire administration of its own affairs is jeopardized. I should suppose that is far worse. Furthermore, if the Senator from Colorado really believes the city ought to receive a Federal payment of some kind, then this argument makes little sense. The city will expect the Federal aid one way or the other. It is just that one way makes planning impossible and the other approach, the approach of S. 1118, which the Senate is now considering, facilitates it.

Third, it is argued that the automatic payment sets a bad precedent, both because States and localities where there are large Federal holdings will also demand such a payment, and because local communities will use it as the basis for demanding a similar payment from their State governments. The District has been receiving a Federal payment in one form or another from Congress since 1879. Until 1920 it was quite automatic—a fixed 50 percent of the District's annual budget. In recent years it has dropped to as low as 11 percent. I do not think we are suddenly creating any new precedent.

Further, our treatment of the District creates no precedent, because the Federal Government's relationship with the District is unique. The Federal Government owns 44 percent of the total land area in the District. It imposes height limitations on commercial buildings, thereby cutting down on other District tax revenues. It gives numerous tax exemptions for other property in the District.

In short, the Federal Government really pervades every aspect of District life. That is why Congress has been giving the District a Federal payment since 1879. What we do for the District creates no precedent for the rest of the Nation. Indeed, in situations where the Government was as deeply involved as it is here—in Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Richland, Wash.—it has provided a Federal payment very much like the one contained in S. 1118.

Fourth, it is argued that the automatic payment, based as it is on the sum that the Federal Government would have paid in taxes if its property and business were taxable, undermines the concept of tax exemption for governmental entities. This argument ignores the unique position which the Federal Government occupies in the District of Columbia. Since the Government has been making a Federal payment since 1879, I do not see that any new undermining of intergovernmental immunity is occurring here.

We just cannot have it both ways. If we are finally going to divest ourselves of the day-to-day responsibility for the District so that its citizens can have meaningful self-government, we must do so without self-defeating strings attached.

Let us pass S. 1118, and let us pass it with the automatic Federal payment intact as amended by the committee.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the granting of local self-government to the District of Columbia is long overdue. Therefore, I find a great deal of personal satisfaction in being a cosponsor of the District of Columbia home rule bill.

The bill seeks to extend the basic American right to have a voice in one's government to the citizens of our Nation's Capital. It is most fitting that the bill be passed at the present session of the Congress, when there will also be enacted into law a measure which will assure to American citizens in every part of our Nation the right to vote.

The people of the District of Columbia, no less than the citizens of every other area, deserve the right to vote in order that they may elect their own local officials, who will be responsive to their own local needs.

That there should be any controversy about the merits of granting local self-government to any American municipality is, I believe, most unfortunate, for local self-government is the keystone of our democratic Federal system. Washington is our National Capital, the seat of the Federal Government; but it is also a great city, with all of the municipal problems of a great urban complex. By extending local self-government to the residents and citizens of the District of Columbia, we are voting to allow American citizens to elect their own officials to manage and handle their own local affairs. The national interest in the District of Columbia would be protected by provisions in the pending measure which provide for a Presidential veto, and by the continuing power of the Congress to legislate concerning District of Columbia affairs.

The proposed legislation is not a constitutional amendment; the measure pending would be an act of Congress.

Many issues come before Congress relating to the District of Columbia which it would be in the national interest to have handled at the municipal level by local officials elected by the citizens of this municipality.

To cite an example, soon after World War II, when Congress was considering ways to restore a war-ravaged Europe with some degree of strength and vigor, debate on the floor of the Senate concerning economic assistance to Great Britain was interruped so that the Senate, the greatest deliberative body in the world, could consider a bill to establish the size of rock fish which might legally be taken from the Potomac River.

There are many decidedly local issues. For example, there are the issues of snow removal, sanitary measures, the eradication of starlings, vivisection, elimination of the duplicate filing system in the Department of Motor Vehicles, the requirement that dogs be kept on leashes, the permissible length of leashes when one is walking in the streets, the definition of a dead tree, and the requirement that dead branches be cut from trees. All those issues, and more, should be handled by an elected local city council for the District of Columbia. My own bill to require blood tests before the issuance of marriage licenses in the District of Columbia would fall into the category of proposed legislation which should be considered and enacted by a locally elected District Council, with executive leadership provided by the mayor of Washington.

These are categories of legislation which could better be considered and enacted by a local municipal body, elected by local citizens.

The national interest in the District of Columbia would not be at all impaired if locally elected officials could legislate concerning their local affairs. There is no great pressing reason why Congress and the President should be saddled with continuing responsibility for the housekeeping details of the District of Columbia. The residual powers of the President and of Congress will amply protect the Federal interest after home rule is enacted. I repeat: We are considering a legislative enactment, not a constitutional amendment.

Mr. President, it has been a great pleasure for me to participate in the deliberations on this bill, under the most able and dedicated leadership of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE].

The Senator from Nevada has a long record of creative leadership in advancing the interests of the District of Columbia, and thereby advancing the interests of every American. Under his chairmanship, the District of Columbia Committee has adopted several amendments to the home rule charter bill, in an attempt to seek out the most practical and workable system for the exercise of local self-government.

Mr. President, the bill which the Committee on the District of Columbia has unanimously reported to the Senate, is, I believe, well-designed to extend to the residents of the Capital of the free world the basic rights of popularly elected Government which are a part of the heritage of every American citizen.

HOME RULE NOW

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I strongly support the bill now before us, S. 1118, to provide home rule for the District of Columbia. I plead for its passage. It is time—it has always been time—for home rule for the District of Columbia. It is time—it has always been time—for the Congress to be done with its hasty and incompetent masquerade as the city council of our Nation's Capital.

I feel very strongly about this. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I sit with seven other Senators on the District of Columbia Subcommittee. As a member of four other appropriations subcommittees I must pass upon requests for literally billions and billions of dollars. As a member of the full committee, I must review the close to $100 billion of appropriations requests made by the President.

In addition to this, I am a member of two other Senate committees, the Small Business Committee and the Commerce Committee. The Commerce Committee is charged with the legislative responsibilities arising out of the production, transportation, and communication industries. All interstate and foreign commerce and all that is associated with it is within the purview of this committee.

In addition to all of this, I must concern myself—and I do so willingly—with the problems, the interests, and the welfare of my own State of Alaska. Ninety-eight percent of the land mass of Alaska is owned by the Federal Government. Alaska's future is tied to the development of its resources and most of its resources lie on Federal ground. Alaska's industrial development depends upon the expansion of Pacific trade. What Congress does and does not do are of immense importance to Alaska and must take perforce a substantial amount of an Alaska Senator's time.

And yet, I am a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee charged with reviewing the District of Columbia budget. It is obvious that I cannot give this review the time it deserves and requires.

I am distressed about this. I am embarrassed about this but there is nothing that I can do about it.

I venture to say that much the same thing is true of the other members of the Senate District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee as well as the District of Columbia Authorization Committee. In fact, the citizens of Washington are fortunate indeed for the two selfless Senators who give so much of their time to the District and its welfare. Were it not for the hard work, dedication, and ability of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], who is chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, and the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is chairman of the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee, conditions in the District would be a good deal worse than they are today.

The case for home rule is as simple as it is clear. It is as old as the American Revolution; more than that, it is as old as the Athenian city state. It is intolerable to be governed by people who do not care and who are not electorally responsible to those whom they govern.

In the case of the Nation's Capital, it is not only intolerable, it is absurd. The Congress has no business wasting its time in debates over whether women can stand or must sit in taverns or how used car or parking lots are to be run. Not only does Congress squander its time when it takes up such items, it takes them up badly. Ninety-nine percent of the Congress does not care about and will not spare the attention to find out the merits of such matters.

The District of Columbia is the only major capital in the world without local self-government. Washington is the ninth largest city in the United States. It has more citizens than 11 of our States, and yet it cannot vote for mayor, and it does not have a voice in the Congress.

It is extraordinary in this day and age and country that Washington should be totally denied self-government. For even during the darkest days of imperialism, even in the farthest flung reaches of empire, the colonial powers allowed a modicum of self-government at the local level. Alaska, during the long years before the emancipation of statehood, was allowed an elected territorial legislature and an elected municipal government. In Africa, in Ghana, in Nigeria, in Tanganyika, in Kenya, in Malawi, and in Zambia, in all these places the villagers were allowed to select their own village leaders.

But not in the District of Columbia. For 95 years Washington, our Nation's Capital, has been ruled as a conquered city by an occupation army. It has been ruled by the threat of force and the control of parsimony. The Congress has begrudged it funds and denied it taxes and refused it the right held by all but the most benighted, the right to choose its local leaders, the right to run its local affairs.

UNITED STATES URGED TO DEFEND WORLD PROSPERITY UNTIL WORLD MONEY REFORM IS ACHIEVED

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the American Government's expressed willingness to participate in the work of world monetary reform is a vital step in the continuing process of living up to our international responsibilities. This historic commitment by the Johnson administration represents a determination to defend world prosperity by means of world cooperation. But, as Treasury Secretary Fowler himself said in his landmark speech of July 10:

> It is not * * * easy to arrive at the degree of international consensus we must have for any workable reform of the international monetary system. We can expect no overnight solution—but only patient exploration of the alternatives with our trading partners.

The action of the French yesterday bears out Secretary Fowler's statement.

Let us make no mistake about it, fundamental and far-reaching reform of the world monetary system is going to take time, years of time. It is unimaginable that the process of preparation and negotiation, of agreement and ratification can take less than 2 years. It may well take as many as 3, 4, or 5 years. Our Government has faced up to the critical long-term problem of international credit and liquidity. Now we must face up to the short-term, yet equally critical problem of what must be done in the meantime. We must keep the machinery running until it is either overhauled or replaced.

Mr. President, the basis of our newfound international bargaining power is the mounting balance of payments surplus which the President's emergency payments program has produced. But our new position of strength—both economic and political—has in turn produced a new dilemma. On the one hand, the United States may continue to run payments surpluses, during the entire long, drawn-out process of monetary reform—and the result threatens to be exactly the shortage of international liquidity and the resultant international recession world monetary reform is intended to head off. On the other hand, the United States may find itself falling back into unintended payments deficits as exports fall due to lack of adequate credit availability—and, then, lost bargaining power threatens to be the result even as negotiations for reform are underway.

Put simply, the United States must now fashion a third alternative to the dilemma of attaining a balance-of-payments position too strong for the world's good or falling back into one too weak for our own good. During the coming months and years of negotiation over monetary reform, this dilemma is certain to grow even more acute if it is not attacked today. Fortunately for the world and for ourselves, the material out of which a solution to this new dilemma can be fashioned is at hand.

Today, the international and domestic economic strength of the United States is now clear to all the world. Even more, we have proven to all the world—from Paris to Peiping—that a free society can live up to its commitments and responsibilities without coercion or the threat of it. Let us not forget that the heart of the President's emergency payments program which has succeeded so brilliantly is a voluntary program of self-restraint, voluntarily joined in by the bankers and businessmen of this Nation. The result is a position of strength and an opportunity for leadership which few nations have ever enjoyed.

On the basis of its position of strength, our Government today has the opportunity as well as the responsibility to take the lead in defending world prosperity, and our own, during the critical years of negotiation for world monetary reform. The first step in the direction of such a defense is a clear understanding that balance-of-payments equilibrium on the part of the United States does not necessarily mean a surplus or even a zero balance. If our trade surplus is strong and stable, if our outflow of investment capital is restrained, if our governmental commitments overseas are under control—a payments deficit of as much as $1 billion can represent balance-of-payments equilibrium so long as those dollars are being used to finance trade and protect prosperity.

The second step in the direction of defending prosperity of the world is a clear understanding that the proper balance-of-payments position of the United States must be judged in terms of the needs of the world and of world trade. As long as the dollar is the major trading and reserve currency—and it will continue to be so at least until world monetary reform is accomplished some years hence—the world will need dollars. Fifteen years ago, the United States was in a strong and continuous payments surplus, and the rest of the world suffered from the dollar gap. Five years ago, the United States was in deep and growing payments deficit, and the rest of the world thrived on our shipments of dollars. We must not react to the threat of a dollar glut by re-creating the conditions of the dollar gap.

No one can say with accuracy exactly how many dollars—how large an American payments deficit—the world needs until a world monetary conference provides new means of expanding the international money supply. It is clear, however, that enlightened American policy will recognize that supplying the interim need of the world for dollars is fully consistent with the maintenance of overall American payments equilibrium. Such a policy will avoid a destructive and ultimately disastrous piling up of payments surpluses in order to show our critics that we mean business, at a time when it is already clear that we have put our international house in order. Such a policy would be clearly evidenced by a general relaxation of the voluntary program of restraint on foreign lending commensurate with the success that program has already achieved. As well as easing the strain overseas caused by the new dollar shortage, such a relaxation would insure against an inadequate supply of export credit causing a drop in U.S. exports and a deterioration in our trade surplus. It should be remembered that fully 13.5 percent of U.S. employment is dependent—directly or indirectly—on American exports.

This policy of defending world prosperity in the short term while fundamental, long-term reform is being negotiated requires the cooperation of all nations. Of greatest importance is that any small but significant increase in the world money supply be allowed to do its work—namely the work of financing world trade. If dollars continue to be cashed in for gold, if other nations refuse to allow those dollars to do their work—then our Government's response should be unequivocal. With the machinery of the President's emergency program still in existence, the means for a return to clear payments surplus will always be at hand.

Now that our Government has assumed its proper place at the head of the movement for responsible reform of the world monetary system, now that the consensus is growing that such reform is critically necessary to meet the needs of world trade and world prosperity, it would be a tragedy of historic import if the world economy were to falter even as a world conference to protect it was underway. Secretary Fowler has said, "To meet and not succeed would be worse than not meeting at all." I would add that to identify a threat—and to then allow it to become a reality before acting to meet it—would be worse than not identifying it at all.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHARTER ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1118) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the interested parties. I ask unanimous consent that, beginning at the conclusion of the morning business tomorrow, there be a time limitation, in the usual form, of 1 hour on each amendment, the time to be divided equally between the author of the amendment and the Senator in charge of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]; and that, on the Dominick Federal payment amendment, there be 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hearing none, it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Wednesday, July 21, 1965, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill S. 1118, to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment (except an amendment No. 355 to be offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] which shall be debated for two hours), motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]: *Provided*, That, in the event the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to the members of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom the people of this city and the people of the Nation are greatly indebted for the work they have done to further the cause of home rule legislation for the Nation's Capital.

I pay particular tribute to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], who has performed an excellent service in helping to direct home rule legislation through the Senate in the past several years.

It has been a great pleasure for me to work with the Senator from Nevada and other members of the committee to further the cause of home rule legislation. Throughout our executive session meetings on home rule legislation, I have attempted to work within the committee to combine the best features of both the Morse home rule bill and the administration bill. The bill pending before the Senate represents the best judgment of the committee.

I suppose I could be described as one of the District of Columbia Committee's veterans on the home rule issue. For 20 years, year after year, the senior Senator from Oregon has fought for the adoption of home rule in the District of Columbia.

As I have said ad infinitum, over those many years, we cannot justify on any ground whatsoever—and I have yet to hear the first sensible ground that would justify it—the denying to the several hundreds of thousands of people in the District of Columbia the same rights of citizenship that our constituents back home enjoy.

I wish that a former colleague in the Senate were alive today as we debate once again the home rule issue. I wish that he could witness the vote that I am satisfied will take place tomorrow when, for the fifth time, a home rule bill would be passed by the Senate. I shall always be proud of the fact that my name has been associated on three previous occasions with this former colleague, the great liberal Senator from West Virginia, Matthew Neely. For many years Matt Neely was chairman of the Senate District of Columbia Committee. He and I worked shoulder to shoulder as we pressed, on three occasions, the merits of the bill which became known, in the first instance, as the Neely-Morse bill, and, after the death of the Senator from West Virginia, I had to introduce the measure then, as the Morse-Neely bill.

The bill which has now been offered by the distinguished Senator from Nevada, the present chairman of the committee, encompasses the major features of the Neely-Morse bill, as it was passed by the Senate over the years, and improved the Neely-Morse bill in the particulars I am about to mention.

That does not mean that I supported this measure in all of its particulars in the committee. I offered several amendments in committee that I shall very briefly discuss here. However, of the amendments that I offered in committee, I shall offer only one on the floor of the Senate.

I believe that the bill before the Senate today is a good bill. I would be pleased with its passage in its present form, although I have an obligation to try to improve it in one respect, and I shall offer my amendment shortly.

As a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia for many years, I have fought for long overdue home-rule legislation for the District of Columbia. The denial of first-class citizenship to the people of the District of Columbia is much better known and understood in the capitals of the underdeveloped areas of the world than in the capitals of the 50 States of the United States, I am sorry to say.

For years I have pointed out that I thought the final passage of home rule for the people of the District of Columbia depend more on the American people in our 50 States throwing off their cloak of lethargy in regard to this great problem than on any other one thing.

It has been extremely gratifying to me, as I have gone about our country in the past several years, to find increasing knowledge about and interest in the problem of the denial of home rule or self-government in the District of Columbia. Only time will tell whether the American people have sufficiently advised their Representatives in both Houses of Congress of their wish to end this unconscionable discrimination against the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Imagine a population of 850,000 people. Imagine the adults in that population being denied the right to elect the aldermen, the mayor, and the school board, and being denied the right to really engage in government and participate in the affairs of their own municipality.

I know the argument is made that this is a Federal city. That is a lot of "bosh" in the sense that it is used as an alibi or a rationalization for making second-class citizens of the adults in a population of 850,000 people who happen to reside within the District of Columbia.

That is not the reason. There are other reasons, some of them sordid, some of them ugly, that really explain why the American people have tolerated this discrimination against the people of the District of Columbia.

I hope that is all behind us. I hope that we shall see a new day dawn and that, at long last, we place 850,000 fellow Americans in the District of Columbia on a footing of equality with 180 million people from the other parts of the United States.

I am grateful to both the Kennedy and the Johnson administrations for recognizing the soundness of the bills I have introduced in the Senate, on which the Senate acted in recent years.

The soundness of the previous bills is demonstrated by the fact that the administration bill which the Senate is considering today closely resembles in many ways the Morse-Neely bills acted upon by the Senate in the last Congress.

I believe that, if Senators will compare the present bill with the previous Morse-Neely home-rule legislation, they cannot escape finding markedly similar language. However, I believe that the Federal payment provision in the administration bill is a great improvement over the provision in my bill. I strongly support the Bible Federal payment provision.

I commend the Senator from Nevada for his leadership in enlarging upon the original proposal of the Morse-Neely bill, giving it, in my opinion, a much sounder basis. The Bible Federal-payment provision bill is essential if we are to have a soundly operated municipality in the District of Columbia.

I realize that this part of the bill will develop into one of the most controversial sections of the bill in the hours ahead, but the senior Senator from Oregon goes on record now, unequivocally and emphatically, in support of the Bible Federal-payment provision. The senior Senator from Oregon believes that those who are given the responsibility of governing this municipality, once a home rule bill is adopted and becomes law, are entitled to the assurance that the Bible Federal-payment plan gives to them.

How in the world can we expect people who are charged with the responsibility of governing the District of Columbia under a home rule law to run the District efficiently and effectively without the Bible Federal-payment provision?

If anyone wants to ask me what I believe is probably the most important section of the bill, if the sections of the bill could be separated as to evaluation, I would name the Bible Federal-payment provision as really the heart of the bill, so far as a successful administration under any home rule is concerned.

I recognize that every other part of the bill is important. In my judgment, we cannot eliminate any section of the bill and have a workable home rule government in the District of Columbia. We all know the importance of the money base for the operation of any municipality. If we are to entrust the mayor and city council with the responsibility of governing this city, we must do it with the Bible Federal-payment provision.

In support of the observation I made a very few minutes ago, that the bill does not conform exactly to the blueprint of the Morse-Neely bill, we all know that legislation must involve compromises. Although I was disappointed in the rejection of some of my amendments in committee, only one of those amendments was fundamental from the standpoint of the principle of what I think is essential to our system of government, so I shall offer no amendment except the one pertaining to that principle. However, I regret that the committee did not see fit in executive session, when the bill was marked up, to adopt the Morse amendment, which would call for a nonpartisan city government.

I have been advised that in all probability the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] will offer an amendment similar to the one I offered in committee. If he does, I shall vote for that amendment. But I shall not offer it myself, because I feel that I have had my day in court in respect to this matter in committee.

We have a choice, it seems to me, of two political forms of city government organization. I was outvoted in my preference for the nonpartisan form of city government. I do not feel that any basic principle of government policy or structure is involved, as I do feel in connection with the one amendment I shall offer shortly.

Nevertheless, I wish to restate, in capsule form, my reasons for supporting a nonpartisan city government.

First, I point out that that is the point of view in the testimony of what I consider to be the preponderance of opinion among experts in the field of municipal government. That has been the increasing trend for many years. It is unfortunate, so long as we are setting up a city government in the District of Columbia, that we do not come closer to what is recognized as a model form in respect of this particular issue. But a majority of my colleagues in the committee are just as sincere in their feeling that partisan politics are good for municipal elections. I do not happen to share that view.

The record should show that the vote in opposition to my amendment in committee was a vote of 4 to 3 against.

The hearings show—and I invite the attention of Senators to page 289 of the hearings—that in cities of over 1 million in the United States, 3 out of 5 have nonpartisan mayors and city councils.

With respect to cities of 500,000 to 1 million, the ratio is 6 to 16. Six have nonpartisan mayors and city councils, and 16 have partisan mayors and city councils. But it is only in recent years that the trend has been toward the development of nonpartisan mayors and city councils in those cities, as represented by the figures.

In cities having populations of 250,000 to 500,000, the ratio is 7 to 31; but, here again, the 7 nonpartisan city governments are of recent development, and in line with the testimony that the municipal authorities gave in our committee.

There is another reason why I think we should have a nonpartisan mayor and a nonpartisan city council. There is a corollary trend in the evolutionary development of city governments, which is to have a city manager in addition to a mayor and city council. He is a rather highly paid official who really is the administrator of the city in an executive sense, from the standpoint of managerial operation.

It will be found that writers on municipal government problems point out that it is extremely difficult to be a city manager or a city administrator if he is to be constantly involved in matters of partisan politics between the mayor and a majority of the members of the city council who may be of a political party opposite to that of the mayor, or even if he has a strong minority belonging to a party opposite to that of the mayor.

So I felt we ought to follow what I consider to be the advice of leading authorities on this matter, of taking the city government out of partisan politics, and I offered my amendment to that effect. I was defeated 4 to 3, and I shall stand, so far as I am concerned, with that defeat, except that I shall vote for the Dominick amendment if he decides to offer the amendment for a nonpartisan city government.

He voted with me in committee and argued in support of my position. However, there is one part of the bill which I believe involves a basic principle that should be changed as it appears in its present form. Senators have probably become a little bored with my consistent, persistent insistence upon keeping faith with the constitutional system of checks and balances. I do not believe that we can maintain our constitutional form of government if, as a Congress, we constantly delegate away our constitutional controls over the chief executive. I believe that we are giving to the chief executive, through this bill, authority which does not belong to him, an authority with which he should not be plagued and harassed, and an authority which, in my judgment, would violate the system of checks and balances.

Therefore, I regret that the committee did not adopt an amendment offered in executive session, which has been in my previous bills for a good many years, which would prohibit the President from exercising veto power over acts of the city council. I believe that the committee made a serious mistake in allowing the President to exercise the veto power over acts of the city council. The provision in my bill would permit Congress to exercise its legislative responsibility over the city government.

As the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] has pointed out in his speech in the Senate earlier today in support of the bill, he states in part:

> It must be borne clearly in mind that by adoption of home rule legislation, Congress does not lose its power over the District of Columbia in any way. Congress only delegates the housekeeping portion to a municipal elected council, but Congress under the Constitution must retain ultimate power over the District of Columbia as set forth in article I, section 8 of the Constitution

Which provides—and the Senator from Nevada quotes it as follows:

> Congress shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, * * *

Mr. President, that is a constitutional authority which continues to vest in Congress, making perfectly clear what our Constitutional Fathers intended as to who was to exercise, in the first instance, jurisdiction and authority over the District of Columbia.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible] is quite correct. It is not the intention of the bill to take away that inherent congressional power.

I am reminded of a game of checkers where, instead of jumping one square at a time, in the pending bill we would jump almost the length of the checkerboard, and would give to the President the original jurisdiction to veto an act of the city council.

In my opinion, if the city council should pass an act which violates Federal interest, and it cannot be justified in the opinion of Congress, Congress should take the necessary action and has the inherent right to do so. The President can then either approve or veto congressional action. Then, if a two-thirds vote is not obtained to override the veto, the President's action would stand.

I find it difficult to reconcile the granting of a veto power over the city council by the President with article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

Furthermore, I believe that it is almost silly to burden the President with the job of serving as a supermayor of the District of Columbia, in the first instance. Suppose the city council should pass an ordinance, and the mayor should sign it, and then representations—I was about to say pressures, but I will call them merely representations—were made to the President that he should veto it. Why should the President, with all the other burdens that go with his office, have placed upon him this additional responsibility, in the first instance?

Suppose the city council passes an ordinance, and it is signed by the mayor, and that ordinance had the effect of interfering with the interests of the Federal Government in the operation of the District of Columbia so as, in the opinion of Congress, to do violence to the inherent right of Congress to determine what the final policy shall be in the District of Columbia, as vested in it by article I, section 8 of the Constitution? The job should be done by Congress, not by the President.

I never could understand the objective of this proposal in the bill. I do not know what purpose would be served by giving the President this additional chore, in addition to his other heavy duties, which time and time again harass the President. We should be thinking of ways to relieve him of many of his burdens, not adding to them.

There are two committees in Congress on the District of Columbia. They should, as committees, consider, in the first instance, any claims that some city ordinance or act of the city government imposes upon the Federal interest, and decide the question legislatively.

Then, if it is a matter of such importance that the President does not wish to sign the action, he can veto it.

The next point I wish to make is that I am strong for the amendment because it is in keeping with what I consider to be the structure of our Government.

I believe that this proposal would have the effect—and I speak respectfully—of being a run around of Congress, because I believe Congress should have the responsibility to act legislatively. If the city council should pass a bill which interfered with what we find, upon due hearing, to be a Federal interest, Congress should handle it legislatively and set it aside by way of a law to repeal the act of the city council. Then the President, under our system of separation of powers, would have the opportunity to veto the action of Congress. That is the proper procedure to follow.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall send my amendment to the desk momentarily. I say that through my amendment, Congress would be carrying out its clear legislative responsibility under article I, section 8 of the Constitution, and, in this way, the President, if he disapproves of the action taken by Congress in the normal course of events, can exercise his veto power, and thus keep faith with what I consider to be a principle basic to the preservation of our form of government, namely, the separation of powers doctrine, and the application of our precious system of checks and balances.

Therefore, Mr. President, I send my amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated, and ask for its careful consideration by all Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Tydings in the chair). The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 106, line 12, strike out "he shall present the act to the President." and insert in lieu thereof "such act shall become law.".

On page 106, line 18, beginning with "he", strike out all through the period on line 19 and insert in lieu thereof "it shall become law.".

On page 106, line 22, beginning with the comma, strike out all through the period on line 24 and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "it shall become law.".

On page 106, line 22, beginning with the out all through line 10 on page 107.

On page 107, line 11, strike out "(f)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)".

On page 107, line 21, strike out "(g)" and insert in lieu thereof "(f)".

On page 108, line 9, strike out "(h)" and insert in lieu thereof "(g)".

On page 108, line 17, strike out "(i)" and insert in lieu thereof "(h)".

On page 108, line 21, strike out "(j)" and insert in lieu thereof "(i)".

On page 185, line 11, immediately after the period, add the following: "Any measure so proposed by petition shall, if approved by a majority of the qualified voters voting thereon in such election, take effect and become law on the day following the day on which the Board of Elections certifies the results of such election or on the date provided for by such measure."

On page 185, beginning with line 12, strike out all through line 4 on page 186.

On page 186, line 5, strike out "(d)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

On page 186, line 8, strike out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)".

On page 186, line 12, strike out "(f)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)".

On page 186, line 15, strike out "(g)" and insert in lieu thereof "(f)".

On page 186, line 21, strike out "(h)" and insert in lieu thereof "(g)".

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in essence, the amendment provides that the President shall not be given the original authority, in the first instance, to veto an action of the city council, and that Congress shall have the responsibility to take legislative action, retaining, of course, to the President, his right subsequently to veto the action of Congress if he does not approve.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished Senator from Oregon upon his usually persuasive and erudite presentation of the home rule bill. He has been a leader in this field for many years. I am merely following in his footsteps.

Whatever differences we may have are rather minor, I am sure, and will not cause a great deal of difference as we move the bill forward later during the day or tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. I deeply appreciate the remarks of my friend from Nevada, the chairman of my committee. I wish he would include in his very kind remarks his appreciation of my unusual brevity.

Mr. BIBLE. I commend him on that too. This bill has many facets. It is a complicated bill. He has explained it very well in a very short period of time.

I do not know whether the Senator from Oregon was in the Chamber at the time, but the Senator from Colorado indicated that he would offer three amendments; first, on the so-called Federal payment aspect of the bill; second, on the nonpartisan problem, to which the Senator has alluded; and third, dealing with the taxing authority.

These are the three amendments that will be offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator from Colorado that I understood he would offer an amendment on nonpartisan elections. I offered the amendment in committee, and the Senator supported me. We were defeated by a vote of 4 to 3 on that amendment. I said I would not offer the amendment in the Senate, but would support the Senator from Colorado if he offered it. I said I felt I would not offer it because I had had my day in court, so to speak, and I did not feel that subject involved a basic principle, such as the presidential veto. It involves a matter of sound policy so far as the trend in modern municipal governmental development is concerned. I shall therefore support the Senator's amendment.

Mr. **DOMINICK**. I welcome the support of the Senator from Oregon. He is a valiant battler. I know that if he takes up the battle I shall have a great ally on my side.

The nonpartisan election amendment will be combined with the elimination of the Hatch Act waiver which is incorporated in the bill. The two subjects dealing with political activity will be combined in one amendment.

Mr. **BIBLE**. Mr. President, I should like to ask my friend from Oregon if it is his position that he would like to have a yea-and-nay vote on his amendment, which is now pending. I ask the question merely for guidance, because a number of Senators have asked me if there would be any yea-and-nay votes today, in the light of the unanimous-consent agreement that has been entered into. I did not anticipate that there would be any such votes today. However, I would like to be completely frank with the Senator from Oregon and ask him whether he wishes a yea-and-nay vote on his amendment.

Mr. **MORSE**. If I may have the attention of the majority leader, to accommodate the majority leader and the chairman of the committee, I would be perfectly willing, if it is not convenient to have a yea-and-nay vote today, to withdraw the amendment and offer it tomorrow, because I wish to have a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment.

Mr. **BIBLE**. That was the purpose of my inquiry of the Senator. It would seem to be indicated that there will be three or four yea-and-nay votes tomorrow.

Mr. **DOMINICK**. If the Senator from Oregon wishes to withdraw his amendment, I have an amendment which I do not anticipate carrying to a vote today. If he wished to withdraw his amendment, I would be happy to make my amendment the pending business. It deals with the financing of the school board.

Mr. **MORSE**. If the majority leader and other Senators have an understanding with any group of Senators that there will be no yea-and-nay votes today, I shall be perfectly willing to withdraw my amendment and offer it tomorrow.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. If the Senator will carry out the latter part of his suggestion, it would be best for all concerned. I appreciate his courtesy. It is my understanding that there will be a considerable amount of discussion of the subject to be brought up by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. It might be in the best interest of all concerned if the Senator from Oregon would follow his suggestion and allow the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] to offer his amendment.

Mr. **BIBLE**. I believe that course of action would be desirable.

I have assured some Senators that there would be no yea-and-nay votes today, in light of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. **MORSE**. If I had known that, I would not have offered the amendment. Our lines of communication broke down. I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw my amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The Senator does not need unanimous consent. He controls his own amendment.

Mr. **MORSE**. I withdraw the amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. **MORSE**. May I have an understanding that I shall be allowed to bring up the amendment some time early tomorrow?

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Yes; the Senator has our word on that.

AMENDMENT NO. 361

Mr. **DOMINICK**. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, to establish an independent school board for the District of Columbia, and for financing purposes. I ask that it be made the pending business.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 93, in the table of contents, strike out the following:

TITLE XVI—BOARD OF EDUCATION

Sec. 1601. Control of public schools.
Sec. 1602. Qualifications.
Sec. 1603. Per diem.
Sec. 1604. Amendments.

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

TITLE XVI—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL BOARD

Sec. 1601. Independent School Board.
Sec. 1602. Initial Election.
Sec. 1603. Meetings; Officers.
Sec. 1604. General Powers.
Sec. 1605. Duties.
Sec. 1606. Personnel.
Sec. 1607. Referendums; Initiative.
Sec. 1608. Actions Requiring Referendum.
Sec. 1609. Referendum Procedure.
Sec. 1610. Duties of Election Board.
Sec. 1611. Composition of School Board.
Sec. 1612. Qualifications of Members.
Sec. 1613. Terms.
Sec. 1614. Interim Members.
Sec. 1615. Amendment to District Election Law.
Sec. 1616. Amendment to District Election Law.
Sec. 1617. Amendment to District Election Law.
Sec. 1618. Amendment to District Election Law.
Sec. 1619. Amendment to District Election Law.
Sec. 1620. Amendment to District Election Law.
Sec. 1621. Petition for Removal.
Sec. 1622. Ineligibility.
Sec. 1623. Petition; Procedure.
Sec. 1624. Suspension From Office.
Sec. 1625. Judgment of Removal.
Sec. 1626. Bond for Costs.
Sec. 1627. Effect of Dismissal.
Sec. 1628. Budget—Fiscal Year.
Sec. 1629. Budget.
Sec. 1630. Borrowing Power; Debt Limitations.
Sec. 1631. Contents of Borrowing Resolution.
Sec. 1632. Publication of Borrowing Resolution.
Sec. 1633. Short Period of Limitation.
Sec. 1634. Issue of Bonds.
Sec. 1635. Public Sale.
Sec. 1636. Borrowing in Anticipation of Revenue.
Sec. 1637. Redemption and Sale of Notes.
Sec. 1638. Credit of the United States.
Sec. 1639. Treasurer.
Sec. 1640. Financial Duties of the Treasurer.
Sec. 1641. Surety Bonds.
Sec. 1642. Accounting Supervision and Control.
Sec. 1643. Independent Audit.
Sec. 1644. Amendment of Budget and Accounting Act.
Sec. 1645. General Account.
Sec. 1646. Capital Construction Account.
Sec. 1647. Real Property Tax.
Sec. 1648. Sales and Personal Income Taxes.
Sec. 1649. Repeal of Certain Laws.
Sec. 1650. Technical Amendment.

On page 96, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

(19) The term "School Board" means the District of Columbia Independent School Board created by title XVI of this Act.

(20) The term "Board of Education" means the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, created by the Act of June 20, 1906 (D.C. Code, sec. 31-101).

(21) The term "school election" means any election or referendum held under section 1610, or under sections 1615 through 1620 of title XVI of this Act.

(22) The term "school electoral district" means one of the fourteen districts created by the Election Board pursuant to section 5(a)(7) of the District Election Act of 1955.

(23) The term "school elector" means a person entitled to vote in a school election according to section 7(f) of the District Election Act of 1955.

On page 94, strike out line 13 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(7) The terms "District Election Act of 1955" and "District election law" mean.

On page 95, strike out line 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(13) The terms "Board of Elections" and "Election Board" mean the Board.

On page 99, beginning with line 17, strike out all through line 5 on page 100.

On page 100, line 6, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(1)".

On page 100, line 11, strike out "(3)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)".

On page 100, line 18, strike out "(4)" and insert in lieu thereof "(3)".

On page 100, line 22, strike out "(5)" and insert in lieu thereof "(4)".

On page 101, line 22, strike out "(6)" and insert in lieu thereof "(5)".

On page 102, line 4, beginning with the second comma, strike out all through the first comma on line 5.

On page 102, beginning with line 14, strike out all through line 23.

On page 152, line 6, strike out "the Board of Education" and insert in lieu thereof "the District of Columbia Independent School Board".

On page 152, beginning with line 22, strike out all through line 3 on page 153.

On page 153, line 20, strike out "(1)".

On page 154, beginning with line 3, strike out all through line 5.

On page 161, beginning with line 1, strike out all through line 7 and renumber succeeding subsections accordingly.

On page 161, line 19, strike out "or a candidate for the Board of Education".

On page 161, line 22, beginning with "or", strike out all through "Education" on line 23.

On page 162, line 11, strike out "Board of Education" and insert in lieu thereof "school board".

On page 163, line 8, beginning with the comma, strike out all through "resident" on line 10.

On page 163, line 13, beginning with "or", strike out all through line 14 and insert in lieu thereof "has been nominated".

On page 182, beginning with line 12, strike out through line 12 on page 184 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

TITLE XVI—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL BOARD

School Board

SEC. 1601. (a) There is hereby established the District of Columbia Independent School Board, which shall manage and control the school system of the District and shall be an independent agency of the District. The School Board may contract, sue, and be sued in its own name and capacity, and no member shall be personally liable for any action taken in good faith by the School Board, or by him in his official capacity as a member. The School Board shall have the authority, according to the provisions of sections 1628 through 1648, inclusive, of this title to tax, to issue bonds, and to expend all revenues accruing to it by this Act for any educational purpose related to the needs of the District school system.

(b) On the effective date of this title the control of the District school system and the functions of the Board of Education shall be transferred to the School Board, and the Board of Education abolished. The School Board shall, in addition, have the functions accorded it by subsection (a) of this section and sections 1603 through 1606, inclusive, of this title. Where functions transferred by this section conflict with limitations imposed by such subsection and sections on powers of the School Board, such subsection and sections shall govern.

(c) A transfer of a function under this title shall, in addition, be a transfer of the personnel necessary for the administration of the function and of property, records, and funds which relate primarily to the function so transferred. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall decide any question arising out of this subsection.

(d) No suit, action, or other judicial proceeding nor any administrative proceeding lawfully commenced shall abate solely by reason of the taking effect of any provision of this title. Such proceeding shall be continued with such substitutions as to parties and officers or agencies as the court or agency deems appropriate.

(e) Any statute concerning or administrative action concerning or taken by any officer or agency from which any function is transferred by this title shall, except to the extent made inapplicable by or under authority of law, continue in effect as if such transfer had not been made. After such transfer references in a statute or administrative action to an officer or agency from which a transfer is made by this title shall be deemed to refer to the officer or agency to which the transfer is made.

(f) As used in subsection (e) of this section, the "administrative action" includes any rule, regulation, order, contract, policy, determination, directive, grant, authorization, permit, requirement, or designation.

Initial election

SEC. 1602. (a) As soon as practicable after the effective date of this section, the Election Board shall announce the date for an election to be held for the purpose of electing the initial members of the School Board, and shall immediately create the school electoral districts referred to in section 5(a)(7) of the District Election Act of 1955. Such election shall be held on the second Monday in the first month of September which begins after the effective date of this section. No member of the Board of Education shall be prohibited from being a candidate for membership on the School Board by reason of his membership on such Board of Education. Members of the School Board shall be elected for terms of two years. Terms of the members initially elected shall begin on the fourth Monday in the first month of September which begins after their election.

(b) The initially elected members of the School Board shall meet at a place and time of day designated by the Chief Judge of the Court of General Sessions to take the oath of office, and after not less than six members have taken the oath, to proceed with the initial meeting pursuant to section 1603 of this title.

Meetings; officers

SEC. 1603. The School Board shall annually hold a meeting on the fourth Monday in September at which time new members shall take the oath of office and officers shall be elected. The officers shall consist of a president and secretary chosen from the School Board, and a nonmember treasurer chosen according to the provisions of section 1639 of this title. The School Board shall also hold meetings every month on a date set at the previous meeting. Special meetings may at any time be called by any officer upon notice to members by registered letter mailed not less than five days before the meeting. Meetings shall be public. A quorum shall consist of eight members. If a quorum is present, a majority of members present may decide any question (except those requesting a special referendum under section 1609 of this title and of removing the Treasurer under section 1639 of this title). Members shall serve without compensation.

General powers

SEC. 1604. The School Board shall have the following powers:

(1) To reorganize the school system.

(2) To establish standards of academic achievement for pupils in the school system.

(3) To assign pupils to the schools in school system.

(4) To make rules for the use of school buildings and school grounds (subject to rules relating to public meetings adopted by referendum under section 1607 of this title).

(5) To fix the number and location of schools.

(6) To fix the length and dates of the school year.

(7) To fill vacant memberships on the School Board in accordance with section 1614 of this title.

(8) To take private property for public use in accordance with the first section of the Act of March 1, 1929 (45 Stat. 1415).

(9) Subject to any referendum which has been or may be initiated in accordance with section 1607, to act upon any question on which such referendum may be initiated.

(10) To call a referendum, according to the provisions of section 1609 (a) and (b) of this title, on any subject on which it is empowered to act or which it is required to submit to referendum before acting.

Duties

SEC. 1605. The School Board shall have the duty to—

(1) examine books, accounts, and financial statements of the school system; and

(2) visit or delegate one of its members to visit each school during each school year.

Personnel

SEC. 1606. (a) Subject to subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e), the School Board shall have the power—

(1) to appoint, promote, and dismiss all employees of the school system, and to employ a superintendent who shall be the chief executive officer of the School Board;

(2) to establish classes of teaching and supervisory positions;

(3) to set salaries and other terms and conditions of employment for all employees of the school system;

(4) to make rules for the conduct of teachers and other employees; and

(5) to establish standards of professional ability for teachers and other employees.

(b) Civil service and other personnel laws and regulations applicable to employees of the Board of Education before their transfer to the School Board shall remain applicable after their transfer until such time as the School Board, pursuant to this section, provides similar or comparable coverage under a personnel system based on merit. Such personnel system shall be established by resolution of the School Board and shall provide coverage similar or comparable to, or shall provide for continued participation in, all or part of the Federal civil service system. Such personnel system shall take effect not earlier than nine months or later than five years after the effective date of this section.

(c) Any person who, on the effective date of this title, is covered by the Act of January 20, 1920 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–701), or by the Act of August 7, 1946 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–721), as amended, shall have the option of continuing under the coverage of said Acts.

(d) Contracts with teachers shall be in writing, and shall state the length of time the school is to be taught, the compensation per week or month, and such other matters as may be agreed upon, including employment for a term not exceeding one year, and payment by the calendar or school month. The contract shall be signed by an officer of the School Board and teacher, and shall be filed with the Secretary of the School Board before the teacher enters upon performance of the contract.

Such contract shall remain in force and effect for the period stated in the contract and thereafter shall be automatically continued in force and effect for equivalent periods, except as modified or terminated by mutual agreement of the School Board and the teacher, until terminated as hereinafter provided. On or before April 15 of each year the teacher may file his written resignation with the Secretary of the School Board, or the School Board may by a majority vote cause said contract to be terminated by written notification of termination, by a registered letter mailed to the teacher not later than the 10th day of April; in event of such termination, it shall take effect at the close of the school year in which the contract is terminated by either of said methods. The teacher shall have the right to protest the action of the School Board, and to a hearing thereon, by notifying the President or Secretary of the School Board in writing of such protest within twenty days of the receipt by him of the notice to terminate, in which event the School Board shall hold a public hearing on such protest at the next regular meeting of the School Board, or at a special meeting called by the President of the School Board for that purpose, and shall give notice in writing to the teacher of the time of the hearing on the protest. Upon the conclusion of the hearing the School Board shall determine the question of continuance or discontinuance of the contract by a rollcall vote entered in the minutes of the School Board, and the action of the School Board shall be final. The foregoing provisions for termination shall not affect the power of the School Board to discharge a teacher for cause under the provisions of subsection (e).

(e) The School Board may, by a majority vote, discharge any teacher for incompetency, inattention to duty, partiality, or any good cause, after a full and fair investigation made at a meeting of the School Board held for that purpose, at which the teacher shall be permitted to be present and make defense, allowing him a reasonable time therefor.

Referendums—Initiative

Sec. 1607. The school electors may direct the School Board—

(1) to set the curriculum in the school system;

(2) to choose textbooks;

(3) to sell the property of the school system;

(4) to permit public meetings in school buildings;

(5) to establish a junior college;

(6) to levy the tax provided for by section 1647 of this title;

(7) to make rules for the conduct of pupils; and

(8) to transfer funds from the capital construction account to the general account, subject to the limitations as to amount in section 1646(d)(2) of this title, by initiating a referendum in accordance with section 1609(c) of this title.

Actions requiring referendum

Sec. 1608. The School Board may not—

(1) issue bonds, or

(2) transfer funds from the capital construction account to the general account in accordance with section 1646(d)(1) of this title, unless the school electors approve in a referendum required by section 1630 or 1646, as the case may be.

Referendum procedure

Sec. 1609. (a) Subject to the time limitations of section 15(c) of the District election law, the School Board may by resolution initiate a referendum to be held at the next school election by sending the Election Board a certificate setting forth (1) the resolution directing the referendum, and (2) the question to be presented to the school electors.

(b) Not less than seven members of the School Board may initiate a referendum to be held under the provisions of section 15(b) of the District election law by sending the Election Board a certificate signed by the members favoring the resolution directing the referendum and setting out (1) such resolution and (2) the question to be presented to the school electors.

(c) Subject to the limitations of subject matter contained in section 1607 of this Title, and of time contained in section 15(c) of the District election law, fifty school electors may initiate a referendum to be held at the next school election by signing a petition in the form prescribed by the Election Board.

(d) All propositions submitted to referendum under this title shall be decided by a majority of the valid votes cast for and against the proposition. The conduct of referendums shall be governed by the District election law and by such regulations as the Election Board may make.

Duties of Election Board

Sec. 1610. The District election law is amended by adding a new section 15 to read as follows:

"Referendum

"Sec. 15. (a) The Board shall conduct all referendums provided for by title XVI of the District of Columbia Charter Act. It shall hold a referendum—

"(1) pursuant to section 1609(b) of such title, not less than forty nor more than fifty days after the receipt of the certificate required by such section, and

"(3) pursuant to section 1609 (a) and (c) of such title, on the second Monday in the first month of September which begins more than thirty days after the receipt of a certificate from the District of Columbia School Board (under section 1609(a) of such title), or after the receipt of a petition signed by fifty electors (under section 1609(c) of such title).

"(b) The Board shall publish once a week for four weeks in a newspaper of general circulation in the District a notice of the referendum stating the proposition to be voted upon and the date, time, and polling places for the referendum stating the proposition to be voted upon and the date, time, and polling places for the referendum. Not more than seven days after the refendum the Board shall certify the results to the District of Columbia Independent School Board and shall promulgate such results by publication in a newspaper of general circulation in the District. The other provisions of this Act shall apply to referendums insofar as they are applicable. The Board shall make necessary regulations for conduct of referendums. Any voter may demand a recount according to section 11 of this Act."

Composition of school board

Sec. 1611. The Board shall consist of fourteen members. The members shall be elected according to the provisions of sections 8(h) and 10(a)(3) of the District election law.

Qualifications of members

Sec. 1612. Each member at the time of his nomination shall be a school elector in the school electoral district from which he seeks election and shall have been a resident of the District of Columbia for five consecutive years.

Terms

Sec. 1613. Except as provided in sections 1602(a) and 1614 of this title, every member's term shall be for two years and shall expire on the fourth Monday in September. A member may serve until his successor has taken the oath of office and may serve more than one term.

Interim members

Sec. 1614. Each membership vacated before the expiration of the last incumbent's term shall be filled by election (pursuant to section 10(a)(3)(B) of the District election law) for an interim term equal to the unexpired portion of the last incumbent's term, but the School Board may temporarily designate a person to fill the vacancy pending such election. Such designee shall have the qualifications required of the last incumbent.

Amendment to District election law

Sec. 1615. The first section of the District election law is amended by inserting in the first section after the words "United States" where they first appear, the following: "the members of the District of Columbia Independent School Board,".

Amendment to district election law

Sec. 1616. Section 5(a) of the District election law is amended by renumbering paragraphs (7) and (8) as paragraphs (8) and (9), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph (7):

"(7) divide the District into fourteen compact and contiguous school electoral districts of approximately equal population, maintain a registry in each school election district, and reapportion the districts according to population after each decennial census;".

Amendment to district election law

Sec. 1617. Section 7 of the District election law is amended by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f) A person shall be entitled to vote in any election of a member of the District of Columbia Independent School Board or in any referendum held under section 15 of this Act if he meets the requirements of subsection (a) of this section, and if in addition he files an affidavit that he resides in the school electoral district in which he wishes to vote. Such affidavits must be filed with the Board not less than seven days before such election. A person who moves his residence from one school electoral district to another shall be entitled to vote in the school electoral district to which he moved seven days after filing with the Board an affidavit of change of residence, but shall not be entitled to vote in the school electoral district from which he moved more than one month after quitting his former residence or more than seven days after he files an affidavit of change of residence, whichever is sooner. Absentees may vote in the district in which they last resided."

Amendment to District election law

Sec. 1618. Section 8 of the District election law is amended by inserting a new subsection after subsection (g) as follows:

"(h) A candidate for membership on the District of Columbia Independent School Board—

"(1) shall meet the qualifications prescribed by section 1612 of title XVI of the District of Columbia Charter Act, and

"(2) shall have filed with the Board not less than thirty days before the election a nomination petition in the form prescribed by the Board and signed by fifty persons entitled to vote in a school election in the district from which he seeks election."

Amendment to District election law

Sec. 1619. Section 10 of the District election law is amended by inserting after subsection (a)(2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) Elections of members of the District of Columbia Independent School Board shall be held on the second Monday of September in each year in any school election district in which—

"(A) the term of the member representing such district will expire during the calendar year, or

"(B) the membership has been vacated before the expiration of the last incumbent's term and before the second Monday in July of such year."

Amendment to District election law

Sec. 1620. Section 10 of the District election law is amended by inserting after the word "officer" in subsection (d) the words "(other than a member of the District of Columbia Independent School Board)".

Petition for removal

Sec. 1621. The Attorney General, the chief legal officer of the District, or five school electors may petition the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for the purpose of removing the Treasurer or any member of the School Board for any of the following reasons:

(1) willful or habitual neglect or refusal to perform the duties of his office;

(2) disability preventing a proper discharge of the duties of his office;

(3) failure to produce and fully account for all public funds and property in his hands at any inspection or settlement;

(4) ineligibility to hold the office by reason of section 1622 of this title; or

(5) corruption, extortion, oppression, gross partiality, intoxication, conviction of a felony, maladministration in office or willful misconduct.

Ineligibility

Sec. 1622. If a member becomes ineligible to continue to hold office at any time he would be ineligible under sections 1611, 1612, 1613, or 1614 of this title for election to the same office.

Petition; procedure

Sec. 1623. The removal petition shall be filed in the name of the petitioner and the accused shall be named as defendant. The petition shall be in the form of a complaint in a civil action and, unless filed by the Attorney General, shall be verified. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure shall govern throughout the action.

Suspension from office

Sec. 1624. Upon commencement of the action, the judge may suspend the accused from office, if in his judgment sufficient cause appears from the petition and from affidavits presented in support of the petition. Any order of suspension shall be served upon the member in question, and it shall be unlawful for such member to exercise or attempt to exercise any of the functions of his office until such suspension is revoked.

Judgment of removal

SEC. 1625. Judgment of removal shall be rendered if the allegations of the petition are sufficient and true. Such judgment shall be entered of record, and the vacancy forthwith filled as provided by sections 1611, 1612, 1613, and 1614 of this title.

Bond for costs

SEC. 1626. If the petition for removal is filed by anyone other than the Attorney General or the chief legal officer of the District, the court shall require the petitioners to file a bond (in such amount and with such surety as the court may require) to cover costs taxable to the petitioner under section 1627 of this title.

Effect of dismissal

SEC. 1627. (a) If the petition is dismissed on the merits, the defendant shall have judgment—

(1) against the United States, if the action was commenced by the Attorney General, or

(2) against the District, if the action was initiated by the chief legal officer of the District, for the reasonable and necessary expenses incurred by the defendant in making his defense, including a reasonable attorney's fee to be fixed by the court or judge.

(b) If the action is instituted by the electors, and if it appears to the court that there was no reasonable cause for filing the petition, the expenses referred to in subsection (a) may be taxed as costs against the petitioners.

Budget-fiscal year

SEC. 1628. The fiscal year of the School Board shall begin on the 1st day of October and shall end on the 30th day of September of the succeeding calendar year.

Budget

SEC. 1629. Not later than July 1 of each year, the Treasurer shall prepare and submit to the School Board, in such form as the School Board shall require, the annual budget for the school system. The budget shall contain separate accounting classifications for expenditures from the general account and from the capital construction account. The School Board shall by resolution adopt a budget for each fiscal year not later than August 15 of the preceding fiscal year.

Borrowing power; debt limitations

SEC. 1630. (a) The School Board may incur indebtedness by issuing bonds in either coupon or registered form. Funds obtained by borrowing pursuant to this subpart shall be included in the capital construction account. Unless the school electors approve in a referendum provided for in section 1609 of this title, the School Board shall not issue bonds in an amount which will cause the aggregate of indebtedness of the School Board to exceed 1¼ per centum of assessed valuation of District property. The School Board shall not issue bonds in an amount which will cause the aggregate of indebtedness of the School Board to exceed 5 per centum of such average assessed value.

(b) For the purposes of this section, the term "indebtedness" includes principal and unpaid accrued interest on bonds issued under this subpart, but excludes short-term borrowing under subpart 2 of this part. A deduction from indebtedness shall be made in an amount equal to moneys set aside into any sinking fund and irrevocably dedicated to the payment of such bonded indebtedness.

(c) For the purposes of this section, "assessed value of District property" means the average assessed value of the real property in the District subject to taxation by the School Board under section 1647 of this title or by the District or by both as of the first day of July of the ten most recent fiscal years for which such assessed values are available.

Contents of borrowing resolution

SEC. 1631. A resolution authorizing the issue of a series of bonds shall contain at least the following provisions:

(1) The denomination and serial numbers of bonds to be issued in such series;

(2) The maximum amount of the principal of the indebtedness to be incurred in such series;

(3) The maximum rate of interest to be paid on such indebtedness; and

(4) The date on which the referendum will be held, the manner of holding such referendum, the manner of voting for or against the incurring of such indebtedness, and the form of ballot to be used at such referendum, if the School Board is required by section 1630, or if it decides in its discretion, to submit the question of issuing such bonds to referendum.

Publication of borrowing resolution

SEC. 1632. Not later than five days after the passage of a resolution authorizing the issuing of bonds, the Treasurer shall publish such resolution in a newspaper of general circulation in the District, together with a notice that a suit or other proceeding questioning the validity of such bonds shall be forever barred unless commenced within the period provided for in section 1633 of this title.

Short period of limitation

SEC. 1633. No suit or other proceeding contesting the validity of bonds issued pursuant to sections 1630 through 1635, inclusive, may be commenced later than twenty days after (1) the publication, in accordance with section 1632 of this title, of notice of passage of an authorizing resolution, if the question of issuing bonds is not submitted to referendum, or (2) the promulgation of the results of the referendum if such question is submitted to referendum.

Issue of bonds

SEC. 1634. After the expiration of the twenty-day limitation period provided for in section 1633 of this title, the School Board may by resolution issue a series of bonds described in a resolution passed in accordance with section 1631 of this title. The bonds of any authorized series may be issued all at one time, or from time to time in such amounts as the School Board shall deem advisable. The resolution issuing any series of bonds shall fix the date of issue of the bonds of such series. Bonds of each such series shall be payable in annual installments beginning not more than three years after the date of issue of the bonds and ending not more than twenty years from such date. Such resolution shall also prescribe the form of the bonds to be issued thereunder, and interest coupons, the manner in which said bonds and coupons shall be executed and in which they may be registered, and the place where they are payable.

Public sale

SEC. 1635. All bonds issued under sections 1630 through 1635, inclusive, shall be sold at public sale upon sealed proposals at such price or prices as shall be approved by the School Board after publication of a notice of such sale at least once not less than ten days prior to the date fixed for the sale in a daily newspaper carrying municipal bond notices and devoted primarily to financial news or to the subject of State and municipal bonds published in the city of New York, New York, and in a newspaper of general circulation published in the District. Such notice shall state among other things that no proposal shall be considered unless there is deposited with the Treasurer as a downpayment a certified check or cashier's check for an amount equal to at least 2 per centum of the par amount of bonds bid for. The School Board shall reserve the right to reject any bid.

Borrowing in anticipation of revenue

SEC. 1636. For any fiscal year, in anticipation of the receipt of revenues of that fiscal year, the School Board may by resolution authorize the borrowing of money by the execution of negotiable notes of the School Board, not to exceed in the aggregate at any time outstanding 25 per centum of the total revenue anticipated for that fiscal year, each of which shall be designated "Revenue Note for the Fiscal Year 19 ". Such notes may be renewed from time to time, but all such notes, together with the renewals, shall mature and be paid not later than the end of the fiscal year for which the original notes have been issued.

Redemption and sale of notes

SEC. 1637. (a) No notes issued pursuant to in sections 1630 through 1636, inclusive, shall be made payable on demand, but any note may be made subject to redemption prior to maturity on such notice and at such time as may be stated in the note.

(b) All notes issued pursuant to in such sections referred to in subsection (a) may be sold at not less than par and accrued interest at private sale without previous advertising.

Credit of United States

SEC. 1638. Bonds and notes issued by the School Board pursuant to this title shall not be deemed obligations of the United States or the District (except for the purposes of section 103(a) of the Internal Revenue Code), and the full faith and credit of the United States shall not be pledged in payment of them.

Treasurer

SEC. 1639. The School Board shall annually, on the fourth Monday of September, elect a Treasurer. The Treasurer shall receive such salary as the School Board may direct. The Treasurer may at any time be removed by a vote of not less than nine members of the School Board, or by the district court under sections 1621 through 1627, inclusive, of this title.

Financial duties of the treasurer

SEC. 1640. The Treasurer shall have charge of the administration of the financial affairs of the school system and to that end he shall—

(1) prepare and submit in the form prescribed by the School Board under section 1629 of this title the annual budget estimates;

(2) supervise and be responsible for all financial transactions to insure adequate control of revenues and resources and to insure that budgetary authorizations are not exceeded;

(3) maintain systems of accounting and internal control designed to provide—

(A) full disclosure of the financial results of the School Board's activities,

(B) adequate financial information needed by the School Board for management purposes,

(C) effective control over and accountability for all funds, property, and other assets,

(4) submit to the School Board a monthly financial statement in such form as the School Board may specify;

(5) prepare, as of the end of each fiscal year, a complete financial statement and report;

(6) receive all money receivable by the School Board from the Federal Government and from the District of Columbia;

(7) have custody of all public funds belonging to or under the control of the School Board, and deposit all funds coming into his hands, in such depositories as may be designated and under such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the School Board; and

(8) have custody of all investments and invested funds of the School Board and have the safekeeping of all bonds and notes of the School Board.

Surety bonds

SEC. 1641. The Treasurer, and such other officers and employees of the School Board as the School Board shall require, shall be bonded with such sureties and in such amounts as the School Board may prescribe. The premiums for all such bonds shall be paid out of the funds of the School Board.

Accounting supervision and control

SEC. 1642. (a) The Treasurer and his duly authorized subordinates shall—

(1) prescribe the forms of receipts, vouchers, bills, and claims to be used by the School Board;

(2) examine and approve all contracts, orders, and other documents by which the School Board incurs financial obligations, having ascertained that moneys have been allotted and will be available when the obligations shall become due and payable;

(3) audit and approve before payment all bills, invoices, payrolls, and other evidences of claims, demands, or charges against the School Board and with the advice of the legal officials of the School Board determine the regularity, legality, and correctness of such claims, demands, or charges; and

(4) perform internal audits of accounts and records of the School Board, including the examination of any accounts or records of financial transactions, and giving due consideration to the effectiveness of accounting systems, internal control, and related administrative practices of the respective agencies.

Independent audit

SEC. 1643. (a) The financial transactions of the School Board shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with such principles and procedures and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. In the determination of the auditing procedures to be followed and the extent of the examination of vouchers and other documents, the Comptroller General shall give due regard to generally accepted principle of auditing, including consideration of the effectiveness of the accounting organizations and systems, internal audit and control, and related administrative practices. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the School Board and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians.

(b) (1) The Comptroller General shall submit such audit reports as he may deem necessary to the Congress and the School Board. The reports shall set forth the scope of the audits and shall include such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep the School Board informed of the operations to which the reports relate, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General may deem advisable. The reports shall show specifically every program, expenditure, and other financial transactions or undertaking which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law.

(2) The School Board shall make such report, together with such other material as it deems pertinent thereto, available for public inspection.

Amendment of budget and accounting act

SEC. 1644. Section 2 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 2), is hereby amended by inserting in the first paragraph after "legislative branch of the Government" the words ", the District of Columbia Independent School Board,".

General account

SEC. 1645. The School Board's general account shall consist of all of the Board's funds except those in the capital construction account. The revenue accruing to the general account in any fiscal year (other than revenues diverted to the general account from the capital construction account under section 1646(d) of this title shall not exceed $200 per pupil enrolled at the end of the previous school year in the District school system.

Capital construction account

SEC. 1646. (a) The capital construction account shall consist of all revenues accruing thereto under subsection (b) not expended pursuant to subsection (c).

(b) The revenues accruing to the capital construction account shall consist of (1) five-sevenths of the tax to be levied pursuant to section 1647 of this title; (2) the proceeds of sale of bonds issued pursuant to sections 1630 through 1635, inclusive, of this title; and (3) funds transferred by resolution from the general account to the capital construction account.

(c) Funds in the capital construction account may be expended (1) for acquisition of land, construction of buildings and improvements, and purchase of school equipment; (2) for the payment of principal and interest on bonds issued pursuant to sections 1630 through 1635, inclusive, of this title; and (3) if transferred to the general account pursuant to subsection (d), for other purposes.

(d) (1) If approved by the school electors in a referendum in accordance with section 1608(2), the School Board may in any fiscal year transfer from the capital construction account to the general account an amount not exceeding the amount by which the capital construction account (at the time of transfer) exceeds sums falling due in such fiscal year for principal and interest on bonds issued pursuant to sections 1630 through 1635, inclusive, of this title.

(2) Without approval in referendum under section 1608(2), the School Board may in any fiscal year transfer from the capital construction account to the general account an amount not exceeding either (A) the amount transferable under subsection (d)(1) of this section or (B) 10 per centum of the revenue accruing to the capital construction account in that fiscal year.

Real property tax

SEC. 1647. The School Board may cause to be levied an ad valorem real property tax on all the taxable real property in the District. Not later than August 15 of each year the School Board shall certify to the District Council the amount proposed to be raised by the tax in the next fiscal year. The tax shall be levied by the council in the same manner as is the real property tax levied under the authority of any act of Congress relating to the District or any act of the council, and the amounts so raised shall be paid to the account of the School Board in such manner as the School Board may direct. The amount so certified and paid shall not—

(1) be less than amounts falling due in that fiscal year on principal and interest on bonds issued pursuant to sections 1630 through 1635, inclusive, of this title, and

(2) exceed fourteen mills when divided by the assessed value of taxable real property in the District (paragraph (1) of this section notwithstanding).

Sales and personal income taxes

SEC. 1648. The School Board may cause to be levied a sales tax in an amount not to exceed one-half of the amount levied by the District under the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act, and a personal income tax in an amount not to exceed one-half of the amount levied by the District under the District of Columbia Income Tax Act. Upon receiving from the School Board a certificate showing the amount to be raised by such taxes, the Council shall collect the taxes in the same manner as the respective District taxes are collected. The District shall diminish the amount of taxes levied by the District and collected for its own account to an amount which, if added to the taxes collected for the account of the School Board, shall not exceed the amount which (this section notwithstanding) the District would by law be authorized to levy and collect for its own account.

Repeal of certain laws

SEC. 1649. The following Acts are hereby repealed:

(1) The Act entitled "An Act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia", approved June 20, 1906 (D.C. Code, sec. 31-101).

(2) The Act entitled "An Act to authorize the appointment of public school employees between meetings of the Board of Education", approved April 22, 1932 (D.C. Code, sec. 31-106).

Technical amendment

SEC. 1650. The first section of the Act of March 1, 1929 (D.C. Code, sec. 16-619), is amended by inserting after the words "any board or commission of the United States" the following: ", including the District of Columbia Independent School Board,".

On page 176, line 8, strike out "and".

On page 176, line 12, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "and".

On page 176, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

(4) other than with respect to section 1602 of title XVI, title XVI shall take effect on the day on which the eighth member of the first School Board takes the oath of office.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I could go into an explanation of the amendment, but the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] has been very kind in permitting us to continue this discussion. Prior to the Senator from Nebraska obtaining the floor, I had explained what was involved. If I may do so at this point, I shall have the amendment as the pending business before the Senate and shall make my argument in connection with it at a later date.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE FAIR APPORTIONMENT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I am speaking today to urge approval by the Senate of the Dirksen amendment (S.J. Res. 2) in its modified form now before the Senate Judiciary Committee, as set out on page 16978 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 15.

It is particularly fortunate that the Senator from Nebraska is able to address the Senate on this occasion with the present occupant of the chair [Mr. TYDINGS] in charge, because he has been highly articulate and frequent in expressing his opposition to the position of the Senator from Nebraska on this particular issue. I welcome him as a Presiding Officer on this occasion.

I believe it is also particularly fortunate that this particular subject be considered at the present time, because the pending business relates to the right of self-determination by the citizens of the District of Columbia. That is, not only the possession of the right to vote—but also an opportunity to cast it in the process of self-determination.

So that no one will misunderstand the clear meaning of this amendment, I will read the language of Senate Joint Resolution 2 as it is now before the Senate, leaving out the preamble.

S.J. RES. 2

SECTION 1. The people of a State may apportion one house of a bicameral legislature using population, geography or political subdivisions as factors, giving each factor such weight as they deem appropriate, or giving similar weight to the same factors in apportioning a unicameral legislature, if, in either case, such plan of apportionment has been submitted to a vote of the people in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution and has been approved by a majority of those voting on that issue. When the first plan of apportionment is submitted to a vote of the people under this section there shall also be submitted, at the same election, an alternative plan of apportionment based upon substantial equality of population.

SEC. 2. Any plan of apportionment which has been approved under this article shall be resubmitted to a vote of the people, or, another plan may be submitted under the provisions of section 1, at the November general election held two years following each year in which there is commenced any enumeration provided for in section 2 of article I, and upon approval by a majority of those voting thereon, such plan of apportionment shall continue in effect until changed in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution.

It is incredible to me that any person who believes in American principles of democratic government—and, I might add, self-determination—can oppose this constitutional amendment to guarantee the people of the 50 States the right to exercise their democratic right of decision with respect to the composition of their State legislatures.

Opponents of this amendment are saying, in effect: the people have no right to make their own decisions; the people cannot be trusted to make the right decisions.

It is particularly incredible that, in the very year when this body is taking the historic step of guaranteeing all the people of all the States their civil right to register to vote, there are some voices in the Senate which would deny the people the opportunity to exercise an even more important civil right: the right to vote, once they have registered.

FAITH IN THE ELECTORATE

I utterly reject the implied arguments of the opponents of this amendment that the people are too stupid to be allowed to vote—on a one-man, one-vote basis, at statewide elections—on how they wish to constitute their States legislatures. I reject the premise of the opponents of this amendment that our country is an oligarchy rather than a democracy.

Actually, this amendment is a very moderate measure. It does not require the people of any State to constitute one house of their legislature on a basis other than population. It is simply permissive in this respect, leaving the decision up to the people themselves, State by State. And, because there is general consensus that this permissive right of decision is desired for one house only of bicameral legislatures, the amendment guarantees that at least one legislative house in each State will be chosen on a strict population basis.

NO QUARREL WITH COURT

The U.S. Supreme Court has corrected abuses that existed for many years in some States in which State legislatures were apportioned under plans that had not been reviewed for decades, and in which the people of those States were never afforded the right to vote on reapportionment proposals in keeping with changing times and conditions.

The philosophy of this amendment in no way quarrels with the effects of the Court's decisions which have forced revisions of long frozen-in apportionment plans never subjected to popular approval; nor with its decisions as to States in which legislative bodies were apportioned in a fashion which violated provisions of the State's constitution.

This amendment takes up from where the Court necessarily left off. It assures that any apportionment plan on a basis other than population will be subjected to popular approval. It assures that the composition of one legislative house will be on a strict population basis, and it allows the composition of the other house to be on a basis—whether population, area, or a combination of both—that the majority of all the voters within the State actually want.

POPULAR APPROVAL

This amendment buttresses the democratic process. Opposition to it stems from inherent lack of faith in the democratic process. In fact, such opposition constitutes a rejection and repudiation of the democratic process.

Opponents of the amendment demonstrate a singular and chilling lack of faith in the integrity and viability of this august body, the U.S. Senate.

For in the final analysis what we are talking about is a right of the people and those States who so wish to continue a long tradition existing in many States of constituting their State legislatures along the Federal plan—whereby the members of one house are elected from districts formed on a population basis, and the members of the other house are elected from districts formed on an area basis, or a combination of area and population.

Evidence of this lack of faith is to be found continuously in the testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments and before the House Judiciary Committee.

By way of example, one need only to follow the testimony for instance of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in pages 35–62 of the report of the hearing of the Senate subcommittee in which the lack of faith in the intelligence and wisdom of the people is displayed in such frightening manner.

Or one might turn to pages 699–717 of the same hearings and find this same strange logic, this same concept that the people have so little ability to decide how they wish to be governed themselves, as presented by the Honorable ANDREW JACOBS, Jr., a Member of the House of Representatives from Indiana.

One could turn to the testimony submitted to the House Judiciary Committee presented by Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller, a representative of the AFL-CIO, who blithely rejects the concept that the majority of the people of a State have any right to devise laws affecting all the people of that State.

These should suffice for quick examples.

THE CONGRESS

The U.S. Constitution provides that the Members of one House of our Federal legislative body—the U.S. Senate—shall be selected on an area basis: two Senators from each State. This provision is reaffirmed in the 17th amendment to the Constitution.

The House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress is elected, basically, on a population, one-man, one-vote basis. But no one can contend that the Senate is elected on a one-man, one-vote basis. It is elected on area basis—the areas being determined by the boundaries of the States, which vary greatly in geographic size and population content.

Does anyone in this body claim that the two Senators from the State of New York are less effective in the service of their country and in representing the interests of their constituents than the two Senators from the State of Rhode Island merely because, following the statistical arguments of the strict, one-man, one-vote dogmatists, the people of New York have only one-twentieth as much so-called voting strength in the Senate as the people of Rhode Island?

Does anyone contend that the people of Rhode Island have secured undue advantages, preferences, and privileges from this body?

Are the opponents of the amendment prepared to argue that the two Senators from the State of California are less effective in the service of their country and in representing the interests of their constituents than the two Senators from the State of Hawaii because the people of California have only one twenty-fifth as much representation, on a statistical basis, in the U.S. Senate as the people of Hawaii?

Do the opponents of the amendment contend for a moment that the people of Hawaii have secured advantages, preferences, and privileges from this body in excess of what they are entitled to as citizens of the United States?

I am quite aware that the 50 States are, in a sense, sovereign, and that the various counties within the States are not, but are instead political subdivisions created by the State governments.

The point is that the counties are viable political subdivisions of the States, just as the States are viable political subdivisions of the Nation. They form communities of common interest, just as the States do. And just as the geographic, demographic, and political interests of the people of the State of Hawaii differ widely from the interests of the people of California—just as Rhode Island differs from New York, as North Dakota differs from North Carolina—the community interests of counties and areas within many States vary widely.

The point is that whether the U.S. Senate in its present form was comprised as a result of a compromise permitting the formation of a Nation is irrelevant in this instance. The real point of issue is that our system of government has worked outstandingly well to provide a balanced, effective, and fair government, regardless of its origin. Because it has worked so well, the system has been followed by States. Where this has been done by legal, constitutional means, it should be permitted to stand. Where it has been done in violation of State constitution or law, it should be corrected by proper court action.

LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE

In those States where the people, voting as a whole, choose to follow the example of the Federal Government in the constitution of their legislatures, the Federal plan of area representation in one house and population representation in the other can function well. It has functioned well in many States in the past, and the constitutional amendment now under discussion will make it possible for the people of the various States to choose this proven system if it is deemed appropriate in their State by the consent of the governed—that is, by a vote of the people.

The opponents of the amendment argue that both houses of State legislatures must be apportioned on a strict population basis, regardless of the people's desires. They contend, by a strained logic that escapes me, that to choose one house on an area basis is immoral.

Will the opponents of this amendment argue that the U.S. Senate is constituted on an immoral basis? Do they argue for repeal of the 17th amendment? Do they argue for an amendment of their own that would erase State lines and elect the Members of this body from arbitrary and constantly changing districts based on population?

I believe the opponents of this amendment ignore the evidence of all the years since the founding of our Nation—all the years that the U.S. Senate has honorably served as one of the prime movers in our time-tested governmental system of checks and balances, a system that has been responsive to the needs of the people and at the same time, primarily because of the unique basis for selection of the Members of this body, a system that has respected and protected the rights of minorities against the transient, shifting winds of political change.

A vote for the proposed amendment is a vote of confidence in the intelligence of the people of the 50 States to choose the system of legislative representation that best meets their individual needs and circumstances.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I appreciate the courtesy of my colleague from Nebraska in yielding. I must leave the Chamber to attend a committee meeting. I am familiar with the Senator's manuscript. I commend him for it and congratulate him on an excellent statement.

Do I correctly understand that the substance of what the Senator has just stated is that what is really involved is the right of the people of each of the States to determine for themselves the question of legislative apportionment?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. It is not essentially an argument that they cannot apportion on the basis of population alone, but that they should have the right to decide that question?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct. If the people of a State do not take any action, the rule uttered by the Supreme Court in the case of Reynolds against Sims will prevail; namely, both houses of the legislature of the State shall be apportioned substantially on the basis of population.

Mr. CURTIS. Might it not be stated in this way: Were we to contend for the principle that the Federal Government has a right to say that only population shall be considered, the same Federal Government might have the right to institute any practice.

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CURTIS. What is really involved is the right of the people to be self governed.

Mr. HRUSKA. And to change from the basic, organic law in a way that will conform to their wishes, rather than to the wishes of any branch of the Federal Government, whether it be the legislative branch or the judicial branch.

Mr. CURTIS. As to the constitutional forms involved, had it been stated in the Constitution, even vaguely, that the ratifying States were conveying to the new Federal or Central Government the power to determine how legislatures were to be constituted, in the Senator's opinion would the Constitution have been ratified.

Mr. HRUSKA. The opinion of this Senator from Nebraska on that score may not be persuasive with many persons; but when we consider the dissenting opinion of Justice Harlan in the case of Reynolds against Sims, in which he spells out and documents from the debates and from the records of this body—and that debate was held in this very Chamber—that had that construction been placed upon the 14th amendment and the equal protection clause thereof, it is virtually certain that that amendment never would have been ratified by the necessary three-fourths of the States that existed at that time nor approved by those voting on that amendment.

A reading of that opinion would clearly convince anyone on that question.

Mr. CURTIS. It is also a general rule of law that language means what it says.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is what we like to think. Sometimes we are baffled by the nonacceptance of that rule by some judicial body. However, that is the usual rule.

Mr. CURTIS. In the absence of ambiguity, when we can determine what something says, the general rule is that the writers intended the document to speak for itself.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Very likely there was no overt statement to the effect that such power was being conferred upon the Federal Government.

Mr. HRUSKA. That can be said.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator on his statement. I regret that I cannot remain longer.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Nebraska on a speech that is searching and sound. I think his speech cannot be successfully refuted.

In addition to all of the technical arguments, it seems to me so hopeless to find any one method of distributing the citizens in the legislative bodies of the various States that would be equally applicable to all States, regardless of their size, stage of development, or problems. Does the Senator not believe that the individual rights of the citizens of a State should be recognized when, in their opinion, they think one house of their legislature should be set up in a different way from the one-man, one-vote principle because the new way would serve their own needs much better than the one-man, one-vote principle?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is precisely the objective of the proposed amendment.

The Supreme Court in its decision in Reynolds against Sims pointed out that it is impossible to achieve a precise mathematical arrangement of population in apportionment problems, and other factors would have to be considered. When we get into the problem of using factors other than population, we enter the field of legislation. It has been always been our understanding that the function of legislating belongs to Congress and State legislatures, rather than to any other branch of the government.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator.

Would the distinguished Senator mind my asking a set of questions based upon a little research which I have done—not applicable to the highly developed States, but to some of the States which are highly desirous of further development and which offer great assets for the entire Nation if they can be further developed?

I should like to ask these questions with reference to four States.

Mr. HRUSKA. I very much welcome the propounding of such questions.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. First, I shall mention the new State of Alaska. The State of Alaska is a pioneer area, with great possibilities. It revives the opportunities that American citizens used to have with reference to the great areas of the West.

I shall read some statistics with reference to the State of Alaska.

The State of Alaska has a total area of 571,065 square miles. It is more than twice as large as our former largest State, the State of Texas.

The population of Alaska, by reason of its nonuniform development, is largely found in two counties. The county of Anchorage has 82,833 people. The county of Fairbanks has 43,412 people. The two counties have a combined total population of 126,245 people. These figures are obtained from the 1960 census.

The total population of the State of Alaska at the time of the 1960 census was 226,167. Therefore, more than half of the population of the new State, which we hope and want to see develop, is contained in the two counties of Anchorage and Fairbanks, which have a combined area of less than one-twentieth of the area of the State.

Does the Senator believe it is possible that the people of Alaska might not feel—desirous as they are of developing that great area—that the outlying area not now heavily populated should be given a voice in one house, disproportionate to the present population?

Mr. HRUSKA. This Senator would believe that even granting the utmost good faith to the representatives from this concentrated area of population, it would be difficult indeed to understand the complex and distant problems which exist in the remote areas of Alaska, so that the representatives could deal with them intelligently. This is to be contrasted with the kind of representation which representatives from those distance places would provide. I believe that under the one-man, one-vote rule, they would be foreclosed from doing so.

Mr. HOLLAND. Under the one-man, one-vote rule, if it were to operate, those two counties alone—comprising much more than half the population of the State of Alaska and less than one-twentieth the area of Alaska—would dominate the legislative process in the State of Alaska.

Mr. HRUSKA. That would be an inevitable, inescapable wrong.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

I shall next discuss the statistics from the State of Arizona. Arizona is nearer than Alaska. It is a State which has great potentials of developing rapidly. I believe it is now one of the fastest growing States, if not the fastest growing.

The State of Arizona has a total area of 113,575 square miles. Therefore, the State of Arizona is twice as large as the State of Florida, which I represent in part.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is one and one-half times as large as the State which I represent in part.

Mr. HOLLAND. The State of Arizona, in the 1960 census, had a population of 1,302,161 people.

The county of Maricopa, in which the city of Phoenix is located, had more than half the population of Arizona, having 663,510 people. At the same time, it had only 9,226 square miles, of the total area of the State.

The county of Pima, in which Tucson is located, is the next most heavily populated county with a population of 265,660.

In 1960 those two counties had a combined population of 929,170 people, leaving between 300,000 and 400,000 people in the rest of the State. There are only 14 counties in the State of Arizona.

Does the Senator think it is possible that in order to emphasize the chance of development and growth in the other 12 counties, the people in the counties of Maricopa and Pima would say, "By all means, let us give them direct representation in one house so that they may be heard and their legitimate ambition for growth may be better realized."

Does the Senator believe it is possible that the State of Arizona might, if given a chance, adopt a program different from the one-man, one-vote principle as to one house of its legislature?

Mr. HRUSKA. There can be no question that under the plan which would be adopted by the legislature from time to time, even granting again, the utmost of good faith and good intentions on the part of the one-man, one-vote rule, those more distant points would not be able to be properly represented.

There is another factor of which I am sure the Senator from Florida is aware. The people in the more distant parts of the State would not have access to the representatives as those from the concentrated areas of the two counties would have. So that their sentiments, views, and desires could not even be made known, let alone be considered.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct in that conclusion. Of course, one of the primary objects of representative government is to have people feel that they are personally represented by someone charged with the responsibility for making the laws which govern them.

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes, and fairly and practically accessible to that representation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Exactly.

I took the opportunity to ask the Senator to put the facts in regard to these matters into the RECORD because I find that some of us who come from States developed within their boundaries—but not completely developed, because I do not think that any one American State is developed to its full potential, but more uniformly developed throughout their boundaries—have not given due consideration to the needs of the newer States, the greater States in area, which are not as fully developed, and not by any means fully populated.

I come now to the State of Hawaii, with a population, according to the 1960 census, of 632,772. We find that State is divided into five counties. There are eight islands that are habitable in that State, some of them at substantial water distances from each other. From the standpoint just mentioned by the Senator from Nebraska, it is exceedingly difficult for the people in some of the outlying islands to have speedy, convenient, and ready access in terms of cost and transportation to the more populated islands, where presumably their representation would be if the one-man, one-vote principle applied.

In the County of Honolulu, which embraces the Island of Oahu, are found nearly five-sixths of the present population of Hawaii, according to the figures for 1960. The population of Honolulu County in 1960 was 500,409, out of a total population of 632,772 in the whole of Hawaii.

It seems clear to me from looking at that picture that the people in Honolulu County, despite their great preponderance in numbers, would be so anxious to see their State develop and realize its full potentiality that they might easily feel that départure from the one-man, one-vote principle would be preferable as regards one house of its legislature, so that the outlying areas might have direct representation and direct opportunity to develop and help bring those farflung areas to the great potentiality which they possess.

Does the Senator from Nebraska join me in that thought?

Mr. HRUSKA. I join the Senator from Florida in that comment. It applies in the case of Hawaii just as much as it applied to the case of Alaska and Arizona.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

I now come to the last of the States, and a much older State, a State which was given statehood during the Civil War; namely, the State of Nevada.

Yet its growth has been only recent, and it has been a great growth. There has been a great growth since 1960, which I think accentuates the figures shown by the 1960 census.

In that State, with its 17 counties, there are 2 counties which have about three-fourths of the population of the State, or did in 1960. The county of Clark, where Las Vegas is located, has a population of 127,016, and the county of Washoe, where Reno is located, has a population of 84,743, or a combined population of 211,759 out of the total of 285,278 people who were in Nevada when the 1960 census was taken.

Does not the Senator believe it is highly possible that the people of Nevada, anxious as they are to grow and develop, would believe that the outlying counties in that State of 109,788 square miles, with 17 counties, should be entitled to have direct representation in one house of the legislature, so that their ambitions and opportunities for growth and development might be better realized? Does the Senator believe that great and growing and relatively new State in development would rather give direct representation to the people of the 15 as yet undeveloped counties so they could move ahead with their development?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is the feeling of the Senator from Nebraska, and it is also the feeling of the Senators from Nevada, because they testified before the subcommittee on this subject, they indicated their preference for that kind of organization.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. Only this morning I talked with one of the distinguished Senators from Nevada, who supplied me with the source of the information I previously stated. The disparity in size between the two cities of Reno and Las Vegas and the counties in which they are located and the rest of the State, as shown by the figures I have read into the RECORD for 1960, is even greater now because there has been greater growth in the two cities I have mentioned than in the rest of the State.

The Senator from Nevada said he was sure the disparity appearing in 1960 between the two counties and the rest of the State in population would be greater now than it was then.

I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator in yielding to me. It has seemed to me that some of us who represent older States, where the problems are different and which, because of uniform growth, have adopted in their own wisdom, what amounts to the one-man one-vote theory in both houses of their legislatures have overlooked the fact that one rule cannot adequately fit the needs of all 50 States of the Union. They are different in size, area, stages of development and number of industries to be found in a single State. There must be some flexibility, if the people of the State desire it, so that they may, in one house of the legislature, depart from the one-man one-vote rule in order to serve the people of the State and make their own decision.

I so completely approve of the position of the Senator from Nebraska that I wish to state for the RECORD that we would be blind to the needs of our States—and I have mentioned only four—if we sat idly by and watched the Supreme Court rule of one-man, one-vote requirement become fixed and necessarily applicable to all the States of the Union, regardless of their varying needs and their different degrees of development.

I am glad the Senator is making his scholarly statement on this subject, of which I approve completely.

Mr. HRUSKA. Let me observe that the Senator from Florida was one of the witnesses before our subcommittee. He appeared in company with, and introduced, a justice of the State of Florida's Supreme Court, Judge Caldwell, who, in my judgment, made one of the most incisive and persuasive statements which was received. We on the subcommittee were grateful, and all Senators should be grateful, not only for the appearance of the Senator from Florida, and for the remarks he has made in the Chamber today, but also for bringing in Judge Caldwell for the testimony which he gave on that occasion.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy that Judge Caldwell, formerly Representative Caldwell, and later Governor Caldwell, was able to appear. I gloried in his testimony. I thought it was sound and directly to the point.

For the RECORD, I invite attention to the fact that not only has he served as Governor of the State of Florida, in which position he served both as chairman of the National Governors' conference and chairman of the Southern Governors' conference, but he was also a Representative for several years. As a matter of patriotic duty, he was called to head the civil defense efforts of the Nation at a critical time, as the Senator knows. He is now a justice on our supreme court in Florida. He has had a wide opportunity to observe the differing situations throughout the Nation.

I thought his testimony was most persuasive.

I did not need to be persuaded, but if I had been undecided and had listened to the testimony of one with as much experience as he has, and the sound statements he made, I would have been persuaded even though I had been previously of a different attitude.

I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his kind remarks with reference to Judge Caldwell.

Mr. HRUSKA. In the case of Lucas against Colorado General Assembly, a few of the points which were made by the Senator from Florida in regard to these four States were commented upon by Justice Stewart, who says in part:

> I do not pretend to any specialized knowledge of the myriad of individual characteristics of the several States, beyond the records in the cases before us today. But I do know enough to be aware that a system of legislative apportionment which might be best for South Dakota, might be unwise for Hawaii with its many islands, or Michigan with its Northern Peninsula. I do know enough to realize that Montana with its vast distances is not Rhode Island with its heavy concentrations of people. I do know enough to be aware of the great variations among the several States in their historic manner of distributing legislative power—of the Governors' councils in New England, of the broad powers of initiative and referendum retained in some States by the people, of the legislative power which some States give to their Governors, by the right of veto or otherwise, of the widely autonomous home rule which many States give to their cities. The Court today declines to give any recognition to these considerations and countless others, tangible and intangible, in holding unconstitutional the particular systems of legislative apportionment which these States have chosen.

Mr. President, that is precisely the point the Senator from Florida brought out, giving the very fine examples of Alaska, Arizona, Hawaii, and Nevada.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. In view of the fact that the subject of Colorado comes up, in connection with what the Senator from Florida said, I thought it would be worth while to spread on the RECORD what happened to us in Colorado.

In the election of 1962, we put on the ballot, by petition of the people, the so-called Federal plan, one house based on population only, the other house to be districted on the basis of geography plus population. At the same time we did that, we put another one on the ballot for the people to vote on, again by petition of the people, providing for both houses to be selected on a one-man, one-vote basis.

When the election came and the returns were in, by a 2-to-1 majority, the people of Colorado had chosen the Federal plan over the one-man, one-vote rule.

Mr. HRUSKA. Is it not true that the proposal carried in every county in the State?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct, including the populous metropolitan area of Denver and the surrounding counties—almost two to one in every one of them. The Supreme Court said no, that we could not do that, and threw it out. Then we came back and, being dutiful citizens, as almost all the rest of the citizens of this country are, the State legislature went through the pattern of developing a new plan of the one-man, one-vote rule on both houses, and we submitted it to a three-man Federal court which said that it complied with the requirements of the Supreme Court, and the Governor signed it into law. But the State supreme court ruled it unconstitutional under our State constitution. So we stood with those who had been elected throughout the State, who had been doing their jobs, and good ones, but no one has the faintest idea whether they are properly, validly, legally elected, or what the effect will be on the State legislature.

We are now in a complete and hopeless mess. Until we can obtain some amendment of this kind, which will clarify the rights of the States, we shall continue to be in a difficult position.

Mr. HRUSKA. I am informed that the Federal district court in Colorado gave the Colorado Legislature only 15 days in which to reapportion during which time they had to call a special session, get a working quorum, make a plan, debate it out, pass it into law, and get it signed by the Governor.

That is only the beginning, because from the decision of Reynolds against Sims, the Supreme Court and the judiciary branch of the Government of this Nation will take continuing jurisdiction over the composition of all the State legislatures of the Nation. Later in my remarks, I expect to develop that point more in detail.

Mr. DOMINICK. I believe that the speech of the Senator from Nebraska is of such paramount importance that it should be reiterated every day throughout this session until we finally get some action.

Mr. HRUSKA. I refer the Senator from Colorado to the language in Reynolds against Sims, on page 42 of the original opinion:

> Mathematical exactness or precision is hardly a workable constitutional requirement.

Continuing on the next page:

> For the present, we deem it expedient not to attempt to spell out any precise constitutional tests. What is marginally permissible in one State may be unsatisfactory in another, depending on the particular circumstances of the case. Developing a body of doctrine on a case-by-case basis appears to us to provide the most satisfactory means of arriving at detailed constitutional requirements in the area of State legislative apportionment.

This means that the needs of the States will be dealt with by the Supreme Court and its inferior court on a case-by-case basis. It will be they who will be legislating the needs of each State.

Mr. DOMINICK. And on a continuing jurisdictional basis.

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes; on a continuing jurisdictional basis.

Mr. DOMINICK. Along the lines that the Senator from Florida has stated.

It is important to note that in Colorado, for example, there are four major river systems. Those 4 major river systems are divided by some 50 mountains which are higher than 14,000 feet and over which there are only a few roads. Therefore, anyone elected from an area in the unpopulated portion of the State, trying to get an equal number of people into it such as we would from a suburban county outside Denver, has practically one-third of an empty State to cover, and he cannot keep in contact.

Mr. HRUSKA. Nor can people keep in contact with him.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator for his fine contribution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska be tolerant enough to yield to me, to permit me to make one more observation?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. In my own State, we have a classic example of the complete instability of the court's control of this question. A three-judge court nullified the districting program set up by our legislature, and required the legislature to act again. The legislature returned and worked with the court and enacted another program on districting. The three-judge court promptly approved it.

A little later the Supreme Court of the United States, without permitting oral argument, without allowing the State of Florida to be heard on the subject, ruled that the three-judge court, which was a court of considerable dignity and stature, was wrong, and eliminated that redistricting.

That is the kind of experience we can expect to have periodically in many of the States because under our program, based on the one man, one vote principle, we must recall that at least every 10 years a census is taken, and that no State is static, because there are always some changes in the distribution of its population, particularly in the newer States.

Therefore, if we wish to have complete insecurity and instability in that basic situation which is the distribution of our legislative representation, the best way to get it is to let the courts take charge of the whole subject.

Mr. HRUSKA. And keeping the whole subject up in the air.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation and for some questions, with the understanding that he will not lose the floor by doing so?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Carolina, who serves so effectively on the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Nebraska recall that in writing his dissenting opinion in the Baker case, Justice Felix Frankfurter said that the Supreme Court of the United States ought not to enter the political thicket involved in the reapportionment of State legislatures?

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Nebraska agree with the Senator from North Carolina that the expression "political thicket" was well chosen by Justice Frankfurter in his dissenting opinion?

Mr. HRUSKA. There is no question about it. Even in the limited experience with legislative apportionment cases that have arisen in the last 12 months, that is true.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, recently I received a letter asking me to stand by the opinion of the Supreme Court in the reapportionment cases. I read those cases. I came to the conclusion that I did not know which one to stand by, because following the Baker decision there have been five or six opinions entertained by five or six different judges who differed as to what should be done about it. Does the Senator from Nebraska find himself in more or less a similar state?

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes. The Senator from Nebraska derives some feeling of certainty about one aspect of the whole procedure, and that is, that the Supreme Court has now placed its imprimatur on this sentence in the opinion it wrote in Reynolds against Sims:

> Developing a body of doctrine on a case-by-case basis appears to us to provide the most satisfactory means of arriving at detailed constitutional requirements in the area of State legislative apportionment.

It might be quite satisfactory to the judicial branch of the Government, but it surely is not the most satisfactory situation for a component part of the judicial branch of the Government to engage in what essentially and inescapably is a legislature chore. That is what it is.

Mr. ERVIN. Would not the solution of this problem by a case-by-case method result in confusion?

Mr. HRUSKA. There is no question about it. The momentum in achieving universal confusion is becoming greater every day.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like, as a three-time member of the State legislature of North Carolina to note that placing that limitation upon the action of the Colorado legislature is an indication that the court was unable to appreciate all the implications and factors which are involved in the reapportionment of the membership of a legislative body.

One of the most difficult tasks which falls upon a legislature is assigning representation in a State legislature on the basis of population. I have had some experience in that field as a member of the Legislature of North Carolina.

We have a system of apportionment of the State legislature that works as follows: North Carolina has 50 State senators. Membership in the State senate under the North Carolina constitution is apportioned solely on the basis of population. We have 100 counties, some large, some small. Our house of representatives has a membership of 120, under our State constitution. The State constitution assigns 1 member of the house of representatives to each county, regardless of population, and divides the extra 20 members of the house of representatives among the larger counties solely on the basis of population. When the legislature undertakes to apportion this membership among the various areas of the State, it has to take into consideration many factors. One of the factors is population. Another is the political ambitions of various members of the State legislature, whose interests, as in North Carolina, may be served by one kind of State senator as distinct from another.

There are different areas with different economic interests. Then there is the division in political parties. In my State some counties are strongly one way, and some counties are strongly another way, while still other counties are rather mixed in the political affiliations of their residents.

The legislature must take all these things into consideration when it reapportions its membership. It is possible to put certain counties into a State senatorial district, and others in another senatorial district, and change about the political affiliation of the one who is to represent them by so doing.

This is something that Justice Frankfurter had in mind when he spoke of this area as a "political thicket."

Does not the Senator from Nebraska agree with the Senator from North Carolina that that has been a tradition, and a fine tradition and a high tradition, throughout our country, that men occupying judicial office should refrain from too much activity in what are essentially political matters?

Mr. HRUSKA. That has been a tradition of the country, and it has been one of the finest traditions of our country.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the participation of a Federal court in the reapportionment of the membership in a State legislature bring that Federal court into a position in which its action will have a political effect, one way or another, in a high percentage of cases?

Mr. HRUSKA. There is no question about it.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Nebraska agree with the Senator from North Carolina that there is nothing which robs the judiciary more quickly of its prestige and its respect by the people if it takes actions which the people can infer are actions of a political nature?

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Nebraska is totally in agreement with that statement.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska if the amendment does not adopt the principle which the Federal Constitution applies to membership in the Senate and in the House of Representatives?

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Does the Senator from Nebraska agree with the Senator from North Carolina that no one can very consistently oppose the proposed amendment unless he believes that the Senate is constituted in a manner in which it ought not to be constituted?

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Nebraska firmly believes what the Senator from North Carolina has said. Those who would deny the proposition, and who rely on the history and the compromise nature of the body in which we have the honor to sit, miss the point. That is not the point. The point is that whatever the origin of our system, the system is working well. If the people of any individual State wish by popular vote to adopt a similar system, they should be the ones who should determine that question and not some other branch of the Government. No branch of the Government has that right, because the Constitution of our Republic starts with the statement, "We, the people." We ought to give that expression force and effect.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not true that the membership of the Senate which was fixed by the original Constitution and the principle adhered to since 1789, has worked exceedingly well for our country?

Mr. HRUSKA. All of us think it has. We are the envy of the world for the system that we have developed under that very arrangement.

Mr. ERVIN. Can it not be said that the membership of the Senate is apportioned on the basis of geographical lines, or at least political subdivisions of the country?

Mr. HRUSKA. Political subdivisions or geography, either way.

Mr. ERVIN. All the amendment would do would be to permit not the State legislatures, but the people of the States, to apportion one house of their legislatures in States having bicameral legislatures, or a single house in States having a unicameral legislature, on the same basis—on the basis of population and geographical subdivision and political subdivision of the country. Is not that what the amendment would provide?

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct. That is all it would do. That is all the amendment provides. I point out also that it would be permissive in nature. We did not seek in the proposed amendment to dictate to the States. Each State would have a choice. It could follow the one-man, one-vote rule, if the State chose to do so, in both of its houses.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Nebraska agree with the Senator from North Carolina that those who oppose the amendment do not themselves believe in the one-man, one-vote rule in the sense that they are unwilling to submit the question of apportionment of a house of the legislature of a State on the basis of such factors as geographical and political subdivisions on the basis of the one-man, one-vote rule?

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct. As the Senator from North Carolina probably recalls, it has been my contention that, in coining the slogan "one man, one vote," the originators of the term stopped too soon. What they should have done was to keep going and say, "One man, one vote, and an opportunity to use that vote to determine whether the Constitution should be amended to modify in part the decision in the case of Reynolds against Sims."

Mr. ERVIN. Those who oppose the amendment are unwilling to have the one-man, one-vote rule applied on the particular question which we are discussing in any one of the 50 States of the Union.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct. I cannot blame anyone for having a personal and sincere conviction on the subject.

When he seeks to impose his particular conclusions on his own State or on any other State, without giving the people of that State an opportunity to participate in an election to determine the question, I say that that person is gravely wrong.

Mr. ERVIN. After all, the members of the State legislature are supposed to represent the people of the State, and the people of the State ought to be permitted, even under the one-man, one-vote theory, to choose their representatives in the manner in which they see fit, at least in one house.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct. It would be truly in keeping with the tradition of our country to allow the States to be as sovereign as possible along those very lines—which is another point which I intend to develop later in my remarks.

Mr. ERVIN. The amendment would make certain that at least one house in a bicameral legislature would be apportioned solely upon the basis of one man, one vote.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is true. That would be a requirement under the proposed amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from Nebraska is familiar with the old expression that has come down to us from the days of the founding of our country, that all just powers of the Government are derived from the consent of the governed. The proposed amendment merely provides that the people in each State shall have the right to determine whether or not they can have one house in a State legislature apportioned on exactly the same basis as the membership of the U.S. Senate is apportioned by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct. That is exactly what it proposes to do.

Mr. ERVIN. The proposed amendment respects the one-man, one-vote theory by stating that the problem should be solved by the people of each State on the basis of one man, one vote, and the people should be free—and their wisdom ought to be recognized—to determine that question to the extent of one house of the State legislature.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is exactly the situation.

Mr. ERVIN. In the final analysis, is not the alternative that instead of having the just powers of government derived from the consent of the governed, the people of all 50 States of the Union would be denied the right to apportion their own State legislatures by what might conceivably be called a judicial oligarchy of the 9 members of the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. HRUSKA. There is no question but that that is true. The Senator has already said that we are a democracy, not an oligarchy. I would make this suggestion to the Senator that, in this instance, it is not an oligarchy of nine men. It is an oligarchy of five of those nine men which made the basic decision which the Court has been following.

Mr. ERVIN. So the question that the proposed amendment presents to the Congress in the first instance is whether or not the 190 million Americans who inhabit the 50 States would have the power to say how 1 house of their legislature should be apportioned, rather than leaving that power vested in 5 of the 9 Supreme Court Justices.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

As the Senator from North Carolina has already pointed out, without finding any fault with the Supreme Court, and assuming that their construction of the Constitution is without fault there is still reserved to the people of this country under article V of the Federal Constitution the right to amend that Constitution. That is what is involved—the opportunity to submit the proposed resolution to the legislatures of the States. If the amendment is ratified by three-fourths of the States, the Constitution, as it is conceived in the eyes and the minds of the members of the Supreme Court, will be amended.

That is what is involved here.

Mr. ERVIN. The proposed amendment would not change the Constitution of the United States in any respect unless the people of three-fourths of the States desired it to be changed.

Mr. HRUSKA. Exactly. There must be a popular vote on any plan that would depart from the Constitution as it is presently envisaged and held to be by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. ERVIN. So a vote in opposition to our resolution would be a vote to deny the people of a State not only the power to apportion the membership in one house of a State legislature on the basis of factors such as geographical considerations and political subdivisions, but also the opportunity to say if they want to amend the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HRUSKA. Exactly. As the Senator from North Carolina has pointed out, when a proposal of this kind results in a change of a system that has existed for over a century and a half—and the decision in Reynolds against Sims did just that—where there is a great interest in having that rule changed back to what it was, and when the people want an amendment to the Constitution, then and in that case it is the duty of the Congress to present that amendment to the people for ratification through their legislatures.

I remind the Senator from North Carolina that to date 28 State legislatures have approved resolutions calling for the convening of constitutional conventions, again under article V of the Federal Constitution, for the purpose of amending the Constitution so as to overcome the harshness, the unfairness, and the unwanted features of Reynolds against Simms.

So there is a widespread demand and desire on the part of the people to be heard on this issue, and we are now engaged in a debate to decide whether we shall let them be heard in that orderly fashion provided by the Constitution for the amendment of that basic document.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Nebraska upon a painstaking, thorough, eloquent exposition of one of the serious problems that confront our country at the present moment. He has pointed out what I believe is one of the fundamental reasons why the amendment should be approved; that is, that the question of the apportionment of the membership in a State legislature is essentially a legislative or political question, not a judicial question. It cannot be made a judicial question because there is no judicial standard by which State legislatures can be apportioned.

I thank the Senator from Nebraska for yielding.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from North Carolina for his pertinent and persuasive contribution to the debate.

Mr. President, a vote against the amendment is a vote, in the long run, to undermine public confidence in the integrity of the U.S. Senate, and the balanced Federal system of legislative representation, which stands as an example for so many States in the composition of their own State legislatures.

Prof. Alfred de Grazia, the noted political scientist, in his recently published work, "Apportionment and Representative Government," points out that:

> The proponents of equal population districts have fumbled for a logic that would prove State senates are not analogous to the Federal Senate. Historically, their argument is groundless and unworthy of attention. Moreover, as a political matter, it seems absurd to assert that the National Government may have a Senate based upon representation of each State equally, but that a State senate may not be composed of representatives from the counties or multicounty areas of the State. Still, if they wish the courts to destroy the State senate apportionments, they must chew this rag. Else the courts will perceive clearly that to disturb the structure of State senates must imply the right to reshape the U.S. Senate.

This is no idle possibility. In *Bolling* v. *Sharpe*, 347 U.S. 497, 500, the Supreme Court held that racial segregation in the public schools of the District of Columbia is a denial to Negro children of the due process of law guaranteed by the 5th amendment—not the 14th amendment, but the 5th—even though the 5th amendment does not contain an equal protection clause, as does the 14th amendment which applies only to the States and on which the Court's earlier decision prohibiting States from maintaining racially segregated public schools was based.

I am sure most of the Members of this body are in agreement with the Court's decision to end racial segregation in the public schools of the District of Columbia, but the constitutional precedent established by Bolling against Sharpe should be of grave concern to us today in our consideration of reapportionment problems. In the Court's opinion, delivered by Chief Justice Warren, it is stated:

> In view of our decision that the Constitution prohibits the States from maintaining racially segregated public schools, it would be unthinkable that the same Constitution would impose a lesser duty on the Federal Government.

THE GOAL OF THE PEOPLE'S OPPONENTS

It should be obvious that unless the Dirksen amendment is passed by Congress and ratified by the States, and the present doctrine of equal population representation in both houses of State legislatures is modified, the same reasoning used in Bolling against Sharpe could be logically applied to eliminate the traditional basis of representation in the U.S. Senate and substitute arbitrarily drawn equal population districts for State boundaries. Indeed, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has publicly stated that he deplores the existence of the U.S. Senate. Presumably, he would be happy to see it abolished in the form we now know it, but I hope that Senator CLARK is a minority of one in this regard.

The speech delivered by the Senator from Maryland in this body on June 2—a compilation of arguments voiced by dogmatic opponents to the people's right of expression on this issue before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments—raised various objections to the Dirksen amendment. Three of these objections have been rendered utterly superfluous by the wording of the amendment in the form now under consideration.

UNDER PROPOSED AMENDMENT JUDICIAL REVIEW EXISTS

The first of these objections was a fear that the Dirksen amendment in its original form could be interpreted as preventing judicial review of action taken as a result of the amendment. The sentence on which Senator TYDINGS based his fears was as follows:

> The right and power to determine the composition of the legislature of a State and the apportionment of the membership thereof shall remain in the people of that State.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] pointed out that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] had introduced a resolution with the same basic purpose as the Dirksen amendment which, however, did not contain the sentence just quoted, and Senator TYDINGS admitted that an amendment which did not include this sentence would not infringe upon the right of judicial review. This question is now moot as the sentence objected to has been eliminated from the Dirksen resolution as now before us.

PERIODIC REVIEW BY PEOPLE IS PROVIDED

A second objection of the Senator from Maryland was that the Dirksen amendment in its original form made no provision for periodic review of apportionment plans varying from strict equal population district representation. This question also is no longer valid as the Dirksen amendment now provides that any such apportionment plan must be resubmitted to the people and approved within 2 years following each decennial census.

RIGHTS OF MINORITIES ARE PROTECTED

A third objection of the Senator from Maryland, which has been rendered completely moot by the final wording of the Dirksen amendment, is the claim that the amendment would be inimical to the interests of racial minorities. This is a ridiculous argument on the face of it and is a particularly inapplicable argument with respect to the sponsorship of this amendment by Senator DIRKSEN, whose outstanding leadership contributed greatly to passage of the civil rights legislation of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. At this very hour a conference is being held between Members of the House and Senate to reconcile differences between the two bodies on the voting rights bill. Both of those measures guarantee the right of all Americans of voting age to register regardless of race, and to be able to actually exercise the rights of citizens in every way.

The opponents of the Dirksen amendment have argued that permitting the people of the various States to choose to elect members of one house of their State legislatures on a basis other than population would permit the majority of the people in the various States to form districts in a way that would discriminate against racial minorities. This argument has been a spurious one to begin with and has now been effectively demolished by the revised wording of the Dirksen amendment which makes explicitly clear that apportionment plans must fully comply with all other provisions of the U.S. Constitution including those amendments which guarantee the equal rights of all citizens regardless of race, color, or creed. To be specific, the only qualifications for basing one house on factors other than population are factors of geography and political subdivision.

We are getting into a ridiculous and self-defeating situation when we try to catalog every move on the basis of its possible effects in terms of ethnic counts. I invite the attention of my colleagues to a recent decision of the U.S. District Court for the District of Hawaii, rejecting a Senate apportionment plan adopted by that State's legislature. The case I am citing is *Holt* v. *Richardson*, 240 F. Supp. 724 (D.C. Hawaii, 1965). Among various reasons for its decision, the court cited a statistician's findings that one proposed district "encompassed a highly heterogeneous area containing a multitude of Caucasian widows in the uplands area, and an overabundance of

Filipino males in the seaward portion of the district."

It is my opinion that the interests of Caucasian widows and Filipino males alike in any State are best served by not segregating them into arbitrary confinements but by regarding them as American citizens sharing a community of interests with their neighbors in the natural geographical and political subdivisions that exist.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the opinion in Bolling against Sharpe, and the text of the opinion in Holt against Richardson be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

THE PEOPLE VERSUS POLITICAL POWER

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the opponents of this amendment are obsessed with the intricacies of political power, of putting group against group. I submit that this amendment is in the best tradition of American representative government, and that not the least of its beneficial effects will be to substitute, in reapportionment decisions, the will of the people, within proper constitutional safeguards, as expressed in statewide elections, for stultified, statistical legalistic wrangling in the courts such as has been going on since the decision in Reynolds against Simms.

It should be further pointed out that equal population districts, far from protecting minorities, are potentially dangerous to the interests of minorities. All of us, in one sense or another, are members of minority groups. In some States farmers are minorities, people living in small towns can be minorities, people dependent for their livelihood on resource industries can be minorities. That is the case in the State of Nebraska, as well as many other States.

The creation of arbitrary districts without reference to existing political subdivisions is an encouragement to gerrymandering schemes which, throughout our history, have been extremely harmful to minorities, whether those minorities are racial, ethnic, political, or economic. Multimember districts which are possible under strict application of the one-man, one-vote dogma are also a potential way to discriminate against minorities.

It is amusing that the opponents of the Dirksen amendment on the one hand claim that equal population districts are necessary to weaken the power of rural minorities, while on the other they argue that this same system is necessary to increase the power of racial minorities. They cannot have the argument both ways. As De Grazia says:

> The pressure of demographic effects in apportionment schemes is used by the advocates of equal population districts both to condemn the existing system and to praise the new. If one so-called minority is holding up the majority program, why do equal population advocates justify a new scheme on behalf of new minorities? They should be explicit so that a court of law and of opinion can judge whether they are truly majority advocates or minority advocates.

The whole purpose, theory, and intent of the Dirksen amendment is to permit States to insure protection to minorities by choosing systems of apportionment which, while giving due consideration to population, place emphasis on community interest and provide a weight against overcentralization of power. There are many valid reasons that large geographic areas, even though more sparsely populated than some urban areas, require greater legislative representation.

Mr. President, the saving grace of the Dirksen amendment is that the determination of those districts places emphasis on community interest and provides weight against overcentralization of power. It would be a power that would be exercised by elected representatives of the people of that State. The representatives would work out a plan to be submitted to the people of that State. That plan will not and cannot, under the Dirksen amendment, go into effect unless approved by a popular vote.

It is physically easier for a legislator to represent people densely concentrated in a city than the same number scattered throughout the countryside. In this connection, De Grazia points out:

> If one were to examine a map showing the location of the Ford car dealers, or of a life insurance company, or to plot locations of wholesalers of wrapping papers, he would probably find that these, like many other companies and governmental agencies, maintain offices doing less volume in rural and small city areas than other offices in big cities. More city business can be transacted through a single office than town and country business. The work of legislators is in good part liaison and broker between individual constituents, groups, and governmental units on the one hand and the agencies of the State on the other. The town and country legislators cannot transact the volume of business a city legislator can.

ELIHU ROOT PRINCIPLES

Historian Robert Luce in his penetrating work, "Legislative Principles," discussed the arguments of the late, great Senator Elihu Root on this subject. Senator Root stated:

> There were two reasons for not applying strict rules of representation according to absolute population of the whole state, first, that territorial extension, variety and separation of interests required a representation not necessary when there was a condensation in the great centers of population; and in the second place, that the great increase of effective force which comes from the election of a large number of representatives in one city—representatives who represent not in fact their separate districts but the whole city, representatives who are responsible to the same public opinion, and, in fact, represent but one combined interest of the citizens of that city—the great accumulated power created by that combination so far outweighed the effective power of a great number of scattered representatives of widely divided centers of population, small centers of population, that a difference in the ratio went but a small way toward equalization.
>
> Every man who is sent to the legislature from a great city represents not this artificial territory, this territory artificially defined; that is but a means of determining what voters shall pass upon the question of whether he or another man goes to the legislature. But he represents the whole city; every representative of every part of the city represents the whole city and no special part of it. I insist upon the principle which has been adopted in a large number of States in this Union, in almost every State which has had to deal with the problem of a great city within its borders and the relations of that city to an agricultural community that the problem which they have had to deal with shall be dealt with by us upon the same principle; that the small and widely scattered communities with their feeble power comparatively because of their division shall, by the distribution of representation, be put upon an equal footing, so far as may be, with the concentrated power of the cities. Otherwise, we never can have a truly representative Government.

MINORITY PROTECTION

In considering the need for minority protection through area representation in State legislatures, it should be pointed out that the need of any local unit does not diminish because some other unit has grown to great size. Opponents of the Dirksen amendment argue that to give minorities, other than racial minorities, effective representation is a form of discrimination against majorities—although they inconsistently talk out of the other side of their mouths with respect to racial minorities.

De Grazia points out:

> In numerous realms of life the law tries to engage in such preventive discrimination in favor of the probably or potentially weaker—laws giving extra assistance to the legal defense of the poor; relieving the poor from burdens that the well-to-do have to carry; providing educational opportunities to the poor; cutting down the estates of the rich deceased; giving minorities representation regardless of numerical proportions in committees and legislative bodies elsewhere; laws against tendencies to monopoly; laws giving minority elements some kind of "better deal" as labor unions are helped to organize within corporations.

Do the opponents of the Dirksen amendment, who base their opposition on claims that area representation discriminates against majorities in favor of minorities, wish to extend the logic of their argument to positions in opposition to the expenditure of public funds in the war on poverty programs on the grounds that such expenditures discriminate against the majority in favor of the minority?

Another reason why many States have adopted area representation in at least one house of their State legislatures is the need for protection of the less easily organized areas from the political power of more easily organized areas. Again, De Grazia points out:

> The big city presents better opportunities to organize on a large scale than the country and smaller cities do. There can be a boss of a rural area, there can be a county courthouse gang, there can be a clique that runs a small-sized city and all of these present serious problems * * * but a Chicago or New York machine might dominate a whole State if given the chance to repeat on a statewide scale what has perpetrated upon their own city.

CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN

Chief Justice Earl Warren, when he was Governor of California stated about this subject:

> **There was a time when California was completely dominated by boss rule, but**

> liberal election laws and representative apportionment have liberated us from such domination.
>
> Any weakening of these laws would invite a return of boss rule which we are happily rid of. Our State has made almost unbelievable progress under our present system of legislative apportionment. I believe we should keep it.
>
> They (the 58 counties) are far more important in the life of our State than their population bears to the entire population of the State. In this respect they are comparable to some of the less populous but important States of the Union.
>
> It is for this reason I have never been in favor of restricting their representation in our State senate to a strictly population basis.
>
> It is the same reason that the Founding Fathers of our country gave balanced representation to the States of the Union—equal representation in one house and proportionate representation based upon population in the other.

Mr. President, we have testimony from members of the California Legislature on that very point. In their testimony they went into the plan in great detail.

I commend to my colleagues the reading of the testimony of the witnesses from the State of California. Their testimony will be found in the transcript of the hearings.

BIG CITY MACHINES

It is no secret that the hard-core opposition to the Dirksen amendment stems from those who speak for cities in the United States which are traditionally dominated by machine politics—New York, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, and Detroit.

The elimination of the three objections expressed by the Senator from Maryland to the Dirksen amendment which I have discussed already and which have been rendered moot by the actual wording of the amendment as now revised leave four main thrusts to remaining arguments made.

FALLACY OF THE OPPOSITION

The first of these objections I shall dismiss briefly because it is palpably false. This is the argument that apportionment plans submitted to the people could not be trusted to be fair ones as, in some instances, such plans would be drafted by allegedly malapportioned legislatures. This objection is totally without merit, for, if any plans are unfair and rejected by the voters, the strict population apportionment of both houses must apply under existing Supreme Court rules and the terms of the Dirksen amendment.

The second of the remaining arguments is contained in the Senator from Maryland's long, rambling piece of historical mish-mash attempting to demonstrate that the Founding Fathers of our country were dedicated to a man to the dogmatic principle of one man, one vote.

It is amusing that many of the people who normally denigrate tradition should appeal to it in this instance. I would raise the further question that if the submitted premise is correct; namely, that the ground rules for legislative apportionment changed from an 18th century concept of equal population districts to a 19th century concept of area representation, would that necessarily be bad? I would point out that the Founding Fathers defended slavery, which was eliminated in the 19th century. Would the opponents of the Dirksen amendment have us return to slavery merely because the concept of equal opportunity for all races came into being in the 19th century?

In any event, the historical arguments of the Senator from Maryland are arrant nonsense and disclose a shocking and inaccurate reporting of history, as a matter of fact.

The Senator quoted from Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, and James Madison in an attempt to prove that the Founding Fathers were unanimously in favor of apportionment by strict equal population districts. The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] even said:

> All of our leading Founding Fathers—may I stress "all"—felt this way.

Senators TYDINGS and PROXMIRE, of course, neglected to observe that Thomas Jefferson vociferously favored agrarian supremacy and spoke from the standpoint of one who strongly felt that the power of urban centers should be curbed.

JAMES MADISON

As for James Madison, I should like to place in the RECORD his remarks from the Federalist Papers, No. 51:

> In republican government the legislative authority necessarily predominates. The remedy for this is to divide the legislature into different branches; and to render them, by different modes of election and different principles of action, as little connected with each other as the nature of their common functions and their common dependence on society will admit.

JOHN ADAMS

John Adams, who has always been considered a member in good standing of the Founding Fathers, had this to say:

> To expect self-denial from men when they have a majority in their favor, and consequently, power to gratify themselves is to disbelieve all history and universal experience * * * there is, in short, no possible way of defending the minority from the tyranny of the majority but by giving the former a negative of the latter.

Any contention to the contrary from these quotations could reasonably be classed as being held by one not as well read on the ramifications of the variety of opinions held by the various Founding Fathers on the subject of apportionment as he should be.

ORIGINAL STATE CONSTITUTIONS WERE ON NONPOPULATION APPORTIONMENT

The first constitutions of the Original States reflected a wide variety of opinion on desirable systems of legislative apportionment, and in the main demonstrated widespread approval for balanced systems giving recognition not just to population but to community interests and the necessity to counterpoise overcentralization of power. I shall list a brief rundown of the apportionment methods chosen by the Thirteen Original States.

This rundown is predicated upon analysis of the subject by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. The material begins at page 1126 of the hearings. Three corrections would have to be made. Those are the ones pertaining to the State of Maryland, the State of New Jersey, and the State of Pennsylvania. I have those correcting pages in my hand, consisting of the constitutions that were in effect when the Republic came into being in 1789.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the constitutions in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered. (See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the first State about which I shall comment is Connecticut, which apportioned its representatives by towns, starting after the Revolution with two representatives apportioned from each town, but gave but one each to newly incorporated towns regardless of size. That is not "one-man-one-vote." That is plainly a geographic or political subdivisions proposition.

Senators were also chosen on a geographic basis, with no regard to population.

Second. In Delaware, which proudly designates itself "The First State," both senators and representatives were chosen by counties with no regard to population.

Third. In Georgia, which had a unicameral legislature, 5 seacoast counties were given 36 legislators, 2 middle counties 20 legislators and one upland county given 10. Yet these three areas were approximately equal in population.

Fourth. In the State of Maryland, the house of delegates consisted of four members from each county and two each from Annapolis and Baltimore. Members of the senate were chosen by an electoral college, the members of which in turn, were elected on a county basis.

Fifth. In Massachusetts every town had at least one representative in the house. Forty senators were divided among 13 districts and proportioned to the State tax paid by each district.

Sixth. In New Hampshire there was a very large house elected by towns and a very small senate, the seats of which were filled by districts.

Seventh. The original constitution of New Jersey assigned three members of the assembly to each county, permitting the legislature to add to or diminish the number when they might judge it "equitable and proper on the principles of more equal representation." The senate consisted of one senator from each county, regardless of population.

Eighth. The New York Assembly consisted of 70 men elected from the counties in proportions constitutionally fixed, but subject to correction by septennial censuses. The senate was composed of 24 members elected from four large senatorial districts.

Ninth. North Carolina began as a State with one senator from each county and one from each of six specified towns.

Tenth. Pennsylvania originally had a unicameral legislature—as my own State of Nebraska now has, and has had for the last approximately 30 years—the members of which were to be elected annually by the counties and Philadelphia.

The State, however, soon revised its constitution incorporating a bicameral legislature modeled after the Federal Constitution, the lower house elected by population and the senate chosen from districts.

Eleventh. In Rhode Island, where no constitution was adopted until 1842, apportionment was by modified population with each city and town having at least one representative, and none to have more than one-sixth of the total. Each town and city had one senator, regardless of population.

Twelfth. The South Carolina constitution apportioned senators and representatives by parishes and districts and directed that reapportionment 7 years later, and then after every 14 years should "be proportioned in the most equitable and just manner according to the particular and comparative strength and taxable property of the different parts of the same."

Thirteenth. The Virginia constitution required each county annually to elect two members to the lower house, while the senate consisted of 12 men chosen from specially formed districts.

I would like to remind the Presiding Officer and listeners that that was the State of Thomas Jefferson.

The first State admitted to the Union after the formation of the Union was Vermont. It originally had a unicameral legislature with representatives apportioned by towns for the first 7 years, two from major towns and one from smaller towns, and after 7 years, one from each.

From this brief rundown, in spite of the many assertions to the contrary, it is readily apparent that the proposition that the doctrine of equal population districts is holy writ handed down as revealed truth by the Founding Fathers is unadulterated inaccuracy.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from Nebraska explain the source of the information reflecting the manner in which legislative representation was apportioned in the Original States? I believe he has already made mention of it.

Mr. HRUSKA. I made mention of it. The source of the information is the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. In that connection, the material is to be found in the hearings beginning at page 1126. That material, on that page and following pages, should be read in conjunction with the corrected sheets which have been inserted in the record in the case of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maryland.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Based upon what has been related concerning the method by which legislators were apportioned, it would seem, on the basis of the information provided by the Senator from Nebraska dealing with the Thirteen States, that representation solely on the basis of population was a rare condition.

Mr. HRUSKA. It was, indeed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Practically each of the Thirteen States, in one manner or another, and most of them completely, made the apportionment of representation on the basis of towns and counties: Is that the inference to be drawn from the statistical information given by the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HRUSKA. I did not understand the Senator's question completely.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the Thirteen Original States, the representation was allocated principally and practically in all of the States on the basis of representation of towns and counties.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct. There is no question about it, in considering the original text of the constitutions involved in that situation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is, even though one town had a larger population than another, the allocation of the representatives was numerically identical.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have not been able to identify a single instance, except probably New York, where representation was allocated on the basis of population. If we could take a look at New York for a moment——

Mr. HRUSKA. In New York, the senate was composed of 24 members elected from 4 large senatorial districts. The assembly consisted of 70 men elected from the counties in proportions constitutionally fixed, but that was subject to correction by a septennial census.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The first sentence of the paragraph dealing with New York reads as follows:

> The New York Assembly consisted of 70 men elected from the counties in proportions constitutionally fixed, but subject to correction by septennial census.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It does not state whether the problems were on the basis of geographic area, or on the basis of population.

Mr. HRUSKA. In the brief description of the New York situation, the population of the senatorial districts is not detailed; but in my judgment, the Senator is correct in his appraisal of the fact that New York is the only State of the 14 States to which I have referred which anywhere near approaches population as the basis of apportionment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator referred to 13 States. The first State admitted to the Union was Vermont.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Based upon what the Senator from Nebraska has said, the conclusion must be drawn that in the original State, representation was assigned on the basis of geographical area and not on the basis of population.

Mr. HRUSKA. If any generalization could be made in that regard, that would have to be it.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the Senator from Maryland, himself, really believes that our Founding Fathers, having perfected a sort of holy writ, passed it down to later generations including this one, because he stated, in part:

> A fair examination of the facts shows that for the first hundred years of our Federal Republic our legislatures were almost without exception fairly apportioned substantially on the basis of population.

Mr. President, I submit that the key word here is "substantially." It is a qualifying word indicating awareness that factors other than population were taken into account in the early composition of our State legislatures, just as they have been in more recent times. Proponents of the Dirksen amendment fully support the idea that State legislatures should be constituted "substantially" on the basis of population. Under its terms, one house of each State legislature must be apportioned strictly on the basis of population. The factor of population certainly will be a substantial consideration in apportionment plans adopted under the terms of this amendment for the other house of State legislatures where those plans include other factors.

But, as Prof. Robert G. McCloskey, writing in the Harvard Law Review, volume 76, November 1962, stated:

> It is certainly untrue that "one-man, one-vote" was regarded by the framers [of the Constitution] as an imperative basic principle for carrying on the day-to-day, year-to-year process of government; and it is at least dubious that any such principle became embodied in our constitutional tradition in the years that followed.

Mr. McCloskey continues:

> But it is beyond doubt that the framers of the Constitution acknowledged popular consent as the indispensable basis for setting up that process of government in the first place. Though the Government might take various forms and possess various powers, those characteristics were derived from the consent of the governed. If this central principle, so created in the Declaration, was not expressed in the explicit language of the Constitution, it is because after 1776 it was taken for granted. Its claim to be a fundamental principle of the Constitution is about as solid as any claim could well be.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is rather interesting to observe what Prof. Robert G. McCloskey stated:

> It is certainly untrue.

He uses a rather emphatic word "untrue."

"That one man, one vote was regarded by the framers of the Constitution as an imperative basic principle for carrying on the day-to-day, year-to-year process of government."

Mr. President, I believe that the use of that word is quite significant, because the professor knew that that argument was being advanced, and he went on to point out that the argument was faulty.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator for his observation. He is correct in his appraisal of the meaning of that word "untrue." It is quite an unbending and inflexible word.

EXPAND THE PEOPLE'S VOICE

Mr. McCloskey's observations lead us to the third main remaining argument of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and his supporters—the upside-down, intellectually bankrupt argument that the Dirksen amendment proposes to restrict the right of franchise rather than vice versa. The sheer audacity in advancing such an argument is wonderful to behold. It is an audacity born of desperation. As anyone with third grade intelligence should be able to understand, the Dirksen amendment extends the right of the franchise to allow the people of all States—not just the people of some of the States which have enjoyed this right in the past—to have a meaningful voice in the manner in which they wish their legislatures constituted.

It would be subject to the periodic review which would be required by the Dirksen amendment. Within 2 years after the census is completed, there must be a resubmittal in those States, where such departure from the rule of Reynolds against Simms prevails, so that a substitute plan will go to the voters of the States and they will have a new opportunity, once every 10 years, to decide whether they wish to continue or whether they wish to return to equal population as the sole source of apportionment.

Indeed, the chief point the Supreme Court made in its decision in Baker against Carr was that in Tennessee, a State with no provision for popular initiative, the State legislature had last been apportioned in 1901, and no opportunity ever had been given the people of Tennessee since that time to determine whether they wished a change.

The Dirksen amendment, in conformity with America's basic governmental principle of popular consent, provides that apportionment plans for one house of State legislatures at variance with strict population representation must be submitted to the people of that State, voting on a one-man-one-vote basis in a statewide election, for approval or rejection, and that no such manner of apportionment can continue in effect beyond 2 years after the following decennial census, at which time such a plan or a similar one proposed by the legislature, must again be submitted to the voters for their approval or rejection.

How this extension of the franchise can be viewed as a restriction of the franchise is beyond understanding, except perhaps in the sense that some words are defined differently by some people than by other people, as in the use of the word "democracy" by the Communist countries to describe a system of government totally different from democracy as we know it here.

We know, of course, in another field, totally unrelated to this field, how the use of the word "democracy" by Communist countries is used to describe a government totally different from the democracy that we know here. Certainly, in the case of Tennessee, where the amendment would bring to the people of Tennessee an opportunity to vote on their plan of apportionment once every 10 years, when they have had no such opportunity since 1901, would not be an abridgment of the right of franchise; it would be an enlargement of it.

WHY FEAR THE PEOPLE?

Opponents of the Dirksen amendment cannot avoid the uncomfortable position they have placed themselves in—the position that the people cannot be trusted to make the right decisions at the polls, that is, decisions not meeting the liking and approval of such opponents. That is what it means. But it should be noted well that those opponents are not those to whom reference is made in the first three words of our Constitution—namely, "We, the People." Not "we, the Senate"; not "we, the Congress"; not "we, the opponents of the Dirksen amendment"; but "We, the People." Those words refer to all the people, not just to those who by their opposition seek to prevent the people from an opportunity to make a choice.

CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED

In fact, there is painted a frightening picture of the alleged ease with which the mass of voters can be misled in election campaigns. If any Senator has so little faith in the ability of the people in his State to comprehend the issues in an election on legislative apportionment, how can he feel comfortable serving in the U.S. Senate to which those same people have elected him? How else can the "consent of the governed be determined?

The Legislature of the State of Maryland, and the legislatures of many other States—28 in all—have called for a constitutional convention to enact just such an amendment as the Senator from Maryland opposes. And it should be pointed out that not just the houses in those States that are elected on a basis other than population have acted, but the houses as well that are elected on a strict population basis.

THE MICHIGAN CASE

The example of the State of Michigan clearly refutes the argument that the people are too stupid or unreliable to be entrusted with the right to vote on legislative apportionment plans. In 1952 the voters of Michigan were presented with two proposed constitutional amendments on reapportionment, both appearing on the ballot as the result of initiatives. The first proposal provided for a senate of 33 members elected from single member districts. The ratio for districts was the State population divided by 33 and no district might contain a greater than 15 percent deviation from the ratio. The house was to be of 99 members with the ratio calculated in the same way. This was a pure equal population district plan.

The second proposal on the ballot called for a Federal plan, placing the senate on an area basis with fixed districts described in the constitution. The house was set at 110 members with the ratio computed by dividing the State population by 110. A county or group of counties received one representative if it had over 50 percent of the ratio and another for each full ratio thereafter. This, in other words, was a plan that combined population representation in one house with area representation recognizing community interests in the other.

The voters rejected the strict one-man-one-vote plan by 1,415,355 to 924,242, a margin of 491,113, almost half a million. They approved the Federal plan of apportionment by a vote of 1,269,807 to 975,518. Only two of the State's eight industrial counties favored the defeated proposal. Eighty-two percent of those voting for the Governor voted on the first proposal, 79 percent on the second.

As Dr. de Grazia has pointed out:

> The Michigan case is a spectacular demonstration of how idealogues of the egalitarian-majoritarian type can leap quickly from adoration to contempt of the will of the citizens as expressed at the polls. The initiators of the equal populations proposal defeated in the popular voting and the plaintiffs seeking to declare the subsequent decision of the voters null and void were explicitly and overtly one and the same—the leaders of the Michigan State AFL–CIO. They asked for an expression of the will of the people at the polls on the equal populations proposal; when the "will of the people" did not conform to their plan, even those supposed to benefit most opposing them, they turned to the courts in order to nullify the clear and unambiguous decision of the voters.

NO DOUBLE STANDARDS

I do not believe that we in this body can operate under a double standard. I do not believe that we can periodically appeal to the intelligence of the voters of our respective States to elect us to office and at the same time accuse the voters of gullibility and lack of intelligence as an argument to deny them the right granted by the Dirksen amendment to vote on the method of apportioning State legislatures.

The final objection in the remaining arguments is perhaps the most curious and offensive of all: The contention that this Congress has usurped the power of the States and the contention that this alleged usurpation has resulted from the failure of the State legislatures to conduct themselves properly—an alleged failure that would be instantly cured if both houses of all State legislatures were elected on an equal population district basis.

The odd argument is advanced that Congress is besieged with problems in the areas of housing, air and water pollution, mass transportation, and more, because legislatures which are alleged to be malapportioned have failed to act in this connection within their own States.

In the first instance, the argument is ridiculous on the face of it, but I would say to those who advance it, what of those States the legislatures of which already are comprised on the basis of population? Has a single such State suggested to this Congress that it no longer wishes Federal funds for the purposes cited? Of course not. Yet such action would be the logical conclusion if the premise advanced were correct.

I point out further that the States have led the Federal Government in a great variety of fields, not the least of which are fair employment practices and voting rights. Or, I would point out that long before the Federal Government involved itself with the issues cited of housing, air and water pollution, and mass transportation, many States were embarked on major State projects to cope with just these problems.

I, for one, do not wish to be a party to any childish name-calling battle between the Federal Government and the State governments. Each should respect the other, and in these modern times must function cooperatively with many programs of a partnership nature.

No legislature has a perfect record. This Congress itself is often criticized, and State legislatures certainly are proper subjects of criticism on occasion, but I think any fairminded observer must be willing to agree that State legislatures as a whole have done a remarkable job in many fields, including the fields of education and welfare.

There were pointed out instances where State senates have disapproved legislation approved in the lower State houses. This, of course, is the checks and balances system at work. Lower State houses also have turned down legislation approved by State senates. The U.S. Senate has refused to go along with legislation approved by the House of Representatives and vice versa on countless occasions. For every example of so-called good legislation passed by a population-oriented house and disapproved by an area-oriented senate, similar examples can be cited of similar legislation passed by an area-oriented senate and disapproved by a population-oriented house.

In his work, referred to above, Dr. de Grazia points to a pertinent study of the clash of metropolitan and nonmetropolitan interests in the State legislatures of Illinois and Missouri by Dr. David R. Derge, published in the American Political Science Review of December, 1958, page 1065. In it Professor Derge compares the voting behavior of metropolitan and nonmetropolitan legislators. He reports:

> The nonmetropolitan members seldom vote as a bloc against the metropolitan; nor do the metropolitan members usually vote together. When the city legislators do vote together they usually prevail.

Dr. de Grazia refers to another significant study dealing with the special session of the Missouri General Assembly in 1958 called to consider "emergency" legislation requested by the administrations of St. Louis and Kansas City. This study, reported in National Civic Review, observes:

> The difficulty in passing city legislation does not come from rural members, but from members of the city's own delegation. * * * It is almost invariably true that if the city's delegation is united upon a measure it will be accepted by the entire general assembly.

The legislation in question failed in passage. As Dr. de Grazia points out:

> This evidence is damaging enough to the nonempirical and simplistic theory of the country as the source of the city's woes. But, in addition, Missouri happens to be one of the States most closely apportioned on an equal populations basis. And in both houses.

FALLACIOUS ARGUMENT

To argue that the trend toward increased centralization of government in the United States is simply the result of failure of State governments to be responsive to the needs of the people is to ignore a welter of factors that have contributed to this trend—the revolution in speed of communications and travel; the decisive weakening of the "sovereignty of the States" concept as a result of the Civil War; the centralizing effects of U.S. participation in two major World Wars in this century; and the adoption in 1913 of the 16th amendment giving the Federal Government the power to raise revenues on a previously unimaginable scale.

To argue that State legislatures have been unresponsive to the electorate is to ignore the fact pointed out by Robert G. Dixon, Jr., professor of law at the George Washington University Law School, in his article, "Reapportionment Perspectives: What Is Fair Representation?" in the April 1965 issue of the American Bar Association Journal:

> There are three instruments of representation and legislative leadership in State governments, not two: the upper house of the legislature, the lower house of the legislature (traditionally elected on a one man, one vote basis in most States) and the Governor (invariably elected on a one man, one vote basis).

As Mr. Dixon points out:

> The Governor proposes and vetoes and normally has an even greater legislative role in State government than the President has in our National Government.

A final fallacy of this particular line of argument advanced by the Senator from Maryland and his supporters against the proposition that the people of any State should have the right to choose to select members of one house of their State legislatures on a basis other than population is clearly revealed in the fact that one House—the Senate—of the Federal Congress is selected on a basis other than population. If election of State senators on an area basis results, as opponents of the Dirksen amendment maintain, in unresponsiveness by State governments to public needs, how can the Federal Government with one legislative House elected on an area basis be responsive to those same needs?

The untenability of the argument of opponents of the Dirksen amendment on this point is illustrated by a question raised by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] during the speech on June 2, by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. The Senator asked:

> Is it not true that when one house has been based on elements other than population the State governments have been unable to act, unable, primarily, to act on urban affairs, as well as many other problems, because they have different constituencies and because there is a built-in conflict, assuring the States that their legislatures will clash, conflict, disagree, and frequently be unable to act?

If the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] believes that the composition of two State legislative houses on different bases renders effective legislative action impossible, he must also believe that the composition of the U.S. Congress, where the two Houses are constituted on different bases, renders the U.S. Congress incapable of acting effectively. If this were true—which, of course, it is not—then how can opponents of the Dirksen amendment logically argue that the Congress has acted in various fields because of the ineffectiveness in these fields of the State legislatures?

The States rights argument of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and his supporters, who have traditionally denigrated States rights in other contexts, is hypocrisy at its most blatant point of view. The prospect of arresting the flow of political power in Washington depends on strong State governments, on viable State governments, on governments selected in a manner which balances urban and rural interests and which provides some measure of participation by minority interests, whether they are racial, sectional, or political minorities.

TREND TOWARD POWER

Certainly the trend toward greater political centralization can never be arrested if the people become imbued with a feeling of helplessness and disinterest in their State governments through denial of the right to choose the methods of electing their State governments appropriate to their State within constitutional ground rules. The trend can never be arrested if the people, as in California, Colorado, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, and many others are to be told that, having chosen on a Statewide one-man, one-vote basis to constitute one house of their legislatures on an area basis, their votes and their preferences are meaningless.

During the discourse of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] raised the question:

> I ask if it is not true that questions that deal with urban problems that have been crowding the Congress of the United States this year as never before and will continue to crowd us in future years—such as housing problems, clean air and clean water, mass transportation and many other questions—would be handled more expeditiously and in a more satisfactory way on a local or State level if the States had a one-man, one-vote representation in both houses of their State legislatures, so they would not be divided against themselves as they are now and as they would be under the Dirksen amendment?

This question implies that if the Dirksen amendment is not adopted and one man, one vote is applied to both houses of all State legislatures, the Federal Government would leave these issues to the States. Are the Senators from Wisconsin and Maryland and their supporters willing to pledge that if the Dirksen amendment were rejected by the Senate they would oppose all proposals from here on out to involve the Federal Government in housing problems, clean air, clean water and mass transportation?

OPPONENTS FOR BOSS RULE

In the final analysis, opponents of the Dirksen amendment must be for boss rule of big city machines—the kind of boss rule discussed by Chief Justice Earl Warren—and for the extension of opportunities to gerrymander legislative districts for the benefit of those machines. They are opposed to the recognition of minority and community interests and they are opposed to the basic principle that Government should be by the consent of the governed. They distrust the intelligence of the people to make their own decisions.

They are blinded by the simplistic appeal of the one-man, one-vote slogan, appropriate to the cause of civil rights but totally inappropriate to the issues of legislative apportionment.

I quote again from Professor de Grazia:

> In the hypnotic glare of the equal protection idea blindly seeking a grotesquely simple equality, the argument against the existing apportionments continues to run: If the number electing an official in one constituency is less than in another when both officials have the same formal power in the same policy making group, then the people of the first constituency are denied something and the extent of the denial and inequality varies with the difference in number between the two constituencies. * * * No attention is paid to whether people are truly represented.
>
> A mechanical view of man and human relations is held and a numbers obsession evolves.

This simple belief in the unrestrained power of majorities has, on the most cursory examination, no relation to equality. As Dr. de Grazia points out:

> If X, Y, and Z are 3 constituencies and each has 1,000 people and 1 representative, then, according to this belief (in absolute numerical equality) each person living in X, Y, and Z has equal power over his representative, and representatives A, B, and C have equal power in relationship to each other in respect to whatever they do collectively and individually as legislators. * * * However, if the election of A, B, and C is by majority principle, then a number of people will not be equally powered—they will win or lose only.
>
> Furthermore, if A, B, and C have to decide by majority vote as legislatures usually try to do, then it will occur that A and B, or B and C, or A and C can override the third man. The majority principle operates to make a great many people and representatives greatly unequal all the time. * * * The equal populations numerology * * * is a dangerous flirtation with mass neurosis. Man loses something as a citizen—without regard to slogans of one man, one vote—when he is reduced to naked abstract numbers. He is a faceless equality with other numbered citizens. They become equally devoid of group ties and human responses until they become the mass. The mass, in fact, cannot be said to exist until citizenship has been destroyed through individuals being torn loose from their social relationships and reduced to separate items helplessly confronting the central state.

Professor de Grazia has expressed with great vigor the case against strict reliance on equal population districts as the only permissible method of legislative apportionment. Perhaps he has overstated the case.

In any event, supporters of the Dirksen amendment wish only for the people in each State to have the right to choose within a rigidly restricted framework the method of legislative apportionment which they deem appropriate to their State, whether it be a strict population basis for both houses, or some variation of the Federal plan under which the Federal Government successfully operates.

It must be stressed that the Dirksen amendment is permissive in nature. That statement has been made on the floor of the Senate many times this afternoon, and it will be made many more times, because it is of the essence.

It does not require any State to apportion one house of a bicameral legislature on a basis other than population. Only if the majority of the voters in any State so approve such an apportionment plan can any variation from a strict population apportionment be adopted. Regardless of the existing composition of State legislatures, only the people voting at a statewide election can place into effect an apportionment plan providing for areas other than population representation in one legislative house.

In conclusion, I wish to read once more, as I did at the beginning of this discussion, the best argument for the Dirksen amendment, the language of the amendment itself as before the Senate Judiciary Committee which has been carefully evolved after many weeks of exhaustive study and deliberation by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments:

> SECTION 1. The people of a State may apportion one house of a bicameral legislature using population, geography or political subdivisions as factors, giving each factor such weight as they deem appropriate, or giving similar weight to the same factors in apportioning a unicameral legislature if, in either case, such plan of apportionment has been submitted to a vote of the people in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution and has been approved by a majority of those voting on that issue. When the first plan of apportionment is submitted to a vote of the people under this section there shall also be submitted, at the same election, an alternative plan of apportionment based upon substantial equality of population.
>
> SEC. 2. Any plan of apportionment which has been approved under this article shall be resubmitted to a vote of the people, or, another plan may be submitted under the provisions of section 1, at the November general election held two years following each year in which there is commenced any enumeration provided for in section 2 of Article I, and upon approval by a majority of those voting thereon, such plan of apportionment shall continue in effect until changed in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution.

That with which we are confronted here is not a question of whether the interpretation of the Supreme Court is correct or incorrect.

During the hearings of our subcommittee that question received small attention one way or another. It was assumed that the decision in Reynolds against Simms was the law of the land—that is the way most law abiding people like to look at those things—and that the Constitution is what Reynolds against Simms says it is. The question is not whether that decision is right or wrong. The question is whether the changes now confronting our system of government are sound and wise, and whether the people consider them sound and wise.

The decision must be made by the people. This Nation does not belong to the U.S. Senate, nor to the House of Representatives, nor to any branch of Government.

It belongs to the people. Let us act to make the words "We, the people" mean what they say.

Let the people decide.

EXHIBIT 1

BOLLING ET AL. *v.* SHARPE ET AL., CERTIORARI TO THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(No. 8—Argued December 10–11, 1952—Reargued December 8–9, 1953—Decided May 17, 1954)

Racial segregation in the public schools of the District of Columbia is a denial to Negro children of the due process of law guaranteed by the fifth amendment (pp. 498–500).

(a) Though the 5th amendment does not contain an equal protection clause, as does the 14th amendment which applies only to the States, the concepts of equal protection and due process are not mutually exclusive (p. 499).

(b) Discrimination may be so unjustifiable as to be violative of due process (p. 499).

(c) Segregation in public education is not reasonably related to any proper governmental objective, and thus it imposes on Negro children of the District of Columbia a burden that constitutes an arbitrary deprivation of their liberty in violation of the due-process clauses (pp. 499–500).

(d) In view of this court's decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education, ante* (p. 483), that the Constitution prohibits the States from maintaining racially segregated public schools, it would be unthinkable that the same Constitution would impose a lesser duty on the Federal Government (p. 500).

(e) The case is restored to the docket for further argument on specified questions relating to the form of the decree (p. 500).

George E. C. Hayes and James M. Nabrit, Jr., argued the cause for petitioners on the original argument and on the reargument. With them on the briefs were George M. Johnson and Herbert O. Reid, Jr. Charles W. Quick was also on the brief on the reargument.

Milton D. Korman argued the cause for respondents on the original argument and on the reargument. With him on the briefs were Vernon E. West, Chester H. Gray, and Lyman J. Umstead.

By special leave of court, Assistant Attorney General Rankin argued the cause on the reargument for the United States, as amicus curiae, urging reversal. With him on the brief were Attorney General Brownell, Philip Elman, Leon Ulman, William J. Lamont, and M. Magdelena Schoch. James P. McGranery, then Attorney General, and Philip Elman filed a brief on the original argument for the United States, as amicus curiae, urging reversal.

Brief of amici curiae supporting petitioners were filed by S. Walter Shine, Sanford H. Bolz, and Samuel B. Groner for the American Council on Human Rights, and others; by John Ligtenberg and Selma M. Borchardt for the American Federation of Teachers; and by Phineas Indritz for the American Veterans Committee, Inc.

Mr. Chief Justice Warren delivered the opinion of the Court.

This case challenges the validity of segregation in the public schools of the District of Columbia. The petitioners, minors of the Negro race, allege that such segregation deprives them of due process of law under the fifth amendment. They were refused admission to a public school attended by white children solely because of their race. They sought the aid of the District Court for the District of Columbia in obtaining admission. That court dismissed their complaint. The Court granted a writ of certiorari before judgment in the court of appeals because of the importance of the constitutional question presented (344 U.S. 873).

We have this day held that the equal-protection clause of the 14th amendment prohibits the States from maintaining racially segregated public schools.[1] The legal problem in the District of Columbia is somewhat different, however.

The 5th amendment, which is applicable in the District of Columbia, does not contain an equal protection clause as does the 14th amendment which applies only to the States. But the concepts of equal protection and due process, both stemming from our American ideal of fairness, are not mutually exclusive. The "equal protection of the laws" is a more explicit safeguard of prohibited unfairness than "due process of law," and, therefore, we do not imply that the two are always interchangeable phrases. But, as this Court has recognized, discrimination may be so unjustifiable as to be violative of due process.[2]

Classifications based solely upon race must be scrutinized with particular care, since they are contrary to our traditions, and hence constitutionally suspect.[3] As long ago as 1896, this Court declared the principle "that the Constitution of the United States, in its present form, forbids, so far as civil and political rights are concerned, discrimination by the General Government, or by the States, against any citizen because of his race."[4] And in *Buchanan* v. *Warley*, 245 U.S. 60, the Court held that a statute which limited the right of a property owner to convey his property to a person of another race was, as an unreasonable discrimination, a denial of due process of law.

Although the Court has not assumed to define "liberty" with any great precision, that term is not confined to mere freedom from bodily restraint. Liberty under law extends to the full range of conduct which the individual is free to pursue, and it cannot be restricted except for a proper governmental objective. Segregation in public education is not reasonably related to any proper governmental objective, and thus it imposes on Negro children of the District of Columbia a burden that constitutes an arbitrary deprivation of their liberty in violation of the due-process clause.

In view of our decision that the Constitution prohibits the States from maintaining racially segregated public schools, it would be unthinkable that the same Constitution would impose a lesser duty on the Federal Government.[5] We hold that racial segregation in the public schools of the District of Columbia is a denial of the due process of law guaranteed by the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

For the reasons set out in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, this case will be restored to the docket for reargument on questions 4 and 5 previously propounded by the Court (345 U.S. 972).

It is so ordered.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT, DISTRICT OF HAWAII, APRIL 23, 1965—CIV. NO. 2308

(*Henrietta Davidson Holt et al., plaintiffs* v. *William S. Richardson, Lieutenant Governor of Hawaii, defendant;* John J. Hulten et al., and John A. Burns, Governor of Hawaii, intervenors-plaintiffs; Nelson K. Doi et al., and Elmer F. Cravalho et al., intervenors-defendants)

Proceeding on Hawaii's Senate reapportionment plan. The three-judge district court held that bill providing for apportionment of senatorial and house districts in such manner that multimember 3rd and 4th Senatorial Districts in Honolulu were the same as 8th Representative District and that 6th Senatorial District was fashioned almost entirely from 15th Representative District was unconstitutional for lack of totality of consideration of factors of population, compactness and contiguity of territory, community interests, community of problems, socioeconomic status, and political and racial factors.

Stay order rescinded; final order automatically reinstated.

1. Constitutional law, see 225(1): Number of registered voters per senatorial district and apportionment of senators to the 4 basic areas, viz., 3 to county of Hawaii, 2 to county of Maui, 19 to city and county of Honolulu, and 1 to county of Kauai conformed to standards required under equal proportions method prescribed by Constitution (U.S.C.A. Const. amend. 14).

2. States, see 27: To be valid, makeup of senate must positively complement makeup of house to provide vital equality of voter representation (U.S.C.A. Const. amend 14).

3. States, see 27: Schemes of districting each house of legislature, when conjoined, must offer compensating advantages to the voters, not only those voters within each representative district but all voters throughout the State (U.S.C.A. Const. amend. 14).

4. States, see 27: Overlap of representation with several senate and house districts must not be such as to concentrate and intensify voting power of single senatorial-representative district to point that voters therein have built-in disproportionate representational advantage over other voters of the State (U.S.C.A. Const. amend. 14).

5. States, see 27: Population is fundamental factor but not the sole definitive measure for setting up representative or senatorial districts (U.S.C.A. Const. amend. 14).

6. States, see 27: Compactness and contiguity of territory are factors for setting up representative and senatorial districts, but community of interests, community of problems, socioeconomic status, and political and racial factors must also be considered (U.S.C.A. Const. amend. 14).

7. States, see 27: Electoral districts must be laid out with totality of factors of population, compactness and contiguity of territory, community of problems, socioeconomic status, and political and racial factors having been considered, and sum total of all districting must result in substantial equality of meaningful representation to each and all voters (U.S.C.A. Const. amend. 14).

8. Constitutional law, see 225(1); States, sec. 27: Bill providing for apportionment of senatorial and house districts in such a manner that multimember 3d and 4th senatorial districts in Honolulu were the same as 8th representative district and that 6th senatorial district was fashioned almost entirely from 15th representative district was unconstitutional for lack of totality of consideration of factors of population, compactness and contiquity of territory, community of interests, community of problems, socioeconomic status, and political and racial factors (U.S.C.A. Const. amend 14).

9. Statutes, see 29: Reapportionment bill which had passed senate by barest majority and which had not yet lain on desk of Governor for 10 days prior to final adoption had not procedurally been submitted to three-judge district court entertaining action involving reapportionment.

Charles M. Tonaki, Barry J. Rubin, Honolulu, Hawaii, Masaji Marumoto, associate counsel, Honolulu, Hawaii, for plaintiffs.

Heen, Kai & Dodge, Robert G. Dodge, Honolulu, Hawaii, for defendant.

Bert T. Kobayashi, attorney general, State of Hawaii; Bertram T. Kanbara, Nobuki Kamida, deputy attorneys general, Honolulu, Hawaii, for intervenors-plaintiffs.

James T. Funaki, Honolulu, Hawaii, Robert Kimura, Honolulu, Hawaii, for intervenors-defendants.

Before Jertberg, circuit judge, and Beeks and Pence, district judges.

Per curiam.

This court has now before it the Hawaii State Legislature's H.B. No. 987, S.D. 1, C.D. 1; H.B. No. 773, S.D. 1, C.D. 1; and H.B. No. 986, setting forth that body's response to this court's order of March 9, 1965, viz., presenting (a) a plan for the provisional reapportionment of the senate on the basis of the voters registered for the 1964 general election; (b) a proposed constitutional amendment encompassing the same plan; and (c) a submission to the electorate in 1966 of the question of calling a constitutional convention.

The road by which the above bills reached this court is tortuous. In August of 1964, when this court first heard this case, the Legislature of Hawaii was then sitting in special session called by the Governor of Hawaii for the specific purpose of attempting to devise a scheme of legislative reapportionment which would be constitutionally valid. The legislature at that session failed to agree on any reapportionment plan. After a hearing in January 1965, this court, on February 17, 1965, 238 F. Supp. 468, found that article III, section 2, of the Hawaii State constitution fixing the number of senators per senatorial district, as well as the proviso at the end of the sixth paragraph in section 2 of article XV of the constitution, were invalid, "determined that the senate at least must be reapportioned before the 1966 general election," and enjoined the third State legislature in its regular 1965 session from passing any but preliminary housekeeping acts until it had set up the machinery for the convening of a constitutional convention to amend the State's legislative scheme of apportionment before the 1966 election.

On March 1, 1965, the legislature, then convened in regular session, requested this court to alter its order of February 17 so as to permit the legislature itself during that session to pass legislation:

(a) Enacting a provisional plan for reapportioning the senate on the basis of the 1964 registered voters, to be effective for the 1966 election and until a constitutional amendment on reapportionment had been adopted by the people of Hawaii as provided in the constitution.

(b) Adopting a proposed constitutional amendment embodying pertinent provisions of the foregoing reapportionment plan to be presented to the electorate for ratification at the 1966 general election.

(c) Submitting to the electorate at that 1966 election the question, under article XV of the State constitution: Shall there be a convention to propose a revision of or amendments to the constitution?

Counsel for all parties to the suit were in accord with the objectives outlined in the motion, and this court was satisfied from the representations made that the constitutional convention route prescribed by its February 17 order would be very expensive and perforce would demand the devotion of great time and effort from the people of Hawaii. The court, then, also believed that the legislators, each and all, would recognize their obligations to the entire electorate of Hawaii, would rise above any possible self-interest, would heed the admonitions of the attorney general, and would certainly note the flashing red lights of the caveats set out in this court's order of February 17, viz, that a constitutional convention in addition to providing for reapportionment of the senate might also consider (1) whether the registered voter population should continue to be used as the basis for apportionment, or some other type of population basis should be adopted; (2) "whether it is better to have one or both houses of the legislature composed of single member representative districts, or to have and justify one or both houses composed in whole or in part, multi-member of floterial districts. *Butcher* v. *Bloom*, 415 Pa. 438, 203 A. 2d 556, 572–573"; (3) whether there should be a change in the date of decennial reapportionment; and (4) whether there should be redistricting of the representative district.

---

[1] *Brown* v. *Board of Education, ante*, p. 483.

[2] *Detroit Bank* v. *United States*, 317 U.S. 329; *Currin* v. *Wallace*, 306 U.S. 1, 13–14; *Steward Machine Co.* v. *Davis*, 301 U.S. 548, 585.

[3] *Korematsu* v. *United States*, 323 U.S. 214, 216; *Hirabayashi* v. *United States*, 320 U.S. 81, 100.

[4] *Gibson* v. *Mississippi*, 162 U.S. 565, 591. Cf. *Steele* v. *Louisville & Nashville R. Co.*, 323 U.S. 192, 198–199.

[5] Cf. *Hurd* v. *Hodge*, 334 U.S. 24.

The court therefore, by order of March 9, 1965, altered its February 17 order to permit the legislature (a) to enact a provisional reapportionment and redistributing plan for the senate; (b) to adopt "a proposed constitutional amendment embodying pertinent provisions of the foregoing reapportionment and redistricting plan" for submission to the electorate at the 1966 general election; (c) to enact legislation to submit to the electorate the question: Shall there be a convention to propose a revision of or amendments to the constitution? This order, like the one of February 17, demanded that the plan be approved by this court; failing approval, the order of February 17 demanding legislation for implementing a constitutional convention would again become effective.

On March 18 this court was advised that a provisional plan, in substance approved by both houses, was then in conference committee and about ready to be presented to this court, whereby the senate was reapportioned by dividing the State into the same original six senatorial districts, changing only the number of senators allocated to each district, based upon the use of the method of equal proportion. By that March 18 plan, 2 senators were apportioned to the first senatorial district—east Hawaii; 1 to the second—west Hawaii; 2 to the third—Maui; 9 to the fourth—southern Oahu; 10 to the fifth—the remainder of Oahu; and 1 to the sixth—Kauai.

The legislature quickly thereafter was informally made to understand that such a grossly lumpy apportionment of senators, whereby 40 percent of the entire senate would come from one senatorial district and 36 percent from another alongside, could never be approved, and the plan was forthwith withdrawn from conference committee for reconsideration by the house of representatives. Shortly thereafter, this court flashed an even brighter red light on its caveat number (2) above by informally indicating that because Hawaii had a multimember district house, any other than single member senatorial districting would have to be justified to this court.

On April 14, 1965, the legislature passed and sent to this court the numbered bills, identified supra:

Answer. House bill 987, its proposed provisional senatorial reapportionment plan; house bill 773, its proposed constitutional amendment embodying that same plan; and house bill 986, submitting to the electorate in the 1966 general election the question of the calling of a constitutional convention. By house bill 987, the State was divided into eight senatorial districts, viz:

County	Senatorial district	Number of Senators	1964 registered voters per district
Hawaii	1st	3	28,130
Maui	2d	2	18,786
Honolulu	3d	3	27,073
Do	4th	4	35,780
Do	5th	4	39,361
Do	6th	4	40,629
Do	7th	4	37,336
Kauai	8th	1	12,266

B. Exhibits A and B, attached to the plan, the same being the reports of the conference committee on the proposed provisional plan (H.B. 987), as well as the proposed plan for the constitutional amendment (H.B. 773) embodying the same, setting forth the conference committee's "justification" for wholly abandoning any attempt to redistrict the senate on a single member district basis.

Senate exhibits Nos. 5 and 6 (maps also filed), outlined the geographical boundaries of the respective senatorial districts of Honolulu.

(1) The court would agree that the number of registered voters per senatorial district and apportioned to the 4 basic areas; viz, 3 to the county of Hawaii, 2 to the county of Maui, 19 to the city and county of Honolulu, and 1 to the county of Kauai, conforms to the standards required under the method of equal proportions prescribed by the constitution of the State of Hawaii and thus meets that 1 test of constitutionality, *Roman* v. *Sincock*, 377 U.S. 695, 84 S. Ct. 1449, 12 L. Ed. 2d 620 (1964); *Reynolds* v. *Sims*, 377 U.S. 533, 84 S. Ct. 1362, 12 L. Ed. 2d. 506 (1964).

In the attached committee reports, the reasons given i.e., "justification," for choosing multimember districts of three and four senators per district were substantially: (1) single-member districts would tend to cause the senators therefrom to be concerned with localized issues and ignore the broader issues facing the State, and therefore it might fragment the approach to statewide problems and programs to the detriment of the State; (2) historically the members of the house had represented smaller constituencies than members of the senate, and tradition and experience had proved that balance desirable; (3) multimember districts would increase the significance of an individual's vote by focusing his attention on the broad spectrum of major community problems as opposed to those of more limited and local concern; (4) to set up single-member districts would compound the more technical and more intricate problem of drawing the boundaries; (5) population shifts would more drastically affect the boundaries of many smaller single-member districts—to a greater degree than would be found in larger multimember districts, citing Oahu's population boom and subdivision development.

In drawing the district lines the legislature reported that it "relied very heavily" on the standards of compactness and contiguity—"geographical separation and long-established representative precinct lines."

Except for the slightly misleading conclusion that the third senatorial district was primarily a suburban area, and that the fourth senatorial district was composed of substantially plantation and suburban communities, from the report it appears that no other criteria, save number of registered voters, geographical boundaries and historical representative district lines were considered or used in forming the plan. Apparently, ethnic, political, industrial, economic, social, occupational factors, and community of interests and problems were given little if any consideration by the legislature.

The testimony of Senator Sakai Takahashi, chairman of the conference committee, at the April 15, 1965, hearing on the plan, summed up the legislature's underlying raison d'être with his statement: "We thought it fair."

Mr. Robert Schmitt, statistician, who had testified at length in the hearing of August 1964, again a witness, testified in favor of applying the law of large numbers; viz, that smaller areas with small numbers fluctuate in much greater proportion that do larger areas with larger numbers, to senatorial districts. He, however, had not been consulted on the problem of the multimember districts versus single member, or the problem of district lines.[1]

In analyzing the plan, all Mr. Schmitt could say for the Third Senatorial District was that it had excellent statistical boundaries.[2] It was logical to deduce from his testimony that the boundary between the Fourth and Fifth Senatorial Districts had accidentally resulted in an excellent line of division, in that it separated the military area; i.e., military housing, etc., from the city proper. The best that he could say, however, for the line between the Fifth and Sixth Senatorial Districts was that it neatly separated the central business district from residential areas alongside. The line between the Sixth and Seventh Senatorial Districts was historical.

Mr. Schmitt, in contradistinction to the conference committee, found it necessary to analyze the representative districts and criticized many of them as being far too small; e.g., the 1st—on Hawaii, the 13th—Kahili, on Oahu; or much too large; e.g., the 15th with its six representatives. Schmitt pointed out that within the 15th district, in the Moiliili area, there was a higher proportion of persons of Japanese ancestry than in any census tract of the island, yet Waikiki, primarily concerned with tourist service, was the second highest among census tracts in percentage of Caucasian residents. Also, high-level professional, technical, and managerial people tended to live in Waikiki or upper Manoa,[3] whereas operatives, laborers, clerical workers, middle and lower middle income people lived in the central (Moiliili, etc.) area.

Mr. Schmitt stated that the Fifth Senatorial District likewise encompassed a highly heterogeneous area containing a multitude of Caucasian widows in the uplands area, and an overabundance of Filipino males in the seaward portion of the district. The 12th Representative District, therein, had a very high proportion of persons of foreign birth or Asiatic ancestry, of the lower middle socioeconomic group.[4] Schmitt's only other comment regarding the 5th Senatorial District was that the boundary between the 12th and 13th Representative Districts; i.e., within the proposed 5th Senatorial District, had a very unfortunate location.

Schmitt also pointed out that within the seventh senatorial district were too clearly defined and geographically, economically and socially divided groups. In Palolo in the 16th Representative District area were found the lower socio-economic laborers, operatives, and clerical workers, and in the Waialae-Kahala and Aina Haina areas were the highly professional and managerial class. In the latter area the median annual family income in 1959 was almost $16,000, whereas in Palolo it was $3,000.

---

[1] In its (unsubmitted) plan of March 18, supra p. 726 two senators were to be elected from east Hawaii, and one senator from west Hawaii. The total registered voters in 1964 in east Hawaii was 20,770, and in west Hawaii was 7,360. In the present provisional plan, this division of the island of Hawaii was dropped and three senators were to be elected from the first senatorial district, which would now include the entire island. Of the seven senators presently elected from districts one and two, five live within a short distance of each other in Hilo, in east Hawaii.

[2] The location of the residences of two of Honolulu's present total of 10 senators is in this district.

[3] The residences of the three senators from the present Fourth Senatorial District showed that all lived only a very short distance apart in the upper Manoa area of the 15th Representative District.

[4] Similarly, three senators from the Fifth District likewise lived a short distance from each other in the 12th Representative District.

From the committee reports and the testimony of Senator Takahashi, it is obvious that the legislature gave sparse, if any, consideration of any of the facts or factors pointed out by Mr. Schmitt, in devising its scheme of multimember senatorial districts for Oahu.

Although we initially determined that the house of representatives was not unconstitutionally apportioned, by that decision we did not say that those representative districts had been perfectly laid out. We agree with Mr. Schmitt that, compared to the makeup of all other representative districts in the State, the 15th is too large.

There can be no truly representative government without a system of apportionment which provides potentially equal representation to the divergent factors incorporated within the body politic. Our own representative form of government demands checks and balances, devices and procedures to channel the many and diverse interests of the people into the making of a stream of legislation that produces for each person in that State the maximum beneficence possible. Methods of securing this desired objective were pointed out in *Reynolds* v. *Sims*, *supra*, 377 U.S. at 576–577, 84 S. Ct. at 1389:

"Different constituencies can be represented in the two houses. One body could be composed of single-member districts while the other could have at least some multimember districts. The length of terms of the legislators in the separate bodies could differ. The numerical size of the two bodies could be made to differ, even significantly, and the geographical size of districts from which legislators are elected could also be made to differ. And apportionment in one house could be arranged so as to balance off minor inequities in the representation of certain areas in the other house. In summary, these and other factors could be, and are presently in many States, utilized to engender differing complexions and collective attitudes in the two bodies of a State legislature, although both are apportioned substantially on a population basis."

(2–4) In reapportioning and redistricting the senate, both houses overlooked the fact that, to be valid, the makeup of the senate must positively complement the makeup of the house, to provide the vital equality of voter representation. Both houses of the legislature seemingly forgot that the schemes of districting each house, when conjoined, must offer compensating advantages to the voters—not only to those voters within each representative district, be it senate or house, but to all voters throughout the State. While there perforce must be some overlap of representation with the several senate and house districts, that overlap must not be such as to concentrate and intensify the voting power of a single senatorial-representative district to the point that the voters therein have a built-in disproportionate representational advantage over any other voters of the State.

If the achievement of this goal is even to be approached, there should not be any monolithic political units of representation in that all-inclusive system of apportionment. Unless, within any single geographically defined political area or unit, there is a meaningful and substantial difference in the composition of that body of electors therein, whose combined votes elect a senator, from that body whose combined votes elect a member of the house, then the demanded differing complexions and collective attitudes are lost, the necessary cross checking and resulting balance is absent, and the majorities therein are given a disproportional monolithic command, not only within the narrow political unit, but also within the legislative bodies. Such artificially concentrated political power negates any notion of equality of representation for the minorities entrapped therein, as well as for all other electors of the State outside such a monolithic political unit.

"However complicated or sophisticated an apportionment scheme might be, it cannot, consistent with the equal protection clause, result in a significant undervaluation of the weight of the votes of certain of a State's citizens merely because of where they happen to reside." *WMCA, Inc.* v. *Lomenzo*, 377 U.S. 633, 653, 84 S. Ct. 1418, 1428, 12 L. Ed. 2d 568.

The Hawaiian Legislature, whether innocently or designedly, has, nevertheless, built just such monoliths into its reapportionment scheme.

In its efforts to achieve its objective of multimember (three and four) senatorial districts in Honolulu, the legislature made the boundaries of the third senatorial district and the eighth representative district one and the same. Thus from one political and geographical unit would be elected four representatives and three senators—seven members of the legislature all responsible to and representing exactly the same constituency. Similarly, the 6th senatorial district was fashioned almost entirely from the 15th representative district, with the result that from the 15th representative unit, i.e., from the dominant three-fourths of the voting population of that senatorial district, would come six representatives and four senators (31,302 of the senatorial district's total of 40,629 voters reside in the 15th representative district).

[5–7] While it is a fundamental factor under the decisions of the Court, population is not the sole definitive measure for setting up either representative or senatorial districts. Compactness and contiguity of the territory are admittedly also factors, but community of interests, community of problems, socioeconomic status, political and racial factors—each and all must be considered, and not only must the electoral districts be laid out with the totality of those factors having been taken into consideration, but even more, the sum total of all of the districting must result in substantial equality of meaningful representation to each and all of the voters of the State. "[A]ll who participate in the election are to have an equal vote—whatever their race, whatever their sex, whatever their occupation, whatever their income, and wherever their home may be in that geographical unit." *Gray* v. *Sanders*, 372 U.S. 368, 379, 83 S.Ct. 801, 808, 9 L.Ed. 2d 821. As indicated, not only was there no totality of consideration of the above factors in setting up the senatorial districts on Oahu, but there was even less totality of consideration of the factors of equal representation to all voters on Oahu and the rest of the State.

Here, the realistic political weight of the voters in both the third and sixth senatorial districts would far exceed the political weight of any voter in any other district, not only in Honolulu but in any other county of the State. It is patent to the court that both the house and the senate, in setting up the senatorial plan either failed or refused to recognize the effect that such a plan would have upon the basis for representation of the entire voting population. Both the Hawaiian senate and house ignored the admonition of the Supreme Court:

"(I)n reviewing a State legislative apportionment case, this Court must of necessity consider the challenged scheme as a whole in determining whether the particular State's apportionment plan, in its entirety, meets Federal constitutional requisites. It is simply impossible to decide upon the validity of the apportionment of one house of a bicameral legislature in the abstract, without also evaluating the actual scheme of representation employed with respect to the other house. Rather, the proper and, indeed, indispenable, subject for judicial focus in a legislative apportionment controversy is the overall representation accorded to the State's voters, in both houses of a bicameral State legislature." *Maryland Committee for Fair Representation* v. *Tawes*, 377 U.S. 656, 673, 84 S. Ct. 1429, 1438, 1439, 12 L. ed. 2d 595.

(8) This court heretofore said that the house was not unconstitutionally apportioned. This court indicated the means by which the senate could be apportioned to give to every voter the equal protection and equal representation that he is entitled to without disturbing the makeup of the house, but because both houses failed to look at the political scene in its totality and instead viewed the reapportionment scheme of the senate as if it were something that could be fashioned without consideration of its tight juxtaposition to the house of representatives, each house of the legislature jointly and separately took such a myopic view of the political problem involved, that they failed to see and anticipate the overall result of arbitrarily joining their independently constructed senatorial plan with the existing representative scheme.[5] As indicated, both houses failed to heed the words of the Supreme Court, as well as any of the red lights this court had flashed. Both houses failed to heed the advice of the attorney general of the State of Hawaii, and the end result, based as it is upon reasons which fall very, very short of justifying the resultant multimember districting of both houses, fails to give to each and every voter of the State of Hawaii the fundamental equality of representation to which each is entitled under the 14th amendment.

Even if the above, alone, were not enough to render the proposed scheme invalid, it is manifest to this court that the legislature's adamant insistence on three- and four-member senatorial districting was the conscious or unconscious—though not unnatural—reluctance of the affected senators to carve out single-member districts which thereafter would in all probability result in a political duel-to-the-death with a fellow and neighbor senator. To have crosscut any of Honolulu's 8th, 12th, or 15th representative districts in order to mark out single-member senatorial districts would, with practical certainty, have left 2 or 3 present incumbents to compete head on for a single senatorial seat.

Likewise, the shift on Hawaii from the double, 2–1, senator district scheme, tentatively adopted on March 18, to the single 3-senator district in the instant plan, was an unmistakable application to east Hawaii's incumbent senators of that same factor of political self-preservation implanted into the Honolulu districting scheme.[6]

---

[5] As foretold in *Fortson* v. *Dorsey*, 379 U.S. 433, 85 S. Ct. 498, 13 L. ed. 2d 401 (1965), "[i]t might well be that, designedly or otherwise, a multimember constituency apportionment scheme, under the circumstances of a particular case, would operate to minimize or cancel out the voting strength of racial or political elements of the voting population."

[6] "(I)n the absence of any reasonable justification (historical or otherwise), such districting (creation of single-member and multimember districts) might be the result of gerrymandering for partisan advantage and, in that event, would be arbitrary and capricious. In the light of the constitutional pitfalls inherent in such a districting scheme, it would be more prudent to approach the matter of apportionment by setting up single-member districts unless valid and compelling reasons exist which require the creation of some multimember districts." *Butcher* v. *Bloom*, 415 Pa. 438, 203 A. 2d 556, 573.

This court finds that the present multimember district scheme of senatorial reapportionment resulted, in a material part at least, from gerrymandering.

We find the proposed plan does not meet the test of equality of representation set down by our Supreme Court and is invalid. We therefore do not approve the plan.

Circuitous or expensive as it may be, the route set out by the constitution of this State, viz, by way of a constitutional convention, must now be followed. Inasmuch as the plan set forth in H.B. 987 cannot be and is not approved by this court, it is therefore ordered: (1) The stay order of this court dated April 19, 1965, is rescinded, effective forthwith; and (2) as indicated in our Final Order of March 19, 1965, item 4 on pages 19–20, and item 6 on pages 20–21 of the Decision and Order of this court dated February 17, 1965, be and they are hereby automatically reinstated and now remain and shall continue in full force and effect until further order of this court.

(9) As may be noted, this court has not herein discussed H.B. 773. We are advised that it was able to pass the senate by but the barest majority, 13 to 12, far short of the two-thirds demanded by the State constitution for the adoption of a proposed constitutional amendment. The same also has not yet lain on the desk of the Governor for the 10 days prior to final adoption, as provided by the constitution.[7] Therefore, procedurally, the same has not yet been submitted to us. *Wright* v. *Rockefeller,* 376 U.S. 52, 58, 84 S. Ct. 603, 11 L. ed. 2d 512. Even if it were, nevertheless, in view of our decision on the provisional plan, H.B. 987, we would not and now do not find it necessary to consider the validity of the proposed amendment, H.B. 773, or the question proposed by H.B. 986.

This court continues to retain jurisdiction of this action for all purposes.

This decision shall take effect forthwith.

Exhibit 2

Maryland—1776

THE CONSTITUTION, OR FORM OF GOVERNMENT, ET CETERA

1. That the legislature consist of two distinct branches, a senate and house of delegates, which shall be styled, the General Assembly of Maryland.

2. That the house of delegates shall be chosen in the following manner: All freemen, above 21 years of age, having a freehold of 50 acres of land, in the county in which they offer to vote, and residing therein—and all freemen, having property in this State above the value of 30 pounds current money, and having resided in the county, in which they offer to vote, one whole year next preceding the election, shall have a right of suffrage, in the election of delegates for such county: and all freemen, so qualified, shall, on the first Monday of October 1777 and on the same day in every year thereafter, assemble in the counties, in which they are respectively qualified to vote, at the courthouse, in the said counties; or at such other place as the legislature shall direct; and, when assembled, they shall proceed to elect, viva voce, four delegates, for their respective counties, of the most wise, sensible, and discreet of the people, residents in the county where they are to be chosen, one whole year next preceding the election, above 21 years of age, and having, in the State, real or personal property above the value of 500 pounds current money; and upon the final casting of the polls, the four persons who shall appear to have the greatest number of legal votes shall be declared and returned duly elected for their respective counties.

3. That the sheriff of each county, or, in case of sickness, his deputy (summoning two justices of the county, who are required to attend, for the preservation of the peace) shall be the judges of the election, and may adjourn from day to day, if necessary, till the same be finished, so that the whole election shall be concluded in 4 days; and shall make his return thereof, under his hand, to the chancellor of this State for the time being.

4. That all persons qualified, by the charter of the city of Annapolis, to vote for burgesses, shall, on the same first Monday of October 1777 and on the same day in every year forever thereafter, elect, viva voce, by a majority of votes, two delegates, qualified agreeable to the said charter; that the mayor, recorder, and aldermen of the said city, or any three of them, be judges of the election, appoint the place in the said city for holding the same, and may adjourn from day to day, as aforesaid, and shall make return thereof, as aforesaid; but the inhabitants of the said city shall not be entitled to vote for delegates for Anne Arundel County, unless they have a freehold of 50 acres of land in the county distinct from the city.

5. That all persons, inhabitants of Baltimore town, and having the same qualifications as electors in the county, shall, on the same first Monday in October 1777, and on the same day in every year forever thereafter, at such place in the said town as the judges shall appoint, elect, viva voce, by a majority of votes, two delegates, qualified as aforesaid: but if the said inhabitants of the town shall so decrease, as that a number of persons, having a right of suffrage therein, shall have been, for the space of 7 years successively, less than one-half the number of votes in some one county in this State, such town shall thenceforward cease to send two delegates or representatives to the house of delegates, until the said town shall have one-half of the number of voters in some one county in this State.

6. That the commissioners of the said town, or any three or more of them, for the time being, shall be judges of the said election, and may adjourn, as aforesaid, and shall make return thereof, as aforesaid; but the inhabitants of the said town shall not be entitled to vote for, or be elected, delegates for Baltimore County; neither shall the inhabitants of Baltimore County, out of the limits of Baltimore town, be entitled to vote for, or be elected, delegates for the said town.

7. That on refusal, death, disqualification, resignation, or removal out of this State of any delegate, or on his becoming Governor, or member of the council, a warrant of election shall issue by the speaker, for the election of another in his place; of which 10 days' notice, at least (excluding the day of notice, and the day of election), shall be given.

8. That not less than a majority of the delegates, with their speaker (to be chosen by them, by ballot) constitute a house, for the transaction of any business other than that of adjourning.

* * * * *

14. That the senate be chosen in the following manner: All persons, qualified as aforesaid to vote for county delegates, shall, on the first day of September 1781, and on the same day in every fifth year forever thereafter, elect, viva voce, by a majority of votes, two persons for their respective counties (qualified as aforesaid to be elected county delegates) to be electors of the Senate; and the sheriff of each county, or, in case of sickness, his deputy (summoning two justices of the county, who are required to attend, for the preservation of the peace) shall hold and be judge of the said election, and make return thereof, as aforesaid. And all persons, qualified as aforesaid, to vote for delegates for the city of Annapolis and Baltimore town, shall, on the same first Monday of September 1781, and on the same day in every fifth year forever thereafter, elect, viva voce, by a majority of votes, one person for the said city and town respectively, qualified as aforesaid to be elected a delegate for the said city and town respectively; the said election to be held in the same manner, as the election of delegates for the said city and town; the right to elect the said elector, with respect to Baltimore town, to continue as long as the right to elect delegates for the said town.

15. That the said electors of the senate meet at the city of Annapolis, or such other place as shall be appointed for convening the legislature, on the third Monday in September 1781, and on the same day in every fifth year forever thereafter, and they, or any 24 of them so met, shall proceed to elect, by ballot, either out of their own body, or the people at large, 15 Senators (9 of whom to be residents on the western, and 6 to be residents on the Eastern Shore) men of the most wisdom, experience and virtue, above 25 years of age, residents of the State above 3 whole years next preceding the election, and having real and personal property above the value of 1,000 pounds current money.

16. That the senators shall be balloted for, at one and the same time, and out of the gentleman residents of the western shore, who shall be proposed as senators, the nine who shall, on striking the ballots, appear to have the greatest numbers in their favor, shall be accordingly declared and returned duly elected: and out of the gentlemen residents of the eastern shore, who shall be proposed as senators, the six who shall, on striking the ballots, appear to have the greatest number in their favor, shall be accordingly declared and returned duly elected: and if two or more on the same shore shall have an equal number of ballots in their favor, by which the choice shall not be determined on the first ballot, then the electors shall again ballot, before they separate; in which they shall be confined to the persons who on the first ballot shall have an equal number: and they who shall have the greatest number in their favor on the second ballot, shall be accordingly declared and returned duly elected: and if the whole number shall not thus be made up, because of an equal number, on the second ballot, still being in favor of two or more persons, then the election shall be determined by lot, between those who have equal numbers; which proceedings of the electors shall be certified under their hands, and returned to the chancellor for the time being.

17. That the electors of senators shall judge of the qualifications and elections of members of their body; and, on a contested election, shall admit to a seat, as an elector, such qualified person as shall appear to them to have the greatest number of legal votes in his favor.

18. That the electors, immediately on their meeting, and before they proceed to the election of senators, take such oath of support and fidelity to this State, as this convention, or the legislature, shall direct; and also an oath "to elect without favor, affection, partiality, or prejudice, such persons for senators, as they, in their judgment and conscience, believe best qualified for the office."

19. That in case of refusal, death, resignation, disqualification, or removal out of this State, of any senator, or on his becoming Governor, or a member of the council,

---

[7] In order to move the reapportionment problem with the greatest celerity, this court, nevertheless, had advised all parties that a provisional plan of reapportionment could be submitted to this court and a hearing had thereon immediately after the same was passed by the legislature and before the 10-day period during which a proposed amendment must lie on the desk of the Governor before the same can be adopted and passed. The instant hearing therefore was solely upon the matter of the proposed provisional plan.

the senate shall, immediately thereupon, or at their next meeting, thereafter, elect by ballot (in the same manner as the electors are above directed to choose senators) another person in his place, for the residue of the said term of 5 years.

NEW JERSEY—1776

1. That the government of this Province shall be vested in a Governor, legislative council, and general assembly.

2. That the legislative council, and general assembly, shall be chosen, for the first time, on the second Tuesday in August next; the members whereof shall be the same in number and qualifications as are hereinafter mentioned; and shall be and remain vested with all the powers and authority to be held by any future legislative council and assembly of this Colony, until the second Tuesday in October, which shall be in the year of our Lord 1777.

3. That on the second Tuesday in October yearly, and every year forever (with the privilege of adjourning from day to day as occasion may require) the counties shall severally choose one person, to be a member of the legislative council of this Colony, who shall be, and have been, for 1 whole year next before the election, an inhabitant and freeholder in the county in which he is chosen and worth at least 1,000 pounds proclamation money, of real and personal estate, within the same county; that, at the same time, each county shall also choose three members of assembly: *Provided*, That no person shall be entitled to a seat in the said assembly unless he be, and have been, for 1 whole year next before the election, an inhabitant of the county he is to represent, and worth 500 pounds proclamation money, in real and personal estate, in the same county: that on the second Tuesday next after the day of election, the council and assembly shall separately meet; and that the consent of both houses shall be necessary to every law: *Provided*, That seven shall be a quorum of the council, for doing business, and that no law shall pass, unless there be a majority of all the representatives of each body personally present, and agreeing thereto: *Provided always*, That if a majority of the representatives of this Province, in council and general assembly convened, shall, at any time or times hereafter, judge it equitable and proper, to add to or diminish the number or proportion of the members of assembly for any county or counties in this Colony, then, and in such case, the same may, on the principles of more equal representation, be lawfully done; anything in this charter to the contrary notwithstanding: so that the whole number of representatives in assembly shall not, at any time, be less than 39.

4. That all inhabitants of this Colony, of full age, who are worth 50 pounds proclamation money, clear estate in the same, and have resided within the county in which they claim a vote for 12 months immediately preceding the election, shall be entitled to vote for representatives in council and assembly; and also for all other public officers, that shall be elected by the people of the county at large.

PENNSYLVANIA—1776

PLAN OR FRAME OF GOVERNMENT FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OR STATE OF PENNSLYVANIA

SEC. 1. The Commonwealth or State of Pennsylvania shall be governed hereafter by an assembly of the representatives of the freemen of the same, and a president and council, in manner and form following—

SEC. 2. The supreme legislative power shall be vested in a house of representatives of the freemen of the Commonwealth or State of Pennsylvania.

* * * * *

SEC. 6. Every freemen of the full age of 21 years, having resided in this State for the space of 1 whole year next before the day of election for representatives, and paid public taxes during that time, shall enjoy the right of an elector: *Provided always*, That sons of freeholders of the age of 21 years shall be entitled to vote although they have not paid taxes.

SEC. 7. The house of representatives of the freemen of this Commonwealth shall consist of persons most noted for wisdom and virtue, to be chosen by the freemen of every city and county of this Commonwealth respectively. And no person shall be elected unless he has resided in the city or county for which he shall be chosen 2 years immediately before the said election; nor shall any member, while he continues such, hold any other office, except in the militia.

SEC. 8. No person shall be capable of being elected a member to serve in the house of representatives of the freemen of this Commonwealth more than 4 years in 7.

SEC. 9. The members of the house of representatives shall be chosen annually by ballot, by the freemen of the Commonwealth, on the second Tuesday in October forever (except this present year), and shall meet on the fourth Monday of the same month, and shall be stiled, The general assembly of the representatives of the freemen of Pennsylvania, and shall have power to choose their speaker, the treasurer of the State, and their other officers; sit on their own adjournments; prepare bills and enact them into laws; judge of the elections and qualifications of their own members; they may expel a member, but not a second time for the same cause; they may administer oaths or affirmations on examination of witnesses; redress grievances; impeach State criminals; grant charters of incorporation; constitute towns, boroughs, cities, and counties; and shall have all other powers necessary for the legislature of a free State or Commonwealth: But they shall have no power to add to, alter, abolish, or infringe any part of this constitution.

* * * * *

SEC. 12. If any city or cities, county or counties shall neglect or refuse to elect and send representatives to the general assembly, two-thirds of the members from the cities or counties that do elect and send representatives, provided they be a majority of the cities and counties of the whole State, when met, shall have all the powers of the general assembly, as fully and amply as if the whole were present.

SEC. 13. The doors of the house in which the representatives of the freemen of this State shall sit in general assembly, shall be and remain open for the admission of all persons who behave decently, except only when the welfare of this State may require the doors to be shut.

* * * * *

SEC. 17. The city of Philadelphia and each county of this Commonwealth, respectively, shall, on the first Tuesday of November in this present year, and on the second Tuesday of October annually for the 2 next succeeding years, viz, the year 1777 and the year 1778, choose six persons to represent them in general assembly. But as representation in proportion to the number of taxable inhabitants is the only principle which can at all times secure liberty, and make the voice of a majority of the people the law of the land; therefore the general assembly shall cause complete lists of the taxable inhabitants in the city and each county in the Commonwealth, respectively, to be taken and returned to them, on or before the last meeting of the assembly elected in the year 1778, who shall appoint a representation to each, in proportion to the number of taxables in such returns; which representation shall continue for the next 7 years afterward at the end of which, a new return of the taxable inhabitants shall be made, and a representation agreeable thereto appointed by the said assembly, and so on, septennially forever. The wages of the representatives in general assembly, and all other State charges shall be paid out of the State treasury.

SEC. 18. In order that the freemen of this Commonwealth may enjoy the benefit of election as equally as may be until the representation shall commence, as directed in the foregoing section; each county at its own choice may be divided into districts, hold elections therein, and elect their representatives in the county, and their other elective officers, as shall be hereafter regulated by the general assembly of this State. And no inhabitant of this State shall have more than one annual vote at the general election for representatives in assembly.

SEC. 19. For the present the supreme executive council of this State shall consist of 12 persons chosen in the following manner: The freemen of the city of Philadelphia, and of the counties of Philadelphia, Chester, and Bucks, respectively, shall choose by ballot one person for the city, and one for each county aforesaid, to serve for 3 years and no longer, at the time and place for electing representatives in general assembly. The freemen of the counties of Lancaster, York, Cumberland, and Berks, shall, in like manner elect one person for each county respectively, to serve as counselors for 2 years and no longer. And the counties of Northampton, Bedford, Northumberland, and Westmoreland, respectively, shall, in like manner, elect one person for each county, to serve as counselors for 1 year, and no longer. And at the expiration of the time for which each counselor was chosen to serve, the freemen of the city of Philadelphia, and of the several counties in this State, respectively, shall elect one person to serve as counselor for 3 years and no longer; and so on every third year forever. By this mode of election and continued rotation, more men will be trained to public business, there will in every subsequent year be found in the council a number of persons acquainted with the proceedings of the foregoing years, whereby the business will be more consistently conducted, and moreover the danger of establishing an inconvenient aristocracy will be effectually prevented. All vacancies in the council that may happen by death, resignation, or otherwise, shall be filled at the next general election for representatives in general assembly, unless a particular election for that purpose shall be sooner appointed by the president and council. No member of the general assembly or delegate in congress, shall be chosen a member of the council. The president and vice president shall be chosen annually by the joint ballot of the general assembly and council, of the members of the council. Any person having served as a counselor for 3 successive years, shall be incapable of holding that office for 4 years afterward. Every member of the council shall be a justice of the peace for the whole commonwealth, by virtue of his office.

In case new additional counties shall hereafter be erected in this State, such county or counties shall elect a counselor, and such county or counties shall be annexed to the next neighboring counties, and shall take rotation with such counties.

The council shall meet annually, at the same time and place with the general assembly.

The treasurer of the State, trustees of the loan office, naval officers, collectors of customs or excise, judge of the admiralty, attorneys general, sheriffs, and prothonotaries, shall not be capable of a seat in the general assembly, executive council, or Continental Congress.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. At the beginning of my remarks, I commend the Senator from Nebraska for an informative, excellently composed speech presenting the issues as they will come before the Senate. I am delighted that I remained in the Chamber to hear what the Senator had to say on the subject. I ask this question to summarize:

Is it a proper conclusion to state that the Dirksen amendment contemplates giving to the people of the several States the right, if they so choose, to adopt a system of legislative apportionment for the States similar to that which now prevails in the Federal Government?

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct, with the added condition, of course, contained in the text of the amendment, that it shall apply to one house in which the variation from the population factor would be limited to political subdivisions or geographical areas.

The final condition is that the arrangement must be submitted to the people and approved by a vote of the people, and that the people will have an opportunity, if they adopt such a plan, to have it resubmitted to them at least once every 10 years, under the terms of the amendment, for another popular vote as to whether the system shall be continued or discontinued.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the present and eternal composition of Congress, as drafted in 1787, requiring representation in the Senate to be geographical, on the basis of two Senators for each State, and the representation in the House to be on a basis of population, is good for the Federal Government, is it not likewise good to give the people of the States an opportunity to choose the same type of legislative representation?

Mr. HRUSKA. I believe that to be true. If we mean what we say, when we say, "We the people," or "the consent of the governed," it is the people who should make the decision as to whether the Federal type of organization for their legislative bodies should be adopted, or some other system should prevail. That is all the resolution provides.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not also fair to infer that when the opponents of the Dirksen amendment state that the people of the several States should not be given the opportunity to choose a legislative system similar to that in the U.S. Congress, they are in effect saying that the system of congressional representation that now exists in the Federal Government should be abolished?

Mr. HRUSKA. That has been a part of the argument in my principal remarks. I should say that the Senator from Ohio has put his finger on a highly sensitive spot.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How does the Senator from Nebraska answer the argument that is made: "We do not believe it is good for the States to be given the right to constitute a legislature in which one house must be chosen on the basis of population and the other permissively on the basis of geographical representation, but that it is right to do so in the U.S. Congress?" How can that position be defended by those who advocate it?

Mr. HRUSKA. In my opinion, it cannot be defended. The argument of those who seek to disown the Federal analogy is that the Federal system was made necessary in 1787 as a compromise to make the formation of the Republic possible. The only way in which the Thirteen Colonies could come to any agreement whatever was to provide that the States should be represented in the House on a population basis and in the Senate on a geographical basis.

But I say to the Senator from Ohio that is not what is at issue here. The question is not whether the Federal system has a historic beginning of one kind or another. That is not at issue. What is at issue is the experience of the Federal system since 1789.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What does the Senator from Nebraska say that experience is?

Mr. HRUSKA. I say that the experience is such that it is not capable of replacement by any other system bearing any semblance to the productivity, stability, and brilliant record of self-government that has been compiled by the Federal Congress.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It seems to me that it logically follows that when the opponents of the Dirksen amendment claim that that which is good for the Federal Government is not good for the States, they must eventually propose that a change be made in the composition of the U.S. Congress.

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes; pushed to its logical extreme, that is exactly what they would have to come to.

At the end of my principal remarks, I placed in the RECORD the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of Bolling against Sharpe, in which the Chief Justice rendered the opinion. In that case racial segregation in the public schools of the District of Columbia was held to be unconstitutional under the fifth amendment. The 5th amendment does not have an equal protection clause; the 14th amendment does. But the 14th amendment applies in all States. So the Supreme Court went to the fifth amendment and said that even though it does not contain an equal-protection clause, the Federal Government cannot discriminate on a racial basis and by way of segregation. What is alarming is that Chief Justice Warren said:

> In view of our decision that the Constitution prohibits the States from maintaining racially segregated public schools, it would be unthinkable that the same Constitution would impose a lesser duty on the Federal Government.

May that not be paraphrased to read:

> In view of our decision that the Constitution prohibits the States from maintaining legislatures unless they are apportioned solely on a basis of population, it would be unthinkable that the same Constitution would impose a lesser duty upon the Federal Government.

They lie hand in hand. The analogy and parallel are perfect. That is what concerns many persons.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for yielding. It is regrettable that more Senators were not in the Chamber to listen to what the Senator from Nebraska said. Whether one supports the Senator from Nebraska or opposes him, I express the opinion that his speech will enrich each Senator's intelligence and approach to this problem, if he will read what the Senator from Nebraska has said on the subject.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Ohio is very kind. I greatly appreciate his remarks.

Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado has been very patient. I now yield to him for such questions as he may wish to propound, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I shall first comment on the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska in their entirety.

The Senator was kind enough to provide me with a copy of his remarks. As the Senator knows, I had to leave the floor in the middle of his speech, and was able to hear only the first and last portions thereof.

I would have a somewhat different approach to the problem. The approach of the Senator is very good, to the effect that the real point is that the people should be permitted to decide. I believe that in order to do that we must, of necessity, almost take the position—and I do take the position—that the Supreme Court was wrong.

Does the Senator conceive that our forefathers ever had any idea of apportioning the two Houses of the U.S. Congress or the houses of the State legislatures on any basis other than the system which has been in effect from 1789 until the recent decision of the Supreme Court?

Mr. HRUSKA. I covered that subject in detail in my principal remarks. I pointed out, under the authority of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, that, of the Thirteen Original Colonies and the first State to come into the Union after the formation of the Republic, there was only one that had any semblance of a really substantial basis for apportionment on the basis of population alone.

In the other 13 instances, by an actual count, the overwhelming predominance of the applicability of apportionment on the basis of either political subdivision or geography was the case.

With that history, it would be very odd to presume that the Founding Fathers had in mind that there would be a one-man, one-vote rule. A reading of the dissenting opinion of Justice Harlan in the case of Reynolds against Sims would make the same principle apply in the case of the 14th amendment. If this ruling had been construed to apply at that time, the State legislatures would not have approved the Senate, of which we are part, nor would the amendment have been ratified by the State legislatures had it been approved by Congress.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is entirely correct.

I have always been rather influenced in my study of this matter by his reference, which I have used on previous occasions myself, to the "Federalist Papers" by James Madison, and the quotation from John Adams, and particularly James Madison when he said:

> In republican government, the legislative authority necessarily predominates. The remedy for this is to divide the legislature into different branches and to render them, by different modes of election and different principles of action, as little connected with each other as the nature of their common functions and their common dependence on society would permit.

This is what we have done with Congress.

Taking the general theme of the remarks of the Senator this afternoon, with which I am wholly in accord, I would place a little more accent on the Supreme Court decision itself. I am sure that the Senator is aware that in 1962, the Colorado people had two amendments presented to them on the ballot that fall which may have had the initiative of a constitutional amendment.

The first one was amendment No. 7, the so-called Federal system, under which the State would be able to select its representatives and Senators in any manner it saw fit. The second one was the so-called one-man, one-vote rule, which is a slogan that seems to appeal to some people. That proposal was known as amendment No. 8.

The people of Colorado spoke out with a clear and loud voice, as loudly as anyone could speak, as to their preference.

Amendment No. 7, which would permit an election on other than a population basis, was passed by a vote of more than 2 to 1 in the State of Colorado. Amendment No. 8 was defeated by a vote of more than 2 to 1.

It is significant, I believe, when we talk about reposing confidence in the people and their ordinary commonsense, that in every one of the 63 counties, the majority of the people voting voted for amendment No. 7, which would provide for the Federal system, such as we are trying to espouse in the Dirksen amendment.

The five or six counties immediately surrounding Denver—the counties of Arapahoe, Adams, Boulder, and Jefferson—represent a large proportion of the vote of the State of Colorado—I should say over 50 percent. It is significant that every county, including the counties which people say would be abused if we were to adopt the Federal system, voted by a substantial majority to adopt the Federal system.

All that the Senator is saying is that the people are being deprived of our vote. We in the State of Colorado feel that we have been deprived of our vote because our people voted overwhelmingly, by a 2-to-1 vote, to adopt the Federal system. We rejected the other proposal with just as strong a vote. This occurred in every one of the 63 counties.

Amendment No. 7 was passed in every county. Therefore, we could say that, under the present system which has been placed upon us by the decision of the Supreme Court, we in Colorado have been deprived of our vote. We have been deprived of the right to determine the answer for ourselves.

I believe that when the States came into the Union, and when the U.S. Government and Congress ratified their coming into the Union—and ratified Colorado and Nebraska coming into the Union—it was clearly set up as to how we would choose our legislature. The Court is in a completely untenable position in overturning these decisions.

It seems to me that it is by way of a contract. We have that question raised in other areas when we deal with the water problem. However, we have a situation which existed when we came into the Union with regard to the selection of our legislature. Congress said: "Come on in. We are glad to have you with the constitution that you have. Your constitution does not abrogate the Federal Constitution." We now come along, 100 and some odd years later, and are told, "Your constitution abrogates the Federal Constitution." To me, that is completely inconsistent.

Mr. HRUSKA. Let the Senator from Nebraska say first of all that the Senator from Colorado will find not only this Senator in full sympathy with him on that vote in 1962, but also the citizens of the State to the east of his State; namely, my native State of Nebraska.

In that same year, we had a constitutional amendment that was approved by a popular vote of the people. We have a unicameral legislature. The amendment was approved by a substantial majority in an election in which some 83 percent of the people who voted for Governor voted on that initiative petition.

The people voted to depart from the apportionment by population to the extent of giving a 20-percent weight factor to area and 80-percent weight factor to population.

That was stricken down by the Federal court.

We did not like it any better than the people in Colorado liked having their popularly approved plan upset by the Federal Government.

Mr. ALLOTT. And it was passed in the State of Nebraska, was it not?

Mr. HRUSKA. It was, indeed. It is still a part of our Constitution, but the Supreme Court will not let us use it. We are engaged today in an effort to have the issue become available for the people to vote on it. If their mind is the same, we want to proceed with it. If they have changed their minds, we will go back to the population-only rule.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding to me, and also for making concise answers to my questions.

Mr. HRUSKA. When I reported that in our hearings there was a virtual disregard of the rightness or wrongness of the Supreme Court decision, it was not because witnesses disagreed as to whether it was right, but, being practical and law abiding, it was decided not to take the time of the witnesses or of the committee to labor the point, but to take the Constitution, consisting of the document as we have it, and as interpreted in Reynolds against Sims as being the Constitution, and saying we want to amend the Constitution as it is now constituted and composed in a way that will in part modify the impact of Reynolds against Sims. That was the reasoning behind the effort.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate that.

One further thought occurred to me. The argument has been made that the adoption of this amendment would be inimical to racial minorities. I think I am qualified to speak in this area, because, as the Senator from Nebraska well knows, even before I came to Congress 11 years ago, I had been a stout and stanch advocate of civil rights, and I will not surrender my support of civil rights or my advocacy of it to anybody in this Congress, no matter where he may be from. I believe I have been consistent. I know I have been consistent. No one has a better or more consistent record of supporting civil rights than I have. I can, therefore, ask questions like this without being in fear of someone's saying, "He is against racial minorities." To me it seems impossible that anyone could drag any question like that into the debate and do it with a straight face.

Can the Senator explain to me how this proposal could possibly be inimical to racial minorities?

Mr. HRUSKA. That again is a point which this Senator has labored somewhat. Of course, the rest of the Constitution is not suspended. It is not impaired. That part of the Constitution bearing on discrimination on account of race or color, that part which forbids anything but equal treatment, except for the apportionment pursuant to the formula set out in the proposed amendment, will remain just as effective as they are now.

I previously called attention to the case of Holt against Richardson, a case in Hawaii. The three-judge Federal court assigned various reasons for the decision considering the reapportionment plan as unconstitutional. One of the reasons was that one proposed district "encompassed a highly heterogeneous area containing a multitude of Caucasian widows in the uplands area, and an overabundance of Filipino males in the seaward portion of the district."

The best interests of Caucasians and Filipinos and all other groups are best served when the people of the States can carry out their aspirations, so that all the racial minorities to which reference was made in the hearings can be equally served.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Supreme Court decision and the adherence to the one-man, one-vote doctrine does far more to raise racial issues and racial problems than any question in the history of the United States. When one argues this question with regard to racial matters, the setting up of election districts is not a racial question; it is a human question, whether they be Caucasian women, Filipino men, Chinese, Slovaks, Italians, or Spanish-Americans. We have all those groups in my State. I cannot see how our amendment No. 7 in Colorado was inimical to the interest of any one of those groups.

Mr. HRUSKA. There is a further argument. Even if there were validity and soundness to the argument, namely, that the adoption of the Dirksen amendment would make possible discrimination against racial minorities, would not the position of the opponents of the amendment be, "Let us defeat the amendment so the racial minorities do not gain control or advantage, but the other minorities—in this case the rural minorities—will lose their position of advantage?" It would be pitting one group against another on a racial basis rather than on the basis of geography or political subdivisions, which is what the amendment provides.

Mr. ALLOTT. Plus the fact that each one is a human being.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct; and he has a vote in voting on the question to be submitted.

Mr. MURPHY and Mr. TYDINGS addressed the Chair.

Mr. HRUSKA. I had promised to yield to the Senator from California first. I should like to have the Senator from Maryland remain, for I shall be glad to hear what he has to say.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator for being so patient. I am sorry I missed the main body of the Senator's presentation. I aline myself with the outline he has provided. I shall read it carefully. As of this moment a committee from my own State of California is considering this question. They called on me yesterday. The Senator may be pleased to know that the committee is made up of the majority leader of the senate and the minority leader of the senate and representatives of both the Democratic majority and the Republican minority in California. They are in complete agreement in supporting what the Senator from Nebraska has said, and have spent a great deal of time, and intend to spend more time, to do what they can to bring to the realization of the U.S. Senate that our purpose is to reflect the judgment of the people of the State of California. The people of California, on both sides of the political spectrum, are in complete agreement. They believe, as the Senator from Nebraska believes and as I believe, that there is great faith to be placed in the judgment of the people and that this Government, please God, still believes in the people. In the final analysis, the people should be allowed to make a judgment in this particular matter.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me, and I thank the Senator for his patience.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from California. I may state that there was presented in the hearings a statement for the Honorable Edmund G. Brown, of California, by Hale Champion, California State Director of Finance. There also appeared Hon. Virgil O'Sullivan and Hon. Joseph A. Rattigan, members of the State of California Legislature.

Mr. MURPHY. The two members who appeared in my office yesterday were Hon. Hugh Burns, Democrat, majority leader of the State senate, and the minority leader, Senator Jack McCarthy, so their names could be added to that list.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator. I now yield to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from Nebraska. I may preface my remarks with the comment that it has been a real pleasure for me to serve with the Senator from Nebraska on a number of subcommittees, particularly on the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I make only a few remarks because I intend to comment more at length later on, when the hour perhaps is not so late.

I must say, however, that it is flattering to have so many of the Senator's 43-page speech devoted to refuting arguments which I propounded on the Senate floor early last month. I am delighted by the inference in the Senator's speech that at least as to three of the points which I had previously raised; namely, the lack of judicial review, the absence of periodic review and failure of the amendment to protect the rights of racial minorities, that a new and revised version of the Dirksen rotten borough amendment has been put forward which contains language that its proponents contend will take care of the objections which I did raise.

The Senator devoted a good deal of time in his remarks to the question of whether our State legislatures were historically apportioned on the basis of population. I shall not debate that interesting question at this time. But I should like to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD chapter 2 of the report of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, dated December 1962, concerning the apportionment of State legislatures. The chapter is entitled "Evolution of Representation and Structure of State Legislatures." I ask that this chapter be included at the end of my remarks, and that the statement of Mr. William Coleman before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, on which the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and I both serve, also be included in the RECORD. Mr. Coleman's testimony contains the names of the members of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. It contains such distinguished names as the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and other Senators, Governors, Cabinet officers, and mayors.

I particularly invite attention to one paragraph in the testimony of Mr. Coleman, who was the executive director of this outstanding blue-ribbon Commission, where he says:

> First, population as the sole basis of representation in both houses of State legislatures is not a new or revolutionary doctrine.
>
> To the contrary, in the earlier days of our Republic, this tended to be the rule with other bases constituting the exception. At one time or another, 36 of our 50 States have provided in their constitutions that population would be the primary basis for representation of both houses in the legislature. Twenty-seven of these States provided that it should be the sole basis. This has been an extremely uncomfortable fact for those who contend that the very foundations of the Republic were swept away by the Supreme Court decisions of 1964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I have no objection to that material being printed in the RECORD. I am familiar with the statement. I also know that there are dissenting views in that report, and I ask unanimous consent that those dissenting views be placed in the RECORD immediately following those of the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. In that event, I ask unanimous consent that all of chapter 5 of the Commission's report, including both majority recommendations and dissenting views be included in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I gave assurance to the present occupant of the chair, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], that I would not be long winded in my remarks this evening. I should like to make two other brief points.

On page 26 of the speech of the Senator from Nebraska, he states that the key word is "substantially." He goes on to say that the proponents of the Dirksen amendment fully support the idea that State legislatures should be constituted "substantially" on the basis of population.

I gather from the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska that he has no quarrel with the word "substantially." If that is true, I believe that we should definitely hear from the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] as to whether he would be willing to put the word "substantially" in his amendment, because it would make the difference between night and day.

Finally, I should like to propound some rhetorical questions, to which I do not seek answers this evening, but which I believe must be answered for the RECORD, and for the American public, if the rotten borough amendment should ever reach the floor of the Senate.

Under the latest, third version, of the revised rotten borough amendment, one house of a bicameral legislature or a unicameral legislature may be apportioned on factors other than population, provided those factors are geography or a political subdivision.

My question is: What is geography as a factor in apportioning a State legislature? By that I mean can a State give more weight to an area with mountaineers than it can to a seashore town with fishermen, more seats or more weight to a desert area than to, say, an open area along rivers or along the seacoast where there are little fishing villages?

Can it give more weight to one suburban area than it can to another suburban area, or must it be consistent in applying the geographical factor?

To make the point even more explicitly, the colloquy here yesterday brought up the fact that Hawaii was one State which might be affected, because in Hawaii there are plans to go ahead and annex Samoa and Guam, an area extending over thousands of miles.

Could the distance from Hawaii to Samoa or Guam, under the geographic system, be considered in determining the number of representatives in the Hawaii Legislature which Guam or Samoa might have; or could it not?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator please, I would like to continue to propound my rhetorical questions because I am not seeking debate, I am merely seeking to place these questions in the RECORD. These are questions which should and must be answered in order to know what the constitutional amendment would do. These are questions which were not answered in our hearings.

Mr. MURPHY. If the Senator will yield for just a moment, I merely rise for clarification. Is the Senator's proposal that, if there were annexation of Samoa and Guam to Hawaii, that the intervening waters be considered as part of the geography?

Mr. TYDINGS. Not the intervening waters, but would the distance between Guam and Samoa be considered? We have heard a great deal of talk about distance being a geographic factor. I was referring to the distance a legislator would have to travel—the distance, not the water. I would hope that geography would not include the water area itself.

Mr. MURPHY. But would distance be a geographical factor?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am just asking the question. I am not proposing anything. However, I must say that these are areas in which we have not heard testimony, and on which we do not know the answers. If the Senator from California has the answers and can speak for the Senator from Illinois I believe that we should have them in the RECORD; but I do not know the answer, and I am merely propounding the question for the RECORD.

Mr. President, second, what are political subdivisions? Would an unincorporated town or a sanitary district, or a school district, come within the term "political subdivision." Would a subdivision be limited to counties or towns and cities which have been created by the act of a State legislature, or would a political subdivision extend to bodies which could be created within a county or a township? Where are the lines? What are the extents or the limits to what constitutes a political subdivision? Can new subdivisions be created at will in order to effectuate a malapportionment plan?

Mr. President, these are questions on which I do not seek answers tonight, but which I believe in fairness to all should be answered by the chief proponents of the amendment. There was no specific testimony on these points. These are new areas. I merely bring them up at this time and perhaps later on the Senator from Nebraska may wish to answer them.

Finally, Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Nebraska for permitting me this opportunity to make a few comments by yielding to me. I have enjoyed and will continue to enjoy my association with him.

EXHIBIT 1

CHAPTER II.—EVOLUTION OF REPRESENTATION AND THE STRUCTURE OF STATE LEGISLATURES

HISTORY OF REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT AS APPLIED TO STATE LEGISLATURES

In order to understand the present structure of State legislatures—as expressed both in constitutional provisions and in the often avoidance or ineffective implementation of those provisions—it is necessary to understand the theory of representative government, and to view its application at different times in history. As with any theory of government, the theory of representative government has been subject to constant change and modification in order to meet changing times and circumstances. Since this report is concerned solely with the basis of representation in State legislatures, the review of the general theory will be limited.

The path of representative government has followed the changing interests of the community. Its history, for purposes of application to State legislatures, began with the struggle between the European kings and their subjects. The kings, in order to raise revenues and armies, had to have the assistance of the feudal lords. To obtain this assistance, various councils to the king were created—in England the council soon became the Parliament. Once established, the council or Parliament, began to appreciate its power with respect to the king. Slowly, the leverage gained by these lords developed into representative government. As Charles A. Beard has said:

"Representative government began its career as an instrument of political power, in a given complex of social and economic circumstances, to serve the purposes of the ruling monarchs; and it has played a bewildering role, in form, spirit and authority for more than five hundred years. Flexibility has been its prime characteristic.[2]

During the American colonial period profound changes were taking place in the governmental structure of England.

The American colonies were founded in a century in which England developed highly significant ideas of representation. At the beginning of the 17th century, the power of the Throne in England was great. By the middle of the century, the Crown had been temporarily banished, and by the end of the century, Parliament had become supreme and modern "representative government" had begun.[3]

These developments had a strong impact on colonial America. The English development during the 17th century was concerned largely with the respective roles of the King and Parliament. It was not until this issue was resolved, or its conclusion clear, that attention was turned to the constitution and operation of the representative body.

Representative government in England was conceived at a time when nearly all wealth was measured by land. It was natural, therefore, for the first representatives to the King's Council or Parliament to be selected on the basis of land holdings, since it was from such land that the king hoped to obtain royal revenues. As commerce grew, the king found it expedient to grant charters to cities and towns. Such charters, in addition to dealing with taxing powers of the king, usually granted the town representation in the Parliament. Representation at this time was not based on population or any other criterion that might be related to population—it was based on town or feudal units.

As the power of Parliament grew and as it turned its attention to matters other than revenue and taxes, stirrings began to be heard. Were land and political subdivisions the appropriate criteria for determining representation in Parliament? It was not until the Reform Act of 1832 that England finally resolved the question of Parliamentary representation in favor of population. The struggle had lasted for nearly two centuries, and it was during this struggle that colonial America was settled.

American colonial legislatures were greatly affected by the matters at issue in England, but the heirs of English history were quicker to accept population as a basis of representation than was the mother country. As early as 1635 Massachusetts gave recognition to population in towns by establishing the following formula:[4]

No. of freeholders:	*Representatives*
0–10	0
10–20	1
20–40	2
Over 40	3

Rhode Island gave similar recognition to population, but Connecticut provided for equal representation for each town.[5] In view of this checkerboard pattern, Luce was able to say "Nowhere did representation bear any uniform relation to the number of electors. Here and there the factor of size had been crudely recognized."[6]

During the period from 1776 to 1790, the States of the emerging nation grappled with the problem of organizing their respective governments. The problem of legislative representation based on population (or one of its equivalents—qualified electors, taxable inhabitants, taxes paid, etc.) or political subdivision was one of many dealt with at great length. The question of the basis of representation at the State level was intertwined with numerous other issues (particularly qualifications for voting and qualifications for holding office), but we are not here concerned with these matters.

Mr. Luce gives to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, under its constitution of 1776, the distinction of being the first to adopt population—in this case taxable inhabitants—as the basis for legislative representation. The Pennsylvania constitution of 1776 also provided for a unicameral legislature. When a new constitution, adopted in 1790, established a bicameral legislature, Pennsylvania retained population as the basis of representation in both houses of its legislature. Following the lead of Pennsylvania, the States of Georgia (unicameral), New York, and South Carolina adopted population as the basis of representation. Massachusetts and New Hampshire modified population somewhat as the basis of representation in one of the houses of their bicameral legislature. The tradition of representation from the town was to be retained, but both States required a minimum number of "rateable polls" (qualified voters) for representation and provided for additional representation for the larger towns. In Massachusetts the ratios were: 150–175, one representative; 175–600, two representatives; 600,

---

[1] The brief historical review which follows necessarily oversimplifies the issues and conflicts in the development of representative government. For a comprehensive review of the history of representative government see Robert Luce, "Legislative Principles" (Houghton Mifflin Co., 1930) and Alfred de Grazia, "Public and Republic" (Alfred A. Knoph, Inc., 1951).

[2] Charles A. Beard and John D. Lewis, "Representative Government in Evolution," American Political Science Review, 26: 223 (1932).

[3] De Grazia, op. cit., p. 13.

[4] Luce, op. cit., p. 337.

[5] Ibid., p. 340.

[6] Ibid., p. 342.

three representatives; and an additional representative for each 250 "rateable polls." New Hampshire adopted a similar formula.

Representation based on political subdivisions—counties—of the State developed in the middle Atlantic States. Delaware and New Jersey based representation in both houses of their legislatures on the county. Maryland, North Carolina and Virginia did the same but provided additional representation for certain specified cities. If the 1790 population figures of these five States are considered, it appears that representation based on counties did not differ greatly from the distribution of the State's population (table I).

TABLE I.—*Distribution of counties by population in States using the county as the basis of representation in 1790* [1]

County population	Delaware	New Jersey	Maryland [2]	North Carolina	Virginia
Over 20,000	1	1	5	0	1
15,000 to 20,000	2	6	6	1	6
10,000 to 15,000	0	4	6	9	24
5,000 to 10,000	0	1	2	36	37
Under 5,000	0	1	1	8	41

[1] Source: "First Census of the United States: Return of the Whole Number of Persons," 1790.

[2] Baltimore City with a population of 13,503 is included as a separate county.

Closer analysis reveals that the disparity between population and representation was even less than that which appears in Table I for some of the five States. In Delaware the population of the most populous county was 20,488 while that of the least populous was 18,920. In New Jersey, with the exception of one county with a population of 2,571, the population range for 12 counties was between 8,248 and 20,153. The population distribution by counties in Maryland and North Carolina, while not as uniform as that of Delaware and New Jersey, was sufficiently uniform so that representation based on the county permitted all interests to be reasonably represented in the State legislature. In Maryland county population ranged from 4,809 to 30,791; between these extremes were 15 counties with populations between 11,640 and 22,598. In North Carolina the range was between a high of 15,828 and a low of 3,071. Virginia had the greatest extreme—a low 951 and a high of 22,105. This variation of representation in the Virginia legislature caused Thomas Jefferson to criticize the Virginia constitution because "among those who share the representation, the shares are unequal." [7]

Connecticut and Rhode Island used the town for the basis of representation in one house of their bicameral legislatures; though in both States, size of towns was crudely recognized. Unfortunately, the 1790 census did not list town populations for Connecticut. The 30 towns of Rhode Island contained populations ranging from a low of 507 to a high of 6,716 and 24 of them had populations between 1,100 and 4,200. As with the States using the county as the basis of representation, the population differences between towns were relatively small in Rhode Island.

The next significant event was the passage of the Northwest Ordinance by the Congress under the Articles of Confederation on July 13, 1787. This ordinance provided the guide to the development of the American West. It is perhaps significant that this ordinance was enacted in the same year that the Constitutional Convention completed the final draft of the new Constitution of the United States for submission to the States for ratification, and it should be recalled that the Northwest Ordinance was adopted with each State having only one vote. With respect to representation in territorial legislatures the ordinance said in section 9:

So soon as there shall be 5,000 free male inhabitants, of full age, in the district, upon giving proof thereof to the governor, they shall receive authority, with time and place, to elect representatives from their counties or townships, to represent them in the general assembly. Provided, that for every 500 free male inhabitants there shall be one representative, and so on, progressively with the number of free male inhabitants, shall the right of representation increase, until the number of representatives shall amount to 25; after which the number and proportion of representatives shall be regulated by the legislature.

While the basis of representation specified in the Northwest Ordinance may not be absolutely clear from a reading of its provisions, the subsequent actions of the States formed out of the Northwest Territory leaves little doubt as to their understanding of the basis for legislative representation. Table II indicates that the newly formed States clearly considered population to be the basis of legislative representation for both houses of their legislatures. Of the 20 States joining the union after ratification of the constitution and prior to the Civil War only two, Vermont and Florida, provided otherwise.

TABLE II.—*Basis for representation in State legislatures as contained in original State constitutions*

Year of admission	Number of States	Both houses population	Both houses population with slight modification in 1 house	1 house population; 1 house subdivision	Both houses subdivision	
					With modification	Without modification
Colonies	13	[1] 4	2	2	3	2
To 1800	3	2			[1] 1	
1801-20	7	5	2			
1821-40	3	1	2			
1841-60	7	6		[2] 1		
1861-80	5	[3] 3	1	1		
1881-1900	7	[4] 4	1	[5] 1		1
1901-20	3	[6] 2			1	
1921 to date	2		1	[7] 1		
Total	50	27	9	6	5	3

[1] Georgia, Pennsylvania, and Vermont adopted a unicameral legislature in their original constitutions and are included on the basis of the particular apportionment formula.

[2] The Florida Senate, while based on counties, required newly organized counties to have the equivalent of the statewide ratio before being entitled to a senator.

[3] The Colorado constitution provided for representation in both houses of its legislature to be according to "ratios" fixed by law.

[4] The Utah constitution was similar to that of Colorado.

[5] While the Idaho constitution gave 1 senator to each county, the original constitutional apportionment combined several counties to form senate districts.

[6] The New Mexico constitution contained no provision for apportionment, but in allocating legislative seats, it combined counties as well as giving more than 1 senator and/or representative to certain named counties.

[7] The Hawaiian Senate is apportioned according to constitutionally specified districts which give some recognition to population and the house is apportioned according to population.

In summary, the original constitutions of 36 States required that representation be based completely, or almost so, on population. Subsequently, through constitutional amendment, often according legal status to institutionalized practices, this pattern was to change because of the growth of big cities.

THE STRUCTURE OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Present constitutional apportionment formulas

A summary of State constitutional provisions governing apportionment as of November, 1, 1961, is included in appendix A. Table III summarizes the data from appendix A in a manner designed for comparison with the information contained in table II.

TABLE III.—*Constitutional provisions for representation in State legislatures as of November 1961* [1]

	Col. 1 Both houses population	Both houses population		Col. 4 1 house population; 1 house subdivision	Col. 5 Both houses subdivision	
		Col. 2 With slight modification in 1 house	Col. 3 With significant modification in 1 house		With modification	Without modification
50 States	15	9	12	7	7	

[1] Where population is qualified by permitting a county with ½ (for example, Oregon) or ⅔ (for example, Tennessee) of the State population ratio to send a representative to a particular legislative body, that qualification is not considered as modifying the population basis of representation. Thus, Oregon which provides a ½ ratio provision for representation in both houses of its legislature is placed in col. 1. Nebraska, with a unicameral legislature, based on population is also placed in col. 1. The placing of certain States in col. 2 or col. 3 presented certain difficulties which were resolved somewhat arbitrarily: For example, both Alabama and Iowa provide that its house of representatives shall be based on population, but each county is guaranteed 1 representative. Despite identical constitutional provisions, Alabama was included in col. 2, and Iowa is included in col. 3. The reason for this distinction is the relation between the size of the particular house and the number of representatives authorized in that body. The Alabama House has 106 members, and the State has 67 counties, while the Iowa House has 108 members and the State has 99 counties. In Iowa, only 9 seats may be distributed on the basis of population, but in Alabama, 39 seats may be so distributed. In Alabama, if 2 counties contained 50 percent of the State's population, they might elect 38.7 percent of the membership of the body, but 2 similar counties in Iowa would elect at most 10.2 percent of the membership of the legislative body.

NOTE.—Certain factors relating to the classification set forth in table III must be made before a comparison is undertaken.

Pennsylvania limits house representation from any one city or county to one-sixth of the membership. The constitutions of New York and Rhode Island contain similar limitations on representation from single political subdivisions. These limitations at one time operated to limit the representation, if based only on population, of the cities of Philadelphia, New York, and Providence. Now, shifts in population have neutralized the effects of such restrictions upon the relationship between population and representation, and they are unlikely to affect apportionment in these States in the future. In some States, such as Colorado and Hawaii, such restrictions would seriously affect the distribution of legislative seats.

---

[7] Ibid., p. 352.

States such as California, Illinois, and Michigan combine area and population as the basis for apportionment of senate seats. California provides that its senate, consisting of 40 members, shall be apportioned according to population, except that no single county shall have more than one senator (over a third of the State's population resides in one county), and no more than three of the State's 58 counties may be combined to form a senatorial district. The Illinois constitution divides the State into three districts—Chicago, the rest of Cook County, and the rest of the State—and apportions a specified number of senate seats to the respective districts. Area is a prime consideration in apportioning seats within the three districts. The assignment of seats to the three districts recognizes the population factor to some extent. The constitutionally specified senatorial districts in Michigan represent an apportionment somewhat similar to the combination of constitutional provision and actual practice in Illinois.

The extent to which the population factor is limited in apportionment of both houses varies greatly among the States. The Arkansas senate is apportioned permanently into districts based on the State's population in the 1950 census; its house, 100 members, is apportioned according to population, with each of 75 counties guaranteed one seat.[8] The distinction between the Arkansas provisions and those of Pennsylvania and Rhode Island, discussed above are obvious. The effect of the Mississippi constitutional provisions is similar to that of the Arkansas provisions in that apportionment under the present constitutional formula could provide for representation substantially in accord with the State's population distribution; a future change in that distribution could result in significant differences between population and representation.[9] Florida and Georgia, both having small senates and houses of representatives relative to the number of counties, limit the representation from single counties to one member in the senate, and guarantee each county one representative while at the same time limiting representation from the larger counties in the house. The combination of these requirements permits a small percentage of the State's population to elect a majority of representatives to both legislative bodies in these two States.

Certain significant differences appear between original and present State constitutional apportionment provisions. The original constitutional provisions of 36 States contained apportionment provisions based completely or substantially on population. At present only 24 constitutions contain such apportionment provisions. The original constitutions of three States based representation in both houses on political subdivisions, with no recognition of population differences—no State constitution contains such provisions today. A concept not found in original State constitutions—one house based on population and the second based on population with significant modification—now appears in the constitutions of 12 States.

Composition of State legislatures

A characteristic feature of most State legislatures is that a relatively small percentage of population elects a majority of the members. This characteristic has given rise to most of the litigation that has followed in the wake of *Baker* v. *Carr*.

The facts noted in numerous studies of representation in State legislatures are generally known, and it is unnecessary to repeat many of them here. To summarize, as of June 1, 1961, in only 11 States did 35 percent or more of the population elect a majority of the members to both houses of the State legislature; in only five of these States did the figure exceed 40 percent. On the other hand, there were at least seven States where less than 30 percent of the population elected a majority of the representatives to both houses of the legislature. Appendix B details data on the percentages necessary to elect a controlling majority in State legislative bodies and the population of the smallest and largest legislative districts in each State. In most instances where significantly less than a majority of a State's population can elect 50 percent or more of the legislators, it is the suburban or entire metropolitan areas which are underrepresented rather than the central city.[10]

The size of a legislature has an important bearing on the legislative process, and has particular implications for legislative apportionment. The membership of State senates ranges from 17 to 67, while the size of State houses of representatives ranges from 35 to 400. Without exception, State senates are the smaller bodies in the legislative branch of the State government. Size of the legislative body is particularly significant where representation is based on political subdivisions of the State. (The size and political control of State legislatures and the political affiliation of the Governor as of November 1, 1961, is contained in appendix C.)

With the exception of three New England States—Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont—all States which require recognition of political subdivisions in apportioning legislative seats utilize the county as the unit for this purpose.[11] This requirement, when applied to the number of applicable subdivisions in a particular State usually limits representation on a population basis, especially in a small legislative body or in a State with a large number of political subdivisions.

The constitutions of 28 States guarantee at least one representative to each county or town in the State. However, in only eight of these States is the county or town the only factor in apportionment. The other 22 States give some recognition to population while insisting that each designated political subdivision receive at least one seat.

Of the latter 22 States, 17 have over 75 counties. While these States give some recognition to population in apportioning additional seats in the house, given such a requirement, it is difficult to avoid great disparities between representation and population without having an unduly large legislative body. For example, if Georgia, with 159 counties, were to apportion seats in its house of representatives on the basis of population and still provide at least one representative from each county, its house would consist of over 2,600 members. On the other hand, although Alabama gives each county one representative in its house of representatives, this apportionment does not result in as serious a deviation from population representation as does a similar requirement in Iowa. (See footnote to table III.) Yet, to give full effect to population would require over 300 members in the Alabama house instead of 106.

Party affiliation is of fundamental importance in the apportionment process. Of 74 legislative bodies, in 37 States,[12] the Democratic Party has a majority in 38 bodies, the Republican Party has a majority in 35 bodies, and in one body representation is equal (appendix C). In only five of these States is party control limited to only one house. In 31 States one party controls both houses of the State legislature.

The apportionment process in the States

While numerous State constitutional provisions place severe or minor limitations on the degree to which apportionment of legislative seats may be based on population, considerable latitude remains for the apportioning agencies to give greater weight to population than they have chosen to do. Of the total of 99 State legislative bodies, there are 16 which because of constitutional provisions may not be reapportioned periodically. Such limiting provisions either allocate a specified number of representatives to each political subdivision or establish permanent legislative districts. For eight additional legislative bodies, the constitutional requirements are so restrictive that the apportioning agency has very little discretion in apportioning seats in the legislature. The apportioning agencies of the remaining 75 legislative bodies possess considerable authority in the apportionment process within the limits of State constitutions. Many of these limits are explicit as to the standards the apportioning agency must follow.

The State legislature has sole responsibility for the periodic apportionment of legislative seats in 60 of the 83 legislative bodies for which permanent legislative districts are not established. As will be seen below, it is primarily because of the way this power has been exercised or ignored that much of the apportionment litigation has been initiated. Although there are some exceptions, State legislatures simply have not complied with their constitutional duties regarding apportionment.

---

[8] Based on the 1960 census figures, the apportionment provisions of the Arkansas constitution would not justify classifying Arkansas with the group of States whose constitutional provisions require apportionment of both houses of the State legislature in such a manner as to provide gross disparities between population and representation. However, despite the immediate situation Arkansas has been so classified because of the likely effect of future population growth.

[9] The constitutional provisions for apportionment of the Mississippi Legislature provide a unique example of a basic problem in legislative apportionment. The State is divided in three large districts representing historical differences of interests and power. With the exception of the fact that each of 82 counties is guaranteed 1 representative in a 140-member house, seats in both houses are to be apportioned almost equally among the three districts and on the basis of population within the districts. At the present time, the population of, and number of counties within, the three districts are relatively equal, and within each district, the population distribution is such that apportionment of 58 house seats on the basis of population would permit representation substantially in accord with population. While this population distribution has been present through most of the history of the State of Mississippi there is no certainty that it will continue.

[10] Paul T. David and Ralph Eisenberg, "Devaluation of the Urban and Suburban Vote" (University of Virginia, 1961), pp. 12–13.

[11] As used here, recognition means granting at least one representative to each political subdivision of a given type within the State. In Louisiana the parish is used for this purpose.

[12] For purposes of this analysis each house of the State legislature is considered a separate legislative body. In addition, the 11 Southern States and the 2 States with nonpartisan elections are omitted. Information is as of Nov. 1, 1961, as contained in Book of the States 1962–63, Council of State Governments (Chicago, 1962), p. 41.

To secure apportionment of legislative seats at constitutionally prescribed intervals in the 60 legislative bodies mentioned above would require action on the part of 34 State legislatures. Of these, 15 can be said to have apportioned legislative seats at regular intervals (every 10 years or less since 1940), while 7 have not taken any apportionment action since 1930. The remaining 12 legislatures have acted on apportionment at regular intervals since 1930.[13]

Of the 15 legislatures that have apportioned regularly, five—Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico and South Carolina—are limited by constitutional provisions to apportionment of seats in only one house of the legislature. In most instances these five legislatures have performed their limited responsibility. In two States—Georgia and Kansas—legislative authority is broad with respect to apportioning one house of the legislature on the basis of population, but narrow with respect to the second house. In these States the legislatures acted creditably in exercising their limited responsibility, but very conservatively in exercising their broad responsibility. The Florida legislature is permitted only narrow authority in apportioning both houses. The final group of seven States—Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Oklahoma, Virginia, and West Virginia—present significant variations. The New York and Oklahoma constitutions contain what many call severe limitations on apportionment according to population. Despite these limitations, the New York legislature has apportioned legislative seats according to its constitution while Oklahoma has not. Apportionment is based strictly on population in three (Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Virginia) of the remaining five States (Maine and West Virginia are the exceptions) and the three State legislatures have done reasonably well in meeting their apportionment duties, though the three apportionments are being challenged in court. The limitations contained in the Maine and West Virginia constitutions are not particularly significant in view of the States' population distribution, and the Maine legislature has complied with its constitutional provisions while West Virginia has not.

Obviously and understandably State legislatures generally have had an extremely difficult time when confronted with apportionment legislation. It is essential to look briefly at some of the reasons for the difficulty. If we can understand the difficulties, it may then be possible to develop procedures that will eliminate or at least minimize them.

The major problem facing legislators in this matter, is that apportionment of legislative seats is a function of political power—political power in the most personal sense. Certainly apportionment is of major concern to political parties, the many interest groups in our society, the political subdivisions of the State, and the people generally, but to the State legislator, apportionment often represents a challenge to the interests of his constituents, to his tenure in office, and to his power to influence the policy decisions of the State. In a study of the problem in Illinois it was said that:

"Redistricting legislation is of basic concern to legislators because it is a kind of job specification which can be drawn to the special advantage or disadvantage of any member. Redistricting can insure continuity in office or can insure retirement, depending on the terms of the bill. No other legislation has quite the same direct effect on a legislative career, and with no other legislation do the demands, the proposals, the maneuvering, and the compromises emanate within the legislative body to the same extent."[14]

Steiner and Gove observed that "Redistricting proposals that dislodge a minimum number of sitting members, irrespective of party, will be favored over proposals that do not take into account sitting members."[15] This conclusion is supported by numerous other studies.

While personal factors may play a primary or the primary role in legislative apportionment when the legislature itself is called upon to act, numerous other factors are involved. Second only to the personal factor is the problem of the so-called "urban-rural" conflict. In this context the issue is not one of determining the basis of representation, but of which "group" shall control the legislature of a State. (The history of apportionment has shown that the States considered population to be the basic factor in the apportionment of legislative seats when their first constitutions were adopted. Around the turn of the present century, it became evident that significant shifts in legislative districts would be required in most States if population continued to be the primary or sole basis of representation. The possibility of shift coincided with the beginning of the real growth of big cities and urban areas. Up until that time most of the legislatures had been apportioned in accordance with constitutional mandates. For example, the last apportionment in Illinois, before its 1955 constitutional amendment, occurred in 1901. In 1901 Cook County contained 38.1 percent of the State's population and the county received 37 percent of the seats in each house of the legislature. That the start of the 20th century marked a turning point in apportionment, is attested to by numerous studies.[16])

The pattern on which to challenge population as the basis of apportionment was developed in the States during the 19th century and followed in some respects the pattern used in England prior to 1832. While State constitutions called for apportionment according to population, in most instances they required that counties not be split when forming a legislative district. During this period it becomes the common practice to give each county one representative in at least one house of the State legislature. At that time there were few States with large centers of population in relation to the State's total population. In addition, many counties were unorganized. Since the State had the basic responsibility for elections, it was only logical to select the county as the basic unit through which to administer elections. The institutionalized practice of giving each county one representative in one house of a State legislature was given legal status in some State constitutions, such as Kansas and Iowa, and became the standard practice of legislatures in other States, including West Virginia.

While apportionment has produced serious inter-party conflict in some States, most observers have been unable to find clearly partisan political positions taken in this field. The following observations were made of two States—Michigan and New York—where apportionment certainly has been considered a partisan issue:

"Moreover, not all Democrats or Republicans share their own party's view on this issue—Democrats in the Upper Peninsula of the State would be likely to lose seats in a reapportionment, for example, and heavily populated and Republican Oakland County would probably gain some legislative seats. Thus, while party politics are clearly involved, this is not entirely a political party issue.[17]

"The position of Tammany legislators is illustrative of the politics of reapportionment in several States today where politicians of the city proper team up with rural county legislators to oppose redistricting along population lines because both are likely to lose some seats to the growing metropolitan area."[18]

This matter of intra- as opposed to inter-party rivalry in apportionment is even more apparent in States where one party has commanded the allegiance of a large majority of the voters for a long period of time. The problem is perhaps best summed up by Hobbs:

"In most States, legislative reapportionments are blocked by representatives whose counties are overrepresented. This is at least understandable, but in some States representatives from greatly underrepresented counties also secretly work in collusion with representatives from greatly overrepresented counties to block increased representation. The reasoning being that so long as a small number of representatives are elected in their districts the more important they become. It is a truism that power sharing is not often eagerly sought by politicians.[19]

Further, in regard to the frequency of apportionment, the constitutions of some States require apportionment more often than every 10 years. Such provisions were more common in constitutions of the 19th century. Hobbs, noting that Mississippi reapportioned its legislature on the average of every four and a half years during the 19th century, says: "The regular periodicity of reapportionment made them quite easy to effect since population changes were not given an opportunity to create vested interests in the status quo to the point where reassigning legislators became next to impossible."[20]

In 14 States the responsibility for periodically apportioning the seats of 23 legislative bodies has been partially or completely removed from the jurisdiction of the legislature.[21] Ohio, in its constitution of 1851, was first to adopt this approach. Most of the other States having such a procedure adopted it quite recently. Perhaps the most significant result of this development is that in most of the States having such procedures, the apportioning agency has complied with State constitutional apportionment requirements. The development and growth of nonlegislative apportionment procedures have occurred because of dissatisfaction with the manner in which many State legislatures had dealt with their responsibilities.

---

[13] See appendix A.

[14] Gilbert Y. Steiner and Samuel K. Gove, "The Legislature Redistricts Illinois" (the Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois, 1956), p. 5.

[15] Ibid., p. 31.

[16] See Gordon E. Baker, "Rural Versus Urban Political Power" (Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1955); Thomas Page, "Legislative Apportionment in Kansas" (Bureau of Government Research, University of Kansas, 1952); Edward H. Hobbs, "Legislative Apportionment," Yesterday's Constitution Today, edited by Hobbs (Bureau of Public Administration, University of Mississippi, 1960).

[17] Herbert Garfinkel and L. J. Fein, "Fair Representation: A Citizen's Guide to Legislative Apportionment in Michigan" (Michigan State University, 1960), p. 1.

[18] Hugh A. Bone, "States Attempting To Comply With Reapportionment Requirements," Law and Contemporary Problems, 17:401 (Spring 1952). New York did not reapportion its legislature between 1917 and 1941. The Democratic Party obtained control of both houses of the State legislature and the governorship in the late 1930's. Despite the concerted efforts of the statewide party leaders, the Manhattan Democrats, joining with Republican legislators, were able to defeat any apportionment legislation. Manhattan opposition was based on the fact that it would lose representatives while other portions of Democratic New York City would gain representatives.

[19] Hobbs, op. cit. (footnote 19), p. 127.

[20] Ibid., p. 126.

[21] On Nov. 6, 1962, voters in three States approved proposals affecting apportionment procedures. In Colorado, members of a legislature that fails to apportion house seats according to the population formula in the constitution can be denied their salary or the opportunity to seek reelection. In North Carolina, the speaker of the house was assigned responsibility to apportion house seats, and in Oklahoma an apportionment commission was given the responsibility to apportion seats in the legislature.

The 14 States divide into two basic groups. The first, including California, Oregon, Illinois, South Dakota, Texas, Michigan, and North Dakota, provide for nonlegislative action in the event that the legislature fails to act within a designated time. The other seven States—Alaska, Missouri, Ohio, Hawaii, New Jersey (statutory only), Arkansas, and Arizona—have removed the legislature completely from the apportionment process.

At least seven State constitutions—Alaska, Arkansas, Hawaii, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Texas—specifically provide for court review of apportionment legislation or plans. In addition, a number of State courts have held that they may review apportionment proposals to insure that the provisions of the State constitution have been compiled with. Most of these State court decisions were rendered long before *Baker* v. *Carr*. Among the States in which courts have reached this decision are Massachusetts, New Jersey, Virginia, Michigan, Illinois, Ohio, Washington, Clorado, Indiana, Kansas, and Kentucky. While these and other State courts have exercised the authority to review the constitutionality of State apportionment proposals, they have, except where a local government districting or a nonlegislative body is involved, generally refused to direct the legislature to apportion according to the constitutional provisions of the State. The first exception to this practice was made not by the U.S. Supreme Court, but by the Supreme Court of New Jersey in *Asbury Park Press, Inc.* v. *Woolley*.[22]

EFFECTS OF THE PRESENT STRUCTURE

The urban-rural conflict

In determining the effects of "malapportionment" of State legislatures, it is necessary to define what constitutes malapportionment. In most simple terms, it is the granting of greater representation to rural or sparsely populated areas than they are either entitled to under the provisions of the State constitution or they would be entitled to if apportionment were based solely on population. Conversely, if population alone is considered, urban areas are underrepresented in State legislatures on either basis. If persons residing in rural and urban areas, assuming they can be divided into two separate groups, sought the same legislative goals there might be no issue raised by the fact that legislative seats are not apportioned according to population. While no absolute dichotomy of interests exists between urban and rural residents, there are apparently enough differences affecting enough interests to say that some type of a conflict exists. Whether this conflict can be analyzed in concrete terms when applied to specific issues is another question. There is no doubt that the conflict exists in the actual apportionment process. Even in the apportionment process, however, many instances have been noted where urban leaders have been less than forthright in their demands for more equal representation. Against this immediate qualification, it is obviously difficult to trace with any degree of precision the effects of the present systems of apportionment.

To quantify the extent of the underrepresentation of population in State legislatures (as show in Appendix B) is one matter, but to determine what particular segment of the population actually is underrepresented in a particular State requires much more careful analysis. The 1960 Census revealed that 112.9 million individuals or 63.0 percent of the Nation's population reside in the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas.[23] While the residents of SMSA's are usually the people who are most underrepresented in State legislatures, they do not form a single homogenous group. On a national scale approximately half of these people reside outside the central cities. Appendix D shows the central city-suburban population distribution by States. In the present distribution of seats in many State legislatures it is the suburban area and not the city that is most underrepresented. In Maryland, for instance, the city of Baltimore has 30 percent of the State's population and it elects 20 percent of the members of the State senate, while the three largest counties, all within SMSA's have 35 percent of the State's population but elect only 10 percent of the Senate senators. The potential impact of this population distribution will be explored below.

Effects on intergovernmental relations

The most often quoted statement concerning the effect of underrepresentation of urban areas in State legislatures was made by the earlier Kestnbaum Commission:

"Reapportionment should not be thought of solely in terms of a conflict of interests between urban and rural areas. In the long run, the interests of all in an equitable system of representation that will strengthen State government is far more important than any temporary advantage to an area enjoying overrepresentation.

"The problem of reapportionment is important * * * because legislative neglect of urban communities has led more and more people to look to Washington for more and more of the services and controls they desire. * * *

"One result of State neglect of the reapportionment problem is that urban governments have bypassed the States and made direct cooperative agreements with the National Government * * * the multiplication of the National-local relationships tends to weaken the State's proper control over its own policies and its authority over its own political subdivisions."[24]

While there can be little doubt that the past 30 years have seen an increasing national interest in matters that were once considered the basic responsibility of State and local governments, it is sometimes difficult to place all responsibility for this trend at the feet of State legislatures not apportioned according to population. As Harvey Walker has said:

"History has shown that despite the transfer of many State activities to Federal control, the tasks to be performed by the States have not declined, but have increased, new ones being added frequently in response to public demand."[25]

Although the above statements may be contradictory, the available facts certainly support both. The Federal Government is now involved in housing, sewerage treatment, airports, and numerous other programs directly affecting both State and local government. At the same time, the States have assumed larger roles in programs involving water resources, recreation, mental health, and education, among others. The extent of State government activities is attested to by the continuing increase in State taxation and expenditures during the past 20 years.[26] To what extent the trend of Federal participation is due to the growing complexity of our society is certainly an unanswered question at the present time. Ruth C. Silva has provided one answer:

"The multiplication of national-local relations does, of course, weaken the State's proper control over its own policies and its authority over its own political subdivisions. The (Kestnbaum) Commission correctly pointed out that the National Government is often more responsive to urban needs, because urban interests are frequently more effectively represented in Congress than in their own State legislatures. The same shift in population which has made our State legislatures less representative has made the Congress more representative of urban areas. For, unlike most State legislatures, the national House of Representatives has been reapportioned after almost every decennial census. Moreover, since United States Senators are elected at large, they have become increasingly dependent on urban voters for their election to the Senate."[27]

The impact of the present apportionment of State legislatures on State-local and interlocal relations is also difficult to assess. During the latter half of the 19th century the city home rule movement began. Today many States have granted full or partial recognition to municipal home rule. But this solution to a problem of the 19th century and early 20th century may be inadequate today. Home rule was developed in order to permit cities to resolve their own problems without having to go to the State for assistance. At the time most of the residents and industry of urban areas were congregated within the territorial limits of the city itself; this is no longer true. This shift in population distribution within many metropolitan areas has meant that the central city no longer possesses the authority to resolve areawide problems, and since the views of the central city and its suburban area often are in conflict, they cannot reach agreement on a particular approach to the problem. This disagreement or conflict often is transferred to the State legislature. The 1955 apportionment of the Illinois house according to population shows this clearly:

"It is interesting that in the 1957 House, after reapportionment had placed all Cook County districts either completely inside or completely outside the city of Chicago, there were only 4 of the 332 contested roll calls displaying a cohesion of more than 67 percent for the combined Chicago-Cook County group which had a numerical majority in the House."[28]

Derge also notes that disagreement within the delegation from the Chicago metropolitan area occurred more frequently than any other disagreement in the State legislature. Many have said that in most instances where the representatives of the urban area could agree among themselves as to what they want, the State legislature would be more than happy to give it to them.

---

[22] 161 Atl. 2d 705 (1960).

[23] A standard metropolitan statistical area includes a central city or cities with a population in excess of 50,000 and the surrounding counties which form an integrated community with such city or cities. See U.S. Bureau of the Census "U.S. Census of Population 1960, U.S. Summary," number of inhabitants, PC (1), 1A (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961), p. XXIV, for detailed definition.

[24] Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, "A Report to the President for Transmittal to the Congress" (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1955), pp. 39–40.

[25] Harvey Walker, "Myth and Reality in State Constitutional Development," State Constitutional Revision, ed. W. Brooke Graves (Public Administration Service, 1960), p. 9.

[26] See annual series, U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Compendium of State Government Finances in 19—" (U.S. Government Printing Office).

[27] Ruth C. Silva, "Legilslative Representation With Special Reference to New York," Law and Contemporary Problems, 27: 409 (summer 1962).

[28] David R. Derge, "Urban-Rural Conflict: The Case in Illinois," Legislative Behavior, A Reader in Theory and Research, ed. John C. Wahlke and Heinz Eulau (The Free Press, 1959), p. 227.

Obviously this reflects only part of the picture. After indicating that 239 of 1,102 laws dealing with city government enacted by the Kansas legislature between 1911 and 1947 related only to Wichita, Topeka, and Kansas City, Page said:

"The legislature actually abdicates the general legislative function by yielding to any local government's request for a new or amended power as long as that power is narrow in scope and is made special for that unit alone."[29]

This statement leads to several observations. The fact that the power granted is usually narrow in scope means that it often may not be sufficient to resolve the problem that precipitated the appeal to the State legislature. Perhaps more important, it reveals a general disassociation on the part of some State legislators with the problems that may confront the city. A power, narrow in scope, frequently is granted without a full evaluation of its effect. The legislature in effect says: "It's your problem. You want this power. Okay—but don't bother us about it." This point is spelled out in detail by both Page and Derge.

One further point should be mentioned. In discussing the provisions of the Mississippi constitution guaranteeing each county one seat in the house, Hobbs says:

"Under present constitutional provisions county consolidation is made virtually impossible, since to consolidate may be to lose representation."[30]

County governments, established by the State legislature, were for the most part created during the 19th century, and structured to meet the problems of that century. Guaranteeing county representation in a legislature impedes county consolidation where such action might be necessary to resolve new problems or to provide more effective local government. This adverse effect on local government structure probably would occur most frequently in rural areas.

Effects on functional programs

The 1960 and 1962 reports of the National Municipal League[31] reveal that its observers find the greatest effect of present apportionment of State legislatures involves State grants-in-aid or the allocation of funds to local government, and labor and welfare matters. These observations are in accord with other studies[32] as well as numerous comments made to the Commission staff during the preparation of this report. In some States none of these effects were noted; in others only some were noted. Perhaps the most significant factor about the functions listed as most affected by the present apportionment of State legislatures is that they involve problems closely tied to urban areas.

Effects on political parties

Available studies indicate that the present distribution of legislative seats does affect the political makeup of legislatures in some States. In order to assess this impact, it is necessary to determine whether the main strength of a political party is located in an area that is underrepresented in the State legislature, and to determine to what extent issues coming before the legislature are framed as party issues.

Taking the States as a whole, it is difficult to determine the overall effect of the present structure on the political composition of State legislatures. It is assumed by many that underrepresented cities outside the southern and border States are basically strongholds of the Democratic Party, but that the underrepresented suburbs in these States tend to support the Republican Party. In the southern and border States the Republican Party has tended to be strongest in the urban areas. In view of the fact that the urban area population of the Nation is divided almost equally between the central city and the suburbs, it is difficult to arrive at any overall national consensus as to the party gaining or suffering most from present apportionment practices.

Detailed studies in two highly urban States, New York[33] and Michigan,[34] would seem to indicate that people who vote for Democratic Party candidates are underrepresented in the State legislature. But other States with large urban populations, Massachusetts, Maryland, and Texas, present another situation. While detailed studies in the latter three States have not been made, there is a great disparity between votes received by Republican Party candidates for statewide office and the number of State legislative seats held by that party.

Two extensive studies on party voting in State legislatures conclude with the observation that party issues do not take up a significant portion of the business of State legislatures.[35] This does not mean that important issues are not the subject of party conflict. The Jewell study also notes that the larger the State's population and the more urbanized the State is, the more issues coming before the legislature are likely to become issues of party conflict.

STATEMENT OF WM. G. COLMAN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is William G. Colman, and I am Executive Director of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; accompanying me is Mr. Stuart Urbach, a senior analyst on the staff of the Commission.

Our purpose in appearing before this subcommittee is not to present testimony in behalf of or in opposition to any proposed constitutional amendments or congressional enactments dealing with State legislative apportionment. Rather, our purpose is to present to the committee some factual, technical, and procedural aspects of this problem. Our remarks stem from a comprehensive research project on this subject which the Advisory Commission undertook in 1962 and upon which our report "Apportionment of State Legislatures," is based. This report has been used as a sort of factbook throughout the country by both plaintiff and defense attorneys in reapportionment cases and by Federal and State judges in rendering decisions thereon. Copies of the report have already been made available to the members of this committee and its staff.

Before summarizing the significant findings in this report, it would be well to describe very briefly the origin and current activities of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The Commission was created by act of Congress in 1959 (Public Law 86-380) following 2 years of hearings and study by the Committees on Government Operations of the two Houses. The Commission is a permanent, bipartisan body charged with examining and making recommendations with regard to problems of relations among Federal, State, and local governments with a view to strengthening our overall Federal system of government under the Constitution.

The Commission has been in actual operation a little more than 5 years and it has addressed itself to a number of specific friction points in our Federal system, of which State legislative apportionment has certainly been one. The Commission is comprised of 26 members, coming from all levels of government. Three members come from the general public; of the remaining 23, 14 come from State and local government, and only 9 from the National Government. Of these 9, 6 come from the Congress and 3 from the executive branch, so only in a technical sense can the Commission be considered a Federal agency. In a practical sense, it is a national body responsive and responsible to the various levels of government. The membership of the Commission on the date of the adoption of the report on "Apportionment of State Legislatures" was:

Frank Bane, Chairman; Don Hummel, Vice Chairman; John Anderson, Jr., Governor of Kansas; Richard Y. Batterton, mayor, Denver, Colo.; Neal S. Blaisdell, mayor, Honolulu, Hawaii; Howard R. Rowen, citizen member, Grinnell, Iowa; Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Edward Connor, supervisor, Wayne County, Mich.; C. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury; Michael V. DiSalle, Governor of Ohio; Clair Donnenwirth, supervisor, Plumas County, Calif.; Robert B. Duncan, speaker, house of representatives, Salem, Oreg.; Mrs. FLORENCE P. DWYER, Member of the House of Representatives; SAM J. ERVIN, JR., Member of the Senate; L. H. FOUNTAIN, Member of the House of Representatives; Ernest F. Hollings, Governor of South Carolina, EUGENE J. KEOGH, Member of the House of Representatives; KARL E. MUNDT, Member of the Senate; EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Member of the Senate; Arthur Naftalin, mayor, Minneapolis, Minn.; Graham S. Newell, member of the State senate, Montpelier, Vt.; John E. Powers, president, State senate, Boston, Mass.; Robert E. Smylie, Governor of Idaho; Raymond R. Tucker, mayor, St. Louis, Mo.; Robert C. Weaver, Administrator, Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency; and Mrs. Barbara A. Wilcox, commissioner, Washington County, Oreg.

The Commission operates with a small professional staff of 10 people and an annual appropriation of approximately $400,000.

In the light of the widely varying backgrounds and positions of the members of the Commission, you may find it surprising that it acted unanimously upon all but one of the recommendations contained in its report on State legislative apportionment. It would be well to summarize these recommendations because all but one deal with the philosophy and procedure of apportionment rather than the specific quantitative basis thereof. The Commission's recommendations in this area were as follows:

First, apportionment of seats in State legislative bodies is a basic factor of representative government and provisions relating thereto should be clearly specified in State constitutions.

Second, the apportionment formula for each body of the State legislature should be spelled out in clear and sufficient detail so that there can be no question as to the meaning of the formula. The Commission recommended that, where a legislative body is to be apportioned according to population only, the State constitution specify the extent to which legislative districts may represent different numbers of people in terms of a percent deviation, not to exceed 10 percent, from the number obtained by dividing the total population of the State by the number of representatives in the legislative body. Some States might wish to substitute a requirement that a given percentage of the State's population, e.g., 45 percent, must be in a position to elect a majority of the legislative body.

---

[29] Page, op. cit. (footnote 19), p. 136.

[30] Hobbs, op. cit. (footnote 19), p. 122.

[31] National Municipal League, "Compendium on Legislative Apportionment" (New York, 1960 and 1962).

[32] Robert S. Friedman, "The Urban-Rural Conflict Revisited," Western Political Quarterly, 16:481 (1961); and Charles W. Shull, "Political and Partisan Implications of State Legislative Apportionment," Law and Contemporary Problems, 17:417 (Spring 1952).

[33] David I. Wells, "Legislative Reapportionment in New York State" (International Ladies Garment Workers Union, 1962).

[34] Garfinkel and Fein, op. cit. (footnote 20).

[35] Malcolm E. Jewell, "Party Voting in American State Legislatures," American Political Science Review, 49:773 (1955); and William J. Keefe, "Parties, Partnerships, and Public Policy in the Pennsylvania Legislature," American Political Science Review, 48:450 (1954).

Third, the State constiution should specify the frequency of State reapportionment. (In this connection, it is interesting to note that today Arizona is the only State that reapportions legislative seats more frequently than once every 10 years. The original constitutions of many States required reapportionments more frequently than every 10 years. Arizona reapportions its house every 4 years, and their apportionment formula is based on actual votes cast at the preceding gubernatorial election. Using the number of votes cast at a particular election permits frequent reapportionments.)

Fourth, the State constitution should specify the body or officer having a responsibility for apportioning seats in the State legislature. The Commission recommended that this responsibility be vested in the State legislature itself. It further recommended that a bipartisan or nonpartisan board or commission or other administrative officer or body be given responsibility to apportion legislative seats if the legislature fails to act within the time specified by the constitution, or when the legislature acts in a manner which is subsequently declared unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction.

As of the date of the Commission's report, 14 States had adopted provisions partly or completely removing the legislature from the apportionment process and had placed this responsibility with different individuals or boards. Additional States have acted along these lines subsequent to 1962.

Fifth, the Commission recommended that State courts be constitutionally provided with appropriate jurisdiction and remedies to insure that State officials comply with their apportionment responsibilities.

The Commission felt that it is incumbent upon States to act promptly in this matter. The role of the State in the federal system depends largely on the confidence the people have in State legislatures. Where both State legislatures and State courts fail to insure that State constitutional provisions are complied with, State government suffers. As of mid-1962, for example, the constitutions of 15 States provided that apportionment of seats in both houses of their legislature should be based on population, but in only 1 or 2 States had the legislature complied substantially with the State constitution. Consequently, State courts must have necessary power to insure that apportionment provisions are complied with by the apportioning body of the State.

Finally, the actual apportionment of a State legislature, including as it must, many elements of negotiation and accommodation that do not lend themselves to adversary proceedings, should be accomplished by the legislative or other specified nonjudicial body or officer. The Commission believes that State and Federal courts should confine their role to insuring that such nonjudicial body or officer promptly produces a reasonable apportionment meeting constitutional requirements, and urges both State and Federal courts to avoid, except in the most extreme circumstances, the prescription by judicial decree of specific apportionment formulas or the geographic composition of legislative districts.

Let me emphasize that the foregoing recommendations, while dealing with very controversial subject matter, were adopted without dissent by any member of the Commission. We believe that regardless of the basis of apportionment, the adoption of the foregoing procedures by States not now having them would greatly improve the responsiveness and responsibility of State government in this very important field.

The research conducted by the Commission on the subject of State legislative apportionment tended to dispel quite a bit of folklore on both sides of the reapportionment argument. Five major points might be emphasized in this regard.

First, population as the sole basis of representation in both houses of State legislatures is not a new or revolutionary doctrine.

To the contrary, in the earlier days of our Republic, this tended to be the rule with other bases constituting the exception. At one time or another, 36 of our 50 States have provided in their constitutions that population would be the primary basis for representation of both houses in the legislature. Twenty-seven of these States provided that it should be the sole basis. This has been an extremely uncomfortable fact for those who contend that the very foundations of the Republic were swept away by the Supreme Court decisions of 1964.

Second, neither historically, nor intrinsically does bicameralism necessitate a different base of apportionment in each house.

Of the 36 States mentioned above, only three provide for unicameral legislatures. (Georgia, Pennsylvania, and Vermont adopted a unicameral legislature in their original constitutions and later changed to bicameral. Today, only Nebraska now operates under a unicameral legislature and it is of fairly recent vintage—1934.) A two-house legislature with a small senate and a large house of representatives—both based on population—could be expected to consider issues from different vantage points. For example, members of the smaller body would be representing a more diversified constituency than would members of the larger body. The term of office in one body could be longer than the term in the second body and legislative terms themselves could expire at different times. These factors were all inherent in the decisions of the States in early period of our history to base both houses on population.

Third, the argument that "rural dominated" legislatures cannot and will not give proper attention to urban problems does not stand up under analysis.

It is certainly true that States have tended to neglect their responsibilities with respect to urban affairs, and this is illustrated by the fact that only a handful of States have seen fit to create departments or offices of urban affairs, while sentiment in the Congress to create a Federal Department of Urban Affairs continues to mount.

However, in many States, failure to act on urban problems and to pass enabling legislation authorizing local governments in urban areas to cope with their problems has been due not to apathy or antagonism on the part of rural representatives but rather to "squabbling" between central city and suburban delegations to the legislature which quite frequently represent different political parties. One researcher pointed out a few years ago with respect to Illinois:

"It is interesting that in the 1957 house, after reapportionment had placed all Cook County districts either completely inside or completely outside the city of Chicago, there were only 4 of the 332 contested rollcalls displaying a cohesion of more than 67 percent for the combined Chicago-Cook County group which had a numerical majority in the house."

Fourth, the residents in urban areas are not always desirous for equal representation in the State legislature.

In Michigan, Colorado, and California, to cite three States, the people of the State have gone to the polls in statewide elections, with "each man having one vote" and have voted solidly against basing both houses of the legislature on population, although the urban residents in two of these three States far outweigh the number of rural residents.

Fifth, in no State is it likely or even possible for legislative reapportionment based on population to result in control of a majority of the votes in the legislature by the "political machine" of a single city.

Among the arguments advanced against apportionment of State legislative bodies on the basis of population has been the allegation that to so apportion would turn over political control of the State to the party organization in the big city of the State. This was a realistic argument in some States from the late 1800's until a couple of decades ago. However, in recent years and today, the population increase is occurring principally in the suburbs. (Statistics bearing on this question are presented in the Commission's report on pp. 44–48.)

In terms of 1960 census data, in only two States—Arizona and New York—would residents of the central cities of the standard metropolitan statistical areas in those States be able to elect a majority of representatives to the legislature. In the case of Arizona it would require an alliance between dominant political organizations of the same party in both Tucson and Phoenix in order to accomplish this objective. In the case of New York, it would require the alliance of political leadership of two upstate cities with that of New York City in order to accomplish the objective. It might be observed at this point that recent events have demonstrated that the relationships between political leaders of New York City and the upstate cities are not exactly harmonious.

On the other hand, in 36 States the combined populations of each State's 3 largest cities constituted less than 30 percent of the total population of the State in 1960. Undoubtedly, with continued population growth in the suburbs, future censuses will render the concept of single city political domination over the State legislature much more fictional than today.

The role of the people in being able to modify a "population requirement" was the major point of difference among members of the Advisory Commission when the Commission voted on the key question of whether or not apportionment of both houses of a legislature should be based on population. The majority of the Commission expressed themselves as follows:

" 'Equal protection of the laws' would seem to presume, and considerations of political equity demand, that the apportionment of both houses in the State legislature, be based strictly on population."

In other words, the majority of the Commission took the same position in 1962 that the majority U.S. Supreme Court took in its apportionment decisions of 1964.

However, a sizable minority of the Commission (Governor Smylie, Governor Anderson, Supervisor Donnenwirth, Governor Hollings, Mr. Don Hummel, and Senator Newell) stated:

"We would have preferred that the Commission adopt the following statement of principle: 'Equal protection of the laws' would seem to presmume, and considerations of political equity demand, that the apportionment of both houses in the State legislature be based strictly on population, unless the people directly determine otherwise."

Four members of the Commission (Senators ERVIN, MUNDT, and MUSKIE, and Congressman FOUNTAIN) expressed individual views and these are contained on pages 74–76 of the Commission's report.

Most of the recommendations and guidelines contained in the Commission's report were concerned with procedures for apportioning seats in a State legislature. Consistent with these, a draft State constitutional amendment has been developed, and widely distributed to State and local officials, designed to establish a procedure for insuring that State legisltures are periodically reapportioned in accord with formulas meeting both State and Federal constitutional standards. State legislative committees and organizations of municipal and county officials have been making considerable use of the draft amendment. Copies of this draft material can be provided to the committee staff if you desire.

That concludes our prepared statement, Mr. Chairman, and we will be glad to try to answer any questions.

Membership of Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C., October 10, 1962

Frank Bane, Chairman.
Don Hummel, Vice Chairman.
John Anderson, Jr., Governor of Kansas.
Richard Y. Batterton, mayor, Denver, Colo.
Neal S. Blaisdell, mayor, Honolulu, Hawaii.
Howard R. Bowen, citizen member, Grinnell, Iowa.
Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.
Edward Connor, supervisor, Wayne County, Mich.
C. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury.
Michael V. DiSalle, Governor of Ohio.
Clair Donnenwirth, supervisor, Plumas County, Calif.
Robert B. Duncan, speaker, house of representatives, Salem, Oreg.
Mrs. Florence P. Dwyer, Member of the House of Representatives.
Sam J. Ervin, Jr., Member of the Senate.
L. H. Fountain, Member of the House of Representatives.
Ernest F. Hollings, Governor of South Carolina.
Eugene J. Keogh, Member of the House of Representatives.
Karl E. Mundt, Member of the Senate.
Edmund S. Muskie, Member of the Senate.
Arthur Naftalin, mayor, Minneapolis, Minn.
Graham S. Newell, member of the State senate, Montpelier, Vt.
John E. Powers, president, State senate, Boston, Mass.
Robert E. Smylie, Governor of Idaho.
Raymond R. Tucker, mayor, St. Louis, Mo.
Robert C. Weaver, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency.
Mrs. Barbara A. Wilcox, commissioner, Washington County, Oreg.
Wm. G. Colman, Executive Director.

Exhibit 2

Chapter V

PRINCIPLES FOR CONSIDERATION AND USE OF GOVERNORS, LEGISLATORS, AND STATE AND FEDERAL COURTS

The preceding presentation of the operation and consequences of existing and possible future State apportionment formulas and practices will be of little consolation to any particular group. The very uncertainties concerning possible consequences of change undoubtedly have contributed materially to the maintenance of the status quo. *Baker* v. *Carr* has provided the stimulant for an extensive review of apportionment formulas and procedures by all those interested in the Federal system of Government in this country.

While the pattern revealed by this study is in some respects ambiguous, the Commission finds that certain conclusions must inevitably be reached; these conclusions, if followed, might require some States to change their apportioning procedures and require some States to change their apportioning formula. The Commission's conclusions and recommendations, in the form of guiding principles to appropriate officials, can be broken down into three categories. The principles outlined in A through C relate to various procedures designed to facilitate periodic apportionment of seats in State legislatures. The principle contained in D is directed toward setting forth a firm boundary between judicial and political responsibilities. The permissible limits of a formula for the apportionment of State legislatures are contained in principle E.

A. Apportionment of seats in State legislative bodies is a basic factor of representative government in the United States and hence provisions relating thereto should be clearly specified in State constitutions

The legislature represents the foundation of democratic government in the State. It is responsible for developing or approving the general policy of State government. It is responsible for finding common principles within which competing interests must operate. The legislature derives its authority to perform these functions from the people of the State. In order that State legislative bodies adequately reflect the needs and interests of the people of each individual State, each State should develop an apportionment formula that gives adequate representation to the diverse needs and interests of its people and at the same time satisfies the requirements imposed by the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

1. The apportionment formula for each body of the State legislature should be spelled out in clear and sufficient detail so that there can be no question as to the meaning of the formula. The Commission recommends that, where a legislative body is to be apportioned according to population only, the State constitution specify the extent to which legislative districts may represent different numbers of people in terms of a percent deviation, not to exceed 10 percent, from the number obtained by dividing the total population of the State by the number of representatives in the legislative body.[1]

The history of State legislative apportionment reveals that use of ambiguous or ill-defined words and phrases had caused extensive conflict and unnecessary delays in attempts to achieve periodic apportionment of legislative seats. "As nearly equal as possible" has been a particularly troublesome phrase. For this reason the Commission recommends that where population is the only factor in apportionment of legislative seats, the extent to which districts may deviate from each other be expressed in terms of a percentage, not to exceed 10 percent, of the total population divided by the number of seats in the legislative body. If the State's population is 2 million and the number of seats in the legislative body is 40, each legislator would represent exactly 50,000 people if seats could be apportioned exactly according to population—this often is a practical impossibility. In this instance, if the constitutionally permitted percentage of deviation were 10 percent, as suggested by the Commission, all legislative districts would have to have a population between 45,000 and 55,000 people; if the percentage were 25, the population range of districts would be between 37,500 and 62,500 people. The Commission believes that one significant virtue of this recommendation is that it is simple to determine when the apportioning body has complied with the constitutional formula.

The Commission has singled out the phrase "as nearly equal as possible" for special consideration as it is the one that has caused the most difficulty in the most States, but it is not the only problem caused by constitutional language. Most other constitutional provisions of apportionment formulas relate to where and how district lines are to be formed. These provisions prohibit the splitting of local units of government to form legislative districts and require that only contiguous units of local government may be joined together to form a legislative district. Such provisions are designed to reduce the role of political considerations in the drawing of boundaries of legislative districts. Only one procedure has been developed that can eliminate the problem of drawing district lines. This procedure would base representation permanently on political subdivisions or on geographic areas which may or may not take population into consideration. Population may be a factor by permitting those units with larger populations to elect more than one legislator but by requiring all such legislators to be elected at large. Thus, the need to draw district lines after each apportionment is eliminated.

Constitutional requirements relating to district lines must be drafted with care to insure that they do not conflict with the provision relating to maximum population deviation. Conflicts may arise between a provision requiring that counties not be divided in making districts composed of more than one county and the maximum population deviation provision. The constitution should resolve this potential conflict before it actually arises. Possible solutions to the problem would be use of: (1) flotorial districts as in Texas and Tennessee; (2) additional representation in some, but not all, of the legislative sessions between apportionments as in Ohio or New Hampshire; or (3) political subdivisions smaller than the county for the determination of legislative districts. As noted earlier, a number of State constitutions do not require that county boundaries be followed in drawing legislative district lines, but the State apportioning body generally uses such boundaries for convenience. This conflict is most likely to arise in suburban counties (almost always within standard metropolitan statistical areas) where the population exceeds the requirements for one representative, but is not sufficient for two representatives. In such situations, joining portions of the suburban county with an adjoining county might be desirable. The suburban county could be divided along the lines of smaller political subdivisions of the county or along the lines of the census tracts within the county.

Regardless of what provisions are incorporated into the apportionment formulas of State constitutions, they should be clear enough that the apportioning body will have little difficulty in determining their application. Clarity is also necessary in order that the people may be in a position to evaluate the extent to which the apportioning body has met its responsibility and so that a court may easily decide if the State constitutional requirements have been complied with. To the extent that an apportionment formula attempts to balance certain conflicting interests within the State, it may not be possible to spell out its provisions with mathematical exactness. Despite this, States should make every effort to embody their apportionment formula in constitutional language that is clear and unambiguous.

2. The State constitution should specify the frequency of reapportionment.

Some State constitutions contain no provision relating to frequency of reapportionment, others specify frequencies ranging from 2 to 10 years, and still others permit the legislature to determine when reapportionment shall be undertaken. When a

---

[1] Some States may wish to substitute a requirement that a given percentage of the State's population, e.g., 45 percent must be in a position to elect a majority of the legislative body.

State has determined that reapportionment should be made periodically, the constitution should state the frequency at which such reapportionments are to be made and that frequency should be related to the availability of the official statistics required by the apportionment formula of the State. Some State constitutions with apportionment formulas based on population require reapportionments to be made every 5 or 6 years. When these provisions were originally included in State constitutions, the States were directed to make the necessary censuses that would provide the information to carry out the apportionment requirements.

Arizona is the only State that apportions legislative seats more frequently than once every 10 years. The frequency of Arizona apportionments is based on the frequency of gubernatorial elections—at the moment every 2 years—and the apportionment formula is based on actual votes cast at each election. Using the number of votes cast at a particular election permits frequent apportionments with a minimum of administrative delay.

3. The State constitution should specify the body or officer having a responsibility for apportioning seats in the State legislature. The Commission recommends that this responsibility be vested in the State legislature itself. It further recommends that a bipartisan or nonpartisan board or commission or other administrative officer or body be given responsibility to apportion legislative seats if the legislature fails to act within the time specified by the constitution, or when the legislature acts in a manner which is subsequently declared unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction.

State legislative bodies have found it extremely difficult to meet constitutional requirements calling for periodic apportionment of legislative seats. Periodic apportionment of legislative seats is based on the premise that population shifts or changes in other factors in apportionment formulas require a reallocation of legislative seats to reflect more accurately the changing needs and interests of the State as a whole. Yet an individual legislator has a responsibility to his constituency—he must protect its interests. In addition, supporting a proposal that would reduce the representation of his constituency might well eliminate him from the legislative body. While this may be a reasonable position for an individual State legislator, the cumulative effect of such action is to nullify, in whole or in part, a constitutional requirement for periodic apportionment of legislative seats.

In order to eliminate this type of avoidance of State constitutional provisions, the Commission urges all States to provide for a bipartisan or nonpartisan board or commission or other administrative officer or body to apportion seats in the State legislature in the event that the legislature itself fails to make the apportionment at the time stated in the constitution or if a court of competent jurisdiction has declared that a particular apportionment does not comply with the provisions of the State constitution. In making this recommendation, the Commission fully recognizes that the primary responsibility for apportioning seats in the legislature is a responsibility of the legislature itself. The experience of States which have completely or partially removed the responsibility for apportionment from the hands of the legislature shows that it is possible to have periodic apportionments which comply with the terms of State constitutions. The biggest difficulty with procedures providing for a nonlegislative body to act if the legislature fails to do so, has been the authority of that body when the legislature provides only a token apportionment or otherwise does not completely comply with the constitutional apportionment formula. To eliminate this difficulty the apportioning body should be given authority to apportion legislative seats if the State supreme court (or a court of higher authority) declares that the legislative apportionment does not comply with the provisions of the State constitution.

The 14 States that have adopted provisions partly or completely removing the legislature from the apportionment process have placed this responsibility with different individuals or boards. While the Commission has no preference as to who, as an individual or as members of a board, should have this responsibility, it would like to offer one suggestion. The Commission feels that designation of members of a nonlegislative apportioning body is a matter that must be considered in the light of tradition of the individual State. But it suggests that in no case should a member of the highest court of the State be a member of such a body as that court may have to rule on the constitutionality of the apportionment plan developed by it.

B. The people should have an opportunity at any time to react at the polls to the continuance or change of the formula apportioning seats in the State legislature

Constitutions are intended to provide a certain degree of stability to the institutions of the State. The provisions of State constitutions are designed to last for many years, but the constitutions are not intended to shackle future generations.

These conflicting goals have been recognized in all State constitutions through the various provisions for amending the constitutions.

Except in States permitting constitutional initiative, prevailing provisions for amending State constitutions do not provide a reasonable opportunity to amend the provisions of the constitution relating to legislative apportionment because such amendments must be initiated by the legislature itself. Thus the legislature is in a position to block any proposed amendment if it so desires. The action of State legislators on such a constitutional amendment probably would be the same as their action, or inaction, regarding the periodic application of existing constitutional apportionment formulas. Several States, through use of the constitutional initiative, have been able to successfully meet this problem. However, there is no need for all States to adopt the constitutional initiative. The State constitution might provide that at specific intervals the question of the apportionment formula be placed on the ballot. Several State constitutions contain similar provisions for the calling of a constitutional convention. In addition, the legislature itself might be authorized to place apportionment proposals before the people under appropriate procedural safeguards.

The States that permit constitutional initiative or referendum do not in any way limit the constitutional provisions that may be amended by this procedure. The general issue of such direct action by the people was discussed at length many years ago. The Commission has no desire to raise the issue again. But the Commission feels that such a procedure can be an important factor in determining whether the rights of the citizens of the State have been protected when the State has a unique formula for apportioning seats in the State legislature.

C. The Commission recommends that State courts be constitutionally provided with appropriate jurisdiction and remedies to insure that State officials comply with their apportionment responsibilities

Several State constitutions specifically authorize the State supreme court to review any challenged application of the apportionment provisions of the State constitution. Other State supreme courts have exercised this right without its being contained in the constitution both prior to and following the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Baker* v. *Carr*. Regardless of the basis on which State courts have exercised the right to review the constitutionality of a particular apportionment, they have generally held that their powers are limited to declaring a particular apportionment constitutional or unconstitutional. Until recently they have generally refused to provide any remedy in those instances where the apportionment has been declared unconstitutional. The Commission urges all States to provide its highest court with appropriate jurisdiction to review apportionments made by the apportioning body or officer, whether legislative or nonlegislative, to insure that they comply with the apportionment provisions of the State constitution. In addition, the Commission recommends that such courts be provided with appropriate remedies to insure that if the apportioning body or officer refuses to act in accordance with the provisions of the constitution, the interests of the people will not suffer. In view of the limited experience courts have with the use of suggested remedies, the Commission does not feel it is in a position itself to make specific recommendations as to what remedial devices should be adopted. Such possible devices include: (a) requiring election at large; (b) issuance of writ of mandamus to the apportioning body or official; (c) enjoining the holding of elections for filling legislative seats; (d) nullification of acts of an unconstitutionally apportioned legislature; (e) enjoining of the payment of legislative salaries; and (f) declaring members of a legislature that fails to apportion properly to be ineligible for reelection.

The Commission feels that it is incumbent upon States to act promptly in this matter. The role of the State in the Federal system depends largely on the confidence the people have in State legislatures. Where both State legislatures and State courts fail to insure that State constitutional provisions are complied with, State government suffers. The legislature must confer upon the State courts the necessary power to permit such courts to insure that apportionment provisions are complied with by the apportioning body of the State.

D. The actual apportionment of a State legislature, including as it must, many elements of negotiation and accommodation that do not lend themselves to adversary proceedings, should be accomplished by the legislative or other specified nonjudicial body or officer. The Commission believes that State and Federal courts should confine their role to insuring that such nonjudicial body or officer promptly produce a reasonable apportionment meeting constitutional requirements, and urges both State and Federal courts to avoid, except in the most extreme circumstances, the prescription by judicial decree of specific apportionment formulas or the geographic composition of legislative districts

The application of constitutional formulas for the apportionment of seats in a State legislature is no easy matter. There are many areas in which the apportioning body or officer must weigh factors which cannot be measured with any degree of mathematical certainty. There are factors in the apportionment formula which can be statistically verified, but these present little difficulty to any apportioning body, officer, or court.

Court procedures are adequate to permit the proper determination of any challenge to the application of the apportionment formula on the grounds that such application is not in accord with the provisions of the State constitution. Courts have already performed this function, even where the constitutional apportionment provisions were ambiguous and uncertain. Some recent developments in the apportionment field point the way toward reducing or eliminating much of this ambiguity and uncertainty. Use of the proposal limiting the degree of population disparity among legislative districts would eliminate a great many problems. Similarly, chapter IV contains a discussion of approaches which would eliminate or reduce many other difficulties to court review. While the Commission does not specifically support any of the proposals relating to the drawing of district lines, States should continue to experiment in this area and eventually develop different approaches which will prove satisfactory.

Despite recent proposals, which if adopted by a State, would facilitate the determination of whether or not the apportioning body or officer has complied with the constitutional provisions relating to apportionment, a court is still not the proper body to do the actual apportioning. Except in those instances where apportionment of legislative seats has become automatic or semiautomatic—for example, the House of Representatives of Ohio and New Jersey—the application of the constitutional provisions still permits a great deal of discretion to the apportioning body or officer. This discretion can best be exercised through the political processes of accommodation, negotiation and compromise. The adversary proceedings of a court of law are not conducive to the operation of such processes.

The Commission recognizes that there may be occasions where court action declaring the application of an apportionment formula unconstitutional, or declaring the formula itself unconstitutional, may not be sufficient to insure that the apportioning body or officer will perform its duties properly. The record of recent years, particularly in those States where the responsibility for apportionment has been completely or partially removed from the hands of the State legislature, indicates that the role of the courts in the apportionment process can be kept at a minimal level. It is incumbent upon the States themselves to adopt procedures which insure that actual apportionment is carried out by a constitutionally designated body or officer, and not the courts.

E. Basis of apportionment

The preceding recommendations are directed toward improving the apportioning procedure. In the recommendation that follows, the Commission endeavors to resolve the question of the extent to which, if any, factors other than population may be used as the basis of apportionment. The Commission approaches this question not from the standpoint of constitutional law, as such, but from the standpoint of legal, political, and philosophic needs of the Nation.

"Equal protection of the laws" would seem to presume, and considerations of political equity demand, that the apportionment of both houses in the State legislature be based strictly on population.[3]

The 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution is an amendment designed for the protection of the people. It is not intended to protect political subdivisions, minority views, or any particular form of governmental structure. The 14th amendment is concerned with one thing, and one thing only—that each person be treated equally in the eyes of the law of each and every State.

In applying the requirement that each person be treated equally in the eyes of State law to the question of apportionment

---

[3] Governor Smylie, joined by Governor Anderson, Supervisor Donnenwirth, Governor Hollings, Mr. Don Hummel, and Senator Newell, states: We would have preferred that the Commission adopt the following statement of principle:

"Equal protection of the laws" would seem to presume, and considerations of political equity demand, that the apportionment of both houses in the State legislature be based strictly on population, unless the people directly determine otherwise.

Our reasons follow:

As emphasized throughout this report, we are impressed with two facts: (1) the reappraisal of State legislative apportionment mandated by the courts, is one of the most significant developments in many years in the evolution of the Federal form of government under the Constitution and will have profound effect upon the structure, policies, and operations of State government; and (2) all States (49 of them explicitly) provide in their constitutions that all power of the State resides in or is derived from the people. Consequently, we believe that since legislative apportionment is such a basic question of State government, the people, in the exercise of their constitutional power should have a major and direct voice in determining the future course of legislative apportionment and that the results of the exercise of this power by the people should be persuasive upon the courts, State and Federal alike.

We believe that considerations of equity, faith in the democratic process, and political discretion of a high order should lead Governors, legislators, and the judiciary to rely upon the people for determining the general lines along which apportionment will proceed in the individual States. Some will say that this question is too important to be left to the people and that it would be better decided by legislators—or judges. The choice here often depends upon the point of view of the particular protagonist. We do not agree. The principles of democratic government are many, but at the fountainhead of our form of government is the fact that all power is derived from, and all power rests with, the people. The people have the right to make mistakes in a democracy. Depending upon one's views, this is an asset or a liability of the democratic form of government. If one believes in democracy, one must accept the possibility that the people may make mistakes. However, the saving grace in a democracy is that the people have the means available to correct their own mistakes or the mistakes of their duly elected representatives. Of course, this country enjoys a system of representative government rather than a pure democracy. But it necessarily follows that the form and degree of "representativeness" must be determined by the people if the theory of representative government is to be practiced as well as preached.

We are inclined to believe that in a number of States, the people if faced squarely with the pertinent issues involved in legislative apportionment, would decide in favor of an apportionment system based solely or predominantly upon population. We also are inclined to believe that in a number of other States, the people, for reasons of geography, or because of economic, partisan, or social differences, would decide that their legislatures should be based upon factors in addition to population. For example, the voters of Michigan and California in recent years, in statewide elections with one man having one vote decided unequivocally that they did not want their State senates based solely on population. Who can argue, when the majority of people of these States (including a large number of voters in the urban areas) have said that they prefer factors in addition to population to be taken into account in the apportionment of one house of their State legislatures, that these same people have been deprived of equal protection of the laws? On the other hand, we would question seriously whether equal protection of the laws has been afforded if the people of the State have prescribed for them without their affirmative consent, an apportionment system including factors other than population no matter how rational or traditional such a system may appear to be.

The policy enunciated here may be objected to on the ground that decisions by the electorate on a statewide basis may trample the rights of a minority and that under the 14th amendment, the people of the State have no more right to decide how their State legislature shall be apportioned than they have to decide that their public school systems shall be segregated according to race. We firmly reject this line of reasoning. We would agree, of course, that if in the process of deciding the question of State legislative apportionment, the people of the State adopted a plan that was patently discriminatory and with obvious oppression directed against particular segments of the State's population, the oppressed should be able to seek and should be given judicial relief. In essence, what we are saying is that a decision on State legislative apportionment arrived at by the electorate should be honored by the courts in the absence of compelling considerations to the contrary.

Finally, the policy proposed here preserves one of the essential advantages of a Federal system—namely, the role of the States as the "testing laboratories" of the governmental process, whereby innovation and experiment may be undertaken and later retained or rejected as the results dictate. Despite our 300 years experience, most would agree that there is still much to be learned and many improvements possible in the application of the theory of representative Government. The policy proposed here would allow the people of any State, if they so decided, to experiment and innovate in the highly difficult field of legislative apportionment.

We recognize that the position taken here will not be popular with either the urban population school or the rural area school. The position taken here holds to the population point of view unless the people decide to the contrary. It does not permit the foisting upon the people without their consent of anything substantially short of a population base for their legislatures. On the other hand, it does permit, if the people so determine, the adoption of a Federal plan, one house on population—one house on area, or any other combination that does not do evident violence to minority population groups.

The views of Senator MUSKIE: "To the extent that the majority view reflects a political judgment that population should be the dominant and primary factor for determining the electoral districting of State legislative bodies, I can support the majority view. For it is my personal opinion that political experience argues strongly for legislative apportionment on a strict population basis. If, however, compelling evidence can be presented that such a formula will in a given set of circumstances breed inequity, then the use of factors other than population may be justified, but should be limited to the apportionment of only one House of a bicameral legislature. And even then the use of such other factors should be approved by the people in a statewide election. The use of such other factors would, of course, be subject to appropriate review by the courts.

"To the extent that the majority statement implies, indeed asserts, a legal judgment that the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment dictates that legislative apportionment in the States must be based solely and undeviatingly on population, I cannot support it. There are simply no decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court to support such a view. While it is true the opinion of the Court in *Baker* v. *Carr* sheds no light on the substantive requirements of "equal protection" in legislative apportionment cases, it is, nevertheless, of compelling sigof seats in the State legislature, only one interpretation is possible. That interpretation requires that each man's vote must count the same as every other man's vote. The State has no authority to classify people according to where they live—urban or rural areas—the type of work they do—laborer or banker—the type of education they have had—high school or college graduate—and authorize such classes to elect representatives to the State legislature in such a manner as to permit the vote of the members of any such class to have more weight in the election of State legislators than the members of any other class. Therefore, the Commission believes that population is the only fair and acceptable method of apportioning seats in the State legislature.

Assuming for the sake of discussion that the 14th amendment does not require the States to apportion solely on the basis of population, the history of representation in State legislatures and the theory of democratic government seem to demand that seats in State legislatures be apportioned according to population. The original constitutions of 36 States gave implicit recognition to this principle.

The government of the individual States is based on the theory of representative democracy. This means that legislative bodies must mirror the views of the citizens within the jurisdiction. This does not justify policymaking bodies being set up in such a way that minority interests of any type are represented in any way other than as justified by their relative numbers. They remain a minority interest until such time as they convince a majority of the people that their view is the one that should prevail. The fact that this permits a majority to impose its will on the minority is of no consequence. Our form of government is based on the assumption that a majority of the people elect a majority of the legislators to enact laws and develop policies that the voters have supported.

Except to the extent that they are represented according to their numbers and that they have an opportunity to present their views to that body, minorities are not entitled to protection in the State legislature. Protection of minority interests or views does not mean the minority should be in a position to veto the desires of the majority. The protection given minority views and interests should not be a veto power in the legislative process, since other adequate protections are offered by both Federal and State constitutions. If minority interests are permitted to control the legislative branch of State government so as to defeat the wishes of the majority, the Nation is faced with one of three alternatives: (1) the eclipse of State government because the people will turn to a more broadly responsive National Government to obtain their needs; (2) the perpetuation of tyranny of a minority over the affairs of State government; or (3) the resort to precipitous or illegal means by the majority of the people whose desires have been frustrated.

The founders of this Nation fully recognized that the Nation and the States must be governed by the views of the majority of the voters. In enacting the Northwest Ordinance, the Congress affirmed the principle that representation in State and territorial legislatures was to be based on population. The new Western States that entered the Union between 1790 and 1860 all apportioned seats in both houses of the State legislature according to population with but minor qualifications.

Some argue that the theory of checks and balances requires that if there are to be two houses of a legislature they must rest on different bases of apportionment. Obviously legislative bodies apportioned according to different formulas would be expected to consider issues in a different light. But this difference of viewpoint can be achieved even though both houses of legislature are apportioned according to population. Members of the smaller legislative body would be responsible to a more diversified constituency. In addition, the term of members of one body could be longer than the term of the other and expire at different times.

Based on law—based on theory of democratic government—based on the history of representation in State government—the Commission reaches the inescapable conclusion that both houses of a State legislature should be apportioned strictly according to population.

nificance that the five other opinions written in that case (three concurring and two dissenting) all express the view that the equal protection clause has never been construed so as to guarantee either mathematical identity or universal equality.

"As stated by Mr. Justice Douglas in his concurring opinion in *Baker* v. *Carr*, the traditional test in these cases has been whether a State has made 'an individious discrimination.' The closest the Court has ever come to a requirement of absolute equality is to say that 'equal protection of the laws' means the uniform treatment of persons standing in an identical relation to whatever governmental action is challenged, but a determination of whether the treatment is equal necessarily presupposes a determination concerning the nature of the relationship. With respect to legislative apportionment, this determination of relationship becomes exceedingly complex and so filled with subleties that it seems to me impossible to state a priori that the relationship will in all cases be elucidated by the single standard of population distribution.

"It is, indeed, unfortunate that the majority has been so phrased as to be an admixture of expressions of political aspiration and legal interpretation. For having chosen to support their political judgments, appealing as they may be, with an assertion of alleged constitutional mandate, the majority is then bound to abide by the precepts of constitutional construction. However, the majority's statement by its very language ignores a cardinal principle of constitutional construction, that of avoiding absolute rigidity. Implicit in this principle is an acknowledgment of the lessons of history demonstrating that no individual or body of individuals is endowed with the all-encompassing genius to perceive in the present all of the conditions, circumstances, and problems which may confront the institutions of representative government in the future. This fact of history argues strongly for the enunciation of fundamental governing standards in terms sufficiently broad to assure that the essence of any given standard will be preserved when applied in a climate of circumstances not anticipated at the moment of authorship.

"Had the majority followed either of two alternative courses, it could have avoided any serious challenge to the factual correctness of its assertion. On the other hand, the argument for apportionment based strictly on population could have been so phrased as to make it unmistakably clear that it was nothing more than the statement of a generally desirable political objective. Or, as the majority now does, the statement could have sought to delineate the substantive legal requirements dictated by the equal protection clause, but employed less rigid terms that do not attempt to prejudge in the present all the circumstances which may affect legislative apportionment in the future. The majority followed neither of these alternatives, either of which I would have supported."

The views of Senator Mundt: "On the matter of apportioning seats in the legislatures of the several States, I desire to associate myself with the views expressed by my colleague, Senator Edmund S. Muskie. Additionally, I wish to take this opportunity to call attention to the most serious example of electoral malapportionment in our entire structure of representative government; namely, the continued use of the so-called 'general ticket system' for the election of the President and Vice President of the United States. Under this system the disparity in voter power reaches the extreme ratio of 15 to 1 when comparing the voting power of an elector in the State of New York with the voting power of an elector in a small State such as Delaware. The 'general ticket system' gives rise to invidious discrimination against literally millions of voters in every presidential election, and I earnestly hope that prompt and appropriate steps will be taken to remedy this rank injustice."

The views of Congressman Fountain: "I do not believe that the 14th amendment requires the apportionment of both houses of a State legislature on a strict population basis. Moreover, a rigid interpretation of this kind would be undesirable in practice.

"It is my view that equal protection of the laws presumes and political equity requires that population be treated as the basic and principal determinant for apportioning seats in a State legislature. However, it should be recognized that special conditions in some States may justify reasonable deviation from a strict population basis in the apportionment of one House of a bicameral legislature. Each State has an interest in insuring that its legislative body is constituted in such a way as to assure the various segments of the State's population an adequate voice in the legislative process.

"I cannot subscribe to a principle which would deny to the people of any State the right, if a majority of the electorate so decides in a statewide election, to take into account relevant factors other than population in apportioning one House of their legislature.

"It is important in a representative democracy such as ours that the States have the opportunity to experiment with reasonable proposals for insuring the adequate representation of all segments of the population. A rigid interpretation of the 14th amendment setting up one, and only one, standard of representation would surely inhibit the future development of the democratic process, since there is no guarantee that what some may say is an appropriate apportionment formula today will be appropriate tomorrow. There is still much to be learned in the application of the theory of representative democracy, and our legal framework should be sufficiently flexible to permit the necessary experimentation for achieving representative democracy in practice."

The views of Senator Ervin: "I am strongly opposed to the proposal that both houses of State legislatures should be apportioned strictly on the basis of population."

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is most gracious.

I am not going to spend too much time now on these rhetorical questions, but I should like to comment on them.

If we do not know what geography is, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland a rhetorical question on what population is. What does population mean? The Supreme Court of the United States did not say what population was. It said in its opinion:

> Mathematical exactness or precision is hardly a workable constitutional requirement.

> For the present, we deem it expedient not to attempt to spell out any precise constitutional tests. What is marginally permissible in one State may be unsatisfactory in another, depending on the particular circumstances of the case. Developing a body of doctrine on a case by case basis appears to us to provide the most satisfactory means of arriving at detailed constitutional requirements in the area of State legislative apportionment.

What does population mean under that circumstance?

It means that population is used but only insofar as other factors are also considered. What body determines other factors, and to what extent? A nonelected judicial body of the U.S. Government.

I say, Mr. President, that the proper people to legislate are the elected representatives of the people. They are required to submit their recommendations to the people. We have a practical application of the Federal court's recommendation in Holt against Richardson. The syllabus reads as follows:

> Electorial districts must be laid out with totality of factors of population, compactness and contiguity of territory community of problems, socioeconomic status, and political and racial factors having been considered, and sum total of all districting must result in substantial equality of meaningful representation to each and all voters.

Mr. President, this leaves us in nothing but confusion. We are left in nothing but an area of legislation in which the judicial branch is participating.

Let us separate those two. Let the legislature provide the guidelines.

What is geography? The courts know what geography is. The courts know what political subdivisions are. So do we.

Therefore I say that there is no necessity for any hearings on matters of this kind, because they are sufficiently precise as guidelines for the courts as well as the legislatures.

It is now my pleasure to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for his usually able and incisive analysis of a most important problem, and also for his in-depth answers to some questions that have been propounded to him.

First I should like to comment on the question of, What is population? I ask the Senator's reaction.

It seems to me that most of the arguments about the population factor being the important factor revolve around the vote power of the individual citizen.

Yet when one looks at the Supreme Court's decision and the way the decision is being implemented, it appears that population means more than vote; it means total number of people. Has the Senator any thought on the question of whether or not population ought to mean persons over 21 years of age, or does he feel that population ought to mean the total population, including those who are infants and up to those of voting age?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is left open under the decision in Reynolds against Sims. What is population? Is it the people who are voters, or people who are eligible to vote but do not vote? That question is left open. There is nothing sacroscanct about that. They will work that out on a case-by-case basis and establish a body of doctrine. The Senator from Iowa knows, fully as well as does the Senator from Nebraska, and perhaps even better, that that constitutes legislation. It should be conducted and should be executed by the elected representatives of the people. We have been chosen for the purpose of legislating. That task should not be left to the hands of those who are appointed to office. And may be out of touch with the surrounding circumstances and niceties, and all the other things that are involved in the matter of apportioning of legislative districts.

Mr. MILLER. And by members of a court only one of whom, as I recall, has ever had the privilege of serving in a State legislature.

Mr. HRUSKA. On that score the Senator from Nebraska is not informed, but he will accept the accurate recollection of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. One always hears two arguments against this proposal on which the Senator from Nebraska has been speaking, and which I also favor. The first is that this proposal should not be ratified except by reapportioned legislatures, both houses of which are apportioned on a population basis.

This may be the answer to that argument. It is a superficial argument, but it has been given undue weight by the attention given to it by some writers who apparently have not done too much of their homework.

Let us assume that there is a State legislature, both houses of which are on a nonpopulation basis. Let us say 25 percent of the people control both houses of the legislature. If the proposed amendment to the Constitution goes out to the State legislature for ratification, the legislators will be faced with one of two choices. If they choose to sit and do nothing, they know that the law will remain as it is, and that both houses must be apportioned on a population basis. Therefore, automatically, they will be out of business.

If they vote for ratification, they know that one house must be apportioned on a strict population basis, and the people of the State in a general referendum will decide the question with respect to the second house. It seems to me that the argument, if the proposal is allowed to be ratified by malapportioned legislatures, that the legislators will lock themselves in for evermore, falls flat, because of the choices I have outlined. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator has analyzed the point very well. I would make an additional observation. If the requirement be made that the legislatures which ratify the amendment must be legislatures which have complied with the one-man, one-vote rule, that will open the door to confusion for years on end.

As soon as the effort is made by any legislature to act on the ratification of the amendment, there will be those who will challenge the validity and legality of a State legislature to act upon it. We shall have nothing but delay and confusion, and the will of the people will be thwarted.

A second observation which, in my judgment, is appropriate at this point. I hope that the courts will not reach the point at which they will say there will be a blackout of all legislative effort until the legislature is purged and purified. The legislative bodies, whatever they are, may continue to function by sufferance of the Federal judiciary.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator's point is very well taken. If I could see any real justification behind the proposal, I would be more than happy to support it. But, as I see it—and I have not had anyone refute this view—if the constitutional amendment proposal goes out to a malapportioned State legislature for ratification, there are only two choices: One is to do nothing, in which event the law of the land will be that both houses must be apportioned on a strictly population basis, so the malapportioned legislatures would be out of business.

The other choice would be to ratify the proposed amendment, which means that one house would be out of business, because the amendment would provide that one house would be on a strict population basis. With respect to the second house, the legislatures in the present malapportioned houses cannot lock themselves in because it would then be left up to the people to decide the question. So I cannot see any substantial value in the proposal to require that ratification be by a reapportioned State legislature.

Another point is that the amendment is not a good amendment. The Supreme Court's decision should stand, because both houses should in fact be on a population basis.

I do not question the sincerity of many people who hold to that view. But I do question the logic of their argument against that proposal. It seems to me that what we are doing is saying, "We want to put our faith and confidence in the State legislature which is controlled by the people. We know that under the proposed amendment one house would have to be controlled by the people; the other house they want to be controlled by the people, too. But then we would say to them, "If you want to place your trust and confidence in the second house which will be controlled by the people, why are you unwilling to place your trust and confidence in the people in a general referendum?"

I have not yet heard any answer to that question.

Mr. HRUSKA. There is none.

Mr. MILLER. I do not believe that there can be.

I should like to bring up another point. The Senator from Nebraska might recall that the Senator from Iowa filed a proposed amendment to the bill which would provide that in a State legislature in which there is a political subdivision, such as a county, having more than one legislator, that there be a requirement under the Federal Constitution that that county or political subdivision be subdivided into equal population units, so that each legislator will represent his own particular subdivision, instead of allowing the election at large of legislators from multilegislative counties.

In my testimony before the committee, I pointed out the ludicrous situation now existing in Polk County, Iowa. Polk County is the largest county in the State of Iowa. It has 11 State representatives. Representatives run at large in Polk County. Under the present state of the law, all 11 of those legislators could be elected from one ward or precinct in the city of Des Moines, Iowa. There is no provision in the present law to protect racial, religious, or political minorities in Polk County.

On the other hand, if there were a separate district for each of those 11 State representatives, those racial minorities, of whom we have some in certain areas of Polk County, would be guaranteed a voice in the State legislature.

I do not know as to religious minorities, but certainly as to political minorities it is well known that some areas of Des Moines in Polk County are heavily Democratic and others are heavily Republican. Those districts would be guaranteed a voice in the State legislatures. But under the present state of the law, with all 11 State representatives running at large, most of the people of Polk County do not have enough information on the basis of which to evaluate all 11, and they all can come from 1 small part of the county, leaving racial, religious, and political minorities without representation.

Mr. HRUSKA. It seems to me that the Senator's State has enough troubles now without wading into the problems and infinite troubles that would result from the retention of the one-man, one-vote rule. In view of the guidelines which are so vague, which are manufactured, which are fabricated, and which are developed within the judicial branch, there would be no assurance that the situation to which the Senator refers as existing in Polk County could ever be corrected unless the people themselves are allowed to vote a plan as would be possible under the Dirksen amendment.

Mr. MILLER. That is so. I bring up the point because I hope that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] would, before the question comes before the Senate for a vote, consider the possibility of a modification of his proposal along the lines of the amendment which I have offered. If we are going to do a job on reapportionment, it seems to me that we ought to go all the way. One way we can fill a presently needed gap is to require that under the Federal Constitution there be separate districts for each legislator in a State legislature, so that we do not have the potential discrimination against racial, religious, and political minorities which we have under the present law.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MILLER and **Mr. BIBLE** addressed the Chair.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Nevada, if I may have unanimous consent that I be permitted to retain the floor.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator, but I was about to make a motion to adjourn.

Mr. MILLER. I expect, in order to retain the rights that I would secure under my request, the resulting agreement would not operate under those conditions. But I shall not be long.

THE OTEPKA CASE—WILLIAM WIELAND DISPATCHED TO AUSTRALIA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the State Department, according to press reports, is dispatching William Wieland to Australia as supervisory consul general in Canberra.

This assignment makes Wieland the top consular officer in Australia.

Such an announcement normally is treated with a bare mention in the press and seldom is noted on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

This assignment merits more than the usual treatment because the official in question is one of the central figures in the controversy over security policies and practices in the State Department itself.

In the New York Times of Monday, July 19, this paragraph appears:

> According to a State Department spokesman today, Mr. Wieland is now considered "completely cleared and his case closed."

While the State Department has closed the case, I, for one, do not intend to dismiss so lightly what has occurred previously in this matter.

Perhaps there should be a review of what has gone on before in this case and to question whether the surface reason for closing the case by the State Department is good enough.

Wieland was chief of the Office of Caribbean Affairs of the State Department when Castro grabbed power in Cuba.

Based on testimony of the Department's chief security evaluator, Otto Otepka—now being persecuted by the Department for daring to testify before a Senate committee—Wieland had lied about his contacts with Castro.

Otepka stated that there is a transcript of the Wieland testimony which shows that Wieland said he had only one meeting with Castro. Otepka says he has evidence that Wieland met with Castro on at least six occasions.

Wieland failed to list his former name of William Arthur Montenegro on his Government forms. The Senate Internal Security Committee questioned Wieland on this omission and the transcript was subsequently sent to the Justice Department for study for possible perjury prosecution.

The Justice Department reported, according to documents, that there was insufficient evidence for a perjury prosecution. And this report apparently is the basis for restoration of Wieland to active duty assignments abroad, even though he held down a $24,000 annual job in the office of the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration during the interval.

But is this report by the Justice Department sufficient grounds for giving Wieland a clear bill of health? I think not.

What about the misrepresentations involving meetings with Castro? There appears to be ample evidence that Wieland, as chief of the Caribbean desk, "sat on" reports which showed that Castro was a Communist, while the entire world was led to believe that he was otherwise; that he was a "patriot" of the first order. What was Wieland's excuse for not listing his former name on the Government forms?

Why has Otepka been beset with continued harassment for his testimony before the Senate committee?

What was in the report from the Federal Bureau of Investigation to force a stay of assignment of Wieland to a sensitive post in West Germany?

These are questions that must be answered; if they are not, the security measures of the State Department will remain suspect.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "U.S. Expert on Cuba Restored to Full Duty Following Inquiry," written by Richerd Eder, and published in the New York Times of July 19, 1965; an article entitled "Board Clears Wieland, Security Case Closed," written by Endre Marton, and published in the Washington Post of July 19, 1965; and the lead editorial entitled "The State Department Security Scandal," published in the Chicago Tribune of July 19, 1965.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 19, 1965]

U.S. EXPERT ON CUBA RESTORED TO FULL DUTY FOLLOWING INQUIRY—STATE DEPARTMENT ADVISORY PANEL UPHOLDS WIELAND'S JUDGMENTS ON CASTRO

(By Richard Eder)

Washington, July 18.—William A. Wieland, a State Department officer who came under congressional attack for his role in shaping United States policy on Cuba in the early days of the Castro regime, has been cleared and restored to full active duty, according to a Department announcement.

Mr. Wieland, a high-ranking 57-year-old career officer, will go to Sanberra as supervisory consul general for Australia.

The Department's announcement, made to coincide with the publication of hearings by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security on Mr. Wieland, disclosed by implication that he had been placed on what amounted to limited duty during an interagency review of his record.

A three-man advisory panel was appointed by the State Department in 1965 to consider Mr. Wieland's case. After reviewing the Department's own records and information supplied by other agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the panel, two of whose members were from outside the Department, recommended that "the subject be restored to full status as an active senior Foreign Service officer."

JUDGMENT IS UPHELD

Mr. Wieland, the board reported, "has honestly exercised his judgment over the years, including the period of the difficult and highly complex Cuban situation."

State Department officials said that at no time had Mr. Wieland been suspended during the investgation. A spokesman was unable to define what lesser degree of status was involved in the panel's recommendation that he be "restored" to full status.

One official source pointed out, however, that Mr. Wieland's most recent assignment—as an administrative specialist in the office of the Deputy Under Secretary for Administration—was considered an unobstructive job for someone of his experience.

The Senate subcommittee, in a report made in 1962, said that Mr. Wieland, who held posts concerned with Caribbean policy before and during the first years of Premier Fidel Castro's government was in part responsible for Mr. Castro's emergence.

In testimony, three former U.S. Ambassadors in Latin America—Robert C. Hill, Earl E. T. Smith, and William D. Pawley—criticized Mr. Wieland for recommending the withdrawal of American support from President Fulgencio Batista, who exercised dictatorial powers in Cuba in the late 1950's.

Mr. Wieland testified that he had begun to distrust Mr. Castro even before the latter took power, but that he was not convinced of the Premier's direct Communist connections until some months afterwards.

Early in 1962, Mr. Wieland was one of two State Department officers whom President Kennedy defended when they were called security risks.

In 1961, Mr. Wieland was assigned to a consular post in Germany but his security clearance was delayed and the assignment was finally withdrawn.

According to a State Department spokesman today, Mr. Wieland is now considered "completely cleared and his case closed." This action was taken, although not announced, in January, when the State Department's review panel approved the findings of the three-man advisory panel.

The members of the panel were William J. Sebald, former Ambassador to Burma; Samuel Waugh, President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and Brig. Gen. Milton F. Summerselt, retired.

[From the Washington Post, July 19, 1965]

BOARD CLEARS WIELAND, SECURITY CASE CLOSED

(By Endre Marton)

William A. Wieland, the American diplomat blamed by some critics for initial U.S. good will toward Fidel Castro, has been cleared fully and his security case closed, a Senate publication revealed last night.

The publication, containing transcripts of secret testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee between 1963 and 1965, bears the title "The Wieland Case Updated." It is the first of a reported 30 volumes on hearings held in these years on State Department security.

The volume, however, contains little added detail on the Wieland case, which was extensively discussed in an earlier volume released in 1962 when Wieland was first cleared.

There is much more in the present publication on the role played in the Wieland investigation by Otto F. Otepka, the State Department's chief security evaluator who, though fired in 1963 on charges of insubordination, still is on the State Department's payroll.

SECRET TESTIMONY

The fact that Wieland, head of the State Department's Office of Caribbean Affairs when Castro grabbed power in Cuba, had been cleared again was revealed by William J. Crockett, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, in secret testimony befor the subcommittee May 4, 1965.

The decision by a three-man board to close finally the once-reopened security case against the 57-year-old Wieland was made in concurrence with the Justice Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, a special personnel advisory board, and the then Attorney General, ROBERT F. KENNEDY, Crockett testified.

The Deputy Under Secretary told the subcommittee the first favorable determination in the Wieland case, in January 1962, was signed by Otepka, even though he told the subcommittee 18 months later, in August 1963, that he questioned Wieland's "judgment and integrity."

Otepka was suspended in September 1963, and charged with conduct "unbecoming an officer of the Department of State" for allegedly having made classified documents available to the Senate subcommittee without authorization. He was dismissed from the Service November 5, 1963.

Otepka has appealed the dismissal. His counsel, Roger Robb, has asked on five occasions for postponements of the hearing which have been granted. The reason Robb gave was that he wanted to study the transcript of the subcommittee hearings, the first of which is the volume on Wieland.

INQUIRY ORDERED

Most of the witnesses were questioned by subcommittee counsel, J. G. Sourwine, to find out why Otepka took no part in the second phase of the Wieland investigation in 1963. This investigation was ordered after the subcommittee accused Wieland of being "an active apologist for Fidel Castro," and a man who, in Sourwine's words, "lied to this committee."

"An evaluation of all the new material was made * * *. No reason was found to remove Mr. Wieland's clearance," Crockett told the subcommittee in his May 4 testimony.

There were two conflicting versions of why Otepka did not participate in the reevaluation of Wieland.

According to John F. Reilly's testimony—he was then head of the Office of Security and as such Otepka's superior—Otepka disqualified himself voluntarily from handling the reevaluation on the ground that he had testified before the subcommittee.

Otepka, on the other hand, said his superiors first wanted him to handle the Wieland case, then abolished his job as Deputy Director of his office on the grounds that Otepka was devoting too much time to personnel security cases.

DENIES PREJUDICES

Therefore, Otepka said, "and not because of presumed prejudices against Wieland," he did not wish to become again the principal evaluator of the Wieland case.

The board that reviewed the case of Wieland was unanimous in its recommendation for Wieland's restoration to full status as an active senior Foreign Service officer.

The board, in its finding, said its members were puzzled, individually and collectively, as to why Wieland was singled out as a scapegoat for the Castro takeover.

Wieland is currently an administrative specialist at the State Department. Now that his case is closed, he is being assigned as supervisory consul general in Canberra, Australia—a position making him the top consular officer in Australia.

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 20, 1965]

THE STATE DEPARTMENT SECURITY SCANDAL

After 3 years of hearings and a million and a half words of testimony and documentation, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has released the first installment of its account of how Otto F. Otepka was fired as Chief of the Evaluations Division of the State Department's Office of Security.

It is almost unbelievable that so much time and effort had to be devoted to what is essentially a simple case. But the facts as they emerge will, we are certain, have a profound impact on the American public. For this is a story of high-level intrigue, of deceit and evasion by the people's servants in high places, and of shameful retaliation against an honorable man simply because he told the truth to a committee of Congress, as by law he was required to do.

As Chief of Evaluations, Otepka's job was to separate the wrong guys from the right ones seeking employment and assignment to the Department. He was charged with informing his superiors whether an applicant or an existing employee was a loyalty or security risk. He did so conscientiously, but his findings were ignored. The wrong guys were posted to handle the sensitive diplomacy of the United States, while the right guy—Mr. Opteka—found himself out of a job.

He had the right to appeal his dismissal, and did, but for close to 2 years the State Department has refused to give him a hearing. So he remains on the payroll, collects his salary, but is confined to a cubbyhole, in effect cutting up paper dolls. For his patriotism and his adherence to truth, he is ostracized by the brass and rankers of the Department, who operate on the code that loyalty to the Department comes before loyalty to the country.

Secretary of State Rusk and his bureaucracy can't afford to give Mr. Otepka his hearing, for to do so would expose the curious values that prevail in the Department, where men of dubious reliability are to be protected, as "members of the club," at all costs.

Otepka fell into disfavor after he was summoned by the subcommittee to assist in a study it had undertaken of security practices in the Department. He testified about "quickie" clearances designed to bypass security rules. One of the Department officials attracting the notice of the Senators was William A. Wieland, a Foreign Service officer of the first class, who has been paid $20,000 a year but has just been appointed chief American consular officer in Australia, at a salary advance of another $4,000.

It developed that Wieland had once lived in Cuba under the name of Montenegro, but concealed the fact in his job application, which exposed him to prosecution for perjury. In his testimony before the subcommittee, he admitted having seen Fidel Castro only once, but Otepka testified to six meetings. Wieland was a consistent apologist for Castro while presiding over the State Department's Caribbean desk.

His appointment to that post shocked William D. Pawley, former Ambassador to Brazil, under whom Weiland had served. By cutting off the supply of arms to Cuba, Wieland helped bring about the downfall of the Fulgencio Batista government and assisted the rise of Castro. Every intelligence report demonstrating that Castro was, and always had been, a Communist was disregarded, denounced, or sidetracked by Wieland. Robert C. Hill, a former Ambassador, told the Senators that Wieland was either "a damn fool or a Communist."

The subcommittee's first report deals with the Wieland case. Yet this man enjoys favor in the State Department and has been publicly defended by no less august a person than the late President Kennedy, while Otepka and his security staff have been rendered impotent and have been disgracefully hounded out of their protective office. It is an all but incredible story, but it is true. How long will the people tolerate these betrayals?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Yesterday the report of the Subcommittee on Internal Security was made available. I took the time last night to read the report from start to finish. I recommend to all Senators a reading of the report. If Senators will read the report of the actual hearings and findings, as I did, and place them side by side with the report of the statement issued by the Department of State, they will find that they do not appear to be referring to the same situation.

I commend the Senator from Iowa for bringing this information to the attention of the Senate. I recommend that further scrutiny be made of this question because of the tensions of the world today. Now, more than ever, questions not only of security, but of international operations, are becoming more and more essential.

The President, in making his determinations, must depend on reports, including those which are issued by officers such as the gentleman who is in question today. We must be more certain than ever before as to the qualifications, reliability, and other attributes of men of this character.

I commend the Senator from Iowa for bringing this subject to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from California for his gracious remarks. I commend him for reading the report. I have not had the opportunity to read all of the report; but I have read enough to warrant the statements that I have made. I hope that not only will Members of the Senate read it, but that members of the State Department in high posts will read it, too.

UNDERSTANDING THE VIETNAM PROBLEM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star on July 19, 1965, published an excellent article entitled "The 1954 Parley Led to Vietnam Crisis," written by the distinguished columnist David Lawrence. The article is based on Mr. Lawrence's personal observations during the 1954 Geneva conversations, which led to the Geneva agreements, which have been referred to so often during the running debate on our position in Vietnam.

Because I believe it would be a valuable article to read as background for an understanding of why we are engaged as we are in Vietnam today, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 1954 PARLEY LED TO VIETNAM CRISIS

(By David Lawrence)

To understand the Vietnam problem and the great danger that the world faces if appeasement and surrender should take the place of firmness and courage, it is only necessary to go back 11 years to the historic Conference at Geneva in 1954 and examine the mistakes that were made then which have led to the crisis of today.

For the Vietnam dilemma is not just a local affair in far-off Asia. It is the most vital and fundamental confrontation between Communist imperialism and the free world which has developed since the Korean war of 1950.

The American people have not yet been awakened to the implications of the Vietnam struggle. There's a tendency to pass it off as something that will be compromised sooner or later or as a conflict from which America should gracefully withdraw.

The same kind of pressures from the appeasers and the defeatists managed to weaken the will of France and Britain at the Geneva Conference in 1954, so that in the end the United States disassociated itself from the agreement reached because it was clear that no strong foundation for peace in southeast Asia had been laid.

This correspondent spent several weeks covering the Conference at Geneva and wrote daily dispatches about it. Here are some excerpts which indicate clearly that the world hasn't learned its lesson and why aggressors are still undismayed:

May 13, 1954: "As to Indochina, there will be a patched-up proposal to bring about a cessation of hostilities, but the United States will not be satisfied with the plan because of a fear that the Communists will be able thereby to overrun all of Indochina. Accordingly, as was announced in the early days of this Conference by Secretary of State Dulles, the American Government will 'disassociate' itself from the proposal."

May 30: "For what good will it do to withdraw all French protection from the newly created states of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam if Moscow-trained leaders like Ho Chi Minh are in charge of the Government of Vietnam and of its armies, with substantial aid from Red China, continue to overrun the neighboring states and threaten also Burma and Thailand, whose borders are nearby?"

June 14: "The world is witnessing the dangerous consequences of allied disunity. The American Government is an interested but helpless bystander. For American public opinion would not sanction military intervention in Indochina except on an allied basis, and the French have never been ready formally to ask for it. Hence the free world allows the advantage once more to go to the Communists, who are thereby encouraged to encroach further and further. This hastens the day of a showdown which, if it comes too late, may make it impossible to stop the sweep of Communist imperialism throughout Asia."

July 20: "The Indochina truce, like the Korean armistice, is not a victory, but a readiness to compromise with aggressors and to sanction their continued hold on many million more people who are to become enslaved.

"Plainly the trend in Europe on the part of America's allies is toward further surrender to Communist imperialism."

Back in 1954, while the Geneva Conference was going on, the Democrats in Congress, including then Senate majority leader, Lyndon Johnson, were sniping at the Eisenhower administration and accusing it of being a "warmongering" regime. The political disunity in this country had its effect abroad. Inside the British Government the Socialist Labor groups were taking an extreme position and preventing Britain from giving wholehearted support to the United States in its effort to form a truly effective southeast Asia organization.

The politicians somehow have not changed their attitude, and today there are Republicans as well as Democrats here who are making it more difficult for the incumbent administration to convince the Communists that the United States is not going to surrender and will not withdraw its military forces, but will insist upon driving the Communists out of South Vietnam.

It's certainly a critical time in American history and far more dangerous than the average man has been led to believe. The United States has its hands full in trying to fight the southeast Asia war alone. It needs the help of its allies—assistance not only in money but in manpower and particularly by an agreement to embargo all commerce with the Communist countries now supplying aid to North Vietnam.

Such action now can prevent world war III, which otherwise might come through step-by-step escalation set in motion by the same kind of appeasement, pacifism and timidity that led to World War II.

TAX CUTS AND TAX INCREASES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the July 19 issue of U.S. News & World Report contains two very timely articles. Both have as their base the Senate's recent action on the so-called medicare bill.

One bluntly states:

> Despite all the tax-cut talk, bigger and bigger bills lie ahead for the vast majority of taxpayers.

It underscores that some of the effects of last year's income tax cut will be wiped out by raising social security taxes, effective next January 1. While it does not say so in so many words, this is the age-old policy of giving with one hand and taking away with the other.

In an accompanying table, the magazine shows the impact of new taxes on a married man with two children. For those with an income of $5,000, the tax increase from this year to the next year will be 9.5 percent.

Editor David Lawrence, in the same issue, makes this observation:

> Now, with an increase in Social Security taxes about to be imposed, there will be a reduction in take-home pay for the wage earner, starting next January. Under the Senate bill, factory workers getting between $4,800 and $6,600 a year will have their payments for social security taxes raised from $174 to sums ranging up to $275. This means an increase of from 15 to 58 percent of their current social security tax.

To those who believe they are getting something for nothing, let me repeat the last sentence:

> This means an increase of from 15 to 58 percent of their current social security tax.

This accurately sums up some of my arguments against the bill passed last week: The medicare bill will weigh most heavily on those least able to afford such increases.

Mr. Lawrence also points up another argument I made last week:

> The American people could have paid for "medicare" out of the general revenues, and the social security tax could have been kept somewhere near the low rates originally planned. But this would have made it necessary for the Government to economize. Too much public money is being spent nowadays for what might be called luxuries—they are not necessities. * * * Inefficiency and waste in expenditures are greater than ever before.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "With All the Talk About a Tax Cut," with the accompanying table entitled "Tax on Married Man With Two Children," and the editorial "Reducing Take-Home Pay," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article, table, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITH ALL THE TALK ABOUT A TAX CUT

In Arizona, taxpayers are being hit with a 30-percent jump in the State income tax, a rise of 4½ cents a pack in cigarette taxes, and a boost in the gasoline levy by 1 cent per gallon.

That's typical of a process going on in many States across the Nation: Recent Federal tax cuts are being eaten up by steadily rising State, city and county levies.

The Federal Government itself soon is to wipe out some of the effects of last year's income tax cut by raising social security taxes, effective next January 1.

The upshot: The total tax bite for Americans is going up again after a brief downturn.

The rise that lies ahead will center in State and local taxes and in payroll taxes to support social security programs.

The payroll tax now is 3.625 percent each for employer and employee on the first $4,800 of an individual's income. On January 1, under a Senate plan, it will rise to 4.175 percent on the first $6,600 of earnings.

The tax on the individual and his employer thus will rise from the present maximum of $174 each to $275.55 each next year.

WHAT CONGRESS IS DOING

The Senate on July 9 approved the payroll tax increase. The House has already approved a somewhat smaller boost as part of a package that will include "medicare" for aged persons and an increase in social security benefits.

If experience is a guide, both the health-care and social security programs will continue to expand, in coverage and cost, during the years ahead—and payroll taxes will rise much above the levels now projected.

The accompanying chart gives you some idea of the heavier tax impact due next January 1. It reflects the anticipated boosts in the payroll tax for social security, on the basis of the increases that were approved by the Senate on July 9, and the boosts expected in the major taxes that are levied by the States.

On a percentage basis, the impact will be greatest on individuals with incomes of $10,000 or less, although it will also be substantial on those earning higher incomes.

In a typical example, a married man with 2 children and $3,000 of annual income can expect his State and Federal tax bill on 1966 income to climb by $17 above this year, or 15 percent.

At the $4,000 level, a boost of $26 is in store next year, while the family man making $10,000 faces an increase of $160, or nearly 11 percent.

In the case of a single man earning $2,500, a tax boost of $28 is in prospect—more than half a week's wage.

Not counted in these figures are a raft of other State and local taxes, including certain sales taxes, real estate levies and auto-license fees. Such taxes are scheduled to go up in many States. Thus many taxpayers across the country face even stiffer hikes in tax bills than shown in the table.

It will take some time, in the case of many individuals, before rising State and local taxes and higher social security levies exceed the recent reductions in Federal income taxes. Yet the trend is clear:

Despite all the tax-cut talk, bigger and bigger bills lie ahead for the vast majority of taxpayers.

Tax on married man with 2 children [1]

Total income per year	1965	1966	Change
$5,000	$503	$551	Up $48, or 9.5 percent.
$10,000	1,462	1,622	Up $160, or 10.9 percent.
$15,000	2,545	2,750	Up $205, or 8 percent.
$25,000	5,165	5,460	Up $295, or 5.7 percent.
$50,000	14,766	15,286	Up $520, or 3.5 percent.
$100,000	40,526	41,496	Up $970, or 2.4 percent.

[1] Not included in these figures are sales taxes, real estate taxes, and auto license fees. Such levies are rising in many States, will boost total tax bills still higher in months ahead.

NOTE.—Figures for 1966 are based on social security bill as approved by the Senate.

Source: U.S. News & World Report Economic Unit.

Reducing Take-Home Pay

(By David Lawrence)

Most workers, when asked how much they are earning, cannot, as a rule, remember exactly the total sum—they think only in terms of take-home pay. What is deducted by the employer from wages or salary for payment of the worker's taxes is not usually considered a part of income. Labor unions, for example, base their calculations on what the wage earner actually takes home.

Now, with an increase in social security taxes about to be imposed, there will be a reduction in take-home pay for the wage earner, starting next January. Under the Senate bill, factory workers getting between $4,800 and $6,600 a year will have their payments for social security taxes raised from $174 to sums ranging up to $275. This means an increase of from 15 to 58 percent of their current social security tax.

The Government also requires employers to match the amounts paid by the employees, so that next year approximately $5 billion more will be collected in social security taxes. This amount is to increase steadily, and in 7 years will go up by $17.4 billion.

What does all this mean to the economy of the Nation? What effect will it have on labor-union demands for increased incomes for the workers? What will be the impact on the price structure?

All these questions need to be examined because anything which is going to affect the national economy so intensively is bound to have some influence on business conditions as a whole and particularly on the capacity of the United States to compete in certain foreign markets. For undoubtedly prices in this country will have to rise to take care of the increased costs.

Theoretically, the Federal Government has reduced the tax burden by cutting income-tax rates and by eliminating some of the excise taxes. But, at the same time, the increases in taxes levied for social security will tend to offset some of the benefits allegedly to be derived from the tax-reduction policies of the last 2 years.

Certainly the labor unions are not going to overlook the fact that take-home pay will be reduced. Demands for higher wages are inevitable.

But, even though the individual worker may be convinced that "medicare" is eventually for his own benefit and for that of older members of his family whom he might otherwise be compelled to care for out of his wages, the fact remains that the labor unions will feel it their duty to obtain as quickly as possible increases in wages to offset the drop in take-home pay resulting from larger payroll deductions for social security.

Was there some other way to take care of the medical problems of the elderly? Unquestionably it could have been done and benefits given not only to the needy but to all the aged if the Government had decided to pay for medical care out of its general receipts. Persons with large incomes now are paying higher rates than those with low incomes. There certainly is no reason why the principle of the graduated income tax shouldn't continue to apply, instead of using a system of special taxes.

For it is a hardship to impose what is really a double tax on income. Many citizens who have been led to believe they benefit from being in a low income-tax bracket will discover that there are no tax deductions or exemptions when it comes to paying social security taxes. Some portion of social security benefits certainly should be paid for out of wages. But the whole system now has been extended so much that in the not-far-distant future employers and employees together will be paying for social security about 11 percent of all wages up to $6,600 a year. This is entirely apart from deductions made by the withholding of income taxes under the so-called pay-as-you-go plan.

The American people could have paid for "medicare" out of the general revenues, and the social security tax could have been kept somewhere near the low rates originally planned. But this would have made it necessary for the Government to economize. Too much public money is being spent nowadays for what might be called luxuries—they are not necessities. The pressure by the politicians to get pork barrel appropriations continues. Inefficiency and waste in expenditures are greater than ever before.

A prudent system of managing the Nation's finances would have provided all of the benefits that now are to be given for the medical care of the aged and for retirement incomes for the workers. But a double system of taxation is bound to increase the hardships of many millions of wage earners who really cannot afford to have their take-home pay reduced.

Sooner or later, the Federal Government must adopt sound fiscal policies and insist upon efficiency and economy in the expenditure of public funds. Otherwise, as the Treasury deficits continue year after year, the value of the dollar will continue to decline and America will feel the full effects of the dreaded inflation which, throughout history, has ruined the financial structure of many a nation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 627. An act to exempt oceanographic research vessels from the application of certain vessel inspection laws, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1217. An act for the relief of Capt. Paul W. Oberdorfer;

H.R. 1314. An act for the relief of Foster Masahiko Gushard;

H.R. 1322. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ana Cristina Rainforth;

H.R. 1374. An act for the relief of CWO Elden R. Comer;

H.R. 1487. An act for the relief of Maj. Kenneth F. Coykendall, U.S. Army;

H.R. 1889. An act for the relief of Albert Marks;

H.R. 2881. An act for the relief of George A. Grabert;

H.R. 3625. An act for the relief of Alfred Estrada; and

H.R. 8484. An act to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of members of the Armed Forces on a change of permanent station.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 21, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 20, 1965:

U.N. Ambassador

Arthur J. Goldberg, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 20, 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Harry R. Anderson, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 20, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with this verse of Scripture: II Corinthians 4: 11: *That the life of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh.*

O Thou God of all grace and goodness, we commit and commend ourselves not to the changing tides of time but to the majesty and mercy of the triumphant and the eternal.

Grant that we may be inspired to select decisively the highest values of life and serve them faithfully at any cost and to the very end and fulfilling them in sacrifice.

Help us to make more real and vivid the life of our blessed Lord and those characteristics of His spirit which we were meant to reveal.

May we in these troubled times manifest more of His sympathy, His compassion, His love, His passion for peace that we may all become one in His spirit.

To Thy name shall be the eternal praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1217. An act for the relief of Capt. Paul W. Oberdorfer;

H.R. 1314. An act for the relief of Foster Masahiko Gushard;

H.R. 1322. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ana Cristina Rainforth;

H.R. 1374. An act for the relief of CWO Elden R. Comer;

H.R. 1487. An act for the relief of Maj. Kenneth F. Coykendall, U.S. Army;

H.R. 1889. An act for the relief of Albert Marks;

H.R. 2881. An act for the relief of George A. Grabert;

H.R. 3625. An act for the relief of Alfred Estrada; and

H.R. 8484. An act to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of members of the Armed Forces on a change of permanent station.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 9. An act to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period;

S. 76. An act for the relief of Anna Maria Heiland;

S. 102. An act to provide an additional place for holding court in the district of North Dakota;

S. 135. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Kam Oi Hu;

S. 136. An act for the relief of Angel Lagmay;

S. 137. An act for the relief of Rosauro L. Lindogan;

S. 375. An act for the relief of Pedro Antonio Julio Sanchez;

S. 612. An act for the relief of Kevin Dillon Schofield;

S. 711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth;

S. 850. An act for the relief of Samuel L. McCoy;

S. 870. An act for the relief of Kaloyan D. Kaloyanoff;

S. 872. An act for the relief of Vasil Laci;

S. 879. An act for the relief of Kim Sa Suk;

S. 949. An act to promote commerce and encourage economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise;

S. 1119. An act for the relief of Julio Francisco Dumas y Alcocer and Maria Josefa Dumas; and

S. 1198. An act for the relief of Mrs. Harley Brewer.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 627. An act to exempt oceanographic research vessels from the application of certain vessel inspection laws, and for other purposes.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC FINANCE OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance of the Committee on Banking and Currency have permission to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I thought we had a rather large bill coming up today, dealing with poverty. I should think the Committee on Banking and Currency and all its members would be interested in that bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have a hearing concerning certain unsavory characters in certain institutions in our country. We have some witnesses from some distance and should like to accommodate them. The hearing should not be very long. I can assure the gentleman that our members are interested in the bill that is coming up.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says that the committee has some out-of-town witnesses to hear?

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture have until midnight to file a report on the bill H.R. 9811, the farm bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MRS. NATHALIE ILINE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1380) for the relief of Mrs. Nathalie Iline.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

OUTLET STORES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2924) for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CHARLES MAROWITZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1445) for the relief of Charles Marowitz.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

NORA ISABELLA SAMUELLI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 618) for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EDWARD V. AMASON AND EMERITA CECILIA AMADOR AMASON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1473) for the relief of Edward V. Amason, and Emerita Cecilia Amador Amason.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

JOANNE MARIE EVANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3103) for the relief of Joanne Marie Evans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DEDRICK A. MAANUM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4070) for the relief of Dedrick A. Maanum.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MRS. RUTH GORFAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5206) for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Gorfain.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LT. COL. JAMES P. HUBBARD, U.S. ARMY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5815) for the relief of Lt. Col. James P. Hubbard, U.S. Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

E. F. FORT, CORA LEE FORT CORBETT, AND W. R. FORT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6527) for the relief of E. F. Fort, Cora Lee Fort Corbett, and W. R. Fort.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

MARVIN D. NELLS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7822) for the relief of Marvin D. Nells.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DEBRA LYNNE SANDERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 916) for the relief of Debra Lynne Sanders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

ESTERINA RICUPERO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1627) for the relief of Esterina Ricupero.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1627

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Naturalization Act, Esterina Ricupero may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act: *Provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 3, strike out "section 212 (a)" and substitute in lieu thereof "section 212(a)(1)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MICHIKO MIYAZAKI WILLIAMS

The clerk called the bill (H.R. 1274) for the relief of Mrs. Michiko Miyazaki Williams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ANNIE GABBAY

The clerk called the bill (H.R. 1392) for the relief of Annie Gabbay.

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1392

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Annie Gabbay shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one nunmber from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Annie Gabbay. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Annie Gabbay shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS ADLER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1821) for the relief of Louis Adler.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ANNA DEL BAGLIVO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1871) for the relief of Anna Del Baglivo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **GROSS.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CONSUELO ALVARADO DE CORPUS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3292) for the relief of Consuelo Alvarado de Corpus.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3292

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a) (31) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Consuelo Alvarado de Corpus may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. GUISIPPINA RUSSO LUCIFORO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1415) for the relief of Mrs. Guisippina Russo Luciforo.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **GROSS.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CARLO ANTONIO DeLUCA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4032) for the relief of Carlo Antonio DeLuca.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **HALL.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO SELL RESERVED PHOSPHATE INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES IN LANDS LOCATED IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA TO THE RECORD OWNERS OF THE SURFACE THEREOF

The Clerk called the bill H.R. 7378, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7378

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey, sell, and quitclaim all phosphate interests now owned by the United States in and to the hereinafter described lands to the present record owner or owners of the surface rights thereof: The southeast quarter, the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter, and the south half of the southwest quarter of section 7; and the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 18; all in township 36 south, range 21 east, Tallahassee meridian, Florida.

Sec. 2. In the event that the Secretary of the Interior determines that the lands described in the first section are not prospectively valuable for phosphate, he shall convey the reserved phosphate interests to the present record owner or owners of the surface rights upon the payment of a sum of $200 to reimburse the United States for the administrative cost of the conveyance; otherwise, the phosphate interests shall be sold to the record owner or owners of the surface rights upon the payment of a sum equal to $200 plus the fair market value of the phosphate interests as determined by the Secretary after taking into consideration such appraisals as he deems necessary.

Sec. 3. Proceeds from the sale made hereunder shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The **SPEAKER.** This concludes the call of bills on the private calendar.

UNIFORMED SERVICES PAY ACT OF 1965

The **SPEAKER.** The unfinished business is the question on the passage of the bill (H.R. 9075) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. **PHILBIN.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PHILBIN.** Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief in my comments on the pending bill, because I believe that the House fully understands what the bill does and that it will be enacted by an overwhelming, and perhaps a unanimous, vote.

The sterling leader and brilliant chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the able, distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers], my dear friend, has fully outlined its purpose, provisions and effects, and those who so ably followed him have placed a seal of approval upon his impressive contributions, about which I would like to say just a brief word.

The job of succeeding the great American, Chairman Carl Vinson, who headed the House Armed Services Committee as chairman for so many years, a 50-year veteran of this House with a memorable record, was not an easy one. But the present outstanding chairman has made this challenging transition with characteristic versatility and ability to cope with every situation.

He has surmounted the difficulties, mastered the thorny problems, taken the hurdles in stride, and by the courage, ability and inspiration of his leadership, his vast knowledge of the scope and character of his duties and obligations, and his completely selfless spirit of dedication and devotion to duty, he enjoys the confidence, respect, admiration and affection of the Members of this House and solid support for the policies and programs he has fostered in the committee and the House.

The chairman is well informed. He knows what he wants to do and he knows how to do it. His purposes are lofty; his aim is high. He seeks to serve the Nation; to carry out the constitutional mandate of this body and the Congress; to provide for the common defense; and to defend the country and its free institutions, and to sustain those committed to the cause of freedom.

He boasts no pride of authorship; he pretends no infallibility. As a loyal, team worker and sagacious leader, he seeks the counsel and help of his entire committee, of which I am so proud to be the ranking member, and he calls and counts upon the talents, ability, knowledge and experience of those who know and understand the problems of the armed services to assist him in his tasks.

The chairman realizes the compelling urgency of a balanced, national defense, combining all the great services Congress has put together into an invincible consortium of loyal and cooperative branches, thinking together, working together, drawing upon scientific genius and industrial know-how, calling upon the great skills and the most sophisticated equipment, weapons and weapon systems of our miraculous age, uniting the many talents and capabilities we need these days to make our defense the greatest striking force in history—well able to discharge its great responsibility to the Nation and the free world and to carry out our policy of peace, brotherhood and understanding among all peoples, through the image of overwhelming strength before those forces of subversion and evil in the world which are plotting and feverishly working for the destruction of the great free Nation, and other nations like it dedicated to free institutions.

Let me assure you, my friends, that the gentleman from South Carolina never falters, never hesitates, never draws back, once he is sure he is right. His mind is always open to honest argument and persuasion.

He is broad, knowledgeable, and just in his outlook, but make no mistake about it, he is resolute in his purpose, and his purpose and the committee's purpose, is to keep this country just as strong as it has to be to meet every emergency, and every contingency that may confront us in this dangerous world, and at the same time, to make as sure as we can that the officers and men of our armed services are treated equitably, justly, and fairly, and that they and their dependents are treated with due regard to the great sacrifices and invaluable services they are rendering in the defense of our country.

It is in the furtherance of these aims and these purposes, upon which I think we can all be agreed, that this pending military pay bill is brought to the floor of the House for what I hope will be unanimous approval.

There is a retention problem in our armed services, and it springs from the fact that there is clear evidence that we have not treated our officers and enlisted personnel equitably in the matter of pay. They are not being accorded the comparable recompense to which they are entitled, let alone proper consideration for the sacrifices to which I have alluded, and the critical, crucial, imperative services they render to the Nation.

I do not believe this Congress would ever knowingly be grossly neglectful of these men who are doing so much for our cause, and I do not believe that we would ever knowingly overlook the needs and deserts of the many officers and men who are serving us with such complete fidelity and risk of their lives, to provide us with the strength and power we need in these perilous times.

This bill is based upon the principle that military pay should be fairly equated with the pay of civil servants and workers in private industry, and if we can accomplish that, or even move in the direction of finally accomplishing it in a truly substantial way, we shall be doing justice to our military personnel and be making a very meritorious, worthwhile contribution to the national defense, as I am sure it is our high intention to do.

The bill provides an annual pay review to insure that military pay will be kept comparable in the future with the levels and pay standards of civil and industrial life as sought by this bill.

As drafted by the committee, the bill takes into account the vital facilities of housing, subsistence, retirement, and other substantial fringe benefits currently enjoyed by military personnel.

Anything more than this bill provides for our armed services would be justified, in my opinion, as time goes along, to do equity to those who strive and fight. Certainly, anything less than this bill provides would be painfully and grossly inadequate—a pretense and a delusion.

To allow an ex parte pay panel to substitute its judgment for that of the House and the Congress in the determination of military pay would be, in my judgment, to reject and default our responsibility to the national defense and to all the members of our Armed Forces.

I do not wish to belabor the issue and the arguments, because they are so well known to the Members of the House that they are hardly in need of further elaboration.

Current pay scales for members of the armed services are in so many instances so far below the standards of the civil service or private industry as to bear no true comparison. One of the great ends this bill serves is to narrow that gap, and move in the not too distant future, toward eliminating it.

This bill will go a considerable way to make military pay relatively competitive with that of other segments of the economy. Admittedly, we cannot afford to let the military lag behind the civilian in this respect. This Nation must have the best personnel, the best equipment, the best weapons, weapon systems and military wherewithal that genius can create and money can buy. Inadequacy, mediocrity or scarcity in these essentials of manpower and materiel that are so urgently needed today for our national defense simply invite disaster and cannot be tolerated.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks, the posture, and the programs enunciated here by the great, beloved American who heads our military committee at a time when American servicemen are committed in ever increasing numbers against vicious guerrilla fighters in Vietnam, where the going is steadily getting tougher than perhaps many of us could realize, where the sacrifices are bitter beyond description, and where courage and patriotism find their greatest test.

This Congress and this Nation must make sure that all our military personnel, regardless of their rank are assured, insofar as we can provide it, of just, fair, comparable and equitable pay scales. In a real sense, no pay could ever compensate those who are so gallantly fighting for our freedoms.

The least we can do for those who are fighting for our liberties and for the preservation of this great Nation and for a world free of violence, tyrrany and oppression is to pay them well. In the name of justice and equity for the gallant officers and enlisted men of our armed services, upon whom we must depend to protect this Nation, and to carry out our solemn commitments to the cause of freedom, I appeal to the Members of this House to pass this bill without delay, and I have every confidence that you will do so, because you, far better than any others, know what the issues are that are involved in this bill, and realize full well that they must be met by this House in such a way that no one could ever mistake our purpose and our determination to measure up to our responsibilities to our military personnel, to the Nation and to the cause of freedom.

This vote is crucial and vital. Let it ring out as an expression of the confidence the House has in the new leadership of our House Armed Services Committee.

Let it reaffirm our collective purpose to keep this Nation, militarily, economically, socially, and, above all, spiritually strong, great, prosperous, and free.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 410, nays 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

YEAS—410

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baldwin
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Clevenger
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan

Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—23

Bonner
Bow
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Flynt
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Jacobs
Keogh
Lindsay
Macdonald
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Murray
Roncalio
Schisler
Scott
Shipley
Stephens
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Waggonner
White, Idaho

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Lindsay.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Bow.

Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Murray.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Schisler.

Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Bonner.

Mr. Scott with Mr. Flynt.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 431 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, upon the adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed five hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, House Resolution 431, makes in order consideration of the bill H.R. 8283, providing for the continuation of the Office of Economic Opportunity and increasing its authorization.

I believe every Member knows this is a very controversial matter and a very complicated matter. For that reason the Committee on Rules has provided a long period of general debate—5 hours.

Mr. Speaker, at the moment I have no requests for time and therefore reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 431 provides an open rule, 5 hours of debate for the consideration of H.R. 8283, Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 carried an authorization for an appropriation 1 year; $785.4 million was appropriated for fiscal year 1965; $947.5 million had been authorized in Public Law 88–452. As of the end of May 1965, about $650 million had been obligated, and the Office of Economic Opportunity indicated that they would end the fiscal year with only a small deficit.

More than half of the total appropriation last year was funded for title I—Jobs Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and work studies programs—and title II—community action and adult basic education programs.

Although the committee report on page 1 states that it was not possible to completely judge some of the programs of this great new approach to the elimination of poverty, because the program is only in its initial stages of operation, the bill authorizes an appropriation of $1.895 billion. It is interesting to note that OEO had asked for $1.5 billion for fiscal 1966, but it was increased by the majority of the committee to $1.895 billion. This is broken down as follows:

Title I, $825 million; title II, $680 million; title III, $70 million; title V, $300 million; and title VI, $20 million.

The brief hearings on the community action program were shut off abruptly over the protests of committee Republicans. The Republicans then set up a task force and, with the cooperation of the Republican policy committee, have prepared information setting forth the more serious defects in the program and have drawn a number of conclusions which they believe will help the program. I assume that they will be presented in detail during the general debate.

H.R. 8283 follows pretty much the bill as passed last year with the exception of asking for more money and with the seriously objected to major change removing the only effective State control over Federal poverty programs, to wit: the veto power of the Governor. H.R. 8283 gives authority to the Poverty Director to veto the veto of a Governor. This action has been strongly opposed by Governors of both parties inasmuch as it takes away from them their only check on the Federal Government and its determination as to what is good for a State.

While information concerning the programs of the war on poverty is difficult to find, some is available which raises very serious doubts about the programs. Some programs are clearly in deep trouble. The solution is not more money but a careful evaluation of the programs.

As an example, the Job Corps has been praised as a successful program. Although no accurate information has been made available by either the committee or the OEO, as to the dropout rate at the camps, newspapers report that 35 percent have dropped out at the Catoctin, Md., camp, and this has not been denied. As to the Neighborhood Youth Corps, as yet no programs for job training have been given to the enrollees. They are merely being kept off the streets at $1.25 per hour, this by the direction of the Secretary of Labor, though the act requires pay to be based on the area's prevailing wage rates. The community action programs seem to be in a considerable state of confusion because of the lack of clear guidelines and definitions. There are none as to how a community action board is to be established, and so jurisdictional squabbles have developed. There is no definition of "community" so there is confusion over who or how many people from an area may apply for grants. The result is a struggle for "control" of the poor.

So, Mr. Speaker, at a time when the administration's war on poverty is proving a monstrous boondoggle, Congress is being asked to appropriate twice the amount of money for the next fiscal year as was approved for fiscal 1965, despite the fact that no meaningful evaluation of the effect of the program has been offered Congress.

Public criticism of the conduct of the "war" is aplenty. From all across the land, we hear of local Project Head Starts, first official undertaking of the community action program, being beset with conflict over power between rival welfare and political groups. Big city politicians are handing out Federal funds on a patronage basis to a large number of highly paid administrators, consultants, coordinators, teachers, officeworkers, and so forth. There is little evidence of money getting down to the poor, nor of the funds being used to help them get jobs.

Local welfare agencies, both public and private, which in general perform satisfactorily, are concerned over losses of their trained social workers to newly established groups supported by Federal funds. The Federal programs come along, offer more money, and the local agencies lose their qualified personnel. This is just one more example of the Central Federal Government intruding into areas of local responsibility and seizing control. It is one more step in the drive of the welfare-staters toward complete erosion of State and local authority.

It has now been established that young people are not interested in the war on poverty programs as planned for them. For example, Job Corps applicants in Washington, D.C., who have accepted appointments, have numbered 36, as against a quota of 500 set by the District of Columbia office of the war on poverty agency, the Office of Economic Opportunity. The agency had represented Washington as being an area where the poverty problem was particularly acute, and where the Job Corps could accomplish big things.

To make the new bill for extending the "war" another year all the more unpalatable, it eliminates an original requirement that no funds may be used for payment to any person who refuses to make an affidavit that he is not a member of any organization that advocates overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence.

The best that may be said of the program's first year of operations is that it has not proved its worth to the extent of deserving nearly $2 billion for expanded activities in the second year. The worst to be said is that it has proved to be a costly blunder, which never should have been undertaken in the first place, and which should now be abandoned.

The Republican members of the Rules Committee are opposed to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman was "dead right" when he spoke of the high salaries being paid to administrative officials in this alleged poverty office.

I have hastily put together a few figures. In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare there are 226 supergrades, which means 1 supergrade paid from $19,000 to $24,500, for every 372 employees. In the Commerce Department there are 326 supergrades, which means 1 supergrade employee for every 101 employees. In the Department of Agriculture there are 198 supergrades, which means 1 supergrade for every 525 employees. In the Department of Defense there are 873 supergrades, or 1 supergrade for every 1,175 employees.

In the Office of Economic Opportunity there are 65 supergrades paid up to $24,500 a year under civil service, or 1 supergrade employee for every 18 employees in the alleged poverty setup.

If this is an austere, poverty operation, then I do not know the meaning of the words. On the basis of employees to top officials this is one of the lushest payrolls in the Government and I have not even included the several directors who are paid up to $28,000 per year.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his interesting statistics.

I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to say that there is no opposition to the adoption of the rule. We have been given an open rule which will make it possible for any Member to offer any amendments to the legislation that he so chooses.

Mr. Speaker, my record in this Congress will show that I have never been one to rise in opposition for opposition's sake. I do not do so now.

We, in the United States of America, enjoy the highest standard of living ever known to man. I would that every person living in our boundaries could share in the bountiful life that is possible here.

As one who knew poverty as a youth, I have compassion for the impoverished and favor all constructive measures that would improve their situation.

When the President made his antipoverty speech last year, I concurred in his objectives and looked forward toward joining in his battle to clean up poverty. I thought that his advisers had devised some new, well-thought-out method that would raise the income of those on the lowest level.

In the previous Congress, we had attacked this problem through educational and retraining acts. We had done this in a nonpartisan manner.

I was hoping that the President would adopt this same approach. I guess this was too much to expect in a national election year.

It was with a deep sense of regret that I read the administration bill. Instead of a well engineered method of attacking the primary causes of poverty, here was a conglomeration of old ideas wrapped together with a bright antipoverty label. Many of these proposals had previously been discarded as unworkable.

Unworkable, they have proved to be. Despite the efforts of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunities to dress them up in Madison Avenue glitter and gold, they have failed. I do not express this as my judgment alone. It is the judgment of those best able to evaluate the program. I speak of the poor.

The hearings held by the subcommittee on the poverty war program, of the House Education and Labor Committee, were brought to an abrupt conclusion. The reason was evident. The image of the administration as a champion of the poor was suffering irreparable damage because of the testimony being offered. The attacks were the most severe that I have ever heard in my many years in the Congress.

Let me assure you that these attacks did not come from the minority side of the committee. Without exception, they were presented by either the majority side or by witnesses invited by them.

Many of these pointed out the outright capture of the community action phase of the program by big city political bosses. These bosses were using it as a means of recreating a series of Tammy halls in their cities.

On August 7, I called to the attention of this House a letter written by Mr. Adam Yarmolinsky, then the principal proponent of the Antipoverty Act. This letter, never meant for the public's eye, detailed the political motivation behind the bill then before us.

Mr. Yarmolinsky was promptly disavowed by the bill's author and we were assured by that distinguished gentleman that he had been promised by the "highest authority" that Mr. Yarmolinsky would have no place in the operation of the antipoverty program.

I took this to mean that he had been publicly discredited for bringing politics into the war on poverty.

Mr. Yarmolinsky is not part of the program but most certainly the political motivations behind the program are plainly visible for all to see.

The enactment of the antipoverty bill was of great aid to the administration during the past national elections. As a campaign project, it was almost without equal. It undoubtedly brought hundreds of thousands of the poor into the Johnson-Humphrey ranks.

A beautiful picture was painted for the poor. Director Shriver stood upright using the long bow to shoot an arrow in the war on poverty. The arrow has begun to turn, and lo and behold, it will turn into a boomerang that will destroy those who launched it.

The Antipoverty Act as now constituted cannot effectively attack the basic causes of poverty. Many of our people are now aware of this fact and as the program develops, more will be so.

The American people will resent the use of the antipoverty program for political purposes. Just this week, I received a letter from a constituent from my district. This party stated that his local post office was authorized to hire five summer helpers under the national youth program. When I was a youngster, I had to work summers, so I am sympathetic toward this idea. Certainly we should help the poor youngsters. However, according to my constituent, no search was made for the most needy youngsters. Instead, the jobs were given to five boys recommended by the Democratic county leader. None of these boys could be ranked among the needy. Incidentally one of them was the son of the local Democratic political boss. Yes, he is supporting the reenactment of the Economic Opportunity Act. His son wants the job next summer, too.

Now they are before us with a demand for the practically doubling of funds. In no place have I seen any plan for the constructive spending of these moneys.

Last year, I offered a bill that would have created a commission to evaluate the programs affecting the impoverished. It would also have defined the unmet community and individual needs to which new programs might be directed. It then would have evolved programs to meet these needs. It provided for an appropriation sufficiently large for us to have availed ourselves of the best technical minds so as to create a program that would not only declare war on poverty but carry on that war to a successful conclusion.

This is the method by which any organization carrys a program to success. If my bill had been adopted last year, we would now be in a position to pass on legislation that we could all endorse—legislation for which we would be proud to accept the responsibility.

This logical approach to this important problem received no proper recognition. The reason for this is obvious. It was not a vote-getting bill, and the national elections were in the offing.

I still hope that we can salvage something from this program. I would like to see a Job Corps patterned after the Manpower Retraining Act. The responsibility for its performance placed in the experienced hands of the Department of Labor.

The minority will submit many constructive amendments here today. We would not abandon any solution to maintain an issue.

When the President started the cleanup poverty campaign, he named Sargent Shriver as "Mr. Clean." That astute gentleman has been able to devote but half of his time to its administration. We are now asked to double the appropriation and still have it retain a half-time Director. We should rectify this situation today.

We have seen unwarranted attacks on some of the Governors of our States. The Office of Economic Opportunity, through its Director, was accusing them of "foot dragging" on projects for which his own Office was at fault. Certainly we should not put our State Governors at the mercy of such an inefficient, politically oriented agency. The final decision on all programs should be continued in the hands of the chief executives of the States.

Mr. Speaker, in 1964, when this bill was first brought out of committee, I did not sign the minority report. I wanted to give it every chance. It has now been tried and found wanting.

Let us recognize it for what it truly is—an attempt to "romance" the poor.

Mr BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I approach this subject with some misgiving. I do not think there is anything that I could say here that would have any effect upon the final vote on this bill. But I am assuming that the bill is going to pass. Therefore, I wanted to—and I feel I owe it to my constituents and to the country—discuss briefly one phase of the administration of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I did not support this bill in the beginning and I cannot support its expansion. I do not feel that it is a proper approach to the problem its proponents say we face.

Mr. Speaker, the thing that I particularly wanted to call to the attention of this House is a letter that I received in which I feel the Members would be interested from a constituent down in my district, a Negro woman.

Mr. Speaker, this woman is possessed of two college degrees. She is a teacher in the public schools of the city of Hattiesburg, Miss.

When this program "Head Start" was announced, she applied for a position as one of the teachers in the program locally there.

She was refused employment upon the ground that she had not been active in the community in the civil rights movement. If that sounds a bit harsh to you, let me say that it is substantiated by the fact that the questionnaire submitted asked, among other things, indicating the background of the applicant, "What has been your experience in the civil rights movement?"

She was turned down. In discussing it with one of her neighbors, another Negro woman, a woman with an eighth-grade education, she found this woman had been employed in this movement. Whereupon, she went back to the interviewer and told him that here was a woman with only an eighth-grade education who had also not been active in the civil rights movement but had been employed.

What happened? The woman with the eighth-grade education was also denied an opportunity to work in the movement; in other words, she had been employed and she was fired.

Who was doing the interviewing? According to my constituents, the school teacher with two degrees from colleges was interviewed by a Mr. Fawcett. I wrote Mr. Shriver, and I furnished the woman's letter. I have had the privilege of knowing Mr. Shriver. I think he is one of the able men in this administration. I know he has one of the most pleasing personalities and the ability to sell his product. So I am not directing my criticism to Mr. Shriver, although he is responsible for the administration of this program. I know in a thing as big as this, it is pretty difficult to keep up with all of the matters involved.

But nearly 3 weeks elapsed and I had not received a reply to my letter to Mr. Shriver. This bill came up before the Rules Committee and I thought I had an obligation to the people, to this woman who was well qualified for this job, my constituent, and the public generally. So I explored this matter in the Rules Committee. I referred to the fact that I had not had a reply to my letter. This was about noon. Well, I got a reply that evening before the sun went down, an interim report. Mr. Shriver then asked a member of his staff, and the man who is running the program down in the State of Mississippi to come to my office. They reported that the qualifications are not based upon this matter of engagement in the civil rights movement. I say that in fairness to them.

But I do not know to this day, and I talked to them for an hour and one-half, who this Mr. Fawcett was. They said he was not an employee; he was not on the Government payroll. But what was he doing down there, making or taking these applications and employing these people. They tell me he was from the great State of Oregon and that now he has returned to the great State of Oregon. That is just part of the story.

What happens here? $1,200,000 or was it $1,400,000 was allocated for this head start program in Mississippi—to a small Negro college in north Mississippi. I doubt, and I say this in all seriousness, that this college ever had $1,200,000 or $1,400,000 in its total existence.

I am not casting any aspersions on the college or on those people who run it. I am trying to show you how this thing is administered.

What happens then? A man from New York, a Ph. D., a Dr. Levin, comes down to Mississippi and he contracts with the college to administer this program. And where did Dr. Levin have his headquarters? He has his headquarters out at Edwards, Miss., a very small town on some ground there that is—I do not know—the National Council of Churches has something to do with it. Upon that ground or campus or whatever it is is centered—COFO, SNCC and all of these—what I am pleased to term, left-wing organizations. Edwards is located just outside of the capital of Mississippi, Jackson, and it was from this little town of Edwards that all of these demonstrators moved upon the capital of Mississippi here recently. You read about it. You saw it on TV. Where 850 of them were arrested for marching upon the capital in violation of the ordinance of the city and statutes of the State. To do what? To protest the repeal of the laws that they say are obnoxious, the voting laws, that the Governor had called the legislature into special session to repeal. Bear in mind, the legislature was in session to repeal these laws that they say are so obnoxious. They said the Governor had some ulterior motive. As I say, they marched upon the capital and they were arrested.

Oh, yes, as usual, you heard a lot about police brutality, but they were unable to show any evidences of it.

That is the old slogan.

I am interested—and some people here believe it, and some people sitting over there believe it—in the progress of the Negro race.

I said that I did not support this program, or this legislation, but since the recipients are largely, if not totally, in my State, the small Negro children, I believe it could be developed into a worthwhile program. I want to see them make progress. As I have said before, the answer to the Negro problem is evolution, not revolution. But if it is going to be administered in that kind of an atmosphere it cannot be a successful program.

I saw a primer which was put out by some of these organizations to which I referred, which conducted seminars or schools, that was critical of the President of the United States and which quoted rabid statements that had been made by irresponsible civil rights leaders. I do not know that that primer is going to be used for these children of tender age. Perhaps they will get up a new one. I do not know what it will be.

I say to you what I said to Dr. Levin in my office the other day: You cannot have a successful program in that kind of an atmosphere. You cannot bring the Dr. Levins and Mr. Fawcetts from New York, from Oregon and from other States into a local community and put across a program of that nature with the backing of these leftwing organizations.

Mr. Speaker, that is my story. I know I will be criticized for having told it, but I believe it is something Members ought to know about.

I have not touched upon the basic philosophy of the overall bill, but even had I supported this legislation in the beginning I could not support it now, considering the experience and the observations I have had of it in my district.

Perhaps I have served no good purpose. Perhaps it has been a good thing, if it does nothing other than to forcibly call the attention of those who are responsible for the expenditure of these billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to the way some of it is being administered.

Mr. Speaker, the letter to which I referred is as follows:

HATTIESBURG, MISS.,
May 24, 1965.

Congressman WILLIAM COLMER,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COLMER: I am a Negro resident of Hattiesburg, Forrest County, and have resided in Hattiesburg 37 years. At present I am employed by the Hattiesburg Public School System as a classroom teacher on the elementary level. My parents, Rev. and Mrs. R. W. Woullard have resided in Hattiesburg for 44 years. I am a graduate of Lincoln University, Missouri, with a major in sociology. I have also had 20 hours of education at our State institutions. I am known in Hattiesburg by most of the older residents, in particular, Mr. Earl Roseberry, as he was the person that referred me to contact you to seek the answers to questions that I shall outline to you.

Congressman, I am interested in the operational phase of "Operation Headstart" in the city of Hattiesburg. As you know the Hattiesburg area will operate under the auspices of the Mary Holmes Center of West Point. A Mr. Fawcett (white) was sent into the Hattiesburg area to serve as coordinator for the five centers that have been approved here. His headquarters, or rather the only place I know of to contact him, is at the Ministers Project on Mobile Street. I contacted him to inquire of employment in the social work aspect of the program here. He informed me that he would secure the information for me after a meeting in Edwards. Meanwhile, a widespread rumor developed in the community that only local Negroes that had been active in the civil rights movement were eligible for these jobs. I questioned him about this and he vehemently denied it. Later, I was asked by one of my neighbors who operates a kindergarten and had been selected to serve on the committee for my precinct, to work as an instructor. This person was the only one placed on the committee that did not have a record with the civil rights movement as a worker. Later, Mr. Fawcett came to my neighbor and asked for her resignation from the committee because of her nonparticipation in civil rights work and because she was recommending a teacher who did not enter civil rights activities. This local committee approves or rejects all names submitted for work in Operation Headstart in my district. The entire committee is composed of persons that have been active in the civil rights movement in Hattiesburg. The average education level of the committee is 8th grade with the highest academic level reached by a member of the committee being the 10th grade. In a later conversation with Mr. Fawcett, he admitted that lack of participation in the civil rights movement is legitimate grounds for rejecting an applicant by the committee.

Congressman, this is what I would appreciate very much if you would answer for me: first, has this Federal money that has been appropriated for the Mary Holmes Center and the Hattiesburg area specifically been designated to be used as rewards for local Negro residents that work with the civil rights movement without regards to qualifications academically, or was it designed for the underprivileged child to help eradicate emotional and other problems stemming from poverty in giving to the child a readiness program preparatory for beginning public school.

The next question I would like answered is, Do not the people who are to serve on these committees and work as instructors need have some qualifications regardless of their participation in movement work?

I am sure you can see what a grave injustice will be done to the children of Hattiesburg who are eligible for this program if it continues in the hands of people who do not have the slightest idea of what the expected outcomes are to be.

Congressman, I would very much appreciate it if you would spare time from your busy schedule to answer the above-stated questions.

Very truly yours,
Mrs. NAREATHA W. NAYLOR.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Moss). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 8283, with Mr. ROONEY of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 8283, the 1965 amendments to the 1964 Economic Opportunity Act, the enabling legislation for the war on poverty.

I would like to thank all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle for their great contributions and to thank the one or two on the other side of the aisle on the committee who have helped in putting this through. I would like to pay special tribute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] for his excellent work. He has the authorship of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, this new attack on want has carried the country to a higher threshold of compassion for those imprisoned by poverty.

In his moving inaugural address of just a short 19 months ago, President Johnson touched us all with these words:

> In a land of wealth, families must not live in hopeless poverty. In a land rich in harvest, children must not go hungry.

If there is any irreducible minimum of standards for the Great Society, it is framed within those declarations.

Slowly, almost obstinately, we have come to an embarrassing realization: for a society that can orbit men around the earth today in an electrifying demonstration of technological excellence, poverty is an inexcusable shame.

Even with the proud mastery of outer space, the Great Society translates into little more than a catch phrase for 9½ million white and black families who survive—not live—but barely survive on the tattered edge of poverty. Their hunger, their want, their despair, and their deprivation should continue to haunt us all.

Only this great legislative body has within it the power to undo the heavy burdens of the poor and break every yoke that consigns them to a lifetime of poverty.

As we meet today to consider H.R. 8283, that is our moral commitment.

I candidly admit that the war on poverty has not been without its share of birth pains. Indeed, the embryos of social welfare power struggles, political friction, and public controversy have been spawned. But in the all too short a span of just 9 months—not even 1 full year—the fertile accomplishments of this program have yielded a far richer harvest. Over 3 million men, women, boys, and girls who were drifting aimlessly through shabby lives have already been uplifted and given new hope.

This new hope has come through more than 15,000 community action programs, Job Corps projects, Neighborhood Youth Corps programs, Head Start projects, small-business loans, migrant-worker services, work-study programs, and work-experience programs. Together, these 15,000 programs have become the tools for America's Operation Uplift. By using these tools, our communities are reclaiming their most sacred natural resource—people. So the discords of controversy do not dismay me.

Rather, we should remember that whenever this country sought to sculpture new and happier tomorrows for its people, ardent clashes of opinion attended those changes. Such dialogs only strengthen democracy.

And just as the Wagner Act has been hailed as the Magna Carta of organized labor, so the Economic Opportunity Act will one day be exalted as the Magna Carta of the poor—the unorganized and invisible poor.

With the war on poverty, we now seek to organize this poor into a new visibility. No longer need the poor be stigmatized as children of charity when they can be respected as workers with dignity.

From the dark subculture of their nobodiness, they are becoming somebody—the somebodiness of local board members, neighborhood workers, administrative aids, social planners, advisory committee members, Job Corps assistants and volunteers.

With little fanfare, this transition is taking place almost overnight. The abundant good life of America is not yet a reality for all families, but many more are beginning to taste its sweetness.

Still, in far too many homes today, the sour staleness of hunger is present. A small child cries pitifully for one glass of milk. A father hangs his head in shame because he cannot buy bread. A mother suffers a silent agony at her helplessness. A school dropout lashes back in criminal violence at a society which dropped him the day he was born.

We speak to them all today—the least in our society—and we reaffirm their human dignity by remembering the message of One who loved us all that:

> Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AND THE NEW EDUCATION PREAMBLE

The keystone of the Great Society is integration, in its broadest and most profound sense.

No society which is not fully integrated can sustain greatness. No society in which people are alienated from one another—by race, by religion, by educational and economic opportunity—can continue to grow and prosper.

America has progressed in the first half of the sixties to towering heights of prosperity. This prosperity, however, cannot long endure while major groups of Americans struggle behind in the onward march of American society.

The one-fifth of a nation that is steeped in poverty has, until very recently, been consistently excluded from the mainstream of American society—barred, in effect, from its fair share in the work and hopes that propel America forward.

But this last year has seen the emergence of a new force which is integrating these alienated people into the Great Society. This new force, embodied in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and the present legislation which seeks to extend and improve upon this act, can be called the new education.

The new education is not confined to curriculums and textbooks. It is an education of America's well-to-do to recognize their long-forgotten countrymen among the poor. More important, it is an education to inspire the poor themselves to claim their birthright and assume their rightful place in this productive and prosperous society.

The new education is geared to enlist the poor in making the Nation's communities not only decent places in which to live but broad channels through which to direct their own and the Nation's progress as well. It is geared to equip the poor with the sense of purpose and sense of belonging that comes with responsible jobs. It is geared to allow for the diversity of the many groups among the poor and to integrate them into American society.

The new education makes pupils of us all—those of us who are trying to help as well as those who must be helped. We are no longer relying solely on the tried and true methods of the past. We are, instead, innovating, blazing new and unmapped trails. This is a challenge which has stimulated the most dedicated concern, the most thoughtful experimentation, the most creative efforts from all who are involved in this fight.

But before the battle can be fully mounted and successfully completed, we must first chart our course and sight our goals. We must ask ourselves questions: What is poverty? Who are the poor? Where must we focus our efforts to help the most numbers of people and the most seriously affected people? How can we integrate our resources and coordinate our efforts to achieve maximum results for the poor specifically and for society as a whole generally?

POVERTY DEFINED

No more eloquent definition of poverty exists than the personal account of Mrs. Janice Bradshaw of Pueblo, Colo.:

> Poverty is taking your children to the hospital and spending the whole day waiting with no one even taking your name—and then coming back again the next day, and the next, until they finally get around to you.
>
> Poverty is having a landlady (who is also a public health nurse) who turns off the heat when she leaves for work in the morning and turns it back on at 6 when she returns. It's being helpless to do anything about it because by the time the officials get around to it, she has turned the heat back on for the day and then it will be off the next.
>
> Poverty is having the welfare investigators break in at 4 o'clock in the morning and cut off your welfare check without an explanation, and then when you go down and ask, they tell you it is because they found a pair of men's house slippers in the attic, where your brother left them when he visited a month ago.
>
> Poverty is having a child with glaucoma and watching that eye condition grow worse every day, while the public officials send you to the private agencies, and the private agencies send you back to the public, and when you ask the public officials to refer you to this special hospital, they say they can't—and when you say it is prejudice because you are a Negro, they deny it flatly—and they shout at you, "Name 1 white child we have referred there"; and when you name 25, they sit down, and shut up, and they finally refer you but it is too late then, because your child has permanently lost 80 percent of his vision; and you are told that if only they had caught it a month earlier, when you first made inquiry about the film over his eyes, they could have preserved his vision.

Mrs. Bradshaw's definition is couched in human terms that none of us can ignore. Her words arouse a sense of indignation and outrage in even the most cynical of persons.

The statisticians have not been as poetic as Mrs. Bradshaw in developing a working definition of poverty, but they have been increasingly precise in creating an accurate profile of the poverty population in order to show us where our efforts must be directed.

Last year, the Council of Economic Advisers used annual income of less than $3,000 for a family and $1,500 for an individual to define the poverty level. This crude, but approximate measure has since been succeeded by another standard—the economy level income—established by the Division of Research and Statistics of the Social Security Administration. The economy level index considers other factors besides income; it makes allowances for food, rent and other expenses as well as the size and location of poor families.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has adopted the findings of the Social Security Administration research staff in redefining poverty income levels. The new definition does not significantly change the estimates of the number of the poor—it still embraces approximately 35 million people or roughly one-fifth of our population—but it does somewhat alter the composition of the poor population. For example, under the more precise calculations it becomes clear that more of the poor than we realized are children, since more large families are poor than originally calculated.

At this point, I would like to insert charts showing the calculations of the incidences of poverty in 1963 in the United States among families and individuals, according to the two methods of measuring poverty, the Council of Economic Advisers index, and the more refined Social Security Administration measure.

Incidence of poverty by two measures: Families with 1963 incomes below $3,000 and below the economy level of the SSA poverty index, by specified characteristics

[Numbers in millions]

Characteristic	Total number of families	Poor—with incomes under $3,000 [1]		Poor—with incomes below economy level [2]		
		Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total	Percentage distribution of all poor families
All families	47.4	8.8	19	7.2	15	100
Residence:						
Farm	3.1	1.3	43	.7	23	10
Nonfarm	44.3	7.5	17	6.5	15	90
Race of head:						
White	42.7	6.8	16	5.2	12	72
Nonwhite	4.7	2.0	43	2.0	42	28
Age of head:						
14 to 24	2.7	.8	30	.7	26	10
25 to 54	30.6	3.6	12	4.0	13	54
55 to 64	7.4	1.3	18	1.0	13	14
65 and over	6.7	3.1	45	1.5	24	22
Type of family:						
Husband-wife	41.3	6.2	15	5.0	12	70
Wife in paid labor force	13.4	1.0	8	.9	7	13
Wife not in paid labor force	27.9	5.2	19	4.1	15	57
Other male head	1.2	.3	23	.2	17	3
Female head	4.9	2.3	47	2.0	40	27
Number of persons in family:						
2	15.3	4.6	30	2.5	16	34
3	9.8	1.5	16	1.0	11	14
4	9.4	1.0	10	1.0	10	14
5	6.3	.7	11	.9	14	13
6	3.3	.4	12	.6	19	9
7 or more	3.3	.6	18	1.2	35	16
Number of related children under age 18:						
None	19.1	4.7	25	2.4	13	34
1	8.7	1.4	16	1.1	12	15
2	8.6	1.0	11	1.0	11	13
3	5.5	.7	14	1.0	17	14
4	2.9	.4	15	.6	23	9
Number of related children under age 18—Continued						
5	1.4	0.3	18	0.5	36	7
6	1.2	.3	30	.6	49	8
Numbers of earners:						
None	3.7	2.8	76	2.0	53	27
1	20.8	3.9	19	3.3	16	46
2	17.3	1.8	10	1.5	9	21
3 or more	5.6	.3	6	.4	7	6
Employment status and occupation of head:						
Not in labor force [3]	8.8	4.3	49	3.0	34	42
Unemployed	1.4	.4	28	.4	28	6
Employed	37.2	4.1	11	3.7	10	52
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	4.7	.1	3	.1	3	2
Farmers and farm managers	1.8	.9	48	.5	29	8
Managers, officials, and proprietors (except farm)	6.0	.4	6	.3	5	4
Clerical, sales, and kindred workers	4.9	.2	6	.2	4	3
Craftsmen, operatives, and kindred workers	14.5	1.1	8	1.2	8	17
Service workers, including private household	3.0	.7	23	.6	20	8
Laborers (except mine)	2.3	.7	33	.7	30	10
Work experience of head in 1963: [4]						
Worked in 1963	40.7	5.1	13	4.6	11	64
Worked at full-time jobs	37.9	3.8	10	3.6	10	50
50 to 52 weeks	30.7	2.1	7	2.0	7	28
Worked at part-time jobs	2.8	1.4	49	1.0	36	14
Did not work in 1963	6.7	3.7	54	2.6	38	36

[1] Prepared by the Bureau of the Census from P-60, No. 43, Income of Families and Persons in the U.S., 1963.

[2] Derived from special tabulations by the Bureau of the Census for the Social Security Administration. For definition of poverty criteria, see text.

[3] Includes approximately 900,000 family heads in the Armed Forces, of whom about 100,000 have incomes under $3,000.

[4] All work-experience data, including data for year-round, full-time workers, limited to civilian workers.

Incidence of poverty by two measures: Unrelated individuals with 1963 incomes below $1,500 and below the economy level of the SSA poverty index, by specified characteristics

[Numbers in millions]

Characteristic	Total number	Poor—with incomes under $1,500 [1]		Poor—with incomes below economy level [2]		
		Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total	Percentage distribution of all poor unrelated individuals
All unrelated individuals	11.2	4.9	44	4.9	44	100
Residence:						
Nonfarm	10.8	4.7	43	4.7	44	97
Farm	.4	.2	67	.2	40	3
Race:						
White	9.7	4.1	42	4.1	42	83
Nonwhite	1.5	.8	56	.8	58	17
Age:						
14 to 24	1.0	.5	47	.5	48	10
25 to 64	5.9	1.8	31	1.9	32	38
65 and over	4.3	2.6	62	2.5	59	52
Sex:						
Male	4.3	1.4	33	1.4	34	30
Female	6.9	3.5	51	3.5	50	70
Earner status:						
Earner	7.0	1.8	26	1.8	26	37
Nonearner	4.2	3.1	75	3.1	74	63
Work experience in 1963: [3]						
Worked in 1963	6.7	1.8	26	1.8	26	36
Worked at full-time jobs	5.5	1.1	20	1.2	21	23
50 to 52 weeks	3.7	.5	12	.5	13	10
Worked at part-time jobs	1.2	.7	55	.6	54	13
Did not work in 1963	4.5	3.1	72	3.1	70	64

[1] Prepared by Bureau of the Census from P-60, No. 43, Income of Families and Persons in the U.S., 1963.

[2] Derived from special tabulations by the Bureau of the Census for the Social Security Administration. For definition of poverty criteria, see text.

[3] All work-experience data, including data for year-round, full-time workers, limited to civilian workers.

The new standards have helped us to clarify our picture of poverty in America. It has shown us, too, that by any definition, from the simplest to the most refined, one-fifth of our population lives in poverty and that all our efforts to date have merely been a preliminary skirmish before the full-sized battle that we must inevitably launch.

POVERTY PERSONALIZED

As we are all well aware by now, poverty afflicts certain groups of the population more heavily than others.

Of the 34.6 million poor, about 5 million are aged 65 and over. While this represents only 15 percent of the total poor, it includes almost one-half of all poor individuals who live alone or with unrelated persons and one-half of all poor two-person family units.

Children under 18 account for 15 million of the poor—more than 43 percent.

Nonwhites—who comprise about 10 percent of our total population—represent 30 percent of the poor. Conversely, half of all nonwhites in this country are poor.

Families headed by women are another group inordinately weighed down by poverty. Nearly one-half of all families with women as heads are poor.

These groups—children, the aged, nonwhites, and families headed by women—are all high risk potentials. They all exist in vulnerable circumstances which are especially propitious for poverty. But there are two groups that I would like especially to discuss—the youth and the aged. These two groups often possess other characteristics of poverty. They are often nonwhite and often in families with female heads. Yet, it is their youth and their age—both dependent positions—which interest us here.

Together the young and the old account for almost 60 percent of our Nation's poor. In addition to the significant fact that together they represent the largest number of the poor, we must also note that these two population groups are growing proportionately faster than the rest of the population. The age structure of our population is changing radically. And these two population groups—each dependent upon society by their nature—will demand increasing attention and sustained support in the years ahead.

YOUTH: EDUCATION FOR LIVING

American young people today face a future which is by no means unclouded and worry-free. They were born into a highly technical society which has little use for the underskilled and the undereducated. They were born into an era of vastness—big business, big education, big Government—which idealism and individualism often seem all but totally submerged. They have grown up at a time when jobs are being eliminated by machines more rapidly than they are being created by human ingenuity. And perhaps, as a result of all these circumstances, they are often cynical and negative and careless of the future.

Youth crime continues to increase at an alarming rate. Youth arrests rose 13 percent in 1964 over 1963 and the crimes committed are more often violent in nature.

Students continue to drop out of school at a fairly consistent rate of 30 percent, in spite of the handicaps that a lack of a high school diploma entails.

Youth unemployment is persistently high—sometimes as much as three times as high as the national unemployment rate. And unemployment among dropouts is 50 percent higher than among high school graduates.

Poor youth, of course, suffer proportionately more than their more fortunate contemporaries. Their environment does not prepare them to compete, to cope with the demands and the pressures of life in 20th century America. They are the malleable raw material of their environment and, by the time they leave childhood, they are often warped and forged into misshapen tools, incapable of functioning efficiently in our society.

The Economic Opportunity Act is attempting to face squarely the special problems of young people born into poverty. The new education is being adapted to fill their varied and special needs.

There are the needs of the poor youths who strive to obtain a college education which, until now, was far beyond their limited reach. Even the extensive student loan programs and scholarships available have not extended their assistance to them. College work-study programs now provide them with a new chance—a chance to be employed at jobs related to their studies while they are working for their degrees. Almost 700 institutions now offer the opportunity of work-study to students from low-income families. With such sustained assistance, poor young people will be provided with the strength and knowledge to hoist themselves out of the subbasement of the American household. They who grew up in poverty will be able to provide a better start for their own children.

There are the needs of the children who have grown up in slums and dropped out of school. The Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps extend a hand to them. Through these programs, they can acquire skills and training that will earn them a place in the employment marketplace. Through these programs, they might have a better chance to avoid a lifetime of menial tasks at best and total joblessness at worst.

Perhaps most pointedly there are the very young children—those too young even to have attended school. For them, Project Head Start has been developed. Head Start recognizes that being poor is a state of mind as well as an economic condition.

Children of the poor are cheated from the very beginning. Poverty is little different from other birth defects. It stunts growth of children—if not physically, then certainly spiritually and mentally. By the time the average child from a low-income family enters school, he is 6 months behind the middle-class child; and by the time he enters the fifth grade he will be as much as 2 years behind his less deprived classmates.

Head Start makes an attempt to offset the handicaps of being born poor. It is a preschool program to provide a child with learning activities, with medical and dental care, with field trips out of the slums into a brighter world, with balanced meals, and with contact with interested adults. It prepares him for the totally foreign experience of entering a classroom.

These are all programs to teach children who have not been reached by our conventional methods. And a big part of the new education is the reexamination of a system which has not taken into account the special needs of 15 million children of the poor. Our educational system has been geared to the normal child—that is, the normal child with normal parents with normal incomes and normal jobs. It has somehow not communicated with the child whose circumstances are not normal—a child whose parent is called upon daily to make a painful decision as to whether the child will eat that day or whether he will receive some other necessity, such as clothing or medical care.

The war on poverty is not just a war on the oppressions which afflict the poor and the mentality which develops with poverty. It is no less a war on the preconceptions and prejudices of the society in which this poverty exists. We must teach the poor children with the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps and with work-study programs and with Project Head Start. But we must learn from them as well. We must learn what their needs are, and minister to those needs. We must learn how they think, and deal with them in terms of their values, not ours. We must learn what they want, and direct the programs toward those goals, not toward the goals that we would necessarily choose.

This will necessitate our changing along with the poor. Efforts are now afoot to refocus many of our school curricula so that they will have some application to the backgrounds of the students and the futures which they hope to build. Only through mutual understanding and compromise will success be attained. And this success can only be measured in terms of young lives freed from the shackles of poverty, of young futures saved from the waste of failure and despair.

THE AGED: EDUCATION AND LEISURE

The aged among the poor present a much more complicated problem for society—a problem for which there is no easy solution. The aged are defined as those 65 years old and up, those who have reached retirement age and have withdrawn from productive life. Although they basically have a retirement income, they are as dependent in the broad sense, as youth, since they no longer work. And they are a rapidly growing segment of the population. In the 15 years since 1950, for example, the aged population increased 50 percent from 12 million to almost 18 million people. Modern science has lengthened the lifespan but it has not come up with a cure for the social and economic problems that beset the aged.

Age brings with it a drop in income for all but a fortunate few. Our system of social insurance which provides retirement income to those no longer in the labor force does not often satisfy the minimum requirements of the elderly person. The ranks of the poverty-stricken aged are also swelled by those who managed to keep a step ahead while working, but who fell behind when accumulated savings and reduced retirement income did not offset the financial losses incurred by retirement.

The aged Negro is doubly cursed, since even during his earning years his family normally earns half as much as the average white family. Retirement from the labor force strikes him still more severly and curtails an already grossly inadequate income.

He is less likely to have social security coverage than a white man since the employment areas where he concentrated—agricultural labor and service occupations—still lie outside the scope of social insurance. He is less likely to have any savings since he has probably been poor all his life. He is less likely to own a home or have a decent place to live. He is more likely to face old age and its troubles alone.

For too many of the aged, old age has not brought golden leisure and dignity and relaxation. It has brought, instead, greater problems of ill health without the funds for proper treatment; endless empty hours without the interests or the activities to fill them; and bitter regrets and remorse for having spent a life that could not provide them with peace and comfort in their old age.

Up to the present we have done little to assist this portion of our population in dealing with their problems. Indeed, we barely know how to help. And until very lately we have not accepted that fact that their problems are our problems as well. Many of the solutions to the problems of age fall outside the scope of the legislation before us—such as medical care for the aged, increased retirement benefits to fall more in line with current living costs and the like.

Yet this legislation can provide some aids to the elderly. It can show them how to adjust to their new position in society. It can educate them to accept and enjoy and be productive in their later years. And it can include the elderly in its comprehensive planning for a better society. Sargent Shriver has recently appointed a Task Force on the Older Poor to explore more ways of acting in behalf of the elderly.

Programs of adult education could certainly be adopted to serve the aged poor—although little attention has been paid to this group up to the present time—and this would certainly be done under the Economic Opportunity Act.

Such education programs geared to the aged poor could help them enrich their plentiful free time and maintain their mental alertness; continue successful employment; keep up to date, in touch with reality and the modern world; expand their interests and their mental horizons; and provide a more satisfying home and family life through attention to consumer education, family relations, housing, and other aspects of daily living.

Elderly people have been the forgotten class in a youth-oriented America. And the elderly are too often on the outside of community activity and development. Even in the poverty program they have been relatively ignored in the emphasis on programs for youth. The new education has shown us that we have ignored a valuable source of wisdom, of experience, and of talent in our exclusion of the aged from an active part in our society.

There is much that we can do for the aged and I hope that we shall do these things in the near future. But, under the programs of this legislation, there is much more that they can do for us—the poor especially and the Nation generally.

Community action programs provide the best medium for reaching the elderly. The aged are too often only in the community but not of it. They exist outside the main current of community life, apart from the activities and interests that hold the community together.

The community loses by this alienation and separation as much as the elderly themselves. For, just because a person is deemed too old to be a member of the labor force, his talents and his interests are still very much alive and usable. The elderly can serve as volunteers, either through the national VISTA program or through local organization. They can help local children in Head Start projects or visit other elderly persons who are confined to their homes. They can devote their ample free time to working as community organizers and coordinators in community action programs. And they can impart their skills and their experience to guide younger and less experienced people in making decisions.

To ignore their presence and their abilities is to ignore a goldmine in the backyard.

THE NEW EDUCATION: LIFE-CENTERED LEARNING

A gaping chasm separates the two Americas. And all of our efforts have had little more effect than dropping handfuls of pebbles to fill in the Grand Canyon. Poverty is still conspicuously evident in the world's most affluent society and complex modern conditions are conspiring to maintain it at its present high rate.

We are learning new ways to cope with poverty, one of the oldest problems on the face of God's earth. We hope to use these new methods to bridge the gap between the affluent society and the other America.

The preparation for this task is almost as rigorous as the task itself. It requires us to admit our humility and ignorance in the face of this deeply entrenched social problem. It requires us to surrender many of our treasured preconceptions, assumptions, and generalizations about poverty and the poor. It requires us to leave our comfortable neighborhoods and our distant perspectives to confront poverty and the poor directly, to open a dialog that will be a very revealing one for both sides in the debate.

To achieve success in the war against poverty, a new strategy must replace the tried and not-so-true methods of the past. We must first reach a consensus of opinion and activity among ourselves and the poor. The poor themselves must take an active and prominent role in devising an antipoverty program.

In the past, we have made decisions on how to eliminate poverty without consulting the experts on poverty—the poor themselves. This is ironic in the face of America's reliance on expert consultation and concensus before embarking on any major program. Yet, we have not often consulted the poor.

Nothing more clearly illustrates this glaring omission than the heated controversy that has arisen over the concept of maximum participation of the poor in current antipoverty programs. Had no one ever thought of asking the poor what they needed and where it hurt the most? Had no one considered that the goals and needs and aspirations of the poor may not take exactly the same form as those of less deprived members of society?

There can be no delay in creating a dialog between ourselves and the poor—and a two-sided dialog in which we listen and learn as much as we talk and teach.

Next we must establish broadly based programs—programs which provide a wide variety of services and draw on the talents of a multitude of groups and individuals. Poverty is rarely a single misfortune, but more often a syndrome of interrelated problems. Programs which aim at alleviating the employment problem of the poor, without facing the fact that the poor attend bad schools and live in substandard housing and encounter more mental and physical health problems—such programs are going to have little impact on the culture of poverty. The totality of poverty must be confronted and all of its aspects must come under close scrutiny.

The Economic Opportunity Act provides the medium of multifaceted action in low-income areas through the community action programs. The action organizations will provide a wide variety of services to offset the variety of elements which make up the problems of the poor.

Not only must antipoverty efforts engage the efforts of the poor as well as the affluent and call on the services of different kinds of agencies and assistance; they must operate on a large scale as well.

Isolated experimentation makes little more than a dent in the facade of the poverty subculture. Programs must be initiated on a scale comparable to the size and difficulty of the problems involved.

It is essential that we learn how to apply what we are learning about the poor to as many of the poor as our resources and talents will allow. There are many communities across the land which have devised imaginative schemes for eliminating deprivation, yet they have not had the resources to implement their ideas. The Economic Opportunity Act can finance these efforts and make them more efficient and effective.

One of the most effective means for diffusing the new education is the existing educational system in this Nation. No institution is more strategically placed, more standardly available, than the neighborhood school.

The schools are the link between the two Americas, yet they have too often been the weakest link. The law requires children to go to school, but it cannot require them to learn. The environment of low-income communities have generally perverted the purpose of education in such communities rather than the schools influencing positively the atmosphere of the communities.

Success in such schools has normally been measured in terms of the degree of discipline maintained. One teacher in my district was quoted as saying that "You do not worry about teaching these kids here. You just keep them from killing each other and from killing you."

In imaginative communities the schools are taking on a newer and truer purpose. Creative thinking is finding new uses for the old institution of the neighborhood school. Creative thinking has reshaped the curriculums to fit the needs of the students. It has changed the attitude of the faculty from that of disciplinarians to that of educators. It has lengthened the school day beyond the class hours and varied the school activities beyond the sphere of the academic. And, above all, it is nurturing hope and youthful enthusiasm in children whose attitudes were negative and cynical.

In many communities the neighborhood school is becoming more like a community center. After school hours, its classrooms are used for meetings and adult education. Its facilities are left open out of hours to provide recreation to the neighborhood. It offers remedial teaching to its students and other residents of the neighborhoods and involves parents in the educational process of their children.

In essence, schools are becoming an integral and integrated part of the community rather than foreign and alien elements in its midst.

The schools are only an example of the activities that the Economic Opportunity Act permits in drawing the poor closer to the main body of American society. Although the emphasis in the antipoverty effort is on new techniques, these will often have to be applied through conventional channels and existing institutions.

Schools are representative of the greater society—a society that has too often been indifferent to the burdens of the poor. They must now serve in low-income communities as symbols of that society's efforts to eliminate poverty from the lives of the poor.

The possibilities of schools serving as links have not been properly utilized nor fully explored in the past. But through expanding their activities and enlarging their horizons, they can reach the poor and broaden their narrow vision as well.

Few of us realized 1 short year ago that the Economic Opportunity Act will ultimately affect all our lives as intimately as it affects the poor. Yes, we knew that if poverty could be eliminated we could achieve new heights of productivity and prosperity. And we knew that we would be changing the structure of our society so as not to permit one-fifth of our people to live in need.

But we did not realize that in examining the poor we would also have to examine ourselves and change our attitudes as well. We did not realize that the alienation of the poor was not wholly a product of their misfortunes but partially a result of our own lack of understanding.

We are learning—and we must learn. For only a highly educated citizenry will be able to cope with these problems in an intelligent and mature and effective way.

Through its programs the Economic Opportunity Act is attempting to bridge the gulf between the prosperous and the poor. It is a program which demands as much as it gives. But the promise it holds for the American poor makes it well worth the efforts it requires.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida, the distinguished author of this bill [Mr. Gibbons], such time as he may desire.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of humility that I stand here today to talk about a bill that I feel certain will become law during this first session of the 89th Congress. We in America have been a most successful nation. Certainly we should not lose sight of that success as we discuss this program today. But with all the success that we have had, we have had the paradox of the continuing and almost unending poverty of a relatively small segment of our society. And as long as that blight continues it is a spot of shame not only for freemen, but a spot of potential hatred among freemen; it is a blight upon our conscience and a blight upon the Great Society that we aspire to achieve.

In the short 9 months that the Office of Economic Opportunity has been in existence I feel certain that a sound, constructive program to eliminate poverty by attacking it at its roots has been launched.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, we hear criticisms, for that is a part of this great free system that we enjoy. I sometimes worry because the criticism always seems to come from the same source and I sometimes wonder if that source can do anything but criticize.

Mr. Chairman, the people that we heard during the debate on the adoption of the rule today are the same voices of doom that have haunted this Chamber in the brief time since I have been here. The tales that they have told and the statistics they have cited are the same old stories and the same old things they have said before.

But, Mr. Chairman, the real issue in this Chamber today is whether we are going to turn back and go back into the past and adopt a do-nothing attitude, a do-nothing program, but whether or not a strong vibrant nation such as America can move forward with a strong, sound, productive program to eliminate the causes of poverty.

Mr. Chairman, your House Committee on Education and Labor has brought forth such a program. That program is in operation and I believe we should spend some time talking about what has been accomplished in the brief 9 months of its existence.

Of course, starting from scratch or starting from zero; yes, as it was necessary to do in this new program, it was first necessary to recruit a staff. The supergrades that have been mentioned here in debate are of course the first people that you want to get into your program. Who is going out and hire all of the privates in an army if you first do not have the leaders? And, besides, this is a program that is being carried on in the field. It is being carried on in the existing schools. The soldiers in this program are the people who are in our school system, who are in other training programs, and the Office of Economic Opportunity here in Washington is in effect a coordinating agency to help us bring together the public and the private, the State, the National, and the local interests who should be mobilized to fight this battle.

So, Mr. Chairman, as you tool up, as you begin to mobilize your forces, you bring in a higher percentage of those people you need to direct and aim the program. But it was necessary to write programs and all of you know who have had any experience at all in Government operations that you just cannot set up a program and start talking about it and all of a sudden turn it into action. You have got to comply with the law, this particular law, and all the other laws on the books. You have to recruit the staff and train the staff and direct the staff and try to write the regulations and to follow the sound procedures that are necessary in order to get a program into operation.

Mr. Chairman, when one considers all that and when one considers the magnitude of this program, I believe real miracles have been accomplished in the first 9 months of the life of this program.

In the Job Corps alone there are presently 10,241 youths who are receiving training in education and work training. These are youths from disadvantaged homes, disadvantaged environments, and youths accustomed to a lifetime of failure and, perhaps, have really never known success not only in their lifetime or in the lifetime of their predecessors.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I just wonder if the gentleman is going to put into the Record the places where the Job Corps training is going on and the number of enrollees at each, since this is not available to anyone to date.

I believe the gentleman would lend assistance to the debate if he would submit this for the Record.

Mr. GIBBONS. I do not have that data immediately available today, but I shall attempt to get it and put it in the Record. However, I repeat, the figure is 10,241 enrollees to date who are presently at 48 Job Corps centers scattered throughout the United States and that we plan to have within the not too distant future an additional 50 Job Corps centers in operation.

There are over 300,000 applicants, some of whom are qualified and some of whom are not qualified to go to these centers. At the same time all this was going on, a very large program for disadvantaged youths still in school, who could receive profit by training at home, who could stay in school because they could obtain part-time jobs, who were able to obtain these jobs through the neighborhood Youth Corps, title I(b) of this act. There are presently in 639 projects involving some 276,000 participants.

And in addition to that, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Colmer], referred to this, although he apparently doubts the wisdom of the administration of this program, he apparently supports the wisdom of the headstart approach, I think all of us support head start because we realize to get the best start in life we have to start as early as possible. But there are in the schools and in the school systems, most of them public, some of them private, some 556,000 students, young students below the age of 16 years. These students are getting what we think will be the type of head start they need to go forward in life.

There are many things that have been accomplished. I do not want to spend all of the time on our side telling you about all of the fine things that have happened in this program. But many fine things have happened. I think we have here a soundly administered, a soundly financed, and constructive program for eliminating poverty by attacking it at its roots and continuing the war to a successful conclusion.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. First, I want to commend the gentleman from Florida for an outstanding presentation and for such an outstanding job he did in connection with this legislation.

I agree wholeheartedly with everything the gentleman has stated. I personally feel that we should have gone a lot further in the legislation and provided for economic development. But, be that as it may, I think the gentleman will agree that we cannot afford to turn our backs on a million youngsters at the point when we have authorized a constructive and promising program, which is just getting started and has raised the hopes of many families and communities throughout the Nation.

Mr. GIBBONS. I thank the gentleman for his generous remarks. I think it is worth repeating again the point the gentleman has made of the approximately 1 million youngsters in these United States whose families live in poverty and who inherited poverty as their way of life, we have now in the short length of time this program has been in operation provided over half of those children a head start which will give them also a head start in school. This will give them a better chance.

Mr. PERKINS. In connection with the job corps program, the gentleman recited that over 10,000 had been enrolled. I will ask the gentleman if it has not been the policy of the director that the camps be set up on Government property for the training centers. Did we not have to start from scratch in many instances and provide the necessary facilities and acquire the necessary equipment and is it not a fact that the activating of these camps has run the cost high in the beginning and that within the next year the cost will level off and the cost will be much lower?

Mr. GIBBONS. That is very true. If you take an abandoned military installation and have to rehabilitate it even for military troops, you are going to have a high-cost factor. Many of these camps have had to be rehabilitated. They have been left abandoned because there was no military use for them so the cost of training will come down as the camps are put to use. I think when we talk about the cost of training, we must realize that while we have all heard that you can get better education for less money at Vassar or Harvard, you must realize we are not dealing with the most successful graduates of the high schools. We are dealing with the ones who have been the least successful and it is going to be extremely hard to train and to retrain them. But if we fail to train and to retrain them, we have helped to condemn them to a lifetime of welfarism on the welfare rolls. While the training cost may be a little higher than the cost of some of the institutions where some of our most successful youngsters are privileged to go and are able to go, we cannot in any true sense compare this program with that situation.

To erase the social damage that has been done to those people that we seek to help in the Job Corps is going to require a lot of money. Fortunately, as I say, this is a small segment of our society but it is an expensive segment and I think we have a program that is going to do something about the situation.

Mr. PERKINS. As a sponsor of the legislation and considering your membership on the ad hoc committee conducting hearings in different sections of the country, you heard the gentleman from Ohio refer to the involvement of political machines in an effort to cast doubts about some of the programs. Was there any evidence of any corruption insofar as the administration of this program is concerned?

Mr. GIBBONS. No, there was not. And I want to say this clearly and unequivocally, and I am looking at my colleagues over here to the left of me, and realizing in the opportunity that all of us had to go out in the field that only two of them participated. One of them made one short trip and the other one was very studious in his attendance at the meetings. There was no evidence that I uncovered and no evidence that anyone uncovered. We went out to actually see at the time we did in April whether anything was going on as has been alleged by our minority group.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AYRES. I heard the gentleman from Kentucky, at least I think I heard him state that I had said there was corruption in the program. I do not find that in my remarks.

Mr. PERKINS. Maybe I misunderstood the gentleman. I just heard the gentleman making reference to "Tammany Halls" being established through this program.

Mr. AYRES. Is Tammany Hall necessarily corrupt?

Mr. PERKINS. Well, no, it is not necessarily corrupt. I certainly agree they are not corrupt. But I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. AYRES. Why would you infer from my mentioning Tammany Hall that there was corruption?

Mr. PERKINS. I did not make that inference. You were trying to imply and insinuate that we are establishing political machines.

Mr. AYRES. Is that not true? Did we not have much testimony with reference to that?

Mr. PERKINS. Well, I am delighted to hear the gentleman from Ohio retract in substance what he stated a few moments ago.

Mr. AYRES. Why leave the substance there?

Mr. PERKINS. Well, just retract what he said a while ago. I am delighted to hear the gentleman state there is no corruption and no political machines being established under the administration of this program.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman knows what Chairman POWELL says so far as political machines are concerned because I have heard his testimony and one of his objections was that he did not want these political machines developed which were being developed.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I merely want to observe, it seems very strange to me that the opponents of this program are always expressing alarm that there might be political appointees or political considerations may enter into the staffing, and on the other hand when a local body such as the community that I represent hires a competent man and pays him a good salary in keeping with his standing as a professional, they say it shows that the man is being overpaid.

So I believe they are trying to get it both ways. On the one hand, they do not want to pay professionals the way professionals should be paid; and, on the other hand, they do not want what they call "political hacks." I believe they just do not want the program but are not willing to say so.

Mr. GIBBONS. I believe the gentleman is correct.

The arguments against this program break down to those who say it is too little and to those who say it is too much and to those who say, "We have always been against it, so we are still against it."

I have not heard any new arguments, and I have listened to all of them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The question as to whether or not a political machine might be building up in this program has been brought up. I do not know whether the gentleman heard the remarks of my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] a few minutes ago.

I happen to know that at Mount Beulah, near Edwards, Miss., about 12 miles from my home, there has been a cancerous growth on the State of Mississippi for 20 years, having been used by the "pinks" and the "punks" and "fellow travelers" from the campaign of Henry Wallace back in 1948 right on up to date. Mount Beulah, which is the headquarters of this so-called Head Start and VISTA operation in the State of Mississippi, which has been invaded by from 400 to 500 people from outside the State, financed by this program, who marched on the city of Jackson in our State and have caused trouble all over our State, is not only the headquarters for this operation but is also the headquarters for the COFO organization and is also the headquarters for the National Council of Churches in Mississippi. Yes, and it is the headquarters for the so-called Freedom Democratic Party in the State of Mississippi.

If the gentleman can separate politics from that, he is a wizard.

Mr. GIBBONS. I say to my friend from Mississippi that I regret the problem which the people of Mississippi find themselves with. I have lived in the South all of my life and so have all of my forefathers. I know of some of the problems of which he speaks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman really regrets it, instead of trying to subsidize it with Federal funds he would be trying to help quiet it.

Mr. GIBBONS. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] I am not trying to subsidize it with Federal funds.

I have talked to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] about the allegations he makes. I have attempted to get him information. I have supplied him with information. I have seen him on the floor here, I suppose, 15 or 20 times since the time I tried to get him the information, and he has never raised the question since that time.

I do not know how many times I have seen the gentleman from Mississippi on the floor here, but this is the first time I have heard these charges.

I believe this has been fairly friendly. We enjoy a good relationship. I regret that if you had these misgivings about the program you did not see fit to bring them to my attention before.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not know the gentleman was in charge of the program. I have brought it to the attention of Sargent Shriver.

May I add that the headquarters of the so-called head start program in McComb, Miss., is in the so-called COFO house in McComb, and uses the same telephone number.

Mr. GIBBONS. I will say, about the head start program in Mississippi, that when the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] first brought this to my attention, I felt that perhaps in Mississippi things had been so turbulent that none of the local school boards there wanted to participate in the head start program. I found, upon examination, that a great many school boards in Mississippi had made applications for head start grants and public school boards in many Mississippi counties and cities are participating in the head start program.

The allegation which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] makes about Head Start being infiltrated by some small Negro college is involved. I am not familiar with the college, but I found out it is a small Presbyterian, perhaps Negro-related, church college. I do not doubt it is Negro.

They are doing a good job, so far as I know. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has not since a month ago, when we talked about this, said anything to me. While I do not doubt the gentleman from Mississippi's [Mr. COLMER] motives or integrity, if it has been such a burning question in Mississippi, I believe it would have been brought up again.

I regret that the people of Mississippi have so many problems.

I hope they can be resolved without any further bloodshed or any further ill feeling. However, I am a realist. I know it is going to be tough, but I do not see anything sinister about Head Start, because I think they are doing a terrific job in Head Start for Mississippi, from all of the reports that I get. I am sorry that a program as well intentioned and as well meaning as this has been dragged into the mire of this debate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman will listen a little bit later when I will have time, I will get documented proof for what I have just said.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MIZE. Is it not true that the reason why people are poor is that they cannot find a productive job to support themselves and their families, or they are not capable for some reason, either physical reasons or lack of education or lack of training, to hold a productive job? Is that not generally true?

Mr. GIBBONS. Well, there are many reasons why people are poor. The gentleman has mentioned a few of them. A lot of the reasons stem from lack of opportunity; that is, a lack of opportunity brought about by the surroundings in which they live and the economic conditions of the community and the economic conditions of the particular people they associate with and have associated with all through life. These are all factors. There are so many factors as to why a person is poor that it is hard to generalize in any one or several areas.

Mr. MIZE. I will agree with my colleague, but let us assume that this program is eminently successful and it eliminates all of these unfortunate physical, environmental, and educational deficiencies and that everybody, young and old and so forth, is capable of holding down a productive job. Is it not still absolutely essential that enough jobs be available then so that they can earn a satisfactory living to take care of themselves and their families?

Mr. GIBBONS. What you say is certainly true. If the gentleman feels that we are going to be able to educate all of these people in a year or two and motivate and train them all in a year or two, then there is real cause for worry as to whether there will be sufficient jobs to take care of them. However, this program, even in the opinion of its most avid supporters, could not possibly succeed in so short a period of time.

We are facing in a war here man's oldest and toughest enemies—the lack of opportunity, the lack of training, the lack of motivation, as well as disease and want. These are the things we are trying to overcome. It will take a long time to do it and it is going to take innovating programs and innovating approaches to do it. We cannot possibly put everyone in a job, because no one is that unrealistic. However, we can reduce to a bare minimum the number of people now living in poverty. When you think that in this great country there are 35 million people who do not produce enough to take care of themselves even though they are of an age to be productively employed, I think you begin to see the magnitude of the problem. In this Economic Opportunity Act we have a section here that we have not yet talked about today, and I hope some of the people on your side of the aisle will talk about it constructively, because there are programs there designed to create a healthier financial condition in this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be accused of exercising the old southern style of filibuster, so I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as we start this debate today I wish I could come before you and say that the warnings we pointed out a year ago in the minority views of the minority party and in the debate by many of us on this side of the aisle—I wish we could come to you and say that we were wrong, that this program has worked well, that it does the job that it was planned to do. I am sorry I cannot say such a thing because for all its exalted motives and glamorized goals the so-called "war on poverty" is a mess and the Office of Economic Opportunity is an administrative shambles; the program it administers are sad shadows of press releases which describe them.

This bill, H.R. 8283, does nothing to clean up the mess. Its main point is to double the money available to the Office of Economic Opportunity for this fiscal year's stroll through the maze of bureaucratic ineptitude. This doubling of money is to come on top of the money obligated but not spent in 1965. It means that the Office of Economic Opportunity is to have more than twice the money with which to make mistakes.

The money is not the solution to the mess in OEO. Better legislation providing for better methods of planning and administration is the answer to the problems that have unfolded during this first year of groping operation.

What are the causes of this chaos?

The so-called war on poverty has been given first priority in Administration publicity, but it is not even considered worthy of a full-time director. Can the part-time Poverty Director care adequately for his duties both as Peace Corps Director and Director of Poverty?

I have copies of two letters that I have written to Director Shriver which have gone unanswered and unacknowledged. The first one I wrote to him on May 28 as follows:

MAY 28, 1965.

Mr. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: After making several unsuccessful attempts to obtain information from the research department of the Office of Economic Opportunity, I am directing my questions to you. I am certain you will be able to obtain the information for me.

I would like to know: (1) The number of civil service employees at the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington; (2) the number of civil service employees in the regional offices of the Office of Economic Opportunity; (3) the number of TAPER appointments at the Office of Economic Opportunity; and (4) the number of consultants that have been and are presently in the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In addition, I would like to know the funds that the Office of Economic Opportunity has expended, to date, for each of the major programs such as Job Corps and the number of persons enrolled in those programs.

Sincerely yours,

Albert H. Quie,
Member of Congress.

To date not only have I not had an answer to this letter, but Director Shriver has not even acknowledged that he received it.

Then on June 18 I wrote again and I said:

June 18, 1965.

Mr. R. Sargent Shriver,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Shriver: The hearings of the Republican task force on economic opportunity and the Education and Labor Committee have raised numerous questions about the operations of the war on poverty. It has been very difficult for the Members of Congress to obtain information about some of the programs. In order that I may clarify some of my questions about the operations of the Office of Economic Opportunity I hope you will be able to provide me with the following information, some of which I have previously requested but not received.

1. I would like a copy of the application submitted by the University of Michigan to obtain a demonstration grant to conduct a community action program for the village of Willow Run, Mich.

2. I would like cost figures for the operation of each of the types of Job Corps camps.

3. I would like a personnel list. What I am interested in knowing is the names of the people who are heads of the various divisions (i.e., recruiting and training and project evaluation) so that I may be able to avail myself of further information without having to bother your Office with routine questions.

4. I would like to know how many regional offices there are, the number of proposed offices. In addition I would like to know what are the functions and jurisdictions of these offices and the top personnel in each of the offices already in operation.

Sincerely yours,

Albert H. Quie,
Member of Congress.

Again, I have not even had an acknowledgment of this letter, to say nothing of an answer to the letter. This has been the problem time and time again.

What are they doing down there? They ought to hire a few stenographers to answer a few letters down there.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am sure that the gentleman from Minnesota knows that I put some correspondence which I had had with the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity in the Congressional Record. Mr. Shriver has answered each one of my letters, but I might say I have received no more satisfaction from him than if he had not answered me at all. Each time I say we would like to get him up on the Hill for a frank discussion, off the record or on the record, at his convenience, he has suggested that he will be glad to do so and then he seems to say that he will not come to see us. So I think this is all a part of a pattern. They either do not know what is going on in the Office themselves or they do not want anyone else to know. It is quite clear that the only way we can proceed in any orderly fashion is to require that certain questions be answered, with respect to these varied and controversial programs, before we authorize a doubling of the program.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. I did want to call his attention to the fact that answers from Mr. Shriver will not necesarily contribute much. If we could get some responsible answers to our questions, we might be able to know more about the success, and the failures, of the programs for which he is responsible, than if we get no answers at all as is presently the case.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman from New Jersey has surely raised the main point pending before us today. We are asked to double the money and yet we do not know what has been done in this last year.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. What is the date of your inquiry?

Mr. QUIE. The first inquiry was dated May 28, 1965, and the second was dated June 18, 1965. We have had more than a month, practically 2 months, on one of them in which to receive a reply.

Mr. NELSEN. I would call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that I have made inquiries of the Justice Department relative to the documented violations of the Corrupt Practices Act, asking for an interview with representatives of the Justice Department. I have received no interview nor have I even received a reply. You are fortunate at least to have had some replies coming back but I have had none.

Mr. QUIE. As the gentleman will note, I have not had an acknowledgment, but the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Frelinghuysen] stated that he has received an acknowledgment and a reply.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROBISON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman's remarks leave me rather troubled because evidently the information he was after represents the basic type of information that should have been brought out during the course of the hearings on this bill.

Is the gentleman indicating to the committee that it was not possible during the hearings to obtain this kind of information as to how many regional offices there were or how many employees there were in the regional offices?

Mr. QUIE. That information was never secured. The gentleman can check the hearings and none of that was available.

I might say, however, that the program has been developed since the time of the hearings. We have not had hearings for some time. During that time that information would not have been available even at the time of the hearings. But even the scant information which we received, most of the time that information was spent on the community action program and very little on the Job Corps or virtually none of any of the other titles of the bill.

We had hearings on title II of the program only. The question that came to my mind is, Does the part-time Director think that Congress should not know about these things, that he should not give this information to the Congress? Or perhaps doesn't he know the answers?

I defy anyone to say he has seen a telephone directory of the Office of Economic Opportunity. They do not print one.

We have these directories in our offices so we can pick them up and look at the personnel employed here and if necessary call them up. Yet we do not have such a directory available from the Office of Economic Opportunity. They do not print one down there. You cannot find out who is there. The only thing I can assume is that they do not want us to know how many people they have as public information. They surely have been putting out a lot of stuff as to public relations because they have put out a real good-looking brochure with a poor child appearing on the front thereof to pull at our heartstrings, but not anything about the program of any real value.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. If the gentleman would like a telephone directory, I will get one for him.

Mr. QUIE. OK, you get me one. I would like to see it, and bring it down here, if you would.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Judging from the response given to the gentleman from Minnesota by the gentleman from Florida, he has one and has been given a breakdown of who is in charge and what their responsibilities are down there.

I think it would be helpful if we put it in the record since we have not been able to get any response. Members of Congress receive requests from the districts from people who are anxious to help in this program. We have to know who to talk to, who to confer with. Many of us are interested in these programs. Several of the programs now a part of the Office of Economic Opportunity were originally suggested by the gentleman now in the well and myself. We have a great interest in these programs. We are unable to determine who is in charge of the program or who is running it. In many instances, they have no regional offices that have any structure at all so far as responsibility is concerned.

I had a similar instance from my own State of New York where individuals were interested in participating in this program. They went to the New York office, supposedly the regional office of the Office of Economic Opportunity. They were unable to find any answers there at all. They came to me and said, "This is the most chaotic situation I have ever seen." So I advised them to come to Washington. They went to Washington and came back and told me Washington is worse than New York. That is the kind of situation these people are facing who are directing the organization programs.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I am sure the gentleman from New York, Mr. Goodell, realizes that different sections of this bill are administered by different departments. We have some of the greatest administrators in America administering the present legislation, in my judgment. Sargent Shriver, head of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony J. Celebrezze, are all involved and are doing an outstanding job of administrating their various responsibilities for the programs authorized by this act.

I never heard any complaints of the type detailed here by the gentleman from New York. On the other hand, I just heard complimentary reports from many people throughout the country in the administration of this act.

Mr. QUIE. I will put plenty in the record which will detail all of the complaints and they will be from all over the country as well as here in Washington. You will have ample opportunity to see these.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to this colloquy with interest. I would like to report a personal experience my own office had. We received from the Community Action Committee in one of the counties in my district a letter to check on the applications they had made.

My executive secretary called over to the office of the poverty war headquarters and explained she was calling on behalf of this local committee. The answer she received, I wish you would listen to because it is fascinating as well as intriguing. When she posed the question, the answer was this: "Relax, won't you relax?"

My executive secretary had worked on the Hill for many years. She had worked for Senator Capehart before she came to my office. She was utterly taken aback. She thought she had got some flunky in the department and posed her question again. The answer came back, "Relax, what is your hurry?" She was talking to one of the the key people of the poverty war headquarters.

Finally, when she could get no response at all she called another agency of the Government, I think it was HEW, someone she had been working with for many years. They gave her the same information. They said, "We have just as much trouble as you have; however we are a Government agency and we may be able to help you out more."

We managed to get the information we wanted on this particular matter.

What has happened to us since? Instead of finding out what we want from the Office of Economic Opportunity, when occasion arises, we work through some other Government headquarters. That is a personal experience my own office had about a month ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 15 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. I think for the record—and I have great respect for the gentleman from Kentucky—that he completely misses the point, to try to divert this discussion into a question of the integrity and the ability of Mr. Wirtz as Secretary of Labor and other officials in the Cabinet. We are not talking about the officials in the Cabinet. We are talking about the organization and administration in the Office of Economic Opportunity. We do not expect that we are going to call Mr. Shriver for every detail when a group from every different section in this country comes in and wants guidance. We do not expect we are going to talk to Mr. Wirtz and other Cabinet level officers. That is the basis for the agency being organized into a structure that makes some sense so that you can have some delegation of authority and receive some clear answers. I would say from my experience from the hearings that were held by the separate task forces and from the hearings that were held by this committee that this up to date is the worst administered program that I have seen in Washington. I use those words very advisedly and state them to the Congress of the United States—I think it is the worst administered program. That does not mean that many of the objectives of this program are not good or that many of the specific programs do not have great potential. As I indicated before, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] and I have long been advocates, prior to it being adopted in this administration, of the Head Start programs, the preschool and early school training. We originated a proposal for a type of Job Corps that would tie in with your existing facilities and existing agencies and we chose the title "Urban Service Corps" so that it could be coordinated with all of your various agencies now working in the urban areas to help youngsters who do not have jobs and who need further education and training and assistance.

These proposals, and many others, we favor, but we point out that the administration of the programs, as was clearly pointed out in debate last year, under the structure of this act, could not be much worse.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I regret that the gentleman feels that I missed the point that the gentleman is driving at, but I nevertheless believe my answer was pertinent. The gentleman from New York should state which programs are not being properly administered.

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman from Kentucky will just wait, I will do that.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIBBONS. I have asked the gentleman to yield long enough to give you a directory of the regional telephone directory from the Office of Economic Opportunity dated May 14.

Mr. QUIE. That is great. I have been trying for a long time to get one of those, and I am surely happy to get it from the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. The gentleman just came to the right place.

Mr. QUIE. From now on I will go to the gentleman from Florida for that kind of information.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the telephone directory would include that operation that we are hearing so much about down at St. Petersburg, Fla.?

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may answer the question?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIBBONS. If there is any trouble with that operation down there—and I sincerely doubt that there is any trouble with it, I say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross]—I think that your party would be more interested in correcting it than would our party. I think it ought to be pointed out that the school board down there is a contracting agency and is a Republican-controlled school board. I think they are doing a good job. They got a little skittish down there and some of the old people started complaining that a bunch of new people were moving into the neighborhood. But from my talking with the people who are responsible and working on that program down there, I believe the program is now proceeding on an even keel and I think it is going to be successful. We are dealing with people who are very hard to train. We are dealing with people who are the most unsuccessful in our whole society. These people are the lost sheep of our society and we should be going out and trying to find them.

We ought to be going out, trying to find them. We ought to be trying to bring them back into society, not pouncing on them like a bunch of wolves.

I believe the good people of St. Petersburg have come to that conclusion. I live near that particular headquarters, which is not in my district.

I believe this is moving along in a sound and constructive manner.

Mr. GROSS. Is this the institution where six women either were dismissed or dropped for drunkenness?

Mr. GIBBONS. Six women were dismissed, if the gentleman will yield further. I am glad to answer that. They were dismissed by the Job Corps there. They were apparently troublemakers. All of this has appeared in the newspapers, even in the Wall Street Journal.

I can remember that in my college days, involving those even more successful, unfortunate occurrences such as this occurred. I talked to the chief of police down there at St. Petersburg.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I do not believe there is very much comparability with the gentleman's experience in college days. As I understand it, he probably paid his way when he went to college. These people are living on the backs of the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. GIBBONS. Yes, sir; unless we teach them to do better.

Mr. GROSS. To carry this a step further, I understand they were provided maid service, to give them ample time to carry on their drinking. Their meals were provided for them. Their meals were prepared for them and all that sort of thing.

Can this possibly be true?

Mr. GIBBONS. No.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the Members read some of the newspaper accounts which I put into the RECORD of yesterday, on page A3875 of the daily RECORD. There Members can find out what happened when Etta went over the wall.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to talk about this telephone directory. What if you went to a strange city and wanted to get a doctor, yet no place in the telephone directory was there mentioned who was a doctor? What if they had doctors, by name, but did not mention that they were doctors?

That is what a telephone directory should do. This does not say what any of these people do. If you want to check, where do you find out? They have the names listed alphabetically, but nothing is said about what they do or in what department they work. You cannot find out a thing from the OEO directory. If you happen to know what someone does, then you can know, but they left all of that out.

They omitted a column listing the individuals' occupation. I suggest that if this is to be of some value to us they should put in such a column. At this point I want to have printed in the RECORD a copy of this directory, permission which I will secure when we are back in the House.

This directory is indicative of other reports, which say that OEO is an administrative shambles. Personnel turnover is reported to be fantastically high for a Federal agency. Many people have been hired with the utter disregard of civil service regulations.

I believe an investigation is warranted, for reports indicate that square pegs are being made to fit round holes. People are being placed into OEO jobs for which they lack qualification. No wonder there is an administrative shambles.

The directory follows:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY—HEADQUARTERS AND REGIONAL OFFICES TELEPHONE DIRECTORY, MAY 14, 1965

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Consolidated telephone directory: This directory shows headquarters' personnel on pages 1 through 34. Regional office personnel are listed on pages 35 through 42 by region.

2. Headquarters telephone exchange numbers: Unless otherwise indicated, all telephone extensions are on interdepartmental code 128. The exchange number when calling from a non-Government telephone is 382 plus the extension. OEO has been assigned both four- and five-digit telephone extensions by GSA; when a five-digit extension is encountered, it is not in error.

3. Regional office exchange numbers: Interdepartmental codes are not used outside the Washington, D.C., area. The correct area code and exchange is shown on the first page of each regional office listing.

4. Headquarters room numbers: Headquarters' personnel are housed in three buildings. The name of the building, address and letter prefix used in this telephone directory to differentiate identical room numbers in these three buildings are shown below:

Building name, building address, and room number prefix:

New Colonial Hotel, 1156 15th Street NW. (N).

Brown Building, 1200 19th Street NW. (B).

Maiatico Building, 806 Connecticut Avenue NW. (M).

5. Telephone locator service: Telephone directory information can be obtained by calling extension 3777, located in the lobby of the Brown Building.

6. Entry and exit to the Brown Building: A building pass will be necessary to enter the building between the hours of 7 p.m. and 8 a.m. on weekdays and all day and night on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. A GSA guard is on duty at all times except from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. on weekdays.

7. Entry and exit to the New Colonial Hotel: A building pass will be necessary to enter the building between the hours of 7 p.m. and 7:30 a.m., on weekdays, and between the hours of 5 p.m. Saturday until 7:30 a.m. Monday. A GSA guard is on duty 5 p.m. until 1 a.m. on weekdays and all day Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. In the event it is necessary to enter or leave the New Colonial Hotel when there is no GSA guard on duty, you can do so by calling code 148, extension 2787 or, if outside, by calling 389–2787. A guard will come to the building from the Veterans' Administration building, located at 810 Vermont Avenue NW., to let you in or out.

8. Registration of consultants or delegation personnel: Consultants and personnel visiting OEO for prolonged periods of time on official business will not be issued building passes. A responsible official of the office involved should notify the Chief, Personnel Division, by memorandum, in duplicate, listing the names of such personnel and the dates that admittance to the building is required. A copy of the memorandum will be furnished by the Personnel Division to the guard on duty in the lobby.

9. Shuttle service between Brown Building and New Colonial Hotel: The following shuttle-bus schedule will be observed Monday through Saturday for the pickup and delivery of mail to the New Colonial Hotel from the Brown Building:

Monday through Friday schedule

Leave Brown Building: 9:30 a.m.; 11 a.m.; 2 p.m.; 4 p.m.

Leave New Colonial Hotel: 10 a.m.; 11:30 a.m.; 2:30 p.m.; 4:30 p.m.

Saturday schedule

Leave Brown Building: 9:30 a.m.; 1 p.m.; 4 p.m.

Leave New Colonial Hotel: 10 a.m.; 1:30 p.m.; 4:30 p.m.

The purpose of the shuttle will be primarily to deliver and pick up mail. However, personnel can utilize the mail-shuttle at the same time.

TIMELY TELEPHONE TIPS

When you receive a telephone call, always remember to—

1. Answer as promptly as possible. Try to answer before second ring.

2. Identify yourself when answering: "Mr. Brown's office, Miss Andrews." "Personnel, Mason."

3. Speak distinctly and pleasantly. Hold mouthpiece well up in front of lips.

4. Avoid trite or abrupt phrases: "Who's calling?" "Just a moment." "He's busy." "He's in conference." "He's tied up." "He isn't in."

5. Volunteer the whereabouts and whenabouts of an absent person: "He can be reached in Mr. Jones' office, extension 2094." "He is out of the building until 3 o'clock." "May I locate him and ask him to call you?"

6. Volunteer your own assistance: "Is there something I could do?" "Could I help you?" "Or anyone else?"

7. Request identity of caller only when necessary, and in a tactful manner: "May I have your name?" "May I ask who this is, please?"

8. Explain off-the-line delays: "It's in files. Can you wait a moment?"

9. Take messages willingly. Write essential details on a suitable message form; deliver promptly.

10. Transfer elsewhere only when you know definitely the correct person or number. Give caller these facts before transferring.

When you make a telephone call, always remember to—

1. Plan an effective conversation. Get your thoughts in order before calling.

2. Place the call yourself, except in special circumstances. Make sure you are on the line ready to talk when the called person is reached.

3. Have the correct number (or extension) in mind. Consult your directory, or personal number list.

4. Listen for dial tone—dial carefully. See general information page in your directory.

5. Identify yourself immediately to the first person answering the called telephone: "This is Mr. Johnson. May I speak to Mr. Hodges, please?"

6. Identify also, when helpful, your office and purpose in calling: "Mr. Brown, in accounts, returning Mr. Green's call."

7. Ask whether called person has time to talk now if call is likely to be lengthy.

8. Try to complete your business on one call by securing information or leaving a message.

9. Volunteer your extension and the best time to reach you in case you request a callback.

10. Keep your conversation brief and businesslike.

Headquarters

[Area code, 202; exchange, 382]

Name	Telephone extension	Room location
Abbott, Ethelyn	7273	B614
Adams, Alonia	3243	B811
Adams, Barbara	6014	B607
Adler, James N	4887	B708–B
Agner, Bonnie	6456	B707
Aguirre, Humberto	6391	N625
Alestock, Yvonne B	6891	B514
Alexander, Allan A	28644	B630
Allott, Patricia A	3275	B814–U
Alston, Orilla	28817	B628
Alt, Terry	5671	B636
Ammidow, Robert L	3755	B704–A
Andersen, Robert A	5671	B636
Archer, Steve	6391	N625
Armstrong, Jannett	7047	B631
Arnold, Lucille	5871	B604
Arthur, Ralph W	6070	B428
Atkinson, Gordon	6051	B708–J
Baer, Joscelind B	3897	B717
Baer, Sammie	5755	B501
Baggerly, Vaughn H	3961	B715–G
Bailey, John	6044	B712–F
Baker, Donald M	6871	B808–A
Baker, Robert N	6433	B715–F
Baldwin, Fred D	6391	N625
Ball, R. Markham	5871	B807
Bamberger, Lisbeth	7321	B543
Bane, Mary C	3861	B715
Barker, Dorothy	6017	B624
Barlas, Eleanor	6021	B812
Barron, Fraser	6165	B817
Bass, William H	4388	B511
Beach, Thurman T	----------	B446
Beattie, Mary Ann	6046	B812
Bechtold, Hertert A	3447	B560
Bell, John Price	3121	B814–D
Bell, John	5853	B807
Belt, Victor L	6623	B726
Bender, Paul C	3966	B701–B
Berg, Susan G	3755	B704
Bernstein, Jerome S	7278	B551
Berry, Mildred	6089	B808
Berry, Theodore	4876	B535
Black, Irvin D	6054	B715–H
Blackburn, Glenn	6017	B624–A
Blanton, Mary Jane	6421	B712
Blatt, Ethel	5762	B564
Blick, Naomi	6134	B625
Blinderman, Audrey V	7321	B578
Boasberg, Emanuel	6093	B811–D
Boettger, Evelyn I	3751	B431–A
Bonds, Katreen H	3387	B576
Bookbinder, Hyman H	6001	B809–A
Booker, John	5277	B705–B
Boone, Richard	3601	B536
Borcher, Jessie	6825	B410
Bott, Lawrence	5891	B634
Bowman, Catherine S	3755	B704
Bowman, William S	28951	B424–A
Boxall, George W	5040	B715–B
Bozman, William H	6194	B525
Bradigan, Ellen J	6025	B812
Brady, Catherine	6071	B803
Brashears, Benjamin S	4378	B727
Braun, Margaret	5867	B428
Brechner, Jennie L	7438	B403
Breed, Dudley	7471	B817
Brenden, Jesse L	6054	B715–H
Bresnick, Fred	5466	B546
Brewer, Harold E	6421	B712–A
Bridgeford, Mildred	28951	B425
Brooks, Florence	7323	B580
Brown, Arsula C	5927	B711
Brown, Ellen	6131	B562
Brown, Holmes	6877	B814–A
Brown, Joyce	5891	B604
Brown, Walter	6017	B621
Browne, Wayles E. (Dr.)	6226	B506
Brownstein, Sidney	6110	B428
Brun, John	6933	B618
Brussel, Juliet R	6421	B712–D
Bullock, Gwendoloyn A	3411	B549
Burke, Edward J	5718	B712–G
Burns, John F	3961	B715–G
Butts, Maureen J	3231	B408
Buxbaum, Jean	3803	B626
Byas, Kay A	3366	B529
Cahill, Patricia	5927	B709–F
Cahn, Edgar S	6064	B802
Calloway, Joyce E	3041	B416
Calvert, Ellen F	3387	B575
Cantrell, Robert	3956	B719–A
Capiga, Geraldine	7047	B631
Caprio, Ralph	3601	B537
Capron, Charles E	6456	B707
Cardwell, Warren	3447	B559
Carley, John W	7353	B712
Carlile, Judy	3027	B814–B
Carnivale, Carolyn	6134	B625
Carroll, Catherine T	6064	B803
Carrozza Mary V	6933	B617
Carter, Barbara	6501	B526
Carter, Charles	6933	B618
Carter, Lisle	6631	B811–A
Carter, Tom	4016	B516
Cassell, Elaine	6421	B712–D
Casserly Agnes	21821	B441
Cassidy Robert	7612	B422
Cassidy, Thomas A	7018	B810
Castelberry, G. P	3421	B448
Cawley, James F	7951	B440
Charles, Ronald	6651	B639
Chayes, Kitty	7321	B549
Cheston, John	6421	B712–B
Chong, Charles	6017	B622–A
Christian, Joyce	28817	B628
Church, Catherine	5687	B632
Clampitt, Robert H	6226	B503
Clark, Neilie	5676	B631
Cloney, Michelene O	3751	B431–A
Clurman, Rodney H	7278	B550
Coakley, Charline K	3751	B432
Cole, Charles C	6054	B715–H
Cole, Sheldon	3923	B632
Coleman, Katherine A	4305	B703
Coles, Lucille	4305	B704
Collier, Wayne F	6057	B8th floor lobby
Colligan, Jean	5766	B823
Collins, Arline	5827	B517
Collins, Mary D	28951	B424
Colombo, Russell	3041	B416
Compton, Jean	6825	B410
Concannon, Mary G	6017	B622
Condeles, Dora	5881	B807
Conn, Philip	6017	B623
Conroy, Ralph J	3961	B715–C
Cook, Kay	3411	B549
Constable, Elinor	5687	B601
Conway, Jack T	6085	B805
Corbett, Alfred	3381	B568
Cosgrove, Thomas	3366	B532
Cosler, Mary	22365	B629
Courtney, Mary C	6165	B816
Crawford, Robert C	4347	B811–C
Crawford, Robert D	6051	B708–D
Crawley, Donna M	3751	B432
Cremers, Joyce M	28951	B425
Crosby, Margaret H	6458	B707
Culpepper, Elizabeth	7951	B440
Cummins, Robert V	5655	B417
Cunningham, Edwin S	7331	B411
Cupp, Anne	22365	B629
Curns, Diane	6165	B816
Curtis, Anita	6085	B805
Cutler, Nathan	6186	B405
Cutler, Theodore	3421	B448
Czapiewski, Robert	6014	B605
Dacus, Benjamin T	3352	B401
Daggett, Lois	5853	B807
Dail, Francis R	3897	B717
Daschbach, John A	3041	B416
Davis, Alpha L	3961	B715–G
Davis, Dwight	6391	N625
Davis, Julia	7253	B611
Dawkins, Daniel B	3352	B401
Dawkins, Maurice	3931	B604–A
Dean, John	7343	B568
Deimer, Fred	6791	B610
Deinema, J. W	3956	B719
Delaney, Sheila	3130	B581
Delo, David A	6037	B812–D
Denny, Charles V	7323	B579
Derman, Donald	6021	B812
Devlin, John R	5927	B711
Dewey, Howard S	3751	B431
DeYoung, Audrey	5755	B501
Dietz, Sharon L	4305	B704
Dingle, Loretha	6014	B607
Dodson, Sondra F	6462	B538
Doherty, James E	3143	B814
Doke, Mary	5891	B604
Donahue, Elizabeth	6071	B804
Donohue, John A	7613	B423
Donvito, Pasqual	3623	B812–E
Dotson, Helen	7047	B631
Douffas, Ruth	5101	B814
Drachman, Robert	3433	B507
Drake, Charles H	6601	B544
Drob, Judah	3366	B531
Drohat, D. C	4771	B520
Dromgoole, Richard H	6421	B712–J
Duffy, James E	3387	B573
Duke, Sherry	6037	B812
Dunlap, Frances	7267	B640
Dunn, S. K	5277	B705–A
Early, Reubena	5671	B608
Easter, Shirley	3091	B814
Eigen, Lewis D	3755	B704–A
Eisert, Grace	6194	B524
Elder, Charles	7131	B414
Elderman, John	6071	B624
Eldred, Phil H	5827	B557
Ellis, Garrison M	5150	B814–N
Elwell, Richard R	3143	B814–S
Engleberg, Morton R	5101	B814–H
Epps, Theresa	6633	B638
Evans, John P	7291	B612
Eversole, Gordon	7278	B551
Fargotstein, Elka	7273	B614
Feczkanin, Anne	3917	B707–L
Fennel, Carol	3387	B575
Fensterer, Judith	6226	B503
Ferguson, Glenn W	6134	B625–A
Ferguson, Rubye	5914	B807
Ferlo, Virgil J	3961	B715–G
Fiedelman, Judith A	6601	B543
Fine, Edith W	5943	B807
Fischer, Barbara	6108	B428
Fischer, William C	6037	B812–C
Fisher, Rose Z	5927	B711
Flaherty, Melvin	7331	B411
Flather, Elizabeth	7291	B612
Fogelman, Milton	3751	B400–A
Foote, Mary E	4887	B708
Forbes, Lorraine	6425	B711
Ford, Margaret M	6017	B621
Forman, Sylvia M	7975	B647
Forsman, Lynn R	3751	B433
Foster, Pamela	6891	B514
Foster, Stanley	7423	B451
Franck, Phyllis	7018	B810
Frank, Jean P	7975	B647
Frank, Joseph A	3387	B574
Frank, Peggy (Dr.)	5927	B709
Frazier, Howard	5827	B513
Freckleton, Ruth F	6054	B715–H
Friedberg, Judith E	6877	B814–B
Fulton, James L	7128	B413
Gabaldon, Charles	6433	B715–F
Gaffney, Barbara	4024	B561
Garrity, Margaret	5827	B557
Garvey, Gail	6015	B635
Gary, Doris E	5831	B807
Gawlik, Helen M	7395	B428
Gearhart, Carol	5277	B705
Gee, Thomas	5782	B822
Geis, Gilbert	5927	B709–F
Genovese, Joseph J	7315	B404
George, John A	3272	B628–D
George, Thomas R	7353	B725
Gerber, Joseph H	3961	B715–D
Gerran, Ernest D	3231	B409
Gerson, Richard	3863	B626–A
Gibbs, Juanita	3120	B581
Gibson, Felton A	3863	B626
Gilgoff, Leon	6025	B812–A
Gill, Patricia	6456	B707–F
Gillis, James C., Jr	5927	B709–F
Gilmore, Lorena	6134	B625
Glass, Thomas	3641	B563
Glazer, Etta	3281	B455
Gleason, Helen K	4293	B722
Glennie, Jean	6093	B811
Gold, William	5629	B814–P
Goldberg, Bernard	22365	B628–B
Goldstein, Stanley	3352	B401
Golten, Bob	5943	B807
Gonzales, Jack	6754	N301
Good, Connie	6877	B814
Gottlieb, David	3755	B704–B
Gottlieb, Hyman G	6433	B715–E
Gould, James P	3121	B814–E
Graves, Patricia R	6877	B814
Graves, Ruth E	5827	B557
Greenberg, Polly	6831	N101
Gross, Ernest	3143	B814–T
Grossman, David A	6196	B523
Grossman, Harvey G	3623	B812–E
Guskin, Alan	7151	B621–D
Haas, Louisa	6014	B635
Haber, Murray	6791	B610
Haddad, William	5755	B501
Hagan, Joseph H	3120	B581
Hall, Chester G., Jr	4305	B704–G
Hall, Clifton G	7131	B414
Hall, C. Mitchel	6054	B715–H
Hall, Mary F	6043	B712
Hamilton, L. Clark	5879	B428
Hanau, Fred M	7438	B403
Hanson, Hazel	6147	B508
Harlan, Edward N	7421	B451
Harris, Kenneth	7975	B647
Harris, Richard	6147	B508
Hart, Diana	7471	B816
Hasting, Priscilla	3421	B448
Hartington, Pauline M	3956	B719–C
Hatch, Joyce	7047	B631
Hathaway, Virginia	6014	B635
Hauck, Arthur	6017	B621
Hausler, Richard	6891	B515
Hayes, Dora	28817	B628
Hayes, Frederick O. R	6501	B527
Haymes, Charles S	7315	B404
Hazelton, Joan M	6267	B821
Healy, Edward P	3897	B717–A
Heath, James A., Jr	3272	B627
Helal, Georganna	7612	B422
Heller, James	5881	B807

Headquarters—Continued

[Area code, 202; exchange, 382]

Name	Telephone extension	Room location
Henderson, Deirdre M	6131	B517
Henry, June W	6456	B707-H
Hershey, Amber	5883	B621
Hiebert, Mary Anne	3755	B704-A
Hill, Barbara	5871	B807
Hill, Charley J	3720	B627
Himmele, Irvin	6456	B708-F
Hill, Maurice	6014	B635
Hill, Wilma	6134	B625
Hinnitt, Janice	6014	B607
Hite, Kathie	4771	B519
Hoehler, Fred K	3366	B531
Hogan, Virginia	3387	B575
Hohenstein, Albert	3923	B633-A
Holladay, Ann E	6186	B405
Holland, Margaret	6014	B635
Holman, William G	5729	B709-C
Holt, Fred	6391	N625
Holtby, Bert E	5927	B709
Holton, Pauline	3366	B529
Hopkins, Edna	3966	B702
Hornbuckle, Richard	7291	B613
Howard, Ralph A	3751	B432
Howell, Joseph	3381	B565
Hoy, June	3231	B408
Huffmon, Marilyn	4347	B811
Hughes, Betty K	3923	B633
Hughes, Eleanor Pollock	6877	B814
Hughes, Joann	5717	B712-G
Hughley, Louise	6134	B625
Humbert, Homer	6045	B712-C
Hunsinger, Jane	6134	B625
Hunter, Edith	6165	B817
Hunter, Patricia	3863	B626-A
Huntington, Haskins	6054	B715-H
Hutchison, John	7137	B-615
Hummel, Anne Marie	6037	B812
Hylton, Taft H	7951	B440
Hymes, James L	5467	B545
Ikler, Sandra	3121	B814-E
Impett, V. Grant	5716	B712-H
Irby, Alice J	3966	B700
Israel, Tom S	4771	B519
Jackson, Edna N	6601	B541
Jackson, Johnetta	5871	B807
Jackson, Robert	7393	B428
Jackson, William	5878	B428
Jacobson, William C	6037	B812
Jager, Oscar	3366	B580
James, Catherine R	6376	B541
Jarrard, Rhid	6226	B503
Jewert, Russell	6391	N625
Johnson, Arthur	7975	B647
Johnson, Dorothy S	6843	B416
Johnson, Gertrude	6017	B624
Johnson, Henry A	3231	B408
Johnson, Jean	7047	B631
Johnson, Jeralyn	7047	B631
Johnson, John D	3623	B812-E
Johnson, R. Glenn	28644	B630-A
Johnson, Ronald J	5671	B608
Johnson, William	5466	N703
Johnston, Robert W	7417	B455
Jones, Juanita L	7951	B440
Kahn, Fred	7353	B725
Kane, Roslyn	5891	B603
Kapfer, Andrew J	7331	B411
Kashdan, Bruce	6014	B635
Kauders, Peggy	6628	B628
Keating, Raymond F	6051	B708-H
Keehan, Virginia	6456	B707-C
Keeton, Karen B	7018	B810
Kelly, William P	6661	B422
Kendall, Johanna	6843	B416
Kennedy, John H	6051	B708-C
Kennedy, Padraic	5684	B600-A
Kershaw, Joseph A	6025	B812
Keville, Maurice	5881	B807
Keyser, Stephney J	4313	N205
Killeri, Marilyn	7353	B725
King, Carol L	3387	B573
King, Edward F	28951	B424
King, Judith H	4811	B709
Kinney, Linda	28817	B628
Kirrane, Michael D	7331	B411
Klee, Raymond B	5729	B709
Klores, Noel	5165	B522
Knight, William F. T	6501	B528
Koch, George	6017	B623
Kogan, Deborah	6014	B607
Kolberg, Rosemond	6831	N101
Kornegay, Emma M	5277	B717
Kramer, Leo	7162	B621-A
Kravitz, Sanford	6376	B540
Kreigh, McKinley W	3387	B572
Krovette, Karen	3130	B581
Laciny, Dorothy	4226	B406
Lagon, Barbara A	3976	B707
Lander, Clifton P	3956	B719-C
Large, Hazel W	6433	B715-F
Larson, Joan	6017	B644
Lawrence, William C	6601	B542
Lawson, Gussie L	6425	B709
Lee, Winston	6651	B639
Lefkowitz, Gary	6226	B504
Leibner, Stanley	6043	B712-C

Headquarters—Continued

[Area code, 202; exchange, 382]

Name	Telephone extension	Room location
Lendt, Lee A	6131	B562
Leonard, William C	6501	B528
Lesniewski, Elizabeth	7613	B422
Lester, Edwina	6633	B638
Levine, Robert A	6046	B812-F
Levine, Shirley	6661	B422
Levine, Stanley R	5277	B705
Lewis, Dorothy	3641	B563
Lewis, Elizabeth M	3956	B719
Lewis, Jean T	3956	B719
Lewis, Rosalie	6633	B638
Lickus, Barbara	7151	B620
Liebling, Harold S	5277	B705
Lieman, Joan	4354	B520
Lincoln, Leslie	6131	B518
Lines, Francis E	7353	B725
Linfield, Jon W	3387	B573
Linford, Velma	6014	B606
L'Italien, Richard W	7331	B411
Little, Roy	3957	B719
Lloyd, Wilma Hill	5684	B600
Logan, Edward F	3387	B572
Long, Gillis (Hon.)	6165	B817-A
Long, Lewis	6933	B617
Lorenzo, Michael	3897	B717
Lyday, James	6021	B812
Lyons, Judy	7018	B810
Lyons, Maureen G	7323	B552
Mackrill, Georgia	6433	B715-F
Macomber, Richard	6877	B814-C
Madison, James A	3897	B717-B
Madsen, Brigham	5891	B603
Maguire, Francis X	3285	B814-G
Mahoney, Theresa K	3048	B505
Maley, Thelma	5891	B628
Mancuso, Jo Ann	3751	B433
Mangold, Raymond J	3956	B719
Manly, M. Dorcas	3387	B574
Mann, Mary	6017	B622
Mann, Phyllis A	6054	B715-H
Mansfield, Norman	5671	B637
Mantel, Arlene L	5466	B546
Margolin, Joseph	5467	B545
Marley, Frederick	5277	B705
Masters, Peter F	3275	B814-U
Mathews, Fleming	6433	B715-F
Mathis, Donald B	6391	N626
May, Annie E	5927	B709-E
May, Edgar	6134	B625-B
May, John E	7423	B451
Mayes, Margaret W	6456	B707
Mayes, Maurice S	7421	B437
McAllister, Raymond	5927	B709-E
McAteer, John M	7975	B647
McCabe, Charlotte	6425	B709
McCall, Ella	5687	B600
McCamley, Edward	28951	B424
McCarthy, Carol	3623	B812
McCarthy, George D	5981	B727
McCarthy, Rita	5853	B807
McConnell, Beatrice	5827	B557
McConnell, William A	6433	B715-E
McCormack, Richard E	3966	B702
McCormick, Sara	6871	B808
McDowell, Charles	6425	B709-C
McEntee, Girard L	3352	B401
McGuign, William	22365	B628-C
McGuinness, Lou	5466	N703
McHale, Margaret	7162	B626
McKenna, Thomas	22365	B628-A
McKensie, Mary	3387	B575
McLaughlin, William	7421	B437
McMahon, Michael J	7323	B580
Melton, Mary M	7128	B413
Mennis, Susan	4293	B722
Michael, Raymond V	28644	B630
Michaelis, Diana	3027	B814-B
Michaels, Anne M	5619	B814
Mields, Irene H	3091	B814-F
Miller, Harry J	3121	B814-D
Miller, Paul	5466	N703
Mitchell, Donn S	6165	B817-B
Mittenthal, Stephen	5671	B636
Mittman, Evelyn	6001	B809
Moeller, Robert I	5867	B428
Monahan, Fergus T	6730	B715-D
Montgomery, Nellie	7951	B440
Moore, Anne	6631	B811
Moore, Michael	6391	N626
Moore, Robert	5983	N616
Moran, William	3641	B563
Morris, Dudley	6462	N710
Morris, Geraldine O	6085	B805
Morrow, Don	6391	N625
Morstad, Arliz P	3976	B707-L
Mosenfelder, John	5277	B705-B
Moss, Edward K	6877	B814-Q
Moyano, Magda	6051	B708
Mozee, Vernon	6843	B416-C
Mullins, William B	6165	B817-C
Murphy, Janet A	3352	B401
Murphy, John	5881	B807
Murphy, Sharron M	6753	N323
Muss, Lois B	5129	B814-M
Muth, Frances	3121	B814
Myers, Ernie R	7253	B611

Headquarters—Continued

[Area code, 202; exchange, 382]

Name	Telephone extension	Room location
Myers, John	5878	B428
Nadherny, Ferd	3859	B824
Napier, Jane	5881	B807
Naylor, Fannie M	6057	8th floor lobby
Nelson, Genevieve V	6425	B711
Ness, Susan M	7131	B414
Newbury, Arthur W	22365	B628-B
Newman, Carole	4305	B704
Nichols, Sylvia	5277	B705
Nickell, Patricia	3130	B581
Nikkel, Catherine	5676	B631
Nikkel, Florence	5676	B631
Noel, Robert W	28644	B630
Noone, Thomas J	28951	B424
Norman, Joyce	7047	B631
Norried, Barbara	6391	N625
Nygren, Annie Laura	3956	B719
O'Callaghan, Donal N	5927	B709-C
Ogle, Audrey	3387	B573
O'Hara, Edward A	5096	B814-J
Oliver, Patricia	6165	B816
Olliver, Mary A	3751	B431
Olson, William A	6433	B715-F
Ornati, Oscar	7321	B577
Ortega, Linda L	7471	B817
Osborn, Keith	3433	B507
Osburn, Jimmie R	28951	B424
Oswald, Paul F	4811	B709-B
Otter, Ann	5573	N719
Otto, David	7267	B640
Oulicky, Mildred A	7471	B817
Overbey, Ethel	4468	B512
Pacheco, Nancy	22365	B629
Pachios, Harold	3863	B626
Paige, Theodore	5927	B709
Palmer, Frank C	5277	B705-A
Papa, William	5878	B428
Papadakis, Dorothy G	4887	B708
Parker, Margorie	7975	B647
Parker, Robert A	7353	B725
Partridge, Anthony	5853	B807
Pathy, Elizabeth	6043	B712-C
Patterson, Floyd	28644	B630
Paul, James R	5878	B428
Paynter, David	4811	B709-A
Pearl, Sherman J	6877	B814
Pearson, Robert	3923	B633
Pecknay, Pamela	6017	B644
Pelo, June M	7128	B413
Perine, James	7047	B631
Perry, Joann	6421	B712
Petrie, Ronald	5827	B513
Phillips, William R	7394	B428
Pinette, Yvonne	6165	B817
Piper, Penny	6037	B812
Platt, Elwood A	4226	B406
Pleasants, Doris	3931	B604
Plein, Paul	6021	B812
Pope, Elizabeth	28644	B630
Porter, Douglas	5277	B705-A
Portlock, Dan	3863	B626
Powers, Thomas	5891	B634
Price, Claudia H	3421	B448
Price, Gary	5891	B602
Price, Murray N	5464	B411-A
Proctor, Welles A	7423	B451
Pubulis, Maris	6054	B715-H
Pulakos, Milton	6043	B712-C
Purdon, Eric	3897	B717
Putnam, I	3623	B812-E
Pye, Judy King	5927	B709
Quattlebaum, Mary	5827	B516
Rae, Norman	5883	B621-B
Ramirez, Larry	6391	N625
Rantane, Bruno	6017	B624
Raphael, Frances J	6425	B709
Ratcliffe, Rita	3923	B633
Raul, B. Michael	4876	B534
Ravin, Louis	3411	B550
Redmond, Sylvia	4876	B534
Reed, M. Virginia	6421	B712
Reid, Marjorie S	6196	B521
Reidy, Ursula	6831	N101
Reiser, Peter	5466	N703
Reuter, Judith A	5277	B705
Richardson, James A	7421	B437
Richmond, Julius	6147	B507-A
Richmond, Lillian	5755	B501
Ridder, Marie W	3027	B814-B
Rioux, J. William	5466	N703
Roberson, Kenneth W	7411	B501
Roberson, Paul L	3755	B704
Robinson, Wade	4293	B723
Roddy, Robert	3923	B633
Rose, Mathew	3447	B559
Rosenthal, Elaine	6017	B621
Rosenthal, Gerald	7353	B725
Ross, Elizabeth H	6601	B543
Rowe, Bernice C	7018	B810
Roy, Leatrice D	3366	B529
Royster, Kathryn J	3976	B707-B
Rubin, Matt	5891	B634
Rudd, Glenn	3923	B633-A
Rule, Lee	3285	B814-G
Sabine, Ellen	3755	B705

Headquarters—Continued

[Area code, 202; exchange, 382]

Name	Telephone extension	Room location
Salesses, Gerald P	3352	B401
Salett, Stanley	5466	B546
Salisbury, Judy	3923	B633–A
Salm, Frederick M	4313	N206
Salony, Patricia	6504	B564
Sandifier, William	3366	B570
Sandler, Benjamin	3751	B400–C
Saunders, Elmira	7267	B641
Savwoir, Edward O	3961	B715–G
Scandone, Sue	6021	B812
Schima, Marilyn	6456	B707–G
Schlaak, Alta C	4305	B704
Schmais, Aaron	6601	B544
Schoepple, Harry C	5927	B709
Schrieber, Daniel	4887	B708–D
Schuh, Nancy	3272	B628
Schultz, Susan M	7331	B411
Scott, Florence M	6623	B726
Scott, Herbert	3923	B633–A
Scott, Vivian	7273	B614
Scurlock, India W	6877	B814
Seaton, Barbara J	5129	B814
Seligman, Jack	3231	B408
Sell, Cindy	6021	B812
Sexton, Brendan J	3366	B530
Shaftel, Sally	3976	B707
Shanley, Thomas	5676	B631
Shea, Gerald	28951	B425
Shealy, Norris	6769	B715–G
Shelton, Carole	6001	B809
Shepherd, Joan F	6131	B517
Sher, Michael	3863	B626
Sherman, Annabelle (Dr.)	6456	B707–E
Sherman, Eleanor	6933	B617
Shmelzer, June L	5891	B634
Shoemaker, Francis E	6623	B726
Shook, Anna	3272	B627
Shorr, Ellen J	7291	B612
Shovell, William	5763	B563
Shriver, Sargent	6095 22025	B800 M513
Siegal, Pamela	6017	B621
Sienkiewicz, Edward J	28951	B425
Sill, Maurice	6014	B605
Silverstein, Susan	7267	B641
Simkus, Lora D	3966	B701
Singleton, Lorena	6046	B812
Sinkin, Nancy	6017	B623
Singletary, Otis A	3966	B700
Sisleck, Winifred L	3623	B812
Skinner, Frances V	3121	B814
Skinner, Lois Fox	7018	B810
Skuhr, Cheryl	5455	B418
Smith, Carla	5676	B631
Smith, Doris G	3863	B626–B
Smith, Dorothy	6165	B817
Smith, Dorothy H	3861	B715
Smith, E. Hunter, Jr	3861	B715–A
Smith, Ed	6633	B638
Smith, Ethel E	3976	B707
Smith, Gail E	7471	B817
Smith, George T	6246	N100
Smith, Margo	7975	B647
Smith, Mary	28817	B628
Smith, Wray	4293	B721
Snowden, Jacqueline J	3352	B401
Snyder, Elizabeth	5676	B631
Snyder, William M	7417	B455
Solomon, Eula B	3231	B408
Somerville, Walter	22365	B629
Sonders, Simone	6335	B819
Sonnenfeldt, Marjorie H	5687	B632
Speake, Margaret	5165	B524
Spinosa, Annette	6165	B817
Stack, Nora	5687	B600
Stang, Nancy	6651	B639
Staudte, Curtis E	7164	B419–A
Steck, Charles F	6110	B428
Stein, Sue	6785	N600
Steinberg, Susan F	3144	B814
Steinbraker, Betty	6017	B644
Stellwagen, Walter	4305	B704–C
Stensrud, Susan	3275	B814–H
Stephenson, Barbara	6070	B428
Stewart, Michael	4024	B561
Stewart, Thomas M	7471	B817
Stone, Faye Blackburn	5938	B807
Stoughton, Fiath R	6021	B812
Stuck, Harry	5927	B709–C
Sugarman, Jule M	6753	N325
Sullivan, Henry J	6051	B708–E
Sullivan, Margaret	4876	B533
Susco, Richard	28951	B425
Sutherby, Margaret M	5981	B727
Svenson, E. V	4887	B708
Swanson, H. A	4416	B715
Tait, Pauline W	6877	B814
Tant, John A	3387	B572
Tate, Martha L	3387	B572
Taylor, Clementine F	5782	B823
Taylor, Nancy	7353	B725
Teeter, Benjamin T	6021	B812
Temple, Mary Ann	6054	B715–H
Terris, Bruce	5871	B807
Terris, Shirley	6831	N101
Temko, Francine S	5881	B807
Temple, Mary Ann	5831	B808
Thieberger, Fred	28951	B425
Thomas, Benjamin	7253	B611
Thomas, Carol M	3751	B432
Thomas, John	5277	B705
Thompson, Dan	6791	B610
Thompson, Joyce	28817	B628
Thompson, Virginia F	7331	B411
Thornell, Joan T	5755	B501
Thorpe, Nancy	6017	B624
Tice, James	6391	N625
Tierney, Cornelius E	7438	B403
Tillman, George	7423	B451
Tini, Emidio	6843	B416
Tise, Vivian	3272	B627
Tolmach, Eric	3366	B532
Towle, John M	6391	N625
Troudy, Chester W	4811	B709–B
Troutman, John E	5729	B709–C
Turley, Richard	6504	B564
Turner, Connie	6017	B623
Turpyn, Geogre C	6433	B715–F
Tyler, Audrey L	3352	B401
Ussach, Steve	3130	B581
Vanden, Maxine	6246	N101
Van Doren, Ronald	3143	B814
Van Ess, Dorothy A	7251	B642
Vaughan, Herman D	3387	B574
Vignola, Josephine A	3956	B719
Vogel, Clifford W	3751	B400–D
Vogts, Helen	6001	B809
Wagner, Richard E	5717	B712–H
Walden, David	5687	B600
Walker, Stephen D	7423	B451
Wallace, Horace S	4416	B715
Walstedt, Jane D	3966	B701
Walter, Robert G	3381	B565
Walton, Phyllis J	4270	N217
Walsh, Ira P	6335	B819
Wardman, Mary O	4416	B715
Warren, Patricia J	3091	B814–F
Washington, Bennetta B	3976	B707–A
Wateski, Raymond R	7131	B414
Wayman, Cathryn	28644	B630
Weatherford, Willis	5687	B600–B
Weaver, Lucille	21821	B441
Weeks, Christopher	3966	B702
Weigle, Walter P	3751	B431
Welles, Judith	6017	B624
Wenner, Richard	6891	B513
Werksman, Richard	5831	B807
Westgate, Robert D	5114	B814–L
Wetterau, Kathryn L	3447	B560
White, Eloise	6043	B712–C
White, Richard W	6043	B712–F
White, Ruth	7975	B647
Whoberry, Willard T	6051	B708
Wickland, Roger	5671	B637
Wickham, Mary Ann	7331	B411
Williams, Beatrice A	4293	B722
Williams, Dorothy	5466	B546
Williams, J. Earl	3411	B549
Williams, Jack	5755	B501
Williams, Joan	3285	B814–G
Williams, Jonas E	3411	B548
Wilkins, Joseph	3003	B504
Wilkins, William D	3976	B707–D
Willis, Jerry	22365	B629
Wilson, Augusta	6165	B816
Wilson, Henry D	7421	B437
Wilson, Kay	6871	B807
Wilson, Reba V	3966	B701
Wilson, Wilbur	5729	B709–C
Winder, Michele	5943	B807
Winston, Gracie	5671	B608
Winter, Lynn	6456	B707
Wirtz, Richard	4354	B519
Wiseman, Donald L	6246	N100
Wizner, Rachel S	6601	B543
Wofford, John	6501	B528
Wohlgemuth, Peggy	6017	B622–B
Wolfe, Mary Ann	7291	B612
Wolff, Ruth R	7023	B419
Wolfrey, William T	7023	B420
Woods, Doug	5832	B807
Woods, Paul	5716	B712–H
Woodson, Audrey	6551	B511
Womack, Joseph D	4305	B704–E
Worley, Skip	5867	B428
Wortman, Donald	6046	B812–B
Wright, Dale H	5633	B814
Wright, Francine E	7951	B440
Wyne, Marvis C	4811	B709
Wynne, Edward	6043	B712–C
Ximenes, Vicente	6226	B506
Yeldell, Gladys	6633	B638
Yette, Samuel F	6267	B821
Zagorin, Ruth	3625	B812–E
Zeda, Gladys	6147	B508
Ziegler, Jerome M	3411	N704
Zimmerman, Stanley	5831	B807

Middle Atlantic region, 1156 15th St., NW., Washington, D.C.

[Area code, 202; exchange, 382]

Name	Telephone extension	Room location
Allen, L. B. (Dr.)	6161	N517
Anderson, Darline	6787	N509
Bailin, Harold M	6787	N507
Bingham, June M	6787	N508
Brown, Ethel	23823	N525
Bruce, Preston	6783	N501
Burns, Robert	6783	N501
Ciaccio, Jack	6781	N511
Collins, Ray	6905	N514
Cotton, Mello	6161	N516
Guss, Barbara	6161	N519
Garofalo, Dominic	6781	N512
Grasso, Dorothea	6383	N505
Harris, Naomi	6383	N505
Kissick, Dr. Wm	6783	N503
Manley, Mary	6783	N506
Oliver, Barbara	28323	N527
Sherlock, Audrey	6781	N510
Silverstein, Bernice	6161	N518
Stack, Michael	28332	N526
Taylor, Lynnette	6161	N519
Van Dorpe, Helen	23823	N525
Wagner, Lois	6781	N510
Webb, Samuel	6783	N503
Woodring, George	6905	N514
Woolner, Sidney H	6383	N505
Worrell, Carolyn	6781	N512
File room	----------	N515

Kansas City region, 1156 15th St., NW., Washington, D.C.

[Area code, 202, exchange, 382]

Name	Telephone extension	Room location
Baldwin, Fred	6391	625
Moore, Michael	6391	625
Morrow, Don	6391	625
Norried, Barbara	6391	625
Ramirez, Larry	6291	625
Tice, James	6391	625
Towle, John M	6391	625

Austin region, 1156 15th St., NW., Washington, D.C.

[Area code, 202; exchange, 382]

Name	Telephone extension	Room location
Aguirre, Humberto	6391	625
Baldwin, Fred	6391	625
Davis, Dwight	6391	625
Holt, Fred	6391	625
Jewert, Russell	6391	625
Mathis, Donald	6391	625
Norried, Barbara	6391	625
Tyson, Herbert	6391	625

Northeastern Region, Grand Central Post Office, 110 East 45th St., New York, N.Y., 10017

[Area code, 212; exchange, 889]

Name	Telephone extension	Room location
Banks, Calvin	4508	533
Banks, Dorothea	4504	533
Crowley, James	4507	533
Elser, Eleanore	4501	533
Faye, Larry	4510	533
Ferro, Frank	4511	533
Fiorillo, John	4509	533
Gratwick, Katharine	4512	533
Hanon, Thomas	4512	533
Hayden, Mary	4512	533
Hill, Thomas	4520	533
Kuc, Lillian	4513	533
Kupstas, Marylin	4516	533
Lesser, Saal	4505	533
Nieves, Josephine	4505	533
Passett, Barry	4515	533
Phillips, Irene	4507	533
Pulakos, Milton	4521	533
Schur, Susan	4517	533
Scudder, Manuel	4520	533
Slosberg, Augusta	4506	533
Stein, Susan	4504	533
Vanden Heuvel, William J	4500	533

Southeastern Region, 201 Ivy St., Atlanta, Ga., 30303

[Area code, 404; exchange, 526]

Name	Extension
Arneson, Henry K	6223
Clark, Aida	6456
Elliott, John R	6068
Feltus, Charles	6901
Floyd, Picot B	6353
Fox, Lester J	6901
Grice, Mary Y	6456
Harris, William L	6901
Jacobs, Vernie J	6901
Jordan, Vernon	6068
Mabry, Helen F	6621
McClung, Jean D	6223
McMillan, Elridge W	6353
McQuary, Ted G	6456
Redwine, Earl M	6901
Wyand, Holly H	6621
Zierden, William	6901

Midwestern region, 226 West Jackson Boulevard Building, Chicago, Ill., 60606

[Area code, 312; exchange, 828]

Name	Telephone extension	Room location
Abromowitz, Lillian	5786	13th floor.
Bepko, Gerald	5786	Do.
Biro, Emery	5793	Do.
Galvin, James	5790	Do.
Hollander, Sidney	5826	Do.
Hyman, Milton	5826	Do.
McArdle, Thomas	5790	Do.
Mehlberg, Wallace	5793	Do.
Miller, Mary Ellen	5790	Do.
Racusen, Belle	5808	Do.
Rice, William	5790	Do.
Robinson, Ellis	5808	Do.
Schurr, Helen	5793	Do.
Shackford, Robert I	5786	Do.
Williams, Robert E	5796	Do.

Western region, 100 McAllister St., San Francisco, Calif.

[Area code, 415; exchange, 556]

Name	Telephone extension	Room location
Archer, Stephen M	7716	1327
Bull, Robert	7716	1327
Cabrera, Richard	7716	1327
Cooke, Mary	7716	1327
Cutler, Thomas	7716	1327
Goodwin, James	7716	1327
Kurland, Norman	7716	1327
Leonard, Jean	7716	1327
Martin, John	7716	1327
Mitzman, Nathan	7716	1327
Mogulof, Melvin	7716	1327
Singler, Edward	7716	1327
Stocks, Donald	7716	1327
Vasquez, Marcelino	7716	1327
Van Horn, Robert	7716	1327

Governmental interdepartmental dial codes

[NOTE.—All listings in italic are through-dial codes. To reach information on through-dial codes, dial code and 0 except on code 11, dial 1170; code 13, dial 1330; code 14, dial 1460; code 183, dial 18370]

Agency	Dial code	Post office stop
Accounts, Bureau of	184	224
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	128	445
Agency for International Development	182	100
Agriculture, Department of	111	209
Agriculture Research Center, Beltsville, Md	1234	--------
Air Force, Department of	11	103
Air Museum, National	144	--------
Alaska Railroad	183	--------
Alcohol Beverage Control Board, District of Columbia	137	--------
Alien Property, Office of	187	134
American Legion Office, Veterans' Administration	148	--------
American Red Cross, The National, District of Columbia Chapter	170	--------
Andrews Air Force Base	185	12
Antarctic Projects Officer, U.S	128	187
Area Redevelopment Administration	112	--------
Arlington Hall Station	11	242
Armed Forces Institute of Pathology	198	215
Armed Services Police Detachment	11	--------
Army Strategy and Tactics Analysis Group, Bethesda, Md	1231	--------
Army, Department of	11	103
Army Map Service	140	32
Army Medical Center	198	358
Army Security Agency, Arlington Hall Station	11	242
Atomic Energy Commission	119	4
Attorney General	187	219
Auditorium, Departmental	13	206
Beach Erosion Board	152	107
Board of Governors of Federal Reserve System	147	45
Bolling Air Force Base	141	11
Bonneville Power Amdinistration	183	43
Botanic Gardens	180	304
Budget, Bureau of	128	20
Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training	110	--------
Bureau of Engraving and Printing	184	213
Bureau of Standards, National	154	3
Bureau of Standards, Gaithersburg, Md	164	--------
Business and Defense Services Administration, Department of Commerce	112	206
Business Economics, Office of, Department of Commerce	112	206
Cameron Station, Department of Army	11	--------
Capitol, U.S	180	304
Census, Bureau of the	157	396
Central Heating Section	13	29
Central Intelligence Agency	143	64
Child Welfare, District of Columbia	139	--------
Children's Bureau, U.S	13	367
Civil Aeronautics Board	128	235
Civil Service Commission	129	227
Civil War Centennial Commission	128	361
Coast and Geodetic Survey	112	206
Coast Guard, U.S	184	280
Colonial Building	128	--------
Commerce, Department of	112	206
Commerce, Department of, Annex 1-2-3	186	206
Commercial Fisheries, Bureau of	183	--------
Commission on Civil Rights	128	152
Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure	128	448
Community Facilities Administration	128	98
Comptroller of the Currency, Office of	184	223
Comptroller General	129	308
Corporation Counsel, District of Columbia	137	--------
Council of Economic Advisers	128	20
Court of Claims	128	53
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals	184	--------
Customs, Bureau of	184	311
David Taylor Model Basin	158	--------
Defense Air Transport Administration	112	206
Defense Atomic Support Agency	11	--------
Defense Communications Agency	11	108
Defense, Department of	11	103
Defense Intelligence Agency	11	103
Defense Lending, Office of	184	--------
Defense Materials Service	183	29
Defense Supply Agency	11	--------
Department of. (See other part of title.)		
Departmental Auditorium	13	206
Disbursement, Division of	184	224
District Attorney, U.S	1204	--------
District of Columbia Department of Veterans' Affairs	1211	--------
District of Columbia General Hospital	1238	--------
District of Columbia Government	137	--------
District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency	--------	128
District of Columbia Rehabilitation Service	1267	--------
District of Columbia Village	1226	--------
District of Columbia Water Department	1221	--------
District Unemployment Compensation Board	1237	--------
Dulles International Airport, Chantilly, Va	1235	------
Eastern Regional Renegotiation Board	128	------
Education, District of Columbia Board of	1219	--------
Education, U.S. Office of	13	113
Employees Compensation Appeals Board	110	137
Employees Compensation, Bureau of	110	275
Employment Security, Bureau of	110	205
Employment Service, District of Columbia	1237	--------
Engineers, Corps of, Washington District	152	320
Enthology, Bureau of American	144	--------
Executive Mansion	145	28
Executive Office of the President	128	28
Export-Import Bank of Washington	1246	292
Family Services, Bureau of	13	367
Farm Credit Administration	111	200
Federal Aviation Agency	13	34
Federal Bureau of Investigation	175	94
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	128	452
Federal Communications Commission	169	201A
Federal Credit Unions, Bureau of	13	367
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1254	260
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	129	305
Federal Housing Administration	128	341
Comptroller	129	--------
District of Columbia Insuring Office	1244	--------
General Services	129	--------
Property Improvement	129	--------
Title 1 Division	129	--------
Federal Maritime Commission	129	193
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	110	33
Federal National Mortgage Association	128	295
Federal Power Commission	129	22
Federal Prison Industries	187	305B
Federal Radiation Council	128	499
Federal Records Center	1253	--------
Federal Register	13	220
Federal Reserve Board	147	45
Federal Safety Council	110	205
Federal Specifications	13	29
Federal Supply Service	13	29
Federal Trade Commission	1262	221
Field Services, Office of, Department of Commerce	112	--------
Fine Arts, Commission of	183	43
Fish and Wildlife Service	183	43
Fleet Reserve	11	103
Flood Control	11	107
Food and Agriculture Organization of the U.N	111	165
Food and Drug Administration	13	155
Foreign Assets Control	184	--------
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	128	261
Foreign Trade Zones	112	206
Fort Belvoir	192	--------
Fort Detrick	1625	--------
Fort Lesley J. McNair	11	315
Fort Meade	150	--------
Fort Monroe, Hampton, Va	1279	--------
Fort Myer	193	52
Fort Myer, South area	1213	52
Fort Ritchie, Md	196	--------
Freedmen s Hospital	1624	321
Freer Gallery of Art	144	--------
Fuel yard	13	29
General Accounting Office, main	129	308
General Services Administration	183	29
General Services Administration, region 3	13	218
Geodetic Survey, Coast and	112	206
Geographic Names, Board on	128	43
Geological Survey	183	29A
Government Printing Office	149	370
Great Lakes Pilotage Administration	128	--------
Harry Diamond Laboratories	154	119
Health, Education, and Welfare	13	367
Hearings and Appeals, Bureau of	128	199
Highway Research, U.S.	1224	44
Highways, U.S. Bureau of	128	--------
Housing and Home Finance Agency	128	98
Howard University	151	381
Immigration and Naturalization Service	155	234
Income Tax Information, Federal	184	--------
Indian Affairs, Bureau of	183	43
Economic Development Division	1208	--------
Indian Claims Commission	129	308
Intelligence Office, Potomac River Naval Command	11	314
Inter-American Development Bank	128	243
Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences	176	--------
Inter-Government Committee for European Migration	1248	--------
Interior, Department of	183	43
Internal Revenue Service	184	203
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	181	26
International Business Operations, Bureau of	112	--------
International Finance Corporation	181	--------
International Finance, Office of	184	223
International Joint Commission	13	86
International Monetary Fund	181	8
International Programs, Bureau of	112	--------
International Trade Fairs, Office of	186	206
Interstate Commerce Commission	156	204
Jefferson Memorial	1230	43
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	128	208
Joint Chiefs of Staff	11	103
Joint Publications Research Service, United States	13	159
Junior Village	1226	--------
Justice, Department of	187	219
Juvenile Court	1623	--------
Labor, Department of	110	205
Labor Management Reports, Bureau of	110	--------
Labor Standards, Bureau of	110	--------
Labor Statistics, Bureau of	110	275
Land Management, Bureau of	183	43
Library, District of Columbia Public	137	--------

Governmental interdepartmental dial codes—Continued

Agency	Dial code	Post office stop
Library of Congress	173	303
Lincoln Memorial	1230	43
Lincoln Museum	1230	43
Lorton Reformatory	137	--------
Marine Barracks (Department of Defense)	1239	313
Marine Corps School, Quantico, Va	136	--------
Marine Corps, U.S	11	82
Maritime Administration	129	114
Marshal's Office, U.S	1204	--------
Merchant Marine	129	280
Military District of Washington	11	106
Mines, Bureau of	183	43
Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board	137	--------
Mint, Bureau of the	184	223
Missile Sites Labor Commission	110	--------
Motor Pool, Interagency	13	218
Motor Vehicle Parking Agency	137	--------
Mount Alto Hospital	159	50
Municipal Center, District of Columbia	137	--------
Municipal Court, District of Columbia	1206	--------
Narcotics, Bureau of	184	349B
National Academy of Sciences	1224	44
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	128	85
Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Md	134	232
Langley Field, Va	165	--------
Wallops Island	189	--------
National Aeronautics and Space Council	128	338
National Air Museum	144	--------
National Archives and Records Service	13	220
National Bureau of Standards	154	3
National Capital Housing Authority	128	101
National Capital Region	1230	43
National Capital Planning Commission	128	456
National Capital Transportation Agency	128	179
National Collection of Fine Arts	144	338
National Gallery of Art	1218	265
National Guard Bureau	11	103
National Institutes of Health	14	--------
National Inventors Council	186	--------
National Labor Relations Board	128	--------
National Library of Medicine	14	--------
National Mediation Board	128	135
National Museum	144	217
National Park Service	183	43
National Science Foundation	178	19
National Security Agency	188	66
National Security Council	128	28
National War College	11	315
Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md	1229	--------
Naval Base, Philadelphia, Pa	1626	--------
Naval Communications Station, Cheltenham	171	174
Naval Medical Center	1223	--------
Naval Observatory	11	1
Naval Oceanographic Office, U.S	153	504
Naval Ordnance Laboratory	194	--------
Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head, Md	135	--------
Naval Reconnaissance and Technical Support Center	199	--------
Naval Research Laboratory	172	10
Naval Research Laboratory Annex, Chesapeake Beach, Md	1220	--------
Naval Security Station	11	172
Naval Station	11	9
Washington Navy Yard Annex	11	314
Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, Va	1232	--------
Navy, Department of	11	48
Office of Civil Defense, Pentagon, Arlington	11	--------
Region 2 Headquarters (Olney, Md.)	1269	--------
Olney Facility	1269	--------
Office of Economic Opportunity	128	277
Office of Emergency Planning	128	16
Frequency Management Division	129	--------
Interdepartment Radio Advisory Committee	129	16
Office of Minerals Mobilization	183	43
Office of Presidential Consultant on a National Service Program	128	--------
Office of Science and Technology	128	--------
Office of Special Investigation	1201	--------
Oil and Gas, Office of	183	43
Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, Baltimore. Md	130	--------
Washington District Office	13	--------
Pan American Sanitary Bureau	195	--------
Pan American Union	176	--------
Park Police, U.S	1230	43
Parole, Board of	187	--------
Patent Office	112	206
Patuxent River Naval Air Station	131	--------
Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Laurel, Md	1227	--------
Peace Corps	128	255
Plant Industry, Beltsville, Md	1233	--------
Post Office Department	177	201
President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy	110	--------
President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped	110	205
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	110	205
President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime	13	--------
President's Committee on Migratory Labor	110	205
President's Council on Physical Fitness	129	308
Prisons, Bureau of	187	305B
Public Assistance Division of District of Columbia	139	--------
Public Buildings Service	183	29
Public Debt, Bureau of	184	212
Public Health Service	13	367
Woodmont Building, Bethesda, Md	1247	--------
Medical Services, Bureau of, Silver Spring, Md	1276	--------
State Services, Bureau of, Silver Spring, Md	1276	--------
Public Housing Administration	128	99
Public Roads, Bureau of:		
Main	128	29C
Region 15	1252	29C
Arlington Division	128	29C
Physical Research Laboratory	128	29C
Research Station	1266	29C
Public Utilities Commission, District of Columbia	137	--------
Public Welfare, District of Columbia, Department of	137	--------
Bell School	1250	--------
Railroad Retirement Board	1277	--------
District Field Office	1271	--------
Reciprocity Information, Committee for	1272	226
Reclamation, Bureau of	183	43
Recreation Department, District of Columbia	1214	--------
Red Cross, The American National	170	--------
Renegotiation Board, The	128	61
Research Council, National	1224	44
Resources and Investigations, Division of District of Columbia	139	--------
Rivers and Harbors, Improvement of	11	106
St. Elizabeths Hospital	1620	--------
Savings Bonds Division	184	307
Schools, District of Columbia Public	137	--------
Scientific and Technical Intelligence Center, Department of the Navy	11	--------
Secret Service, U.S	184	223
Secretary, Office of (Commerce)	112	--------
Securities and Exchange Commission	13	349C
Selective Service, National Headquarters	183	40
Advisory Committee, National	183	40
Appeals Board, National	183	40
District of Columbia	129	133
Small Business Administration	128	180
Smithsonian Institution	144	217
Social Security Administration:		
Washington	13	367
Baltimore, Md	130	--------
Property Management	1241	--------
Soldiers' and Sailors' Temporary Home	137	84
Solicitor, Office of the	110	--------
Southeastern Power Administration	183	43
Southwestern Power Administration	183	43
Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Bureau of	183	43
State, Department of	182	27
Subversive Activities Control Board	128	299
Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office	149	370
Supreme Court, U.S	1207	302
Tariff Commission, U.S	1272	226
Tax Court, U.S	184	203
Technical Services, Office of	186	206
Tempo 8 Bldg. (Department of Defense)	11	103
Tennessee Valley Authority	183	337
Territories, Office of	183	43
Travel Service, U.S	112	--------
Treasurer of the United States, Office of	184	223
Treasury, Department of	184	223
United Nations Information Center	1265	--------
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	1216	--------
U.S. Attorney's Office	1204	--------
U.S. Courts	1204	--------
U.S. Courts, Administrative Office of	1207	312
U.S. Employment Service:		
National	110	275
District of Columbia Office	1237	144
U.S. Engineers, Washington District	152	320
U.S. Information Agency	182	121
HEW Bldg	13	121
Tempo R	13	121
Auditors	182	121
U.S. Marshal's Office	1204	--------
Urban Renewal Administration	128	98
Vehicles and Traffic, District of Columbia, Department of	137	--------
Veterans' Administration, Main	148	73
Munitions Bldg	148	--------
Veterans Benefit Office	148	--------
Veterans Reemployment Rights, Bureau of	110	205
Vint Hill Farms Station	190	--------
Vital Statistics, National Office of	13	367
Vocational Rehabilitation, Administration	13	367
Vocational and Rehabilitation Service, District of Columbia	1267	--------
Voluntary Foreign Aid, Advisory Committee on	182	100
WAEPA	13	--------
Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division	110	205
Walter Reed Hospital	198	358
Washington Field Office, FBI	175	379
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission	11	--------
Washington Monument	1230	43
Washington National Airport	1251	--------
Welfare Administration	13	367
Weather Bureau	191	7
River Information	128	--------
White House	145	28
Women's Bureau	110	205
World Bank	181	292
World Science Pan-Pacific Exposition	112	--------
Worth 3-1110 PBX	13	218

NOTE.—Numbers not preceded by code are 343-1100 extensions, code 183.

In event of emergency, call emergency control center, code 13-26631 or 13-22957.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Many months ago, in the early part of this session, a number of Members of this body from both sides of the aisle expressed their deep concern about the problem of the availability of public information, of the public business being made available to the public, by introducing a bill in the Congress of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, to the Subcommittee on Government Information.

That subcommittee has held hearings. During those hearings, representatives from the executive branch of the Federal Government testified and in so many words said it would be unconstitutional for the Congress of the United States to pass a bill which required the executive branch of the Federal Government to disclose the public business to the public. I believe the testimony which was given before that subcommittee is similar in many ways to the instances which have been cited here today, not merely with respect to this particular program but with respect to other programs which individuals have called to the attention of Members.

I believe this dramatizes the importance of the Congress of the United States passing a bill which will require that the public business be conducted in public and that the people who are paying the tax dollars in this country have access to the information as to the use of those dollars and the conduct of various Federal programs.

I am certainly hopeful that the Government Operations Committee will report such a bill to this body in the near future and that we will have an opportunity to put an end once and for all to the withholding of information not only from the Congress but also from the people of the United States.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I will not go any further into this question, because there are other gentlemen on our side who will go into it. Let me go to another point.

The Federal, State and local partnership which has worked well in many Federal programs has been disregarded in this program, in the so-called war on poverty. This is one of the reasons why the program is in trouble. We have been bypassing this usual method of operation. We have agencies and organizations warring among themselves as to who is to control the program in given communities.

We have more than 20 Governors, both Democrats and Republicans, whose power is now to be taken away from them in this bill, even though this is the one check we have left in the States over the Federal program. We have mayors who are protesting the way in which the poverty administrators are better paid than they are and the way in which in the area of the poverty war they have 100 percent more authority than the mayors have in their own cities.

We have a request before us now for doubling the money for this program with all of this controversy and objection that has been raised about it. What are we to obtain in return for this? We have a case here in which 1 year's rent in a former luxury hotel is more than the assessed valuation of the hotel. The OEO pays the bill for a women's job corps training center in the city of St. Petersburg in Florida. After more than 5 years of experience they are asking the training center to leave town.

What has been done in the meantime is hard to tell. They have been trying to change the location, and most everybody agrees that it has not only been mislocated, as was said by the merchants association, but it was misrepresented to them, and they terminated the contract.

Also, in the Job Corps we have been flying young men from all over the country to so-called Job Corps camps. Here we read not once or twice but almost daily of their indulging in such constructive activities as fighting, drinking, and possessing marihuana and, when the novelty has worn off, they are flown back home.

We read in the New York Herald Tribune that an aid in a job training program has been arrested for possessing dope, smut, and knives. In the Savannah Press of July 12 they write that Job Corps volunteers have been hauled back. In Astoria, Oreg., the Oregonian of June 22 said that 25 boys were involved in fights in job centers.

In the so-called community action programs we have the disillusionment of a type expressed by Herbert Hill, the national labor secretary of the NAACP. Speaking at the organization's national convention in Denver on June 29, he said that the so-called war on poverty is simply an extension of white welfare paternalism, and he went on to say that we must shed the illusion that this is a war against poverty, because it is merely a BB shot against poverty. Its job should not be to help the poor to better endure the burdens of poverty but, rather, to make it possible for them to escape poverty as a result of their own efforts.

This type of disillusionment that we have is growing, with good reason. As the poor asked me during investigations by the special ad hoc subcommittee on the war on poverty in Detroit and Cleveland, why are we not allowed to help develop the programs? We know the problems. We believe we have ideas that can help, but the poor are not being involved. Five-figure salaried poverty lawyers go on planning extensions of welfare paternalism. From Cleveland and Chicago we heard testimony that the poor have not been involved in this program.

It would be interesting to read the testimony of Mr. Lynwood Stevenson, the president of the Woodlawn Association in Chicago, when he testified before the Committee on Education and Labor. He talked about the Urban Opportunity Committee of the city of Chicago and told who they were. He said that there is maximum feasible participation of precinct captains and ward committeemen and so on, but where is the maximum feasible participation of the poor? Incidentally, the law carries this provision, that there should be maximum feasible participation on the part of the poor. He goes on to say that there is not even minimum feasible participation of the poor people.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wonder if he read an article in the July 1965 issue of Harper's magazine.

Mr. QUIE. I sure did.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Entitled "A Professional Radical Moves in on Rochester," by Saul Alinsky.

Mr. QUIE. Saul Alinsky, yes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. There is a very interesting thought in this, if the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. He says:

> That's why the poverty program is turning into a prize piece of political pornography. It's a huge political pork barrel, and a feeding trough for the welfare industry, surrounded by sanctimonious, hypocritical, phony, moralistic crap. For instance, in Chicago one of our top poverty officials is dragging down $22,500 and before that he was making 14 grand. That's what I call really helping the poor. Directors of the "baby city halls" which are called "urban progress centers" are getting about $12,400. Before that they were averaging between $8,000 and $9,000. A police detective who was making $7,000 is now a Credit Education Consultant (you figure out what that means) and he is getting $10,000. People like that really know right down to the guts of their billfold what Johnson means by the Great Society. Across the country, city halls have their committees on economic opportunity to identify what they call positive and negative programs and leaders. Positive means you do whatever city hall tells you to do and negative means you are so subversive that you think for yourself.

I think this expression of a professional in this field is a good indication of the nature of the problems we are getting into when we start programs without looking into the consequences of what we are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I think it points up, like a TV commentator once said, perhaps facetiously, but there is truth to it, that in this war on poverty we ought to give a little money to the poor so they can fight back.

Mr. Charles Craggett, appearing before the committee on behalf of the Citizens' Committee for an Adequate Cleveland Community Action Program, testified:

> If the goals of the poverty program are to become a reality to those for whom it was meant, the victims of poverty, it must be these same victims who are in the role of determining the course, of determining the depth and scope of the programs, and, hence, whatever victory or success is achieved.
>
> In short, if the poverty-stricken are to be able to rise above their state of degradation, they must have a say so in what is being planned, what is being done, and what is being accomplished.
>
> If not, then, as has been our experience in the past and in every instance in our community—and this is emphasized over and over in our urban renewal program and in our JC program—this will be just more money, millions and millions of dollars wasted. It will be time wasted, and effort, and, above all, a tragic waste of humanity.
>
> In our community, not one program has been geared for the real dynamic citizen involvement. Hence, not one program has really been successful in achieving any valid goals.

If you will look at community ventures that have been successful in the past, I think you will see this glaringly in front of you. Where they have been successful, people have been involved. However, I have had experience all my life in cooperative extension, and in this program farmers are involved. They participate in developing the programs. That is the only reason why they are successful. They looked on it askance, many of them, when they were first started, but because they helped to develop the program, the program has done a tremendous job in rural areas. This program has to involve the poor themselves, or it is doomed to failure. That is one of the difficulties that we have had here.

Mr. Chairman, in some cities we see political machines attempt to seize control of the poverty programs for patronage purposes. This was discussed a little bit earlier. The chairman of the Education and Labor Committee said that we must "halt these giant fiestas of political patronage." He then promptly shut off investigation of the complaints, after a few days.

I had hoped that community action programs would have been developed by a sharing of responsibility by the governing body of a community, agencies which have had experience in working with the poor, and the poor, themselves.

This was described last year as a three-legged stool. In some cities just one of these groups is involved. We have seen it set up as two-legged stools and we have seen it set up as one-legged stools, and in Ypsilanti, Mich., we found that there was a no-legged stool on which these were placed. In Ypsilanti we found the University of Michigan did it without the approval of either the governing body or the agency, and worked with the poor, with the poor themselves.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. The Ypsilanti project that the gentleman is talking about, rather carelessly I think, I might say is immediately adjacent to my congressional district. I have taken the time to look into it in some detail. Once again, we have an example of members of the gentleman's party playing politics with the poverty program. We have the Republican Party where the local official is fighting with the county and the educational representatives in his community as well as members of his own board.

Mr. Chairman, there is a clear-cut split within the Ypsilanti Township which is the applicant in this case for Willow Village, a split between the Democratic and Republican members of the board, with only Republicans voicing opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN The gentleman is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, the Office of Economic Opportunity, as I have said, has no full-time director. There is little State or local responsibility. There is little participation by the poor. Under the circumstances we then should not double the money involved in order to perpetuate this shambles. Good intentions do not inevitably mean good results. As long as the House remains quiescent, which it does, and pays no attention to the results, we will have disillusioned BB shots instead of a war on poverty and this program could become just not a national disgrace but a national catastrophe.

Mr. Chairman, I have not said these things lightly. Everything I have said will be explained in detail during the debate in the material which I shall place into the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, amendments are to be offered when we are through with the general debate in an effort to try and change the operations of the so-called war on poverty so that it will be without these faults that we pointed out last year and without these faults that we have pointed out this year.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the first step is to recognize that this program is in chaos. We cannot clean it up without recognizing this fact. If we do not recognize it, we will have another year of chaos next year. Then, we will face the same problems all over again.

Mr. Chairman, we need a thorough investigation of the program in order to put it on a sound basis so that the people who are poor will not be denied the opportunity and will have the opportunity to bring themselves out of the kind of distress and hopelessness in which they find themselves at the present time.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. I note throughout the gentleman's discourse there is criticism based upon what the gentleman seems to believe is an abject failure of this program, as the gentleman referred to it as a shambles. The gentleman further says that it has been ineffective and says that there has not been participation at the proper levels.

Can the gentleman name any major program during his lifetime which has been passed by the Congress covering such a wide range of needs that has gotten as far ahead in the short time it has been in existence as this program has?

Mr. QUIE. If one wants to look at a program, not as widespread and spread all over the country as the war on poverty——

Mr. DENT. Excuse me. I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. I will get to that. The war on poverty involves many programs, but if the gentleman wants to look at one that works well and the way it ought to work, just look at the vocational rehabilitation program. There will be some changes in the program and when that bill comes up the gentleman will find that there will be great cooperation in support of the bill.

The vocational rehabilitation program has worked well because it begins at the local community level where one single project can be set up, and you do not need these umbrella agencies to keep it in operation. In other words, the State knows what is going on and the local community knows what is going on. This is the kind of cooperation between the various bodies of government, where they have their responsibilities, where they have the participation of the people who are involved. That is why that program works well, and that is why I believe this program ought to be changed to proceed in the way which the vocational rehabilitation program operates at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I have a very important observation to make on the remark which the gentleman just made.

The gentleman points out that the vocational rehabilitation program works well but the gentleman fails to realize that that is not a new program. Here you are plowing new ground for the first time, whereas in the vocational rehabilitation program you are not, except that the National Government has stepped into a field that has been harvested year after year after year by the State governments and local governments. All we did was superimpose upon a structure already created.

Mr. QUIE. At one time that program was new. However, it was started slower until we found out how it should be operated. That was true also with reference to the Manpower Development and Training Act. This program started slower and we found out how it should be operated and, therefore, it does not have this criticism.

If you give the people an opportunity to share in the responsibilities this program will work.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I will say to the gentleman that it seems to me a very lame excuse to talk here and say that this is a new program plowing new ground and, therefore, there are going to be all sorts of human resource waste and waste of money.

As Republicans on this committee we are trying to be constructive and improve the program. We had no hearings in depth and breadth on this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. QUIE. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. We had no hearings in depth or breadth that could help or correct some of these mistakes. We had no disposition on the part of the administration or those in charge of this program to try to alter some of the obvious mistakes that have been made so that this program can refocus itself and redirect itself.

I want to conclude after the long time that the gentleman in the well has been answering questions and yielding to both sides in developing a very provocative and, I think, enlightening debate. I think we should all recognize the work the gentleman from Minnesota has placed in this program and in education and labor problems generally. He is a man who does not book destructively and negatively. His answers, in my opinion, are based on well developed facts. He has progressive, constructive suggestions. He has always advanced them in committee and we have seen the results of those suggestions when they have been listened to in the Educational Act and in the Higher Education Act. If he had been listened to more, we would all be better off.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. I thank the gentleman from New York. His comments are most appropriate. He sat through the hearings we had on this matter and was the ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

An eminent minister from Chicago, the Reverend Lynward Stevenson, president of the Woodlawn organization, testified. Mr. Stevenson has been conducting a

Manpower Development and Training Act job training program for the hard core unemployed since July 1964.

He came before the committee and gave some constructive testimony. Those of you who say this does not reek with politics have not attended the hearings. I refer to page 357 of the hearings where Reverend Stevenson said:

> I would like to give you some of the names of the persons who serve on the committee, to show you that it is not a representative committee.

He went on and he gave the names, or several names, and he concluded:

> I could go on with this impressive list, which sounds like the fund-raising committee of the Democratic Party. I will not read all of these names.

But he did go on and read them and on checking them you will find this is the hard core, not of the unemployed but the hard core of the Democratic Party in Chicago, Ill.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. I would like to add my word to the gentleman from New York in reference to the outstanding job that the gentleman in the well has done. He has always been constructive in all of the work he has done on various bills.

I want to point out another thing. This program embarks on a program that is entirely novel to any program of Federal aid, is that true?

Mr. QUIE. Yes.

Mr. BELL. In this case, we are bypassing every well known local government function and going direct to the people.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, we know, of our own knowledge, that the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 was passed in haste, proper legislative processes were ignored in an attempt to ready a potent weapon for the 1964 political campaign. In those emotion-filled days, anyone who saw error in this program was branded as being "against the poor." Anyone who was for the program was a "friend of the poor." There was no gray between black and white—although gray is always an essential shading in any endeavor affecting human relations.

I opposed passage of the act last year because it was so carelessly constructed as to provoke greater problems than it was seeking to solve; because it appeared that this program would operate in competition with existing programs; because it courted chaos by ignoring established lines of authority; and because I do not feel that the hopes of the poor should be used to feed political ambition.

My decision to oppose H.R. 8283 this year has been based on facts which have, unfortunately, borne out my fears of last year.

As a selling point in pushing for passage of the act last year, the majority made repeated assurances that extensive and comprehensive hearings would be held this year. The program was to be held up to the light and every experimental facet of its many-faced bulk was to be closely examined. However, the majority of the House Education and Labor Committee, under the leadership of its chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] has fallen far short of this promise. The majority of this committee admitted on the very first page of its report on this bill, that a "complete investigation was not possible."

Why not? This is a question I hope will be answered during the course of this debate.

Is this program not important enough to warrant a complete investigation? This seems incredible, in light of the fantastic amount of attention paid it between June and November 1964, by the majority party. Or is it not doing well enough to bear the scrutiny of investigation?

The latter hypothesis is a possibility, for the chairman very honestly brought to light some of the problems that had arisen as hearings opened this year. He promised to make appropriate changes in the legislation, for, he said, "giant fiestas of political patronage" must be halted. He suggested that salaries paid professional poverty fighters were "unreasonable and wildly unrealistic" and that they should be brought in line with comparable municipal salaries. We were told that the failure to involve the poor in the programs affecting them would be ended. We were told that the various types of grants available would be clearly defined to avoid further confusion and conflict.

The beginning of hearings brought testimony showing critical problems in the administration of the so-called war on poverty. The minority was encouraged, for it thought that here, at last, was an honest appraisal of the operation of this hastily concocted political act. We thought back to the great days of bi-partisanship on the Education and Labor Committee which brought forth such outstanding legislation as the Higher Education Facilities Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act. We thought that, at last, those days had come again and now, at last, the so-called war on poverty could be improved and made meaningful.

And then, a strange thing happened. Apparently fearing for the very life of the act if public exposure of the problems continued, the part-time "poverty director, Sargent Shriver" decided to exercise his unique and never fully explained powers to indulge in legislation by personal letter. First came a letter that apparently assuaged the chairman's fears concerning those "wildly unrealistic" salaries. Then came a second, calming the chairman's ruffles over the "giant fiestas of political patronage."

With these two amendments in his pocket, the chairman terminated the hearings. The minority made several requests for the hearings to be extended. We felt that much more evidence concerning the operations of the act necessary, if it was to be improved, so that the hopes of the people for whom it was intended were not destroyed. We knew that the hearings were not terminated for lack of information. There were numerous witnesses who had requested to be heard by the committee.

As a matter of fact, the only portion of the act which received any examination during hearings was title II, dealing with community action programs, and this is one of 10 programs under the OEO. Even that examination was almost exclusively limited to a discussion of the political struggles of big cities to launch community action programs.

Stepping into the vacuum left by the Education and Labor Committee, the Republican Task Force on Economic Opportunity held 5 days of hearings on its own to glean more evidence. As a member of that committee, I can state that we tried to get at some of the causes of the conflicts to see if the flaws are repairable.

Testimony given to the Republican members of the ad hoc Subcommittee on Poverty of the Education and Labor Committee indicates that staff turnover at OEO is abnormally large for a Federal agency. Despite my request, we have not been able to obtain a list of the various staff positions or the names of the people who head such divisions as recruitment or project evaluation. Congress is obviously to be kept in the dark.

Additional testimony given to us indicates that there is not nearly enough clerical help. As a result, consultants and career personnel would have to handle routine correspondence. At the rate the consultants are reported to be paid, this is certainly an expensive way to run an office. In addition to being expensive, it is also inefficient, as I am sure each of my colleagues must know if they have attempted to correspond with the Office of Economic Opportunity.

There is a considerable amount of propaganda about the dedication of the personnel of OEO and the long hours they work. The OEO staff is often in the office past 9 p.m., say the defenders. I admire diligence and hard work. I also admire accomplishments. If the accomplishments were forthcoming, I would raise no objection to the staff of OEO leaving at noon. But I certainly object to the fact that OEO is showing so few accomplishments, even by working until 9 p.m. I also understand that the desirability of working long hours, the diligence and dedication of the staff, is enhanced by time and a half for overtime.

A summary view of the major programs established by OEO reveals a common characteristic in all. Considerable confusion exists in the establishment of all programs and none of them has progessed far enough to permit full evaluation.

This is the picture which emerged from the short hearings of the Education and Labor Committee, the investigation of the ad hoc Subcommittee on Poverty and the hearings of the Republican Task Force on Economic Opportunity. This unbelievable administrative shambles is the canvas on which all the errors of OEO are painted.

What do we have to counter this evidence? We have, as the only major source of information, the glowing and often-repeated reports of the part-time

Director of the programs, a few of his top personnel and the public relations office of OEO. They all cite glowing figures on the progress of the programs which are clearly recognizable as the goals—not the current progress—of these programs which is quite a different thing. Certainly nobody is going to receive a true picture by reading the glossy congressional presentation of OEO, or by listening to its officials.

For instance, my State of Minnesota was visited on May 15 by Jack T. Conway, a Deputy Director of OEO. Following is an account of his speech which appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press on May 15:

Progress Seen In Poverty War

Progress in the Nation's war on poverty has been steady, but much organization still remains to be done, said Jack T. Conway, in Minneapolis today to address the DFL women's State workshop in the Radisson Hotel.

Conway is Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington. He said 2,000 volunteers in the antipoverty campaign, who are known as VISTA, are already in the field, going from State to State on call. They range in age from 18 years to a woman psychologist aged 83, he said.

There are 40,000 young people aged from 16 to 21 from low-income families being trained in work projects. Conway hopes this number will be raised to 200,000 by the end of the summer.

The young people comprise one part of the campaign to aid low-income families. The other consists of community action programs sponsored locally with private and public resources. The Federal Government contributes 90 percent of the costs of the community action programs, and the local community 10 percent, when a community action group submits a workable program, Conway said.

In Minnesota, the first calls for VISTA volunteers have come from Indian reservations, and their demands have been filled, he said.

Conway is a former administrative assistant to Walter B. Reuther, head of the United Automobile Workers Union, and in 1963 became head of the industrial union department of the AFL–CIO.

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note that Mr. Conway told a Democratic women's group in St. Paul that there were, on May 15, 2,000 VISTA volunteers "going from State to State." Two days later, on May 17, Sargent Shriver told me that there were only 176 VISTA volunteers in the field, although he hoped for "substantially more" by July 1. The latest published report I have seen says there are about 1,000 now in the field or in training. We recall, of course, that the 2,000 figure was the hoped-for July 1 goal of VISTA.

The National Observer has been good enough to supply some additional information. It was printed on May 31, and so it can be assumed that it is even more current than Mr. Conway's comments in St. Paul on May 15, or Mr. Shriver's comments on May 17. It is interesting to note that the National Observer refers to 136 VISTA volunteers at work and another 52 in training. Following is the complete text of the article:

Three years ago, President Kennedy suggested that a Federal program might be set up through which Americans would volunteer to assist in various kinds of social-welfare work in this country, much as Peace Corps men were doing abroad. Last year, Congress approved the idea as part of the administration's antipoverty program and allotted $4,500,000 to get the project going.

This new effort—Volunteers in Service to America, or VISTA as it's more commonly known—naturally fell into the province of Sargent Shriver, director of the poverty program. Since then, Mr. Shriver has been irrepressibly voluble about VISTA. He has said on a number of occasions, that there would be more than 25,000 applicants for VISTA by July 1, and that some 2,000 men and women would be in the field or in training by then.

It won't happen. The truth, as Staff Writer Mark Arnold reports in an article on page 5, is that the VISTA program is in dire straits. Some administrative jobs still haven't been filled; volunteers have not flocked to sign up; recruiting campaigns have failed to stir much enthusiasm; and budgeting and bureaucratic ineptness have created innumerable snafus. As a result, there are today just 136 VISTA volunteers at work and another 52 in training.

As a prophet, Mr. Shriver comes a cropper. But that's not the real point. Mr. Shriver is a very able fellow, and he's not the first administrator in Washington to be caught up in the current tide of hucksterism.

The real point about VISTA, however, is that the experience thus far plainly demonstrates the limitations of such Federal programs. Granted that its aims are lofty and worthwhile. What has happened?

For one thing, there aren't enough good administrators around to staff the program; VISTA officials complain they are being "siphoned" off to run more expansive projects, the Job Corps, the Peace Corps, the Head Start program for preschool children, among others. Moreover, the competition among governmental agencies for participants in their multitudinous programs is becoming increasingly acute. VISTA officials fret because they lacked the money and the manpower (it has only 14 recruiters) to compete against the Peace Corps, which mounted an elaborate recruiting campaign on college campuses this spring.

It is only a simple leap in logic from this kind of frustration to the common conclusion that the problems of VISTA, or any other Federal program, could easily be solved by heavier injections of funds—money to publicize the program more, money to offer higher salaries, money for better recruiting drives, money for bigger and better facilities. Thus, VISTA is asking for a fivefold increase in its annual budget—to $24,500,000 in the next fiscal year.

Unthinkable as the thought might be to some, it is possible that this country does not need such a proliferation of Federal programs. To be sure, all the problems of the poor, the ill, the uneducated, the distressed have not been solved. But how necessary in the task is a Federal agency incapable of being either effective or efficient?

VISTA's plight is sad, but it would be sadder still to ignore the lesson of VISTA and blithely assume that the Federal Government can solve old problems by fathering new ones.

Mr. Chairman, the concern over the bungling of the so-called war on poverty has apparently reached to the highest level of Government. Following is a column by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, which appeared in many newspapers on or about April 26:

President Wants Answers—L.B.J.'s Poverty War Rangers

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

Washington.—President Johnson is launching his own private investigation to determine why his highly publicized "war on poverty" isn't getting off the ground.

He is sending more than a dozen trusted political aids into the field to make on-the-spot inquiries of the quagmire of local politics and bad generalship bogging down the antipoverty crusade.

Significantly, the President is going outside the Government to get most of his troubleshooters, carefully selecting them from a list of 40 advance men and political aids who worked in his 1964 campaign.

These "poverty rangers" are being instructed to take their orders from and report their findings directly to Bill Moyers, the President's chief staff assistant, or aids designated by him.

They are being given White House badges of authority to roam the poverty range in their assigned States, knocking political heads together to obtain unity in local programs, weeding out misfits and political undesirables, and drumming up local support for the programs.

Another major assignment of the "poverty rangers" is to dig their spurs into local officials to get new projects underway before June 30, end of the fiscal year.

Latest report sent to the White House by Director Sargent Shriver shows that as of April 1 only $200 million, or one-fourth of the $800 million voted by Congress last year, has been alloted under the poverty program.

With a new $1.5 billion request before Congress, the President and his domestic advisers are deeply concerned that the Senate and House Appropriations Committees may slash this spending proposal if last year's unused funds aren't earmarked for projects.

The President has asked his "poverty rangers" to check whether salaries of local antipoverty officials are excessive.

This review was ordered after several Democratic Senators, accompanying the President during his recent inspection of flood and storm damage areas, complained that the outlandishly high salaries being paid by the Office of Economic Opportunity, which administers the antipoverty program, were giving it a bad image.

Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, pointed out that OEO authorities were recruiting teachers at salaries 25 percent above those paid by universities and public and private schools in his State. He warned that the salaries were so out of line they were turning many Indianians against the project.

The President, who had asked the Senators, "What is wrong with the antipoverty program?" said he would investigate.

One of his troubleshooters is checking the operations of the OEO officials in Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, and Michigan. Another is doing the same in Illinois and Ohio.

In these six industrial States, the salaries of OEO officials range upward to $25,000 with "several hundred" being paid "more than $10,000."

A local antipoverty agency in New Jersey submitted a budget for $878,000 the first year, including $567,000 for salaries. It proposed 93 paying positions; 26 calling for salaries of more than $10,000. The budget is being cut to $204,000.

A third special investigator for the White House is enroute to check on Alabama, North Carolina, and South Carolina programs, with instructions to seek the hiring of more Negroes.

This troubleshooter will arrive in South Carolina at the same time civil rights leaders plan to march on the Capitol in Columbia to protest the handling of the antipoverty program.

The march is being closely watched by Federal investigators since it signals the

> linking together of civil rights and antipoverty demonstrators into a powerful new force to put pressure on local, State, and Federal governments.
>
> The big problem facing President Johnson's "poverty rangers" is whether they will be able to see the trees for the forest in their reports to the White House. The shape the Great Society will take could be hanging in the balance.

Mr. Chairman, the President has apparently also been concerned. However, his quiet investigation with "poverty rangers" has not stopped the distorted reports. For instance, Mr. Richard Wilson, chief of the Minneapolis Tribune's Washington bureau, wrote, in part, on May 1:

> President Johnson's recent announcements of poverty program accomplishments—250,000 in the Job Corps, 45,000 needy students in 800 colleges, 125,000 in adult education programs—sound impressive but barely scratch the surface of the basic programs.

The figure of 250,000 in the Job Corps is an interesting one. Mr. Richard Corrigan of the Washington Post wrote on June 9:

> The Job Corps camps are live-work-train-and-study centers for youths aged 16 to 21. They serve as fresh-air outposts in President Johnson's war on poverty and have been likened to the Civilian Conservation Corps camps of the 1930's.
>
> Right now, 4,737 youths are staying in the 27 camps, according to the Associate Director of the national Job Corps program, Lewis Elgen. By the end of this month 10,000 will be in the camps and by December the total will be 40,000, Eigen said.

Mr. Chairman, this is, indeed, a case of confusion.

It is interesting to note that the Job Corps has received the most attention from the public relations division of the Office of Economic Opportunity, or, at least, certain aspects of the program have been so honored. Movies and picture books show photographs of boys from underprivileged neighborhoods breathing in the pure, clean air of Oregon and Maryland. What the pictures do not show is the number of dropouts from the camps or the many other difficulties already encountered.

The New York Herald Tribune of June 29 quotes Mr. Shriver as telling the Senate committee that the dropout rate is only 3.7 percent. He says this is because the boys are not considered part of the program before they have been at the camp for a month. That is an interesting new angle. Reports from throughout the Nation show the dropout rate at about 30 percent. But, of course, this figure includes no criterion for staying a month before becoming a dropout. I suppose on the basis of such reasoning, a high school student could attend classes 1 day each month and not be considered a dropout.

During the course of debate, the dropout rate for several individual Job Corps camps will be offered. However, I must emphasize that these will be figures obtained through the initiative of the working press. Actual figures about the dropout rate are very difficult to obtain.

I shall say that the information which I received agrees in substance with the following public information that has appeared in the public press.

First. The Washington Post recently stated that the drop-out rate at the conservation camp at Catoctin, Md., is 30 percent.

Second. A recent Associated Press report indicated that 20 of 80 enrollees at Stapp work center, a Job Corps camp in Hodgens, Okla., had returned to their homes. The explanation of the OEO was that the boys were mostly from the East and were homesick.

Third. United Press International reported that a conservation camp in Trinity National Forest, Calif., is in "serious trouble." A Corps official there said that some youths had been sent home for "disciplinary problems" and that others had left because they "did not like rural living." Local citizens had voiced serious objections to a lack of discipline, which they said resulted in a knifing, a shooting spree, and illegal purchase of alcoholic beverages.

The article also noted that the camp's director had been transferred to Washington. Until a replacement could be found, the local elementary school principal is acting as director.

Mr. Chairman, we can gain some insight into the administrative shambles of the Job Corps camps and the concern of local citizenry and State officials from a series of articles that appeared in the Astoria, Oreg., Astorian, and the Portland, Oreg., Oregonian, concerning the Job Corps camp at Astoria. The first two of these articles is dated June 22. The third appeared on June 23. These three are from the Astorian. The fourth, a summary view, appeared in the Oregonian on June 24.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first of the articles:

TWENTY-FIVE BOYS SAID INVOLVED IN FIGHTS AT JOB SCHOOL

Fist fights involving not more than 25 trainees took place Monday evening at Tongue Point Job Corps Center, the Daily Astorian learned Tuesday.

Groups of instructors and counselors calmed the fighting and late in the evening the institution was completely quiet, according to people who were there.

The fist fights were in several isolated groups and there was no general rioting, it was reported. Tongue Point Center officials could not be reached late Tuesday morning for comment, but it was understood they were holding conferences with trainees to try to reduce the risk of further trouble.

The trouble had racial basis, according to reports.

Guy Shellenbarger, in charge of security at the center, called Gov. Mark Hatfield's office Monday night to report the trouble. He also is understood to have called the Clatsop County sheriff's office to request professional advice and whether a tear gas supply was available in case of necessity.

OFFICERS SILENT

Sheriff's officers declined to discuss this report and said any information regarding the incident should come from the Job Corps.

Gene Hulet, U.S. marshal for Oregon, was in Astoria Tuesday on other business and discussed the situation with Governor Hatfield by telephone.

Hulet said his office was ready to do what it could, within its own limitations, to prevent trouble.

MAY DEPUTIZE MEN

Since county, city and State officers have no authority to go on the center, Hulet said a possible solution might be to deputize, for the occasion, any local and State officers who might be needed to control any outbreak of trouble at the center.

One report was that the trouble Monday night involved "southern white boys and Chicago Negroes."

Mr. Chairman, this is the second of the articles:

HATFIELD URGES TIGHTER CONTROL FOR JOB CORPS

SALEM.—Gov. Mark Hatfield today urged "tighter administrative control" and a "meaningful screening program" for Job Corps trainees assigned to Tongue Point near Astoria.

The comments came in the wake of reports there were several fights with racial overtones at the camp Monday night.

Hatfield said he hoped to discuss the situation later today with Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver, and urge a security force be established on the base.

The present security consists mainly of watchmen, it was reported.

Hatfield said Attorney General Robert Y. Thornton had advised that State police cannot contract to provide security at the base because it is on Federal property.

Thornton said in emergency situations State police could be deputized as U.S. marshals, and go on the base.

There were reports that Negroes made up about 75 percent of the recent groups of trainees assigned to the base.

Earlier groups of trainees were whites from the South, it was reported.

Camp Administrator Douglas Olds earlier this week said he planned to keep the trainees on the base over the July 4 weekend.

Mr. Chairman, following is the third of the articles:

CLASSES RESUME AT JOB SCHOOL, HATFIELD ASKS SECURITY FORCES

Normal class sessions were in progress Wednesday at the Tongue Point Job Corps Center, following a quiet night, officials reported.

Two of five youths who had principal roles in fisticuffs there Monday night have been sent home. Cases of the other three were still under investigation Wednesday.

In addition, 40 to 50 recent arrivals have asked to go home following the Monday night altercations. They were being processed Wednesday. Most of these young men are from the South and include both whites and Negroes, center officials said.

Two investigators sent by Gov. Mark Hatfield were reported to be making inquiries in Astoria about the center Wednesday, but Job Corps officials said they had not seen these people.

One boy, a white youth from Florida, called his mother by telephone Tuesday and said he was afraid and wanted to go home. This lad apparently had gone "over the hill" Wednesday and Job Corps officials were looking for him.

Job Corps officials said a jam session was held in the recreation building at Tongue Point Tuesday night and many of the trainees attended. All was orderly, they said.

Representatives of the Congress of Racial Equality from Portland have been invited to visit Tongue Point and see conditions at the Job Corps Center, officials said. The visitors are expected Friday.

A "potentially serious situation" at the Tongue Point Job Corps Center, heightened by recent fights among whites and Negroes, brought a request from Gov. Mark Hatfield today for more security forces.

Douglas Olds, camp administrator, said there were two fights involving four boys on Monday night. He termed it a "racial misunderstanding."

Classes were suspended Tuesday morning, so small groups of trainees and counselors could discuss the problem. Classes resumed in the afternoon.

The fights occurred in a dormitory where 500 trainees sleep. One boy had his glasses broken and received a cut face and another boy was struck on the head according to Lynn Wykoff, information officer.

Olds said the fights came after white enrollees used disparaging language toward Negro youths.

Wykoff termed the situation "potentially serious." He said there were 300 boys at the center until 3 weeks ago, then 400 were sent in during the past 2 weeks The latest arrivals "included a larger percentage of Negroes, and white youths from the South," he said. About 30 percent of the 687 boys at the center are Negroes.

CONCERN EXPRESSED

Hatfield expressed fear that more serious trouble might break out without adequate enforcement personnel on hand.

The Governor said, "There has been no Federal initiative to get controls at the camp, and we have been urging a security force on the grounds."

He talked by telephone late Tuesday with Antipoverty Director Sargent Shriver. The Governor's office said Shriver "expressed appreciation for Hatfield's concern."

Atty. Gen. Robert Y. Thornton said that State police could be used in any emergencies if they were sworn in as deputy U.S. marshals.

Olds said there was a 12-member watchman force at the center but no police-type controls. He said the Monday night trouble began about 10:30 p.m. and ended shortly after midnight. Deputies from Astoria equipped with tear gas were reported sent to the base but the trouble died down by the time they arrived.

In Portland, Federal Judge Gus Solomon announced appointment of Robert C. Anderson, an Astoria attorney, as U.S. commissioner for Clatsop County effective June 28. He can try petty offenses, sign complaints, warrants, and conduct preliminary hearings.

Mr. Chairman, the fourth of the articles follows:

CHANCE LOST FOR 245—REASONS VARY FOR DROPOUTS IN JOB CORPS

(By Robert Olmos)

ASTORIA.—There was no place in the Great Society for 245 out of 932 boys at the Tongue Point Job Corps Center here.

The 245 constitute the total who have dropped out of the Tongue Point project since the center opened February 1.

Why did they drop out?

The reasons are varied, according to information given by center officials.

Some could not easily abandon habits they had long-learned in city slum areas and backwoods towns. They continued to drink when they could get their hands on liquor. They intimidated other enrollees. They went AWOL. They presented disciplinary problems that forced officials to send them packing back to their homes at Government expense. While they had come to the center amid the luxury of an airplane, they were told to get lost via bus trip.

Others were frightened and had not been prepared regarding what to expect from center life. Their trip to Oregon was their first time away from home. They took their first airplane ride getting here and expressed feelings that they felt "strange" and "out of place" sitting among the affluent passengers on the plane. They arrived to meet typical Northwest weather—the downpour of rain, the depressing dead-gray sky. These experiences totaled up caused the youths to panic and ask to be returned home. Some said that "maybe home is not much, but, at least, it's home."

Still others dropped out because Federal officials "goofed" by their efforts to push youths as quickly as possible into camp and center training situations.

YOUTHS UNPREPARED

Spokesmen at the center said the dropout rate is 26.3—lower than the 30 percent recently reported at the much-publicized rural Job Corps camp at Catoctin, Md. Catoctin has received national attention because it is located close to Camp David, a Presidential retreat. President Johnson made an inspection visit at Catoctin a few months ago.

Why did some youths arrive at the Oregon center unprepared?

Officials blame original screening done on some of the boys as a reason.

"In small towns, where the boys are screened by people in the local department of employment office, workers do not have enough knowledge of how the center operates. They are not able to give the boys a good picture of center life," said a spokesman here.

Boys arrived at the center without any knowledge that they would be work to be performed, that classroom studies would be involved, that there would be strict rules to follow.

"To some boys, it was like being in school again. And they didn't like it. They expected the center to be something else," said the spokesman.

In an effort to provide better screening procedures, officials of the Office of Economic Opportunity now are thinking of establishing what are being referred to as "staging centers," to be possibly located in the larger cities of each State. At these "staging centers," the boys will receive thorough indoctrination into Job Corps urban center and rural camp life. Local officials said they did not know how much expense will be involved in setting up the "staging centers."

Another reason for the dropouts:

Recently 60 boys who were scheduled to go to rural camps were sent, instead, to the urban center here. The boys were immediately "out of place."

Why?

Boys sent to rural camps often are those who are virtually illiterate and the aim of rural camps is to provide them with the rudiments of work experience. Those chosen for urban camps must have at least a fifth grade educational level so that they may learn to read vocational training manuals.

CAMPS NOT READY

Tongue Point Center officials said that a group of 60 was sent here because "the Government wanted these boys in camps as soon as possible and rural camps are not being built fast enough to take them."

Discouraged, 45 of the boys in that group asked to leave.

For the 15 who remained, a program had to be quickly devised. A hunt is out for teachers to teach them. Most do not fit into the educational and training program carried on at the center. The planned program, which will train them in forest conservation work, still has not started. Meanwhile, the boys are helping to clean up portions of Tongue Point's wooded areas to create a community picnic ground.

Enrollees have come to the center from almost every State and each State is represented in the dropout rate, a center spokesman said.

No one area of the country, however, shows up as producing a higher amount of dropouts than another, he said.

"One would think that there would be a higher dropout rate among youths coming from the warmer climates to the Northwest's climate, but that doesn't hold true," he said.

Officials here are not discouraged by the dropout rate. They say that they have had—on the whole—few disciplinary problems of major consequence and nothing at all like the burning down of a bungalow at one Job Corps camp. They are hopeful that with establishment of "staging centers" and increased construction of other centers and camps some of the dropout pitfalls will be eliminated.

They said they have no figures to show what the dropout rate has cost taxpayers.

There are 687 youths between the ages of 16 and 21 now at the center. They are being trained at various job skills that, hopefully, will assure them a place in "The Great Society." They are still working at the chance that has been given them.

But for the 245 others that chance has been lost.

Mr. Chairman, the Women's Job Corps appears to be an even greater mystery. The Republican Task Force was to have heard testimony from a medical examiner for the St. Petersburg Women's Center, Fla., but due to what we believe was arm-twisting, the witness was unable to appear before us. Information on that center was made available by the press, however.

Mr. Chairman, following is an article from the Chicago Tribune, describing some of the procedures at the St. Petersburg center:

COST NO OBJECT AT JOB CENTER

(By Mary Pakhenham)

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.—"Sure it's expensive, but over there they don't seem to care about that."

That was the response of Dr. Charles J. Crist, medical director for the Johnson administration's first Job Corps Center for Women, to a reporter's questions about the center's medical expenses.

Dr. Crist said thousands of dollars are being wasted by inadequate screening of potential recruits before they are sent to the center.

Federal officials say it costs about $75 for each acceptable recruit obtained through local screening agencies. Officials estimate that travel costs to and from the center average $70 one way for each recruit.

Some officials of the center have attempted to conceal the number of screening failures discovered since it opened April 6. A worried staff member sought out a Chicago Tribune Press Service reporter to report that at least 13 girls already have left and that a dozen more have asked to be released.

Included among those who have left, most of them by plane, are two described as emotionally disturbed. They stayed less than 2 days. The cost of returning one of them to her home in Massachusetts will include round trip plane fare for an employee of the center because the girl could not be trusted to travel alone.

Dr. Crist gets $1,000 a month from the center to examine incoming girls for major diseases and to be on call for emergencies.

Joseph Ems, director of the center, said Dr. Crist has spent 30 minutes to 1 hour a day at this job since the girls began arriving April 6.

Dr. Crist said his examinations, conducted in the center's infirmary with the help of four nurses who staff it in shifts, have turned up "mostly mental problems and bad tonsils."

A major purpose of these examinations, Crist said, is to rehearse the girls for the visits they then make to other doctors who charge the center regular fees for more thorough examinations.

He said many of the girls have then been referred to specialists, including psychiatrists. Many of the girls, more than half of whom are Negroes, are presumed never to have seen a doctor before.

Dr. Crist said his services to the center "may cut a little bit into" his regular practice, "but not much." The center's total budget for health services is $221,800 for the first 18 months.

The center is the first and the prototype in an experimental program which its sponsors hope eventually will include hundreds of thousands of girls from poor families and billion of taxpayer dollars.

Representatives of four other women's centers, just opening or about to open, have visited St. Petersburg to obtain ideas they have taken back to Cleveland, Los Angeles, Charleston, W. Va., and Omaha. The YWCA of Chicago is among the many prospective operators of such centers which also have sent representatives here or watched the first centers progress from afar.

Mr. Chairman, although the exact cost figures for operation of the center are virtually unobtainable, a number of estimates have been made. The OEO officially estimates the cost per month for each girl as $507.20. Other estimates range from $455 to $730. Additional allowances, transportation costs, and doctor's fees are not included in the OEO estimate.

Let us examine the newspaper accounts of what happened in St. Petersburg, as reported by its own newspapers, the St. Petersburg Times and St. Petersburg Independent. The following five articles are from those newspapers:

Job Corps Center Guard Increased

Neighborhood complaints near the Women's Job Corps Center at the Huntington Hotel have led to greater surveillance by both the St. Petersburg police and security guards hired by the Job Corps.

Nin Bond, who owns the Bond Hotel directly across the street from the Huntington Hotel, 226 Fourth Avenue N., wrote to City Manager Lynn Andrews requesting an appearance before city council Thursday to air his complaints.

Bond told the Evening Independent today, however, he intends to withdraw his request because Job Corps officials promised they were taking steps to alleviate the problem.

Already police surveillance of the block has been increased.

Job Corps Director Joseph Ems said he plans to increase the number of private security guards engaged by the Job Corps from two to four.

Most of the disturbance, according to Bond, comes from noisy motorcycles and screeching cars. There also has been a problem of congregating and other incidents.

"We're doing everything possible to cooperate with the police and area residents," Ems said. "In an overwhelming number of cases, the problems aren't being generated by the girls."

Police Chief Harold Smith said that there have been about 15 or 20 complaints and incidents in the vicinity of the Huntington Hotel.

"Many of the complaints are unfounded," Smith said.

In the past few days, he said, two teenage boys were arrested there for having alcoholic beverages in their possession.

Seventeen of the 176 girls have left the rehabilitation program since it began earlier this year. Of that number, 15 left voluntarily and two were dismissed.

Mr. Chairman, this is the second of the articles:

Hears Hotelman's Criticism—Chamber To Probe Corps

(By Paul Davis)

Governors of the Greater St. Petersburg Chamber of Commerce today instructed Walter T. Jerkins, their executive vice president, to ascertain all the facts available on operation of the Women's Job Corps center in Hotel Huntington and be prepared to report back by July 1.

"The sooner the better," the governors said.

The discussion was precipitated by Hotelman Nin Bond, who operates the Bond Hotel at 357 Second Street, North, across the street from the Huntington.

He told the governors his hotel could not stay in business as conditions now exist at the Huntington.

Boys with noisy cars show up at night, he said, and citizens who have read about the protests circle the block day and night on sightseeing tours.

Bond said the setup here had been widely advertised with stories appearing in the northern press which seemed to be better informed on what was going on here than local citizens.

The Huntington Hotel was "just the worst possible location that could have been chosen to locate this project," said Bond. "It is not fair to the girls themselves," he added.

Bond said he would like the chamber governors to urge a relocation of the local project.

Raleigh W. Greene, Jr., who made the motion that Jerkins get all tbe facts available on the situation, said he was concerned "by the complete lack of information."

He charged there was a clause in the Federal contract that "prohibited the dissemination of information" about the Corps.

He said he did not know by what standards the girls at the center were chosen, what courses they would study, who would teach them, or the real purpose of the training.

Bond said he hoped to get the Job Corps to locate their center in some other place.

Greene said the chamber's interest was in this tourist city as a whole and it therefore had a duty to perform in investigating the project.

Bond said if any members of the board wished to get a closeup look they could sit on the front porch of his hotel.

On a voice vote, Greene's resolution carried. At least one vote was cast against it. About 20 directors voted.

Mr. Chairman, this is the third of the articles, describing how the St. Petersburg School Board determined that it would like to escape from its contract with OEO, that once sounded so attractive:

School Board Wants To Oust Job Corps—In Washington: Stunned Silence

(By Bette Orsini)

Clearwater.—Pinellas County School Superintendent Floyd J. Christian and school board members decided yesterday to terminate their contract with the Women's Job Corps at the end of the current 18 months—sooner, if possible.

However, in Washington, the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) said somebody should have told the board the contract isn't for 18 months but runs through July 31, 1968, "and one does not lightly walk away from a public contract."

Christian made his surprise recommendation midway in a board session in Clearwater, declaring the program "has not been a success," "has been mislocated" at the Huntington Hotel and "has not improved the board's image in any way."

The announcement stunned the OEO, Job Corps Center Director Joe Ems and the Center staff.

At Washington, Milton Fogelman, chief contracting officer for the OEO, said, "If there is a default on the part of a contractor who is engaged in a public contract, this is fairly serious business. One does not lightly walk away from these and I am sort of surprised at the impetuousness of the people in St. Petersburg through not having familiarized themselves through talking to their legal counsel of the ramifications of this."

Fogelman said any contract can be terminated any time. "The best interest of the Government, however, may very well require that the Government be reimbursed for what it has put in fixing the hotel, training the staff and other costs that have been generated based upon a lengthy relationship," he added.

He said, "I don't know. I'm not saying this is the way it would go. All I can say is this catches me by complete surprise."

School board approval of Christian's recommendation was unanimous among members present. Board Member James Hendry had left for another appointment before the matter came up.

In an exchange after the vote, Board Chairman William H. Williams asked Christian, "Can we as a board know when somebody comes up with a new program? * * * I would like to have anybody's plans and dreams submitted to this board first so we would have a chance to thrash it out and see if it's a good thing * * * so that we don't read it in the paper before we know a single thing about it, particularly if that suggestion is proposed by someone who is an employee of this board."

Williams was referring to comments by vocational-technical director Joe Mills, who got the Job Corps Center into operation and hired most of the staff. His reference was to one of Mills' proposals to Washington suggesting spending $25,000 on a documentary film about the center and his subsequent explanation he wrote the letter because OEO officials suggested he write it.

Williams said any proposals or suggestions for programs Mills gets, "he should present promptly to the superintendent and the superintendent should present them promptly to the board."

Board member Mrs. Mildred Day said, "I think this whole program not only has been mislocated but has been misrepresented to us and I think that the sooner we terminate the contract the better. I don't think we should wait 18 months."

Christian said, "I will see if there is any possibility of doing it sooner."

The school board considers the contract effective February 1, 1965, and ending August 1, 1966.

The superintendent introduced his recommendation to end the contract by saying "When we entered into this agreement for the operation of the Women's Job Corps for 18 months, we entered into it on two bases primarily. We thought we were qualified by personnel and by operation of the previous program that we had (presumably a reference to the Manpower Development Training Act program at the Maritime Base). And we looked at the economic boost to the county by 130 additional employees adding money for this county.

"Looking at it now, after it's been in operation since February, I can honestly say I think we have mislocated it. We have had continuous problems that you have been aware of from other people. It's going to take us some time to properly dispose of it. I don't think we should wait (to inform the Job Corps staff at the center). It's not fair to the employees.

"I would like to recommend to this board that this contract with the Women's Job

Corps be discontinued" at the end of this contract period and that "we amply inform these people" of the staff now.

The superintendent said, "There are some people down there who can obtain employment through this board. I don't think we should wait until the last minute."

He said, "This has not been a success. It has been mislocation. The criticism far outweighs the good we could do. I would like this to be clearly stated that I have not lost confidence in the intent of this program" to help girls who haven't gotten help in the schools. "I think mostly it is based on where we put it. It's not in the right location * * * 300 young ladies down there create quite a problem to the surrounding people."

Board member Jane Manson offered the motion that school officials "begin negotiations for terminating our contract with the Women's Job Corps."

Christian said, "We do want to do the best job with these young ladies while we have them."

At the Job Corps Center, Director Ems said he hadn't heard anything official on the action. He said, "I believe and so does this staff in the concept of this Job Corps or we would not be in it. We're talking about rehabilitation of young people and, to the contrary, we believe that it is meaningfully geared to this second-chance opportunity for these young ladies.

"We have success stories already in evidence. As to mislocation, certainly no one's going to gainsay the fact that the choice for the first Women's Job Corps could be more advantageously and strategically located, other than in the heart of this residential community."

Ems said he could not comment on the termination statement "until I can get a reading from Washington as to whether or not a new contractor will be chosen." He said, "It is important for our girls here that there is certainty for the continuity of the program and that this community will continue to devote its time and talents toward the fulfillment of this program."

A key staff member at the center, who asked not to be identified, said he has "heard the rumor floating around for quite some time that there are three or four contractors waiting around who would step in and fill the gap."

He said none of the staff had any indication from Mills or the superintendent that he planned to recommend termination yesterday. He said Ems called Mills after he heard indirectly about the board action and asked Mills what the developments were. He said, "Ems couldn't find out anything except that the contract was to be terminated. That's all Mills would say."

The staff member said, "If the community and the school board had been told the facts at the outset, this would have worked and the problems could have been worked out."

The OEO's Fogleman said, "My reaction, you may quote, is stunned silence. This comes as a complete surprise to me. If there has been correspondence on this, it has not yet come to me."

He said, "You recognize that the contract we have is not for 18 months. It contains two additional years beyond the 18 months. The contract as presently written provides for services from the Board of Instruction through July 31, 1968. I know nothing about it (the termination) so I cannot comment intelligently about it."

Fogleman said, "All I can say is, I thought things were moving along well. I was unaware there are problems."

The OEO spokesman said he "would need policy guidance on exactly how this would be finally resolved." He said that probably would come from Dr. Otis Singletary and Dr. Bennetta Washington, key Job Corps figures. They wouldn't be able to come to a conclusion, he said, until they knew the circumstances that were involved. He said, "I can't even estimate the reasons for it. I know no cause for it."

Fogleman said, "You recognize that they picked the hotel. I didn't even know the hotel. I assumed that a group of citizens would know the area. This is up to a group certainly that is familiar with the city. To now levy an attack and inconvenience on Job Corps because there was a choice of a hotel made by the Pinellas County Board of Instruction" he couldn't understand.

"And secondly," he said, "so far as the program is concerned, they are running it. If the program is not what they expect it to be, it is because they chose to do it that way. They set the pace on the thing. If there's misrepresentation, I don't know what it is."

Fogleman said, "I don't know whether they are alleging we have breached the contract or whether they are stating they wish to breach the contract. The term 'misrepresent' is, I think, certainly inappropriate in this context."

The OEO spokesman said his job as contracting officer in representing the interests of the Government "would require that the best interests of the Government, the girls, the contractor and the city should all be fairly considered. I have no record of correspondence telling me of any kind of a problem. I have no information ever given to me by any persons in the Pinellas County Board of Instruction indicating that there was somehow or another a problem involved."

Fogleman said, "We will look at the problem as soon as we know what the problem is. I hope they will see fit to inform me of what their intentions are."

In action prior to Christian's surprise recommendation, Edward A. Turville, who is attorney for both the school board and the Job Corps Center, had the board approve two agreements he said the Women's Job Corps was proposing to enter into. The board questioned one, but was told by Turville, he believed it already was being done anyway.

Turville said he was only conveying information from his conversation with Mills that a greater percentage of the girls were interested in taking cosmetology than anything else and that there was a necessity of obtaining additional classroom space for basic education.

The board approved an arrangement with Sun State Academy of Cosmetology at 200 Second Avenue South under which enrollees may take a 1,200-hour course which extends a year. The center will pay $185 per student if the student completes the course. A $50 down payment will be paid first and the girl will be supplied a kit. If at the end of 30 days the academy doesn't feel the student is qualified, she won't go on. If she does go on, the remaining $135 will be paid. If the student drops out before finishing 500 hours, the academy refunds $35 to the Job Corps and the kit becomes Job Corps property.

Board members feared the long hours required every day in the academy would prevent the center from giving the enrollee the orientation, guidance and other training supplied there. They have asked Christian to see if the cosmetology study can't be done at night and on Saturdays so the girls still can get their regular center program. Turville said, "I think you've already got girls going there [to the academy]." In the other action, Turville said there's been a meeting with Bixby Business College owners and they are willing to assign to the board their right under their lease of the college's old quarters at 106 Seventh Street South. The board will be able to rent the second floor of the building for $160 a month and can cancel with 30 days' notice.

Turville said he wanted to tell the board about legal services he's been providing the girls that he didn't think the board realized. He said, "These legal problems come up and these counselors can't give them legal advice so they bring them in to me. Although they were supposed not to be married, there are divorcees and matters of child support. This runs constantly. I did want you to know that this goes on rather continuously and I'm glad to be of service to them. But it takes quite a few hours."

Mr. Chairman, the action of the Board of Education quickly received the support of the merchants of St. Petersburg. Following is the fourth of the articles:

MERCHANTS BACK MOVE TO EVICT JOB CORPS

Directors of the St. Petersburg Merchants Association today unanimously supported the Pinellas County School Board's move to terminate the board's contract with the Women's Job Corps.

In surprise action yesterday, the school board voted unanimously to cancel its $2.4-million contract with the Office of Economic Opportunity for the Job Corps.

Dick Tourtelot, St. Petersburg real estate man, who made the motion to the merchants' directors today said location of the corps in the Hotel Huntington was a poor selection.

His motion asking that the corps be removed "in its entirety" pointed out the corps doesn't fit into a quality tourist city such as St. Petersburg.

His motion was seconded by Bruce W. Watters, Jr., association president, who vacated the chair as presiding officer to second the motion and speak.

Tourtelot, who spoke against the lease before it was signed by the county school board, said he thought the merchants should take action "because we were the only organization that opposed the contract before the school board."

When a director mentioned the Job Corps project had brought considerable money into St. Petersburg, Tourtelot replied, "But the point is, it's our money."

Tourtelot said he was named by the merchants to look into locating the school at the Huntington, and as a result, he talked with hotels in the neighborhood of the Huntington.

Tourtelot said that for each dollar spent on the project "the hotels had lost $100 in tourist dollars."

Canadians who spend their winters in the area, he said, have declared their intentions not to return another year.

Tourtelot charged there was "secrecy" in the move to locate the corps in this city.

"I was told by the attorney that the papers had been executed by the Government when handed to him," said Tourtelot. Later he told the Independent he referred to school board attorney Edward Turville.

He was told that Mayor Herman W. Goldner knew about the project.

Tourtelot said county school officials had not acted on the lease at the time of its delivery. He wondered if it could be held invalid because "people had not been informed" of the project.

Mr. Chairman, following is the fifth of the articles, giving considerable background on the administrative shambles of the St. Petersburg project:

JOB CORPS DEVELOPMENT STIRS HOT INFIGHTING

(By Jack Nease)

Operating a Women's Job Corps Center is new to both the Federal Government and the Pinellas School Board, so everything had to be decided from scratch.

In the process, the infighting got a little heated.

Job Corps files contain a letter from Pinellas School Superintendent Floyd Christian accusing one U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) official of trying to make "political plums" of Job Corps jobs.

The stimulus for this charge was an April 6 request from OEO Project Manager June Henry that Job Corps Center Director Joe Ems and his assistant be given greater freedom in buying equipment, hiring employees and setting salaries.

Christian wrote Washington this would lead to "chaos in the operation of the center," saying he wanted Job Corps employees "to be compatible with those employed by the board of public instruction."

"To set their salaries higher and to make them political plums, without any reference to the total program of this county, would cause undue hardships on this office and the board of public instruction," he wrote.

Christian said last week he used his rather harsh language because he had read of charges that antipoverty jobs in other sections of the country were being used as patronage.

Further, he said, the Gibbs Junior College situation was on his mind. Thousands of dollars in student loan funds at Gibbs can't be properly accounted for, and the Federal Government is demanding the school board make up the difference.

Asked about the exchange, Miss Henry replied merely that school board procedures and policies are being reviewed by the OEO.

Most of these policies are spelled out in a 70-page booklet prepared by Assistant Superintendent Dan Phillips.

It provides this salary scale:

Director, $12,100; research specialist, $10,500; assistant director, $10,000; supervisors (7), $9,000 to $9,900; counselors (6) $7,680 to $9,180; residence advisors (14), $7,300; teachers (39 planned), $4,020 to $8,160; chef, $7,500; public relations coordinator, $8,000.

Miss Henry said she had heard some criticism of salaries but does not consider it valid.

"I think it's unfair because of the demands on the time of the staff," she said. "Ask the center director and assistant director how many Saturdays and Sundays and nights they put in here."

One of the highest paid teachers, at $8,160 a year, is a swimming instructor. Assistant Superintendent Joe Mills said this figure was arrived at by taking the regular school salary scale for a person with a bachelor's degree with 11 years experience and adding an extra 2 months' pay for full-time work.

Another employee, listed as both swimming instructor and lifeguard, is paid $6,600 a year. He is listed on one payroll as a "water safety coordinator."

(The Job Corps Center has no swimming pool now, but officials hope to get final clearance to use the pool at the maritime base soon. Meanwhile, Ems said, the swimming instructors are being used to manage general recreational programs.)

Job Corps Center Director Joe Ems had little to do with setting salaries for the jobs and filling them. He estimates about 80 percent of the staff was hired before he was.

Mills, who did most of the hiring, said Ems has an opportunity to make changes in the staff he wants to now, since all school personnel contracts are up for renewal July 1.

The center's current payroll includes 122 people who earn a total of $56,843 a month.

This includes Dr. Charles Crist of St. Petersburg, who receives $1,000 a month as part-time medical director. Mills said Crist was chosen for the job by the Pinellas County Medical Society.

Ems said Crist holds sickcall for about an hour every day, is available for emergencies, attends staff meetings, and gives all new enrollees at the center an "initial health screening."

Detailed medical examination of the girls is turned over to doctors who have private offices reasonably close to the center and who want the business. So far they have charged $15 each, with laboratory bills adding $5 apiece to the total cost.

The payroll figure does not include the $250 a month paid from Job Corps funds to St. Petersburg Attorney Ed Eurville. This payment brings Turville's total compensation from the school board to $12,000 a year, plus $1,200 a year for secretarial help.

Not included in the payroll either are private guards furnished by the Wackenhut Corp. The guards are paid on an hourly basis, and the bill for May came to $586.44.

The Christian-Henry letter exchange shows the difficulty in attempting to pin down responsibility for any particular decision in setting up the Women's Job Corps Center.

Although the Job Corps contract and Christian's letter purport to make the school board responsible for many decisions, local officials frequently say their actions were dictated by OEO officials.

There is, for example, a letter in school board files written by Mills to Milton Fogelman, OEO contracting officer, suggesting spending $25,000 on a documentary film about the center.

"This could be used for future public relations in the Job Corps program, also as a historical document that might be of national value," said Mills in the letter. "It could also be used for recruiting by the Job Corps."

Asked about the letter, Mills said OEO officials suggested he write it.

Ems, who is technically boss of the center, appears to be faced with the unenviable task of serving two masters.

Officially Ems is supposed to report to Mills, but in conversation he refers to Miss Henry as his "superior."

Miss Henry describes herself as a "troubleshooter" but notes that since the Federal Government is putting up 100 percent of the money it can say what the program will be and can specify changes as it continues.

The program has put the school board in somewhat of a financial bind. Although OEO officials urged speed in getting the center open, they have been slow in paying for goods and services purchased by the school board.

On June 2 Phillips sent an "urgent" letter to Washington noting the board spent $154,626 on the project from February 23 to April 30, and would request another $125,000 in a few days. He said this was urgently needed by June 30, the end of the board's fiscal year.

Meanwhile, the school board has been forced to borrow money for other projects.

Phillips said yesterday $154,626 of the money came in the Monday morning's mail. He said the rest of it—$139,628 for the month of May—has not yet been received.

OEO officials were so anxious to get the center open that they gave Pinellas officials a 90-day exemption from certain purchasing requirements and permitted many things not generally allowed in Federal programs.

The Job Corps contract, for example, forbids "cost-plus" subcontracts but $19,000 in electrical wiring was done on a cost plus 10-percent basis.

It was during this "emergency" period that a laundry owned by U.S. Representative William C. Cramer got the Job Corps center's linen rental and laundry business.

Christian contends this was awarded on a bid basis, but a check of the record shows the method used violated all normal bidding procedures.

The "bids" were obtained on different standards, and there was a considerable lag in the time between submission of the first bid and submission of the successful "bid."

The Soft Water Laundry bid is dated February 3, while the letter from Cramer's firm, Home Service Laundry, is dated February 25.

A letter from Darrell R. Blackburn, "logistics supervisor," defending the bid procedure is dated May 3.

Blackburn's letter says he contacted three firms by telephone, including Gulf Coast Laundry.

Gulf Coast and Soft Water submitted rental quotations on an item-by-item basis, while Home Service offered to furnish bed linen for 7 cents a pound.

Blackburn said he found out how many pounds each item weighed, and converted Home Service's bid to the same basis as the other laundries. The way he figured it Home Service came out the low bidder.

Whether Pinellas will continue the Job Corps program after its 18 months contract has expired is uncertain. At present school officials are a bit discouraged.

Recalling how St. Petersburg Mayor Herman Goldner sent the first information about that program to him, Mills last week said:

"It came across my desk and I pursued it. I guess the best thing to have done would be to throw it in the trash can. It hasn't helped our image any."

Christian said he wouldn't go into the program again if he had it to do over. "At the time we couldn't have anticipated some of the problems," he said.

"It has made us real unpopular."

Rumors about the center have been much worse than the facts. One girl arrived at the center 5 months pregnant but—according to Ems—none of the girls has become pregnant since arriving. Rumors had it otherwise.

Of the 229 girls to arrive at the center, only 19 have left. Seventeen girls dropped out voluntarily because of homesickness or dislike of the center's rules, while two were sent home involuntarily for violation of curfew and for drinking, Ems said.

Ems is optimistic about success of the program. "We see a change in the majority of the girls," he said. "The feeling of self-worth is beginning to come about."

Christian is taking a wait-and-see attitude.

"My personal feeling is we should evaluate this thing carefully," he said last week. "If we are hurting someone's business then I think we might well consider discontinuing the program."

But he added: "I don't think we should be too fast to judge something that is in the crawling stage."

Screening Methods Hit

Washington.—Representative Albert H. Quie, Republican, of Minnesota, yesterday criticized the screening procedures used in recruiting girls for the Job Corps Center in St. Petersburg.

He said his recent criticism of the selection process for St. Petersburg apparently had been interpreted as a charge of immorality.

Quie said girls physically and psychologically unfit for the program had been sent to St. Petersburg, which showed that the corps was so unorganized it could not screen out unsuitable recruits.

But Quie said he had made no direct charges of immorality and had no proof of it. He recalled saying, however, that some girls had been sent home for activities "frowned upon."

Joseph Ems, director of the St. Petersburg center, yesterday said he deeply resented innuendoes of immorality.

Mr. Chairman, I have made reference to my request—never even acknowledged by Mr. Shriver—for a list of consultants employed by the Office of Economic Opportunity. I have now obtained such a list, but not through the courtesy of that agency or its Director.

The list of consultants—together with their daily salaries, which you will note range from a paltry $35 to a princely $100 per day—is as follows.

Full-time consultants

CURRENT

Name	Date of appointment	Salary	Organization	Selecting official	Duty station	Home address
Brown, Holmes M	Oct. 12, 1964	$100	Public Affairs	H. Brown	Washington, D.C	65 Mayfair Lane, Greenwich, Conn.
Elwell, Richard R	Nov. 30, 1964	65	do	do	do	3850 Tunlaw Rd. NW., Washington, D.C.
Masters, Peter F	Oct. 26, 1964	60	do	do	do	1425 Floral St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Gross, Ernest	Dec. 7, 1964	60	do	do	do	62 Lansing Dr., Delmar, N.Y.
Moss, Edward K	Apr. 1, 1965	75	do	do	do	1600 Foxhall Rd. NW., Washington, D.C.
Maguire, Francis X	Oct. 26, 1964	50	do	do	do	144-30 Roosevelt Ave., Flushing, N.Y.
Miller, Harry J	Oct. 26, 1964	50	do	do	do	87 Pleasant Way, Penfield, N.Y.
Wright, Dale R	Jan. 5, 1965	60	do	do	do	101 G St. SW., Washington, D.C.
Ellis, Garrison M	Dec. 28, 1964	60	do	do	do	49 Wilton St., Princeton, N.J.
Williams, Joan	Apr. 12, 1965	50	do	do	do	444 East 75th St., New York, N.Y.
VanDoren, Ronald D	Nov. 8, 1964	65	do	do	do	1319 Frazier Pl., Falls Church, Va.
Allott, Patricia A	Dec. 29, 1964	35	do	do	do	1231 33d St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Doherty, James E	Nov. 8, 1964	35	do	do	do	1724 17th St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Hughes, Eleanor P	May 3, 1965	50	do	do	do	1301 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Tait, Pauline W	Apr. 29, 1965	50	do	do	do	3331 Quesada St. NW., Washington D.C.,
Michaels, Anna W	May 3, 1965	50	do	do	do	1212 28th St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Roddy, Robert W	Feb. 15, 1965	60	VISTA	G. Ferguson	do	2303 Xerxes Ave. North, Golden Valley, Minn.
Price, Gary	Oct. 26, 1964	55	VISTA	do	do	40 G St. SW., Washington, D.C.
Weatherford, Willis, Jr	do	70	VISTA	do	do	319 Cedar Lane, Swarthmore, Pa.
Constable, Elinor	do	35	VISTA	do	do	3706 Appleton St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Guskin, Alan E	do	50	VISTA	do	do	1150 12th St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Long, Lewis M. K	Jan. 18, 1965	60	VISTA	do	do	201 Waynewood Blvd., Alexandria, Va.
Carter, Charles A	Dec. 1, 1964	40	VISTA	do	do	238 57th Pl. NE., Washington, D.C.
Hutchison, John G	Oct. 26, 1964	50	VISTA	do	do	7319 Essex Ave., Springfield, Va.
Gerson, Richard I	Oct. 29, 1964	75	VISTA	do	do	3416 Porter St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Higgins, Thaddeus F. X	May 10, 1965	55	VISTA	do	do	5303 St. James Ter., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Blackburn, John J	Oct. 26, 1964	55	VISTA	do	do	463 Dartmouth Rd., Winston-Salem, N.C.
Chong, Charles	Nov. 23, 1964	50	VISTA	do	do	1330 New Hampshire Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C.
Parsons, Arch	May 24, 1965	65	VISTA	do	do	730 South Kingsley Dr., Los Angeles, Calif.
Rantane, Bruno	Feb. 15, 1965	50	VISTA	do	do	8600 16th St., Silver Spring, Md.
Sill, Maurice L	Nov. 17, 1964	70	VISTA	do	do	Valley View Farm, Centerville, Fa.
Baker, Robert N	Dec. 10, 1964	60	Job Corps	O. Singletary	do	7514 Cayuga Ave., Bethesda, Md.
Huntington, Haskins	Dec. 31, 1964	70	do	do	do	4561 LaSalle Ave., Alexandria, Va.
Healy, Edward F	Oct. 26, 1964	90	do	do	do	1310 New Hampshire Ave., Washington, D.C.
Woodward, Anola E	Apr. 21, 1965	40	do	do	do	1535 17th St. NW, Washington, D.C.
Pulakos, Milton	Jan. 4, 1965	50	do	do	do	183 West 87th St., New York, N.Y.
Brashears, Benjamin S	Dec. 17, 1964	45	do	do	do	2612 Naylor Rd. SE, Washington, D.C.
Eigen, Lewis D	Oct. 26, 1964	85	do	do	do	1719 Q St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Troutman, John E	Mar. 25, 1965	70	do	do	do	18801 Muncaster Rd., Derwood, Md.
Gottlieb, David	Oct. 26, 1964	70	do	do	do	Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.
Stellwagon, Walter R	Jan. 3, 1965	70	do	do	do	Do.
Katz, Milton S	Apr. 26, 1965	70	do	do	do	12 Tulip Dr., Great Neck, NY.
Levine, Stanley	May 10, 1965	70	do	do	do	158 South Westgate Ave., Los Angeles, Calif.
Gillis, Jr., James C	Oct. 26, 1964	55	do	do	do	260 Pellings Pond Rd., Lynnfield Center, Mass.
Sexton, Brendon	Nov. 30, 1964	100	CAP	T. Berry	do	Washington Square Village, South, New York.
VandenHeuvel, William	Dec. 3, 1964	100	CAP	do	do	3319 Dumbarton Ave. NW., Washington, D.C.
Bohrson, Ralph G	Apr. 5, 1965	80	CAP	do	do	6771 Miller St., Arvada, Colo.
Ross, Elizabeth H	Nov. 9, 1964	65	CAP	do	do	3255 P St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Rauh, B. Michael	Apr. 26, 1965	60	CAP	do	do	3516 Sterling Ave., Alexandria, Va.
Bass, William H	Dec. 14, 1964	60	CAP	do	do	601 Elm Ave., Takoma Park, Md.
Moore, Robert N	Dec. 8, 1964	60	CAP	do	do	424 Margin St., Franklin, Tenn.
Cotton, Mello	Nov. 23, 1964	55	CAP	do	do	1116 South 15th St., Arlington, Va.
Ben-Ami, David Z	Apr. 25, 1965	50	CAP	do	do	Post Office Box 409, Hattiesburg, Miss.
Drake, Charles H	Nov. 9, 1964	50	CAP	do	do	32 Loerept Ave., Lexington, Mass.
Salett, Stanley J	Oct. 26, 1964	45	CAP	do	do	1764 Church St. NW, Washington, D.C.
Wickland, Roger F	Nov. 3, 1964	65	VISTA	G. Ferguson	do	20610 Pacific Coast Highway, Malibu, Calif.
Johnson, James E	May 5, 1965	60	VISTA	do	do	6902 Piney Branch Rd. NW., Washington, D.C.
Alexander, Alan A	Oct. 26, 1964	50	Management	W. Kelly	do	1605 South 28th St., Arlington, Va.
Paynter, David H	Jan. 18, 1965	90	Job Corps	O. Singletary	do	1285 Carmel Dr., Simi, Calif.
Stuck, Harry W	do	40	do	do	do	Care of Frank Barbar, 8300 Cooper St., Alexandria, Va.
O'Hare, Thomas J	May 17, 1965	50	do	do	do	Box 416, Harvard Rd., Shirley, Mass.
Diener, Charles L	Nov. 29, 1964	40	do	do	do	152 East 19th St., Durango, Colo.
O'Callaghan, Donald N	Nov. 8, 1964	65	do	do	do	1636 Molly Dr., Carson City, Nev.
Keating, Raymond F	Dec. 14, 1964	50	do	do	do	52 William St., Yonkers, N.Y.
Wilkins, William D	Jan. 11, 1965	75	do	do	do	3216 Hill St., San Diego, Calif.
Schima, Marilyn E	Oct. 26, 1964	60	do	do	do	1629 Columbia Rd. NW., Washington, D.C.
Hall, C. Mitchell	Jan. 18, 1965	75	do	do	do	3401 Bangor St. SE., Washington, D.C.
McConnell, William A	Jan. 4, 1965	50	do	do	do	613 Plantation Dr., Savannah, Ga.
Ferlo, Virgil J	Dec. 10, 1964	45	do	do	do	821 West Great Falls St., Falls Church, Va.
Garofalo, Dominic G	Mar. 22, 1965	50	CAP	T. Berry	do	Route 1, Box 482, Proctorville, Ohio.
Palmour, Claire T	May 10, 1965	50	CAP	do	do	1623 Valley Rd. NW, Gainesville, Ga.
Fox, Lester J	Feb. 1, 1965	60	CAP	do	Atlanta, Ga	1315 16th St. NW., Apt 613, Washington, D.C.
Sasaki, Tom T	Jan. 21, 1965	60	CAP	do	New Mexico	1400 Quincy St. NE., Albuquerque, N. Mex.
Stocks, Donald M	Apr. 19, 1965	50	CAP	do	Washington, D.C	800 4th St. SW., Washington, D.C.
Eldred, Philip H	Mar. 22, 1965	45	CAP	do	Yakima, Wash	510 East Chestnut, Apt. 2, Yakima, Wash.
Olivero, Jack J	May 11, 1965	45	CAP	do	Washington, D.C	1200 North Court House Rd., Arlington, Va.
Cosgrove, Thomas J	Nov. 30, 1965	70	CAP	do	do	5349 Broad Branch Rd. NW., Washington, D.C.
Lucas, Jane M	Apr. 28, 1965	40	CAP	do	do	1605 Buchanon St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Fallon, Vincent	Mar. 19, 1965	60	CAP	do	do	1525 Colvin Ave., Kenmore, N.J.
Rainey, Virginia	Mar. 15, 1965	45	CAP	do	do	1913 North Ode St., Arlington, Va.
Richmond, Julius M	Feb. 1, 1965	100	CAP	do	do	50 Ely Dr., Fayettesville, N.Y.
Spickler, Martin W	Feb. 28, 1965	60	CAP	do	do	207 Baden St., Silver Spring, Md.
Balzer, Franc	Apr. 16, 1965	50	CAP	do	do	9407 Siena St., Silver Spring, Md.
Sadow, Sue	Feb. 23, 1965	50	CAP	do	do	123 North Carolina Ave. SE., Washington, D.C.
Lowe, Roger D	Apr. 5, 1965	50	CAP	do	do	7913 Roswell, Falls Church, Va.
Darlington, Alice	Mar. 22, 1965	40	CAP	do	do	1929 Q St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Lewis, Joan D	Apr. 8, 1965	45	CAP	do	do	5404 Mohican Rd., Washington, D.C.
Hunter, Gertrude T	Apr. 12, 1965	50	CAP	do	do	4600 Argyle Ter. NW., Washington, D.C.
Fogg, Betty L	Mar. 1, 1965	50	CAP	do	do	5425 North 20th St., Arlington, Va.
Terris, Shirley D	do	50	CAP	do	do	1855 Shepherd St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Blaylock, Marilyn J	Apr. 5, 1965	45	CAP	do	do	65 Hermann St., San Francisco, Calif.
Aguirre, Humberto	May 3, 1965	45	CAP	do	do	1305 Glenwood St., Austin, Tex.
Heller, Adele R	Mar. 22, 1965	40	CAP	do	do	2912 Wilton Ave., Silver Spring, Md.
Martin, John A., Jr	May 17, 1965	50	CAP	do	San Francisco, Calif.	3020 Deakin St., Berkeley, Calif.
Goodwin, James C	May 24, 1965	50	CAP	do	do	919 Shattuck Ave., Berkeley, Calif.
Hyman, Milton	May 10, 1965	60	CAP	do	Chicago, Ill	5214 South Kenwood Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Williams, Robert E	Apr. 6, 1965	60	CAP	do	do	8006 South Drexel Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Mehlberg, Wallace L	Apr. 21, 1965	60	CAP	do	do	Rural Route 2, Spring Valley, Wis.
Jordan, Vernon E	May 20, 1965	60	CAP	do	Atlanta, Ga	2919 Peek Rd. NW., Atlanta, Ga.
Lesser, Saal D	Apr. 19, 1965	60	CAP	do	New York	291 Garfield Pl., Brooklyn, N.Y.
Nieves, Josephine	do	60	CAP	do	do	148 East 30th St., New York, N.Y.
Hanan, Thomas M	Feb. 23, 1965	35	CAP	do	do	338 Bayview Ave., Douglaston, N.Y.
Stack, Michael J	Mar. 22, 1965	65	CAP	do	Washington, D.C	447 Munson Pl., Falls Church, Va.
Collins, Raymond C	Apr. 26, 1965	50	CAP	do	do	508 Orrin St., Vienna, Va.

Full-time consultants—Continued

CURRENT—Continued

Name	Date of appointment	Salary	Organization	Selecting official	Duty station	Home address
Rhine, Earl R	Apr. 16, 1965	$45	CAP	T. Berry	Washington, D.C.	401 Woodlawn, Mattoun, Ill.
Burns, Robert J	do	50	CAP	do	do	13 Wennerberg Rd, Middleton, Mass.
Oliver, Barbara J	May 24, 1965	50	CAP	do	do	209 West 104th St., New York, N.Y.
Ramirez, Lorenzo	May 23, 1965	45	CAP	do	do	2239 North Waco, Wichita, Kans.
Golatz, Helmut J	Dec. 28, 1964	60	CAP	do	do	722 Storch Rd., State College, Pa.
Stenson, Kiernan F	Apr. 5, 1965	100	CAP	do	do	4337 Colonial Park Dr., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Salten, David G	Apr. 14, 1965	100	CAP	do	do	10 The Esplanade, New Rochelle, N.Y.
Bernstein, Jerome S	Dec. 30, 1964	70	CAP	do	do	12012 Kerwood Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Hymes, James L	Feb. 16, 1965	90	CAP	do	do	1621 Oaklawn Ct., Silver Spring, Md.
Morris, Dudley E	Oct. 26, 1964	40	CAP	do	do	149 Peachtree Circle NE., Atlanta, Ga.
Williams, J. Earl	Jan. 27, 1965	85	CAP	do	do	3204 Mount Vernon Dr., Knoxville, Tenn.
Shovell, William L	Feb. 16, 1965	70	CAP	do	do	466 Johnson Parkway, St. Paul, Minn.
Haddad, William F	Jan. 18, 1965	90	Office of the Director	Shriver	do	1 West 72d St., New York, N.Y.
Walsh, Ira P	Feb. 23, 1965	75	do	do	do	240 Sebastian Dr., Millbrea, Calif.
Yette, Samuel F	Nov. 29, 1965	70	do	do	do	1020 B South Euclid Ave., Dayton, Ohio.
Cahn, Edgar S	Oct. 26, 1964	70	do	do	do	10 3d St. SE, Washington, D.C.
Radler, D. H	May 16, 1965	70	do	do	do	50 South Jenny Lane, Indianapolis, Ind.
Zagorin, Ruth K	Oct. 26, 1964	40	do	do	do	1314 Fiddlers Green, Falls Church, Va.
Clampitt, Robert H	Feb. 5, 1965	70	Inspections	W. Haddad	do	280 9th Ave., New York, N.Y.
Brown, E. Wayles, Jr	Apr. 1, 1965	75	do	do	do	646 Independence Ave. SE., Washington, D.C.
Ximenes, Vincente T	Feb. 26, 1965	70	do	do	do	906 Allison St., Alexandria, Va.
Smilen, Kenneth B	Feb. 9, 1965	60	do	do	do	131 Joralemal St., Brooklyn, N.Y.
Williams, John C	Feb. 19, 1965	55	do	do	do	101 Castlebar Rd., Rochester, N.Y.
Boasberg, Emanuel	Dec. 21, 1964	50	Interagency relations	L. Carter	do	40 7th Ave., San Francisco, Calif.
Keville, Maurice L	Apr. 19, 1965	50	General Council	D. Baker	do	507 West Poplar Rd., Sterling, Va.
Murphy, John G	Mar. 29, 1965	60	do	do	do	5516 Carolina Pl. NW., Washington, D.C.

TERMINATED

Name	Date of appointment	Salary	Organization	Selecting official	Duty station	Home address
Lorenzo, Michael	Apr. 5, 1965	$50	Job Corps	O. Singletary	Washington, D.C.	4026 David Lane, Alexandria, Va.
MacKaye, Milton	Oct. 26, 1964	50	Public Affairs	H. Brown	do	2817 Woodley Rd., NW., Washington, D.C.
Margulies, Stuart S	Jan. 18, 1965	80	Job Corps	O. Singletary	do	435 Riverside Dr., New York, N.Y.
Michaelis, Diana	Nov. 16, 1964	50	Public Affairs	H. Brown	do	3316 Volta Pl., NW., Washington, D.C.
Morris, Daniel	Jan. 21, 1964	65	Job Corps	O. Singletary	do	4910 17th Ave., Brooklyn, N.Y.
Morris, Jonas V	Jan. 4, 1965	50	CAP	T. Berry	do	2206 Tunlaw Rd., NW., Washington, D.C.
Noble, Jeanne L	Oct. 26, 1964	85	Job Corps	O. Singletary	do	4 Washington Square Village, New York, N.Y.
Pansing, David H	Mar. 29, 1965	65	CAP	T. Berry	do	5409 14th Pl., Hyattsville, Md.
Rae, Norman T	Oct. 26, 1964	65	VISTA	G. Ferguson	do	1609 Riggs Pl. NW., Washington, D.C.
Ridder, Marie W	Feb. 15, 1965	50	Public Affairs	H. Brown	do	4509 Crest Lane, McLean, Va.
Sagalyn	Apr. 22, 1965	50	CAP	T. Berry	do	3006 Albemarle St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Shimanovsky, Burton	Oct. 26, 1964	45	Job Corps	O. Singletary	do	1217 Cypress Lane, Elk Grove, Ill.
Siena, James V	Nov. 9, 1964	60	General Counsel	D. Baker	do	901 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
Sanzski, William J	Dec. 9, 1964	50	Public Affairs	H. Brown	do	916 25th St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Wagley, John R	Oct. 26, 1964	50	do	do	do	1509 28th St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Westgate, Robert D	Jan. 4, 1965	50	do	do	do	1816 S St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Wheeler, Billy E	Mar. 29, 1965	70	CAP	T. Berry	do	136 Hicks, St., Brooklyn, N.Y.
Adams, John C	Feb. 15, 1965	70	VISTA	G. Ferguson	do	73 Lamplighter Lane, Sherborn, Mass.
Adler, James N	Dec. 31, 1964	60	Job Corps	O. Singletary	do	601 West 50th St., Kansas City, Mo.
Block, Clifford H	Nov. 23, 1964	45	VISTA	G. Ferguson	do	2823 Gainesville St. SE., Washington, D.C.
Fischer, M. Peter	Dec. 8, 1964	55	CAP	T. Berry	do	1666 Connecticut Ave. NW., Washington, D.C.
George, Thomas R	Dec. 26, 1964	50	Job Corps	O. Singletary	do	3113 Ravensworth Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Gill, Patricia E	Oct. 26, 1964	40	do	do	do	Universal House, 1588 Ansel Rd., Cleveland, Ohio
Gold, William	Dec. 21, 1964	45	Public Affairs	H. Brown	do	2436 North Revere Rd., Akron, Ohio.
Gregary, Willola M	Nov. 4, 1964	40	do	do	do	926 North Mohawk St., Chicago, Ill.
Guskin, Judith T	Oct. 26, 1964	30	VISTA	G. Ferguson	do	1150 12th St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Hall, Paul G	Jan. 18, 1965	50	VISTA	do	do	296 Marlborough St., Boston, Mass.
Harris, John K	Oct. 30, 1964	70	VISTA	do	do	1535 17th St. NW., Apartment 2, Washington, D.C.
Hearle, Edward F	Dec. 21, 1964	80	PPAR	J. Kershaw	do	8113 Layola Blvd., Los Angeles, Calif.
Hubbard, Fred D	May 17, 1965	75	CAP	T. Berry	do	601 East 32d St., Chicago, Ill.
James, Edgar	Nov. 30, 1964	60	VISTA	G. Ferguson	do	5600 Frontier Way, Carmichael, Calif.
Holmes, Samuel	Mar. 29, 1965	50	Public Affairs	H. Brown	do	250 West 14th St., New York, N.Y.
Stone, Fay B	Nov. 30, 1964	60	General Counsel	D. Baker	do	2349 North Early St., Alexandria, Va.
Womack, Joseph D	Oct. 26, 1964	50	Job Corps	O. Singletary	do	4218 47th St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Pachios, Harold C	Nov. 30, 1964	50	VISTA	G. Ferguson	do	2001 North Adams St., Arlington, Va.

Intermittent consultants

CURRENT

Name	Date of appointment	Salary	Organization	Selecting official	Duty station	Home address
Temko, Francine S	Dec. 1, 1964	$75	General Counsel	D. Baker	Washington, D.C.	4811 Dexter Ter. NW., Washington, D.C.
Prentice, Edward S	Apr. 26, 1965	100	Program Planning	J. Kershaw	do	205 Bayberry Dr., Stamford, Conn.
Williams, Walter	do	60	do	do	do	2153 Violet Rd., Lexington, Ky.
Watts, Harold W	do	70	do	do	do	1930 Regent St., Madison, Wis.
Delo, David A	Feb. 1, 1965	70	do	do	do	910 Meadowlark Dr., Laguna Beach, Calif.
Donvito, Pasqual A	Feb. 9, 1965	70	do	do	do	3514 Quesada St., NW., Washington, D.C.
McNeil, Donald R	Apr. 1, 1965	50	VISTA	G. Ferguson	do	4214 Odana Rd., Madison, Wis.
Sonnenfeldt, Marjorie H	Apr. 20, 1965	40	VISTA	do	do	4105 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Porter, Douglas	Oct. 26, 1964	65	Job Corps	O. Singletary	do	37 Arlington St., Cambridge, Mass.
Trautman, Ray L	May 24, 1965	70	do	do	do	Greenville, N.Y.
Geis, Gilbert	Jan. 13, 1965	55	do	do	do	9 Bay State Rd., Boston, Mass.
Cohen, Martin A	Apr. 5, 1965	100	CAP	T. Berry	do	55 Valley View Rd., Great Neck, N.Y.
Walden, David C	Mar. 31, 1965	90	CAP	do	do	1747 Kenneth Way, Pasadena, Calif.
Natkin, Herbert	Apr. 5, 1965	100	CAP	do	do	600 South State St., Syracuse, N.Y.
Clarke, Eunice A	Apr. 12, 1965	100	CAP	do	do	Kay Dr. South, Haddonfield, N.J.
McNiven, Hugh G	Nov. 9, 1964	50	VISTA	G. Ferguson	do	503 Northview Dr., Glenshaw, Pa.
Noble, Lindsley H	Feb. 4, 1965	50	Management	W. Kelly	do	5427 Potomac Ave. NW., Washington, D.C.
Hall, Clifton	Mar. 23, 1965	75	do	do	do	7702 Old Chester Rd., Bethesda, Md.
McAlister, Glendon H	Nov. 29, 1964	40	Job Corps	O. Singletary	do	439 East St., Walpole, Mass.
Hughes, Calvin C	do	40	do	do	do	4210 Northwest 11th Ave., Miami, Fla.
Kauffman, Joseph F	Jan. 4, 1965	90	do	do	do	7717 Beachtree Rd., Bethesda, Md.
Schreiber, Daniel	Jan. 25, 1965	75	do	do	do	3710 Harrison St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Barberis, Sister Francetta	Mar. 11, 1965	75	do	do	do	Webster College, Webster Groves, Mo.
Smiley, Marjorie B	do	70	do	do	do	196 East 75th St., New York, N.Y.
Soldwedel, Bette J	do	70	do	do	do	241 Hudson Ter., Piermont, N.Y.

Intermittent consultants—Continued

CURRENT—Continued

Name	Date of appointment	Salary	Organization	Selecting official	Duty station	Home address
Weaver, Ella H	Apr. 15, 1965	$70	Job Corps	O. Singletary	Washington, D.C	295 Central Park West, New York, N.Y.
Shelden, Miriam A	May 19, 1965	75	do	do	do	706 South Coler St., Urbana, Ill.
Keyser, Stephney J	Apr. 12, 1965	60	do	do	do	4505 17th St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Mansfield, Jack P	Feb. 1, 1965	60	CAP	T. Berry	do	2000 Lakeshore Dr., Chapel Hill, N.C.
McConnell, Beatrice	Feb. 5, 1965	50	CAP	do	do	1350 Ingraham St. NW., Washington, D.C.
McEvers, Charles L	Jan. 17, 1965	45	CAP	do	do	10839 Northeast 84th St., Kirkland, Wash.
Goldberg, J. R	Mar. 12, 1965	100	CAP	do	New York	15 Black Birch Lane, Scarsdale, N.Y.
Rendon, Gabino	Mar. 15, 1965	45	CAP	do	Washington, D.C	2637 Valmont Rd., Boulder, Colo.
Goble, Dorothy Y	Mar. 21, 1965	45	CAP	do	do	14634 Nelson Ct., San Jose, Calif.
McConnelly, Beverly B	Mar. 22, 1965	50	CAP	do	Pullman, Wash	1205 Maple St., Pullman, Wash.
Jager, Oscar	Jan. 11, 1965	70	CAP	do	Washington, D.C	4100 West St. N.W., Washington, D.C.
Henderson, Vivian W	Apr. 22, 1965	50	CAP	do	do	1808 Morena St., Nashville, Tenn.
Stone, P. Joseph	Apr. 26, 1965	100	CAP	do	do	Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y.
Ozer, Ann T	Mar. 25, 1965	40	CAP	do	do	Maple Ridge Rd., Bethesda, Md.
Wegman, Myron E	Mar. 8, 1965	100	CAP	do	do	School of Public Health, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Maggen, Donald P	Mar. 9, 1965	100	CAP	do	do	357 East 57th St., New York, N.Y.
Kolberg, Rosemond M	Feb. 3, 1965	40	CAP	do	do	2211 North Quantico St., Arlington, Va.
Allen, Rebecca B	Feb. 10, 1965	40	CAP	do	do	9901 Connecticut Avenue, Kensington, Md.
Cooke, Robert E	Mar. 28, 1965	100	CAP	do	do	550 North Broadway, Baltimore, Md.
Ornati, Oscar	Feb. 1, 1965	100	CAP	do	do	147 Edgars Lane, Hastings on Hudson, N.Y.
Georges, Thomas W	Apr. 2, 1965	100	CAP	do	do	201 East Gorgas Lane, Philadelphia, Pa.
Reader, George G	Apr. 1, 1965	100	CAP	do	do	155 Stuyvesant Ave., Rye, N.Y.
Roessel, Robert A., Jr	Nov. 9, 1964	70	CAP	do	do	1302 West 10th St., Tempe, Ariz.
Duckrey, Marjorie E	Apr. 5, 1965	60	CAP	do	do	100 East Harvey, St. Philadelphia, Pa.
Rein, Martin	Feb. 15, 1965	60	CAP	do	do	34 West Levering Mill Rd., Bala Cynwyd, Pa.
Silcott, T. George	Jan. 11, 1965	60	CAP	do	do	195 Willoughby Ave., Brooklyn, N.Y.
Smith, Hilda W	do	50	CAP	do	do	13 9th St. N.E., Washington, D.C.
Hicks, Florence J	May 10, 1965	45	CAP	do	do	218 35th St. S.E., Washington, D.C.
Gallen, Elizabeth M	Apr. 16, 1965	60	CAP	do	do	3 South Olean St, Worcester, Mass.
Malmborg, Eleanor D	do	45	CAP	do	do	1900 Upshur St. N.W., Washington, D.C.
Parsons, Thomas S	May 3, 1965	75	CAP	do	do	109 Westwood Dr., Park Forest, Ill.
Bevis, Donald D	Apr. 16, 1965	65	CAP	do	do	5629 16th Ave. South, Minneapolis, Minn.
Brown, Milton A	Apr. 5, 1965	70	CAP	do	do	97 London Dr., Hamden, Conn.
Lazar, Irving	do	85	CAP	do	do	1500 Thayer Ave., Los Angeles, Calif.
Bers, Melvin K	Apr. 16, 1965	60	CAP	do	do	3300 West Union Ave., Englewood, Colo.
Plumer, Stephen B	Apr. 5, 1965	50	CAP	do	do	104 Woodmaney Lane, Fayetteville, N.Y.
Seessel, Thomas V	do	50	CAP	do	do	270 Orange St., New Haven, Conn.
Bennett, George	do	95	CAP	do	do	96 Livingston St., New Haven, Conn.
Scheirbeck Helen M	Dec. 7, 1964	40	CAP	do	do	Post Office Box 1628, Washington, D.C.
McKinley, Francis	Feb. 1, 1965	50	CAP	do	do	344 East Palmcroft Dr., Tempe, Ariz.
Donovan, Ronald	Dec. 28, 1964	50	CAP	do	do	Rural Free Delivery 6, Ithaca, N.Y.
McCollum, John W	May 3, 1965	80	CAP	do	do	1642 Myrtle St. N.W., Washington, D.C.
Dowdy, Richard S	Mar. 1 , 1965	60	CAP	do	do	110 Jordan Dr., Hamden, Conn.
Reiner, Janet S	Feb. 1, 1965	50	CAP	do	do	308 North 37th St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Barr, Sherman	Mar. 17, 1965	55	CAP	do	do	1232 Avenue V, Brooklyn, N.Y.
McAndrew, Jordan L	Jan. 25, 1965	55	CAP	do	do	Advancement School, Winston-Salem, N.C.
Simmons, James E	May 3, 1965	45	CAP	do	do	Post Office Box 121, Hanover, N.H.
Allen, Curtis C	Mar. 28, 1965	75	CAP	do	do	746 Santa Rosa, Berkeley, Calif.
Kreps, Juanita M	Apr. 29, 1965	75	CAP	do	do	Morgan Creek Rd., Chapel Hill, N.C.
Smith, Mildred Beatty	Apr. 14, 1965	55	CAP	do	do	718 East Witherbee St., Flint, Mich.
Ginsberg, Mitchell I	Apr. 25, 1965	85	CAP	do	do	788 Columbus Ave., New York, N.Y.
Straklavsky, Ivan L	May 18, 1965	60	CAP	do	do	4442 Greenwich Parkway NW., Washington, D.C.
Berman, Jack D	Apr. 6, 1965	60	CAP	do	do	673 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
Flowers, Charles V	May 9, 1965	40	CAP	do	Baltimore	6203 Elm Lane Ave., Baltimore, Md.
Keat, James F	do	50	CAP	do	Washington, D.C	1475 Euclid St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Krumlauf, Alfred C	May 20, 1965	40	CAP	do	West Hollywood, Fla.	2249 Southwest 68 Ter., Canton, Ohio.
Witherspoon, Ralph	May 10, 1965	100	CAP	do	Tallahassee, Fla	1708 Giths Dr., Tallahassee, Fla.
Lipsen, Zil E	Apr. 26, 1965	50	CAP	do	Washington, D.C	2005 Columbia Pike, Arlington, Va.
Casey, John J	Apr. 28, 1965	50	CAP	do	New Orleans, La	212 Alonzo St., New Orleans, La.
Bird, Robert S., Jr	May 23, 1965	25	CAP	do	Baltimore, Md	1219 Balton St., Baltimore, Md.
Winters, Bruce M	May 9, 1965	45	CAP	do	do	405 Old Orchard Rd., Baltimore, Md.
Davis, Thomas I	May 23, 1965	65	CAP	do	Selma, N.C	300 North Green St., Selma, N.C.
Clifford, George E	Mar. 15, 1965	50	Inspections	W. Haddad	Washington, D.C	2926 Ranawha St. NW., Washington, D.C.
McKay, Martha C	Feb. 23, 1965	50	do	do	do	406 Westwood Dr., Chapel Hill, N.C.
Lefkowitz, Gary	Feb. 16, 1965	45	do	do	do	868 East 95th St., Brooklyn, N.Y.
Swit, David A	Mar. 9, 1965	60	do	do	do	13012 Valleywood Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Jacobson, Gershon	Feb. 7, 1965	45	do	do	New York	280 Sullivan Pl., Brooklyn, N.Y.
Engle, Robert V	Feb. 18, 1965	60	do	do	Washington, D.C	280 Riverside Dr., New York, N.Y.
Jackson, Bernard H	Feb. 19, 1965	50	do	do	do	33 Macombs Pl., New York, N.Y.
Eldridge, Lawrence	Feb. 12, 1965	60	do	do	do	473 West End Ave., New York, N.Y.
Seaton, David L	Feb. 19, 1965	50	do	do	do	3441 85th St., Jackson Heights, N.Y.
Forrest, Robert A	Feb. 8, 1965	55	do	do	do	7 West 81st St., New York, N.Y.
Nichols, William B	Feb. 25, 1965	75	do	do	do	353 West 45th St., New York, N.Y.
Stupay, Arthur M	Feb. 11, 1965	50	do	do	do	17 North Wickom Dr., Westfield, N.Y.
Egan, Robert J	Mar. 9, 1965	45	do	do	New York	308 East 73d St., New York, N.Y.
Martin, Robert L	Feb. 15, 1965	60	do	do	Washington, D.C	52 King St., New York, N.Y.
Rostopulos, Nicholas P	Apr. 13, 1965	70	do	do	do	2109 Atlantic Ave., Virginia Beach, Va.
Petit, Donald Raphael	Mar. 14, 1965	65	do	do	do	422 Rosario Ave., Coral Gables, Fla.
Berle, Peter A. A	Mar. 2, 1965	45	do	do	do	525 East 86th St., New York, N.Y.
Klein, Elihu B	Feb. 8, 1965	60	do	do	do	7-13 Washington Square North, New York, N.Y.
MacLean, Hugh D	Mar. 24, 1965	40	do	do	do	
Kelly, Thomas V	Mar. 24, 1965	50	do	do	do	404 Constitution Ave. NE., Washington. D.C.
Parker, Joseph Ross, Jr	Mar. 30, 1965	45	do	do	do	
Peasinger, Charles W., Jr	Apr. 7, 1965	65	do	do	do	542 North 72d St., Omaha, Nebr.
Park, Darragh A	Feb. 14, 1965	40	do	do	New York	18 West 86th St., New York, N.Y.
Robins, Leurs	Apr. 2, 1965	60	do	do	Washington, D.C	37 West 12th St., New York N.Y.
Lipsen, Charles P	Apr. 19, 1965	70	do	do	do	6414 Earlham Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Brenner, Clifford J	Apr. 22, 1965	70	do	do	New York	207 Weaver St., Lardmont, N.Y.
Patrick, C. B	Apr. 26, 1965	55	do	do	Glenview, Ill	1642 North Greenwood Ave., Glenview, Ill.
Prial, Frances J	Mar. 27, 1965	45	do	do	Washington, D.C	371 Franklin Pl., San Francisco, Calif.

TERMINATED

Name	Date of appointment	Salary	Organization	Selecting official	Duty station	Home address
Janawitz, Gayle S	Apr. 12, 1965	$60	CAP	T. Berry	Washington, D.C	1357 East 55th Pl., Chicago, Ill.
Jessen, Mariana	Dec. 30, 1965	50	CAP	do	New York, N.Y	319 Avenue C, New York, N.Y.
Kemsley, William G	Feb. 18, 1965	70	CAP	do	Washington, D.C	Post Office Box 66, Weston, Vt.
Lerner, Mandel	Dec. 28, 1964	55	VISTA	G. Ferguson	do	Route 4, Box 464, Edwardsville, Ill.
Levine, Louise L	Jan. 4, 1965	65	VISTA	do	do	1057 Linden St., Valley Stream, Long Island, N.Y.
Mankiewicz, Don M	Mar. 30, 1965	75	Public Affairs	H. Brown	New York, N.Y	20 Split Oak Dr., East Norwich, Long Island, N.Y.

Intermittent consultants—Continued

TERMINATED—Continued

Name	Date of appointment	Salary	Organization	Selecting official	Duty station	Home address
Meadows, Joe P	Nov. 29, 1964	$40	Job Corps	O. Singletary	Washington, D.C	Post Office Box 187, Lavaca, Ark.
Miller, Tom E	Nov. 29, 1964	40	do	do	do	Route No. 2, Box 1, McConnelsville, Ohio.
Moed, Martin G	Dec. 9, 1964	70	CAP	T. Berry	do	44 Disc Lane, Wantagh, Long Island, N.Y.
Mathner, Ira S	Feb. 25, 1965	55	Director	do	do	515 West End Ave., New York, N.Y.
O'Rourke, Edward	Apr. 13, 1965	50	CAP	do	do	3801 Grand Ave., Des Moines, Iowa.
Popich, Michael	Nov. 29, 1964	40	Job Corps	O. Singletary	do	706 Oak St., Anaconda, Mont.
Piven, Frances	Mar. 28, 1965	50	CAP	T. Berry	do	90 La Salle St., New York, N.Y.
Poston, Richard W	Dec. 18, 1964	70	VISTA	G. Ferguson	do	808 Hillcrest Dr., Carbondale, Ill.
Quisenberry, Mary Carr	Apr. 5, 1965	50	Public Affairs	H. Brown	do	4 Peter Cooper Rd., New York, N.Y.
Roberts, Ray Dalton	May 17, 1965	50	CAP	T. Berry	Tennessee	2751 Harrison Pike NE., Chattanooga, Tenn.
Shedd, Charles L	Feb. 23, 1965	70	CAP	do	Washington, D.C	1700 High St., Bowling Green, Ky.
Sheridan, Marion L	Mar. 15, 1965	45	CAP	do	do	527 Holdemar Ave., New Cumberland, Pa.
Wagner, John A	Mar. 24, 1965	50	CAP	do	do	5511 San Pedro, suite 205, San Antonio, Tex.
Weinberg, Joseph L	Jan. 28, 1965	60	CAP	do	do	67 Midland Blvd., Maplewood, N.J.
Weingarten, Kenneth	May 17, 1965	60	CAP	do	New York, N.Y	900 West End Ave., New York, N.Y.
Weinstein, Harry	do	100	CAP	do	San Francisco, Calif.	1600 Divesadero St., San Francisco, Calif.
Witherspoon, Y	Dec. 6, 1964	70	VISTA	G. Ferguson	Washington, D.C	2230 Blaine Ave., Salt Lake, Utah.
Ziegler, Jerome M	Jan. 18, 1965	75	CAP	T. Berry	Chicago, Ill	339 Rosebank Ave., Baltimore, Md.
Brain, George B	Feb. 28, 1965	100	CAP	do	Washington, D.C	1301 Upper Dr., Pullman, Wash.
Briar, Joseph S	May 17, 1965	70	CAP	do	California	855 Colusa Ave., Berkeley, Calif.
Bronfenbrenner, Urie	Feb. 15, 1965	100	CAP	do	Washington, D.C	116 McIntyre Pl., Ithaca, N.Y.
Brueckner, William	May 17, 1965	75	CAP	do	Chicago, Ill	915 Walcott Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Clark, Mamie Phipps	Feb. 15, 1965	100	CAP	do	Washington, D.C	17 Pincrest Dr., Hastings-on-Hudson, N.Y.
Crump, E. Perry	Mar. 8, 1965	100	CAP	do	do	2501 Shreeve Lane, Nashville, Tenn.
Davens, Edward	Mar. 1, 1965	100	CAP	do	do	6141 Barroll Rd., Baltimore, Md.
Ford, Norman C	Nov. 29, 1964	40	Job Corps	O. Singletary	do	No address.
Frankel, Hyman H	May 17, 1965	95	CAP	T. Berry	do	7612 14th St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Gallardo, Lloyd L	do	60	CAP	do	Lafayette, Calif.	771 Solano Dr., Lafayette, Calif.
Grennan, Sister	Mar. 15, 1965	100	CAP	do	Washington, D.C	Webster College, St. Louis, Mo.
Hogreft, Russell W	May 17, 1965	75	CAP	do	Highland Park, Ill	1550 Forest Ave., Highland Park, Ill.
Kneedler, Mary K	Feb. 28, 1965	100	CAP	do	Washington, D.C	Box 1086, Cullowhee, N.C.
Kramer, Ralph M	May 17, 1965	50	CAP	do	Piedmont, Calif	62 York Dr., Piedmont, Calif.
Laurie, Reginald S	Mar. 8, 1965	100	CAP	do	Washington, D.C	4305 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Ockert, Roy A	May 17, 1965	60	CAP	do	do	1909 Bonita Ave., Berkeley, Calif.
Argento, Barry	Nov. 29, 1964	40	Job Corps	O. Singletary	do	17 Tahanto Rd., Worcester, Mass.
Barth, William P	Nov. 9, 1964	50	VISTA	G. Ferguson	do	1604 Brooklyn Ave., Ann Arbor, Mich.
Brooks, Michael	Apr. 22, 1965	60	CAP	T. Berry	do	2806 Butner St., Durham, N.C.
Brophy, Jacqueline	Feb. 1, 1965	50	CAP	do	do	411 West 116th St., New York, N.Y.
Cahn, Jean C	Jan. 25, 1965	75	CAP	do	do	10 3d St. SE., Washington, D.C.
Camponeschi, Philip A	Jan. 11, 1965	60	CAP	do	do	339 Rosebank Ave., Baltimore, Md.
Carle, Doris M	Mar. 17, 1965	100	CAP	do	do	5511 San Pedro Ave., San Antonio, Tex.
Clark, John D. J	May 17, 1965	50	CAP	do	Philadelphia, Pa	1922 North Broad St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Click, James W	Feb. 15, 1965	50	CAP	do	Washington, D.C	Route No. 1, Box 314, Pacific, Mo.
Ehrman, Irma	Nov. 9, 1964	50	Job Corps	O. Singletary	do	1708 Q St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Essers, Hendrix A	Dec. 23, 1964	45	do	do	do	813 Wellington Rd., Baltimore, Md.
Fielder, Marie	May 17, 1965	70	CAP	T. Berry	Berkeley, Calif	774 San Luis Rd., Berkeley, Calif.
Fisher, Bernard C	do	45	CAP	do	New York	905 Park Ave., New York, N.Y.
Foote, James A	Apr. 28, 1965	35	Public Affairs	H. Brown	Washington, D.C	180 East End Ave., New York, N.Y.
Freeman, Howard	Apr. 6, 1965	75	CAP	T. Berry	do	41 Windermere Rd., Auburndale, Mass.
Friedberg, Judith E	Feb. 18, 1965	70	Public Affairs	H. Brown	do	Care of Dr. E. B. Friedberg, 6610 Woodwell St., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Gilbert, Monroe A	Nov. 29, 1964	40	Job Corps	O. Singletary	do	71 Todd Ct., Huntington Station, Long Island, N.Y.
Gordon, Norma J	Mar. 10, 1965	50	Public Affairs	H. Brown	do	1330 New Hampshire Ave., Washington, D.C.
Grumer, Morris	Mar. 16, 1965	60	CAP	T. Berry	Los Angeles, Calif	146 North Anita Ave., Los Angeles, Calif.
Gwilliam, Robert F	Dec. 21, 1964	45	VISTA	G. Ferguson	Washington, D.C	5828 Fontaine Bleu, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Halberstam, Michael	Jan. 10, 1965	100	VISTA	do	do	1514 44th St. NW, Washington, D.C.
Hauck, Arthur A	Apr. 22, 1965	50	VISTA	do	do	1661 Crescent Pl. NW, Washington, D.C.
Herman, Melvin	Jan. 18, 1965	75	CAP	T. Berry	do	93 Edgemont Rd., Scarsdale, N.Y.
Hoehler, Fred, Jr	Nov. 8, 1964	100	CAP	do	do	4571 Ottawa Dr., Okemas, Mich.
Patterson, John N	May 17, 1965	50	CAP	do	do	508 Spring Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.
Perry, Yvonne S	do	50	CAP	do	do	4535 Larchwood Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.
Zigler, Edward	Mar. 8, 1965	100	CAP	do	do	111 Mowry St., North Haven, Conn.

Full-time experts

CURRENT

Name	Date of appointment	Salary	Organization	Selecting official	Duty station	Home address
Macomber, John Z	Mar. 16, 1965	$60	Public Affairs	H. Brown	Washington, D.C	Spring Mount Rd., R.D. No. 1, Box 98, Schwenksville, Pa.
Robinson, Wade M	Oct. 26, 1964	100	Job Corps	O. Singletary	do	2 Waldron Ct., Marblehead, Mass.
Wynne, Edward	Mar. 21, 1965	50	do	do	do	604 3d St. SW., Washington, D.C.
Clay, Ozzie	Mar. 1, 1965	40	do	do	do	4203 East Capitol St. SE., Washington, D.C.
Sanders, Lonnie	do	40	do	do	do	Do.
Marley, Frederick H	June 14, 1965	60	do	do	do	5111 8th Rd. South, Arlington, Va.
Devlin, John R	Oct. 26, 1964	50	do	do	do	63 Dartmouth St., Lynn, Mass.
Moretton, Ernest R	Jan. 4, 1965	50	do	do	do	700 Old Stage Rd., Salinas, Calif.
McDaniel, Linwood	do	50	do	do	do	718 Cypress Ave., San Mateo, Calif.
Spector, Sidney	Mar. 8, 1965	50	Management	W. Kelly	do	325 East Olive St., Long Beach, N.Y.
Wilson, Wilbur	May 13, 1965	65	Job Corps	O. Singletary	do	1400 South Joyce St., Arlington, Va.
Holman, William G	do	65	do	do	do	3326 Reservoir Rd. NW., Washington, D.C.
Donahue, Joseph P	Apr. 19, 1965	45	do	do	do	2409 North Fairfax Dr., Arlington, Va.
Merrill, Keith W	Apr. 9, 1965	60	do	do	do	726 Mosby Woods Dr., Fairfax, Va.
Johnston, Robert W	Mar. 19, 1965	35	do	do	do	2704 South Adams St., apartment 2, Arlington, Va.
Brewer, Harold E	Dec. 1, 1964	100	do	do	do	28 Springdale Rd., New Rochelle, N.Y.
Halse, Marion W	June 7, 1965	50	do	do	do	3419 Barcroft Rd., Baltimore, Md.
Pinesy, Maxwell	May 24, 1965	50	do	do	do	28 Sivale Rd., Norwalk, Conn.
Svenson, E. V	Feb. 23, 1965	80	do	do	do	14312 Robler Pl., Sherman Oaks, Calif.
Flaherty, Thomas F	Mar. 29, 1965	60	do	do	do	4415 Fairfield Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Arndt, William F	do	60	do	do	do	10401 Colesville Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Magovern, Thomas F	Apr. 12, 1965	60	do	do	do	4506 Yuma St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Marlow, John L	Apr. 1, 1965	60	do	do	do	2016 North Adams St., Arlington, Va.
Giordano, Louis W	Apr. 9, 1965	60	do	do	do	3625 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Mermel, John F	Apr. 1, 1965	60	do	do	do	4431 South 34th St., Arlington, Va.

Full-time experts—Continued

CURRENT—Continued

Name	Date of appointment	Salary	Organization	Selecting official	Duty station	Home address
Gering, Henry S	Apr. 12, 1965	$60	Public Affairs	H. Brown	New York, N.Y.	2714 Fort Baker Dr. SE., Washington, D.C.
Wienceke, Karl F	Apr. 1, 1965	60	do	do	do	3761 Benton St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Dean, John	Apr. 8, 1965	50	CAP	T. Berry	do	3307 Miles St., Silver Spring, Md.
McMillan, Eldridge	Mar. 17, 1965	45	CAP	do	Atlanta, Ga	1824 Penelope Rd. SW., Atlanta, Ga.
Wilms, Edward G	Mar. 22, 1965	70	CAP	do	Washington, D.C.	18 South Warren St., Trenton, N.J.
Ellington, Betty	Mar. 17, 1965	50	CAP	do	do	4717 45th St. NE., Seattle, Wash.
Barksdale, Marie C	Feb. 23, 1965	45	CAP	do	do	1712 16th St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Chayes, Kitty Torch	Feb. 8, 1965	50	CAP	do	do	4000 Tunlaw Rd. NW., Washington, D.C.
TERMINATED						
Bell, John P	Mar. 22, 1965	$60	Public Affairs	H. Brown	Washington, D.C.	2011 N St. NW., Washington, D.C.
Gardner, Joseph C	Jan. 4, 1965	50	Job Corps	O. Singletary	do	Post Office Box 469, Elko, Nev.

Mr. Chairman, it is astonishing that this agency requires so many high-priced consultants, all of whom are hired without regard to most of the qualifications which civil service employees must meet. I note that 32 of these approximately 400 consultants are attached to some activity described as "public affairs." You will not find any authorization in the act for "public affairs," so in case you are in any doubt, this is a euphemism for "propaganda."

But we can all be sure of one thing: these consultants were not hired in "public affairs" to supply information to mere Congressmen. If one or two were assigned to that job, I might have been able to get this fascinating list of poverty war beneficiaries directly from OEO.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I plan to vote for the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965, H.R. 8283, but I want to state that I do so with some hesitancy and I confine my support to this particular bill at this particular time.

I am sure that all of us agree with the objectives of this legislation with its purpose of helping the underprivileged of our society and undoubtedly there is agreement that this is a legitimate objective of the Government in the 20th century in a $650 billion economy. It is necessarily true that this program is tentative and experimental and it has experienced some inevitable growing pains as a result of its hasty and broad-scale expansion. For all these reasons we must be tolerant of the program and give it full opportunity to demonstrate its worth and the justification for its continuance. I do not wish to have the charge made that an organization for substantial social improvement was cut off before it had a chance to set its feet firmly on the ground.

At the same time, there are many disquieting questions that are raised by the operation of the economic opportunity program in its present form. Are the agency and its subordinates topheavy in administration? Is there a danger that administrative costs and salaries will take a disproportionate amount of the appropriated funds? Is there a lack of realism in the concept of the educational portions of the program? Is there an absence of responsible public control by officials subject to recall by the people? Are the Job Corps programs ill-suited to the type of applicants who are available and has the dropout rate been exorbitant? Is there a danger of creating a competitive bureaucratic monopoly which will affect the normal growth and contribution of existing public and private agencies? These are persistent and legitimate questions and they will have to be answered in the near future. I shall certainly await developments and further experience with great interest and my support of the program in the future will depend on these answers.

Not the least disturbing to me has been the evidence of the inadequate operation of the agency at the national level. In practically all of the major cities of my district I have had complaints from people charged with local administration of the program. They have found serious difficulty in organizing this effort because of their inability to obtain decisions on fundamental matters from Washington, where authority and control have been concentrated. In addition, I have found that where decisions have been communicated to me and by me, in turn, passed on to local officials who have thereupon relied upon them, these decisions have not been carried out and there has been resultant embarrassment and distress for all concerned. The administrators of the program will not much longer be able to receive indulgence on the ground that the operation is experimental and tentative and working under novel conditions and pressures of a new organization. This confusion, inefficiency and lack of reliability at the national level will have to be eliminated in the immediate future or it clearly will not be possible to entrust this Agency with the enormous sums which we are asked to authorize.

I therefore shall vote for H.R. 8283, but with the reservations I have expressed and with the requirement that the questions I have raised be satisfactorily answered in order to justify my further support.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciated very much the argument of the gentleman from Minnesota, especially his statement to the gentleman from New York about all of the constructive work that had been done by the minority on this legislation. After hearing the gentleman from Minnesota who called this legislation a mess and adding the terminology, "shambles," I was hoping to hear some alternative plan that would really improve the program. But I suspect that these remarks are aimed to defeat the programs and not for the purpose of effecting any cures to the problems of economic deprivation.

I just want to state that this legislation from beginning to end involves the poor. We have some 10 million families in this country that this legislation affects. It affects the parents and it affects their children. The poor are involved from beginning to end in this legislation.

Now with respect to title I. We conducted hearings——

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Not at this point. I will yield later on.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the gentleman that he will be able to see when we reach the amendment stage that what we do offer is an alternative. We are not here just to object. We are going to offer alternatives. Let me tell you what we plan to offer. There will be an opportunity for the local government agency to participate in every community action program and every State agency to participate in every community action program.

Mr. PERKINS. Can the gentleman tell me as the program is now being administered, any program where the local government agency has not participated?

Mr. QUIE. I am speaking about the community action demonstration programs. The ones I recall are Ypsilanti, Syracuse, Boston, and Washington.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BELL. The basic point that the gentleman now in the well is missing, I think is the fact that, true in the local community some of the cities are participating, but the point is that nowhere do the local governmental organizations have any kind of control or any kind of direct authority. That is where the basic difference is between the poverty act and the vocational and eductional programs and the manpower development and retraining act. This is the crux of the matter and this is why we are having our troubles today.

Mr. PERKINS. Now the gentleman from California well realizes there are only a small percentage of the programs under the community actions title that have not gone through local governmental agencies.

Mr. BELL. Do the local governmental agencies have the privilege of disapproving or approving?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield any further at this point.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota if I understand him now to be changing from the position that he has taken in the minority views in the report on this bill, the position that he has so frequently taken in the committee, that the community action program should in fact be controlled by poor people and those people who are directly involved with the object of the program. Is he now taking the position, consistent with that long advocated by the gentleman from California, that all programs must be controlled by local governmental agencies rather than by committees, the majority of whom might be from poor neighborhoods and have no governmental position that they occupy at all.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. I am not changing my position. I am merely saying the people from the governing body ought to have a voice and I still believe the poor people ought to have a dominant voice. The poor people ought to be able to select their own representatives and I still feel this strongly, the only way the program is going to work is that the poor people are involved. But that does not mean that we should throw out any representation by the governing body or the agencies that have normally been working with the poor in the past. I believe in the three-legged stool. I think this ought to be operating, but anything that does not have three legs, I believe, will not function as well.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further at this time.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, this legislation has received thorough consideration by the Committee on Education and Labor. For several sessions the Committee on Education and Labor conducted hearings on legislation to provide programs similar to those in title I. We were never able to enact legislation until last year although we gained an insight into the magnitude of the need. I think we ought to look and see what are some of the fruits and benefits from this legislation and its potential for outstanding success before we undertake to criticize it so severely.

The achievements to date are nothing but encouraging. This program has been well administered. If it had not been well administered the opposition would have come here with some specific evidence of corruption or its failure somewhere. That they cannot do.

Under title I, part A, more than 11,000 young men and women are now enrolled in 50 Job Corps training centers. About 40,000 will be enrolled by the end of this first year of operation, learning job skills and self-confidence which will enable them to take a decent place in our society. That program is alive and flourishing. There is no mess there, Mr. Chairman.

Under the VISTA program, nearly 1,200 VISTA volunteers will be on the job, many of them in the depressed communities in eastern Kentucky, in the next month. This is more than famous Peace Corps was able to field in the same length of time. Is that a mess or is that progress?

The Neighborhood Youth Corps—title I, part B is administered by the Department of Labor—has already provided jobs for upwards of 100,000 high school age youths. Some of these youngsters were out of school and some of them were in school. Others were about to join the ranks of school dropouts. Now they are all learning self-respect and the value of education. Talk to some of these youngsters and ask them if the program is a mess. By the end of summer under the Neighborhood Youth Corps the ranks will total about 265,000. These needy young men and women are doing jobs which are providing some useful service to their communities and at the same time giving the youngsters money, and counseling which will help them to stay in school, or giving them an opportunity to increase their employability and enter the world of employment with a better understanding of themselves and of what is required to get and to hold a permanent job.

I cannot believe that our minority Members would want us to turn our backs on programs which are making such a wonderful contribution in taking these youngsters off the street, and giving meaning and direction to their lives.

I should like to ask the minority how much more money it would cost if we failed to take action of this type, if we let them follow the paths they are now following, if we did not try to do something for these 1 million youngsters, to get them off the streets and to try to give them some training and some education in order that they may assume adult responsibilities and make themselves capable of earning a livelihood?

It is the duty of this Congress, and we would be derelict in that duty if we failed to go forward and reenact this legislation and greatly expand this program.

I say to the gentleman from Minnesota that contrary to his statement the program is not a mess. It is a success, a well-operated program and is working, will work better as it reaches the lives of more and more needy people. All we need is to expand the program and to get more of these youngsters involved and to do more for the elderly people who are in this disadvantaged group.

Project Head Start has been mentioned. This has received one of the most enthusiastic public responses of any peacetime program within my memory. This summer over a half million children of poverty will get preschool training in more than 13,000 centers throughout the country. What is wrong with this program? Where is the bogdown? Where is the mess, when we are doing something to give disadvantaged youngsters an opportunity to come up to the level of advantaged youngsters in the country? This is no mess, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman has asked a series of questions, and has not waited for an answer.

I would like to say that many of us feel the basic objective of Operation Head Start is good. What is wrong with the program is just what the gentleman advises. We should go ahead and do some more of it. We are expanding it far too quickly, I believe. At the beginning of the year there were supposed to be 100,000 young children in Operation Head Start, which was beefed up in the course of a few months to a total of 560,000, a majority of whom are presumably being benefited by this program. What is wrong with the program is that we may well have moved far too quickly in too short a time, and in the pursuit of a good objective we may come up with a serious failure either because we have not included teachers adequately or have paid them far too much for what they provide to these children or for a variety of other reasons. Now, for the gentleman to advocate a blind increase of all the programs without an adequate evaluation is surely heading us for trouble. It is this course that we are trying to provide against.

It is not that we do not appreciate the valuable objectives of certain of these programs which the gentleman has mentioned, but the gentleman suggested one of the reasons or perhaps the major reason why we should be for this antipoverty program is so as to get young people off the streets. Yet, if I am not incorrect, it costs about $5,900 per person in the Job Corps simply to get a young individual off the street. I might suggest that we may well put that amount of money into other programs which would be more effective in training these young people for some useful occupation. This gets them off the street, but it does not solve any of the basic problems they may have when they go back to the streets at the end of their tour of duty.

Mr. PERKINS. I think the gentleman from New Jersey will agree with me that we must give some basic education and training to so many of these youngsters before we can get them into a technical or vocational training school. That is why we are advocating these programs. It is the purpose, of course, to bring them up to that level.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. But we should not have 4-year-olds going to training school, I will say.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I will yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK. I would like to make an observation on the comments just made with reference to this program and its ability to take the young people off the streets and try to train them for useful occupations. I have been privileged to serve on the subcommittee which conducted numerous studies and took various trips and visited these Job Corps centers. I would like to point out one of the outstanding features of these centers is their ability to take these youngsters who are educationally and culturally deprived and give them not only a home environment in this setting but also to provide them with the kind of basic educational training that they need as well as vocational training and technical training. So the objections that the gentleman raised earlier are not based on the actual experience that these youngsters are undergoing now.

I would like to cite also an objective and interesting analysis that was printed in the July 26, 1965, issue of U.S. News & World Report. This is an outstanding article which differentiates the Job Corps program from the CCC program that we are all familiar with from the past. In that CCC program the article notes the main objective was simply to find jobs to keep our young people busy. They make the outstanding observation here by saying that the Job Corps youngsters today are vastly different from that young person who was interested in the CCC because we find that a great many of the young people in the Job Corps are unable to read and write and to find jobs which might be available for this kind of youngster. So I think that the emphasis of the program as contrasted to what you were saying is that it is trying to provide job training and to get them out of the street and into jobs as self-sufficient and productive citizens of the community. I think this is one of the great features of this particular program being conducted in the urban job centers for both men and women.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii, and before I yield to the gentleman from California, let me state that I feel—and I think it is the general consensus—that Sargent Shriver should be complimented for the very meaningful and constructive beginning of this program that has been made.

I think it is generally recognized that Sargent Shriver should be commended for getting the headstart program off the ground as rapidly as has been done and for the progress that has been made, which speaks well of him as a great administrator.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform the gentleman relative to his question concerning the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] that there was a year ago a bill introduced called the Frelinghuysen amendment, which was voted down, but which brought, I think, to a head, some of the problems that you are having today. That is the route from Federal to State to local appropriation in this fashion, giving the local governments a certain amount of control. Herein lies the trouble we are having with the poverty program today, because the Federal Government is going direct to communities and people without touching base, you might say, with local governments, cities, and States, and so on. They should have their local responsibility. All our other programs have been based on this foundation.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from California has said over and over again that the administration is not touching base with local authorities. If he knows anything about the administration of the act he would know that there is a recognition that the local mayors and the local body be represented. Every local body does have a voice itself. So what the gentleman has said is very confusing.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. BELL. They do have representation on the community action programs but they have no authority. That is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman from California well realizes that in practically all of the community action programs that have been approved throughout the country the local leaders, the local city governments, have assumed responsibility and have been represented and there has been very little dissatisfaction.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Let me say to my good friend from California that the difference between us is that I say you have authority when you have a voice and a vote. The gentleman wants to give them a veto. He wants to make them a dictator, and I am against it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the mayor of the city of Los Angeles, as an example, is one who is very much disturbed about the role of the local government. The mayor of the city of San Francisco is another one—both Democrats—who I might say is very much concerned about the role of the local government in these OEO programs. Again, it comes as no surprise—the gentleman from Kentucky may know more about this than I—that no less than 11 municipal mayors I think met with the Vice President of the United States himself on June 7 of this year to express their concern about the lack of any real role for local governments in these programs. I am sure also that the gentleman realizes that the mayors have also formally issued a resolution urging the director of the OEO to provide Federal Government and local government general standards of representation so that they will recognize their local government and assure full participation of duly elected local officials and assure full and adequate participation of the board.

So this, it seems to me, is solid evidence that there is serious trouble here and this effort to brush it under the rug is not going to mean that we will not have more serious problems in the future. It is this that concerns me most deeply about the lack of interest in the problems that the OEO is having, because if we provide them more money without evaluation and without straightening out some of these problems we are going to have more difficulty piled on top of the present ones.

Mr. PERKINS. I will have more to say about community action in a moment. I have just stated that the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity is doing a great job. So far as the neighborhood Youth Corps was concerned, that that program is administered largely by the Department of Labor. The Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz is doing an equally effective job of administration. I have heard no criticism of the Department of Labor.

With reference to part I C, the work-study program, in this summer alone, some 40,000 college students from some 750 colleges will benefit from the college work-study program. The administration of this phase of the antipoverty program is a credit to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Celebrezze, and the colleges and universities participating. This program has already given 75,000 students the means toward their educational end, providing funds for 75,000 youngsters to work their way through college.

Mr. Chairman, 35 States and the District of Columbia are establishing adult basic education programs. About 35,000 men and women who have been sunk in darkness of illiteracy are already emerging in the way of literacy training.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the work-study program and the adult basic education program for all intents and purposes are administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Poverty Director, Sargent Shriver, has coordinated those programs. I have not heard any specific objections to these programs. In fact they just say the program is bogged down, but they do not give any specific indications and their allegations are untrue and their allegations are completely erroneous.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us go to title V, the work experience program which has some 88,000 adults with a total of nearly 250,000 dependents learning new job skills that will lift them from poverty, out of the morass of unemployment. None of these programs indicate a mess or a bogging down. Neither does the fact that to date some 700 grants have been made for community action programs and 11,000 rural loans issued under the Economic Opportunities Act.

Mr. Chairman, community action is at work in 250 cities and towns across America. Approximately $235 million has already been obligated for these programs.

Mr. Chairman, in just 9 months of operation—in just 9 months—over 3 million poor people have been reached directly or indirectly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is in the community action phase of the poverty program that most of the disagreement and controversy has occurred. But this was to be expected. In fact I see it as an indication of progress because it means that communities are being stirred up about their poverty problems. Various elements of the community are coming together to attack the problem and disagreement is inevitable. Far more than merely raising barriers to the program, it can stimulate communities to new ways of attacking poverty and to an exchange of ideas from which a consensus can emerge.

In many cases the various segments are talking to each other, trying to work together for the first time, and they are succeeding. This kind of stimulation is in my view every bit as important as the quantitative results the program has achieved.

What really counts is that broad-based community organizations are being formed and that for the first time the entire community is pulling together, despite disagreement, to worry about the poor and that for the first time Government and private agencies are locked in a special kind of partnership in a common cause, that for the first time the poor have a forum in which they are represented. Do not let any of these minority Members kid you, the poor are represented from the first page in this bill to the last page and their voices are being heard.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MOELLER. I appreciate the remarks made by the gentleman from Kentucky relative to this very, very vital legislation. However, I have not heard much reference to the poverty problem with respect to what is proposed for those living in rural areas.

According to statistics, some 46 percent of the 10 million so-called poor families under the $3,000-per-year income level, live in rural areas.

Now, this is not one of those sporadic things, but it is a chronic situation. People born into these impoverished families tend to live on that kind of level and bring up their children in the same kind of circumstances. So, you get a very vicious cycle.

What is intended in this legislation to put greater emphasis on efforts in behalf of the rural poor and impoverished America?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague and neighbor from Ohio, I share his concern for the farm family, rural home, and farm community.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I have appealed for as much program development for the rural communities as I could possibly get support for. Since I have been in Congress the population has shifted. Although we have as many poor people, impoverished people, in the rural areas today as we have in the metropolitan areas, we only have about 30 percent of the population. Within that 30 percent population are the farmers of my district, and in a few low per capita income counties as many as 75 percent could benefit from this bill. We must get more projects under community actions funded in the rural area. Perhaps the other titles of the act have worked more effectively in the rural areas than the community action programs. But in this particular program, as you well known, you appreciate and I appreciate, as a general rule you have a greater need for engineers, and more technicians on the local level to depelop a program. They have the technical assistance available in the metropolitan areas. That, to my way of thinking, is not the fault of the Director by any means. We must insist that rural America get the appropriate technical assistance to assure sizable and effective community action programs. I have one county where we have a 4-year college, the largest county in my district, and we do not even have a technical assistance grant. But that is not the fault of the Director.

It is the intent of the law, and the act so provides, that rural people shall be given equal consideration to the metropolitan areas and I believe that is what is going to take place.

Mr. MOELLER. Is it correct, as I think we read, that only 5 percent of community action funds get allocated to rural areas? Is that a correct figure?

Mr. PERKINS. I really doubt that the 5-percent figure is correct at this stage of the development of the program. I know the Secretary of Agriculture made mention of that figure early in the year. But under the other titles of this bill, the rural areas have shared equally with the metropolitan areas. I think we should point that out. But improvement, I feel, could be made along the lines I have stated, and I am sure Director Sargent Shriver will work with Secretary Freeman through the Rural Development Community Services and other rural development organizations within the Department of Agriculture to get all the technical assistance possible into the rural areas for the further development of hard-to-reach and isolated farm communities and families.

So much attention has focused on controversies arising out of the community actions section, we need to be reminded of what we are accomplishing. We hear that the program is bogged down. We hear that it is a mess, a shambles, and all the bickering and squabbling about administration would seem to be the quarreling of vultures over a fresh cadaver.

Well, we in Kentucky take another view. We have welcomed the antipoverty program as a harbinger of hope for thousands of our people, and so we have been far more interested in what is being done than in what is being said.

And the achievements to date are nothing but encouraging. For example:

More than 11,000 young men and women are now enrolled in 50 Job Corps training centers. About 40,000 will be enrolled by the end of this first year of operation, learning job skills and self-confidence that will enable them to take a decent place in our society. That program is alive and flourishing. There is no mess there.

Nearly 1,200 VISTA volunteers will be on the job—many of them in the depressed communities of eastern Kentucky—in the next month. And this is more than the famous Peace Corps was able to field in the same length of time.

Is that a mess, or is that progress?

The Neighborhood Youth Corps has already provided jobs for upward of 100,000 high-school-age youths. Some of these youngsters were out of work and out of school; others were about to join the ranks of school dropouts. Now they are all learning self-respect and the value of education.

Ask them if the program is a mess. By the end of summer, their ranks will total about 265,000. These needy young men and women are doing jobs that are providing some useful service to their community and, at the same time, giving the youngsters the money and counseling which will help them to stay in school; or giving them a chance to increase their employability and enter the world of employment with a better understanding of themselves and of what is required to get and hold a permanent job.

I would like to quote from the reports sent by the project directors to the Neighborhood Youth Corps to show just what this program means to the youngsters in it and to the communities where it takes place.

From Wolfe County:

> The students * * * are doing a splendid job * * * what a change has taken place since the work training program became effective in the school. All the students doing clerical work plan on making a career in this field. All these students are doing a good job; their supervisors are well pleased with them. The program has been wonderfully accepted by the public as well as the enrollees. The people realize that the training program is not a handout by the Federal Government, but rather a means by which many needy and deserving students may obtain a high school education. One student said: "I certainly appreciate the opportunity we have here to work under this

> program. I would have been forced to drop out of school in the near future because of sickness in the family."

From Breathitt High School:

> The children are working diligently and earnestly in attempting to learn how to carry on their jobs effectively.

From Martin County:

> The project has certainly been received with enthusiasm by enrollees, school employees, and the public. Many parents have commented favorably on the project and the spirit of the enrollees is reflected in the improved appearances of the schools in which they are working and in the eagerness with which they generally attack their jobs. It is working well and will mean a great deal to the youth of the county. It is expected to prevent many high school dropouts.
>
> Many inquiries are being received from youths who have dropped out of school as to whether they could return to school next year and participate in the program. It is anticipated that there will be a good number of reentrants of dropouts next year especially those under 18.

Comments by enrollees from Letcher County:

> I've never had a chance like this in my life.
>
> This NYC provides a wonderful opportunity to learn to do something.
>
> I can buy some of the school things I need.
>
> Boy, I'm happy in this.

And again from Wolfe County:

> I feel that the reason the public accepted the work training program so well is because they see the students working, see the results from the work, and realize that the students are earning their money. The students have been spending their money wisely. They have been paying debts they owed the school for lunches, books, and other school supplies. They have also been spending some of their money on clothing. Several comments have been made that the overall appearance of the student body has improved.

> BREATHITT COUNTY BOARD
> OF EDUCATION,
> *Jackson, Ky., July 12, 1965.*
>
> Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
> *House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR CARL: Our summer work training program for high school students has been in progress for 4 weeks and it is amazing the willingness and eagerness with which these boys and girls have entered into this program.
>
> Seventy-five students are employed under the program for the summer months. We have had a group painting the classrooms at Breathitt High (and they have done a wonderful job); others have been assigned to the bus mechanic and the girls have been doing miscellaneous chores around the school such as mending textbooks and library titles, cleaning the windows and venetian blinds, and working for our guidance counselor, et cetera.
>
> One of our special projects has been the beautification of our high school campus. The boys are getting some real good and practical experience in not only excavating and readying the ground for sodding, but also in actual laying and placing of sod. They have taken a very personal interest in keeping the campus mowed and the shrubbery trimmed.
>
> We are quite pleased with the success of the program, and every person in charge of a group of these youngsters has been so complimentary of their attitude toward the program. We feel that the assurance and confidence that the program has instilled in these young people is one of the main purposes of the program, and we are looking forward to still greater returns when school starts this fall.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> MARIE R. TURNER,
> *Superintendent, Breathitt County Schools.*

It is obvious from these reports that the Neighborhood Youth Corps is meeting a tremendous need and is meeting it well.

Project Head Start has received one of the most enthusiastic public responses of any peacetime program within memory. This summer, over half a million children of poverty will get preschool training in more than 13,000 centers throughout the country.

Where is the mess here; where is the bog down?

This summer alone, some 40,000 college students from 750 colleges will benefit from the college work-study program—a program that has already given 75,000 students the means toward their educational ends.

Thirty-five States and the District of Columbia are establishing adult basic education programs. About 37,000 men and women who have been sunk in darkness of illiteracy are already emerging, via literacy training.

The work-experience program has some 88,000 adults—with a total of nearly 250,000 dependents—learning new job skills that will lift them from poverty, out of the morass of unemployment.

None of these programs indicate a mess or a bog down.

Neither does the fact that to date, some 700 grants have been made for Community Action programs, and 11,000 rural loans issued, under the Economic Opportunity Act. Community Action is at work in 250 cities and towns across America. Approximately $235 million has already been obligated for these programs.

And all this, and more, in just 9 months of operation. In just 9 months over 3 million poor people have been reached, directly and indirectly. That is quite a gestation period.

Now, it is in the Community Action phase of the poverty program that most of the disagreement and controversy has occurred. But this was to be expected. In fact, I see it as an indication of progress, because it means that communities are being stirred up about their poverty problems. Various elements of the community are coming together to attack the problem, and disagreement is inevitable; far more than merely raising barriers to the program, it can stimulate communities to new ways of attacking poverty, to an exchange of ideas from which a consensus can emerge.

In many cases, the various segments are talking to each other, trying to work together, for the first time. And they are succeeding.

This kind of stimulation is, in my view, every bit as important as the quantitative results the program has achieved. What counts—what really counts—is that broad-based community organizations are being formed, that for the first time, the entire community is pulling together, despite disagreement, to worry about the poor, that for the first time Government and private agencies are locked in a special kind of partnership in a common cause, that for the first time, the poor have a forum in which they are represented, and in which their voice is being heard.

In Kentucky, one example of such pathfinding is a poverty program experiment for children. A grant was made recently to the Kentucky Child Welfare Research Foundation for a demonstration project involving 14 rural early childhood centers in Appalachia. This project is designed to show the feasibility of training low-income people in the development and operation of child care centers. I am told it is progressing quite nicely; but I know that its true significance is not in the number of children it cares for, nor in the number of adults it trains, but in the possibilities it opens up for other areas by serving as an example.

We are finding new ideas born, new energies released, new methods employed across the country.

Old attitudes toward the poor are changing.

Old conceptions about the ways of fighting poverty are being revised.

Old myths about the causes of poverty are dissolving.

And all this is adding up to the glorious possibility that if the process is continued, if we are not discouraged by the carping of critics, if our hearts and minds remain open and our visions unclouded, we shall be able to really do something for the poor in this generation.

Mr. Chairman, the programs authorized by this legislation have only been in operation for a very few months and while the funds authorized by the legislation to implement these programs have been modest in proportion to the size of the problems with which they deal, broad public support and tangible results are beginning to appear.

I was enthusiastic about the prospects for the program when hearings were conducted during the last Congress and when the final legislation took form and was debated in committee and on this House floor. My enthusiasm continues to this hour and stems from the broad approach taken in dealing with several aspects of the total poverty problem and the manner in which the legislation called for participation by all elements of the community in increasing the opportunity of both young and old for work, income, education, training, health services, and the hope for increased participation in the expanding economic and social horizons of our country.

In the mountainous areas of eastern Kentucky where automation in the coal mining industry has produced a devastating toll of unemployment over the past decade, the work experience and training program offered under title V of the act has made a substantial difference in the lives of many unemployed persons and their dependents. H.R. 8283 would not only extend this program but would increase the funds available for it from $150 to $300 million.

Not only is this expansion justified but it is urgently needed in order for the program to be provided for the first time to many communities throughout eastern Kentucky and other portions of the Nation where jobless parents have absolutely no hope for employment and where there exist work projects which could contribute substantially to the betterment of these communities.

In the eastern Kentucky counties where this program is now operating, small communites and groups of families isolated completely by the lack of roads are seeing built public ways over which their children can maintain regular school attendance and the family can particpate more fully in community activities and needs. These are small construction projects that would never be undertaken under any conceivable highway construction program for the area and which at the same time provide the unemployed, not just a subsistence check for his family, but a real opportunity to gain work experience and make a contribution of public improvement to his community.

Title V work experience program of the Economic Opportunities Act of 1964 is one of the most effective instruments devised to combat poverty. The seed for this program was the successful operation of the pilot community work and training programs authorized by the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 to the Social Security Act. Nothing has been done in the public welfare field in recent years which has drawn such positive response from recipients and the public at large. I was delighted to hear recently from Dr. Ellen Winston, U.S. Commissioner of Welfare, that it has been possible to develop this new program so as to meet in full the first year's target of approving work experience and training projects for 88,000 project participants and I wish to take note of this work experience program surpassing our expectations.

Counting the estimated 254,000 dependents of the participants, that means a grand total of approximately 350,000 persons will directly and indirectly benefit from the first year of title V projects. As of today there are about 160 approved projects in 43 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. These projects are serving more than 300 cities, counties, and Indian reservations.

The basic objectives of title V projects are directed toward enabling individuals to be fully supportive as possible of their families. This is accomplished through the development or preservation of good work habits and attitudes, the conservation or improvement of existing work skills, and the development of new skills. Training can profitably cover such needs as basic literacy courses in reading and writing, instruction in simple arithmetic, in the importance of employee cooperation on the job, and the importance of good relations with the employer. Full use is made of the adult basic education program under the Economic Opportunities Act, and advanced courses for improving skills under the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Vocational Education Act.

I feel I know much about the title V program because of what it is accomplishing for the people in 19 counties of my own State of Kentucky: one example offers an impressive result. Out of the 3,500 participants who were assigned to work experience activities in the first project of nine counties—Breathitt, Bell, Floyd, Harlan, Knott, Leslie, Letcher, Perry, and Pike—more than 90 percent are taking adult basic education. This is a remarkable achievement in light of the fact that many of these persons are middle aged and elderly, received scant elementary schooling as children, and must travel long distances to attend classes which are held after working hours.

Work experience and training is accomplishing other fine results in Kentucky, one of which is shared by many other States and localities. In supporting the President's natural beautification program, Kentucky's title V projects include road and stream beautification activities. Beautification is also being carried out as part of work experience and training projects in other States—Rhode Island, Connecticut, Colorado, Arkansas, North Dakota, Louisiana—to name a few. Participants in these beautification activities receive training which increases their employability, so that while we improve the land we advance the man.

While we made substantial progress in the 19 counties in eastern Kentucky for which title V funds have been approved, there is much more to be done. For example, the program is now limited to unemployed fathers and it is desirable to expand the program so as to include unemployed women as well as other needy persons. To do this, as well as to expand title V to other hard-hit counties in eastern Kentucky and other areas of the Nation, additional funds are needed for fiscal year 1966. In view of the successful operation of this program, the House Committee on Education and Labor has recommended an increase in the appropriation authorization from $150 to $300 million for title V.

This is particularly significant because great interest in the title V program throughout the Nation is reflected in the 33 pending project proposals and amendments in Washington which now approximate about $16 million; and by the fact that the cost of about 60 prospective projects being developed in the States and localities—already in the pipeline—to be submitted to Washington within the next few weeks will exceed $42 million.

There are other title V program results and I select a few at random. The Fulton County, Georgia Project Uplift that has been in operation only a short time and which is now providing work experience and training to about 180 needy persons has already resulted in 18 persons, or 10 percent, obtaining private employment. In Madera County, Calif., out of 20 persons in training to operate farm tractors, 2 had promises of jobs before their training was completed. In Rhode Island, 60 men and women out of 124 persons being evaluated and selected for referral to the State's work experience and training program found jobs in the community.

State Administrator of Public Assistance, James H. Reilly, believes "the clearing process itself apparently stimulates people to try to get jobs on their own." Of the 49 in training in March there were 13 persons, or about 26 percent, who went into private employment after title V training.

Such title V program results are undoubtedly being duplicated wherever a work experience and training project is underway, and I do not wish to take time to go over them one by one. Before consuming all of my time I would like to take this occasion to commend the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] for his outstanding leadership in sponsoring this legislation and his diligent efforts to see it projected to accomplish this most worthwhile objective. At the same time, I fully recognize that this legislation would not be possible without the fine support that has been given to it by the members of the Antipoverty Subcommittee and the members of the full committee who have been active in their support. The chairman of the full committee is certainly to be commended for his conduct of the hearings and the task force studies made on the operation of the programs.

Of tremendous importance are projects under title I of the legislation providing opportunities for youth to gain education, training and work experience in three distinct programs—the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the college work-study program and the Job Corps.

Of tremendous importance are the provisions of title I(b) providing for programs of work experience and training for young men and women between the ages of 16 and 21 through participation in State and community efforts—popularly known as the Neighborhood Youth Corps. This part of the antipoverty program is a direct approach to the elimination of one of the causes and one of the remedies to the school dropout problem. In this program, full- or part-time work experience and related training is given young people, with compensation, thus enabling them to stay in or return to school—or in some instances to obtain employment.

By March 31 of this year a total of 167 Neighborhood Youth Corps projects had been announced by the Office of Economic Opportunity and had been submitted to the Governors of the various States for review. These projects were designed to accommodate more than 93,000 enrollees. In presentations to the Subcommittee on the War on Poverty Program it was indicated that in the fiscal year 1966 plans called for an enrollment in the Neighborhood Youth Corps of 265,000 young people including 50,000 summer enrollees in a total of 430 different projects.

This is a particularly meaningful program for the eastern Kentucky area which I am privileged to represent. Neighborhood Youth Corps projects have been approved for Pike, Wolfe, Breathitt, Martin, Letcher, Menifee, Floyd and Knott Counties. Applications for projects in Lee and Johnson Counties are pending. This program could effectively operate in all of the other counties of the 7th Congressional District and I am hopeful that these communities will soon take advantage of this very effective means of enabling needy children to maintain normal school attendance, receive work experience, and for those who have left school to find opportunities in further vocational training or educational pursuits and employment.

The legislation debated today carries with it authorizations of appropriations which will enable the Job Corps to absorb 80,000 enrollees. While this is a modest number considering the national need, it represents an expansion of the program to a level considerably above what the present authorizations permit. In the State of Kentucky there have been 7,371 applicants for this particular program. I am hopeful that the increased authorization will enable the Job Corps program to accept the application of every young person desiring to gain the benefit of this residence work-education-training program.

The authorization provided in H.R. 8283 will enable 300,000 teenagers in 500 communities plus an additional 100,000 during the summer of 1966 to participate in these local work-education-training programs for community and youth betterment.

The provisions of this legislation would enlarge the college work-study program to accommodate approximately 145,000 students in 1,300 colleges. Participating in these programs in Kentucky are approximately 1,889 students in the following 15 institutions: Alice Lloyd College, Bellarmine College, Bera College, Campbellsville College, Cumberland College, Eastern Kentucky State College, Kentucky State College, Lee Junior College, Morehead State College, Murray State College, Pikeville College, Union College, University of Kentucky, Villa Madonna College, and Western Kentucky State College.

While the college work-study program has not received the public attention that has attended some of the other programs authorized by this legislation to my mind, it can produce some of the best long-range benefits. The college work-study program will provide many young people the first hope that they have ever had of being able to pursue courses of college training.

I would also emphasize the importance of the rural loan provisions of the legislation provided in title III.

Finally, I want to call attention to the title II authorizations for community action programs. This is a tremendously important aspect of the total program because of the variety of ways afforded a local community in meeting the peculiar aspects of problems that might exist in such communities. Projects that might be undertaken under the community action program may involve such diverse subjects as remedial reading, literacy instruction, job development, vocational rehabilitation, and health services. It is under this title of the legislation that Project Head Starts are being initiated for preschool children this summer in many poverty-ridden communities throughout the Nation. The appropriate preparation of children from low-income families for their first year of school may have far-reaching effects on the progress that such students will make in their academic work and could well be extremely effective in making sizable reductions of the drop-out rate which is too frequently occasioned by the inability of students to keep up with their class.

Twenty counties of the 23-county district that I am privileged to represent have approved Head Start projects to begin this summer.

I am hopeful that more communities will seize the opportunity afforded by title II to devise programs which will meet their special needs. One important factor of this program is the complete involvement of many local and State agencies in concerted effort to deal with the problems of poverty in a community. This organization involvement concerns not only governmental agencies, but it brings together business, private groups, and associations working together for community development and betterment.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Bell] 15 minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to doubling the financial authorization of this economic opportunity act for two basic reasons.

One reason is an insufficient study has been made of the operation of the economic opportunity act, by our committee.

No. 2—no substantive changes are proposed in H.R. 8283 which would remedy any of the numerous administrative deficiencies that are plaguing this program right now.

Very simply, a businesslike approach has not been taken in approaching this problem. It is neither wise nor businesslike to double our country's financial commitment in a venture that has been initiated for less than 1 year and which has become a lettle more than 50 percent operational—a venture that is entirely novel and which from its very inception raises very many practical questions.

I find it difficult to believe that the Congress of the United States will find such action prudent. Last year I opposed the enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act because I felt at that time we had certain ongoing programs that we could have used and possibly expanded and improved such as the Manpower Development and Retraining Act, the vocational and educational programs, the ARA and many others that we could have used to fight poverty.

These programs combined with the recently passed elementary and secondary education act would accomplish a great deal more with greater efficiency.

Nothing in the few months that have passed since the economic opportunity act became law has led me to alter my viewpoint. As was predicted in the debate last year, great administrative and substantive problems have arisen in the program. Warring factions in most of the metropolitan areas of the country are today fighting for funds and leadership in the programs without an inkling of the direction that Congress envisions for the effort.

It was my hope that these problems would receive close attention in this session of the committee, and I am sorry to say they have not. No records were kept of the hearings, or at least very few records were kept of the hearings of the several task forces in their onsite inspection of the projects. The hearings in Washington paid little attention to other titles and programs, only those under title II.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIBBONS. Would the gentleman tell this committee how many of these field trips the gentleman participated in?

Mr. BELL. I did not happen to participate in any of the field trips. But I can tell the gentleman the field trips I would have participated in kept no records to speak of at all, and the hearings that I might have participated in did not have adequate records of what transpired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for an observation, I think the gentleman from California ever since the first year he came to the Congress knows that we conducted hearings on the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps for 4 continuous years. The gentleman from California [Mr. Bell] was on that subcommittee and assisted in conducting those hearings. That is correct; is it not?

Mr. BELL. The gentleman is talking about last year? Yes, last year I will say we did have hearings on the Job Corps.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. I wonder what good it is to hold hearings on a program before it is in operation? We can have all kinds of hearings before a program is in operation. We had hearings of the ad hoc committee on the war on poverty in order to find out what was going on and not to develop some unknown program. So that was long before the bill passed and was really meaningless.

Mr. BELL. I quite agree with the gentleman. Serious weaknesses and shortcomings in the program were brought out and they are detailed in the minority report; and this bill, H.R. 8283, does nothing to remedy them. Most alarming are the administrative complications that have developed.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, I would just like to ask at this point if you have overlooked that at the very opening of the formal hearings in Washington, at which time, and I can point out that they start on page 1 of the transcript of the formal hearings which runs several hundreds of pages.

The gentleman will find that each one of the four task forces which went about the country inspecting the program made very detailed reports. I rendered the report for the Midwest. The gentleman will note that Mr. AUGUSTUS HAWKINS reported for the Pacific coast task force, in the gentleman's absence, perhaps, but nevertheless it is a part of the formal record. I commend the beginning of the hearings and the formal report starting at page 1.

Mr. BELL. As I said earlier, adequate hearings were not held. There was not a court reporter or any other kind of reporter there to adequately take down the hearings in California for task force inspection. I have talked to Mr. HAWKINS about this, and I believe he will concur that there was not adequate testimony taken down. It was a hit-and-miss type of operation. They found a girl who could take some notes and she took some shorthand notes, and that was it. I have tried to follow it, and it has been difficult even to know what was said.

Unlike any other legislation, this act attempts to create entirely new approaches to combating deprivation while disregarding successful existing experience of other programs and people.

All other education and training programs specifically seek to incorporate the knowledge and guidance of the State and local levels of government in locally oriented programs.

Development of programs and orderly procedures of funding them are carried out with the cooperation of experienced people in the State departments of education and welfare and local boards and councils.

This has been a proven method of administration and it should not be abandoned by this legislation.

Page 13 of the report makes favorable reference to programs in which the Federal Government and local government deal directly—specifically, urban renewal, public housing, manpower development and training, Federal aid to airports, and the "impact education" program.

The statement is made that these programs are "based on the theory that the local level of government and persons closest to the problem understand that problem best."

I could not agree more, but under the present Economic Opportunity Act this theory is not maintained, since the local government is not specifically given a role. All of these programs are part and parcel of the war against poverty and have proven themselves to be successful.

For example, could anybody say that urban renewal, public housing, manpower development and retraining, and "impact education" aid are not wars against poverty? Could anyone say that vocational education is not a war against poverty? Could anyone say that Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools is not a war against poverty? Of course no one could.

I wanted to make a point that was made earlier.

In all of these programs that are successful the local government has had some control. I would suggest to the gentleman from California, who mentioned something about dictatorship, that perhaps he would prefer to substitute a dictatorship from Washington over the local governments, which is what this bill in effect does.

I would point out that none of these programs ever raised the controversy and criticisms as has the Economic Opportunity Act during the first year of its operation.

Clearly, then, there is a difference between the approaches.

The difference is that under the Economic Opportunity Act an entirely new administrative concept has been attempted—a concept that I feel is basically unsound.

The partnership among the Federal, State and local governments is disregarded.

Funds are funneled directly from Washington to the community action groups, which in many cases are not responsible to the community as a whole. In fact, in some cases they are not responsible to anybody but themselves.

It is my hope that we may correct this situation by incorporating specific language into the act giving guidelines to communities and providing definitive roles for local and State governments, private charitable organizations, and the poor themselves.

Such amendments will be proposed, and I emphatically urge serious consideration of them.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman pointed out, quite correctly I think, that the war on poverty is not restricted to this particular effort. On the other hand, he said, in other areas we rely wholly or nearly so on local governments. Will the gentleman agree, in the minimum wage legislation now under consideration, this could be included in the war on poverty?

Mr. BELL. I think the minimum wage possibly could be considered such, although it is not geared to the type of operation that this is particularly tied to. It is not similar to the vocational education or the poverty act. It is a part of a general wage level, which we are all familiar with.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the gentleman will yield further, may I say he is absolutely correct and it is not the same. I am sure the gentleman would not give to every Governor or city council a veto over the minimum wage in his area. Similarly, all of the other various operations he mentioned have to be fitted into their own particular pattern. Here, if he will look at it, when we were talking about dictatorship, he will find that this is the most democratic effort probably ever launched in the war on poverty, because it does include the various elements of the community and includes the private agencies. Therefore, I hope the gentleman will understand we are not eliminating the people he is interested in, the mayors and the city councils, but they are joined together.

Mr. BELL. I think there is a considerable difference between the minimum wage program, the war on poverty program, and the vocational education program, and the manpower development and retraining program. They are entirely different types of programs and should be geared to the local effort. It is my feeling that this particular bill completely bypasses that function. That is why we are having so much administrative trouble. It is because they are not using the local organizations.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the Office of Economic Opportunity has been in existence for only 9 months. Its operations during that period have confirmed apprehensions felt by many of us when we considered this program last year. By and large the antipoverty programs administered by the OEO have been failures. Some of the things done almost surely should not have been done. What has been accomplished could have been achieved more effectively and far less expensively through other means and through existing Federal programs.

The shortcomings of the program are partly Congress failure last year to establish guidelines under which successful projects might have been developed. Last August there was a compulsion to get the so-called war on poverty launched. This created the feeling that a reevaluation could be postponed safely until after the first year's operation. Democrats and Republicans tacitly agreed on the need for such a survey when they set up the OEO for 1 year only. The committee report on this bill, H.R. 8283, points this up very clearly. In the second paragraph of the majority report it is pointed out that a 1-year authorization was adopted as a control technique, developed by the Congress in order to require a close check and reevaluation of this new program.

When the House Committee on Education and Labor opened hearings last March, it seemed possible that the necessary examination and reevaluation of the OEO would take place. Unfortunately, these hopes were soon destroyed. Instead of making a serious effort to improve what is being done, the committee simply ignored most of the serious problems which had already become apparent and have since become increasingly in the news. The hearings accomplished little, and the net result was this bill, simply authorizing even more funds than the administration had asked for.

I would like to point again to the title of the bill. The function of this bill is to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of the programs under the OEO. However, nowhere is any significant improvement in the effectiveness of these programs offered by this bill. Our concern today is the way in which these programs are administered, and not the basic objectives which we seek by them. Without a reevaluation, without this effort to improve their effectiveness, it seems to me the height of folly for us to approve so much money.

In any event, how can we account for this astonishing lapse on the part of the

Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. Chairman? Having served on that committee for 12 years perhaps I know the answer, but I will not give my own views.

In any event, in my own opinion, a new Federal program reaching deep into affairs properly the concern of other Federal agencies and into the jurisdiction of other levels of government should have received the careful scrutiny which is so obviously needed.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, willl the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I have heard several remarks this afternoon criticizing the administrators of this program for a lack of business-like organization, lack of comptrollership, lack of review and analysis. I wonder if the gentleman from New Jersey realizes that the OEO has one of the most sophisticated comptrollership operations and has one of the most highly refined review and analysis procedures of any agency of the Federal Government.

For example, they have one of the top program analysts from the Army Air Force organizing a continuing input-output audit of the entire program. They have one of the top program analysts from the Rand Corp., organizing similar studies on each of the component parts of the program.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further. I might say to the gentleman, if what he tells us is the case, it astonishes me that more constructive suggestions were not made by the committee. The majority report itself says that a more complete investigation was not possible because of very heavy legislative schedules. That was their excuse for not coming up with more constructive suggestions.

Mr. SCHEUER. But, during the committee hearings Mr. Shriver articulated very interestingly their numerous concurrent investigations; the fact that they are investigating and following up every single person who comes in contact with the poverty program, from the Head Start child to the adult illiterate; and that they are going to follow them through their careers and compare them with a comparable "control" of persons not participating in the program, that they will therefore know which of the new tools, techniques, and approaches work—and which prove to be less effective.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from New York knows so much, why has there been such a tremendous dropout rate in the Job Corps?

Mr. SCHEUER. The dropout rate from the Job Corps is now about 15 percent for the first 3 months and about 3.2 percent thereafter. It compares extremely favorably with the dropout rate in our universities of about 50 percent; the dropout rate in our high schools of about 40 percent; the dropout rate in both the Peace Corps and in the CCC camps of a generation ago, both of which were 25 percent.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman's figures are not borne out by the testimony received by his committee. They are not borne out by the Director of the OEO himself, when he testified as to what the dropout rate is. They do not coincide with testimony which I have been able to develop on my own.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman from New York is comparing apples and oranges, if he claims a rate of 15 percent in 3 months for the Job Corps and compares it with 50 percent in the institutions of higher education in the first 3 months. He is talking about the dropout rate in the entire 4 years. The same is true with the dropout rate in the high schools of 40 percent. That is a 4-year dropout rate. We found that the dropout rate at Catoctin is 30 percent. We found out with references to the Job Corps camp in Oklahoma that out of the first 80, 20 of them went back home. They were from the East. The only time we get statistics from a particular camp on which we have a dropout rate, it is much higher.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say that in the Job Corps established in Wellfleet, in the State of Massachusetts, 29 out of an original class of 132 dropped out. Other examples of high dropout rates could be cited.

I would consider this dropout rate in Wellfleet is a very high percentage, no matter what kind of standards one adopts.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I noted in the gentleman's colloquy with the gentleman from New York that the gentleman stated an analyst or expert in analysis from the Air Force was on loan to the Job Corps. I also happen to know that a Maj. June Henry, who is considered by the Air Force to be a logistics expert, has been participating in the debacle which has occurred at the St. Petersburg Job Corps Center.

I am wondering how many Air Force people or other military people are on loan to the Office of Economic Opportunity. I know that they are reimbursed, but the fact still remains that the retirement credit which is a considerable expense of the Department of Defense is being borne by the Department of Defense, which amounts to a subsidy to the Job Corps.

I am also wondering, since we have got a war going on in Vietnam and men are dying and we are going to call up the Reserves and we are going to ask people to come out of civilian life to help fight that war, why we have to use military personnel in the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. SCHEUER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHEUER. The men involved are statistical and program analysts who are civilian employees of the Air Force. They have set up these highly rationalized, refined, and sophisticated analyses of the ongoing programs which will enable us to compare the progress of the recipients of aid all the way from the Head Start program to the adult illiteracy programs with the progress demonstrated by their counterpart control groups not receiving such aid. They are in the process of analyzing each program on its merits on a sophisticated input-output basis with reference to the value received for the dollars spent, with reference to the degree of success the programs enjoyed in motivating, stimulating, and projecting these young people into the mainstream of our society. They also have, interestingly enough, a university research program comparing the effectiveness of all of the OEO programs, taken together, with the $100 billion now being spent on present Federal, State and private welfare programs in an effort to see if there is not some way that the entire mix may be adjusted and rationalized in order to obtain a far better total result in motivating and stimulating this dependent welfare group into self-sufficiency, pride, and independence.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The apologists for what the OEO is doing are content to pat themselves on the back. All I can say is that if so many analysts are making these highly refined and sophisticated analyses of these programs that the programs themselves should be better than they are now.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California mentioned the first girls' Job Corps Center located at St. Petersburg, Fla.

I would like to ask a few questions about that program.

Is it true that the St. Petersburg program has a staff of 122 people, at a monthly salary of over $55,000 to serve a student enrollment of 237 young women?

Does anyone have an answer to that question?

Mr. GIBBONS. If the gentleman will yield, I am sorry but I did not hear the full question.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would suggest that perhaps someone who listened to the question might be able to help answer it better than the gentleman from Florida.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, among other questions about the St. Petersburg Job Corps, is it true that 42 young women have already quit that particular Job Corps center, and that 8 others have been expelled for drinking? Furthermore, is it true, as reported in the newspapers, that the hotel at St. Petersburg, which they are now being asked to vacate, has been rented for an 18-month period for the sum of $225,000?

Is it true also that that figure is $20,000 more than the appraised value of the hotel made only a few years ago?

I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] to answer these questions. The fact that this was not brought out in the testimony before his committee means that we need answers now.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey that we welcome him back to his old committee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman is very kind.

Mr. PERKINS. May I say to the gentleman, assuming they do have all of the personnel referred to for the St. Petersburg Job Corps, and assuming that the dropout rate is as high as the gentleman states it is, and further assuming that the incidents did take place, the gentleman from New Jersey will agree that incidents of that type take place in high schools of the country and in the schools of the country, and that the dropout rate is not excessive. But the point is, we should keep our eye on the polar star in this situation, and that is the good we are doing those remaining in the Job Corps and the amount of money we would spend to keep those people, if they followed the juvenile delinquency path, or the path to continued public welfare, if we did not give them the type of training they are receiving.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman's argument is we do not know where we are, we do not know what the dropout rate is, we do not know how many young girls are drinking, nor how much it costs. He argues that we need not worry about how many are in school or what they are being taught. It is because we refuse to look facts in the face that the program is in trouble. Many mistakes have been made yet we try to brush them under the rug.

This program does not deserve an additional penny. I am informed that the other body has indicated through its majority leader they do not expect to bring this up in the present session. I suggest, therefore, that the proper thing to do is to refer it back to the committee. If the gentleman from Kentucky is not interested in the way the money is being spent and in the way these young people are given far too much freedom, I would hope others would be more serious concerning problems of this kind. This complacency is one of the fundamental problems under this OEO program.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman did not correctly state my position.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Maybe the gentleman did not state his position correctly. Maybe the gentleman would like to correct it.

Mr. PERKINS. We should use all the means at our command to keep these youngsters in the Job Corps and give them the best possible training. But that costs money, that takes money, instructors, and supervisors, and in spite of all of those things we are going to have some of these incidents. We should not judge this program on the basis of an isolated incident. It is my view that we are eliminating to a minimum these incidents, and that the Director is doing everything in his power to keep those incidents at a minimum.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If there is one staff member for every two enrollees, you should have enough staff to lock step with these young women. We should send this back and take a better look at this program before we advocate the establishment of more of these camps throughout the country. I am not saying there is not some substance to some Job Corps, but if we refuse to recognize their weak points, if we refuse to do something about improving those weak points, we have something that we should not authorize at all.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman with pleasure.

Mrs. MINK. I am rather distressed that in evaluating the merits of this program, the gentleman has placed such great emphasis on the number of young women who have dropped out of the first center which was established in St. Petersburg and the number of women who have been caught and expelled for drinking. I think what we do, when we emphasize only the failures of an outstanding program such as this, is to neglect the fact that there are 237 other girls in the center who are getting great benefit out of this program through the instruction and through the experience of home living and training which they are receiving. I think it is regrettable that not all of the young women who are permitted to take part in a program like this can be successful. But I think it is obvious that the very reason a program such as this has to exist is the fact that these young women and young men from urban centers are coming from environments of deprivation and environments where they have had no one to care for them and give them the kind of motivation that one needs in order to succeed in life. Therefore, because we are drawing from these very segments of our community, these young people to be enrollees in the center, I think we must expect a certain number of them will not be successful in these centers. We are not going to be able to be 100 percent successful. Of course, it does not diminish the value of these programs because there are some individuals who may fail to accomplish their goals.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let me say to the gentlewoman, I appreciate very much her eloquent statement. In dealing with these problems of young people, I do not mean by stressing the negative that there is no good involved in any part of it. Of course, there is good. What we are saying is that we must not overlook, we must not shove under the rug, the fact that there are problems. If we can put our finger on those problems and if we can do something to remedy the situation, we will do more good for the young people who may hereafter come under the program.

This is what disturbs me—the fact that we are going full steam ahead, we are going to beef up these programs even more without taking the kind of look that is so necessary. Our refusal to take such a look is going to lead to more trouble and not less trouble.

I might say also, and I could cite many more facts if time permitted, this is not an isolated case, unfortunately. The dropout rate in a great many areas is substantial. The problems faced both with respect to discipline and with summary firings from enrollment in the Job Corps have also been substantial. The fact is that the testimony before the Committee on Education and Labor hardly touched on this. This is unfortunate, especially as the chairman at least indicated there were serious problems in connection with the administration of OEO which needed immediate attention.

I might point out that Mr. Shriver, the director of the so-called war on poverty, admitted recently that his office is still in the learning and experimental phases of the war on poverty. Of course, no one is likely to argue with Mr. Shriver on that point, that his programs are experimental or that more needs to be learned about them and from them.

The war on poverty has a laudable goal but its promises are mocked by its methods. We must realize the lives of people are at stake here. We should not start a revolution of ambitions without the means or ability to fulfill expectations without adequate knowledge and evaluation of existing programs. Why should we make available such large sums now? If appropriations are made available to meet fully the demands of the OEO, it will more than double the funds actually available for the fiscal year 1965. In addition, substantial funds from the year 1965 will be carried over for use next year.

My point, Mr. Chairman, is that such force feeding in a new and admittedly experimental program is unwise. Is it not the path of wisdom first to evaluate the various programs and then to proceed on a modest basis which can stand scrutiny?

How else can we justify to the taxpayers this spending of their money? How else can we avoid sinking deeper into the chaos and controversy which already surrounds the OEO?

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. I should like to ask my colleague if he is not satisfied with the fact that this is a modest program and that the results are constantly being researched and scrutinized? Is my colleague not satisfied with the modest dimensions of a program which is funded to reach only about 3 percent of the poverty stricken people in this country in its first full year of operations?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would say to the gentleman that I am not a bit satisfied, or I would not have said what I said. I am not satisfied either about the way the program is going or its scope. We need to take a look now at these programs.

I am disturbed, furthermore, about a disturbing rumor now circulating that if this bill should be approved, the money sought by the OEO would be obtained by bypassing the House Committee on Appropriations? Should this in fact occur, the normal inquiry made by that knowledgeable committee would be omitted. Such a development, in my opinion, would be most unwise. The Appropriations Committee has a major job to do. Spending involved in these antipoverty programs is considerable; many of the programs being financed are controversial, and the increased rate of spending suggests ever-increasing demands on the Federal Treasury.

The lack of success of the antipoverty programs cannot be blamed wholly on Congress. Those responsible for the almost incredibly bad management of the Washington Office cannot escape criticism. Although the formal hearings unfortunately bear this out only indirectly, there is substantial evidence to prove that funds are being distributed in the most haphazard manner, and that extensive commitments are being made with little or no foresight.

Mr. Shriver, in recent testimony before a subcommittee of the other body, was frank in his admission that his antipoverty war in years to come will "surely" expand to "several times" its present size. What a prospect. If spending increases as quickly as this present request would indicate, Congress surely created a monster last year when it established the OEO. At the very least, in my opinion, we should carefully and immediately evaluate the effectiveness of these many programs and seek to improve their administration.

This, however, has not even been attempted, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Shriver himself admits that there have already been some failures in the antipoverty program, but he tries to minimize them by asserting that "in most cases" the failures have been corrected. What are the admitted failures, Mr. Chairman, and why were they permitted? What failures have still not been corrected, and how much are we spending for these failures? And why are we even considering expanding our spending so drastically before we learn from these "experiments"?

The truth is that the poverty program is in trouble. The facade, so carefully polished by Czar Shriver's public relations men at the OEO, reveals deep faults and ever-widening flaws. Had the Education and Labor Committee probed more deeply than it did, it might have discovered why there has been so much trouble, and it might have recommended changes to improve the program. As it developed, however, this was not done.

During just five brief sessions of hearings, in an attempt to fill the gap in the legislative process, the Republican Task Force on Economic Opportunity undertook a further inquiry. It learned that almost every one of the many parts of the so-called war on poverty is paralyzed by a serious lack of information about the various programs and a complete breakdown in communications between the innumerable agencies supposed to be participating. The only coordination which the OEO seems capable of handling is that of advertising itself and Sargent Shriver.

It is indeed a new low, even for the OEO, when the Federal Government sponsors a rock-and-roll program in prime evening TV time to ask teenagers precisely what it is that the OEO should be doing. Actually, Mr. Shriver's office is trying to do far too much far too quickly with the taxpayers' money, with too little thought of the consequences. What of programs such as "Upward Bound," "New Chance," "Books for Appalachia"? These are just a few of the many special programs for which money is being expended but about which no information is available. Instead of all this experimentation, why not try doing a few of those things well.

Financially speaking, the two largest programs under the ever-spreading OEO umbrella are the community action programs under title II of the act and the Job Corps under title I. In reference to the former, our task force hearings brought out a number of very basic difficulties. We, the Republicans of Congress, invited the administration to reason together with us to resolve these problems, but our invitation is unheeded. Instead, we are asked to rubberstamp a seriously defective bill—more than doubling OEO funds will not repair the flaws in the program. Indeed, increased spending without serious evaluation of what the spending is for will simply compound the problems.

The community action program, which involves about $240 million in taxpayers' money, is supposed to be allocated among the States on the basis of a three-factor formula. According to the act, 20 percent of the appropriation can be "allotted among the States as the Director shall determine." The remainder shall be distributed in the following manner: One-third will be "an amount which bears the same ratio as the number of assistance recipients in such State bears to the total number of public assistance recipients in all the States." A second one-third of the amount is based on the annual average number of persons unemployed in the State, relative to the national average. The final one-third is related to the number of children under 18 living in families with incomes of less than $1,000.

Yet, as of the end of April, in the actual distribution of community action funds the formula worked out by Congress was ignored, and the OEO has doled out the money quite unevenly. The allotment for the District of Columbia, for example, is almost twice as large as its allowance, while Montana has received no OEO community action money.

In considering H.R. 8283, the Congress should remember that the Director of OEO has the power to allot these funds as he sees fit—there is no assurance that a State will actually receive even a dollar of its authorization. Since the District of Columbia had already received almost twice its authorized estimate by the end of March, Congress should consider establishing a safeguard for the proper distribution of these funds: For example, no State shall receive more than its authorized share until all States have received at least 50 percent of their estimate.

The name, community action, is a serious misnomer—as being administered, these programs could be more appropriately described by some term involving the names pork-barrel or boondoggle. In 1965, 170 of the programs approved by the OEO were for planning and 240 for action. The strategy for 1966 is to have 300 planning grants and 300 for action. Of course, we should not embark on so many untested programs without adequate preparation. In particular, Congress should really specify whether the programs of the type described by Mayor Walsh of Syracuse as "dangerous social experimentation" are what we want. However, may I ask, Mr. Chairman, could we not use one of these 470 "planning" plans as a basis for action? Are we really so unsure of whether what we are doing is at all worthwhile?

Newspapers all over the country have been carrying stories about the political bickering associated with the title II program. Who does have the authority and the responsibility under the community action programs? According to the hearings on H.R. 8283, the "three-legged stool pattern" should be followed: The local government, private nonprofit corporations, that is existing private welfare agencies, and the resident poor are all somehow to get involved in both policy and administration. However, the three-legged stool almost never has all three of its legs and more often than not at least one of its legs is crooked. What seems to be occurring far too often is serious wrangling over "who owns the poor."

There can be no doubt that great difficulties have been encountered in getting any of the legs to stand up under the pressure of Federal bureaucracy. The U.S. Conference of Mayors, which "gave strong and full support to the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964" felt obliged to adopt a resolution at its 1965 meeting in early June in effect censuring the administration of the war on poverty. Quoting from the resolution, the mayors felt that "it is becoming clear that Federal administration policy is failing to recognize the legal and moral responsibilities of local officials who are accountable to the taxpayers for expenditure of local public funds."

Furthermore, the mayors took issue with the OEO workbook which implied that the goals of the program can only be achieved "by fostering class struggle." The resolution urged the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity "to provide effective and workable general standards of representation" so that they will "recognize the integrity of local government," "assure full participation of duly elected local officials," and "assure full and adequate participation of the poor."

This lack of sympathy, and indeed hostility, on the part of the Nation's mayors is no small problem, Mr. Chairman. For example, the Democratic mayor of Los Angeles, Samuel Yorty, has been deeply concerned, as has the Democratic mayor of San Francisco, Jack Shelley. We all know that a group of 11 influential mayors visited the Vice President himself on June 7 to express their concern.

The second major program, involving a 1965 fiscal year appropriation of $183 million, is that of Job Corps centers. While I have always had a healthy interest in conservation of our natural resources, these centers seem to invite problems.

In the first place, the location of many of the job centers in faraway reservations creates problems. We may be witnessing the birth of "wildcat welfare"—the location of retraining centers in spots where wildcats would fear to tread. But the relative isolation of these centers is not the only problem. Testimony given to our task force by Congressman MAY, of Washington, brought out truly shocking disregard for local attitudes and conditions.

In Mrs. MAY's district, two Job Corps centers were proposed—one near White Swan, Wash., and the other in the vicinity of Ephrata or Moses Lake, Wash. In the first case, a community of approximately 200 inhabitants received its first notification of a camp about the same size either by watching the building of the center which was surrounded by a "great deal of secrecy" or by hearing about "this community asset" from a highhanded bureaucratic announcement. In the second case, the city of Ephrata had "actively sought the center" and an announcement of such a center was made. "Within a matter of hours," Congresswoman MAY stated, "the announcement was withdrawn insofar as exact location is concerned." Furthermore, Mrs. MAY says:

> No one in the Office of Economic Opportunity has ever explained to me why the announcement was made for Ephrata in the first place and, as a matter of fact, they won't even admit that it was announced for Ephrata even though I have a copy of the announcement in my possession.

Mrs. MAY concluded:

> This, Mr. Chairman, strikes me as a prime example of the right bureaucratic hand not knowing what the left bureaucratic hand is doing.

I heartily concur in Mrs. MAY's observation—this is not an isolated incident.

Recent newspaper accounts of conditions at many Job Corps centers have focused on the lack of discipline and an extraordinarily high dropout rate. The rioting at the Tongue Point Job Corps Center in Oregon forced Gov. Mark Hatfield to send in "more security forces." The first camp in California, in Lewiston, produced a "long list of complaints" from local citizens—including a knifing, "a wild shooting," and "charges by merchants that adult corpsmen were buying liquor and providing it to camp minors." In St. Petersburg, Fla., the county school board voted unanimously to end the center, because of "complaints of residents living in the vicinity of the center."

Problems in the areas of recruitment and expensive dropout rates have been equally serious. A number of Washington Post articles, which could well be expected to be favorable to the program, have documented these problems. The Job Corps Center at Catoctin, Md., has a dropout rate in excess of 30 percent, according to a story in the June 14 issue of the Washington Post. According to other newspaper accounts—unfortunately—the OEO refuses to release exact data to the Congress—a dropout rate of this size is about average. In his testimony of June 28 before the Senate Select Subcommittee on Poverty, part-time poverty czar Shriver claimed the dropout rate was only about 4 percent. For some strange reason a youth is not considered a Job Corps member until he has had a month in the corps. By extending this statistical sleight-of-mouth, Mr. Shriver could, of course, get down to a zero dropout rate.

Despite all the public relations gyrations and despite all the wheeling and dealing, recruitment for both the Job Corps and VISTA remains a dismal failure. Despite directors who earn $25,000 and above and Operation Head Start nursery school aids who get $9 an hour, strategy is sadly absent from the war on poverty. Instead of wheeling this way, dealing that way, and throwing a little pork to everyone down the line, would it not be better to make an honest and thorough evaluation of all these programs now?

The administration is saying in effect: "We have the Congress so well in hand that what we actually do does not matter. After all, our large majority will always get the votes—even if an arm or two must be bent." We cannot permit this attitude to persist. The country expects some independence from the legislative branch.

We in Congress should put the rubber stamp back in the drawer and reach for a pen—to write legislation that is clear, that defines precisely the limits of OEO authority, that gives local officials rights and responsibilities, and that improves economic opportunities for everyone.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, less than a year ago, this Nation began the battle in the war on poverty. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, a grand achievement of the 88th Congress, boldly declared it "the policy of the United States to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty in this Nation."

Who could have imagined the swift mustering of teachers, technicians, nurses, and countless other talented persons to wage the first battle against deprivation? Or who could have predicted the unprecedented response of boys and girls who hungered for an opportunity to acquire skills and a new chance for a successful and productive life? For there have been 250,000 applicants for the Job Corps alone. Letters and cards have poured into the Office of Economic Opportunity.

As the noted economist Leon Keyserling says, "the war against poverty is eliciting the broadest national response, and this consensus is both a tribute to the President and the people, and an inestimable asset if properly used."

This quick response has enabled the Office of Economic Opportunity to advance rapidly. It has made 500 grants in 50 States affecting 4 million persons under the community action program. Two hundred thousand youth are enrolled in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The Job Corps is training 13,000 boys and girls for useful roles in a complex society.

But President Johnson has set before the Nation the goal of "total victory" in this great war. We have really only begun to fight.

Winston Churchill once said, in pleading for the lend-lease program, "Give us the tools and we shall do the job." The Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965 should provide more tools "to do the job." These amendments must be approved if we are to continue to eliminate the paradox of poverty amidst affluence.

For although we have begun, there is much more we can do. First, by means of the amendments we can increase the Federal effort in this program to $1.895 billion. We on the committee felt strongly that the war on poverty must be supported in a manner consistent with the high national purpose that it represents and the pressing need that exists.

Second, the amendments insure the success of the important work-training and work-study programs by extending 90 percent Federal financing through 1967. Localities need time to evaluate and plan these programs. To reduce the Federal share at an early date would inflict undue hardship on many communities interested in these programs. Certainly these programs are vital. All of our youth must be given the opportunity to obtain the best training and the best education.

Third, section 10 of this bill makes the important addition of allocating money to train teachers for instruction in the adult basic education programs. No aspect of the poverty program is more important. My own State of Pennsylvania had 630,417 persons in 1960 with less than 6 grades of school. We must not lose the battle on the education front.

Fourth, this bill eliminates the absolute veto power of the Governors, which is without precedent in similar Federal programs. Some opponents of the amendments argue that this makes the Director a "poverty czar." This is the usual argument directed against any effective Federal administration of a program. It is often used by the very persons who criticize the Federal Government for lack of checks and controls in a program. We must give the Director authority to exercise his judgments. He must be allowed to uphold Federal standards. This is a necessary amendment.

Fifth, H.R. 8283 will add a needed provision for the benefit of rural farm families. It provides that "Workers in farm families with less than $1,200 net family income shall be considered unemployed" and, therefore, eligible for training assistance. Workers in families with such a limited cash income certainly should be considered unemployed for the purposes of this program, since their farm work provides so little return.

Sixth, this bill opens up the avenues of service for VISTA volunteers—"the arms and legs of the antipoverty program." Our committee found too many arbitrary restrictions as to where these volunteers might serve. For example, with Indians living on reservations but not with Indians living as a distinct community off the reservation, in federally assisted mental hospitals but not in other hospitals where great need exists. The amendment allows volunteers to work in any program "eligible for assistance under this act."

These are a few highlights of the amendments to "expand the war on poverty." Whether we succeed or not depends on the willingness of the Congress to meet the hopes of countless youth and men and women who want a chance to learn a skill, to get an education, to see a new horizon, to be a better citizen, a better American.

Let us meet their expectation by providing the tools and necessary support for "total victory" in the war on poverty.

Mr. Chairman, less than a year ago we started out on this program. This Nation began the battle at that time in the war on poverty, the first time in organized history that any nation started out with the intended purpose and goal of eliminating from its midst, poverty.

It has been said that unless you have tasted the pangs of hunger, you can never really evaluate a thick, juicy steak. So it is with poverty in the general course of living in a community in which there is both poverty and affluence.

I have often heard it said that a man who complains a great deal about having a sore hand seems to get over that pain immediately when he meets a man who has no arm. So it is in this war on poverty.

While we are all talking about this program, we find that even the opposition, while still trying to stay in bed with the poverty program's award of contracts is trying to tumble out of bed when it comes to sleeping with the responsibility for the act itself.

I come here this afternoon to praise Caesar and not to bury him, but it appears to me that the opposition comes to praise Caesar and to bury him. While they condemn the job being done by Mr. Shriver, they say he is a wonderful man and a very good administrator. He cannot be both. Either he is a bad administrator and a bad head of this department and his program is bad, or he is good all the way through.

Certainly, there are some bad situations. We see those everywhere in every area of public life.

We have heard talk about St. Petersburg, and some have talked about eight girls being dropped out. Why, those girls were dropouts to begin with. We took them out of poor poverty-stricken areas and homes and tried to make something out of them that they could not achieve in the regular course of their living in the communities in which they lived.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. Would the gentleman not ascribe some importance to the fact that these youngsters who come into the Job Corps are the many-time failures and rejects of American life; that 30 percent are rejectees from the armed services; that 40 percent come from families on welfare; that 50 percent come from families in which both parents have less than eighth grade educations; that two-thirds come from families in which the primary wage earner is unemployed; that two-thirds have parents totally unskilled; that two-thirds come from families which are what the sociologists call multiproblem deprived families? Is this not all a part of the problem we must consider—that these are not "cosmetic kids," these kids do not resemble the attractive, freckled face youngster down the block, these are not graduates of Hotchkiss, Choate, Andover, or Exeter, but youngsters whom society has failed.

The fact that we have a 3 percent dropout rate after the first 30 days of the program as compared to the 50 percent college dropout rate across the country and the 40 percent high school dropout rate and the 25 percent Peace Corps and Civilian Conservation Corps dropout rate is somewhat of a minor miracle in administration.

Mr. DENT. I agree with the gentleman from New York, and I might say that I was going to draw the parallel between these kids being dropped out for misbehavior, as one said. One said that eight of them drank and others were chased by boys. Now, maybe that is unusual in Florida, but it is not unusual where I come from. They said they were dropped out or expelled from school. Has anybody suggested that we close the Air Force Academy when the cream of the crop of American youth, which were sent there on recommendation of the Members of Congress, were expelled? And what about the Naval Academy and the Army Academy? They have all had their little cheating scandals that have come to light. Did we say close them? And how much money are we spending on each one of these kids that we are sending to the military academies?

We are talking about the cost per person. They used as an illustration $55,000 was spent for 267 kids starting out in the St. Petersburg project. In my State of Pennsylvania the State pays $190 per person for anyone they will take in, or any elderly people, for nothing but custodial care. They do not have to teach them anything or give them anything, but they just prepare some food for them and give them a good, clean bed to sleep in, and that costs $190. You are complaining about kids picked up out of poverty where we are trying to give them something decent to look at and decent to live in. They are talking about the plush apartments that they live in and talk about this plush hotel and all of this that is too plush for them. After the kind of buildings we build for ourselves, can we stand here and condemn kids who are going to have, for once in their lives, a sofa with a soft seat on it? The first one in their lives?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. First, I wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] for making such an eloquent statement. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania will agree that when the minority commences to quibble about these minor points and enumerates such minor evidences of misconduct, that is the best evidence we have that the program is operating successfully. I refer to the Job Corps program. The gentleman, I am sure, will further agree that we must give training and basic education to these disadvantaged youngsters because they are not qualified to enter into any vocational schools or training centers. Am I correct in that?

Mr. DENT. You are not only correct, but the history of the St. Petersburg project alone is an illustration of the very reasons why this legislation was passed. Out of 247 kids in that particular project, only 2 out of the entire group had a 12th grade reading education. Now, are we trying to kid ourselves? These are not the cream of the crop. They are the cream of poverty that we are picking out and trying to make something of and put them on an equal footing with the better off and more fortunate citizens in the community. We are not gilding any lilies here. We just hope when we get through that they look like gilded lilies instead of a forgotten and wilted rose.

Mr. COLLIER. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLLIER. I gather from what the gentleman from Pennsylvania said that there was apparently someone in favor of closing these camps because of what is an obvious problem.

Mr. DENT. That is right.

Mr. COLLIER. I have been listening to the debate all day, and I never heard anyone on the floor suggest closing them any more than they suggested closing the Air Force Academy because of the unfortunate incident which occurred there. I would still like to know whether anyone suggested closing these places.

Mr. DENT. I might answer the gentleman very quickly and say that if you kill a program and you are opposed to it, will that close them or not?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, but nobody has suggested killing the whole program.

Mr. DENT. Are they going to pick out the ones they condemn? The reason why they say they are opposed to them and want to close them is because of the failure of the project. If you oppose a project and want to kill it, you certainly close it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have one observation I want to make. I want to make sure I get into the political aspects of this because I understand there is some hue and cry on the other side that there is politics in this.

I was foolish enough to step into that arena not too long ago when it was reported that the Governor of Pennsylvania who, incidentally, is a former Member of the House, and a Republican Governor——

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Would the gentleman from Pennsylvania be suggesting that in his State there is politics in connection with the poverty program?

Mr. DENT. I would like to answer the gentleman by saying that I did suggest that a little while ago and I got myself into it, because the Governor happens to be a Republican and so, of course, I was accused of playing politics because I condemned the Governor for making certain appointments of people who happen to be defeated Republican candidates for the legislature. I said, "You are playing politics," but he assured me that he was acting in good conscience; as he said, the same as all the other Governors. That included our boys, too. So I had to shut up, because it seemed to me that they were both in the same poker game and both had the same marked deck, and each one of them knew it.

So I started to do a little investigating of my own and I found out that out of a total of 82 projects under all titles of the act in the State of Pennsylvania—of course, it is only incidental, and I mean this sincerely; it is only incidental that we have a Republican Governor. But anyway, out of 82 projects, 56 are in Republican counties and 26 are in Democratic counties. Now, that is a little bit of politics.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. With a great deal of pleasure I yield to one of the supporters of the bill.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. And a supporter of the Governor of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Yes, surely.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. We people in Pennsylvania, of course, are divided between two major parties. I would say that in each party we play just as little politics as does the other party.

Mr. DENT. Right.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. But we have more Republican counties in Pennsylvania than we have Democratic counties. The two big Democratic counties are Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. So when you talk about counties, you are talking horses and elephants, or—what is the Democratic symbol—donkeys and elephants.

Mr. DENT. That is right.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. So it is not really a good comparison when you talk about Pittsburgh and Allegheny County and Philadelphia County and then you have some little county with about 10,000 or 12,000 people in it. In other words, when you compare them county by county, it is not a good comparison. But, may I say this, that we Republicans are amateurs compared to the good Democratic Party in Philadelphia and in Pittsburgh and in Pennsylvania. We are learning a few things, but do not criticize us too much for our amateurish approach.

Mr. DENT. I wish the gentleman had been here during the whole of this discussion on the floor, because he would have heard that I defended the Governor of Pennsylvania in that every time I got my foot into it by accusing him of politics I was assured that he was acting in just as good conscience as the other Governors of the country, which meant the Democrats.

I might say also, when the gentleman says that the Democrats are more proficient in plying the trade of politics or the profession of politics in Pennsylvania than the Republicans, he must remember that in 140 years we have had four Governors, and they have had all the rest of them. So we are not doing too well.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Ray Bliss, chairman of the Republican National Committee, has informed us that the Republican Party nationally is in the process of building a new image. Would the gentleman care, in the light of this debate, to characterize that new image that the Republican Party seems to be building?

Mr. DENT. I am probably too old and my memory is somewhat befuddled, because I can only think of the old image. That is the only one I am stuck with. There might be new faces, new shadows, but it is the old image of opposition, criticism, cynicism, and absolute disbelief in everything except getting the contracts after we pass the program.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. I would like to know if what the gentleman has just related is not brilliantly exemplified by the policy of the opposition in saying we are not against this program, we just want to cut the appropriations for it in half so that there will be no funds available for carrying out the program. We are for it in principle, they are saying; but we want to cut the heart and guts out of it. This bill carries the authorization of an appropriation of $1,890 million this year in order to maintain the OEO program at its current level. If only half of that appropriation is authorized and then received, only half of the 550,000 Head Start kids are going to get the benefit of that program, only half of the 360,000 kids now in the Job Corps, the Youth Corps, and the work-study program, are going to get the benefits of those programs, and only half of the 30,000 adult illiterates are going to get the benefit of OEO training and literacy programs.

How can they have it both ways?

Mr. DENT. They always have it both ways. They remind me of the man who gets up in the morning and kisses his wife as he meets her in the kitchen and then slaps her face because she accidentally burned the toast.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and nine Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8283, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965.

Mr. Chairman, I would remind my distinguished colleagues and the Speaker on the other side of the aisle that the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the war on poverty, was passed with bipartisan support—226 to 185. Indeed, I am not sure that the program could have been passed without the support of 22 Members on this side of the aisle who believed in its fundamental principles.

This is not to say that many of us on this side of the aisle do not have some criticisms, that we may still offer some serious amendments, and I expect that we will. But let it be said before this House that some of us on this side of the aisle will join in bipartisan support of a program which we think is basic to the future of this country, to school dropout problems, to the young men and women of this country, and which will help many to break out of a hopeless cycle of poverty and despair and the lack of opportunity.

Second, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I am sure comments could be made with regard to both the majority and the minority report, and that the committee could have benefited from somewhat longer hearings.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the gentleman now in the well for the sound, constructive, and hard approach he has taken to this whole problem. We have had a lot of fun and a little levity here about parties, but I want to make it perfectly clear, having observed the work of the gentleman now in the well on this particular piece of legislation and other legislation before the Committee on Education and Labor, he is honest, conscientious, and a hard working Member of the Congress and of his party. I submit it is a fine position he takes on this legislation.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. I would like to add a word to what my colleague has said. I can say as a fellow member of the New York delegation that the gentleman from New York has worked closely with his fellow Democrats from New York and always in a helpful, construction, and thoughtful fashion.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman. I think it is the spirit of this House that on major legislation Members of both parties can find it in their hearts, and on the basis of need and sound information to work together in the national interest.

I believe the second point which should be made in regard to this legislation—that has been made clearly on our side of the aisle—is that the program is only 9 months old. The appropriation was not signed until October 7, 1964. The first Job Corps did not start until November 11 and the first community action program did not start until November 24. Hence, it is early to make any hard and fast judgments—prior to the program's first birthday.

Third, it seems to me there are a number of programs that are creative and based on sound principles. There is much hope in the country in regard to "Headstart" which already involves some 556,857 children in 13,345 centers.

I believe there has been no serious criticism of the work-study program, making it possible for many students to stay in college. During the past spring some 34,000 students were assisted in 648 institutions, and 40,500 students from 755 institutions are participating in the work-study program in summer school. I believe the domestic Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) is some indication it will be as worthwhile as the overseas Peace Corps.

It is clear there are areas where there are proper criticisms. Some criticism can be directed at the speed of the program, perhaps at the administration, although I am frank to say Sargent Shriver is one of the most able administrators in the U.S. Government. He should be supported.

I will say also, as I have said before, it is difficult for any man to wear two hats in as important a program as this is.

If I may, I would like to mention briefly my limited experience with the programs in Westchester County. As many of the Members know, in Westchester we have some aspects of serious poverty amid affluence. While we have a median family income of over $8,000, and an average of well over 12 years of education among heads of families, it is very clear that we also have poverty. In 1960, the Westchester Council of Social Agencies found that 1 in 12 families were living in "abject poverty," that is, making less than $3,000 a year.

But this agency felt, and I agree, that this ratio did not wholly reflect the true dimensions. A more realistic figure would perhaps be $5,000. If that is the criteria that is used, one in five families in Westchester County are "deprived." Poverty does not respect geography. Indeed, affluence can make human suffering and the disparity all the more poignant and its identification less likely as it is unexpected.

In Westchester County I would say programs that have started in White Plains and in New Rochelle and other parts of the county show some real promise. The White Plains community action program has started a special summer program for elementary schoolchildren. About 115 deprived youngsters will benefit from tutoring and language skill training through this program. Some 200 parents are being counseled on how to help the children at home.

In New Rochelle there are the beginnings of a worthwhile neighborhood youth corps which would help some 88 financially impoverished youths aged 16 through 21; a tutoring program for children from the 1st to the 12th grades; a preschool program for 200 children from 3½ to 4½ years old. There is a community program which will provide intensive social services—including legal aid, home management, budgeting, and family counseling—for some 400 residents of three low-rent housing projects.

The program here in a sense is not only trying to identify the problem of those living outside of the mainstreams of the community; but to try to create a measure of hope for those who may be in poor health and illiterate or undereducated. Therefore, I think in Westchester County there is not only need for the program but it is well launched.

I would submit the responsibility of this House is to improve legislation and to make such changes in it as are indicated. I intend to offer an amendment in this regard. But I believe strongly, and I think it would be a great mistake for this House either to seriously cut the program or to throw the baby out with the bath water. This program is in its beginnings. We have not had enough time to seriously judge it. We can question its rate of progress and its administration—but that it is backed by some basic principles with some very dedicated people throughout the United States, I think is clear. So I, for one, am sure that other Members will approach it in a constructive spirit doing what we can to further a program that is basic, if we are to break out of a cycle of hopelessness, to give all Americans a chance to maximize their potential and to live the kind of life in human dignity and in hope that this great country offers and that should be a reality for all.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] 10 minutes.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8283, the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1965.

I would like to discuss that part of the bill known as the community action program. It is in this area that we have commenced a comprehensive program to alleviate the poverty cycle which is a fact of life in the great cities of this Nation. I would be less than candid if I did not concede that all programs have not always lived up to our expectations. It is easy to criticize but harder to build. I might add that in almost all cases the successes have far outweighed the failures.

The community action program provides technical and financial assistance to urban and rural communities to support comprehensive action programs developed by local community action organizations. Grants are primarily used as the funding vehicle. These grants are designed to provide the means for new programs and augment existing private and public resources by financing up to 90 percent of the costs of those new programs. Grants may be made to both public and private nonprofit agencies. Remedial reading, literacy courses, job training, employment counseling, homemaker services, job development, and health services are some of the many activities that can be supported and coordinated within a local antipoverty program.

In addition to the operating and planning grants, funds are included to support research, training, and demonstration programs. Research programs are designed to identify the causes of poverty and variation in the patterns of poverty, regionally and locally. The training programs include internships with local, State, and Federal levels.

The demonstration programs include both experimental programs designed to test the value of proposed activities prior to initiating their use, and national priority programs providing assistance on a widespread basis in order to expedite community understanding of the values or new programs.

Technical assistance is provided to both State agencies and local communities. It will have a particular impact on rural communities and the smaller cities which may not have resources to organize their own proposals.

Included within the community action programs is the migrant agricultural employees program. This activity provides a special program to meet the housing, sanitation, education, and day care needs of migratory agricultural workers and their families. Grants or contracts will be made to expedite the activities of public and nonprofit agencies now conducting programs of assistance to improve health and living conditions of migratory workers.

The community action program for fiscal 1965 was programed at $235 million with which the Office of Economic Opportunity expected to approve a total of 500 grants in 350 communities. Over $50 million of the funds programed in fiscal 1965 was used in Project Head Start which will provide preschool learning activities, medical and dental care, supervised field trips, and balanced meals for over 300,000 needy children.

It is estimated that $638 million will be required to sustain and increase the scope of these programs in fiscal 1966. This increase in funds for fiscal 1966 will permit an estimated 650 grants to be approved. This increase of $403 million between fiscal 1965 and fiscal 1966 is in large part determined by the increase programed for preschool programs during fiscal year 1966 and three other factors:

First. The number of communities seeking funds is rising very rapidly.

Second. Many of the grants funded in fiscal year 1965 were for the development of programs. When these development grants are funded for operational programs, their costs will be 10 to 20 times what they are at present.

Third. Programs which are currently funded for less than 1 year will, in most cases, receive full-year grants in fiscal year 1966.

There has been, I think, a high degree of success in bringing the poor into the community action programs.

In various parts of the country the programs are organized in different ways reflecting the feelings of local leaders as to how community action programs may be best put into effect. In some places the programs are run by public agencies and in others by private groups. Placing the administrative responsibilities on the local level is in the best American tradition.

Mr. Chairman, the community action program in some cities have not developed without controversy. But in almost all cases the war on poverty is moving ahead, and is achieving an increasingly meaningful and effective involvement by persons inhabiting impoverished neighborhoods. This fact, Mr. Chairman, constitutes a fundamental strength of the war on poverty and a source of great hope for those of us who wish to see the blight of poverty eradicated from the American scene, as well as a compelling justification for enactment of the legislation now before this body.

I would like at this time to discuss New Jersey's role in getting the community action program into operation. I am very proud of the way the forward-looking administration of Gov. Richard J. Hughes on the State level and the many hard-working public officials and private citizens on the local level have gone to work to make this program a success.

Since the initiation of the community action program in 1964, the State of New Jersey has moved rapidly to insure the success of the war on poverty in every part of the State. Over $6,600,000 in community action funds have been awarded to antipoverty programs throughout New Jersey. Major cities such as Trenton, Newark, Jersey City, and Elizabeth have already spent several months developing projects under program development grants. In Atlantic and Monmouth Counties, the community action organizations have moved to integrate the efforts of both the urban and rural sections of their respective counties and have begun to submit community action projects.

In the city of Trenton, a model of community action, all sections of the community have been involved in the development of the program approach. Education projects are already underway in this city and extension of the program into other fields is now being implemented. Involvement within the program of those citizens who reside in areas with a high incidence of poverty was achieved through a unique system of local elections which has come to be known nationally as the "Jersey plan." In Trenton, elections were actually held with the aid of voting machines and more than 25 percent of the poverty area residents reported to cast their ballot.

An impressive feature of the economic opportunity program in the State of New Jersey has been the New Jersey State Office of Economic Opportunity. A highly trained and competent staff has been created to serve communities with technical assistance in the development and submission of community action projects. Education specialists, manpower specialists, and specialists in the problem of rural areas are available to all communities in the State on a continuing basis. The State office itself has sponsored several projects including comprehensive rural programs for both the southern and northwestern regions of the State.

Local communities in the State of New Jersey have looked with great anticipation to the Office of Economic Opportunity for assistance in the development of community action programs. Local public officials have been enthusiastic in their support of the program and all groups within the community have seen the program as a new and broad avenue of social change. The State of New Jersey has been quick to recognize that poverty exists, that it must not continue to exist and that it need not continue to exist, if the State can continue to rely on the support of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, we have not won the war on poverty. We have, however, taken the most significant step. We have convinced the people of this Nation that rich, prosperous America can no longer afford to have soul searing misery existing in the midst of plenty. The war on poverty is a war that must be won.

A vote in favor of H.R. 8283 is a vote in favor of the great American dream. The dream that every American boy can move out of the slums into a richer and more rewarding life. We cannot allow the great potential of millions of Americans to be wasted. At this critical time in history we must use all our natural resources. The most valuable resource we possess is the creative instincts of all our people. We must insure that those Americans who are trapped in the vicious cycle are liberated so that they too may share in the benefits offered by citizenship in this Nation and that they too may be able to make a meaningful contribution to a better America.

A vote in favor of H.R. 8283 is an affirmation of our belief in America's future. I urge all Members to make this affirmation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIELS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman mentioned that some $235 million would be available in the fiscal year for the community action programs. Is it not true that something like $640 million would be available, if this bill were approved, for these programs?

Mr. DANIELS. For the community action programs, as I understand it, we are asking an increase of $438 million.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Would the gentleman also agree that these programs are gambles, all of them?

Mr. DANIELS. I certainly do not agree with my able colleague from New Jersey. We must realize that many of these programs are novel. They are planning grants. In initiating any kind of a new program to relieve such an important problem as poverty, ignorance and unemployment which exists today in many areas, it is only natural to expect that some mistakes will be made. I do not know of anyone who never admitted having made a mistake, including myself.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I was not asking the gentleman to agree with me. I was asking him to agree with Mr. Shriver, who said that all of these local programs are gambles—all of them. I am just quoting Mr. Shriver; as reported in Look magazine on July 27, in asking the question. I did not mean to trap the gentleman, but I was not asking him to agree with me. Mr. Shriver describes these programs as experimental. He says that these programs are all gambles.

I am discussing the fact that a great deal more money is asked for all of these programs, which the Director admits are gambles.

I am quoting Mr. Shriver:

> We don't know, and the community doesn't know, if every single one of these projects is exactly the right combination to eliminate poverty today, tomorrow or the next day.

Now, this is a mighty big program about which we know very little, that we are being asked to provide.

Mr. DANIELS. I may say to my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], if Mr. Shriver employed the word "gamble," he may not have employed the proper descriptive word for these projects. I do know that in our own State of New Jersey we have several of these community action programs in operation and they are doing a very fine job. I think the gentleman will admit it, also.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say to the gentleman, if he will yield further, I am not trying to embroil him in an argument with the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. DANIELS. I do not think that we are going to be embroiled in an argument with the Director. I think Sargent Shriver, for whom I have the greatest admiration and respect, if he did use the word "gamble," as was stated by the gentleman from New Jersey, perhaps used an improper descriptive word for the problem.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DANIELS. Yes, I do.

Mr. KREBS. I wonder if my colleague from New Jersey at the end of his presentation will read some of the statistics revealing the programs already in operation in the State of New Jersey from which State Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN also comes so that he can see the positive side of this situation.

Mr. DANIELS. If time permits, I will be only too happy to do so.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DANIELS. I now yield to my colleague from California, a member of the committee.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank my good friend and colleague for yielding to me.

May I say with reference to your colleague and friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], of course, there is risk in this program. There is risk in every program which tries to attack a problem in a different way, but I think we have already shown by the results which have been achieved to date that this risk is diminishing every day, and it certainly justifies us in going ahead with the program at the rate now asked for.

Mr. DANIELS. I thank you for your contribution.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DANIELS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to thank the gentleman for his kindness in yielding so often.

I do not say that no good comes from the expenditure of this money for the community action programs. I am quite sure our own State of New Jersey will benefit to some extent. However, what does worry me, as the gentleman from California points out, is the way in which we do it. The way may not be appropriate. In many cases, as a practical matter, we are bypassing the local community, as in the case of the gentleman from California's own city of Los Angeles, in the development of these programs. You are upsetting the tried and proven ways of combating poverty.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eight members are present, a quorum.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GLENN ANDREWS].

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back to the subject, first of all, of the Air Academy and say that the discovery that 100 students had been cheating at the Air Academy is no excuse for doubling the size of the Air Academy.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill in its present form. I rise in praise of the great idea behind this poverty bill. I rise to criticize and demand some important changes in order to protect or even permit the implementation of this great idea. Paraphrasing Dickens, this is either the best of bills or it is the worst of bills.

If this bill be an instrument for setting up political Tammany Halls all over the Nation with new and untried wardheelers and indigenous political authorities, then I am against it. If it be an instrument for perfecting the united Cook Counties of America for the political exploitation of the poor, then I am against it. If this bill be a method of further erosion of State function in order to concentrate power in the Office of Economic Opportunity, then I am against it. If this bill is a blueprint for revolution—if it would storm the Bastile of all present political structure with a double-barreled pork barrel, then I am against it.

There are seven, eight, or nine programs wrapped up in this poverty bill. In my committee we held extensive hearings on one section only. Under this section, the community action program, disclosure of all the tendencies I have just mentioned dominated these hearings. Our chairman called the community action program a "political fiesta." Evidence of this sort of thing came through clear from all over the Nation. Practically nothing good was heard in all the testimony except good intentions—only Tammany Halls, Cook Counties, revolutions, State or Governor function bypass, concentration of power in Washington, pork barrel. Most of the reports were bad. Only one of the programs out of nine was even discussed. This was not the evidence which should have caused my committee to double the funds and start the bill on its second year. This was a most astonishing performance. This was surely not one of the mandates of the election of November 1964. Someone surely is misinterpreting this mandate.

This bill could have promise. It could be a great idea if we are able to put it properly to work. On our side of the aisle we have a series of changes and amendments which will help it, and if they are enacted this measure will gain my full support. This should be an education bill, not a political bill. This bill should educate the poor to find some productive and worthwhile place in a highly competitive society. It should not set them up for political exploitation and/or teach them how to use the ballot for Treasury raids or handouts. This bill should not make poverty attractive, but should prepare the victims of poverty for escape. Education and development of all our people is the avenue of escape—the liberation of the individual from the poverty cycle, the enrichment of life—the key to a fuller life. Education stirs the imagination and whets the appetite for good things. Education builds drive and ambition. As an advertising man, I know that knowledge does whet the appetite and gives drive and ambition.

There are excellent promises to some of these programs. Operation Head Start, on the preschool training of the poor and educationally deprived, has great merit. The effort to keep all our people in school is commensurate with the situation in this abundant land when jobs are too few.

This bill could very well be a great economy measure. I read the other day where it would take $100,000 to institutionalize a mentally retarded child for lifetime. I attended in my State last week a meeting of the Alabama Mentally Retarded Children's Association. It was shown there that to teach this child with patience how to dress and undress would cut down heavily on this enormous public cost.

Each new training given the mentally retarded child, teaching him to do for himself, cuts down further on the cost of his life to the public in taking care of him. Initially, costly, highly specialized education then has an advantage to the child and to the public when this child is a ward of the State.

The problem of the poor resembles somewhat the problem with the mentally retarded.

We are not specifically dealing with mentally retarded children in this poverty bill. But the educational thrust of the effort on those who through poverty of environment are deficient in knowledge is a parallel problem. This bill should be aimed at keeping people off the relief rolls. This is the great idea behind it. It purports to do for the educationally poor what manpower development and vocational training does for the job displaced and unemployed.

The problem down in Alabama as well as the rest of the Nation is jobs—particularly for the poor and uneducated. This poverty program could get these jobs. It might not help people get into unions, which are concerned primarily today with the skilled or productive jobs, but it will help them get some jobs where they have not before been able to hold a job. Adult education itself will help people get and hold jobs. The ability to read and write will help in getting and holding a job.

The greatest friend of discrimination is lack of jobs. This bill is concerned with the people on the bottom of the economic ladder. It could help them get and hold jobs. Every State and every community has the job problem. Every developed individual in a State is an increased asset to the State and no longer a liability. He builds his own social security and shrinks the relief rolls. Man is happier when he is busy. Occupation itself is education.

Help get politics out of this bill with some of our amendments—and let us turn this into an education bill, instead of a political bill.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, a great deal of concern is being expressed today by a number of my respected colleagues. For the most part this concern is over the manner in which the poverty program is being administered.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing similar concern.

I do regret, Mr. Chairman, that there is so much evidence from all parts of the country that the poverty program is not working well, and I take no pleasure in finding that my worst fears about the administration of this program have materialized. I think what the Congress needs is some assurance that attempts will be made to correct some of the more serious errors, some of which, I am sure, were made because this program is relatively new and experience in this field was lacking.

But, Mr. Chairman, at least as far as my personal experience with the Office of Economic Opportunity is concerned, such promise of "we will try to do better" is completely lacking. After all, if many of these programs have hope of really assisting the poverty stricken, they must be administered in such a manner as to do everything possible to enhance the success of the various programs of this act. It was with this point in mind that I offered some constructive suggestions when the task force on economic opportunity of the Republican planning and research committee invited testimony last month. I offered these suggestions after describing what I consider to be mishandling of two Job Corps Conservation Centers proposed for my congressional district. In one case the circumstances surrounding a 1-year delay in establishing such a camp must be borne by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In the other instance, the Office of Economic Opportunity made a pretty bad blunder in officially announcing a conservation center would be located in one community of my district that had sought the project, only to take the project away from that community and give it to a neighboring community which had not actively sought the project.

I was, quite frankly, shocked at the response to my testimony, recently received from the Office of Economic Opportunity, because all the response received did was to try to justify—unsuccessfully—the errors previously committed by that office. I have been here long enough to know that trying to get admission from a Federal agency that they erred is not the easiest thing in the world to do, but when that agency commits serious errors in attempting to justify previous errors with an indication that more of the same can be expected in the future, this certainly does not act as an incentive to me to support the agency's request for twice as much money. I predict that unless we severely amend the committee bill before us today, the Office of Economic Opportunity will be committing twice as many mistakes simply because they will be able to double the scope of the present programs which so badly need improvement.

For the information of my colleagues I am glad to include at this point in the Record the formal statement I made before the Republican task force, a response that statement received from the Office of Economic Opportunity in the form of a letter signed by Sargent Shriver, together with my subsequent reply to Sargent Shriver:

Statement of Catherine May, Representative From the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington, Before the Republican Planning and Research Committee, Task Force on Economic Opportunity, June 16, 1965

Mr. Chairman and members of the task force on economic opportunity, as a Member of Congress from an area in which the Office of Economic Opportunity has a number of projects on-going or contemplated, I am, quite naturally, anxious that these programs succeed. It is my understanding this task force committee wants constructive criticism to insure that they succeed. Where the programs are bogging down, where experience has shown improvements are necessary, where constructive suggestions can be made, I feel we would all be derelict in our duty if we chose to ignore our responsibility to not only the poverty-stricken—which these programs are supposed to help—but also to all the American people. This is why I welcome the opportunity to discuss with the task force on economic opportunity the experiences in the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington on two proposed Job Corps conservation centers—one to be established on the Yakima Indian Reservation at Fort Simcoe near White Swan, Wash., and the other on the Columbia Basin reclamation project in the vicinity of Ephrata or Moses Lake, Wash.

I do not intend, Mr. Chairman, to discuss with the task force the merits of Job Corps conservation centers, other than to state it is my firm belief that the success or failure of such centers from the standpoint of the enrollees will be heavily dependent upon community acceptance. Certainly, if I may draw a parallel, the success of the Peace Corps is largely attributed to acceptance of Peace Corps efforts by the people of the countries in which Peace Corps volunteers have been working. At least, this is what Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver has told us. It is in this context that I am concerned because of the two Job Corps conservation centers announced by the Office of Economic Opportunity for my congressional district. No initial effort to secure community cooperation is evident on the part of the Office of Economic Opportunity in this regard.

The first situation I would like to discuss is the announced establishment of a Job Corps conservation center to be located on the Yakima Indian Reservation near the small community of White Swan.

The official announcement concerning this Job Corps camp was contained in a press release from the Office of the Secretary of the Interior which detailed the locations of 14 Job Corps camps in 10 States to be activated early that fall. The Secretary's announcement states, "Each of these camps will also be a great community asset." This press release, which was received in my office on August 19, 1964, the date it was to be released, was the first notification received by me of this project and was, in fact, the first official notification received by the people of White Swan, a community of approximately 200 inhabitants and approximately 2 miles from the announced site of the camp.

From information I was able to piece together later, it became evident that a great deal of secrecy had surrounded the circumstances in arriving at the selection of this site for a Job Corps camp. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, once a decision had been made, consulted only with the Yakima Tribal Council, and it is my understanding the Bureau told the tribal council that Indians would be put to work and that the work to be accomplished would be in the nature of work which would benefit the Indian reservation. The Secretary of the Interior's announcement of August 19, 1964, in fact, stated, "The enrollees will be concerned primarily with timber and range conservation practices such as timber thinning and construction of fire roads and trails."

It is not difficult to understand the immediate reaction of the people of White Swan who naturally were concerned over the effect on their community of the arrival of as many Job Corps "guests" as there are inhabitants. Urgent requests for complete information on the impact of such a facility were made to my office. I point out again that no such information had been volunteered either prior to or following the brief original announcement. Inquiries were initiated by my office to the Bureau of Indian affairs because the Office of Economic Opportunity advised they had no information with which to respond to the community concern. To give an example of this kind of bureaucratic attitude, we were told by a spokesman of the Bureau of Indian Affairs that "if a community wishes to protest it should do so to the Yakima Indian Agency superintendent." On August 28, 1964, we were also advised that this was only a "proposed" establishment since Congress had not as yet appropriated the money to establish any of the Job Corps centers. This fact brought out yet another interesting point because I was later informed that, even prior to the August 19 announcement, work crews contracted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs were busy clearing a site for the proposed establishment. I still do not know the source of the funds for this preliminary work. To compound the good reason for local concern in the community of White Swan was an application which was received by a White Swan resident for the job of camp director which asked the applicant exactly how he would handle certain hypothetical situations if they should develop at the camp. I quote the five situations listed in the application form:

"1. Assume that you receive an anonymous note indicating that there are homosexual practices actively going on among several campers and that the informant has been approached. You have no other information.

"2. Assume that from time to time over a period of a month, tools and equipment have disappeared from a project to which seven boys have been assigned. You have no reason to suspect one boy more than any other. The boys are of different racial origins and have as their primary friendship groups, boys other than those in the work group—the project will be completed in three days.

"3. Assume that one of the boys has reported for treatment for a superficial knife wound. He claims that the wound was accidentally self-inflicted, but you have excellent reason to suspect otherwise. He has been involved in fist fights on two previous occasions, where he had been provoked into a fight. You know that once knifings begin, they tend to become prevalent.

"4. Assume that you return from a trip to learn that six teams have been chosen for a football competition by boys originally appointed as team captains. Two boys—one white and one Negro—have each purposely chosen only members of his own race for his own team. Other teams are mixed. One game has been played by each team without incident—nine more games are scheduled for each team.

"5. Assume that you receive a phone call at 3 a.m. from the police chief in a small neighboring community informing you that he has in custody one of your campers. The boy has been accused of rape and assault with a local teenager as his victim."

Naturally, Mr. Chairman, the local recipient of this communication from the Office of Economic Opportunity was concerned that such problems could occur and he advised the local newspaper of the contents of the application form. It is not difficult to imagine the reaction that ensued from a community seeking information about the proposed Job Corps conservation center to be constructed in their area.

On August 28, 1964, I asked Sargent Shriver, Director of the President's Task Force on the War on Poverty, to arrange for a public hearing on the announced establishment of a Job Corps camp near White Swan. I advised Mr. Shriver that since the August 19, 1964, announcement of the location of the camp, a number of residents of nearby communities had indicated their concern over the location of such a camp in their area and that many of these individuals were asking questions which deserved factual answers. I advised Mr. Shriver that I had discussed the situation with the Governor's representative appointed to handle antipoverty programs in the State (who incidentally had not been provided answers to the questions being asked) and that we both agreed that a full public hearing should be held in the area as soon as possible so that all the individual citizens would have all the facts upon which to base opinions. On September 2, 1964, I was advised by the Governor's representative that the Bureau of Indian Affairs regional office had notified him that they would hold a public meeting in the White Swan High School on September 9 to inform the community of plans for the proposed Job Corps camp. I initiated telephone calls to the Office of Economic Opportunity to ask whether this meeting was in response to my request for a hearing and was advised that a representative of Sargent Shriver's office would attend the meeting. I did not receive any written response to my letter requesting a hearing.

The meeting was held in the White Swan High School the evening of September 9, 1964. I was subsequently advised that only written questions were allowed from an audience of about 350 persons and no oral discussion was permitted. One gentleman stood up and demanded that he be heard and was given the opportunity to make a brief statement. This, Mr. Chairman, was not the kind of hearing I had requested, although I was given to understand that generally speaking the audience seemed to be satisfied with the answers received to their written questions, mostly handled by the representative from Sargent Shriver's office.

I won't go into any more details of subsequent events except to state that the controversy raged on with local residents signing petitions to the Governor of the State of Washington and Sargent Shriver's office, expressing either support or opposition to the establishment of a Job Corps camp. According to a newspaper article, on October 13, 1964, the deadline set by the Governor's representative for filing of statements concerning the camp, opinions stood 1,378 in favor and 714 against.

The then Governor of the State of Washington subsequently approved the camp. It was about this time that a local attorney for a group of White Swan residents protested to the Office of Economic Opportunity the establishment of the camp, contending that work planned by occupants of the camp would benefit Yakima Indians only and, therefore, was discriminatory against non-Indians. The attorney based his contention on the Civil Rights Act passed by Congress in 1964. The general counsel for the Office of Economic Opportunity advised the local attorney, "We are acquainted with no law or policy against discrimination on the basis of race which is violated by the operation of a conservation center on the Yakima Indian Reservation Center." The general counsel went on to state in his letter, "Government policy against discrimination, whatever source, does not generally prevent the expenditure of money to benefit Indians on an Indian reservation." The local attorney said he could not agree and that he would seek a Federal injunction to stop the establishment of a camp. The new Governor agreed that before he would approve the camp that assurance would have to be given that the general public would have access to and use of facilities constructed by the Job Corps. There the matter rested for many months. However, as recently as early this month, Otis A. Singletary, director of the Job Corps, said in a letter to the local newspaper in Yakima, Wash., the largest nearby community, that he was holding up approval of the White Swan camp because of "poor community attitudes." Apparently recognizing the former Governor's approval of the site and not waiting for the new Governor's recommendation, Dr. Singletary indicated in his letter that the Office of Economic Opportunity had every legal right to proceed with the camp, but the delay was "based solely on my concern for the enrollees."

In the meantime, the new Governor, continuing to be concerned over the two questions; that of community acceptance and that of general public use of an access to the facilities, obtained from local communities assurances that public opinion had gradually changed to favor the camp and new letters were received from the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Yakima Tribal Council giving assurances the public would have access to and use of the facilities, after all. The Governor just last week wrote to the Office of Economic Opportunity approving the location of the camp, and this last Friday evening, June 11, my office was called by the Deputy Director for the Job Corps to be advised that that office would now proceed with the camp.

I might say parenthetically that when I asked the Office of Economic Opportunity last Friday evening for details I was advised they had none. They assumed the camp would be established as originally proposed, but that the Bureau of Indian Affairs would have to provide the details. Once again, Mr. Chairman, the local citizens found themselves in the dark as to details of the situation.

I will not dwell long on the second Job Corps camp proposal in my district.

This is a camp to be administered by the Bureau of Reclamation to be located on the Columbia Basin reclamation project. In February of this year it was announced by the Bureau of Reclamation headquarters on the project that the Office of Economic Opportunity had requested a recommendation for a location of a Job Corps conservation center on the Columbia Basin project. This was undertaken and on April 27 of this year the President announced a number of new Job Corps conservation centers, including one on the Columbia Basin project. Accompanying the White House announcement was a detailed fact sheet which stated that the Columbia Basin center would be located on land owned by the city of Ephrata. The announcement went on to state that two buildings consisting of a two-story dormitory building and a former mess hall will be made available by the city of Ephrata. The city of Ephrata was delighted by this announcement because the people of Ephrata had actively sought the center and the Ephrata location had received a favorable recommendation from the Bureau of Reclamation.

Within a matter of hours after the President's announcement, however, the announcement was withdrawn insofar as exact location is concerned and I received from the Ephrata Chamber of Commerce an urgent letter wanting to know what had happened and reaffirming its wishes for the center. My office, Mr. Chairman, made repeated calls to the Office of Economic Opportunity from Dr. Singletary on down and about all we could learn was that the Office of Economic Opportunity thinks it will establish the Job Corps center at Larson Air Force Base near Moses Lake, Wash., instead of Ephrata. As nearly as I can tell, no local request for establishment of the center at Larson Air Force Base or at Moses Lake was ever made. The people of Ephrata are understandably angry, especially because the center was announced for their town and then the announcement withdrawn. No one in the Office of Economic Opportunity has ever explained to me why the announcement was made for Ephrata in the first place and as a matter of fact, they won't even admit that it was announced for Ephrata even though I have a copy of the announcement in my possession. This, Mr. Chairman, strikes me as a prime example of the right bureaucratic hand not knowing what the left bureaucratic hand is doing.

Again, Mr. Chairman, one would think the people in the Office of Economic Opportunity would have learned from the White Swan situation, but experience made no difference in the case of the Columbia Basin center. What I am afraid of now, Mr. Chairman, is that the Ephrata people will be hostile to the project and will not be in a mood to cooperate with the trainees. Ephrata is only 26 miles from Moses Lake.

In conclusion I would like to quote from an editorial in the Yakima Daily Republic of Yakima, Wash., which, it seems to me, should apply to all proposals to locate Job Corps camps throughout our Nation. The editorial states:

"The issue does raise a serious question about a philosophy that seems ingrained among Government workers of all administrations, regardless of political attachments. That is the assumption of some staffers that what they do is nobody's business, unless some busybody or nosey newspaperman starts to pry.

"Well, the painful truth is that everything a bureau worker does—whether it's his coffee break, thinking time, or a major decision—is the business of you and your neighbor and your cousins and friends. It's taxpayers' money that pays for every stitch of Government, and it's taxpayers' business that is transacted.

"And when the staffers resent having to throw their actions open to public gaze, they should be reminded—as they doubtless have in the Fort Simcoe Job Corps hassle—that their first responsibility is to the public and that's everybody."

Thank you for the opportunity to describe the problems we have had on this subject in my congressional district.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, June 28, 1965.

Hon. CATHERINE MAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MAY: In your testimony before the House Republican planning and research committee task force on economic opportunity, on June 16, 1965, you stated that the selection of the Yakima Indian Reservation at Fort Simcoe as a site for establishment of a Job Corps conservation center was veiled in secrecy. No less than two public documents—Senate hearings on S. 2462 (June 17–25, 1964) and Yakima Tribal resolution T–17–65 (August 14, 1964)—which antedate the Department of the Interior's public announcement of preliminary plans for establishing a conservation center at Fort Simcoe, indicate the possible use of this site by Job Corps. The hearings, at page 152, list the White Swan Mission at Fort Simcoe, among other Federal lands in the State of Washington, as a possible Job Corps conservation center. The resolution requests establishment of a Youth Corps camp on the reservation "southwesterly from Fort Simcoe."

You state further that no initial effort to secure community cooperation is evident on the part of the Office of Economic Opportunity in establishment of conservation centers, while you note in the same testimony that prior to Gov. Albert Rosellini's approval of the center at Fort Simcoe, a public poll indicated 1,378 local residents in favor of the center, as opposed to 714 against it. The 30-day period in which a Governor must either approve or reject an announced center enables him to assess community attitudes which may influence his decision.

You also inferred that Columbia Basin Job Corps conservation center site was removed from the city of Ephrata to Moses Lake at the whim of OEO in spite of the protests of the residents of Ephrata, who had actively sought the center. Moses Lake, the residents of which were equally as receptive to establishment of the center, is but 25 miles from Ephrata and a far less expensive site, as noted by cost data shown below:

Ephrata (construction only) ------	$567,000
Moses Lake (Larson Air Force Base) (rehabilitation only) -----	220,000

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 29, 1965.

Hon. R. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: I have received your June 28 letter relating to my recent testimony before the House Republican planning and research committee, task force on economic opportunity, in which I discussed experiences in the State of Washington in the establishment of Job Corps conservation centers on the Yakima Indian Reservation and on the Columbia Basin project.

While I appreciate hearing from you on these two subjects, it is with regret I note your letter seems to indicate that you feel the manner in which these two centers have been handled was proper. It had been my hope that my testimony would be accepted in the spirit in which it was intended—that of constructive criticism. Instead, your letter attempts to refute certain statements in my testimony with information that has little or no relationship to the statements I made.

The first paragraph of your letter seems to deny that the selection of the site southwesterly from Fort Simcoe as a proposed Job Corps conservation center on the Yakima Indian Reservation was veiled in secrecy, and describes two documents as an indication there was no attempt at secrecy. You point out the Senate hearings on S. 2462 in June, 1964, list the White Swan Mission at Fort Simcoe as a possible Job Corps conservation center. I feel it necessary to point out that the White Swan Mission is not at Fort Simcoe, the White Swan Mission is not the site selected for the Job Corps center, and the White Swan Mission is not located southwesterly from Fort Simcoe. In short, the site selected for this center was at a location different from that described in the Senate hearings. Second, the Yakima Indian Tribal Council resolution was unknown to local residents until after they discovered a site was being cleared for the camp southwesterly from Fort Simcoe. According to local residents, the people preparing the site were instructed to keep secret the purposes for which the land was being cleared. Enclosed are copies of editorials from the September 4 and September 11, 1964, issues of the Yakima Daily Republic which comment on the situation at that time.

The second paragraph of your letter describes a public poll as evidence that the Office of Economic Opportunity attempted to secure community cooperation in connection with the Job Corps conservation center near Fort Simcoe. The public poll, rather than being initiated by the Office of Economic Opportunity, was initiated by local residents who were either for or against the proposal. Many of those opposing the establishment of the center based their opposition on the fact that they could not get factual answers to their questions about the center. Your letter further states: "The 30-day period in which a Governor must either approve or reject an announced center enables him to assess community attitudes which may influence his decision." The then Governor of the State of Washington neither approved or rejected this proposal within the 30-day period from the August 19, 1964, public announcement of the proposal. The Governor's approval came in November, following the general election in which he was defeated. Further, it is my understanding that the 1965 Poverty Act amendments proposed by you would effectively eliminate the veto power of the State Governors in this field.

The third paragraph of your letter discusses the advantages of a Moses Lake location over an Ephrata location of a proposed Job Corps center on the Columbia Basin project. Although I am glad to have the cost data you have provided, the point I was attempting to make, as you will note from the enclosed copy of my prepared testimony, was that the worse possible community attitude was invited by the Office of Economic Opportunity when it first announced the selection of Ephrata as the site, and then, a few hours later the announcement was withdrawn. In connection with this, I still have not been informed by the Office of Economic Opportunity which site has been selected, although I was assured several weeks ago a decision would be made very shortly and I would be informed.

The main point I was trying to make in my testimony was that if the Office of Economic Opportunity would initiate some kind of public relations effort with the people in the affected areas, a great deal of the bitterness local residents have experienced could be avoided. The one year delay could have been avoided in getting the Job Corps center on the Yakima Indian Reservation into operation. Also the bitterness created by your office in the situation involving the neighboring communities of Ephrata and Moses Lake could have been avoided.

I would like to see the Job Corps program work, and work well, and I trust that in this we are in agreement.

Sincerely yours,

CATHERINE MAY,
Member of Congress.

[From the Yakima Daily Republic, Sept. 4, 1964]

WHOSE BUSINESS?

We suspect that the irksome secrecy surrounding the establishment of a Job Corps camp near Fort Simcoe was the product of bureau-oriented thinking somewhere along the line. With a public meeting called for September 9, it also seems probable that the whole thing will be ironed out, and plans for the camp explained and continued.

The issue does raise a serious question about a philosophy that seems ingrained among Government workers of all administrations, regardless of political attachments. That is the assumption of some staffers that what they do is nobody's business, unless some busybody or nosey newspaperman starts to pry.

Well, the painful truth is that everything a bureau worker does—whether it's his coffee break, thinking time or a major decision—is the business of you and your neighbor and your cousins and friends. It's taxpayers' money that pays for every stitch of Government, and it's taxpayers' business that is transacted.

And when the staffers resent having to throw their actions open to public gaze, they should be reminded—as they doubtless have in the Fort Simcoe Job Corps hassle—that their first responsibility is to the public and that's everybody.

[From the Yakima Daily Republic, Sept. 11, 1964]

WHY SO CAGEY?

If the Office of Economic Development is sincere in its assertion that Job Corps youth camps will not be located where communities do not want them, then the people of White Swan should be granted a public hearing at which protests—if there are any—may be voiced. Many of the 350 valley residents who attended a meeting Wednesday night came away disappointed. The session, at which OEO assistant Pat Healy spoke, was a question-and-answer meeting at which no opinions were invited.

It is entirely possible that protests already raised might be readily explained. It is also possible that the protests might be well-founded. And it is possible that some other area of central Washington might want the Job Corps camp now apparently tagged for the Fort Simcoe area near White Swan, if the White Swan people do not want it.

Those are details that can be ironed out only in a public hearing. As matters stand, the only chance for expressing local opinion lies in letters to Jack Gordon, State employment security commissioner, in Olympia.

If there actually is no politics involved in the Job Corps section of the President's antipoverty law, the machinery thus far operating in the White Swan instance is throwing a fog of suspicion over what may actually be an innocent project. We fail to see the reason for refusing to expose the plan to public discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. If the material the gentlewoman refers to is her own statement, it may be included in the RECORD.

Mrs. MAY. Yes, it is, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I want to thank the gentlewoman. I simply want to take this opportunity to thank her very much for her appearance before the task force on economic opportunity, and her presentation of a very practical problem which could have been avoided if the Office of Economic Opportunity had been at all aware of the necessity of keeping in touch with the community that they were going into. In this case, of course, more than one community was involved and in spite of the fact that their attention was called to the problem they were creating they still did nothing to correct it.

That is very specific evidence of the kind of problem the OEO is getting into. It has been dramatically set forth here by the gentlewoman.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Mr. QUIE. The gentlewoman was mentioning to me some other difficulties for the State office, with the Governor. I was wondering if she could bring this to light at this time.

Mrs. MAY. Within the limits of my time, I was not going to make this a part of my regular statement today. But to give just a recent example. The Governor of the State of Washington, Dan Evans, last April appointed a Mr. Byron E. Brady as director of the Washington State Office of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Following his appointment, Mr. Brady came to Washington, D.C., where he spent the better part of a week meeting with the staff of the Economic Opportunity Office in an effort to establish an effective liaison between that Office and his office under the Governor.

I was terribly surprised when just the other day I received a letter signed by the Director of the Office, Mr. Shriver, which was a copy of a letter to one of my constituents which told that constituent that he should get in touch with Mr. James Dolliver as the State coordinator for the antipoverty program. Mr. Dolliver, I might explain, did hold that position briefly last April, but has since been administrative assistant to our Governor. I feel sure Mr. Brady would be very shocked to know that his trip to Washington, which was for the purpose of establishing and encouraging an effective liaison between his office and that of Washington, was not even noted by the Office downtown because they were not aware of his name.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY].

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, and our distinguished floor manager for the bill today, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], I very much appreciate this allocation of time. However, I have noticed during the last several hours the great energy and devotion of our distinguished Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, my great and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], in maintaining a most precarious quorum. I am somewhat fearful lest my powers of persuasion and strength of conviction be such that I might alienate someone on the minority side of the Chamber and force that person from this room thereby endangering that precarious quorum. However, Mr. Chairman, the importance of this legislation is such that I must take that risk.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation to extend and expand equality of economic opportunity. I do so with a full sense of the magnitude of the task before us. I am prepared to acknowledge that we have just begun, but our beginnings are as good, and hopeful, as they are bold and fresh. Mistakes have been made and errors uncovered but I am frankly surprised and delighted because the mistakes have been few and the errors far between.

During the spring of this year I served with my colleagues from New York, Representatives OGDEN REID and JAMES SCHEUER, as chairman of a task force charged with surveillance on oversight on the program as it got underway in the District, and other cities from Maine to Virginia. I want to assure this committee that in my experiences whenever I met with any situation which tended to transgress the will of the Congress as set forth in this legislation, we received prompt and full cooperation from the Director, Mr. Sargent Shriver, and his able assistant for congressional affairs, our distinguished former colleague, Gillis Long. Here and now I want to state that the administration, and indeed our country, but most particularly the beneficiaries of this program are truly fortunate to have the talent and devotion of Mr. Shriver and his staff guiding and moving the operation.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, you have heard and you will hear, scorn and opprobrium heaped on such areas as community action, Job Corps, preschool and work training because here and there the critics of this legislation have found fissures and faults which they would have you believe are of great magnitude.

I tell you, as one who has lived with our effort at equal economic opportunity since its infancy that these few isolated defects are miniscule in proportion to the magnitude of our undertaking. In truth, speaking of infancy, this program is still in its infancy and fledgling stage and like any infant or fledgling it will get its share of knocks and falls and bruises.

But you do not stop feeding a child because he breaks a saucer and you do not give up on a growing boy because he barks his shins. This program is a growing, living, breathing force in our civilization today. If we would grow as a country we must grow totally, in all sectors among all groups with no leftouts or castoffs or forgotten men and this legislation is vital to that kind of growth.

I recall a witness on behalf of the American Friends Service Committee before our Committee, who spoke in behalf of a project undertaken in migrant labor camps, not in the West but in the East—a project to try and develop leadership and family stability, health, hygiene and appreciation of human and community values. The worst fear the witness had—this diligent, devoted and selfless volunteer—was not that this project would fail or that it was too difficult. Her fear, well expressed, was that that particular project and other projects would be judged prematurely, rashly, and harshly by Congress. She feared that Congress, sensitive to criticism because we are supporting new, different, changing, and challenging undertakings would lose patience and faith and heart.

I would like to assure that person and all the thousands of workers, who are launched in this great national effort to bring dignity and respect to the families in the subcellars of society, that we will not lose heart nor judge this venture prematurely. This Nation has never lost any great crusade for freedom abroad and we certainly cannot afford to think in terms of losing the crusade against conquerable poverty and deprivation within our domestic borders.

I think it is time we looked at the objectives we have already gained and it will become clear that not only do we know what we are doing and where we are going but for the first time in the history of mankind the dream of equal opportunity will in this century be a realization.

Remember that some of these objectives were considered insurmountable less than a year ago and then look at our achievements at this early hour.

Here, in part, is the record to date:

Some 1,735,000 persons have been aided directly and 2,080,000 indirectly by the following:

More than 824 grants totaling over $152 million have been made for community action programs in 50 States. In testing whether the grass roots of our country are receptive to this program consider that every one of these community action programs originated and is operated at a local level, a level of community initiative not Federal subvention.

Job Corps started nationwide recruiting on January 1 this year. In the first 40 days, 123,000 young people applied and the total is now over 304,000 with 48 centers already in operation. Here is the answer to those who said that adolescents and teenagers could not be motivated and energized to seek training work disciplines and improve themselves. We owe it to these applicants to make the funds available to open enough camps, provide enough teachers and counselors so that no applicant is turned away and every enrollee receives the best possible education and training. Keep in mind that the total Job Corps applications are five times the size of our combat strength in South Vietnam and you will be forced to agree that this is a manpower potential we cannot, dare not, neglect. We must make certain that no applicant is turned away and every individual's potential is developed and that is why we need an extended and expanded Opportunity Act at this time.

Project Head Start is not only off and running, its progress is lengths ahead of our most extravagant hopes. Over 2,300 grants have established 13,345 classes to enable 516,000 children to enter preschool programs this summer. Without reservation or hesitation I submit to the members of this committee that this program, dovetailed with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 could be the most important educational undertaking of this generation. Let me cite just a few significant aspects of this new dawn of learning for needy children.

First. Not only the children are involved but the parents who were resigned to seeing their children lag behind others in school are participating in the centers. Even more impressive is the fact that elderly persons are engaged in these activities through the grandparents for progress activities in preschool programs which have been initiated in many communities.

This involvement of the elderly is most important when we consider that 27 percent of our impoverished population are over 65 and more than half of all our citizens over 65 have incomes below the level of dignified existence.

I cite this detail on the elderly again to emphasize the span and scope of our undertaking to bring economic wellbeing to those most in need.

Second. In another context Project Head Start confounded the cynics who feared and doubted that public and parochial school officials could work together without friction. In my city and in many States and other large cities the children of the poor are receiving devoted and effective care and instruction from public and nonpublic teachers and supervisors working together.

Third. The initiation of preschool activities with funds under the program has inspired and promoted State and local and private agencies to activate continuing Head Start programs. This is most important because at best our Federal support level even under the terms of this new legislation has afforded enough funds for summer month activity only. Clearly, however, on the basis of our experience and the results achieved, preschool education is needed year round and this bill will serve to assist communities in meeting that need through training and organizing teams to conduct such programs.

In a real sense it can be said that the effect of this act in many ways multiplies results far greater than the net worth of dollars invested.

This is because the activities of volunteers and voluntary agencies contributed and added to the Federal aid dollars extended and stretched these dollars to reach places and people who have been heretofore beyond aid and without help.

This is why it is important for us to continue to involve, to use, to encourage private voluntary agencies to participate in this campaign.

The dimensions of their value to this program can be estimated very easily when one considers that one agency alone, United Community Fund, annually distributes as much money to those in need as does this entire program at present levels. And I might add that officials and fundraisers in this type agency are paid on the average a great deal more than those who administer these Federal programs.

I would continue to recite our successes to date in work study, in small business, in neighborhood youth corps, aid to migrants and adult education, but other members of our committee have done a splendid job of spreading the story of these gains upon the record.

I should like to close by pointing to what is underway in my own city to demonstrate what this act means to urban areas.

Fortunately I do not need to recite the record at any great length because that good Republican newspaper, the New York Herald Tribune, chronicled our New York status in a most complete way on Sunday, July 18, and I submit this account for the Record at this point, entitled "Ray of Hope Out of Cloud of Poverty," by Marshall Peck.

Ray of Hope Out of a Cloud of Poverty

(By Marshall Peck)

A lack of 15 cents caused James Bennett to walk a mile to the subway the other day—that and a lot of hope.

Mr. Bennett, with a wife and three children, is on welfare—but he's on his way back.

James Bennett—World War II veteran, TB victim, on the welfare rolls since April 1964—heads one of New York's 317,000 families that live under the cloud of poverty. After serving with the Navy, he worked as an office clerk and an elevator operator. But in 1957, he was sidelined for a year with tuberculosis; bad health has plagued him since, and he has managed only occasional work as an elevator operator, a porter, a night watchman. He and his family live in four rooms on the fourth floor of a walk-up at the far end of Coney Island.

Something has become important on Bennett's horizon in the past month: A chance to learn a trade; a chance to pull himself out of the abyss life has shaped around him. Bennett didn't turn down the chance, and his effort can be offered as part of the picture, of what this country's antipoverty campaign is all about.

The Economic Opportunity Act, which last year launched the so-called war on poverty in this country, is designed to reclaim, revitalize, repair, renew. Its vast variety of programs involves children—in Head Start, for instance, teenagers in the Job Corps; and older men and women. One of the projects—the one that reached down and tapped James Bennett—offers the opportunity for a man to fight back, if he wants to.

Mr. Bennett, the morning he walked a mile to the subway, was on his way to courses in a city-funded $2.2 million "fight back" program set up by the City Department of Labor and the Port of New York Authority. The purpose of the year-long training program is to train 6,000 men, the majority of them unemployed, in trades of work for which a demand by employers exists.

When the program started on June 7, at the Port Authority Building at 30 Church Street, there were 1,500 applicants for the 700 openings in the first class.

Those who could not be admitted for the first class will be accommodated later; currently, there are more than 2,000 waiting to get in the program.

During the course period—which may vary from 8 to 12 weeks, according to the trade—the enrollee continues to receive his regular unemployment or welfare benefits. Some provision is being made to remunerate men on welfare with travel and lunch expense money (an instructor, incidentally, loaned Mr. Bennett bus fare for the ride home).

Bennett is taking the course in air-conditioning repair and installation. Other courses include heavy vehicle driving, general maintenance, oil burner repair and installation, building and grounds sanitation, and gardening. There are 220,000 unemployed in New York City, but there are also 53,000 vacant jobs, many of them in these categories.

Indeed, there is much optimism that a large number of the first class, which starts being graduated on August 7, will be placed in jobs almost immediately. For example, the Kinney Service Corp. has pledged to hire the entire 100-plus men following the course in buildings and grounds sanitation. Representatives of other firms have been to the port authority to look for potential employees.

"This is a challenge to do something practical, to learn by doing," said James J. McFadden, acting labor commissioner. "The big thing is that it gives a man a chance to break the relief chain."

At the port authority, which has been offering these courses to employees in the past, the program is supervised by Thomas J. Riley. The second and sixth floors are given over to bang and clatter training and to classes in remedial English and mathematics.

A city official pointed out, that if 2,000 of the 6,000 men taking the course this year are from the welfare list and are placed in jobs and have been receiving for their family an avearge relief check of $250 a month, it would mean a reduction of $6 million in annual payments.

Of course, the primary way that this official and others look at the program is in the terms of the men who have availed themselves. They make their way to class, some not able to afford lunch, because they are men who may have been knocked down but don't intend to stay that way.

TASK FORCES IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

Despite confusion and delays, caused by controversy about the structure and control of the antipoverty program, New York City has been able to inaugurate a number of projects aimed at helping the poor and disadvantaged. The following is a situation chart of the major projects that are now underway. There are 14 programs which are earmarked for Federal grants totaling $29,678,536. In addition, $12,174,177 has been committed by the city for some 50 programs. Haryou-Act, the Harlem community organization, is the only social action group to be directly financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington with Federal funds. Some programs pool State and city moneys. The projects listed here have been approved for grants of more than $500,000 from either the Federal Government or New York City, and the figures are for a 1-year period, unless otherwise noted (as in the case of summer programs). Some projects have been underway since last fall; others are still organizing.

Community action program

Objective: The organization of 6 community progress centers in the areas considered the neediest of the 16 neighborhoods designated as poverty targets. The centers will provide actual employment for 10,200 poor and services to more than 55,000 persons. Community committees will act as the boards of directors of the centers. The CAP will also prepare for the election of target population representatives to the New York City Council Against Poverty.

Present status: It is anticipated that at least three centers will open before September 1. Plans are now underway for formation of community committes and for broadening of the council to include 32 members of the poor. Several hundred community groups have applied for funding for neighborhood projects as part of the CAP.

Who's in charge: Economic Opportunity Committee, the operational arm of the New York City Council Against Poverty.

Budget: $9,183,616 in Federal funds.

Neighborhood Youth Corps

Objective: The creation of 17,200 jobs for young people, 16 to 21, this summer.

Present status: Nearly 10,000 now employed in variety of tasks in city agencies, or nonprofit voluntary agencies. Pay is $1.25 an hour for a 30-hour week.

Who's in charge: Economic Opportunity Committee.

Budget: $9,156,310 in Federal funds.

Project Head Start

Objective: Preschool training for 2 months for 25,675 children from slum areas, with emphasis on close contact with parents. Included are complete medical examinations and treatment where necessary. The 5- and 6-year-old children get free lunches and recreational activities aimed at educational and cultural enrichment.

Present status: Nearly 26,000 children are enrolled in program that started July 6. They meet in 280 centers located in public and parochial schools, settlement houses and other locations in the 16 poverty-target areas.

Who's in charge: Economic Opportunity Committee.

Budget: $4,759,000 in Federal funds (New York City advanced $1 million to enable many agencies to get started without waiting for Federal funds).

Summer crash program

Objective: Summer activities ranging from recreational camps for 11,200 children, to cultural programs, training projects and home management assistance geared for older children, teenagers and adults.

Present status: The 34 agencies involved now are tooling up for actual operation. It is expected that children will start departing for camps in 1 week.

Who's in charge: Coordinated by the Community Council of Greater New York, under direction of the EOC.

Budget: $2,368,870 in Federal funds. (New York City has advanced $750,000 while awaiting Federal funds.)

New York Medical College Institute for Development Studies

Objective: To attempt to reverse the effects of social disadvantage or deprivation through a 5-year experimental and demonstration program by offering a special curriculum in courses covering five age groups, from prekindergarten through third grade.

Present status: The program was started in 1962 through private funding. It has enrolled 1 successive class each year and now has 400 children.

Who's in charge: New York Medical College Institute of Developmental Studies.

Budget: $558,480, in Federal funds.

Harlem Youth Unlimited program

Objective: To offer young people their own social action program, covering eight general areas; personnel, fiscal, legal, community action, community services, arts and culture, business enterprise, and public relations.

Present status: About 1,500 enrolled in 35 units.

Who's in charge: Haryou-ACT.

Budget: $597,276 in city funds and $82,839 in Federal funds.

Occupational job training program

Objective: The training of heretofore unemployable young boys and girls, 16 to 21, and providing them with skills through on-the-job-training in a number of job categories, including household appliance and refrigeration repair, auto body work, hairmaking (wigs), cabinetmaking, shoe repair.

Present status: There are 145 now engaged in on-the-job training work through arrangements with business organizations.

Who's in charge: Haryou-ACT.

Budget: $567,000 in Federal funds.

Project uplift

Objective: Engaging youngsters in purposeful activities through a 10 week summer crash training program that will fulfill some of Harlem's needs. Projects envisioned call for tree planting, creation of miniature parks by the cleaning up of debris-ridden empty lots, repair and refurbishment work where it can be used, and assistance in tenant and block organization by older participants.

Present status: To date, 2,500 persons are enlisted. Young adults, 22 to 25 years old, can earn up to $80 a week as supervisors in sports and city day camps that will serve 16,000 children. Those in the 14 to 21 age group earn $1.25 an hour. Handling parts of the program are the Uban League, Associated Community Teams, the Harlem Neighborhood Association, and the Harlem Action Committee.

Who's in charge: Haryou-ACT.

Budget: $2.1 million in Federal funds.

Arts and sciences

Objective: To instill cultural awareness in Harlem youth and develop their talents in the arts. Program helps find jobs.

Present status: About 700 young people are involved in courses in the dance, drama, fashion and design, film and sound, newspaper work, band music, culture.

Who's in charge: Haryou-ACT.

Budget: $452,000 from the city and $82,735 in Federal funds.

New York City Department of Labor—Port of New York Authority training program

Objective: The training through a 1-year program of 6,000 men who are on welfare or who are unemployed, and at end of training periods placing them on jobs. Training includes heavy vehicle driving, oil burner and air-conditioning maintenance, custodial, and gardening work.

Present status: There were 1,500 applicants for enrollment, and 700 are now taking courses in the first training period. After they leave, other applicants will be received throughout the year.

Who is in charge: Port of New York Authority, under responsibility of city labor department.

Budget: $1,836,167 in city funds.

College discovery program

Objective: To help students, disadvantaged by socioeconomic circumstances, whose teachers in high school believe they have potential beyond their grades because of interest and motivation.

Present status: The program was started in 1964 with State funds, and 210 young people entered community colleges of the City University of New York. The program will be doubled this year.

Who is in charge: City University of New York.

Budget: $1 million from New York State and $500,000 in city funds.

My whole thesis on what this means in my city can be summed up in this observation: Last year in July we had riots, violence, desperation, and disorder all over our city. This year thankfully thus far we have had no such recurrence. Maybe it is not out attention to the poor and community action that is bringing peace in some way to my town but we must be doing something right and if the war on poverty is that something I am going to support it with faith and hope.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and six Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I must rise in opposition to H.R. 8283 since the goal of the poverty program is one that I share, but the bill now before us is possibly the worst example of an ill-conceived attempt at buying votes by a Federal giveaway program.

In an attempt to secure some information about this program, the Republican task force on economic opportunity held 5 days of hearings which began on June 8 and ended on June 17.

On June 9 the task force heard from Carl H. Madden, director of the department of economic research of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Dr. Madden's statement was an eloquent repudiation of H.R. 8283, which would double funds for the hastily contrived programs administered by the OEO. Dr. Madden's statement was almost identical to the one which he had submitted to the House Committee on Education and Labor and it was meant to be placed into the record of the brief hearings held by Chairman POWELL, but it was, perhaps inadvertently, left out of the published materials.

Dr. Madden explained that the chamber had cautioned against hasty enactment of this legislation when it was first proposed last year, since there were and still are serious gaps in our knowledge and understanding about poverty in America. Despite the fact that this program will have a very large impact on the lives of many of our citizens, the vote-buying power of the proposals was apparently so strong that the half-baked program was rushed through the last Congress—unfortunately, without heeding past mistakes in similar programs. The Congress was promised a full review of this program for the 89th Congress, but all we got was a picture book, glossing over any attempts at constructive discussion.

The chamber's opposition to the bill in the last Congress and Dr. Madden's serious reservations about the bill now before us do not imply in any way that the business community regards the problem of poverty as insignificant. According to Dr. Madden, the business community is indeed concerned, as witnessed by the impressive list of experts contacted by the chamber's study group on the subject, but the chamber advocates greater use of existing Federal programs to fight poverty until the problem is better understood. Doubling of funds only doubles mistakes and may actually reduce understanding. Since the 10 or 11 programs under OEO's direction established new social institutions, which manipulate the lives of people by their very nature, the war on poverty must proceed with care and discretion.

A great many problems have been uncovered by our task force hearings in a brief 5 days. Work-training programs are encouraging some youngsters to drop out of school; Job Corps camps are the scenes of riots; and continuous administrative bickering over who owns them is the only way in which the poor are being involved. The task force believes that more information is necessary about the successes and failures of prior campaigns. I repeat, doubling the funds for programs already in trouble leads only to an escalation of these difficulties.

Since I come from a State where 40 percent of all families have incomes below $3,000, I am indeed anxious to see victory over poverty. Yet, I question whether programs involving tight bureaucratic Federal control are an efficient way to do this. Local authorities who are much closer to the problem and are politically responsive to the needs of their people are the ones who should have a major share of the responsibility and, therefore, also the control. They should not be bypassed and all decisions left to the OEO office in Washington. I firmly believe that effective antipoverty programs cannot be conducted by a centralized bureaucracy, which is isolated from the problem and, in particular, by a part-time Administrator.

I do believe that poverty can be eliminated and the distress of the poor alleviated. Since the Federal Government classifies almost a quarter of my constituents as poor, my personal concern is strengthened by my political responsibility. However, I am sure that the vicious cycle of poverty for my constituents will never be broken by the present program.

A more correct approach to the solution of the poverty problem may involve some of the programs presently advocated by House Republicans and other concerned citizens. The education tax credits, extension of the work-study program, and technical assistance to States are the cornerstones upon which a meaningful poverty program might be built. Furthermore, I believe that the surest cure for the disease of poverty is vigorous economic growth in the private sector. We should not give up on free enterprise which has done the job so well in the past.

In short, I am as eager as anyone for a constructive program to alleviate the conditions under which a sizable part of our Nation's families must live. I am, however, opposed to doubling the authorization for a program which was built on false premises, hastily concocted, and is now being administered without any regard to local sensibilities. I believe very strongly that the solution lies in the greater utilization of the private sector and not in huge Federal giveaway programs that are constructed by using plans drawn up on the basis of political expediency, rather than economic efficiency. Therefore, I regret that I must oppose H.R. 8283.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. In light of the gentleman's comment with regard to doubling the program, is the gentleman aware of the fact that the authorization asked for in the amendments now pending before this body would do nothing more than maintain, and perhaps not fully, the present level of spending, without increasing the size or magnitude of a single program presently conceived and in operation at the local level?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. We have been told that but it appears from the way we are beginning that next year we will be told that we will need $4 billion in order to do the same thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I might point out that a tremendous amount of the money that was appropriated for the fiscal year we have passed, fiscal year 1965, was incurred, was obligated but it was not spent. That money will be spent in this coming fiscal year. The authorization provided for in this bill if it is fully appropriated would be on top of that amount. So it is not $1.9 billion about which we are talking that could be spent in fiscal year 1966, but it is also the money that has been obligated but not spent for fiscal year 1965 as well. The figures I have received from OEO are as follows:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Fiscal summary of obligations

[Thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year program	Incurred to June 19, 1965	Incurred to June 30, 1965	Unobligated balances
Direct programs:				
Job Corps	183,000	173,000	178,950	4,050
Community action program	240,100	196,899	236,819	3,281
Migratory agricultural workers	15,000	11,739	14,945	55
VISTA program	3,200	2,507	2,750	450
General direction and administration	6,500	4,906	6,291	209
Total direct programs	447,800	389,310	439,755	6,045
Delegated programs:				
Working training, Labor	132,500	125,205	132,142	358
Work study, HEW	56,000	31,417	55,088	912
Rural areas, FHA	25,700	18,296	20,150	5,550
Work experience, HEW	112,000	81,592	111,983	17
Adult literacy, HEW	19,000	2,692	4,438	14,562
Total delegated programs	345,200	259,202	323,801	21,499
Total OEO programs	793,000	648,512	763,556	29,444

NOTE.—The fact that so much of the funds have so recently been incurred indicates that they will actually be spent after July 1, 1965.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I should like to correct the RECORD. The statement made by the gentleman from Minnesota is entirely incorrect and not at all in keeping with the facts of the matter.

In my own State of Michigan I can demonstrate numerous programs which have been approved and which are awaiting the new authorization because the funds for the carrying out of the programs have been exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to get into any dialog with my colleague on the committee who criticized the Chicago program.

The record will show that Chicago today has the best antipoverty program in this country. We have seven community action centers actually operating. We have 20,000 youngsters in Head Start. We have utilized every aspect of this program.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Chicago program will stand up to any test that anyone wants to offer.

Mr. Chairman, my purpose in discussing this bill today is to discuss the part which deals with the elderly people in this program. We frequently get the impression that the President's antipoverty program is directed primarily at young people, certainly, because problems have been most acute among the young people.

President Johnson, in announcing this program, said it was his great hope we might be able to make some dent in the tragic trend of one generation after another of Americans remaining in poverty. So, quite understandingly and properly, the main crux of this program has been at the young people, but I want my colleagues to know that the Office of Economic Opportunity regards the plight of the aged poor as a matter of highest priority. It has taken steps both to implement its own attack on their severe and only partially resolved problems, and to lend its weight to major, existing programs.

The OEO has shown itself acutely conscious of the fact that one-third of our citizens over 65 are poor. At a time when, by any humane standard, these men and women should be free of harrassing and debilitating problems—free to enjoy peace of mind based on secure leisure or constructive work within their capacities—they are as troubled—more troubled—than in the days of their prime.

The OEO, I understand, has accepted a triple role in helping to solve their problems:

First, initiating and conducting programs based on analysis of the problems peculiar to the aged poor;

Second, seeing to it that the elderly are not slighted in the existing community action programs now functioning in more than 600 cities and counties throughout the nation;

And third—keeping these citizens informed of those benefits available to them under all existing legislation. So far, no study has been made, to my knowledge, of the number of these elderly persons who know vaguely of all such legislation designed to help them. I venture to guess the number is small. Because of incapacity, many cannot get down to the corner drugstore for a newspaper, or even lack the bus fare to get to the office where they can be served. Then there are the additional hindrances of having to fill out applications, long waits in the office, and the long waiting thereafter for help to arrive.

Here is how the poverty war is going to attack the problems of the elderly.

Along with the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, it will launch within the next few weeks what is known as the foster grandparents program. This program will employ poor persons, 55 and older, to help care for infants and young children in charity wards, institutions for abandoned and neglected children, in pediatric and general hospitals. These institutions house tens of thousands of healthy but neglected youngsters. The OEO proposes to find and to finance jobs for the elderly to help care for, and to stimulate the minds of, these children. I believe this program will open an opportunity to a substantial number of the aged poor to supplement their meager incomes to a point where they can at least hold the line against poverty, while giving them simultaneously a sense of worth in helping solve a very serious social problem.

A second program is also soon to be implemented—one designed to help the chronically ill and physically disabled by sending elderly visitors to homes of shut-ins, making life a little more cheerful for them while providing useful work for the visitors. The elderly can provide such services as shopping, cleaning, cooking, and make it possible to keep scores out of institutions. A demonstration project along these lines has been funded in Baltimore—a project providing help for the chronically ill over 60. Johns Hopkins University Hospital, the University of Maryland Hospital, the city hospitals, the Department of Public Health, and the Visiting Nurses Association—all are cooperating.

Of course, the deep substantive effort for the elderly poor must continue to be made by the social security program with its new medicare provisions, the omnibus housing bill, the grants involved in the Older Americans Act, and others. But the antipoverty program is now ready to supplement these measures with concrete and dynamic programs.

This is not a babysitter project but rather a sincere effort to make maximum use of the excellent help we can get from America's senior citizens in raising the standards of impoverished children.

In Chicago alone, we need today 70,000 foster homes to help these unfortunate youngsters—the senior citizens contemplated in this project will not provide foster homes but they will provide the next best thing—guidance for these youngsters in public institutions on a part-time basis.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, earlier in this debate reference has been made to the fact that the primary problems of the War on Poverty are due to the partisan politics involved in the administration of the program. It has also been suggested that anyone criticizing the program is doing so for purely partisan political reasons. Mr. Chairman, I want to bring this type of comment to a screeching halt because I am personally convinced that no benefits will accrue to the program or the Congress generally by a continuance of this type of remark or reference.

I would make this observation, however, that I believe every Member of this House has a continuing responsibility to oppose that which he or she feels is not in the best interests of this country's progress and in particular to see that our taxpayer and constituent interests are protected. If the day ever comes when we are not permitted to constructively criticize any part of the Federal Government's vast operations, God help us.

While many people may be back here for the sole purpose of rubberstamping every legislative proposal of the administration, I want to make it perfectly clear that I shall never yield my right to forthrightly present an opposing point of view. Conversely, I will be among the first to support and praise a program when I think it serves the best interests of all our people. I believe my record will bear this out.

For many of us who serve on committees other than the Education and Labor Committee, our only opportunity to hear comment on the poverty program comes from constituent correspondence or some of the committee reports. However, in order to better inform myself on this vital subject, I was asked and subsequently consented to serve on a special study committee formed to evaluate and hear testimony from people throughout the country who were becoming disenchanted with the administration of the program. Briefly, I would like to offer a few of the observations made.

First, let me say there are some very fine and dedicated people who are working diligently to improve the lot of underprivileged people throughout the Nation. They were working before this so-called war on poverty program was established and I am convinced they will be working toward the some goals long after this program either ceases or is revised because this is the kind of people they are. Quite frankly the great volunteer organizations of this Nation have been the backbone of the outstanding humanitarian efforts which truly represent what is great about America—the unselfish devotion to help our fellowman in time of need. I like to think that I have made some small contribution to the advancement of a number of these programs in the communities of my residence.

Secondly, I am going to say there has been a considerable amount of good in this program, because if one is honest and realistic, I believe there is good to be found in any program and this is no exception. The thing that does concern me and I know many of my colleagues is how sensitive the proponents of this legislation are to criticism or offers of amendments to improve the bill.

If any program at any level of government cannot stand the test of committee scrutiny, that program is unworthy of the support of this Congress and should be stopped.

The members of the committee have expressed consistent displeasure with the lack of adequate committee hearings on all sections of the bill. Again, I believe it is the responsibility of this committee to hear all sides of what has developed into a controversial piece of legislation, thereby permitting the concerned citizenry to either praise or condemn the various sections of the bill. Apparently, the majority has not seen fit to do so, even though the Members of the Senate are asking that this be done. My colleagues, a price will be paid for the railroading of legislation through this House—a price in dollars wasted and a price in some of the improper sense of values being created by certain portions of the bill.

The Republican Task Force on Economic Opportunity, of which I am a member, has examined a number of the programs established under the Economic Opportunity Act. This brief examination reveals that the whole antipoverty program is based on false premises. The program was enacted in haste, without careful consideration of the experience of existing programs, and with little regard for what the local authorities were trying to do. The desire to do something to help those who are living in poverty is one which I wholeheartedly share, but the poverty program as it now operates is not the answer. It would be extremely undesirable to double the funds for an as yet unproven program in which more flaws are appearing every day. For these reasons, I have grave reservations about lending support to the passage of H.R. 8283.

One of the task force witnesses, Rose Friedman, an economist from the University of Chicago, testified before us on June 10. In her statement, and in her book, "Poverty: Definition and Perspective," Mrs. Friedman stresses what is perhaps the most questionable assumption of the whole poverty program: The implicit acceptance of an unsuitable definition of poverty. Mrs. Friedman concludes that there is no objective criterion of poverty, because there is no objective and unchanging way to rank people according to their level of living, and no unambiguous way to draw a dividing line separating those in poverty from those who are not. Investigators have been driven to concentrate on the material standard of life; that is, the money value of the goods and services a family can acquire.

Unable to arrive at a true money value of these goods and services, these investigators have turned to the most elementary of the material needs of life. The $3,000 definition of poverty which was presented in the 1964 report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers is implicitly based on food expenditures as a criterion for defining poverty: The estimated cost of adequate nutrition derived by the Department of Agriculture was multiplied by an estimate of what part of a family's income is spent for food, ignoring the widely accepted fact that as income rises, the percentage spent on food goes down.

The acceptance of the $3,000 criterion is misleading. The number of people considered to be living in poverty is grossly overestimated as a result of this definition of poverty which fails to take into account the size of family, regional differences, nonmoney income, or many other factors.

An even more important problem created by acceptance of the simple $3,000 boundary is that the poor are misidentified, and programs are aimed at the wrong area. The community action programs and the Job Corps, for example, often ignore the basic problems such as making sure that large families have enough to eat, and that the children of large families are able to receive education. Adhesion to the $3,000 definition of poverty has already encumbered the operation of work-study programs set up under the Economic Opportunity Act.

The Economic Opportunity Act programs, aside from being based on misleading definition of poverty, have committed errors in bypassing local authorities and organizations. The projects have begun to replace existing agencies and church organizations without pausing to learn from their experience. Considerably more involvement of these long-standing, established agencies is called for, but the OEO bureaucracy has virtually ignored them. The bureaucrats who direct the OEO program do not have the knowledge or the understanding of local problems; they are making an irreparable mistake in ignoring past experiences and neglecting to profit from the expertise of local administrators.

Initiative is stifled and volunteer programs abandoned when poorly directed Federal money pours into an area. Who will continue to support the Salvation Army, when the Federal Government promises to perform all its functions without asking for local money or volunteers? The something for nothing idea of the EOA is appealing, but fatal to local initiative.

If we cannot reexamine the poverty program with an eye to correcting its flaws, at least we need not double our authorization to it to perpetrate these errors. Unless amendments are adopted to improve the bill, I shall have to oppose this legislation.

Today the gentlemen from California [Mr. Bell and Mr. Roosevelt] engaged themselves in a brief colloquy about certain veto powers to either be included or left out of this legislation.

As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] has so ably pointed out—the success of the program is entirely dependent upon the full cooperation of the local units of government, the States and the people involved in the actual poverty areas.

The gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt] has charged that to grant the local unit of government a veto power over this program would be like establishing a dictatorship. I now see why he was rejected by the voters of Los Angeles in the recent mayoralty primary—he just does not understand the workings of local government and in particular California's local government, which is generally recognized as nearly the best, if not the finest, in the United States.

All of these representatives, serving as councilmen and supervisors are elected, I repeat, elected to their respective offices. If this is a dictatorship, I think Mr. Webster's dictionary needs to be revised. This is truly representative government at the level closest to the people where the problems actually exist. They, too, have a responsibility to be concerned about the problems of their respective communities. Above all, these representatives of local government should have the maximum opportunity to have a say in any governmental program—if anyone is entitled to a veto power, it should be these elected officials, be they mayor, supervisor, or councilman. The Governor of each State should have a similar right in order to guarantee against a wasteful duplication of effort and money. One of the greatest dangers of this bill lies in the possible circumvention of local and State authorities. Every successful program thus far developed such as Vocational Education and the Manpower Development and Training Acts have provided this basic recognition of State and local government participation and responsibility. This program will not be successful unless this concept is recognized and included in the language of the bill.

As I have said before, one must praise segments of legislation if experience proves the overall benefits and success of a program to be worthwhile.

Without question, the so-called Project Head Start portion of the bill has received high praise in many sections of the country. This pleases me for two reasons.

First, this head start concept is included in an education bill that I introduced, along with some of my Republican colleagues as an alternative to the administration's Federal aid to education and secondly, this concept had the endorsement and approval of our California Teachers Association. This again proves that worthwhile recommendations can stand up under the most careful scrutiny of any congressional committee, providing the committee has the unrestricted opportunity to work its will—free from partisan political bickering or steamroller tactics.

The St. Petersburg problem heretofore referred to in this debate has developed some facts that suggest a thorough investigation by an appropriate committee of the Congress. In view of remarks made here today, some rather serious allegations have been made and it leads one to believe that certain aspects of the operations might properly come within the purview of Federal grand juries.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to make my position abundantly clear. I will vote for any program that has been carefully worked out by any congressional committee that clearly recognizes the basic authority and responsibility of all levels of Government. My own committee on Public Works recently presented to this House the water pollution bill. This legislation, I am proud to say, was one of the few bills in the history of this Congress to pass unanimously. This should prove rather specifically that we practice what we preach.

It is very regrettable that the House Committee on Education and Labor has not seen fit to carry on its proceedings in a similar manner.

In order to have true representative government function at its best we must permit all Members to participate in the development of our legislation. There is no one Member of this Congress who knows all the answers to all problems. Real progress is born as a result of a clash of ideas—mutually dedicated to a common goal. This is the inherent objective of our great two-party system. Continued acceptance of this practice will always lead to success and political expedience, without proper checks, will lead to failure—our history is full of ill-advised attempts to circumvent the regularly established authorities of this Nation. I hope the Members will permit the Committee of this Whole House to work its will during the time for amendments. I thank the committee members for granting me this time to express myself on this measure.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, there are only a couple more speakers on this side. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Minnesota whether he is ready to wind up general debate on this today. Any other speakers we have would certainly be willing to extend their remarks at this time.

I do not wish to delay the House or to hold Members here all night or anything like that. I thought perhaps we could reach some amicable conclusion of the general debate. I understand there are 21 amendments to be considered tomorrow under the 5-minute rule. I do not wish to be arbitrary about the time under the 5-minute rule tomorrow. I should like to allow plenty of time. I thought perhaps we could work out some amicable arrangement for ending the discussion today.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I promised these gentlemen an opportunity to speak today. I feel obligated to permit them to do so.

Mr. GIBBONS. So far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Minnesota will proceed and yield time for his people to speak, I will not impose on my colleagues.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Buchanan].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee which, ably chaired by the gentleman from North Carolina David Henderson, has, I believe, already saved this country millions of dollars in its work, in taking a hard look at the executive side of this Government and recommending improvements in the use of personnel.

At a recent hearing we had before us officials of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Our primary witness was Mr. Jack T. Conway, its Deputy Director. In the course of that hearing I began a line of questioning which brought me into an area which gives me great concern.

Mr. Conway testified that among the other groups in the community action program of the war on poverty which are participating were church and other religious organizations. This represents only a tiny minority of the programs in existence.

For example, under the Project Head Start program only some 86 out of 2,400 or 2,500 Head Start project grants were made to church or religious organizations. Doing away with this portion involving church and religious organizations in these Government projects would in no way endanger the poverty program or limit it from the point of view of its most ardent supporters.

May I point out that in my State, out of some 62 Project Head Start programs, 38 are being handled by county or city boards of education, which seems to me entirely fitting and proper. Four are handled by individual schools, and 16 by civic groups, including three PTA groups. All of these are proper groups to administer such a program. But four of these projects are handled by church organizations. Only 4 out of some 62 I know of in my State are handled that way. I believe this to be typical around the country. This is a tiny minority, but one which gets us into an area in which it seems to me we are operating in direct conflict with the first amendment to the Constitution. I do not believe that this was the intent of the Congress in the passage of the act. There is nothing in the bill that I can find which would give leeway for the use of church organizations in dispensing Federal funds.

Such an arrangement means that either the church is acting as an agency of the Government and therefore coming under the Government, which is an improper arrangement for a church, or it means that Federal funds are being expended to carry on a church program with tax money.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the projects he is talking about are based on applications not made directly by the churches or any religious group but by a corporation chartered expressly for the purpose of carrying out the purposes for which the application is made? I might say to the gentleman that in my own State of Michigan there is such an organization of Protestant welfare groups and a Catholic welfare conference representing the Catholic churches which went to work and chartered just such a corporation. Is it not true that if we adopt the reason the gentleman is now putting forth, we would prevent these two fine organizations, representing the two principal religious groups in my State, from forming such a public corporation for the purpose of carrying on the migrant worker program?

Mr. BUCHANAN. May I say to the gentleman for 2,000 years the Christian church has operated without the assistance of taxpayers' money but with offerings from the hearts of people and works from the hands of people voluntarily given in caring for widows and orphans and carrying on programs of benevolence. May I say further that one of the greatest dangers to the church in our time is that it is losing its centrality and importance in our society because it is turning over such benevolent functions to secular organizations and the State.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AYRES. For the benefit of the members of the Committee, I would like to say that the gentleman from Alabama now in the well speaks as an authority on the subject as one of the few ordained ministers in the House. I commend him for the thoroughness with which he has gone into this and for bringing it before the House, because it is a very, very serious question.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, the war on poverty is not a slogan nor an objective. It is a number of federally financed programs administered variously by the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Labor, the Small Business Administration, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

No real understanding can be had of the various programs if they are lumped together in discussion, for they have little in common with each other.

I had the opportunity earlier this year to express my point of view before the Tri-County Long Island Labor-Management Institute, which is jointly sponsored by the Long Island Press in cooperation with the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

I fully agree with the objective of eliminating poverty in our Nation. I worked toward this end from my first day in Congress. But I did not in the name of antipoverty support programs that could not be demonstrated to have a reasonable chance to achieve their ends.

The resources of our Treasury and the patience of our taxpayers are limited. They should not be squandered nor wasted, but they should be utilized wisely, soundly, and where they will do the most good.

To put it graphically—if we load our cannon in this war with duds, then no matter how high and lofty our aim, we are sure to fail.

For example: The manpower retraining program, which I supported, had defined goals, and a system of achievement spelled out in reasonable detail. It has produced results and will continue to do so.

On the other hand, the poverty program was literally thrown at Congress without proper committee study, and passed without deliberation. As a result the program contains more hope than substance and is a dangerous delusion.

Its noble aims are no answer to attacks being launched from all quarters upon it.

Its mistake is that while it is in the main an experimental program, it is financed as an operational one.

For example: The community action programs are not really programs but merely Federal financing for programs and should have been tried experimentally and developed in a few communities. This experience would have demonstrated the means to success and would have eliminated the causes of the failures.

Instead, we are simultaneously starting thousands of programs at the cost of billions of dollars. The frustration, confusion, and waste of funds that has resulted are inevitable.

There are those who justify this procedure because of the emergency nature of the poverty problem arising from its racial aspects. I agree that we should be bold and more daring because of this, but I believe it more dangerous in the long run to promise more than can be delivered, and the waste of our resources will embitter those who need help, and whose help we need the most.

Personally, my conscience is not eased nor is my sense of civic responsibility reassured by the spending of large amounts of tax dollars.

Rather, I am deeply disturbed by the daily recitation in the press of the struggle for control of the Federal dollars—an aspect that makes the war on poverty appear to be a civil war between the poor and the politicians.

I am confused by the argument over allowing the poor to run the programs when being poor is subject to changing bureaucratic definition, and when it is evident that immediately upon going to work for the poverty program, the poor person is no longer a member of the poverty-stricken group.

I am apprehensive of public reaction when I find that children of non-poverty-stricken parents will be allowed to attend free, federally financed nursery schools.

I question the wisdom of paying those who drop out of school to return because of the example it sets for those left behind on the borderline.

Last year when I raised these questions, mine was a lonely voice. Now that a chorus of dissent is being raised, I find no pleasure in adding to the din.

I want the program to succeed, and I do believe it can be of help. But it will fail if public confidence is undermined. This was the fate of the Area Redevelopment Administration.

I call now for a dimension to the program that is in keeping with our state of the art. The program should be of a size to be administered effectively. It should be treated as an experiment, and all groups should be given an opportunity to demonstrate how their programs will achieve results.

Politics and patronage must be totally excluded. Accountability must be maintained.

I am preparing an amendment which will call for an effective audit by the General Accounting Office of all Federal funds spent by private organizations and councils under this program. I intend to offer it on the floor when the bill is open for amendments under the rule.

I hope it will be adopted.

Our purpose must be to maintain public confidence in the program—for without public backing no war can be won.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, for evidence of how well this war on poverty is doing, I naturally look first to Rhode Island. And what I have seen there—what I have watched develop in just the past few months—is one of the most heartening and promising peacetime programs I have ever witnessed in my State.

For what I find there are not just tangible and immediate results—though those have been ample. I find that a process of progress has been set in motion, that there is an impetus toward far greater achievement in the future. I find that our communities have geared up to eradicate poverty from their midsts. I find that citizens of all interests and all walks of life have mobilized into active forces against this common enemy. I find them joined together in a special partnership dedicated to helping the poor and, by so doing, elevating the whole community.

A new spirit of initiative has come alive in this great movement of conscience. I take great pride in citing some of its achievements.

The Second Congressional District of Rhode Island has so far been granted well over $3 million by the Office of Economic Opportunity. With these funds, first of all, a special program is underway to help school-age children—those from poor families who are potential dropouts—make a success of school. Some 5,500 of them have been or will be aided in projects that will run through next June.

Four of our communities have opened Project Head Start child development centers, where 720 children are being helped to get a good start in school next September. And the project is reaching a lot of adults, too—67 mothers of these children, all of them poor, are employed by the centers. About 50 other residents of the poverty areas are working as volunteer aids.

But of even broader significance are the funds the cities of Providence and Warwick have received for program development—grants that are helping them to identify their poverty problems and formulate a solid plan of attack.

Program development in Providence was an 8-month project, and it is almost completed. Long-range plans are about to be put into effect. Under the local antipoverty organization, called Progress for Providence, Inc., data has been collected and analyzed and used as a sound basis for plans. It will not be long now before the plans are converted into projects that will reach into the roots of poverty and weed it out.

Like Providence, Warwick has a program development organization that is broadly representative of public and private agencies, various interest groups and—most importantly—the poor themselves. The Warwick group is called the Committee for Economic Opportunity, and like the Providence organization, it was responsible for the Head Start and other school projects.

There are other examples of how the war on poverty is affecting my district. There is the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which is keeping some 1,700 Providence youths employed, helping them to stay in school or teaching them job skills. There are the VISTA volunteers assigned to South Providence to expand the city's pioneering effort to improve the living conditions of families trapped in poverty.

We are being asked to authorize more than twice the original appropriations for this humanitarian war. By and large, this increase is not a new investment. It is not so much a matter of making a new commitment as simply keeping the old one.

The real commitment was made last year. We committed enough funds to put the staffs together, design the operation, lay the plans and make the rules, and finally to get the production lines rolling—producing opportunity for 35 million of our fellow citizens. And the demand for our product has been overwhelming.

But the question now is: Will we keep the supply coming? After creating hope in America's needy millions, after having let them sample opportunity, will we move on to give them a full measure of what the program promised? Or will we disappoint them, as they have so often been disappointed in the past? Will we have raised their expectations, only to sink them under the weight of our own falling spirits?

We cannot and we will not. We must back up our initial investment with continued dedication to, and belief in, our great enterprise.

And I for one see no reason to hedge or waiver now. Indeed, there is every reason to believe the program has progressed beyond all reasonable expectations—in Rhode Island as throughout the country. A total of more than 3½ million poor people already benefited. And the faith of the Congress that the American people, given only the chance and the impetus, would join together in a massive demonstration of their wills to improve the plight of their less fortunate neighbors, is being vindicated.

The war on poverty is essentially a hometown fight by all citizens. Thus, to curtail it now, to arbitrarily weaken or slow it, would be a betrayal of all our people.

I feel that an increase in appropriations is fully justified—not only in the light of future promises, not only in the light of past accomplishments, but in the light of what past efforts promise in the way of future achievement. And in the light of the program's goals—the banishment of poverty from our land—an increase seems to me absolutely vital.

Mr. Chairman, let me add that my faith in the American people to implement this program is matched by my faith in the OEO to administer it well. Under its dynamic director, Sargent Shriver, that agency has carried on a program that is prudent, practical, and purposeful. I have every confidence that it will continue to be so.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I do not hesitate to give my full support to the bill before us. And I urge my colleagues to join me in lining up to the commitment, and the promise, we made to America last year.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8238, the bill to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The bill we passed last year establishing this novel and very worthwhile program carried an authorization for an appropriation for only 1 year. This legislation will authorize an antipoverty program of $1.895 billion for another year. The Committee on Education and Labor points out in its report that the authorizations contained in the bill are estimated as sufficient to support the following program levels:

Job Corps 80,000 enrollees; Community Action, 1,100 grants in 700 communities; Volunteers In Service to America—VISTA—5,000 volunteers in 200 communities; Neighborhood Youth Corps, 300,000 teenagers in 500 communities, plus an additional 100,000 during the summer of 1966; college work-study, approximately 145,000 students in 1,300 colleges; adult basic education, 70,000 trainees in 50 States and 4 territories; work experience, 224,000 participants in 50 States and 4 territories; and rural loans, $36,800,000 for 22,100 individual loans and $8,200,000 for 410 co-op loans.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the committee report that the war on poverty, although only 10 months old, has been well begun. The programs seem soundly conceived and the administration of it, while experiencing some growing pains, is being well and faithfully carried out by a very small but hard-working, zealous, and dedicated staff under the directorship of Sargent Shriver. I know that the poverty programs have been well received by all of the public and private social agencies in the communities of my congressional district. The cities of Springfield and Chicopee and the town of Palmer have made significant progress in establishing community action commissions, making applications for grants, and initiating programs available under this war-on-poverty legislation. Other communities in my district are now organizing their community action commissions and will soon arrive at the stage of formal applications submission. I have kept in close touch with these communities, their programs, and their progress, and given them every bit of assistance possible in launching their efforts in the war on poverty. I want to take this opportunity to thank Director Shriver and the members of his dedicated and overworked staff, and the staffs of the separate agencies participating in the antipoverty programs, such as Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, for their fine cooperation and courtesy extended to me and my office staff in checking out programs, policies, and applications so that we can be of assistance to the communities of the Second District of Massachusetts in the war on poverty.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this authorization so that this antipoverty program can continue to help people help themselves.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, every so often, perhaps once in a generation, the American people are joined together in a cause so universal, so unquestionably worthy, that it transcends all boundaries of race, religion, political affiliation, social status, and economic interest. Such a cause, I believe, is the war on poverty. I do not know of any peacetime effort that has so engrossed so many of our people, from so wide a range of backgrounds and interests.

And so, when we consider this year's bill to conduct this great campaign, let us remember this: The concerns of Americans on all levels—not just of the poor themselves—are at stake.

We know this program is not just a Government effort. We know it cannot be, without falling into the same bottomless pit that has consumed so many other welfare projects. The fact that poverty is still shockingly with us indicates the need for a new approach. And the approach called for—by the Economic Opportunity Act and by our common humanity—is a joining of hands and resources, public and private.

Now, this is being done on a grand and inspiring scale. But it seems to me that so much attention has been given public efforts, the work of the private sector has been overshadowed and overlooked. We have failed to give due credit to a vital ally in this struggle.

I am speaking of American business and industry. In a recent article, the renowned columnist, Miss Sylvia Porter, gave credit where credit is due. She shed light on a facet of this tremendous national undertaking that has been obscured too long.

She gives a few poignant examples of what the private sector is doing. Such as:

The American Optometric Association has offered the services of its 12,000 members to both Project Head Start preschoolers and Job Corps enrollees. It will provide free eye exams and glasses to thousands of these youngsters.

The communications media—newspapers, magazines, TV, radio, billboards—have contributed $8 million of free publicity to promote the poverty program's **Job Corps, Head Start,** and VISTA volunteer projects.

Five great industries are running urban Job Corps centers on a very slim margin of profit—far below what they might expect on normal investments. And one of them—Ford—has donated $20,000 worth of equipment for training auto mechanics.

Industry's involvement in the war on poverty is thorough; industrialists are setting up business leadership advisory councils to work with Government-sponsored antipoverty programs; the American Bankers Association has created a bankers council on economic opportunity; chambers of commerce are studying local poverty conditions and needs; the New York Stock Exchange will hire Job Corps graduates, despite the lack of the usual educational requirements; individual businessmen are lending their special talents to their community programs, joining with other segments of the community in this united campaign.

Corporations across the country are opening job opportunities to young people trained by the war on poverty. And they are spending billions on their own training and retraining programs.

All in all, industry's private war on poverty is costing some $17 billion a year—or more than half of what government on all levels is spending to help the poor.

All these efforts deserve the highest commendation. It is obvious that industry is doing more than merely cooperating in a Government program. It is assuming leadership in a program that depends on the resources of all segments of our Nation for success. And it is proving once again that it can and will respond to the Nation's needs—freely and generously.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has recognized industry's contributions. And they have emphasized that the war on poverty is doomed without the support of the private sector.

It is crystal clear that such support is being given. And with this kind of stability, this kind of balance, the program has proved itself worthy of our continued enthusiasm.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, the so-called Bell amendment would destroy the concept of community action as created by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and since the object of the amendment is to destroy that concept it is fitting to refresh the minds of the Members here as to the relevant purposes of that concept.

The community action program was to draw upon all resources of the community both public and private, both from persons experienced in sociological difficulties in poverty and from the groups to be served by this legislation. It was the intention of title IIA to carry out a multifaceted coordinated attack on the interrelated causes of poverty. The attack was to be comprehensive. And the attack was to make use of the agencies, private as well as public, who had gained experience with the problem under attack through long years of attempting to deal with it.

This task has been undertaken. Where the concept has been followed the community action concept has been confirmed as a proper objective. The difficulty thus far has not been with the concept of community action but with conformity with that concept.

Having stated this, the deficiencies of the Bell amendment will be apparent. It will make the elimination of poverty in these communities more expensive. First, by eliminating the partnership of private resources in combatting poverty, and secondly, by disregarding the efforts of the groups served by this legislation in helping themselves. In other words, the amendment would permanently damage the tripartite partnership of the resources which are waiting to be called forth for the eradication of poverty.

It may be argued that despite the fact that the mayors and county boards may veto these programs, the private agency will still have a role to perform. However, it is less likely that they will engage freely in these programs when they may be frustrated at every turn by Government officials, when an overall limitation on their actions may be imposed by politicians not favoring these groups. Indeed, experience has shown that municipal government has a tendency to desire complete control of these programs under the present act as it is on the books and to exclude the partnership and participation of private agencies and the residents of the areas and members of the groups served unless they have such control. This is wasteful of funds and personnel anxious to help the poor and waiting to be called forward, experienced by years of trying to end the misery of poverty.

There is an additional problem of what might be termed rural confusion or chaos. A number of geographic areas throughout this country are so sparsely populated as to prevent the formation of a community action program under any form of a local centralized governing body. One community action program in Louisiana encompasses six parishes. Southern Georgia and northern Florida each have multicounty community action programs. The need for such spread out community action programs are evident when we consider the fiscal responsibility of making each community action program worth its investment. It would be financially unfeasible to expend large sums of money in administrative costs for a program that would encompass relatively few people. Therefore, we must of necessity in many cases take more than one county or parish in a State and combine these sparsely populated areas so that we can reach enough people in a community action program to make the investment profitable. When such a situation arises, we quite logically will be dealing with multiple political subdivisions at the county and local levels. To adopt the Bell amendment would be to draw these programs into hopeless confusion. There would be no way of determining whether the city council, city manager, city mayor, county manager, county mayor, or any other city or county or groups of city or county governing heads would have the right to veto such a program.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity to express my support for the Economic Opportunity Act of 1965. I had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Education and Labor in the 88th Congress, and of participating in a small way in the development of the act as it was passed last year. Because of a long-standing concern for the problems of adult education, I was particularly pleased and honored to be the primary author of the Adult Basic Education Act of 1964, which, although not passed in its original form, was incorporated into the Economic Opportunity Act as title II–B. I would, therefore, like to say a few words about the operation of this phase of our war on poverty in the United States.

Of all the causes of poverty, none is more serious than the lack of a basic education. The adult basic education program is designed to provide an elementary level education for the 11½ million adults of our country who have less than a sixth grade education. Instruction, under this program, emphasizes mastering of the fundamental skills of reading, writing, speaking, and basic arithmetic. Course content for teaching these skills includes such adult experiences as getting and keeping a job, consumer buying practices, health habits, relationships with other members of the family and community, homemaking, and citizenship responsibilities.

U.S. Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, in a statement made before the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Poverty War Program of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, April 30, 1965, said of this program:

> A beginning step has been taken on what will be a long journey. I am delighted to say that the enthusiasm of the people for this program at all levels has exceeded our most optimistic expectations. We have plenty of poor people wanting to enter this program and I might add that the overwhelming majority of our participants are from the miserably poor.

When the adult basic education program was established, the goal set for fiscal year 1965 was 37,500 participants in all 50 States and the several territories. With only eight States actually operating programs as of June 21, 1965, the enrollment has reached 30,000 in these eight States alone and by June 30, was expected to have 39,000 adults enrolled. In North Carolina alone, there are 15,000 currently enrolled in the ABE program. All of this has taken place in less than 4 months after the first adult basic education programs were made available.

A brief boxscore of accomplishments so far under the adult basic education is revealing.

Adult basic education boxscore

(As of June 21, 1965)

Number of State plans approved	39
Number of State plans pending approval	6
Total	45
Number of participants	29,880
Number of staff (Federal) recruited	21
Number of teachers trained by the States (estimated)	3,000
Number of teacher trainers trained at 3 nationwide institutes (held at the University of Maryland, University of New Mexico, University of Washington) (estimated)	120
Number of State programs funded	13

A superintendent of schools in Boone County, N.C., recently summed it up by saying:

> A bootstrap adult basic education program in my county is serving as a working example to many other small communities that good adult education classes need not always be located in the larger cities and towns. Cooperation with local, civic, business, and education groups; dedicated leadership; and the full use of all available State and Federal funds have enabled this program—without a single pencil, desk, teacher, or director in 1961—to become a showcase for the entire State.

The development of adequate State plans is a time-consuming process. It requires the involvement of local persons in the planning who are familiar with the problems of illiteracy. The State plan is required to reflect the needs as determined by the local communities and the States. Consequently, when a State plan finally is developed, there has been thorough involvement of persons and agencies at all levels within the State. Characteristically, it is this very involvement procedure buttressed by careful planning and teacher training that will in the very near future allow the adult basic education program to accelerate at a much swifter rate the number of people being served by programs at the local level.

The States with approved adult basic education plans involve commitments of fiscal year 1965 allotments totaling $17,215,041. With the 1966 appropriation and the carryover of the fiscal year 1965 funds in the States and territories with approved plans, we expect a minimum of 105,000 adults to be enrolled in adult basic education classes throughout the Nation in the current fiscal year.

Recent information from many State Departments of Education attests to the tremendous need for this program and the great effort being expended to reach and teach those unfortunate masses who are effectively shut out of the American mainstream because of their inability to read and write. To cite only a few instances of progress:

First. In Hawaii this week 1,000 persons are registered in 86 adult basic education classes. For the first time ever, summer classes have been made possible.

Second. In Kentucky, total State enrollment from April to June of this year reached 7,650 persons. In the 19-county Appalachian area project, 4,715 adults were enrolled in basic education classes in cooperation with title V, work experience, program. On July 14, recognition day was held in Floyd County for the 635 enrollees whose classes recently ended. Over 300 of these enrollees were totally illiterate. At a cost of only 46 cents per clock hour, these individuals have achieved gains in grade ranging from .5 to 4.8 grade levels with only 150 hours of instruction.

Third. New York City expected to have 250–275 classes beginning July 6, averaging 15 people each. The city will add an additional 200 hours of instruction in English for their Spanish-speaking population in advance of adult basic education, because experience has proved this training to be necessary.

It hardly seems possible that this great Nation of ours can afford any longer to ignore or short change the millions of adults in our society who are unemployed and unemployable and who represent, therefore, a tremendous drag on our economy. We are paying the cost of limited educational attainment of a large segment of our population in terms of unemployment, low levels of trainable adults, decline in the strength of the family structure, and reduction of participation in the political institutions of our great country.

Funds provided through title II–B of the Economic Opportunity Act in fiscal year 1965 have helped develop an organizational structure, an expertise, and a procedure for attacking the problem. Public school educators have become aware of the pockets of illiteracy all around them. True it is that the 30,000 persons reached so far and the 105,000 who will be reached in fiscal year 1966 are only a beginning attack on the big problem ahead of us. But with sufficient funds it is possible for this, the richest nation in the world, to begin on the long road that will lead to making our country 96 or even 98 percent functionally literate. We have the resources and we know the goal.

We believe there is now a national will to do that recognizes that, to make even a minimal impact on the total problem, the Federal Government should aim to reach effectively no less than 5 million illiterates in the next 10 years.

A firm foundation for the Adult Basic Education Program has been built. Let us proceed now to construct a plan for the future that will substantially conquer our illiteracy problem throughout this great country.

I would be remiss in not concluding by pointing out the great benefit which this part of the Economic Opportunity Act confers upon my own State of California. We are a great State—now the largest in the Union in terms of population—because of a great influx of new citizens who constantly enter our portals.

Many of these new residents are from our sister Republic of Mexico, and other Latin American countries, and are immediately faced with a language barrier and a cultural barrier—of which language is a major part. They are not literate in the English language, although they may be skilled and hardworking citizens who have an adequate mastery of their own tongue. The Adult Basic Education provisions of this legislation will make it possible to take great strides toward meeting the needs of these adults and, by virtue of this, to ease the impact of acculturation on them and upon their children.

Similarly, we are experiencing a great migration of citizens from other States—particularly from the South—and, in many cases, these citizens are undereducated, from rural backgrounds, with many problems of adjustment to an urban culture. Adult Basic Education will provide an opportunity which has implications and results far greater than merely teaching an adult the basic skills of reading and writing.

It has been found over and over again that it is the children from families where the parents do not read and write, where books are a rarity, and where there is little regard for the learning process, who become the problem children in our schools. These are the ones who become dropouts, delinquents, or welfare cases.

California has had more than her share of this kind of problem. Despite her great resources and high standards of education the State has not been able to conquer that problem. So it has been that the help offered by the Economic Opportunity Act will be, if anything, of greater benefit to California than to many of the more economically depressed States of the Union.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that my colleagues will join with me in supporting this legislation and in seeking, with all our ability, to eliminate the scourge of illiteracy in this country and, therefore, the poverty which invariably accompanies that illiteracy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-eight Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, had come to no resolution thereon.

THE LATE NEIL CURRY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise an dextend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that a distinguished American, Mr. Neil Curry, has passed away. Mr. Curry was a great public-spirited citizen whose activities embraced business, politics, civic work, and philanthropy. He was probably known to more Members of Congress than any other person in the country who had not actually served in this body.

He was one of the recognized business geniuses of this country; he served actively on the boards of directors of some 30 of our most prominent corporations. Only a deep and abiding sense of public responsibility and compassion could motivate a man already so burdened to engage, as he did, in so many important civic and charitable undertakings. Mr. Curry was especially fond of children and there is no estimating his contributions to the welfare of asthmatic children and others having medical problems. He was the greatest friend to children that I have ever known; he gave unstintingly to them of both his time and his fortune.

He was eminently admired and loved in Oklahoma. I am sad indeed to announce that this man who was my friend, a friend of my State, of so many Members of Congress, and of so many Americans, will be with us no longer. His good works attest to the worth of his life and stand as towering memorials to his values and his achievements.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his widow, his son and daughters, his grandchildren, and loved ones.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished majority leader in his expression of bereavement over the passing of a very distinguished and a great American, Neil Curry. Neil Curry was chairman of the State Racing Commission of the State of California. He was a great Californian transplanted from Pennsylvania. He built up in California one of the biggest trucking organizations in the Nation. He was a leader in the trucking industry and served as president of the American Trucking Association.

His loss will be felt by many Californians. He was a great friend to all people. He cut across party lines. He was particularly helpful to the Democratic Party. He will be missed by our party and he will be missed by the large number of friends he had here in the Congress.

I join in the expression of bereavement and I express to his family my deep sorrow at his passing.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join the majority leader and the gentleman from Massachusetts in their expression of their deep sorrow at the passing of Neil Curry. Neil Curry was a close personal friend of mine and I know the entire California delegation will be saddened by the news we have heard today. He was a great American and we will miss him terribly.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Neil Curry was a personal friend of mine. I deeply regret his passing. Even though we had some differences politically I admired his views and appreciated deeply his friendship. He was a close friend of many friends of mine. They will be shocked at his sudden passing. They, as I, will have lost a good friend and stanch supporter of the trucking industry.

I express to his family my deepest regrets.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday this House was saddened by the news of the tragic death of an outstanding American, Neil Curry, of California.

Neil Curry was a citizen of great ability and distinction whose friends were legion, from one end of this country to the other.

One of the Nation's leading businessmen, Mr. Curry was active in many civic and public organizations and took an active role in public affairs.

He was a tower of strength in the Democratic Party, and one of its most effective and constructive leaders.

Neil Curry will be sorely missed by many who have known him as a warm friend and able fellow American.

My deepest sympathy goes to his family and loved ones.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it was with the deepest regret and sorrow that I learned of the death of a very distinguished American, Mr. Neil Curry. Several years ago, as chairman of the Western Interstate Highway Committee on Policy Problems, I had the opportunity of first meeting Mr. Curry. At that time he worked with Senator Collier's subcommittee to develop the reciprocity agreements which are now in effect throughout the Western States and have become, through subsequent legislative action in those States, a model of interstate highway cooperation and provide a pattern of harmonious transportation.

Mr. Curry not only was an extremely successful businessman, but he was equally distinguished for his leadership in the field of public affairs. As the majority leader has so ably stated, there can probably be no total estimation of his contribution to the welfare of children. Numerous boards interested in community programs and welfare are the richer for his service.

Every westerner, I know, today shares with me the deep sense of loss his passing means to our western land.

To his widow, his sons, daughters, and loved ones, my deepest and sincerest sympathy. Also, may I express my gratitude for having had the privilege of knowing and working with this unselfish American.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are saddened by the passing of Neil Curry. Neil Curry was a creative genius, a man who served his fellow man in so many different capacities that it is difficult to comprehend the full extent of his accomplishments.

In but 56 years, he achieved the highest stature in his business, our community and our Nation. Neil was not only the president of his own trucking firm, one of the largest in the western United States, but he also served on the board of directors of more than 30 leading corporations. He was a past president of the American Trucking Association and held numerous other important posts within the trucking industry.

Yet this activity was only part of Neil Curry's contribution. He served as a director of the National Safety Council and as a trustee of the City of Hope Medical Center. For 4 years, Neil was president of the California Racing Commission. His work in public affairs included a long and constructive record as a supporter of the Democratic Party.

Neil Curry's life and work constitutes an outstanding example of the vigor, intelligence, and humanity which one man can bring to the work of building and strengthening our free way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing our sense of loss and bereavement upon the passing of Neil Curry and in voicing our profoundest sympathy to his widow and his family.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I join my many colleagues in expressing shock and sorrow at the death of Neil J. Curry. Most of us had the pleasure of seeing our good friend when he was in Washington, D.C., in connection with his duties as chairman of a recent Democratic fundraising dinner here.

His activities in California and national politics were legion. His public service included acting as a director of the National Safety Council, and as a trustee of the City of Hope Medical Center in Duarte, Calif.

He was also past president of the American Trucking Association, the California Trucking Association, and the Western Highway Institute.

To his wife and three children I extend my sincere sympathy.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of Neil J. Curry is a shock to both the trucking industry, in which he stood sovereign, and the many people who were privileged to know and work with him during his brilliant and many-faceted career.

I am one of these fortunate people, for I knew Neil through his work for California and for the Democratic Party. Although expert in the specialized field of transportation, he recognized a responsibility to bring his considerable organizational and promotional talent to work for what he believed in. As such, he served his beloved city of Los Angeles on the chamber of commerce and spearheaded the fundraising campaigns for both John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson.

Whenever called, Neil Curry served—as a representative on the U.S. Senate Advisory Committee studying transportation problems, as a member of the President's Committee for Traffic Safety throughout the last two administrations. All this he did while continuing as the vigorous leader of the American Trucking Association and participating on the executive level in numerous other organizations—and he did everything thoroughly and well.

A breeder of thoroughbred horses, Neil Curry was a distinguished leader in the horseracing world. Chairman of a committee to codify national racetrack rules, past chairman of California's State Horseracing Board, and past president of the National Association of State Racing Commissioners, he was dedicated to furthering the sport of horseracing throughout the free world. Only a few short weeks ago he was honored by the leading owners, breeders, trainers, and riders of the country at a testimonial dinner given by the Horsemen's Benevolent & Protective Association where he was named as "Man of the Year." He not only used his talent to further domestic horseracing, but also was very influential in giving the sport the worldwide recognition it deserves. He loved the sport of thoroughbred racing and did not want to see its image tarnished. He worked actively to sustain horseracing as one of the world's great and most popular sports.

The executive in today's contracting world must be more than an administrator; he must be a man aware—of the continual and rapid changes around him, of the intricate interplay between Government and industry, of the needs and wants of the vast number of people directly, or indirectly, affected by his business. Neil Curry was responsive to all these challenges; his knowledge of administration, public relations, and Government relations served to make him the outstanding leader that he was.

Yet, in his own words, he was first of all a trucker, and in 1956 the industry honored him by creating a new position of chairman pro tem of the executive committee of the American Trucking Association. No greater tribute can be bestowed than that of one's fellow workers, and I can only second their praise for a giant of his times, the remarkable Neil J. Curry.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and work of Neil Curry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MR. JUSTICE GOLDBERG AS AMBASSADOR TO UNITED NATIONS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the President has again demonstrated his great gift for hiring the ideal public servant to fill a specific responsibility from the ranks of those not previously speculated upon.

The appointment of Justice Arthur Goldberg as Ambassador to the United Nations is exciting and encouraging. It gives heart to those who realized the appointment would be a signal of our assessment of the value of the United Nations to the cause of world peace. Justice Goldberg brings a record of public service rarely equalled, and the breadth of his knowledge and proven skills will give his voice in the United Nations the ring of leadership and authority from which the whole world will benefit.

His own unselfish patriotism in leaving the Supreme Court of our land, a life appointment, will not go unmarked or unappreciated.

We all wish him well; we are proud as Americans; we applaud our President's wisdom; and we who know the Justice as a true friend greet our Ambassador with our heartfelt congratulations and affectionate respects.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter in the RECORD on the bill H.R. 8283.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to pay tribute to the memory of a great world citizen—Adlai Ewing Stevenson, who was laid to his final rest yesterday.

Modest by nature, eloquent of speech, and completely dedicated to the advancement of democratic ideals throughout the world, as well as in his own country, Adlai Stevenson will long be remembered as one of America's greatest statesmen.

His appointment by President Kennedy as chief delegate of the United States to the United Nations was universally acclaimed, for Adlai Stevenson's reputation as a gentleman, scholar, liberal, and a statesman of great wit and humor had preceded him.

He was regarded with special warmth by the representatives of the newly independent nations.

Stevenson, a man of peace, must have received great satisfaction when he went to Moscow as a delegate in 1963 for the signing of the limited nuclear test ban agreement, for it was Stevenson, who during his 1956 campaign for the Presidency, proposed such a ban. Although political observers contended that it did not help his campaign, it did nevertheless become one of the great issues of the day.

In an age in which public enterprise and international affairs were largely disfigured by malice, he was a man without malice. In an era marked by cold calculation and selfishness he was a man of great warmth of spirit and largeness of heart. He was a man of humor and wit during a time when such a quality was looked upon with suspicion by some. He was humble. And, in his utterances he was much like Jefferson—felicitous, graceful, and beautifully eloquent. In an interval of history preempted by men of action he was a man given to introspection.

Indeed he was idolized by millions the world over, and looked upon by the people of foreign nations as the embodiment of the best traditions of American democracy. The impact of his death in London, it is said, and I believe it to be so, was the same as that which comes from the passing of a great head of state. To many of us it inflicted a sense of painful deprivation.

I shall always cherish the memory of the few moments I shared with him. I had the privilege and honor of talking with Adlai Stevenson on several occasions, first in Hawaii, and later here in Washington. On each occasion I was deeply impressed with the charm, wit, and human qualities of this man, upon whom tremendous responsibilities were placed by his State, his Nation, and the world.

He made me feel he remembered me each time we met, although I suspected he did not. Then on one occasion he warmed my heart when he addressed me as "Sparky" and said Hawaii was one of the loveliest spots on earth and he hoped to go back there some day. He even recalled the "Kalua pua" which was served at a "Luau" given by the Hawaii Democrats in his honor in March of 1953.

During his long controversial public life he was many times reproached, but even his severest critics never dared to say or hint that he was not at all times acting with the best interests of his country at heart. Indeed he was a patriot in the finest sense of the word—loyal to his country and true to the ideals of justice and the well being of his countrymen.

There have been few men in the history of this country, about whom it could be asserted without any reservations that they never permitted private interests to conflict with what they understood to be the public good. Adlai Stevenson was without any question one such man.

Adlai Stevenson now belongs to history.

As I listened to the eulogy at his funeral services held at the National Cathedral last Friday, here in the Nation's Capital, I asked myself: "Will our Creator be so kind as to send us another like him in this century of emotional and philosophical confusion to guide us and to help us to keep our wit and commonsense about us?"

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] may extend his remarks in the RECORD preceding those of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. BUCHANAN].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MR. JUSTICE GOLDBERG AS AMBASSADOR TO THE U.N.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, today the President of the United States has acted splendidly to enhance the importance of the United Nations by designating Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg of Illinois as Ambassador of the United States to the U.N.

Justice Goldberg has proved himself to be one of the most brilliant men of our time. As Secretary of Labor he proved his peerless ability as an arbitrator, conciliator, and mediator. In his days of legal practice, he was renowned as an astute negotiator and formidable advocate. These qualities will all serve him and us in good stead as head of the U.S. delegation.

Although Justice Goldberg has served on the Supreme Court with great distinction and will be missed, his leadership and wisdom are much needed at the United Nations. This great body which unfortunately has recently fallen into a kind of desuetude will reap the benefit of Justice Goldberg's creativity and resourcefulness in dealing with the complicated and awesome problems which are before it.

I am sure my colleagues join me in wishing Justice Goldberg Godspeed on his new voyage. Although the seas of international conflict are now somewhat stormy, Mr. Goldberg has never reacted to swirling waters with a queasy stomach. He will bring new understanding, prestige, and nobility of spirit to the United Nations. In thus honoring Justice Goldberg, President Johnson has reached for one of America's most luminous intellects and intrepid spirits. He has thus honored us all, and added greatly to the strength and quality of free world leadership within the U.N.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield to me?

Mr. SCHEUER. Of course.

Mr. ALBERT. I appreciate the gentleman taking this time for this purpose. I associate myself with the remarks he has made.

It has been my good fortune to know Justice Goldberg for several years and I have had on occasion the privilege of working with him. I have never in my life known a more constructive, intelligent, or productive person. He is truly one of the great men of this generation. He has succeeded in every endeavor which he has ever undertaken. I am sure he will do an outstanding job in the important new role in which he will now engage. He is a great and selfless soldier to accept this job. He held a lifetime appointment to one of the highest offices in the land which undoubtedly provided a satisfactory field for his many and particular talents.

I congratulate the President of the United States upon this selection. I am confident that Mr. Goldberg will serve with his usual creativeness and distinction.

Mr. SCHEUER. I am honored and delighted to have had the distinguished majority leader join me in these remarks.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, earlier today H.R. 9075, to authorize a military pay raise, was considered and voted upon. I was unavoidably detained while in performance of my duties and my vote was, therefore, not recorded on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present at the time the vote was taken, I would have voted in favor of such pay increases, something that I am proud to do in light of the sacrifices and services we receive from our servicemen in these great days of world turmoil.

FUTURE OF PRIVATE SHIPBUILDING IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, for the past several years I have shared with a great many Members of this body a deep concern over the future of private shipbuilding in the United States of America. I have had this concern because of what I know from personal experience is the contribution that has been made to our country by private shipbuilders. My concern has been heightened and intensified over the last 6 months because we have witnessed an amazing series of trial balloons of particular concern not only to me and my constituents but to the country in general. I refer to the suggestion that ships for the United States Navy and for the United States-flag merchant marine should be constructed in foreign shipyards rather than in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the Maritime Administrator has been quite openly promoting this scheme, while his superior, the Secretary of the Department of Commerce, has assured the Congress of the United States that the policy of this administration, because of the balance-of-payments situation, is to promote the construction of merchant ships in United States yards.

Now, it has been my observation that at the very time these suggestions have been made by the Maritime Administrator and have not been denied by the Secretary of the Department of Commerce or any other authoritative statesman or spokesman for this administration, we are at the very same time experiencing one of the great international crises in the world and a national crisis with reference to the private shipbuilding interests in the United States.

It is interesting to note that an authoritative source has indicated to me that we have spent over $1 billion in rehabilitating and equipping foreign shipyards under the foreign aid bill, while we have been completely ignoring and neglecting many of our own private shipyards.

I need not tell the Members of this House the number of industries that are subsidized by the Federal Government. There is a booklet published by the Library of Congress and one of the committees has published a statement. I recommend it to your reading.

You will find that we subsidize aircraft manufacturers, missile manufacturers, we give price supports to farmers, we subsidize textile manufacturers, indeed almost every facet of American life except private shipbuilding. When the other industries in this Nation indicate they are suffering as a result of competition, we generally wind up by giving them a subsidy, but when it comes to shipbuilding, we usually ask, "Who needs it?"

Let me say to the people of the United States of America that in my humble opinion, the United States today is operating a Navy that is equipped with inadequate ships, with an inadequate number, and which may in the very near future be called upon to do a job that it is not equipped to do. I would say that in my humble opinion, from what I have read and from my studies, our merchant fleet is completely deteriorating if not vanishing from the high seas.

It is time for the Secretary of Commerce, it is time for the Secretary of Defense, it is time for the Maritime Administrator to come out categorically and unequivocally and state what their policy is in relation to the construction of new ships. I would certainly hope that statements will be forthcoming to this Congress within the next few days, because if it is not, I intend once again to take the floor of the House and urge such a statement so that the Members of Congress and the people of these United States will understand once and for all that we are not going to build ships in Great Britain, we are not going to build ships anywhere but in American shipyards.

It is time that these men and the administration speak forthrightly to the American people. I would hope they will follow what I understand to be the maritime policy of the United States.

I do not know how many Members saw a booklet that was put out by the Maritime Administration and by the administration called "This Is MarAd." I had occasion to examine that booklet and to find, to my surprise and amazement, that when the maritime policy of the United States was suggested, in this book it was stated erroneously. The policy, as I understand it, is set forth specifically in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. That act specifically requires that ships shall be constructed in the United States, yet when the booklet was published the words "constructed in the United States" were not in that policy.

I wrote to the Maritime Administrator and I received a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Allen S. Boyd, that says, "the Maritime Administrator advises that this was purely an oversight."

"The Maritime Administrator advises that this is purely an oversight."

Purely an oversight. Here is a booklet published and widely distributed setting forth what is supposed to be the policy of the United States as dictated by the statutes of our country omitting one of the most important phrases of the statute. This with all of the other talk that is going on has brought I think to the American public a bigger question mark of where we are going in shipbuilding.

So it seems to me, Members of the House, the time has come for all of us who are interested in shipbuilding to insist upon a reevaluation of the role private and naval shipyards play in the welfare of the United States and in the defense of the United States and that we take some affirmative, positive stand to insure the continuation of these shipyards.

I want to say, because I believe this, that in my judgment both naval shipyards and private shipyards are essential. But I also would have to add it seems completely inconsistent in policy, so far as I am concerned at least, to observe that our Government is allocating on a cost-plus basis the construction of new ships in naval shipyards and at the very same time is insisting upon a policy of low competitive bidding for private shipyards. Now all that this is doing is driving the private shipbuilder out of business. If the time ever comes when our country has to rely solely upon naval shipyards and has eliminated the private shipyard, we will have lost a tremendously valuable asset to our country and to our economy. Because private shipbuilding and naval shipyards both have throughout the history of our country been able to work together, both being necessary and both having their own functions and both working together, and they have given us a sound pricing for the construction of ships and have made available for the country places where those ships may be repaired and outfitted and remodeled and where the crews and all of the men on those ships can live and be fed. So both of these facilities are necessary.

I suggested on the floor sometime ago what Russia was doing and I compared what Russia is doing in shipbuilding to what we are doing in the United States. Of course, I have a deep concern because in my own congressional district we have one of the oldest shipyards and one of the best shipyards in the United States, the New York shipyard.

The New York shipyard has built some of the great warships in American history and some of the greatest fighting ships that we have ever had. The New York shipyard has not had a new contract for 2 years. Their former high employment of 10,000 or 12,000 workers has shrunk to 4,000. The employment situation there is deteriorating all the time. The reason for their inability to get contracts is that the shipyards of the United States are only being utilized to 50 percent of their capacity.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the subject of the U.S. merchant marine and the plight of American shipyards deserves serious consideration.

The Nation's vital interests can only be served by a rebuilding and expansion of our fleets to cope with the ever increasing construction by other countries.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point two letters to Maritime Administrator Nicholas Johnson, the first from Edwin M. Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, and the second from me. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed a letter from Mr. John J. Grogan, president of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The letters are as follows:

SHIPBUILDERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., June 22, 1965.

Hon. NICHOLAS JOHNSON,
Maritime Administrator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: At our board of directors meeting last Wednesday, certain parts of your recent publication entitled "This Is MarAd" were discussed.

Special exception was taken to the omission of the longstanding and still-continuing national objective—that ships for the American merchant marine be built in U.S. shipyards—from the listing of "Maritime Policy" on page 10. All other facets of the "Declaration of Policy" in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 are specifically itemized, and we do not believe that exclusion of the "constructed in the United States" requirement is compatible with the statement by the Secretary of Commerce before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on March 3, 1965. You will recall Secretary Connor then assured the committee the policy of the Administration continues to be that of encouraging the building of ships for the U.S.-flag merchant marine in U.S. shipyards. His statement was, of course, made in the context of the balance-of-payments problem.

No one was able to recall whether or not you—in your many public speeches and addresses since March 3—have similarly defined the present policy of the Government with respect to shipbuilding, and I have therefore been commissioned to inquire formally as to whether or not the above-mentioned omission reflects (1) a departure from the policy stated by Secretary Connor, (2) a precursor of a change in policy, or (3) an oversight. Any clarification you might care to provide us would be deeply appreciated.

Reference was also made to the assertion on page 14 that "U.S. shipbuilding prices are more than double those of many foreign countries." Comparative data available to us would indicate that this is an accurate statement only with respect to Japanese prices. And, it needs to be said that shipyard selling prices vary in Japan, from low to high, just as they do in this country, and that the unqualified statement in "This is Marad" does not literally portray the precise situation. A comparison of our lowest prices with other than the lowest Japanese price gives an entirely different picture of general shipyard economics in that country.

In the same section, on page 15, the comment is made that "merchant shipbuilding represents less than 10 percent of this Nation's total shipyard activity." Using the dollar value of work backlog of commercial and naval shipbuilding contracts as a yardstick, the workload involving merchant ships accounts for 23 percent of our industry's activity.

Using another yardstick, you may recall that in our pamphlet on "U.S. Private Shipyards—A Vital National Asset," these paragraphs are included:

"The latest figures available from the Department of Commerce Census of Manufactures showed that the value of shipwork done in U.S. private shipyards during 1963 totaled $1,499,700,000. Of this amount, merchant ship construction of all types represented $314,145,000 or 20.9 percent. Repairs and conversions to merchant vessels of all types amounted to another $276,514,000 or 18.4 percent. In other words, 39.3 percent of the total volume of work performed in domestic shipyards in that year can be attributed to work on merchant vessels, and about 13.3 percent involved ship construction contracts coming under the jurisdiction of the Maritime Administration.

"Again, according to the 1963 Census of Manufacturers, the private shipbuilding and repairing industry employed 114,205 people, including 96,053 production workers, with a total payroll of $779,678,000. Approximately 10,000 shipyard employees are directly or indirectly engaged on Maritime Administration contracts. Based on the ratio of purchased goods and services to total ship cost, it is estimated that another 10,000 persons in supporting endeavors and industries earn their livelihood as a result of the MarAd shipbuilding program. It should be pointed out here that every State of the Union provides a component, resource or service that goes into the construction of every ship in a U.S. shipyard.

"Government economists use a factor—known as the multiplier effect—of one job in industry creates one job in supporting services or commercial enterprise. Thus, shipbuilding under Maritime Administration auspices accounts for about 40,000 jobs and more than $300 million in gross national product. Since, by Bureau of Labor Statistics yardsticks, the average family size is considered to be 3.7 persons, the loss of MarAd ship construction in U.S. yards would have the potential of removing the means of support for about 148,000 persons. The inclusion of repair work on MarAd-sponsored vessels would of course increase this latter figure significantly."

Further with regard to employment data, we have never been satisfied that the monthly reports issued by the Maritime Administration correctly reflect existing manpower levels. Though this information is published under the heading of "Shipyards—Total Employment," your agency reports a private shipyards' work force of less than one-half the size reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

For some time, MarAd has used a criteria predicated on the work force of our shipyards having facilities to build ships of 475 feet or longer. All others are not taken into account. It is therefore inaccurate to disseminate such data under the heading of total employment. Your criteria presumably would eliminate yards which could build a Liberty ship, 440 feet long; a Victory ship, 455 feet long; or a C–2, 459 feet long. A specific case that comes to mind involves a yard which a few years ago performed major conversions on two of our largest passenger ships. This yard was not included in your employment figures because its shipbuilding facilities did not conform with your criteria. You may wish to give some attention to the variations between your reports and those of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Census of Manufactures.

Finally, we take exception to the divisive language appearing on page 15 of your booklet reading: "Construction aid is a subsidy for the American shipyards, not the shipowners." This theme, with variations, has been assiduously promoted through the years. Construction aids, as well as operating subsidies, are nothing more and nothing less than labor equalization payments. The shipyards—like the shipowners—are merely transfer agents in dispersing Federal funds to our higher paid workers, and to the manufacturers of suppliers and products that flow from our more affluent economic structure. My point in focusing attention on comparative labor costs here and abroad is not to disparage the American worker. It is to emphasize that the American standard of living, of which we are justifiably proud, is not an inconsiderable factor in the economic equation that determines the price of materials and services which shipyards must procure. Moreover, as I endeavored to establish in my Fort Schuyler speech, there is a distinct relationship between construction and operating costs:

"We must recognize that dollars in capital investment often save dollars in operating subsidy. We must cast aside the unrealistic idea that shipbuilding and ship operations are separable. We must demonstrate that there are instances where the Federal Government could save a considerable amount of money by investing in ships rather than ship operations. We must also understand the relationship between capital investment and current expense."

We hope that these points of view will receive your earnest consideration, and send you our warmest personal regards.

Cordially,

EDWIN M. HOOD, *President*.

JULY 14, 1965.

MR. NICHOLAS JOHNSON,
Administrator, Maritime Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I have had an opportunity to carefully review your recent publication, "This Is MarAd."

I find that on page 10, under maritime policy, none of the 5 points listed mention the congressional mandate of that the U.S. merchant marine should be built in the United States. This policy is spelled out in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, section 1101, title 46, United States Code:

"This merchant marine should consist of the best equipped, safest and most suitable vessels, constructed in the United States, and manned by trained, efficient U.S. citizens."

It would appear that this is a deliberate deletion of the "build American" policy in the Maritime Administration's publication. It does not appear to me that exclusion of the "Constructed in the United States" requirement is compatible with the statements made by the Secretary of Commerce during March of 1965. It is my recollection that the Secretary did assure the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that the policy of the administration was to encourage building of ships for the U.S. merchant marine in shipyards in the United States.

I would appreciate your advising me of the present Maritime Administration policy and intent regarding ship construction in the United States.

Awaiting your reply and with best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

JAMES A. BURKE,
Member of Congress.

INDUSTRIAL UNION OF MARINE
AND SHIPBUILDING WORKERS OF
AMERICA,
Camden, N.J., July 16, 1965.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR PRESIDENT: I regret that I must write you of my distress and my emphatic protest concerning statements made by Maritime Administrator Nicholas Johnson both during a speech and a press interview given by him in San Francisco, July 2.

Maritime Administrator Johnson avowed: "There may not be a real purpose in having a U.S. merchant marine at all." He was also quoted as answering a question: "Why must private shipping be subsidized?" with the response, "I, for one, have tried to get the Government out of it but I have met with no little opposition."

The Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in title I, "Declaration of policy," section 101, states:

"It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine (a) sufficient to carry its domestic waterborne commerce and a substantial portion of the waterborne export and import foreign commerce of the United States and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign waterborne commerce at all times, (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, (c) owned and operated under the U.S. flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable, and (d) composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine."

It further states the members of the Maritime Administration "shall be appointed with due regard to their special fitness for the efficient discharge of the duties imposed upon them by this act."

At this hour a realistic assessment of the American merchant marine, our shipbuilding, repair, and allied maritime industries grimly and inexorably underscores the fact that such statements by the Maritime Administrator serve only to scuttle the U.S.-flag-flying fleet and to accelerate its continued downward spiral. We cannot escape the fact that the Maritime Administrator has abdicated his responsibilities in carrying out "the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance" of a merchant marine adequate for our national defense and our foreign and domestic waterborne commerce.

The flaunting of the provisions of the 1936 act, as restated and reaffirmed in subsequent legislation, and the obligations imposed upon the Maritime Administrator is an abrogation of congressional policy. His advocacy of the annihilation of the U.S. merchant marine will further the slashing of the full-time shipwork employment and even of part-time work and wages in our famine-stricken industry.

It is incomprehensible how Mr. Johnson can in all good conscience continue to serve an agency to whose purpose he gives evidence of being opposed and to whose emasculation he contributes consistently and deliberately.

The paradox of the Maritime Administrator's sowing seeds of doubt for our Nation's need for an American merchant marine and the paramount necessity for the maintenance of a skilled shipbuilding and repair labor force haunts every shipyard worker now gazing on an American merchant marine being scrapped and its shipyard gates being closed, everywhere with a deepening sense of frustration.

Despite the Maritime Administrator's rejection of the American merchant marine, the decay and destruction of the shipbuilding and repair industry are not inevitable; the industry can be saved; we avow our faith in the capacity and achievements and skills of our industry. We pledge to intensify our struggle to save our industry, to face up to the responsibility that the Maritime Administrator rejects in our present plight.

We respectfully submit that you request Congress to act to eradicate the plague of unemployment and low annual earnings in the shipyards and to build the seapower necessary for the defense and prosperity of the Nation. We appeal to you to direct the Maritime Administrator to give voice to the enunciated policy of Congress so that the Nation's vital interests will be served in the rebuilding and expansion of our fleets to meet the menacing expansion of the Red sea armada.

Respectfully and sincerely,

JOHN J. GROGAN,
President.

Mr. **BURKE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. **GARMATZ**. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself most completely with the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey in opposition to the Defense Department's proposal to build a number of noncombatant ships for our Navy in shipyards of Great Britain.

I have already protested strongly to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, for whose accomplishments in behalf of the Defense Department and of our defense system I have the most profound regard.

Our own country's private yards are deplorably depressed. They need work to keep their skilled organizations together. These are the yards that built the ships that made victory possible in World War II. On any basis they rate consideration far more than do any foreign yard.

Mr. **BURKE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. **O'NEILL** of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Boston, Mass., has a long history of shipbuilding. From my section of the country have come many of the skilled craftsmen that through the years and even now build ships for our Navy and for our merchant marine. From our shipyards have come some of the mightiest fighting vessels and some of the fastest merchant vessels. Our waterfront activity is supported by products, services, and components that come from every State in the Union.

It can thus be said that shipbuilding is an inland industry as well. Every trade and skill—from mining and transportation to printing and decoration—is involved. All of the natural and production resources of the United States contribute to the building of the ships that compose our Navy, our export, and our commerce throughout the world.

My constituents are, therefore, not alone in being concerned about recent reports indicating that some of our national planners would like to take contracts away from our shipyards and give them to shipyards in other countries. Both naval vessels and merchant ships are mentioned.

These proposals I find incredible. They come at a time when our naval and our merchant marine needs new and modern ships. They come at a time when our shipyards are operating at less than 50-percent capacity.

These proposals are generally couched in terms of only a handful of ships. Both these proposals would eventually bring about the ruin of our shipyards, for once started, who is to say that 1, 10, or 100, or even 1,000 ships should be built abroad. Even a handful of ships are today important to our national security. Our trade and commerce, the critical balance-of-payments situation, is affected. A handful of ships represent better than one-third of the present Federal maritime construction program. A handful of ships could mean the difference between survival and failure for many of our shipyards.

I implore my colleagues to join with me in having the Congress put down these destructive proposals and to join in formulating a maritime and naval shipbuilding program which will reasonably make sure that the United States will always be a dominant power on the seas. I hope my colleagues will support H.R. 9749, which I introduced on July 9, to prohibit a construction of vessels for the U.S. Navy at places outside the United States.

As an illustration of the feelings of my people, I insert in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Buy Ships Abroad?" which appeared in the New Bedford, Mass., Standard Times on June 21, 1965:

BUY SHIPS ABROAD?

Announcement that the Defense Department is considering a suggestion that the U.S. Navy buy some noncombatant ships from Britain will come as a disquieting surprise to many Americans.

The idea, which is being examined at the Office of International Security Affairs, is one of several proposals aimed at keeping defense industries in major allied countries in a condition of readiness for expansion in the event of an emergency. Due to budgetary problems and greater reliance on U.S. weaponry, military procurement has dropped off sharply in many of the larger non-Communist countries.

In addition, those who see possible advantages in the proposal for buying Navy cargo ships from British yards believe that the British vessels might be better, at a lower cost, than ships produced in the United States.

But having stated the case for this suggestion, as advanced by its proponents, simple justice requires as well consideration of the many questions such a policy would raise.

First of all, the very fact that the Government is thinking of buying such ships out of the country is certain to stir apprehension in the already squeezed American shipbuilding industry and in communities where Navy shipyards are being closed down.

It will reasonably be argued that if American tax dollars are going to be spent to keep shipyards open, why shouldn't they be our own?

Recent administrations, both Republican and Democratic, have offered little help of protective nature to American industries (even some of wartime value, such as watchmaking) which appealed to Washington because they weren't doing enough business. The Government's attitude generally in these cases was that it wasn't economically sound to subsidize or protect even a valuable industry if, for reasons of high production costs, outmoded methods, or foreign competition, it could not compete.

Why, it will be asked, is it necessary for us to help British shipyards? Is their failure to compete successfully due to the same reasons that harass some of our industries? It might also be asked whether all new British ships are built in British yards (they certainly are not), and if they are not, whether they shouldn't be, as a matter of London policy, before we place a single order there.

Finally, we have literally acres of cargo-carrying ships lying idle in the Nation's mothball fleet. It seems incredible that it wouldn't be worthwhile to refurbish some of the newer ones and put them back into service, if this is what is needed.

These are a few of the factors the Government ought to think about before it goes overseas for ships.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by commending my good friend from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] in saying that there is no more serious problem in this country today than the shipbuilding industry is facing. There is no problem that needs the attention of the Defense Department and the Maritime Commission more than the problem facing the shipbuilding industry. It is high time that those who are trying to drive this industry out of existence started to recognize the real problem and started to do something about it.

Let us build ships here in America and let us put American seamen to work on the high seas of the world. Let us build a navy in this Nation second to none in the world, and let us build a shipping industry which will be able to compete with the Japanese fleet and the Russian fleet. Let us put this country back where it belongs—in first place.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much, and I want to say that I wholeheartedly agree with everything he has said. What he has said has reaffirmed my belief that the present Maritime Administrator either does not understand or refuses to consider the vital importance that American shipyards are playing in the overall defense of our country.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I yield to my friend from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my admiration for the job that the gentleman from New Jersey has done today in bringing to the attention of the House and to the attention of the country the very critical condition in which our merchant marine finds itself, which is reflected in the condition of the shipbuilding industry. It is a critical industry to us in Maryland. I feel very strongly that we need the kind of leadership the gentleman from New Jersey is exhibiting here today in calling the attention of the American people to the situation where we are slipping in our relative position in shipbuilding in the world and in merchant marine activities and slipping as a national activity.

I want to express my personal thanks to the gentleman for doing as he has done today, in making a careful and factual presentation of a national problem.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DOWNING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend from New Jersey and also my friend from Massachusetts for the contribution they have made today. It is time this thing is brought out, as you are doing right now, and that the American people know about it and that our own colleagues in the Congress know about it. What you have said is absolutely correct. To build ships abroad is contrary to the merchant marine policy of this country and contrary to the law and the best interests of this country certainly to the best interests of the shipbuilding industry and shipyard industry. It has shocked me. When I first heard of this thing some weeks ago I did not believe it could be true, because we have talked so much about the balance of payments and about promoting our merchant marine and the shipbuilding industry. I could not believe it was true. But I made several calls and finally contacted the right Federal agency or bureau which has this matter under its jurisdiction. It is not the Maritime Administration, although I would say to the gentleman that the Maritime Administration has the authority to stop any further consideration of this matter. I think they should take the necessary action now so that it does not go any further. However, I finally contacted the man who was considering this proposition. I cannot recall his name right now, but he is an assistant secretary. He said it was true that they were considering it. One of the reasons given for it was that it will help indirectly our balance of payments situation. I asked him how this came about, and he said, "Well, Great Britain purchases a lot from the United States and we in turn have to purchase something from them." I said, "That is true, but for goodness sakes why pick on a dying industry and increase its downward pace by taking this action?" The gentleman with whom I was speaking said he would take this under consideration and the matter would be given due consideration.

I am saying, though, what you are doing here is timely. We should raise our voices now and tell these people considering this to stop it because it is contrary to law and to maritime policy.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman. He brings to mind, this desire that we seem to have of giving America away and certainly giving our American shipbuilding contracts away, the words attributed to that outstanding British statesman, Winston Churchill, when one day he is alleged to have said in the House of Commons, that "This island is beset by a tribe of neurotic philosophers who awaken each day by thinking what of Britain they can give away and each day end by regretting what they had done."

I certainly feel that if we continue, or even pursue this avenue described by the gentleman from Virginia who is most knowledgeable and who has been most forceful in this fight for continued contracts for American shipyards, as indicated to him by an Assistant Secretary, I believe he said, of Defense, then certainly we would be following the road to complete ruin.

Mr. Speaker, let me close my remarks by saying to you that in relation to this shipyard which I was describing when I yielded to the gentleman from Massachusetts, they have found themselves unable to get contracts because of the competitive nature of shipbuilding. And so this year—and I think this is something novel in the annals of collective bargaining, at least in this year of our Lord, 1965—even though these men believe that they are entitled to more money, even though they believe they are entitled to more benefits, even though they are not getting money being paid in comparable jobs in other shipyards, they renewed for an additional year their existing contract; and management, even though they had not been getting new contracts, and because they would not be making money, probably and properly felt that wages should be reduced even more, but agreed to go along for another year.

This was a combined effort to try and work together to get new jobs for an industry that is crying for help.

Therefore, I want to commend the men of management and labor of New York ship for this evidence of their desire to work in cooperation to make their shipyard a competitive shipyard. And it is parenthetically interesting to note that there are in this country today in a couple of the major shipbuilding yards strikes that are going on. And yet the shipyard in Camden, N.J., where labor relations are now in good shape, where their capacity and their ability to do the job have been proven, is unable to get a contract.

So it seems to me that the time has come for the people in authority to follow what we know to be the policy of the Congress and the law of the land, to say so and to say it immediately and to say it forthrightly. Also, if they do not do it—and even if they do it—it seems to me private shipbuilding in the United States is in such shape today that this Congress ought to establish a special committee—perhaps a special committee of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries—but certainly a special committee to investigate the plight of private shipbuilding in the United States and to recommend necessary aids for those shipyards.

Because if we do not come up with an answer in the next 5 or 10 years we will not have any private shipbuilding in these United States of America.

It seems to me that there has to be a reconsideration and a reevaluation of our present national policy to award to naval shipyards contracts without bidding and at the same time to award private shipbuilding contracts solely on competitive bidding. There must be, I think, some investigation made and some recommendations made and some decisions made on how both of these facilities which are necessary to the welfare of our country may continue together equally, side-by-side, in the best interests of our country.

So, it seems to me we must change our policy if we are going to maintain the integrity of private shipbuilding and the safety of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my distinguished colleague from New Jersey, WILLIAM T. CAHILL, for his initiative and leadership in facing up to the problems that affect our country's capacity to build ships.

Shipbuilding, one of the industries that made this Nation a world power and enabled us in past centuries to capture a good share of the world shipping trade, is suffering the fate of many of our other most important and historic industries—it is threatened with destruction by the ever-increasing competition of foreign builders, who thrive on our neglect of this industry as much as they gain by their lower wage rates and lower material costs.

Our private shipyards, of course, have suffered the most.

My concern with this problem is based on its serious ramifications for our national security, our place in the world market, and on our highly skilled corps of trained labor. My knowledge of the subject comes both as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and as a representative in Congress of many workers and officers of the famous Fore River Shipyard in Quincy and the Boston Naval Shipyard in Charlestown.

I also represent New Bedford, which is increasingly important as an east coast port and as the leading fishing port on the Atlantic coast. Many of the problems of the declining commercial fishing industry can be traced to the competition of low-cost foreign fishing vessels, so the fishing industry in this country has a very real interest in the health and productivity of our shipbuilding industry.

In a country where national policies have changed frequently in many important fields of interest over the years, one constant and until recently unchallenged concept has been the certainty that the national economic well-being and the national security required a strong American shipbuilding capability. In fact, it has been law that American warships, merchantmen and commercial fishing vessels must be built in American yards. This policy has served us well in peace and war and, for my part, I can foresee no situation that would justify its abandonment. To the contrary, the crash building program of the Iron Curtain nations of merchant, naval and fishing vessels fortifies my belief that we must pursue this "build American" policy.

Not too long ago, Seafarer's Log reported that Lloyd's Register of Shipping ranks the United States as fifth as a deep sea shipping nation, and that the the biggest decline in gross tonnage in 1964 in the shipping world occurred in the U.S. merchant fleet. We dropped 704,000 gross tons, and the Soviet Union climbed into sixth place as a shipping power, with strong indications that it will soon overtake our declining fleet.

The massive Soviet buildup is worth noting. Russia, once considered virtually land- and ice-locked, is now second only to the United States as a naval power. Experts predict that she will surpass the United States in less than 2 years as an overall maritime power—now having nearly 6.5 million tons of merchant ships under construction or on order. The president of the Shipbuilder's Council of America, Edwin M. Hood, recently disclosed that this means 673 new vessels for the U.S.S.R. compared to the 40 we are building or plan to build in the immediate future. I would like to quote briefly from a speech Mr. Hood made on this subject in March:

> This extensive (Soviet) building program represents the Communist's approach to the cold war on the economic front, and recognizes merchant ships as instruments of major economic influence.

I would inject here that Russia is applying this same economic principle to commercial fishing. Her giant, ultramodern fishing armadas now roam the world. Aside from their prestige value and the dual use they have as an intelligence and scientific data gathering fleet, Russian trawlers are exploiting natural resources once considered practically our exclusive property. These fishing operations are also helping take the pressure off the Kremlin for its repeated agriculture failures.

Mr. Hood continues:

> The present Soviet merchant shipbuilding effort is more than 10 times that of the United States. Nearly 2 million tons of the vessels under construction for the Russian flag are being built in Russian shipyards, an activity level three times that in U.S. shipyards. It should be noted that the Soviet Union has placed shipbuilding contracts with other countries—including some of our friends in the community of free nations—only because of this high degree of utilization of her own shipyard capacity.

There have been several disturbing suggestions that the administration was considering the abandonment of our traditional policies and would go abroad for vessels built with cheap labor and cheap materials.

This would be a tragedy and could have serious consequences for our labor force, our balance of payments, our national prestige, our security, and our overall ability, as a nation, to meet and overcome the challenges of a rapidly changing world.

I think the basic problem facing us was summed up very well by former Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Fred Korth:

> In perspective, our merchant marine has not been reduced to its present state due to labor-management difficulties, improper legislation, or unsound shipping practices. These are merely symptoms of the real problem, which is a lack of understanding as to why we need a strong, healthy shipping industry and, therefore, no public resolve to do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, I again congratulate and commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill], for his role in bringing this problem once again to the attention of the House.

I support the gentleman's suggestion that special attention ought to be paid the shipping and shipbuilding problem, and that Congress should seriously consider the proposals for the construction of a fleet of high-speed automated nuclear ships. His suggestion, too, that graduate studies in ship automation and nuclear technology be instituted at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy should also get the prompt attention of the Congress.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE HERBERT HOOVER NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE IN THE STATE OF IOWA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Matsunaga). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of last week, July 12, this body passed H.R. 8111, to establish the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site in the State of Iowa. I supported that action, for the legislation properly honors a former distinguished President and his wife who now lie buried in the soil of their native State.

In view of certain remarks which were inserted in the Record of July 12 by the gentlemen from Iowa [Mr. Schmidhauser and Mr. Smith] and an unfair and untrue statement in an article which appeared in the Des Moines Register of July 13, I want to set the Record straight.

I was the first Member of this body to introduce legislation to establish a fitting memorial in honor of the late President Hoover. My bill, H.R. 4252, was introduced on February 3. The bill passed by this body, H.R. 8111, was introduced on May 12.

In the remarks which he inserted in the Record, Mr. Schmidhauser said:

> I refrained from introducing this legislation hastily. The bill, which I introduced, was not written until I had consulted with the National Park Service and had consulted also at the site with a regional team of that agency. The bill was not written until I had consulted many times with the good friends and neighbors I have known for so many years in the community of West Branch.

This, of course, implies that my bill was introduced hastily, and without consultation with anyone. This simply is not true.

Mr. Smith states, in the remarks he inserted in the Record:

> While some others tried to play politics with the proposal, Mr. Schmidhauser proceeded very objectively and methodically.

The implication is that anyone who introduced a bill before the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schmidhauser] was acting hastily and trying to play politics. I regret the gentleman saw fit to make such an unfair and unfounded charge.

The bill I introduced on February 3 was drafted by experts in this field. It was introduced only after consultation with individuals far more familiar with West Branch, Iowa, than the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schmidhauser]—including representatives of the Herbert Hoover Birthplace Foundation, Inc. I also conferred with a former Member of this body, the Honorable John Kyl.

I am sure his former colleague on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will attest to the fact that Mr. Kyl is knowledgeable in matters pertaining to the establishment of national monuments and historic sites.

In the article in the July 13 issue of the Des Moines Register to which I referred previously, it is stated:

> Schmidhauser was the only Iowa Congressman or Senator who did his homework on how the National Park Service goes about honoring presidential birthplaces.

This is a strange observation in view of the action of the Interior Committee. If Mr. Schmidhauser had in fact done his homework, why was it necessary for the committee to drastically amend his bill? If, as the Register article states, I failed to do my homework, I cannot understand why the committee amended the bill in line with the suggestions I made during my testimony before the Interior Committee's Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation on June 11.

I suggested that the word "Birthplace" be eliminated from the title of the bill, since the site includes not only Mr. Hoover's birthplace but the graves of both the President and Mrs. Hoover, the Herbert Hoover Library, his father's blacksmith shop and a pioneer Quaker meeting house. The word "Birthplace" was eliminated.

I also suggested, after consultation with the late President's son, Allan Hoover, that a provision in H.R. 8111 authorizing use by the Secretary of the Interior of portions of the Herbert Hoover Library building be eliminated. It was.

In addition, I questioned the need for an advisory commission, as originally called for in the Schmidhauser bill, H.R. 8111. The section was stricken. In this regard, I might mention that this particular section was opposed by Allan Hoover, representatives of the Herbert Hoover Birthplace Foundation, Inc., and the governing board of the West Branch Commercial Club.

At no time have I tried to play politics in the consideration of this important matter, and I regret that certain individuals have felt compelled to imply that I was politically motivated in the introduction of H.R. 4252 and that I acted hastily.

My sole purpose from the day I introduced H.R. 4252 was to do what I could to the end that proper recognition would be paid to the memory of the 31st President of the United States.

Statement by Representative H. R. Gross, Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, June 11, 1965

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am grateful for this opportunity to testify in support of legislation to establish a Herbert Hoover National Monument—or national historic site—at West Branch, Iowa. Although the bill I introduced on February 3 (H.R. 4252) would designate the memorial a national monument, I leave it to the judgement of this committee as to whether it should be designated a monument or historic site.

You might wonder why I would introduce legislation to establish a national monument outside of the district I represent. The answer is simple. The late Herbert Hoover is Iowa's most famous son, and all Iowans desire to see proper tribute paid to his memory. I might add that those of us from Waterloo, Iowa, are proud to say that the late Mrs. Hoover was born in that community.

Incidentally, you may be interested to know that in the drafting of legislation to honor the Nation's 31st President, I worked closely with a former member of this committee, the Honorable John Kyl. H.R. 4252 has his wholehearted support.

Recognizing as I do the political facts of life, I do not expect that if the committee grants approval to the establishment of a memorial in honor of the late Herbert Hoover, the legislation will bear the number, H.R. 4252. This is not of real importance to me.

What is important is that proper recognition be paid to the memory of this peace-loving humanitarian.

As I envision it, the area which would be included in the memorial is unique because of its completeness. Included are the birthplace of Herbert Hoover, the graves of both the President and Mrs. Hoover, the Herbert Hoover Library, his father's blacksmith shop and a pioneer Quaker meeting house. Under the circumstances, I would hope the memorial will be designated the Herbert Hoover National Monument or National Historic Site, and not the Herbert Hoover Birthplace National Historic Site.

Without intending to be unduly critical of the bill introduced by the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Schmidhauser, I would question the need for an advisory commission, as called for in H.R. 8111. Also, I understand that Mr. Allan Hoover and others object to a provision in H.R. 8111 which would authorize the use by the Secretary of the Interior of portions of the Herbert Hoover Library building. No doubt Mr. Hoover will have comments to make on this in his testimony.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I believe there is need for enactment of legislation to establish a Herbert Hoover memorial at West Branch because commercial development threatens the beauty and significance of the area. Most important to keep in mind is that it would be a memorial to a distinguished President, and so far as I know the only memorial being sought in his honor.

Thank you.

H.R. 4252

A bill authorizing the establishment of the Herbert Hoover National Monument in the State of Iowa

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall acquire on behalf of the United States by gift, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, all right, title, and interest in and to such lands, together with any improvements thereon, as the Secretary may deem necessary for the purpose of establishing a national monument commemorating the birthplace and burial place of Herbert Hoover, the thirty-first President of the United States on the site located in Cedar County in the State of Iowa.

SEC. 2. (a) The property acquired under the provisions of the first section of this Act shall be designated as the Herbert Hoover National Monument and shall be set aside as a public national memorial. The National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall administer, protect, and develop such monument, subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935, as amended.

(b) In order to provide for the proper development and maintenance of such national monument, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and maintain therein such markers, buildings, and other improvements, and such facilities for the care and accommodation of visitors, as he may deem necessary.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

H.R. 8111

In the House of Representatives, May 12, 1965, Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

A bill to establish the Herbert Hoover Birthplace National Historic Site in the State of Iowa

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to preserve in public ownership historically significant properties associated with the life of Herbert Hoover, the Secretary of the Interior may acquire the necessary acres of land or interests in land (including scenic easements) in or near West Branch, Iowa, by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, transfer from a Federal agency, or otherwise. Such property shall be known as the Herbert Hoover Birthplace National Historic Site.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of General Services may enter into agreements which provide for the—

(1) transfer of lands and other property, except the Herbert Hoover Library building, from the administrative control of the Administrator to that of the Secretary without transfer of funds;

(2) use by the Secretary of portions of the Herbert Hoover Library building; and

(3) use by the Administrator of portions of facilities constructed by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. (a) There is established a Herbert Hoover Birthplace National Historic Site Advisory Commission.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of five members each appointed for a term of two years by the Secretary as follows:

(1) Two members appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of Iowa;

(2) One member appointed from recommendations made by the chairman, Board of County Supervisors of Cedar County, Iowa;

(3) One member appointed from recommendations made by the mayor of West Branch, Iowa;

(4) One member who is a prominent historian to be designated by the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(d) The Secretary may appoint ex officio members.

(e) Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such, but the Secretary may pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission in the performance of its functions upon presentation of vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(f) The Secretary may consult with the Commission from time to time with respect to the development of the Herbert Hoover Birthplace National Historic Site.

SEC. 4. The Secretary shall administer the Herbert Hoover Birthplace National Historic Site in accordance with the Act approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, and the Act approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666).

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

H.R. 8111

An act to establish the Herbert Hoover National Historical Site in the State of Iowa

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to preserve in public ownership historically significant properties associated with the life of Herbert Hoover, the Secretary of the Interior may acquire the necessary acres of land or interests in land (including scenic easements) in or near West Branch, Iowa, by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, transfer from a Federal agency, or otherwise. Such property shall be known as the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of General Services may enter into agreements which provide for the—

(1) transfer of lands and other property, except the Herbert Hoover Library building, from the administrative control of the Administrator to that of the Secretary without transfer of funds; and

(2) use by the Administrator of portions of facilities constructed by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall administer the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site in accordance with the Act approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, and the Act approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666).

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated not more than $1,650,000 for land acquisition and development in connection with the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site as provided in this Act.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the May 16, 1965, issue of the Des Moines Register is interesting in view of the implication that I have indulged in politics in connection with this issue:

HOOVER BIRTHPLACE POLITICS

Two differing bills to establish a Federal memorial to Herbert Hoover at West Branch have been introduced in Congress, one by Republican Senators JACK MILLER and BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER and a later one by Representative JOHN SCHMIDHAUSER, Iowa City Democrat.

The Miller-Hickenlooper bill calls for the National Park Service to take over the West Branch grounds for a national monument. SCHMIDHAUSER would make the grounds a national historic site and would provide for an Iowa advisory commission to consult with the park service on use.

SCHMIDHAUSER said the right classification is "site" rather than "monument" and that the latter word is used for scenic wonders and the like. He says that some persons have felt MILLER might not have known the difference. SCHMIDHAUSER says the honoring of Hoover shouldn't be a political matter. But he appears to be making it a political issue by introducing a rival bill.

The list of monuments and sites doesn't show quite as clear a division as SCHMIDHAUSER describes. George Washington's birthplace, which is no waterfall, is a national monument and there are plenty of old forts in both categories. The name which the Hoover birthplace and grounds should go under is whichever name carries with it the powers to provide proper management.

Senator MILLER says he is willing to accept any helpful amendments that are suggested. Such suggestions rather than rival bills provide the best chance to keep the project nonpolitical.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the text of my statement of June 11 before the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, the text of my bill, H.R. 4252, the text of H.R. 8111, as originally introduced, the text of H.R. 8111 in the form in which it was passed by the House, and an editorial from the May 16, 1965, issue of the Des Moines Sunday Register.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has served on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for some 16 years.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to commend my colleague from Iowa for having introduced the first piece of legislation with regard to Herbert Hoover.

I would like to put a few remarks in the RECORD, too, because it seems that somebody has put out a story in Iowa that the gentleman did not do his homework. May I say if anybody has not done their homework it is the gentleman whose bill we finally reported because the record clearly shows that the bill he introduced originally had 55 lines and the House Committee struck out 31 of the 55 lines, amended the title, and then had to rewrite section 4. So if anybody did not do their homework, it was not the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Strange things have happened in the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee recently and some of these were pointed out on last Monday. Among other things, we brought out a bill that had to do, not with Iowa but with Ellis Island. At the time that bill was presented before our committee we had two Members, one from New Jersey and one from New York, both of whom claimed it was within their congressional district. The matter was not resolved until it came before our committee and the committee decided it. Our committee's policy always has been that if a member of the committee introduced a bill, regardless of his party, Democrat or Republican, the committee bill was taken up. But lo and behold, we did not take the bill of either the Member from New Jersey or the Member from New York in whose territory Ellis Island is located. We took Mr. Bringham's bill, he being a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

But when the bill to create the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site was considered and a motion was made to take up a bill of a member of the committee, we were accused of playing politics. As I said last Monday, politics is a strange thing. It is all right to use it when it suits you, but it seems very, very strange that a party, which for 20 years conducted campaigns on the basis of the so-called Hoover depression, suddenly decides that it now becomes very important, because it has a member of the Democrat party who represents the area where he was born and where he has been laid to rest to take up his bill.

If there has been any playing of politics in this business, I am quite sure it has not been the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], or the gentleman from Pennsylvania, presently addressing the House. It happens to be those who use this business of authorship of bills for their convenience. I think the record will show the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN], in whose congressional district Ellis Island is located, said it was about time the committee went back and took up its original policy. Perhaps as a result of this special order today we will be able to get our committee back on the track.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], for having introduced the bill, the first bill, and I know he did his homework because the bill that was reported out and approved by the House is almost identically the bill that he introduced.

Mr. GROSS. I greatly appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and one of the hardest working and conscientious Members of this Congress.

In conclusion, I would amend his statement only to say that some Democrats have been running against Herbert Hoover for the last 30 or nearly 35 years rather than 20 years. Again I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his forthright remarks.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PATRONAGE SHOULD BE ON THE BASIS OF MERIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. Andrew Jackson, "Old Hickory," introduced the spoils system into the Federal Government in 1828. He fired 252 Federal employees to make room for members of his political party.

The Whigs won in 1840 and threw out the Democratic appointees. Then the Democrats, under President Polk, fired the Whigs.

The savage spoils system led to the assassination of President James A. Garfield by a disappointed jobseeker and caused the enactment of the civil service reform law of 1883.

Almost a century has passed since the Congress took action to end the spoils system in the executive branch of the Federal Government. The spoils system of the House of Representatives is still in effect.

There are approximately 1,298 so-called patronage employees of the House; elevator operators, policemen, doorkeepers, publication workers, pages, and so on. The majority party appoints 1,266 and the minority party appoints 32.

The minority party is allotted 4 pages, 10 policemen, and a miscellaneous assortment of other positions. With 1 vacancy, there are 141 Representatives in the minority party and 293 in the majority party. The minority party holds 32 percent of the 435 seats; it is given 2½ percent of the patronage positions.

Whenever the majority changes in the House of Representatives, even by one seat, a tremendous upheaval is created among the House patronage employees. During the month of January following the election, hundreds of competent, experienced people are fired. Applicants, endorsed by the new majority are hired in a mad scramble. Production dwindles with untrained employees and those discharged may lose their income for months during their search for new employment.

The House of Representatives preaches the merit system to the executive branch by law, by investigations, and speeches on the floor. The House of Representatives practices the spoils system even more viciously than Andrew Jackson. He only fired 40 percent of those serving under Presidential supervision.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for an end to the patronage appointment system. I ask for the assignment of minority seats on the patronage committee. I recommend that the committee and its staff develop procedures of selecting the best qualified candidates instead of determining which congressional sponsor has the priority. I suggest that the patronage committee concern itself with the supervision of employees on our rolls so that visiting citizens are not shocked by bookreading, sloppily dressed elevator operators, and other such sights. A department store makes a better impression in this aspect than does the seat of our Government.

I propose that the patronage committee furnish us with a sorely needed central employment office providing a source of qualified candidates for all types of vacancies.

Knowing the House as I do, knowing the machinery for change is as ponderous as the tradition itself, I realize that the prospects of immediate establishment of a full merit system are indeed minute. Let me then suggest, as a first step, an alleviation of our spoils system which would eliminate the mass turnover of employees when the majority changes.

I suggest that these patronage positions be assigned in proportion to the number of seats held by each party. If we must divide page jobs by politics, give the minority party 16 in this Congress and the majority 34. Then, if the majority changes in November 1966, or at some future time, there will be fewer high school students who are bewildered by separation without bona fide reason or cause.

Further, I propose that the present minority commit themselves not to fire a single patronage employee when it regains the majority. The process of achieving a proportion in jobs according to proportion of seats could be accomplished by filling the vacancies that normally occur through retirement and resignations. When proportion is reached, appointments can be alternated between the parties to maintain equity.

There is no reason to summarily dismiss those appointed by the opposition party when the majority changes. These employees service every Member who calls upon them diligently and faithfully. They serve the majority well, they serve the minority equally well. They are not in a position to influence the welfare of either party nor would they desire to do so. We do not ask their political affiliation when they are hired; only the affiliation of their sponsor is of interest. These employees are primarily interested in doing a good job and earning funds for the support of their families. It is indeed a great injustice to place such a person's livelihood on the ballot at each election.

Let me give you an example of our present archaic employee-employer relationship. There is on our rolls a man who has worked at the same job for 10 years. He has a wife and seven children to support. In November 1964, his congressional sponsor was defeated. In January of this year, he was told by the patronage committee that he would be separated at the end of the month unless another Member of the majority party agreed that the position could be charged to his patronage account. After 2 weeks of worry and anxious requests, the man fortunately found a new sponsor.

I have personally observed this man's work as have most Members and legislative employees. He serves the public in his position. I can certify he is a capable, efficient person who is most courteous to those he serves.

If a new sponsor had not been found, the House would have lost the value of 10 years' experience and training of this man. We would have traded him for a raw recruit from another congressional district. If a sponsor had not been found this man would have been dismissed without consideration of his excellent record and his seniority.

I call upon the majority leader and the minority leader to begin negotiations immediately to establish a new and better tradition in patronage matters.

If there is merit in the tradition of "to the victor belongs the spoils" then surely there must be more merit to add "in proportion to this victory."

With a bipartisan patronage committee, and let it be one of respect whose name and members are listed in the Congressional Directory, we will have a start toward better treatment of our own employees. We will have a start toward letting our employees take pride in their work instead of in their sponsor. We can begin to investigate the school grades of those who we appoint as pages before we risk their college preparation. We can check past employment records of of workmen before appointment and take beginning steps of selecting the best applicant instead of the best sponsor.

Mr. Speaker, this improvement can only take place with the willingness of the majority to give up present advantages for future betterment. Whether it be the present majority or a future one, there will always be the short-sighted view. I emphasize that over a long period, neither side will gain or lose. The number of patronage positions each controls will balance out in years to come as they have in the years gone by.

It is not therefore to the gain of the present minority party that I speak, nor to the detriment of the present majority party. I speak to the betterment of the House of Representatives. I rise in sympathy for the hundreds whose livelihoods are at risk in November of each even-numbered year. I speak for those who are not even privileged to apply for a position with their Congress simply because their Representative is currently in the minority party. The balancing out of appointments between the parties over a hundred years may bring equality to the parties, but during that period it will bring injustices to thousands of individuals.

Mr. Speaker, concealed envy of the majority party privileges does not motivate my remarks. There is no Member here that does not know the lack of patronage is frequently a greater blessing than the power of appointment. As is often said, in rural carrier and postmaster appointments, a Member makes one friend and ten enemies. And have not each of us occasionally sought the comforting protection of the civil service merit examination rather than make a personal selection in one of these?

I speak for the use of merit in our selections of House patronage employees as a good business practice. I speak against mass dismissals as a bad business practice and a grave injustice to the employees. I speak for a proportioning of the positions as it is an injustice to any American citizen to deny him the right to compete for these jobs solely because the Congressman who represents the district in which the applicant lives happens to me a member of the party currently in the minority.

Mr. Speaker, I have made some specific suggestions for a solution. I am sure there are other equally good plans which could be considered. I can state with certainty that our antiquated spoils system presents a specific problem. I hope my suggestions will be of assistance to the majority and minority leaders in reaching a solution. I urge them to begin discussions as a matter in the best interests of both parties and of the House of Representatives.

CLINICAL LABORATORY LICENSING ACT OF 1965

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to license and regulate under the authority of the Surgeon General of the United States, clinical laboratories which conduct their business in interstate commerce. It is identical to the bill which Senators JACOB JAVITS of New York and GEORGE MURPHY of California recently introduced in the other body as S. 2184, the "Clinical Laboratory Licensing Act of 1965."

Mr. Speaker, the medical profession in this, the latter half of the 20th century, often seems to us to be something of a priesthood of miracle workers. The doctors have made wondrous advances in the diagnosis and treatment of ailments that once were thought to be beyond hope. We cannot but marvel at the application of scientific techniques which take much of the guesswork out of medicine.

One of the major weapons in the medical arsenal is the laboratory analysis of blood, urine, and tissue specimens taken from the patient and carefully examined in order to discover what ails him. Clinical laboratories test for pregnancy; for the presence of too much blood sugar, indicating diabetes; for the presence of malignancy in tissue, indicating cancer; for any number of other clues which the medical detective uses in his diagnosis. The clinical laboratory, through the professional application of the sciences of microbiology, chemistry, hematology, biophysics, cystology, and pathology, makes a major contribution to the healing of the sick.

It performs a service that most physicians have neither the time nor the facilities nor the professional training to perform for themselves. Thus many doctors utilize the services of the laboratory in the hospital with which they are affiliated. A great many other physicians, especially those in small towns and rural areas, send by mail samples for analysis to private clinical laboratories often located in another State and operated for profit.

It is estimated that there are about 3,000 private medical laboratories run for profit in this country. They do a fantastic amount of business. One west coast laboratory runs more than 500,000 tests monthly. These laboratories charge from under $5 to over $100 for various kinds of tests which require varying degrees of time, equipment, and professional skill.

There is no need for me to emphasize that mistakes made by the laboratory technician can be lethal to the patient. Unnecessary surgery may be performed; necessary surgery may be postponed. Hidden symptoms, warning signs of impending danger, may remain hidden as a result of error.

The fact is that the patient necessarily places the same faith in the ability of the anonymous laboratory technician as he places in his physician. And yet the laboratory technician, in most States, need not be a licensed doctor of medicine, or even licensed at all. Only 10 States require some form of licensure for medical laboratories, among them my home State of New York. Many of these laws require only that the laboratory director meet certain qualifications. Thirty-five States have no laws at all.

Does this mean that in these States anybody can put on a white coat and buy some test tubes and a microscope and open a clinical laboratory? It certainly does, and horrifying abuses have resulted.

I refer my colleagues to an article published in the May 1965 issue of McCall's magazine, written by Alice Lake and entitled "Medical Lab Tests: The Dangerous Mistakes."

It is reprinted in the RECORD of June 23, page 14593. It documents some of the frightening errors perpetrated by medical laboratories which are run by incompetent personnel, personnel often more interested in making a profit than in providing a medical service. For example, a girl's uterus was removed after a laboratory wrongly reported a test for cancer to be positive. A young man involved in a paternity suit was ordered to provide financial support for a child he had not fathered after a laboratory completed an inaccurate blood test. A hidden case of diabetes was not discovered until the patient almost died after a laboratory made a serious error in analysis.

The article reports that a 1959 New York City survey revealed that only one in every four private laboratories performed an Rh-factor study correctly; that 4 out of 10 laboratories in Illinois, out of 300 queried, made errors in blood group specimen tests.

The McCall's article is confirmed by a CBS news special program broadcast on June 24 and 25. A CBS news factfinding unit sent 12 samples of distilled water, colored yellow, to a mail-order medical laboratory, which was asked to perform a hormone test on what purported to be specimens of human urine. The New York City Bureau of Laboratories, which prepared the colored water specimens, said it would be impossible to find any hormones in the water. Yet the mail-order laboratory returned reports showing sizable amounts of hormones in the samples submitted.

The sad truth is that many shady laboratories perform a "sink test." That is, they pour the specimen into a sink and then write their report. Others are staffed by incompetent personnel, out to make a buck. The larger labs combine volume output with cutrate prices. And many times, the physicians who send in samples and who have only dealt with the laboratory by mail, do not realize until it is too late the fraud that is being perpetrated upon them and upon their patients.

Many mail-order laboratories are excellent, run by pathologists with 5 years of training following medical school, or by Ph. D. chemists or microbiologists who are fully qualified. But State law at present does very little, in most places, to curb the abuses of the fly-by-night private laboratories run for profit. The Federal Food and Drug Commissioner, George Larrick, said on the CBS program that Federal law usually cannot touch them unless the diagnosis is accompanied, in one way or another, by the shipment of medicine or a therapeutic device in interstate commerce.

My bill would go a long way toward protecting the public from the peril of putting human life in the hands of laboratory technicians who are not qualified. It would require the licensing of clinical laboratories operating in interstate commerce under minimum standards to be set by the Surgeon General.

Further, it would provide for inspection of these laboratories by the Surgeon General and evaluation of their effectiveness, including submission of test samples for analysis. It would establish standards and certification for laboratory directors. It would provide for revocation, suspension, and limitation of licenses for failure to meet standards, incompetence, misrepresentation, or similar causes. It would establish appropriate hearing and judicial review procedures.

I hope the Congress will see fit to expedite the passage of this bill, for I truly believe that every day we delay in this matter, we expose innocent people to terrible consequences. In this age of medical achievement there is no excuse for shoddily administered private laboratories to exist and to continue to bilk doctors and patients. I suggest that we act speedily to put them out of business.

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF EUGENE ZUCKERT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month Gene Zuckert's resignation was announced, to be effective in September. I regret very much indeed that this announcement has been made. I consider him one of the most valuable men in Government service today. We can ill afford to lose men of this type. Replacements come hard. I have known him throughout his Government service. I have known him particularly well during the time he has been Secretary of the Air Force. I doubt that any military service has ever shown a greater improvement in proficiency and standards in a similar period and much of this is due to the stewardship of Gene Zuckert.

Mr. Zuckert has served as Secretary of the Air Force since 1961—longer than any other Secretary in the history of the U.S. Air Force. He was an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force from 1947–52 and for 18 months prior to that, served as special assistant to the Assistant Secretary of War for Air. His experience in the management and administration of defense affairs is not equalled by any other statutory official of a military department.

Most of Mr. Zuckert's life has been devoted to public service. In addition to his long tenure as a civilian official of the Air Force, he has been an attorney for the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, executive assistant to the Administrator of Surplus Property, and a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. During World War II, he served in uniform as a naval officer.

From 1940 to 1944, he was a member of the faculty and assistant dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, where he specialized in Government-business relations.

Under Secretary Zuckert's leadership the Air Force has become a flexible and responsive military instrument. The Air Force strategic deterrent force made an unparalleled transition since January 1961 from a force composed almost entirely of manned bombers to a balanced bomber-missile force.

In January 1961, the Air Force had six operational ICBM's and about 1,900 manned bombers. Today, the Strategic Air Command inventory includes more than 850 ICBM's and some 900 manned bombers. This transition, which was made with no loss of operational effectiveness at any time, is a tribute to Secretary Zuckert's skill as a manager and administrator.

Both missile and bomber elements now can react almost instantaneously to any threat. Their security against attack has been improved many fold by dispersal, alert procedures, hardening, and more effective warning systems. The efficiency of the strategic deterrent has increased several times over. And the flexibility of our big bombers, which are usually associated with general war and nuclear weapons, has been demonstrated recently by their effective delivery of conventional bombs against Viet Cong targets in southeast Asia.

Secretary Zuckert has managed several programs that have given our military forces a degree of mobility never before attained. Our airlift has been increased by more than 200 percent since 1961. The C–141, with which military air transport units are now being equipped, will give us considerable additional capability for rapid movement of U.S. forces and equipment anywhere in the world where they may be needed.

As one of the top managers of the Department of Defense, Mr. Zuckert has assisted in developing Air Force tactical aircraft and units to support our ground forces throughout the world. Most effective of the new tactical fighters is the swept-wing F–111. Development of this revolutionary aircraft was started in 1962. We will begin equipping Tactical Air Command squadrons with F–111's within a year.

The Air Force preparation for a more effective wartime use of conventional weapons is another reflection of Secretary Zuckert's support of President Johnson's insistence on a variety of military options to fit any foreseeable contingency. The Secretary also has been responsible for a very important innovation in the use of air power—the development of counter-insurgency forces that can act effectively in cooperation with other military forces to suppress guerrilla warfare, or train military personnel of less developed countries to protect their nations against subversion. Training for this important program is done at Eglin Air Force Base in my district.

Secretary Zuckert has remained a strong supporter of the need for three separate Services in order to provide management efficiency and professional experience, and to promote esprit. At the same time, he has advocated and practiced inter-service teamwork and has contributed greatly to strengthening the basis for Army-Air Force cooperation. In the field of tactical air operations, Secretary Zuckert has given the strongest kind of support to the STRICCOM concept of joint Army-Air Force tactical operations.

One of Secretary Zuckert's greatest contributions to national security has been to improve the efficiency with which the Air Force's $18-billion a year budget and many billions of dollars in capital assets are managed. As an Assistant Secretary, he was a leader in establishing management systems that assured sound business practices in the Air Force. As Secretary, he has reorganized the logistics and research and development activities of the Air Force for economic and efficient operation.

During his first year as Secretary, Mr. Zuckert established the designated systems management group technique by which critical weapons systems were identified and managed as an integrated entity. The designated systems management group was largely responsible for bringing to operational readiness in record time four generations of intercontinental ballistic missiles. The Titan III booster rocket provides one of the most dramatic illustrations of the effectiveness of this management technique. Less than 2 years after development contracts were signed, the first Titan III was fired successfully at Cape Kennedy. By anticipating major management problems before they developed, Mr. Zuckert's designated systems management group was able to carry forward Secretary McNamara's drive for development of new weapons at the lowest possible cost and in the shortest possible time. The Air Force has been a leader in reducing operating costs through the use of modern management practices.

Under Secretary Zuckert's leadership, the Air Force has cooperated with NASA in many space projects. The Air Force has made significant contributions to success of the Gemini program, including development of the Titan III booster, providing the Atlas Agena as the best vehicle for rendezvous and docking, and making available launch facilities and experienced crews at Cape Kennedy. Working relations between the two organizations, developed by NASA Administrator Webb and Mr. Zuckert are excellent.

No Air Force Secretary has been more insistent than Secretary Zuckert that he and his staff keep in close touch with the field. He has set an example for his senior civilian and military staff members by frequent visits to operating units, which give him an opportunity to talk with the enlisted personnel and officers who keep our aircraft and missiles in a constant state of readiness.

Secretary Zuckert has spoken and written frequently about those attributes of the military man that are summed up in the word "professionalism." The attention which he has given to the selection, education, training, motivation and promotion of Air Force personnel has been a major factor in creating the most highly qualified group of uniformed and civilian people the Air Force has had in its 18-year history as a separate military department.

It is difficult to characterize in a few words Mr. Zuckert's incumbency as Secretary of the Air Force. Most observers would agree that under his leadership, the Air Force has gone through the most imaginative and productive period of its history. He has brought to the Air Force a willingness to look for new ideas and to adapt to them, an insistence on high intellectual standards, unquestioned loyalty to his superiors and subordinates, an appreciation of the need for sophisticated planning and management techniques and unfailing support of interagency teamwork.

These are hallmarks of an outstanding public servant.

Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to include in my remarks a summary of Secretary Zuckert's life and achievements.

Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary of the Air Force

Mr. Zuckert, a native New Yorker, was born in that city on November 9, 1911, the son of Harry M. and Eugenie Adrienne Pincoffs Zuckert (deceased).

From Yale University he received his B.A. in 1933 and his LL.B. in 1937. He also received a certificate for completion of the combined Yale Law and Harvard Business School course. While at Yale he was a member of the Beta Theta Pi fraternity. His honorary degrees include an LL.D. degree from George Washington University and a doctor of engineering degree from Clarkson College, N.Y.

During the period 1940–44, he was an instructor in government-business relations at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, and became an assistant professor and assistant dean of the school. He organized and administered the school's first advanced management course.

Mr. Zuckert has spent almost 20 years in public service, principally in the field of administration. His first Government service was as an attorney for the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (1937–40). During World War II he was commissioned in the U.S. Navy and was assigned to the office of the Chief of Naval Operations.

He has held several key Government posts, including that of Assistant Secretary of the Air Force under the first Secretary of the Air Force, Stuart Symington. After serving as a member of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission for 2½ years and then devoting a period to his private law practice as a consultant in the field of atomic energy, Mr. Zuckert returned to Government service on January 24, 1961, as Secretary of the Air Force, the position he has now held longer than any previous Secretary.

Mr. Zuckert is a director of the People-to-People Health Foundation, a nonprofit corporation which operates the *Hope* ship. He is coauthor of the book, "Atomic Energy for Your Business."

Secretary and Mrs. Zuckert, the former Barbara Jackman, of Newburyport, Mass., have three children: two daughters, Adrienne K. and Gene, and a son, Robert B. The Zuckerts are long-time residents of Chevy Chase, Md.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Patten] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, when Eugene Zuckert retired as Secretary of the Air Force, that branch lost one of its most competent and able administrators in its history.

Secretary Zuckert was exceeded in tenure by one three service secretaries in the 20th century—Josephus Daniels, Henry Stimson and Wilbur Brucker—and he set a record for improvement, efficiency, balance and objectivity rarely equalled by any secretary.

In the fields of offensive and defensive forces, research and development, logistics, mobility and counterinsurgency, Mr. Zuckert infused new life into existing projects and, where there was need, initiated his own programs and systems. In the all-important field of space and astronautics, Secretary Zuckert established an unparalleled working relationship with NASA Director James Webb, giving a never-before-achieved degree of maturity to USAF efforts.

In the long run, however, Secretary Zuckert's greatest accomplishment can not be measured in terms of planes or in terms of capabilities or in terms of bomber units. He brought to the office of Secretary an intellectual attitude which acknowledged, in effect, that defense problems—like problems of state—must be solved by a meaningful evaluation of alternatives. Through his efforts, the operating philosophy of the Air Force has been transformed into one of the most dynamic, creative and progressive units in the entire Government.

We salute Secretary Zuckert today on 4½ years of accomplishments and we send along a sincere thank you for more than 18 years of loyal and dedicated public service. His career has, indeed, been distinguished.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great privilege to join my colleague from Florida [Mr. Sikes] in paying tribute to the distinguished public service of Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert, who has submitted his resignation after serving for 4½ years—the longest period ever served by one man in his important position.

It has been my pleasure to have known and worked with Mr. Zuckert throughout his tour as Secretary of the Air Force. We have had frequent contact in connection with subjects involving the House Committee on Armed Services, on which I serve.

Also, Mr. Zuckert is a director of the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc., which operates the hospital ship *Hope*, whose establishment resulted from efforts in which I am proud to have participated. Then, I was interested to note that Secretary Zuckert, who is a native of New York City, chose as his wife the former Barbara Jackman of Newburyport, Mass., in my congressional district.

So, as I rise to salute "Gene" Zuckert, I do so with a feeling that I know the man about whom we are talking. I have long had great admiration and respect for him, for what he has stood, and for his accomplishments. I am sure that he will always be regarded as one of the most outstanding Secretaries of the Air Force, and I trust that his counsel will continue to be available to his Government as he retires to less strenuous pursuits.

I am happy at this time to add my congratulations to Secretary Zuckert on earning another "well done" in his notable career and to wish him many more fruitful years on whatever path he may tread.

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to know Secretary Zuckert and I feel that our country has lost a fine and dedicated public servant. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman from Florida in paying tribute to this man who has served longer than any other man in Air Force history as its Secretary.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the Gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes] in paying tribute to a man who has served his country and the Air Force exceedingly well in his 4½ years as Secretary of the Air Force.

As a member of the Defense Appropriations Committee, I have had a continuing opportunity to observe and work with Eugene Zuckert and I can state unequivocally that his service has been a credit to him personally and to the Defense Establishment with which he has been so intimately involved as Air Force Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that we in this body who have worked with Gene Zuckert wish him well as he leaves the post he has filled so ably.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of personal satisfaction and pleasure to join in paying tribute to "Gene" Zuckert, the outgoing Secretary of the Air Force. The Nation owes Mr. Zuckert a special debt of gratitude.

By serving the Government in various capacities over an extended period of time, he has been able to make an extraordinary contribution to the welfare of his country. Regardless of a man's capabilities, he needs a great deal of knowledge and experience to be able to help give the Government at top levels the guidance and direction needed during these complex and difficult days. "Gene" Zuckert has brought to high Government office the qualities of mind and heart and experience which are indispensable to the welfare of our country.

Few men have so adequately filled important positions in the Government. When the present Senator from the State of Missouri, Mr. SYMINGTON, became the first Secretary of the Air Force, "Gene" Zuckert became the Assistant Secretary for Management. In this role, he instituted new methods of budgetary reporting and control and became known to those of us who were closely involved in Defense appropriations as a man possessing genuine ability.

Later Mr. Zuckert served as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. He remained active in the field of atomic energy after returning to private life. When he was appointed Secretary of the Air Force by President Kennedy in January of 1961, he was well equipped by experience to be a real leader in the Department of the Air Force. His greatest testimonial is the present Air Force. If one should subtract from the progress which has been made in national defense the contribution of "Gene" Zuckert, this country would be weaker and much less prepared for the challenges which confront us as a nation.

Gene Zuckert and I have worked closely together through the years. I esteem his friendship highly, and he will always have a very warm place in my heart. He is well known to many in the congressional district which I have the honor to serve. They know him as a friend as well as an able public servant. I am grateful for the cooperation which he has given to me and to the Committee on Appropriations during the years. He has always shown high respect for the legislative branch of the Government.

I appreciate his objectivity, his ability to look at a proposition from all sides, and his desire to deal with his associates in Government on a basis of good will and understanding.

I do not know just what new job or new challenge will come to Mr. Zuckert, but I do know that he will measure up to any responsibility which he undertakes, and I wish him every success and happiness in his future endeavors. I have no doubt but that he will continue to contribute to the welfare of our country.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my personal remarks to the words and praise which are being extended to the former Air Force Secretary, Eugene M. Zuckert. It is, of course, a special pleasure to cite one who has close ties with Connecticut, but it is most important to recognize the wide experience and ability of such a man, who has made so many outstanding contributions to our Government.

Not only has Eugene M. Zuckert served longer as Secretary of the Air Force than any of his predecessors in that assignment—indeed, there are only about five men who have served as long in this century in any of the secretariat positions—but he has unselfishly devoted much of his life to the public service. He was a lieutenant in the Navy, was later Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, then a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

He has also been of great service with international health programs, as an instructor and assistant dean in business administration, and is an author of a work which shows some of the promise of atomic energy's uses. Since he was brought back to Washington in the early days of the Kennedy administration to assume a leading role in our defense effort, he has performed outstanding service.

He is a man of genuine stature, who has faced and contributed to the solution of many of the difficult problems caused by the impact of science and technology on our policies and programs. We wish him well.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of Eugene Zuckert as Secretary of the Air Force is a distinct loss to the Air Force and to the entire Nation. Those of us who have had occasion to know Mr. Zuckert and work with him have come to recognize his great ability and leadership in the field of national defense. He will undoubtedly go down in history as one of the great Air Force Secretaries who played a stellar role in plans and developments of the greatest air power striking and defense force in history.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Zuckert, a distinguished and noble American, has made a great personal sacrifice by his long service as Secretary of the Air Force. But he has left behind him a stronger national defense and a more secure America. We are all deeply his debtor.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is correct to say that when an outstanding public official decides to retire we all meet the announcement with mixed feelings. We are happy for him that he can be relieved from the constant burdens and difficult responsibilities of his high office and, at the same time, we wish that he would continue to serve because of his great and wide experience in the office he holds.

This was the way I felt when the announcement came a few days ago that Eugene Zuckert was stepping down as Secretary of the Air Force after serving longer, 4½ years, than any other man in the history of the Air Force.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have been here a long time and I have seen Secretaries of the Air Force come and go. But, I can say with all honesty we have never had a Secretary of the Air Force as talented and as effective as Gene Zuckert. He has performed a truly outstanding job for the Air Force and for our Defense Establishment, and all of the American people owe this fine public servant a debt of gratitude and deep thanks.

It was my good fortune to become closely associated and acquainted with Gene Zuckert in my capacity as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of Defense and the Secretary, of course, came before that committee on numerous occasions to testify. Therefore, I have firsthand knowledge of his great abilities and, believe me, they are great in the full sense of the term.

Like all of my colleagues here today, I am truly sorry to see Gene Zuckert leave as Secretary of the Air Force but I certainly understand that he richly deserves and has earned a respite from the terrible burdens of that office.

I wish him the very best in health and happiness in the years that follow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues who have spoken about a great public servant on the eve of his departure as Secretary of the Air Force. Eugene M. Zuckert was appointed by President Kennedy immediately after his inauguration in 1961 and has remained at the pilot's seat since that time.

Previous to that appointment, Secretary Zuckert served with the Securities and Exchange Commission and the War Assets Corp.; he was Assistant Secretary of War for Air and was a commissioner of the Atomic Energy Commission; he also saw active duty with the Navy in World War II. This devoted public servant has occupied high positions of trust and responsibility for almost 18 years and has served the Nation with distinction in many dimensions.

As Secretary of the Air Force Eugene Zuckert has always maintained that the strength of the Armed Forces and of the Nation lies in its people. I believe that his faith in this belief is well exemplified in a speech which he made to the chamber of commerce in Omaha, Nebr., a few years ago. Under the unanimous-consent rule, I am placing a copy of that speech in the RECORD.

TODAY'S MILITARY MAN

(Address by Hon. Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary of the Air Force to Military Affairs Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Omaha, Nebr, May 22, 1963)

It is a pleasure to join the Military Affairs Committee of the Omaha Chamber of Commerce in paying tribute to the members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in this area.

I sincerely welcome this opportunity to speak to all of you representatives of the people of Omaha. The friendly, cooperative relationship between the people of this community and members of the Strategic Air Command here has been ideal. By innumerable acts of thoughtfulness and genuine understanding, you have made a very difficult military task easier for our Air Force people and definitely have contributed to the strength of the Strategic Air Command.

SAC and the Air Force have been fortunate to have the headquarters of the strategic aerospace force located in Omaha. And I know that you agree with me that you have been fortunate in having two men like our Chief of Staff Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, and Gen. Thomas S. Power, the Commander in Chief, Strategic Air Command, as the top commanders here for so many years.

Both men exemplify the finest qualities of the U.S. military man—they are experienced, versatile, practical, responsible, dedicated, and far-seeing.

Does this sound like unwarranted praise for the U.S. military man? You who know the backgrounds of Generals LeMay and Power know that they have all these attributes and more. Yet probably not many know, for example, that the Air Force chief of staff not only was the innovator of bombing techniques in World War II, organizer of air operations for the Berlin airlift and builder of SAC in its first 10 years—he also is a graduate civil engineer, was the Air Force's first deputy chief of air staff for research and development, and played a major role in leading and supervising development of our ICBM force.

But what about military men, in general, throughout the services? Does the so-called military men—the man with the military mind actually exist to any significant extent in the U.S. Armed Forces? From my more than 15 years personal experience with the military services, I say that the stereotype of the typical military man is a myth.

Certainly, as in any large organization, there are conservative men along with the dynamic advocates of new ideas and methods. But neither the advocates of change nor the advocates of the slower approach have been smothered in this vast organization. Each element has been either sharpened or tempered by the other, and the military sword is stronger and sharper because of a surprisingly great degree of freedom of ideas and actions.

Then who is this military man we hear about? Is he a Maj. Gordon Cooper, or a Lt. Col. John Glenn? Is he a General Eisenhower, a General MacArthur or a General Marshall? Is he a General Bradley or a General Vandenberg? Is he General Gruenther or a General Norstad?

Does he look backward instead of forward? Or does he have the vision of a General "Billy" Mitchell or a General "Hap" Arnold? Is he narrow in his interests? Or does he have the broad interest of a General "Jimmie" Doolittle, General Spaatz, a General White, an Admiral Rickover?

Of course, you know that these outstanding military men are only a few of hundreds of exceptional American military leaders in all the services that you and I together could name.

Last year, in a major study, the Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery commended the kind of training and job experiences that military leaders are given to prepare them for a broad grasp of national security problems. The armed services, says the report, "have recognized the requirement for military generalists. The career patterns followed by promising officers expose them to problems of their service as a whole. And today, attendance at the National War Colleg or its equivalent, together with a tour of duty in a joint or international command is virtually required of those reaching general officer rank."

However, what counts most in evaluating the military man is his record of achievement. I believe that the Air Force record in this respect has been especially noteworthy. It reflects anything but a tendency to "rely on the weapons of the last war to fight the next one." I cite the Air Force record most particularly because I know it.

It was a group of like-minded people within the Army in the early part of this century who saw the great potential of aviation and worked together to develop it, with the aid of industry. This organization of airpower enthusiasts developed into the Air Corps, and then the Army Air Forces, and then the U.S. Air Force.

It was proved in World War II what airpower could do.

Even before World War II ended the Army Air Forces began to work on guided missiles. After the war the Air Force also began work on ballistic missiles, but had to cancel the program in 1947 for lack of funds. Four years later it gave a contract that led to work on the Atlas ICBM. This was before the thermonuclear breakthrough that led the Air Force Strategic Missiles Evaluation Committee to recommend a strong program for accelerating development of intercontinental ballistic missiles. The Air Force approved the recommendation and asssigned the program the very highest priority.

Today we see the results of the most massive and complex research, development and management undertaking of all time—the Air Force-industry production of the Thor, Atlas, Titan and Minuteman ballistic missiles. These, along with Polaris, have given our Nation a clear military superiority in strategic missiles. But more than that, Air Force missiles have provided the space boosters for the larger space vehicles, including the Mercury capsules, for our national space program.

The credit for this great national achievement must be shared by many farsighted, dedicated military men—and civilians, both inside and outside of government. Much credit must be given to General "Hap" Arnold, who pioneered Air Force use of some of the Nation's best scientific brains to help keep us ahead of any potential aggressor. In 1944 General Arnold set up a scientific advisory group under the direction of the late Dr. Theodore von Karman. He told them he wanted them to think ahead 20 years to consider any phases of aviation that might affect the development and employment of airpower. General Arnold also set up Project RAND in 1946. One of its first studies was on space satellite systems.

Military men also developed the concept of the weapon system as integrating weapon, people, and all other supporting elements into a manageable unit for planning purposes; they developed the concept of concurrency, involving the compression of time-scheduling from the start of the development of the weapon until it reaches the inventory stage. Imagine the job of managing simultaneously the many facets of missile development, test site construction and deployment at a couple of dozen bases in 18 States—building three different ICBM systems in seven basic configurations—using hundreds of contractors, more than 30 labor unions, more than 400,000 people.

Concurrency has greatly reduced weapon system acquisition leadtime. The Thor IRBM became operational in 4.3 years from the time of approval; Atlas ICBM in 5.2 years; and the Titan ICBM, in 5.8 years. The relatively simple, but highly sophisticated Minuteman ICBM was ready in just 4 years. In only 5 years since the first contract was signed, the 100th Minuteman missile site has become operational. ICMB's are becoming operational in the Air Force inventory at the rate of more than one a day. This has been an unprecedented achievement under any terms of comparison.

The military departments often run ahead of the civilian economy in the introduction of management techniques. One example is the use of computers for planning and programing. The Air Force started the use of computers back in 1948 when General Rawlings, then Air Force comptroller and now president of a major corporation, provided the leadership to bring in the first computer to be used in defense programing.

As Vice Chief of Staff since July 1957 and Chief of Staff since July 1961 and the commander of SAC for nearly 10 years before coming to Washington, General LeMay has contributed most extensively to the Air Force as we know it today. Last week I had a brief summary prepared listing the major tasks the Air Force performs in support of national objectives. It gives a picture in quick, broad-brush strokes of what the military man in today's Air Force, together with the civilian employee, is doing.

With about 39 percent of the Defense budget, the Air Force provides our Nation not only with the Strategic Air Command and its more than 80 percent of the free world's strategic nuclear delivery capability, but it also provides some 70 percent of the personnel for the North American Air Defense Command, and the greatest portion of the facilities for defending our skies against attackers.

In addition, the Air Force provides:

The greatest portion by far of the Nation's global military airlift and assault airlift, air support for the Army, the primary air arms for our Armed Forces in Europe, the Pacific, the Far East, Alaska, and the Caribbean area, and the major Department of Defense support of the national space program.

The Air Force Communications Service operates and maintains a global network of more than 5 million miles of communications channels and a worldwide system of more than 1,500 electronic aids of air navigation and air traffic control.

The Military Air Transport Service maintains a 115,000-mile system of military air routes on a wartime readiness basis.

The Air Force Systems Command, which is involved in coordinating the Nation's military and scientific efforts toward development of aerospace weapon systems, administers, at any given time, 60,000 contracts.

Air Force Logistics Command processes more than 26 million supply demands each year. Its stock of technical items is subject to random demands from some 15,000 organizations and units worldwide.

The President's report to Congress on aeronautic and space activities shows that of the 54 satellites orbited by the United States in 1962, 40 were launched by the Air Force.

I know that most of you here are familiar with many other examples of value received for the Air Force portion of the Defense budget; the ballistic missiles; the X-15 program being conducted in cooperation with NASA; and aircrews on constant ground alert and those overhead in the air.

At the same time that the Air Force is working on projects such as the Dyna-Soar piloted aerospacecraft, the Titan III space booster and with NASA on the Gemini manned space effort, it is involved in the more down-to-earth tasks of training and using air commandos and training Vietnamese pilots in actual air operations.

At the heart of all these activities and systems are the people who envision them, who develop them, manage them, maintain them, plan their employment, and operate them. These are the people you know—the officers and the airmen.

These comprise the so-called military man.

This is the military man I am talking about. He is not the military man you will find in some history books. He is not the military man of some other country. He is the American military man of the 1960s—shaped by our institutions and controlled by his understanding of these institutions, by our governmental checks and balances, by our free press and by the Congress.

Some of these military men you know are air crews and support personnel working 70 to 80 hours a week—sometimes even longer. Some SAC and Tactical Air Command crews rotate routinely between stateside and overseas bases. Air Force transport crews fly great distances to many places on the planet. Families are separated for long periods of time. But all these people know that what they are doing is important. As you know, others of our military men are away from the day-to-day flying and missile operations—involved in the extremely difficult business of planning, of helping the defense establishment to arrive at sound decisions on the composition and deployment of our forces simultaneously for today, tomorrow, and the day after tomorrow.

The responsibility for today is maintaining the present posture of our strength. Today's job for tomorrow is to bring to fruition the plans and the weapon systems conceived years ago.

The job for the day after tomorrow is to make decisions now that will result in the weapon systems of the 1970's designed to maintain our superiority against any potential enemy.

I have always been struck by the duality of the military man's responsibility—not only must he be able to think clearly about long-range plans for war in the future, but also, he must maintain a keen edge of readiness to respond instantly to an emergency that could arise at any moment.

Our military men, working with the civilian leadership in the Department of Defense, are coping with the most difficult factors—attempting to balance knowns against unknowns: technological advances; possible scientific breakthroughs; enemy intentions; arms control; nuclear testing; actions of our allied nations; international economics, and countless other factors.

Naturally there will be sources of disagreement. No one in our system would expect the decision-making process to be otherwise. But I have noted a tremendous improvement since my previous tour in the Pentagon in the machinery for isolating problems, putting them in focus, analyzing them, discussing and arguing the pros and cons. This process provides the best foundation for decisions. Decisions are based on national and international policy considerations as well as military considerations and are quite properly the responsibility of the Secretary of Defense or the President. Most important in this decision-making process is an understanding by the military of the responsibilities of the civilian leaders and an appreciation by the civilian leadership of the unique experience of our military leaders.

This country is fortunate to have officers like Generals LeMay and Power in key positions in its defense forces. Their experience, knowledge, and calm resolution contribute the kind of strength we need in these trying times. Knowing war well, they want to know peace even better.

Last year a distinguished European, Andre Malraux, French Minister of State for Cultural Affairs, paid a great tribute to our Nation. It seems to me that in doing so he unconsciously paid high tribute to the U.S. military man, as well as to our system of Government with its checks and balances, and to the moral strength of our people.

He said that ours is "the only nation that has waged war but not worshipped it, that has won the greatest power in the world but not sought it, that has wrought the greatest weapon of death but has not wished to wield. May it inspire men with dreams worthy of its action."

To the noble words of this tribute to all Americans I would like simply to add these: May this Nation continue to inspire military men with actions worthy of its dreams.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF EUGENE M. ZUCKERT, SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. Zuckert was born November 9, 1911, in New York City and is the son of Harry M. and Eugenie Adrienne Pincoffs Zuckert (deceased).

He attended public elementary and high schools of suburban New York, received preparatory education at the Salisbury School, Salisbury, Conn., and obtained his B.A. from Yale University in 1933; in 1937, received LL.B. from Yale; has a certificate for completion of the combined law-business course at Harvard and Yale. At Yale he was a member of the Beta Theta Pi fraternity.

Mr. Zuckert is a member of the bar in Connecticut, New York, and the District of Columbia and has practiced law in these States; however, most of his professional career has been devoted to public service.

From 1937 to 1940, Mr. Zuckert was attorney for the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission at Washington and New York. From 1940 to 1944 he was an instructor in relations between Government and business at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, advancing to assistant professor and later to assistant dean of the school. During this period, he also served as administrative head of the first advanced management course given at the Harvard Graduate School.

In 1944, Mr. Zuckert entered the U.S. Navy on military duty and served in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations as a lieutenant (jg). On September 26, 1947, he was appointed Assistant Secretary of the Air Force under Secretary of the Air Force Stuart Symington.

He was appointed a member of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission on January 21, 1952, and served until June 30, 1954, when he returned to the private practice of law specializing as a consultant in the field of atomic energy. He coauthored with Arnold Kramish the book, "Atomic Energy for Your Business."

Secretary Zuckert is a director of the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc., a nonprofit organization which is operating the *Hope* ship as part of the President's people-to-people program.

Mr. Zuckert has received an honorably LL.D degree from George Washington University and an honorary doctor of engineering degree from Clarkson College, N.Y.

Mr. Zuckert was sworn in as Secretary of the Air Force on January 24, 1961. He is married to the former Barbara Jackman of Newburyport, Mass. He has three children; two daughters, Adrienne K., and Gene, and a son, Robert B.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, a lot of nice things have been said about Gene Zuckert upon the occasion of his departure from his position as Secretary of the Air Force. Having a major Air Force installation located in my congressional district, I had occasion to visit him personally numerous times to discuss with him matters of mutual concern. Without exception, I found him to be courteous, cooperative, understanding, and willing to work with me in solving various problems.

I believe his attitude is best exemplified by an editorial that appeared in the Goldsboro, N.C., News-Argus at the time of Secretary Zuckert's visit in my congressional district.

The editorial is as follows:

ABOUT MR. ZUCKERT

For a fellow born in New York City and educated at Yale, Eugene Zuckert turned out to be a down-to-earth regular fellow.

The Air Force Secretary visited Wayne County this week on a tour of Seymour Johnson AFB.

Civilians and military folks alike were on their P's and Q's.

When he hopped, bareheaded, off his airplane and walked up to microphones set up by TV newsmen, reporters prepared for a formal, stilted press conference.

But Zuckert walked right past the microphones and came over to shake hands with the reporters. "I just wanted to meet you fellows," he smiled; and right off you felt he was genuinely friendly and not another politician trying to butter up the press.

When lunch time came, Secretary Zuckert ate with the noncommissioned officers—and he ate the same food everyone else was being served.

Later, at Sleepy Creek, he became just another member of the group digging out barbecued pig tenderloins with his fingers and gnawing a rib.

That night he was guest of honor at a formal dinner at the officers' club. Now we're sure Mr. Zuckert, whose record of public service is not matched by many, was a perfect and appreciative guest of honor.

But we have a suspicion that, had he had his "druthers," Mr. Zuckert would still have been messing around with the boys out at Sleepy Creek—chewing on barbecued pig skins, gnawing on ribs, and getting all greasy mouthed.

He's our kind of folks. Even if he was born in the big city and went to Yale.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and service of the Hon. Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary of the Air Force.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

FAILURE OF MANUFACTURERS TO PASS ON EXCISE TAX CUTS TO THE CONSUMER

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a table.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in checking over the new price lists of business machines to the U.S. Government, I am shocked to learn that the Government itself is being bilked of its proper share of the excise tax reduction on business machines. It seems incredible that manufacturers of business machines who a short time ago promised to pass on the excise tax cut to the consumer should be taking advantage of the Federal Government itself. From the following table, it can be seen that certain manufacturers of business machine are keeping in their pockets up to 89 percent of the excise tax cut.

Congress may be compelled to reconsider its recent reduction of excise tax where tax benefits are retained by the manufacturer as extra profits.

Following is a table listing the Government's prices on leading business machines:

Effect of excise tax reduction on Government purchase of business machines

Machine	Prior to June 22	Federal excise tax	June 22-30	Portion of excise tax retained by company		July 1 on	Portion of excise tax returned to Government	
				Amount	Percent		Amount	Percent
Gestetner model 360	$686.50	--------	$640.00	--------	--------	$640.00	--------	--------
Gestetner model 320	425.70	--------	396.00	--------	--------	396.00	--------	--------
Gestetner model 310	382.70	--------	376.00	--------	--------	376.50	--------	--------
A. B. Dick model 525	408.00	$25.50	382.50	--------	--------	382.50	--------	--------
A. B. Dick model 438	705.00	43.50	661.50	$36.00	83	697.00	$7.50	17
Elliott model 2200	903.95	--------	850.25	--------	--------	850.25	--------	--------
IBM typewriter model C	441.60	27.60	414.00	9.00	33	423.00	18.60	67
IBM typewriter model 713	480.00	--------	450.00	--------	--------	450.00	--------	--------
IBM typewriter model 723	456.00	28.50	427.50	13.50	47	441.00	15.00	53
IBM typewriter model Executive	619.20	38.70	580.50	13.50	35	594.00	25.20	65
IBM dictator model 211	445.20	25.20	420.00	10.00	40	430.00	15.20	60
IBM dictator model 212	418.70	23.70	395.00	10.00	42	405.00	13.70	58
IBM dictator model 213	498.20	28.20	470.00	25.00	89	495.00	3.20	11
IBM dictator model 214	429.30	24.30	405.00	15.00	62	420.00	9.30	38
Remington typewriter	437.10	--------	409.50	--------	--------	409.50	--------	--------
Smith-Corona typewriter model 250	241.00	--------	225.00	--------	--------	225.00	--------	--------
Smith-Corona typewriter model 410	452.34	20.34	423.00	9.00	31	432.00	20.34	69
Dictaphone recorder	434.60	24.60	410.00	10.00	41	420.00	14.60	59
Dictaphone transcriber	420.82	23.82	397.00	10.00	43	407.00	13.82	58
Dictaphone combination	503.50	--------	475.00	--------	--------	475.00	--------	--------
SoundScriber communicator	417.91	--------	395.00	--------	--------	395.00	--------	--------
SoundScriber transcriber	407.33	--------	385.00	--------	--------	385.00	--------	--------

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, for the past 6 years, the third week of July in this country has observed a Captive Nations Week during which the plight of the people behind the Iron Curtain is officially noted. We do this because the Congress, in Public Law 86–90, unanimously declared that it should be done, but more than that, I hope we do it because we honestly know of the aspirations of the captive peoples of the world and want them to know we care.

It seems particularly important to me that as the international political struggle tightens around us almost daily that we realize what happened to the nations of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azorbaigan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ukal, Tibet, Cossacki, Turkestan, and others. Certainly we can see what is happening in Vietnam just by picking up a daily paper and looking at the front page.

The people from the captive nations have a better understanding of the truth about Soviet communism than anyone. They know from firsthand experience how the Russians overran their countries and denied the people their freedom. Let us learn from them.

One of America's most vigorous anti-Communist statesman was the late John Foster Dulles, President Eisenhower's dedicated Secretary of State. I like to recall what he had to say about this struggle. In November 1958 he said:

> There are some who seem to feel that, because international communism is a powerful and stubborn force, we should give way before it. Nothing could be more dangerous than to operate on the theory that, if hostile and evil forces do not readily change, it is always we who must change to accommodate them.
>
> Communism is stubborn for the wrong; let us be steadfast for the right. A capacity to change is indispensable. Equally indispensable is the capacity to hold fast that which is good. But let us make our opposition not just a barren negative but a positive alternative.
>
> Despotisms, with their iron discipline, their materialistic productions, their hard and glittering exterior, always seem to have the advantage over democracies which advertise their differences to all the world and which often appear as about to fall apart.
>
> The fact is that the despotisms are always weaker than they appear and the free nations are usually stronger than they seem.

Dealing with this "stubborn wrong"—as Dulles called it—often seems like an impossible job, especially when it is geographically remote and it seems that we are only indirectly involved.

In recent years, however, Americans have realized that the tenacles of communism did not stop in Eastern Europe. We were confronted—and still are, for that matter—with a Communist beachhead right here in our own hemisphere. This probably did not surprise many of the captive peoples of Eastern Europe who understand communism and its ways much better than we ever seemed to want to.

It is regrettable that we must be brought to our senses by painful object lessons like Vietnam. It is a tragedy when more blood has to be spilled because of an earlier failure to stand firm against the stubborn wrong.

Let us salute the captive peoples this week in their brave fight against despotism. Let us give them every encouragement and let us give them hope through our better recognition of the problem that confronts not just them but us.

Let us show them that the positive alternative we offer is justice and freedom as we offer our prayers and hopes for those who have fallen to communism. Let us show our conviction and dedication to principle to the whole world that it might hearten the conquered and discourage the conqueror.

A SON OF ILLINOIS COMES HOME

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my personal sympathy and that of other members of my family and in behalf of all of the residents of the 12th Illinois District on the occasion of the passing of Adlai E. Stevenson. Our sympathy is directed to Ambassador Stevenson's bereaved family as well as to the many intimate friends to whom his passing is a deep personal loss.

Millions of words of eulogy are being, and have been, written and spoken on Adlai Stevenson's career as a statesman and world leader. But I am inclined to recall him as my most illustrious constituent—one whose life path reached from the prairies of Illinois to a pinnacle of national and international prominence. I am grateful that my life touched his at several points.

I had known Adlai Stevenson for many years as a neighbor and as a friend. His home was only a few miles away from mine in Lake County. For many years I knew Adlai Stevenson as a distinguished fellow attorney at the Illinois bar. I had the privilege of serving in the Illinois General Assembly during Adlai Stevenson's term as Governor of Illinois. Our great love for the State of Illinois has been beautifully described in his own eloquent words:

> Here, on the prairies of Illinois and the Middle West, we can see a long way in all directions. We look to east, to west, to north and south. Our commerce, our ideas come and go in all directions. Here are no barriers, no defenses to ideas and aspirations. We want none; we want no shackles on the mind or the spirit, no rigid patterns of thought, no iron conformity. We want only the faith and conviction that triumph in free contest.

Following the 1948 general election, Adlai E. Stevenson went to Springfield as the Governor of Illinois. As a representative in the general assembly for our district during part of his term, I knew him intimately as Illinois' chief executive and as a State leader of integrity, vision, and idealism.

As his path advanced into national and international affairs, I saw Governor Stevenson less frequently. Often he was far from Lake County—as he was at the time of his passing—but he spoke of "back home." His most recent personal plans had included vacationing at his Libertyville home with his sons and their families—a vacation scheduled to begin this week.

Now he has gone beyond our sight and sound and we seek to explain the void of his absence. I like to think of him as resting in our beloved State of Illinois with his own words as eulogy and epitaph:

> No American can travel the long road I have traveled and not find his faith renewed, his faith in his country and its future.
>
> I have traversed the New England hills, ablaze with autumn color, and felt the touch of the soft air of the Southland.
>
> I have flown over the mighty mountains to the Golden Gate and the blue Pacific.
>
> I have flown over the fir-clad slopes and the rolling wheatlands of the great Northwest, and over the lonely cattle lands of the old Southwest.
>
> I have traveled the routes that my forebears followed westward to Illinois. I have seen the old stone houses in the Pennsylvania hills, and I have come home to the sweep and the swell of the free soil of our beloved Illinois.

GILBERT AMENDMENT TO THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, during the consideration and passage of H.R. 6400, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, I was necessarily absent. In view of the fact that I did not anticipate the presentation or any vote thereon of the Gilbert amendment, I left no instructions for pairing. Inadvertently, on rollcall No. 177, I am recorded as paired against the amendment. However, had I been present and voting I would have voted in the affirmative and I take this opportunity to clarify my position on this amendment.

OPPOSITION OF REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE TO H.R. 8283

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I rise as chairman of the House Republican policy committee to express the opposition of the committee to H.R. 8283.

This bill extends a program which has shown itself to be largely ineffective and badly mismanaged. Although it doubles the cost of the program, there was no real investigation into the shoddy operation that even the few days of hearings revealed.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD at this point my statement on the bill as issued following the policy committee's action in opposing the bill as presently written:

STATEMENT BY MR. RHODES OF ARIZONA

The opposition of the Republican policy committee to H.R. 8283, the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1965 is based upon the unfortunate fact that the so-called war on poverty is becoming a rout for the forces of affluence.

The administration of the program, guided by a part-time administrator has been so poor as to create the real possibility that the entire program may collapse under the weight of mismanagement, shoddy political patronage and crude power politics.

The majority of the Republican members of the Education and Labor Committee have pointed to some of the more serious defects in the program which this bill seeks to implement:

1. The community action program has fallen into the hands of big city political bosses "whose only interest in the poor is to exploit them."

2. "The entire act is the least coordinated, most confused tangle in recent memory and this has been made even worse by removing the last vestige of State authority—giving the Director of OEO the power to override the Governor's veto."

3. "The OEO, under the part-time czar, is an administrative shambles in which a fantastic number of highly paid, casually selected amateurs frantically attempt to patch together programs that will reflect a favorable image to the Congress and public."

4. The bill doubles appropriation authorizations in spite of the fact that no meaningful evaluation of the real worth of the present program has been undertaken.

A brief look at the present act is called for. By March 31 of this year only 1 of the 9 programs authorized by the act had been funded in excess of 35 percent. Other programs ranged from a fraction of 1 to 35 percent.

There is only one item upon which the OEO has managed to spend lavishly—itself. The OEO has spent a whopping 85 percent of the $5.5 million budgeted for personnel and administration.

The brief hearings on the community action program, shut off abruptly over the protests of the committee Republicans, opened a crack in the door just wide enough for glimpses to be had of the unbelievable misuse of this program across the Nation.

This minute glimpse was sufficient to show that the community action program is little more than a sham—a hoax upon the poor.

In light of these facts the Republican policy committee is opposed to the bill as written. We join the minority members of the committee in the hope that the bill will not be enacted unless the following steps are taken:

1. An investigation of the entire existing program by a bipartisan committee selected by the Speaker.

2. The restoration of the veto power of State Governors and the institution of arrangements for State coordination of community action programs.

3. The appointment of a full-time administrator who is barred from holding other Federal posts.

4. The reduction of the authorization of funds to the present level until a proper evaluation of the existing act can be undertaken and completed.

In the name of the poverty stricken of the Nation who need pity, not patronage for politicians, protection and assistance, not shining promises, we urge that these essential measures be undertaken immediately.

NEW HAMPSHIRE LEGION CALLS FOR NATIONAL CEMETERY IN NEW ENGLAND

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, the American Legion, department of New Hampshire, completed a most productive convention, adopting a series of resolutions concerning issues of importance to the Nation generally, and to veterans in particular. I was especially pleased to note the Legion's endorsement for proposals to establish a national cemetery in New England. On March 24, I introduced H.R. 6678, a duplicate of a bill I sponsored in the 88th Congress for the purpose of creating such a cemetery. I heartily endorse the resolution and offer it at this point in the RECORD:

VETERANS' AFFAIRS RESOLUTION 2

Whereas there does not now exist a national cemetery anywhere in the New England States; and

Whereas there is cause for a national cemetery to be established in New England: Therefore be it

Resolved by the New Hampshire department, the American Legion, in convention assembled this 26th day of June, 1965, in Laconia, N.H., That suitable legislation be enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in New England, the Secretary of the Army to acquire by gift, purchase, or condemnation an amount of land not to exceed 500 acres for the purpose of establishing such cemetery; and be it further

Resolved, That by this legislation the Secretary of the Army be authorized and directed to provide for the care and maintenance of the national cemetery established under authority of the first section of this act.

HUMANE TREATMENT FOR LABORATORY ANIMALS; KEENE, N.H. GARDEN CLUB ENDORSES CLEVELAND BILL

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the Old Homestead Garden Club of Keene, N.H., has voted its support of my bill, H.R. 5647, which would establish humane standards for the treatment of experimental animals used in research financed all or in part by the Federal Government. Mrs. Alton Coller, president of the club, has forwarded to me the text of the resolution, which I offer at this point in the RECORD, along with my reply to her letter:

THE OLD HOMESTEAD GARDEN CLUB,
Swanzey, N.H., July 6, 1965.
Congressman JAMES CLEVELAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Old Homestead Garden Club of Keene, N.H., has unanimously passed the following resolution:

"That the Congress and Senate committees hold hearings on humane animals legislation, without further delay, and endorse bill H.R. 5647, introduced by Representative JAMES CLEVELAND, and bill S. 1071, introduced by Senator JOSEPH CLARK, identical bills. These two bills meet the six basic humane requirements to prevent needless suffering of animals used in laboratories and other research, and urge the passage of these bills during the present session of Congress."

Respectfully,
MRS. ALTON COLLER,
President.

JULY 8, 1965.
MRS. ALTON COLLER,
President, the Old Homestead Garden Club,
Swanzey, N.H.

DEAR MRS. COLLER: Thank you for informing me of the encouraging resolution passed by the Old Homestead Garden Club of Keene, N.H., concerning the humane treatment of experimental animals.

This support, following that recently given by the New Hampshire Federation of Women's Clubs, is very much appreciated.

In this regard, I thought you might be interested in the enclosed insert from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 3, 1965.

Regards and best wishes,
JAMES C. CLEVELAND,
Member of Congress.

NOW THE RECORD IS STRAIGHT

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of July 7, I entered the transcript of an NBC television program, "Situation Report," of July 1, which dealt with the debate now going on in Congress about our Government's policies in Vietnam. NBC News Correspondent Robert Goralski was the commentator.

I called attention to some inaccuracies in that broadcast, particularly to a statement implying that the distinguished chairman of the Republican conference, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], had recommended that the United States "pour combat troops into South Vietnam's jungles" and that U.S. planes "would destroy everything in sight north of the 17th parallel, including Hanoi itself."

On the following Thursday, July 8, Mr. Goralski, on the same broadcast, made some clarification of his remarks when he said:

> Before going into tonight's "Situation Report," I'd like to clarify a point made on last Thursday's program. In referring to Republican calls for new military efforts in Vietnam, I may have left the impression that Representative MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin, was calling for a further buildup of American ground forces. Representative LAIRD has never made such a proposal * * * he's urged consideration of more extensive use of air and naval forces. The point needed clarifying.

I appreciate the correction of Mr. Goralski has made and under unanimous consent, I include the full transcript of "Situation Report" of July 8 in the RECORD at this point:

SITUATION REPORT, JULY 8

(By Robert Goralski)

South Vietnam's problems will be all too familiar to Henry Cabot Lodge when he returns to Saigon. A "Situation Report" after this.

* * * * *

Before going into tonight's "Situation Report," I'd like to clarify a point made on last Thursday's program. In referring to Republican calls for new military efforts in Vietnam, I may have left the impression that Representative MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin, was calling for a further buildup of American ground forces there. Representative LAIRD has never made such a proposal * * * he's urged consideration of more extensive use of air and naval forces. The point needed clarifying.

Henry Cabot Lodge's reappointment as Ambassador to Saigon will probably be well received by the Vietnamese. He was always popular—he was charming and affable as he was insistent that the war be prosecuted to a successful conclusion.

But Mr. Lodge is going to find that when he returns to the Embassy in Saigon the internal political situation is just as confused as ever. Today's government may not be there tomorrow. His task is going to be made doubly difficult because of the latest premier, Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky. The young Vietnamese is impetuous and bold, and his actions are raising many an eyebrow. Ky has promised to execute war profiteers personally, picking his victims in an arbitrary manner.

What concerns most people, however, is a statement Ky reportedly made to a correspondent for the London Sunday Mirror. According to the paper, Ky said he had only one hero—that was Adolf Hitler. He is further quoted as saying what South Vietnam needs are four or five Hitlers. Since publication of the article, there's been no effort by Ky to retract.

If true, it's an appalling statement. The most immediate effect has been a propaganda field day for the Communists. Radio Moscow and other Communists news organs have picked up the remarks and are painting the United States as supporting a government headed by a man who worships the memory of Hitler. It places the United States in a most embarrassing position, to be sure.

If Ky honestly holds Hitler as his model, one might wonder what he has in store for the South Vietnamese. He's already cracked down on war profiteers, draft dodgers—desirable measures, but what's he going to do next.

Henry Cabot Lodge will undoubtedly have his hands full with Ky. Chronic political instability is not going to be relieved with Ky moving in wild directions. The colorful airman is known to favor air strikes against Hanoi; he's now taken up the call to liberate North Vietnam, presumably by an army marching north over the 17th parallel.

The months ahead should be interesting, and Henry Cabot Lodge surely will have one of the most difficult jobs in his long career of public service.

BRILLANCE IN THE BERKSHIRES

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, among the most distinguished summer residents of my congressional district are the members of the Boston Symphony Orchestra and their renowned conductor, Erich Leinsdorf. For 7 weeks the beautiful Tanglewood estate overlooking Lake Mahkeenac near Lenox, Mass., becomes a musician's paradise as the Symphony gathers there to perform a series of 24 concerts comprising the Berkshire Music Festival. Tanglewood also houses an educational center where promising young musicians can study under the guidance of the most talented men in the country. This year Tanglewood is attracting such distinguished musicians as Van Cliburn, Aaron Copland, Charles Munch, Rudolf Serkin, Isaac Stern, Leopold Stokowski, and others too numerous to mention. The Harvard Glee Club and Radcliffe Choral Society will sing. Chamber music groups will perform. As a grand finale, the final weekend will be devoted to a complete performance of Richard Wagner's Lohengrin.

Presiding over this rich mélange of talent is Erich Leinsdorf. Last week Life magazine wrote a short but perceptive article about Mr. Leinsdorf, and I enjoyed it so much that I want all of my colleagues to have the opportunity to read it. I have included here the text of the article and picture captions which are self-explanatory. I regret that the RECORD has no facilities for printing Life's excellent photographs. There is one especially good one; it shows Leinsdorf in bed, his hand to his brow in a gesture of disbelief, reading a copy of the RECORD. Says Leinsdorf:

> I take the RECORD to bed with me every night—and I don't mean that reading it puts me to sleep. It is marvelous. Where else can you find out exactly what is going on in this country? I especially look for WAYNE MORSE. What a maverick.

The article follows:

ERICH LEINSDORF IS BOSTON'S INSATIABLE PERFECTIONIST: THE MAESTRO DEMANDS BRILLIANCE

With fierce and tender concentration, Erich Leinsdorf hones his Boston Symphony Orchestra to brilliant precision. Perfection is his passion, and last week he was demanding it in the hills of Tanglewood, Mass., at the opening of the annual Berkshire Music Festival. Living up to his own exacting standard, Leinsdorf has made his gem-like orchestra one of the finest ornaments of American music. "I am in heaven when I play with him," says pianist Artur Rubinstein.

Vienna-born Leinsdorf, 53, made his American debut with the Metropolitan Opera in 1938 and has lived here ever since. Though stiff and uncompromising on the podium, off stage he is an amiable, gregarious father of five who collects clothes, stamps, wines, and mechanical toys. But even in these pursuits there is no such thing as a casual approach. "When my sons became interested in baseball," he says, "I briefed myself on it. I even corresponded with Red Barber." Once feared as an arrogant martinet, he has mellowed with success. "I used to think there was only one right way," he says, "but now I know there are right ways and right ways."

Here are some of Leinsdorf's comments about his world:

"Boston is a liberal city, and the old ladies on Friday afternoon are the most liberal audience because they have heard the most music. They might not like everything, but they appreciate an expanding repertory.

"We are today in a mass culture. There are more audiences, and I think it is a very exciting thing. But we are not compromising on account of our large audiences, quite the contrary.

"Today's young musicians have gone from the horse and buggy to the airplane without having gone through the railroad station. All these kids jump the 19th century. They accept Vivaldi and Bach, but they loathe Wagner and Tchaikovsky.

"I have a quiet period in the morning and always before I go to a concert. I need an awful lot of time to myself.

"There are three worlds of music—the composer's, the performer's, and the critic's, I believe in friction, for without friction there can be no progress. The music world cannot live without it.

"I've always felt that operatic work and concert work together make up a complete musical life. But in symphony conducting the conductor is a larger percentage of the show than in opera. There is not the visual to fall back on, and thus one's resources must be richer.

"My orchestra is a wonderful blend of Europe and America. You eat dinner somewhere with the orchestra and first someone comes up and addresses you in perfect French, and then along comes a young man from Indiana.

"To have been graced by providence with special aptitudes and abilities, maybe even genius, does not at once entitle the bearer to present a bill to the world for remittance.

"Conducting is a matter of knowing that there is much you don't conduct. It's constantly alternating between listening and leading. Beating time is not conducting an orchestra.

"We have a crazy schedule in Boston—too much work and too many vacations. Each year I conduct 100 concerts. To relax I like to walk and ride horseback. I like to ride in the mountains especially. And I read a lot, mainly history."

DEFER BERLIN CRISIS VETERANS

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, Congress should act to defer any active duty callup of reservists and National Guardsmen who were mobilized during the 1961 Berlin crisis or whose enlistments were extended for more than 90 days during the Berlin crisis. These personnel should not be recalled to active duty in any current callup unless absolutely vital to the national security.

I am today introducing a House concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that "the President should, insofar as it is consistent with the national defense and security, defer until last" the callup of personnel who were returned to active duty for more than 30 days during the Berlin crisis or whose enlistments were extended for more than 90 days.

As my colleagues know, there has been no notification of any impending callup by the President but there are indications such a mobilization is pending. I am not in a position to evaluate the need for a callup until further information is made available by Defense Secretary McNamara. Assuming, however, that the President intends such a callup, I urge that the Congress act promptly on this resolution.

Some 148,000 reservists and guardsmen were recalled to active duty in 1961 for the Berlin crisis. In addition, more than 300,000 Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine personnel then on active duty had their terms of service extended by order of the President. Many served up to 10 months of additional active duty time.

A joint resolution signed into law August 1, 1961, formed the basis of President Kennedy's Executive order of August 10, 1961, authorizing the mobilization of up to 250,000 ready reservists for not more than 12 months. The same order authorized the Secretary of Defense to involuntarily extend enlistments and periods of obligated service for up to 12 months.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the support of my colleagues for this resolution and urge speedy approval.

LAWLESSNESS OF RACE DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you appreciate the feeling some of us who represent the Southern States feel when we rise to discuss any measure dealing with so-called civil rights. We have taken the floor in the vast majority of cases in an effort to urge commonsense in the face of irrational, extremist proposals whose singlemost feature is their premise that the end justifies any means necessary, including unconstitutional legislation, discriminatory legislation, and legislation that is admitted to be faulty and hasty in the cloakrooms but defended with rare bursts of oratory on the floor.

There are some, however, who will heed nothing a southerner has to say on the subject. It is to this minority I would like to direct the following item which is reproduced from the July 4 issue of the Shreveport Times. It is a dissertation on the lawlessness of race demonstrations. It is written, not by a southerner, but by a native of Kansas, former Supreme Court Justice Charles E. Whittaker.

If ever there was a time since Reconstruction Days when there was a need for reasonable men to reason together for the total good of all races, that day is now. I urge the attention of every Member to the reasonableness which follows:

EX-COURT JUSTICE HITS RACE DEMONSTRATIONS—SAYS THEY PRODUCE LAWLESSNESS IN UNITED STATES

(NOTE.—Retired Supreme Court Justice Charles E. Whittaker made a speech before the Tennessee Bar Association at Nashville 2 weeks ago that is attracting nationwide attention. In the speech, he described racial demonstrators in general as lawless, and support of them—regardless of the source of the support—as being an encouragement to or creation of national lawlessness. He said Communists are using the racial demonstrations and their consequent nationwide crime to further their own causes. The Times considers the speech so important that herewith we publish the full text. A native of Kansas, Judge Whittaker was appointed to the Federal District Circuit and Supreme Courts by President Eisenhower. He now practices law in Washington, D.C.)

(By Charles E. Whittaker, retired Supreme Court Justice)

No doubt you, just as I, have noticed in the news media an ever-increasing number of items and articles that show with unmistakable clarity, a rapid spread of lawlessness in our land that seems to be thoroughly planned, and also to be designed to destroy, and that seriously threatens to destroy law, order, and all vestiges of decency in our land.

Recently, while sitting in my library meditating upon that subject and upon appropriate remarks here today, and also listening to the beautiful music of "My Fair Lady"—and being, perhaps, thereby lulled into a satirical mood—it occurred to me: Why not speak on "Old-Fashioned Law and Order—Wouldn't That Be Lovely?"

One of the recent articles that had deeply impressed me was by a husband-and-wife team of eminent criminologists of the Harvard Law School. It dealt with the rapid increase and spread of crime, and concluded with the statement that "unless much is done to check (current) vicious cycles, we are in for a period of violence beyond anything we have yet seen."

Another recent and impressive article contained the theme—which I think is fundamental—of the recent presidentially proclaimed Law Day, 1965, which was: "Uphold the law—a citizen's first duty."

Believing that this theme states an indisputable truth, yet having read and heard many recent open and direct preachments of disrepect for and disobedience of our laws, and also having seen the destructive effects of those preachments upon the good order and morality of our society, I am moved to speak out in demand for an immediate end to such conduct by the vigorous and evenhanded enforcement of our laws.

SELECTIVE OBEDIENCE TO THE LAWS WRONG

While I do not claim that all of our crime is due to any one cause, it seems rather clear that a large part of the current rash and rapid spread of lawlessness in our land has been, at least, fostered and inflamed by the preachments of self-appointed leaders of minority groups to "obey the good laws, but to violate the bad ones"—which, of course, simply advocates violation of the laws they do not like, or, in other words, the taking of the law into their own hands.

And this is precisely what their followers have done and are doing—all under the banner of "peaceable civil disobedience," which they have claimed to be protected by the peaceable-assembly-and-petition provisions of the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Although such preachments and practices have become far more vocal and widespread in our recent racial strife, they did not have their origin in that strife, but, rather, in the labor strife, sit-ins and lie-downs of an earlier era.

More recently certain self-appointed racial leaders, doubtless recalling the appeasements and, hence, successes of that earlier conduct, have simply adopted and used those techniques in fomenting and waging their lawless campaigns which they have called "demonstrations."

They have recently used these techniques to incite their followers to assemble, from far and wide—often, unfortunately, with the encouragement and at the expense of well-meaning but misguided church organizations—into large and loosely assembled groups, which many have regarded as mobs, to wage what they have called "demonstrations" to force the grant of "rights" in defiance of the law, the court and all constituted authority.

ESCALATION OF DEMONSTRATIONS

At the beginning, those demonstrations consisted of episodic group invasions and appropriation of private stores, first by sitting down and later by lying down therein, and, eventually, by blocking the entrances thereto with their bodies.

Seeing that those trespasses were often applauded in high places, were generally not punished, but rather, were compelled to be appeased and rewarded, those racial leaders and their groups quickly enlarged the scope of their activities by massing and marching their followers on the sidewalks, streets, and highways—frequently blocking and appropriating them to a degree that precluded their intended public uses.

And that conduct, too, being nearly always appeased, the process spread areawise, as might have been expected, from one southern city to another, and then into many northern cities, including St. Louis, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Washington, New York, Brooklyn, Syracuse, Rochester, and, eventually, pretty generally throughout the land.

"Crime," says Webster, means "an act or omission forbidden by law and punishable upon conviction." It cannot be denied that each of those trespasses violated, at least, the criminal-trespass laws of the local jurisdiction involved, nor that those laws impose penalties for their violation, nor, hence, that those trespasses constituted crimes.

In the first place, that conduct cannot properly be termed "peaceable," for we all know from experience that the assembly of large groups for the avowed purpose of forcing direct action outside the law amounts to the creation of a mob bent on lawlessness, and inherently disturbs the peace of all others.

LAWLESSNESS MEANS RULE OF STRONGEST

One could hardly deny the truth of the statement written by Mr. Justice Black, joined by two other justices, in June, 1964, that "force leads to violence, violence to mob conflicts, and these to rule by the strongest groups with control of the most deadly weapons."

Nor can this conduct even be termed "civil disobedience," for conduct violating criminal laws is not "civil" but "criminal" disobedience. And, lastly, that conduct is not protected by the peaceable-assembly-and-petition provisions of the first amendment.

That provision says "Congress shall make no law * * * abridging * * * the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Nothing in that language grants a license to any man, acting either singly or in a group, to violate State criminal laws—including those laws which prohibit trespass upon, and appropriation of, private property, and those laws prohibiting the willful obstruction of the public walks, streets and highways.

Rather, as Mr. Justice Roberts wrote upon the subject in 1939, "The privilege of a citizen of the United States to use the streets and parks for communication of views on national questions must be regulated in the interest of all; it is not absolute, but is relative, and must be exercised in subordination to the general comfort and convenience, and in consonance with peace and good order * * *."

Surely, no thoughtful person will disagree with that statement, nor with the statement made very recently by the president of Yale University in a speech at Detroit, that the current rash of "demonstrations" makes, "a ludicrous mockery of the democratic debating process."

COMMUNISTS THRIVE ON LAWBREAKING

The philosophy of "obeying only the laws you like," and of openly defying and breaking the ones you do not like, has given rise to mobs and mob actions that have proven—as certainly we should have expected—to be tailor made for infiltration, takeover and use by rabblerousers and Communists who are avowedly bent on the breakdown of law, order, and morality in our society and hence, on its destruction.

And even though those results may not have been contemplated, and surely weren't wished by those Americans who so advocated disobedience of our laws, nevertheless, they did advocate that philosophy and they did put its process into action and cannot now escape responsibility for its results.

The process has now spread even into the campuses of many, indeed most, of our great universities. A fair example of what is there happening was recently related by the California State superintendent of public instruction, who, in commenting about conditions on the campus at Berkeley, said:

"Demonstrations there provided a vehicle for infiltration by rabblerousers, redhots, and Communists and resulted in assaults, kidnapings, and imprisonment of police officers, the commandeering of public address systems, and their use in spewing over the campus the most filthy four letter words, and the general breakdown of law and order."

A recent national magazine contained an interview with Dr. James M. Nabrit, president of Howard University—the largest Negro university in our country—who finds on his campus "open defiance of law and order," which he characterized as part of a campaign "to bring the university into general disrepute."

Dr. Nabrit cautioned: "We must beware of some people who come to us like the Greeks bearing gifts. They do not believe in civil rights for anyone. They are children of lawlessness and disciples of destruction. They are people who cloak themselves in the roles of civil righters but plot and plan in secret to disrupt our fight for justice and full citizenship. They must be unmasked for the frauds that they are, they must be fought in every arena."

He stated that he had seen known Communists passing out throwaways and helping to deliver placards to pickets on and about his campus.

A NEGRO EDUCATOR HITS DEMONSTRATORS

The Kansas City Times of Wednesday, May 19, published an Associated Press dispatch about the lawless demonstrations in progress on the campus of the University of Wisconsin. It said that one of the leaders openly espoused, from a public rostrum on the campus, that "the students should band together to bring down the Government by any means."

It also said that the demonstrations there had now been infiltrated and were being led by "eight to a dozen" ringleaders who are operating under "pretty good cover"; that at least some of them are known members of the Du Bois Clubs of America, which Senator Dodd and J. Edgar Hoover have recently described as a new Communist-oriented youth organization dominated and controlled by the Communists.

These lawless activities, nauseating as they are, can hardly be surprising, for they are, purely and simply, some of the results that we should have known would inevitably come from tolerating open and direct preachments to defy and violate the law.

A very recent issue of U.S. News & World Report (May 17, 1965) contains two pertinent articles, one saying that increased Communist penetration and influence inside some sections of the Negro movement in the United States is a subject of growing concern to the FBI and White House, the other saying J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director, and President Johnson both are increasingly concerned by the growing activity of known Communists on the campuses of colleges around the country. They would like to alert the country to the situation, but are concerned about being considered "Red-baiters" if they do.

THE PRESIDENT SHOULD WARN AGAINST REDS

I, for one, would like to lend a voice of encouragement to them to forget those fears and to alert the country fully about the facts, for surely that is their duty and no odium can result from exposing those who are preaching and practicing defiance of our law and, hence, the destruction of our society.

There are, of course, first duties of citizenship, but there are also first duties of Government. It is undoubtedly true, as recited in the theme of the presidentially proclaimed Law Day, 1965, that "a citizen's first duty is to uphold the law," but it is also a first duty of Government to enforce the law—to do so by prosecuting and punishing those who violate our criminal laws.

In no other way can our people be secure from assaults and trespasses upon their persons and property, or maintain an ordered and moral society.

Because some of our citizens will not voluntarily perform their "first duty" to uphold the law, our governments, State and Federal, have the paramount duty of, at least, making them obey it.

We have all along been told, and many of us have preached, that crime does not pay, but the recent rash and spread of law defiance, and the successes—however tenuous and temporary—of that philosophy in attaining goals, seems to compel a reappraisal of that concept, for, from what we see currently happening, one could reasonably believe that certain types of crimes are being permitted to pay.

Probably because of a rather widespread recognition that, at times and in certain sectors, some of our colored brethren have suffered unconstitutional discriminations, and because many of us have been sympathetic to the ends they seek—and have not, therefore, thought very much about the destructive means they have embarked upon to attain those ends—there has been a rather general public apathy toward their preachments to violate, and their practices in violating, our laws.

KING'S STATEMENTS CREATED DISORDERS

Indeed, one of those who first advised, and was most successful in inducing, his followers to take the law into their own hands—and who, now that their conduct has led to widespread disorder, attempts, to excuse his responsibility for it with the doubtless-true statement: "I cannot control them"—parenthetically, an excuse quite reminiscent of the one given by the man who lighted the squib and threw it into the crowd—was rather recently twice honored. Once by an old and respected American university by conferring upon him an honorary degree—not in some new political science—but in law, and second, by an honored foreign cultural group by awarding him a prize for, of all things, his contributions to peace.

What, I would like to ask, has happened to our sense of values?

But a recent article in the May 3, 1965, issue of U.S. & World Report hints at a new and different appraisal of this conduct, and indicates some official impatience with this gentleman's apparent insatiable appetite for power, and some displeasure at his recently voiced criticism of the administration's foreign policies in Vietnam and elsewhere—concluding with the statement that "some Washington observers profess to see an attempt (by this gentleman) to 'escalate' his status as a national figure—perhaps with political goals in view."

This is heartening, as it indicates a new awareness of the inevitable destruction of ordered liberty that must be expected if we continue to allow any of our citizens to incite others to disobey the law—to take it into their own hands, and to get away with it.

Whatever may have been the provocations—and, doubtless, there have been some—no man, or any group or race of men, can be permitted, in a government of laws, to take the law, or what they think ought to be the law, into their own hands, for that is anarchy, and sure to result in chaos.

The fact that the provocations may have been themselves constitutionally unlawful cannot justify unlawful means for their resolution.

NEGRO GRIEVANCES ARE NO EXCUSE

Both types of conduct are wrong, the one as much as the other. And, obviously, two wrongs cannot make a right.

All discriminations that violate the Constitution and laws of the United States are readily redressable in our courts, which have always been open to all citizens. And no one has any room to doubt that, if he will resort to those courts, and have the patience to await their processes—as we all must do in an ordered society—all his constitutional and legal rights will be vouchsafed to him, whatever his creed or color.

But there has been impatience with the judicial process, manifested by the recent hue and cry for "action now—not the delays of the law."

Certainly this cliche, too, advocates such direct action as amounts to a clear call for disobedience of the laws, the judgments of the courts and of all constituted authority and lawful processes.

It is true that legal processes, being refined and deliberative processes, are slow.

But like the mills of the gods, though they grind slowly, they grind exceedingly fine, and their judgments are most likely to be just.

In all events, there is no other fair and orderly way to decide the issues that arise among us, and to have an ordered liberty.

Every ordered society in history has found it necessary to establish laws, and courts fairly to interpret and enforce them; and the same history makes clear, too, that the first evidences of a society's decay may be seen in its toleration of disrespect for, and disobedience of, its laws and the judgment of its courts.

MINORITIES ENDANGER OWN PROTECTION

The great pity here is that these minority groups, in preaching and practicing defiance of the law, are, in fact, advocating erosion and destruction of the only structure that can ever assure to them, or permanently maintain for them, due process of law and the equal protection of the laws, and that can, thus, protect them from discriminations and abuses by majorities.

In May 1965, Mr. Lewis F. Powell, president of the American Bar Association, in a speech dedicating the new Missouri Bar Center at Jefferson City, said, "Many centuries of human misery show that once a society departs from the rule of law, and every man becomes the judge of which laws he will obey, only the strongest remain free," and also that "those who break the great tradition of respect and tolerance for the differing views of others by resorting to coercion, whether 'violent' or 'nonviolent,' menace the spirit of responsible inquiry essential to (our) institutions." "No 'end,'" he said. "however worthy (can ever) justify resort to unlawful means."

He concluded with the statement that "America needs a genuine revival of respect for law and orderly processes, a reawakening of individual responsibility, a new impatience with those who violate and circumvent laws, and a determined insistence that laws be enforced, courts respected and due process followed." To this, I say amen.

Surely we must always strive to eliminate injustice and discrimination, but we must do so by orderly processes in the legislatures and the court, and not by defying their processes and actions, not by taking the laws into our own hands.

TAKE LAW TO HEART, NOT INTO HANDS

We must take the laws into our hearts rather than into our hands, and seek redress in the courts rather than in the streets.

A very recent issue of "The Kansas City Star" contained several articles about the general breakdown of law and order on our college campuses.

One of them fairly puts the finger on the cause. It did so through quoting one of the "demonstrating" students. He was asked why some students had abandoned historical "panty raids" and similar college pranks for open and riotous rebellion. "Why," he said, "you could get kicked out of school for conducting a panty raid and things of that kind, but no one is ever kicked out or punished for demonstrating for something like civil rights."

It is thus plain that the students, knowing just as everyone else knows, that open and riotous rebellion in the name of "civil rights" is not being punished, but is being tolerated, have been thus encouraged to wage and spread rebellion.

Another of these articles quoted some comments of J. Edgar Hoover about the effects of spreading crime upon the peace and safety of our citizens. He said: "There is too much concern in the country * * * for the 'rights' of an individual who commits a crime.

"I think he is entitled to his (legal rights), but I think the citizens of this country ought to be able to walk all the streets of our cities without being mugged, raped, or robbed." But, he said, we can't do so today, and he added: "All through the country, almost without exception, this condition prevails."

The April 10, 1965, issue of the magazine "America" contained an article on the imperative need for certain and severe punishment of crime, which made many pertinent observations, including this one:

GOVERNMENT HAS DUTY TO PROTECT

"Government has no right to turn the cheek of its citizens. Instead, it is gravely obligated—by the very purpose of its existence—to see to their protection.

"Sure and swift punishment (is our only way) to guarantee that protection * * *. We stand in need of sure, swift, tough punishment if we expect to decrease the crime rate, and to protect the great mass of our upright citizens."

To this, too, I can only say amen.

The causes are plain. We have, in high places, tolerated and even encouraged preachments to break the law—such as: "Obey the good laws but break the bad ones," which, of course, means to obey only the laws you like; and such as: "Action now, not the delays of the law," which is, of course, a call for direct action outside the law and the courts.

And we have also tolerated and in some high places have even encouraged, the actual defiances of the law which those preachments have advocated and brought into existence, and which have now spread to all areas of the Nation, and seriously threaten the breakdown of law, order, and morality.

The remedy is equally plain. It is simply to insist that our governments, State and Federal, reassume and discharge their first duty of protecting the people against lawless invasions of their persons and property and from assaults upon their liberties by demanding and commanding respect for law and legal processes through the impartial, evenhanded, vigorous, swift, and certain enforcement of our criminal laws, and the real and substantial punishment thereunder of all conduct that violates those laws.

These are not platitudes, but are fundamentals and vital, as every thinking man should see, to the survival of our Nation.

In no other way can we orderly resolve the issues that confront and divide us, or live together in peace and harmony as a civilized nation of brothers under the fatherhood of God.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART CXXXIV

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 25, 1965, concerning New York's part in the poverty.

The article is part of the series on New York City in Crisis and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—ANGRY NO'S TO CITY POVERTY PLAN—PUERTO RICANS; U.S. ACT IS VIOLATED

(By Marshall Peck)

A sweeping repudiation of New York City's poverty program structure was voiced yesterday by Livingston Wingate, executive director of Haryou-Act, and by representatives of the Puerto Rican Forum, a citywide grouping of some 12 Puerto Rican organizations. It was charged that the organization of the present city program, which formally was announced yesterday by Mayor Wagner in an executive order, was "in direct confrontation with many aspects of the Economic Opportunity Act."

The opposition was voiced by angry representatives of Puerto Rican groups in a press conference at the Puerto Rican Forum headquarters, and by Mr. Wingate after he arrived at the Forum offices to confer on a course of action in the next few days.

It was further learned that several top staffers of an older and respected voluntary agency, who wish to remain anonymous, have been campaigning vigorously behind scenes, in New York and in Washington, because of its fear that the "rubber stamp board" in this city's program effectively would hamstring the full purpose of the antipoverty operation.

Representatives of this agency, who gave credit to Haryou-ACT and to Mobilization for Youth "for having awakening the older agencies," asked a Herald Tribune reporter to the organization's office to hear their warning that under the present structure "City Hall will foment division" and that "a monolithic bureaucracy will be created with no chance for dialog."

The major sticking point of New York's overall antipoverty drive has been the search for administrative formula acceptable to all factions involved. The difficulty of setting up a program, with the central question of who was to be in charge and approve programs and funding applications, has in fact delayed New York's $10.5 community request from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mayor Wagner's first proposal to have a private corporation made up of the 11-member poverty board and 5 private citizens was strongly opposed by Democratic Representative Adam Clayton Powell, chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee. The city responded by setting up an up-to-100-member New York City Council Against Poverty, to which 52 persons have been named, and an economic opportunity corporation, made up of 11 city officials and 2 members of voluntary agencies and 4 neighborhood representatives.

It is charged by opponents that representation in this structure is not consistent with the aims of the Economic Opportunity Act, which calls for large scale representation by the impoverished, and that the Economic Opportunity Corp., as the repository of ultimate authority, will keep the city in full control of the purse strings.

Mr. Wingate, under fire himself because of reported charges made against his administration at Haryou-ACT and allegations that he has been closely guided in this administration by Representative Powell—to whom he was a former aid—said that "it is mandatory that the present structure be radically revised."

"We feel we never had any dialog with the city in regards to the composition of the present council," he said, "and therefore we don't recognize it. We have been in touch with key city officials and we have specific proposals for the basis of a new structure."

Mr. Wingate said that the proposals he envisaged would, in the membership of the major policy board in the city program, "reflect the majority of the poor, with greater representation from community action groups and from neighborhood civic groups."

Antonio Pantojo, who served as the main spokesman for representatives of six Puerto Rican groups, said: "We want New York City to comply with the law. We want to be assured that the poor are represented significantly."

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART CXXXV

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns the loss of factory jobs in New York and is part of the series on New York City in Crisis and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune.

This article appeared in the Tribune of May 26, 1965, and follows:

New York City in Crisis—Lost—12,000 Factory Jobs a Year

(By Barrett McGurn)

"If I sound somewhat defensive about the economy of New York City, I must explain that I get this way because other people are unduly offensive. So I may be leaning a little bit, but I don't think I am overlooking any facts."

This was Mayor Wagner speaking yesterday at a top-level city conference on the blue-collar job drain. He spoke immediately after Herbert Bienstock, the Federal labor statistician in this area, reported a parade of chilling facts, including these.

New York City's factory job loss has amounted to more than the equivalent of the New York (Brooklyn) Navy Yard for each of the last 17 years—12,000 jobs a year, a total of 204,000.

The Negroes and Puerto Ricans who are most in need of low-skilled factory jobs are increasing at so rapid a rate that 63 percent of youths between 15 and 24 years of age inside the five boroughs 5 years from now will be Negro or Puerto Rican.

Mayor Wagner put his emphasis on a fact no one at the conference denied, that white collar clerical and management jobs are multiplying and that highly educated youths can look forward confidently to getting them. The Mayor turned next to the Negroes, Puerto Ricans and the blue-collar job drain, saying that New York City had to have Federal help with that. He said:

"Untrained and unskilled youth are flooding into the labor market at an unprecedented rate.

"It is clear to me that the national aspects of the problem call for national measures. The economy needs to be stimulated * * * through the deliberate and planned creation of blue-collar jobs, including a major component of jobs in the skilled and semi-skilled categories. At the earliest possible time, the Federal Government can and must launch such a program."

The Mayor put no price tag on what he had in mind but Dr. Arthur C. Logan, chairman of the city's new Council Against Poverty, commented that $800 million in antipoverty funds was now being spent across the country and that $1½ billion likely would follow next year.

"We don't need $1½ billion, we need $15 billion, and $15 billion every year," David Kaplan, president of the Economics of Distribution Foundation, objected.

GARBAGE

"Garbage is being thrown on New York," the president of the New York City Building Trades Council, Peter J. Brennan, protested.

"Even the narcotics-ridden are people; they are not garbage," someone counterprotested from the floor. He evidently misunderstood Mr. Brennan's complaint about what the latter considered too much New York unemployment crisis talk.

Mr. Bienstock gave these further figures:

Nonresidents have an imposing share of the most desirable jobs in the city. He said that commuters have 20 percent of New York City's white collar tasks and 30 percent of the managerial employment.

New York City has lost 27 percent of its manufacturing jobs since 1947 at a time when the country as a whole has gained 12 percent.

Since 1950 the job increase in New York City in finance, insurance, real estate, and government has represented one-third of the gain of the country as a whole. Heavy construction has risen 33 percent from coast to coast but is only 2½ percent above the 1950 level in New York. (It sparked us as the World's Fair was built, but that impetus has been lost.)

In the wholesale and retail trade the country has gained 32 percent since 1950 but New York City has lost 2 percent.

Of 19 metropolitan areas in the country, New York City ranks 18th in the trend of manufacturing jobs over the last 5 years (New York lost about 12 percent, Boston about 3 percent. Miami gained 23 percent and was No. 1).

Puerto Ricans and the Negroes, while multiplying numerically, are lagging far behind in the race for education. Thirteen percent of New York City's population was Negro and Puerto Rican in 1950. Twenty-eight percent will be 5 years from now. To magnify the effect, the Negro and Puerto Rican population is the more fertile. On the other hand, where 25 percent of New York City's whites go on to college training, only 11 percent of the nonwhites are doing so.

POSITIVE

About 100 labor union, industry, and city and Federal Government representatives took part in the all-day discussion. Many comments were gloomy, but John Keith and William Shore of the Regional Plan Association lent some support to Mayor Wagner's efforts to emphasize the positive.

They said that the boom in white collar jobs has helped to draw 400,000 persons into New York since 1959, a net gain over outflow. They added that since New York City's population has remained static for more than a decade it is not surprising that a Nation which has added 26 percent in population should show greater advances elsewhere.

Representative John Lindsay, Republican, of New York, was not at the session, but he commented on it from Washington. He said that Mr. Bienstock's report was "deeply disturbing." He said he hoped his candidacy for mayor could "mobilize public concern about this matter" and "generate hope and confidence that with new leadership things can be better for New York."

BREAD TAX ARGUMENT IS RIDICULOUS

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Purcell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the opponents of the administration's farm bill are getting more ridiculous every day in their poppycock propaganda attacks against the bill.

The wheat certificate program in the farm bill would give wheat farmers their first increase in more than 15 years in the price of wheat that goes into a loaf of bread.

The increase would be seven-tenths of 1 cent.

Now, the big bakers are screaming that this would be a bread tax and would raise the price of bread 2 cents a loaf to the consumer.

They have never yet explained why an increase to the farmer of seven-tenths of a cent would be multiplied by a 2-cent price rise to the consumer.

They never have explained why the average retail price of a loaf of bread has risen from 12 cents to 21 cents during the last 15 years but the farmer's share of that loaf of bread has remained at 2.7 cents for the wheat in the loaf.

They do not explain why that price increase of from 12 cents to 21 cents is not considered a bread tax; they do not even like to be reminded of it.

Now, they have reached a new level of absurdity by claiming that the farm bill would increase the cost of wheat in a loaf of bread to such an extent that consumption of bread and other wheat products would decline.

The truth of the matter is that total quantities of wheat used for food in the United States have changed little during the past 15 years, despite the fact that the price of a loaf of bread has climbed up from 12 cents to 21 cents during that period.

Total domestic consumption of wheat as food changes very little year by year. In 1950, approximately 481 million bushels of wheat were consumed by our civilian population. In 1963, total consumption was about 495 million bushels.

The average consumer is using less wheat for food each year, but there appears to be little relationship between consumption of grain products and changes in retail prices.

In 1950, per capita civilian consumption of all wheat flour was about 135 pounds. By 1964, average usage had dropped to 116 pounds per person, despite a resurgence of demand for semolina flour, used in products such as macaroni and spaghetti to near 1950 levels of around 6 pounds per person.

This downward trend also is occurring in other foods which often are substituted for wheat products. Between 1950 and 1964, the per capita consumption of sweet potatoes declined 55 percent; dry peas 50 percent; cornmeal and hominy 32 percent, and dry beans 13 percent.

The average U.S. family in 1955 spent about 10 cents out of its food dollar for flour, cereals, and bakery goods. They were spending about 38 cents for meat, poultry, fish, eggs, nuts and dry beans. Approximately 15 cents of the food dollar was going for milk and milk products, and 12 cents for vegetables.

From 1950 to 1964, average prices for cereals and bakery products rose by 39 percent. The largest increase was noted for corn flakes—up 80 percent. The price for cornmeal rose by 62 percent, white bread by 45 percent. Wheat flour showed the least price increase for any item in the group—up 15 percent.

But, despite these price increases averaging 39 percent for all cereal and bakery products, Mr. Speaker, there has been little change in the per capita consumption of wheat products.

If the American people did not sharply reduce their consumption of wheat during the price rise of from 12 cents a loaf to 21 cents a loaf for white bread, what makes the bakers think an increase of less than one penny will all of a sudden sharply reduce our wheat consumption now?

It is a perfectly ridiculous argument, Mr. Speaker, that the bakers are advancing now in their frantic efforts to defeat the administration's farm program.

Mr. Speaker, the wheat certificate program would increase the cost of all wheat products to the American consumer by about $1.60 per capita in an entire year. This is about three cents a week. For a family of four this is about $6.40 a year.

Meanwhile, the $200 million estimated saving to the taxpayer in the farm bill could be used to expand the food stamp program, which really helps our low income families.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that when the time comes my colleagues in the House will join me in supporting the administration's farm bill to improve farm income, to cut Government costs and to maintain stable prices.

Let us not be misled by the false propaganda from the paid lobbyists of the baking industry.

THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR THE PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE AND THE CIVILIAN MARKSMANSHIP PROGRAM

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it has always been my purpose to criticize constructively when criticism is required. Weak programs should be strengthened, rotten ones reformed, and unnecessary ones eliminated. To my knowledge, the civilian marksmanship program of the Department of the Army has not been thoroughly examined or investigated since its inception at the turn of the century. I understand that the Army has now retained Arthur D. Little, Inc., a private industrial and management research firm, to completely review the civilian marksmanship program both as to the function, if any, it serves, and the control mechanisms which it possesses. Arthur D. Little, Inc., will then make and publish its recommendations to the Army. Presumably, at that time we will be in a better position to know whether the program in question is rotten or unnecessary. We already know it is weak.

The numerous speeches I have delivered on the floor of this House for well over a year have demonstrated the weakness of the civilian marksmanship program. I have pointed out the lack of controls, the ease with which private persons including rightwing fanatics may organize gun clubs, affiliate with the National Rifle Association, enroll in the program and receive their supply of free guns and ammunition, and the fact that the Federal Government has no actual knowledge of what is done with the guns and ammunition once they are given to the private clubs. The looseness with which the program has been administered was underscored by a story which appeared in the New York Times, June 7, 1964, stating that the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice was changing some of its procedures so as to be able to keep a closer check on members of gun clubs receiving free ammunition from the Government. The change contemplated was that instead of relying upon the records of the National Rifle Association, the NBPRP would thereafter maintain its own detailed membership rolls of clubs it supports.

According to the Times' story, the change was prompted by President Kennedy's assassination and the publicity attached to the self-proclaimed guerrilla fighters known as the Minutemen.

Whether the change was in fact actually implemented I do not know. So far as I know, no official notice of the alleged change was ever made. But I do know that the fact that the Army has never, up to at least June 1964, kept its own detailed membership lists of the clubs it has been subsidizing with free guns and ammunition shows an unparalleled and unbelievable lack of control. The National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, in other words, has been giving away more than 60 million rounds of ammunition a year to private gun clubs without even knowing the names of the members of those gun clubs.

Recently I met with representatives of Arthur D. Little, Inc., the firm retained by the Army to examine the civilian marksmanship program. This is the first time that I have been contacted by anyone connected with the Army and the civilian marksmanship program.

I have prepared a list of recommendations for changing and improving this program to the extent that they would at least provide what I consider to be some very basic and much-needed controls. My list of recommendations follows:

First. Any gun club wishing to participate in the civilian marksmanship program should be thoroughly investigated by the Department of the Army, or by the local law enforcement agency in the community where the members of the gun club reside. The present provisions for investigation are defective and in many cases practically nonexistent. Technically, the adjutant general of the State and the State NRA office of the State in which the gun club is located are supposed to investigate applicants. But State adjutant generals are often not equipped to conduct these kinds of investigations. Further, the investigation by the NRA is completely unsatisfactory because of the possibilities for conflicts of interests. The NRA stands to gain and to profit by the enlargement of the civilian marksmanship program. An increase in the number of gun clubs in the program means an increase in the membership of the NRA.

One of the areas which I feel should be fully explored in the investigation of any group desiring ammunition and guns from the Government is the membership or affiliation of any of the individuals in the group with other private clubs or organizations which engage in target practice or the use of military weapons, or which conduct military training or guerrilla tactics.

Second. The Army should maintain complete membership lists of the private gun clubs in the program and should provide copies of these lists to the appropriate local law enforcement authorities.

Third. The practice of giving ammunition and making loans of guns free of charge to private clubs should stop. If it is decided that the continuance of the civilian marksmanship program is justified, and this cannot be determined until there has been a complete investigation, then those who benefit from it should be willing to reimburse the Government the costs of the ammunition and guns.

Fourth. Any ammunition distributed under the program should be used up by the members of the gun clubs in target practice within 30 days of receipt of the ammunition.

Fifth. Notice of the distribution of any ammunition should be given to the appropriate local law enforcement authority. The local law enforcement authority should be apprised of the amount of ammunition distributed, the date of issuance and the date of receipt.

Sixth. Notice of each target practice session conducted with ammunition received under the civilian marksmanship program should be given to the local law enforcement authority and to the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice. The notice should consist of the time and place of the target practice session so that the law enforcement authority has the opportunity to be present.

Seventh. Following each target practice session conducted with ammunition received through the program a complete statement, verified by the local law enforcement authority, should be submitted to the NBPRP. This statement should contain the names of the members who participated, the amount of rounds fired, the time and place of the target practice session. This statement should be submitted no later than 30 days following the receipt of any ammunition received under the program.

Eighth. The National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice should make a complete report to Congress annually on the activities of the civilian marksmanship program for each of the previous 2 years, including the number of rounds of ammunition and guns distributed to private gun clubs and the cost to the Federal Government, and the number of rounds of ammunition used in target practice, the number of gun clubs and the number of persons enrolled in the program.

Ninth. The Department of the Army should take steps to determine whether any private gun club in the program is not in compliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VI prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin, in any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

These are the minimum changes which need to be made in the civilian marksmanship program if it is to have an adequate control mechanism. The question of whether this 60-year-old program ought to be continued at all, as I have said, can only be answered after a complete investigation of it has been made. I have forwarded copies of my recommendation to the Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, and the Secretary of the Army, Stanley R. Resor.

THE MILITARY MINIMUM WAGE BILL

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the question of military pay and compensation blossoms out in Congress for a brief period each year, attracts a good deal of attention for a time, as it has yesterday and today, and soon becomes faded and forgotten. Sometimes temporary, stopgap legislation is adopted which does not meet the problem squarely and only postpones it for another Congress.

During the 88th Congress we had the dubious distinction of enacting two stopgap, and in my opinion wholly inadequate, military pay raise bills. Now the 89th Congress is considering whether to grant the members of the armed services, many thousands of whom are risking their lives in Vietnam, a 4 percent or 5 percent or maybe a 10 percent pay raise. But even a 10 percent raise means little to those in the lower pay groups who need an increase most, the enlisted men who do the bulk of the fighting and the dying when the Nation calls upon the armed services to make sacrifices for their country.

This perennial problem is one that I have been deeply concerned with for a number of years. I am now convinced that the present military pay scale is not only inadequate, but that the entire system of military pay is unrealistic and obsolete.

An example of the inadequacy of the system of compensation is the subsistence allowance. Members of the military are supposed to be able to pay for their meals off base with a subsistence allowance that varies from $30.90 for enlisted men to $47.88 for officers per month. This works out to a rate starting at about a dollar a day. This is a true subsistence allowance on which a man can subsist, but no more.

The Department of Labor recently launched a youth farm labor program in which high school students are to work on farms during the summer to help harvest the crops. These youngsters are supposed to be paid hourly for their work. For their meals they are to pay their employers $2.25 per day. Now this seems to me to be a reasonable amount to pay for three meals. But by the same token, how is it that the Federal Government can say that $2.25 is a fair amount for youngsters to pay for three meals a day, while at the same time men in the military are supposed to be able to eat on $1 a day?

This inconsistent thinking on the part of the Federal Government characterizes the whole system of military pay and compensation. In order to correct the scale of subsistence allowances I introduced a bill, H.R. 1026, on the first day of the 89th Congress to increase the allowance from the present levels to a flat $75 per month. I believe that the low levels of subsistence allowances for enlisted men and officers are as unrealistic and irrational as the implied assumption that enlisted men can obtain a decent diet on less money than officers can, or that officers are entitled to a better diet than enlisted men.

The subject of military pay also suffers from an overdose of antiquated thinking. I, for one, believe that the present system of military pay ought to be retired to the Smithsonian Institution where it will make a valuable addition to the national collection of relics of the past. In its place I propose that we grant to all members of the uniformed services a minimum wage of $1.25 an hour. This minimum wage would apply to the first 40 hours of assigned duty performed per week. Because of the nature of military service there would be no overtime pay.

The effects of such a military minimum wage law would be to set a pay floor beneath the military man of approximately $200 per month. A pay floor of this kind is in perfect keeping with the wage and compensation philosophy which pervades both public and private employment. Unfortunately this philosophy has not yet been applied to the men and women of the military.

On June 17, 1965, I introduced the military minimum wage bill, H.R. 9210. I urge my colleagues in this House to study the military minimum wage bill, as well as the bill to increase subsistence allowances. I intend to vote for the bill we are now debating, H.R. 9075. The Armed Services Committee, under the able leadership of Chairman Mendel Rivers, has done an outstanding job of putting together a military pay raise bill within the confines of the present system. But basic changes need to be made in this system in the future if we are to be able to meet our congressional responsibilities to the men and women of the armed services and to the demands of national defense. It does not make sense to me for Congress to have to meet each year in order to patch up the outmoded system of pay and compensation that is now in force. The fundamental problem, as I see it, is that we have not done for the military man what we have done for Federal civilian employment and for private employment in many areas. That is, to place a wage floor beneath military employment so that every member of the armed services may be assured of a decent standard of living.

With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the Record at this point a copy of H.R. 1026, to increase subsistence allowances, and a copy of H.R. 9210, the military minimum wage bill:

H.R. 1026

A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code to increase the subsistence allowance for members of the uniformed services to $75 per month

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 402(d) of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The basic allowance for subsistence for officers and enlisted members of the uniformed services shall be at the rate of $75 per month."

Sec. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar month following the date of enactment of this Act.

H.R. 9210

A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code to provide that each member of the uniformed services shall be paid at least $1.25 per hour for up to forty hours of assigned duty in each seven-day period he is on active duty

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 203 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out "The rates of monthly pay" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, the rates of monthly pay."

SEC. 2. Section 203 of title 37, United States Code, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The rate of basic pay for each member of the uniformed services shall not be less than $1.25 per hour for each hour of assigned duty that such member performs while on active duty, for not exceeding forty hours in any period of seven consecutive days. If the amount of basic pay to which any member of the uniformed services would be entitled for any monthly pay period would be greater if determined under this subsection, such member's basic pay shall be determined under this subsection for such monthly pay period, otherwise his basic pay shall be determined under subsection (a) of this section for such monthly pay period."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar month which begins more than thirty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is a momentous and memorable week, one that has been observed annually since 1959 in pursuance of a joint congressional resolution and Presidential proclamation. We all are aware that numerous nations in Europe, enjoying freedom before the outbreak of the last war, have become captives of the Soviet Union as the result of postwar international developments. Some of these nations—the Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, and of course the Ukrainians—have been captives of the Soviet Union behind the Iron Curtain for more than two decades. It was in protest against the Soviet Government's evil design to uproot and eliminate all freedom in these countries that this Captive Nations Week was established.

The American people and Government have always viewed with utmost sympathy the lot of these unfortunate peoples. The fate of the captive nations has been, and continues to be, a serious concern of our Government and its allies. And, because of our devotion to freedom, the captive nations on their part, feel that they have some claim upon us. They feel, with justification, that in these anxious days for democracy they are waging the struggle for the cause of freedom against its foes in central and Eastern Europe. We are fully cognizant of their efforts, as we are also aware of our moral responsibility to these peoples. The Joint Congressional Resolution establishing Captive Nations Week is clear confirmation of our awareness of such responsibility. By this resolution the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation each year declaring the third week of July, Captive Nations Week, "until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

In enacting this joint resolution, Congress felt that it was not only carrying out the wishes of the people of this country, but that it was also keeping alive our fine tradition of showing our wholehearted sympathy for the oppressed and the underdog, for the helpless and the unfortunate. We have always felt, and still feel, that the cause of the captive nations is a righteous cause, a just and noble cause, a sacred and humane cause. I am glad to participate in the observance of Captive Nations Week.

ADLAI E. STEVENSON

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, "How are the mighty fallen in the midst of the battle." Thus lamented David when the report reached him that his loyal friend, Jonathan, had become a victim of war. "I am distressed for thee, my brother Jonathan; very pleasant hast thou been to me: thy love to me was wonderful."

These words might well be echoed by the incarnated voice of this mighty Republic as the message of the untimely passing of a great American flashed across the Atlantic. In these last few years, Adlai Stevenson has been the conscience of America speaking above the tumult of violence and hatred, calling for a cessation of war and conflict. In a breathless and almost desperate campaign for peace, in which too few arrayed themselves on his side, his strength failed at last. For the moment, at least, the world is left without a recognized leader in the long search for a better and more kindly way of life for all the earth.

Ambassador Stevenson was born to a family of national prominence, of longstanding prestige, of culture, and of a reasonable degree of wealth. He was reared in all the traditions of noblesse oblige. He had reason to anticipate a lifetime career among the great and powerful. And he chose to dedicate that career to the service of the common good. He has won the love as well as the admiration of millions of his fellow Americans, not to mention the citizens of other lands, as much by his unfeigned humility as by his profound wisdom and his unfailing integrity. The shoe with the hole in the bottom which was featured in his campaign tours was a fitting symbol of his indifference to the unimportant things, and of his scorn of pomp and circumstance.

Twenty years ago the Organization of the United Nations was fashioned with the fervent hope that it would be an effective instrument in reconciling the conflicting interests of suspicious and hostile nations. For a number of years Ambassador Stevenson has thrown all his formidable energy and his broad talent into a determined effort to bring the Organization to a full realization of its benign purposes. The old and well known centrifugal forces of greed and pride are still operative on the international field, however, and the United Nations has been in danger of disintegration. It may not be an unreasonable statement to say that it has been held together by the eloquence of Ambassador Stevenson. He has put forward the policy of the United States in phrases so vital, so clear-cut, and so convincing that no opponent could afford to challenge their rightness. It was the crowning achievement of a long career designed to serve humanity.

"The beauty of Israel is slain upon thy high places: how are the mighty fallen."

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY CONFERENCE

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I was much heartened when the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Fowler, announced on July 10 that the United States "now stands prepared to attend and participate in an international monetary conference that would consider what action we might jointly take to secure substantial improvements in international monetary arrangements." Such a conference could be the most important development in international monetary matters since the Bretton Woods Conference in 1944 which led to the creation of the IMF. I have long felt that basic improvements in the international monetary system are essential.

I therefore read with considerable regret today that France regards the proposed conference as "inopportune." We may hope that France will reconsider. Clearly any new arrangements would be stronger if the French took part.

But even if France refuses to participate, I think that we should go ahead.

We must now recognize that unanimity is not essential for progress. We do not run our own affairs that way—and the international monetary system is not run that way either. Decisions at the IMF are made by weighted voting. It does not take agreement by all 102 members before important decisions can be made.

Sometimes we have been willing to pay too high a price for unanimity. Often the price of unanimous agreement is a position so watered down to a low common denominator that it is scarcely worth achieving.

If France does not want to participate in an international monetary conference, that is too bad. But let us proceed anyway. France can then operate outside the framework of what we accomplish. This is, after all, largely the pattern of the Swiss, who have never joined the IMF but who participate in swap arrangements and have associated themselves with the Fund's general arrangements to borrow. To paraphrase that grand song from "My Fair Lady," we should be prepared to respond:

The IMF can still thrive without you
Trade and aid will survive without you,
So go back in your shell, we can do bloody
well without you.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8775, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8775) making appropriations for the legislative branch.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Vanik, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Pirnie (at the request of Mr. Brock), for 60 minutes, on Tuesday, July 27.

Mr. Monagan (at the request of Mr. Vivian), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, July 21.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Jonas and to include a questionnaire circulated in his congressional district earlier this year.

Mr. Fino and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. May to revise and extend her remarks in the Committee of the Whole and include extraneous material.

Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. St. Onge.

Mr. Quie, his remarks in general debate today and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Brock) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Dole.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Vivian) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Fallon.
Mrs. Kelly.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Hanley.
Mr. McCormack.
Mr. Evans of Colorado.
Mr. Rosenthal.

Mr. Carey (at the request of Mr. Vivian) in his remarks in the Committee on the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 9. An act to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 76. An act for the relief of Anna Maria Heiland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 102. An act to provide an additional place for holding court in the district of North Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 135. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Kam Oi Hu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 136. An act for the relief of Angel Lagmay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 137. An act for the relief of Rosauro L. Lindogan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 375. An act for the relief of Pedro Antonio Julio Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 612. An act for the relief of Kevin Dillon Schofield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 850. An act for the relief of Samuel L. McCoy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 870. An act for the relief of Kaloyan D. Kaloyanoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 872. An act for the relief of Vasil Laci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 879. An act for the relief of Kim Sa Suk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 949. An act to promote commerce and encourage economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1119. An act for the relief of Julio Francisco Dumas y Alcocer and Maria Josefa Dumas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1198. An act for the relief of Mrs. Harley Brewer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1217. An act for relief of Capt. Paul W. Oberdorfer;

H.R. 1314. An act for the relief of Foster Masahiko Gushard;

H.R. 1322. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ana Cristina Rainforth;

H.R. 1374. An act for the relief of CWO Elden R. Comer;

H.R. 1487. An act for the relief of Maj. Kenneth F. Coykendall, U.S. Army;

H.R. 1889. An act for the relief of Albert Marks;

H.R. 2881. An act for the relief of George A. Grabert;

H.R. 3625. An act for the relief of Alfred Estrada; and

H.R. 8484. An act to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of members of the Armed Forces on a change of permanent station.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 627. An act to exempt oceanographic research vessels from the application of certain vessel inspection laws, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 225. An act to amend chapter 1 of title 38, United States Code, and incorporate therein specific statutory authority for the Presidential memorial certificate program; and

H.R. 5242. An act to amend paragraph (10) of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to change the basis for determining whether a proposed unification or acquisition of control comes within the exemption provided for by such paragraph.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 21, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1361. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting supplementary report on displacement of commercial dollar sales of tallow to the United Arab Republic, Department of State, Department of Agriculture, Agency for International Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1362. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Acting Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 30, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa Forks, Ky., W. Va., and Va., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted April 21, 1954, March 19, 1963, and June 19, 1963, and authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved September 3, 1954 (H. Doc. No. 246); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

1363. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 408 of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of savings and loan holding companies and subsidiary companies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1364. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of deficiencies in motor vehicle maintenance use and replacement practices, Atomic Energy Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1365. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of displacement of commercial dollar sales of tallow to the United Arab Republic, Department of State, Department of Agriculture, Agency for International Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1366. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the activities carried on by the Geological Survey of the Department in areas outside the national domain for the period January 1 to June 30, 1965, pursuant to section 2 of the act of September 5, 1962; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 579. An act for the relief of the State of New Hampshire; without amendment (Rept. No. 627). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7755. A bill to amend section 633 of title 28, United States Code, prescribing fees of U.S. commissioners; with amendment (Rept. No. 628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on Un-American Activities. H.R. 9713. A bill to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy, to conduct research to develop an integrated body of operational knowledge in the political, psychological, economic, technological, and organizational areas to increase the nonmilitary capabilities of the United States and other nations in the global struggle between freedom and communism, to educate and train Government personnel and private citizens to understand and implement this body of knowledge, and also to provide education and training for foreign students in these areas of knowledge under appropriate conditions; with amendment (Rept. No. 629). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS: Committee of conference. H.R. 8775. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 630). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 9811. A bill to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs, and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 631). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9945. A bill to provide fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel, to improve the quality of teacher training programs, and to establish a National Teacher Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 9946. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 9947. A bill to amend the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1959, to provide for reimbursement of transportation expenses for Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 9948. A bill to increase educational opportunities throughout the Nation by providing grants for the construction of elementary and secondary schools and supplemental educational centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 9949. A bill to provide for the establishment of an independent civilian board to review and correct military discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 9950. A bill to place in the Comptroller of the Currency authority over foreign branches of national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 9951. A bill to establish a U.S. Capitol page system for needy and deserving students of a college, university, or other institution of higher education; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 9952. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 9953. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide career incentives for certain professionally trained officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 9954. A bill to provide fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel, to improve the quality of teacher training programs, and to establish a National Teacher Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 9955. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program of research, study and surveys, documentation and description of the natural environmental systems of the United States for the purpose of understanding and evaluating the condition of these systems and to provide information to those concerned with natural resources management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9956. A bill establishing the Clinical Laboratory Licensing Act of 1965; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 9957. A bill to provide fellowships for graduate study leading to a master's degree or doctor's degree for elementary and secondary school teachers and those who train, guide, or supervise such teachers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 9958. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program of research, study, and surveys, documentation and description of the natural environmental systems of the United States for the purpose of understanding and evaluating the condition of these systems and to provide information to those concerned with natural resources management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 9959. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to lease under certain conditions property acquired for flood control projects to the children of the former owners of such property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 9960. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit contracting for the construction of vessels for the U.S. Navy at places outside of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 9961. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that where a veteran receiving pension under this chapter disappears, the Administrator may pay the pension otherwise payable to the dependent's wife and children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9962. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by making it clear that the income, including subscription and advertising income, derived by an organization in carrying on any publication, such as a trade or professional journal, shall not be deemed to be unrelated business taxable income if the publication is substantially related to the purpose or function constituting the organization's basis for its tax exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 9963. A bill to promote the economic development of the State of Alaska by providing for U.S. participation in the statewide exposition to be held in Alaska during 1967; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 9964. A bill to require that voters in Federal, State, and local elections subscribe to a written affirmation of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 584. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the last week in October of every year as National Student Council Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H. Con. Res. 449. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the order in which certain Reserve members of the Armed Forces and members of the National Guard should be ordered to active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9965. A bill for the relief of Abraham Grobard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 9966. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios and Lena Arvanitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 9967. A bill for the relief of Patterson, Eagle, Greenough, and Day, Esqs.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 9968. A bill for the relief of Anthony Mosquera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the President has designated the week of July 18 to July 24 as Captive Nations Week. I should like today to remind the people of the United States and of all the world's free nations that there still exists many states which are under foreign domination; it is the responsibility of all free men to study the plight of these states and to pledge support to all those struggling to become independent.

We are all familiar with the histories of the unfortunate nations which have been subjected to Communist Chinese domination. We recognize Red China's intention to extend the Bamboo Curtain further to include South Vietnam and Laos, and eventually, all southeast Asia. We are aware of their efforts in Africa to take advantage of the unstable political and economic situations of newly independent states and to overthrow the existing governments.

But we have been lulled into ignoring the conditions in the nations of Eastern Europe, lulled by the Soviet policy of peaceful coexistence with the West. Pleased by advances in our relations with the Soviet Union, we have forgotten that there remain many states under Soviet imperialistic control. Recently, we have begun to detect the enormous tensions that exist today within the Soviet bloc, particularly in southeastern Europe, caused by people who have ceased to be intimidated by Communist techniques and who are now rising to claim autonomy for themselves.

Yet the Iron Curtain is only weaker; it is not yet broken. It still oppressively shuts off many nations, particularly the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Lithuania, for example, a powerful independent state from the Middle Ages until 1775, had long been trying to resist Russian domination. After a too brief period of independence between the two World Wars. and great suffering in World War II, it was reoccupied by the Red army in 1944 and swallowed by the Soviet Union.

The Lithuanians are not voluntary allies of Soviet Russia: even under the terrorist conditions of Communist rule, the farmers of Lithuania in 1949 conducted an organized campaign to resist the collectivization of agriculture. They were punished with mass deportation, the same treatment they were given when the Russians took control in 1944. Soviet techniques in such matters have changed, but Lithuania remains a subject nation, firmly guarded from contacts with the free world or with its Baltic neighbors. Until 1959, no Western observers were permitted there and even today only one city is open to visitors.

It is people such as these in all the captive nations to whom we should extend all possible encouragement, to those who are forced to ignore their nationalist feelings, forced to submit to the rule of an alien people. Mr. Speaker, we, the possessors of the priceless gifts of freedom and democracy, must do all in our power to support the attempt of any people who seek to throw off the yoke of foreign domination.

Joseph L. Milhender, President of Milhender Distributors, Inc., Boston, Mass., Completes 50 Years in Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1965

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in January 1965, the New England Housewares Club gave Joseph L. Milhender their Man of the Year Award. He is considered the "dean" of the housewares and electrical housewares industry; housewares manufacturers continually seek his advice in the packaging and marketing of their products. In recognition of his contribution to the growth of the housewares and electrical housewares industry, the leading manufacturers at their National Housewares Show in Chicago presented Joseph L. Milhender with their Merchandiser of the Year Award.

September 1, 1965, will mark the 50th anniversary for Joseph L. Milhender in business. The life story of Joe Milhender is like a reflecting pool of our American way of life, where every individual is a freeman and has the right to pursue whatever economic endeavor he chooses.

Joe Milhender chose to establish a small business as a young man. Through the years he has labored at developing this business so that he could better serve his community and better provide for his family. Under our American freedom of enterprise, the public is free to accept or reject the services and products of any business concern. Joe Milhender's business, like all other business concerns, was judged on its ability to anticipate, to meet, and to satisfy the public's wants. We know that Joe Milhender's business has been well accepted by the people it serves, the public, because Milhender Distributors, Inc., has grown to be a leading business in the State of Massachusetts and a major outlet in its industry.

In commemoration of his 50th anniversary in business, Joe Milhender will, on September 18 and 19, 1965, run a housewares and electrical housewares trade show at the War Memorial Auditorium at the New Prudential Center in Boston.

Joseph L. Milhender is a successful man. Not only has he measured up to excellence in his business endeavors, but he has also measured up to excellence in our best American traditions for his philanthropic and charitable work. He has contributed his time, his energy, his talents, and his money generously to the good of mankind.

The life story of Joseph L. Milhender is the noblest testimony for the free enterprise system. It is people like Joe Milhender that assure the continuance of our American way of life.

Results of a Public Opinion Survey Taken in North Carolina's Eighth Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1965

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the results of my annual public opinion survey among residents of the Eighth Congressional District of North Carolina.

I would like to express appreciation to all those who took the trouble to inform me of their stands on some of the important issues before this session of Congress. A total of 12,067 persons completed questionnaires and mailed them to my Washington office—a return of approximately 12 percent. Although this is a somewhat smaller percentage return than last year, considering that this is a nonelection year I am highly pleased with the interest demonstrated by Eighth District residents in national issues.

One especially gratifying aspect of this year's questionnaire is that so many persons—I would estimate a majority—added comments elaborating their views on one or more of the questions or on some other issue of concern to them.

Some of the questions, current when they were drawn up and when the majority of questionnaires were filled out, have been resolved by action in Congress. Nonetheless, I think the attitude expressed by the citizens of my district on these questions is worth noting. It is my judgment that the response recorded here is a fair reflection of the thinking of Eighth District residents. Questionnaires were mailed to the broadest possible cross section of district residents.

The answers were tabulated by Data Management, Inc., of Washington, D.C., by the use of data-processing equipment.

I am listing below the questions asked, the total number of replies received to each question, and a percentage figure for each answer. Before submitting this listing I would like to call particular attention to certain of the results.

For instance, the returned questionnaires reveal broad support for continuation of legislation designed to eliminate the advantage foreign firms once enjoyed under the two-price cotton system. At the same time, a majority of those responding—52.7 percent—do not favor continuing the present farm support programs, while 27.1 percent would continue them.

I think it is interesting to note that Federal aid to education on the elementary and secondary level, with provisions for some forms of assistance to nonpublic schools, was disapproved by Eighth District residents by a 2-to-1 margin, 62.7 percent opposed and 29.8 percent favoring.

The question receiving the clearest expression of opinion has to do with the United Nations financial crisis. Almost 84 percent of those responding feel this country should insist that all nations meet their financial obligations, even to the point where nations in arrears might withdraw. Only 9.3 percent opposed this position while 6.8 percent of those returning the questionnaire expressed no opinion one way or the other.

I would point out with regard to the question on Vietnam that most of the questionnaire responses were made in March, before the tempo of our involvement increased to the extent we know it today. I would interpret the results to mean that residents of my district give considerable support to the President's increased use of American power to halt Communist aggression in South Vietnam.

While the original medicare bill has been much modified already by Congress, it is worth noting that the administration bill first introduced this year received support from only 10.3 percent of those answering my question about health care for the elderly.

On one of the major legislative battles shaping up for this session, the proposed repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, Eighth District residents have a clear opinion. Those responding to this question opposed repeal of this section which permits right-to-work laws, such as North Carolina has adopted, by a 5-to-1 margin. Fifteen percent would repeal the section while 75.1 percent oppose repeal and 9.9 percent expressed no opinion.

Residents of the Eighth District split almost evenly on the controversy about the apportionment of State legislatures. While 43.8 percent would approve a constitutional amendment permitting States, with the voters' approval, to apportion one house of the legislature on factors in addition to population, 42.6 percent oppose this. Another 13.6 percent did not reply.

In view of my longstanding campaign to induce the Federal Government to take steps to reduce the national debt and the resulting interest burden, I naturally was pleased that 81.3 percent of those replying to my questions on this subject are alarmed about the continuing debt increases. Only 6 percent say they are unworried while another 9.5 percent would have the Government spend without reference to the size of the debt. Just 3.2 percent had no opinion on this question.

Following are the questions asked in my 1965 poll and the response received, by numbers and percentages:

1. Do you favor continuing present programs of price supports and acreage controls?

	Percent
Yes (3,266)	27.1
No (6,356)	52.7
No answer (2,445)	20.2

2. Do you favor extending existing legislation designed to eliminate the two-price cotton system?

	Percent
Yes (6,552)	54.2
No (2,354)	19.6
No answer (3,161)	26.2

3. Do you favor the President's proposal to authorize production and marketing limits of tobacco on an "acreage-poundage" basis?

	Percent
Yes (3,063)	25.3
No (5,577)	46.3
No answer (3,427)	28.4

4. The President has recommended an appropriation of $1 billion to provide assistance to public elementary and secondary schools serving "children of low-income families," with a requirement that in order to receive funds school districts must have provision for shared use of their facilities and special educational services by children who attend nonpublic as well as public schools. He has also recommended grants to the States for the purchase of textbooks, library books, and instructional materials for use by children who attend both public and nonpublic schools. Do you favor these proposals?

	Percent
Yes (3,589)	29.8
No (7,568)	62.7
No answer (910)	7.5

5. Do you think the United States should seek to expand trade with Communist countries?

	Percent
Yes (3,204)	26.6
No (7,783)	64.4
No answer (1,080)	9.0

6. Should the United States insist that all nations discharge their financial obligations to the United Nations even if it results in the withdrawal of those nations in arrears?

	Percent
Yes (10,120)	83.9
No (1,126)	9.3
No answer (821)	6.8

7. With respect to South Vietnam, do you think the United States should (choose one):

(a) Continue as at present? (558), 4.6 percent.

(b) Extend the war as necessary to halt the flow of supplies and materals to the Vietcong? (6,690), 55.4 percent.

(c) Seek a negotiated peace? (3,236), 26.8 percent.

(d) Withdraw U.S. troops from South Vietnam? (910), 7.5 percent.

No answer (673), 5.7 percent.

8. Indicate which of the following plans under consideration in Congress you prefer:

(a) The "medicare" plan would provide limited hospital and posthospital care (in a nursing home affiliated with a hospital), outpatient diagnostic services and home visits by a nurse to all persons 65 and over regardless of need. This plan would be financed by increased social security taxes on workers, employers, and self-employed, and by raising the taxable base from $4,800 to $5,600. (1,237), 10.3 percent.

(b) The "eldercare" plan would provide private health insurance policies, on a voluntary basis, to persons 65 and over, covering hospitalization, nursing home care, doctor and surgeon bills and medicine. This program is, in effect, an expansion of Kerr-Mills assistance under which policyholders would pay all, part, or none of the premiums depending on their income and with deficits made up out of Federal-State matching funds from general revenues: (9,892), 82 percent; no answer (938), 7.7 percent.

9. In his state of the Union message the President stated: "As pledged in our 1960 and 1964 (Democratic) platforms I will propose to Congress changes in the Taft-Hartley Act including section 14(b)." Section 14(b) is the one which authorizes States to enact right-to-work laws. Do you favor repeal of section 14(b)?

	Percent
Yes (1,815)	15.0
No (9,067)	75.1
No answer (1,185)	9.9

10. The present immigration laws are based upon a national origins quota system. The President has proposed to change this by substituting a system under which first preference will be granted immigrants with needed skills without requiring that they have an employer here before they can enter, second preference to persons with close relatives who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States, and to admit others in the order of their applications. Do you favor this change in our immigration laws?

	Percent
Yes (4,473)	37.1
No (6,489)	53.8
No answer (1,105)	9.1

11. Do you favor a proposed constitutional amendment permitting States, subject to approval by the voters, to apportion one house of the legislature on factors in addition to population (such as geography)?

	Percent
Yes (5,279)	43.8
No (5,136)	42.6
No answer (1,652)	13.6

12. The national debt, which now requires 12.3 percent of the net budget receipts for the annual interest payments has increased in recent years as follows: January 1961, $290 billion; January 1962, $296 billion; January 1963, $304 billion; January 1964, $309 billion; January 1965, $319 billion. Please answer one of the following:

(a) Are you alarmed at this trend? (9,816), 81.3 percent.

(b) Are you unworried about it? (720), 6 percent.

(c) Do you think Government spending should be increased without reference to the size of the debt? (1,144), 9.5 percent.

No answer (387), 3.2 percent.

USDA: Consumer Friend—USDA Helps American Housewives Take Advantage of "Good Buys" in Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, each day housewives all over the country consult the food pages of newspapers—or listen to the radio—to find out what foods are a "good buy" this week. I cite this as one of the popular and important—but little known—services of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Through its plentiful foods program, USDA has for many years been supplying information on good food buys to the food trade and the news media, in the interests of consumers, business, and farmers.

Here is how it works.

Each month commodity specialists in the Department collect all the available information about supplies of various foods—both present supplies and those projected for the near future. Then the Department puts out a list of foods expected to be in especially heavy supply in the next few weeks. This information is widely published through the cooperative efforts of all parts of the food industry and the news media.

Such a service is especially valuable to low-income families and those who need to stretch their food dollars to the limit. But it also helps families not on a strict budget. It alerts housewives to foods that are seasonally plentiful and at their best in quality.

Farmers and the food trade like this service, too. By stimulating sales of plentiful foods, it helps prevent serious price and supply troubles that would hurt not only farmers and business but in the long run consumers as well. Reasonably stable prices help everybody except speculators. Erratic food prices, on the other hand, can ruin farmers, imperil sound competition in the food trade and result in higher prices overall for consumers.

Sometimes the supply of a commodity gets into particularly serious trouble. Then the USDA pulls out all the stops in its plentiful foods program and gives an all-out promotion. This was done this spring when many egg producers were experiencing great price difficulties. Consumers responded to the promotion. They got an especially good buy in eggs for a couple of months. Prices to producers have now improved. But consumers are still getting eggs at reasonable prices.

I am happy to take this opportunity to commend the Department of Agriculture for helping American housewives take advantage of "good buys" in food.

Military Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. EVANS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 20, 1965

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply impressed by the dedicated and able assistance given by the men in our military services during the recent June floods in Colorado.

There were many men and women, both military and civilian, and many organizations such as the Red Cross, that gave significant aid, but I especially want to cite the contributions by the men of the U.S. Air Force Academy, Ent Air Force Base, Fort Carson, the Pueblo Army Depot and the National Guard for their missions of mercy during the devastating floods that hit portions of Colorado.

The combined efforts of our military and civilian personnel teamed to quickly mobilize forces that include air police, communications, civil engineering personnel, ambulances, bulldozers, emergency vehicles, temporary housing to assist in areas nearby, hard hit by flood and wind damage.

Many comments of thanks and praise have been directed to our military leaders.

> We are particularly indebted to you for your fine work in saving the dam at Monument Lake.

The mayor of Colorado Springs wrote the Fort Carson commander.

> Without your untiring efforts, the situation in Colorado Springs might have been desperate.

"Boy, we would never have made it without the National Guard," was the statement of a county civil defense director in the southeastern part of the State.

Air Force Academy personnel responded quickly to pleas for help in the Palmer Lake area and in Pueblo, the Pueblo Army Depot provided urgently needed assistance.

Air Defense Command's Ent Air Force Base was a major contributor to the rescue and recovery efforts. From June 15 to 22, Ent personnel, equipment, and facilities were thrown into the all-out effort to save lives and property. For some time, the only communications in the Lamar area was a mobile unit of the 4600th Air Base Wing.

It is impossible to cite all of the actions of many groups and individuals involved in the extensive operation to assist the flood-damaged communities, but the personnel at the military installations in Colorado played a noteworthy and significant role in this humanitarian effort.

In the finest American tradition, the men in the military service rolled up their sleeves and worked around the clock in many instances, to aid the people and the communities hard hit by this disaster.

They deserve our thanks—and our gratitude.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 20, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, this week we as citizens of a truly free nation pause to observe Captive Nations Week. Throughout our Nation, this week is marked by ceremonies, statements by many State and local officials, official State proclamations, and the annual proclamation of Captive Nations Week by the President of the United States. All of these add up to a total national observance that is indeed great in scope and encouraging in comprehension. That so many of our citizens are thus made more aware of the sad circumstances of these captive nations is a result that should please us in the Congress of this great Nation and the peoples of both the free world and the captive nations. At the same time, it should caution the leaders of those nations striving for world domination that they are encountering a dedication to freedom, an understanding of their insidious methods, and a resistance to tyranny that will prove ever greater.

The peoples of the captive nations have been victims of an imperialism that has spanned a period of some 45 years. In this time, we have seen the leaders of this imperialism change, we have heard various refutals and alterations of ideology and dogma, methods and means, yet the ultimate goal of these haters of freedom has remained unchanged. That their subtle nets have reached out into much of the world, causing unrest, strife, and bloodshed, and that their overt military gestures and occupations have resulted in captivity and misery for many of the world's peoples, we are well aware. Yet, we are fortunate that the scope of the interest aroused by and the activities carried on in conjunction with Captive Nations Week have so successfully increased our awareness of the plight of these nations and the nature of the enemy we face. An educated public, fully aware of the intentions of the international menace we are dedicated to resisting, with such examples of gross, ugly imperialism and tyranny before them, cannot but be better equipped to insure the ultimate victory of freedom, truth, and peace.

We have, indeed, been given some great and inspiring examples of the strength of mankind's dedication to freedom by the unfortunate peoples of the captive nations. We share in their dedication to this most basic right of man, and we honor them for their long fight against tyranny and the many sufferings and privations that they have undergone.

Captive Nations Week is a time for us to offer to these peoples, wherever they may be throughout the world, our assurances of understanding and our sincere hopes for a future of true freedom for all men.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 20, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, each year during the third week in July we observe Captive Nations Week, dedicated to the millions of people suffering under the yoke of communism in the countries of Eastern and Central Europe. This observance is by now almost a tradition dating back to July 1959 when Congress unanimously adopted a resolution designating this particular week as Captive Nations Week.

During these past 6 years no progress has been made in securing the right of self-determination of the peoples held in captivity in those countries by their Communist overlords. They remain under alien rule. They are still denied basic human rights. Consequently, our observance of Captive Nations Week and our association with these peoples in their struggle to attain their freedom and independence is as timely today as it was 6 years ago.

The hopes of the enslaved peoples must be kept alive, if they are to continue their struggle and their efforts for survival. By reaffirming our ideals embodied in the concept as represented by Captive Nations Week we encourage these peoples and contribute toward the ultimate achievement of their goal. We help to lighten their burden of suffering and degradation.

Most of all, by our discussion of this problem and focusing attention on the treatment of these captive peoples by their Communist masters we help to expose the ruthless face and features of Communist imperialism for all the world to see. I have also introduced in March of this year a resolution to create a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives for the purpose of conducting studies of the situation in the captive nations and seeking the means to assist them to regain their national freedom.

I am pleased to join in the observance of Captive Nations Week as a way of demonstrating our support of these nations in their efforts to fulfill their national aspirations of freedom. It is our way of expressing renewed assurance to all captive and oppressed nations of the world that we stand for freedom, justice, and human dignity for all mankind.

Emergency Highway Relief Fund (H.R. 6790)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1965

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 6790, which passed on Monday, July 19, which will increase the amount of funds available to States for emergency repair and reconstruction of highways and bridges damaged or destroyed by major natural disasters, such as floods, earthquakes, and severe storms.

Last March testimony before the Public Works Subcommittee on Roads revealed the $30 million authorized by existing law for emergency highway relief far from adequate to meet current repair needs. At that time requests from States for funds to make necessary repairs to highways damaged by recent major disasters, already exceeded the amount of funds available.

Subsequently, large-scale flooding in Colorado and Kansas left hundreds of miles of highways and roads in need of repair. Bridges and bridge approaches were washed away by floodwaters. In my district in Kansas, the Army Corps of Engineers estimate the total flood damage in the Arkansas River Basin to Great Bend, Kans., at $19 million. Total damages downstream from Great Bend are estimated at $13 million and much of the damage in this area is in rural areas, to crops and county roads. Of these area totals, reports from the Bureau of Public Roads indicate, and reports on highway and roadway damages are by no means complete, permanent repairs on Federal-aid secondary highways, that is, county roads and farm to market roads, will amount to $1,700,000. To make temporary repairs on Federal-aid primary highways, the Bureau estimates $150,000. These reports, though incomplete, are indicative of extensive highway repair needs which must be met in part with emergency highway relief funds.

The Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965, recently enacted, responds to existing nationwide needs for necessary highway and bridge repairs by authorizing a $50 million increase in the emergency highway relief fund for fiscal 1965 and a $20 million increase for fiscal 1966. These funds are authorized to be used on a nationwide basis by the Secretary of Commerce for emergency road repair wherever and whenever the need has arisen.

However, when major disaster strikes it is necessary that adequate emergency funds be available to give States prompt assistance for highway repairs. This bill would provide an annual increase of $20 million in available emergency highway relief funds for fiscal 1965 and each succeeding year. Its enactment will make funds available more nearly commensurate with projected needs and costs of emergency highway repair and will serve to minimize the need to authorize special legislation for relief of unforeseen disaster situations.

USDA—Consumer Friend—USDA Regulatory Services Protect Consumers in the Marketplace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, during my service with the Committee on Agriculture, I was quite impressed with the work done by the Department of Agriculture, and by the many ways by which the Department is geared to protect the consumer.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture administers more regulatory statutes than any other Government department.

Every year, for the protection of consumers, producers, and marketers of agricultural products, the USDA checks thousands of carloads of produce, tests thousands of samples of seed, exercises daily surveillance over hundreds of large traders in commodity futures markets, licenses and inspects storage warehouses, and administers marketing agreement and order programs under which billions of dollars worth of agricultural commodities are marketed.

Carrying out responsibilities given it by the Congress, the USDA thus seeks to assure fair play and fair competition in the marketplace and safe storage of farm products in licensed warehouses. I want to go on record that the Department deserves a great deal of commendation for the way it fulfills its responsibilities in this difficult but important area.

Because our food comes from many sections of our vast country—beef from the West—broilers from the Southeast—fruits and vegetables from Florida and California—dairy products from the Lake States—our Nation has probably the most complex marketing system in the world. Yet it is undoubtedly the most efficient.

The regulatory acts administered by the Department play a vital role in keeping this system operating smoothly. By quickly settling disputes between buyers and sellers, these laws help cut down the risks of doing business.

Over 2,500 cases were handled last year under the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, a law that incorporates a code of ethics for the fruit and vegetable industry. These cases resulted in payments to interested parties of more than $1.7 million—money that did not have to be recovered from consumers in the form of higher prices.

The Packers and Stockyards Act helps preserve free and open competition in the livestock and poultry industries. Working closely with State governments and industry the Department of Agriculture investigates and prosecutes alleged restriction of competition and price discrimination in livestock and meat marketing, and unfair practices in poultry marketing. This act also requires that charges for marketing livestock be fair and reasonable, and that livestock be correctly weighed on accurate scales.

In enforcing the Federal Seed Act—a truth in labeling law—the Department in 1964 made 43,000 separate tests on 16,000 samples of seed. It turned back about 3½ million pounds of seeds because of low quality or false labeling.

To maintain free and competitive pricing in the commodity futures markets at Chicago, New York, and other centers, the USDA last year exercised daily surveillance of some 900 large traders.

Another behind-the-scenes service of the Department of Agriculture is carried out under the U.S. Warehouse Act. This provides for voluntary licensing and inspection of warehouses, thus helping to assure safe storage of food supplies.

Marketing orders administered by USDA help provide a steady supply of milk and fruits and vegetables at stable and reasonable prices. Most of the milk and about two-fifths of the fruits, vegetables, and nuts produced are marketed under these orders.

The services of the U.S. Department of Agriculture made possible through the laws which I have briefly mentioned are a major reason why the American homemaker is blessed with such a variety of fresh foods at reasonable prices. Our complex and free marketing system, regulated to protect both buyers and sellers, coupled with the productive genius of the American family farmer, makes it possible for us to enjoy the highest standard of living in the world and at the same time pay a smaller share of our take-home pay for food than any other nation at any time in history.

Better Living Through Resource Conservation—Secretary Freeman's Speech Commemorating 50th Anniversary of the Cook County Forest Preserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 20, 1965

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is no secret that this Nation has a heritage of seeking ways to better the lives and economic opportunities of its citizens. One of these ways is through the protection and improvement of natural resources.

Few countries have been endowed with such an abundance of land resources as the United States. The great outdoors with its seemingly unlimited land resources made it possible for the early settlers who migrated to all corners of the land, to develop and build this Nation.

Today, the great trek is not to seek new land. Today more than 130 million Americans are on the move searching for places to swim, hunt, fish, picnic, and places to play, relax, and enjoy natural beauty, fresh air, and sunshine.

On Sunday, June 27, 1965, the 50th anniversary of the Cook County Forest Preserve District was celebrated at the Chicago Zoological Park in Brookfield, Ill. Such an anniversary is evidence of the great leadership and foresightedness of Cook County people in regard to better living through conservation.

Mr. Orville Freeman, the Secretary of Agriculture, addressed that meeting. His remarks were of such significance and bear so directly on this Nation's need for conservation unity of action and purpose, that they should be read and thoughtfully considered by all.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, SECRETARY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

It is an honor to participate in this 50th anniversary celebration.

On behalf of President Johnson, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the entire Johnson administration, I extend congratulations and best wishes to the Cook County Forest Preserve District, to the board of commissioners, and the 5 million citizens of this great metropolis who both enjoy and support these wonderful facilities for recreation and re-creation. Here you have opportunity for casual fun and for spiritual regeneration.

This is not only a beautiful and useful public asset, not only a monument to the foresight of leaders who established and developed this area—it is an example to all who live today, proof that the battle against ugliness and noise and pollution can be won.

Here is proof that men and women with vision and determination can build for themselves and their descendants a better place in which to live. This is a challenge to you and to me.

The challenge is the more real because your success came hard. The example you offer is one of hard work and perseverance as well as achievement.

In the U.S. Department of Agriculture Library, we have a good deal of historical literature about this forest preserve district. Scanning it we are reminded that your success was achieved against great odds. In the late 1800's Chicago was growing at a terrific rate in size, population, wealth, and complexity—and also in its output of smoke and sewage, in creation of slums, in problems of health, education, and recreation. Some people who made their fortunes in Chicago moved elsewhere to enjoy life.

Complicating the situation was the influx of foreign-born people, many of whom were poor and disadvantaged but who were accustomed in their old countries to publicly supported parks.

A leader of that period—Dr. John Rauch—wrote vigorously of the need for parks, saying "* * * we want not alone a place for business, but also one in which we can live."

Fortunately, good citizens took an interest. Many of the famous names of Chicago history are associated with the forest preserve. Also by good fortune, the forest preserve had the benefit of competent metropolitan planning.

Very early, according to the records, the Special Park Commission of the Municipal Science Club recommended (and I quote): "Instead of acquiring space only, the opportunity exists for reserving country naturally beautiful."

In 1909 the "Plan of Chicago" prepared under the direction of the Commercial Club stated that "nearby woodlands should be brought within easy reach of all people, and especially the wage earners," because of the restorative value of natural scenery to city dwellers.

While areas have been allotted for the zoo, playfields, golf courses, picnic grounds, and other important intensive uses, the emphasis through the years has remained on natural forests, natural beauty.

As Anton J. Cermak said in his report as president of the board of commissioners in 1925: "This has been a unique venture in combining the beautiful and the practical."

In the 1921 report is the record of a meeting honoring the memory of the first president of the board, Peter Reinberg. On the cover of the book is a poem:

"The kindest thing God ever made,
His hand of very healing laid
Upon a fevered world, is shade.

"Green temples, closed against the beat
Of noontime's burning glare and heat
Open to any pilgrim's feet.

"This is God's hospitality,
And whoso rests beneath a tree
Has cause to thank him gratefully."

The need for natural beauty is not new. It is very old.

Recognition of the need is not new either.

But we do have a new expression of that need—a new call to action—a new challenge.

We are rich and powerful and advanced in scientific achievement, yet we continue—thoughtlessly or ruthlessly—to pollute and despoil the earth on which we live. We foul our environment to such an extent that we rob our lives of the joys that could easily be ours—the simple joys of being alive, of being human, of being children of God in the universe of His creation.

Today we cannot even be sure we are fulfilling the most elementary animal instinct—the preservation of species. For the would-be human population of the future may find an earth not only bleak and bereft of joy but unfriendly to life itself. Destruction and pollution and uglification of our vital resources are the suicidal, manmade enemies of man.

And if the richest Nation on earth—blessed with democratic institutions—cannot build for the future, pray tell, what hope is there for the earth as a whole?

Fortunately, the Nation is awakening to the danger and facing the challenge. President Johnson with his genius for expressing the will of the people has called for a new drive to regain and retain the natural beauty of our country.

As he stated it in a recent message to the Congress:

"The beauty of our land is a natural resource. Its preservation is linked to the inner prosperity of the human spirit."

In this statement, President Johnson has not merely expressed his own philosophy—although he has done that in admirable fashion—but he has sensed and put into words that you and I would have been proud to utter the feelings, belief, and determination of the whole people.

We recognize that the love of beauty is one of the most fundamental attributes of human nature—one of our finest attributes. We recognize also that natural beauty is one of the most important dimensions of our practical goal of conserving and revitalizing our natural resources.

It is suddenly clear to us that our concept of conservation has been growing and taking new form, escaping old cubicles and dividing lines, emerging as a new philosophy.

The new concept is characterized by unity.

No longer can there be separate compartments in the conservation world—no compartment for soil conservation apart from beauty preservation, no longer a wall between wildlife protection and agricultural conservation, no longer a forestry objective separate from the interests of the grasslands, no longer a policy question as to multiple use of water resources, and, finally, no more a disunity between city and open country.

Perhaps there is symbolic significance as well as practicality in the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture is Chairman of the Recreation Advisory Committee of the U.S. Government.

The conservationist of 1965 is an exponent of natural beauty in its many forms for the enjoyment of all the people—he is an enemy of preventable ugliness.

The modern conservationist is a proponent of the principle of sustained economic use of resources—an opponent of mere hoarding, and an enemy of waste—waste in any form, including erosion, fire, or uneconomic production.

The conservationist of 1965 is an advocate of open space and quiet areas—an enemy of crowded slums, filth, and air filled with stench, poison fumes, and fallout.

The true conservationist of today sees the union of resources and values on which humanity depends, and he would preserve that union. He sees the world of conservation as one world.

The love of natural beauty is a great unifying force in the modern conservation movement. As President Johnson said, "* * * we can introduce into all our planning, our programs, our building, and our growth a conscious and active concern for the values of beauty." In agricultural terms, we can express this ideal as a concept of multiple-use management. Under multiple-use management, natural beauty can be developed and maintained; food, fiber, wildlife, recreation, forage, and timber can be provided; soil and water can be conserved.

In our national forests—which comprise 19 percent of our country's commercial timberland—we no longer think of ourselves merely as custodians and protectors. We practice multiple-use management to the end that the greatest possible number of people may benefit.

In community programs such as small watershed projects on private land, we combine flood control with municipal water development, recreation, and farmland conservation.

In our public partnership with farmers for conservation work on individual farms we encourage the use of practices which not only conserve soil and water for agricultural use but also provide better conditions for fish and wildlife and recreation for the public.

Let me give you some illustrations of our multipurpose conservation activities.

Here in Illinois 50,000 to 60,000 farmers do partnership work with you every year through the agricultural conservation program. With cost-sharing assistance from you and the rest of the taxpaying public, they build ponds which are a boon to waterfowl, and aid in flood prevention, and a means of helping maintain the ground water table. They establish grassed waterways to dispose of runoff water without the erosion of soil. They plant trees.

Down in Johnson County last year 150 farmers—every farmer in one particular area—cooperated in a special pooling of funds under the agricultural conservation program—and they built 80 ponds and established a protective grass cover on 3,000 acres. The result was a great boost in conservation—and in beautification.

A similar project is underway this year in Clark County.

In Henderson County, along the Mississippi River, we have a special ACP project under way to heal the ugly gullies in the bluffs and to reduce the siltation of streams and reservoirs below.

In my home State of Minnesota, farmers in one county, in just 1 year recently, planted well over 3½ million trees on 3,000 acres. They did this with the help of the ACP.

The farmers in Minnesota and other nearby States are being encouraged to plant oats for wildlife on land diverted from market crops under the feed grain program. This should make a lot more good cover for nesting birds and a lot of feed for them as well.

In projects of this kind we have the cooperation of several agencies and many people—the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, which administers the program through the farmer committee system; the Soil Conservation Service, which provides technical assistance; the Federal-State-county extension service, which carries out educational responsibilities; the Farmers Home Administration, which makes loans for conservation and development, including recreation, to eligible persons and groups; State agencies responsible for work in forestry, and in fishing and wildlife; soil conservation districts; conservation organizations; local civic organizations; business and professional people; and, of course, the farmers themselves.

Here in Illinois, 99 percent of the farms are in locally organized soil conservation districts that have been set up under State law. Our technical assistance is provided through those districts in which there are 65,000 cooperators. The Department also works with local groups, usually soil conservation districts, in planning and developing small watershed projects for flood prevention, water supply, recreation and other public purposes. In your State, local groups have made formal application for 56 of these watershed projects, and so far 9 have been approved for operations with 17 more approved for planning.

In Lake County the regional planning commission and other local agencies are using for urban purposes the soil survey maps that were made primarily for soil conservation use on farms. These maps have been used to help prevent the location of home developments where basements will flood or where soil is not porous enough for septic tanks or for drainage of lawns and gardens. They are also used to help roadbuilders avoid unstable soil and to help in selection of trees and shrubs that will do well.

You have seen from a hilltop or from an airplane the graceful lines of crops planted on the contours of sloping fields. This beauty came about for a practical reason: We had to fight erosion. Farmers and public together have done it, the public providing the technical, educational and cost-sharing help that the public interest justifies—farmers providing their labor and a big share of the dollar cost. We now have 40 million acres, nearly a tenth of our cropland, on the contour.

In our agricultural extension work with 95,000 4-H Clubs, and with home demonstration units, garden clubs and other organizations, we provide and emphasize education on beautification of home and community.

Our agricultural research people do a great deal to improve varieties of ornamental plants and their culture. Our loans for rural telephone and electric systems are used increasingly for lines that run underground rather than on poles that are sometimes very noticeable and unsightly.

We have credit programs that enable many people on farms and in rural towns to build new homes to take the place of rundown houses and shacks.

Since 1962 we have made loans to 133 nonprofit rural associations to build community recreation facilities and to 375 farmers to develop income-producing recreation facilities.

In 616 small watersheds we are working with local groups, largely soil conservation districts, to build dams and develop the resources for flood prevention, watershed protection, erosion control, municipal water supply, fish and wildlife, and recreation. In these projects, the public provides technical help and part of the dollar costs; the local groups provide the rest.

We have cooperative forestry work involving the U.S. Department of Agriculture, State and local agencies and individual owners of woods and forests. The people working in this field report that in the 12 months just past about 950 million seedlings were planted on well over a million acres, and fire protection was provided for well over 400 million acres.

You undoubtedly know a lot about the national forests. There are 154 of them and 19 national grasslands, all owned by the public and managed by the Department of Agriculture. We recorded 134 million visits by persons seeking recreation last year. The national parks administered by the Department of the Interior enjoyed similar popularity. As it is here in Cook County, some of the visitors to public lands wanted strenuous activity; others—or the same persons at different times—wanted just to enjoy quiet and beauty. Not incidentally, the national forests include thousands of miles of free-flowing wild rivers and 14½ million acres of primitive areas and wilderness.

I have given you examples and an abbreviated checklist of activities in which the Department of Agriculture is involved to indicate in general what can be done for natural beauty and conservation when the public cares enough.

In a democracy we tailor method to the job. In the Cook County Forest Preserve District and in the national forests, we see public ownership. In some of our watersheds we see teamwork between Federal agencies and legally constituted local groups. On our millions of farms, we see the individual in league with the public through local, State and Federal agencies.

Much is being done to benefit the people of both city and country. Much that is being done contributes not only to our material welfare but also to our enjoyment of beauty and our opportunities to re-create our inner lives.

The programs through which we are making this kind of progress have had the support of most of your Members of Congress, even when ill-informed people and mass media at times labeled them as Government interference, or subsidy farm program. I salute them for their courage and farsightedness.

But so much more needs to be done.

And right now we have a tremendous opportunity to take another gigantic step forward. The proven philosophy and principle of unity and use in conservation can, if we are wise and alert, be constructively applied once more—this time in the Great Society farm program now pending before the U.S. Congress.

We are in the vortex of an amazing technological revolution. Science and capital in combination enable our farmers to keep on increasing output of crops year after year. We are diverting surplus acres by means of our feed grain program and other commodity programs as a means of holding back surpluses that otherwise threaten the Nation's economic well-being and the welfare of the farmer. But as we take out of production the land not needed in producing food, let us use our commonsense and—rather than merely retiring this land or banking it—put it to use.

Right now Congress has before it a proposed cropland adjustment program recommended by the President and the Secretary of Agriculture and various public-spirited organizations, including conservation and wildlife groups.

This program would provide good uses for as much as 40 million acres of surplus cropland. These are opportunity acres for the public. We can put them to use as forested and grass-covered watersheds producing clean water, reducing the erosion of soil and sedimentation of streams. We can use them to create more open space near cities. In fact, one feature of the proposed program would provide direct help for cities in acquiring surplus cropland to meet their needs for parks and open spaces.

We can also benefit as citizens when farmers devote more of their surplus acres to ponds and lakes, hunting areas, hiking trails, and other recreation opportunities open to the public. And as we do this, we will benefit from reduction in government costs of protecting the economy against the effects of surplus production. Truly, in this program the basic concepts of modern conservation—of unity and of use—can and must be put to work. I commend this program to your study, and I hope you will give it your wholehearted support as a means of carrying out your objectives toward conservation, recreation, and beautification.

Do not be misled by those who narrowly and spitefully attempt to plaster the label "farm subsidy" on this legislation. It is all to the good that it will help meet our commodity problems and help to improve the farmer's income. The main thing is that at the same time it will accomplish improved use and preservation of our national resources. It deals with a whole union of values. It is of interest to every conservationist, whether on the farm or in the city, no matter from which part of the old conservation world he emigrated to the one world of today.

Just as truly as it is agricultural, it is urban legislation. As surely as it is a farm bill, it is a beautification bill.

Fortunately for us and those who will live after us, our Nation has the opportunity to choose paths we wish to take toward the future. Despite neglect and waste, we still have tremendous resources. We have a large measure of prosperity. We have pride in our Nation, a feeling of citizenship in the world community, and a sense of stewardship as temporary users of the resources of Creation.

Like those who had the vision and the fortitude to establish this forest preserve district 50 years ago, we today seek to do our bit toward the building of a Great Society.

In this anniversary celebration, we find good cause to take heart. For here we celebrate a triumph of conservation over despoliation, of beauty over ugliness—a triumph of the spirit with which man was endowed by God.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, this week we celebrate the seventh annual observance of Captive Nations Week It was my distinct pleasure last Sunday evening to initiate the observance in Syracuse with an address before the Syracuse and Onondaga County Captive Nations Committee. Considering the importance of this observance, I am including herewith the text of my address:

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

Ladies and gentlemen, we are gathered this evening in observance of Captive Nations Week. On this solemn occasion we acknowledge a responsibility which we bear to the millions now enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. To these millions we are bound by ties of friendship, of blood, and of national origin. These ties demand that we concern ourselves with the tragic state of affairs existing today in Eastern Europe—that we not forget—nor let the world forget—the plight of men, once free, and of nations, once self-determining.

The year 1965 marks the 25th anniversary of the Soviet invasion, occupation, and incorporation of the Baltic Republics. Let us remember their tragic fate. The suffering of their people marks one of the grimmest chapters in modern history. It reveals the full enormity of Russian imperialism and of Communist tyranny.

At the time of their annihilation, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were sovereign states, nations in themselves with a rich heritage and a proud history. Each state had won its independence through force of arms, and the independence of each was recognized by the Soviet Union in sacred treaty. In the interwar years, the Baltic Republics were "going concerns"—progressive, prosperous, and peace loving. Two decades after achieving their hard-won freedom, they were invaded by 300,000 Red army troops. Their legitimate governments were unseated. They were robbed of their independence and transformed into colonies of the Soviet Union.

Today the Soviet Union pursues a policy of russification aimed at the total obliteration of the national character and the will to survive of the Baltic peoples. By means of mass deportations, Russian immigration and forced resettlement, the U.S.S.R is attempting to break down the ethnic structure of their captives. A recent Soviet census illustrates the brutal efficiency of this policy; between 1939 and 1959, the population of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania declined by nearly 1 million out of a total population of 6 million. It is estimated that 10 percent of the population—600,000 people—were deported in 1949 alone. The Baltic Republics are losing not only their population but their culture. Russification threatens the very life of their religion, their language, and their literature. In Lithuania, 300 priests, pastors and rabbis have been arrested, killed or deported to Siberia. In Latvia, the number of churches has declined from 300 in 1939 to 110 in 1963. The Russian language now predominates in transportation and communications. One cannot even send a registered letter without addressing it in Russian. In the schools, Russian has replaced the native tongues as the language of instruction.

The United States has not, nor will it ever recognize the forcible incorporation of the Baltic Republics into the Soviet Union. Seventy resolutions relating to the status of the Baltic Republics have been introduced in the Congress this year. I voted for passage of House Concurrent Resolution 416 as an expression of my deep concern over the fate of the Baltic nations. This resolution urges the President to direct the full attention of world opinion, with all appropriate means, to the denial of the right of self-determination, and to bring the force of this opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of this right to the Baltic Republics.

The Baltic Republics are not the only victims of Russian imperialism and Communist tyranny we remember tonight. The Poles, the Czechs, the Hungarians, the Yugoslavs, the Albanians, the Rumanians, the Bulgarians, the Ukrainians, and the Armenians all suffer equally under the yoke of communism. Isolated from the West by a barrier of barbed wire and minefields, their governments still managed from Moscow, these people exist in a limbo of frustration, of bitterness. Their only consolation is that, unlike the Baltic States, they have been spared the fate of wholesale incorporation into the Soviet Union. Over the past 20 years, their people have been subjected to treachery, aggression, subversion, and tyranny, and their history has been one of economic exploitation, religious persecution, expropriation of property, incessant brainwashing, terror, purge, imprisonment—finally death.

It is argued that the Communist regimes in Eastern Europe have changed, that political prisoners have been freed. They say that now one can buy more consumer goods, that one can listen to Radio Free Europe—unjammed. Perhaps. But answer me this: Does the press print the truth? Do the people speak without fear? Is the government elected by the people and responsible to them alone? Are the churches allowed their freedom? Emphatically no. These so-called changes are only sops thrown to the people by regimes whose sole motivations are fear of revolt and an all-consuming sense of self-preservation. While the outward trappings of repression may be disappearing, the people of each of these countries continue to live under totalitarian rules. The basic tenets of communism as practiced in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe remain unchanged.

Let us not forget that wherever and whenever it exists, communism remains dedicated to the destruction of the individual, while in America, the purpose of government is to serve the individual—to protect the individual's life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. In America, the purpose of government is to insure that all individuals are accorded an equal opportunity to fulfill themselves. Behind the Iron Curtain, however, the purpose of government is to strip men of all individuality, to destroy the church, the family, and property and to reduce man to a robot—automatically, mechanically, and mindlessly obedient to the will of the state. The Communist dreams of a world in which the fate of men will hang on the whim of the government.

Now we ask ourselves: Have the Communist regimes behind the Iron Curtain realized their objective? Have they succeeded in crushing the spirit of liberty?—The Hungarian Revolution, the Polish October Days, the Berlin Wall, and the recent Prague demonstrations offer singular, negative testimony. From all indications, the people of Eastern Europe remain antagonistic to the Communist regime, its methods, its purposes, its international connections. They are unconvinced. They are disenchanted. They are hostile. Twenty years of political education have failed to win youth to the side of communism. In Eastern Europe, Communist ideology meets sarcasm, a contemptuous shrug of the shoulders or a yawn from the young generation. And more important, communism has failed to destroy the national identity of the captive nations. The countries of Eastern Europe are rich in national history. Each cherishes its own tradition, its dress, its language and literature. Each treasurers the memory of its heroes, of Kossuth, of Masryk, of Kosciuszko and Shevchenko. To the peoples of the captive nations, communism remains an alien ideology—imposed by Russian arms, and maintained by the brutal efficiency of totalitarian regimes.

What, then, can we, as Americans, do to aid in the restoration of national sovereignty and of personal freedom behind the Iron Curtain? Our policy toward international communism must have two main objectives: 1. To prevent the Communists from extending their domain and to make it costly, dangerous and futile for them to try to do so; 2. to encourage trends within the Communist world toward national sovereignty.

Join me tonight in urging that the United States never accept the status quo in eastern Europe. Let me demand that the United States press further its campaign to secure the power of self-determination for the nations now enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. Let us demand that America avail itself of every opportunity to expose the methods, the implications, and the consequences of Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe.

If the cause of liberty is to be truly served, let us continue to demand the freedom of the Poles, the Ukrainians, the Czechs, and the Hungarians.

With particular reference to the Ukrainian people, I would like to make a few remarks. The Ukrainians, despite Russian claims to the contrary, are not Russians. They have a proud history, culture, and tradition all their own, separate and distinct from any other nation. They were an independent people, free and proud.

The Communists, in the name of Pan-slavism, overran and subverted the independence of the Ukraine, they now try to claim that the Ukrainians are actually Russians, that, in effect, they are one. Let this claim not go unanswered.

Let us press on with a demand that the Reds pull out of the Baltic States, that they return to the Bulgarians and Rumanians the reins of their own government, and that they remove themselves from the Balkans.

We are a world leader. Let us not fail to act like one.

If there were no hope that our goals of liberty could be realized, none of us would be here tonight. If there were no basis to our cause, my address tonight would be hollow.

But our goals can be realized and our cause is right.

To the Russian Communists, I say you cannot succeed in stamping out the national spirit of your slaves. To our allies, I say the Russians must not succeed. To you I say, they will not succeed.

There are those who question the need for Captive Nations Week observances. Let them look at the howls of indignation arising from the Kremlin.

There are those who would maintain the status quo in Europe. Let them look at the aims of communism.

There are those who would appease. Let them look to Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Vietnam.

And if after searching, they do not see, let them look to their Creator, for they are blind.

And so, in closing, as we gather here and meditate on the lot of our brothers behind the Iron Curtain, we must resolve that their fate is not sealed, that they are not doomed to an endless hell on earth, that they will not be forgotten, for in a very real sense, their bravery is our strength and their determination is our own will to survive.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in this era of emphasis upon human rights, the term "Captive Nations Week" would seem an impossible anomaly had it not been for so long so bitter a reality that there are captive nations. Not only in the United States is this an era of stress upon the right to freedom and justice for the individual and upon the right to independence of all peoples, but, the world over, there is an ideological stirring and definite movement to promote respect for human rights.

The United Nations, since its inception in 1945, has sponsored and received worldwide support for various conventions designed specifically to prevent "man's inhumanity to man." There have been adopted conventions to liberate humanity from such shackles as still exist in the fields of slavery, forced labor, discriminations against women, and various other indignities to the individual

Yet during the very years of greatest activity to promote such freedoms we find the continuing denial of liberty to a whole body of nations. Those captive nations stretch from the Baltic Sea to the Mediterranean, from the Elbe to the Black Sea. Domination by the Soviet Union began in the early days of World War II. The Iron Curtain dropped across the middle of the continent of Europe by the U.S.S.R. to this day has not been lifted—though, happily, it has worn a little thin in spots.

For these were nations which fell behind it with a history of independence dating—with some unhappy intervals—from the Middle Ages. There were nations such as Poland, Lithuania, Hungary. There were nations of great modern development, such as Czechoslovakia. There were numerous other countries and peoples with records of national identity and independence well established in history. There were tens of millions of peoples who were by tradition, by training, and by inclination abhorrent to this sudden exposure to dominance from the outside; but who were, even collectively, unable to withstand the inroads of Soviet power.

Those tens of millons of people have been now for more than 20 years the victims of a nearly intolerable situation. The evidences among them of discontent and rebellion have taken various forms: some open and active; some more restrained but clearly recognizable; some latent but undeniable. There has been open defiance, such as that of Bulgaria in its recent dealings with Communist China. There has been, too, such a considerable degree of growing independence among them that the hope of a restoration of liberty—never dead—has risen higher and higher with the passing years.

More power to it. It is the spirit of liberty and the love of freedom in its perpetual effort toward accomplishment that we hail in Captive Nations Week.

Undocument Charge Against the American Friends Service Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 20, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, last week the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, of which I am a member, published a study which impugned the integrity and the loyalty of the American Friends Service Committee. This study, written by a French journalist, accused the American Friends Service Committee of being "well known as a transmission belt for the Communist apparatus." I issued a statement at that time in which I condemned this reckless charge against one of our Nation's finest humanitarian organizations. I ask unanimous consent that my statement, an editorial on this matter which appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of July 16, 1965, and a statement by Mr. Colin W. Bell, executive secretary of the American Friends Service Committee, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUGH SCOTT

A study of "Techniques of Soviet Propaganda" just issued by the chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, of which I am a member, gives what I believe to be a shocking description of the American Friends Service Committee. The author, Suzanne Labin, describes this humanitarian organization, whose record of good works needs no elaboration by me, as being "well known as a transmission belt for the Communist apparatus."

I do not always share the views of the American Friends Service Committee. But I cannot stand silently by in the face of this unfortunate and undocumented charge contained in a study issued by a subcommittee of which I am a member.

The views expressed in this study are not the views of the subcommittee as a whole because the subcommittee as a whole did not confer on the study's release. They are essentially the views of Mrs. Labin.

MCCARTHYITE REPORT

A 1958 Bulletin editorial said of the American Friends Service Committee: "It can get in with its ministrations where many other organizations cannot penetrate because it is well known to have no political objectives. It is one organization nobody wants to investigate—it operates in a goldfish bowl."

Now somebody has "investigated" the AFSC, if it can be called that. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has put out a 64-page report dealing with Communists and propaganda. One undocumented paragraph in it makes out that the American Friends Service Committee is "a transmission belt for the Communist apparatus."

The paragraph says the AFSC "shelters half the pacifist groups." Lest there be any doubt, the AFSC is a pacifist organization. It has been devoted to the cause of peace since its founding. It denies "sheltering" any organization. But what does the charge mean, anyway? There's no explanation.

One Marion Miller, a former FBI undercover agent in the Communist Party, is quoted as having testified that "much of the propaganda literature of the Peace Committee was written within and distributed by this AFSC, well known as a transmission belt for the Communist apparatus."

Miss Miller's testimony is well known to the AFSC. She related that Communists used AFSC literature in the early 1950's because of the respectability of the AFSC and its separation from the Communists. The AFSC brought all its major publications of that time to her and asked her to identify the one or ones that had been so used and she could not, says Colin Bell, AFSC executive secretary.

The service committee believes it possible that some Communist-connected group could have used its literature. It doesn't know one way or the other. Neither, apparently, does the Senate subcommittee, or it would have said so. Even if this could be proved, however, what would it tell us about the AFSC? It would simply prove that Communists use other people's pacifist literature.

Innuendo-laden charges of the sort found in the subcommittee report deserve the most meticulous documentation. None is supplied. The result is the McCarthyite smearing of an honorable organization.

STATEMENT OF COLIN W. BELL

A report of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, whose chairman is Senator EASTLAND of Mississippi, has just been published. It is entitled, "Techniques of Soviet Propaganda," and is written by a French journalist, Suzanne Labin, who is a writer of anti-Communist books.

One small paragraph of this 64-page report impugns the integrity and the loyalty of the American Friends Service Committee, which the author states is "well known as a transmission belt for the Communist apparatus." This charge is completely untrue and undocumented.

The AFSC was formed in 1917 by a group of distinguished members of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers). It is a corporation of over 200 Quakers drawn from many of the society's yearly meetings across the country, and controlled by a board of 55 Friends, though it is not an organ of any one yearly meeting.

For 300 years Quakers have prayed and worked and witnessed for the nonviolent ordering of human society, and have done so out of deep religious conviction concerning the nature of the Christian message. That we have failed so far is evidenced by history, but history has also recognized the sincerity of our belief and much of what Friends have stood for in the past has now been accepted by society.

The AFSC is an emanation of these religious convictions. We have tried to heal the tragedies caused by war in a great number of countries for 48 years. Our only criterion in relief work has been dire human need, and we have been and are supported in this work by countless Americans of many faiths. Although carried out in situations of grave political tension, we have never to our knowledge caused offense to the governments of countries in which we work, or to our own Government, to which we have always related openly and harmoniously through succeeding administrations.

But it is basic to our beliefs that we are impelled to try to prevent the breakdowns into violence which cause human suffering and degeneration of soul. Violence begins in the hearts of men and takes many forms—greed, tyranny, social injustice, racial and religious prejudice, the denial of rights and the forfeiture of responsibilities. These are our problems, and the problems of our fellow men, and many of our programs in this country and elsewhere are disinterested efforts to involve ourselves and others in human betterment, in the establishment of just conditions for all, and in a greater understanding of the common dilemmas of men.

We believe that a citizen's deepest spiritual insights form the true basis on which he may know how best to serve his own country and all men. Many among us are pacifists; that is, we do not believe that violence, of which war is the ultimate expression, can achieve the good life and the freedom of spirit to which all men have the right. Insofar as the violence in our own natures allows, we must witness to that belief. In a world such as we now live in, the moral dilemmas of the pacifist are very great. Perhaps they are only exceeded by the moral dilemmas of the nonpacifist.

When we speak, write, or distribute literature, we do so under our own banner. We expect there have been occasions in nearly 50 years when others over whom we have no control and with whom we have no relationship have used our material to their own ends.

We have no activities to hide from anyone who genuinely seeks to know the truth, and we are neither beholden to nor affiliated with any group, party, or movement in ways that are not open for all to see.

We do believe that where there are gulfs of hatred, misunderstanding, cruelty, ignorance, prejudice, indifference, or absence of normal human relations, it is both a religious and a democratic duty for men to seek ways of bridging those gulfs. We have not deviated from this concern, although in the vicissitudes of history our aims have often been misunderstood. We have been called, at different times, adherents of the "America First" concept when we advocated noninvolvement in war; unpatriotic when we opposed universal military training; pro-Japanese when we worked for justice for Japanese-Americans; pro-German when we fed German children; pro-Communist when we seek to understand the minds of those from whom we are estranged by an ideology in many ways utterly alien to our hopes for the ordering of human affairs.

We do not accept at all the concept that ideological opponents have a diabolical cunning against which our citizens have no intellectual defense or spiritual stamina, and we consider that this concept subverts the vigor of our democratic processes. Indeed, we have faith in the constructive results which can flow from real communication across barriers; and the higher the barrier the greater the need.

We shall have to bear this situation today as we have in the past. We expect to support and work with and for our Government, as we always have done, and are now doing (in numbers of our programs). We expect to make clear and open criticism of national policies whenever it seems right, and therefore truly patriotic, to do so. And we expect to continue following the same cause though the tides of history and the moods of men change their allegiances, their fears, and their hopes.

We are weak and fallible humans, and we make mistakes as all others do, but we are not ignorant of the world and its ways, we are not seeking our own benefit at the expense of others, and we are free to do our best as God helps us to do it.

The Problem of Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1965

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, there is a fortunate and commendable awareness among our congressional colleagues that conservation of our national water resources is vital for our American future. All know that there is widespread activity in seeking solutions to the problem. Paramount to success is what we do to prevent water pollution and are doing to rectify what damage has been done.

No one is more qualified to summarize these efforts than the very able Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, of Minnesota. A member of our Public Works Committee he has devoted years of study and effort in this field. In the certainty that his recent speech before the 52d national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress will be welcomed for its wealth of information, I include it in the RECORD:

THE PROBLEM OF WATER POLLUTION

(By Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, of Minnesota)

Thank you very much, President Buckman, and good morning, or good noon distinguished guests, officers, delegates and friends at the 52d annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. President, I do hope you'll accept my tardy slip and the absence slip in the last few days. I wanted very, very much to be at some of your work sessions, where the real nuts and bolts work of the conference were carried out. I figured I missed not being with the Committee on Industrial Uses of Water and Water Pollution, and I appreciate Judge Sturrock taking over, and my other good friends on the subcommittee. We have been quite tied up with long sessions in the committee, and with floor work. But I'm pleased to be here. You practically made a speech—in fact, you did make this speech, and I'll try to make mine as brief as I possibly can.

It's a real honor, and a privilege and a personal pleasure over these years to have been associated with the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. You've been dedicated to the utilization of water and all of its uses, as well as its conservation and its preservation. This is my 19th year now that I've sat on the House Public Works Committee, sat as chairman for the past several years of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and very active on the flood control subcommittee, and, of course, about 10 years ago, introduced what became the first real significant Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956, and subsequently amended in 1961, and now again in the process of further being amended by the Water Quality Act of 1965.

There is testimony to the ever-growing awareness throughout the land on the part of our citizens and industry, groups of all different sectors, conservation, industy people, recreationists, you name it. And in this battle, it is your organization that has made one of the major contributions, and constantly, in a solid, actual, learned and informed way calling attention to the Nation and to your representatives in the Congress about the importance of paying attention to this ever-growing problem which only recently is receiving the serious consideration that it deserves.

You recall, earlier, in the early stages, many people believed the problem was serious, but they tended to regard it as somewhat as Mark Twain referred to the weather—everybody would talk about it but nobody did anything about it. Well, we have been doing something about it, and have been continuing to do something, and a considerable amount, but as the President said so accurately, a great deal more remains yet to be done.

And your informative monthly Reporter noted last December that the ever increasing need for some real advance toward solutions of problems of water pollution is rapidly emerging as the most insistent of our needs in the water use and conservation. In the April issue, it put the urgency of the problem before us in these well chosen words, and I quote. "The times are pregnant with a new concept, the realization that an ample supply of water of suitable quality to assure the forward progress of the United States can no longer be taken for granted. Only an adequate and sustained mobilization of brains and action can do this."

When the National Rivers and Harbors Congress was founded in 1901, there were about 77 million Americans. Fifty years later, the population had doubled to 154 million. But in that same period of 50 years, of one-half a century, the water use in the United States increased by fivefold, or five times, from somewhat about 40 billion gallons a day in 1901 to over 200 billion gallons a day 50 years later. The estimated population now is about 194 million people. I recall in the years since I've been here since 1947, it has increased, I judge, close to 45 million people. Elmer Staats, the distinguished Director of the Budget, or Associate Director might help me. Am I correct? Is the population of France about 45 million or in that range? I was thinking of West Germany. But practically a whole new nation. We've added 45 million new people, who not only need water, but more water per capita than before.

Now with this estimated population of 194 million, water use this year was forecast at about 372 billion gallons a day. Now water resource development projects, to which this organization lends valuable, not only guidance, but support and leadership in their adoption and execution, can be expected to increase the dependable supply of fresh water from about 315 billion gallons a day to 515 billion gallons a day by 1980, and 650 billion gallons a day by the year 2000. By 1980, and that's only 16 years away, not very far—it's amazing how fast time goes—by 1980 we will have approximately 515 billion gallons day of water, but by that time in 1980, experts today predict that water use will have risen to as much as 600 billion gallons a day. In other words, we're going to have a deficit of 80 billion gallons of water. I'm not going to belabor you with the details. We saw this way back in 1955, 10 years ago.

We drew a very simple chart you can visualize on the screen behind us, a white chart with a straight line, somewhat inclining toward the right. That would be labeled the available supply of water. It's fairly constant. Then you take a lower curve, beginning lower down in the left-hand corner and sweeping sharply, rapidly upward, and about 1980 you have the intersection between the demand for water, both human and industrial, and agricultural, and the availability. At that point, around 1980, we knew that the sands in the hourglass would have run out, the bells would have rung, and the red lights flashed, we would have been in a crisis.

Now we've already got a shortage of water. You take what used to be the water-rich Northeast, critically lacks enough water right now for the ordinary uses of its population. Who in the world would have ever thought not long ago that we'd be able to drink ourselves out of water? It reminds me of the story my father used to tell me when he was a young man. We live up in northeastern Minnesota. And as they enter the Canadian border to pay a visit, he recalled this great big billboard sign advertising a well-known beverage, a soft drink. It says, "Drink Canada Dry." He says, "We tried and never made it."

He had a story of one man who was a little more addicted to the use of ethyl hydroxyl, more commonly known as alcohol in a different form. And he was overdoing it, and his poor wife, Mary, at her wits end, finally on a dark summer evening took him on a hill that overlooked a lovely valley below where at one end was a distillery with all of its lights ablaze, and the smoke belching forth full steam. And Mary said: "Look, John, for 20 years you've been trying to drink them dry, but can't you see you'll never catch up to them." And he looked down with admiration and self pride and he said: "Yes, Mary, but I've sure got them working overtime."

But getting back to the simple taking for granted commodity of water, as we have taken for granted air, both becoming more and more critical problems. One of the most complex and insoluable things. There's no substitute for this. You know my Irish friends claim they do find a substitute on St. Patty's Day for awhile. It doesn't last too long. You can't squeeze it. You can't squeeze a drop of water out a glass of water. You can't find a synthetic. You can do it for gasoline, for rubber, as we did in World War II. You can develop new alloys as we've done in very recent years, in high-temperature, high-heat-resistant alloys have made possible these fabulous high thermo propulsion engines that send up the missiles. You develop new types of fuels and synthetic fuels, both liquid, gas, and now solid, that will eventually project a vehicle up to space. About 5 years ago I made this statement, and it didn't seem to cause much attention or interest.

My background being science, by way of explanation, my big love always was. I was good in science. I did very well in school. I must be honest though. I flunked English. You can't be strong in all categories, as some of the able, brilliant administrators we have here. But I made a statement in 1958 or 1960, as we were approaching the amendments of 1960, that technology and the effort and the energy and the financing and the total overall effort which we will exert and put behind the space program, as we did behind the atomic and the thermo nuclear or hydrogen program earlier, that that effort will place an American or Americans on the moon, and return them to earth safely long before we shall have solved the problem simply of having a good supply of water of quality and quantity to meet the many multivaried needs of this ever-growing and becoming more complex society of ours. And President Buckman pointed out very clearly. And I still repeat that statement.

Now it isn't that it can't be done. It just will require a greater effort, as the President said, as your own magazine article last April said. We've been aware of this. We've been trying to push ahead. There are those who say we can't afford to spend the billions of dollars that the whole program will cost. Well they said the same thing about the housing program. They said the same thing about the urban redevelopment program, and I see many mayors and local officials at this conference.

They said the same thing in early days about the atomic and hydrogen program, and later on the jet aircraft program, and then the $20 billion program for space exploration. More intimately with which I am familiar, the highway program. We can't afford $1 billion for roads.

Why we can't afford it. We'll go bankrupt. We're finding out we're going to be saving over $7 billion a year in economic savings alone because of the efficiency and safety with which we have this mass flow of goods and services and human beings across the United States, connecting every major metropolitan and populated city of the country. Not only the safety and ease and efficiency, but look at the lives we're going to be saving, perhaps as high as 9,000 to 10,000 lives a year. We killed last year, I believe, close to 46,000 men, women, and children, all civilians, maybe a few military mixed in, combined in with them. And it hardly stirs a ripple in the newspapers. Why that's 10,000 more innocent civilians, given our highways, and byways and roads and streets 10,000 Americans and civilians, including women and children that were killed in the 42 months of Korea, back in 1951 and 1952, and 1953. And they were military men. Yet they say you can't afford it.

Why, of course, you can afford it. You have to. And it's got to be done. And I want to express my public appreciation and commendation to my colleagues that have worked with me in the House Public Works Committee and others in the House on both sides of the aisle, those who work on the Appropriations Committee, particularly my very dear friend for many, many years, my mentor and tutor, so to say, Chairman MIKE KIRWAN, who will be most appropriately, truly justifiably named, I understand, at a luncheon this afternoon, for a most significant award.

So water—this whole problem can be licked and it will be licked. We've done a tremendous job. I recall in the early years when we suggested grants, Federal grants to municipalities, and they were bona fide arguments raised by people who really believed—and experienced people—believed that this would slow up the program.

On the contrary, it accelerated the program. To the everlasting credit of the local municipalities, I want to commend and to pay public tribute, and to call public attention to local officials, to mayors and the councils, and city engineers, and to health authorities, and to the citizens that supported them. In 1955 and the 3 years previously the total national average expenditure for water pollution and treatment plants was at a $222 million level, and began gradually to inch upward to over $400 million—$450 million—$480 million, more than double. We passed the Blatnik public works accelerated program, I believe back in about 1961 or 1962, and a good deal of that money went into pollution treatment facilities. We finally reached a little over the $800 million level.

It has slipped down some now to about the $660 million level. We should be around the $800 million plus—$850 million plus level of spending, to a little better than hold our own, to hold our own, and to close the gap that has been increasing wider each year. You know, even now the gap is a little bit wider. We have more polluted water than we had the year before, not only more polluted water, but more complicated pollutants. It's not just a matter of health now, with new synthetics, new plastics, the radioactive materials the President referred to.

I want to make just one little statistical—refer to a statistical fact in the field of medicine, with which I have a special interest and a rather limited familiarity. In medicine, if there is an advance made in biochemical research, it is somewhat indicative of an advance leading to chemistry of synthetics and textiles, in dyes and plastics, and many other areas.

In medicine today, three-fourths—you heard me, over 75 percent—of the prescriptions written by doctors every day are for medications and for medicants that were not in existence in 1948, way after World War II. It shows you the incredible advance in the chemistry of matter and breaking up the atom, realining them and creating new substances. You know it's been more than just the human pollutants in the water. We've got into pesticides, and it is now getting more and more complicated. We need to know more about the water, and that's why we authorized seven regional laboratories, and a fresh water laboratory.

I wondered who in the world had to study fresh water. I thought water was water. I never realized the amount of graduate training, years in chemistry, how much we didn't know about water and how much we had to learn. And the reason I clung to that is because we're going to have to work in a joint effort as we worked so beautifully with municipalities on the Federal level, and bring the States in a joint effort to start to work on water quality criteria and standards. I pay tribute, and every bit of it justified and sincere to the municipalities, because of this grant money, instead of swelling their program, for every $1 of Federal money—every Federal dollar went into the treatment plant, the local municipalities on an average raised up $4 to $4½ to $5 and $5½, averaging over 80 percent of the financial burden to be carried on their own shoulders. We gave them just enough of an assist to either stimulate them or motivate them or help them over a hump, to get local public support for a bond issue, or whatever it may be. But it worked. And because it worked so well, we've increased the present $100 million a year authorization by 50 percent in the current bill now in conference in the Congress to $150 million.

I also want to say publicly, and although critically, I hope it will be taken in a positive sense, the one area where we've failed the greatest and received the least amount of support, and undoubtedly in some areas perhaps they couldn't give all the support they could, and others they just, for some reason wouldn't, and that's on the State level. The

States have got to do more. And I commend Governor Rockefeller, even though I'm a strong Democrat. He came forth and said there ought to be a revolving program, meaning if the Federal Government would promise later on to reimburse us, we'll bond ourselves today when the costs are lower and the needs are greatest.

The States have got to do more, both in terms of assisting and getting the principal plants, but also in enforcement. Because I'm not going to be satisfied, and Senator MUSKIE and his colleagues, and my colleagues are not going to be satisfied with merely waiting until a stream is all fouled up, until it stinks to high heaven, and it's so awful and so messy and so miserable that any 6-year-old kid wouldn't go in it, and no puppy dog would walk nearby to lap a little water. We're too intelligent for that.

The minute you see a development in a basin authority knowing the quantity of water and the drainage, and we've got excellent statistics from geological and meteorological and the Corps of Engineers and other agencies, we know pretty well how much the tolerance of a river can be, and when you see the type of use developing, whether it's residential or essentially an industrial, and the type of industrial, or a combination, or residential and industrial, you ought to know and we ought to have a control level, just as you have levels on river gaging, you know, low tide and high tide, we've got to now begin to work on preventive measures. No one can reach up to these tolerances. In other words, we've got to think now and we serve notice in a friendly and positive way because we'll work with them in a helpful way, to the municipalities, but particularly to these industries, and above all to the States, to pay more attention and to utilize the talents of informed and skilled public officials in the field of water utilization, and the research people in the field of water, to utilize and to work out preventive measures, to work out water quality criteria and standards.

Mr. President, you've been more than generous with the time you've allotted me. My fellow Members of the Congress, and my good friends, you have been most patient and most kind with your attention. I appreciate it. I thank you each and every one of you, and I bid you all good luck.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 21, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with this verse of Scripture: Hebrews 12: 2: *Looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith.*

Almighty God, may this day make a new beginning in us of faith, teaching us a more daring venture of trust, constraining us to live radiantly and helpfully, lifting our desires into a purer and holier atmosphere, and causing us to seek what we should have of Thee and what we should do and be.

Grant that we may consider this day as our opportunity for the culture of our spiritual life, otherwise we can make no sense and meaning out of it. May that bundle of instincts, appetites, passions, possibilities, and struggles be developed and refined to be more spiritual, however fierce the battle, however long and desperate the struggle.

We humbly acknowledge that we often find ourselves fighting a hard battle and against heavy odds and we suffer many losses, but encourage Thou us to keep the light of faith burning and inspire us to continue to climb the high mountains and never allow ourselves to loiter in the valley.

Hear us in His name in whom we have the victory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1148. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to utilize its employees more effectively and to improve administrative efficiency.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight Monday next to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 6675.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, in order that the membership may have information prior to receipt of the conference report concerning a summary of the major decisions of the conference committee, I ask unanimous consent that a summary plus tables giving the actuarial data on the conference report may be included at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

(The Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, and chairman of the House-Senate conference committee on H.R. 6675, announced the decisions of the conference committee on H.R. 6675, the Social Security Amendments of 1965, a summary of which is set forth below. Chairman MILLS stated that it was expected that the conference report would be filed by midnight Monday, July 26, and will be available in printed form on Tuesday, July 27. The conference report and statement of managers on the part of the House which will accompany it will contain the detailed decisions on each of the 513 amendments which were added by the Senate. A summary of the major decisions of the conference committee follows.)

BASIC HOSPITAL INSURANCE PLAN

Benefit duration: House provided 60 days of hospital care after a deductible of $40 currently. Senate provided unlimited duration but with a $10 coinsurance for each day in excess of 60. Conference provided 60 days with House bill deductible ($40 currently) and with an additional 30 days with the Senate's $10 coinsurance feature.

Posthospital extended care (skilled nursing home): House provided 20 days of such care with 2 additional days for each unused hospital day but a maximum of 100 days. Senate provided 100 days but imposed a $5 a day coinsurance for each day in excess of 20. Conference adopted Senate version.

Posthospital home-health visits: House authorized 100 visits after hospitalization. Senate increased the number of visits to 175 and deleted requirement of hospitalization. Conference adopted House version.

Outpatient diagnostic services: House imposed a $20 deductible with this amount creditable against an inpatient hospital deductible which was imposed at the same hospital within 20 days. Senate imposed a 20 percent coinsurance on such services, removed the credit against the inpatient hospital deductible but allowed a credit for the deductible as an incurred expense under the voluntary supplementary program (for deductible and reimbursement purposes). Conference adopted Senate version.

Psychiatric facilities: House provided for 60 days of pyschiatric hospital care with a 180-day lifetime limit in the voluntary supplementary program. Senate moved these services over into basic hospital insurance program and increased the lifetime limit to 210 days. Conference accepted the Senate version but reduced the lifetime limit to 190 days.

House excluded any extended care facility primary for the care and treatment of mental diseases or tuberculosis. Senate included such facilities but made both psychiatric extended care days and psychiatric hospital days subject to the lifetime limitation of days of care. Conference continued the House exclusion.

Christian Science services: House covered Christian Science sanatoria under hospital services (60 days with $40 deductible). Senate added coverage for extended care and visiting nurse services. Under the conference agreement, Christian Science services will be covered as follows: Christian Science sanatoria services, 60 days with $40 deductible plus 30 additional days at $10 coinsurance per day, as hospital service; plus an additional 30 days in a Christian Science sanatorium as extended-care facility services with a $5 per day coinsurance feature.

Scope of services, specialists: House excluded medical doctor services in the field of pathology, radiology, physiatry, or anesthesiology from basic hospital insurance benefit (but provided for their payment under supplementary medical insurance program). Senate included these services if billed through a hospital. Conference accepted House version.

Emergency services for areas immediately bordering the United States: Senate provided hospital services in border areas immediately outside the United States where comparable services are not as accessible in the United States for a beneficiary who becomes ill in this country. Conference adopted Senate amendment.

Interns: House included, under inpatient hospital services, the services of medical interns and residents under approved training programs. Senate extended this provision to dental interns and residents in hospitals under approved training programs. Conference accepted Senate addition.

Drugs: House limited drugs to certain standard drug formularies and to those approved by hospital pharmacy and drug therapeutics committees. Senate added the Homeopathic Pharmacopoeia to the list of formularies and added a provision to include combination drugs if their principal ingredient is listed in one of the formularies. Conference accepted the Homeopathic Pharmacopoeia provision but did not accept the Senate's combination drug provision.

Eligibility of aliens under transitional provision for the uninsured: House specified that such aliens must have 10 years of residence prior to filing of application. Senate added a requirement of permanent residence but reduced residence requirement to 6 months before application. Conference increased the residence requirement to 5 years and retained requirement of permanent residence.

Federal employees, under transitional provision for the uninsured: House excluded all persons who had been eligible under the Federal Employee's Health Benefits Act of 1959 (FEHBA) if they, or some other individual, had had the opportunity to enroll under that program. Senate excluded only those who are actually covered under FEHBA. Conference limited the scope of the Senate provision so that individuals who retired before February 16, 1965, and were not covered then under FEHBA will be eligible.

Railroad retirement employees. House bill taxed railroad workers and their employers directly under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with major administrative duties to be handled by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Senate put financing feature under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act and railroad retirement account, and with primary responsibility for administration under the Railroad Retirement Board. Conference agreement provided that taxes would be collected under the railroad system but paid into the hospital insurance trust fund. Railroad Retirement Board would determine eligibility but the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would reimburse providers (except Canadian hospitals). Like the Senate amendment, the conference approach would be effective only if the railroad retirement taxable wage base is equivalent to the Federal hospital insurance tax earnings base—but, unlike the Senate amendment, such equivalence would be a continuing requirement which, if not met, would mean the system would revert to the approach provided in the House bill.

Appeals: House limited appeal to a hearing examiner and judicial review to claims of $1,000 or more. Senate reduced this amount to $100. Conference provided that for claims from $100 to $1,000 there would be hearing examiner review but no judicial review. For claims above $1,000 there would be both.

State standard for institutions: Conference accepted (with technical amendment) Senate amendment relating to higher State standards than those necessary for hospital accreditation.

Conference rejected following amendments added by the Senate:

Providing for a comprehensive study and report, with recommendations, on extended care facilities and nursing home care.

Making certain requirements for use of State agencies in certification of facilities.

Relating to transfer agreement between facilities in different States.

Requiring personal notice to health care beneficiaries of benefit rights.

SUPPLEMENTARY MEDICAL INSURANCE

Effective date: House effective date July 1, 1966. Senate effective date January 1, 1967. Conference accepted House version.

Medical services: House bill limited to physicians. Senate bill extended program to dentists performing certain dental surgeon functions and to chiropractors and podiatrists. Conference adopted dental surgeon's services but rejected those of podiatrists and chiropractors.

Eligibility of aliens: House made aliens ineligible unless admitted for permanent residence. Senate added a requirement of 10 years of residence. Conference reduced requirement to 5 years of residence and made any individual eligible if he was eligible for social security.

Drug study: Senate authorized a study of the feasibility of extending the program to prescribed drugs. Conference rejected this provision.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE—NEW TITLE XIX

Administering agency: House required that the single State agency administering the medical assistance program must be the agency administering title I or XVI (the welfare agency). Senate provided that any single State agency may be chosen by the State to administer the program providing the agency administering title I or XVI be used to determine eligibility. Conference adopted Senate version.

Future termination of existing medical vendor programs: House required that all existing medical programs in the five titles of the Social Security Act would be terminated on June 30, 1967. Senate gave States the option of continuing under existing law or under new program. Conference would terminate existing programs on December 31, 1969.

Kerr-Mills for children: House provided that dependent children and specified relatives caring for them under the age of 21 could be included even though they did not meet requirements for need and age under the State plans for aid to families with dependent children, but were otherwise qualified. Senate included all individuals under 21 and adults caring for them. Conference adopted Senate provision as to the coverage of children under 21 but accepted House provision as to coverage of the adult caretakers.

Dental services for children: House made dental services for children under 21 optional. Senate made them mandatory. Conference accepted House version.

State participation in non-Federal share: House provided that there must be only State participation in non-Federal share of matching by July 1, 1970. Senate provided an alternative under which local funds could be used after that date with certain safeguards. Conference adopted the Senate version.

Rejected Senate amendments: (1) Imposing Federal standards as to fire and safety on participating institutions; (2) requiring that an individual will be entitled to medical assistance from the provider of his choice.

OTHER AMENDMENTS RELATING TO HEALTH CARE AND WELFARE

Services for emotionally disturbed children: Senate authorized special project grants for emotionally disturbed children; and authorized a study on prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of emotionally disturbed children. Conference removed the added authorization for project grants, but approved the study.

Child welfare services: Senate removed earmarking provision of existing law for "day care" services and increased child welfare authorizations to levels provided in the bill for maternal and child health and crippled children's programs. Conference approved Senate addition and established January 1, 1966, as the effective date.

SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Retirement test (earning limitation). House provided for expansion of the $1 deduction for each $2 of earnings band (above the fully exempt $1,200 in existing law) from $1,700 to $2,400. Senate version increased the fully exempt amount from $1,200 to $1,800 and extended the $2 for $1 band to cover earnings between $1,800 and $3,000. Conference increased the fully exempt amount to $1,500 and applied the $2 for $1 band on earnings between $1,500 and $2,700.

Provisions relating to the disability insurance program

1. Definition: House provided that an individual would be disabled if his disability had lasted 6 months. It also reduced the waiting period by 1 month. Senate provided that the disability have lasted, or can be expected to last, 12 months for eligibility. It retained waiting period in existing law. Conference adopted Senate version.

2. Blindness: Senate added an alternative for insured status for disability benefits of six quarters of coverage, acquired at any time, for individuals who meet liberalized definition of blindness. (For insured status under existing law, an individual (1) must have at least 20 quarters of coverage in the 40 quarters ending with the quarter in which the disability begins and (2) must be fully insured.) Under the Senate definition for both the freeze and benefit purposes the following degree of blindness was deemed disabling: Central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye with the use of correcting lenses, or visual acuity greater than 20/200 if accompanied by a limitation in the fields of vision such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle no greater than 20°.

(Under existing law, for benefit purposes, an individual must be precluded from engaging in any substantial gainful activity by reason of a physical or mental impairment. The following definition of blindness is deemed disabling for disability "freeze" purposes: Central visual acuity of 5/200 or less in the better eye with use of correcting lens. An eye in which the visual field is reduced to five degrees or less concentric contraction shall be considered as having a visual acuity of 5/200 or less.)

Conference substituted the following two provisions for the Senate amendment:

1. Young workers who are blind and disabled: Establishes alternative insured status requirement for workers disabled before age 31 of one-half of the quarters elapsing after age 21 up to the point of disability with a minimum of six quarters. To qualify for this alternative, the worker would have to meet the statutory definition of blindness for the disability "freeze" noted above. Worker will, however, have to meet the other regular requirements for entitlement to disability benefits, including inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity.

2. Older workers who are blind and disabled: Provides that those individuals aged 55 or over who meet the statutory definition of blindness in the disability "freeze" could qualify for cash benefits on the basis of their inability to engage in their past occupation or occupations. Their benefits would not be paid, however, if they were actually engaging in any substantial gainful activity.

3. Vocational rehabilitation for disability beneficiaries: Conference adopted Senate provision that State vocational rehabilitation agencies will be reimbursed from the social security trust funds for the cost of rehabilitation services furnished to individuals who are entitled to disability insurance benefits or to a disabled child's benefits, except that the total sums available for this purpose could not, in any year, exceed 1 percent of the disability benefits paid in the previous year.

4. Offset for workmen's compensation: Senate provided that the social security disability benefits for any month for which a worker is receiving a workmen's compensation benefit will be reduced to the extent that the total benefits payable to him and his dependents under both programs exceed 80 percent of his average monthly earnings

prior to the onset of disability, but with the reduction periodically adjusted to take account of changes in national average earnings levels. The offset provision will be applicable with respect to benefits payable for months after December 1965 on the basis of disabilities commencing after June 1, 1965. Conference adopted Senate version.

Coverage provisions

1. Cash tips: House provided for the coverage of tips reported by the employee to the employer—with the employer to report such income and withhold for income tax purposes. No liability would be imposed on the employer for tips that are not reported nor in cases where he does not have or is not given funds to cover the employee's share of the tax. Senate provided that cash tips received would be considered as self-employment income. Conference generally follows House provision for social security and income tax purposes with the major exception that no social security tax liability would be imposed on the employer.

2. Coverage of doctors of medicine: House covered doctors of medicine effective for taxable years ending after December 31, 1965. Senate moved up the effective date to taxable years ending on or after December 31, 1965. Conference adopted Senate version.

3. Ministers: Senate reopened to April 15, 1966, the period (which expired on April 15, 1965) during which ministers who have been in the ministry for at least 2 years may file waiver certificates electing social security coverage. Conference accepted.

4. Coverage of employees of State and local governments:

1. House added "Kentucky" and "Alaska" as States which could provide coverage for State and local employees under the split-system provision. Senate and conference deleted "Kentucky."

2. Senate reopened until July 1, 1970, a provision of law permitting the State of Maine to treat teaching and nonteaching employees actually in the same retirement system as though they were in separate retirement systems for social security coverage purposes. Conference accepted but limited option to July 1, 1967.

3. Senate authorized the State of Iowa and the State of North Dakota to modify their coverage agreements to exclude from social security coverage certain service performed in any calendar quarter in the employ of a school, college, or university by a student if the remuneration for such service is less than $50. Conference accepted.

4. Conference accepted Senate validation of past coverage of employees in certain school districts in Alaska.

The conference also adopted the following Senate amendments on social security:

1. Remarried widows: Benefits would be payable to widows aged 60 or over and to widowers aged 62 or over who remarry—the amount of the benefit to be equal to 50 percent of the primary benefit of the deceased spouse, if that amount is higher than her wife's benefit as a result of the remarriage.

2. Children's benefits:

(a) Included in definition of child is a child who cannot inherit his father's intestate personal property if the father had acknowledged him in writing, had been ordered by a court to contribute to his support, had been judicially decreed to be his father or had been shown by other satisfactory evidence to be his father and was living with or contributing to his support.

(b) An exception is provided so that child's benefits would not terminate if child is adopted by his brother or sister after death of worker. Under present law benefits terminate unless he is adopted by his stepparent, grandparent, uncle, or aunt after death of worker on whose earnings record he is getting benefits.

3. Social security records: The Social Security Administration is required to furnish information to help locate deserting parent or husband to any welfare agency or court. Conference accepted amendment with modification that information must be transmitted through a welfare agency (if to a court), that an actual public assistance case must be involved, and that all non-disclosure provisions be complied with.

4. Court fees: A court that renders a judgment favorable to a claimant in an action arising under the social security program is permitted to set a reasonable fee (not in excess of 25 percent of past due benefits which become payable by reason of the judgment) for an attorney who successfully represented the claimant. The Secretary would be permitted to certify payment of the fee to the attorney out of such past due benefits.

Conference rejected the following social security amendments added by the Senate.

Provision that the Secretary (rather than State agency) can make determinations of disability or cessation of disability where medical and other information or evidence indicates, on its face, that the individual is under a disability or that the disability has ceased.

Reducing from 62 to 60 the age at which an eligible worker could elect to start getting an actuarially reduced benefit.

Providing that the amount of the 1965 social security benefit increase would not be counted toward the Veterans' Administration income limitation.

Provision relating to reduction of total employer tax as to a worker employed consecutively by two affiliated corporations.

Expansion of disabled child's benefit to children disabled before age 22 (now prior to age 18).

FINANCING OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND HOSPITAL INSURANCE PROGRAMS

Earnings base: The House bill established an earnings base of $5,600 a year in 1966 and $6,600 in 1971 and thereafter. The Senate provided an earnings base of $6,600 in 1966. The conference accepted the Senate figure of $6,600 in 1966.

The following are the tax rates for the House, Senate, and conference for both systems:

OASDI tax rates

[In percent]

Years	Employer-employee rate			Self-employed rate, conference
	House	Senate	Conference	
1966	8.0	7.7	7.7	5.8
1967-68	8.0	7.7	7.8	5.9
1969-72	8.8	9.0	8.8	6.6
1973 and after	9.6	9.9	9.7	7.0

Hospital insurance tax rates

[In percent]

Years	Employer-employee rate			Self-employed rate, conference
	House	Senate	Conference	
1966	0.7	0.65	0.7	0.35
1967-70	1.0	1.0	1.0	.5
1971-72	1.0	1.1	1.0	.5
1973-75	1.1	1.3	1.1	.55
1976-79	1.2	1.4	1.2	.6
1980-86	1.4	1.6	1.4	.7
1987 and after	1.6	1.7	1.6	.8

The conference established the allocation to the disability insurance trust fund at 0.70 percent of taxable wages and 0.525 of self-employment income. The figures under existing law are 0.50 and 0.375 percent, respectively.

INCOME TAX PROVISIONS

The Senate had deleted the House provision which would have limited the deduction for medical care expense of taxpayers (or dependent parents) aged 65 or over to the amount in excess of 3 percent of adjusted gross income and which would have limited the amount of medicine and drug costs included in medical care expenses to the amounts in excess of 1 percent of adjusted gross income. The conference restored the House provision.

The Senate had also deleted the House provision which would have allowed all taxpayers to deduct one-half of the cost of medical-care insurance (up to $250 a year) outside the regular medical expense category. Conference restored House provision but reduced maximum deduction to $150 a year.

The conference accepted Senate amendment which eliminates all maximum limitations on the medical expense deduction for all taxpayers.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Effective date: House put effective date of increased Federal matching through formula change for all five public assistance programs at January 1, 1966. Senate advanced date to June 30, 1965. Conference adopted House version.

Income exemptions:

1. Aid to families with dependent children: Senate added an amendment which allows the State, at its option, to disregard up to $50 per month of earned income of any three dependent children under the age of 18 in the same home. Conference modified Senate amendment so as to put a family maximum of $150 in earnings per month not limited to three children but no child could have earnings of more than $50 exempted.

2. Aid to the permanently and totally disabled and combined program (title XVI): Senate added an exemption of earnings, at the option of the State, for recipients of aid to the permanently and totally disabled. As is the case of the aged, the first $20 per month of earnings and one-half of the next $60 could be exempted. In addition, any additional income and resources could be exempted as part of an approved plan to achieve self-support during the time the recipient was undergoing vocational rehabilitation (essentially as under existing law in the aid to the blind program). Conference accepted Senate provision.

3. Income exemption for all public assistance programs: Senate allowed States, at their option, to disregard not more than $7 per month of any income in all five public assistance programs. Conference adopted Senate amendment but reduced figure to $5 per month.

Protective payments: House included a provision for protective payments to third persons on behalf of old-age assistance recipients (and recipients of combined adult program, title XVI) unable to manage their money because of physical or mental incapacity. Senate extended the same provision for protective payments to the programs of aid to the blind and aid to the permanently and totally disabled. Conference accepted Senate provision.

Children in school: Senate added an amendment broadening the definition of "school" in existing law (high school) to include any school or college, at the State's option, with respect to continuing payments under Aid to Families With Dependent Children from age 18 up to age 21 if they are attending such schools. Conference adopted Senate amendment.

Uniform matching: Conference accepted Senate amendment which would permit a

State that has a medical assistance program under title XIX to claim Federal sharing in total expenditures for money payments under other titles, under the same formula used for determining the Federal share for medical assistance under title XIX.

MISCELLANEOUS

Conference rejected additional language added by Senate relating to optometrists' services under all titles of the Social Security Act. (House language on optometrists' services retained.)

TABLE 1.—*Summary of 1st-year costs under H.R. 6675*

[In millions of dollars]

	Trust funds			General Treasury		
	House	Senate	Conference	House	Senate	Conference
Health care programs:						
Basic hospital insurance	$2,190	$2,403	$2,210	$275	$295	$290
Voluntary supplementary medical	[1] 600	[1] 600	600	600	600	600
MAA liberalization				200	200	200
Total	2,790	3,003	2,810	1,075	1,095	1,090
OASDI:						
7 percent benefit increase	1,430	1,470	1,470			
Child school benefit	195	195	195			
Broader definition of "child"		10	10			
Child disabled at 18 to 21		10				
Blind disability		120	5			
Reduced benefits at 60	165	590	165			
Transitional benefits at 72	140	140	140			
Disabled definition	105	40	40			
Retirement test	65	590	295			
Total	2,100	3,165	2,320			
Public assistance and child health:						
Increase in formula				150	150	150
TB and mental exclusion				75	75	75
Coverage of MA					50	40
Maternal and child health				60	61	61
Miscellaneous				6	13	13
Total				291	349	339
Income tax changes				−82		−97
Total, all programs	4,890	6,168	5,130	1,284	1,444	1,332
Grand total, House			6,174			
Grand total, Senate			7,612			
Grand total, conference			6,462			

[1] Contributions of participants.

TABLE 2

OASDI TAX RATES

[In percent]

Years	Employer-employee rate			Self-employed rate, conference
	House	Senate	Conference	
1966	8.0	7.7	7.7	5.8
1967-68	8.0	7.7	7.8	5.9
1969-72	8.8	9.0	8.8	6.6
1973 and after	9.6	9.9	9.7	7.0

HOSPITAL INSURANCE TAX RATES

[In percent]

1966	0.7	0.65	0.7	0.35
1967-70	1.0	1.0	1.0	.50
1971-72	1.0	1.1	1.0	.50
1973-75	1.1	1.3	1.1	.55
1976-79	1.2	1.4	1.2	.60
1980-86	1.4	1.6	1.4	.70
1987 and after	1.6	1.7	1.6	.80

COMBINED OASDI AND HOSPITAL INSURANCE TAX RATES AND TAXES UNDER CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

Years	Employer-employee		Self-employed	
	Rate	Maximum amount	Rate	Maximum amount
	Percent		*Percent*	
1966	8.4	$554.40	6.15	$405 90
1967-68	8.8	580.80	6.40	422.40
1969-72	9.8	646.80	7.10	468.60
1973-75	10.8	712.80	7.55	498.30
1976-79	10.9	719.40	7.60	501.60
1980-86	11.1	732.60	7.70	508.20
1987 and after	11.3	745.80	7.80	514.80

TABLE 3.—*Changes in actuarial balance of OASDI system, expressed in terms of estimated level-cost as percentage of taxable payroll*

Item	OASI	DI	Total
Actuarial balance of previous system	+0.14	−0.13	+0.01
Earnings base increase to $6,600	+.51	+.04	+.55
Revised contribution schedule	+.09	+.20	+.29
Extensions of coverage	+.01		+.01
7 percent benefit increase	−.59	−.05	−.64
Earnings test liberalization	−.14		−.14
Child's benefits to age 22 if in school	−.10	−.02	−.12
Reduced widow's benefits at age 60			
Disability definition revision		−.01	−.01
Transitional insured status at age 72	−.01		−.01
Broader definition of child	−.01		−.01
Total effect of changes	−.24	+.16	−.08
Actuarial balance of bill	−.10	+.03	−.07

TABLE 4.—*Actuarial balance of hospital insurance system, expressed in terms of estimated level-cost as percentage of taxable payroll*

	Level-cost, percent
Hospital and extended care facility benefits	1.19
Outpatient diagnostic benefits	.01
Home health service benefits	.03
Total benefits	1.23
Contributions	1.23
Actuarial balance	0.00

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COAST GUARD OF COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on the Coast Guard of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SOCIAL SECURITY MEDICARE BILL OF 1965

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to commend the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] for having just completed work on what I consider a monumental piece of legislation—the social security medicare bill of 1965.

We will, I know, debate that conference report early next week, Mr. Speaker, but I think it can be said without fear of contradiction that this is indeed an historic legislative achievement. I might say in conference we had the full cooperation of the minority members, not that they agreed with every decision that was made, but it was a hard-working conference. There were 513 amendments in disagreement and the gentleman from Arkansas has earned the commendation of the entire Nation.

HOUSING BILL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on H.R. 7984, the housing bill, may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

TO AMEND VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT

Mr. SISK, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 486, Rept. No. 633) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8310) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. **CEDERBERG.** Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER.** Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. **ALBERT.** Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 194]

Blatnik
Bonner
Bow
Cabell
Clark
Cohelan
Dulski
Green, Oreg.
Halleck
Harvey, Ind.
Keogh
Lindsay
McMillan
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Murray
Powell
Roncalio
Scott
Shipley
Stephens
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Waggonner
White, Idaho

The **SPEAKER.** On this rollcall 407 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS, 1966

Mr. **GEORGE W. ANDREWS.** Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8775) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. **GROSS.** Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman will, I assume, take some time to explain the conference report.

Mr. **GEORGE W. ANDREWS.** I will.

Mr. **GROSS.** Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 630)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8775) "making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 39, 40, 41, and 45.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 37 and 47; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,738,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$780,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,844,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,694,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 38.

Geo. W. Andrews,
Tom Steed,
Michael J. Kirwan,
John M. Slack, Jr.,
John J. Flynt, Jr.,
George Mahon,
Odin Langen,
Ben Reifel,
Charles R. Jonas,
Managers on the Part of the House.

A. S. Mike Monroney,
E. L. Bartlett,
William Proxmire,
Ralph W. Yarborough,
Carl Hayden,
Leverett Saltonstall,
Milton R. Young,
Thomas Kuchel,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate Nos. 37 to 41, inclusive, and 44 to 49, inclusive, to the bill (H.R. 8775) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each such amendment, namely:

AMENDMENTS PREVIOUSLY AGREED TO

Amendments of the Senate Nos. 1 to 36, inclusive, and Nos. 42 and 43, relating solely to appropriations for the expenses of that body, were agreed to by the House just prior to sending the remaining amendments, listed above, to conference on July 19.

JOINT ITEMS

Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates $24,100 for the committee as proposed by the Senate instead of $120,000 proposed by the House.

Capitol Police Board

Amendment No. 38: Reported in technical disagreement with the object of offering a motion to recede and concur with an amendment adding sufficient funds to finance the detail of ten additional Metropolitan Police during the period from about Easter through Labor Day to provide protective coverage on the House side incident to evening opening of the Capitol Building to the visiting public.

This proposed action being in lieu of the provision of twenty positions in the original House bill for such protective coverage under the appropriation for the Office of the Sergeant at Arms, the managers on the part of the House are specifying that the Sergeant at Arms should not utilize any of the additional twenty Capitol police positions unless first approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Amendment No. 39: Restores to the bill language proposed by the House with the intent of permitting the police man-dog teams on evening patrol of the Capitol grounds to extend their patrol, as may be necessary, to the adjacent Library of Congress grounds.

Architect of the Capitol

Salaries, Office of the Architect

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates $587,600 as proposed by the House instead of $570,070 proposed by the Senate.

Restoration of Old Senate and Old Supreme Court Chambers.

Amendment No. 41: Strikes out the $700,000 proposition of the Senate to restore these old chambers in the Capitol.

The conferees agreed that there is much merit in the proposed restoration of the Old Senate Chamber and the Old Supreme Court Chamber, and that they should be restored to their original state for the benefit of visitors, but a majority of the House managers felt that this work could be more efficiently and logically carried out when the west central front of the Capitol is rebuilt and this must be done very shortly.

Library of Congress

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $11,738,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $11,772,000 as proposed by the Senate and $11,663,000 as proposed by the House—$10,000 of the addition to the House bill relates to the automation study and $65,000 is for 10 additional lower-level positions.

Legislative Reference Service

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates $2,524,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $2,492,000 proposed by the Senate.

Books for the General Collections

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates $780,000 for books for the general collections instead of $800,000 proposed by the Senate and $760,000 proposed by the House.

Books for the Law Library

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $125,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $120,000 as proposed by the House.

Collection and Distribution of Library Materials (Special Foreign Currency Program)

Amendments Nos. 48 and 49: Appropriates $1,844,900 for this program instead of $2,068,300 proposed by the Senate and $1,541,500 proposed by the House, of which $1,694,000 instead of $1,900,000 proposed by the Senate and $1,417,000 proposed by the House shall be available only in the form of U.S.-owned foreign currencies determined to be excess to normal U.S. requirements.

The effect of the conference agreement is to adopt the Senate proposition except for deletion of funds to initiate acquisition programs in Poland and Yugoslavia.

Government Printing Office

Congressional Printing and Binding

In connection with the suggestion in the reports of the two committees on this bill concerning the feasibility of adopting procedures for reporting printing costs by congressional committee and other significant ordering sources, the proposals worked out and submitted by the Government Printing Office, as shown in the Congressional Record of July 12, seem satisfactory, at least as a beginning. Costs on the basis of billings for work completed, commencing with fiscal year 1966, will be reported periodically to the ordering committee or office. This disclosure reporting should be illuminating, should secure greater cost consciousness, and may well result in some economies. There will be a summarization and reporting on this basis in the annual appropriation hearings.

GEORGE W. ANDREWS
TOM STEED
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
JOHN M. SLACK, Jr.
JOHN J. FLYNT, Jr.
GEORGE MAHON
ODIN LANGEN
BEN REIFEL
CHARLES R. JONAS
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield my self 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report provides $189,993,297.

The bill as passed by the House carried $150,589,107, which did not of course include the so-called housekeeping expenses for the Senate.

The bill as passed by the Senate, with the housekeeping expenses in, amounted to $190,840,167.

The amount in the final version of the bill, including the 38 amendments agreed to here on the floor, July 19, before we went to conference, is $189,993,297.

We went to conference with only a $1,358,770 difference in money between the House and the Senate; only 11 of the 49 amendments were at the conference table. The agreement on each of the 11 amendments is explained in the report of the managers, which is in this morning's RECORD. The amount before the House in the pending conference report is $430,900 over and above the previous House total and $927,870 under the Senate bill; those two sums account for the total difference of $1,358,770. We gave up $430,900 and the Senate gave up $927,870.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Then, as I understand it from looking at these figures—and I first saw them only a moment ago—the Senate is getting $36,379,790, which is only slightly less than half the appropriation for the housekeeping expenses of the House of Representatives, despite the fact that the House has 435 Members and the Senate only 100 Members. Would the gentleman think that there would be enough money in the bill for the Senate to continue to purchase fragrant air bombs by the case and mountain spring water for drinking purposes instead of using tap water?

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. As the gentleman knows, we do not examine the budget for expenses of the other body; they do not examine the budgets for expenses of the House. I am sure that the Members of the other body will see that their needs are met as they determine their needs to be.

Mr. GROSS. I want to be sure that their free haircuts are continued, as well as manicures, the mountain spring water, or whatever it is, and fragrant air bombs.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Under leave granted, I include a recapitulation of the amounts in the final version of the bill, with appropriate comparisons:

Legislative branch appropriation bill, 1966

Item	1965 appropriation	1966 budget estimate	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						1965 appropriation	Budget estimate	House	Senate
Senate	$34,834,570	$35,866,895	(1)	$36,379,790	2 $36,379,790	+$1,545,220	+$512,895	+$36,379,790	
House of Representatives	60,525,470	69,012,520	$66,414,730	66,414,730	66,414,730	+5,889,260	−2,597,790		
Joint items	6,876,778	8,655,502	8,748,477	8,775,977	8,856,977	+1,980,199	+201,475	+108,500	+$81,000
Architect of the Capitol	22,241,600	26,645,900	23,127,600	26,322,570	3 25,640,100	+3,398,500	−1,005,800	+2,512,500	−682,470
Botanic Garden	500,000	467,000	467,000	467,000	467,000	−33,000			
Library of Congress	24,081,800	26,644,800	25,502,300	26,151,100	25,905,700	+1,823,900	−739,100	+403,400	−245,400
Government Printing Office (excluding proposed new building)	23,562,000	26,329,000	26,329,000	26,329,000	26,329,000	+2,767,000			
Subtotal	172,622,218	193,621,617	150,589,107	190,840,167	189,993,297	+17,371,079	−3,628,320	+39,404,190	−846,870
Proposed new building for Government Printing Office	2,500,000	49,640,000				−2,500,000	−49,640,000		
Grand total	175,122,218	243,261,617	150,589,107	190,840,167	189,993,297	+14,871,079	−53,268,320	+39,404,190	−846,870

[1] In accord with custom, amendments relating solely to the Senate are omitted from the original House bill.

[2] Actually, these amounts were agreed to in House on July 19 just prior to sending certain remaining amendments to conference (they are included here to reach the full total for the bill).

[3] Actually, $2,512,500 of this amount was handled in the manner indicated in footnote 2.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the time of the House to offer any further explanation of the conference report at this time. The chairman has already gone over this very thoroughly and has given to the House an explanation that is sufficient in the way of calling to our attention the action taken by the conference committee. It is my humble opinion under the circumstances the conference committee performed in an admirable manner and came up with decisions which will serve the cause of this legislation to the best of everyone's interest. I recommend the conference report for approval by the House.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad and dismal day for the great House of Representatives. This is a black day in the annals of representative government in which this House is about to bow to the whim and will of but one of its Members, in open defiance of the statutory requirements laid down in law as the responsibility of the Congress for regulating immigration into the United States.

I say this because the conference report on the legislative appropriations bill brings the inexplicable news that this great deliberative body, this revered House which our late Speaker Sam Rayburn said he loved so much, has been victimized by one of its Members, the gentleman from Brooklyn and Mount Kisko, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER. It is a matter of record that the House on June 8, did pass, without a dissenting vote, the funds requested by the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy in the amount of $120,000. Mr. CELLER did not oppose this request for funds in the House, either before the Appropriations Subcommittee or on the floor of the House. These opportunities were open to him, as the proper and ethical method to enter his protest, but he lacked the courage and the honesty of conviction to make an open fight in which the merits of his protest would be judged by his fellow Members of this House. His memory reminded him that last year he pursued this legitimate course of action and, despite the backing of the leadership of the House, he managed to escape defeat by a tie 69-to-69 vote. And worse, Mr. CELLER informed me late in the morning of June 8, the day the issue was scheduled before the House, that he had decided to drop his opposition to funding the joint committee. He knew then that his opposition would have been soundly defeated by the House because I was thoroughly prepared to sharpen the issue in a manner which would provide the Members with a clear-cut choice. Fearing the honest judgment of the House on this issue, and after the House had acted favorably on the issue, he took his protest to the other body to air the personal views which he could not defend in the House. There he argued his case which this House had rejected earlier. The arguments he advanced were the same old ones he dragged through the House last year and which he could not use this year in the House because they had been exposed as unfounded and pernicious in intent.

Nevertheless, the Member from Brooklyn has extracted his price. He has prevailed in his efforts to strangle the purposes of the Joint Committee, to prevent the Joint Committee from carrying out its statutory responsibilities, to prevent the Congress from establishing control over immigration policy.

The gentleman from Brooklyn when confronted with the truth is given to falling back upon what he calls the thunder of his silence. He likens himself to Thor in Norse mythology—the god of thunder who carried the magic hammer, the thunderbolt. Only a few days ago, when I called upon him in the House to tender his resignation from membership on the Joint Committee because he has disqualified himself from such membership, his only reply was in his words—the thunder of his silence. That was simply a plea of nolle contendere—meaning he had no defense.

But the gentleman from Brooklyn has demonstrated that he does possess a hammer which he has used to overturn the uncontested action of the House on June 5, when funds for the Joint Committee were voted. If the Member from Brooklyn does not put that hammer on the open table so that all the Members may examine it thoroughly and make their own estimates of those who got hit over the head with that hammer, I will bend every effort to accomplish that end before this session ends. There will be ample time and opportunity afforded for this purpose when an immigration bill reaches the floor for action by the House.

The immigration bill which I introduced on June 1, was geared to what I understood was a firm agreement that the Joint Committee would undertake immediate review of the policy implications of nonquota status for natives of the independent countries of the Western Hemisphere. I did not seek immediate repeal of that privileged status because of this firm agreement. With this unexpected and inexplicable turn of events the issue now remains open. I want this matter clearly understood by those national organizations who gave their support to my bill, H.R. 8662, with the agreement that the Joint Committee would be funded and would commence immediately with the priority task I have stated.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] continues to make a large point of his willingness to appoint staff personnel of my choice to the House subcommittee. Let me put that false claim to rest. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has refused to act on every recommendation I have made to him, despite his commitments made in the House last year. It is clear he will appoint only personnel of his exclusive choice who will do his bidding without question.

Mr. Speaker, this issue will not die because the decision of the House has been overturned by one of its Members. It is too vital to be brushed away by the whim and will of one of our Members. We have not heard the last of this inexplicable event.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we used to have an old pettifogging lawyer in Brooklyn who when he had no case on the facts would attack the law. When he had no case on the law he would attack the facts. When he had no case on the law and the facts he would attack the judge. So I fear me that our good friend from Ohio having no leg to stand on, on either the facts or the law, he just attacks me. I am sorry that he has indulged in personalities. Personalities should have no place in a debate of this character.

Mr. Speaker, I tried very hard to avoid a clash of personalities when I said I would treat him, after he made certain extravagant unfair charges against me, with the thunder of my silence.

Mr. Speaker, I said that because I did not want to indulge in any pettifogging tactics with the gentleman from Ohio. I would rather pour oil on troubled water. I have held out the olive branch of peace to this gentleman for the longest while and continue to hold it out.

He has asked for $120,000 for so-called investigations of our immigration and naturalization policy from the Appropriations Committee of this distinguished House for the Joint Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

That committee has not functioned for 14 years. Fourteen years ago it met for 5 minutes. I was a member of the committee then, the late lamented Francis Walter of Pennsylvania was chairman. The meeting broke up as is usually the case with joint committees because joint committees never function smoothly or properly. In any event that committee has never met in 14 years. Now, suddenly, the gentleman from Ohio wants to reactivate that committee.

Why? He claims he wants to make certain studies. He can make those same studies within the confines of his own subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee under the aegis of the full Judiciary Committee of the House. He does not want to do that.

There is an old saying that when two men ride a horse one man must ride behind. I am going to tell you that nobody is going to ride in front of me when I ride the horse of the Committee on the Judiciary. I am responsible for the activities of the Judiciary Committee. It is a grave responsibility. I have been chairman of that committee for quite a few years. I have tried to conduct it in the most honorable fashion and I believe I have immeasurably succeeded. I think I have the good will of most of the Members of this House because of my actions and words as chairman of that committee, and as a Member of the House.

The $120,000 that the gentleman from Ohio asks, he could get out of the appropriations of the Judiciary Committee. I told him I would give him upward of $100,000 out of the $250,000 allocated to me by the House Administration Committee and which was approved by this House. No, he does not want to take that from me; he wants to take it from another source. I have even told him in addition to the professional staff he has now I would yield to him two additional professionals. I said, "Give me the names." He did give me names, but I could not accept the names he gave. Unfortunately one, for example, was the subject of a report I received from the Department of Justice. I am not going to name names, I am not going to tell you how horrendous that report was, but no Member of this House in his right senses could have embraced as a member of the professional staff that professional who was the subject of that report. It was an outrageous report. How in the thunder could I accept on the staff of the Judiciary Committee a man who had been so excoriated by the Department of Justice?

So it was with the other gentleman that was named. I said, "Name another name." No, the gentleman insists upon those names. Therefore, we came to an impasse.

The subcommittee has made innumerable reports, reports of all sorts, which are the reports that undoubtedly the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality would also make. Let me give you some of the names of these comprehensive reports made by our Subcommittee on Immigration.

Study of population and immigration problems in the United States.

Study of population and immigration problems of the world.

Asian populations.

Trends in Canadian populations.

The demographic position of the Caribbean.

The growth of the population in Central and South America.

Immigration to the United States, as presented by the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The population of western Europe.

Nonimmigrant visa issuance and registered demand for quota immigrant visas.

Refugees and international migration.

Admission of aliens into the United States for temporary employment.

Commuter workers.

Study of population and immigration problems.

Inquiry into the alien medical examination program of the U.S. Public Health Service.

Inquiry into the entries of aliens under administration discretionary (parole) authority.

Inquiry into the selection, security screenings, admission, emergency care, and resettlement of Cuban refugees in the United States.

Inquiry into the enlistment of nations of the Republic of the Philippines in the U.S. Navy, and the U.S. Coast Guard.

Judicial decisions construing certain provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Those are very comprehensive studies that have been made by the subcommittee of which he is chairman. Remember, this Joint Committee has no legislative responsibility. Now why does he want to stray afield and have additional studies made with a duplication of funds and a waste of money because of duplication by some of the committee. I cannot see that. I have tried to argue with the gentleman but I apparently can give him explanations, but I cannot give him understanding. That is the way the situation lies unfortunately.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman. I would be very happy to yield although I am not a merchant and I do not come from Mount Kisco; I come from the State of New York and I do not represent the state of Brooklyn—there is no such State.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Is it not correct to say that those reports that you have enumerated were directed at policy questions. Not one of them was directed toward policy implications. They are only an accumulation of information regarding trends in population.

Mr. CELLER. Oh, I cannot agree with that. Of course, there is policy involved in all these studies, but if the gentleman feels it is necessary to make some investigations of policy, he has a perfect right as chairman of the subcommittee to set up inquiries. Nobody could object to his doing that. If the gentleman wants funds for that purpose, I would be glad to give him the funds. Never have you been denied any funds from me. If you want the funds, the funds are there and I will be glad to make them available to you.

So I would hope that I have answered the distinguished Member from Ohio and I hope that the conference report will be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Senate amendment No. 38: Page 21, line 15, strike out "$604,600" and insert "$728,000".

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. George W. Andrews moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "$809,000".

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and the amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter and tabulations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of the programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 8283, with Mr. Rooney of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] had 48 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ayres] had 26 minutes remaining.

Before the Committee rose the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Buchanan] had the floor. The gentleman from Alabama has 4 minutes remaining, and is recognized at this time.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not speak for myself alone or even for the large number of my constituents for whom I am certain I speak, but for not less than millions of American citizens, in voicing my concern over one aspect of the present war on poverty, that aspect which constitutes only a small part of the present program but which involves the activity of churches and other religious organizations in the community action programs of the OEO.

May I say at the outset, I understand that in these cases a grant is not made directly to a church. Rather, the members of a church form a public corporation for the purpose, and said public corporation is controlled in many cases by said church, and this public corporation formed by and controlled by the church receives a grant and administers the program. To say that because of this arrangement there is no connection between church and state in this program is to say that the stockholders of a corporation derive no benefit from benefits accruing to that corporation or that the board of directors of General Motors has no connection with the corporation itself.

Mr. Chairman, there is a specific constitutional prohibition against our making any law to establish religion. I do not and cannot believe it was the intent of the Congress at the outset that this should be a part of the poverty program.

There are many voices from the past which would echo concern.

For example, John Adams, the second President, said:

> I hope Congress will never meddle with religion further than to say their own prayers.

Thomas Jefferson said:

> I consider the Government of the United States as interdicted by the Constitution from intermeddling with religious institutions, their doctrines, disciplines, or exercises. Certainly no power to prescribe any religious exercise or assume authority in religious discipline, has been delegated to the general government.

James Madison said:

> There is not a shadow of right in the general government to intermeddle with religion. Its least interference with it would be a most flagrant usurpation.

Andrew Johnson said:

> Here religion, released from political connection with the civil government, refuses to subserve the craft of statesmen, and becomes in its independence the spiritual life of the people.

I do not stand alone in my concern about the constitutionality of this question. Earlier this year a case reached the court in Kansas City, Mo. I have here an article from the Kansas City Times, which I will request permission to include at this point in the Record, telling of a case of some 18 citizens against church participation in the Head Start program there. It is being tested now and OEO attorneys are participating in that suit.

[From the Kansas City Times, June 17, 1965]

SUE ON CHURCH POVERTY ROLE: CONSTITUTIONALITY OF USING CATHOLIC BUILDING QUESTIONED—IN HEAD START PLAN—PLAINTIFFS ARE AREA MEN BACKED BY P.O.A.U. CHAPTER

A lawsuit challenging the participation of the Kansas City-St. Joseph Catholic diocese in Operation Head Start, a preschool program for poor children, was filed here yesterday.

The action will bring the first court test in the Nation on Head Start, and is believed to be the first court challenge of any aspect of the nationwide war on poverty, initiated by the Federal Government and administered locally.

A CONSTITUTIONAL POINT

The suit challenges the proposed use of three Catholic schools as sites for part of an 8-week summer program to prepare children of poor families to begin school. The suit alleges violation of the constitutional provision of separation of church and State.

Plaintiffs in the suit are 18 Kansas City area men and women backed strongly by Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State, a national organization. Most of the plaintiffs are members of the Kansas City P.O.A.U. chapter.

The petition, filed in the Jackson County Circuit Court in Independence, alleges participation in the poverty project by the Catholic diocese violates article I of the Missouri constitution and the 1st and 14th amendments of the U.S. Constitution in these respects:

It aids religion because it causes a public welfare program to be conducted by and in religious institutions.

It places behind such participation the power, prestige, and financial support of governmental bodies.

It causes a fusion of governmental and religious functions.

It causes tax money to be used in support of a religious activity or institution.

It furnishes a preschool program with tax funds to parochial schoolchildren which is otherwise not provided.

Named defendants are the Human Resources Corp., which administers the war on poverty in Kansas City and Jackson County, including the dispensing of Federal funds; Kansas City and Jackson County, which each contributed $10,000 to the corporation as their share; and the city and county treasurers.

EVENING THE ODDS

The object of Operation Head Start is to give children in designated poverty areas as good a chance to succeed in school as children with a middle-class background. One basic function of the preschool courses will be to enlarge the vocabulary of the children.

The Human Resources Corp. developed a plan in which 345 children will be taught in preschool courses this summer at 9 schools—6 public and 3 Catholic.

Enrollment is scheduled for today. Twenty-three teachers are undergoing special training this week at the University of Oklahoma. Classes will begin Monday.

The local plan, including Catholic diocesan participation, was approved May 17 by the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington, which provided $54,850 in Federal funds to finance the summer project. As contemplated, Operation Head Start will continue again in the fall, on a larger scale, with more Federal funds.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS NEAR

The six public schools are Attucks, Garfield, Switzer, Washington, Woodland, and Yates. The Catholic schools are Annunciation, Guadalupe, and St. Aloysius.

The lawsuit says that there are public school buildings in the vicinity of the three Catholic schools and suggested that the courses at Annunciation be moved to Holmes School, at Guadalupe to either Switzer or Douglas schools, and at St. Aloysius to Benneker School.

The suit asks for a declaratory judgment on four points:

That Catholic participation in the program is unconstitutional.

That the Human Resources Corp. cannot legally contract with a religious institution to conduct a program under Head Start.

That the payment, directly or indirectly, of any Federal, State, or local tax money to a religious institution for its participation in Head Start is constitutionally prohibited.

That the preschool programs now proposed for the three Catholic schools be transferred to the nearest public school.

The petition also asked that the defendants be enjoined from contracting with, transferring money to, or otherwise participating in Head Start while the program is being conducted in schools owned, controlled, or operated by any religious institution.

REASON FOR DECISION

It did not, however, ask for any immediate relief and no hearings were set. It was filed in the division of Judge Richard C. Jensen.

At a brief press conference held in his law offices, Walter A. Raymond, attorney for the plaintiffs, was asked why the suit was filed here, since similar Head Start programs involving the use of parochial schools are underway in many cities across the country.

"We focused it here," he said, "for three reasons. For one, the Missouri constitution has about the strongest statements about the separation of church and state of any State constitution.

"Secondly, the Missouri Supreme Court has handed down some of the strongest opinions enforcing this separation. And third, both the city and the county have made substantial contributions of the taxpayers' money to the program."

REASON IS GIVEN

"Our purpose in filing this suit," Raymond said, "is not to express opposition to this particular antipoverty program, but only to insure that it is administered solely by public agencies and not private, religious agencies."

Earlier than this, on May 24, 1965, the New York Times in an editorial expressed its concern, stating the view that Project Head Start programs are ignoring the constitutional principle of church-state separation and should be tested in the courts. The New York Times stated its opposition to this kind of participation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, perhaps the most basic freedom in our land is that provided our citizens in the first amendment. I know of no case personally in history where there has been preserved absolute religious liberty unless there was also absolute separation of church and state. I am concerned about this program from the point of view of the church. It seems to me for a church, at the worst, an unholy arrangement and, at the best, an unwise arrangement to be joined in a union and partnership with Government and the secular State.

I am concerned as a citizen about the Federal Government establishing religion in any place by pouring taxpayers' funds into a program conducted and carried on by a church. Although we may say that we are not helping to propagate a particular faith or to exalt a particular faith in a particular locality, that which enriches my right pocket also enriches my left pocket. That which puts me in the role of one conducting great charities in my community also exalts my reputation in other ways. I see no escape from the fact that this program does aid in the establishment of religion and fosters particular religious groups in particular communities.

Many religious faiths and indeed most of the people in my fellowship, about 10 million strong, could not approve as a matter of conscience and could not participate in such a program. We operate out of voluntary giving as Christian churches have throughout all the centuries. I believe it is still the right way for churches to conduct their works.

From a governmental point of view, it is not necessary for church groups to participate. Most of these programs are conducted by city or county boards of education or other groups, public or private, and only a relative handful are conducted by churches or religious organizations. Eliminating these would not, therefore, limit or handicap the "war on poverty."

When I interrogated the Deputy Director, Mr. Conway, concerning the use of churches in the program, he replied that there was very strict supervision of those churches to make sure that the taxpayers' money was not used for religious purposes. However, I have in my hand a notarized statement from Constable Jack M. Bailey, whom I have known for years and whose character I can attest to as one of absolute integrity and reliability. I quote:

State of Alabama,
County of Jefferson.

Before me, undersigned authority, in and for said State and county, personally appeared Mr. Jack M. Bailey, and being by me first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says:

"While carrying out my duties as constable of precinct 10 in Jefferson County, I encountered two young men going door to door. I had occasion to serve a civil process at one house at the same time that one of the boys was there.

"First he said that he was working with Operation Head Start. He then asked if anyone in the household was a member of a specific religion. He asked if any persons living there was interested in this particular religion and if they would accept some literature on the religion. He then asked for their names and addresses so that he might send additional literature. He then asked if all adults in the family were registered voters because he said he was helping on the voter registration drive.

"I was working the same area and managed to approach another house just behind this person and heard the same story again. I then stopped him and talked with him. He said that his home was in Long Island, N.Y., and that he was in Birmingham for the summer. He said he worked on canvassing in the morning and at (a certain named church) on Operation Head Start in the afternoon.

"Jack M. Bailey."

Sworn to and subscribed before me this the 20th day of July 1965.

Mary F. Childers,
Notary Public.

My commission expires July 26, 1968.

I have neither time nor resources to conduct a nationwide investigation, nor do I point an accusing finger at any particular church. I do not know how often this has happened. I do not know if this was one wrongheaded young man or one known example of a nationwide pattern of practice. All I know is that when there is an unholy union of a civil state and a church, this is the sort of result that is almost certain to follow. For the good of both church and state let us make their separation pure and complete. Toward this end, Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment that I shall offer later to bar the Director from making further grants to or contracts with churches or other religious organizations.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, the vision of President Johnson in declaring an all-out war against poverty and its causes has won the excited admiration of the millions throughout our country.

Millions of the underprivileged are given hope where once they faced only despair.

Those of us who are members of the bar have been especially gratified that in the formulation of his proposal the President allowed for means to provide legal aid to the indigent on the broadest possible basis. In the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Congress wisely implemented that proposal.

The bar throughout the country has already signified its interest in and hearty support of this provision.

It has long troubled thoughtful members of the bar that while an indigent's constitutional right to counsel when he has been charged with crime is now fully recognized, there has not yet been a corresponding recognition that, if there is to be equal justice under law, an indigent is equally entitled to legal help in connection with all of the problems that confront him under the civil law.

Surely when a poor man and his family are exploited by an unconscionable and illegal installment purchase contract that is but the veil of fraud, he needs legal help just as much as when he is criminally charged. Indeed in such circumstances, as a practicable matter, his need for legal help may be much greater.

Yet the ability of the indigent to get such legal help in our country thus far has been far from realized. Despite diligent effort on the part of legal aid societies, despite the utmost good will on the part of the organized bar, the resources of our Nation have never heretofore been mobilized to make it fully possible for the indigent to receive all of the legal help they need.

But under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 plans are being developed in many communities throughout the Nation to provide more adequate legal aid to the indigent for all their legal problems, civil as well as criminal.

It is notable that here in the Nation's Capital one of the first such plans has already been put into operation and is now rapidly demonstrating its value to the poor of our city. The so-called neighborhood legal services project began opening in early January of this year neighborhood legal offices in poverty-striken areas. Six such offices are now in operation and more are planned. Functioning in close cooperation with the traditional Legal Aid Society of the District of Columbia, these neighborhood legal services project offices have demonstrated in most dramatic fashion the great benefits to be derived from making full-scale legal aid readily accessible to the poor in the neighborhoods where they live.

It is to be hoped that responsible leaders in other cities will quickly follow suit. I particularly hope that in my own home city of Cleveland a similar project may soon be underway. The Legal Aid Society of Cleveland and leaders of the bar and others in that community have actively begun laying plans.

Progress toward achieving the goals of a Great Society cannot and must not be delayed. On the contrary, it must be hastened. Our local communities must be galvanized into action and no principle is more precious than that the ideal of equal justice under law should at long last be translated into reality. Any delay in achieving that reality means that justice is denied to someone simply because he is poor.

We can take pride that in our Nation's Capital progress is now swift. We can hope that similar progress will be made swiftly in other cities. And I expect that in my home city, with its great tradition of civic pride and improvement, our people will move forward at a pace even faster than have those here in the Capital of our Nation.

The Congress can do no less than support and strengthen the mobilization of our resources in the war on poverty.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles].

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, I noticed an article in the newspaper, just a few moments ago, that there was a baby born yesterday. While we were discussing the poverty bill and sometimes referring to its Director, Mr. Shriver, his wife was very busy up in Boston, Mass., delivering an 8-pound-2-ounce boy, their fifth child—apparently unnamed as yet. So yesterday while we were so concerned about the number of employments of Mr. Shriver, he was acquiring another challenging responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I take the time allotted to me to discuss that very issue, the issue of two jobs for Shriver. Yesterday I had the impression that perhaps we should call the issue "Two Letters to Shriver," or "The Case of the Missing Phone Directory." But, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania said yesterday, I did not come here to bury Shriver, nor did I come here to praise him, because I do not think his qualifications are really at issue.

You will recall that on June 2, in the other body, the issue was raised about the wisdom of Sargent Shriver's being both Director of the Peace Corps and Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The other body did go so far as to approve an amendment to the Peace Corps appropriations bill which would, if carried out, limit Mr. Shriver to just one job.

When that amendment was proposed, and as I recall when the issue was raised yesterday, no one questioned the educational background of Mr. Shriver. That is not surprising because he has a law degree and so many of us in the Congress have law degrees.

When that amendment was proposed, no one questioned the private industry experience of Mr. Shriver. He was a very successful manager of the Merchandise Mart in Chicago.

When the amendment was before the Senate no one questioned the previous Government experience that he had, including the fact that he was the key man in establishing the Office of the Peace Corps.

And, Mr. Chairman, when that amendment was proposed no one questioned the deep and abiding personal commitment that Mr. Shriver obviously has to the program he is charged with the responsibility to administer.

Also, when that amendment was proposed no one questioned the great energy and attention to duty that he has displayed in the public service.

Mr. Chairman, it does seem to me, however, that there are some very serious questions which are raised regarding the wisdom of the action which was taken by the other body and the wisdom of our taking such action, if it is proposed, when the issue is placed in proper perspective.

Mr. Chairman, let us consider for a minute the real issues which are raised by such ill-considered action.

A very serious question is raised regarding the proper limits of the President's prerogatives with respect to the appointment of key officials in his administration.

The President, under our Constitution, is our Chief Executive. While he can delegate authority to perform the tasks of Government, he still retains the ultimate responsibility. President Johnson is not unhappy with the job being performed by Mr. Shriver. Mr. Shriver is not unhappy with the two hats the President has asked him to wear. The President needs a wide variety of skilled individuals to help him meet his responsibility to the American people and we should question neither the authority nor the obvious ability of the President to choose leaders of his own administration. The Congress must allow him to fill the positions in his administration with men in whom he has full trust. It should not override the judgment of the President as to who is best suited to manage Federal programs.

Another question raised is whether or not the two jobs are too big for one man to handle.

This argument must sound like sheer nonsense to the President, who not only has two jobs but in reality at least 20 times two jobs. There are other men in Government, such as Secretary of Defense McNamara, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, who must have tremendously diverse jobs to perform. There are men in private industry, heading our large corporations, who have administrative responsibilities that far exceed those of Mr. Shriver. Even we here in Congress have in reality more than two jobs. Besides legislating, as we are doing today, we must provide service to our constituents on a wide variety of problems. And we must perform as political leaders in order to both maintain the strength of our respective political parties and remain in office.

Mr. Chairman, another question raised is regarding the precedent that will be set if Mr. Shriver is restricted to one job.

The essential question involved here is not whether a particular individual should be allowed to serve in two high-level jobs but, rather, should the Congress unduly restrict the President in his choice of men to run various agencies of the Federal Government. Mr. Chairman, the establishment of a precedent under which Congress could continually infringe upon the removal power of the President would be detrimental to the smooth functioning of Government; not just in this administration, but in subsequent administrations, whether it be Democratic or Republican.

Mr. Chairman, the question is raised regarding the inventiveness which may be curbed if Mr. Shriver is limited to two jobs.

There are many ways in which the executive branch may be organized to fulfill its responsibility. While there are certain legal limitations restricting the President's power to effect reorganization in the executive branch, it seems to me to be unwise to curb his power of innovation, especially when considering the establishment of new programs. We in Congress should encourage new approaches to the job the Government must perform, rather than stifle innovation by unduly restricting administrative flexibility.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SICKLES. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman from Maryland is touching upon a very interesting point and perhaps a sensitive point. There are many of us who feel that it may have been a poor decision on the part of the President to choose one man for two totally different types of jobs.

The gentleman suggested that if we interfered with the President's prerogative—and I think we should hesitate to do that—we may in some way be doing something which will detrimental to what he referred to as the smooth functioning of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, one of the problems we face as a practical matter is that one of the programs for which Mr. Shriver is at least theoretically responsible, is not functioning smoothly. This is true no matter how we gloss over the criticism of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we can in fairness say that there has been increasing public criticism about certain aspects of that program.

If the man responsible for the job of running that office does his job as a part-time responsibility, we are increasing the chances that these criticisms will not be looked at and attended to. There is no relevance in saying that the President's job is a big one, that the Secretary of Defense has a big job. Of course, the Secretary of Defense has many responsibilities, as has the Secretary of State. However, the basic responsibility of both those individuals is at least in one place, whereas in this case there is no relevance between the OEO and the Peace Corps except perhaps that both jobs need a different kind of inspiration. Perhaps it is thought that Mr. Shriver can only provide that inspiration out of some 190 million Americans.

We are being a little casual with what seems to be an inadequate discharge of responsibility on the part of one man, because he has responsibility for these different kinds of jobs. If one man with the responsibility works only 3 days a week it is not enough. Mr. Shriver is willing, so far as the public knows, to continue these two jobs, but so far as the smooth functioning of Government is concerned, which the gentleman is talking about, we might get a better job done both in the Peace Corps and the antipoverty program if we had two individuals in charge.

I say this in no disrespect to Mr. Shriver. He and I went to law school together. I recognize his ability, his experience, and his other qualities, but it does seem to me, because he is dividing his time between two different jobs, that the Government is suffering.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SICKLES. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to differ respectfully with my good friend from New Jersey. The gentleman now in the well of the House has made one of the most thoughtful and logical answers I ever heard on the floor of the House about an unjustified criticism of a public official. He has thoroughly documented the case that the President is acting wisely in appointing Mr. Shriver. Every one of us in our respective offices does the same thing.

It would seem to me that the presentation made by the gentleman from Maryland not only gives a proper and overdue tribute to a splendid public official, one of the most talented men we have in public life today, but also points out very clearly the Presidential prerogative that is involved. This is exercised daily in our own legislative field when we place additonal burdens on the leadership in the Congress and upon men who already have important responsibilities. You can point to a number of joint committees working on some of the most important legislative problems facing the Congress that are headed by men who are also chairmen of committees operating in the House and in the Senate.

Mr. SICKLES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. In further reply to the gentleman from New Jersey, the suggestion is made we should take these two jobs away from the present incumbent and give them to two separate individuals. Since this is a question of leadership, an untangible, if we follow this suggestion we may create a bad situation depending upon the qualities of the two individuals who may be selected. It seems to me that what we are concerned with is placing men in office based upon their capacities.

The Director does not become involved in crossing every "t" or dotting every "i". He sees to it that jobs get done. If you have a big job to do, give it to a busy man.

Let me next refer to a question that is raised regarding the economies involved. To make the record perfectly clear, Mr. Shriver is only receiving one salary and that is his salary as Director of the Peace Corps. He is not being paid two salaries. This may be something that future Presidents or the incumbent may consider with respect to other appointments.

A question has been raised regarding the essential differences between the two jobs now being held by Mr. Shriver.

In both the Peace Corps and the war on poverty volunteers play a very prominent role. The war on poverty has a direct counterpart to the overseas Peace Corps, VISTA, which is under the administrative direction of the Office of Economic Opportunity. In addition, the war on poverty, especially in its community action program, depends upon the involvement of large numbers of volunteers. In my State of Maryland alone, we have over 3,000 unpaid volunteers working this summer on youth programs funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Mr. Shriver has a demonstrated capacity to inspire others to volunteer their services.

A serious constitutional question has been raised as to the legality of the action taken by the Senate.

Under our Constitution the President has the power to appoint certain key officials of the executive branch subject to confirmation by the Senate. The courts have held that the President also has the unrestricted power of removal. The Congress cannot infringe upon this power unless wrongdoing is involved. The other body has exercised their constitutional authority by confirming Mr. Shriver to both positions he now holds. It is incongruous to me that efforts should now be made to usurp the power of the President by attempting to require him to fill one of the jobs Mr. Shriver now holds with another individual.

There was a letter which was sent to the General Counsel of the Peace Corps, William H. Josephson, dated June 18, 1965.

The letter is as follows:

JUNE 23, 1965.

Mr. BOYD CRAWFORD,
Staff Administrator, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOYD: Last week, the staff of the Committee on Foreign Affairs asked me for my opinion with respect to the issue raised by the language appearing in lines 4 through 7 on page 2 of S. 2054 as that bill was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs on June 3, 1965.

Enclosed for such use as the committee deems appropriate is a copy of a letter to me dated June 18, 1965, from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel, Department of Justice, Mr. Norbert A. Schlei.

You will note his opinion that the language in question "would constitute an unconstitutional attempt by Congress to remove from office an officer of the executive branch."

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM JOSEPHSON,
General Counsel.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, June 18, 1965.

Mr. WILLIAM H. JOSEPHSON,
General Counsel, Peace Corps,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JOSEPHSON: This is in reply to your request for my views concerning the constitutionality of the Javits amendment to S. 2054, 89th Congress, 1st session, a bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes. That amendment, which has been adopted by the Senate, would add to section 4(a) of the Peace Corps Act the following sentence:

> The Director [of the Peace Corps] shall hold no other Federal office of equivalent rank.

The purpose of the proposal, in the words of its sponsor, was "to provide that the Director of the Peace Corps, Sargent Shriver, shall not be, at one and the same time, Director of the Peace Corps and Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, administering the antipoverty program." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 2, 1965, p. 12881.)

It is my conclusion that this amendment would constitute an unconstitutional attempt by Congress to remove from office an officer of the executive branch in a manner not authorized by the Constitution. Under the Constitution, the power to remove an officer of the executive branch is vested exclusively in the President. Congress can oust such an officer only by the process of impeachment or by abolishing the office. And while Congress can impose reasonable qualifications for civil offices, it may not impose such qualifications retroactively so that its action has the effect of removing the incumbent from office.

The Constitution provides that the President shall nominate, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint the officers of the United States, except those inferior officers whose appointments the Congress may vest in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments. The Congress, during a famous debate of 1789, recognized that the power of removing the officers of the executive branch was vested in the President alone and that the Congress could not limit this power by providing that removal, like appointment, required senatorial advice and consent. The constitutional principle that the power of removal of executive officers is vested in the President alone was judicially recognized in *Myers* v. *United States,* 272 U.S. 52 (1926).[1] The only constitutional way in which Congress can bring about the removal of an executive officer, without abolishing his office, is by way of impeachment—a process which involves a trial by the Senate and conviction by two-thirds of the Senators present.

The Presidents have on several occasions successfully defended from congressional encroachment their exclusive power to remove executive officers. When, in 1924, in connection with the Teapot Dome scandal, the Senate passed a resolution calling for the removal of Secretary of the Navy Denby (65 Congressional Record 2245), the President declined to comply with that request. He stated:

"The dismissal of an officer of the Government, such as is involved in this case, other than by impeachment, is exclusively an Executive function. I regard this as a vital principle of our Government" (65 Congressional Record 2335).

In December 1930, the Senate confirmed the nomination of three members of the Federal Power Commission and ordered that the resolution of confirmation be forwarded to the President, who thereupon appointed those officers. After the Christmas recess, the Senate voted to reconsider the nomination and asked the President to return the resolution of confirmation. President Hoover refused to comply with that request. He said:

"I am advised that these appointments were constitutionally made, with the consent of the Senate formally communicated to me, and that the return of the documents by me and reconsideration by the Senate would be ineffective to disturb the appointees in their offices. I cannot admit the power in the Senate to encroach upon the Executive functions by removal of a duly appointed executive officer under the guise of reconsideration of his nomination." (74 Congressional Record, 1929–1930.)

The Supreme Court upheld the President's refusal to permit the removal by the Senate of validly appointed officers.[2]

Section 304 of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1943, 57 Stat. 431, 450, provided that no funds could be used to pay the salaries of three named Government officials. When President Roosevelt signed the bill, he stated:

"The Senate yielded, as I have been forced to yield, to avoid delaying our conduct of the war. But I cannot so yield without placing on record my view that this provision is not only unwise and discriminatory, but unconstitutional.

* * * * *

"This rider is an unwarranted encroachment upon the authority of both the executive and the judicial branches under our Constitution. It is not, in my judgment, binding upon them." (89 Congressional Record, 7521.)

In *United States* v. *Lovett,* 328 U.S. 303, the Supreme Court held that this attempt to remove the three officials by cutting off their salaries was unconstitutional. While the Court relied on the bill-of-attainder clause of the Constitution, which would probably not be applicable in the present case, its reasoning rested in part on the proposition that the legislative branch has available to it only one procedure, namely impeachment, for the removal of officers of the executive branch.

When the Economic Opportunity Act was before Congress last year it was generally known that Mr. Shriver would be appointed to administer that act; when Mr. Shriver was appointed Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity it was known to the Senate that he would hold the two offices. Had it wished to do so at that time, Congress could have provided in the legislation that the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity could not be Director of the Peace Corps at the same time, or the Senate could have refused confirmation for that reason. For Congress may impose reasonable qualifications, applicable prospectively, upon those who would hold executive posts it has created. But if Congress could impose qualifications retroactively, thereby ousting the incumbent, it could remove any officer whose performance, however satisfactory to the President, was unsatisfactory to it. The Constitution is certainly not susceptible of any such interpretation.

In view of the fact that Mr. Shriver has been appointed, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to both of the offices which he now holds, the Congress may not constitutionally undo either appointment by legislation. So long as both posts continue to exist, Mr. Shriver can be removed only by Presidential action or by impeachment.

Sincerely,

Norbert A. Schlei,
Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SICKLES. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. The gentleman referred to Mr. Shriver as holding two jobs, one with salary and one without salary. Is it not true that he has two unlimited expense accounts which are income tax free, one for war and one for peace?

Mr. SICKLES. I have not looked into that question, but I assume he is not drawing on both at the same time. I do not believe the gentleman means to suggest that there has been an unnecessary duplication in the use of these expense accounts.

Mr. WIDNALL. I am suggesting duplication.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill].

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, I supported the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964 because I believed in the objective and in the need. I must confess, however, that I have been greatly disturbed in the past year by the ineffective administration of this legislation. I have also been disturbed, as have many Members and countless citizens, by the apparent use of the program for political purposes. The record of this debate is replete with illustrations of how politics has played its part in the so-called antipoverty programs. Yesterday the names of countless consultants were inserted in the record illustrating just how the program has operated and how costly it has become.

The entire program was geared to eliminate poverty from America and there is not a man or women in the House of Representatives who does not subscribe to that lofty aim. However, it is time, I believe, for the administration and certainly for Mr. Shriver and those associated with him in administering this program to recognize that politics has no part in the antipoverty program and that the waste in this program must be eliminated.

As an illustration of the inept administration of this program, I can cite one personal experience which is illustrative of many which have come to my attention. I had occasion back in 1964 to recommend a constituent who was eminently qualified for and was anxious to obtain employment with the poverty program. I communicated with a Mr. James Gillis as early as September 1964. I did not hear from him and I again wrote to him in January, February, and in March. On the 14th of April, 1965, I received a letter from Mr. Gillis W. Long, Assistant Director, who advised me:

> Public response to our program has been so great that we have fallen behind in acknowledging many of our inquiries.

In the same letter, Mr. Long advised me that they had no record of the application to which I referred and which I had brought to his attention as early as September 1964, with follow-ups as above recited.

The interesting feature of this case, however, is the fact that my constituent did receive an application, did complete it, and was interviewed both at Temple University in Philadelphia on several occasions and personally in Washington by accredited representatives of the poverty program, including the same James Gillis with whom I had corresponded. As a matter of fact, this constituent received an acknowledgment from the program by way of a card indicating that his application was completed, that he was qualified, and that he would hear in the immediate future.

When last heard from my constituent, he advised me that while he was entirely solvent when he first applied for the job, he now found himself, after expending funds for travel between New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Washington, submitting to interviews, and so forth, poverty stricken himself. In other words, instead of administering the act, he was now in a position where he should be a recipient of the program.

While this may seem farfetched, the facts are accurate and can be completely attested by correspondence. The question, therefore, naturally arises as to how many other incidents similar to this have occurred, how much duplicity of effort, how much waste of time?

If I wished to be facetious in my presentation, I might even suggest an amendment to the adult basic education program under the Economic Opportunity Act so that the section could be expanded to incorporate a filing course for Federal personnel under the antipoverty program. The case at hand would certainly indicate gross neglect in the filing department.

---

[1] Congress can limit the President's power to remove quasi-legislative or quasi-judicial officers. *Wiener* v. *United States,* 357 U.S. 349; *Humphrey's Executor* v. *United States,* 295 U.S. 602. The Offices of the Director of the Peace Corps and of the Office of Economic Opportunity do not, however, fall into those categories.

[2] *United States* v. *Smith,* 286 U.S. 6; see also 36 Op. A.G. 382. The opinion of the Court deals primarily with interpretation of the Senate rules rather than with the question here involved.

But this is just one small example of thousands that have been reported by the press and by the Members occurring throughout our country. I regret that politics and inept administration have been permitted to dull, if not destroy, the lofty aims and objectives raised when this program was first initiated. I would hope that the President, who has evidenced a special interest in this program, would appoint a full-time Administrator, whether it be Sargent Shriver, a man of proven ability in many fields, or someone else. The job requires full time.

As general debate now ends, I shall look forward to the amendments that are going to be presented and I am hopeful that several of them will be adopted in order that the wastefulness and the political machinations of this program can be lessened, if not completely eliminated.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise as a Member whose misgivings about the original Economic Opportunity Act were blandly dismissed by proponents of the bill, but have since unfortunately proven to be substantially correct.

Before continuing let me make it perfectly clear that I am as anxious to fight poverty in this Nation as any Member of this body, but I question, Mr. Chairman the means of combat now being employed. As I stated on August 7 in the debate on the original OEO bill:

> This legislation overlaps many existing programs and conflicts with others. We have scores of federally financed programs.

I also expressed misgivings about "new problems of irresponsibility, buck-passing, and confusion which will hinder rather than help the war on poverty which has been going on in this country for many years."

In a similar vein in earlier debate on June 3, 1964, I expressed disapproval of the fact that as worded the Economic Opportunity Act provides that an existing local or township-established general assistance department may be bypassed. In fact the Administrator of the Federal OEO program is under no legal obligation to even communicate the nature of his activities to the existing welfare and local authorities. On June 3, 1964, I was assured by my distinguished colleague [Mr. PUCINSKI] that it is "incorrect to say a public agency might be bypassed," and in effect that my fears were unwarranted.

Well, gentlemen, I am afraid my misgivings were not unwarranted. For the Republican task force, in hearing testimony from Arthur Amolsch, of Ypsilanti, Mich., discovered the very same problem of lack of Federal-local communication which I was so concerned. Mr. Amolsch testified that the Willow Run Association for Neighborhood Development—WRAND—set up as OEO project was not only sloppily conceived, but essentially unnecessary. WRAND was set up with no attempt to contact town officials in Ypsilanti. This unfortunate lack of communication resulted in the compilation of a report which painted the picture of poverty in Ypsilanti much darker than it actually is. In fact the citizens of Ypsilanti neither need nor desire the projects being set in motion and have organized a group called REPLY—return every penny, leave Ypsilanti. Mr. Gordon Matteson, director of this REPLY organization suggested to our task force that "perhaps WRAND wants to function as a government by themselves."

As I stated during the testimony of Mr. Amolsch and Mr. Matteson, Ypsilanti is clearly a case of the Federal Government moving into an area without consulting the local people, who would have intimate knowledge of the problems of welfare at the local level. The Economic Opportunity Act may state in section 202(a) that a community action program means a program which is developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served by Ypsilanti is a prime example of glaring failure to even make an attempt at participation of existing local authorities and public aid agencies. I would certainly advocate the amendment to make such participation mandatory.

I should add, here, that this problem of lack of communication between Federal OEO officials and local officials was further emphasized in the testimony of Mayor Walsh of Syracuse before our task force on poverty. Mayor Walsh stated that an OEO grant to Syracuse University conflicted with an existing city program, the crusade for opportunity. The Honorable CATHERINE MAY testified in the same vein that in the small community of White Swan, Wash., a great deal of hostility has arisen among local citizens due to OEO failure to even communicate the nature and intent of their activities to the town. The result is hostility toward the newly established Job Corps Conservation Center.

Perhaps the most recent and most publicized debacle concerning problems of communication in the implementation of Job Corps Centers is the situation in St. Petersburg, Fla. Without going into great detail about the charges of extravagant expenses, country club living, excessive noise, discipline problems, and inadequate screening of candidates, I wish to dwell on one aspect of the problem which could have been avoided by better Federal-local communication.

This problem in my opinion is that of mislocation. The center is located in the Huntington Hotel, a former luxury resort hotel in an area where many retired people live. Seven nearby hotels report that they have lost full-time guests due to excessive noise. Sports activities have had to be moved to another building. Mr. Nins Bond who operates the Bond Hotel for elderly people across the street from the center convinced the city council to ask removal of the OEO project from the city as soon as possible. He pinpointed the problem as one of "mislocation" of the center in a residential hotel area. As a result of mislocation and other problems the Pinellas County School Board which set up and operates the center for the Government voted to terminate its $2.5 million 2-year contract sooner than its expiration date in July 1966, if possible.

Time does not permit a more complete discussion of these failures, nor have funds allowed our task force to make a more complete investigation, but it has become clear that before we blithely double the appropriation this year to the Office of Economic Opportunity, we have a solemn obligation and responsibility to be sure that we have adequately analyzed the program to date.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I wish to express my disapproval of section 8 of this amendment of the Economic Opportunity Act which seeks to destroy the right of Governors of the various States to call a halt to unsuccessful OEO programs in their States. As the act now stands, the Governors have 30 days to disapprove of OEO plans. Section 8 of the amendment being considered today seeks to make it possible for the OEO Director to continue his program over the Governor's veto if upon reconsideration, said Director finds the program consistent with the provisions of title I, part B, and title II of the Economic Opportunity Act. I only ask you to judge for yourself whether given the evidence of OEO action without consulting local officials in Ypsilanti, Syracuse, New York, and White Swan, it is wise to go still further and remove the Governor's veto. I, for one, cannot see that it is.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CONABLE].

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, in my analysis of this legislation, I would like to discuss two aspects of the poverty program: national and local.

Nationally, we must consider both concept and performance. From what I have been able to learn, we in Congress have little cause for pride on either score. Conceptually, the program is a hodgepodge of diverse activities, many of which would make more sense in the context of an established agency having overall purview of its functional field. Some of these activities have little to recommend them except their labels, which admittedly reflect the compassion and hope of those who consider poverty an unnecessary affliction. A few of these activities, like Operation Headstart, are new and good. Some of these activities, like the Job Corps, are old and of questionable value.

Without a doubt, the greatest conceptual weakness of the program is its unwillingness to tap the resources of local government except through the indirect device of the local advisory board. The Great Society may be the exclusive province of the Federal Government, but a greater society would result from a system incorporating and stimulating local initiative, rather than bypassing it. Indeed, I question whether we can have a vital democracy which is not firmly based on strong, elected local institutions. In short, conceptually, I feel that this program leaves much to be desired.

From the point of view of performance, the poverty program is at best suspect. A cloak of confusion and mystery surrounds its central administration. Even making allowance for the difficulties of getting a new bureaucracy to function in many unrelated areas at the same time, there seems to be what I hope is an unnecessary reluctance by the sponsors of this legislation to have the program reviewed in detail through comprehensive hearings designed to weed out the inevitable weaknesses discovered during the first 9 months of the program's operation. During this debate, the minority has recounted a series of incidents and episodes indicating that all is not well in the administration of the program. As an illustration, the city of Syracuse, N.Y., has two different local agencies conducting separate poverty programs and these programs are tending to reduce the effectiveness of one another because there was inadequate consideration of their overall goals and methods before approval by Washington.

These criticisms have not been answered, except by those who call them petty. We have a responsibility, in voting the not so petty amount of almost $2 billion of the people's money, to see that it is not wasted in sloppy administration. Bad administration can become a matter of substance, as wasteful as bad legislating, and certainly we have little in the record to assure us that all is well in the administration of the poverty program.

But, Mr. Chairman, the national aspect of the poverty program is only part of the story, and, if this is in doubt, it is appropriate that I turn to the program in my own district to see how things are going. The city of Rochester, part of which I represent, had some unfortunate national publicity at just about the time the war on poverty was getting underway. The funds made available through this program have become a focal point for a great educational effort with a broad base of community support. Approval has been given to nine programs, including seven community action programs, which are designed to help a total of 70,000 persons through neighborhood service and information centers, educational centers, day care programs and the headstart program.

There is no community in New York State which has used its poverty funds so well. There are short-term problems, such as insufficient involvement of the poor in planning, but the long-term benefits to the community will far outweigh deficiencies which were mostly caused by the need for haste with some sort of constructive activity. If the poverty funds had not been available, some similar program would have been necessary. This past weekend I discussed the program with a number of community leaders whose judgment I respect, and they were unanimously of the opinion that poverty funds in Rochester are serving a needed purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I am unwilling to overlook this strong and consistent opinion from my district, despite the misgivings I have about the design and the administration of the program nationally. Were more complete information available at this time, I might easily decide that my obligation as a member of the Federal Government required a different vote than that of a Representative of my district. In view of the importance of this program in my area and the constructive use which is being made of it, I am unwilling to see this program killed on the basis of the poor information which is available on the overall program. By my support at this time, however, I am not committing my vote for all time to come. We cannot continue indefinitely to extend this program on the basis of faith, hope, and political declarations. I trust Congress will insist on the closest scrutiny of the Office of Economic Opportunity from this time forward, so that in another year we can decide this issue on some other basis than party loyalty, newspaper revelations, or grassroots samplings.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Gubser].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, this is an age of great moral issues which, because they are moral, are presumed to be above the democratic process of debate and the human right to dissent and to question.

If one so much as raises an honest question on civil rights today he is branded as a bigot. If he defends administration policy in Vietnam, he is a warmonger. And if he questions the poverty program, he is considered heartless and insensitive to the feelings of the poor.

We who question this program have only been told of the great need to cure poverty—a need with which we agree—we have not been told of the validity of the plan to accomplish this purpose, nor have we been presented with the facts and a record of sound accomplishment. In fact, facts have been suppressed and denied us.

At the Women's Job Corps Center in St. Petersburg, Fla., a national press conference was scheduled on May 17. On Friday, May 14, Miss Norma Gordon, who was to handle the press conference, called an employee of the Women's Job Corps Center at St. Petersburg from Washington and ordered her to keep Mrs. Mary Packenham, a reporter for the Chicago Tribune, under surveillance during her entire stay in St. Petersburg. The explanation given was that Mrs. Packenham's paper, the Chicago Tribune, was known to be antiadministration and known to be unsympathetic to the Job Corps. Miss Gordon instructed this employee in St. Petersburg, Fla., to see to it that Mrs. Packenham did not obtain any unfavorable information that she could publish.

Mr. Chairman, this could happen with the NKVD in Russia, but it is hardly something that one expects in this country. Nor is it something which engenders the faith and the respect of those of us who belong to this great deliberative body and conscientiously assume our responsibilities within the democratic process to ask honest and sincere questions as to whether we are being given the truth and the full truth regarding the Job Corps.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may need to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein].

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I give my wholehearted support to the effort to make the war on poverty a success. I am encouraged by the imagination and vigor that has characterized the implementation of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 thus far, but I recognize, as we all must, that it is incumbent upon us to reaffirm and rededicate ourselves to this great national commitment in order to assure its success.

Let me remind you that the basic goals of the war on poverty program were to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty by opening to everyone the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity. In a word, it is our continuing aim to provide the wherewithal to our impoverished fellow Americans to enable them to lift themselves up by their own bootstraps so that the children of poverty do not become the fathers of poverty.

We have instituted this program so that the unemployed teenagers who are interested in "handouts, muggings, and switchblades" will be persuaded to believe in the Job Corps motto of "work, learn, earn"; so that the dropouts of today will be the occupationally trained and responsible citizens of tomorrow. The war is aimed not only at individuals, but at entire neighborhoods, communities, cities, and States. We cannot make these people work, but we can see to it that they are trained to work and inculcated with the desire to be self-supporting.

Under the antipoverty program, every major city has instituted poverty planning, and 500 community action programs will have been initiated this summer, twice the anticipated number. Some programs like the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and Head Start have surpassed expectations. Over 200,000 young men and women have volunteered for the Job Corps. They arrive in hand-me-down clothes—undernourished, undereducated, and underskilled. Many have never been more than 25 or 30 miles from home before in their lives. The Job Corps offers them job training and work experience, catchup courses in basic academic subjects, nutrition, guidance, and counseling. It offers them a chance to be somebody, to do something, to leave the urban slum or rural hollow in which they now reside.

During the 8 brief months of the poverty program, over 15,000 VISTA volunteers have contributed their services to improving the conditions of the poor. They are at work on Indian reservations, in urban and rural community action programs, in slum areas, hospitals, schools, and in institutions for the mentally ill and retarded. They have seen how poverty blasts the lives of young and old in the underprivileged segment of our society; they have seen the wasted human resources that result from the lack of economic opportunity, and they have joined the Volunteers in Service to America to contribute their share to the war on poverty.

In my own State of New York, there has been great interest and enthusiasm in the poverty program. We not only believe in this war, but are waging it with our own resources well beyond the limits and levels of the Federal commitment. Under the Federal program, New York City has established Neighborhood Youth Corps programs covering 6,000 youths, most of whom are either dropouts or unemployable. This project provides full- or part-time work experience and training for these young men and women, placing them in newly created jobs in hospitals, settlement houses, schools, libraries, parks, and playgrounds. This has enabled the dropouts, youths who have had trouble with the law, and social rejects, to attain a new grasp on life through purposeful employment.

New York City has funded adult basic education centers designed to recruit and bring instruction to adults with educational deficiencies. In my district, leaders have provided educational programs in home economics, consumer education, civil service preparation, leadership training, typing, and clerical work. Participants have been helped to obtain and hold jobs and have thus been enabled to make a meaningful contribution to the society which once supported them.

Under the community action program, my district has initiated programs offering remedial reading and cultural enrichment to 500 second through sixth graders; 800 teenagers, young adults, and school-age children are engaged in supervised recreation and day-camp activities. We have set up 14 Head Start centers which will provide 8 weeks of preschool training this summer to 26,000 children of the poor. This program is designed to help children overcome the obvious deficiencies imposed on them by poverty and prepare them to face life and school with a better chance of success.

Mr. Chairman, these are only examples of identical work being done in all 50 States. Seldom before has a national program brought together so many agencies and so many people to work toward a common goal. We have now taken our first step; it is a step in the right direction, and having taken the first step, we must insure its success.

This massive assault on poverty in our Nation is a new idea. Every new idea in its infancy must periodically be critically reevaluated, but failure to achieve instant perfection is no grounds for a rash prejudgment of its efficacy. If the Office of Economic Opportunity had waited until perfection could be guaranteed or until criticism could be avoided, the poverty programs would still be in review committees or on the drafting boards. What has happened in this short year hasn't all been successful, nor has it all been failure. The poverty program is still in its experimental stage and it is expected that some miscalculations will become evident. While many strides have been made to alleviate the problem of poverty and undeveloped human resources, there is much that remains to be done and we must get about the business of doing it.

It is my strong conviction that H.R. 8283 will help resolve many of the stumbling blocks that have developed during the first year of the poverty program. Clearly, it is not the panacea of the problems of impoverished Americans, but it is a significant step in expanding the war on poverty and I feel it will greatly augment the effectiveness of programs under the Anti-Poverty Act.

Let us consider together exactly what this admirable bill will do for the Nation.

Under the new Economic Opportunity Act of 1965, authority for 90 percent financing will be extended through fiscal year 1967. This extension of time will assure local public and volunteer organizations that the Federal program will continue long enough to make the investment of time and energy a worthwhile effort. It will provide localities with necessary time to evaluate and build support of local programs which other wise might be severely crippled before they get underway. In addition, the 1965 amendments provide additional funds which will insure the success of the many faceted program. The increase in funds will permit the local agencies to improve their facilities and to go into the program with greater depth of personnel.

The bill revises section 311 of the 1964 act so as to delete the provision allowing for control of funds by political subdivision and individuals. This will tend to insure that the funds will not be used for personal advancement but solely for the purposes of eradicating poverty. Under the amendment, the types of assistance that may be extended are specified. It provides for loans, loan guarantees, and grants to assist State and local agencies, private nonprofit institutions, and cooperatives in establishing, administering, and operating programs to meet the needs of migrant workers and seasonal farm laborers.

The bill—section 13a—enhances the effectiveness of the VISTA volunteers by making them available for assistance in communities with any kind of local program which is receiving or could receive assistance under the act, and further provides for volunteer assistance on an assignment basis in localities which have the greatest need.

Finally, I feel that another significant change appears in section 15. This section provides for an additional six new members to be appointed to the National Advisory Council established under section 605 of the antipoverty bill. This is designed to provide the Council with a somewhat broader base; it will make the Council more representative and aware of the needs of different interest groups and areas. A big problem facing the administration is insufficient information for economic analysis, insufficient data on geographic regions, States, and counties, and insufficient data on the needs and programs required in certain areas. With the extension of the National Advisory Council, the Office of Economic Opportunity will be better able to assess and implement its program.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the American people in their national commitment toward the economic redemption of the poor. I am proud of the Economic Opportunity Act and what it represents; and I feel that the provisions of H.R. 8283 will do much to improve its effectiveness. As a result, the future operation of this tremendous undertaking in human welfare will be enhanced and improved.

Mr. Chairman, condition of poverty, misery, and degradation have been with mankind for thousands of years. We cannot eradicate it today, or this year, or even next year. But if it is to be eradicated at some future time, there must be a beginning. This Congress has just begun to fight the war on poverty with the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Already this war on poverty has produced hope in the hearts of many. We cannot now pause in our efforts if we are to fulfill the mandate of the American people. And thus, I urge the speedy passage of H.R. 8283, the new Economic Opportunity Act of 1965.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may need to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS].

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I merely use this time to answer a statement that was made several times yesterday by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. In supporting his contention that this program should be turned over to the cities, he used the case of the city of Los Angeles. I suspect, living 3,000 miles away, he does not know what is happening in Los Angeles.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me, since he mentioned my name?

Mr. HAWKINS. Yes. I will be glad to.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman apparently neglected to listen to what I said yesterday. I never suggested turning over the antipoverty programs to the cities of this country though, of course, they have a role to play. If he will read the RECORD of yesterday, he will find that I did not say any such thing. I said that there was a difference of opinion between the mayor of Los Angeles and those running the programs financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity. How the gentleman could have read such a conclusion into what I said I cannot conceive. I do not think there is any argument that Mayor Yorty has been in disagreement, as has Mayor Christopher, of San Francisco. In fact, they are taking their disagreements as high as Vice President HUMPHREY. You cannot go much higher than that in expressing objections about the way that these Federal programs are run. I am not suggesting that the answer lies simply in turning the programs over to the local governments. I do not know how you can arrive at such a misconception.

Mr. HAWKINS. Do you know how the program is being operated in Los Angeles?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am hoping to hear from the gentleman right now. I am listening intently.

Mr. HAWKINS. If you will listen to me, I will tell you how it is being operated.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HAWKINS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman from New Jersey is a little out of date. The mayor of San Francisco's name happens to be Mr. Shelley and not Mr. Christopher.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWKINS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say it was a slip of the tongue, a Freudian slip, perhaps. I was thinking of the time when we used to have a Republican mayor of San Francisco, as I look forward to the time when we will again. I thank the gentleman from California for correcting me.

Mr. HAWKINS. May I state again for the sake of the gentleman from New Jersey as well as others who might have heard his statement yesterday that the program in Los Angeles has been operated for 6 months by five public agencies including the city of Los Angeles and the county of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles School Board, which is a unified school district, the Los Angeles County School Board, and the State of California. If you get any agency that is operated more by public agencies, then I do not know what it is. This is not a good example, certainly, to use an agency that is being objected to by those advocating the use of public agencies. I think this is only an indication. There are some—not all but at least some—Republicans who in one breath are saying that there must be more participation from the public in the poverty areas and others on the other side who are saying that the public agencies should dominate this program. As much as I listened to the Republicans yesterday, I think that they miss the whole objective of this program and the involvement of the people of the poverty areas.

I wish to pay a compliment to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] because I think above all he came nearest to putting his finger on the problem when on page 17520 of the Record he said in answer to a question from Mr. William D. Ford as to what had changed his position:

> I am not changing my position. I am merely saying the people from the governing body ought to have a voice and I still believe the poor people ought to have a dominant voice.

Remember he said they should have a dominant voice.

> The poor people ought to be able to select their own representatives and, I still feel this strongly, the only way the program is going to work is that the poor people are involved.

I want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] for that statement and certainly hope in the consideration of this matter the Republicans will bring in an amendment not only to strengthen the role of public agencies, which all of us insist should be done, but also to strengthen the role of private agencies and, above all, to give some role to the people who are closest to the problem, that is, the poor people.

It seems to me, if they do not do this, in order to accomplish their objective as expressed in the fine words of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie], then they have done only half a job and failed to fulfill their obligation of making the Republican Party into something which presents a new face to the American people.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota; I mentioned his name.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the comments that he has made. I have an amendment which I shall offer—in fact, it will be the first one that I shall offer—in which I make provision for the Community Action Board to be represented at least one-third from the poor, selected by the poor themselves; and the other two-thirds by the elected officials or representatives appointed by them, the representatives of the agencies that work with the poor. I thank the gentleman for agreeing with it, and I shall send him a copy of my amendment.

Mr. HAWKINS. I thank the gentleman. I have had a little trouble getting copies of the other amendments. I should like to ask the gentleman this question. In the event his amendment fails, is it his intention not to support the so-called Bell amendment that would provide for the strengthening of the public agencies? In other words, failing in the attempt to get the poor involved in the program, will the gentleman then turn around and strengthen the role of the public agencies?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the amendment of the gentleman from California, [Mr. Bell], it would merely prohibit the local officials from being circumvented entirely. I might pont out that I have a letter from some county commissioners wherein they were told by the Office of Economic Opportunity that if they did not set up their agency organization that there would be established citizens committees and they would act through such a group. I think it is unwise for them to be able to circumvent entirely the local governmental body, because they are the only ones responsible.

Mr. HAWKINS. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California, [Mr. Bell].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] is exactly right when he says that this is the purpose of my amendment. It is to prevent the circumventing of the local government. I want to point out further that a great majority of our programs today, where there is Federal aid, are routed through local governmental programs. Would the gentleman, for example, disagree with the elementary and secondary educational programs where you are dealing with a local government?

Mr. HAWKINS. The gentleman's amendment goes far beyond that. Not only will his amendment give complete control to local cities and governmental bodies; it will completely destroy the program, because under the amendment, the way you administer that amendment, it would be possible for a city to have control over a State program because the State program, operating within a city, would then have to get the approval of each and every city.

In Los Angeles County alone that would mean the approval of some 76 cities. You recognize that the city of Los Angeles, along with the other agencies I have enumerated, have been 6 months squabbling over a program. If 1 city takes 6 months to approve a program, it certainly would take 6 years, possibly, for 76 cities to approve one. That is exactly what the gentleman's amendment would do.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, my comments today are not directed toward opposing the war on poverty but toward recommending a more constructive means of implementing the programs than the proposed legislation. The poverty projects which have been initiated thus far have encountered serious problems in areas such as overlapping jurisdiction, administration, and local-Federal cooperation. In too many cases, the local groups and organizations sponsoring various projects have had their hands tied by administrators at higher levels. In addition, local experts are often ignored when the final project prospecti are compiled. I must point out that this legislation as it is now proposed has an excellent possibility of multiplying the numerous problems which these new programs have faced unless at the same time, Congress insures that the appropriate steps are being taken to remedy areas already found to be deficient. The various poverty projects suffer from the usual pains of any newly conceived programs, but it is only through continual improvement by revision and modification that we can truly construct a successful war on poverty.

Earlier this year I pointed out the problems being created by the somewhat unusual salary scales being used for bureaucrats in the war on poverty. Although I have been reassured by the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Mr. Shriver, that these salaries are not at all out of keeping with the job designations, there still appears to be overadministration at the highest levels of the war on poverty. In my own State of New Jersey, the State-level OEO director receives $25,000 a year and supervises a staff several of whom draw proportionately substantial salaries. The administration's recently proposed National Teachers Corps, according to newspaper reports, would require that salary scales be set with respect to the prevailing pay rates of the individual community. It seems to me that the same situation should exist in the other poverty programs as well. The poverty salaries which have been termed unrealistic in many cases have resulted in a depletion of the ranks in parallel local agencies. Not only are these salaries unrealistic but they are also inconsistent, particularly at the local level, further tying the hands of the local projects and services. In fact, the Employment Services offices, which have been asked to handle the poverty program recommendations on the local level, suffer from underadministration and a lack of qualified personnel. I have recently been contacted concerning a young man from my district who has experienced the difficulties from such underadministration. It is quite possible that this young man received inadequate counseling on his Job Corps application due to the inability of the local office to maintain qualified personnel in this capacity.

As a member of the minority task force on economic opportunity, I had an opportunity to view firsthand data on several of the poverty programs. There is no real need to reiterate those items which have appeared in the newspapers of late but they reflected the problems uncovered by the task force. My own district has not been immune to these difficulties. The community action program prospectus of Bergen County emerged from the Washington poverty headquarters in a form which would have been illegal had it been acted on by the county according to the county attorney. Although I have arranged talks to resolve the difficulty, the problem has not as yet been successfully resolved. In fact, the most recent check with the poverty office indicates that no action has been taken by Federal officials at all.

Unfortunately, the poverty management has been particularly inept when dealing with our Nation's deprived youth. This naturally causes me a good deal of concern. For example, it would seem that great care might be necessary in operating a project on the scale of the Labor Department's Neighborhood Youth Corps project which is organized to increase the employability of youths or aid them in continuing or resuming their education. In New Jersey alone, NYC projects have been approved for 24 communities involving a total of 5,032 young people. These projects are being operated at a total cost of over $3.5 million and the jobs provided run the gamut from custodial work in public facilities to snake handling in a city museum. And yet all these young people have been placed or will be placed without the benefit of a significant study to determine whether these jobs will actually increase their employability or as to the long-term requirements of the labor market.

The effectiveness of the newest OEO project, Operation Head Start, is already being questioned by professional educators. The use of private welfare, public welfare, school boards, and a variety of sponsors makes this program highly experimental and there is no assurance that the children will experience any real benefit when they enter school for the first time in the fall. In my own district, the lack of sufficient consultation with the professional educators in the community was apparent when the Head Start projects in Hunterdon County of my district were being established. These factors and the very skimpiness of the preliminary preparation for the Head Start program are the cause for some concern. The headlong rush to establish something concrete and justify the expense to a public that, according to the polls, is rather apathetic toward this "war," has characterized the administration efforts from the start. This same approach is also beginning to take its toll in other programs affecting the Nation's youth such as the President's Summer Jobs for Youth Campaign.

Now is the time to stabilize these poverty programs as well as increase their scope. When the Equal Opportunity Act of 1964 was in committee last year, I suggested a continuing committee review of the war on poverty. In the light of recent developments, I feel that such a requirement is even more imperative. There is at present, no serious evaluation being conducted on these programs nor is there any apparent effort at improvement. I strongly recommend that Congress take steps to insure the effective development of the war on poverty as it considers increasing the poverty budget. If we are to keep faith with the Nation's underprivileged citizens, we can do no less.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY].

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, last year the 88th Congress passed one of the boldest pieces of legislation in our history. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is an idealistic yet practical attempt to bridge the gap between the haves and the have nots. It is not a welfare program, but rather it is an attempt to help others help themselves. When the bill was passed last year it was acknowledged that adjustments would have to be made as time passed, that some programs would not work as well as others at first. The poverty bill of 1965 is designed to implement the 1964 bill and to further strengthen the excellent programs set in motion last year.

Maine people have traditionally been skeptical of Federal programs. Yet it is extremely important to note that Maine citizens have responded most favorably and enthusiastically to the war on poverty programs. Maine citizens are presently participating in every poverty program except the VISTA volunteers.

There have been 25 Head Start programs organized geared to accommodate 1,281 preschool children. These projects have received $146,286. One hundred full-time teachers along with 35 neighborhood volunteers as teachers' aids and 54 additional volunteers are participating.

Probably one of Maine's more noteworthy programs is the demonstration project of Camp Mainstay at Camp Modin in Canaan. This program is receiving $158,508 in Federal funds. It is a project which enables ADC mothers and their children, as well as elder citizens, emotionally disturbed youngsters and school dropouts, to benefit from a wholesome family environment away from home. Those participating come from fatherless homes. This ambitious project promises to be highly successful.

Maine has endorsed community action with great enthusiasm. Plans have been submitted by 11 of Maine's 16 counties and the cities of Portland and Bangor under the community action program.

Work experience programs have been organized by the health and welfare department and by Washington and Knox Counties. It is expected that the projects in Knox and Washington Counties will affect some 1,100 persons including about 220 who will actually receive job training and education. These programs will prepare unskilled unemployed persons to fill job opportunities which are available or which can be developed in the areas affected.

A $438,000 Job Corps project is in operation in Acadia National Park.

Eight of Maine's nine colleges are participating in the work study program. This program is providing employment to college students who come from low-income families in order that they may attend summer classes.

Maine has neighborhood youth corps projects either pending or approved in 15 different communities, 8 school administrative districts, and a State neighborhood youth corps which is pending and, upon approval, will be a $113,400 project for 201 students. Just this past Monday, four new projects were approved for Maine involving a total of $111,379. The largest of these programs is in Lewiston where $45,120 is earmarked to train 84 young men and 41 young women just out of high school.

This response on the part of Maine citizens is indicative not only of their acceptance of the Economic Opportunity Act, but also of their reliance upon it to solve some of the serious problems which plague those enmeshed in the web of poverty.

Programs under this act have been in operation for a very short time. They deal with complex social problems which the best efforts of educators, social workers, and others have failed to solve after years of effort.

It would be foolhardy, even cruel, to terminate or curb these vital programs for social betterment after only some 6 months of trial.

I support the extension of the time limit of this beneficial law through passage of the bill which we are considering here today—without amendment.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the very distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be able to speak on behalf of H.R. 8283, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965. I have been privileged to serve on the special ad hoc subcommittee on the poverty war program, and have had an opportunity to examine its progress and implementation. I am extremely enthusiastic about this program, because it is founded on the basic notion that through education and training every individual can ultimately realize his own capacity and potential for growth.

The President of the United States must be commended for the great initiative that he has fostered in communities all across this country to meet the problems of poverty through broad, imaginative programs which seek to get to the heart of the problems of the poor.

JOB CORPS

Two specific areas of this act are of particular interest to me, because they are directed to helping our young people. The Job Corps, both the rural conservation centers as well as the urban centers, has offered to 10,241 young men and women an opportunity to live in a new environment, to learn new things, and to begin to build for a new life of dignity, with improved prospects for employment. The Job Corps is generating a new feeling of hope in these young people and instilling in them the confidence that the people of this country do really care about their lives. This program is helping to motivate them toward a course of self-improvement, by pointing them in the direction of greater opportunities.

There are many people in this country who are simply not sympathetic to the problems of others, and who care little for programs which are designed to give the unfortunate a helping hand. We must not allow these people to stifle this program by constant criticism about difficulties which are part of the program itself. That they are poor is the very basis of their inclusion in this effort; that they are educationally and culturally deprived is part of the social problem that this program is designed to meet. What we are saying is that given the fact that these are conditions in which we find the vast majority of the young people who come to us for help, we firmly believe that they can be helped to seek a better life and become responsible, productive citizens in our country.

The value of this effort cannot be measured in the dollar cost. The establishment of residential centers is always high, and it is grossly unfair to compare them with the cost of nonresidential vocational, technical institutions. We are not merely seeking to train and educate them with skills which this country can use in business and industry, but we are trying to overcome the years of deprivation which have stifled these young people's capacity to seek a life of opportunity.

The most important facet of this program is the recognition it gives to the youngster's home environment and the part that it has played in his development; it takes cognizance of the concept that a new wholesome "home" situation must be offered these young people in addition to all the tools of learning. This is the strength of the program, and why I believe that permanent, far-reaching changes will be effected in the general outlook and desire of these young people to better themselves constantly, even after they have left the Job Corps centers and returned to their respective communities.

The Job Corps has faced formidable problems in getting started. We must not judge its worth or value by news stories which highlight only these problems and not the successes that they have enjoyed. Our task is rather to give these projects our encouragement and to help them organize facilities which will be effective in offering the kind of well-planned, well-rounded help that these deprived youths require if they are to be salvaged into resourceful, imaginative, and productive citizens. We must assure these centers adequate well-trained staffs to handle the myriad of problems that residential educational centers must face on a day-to-day, 24-hour basis. We must appreciate their responsibilities in handling these youngsters as individuals, by offering them the guidance and attention of which they have been deprived and the lack of which has been the greatest single factor in their being enrollees in the first place. They must be screened and tested to see what abilities and talents they possess, and then they must be carefully guided into the courses of instruction which would be of greatest interest and use to them. This means that a center must have a wide range of offerings, of guidance and counseling, and of skilled instructional as well as academic training. In connection with learning a trade, many have to study mathematics and many have to improve their reading and language skills. In 2 short years, this program must succeed in helping to reconstruct these young people and to help place them upon the road of opportunity.

It is hoped that through the additional funds provided by this bill, that there will be 80,000 enrollees in the Jobs Corps by this time next year. As of June of this year, the Job Corps had received a total of 297,359 applications, of which 228,609 were considered acceptable. Of these applications 53,256 were from women.

The following is the breakdown of the Job Corps centers as of today, July 14:

CONSERVATION CENTERS

State	County	Center name	Enrollees
Arizona	Navajo	Winslow [1]	142
Arkansas	Franklin	Cass [1]	90
	Garland	Ouachita [1]	106
California	Eldorado	Sly Park [1]	67
	Glenn	Alder Springs [1]	140
	Los Angeles	Fenner Canyon [1]	83
	Riverside	Oak Glen [1] [2]	82
	Shasta	Toyon [1]	96
	Trinity	Lewiston [1]	106
Colorado	Mesa	Collbran [1]	83
Idaho	Idaho	Cottonwood [1]	69
Illinois	Pope	Golconda [1]	135
	Williamson	Crab Orchard [1]	85
Indiana	Perry	Branchville [1]	87
Kentucky	Bell	Cumberland Gap [1]	53
	Edmonson	Great Onyx [1]	123
Maryland	Frederick	Catoctin [1]	90
Massachusetts	Barnstable	Wellfleet [1]	95
Missouri	Butler	Poplar Bluff [1]	64
New Mexico	Torrance	Mountainair [1]	103
	Valencia	Grants [1]	188
North Carolina	Macon	Arrowood [1]	87
	Transylvania	Schenck [1]	175
North Dakota	Stark	Dickinson [1]	70
Ohio	Lawrence	Vesuvius [1]	80
Oklahoma	Le Flore	Hodgens [1]	100
Oregon	Douglas	Wolf Creek [1]	181
	Harney	Malheur [1]	112
	Lincoln	Angell [1]	119
	Tillamook	Tillamook [1]	156
Pennsylvania	Forest	Blue Jay [1]	79
Tennessee	Sullivan	Jacobs Creek [1]	76
Washington	Clallam	Neah Bay [1]	91
	Ferry	Curlew [1]	161
	Lewis	Cispus [1]	157
Wyoming	Natrona	Casper [1]	82

URBAN CENTERS FOR MEN

California	Pleasanton	Camp Parks [1]	1087
Indiana	Edinburg	Camp Atterbury [1]	543
Kentucky	Morganfield	Camp Breckinridge [1]	414
Michigan	Fort Custer	Fort Custer [1]	97
New Jersey	Edison	Camp Kilmer [1]	1,072
Oregon	Astoria	Tongue Point Naval Station [1]	540
Texas	San Marcos	Camp Gary [1]	1,291

WOMEN'S CENTERS

California	Los Angeles [1]		202
Florida	St. Petersburg [1]		222
Nebraska	Omaha [1]		70
Ohio	Cleveland [1]		243
West Virginia	Charleston [1]		112

[1] In operation on June 30, 1965.

[2] State related center.

We know, Mr. Chairman, that most of these young people come from poor families. They have backgrounds of privation and hopelessness. They have been cheated of the incentives to learn, of the self-confidence to try for a meaningful place in modern society; and so they take the path of least resistance—despair.

Now, by creating Job Corps, the Economic Opportunity Act offered such youngsters an alternative course—self-realization. Job Corps is designed to reach young people who come from such crippling environments that they must get away from home to get ahead. And so, the wisdom on our investment—and our willingness to invest still more—largely depends on whether or not Job Corps is in fact reaching those for whom it was created.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has been able to survey these Job Corpsmen, to see just who they are, as a composite, and what their backgrounds are.

I think the findings will be interesting to every Member.

The average enrollee is a little over 17. In school, he got as far as the ninth grade, and then dropped out. He may have reached the ninth grade, but his skills in the three R's are at roughly the sixth-grade level. Three out of four enrollees had been out of school for more than 6 months at the time they entered the Job Corps.

Seventy percent of these young people come from families living in substandard and overcrowded housing; their families had an average of six people living in the home.

The parents of more than a third of the enrollees have a serious physical and mental condition; and the parents of nearly two out of five have had less than an eighth-grade education, or do not speak English.

Nine out of ten enrollees were unemployed but looking for work at the time they entered the Job Corps. Of the 1 out of 20 employed at that time, only half had held their positions for more than 4 months. They had worked for an average of 85 cents an hour, but even at that rate they could find only about 28 hours of work a week. The average earnings of those employed was just $22.40 a week.

The overwhelming majority of Job Corpsmen come from families where the primary wage earner was unskilled and held only menial jobs. In two out of three of their families the primary wage earner was unemployed or severely underemployed, and the families of one-third of the corpsmen were on welfare.

Statistics alone, Mr. Chairman, cannot adequately describe the bleak lives these young people had led before joining the Job Corps. But I believe they do indicate that those who have been allowed to come into the Corps are those who need it most.

The results, in terms of acquiring good jobs after Job Corps training, are of course yet to be seen. But we can be sure of this: hope is being offered to thousands of youths whose conditions would otherwise be quite hopeless. A gate has opened on the poverty of their lives. And it is heartening to know that this important part of the war on poverty is not avoiding the toughest battles.

It has earned our continued support and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

The Neighborhood Youth Corps portion of the Economic Opportunity Act has had considerable response and success. As of June 30, 1965, there were 640 programs established in the United States. A total of 261,686 young men and women between the ages of 16 and 21 years have participated or are now participating in it: 178,082 of these young people were part of the program while still attending school, and 83,606 were out of school.

Secretary Wirtz has said:

> The primary goal of the Neighborhood Youth Corps is to provide the necessary income to our young people so that they can remain in or return to school.

However, for those who do not return to school, they are given worthwhile work experience so as to improve their employability in the future. For those who remain in school, this program provides them with a small amount of money to help pay for the expenses needed to stay in school without having to depend upon their poor parents for their full support.

The U.S. Department of Labor is charged with the responsibility of administering this phase of the act. The Federal Government pays 90 percent of the cost of this program, with the local sponsoring organization providing the remainder of the funds, in cash or kind.

For most of the young people helped by this program, this is their first job, their first income, and their first meaningful step in the development of the kind of attitudes they will need to become contributing members of our society. We know that over a million youngsters drop out of school each year. This program will help to keep these students in school, by offering not only work experience but also the chance to earn money to help meet the demands made by their families that they should leave school to earn a living.

The success of this program means hope to thousands of our children who have been sapped of hope and the kind of personal motivation needed to keep them working to improve themselves. With the help provided by this program they are encouraged to stay in school; with the training they receive they are better able to compete for a decent job. Without this help they will surely be locked within the cycle of poverty which robs this country of this great wealth of untapped human resource.

Mr. Chairman, the Economic Opportunity Act has given our youth a second chance to be somebody. I am proud of the initiative they have shown. I am eager to keep this program moving forward, and therefore urge all my colleagues of this House to support this bill, and thereby keep faith with these young people who have responded so enthusiastically and who are seeking our help and our confidence.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida if he is going to yield some time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] and if he could do it now.

Mr. GIBBONS. I cannot at this time. I prefer not to yield at this time since I have so many requests. I will try to work him in. I am sorry you cannot yield to him on your own time.

Mr. QUIE. We have the ranking member of the committee—and I would like to yield to him now—the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] 5 minutes.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, late yesterday afternoon the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] was able to receive a list of the consultants of the antipoverty program. He had been trying for several weeks to get this list but to no avail.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. AYRES. I will yield to you on your time only. Will you give me 2 additional minutes?

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] called me. I reviewed that list and I saw many familiar names, including some of our top Washington lobbyists and some of our top newspaper people in the United States. Then I looked at the amount of money they were drawing. Some of them are getting as high as $90 a day plus expenses.

There is one name, Mr. Rauh, Michael B.—the son of the same Mr. Rauh who is the great Democratic leader in the District of Columbia, the head of the ADA. His son is not poor. In fact, after he was a consultant he became a full-time employee and they neglected to take him off as consultant for several weeks.

Then I scanned the list a little further and I saw a gentleman by the name of Haddad.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Is the gentleman referring to William F. Haddad?

Mr. AYRES. William F. Haddad, of New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. This is the man who is supposed to be Inspector General of the poverty program.

Mr. AYRES. He is listed as consultant. He has hired 33 people who are directly under his jurisdiction.

Mr. QUIE. He is also listed as Inspector General.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. You know he has campaigned against me.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I will yield to you on your time only.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. He is the gentleman who ran against me last year and has stated publicly that he is going to run again. Now it is my opinion that he is subverting parts of this program for his own personal political gain. I think he is attempting to build a personal political organization out of poverty funds. From the record that I have seen, six consultants have been appointed by Mr. Haddad, who lives in the 19th Congressional District, which is my district; six other consultants who live in my district have been appointed by others. Of course, whether there is any liaison on that I do not know but I suspect there is.

There are seven other consultants who live right along side of my district, three of which were appointed by Mr. Haddad. Now this seems to me to be a situation where an individual thinks he is going to outsmart the world. But time and events usually catch up with those fellows and they wind up outsmarting themselves.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. No, not on my time. If the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons] wants to give me 5 more minutes, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. SCHEUER. I thank the gentleman.

I do not hold any brief for those who permitted this. If there are none who knew this was going on, something is wrong somewhere.

This seems to be wholly unfair and something which should not have been permitted. I simply cannot understand it. I should like the gentleman to explain it, if the gentleman in the well can explain it.

Mr. AYRES. I would not accuse Mr. Haddad of using these funds for political purposes. Of course he is not. We all know that.

But I was criticized for having alerted the House to this serious situation, because out of my own funds I spent $411 to alert Members that they might have a primary opponent.

Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein] know that by actual count 12 Members have given me $10, because 12 Members found opponents on that list?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. All I can say is, it is very interesting, especially because it involves the individual who is the Inspector General. He is supposed to be the one to oversee the program, to make certain that there is no skulduggery and there are no peccadillos involved in this program. He appoints the consultants. As I say, he appointed 33 consultants and undoubtedly was responsible, as I said earlier, for having some liaison with the appointment of perhaps 13 other consultants.

Mr. AYRES. I thank the gentleman for calling that to the attention of the committee. I should like to refer Members who have not seen the telegram to pages 17515 through 17519, where 450 names are listed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Ohio 3 additional minutes.

Mr. AYRES. There you may find your next opponent.

It is pretty easy, when one has the taxpayers' money flowing into a district, with handpicked lieutenants who know nothing about poverty.

Members should take a look at the newspaper people involved. We even find Mrs. Riddik, the poor little girl. Everybody thought she was a volunteer until this list came out. She is getting only $60 a day. I do not think she is building any machine.

What this Sargent Shriver has been able to do in the way of propaganda has been unbelievable.

I commend myself for having spent $411. I will be reimbursed by many Members and many people who realize I am in poverty. When one can invest $411 with the possibility of saving the taxpayers a billion dollars, that is a very good investment.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Aside from this situation, I am sure the gentleman feels an incident of this nature should not be permitted to interfere with an overall wonderful program, one which is absolutely necessary for the people of this Nation.

At least, that is the way I feel about it, aside from this particular individual, who is somewhat of a barnacle—that at times attaches to new programs or agencies for personal political gain. I believe this is a program we must have in this country for the good it does.

Mr. AYRES. I could not agree with the gentleman more.

The gentleman will have an opportunity to vote for amendments that will make it possible to get rid of 411 Haddads who are not named "Haddad" but are of the same stripe, when we come to the amendments we will offer.

We Republicans want to help, but we want to do it in the right way. We are not in favor of building political machines to defeat incumbents in this Congress, Democrat or Republican.

My wire went to both Democrats and Republicans. Take a good look at the list in the Record. As I say, you might find some very, very dear friends who will meet you in the election in 1966.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I wonder if the gentleman recalls that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] mentioned that the State director of the antipoverty program in New Jersey receives a salary of $25,000. I wonder if the gentleman from Ohio would draw any conclusion from the fact that the State director of the program is a constituent of mine? Should I start to worry about a possible opponent next year because of this fact?

Mr. AYRES. I believe that as long as they have a billion dollars to play politics with, we all had better worry. One never knows when one of these "Haddads" is going to stick his head up.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. AYRES. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Another interesting note in looking over the names is the fact that in these full-time expert consultant lists working on the so-called war on poverty we see that there are two Redskin players, Halfback Ozzie Clay and Lonnie Sanders, listed as full-time expert consultants. The list says they are paid $40 a day. Why are these two professional football players being hired as full-time consultants by the Office of Economic Opportunity? If it is to use their names for publicity purposes, this is certainly not a full-time occupation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

If the gentleman will yield further, in fact I checked on it and I learned that they are both in training right now at the Redskin training camp at Carlisle, Pa. This activity can be expected to take up their time for the start of the season, and I imagine they will be fighting poverty on the gridiron toward the first of next year. I wonder what Sargent Shriver calls full-time employment in the Office of Economic Opportunity and what these people are really doing. Before we go any further we ought to stop and analyze the entire employment list of OEO. Who are these people? Where are they? What are they doing to aid poverty stricken? I would like answers to these questions. The American people also would like to know, I am sure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. AYRES. These people are fine athletes—not particularly expert, but they are listed as dropouts, I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota. They could not get into the Job Corps because they had to stay here to practice football, but they could put them on as consultants and sort of ease them out. I understand those people on this list, in view of the fact that these gentlemen are getting $40 a day, are all going to get season passes to see the Redskin games.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I could not get the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ayres] to yield to me, because I wanted to compliment him on the great rate that he apparently got from Western Union. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones] earlier computed the cost to have been around $4,500.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. Not on my time.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. GIBBONS. I want to laugh at the crocodile tears shed over there about these consultants. This is really something. Mr. Quie stood in the well of the House yesterday and said he could not get any information. Then I gave him the telephone book that he said he needed. Then he said he could not get any information and then he puts in all of this list of consultants. Today he tries to make it look like it is a great piece of espionage work that he has done. Really, anybody who knows what is going on in Congress knows already that another committee of the Congress inquired into this situation. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service held hearings on it, and the information came from there. The only thing about it is when they inserted it in the Record he conveniently cut out some of the little choice bits in here about how much the consultants were getting on the jobs they quit or gave up so that any reasonable persons could contrast the pay. They fail to mention it is a standard Government practice in any agency being set up or being tooled up. Listen to this little choice tidbit that they have cut out and which we should cut the House in on, because they left it out. They did not explain who was not getting paid at all. Whom do we have on that list? It is good, and you will really enjoy it. We will probably all like to get some of these consultants ourselves. These are unpaid consultants that I am talking about now. First of all, we have such people as the head of IBM working unpaid. We have another man who gave up a $50,000 a year job to come here to work for a lot less than that. We have Gina Lollobrigida working for nothing as a consultant. I am sure that the gentleman from Ohio would not object to that. We have Donna Reed, and she is working for nothing, too. And Jackie Gleason and Dick Van Dyke and Andy Williams.

No. They make great political hay at the taxpayers' expense by sending around this $4,500 wire, and they try to convince everybody that they have found something that is a big scandal when it is in the records of the committees of this Congress and then they try to come here to convince you at the last minute about this. Who is crying crocodile tears around here? These are the same fainthearted voices of doom and despair? We hear them all the time.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a clarification?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] is my close personal friend. He has stated to me that he apologizes for having misread a cipher. The amount was $411.52.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, here we are at the end of the debate on the war against poverty. I must say that I originally had about 15 minutes, but it has now dwindled down to about 4, so I am going to try to summarize a little bit what I think our position is on this bill.

Let me say at the outset that it was not a long time ago, just in the last Congress, in fact, that this House of Representatives had the good commonsense to call a halt to a program, or at least to trim it down a little, when we recognized that we did have a poor program and it was not working well. I am calling attention to the Area Redevelopment Administration—ARA—which was the very first program initiated by the Kennedy-Johnson administration. It got into serious trouble, and the hearings so proved. So in 1963 this Congress had the good sense not to continue and double the authorization for that program.

It seems to me that this is where we are in this particular bill. No one in this House is against a program that is against poverty. There is not anybody on our side of the aisle that is against youth programs like the Women's Job Corps that has gotten off to such a bad start in St. Petersburg. I do not want to talk about the drunkenness down there; I do not think that is the main thing. I do not think that the point in St. Petersburg is the kind of underprivileged young women they are trying to retrain, but the point is that it was so poorly started. For example, it was put in a section of the city where it never should have been and that they leased the hotel at a dollar figure which exceeded, for 18 months, the appraised value of the hotel.

I wish I had the time to go into the St. Petersburg story. I will simply summarize it by saying this to you, that the merchants association and the city council voted to move it. The school board voted to abandon the contract as soon as they could. It just has not worked well at all, not because the idea was not a good one, but because it started so hastily that it just was not done well. Even the administrator in charge of the job has resigned because of tension headaches. That is how bad a start the Women's Job Corps has gotten off to in St. Petersburg.

I wish I had time to comment on the dual role of Sargent Shriver. Everybody admits that he is an excellent Administrator. But do you think a board of directors of General Motors Corp. and Chrysler would employ the same man to run the two corporations?

If you want to read a magnificent book read MacArthur's "Reminiscences," just off the press. It is a good story about World War II. And one of the points this brilliant soldier makes is that the Philippines campaign nearly fell flat on its face and we nearly had one of the greatest military disasters in World War II; why? Because we had a divided command. Half of the naval forces were under Nimitz's command in Hawaii and half were under MacArthur's command in the Philippine Islands.

And, that is exactly the trouble with this poverty program. It does not have any head that knows where it is going and knows what it wants to do, or has the time and the administrative ability to get it there, because the head is dividing his talents between two enormous undertakings. Consequently the poverty war is suffering.

Mr. Chairman, this very Women's Job Corps about which I have talked to the Members and which has not done too well in St. Petersburg, Fla., I believe represents a very interesting illustration of people running a program who are not qualified to do the job.

Mr. Chairman, open up your hearings to page 193. The Director of the Job Corps is a Dr. Otis A. Singletary. He is one of our outstanding educators and I am sure a splendid man. He is a former chancellor of the University of North Carolina. He is a leading educator and author and has contributed to all sorts of intellectual magazines. However, insofar as I know he has never had a thing to do with welfare and running a Job Corps.

And, Mr. Chairman, if you will look down the page you will note the staff members that are listed there and will find that same situation again and again, of unqualified heads of programs—I suppose they will probably learn in a year or two and this is the point that we Republicans are trying to make—why do we have to teach them, the people that are running the program, on a kind of an on-the-job training basis?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida the 1 additional minute remaining on this side.

Mr. GURNEY. Well, Mr. Chairman, I probably should have stopped when I thought I was ahead, if that was the case.

But at any rate let me sum up by simply saying this and let me make this point: It occurs to me that we are trying to fight a war here with green troops. Certainly an elemental basic principle of warfare is that you cannot win a war with green troops when you are up against a hard-core enemy—and certainly as far as poverty is concerned that is precisely what we are up against in this poverty war—and you have to have the best kind of troops to do the job.

Mr. Chairman, we on the Republican side suggested last year that we should put the program under the present welfare programs which we have going on and in operation in the Federal Government today, 42 such programs that expend $32 billion a year in the Federal Government and $50 billion a year nationwide at all levels of government.

Mr. Chairman, the point we would like to make is that if we really want to do a good job, why kill this program with kindness?

Mr. Chairman, we have a man already in the hospital from overeating but here we are intending to try to give him more food and try to kill him, more food in the form of more dollars, a doubling of the authorization for this program, when it is not working even half well under its present authorization.

Last year, the Great Society with great fanfare and a loud beating of drums declared war on poverty. The bugler's notes were rich and ringing—they rang with a refrain, "Never would so much be done for so many"—in this business of fighting poverty.

One year later the tune has changed from brave ringing notes to a flat bleat—"Never has so little been done with so much—money, that is."

If ever a mammoth gave birth to a mouse—and a spavined one at that—this is the classic case.

What is wrong here anyway? Is it that there is no job to be done? No need to be fulfilled? No indeed, there is plenty of poverty even in this Nation of the greatest plenty the world has ever seen.

The problem with this poverty war is that it was conceived in politics as an election year gimmick to capture votes, and it has been up to its ears in politics ever since.

The chairman of the committee bringing this bill to this House opened hearings this year by describing the program as giant fiestas of political patronage.

Complaints and criticism have poured in from all over the Nation. The criticism has not been partisan, either. Much of the criticism has come from leading members of the administration's political party, such prominent officeholders as the Democrat mayors of two of our greatest cities—New York and Chicago.

The facts, such as they are, scantily available because of the deliberately foreshortened hearings, have been documented here by previous speakers. I will not replow this already turned ground.

It seems obvious and clear to the most casual observer what the problem is. The poverty war is being fought by green troops, rank amateurs, soldiers drafted fresh out of civilian ranks, who have had a poverty rifle thrust into their hands and told to go up to the front lines.

These green troops have been given a mission to face up to and lick, the toughest foe of all—poverty—which has been with this Nation, all nations, in every period of history.

Now a basic tenet of warfare is that you cannot lick a veteran foe with green troops. This poverty war was doomed to defeat before the bill was ever passed in this House last year.

"I told you so" is not the most popular thing to say. Yet the opponents of this bill were pointing out last year and saying, "If we are going to fight a poverty war, let us give the assignment to experienced people. Let us assign these programs to the agencies already fighting poverty."

There were 42 then existing Federal programs already at the front fighting the poverty war with $32 billion annually. In fact, the Nation was then and is now spending in welfare-type programs in all governments—Federal, State, and local—close to $50 billion annually.

With all the wealth of talent hard at work in such a vast war, it seemed last year the height of folly to run in a bunch of untrained, untried troops.

The first mistake was in the appointment of the general to command this war, Mr. Shriver. Now, this is no reflection on Mr. Shriver's leadership ability, which is outstanding, but whoever heard of a general in command of two armies at the same time—the Peace Corps and the poverty troops. That would be comparable to placing Eisenhower in command of both the ETO and the South Pacific, or MacArthur in command of the South Pacific and the ETO. It will not work. What large corporation head runs two great businesses? What board of directors would name the same man president of General Motors and General Electric?

Speaking of war and divided commands, I commend you to read Douglas MacArthur's "Reminiscences." MacArthur retells how the U.S. forces nearly met great disaster in the invasion of the Philippines because of divided naval command—one-half the forces under MacArthur and one-half under Nimitz at Pearl Harbor.

So here in this poverty war the first thing we must do is put a man as the general in charge, who is not burdened with other great responsibilities.

What we ought to do next is put the various programs under presently, well-tried and working welfare and poverty programs. However, I know that will not be done, because the war has been declared and the commander will not back off now.

The next best thing is to stop killing the war with kindness—in this case with too many dollars.

The hearings clearly show that the poverty war has not been able to digest what we have already given it. In fact, it has not been even able to eat what we have given it, much less digest it.

What is proposed here is to double the rations of a man already in the hospital from overeating.

And lest you think I have been exaggerating here, let me tell you the Florida story.

The Job Corps is one of the key programs of the poverty war. The very first unit to be started nationwide in the women's division was at St. Petersburg, Fla. If this particular venture is a typical example of the Women's Job Corps, heaven help the program. It would be better to terminate it forthwith, before it gets further out of hand.

The St. Pete project was begun in March of this year.

This Women's Job Corps center is operated by the Pinellas County School Board under a contract with the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Now one would have thought that the OEO would have been pretty careful in its first pilot project, to make certain that this one at least, got started in good shape. But instead, this project was hardly off the ground before it went into a tailspin.

Here are some of the facts.

First, a hotel was leased to provide the project with a headquarters and living quarters for the corps girls. The lease figure was $225,000 for 18 months which was $20,000 more than the value of the hotel as determined by a competent real estate appraisal some 3 years prior to that.

Incidentally, the St. Petersburg Times reported in an article on June 22 about this Job Corps project, that a real estate man made a $4,000 commission as a finders fee out of this deal by putting the school officials in touch with the hotel owner.

Another interesting item was electrical work let by the Job Corps people for $19,495 on a cost-plus-10-percent basis. About $40,000 was spent in total in remodeling.

Figures about the staff are fascinating too. There are 122 staff members supporting a student complement of 237, drawing a monthly payroll of $55,424—yearly about $700,000. The ratio of faculty to student is better than 1 for every 2. The ratio, at Harvard College, our Nation's oldest and wealthiest university, is 1 for every 6. The Women's Job Corps at St. Pete is really riding in style.

The cost per student will run between $6,000 and $7,000 per year.

Incidentally, one of the staff members is a swimming instructor hired at a salary of $8,160. Another a life guard who is called a "water safety coordinator"—pretty fancy. I wish I had a title like that when I was working in summer camps back in college days. But the bell-ringer here is that there is no swimming pool.

If the poverty people had made a study of finding a worse location, it would have been difficult to have come up with a better, worse location. For the leased hotel is in an area of the city, occupied by hotels and rooming houses for elderly people. The trainees are age 16 to 21. Nor are they hardly groomed to fit into an elderly St. Pete atmosphere. School dropouts that they are, coming from poverty homes, off the streets in some cases, an average reading comprehension of ninth grade, it is no wonder that a general complaint, for example, is that the girls undress in front of open windows and shock the neighbors.

Quite apart from whether the project is working well or not, the site location was an exercise of appalling bad judgment. The general conduct of the girls has left much to be desired. First, one of the girls arrived at the center 5 months pregnant, although the Director has stated that none have become pregnant since arrival at the center. Now that is reassuring, but it would be more so, if proper screening were done in the first instance.

One girl was married with two children and turned out to be an alcoholic.

Eight girls have been expelled for drinking.

These have been instances of actual drunkenness on the part of the girls.

There have been continuous complaints from others who live in the neighborhood, of the noise and rowdiness of the girls.

In connection with this an OEO spokesman issued a classic statement. He said:

> One of the problems peculiar to the St. Petersburg section is that there are many retired people there who sometimes frown on the animal spirits of the young.

I would hope he really does not classify these underprivileged young women as animals.

To make a long story short and to perhaps give a good idea of the tremendous success with which this first, model, pilot project of the Women's Job Corps got launched, here are some of the facts.

First. The director of the center has resigned amid complaints of tension headaches. Three other officials also submitted their resignations.

Second. The city council and the merchants association have requested that the Job Corps move to another location because it was giving the area a bad name and driving business away.

Third. The school board voted to divorce itself from the Job Corps as soon as its contract expires and sooner if possible.

As the St. Petersburg Times said in an editorial:

> The shortcomings of the center as administered to date are serious.

This editorial comment incidentally was by a newspaper which has been and still is sympathetic to and in support of the Women's Job Corps center.

What should Congress do to help clean up this mess at St. Petersburg and prevent further fiascos?

The wise thing to do would be to transfer these poverty war programs to the proper agencies which are presently handling similar problems such as the

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

For example, instead of launching a brand new Women's Job Corps, would not it have been far more sensible to have expanded the manpower training and development program or the vocational rehabilitation program to include the aims of the Job Corps?

However, now that the poverty war people have the bit in their teeth and galloping full tilt down the road, I am well aware that the facts of life are that we are not going to change the format—at least in this Congress.

There is one thing we can do, if we still are in full possession of sound and reasoning faculties. Let us continue this program at its present level of spending. Let us not increase by twice as much.

Let us require the Office of Economic Opportunity to really prove they can do a job before we increase the program.

Let us not reward incompetence and failure.

Let us not kill the poverty war with kindness. Kindness of too much money.

The kindest and most sensible thing we can do here is to hold the program to its present level of spending.

I sincerely hope this is the decision the House will make on this bill.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, in discussing the Economic Opportunity Act when it was before the House last August, I declared that people, not politics, should be our prime consideration. We should judge this and all legislation, I said then, not in terms of slogans or partisan claims and counterclaims, but in terms of its real impact upon the people whom it is designed to help. We should ask whether this is the best way to do the job—in this case, the best way to mobilize our human and financial resources to bring economic opportunity within the reach of those many Americans who lack it now. This same approach, placing people above politics, should be applied today as we debate the extension of the war on poverty.

One year is hardly long enough in which to learn whether this program works or does not work. But a year is long enough in which to see some progress and some problems. Now is not too soon to indicate where Congress feels that changes should be made, so that this program will not become bogged down, abused, or diverted from its original purposes.

Of course some problems can be anticipated for any new program, especially one which tries to reach and involve Americans who may never before have met a sympathetic public official. Such problems have arisen, for example, in some of the Job Corps centers. I have heard reports that up to half of the original Job Corps enrollees in the first Job Corps center, Camp Catoctin in Thurmont, Md., in my district, have now become Job Corps dropouts. Some left Camp Catoctin because of homesickness and unwillingness to adjust. These problems can be expected, and cannot be totally eliminated. But other youths have left because, during the late winter and early spring, their rooms were cold and camp facilities were incomplete—and some left because they were unable to form any rapport with a staff which had been hastily hired and inadequately trained.

Mr. Chairman, when underprivileged teenagers, apparently lost in the slums or in rural poverty-stricken areas, are rescued by the Job Corps, we all benefit. But when these teenagers are lost again, and lost forever, we all lose. When they are turned away through no fault of their own, but through administrative failures, the administration of this program must be reformed. There has been too much emphasis on fast action, so camps have been opened before the facilities or the staff was ready. There has been too much emphasis on promotion, and too little attention paid to processing of applicants—so New York City youths, having become interested enough to apply, have to wait months for any word, and so the OEO is now recruiting volunteers to help answer, probably with form letters, the thousands of letters generated by the recent network TV promotion of the Job Corps.

When teenagers ask for help, they should not be answered with form letters and long delays, or their first contact with a program designed to help them can be perhaps tragically disappointing.

The same overemphasis on quick action has already endangered parts of Operation Head Start, the summer program for underprivileged preschool children, which, properly administered, could be one of the most effective instruments against crippling undereducation. But Operation Head Start and its companion program for grade school children, Operation Catch Up, require skilled, sensitive planning in order to provide the enrichment and remedial training which disadvantaged children need. Unfortunately, Operation Head Start was started too fast. Although some applicants had obviously no experience with such programs for young children, and although some applications were very hastily drafted, OEO approved virtually every application which came in on time. In some cases, announcement of the grant was made only a few weeks before the opening of the summer session, allowing no time for adequate, careful preparation and training of staff.

Summer programs for grade school children are now underway, for example, in every county in my congressional district. These programs are supposed to aid almost 3,000 children at a cost of $360,457. Yet, four of these five grants were announced only on July 1—barely 2 weeks before the programs began. Regardless of the competence of the supervisors, it is impossible to organize an effective specialized program in 2 weeks.

Further, there is a puzzling lack of uniformity among these programs. In some areas, parents have told me that their children have been denied admission because their family income was slightly above the poverty level of $3,000. In other areas, every child who wishes to attend has been admitted, regardless of his family's income level. I see no need for these discrepancies. I hope the OEO will publish clear and uniform guidelines for eligibility, so that the program will not become, in some areas, simply a general summer school.

The lack of firm OEO standards has had most crippling consequences in the community action programs. I need not recount in detail the difficulties which have arisen in city after city across the country, as the war on poverty has been hampered by infighting among its generals—local politicians, private agencies, and public welfare establishments. Too much money is going to uphold cumbersome administrative pyramids, and too much time is being spent in forming huge committees which include representatives of the poor, while actual decisions are made elsewhere. OEO's willingness to experiment has led to costly abuse, while many programs seem to be guided less by principle than by political expediency.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that one of the most effective weapons against poverty has been the relatively modest, quiet, earnest VISTA program. Without benefit of titles, committees, or publicity, dedicated men and women of all ages and backgrounds are entering communities, living there, establishing friendships, and helping people to help themselves in a spirit of cooperation and mutual respect. I hope this program won't become tangled in politics, for it seems that the VISTA volunteers, working at the grassroots and concrete bases of poverty, may well score successes more lasting than those of more ambitious and spectacular efforts.

The success of the VISTA program underlines the truth that no amount of money can solve the problem of poverty in America unless a great investment of human talent and energy is also made. Poverty is more than a financial status—it is a poorness of education, a thinness of opportunity, a lack of hope. Thus, the poor must be reached; they should be helped; above all, they should be heartened and encouraged. I have suggested some of the reforms which should be made, so that the OEO will better reach and help and encourage the people for whom it was established.

I am hopeful that these changes will be made. If they are not, future large authorizations for this program may not be easily justified.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, the arguments we have just heard from our Republican colleagues inspire me to poetry.

> "The time has come," the walrus said,
> "To talk of many things,
> Of Haddads, Redskins, telephone books,
> And cabbages and kings."

Mr. Chairman, now that we have finished with the smoke screen and all of the argumentum ad hominem, the personal attacks, the grave discussions of seven or eight girls who bent their elbows a little too much——

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. I am sorry but I cannot yield to the gentleman at this point.

Mr. GURNEY. The gentleman just mentioned the previous speaker in the well.

Mr. SCHEUER. I yield very briefly, 30 seconds.

Mr. GURNEY. The gentleman's remarks remind me of an old professor of mine back in college days who was a professor of public speaking. He had one very effective thing he used to perform when someone was trying to draw a red herring across the path in debate. He would say this: "The gentleman sounds like an empty barrel, peculiarly his own sound."

Mr. SCHEUER. I thank my colleague for his courteous and courtly remark. What better proof that we have been treated to a diversionary circus exhibition involving a great deal of sound and fury, signifying nothing. The drolleries and hit-and-miss diversions are entertaining. But time is running out and we must now get down to the business of legislating. We should no longer be debating whether we need a massive Federal program attacking the root causes of poverty. Congress faced up to this moral imperative last year.

Rather, we should be discussing whether the shameful condition and urgent needs of this population subgroup in our society warrant the proposed expenditure in fiscal 1966 of $1.895 billion.

In making our decision whether to commit ourselves and our resources fully to fund this program, we now have only three basic questions to resolve: First, is there a demonstrable need for a program of the scope and scale proposed; second, is a commitment of less than $2 billion consistent with, or alien to, our history and traditions; third, can we afford the proposed program, can we undertake it without crippling and enervating our economy, without impeding the forward thrust and surge of our dynamic and expanding economy.

As of June 30, 1965, 1.1 million poor Americans had directly participated in the war against poverty. Since July 1 of this year, the Project Head Start program has already directly benefited another 550,000 children. An additional 1 million poor people have been assisted indirectly through the aid extended to them by members of their families who are immediately involved, in just 8 months.

Yet a full 450,000, or 45 percent, of the 1 million young children who urgently require Project Head Start preparation now before they enter the schoolhouse doors in September are not receiving this desperately needed help; only 360,000, or 15 percent, of the teenagers who are eligible for the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, or work-study programs are presently enrolled, leaving almost 2 million others without this vital training; and only 35,000, or a mere one-third of 1 percent, of the 12 million Americans who need adult basic education assistance in order to liberate themselves from the crippling shackles of functional illiteracy are presently benefiting from this remedial education.

Although the war against poverty is making bold progress, it is clear that with less than 10 percent of our impoverished population engaged directly and indirectly in our poverty program, and with 32 million impoverished Americans still to be helped, the effort undertaken so far is just a minimum beginning. Surely, this is a modest proposal.

If the Members of this distinguished House were to visit just one of the programs which we are presently considering and see firsthand how poverty has afflicted the poor, they would not doubt that this minimum scale of operations is necessary and appropriate to fit the needs.

In a Job Corps camp, for example, they would learn that the Job Corps man is not a well groomed, carefully scrubbed middle-class youngster with a happy past and a bright future. He is typically, a tough, scrawny, sullen kid whose economic and cultural deprivation has stamped upon him a haunting and frustrating sense of failure. He comes from a family averaging six persons who live in crowded, substandard housing.

Typically, he is an unemployed high school dropout who has been rejected by the Armed Forces as physically or mentally unfit for duty. He arrives with such a strange combination of fear, surliness, hope, suspicion—and, above all habitual impoverishment—that if at first he is uneasy at dinner, it is often because the table he sits at is the first one he has ever used, as are the dishes and the sanitary facilities. If he stares at some of the food served him, it is because the slab of roast beef is the first piece of meat he has ever seen—other than pork hocks and fat back in the family stew—that is large enough to require cutting with a knife.

His diet was so substandard that on the average $300 will have to be spent on him for dental care alone. He is so lacking in nourishment that for the first month the Job Corps cannot even provide him with a full set of clothes, because he will gain an average of 22 pounds as a result of eating three well-balanced meals a day for the first time, and thus will burst out of any outfit he may have received upon arrival

And there are more like him at "home." His preschool brothers and sisters, as the Project Head Start is now discovering, lack of the most basic knowledge and awareness of themselves and of their environment. They do not know the names of everyday items such as pencils and paper, crayons, or a children's book. No one has taught them the difference between silk and wool, to tell time, or the days of the week.

These children are so helplessly behind the first day they enter the schoolhouse door that—at age 3, 4, and 5—they are already predestined by their isolation and cultural impoverishment to be high-school dropouts a decade later.

Yet the dropout rate for these deprived kids in the Job Corps camps, with their radically different surroundings and resultant emotional strain, is only 3.2 percent after the first 30 days—and this for a group of young men and women of whom 94 percent were high school dropouts. In comparison, of the class of 1969 which enters our Nation's colleges this September, 50 percent will drop out of their school within the first 2 years; 40 percent of high school freshmen will never receive their diplomas.

Mr. Chairman, surely this program reflects our deep religious and political convictions identifying our Nation with the well-being of mankind everywhere. For the United States has a long and proud tradition of spending large sums to help peoples around the world develop and enhance their human resources.

In 1908, a few years after the Boxer Rebellion, America granted $10 million to China to send students to the United States for education and training that enabled them to return home and aid the impoverished in their own country.

After World War I, the U.S. aid to Europe under the U.S. Food Administration amounted to over $3 billion, or four-tenths of 1 percent of the gross national product.

From 1945 to the present time we gave a total of $100 billion in Marshall plan and foreign aid grants to impoverished peoples abroad, which represents 1.25 percent of the cumulative gross national product during this period of two decades.

At this point in our history, we have finally decided to look inwardly—to scrutinize our own problem of impoverishment, our own problem of undeveloped human resources. Can we believe that the pending authorization of $1.895 billion—or one-third of 1 percent of our gross national product—represents an inappropriate share of the Federal budget devoted to this high purpose, that it jeopardizes our Nation's fiscal solvency?

Our economy has never been healthier. President Johnson observes in his report on the budget for 1966 that the ratio of Federal spending, which is now about $100 billion, to the gross national product of $660 billion will drop to under 15 percent in 1966, the lowest ratio in 15 years. Furthermore, the President notes that the public debt of $323.5 billion as a percentage of the gross national product has declined sharply since 1947, from 116 percent then to less than 50 percent now.

There is no doubt that America today is capable of bridging the huge gap between our unparalleled affluence and our grinding poverty. The proposed bill would authorize $1.895 billion for fighting poverty. This amounts to one-third of 1 percent of the estimated $660 billion gross national product for 1965. It provides for our domestic war against poverty less than 4 percent of this year's defense budget of $53 billion, less than 5 percent of the $40 billion increase in the gross national product for this year alone, less than 6 percent of the $36.5 billion annual rate of corporate profits after taxes, and less than 7 percent of last year's $29 billion increase in disposable personal income.

This sum of $1.895 billion for the poor of our Nation is only one-third of the annual $6 billion increase in Federal tax revenues, one-third of last year's $6 billion increase in corporate profits, one-third of last year's increase of $6 billion in gross private savings, one-third of the 1965 Federal revenues of $6 billion from liquor and tobacco taxes alone; it is only one-half of last year's increase of $4 billion on the automobile expenditures, $600 million less than the $2.5 billion in surprise savings on this year's defense budget, and over $1 billion less than the 1965 budget of $3 billion for Project Apollo.

Mr. Chairman, if we can achieve a national consensus to spend $3 billion to propel three Americans off the earth and onto the moon, can we not spend less than $2 billion to propel 35 million Americans off their knees and onto their feet?

We have an economic capability—a capacity to produce goods and services—of such prodigious vitality as to dwarf our expectations of even a decade ago. Never in history has a society known such extraordinary vitality and productivity. Indeed, never until now has a society been able realistically to contemplate the elimination of poverty in its midst.

Mr. Chairman, we are all genuinely concerned about fiscal prudence. Is it fiscally prudent for private and city, State and Federal agencies to spend a combined estimated total of $100 billion a year on welfare programs—frequently using the demonstrably inadequate approaches of the past—when the current second and third generation of relief recipients is producing still another, and larger, generation of culturally impoverished and prospectively unemployable children—children who will surely spend their entire lives on welfare, at a cost of over $100,000 for each family, unless we intervene dramatically.

Is it fiscally prudent to continue to spend $1,800 a year to keep a delinquent in a detention home, $2,500 a year to keep a family on relief, an average of $4,100 a year for an inmate in a State prison, and over $4,900 a year for a youth at the National Training School for Boys, without at least attempting to discover why these mounting expenditures have not in the past overcome the cruel legacy that the poor leave to the poor: underemployment, unemployment, and saddest of all, unemployability?

Is it fiscally prudent not to spend $4,700 to give a young man training in the Job Corps, when, if he were earning only $4,000 a year with three dependents, his Federal income taxes alone over his lifetime would far exceed the cost of his training?

We could actually save over $120,000 on this one young man alone by avoiding the welfare, criminal, and other costs otherwise likely if he remained hopeless and jobless, and by collecting the income tax and social security payments, he would make throughout his working career. But we must spend the modest sum of $4,700 to train him now.

Either we spend that $4,700 now, or we will spend $2,500 year in and year out over the generations just to keep that man's family at subsistence level.

Either we spend that $4,700 now, or we might have to spend annually over $4,100 for his lifetime to keep him in prison.

The fortunate minority who receive a college education can expect average lifetime earnings of $453,000, almost twice the $273,000 high school graduates make, and exactly three times the $151,000 earned by those who do not finish high school. So too, do the unfortunate 35 million of our Nation's poor increase their own chance for economic success through the training and education which they receive from the war against poverty.

And what is the alternative to a genuine campaign against poverty now? If we postpone this necessary action now, later on our children will surely be forced to pay the price of our neglect anyway. For the war against poverty is preventive medicine. Every dollar that we invest now will pay future dividends in a stable, productive society for our children.

Instead of a society where every young child will grow up with a real chance for future economic success, in the next generation more than the present 15 million impoverished children under age 18 will grow up in real poverty. As teenagers, 2 million of them will be out of school, unemployed, and unemployable.

Instead of a society where education creates necessary skills, inadequate education and no education at all will create illiteracy and joblessness, which in turn produce despair, desperation, and delinquency.

Instead of a society where all of our citizens can enjoy unparalleled prosperity in productive security, chronic crime, and widespread fear will threaten the very stability of our Nation.

Of what avail will be success in our efforts to build beautiful cities, restore clean air and water, and preserve our natural heritage, if our citizens are afraid to walk the streets and use the parks and playgrounds—in the day as well as at night?

Mr. Chairman, we really have no choice. Either we meaningfully attack the problems of poverty now, or in a decade or two we will be forced to confront a situation more inequitable, more dangerous, and more costly.

If we do not now authorize the full expenditures necessary to eliminate poverty and deprivation in our midst, then our children may chastise us as George Bernard Shaw once did:

> We tolerate poverty as if it were either a wholesome tonic for lazy people, or else a virtue to be embraced as St. Francis embraced it. If a man is indolent, let him be poor. Now what does this "Let him be poor" mean? It means let him be weak. Let him be ignorant. Let him become a nucleus of disease. Let him be a standing exhibition and example of ugliness and dirt. Let him have rickety children. Let his habitations turn our cities into poisonous congeries of slums. Let the undeserving become still less deserving.

Eleven days ago, in Geneva, a great American, in one of his last acts of noble service, said:

> We travel together, passengers on a little spaceship, dependent on its vulnerable reserves of air and soil; all committed for our safety to its security and peace. We cannot maintain it half fortunate, half miserable, half confident, half despairing, half slave—to the ancient enemies of man—half free in a liberation of resources undreamed of until this day. No craft, no crew can travel safely with such vast contradictions. On their resolution depend the survival of us all.

One hundred years before Ambassador Stevenson's eloquent observation, another great American, and a former member of this great body, declared that this Nation could not endure half slave and half free.

If Abraham Lincoln were present with us today, he would proclaim in the well of this House that America cannot exist four-fifths educated, employed, self-sufficient, and affluent, and one-fifth unschooled, jobless, dependent, and impoverished.

So long as the great potential of this rich country is wasted, then the Nation as a whole is impoverished by that very gap between our potential and our performance. So long as there is the "other America" of the desperate poor, we are, all of us, poorer because of it.

The great Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., once said:

> I think that, as life is action and passion it is required of a man that he should share the passion and action of his time, at peril of being judged not to have lived.

Mr. Chairman, the President and Congress demonstrated last year that we do, indeed, have a compassionate concern for the underprivileged of this Nation. It is now up to us to match this deep concern with effective meaningful support. One last thought, Mr. Chairman, the job training and retraining programs we have initiated will give our unemployed the skills to become contributing members of society. But unless other measures in the war against poverty are enlarged in scope and increased in effectiveness, the high expectations we have generated in these people will lead to bitterness, disappointment, and disillusionment. For we will be motivating, educating, and equipping with employment skills many hundreds of thousands of men and women who will then face an economy which offers them no hope of employment.

We must begin now to create job opportunities by expanding those areas of output where our Nation's unmet needs are greatest. We can create a truly Great Society by enlarging our programs in such deficient areas as the rehousing of slum dwellers, the development of a comprehensive urban renewal program, and the construction of a national urban mass transit system, schools, hospitals, libraries, museums, and cultural centers.

To enjoy fully this Great Society we are building, however, we must keep our schools, parks, playgrounds, libraries, and art galleries open and staffed with skilled cultural and recreational aids. Instead of standing empty and unused much of the time, these facilities should be thrown open for the pleasure and enlightenment of our citizens in the evenings, on weekends, and during the summer.

This would require the employment of thousands to provide the maintenance and custodial care to keep these buildings and areas open; and it would insure to our citizens the facilities to make their increased leisure hours meaningful and enjoyable. At the same time, by utilizing the labor potential among the poor that is presently untapped, this kind of program would assure greater success in our war against poverty.

Mr. Chairman, the passage by the House last week of a Voting Rights Act decades overdue well-merited praise as "historic," as did the medicare, education, and housing bills. Indeed, we have known many proud moments in this session of Congress.

But I predict that if we underwrite fully the commitment we made last year to meet the proven needs and the moral challenge we face in one out of every five Americans, my colleagues one day will look back upon passage of this bill as one of the nobler acts of an already historic 89th Congress.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, you are not going to make the job of holding onto a hot potato any easier by increasing the size of the potato. However, this seems to be the type of reasoning employed by those who favor expansion of the war on poverty by approval of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965.

Without taking a long, searching look at the results of the past year under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, there are those who are ready to greatly increase the funds available to the Office of Economic Opportunity. Having had a year to spend $785 million, the proposed amendments call for increased expenditures in the neighborhood of $1.9 billion. This sounds like a pretty expensive way to leap before you look.

It is apparent that the bureaucratic entanglements of the complex EOA programs have produced a confusing, unclear mass of "approximatelys" and "expected to be's." We have not been given the facts; we do not know all the truths.

I read in a Look magazine article that a virtue and safeguard of the Economic Opportunity Act is the fact that "the Governor of a State has the power to veto nearly every program he does not like." Sargent Shriver, EOA Director and author of the article, lauded the Governors of the States for their cooperation in approving his programs over the past year. According to Shriver, the fears concerning southern Governors' using the veto in retaliation against civil rights legislation were unfounded. If this is the case, why is there a provision in the proposed Economic Opportunity amendments giving the Director of the war on poverty the power to override the veto of the States' chief executives.

This program is turning into another example of Federal encroachment on the rights of the individual citizen and his local government. It would seem that the agency best suited to fight poverty would be the one closest to the source of the ailment. Why not direct some of these funds into local coffers with no strings attached, allowing the State and local governments to wage their war on poverty without unnecessary, boondoggling Federal Government intervention.

On paper, the war on poverty looked like the answer to the prayers of millions of needy citizens. In reality, it appears to have become the tool of greedy politicians looking for votes. New York City is a good example of this political maze. Harlem Democratic Congressman POWELL has been charging "political patronage" in the administration of the city's $9 million stipend for poverty. Mayor Wagner, in control of the funds, had to frantically search for a means whereby he could get Governor Rockefeller to approve the project and still hang onto his control of the Federal money. The dispute goes back and forth and very little of concrete value is being accomplished.

Conflicting reports of the success of preliminary programs has more than one citizen wondering just what is really going on. Shriver lists 265,000 enrolled in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, yet only 1 month ago, he was publicizing the induction of the 100,000th enrollee in a ceremony at the White House. Work experience programs have, according to Shriver, drawn 88,000; yet HEW officials, the agency supposedly in charge of the program, list only 15,240. Originally scheduled to enroll 5,000 by now, the VISTA program has only a little over a thousand in the field and in training. The list goes on and the confusion increases. How are the American people and, more important, the Congress of the United States supposed to get a clear picture of what has been accomplished when the facts are hidden by conflicting figures, vague but pompous advertising campaigns, and a host of other misleading tactics.

If we're going to make a fair decision regarding extension of the war on poverty, we should have the facts and we should have them now before we rush ahead and finance an expensive program that, at best, looks suspicious.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 8283.

The administration's war on poverty has turned out to be such an obvious fiasco it is surprising that they are not a little embarrassed to come before us requesting $2 billion more.

There is hardly an aspect of the program that has not become mired in waste and utter confusion.

First of all, before any observable steps had been take to assist the poor, it appears that those who were going to fight this war took some decisive steps to assist themselves. They established a bureaucratic network with a lavish pay scale, which for some programs left very little money to help the poor. Furthermore, the political wrangle over the control of these programs has impeded progress. This new program is in danger of being paralyzed by its own massive bureaucracy and internal squabbling.

Not much of substance has been accomplished for the poor, and public confidence in the program is rapidly waning as more and more news reports appear, detailing the problems besetting this effort all over the country. Particularly, there is growing disenchantment among the poor, who have been repeatedly promised help but do not seem to be getting it.

It is understandable that a new program—particularly one of these dimensions—would have some difficulty getting off the ground. However, after many months of operation we still find bad communications, poor administration, job patronage and fat salaries.

In our own city of Cincinnati, Juvenile Court Judge Benjamin Schwartz, one of the founding members of the Community Action Commission which directs the antipoverty program there, recently stated publicly that the war on poverty in Cincinnati is not attacking the basic problem of the poor—hunger—but instead is creating a huge bureaucracy that duplicates existing services. Judge Schwartz, whose long experience on the bench of the juvenile court has given him a firsthand look at some of the problems of the poor, believes too much money is being spent to finance study after study instead of being given to existing agencies already doing a competent job of aiding the poor.

In view of the large number of complaints that have been registered concerning the administration of the antipoverty effort, it is certainly unfortunate that over the protests of the minority members of the committee, hearings on this bill were concluded so quickly. Many who wished to testify were not given the opportunity to do so, and no real effort is evident in this legislation to correct the many glaring defects in the administration of the program.

I am also disappointed to see that the only basic change made by the committee in the Economic Opportunity Act was to virtually remove the veto powers of the Governors with respect to community action programs. Instead, an effort should have been made to provide for positive participation in these programs by the appropriate agencies of the State so that the States would be permitted an active role in program development.

Certainly those of us who will vote against this bill desire for all Americans full employment, better living conditions and, hopefully, the eventual elimination of poverty. Our concern for the aged and infirmed, the school dropout, and other of our citizens in need of assistance is every bit as great as that of our colleagues who intend to support H.R. 8283. Our differences lie not in the ends desired, but instead in the means best suited for achieving these ends.

In my judgment, we should concentrate our efforts on making more effective the numerous existing Federal programs which seek to help the poor, rather than spending vast sums on overlapping and duplicating programs. In addition, I feel we should work for the adoption of Government policies and attitudes that will permit our free enterprise system to operate at peak efficiency and in this way produce more and better jobs.

I believe one worthwhile approach would be to offer employers an income-tax credit toward the expense of programs designed to train prospective employees for jobs with the company or to retrain current employees for more demanding jobs with the company. Such a credit should serve to encourage American business to provide new jobs and upgrade the job skills of the labor force.

For the general reasons outlined, I strongly urge the defeat of H.R. 8283. The infinitely complex causes of poverty in America will not be cured by huge indiscriminate expenditures of the public's money.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, much criticism has been leveled at some of the training programs conducted by the Office of Economic Opportunity. In an effort to describe to the House a successful, well thought out, and well operated plan, I would like to describe the BEST training program for the underprivileged people in my city.

Actually the name of the program is BEST which stands for basic essential skills training program. This program was derived through the cooperation of the New York City Trucking Authority of which Hugh Sheridan has been chairman for over two decades; with the Empire State Highway Transportation Association, whose managing director is Joseph Adelizzi; by the Teamster Unions involved, John O'Rourke being the district 16 international vice president; and by the many private operators who have realized from experience that there is virtually no labor pool of skilled small, medium, or heavy truck drivers, or truck maintenance men in the New York area. Private operators have found that in order to qualify a man as a truckdriver they actually have to put him in their own kindergarten, and let him work his way up in an area where there is no apprenticeship program and consequently at great expense to the employer.

A brief description of the BEST program and its present operations is as follows:

Mayor Robert F. Wagner and Paul R. Screvane, president of the council and chairman of the antipoverty operations board, have arranged with the Port of New York Authority's executive director, Austin J. Tobin, for the largest basic trades training program in the country as part of the city's campaign against poverty. The program will train 6,000 individuals in 1 year, with preference given to the unemployed and those receiving public assistance, and will utilize existing port authority training facilities.

The entire project will cost $2,240,289 and is financed by funds allocated by the city.

Mayor Wagner, Mr. Screvance, and James J. McFadden, acting commissioner of the New York City Department of Labor, and New York City trucking authority for driver training initiated the joint program with the antipoverty operations board, the port authority, and Commissioner Dumpson of the city's welfare department.

Thomas J. Riley, supervisor of maintenance skills training for the port authority, will serve as executive director of the BEST program (basic essential skills training) at no cost to the city.

Six free courses will be given in occupations wherein research indicated jobs are presently unfilled in the city due to lack of skills and increased job complexity. The areas covered by the BEST program include heavy vehicle driver training; general maintenance; oil burner repair and installation; building and grounds sanitation; window and package air conditioning repair and installation; and gardening.

Registration and classes will be conducted at BEST offices, Port Authority Building, 30 Church Street, New York, telephone: 233-1800.

Classes begin on Monday, June 7, 1965, Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Through sound trade skills, the indigent and deprived of the city may achieve a brighter financial future and become economically contributing citizens, as one segment of the city's all-out attack on poverty.

The curriculum for the various courses is as follows: Heavy vehicle driver training (320 attendance hours):

This program is designed to prepare trainees for positions in the transportation field and to pass the New York State Motor Vehicle Bureau's tests for chauffeur in the following categories: Tractor trailer, bus operation, heavy vehicle (over 18,000 pounds). Diesel tractor trailer.

Requirements: Grammar school or equivalent, operator's license, physically fit and 18 years of age.

General maintenance (480 attendance hours): A training program designed to assist trainees in preparing for jobs in general maintenance fields. It is a practical course covering 21 basic skills including painting, carpentry, electricity, plumbing and sheet metal.

Requirements: Physically fit and 17 years of age.

Building and grounds sanitation (320 attendance hours): Instruction covers all aspects of the duties of an operator in a building and grounds sanitation program including buffing, stripping and refinishing of floors; carpet cleaning; metal maintenance; policing of areas and relamping light fixtures.

Requirements: Physically fit and 17 years of age.

Oil burner repair and installation (320 attendance hours): Trainees receive instruction in the basic knowledge and skills required for the installation, maintenance, and repair of oil burner units. Stress is given to aspects such as blueprint reading; installation procedures and codes; installation of conversion burner and motor transformer principles.

Requirements: High school or equivalent, 18 years of age, physically fit.

Window and package air-conditioning repair and installation (320 attendance hours): This practical course provides knowledge of the operation, maintenance, repair, and installation of air-conditioning units. Curriculum covers 14 study units, including fundamentals of refrigeration; installation and servicing of window and floor units; blueprint reading, and duct installations.

Requirements: High school or equivalent, 18 years of age, physically fit.

Gardener's helper (320 attendance hours): Curriculum covers various skills required to assist the gardener in his duties. Program comprises 13 study units including repair; operation and maintenance of gardening equipment; policing of grounds; preparation and use of spray solutions and emulsions.

Requirements: Physically fit, 17 years of age.

(NOTE.—Every course, listed above, also includes 160 hours of remedial instruction in trade English and mathematics.)

Mr. Chairman, this is an example of solid accomplishment in training and teaching impoverished youths in vitally needed skills. It bridges the gap from common labor to the Government's apprenticeship training program which is geared more to the highly skilled groups. It is a continuation of a program conceived more than 4 years ago at the local level by industry and labor working jointly to solve its own problems in job placement.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, in my entire seven terms in this House, I have never heard any program criticized as has been this so-called antipoverty economic opportunity bill. That I opposed this program last year, and prophesied some of the poor administration that has come about has nothing to do with my feelings this year. I am only sorry that I was right last year. I am only sorry that hearings and the debate this year proved what has been said; namely, that this is the worst-administered program in history.

No one seriously denies this charge; yet, those who support this bill here today say that the way to improve the program is to double its cost. To me, that means double the waste and confusion.

Mr. Chairman, I have never quarreled with the objectives of this legislation. I did, however, and still do say that the various programs included under this act should have been carried out by existing agencies, rather than by setting up a new agency. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Shriver was doing a good job with the Peace Corps. It is a shame that he was given this dual responsibility and that his fine record has been spoiled. To think that he would head an agency where letters from Members of Congress are not answered for months. To think that he would head an agency which cannot even give Members of Congress a list of projects in their States. To think that he would head an agency that is so loaded with politics.

Certainly the testimony indicates that in many areas this program is little more than a political boondoggle. In many areas, too, the poor and needy, under this program, are mere pawns, while the politicians get the plums. In short, Mr. Chairman, I cannot in good conscience support this bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to speak in favor of H.R. 8283 and to lend my support to an extension and an expansion of the national war on poverty.

I am particularly pleased to support the provisions in the bill that strengthen and expand the VISTA volunteer program. In the early days of the 88th Congress, I was a sponsor of legislation to establish a national program of domestic volunteer service, and last year, I was a supporter of the proposal to create the VISTA program under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

VISTA volunteers play a vital role in expanding the economic opportunities of many of our citizens. Volunteers can supply the human element to support other antipoverty programs and to supplement the part-time voluntary efforts of millions of Americans.

Living with those hindered by a background of poverty and sharing their living conditions, VISTA volunteers can serve to interpret existing programs to those needing assistance, to help them identify and express their needs, and to provide necessary skills. They can stimulate hope and personal development by introducing citizens to opportunities available in the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps or other youth and adult programs in education and training. Too often those blighted by poverty lack the information, the confidence, and the hope of real progress which provide in large measure the motivation for self-improvement. To these citizens the VISTA volunteer, his skills and dedication, can offer guidance and assistance through the curtain of despair and futility so often created by poverty. In this task they serve in community action programs which are financially supported under other provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act. Perhaps most significantly volunteers can help identify and develop community resources that can contribute to meeting local and individual needs.

The VISTA program was launched at the beginning of this year. The first volunteers entered training in January and completed their training in late February. As of July 2, there were more than 220 volunteers on assignment and over 800 in training. Those on assignment are serving on American Indian reservations, with migrant workers, in rural Appalachia, in large urban community development projects, and in mental health and mental retardation programs. Volunteers are now serving in 25 States involving 53 individual projects. In every project the volunteers serve under the direction and guidance of a local supervisor.

VISTA volunteers reflect a remarkable diversity of skills and talents. There are teachers, lawyers, and carpenters. There are students, recent college graduates, and senior citizens. The youngest volunteer is 18 and the oldest 83. Volunteers bring with them skills learned in college classrooms, in years of business experience, in teaching, and in working with people. Over 20,000 citizens have submitted preliminary applications and almost 7,000 have filed final applications.

The volunteer spends the first 6 weeks of VISTA service in a practical training program learning to apply the skills developed in private life to the environment of poverty. Those familiar with the culture of the affluent America must learn to work in the culture of the other America in which citizens suffer from malnutrition of the body, the intellect, and the spirit.

A school teacher serving with VISTA can have outstanding success with high-school dropouts or illiterate adults. A retired businessman can assist in the development of community organization and structure. A young college graduate can use his skills in developing a local preschool program in counseling, or in providing services for the mentally ill and retarded. When volunteers are assigned to duty—at the request of a local antipoverty group—each volunteer has a specific job to do, and the background to do it.

VISTA is truly a creative program for it nourishes within those blighted by poverty the growth of self-reliance, initiative, confidence, and skills which will enable each individual to fight, and to win, his war against poverty. I believe that our country is being well served by the dedicated Americans who have chosen to become VISTA volunteers. I wholeheartedly support H.R. 8283, and I endorse the provisions which will strengthen the VISTA volunteer program.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to endorse this legislation and to pledge my support to continue our war on America's most insidious and demoralizing enemy—poverty. I have watched this program develop with great interest and I have seen in my own district its tangible and considerable results. I have watched communities mobilize in an effort to develop programs to uproot the causes of poverty. I have seen youth wrested from stagnating unemployment and disadvantaged children given an opportunity to learn to be as productive in school as their more fortunate neighbors.

Well over $500,000 has been granted to eight communities in my district under the Neighborhood Youth Corps. We have received $200,000 for projects in Woonsocket, Central Falls, Pawtucket, East Providence, Portsmouth, Jamestown, and Newport. Providence has received another $350,000. Almost 3,000 youths are enrolled and employed, acquiring valuable work experience and supporting their own educations at the same time. This is employment they would not otherwise find, and yet it is more than simply a job. It is a chance to learn; a chance to progress in education and in society.

One hundred and fifty thousand dollars was funded to Newport, East Providence and Providence under Project Head Start this summer whereby hundreds of preschool children from poor neighborhoods are being given an opportunity to catch up to their contemporaries. Medical and dental care and guidance under the dedicated supervision of concerned teachers and aids have given these children a chance to profit from school in the fall; a chance to develop along with other children their own age.

East Providence was among the first wave of cities to receive program development grants this year under title II–A of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Since that time, it has been funded over $110,000 for a community action program for food distribution and nutrition. Newport, too, has a program development grant of $20,000. And, I am happy to see other communities joining in the effort to analyze and plan the ways to subdue and exterminate poverty. Pawtucket's proposal is under review now; Cumberland and Lincoln will have a program shortly.

Programs such as these must be allowed to have their full effect. Neither the awesomeness of the task which lies before us nor the difficulty of our first few steps should cause us to waiver in our resolve to go on. We must not falter, for too many lives and futures are at stake. Rather, in the words of our President, "Let us continue."

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965. This legislation if approved would continue in operation the so-called war on poverty program which in my estimation, represents the greatest display of political hokum in this century.

The administrative officials in this "war" have certainly demonstrated, if we are to judge from the operation of the program thus far, that the real purpose of the 1964 act was not to help the poor. In some cases, as much as 85 percent of the poverty money appropriated has been spent on extravagant bureaucratic salaries. Furthermore, most of these people were not by any means, poor.

During the initial hearings on these proposed amendments this year numerous examples of mismanagement and inefficiency were pointed out. The hearings were suddenly brought to a halt, the chairman contending that time was of the essence.

One example of the extravagance of the war on poverty was brought to light. Even the program officials admitted that costs were out of line. I am speaking of an Operation Head Start project where nursery school teachers will be paid at rates ranging from $8 an hour to over $9 an hour this summer. These teachers will receive $200 a week for work in day care centers. The national average of pay for the same work throughout the country is only about $125 per week. Although Operation Head Start is not being considered in the proposed amendments, I feel that this example points out the enormous waste of tax money brought about by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

About 3 weeks ago another example of the gross inefficiency and wastefulness of the war on poverty was brought to my attention.

In the June 26 issue of the Meridian Star, Meridian, Miss., the following associated press article appeared:

> SCHOOL BOARD CANCELS ANTIPOVERTY PACT
>
> CLEARWATER, FLA.—The Pinellas County School Board has voted unanimously to cancel a $2.4 million contract connected with the first Women's Job Corps Training Center established under President Johnson's antipoverty program.
>
> School Superintendent Floyd T. Christian said the program "has not been a success, has been mislocated and has not improved the board's image in any way."
>
> Christian recommended cancellation of the contract with the Office of Economic Opportunity.
>
> The center, housed in St. Petersburg's Huntington Hotel, enrolls high school dropouts and trains them with skills to find jobs.
>
> The board said neighboring residents, mostly retired elderly persons, have complained about excessive noise. The board also complained that a staff of 130 for an anticipated 280 to 300 girls amounted to nearly 1 instructor for every 2 girls.
>
> In a series of articles, the St. Petersburg Times said costs amounted to between $6,000 to $7,000 to train one girl a year.
>
> One point brought up was the annual salary of $8,160 for a swimming instructor.
>
> The Times said the monthly pay for the staff was about the same as county teachers.

> Many of the county's top teachers were leaving their posts to take jobs with the center, the paper said.
>
> The rent paid for the center at the downtown hotel for 18 months was reported by the Times as $250,000 close to the valuation of the building for tax purposes.
>
> The Times quoted Milton Fogelman, chief contracting officer for the OEO in Washington, as saying that the $2.4 million contract runs through July 31, 1968 "and one does not lightly walk away from a public contract."
>
> Christian wants the board to end the contract within 18 months "or sooner if possible."

One other point that disturbs me about this measure is the fact that this bill places within the authority of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity the power to override the State Governors. Although proponents of the section contained in title 8 claim that it is a compromise, the way I see it, this section merely allows the State Governors authority to agree with the Director—if he, the Governor, agrees that certain of the war on poverty programs are acceptable by his State, then his authority prevails, but as soon as he disagrees with poverty officials on a particular phase of the program for his State, then he must bow to the wishes of the Director. I submit that the provision written into the bill giving the State Governor discretionary authority to accept or reject, carries no weight whatsoever as long as the Director has the power to overrule him.

Mr. Chairman, after careful study of the present administration of the war on poverty program, and because of a firm belief in the philosophies of States rights, I must therefore oppose this legislation, and respectfully urge my colleagues to do likewise.

And finally, last week we received reports where 8 out of 25 men enrolled in a Job Corps training program were arrested on charges ranging from possession of narcotics to possession of pornographic material. These men were supposedly training to be hospital chefs in a school at the Hudson River State Hospital in New York. The point I wish to make with these three of many many examples of immorality, ineffectiveness, and mismanagement which if offered a year of trial, these programs have proved so costly and ineffective, we should scuttle the entire program.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, the antipoverty program is 1 year old, and the achievements thus far have been most encouraging. Already it is proving a harbinger of hope for the Nation's poor, directly or indirectly. There has been criticism of the program; some disagreements and dissensions are to be expected in launching a program of such magnitude. But we must remember that breaking the cycle of poverty for several million families is a tremendous task and one that cannot possibly be accomplished in a year or a few years; it must be long range and may well take a generation.

Our major assault on poverty is being undertaken through the youth programs and the community action programs. State, local, and private nonprofit organizations are utilizing local resources in planning and carrying out programs which assist low-income families with job training and counseling, special education, and housing and health problems.

In my congressional district in the Bronx, which unfortunately is a depressed, low-income area, the underprivileged, young and old, are benefiting from the various community action programs—the work training, the Job Corps, Head Start, and adult basic education programs. These important and urgently needed programs are opening job and school opportunities to youth in my area whose future otherwise would be filled with frustration, hopelessness, and poverty. For the first time, many boys and girls in my congressional district are being given the opportunity to compete with youths of higher economic levels in other areas. We are utilizing brainpower and skill which otherwise would be wasted. An example of this is the recent selection of 60 youths from poverty-stricken homes in the Bronx to begin a 5-year college program leading to teaching careers. These boys—unable to compete for college scholarships with students from families and neighborhoods offering more advantages—are being given the opportunity to overcome the severe handicaps of their poverty-stricken backgrounds. The investments we are making like this, not only in my district, but throughout the country, will be repaid many times over.

In New York the Head Start project is the largest in the country, and is assisting over 25,500 underprivileged children. Nationwide, this program embraces more than 500,000 children and is helping them escape from the clutches of poverty by striking at the root cause: lack of early education. In addition, many of these children have defects in eyesight, in their teeth, and hearing, and have other health problems which are receiving attention for the first time. Headstart is helping these youngsters face life with hope; and is putting them on an equal with more fortunate children.

One of several community progress centers being established in New York will be located in the south Bronx. These centers provide neighborhood mobilization, a variety of social services, and are coordinating many projects that are, and will be, operating within the neighborhood.

Within the next year, New York should have a fully coordinated and broadly representative program. We are utilizing all available resources and organizations, both professional and neighborhood based, with selection of personnel from residents of the neighborhood. Our program encompasses a number of neighborhood associations and we are extending such programs as the "hot summer program" to alleviate tensions and provide for youth to expend energies. The youth employment program, the ASPIRA-Puerto Rican forum is conducting a bilingual nursery school project with three preschool multipurpose centers, and they will direct 2,500 Puerto Rican adolescents from slums toward college. The United Neighborhood Houses will have three integrated preschool and parent opportunity centers. These will employ neighborhood aids and will serve 425 mothers and children. Neighborhood training, placement, and sheltered work facilities in the Bronx will assist 250 disabled persons over 50 years of age.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is providing jobs and training for thousands of high school age youths, who were out of work and out of school, or were about to become school dropouts. These boys and girls are now learning self-respect and for the first time in their lives they are grasping the meaning of education and having a goal in life. The Neighborhood Youth Corps in New York, as of now, has 5,500 youths at work under this program. In addition, a summer project was approved for 8,500 enrollees.

Under the college work-study program, poor and underprivileged college students are working and studying during the summer months. The work-experience program is providing thousands of adults with dependents with job skills that will enable them to free themselves from the shackles of poverty and despair. The VISTA program has 5,000 volunteers in 200 communities. The adult basic education programs in all 50 States are benefiting 70,000 adults.

In addition to the important activities I have mentioned, the Economic Opportunity Act also provides aid to migrant workers, loans to needy rural families, and assistance to small businesses.

And so, Mr. Chairman, the war on poverty is off to a good start, but it is only a start; much remains to be done. Never has such a large program, involving so many elements—public and private—been undertaken in this country. Poverty is everyone's problem, for poverty in a community affects every resident of that community. It involves a network of social ills—unemployment, poor health, slum housing, and illiteracy. Our out-of-school and out-of-work youths contribute to juvenile delinquency. Inadequate housing, overcrowding in slum areas, breed discontent and crime. The lack of education and job skills swell the unemployment rolls.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8283, to extend and expand the Economic Opportunity Act. This program has wide support and has had a successful and encouraging beginning; we must enlarge and increase its scope and effectiveness. I call upon my colleagues in the House to lend their support to this legislation. Let us complete the task we have begun: To eliminate want, deprivation, and need in our country, the richest Nation in the world.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, during the debate on this bill, I mentioned some people who are working for OEO without compensation. I include at this point in the RECORD the complete list for the information of the membership of the House.

MEMBERS OF THE BUSINESS LEADERSHIP ADVISORY COUNCIL

[WOC=without compensation]

Name	Salary	Selecting official	Duty station	Present employment
Besse, Ralph M	WOC	Sargent Shriver	Washington, D.C	Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., president.
Brown, George R	WOC	do	do	Brown & Root, Inc., president.
Burke, John	WOC	do	do	Business Council, executive secretary.
Carter, Richard H	WOC	do	do	Fostoria Corp., president.
Cisler, Walker L	WOC	do	do	Detroit Edison Co., chairman.
Cutler, Lloyd N., Esq	WOC	do	do	Wilmer, Cutler, & Pickering.
Dadian, Arthur H., Esq	WOC	do	do	Attorney at law.
Donahue, Alphonsus J	WOC	do	do	Donahue Sales Corp., president.
Douglas, Donald, Jr	WOC	do	do	Douglas Aircraft Co., president.
Eisenhower, Dr. Milton	WOC	do	do	Johns Hopkins University, president.
Ely, John M	WOC	do	do	Prexy's, Inc., president.
Gerstacker, Carl A	WOC	do	do	Dow Chemical Co., chairman of the board.
Goldston, Eli	WOC	do	do	Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates, president.
Houvouras, Andrew J., Jr	WOC	do	do	Huntington Plating, Inc., president.
Kaiser, Edgar F	WOC	do	do	Kaiser Industries Corp., chairman.
Klutznick, Philip	WOC	do	do	Klutznick Enterprises.
Linowitz, Sol M	WOC	do	do	Xerox Corp., chairman of the board.
Martin, Virgil C	WOC	do	do	Carson Pirie Scott & Co., president.
Menke, W. Kenneth	WOC	do	do	Pittsburgh Chemical Co., president.
McCormack, James	WOC	do	do	Massachusetts Institute of Technology, vice president.
Nahas, R. T	WOC	do	do	R. T. Nahas Co., president.
Nichols, Thomas S	WOC	do	do	Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., chairman.
Peterkin, Daniel, Jr	WOC	do	do	Morton Salt Co., president.
Phillippe, G. L	WOC	do	do	General Electric Co., chairman of the board.
Ross, Joseph	WOC	do	do	Davidson Bros., president.
Saunders, Stuart T	WOC	do	do	Pennsylvania Railroad Co., chairman of the board.
Sonnabend, Roger P	WOC	do	do	Hotel Corp. of America, president.
Spencer, Lyle	WOC	do	do	Science Research Associates, Inc., president.
Watson, Thomas J., Jr	WOC	do	do	IBM, chairman of the board.
Wheeler, John	WOC	do	do	Mechanics & Farmers Bank, president.
Reppler, Theodore S	WOC	do	do	Advertising Council, president.
Alden, Vernon	WOC	do	do	Ohio University, president.
Carmichael, Donald S., Esq	WOC	do	do	Counselor at law.
Rubel, John H	WOC	do	do	Litton Industries, vice president.
Bullock, Hugh	WOC	do	do	Calvin Bullock, Ltd., president.
Fowler, Henry H	WOC	do	do	Business Leadership Council, resigned.

LABOR ADVISORY COUNCIL

Allen, Finlay C	WOC	Sargent Shriver	Washington, D.C	United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, AFL-CIO, vice president.
Fried, Milton	WOC	do	do	Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO director of research.
Goldfinger, Nat	WOC	do	do	AFL-CIO, director of research.
Greenberg, Max	WOC	do	do	Wholesale & Department Store Union, AFL-CIO, president.
Haggerty, C. J	WOC	do	do	Building & Construction Trades, AFL-CIO, president.
Lesser, Leonard	WOC	do	do	Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, assistant to president.
Perlis, Leo	WOC	do	do	Community Services Department, AFL-CIO, director.
Reed, W. Vernie	WOC	do	do	AFL-CIO, vice president.
Rogin, Larry	WOC	do	do	Department of Education, AFL-CIO, director.
Sullivan, David	WOC	do	do	Building Service Employees International Union, AFL-CIO.
Weeks, Barney	WOC	do	do	Alabama Labor Council, AFL-CIO, president.
Brown, Pete	WOC	do	do	American Federation of State, City & Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, special international representative.

INTERIM INTER-FAITH PLANNING COMMITTEE ON POVERTY

Comfort, Rev. Richard	WOC	Sargent Shriver	Washington, D.C	National Council of Churches.
Greene, Rev. Shirley E	WOC	do	do	National Council of the Churches of Christ.
Rahn, Rev. Sheldon	WOC	do	do	National Council of Churches.
Hinton, Thomas D	WOC	do	do	National Catholic Community Service.
Gallagher, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Raymond.	WOC	do	do	National Conference of Catholic Charities.
Bernstein, Philip	WOC	do	do	Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds.
Hirsch, Rabbi Richard G	WOC	do	do	Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
Solender, Sanford	WOC	do	do	National Jewish Welfare Board.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS—SUBCOMMITTEE ON POVERTY

Danstedt, Rudolph T	WOC	Sargent Shriver	Washington, D.C	National Association of Social Workers, ACSW, director.
Lourie, Norman V	WOC	do	do	Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare.
McNeil, C. F	WOC	do	do	NASW Commission on Community Organization-Health and Welfare Council.
Shiffman, Bernard M	WOC	do	do	Director of program for development and training.
Tavani, Cleonice	WOC	do	do	National Association of Social Workers.
Vasey, Wayne	WOC	do	do	Dean, George Warren Brown School of Social Work, George Washington University.

TASK FORCE ON PROGRAMS FOR OLDER POOR

Aller, Dr. Curtis	WOC	Sargent Shriver	Washington, D.C	San Francisco State College.
Baxt, Roland	WOC	do	do	Executive director, Federation Employment & Guidance Service of New York.
Fitch, William C	WOC	do	do	Executive director, American Association of Retired Personnel.
Kreps, Dr. Juanita	WOC	do	do	Professor of economics, Duke University.
Odell, Charles E	WOC	do	do	Older and Retired Workers Department, United Auto Workers.
Patton, James	WOC	do	do	National Farmers Union.
Aramony, William	WOC	do	do	United Funds of Dade County.
Edelman, John	WOC	do	do	National Council of Senior Citizens.
Houstoun, Lawrence O., Jr	WOC	do	do	New Jersey Office of Economic Opportunity.
Mathiasen, Mrs. Geneva	WOC	do	do	National Council on Aging.

TASK FORCE ON PROGRAMS FOR OLDER POOR—Continued

[WOC=without compensation]

Name	Salary	Selecting official	Duty station	Present employment
Maurer, Robert S	WOC	Sargent Shriver	Washington, D.C	1120 Connecticut Ave. NW.
Kiley, Ed	WOC	do	do	National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.
Shelley, Edwin	WOC	do	do	Engineering management, care of New York Institute of Technology.
Sheppard, Dr. Harold L	WOC	do	do	W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.
Calloway, Dr. Nathaniel O	WOC	do	do	Veterans' Administration hospital.
Ravin, Louis	WOC	do	do	Executive Secretary, Task Force on Programs for the Older Poor, Office of Economic Opportunity.
Wiesen, Aaron M	WOC	do	do	Chairman, Council of Aging, Health and Welfare Council of the Cincinnati Community Chest.
Jackson, Hobart	WOC	do	do	Stephen Smith Home for the Aged.
Russell, Mrs. A. M. G	WOC	do	do	Chairman, California State Committee on Aging.
WICS (WOMEN IN COMMUNITY SERVICE)				
Cooper, Mrs. William	WOC	Sargent Shriver	Washington, D.C	National Council of Jewish Women; WICS president.
Fischer, Mrs. Albert	WOC	do	do	United Church Women; WICS vice president.
Mealey, Margaret	WOC	do	do	National Council of Catholic Women; WICS treasurer.
Williams, Ethel	WOC	do	do	National Council of Negro Women; WICS secretary.
POVERTY LIAISON OFFICERS				
Bakken, Elmaar H	WOC	Sargent Shriver	Washington, D.C	Director, Boy Scouts of America.
Bird, Clarence W	WOC	do	do	National Economic Commission-American Legion.
Cortner, Mrs. C. E	WOC	do	do	Girl Scouts of the United States of America.
Dudley, Tilford E	WOC	do	do	AFL-CIO.
Fields, Mrs. Howard	WOC	do	do	Woman's Auxiliary to the American Optometric Association.
Goldberg, Ned	WOC	do	do	National Federation of Settlements & Neighborhood Centers.
Gunther, Mrs. Violet	WOC	do	do	Citizens Crusade Against Poverty.
Johnson, Mrs. Cernoria D	WOC	do	do	National Urban League, Inc.
Kimbrel, M. Monroe	WOC	do	do	Chairman of the board, First National Bank. Chairman, American Bankers Association Liaison Committee to OEO.
Mahlman, Tony	WOC	do	do	American Optometric Association.
Rollins, Robert P	WOC	do	do	American National Red Cross.
Stanley, Miles	WOC	do	do	AFL-CIO.
PROFESSIONAL INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS				
Andy Williams	WOC	Sargent Shriver	Washington, D.C	Singer.
Dick Van Dyke	WOC	do	do	TV personality.
Richard Crenna	WOC	do	do	Do.
Jackie Gleason	WOC	do	do	Do.
Danny Kaye	WOC	do	do	Do.
Andy Griffith	WOC	do	do	Do.
Johnny Mathis	WOC	do	do	Singer.
Lloyd Thaxton	WOC	do	do	Do.
Dinah Shore	WOC	do	do	Do.
Harry Belafonte	WOC	do	do	Do.
Gina Lollobrigida	WOC	do	do	Movie actress.
Donna Reed	WOC	do	do	TV and movie actress.
Betty Furness	WOC	do	do	TV public relations specialist.
Gregory Peck	WOC	do	do	Movie actor.
Al Capp	WOC	do	do	Nationally syndicated cartoonist.
Walt Disney	WOC	do	do	TV and movie producer.
Earl Newsom	WOC	do	do	Public relations specialist.
J. Walter Thompson	WOC	do	do	Do.
Young and Rubicam	WOC	do	do	Do.
Papert, Koenig, and Lois	WOC	do	do	Do.
Osgood Nichols	WOC	do	do	Do.
MEMBERS OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL				
Blake, Rev. Eugene Carson	WOC	Sargent Shriver	Washington, D.C	World Council of Churches.
Conant, Dr. James B	WOC	do	do	Writer; former president of Harvard.
Galbraith, Dr. J. Kenneth	WOC	do	do	Harvard economist; former Ambassador to India.
Johnson, John H	WOC	do	do	Editor-publisher.
Keeler, W. W	WOC	do	do	Phillips Petroleum Co., vice president.
Lucey, Most Rev. Robert E	WOC	do	do	Head, Archdiocese of San Antonio.
McNamara, Mrs. Robert S	WOC	do	do	Activities concerned with youth welfare, counseling, and juvenile courts.
Marland, Dr. Sidney P	WOC	do	do	Superintendent of schools, Pittsburgh.
Olivarez, Mrs. Grace	WOC	do	do	Executive secretary, National Conference on Poverty.
Randolph, A. Philip	WOC	do	do	Vice president, AFL-CIO.
Russell, Mrs. A. M. G	WOC	do	do	Member, California State Committee on Aging.
Spock, Dr. Benjamin M	WOC	do	do	Doctor-writer.
Stanley, Miles C	WOC	do	do	West Virginia Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, president.
Young, Whitney M	WOC	do	do	Executive secretary, National Urban League.

Mr. **FULTON** of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this is an occasion for commendation—not condemnation—of the efforts and work being carried out under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

This week I received a letter from a lady in my district. She complained rather bitterly about deficiencies in and abuses of our welfare programs around the Nation. She enclosed an article from a publication with nationwide circulation pointing out some of these problems and asked what the Congress is doing about the situation. Her letter was particularly appropriate and her question particularly pertinent at this time.

My reply was that as far as the Congress is concerned, and as far as administration policy is concerned, our answer to welfare abuse is the elimination of the need for welfare through the war on poverty.

There is no one who will deny that our efforts toward this end have suffered some setbacks. We have had some defeats in this war on poverty. But many wars have been won convincingly despite innumerable battles lost.

We are all too well aware of the St. Petersburgs, of the Job Corps youths who have gotten into trouble, of the failure here and the lack of progress there. But as we consider this bill, let us be mindful that the success of a program such as this, a war on poverty, should not be measured by the loss of a few battles.

When we measure the results of this war on poverty, we must take into paramount consideration the people at whom the programs are directed and what type of people we are trying to assist.

We are attempting to reach the people who, for one reason or another, have been denied the opportunity for economic advancement that the vast majority of the citizens of this Nation enjoy. These are the people who have failed or will fail because of lack of training. These are the families on relief who contribute very little materially to our society. And these are the children of these families who will be faced with an even darker economic future than their parents, who will be bypassed by the future growth and greatness of this Nation, who will be left in the backwash of progress, unless we aid them now.

We must remember also that the war on poverty is unlike programs such as college aid and student loans where the success rate is expected to be high. This is a program in which the rate of failure and expectation of failure is very high. Therefore, if this program is successful in assisting 6, 4, or even 2 of every 10 persons living in poverty today to escape the cycle of poverty, if it enables the children of these people who may not yet be fully caught up in this cycle to break loose, then this program is and will continue to be a tremendous success.

Less than a year ago, there was no Economic Opportunity Act. Less than a year ago, there was no Office of Economic Opportunity. Yet in less than a year, under passage of that act, the Office of Economic Opportunity has grown from a small overworked and understaffed cadre of dedicated public servants until today it is, in consideration of the herculean task it has undertaken, one of the most efficient and least bureaucratically hampered offices in our Federal Government.

Just what has been accomplished in these past 11 months in face of the difficulties of establishing office staff, procedures, screening of thousands of applications, and the many, many other problems which arise in the establishment of a new office and program of this magnitude?

The major goal of the war on poverty is, of course, to reach the poor and help them help themselves. As of June 30 of this year, the war on poverty had directly served 1,167,000 poor Americans. This is a truly commendable achievement for a program of this nature which has yet to observe its first anniversary. This total does not include the 530,000 preschool children in the 12,500 community centers, who this summer, are being aided through Project Head Start.

In addition, at the completion of the proposed 1965 program of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the war on poverty will have directly served 3,009,000 poor Americans.

I have a breakdown on these figures by program and year for which I have requested unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

War, as this Nation well knows, is a horrible thing. Yet from war, this country emerged, was tested, and became the greatest and most powerful Nation on earth.

A War of Independence made a nation of this colonial region.

A Civil War tested the strength of our great Union and proved it could endure.

Two World Wars proved that no challenge was too great for a nation dedicated to democracy and freedom.

Korea and Vietnam have proved that no challenge was too great for a nation dedicated to democracy and freedom.

Korea and Vietnam have proved that no challenge, though by comparison small, is too small to undertake in the defense of freedom though the price be high.

In the course of all these wars, scores of battles were lost. But the ultimate prize has been ours.

So it is with the war on poverty.

Our greatest asset for a continued democracy is an abundant life for each of our citizens. A life in which they have an opportunity to assume personal responsibility for their own well-being and a desire to contribute to the well-being of the future citizens of their nation. The continuation of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 will be a progressive move toward this accomplishment.

The table referred to follows:

Office of Economic Opportunity—Fiscal year 1965 program

	Poor served by June 30			Total poor to be served with 1965 program		
	Direct	Indirect [1]	Total	Direct	Indirect	Total
Community action program:						
Action grants	600,000	330,000	930,000	1,800,000	1,000,000	2,800,000
Head Start children	----------	----------	----------	560,000	----------	560,000
Head Start workers	----------	----------	----------	60,000	180,000	240,000
Migratory agricultural workers	73,000	425,000	498,000	73,000	425,000	498,000
Job Corps	10,000	30,000	40,000	32,000	100,000	132,000
Neighborhood Youth Corps	265,000	850,000	1,115,000	265,000	85 ,000	1,115,000
Work experience program	88,000	264,000	352,000	88,000	264,000	352,000
Work study program	85,000	----------	85,000	85,000	----------	85,000
Rural loan program	11,000	44,000	55,000	11,000	44,000	55,000
Adult basic education	35,000	----------	35,000	35,000	----------	35,000
Total served	1,167,000	1,943,000	[2] 3,110,000	3,009,000	2,863,000	[2] 5,872,000

[1] Indirect includes other family members and such things as temporary use of rest-stop facilities in the care of migratory workers.

[2] Not adjusted for poor people served by more than 1 program.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, we may well look at the economic opportunity amendments by looking back over the hopes that Congress had for the original act last year. These were shared by the impoverished whom this act should have helped. What were these hopes?

We were promised by the administration a strong, vigorous, imaginative program designed and equipped to combat poverty. We expected that it would be coordinated with the other attempts being made by the Federal, State, and local agencies and private organizations who spend about $100 billion a year already.

We wanted to give the impoverished the hope that there was a way out of the crowded tenements and dirty, narrow streets, a hope that their children would not spend their whole lives struggling in the environment they were born into. We wanted them to know that somebody cared.

We planned that the money was to go to qualified groups who were sincerely interested in helping the poor, often to the existing groups, and that programs would be established in those areas where the need was the greatest.

We hoped that the existing leaders of the poor would be included in the planning and that people who have had direct contact with the poor through settlement houses and other welfare agencies would be employed. We were led to believe that the poor would be organized to help themselves when this was feasible and that their present groups and the leaders they trust would be utilized. Not only would this increase the effectiveness of the program, but it would maintain the self-respect of the people we are helping.

We foresaw that qualified and trained professional personnel would be hired to work at the roots of the problem, people who were familiar with the work of welfare agencies. We hoped that the program would be effective, not merely look busy and spend its allotted funds.

But what, Mr. Chairman, have we had in answer to our hopes? What have the poor seen of this program? We have in answer to our hopes for sound program planning, a huge, bungling and confused administration, concerned more with salaries, titles, and offices than with the poor. In the words of the gentleman from New York, committee Chairman POWELL, as he opened the hearings of the ad hoc subcommittee:

> There has been an overemphasis on planning and a dismal deemphasis on action.

Of the 218 grants made by the community action program, only 34 have been for action. He continued to describe salaries which he characterized as "excessively high and in some instances unreasonable and wildly unrealistic."

By March 31 of 1965, 85 percent of the funds allocated for administration had been used. By that time the OEO had 346 special consultants, plus 574 regular employees in the Washington office and 74 in the field. The personnel roster was a topheavy list of highly paid chiefs directing a very few Indians. Mail piled up, due to the lack of organization, for several months until consultants costing the taxpayer $50 a day were put to work answering routine correspondence.

To quote again from the gentleman from New York, Chairman POWELL:

> In far too many communities, giant fiestas of political patronage have been encouraged.

And he continued to describe how "politicians have used the reservoir of poverty funds to feed their political hacks at the trough of mediocrity." Strong words, but from the chairman whose mail every week had been full of letters from all over the country describing the situation.

In the course of the hearings Chicago's shocking record was slowly unfolded by witnesses, a record of using poverty jobs as political tools.

A letter from a ward captain or an alderman was the key for a job. Far more highly qualified people were interviewed, without this calling card, and turned away with only brief formalities of consideration. The record shows the same lack of interest in qualification or experience across the Nation as highly paid amateurs are set to work in solving problems they have no familiarity with, while qualified groups are ignored to operate as best they can.

In its haste to spend money, the Office of Economic Opportunity seems to have lost sight of the purpose of the spending. They have hired untrained boys to do a tough man's job.

If ever there was a job that needed trained, competent, capable people, familiar with their profession, this is it. But the people chosen have been rank amateurs—from the ranks of the party faithful.

We had hoped and were assured that when such existed, neighborhood organizations and groups would be included.

> There had been an obvious failure—

Says the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]—

> to carry out a most important objective: that of involving the poor in the war on poverty.

He continued to state that in many cases the people who had been responsible for keeping the poor impoverished were now responsible for running the war on poverty.

The program we have established here in the Congress has not moved an inch in the direction of helping and encouraging the poor to initiate programs to help themselves. They have been excluded from the planning even in those areas where they have already made advances in solving their own problems to the limits of their resources. Evidence that the poor are capable and willing to improve their own conditions has been discredited.

There is substantial evidence in the letters which were inserted in the proceedings of the hearings, that often a wealthy or at least not impoverished Negro, or a better off person living in or near a slum neighborhood is placed on the councils and pointed to as the representative of the poor or the minorities. The people for whom the program is designed do not recognize these people as their leaders, often do not know them and have no trust in them.

There is a similar disregard of the independent private and religious groups which are already at work tackling the problems of the poor. The act of 1964 specifically stated that "public or private nonprofit agencies" should be included, yet in many communities a new organization is set up which ignores existing groups whose skills and experience could be invaluable to them and who are willing to combine efforts.

In Chicago, of the 24 members of the council, none represents a private social welfare agency, none a neighborhood or community organization. They have shown rude disinterest to the offers of slum clearance leaders and have refused to sit down and discuss the program with church leaders who come, not asking but offering.

There has been little attempt to cooperate with the State and local poverty programs, and jurisdictional disputes have taken up time that could have been spent in helping the poor. Little attempt has been made to tailor the programs to the needs in some States, and it has been necessary for State Governors to veto the programs which should have been designed to be of help. Little attempt has even been made to coordinate efforts with the 42 existing Federal programs designed to combat poverty.

Funds have been given out without investigation to sham groups, in areas where poverty is almost unknown. The Republican task force on economic opportunity heard responsible testimony on a case in Ypsilanti, Mich., costing the taxpayers nearly $200,000. An association, consisting, as far as anyone has been able to establish, of six men, from the community, led by six others from Ann Arbor and calling itself the Willow Run Association for Neighborhood Development, sent a report to the OEO claiming that Willow Village was a depressed area and a pocket of poverty. According to the testimony:

> The report blandly states that there is no recreation or cultural or even entertainment facility, but the township and school district operate recreational facilities including public use of the high school swimming pool; the two universities in the area of course operate full-time cultural activities and there is, among other things, a major chain motion picture theater approximately 2 miles away.
>
> The report alleges that there are no stores in the area, yet there is a modern shopping center right in the middle of the village. As a matter of fact, a neighborhood grocer closed his store recently because of a lack of business—suggesting that retailing facilities are at least adequate.
>
> The WRAND report claims that urban renewal demolished the community center [which is now located in a former school building], the schools [there are several], the gas station [there are three], the grocery [there is still a small grocery right across the street from the shopping center], the medical and dental clinics [both of which are less than 5 minutes away by car].

There were obvious contradictions in the report, which should have been spotted by one of the highly paid staff people here in Washington. But the most shocking part of the whole thing is that the community is one in which over 90 percent of the population own their own houses, nearly everyone owns at least one car and a TV set, and the average family income is just dollars short of $8,000.

A questionnaire was distributed by local citizens and out of 55-percent response—despite the fact that WRAND people followed the questionnaire distributors and told people not to fill them out—only 11 people felt themselves impoverished. Only 12 people thought that the area ought to keep the grant. The rest thought that it should be returned to the Federal Government.

There was apparently no attempt made to verify the report or the credentials of the front organization with local authorities, and the money was sent out.

Mr. Chairman, this is the exact kind of activity we are encouraging if we pass this bill without imposing any safeguards or making further investigation into the past operation.

What attempts have been made by the OEO to remedy these situations? They have made heroic attempts to cover up the deficiencies, look busy, and assure the Congress that they have a capable, efficient, and effective program whose initial flaws are being ironed out smoothly.

What should we here be doing about this situation? We should be holding hearings to investigate and find out what makes the program tick. As the gentleman from New York, Chairman POWELL, pointed out in the opening of the hearings:

> Every new idea, in its infancy, must periodically stand adult evaluation. No idea can fulfill its intended mission without exposure to searching and honest criticism.

All those who wish and need to be heard should be listened to.

After we have seen the problems, we should implement the legislation with sound safeguards to see that the programs will accomplish what they were set up to do, and to see that our money is being used wisely, and purposefully.

We should see that unqualified recipients are cut out and that the staff and administrative personnel are of the highest caliber and trained for the work they are to do. We should see that the poor are brought in, for unless they are made conscious of their condition and encouraged to improve it, we cannot accomplish our goals. The poor must be more than represented, they must take part and their ideas must be heard.

The program must be brought into close cooperation with Federal, State, and private welfare programs, so that the energies of the programs may be best utilized to help the poor, not to argue over who is in command of what.

We should continue the experimental programs at their present level until the results can be determined. We should continue the whole program at its present level of funds until it is shown that the operations are set up properly and able to work efficiently and do the job they should already be doing.

That, Mr. Chairman, is what we should have done. But what have we done?

The hearings have been cut short before there could be any more publicity to point up the dismal failure of a program whose administrators describe it as a success. It became necessary for the Republican task force to hold their own hearings outside the legislative process in order to hear the truth which was only partly disclosed in the subcommittee's proceedings.

What improvements have been written into the bill to assure that there will be no more of the kind of monkeyshines that have characterized the program in the past? Nothing. Only a letter from the part-time Director promising that all those in his charge will be good boys in the future.

That, Mr. Chairman, is not enough for most of us. The committee struck out the veto power of the Governor, over the strong, sound and well-reasoned protests of the Governors who see the need to tailor each plan to the particular State and to be able to correlate it with its agencies. It doubles the money for expensive and untested programs before we have had a chance to see if they really work. We have thereby encouraged further bungling and further undesirable practices. And in the process of trying to stem this highhanded irresponsible action, the minority has been frowned upon, and accused of being the enemy of the poor.

Mr. Chairman, it is because we are not the enemy of the poor that we want to see them helped. It is because we support in good faith the purported purpose of this whole plan, that we must oppose the action before us today. The evidence has shown clearly that the best interests of the poor are not being served, nor are the Nation's. Because we are genuinely concerned with the problems and conditions of poverty, we must oppose this bill. Saying that the bill helps the poor and calling it a war on poverty is not enough. The bill must actually do these things. The poor are not being fooled by promises anymore than we in Congress are.

We sincerely want to answer the cries of social workers, religious leaders and workers and the poor themselves when they ask, "When will the poor be helped?" We want to answer now. And the answer is not in this bill we have before us.

It is not in giving more money to be wasted, more jobs for political hacks, more power to the already powerful, more confusion to the already confused.

The answer is in sound administration, genuine concern, qualified leadership, interested cooperation, real involvement of the people concerned, and action.

Only then will the poor be helped and the war on poverty be won. It is for the sake of the poverty stricken that we oppose the poverty program today.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, until this decade Americans appeared to accept the proposition that some poverty was inevitable—that the poor would always be with us.

But last year our President, with the strong backing of our Congress, proclaimed war against poverty—and that ancient view that it must inevitably plague us.

In the mere 11 months that have passed since the enactment of Public Law 88-452, poverty has not been eliminated from our land. Indeed, no one could possibly have anticipated that this age-old scourge could be eliminated in so short a time. It will take many times 11 months; many, many years before poverty is no longer a problem. It is this very fact that commands us to not just maintain our war against poverty, but to redouble our commitment to that war.

Familiar as they are, the bare facts of poverty in the United States, the world's most favored Nation, bear recounting. In this period of unprecedented prosperity and productivity: One in five Americans live in poverty. This includes more than 5 million adults and 3 million children receiving public assistance or relief. This 20 percent of the population at the lowest income level receives only 5 percent of the national income, a proportion that has not changed since 1946.

Thus, the benefits of our affluent society are not being equally enjoyed.

Today, poverty is still a chronic condition for millions of our citizens. Large numbers are isolated from the rewards and opportunities of our country because of economic and social obstacles. These include millions of Negroes, Indians, and Spanish Americans, dwellers in isolated and rural areas, migrant laborers, children in large and fatherless families, the old, those whose education is inadequate for today's needs, the unemployed, the underemployed, and indeed, some who are fully employed. Poverty may be either the cause or an effect of these problems.

Today, for too many people, deprivation is not a passing phenomenon. It is a continuing condition of day-by-day life. Still, today, many have been alienated from the larger society of the Nation, the State, the community, or even the neighborhood in which they live.

But, today we are doing something about these appalling facts—this horrendous condition. Yes, we have had many laws, many programs directed toward various aspects of poverty. It is absurd to think that prior administrations and Congresses have been blind to the poverty in this country. But the remarkable, exciting, and challenging aspect of this war against poverty is that today we are attempting to cut at the very heart of poverty—at the causes of poverty. Never before has a great democratic nation taken such a thorough, honest, and bold course against poverty.

By enacting title II-A of the Economic Opportunity Act, Congress clearly expressed a basic understanding of the nature of poverty and established the guidelines for attacking it. These guidelines call for a mobilization of resources, for programs of sufficient scope and size to give promise of progress toward the elimination of poverty, for participation of the poor in the resolution of their own problems, and for local administration.

Mobilization of resources calls for the linking of efforts of agencies which traditionally have gone their separate ways. It calls for the development of a local organization with the commitment, power, and prestige to link these efforts together. Consequently the Office of Economic Opportunity has given preference to broadly based agencies seeking to carry out coordinated antipoverty programs. This policy is based on the belief that such agencies, and such programs, are most likely to achieve successful mobilization of all community resources in an attack on poverty.

Because separate and independent agencies often have separate and independent rules for determining whom they will assist, large numbers of the poor never receive the full range of help needed to move out of poverty. The community action agency is responsible for seeing that poor persons do not fall between agencies, their needs going unnoticed and unheeded. Its basic responsibility is not to the agencies but to the poor people. With this mandate, and its responsibility for coordination, it can be held responsible for developing programs which are truly responsive to all the needs of the poor, without any prior commitment to providing particular kinds of services.

In addition, the act stipulates that local antipoverty programs should be of "sufficient scope and size to give promise of progress toward the elimination of poverty or a cause or causes of poverty." This commitment to large-scale efforts to help many poor people necessitates the development of machinery to launch and coordinate a multipronged attack. A large, single-purpose program might be administered by a single, independent agency. However, the act calls for activities of sufficient scope as well as size. Reflected in this wording is a basic understanding of the complexity of dealing with the causes of poverty. Scope means the development of a variety of programs meeting the numerous needs of poor people.

Recognizing the ultimate desirability of a broad-based and multifaceted approach to poverty in any given community, I must nonetheless note that last year when we first considered this aspect of the legislation, I warned that there would be communities which could not mount such a broad-based program. There are numerous reasons, some of them political, some of them economic, some of them social. But the fact is that the Office of Economic Opportunities has had some of its greatest problems in this area. My own city of Los Angeles does not yet have a qualified community action agency. The OEO has set out clearly that in such cases grants to single-purpose agencies shall be made so that antipoverty programs can get under way. The policy in this matter is entirely in accord with the intention of Congress, and has been restated on May 12, 1965, as follows:

> Having said that we encourage the establishment of such broad-based agencies, it should also be said that the existence of such an agency is not a prerequisite to the granting of Federal assistance. Grants to independent single-purpose agencies are made when formation of a community action agency appears to be impractical. Such grants have been made when there was substantial promise that the single-purpose program would provide the genesis for true community action. The reluctance of public agencies to participate in a broadly-based

> program or their withdrawal from participation in an ongoing program will not make it impossible for private agencies and groups to be funded.
>
> We want also to make it clear that we have not permitted nor will we permit community action agencies to develop into bureaucratic monopolies.
>
> We have a number of ways to prevent development of monopolies.
>
> First, successful and truly representative community agencies reduce the likelihood of monopolistic abuses.
>
> Second, we can condition the funding of a particular application or of future programs upon the more effective utilization of resources, upon the inclusion of programs not applied for, or upon the use of agencies whose proffers of service have not been accepted.
>
> Finally, OEO has informed a number of community action agencies of its intention to permit single-purpose agencies to appeal to Washington directly to circumvent the community action agency in any case where it can be shown that such a single-purpose agency has been arbitrarily, unfairly, or improperly discriminated against.

Although efforts should be made to interrelate all resources in the community directed toward the eradication of poverty, single-purpose independent groups having no relationship to a communitywide structure are eligible for funding under section 205 of the act. That these single-purpose agencies have no chance of developing into a communitywide structure is not a condition for receiving such grants. The Congress has contemplated the existence of independent single-purpose agencies in the same community that a communitywide structure has been created. Such competitiveness and experimentation is appropriate in an area in which conclusive remedies have not been established.

Perhaps the single most significant requirement for community action agencies is that they have substantial and effective representation of residents of the area and members of the groups served on their governing boards.

But since this great antipoverty effort demands effective participation by the poor themselves, we should examine the role being played by a large and special segment of the population—its minority group members.

Let us not fail to accomplish the ultimate good which can come from the program envisioned by the Economic Opportunity Act and, above all, let us not fail to profit from past experience which gives us a new insight and a new approach to the age-old problem of poverty. I refer to section 202(a) (3) of the act which requires that "a community action program be developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of the residents of the area and of the groups that it will serve." These few words distinguish the community action program from virtually all prior programs designed to combat poverty. It requires that ways be provided for the poor to play a significant role in the design and operation of programs instituted to break the cycle of poverty. This philosophy, I realize, is somewhat of a departure from the theory that "I am my brother's keeper."

Our present relief programs have been undertaken in a paternalistic manner which tends to rob the recipient of his dignity and feeling of worth. This paternal system of giving also creates feelings of helplessness. The system has made little claim to treatment or resolution of the social problems involved. This past experience tends to prove that we need to involve each human being in the planning of his own destiny if we are to help him achieve self-dependence and, if he is not to be continually relegated to the position of being an object of charity; and, if we are to accomplish his involvement in the mainstream of society.

Our posture of bountiful benefactors has created attitudes in the public ranging from overindulgence to unjust criticism and scornful rejection of the objects of our bounty. Conversely, it has aroused hostility in the recipient who, because of his position of complete and total dependence on the donor, could not express his feelings for fear that any overt acts on his part would lead to termination of welfare. We have, in effect, forced submissiveness to a paternalistic pattern of welfare and in return have attempted to protect them from want. This has caused many to retreat from any and all forms of responsibility. Think of the conflict of the situation: the need for expression, yet the necessity for submission.

Furthermore, the person who is constantly deprived of any participation in maintaining his existence and of meaningful relationships to other members in the community tends to develop a concept of himself as an inadequate person unable to fulfill his potential. He is robbed of any and all guiding principles for meeting life's problems. The individual can preserve the integrity of himself only if he can satisfy some of his personal and social needs. This preservation is not brought about through a passive molding of the person; it involves the active reaching out by the individual. It can be said that man has three basic needs:

First. A need for social recognition. Each individual needs a feeling of belonging, a sense of approval and acceptance and, to some degree, a feeling of prestige;

Second. A need for self-realization. Each individual must have some opportunity to fulfill his potential for achievement and independence; and

Third. A need for security. There must be fostered in each individual the feeling that he will be able to maintain some kind of stable and satisfying relationship with people who are important in his life. It has been said the male figure, particularly in the minority groups, has been virtually emasculated because he is unable to perform his most basic function—that of supporting his family—and he has been forced to abdicate his role as head of the household, in many instances. There are many ramifications to the family unit, as well as to society as a result. The Economic Opportunity Act conceives of a program which would not only give depressed areas of the Nation the means to improve their economies, but a program cognizant of the adjustment process necessary for those who have been materially deprived by the circumstance of poverty. The act seeks to deal with poverty by making the people self-sustaining through education, training, and self-help programs. In addition, it seeks to encourage local leadership and action at the neighborhood level by involving the poor in the solution of their own problems at every stage by permitting them to help make decisions and by participation in the actual overall planning to the greatest extent feasible. The present act is a profound effort to get at the causes of poverty and not merely treat the symptoms. This theory is not based on a sentimental view of the poor nor on an abstract theory of social action.

The President summed up the situation when he stated, in his message of March 25, 1965:

> The conditions of our distressed areas today are among our most important economic problems. They hold back the progress of our Nation, and breed a despair and poverty which are inexcusable in the richest Nation on earth. We will not permit any part of this country to be a prison where hopes are crushed, human being chained to misery, and the promise of America denied.

There is no single formula for participation of the poor. The effort is now being made in many different ways, and it is becoming increasingly apparent that maximum participation can be effected not by one specific and rigid formula but must be achieved through a variety of devices appropriate to the individual community.

Achievement of meaningful participation must be a continuing objective of every community action program since it is only through the effective participation of residents of the area and the groups to be served that we can hope to achieve the objective of a permanent increase in their capacity to deal with their own problems without further assistance.

We know that the disease of poverty is far from indiscriminate. It breeds on oppression. It is a byproduct of discrimination. It flourishes best among the outcasts of our society—the strangers, the unacceptable, the social basement dwellers—among those whose skins or accents distinguish them from our affluent majority.

In short, poverty hits hardest our minority groups. We know this, unfortunately, without statistical proof. But one simple comparison shows just how severe this condition is: while 1 in 5 of all Americans live in poverty, one-half of all Negro families dwell there. The same sad imbalance generally holds true for other minorities, such as Mexican Americans in the West and Southwest, the Puerto Rican immigrants in the East.

And so, the hand we extend to the poor is very much directed at members of minorities.

Now, nowhere in the Economic Opportunity Act are minority groups specified. The Congress, in its wisdom, directed the act toward the great minority in need—the poor—and by so doing insured equal opportunity for all the needy. But there are two guidelines that have brought minorities into the forefront of this humane war on poverty:

First, the Office of Economic Opportunity has been encouraging the formation of broad-based, widely representative community action agencies—organizations that encompass all segments of the community with a vital interest in the programs.

Second, the letter and spirit of the law demand that groups and neighborhoods to be served the programs be given equitable representation on antipoverty councils.

The result of these guidelines can be found on community action boards wherever this war is being waged. Of a rough total of 4,500 people sitting on these boards, over 1,500 are poor. And of these representatives of the poor, some 1,000 are from minority groups.

If the number of minority group representatives seems out of proportion, it is not only because poverty is cruelly disproportionate among these groups. It is because the character of American cities—the large cities which have the most dynamic programs—is such that racial and ethnic groups tend to live in distinct ghettos. Ironically, the evil of confinement in these unwalled prisons has a positive effect: it makes for large communities of poverty that can be easily recognized and appropriately represented.

Negroes have had still another vehicle for involvement—and that is through their own organizations. Over the past few years these groups have been loud and effective voices of the Negro community; expressing its grievances, articulating its demands, demonstrating its needs. And Negroes have mobilized to secure better jobs, better education, improved housing—all of the objectives of the antipoverty program.

And so, when the Economic Opportunity Act began to open gates on poverty, Negro groups were ready to lead the way through.

Now I would like to turn to a particularly important concept of the Community Action Agency. That is the requirement of local administration. From the unhappy experience of Los Angeles, I have come to the conclusion that the OEO needs to develop guidelines which take into account the great variety of local governmental organizations. It is not enough to require programs of sufficient size and scope. The OEO must consider that there is an optimum size, in terms of geographic area covered and number of persons affected, beyond which the community action agency concept breaks down and becomes the agent of confusion rather than coordination. It may well be that the criteria for establishing community action agencies should include greater attention to such factors. In Los Angeles, for instance, there are 75 cities, aside from the city of Los Angeles, within the county of Los Angeles.

A community action agency for the county may be too large to adequately deal with the vast numbers of poor persons in the county, not to mention the administrative problems associated with the existence of a multitude of governmental entities, private organizations, and public agencies. In other major metropolitan areas, such as San Francisco, or New York, the city's geographic area and population is identical with the county. Not so in Los Angeles. It is clear that the OEO, through its rules and regulations, must provide sufficient flexibility for adjoining cities, or counties, or parts of cities or counties, to organize community action agencies which pay primary attention to the persons to be served, and their needs, and can disregard to the extent necessary for a vital and meaningful program, the existence of political subdivisions. Further, it must reflect recognition of the fact that areas like Los Angeles may need several community action agencies to adequately serve the needs of the poor in major metropolitan areas. This is an area where the OEO needs to develop guides which will end the confusion so apparent in the Los Angeles controversy, for one.

Mr. Chairman, there are criticisms which the OEO has earned—there is much that it still must do. But we have embarked on a program which is new in many aspects of its approach to a vast national problem.

If some mistakes are made, this is to be expected. But we cannot stumble now—we cannot lose sight of that magnificent vision outlined for us by our President. This can—and will—be a land where every person shares in our great prosperity.

Let us not shrink from this great task—let us not grow weary after but 11 months. We have embodied in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 a monumental national purpose. Let us be on with it.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, let me briefly in summation say I think on the whole this debate has been salutory and while at times it has been amusing, it has also had its valuable serious points.

Certainly, no one would say that a 9-month program, for this program has only been in effect for 9 months, would be so perfect that it would not be possible to find places in which it had erred or to find places in which it had made mistakes or where there had been confusion. There has indeed.

I would like to say, all of us I think at times find there are places of confusion even in our private lives. I walk around the corridors and have people come up and congratulate me for having been elected mayor of Miami Beach. I look at them, and I do not say they are completely out of their mind, but I just want to say if you look at the total record and that is what I want to put in the RECORD now—the total record—you will see that the record which has been accomplished in 9 months is an amazing record and one which therefore deserves the additional funds that are now being asked.

Let me give this national summary as of June 30 of this year:

The community action programs—824 grants have been made totaling $152,114,309.

The Head Start programs—2,381 grants establishing 13,345 centers and have enabled over 556,857 children to enter preschool programs.

All of this, mind you, is inside of a 9-month period.

The VISTA programs—202 volunteers in service in 59 projects in 27 States; 851 volunteers in training and 20,201 preliminary applications have been received. 19 training programs have been completed or are in operation as of June 30.

With reference to the Neighborhood Youth Corps—certainly that is one of the most important things in this whole project—639 projects signed with 276,875 participants. $127,076,318—already on the books in two programs. Nearing approval 43,137 participants with an additional $26,675,732.

In the college work study, in the spring semester, 34,000 students were assisted in 648 institutions at a total cost of $4,715,000. In the summer session, 40,500 students were assisted in 755 institutions.

In the adult basic education, 40 State plans have been approved, including the District of Columbia, and 5 additional State plans have been formally received.

In rural loans, 10,640 loans have been approved totaling $17,940,730.

In small business loans, 135 individual loans have been approved totaling almost $1.5 million.

In work experience, 164 projects in 46 jurisdictions, including the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, are underway, with 87,500 participants and an estimated 271,000 dependents at a total cost of $111,493,000.

My friends, all of this has been a 9-month period, already going and on the books.

My friend from Florida, on the other side of the aisle, said that this had been done with "green troops." Yes, they were green troops, for never has the Government before in its history tried to mount a program to attack poverty on the scale on which we have now embarked.

But my friends on the other side of the aisle would abolish all that training and throw it all to the four winds.

Instead, we propose that these green troops, who are now seasoned, be allowed to continue and to do the job in our good democratic tradition of not turning back just because we are not perfect. The war on poverty must go forward. We shall learn by and correct our few mistakes but we will not remove the gleam of hope from the eyes of millions of Americans. With their help we shall win the war on poverty.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, when the Congress first inaugurated economic opportunity legislation, we recognized that the war on poverty would demand a protracted engagement. We cannot in one instant wave a wand over this country and expect light to fall into every dark corner. But, in implementing the act of 1964, Federal and local officials agree that their success, coupled with the enthusiasm of participating individuals far exceeds the difficulties encountered. We are now requesting expansion of the act to conquer obstacles and to channel this warm response.

I believe the heart of the Economic Opportunity Act to lie in the community action programs. Here we are approaching the impoverished by honoring their dignity, for community action programs furnish the poor with creative opportunities and equal advantages so that they may rally their abilities. Rather than encouraging hostility or idleness, community action programs are building resolution and purpose.

An increase in the moneys allotted to the community action programs of $403 million has been recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor. How can we effectively take the field against privation if we deaden the zeal of local groups? Inspiring community action programs assures future Congresses that innovation will not be cynically condemned.

In the Second Congressional District of Washington, enthusiasm for locally developed, locally administered projects was wanting only for financial assistance. On January 23, 1964, months before approval of the Economic Opportunity Act, responsible citizens organized the Social Planning Council of Snohomish County. As President Johnson was urging passage of the act, this council was exploring projects in youth services, recreational development, family counseling, and dental care for needy children.

Having a model, nonpartisan agency tailored to assume responsibility, mayors, county commissioners, and civil service personnel quite naturally selected the social planning council to become the focus of community action in Snohomish County.

Membership in the council attracted prominent residents concerned for social justice. Merchants, attorneys, newspapermen, doctors, Indians, school personnel, unions, social workers—all command spokesmen on the social planning council.

Until May, when Certified Public Accountant Leroy Stave assumed the presidency of the social planning council of Snohomish County, the council was chaired by Ivan Merrick, rector of the Trinity Episcopal Church in Everett. Now, if you regard a clergyman as a political hack, then you have far more to worry about than the future of these programs.

The community action programs throughout my district are administered by competent, nonpartisan individuals. No Federal money lubricates a political machine. Warren Beecroft, chairman of Skagit County Head Start, possesses 17 years administrative insight as well as a masters degree in education. Bruce Wilkie and Quentin Markishtum are extremely capable officers of the Makah Indian Tribe in Clallam County. By intensifying productivity in salmon fishing and logging, they are according their tribe dignity and dollars.

The Whatcom County Opportunity Council, directed by school principal Bob Weihe, has likewise encouraged wide group access to policy formation. This summer they are probing the education and care of retarded children.

As you can see, the various activities cited above are as diverse as is necessary to meet the needs of communities with differing problems and resources. Incorporating heterogeneous groups as well as the poor into one flexible agency provides a central democratic body well constituted to take action within each community. What could be a better umbrella than one public agency under which such diverse perspectives are integrated into efficient procedures? Unless we have multiagency participation through a central coordinating body, we will have unilateral chaos.

Well-planned, well-programed efforts can function outside the umbrella when their merit is obvious or when necessity does not compel them to labor under the umbrella agency. Such a situation currently prevails in my district in the Head Start programs which are functioning quite apart from local community action groups.

There has been some criticism of the salary structure within the community action program. Nationwide surveys manifestly disprove this criticism, for a tabulation representing 38 of the 39 cities presently conducting such efforts shows that average salaries of the staff directors of community action programs are: $6,000 below the mayor or city manager, $10,000 below the superintendent of schools, $2,000 below the director of urban renewal, $1,000 below the director of public works, and higher only by approximately $2,000 than the director of public welfare.

On March 6 of this year the president of the Snohomish County Planning Council wrote me and urged retention of a permanent director to be given an adequate salary.

He said—

> The need for professional coordination becomes daily more apparent.

Compensation of $12,000, equal to that of the local Executive Secretary of the United Good Neighbors, was recommended by authorities at the University of Washington. While aiding the poor offers personal fulfillment, a labor of charity alone cannot support a family. On April 6 the Planning Council was awarded a 6-month grant of $11,000, all of which must bolster a staff of five.

Community action programs, however, do not alone relate the entire story of success in combating poverty. The State of Washington is advancing in other areas as well. New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio entertain four Neighborhood Youth Corps projects. Washington has seven. Last week we received a $76,000 technical assistance grant. And Project Head Start is rolling forward.

Great potential exists within the VISTA program for the Indian tribes within my district. The condition of the Indians on reservations attests to the inability of previous programs to really grasp the core problem—empathy. The VISTA program enables volunteers to go among these people, to learn of their difficulties, and to take meaningful action. The success of such an empathy oriented program has been well established by the Peace Corps.

All of these projects depend largely upon local initiative, local planning, local control, and local involvement.

Through passage of the amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 we can nourish local agencies and local initiative. But to extinguish the sparks of optimism and reform would make rekindling improbable. We must continue to support the efforts of local communities to help themselves. I can see a new day. Let us move forward and continue to illuminate those shadowed and afflicted corners of American life.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965".

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE I—YOUTH PROGRAMS

Job Corps—Enrollee affidavits

SEC. 2. Section 104(d) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows: "(d) Each enrollee must take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies foreign and domestic'. The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable to the oath or affirmation required under this subsection."

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we all want to move this bill along as expeditiously as possible. We want to give everyone a fair opportunity. It is my hope that we will arrive at a conclusion of this matter not later than tomorrow afternoon.

As the chairman of the committee handling the legislative matter on this side of the aisle, I hope that there will not be any dilatory tactics.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I am glad to yield to my friend from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. I will say to the chairman that finishing the bill late tomorrow afternoon is quite acceptable to me. I have talked to other gentlemen on your side of the aisle.

With that understanding, it seems there should be no necessity for closing off debate, unless for some reason it should appear it will run beyond that time. That surely is acceptable to this side.

I believe this would be the best way to expedite the matter, and all would have an opportunity to offer any amendments they desire to offer.

Mr. POWELL. Will the gentleman be kind enough to inform us as to roughly how many amendments there are on that side of the aisle?

Mr. QUIE. So far as the committee is concerned, we have 23.

If there is anybody off the committee that has not told us about it, then we do not know about that. However, on the committee where we drafted amendments to accomplish what we think ought to be done with this legislation, we have 23 amendments.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. Mr. Chairman, I listened with keen interest to the record reported to the committee by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] in closing general debate. It is my opinion that every single one of the programs described by him could have been handled by existing Federal or State agencies without creating this vast new Government bureaucracy. There has been a great deal said on the floor in the debate today about the high cost of consultants. This high overhead cost could have been eliminated if the sponsors of the antipoverty program had been willing to act through existing Federal, State, and local agencies which in my opinion are perfectly capable of handling these programs with existing machinery.

I tried to get some time during general debate but it was not available. I cannot say all that I would like to say about this bill in 5 minutes so will restrict my comment to only one program. I do this because it offers a glaring example of extra cost whenever the Federal Government insists on handling a local program out of Washington.

I do not blame the bureaucrats downtown for wanting to expand their authority. I do not blame them for wanting to concentrate all power in the Federal Government or for arguing that the people at local and State levels are incapable of managing their own affairs and that all of the intelligence in this country is vested in the people who work in Washington. I do not believe these things but understand why the bureaucrats advance these arguments. Bureaucracy feeds on power and it would be unnatural for those who have tasted power not to seek to extend and expand that power.

I do blame Congress for accepting these points of view because we all come from local communities and we know there is just as much ability, integrity, compassion, and intelligence in the local communities of this country, and the various State capitals of the Nation, as in Washington, D.C.

I wish to talk about the Head Start program. This in my judgment is a wonderful program and should be continued but one listening to the debate on this bill must have concluded that this was a brandnew program conceived in the mind of the President of the United States or of the Director of the antipoverty program. The fact of the matter is that we had a Head Start program in North Carolina before this bill was ever drafted. The only difference is we called it a summer readiness program which was part of our State's school improvement program. North Carolina conducted 100 separate summer readiness programs in 1964, all financed by non-Federal funds. The plan contemplated increasing the program to 200 units in 1965 and to 300 units in 1966.

When the Federal Head Start program was inaugurated, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction submitted an application to the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity for funds to expand the North Carolina program to 1,000 units which would have benefited 15,000 children. Since we already had a program underway, with all the machinery in place to expand it, all the Project Head Start people had to do was to make a grant of money to the State. But the North Carolina proposition and suggested expansion of the summer readiness program was rejected by the Federal officials who insisted that the Federal Government would have to exercise control and direction of the entire program.

The sole reason advanced by the Director of Project Head Start for rejecting the North Carolina plan was that our plan was based on State administration of the funds and program. It apparently did not matter to the Federal officials that the North Carolina program had been conducted by professional and trained public schoolteachers at a cost of $30 per child and that the federally directed program would cost $170 per child. They were not interested in expanding a well established and efficiently operating program which would cost $140 per child less than the Federal program but their concern was to retain control and direction of the program in the hands of Federal officials.

Among the conditions imposed by the Federal officials to the North Carolina proposal to incorporate its summer readiness program into the Head Start project was that an opportunity be given to "other than professional personnel" to become Head Start teachers, and that local organizations sponsoring programs would be able to submit nonschool plans to community action groups, dealing directly with Federal officials in Washington without channeling the plans through any State agency other than the Office of the Director of the Economic Opportunity Act. Here is an example of Federal officials in charge of this program refusing to expand an already functioning Head Start program in our State because they did not want the program handled by professionally trained teachers, under the direction of public school officials of North Carolina, and requiring sponsors to bypass public school officials in North Carolina and deal directly with the Director of the Economic Opportunity Act. It did not matter to them that the cost of the program would be increased from $30 per child to $170 per child. It was the central direction and control they sought.

Under leave obtained in the House, I include as part of my remarks a copy of a circular letter written by the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of North Carolina to county and city superintendents of schools in our State under date of May 17, 1965; copy of a letter written by Dr. Julius B. Richmond, program director of Project Head Start, to Governor Dan K. Moore of North Carolina under date of May 13, 1965; and a news story taken from the Charlotte Observer which quotes our State superintendent of public instruction as having said, in commenting on the rejection of North Carolina's application and on the conditions laid down by the Office of Economic Opportunity for incorporating the North Carolina summer readiness programs into the Head Start programs:

> I feel the plan makes it easier to federalize education in the several States to a great degree.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Raleigh, May 17, 1965.

To: County and city superintendents of schools.

From: Chas. F. Carroll, State superintendent of public instruction.

Subject: Rejection by Office of Economic Opportunity of application of State department of public instruction.

It is with regret that I must inform you that I have today a copy of a letter received only yesterday, May 16, by Gov. Dan K. Moore, to the effect that the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington has failed to approve the application of the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction for Project Head Start programs to be administered by State, county, and city boards of education for the benefit of as many as 15,000 children.

A copy of the letter received by Governor Moore from Dr. Julius B. Richmond, Program Director, Project Head Start, is enclosed.

In meetings in Marion and Lexington on April 8 and in Raleigh and Kinston on the following day, I related to you, your board chairman, and attorney, the status of Project Head Start from the point of view of the State board of education and the department of public instruction. Events leading to our submission of an application for funds with which to finance 1,000 units in the summer readiness program included:

At a meeting in Charlotte on March 16 our Dr. Woodrow Sugg, director, comprehensive school improvement project, met with Mr. George Esser and North Carolina fund community consultants as per a request conveyed by Mr. Esser. Mrs. Polly Greenberg, senior program analyst of Head Start's southeastern region, discussed Head Start. Dr. Sugg conferred with Mrs. Greenberg relative to both Project Head Start and North Carolina's comprehensive school improvement project.

On March 22, Dr. Sugg received a letter from Mrs. Greenberg suggesting possible merger of the comprehensive school improvement project and the Head Start project.

On March 29, Dr. Sugg and Dr. James White, North Carolina's State technical assistance director, met in Washington with Mrs. Greenberg and Mr. Dudley Morris of the Office of Economic Opportunity Head Start staff. Following their return, Messrs. Sugg and White presented me with a memorandum to the effect that: "Head Start officials have indicated willingness to accept and incorporate the 200 North Carolina comprehensive school improvement project summer readiness programs into the Head Start program provided that:

1. Every effort shall be made to give opportunity to other than professional personnel to become head teachers in all units that are added to the 200 contemplated by the comprehensive school improvement project.
2. A concerted effort shall be made to integrate staff.
3. A reasonable effort shall be made to integrate students.
4. The program shall be extended to 8 weeks with increased staff and services.

And, provided further, that local organizations shall be able to submit nonschool plans to community action groups and deal directly with Federal officials in Washington without channeling the plans through any

State agency other than the Office of the Director of the Economic Opportunity Act.

On April 1, the State board of education expressed its willingness to merge the board's contemplated 200 summer readiness programs, a part of the comprehensive school improvement project, with the head start program, with the probable result that as many as 1,000 units or programs might be conducted in North Carolina in 1965, on the condition that the total program shall be operated by county and city boards of education under the supervision of the State department of public instruction and under policies, rules, and regulations adopted by the State board of education in 1964.

Among the State board's policies, rules, and regulations, these constitute the minimum:

1. The State superintendent of public instruction shall organize and administer the project in accordance with policies and procedures adopted by the State board of education.
2. The staff employed to administer and supervise the project shall be employed by the State board of education upon recommendation of the State superintendent.
3. At the local level, the project shall be administered and supervised by the superintendent of schools with the concurrence of his board of education and all negotiations concerning the project shall be between the State superintendent of public instruction and the county or city superintendent of schools.
4. All fiscal affairs related to the project shall be administered by the controller of the State board of education in accordance with policies and procedures approved by the State board of education.
5. Upon recommendation of the State superintendent, the State board of education shall from time to time appoint such advisory committees as may be needed in the conduct of the project.

The State board of education directed the superintendent of public instruction to prepare and submit a State proposal for the Head Start project.

On April 15, Dr. Sugg carried North Carolina's application for Head Start program to Washington and conferred with Dr. Jule M. Sugarman, deputy associate director, community action program, and with Mr. Dudley Morris.

It is to be observed that the communication from Dr. Julius Richmond declares that today, May 17, is the deadline for the submission of applications from local communities. This deadline appears to be in direct conflict with his statement "that State authorities and particularly the department of public instruction can play an extremely constructive role in helping local communities to develop their own program." Certainly, we at the State level are available to assist, to the extent of our ability, county and city boards of education as they develop plans in collaboration with community action groups for submission to the Office of Economic Opportunity.

With respect to the summer readiness programs conducted as a part of the comprehensive school improvement project it is our intention to proceed with these programs separate and apart from Head Start subject to the availability of funds to be provided by the 1965 general assembly. If there should be any change in the status of these programs, we shall notify your immediately.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, D.C., May 13, 1965.
Hon. DAN K. MOORE,
Governor of North Carolina,
Raleigh, N.C.

DEAR GOVERNOR MOORE: Thank you for your letter concerning Project Head Start. I am well acquainted with the excellent progress that North Carolina has been making in improving its educational programs and particularly with the cooperation between the State and the North Carolina Fund. The number of applications received from communities in North Carolina for Project Head Start indicates a continuing and growing interest in programs for early childhood development. I believe that it will be a very busy summer for all of you in getting these programs underway.

The application by the State department of public instruction presents difficulties in terms of our basic legislation and community action guidelines. With the exception of special problems and groups such as migrants, whose needs by their very nature cannot be adequately met on a local basis, community action programs are based on local communities. Moreover, these communities should include, as nearly as possible, all urban areas within their geographical borders. As you know, more than 70 North Carolina communities have already applied separately for Head Start grants. It is therefore not possible for us to approve a Head Start grant for North Carolina based on State administration of the funds and program. However, we do believe that State authorities and particularly the department of public instruction can play an extremely constructive role in helping local communities to develop their own programs. We have indicated to your associates that we would welcome supplemental applications directly from North Carolina communities which were originally included in the department of public instruction's application and we feel that the department can be extremely helpful to those communities in preparing these supplemental applications. Provided we can receive the applications by the close of business Monday, May 17, it will be possible to process them in time for a summer program.

We have previously forwarded to your State technical assistance director, Mr. White, a list of the applications which were submitted from North Carolina. I am sure he would be happy to make these available.

We look forward to working with you and your associates on many projects in the future. Please be assured that we welcome the opportunity to cooperate as closely as possible with the State government within the framework of our legislation.

Sincerely,
JULIUS B. RICHMOND, M.D.,
Program Director,
Project Head Start.

SCHOOL BILLS SEEK TO SKIP RALEIGH

(By Joe Doster)

RALEIGH.—Bills to permit local school administrative units to deal directly with the Federal Government on such projects as Head Start were introduced jointly Tuesday in both houses of the general assembly.

More than 40 counties hope to participate in the Federal program to prepare more than 17,000 State children for the first grade through a preschool program.

The State has recently lost in its efforts to have funds and control of the program channeled through the North Carolina Board of Education and the Department of Public Instruction.

Superintendent of Instruction, Dr. Charles Carroll, described the bills as "one of the most profound declarations of State policy that has occurred in my lifetime in education."

"I feel the plan makes it easier to federalize education in the several States to a great degree."

Deputy Attorney General Ralph Moody agreed with Carroll's remarks, but said he felt the bills were necessary for the local communities to keep the funds some have already received.

Moody said recent decisions by the courts and actions by Congress had convinced him that the U.S. Constitution was "no longer worth the paper it is written on."

Department of Administration Director Ed Rankin, representing Governor Dan K. Moore, urged the committee to go ahead with the bills.

The Governor, he said, "shares much of the reluctance of Dr. Carroll and Mr. Moody in the methods Congress is using in this Economic Opportunity Act, but he thinks we can do nothing but proceed in this way.

"The funds are already being received. About $1 million in Federal money is resting on the desk of the OEO (Office of Economic Opportunity) in Washington."

"We are in the situation of saying to you that we see no other answer than to allow the city and county administrative units to deal with the Federal Government directly."

Members of the education committee asked if the bills were defeated would this mean the Federal Government would continue to deal directly with the local communities.

"I imagine some units will go ahead. I just don't know," Moody said. "Whatever the local school board is a State agency or not, I just don't know."

Carroll said he too felt that the Federal Government would continue to bypass the State board and deal directly with community action groups.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], has expired.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate emanating from the Republican side and it reminds me of the very wealthy woman to whose door a beggar came. This beggar was dirty, disheveled, desperate, and dreary and he asked her for something to eat. The woman looked at him in tears and she said, "Throw him out, he is breaking my heart."

I say that the Republican attitude on this problem is that it is a difficult, desperate problem, and because of that they say, "Throw it out, it is breaking our hearts."

I have heard some of the most arrant nonsense today I have ever heard. We are asked to vote against this bill because, perhaps, somebody might get a job and he will run against us in a primary. I would say that is a really noble, edifying reason for opposing a poverty program.

I have heard a lot of talk about the inadequacies of the program. I have heard it said that some of the people who go into the Job Corps drop out, drop out of the program. Well, that is not a great surprise. Here we are dealing with disadvantaged, disoriented people who have a history of dropping out, and we must expect this to continue to some degree. But that is no reason to stop the program any more than you should stop treating narcotics victims because many of them backslide.

This is a problem we have got to stick with. We cannot despair, we cannot be summer soldiers and sunshine patriots. I will say to you that this program will go on, and in 5 or 10 years it will be a success and will be functioning smoothly, and the Republicans then, as they are now saying about social security and unemployment insurance, will go to the people and say, "We are for this wonderful program."

But you will not be able to fool the people because the GOP has a new initial added, GOOP—the "Grand Old Obstructionist Party."

My free advice to you is to get with it and start backing some of these programs instead of obstructing them and carping about them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman. He told a story about this wealthy lady who turned away a beggar. I just wonder if that wealthy lady was one of those $100-a-day consultants for the poverty program.

Mr. JOELSON. Well, I will say to the gentleman that probably she would not want to be a consultant to this program because it is much easier to turn your back on a program than to do something about it. So she probably was not one of the consultants.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 8263. Title II(A) is perhaps the most imaginative and progressive section of this act.

The community action program is designed to allow a local community to create and coordinate its own local attack on poverty, and I shall address myself specifically to this part of the legislation.

It provides two things:

First. Federal funds are made available to finance new activities to assist poor persons of all ages to achieve improvements in education, employment training, health, housing, and other areas.

Second. It establishes a mechanism to coordinate these new activities with other new and existing programs so that together they will constitute an effective attack on the complex cycle of poverty.

Community action agencies have been set up in localities ranging in size from Detroit, New York, and Chicago to rural Appalachian counties and Indian reservations. They include representatives of many local public and private organizations—who help to coordinate local antipoverty efforts—and of the poor themselves, to assure that the people to be served play a real role in shaping the program. In Cleveland, over 200 organizations concerned with specific problems of poverty have banded together to form there community action program.

These agencies can apply for and receive Federal grants covering up to 90 percent—and in some cases 100 percent—of the cost of carrying out such projects as:

Preschool programs, for children who would otherwise enter school unprepared to respond to effective education. Neighborhood centers, where a range of day care, health services, adult education, counseling, employment training and assistance, housing information, and similar benefits can be offered within the neighborhood, close to the families that need them. Legal services to help poor families obtain their rights. Homemaker and home management aid, and consumer education to help poor families to manage their limited resources. Job development actions and business loans, often offered through small business development centers.

Many, many other activities are also possible, either to supplement existing programs or to link them together so that they will work together.

A key to all community action programs is involvement of the poor. In many places, this is achieved by employing unskilled but willing persons as community organizers, teachers' aids, health worker aids, and in other jobs where advanced education is not a prerequisite. It is also achieved by creating new neighborhood organizations to consider and advise on project design and operation, to be sure they reach the felt needs of the families to be served.

In addition to the activities funded under title II(A), community action agencies develop and coordinate other antipoverty actions, such as Neighborhood Youth Corps and work-experience projects, VISTA volunteers, Job Corps recruiting, Manpower Defense Training Act training programs, vocational education, community mental health centers, youth opportunity centers, and other Federal programs.

The community action agency carries out some projects itself and delegates the operation of others to the local public and private nonprofit agencies who are best equipped to run them, such as school or housing agencies or private social welfare organizations. The delegation process helps to coordinate different projects so that they support one another and result in a more effective overall program.

Community action, in summary, has three principal features:

First, local initiative, on the assumption that local knowledge is needed to solve local problems.

Second, coordinated action in a wide range of related fields, on the assumption that there is no single, simple solution to poverty and deprivation.

Third, meaningful involvement of the poor at all levels of the program together with responsible local public and private officials on the assumption that without this involvement the recipients of aid would not be motivated to help meet their own problems, and the war on poverty could not succeed.

There is no single, standard pattern to community action. It is an open-end process, subject to local variation to meet changing local needs, but always guided by the belief that a comprehensive assault on poverty stands the best chance to succeed and that a person motivated to overcome his own poverty contributes a vital ingredient to the comprehensive effort of his community.

As acting chairman of the task force designated by our committee to hold hearings on this legislation in Cleveland, Ohio, and Detroit, Mich., I was frankly pleased to see concrete evidence of broad based community participation in the organization of their community action programs.

Several persons in each city observed that the community action programs under this act represent the greatest mobilizations of the individual citizens of widely varied backgrounds ever accomplished in these very forward looking cities.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, it is less than a year since Congress decided to begin a war on poverty. In passing the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, we expressed a determination to wipe out deprivation in the midst of plenty. We declared that we would bring new hope to our 35 million poverty-stricken citizens—"the other America" about which we have heard so much—that we would assure everyone the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity.

The present bill, H.R. 8283, extends that effort. By increasing the original bill's authorization, it allows for a greater struggle against the causes of American poverty.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly supported the original bill last year, and I support this bill.

Last year I said:

> This bill presents us with the opportunity to mobilize our resources and to get to the root of the problem of despair and hopelessness that is caused by poverty in this country.

I feel the same way about this bill. It would continue and enlarge one of our Nation's most important undertakings—the eradication of want within a land of plenty.

Let us consider the bill's major provisions.

It would double the authorization for economic opportunity programs to $1.985 billion for the fiscal year 1966. This increased authorization should be sufficient to provide for 1,100 community action grants in 700 communities; adult basic education programs in all 50 States, benefiting 70,000 adults; 480,000 enrollees in the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps; work experience programs in all States, with 224,000 participants; $45 million in rural poverty loans to 22,100 individuals and 410 cooperatives; and 5,000 VISTA volunteers in 200 communities.

It would extend through August 20, 1967, the provisions for 90 percent Federal contribution to the work-training, work-study, and community action programs.

It would extend for 1 additional year, through June 30, 1968, the other antipoverty programs of the 1964 act, thus making the initial 3-year struggle a 4-year effort.

It would allot up to 5 percent of the adult basic education funds for the training of teachers for adult basic education courses.

It would authorize the assignment of VISTA volunteers, our domestic Peace Corps, to any of the act's programs.

Finally, it would allow the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to reconsider a community action, adult basic education, or work-training plan disapproved by a Governor, and to carry it out if, upon reconsideration, it is found by him to be fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of the Economic Opportunity Act.

The last provision attempts to correct one of the major problems that has faced the poverty program. But it does not go far enough. It still allows for a delaying tactic by any Governor on community action programs. It does nothing about the veto over Job Corps Centers or the veto over VISTA volunteer projects, both of which the Governors will retain.

We should take action now against the veto, in any form, of any project. It has been responsible for most of the poverty program's few setbacks. In Alabama, for instance, Governor Wallace vetoed a Birmingham community action program and a Project Head Start program at Green City. In Mississippi, a Head Start project at Clarksdale was vetoed by Governor Johnson. We acted last week to eradicate voting discrimination. Yet, the door must not be left open for discrimination in the struggle against poverty, that very poverty which keeps Negroes from education, employment, and from developing the necessary skills to fully enter American economic and political life. In my own State, the actions of Governor Rockefeller almost prevented $16 million of aid to New York City. The Governor's veto should be completely abolished.

Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I did not point out several deficiencies in the administration of the program as it has been conducted to date which the bill before us does not correct.

I think that we must make clear our determination that there be a greater participation on the part of the people in the affected areas in the making of the policy of the antipoverty program. Community development efforts throughout the world have shown that programs which do not relate to existing cultural patterns and leadership norms inevitably fail. The persons most closely affected by community-change efforts have a unique perspective from which they can help counter this failure—free of organizational or political interests.

Participation would help stop the apathy of the impoverished, which only helps to perpetuate their situation. It would help engage the poor in constructive social action, which is and can be the only antidote to destructiveness.

Mr. Chairman, I will have more to say on this later on in the debate because I believe we must provide not only for the maximum feasible participation by the poor, as written into the present law, but we must go further and write in language to encourage local elections to antipoverty community action boards.

Mr. Chairman, another point I want to make is the fact that the Office of Economic Opportunity has not been willing to assert itself and to intervene when a city administration fails to take advantage of the programs or to implement them properly. I could point out examples in the city of New York. The Job Corps was intended to reach youngsters between the ages of 16 and 21 who are largely unemployable because they lack skills and education. It is aimed at young people who have not completed high school and who are not working. At the conservation camps and training centers, basic education and job training are being provided.

In New York City it is estimated that there are 75,000 youths out of school and out of work. The Job Corps is important to them. Recruiting out-of-school, out-of-work youth, the Job Corps could get youths off the streets, give them work, inspiration, and skills.

In March of this year the Office of Economic Opportunity asked New York City to recommend some 830 youths for the Job Corps' initial enrollment. By the end of May New York City had screened 26 applicants, and only 2 New York City youths were in Job Corps camps.

On June 1, I urged the Office of Economic Opportunity to set up special emergency screening centers in New York City to process applications. This should have been done before summer arrived. Instead, the pious hope was expressed that the New York City administration would wake up and move. It has not, Mr. Chairman. When I checked last week, I found that instead of moving ahead, New York City had somehow managed, painfully managed, to process 64 youths who have been assigned to the Job Corps.

Mr. Chairman, although the Job Corps has not received substantial publicity in New York and although there has been no real effort at recruitment, some 2,056 youths have sent in applications. And now only 64 are assigned to centers.

Mr. Chairman, this incredible mismanagement should never have been permitted. The Office of Economic Opportunity should have stepped in. It should step in now so that these youngsters will be able to take advantage of opportunities in the Job Corps which are being denied to them because of the inefficient, bureaucratic administration which has not implemented this program.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, New York was the last major city to submit and receive approval of its program from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

This was the direct result of the city's effort to set up a city hall dominated corporation to control community action programs. Instead of complying with the intent of the act to insure "maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served," the city administration submitted a proposal which was generally unacceptable. After the proposal was revised, it was approved in Washington although in my judgment it still fails to involve "the maximum feasible" participation of the community. Such attempts to monopolize programs endanger the success of the whole antipoverty effort.

I strongly endorse the programs of the Economic Opportunity Act. But I fear that its programs will become unfilled promises unless vigilant watch is kept over them. The Office of Economic Opportunity must be the coordinating body for all antipoverty programs, unhampered by local political power plays, and affected only by the needs of the poor.

Last year on August 6, when we considered the original act, I warned that the greater national effort could be endangered by local bureaucracies. At that time, I said:

> I am concerned that local community action programs be closely supervised by the Office of Economic Opportunity. It will not be enough to authorize community action programs and leave their administration to local public and private agencies. For instance, under the Manpower Development and Training Act, the departments having jurisdiction too often have been too reluctant to step in and exercise proper supervision, too ready to yield to the demands of local and State autonomy. Layers of city and State bureaucratic redtape can strangle any worthwhile concept. It must not happen in this program.

I might well utter that same warning again. In Alabama, Mississippi, South Carolina, Florida, and Texas, Governors have vetoed parts of the national program. Vetoes have occurred in California and Montana. And in other cities, including New York, the national effort has been hindered by local establishments which are fearful of change. The Office of Economic Opportunity must be a firm general, if the war on poverty is to be prosecuted successfully.

Mr. Chairman, if this legislation is to bring about the change of a system which has permitted poverty to persist, despite general prosperity, then it must encourage the new and the experimental. It must involve the hitherto silent poor in the planning and execution of programs. If the concept of involvement of the poor is sacrificed, then the central idea of the struggle for economic opportunity will be ignored.

Mr. Chairman, this program offers much promise. It must be made to work. The increased authorization is a step forward. If not enough, it is a recognition of our responsibility to press forward to deal with the cycle of poverty and provide economic opportunity for all our citizens.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GIBBONS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GIBBONS: Page 1, after line 5, insert the following:
>
> "JOB CORPS—CUBAN REFUGEES
>
> "SEC. 2. Section 104(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'For purposes of this subsection and section 114(a), any native and citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United States from Cuba as a nonimmigrant or as a parolee subsequent to January 1, 1959, under the provisions of section 214(a) or 212(d)(5), respectively, of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be considered a permanent resident of the United States.' "
>
> And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It applies only to Cuban refugees. It is specifically spelled out and tied down in the amendment. It allows them to participate in the Job Corps training program and in the neighborhood youth program, the only places I know of where there are a sufficient number of these to participate are in the city of Miami.

I am offering this amendment in support of my colleagues, the gentlemen from Florida [Mr. PEPPER and Mr. FASCELL]. I believe this has the support of the people in Miami. It will help them solve a problem, it will help them eliminate some of the problems that have come about by virtue of that situation down there.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is the application to citizenship, as mentioned in the reading of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. GIBBONS. It does not make them citizens. It does not give them any additional rights. It just applies to this particular economic opportunity program. It applies to title 1, sections (a) and (b) where they are required to be permanent citizens of the United States in order to participate. It will not accelerate their right to citizenship. I am aware of the problems and I am not attempting in any way to change their rights to citizenship.

Mr. GROSS. Might this be called the domestic foreign-aid program?

Mr. GIBBONS. No, it may not be called that. This is a simple program to help these unfortunate people who are having a hard time becoming American citizens because of the vexatious position they find themselves in, and allowing them to grow up under that situation. We are trying to get them off the relief rolls by having them get into these two work programs. It will save the money we are paying them to sit still now. We are going to try to get them to work and help them become useful.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reread.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Gibbons amendment.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I want to ask the gentleman from Florida, author of the amendment, a question. As I understand it, there is no limitation upon the amount of compensation that can be paid to these people.

Mr. GIBBONS. That is not true.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. What is the limitation?

Mr. GIBBONS. The same as any other person in the Job Corps.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Can the gentleman tell me what the limitation is on that?

Mr. GIBBONS. They get $30 a month to take care of incidental needs. They get $50 a month which accumulates in a savings account for their start on a new life when they return home. These Cuban refugees now get quite a bit more than that. This is an effort to try to put them into a productive job and work.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. This amendment would also apply to your neighborhood youth program, would it not?

Mr. GIBBONS. That is right. Because most of these people would stay right there in the same neighborhood. They have language difficulties and language barriers. There are great programs going on in the Miami area and we are trying to work them into participating in our economic system.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In other words, what I want to point out here is that you are going to have some trouble with this amendment if it should carry, and I do not think I am going to vote for your amendment because one of the greatest criticisms I have had from the neighborhood youth program is about the wage scale that is applicable in all sections of the country. I have had several letters from communities where the neighborhood youth program is in effect. I am for the program if it is operated on a commonsense basis.

But now in some instances we have had youngsters in the neighborhood youth corps put to work, let us say, in a hospital and they are paid $1.25 an hour. I presume that is based on the minimum wage. But the people living in the community, adults who are professionals and experienced in doing this same kind of work, are being paid 60 cents to 75 cents an hour. In other words, the youth who goes in there is paid more than the permanent employee who may be the head of a family, mind you. That is bringing about some resentment and bringing about a lot of criticism of this program. I would like to see this program succeed. I am going to point out, as we go along with the consideration of this bill, some of the weaknesses in the program. I think there should be a limitation on the compensation that is paid so that it shall not be in excess of the prevailing wage for comparable work or similar work or identical work in the community, because I think that has caused more criticism of this program. I might say the same thing applies as my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULL] pointed out when he put in a bill here just this week about the Pages in the House. I think that is one of the weaknesses of the system. In other words, these youngsters, and I am for giving them training and all of that, but when we set them up and make them feel they are earning $100 a week, we are just kidding ourselves and we are kidding them. We are putting a false sense of value upon their service and I think it is going to react to their detriment later on in their lives.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIBBONS. Your argument is not germane to the point I am trying to make here.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. My argument is germane on this point here: If you are going to place these foreigners who come over here and let them live better than the people of our own country, and if we are going to pay them more than we are paying our own people to work, and they may be heads of families, I think it is wrong and I think it is pertinent and there should be a limitation put on it.

Mr. GIBBONS. The gentleman of course realizes that we are paying some of these people on the dole and they are not doing any work.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am not in favor of that either. I would like to get that out, too.

Mr. GIBBONS. These people are in a very unfortunate situation. Most of them came in rowboats and after having lost everything they had and they do not have much. I do not want to get into any general debate on this subject about which the gentleman is talking. I am just trying to help some people who are fighting to be free. We are paying them to sit around now. They have all kinds of language barriers and language difficulties. They have no skills that can be used in this country and I am merely trying to get them put to work. The only place I know of that this applied to is Miami. My colleagues [Mr. PEPPER and Mr. FASCELL] are interested in getting these people to work and getting them off the dole. That is all I am trying to do.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending bill, H.R. 8283, to extend and expand the Economic Opportunity Act. I supported the original legislation in the 88th Congress to create this antipoverty offensive because I believed in the promise and potential it held for many millions of deprived and underprivileged people. I now support this authority to continue the war on poverty because, despite the difficulties involved, I believe progress and performance have been recorded so far.

When we pause to consider that this massive Federal program was begun only 9 months ago, we should not expect it to be free from controversy, criticism, and complaint. It is an arm of assistance that deals with human situations that can be unusually unpleasant.

Yet, I think the difficulties which have been experienced—and they should not be described beyond their actual dimensions—are more encouraging than discouraging. They offer hard evidence that the poverty war is being fought on the basic battleground of big-city slums and backwoods villages where life is often raw and revealing.

I have my own community of Rochester and Monroe County, N.Y., to look at for examples of how this kind of Federal assistance can help a community cope with the problems bred by deprived conditions. I can contrast the outlook in Rochester now and just a year ago and detect differences which the advent of the antipoverty effort has meant to the city and county.

The problems faced by the Rochester community—and they were explosive last year—are not going to pale into oblivion tomorrow or next year just because a program of Federal funds has come into existence. But, it is helping. It is providing promise where there once was none. It is offering an opportunity to those who have felt squeezed by economic and social conditions—so squeezed, in fact, that there appeared little reason to ever expect a chance for something better.

I am proud of those in Rochester and Monroe County who have not turned their back on the problems of the poor. They are the leaders in a series of local antipoverty endeavors that are the first ray of light ever seen by some of those who will benefit by this charitable concern.

We have in Rochester and Monroe County many examples of the antipoverty program. Their initial success and their continuing favorable development lies in large measure with Action for a Better Community, Inc., or, as it is familiarly known in my community, ABC, Inc. This is the private, nonprofit agency which was created last year to carry out the various community action programs of the Economic Opportunity Act. I might add that I consider the title II programs are the cornerstone of the whole antipoverty program and were the proposals which convinced me, above all others, of the real merit possessed by this program.

ABC, Inc., draws its membership from a considerable cross section of Rochester and Monroe County. Public and private social welfare agencies, educational institutions, business, labor organizations, religious faiths, civil rights movements, and government are all represented and all participate actively in the formulation of policies and programs.

Its principal and central coordination comes from its 21-member board of directors. The board comprises: City manager, city of Rochester; county manager, county of Monroe; manager, Community Chest of Rochester and Monroe County; executive director, Council of Social Agencies of Rochester and Monroe County; one appointee each from the Catholic diocese of Rochester, the Rochester Area Council of Churches, and the Jewish Community Council; manager, industrial management council; superintendent, city of Rochester school district; president, AFL–CIO council; five members designated by the citizens council against poverty; and six members to be selected by the above identified 15 members.

The citizens council against poverty is composed of residents of the high-priority areas of poverty-stricken people. It presently has a membership of 31. However, it is being expanded to 52 members to broaden the representation from the areas of the community which are the targets of the antipoverty campaign.

Every proposal which the ABC, Inc., board of directors submits for approval is first put before the council for its recommendations and comments. It is worthy of note, I believe, that this "working in harness" arrangement has resulted in the council's full endorsement of every proposal which ABC, Inc., has made.

The ABC, Inc., board of directors also is enlarging its membership. The chairman of the citizens council as well as three more of its members are being brought on to the board. At the same time, the board is adding two more at-large members.

Otis Finley, executive director of ABC, Inc., has discussed these expansions with me and indicated the added flexibility and increased community participation which they will provide. I am particularly pleased at Mr. Finley's reports regarding the reception which the antipoverty programs are receiving in Rochester and Monroe County. Public and private agencies, industry, church organizations, and nearly every other source of community activity are giving increasing support to the program of ABC, Inc.

The local leadership of Rochester and Monroe County's antipoverty program began their efforts with an enlightened approach that I believe could well serve as a model for many other communities. They carefully documented every step they took.

Among the proposals which ABC, Inc., has submitted for approval to the Office of Economic Opportunity, I have found statements that are remarkably instructive on just how people get together in a community and set forth to put flesh on the bones of an antipoverty program. For the value of these commentaries to others interested in learning how Rochester and Monroe County launched a community action effort, I take pleasure in sharing with my colleagues excerpts from materials supplied me by ABC, Inc.

The following is taken from a summary written by Kenneth M. Storandt, executive director of the Council of Social Agencies of Rochester and Monroe County, after a meeting of the citizens advisory council against poverty on November 12, 1964:

> To start with the members of the group represented various creeds, color, and national origin. We first introduced ourselves and generated an informal atmosphere. At the outset, and in retrospect very important, one member of the group observed that this was the first time that people either themselves living in poverty or living in an area of poverty had come together to share their views on the problems of poverty as well as the possible causes. This in itself was an important observation. An equally important agreement reached by the group after an hour and a half of discussion was that while continuing to talk and share ideas was essential, we should also urge that at the earliest possible moment some tangible accomplishment take place so that people would have confidence that something would happen as a result of this program and that it would be more than just a long series of talks.
>
> As the discussion leader I am pleased to say that every member of the group participated—some at greater length or more loudly than others, including one member who leaped to his feet and banged on the table. All of this was good because we don't know what people are thinking until we give them a chance to express themselves.
>
> As was to be expected one member of the group thought that the whole program was a complete waste of the taxpayer's money and that the best way to deal with poverty was to close down the welfare department and tell everybody to go to work. This was, of course, the traditional easy solution until the question was asked where they would work, and at what. The answer was a combination of silence in terms of the question and more comments about wasting money.

Since its inception, I have worked closely with those who direct the ABC, Inc., work. The organization has shared with me copies of its many proposals to the Office of Economic Opportunity and I have willingly endorsed them to the Federal agency.

Among the most recent programs approved for Rochester is one for which I am quite enthusiastic. It is a grant of $180,000 to ABC, Inc., for several youth projects. Its purpose is to provide a variety of needed and wholesome recreational outlets for thousands of young people.

It is expected that more than 20,000 of our disadvantaged young people will be the beneficiaries through:

A program of group counseling and tutoring for 500 high school students who are failing in school.

A program to send nearly 500 adolescents to summer camps.

A recreation program that will take 16- and 17-year olds to county parks for outdoor activity.

A program to establish recreation areas in crowded innercity neighborhoods.

A program to employ 42 nonprofessional aides in helping social workers counsel these 20,000 young people living in poverty-blighted areas. 35 other residents of depressed neighborhoods also are being put to work in the conduct of other local projects.

Of course, Rochester's war on poverty reaches far beyond the teenagers. Part of the summer grant, for example, is providing 8-week summer classes in reading and arithmetic for about 1,000 underprivileged children. Special play-schools for preschoolers have been established throughout the impoverished neighborhoods. And earlier grants have created community centers serving some 45,000 poor people, a day-care center to enable parents to work or to undertake job training, and an experimental program to train antipoverty workers—workers who are themselves in the ranks of the poor.

The lineup of the programs being carried on by ABC, Inc., is indeed impressive. Its nine regular programs, in addition to special summer crash programs, include:

Three work, education, and training centers. These centers have been funded and will serve some 330 young people and adults. Sites for their establishment now are being selected.

A lighted schoolhouse project with five centers has been operating for 6 weeks and is serving 2,500 high school juniors and seniors.

Sites are being chosen at present for three neighborhood service information centers. These multiservice centers will be available to an estimated 45,000 people in the community's area of poverty.

Two neighborhood youth corps projects have been in operation for 3 weeks. By the end of this week, some 500 youths, between 16 and 21, are expected to be involved and at work.

Project Head Start in Rochester and Monroe County is in operation with 18 centers and serves 660 preschool children.

A family-child day care proposal submitted by ABC, Inc., has just been funded. It will help 120 children and 60 families.

Mr. Chairman, this is not all Rochester and Monroe County are doing with Federal assistance to blunt the hostility of poverty. In addition to community action programs, the colleges of our community are participating in combined work and educational programs. Local industries also are becoming involved and activating people and talents to help end the despairing cycle of poverty which affects and afflicts certain parts of the city.

Mr. Chairman, the foregoing offers but a brief outline of what is in reality an exciting and dynamic program of action and ambition. I am confident that what the legislation has meant for Rochester and what its pending extension will mean in the days ahead has application in most, if not all, of the urban centers of this Nation. While I do not presume to speak for them, I can without reservation speak enthusiastically for the role of Rochester and Monroe County in this very worthwhile program and offer it as a very practical reason for continuing and enlarging the work of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment merely for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Florida just what this additional program will cost?

Mr. GIBBONS. This is not an additional program. If the gentleman will look at page 25 of the report and examine the language there printed in accord with the Ramseyer rule, the gentleman will understand the necessity for this amendment.

In the Job Corps enrollees are limited to permanent residents of the United States. These people who come over here in rowboats, escaping communism in Cuba, who fought and did their best, are not permanent residents of the United States under the immigration laws.

We would not change the immigration laws. We would not give them anything else they do not already have. We merely wish to put them into productive labor, rather than to keep them sitting around not earning anything.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman. I should like to repeat my question: What will this cost?

Mr. GIBBONS. It will involve, at the most, approximately 1,000 of those in this whole age group, and less than 1,000 would be eligible to participate in the whole program. It would come out of the allotment going to Miami, Fla., and Dade County. It would not cost the gentleman's section of the country a nickel.

Mr. COLLIER. That is all I wanted to know. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is proposed to be done with these aliens once they are given job training and fitted for employment? Will they enter the labor market of this country?

Mr. GIBBONS. May I answer that question?

I come from a part of the United States which began to get Cuban refugees 100 years ago, may I say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross]. The great Cuban revolutions were spawned in my part of the country. Jose Martin launched one of the first Cuban revolutions from my district.

These people eventually, we hope, will become American citizens. I see no reasonable opportunity for them to return to their country in the next 3 or 4 or 5 years. I do not believe any of us does, barring a miracle.

All we are trying to do is to treat them as other immigrants are treated in this country—other unfortunate immigrants who came over, perhaps, like my great grandparents, in the hold of a ship. We are trying to get them into the mainstream of society. We are not trying to pull anything. There is nothing unusual involved.

If the gentleman will look at page 25, he will see that only permanent residents of the United States can come under this program.

Mr. GROSS. Since you say you have lived with this problem for 100 years, can the great State of Florida not live with it a little while longer, until we can find out where we are headed with this program?

Mr. GIBBONS. We never had refugees in the numbers we have now, may I say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. I see.

Mr. GIBBONS. There were perhaps 25 or 30 or 100. At this time there are hundreds of thousands of refugees, and they represent a very serious problem. It is possible for these people to go off into crime and delinquency and other things unless we can get them some work.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that I was satisfied before, and now he is talking about hundreds of thousands. Less than a minute and a half ago he talked about 1,000.

Mr. GIBBONS. I said that hundreds of thousands have come in. There are only about 1,000 involved in this program, at the most.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Jones of Missouri) there were—ayes 89, noes 28.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to get the floor to ask a few questions about what section 2 of the bill does. We have been talking about everything except the operation of section 2 itself. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the Members of the House and the attention of the members of the committee, I would like to ask the committee for a clarification of the intent of the committee in section 2 and also the rationale behind the change in section 104(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Section 2 of H.R. 8283 changes the form of the loyalty oath which was required of enrollees under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Section 2 strikes out this language:

> Each enrollee must execute and file with the Director an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

This bill strikes out that loyalty oath. I have heard on the floor of the House neither the members of the minority nor the members of the majority on the committee speak in reference to this change. I would like to have a clarification from the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Another Member of this body had prepared remarks to answer any questions on this. That gentleman is the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Teague]. But unfortunately he is detained at this time at the White House working on the GI bill. However, I will answer the question.

This does not strike out the loyalty oath. It merely conforms the loyalty oath that Job Corps enrollees would take to the same loyalty oath that people take for the NDEA and the National Science Foundation. That is the only purpose of it, so we will have the same oath for everybody and the same one that we take, I believe, when we come into this body.

Mr. ICHORD. Let me say to the gentleman from Florida that I did not feel strongly either one way or the other when the great issue of loyalty oaths was sweeping the country. On the one hand, I feel loyalty oaths are rather ineffective because a person who is disloyal usually does not hesitate to take one, but on the other hand, I fail to see the great issue of principle involved against taking a loyalty oath. But I recognize the political facts of life. I recognize what happens out on the political stump. I would ask the gentleman from Florida what is going to happen out on the political stump if some Commies slip in and are enrolled under the Economic Opportunity Act? Here you are taking out the provision that they have to swear that they do not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

Mr. GIBBONS. This is an affirmative oath rather than a negative one. As I say, this issue has been thrashed out on this floor before I ever came here many, many times. It is the oath that Congress, I believe, had agreed to. All we are attempting to do here is to make the oath uniform as between college students and Job Corps enrollees and the National Science Foundation people who receive grants.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I have not heard from the members of the minority of the committee. They are on this committee, too. Does this language satisfy the members of the minority of the committee, I inquire of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. QUIE. I would inform the gentleman in the well that this language now is not identical to the NDEA language. We have not made a point of it, however, since we did not want to be engaged in a long debate over this question.

Mr. ICHORD. Then the gentleman is satisfied with the changes; I assume the minority is, because I have not heard it raised in the debate?

Mr. QUIE. That is right. I do not know of anybody on the minority side that is going to raise the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am very happy that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] brought this matter before the House because, indeed, when this legislation was initially passed by this body the language which was written into the act, was contained in an amendment which I had offered from the floor and adopted by the House. That language—it is section 616 of the present law—reads:

> No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under authority of this act shall be used to make payments to any individual unless such individual has executed and filed with the Director an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

I searched in vain through the hearings for any discussion as to why this language was being deleted from the present bill; in fact there is no discussion of it at all. No reason is given for its deletion. There is nothing in the report except a vague and totally inadequate explanation as to why this language is being taken out of the present law.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has very narrowly construed this amendment based on a letter from the Department of Justice and the remarks of two Members of the other body during debate when the House amendments were agreed to. The interpretation of the legislative history made by the Office of Economic Opportunity is entirely erroneous.

After the Senate debate I spoke on the floor of the House, since I was the author of the amendment, giving the correct interpretation of the amendment, and I am going to put those remarks in the RECORD at this point, when we get back into the House.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 12, 1964]

LOYALTY AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY BILL

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the debate in the other body on yesterday relative to amendments I offered to the economic opportunity bill and which the House adopted.

A letter from the Department of Justice was placed in the RECORD interpreting the scope and intent of the two amendments. Additionally, there was a discussion on the floor purporting to provide a legislative history of the language contained in the loyalty oath amendments.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the Justice Department did not contact me relative to the scope and intent of the amendments. Furthermore, no Member of the other body contacted me with reference to this matter.

At the time the two amendments were offered, a majority of the House had limited the time for debate. As a consequence, I had but a few seconds to explain the amendments.

For the RECORD and as a part of the legislative history, I would like to state that the Justice Department has placed a rather narrow construction on the amendments. I feel that the Justice Department has correctly construed the purpose of my first amendment. The second amendment was intended to apply to every individual who received any monetary consideration, directly or indirectly, from the Treasury of the United States during the course of the administration of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Section 616 applies to every title of the bill. Section 616 is applicable to any loan or grant to any individual participating under the authority of this act.

It was my intent and purpose, as the author of the amendment, to have section 616 apply to an adult education program, a community program, a work-study program, or any kind of program, if the individual receives monetary remuneration which emanated directly or indirectly from the Federal Government. Any individual receiving salary from a nonprofit private or public agency the funds of which were obtained in whole or in part from the Federal Government under authority of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 would be subject to the provisions of section 616. Of course, an institution, private corporation, or public agency would not have to file an affidavit; but if any employee thereof receives his salary, in whole or in part, traceable to the Federal Government under authority of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, he would have to file an affidavit as provided in section 616. That is the intent and purpose of my amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to observe that an Assistant Attorney General of the United States and two Members of the other body do not have the authority or responsibility of interpreting U.S. statutes. That is the function of the Federal judiciary.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, this bill would repeal that, and here is the only explanation that I find for such action in the committee report:

> The committee felt that the loyalty oath as it applies to VISTA volunteers should be the same as the oath for the Job Corps, National Defense Education Act, and National Science Foundation Act. This objective is accomplished by section 15 of H.R. 8283.

The hearings did not touch on the subject anywhere I can find. There is a rather weak justification—and that is a charitable definition—in the presentation by the Office of Economic Opportunity. I quote it:

> 12. VISTA—REVISION OF LOYALTY OATH REQUIREMENT
>
> The bill (sec. 14(b) and 16) would apply to VISTA volunteers the same modified loyalty oath requirement as would be provided under section 2 for Job Corps enrollees.
>
> Section 616 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 presently requires disclaimer affidavits on the part of individuals receiving direct payments from funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under the act. Interpretations expressed during final congressional consideration of the act indicated that this provision would not apply to recipients of loans or to beneficiaries of State of local programs being carried out with Federal assistance, but that it could apply to regular Federal employees, experts and consultants, VISTA volunteers and dairy farmers receiving indemnity payments under section 331 of the act.
>
> In view of requirements normally applicable to Federal personnel, and lapse of the indemnity payments authority, section 616 is no longer significant except in the case of VISTA volunteers. The bill accordingly deletes this section from the act and inserts in its place a specific loyalty oath provision limited to VISTA volunteers. As in the case of Job Corps enrollees, disclaimer affidavits would not be required since these are inconsistent with the provisions of the National Science Foundation Act and the National Defense Education Act on which both section 616 and the Job Corps loyalty oath requirements were patterned.
>
> As a matter of administrative policy, all VISTA volunteers receive a national agency check and are subject to full field investigations whenever this appears warranted. This policy of course would not be affected by the changes made in the bill.

As the bill now reads, Communists will not be excluded from participation in this program. Subversives are not barred from full and active participation under this program as the bill now stands.

There is nothing in the hearings or the report as to why section 616 is undesirable or unworkable. Of course, I have suspicions about its energetic application on the part of the administration.

The war on poverty involves among other things: the indoctrination of small children; adult education; training programs on the community level; and an assortment of programs, many yet undefined and unimagined, touching a large segment of our population. This massive endeavor should be protected against Communist infiltration.

Certainly, we all agree that the poor, the migrant worker, the uneducated, and the jobless are more susceptible to the Godless preachments of communism, than other groups. Despite this, we are making no effort in this bill to insure that this program will not be sabotaged by Communists.

In addition we have seen the turmoil, the confusion, and misbehavior in some of the Job Corps training centers. These people are ripe for Communist propaganda. We should offer some protection to them.

In my district there is a small cluster of buildings which formerly contained an education institution called Mount Beulah. Recently, it has been leased by the National Council of Churches. It is the housing and staging area for persons engaged in civil disobedience. It is also the headquarters of a political action group not sponsored by the NCC. In addition, this small facility is the headquarters of an organization which recently received a Federal grant for $1,424,180 under Operation Head Start.

These three organizations intermingle and the personnel of each is probably indistinguishable. Myles Horton has recently been there. An avowed Socialist and Communist sympathizer, Horton ran what has been described as a Communist training school in Tennessee until the State closed it down. Other known sympathizers have been seen there. Carl and Ann Braden, both notorious Communists, have been operating in and out of Mount Beulah for quite some time.

As an example of the type of persons located at Mount Beulah, let me quote from an article which appeared in the Memphis Press-Scimitar:

> #### Marcher
>
> A good many of them, like Liz Fusco, of Seattle, Wash., may make a career out of causes. She was an English teacher before she started to work on a civil rights campaign in Mississippi 8 months ago. A tiny girl with a long pigtail that hangs down her back and seldom a shoe on her foot, she took part in the march on Washington that demanded the end of the war in Vietnam.
>
> What has the Vietnam movement to do with the Mississippi movement? She said: "The government promised a free election in Vietnam and the people didn't get it. They say it's because of the Communists. There's no free election in Mississippi either."
>
> #### PROPAGANDA?
>
> All believe with great certainty there are no Communists in Vietnam. Acting as a spokesman, Miss Fusco said, "That's just Government propaganda."
>
> She and others said this summer many peace movements—the anti-Government and anti-Vietnam war groups—would be working in the civil rights campaign in Mississippi.

I wonder what the President thinks about her statement that there are no Communists in Vietnam. What does Secretary McNamara think?

Above all, what do the families of the thousands of Americans serving there and those who died there think about the attitudes and philosophy of Liz Fusco and her associates at Mount Beulah, which is also the site of Operation Head Start?

Something needs to be done.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time, I plan to offer an amendment to this bill which would retain the non-Communist affidavit in the law.

Mr. Chairman, the head start program was instituted in Mississippi through a grant to Mary Holmes Junior College, for a project sponsored by the Child Development Group of Mississippi. Insofar as I know or can ascertain, the so-called child development group has no official standing of any kind in my State nor has the personnel of this group been made public. Recently, a Dr. Levin, who reportedly heads the Mississippi Head Start operation, visited in Washington and I discussed this operation with him, though I must confess I was not able to get very much information from him. I asked Dr. Levin who comprised the child development group in Mississippi, and he stated that it was primarily a group of educators and professors who were interested in child development. I asked him how many of these were Mississippians, and how many, if any, were from other States. His response was that all were from outside Mississippi, with the exception of one person, whose name he refused to divulge to me. He declined to give any reason for refusing this information, which I thought certainly I was entitled to have since Federal funds are being spent on this project.

Mr. Chairman, this entire program is shot through with this kind of vague and indefinite administration. Surely the people who pay the taxes that support this farflung program have a right to know how their money is being spent, and who is spending it.

Mr. Chairman, for some reason the people who operate this program seem to feel that they are above scrutiny by the public or representatives of the public. Getting specific information out of this outfit that will give some indication of how our money is being spent is about as easy as finding the pot of gold at the end of a rainbow.

A typical example of this is to be found in a newspaper story that appeared recently in the Jackson, Miss., Clarion Ledger, when an enterprising reporter sought to get some information on the operation of this program. I include herewith the text of this article:

> ### Disorganized Head Starts Seem Not Going by Rules—Project in Greenwood, Itta Bena Exceptional
>
> (By Jane Biggers)
>
> GREENWOOD.—The largest Federal grant under Project Head Start was awarded to Mary Holmes Junior College who channeled $1.4 million to the child development group, an organization set up by the Delta Ministry at Mount Beulah near Edwards, who said funds would be used to maintain 75 centers in the State.
>
> Two such centers opened in Leflore County on Monday bringing to a total 10 head start programs providing training for children unable to attend formal kindergarten.
>
> There is, however, a vast difference in the Operation Head Start schools being maintained in one city, six county and the Pax Christi center at St. Francis Mission.
>
> In order for these centers to qualify, a complete breakdown of proposed plans, list of faculty, background of each teacher, a full-time director, parent assistants, student assistants, menu plans, and sanitation setups were required in a detailed report which took weeks of preparation. Faculty members also attended a 1-week class preparation at the University of Alabama and a week in the local classroom.
>
> When Mary Holmes received the grant, the school president, D. I. Horne, Jr., said that the classes would be staffed by first and second grade teachers at a salary of $150 per week; hot meals, medical and dental service would be provided and social and educational habits would be taught.
>
> #### NOT BEING DONE
>
> None of these are being carried out in the Greenwood and Itta Bena centers.
>
> Faculty members in the original Head Start classes which began the last of June are all college graduates with some holding master's degree. A college degree was not a requirement, but head start officials said they would prefer top personnel as teachers.
>
> In Greenwood the child development operation is at the Negro American Legion building on Jordan Avenue. James Robinson, local commander, said the building was being leased rent free to the organization, but as late as last Friday he said he was not sure the classrooms had been approved.
>
> Bobbie McKennley, who is listed as the district office director, with headquarters in Holly Springs was contacted by telephone during the weekend.
>
> McKennley said he was going to serve as director for the Greenwood and Itta Bena centers as to faculty. "I don't know yet, but we will have a lot of them." As to enrollment he said there "will be a lot of children too." McKennley emphasized the fact the largest grant has been awarded to the child development program, which he said "was special."
>
> #### HANDBILL
>
> While other preschool children were notified by a house to house canvass, the child development centers locally posted a handbill in the Itta Bena post office. It described the program as "regular kindergarten activities, trips to places of interest, health checkup, and hot noon meal." It also listed the centers as "mostly in churches." Children eligible are those entering the first grade this year or next, was also mentioned on the handbill.
>
> Most of the children in the two centers visited on Monday here were under 5 years, and several appeared to be about 3.
>
> In the Greenwood center the children were placed in orderly fashion, looking at picture books. Large alphabet letters were on a bulletin board.
>
> Three faculty members and five adults were present. Six of these are known COFO and SNCC workers, who have participated in demonstrations, here and in Jackson. One of the workers was arrested for assault and battery when she hit a Greenwood auxiliary police officer last year. Another was arrested in Jackson last month.
>
> A Miss Sharon Chelton who said she was from New York City with a degree from Brooklyn College described herself as a resource worker.
>
> #### BRUSHED OFF
>
> When pressed for details as to the noon meal and other plans for classroom activity, Miss Chelton said: "Today they are going to get sandwiches, and the rest is none of your business."
>
> In Edwards, when asked about the known civil rights demonstrators serving as teachers, a spokesman said they were well aware of that, after all in most cases they are the leaders in the community.
>
> State Director Tom Levin, said in an earlier statement the policy of the child development group will "be aggressive compliance to the Civil Rights Act."
>
> When attempts were made to take pictures at the Greenwood Center, one of the teachers tried to break the camera in a grab with a photographer.
>
> Other centers have encouraged press relations and have sought pictures and coverage of their activities.
>
> In Itta Bena the classroom is operated in the Hopewell Baptist Church, the scene of many civil rights meetings.
>
> The small, wood, frame building has no separate facilities. Willie Ester McGee, who said she was acting as "sorta chairman," noted the classroom would be divided into six areas with "more teachers coming."
>
> Mrs. McGee, who is the wife of an active civil rights worker here, said there were 25 pupils on the first day of classes with about 82 coming in all.
>
> #### FOOD "CATERED"
>
> As to food, Mrs. McGee said the noon meal would be "catered" from someplace in Itta Bena. A snack would be served in the morning. At the other Head Start centers here breakfast, a hot noon meal, and a morning

snack is being served under rigid sanitation requirements in school cafeterias.

During the Monday visit two half-gallons of milk were viewed on a pulpit table with paper napkins. There was no refrigeration.

Bill Brainered, another resource worker who gave his home as Chico, Calif. was surprised to learn there are other "headstarts" in the country.

"I did not know that," he said. "You mean they have these centers in Tennessee, Arkansas, and other places?" he asked.

No one at the Itta Bena center knew anything about salaries. "We will just have to see how much it takes to operate the first week," said the chairman.

CHECKS CASHED

It is a fact, that Mrs. McGee cashed two checks signed by Tom Levin, for more than $300 last week with a notation on each check for "child care and food * * * 1 week." Both checks were drawn on a Holly Springs bank.

Brainered said he was not going to serve as one of the faculty members, but Peggy Griffin, who said she had a B.S. in elementary education and a masters from Andover Theological Seminary will be one of the faculty members. Norma Williams said she had received her degree from Tougaloo College, and would "teach some."

"The books have not arrived yet," one teacher pointed, "but, we are expecting some."

Children were seated on the floor, building blocks, or in the church pews with picture puzzles. Two children were sweeping with small brooms, and an elderly woman continued to mop and remop the floor. There were no tables.

Most of the children were much younger than 6, appearing to be as young as 3 years of age, although Mrs. McGee said they were mostly 4, 5, and 6. There were also three teenage boys playing with the preschool puzzles.

In other Head Start centers the students must be 6 years of age, or will be 6 by January of next year. Birth certificates were required.

TEACHER CORRECTED

Mrs. McGee said, "we might teach science and numbers," but she was corrected by another teacher who added, "we will probably not get to that."

Plans to teach table etiquette, study habits and play will be taught later. "I imagine we will get around to that before the classes end in August, this is just the first day," she noted.

Other centers had to have full scale operation in effect the first day.

Leflore County Health Director James Lary said both Greenwood and Itta Bena centers had many violations which would not pass the State board of health requirements.

Lary said in order to qualify to operate a Head Start center they should have petitioned to do so before they began.

The inspector said that in Greenwood there were many corrections to be made in the preparation of the food. The same held true for Itta Bena, where he said the food was being prepared in a woman's home. Lary said that he has given the two centers three days to meet the requirements to serve food and maintain a center for children.

He also noted that no one from the Child Development had sought medical or dental care from the office, while the other centers were being cared for and had petitioned through proper channels. Inspector Lary said the two new Head Start centers would have to meet the requirements or discontinue their operation. Under the present setup they do not qualify to operate, Lary stated.

Mr. Chairman, the operation of this program, certainly insofar as its operation in Mississippi is concerned. could not stand an objective investigation. Instead of extending and enlarging it, the Congress would be wise, in my opinion, to call a halt to it until its operation could be subjected to a full and complete and impartial investigation with no holds barred.

The Clerk read as follows:

JOB CORPS—APPLICATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT

SEC. 3. Section 106(c)(2)(A) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"(A) The term 'performance of duty' in the Federal Employee's Compensation Act shall not include any act of an enrollee while absent from his or her assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity (including an activity while on pass or during travel to or from such post of duty) authorized by or under the direction and supervision of the Corps."

JOB CORPS—ENROLLEE WORK ACTIVITIES

SEC. 4. Section 110 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting the word "male" before the word "enrollees" in the first sentence.

WORK TRAINING PROGRAMS—LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 5. The first sentence of section 115 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "three", and by striking out ", or June 30, 1966, whichever is later,".

WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS—LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 6. Section 124(f) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "three", and by striking out "or June 30, 1966, whichever is later,".

Amendments to Title II—Urban and Rural Community Action Programs

GENERAL COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS—LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 7. (a) The first sentence of section 208(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "three", and by striking out ", or June 30, 1966, whichever is later,".

(b) Section 208 of such Act is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c) and inserting a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) The Director is authorized to prescribe regulations establishing objective criteria pursuant to which assistance may be reduced below 90 per centum for such community action programs or components as have received assistance under section 205 for a period prescribed in such regulations."

(c) Section 208(c) of such Act (as so redesignated by subsection (b) of this section) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "The requirement imposed by the preceding sentence shall be subject to such regulations as the Director may adopt and promulgate establishing objective criteria for determinations covering situations where a literal application of such requirement would result in unnecessary hardship or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved."

AMENDMENT BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk which goes to page 3, line 14. To expedite the matter, I ask unanimous consent that an amendment I have on page 4, line 18, be considered at the same time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. QUIE: Page 3, line 14, insert the following:

"ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNITY ACTION BOARDS—STATE APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS

"SEC. 7. (a) Section 202(a)(4) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', in the case of a program other than a multiple-purpose community action program, or by a community action board, in the case of a multiple-purpose community action program'.

"(b) Section 202 of such Act is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (d), and by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsections:

" '(b) A community action program shall be deemed to be a multiple-purpose community action program if it provides two or more related component programs and is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a community action board; and

" '(c) The term "community action board" means a board which is organized and maintained to conduct, administer, or coordinate a multiple-purpose community action program—

" '(1) at least one-third of the membership of which consists of low-income individuals residing in the area to be served by the program who have been selected through a procedure, designed by the State community action agency, which will insure that such members are truly representative of the low-income individuals in the area, and

" '(2) the membership of which (except for persons elected as provided in paragraph (1)) consists of—

" '(A) a number of representatives of local government who are themselves elective officials or are appointed by elective officials equal to the number of members elected as provided in paragraph (1), and

" '(B) representatives of private institutions or organizations having a concern with the problems of poverty selected by the members of the board described in paragraph (1) and clause (A) of this paragraph, "who are representatives of the governing body of the local political subdivision in which such program is to be carried out, or, if it is to be carried out in more than one local political subdivision, representatives of the governing bodies of all such subdivisions shall be selected in such manner as the State community action organization may prescribe." '

"APPROVAL BY STATE COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY

"SEC. 8. Section 205 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(e) The Director shall not make any grant under this part for any community action program, or any component thereof, until a plan setting forth such community action program or component thereof has been submitted to the State community action agency and has been approved by it.' "

"And renumber the sections which follow."

Page 4, after line 18, insert the following:

"DESIGNATION OF STATE COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

"SEC. 9. (a) Section 209(a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

" '(a) Each State desiring to have Federal assistance for community action programs carried on in the State shall designate as its community action agency either (1) the agency in the State principally concerned with the problems of poverty, or (2) a State agency which includes one or more of the major public health, public welfare, or labor programs of the State. It shall be the function of each community action agency to examine each plan submitted to it under section 205(e), and approve or disapprove it, and to design procedures to govern selection of members of community action boards.'"

"(b) Section 209(c) of such Act is amended by striking out 'and title II'."

"And renumber the sections which follow accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I will spend this time explaining my amendment. I have given a copy of it to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] who spoke of his interest in it, and I hope the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] has a copy as well.

The purpose of this amendment is to require by law the Office of Economic Opportunity to operate first as far as the community action programs are concerned the way I think the men with vision down in the OEO think it ought to operate and it would back them up.

Second, it would enable us to have a State agency responsible for the operation of the CAP which will then be running with the same kind of unanimity of feeling as we see in such programs as vocational rehabilitation.

Let me explain this point by point. It would first define a community action program as one that provides two or more related programs and necessitates the establishment of a community action board to administer such a program.

Two, it would specify that one-third of the membership of the board shall consist of the low-income individuals residing in the area served by the program who will be selected in a manner prescribed by the State community action agency.

Let me state briefly and explain this need. Especially you on the committee will recall the testimony of such individuals as Reverend Stevenson of the Woodlawn organization in Chicago. He was very critical of the fact that the local poor were not participating in developing the program. We heard the same thing from people like Mrs. Craggett and Reverend Younger in Cleveland and from several others across the country. They all had the same criticism. You remember Cecil Moore of Philadelphia who said they ought to have an election in Philadelphia. They have now had their election and even though a small percentage of the people participated, I believe they made an initial effective step toward that election.

Now I prefer that the poor who serve on these councils be elected in every case, but rather than spelling this out in the bill, I permit it to operate the way the cooperative extension program operates. In some States the farmer representatives on the cooperative extension board are elected from within the county by the farmers themselves. In other States they have a process of appointments. But in any case the reason why the cooperative extension program works and is accepted by the farmers is that the farmers themselves participate in the development of the program.

We have seen the criticism of the war on poverty and the community action programs by the people who are themselves poor. They feel they have not been participating.

We do not have to fear that this will be a new power structure which will take over the community. I believe if we recognize this and give them an opportunity, they will work well with the elected officials and other appointed officials who would work on the council.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I will yield to the gentleman, and I hope I may be granted some additional time to explain the amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. I wonder if the gentleman's amendment will not make the operation of the community action program so cumbersome that it would be impossible to get a community action program approved in many instances.

As an example, if an important section of the community wanted a preventive health program, a remedial health program, or a remedial education program, would it not be much more difficult under the amendment to get a program of that type approved?

Mr. QUIE. No, because any single action agency would not come under this. This would apply only to multiple action agencies. The umbrella agencies are the only ones to which it would apply.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Is it not true that now we are administering this program throughout the United States without any such State agency as the gentleman is describing? The amendment would require every single State, as a condition precedent to any city within that State having a community action program, to establish a new bureaucracy and to create a new commission at the State level, which does not now exist; and the cities then would have to submit their plans to it and have them modified by it, and they would be dictated to by a State agency, although this is not now a requirement.

Mr. QUIE. I will explain this, as I get to that part of my amendment.

In many States already, the Governors have appointed a coordinator of the Office of Economic Opportunity within the State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Also, other Federal programs are operating the way I propose, through State agencies. I pointed out vocational rehabilitation as one of them. We do not hear any of the criticisms of that program which we hear of the war on poverty. When anybody brings up a vocational rehabilitation bill, we stumble all over ourselves to show how much we are in favor of it, all over this body.

I should like to see the so-called war on poverty operate in such a way that this would happen with the war on poverty.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I wish to commend the gentleman for his amendment. I support it wholeheartedly.

In answer to the point made by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, it is difficult to conceive of it being any more difficult by any procedure to get an umbrella agency set up on a workable basis than it has been by experience thus far.

Also, one of the greatest problems we have had in the setting up of umbrella agencies is that the States with working organizations, with experience in these fields, have had no authority. As the gentleman from Minnesota indicates, where they are beginning to be set up on a workable basis, it is primarily because the State has taken over some responsibility and, on an ad hoc or informal basis, set up its own coordinator of the Economic Opportunity Act.

I should also like to point out what the gentleman from Minnesota touched on. It seems to me a very peculiar thing to hear our colleagues who are defending this program constantly malign the existing programs in this country today to fight poverty. There are a great many of them, most of which have been supported by our esteemed colleagues on both sides of the aisle. These programs are run on the precise kind of basis proposed in the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota, with States participating and having a role to initiate and set up State plans and to coordinate the programs through their employees, so that it is not necessary to set up a central bureaucracy in Washington to do it all.

I commend the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. The law already provides for participation by State agencies in section 209, and has this authority. We are not doing something completely out of line.

Mr. Chairman, as I promised the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] I would yield to him, I will yield to him now, but otherwise I do not want to yield until I finish my statement. However, since I promised it, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman now.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I am always interested in the great devotion, precision, and accuracy demonstrated by my colleague from the State of Minnesota. I note he mentions the great vocational rehabilitation program as a strength which we should emulate in this program. I know he has attended hearings very consistently and persistently and knows our record on vocational rehabilitation showed that we have numerous communications from State agencies indicating they were opposed to setting up a separate agency to deal with vocational rehabilitation and that they intended to pursue their previous course.

So there is no consistent consensus among the States on the point of setting up a new agency. I will point out in my own State of New York we are somewhat sorry and somewhat niggardly in handling vocational rehabilitation. If we have to emulate the program in New York State to get community action programs going at a greater pace in New York State, we will be in a sorry state indeed. Vocational rehabilitation in New York State for the last several years, as Howard Rusk, who has written very actively in the New York Times, has indicated, has for 3 years running in our State failed to pick up its share in Federal funds, and in vocational rehabilitation we lost $3½ million in 1 year. If we follow that course of action, my State will do what it almost did, which is lose $19 million in one city alone by failing to set up an appropriate agency. We cannot wait for the States to do this themselves, because we have no guarantee that they will do so. That is why we cannot rest the insecurity of poverty in the hands of the State agencies which are now nonexistent and negligible in their setup.

Mr. QUIE. I may say to the gentleman in a vocational rehabilitation bill there is not a proposal that they eliminate State agencies but just free them up and let the State decide which agency will handle it. Also, in the amendments we are going to offer with the vocational rehabilitation program we hope that it will encourage the States like New York or other States in the North to utilize vocational rehabilitation more than they have before.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York will be very happy to learn that the Rules Committee is preparing to grant a rule on the extension of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act with a vast increase in sums.

Mr. QUIE. Let me finish now explaining what is in my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota be permitted to proceed for another 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to object. Reserving the right to object, I want to know how many others want to be heard on this new act being written now.

Mr. QUIE. What was the gentleman's request?

Mr. POWELL. I am calling the Quie amendment a new act.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 5 more minutes and all debate on this amendment close at 5 minutes after 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman, then, does not object to the request of the gentleman from New York. There being no objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, the second point to close all debate would be a requirement for the gentleman from Minnesota to proceed the additional 5 minutes. My request was that I do not object to the gentleman from Minnesota proceeding for 5 more minutes, but I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this particular amendment close at 5 minutes after 4.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close at 5 minutes after 4 and the gentleman from Minnesota be given 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, the second provision in the makeup of the community action board is that the local elected officials or members appointed by the local elected officials serve on this board. The reason is that in some community action efforts there are proposals to bypass the local elected officials.

To give you an example, I will read from a letter that I have just received today from one of the counties in my district. Under a proposal that three counties be set up as an umbrella agency in their community action program, they refused to go along with it. They were told by Mr. Gene Flaten, from the State of Minnesota part of the Office of Economic Opportunity, as follows:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
July 13, 1965.

Department: Office of Economics Opportunity.
To: Bob Shaw.
From: Gene D. Flaten.
Subject: Community Action Committee.

I regretted to hear of the indecision on the part of the various boards with whom I met last evening. In the light of the fact this was the third session for most of them, I was hoping some progress could be made relative to the formation of a multicounty CAP council.

I hope to hear from your board within a week or so, and also from Freeborn. I am of the opinion that you—as well as your counterparts thereabouts—are aware of the breadth of this program effort, and the success we have enjoyed throughout almost the entire State of Minnesota in establishing and making operable CAP councils. On that basis alone, as well as well-established governmental directives, you can be certain we will accomplish our purposes. It is in the best interests of local government and local participation that we have proceeded—to date—through the county boards. If this cannot be done, we will establish citizens committees and proceed with and through such a group. The involvement of county boards or their individual members would be remote in that latter instance.

I submit that there might well be some valid considerations over the present effort of Federal programs to beef up the existing local programs. However, I also submit that there is little nor no likelihood of an alternative in this particular instance. To fight is folly.

I hope to hear from you quite soon so that we can assume the process of setting up a CAP council in your area, and begin to identify programs according to need and practical propriety.

Mr. Chairman, these are very clear words that the local elected officials will be bypassed if they do not go along. I think it is unwise; it is wrong. These men were elected to give some plans to their community, and they should be worked with in offering plans and advice which they will agree on.

Lastly, on this three-legged stool, that the representatives of private institutions and organizations concerned with the problems of poverty also be included on this community action board. This is devised by law. Each community knows that this is the way to set up their council at its very inception. If operated in this way it will work better.

We have traveled to some of the cities and we found out, after they had devised the program and set it up, they would be put on a council at a later date.

In the areas where local officials have been barred in the past there is justifiable criticism wherever they are bypassed because the private agencies who are bypassed are the people who have had a tremendous amount of experience in helping people come out of that situation of poverty.

In case there is more than one political subdivision in the area, where the community action program will operate, representatives of all the governing bodies shall sit on the community action board. They will be selected in a manner prescribed by the State community action agency. You need some agency within the State over all to help them decide how the various members of more than one political subdivision will be selected.

It will prevent the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity from making any grant under title II until the plan for the grant has been approved by the State community action agency. This will give continuity to each State.

Lastly it will require that any State desiring assistance under the act designate a community action agency which will be an agency previously established and chiefly concerned with poverty or a new agency which will include the major health, welfare, and labor programs of the State.

As I look at the Federal assistance programs operating in my congressional district I find that the ones that operate through a State agency, where the State agency submits a plan, are the ones that get along with the least amount of criticism.

There must be the greatest amount of cooperation from the people within the State and the people within each local community in the programs. Where there is direct Federal action into the community, circumventing State, or the possibility of even circumventing the local community, it is full of controversy and political action between various people in the community.

Mr. Chairman, this is what is giving the so-called war on poverty a bad name. I believe in the tried and proven method of local and State and Federal cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, when the Federal Government embarks upon a program that must have the cooperation of the people who are involved, who may be called upon to administer the program, who have the responsibility within their communities, the very fact that this bypasses this type of operation is what is putting this program in what I call a shambles, in chaos, and everyone knows it.

I have not heard very much from the majority side of the aisle in criticism of it, but you know full well that this is the reason why it is in so much trouble.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moorhead] for 1 minute.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I believe that we cannot here in Washington write ground rules that will operate in all of the local communities across this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, in the city of Pittsburgh we have a very successful program in the war against poverty. The core of our program in Pittsburgh is a nonprofit corporation called the Mayor's Committee on Human Resources. It is drawn from all areas. The membership is drawn from all areas in our civic life. We have the mayor, we have the president of the city council, there is an attorney, a bank vice president, a union vice president, a Catholic priest, a Baptist minister, a Presbyterian minister, a judge, a citizen's group official, and the urban renewal development director, two corporation officials, and the State secretary for labor and industry.

Mr. Chairman, this program has kept politics out of our war on poverty. But, Mr. Chairman, this program would not qualify under the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie]. This would be most unfortunate.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation which is designed to rededicate ourselves to the elimination of deprivation and dependency in the United States. The bill is designed—if I may turn Robert Frost's words around—to provide something to look backward to with pride and something to look forward to with hope.

It has been noted already that this is a rare peacetime effort involving public and private agencies, and government at all levels. It has been noted, too, that only in time of war before this, has such a tremendous program as this gotten underway in so short a time. The program is not yet 1 year old.

You have heard about difficulties in some areas. I should like to give you a report on how one specific area is addressing itself to overcoming difficulties and more specifically how it is addressing itself to the war on poverty.

It seems to me that the experience of my own city of Pittsburgh may be of some value as a pattern for other cities and more immediately of some value to Members of this body who must evaluate this program and decide the character of legislation to further implement the program.

The Pittsburgh antipoverty program draws heavily on our earlier and spectacular Pittsburgh renaissance. The antipoverty program has brought together private, public, religious, governmental, labor, and business leaders of Pittsburgh to work out a harmonious, coordinated attack.

The unique aspect of the Pittsburgh battle of this war is the Mayor's Commission on Human Resources, Inc. This is a nonprofit corporation which is both coordinator and clearinghouse in the administering of grants from the Office of Economic Opportunity. It is doubtful that this very admirable agency could function if the amendment to be proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] is adopted by the House. Let me list the areas of civic life in Pittsburgh from which members of the mayor's committee were drawn. In addition to the mayor himself and the president of the city council, there are also an attorney, a bank vice president, a union vice president, a Catholic priest, a Baptist minister, a Presbyterian minister, a judge, a citizens group official, an urban redevelopment director, two corporation officials and the State secretary for labor and industry.

Members of this nonprofit corporation are a bipartisan, broadly representative group. They work hard and without pay.

Our distinguished mayor, Mr. Joseph Barr, told me in a letter several weeks ago that the important point to be made about the Pittsburgh program is that:

> We have been able to consolidate a range of city, county, State, and Federal agencies as well as business, labor, voluntary groups, educational agencies, and the poor themselves into a unified approach in attacking the problems of poverty on a broad-based, nonpartisan level.

The Pittsburgh community action plan is operating in eight neighborhoods. There is a broad-based citizens committee in each neighborhood which is heavily representative of the poor themselves. They have a say in how the programs in their own neighborhoods are set up, how they are run, how they are evaluated.

What has been accomplished?

It seems to me that, in the 4 or 5 months the antipoverty program has been operating in Pittsburgh, we have made real progress and can look forward to a revolutionary change in the lives of thousands of our citizens.

In support of this, let me cite some figures.

In the 8 poverty neighborhoods, 8 neighborhood committees have been established, each with 200 to 300 active members, of which about 35 percent are poor. Thus nearly 2,000 people are involved in these policymaking committees. Six neighborhood coordinators are now on the job with full responsibility for developing a unified service pattern, new programs, and involving the citizens of each neighborhood in full participation in the programs.

Seven neighborhood employment centers are now open and operating. Another will be ready soon. At these centers 4,100 applications have already been received. They have referred 700 persons for jobs and actually placed 300 of these people in jobs.

Parenthetically, I might point out that this program has been taken directly to the people. A few days ago applications were being taken at card tables set up on the sidewalks on a street in Pittsburgh's Hill district.

In the screening for Youth Corps jobs, 1,500 are now working and we have 1,500 additional jobs to fill.

One hundred persons have been placed in the Job Corps from Pittsburgh.

There are seven family service units operating out of the neighborhood centers.

Fourteen thousand children and three thousand five hundred adults have been given compensatory education by the public school system. Catholic schools have served 900 students.

There are 17 former public assistance recipients now working in neighborhood homemaker training; 23 more are now in training for this activity.

For legal aid, there are part-time lawyers working in four neighborhoods. It is planned to have full-time lawyers in all eight centers.

The health services program is established in one neighborhood so far, and there is one housing clinic operating and another ready to go.

Project Head Start finds 1,160 children in 58 centers now receiving health, dental, hearing, and eye tests. More than 2,000 homes in Pittsburgh were visited to find these 1,160 children. Ninety-four professionals and 232 subprofessionals have been hired for Head Start.

It is interesting to note that of the 232 subprofessionals, many never held a job before.

One of these subprofessionals, hired as a teacher's helper, wrote a letter to a Head Start official in Pittsburgh thanking him for providing an opportunity for her to go to work.

She said:

> It means my children won't have to go to Sunday school in tennis shoes any more; it means an end to not quite enough of everything. It means a chance to provide enrichment to my children, all of whom are above average in intelligence, one of whom is extremely gifted, and to me (it means) literally a new life, a second chance, an opportunity at the career I have always wanted.

This lady concluded her heart-warming tribute to the program by expressing her hope that she would be able to justify the faith placed in her and hoped she could be considered in the fall for the ongoing program.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that our experience in Pittsburgh will be of value to Members of the House.

Because the Pittsburgh program proves the worth of this legislation, I urge enactment of H.R. 8283.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Edwards] for 1 minute.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. Bell].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. Bell] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

I want to point out, however, that it is difficult for me to understand why the Members on the majority side are in effect criticizing the ongoing programs that are in effect such as the manpower development and training program, the Vocational Rehabilitation program, and others. They are State-oriented programs under which our Federal aid goes to the State. This is the way it has been operating and this is the way it is systematized. This in effect is the manner in which the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will operate if adopted. It would place responsibility where we are accustomed to having that responsibility placed, at the State and local level.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Frelinghuysen] for 1 minute.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I might say that I regret very much the imposition of such a severe gag rule so early in the discussion of possible improvements to this act.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the height of folly for us to discuss a major modification and improvement in this program in the short length of time we have given ourselves.

The sponsor of the amendment, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie], it is true, has been given 15 minutes to explain it. But the rest of us who have ideas which we would like to advance have no time at all in which to bring them up.

Of course, this shows also the difficulty of legislating sensibly on the floor of the House. The fact of the matter is that this is the kind of an amendment which should be discussed in detail in committee. The fact of the matter is that it was not. The fact of the matter is that there was no real discussion. I must admit, however, that I am not a member of the committee and I cannot speak from firsthand knowledge, but there was no real discussion of any alternatives to what we now have in the community action programs.

Mr. Chairman, this is regrettable. I regret the fact that we are not apparently going to have time to discuss the other major alternatives and improvements to the program, if we follow this gag rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. William D. Ford] for 1 minute.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota shows a complete lack of confidence in local government. The gentleman from California said he preferred that the program be administered at the closest level to the people, that is, at the State or local level. It is administered today at the local level, within the local community. What the gentleman from Minnesota would do would be to authorize those local communities to act when and if they would go to the State capitol and get permission for programs even though they might be conceived for the individual communities. In the State of Minnesota, the gentleman believes that the individual local communities are not capable of this kind of action at the local level without the assistance of the people at the statehouse.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. William D. Ford], should take a look at Minnesota and see that the local communities are objecting. Who is going to do it? The Office of Economic Opportunity. The Director is the czar of the programs. The programs that are presently operated would be operated under my amendment by the States and if they are operating well for a State, the program should be acceptable. Those are the people who live with it. The money should be made available to them, they should make their decision within the guidelines laid out by my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the present amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, after listening to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie], I do not think the amendment he offers would do at all what he said it would do because, after all, the local agency has to go to a State agency for approval by the State agency and then the State agency would have to come back to Washington. He has removed from the local agency any real hope that the local people carrying out the program will be considered at all on the State level. I would have to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie].

The amendments were rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REID OF NEW YORK

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Reid of New York: Page 3, after line 14, insert the following:

"COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS—PUBLIC INFORMATION

"Sec. 7. Section 202(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out 'and' at the end of paragraph (3), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof '; and', and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(5) which includes provision for reasonable public access to books and records of the agency or agencies engaged in the development, conduct, and administration of the program, in accordance with procedures approved by the Director.'"

And renumber the sections which follow accordingly.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment this amendment is clear. It simply provides for public access to books and records as a matter of law. I believe this is important and that it will sustain the right of the American people to know the facts.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. POWELL. I want to compliment the gentleman from New York for his fine contributions to the full committee and to the subcommitte and to say that this is an excellent amendment and on behalf of the Members on this side of the aisle, we accept the amendment.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. First I have a question about this. The last part of its says, "in accordance with the procedures approved by the Director." The Director would be able to decide what he would or would not or what he would let the public have access to; is that correct?

Mr. REID of New York. No, it is my understanding the principle would be clear. There would be public access. The reference to the Director is not as to the principle but as to reasonable procedures to give effect to the principle which is unrestricted and unqualified.

Mr. QUIE. So he would have to make it available, but as to how he would make it available is up to him?

Mr. REID of New York. It would be reasonable and prompt access, that would be my understanding.

Mr. QUIE. I want to say to the gentleman, I accept the amendment.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment to insure that the public would have access to records of all funds expended for the so-called community action program.

My amendment would have called for the auditing by the General Accounting Office of all funds given to a private organization.

It appears that the amendment offered is intended to produce the same result—public disclosure and full accountability.

In the belief this will be effective if such provision is administered fairly, I will withhold the offering of my amendment at this time and join with my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid], and in support of his amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have five questions to ask the chairman of the committee or someone who can speak for the committee who knows what has been taking place in the operation of the so-called Head Start program.

These questions were submitted to me by an Iowa schoolteacher who is observing closely what is taking place. Her first question: When the forms for registration were mailed to the parents, no mention was made that the program was designed for poverty-stricken families—why?

Mr. GIBBONS. I do not know what happened in Iowa. Perhaps they did not follow the suggestion of—I received a form in McLean, Va., were I reside temporarily while the Congress is in session, and it had all of the necessary information on it saying that this is a program limited to low-income families and asking for information such as that. I do not know about Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Then the forms are supposed to be directed to those with low income?

Mr. GIBBONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Would that be $3,000 and below, or what would be the breaking point?

Mr. GIBBONS. Well $3,000 or below or exceeding that in the case of a large family, where the local communities have some leeway in accepting them where there are large families.

Mr. GROSS. The second question is, Why are children who have completed the first grade allowed to participate since the program supposedly is for preschool children?

Mr. GIBBONS. I frankly did not know that they were participating. It is the first time it has ever been brought to my attention. There may be children who have finished the first grade but there are some, I think—it would probably not hurt them a bit to go back and start over again.

Mr. GROSS. The third question: Why are the teachers paid such an exorbitant salary when no attempt is made to accomplish classroom instruction?

Mr. GIBBONS. I am not aware of any exorbitant salaries. I have checked our program in my own congressional district. I believe the salaries are in line with what a competent teacher would receive for that type of work. This is difficult work. These children are given a lot more than reading, writing, and arithmetic. They are taught how to make the simple adjustments which children from good homes and from well-run homes probably already know.

This Head Start program will not only help the young child who is from a disadvantaged home, but also it will help the child from the nondisadvantaged home, because when the two groups of children are mixed in school, the schoolteacher then can have the whole class proceed at a much more rapid rate.

Mr. GROSS. The fourth question: Who is responsible for the approval of participants in each school district?

Mr. GIBBONS. The local school personnel. The local school sponsoring agency. In most cases it is the local public school system.

Mr. GROSS. The fifth question is, Why are children from high-income families allowed to attend? Is this not expensive babysitting?

Mr. GIBBONS. No. It should not be expensive babysitting. I did not know there were children from high-income families participating. It is not the objective of the act to bring in anything of that sort. I regret that it is going on in Iowa. I have no knowledge of it going on in my district or any place I have had an opportunity to check.

Mr. GROSS. So it is not supposed to include those of high or middle income?

Mr. GIBBONS. No. It is supposed to include the low-income child from the disadvantaged family.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, and I hasten to add, Mr. Chairman, that the Head Start program, according to the evidence already available, is not being operated in Iowa in accordance with the answers given by the gentleman from Florida in response to the questions.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the colloquy which just occurred. I will say I believe the gentleman from Florida should have some information about how this Head Start program is operating in some areas.

I have five boys, from 2 to 9 years old. My fourth child is 5 years old, Michael Charles Ellsworth Goodell. We live while Congress is in session in the District of Columbia. He is no genius. None of my children are geniuses by a long shot, but Mike is one of the brightest.

About 3 weeks ago, we were called, and Michael was invited to participate in the Head Start program for the District of Columbia.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], and I both have supported preschool and early school training for youngsters long before the administration adopted it as a policy. We have been urging it in various substitutes. I believe very deeply in this program, but I want to ask the gentleman from Florida if this is his conception as to how the program should operate—that children of Congressmen should be invited to participate in a Head Start program?

Mr. GIBBONS. I would have to answer honestly it was not my intention, and I do not believe it was the intention of the Congress.

I am not aware of what happened to the gentleman's child. All I can repeat is what I saw happening to my children, in the part of the Washington metropolitan area in which I live. The forms which came to my home, delivered to my home from the school system and through the mail, were excellent forms, well prepared, giving exactly the type of information needed.

Mr. GOODELL. Would the gentleman say, as a matter of legislative history today, it is not the intention that children who do not come from deprived families are to participate in the Head Start program?

Mr. GIBBONS. I believe the intention of the act is to cover low-income deprived families.

Mr. GOODELL. And the gentleman says that as a matter of legislative history. The Head Start program is for low-income deprived families, however the administrators define that term.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. CAREY. I believe that what my colleague from New York and his wonderful family are experiencing is something I would term "Operation Head Start contagion."

Operation Head Start has become an infectious and contagious program among educators who have immediately apprehended its value. Therefore, while we have the initiative at the Federal level—and it was initiated at that level—local and community school systems are adopting this concept so as to bring in other children. In that way we are avoiding economic segregation, which means that congressional children go to school with other children.

Mr. GOODELL. I want to say to the gentleman that is not the case in this instance. This was a Federal program, and I am very much distressed to have them invite my child, who I do not believe needs the head start, although it is subject to some discussion. I will say that one of my Democratic colleagues said that they must have looked at my voting record and decided that my boy needed a head start. But, seriously, I hope that it is not the intention of the program to include children who have no need for this kind of help.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. I want to say it is possible, of course, that there might be more than one Goodell in the school system that your lad goes to. Also, it is not unusual for somebody to get a wrong number either on the telephone or anywhere else.

Mr. GOODELL. I must straighten out the RECORD on that, because I did check on it. My neighbors got the same calls, and some of them are participating in the District Head Start program. That is in Northwest Washington, the last place that needs it. With all of the other places in Washington where we have children who need help, they are calling children in Northwest Washington to get these children into this Head Start program. It makes me very angry and I think it would make the gentleman from Pennsylvania very angry, too. It is an abuse of a good idea. And if it is extended nationally in this form, it will ruin the idea and give it a black name.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. There may have been a mistake here somewhere, but I hope it will assuage the gentleman's anger to know how the interest in this program has exploded across every sector of our economy and our society. I hope it will assuage his anger to know that we have had 100,000 full-time people from all sectors of our economy nationally interested in this program; 400,000 of them are part-time volunteers who have contributed $90 million worth of time valued at $1.50 an hour.

Mr. **GOODELL**. The gentleman does not have to sell me on preschool and early school programs for deprived youngsters. I just reiterate my previous remarks the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and I preceded the administration with this suggestion and we believe very deeply in the kind of Head Start program which is directed at those who need it, but we do not believe it ought to be diverted to other children who have not the same kind of need.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. **GOODELL**. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **POWELL**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **GOODELL**. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. **POWELL**. The gentleman is totally correct. Our Operation Head Start is only for the children of the poor. It is my intention and I have just instructed our assistant chief counsel to find out why this happened and to stop it immediately.

Mr. **GOODELL**. I appreciate the assurance from the chairman that Head Start is only for the children of the poor, as he has just said. I also hope that his commitment to stop what they are doing now will be stopped. My boy is just one example.

Mr. **POWELL**. Thank you for your contribution.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

Mr. **RYAN**. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. **POWELL**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **RYAN**. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. **POWELL**. Mr. Chairman, I just wish to take this opportunity to say there are many Members of the House who have been invited to the White House for the education program at 5:15. Therefore, it is my hope that the Committee can rise at 5 o'clock.

Mr. **AYRES**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **RYAN**. Yes. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **AYRES**. I would like to concur in the request of my chairman. I think it would be most unfortunate, in view of the fact that educators have come in from all over the country, for the House of Representatives not to be represented there.

Mr. **FRELINGHUYSEN**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. **RYAN**. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **FRELINGHUYSEN**. I hope the gentleman is not suggesting that because we may rise at 5 o'clock we will have a further imposition of the gag rule with respect to amendments which are pending and already at the desk.

Mr. **POWELL**. I do not believe in a gag rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: Page 3, after line 14, insert the following:

"COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS—ELECTIVE POLICY BOARDS

"SEC. 7. Section 202(a)(3) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after 'served' the following: ', and with maximum feasible use of elections to select members of such groups and residents of such areas to serve on policymaking boards or other bodies'."

And renumber the sections which follow accordingly.

Mr. **RYAN**. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is directed at the section of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which deals with community action programs and particularly amends that section which defines a community action program as one "which is developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served."

This provision in the act has been the subject of considerable discussion and debate since this act has been implemented by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Its interpretation was one of the chief topics during the hearings. I believe very strongly that there should be a real involvement of people in the area affected, that what we are concerned with as much as poverty, in terms of economic poverty, is also the poverty of power. People in the ghetto communities are powerless. One way to overcome this poverty of power is to provide a process whereby representatives of the community are elected to local community action boards.

My amendment would express the sense of Congress, in addition to the language already in the act, that there should be a maximum feasible use of elections, to select members of such groups and residents of such areas to serve on policymaking boards or other bodies.

In view of the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], earlier this afternoon, I would think that this is an amendment which he could support. Those on his side of the aisle as well as on our side of the aisle might find agreement on the value of electing representatives in the neighborhoods.

He spoke of the idea, of the concept, of electing representatives of the poor. He cited the Philadelphia experience and said that he preferred for the poor to be elected. He made an analogy to farmers' extension programs, which I think makes a good deal of sense. Mr. Chairman, if we analyze community action programs which have been developed so far, we should recognize that there has not been sufficient involvement of people at the neighborhood level; that too often programs are imposed from above; that too often city administrations seek to control these programs to the exclusion of the people in the communities who are affected.

So my proposal is simply that we make it clear that we believe there should be a process whereby local citizens, people who are poor, as defined under this act, have an opportunity to vote in their own communities for their own representatives to serve on these boards. It is typical that in some cities there is an overall structure which is called an antipoverty board on which an effort is made to have representatives of the poor. My suggestion is that there be, as in Philadelphia, elections to select these representatives; so that local boards are representative, with members elected from the community.

In this fashion, with this kind of process, the poor people, the deprived people in disadvantaged areas will participate in the decisionmaking process; and by participating in the decisionmaking process, they will immeasurably improve the program, because they know better than anyone else, they know better than any city administration, they know better than any social welfare agency what is needed in their own community, what is needed to take advantage of the opportunities which the Economic Opportunities Act provides.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly that the language of my amendment, which is not binding, but which is advisory, would further spell out the purpose which I believe we intended a year ago when we adopted this act.

The procedures and criteria for conducting the local elections would be worked out between the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the local communities.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that the antipoverty program root out the causes and not merely attack the symptoms of poverty. We need more than palliatives which may in the short run subdue the hostility of those who live as victims of an unjust economic and political system, but which hardly touch the sources of poverty. We need more than legislation to make the daily lives of people a little easier. We need legislation which enables people to live as citizens in a free society, to be involved at all times with decisions that affect their lives.

There is an old maxim that "the poorest man that is in America has a life to live as the richest man." People have a life to live, not a role to fulfill. In a democracy, that means making one's life and the conditions of life one's own.

It is not enough to remove the barriers which entrap the poor, although that is essential. The poor should know the freedom of coming together and setting the alternatives in which they live. Not only a freedom from want but a freedom to act, to control the decisions which affect their own lives, should be the goal.

There are different ways to do this. The poor can be hired for a variety of program tasks. Social organization and action by the poor can be encouraged within the local neighborhoods. The poor can be involved in the planning, policy, and administrative bodies which provide overall guidance and supervision of citywide efforts.

In the first year of the antipoverty program the poor have not been fully involved. New York City is a significant example. There the city administration attempted to dominate the program. Public reaction, congressional pressure, and pressure from the Office of Economic Opportunity forced a change. And the program has been funded. Yet the poor are not involved in the process of making and executing decisions.

The basic issue remains. Indigenous leadership will not be developed unless it is encouraged. The poverty of power will remain as long as city halls and established social agencies dominate community action programs.

There are those who believe that representation of private agencies on antipoverty boards meets the problem.

Prof. Richard A. Cloward, of the Columbia School of Social Work, director of research of the mobilization for youth program on Manhattan's lower East Side, discussed this when he testified before the Senate Select Subcommittee on Poverty recently.

> When private agencies take positions on this expanding range of Government programs, they are quite mindful of their interests. This statement will hold even when their interests run counter to those of what are now the most depressed minority poor, as they often do. If this minority expects to influence the proliferating arenas of governmental activity, they will need their own organizational apparatus to help.

In the administration of antipoverty funds, there is a question about the effect on institutional power. If programs are operated exclusively by municipal governments or established voluntary agencies, the powerlessness of the poor will be perpetuated and their poverty with it.

Mr. Chairman, the changes in the life of the poor cannot come from above but must come from the people themselves. Community development efforts throughout the world have shown that even such beneficial changes as the introduction of improved health practices and facilities are wasted unless the leaders of the impoverished community lend support.

Today, the impoverished are people who are striking out for a future. If this legislation is to provide a world of possibility for the poor, it must elicit responsibility in a maximum way.

The House recently passed the voting rights bill. Let us now create an opportunity for those who not only suffer from economic poverty but also from a poverty of power to use their vote to re-create their lives.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise regretfully in opposition to the amendment offered by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. Chairman, I can understand why my colleague, the gentleman from New York, is preoccupied with elections at this time. But this amendment would cause havoc. It would be almost impossible to administer. Who would establish the criteria? Who would set up the boards of elections? Who would administer the elections? It would cause not maximum feasible use but maximum nonfeasible havoc on the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BUCHANAN: Page 3, after line 14, insert the following:
>
> "COMPONENTS OF COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS—RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS FORBIDDEN
>
> "SEC. 7. (a) The first sentence of section 205(2) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', except that the Director shall make no grant to, and shall not contract with, any church or other religious body.'
>
> "(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to programs approved prior to the enactment of this Act, except that no payments with respect to such a program shall be made after October 1, 1965."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple and clear. It eliminates only one narrow phase of the present area of the poverty program.

The overwhelming number of grants and projects through the community action program of the OEO are not conducted by churches or other religious organizations, but only a relative handful. A small percentage fall into this classification. But in this handful of projects carried on by churches and other religious organizations, there is a dangerous precedent established, and in my judgment clear violation of the first amendment. I understand that these grants are not made directly to churches, but rather in most instances the church organizes a public corporation controlled by the church which corporation would in fact receive the grant and administer the program. Nevertheless, this constitutes an area of grave danger. It seems manifest to me that in such cases the church serves as majority stockholder or as board of directors to the corporation, with the clear and close involvement such a relationship would indicate.

Mr. Chairman, during the general debate I pointed out the counsel of some of our former Presidents such as John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and Andrew Johnson, concerning the value of religious liberty and the importance of maintaining absolute separation of church and state in order to preserve that liberty.

Please note that my amendment does not disturb the present project Head Start program which is now underway. It takes effect on October 1. These are all 8-week programs and they will be concluded by that time. We will, therefore, not default on any present commitments if my amendment is adopted. I believe, however, it will serve to clarify the intent of Congress in its original legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is a matter of administrative interpretation beyond the intent of the Congress, that religious organizations are being included.

From the point of view of the church and as a churchman, I am constrained to say that this is a connection which for a church is unwise, in which it becomes a partner to and with the secular state in the implementation of poverty programs.

Mr. Chairman, through 2,000 years Christian churches have carried out great works of benevolence through voluntary giving and through the voluntary work of its people. This is the proper way for churches to participate in the perpetual war on poverty in our world. Let the church stand secure and serene in her own function in proclaiming to the world her own good tidings and in carrying out her own benevolence to men through the giving of her people. Let her stand apart from the state. Let her not become intermixed and intermingled with that which is political and secular.

This I believe to be proper and right for the church. The maintenance of the principle of separation of church and state is also right for America. We deal too lightly with the Constitution of the United States; not that any document in itself is sacrosanct, but as the basic law of this land, the principles of law and government which it embodies, are basic to human freedom. It is the sure foundation upon which this house of freedom was built and now stands.

The separation of church and state is basic to religious liberty in this country. It is being violated now. Although we might say this is a small breach, let it be likened to a tiny hole in a dike. It is as the first trickle of water over an earthen dam. While the people rest in easy confidence, and the watchmen sleep, the wall of separation of church and state in this country is even now crumbling and falling down. It is time that we stand firm for constitutional principles; it is time we stand firm for that which has preserved religious liberty in this country.

The Pilgrims came to this country to seek a place to work, to live, and to worship in freedom. Notwithstanding which, they soon set up state churches in the Colonies themselves. It was not until the time of the adoption of the Constitution that we had true religious liberty here. I am of a church fellowship that was persecuted in Europe, in England, and in the Colonies. But since the adoption of the first amendment and the establishment of the separation of church and state in this land, we have seen the many splendid expressions of the Christian faith develop all over the Nation in cities and country places, running like a golden thread through the fabric of our free society. Differing churches serving one Lord in varying ways and working in mutual tolerance, mutual freedom, and total separation from their government have contributed beyond our ability to measure to the physical and spiritual well-being of the people of America. They have done so, through the long years, without support from or connection with this Government. They can do so now.

Mr. Speaker, let the church be the church and the government the government. Like two pillars of the same structure, let them stand apart that they might serve together to keep the house of freedom strong and secure upon a foundation which has stood the test of time.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we should be very careful to distinguish exactly what we mean when we talk about participation of a church-related organization in the poverty program. We are not talking about Government support of a religious activity or a church activity in any sense. We are talking about Government using services provided under an agreement with a religiously oriented, or a religious organization or group to do the work of the poverty program in those instances where the church related group is best able to do that work, or, indeed, is uniquely qualified and able to do that work. I think we can understand this amendment better if we look at a few situations in which church-related organizations have entered into contracts with the Office of Economic Opportunity.

For instance, in my own State of Michigan, the Michigan Council of Churches and the Michigan Catholic Conference, together, have created an organization to provide services to migrant workers in the State. It is named Michigan Migrant Opportunity Inc. It is the only organization in Michigan providing the kind of service to migrants contemplated under the poverty program. Similar programs under similar auspices are operating in at least one other State.

The National Council of Catholic Women, the National Council of Jewish Women, the United Church Women, and the National Council of Negro Women have set up an organization known as WICR that is helping the Women's Job Corps to find young women who want and need the Job Corps program. They interview girls who might be interested, encourage them to apply, screen them and assist them in various ways.

I might suggest, in light of the criticism of the St. Petersburg program, that this is a very valuable service to the Job Corps, and it is supplied by a religiously oriented organization.

It should not make any difference to us, it seems to me, if we are getting a service we need, whether that service is performed by someone who wears a sport shirt or a certain kind of collar. It certainly does not if we undertake seismographic research directed toward determining whether or not we can effectively detect underground bomb blasts, for instance, that some of that research may be done by clerics at Georgetown University.

By the same criterion, it should not matter to us when we seek out persons best qualified to carry out some aspect of the poverty program whether or not they are related to a particular church. The question is, Are they doing the job that we need and the job that the American people and the American Congress want?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN] certainly raised an important point. The gentleman from Michigan says in his view this does not constitute any danger in church-State relationships. I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama if he has any indication of any church that has used their relation with the poverty program in a way that he thinks unsound?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank the gentleman for his question.

May I say in response to the gentleman from Michigan that so far as I am concerned, whether a church is acting as an agent of the Federal Government or whether Federal funds are being employed in implementation of a church program, in either event it seems to me to be a union and a partnership which is unwise and which in my considered judgment is unconstitutional.

May I say further there have been at least to my knowledge 86 grants made to public corporations formed by churches and church implemented programs where Federal funds have gone into these programs and where they have been managed by a church group, however indirectly.

May I say, this certainly is an establishment of religion.

As a specific answer to the question of my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, I would say, although I do not desire to point an accusing finger at any church, it is well to point out the danger in the union between church and state in this kind of program. By way of illustration, permit me to read the statement of a man whom I have known for years and whose integrity and character I can vouch for, Constable Jack Bailey of my own district. This is a statement that he made and had notarized and is in the form of an affidavit:

> While carrying out my duties as constable of precinct 10 in Jefferson County, I encountered two young men going door to door. I had occasion to serve a civil process at one house at the same time that one of the boys was there.
>
> First, he said that he was working with Operation Head Start. He then asked if anyone in the household was a member of a specific religion. He asked if any persons living there was interested in this particular religion and if they would accept some literature on the religion. He then asked for their names and addresses so that he might send additional literature. He then asked if all adults in the family were registered voters because he said he was helping on the voter registration drive.
>
> I was working the same area and managed to approach another house just behind this person and heard the same story again. I then stopped him and talked with him. He said that his home was in Long Island, N.Y., and that he was in Birmingham for the summer. He said he worked on canvassing in the morning and at * * * (church) on Operation Head Start in the afternoon.

I prefer not to mention the name of the church.

That is signed and notarized and there will be a copy of this in the RECORD tomorrow.

Whether this is an isolated instance or just one example of a pattern across this Nation generally, I do not and cannot know. All I know is that there is grave danger when we take the risk that we have taken with the principle of separation of church and state and when we, by whatever means, looks lightly upon and deal lightly with the first amendment and the principle it embodies.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I would just like to say that the distinguished gentleman from Alabama is a distinguished minister in his own right and no one feels more strongly about this question than he.

I would certainly like to compliment him and point out, even if it is only an isolated instance, that there is extreme danger of a union of church and state in paying people with Federal funds who go out in the name of a church to solicit for that church.

No matter how worthy the church may be, or how worthy the cause, certainly each and every one of us should agree that Federal funds under this program should not be expended to help recruit for any church.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

I respect my fellow Baptist clergyman from Alabama. It is a well-known fact that we Baptists do not get along too well together, anyway. I am a Baptist clergyman.

> Baptist bred and Baptist born, gonna go
> to heaven, and blow a Baptist horn.

I should like to read from the official guidelines of the OEO, the special conditions existing when a community action component is delegated to a church or church-related organization:

> (a) None of the grant funds shall be used for the teaching of religion, for religious proselytization, or religious worship.
>
> (b) There shall be no religious instruction, proselytization or worship in connection with any program supported in whole or in part by this grant.
>
> (c) Admission to any of the programs supported by this grant shall not be based directly or indirectly on religious affiliation or on attendance at a church, church-related school or other church-related institution or organization. Affirmative steps shall be taken to make known the general availability of such programs in the area served.
>
> (d) Participation in programs supported in whole or in part by this grant shall not be used as a means of inducing participation in sectarian or religious activities or of recruitment for sectarian or religious institutions.
>
> (e) All materials, such as reading materials, used in programs supported in whole or in part by this grant shall be devoid of sectarian or religious content.
>
> (f) Facilities renovated or rented for programs financed in whole or in part by this grant shall be devoid of sectarian or religious symbols, decoration, or other sectarian identification. Other facilities used primarily for such programs shall, to the maximum feasible extent, be devoid of sectarian or religious symbols, decoration, or other sectarian identification.
>
> (g) Grant funds shall not be used in any manner to release funds regularly expended by the church or church-related institution or organization. For example, grant funds shall not be used to pay in any part costs which would otherwise be incurred by the church or church-related institution or organization in its regular operation.

The grantee will, before executing a contract with any church or church-related institution or organization, submit the proposed contract to OEO for approval.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I have listened with great interest to the regulations of the Office of Economic Opportunity, just read for us by the chairman of the committee. It seems to me the very fact that such elaborate and detailed instructions and regulations exist bears rather eloquent proof of the fact which the gentleman from Alabama was trying to point out in offering his amendment; that the inherent possibility of abuse under this provision of permitting grants to church corporations and religious organizations is there, whether we like it or not. It is simply a fact of life that people do not always live up to the regulations.

I believe it is extremely important that we take a careful look, before we vote on this amendment, at the precise language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama: "except that the Director shall make no grant to, and shall not contract with, any church or other religious body."

I do not believe the gentleman means to suggest by the amendment that we need to shut the churches out from participation in Project Head Start or community action programs or anything else. Let me give a specific example from my own home community of Rockford, Ill. Under title II application for a community action program was started under the aegis of a nonprofit corporation. One of the incorporators was a very prominent Unitarian minister in our community. He was active in the nonprofit corporation, which sought a planning grant under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act.

This should not invalidate the grant. This does not violate the principle of separation of church and state. This is the kind of participation I believe we can and should encourage on the part of the clergy, and on the part of organized churches. But it is a very different thing indeed when we go so far as actually to make a grant of money to a church or a church organization or group. This is what the gentleman is objecting to. This is what I believe, that if we are really interested in preserving this very salutary and important principle of separation between the church and the state, everybody in this Chamber ought to be able to agree with. I have been in this body now for going on 5 years, and I have watched, as some of you know, with growing concern the fact that little by little we are eating away and eroding the very basis of that doctrine. It is something of an anomaly that we have one branch of the Federal Government; namely, the Supreme Court of the United States, which by its decisions time and time again in interpreting the establishment of religion clause of the first amendment to the Constitution shows it is aware of this danger and that it is determined that there shall not be a breaking down of the barriers between church and state. Yet in this Congress, when it comes time to legislate on this and other programs, we are very cavalier in our disregard of this doctrine and we make light of it and say that we have regulations and that the administrators have been instructed as to how to carry out a particular program and we should not worry about it. I think that the time has come for this Congress to write into the law the very simple, plain, clear, and unequivocal language proposed in this amendment and once again to reaffirm and reestablish what is an important and basic fundamental concept under our Constitution.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not one of the ministers who are participating in the debate on this amendment, and I shall not deliver a sermon, but I do think a few things ought to be said.

I respect the gentleman from Alabama who sponsored the amendment. He serves on a committee with me, and I respect his ability and I am his friend. But I think his amendment is bad and it ought to be defeated.

For better or for worse, we are engaged in this war on poverty. The act that we passed last year says we shall take community action to mobilize all resources public and private. By his amendment we would say that we are going to put in the ball game everyone but our best players. I say that because in my judgment and in my observation, the people who know what to do and the people who work with dedication and the people who have the background and who have the competence really to do the job are the people who are associated with the fine church organizations in this country.

We have heard a lot of talk about politics in poverty. If there is one group that will keep politics out of poverty, it will be the group composed of the dedicated ministers who have worked among the poor and who have worked among the Indians and the various other deprived groups in this country.

One of the very first poverty grants made by the Office of Economic Opportunity was to a church group in Arizona which works on Indian reservations. I said at that time if I had $1,000 to fight poverty and I wanted to squeeze the most good out of it and the most Christian kindness and uplift for these poor people, I would give that $1,000 to the kind of ministers who operate these little churches out on Indian reservations and in other poor areas of my State.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a matter of fact the question of the separation of the church and state is not involved in this legislation. It has been injected into it by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama, and due to his extreme fears. If we are going to legislate based on fear, we would never get anywhere. Furthermore, the ones who are dedicating themselves are to a great extent people with a very deep faith and a fine moral outlook without regard to religious conviction but with a constructive missionary state of mind. They are the ones who are interested, as well as others. So the question of separation of church and state is not involved and has been injected into the matter by this unnecessary and unwise amendment.

Mr. UDALL. The Speaker has stated the matter far better than I could.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike a serious blow at the very concept of community action programs. Even worse, it would hamper, if not cripple, many of those programs which have been launched during this past year or are just getting underway.

When the Congress endorsed community action as a basic principle in the Economic Opportunity Act, it embraced an American principle which was as old as the Pilgrims and as modern as our united community funds. It is the principle of total mobilization of the resources of a community to solve its problems of poverty and need.

In this country we have never excluded any group willing to extend a helping hand. We have never felt the strife of clericalism and anticlericalism which rent France during the 19th century. We have sensibly accepted the contributions which every group could bring to our common efforts and have thus avoided any danger that one faction would dominate others.

Without this principle, community action would wither in many parts of this country. Our churches were our earliest educators and they are also our oldest private agencies giving aid and hope to the poor. In Alaska today there would be no community action program without the initiative of the Salvation Army, which is establishing in small villages a day care program to enable mothers to earn added income during the fishing and canning season. Our migrant workers throughout the western part of the country would be virtually nonexistent without the planning and impetus which the migrant ministry has brought into many farm areas where these workers are employed. Throughout the South and in many of our big cities, churches and church schools are serving thousands of children in the Head Start program. We literally cannot duplicate or find substitutes for their contributions to the war on poverty. They are a substantial part of the total effort to date.

Why should the poor forgo all these benefits and those provided by hundreds of other church-operated community action programs? There is no reason. Certainly the poor do not share the concern of the gentleman from Alabama. Certainly they are not asking to be saved from this badly needed help.

Nor are they being threatened with conversion through alms to a faith which they have not freely chosen. The Office of Economic Opportunity is sensible to the constitutional and other problems that any excess missionary zeal on the part of religious groups could create. It has adopted admirable rules to ward off any danger of this sort. These rules are in the form of conditions applicable to every community action program which uses church-related schools or involves activities by a church or church-related organization.

Mr. Chairman, these conditions have been universally accepted and widely applauded. They are intended to secularize every aspect of church-conducted community action programs under the Economic Opportunity Act, and to make the sponsoring groups of these programs merely the agencies of a wholly nonreligious effort. They enable this country to utilize the experience, the skills, the energy, and the other magnificient resources which the churches and sectarian groups of this country can and want to contribute to the war on poverty.

To forbid these contributions and banish these groups would be to violate the basic principle of community action. It would be heartless and needless. It would be wasteful. Let me remind the gentleman from Alabama that this act is intended to unite America against a common problem, but his amendment could easily become the lever for dividing America and creating new problems. Where do we stop when once we begin to sort and choose the types of beliefs which we will accept in our ranks? I hope we will not embark on that course today but will remain united in our faith in true community action.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to revise and extend their remarks made in the debate today and to include extraneous matter and tables and charts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

WHERE ARE OUR ASIAN FRIENDS?

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, since the hostilities in Vietnam are specifically for the purpose of aiding the people of Asia to avoid the danger of a Communist takeover, it is a matter of serious concern to me that most of the free nations of Asia as well as most of our so-called allies in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization are deliberately looking the other way.

At a time when we hear talk of calling up our own military reserves, we may well ask where are the troops of those Asiatic nations whose very fate will be determined by the outcome of the bloody struggle in Vietnam.

Where are the Philippine soldiers, or the Japanese, or the Pakistani? Where are the Indian troops who know intimately the danger of Red aggression? They are at home watching us protect Asia with American lives.

Not only would increased Asian participation buoy the morale of our own fighting forces, it would also indicate to the world, Communist and non-Communist alike, that the battle in Vietnam is to protect Asia itself, and that there is some desire upon the part of the people of Asia to resist Communist aggression.

I urge our State Department to face up to this situation, and persuade the governments of Asia to protect themselves.

MILITARY PAY RAISE

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday H.R. 9075, to authorize a military pay raise, was considered and voted upon. I was unavoidably detained while in performance of my duties and my vote was, therefore, not recorded on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present at the time the vote was taken, I would have voted in favor of such pay increases.

PROFESSIONAL ATHLETIC TEAM OWNERS AND SPORTS FANS

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today for appropriate reference a bill which has been called for by the Supreme Court, professional athletic team owners and sports fans throughout the country. This bill is similar in many respects to bills which have been introduced in the past but have failed enactment largely as a result of a lack of time. The bill places the professional team sports of football, baseball, basketball, and hockey under the provisions of our antitrust laws. The bill then provides for specific exemptions which apply solely to the "sports" aspects of these ventures and not to the related business aspects.

Baseball has been exempted from the antitrust laws as a result of two decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. In 1922 in *Federal Baseball Club of Baltimore* v. *National League*, 259 U.S. 200, the Supreme Court ruled that baseball was not a commercial enterprise so the antitrust laws did not apply. In 1953 in *Toolson* v. *New York Yankees*, 346 U.S. 356, the Court affirmed this holding and stated:

> We think that if there are evils in this field which now warrant application to it of the antitrust laws, it should be by legislation.

I shall not reiterate the numerous bills on which there have been hearings and passage by one body or the other since Supreme Court admonition, but I should like to point out the anomoly of baseball being generally exempted from the antitrust laws whereas the Supreme Court has included football—*Radovich* v. *National Football League*, 352 U.S. 443 (1957) and boxing—*United States* v. *International Boxing Corporation of New York*, 348 U.S. 236 (1955)—within the provisions of the antitrust laws. In addition to correcting this discrimination my bill makes four specific proposals which are essential to the continued success of professional sports enterprises. These exemptions provide that the antitrust laws would not apply to contracts, rules, or regulations of the various leagues or teams for:

First. Equalizing competitive player strengths;

Second. The employment, selection, or eligibility of players, or the reservation, selection, or assignment of player contracts, provided that each person who participates as an employer in a plan of selection of players or player contracts shall permit all other persons so engaged in the same professional sport at the same level to participate in such plan on an equitable basis;

Third. The right to operate within specific geographic areas; and

Fourth. The preservation of public confidence in the honesty of sports contests.

In addition to the exemptions which have been contained in most of the bills which have been introduced in the past, my bill provides a unique new feature which would require a common draft by all clubowners who participate in the same professional sport at the same level where the draft is used as a means of assigning rights to player contracts. The purpose of this amendment is to assist in the equalization of player strengths for all teams participating in the same sport at the same level. It would give the less wealthy teams in the professional sport equality with the more wealthy teams in the same sport in bidding for player personnel. The common draft is currently the practice in baseball and it should also be permissible for other sports enterprises without fear of antitrust implications.

I represent in Congress the heart of a large metropolitan area which has shown a strong resurgent interest in professional sports. That is one of the reasons—although certainly not the sole reason—that I have introduced a companion bill to S. 950, the sports bill being considered by the Senate.

My bill, as I have indicated, would go one step beyond S. 950, in that it would make mandatory, rather than merely authorize, a common draft of players by the two major football leagues—the National and the American. The Denver Broncos have been a member of the AFL since 1960.

The presence of a major football franchise in Denver has been a boon to many aspects of our community, just as other franchises have provided great favorable impetus to growth of other communities throughout the Nation.

I am introducing this bill with the hope that early hearings will be called and that representatives of the affected professional sports will be called for their respective opinions.

GLENN WARD DRESBACH

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, Glenn Ward Dresbach is a resident of my home county. I have known him many years. He is a fine American in every sense of that great word. He is a veteran of World War I with a distinguished record in the service of his country.

In addition, he is one of the great poets of America. In tribute to him, I ask permission to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks these poems of his from "The Collected Poems, 1914–48, of Glenn Ward Dresbach." They are: "To a Robin in Late Summer," "Range Cattle," and "Song."

TO A ROBIN IN LATE SUMMER

(By Glenn Ward Dresbach)

The leaves are heavy laden with the sun;
The season like a tanned, full-bosomed maid
Goes down the lane, with baskets over-run
With fruits, through patterns of the sun and shade.
And you, first songster of the gypsy Spring
With dewy flowers tangled in her hair,
Are silent now. You spread a lazy wing
To sun along the grass, but, pressing there,
Your breast against the warm prolific ground
Takes in what spirit-store of lovely sound.
From sun you hop to shade and, standing still,
Look down the lane that ends against the sky
Where maples with their silver crown a hill,
Where leaves too soon will turn to gold and die.
Now I have secrets of the song you made
For leaves unfolding and a nest for birth
Of later song: proportioned sun and shade
True-toned with moment symphonies of earth!
With moistened ground your nest was fashioned strong—
But, bird of earth, blue heavens were in your song!

Fruit-burdened quietude is not the end
To song you trilled before rewards were found
In bloom. Now bushes bright with berries bend
And apples spice the airs along the ground.
Now with the seeds of song warmed through and through
Within your russet breast, turn to the South—
Here frost soon strikes the bowers that you knew
And berries here turn bitter in your mouth.
I would not see you hurt along this wall
Where I must hear the sound of leaves that fall.

Such rapture born in you and turned to song
We lose before we have the voice to sing,
Ghost-notes of fated conquest and old wrong
Throb through the mazes of man's wandering.
We, haunted by such things as men have known
Before us, tainted with them, come to birth
Without your ecstasy and go alone
To seek for it across the breast of earth,
To find it seldom and to lose it soon
When dead leaves blow in clouds across the moon.

RANGE CATTLE

(By Glenn Ward Dresbach)

Against the horizon I have seen their heads
Tossing with clouds or sagging with the sky
To sniff the parching sands of river beds
When water holes were dry—

Range cattle with their wild eyes always turning
To some new spot of green or trickling springs,
Beneath the thunder or the sun's slow burning
And shadows of buzzards' wings.

They do not know the peace of meadows deep
In clover sweetness, and the unfailing flow
Of brooks; on wind-swept ranges where they sleep
The cougar crouches low.

The wobbly calf leans hard against its mother
When wolf packs howl or eagle shadows veer—
For them, their thirst and hunger fail to smother
The sounds we cannot hear.

These cattle keep wild beauty that their kind
Must lose, to plump and drowsy ease beguiled
In pastures fenced; untamed of heart and mind
Their ways are of the wild.

The lift of head, the ripple of muscles under
The hide that braves fierce sun and driven rain. . .
Herds of the thundering hoofs that meet the thunder
Or wade the whirl of stars above the plain.

SONG

(By Glenn Ward Dresbach)

Though the cave man carved in stone
His poor image of the bird
He had hoped to keep the flown
Rapture of the song he heard.

We, with all the years to reap
And with all the world to hear,
Find in many things we keep
Something that we lost is near.

TELEGRAM WASTES TAXPAYERS' MONEY

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I hate to be critical of some of my colleagues, but in view of a thing that happened today I cannot keep quiet any longer. I received this telegram here and I presume other Members of the House received similar telegrams. I have inquired of several Members, and it seems it probably went to every Member of Congress. The only reason I am taking this time is to remind the Members what this telegram costs. It is 140 words. I checked with the telegraph company and the rates are—the first 15 words cost $1.20, the next 125 words cost 6½ cents each, and plus a 10-percent tax. So each telegram sent cost $10.25. Multiply that by 435 Members and you will find that somebody wasted $4,500 of the taxpayers' money, and as a taxpayer I resent that.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIBBONS. Would you not call this playing politics at the taxpayers' expense?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I do not even know what the contents of the telegram are, but I resent a telegram being sent when they could use either a letter or a mimeograph machine and some of the pages that we have to get this information to us, without wasting $4,500 of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. GIBBONS. I can agree with what the gentleman says, especially since this information apparently has been known and is a matter of public record and has been included in the hearings this Congress conducted. It comes as no surprise to any of us who are informed on this program.

IMPENDING CRISIS IN MALAYSIA

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, all of us agree that one Vietnam is enough.

Yet, I fear that we and our allies face another crisis in southeast Asia which eventually could be more dangerous to the free world than the present conflict in Vietnam.

Ever since the creation of the independent nation of Malaysia 2 years ago, Indonesia, led by Sukarno, has been waging a constant campaign of subversion against his relatively tiny neighbor.

This campaign of subversion, murder, and terror has been particularly fierce on the island of Borneo where the borders of these two nations touch.

Indonesian army troops have raided border villages, ambushed Malaysian security forces and supplied Communists in Malaysia with arms, ammunition, and funds.

Just recently, British intelligence forces in Malaysia reported that about 26,000 Chinese who side with Peiping are believed to be in Sarawak, the Malaysian State closest to the Indonesian border.

These include 2,000 hard-core members of the CCO, the Clandestine Communist Organization, a Red unit dedicated to the overthrow of the Malaysian Government. Another 4,000 militants are believed members of the CCO in Sarawak but have not yet been armed, while another 20,000 Malaysians of Chinese origin are believed sympathetic to the Communist cause.

What must be realized is that the main thrust in arms, materials, and propaganda in Sarawak is coming from Indonesia.

Sukarno makes no bones about these raids. He makes no excuses for them. He admits to his policy of so-called confrontation and the fact that it is his aim to bring the government of Malaysia, a nation with only one-tenth Indonesia's population, to its knees.

What does Sukarno want? He wants what the Chinese Communists want and what they are doing their utmost to get—Singapore.

Singapore is one of the key spots on earth through which east-west trade must flow, through which aircraft carriers must pass and through which supplies for civilian and troops alike must go.

It is as important in Asia as the Panama Canal is important to our Nation in commerce and in our military planning.

Because of Sukarno's preoccupation with the acquisition of real estate at the expense of weaker neighbors, I helped amend the foreign aid bill 2 years ago to cut off further U.S. aid to Indonesia unless the President deems that such aid is in the best interests of the United States.

Foreign aid to Indonesia was stopped, both military and economic. Shipment of strategic goods to Sukarno was halted.

But now, in the midst of this new danger of aggression by Indonesia, the State Department wants a private U.S. firm to sell a highly sophisticated military communications system to the Indonesian armed forces, the same forces which at present are engaged in doing their best to subvert and overthrow a weaker neighbor through both open warfare and covert means.

This radio communications system is called a "tropospheric scatter system," a point-to-point communications network which can be accurately aimed, is difficult to intercept and monitor and virtually jamproof.

If all-out war should erupt between Indonesia and Malaysia, it would be difficult to conceive of a better means of communication for the Indonesian military.

And we must remember that Indonesia, in terms of population, is the world's fifth largest country with more than 100 million people.

We must remember that Indonesia's Army in Asia is supplied with more than $1 billion in arms supplied by the Soviet Union.

We must remember that it has a large and potent navy, including missile ships and landing craft, and the largest submarine fleet in the Pacific outside that of the Soviet Union itself.

When a bully throws rocks at a much smaller neighbor, it is not the usual practice to reward the bully with bigger and better rocks.

Yet, that is the curious action the State Department is backing in Indonesia.

We must realize that the thrusts by the Vietcong southward down the Malay Peninsula and the moves northward by the Indonesians toward Malaysia are not accidents of history. They are all part of a grand design, made in China, manufactured by the Communists and well underway in their execution.

If the second prong of this attack is to be blunted, then it must be blunted by a firm statement of our position in this important part of the world backed by deeds which cannot be misunderstood and misinterpreted.

The last thing we need is another Vietnam. But we are going to get it unless we are extremely careful.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Nation, Americans are this week commemorating the brave peoples behind the Iron Curtain through the observance of Captive Nations Week. This is indeed a sad and serious observance, and stands in marked contrast to the celebration of our own freedoms on the Fourth of July.

Yet it is fitting and proper that we should set aside this week in dedication to the hopes and dreams of those who live in tyranny. For in America, Mr. Speaker, we are well aware of the suffering people behind the Iron Curtain. We speak of them often, and I daresay that there is not a man present who has not pledged his efforts to their ultimate liberation.

Yet I wonder how often we stop and think of the scope and meaning of our pledge; we who enjoy the freedoms won for us by the blood and sacrifice of our forefathers.

Can we fully picture or understand the defiance of human dignity and freedom that has become a way of life within the Communist dominated countries of Eastern Europe? We can, Mr. Speaker, and we must if we are to fulfill the hopes and prayers of these brave people.

Yet we cannot fulfill these hopes by giving aid to the Communist oppressors. And we cannot pursue our goal by capitulation to an enemy that has sworn to bury us. We must instead pursue the fight for freedom with strength and firmness of purpose.

Our goal, indeed, is freedom. And we must prove to the captive nations and to the world that not by lipservice, but by action, we intend to reach that goal.

THE LATE SYNGMAN RHEE

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Syngman Rhee, the "Tiger of Korea" who devoted his life to the independence and unification of his native land, is dead. Elected to four terms as President of the Republic of Korea, Syngman Rhee did not live to see the realization of his one burning ambition—the unification of his divided country.

To this—and the earlier task of liberating Korea from Japanese rule which had lasted for 40 years—Rhee dedicated most of his adult life. Often known as the father of Korea, Rhee owed his strength to America, but he was never anyone's puppet.

I knew Syngman Rhee well and my admiration for him had begun years before I ever met him personally. Following is the text of a newsletter I wrote in September 1953, after having visited Syngman Rhee in Korea:

> En route to Okinawa. As I ride in a plane from Seoul to Okinawa I want to write about one of the most controversial figures of our times. We had dinner with Syngman Rhee last night and talked with him for 2 hours about the problems of Korea and the world. He is one of the most interesting men that I have ever known or studied.
>
> The first time that I ever heard of Syngman Rhee was early in World War II when a Korean friend of mine in Hawaii told me that Rhee would ultimately lead the Korean people to freedom. He told me of Rhee's bitter opposition to the Japanese invasion of Korea in 1910 and of his imprisonment and torture by the Japanese. He told me of Rhee's great learning, and how he lived in Washington, D.C., as a refugee from the wrath of the Japanese, waiting until he could return to Korea when the time was ripe for independence.
>
> When I first heard of Rhee, Korean independence seemed very far away. The Pacific fighting had just begun, and I hardly knew the exact location of Korea.
>
> When Gen. John R. Hodge, commanding American troops in Korea at the close of the war, flew Syngman Rhee back into Korea, the earlier stories I had heard about Rhee

returned to my mind. I was rather stunned when I first saw him. He was quite different from Kim Koo, the other great Korean patriot who had been fighting in China for years with the Kwonbuck Army. Koo was later assassinated.

Rhee was a kindly, smiling old man whose picture could well have been used as the loving, doting grandfather type. As a young man he had studied to be a Buddhist priest. He became a devout Christian, however, and an outstanding scholar in both oriental and Western philosophy. I have followed President Rhee's career closely since he returned to Korea.

I had lunch with him and his wife at Pusan in 1951, when I visited Korea in connection with the artificial limb program. At that time he was still the kindly, elderly gentleman, who was most grateful for what we were doing for the Korean amputees. But his fight for the freedom of his people had already made him a legend.

Since that time he has often bitterly opposed the policies of our Army and our Government. He released thousands of war prisoners over the objections of the United States. He once refused to allow the Voice of America to use Korean radio stations. (That is a very interesting story which I haven't space to retell here.) At another time the Korean Legislature was almost unanimously opposing him, but he carried his fight to the people and he now has legislative harmony.

We frequently hear someone ask, "What kind of man is Syngman Rhee?" It will take a century of history to write the answer to that question. I have been asked many times whether, in my opinion, President Rhee is right or wrong. My answer has always been that it depends on the type of yardstick by which you measure him. I wish everyone could have the opportunity to study him and his actions that I have had; yet, I don't understand him. I doubt that any occidental can. He is filled with the deepest and almost fanatical desire to restore to his people a free and united nation. He realizes that there is no one prepared to take his place, and he is nearing 80. He feels as did Cecil Rhodes of South Africa, "So little done—so much to do."

President Rhee has all of the wiles and indirection of the oriental, the direct efficiency of the American, together with the ruthless drive of the forceful leaders of all peoples. He is using everything to gain his end, that of obtaining for his people a free and united Korea. He will sacrifice his life, his friends, and all to realize that great goal. Right or wrong, he is a great man; how great only history can record.

Asia never experienced the Renaissance, which meant so much to Europe. A renaissance is now sweeping Asia, the ultimate effect and extent of which is still unknown.

But when the history of the Asian renaissance is finally written the name of Syngman Rhee will be found among its great figures.

THE OTEPKA CASE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has released the first of 20 volumes of its 1.5-million-word hearings on the Otto Otepka case.

The main focal point of the hearings is Otto Otepka, the State Department security evaluator, who was placed in coventry by the State Department hierarchy in the fall of 1963. Although since then he has been in a no-duty limbo, the Nation has a vital interest in the sequence of events which led to his exile within the State Department.

Hopefully, the committee will severely criticize State Department officials for their part in the attack on Otepka, and will call for his restoration to his original security duties, along with a cessation of cloak and dagger activities, such as wiretapping, shadowing, and other forms of harassment of a loyal employee and patriot.

I believe the Congress must refuse to back away from this confrontation with the executive branch, for Otepka's only crime was that he sought to advise a duly constituted and responsible legislative committee of activities which he thought were inimical to the best interests of his country. For this, he has been made an example to all who put loyalty to country above loyalty to the bureaucracy, or the executive branch.

Otepka's office had played a major part in recommending dismissal of William Wieland for conduct unbecoming a Foreign Service officer, in not alerting the United States about Castro's previously known Communist leanings.

Wieland eventually became the subject of a full security investigation. The Internal Security Subcommittee report said:

> He was cleared improperly by an official who—at the time of the clearance—had not read either the security file on Wieland, or even the official summary and evaluation of that file.

Otepka's great crime was his temerity in publicly questioning a Foreign Service officer, even though that questioning was in an executive session of a congressional committee.

Wieland was a State Department officer, who had a hand in shaping U.S. policy toward Cuba, both before and after Castro's takeover. To his superiors, he was "an apologist for Castro." A security check was done on Wieland in response to charges that he, himself, was a Communist. Otepka's conclusions did not support this charge, but did raise questions as to Wieland's integrity, based in part on his testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Nevertheless, Wieland was cleared by Roger Jones, Deputy Under Secretary for Administration. Jones did so in September 1961, on the basis of the digest of of the Wieland findings, without first obtaining the recommendation of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, and without notifying the Office of Security. Not until January 25, 1962, one day after the Wieland case was raised at a Presidential news conference, was Otepka notified in writing by the Director of the Office of Security, William Boswell, that Jones had, in fact closed the Wieland case. Otepka objected to these irregular procedures.

The Otepka case reads like something out of a case history in gestapo techniques. To most Americans, it will come as a shock that these things could happen in this country, and in the Department of State, charged with the management of our foreign relations and the security of the Nation itself. But it has happened. And the question now before the Congress, is what are we going to do about it?

Mr. Speaker, some of the personnel moves that have been taking place in this administration resemble a chess game where even informed observers can only wonder at the motivations behind the moves. The biggest single problem of the State Department is lack of self-administration.

In recent days we have seen a Supreme Court Justice transferred from the bench to a different office in New York. This in turn creates a new vacancy, which, presumably, will be filled by other moves on the chess board, and no one can guess where it will all end, as each appointment in turn creates a vacancy. A former Ambassador, who was replaced in Vietnam, has now, in turn, replaced his replacement.

The press has speculated for weeks about other possible moves involving the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense. Meanwhile, the general public can be excused for asking, in the Abbott and Costello fashion: "Who's on first?"

The same can be said for the handling of personnel moves in the State Department, as typified by the Wieland case, and the selection of Otto Otepka as the scapegoat, while the guilty ones go unpunished. I hope we will see a valiant public servant, not punished but rewarded, for insisting on telling the truth to Congress. Bravery in the corridors of the State Department should be rewarded just as it is on the battlefields of Vietnam.

APPOINTMENT OF JUSTICE ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG TO BE U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, it is too much to expect that any living person could fill the position of U.S. representative to the United Nations as well as did the late beloved Gov. Adlai E Stevenson. He was a unique individual, not only for his outstanding personal qualities, but as well for the high esteem and admiration with which he was held by all of the delegates of the nations of the world.

But, Mr. Speaker, if any person can fill the shoes of Governor Stevenson, President Johnson's new appointee can do so. President Johnson has found a most worthy successor in Justice Arthur Goldberg, who is my warm personal friend and who is a brilliant, talented, highly experienced, perceptive individual who will make an excellent Ambassador to the United Nations for the many reasons stated in the editorial from today's Washington Post which I shall include with my remarks.

Those of us who grew up with him in Chicago and who know him well are proud of the magnificent record he has made to date. We are certain that his efforts at the United Nations will add another shining chapter to those he has already written.

The editorial follows:

FROM THE COURT TO THE U.N.

The appointment of Justice Arthur J. Goldberg to be the U.S. representative to the United Nations came as a shock to many who had supposed that he would spend the remainder of his life on the Supreme Bench. In nearly all cases the Supreme Court is a permanent assignment, and properly so. There are few other tasks which can justify taking from the Court one of its most energetic and brilliant members. Yet there are exceptions to all rules, and we surmise that this is one instance in which the country will heartily applaud the drafting of a Justice for a more difficult undertaking.

The Supreme Court's loss will be the United Nations' gain. The primary concern about filling this vacancy had been whether the President could find a man who would be a logical and worthy successor to Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson. A routine appointment, it was feared, might have the effect of deflating the prestige of the U.N. and of downgrading the U.S. relations to it. That danger has been entirely averted. When a man of Mr. Goldberg's stature leaves a lifetime position on the Highest Court in the land to become U.S. spokesman at the U.N., it is a powerful testament to this country's belief in the world organization and in the orderly settlement of international differences.

In appraising Mr. Goldberg's qualifications for the task, however, it is more pertinent to recall his work as Secretary of Labor in President Kennedy's Cabinet and his previous career at the bar. From a highly competitive situation he emerged as one of the country's ablest labor lawyers; he repeatedly demonstrated great capacity as a negotiator and as a spokesman for the cause of labor. This background plus his resourcefulness as a debater will be invaluable at the U.N.

Now that Mr. Goldberg has put aside his judicial robe it is well to remember also that there were many laments when he gave up his dynamic career as Secretary of Labor for the Bench. Some wondered at the time whether his dynamism, his administrative ability, and his skill as a mediator could not be used to greater advantage outside the judicial realm. There has been no suggestion since that he was not well adjusted to the cloistered life of a judge. But the other qualities which made him a formidable figure in the Cabinet have not been lost in the 3 years since he succeeded Justice Felix Frankfurter.

The willingness of Mr. Goldberg to leave his choice place in the judicial hierarchy for the rough scramble of international politics in New York tells much about the quality of his statesmanship. No one can seriously doubt that he accepted this more difficult assignment out of a sense of duty. Many years ago Justice Charles Evans Hughes permitted himself to be nominated for the Presidency and later Justice James F. Byrnes left the Court to become a wartime assistant to President Roosevelt for similar reasons. We think it can be stated as a simple fact that Mr. Goldberg would not have left the Court if he had not been convinced that his country has greater need of his talents at the U.N. than on the Bench.

The problems he faces in the world organization are staggering. A man of his intelligence could have no illusions about that. But he sees his assignment as being intimately related to "the greatest adventure in man's history"—his search for peace and the rule of law. In this context it was no mistake but an act of great courage and faith to take the course he has taken. The problems that will bedevil him are not things that can be ironed out by any one individual, but there is much satisfaction in knowing that a man of Arthur Goldberg's talents and dedication will be directing the U.N. aspects of the American struggle for a more orderly world.

THE 1965 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include resolutions, editorials, and related material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members: the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHNEEBELI], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE] have permission to extend their remarks following my own today on this same subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATTEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this same subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this week is the 1965 Captive Nations Week. July 18 to 24 is the seventh observance of this highly important week. We in Congress join with millions of fellow Americans in expressing to the world our firm determination never to forget the freedom aspirations of all the captive nations and to work in every peaceable manner for the achievement of their eventual liberation from the bondage of Red totalitarianism and Sino-Soviet Russian colonialism. Their fixed objective of national independence and freedom is our objective, and each Captive Nations Week observance stresses this fundamental truth.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROCLAMATION

On July 3, the very eve of our own Independence Day, President Johnson issued his annual Captive Nations Week proclamation. Quite appropriately, the President's proclamation underscores the necessity for encouraging the national independence drives of all the captive nations—those in central Europe, in the Soviet Union, in Asia, and in Cuba. Urging every American to read carefully this document, I wish to introduce it at this point as part of my remarks:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
July 3, 1965.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1965: A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as Captive Nations Week until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas all peoples yearn for freedom and justice; and

Whereas these basic rights unfortunately are circumscribed or unrealized in many areas in the world; and

Whereas the United States of America has an abiding commitment to the principles of independence, personal liberty, and human dignity; and

Whereas it remains a fundamental purpose and intention of the Government and people of the United States of America to recognize and encourage constructive actions which foster the growth and development of national independence and human freedom: Now, therefore,

I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 18, 1965, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this second day of July in the year of our Lord 1965, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 198th.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

A NATIONWIDE AND INTERNATIONAL OBSERVANCE

The remarkable feature of the annual Captive Nations Week is its steady growth and expansion from year to year. As countless of our fellow citizens come to learn the long list of captive nations, dating back to 1920, the more they are impressed by the significance and importance of the week. Following the leadership of our President, our State Governors, and mayors also proclaim the week, urging our citizens to dedicate themselves anew to the study of all the captive nations. Under the guidance of the National Captive Nations Committee in Washington, D.C., State and local committees have been formed in practically all large States and major cities to observe the annual week. Moreover, the week has attracted the attention of numerous foreign countries so that in the Republic of China, South Korea, the Philippines, West Germany, Turkey, and elsewhere Captive Nations Week is being appropriately observed and free Asian parliaments are being asked to pass similar Captive Nations Week resolutions.

LESSONS OF THE OBSERVANCE

Mr. Speaker, there are already several concrete lessons that can be drawn from these annual observances. I summarize them in this fashion:

First. By their consistent opposition to and vehement castigation of Captive Nations Week, Moscow, Peiping, and the lesser lights in the Red Empire have shown since 1959 their fear of the total captive nations concept as reflected in Public Law 86–90.

Second. The growth and development of Captive Nations Week in this country and abroad have demonstrated the deepened understanding on the part of our people and others of the basic and fundamental importance of all the captive nations to our national security and that of the free world.

Third. Our concentrated support of all the captive nations, including necessarily the dozen in the Soviet Union itself, is one of our most powerful nonmilitary deterrents against further overt Sino-Soviet Russian aggression and a prime, formidable force for peace with freedom and justice in the world.

Fourth. A broad area of detailed work still remains to be done in exposing the complete breadth and depth of Sino-Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism so that once and for all the peoples of the world will know and never forget who the real imperialists and colonialists are, so that the full impact of world opinion will fall heavily on the two last remaining imperiocolonialist centers, namely and solely Moscow and Peiping; and

Fifth. To open the full vista of this area and to prepare the ground for this vital work, a Special House Captive Nations Committee becomes more urgent, more necessary, more indispensable with the passing of every day. On this commemorative occasion, I again call upon the Rules Committee to at least vote on the dozens of measures which have been submitted to create this desperately needed committee. I again ask the members of that committee to begin with my own, House Resolution 14, which reads as follows:

H. RES. 14

Whereas on the issue of colonialism the blatant hypocrisy of imperialist Moscow has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

Whereas Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

Whereas the nationwide observances in the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the annual observances of Captive Nations Week, Moscow has consistently displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian Empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U–2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalistic form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "noninterference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the four Presidential proclamations it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

THE START OF THE 1965 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. Speaker, the commencement of the 1965 Captive Nations Week already has surpassed the levels of all preceding observances. At this time I should like to indicate the early enthusiastic response to the President's proclamation by requesting that the following be incorporated as parts of my remarks:

First. The early proclamations issued by the Governor of New York, the Honorable Nelson A. Rockefeller; the Governor of Pennsylvania, the Honorable William W. Scranton; the Governor of Tennessee, the Honorable Frank G. Clement; Gov. Frank B. Morrison of Nebraska, Gov. John J. McKeithen of Louisiana, Gov. Richard J. Hughes of New Jersey, Gov. Samuel F. Goddard of Arizona, Gov. Orval E. Faubus of Arkansas, Gov. John B. Connally of Texas, Gov. Jack M. Campbell of New Mexico, Gov. Edmund G. Brown of California, and Gov. William L. Guy of North Dakota.

Second. Also, the proclamations of Mayor John J. Barton of Indianapolis, Mayor Daniel F. Dibble of Holyoke, Mayor Harry Wilklow, Jr., of Battle Creek, Mayor William B. Ingram, Jr., of Memphis, Mayor William H. Taylor, Jr., of Pontiac, Mayor John J. Buckley of Lawrence, Mass., Mayor Paul V. Mullaney of Worcester, Mass., Mayor Richard E. Blake of Stratford, Conn., Mayor William E. Glynn of Hartford, Mayor George J. Vavoulis of St. Paul, Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner of the District of Columbia, Mayor Ralph S. Locher of Cleveland, Mayor Joseph A. Doorley, Jr., of Providence, R.I., Mayor Richard J. Daley of Chicago, Mayor John F. Collins of Boston, Mayor Arthur Naftalin of Minneapolis, and Mayor Victor H. Schiro of New Orleans.

Third. In addition to this impressive material, I would like to make part of my remarks today the press release of the National Captive Nations Committee on Mr. George Meany's appointment as honorary chairman of the organization, the resolution and program of the Greater Philadelphia Captive Nations Week Committee, and an informative analysis of the week in an article written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University titled: "Outstanding U.S. Myths on the Captive Nations":

STATE OF NEW YORK, *Albany*.

PROCLAMATION

Today, no fewer than 25 nations are held captive by the Communists, whose spokesmen are constantly calling us imperialists;

No fewer than 410 million people are now subject to Communist colonialism;

We know that eventually this empire will crumble as have all others amassed by the ruthless force of arms. But that is poor consolation to the victims suffering oppression and unhappiness;

We of the United States are the fortunate inhabitants of a citadel of human freedom. We are proud that we are giving asylum to many refugees from oppressed countries. In point of fact, we have benefited from their presence as they are valued neighbors, loyal and industrious members of our State and Nation;

We have a weapon against communism in recognition and understanding of the plight of those captive peoples. With them, we look forward to the day when their enslavement shall come to an end: Now, therefore,

I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the week of July 18–24, 1965, as Captive Nations Week in New York State.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

By the Governor

WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

PROCLAMATION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 18–24, 1965

Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July as Captive Nations Week and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world;

Whereas the President of the United States of America has by such proclamation invited the people of the United States to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities; and

Whereas the citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are fully aware of and grieve the plight of those made captive under the heavy yoke of communism; and

Whereas it is our purpose to demonstrate to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas it is deemed appropriate to call for a public observance of this occasion so that our knowledge and sympathies may be declared: Now, therefore,

I, William W. Scranton, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, do hereby proclaim the week of July 18–24, 1965, as Captive Nations Week in Pennsylvania.

WILLIAM W. SCRANTON,
Governor.

By the Governor:

———,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now, therefore,

I, Frank G. Clement, as Governor of the State of Tennessee, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 18 1965, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Tennessee, and call upon the citizens of Tennessee to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

FRANK G. CLEMENT,
Governor.

Attest:

———,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF NEBRASKA

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas it is fitting that we express our sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now, therefore,

I, Frank B. Morrison, Governor of the State of Nebraska, do hereby declare the week of July 18, 1965 as Captive Nations Week in Nebraska, and call upon the citizens of Nebraska to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

FRANK B. MORRISON,
Governor.

PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, John J. McKeithen, Governor of the State of Louisiana, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 18, 1965, be observed as Captive Nations Week in the State of Louisiana, and call upon the citizens of Louisiana to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

JOHN J. MCKEITHEN,
Governor of Louisiana.

Attest:

WADE O. MARTIN, JR.,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now, therefore,

I, Richard J. Hughes, Governor of the State of New Jersey, do hereby proclaim the week of July 18–24, 1965 as Captive Nations Week in New Jersey, and call upon the citizens of this State to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

RICHARD J. HUGHES,
Governor.

By the Governor:

ROBERT M. FALERY,
Acting Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION

Although freedom is a birthright in a substantial part of the world, the people of some nations are forced to live under the domination of alien Communist powers, deprived of their national independence and individual liberties;

In these captive nations, the citizens cannot choose their own leaders, cannot make their own laws, cannot move about freely even within the borders of their own country;

The virtual enslavement of these people by the agents of international communism has not broken their spirit, however, nor weakened their determination to shake off the Communist yoke at the first opportunity;

The people of the captive nations have not been forgotten by those of us who enjoy the blessings of freedom: their hopes are our hopes;

To indicate our concern with their plight and our support of their cause, I proclaim July 18 through 24, 1965, Captive Nations Week in Arizona, and urge my fellow Arizonans to commemorate this observance with appropriate activities.

SAMUEL P. GODDARD,
Governor of Arizona.

PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

To all to whom these presents shall come, greetings:

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now, therefore,

I, Orval E. Faubus, Governor of the State of Arkansas, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 18, 1965, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Arkansas, and call upon the citizens of this State to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

ORVAL E. FAUBUS,
Governor.
KELLY BRYANT,
Secretary of State.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
June 30, 1965.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM

In its thrust toward world domination, Communist imperialism has deprived nearly 100 million people of central and eastern Europe of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Silenced, but unconquered, these people will never cease to struggle for their inalienable right to a free life.

The national security and well-being of the citizens of the United States is dependent on the continued desire for liberty and justice on the part of the peoples of these captive nations.

By action of Congress, the third week of July has been designated as Captive Nations Week. It is fitting that we observe this period in tribute to the fight for freedom and in recognition of the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world.

Therefore, I, as Governor of Texas, do hereby designate the week of July 18–24, 1965, as Captive Nations Week in Texas.

PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies, and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now, therefore,

I, Jack M. Campbell, Governor of the State of New Mexico, do hereby proclaim the week commencing July 18, 1965, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Santa Fe, N. Mex., and call upon the citizens of Santa Fe to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

Done at the executive office this 2d day of July 1965.

JACK M. CAMPBELL,
Governor.

Attest:

ALBERTA MILLER,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Sacramento.

This July 18–24 we observe the 7th anniversary of Captive Nations Week, a remembrance of those peoples throughout the world who today live in subjugation and without freedom under Communist rule.

Americans join free peoples throughout the world in a prayer that all men one day shall be free and that the free nations seek release of those who are still denied their basic liberties under governments not of their choosing.

Let us during the week of July 18–24 remind ourselves of our own heritage of freedom and the cost in lives and suffering it has cost past generations to insure it for us. Toward that end, I urge all Californians to join in observing Captive Nations Week.

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor.

PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and,

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now, therefore,

I, William L. Guy, Governor of the State of North Dakota, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 18, 1965, be observed as Captive Nations Week in North Dakota, and call upon the citizens of this State to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

WILLIAM L. GUY,
Governor.

Attest:

BEN MEIER,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION OF THE CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS: CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 18–24, 1965

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies, and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now, therefore,

I, John J. Barton, mayor of Indianapolis, Ind., do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 18, 1965, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Indianapolis, and call upon all the citizens to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

JOHN J. BARTON,
Mayor.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR, CITY OF HOLYOKE—PROCLAMATION

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies, and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, Daniel F. Dibble, mayor of the city of Holyoke, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 18, 1965, be observed as Captive Nations Week in the city of Holyoke, Mass., and call upon the citizens of Holyoke to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

Given at the mayor's office in Holyoke, this twenty-fifth day of June in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-five.

DANIEL F. DIBBLE,
Mayor.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., PROCLAMATION—CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week of July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies, and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, Harry Wilklow, Jr., mayor of the city of Battle Creek, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 18, 1965, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Battle Creek, and call upon the citizens of this city to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the city of Battle Creek to be affixed this 22d day of June 1965.

HARRY WILKLOW, Jr.,
Mayor.

CITY OF MEMPHIS, TENN.—PROCLAMATION

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, be it proclaimed that the week commencing July 18, 1965, shall be Captive Nations Week and all citizens are urged to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the city of Memphis to be affixed this 22d day of June 1965.

WILLIAM B. INGRAM, Jr.

PONTIAC, MICH., CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK PROCLAMATION

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossakia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies, and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, William H. Taylor, Jr., mayor of the city of Pontiac, Mich., do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 18, 1965, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Pontiac and call upon the citizens of Pontiac to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the official seal of the city of Pontiac this 29th day of June, in the year of our Lord, 1965.

WILLIAM H. TAYLOR, Jr.,
Mayor.

LAWRENCE, MASS., PROCLAMATION

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgi, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies, and activities; expressing their sympathy with support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, John J. Buckley, mayor of the city of Lawrence, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 18, 1965, be observed as Captive Nations Week in the city of Lawrence and call upon the citizens of Lawrence to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I hereby set my hand and cause the seal of the city of Lawrence to be affixed this 24th day of June 1965.

JOHN J. BUCKLEY, *Mayor.*

WORCESTER, MASS., PROCLAMATION

Whereas the week of July 18, 1965, will commemorate the seventh observance of Captive Nations Week; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Eastern Europe and Asia; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America does not recognize the existing situation behind the Iron Curtain as being permanent; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, Paul V. Mullaney, mayor of the city of Worcester, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 18, 1965, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Worcester, and call upon the citizens of our community to observe this week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies, and activities to achieve peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples throughout the world.

PAUL V. MULLANEY,
Mayor.

STRATFORD, CONN., CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK PROCLAMATION

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies, and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, Richard E. Blake, town manager of the town of Stratford, Conn., do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 18, 1965, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Stratford, Conn., and call upon the citizens of Stratford, Conn., to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and seal, this 28th day of June 1965.

RICHARD E. BLAKE,
Town Manager.

HARTFORD, CONN., PROCLAMATION

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others, and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war, and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence, and

Whereas the Congress of the United States, by unanimous vote, passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies, and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, William E. Glynn, mayor of the city of Hartford, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 18, 1965, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Hartford and call upon the citizens of our city to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

Dated this 29th day of June 1965.

WILLIAM E. GLYNN,
Mayor.

ST. PAUL, MINN., PROCLAMATION

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of many nations of the world; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the third week in July each year shall be established as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies, and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom:

Now, therefore, I, George J. Vavoulis, mayor of the city of St. Paul, do hereby proclaim the week of July 18, 1965, as Captive Nations Week and urge all citizens to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the city of St. Paul to be affixed this 14th day of July in the year of our Lord, 1965.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—A PROCLAMATION

Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July as Captive Nations Week, and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all captive nations of the world; and

Whereas the National Captive Nations Committee has requested the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate the week commencing July 18, 1965, as Captive Nations Week, to be observed with appropriate ceremonies and activities; and

Whereas there is a strong belief that the observance of Captive Nations Week throughout our country and our community will serve the cause of America and the entire free world; that the keeping alive of the spirit of liberation is the West's most effective instrument in the cold war and the chief deterrent to a shooting war; and that it will, in partciular, strengthen the hand of the West with respect to the ever-present critical situation facing Berlin; and

Whereas it is deemed appropriate and proper to extend to the peoples of the captive nations the support and sympathy of the people of our community for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence;

Now, therefore, we, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have been requested to designate the week of July 18, 1965, as Captive Nations Week, and invite the people of the Nation's Capital to participate in the observance of this period by offering prayers in their churches and synagogues for the peaceful liberation of the subjugated peoples from the godless tryanny which oppresses them.

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
JOHN B. DUNCAN,
C. M. DUKE,
Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, PROCLAMATION

Whereas by act of the U.S. Congress and by proclamation of the President, the week of July 18-24, 1965, will be celebrated as Captive Nations Week throughout the entire country; and

Whereas Captive Nations Week provides an occasion for all Clevelanders to show that their friends, relatives, and allies in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, China, North Korea, North Vietnam, Tibet, and Cuba, have not been forgotten, and it presents an occasion for us to recall the sufferings of these enslaved people and the plight with which they are represented; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas it is fitting that clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore,

I, Ralph S. Locher, as mayor of the city of Cleveland, do hereby proclaim the week of July 18-24, 1965, as Captive Nations Week in Cleveland, and invite and urge all our citizens to give renewed devotion to the aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the corporate seal of the city of Cleveland to be affixed this 8th day of July 1965.

RALPH S. LOCHER,
Mayor.

PROVIDENCE, R.I., PROCLAMATION

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthania, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence;

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies, and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now, therefore, I, Joseph A. Doorley, Jr., mayor of Providence, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 18, 1965, be observed as Captive Nations Week in the city of Providence and call upon the citizens of Providence to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I, Joseph A. Doorley, Jr., mayor of Providence, have hereunto set my hand and caused my seal to be affixed this 9th day of July A.D. 1965.

Joseph A. Doorley, Jr., *Mayor*.

Chicago, Ill., Proclamation

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas by joint resolution of the Congress of the United States the third week of July has been designated as "Captive Nations Week"; and

Whereas the city of Chicago is linked to these captive nations through the bonds of family, since numbered among the people of Chicago are hundreds of thousands of our citizens who through nativity or ancestry treasure the heritage which endowed them with the culture and industry which are theirs; and

Whereas these nations have been made captive by the imperialistic, aggressive, and heartless policies of communism; and

Whereas the peoples of these Communist-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties: and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to demonstrate to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the people of the city of Chicago for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas the people of Chicago, as do all the people of the United States, want for the peoples of the world the same freedom and justice which is theirs: Now, therefore,

I Richard J. Daley, mayor of the city of Chicago, do hereby designate the week beginning July 17, 1965, as Captive Nations Week.

I urge the people of Chicago to join in the programs arranged for observance of the occasion, and I urge all of our churches, our educational institutions, and all media of communications to observe the plight of the Communist-dominated nations and to join in support of the just aspirations of the people of the captive nations.

I especially encourage everyone to concretely demonstrate his or her interest in the people imprisoned in the captive nations by their attendance at or participation in the parade to be held on State Street on Saturday afternoon, July 17 at 2 p.m. and at the assembly following in Grant Park.

Dated this 7th day of July, A.D. 1965.

Richard J. Daley,
Mayor.

Boston, Mass., Declaration

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas Boston, the cradle of liberty, has since its birth more than 300 years ago, pledged itself to championing the individual rights of man: Now, therefore.

I, John F. Collins, mayor of the city of Boston, do hereby declare, That the week commencing July 18, 1965, be observed as Captive Nations Week in the city of Boston, and call upon the citizens of our city to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

John F. Collins,
Mayor.

Minneapolis, Minn., Proclamation

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovania, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now, therefore,

I, Arthur Naftalin, mayor of the city of Minneapolis, do hereby proclaim the week commencing July 18, 1965, to be observed as Captive Nations Week in the city of Minneapolis, and call upon the citizens of Minneapolis to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

Arthur Naftalin,
Mayor.

New Orleans, La., Proclamation

Whereas universal peace and tranquillity are the goal and objective of freemen in every section of the world; and

Whereas the United States derives its greatness through the democratic process, a result of harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas the Communist enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples:

Now, therefore, I, Victor H. Schiro, mayor of the city of New Orleans, do hereby proclaim the week of July 18 to 24, 1965, to be Captive Nations Week in New Orleans.

Given under my hand and the seal of the city of New Orleans this 15th day of July 1965.

Victor H. Schiro,
Mayor.

George Meany Accepts Post as Chairman of National Captive Nations Committee

Washington, D.C., July 16.—George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, has accepted the post of honorary Chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, Executive Director Donald L. Miller announced today.

"Mr. Meany is a distinguished American who has devoted great effort over many years to oppose Communist imperialism and to promote the independence, personal liberty, and human dignity of peoples around the world. All who support the cause of freedom for the captive nations are heartened by his acceptance of this post," Miller said.

President Lyndon B. Johnson on July 3 proclaimed July 18–24 as Captive Nations Week this year, calling upon all Americans "to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty."

During the week mass meetings and rallies in cities from New York to San Francisco will stress support for President Johnson's actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic and the important role freedom aspirations of captive peoples play in advancing the cause of peace by deterring Communist aggression.

Resolutions by Greater Philadelphia Captive Nations Week Signed by Representatives of Member Organizations of the Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee on the Deck of Admiral Dewey's Flagship "S.S. Olympia" and Approved by Acclamation at the Mass Rally on Independence Mall, July 18, 1965

Whereas the U.S. Congress on July 17, 1959, requested the President annually to proclaim the third week of July, Captive Nations Week, "until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world"; and

Whereas President Lyndon B. Johnson on July 3 proclaimed July 18–24 Captive Nations Week for 1965 for the Nation, and Gov. William W. Scranton on June 24 for Pennsylvania, specifying "the plight of those made captive under the heavy yoke of communism," and Mayor James H. J. Tate on July 13 for Philadelphia, declaring "The roll of nations held captive by Russian Communist colonialism * * * of appalling length"; and

Whereas this marks the 25th tragic anniversary of the Soviet Russian enslavement on June 12, 1940, of the Baltic States, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

Whereas Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism and communism also continues to enslave Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Caucasus, Mainland China, Cossackia, Croatia, Cuba, Czechia, East Germany, Georgia, Hungary, Idel-Ural, North Korea, North Vietnam, Outer Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tibet, Turkestan, Ukraine, and White Ruthenia; and

Whereas the dissolution of the totally unjustifiable and brutally totalitarian Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism over peoples that have the proven capacity for self-government is long overdue: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Captive Nations Committee of Greater Philadelphia and this assemblage gathered at historic Independence Mall this July 18, 1965,

That the United States should consciously and professedly pursue a policy most likely to assure the dissolution of the Soviet Russian colonialism and Communist enslavement and the speedy liberation in peace and freedom of all the captive nations; and

That to this end, in the acclaimed conviction that conscience and moral pressure when rightly and consistently applied constitute irresistible dissolvents of tyrannical empires, the United States should apply every possible moral, economic, and diplomatic pressure; and

That all cultural and economic intercourse with Communist governments should be on the basis of concessions and considerations conducive to the eventual liberation of the enslaved peoples; and

That where Communist aggression or infiltration become acute, or as in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic have become so, the United States should intervene with whatever armed forces are necessary to repel the aggression and to forestall absolutely any further Communist takeovers; and

That American delegates to the United Nations and other councils should press for the complete exposure of Sino-Russian imperiocolonialism, including that in Ukraine, White Ruthenia, Georgia, Armenia, and other captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union; and

That, to implement American dedication to the eventual independence of all the captive nations, the House of Representatives should establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; and

That a captive nations freedom stamp series should be inaugurated and a Freedom Academy established; and finally

That copies of these resolutions be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, both Senators from Pennsylvania, all the Representatives of the greater Philadelphia area, and to the newspapers, radio, and television stations of the area.

National Captive Nations Committee, Lev E. Dobriansky, Ph. D., chairman.

Greater Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee: Austin J. App, Ph. D., chairman; Ignatius M. Billinsky, executive vice chairman; Jonas A. Stiklorius, secretary; Harry Dombalagian, treasurer; William Nezowy, Jr., field representative and information officer.

Member organizations: Harry Dombalagian, Armenian Revolutionary Federation of America; George Boychewsky, Cossack National Liberation Movement; Francisco Casacuberta, Union of Cubans in Exile; Karl Huuk, Estonian Committee of Philadelphia; A. J. App, Federation of American Citizens of German Descent; Margit Rohtla, Hungarian-American Rifle Association; Nicholas Viksnins, Ph. D., The Council Latvian Churches and Organizations in Philadelphia; Jonas A. Stiklorius, Lithuanian-American Community of U.S.A.; Casimir Burawski, Polish-American Congress of Eastern Pennsylvania; Kadir Usman, Turkestan-American Association; Wasyl Pospolyta, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Philadelphia chapter; John D. La Mothe, Young Americans for Freedom, Philadelphia chapter.

Observe Captive Nations Week, July 18–24, 1965

I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, invite the people of the United States of America to observe the Captive Nations Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.—President Lyndon B. Johnson.

WHY CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK?

To preserve freedom in the United States.

To promote freedom in the enslaved world.

To make all aware of those who lack freedom.

To give hope to those who aspire to freedom.

These are the captive nations: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Caucasus, Mainland China, Cossakia, Crotia, Cuba, Czechia, East Germany, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Idel-Ural, Latvia, Lithuania, North Korea, North Vietnam, Outer Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tibet, Turkestan, Ukraine, and White Ruthenia.

To believe that we may preserve our freedom while these nations remain enslaved is foolish and suicidal indeed. Each and every American must understand and take part in the battle to keep man a free and independent being under God. The battle is here and overseas; within our boundaries in education and material assistance; overseas in the giving of hope and eventual aid. For now, every crack in the Iron Curtain must become an echo chamber for freedom's voice.

In the past Moscow has reaped cold war successes because the West allowed itself to be confused, divided and deceived by Russian propaganda, basically to the effect that unless the West accepts Moscow's terms of peaceful coexistence the alternative is total destruction by atomic warfare. This, of course, is the perennial bluff and bluster of Kremlin rulers, their method, which unfortunately has been very effective.

The Soviet Union presents on the outside a formidable and cohesive front. However, all is not well. All persecutions, deportations, breaking up and rotation of families, brainwashing and strict censorship has been incapable of stilling the ever present, innate desire for freedom and independence. The curtain opens now and then and the truth flashes through.

Entire nations are enslaved and suffering under the heavy yoke of Russian communism. Since 1917 this control for the minds and bodies of men has been waged by the Reds. Unbelievable slaughters in Hungary, Ukraine, Poland, China and elsewhere have been the rule, not the exception. Their sufferings are beyond comprehension. Commonsense justice demands that we preface any request for peaceful coexistence with consideration of the plight of these captive nations.

The main hope for freedom and independence for these nations rests with us.

We must never forget what is happening and never cease efforts to work toward its eventual end.

When we turn our backs on the captive nations, we decide to allow the suffering of victims today and of yet unborn millions tomorrow.

It is for this reason we celebrate Captive Nations Week. We must remind ourselves constantly that our freedom is insecure while others are enslaved. We, individually and through our representatives, must do everything possible in the cause of freedom. To fail in this duty, we will not only condemn these people to their fate, but we will condemn ourselves to a final surrender of our freedom by default.

Philadelphia Captive Nations Week Committee invites all Philadelphians to attend a mass rally on Independence Mall, July 18, 1965—3 p.m.—prominent speakers in observance of Captive Nations Week.

[From the Sunday Bulletin, Philadelphia, Pa., July 18, 1965]

Captive Nations Week Begins; Adams To Talk

The opening ceremony of Captive Nations Week will be held aboard the cruiser *Olympia* at 1 p.m. today.

At 3 p.m., Secretary of Public Welfare Arlin Adams, will speak on behalf of Governor Scranton at the captive nations observance at Independence Mall.

At the ceremony aboard the *Olympia*, a special resolution condemning communism's leaders for their continued enslavement of peoples of the captive nations will be signed and forwarded to President Johnson.

Copies of the resolution will be mailed to Vice President Humphrey, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Governor Scranton, Pennsylvania Senators Joseph Clark and Hugh Scott and all members of Pennsylvania's congressional delegation.

William Nezowy, field representative for the captive nations group, said the resolution calls upon U.S. delegates to the United Nations to press for the complete exposure of Sino-Russian colonialism.

Dr. Mathew F. Gutowicz, president of the Cruiser Olympia Association, will greet the representatives of the captive nations group.

Spotlighting Soviet Russian Imperialism

(By Austin J. App, Ph. D. chairman, Captive Nations Day Committee of Greater Philadelphia; associate professor of English, LaSalle College; national president, Federation of Americans of German Descent)

As chairman of the Greater Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee, I warmly welcome all of you in the name of our committee and am happy to see so large an assembly representing so many nationalities with relatives behind the Iron Curtan, and also so many just plain Americans with the heart of good Samaritans aching for the captive nations. I also want to thank the members of my committee and the organizations they represent for their cooperation and dedicated effort and especially Mr. Ignatius M. Billinsky, executive vice chairman, and Mr. William Nezowy, our master of ceremonies, for arranging what I am sure you will find an interesting and inspiring program.

Our observance this July 18, 1965, in the historic Independence Hall of Philadelphia, answers the wish of Congress and our President. In his proclamation on July 4, President Lyndon B. Johnson stated that Congress on July 17, 1959, requested the President annually to proclaim a Captive Nations Week with "appropriate ceremoines and activities * * * until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world." On July 13, Mayor James H. J. Tate of Philadelphia issued a similar proclamation, and on June 24, Gov. William W. Scranton had done so, citing "the plight of those made captive under the heavy yoke of communism."

Congress in its joint resolution of 1959 specified such victims of "the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia" since 1918 as follows: "Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others."

In the last 6 years that tragic rollcall, instead of shrinking, has swollen to include Cuba, off our own shores, and but for President Johnson's recent vigorous defensive action might by now have included South Vietnam and Santo Domingo.

It is to be hoped that Washington's prompt and determined action to prevent the Communist takeovers of South Vietnam and the Dominican Republic signals a lasting, long overdue shift from appeasement to not only containment but liberation. Since 25 years ago, on June 12, 1940, Soviet Russia launched its second wave of Red imperialism by invading and crushing the independence of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, it extended its slave empire over another 115 million Europeans of seven once free nations and inflicted the Red tyranny on some 600 million Asiatics.

When the Reds 25 years ago crushed the independence of the three little Christian Baltic nations, what Hungarian or East Berliner or Cuban feared that within a decade or two the heel of the Red slavery would be crushing him? Let us realize in time that if our generation does not now somehow manage to check and turn back Red infiltration and aggression, be it in Berlin, or Vietnam, or Cuba or wherever, no American can feel secure that within another generation or two all of Europe will not be enslaved, nor most or all of this hemisphere, including even the United States.

Therefore we must dedicate ourselves not only to containing Red imperialism but to rolling it back and liberating our brothers already crushed under it. The Great Emancipator Abraham Lincoln said that America cannot endure half slave and half free. Who dare hope that Berlin can endure half slave and half free—or Germany, or Korea. Or Europe—or Central America?

But not only American security requires a policy of liberation, not even only our traditional good samaritanism. Also justice requires it, our share in occasioning much of the Red imperialism. It was the Rooseveltian betrayals and sellouts at Teheran and Yalta, unjustifiable, even treasonable appeasements, that helped deliver much of Eastern Europe and all of mainland China into Communist enslavement.

But how, one asks, can a policy of liberation be implemented except by war? There is a way, a most effective way, the way that virtually ended colonialism in Africa without war and compelled the near dissolution of the once mighty British Empire. It is the spotlight of publicity and the club of public opinion. Ireland and India were not liberated by bombs and battalions but by world opinion, especially by American opinion. Moral, economic, and diplomatic pressure, not nuclear bombs, achieved the often unhappily premature release from colonialism in Africa.

Not even the brute totalitarianism of the Muscovite imperialism can forever resist concerted public opinion backed by economic and diplomatic sanctions of America, and the free world. If the free world would spotlight the Red colonialism as we allowed Communists and fellow travellers to traduce colonialism in Africa, so many flares of freedom would rise up behind the Iron Curtain, so much resistance, so many revolts that no police state could put them all down. Where one Hungarian uprising even without the proper moral support of the free world once rocked the Soviet empire, dozens of them would soon do so and with the proper moral, economic, and diplomatic support of the free world would topple the Red tyrannies that are now crushing their peoples and endangering the world.

The fact is only such a spotlighting by public opinion can hope to liberate the captive nations without a large-scale war. Furthermore, it is probably the only way at all for bypassing the increasing threat of a third world war. But it is the one and only effective lever Washington has not used nor encouraged against the Soviet Empire. In fact, there is good evidence that at least until a year or two ago our State Department has instead championed the preservation "of the Soviet police system" in order to keep "law and order over 200 million-odd Russians and many additional millions in the satellite states," and even urged this policy on the NATO allies. Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, our main speaker today, in his "Outstanding U.S. Myths of the Captive Nations" gives references to this policy, which in effect makes our Government a partner in maintaining the Soviet slave imperialism.

No wonder liberation so far has been nil and Red enslavement till a few months ago on the rise. No wonder more and more nations have become captive—until, fortunately, when all of South Vietnam, and, perhaps, all of southeast Asia were about to become captive, the present administration firmly decided to protect them. May this mark the end of American collaboration with any sort of Red imperialism, and the beginning of deliberate policy of liberation.

If there is to be any hope of such liberation for the captive nations—and indeed of avoiding a third world war to prevent the eventual enslavement of all of Europe and Asia, all of us and America and the Free World must realize that:

1. The Soviet Russian imperialism is the worst and most extensive colonialism in history, so brutal and inhumane that it is the only imperialism that ever has needed to put a barbed wire entanglement around its boarders, not to keep enemies out, but to keep its own people in.

2. This colonialism stretches over nations that have long been sufficiently developed for self-government, have in most instances like the Baltic countries, proven this capacity far more than most of the African and Asian peoples liberated from West European colonialism.

3. By an inexorable development all empires maintained by force must and will dissolve, that the brutality of the Red system cannot ultimately prevent such dissolution, only delay it.

4. Humanity and justice call for such dissolution now, and the security and peace of the world require it.

5. The first step for accomplishing this dissolution of the Sino-Russian imperialism is for the free world to demand it, to say so clearly and insistently.

The free world, America, all of us must resolve to throw the spotlight of publicity on the brutal Red colonialism, must organize public opinion and the moral judgment of the world against it, must encourage the captive peoples to hope for liberation and to enlist every means at their disposal to achieve it, and finally and most of all, we who are free must require our governments to use every moral, economic, and diplomatic means to promote and provoke the liberation of the captive nations and the hundreds of millions now "under the heavy yoke of communism."

Thank you.

Outstanding U.S. Myths on the Captive Nations

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

"This country must never recognize the situation behind the Iron Curtain as a permanent one, but must, by all peaceful means, keep alive the hopes of freedom for the peoples of the captive nations."—John F. Kennedy.

In the spirit of these words uttered by our 35th President, the National Captive Nations Committee in Washington, D.C., has initiated and conducted activities that are designed to prevent any such disastrous recognition from ever coming to pass. It has guided what has come to be known as the broad captive nations movement. The movement has been in existence in this country since July 1959, when the U.S. Congress passed the Captive Nations Week resolution.

For 6 years now this resolution, in the form of Public Law 86–90, has been the basis of steadily expanding Captive Nations Week observances each year. It has also precipitated considerable discussion and increasing thought about all the captive nations in Europe, Asia, and Latin America. Written material on the subject is now quite voluminous. However, there still are numerous outstanding U.S. myths on the captive nations.

An analystic review or these outstanding myths can serve a most instructive and educational purpose. In many instances it shows how petrified and warped are the various preconceptions held by some of our opinionmakers. When these are viewed objectively and dispassionately, one cannot but wonder about the extent to which their readers and listeners are misled by their groundless and, in several cases, foolish observations. A periodic examination of this kind also demonstrates the blind indifference of many commentators to developments of the most basic significance. It appears for whatever reason that superficial and transient events are of greater moment to them than are evidences of penetrating import to the adversary. Doubtlessly, the latter demand a greater measure of expended intellectual energy, both for some necessary research and detailed analysis.

To appreciate the nature and scope of these myths on the captive nations, it is necessary to consider them against a short background of recent events surrounding the Captive Nations Week observances and of certain well-founded perspectives on the captive nations. Every year since the passage of the resolution notable events regarding the observances have been recorded and elaborated upon.[1] It is sufficient here to take a brief look at some of the highlights during the period of 1963–64. The solid growth of the movement has apparently disturbed a few observers whom we shall consider later. In addition, this concise background will afford many points of contrast and comparison to the mythical notions entertained by these observers.

CAPTIVE NATIONS IN THE RECENT PAST

Months before the 1963 Captive Nations Week was proclaimed, Moscow continued to display its displeasure over the observance of the preceding year. At the very beginning of the year a Soviet Russian weekly raised the question, "Is it not high time to discontinue the 'Captive Nations Week' in the United States?" Its ostensible reason was "That is just as much a dead horse as the Hungarian question."[2] It is unnecessary to argue the merits of this position for there are none. The suggestion was part of an uninterrupted campaign to bring about a cessation of Captive Nations Week in this country. The Soviet Russian totalitarians thought they would be able to persuade President Kennedy to do this, but they hardly made a dent. The 1963 observance surpassed all preceding years.

Up to that year, for the first time the President issued his proclamation—the fifth since 1959—before the very eve of the week. Quite appropriately, the week was proclaimed immediately after our own Independence Day. Moscow reacted swiftly and sharply. Its Communist Party organ claimed that "the President of the United States, losing his sense of reality, has declared a 'Week of the Captive Nations' and is trying to turn attention away from the struggle of the Negroes for their liberation."[3] In this particular year Moscow's propagandists attempted to confuse the captive nations issue with that of civil rights, which is like mixing ice cream with sauerkraut. A Negro Radio Moscow was even set up for the purpose.

The so-called government newspaper in this imperio-colonialist capital also gave vent to the Kremlin's feelings about the observance. The Week, it complained, "is a propagandistic trick of the American enemies of the freedom and independence of nations."[4] A Russian tyrant is a lover of peace, and an American patriot is an imperialist in this topsy-turvy semantics. Among the underlings in the Red Empire, North Korea was about the most vicious that year, smearing the President as a "third class clown" for proclaiming the Week and over the same Pyongyang Radio calling Captive Nations Week "a despicable animal campaign of the U.S. ruling circles." One of the comical aspects after all this and more was the release on July 15 of a letter by Andrei A. Gromyko to the United Nations Secretary-General U Thant concerning the 1965 International Cooperation Year, which had been voted upon by the 1962 U.N. General Assembly. According to the Foreign Minister of the world's worst imperio-colonialist system, 1965 should become the year of "the complete and final liquidation of the disgraceful system of colonialism." Captive Nations Week, with its emphasis on the Soviet Russian imperio-colonialist system, was already underway then.

---

[1] E.g., see Dobriansky, Lev E. "Soviet Russian Imperio-Colonialism and the Free World," NATO's 15 Nations, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, August–September 1963, pp. 92–97; also "Captive Nations Week 1964," Washington Report, American Security Council, Chicago, Ill., July 13, 1964.

[2] The New Times, Moscow, Jan. 23, 1963.

[3] Pravda, Moscow, July 8, 1963.

What was the Week like in 1963? Briefly, following the President, over one-half of our State Governors and 4 dozen mayors proclaimed it. Congressional interest in the movement was the most enthusiastic ever, with over one-third of the House and close to a third in the Senate becoming active members of the advisory section in the National Captive Nations Committee. As in previous years, press coverage was nationwide. The New York Times, the Atlanta Journal and Constitution, Chicago Sun-Times, Dallas Times Herald, the Pittsburgh Press, and numerous others carried the activities of the Week. Observances were held across the country, from Boston to Los Angeles, Washington, D.C. to Seattle. Programs in all the major cities were covered by radio and TV. Even internationally, the entire Republic of China observed the week, and Senator Dr. Fetki Tevetoglu submitted the resolution in the senate of Turkey. Outstanding examples of the Week's activities were recorded in successive issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.[5]

The 1964 Captive Nations Week was even more impressive. First, let us note some representative comments from the totalitarian Red Empire, particularly their chosen propaganda twist for the year. Moscow radio blurted comments about a passive observance in the United States, Izvestia had this to say: "With every passing year 'Captive Nations Week' becomes a nuisance."[6] A constant reminder of the existence of the captive nations and the hypocrisy of Russian "peaceful coexistence" is, of course, a "nuisance" from Moscow's viewpoint. The commentary even went on to say that "the reactionary American press does not make any mention of it." It also pointed out that "The stupid situation in which the Washington legislators and rulers found themselves is becoming evident even for those who earnestly propagate the imperialistic policy of the United States." Making good propaganda use of an immature editorial that appeared in the Washington Post, which apparently in Moscow's eyes is not a part of "the reactionary American press," Moscow compliments the paper for its "realistic understanding of the matter" and for realizing that "in a situation where the relation of power has shifted to the side of socialism, the United States cannot force the peoples of the Socialist countries to adopt its standards without risking the holocaust of a world war."

We'll observe the character of the Post editorial later. It is a prime example of myth-making and plain ignorance. Curiously, after all this Izvestia ends with a longing question, "How long do the Capitol and the White House intend to amuse the world with their absurd plans?" Indeed, how they would like to get rid of the week. Even several weeks after the observance Khrushchev couldn't restrain himself when, in a speech in Czechoslovakia, he shouted, "in the United States a farce entitled 'captive nations week' is held every year. The people's democratic system has been in existence for 20 years but the imperialists still ramble on with nonsensical ideas of 'liberating' the nations of eastern Europe."[7]

As indicated, the 1964 week surpassed all others. President Johnson set a new record by issuing his proclamation on June 20. The proclamation read as follows:

"THE WHITE HOUSE—CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1964

"By the President of the United States of America

"A Proclamation

"Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212) authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

"Whereas the cause of human rights and personal dignity remains a universal aspiration; and

"Whereas this Nation is firmly committed to the cause of freedom and justice everywhere; and

"Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the people of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations:

"Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 12, 1964, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

"In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"Done at the city of Washington this 18th day of June in the year of our Lord 1964, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 188th.

"[SEAL] LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

"By the President:

"DEAN RUSK,
"Secretary of State."

In addition, for the first time the Republican National Convention held a unique and highly successful observance of the week in San Francisco. The time of the convention was coincident with the week. Had the Democratic Convention been held then, doubtlessly it too would have staged a fitting observance. Again, as shown by various examples in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, most of the State Governors and dozens of mayors proclaimed the week.[8] The press across the Nation publicized the event, e.g., the Los Angeles Herald Examiner, the Miami Herald, the Chicago Tribune, the Philadelphia Inquirer, the Boston Globe, the San Francisco Chronicle, the Buffalo Courier-Express and so forth. Radio and TV also covered it as, for example, the Georgetown University Forum, NBC, the Daily News station in New York, and numerous others. And internationally, the Republic of China witnessed the largest observance ever, and later at the 10th Conference of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League in Taipei, delegates and observers from over 40 nations unanimously passed a captive nations resolution, calling for a World Congress of Captive Nations.[9] In short, the observance was so "passive" that some 6 weeks after the observance even Khrushchev kept lambasting the event.

SOME GUIDELINES ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

A prime objective of Soviet Russian diplomacy and propaganda is the systematic deprivation of this powerful weapon to our use and development in the cold war. As the ultimate and decisive power center of so-called world communism, Moscow has for years persistently sought the complete acquiescence of free world interests to the permanent captivity of nations and peoples brought under its imperial yoke and influence since the early 1920's. Nonaggression treaties, the abuse of noninterference in "internal affairs" principle, and sheer ignorance on the part of foreign statesmen have been some of the avenues in Moscow's operational approach to this objective. All three, coupled with the exaggerated threat of thermonuclear war, are methodically employed today. So is Moscow's deceptive strategy of "peaceful coexistence," to which Rudyard Kipling gave the answer many decades ago:

"When he stands up as if pleading, in wavering, man-brute guise;
When he veils the hate and cunning in his little swinish eyes;
When he shows as seeking quarter, with paws like hands in prayer;
That is the time of peril—the time of the Truce of the Bear."

Essentially, the tremendous strategic importance of the captive nations to U.S. and free world interest rests on three requisite considerations: (1) a vivid understanding of the total captive nations concept, (2) a consequent appreciation of the most basic source of weakness and vulnerability in Peiping's and Moscow's totalitarian imperia, and (3) a developed recognition of the opportunities provided by the captive nations for paramilitary, cold war operations beyond the patched-up wall of containment. These three considerations are organically related in the given logical sequence, the full efficacy of one being dependent on its precedent. They make up a structure of thought predicated on the genetic development of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism and lendable to a ready absorption of new evidential data, including the current Sino-Soviet rift.

Considering the first requisite, the captive nations concept encompasses all the nations that directly or indirectly owe their present state of captivity to Soviet Russian imperialist influence. These include the so-called satellites in Central Europe, the numerous non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union, those under Red totalitarian control in Asia, and now Cuba. The concept may seem to be blurred by certain phenomena of state classification, independent action, or geographical distance, but both historically and logically it easily accommodates these apparent qualifications. It also helps to point out critically certain errors of thought made by our officials. For example, in an excellent address delivered by the President the mischaracterization of North Vietnam as a country and the omission of the North Vietnamese desiring the genuine unified independence of the Vietnamese nation, one free of the Red Empire, are cases in point.[10]

---

[4] Izvestia, Moscow, July 14, 1963.

[5] See, e.g., "Captive Nations Week," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 109, pt. 9, pp. 11497–12516.

[6] Izvestia, Moscow, July 15, 1964.

[7] Reuters, Banska Bystrica, Czechoslovakia, Aug. 29, 1964.

[8] See "The 1964 Captive Nations Week and House Resolution 14," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 16, pp. 20683–20689; also "U.S. Observance of Captive Nations Week," vol. 110, pt. 16, pp. 20803–20810.

[9] "Resolutions of the 10th APACL Conference," Free China and Asia, Republic of China, Dec. 1964, pp. 32–43.

On the matter of political classification, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia are not nations but rather, like the Soviet Union, states composed of distinct national entities. The nations within are captive to a totalitarian apparatus imposed originally by Soviet Russian sources. As to independent action, the cases of Yugoslavia and mainland China are often brought forward, although interparty struggles have characterized Poland, Albania, Rumania, Ukraine, Georgia, and others in the past. Regardless of the degree of independence shown, none of these totalitarian apparatuses could endure for long without the ultimate power maintained by the Soviet Union and its Soviet Russian base. Finally, distance may separate Cuba from the captive nations of Eurasia, but the Castro apparatus is increasingly dependent for its survival on Eurasian totalitarian resources. As Castro's sister has pointed out, "we could see as the days passed how the country was being delivered to Russian imperialism." [11]

An outstanding American misconception is that the only captive nations are those in central Europe. In fact, they constitute less than a third in the growing family of captive nations. This grave misconception is being steadily corrected by the observance of Public Law 86–90 (the Captive Nations Week Resolution) which advances the above concept. There is an increasing awareness, too, of the reasons behind Khrushchev's unprecedented explosion in July 1959, over the passage of this resolution in the U.S. Congress. For the first time we officially recognized the complete family of the captive nations and also placed emphasis on those in the Soviet Union, which alters radically the picture most Americans have of this power complex.

The development of the conceptual requisite inevitably leads to a cultivated appreciation of the most fundamental weakness and vulnerability in Moscow's totalitarian imperium. This is the invincible force of patriotic nationalism rampant throughout the entire empire and firmly rooted in the hearts and minds of the captive peoples. When the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee speaks of "Communist countries—beginning to free themselves from the blinders of Marxist-Leninist ideology and to look at the world and at their own societies in somewhat more realistic terms," his thinking is 40 years late and, at that, on a beam of misinterpretation.[12] Since the inception of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism there has never been in reality a monolith of Soviet Russian dominion, whether in the Soviet Union, central Europe, or Asia. The supposed fragmentation of the empire today is just another phase in the continuum of nationalist expression and determination that are even strongly reflected in the various totalitarian apparatuses.

Moscow's foremost problems today are the manifest result of a whole decade of captive nations' opposition and resistance to Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism and the respective totalitarian regimes. Whether in East Germany in 1953 or Ukraine 1950–51, Hungary 1956, or Turkestan 1954, Poland and Georgia 1956, or mainland China 1957, the story written by the people is the same. The cold war has more than one dimension; and the captive nations vs. the totalitarian apparatus, ultimately supported by the power of Soviet Russian leadership, is a vital one in the total cold war picture. To the degree we thoroughly explore this dimension, to that extent we shall discern the many opportunities open to us for success in the dimensions of our struggle with the combined totalitarian adversary. Involved also in this, as the Holy Father sagely has pointed out, is the condemnation of systems "which deny God and oppress the church, systems which are often identified with economic, social, and political regimes, amongst which atheistic communism is the chief." [13]

Such exploration and detailed study cannot but prepare us for prudent cold war operations beyond the patched-up wall of containment. It is no wonder that every year Moscow and its totalitarian allies condemn the Captive Nations Week observance. For during this time popular attention is focused on this need, on the ultimate power of Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism, and on the necessity of exposing this power, particularly in the Soviet Union itself. With a fixed orientation toward all the captive nations, we can develop and use economic, diplomatic, cultural and other instruments, designed to increase the political leverage of individual national assertiveness among these nations and thus intensify the centrifugal forces of nationalism within the empire. In this, the prime target would be the U.S.S.R. itself.

Thus, why Captive Nations Week? It is legally provided for in Public Law 86–90; as President Kennedy stressed, it is a tremendous moral symbol signifying that we Americans will never forget or acquiesce; it concentrates on our nuclear spiritual weapons; it is an effective educational medium about all the captive nations, sino-Russian imperiocolonialism, and the cold war; it affords a wholesome national forum for the discussion of most pressing security issues; and it consistently leads to the crystallization of concrete measures of action. Need one wonder why Moscow and its coterie seek the elimination of the week.

THE OUTSTANDING MYTHS

Over the years there have been some rather strange and fanciful notions expressed with regard both to the resolution and the captive nations. For example, we'll never forget the grandiose interpretation given by one columnist: "When I was in Moscow during the October Party Congress, Khrushchev once again vehemently denounced the innocuous Captive Nations Week resolution which Congress passes every year to attract minority votes." [14] In one sentence the ingredients of truth, illogic, and fiction are intermixed. True, the past Russian dictator did vehemently denounce it again; illogical, to have earned such repeated denunciations the resolution could scarcely be innocuous; fictional, the self-renewing resolution doesn't have to be passed each year, and it never had anything to do with minority votes.

Do you think this is bad? Just consider the new crop of myths that has recently sprung up—this by writers who are supposed to enlighten the American public. In a critical article on the views of the Republican presidential nominee in 1964, a well-known columnist wrote: "The Senator is historically wrong to imply (April 25, 1963) that Soviet arms seized Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Turkestan, Georgia, the Ukraine, and North Caucasus." [15] For the purpose of disinforming the American public, Soviet Russian propagandists couldn't have done better. There is no intelligent controversy about the Soviet Russian conquest of these countries. The historical record is clear and substantial. Aside from a vast bibliography of scholarly works on the subject, if the columnist had even bothered to scan the official reports of Congress Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, he would realize that his statement makes as much sense as saying Nazi arms did not seize Austria, Czechoslovakia and so on. One's patent ignorance is no test of historical validity.

Another choice example of mythmaking is furnished by two editorials of a Washington newspaper, written probably by a person who until 1963 never knew a Taras Shevchenko, the Ukrainian national hero, ever existed. In an intellectually irresponsible attack against the resolution, the first editorial stated, "it also includes Cossackia and Idel-Ural which never have existed as nations except for intervals of German invasion. They are about as much captives of the Soviet Union as Anacostia and Cleveland Park are captives of the District of Columbia. As far as that goes, White Ruthenia and Ukraine are political concoctions that describe aspirations more than a national entity." [16] How erratic and even immature some writers can be is easily gaged by reading, for example, this paper's editorial on Shevchenko on September 23, 1963. It speaks of "Ukraine's national poet" and states, "We yield to no one in our esteem for the Ukraine and that country's poet and hero." [17]

Here, too, a knowledge gap prevails. Cossackia and Idel-Ural have traditions in name and reality long preceding any German invasion, and this history of White Ruthenia or Byelorussia is known by many a college undergraduate today. The paper's subsequent editorial commenting sarcastically on these three countries in the U.S.S.R. is evidence enough of the emotional instability of the writer.[18] The positive aspect of all this is the solid evidence we now have justifying the urgent, educational need for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the U.S. Congress.

For a salmagundi of confused thoughts the next example is exemplary. The article states the following: "A nation needs an ideology—a common enthusiasm that gives it cohesiveness and unity of purpose. Strangely enough, the ideology that holds the Soviet Union together is not communism, but the Mother Russia concept. For Mother Russia is the common pride of White Russians, Ukrainians, and Georgians, all of whom have ample historical reason for mutual hate. The Soviet leaders have been tireless in identifying communism as the agency which has glorified Russia." [19] Whether this was written in a state of inebriation or not, it demonstrates a typical looseness of thought regarding the Soviet Union. Suffice it to say that the Soviet Union is not Russia or a nation, nor have the White Ruthenians, Ukrainians, and Georgians any "historical reason for mutual hate," and that the empire significance of the Mother Russia concept is anathema to them. The only force that holds the Soviet Union together is the military occupation of these non-Russian nations by the expediently mixed U.S.S.R. Armed Forces and the KGB.

---

[10] Address on Vietnam, Johns Hopkins University, the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Apr. 8, 1965.

[11] Castro Ruz, Juana. "I Accuse My Brother Fidel," Free Front, Manila, Philippines, October–November 1964, p. 17.

[12] Fulbright, J. W. "The Basic Issue in Foreign Affairs," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 16, p. 21677.

[13] Pope Paul VI. "Ecclesiam Suam," first encyclical letter, the New York Times, Aug. 11, 1964.

[14] Alsop, Stewart. "The Berlin Crisis: Khrushchev's Weakness," Saturday Evening Post, Dec. 16, 1961.

[15] Sulzberger, C. L. "Barry's Brinkmanship," San Francisco Sunday Chronicle, July 19, 1964.

[16] "Captive Nations," the Washington Post, July 11, 1964.

[17] Shevchenko, "A Monument to the Liberation, Freedom, and Independence of All Captive Nations," U.S. GPO, 1964, p. 11.

[18] "Betrayal," the Washington Post, Aug. 17, 1964.

[19] Jones, Jenkin Lloyd, the Evening Star, July 23, 1964.

These few examples are sufficient to indicate the necessity for observing Captive Nations Week. What within a short time books cannot accomplish, popular observance and discussion can. Actually, we don't have much time. The myths conveyed by these examples will rapidly disappear. So will those in these further examples of our cultural lag.

One writer, whose position changes in cycles and whose record is a succession of errors in judgment and prediction as, for instance, close Soviet-American friendship in the postwar era and the permanent captivity of the enslaved nations expressed on the very eve of the 1956 Hungarian revolution, provides us with additional fables on the captive nations. A recent work shows him to be as irritated by the resolution as Moscow has been. "Certain of the national groups," he writes, "whose names appear in the Captive Nations Resolution as those nations thirsting for a lost independence never existed at all in this quality. The Ukraine never was really independent."[20] According to this fable, the Russian Empire has been eternally in existence and the periods of Ukrainian independence in the form of Kievan Rus, the Kozak Republic, and the National Republic nexer existed. Under pressure from within the U.S.S.R., even Moscow continually refers to "independent" Ukraine today. This kind of blind thinking would have precluded even the new independence of any Afro-Asian people.

Here are more fables made to order for Soviet Russian propagandists: "I can think of nothing more catastrophic than that the policy of our Government should be committed to the breakup of the traditional Russian state. Remember that nothing of this sort could be carried forward except at the cost of the violent and total estrangement of the Russian people."[21] He goes on to say that this would mean the "dismemberment of Russia."[22] This fable ignores the fact that Russia is only one part of the U.S.S.R., which no one seeks to dismember. To identify Russia with the U.S.S.R. is patent nonsense; to invoke the Russian people, most of whom have no vested interest in the Soviet Russian Empire, borders on the ridiculous. It is like saying that we should never have helped the different peoples of the Austro-Hungarian or the Ottoman Empires, "traditional states" as they were, because the Austrians or Turks would not like it. The muddy character of the writer's concepts and thoughts is further illustrated by his conception of Yugoslavia as a "nation," with a "desire for national independence."[23] Apparently his stay in Belgrade profited him little.

Before leaving this case for the remaining examples of U.S. myths on the captive nations, we might take note of the shallowness of thought exhibited by this Russian expert. He asserts, "The Captive Nations Resolution has freed no captive nations, nor is it likely to do so * * * My charge is that, uncorrected, unchallenged, and permitted to have the currency it has in this country today, it cripples the hopefulness of any other approach."[24] Now, just a modicum of commonsense is needed to perceive the fact that, like proclamations, no resolution will free anyone anywhere. As I've pointed out often, by its very nature a resolution is an ideational commitment that necessitates action and implementation; and things of this kind—"Needless irritations, such as the Captive Nations Resolution and various antiquated trade restrictions, are still permitted to impede the development of Soviet-American relations"—the faculty of commonsense demands priority.[25]

Examples of this type, short in knowledge and lacking in commonsense, can be multiplied. In a recent work on propaganda, Arthur Larson, a former Eisenhower official, views the resolution as "bad" subversive propaganda, inciting the peoples of Eastern Europe to overthrow their present governments. A columnist, who uncritically inserted into his article a fantasy that was fed him, sees Ukraine as having "been a part of Russia longer than Arizona has been in the Union."[26] An expensive study prepared for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency makes this profound observation: "Whether we admit it to ourselves or not, we benefit enormously from the capability of the Soviet police system to keep law and order over 200 million odd Russians and many additional millions in the satellite states. The breakup of the Russian Communist Empire today would doubtless be conducive to freedom, but would be a good deal more catastrophic for the world order than was the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1918."[27] Observing all this, one wonders if these writers and many like them have ever bothered to scan the resolution, which reads as follows:

"PUBLIC LAW 86–90—86TH CONGRESS, SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 111—JULY 17, 1959

"Joint resolution

"Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

"Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

"Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

"Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

"Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

"Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

"Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

"Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

"Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as 'Captive Nations Week' and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

THE 1965 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

In the period of July 18–24, the seventh Captive Nations Week observance will be conducted throughout the Nation. Its major themes will be: (1) full support for the President's action in Vietnam; (2) a no-trade policy, no slipshod trade liberalization, toward the Red empire; (3) the complete exposure of Sino-Russian imperiocolonialism in the United Nations and throughout the free world; (4) the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the U.S. House of Representatives; (5) the establishment of a Freedom Commission and Academy, and (6) the issuance of a captive nations freedom stamp series.

Captive Nations Week is the citizen's way of letting the captive nations—the peoples themselves as against their oppressive totalitarian states and governments—know that we will never recognize the situation behind the Iron Curtain (and the Bamboo and Sugar Curtains) as a permanent one. The realization of the above themes would give further concrete expression to this. Until certain things that must be done for cold war victory and the avoidance of a hot global war are done, we cannot but still raise the haunting question—"the captive nations—who's next?"

Country and year of Communist domination

	Year
Armenia	1920
Azerbaijan	1920
Byelorussia	1920
Cossackia	1920
Georgia	1920
Idel-Ural	1920
North Caucasia	1920
Democratic Republic of Far East (Siberyaks)	1920
Ukraine	1920
Turkestan	1922
Estonia	1940
Latvia	1940
Lithuania	1940
Albania	1946
Bulgaria	1946
Outer Mongolia	1946
Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, etc., in Yugoslavia	1946
Poland	1947
Rumania	1947
Czechoslovakia	1948
North Korea	1948
Hungary	1949
East Germany	1949

---

[20] Kennan, George F., "On Dealing With the Communist World," New York, 1964, p. 13.

[21] Ibid., p. 13.

[22] Ibid., p. 14.

[23] Ibid., p. 50.

[24] Ibid., p. 19.

[25] Kennan, George F., "A Case for Sparing the Spurs," the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1965.

[26] Drummond, Roscoe. "Captive Nations Cause," New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 19, 1964.

[27] "Special Committee on the Captive Nations," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 217, p. 22666.

Country and year of Communist domination—Continued

	Year
Mainland China	1949
Tibet	1951
North Vietnam	1954
Cuba	1960

Who's next? South Vietnam? Algeria? Colombia? Congo? Laos? Tanzania? Bolivia? Thailand?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as author some years ago of the captive nations resolution in the House of Representatives, it is most certainly appropriate for us to again designate the third week in July as Captive Nations Week, for thus we may do honor to the long and arduous struggle for freedom being waged by these peoples enslaved by an unscrupulously imperialist power.

It is my great hope that for this week our awareness of the plight of these long-suffering peoples may be heightened and that once so increased, it will remain high. The people of America are greatly committed to freedom, and certainly the people of the oppressed captive nations are no less dedicated. It is unfortunate that the pressures of our modern age leave most of us with less time for reflection than we would prefer, and that in dealing with especially pressing problems we sometimes tend to put aside those that have had a longer duration. Some, however, are of such importance for the welfare of mankind that they cannot be even temporarily disregarded. Though we have not been able to devote all of our time to considering the unhappy and unnatural state of existence of these captive nations, concern for them has continually been with us, and this concern has not flagged.

To be living under a foreign country's control is to be a victim of colonialism, but to be systematically oppressed, unnaturally restricted, and overtly coerced is to be a victim of imperialism in its most vicious and tyrannical form. It is difficult for those of us who enjoy the blessings of freedom to imagine the feeling of helplessness, of futility, of resignation and surrender to which even the strong may be reduced by such fearful tyranny. We have, however, been fortunate to witness a most eloquent and noble testimony by the peoples of these captive nations to the strength of mankind, its spirit of dedication to freedom, its resistance to tyranny, and its hope for a better future. For this we honor them, for this we commend them, and, for this we must thank them.

The love of freedom is indeed strong in the people of these unfortunate nations, so strong that where others would have succumbed to such great forces, they could not. We have thousands of fine examples here in the United States of the spirit that sustains these peoples. Men, women, and children forced to flee from the encroaching menace, forced by bloody persecution, cruel mass deportation, and innumerable subtle pressures that were no less terrifying, have come to this free land and dedicated themselves to supporting the freedom that they were so tragically denied in their countries of birth. These new citizens have distinguished themselves in many ways, and their spirit is indeed indicative of that possessed by those still suffering under a foreign yoke in their beloved homelands.

Do we need to be reminded that time is relentlessly fleeting? It has now been 45 years since the first of these nations became entangled by the Communist net, 25 years since the Baltic States lost their freedom, almost 20 years since the Balkans were dominated, over 15 years for the far eastern nations, and 5 years since the Communist conspiracy gained a foothold in the Western Hemisphere. It almost seems that as time marched on, so did the Communist forefront—engulfing, swallowing outright, many fine peoples and brave nations. And the fight goes on. One need only pick up a newspaper to read about the conflict caused by the resistance of free peoples to Communist aggression and expansion.

It does not take much of a realist to admit that the fight against tyranny and oppression is long and difficult. However, it takes even less of a realist to admit that this battle is most certainly worth fighting, worth every effort we can make, every sacrifice we can give. Freedom, our most precious heritage and blessing, is at stake.

Thus we look with humble admiration and true thankfulness at the example set for us by these brave captive peoples. Their fight has been no shorter, no less arduous, no less discouraging than ours yet they have doggedly resisted their oppressors, have resolutely clung to their hopes and ideals of freedom, and have proudly maintained their dignity.

There have been recent indications of greater freedom being granted to the peoples of some of these captive nations, and for this we, no less than they, are thankful. Yet we cannot, and they most certainly will not, be satisfied until it is no longer a question of being granted this freedom, but one of exercising it naturally and unrestrictedly. Neither will we be content until all of these nations are totally free, not just a few, not just to some degree. Freedom, not in name, but in practice, is our hope.

There are many trials yet ahead for both the people of the free world and those enslaved as captives. We need to have before us such inspiring examples as those presented by the peoples of these nations, we need to study and to understand these examples, not just to sympathize with them. Even as we encourage them to maintain their dedication to freedom and truth, we ourselves draw encouragement from them. Changing the political world by peaceful means may save lives, but it will not be so easy that we should expect no tensions to arise, no conflicts to occur. Until we are able to live in a completely free world we must continually dedicate ourselves to peacefully bringing about its existence. In this we need the help and understanding of the captive peoples. We need them to remind us how deep a commitment, a dedication, to freedom can be. We need them to show us human dignity in the face of inhuman oppression, to show us courage and steadfastness, conviction and unity of spirit and purpose. These things they have done for us and are doing for us now. To them, for this, I extend our sincere appreciation.

Much time has passed since the light of freedom and truth was darkened for these people, and there may be much time ahead where it will only gradually begin to brighten. We take heart, though, that they have never allowed the light to go out, but have ever maintained its gleam of hope in their hearts. Every increase in the amount of freedom granted to these unfortunate people is a cause for rejoicing, but every passing year that the flame of freedom is not allowed to burn freely and brilliantly is a cause for sadness and sober thought.

This then, is the position of the captive nations today. This week we shall both honor and thank these brave peoples as we extend to them our most sincere wishes for a future of greater freedom and happiness.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, every year that passes marks the increased prosperity and political stability of Western Europe, while in Eastern Europe, economic progress is either slight or nonexistent. Although the political stability of most of the countries of Eastern Europe is fairly certain, this stability has been allowed to continue only at the cost of the increased allowance of individual liberties and private enterprise and increased nationalistic and ideological independence from the C.P.S.U. To paraphrase the opening lines of the "Communist Manifesto," Marxism is haunted by the specter of Western Europe.

All the signs would indicate that the trend is in the direction of freedom and diversity throughout the world, and Eastern Europe is not an exception. However, this is only the trend, and I cannot emphasize enough, Mr. Speaker, that whether the trend is definitive or transitory must depend at least in part on how we mold our attitudes and policies toward the captive nations. We should never let down our guard to the point where we allow our hope of directly influencing the decisions of the governments of Eastern Europe to prevent us from dealing in word and in action with any moral outrages they may commit. At the same time, we should not let our sense of justice lead us to the point where, burning with fiery but ineffectual rhetoric, we fail to consider and act upon the many intricate and varied details of world politics.

For the challenge of Soviet imperialism is a challenge laid down on many fronts by an exceedingly clever adversary. We must gage all our proposed policy decisions in terms of how appropriately and effectively they meet this challenge. The institution of Captive Nations Week, Mr. Speaker, is one which experience has shown to be both appropriate and effective as a partial response to the challenge of the Soviet domination over the east European countries, a domination which, though having weakened significantly over the past 20 years, nevertheless still continues.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, self-determination is a principle of political life that is vital to democracy. It is a principle that more than any other goes to the heart of the meaning of democracy, because it is this principle that gives man the right to determine his destiny.

Nations constitute a grouping of people who by consensus, expressed through the formal procedure of elections and referendums, have decided upon the particular form of government they desire and the direction in which they wish their nation to develop. The peoples of the democracies of the world have made their choice, and they made it themselves. The actual form of government they have chosen may vary, as in the case of the parliamentary system in England, or that of America and West Germany—but the important point is that it was the people who had made the choice of their government.

It is this vital principle of self-determination that sets the world democracies apart from the Communist nations. The peoples who exist under communism are captive nations in every sense of the word, for they have no choice whatever of the government that rules them or the destiny of their nation. Under communism a small oligarchy of leaders determines their nation's destiny; the masses have no share either in choice of leadership or determination of the nation's development.

During this week when we pay tribute to the captive nations it is well that we reflect upon this important principle of self-determination and its meaning for our own future welfare. And on this occasion let us also express the hope that some day in the future all captive nations will enjoy this right of self-determination, for when that day comes we will all know that no longer will they be nations in captivity but nations in freedom.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the House in observance of Captive Nations Week. I am gratified that President Johnson has issued the captive nations proclamation, calling attention to the plight of persons of captive nations whose spirits have been stifled and whose lives have been reduced to slavery under communism.

Public Law 90 of the 86th Congress established the third week in July of each year as Captive Nations Week. Once again I want to urge my colleagues in the House to join in a reaffirmation of the ideals embodied in Captive Nations Week, that is, to nourish the hopes of enslaved people and contribute to the ultimate goal of a world based on freedom, justice, and peace.

The Soviet Union violated its promises of freedom and independence after World War II to Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. And the U.S.S.R. deprived the captive non-Russian peoples within its own borders of the promise of self-determination and independence.

The meager liberations and concessions by the Soviet in the cultural fields, cultural exchanges, and the extension of East-West trade, have not brought freedom and independence to the captive nations. The Soviet bonds of political and economic subservience still exist; the Soviet goal of international communism and world domination has not been abandoned.

We must keep in mind that the captive nations have not lost their desire for freedom and independence. We must not allow the spirit of captive peoples to succumb to despair; we must keep their spirit and hopes alive. With this in mind, I have joined several of my colleagues in the House in introducing a resolution to establish a special committee on captive nations.

I want to call to the attention of all Members of the Congress my resolution, House Resolution 28, and similar resolutions, and urge the Committee on Rules to consider this proposal as soon as possible.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on the 17th of July 1959, in accordance with a joint resolution of Congress, President Eisenhower proclaimed the beginning of the first Captive Nations Week. This year President Johnson has designated the week of July 18 to July 24 as the seventh observance in this country of the plight of men and women in countries not yet free from foreign domination. I should like to bring this occasion to the attention of our fellow Americans, and I should like to ask free men all over the world to join us in our observance.

In these days of swift communication and rapid transportation, we are very much aware of the thoughts and feelings of men and women in all parts of the globe. We are familiar with opinions in France, in India, in Greece, and in Thailand. We meet visitors from Japan, Egypt, and Great Britain, and we visit their countries in return. In our own city of New York, representatives from states all over the world meet at the United Nations and rise to inform their colleagues and the rest of the world of their policies and philosophies.

Yet there remain still in this modern world millions of families unrepresented abroad, cut off by foreign rule from communicating with any other peoples. There remain states, strongly conscious of their national unity, forced to submit to alien control and to a denial of their nationalistic sentiments.

The beginnings of Russian imperialism go back many, many years: her smaller neighbors have for centuries struggled to preserve their autonomy. The origins of the present situation, however, go back specifically to 1939. On September 28 of that year, the Soviet Union began its aggression against Poland. In quick succession, western Ukraine, western Byelorussia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Bessarabia, and Bukovina were made subjects to Russian Communist rule. The nations of the Volga Germans, the Crimean Tartars, the Kalmyks, the Chechen-Ingush, the Kabardina-Balkars and the Karachai were liquidated. After the war, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary were made to submit to Soviet Communist domination.

Some of these nations have just recently begun to defy the Soviet regime in such strong terms that echoes of their protests have penetrated the Iron Curtain to reach the ears of the West. A new generation has arisen, not afraid of Stalinist techniques, to demand for its people the rights of autonomy and the chance to achieve economic well-being through a democratic form of government. The peoples of Eastern Europe feel acutely their national unity and long to resume their former positions as independent, responsible nations in a free world. They protest their obligations to give up their wealth to a foreign country when that country extends no approximately equal return of benefits; they resent the bonds of puritanical Communist philosophies; they bewail the stifling of creativity and individuality by the Communist doctrines; they desire to live once more as free human beings, responsible to no one but themselves and the rest of mankind as their brothers.

Yet there remain many nations—such as the Baltic States—entirely cut off, not only from the world outside the Iron Curtain, but also from each other. Lithuania, for example, was not allowed to receive any visitors from the west until 1959; to this day, there is only one city there open to western travelers. Other countries are divided by the iron hand of Communist imperialism: People who speak the same language and are related not only by a common culture and a common past but also by blood itself are not permitted to communicate with each other. Other nations are not even allowed the right to call themselves that, but are forced into a position as "states" in the Soviet Union itself.

The people of the United States come from all parts of the world and are proud of their varied origins. Many of them are closely related by blood to those millions in Eastern Europe trapped behind the Iron Curtain; but all Americans, no matter what their ancestry, are by their status as free, self-governing men incontestibly related to the still captive peoples of the world. We, who fought for autonomy and who will defend forever our democratic form of government, are committed to the establishment and preservation of freedom for all men, all over the world.

In more recent years we have come into contact with another manifestation of Communist imperialism, all the more shocking because it exists as a living, working, growing force this very minute. Imperialism is still advancing in the world, now under the auspices of Communist China, under the name of wars of liberation. The Red Chinese do not hesitate to make clear their intentions of bringing under their control all of southeast Asia. And they intend to accomplish this as quickly as possible, for the millions of China need food, and southeast Asia is all Asia's grain basket.

They are determined to win because they are nearing desperation; they are intensely in need of the natural riches of the southeast Asian countries, and they reason that they have little to lose in a struggle. They need to win, but the free world needs to win that the prosperious Thai farmer may not be reduced to the state of the Chinese peasant—

tired, uninspired, restricted in his every attempt to retain his individuality.

Why should the nations of southeast Asia resign their newly-won autonomy and surrender these riches to Red China? Why should they—still struggling to remove the traces of colonialism, to educate their people, to learn how to take full advantage of their natural resources, to realize their ideal of economic prosperity under democracy—why should these people be left unaided in their still-weak state to face the massive, greedy infiltrations of Communist China?

Red China simply took over Tibet. If its wars of national liberation do not succeed in southeast Asia, will it try to take over there, too? It is our responsibility as a free and wealthy people to support those nations in their efforts to stem the tide of Communist propaganda. We must help them now until they are able to stand completely alone against those who seek to enslave them. We must stand up to protect them, but we must also participate actively in their programs to educate all their people for democracy and economic prosperity.

We have long been independent; so has Thailand, whose name means, "land of the free." Can we realize the feelings of the Thai people when the Chinese announced that their country was its next object for infiltration and attempts to overthrow the government? These people have been self-governing for centuries and relatively prosperous almost as long. Especially since World War II, when it resisted the Japanese, just as it had formerly and successfully resisted any attempts at colonialization, Thailand has every day achieved a new height in economic development. Must it lose its ever-increasing prosperity to live in poverty under alien rule?

Yet Thailand, though strong and stable, is small—China by its sheer mass is a threat to its neighbors. We in America are a half-world away, but we too sense the menace of the giant in the east. For the sake of our own security as well as for the freedom of the small southeast Asian states, we are committed to resistance of imperialism in the 1960's. For the sake of freedom, for the privilege of democracy, we are determined to support enthusiastically the attempts of all captive nations, Asian, European, or American, to escape the bonds of communism and to reestablish the priceless rights and responsibilities of independence.

On this, the seventh observance of Captive Nations Week, it is well to remember that we do have, in this country, people and organizations who are constantly alert to the continued threat of the expansion of communistic propaganda spread and Communist domination of the few still free nations.

One of the many of such groups is the Assembly of Captive European Nations and another is the American Friends of the Captive Nations. At this point I would like to include the Captive Nations Week manifesto 1965 released by these organizations for the careful consideration of the Members of this honorable body.

The manifesto follows:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK MANIFESTO 1965

The undersigned organizations, dedicated to the restoration of freedom in the captive nations, call attention to Public Law 86-90, unanimously adopted in 1959 by the Congress of the United States, by which the third week of July of each year was designated as Captive Nations Week.

In our manifesto last year, we deplored the tendency in the west to exaggerate the changes which have occurred in some of the captive nations, and to misinterpret their cause. We warned that despite some relaxation of police state rule, some increase in consumer goods and some indications of increased independence, there had been as yet no basic political change in eastern Europe or elsewhere in the Communist world.

This remains true today. None of the fundamental political rights for which mankind has struggled through the ages has yet been restored to any of the captive peoples, including those within the Soviet and Chinese borders. We welcome such gains as there are because they reduce the immediate sufferings of the people, but the gains could disappear overnight.

During the past year, overoptimism in the west has increased in regard to eastern Europe. It is now often assumed that the trend toward freedom and independence in eastern Europe has been clearly established and has become irreversible. Many talk as if the return of freedom to the captive peoples is assured without further effort in the free world to protest the violation of solemn treaties, or press for the restoration of human rights. The same Communist satellite leaders who helped betray their countries to Soviet rule are now often pictured as patriots and nationalists who deserve our support.

Instead of continuing an economic and political policy of pressure on the Soviet Union and the Communist governments of eastern Europe to live up to their agreements, including the U.N. Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, more and more western countries are extending long-term credits without political conditions. Such a policy ignores the historical fact that it was outside pressure, coupled with the resistance of the captive peoples, and the continuing economic, and especially agricultural difficulties, which Communist rule produced, which forced the Communist regimes to grant the much lauded concessions to their peoples.

Long-term credits are a form of foreign aid. Whatever their immediate purpose, they help to finance economic development in Communist-ruled countries geared overwhelmingly to a rapid growth of the power sector at the expense of the consumer goods output. Thus, unless credits from the West are conditioned upon further concessions to the peoples of the Communist-ruled lands, they will serve to strengthen the peoples' chains, and simultaneously augment the threat to the security of the West. If the credits the Communist governments are seeking are granted without conditions, what incentive is there for the Communist regimes to make political concessions or to substitute for policies geared to the accumulation of power, policies aimed at the welfare of their subjects?

The unconditional long-term credits granted by some European countries direct to the U.S.S.R. are even less defensible, since they increase the ability of the Kremlin to finance its arms race with the free world as well as its worldwide subversion and "wars of liberation." We applaud the fact that the U.S. Government is opposed to such credits, and we earnestly hope that it will vigorously maintain this stand.

It has also become fashionable to assume that the split between the Soviet Union and Communist China makes China the Kremlin's No. 1 enemy; hence, the danger of Soviet aggression toward the West is over, at least for the present. This assumption has helped to further the complacency which has contributed to the division and decay of NATO.

It also encouraged the belief that the Soviets would restrain, rather than abet the aggression of Hanoi and Peiping in Vietnam. But events have proved otherwise. It is now clear that the Russians are trying to prove that they are more effective instigators of worldwide subversion than the Red Chinese themselves.

As for the satellites, only one country, Rumania, has made even a gesture of political independence from Moscow in matters of foreign policy, which is what most concerns us. In the others, support of Soviet foreign policy has been just as slavish as in the past, and the denunciations of the United States in connection with Vietnam and the Dominican Republic have been even more vicious.

The satellite governments, which we are now urged to trust with credits, continue their support of the Cuban economy in partnership with the Soviet Union. They continue to contribute to the training and arming of Latin American subversives, for whom Cuba is the base.

In Poland, the bitter protest of Cardinal Wyszinski and the Polish intellectuals, testify to the further erosion of the limited freedoms won in 1956. The clock has been turned back and the supposed trend reversed. In Russia itself, Stalin has been partly rehabilitated, anti-semitism has been stepped up, and the quarrel with Red China has been softened.

In these circumstances, we must repeat our appeal to the governments of the West to stand by their solemn promises to defend freedom where it still exists, and to extend it wherever possible. We call for no wars of liberation, but we do call for an unyielding military defense, plus a political and moral offensive to compel the Communists to uphold their treaty obligations and keep their promises of self-determination to the captive peoples.

We express our warm support for President Johnson's courageous stand in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic. Only by an absolutely firm military defense against the expansion of communism by force, combined with a political offensive on behalf of freedom, can we encourage the resistance by the captive peoples within the Soviet and Chinese empires, and by the threatened peoples along their borders.

In commemoration of Captive Nations Week:

We accuse the Soviet Union of violating its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nine nations made captive after World War II—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania;

We further accuse the Government of the U.S.S.R. of forcibly depriving the captive non-Russian peoples within its own borders of the promised rights of self-determination and of destroying the formerly independent states of Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, and others;

We urge that the Hungarian question be retained on the United Nations agenda until the U.N. Resolutions on Hungary have been complied with.

We urge the Governments of the United States and its allies:

1. To declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries, adopted by the United Nations on October 14, 1960, their support of the right of self-determination of all peoples held in captivity by the Communist imperial

system and, consequently, make this issue the permanent concern of the United Nations.

2. To recognize that any relaxation of tensions can only follow, not precede, the realization of self-determination through free elections in these captive nations; that there can be no end to the cold war as long as an Iron Curtain divides Europe.

3. To refuse to sign any nonaggression pact based on the present status quo, because this would legitimize and perpetuate the present injustices, and would be interpreted by the captive peoples as their final abandonment by the West.

4. To be always mindful of the proven fact that the Soviet Union and the satellite regimes seek to draw as much of the Western economic strength as they can from trading with the West. Accordingly, the West should use the tremendous bargaining power their economic strength provides in order to exact meaningful political concessions for the captive peoples and for the entire free world.

We appeal to the people of the United States of America, during Captive Nations Week, July 18–24, 1965, to manifest their awareness of the importance of their silent allies in the Soviet-subjugated lands to the worldwide conflict between the forces of liberty and Communist tyranny, and to pledge themselves to help them in their struggle for freedom and independence.

CHRISTOPHER EMMET,
Chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations.
VASIL GERMENJI,
Chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations.
Msgr. JOHN BALKUNAS,
President, Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent.

JUNE 21, 1965.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the distinguished minority leader, of course, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say with the deepest conviction that I have long admired the interest which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has had in the problems of captive nations. I commend him for his continuous efforts to point out forcefully and effectively the problem that has arisen in the world today because of the oppression by the Soviet Union against those nations that we categorize as captive nations.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania of my interest in his efforts in the cause of those who come from those unfortunately dominated captive nations of the world.

Mr. FLOOD. As usual, Mr. Speaker, the minority leader is very gracious and very kind. I might say that during the years that we have discussed this problem on this floor both sides of the aisle have always joined hands in support of this resolution. Many, many Members have joined me in introducing this resolution on both sides of the aisle, and they have done so again this year.

Mr. Speaker, I might add for the purpose of emphasis, this evening the National Captive Nations Committee will stage a very elaborate dinner. At this dinner certain awards will be made for the effort that we are discussing today. I will have the honor and the distinction of receiving one of those awards, and I hasten to add that the next award will be given for the same purposes and the same reason to the gentleman who has just spoke, the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate our very distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for taking this time today to pay fitting tribute to Captive Nations Week.

It is certainly fitting that the Captive Nations Assembly, which is having its annual banquet tonight, should single out the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for the distinguished award. I know of no Member of this Chamber who has worked as tirelessly and as long on behalf of some 180 million people who today are held in Communist bondage against their will in captive nations than the gentleman now in the well of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

His entire political career, and even before he entered into politics, is a continuing story of the tireless and unselfish efforts made on behalf of preserving the dignity of all people everywhere. When this world reaches that magnificent day when all nations enjoy the family of free nations, and when 180 million people now held captive in the captive nations regain their freedom, one of the first Americans who will be singled out for the praise of these people will be the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

I have known of his work for many years. It was through the gentleman that I was appointed to the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee, which wrote the first indictment against the Soviet Union for committing their acts of genocide against 15,000 Army officers in World War II. He was instrumental in getting through a committee that studied the plight of the three Baltic States. He is in the forefront for establishing a committee on captive nations. He was in the forefront in trying to get through the resolution which makes this possible in 1958, signed by President Eisenhower, until such time as these people are again free.

His entire record is one of inspiration for all of us to follow. He has been a source of courage to all of us because undoubtedly he has kept on this fight.

I say that here today is another reminder to these tragic victims of communism behind the Iron Curtain that the free world has not forgotten its commitment to these people and the conscience of the world cannot rest until these people are able to enjoy the same freedom that all of us enjoy in this country. I congratulate the gentleman, and I particularly hope and pray that he will be singled out tonight as that American who has done most in the cause of the captive nations, in freeing the people of the captive nations, by the Captive Nations Assembly.

I congratulate him and I only wish that he will preserve his health and himself so that he may be here when that glorious time comes when these grateful people will personally shower him with their great appreciation.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from Illinois is indeed gracious. It is true that while I was working with the captive nations and with the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee, the gentleman from Illinois who just spoke [Mr. PUCINSKI] the record should show, was my chief investigator and my interpreter. I assure you had it not been, during the investigations in Europe that went on for several months and in this country as well, for the indefatigable work of the gentleman from Illinois, who at that time was not a Member of Congress—he came back to Washington as a Member of Congress—had it not been for his important work on that committee, the committee would have been seriously curtailed, and the great psychological weapon that we used against the Soviets and against atheistic communism can be attributed to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI]. I am most grateful.

I now yield to my friend and neighbor from the State of Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE].

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this time to express my deepest congratulations to my neighbor, the Congressman now in the well, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

As he is honored tonight by the Captive Nations Assembly, certainly they pay honor to a man who has done more in my judgment than any single individual in either body of this great Congress to keep alive the light of conscience and the light of hope for so many people over whom has descended the long night of darkness.

It is a great pleasure for me to extend these compliments to my friend from Wilkes-Barre.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close by saying when they do honor tonight to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman FLOOD, they do honor to the effort he has made to try to bring the hope of freedom to these people who exist today in slavery in much of the world.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes me very happy. As I say, he is my neighbor. We were born and raised in the coalfields of Pennsylvania and we were born and raised with these people and their descendants for generations. We know whereof they speak. We know this problem and what is close to their hearts and their dreams and aspirations are close to our hearts.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the statement that he has made and associate myself with the gentleman's remarks.

I, too, was delighted to learn that the gentleman would be the recipient of the annual award of the Assembly of Captive Nations. I know there is no one in the Congress of the United States who over the years has been more devoted to this cause and who is more deserving of this honor.

I would like also to say that this is a time when this observance is even more significant than it has in the past when the great weight of public opinion has been with the gentleman. I think the opinion is still there but is somewhat quiescent at the present time. But it is still essential that the condition of the Baltic countries and of the captive nations generally be kept before the world and for that reason I compliment the gentleman for the effort he has made over the years.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman is very kind. I might say to the gentleman, during the years that he has been a Member of the House of Representatives and during the years I have been pressing this issue, as he is today on his feet, knowing this problem and these people as he does, he has never failed to be present and he has never failed to make his comments as he is making them today on this subject displaying the awareness that he has of this problem. I am most grateful to my colleague.

Mr. MONAGAN. Further, I would like to say, too, that many people who have come from captive nations areas or whose forebears came from those areas reside in the congressional district that I have the opportunity to represent. They have made an outstanding contribution to the economy and to the social fabric and growth of our area, and they have made us also more aware of the great reservoir of friendship that exists for the United States in the captive countries that we are speaking of here today.

Mr. FLOOD. Of course, that is in the very best American tradition.

Mr. MONAGAN. Yes, exactly.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the seventh anniversary of Captive Nations Week we must immediately look back to the untimely and tragic death of Ambassador Adlai Stevenson and to his role in keeping the peace through the U.N. For in the years that Mr. Stevenson served as Ambassador to the U.N., no new names were added to the roster of infamy, of those nations enslaved by the tyranny of communism.

With Ambassador Stevenson in the United Nations the Cuban missile crisis was settled an the Stanleyville rescue mission was successfully completed. He consistently articulated American policy and scored attempted Russian aggression. The cancer of communism was not allowed to spread in Latin America and it was not permitted to gain a foothold in Africa. Mr. Stevenson spent many years of his life valiantly exposing the true nature of communism in the hope that liberation would come to the captive nations. It is a profound shame that he could not have lived to see this.

Let us now establish the Captive Nation Committee so that Ambassador Stevenson's efforts will not have been in vain. Let us work so that free elections may be held in the enslaved states; so that the people may have a choice between democracy and totalitarianism. There is no doubt in my mind which choice they would make.

The people of East Germany are well aware that their "People's Republic" is a sham and a fraud—that the very basic right of freedom of movement is brutally denied them. The people of Poland, Hungary, and the Ukraine are denied the freedoms of speech, of religion, and of assembly. They too are aware that they cannot vote, that they cannot criticize the government.

The stark horror of the Hungarian rebellion of 1956 serves as a constant reminder of the vicious cruelty of the Soviet Government and of the martial conditions ever present in these countries. The story which Ambassador Stevenson told of Russian children pathetically licking cobblestones in hopes of finding some spilled jam vividly reminds us of the impoverished living conditions rampant in this Socialist republic.

However, there have been indications that Russia has been forced to recognize that it cannot continue in the path of total subjugation indefinitely. Soviet establishment of a council for mutual economic assistance is almost tacit admission that the Russian Government has acknowledged to itself that its economic brand of totalitarianism has failed. As the satellites yearn to break away from Russia's ubiquitous iron grip and as they attempt to economically align themselves with free Western Europe, Russia's hold over these nations will hopefully lessen and the way will be cleared for further democratic inroads.

It is then most imperative that a Captive Nations Committee be formed. I have cosponsored this legislation and have pledged myself to work for its enactment. We must make every effort to ascertain the true situation in these nations and we must—in a sense—strike while the iron is hot. For as these states show their dissatisfaction and as they cry out for the freedom which was once theirs and which is rightfully theirs, we cannot turn the other cheek. We cannot ignore the Russian dictatorship and totalitarianism. We must work—to make freedom an international byword and to make democracy an international reality.

Mr. FLOOD. I might say to my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, the only thing wrong with that statement is that I should have made it myself. It is most timely and certainly very much to the point. I am happy the gentleman brought to the attention of the House the late Adlai Stevenson, my very dear and beloved friend. It would be difficult for me to add to what the gentleman has said. It is so true.

Mr. PATTEN. We should repeat time and time again that our policy of commitments has saved Israel and has saved Berlin and has saved West Germany. It has saved the Congo and part of Africa. At this time when we are looking at our commitments, the whole world should be told that American commitments and our word to the United Nations have kept the peace and saved many free countries today.

Mr. FLOOD. Of course that is true. What the world should keep in mind is that Washington, D.C., is no longer just the Capital of the United States of America. Washington, D.C. is the capital of the world. That is the way it is and that is the way it is going to be from now on. My only concern is that someone may forget the fact.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to my very dear friend in this House, who serves on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, where she is now ranking minority member, the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman very much for the opportunity he has given me and others this afternoon to put a word into the RECORD for these nations still suffering so much.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentlewoman is gracious, as always. Can she remember as far back as when I served on her committee? She does not have to answer.

Mrs. BOLTON. I remember you so well. We had fun with you. We wish we had you on the committee still.

Mr. FLOOD. You are very sweet.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. I wish to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for spearheading again this year the recognition of Captive Nations Week and for his many efforts in behalf of the people who remain behind the Iron Curtain.

As a Representative of a district which has within it a great many families who originated in these captive nations and many persons with relatives who remain behind the Iron Curtain, I have an especial concern with this subject.

I also enjoyed the opportunity to have the late distinguished Adlai Stevenson as my constituent, as well as a friend and neighbor who resided within a few miles of my own home in Lake County, Ill. I also served with him, when he was Governor of Illinois, having served at that time in the Illinois General Assembly. I have followed his illustrious career of statesmanship and leadership, particularly in his role of Ambassador to the United Nations.

I take a great pleasure in participating in this ceremony today.

Mr. Speaker, it is entirely appropriate that the House of Representatives should set aside this time for observance of Captive Nations Week. The public recognition and emphasis provided by Representatives in the Congress has helped to focus broad citizen recognition on the plight of those people held in virtual captivity in the nations behind the Iron Curtain of communism.

The liberating influence of public opinion and this annual reminder from the free world have served to keep uncommitted nations from succumbing to the blandishments of Communist promises. Indeed, some measure of autonomy and individual expression has appeared in recent months in some of the satellite nations bordering the Communist world. These evidences have appeared in Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Poland, Yugoslavia, and even Hungary. Moreover, it has been interesting to note in recent weeks that the Soviet dictatorship has virtually abandoned its efforts to jam Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and other radio broadcasts from the West. This development has resulted also in printing news unfavorable to the Soviet Union in the daily press in contrast with the concealment of information in the past.

A personal struggle for liberation from Communist Poland was experienced by my constituent, George Pulczynski, an engineer at Abbott Laboratories in North Chicago, Ill., who won his own freedom after two escapes from World War II prison camps and recently succeeded in winning an 8-year battle for freedom for his brother, Waclaw.

George Pulczynski joined the Polish Army in 1928 at the age of 17. He learned architecture and mechanical engineering in the Poland Military Academy and was a captain when Hitler marched on Poland to set off World War II.

Later, while serving with a Polish Army unit in France, he joined the British Secret Service for counterespionage work in Hungary and Rumania.

When the Russians liberated Poland in 1944, George Pulczynski was high on their wanted list and they jailed his brother, Waclaw, for 18 months because they thought he was hiding George. In 1947 George was named to an allied commission to negotiate with Russia over the occupation of Germany. The East Germans arrested the whole commission, charged the members with conspiracy and proceeded to send Pulczynski back to Poland for indictment. George, fearing that he would be shot, broke away from his guards at the Poland border, hid without food for 36 hours on a tiny river island, then nearly drowned swimming across the Oder River to East Germany. Hiding by day and walking at night, he finally made his way to the Allied zone of Berlin.

Upon being admitted to the United States, his first job was as a design engineer for the Atomic Energy Commission in 1951. He later joined an engineering firm in Chicago and came to Abbott Laboratories in 1961.

Mr. Speaker, this is but one example of one family fighting its way to freedom from a captive nation. Our efforts, of course, are not to find refuge in the United States or other parts of the free world for citizens of these captive nations; our mission must be and is to liberate the captive nations themselves so that those countries which are now encircled by the Iron Curtain may soon see the light of human liberty and become free and independent nations.

Mr. Speaker, the 12th Illinois District, comprising Lake, McHenry, and Boone Counties, has extended the warm handclasp of friendship to many persons who have fled from such captive nations as Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Yugoslavia, and other such unfortunate countries. I speak on behalf of those many persons who have fled from Communist enslavement and have found freedom in the 12th District. I speak also for their children and other members of their families, both those who are here and those who have remained behind.

These persons, Mr. Speaker, have a personal and particular interest in this observance of Captive Nations Week. Our interest here today, the great efforts which our Nation is making, as well as the efforts of organizations and individual citizens in behalf of restoring freedom to these captive nations is of special significance to them and to me. I urge that these efforts be continued and increased to the end that freedom and independence may be restored in these nations.

Mr. FLOOD. I am glad the gentleman has participated. I might say that the Irish have an old expression, "Who has a better right to be here?" Certainly, with that narrative, judging from where the gentleman comes, who has a better right to be here on this subject?

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks the remarks of the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in this crucial era of international relations it is particularly important that we observe the seventh Captive Nations Week. It is a time to give strong support to nearly a billion people living under the choking yoke of Communist domination.

We must add a strong voice to the growing chorus of people in 2 dozen captive nations who represent a powerful deterrent against Soviet and Red Chinese aggression.

The hopes of freedom for the peoples of captive nations must be strengthened by our dedication to the premise that the Iron Curtain can be made a temporary barrier, not a permanent blockade against justice.

For eventual world peace we must renew our support for the cause of self-determination wherever nations are captive in the Communist Empire.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the week of July 18 to July 24 has been designated by the President as Captive Nations Week. I should like to bring this occasion once more to the attention of the American people and to that of freemen all around the world.

Today we are faced with two problems concerning the captive nations: One, to which world attention is directed, is the aggression of Communist powers in the underdeveloped areas of the world; the other, which is too often forgotten, is the plight of those nations already long under the domination of Communist regimes.

In the former case, we must continue to support the nations which Communist powers, especially China, are seeking to overrun. We must encourage those newly independent States of Africa in their struggle to resist Red Chinese propaganda and infiltration and to achieve economic stability under a democratic form of government. We must stand by those southeast Asian countries which China, as it has openly announced, seeks to conquer in the near future.

Yet we must also encourage those nations long guarded behind the Iron Curtain, those people almost completely cut off—by Soviet decree—from the rest of the world. We are beginning to hear voices raised behind the Curtain, clamoring for economic prosperity and a democratic way of life. Some have been partially successful in establishing contacts with the rest of the world; others, such as the Baltic States, remain totally isolated from each other, as well as from the West.

As a people who have for centuries enjoyed the priceless rights of democracy, it is our responsibility to reach out across both oceans toward those millions still shut off from us by the Bamboo and Iron Curtains. The American people must establish communications with the men and women of Lithuania, of Poland, of Bulgaria, of Cuba, of Tibet, of North Vietnam and North Korea, and all other captive nations, for much of their hope for a future in freedom rests upon our undiminished concern for them.

Through a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations, we hope to make contact with the world's captive millions. Under such a program we would achieve two major objectives: the first, to educate the people of America and the rest of the free world on the conditions in Communist-held countries and to encourage them to participate actively in establishing ties of friendship with their less fortunate brothers; the second, to bring to those people encouragement in their struggle for prosperity and, by example, to give fresh inspiration to their cries demanding independence from foreign domination.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues in the House upon the occasion of the seventh anniversary of Captive Nations Week.

Since the captive nations resolution was adopted by Congress in 1959, this annual observance has continued to grow both in scope and importance.

Millions of Americans who trace their origins to the captive nations, and to other lands, join each year during Captive Nations Week to express their support for policies that will bring the freedoms we enjoy to the peoples of their native and ancestral homes.

These millions do not seek war—but peace. They look for practical actions leading to the freedom of the captive nations as deterrents to war, as promotion of freedom, and as moves to assure world peace.

The captive nations resolution has proved to be a thorn in the side of Khrushchev, Mao, and company, because it has clearly brought to the attention of the whole world the full scope and ruthlessness of Communist imperialism. The Soviet bloc of Communist satellites constitutes a vast prison of captive nations, a land of subjugated peoples whose culture is being gradually destroyed, whose religious beliefs are trampled upon, and whose freedom and self-determination are ruthlessly denied.

Let us set the record straight. Soviet Russia is the largest colonialist, imperialistic, and aggressor nation on the face of the earth. And its leaders have the gall to hold themselves out as the anticolonialist, and further, to brand the United States what we are not, and Soviet Russia is.

The United States, victor in two major world wars, fought to preserve freedom and did not annex 1 inch of territory. And it gave massive aid to her adversaries to alleviate suffering and bring them to complete economic recovery.

Contrast this to Russia's record:

The Communists have attempted to dismiss our observance of Captive Nations Week with utter contempt—yet at the same time they try to abolish it by offering vague promises to improve American-Soviet relations. All of which points up their extreme sensitivity to this observance, and their own insesecurity about their imperialistic conquests.

To the East-Central Europeans, Captive Nations Week continues to be a beacon of hope. It expresses the free world's deep concern for those who have not been privileged to chart their own destiny. It is a tangible sign of the free world's relentless opposition to oppression. And, it offers a vivid reminder of who the real imperialists are in today's world.

We must commit ourselves to a goal of eventual freedom for the captive nations. We must support policies leading to eventual liberty and independence for captive peoples of East-Central Europe, Asia, and Latin America—and that includes Cuba.

I might mention here that I have again sponsored a resolution in this Congress providing for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The urgent need for such a committee is obvious. This committee would be specifically charged with giving particular attention to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over nations and peoples, and to means by which the United States can assist them in their present plight—and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms. The gathering of facts about Communist tyranny would serve as a hard-hitting weapon to explode the myths of Soviet unity and the Soviet national economy.

Let us go back for a moment to V–E day on May 8, 1945—just about 20 years ago. Many of you here will remember well that day.

When the Nazi nightmare ended, the liberation from oppression was not to include the 100 million people of East Central Europe. But they had hope. Had not the Yalta Declaration, scarcely 3 months before V–E day, guaranteed free elections in all liberated lands? Both Presidents Roosevelt and Truman had rejected the concept of spheres of influence that Stalin had favored as a basis of postwar order.

But what happened? The United States began to demobilize, and its military program shifted to peaceful aims. Both American and British action in behalf of the rights of Eastern European nations to free and impartial elections soon became nothing more than weak formal protests.

These Communist-controlled regimes, forcibly imposed, were recognized—even allowed to sign peace treaties, and to join the United Nations in spite of their lack of proper qualifications under the U.N. Charter.

And, yet, the will of these people to regain freedom remains steadfast. The greater their suffering, the more determined they are that a day will come for their country's liberation.

The ideological and political fight of the young generation in the Ukraine, and the other subjugated countries, in literature, art, and science, proves that the idea of nation, religion, tradition, human dignity, and love for freedom has remained vitally alive.

The intensified national fight for freedom and independence on the part of the captive nations is paralyzing the continuation of the direct conquest of the Russian imperialists, who are becoming more and more aware of the possibility of an internal collapse of their empire.

With Khrushchev's fall, a whole class of leaders, who no longer meet contemporary Russian needs, are being systematically replaced. A young class of leaders will seize power—a class which did not go through the October 1917 revolution, but which well endeavor to vitalize and expand the empire. The generation of Shelepin, of Semischasny, and younger Russian military men are forcing their way into power. The renewal of the Russian tyranny class will endeavor anew to save the empire.

Through various reports, we have learned that there has been some relaxation of the police state rule in the past year or so; some increase in consumer items; some indications of increased independence in these captive nations.

But, as yet, there has been no basic political change in Eastern Europe or elsewhere in the Communist world.

None of the fundamental political rights for which patriots such as Taras Shevchenko, and many others, struggled for has yet been restored to any of the captive peoples, including those within the Soviet and Chinese borders.

It is ironic—and tragic—that the wardens of the Communist prison of nations are today raising their voices in anguish about alleged U.S. intervention in Vietnam and Santo Domingo.

We hear talk that the trend toward liberation and freedom in Eastern Europe has been established, and will continue to grow.

It is inferred that independence of these captive peoples is imminent, and requires no further effort on the part of the free world.

We hear that the rift between the Chinese Communists and the Soviets make them arch enemies and, therefore, we do not need to worry about the danger of Soviet aggression.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

We only invite aggression against free peoples by any apparent lack of will to defend, and, indeed, to live up to our own protestations by seeking to expand the areas of freedom in the world.

There is some evidence that such impressions of weakness encouraged the North Koreans to attack South Korea; and misled Khrushchev into believing that he could place long-range missiles in Cuba without incurring any risk of significant American opposition.

Several aspects of the present political situation in the U.S.S.R. are especially worth noting.

First, the reins are being tightened to prevent a collapse of the empire.

Second. Shelepin, the chief of the KGB, is headed for the throne.

Third. A new Russian elite is addressed to the Russian Nation which alone can respond to the ideals of Russian chauvinism, and visions of new conquests. The rehabilitation of Cheka is seen as a logical consequence.

Fourth. The new Russian elite can hardly justify its position internally by imposing the Russian rule and way on the enslaved nations. Therefore, one should expect increased aggression outside the U.S.S.R.

Shelepin appears as the main spokesman for this policy. His seizure of power is being carefully prepared with a view to assuring smoothness and continuity of events.

The Russian Communist system, whether under Lenin, Stalin, Malenkov, Khrushchev, Breshnev, or Shelepin, remains unchangeable. Neither a boastful nor a silent man can touch the central core of this system.

The violent overthrow of the whole system is the only solution. National revolutions—that is the national liberation wars of the captive nations enslaved by Russian imperialism and communism—are a possible alternative to an atomic war, which can be averted through the active support, including military assistance, of the free world to the national revolutions in the captive countries. Liberation of the captive nations, and not disarmament of the free world—hold an decisive resistance to Russian Communist aggression, and not appeasing it—this is the urgent requirement for the West today.

Such is the spirit of the captive nations resolution enacted by the U.S. Congress in 1959. In essence, this resolution supports the breakup of the Russian Empire, the restoration of the state sovereignty to all the captive nations in the U.S.S.R., and its extended territorial empire.

Within the framework of this unity of the free world and the captive nations, against Russian Communist imperialism, is to be found the only potential force which can eliminate and completely annihilate Russian Bolshevism—without which there can be no peace in the world.

And so we see, as I said in the beginning. Russian imperialism is the most brutal form of colonialism ever known in mankind's history. It constitutes the greatest threat to the peace and security of the world, as well as to the independence of nations and individuals. It must be combatted by the combined forces of all mankind.

Surely, we cannot continue forever to live in the present competition between free and closed societies, between the concepts of a world run by a single political-economical-social system and a world of independent nations of free people. One or the other will gain in the competition and dominate the minds of men. If we do not advance toward freedom for all, we must, inevitably, be forced to retreat toward tyranny for all.

Russia retreats only under the pressure of force. Therefore, we, in the free world, we in the United States, shall support the national liberation idea—that is, the dismemberment of the Soviet Russian Empire, and the restoration of the national independence of the enslaved nations. Then, and then only, can we look for a lasting peace and security in the world.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, this year we have celebrated the 20th anniversary of the end of World War II, a war we fought to liberate peoples from totalitarianism. As we observe Captive Nations Week, we must reflect upon the great numbers of people who have not been liberated.

At the end of World War II we proclaimed the right of liberated peoples to determine in free and open elections the kind of government and life they would live. This right is today no more a reality than it was 20 years ago.

We must never lessen our pressure upon the Soviet Government to live up to their agreements; we must increase that pressure. To abandon the enslaved peoples of the captive nations would be to abandon the very tenets upon which our own United States was founded.

Our every action is watched by these captive peoples as they cling to their hopes and determination to once again be free. To lessen our determination that communism shall not be further foisted upon unwilling subjects such as in southeast Asia, would be a sign to the captive nations of today that our deeds do not match our words.

While the day-to-day life of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain may be a little less onerous, this is true only because the Soviets have found this policy a better method than the former one of austerity almost to the point of torture. The Soviets are opportunists who, on the surface, may change, but the deep, basic, ultimate goal of world domination remains unchanged. If we should ever forget this, we know what the consequences would be.

Every day of the year and in every deed we must show to the world, especially the Soviets, that we will never abandon the peoples of the captive nations and their wish and right to self-determination. Let every day be Captive Nations Day while we set aside this one week to reaffirm our daily goal.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with a joint resolution of Congress, the President has designated the week of July 18 to July 24 as this Nation's seventh observance of Captive Nations Week. This is a matter which demands the support of all freemen and deserves to be studied closely by all Americans.

Today we often hear the term "imperialist," and it is most often applied to the United States by the Communist Chinese. They accuse us of seeking territory in Africa and in southeast Asia especially; the peoples of those countries, who still remember clearly the indignities of colonialism, must be tricked into seeing the United States as a land-hungry power. The purpose of such propaganda is, of course, to hide the presence of the only real imperialism in the world today: that of Communist China. We seek to win friends and to help those nations just beginning on the road toward industrialization, education for all, and true democracy; but the only country that seeks land is Red China, which is desperately in need of the vast natural resources of southeast Asia, especially its rich paddy fields.

As free citizens of a wealthy nation, it is our privilege and our responsibility to help the less stable countries of the world to achieve economic independence to complement their political independence. We must not abandon those who are not yet strong enough to face alone the vast infiltrations and massive propaganda from Red China. We must not let the countries of southeast Asia or of sub-Saharan Africa fall into the position of Poland or Lithuania or Bessarabia.

During and for several years after the Second World War, the Soviet Union accomplished its longstanding desire to bring under its direct control all the nations of Eastern Europe. The world was preoccupied and exhausted at the time, the Soviet Communists had little trouble in conquering their neighbors, from Estonia to Rumania. Some countries were left intact though placed under direct Soviet supervision; others lost all rights to call themselves one people united under their own government, and were forced to exist as "states" in the Soviet Union; others were split in half, cut off from their own people, indeed from their own families. Thousands of men and women were killed for resisting Russian aggression or for voicing any view not exactly tailored to Communist doctrine; even more were deported. The people of these nations became captives of the Soviet Government, restricted in every way by the Communist hand.

Only recently have we in the United States been made aware of the conditions behind the Iron Curtain: the situation there is no longer that of 1940 or of 1950. A new generation has arisen, and it is not afraid of terrorist communism. The young people of Eastern Europe resent their captivity and refuse to accept it, as so many of their parents were forced to learn to do. They are insisting on independence for their people; they long for the opportunity to work for their own country, to lead it toward economic prosperity under a democratic form of government.

We, as freemen, are committed not only to preserving the newly won freedom of the African and Asian nations, but also to supporting and encouraging in every way possible all attempts by the captive peoples of Eastern Europe to reestablish their autonomy and individual freedoms.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of my remarks made at the memorable seventh Captive Nations Day observance on Sunday, July 18, in Kenosha, Wis. It was an honor for me to join my esteemed colleague, Congressman ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, of Illinois, in participating with our friends from the Baltic nations in a demonstration of our unswerving determination never to submit to the permanent captivity of the Communist Empire nations.

I wish to especially commend Jonas Milisauskas of Kenosha, who, with his fine committee, arranged an outstanding and impressive tribute to his fellow countrymen and all others who lived and live under the yoke of tyranny.

My comments on that occasion follow:

> America's greatness is a result of the contribution of a great number of people from a great number of nations. Whether it be the English who settled New England or the Spanish who settled New Mexico or the French who settled New Orleans, each nation in its own time, in its own way, and in its own place, has added its part to making America great. To you people from the Baltic nations, while you have already contributed much in the settlements of our country, and its growth, and its development, you have—in my opinion—a strong role to play both in the present and in the future.
>
> For to you—perhaps more than to any other group—goes the responsibility of keeping us alerted to the perils and the ambitions of the communistic countries.
>
> Today, we are commemorating an event which took place 25 years ago—one quarter of a century. At that time, as your Communist neighbors overran the Baltic nations, it was said and thought and believed that this occasion would not be forgotten.
>
> And yet, as the years have gone by, it has been forgotten, or at least the memory of it has been dimmed.
>
> Among you are a great many who saw these actions at firsthand. Among this group today there are many and perhaps all who had relatives who suffered through those dark days. To you who witnessed this or who have heard about it from relatives, the cruelty of it will linger on.
>
> Twenty-five years ago, after violating all treaties with your nations and moving in with military force, Russia took over all of the decisionmaking authority and imposed her political will on your conquered nations. This pattern of activity still exists by the Communists today, so I say to you that your challenge, your contribution to America, is to keep alive the memory of the methods of the Communist invaders, to show to the American people the dangers which exist in yielding to countries of this type. Yours is the challenge of keeping America alert.
>
> Yes, and your role can even be a larger one, because throughout the world there is a disturbing fact that the people of underdeveloped nations, those who are most susceptible to the Communist propaganda, have been misled by the Communists to the point where they believe that America and America's friends are the imperialists and the invaders. Through your knowledge and through the experiences of your Baltic States, it is you, my dear friends, who can correct this distorted image of America and her purposes; it is you who can bear testimony that the force which would shackle other nations in the world is not "our American democracy" as the Communists would claim—rather, it is the Soviet Union and its supporters within the Communist world. This is the message which must be given to the underdeveloped areas of the world. This, because of the experience your nations have suffered and which you as a people have

suffered, is the challenge I leave with you today.

Mr. **CUNNINGHAM**. Mr. Speaker, this week we are commemorating for the seventh year Captive Nations Week. It is fitting and proper that we should set aside our legislative duties for a few moments to pay tribute to those peoples who are today living under Communist domination. There can be no doubt that if all the peoples within the Communist world were given the free exercise of their natural right of self-determination, all would reject communism and establish some system of government wherein the values of democracy would be preeminent. I make this claim with confidence, because I know that within man's soul there is a fundamental inclination to seek what is good, and to seek what is good is to seek, first of all, freedom.

Unfortunately, the peoples held captive by communism have no free choice. Every facet of their lives is controlled by the totalitarian state. They are a suppressed majority, for in the system of communism there can exist one only simple relationship and that is between the ruled and the ruler, the whipped and the whippers.

What shall be the future destiny of these peoples whose lives are really not their own, we just do not know. Historically, it can be seen that tyrannies decay of their own corruption and the free spirit of man inevitably reasserts itself. Perhaps, this is our great hope; indeed it must be. And thus to all peoples now held captive under communism we of the Free World express our solicitude for their welfare and proclaim again this great hope of ours that one day they will be free.

Mr. **NELSEN**. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week, authorized by the Congress in 1959, is being held July 18–24 this year. As a member of the advisory committee to the National Captive Nations Committee, I am proud, of course, to participate again in this national recognition of the plight of nearly a billion people locked away from the free world in over two dozen countries.

We must not make the mistake of forgetting these millions of people, so brutally subjected to Communist tyranny and brutality. Their love of freedom is not dead. It did not end with the brutish repression of the uprising in Poland. Or East Germany. Or Hungary. Because the fundamental right of all peoples to self-determination, to construct their own political institutions guaranteeing individual and political freedom, cannot be permanently crushed.

Almost daily we are reminded of this great continued determination to be free. Cubans are risking their lives in poorly equipped boats to escape their Communist prison and come to America. East Germans take severest risks to overcome the Communist wall in East Berlin.

So it well behooves our Nation to keep alive the hopes of all those still behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, and to assure them of America's strongest support for all those things to which freemen are committed.

Mr. **FARBSTEIN**. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words of recognition and remembrance in behalf of the once proud and free nations of Eastern Europe now burdened and enslaved by Communist rule. Today, in commemoration of Captive Nations Week, established by act of Congress, let us remember as they once were Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Bulgaria, the Ukraine, Georgia, and Armenia.

Let us remember them as free and independent states, numbering over 100 million persons in their populations. Let us recall the many different languages and customs and literatures of Eastern Europe which once highlighted a richly varied and diversified cultural environment. Let us remember that the peoples of Eastern Europe bore the heaviest brunt of World War II for more than 5 years and that their homelands were among the most ravaged parts of the Continent.

They fought the Nazi oppressors and sacrificed their lives by the millions with one single goal in mind—that when peace came they might be rewarded with freedom and independence.

But everyone knows what happened when the war ended. There was no independence. The light which war had snuffed out was not rekindled. To replace the tyranny of the Nazis there was imported the tyranny of the Soviet Union. The cultural richness of Eastern Europe was stultified by the cultural vacuum of a drab, colorless, and thoroughly alien ideology—communism.

For example, the Soviet Union and the satellite governments have shamelessly practiced discrimination against the Jewish population, denying their right to worship and study and observe their customs and ceremonies. Every effort has been made by the Communists to promote anti-Semitism, just as they try to denigrate other ethnic groups and attempt to impose a monotonous cultural homogeneity. Sir Winston Churchill spoke the truth when he said that an Iron Curtain had effectively isolated East from West.

The nations of eastern Europe have not borne the burden of communism lightly. There have been abortive attempts to throw off the yoke of Communist domination in Hungary, Poland, and East Germany. But each time rebellion in the name of freedom and self-determination has been ruthlessly crushed. The nations of eastern Europe remain captive to this day.

This is not to say it will always be so. This Congress continues to hope and believe in the eventual freedom of the captive nations. Their fate has been of serious concern to this Government since the end of the war. We await the day when the fundamental political rights for which mankind has struggled through the ages are restored to the captive peoples.

Freedom for the captive nations will not come about by itself. Much is to be gained by continuing to subject the Soviet Union and other Communist governments to the wholesale disapproval of world public opinion. It is well known that public condemnation of the manner in which the eastern European nations have been made to suffer under communism has resulted in a number of meaningful concessions which have made the lives of the people somewhat more bearable. We must, and we will, continue to exert this kind of influence in order that we may help our friends behind the Iron Curtain. It is a great source of hope to them that we speak out, that we care, that we remember.

I believe I am expressing the sentiment of every Member in this body when I say that we will never resign ourselves to the status quo. We will never regard as legitimate the present injustice perpetrated upon the eastern European nations. We believe that there can be no end to the cold war, no lasting peace, as long as such injustice exists to alienate East from West.

Mr. **PRICE**. Mr. Speaker, the ancient struggle between nations has temporarily brought the nations of eastern Europe under the iron control of the Soviet Union. Had Hitler won the war, no doubt they would have been under Nazi control—and, for that matter, would have been under the Kaiser's control had the Kaiser won the First World War of this century.

We must not make the error of believing that control of satellites is always and inevitably a sign of great strength. It is, to a considerable degree, a sign of weakness—a fear that unless they are held down they will turn against you.

But when you try to hold down the populations of proud and independent nations, that is an element of potential weakness, too. How does the outside aggressor know whether—and when—the populations will rise against him?

There are tens and scores of millions of people in the eastern satellites, some scores of millions within the Soviet Union itself, the peoples of the borderlands besides, who have no disposition whatever to be controlled by Soviet domination. They represent a deterrent against reckless action and even in their captivity they are a formidable force for peace.

It is wise policy for us to refuse to accept the situation behind the Iron Curtain as a permanent one, as the late President Kennedy said, and as President Johnson and other national leaders have said before and since.

The 86th Congress approved the idea of celebrating Captive Nations Week as a time for observing the plight of the satellites, and also as a means of restating our own dedication to the ideal of a world in which no people is held in bondage by a neighboring power that happens to be somewhat stronger.

Let us continue to recognize that we must not accept the present state of the world along the Soviet and Chinese borders as a permanent one, but must play our part to keep hope alive and the spirit of freedom burning.

Mr. **McDADE**. Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session of Congress, I placed before the House a bill to create a Committee of the Captive Nations. Many of my colleagues joined me at that time in urging the Congress to take this action. To date, nothing has been done, and I think this to be a tragedy.

In a line stretching from the Baltic to the Black Sea, there is a veritable ocean of people who have fallen under the evil rule of communism. For many of them, they have even had their own national identity destroyed on the map of Europe—the Ukraine, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Even in maps printed in the Western World, these countries are no longer listed as nations of the world, as though they had somehow disappeared off the face of the earth.

For others, the names of the countries are still there, but the people are no longer living under the governments they would choose if they had their own freedom.

We remember what was done by communism in Poland. We remember that when the Soviet Union occupied Poland during the Second World War, 10,000 intellectual leaders of the great nation of Poland were taken into the Katyn Forest and were massacred, so that there would be no leadership left in Poland at the end of the Second World War to help lead these people to freedom.

We remember the people of Hungary. We remember the line of murderous Soviet tanks that moved with inexorable force to destroy the men who rose to snatch back their freedom from the slavery of communism.

We also remember Czechoslovakia. We remember the murders that were used to take over the government of that nation at the end of the Second World War.

We could go down the entire list of these nations, from the northern end of the Iron Curtain to the southern end, and in each nation we can find the story of murder, of oppression, of subversion, to deliver each nation into the hands of communism.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we must pause for a moment to consider what it means to oppose communism. It is proper for us to do so. We now have nearly a hundred thousand men under arms opposing it in South Vietnam.

We do not oppose a name. What we say is that communism is an evil political and philosophical system that destroys human dignity, human freedom, and even destroys human enterprise.

We say to the nations of the world that if they are foolish enough to embrace communism, they will find themselves crushed in that embrace. They will find their bodies and their souls in slavery, and they will even find their economies destroyed by an economic philosophy that has nothing to do with the realities of human nature.

It is interesting to note that the Communist nations of the world are learning that bitter lesson.

In the Soviet Union, after the sounds of many trumpets and the brazen blaring of false promises, they are now trying to achieve in this year the things they promised 5 years ago but could not produce. Last year when I spoke of the captive nations, Khrushchev was almighty in the Soviet Union. I said then that history would wash him down the drain just as it had washed away Stalin. I did not know how quickly it would be done. There are new masters now in the Kremlin—but there are the same people in slavery.

Throughout Eastern Europe, too, a disillusionment is just beginning to set in. Every day we pick up the paper and read of one more step taken by Rumania, or Hungary, or Poland, or Czechoslovakia away from the total domination of the Soviet Union. Every day we see them inching down the window toward the east, and opening slowly the window toward the west.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress can do something to open that window to the West more rapidly. There are a great number of programs presently in operation to bring the eastern European nations back into the great western tradition, where they belong. But we could concentrate all those efforts in one unit by the creation of a Captive Nations Committee that might study, and seriously study, what steps might be taken to bring these nations back in the direction of western progress, away from the depressing influence of Marxian communism.

We do not covet the lands of Eastern Europe. Nothing would please us in America more than to see those lands growing crops even more abundantly.

We do not desire military alliances with the nations of Eastern Europe. As a matter of fact, we are today in possession with such a vast arsenal of deadly weapons that even after taking the devastation of a total atomic attack, we would still be in possession of weapons powerful enough to destroy any enemy or combination of enemies in the world.

We do not fear the industrial growth of Eastern Europe. As a matter of fact, the more industrial growth there is in any nation, the more the products of American industry are in demand. Their growth would enrich us.

Finally, and most vitally, we do not seek to dictate political decisions in Eastern Europe. We have learned to live in unity with kingdoms, with socialist governments, with democracies—with conservative governments, with liberal governments, and with governments dominated by parties in the middle. We can learn to live with any political entity imaginable—but not with slavery.

What we seek for Eastern Europe is not our good, but their good. We seek only that they should aspire to freedom and greatness as we may aspire to freedom and greatness in the western world.

The Iron Curtain is showing tatters already. The Soviet Union is in no position to do any extensive tailoring right now. She has her hands full with her far eastern allies. I believe we could do much to help tear down that curtain completely.

I ask you, my colleagues, to help bring this bill to the floor of the Congress. Let us form a committee that may work day and night at exploring all the ways through which more freedom might be won for the peoples of Eastern Europe.

For many years these people have been countless, voiceless, hopeless. Now they are, for the first time in a generation, seeing the first glimmer of hope. It is within our power to do those thing which might bring them to the full sun of freedom.

They are still voiceless. But through this Congress they may yet have the most powerful voice in the world speaking for them.

They are still countless. But how splendid it would be, when the final gavel came down on the 89th Congress, if men could say that somewhere in Eastern Europe there were countless voices raised in prayer for this Congress because we had given them a voice and a new hope—not in selfishness, not for political opportunism, but because they are our brothers, and our brothers should be free.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for bringing this important matter of captive nations before this body. When on July 17, 1959, Congress approved a joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating the third week of July as Captive Nations Week and to issue a similar proclamation each year, our Government was actively encouraging the captive nations to keep alive their hopes of eventual freedom from Communist slavery. The first proclamation, issued that same day by President Eisenhower, unequivocally condemned the "imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism" and twice referred to the "Soviet-dominated nations."

I am certain that such direct language was exactly what the Congress had in mind when the resolution was passed. It is a cause for deep concern that the trend of the past few years in issuing Captive Nations Week proclamations seems to be toward sparing the tender feelings of the Communist overlords rather than giving encouragement to the people still under their rule. The 1965 Captive Nations Week proclamation does not carry the word communism, or name any captive nations, or say what nation is holding others captive. It is well to remember that the resolution called on the President to proclaim the observance each year until "such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world." It is doing little more than paying lip service to the ideas of "freedom and independence" unless our Government specifies freedom for whom, and from what.

I would like also to call attention once again to the subject of creating a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Resolutions for this purpose have been before the Committee on Rules since 1961, but action has been delayed largely because of the inflexible opposition of the State Department.

It is hard for me to understand this opposition. The existence of the captive nations—and the fact of their actual subjugation—is an embarrassment to the Soviets. Understandably, they prefer not to talk about these matters. Just as understandably, the United States should prefer to talk about them and to take every reasonable means to bring them to the attention of the rest of the world.

Yet we shy away from discussing this and we allow the Soviets to remain on the offensive. I cannot help but wonder if we have lost our sense of direction when I hear our Government officials speak of the benefits of increased East-West trade, more dialog, and the need to develop areas of mutual interest.

Almost 150 years ago Greece was a captive nation. The birthplace of democracy and origin of many of the basic tenets of western political thought was under the rule of the Turks. One of the greatest poets in the English language, Lord Byron, wrote:

> "The mountains look on Marathon
> And Marathon looks on the sea
> And musing there an hour alone
> I dreamed that Greece might still be free."

Byron did more than muse and dream. He spoke, and he acted, and he died in Greece, but Greece did become a free country. We cannot hope to speak with such eloquence, but we must speak and we must act. To do less would be a betrayal of the millions in the captive nations who look to us for their eventual freedom, as we are their only hope.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a high honor for me to join my colleagues in the observance of Captive Nations Week. I want particularly to commend our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] not only for reserving this time so we might comment on the meaning and importance of this observance but for his great leadership in this fight over the years.

This week is important if only because it serves to remind us of what work remains to be done. It reminds us that in addition to halting further Communist domination, we must continually dedicate ourselves to the reestablishment of freedom in those nations overrun by the ruthless Communist dictators who took advantage of the confusion during the terrible events of World War II to extend their own empire at the expense of freedom-loving peoples in neighboring nations. These illegal acts continued until it was learned by the nations of the free world that none would remain free for long if individual nations were left at the mercy of the Communist giant. We must reaffirm our faith that Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Ukraine, all will be free again from Communist slavery.

We have learned that we must stand up against the Communists. And perhaps the best way to dispel the doubts of those who tell us that the ultimate sacrifices our young men are making today in Vietnam are not worthwhile is to describe to them the conditions in these captive nations.

The religious persecution—churches turned into factories and warehouses; the economic exploitation—industry and business turned over to Russian administrators; and the political castration—installation of Russian puppets and the establishment of Communist rule with the end of free elections, are all tragic examples of what we seek to prevent in Vietnam and what we must not permit to continue indefinitely in the captive nations themselves.

However, perhaps the greatest danger these people face today is to be forgotten, to not only suffer the indignities but to suffer them without hope that justice will someday return, to think that we who remain free do not care.

Today we here in Congress can help make it clear that the United States does care, that we share their hope to be free again, and that we will not forget them.

Neither shall we allow other independent nations and freedom-loving peoples—whether it be in Vietnam or the Dominican Republic—to fall under the Communist yoke and behind an iron or bamboo curtain where both individuals and nations lose their identity and their dignity.

For these reasons I have joined my colleagues not only in calling for and observing this week, but in sponsoring a resolution which would establish a Captive Nations Committee to bring full focus upon a problem that we in the United States and freedom-loving people everywhere must fully understand and never forget.

Sometimes we are tempted to forget unpleasant circumstances. Too little attention is paid; too little is widely known about the conditions in the captive nations. And yet it is this kind of society that the Communists seek to sell throughout the world.

The true facts and the conditions as they really exist should be made clear to all those who are asked to make the choice of which type of society they wish to be a part; and these same facts should be known and remembered by those who question whether the sacrifices we have made over the years and which we will probably be required to continue to make for several years to come are worthwhile.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, these moments we take today and the events of this week, while somber in tone, are not eulogies for past events but rather pledges for the future—pledges for justice and independence for the peoples of the captive nations. And it is with a deep sense of commitment that I join my colleagues in this pledge to the courageous peoples of the captive nations.

Mr. Speaker, it is especially appropriate that as a memento of this week our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], is being honored tonight with a special award from the Assembly of Captive European Nations at a banquet at the National Press Club. We all join in congratulating him on this well deserved hour. Well done, Dan.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, for the past 6 years this Nation has been annually reaffirming its support of some 20-odd, once free, nations who continue to suffer under the heavy hand of Communist takeover.

When President Eisenhower first proclaimed Captive Nations Week—following the prompting of a congressional resolution—this country publicized its abhorrence of the heavy-handed methods by which sovereign nations were being held in virtual enslavement, which thereupon became the rallying cry of persecuted people everywhere, reechoing our own Declaration of Independence of 1776.

The favorite tactic adopted by aggressive communism, when confronted with America's resistance to the spread of that pernicious doctrine, has been to hurl the charge "colonialism" and to indict us with imperialistic motives. The fact remains, however, that in the last quarter century we have spent over 100 billion in treasure and committed the lives of millions of our citizens to the cause of freedom around the world, and without the acquisition of a single acre of territory.

Today the Communist colossus stands condemned as the greatest colonial power of all time. Today the repressive methods employed throughout the Communist empire keep countless millions in a state of serfdom. And at this very moment, Americans are fighting and dying to stave off further encroachment upon a free people in Vietnam. Let us then, with all of the religious fervor that we have displayed in the defense of our own liberties, pledge our fortunes and our honor to the ultimate liberation of those whom we respect as sovereign peoples, even though at the moment they may be held captive.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the 1965 Captive Nations Week has gotten off to the best start yet in the series of seven observances since 1959. As substantial indications of this, I request that the following impressive material be printed at this point in the Record: First, the proclamations of the week issued by Governor John H. Chafee, of Rhode Island, Governor James A. Rhodes of Ohio, Governor Mark O. Hatfield of Oregon, Governor Warren P. Knowles of Wisconsin, Governor Grant Sawyer of Nevada, and Governor John A. Love of Colorado; second, also the proclamations by Mayor Theodore R. McKeldin of Baltimore, Mayor Thomas G. Currigan of Denver, Mayor Dr. William K. McBride of Harrisburg, Mayor L. Bracken Lee of Salt Lake City, Mayor Wendell E. Hulcher of Ann Arbor, Mayor Nick Nuccio of Tampa, Mayor Otto Festge of Madison, Mayor M. E. Sensenbrenner of Columbus, Mayor Nelson Howarth of Springfield, Mayor Elmer Rasmuson of Anchorage, and Mayor Marian S. Erdmann of Great Falls, Mont.; and third, an Associated Press report on the President's proclamation of July 3, significant releases issued by the National Captive Nations Committee, datum on the Georgetown University Forum on the Captive Nations, the reaction of two Red puppets to the annual observance, which appeared in the June issue of the Ukrainian Bulletin, the Philadelphia Inquirer on the observance in the City of Brotherly Love, the United Press International report on the honorary chairmanship of AFL–CIO President George Meany to the National Captive Nations Committee, and a concise, informative article on the week, titled "Along the Red Front" in the VFW magazine of July 1965 and written by Mr. Donald L. Miller, the executive director of the National Captive Nations Committee:

State of Rhode Island and
Providence Plantations,
Providence.

Proclamation by John H. Chafee,
Governor, on Captive Nations Week

Since the end of the First World War over 25 European and Asian nations ranging from

Albania to Tibet have been taken over by Communist regimes. Today many nations are close to being taken over by the Communists.

These regimes rule by fiat. There are no free elections. The basic freedoms of speech, press, assembly, and association are denied.

The peoples of the captive nations of the world would overthrow their governments if they could and they look to the United States to help them: Now, therefore, do I John H. Chafee, Governor of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, proclaim the week of July 18–24, 1965, as Captive Nations Week and urge the citizens of Rhode Island to observe this week.

By the Governor:

JOHN H. CHAFEE,
Governor.
AUGUST P. LAFRANCE,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF OHIO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Columbus.

PROCLAMATION: CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 18–24, 1965

Whereas the harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive: Now, therefore,

I, James A. Rhodes, Governor of the State of Ohio, do hereby designate the week of July 18–24, 1965, as Captive Nations Week and urge that all citizens support this annual recognition of the plight of the oppressed peoples of Eastern Europe.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Salem, June 30, 1965.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The right of all peoples to self-determination as to their form of government, and to freely pursue their economic, social, and cultural development is one dear to all Americans; but it is a right denied to millions throughout the world who have been subjugated and enslaved by Communist aggression.

It is fitting that we in the United States recognize and honor those oppressed citizens of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and elsewhere whose desire for liberty and independence constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war, and who are presently denied the opportunities of freedom.

Captive Nations Week, which will be observed during the period July 18–25, 1965, under authority of Public Law 86–90, provides a means whereby all Americans may remember the peoples of these once-free countries, and reaffirm our determination to honor agreements and otherwise work toward establishment of democratic processes in such areas.

I urge each of our citizens during Captive Nations Week to join with the National Captive Nations Committee and others in appropriately observing this period, through the offering of prayers and otherwise supporting efforts toward peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

MARK O. HATFIELD,
Governor of Oregon.

PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence: Now, therefore,

I, Warren P. Knowles, Governor of the State of Wisconsin, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 18, 1965, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Wisconsin, and call upon the citizens of Wisconsin to join with others in observing this week by dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

By the Governor:

WARREN P. KNOWLES,
Governor.
ROBERT C. ZIMMERMAN,
Secretary of State.

CARSON CITY, NEV., PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now, therefore,

I, Grant Sawyer, Governor of the State of Nevada, by the power in me vested, do hereby proclaim the week commencing July 18, 1965, as Captive Nations Week in Nevada, and call upon the citizens of Nevada to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

GRANT SAWYER,
Governor.
JOHN KOONTZ,
Secretary of State.

DENVER, COLO., PROCLAMATION ON CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 18–25, 1965

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies, and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now, therefore

I, John A. Love, Governor of the State of Colorado, do hereby proclaim the week commencing July 18, 1965, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Colorado, and call upon the citizens of Colorado to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjected peoples all over the world.

JOHN A. LOVE,
Governor.

PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR THEODORE R. MCKELDIN DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF JULY 18–24, 1965, AS CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK IN BALTIMORE

The imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others.

The desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war.

The freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the cita-

del of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence.

The Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies, and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now, therefore

I, Theodore R. McKeldin, mayor of the city of Baltimore, do hereby proclaim the week of July 18–24, 1965, as Captive Nations Week in Baltimore, and call upon our citizens to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

Theodore R. McKeldin,
Mayor.

City and County of Denver,
Denver, Colo.

Proclamation

Whereas the policies of Russian Communists have led to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to our people as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence, and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe this week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities, and expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now, therefore

I, Thomas G. Currigan, mayor of the city and county of Denver, by virtue of the authority vested in me, do hereby proclaim that the week of July 18–25 be observed as Captive Nations Week in Denver, and urge all citizens to observe this week by dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed peoples all over the world.

Thomas G. Currigan,
Mayor.

City of Harrisburg.

Proclamation: Captive Nations Week

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have let, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Lativa, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now, therefore,

I, Dr. Wm. K. McBride, mayor of the city of Harrisburg, do hereby proclaim the week commencing July 18, 1965 to be observed as Captive Nations Week and call upon our citizens to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

Wm. K. McBride,
Mayor of Harrisburg.

July 1, 1965.

Salt Lake City Corporation,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

Proclamation

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the peoples of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now, therefore,

I, J. Bracken Lee, mayor of Salt City, Utah, do hereby proclaim the week of July 18, 1965, as Captive Nations Week in Salt Lake City, Utah, and call upon the citizens of our city to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

J. Bracken Lee,
Mayor.
Herman J. Hogensen,
Recorder.

City of Ann Arbor, Mich.

Proclamation: Captive Nations Week, July 18–24, 1965

Whereas by joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, Congress authorized the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as Captive Nations Week, and to issue a similar proclamation each year; and

Whereas in July 1959 President Dwight D. Eisenhower issued a Captive Nations Declaration; and

Whereas the people of the Soviet-dominated countries have been deprived of their natural independence and their individual liberties, and many people throughout the world have been made captives by imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of people in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence: Now, therefore,

I, Wendell E. Hulcher, mayor of the city of Ann Arbor, do hereby proclaim the week of July 18–24, 1965, as Captive Nations Week in Ann Arbor and call upon our citizens to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated people all over the world.

Wendell E. Hulcher,
Mayor.

Proclamation of the City of Tampa

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies, and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now, therefore,

I, Nick Nuccio, mayor of the city of Tampa, Fla., do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 18, 1965, be observed as "Captive Nations Week" in Tampa, and call upon the citizens of Tampa to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

Dated at Tampa, Fla., this 22d day of June, 1965.

[seal] Nick Nuccio,
Mayor.

Proclamation

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now, therefore,

I, Otto Festge, mayor of the city of Madison, Wis., do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 18, 1965, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Madison, and call upon the citizens of Madison to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

OTTO FESTGE, *Mayor*.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR, CITY OF COLUMBUS, OHIO.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas many of our residents of Columbus—the "All America City"—once lived in captive nations, or have friends and family there today; and

Whereas the more than 550,000 residents of this great and growing capital of Ohio, would wish to extend the freedom and opportunity we enjoy to the less privileged people in the unhappy nations of China, North Vietnam, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Cuba, and other lands in the Baltic and Balkan lands; and

Whereas the Congress has established the third week in July as Captive Nations Week: Now, therefore,

I, M. E. Sensenbrenner, mayor of the "All America City" of Columbus, do hereby proclaim the week of July 19 through 25, as Captive Nations Week and urge all of our citizens to work, pray, and take on a new sense of dedication that people throughout the world may someday enjoy universal freedom and opportunity.

M. E. SENSENBRENNER,
Mayor of the City of Columbus.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK PROCLAMATION

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States, by unanimous vote, passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies, and activities; expressing their sympathy with, and support for, the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now, therefore,

I, Nelson Howarth, mayor of Springfield, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 18, 1965, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Springfield, and call upon the citizens of Springfield to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

NELSON HOWARTH,
Mayor.

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, PROCLAMATION

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkenstan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States, by unanimous vote, passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies, and activities; expressing their sympathy with, and support for, the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now, therefore,

I, Elmer Rasmuson, mayor of Anchorage, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 18, 1965, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Anchorage, Alaska, and call upon the citizens of Anchorage to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

ELMER RASMUSON, *Mayor.*

GREAT FALLS, MONT., PROCLAMATION

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Solvenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies, and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, Marian S. Erdmann, mayor of the city of Great Falls, Mont., do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 18, 1965, be observed as Captive Nations Week in the city of Great Falls and call upon the citizens of Great Falls to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the city of Great Falls, Mont., to be affixed, on 14th day of July 1965.

MARIAN S. ERDMANN,
Mayor.

JOHNSON RECALLS CAPTIVE NATIONS

JOHNSON CITY, TEX.—President Johnson has called upon all Americans "to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty."

In his annual Captive Nations Week proclamation, the President said yesterday that "all peoples yearn for freedom and justice," but "these basic rights unfortunately are circumscribed or unrealized in many areas of the world."

Johnson designated the week beginning July 18 as Captive Nations Week.

STATEMENT OF NATIONAL CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE

PRESIDENT UPHELD ON VIETNAM AND DOMINICAN REPUBLIC BY CAPTIVE NATIONS GROUP

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 22.—President Johnson received further support today for his policies in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic from the National Captive Nations Committee. Speaking at a ceremony at the Shevchenko statue, 22d and P Streets NW., in Washington, D.C., the chairman of the committee, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, said, "We hail this occasion as a most fitting one to express our full support of the President's policies in both Vietnam and the Dominican Republic."

The ceremony, sponsored by the Shevchenko Memorial Committee, was for the encasement of documents pertaining to the erection of the statue last year. The monument of Taras Shevchenko, national hero and poet of Ukraine, was then dedicated "to the freedom and liberation of all the captive nations."

Dr. Dobriansky stressed that the 1965 Captive Nations Week will also highlight citizens' support for the President's policies. The week falls on July 18–24.

Pointing out that "the distance from Shevchenko to Vietnam and the Domincan Republic is but a near step," the Georgetown professor also rapped the "few misleading and garbling voices from some of our campuses" on these issues. He said they "cannot fool the millions who understand all the captive nations who comprehend their significance in our fight against Sino-Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism, and who shall persist in efforts for a cold war strategy against the entire Red empire and its mythology of communism."

In addition to praising the President for his policies, the speaker also urged "a freedom-expanding action directed at the captive people in North Vietnam" and "a planned extinction of the Red empire's outpost in Cuba." He called for political warfare by the free Vietnamese and free Cubans.

Later at a banquet in the Mayflower Hotel, Dr. Dobriansky was awarded a Shevchenko Scientific Society Medal for his leadership in making the Shevchenko statue possible. A similar award has been conferred on former President Dwight D. Eisenhower who signed the legislation in 1960 and unveiled the statue on June 27, 1964.

From Shevchenko to Vietnam and the Dominican Republic

(Excerpts from address by
Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky)

On the surface, this final celebrative occasion in the erection of the Shevchenko statue features the encasement of pertinent historic documents at the base of the monument. Basically and more meaningfully, it confirms again the guiding theme and spirit to which this second statue of liberty has been dedicated to the freedom and liberation of all the captive nations.

In this dedicated spirit we hail this occasion as a most fitting one to express our full support of the President's policies in both Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. Any thinking American who appreciates the Shevchenko tradition, its enduring illumination of the principles and historical forces of genuine patriotic nationalism, its operative significance today and tomorrow in the vast totalitarian Red empire maintained by both Moscow and Peiping, can easily understand that the distance from Shevchenko to Vietnam and the Dominican Republic is but a near step.

From a Shevchenkoist viewpoint and all that this implies politically and historically, we applaud the President's freedom-saving action in Vietnam and at the same time urge a freedom-expanding action directed at the captive people in North Vietnam.

In all the talk about Vietnam today it is amazing how little, if anything, is said about the captive people under the totalitarian Hanoi regime. They, too, are justly entitled to liberation, freedom, and genuine reunion with their brothers of South Vietnam. Despite all the usual hallucinations about an escalated global conflict, our present firm military policy in Vietnam should be systematically supplemented by a paramilitary aid policy toward free Vietnam, equipping and enabling the free Vietnamese to carry their own political warfare to the terrain of captive North Vietnam.

In Shevchenko's time, the purveyors of traditional Russian imperiocolonialism attempted to establish their colonialist interests in Latin America. They failed then. A century later they succeeded, and today we observe the mounting evidence of their imperiocolonialist operations in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Venezuela, Brazil and others. As in the case of Guatemala a decade ago, the Dominican Republic is being saved from a totalitarian Red takeover, sponsored jointly and significantly by Red China, Moscow and Castro Cuba. So-called ideological rifts find no place when the real business of expanding the Red empire is at hand.

With his preventive diplomacy in the Dominican Republic, the President has made a historic contribution to the preservation of freedom in this hemisphere. We praise him for this, and we also urge that the freedom will become absolute and total with a planned extinction of the Red empire's outpost in Cuba.

As we conclude the celebrations in the foundation of this statue, let us once again remember that this second statue of liberty was erected not for the past but for the challenging future. The spirit of Shevchenko is fundamentally one of continuous education. Imbued with this spirit, we must in the months and years ahead intensify our efforts to propagate and implement the truths about all the captive nations, particularly those in the Soviet Union itself.

Our opportunities will be many. Just 2 months from now, the Seventh Captive Nations Week observance will be held across the land in the week of July 18–24. As we have stressed today, the prime theme of the 1965 Captive Nations Week will be full support for the President's policies in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. A few misleading and garbling voices from some of our campuses cannot fool the millions who understand all the captive nations, who comprehend their significance in our fight against Sino-Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism, and who shall persist in efforts for a cold war strategy against the entire totalitarian Red empire and its mythology of communism.

Were he alive today, few here would doubt that Shevchenko, Europe's freedom fighter, would bid and inspire us to carry on the fight in this way.

Statement of National Captive Nations Committee, Washington, D.C.

WHAT ABOUT THE 17 MILLION CAPTIVE NORTH VIETNAMESE?

This question was raised today, on the eve of Captive Nations Week by the National Captive Nations Committee. The chairman of the national organization, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, declared "It is both politically incredible and morally reflective that in all the public discussion on Vietnam no one has asked 'What about the freedom aspirations of 17 million captive North Vietnamese?' "

Pointing out that no psychopolitical sanctuary should be afforded the Communists anywhere in the totalitarian Red empire, Dr. Dobriansky announced that Captive Week observances next week will underscore full support for the President's actions in both Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. He added, "We will also urge that the free South Vietnamese be permitted to conduct an intense political warfare in the north, directed at the freedom and independence of their captive brethren. Myths about Hanoi being a popular government and the Ho Chi-Minh a "Vietnamese George Washington" have blinded many Americans to the fact that the plight of the North Vietnamese is no different from that of the East Germans, the North Koreans, and the mainland Chinese."

Captive Nations Week observances are planned for all major cities across the country. On July 3, President Johnson issued his annual proclamation of the week, July 18–24. Many Governors and mayors have similarly proclaimed the week. Moscow, Peiping and their satraps bitterly oppose the institution and have long sought its abolition.

The National Captive Nations Committee chairman stated that guided by the national committee, State and local observances will also stress these themes: Peace with Justice and Freedom—support of all the captive nations being our most formidable paramilitary deterrent against a hot global war; a poltrade policy toward the Red empire—trade based on political concessions; full exposure of Sino-Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism in the U.N.—with concentration on the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.; creation of both a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations and a Freedom Academy.

National Captive Nations Committee,
July 14, 1965.

The President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: On the eve of the seventh observance of Captive Nations Week, I heartily express for this committee and myself our grateful thanks for the proclamation you issued on July 3, the very eve of our own Independence Day.

The basic concepts and principles enunciated in your proclamation of the 1965 Captive Nations Week, particularly those in paragraphs four and five, serve both as an adequate justification of your courageous actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic and a solid basis for a farseeing program of action against Sino-Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. As the enclosed card shows ("The Captive Nations—Who's Next?") we have been concerned with this long list of captive nations for some time. Without doubt, your firm actions in South Vietnam and the Dominican Republic have prevented this list of captive nations from being extended by further Communist takeovers.

As no one else has done yet, this committee wishes to be the first to congratulate you with infinite praise for your historic contribution in preventing the specific emergence of two more captive nations. Both in Santo Domingo and Hanoi the long arms of colonialist Moscow and Peiping have been present. To divorce these two situations from the full reality of all the captive nations is the apogee of historical myopia.

Based on the concepts and principles in your proclamation, the coming observance of Captive Nations Week will be particularly oriented toward the freedom and independence of the 17 million captive North Vietnamese to be achieved through psychopolitical means. It is plainly incredible that in all the discussion concerning Vietnam, absolutely nothing has been said about the freedom aspirations of this captive Asian nation. Myths that have been widely circulated in our country—such as the Red totalitarian Ho Chi-Minh being a "Vietnamese George Washington," Hanoi being "a representative and popular-based government," and the subversive Vietcong "a nationalist force" aiming at Vietnamese reunification—have blinded countless Americans to the reality and essence of the struggle there. The plight of the captive North Vietnamese is substantially no different from that of the East Germans, the North Koreans, or the mainland Chinese.

The goals of North Vietnamese freedom and the democratic reunification of the entire country are proper and natural objectives for the free Vietnamese. They are unquestionably in conformity with our own principles and traditions.

Mr. President, we strongly recommend an inspiring Presidental statement in behalf of the 17 million captive North Vietnamese and their yearnings for independence and freedom. Captive Nations Week is a most opportune time for this specific declaration of freedom based on your general Captive Nations Week proclamation. We cannot emphasize too often that our declared support for all the captive nations—in Central Europe, the U.S.S.R., Asia, and Cuba—is one of our most powerful paramilitary deterrents against Sino-Soviet Russian imperalist aggression and also a prime force for peace with freedom and justice.

With grateful appreciation for your proclamation and warmest regards.

Sincerely,

Lev E. Dobriansky,
Chairman.

Georgetown University Forum on Captive Nations Week, 1965

(Panel: Dr. Lev D. Dobriansky, chairman, National Captive Nations Committee, professor of Soviet economics, Georgetown University; the Honorable Peter H. Dominick, Republican Senator from Colorado; the Honorable Michael A. Feighan, Democratic Representative from Ohio.)

(Moderator: Wallace Fanning.)

The 1965 Captive Nations Week will be observed throughout the Nation during the week of July 18–24. This observance, based on a resolution known as Public Law 86–90, and passed by the U.S. Congress in 1959, authorizes the President of the United States to issue a proclamation on the week each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world. The people of these nations exist not only behind the

Iron Curtain, but also behind the Bamboo Curtain of North Vietnam and the Sugar Curtain of Cuba.

Believing that support of the captive nations is one of the strongest deterrents against global war, the National Captive Nations Committee has announced a seven-point program for the observance of the week. These include strong endorsement of the U.S. action in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, trade with Communist countries based on political concessions, and the creation of a special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

[From the Ukrainsky Istorychny Zhurnal, February 1965]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—A THORN IN SOVIET SIDE

The active participation of Ukraine and Byelorussia in international relations is proof of the strengthening of the sovereignty of the Soviet Republics and a convincing rejection of the provocative Captive Nations Week proclaimed annually by the American President, and all sorts of ceremonies on the occasion of imaginary independence days of the nations of the U.S.S.R., which are held in some localities in the United States.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, July 19, 1965]

CAPTIVE NATIONS URGE NIXON FOR STEVENSON POST

The Captive Nations Committee of Greater Philadelphia on Sunday urged the appointment of former Vice President Richard M. Nixon as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations to replace the late Adlai Stevenson.

Dr. Lev Dobriansky, national chairman of the Captive Nations Committee, said Nixon is "articulate, firm, and energetic" and knows the extent and depth of Sino-Soviet imperial colonialism. He added: "I am sure Russia and her satellites would have someone to contend with."

AFFIRMED BY 300

Dobriansky made the suggestion in an address at the opening of Captive Nations Week observances at Independence Hall. After the address, Dr. Austin J. App, chairman of the local Captive Nations Committee, asked the audience of 300 to affirm the suggestion by acclamation, which they did. App then said he would wire the suggestion to President Johnson.

In noting the start of Captive Nations Week, Dobriansky called it "a firm and fixed moral symbol of the determination of Americans never to acquiesce, never to make a deal, never accept the permanent captivity" of the 23 so-called captive nations of Eastern Europe and Asia.

MANY NOTIONS

In addition to the eastern European nations behind the Iron Curtain, the "captive nations" list includes North Vietnam, Outer Mongolia, North Korea, Tibet, mainland China, and Cuba.

City Commissioner Maurice S. Osser, representing Mayor James H. J. Tate at Sunday's ceremonies, urged the United States to "more frequently seize the initiative in the United Nations," and suggested that the case of the captive nations be taken before the world body, since "we cannot do much to ease the burden of their captivity short of global conflict."

OLYMPIA CEREMONY

A third speaker, State Welfare Secretary Arlin M. Adams, reminded the audience that Independence Hall, the site of Sunday's ceremonies, "stands for the principle that government should be by consent of the governed."

Prior to the program at the historic shrine, the city's Captive Nations Committee signed a resolution aboard the U.S.S. *Olympia* asking the House of Representatives to create a special committee on the captive nations, to inaugurate a captive nations freedom stamp series and to establish a freedom academy.

Several young women in the costumes of various captive nations laid a wreath at the Liberty Bell to conclude the ceremonies.

[Telegram]

WASHINGTON, July 17.—AFL–CIO President George Meany, has accepted the post of honorary chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee.

The acceptance came as President Johnson proclaimed the week of July 18–24, as Captive Nations Week and called on all Americans to "give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty."

Donald L. Miller, executive director of the committee, said yesterday Meany "has devoted great effort over many years" to opposing Communist imperialism and to promoting the "independence, personal liberty, and human dignity of peoples around the world."

[From the VFW magazine, July 1965]

ALONG THE RED FRONT

(By Donald L. Miller)

The American people again will observe Captive Nations Week the third week in July. Many VFW posts will take part in the meetings and the rallies.

A recent discussion in Washington, D.C., with Congressmen DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, and EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Republican, of Illinois, brought out some of the reasons that Captive Nations Week is so important to us today.

Congressman DERWINSKI, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, said that "since the United States is the leader of the free world, our activity on behalf of captive nations takes on international significance. The U.S. citizen who participates in his local Captive Nations Week observance is making a contribution to the international scene in that he is dramatizing the captivity of the captive peoples, he is keeping alive their spirit and he is participating in an overall program that we believe will lead to a restoration of their freedom."

Congressman FLOOD talked of the observances in terms of taking the Declaration of Independence off the shelf and making it work. He said, "If we believe in these freedoms of ours, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, equality of man and so on, then this must be so every place in the world. If in 1776 we felt a right to resist any tyrant who interposed himself against these things, as we did; if we have any self-confidence in ourselves and can inject self-confidence into these peoples in the captive nations, it must follow that they have this concept of liberty in front of them at all times."

In a separate discussion Congressman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Ohio, brought out another point. Everything we do to promote freedom of the captive nations makes a direct contribution to the peace of the world and the security of the United States. Communist leaders are not likely to risk any general war against the United States when they know millions of their own subjects would rise against them and fight on the side of freedom.

Few times in our history has a dedication to freedom at home and abroad been more important to our security.

The independence of the South Vietnamese is under severe attack. A Vietcong official in Peiping boasted that the U.S. forces will retreat and South Vietnam will fall, not because of the Vietcong's military superiority, but because of demands for U.S. troop withdrawal by groups of students, professors, and others in the United States.

In our own hemisphere the Dominican Republic has been endangered by a Communist takeover. Red guerrillas are active in Venezuela, Guatemala, Colombia, and elsewhere. Thailand, a firm ally of freedom in Asia, is being threatened.

What can you do in your own community to help? One thing you can do is to join in the captive nations observances. Let the world know that we are determined to work for the freedom and independence that is every man's right. By doing this we will encourage others in Asia, Africa, Latin America and behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains to struggle harder against tyranny and for their own freedom.

If no observance is scheduled in your community, write to the National Captive Nations Committee, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., 20036 for information.

The battle for freedom is raging along the Red front everywhere. It deserves every ounce of support we can give it.

Mr. Speaker, I also enclose excerpts from an article in the July 18 issue of Our Sunday Visitor, a national Catholic publication, dramatizing the oppression suffered by the captive peoples:

WILL THERE BE A MARCH FOR THEM?

(By Rev. Lawrence S. Brey)

Captive Nations Week, observed this July throughout America, calls to mind the 1 billion souls suffering under Communist tyranny today and brings up a burning question which is intensely apropos and relevant to the day: What about the civil rights of the captive peoples? When will the collective and individual conscience be aroused to the moral evil of the inhuman oppression of our billion brethren by Marxist tyrants throughout the world and even as close as 90 miles from our shores? Who will begin demonstrating and marching for the civil rights—nay, the human rights—of the people of Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Georgia (U.S.S.R.), Hungary, North Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Red China, Rumania, Russia, Tibet, Turkestan, Ukraine, North Vietnam, Yemen, and Yugoslavia—and more.

If infractions of civil rights of some of our fellow Americans are such as to have triggered massive collective reactions as the march on Washington, the civil rights bill, the march on Selma-Montgomery, and the deployment of Federal troops, how much more immediately imperative is strong collective indignation and action on behalf of the 1 billion brutally oppressed victims of communism all over the world—including, incidentally, many American nationals and servicemen still imprisoned or "detained" behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, and also 6 million Cubans no farther from American soil than Milwaukee is from Chicago? When will there be a "march" on the Soviet Embassy, or on the U.N., on behalf of these oppressed captives—marches enjoying the same degree of publicity and support given to the Selma marches?

SIN BY SILENCE

"When one should protest and he sins by silence, he makes a coward of himself." If these words of Abraham Lincoln might justify demonstrations against violations of interracial justice at home, how much more cogently do they warrant—and oblige—protests and action on behalf of the far more greatly outraged victims of Communist injustice and tyranny?

What grievances are proposed to illustrate this imperative duty? For every individual discriminated against in America, there are millions upon millions abroad who are not only discriminated against, but oppressed, imprisoned, tortured, persecuted or executed behind the Marxian Curtain. For every American citizen disqualified from voting, there are millions abroad who are categorically denied that right. For every southern Negro church burned here at home by a handful of hatemongers, thousands of churches have been burned, bombed, or desecrated by atheistic Reds. For every murdered Negro or civil rights worker in America, there have been millions upon millions of innocent persons murdered or brutally executed during the past 47 years of Communist tryanny abroad, and this blood bath is still in progress.

But now let us cite just a few specifics to complete our case, and this is by no means a complete listing:

1. Violation of religious freedom, and persecution of the church: According to Soviet newspapers, so-called peoples courts are striking at parents who give religious training to their children, by having their children placed in atheistic Soviet boarding schools to purge them of any religious "poison" they may have contracted. An "Academy of Anti-Religious Science" has been established to train "missionaries of atheism." Religious congregations and clergy are being taxed out of existence by exorbitant levies. In spite of "window dressing" concessions to religious freedom, the church continues to be attacked openly by official propaganda, and impeded in its activities, and continually watched by "police." Exiled Baltic clergymen pointed to the situation in Red Lithuania: undeviating program of seizure of church property, suppression of religious education, arrest, assassination, and wholesale deportation of clergymen and laymen. As late as 1963, Polish exiles affirmed that in their country priests are arrested, seminaries closed, monks and nuns expelled from convents, and parents who baptized their children are fired from government jobs. Even if there has been some "amelioration" in some countries as Poland, Cardinal Wyszynski recently stated that there still is great persecution there. He added: "How much longer will one have to fight so that citizens will not be constantly investigated and followed?"

2. Violation of educational and family rights: Children are often expropriated from their families, raised in state "nurseries" and boarding schools, forced to work for the state at an early age. In Cuba over 3,000 children under 12 are sent to Red countries for 6 years of Marxist indoctrination. Countless Hungarian youths have been executed for their part in the 1956 freedom revolt. Castro recently planned the execution of 100 more teenagers on the Isle of Pines.

3. Violation of the rights of labor and business: Free unions and strikes are prohibited. Forced and slave labor is a common and widespread practice. The state controls and operates all business, dictates the worker's job, and freezes him on his job. Emerging Red nations confiscate the business and capital investments of foreign industrialists as well as natives.

4. Violation of suffrage and voting rights: Elections are either nonexistent or are sheer mockery, or rigged, or based on party-selected nominees. Masses of citizens in many cases are denied franchise, even those fully literate and competent. In nearby Cuba (as close to many Americans as Alabama or Mississippi), no citizen has a right to vote.

5. Violation of sheer human rights: Young Peter, a teenager, was brutally murdered while seeking freedom over the Berlin Wall. Well over 60,000 young Hungarians were shipped in cattle cars to brothels and extermination camps in the U.S.S.R. Another 20,000 who fled (in vain hopes) to Yugoslavia were liquidated by "President" Tito. Millions of Iron Curtain citizens are kept "secure" by over a thousand miles of barbed wire frontier, electric fences, minefields, watch towers, and (yes) police dogs.

CALL FOR A MARCH ON HEAVEN

The above is a sampling of civil rights violations of the most overt type, violations which have been perpetrated during the course of the last 45 years, and which have not yet abated. Why are there no massive, highly financed and highly publicized protests and demonstrations on behalf of the millions of human beings so violated? Why not petition for a redress of their grievances? Countless Americans do desire to see massive effective action taken on behalf of these enslaved, just as Pope Pius XII himself explicitly desired on behalf of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters. Though they may have to wait still longer, or even in vain, for such action, we extend to these generous people the invitation to take part in our "March on Heaven." To do so, they are invited to join the League of Prayer for the Captive Peoples.

The League of Prayer was founded by the Most Reverend Alfred L. Mendez, C.S.C. Its present executive director is the Most Reverend Roman R. Atkielski, auxiliary bishop of Milwaukee. In its executive staff and membership it is mainly a layman's organization. The purpose of the league is the marshaling of prayers, masses, and sacrifices on behalf of the enslaved victims of communism, and particularly the members of the Church of Silence.

In effect, then, the LPCP constitutes a secret weapon of unlimited capability.

From another point of view, the prayers and masses of the league constitute a "march on Heaven" by its members, beseeching God and His Immaculate Mother to aid and relieve and ultimately liberate the captive peoples. We cannot wait for, nor count on, national or international action, political or military, or group demonstrations with sufficient support, on behalf of the captives. But we can and do urge everyone to participate in this spiritual crusade, which can be counted on to ultimately succeed.

To sit back and believe that an "amelioration" of the captive people's condition is an evolutionary inevitability, or that communism is changing, or that a great rapprochement is in the offing between East and West, is to deny the strictures of Pius XI about the intrinsic evil of communism, as well as the unremittent flow of testimony to the continuance of Red atrocities and tyranny today.

Communism remains intrinsically wrong. The captive peoples remain captive. Mary's pleas for prayers for the conversion of Russia have not been rescinded. Therefore, the League of Prayer for the Captive Peoples is both relevant and realistic, and deserves the widest possible support and membership.

Mr. Speaker, the key to victory in Vietnam is the captive peoples of the colonial empires, who are the Achilles' heel of the Communist world. It is a myth to picture the Communist world as possessing strength and unity required to defeat the free world nations. We must recognize that all captive nations taken as a whole constitute one of the most powerful deterrents against Sino-Soviet aggression, and thus they are a positive force in the pursuit of peace.

We can achieve freedom for the captive peoples, produce total defeat of communism and accomplish permanent peace for the world by developing an effective diplomatic, propaganda, and economic campaign against the Communist world.

We must support the President in his actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, but we must recognize that he has not gone far enough in developing a practical winning foreign policy to produce freedom and peace throughout the world.

In addition to fighting to maintain freedom of the people of South Vietnam, we should not forget the 17 million people in North Vietnam who are captives of communism.

All the satellite governments of Eastern Europe are cooperating with the Soviet Union in supporting the North Vietnamese Communist regime.

Captive Nations Week acquires a special significance against the background of this year's events. The relentless efforts of the Communist regimes to impose their system on other countries by infiltration, subversion, and "wars of liberation" are today accompanied by shrill denunciation of the United States for its role in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. At the same time, the captive European and Asian peoples remain under alien rule and are still denied fundamental human rights.

Effectively developed outside pressure, coupled with the continued resistance of the captive peoples, is the only thing that will force a retreat of communism and an end to world aggression.

Responsible criticism must be directed against the administration policy in Vietnam. Basically, it is a no-win policy, sacrificing our fighting men just as they were sacrificed in Korea. As long as the Communists realize the administration does not have the fortitude to win the war in Vietnam, they will continue their aggression. If they were informed and recognized that the United States was determined to achieve peace by victory in Vietnam, they would avoid what would be an unequal combat. Vacillation and confusion such as now exist in Washington produces war with its loss of life. A strong foreign policy would preserve freedom under peace.

Mr. Speaker, a fitting tribute to the Captive Nations Week commemorations here in Washington would be immediate action by the House Rules Committee on the resolution introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. FLOOD, to create a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. The objection of the State Department and evidently administration legislative leaders is completely indefensible, and the creation of this Special House Committee is long overdue.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], be permitted to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the President, in proclaiming Captive Nations Week this year said in part:

> I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

To what does he refer? Where are the captive nations of the world today? They are behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, victims of the greatest imperialism the world has ever witnessed—atheistic communism.

In observing this the Seventh Captive Nations Week, the evidence continues to grow that this observance is worthwhile. It is tangible evidence to the people of Eastern Europe of our common hopes and aspirations. In previous years, Communist annoyance with this observance has been expressed very forcefully. Just last year Izvestia, on July 15, 1964, said:

> With every passing year Captive Nations Week becomes a nuisance.

The Soviet Government would like to kill this idea. But the ghosts of murdered nations keep rising to haunt them. The very idea of freedom for all captive Nations is not now confined to just the nations of Europe behind the Iron Curtain. Last year, the 10th Conference of the Asian Anti-Communist League, composed of delegates and observers from over 40 nations, unanimously passed a captive nations resolution calling for a World Congress of Captive Nations.

It is symptomatic that this unrest seems to be reaching a peak at the same time as an intensive drive against religion is underway behind the iron curtain. The evidence points to the most concerted drive against organized religion since the death of Stalin. The church is under heavy attack in Poland where this could trigger a revolt at any moment. Catholic priests have been arrested recently in Hungary. Within the Soviet Union itself, churches and seminaries continue to be harassed and shut down. In the period from 1959 to 1962, the number of churches open decreased from 22,000 to 11,500 and the number of priests from 30,000 to 14,000. This drive is continuing.

Therefore, this year of all years the feelings of the Congress, reflecting those of the American people, need to be made known to the people behind the iron curtain. And this should include all the peoples within the boundaries of the Soviet Union. They should know of our continued friendship for them as people, and of our continued abhorence of the regime and system, under which they are forced to live. This message of our support of their aspirations for true liberty and justice should be gotten to them by all the means at the command of this Government. And to this end, the executive branch of our Government should press to get the captive nations issue on the agenda of the General Assembly of the United Nations, so that the world's greatest imperialist—the Soviet Union—can be exposed before the world.

The signs are hopeful that in some quarters we are winning this battle. Even while we gird ourselves for a final showdown with communism in Vietnam, the indications grow increasingly clear that the peoples behind the Iron Curtain in Europe are becoming more restless, increasingly critical of their governments, and impatient with the despotism of communism to the point that their governments fear for the stability of their regimes.

There is another lesser noted trend at work in the Communist world. This trend is the increasing restiveness of the Russian people in the Soviet Union. There are also growing signs of renewed opposition to the Soviet regime by the nationalities that make up some 50 percent of the population of the Soviet Union. Open revolt broke out in the Soviet Union in 1962 over the increase in food prices. Factories went on strike in several localities. Disorders in the last capital of the Don Cossacks—Novocherkassk—reached a point where special secret police—KGB—troop formations had to be called in to restore order, after the commander of the local garrison had refused to give the order to fire on the demonstrators. The secret police troops shot hundreds of Soviet citizens in the streets. The Soviet press regularly complains of secret and illegal radio transmissions. Other stories and reports describe renewed guerrilla activity in the Ukraine, Byelorussia, and the Caucasus. Partisan activity in Uzbekistan has even been noted.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I join those of my colleagues who are today speaking in behalf of this, the seventh annual observance of Captive Nations Week.

President Eisenhower first delivered his message on this subject 6 years ago. His voice tolled a bell of hope to millions of oppressed people living behind the Iron Curtain. It was also a reaffirmation of America's determination to someday see that these captive nations will be free.

Six years have passed since President Eisenhower's memorable address and since Congress first called on Americans to observe the third week in July as Captive Nations Week. Communist aggression continues to spread.

Today, American soldiers are being shot at and killed in South Vietnam. The enemy in that southeast Asian nation is communism. American soldiers are being shot at and killed in the Dominican Republic. Reliable information confirms that the enemy there too is communism. Having firmly established themselves in Eastern Europe, the Communists are now spreading their tentacles to southeast Asia and Latin America. They have already established a foothold in Cuba.

These events dramatize the need for this Nation's reaffirmance of Captive Nations Week. They reveal that the aggressive designs of the Communists have not changed. World enslavement under atheistic communism continues to be their goal.

The conflicts in southeast Asia and Latin America should open rather than close our eyes to the captive nations in Eastern Europe. It should bring home the indisputable fact that communism is the enemy of freedom loving people in all parts of the world.

Reaffirmation of Captive Nations Week, a reiteration of our steadfast determination that Communist aggression will not succeed, will also serve as a reminder to those behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains that we in America have not forgotten them.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I call upon the administration for top priority leadership to secure passage of any one of a number of resolutions presently before the House Rules Committee which would create a special committee on the captive nations. Continued administration silence on this matter will be interpreted as U.S. recognition of a permanent status of these captive nations as Communist states, and will shatter the hope and faith that sustains these millions of freedom loving people now living in captivity.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago this month, the Congress of the United States adopted unanimously a frank and outspoken resolution calling upon the President to designate a week each year as Captive Nations Week and proclaim this observance yearly until "such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all captive nations of the world."

Sadly for freedom-loving peoples everywhere, this freedom and independence have not been forthcoming. In clear violation of solemn promises, specific treaties, and international law, none of the fundamental political and human rights for which mankind has struggled through the ages has yet been restored to any of the nations subjugated through Communist imperialism.

Twenty-five years of tragic oppression has not dulled the spirit of these courageous people, yet they must not bear this burden alone. A united and unyielding global posture is essential.

We must continue to reiterate our support for the goals which are considered worthwhile by the people of Eastern Europe and southeast Asia. Realizing that every forceful and determined action which the United States and other world powers take against communism anywhere is a powerful morale builder, let us reaffirm our belief that all men are created equal and each has the inherent right to pursue happiness in his own way.

I hope that all Americans will observe Captive Nations Week to manifest their concern for our silent allies in the Soviet subjugated lands in their struggle between the forces of liberty and Communist tyranny. In this way we can again confirm that global freedom is our aim—not a world divided.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, this is the seventh year we have observed Captive Nations Week in the United States.

It is a sad commentary that in those 7 years several million more human beings have joined the hundreds of millions who already were behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains in 1958.

Cuba is now a captive nation, Cambodia and Indonesia are lost to communism, Zanzibar is a satellite.

We are engaged in a bitter struggle in Vietnam to prevent a Communist sweep of southeast Asia and the Pacific. We watch with apprehension the countless trouble spots around the globe—Berlin, Africa, India, Pakistan, the Near East, Malaysia, Latin America. We are accelerating our military efforts to prevent further takeovers. In so doing we are perhaps bringing new hope to the men and women of Eastern Europe who have spent the last 20 years under Soviet domination.

I am well acquainted with the indomitable courage of these people. I know many of their relatives and countrymen in my own Cleveland, Ohio, area. I urge the House to give them more than lipservice once a year. The Congress has been remiss, in my opinion, in bypassing the resolution to create a special committee on the Captive Nations. This resolution has been introduced in each of the last several Congresses but has never reached the floor for action. Its report by the Rules Committee and adoption by the House would give new heart to millions of people around the globe.

As evidence of my support, I am introducing identical legislation today. Along with it, I am introducing a measure condemning discrimination by the Government of Rumania against the Hungarian minority people.

I urge the House Committee on Rules to report these resolutions so that the House can act.

Mr. **RHODES** of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I always thrill when I remember the brave deeds of our forefathers, in building for us our heritage of liberty. The great deliberative body, which is the Congress of the United States, is a majestic tribute to the success of our venture in self-government.

I rgeret that this dream of liberty is not allowed fruition in the captive nations of Europe. The more than two dozen nations under alien Communist tyranny stand as mute testimony to the totalitarian oppression still emanating from Moscow.

Though statements on the value of Captive Nations Week are most commendable, constructive action is needed to combat world ignorance of, and indifference to the problem. Therefore, I support the creation of a bipartisan Congressional Committee on Captive Nations, for these reasons:

First. The committee would be a positive means for the advancement of world freedom in the present psycho-political struggle.

Second. The failure in our cold war strategy is clearly evidenced by our failures to place Moscow under constant, tactful, and skillful pressures in this most vulnerable area of captive nations.

Third. The Soviet Union has promulgated the false propaganda that world communism seeks to liberate the peoples of developing nations from colonialism and imperialism. This can best be combated by the assembling and utilization of truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved conditions of subjugated nations.

Fourth. The Soviet Union has displayed to all the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in its brutal suppression of the peoples of these captive nations. Thus, the creation of this committee would be the first step in transporting the cold war to the terrain of the captive world.

Fifth. I cannot accept the oppressive and tyrannical regimes now in control of these peoples. Instead, I feel there is an obligation to protect and promote the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms wherever they may be denied or threatened, rather than merely in those areas where it seems expedient to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the spirit of freedom is embodied in Captive Nations Week. So long as we hold high the torch of liberty, the flame of hope shall continue to shine brightly, even in those nations now experiencing the awful yoke of totalitarian oppression. Let us reaffirm our belief in the dignity of all men, as we work for the day when those now captive shall be free to exercise self-direction in their lives.

Mr. **FRIEDEL**. Mr. Speaker, in commemorating Captive Nations Week I join my colleagues as we pause to reflect upon the tragic fate of those nations still enslaved by the dismal tyranny of communism.

As Americans, we need hardly be reminded of the continuing threat to the liberties of free people of Communist imperialism. At this very moment American troops are standing alongside the regular forces of South Vietnam to help defend that nation's threatened independence. Others stand ready throughout the world, from Seoul to Santo Domingo, to protect the rights of free nations to choose their own form of government. It is a grave responsibility that we have accepted, one born of a strong belief in the right to self-determination of all peoples.

But today let us pause to consider those unfortunate men and nations who remain under the yoke of Communist domination. As the war in Europe was drawing to a close some 20 years ago, Winston Churchill, a strong champion of the right to self-determination, remarked that if the Soviets managed to gobble up the war-weakened nations of Eastern Europe, they would find the digestion of their meal rather difficult. How right he was. Even as the Iron Curtain was closing across the face of Europe, Yugoslavia was deserting the Soviet bloc to assert its own independence. The myth of Communist solidarity exploded almost before it was uttered.

The Yugoslav defection was the beginning of a trend toward greater independence among Communist governments in defiance of Moscow. A different type of trend was begun when the East German people rioted against their Communist masters in 1953. More riots were to follow 3 years later in Poland, followed by the tragic revolt in Hungary. Despite the ideological claims of the Soviets, it was clear from the start that the only chain which bound the Soviet bloc had been welded by the brute force of the Soviet Army.

Yet even the Soviet tanks could not crush the hopes of its captive peoples. Slowly but surely the Soviet Empire in Europe is crumbling. Despite two decades of servitude, the nations of Eastern Europe are regaining their strength; and, as their strength grows, so do their demands for more independence. One state after another has begun to wriggle out from under the thumb of Moscow. The crack begun by Yugoslavia has extended to Poland, Hungary, and Rumania. More freedom and independence from Russia means greater prosperity, while those still smothered by the heavy hand of the Soviets remain sullen garrisons—oppressive factories for Russian exploitation.

Neverthless, the hope and determination of proud nations cannot be destroyed by even the most oppressive form of despotism. The Berlin Wall stands as a tragic monument to the unending resolve of courageous people who refuse to accept the yoke of Communist tyranny. And who can forget the Hungarian revolt?

Today, unrest is the rule rather than the exception in the Soviet bloc. Even Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia, whose Communist governments have long been considered among the most loyal tools of Moscow, have found it necessary to support their citizens' demands for greater independence. The trend is clear; the only question is how long—how long before the Soviet reign of tyranny must fade from the heart of Europe. The end cannot come too soon.

Meanwhile let us continue to remind ourselves not only of the tragic fate of the captive nations, but the courage and resolve of their citizens, those brave men and women who have refused to bow to the despotism of their Communist masters. Let us be neither lulled into forgetting the cruelty of Communist oppression nor the determination of freemen fighting for their independence.

Mr. **KEOGH**. Mr. Speaker, in 1939, as a result of the Nazi-Soviet pact, Poland was carved in half; the Nazis took Lithuania and left Estonia and Latvia to the Soviets. Later the Soviets agreed to extending the Nazi area of influence in Poland in turn for Lithuania. That is where matters stood at the beginning of World War II. Hitler has since been defeated and Stalin is dead; yet, the areas claimed by the Soviets remain Russian territory. Poland remains a captive of its Moscow-oriented Communist government; Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are so-called Union Republics of the U.S.S.R.

Unfortunately, the area claimed by the Nazi-Soviet pact was only the beginning. By 1948, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Albania, East Germany, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria had passed into the Communist sphere. By the end of 1949, China had a new Communist government and local Communist Parties were doing well in Western Europe, in France, and in Italy. It appeared as if the Soviet monolith was quickly taking form.

Nevertheless, the tide had already begun to turn. Even before Stalin could clamp his iron fist over Eastern Europe, Yugoslavia left the Soviet camp and proclaimed her neutrality. As the nations of Western Europe began to get back in their feet, the Communist popularity at the polls dropped sharply. Rioting and revolt occurred in East Germany, Poland, and then the brave but tragic revolt in Hungary. Courageous men refused to accept Soviet domination and Soviet troops were required to patch over the cracks in the Communist empire. Soon more of the Communist leaders themselves could not agree on their outworn ideology and, more particularly, on their subservience to Moscow. Albania's departure from the Soviet camp was the signal for the coming schism between the two Communist giants, Moscow and Peiping.

Today the international Communist movement consists of several power centers all vying for ideological leadership.

But this offers little solace to the people who remain captives. Moscow's denunciation of China can mean little to a Tibetan herdsman; Peiping polemics against the Soviet leadership bring little joy to a Polish farmer. For regardless of the ideological quarrel, regardless of the struggle for leadership, the lot of men and women in the captive nations changes little. Life remains dark, dreary, and changeless.

Creative man needs freedom to develop his potentialities. Social man needs community to guide his creative self-realization. In the captive nations there is no freedom; there is no community. There are only the gray forms of existence below the shadow of despotic rule.

Today the creative energies of brilliant men in the captive nations remain smothered by the whims of jealous oligarchies. Their destiny has been an unnecessary tragedy. Let those of us who are more fortunate remember their fate. For if we are to protect our own freedom and independence, we must continue to support all men who refuse to bow to the oppression of Communist tyranny.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, among the numerous difficult and disheartening issues of the postwar world, the fate of the captive nations of Europe constitutes one of the saddest faced by Western diplomacy. Nine nations of Europe, together with some 17 million Germans in East Germany, form one-fourth of Europe's population. These nations, with about 100 million peoples, occupy areas in central and Eastern Europe and in the Baltic and Balkan regions. Most of them had regained their freedom and independence after the First World War, and all of them had become respectable members of the community of free states. For two decades many of them lived in fear of losing their freedom, but perhaps none of them could have envisaged the sad fate that was to be theirs during and since World War II.

Soon after the outbreak of that war their freedom fell into grave jeopardy. One of them—Czechoslovakia—was already dismembered and had lost its independence on the eve of the war. In the course of the world catastrophe all these nations—Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians, Poles, Czechoslovaks, Hungarians, Albanians, Bulgarians, and Rumanians—were overwhelmed. All of them, and of course many others, suffered because of the war and because of their subjection to totalitarian tyrannies. All of them went through the ordeal and hoped for their freedom. At the end of the war, however, the onrushing Communist tide swept over the entire northern, central, and southeastern Europe. This startling and stunning conquest took the Western democracies by surprise. And they were rudely shocked when the grasping hand of communism, supported by the might of the Red Army, was determined to choke off all freedom and independence in these countries, thus making them Soviet satellites. Today the Soviet Union's colonialism, under the guise of people's democracies, has enslaved these peoples, and the Soviet Communists are exploiting these countries largely for the benefit of the Soviet Union.

We should firmly resolve to do our best to help these nations in all possible ways, in the firm hope that they all will regain their freedom from atheistic communism.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to join in marking the observance of Captive Nations Week.

I have long been deeply interested in the fate of these countries of Europe which have had their national identity destroyed and their traditional institutions suppressed, and I applaud the observance as a method of reminding the world that the fundamental rights to which every man is entitled in the language of the basic documents of our country and of the United Nations are withheld from the people of these nations.

I was privileged to bring to the floor earlier this year a resolution stating the concern of the Congress with the plight of the Baltic Nations, and the House, through the leadership of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY], subsequently approved a resolution condemning religious and racial persecution in the Soviet Union and other countries of Eastern Europe.

All these actions show that the Congress and the people of the United States have not forgotten their friends behind the Iron Curtain; that they recall to the mind of the world the plight of these unfortunate people and that they express the confident hope that time and necessity, with the constant support of the free world, will return to these people the freedom and identity which is rightfully theirs.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in recognition of Captive Nations Week, the seventh anniversary of which is to be held July 18 to 24. At no time can we forget the fearful plight of the oppressed peoples of central and Eastern Europe.

Countless New Yorkers have written me letters describing the tragic difficulties their very own relatives are suffering. These unfortunate people are leading nightmarish lives in such countries as Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. Their letters, when somehow managing to escape the rigid censorship of the Communist postal system, speak of the dream to come to America. With respect to their present situation in these captive nations, they speak of the lack of food on the table, the lack of adequate clothing, the lack of housing.

Now it is true that not all persons in middle and Eastern Europe are living a concentration camp existence so far as the denial of material things is concerned. But we know that the Communist state mismanagement of agriculture has resulted in many innocent people feeling the brunt of devastating crop failures. The example of the purchase of wheat from the west testifies to the fact that many tables have been without bread. Besides wheat shortages, a critical deficiency in protein supply is plaguing these countries.

As a result of state planning, Communist industries have been kept from providing much-needed consumer goods and the building construction effort has been directed toward the creation of large, cold factories and not enough toward adequate houses and apartments.

But aside from the problems of securing adequate food, clothing, and shelter which face the 100 million Europeans subsisting in the captive nations, is the more deplorable problem of their lack of political freedom. To insure continued enslavement the Communist governments censor mail, tap telephones, bug residences, monitor conversations at work, encourage neighbor to spy on neighbor. Instead of having trust and confidence in their governments, as is the case in the free world, the peoples of captive nations fear, distrust, and hate the all powerful state.

The revolts in East Berlin in 1953, in Poland and Hungary in 1956, and the rebellion of the artists and intellectuals in major cities in Communist bloc countries in this past year were dramatic and heartrending manifestations of the intense desire of these oppressed peoples to escape from totalitarian tyranny.

Despite the all too gradual emergence of some hopeful signs of improvement in a few of these countries, tyranny still is the rule. However, because of the slight improvements that have taken place, there is a risk that the mere passage of time will cause free peoples to forget the continuing plight of those who are not free. The spirit of the people of east-central Europe is the most important weapon in this long struggle. We must encourage this free spirit. The United States must speak out. Our commitment to freedom compels us to dedicate ourselves to the cause of freedom wherever freedom is denied.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, today we are commemorating the seventh Captive Nations Week, in memory of those previously independent nations which have been enslaved by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. These countries, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania, under the impression that the Soviet Union was honestly propagating the independence of all European nations, welcomed the Russian Army and assistance. However, these nations not only received Russian aid, but also received Russian rule. These nations, which had entered the war as sovereign states, emerged in subjugation.

But these captive nations have not quietly succumbed to the Communist takeover; they have not forgotten their heritage of independence and sovereignty. The history of their 20 years of captivity are full of pages detailing the resistance to their tyrannical captors, such as the famous October revolt in

Hungary in 1956 and the attempted coup d'etat in Bulgaria 3 months ago.

And what is America's role in helping these nations regain their lost freedom? Ever since the beginning of their captivity the peoples of these nations have looked to the United States for the inspiration to resist their unwanted masters and to continuously work for the day when they will once again rule themselves.

So, we as Americans must not put down the flame of liberty which our forefathers left to us. This flame has kept the hope of freedom alive in these countries for 20 years; this flame has encouraged many throughout the Communist world to challenge both the Communist doctrine and the absolute rule of Moscow.

America must remember how much freedom and independence means to her citizens, and that her ancestors have left to the present generation the task of offering these most valued of all privileges to the rest of the peoples of the world.

I speak for all Americans when I say that we strongly oppose the crime of depriving a state of its sovereignty. We reiterate our pledge to refuse recognition of the control which communism has on these countries and on the Soviet Union. We will continue to oppose the expansion of communism in any part of the world and to work for the liberation of the captive nations.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in sending in a message of hope to those European countries, commemorated by act of Congress as captive nations, and held under the domination of the Soviet Union not by voluntary political alliance, but by the insidiously gained power of Soviet figureheads.

So long as these nations remain in every sense of the word, captive, freedom is attacked and the imperialism of the Soviet Union flourishes. The Soviet net has spread over the nations of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Romania, claiming that because it has the might to name the officials of these nations, it also has the right to govern the people.

It is unfortunate that the Captive Nations Week observance by the Congress during the third week in July has become virtually a tradition. It is unfortunate that we are now embarked on our seventh year of extending a word of hope to these more than luckless peoples, who have, over centuries of civilization, demonstrated their national pride and their independence. It is unfortunate, indeed, that they are still denied their basic human rights, their self-determination, their human dignity.

I extend my hand in friendship to these people who are bearing a burden which, God willing, this Nation will never experience, even in the remotest sense. I pledge to them that we shall keep the cause of freedom strong and bright in the world and will welcome them back to the community of justice, freedom, and dignity when their bondage has been broken.

Mr. McCARTHY. This week has been set aside for the American people to renew the spiritual bonds that unite us with the peoples of Eastern Europe who are living under the oppression of Communist rule.

These must be strong bonds to penetrate the Iron Curtain erected by Communist officials to isolate their lands from the influence of the free world. And they are strong, for no sentiments are more unifying than the love of freedom and self-determination.

It is hard for us in this country to realize what it means to live under tyranny and be without the basic freedoms that are so central a part of our way of life—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom to worship as one pleases.

Even the phrase "Captive Nations" has now been pronounced so often that we do not stop to recognize its full significance. That whole nations may literally be held captive is astounding and enraging.

But I am convinced that the desire of men to be free will ultimately prove more powerful than the brute force and terror used by the Communists to seize control in these countries and entrench themselves a ruler.

The peoples of Eastern Europe have not lost their spirit or their yearning for freedom. In East Germany in 1953 and in Poland and Hungary in 1956, these courageous people stood up to their oppressors and dramatically showed the world their valiant determination to live under governments responsive to their needs and wishes. The countless number of individuals who have risked or lost their lives escaping from East Berlin is unmistakable evidence of how much these totalitarian regimes are despised.

The very existence of a Berlin wall show that the Communist rulers recognize this humiliating fact. And of course these regimes would not dare to hold free elections, for they know all too well what the outcome would be.

Captive Nations Week is meant to tell the inhabitants of these lands that they have our sympathy and support and to urge them to maintain the courage and fortitude they have so far shown. But we cannot devote our attention to this crucial part of the world a mere one week out of the year. I urge my colleagues to join the effort to create a permanent House Committee on Captive Nations. Such a committee could keep continuous touch with the problems of the people of these nations.

Captive Nations Week is also the time for all Americans to extend support to our fellow citizens of Eastern European descent, for they bear the burden of constant awareness that their kinsmen do not enjoy the freedom and opportunity that is theirs.

Polish-Americans feel this burden especially severely, because the Poles are a people with strong national and cultural ties and because freedom and democracy are deeply rooted in Polish history.

The Am-Pol Eagle, an excellent weekly newspaper serving Americans of Polish descent in the Buffalo, N.Y., area, published a fine editorial last week on Captive Nations Week which I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

President Lyndon Johnson has designated the week of July 18 as Captive Nations Week. During this week all Americans should take time off to thank God that they are a part of a free and independent nation. Americans must also remember that other people throughout the world are not blessed with the freedom and independence which God has showered on these United States.

During this week Americans must signify that they are willing to give strength and moral support to the nations behind the Iron Curtain. It is imperative and of utmost significance that the hope and aspirations of these nations be kept alive and nurtured in love of freedom. There is no doubt that this is necessary if we are to stem the tide of imperialistic Russia and Red China.

The staff of the Am-Pol Eagle pledges its wholehearted support to the observance of Captive Nations Week, and urges all Polish-American people to attend and participate in the ceremonies and activities this week. We further hope that all our people will work for the dream of a free Poland, and that someday this dream will be realized and Poland will once again be a land of freedom, liberty, and self-determination.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to join with my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman DANIEL FLOOD, in participating in the observance of Captive Nations Week.

Although Americans at this moment are preoccupied with the critical situation in southeast Asia, we most assuredly have not forgotten the peoples of Eastern Europe living under Communist control. Captive Nations Week, which since 1959 has been observed annually, symbolizes our unswerving commitment to these subjugated peoples.

A revolution of rising expectations is sweeping across the continents of Africa and Asia; yes, in Eastern Europe, self-determination and fundamental human rights are still denied to more than 100 million victims of Communist expansion.

It is undoubtedly true that the Soviet Union today wields less political leverage over the countries of Eastern Europe than it did during the 1950's. I would submit, however, that the all-important relationship between the people and the State has not changed significantly, international developments notwithstanding. Despite a decline in Stalinist terrorism and some token improvements for the consumer, Eastern Europeans continue to live under an oppressive totalitarianism.

Our policy toward the governments of Eastern Europe must be one which combines military preparedness with political realism. We must continue to build "bridges" of commerce linking east and west, thus drawing the nations of Eastern Europe away from a posture of economic and political reliance upon Moscow or Peiping. In short, our economic strength must be used as a weapon to extract political concessions from the Communist regimes of Eastern Europe.

I am proud to join with President Johnson, my colleagues in the House, and my fellow Americans in observing Captive Nations Week. I sincerely hope that the captive peoples will ultimately be able to enjoy individual freedom, national independence, and lasting peace.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in observing the seventh annual Captive Nations Week today I want to present to this body some observations drawn from my recent trip to Eastern Europe.

As many of you know, it was my singular privilege to represent the President at the Poznan Trade Fair last month. Among my official duties were opening the American Pavilion at the fair on June 13 and acting as host during America Day on June 15.

I also was able to undertake a study mission of conditions in both Poland and Czechoslovakia, observing the life of the people of those countries and speaking to government officials on matters of mutual concern.

Since my visit to Poland was significantly longer than my stop in Czechoslovakia, I will devote my comments today almost solely to the Polish situation.

At the outset, however, I want to express concern lest the term captive nations blind us to certain realities in central and Eastern Europe. Certainly that term aptly describes certain countries, particularly East Germany.

Other nations of Eastern Europe are not captives in the same sense as East Germany. Although Eastern European countries do not permit their people the liberty which they should have—although these countries are ruled under a philosophy we regard as alien to Western traditions, they have achieved some measure of freedom from the domination of Soviet communism.

A liberalization process has occurred in Eastern Europe since the mid-1950's. This fact must, I think, be recognized if we are to formulate responsible, realistic and effective policies toward the nations of Eastern Europe.

It is in this context that I wish to discuss today my findings and observations during my visit to Poland.

THE POLISH GOVERNMENT ON VIETNAM

In Poland I was struck with the vehement attitude of the Polish Government officials and Polish Government-owned and controlled press on the question of Vietnam.

For several years, the Poles have tried to play the role of mediator among the various factions in the Communist world, particularly between the Soviet Union and Red China. As the differences between the U.S.S.R. and China over Vietnam have grown sharper, the Poles have become more and more nervous and frustrated.

On the Government level, their anxiety has taken the form of some not-so-pleasant gestures against the United States. Some of their officials have accused our Nation of murder and genocide because of the bombing of North Vietnam. Poland has reduced—or postponed—a number of Polish-American exchanges.

Polish officials indicated to me that they will not be prepared to talk with the United States about expansion of contacts, or further economic relations, until the Vietnam issue has been settled.

In fairness, I must note that this extreme attitude is not common to all Polish Government officials. Some pleasant and meaningful discussions, for example, were held with Polish foreign trade officials.

THE POLISH PEOPLE ON VIETNAM

The Polish people—as distinct from their Government—do not appear concerned about Vietnam. Everywhere I went in Poland I found considerable evidence of the friendship of the people of Poland for the people of the United States. Assertions by Polish authorities that the Polish people place solidarity with the people of North Vietnam above their friendship for the United States simply are not true. I came away convinced that most Poles resent the constant anti-American propaganda and are in sympathy with the U.S. position.

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION IN POLAND

On the whole, there appears to be some general economic improvement in Poland since my last visit there in 1961. There is more new construction both in the countryside and in the cities. Polish foreign trade has continued to expand—their exports to the United States, for example, increased by some 30 percent last year over 1963. There are more automobiles to be seen on the roads and the clothing of the people seems less drab.

At the same time, however, Poland still faces severe economic problems. The standard of living continues to be low. The housing shortage is little abated. There are chronic shortages of certain food items, of various consumer goods, and—of course—capital goods. Public transportation generally is inadequate and obsolete.

Unemployment and underemployment remains a major domestic problem. There are many more people in the countryside and on the farms than are needed for current agricultural production. The cities offer little opportunity for jobs for those leaving the land.

It is for this reason that Poland has recently permitted the return to some forms of self-employment: small retail stores, handicraft shops and some service establishments.

Poland's unemployment is almost certain to become more acute in 2 or 3 years when the immediate postwar crop of children will move into the labor market. Unless the Polish Government allows the return of free enterprise or greatly expands its investment in production facilities, the country will face grave problems.

FOREIGN TRADE PROBLEMS

The country also faces difficulties in its foreign trade relations. The European Common Market threatens some traditional Polish markets in Western Europe. The Poles also are intensively seeking new commercial credits.

In relations with the United States, the Poles have been very prompt in repaying the loans which we extended to them after World War II and during the late 1950's, and in making settlements on Polish claims of U.S. citizens.

Poland currently is paying us, in U.S. dollars, from 13 to 14 million annually. Because Congress last year made the country ineligible for further soft-currency sales under the food for peace program, however, the Poles are going to face some serious problems in the next 2 or 3 years. Their dollar repayment will double. At the same time, they will have to use hard currencies to purchase farm commodities abroad. This will put them in a double bind.

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CONDITIONS

Internally, the political situation has not changed much in the past 4 years. The people who were in power then are still in power today. Their control over the population does not seem diminished. As a matter of fact, there seems to be evidence of a hardening of internal controls and a move away from the liberalization policies which Poland pursued after 1956.

Social, intellectual, and cultural contacts with the West are not expanding at the present time and, in some instances, they have diminished. Polish artists, writers, film directors, and people in allied professions do not seem to be doing as well as they were 4 years ago.

There appears to be a general tightening of restrictions which is both unfortunate and surprising. Just when the other countries of Eastern Europe are beginning to move in the direction of liberalization, Poland, which once led this movement, appears to be turning in the opposite direction.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

From all indications, the Government campaign against the Catholic Church and religion in general has not abated. In fact, it may be increasing. I heard a number of complaints about this.

Religious education is repressed. The teaching of clergy is restricted and interfered with. Members of the clergy and of religious orders are being refused admission to trade and technical schools. Clergy and those employed in religious institutions are being dropped from social security rolls. This deprives those affected of medical and hospital benefits, pensions, and retirement allowances.

Sometimes the restrictions against religion take subtle forms. For example, on the Feast of Corpus Christi this year, the Polish primate, Cardinal Wyszynski, was denied the use of a loudspeaker system to address the faithful at a traditional gathering of thousands in Warsaw. Despite these efforts by the Communists to restrict church activity, however, it is estimated that 90 percent of the people attend services regularly.

A PEASANT SUMS IT UP

The attitude of the Polish people themselves toward current sociopolitical conditions in Poland was aptly summed up for me by a Polish peasant farmer whom I met during a stop along the road to Lublin. When I asked him how things were, he replied with a rhyme in Polish that could be translated thus:

> It is a bit better now, at least we have a piece of land and a cow, if only the big brothers from the East would get out and the government leave the church alone, we could get along somehow.

The big brothers from the East, of course, are the Soviets who never have been popular in Poland.

A SUMMARY OF FINDINGS IN POLAND

In summary, I would like to make five main points on the situation in Poland:

First, since my last visit to the country in 1961, Poland appears to have made some economic progress. These gains and future prospects are now jeopardized by cumbersome bureaucracy, a poor system of distribution, unemployment, and the tightening of markets in Western Europe.

Second, politically, Poland appears to have stopped moving in the direction of liberalization, and Polish-American relations are being marred by the extreme stand of the Government on the Vietnam issue.

Third, the Polish people themselves continue to be friendly to Americans. This was evident in the crowds which surged through the American pavilion at the Poznan Trade Fair and in many conversations with private individuals in various parts of Poland.

Fourth, the United States has made good beginnings since 1957 to establish wider contacts and relations with Poland. We would hope that this trend could continue. It certainly is in the interest of the people of Poland and consistent with our objective of seeking peace, liberalization, and return to more normal relations and conditions in Eastern and central Europe.

Fifth, there is a general mood of depression and disillusionment among the people of Poland. They are disillusioned because of the lack of significant economic progress, and because they realize that the promise of the October 1956 upheaval—the promise of liberalization—slowly is fading.

AN ACT OF COURAGE BY A POLISH YOUTH

To illustrate the last point, I should like to narrate one of the most memorable events of the trip which occurred in Cracow. Although the Polish press virtually ignored my stay, a group of Cracow youth learned I would be in their city through Radio Free Europe and Voice of America broadcasts.

They searched the city until they found our American cars outside the hotel. When our party came out, one of the young men approached me and placed in my lapel a pin with the initials "P.W." in the form of an anchor. This emblem was the mark of the Polish resistance against Nazi occupations during World War II. The initials stand for "Polska Walczaca" which means "Fighting Poland."

The young man explained that today this emblem is the symbol of those who still are fighting for freedom—that is, against Communist domination. The youth and his friends were running the risk of political arrest for this brave act.

Needless to say, the pin remains a cherished reminder of the love for freedom and indomitable courage of the Polish people. Their regard and respect for our country and our people is equally strong. Together with their religious faith, America is a source of hope for a better future. In my opinion, it is incumbent on us to help keep that hope alive.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, during the month of July the American people celebrated their Independence Day; the French people celebrated the recurrence of Bastille Day which marked the beginning of the French Revolution, one of the most decisive events in modern history. For us and all the peoples of the world these dates are of great significance; they are relevant to our past, our present, and our future.

From the end of the 18th century onward the idea of freedom and independence spread all over the world; the words of liberty and equality became known to all peoples of the earth. And they did not remain mere ideas or empty words, for liberty and equality and the freedom of the individual became the fundamental basis for the constitutions and policies of many nations.

Especially during the last few decades we have witnessed the upsurge of freedom and independence in those continents which had been subjected to foreign domination. On July 1 many African nations celebrated their republic day, and we, the American people, were gladdend by these events. America has not only welcomed the spread of democracy and the progress of freedom, but has always supported other countries in their struggle for independence and democracy. Twice we entered a world war in order to defeat imperialistic designs of other states and protect democratic nations from totalitarian and authoritarian aggressors.

Thus it is with regret and deep sorrow, that now, in 1965 we still have to observe a Captive Nations Week. Twenty years after the last war was won in the name of freedom, 20 years after a global war was fought under the principles of the Atlantic Charter, there are still a great number of nations under subjection, not free to decide their own course. In eastern Europe millions of people are captive. It is especially tragic that many of these people had been subject to Fascist aggression and fought against the aggressors valiantly and courageously—only to fall victim to Communist imperialism after the end of World War II.

How much longer will it take until all people are allowed to make their own choice about their political, economic, and social institutions? How much longer will whole nations have to remain divided, with families separated by barbed wire fences and stone walls? In a world where nations possess more destructive power than needed to destroy the whole globe we cannot attempt to come to the help of the captive nations with armed force, but we will support them in any other way and by all peaceful means available.

There are already a few signs and indications in Eastern Europe which let us hope that those captive peoples will gain freedom. Although there is little reason to believe that they will be completely free and independent in the near future, it should be considered a great progress that greater freedom of expression can be found in the arts and literature of some of these countries. This may well be the first step toward the final goal. The new brand of ideological imperialism exercised in Eastern Europe attempted to dominate the minds of all men, to mold it and to shape it according to their wishes. This has not been successful, and it will never be successful.

We promise our full moral support for the captive nations. We admire their persevering spirit. Their goal will always be our goal—freedom for every man to choose his way of life, and together with them we will continue to resist tyranny in every form. To paraphrase Thomas Jefferson:

> We have sworn eternal hostility against any form of tyranny over the minds of men.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, just recently we have been given a new example of Soviet cynicism. The Soviet Union, it has been reported, is organizing in the once independent Baltic Republics celebrations of the events of 1940 which led to their incorporation into the Soviet Empire. Nothing could demonstrate better the reasons that we observe Captive Nations Week in this country, and the effectiveness of our observations. For it is to be suspected that the Soviet Union is seeking to stamp out the memories of liberty that are reinforced each year by ceremonies held throughout the free world in commemoration of Captive Nations Week.

I am sure that this year, as in previous years, the attempts of the Soviet Union to weaken the links between the peoples of the free world and the captive peoples living behind the Iron Curtain will prove futile. The proud peoples of the Baltic States may be forced by the Soviet rulers to attend these so-called celebrations. But we know that in their hearts they will be marking 1940 as a year of infamy, and that they will be waiting for reassurance from the West that they have not been forgotten and that they will not be forgotten.

This then is the meaning of Captive Nations Week. In towns and cities throughout our country, in the Halls of Congress, and in countries throughout the free world, people who live in freedom and who cherish the blessings that freedom has brought to them will gather together to renew their dedication to the ideal of freedom for all those who remain today deprived of the right of self-determination. By showing that we care, we send a vital message to those living under the yoke of Soviet tyranny. They must not give up hope. The strength of their faith in eventual freedom is part of our strength. Every hope crushed, no matter how distant its realization must be, is a dimming of the lamp of liberty.

The week we are observing then must be an occasion for somber reflection but it must not be an occasion for despair. We must contemplate the enslavement of millions of people by a ruthless dictatorship. We must remember that this enslavement dates back to the very time of the establishment of communism in Russia. And thus we are reminded that the very essence of communism is imperialism, and that imperialism will wane only when communism begins to wane.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today, for the seventh year, we in the Congress of the United States pay tribute and pledge our loyalty to 1,109,500,000 people of the captive nations imprisoned within the Iron Curtain of communism. These people, comprising almost 35 percent of the world's population, live in an enclosure constituting 13,761,000 square miles; over 26 percent of the world's surface. These captive people ask only the right to live in peace, serenity, and freedom.

In 1959, Public Law 86-90, unanimously adopted by the Congress of the United States, designated the third week of July of each year as Captive Nations Week. Its impact can best be measured by the Soviet reaction to it, which has run from studied indifference to vociferous indignation.

For the people of east-central Europe, Captive Nations Week is a sign of the free world's opposition to oppression; a sign that the free world still believes in the right of self-determination of people all over the world.

The Yalta Declaration to which Russia was a party, had guaranteed free elections in all liberated lands. Both President Roosevelt and President Truman had rejected spheres of influence which Moscow had advocated as a basis of the postwar order. Yet, in violation of the Yalta Agreement, and despite the refusal of Roosevelt and later Truman to accept spheres of influence, the Soviet forced their brutal dictatorship upon more than 100 million people of east-central Europe. It is ironic that the wardens of the Communist prison of nations today are raising a hue and cry about alleged U.S. intervention into the affairs of small countries.

Captive Nations Week this year dramatizes the quest for peace with freedom. It offers a vivid reminder of who the imperialists are in today's world.

In 1939 Germany struck the first blow against Poland. This was followed up by the Red army which took over and has since kept Poland enslaved through a puppet government.

Shortly after the seizure of Poland the Soviet took the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. In 1945-46 the Soviet Union installed a puppet regime on Iranian soil. It has occupied Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, denying to them as well as the Ukraine the right of self-determination.

The Soviet Government which shouts loudest of imperialism is the keeper of a prison house of nations. Within its domain it holds the following countries and people:

The captive nations: Who's next?

[Year of Communist domination]

Country and people:	
Armenia	1920
Azerbaijan	1920
Byelorussia	1920
Cossackia	1920
Georgia	1920
Idel-Ural	1920
North Caucasians	1920
Democratic Republic of Far East (Siberyaks)	1920
Ukraine	1920
Turkistan	1922
Estonia	1940
Latvia	1940
Lithuania	1940
Albania	1946
Bulgaria	1946
Outer Mongolia	1946
Serb, Croat, Slovene, etc. in Yugoslavia	1946
Poland	1947
Rumania	1947
Czechoslovakia	1948
Hungary	1949
East Germany	1949
Tibet	1951

We have fought for our own independence; we have fought a war to make the world safe for democracy.

We have been reared in the tradition of a Lincoln who has said, "* * * this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free." We assure the people of the captive nations this world will not endure half slave and half free.

OBSERVANCE IN CHICAGO

I am happy to report that all Chicago is observing Captive Nations Week. Under the sponsorship of Hon. Richard J. Daley, mayor of the city of Chicago, 20 national groups representing the enslaved nations behind the Iron, Bamboo, and Sugar curtains held a mass parade on Saturday last. Starting at 2 p.m. at Wacker Drive and State Street, the marchers went down State Street, to Van Buren, to Michigan Avenue and ending at the Buckingham Fountain where a special program took place. There were 10,000 participants, many significant and colorful floats, bands, open cars, and marchers dressed in native costumes carrying American and National flags.

Mayor Richard J. Daley was the honorary parade marshal. Col. Jack Reilly led the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance and read the proclamation for the Captive Nations Week. The main speaker was Dr. Edward M. O'Connor, Staff Director of the Joint Committee for Immigration and Naturalization and former Commissioner for Displaced Persons in Germany. He is a well known supporter of freedom and independence for all enslaved nations and an expert of Eastern European problems.

Dr. O'Connor said:

> We Americans firmly believe that the time has come when all enslaved nations under the Soviet-Russian and Chinese domination will be free and that the principle of self-determination will be applied to every nation, be it small or large, in order to determine their own future by their truly elected representatives.

On behalf of all enslaved nations, there was an address by Prof. Peteris Lejins, chairman of the Joint Baltic American Committee and president of the American Latvian Association. He said:

> The great asset the Communists have at the present time is not the hydrogen bomb, certainly not the Soviet satellites, but world ignorance of their tactics, strategy and objectives. Captive Nations Week is the citizen's way of letting the captive nations—the people themselves as against their oppressive totalitarian states and governments—know that we will never recognize the situation behind the Iron Curtain as a permanent one.

MAYOR DALEY'S PROCLAMATION

Following is the proclamation by the Honorable Richard J. Daley, mayor of Chicago:

> Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and
>
> Whereas by joint resolution of the Congress of the United States the third week of July has been designated as Captive Nations Week; and
>
> Whereas the city of Chicago is linked to these captive nations through the bonds of family, since numbered among the people of Chicago are hundreds of thousands of our citizens who through nativity or ancestry treasure the heritage which endowed them with the culture and industry which are theirs; and
>
> Whereas these nations have been made captive by the imperialistic, aggressive, and heartless policies of communism; and
>
> Whereas the peoples of these Communist-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and
>
> Whereas it is appropriate and proper to demonstrate to the people of the captive nations the support of the people of the city of Chicago for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and
>
> Whereas the people of Chicago, as do all the people of the United States, want for the peoples of the world the same freedom and justice which is theirs: Now, therefore,
>
> I, Richard J. Daley, mayor of the city of Chicago, do hereby designate the week beginning July 17, 1965, as Captive Nations Week.
>
> I urge the people of Chicago to join in the programs arranged for observance of the occasion, and I urge all of our churches, our educational institutions, and all media of communications to observe the plight of the Communist-dominated nations and to join in support of the just aspirations of the people of the captive nations.
>
> I especially encourage everyone to concretely demonstrate his or her interest in the people imprisoned in the captive nations by their attendance at or participation in the parade to be held on State Street on Saturday afternoon, July 17, at 2 p.m. and at the assembly following in Grant Park.
>
> RICHARD J. DALEY,
> *Mayor.*

Following is the committee named by Mayor Daley for Captive Nations Week:

Albania: H. Yousuff Ozem, Mr. Yaup Xhezaj.

Armenia: Mr. Art Kushdilian.

Bulgaria: Dr. George Paprikoff, Mr. Jorda Pinalski, Mr. George Marinov.

Byelorussia: Mrs. Helen Soloviej.

Croatia: Mr. Elia Sharavania, Mrs. Sandra Sabor.

Cuba: Mr. Jose Hernandez, Mr. Serapio Montejo.

China: Mr. Albert K. Leong.

Ukraine: Mrs. Ulana Celewych, Mr. Volodymyr Nechaj, Mr. Bohdan Bilynskyj.

Poland: Dr. Chester Piekarczyr, committee chairman; Mr. Kazimierz Lukomski, Mr. Boleslaw Krakowski.

Germany: Mr. Dieter K. Schroeder.

Latvia: Mr. Viktor Viksnins.

Lithuania: Mr. L. Prapnolenis, Mr. Anthony Santoras.

Estonia: Mr. Alexander Koepp.

Slovak: Mr. Anton Ondrush.

Hungary: Mr. C. S. Fiedler, Mr. Julius Hovanyi, Mr. Paul Quirico.

Czechoslovakia: Mrs. E. Wraz, Alderman Otto Janousek.

Cossacks: Mr. H. Stiahajlo.

Georgia: Mr. Dimitri Gunia.

Serbia: Mrs. Roksanda Panich, Alderman Samuel Yaksic.

Slovenia: Father Vandelin, St. Stephens Church; Dr. Mirco Geratich.

Korea: President of Korean Methodist Student Center.

HONORARY COMMITTEE FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

His Excellency Most Rev. Jaraslav Gabro.
His Excellency Most Rev. Vincentas Brizgys.
Hon. Frank Tze-tnu Sia.
Hon. Petras Dauzwardis.
Rev. Valdis Landmanis.
Dr. L. B. Dzinich.
Dr. Peter Hletko.
Hon. Roman Pucinski.
Hon. Daniel Rostenkowski.
Dr. Jose J. de Alvare.
Rev. Oleh Myronowych.

GOVERNOR KERNER'S PROCLAMATION

Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the proclamation of the Honorable Otto Kerner, Governor of Illinois.

Proclamation of the State of Illinois on Captive Nations

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led to the enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others, and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war, and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence, and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has established by unanimous vote the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week that the people of the United States may express their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now, therefore, I, Otto Kerner, Governor of the State of Illinois, do hereby proclaim the week commencing July 18, 1965, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Illinois, and call upon our citizens to observe this occasion in a manner fitting and proper.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Illinois to be affixed.

Done at the capitol in the city of Springfield, this ninth day of July, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-five, and of the State of Illinois the one hundredth and forty-seventh.

Otto Kerner,
Governor.

By the Governor:

Paul Powell.

STATEMENT OF CHICAGO COMMITTEE

The following is the statement of the Committee for Captive Nations Week Observance in Chicago:

The philosophy of communism has remained unchanged since 1917. It has one basic goal and that is the world revolution. Its course of world domination has been followed by Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev, and the present rulers of the Soviet Union. Anyone who thought that the Communist leaders could be appeased was very quickly disillusioned when the complete subjugation of the eastern and southeastern European countries was effected immediately following World War II. These countries paid an appalling price for the peace. The wholesale sacrifice of the nations of eastern and southeastern Europe proved to be not only morally wrong for the enslaved nations, but also politically disastrous for the West.

As soon as communism held firm its position in these new colonial countries, the Communist leaders planned a new policy for further conquests. China, South Korea, South Vietnam, Tibet, Congo, Cuba, Algeria and most recently the Dominican Republic—all these trouble spots and hot wars were inspired and instigated by the Moscow revolutionary Communist leaders after World War II. Although the free world was willing to accept the peaceful coexistence proclaimed by the Soviet Union, the Communist revolutionary clique always fomented trouble spots and local wars trying to make new gains for the achievement of their ultimate goal. Events in the Dominican Republic made it evident that the Communist rulers interpret peaceful coexistence to mean only a policy of nonresistance by the free world toward the achievement of its Communist goal.

A firm stand against Communism should be sustained. The free world should not be on the defensive but should be on the offensive. The Communist colonialism should be denounced both for depriving so many ethnic groups of their freedom and independence and for their criminal treatment of the subjected people.

The free world must never forget that concentration camps and slave labor camps are still in existence in Soviet Russia. Mass deportations are continually being effected. We should take steps which will show our disapproval and condemnation of such practices of Soviet colonialism, so that the subjugated people can be assured that their lot and plight are not forgotton and that the free world is actively concerned and interested in their present and in their future.

Any other policy enacted that would be soft on communism would harm and impair our national security and future. We would lose the most dependable and useful allies, these subjugated peoples, if we fail to resist their oppressor. Let this year's Captive Nations Week be another proof of our continued willingness to help all the subjugated people in their fight against communism. Let us remind them that the Atlantic Charter and the principle of self-determination of nations is not just a scrap of paper. Let us remind the enslaved people that they can count on the support of the free world in their struggle for freedom and independence. Let us remind the subjugated gigantic struggle for freedom and justice and people that we shall do our share in this that we also count on them when the hopeful moment comes.

We who have gathered in this outstanding city which stands as a symbol of freedom for all the world's people resolve to press unrelenting toward the goal of achieving for all enslaved people the fulfillment of the liberties which we so proudly enjoy and richly cherish.

Dr. Chester Piekarczyk, Honorary Chairman; Eli Saravanja, Chairman; Ulana Celewych, Secretary; Anton Ondrus, Slovakia Representative; Paul Quirico, Hungary Representative; L. Prapuolenis, Lithuania Representative; Alexander Koepp, Estonia Representative; H. Stiagailo, Cossack Representative; Boleslaw Bilogan, Poland Representative; Roksanda Panich, Serbia Representative; Dr. Pank Chung, Korea Representative; Taras Shpikula, Ukraine Representative; George Marinov, Bulgaria Representative; Dieter K. Schroeder, Germany Representative; Viktor Viksnins, Latvia Representative; Eli Saravanja, Croatia Representative; Albert K. Leong, China Representative; Vera Romuk, Byelorussia Representative.

CHICAGO COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

Following is the resolution of the Chicago committee:

Whereas the Senate and the House of Representatives have authorized the President of the United States to proclaim a Captive Nations Week each year, and the same has been done for the past 6 years; and

Whereas the Russian and Chinese Communist world continues on its road of persecution, aggression, and enslavement and through these means has succeeded to subjugate many nations and ethnic groups, thus depriving a great personal liberty, human rights and dignity and creating a vast colonial empire threatening the security and national existence of the countries of the free world; and

Whereas communism continues to threaten the peace, security, and independence of Latin American countries, having succeeded in a complete take over of Cuba, and recently trying to do the same with Dominican Republic, also causing serious disturbances in many other countries, such as South Vietnam, and Laos and Cambodia;

Whereas the people of the United States share with all the enslaved nations their just aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Captive Nations Committee of Chicago, That it recommends the adoption by the United States of a national policy which would encourage the aspirations and movements for national self-determination of peoples, enslaved by the Communist imperialism, by an expressed and unequivocal commitment of the United States of America to support, by all means possible, such aspirations for national freedom; be it further

Resolved by the Captive Nations Committee of Chicago, That we support a firm stand of our administration against the aggressive policies of communism and we are wholeheartedly in favor of actions taken in Dominican Republic and Vietnam; be it further

Resolved, That the Ambassador of the United States to the United Nations put on the agenda of the United Nations the questions: (a) of the abolishment of all concentration camps, slave labor and mass deportations, (b) of the return to their homes and countries of all the deported and exiled who survived the Communist ordeal, (c) of free elections of all enslaved nations under the supervision of the United Nations Organization; be it further

Resolved, That this committee reiterates its support for the establishment of the permanent Captive Nations Committee (House Resolution 211) and Freedom Academy which would demonstrate to Moscow that the United States will not cease in its efforts until all captive nations are able to enjoy the God given rights of all peoples of freedom and national sovereignty.

> Dr. Chester Piekarczyk, Honorary Chairman; Eli Saravanja, Chairman; Ulana Celewych, Secretary; Anton Ondrus, Slovakia Representative; Paul Quirico, Hungary Representative; L. Prapuolenis, Lithuania Representative; Alexander Koepp, Estonia Representative; H. Stiagailo, Cossack Representative; Boleslaw Bilogan, Poland Representative; Roksanda Panich, Serbia Representative; Dr. Pank Chung, Korea Representative; Taras Shpikula, Ukraine Representative; George Marinov, Bulgaria Representative; Dieter K. Schroeder, Germany Representative; Viktor Viksnins, Latvia Representative; Eli Sarravanja, Croatia Representative; Albert K. Leong, China Representative; Vera Romuk, Byelorussia Representative.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, George Santayana in his work, "The Life of Reason," wrote "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

Even considering only the past 25 years, we have had ample time to commit to memory the history of Russian imperial expansion. We have seen the Red Army, while in alliance with Nazi Germany, occupy Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. We have seen the Red Army stand idly by while the Nazis exterminated the true patriotic seed of Poland, the men who fought in the Warsaw uprising. We have seen the Red Army occupy central Europe under the guise of liberation. We have seen the Russians twist national aspirations to fit their own imperial ends. We have heard them mouth the phrase, self-determination of all peoples, but we have seen the Russians wield brutal power over the peoples in the non-Russian nations now forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union during the first quarter of their 20th-century colonial adventures.

We remember the Russian past. And we must not let them go on repeating it.

When it comes to straight dealing with the problems of colonialism the Russians keep two sets of books—one is for those Western powers who painstakingly, and often painfully, have worked for the full independence, political maturity, and economic viability of their former colonies. In the set of Russian books on this activity there are no words strong enough to describe the so-called horrors of this Western progress toward freedom.

But for the rape of the Baltic Nations, for the mass deportation of Ukrainians behind the Urals, for the Russian slave labor camps, for the cultural genocide of the central Asian peoples, for the mechanized crushing of the peoples of East Berlin, Budapest, and Poznan, for the whole gamut of coerced Russification through imprisonments and assembly-line massacres—for all these operations there is another set of books. In that other set of books the Russians make no mention of colonialism, or enslavement, or imperialism, in spite of the fact that the Russians now in power have outdone the most ambitious and ruthless plans of the czars of the Russian Empire, in spite of the fact that there are more peoples and nations subject to Moscow than ever before, and in spite of the fact that human rights are nowhere more callously denied and ignored.

In this second set of books this all comes under the heading of "Unity of the Working Peoples," and "Liberation."

It must be difficult to keep these two sets of books straight, but woe to the Russian who confuses them. In Russia, it is high treason for the right hand to know what the left hand is doing. In Russia, it is high treason to apply yesterday's principles to today's facts. In Russia, it is high treason to fail to see the Emperor's new clothes.

It is not on the level of a conference in their double think habits that we shall ever make a point that the Russians will accept and honor. But there are other ways to make crystal clear our concern for the peoples of the captive nations. The Russians want long-term credits. They want trade. We should give them neither unless we obtain a political quid pro quo for the relief of the peoples of the captive nations. We do not want double think promises. We do not want to play vainly with platitudes while the peoples of the captive nations are in bondage. We should demand action that we can verify.

The language of action is a language in which even the Russians cannot lie. If we are to trade with regimes behind the Iron Curtain, let us make them speak the language of concrete actions. Let us use our economic power to advance the cause of human freedom.

Our help is needed in the captive nations, and we have the peaceful means to give it. But let us not forget that we need their help. So long as the aspirations of the peoples of the captive nations toward self-determination are strong, they stand as a deterrent to Russian all-out aggression. With a determined force for freedom within the boundaries of their empire it would be too dangerous for them. So long as the people of the captive nations believe that, through all-out efforts, freedom can prevail, the Red Army will be without heart for the cause of Communist expansion and their leaders will be without trust in their conscripts in fear of their civilians. To those captive peoples who are thus serving the cause of peace and freedom, we owe a special duty of support. We are allied to those brave men and women by our common ideals, our common cause, and our common need. And to those bonds let us add one equally important—many of our own citizens trace their origins to those lands now subject to Russian domination. They contribute to the greatness of this Republic a spirit and a tradition of freedom that was born in those now captive nations.

Our own citizens have formed worthy organizations, such as the National Captive Nations Committee; State and city committees of a similar character should listen to their voices, for they are the voices of men and women who know the precious value of freedom, and work for its extension to the darkened nations of the world now seeking the return of their freedom and national independence.

And there is more that we can do. At this time of rededication to the principles enunciated in Public Law 89-90 through which the President has declared Captive Nations Week, we can pledge our renewed support to President Johnson for his swift, sure, and effective prevention of a Communist seizure of power in the Dominican Republic. We can pledge our renewed support to him for his actions in defending the independence of South Vietnam, and for denying sanctuary to the aggressors north of the 17th parallel.

We can, by our resolve, show the world that we remember the past aggressions, and that we are very far indeed from being condemned to their repetition. We, as a free and self governing people, are pledged to support the just aspirations of all nations, large and small, for liberty and national independence.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago this month, the Congress of the United States unanimously passed a resolution calling on the President to designate the third week of July as Captive Nations Week. As a Member of that 86th Congress, I was proud to vote for this resolution. Shortly thereafter, President Eisenhower implemented the resolution by issuing the first proclamation of its kind. And Presidents Kennedy and Johnson have since followed suit.

Our resolution was frank, outspoken, and very useful. Its central contention was this statement:

> The imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ukal, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam and others.

The resolution called on the President to proclaim the observance each year until, "Such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

The purpose of the resolution was twofold: To convince the people behind the Iron and the Bamboo Curtains that the free world had not abandoned them to slavery; and to rally the free people of the world to a greater understanding of our obligations toward those who have been forcibly deprived of their freedom.

By means of this Presidential proclamation and the annual observance of Captive Nations Week in Congress, we are, I believe, helping to sustain the hope and courage of those who are still prisoners of communism. And we are reminding the world that we shall never accept as permanent the present tragic state of once free people and once independent nations.

The Kremlin, of course, expressed outrage when President Eisenhower first issued the captive nations proclamation. The outbursts from Communist leaders—then and now—are understandable, for the proclamation touches the most sensitive nerves of the Soviet regime. It exposes international communism as a most brutal form of imperialism. It identifies the Soviet Union as the world's most oppressive colonial power. And it proclaims our conviction that, like all of history's empires, the Communist empire will ultimately break apart and once again restore the opportunity to be free.

The observance of Captive Nations Week is, I think, an especially suitable and significant occasion for the United States as the foremost free nation in the world. It shows that we have not forgotten our own origins as a colony and our own struggle for independence. It demonstrates that our belief in freedom and in the rights of man is still the central force behind our way of life.

This year's observance, Mr. Speaker, comes at an opportune time. It should serve to remind us that the shifts and uncertainties in the Communist world, especially in eastern Europe, require the most careful policy attention of Congress and the executive branch. For this reason, several of us in the House have been sponsoring legislation to establish a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations, a committee whose job it would be to study conditions in the satellite countries and help develop means of encouraging greater freedom there. This legislation is pending before the Committee on Rules, and I join many of our colleagues in expressing the hope that the committee will soon consider the legislation favorably.

The need for such a committee is well illustrated by the growing difficulty we have experienced with Communist Poland. Just the other day, for instance, the Polish Communist government denied permission for a United States delegation composed of Vice President HUMPHREY and 40 Members of Congress to visit Poland in October to help dedicate a new hospital in Cracow. This hospital, one of the finest in the world, was built in large part with United States aid, and our delegation's proposed visit would have served to strengthen our ties with the Polish people.

The refusal of the Communist government to allow the U.S. delegation to attend the dedication, however, confirms the hard, anti-American line which the Polish Communists have followed recently and strongly suggests the need to review our present policies. Toward this end, a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations could make a valuable contribution.

I hope, therefore, that Captive Nations Week will be observed next week by all Americans, in and out of government, as an opportunity to find new ways to encourage the growth of freedom and halt the spread of communism.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Public Law 90 of the 86th Congress, President Johnson has declared this week as Captive Nations Week.

Every year since 1959, the Congress has paused in its deliberations to consider the tragedy of those nations who have been swallowed up by Communist imperialism. Today, no less than 180 million of our fellow human beings are prisoners of the Soviet system.

We in the 14th District of New Jersey are fortunate to have as neighbors many fine American citizens who are fugitives from Soviet oppression. I use the word "fortunate" because those who know slavery and tyranny firsthand are the most vigorous supporters of freedom and the dignity of man. No foreign invader has violated continental United States since 1815 and no native American now living has had to exist under the conqueror's heel. We who were born in this great Nation have an unfortunate tendency to take the blessings of liberty too lightly. This is not so with those who know firsthand what it is to live in a police state with the ever-present dread of the midnight visit by the secret police. To these newer Americans freedom is a cherished thing and they bring to these shores a love of liberty which is an inspiration to all Americans.

On this seventh observance of Captive Nations Week there is little encouragement we can give to those whose fortune it has been to be imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain. But we do know that in God's time the Poles, the Czechs, the Hungarians, the Rumanians, the Ukrainians, the Latvians, the Lithuanians, the Estonians, the Albanians, the North Koreans, the North Vietnamese, and all the other prisoners of international communism will know what it is to step out of the shadows of slavery into the bright sunlight of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, it is a solemn duty for us to continue to press for the liberation of all captive nations. Let us pray that before too many of these observances have passed we may see these captive nations taking their rightful places among the truly sovereign peoples of the world. It is vital that we always keep the cause of self-determination for all nations constantly before us. We must never—even for a moment—allow ourselves to forget the cause of those who are denied the most basic of freedoms.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, my presentation under special order of July 21 on Captive Nations Week included a speech which I delivered at Kenosha, Wis., last Sunday. Since that time I have received a complete transcript of a speech made by Petras P. Dauzvardis, counsul general of Lithuania at that same commemoration.

I am pleased to insert his speech into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because of the valuable message offered. Consul General Dauzvardis was described by my good colleague, Congressman ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, of Illinois, the main speaker, as a living symbol of the efforts of the Lithuanian people to preserve their identity and to fully regain their freedom from the Soviet tyranny. Congressman PUCINSKI, I point out, was selected by Mayor Richard Daley, of Chicago, as a member of the honorary committee for Captive Nations Week, as was the consul general.

The full text of Consul General Dauzvardis' speech follows:

REMARKS OF HON. PETRAS P. DAUZVARDIS

This significant gathering is organized and conducted in the spirit of the Fourth of July, and the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence of the United States. This gathering, on the first day of Captive Nations Week, affords the opportunity to register a strong protest against the Soviet Union for its illegal seizure of Lithuania and the robbing and enslaving of her people. It provides the opportunity to express thanks to the U.S. Government for not recognizing the grab and incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

The United States recognized Lithuania de jure on July 28, 1922, and firmly maintains this recognition, considering Lithuania an independent state temporarily occupied by Soviet armed forces (a situation similar to that of Hitler's occupation of many nations during the war).

Soviet Russia had recognized Lithuania as an independent sovereign state on July 12, 1920. However, it did not live up to its obligations and agreements: it wantonly violated all of them. September 28, 1939, Soviet Russia colluded with Hitler to divide Lithuania. In June of 1940 it seized Lithuania, deposed her lawful government, and imposed an illegal Soviet puppet regime which, on July 21, 1940 (the third week of July), passed a resolution to incorporate Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

The United States denounced these acts on July 23, 1940, when Acting Secretary of State Sumner Welles called them the devious processes and predatory activities. America refused to recognize the armed seizure of Lithuania and its illegal annexation, and it does not recognize these Soviet acts of subterfuge and armed aggression today.

These facts clearly illustrate the great contrast between American and Russian foreign policy. America supports small or weak states and abides by its pledges. Soviet Russia grabs and exploits small states and violates its pledges—in fact, totally disregards its given word. Soviet leaders say one thing and do exactly the opposite, as is plainly shown in the case of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Soviet leaders talk about "national liberation" and independence for colonies of Africa but they themselves enslave and denationalize independent states in Europe, converting them into Russian colonies. When Lithuanian patriots demanded national liberation, they were sent to Siberia. Soviet Premier Kosygin demands the withdrawal of American troops from the Dominican Republic, but says nothing about the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania and the other Soviet-occupied countries.

Soviet Russia grabs and annihilates countries and their peoples. In Lithuania they have slain or deported to Siberia approximately half a million Lithuanians. The Soviets continue committing this genocide to this day. So far this year they have taken four large groups of Lithuanian youths to the far northern reaches of Russia, and more such shipments are planned. Meanwhile, Russians are being brought into Lithuania from Russia. Denationalization, Russification, communization, and colonization are going on in full swing. Religion and the religious are being persecuted and derided; atheism is being infused.

All this is evident not only to the Lithuanians, but to impartial leaders and statesmen as well as to news media. In connection with the tragic 25-year anniversary of the Soviet seizure and occupation of the Baltic States, the House of Representatives of the United States conducted a hearing of witnesses on May 17 and 18, and on June 21 adopted a resolution condemning the illegal Soviet acts against the Baltic States and their people.

This was done with the approval and support of the Department of State. Shortly thereafter, on June 23, Secretary Dean Rusk received a six-man Baltic delegation to whom he gave reassurance that America stands firmly for the independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—that the policy of nonrecognition of the Soviet occupation will continue.

Captive Nations Week was initiated by the U.S. Congress, its annual observance is proclaimed by the President, and is supported by Governors, mayors, and all freedom-loving people. We are grateful to them.

The total aim of all these measures and efforts is the liberation of the presently captive nations and the restoration of their rights and freedom to them.

Freedom, independence, and sovereignty are rights which belong to Lithuania and the other Soviet-held states. They demand the restoration of these rights. The Soviet Union has no legal ground nor right to refuse them.

The Lithuanian people justly and resolutely say that without a free Lithuania there can be no just or lasting peace. Lithuania must be liberated from the present Soviet occupation and colonialism and restored to the world community of free and independent nations.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, it is with necessarily mixed feelings that we this week recognize the captive nations and join in extending our hopes as a free nation for a future of greater freedom and increased felicity for their people. On one hand, we welcome this chance to witness to our common dedication to truth and freedom, and to assure the peoples of the captive nations of our continued interest and sympathy. On the other hand, we are saddened that again, this year, it is necessary. We would have certainly been much more pleased to be able to instead congratulate the peoples of these nations on having joined us in the world community of truly free nations.

Unfortunately, the tangled net of Communist domination is not an easy one to escape from, no matter how strong and diligent the efforts are that are made to do so. We are encouraged, however, that there has recently been some indication of a significant lessening of the stranglehold that international Communist imperialism has put upon these unfortunate peoples. Yet we still look forward together with the peoples of these nations to a further relaxing of the restrictions and controls that have been imposed upon them through force and fear by an unscrupulously imperialist power of hate. When, once again, these nations can join us in the exercise of their rightful sovereignty and freedom, then we shall be able to say that we are happy to be able to celebrate Captive Nations Week, for it will have been transposed from a day of the sad recollection of past tragedies and the subtle fortitude of hope into one of rejoicing over freedom regained and hopes realized.

More than solely with hopes and dreams, we must remember that the peoples of these captive nations have sustained themselves by a dedication to freedom that has been so strong, even so fierce, that they have been willing to sacrifice their very lives for their freedom, even when the possibility of thereby securing it for their families and homelands was slight indeed because of the sheer enormity of the forces of oppression arrayed against them. Thus we may say that we can understand and share their dedication to freedom, for we have faced and do face dangers of immense proportions, and many of our finest men have willingly given their lives to defend the rights to freedom that were theirs, their families', and their country's, and that indeed are the natural rights of all men.

However, we must realize that the nature of the dedication of these brave peoples is inherently different from ours, for with the superior might of the world's greatest forces for freedom to back us up in our every move, we most certainly are in a different position than they, supported as they are only by the courage in their hearts, the strength of their bodies, and their deep dedication to the freedom that is man's by birth.

Who are the captive nations? I am sure that you have all seen the various lists prepared and published by various groups and official organizations. Rather than to attempt to list here by name those that I would include, I would rather state my conviction that every nation in the world that suffers from external control or influence to the degree that it is not free to determine its own path and its own future is a captive nation.

Further, and perhaps more importantly, every nation that is controlled by a government that restricts or even eliminates the freedom of its subjects in their own private and domestic lives, regardless of how sovereign that nation is in the international arena, is likewise a captive nation. Whether the people of a nation are oppressed by those of a different national origin or those of the same is of secondary interest. What is of primary concern is their freedom, not who has deprived them of this most precious right.

It is, however, easier for us as outsiders to identify an aggressive, imperialist power than an equally insidious and unscrupulous domestic oppressor. While, therefore, we specifically dedicate this week to studying and recognizing the plight of the captive nations entangled in the international Communist web, and extend to them our sincere sympathy and hopes for a future of greater freedom and happiness, we certainly also extend these to all the nations throughout the world in which men are denied their natural freedom and their sacred rights. Our heartfelt sympathy, our sincere hopes and wishes, our common bonds of commitment to the freedom of mankind, we extend to all those who suffer in bondage. This week, especially, we honor and commend them, and thank them for their courageous examples.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to join my colleagues in observing Captive Nations Week.

This observance presents a clear and decisive opportunity for us to emphasize the right of self-determination for all people, and to publicize the facts about Soviet colonialism and betrayal.

Congress has a moral obligation to recognize and publicize the facts about the captive nations. In some of them—Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia—there have been mass deportations, suppression of basic rights and imposed Russification. In others, treaties have been violated, lands occupied and tiny minorities of collaborators thrust into power.

The hypersensitivity with which radio Moscow and the controlled satellite press greet Captive Nations Week should be enough to jar those public officials here who are inclined to be indifferent or who merely pay lipservice.

It would be a mistake for Congress to ignore the plight of the captive nations in the interest of "political realism" or accommodation. We should view the present plight of Eastern Europe neither as irrevocable nor as unworthy of discussion.

It is also a mistake to believe that things will steadily improve in Eastern Europe. While on the whole there have been improvements, there have also been setbacks. For example, Poland has experienced a slide since those heady days that followed the October revolution of 1956. Moreover, the men who lead the nations of Eastern Europe today are often the same men who betrayed their countries to Soviet domination after World War II.

There is little to be gained, in my judgment, by ignoring the fact that the Communists imposed regimes upon unwilling people, that no self-determination exists, and that the ballot box claims of Communist governments are a mockery and a fraud.

A growing percentage of the world's population had not been born when the events of Soviet suppression and perfidy took place. In fact, a growing percentage of U.S. members did not exist as nations when these events took place. In some quarters, therefore, there is a scarcity of knowledge and a scarcity of interest on the plight of these people. We have an obligation to speak out.

Most of the concern in the United Nations, with its changing geographic and racial character, seems to be with injustices committed by whites against nonwhites. But injustice knows no color line—and the injustice committed against the peoples of eastern Europe is long standing and cruel. It behooves all men to care.

History teaches us that seldom can the people of a once-proud nation be made over in a generation. Culture, language, religion, nationalism, struggle and survive in even the bleakest of circumstances.

Most of the nations behind the Iron Curtain have a history of independence going back to the Middle Ages. By inclination and tradition, they are antagonistic to foreign—that is—Soviet domination. Yet, here they are, 20 years after World War II, unable to free themselves from Soviet domination except through the long, tedious and uncertain process of changing the face of communism itself.

From time to time, events occur in eastern Europe which show the tremendous endurance of deep-rooted nationalism and independent spirit. Freemen welcome these manifestations and look for more.

On this occasion, let us give encouragement to the restive people of the captive nations. We look forward to the day when they will genuinely control their own destinies.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I proudly join the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] in the serious recognition of our continuing responsibility to the countless thousands of people who are denied freedom in the captive nations throughout the world. To them I pledge, as have many of my fellow Members of the House of Representatives, that we have not and will not forget their plight. The very principles upon which our Nation was founded constitute our commitment to their eventual liberation.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, our observance of National Captive Nations Week this year takes on added significance for Americans, coming as it does so soon after the passing of one of our more enlightened champions of world peace and freedom, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson. It is hardly necessary for me or any Member of this body to recall the lofty dedication and total commitment of this gifted and courageous man. We mourn his passing with the certain knowledge that we can ill afford to lose his vision and leadership in these troubled times.

Our observance is also marked by the 20th anniversary of the end of the European war in 1945. It was just 20 years ago that the last trace of Hitlerism was, as Winston Churchill had so often prophesied, burnt off the face of Europe. It has been 20 years since the scourge of Nazi tyranny was eliminated, since men again could lift their heads from the dust and rubble without fear of having them shot away. It has been 20 years since men began again to cast fresh dreams and new hopes for the world. And, ironically, it has been scarcely less than 20 years since a new, more subtle yoke of enslavement has settled about the necks of so many of our European neighbors.

As in each of our observances of Captive Nations Week since it was inaugurated by act of Congress 6 years ago, there will be many moving and impassioned tributes made in this body and elsewhere with respect to the plight of these satellite nations and their captive peoples. We will listen to eloquent words uttered by sincere and high-minded men. Speaking for myself, I welcome this utterance. I welcome the testimonials of sympathy and praise that will surely be made. I welcome the exhortations that will be extended to the captive peoples to cling to their faith, to go on believing and hoping for the deliverance that will one day make them free to chart their own destinies, to choose their own form of government and their own way of life.

But I also seek more than oral tribute, no matter how sincere or well meant it may be. I think it is high time we provided some action to go along with the brave words. I submit that there is no more fitting time to launch such action than right now.

I am speaking, of course, of the action which I and other of my colleagues in this body have long advocated to establish a Special Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives. I submit that there has never been a clearer need for the added focus such a committee would provide, nor a better time to take advantage of the reassuring impact such a gesture will have on the people under the Communist yoke in the subjugated nations.

We are reading and hearing a great deal these days of the increasing ferment within the Communist bloc—of the Sino-Soviet rift, of the unrest and frustration of farmers and consumers in Russia, and of the increasing independence of satellite Communist governments from the influence of headquarters in Moscow. We are encouraged by reports of imminent revolution and seething resentment in many of these captive satellites. We are optimistic over the threatened defection of China from Kremlin leadership and the possible internal rupture that could hasten the downfall of both governments. We are anxiously hopeful over signs that a measure of freedom is being restored through such minor incidents as the sudden resumption of the sale of western newspapers in Bucharest. We are hopeful that these are all genuine signs of the hastening doom of world communism and Red totalitarianism.

If these are genuine indicators of such a trend; if, indeed, we can believe our eyes and ears, what better way to expedite the process than by demonstrating our concern and anxiety through establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations. We can solidify and strengthen the natural bonds that connect us with these eastern and central European peoples. We can encourage them to press further, to demand the rights of freemen, to demand the right to choose their own government. And, perhaps most importantly, we can forge a two-way link of communication between ourselves and these peoples. We can provide a national focus to better assess these events, to better judge the mood and tenor of their society, to know better how and where we can apply peaceful pressures to hasten their deliverance.

There is, naturally, a counterbalance of opinion that suggests these so-called changes behind the Iron Curtain are mere propaganda, false and distorted rumors designed to lull ourselves and the rest of the free world into mood of optimistic complacency. The claim is made that, from a practical point of view, things are no different in Poland, Hungary, Rumania, or anywhere else in the Red sphere than they were almost 20 years ago. Certainly there is ample evidence to support this contention.

Free elections are proclaimed, but the list of Communist candidates leaves little to choose between. Freedom of speech is proclaimed, but we listen in vain for the voices of dissent. Self-determination is proclaimed but we wait in vain for our friends and loved ones to cross the frontiers. Symbolically and actually, the Berlin Wall still stands.

So the point remains, I say, that no matter how you gage events inside the Communist satellites, inside Russia, and inside the entire Communist orbit, it is vitally important that we strengthen our knowledge of these events. It is important that we know what is going on there, not only out of sympathy for the captive people within—who are in fact mother and father, brother, and sister to so many of us in the United States—but from the very practical position of our own national security.

It should not be necessary any more to emphasize the significance of internal events behind the Iron Curtain with respect to our national security. The threat of world communism is a genuine, demonstrated reality. We have heard with our own ears the outrageous threats from Communist leaders that they will bury us, and that our grandchildren will be Communists. There can be no mistaking the intent of world communism.

And there is no better way to assess the next manifestation of that intent, or to gage the determination and depth of the next thrust, than to know what is going on behind the Iron Curtain. We cannot ignore the captive nations of Europe any more than we can ignore the future of our own Nation.

The captive nations movement is grounded on the exhaustive exploitation of all possible peaceful means to bring about the liberation of these people. The word peaceful should be emphasized. Among this arsenal are economic weapons of devastating impact. Propaganda devices of frightful power, and the more subtle tactics involved in such things as international trade fairs where the observers from Iron Curtain countries can see for themselves the tremendous outpouring of consumer goods from free capitalist societies.

A Special Captive Nations Committee in this body would go a long way toward improving our activities in all these areas and bringing them into sharper focus. We must keep a clear and alert eye on these nations, in spite of the desperate need for vigilance and preparedness in Vietnam and the rest of southeast Asia. This focus, this important link could be forged in this body through action on House Resolution 140 which I have introduced in the present Congress.

Whatever assessment we make of the political and social climate in Europe today, I think we must agree that the rock of international communism has been nudged a little. Now is the time to put every shoulder against it to keep it moving, to push it over the brink of oblivion. We must not turn our backs and expect it to roll away of its own accord. There are strong forces on the other side who are pushing just as hard to roll the stone over us.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like today to draw to the attention of the people of the United States and of all free nations around the world the plight of those countries still held in subjugation by the Communist powers of the world. The President has marked this week of July 18 to July 24 as Captive Nations Week; I urge freemen everywhere to devote time to the study of those people less fortunate than they.

In this time of Communist propaganda which decries the supposed imperialistic tendencies of the Western nations, we should stop a moment and consider the true world situation. The

Communist claim that imperialism exists is unfortunately true; yet it is time to realize that the true imperialists of the 20th century are the Soviet and Communist Chinese Governments.

Russia's imperialism in Europe was accomplished during the first half of this century; during more recent years it has been effectively contained. However, the conditions behind the Iron Curtain remain the same; the free world tends to lose sight of the continued existence of Soviet imperialism. More attention should be devoted to the plight of the Baltic and Eastern European States, many of which are nations famous in past history for their just and democratic way of life. Every day in Eastern Europe there appears a new sign of the will of the people to reassert their own national values. The nations under Russian domination are struggling to reestablish their freedom; it is the duty and the privilege of all freemen to encourage these brave people in their pursuit of independence.

Yet in other areas of the world the Communist domination is growing rather than diminishing: Communist China does not for 1 day pause in its determined course of imperialism. The nations of Asia are constantly menaced by Red Chinese advances into their territory, whether in the form of massive propaganda campaigns or of armed guerrillas seeking to overthrow the existing government. Recently the Chinese Communists seized Tibet; today, under the cover of most unconvincing propaganda, they are struggling to extend the Bamboo Curtain to Laos and South Vietnam. They have been extremely active in Africa as well, determined to take advantage of the political instability and the economic weakness of newly independent states.

It is our duty—and that of all freemen as defenders of freedom throughout the world—to aid and encourage the struggle of these people under Communist control or threatened by Communist takeover to achieve and to preserve their independence. Let us turn our attention toward freedom; let us appreciate fully our most treasured possessions of autonomy and democracy; let us hope that all peoples of the world succeed in their pursuit of these most priceless gifts.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, we are once again at a most important and noteworthy occasion. I refer to Captive Nations Week, a week dedicated to the memory and a renewed dedication to the nations held captive by the Soviet Union. We have come to a time of renewed dedication and increased perseverance to the dual task of resisting imperialism and of developing positive methods for dealing with it. We have also come to a time for remembering and celebrating the great national traditions of those countries of Eastern Europe who, though languishing under the yoke of an imperialistic power and ideology, are yet still alive and vibrant today with trends toward freedom and democracy.

There has been a marked increase in the feelings of democracy and freedom in these nations. One of the reasons, I am sure, is the increased trade with the free world, and particularly with the United States, which has developed over the last few years.

This developing trade is a great weapon in the hands of the free world. As the captive nations become more and more economically independent of Mother Russia, the greater chance freedom and democracy has to flourish within these nations.

One of the most effective means which the Soviets employed to subjugate the nations of Eastern Europe was to make them economically dependent upon Russia. A nation whose economy is controlled by another can never be said to be really free.

These economic ties with the captive nations must be carefully analyzed while being fostered. It must be remembered that most of the captive nations of Eastern Europe are decisively controlled by Soviet Russia through the use of armed force. In fact, most of the so-called free nations of Western Europe do not have their own armies. We should not allow Russia to gain by this increased trade with the satellites. Economic liberation is a step by which the free world, led by the United States, can help these nations to gain freedom.

Another effective and so far very successful means of prying Russian influence from the captive nations is through the medium of the cultural exchange. By cultural exchange, the peoples of the captive nations are allowed to view firsthand the culture and heritage of the free world. By viewing the culture of the West, the people of the captive nations will surely see the contrasts presented by their own cultures and in this manner it will become clear and more visible. This process will prevent the Soviets from stifling the separate heritages of these nations and enveloping the people in a foreign and completely different cultural milieu.

The emptiness of the repeated Soviet expressions of belief in self-determination at the United Nations becomes obvious from one swift glance at Eastern Europe. Prior to World War II, all of the now captive nations of Eastern Europe were independent states which recognized the individual liberties of their citizens. Today, they are satellites of the Soviet Union. Their rulers dictate with the blessings of Moscow. Their economies are patterned on the centralized planned economy of the Soviet Union. Their foreign policy is determined with the help of the central power in the Kremlin. The Communist Party is synonymous with the Government, and political choice is nonexistent.

This, then, is the plight of the captive nations of Eastern Europe. Nations yearning for freedom, yet deprived of those rights by force, both economic and armed.

Perhaps, too, the whole history of the captive nation should be the mirror that truly reflects just how much people have to say in peoples' republics.

During this week of commemoration, we must not only renew our determination to help free our friends in the captive nations, but we must also renew our determination to prevent any other nation from becoming a captive nation of either Soviet Russia or Red China. We should dedicate again the principle of self-determination, whether it be in southeast Asia, South America, Africa, or any other spot on the globe.

Finally, during these Captive Nation Week observances, let us demonstrate our sympathy for the captive peoples and our faith in their eventual liberation.

Let us constantly remind the captive European nations, and indeed, all people who are kept from true freedom and democracy, that we are on their side.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in marking the observance of the seventh annual Captive Nations Week. It is well for us to remind ourselves of the hundred of millions of people enslaved behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains and in Cuba. The citizens of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Cossackia, Georgia, Idel-Ural, North Caucasians, Democratic Republic of the Far East, Ukraine, and Turkistan have not enjoyed the basic rights of liberty and freedom, so much a part of our way of life, for over 40 years. The Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia have been subjected to the harshest forms of Soviet domination for over 25 years. More recently, Albania, Bulgaria, Outer Mongolia, the Serb, Croat, and Slovene sections in Yugoslavia, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslavakia, North Korea, Hungary, East Germany, mainland China, Tibet, North Vietnam, and Cuba have all fallen under Soviet or Chinese Communist domination. The conquerors have used the most ruthless and vicious means known to man to perpetrate this mass outrage.

It is well known, Mr. Speaker, that the great majority of these enslaved millions still yearn for the return of their freedoms. Uprisings in East Germany in 1953, in Poland in 1956, and the heroic Hungarian revolution of the same year are testimony to the fact that these freedom-loving people have not voluntarily relinquished their sacred rights of free speech, religion, or association.

Captive Nations Week must serve as a reminder to all Americans that love of freedom and desire for liberty still burn in the hearts of the enslaved millions around the world. It is fitting that on this occasion we rededicate ourselves to the support of the people of these captive nations in their quest for the human rights and dignity of which they have been so mercilessly deprived. Let us at this time, Mr. Speaker, renew the pledge of our Government to work toward and for the liberation of these brave millions and, by so doing, obtain a meaningful and lasting peace.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is most appropriate that we set aside a week to remember the fate of those peoples who remain dominated by Soviet or Chinese colonialism. In a very real sense, any nation ruled by a small oligarchy of Communist leaders is truly a captive nation. People without the freedom to choose their own leaders, even their own form of government, are prisoners. In this sense, the Chinese and Cuban people are captives of their Governments just as the East Germans or the Hungarians.

Nevertheless, Communist regimes most often result from outside forces, from a new type of colonialism. It is ironic that today the Soviet Union remains the only nation practicing the type of imperial colonialism which Lenin so roundly condemned. Lenin contended that the worldwide proletarian revolution in modern industrial nations, so confidently predicted by Marx, had been temporarily avoided by the capitalist countries in the early 20th century through an exploitive technique of imperialism. Lenin's argument was that the capitalists had been able to buy off a large section of the skilled proletariat by allowing them some of the profits gained from exploiting underdeveloped colonial territories. By exploiting the profits on cheap raw materials and new markets in the underdeveloped areas, the capitalists, according to Lenin, would be able to forestall the inevitable proletarian revolution for a few years. Today, any serious economist will tell us that Lenin was dead wrong, economically as well as historically.

The hard fact is that far from living off the fat of lucrative new markets, most modern industrial nations have been losing money on their colonial possessions ever since the turn of the century. The only really good market for a modern industrial nation is another industrial nation; an African earning less than $100 a year is not going to be able to purchase a new Ford, or even a Volkswagen. Similarly, in an age of synthetics, the once valuable raw materials of the underdeveloped nations are quickly losing their market value. When one considers the administrative and material costs of maintaining a colony—not to mention defending it—one can understand the fallacy of Lenin's argument.

I mention these facts in order to demonstrate why Soviet colonialism is of a type quite different, and yet strangely related to the situation which Lenin described. The Soviets have actually reversed the situation by occupying and colonizing modern industrial nations. When the Russian Army occupied Eastern Europe at the end of World War II there occurred perhaps the most incredible plunder of national economies ever witnessed in modern history. Livestock was simply removed from farms and shipped by rail to Russia. When a trainload arrived, the Soviets often kept the train as well. Entire factories were simply dismantled and transported to be rebuilt in the Soviet Union. The ravishment accomplished, the Soviets have continued a long period of exploitation of the industrial and agricultural output of their victimized colonies. In the most perverse way, the Soviets were able to make colonialism work to their advantage.

But if Soviet colonialism was intended to achieve economic advantages for the Russian homeland, it was also expected to achieve new political and ideological victories. It is in this sense that it has proven such a failure. The failure of Communist internationalism to compete successfully with nationalism was apparent as early as the First World War, when the vast majority of European Communists deserted the party to fight for their homelands. It was not until after the Second World War that the Soviets were able to persuade any nations to join the international movement. That persuasion was and still is the armed might of Soviet occupying forces.

The Communist International had always been primarily an ancillary arm of Soviet foreign policy, designed to further the interests of the Soviet Union. Relations with the new satellite states proved to be no exception to the rule. The new peoples democracies, classified as a step below Socialist nations by the Soviets, were ruled by puppet leaders who considered the interests of the Soviet Union first, and their own nations second. For the captive nations, the dictatorship of the proletariat meant the despotism of Soviet functionaries whose rule remained subject to the whims of their superiors in Moscow.

It is hard to believe that the Soviets actually expected to gain the loyalty of their subject peoples through the suppression of national as well as individual freedom.

The political experience of the Western democracies has represented a long history of attempting to find the proper balance between freedom and authority. The essential problem from Western democracy was that of giving man enough freedom to realize his creative potential while providing the necessary authority to prevent man's abuse of his freedom at the expense of other members of the political community. Usually this has been most successfully provided by laws developed through national consensus, and promulgated by responsible representatives of the people.

The original failure of theoretical Marxism was to deny that there was need for authority in a Communist society. The great human tragedy of modern communism has been to deny all individual liberty in order to develop a totalitarian authority. Far from developing a system where no central authority was necessary, the Soviets found that a communistic state could not survive without the iron rule of a totalitarian dictatorship.

In the captive nations this has meant not only dictatorial control over the people but over the national governments as well. The Soviets were well aware that a Communist colonial empire would be a good deal more difficult to control than a single Communist nation.

Yet despite the iron hand of Stalin's personally ruled Cominform and Soviet troops employed to retain party discipline, by Khrushchev, the Soviets have not been able to still the quest for freedom in captive nations. Far from an empire of faithful buffer states surrounding the Russian heartland, the Russians find themselves facing civil unrest and hostility when their authority is forcefully exercised, and new Communist power centers challenging their leadership when it is not.

Whether it be the brave tragedy of the Hungarian revolt or the histrionic polemics which pass between Peiping and Moscow, it is apparent to even the most casual observer that the great experiment in proletarian internationalism has failed—and failed miserably. On the one hand, communism simply has not been able to still man's deep desires for freedom and national independence; on the other, it has fallen victim to the struggle for power inevitable in all tyrannical systems.

Theoretically and practically, Communist economics and politics have represented a history of cruel mistakes, failures, and hypocrisy. The great tragedy lies in the fact that millions of brave peoples of proud nations remain captives of the Soviet Empire. Eastern Europe has now been exploited for 20 years, the Baltic nations for a quarter of a century, the Moslems of Central Asia for much longer.

We do not want this sorry record to continue. We must not allow it to spread. The captive nations of the world deserve a better fate; the free nations of the world must be kept free. That is why it is appropriate that we observe Captive Nations Week; that we remember our own political tradition; that we recognize the fallacies and hypocrisies of communism, and above all, that we remember the brave people of the world who continue the fight for freedom and independence in the captive nations.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago the Congress unanimously adopted a resolution calling on the President to designate the third week of July as Captive Nations Week. This observance was first proclaimed by President Eisenhower and each succeeding President has followed suit.

This frank, outspoken, and courageous resolution stated that the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, North Vietnam, and others.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution called on the President to proclaim the observance each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

The high sounding goals embodied in the resolution have not yet been attained. Therefore, this week we are observing Captive Nations Week to show to the people living in the slave nations of the world that the American people support the idea that each one of them will, in time, be free and their country independent. There are some signs that freedom behind the Iron Curtain is increasing, and because of this let us encourage this growth and show the world that global freedom is our aim—not a world divided.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask to be placed in the Record an editorial which appeared in the Seattle, Wash., Times on Monday, July 12, in observance of Captive Nations Week.

Captive Nations Week

Americans who are weary of the everlasting Communist propaganda din about "imperialism" will have formal occasion next week to examine the true face of modern imperialism.

By unanimous declaration of Congress in 1959, the third week in July annually is Captive Nations Week.

This will be a formal reminder that some 100 million East-Central Europeans remain locked behind the Iron Curtain, which descended 20 years ago at the end of the Second World War.

The amelioration of living conditions in the satellite countries is not a reason to shrug off Captive Nations Week.

The same can be said in regard to the lessening of police-state terror and the carefully circumscribed flickerings of independent foreign and economic policy to be seen in some satellite capitals.

No matter how much conditions vary in east-central Europe—and life can be vicious as at the Berlin wall or even gay as at the Black Sea beach resorts—ultimate power through the area rests with the Soviet Army.

But human situations are never static. Eventually, shifting political and economic tides within the Soviet Union or in the world at large could diminish that power or the threat of its use.

Until that happens, the solemn annual observance of Captive Nations Week will help to keep alive the hopes of 100 million victims of modern-day imperialism.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, we have set aside this week to pay tribute to those peoples who share the common misfortune of being held captive in their own lands by the most diabolical tyranny of modern times, communism.

It is not an exaggeration to say that theirs is a terrible fate. It is so because they live a life deprived of liberty. We all know that man enjoys the natural and inalienable right to be free. This is a right granted by his Creator. It is this principle upon which American democracy has been based. It is this principle that motivated our American Revolution. It is also this principle that motivated the great French Revolution.

Now, the Communists claim that they alone bring freedom to mankind. Every book, pamphlet, periodical, or official statement of any kind on the matter of human liberty makes the claim that communism is the promise of the future and that its message is that of freedom for all mankind.

We of the free world know, of course, that communism brings not redemption to man but rather enslavement. We know that whatever communism obtains as a political system it has brought with it all the terrible instruments of tyranny and imposed them upon the people. We have seen this in our lifetime—in Russia, the Baltic States, Eastern Europe, China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Cuba.

Yet where there is tyranny there also lies the seeds of freedom; for the very reason for being of tyranny is to prevent the eruption of liberty. It is, therefore, a fact of life, a reality we must all understand, that in these captive nations of communism there are millions of people who hope and seek genuine freedom. We would do a great disservice to ourselves and a dishonor to these people if we had failed to make the distinction between them and the government that oppresses them. As children of God, they seek the free expression of their own souls, and it is for us to understand this deep-rooted natural inclination and to do whatever is in our power to encourage their hopes.

This is, of course, the purpose of Captive Nations Week: it is simply to provide an opportunity for all Americans to register their protest against the tyranny of communism and to give voice to their profound hopes and sympathies for those peoples that one day they will be able to enjoy to the fullest extent the freedom which they deserve.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying indeed to note the increasing recognition being given Captive Nations Week in its seventh year of observance. During this week, there is a more concentrated discussion of the situation of the various countries under totalitarian rule. In a time of increasing Soviet and Communist Chinese agitation, it is important that free people everywhere be made more aware of the conditions of oppression which exist in other parts of the world.

The purpose of Captive Nations Week is threefold. First, it is an expression of deep sympathy and compassion, from the hearts of the American people, to those who have suffered and are suffering under the yoke of tyranny.

Secondly, it is an expression of support to those within and without their captive homelands, assuring them that the citadel of freedom has not turned its back on their just aspirations for freedom and national unity in a moment of political expediency. It is one of the cardinal rules of a totalitarian regime that the spirit of resistance must be crushed. We must seek, by whatever way possible, to thwart this goal. That our moral support of such resistance strikes home to the rulers of the Kremlin has already been demonstrated in the past. What effect the proclamation of Captive Nations Week earlier this month by President Johnson will have remains to be seen. But surely we can do more than simply memorialize the occasion. We can urge that all instruments for disseminating information to the peoples beyond the Iron Curtain be used to convey our message of hope, and we can unceasingly bring the Soviet Union before the court of moral world opinion whenever the question of the rights of man is raised. Furthermore, we can strengthen and revitalize world organizations to promote the freedom of men and to work for the release of those now suffering under the bonds of totalitarianism.

Lastly, we must not forget that the list of captive nations, numbering not less than 25, is not a closed list as far as the Soviet Union is concerned. From Vietnam to the Congo, the struggle for the minds of men and the control of nations continues. We should use Captive Nations Week to remind ourselves that we must correct our past mistakes, and strive to prevent the subjugation of new areas of the world. A nation that condones indifference to past oppression cannot remain just and, at the same time, a nation that condones indifference to future oppression cannot remain free.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, the people of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania continue to live under totalitarian rule.

None of the basic rights which we hold to be self-evident have been restored. If there has been any improvement in their condition, it is like the improvement that may be found in a skillfully run penal institution.

It is our duty to remember this—to keep in mind that so long as any once-free nation remains captive, all the free people of the world share in that captivity. The bell that tolls for liberty tolls for liberty everywhere.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we commemorate in this Chamber today the observance of Captive Nations Week throughout the 50 States of the United States of America.

We deplore the denial of freedom which prevails behind the Iron Curtain. This annual commemoration of the violent actions which enslaved millions is an observance which proclaims to the free world, as well as to the Communist world, that America's position remains unchanged.

A second generation of people born into political and physical captivity is now reaching maturity. The promises which were shouted to the world by the Communist invaders years ago have not materialized. There are no free elections behind the Iron Curtain. People have no voice in their Government. They cannot worship their God. They may not establish friendships readily. They are not permitted to speak or to write or to paint or to compose except in accordance with rules laid down by the Communist state.

There has been a concerted effort on the part of the Kremlin to stifle creative human thought and consistently to deny the value of individuals in the machine states of the Communist world.

In the midst of this bleak existence, however, an abiding and unquenchable faith remains that a better world exists. Regardless of the obstacles to their freedom, the people of the captive nations remain united in their devotion to liberty.

Liberty—the right to think your own thoughts, select your own government, decide for yourself your own place in society—is the primary force behind the ever-widening cracks in the wall of hostility erected by the Communists years ago.

The free world, throughout these long years, has managed to communicate with those still held captive. By means of trade fairs, cultural exchange programs, photographic exhibits, radio broadcasts, theatrical tours, our essential message has been received. It consists of one all-encompassing word: Hope. We hold out to our neighbors still in bondage the promise of a better world if, by preserving in their devotion to the dream of justice, they continue striving for self-determination.

To augment our efforts to assist by every peaceful means possible the achievement of this self-determination, I have introduced a measure in each Congress since 1959 which would establish a Committee of the House of Representatives on the Captive Nations. It is my hope we will obtain favorable consideration of this bill in the near future. Many of my colleagues have sponsored similar measures, all designed to call attention to the plight of Eastern Europe and to demonstrate unequivocally our concern and our faith in the ultimate victory of those who cannot speak for themselves.

Through our observance of Captive Nations Week in the House of Representatives today, we reaffirm our dedication to liberty as the keystone of civilization.

In 1941, in a special message to Congress, President Roosevelt said:

> In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms. The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world. The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world. The third is freedom from want—everywhere in the world. The fourth is freedom from fear—everywhere in the world.

In this year of 1965, America continues to proclaim this philosophy to the world. As long as there are human beings sharing this planet who are denied the right to speak for themselves, we will continue to proclaim it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, as we pause to observe Captive Nations Week, let us recommit ourselves to the principle that the peoples of the Captive Nations have an inalienable right to choose their own governments and to live once more under freedom. They do not enjoy such freedom today.

Why do they not? Is there one Member of Congress who cannot supply the answer? Is there any doubt in anyone's mind as to who and what is responsible for the tyranny which prevails in Eastern Europe today? Is there anyone here who cannot get to his feet and say plainly and flatly without any hesitation that it is communism which tyrannizes the captive nations and that it is the armed might of the Soviet Union which assures the continuance of Communist tyranny in the captive nations?

I doubt it. Six years ago, President Dwight D. Eisenhower, in the first proclamation marking Captive Nations Week, stated:

> Whereas many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and agressive policies of Soviet communism; and
>
> Whereas the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and
>
> Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and
>
> Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and
>
> Whereas by a joint resolution approved and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as Captive Nations Week and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world:
>
> Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 19, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week."
>
> I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations.

President Eisenhower expressed it most succinctly: it is Soviet imperialism, it is Soviet domination, it is Soviet communism, which is responsible for the absence of freedom and liberty in the captive nations.

This year's proclamation, signed by President Johnson, says in part:

> Whereas all peoples yearn for freedom and justice; and
>
> Whereas these basic rights unfortunately are circumscribed or unrealized in many areas in the world; and
>
> Whereas the United States of America has an abiding commitment to the principles of independence, personal liberty, and human dignity; and
>
> Whereas it remains a fundamental purpose and intention of the Government and people of the United States of America to recognize and encourage constructive actions which foster the growth and development of national independence and human freedom:
>
> Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 18, 1965, as Captive Nations Week.
>
> I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

Mr. Speaker, there is much concern in our country today about the civil rights and the human dignity which the Constitution guarantees to all Americans. I believe that every American should have these rights and should enjoy such dignity. But what about the civil rights and the human dignity of over 1 billion people in the world who labor and toil and suffer under communism? They too deserve our attention, our sympathy, our assistance.

I believe that one of the best ways to help the captive nations is to create a congressional Committee on Captive Nations. I am in complete accord and sympathy with the formation of such a committee. I supported it on the floor of the House when it was first introduced this year. I earnestly hope that the House and the administration will endorse it.

We must demonstrate to the valiant peoples of the captive nations that we do not accept Communist control of their homelands.

A congressional Committee on Captive Nations would assemble and utilize all the truths and facts about the tragic conditions of these subjugated nations.

Such a committee would help disseminate information about the brutal suppression of these nations to the whole world.

Such a committee would place the Soviet Union and all Communist nations on notice that the United States is not beguiled by soft words in the face of the hard and cruel acts of communism and of the continuing oppression of 100 million people in Eastern Europe.

Let us thus prove that we are determined that the captive nations and indeed all nations of the world shall one day enjoy self-determination. Let us here rededicate ourselves to the proposition that man was created to be free.

SPUDS SKIM STRATOSPHERE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, 1965, in a statement to the House, I called attention to the meteoric rise in the price of potatoes. I described this as a national scandal and said that the effect on the consumer had been disastrous and I called for an explanation from the Secretary of Agriculture.

I emphasized my belief that the customary methods of distribution could be adjusted to provide this food staple at a reasonable and constant price.

Incidentally, correspondents since my initial statement have written to complain of the quality of potatoes, as well as the price. Some of these people are in the food business themselves. I quote an excerpt from a recent letter:

> I wish to commend you for your interest in the current food price situation, especially in regard to potatoes. However, I think it should be noted that the quality of potatoes leaves much to be desired. In an era of subsidies, I find it difficult to understand why one-fifth to one-sixth of the potatoes I buy have to be thrown away. * * * As a mother of seven growing youngsters, you can imagine that I am concerned about the cost of food. Since my husband is in the retail food business, I know that excessive profits are not being made at that level. Perhaps I'm not too bright, but I've never understood why the people should have to promote inefficiency and obstruct progress in agriculture. It isn't done for small machine shops, the corner grocer, or any other group that I know of.

Immediately after I made my statement special pleaders for the potato growers combine rushed into print to defend the profits being reaped by the producers. Maine and Idaho began fuming with indignation at the idea that fault could be found with the cushy situation in which the producers found themselves. Mr. George Barnes, president of the Maine Potato Council, asked why I had not found fault with the price of potatoes when it was low. Surely that one should answer itself. When prices are reasonable and farmers are getting along satisfactorily there can be no objection, but when the supply is limited and prices rise and luxury items start moving into Maine and Idaho, then comes the time to ask questions.

In reply to my inquiry, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Meyers emphasized that the Department could appreciate my concern for the high market price for potatoes and pointed out with relief that the high prices were not caused by the programs of the Department of Agriculture—this is news—but by short supply.

Prices have moved up and down in potatoes because of a variation in the plantings by the farmers. The growers planted a record-small spring crop in 1964 and when droughts and freezes came along, the supply was actually inadequate for consumers. This small crop was planted in spite of the fact that the demand for fresh potatoes from our growing population was strong and, in addition, sales of processed potatoes, including chips, frozen and dehydrated items have also been strong.

This, it seems to me, clearly indicates the need for careful scrutiny of the programs of the potato producers. I do not go so far as to say that we should have production controls and guaranteed prices. We have seen unfavorable results of these policies in other areas and we must not rush in with governmental intervention. At the same time, programs of Government controls in other commodities have guaranteed adequate supplies and reasonable prices to the consumer and a fair return to the farmer.

I submit that the time has come for the potato growers to put their house in order and to plan adequately for the growing market which exists. This must be done in such a way as to avoid cataclysmic ups and downs. The planning must be done in the public interest, as well as in the interest of the growers. Unless this course is followed, Government intervention is an ever-present possibility.

I have enough confidence in the good sense of our Maine neighbors to believe that they will take the road that will benefit the great consuming public of this country.

OFFICIAL U.S. STATEMENTS ON BALTIC NATIONS

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, 1 month ago today, the House considered and unanimously passed my bill, House Concurrent Resolution 416—the Baltic resolution. In the debate which preceded final adoption of this measure, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] raised a question concerning the past action of the executive branch, and more specifically, the President, in connection with the Soviet subjugation of the Baltic States. At that time, I answered him in general terms. I believe that the proper response to these inquiries demands specific reference to statements made by both the Executives of this and prior administrations, and our esteemed Ambassador to the United Nations, the late Adlai E. Stevenson. Moreover, since we are presently commemorating Captive Nations Week, it seems peculiarly appropriate to insert some of these statements in the Record at this time:

I used to marvel at the audacity of the Soviet Union in pointing an accusing finger at others—the Soviet Union which signed a pact with Hitler, which forcibly added 264,000 square miles and over 24 million people to its own territory and population in the aftermath of World War II, which subjugated all of Eastern Europe, crushed the uprisings in East Germany and Hungary, and which has persistently sought to enlarge its domination elsewhere beyond its borders.

When one hears, as we did this morning, the Soviet Union, which has politically enslaved more people than any nation in this century, attack the good faith, the sincerity and honesty of the Government of the United Kingdom, which has politically liberated more people than any nation in this century, one gets the measure of the Soviet's cynical disdain for fact or fairness in the pursuit of its goals. (Statement by Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson in the Security Council on the Dominican Republic Question, May 3, 1965.)

Mr. Gromyko says that the United States has asserted the right to attack Cuba because it has another system. He says no nation should interfere in the affairs of another. I marvel at the bland hypocrisy of the nation that subverted the wholesome Cuban social revolution to communism, that crushed with tanks the independence of Hungary, that holds in thrall all of Eastern Europe from the Baltic to the Black Sea. Yet he presumes to lecture us on interference in the affairs of others. But as we know only too well, such righteous rhetoric is the standard Communist cloak for the very interference it charges to others. (Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson before the Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly, Sept. 21, 1962.)

The Soviet Government has signed treaties of nonaggression, as it did with the Baltic States and Finland—and then systematically invaded the countries whose integrity it had solemnly promised to respect.

At Yalta and in a succession of peace treaties it pledged to the liberated countries of Eastern Europe "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live—the restoration of sovereign rights of self-government to those peoples who have been forcibly deprived of them"—and then it systematically denied those rights and consolidated that deprivation. (Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson before the Security Council, Oct. 23, 1962.)

The continued repression of the peoples of Eastern Europe remains an underlying danger to peace. (Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson before the Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly, Sept. 20, 1962.)

The present rulers of the Kremlin, according to U.S. Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, "took advantage of the turmoil and upheaval of the Second World War to continue the process of colonial subjugation at the expense of its neighbors. The Soviets territorial aggrandizement included * * * the independent States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. * * * These are outright annexations of territories whose people are enamored of freedom and as fully entitled to their rights as are the people of Africa, Asia, and the Americas. But there is another category of Soviet colonial territory, where neocolonialism in a form never dreamed of in other parts of the world is practiced."

The disgrace, barbarity, and savagery—to cite the words used by Mr. Khrushchev—of Soviet imperialist rule is indicated by the never-ending flow of refugees from the countries made colonies by the Soviet Union. More than 12 million persons have escaped since the Second World War from the Soviet Union, Communist China, and the areas they control: Albania, Rumania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Tibet.

Even more shocking was the series of deportations undertaken by the Soviets following their ruthless subjugation of the independent nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. In June of 1941, more than 200,000 persons were deported from the Baltic States, and the total now approaches 700,000. (Letter dated Nov. 25, 1961, to the President of the General Assembly of the United Nations.)

The positions of President Johnson and the late President Kennedy concerning captive nations in general are reflected in their annual proclamations during Captive Nations Week:

Captive Nations Week, 1962—A Proclamation

(By the President of the United States of America)

Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), the Congress authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas there exist many historical and cultural ties between the people of these captive nations and the American people; and

Whereas the principles of self-government and human freedom are universal ideals and the common heritage of mankind:

Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 15, 1962, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 13th day of July in the year of our Lord 1962, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 187th.

By the President:

[SEAL] JOHN F. KENNEDY,
DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

Captive Nations Week, 1963—A Proclamation

(By the President of the United States of America)

Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation, designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas the cause of human rights and dignity remains a universal aspiration and

Whereas justice requires the elemental right of free choice and

Whereas this Nation has an abiding commitment to the principles of national self-determination and human freedom:

Now, therefore, I John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 14, 1963, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this fifth day of July in the year of our Lord 1963, and of the independence of the United States of America the 188th.

By the President:

[SEAL] JOHN F. KENNEDY,
DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1964—A PROCLAMATION

(By the President of the United States of America)

Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212) authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas the cause of human rights and personal dignity remains a universal aspiration; and

Whereas this Nation is firmly committed to the cause of freedom and justice everywhere; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the people of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations:

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 12, 1964, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 18th day of June in the year of our Lord 1964, and of the independence of the United States of America the 188th.

By the President:

[SEAL] LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1965—A PROCLAMATION

(By the President of the United States of America)

Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas all peoples yearn for freedom and justice; and

Whereas these basic rights unfortunately are circumscribed or unrealized in many areas in the world; and

Whereas the United States of America has an abiding commitment to the principles of independence, personal liberty, and human dignity; and

Whereas it remains a fundamental purpose and intention of the Government and people of the United States of America to recognize and encourage constructive actions which foster the growth and development of national independence and human freedom:

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 18, 1965, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this second day of July in the year of our Lord 1965, and of the independence of the United States of America the 189th.

By the President:

[SEAL] LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

Also in connection with the U.S. position on this matter at the United Nations, the following statements and denunciations of Soviet domination by U.S. representatives to the U.N. other than as Ambassadors are representative in relation to the Baltic nations:

> The reasons for which my delegation requested inscription this year were made clear in our request and, more recently, when the General Committee considered the matter. There is, therefore, no need to take time now for a lengthy reiteration of our views except to emphasize that they arise not from the cold war but from the concern of this Assembly for human rights and human freedom. We believe that human rights and human freedom are as precious in Eastern Europe as anywhere else in the world. (Ambassador Charles W. Yost before the Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly, Sept. 24, 1962.)
>
> It is a matter of deep significance that in all eight cases the member states that had previously been administering these territories were all members of the free world, that part of the world which we call free because it rests on the fundamental principle of freedom of choice. During this same period, none of the foreign lands dominated by the new Communist imperialism—lands inhabited by peoples of different cultural background, different language, in many cases different race from their masters—during this same period, I say, none of these lands have achieved genuine freedom or even a limited degree of freedom of choice.
>
> I need but refer to the historical record set forth in Document A/4985 and particularly to the section on Soviet colonial practices. Here are the ethnic unfortunates of Soviet colonialism: The Crimean Tartars, the Kalmucks, the Ingush, the nations of the Baltic and of central Asia. You know them all and those of you who will protest the most know them best.
>
> Perhaps I can save the representative of the Soviet Union the trouble of exercising his right of reply to these remarks. He would undoubtedly say that in the Communist world domination of peoples by a distant and foreign government is not colonialism.
>
> The fact is that the Soviet delegation applies terms like colonialism or imperialism only to areas where the governmental system is not to its liking. In this the Soviet Union's representatives remind one of Lewis Carroll's Humpty Dumpty. Those of you who are familiar with the classic "Alice in Wonderland" and its sequel "Through the Looking Glass" will remember that Humpty Dumpty explained his semantic principles to Alice in the following words: "When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said, "it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less."
>
> "The question is," said Alice, "whether you can make words mean so many different things."
>
> "The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "which is to be master—that's all."
>
> Applying the reasoning of Humpty Dumpty to the modern world, one can say that where the Soviet Union is master, there is no colonialism; where the Soviet Union is not master, and perhaps seeks mastery, there the cry of colonialism is raised.
>
> We see the problem differently: We say that colonialism or imperialism exists where there is no freedom of choice. (The Honorable Jonathan B. Bingham before the Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly, Nov. 20, 1962.)

I need but refer to the historical record set forth in Document A/4985 and particularly to the section on Soviet colonial practices. Here are the ethnic unfortunates of Soviet colonialism: The Crimean Tartars, the Kalmucks, the Ingush, the nations of the Baltic and of central Asia. You know them all and those of you who will protest the most know them best. (The Honorable JONATHAN B. BINGHAM before the Plenary meeting of the General Assembly, Nov. 20, 1962.)

We seem to have reverted to our opening day, with the same charges and statements made again, charges against my country that it holds people under its yoke, that it enslaves them, that it serves only its own selfish interests in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. One really wonders what the representative of the Soviet Union seeks to do, whether his whole effort is not to distract attention from his own country, from its disgraceful record of the subjugation of alien peoples from the Baltic Sea to the highlands of Asia. (Statement by Mr. Dwight Dickinson, Alternative Representative on U.N. Trusteeship Council, June 7, 1965.)

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at the appropriate place during the special order of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, once again it is our sad duty to observe Captive Nations Week. This is the sixth annual observance and it provides us with an opportunity to renew our commitment to the freedom of the brave peoples who have been thrust, against their will, behind a high wall of oppression.

To the East Germans, Poles, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Hungarians, Czechs, Rumanians, and Bulgarians, we offer our firm belief in their desire for freedom and our deep concern at their continued enslavement.

While we take this week each year to focus on this problem, we should not forget that day after day throughout the year the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe are working to right the imbalance of information about the free world.

When we commit ourselves to the freedom of the people of the captive nations, we serve the cause of freedom all over the world. As a nation which threw off the bonds of oppression in our own history, we know that the struggle for liberty and self-determination is not easy, nor is it swift. The distance that must be traveled can only heighten our determination to serve the cause of liberty and freedom for all peoples.

I join with the relatives and friends of the people of the captive nations in marking this week and in renewing our dedication to the goal of freedom.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the seventh annual observance by our Nation of Captive Nations Week. In these past 6 years we have been gratified to see the people of the free world, led by our own citizens, taking a much greater interest in the unhappy situation of the captive nations. This healthy and genuine interest has led to much intelligent study and discussion of the plight of these nations and heartening extensions of sincere sympathy to their peoples.

There is much that we can learn from these fine peoples, so unhappily denied the exercise of rights that we in the free world often take for granted. Extensions of sympathy, while assuring these people of our interest and common dedication to freedom, cannot physically aid in the acquisition of freedom for a country under totalitarian domination by a stronger foreign power. Yet insofar as these declarations of common ideals and hopes bring into the public's consciousness an increased awareness of the sad circumstances of these peoples, and stimulate the people of the free world to dedicate more of their time to studying the history and situation of these captive nations and the lessons that may be learned from the exemplary conduct of their peoples, our statements here in the House and elsewhere are not merely words of condolence, but active forces for the progress of truth and freedom.

Happily, it seems that the results engendered by the passage by this august body of Public Law 86-90, the captive nations resolution, in 1959 have been that there are now a great many groups of interested citizens, educators, students, and public servants, organized formally or informally to give needed consideration to the unhappy state of national existence that is the lot of these captive nations, and to consider what realistic and satisfactory efforts should be made by the peoples of the free world to improve the position of these unhappy peoples. The work and results of study by these various organizations has been of both an interesting and beneficial nature, and they certainly therefore deserve our recognition and support.

It is not necessary for the informed citizen of the free world to think overly long to recall incidents, dates and tragedies of wholesale Communist aggression, subjugation, and imperialism. In order that we may better understand the nature of the Communist conspiracy against the freedom of man, we should keep in mind what the Communists themselves have said regarding their own ideological and physical imperialism. As Lenin, for example, wrote:

> Marxism cannot be reconciled with nationalism even if the latter is just, irreproachable, and civilized. Marxism is moving forward, ahead of every nationalism as an international idea of the amalgamation of all nations into a higher whole. National culture is in general the culture of estate owners, clergy, and bourgeoisie. He who defends the slogans of national culture is bourgeois and often a clerical imposture. Our slogan remains: the international culture of democracy and of the worldwide labor movement. Only by throwing away all wild and stupid national superstitions and by melting the workers of all nationalities into a union, will the laboring class be able to oppose the capitalists and force its way through to a really better existence.[1]

This is certainly neither the time nor the place to attempt a complete analysis of the dynamics of Communist imperialism, yet it is clearly evident from this 1913 treatise of Lenin what the basic tenets are. We are indeed certainly aware of the nature of the opponent that confronts and continually attempts to encroach upon us. We can see in Lenin's writings, as in those of other Communist theoreticians, that they are dedicated to the continual advance of their ideology, that to them natural or national boundaries, cultural, linguistic, or religious differences, distinct and honorable histories and traditions, or any of the other bases of self-determination to which we, as a nation, and all the people of the free world are dedicated, mean nothing, or less than nothing. By a diligent and intelligent study of the methods and manners used by this international conspiracy to entrap and subjugate the peoples of these captive nations, we may expect to learn how best to combat them, to resist them, and to prevent further such tragic occurrences. That such goal of ours is not illusory we may certainly believe, for the onward march of communism is not an inevitable historical process, but a gross imperalism controlled from one or more power centers where strings are pulled ruthlessly and heartlessly.

Among the most valuable benefits that have come from the passage of the resolution on captive nations 6 years ago are the increased opportunities made available to study this gross imperialism, and a greatly increased interest in doing so.

What has been the methodology of this cruel imperialism? To completely consider this would require much more time than can be devoted here, yet some of their practices of alienating the young peoples of the captive nations from the ways and beliefs of their fathers and the traditions that have been theirs as a people for hundreds of years, and of seeking to erase and trample on the national honor, pride, and way of life of brave and honorable peoples are so insidious and yet so subtle that they deserve at least passing mention in order that we may better fully understand the plight of these unfortunate peoples.

When one of the smaller free nations of the world becomes tragically entrapped by the Communist net, there is an immediate loss of those things that we hold most sacred, and even basic to life. Thus there is no longer freedom of speech, worship, or the press. There is no longer the freedom to assemble for peaceful purposes. There is no longer the freedom to elect a government by choice, to choose responsible officials that will accurately and responsibly reflect the will and aspirations of the people. And most important of all, there is no longer the freedom from fear.

It is not necessary to remind those among our citizens who remember the period of World War II of the horrors of former totalitarian states, of the atrocities that may be masked by a subservient press while denied by unscrupulous tyrants. It should not be necessary to tell those of our citizens who perhaps do not remember these heinous crimes against humanity that wherever freedom is trampled upon, and the tyranny of totalitarianism holds sway, these same methods may be employed. It cannot be otherwise, for the freedom-loving peoples of the world would never willingingly submit to such restrictions upon their natural rights.

We owe a great tribute to the people of the captive nations for the spirit with which they have for so long and with so much courage and dedication to the rights and freedoms of mankind resisted these tremendous forces of oppression and imperialism. They have resisted both with mind and spirit, and with body and life. Not only have these peoples suffered a loss of their freedom and their rights as freemen, but often they have also been deprived of the very necessities of life, such as adequate housing, sufficient food, and decent and warm clothing.

We have heard many truly sad and moving accounts of the poverty to which the unrealistic and cruel economic system of communism has brought the formerly prosperous and self-sufficient peoples of these captive nations. It is easier for a man to dedicate the energy of his mind and body to furthering his freedom when his energy is not sapped by forced labor on shoddy state projects, and not allowed to go unreplenished because of subsistence rationing caused by bureaucratic inefficiencies and the failure of ill-planned economic schemes. It is easier for him to concentrate upon sorting out the many totalitarian lies from daily news reports and to give sincere thought to the many pressing questions facing men everywhere today if a man is not suffering from continual chill and frost. And I need not elaborate upon the psychological pressure that can be brought upon a man by a state that cruelly and inhumanely separates families and thus puts even the most sacred of relationships in danger, while constantly holding a sword of fear and uncertainty over each member of the separated family.

---

[1] Nikolai Lenin, "Critical Remarks on the National Question," pp. 39, 40, and 48.

The totality of this oppressive imperialism, this totalitarian subjugation of brave peoples, may be symbolized by the Berlin wall. It stands for the cruel separation of men from their freedom, their rights, and their loved ones. It stands for the isolation and insulation from all that they have held dear as a people. It stands for the corruption and restriction of truth and honesty by an unscrupulous government. Yet in spite of all this, it can also stand for a symbol of the brave resistance to oppression, and the stubborn dedication to freedom of the people that it has not succeeded in containing. It stands for the freedom of minds that no wall, however long and broad and high, can confine. It stands for the weakness of the premises upon which totalitarian states base their rule, and for the bankruptcy of the policies employed in implementing their ideologies. And, most of all, it stands for mankind's love of freedom that lives on in the hearts and hopes and dreams of captive peoples everywhere.

In honor of Captive Nations Week, I am again this year, as I did last year, introducing a resolution calling for the freedom of the captive peoples of communism and for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Peoples. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that my resolution differs from others in that it includes as captive peoples the people of Russia itself who have never been allowed the opportunity of choosing freely the form of government under which they should live. I hope that the resolution will be brought to the floor of the House in the near future as I am sure it will receive a unanimous vote when such action is taken.

Captive Nations Week, then, is a time for us to honor and commend the courage and fortitude of these unhappy people, to study not only their plight and the lessons that it teaches us but also means for alleviating it, and to assure them that our hopes are indeed sincere for a happier future of freedom for them.

EXTENSION OF PRICE-ANDERSON ACT

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today I received a letter from W. A. Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers of America, that concisely sets forth what everyone should understand about the Price-Anderson Act, which Congress adopted in 1957 and which the House will be asked to extend under H.R. 8496.

While Mr. Boyle no doubt presented his views on the subject to other Members of Congress, I should like to insert his letter at this point in the RECORD:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1965.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On June 22–24 the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held public hearings on proposals to extend for 10 years, to August 1, 1977, the present provisions of the Price-Anderson Act. Under that act, a total of $560 million is available to pay for damages resulting from an atomic powerplant accident—$60 million from commercial insurance companies and $500 million from the Government (for token premium). The act provides that manufacturers and operators of atomic powerplants will be free from financial responsibility for damages; in other words, the public will have no recourse for damages in excess of $560 million, even if the damages run to several billion dollars.

During the recent hearings, three very important facts came to light, facts which we believe deserve your consideration when you are asked to vote upon extension of the Price-Anderson Act.

First, insurance companies are willing to increase their coverage of public damage by a few million dollars, to a total of $74 million, but they have not demonstrated confidence in the safety of atomic plants. The insurance companies have inserted clauses in their regular casualty policies eliminating coverage on damage from radioactive contamination. As a result, the homeowner, the factory owner, and the owner of office buildings have no insurance coverage in their own policies against radioactive contamination; their recovery will be limited to their proportionate share of a fund which may be grossly inadequate.

Second, the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, an independent group of eminent scientists, told the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that "considerable further improvements in safety are required before large power reactors may be located on sites close to population centers."

Third, various utility witnesses appeared before the joint committee and were asked to comment on the coal industry's proposal that unlimited Government insurance beyond the amount available through private sources be provided at comparable commercial rates, and that the utilities be subject to ordinary rules of law in the event public damage exceeded the coverage purchased. One after the other, the utility witnesses stated they would not build atomic plants if the law made them subject to financial responsibility for the amount of such damage in excess of the commercial insurance and Government indemnity.

Understandably, the coal miners object to any unfair subsidy for a competitor. We hope that you as a representative of the public will feel that the foregoing facts deserve serious consideration in determining whether Congress should continue to give artificial stimulation to the growth of the atomic power industry which is now a force in our competitive economy, or whether this industry like all others should be allowed to grow consistent with the establishment of public confidence through orderly experience and a sound determination as to the safety of nuclear plants.

In particular, we urge that you oppose the extension of the "no recourse" (limitation of liability) provision of the Price-Anderson Act for which there is no rational justification whatsoever.

Sincerely yours,
W. A. BOYLE,
President, United Mine Workers of America.

I congratulate Mr. Boyle for his forthright presentation. It is imperative that all implications of H.R. 8496 be accorded full public disclosure before the bill comes to the floor. Because provisions of the legislation have been given little notice, we would be derelict of duty to make a final decision without first acquainting ourselves thoroughly with every aspect and then relaying this information to our constituents.

Mr. Boyle's protest is all the more justifiable when it is recognized that the Atomic Energy Commission has authority to decide where an atomic plant will be located. Assume, for instance, that the Potomac Electric Power Co. decides to construct a reactor on a site within the District of Columbia or in nearby Maryland. Assume also that your home happens to be within a short distance of this location. Whether or not you are a next door neighbor, however, does not determine whether you would be immune from an untoward incident that might take place when the reactor is under construction or in operation. You have every reason to be concerned if you reside anywhere within commuting distance of the Capital.

You may live in Arlington or Annandale, Silver Spring or Seat Pleasant, Bethesda or Barcroft, but you would still not be exempt from the grave problem that would come with an atomic plant in any sector of this area. A report of the AEC's Office of Technical Information in 1959 contained these quotations by a representative of the Travelers Insurance Co.:

> The average citizen has become aware of the fact that reactors are inherently highly dangerous and in spite of all precautions there exists a potential to catastrophic exposure.

The Travelers' official, Wayne G. Henderson, further stated:

> One pound of plutonium distributed uniformly could contaminate about 10,000 cubic miles of air. The release of the hazardous material in a single reactor could contaminate a large area of the order of several hundred square miles making the area temporarily or possibly permanently uninhabitable.

So who wants to live next door to the atom? Not you or I, yet the Atomic Energy Act presently contains the preemption provision that is meant to prevent us and our neighbors from blocking construction of an atom plant near our homes.

But, as Mr. Boyle's letter explains, that is only half the story. One might suppose that any company or corporation that builds and operates a facility of any kind—an atomic power station, a fertilizer plant, petroleum refinery, or powder works—would be responsible for whatever damages might be incurred in the event of an explosion or other disaster disrupting the health and comfort of the surrounding environs. If your home is destroyed by an accident not attributable to your own negligence and not an act of God, you expect to collect reasonable damages from the party or parties of responsibility.

Under Price-Anderson, residents of a community damaged or destroyed by a nuclear incident might receive only a fraction of the compensation due them. Furthermore, because of waivers in ordinary homeowners insurance policies, they have nowhere else to turn for protection.

Have you looked at the policies covering damage to your homes? Let me read briefly from these homeowner policies made available by a reputable District of Columbia insurance agency.

Under "perils excluded" are these stipulations:

> This policy does not apply to loss: by contamination by any radioactive, fissionable, or fusionable materials; by nuclear reaction or nuclear radiation or radioactive contamination.

I invite my colleagues to peruse these policies, and I am sure you will want to look over your own homeowner policies when you get home this evening.

As Mr. Boyle has explained, besides setting a limit on financial responsibility of companies operating atom plants, Price-Anderson provides for Government subsidization of a major part of the inadequate insurance coverage stipulated under the act. Is it not time that ordinary rules of law apply to all nuclear power facilities operated by private or investor-owned utilities?

Mr. Speaker, this is no partisan matter. It concerns us all. In this connection I am this week sending to all Members of the House and Senate a copy of a statement on the Atomic Energy Act by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein]. I commend it to your attention.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Harsha] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I want to join those of my colleagues who are today taking part in what we have come to know as Captive Nations Week.

I cannot urge too strongly that we join with the slave nations in their firm belief that in time and with proper encouragement and assistance from the free world, they will achieve the freedom and independence which is rightfully theirs and which has so wrongfully been temporarily taken from them by the Communist movement.

Six years ago this month, the Congress of the United States unanimously adopted a resolution calling on the President to designate the third week of July as Captive Nations Week. President Eisenhower issued the first proclamation of its kind—and succeeding Presidents have followed suit.

The congressional resolution was frank, outspoken and courageous. Let me quote a brief extract:

> The imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, North Vietnam, and others.

The resolution called on the President to proclaim the observance each year until "such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

The thinking behind this resolution was clear and logical. It was felt that the people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains would take heart from the fact that they were not forgotten. Deprived of their national independence and individual liberties, prisoners of communism, they desperately needed some sort of gesture on the part of America to boost their courage—to keep them from complete national despair.

By this proclamation, we let them know that we had not accepted as permanent their present tragic situation—that we never would accept it, in fact.

Of course, the Kremlin was outraged when President Eisenhower issued that proclamation. Of course, it touched off a flood of violent outbursts from the then Red leaders. And has since. For one thing, it exposed communism as today's most monstrous colonizer. It laid bare the huge extent of its conquests. And it proclaimed our belief that, like all empires of the past, the Communist empire would eventually collapse; would break up into the various captive peoples of which it was composed. It also intimated—and this is very important—that we would not cease in our efforts to encourage that collapse; to give what help was humanly possible to the uncounted millions of Soviet prisoners in their efforts for freedom.

The observance of Captive Nations Week is—as I see it—fine and honorable and, unfortunately, heartbreakingly necessary. It shows that we have not forgotten our own colonial days. It shows that we still believe that all men are created equal and that each has the inherent right to pursue happiness in his own way.

I have often thought how desperately grateful our ancestors must have been for the encouragement and support they got from the people of France in their struggle for independence 189 years ago. Think what a boost it must have given American morale to know that the people of a powerful nation like France were firmly convinced that we would achieve nationhood.

As you know, Communist propaganda is unceasing. Captive Nations Week is not only a firm declaration of our national position, but is also an excellent piece of counterpropaganda. It exposes the Red empire as being just that, an empire, a colonial empire, holding in bondage people who long to be free.

I hope that Captive Nations Week will be observed this year by all Americans—observed solemnly and prayerfully. I want the slave nations of the world to know that the American people believe each one of them will, in time, achieve independence. Already there are signs and portents that independence behind the Iron Curtain is growing. Let us encourage this growth. Let us show the world that global freedom is our aim—not a world divided.

THE BERKSHIRE EAGLE

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have long maintained that the Berkshire Eagle is the best daily paper of its size in the country. It does a first-rate job in reporting news from every corner of Berkshire County, Mass., as well as keeping its readers informed of developments in Washington and around the world. Its editorial voice has been consistently sensible and progressive; its columnists interesting and informative. In the summer, when Berkshire County becomes New England's cultural center, the Eagle does a masterful job of reporting and criticizing musical and theatrical events.

I was greatly heartened to read an article in the latest issue of Newsweek magazine indicating that others share my high regard for the Berkshire Eagle. Because I think that this article offers a good insight into the operation of this fine newspaper, I would like to include it in the Record.

The article follows:

RARE BIRD

"Pete gets very upset that he can't put out the New York Times," says Donald Miller, 66, publisher of the Berkshire Eagle in western Massachusetts. But if he lacks the resources to publish all the news that's fit to print, Eagle Editor Lawrence "Pete" Miller, 57, still manages to put out what many regard as the best paper in New England. "Actually," says the elder Miller, who occasionally has to slam shut the till on his zealous brother, "we publish a much better paper than we should."

Few hard-eyed publishers would disagree. To cover thoroughly its home base of Pittsfield and every corner of Berkshire County, the Eagle (circulation 29,000) regularly devotes almost half of its space to editorial matter, against a national average of 40 percent. The paper's full-time news staff numbers 49, augmented by 32 stringers. Business Manager Paul Major estimates that the Eagle's editorial expenses run 50 percent higher than most papers of like circulation. "Most people are terribly lazy, including myself," says Editor Miller. "We have got to get reluctant and lazy people to read about what is going on in the world."

MECCA

In summer, when the Boston Symphony Orchestra is at Tanglewood and the Berkshires become a mecca of music, dance, and theater, the Eagle soars. Features and reviews by Jay C. Rosenfeld and Milton R. Bass, the paper's able, knowledgeable music and drama critics, are given big play in both the daily paper and the Berkshire Week, the Eagle's Saturday summer magazine. Edited by Bass' attractive wife, Ruth, a Columbia School of Journalism graduate, the magazine is so popular with tourists that the 12,000 extra copies distributed free each week barely meet the demand. (The magazine is printed offset at the Miller-owned Bennington, Vt., Banner. This year, the Banner won the Ayer Cup for excellence of typography, makeup, and printing, and the Eagle won honorable mention.)

The Eagle's editorial page is consistently liberal. The paper was one of the few in the Nation that backed Adlai Stevenson for President both in 1952 and 1956. Acutely aware that its position in the Berkshires leaves the area only one major political voice, the Millers follow the rare policy of printing almost every letter the paper receives. During political campaigns, they can run as many as 2 dozen a day.

Not only do Eagle subscribers number most of the Berkshires' noted residents (Actress Julie Harris, Playwright William Gibson, and Conductor Erich Leinsdorf), but over the years Editor Miller has cajoled many into contributing, including Reinhold Niebuhr, A. A. Berle, and James MacGregor Burns, who is reviewing Theodore H. White's "The Making of the President 1964" for the newspaper.

More than its name contributors, what really makes the Eagle a rare journalistic bird is Peter Miller's ability to unearth local talent. One of the paper's wittiest weekly columnists is a Housatonic housewife named Joan Mills. In a piece on flying, she wrote last week: "Any travel facility which maintains life insurance dispensaries in all its terminals has a negative attitude." And the paper's Pittsfield-born State politics reporter, 48-year-old A. A. Michelson, is so highly regarded that he is carried by five other Massachusetts papers, including the Boston Globe. "The Eagle's not the best paper of its size in Massachusetts," says Globe Editor L. L. Winship. "It's the best of its size in the country."

MEDICARE BILL AND CHIROPRACTORS

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the medicare bill was amended in the Senate to authorize insurance for chiropractic service as part of the program for paying medical bills. Now, while the House-Senate conferees are meeting to resolve the differences in the bill as passed by the two bodies, I would like to urge the conferees to delete from the bill this novel departure from long-established policy.

The recognition and licensing of chiropractors is a matter for each individual State to determine and to regulate, and I believe that it would be most inappropriate for the Congress to enact this authorization which would apply throughout the Nation.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CONABLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, we are observing the seventh annual Captive Nations Week to reaffirm and renew our support for self-determination for the peoples of those nations who have been deprived of their freedom by the tyranny of communism. More than two dozen nations with almost a billion people are today deprived of freedom and self-government and incorporated into the Red's colonial empire.

During an era when scores of new nations have emerged to a free status, it is ironic that many of the world's oldest nations in Europe and Asia are deprived of their basic freedoms and subjected to the rule of a totalitarian government, instead. Poland and the Ukraine, Estonia and Tibet have been ground into the Communist system.

However, we know that the brave people of these oppressed nations do not accept their present plight as final. Neither can the U.S. Government, as historic defender of liberty, accept this captive status for these nations and peoples. Our policies must continue to press for free elections of governments for these nations so that these peoples may establish their institutions of government according to their own precepts and beliefs. Certainly, none of us in the free world fear the outcome of self-determination by these peoples. Communism has been forcibly imposed upon all these nations; none has freely chosen their Communist governments. We must pledge our continuing efforts to grant them a free choice for freedom.

NASSER'S LATEST FRAUD SHOULD SPELL END OF AID

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today's report to Congress from the Government auditors, the GAO, reveals that almost half of the 186,000 tons of corn given by the United States to the United Arab Republic, in 1961, ostensibly for distribution to the needy, was sold by Nasser's government.

This is a clear-cut case of fraud and corruption. When Egypt sold food provided by America as a gift for the needy, she forfeited any further qualification for inclusion in such programs. Egypt withheld this food from the hungry masses and used it for ends of power, profit, and greed. This surely is a cynical exploitation of food intended for relief of the poor.

How naive can we be? Have we not had enough experience to know we cannot take Nasser at his word?

For years, I and others in Congress have insisted that the Department of State and our aid agencies verify the need for, and the distribution of, our assistance. And for just as many years, these pleas have been ignored. We have warned that our food supplies and other U.S. commodities are being diverted to other hands. But these warnings fell on deaf ears.

The report of the GAO discloses that this shipment of corn to the United Arab Republic valued at $23.7 million was given to Egypt on the basis of that Government's representation that a famine would follow an anticipated crop failure. The report further states that, in fact, no such crop failure took place. In spite of this, the distributing agencies made no effort to investigate the use to which this food was put.

Recently the President of the United States called for a renewal of our food assistance to Egypt after it had been suspended. In view of this startling revelation by our Government's own Accounting Office, I am calling on the President to immediately suspend any portion of the $37.5 million remaining under the agricultural assistance program to Egypt.

GOVERNMENT IN THE CHICKEN BUSINESS

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WALKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I issued the following statement today concerning a House Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee meeting with officers of the Department of Agriculture and the Area Redevelopment Administration on an ARA loan application for a poultry complex in Newcastle, Pa.:

> It is most disturbing to me to see the attitude taken by the USDA and the ARA toward putting Federal money into a poultry complex to the tune of $2,720,000 in Newcastle, Pa., when the poultry industry in the Nation is in such a depressed condition.
>
> The records show that there will be 7 percent more poultry on the market during this month than the same period last year; 14 percent more next month, and between 20 and 25 percent more by October.
>
> Today we on the Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee were told by an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture that the Department had information to the effect that the demand for poultry should be very good by the time the Newcastle poultry complex is ready for production. All I can say is that someone is trying to sell someone a snow job.
>
> We were further informed by the ARA and the Department of Agriculture that Lippman Bros. justify themselves in making this request for Federal funds in these times of depressed poultry prices by asserting that they receive 6 cents a pound more for their chickens than does the rest of the industry.
>
> I feel that members of the poultry industry should be aware of the fact that the Federal Government is anticipating placing their tax dollars into a Government financed operation which will compete with them.

FUTURE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY: ASSETS OUTWEIGH LIABILITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATKINS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia Inquirer of Sunday, July 11 carried a full page article about Thomas B. McCabe, chairman of the board of Scott Paper Co., Chester, Pa., in my congressional district.

I have known Mr. McCabe for many years and have the greatest admiration for him. He has a distinguished career not only in business, but in public service and philanthropy. Government service is just one of his many outside activities. He has served Swarthmore College, also in the Seventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania, for more than 20 years as a member of the board of managers, is a trustee and vice chairman of the Committee for Economic Development, former member of the Institute of Paper Chemistry, member of the Rockefeller brothers special studies project, and chairman of the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowships, Inc.

Not the least of his interests is his assignment as Pennsylvania Republican national committeeman, and I commend to everyone his realistic yet optimistic assessment of the future of the Republican Party as he looks toward 1968.

I consider it a privilege and honor to insert in the RECORD these comments by an outstanding American like Thomas B. McCabe:

Eight months after Lyndon B. Johnson's election blitz littered the political battlefield with Republican wreckage, Thomas B. McCabe, Pennsylvania Republican National Committeeman, looks toward the 1968 campaign realistically and optimistically. Realistically, because he does not minimize the job of rebuilding a party that not only lost the Presidency but drew less than 40 percent of the national vote, was defeated in both branches of Congress by more than two to one, and salvaged only 17 of the Nation's 50 Governors.

Optimistically, because his inventory convinces him that the Republican Party's assets—its performance over more than a century, its basic organization and its brains—far outweigh its liabilities.

McCabe, chairman of the board of the Scott Paper Co., reviewed the state of the party after attending a meeting of the reorganized national committee in Washington. Candidly, with no bitterness, he discussed Republican mistakes, how to correct them, and the hard road back to major party status. Seventy-two years old on Sunday, McCabe heads a business enterprise that has prospered sensationally under his leadership for 38 years. He has pursued a parallel career of distinguished public service—some of it under Democratic administrations—while remaining a proud partisan.

"We need partisanship to preserve the two-party system in the United States," he said. "It has made this country great, politically, socially, and economically. If one party becomes too weak it cannot do its job. It's far healthier for both parties to be vigorous."

Precisely because Republicans are out of power, they must work harder as opposition watchdogs, McCabe believes, to scrutinize every administration action, fight unsound proposals, and offer constructive counterproposals.

"In the Vietnam and Dominican Republic crises, the Republican Party has been more united in supporting President Johnson's program than have the Democrats.

"Both parties joined to reduce Federal taxes, but the Republicans can't rest now. They must follow up by vigorously and intelligently pointing out mistakes in taxes and any other Federal programs.

"The poverty program is a perfect example. Basically, I'm not against it but in Philadelphia the big discussion seems to be about who will get the political plums. That's the sort of thing we've got to watch for and point out when we discuss the program."

As the basis for his party's comeback drive, McCabe reviewed the reasons for the Republican debacle of last November.

"We were defeated in 1964 because we allowed a minority of the party to take over," he said. "The whole campaign was a tragic thing. Theodore H. White in his book, 'The Making of the President-1964,' paints the picture effectively and in vivid colors.

"With the exception of General Eisenhower—who was himself an exception as a war hero of tremendous personal popularity—we haven't elected a President since 1928. The reason is that we haven't been successful in gathering under our banner enough segments of the people. There are great minority and ethnic interests in this country, and Republicans have lost an opportunity in not cultivating them."

According to figures cited by former Republican National Chairman Leonard W. Hall, the Republicans in 1964 lost 75 percent of the Catholic vote; 80 percent of the Jewish vote, and 96 percent of the Negro vote.

"No party can win against such an array," McCabe said. The figures on Negroes alone show something radically wrong, considering that the GOP grew out of the antislavery movement and gave the Negro his freedom. I tell my Negro friends that President Eisenhower did more to help the Negro than any President in a hundred years but we failed to capitalize on that.

"One of the most serious weaknesses of the Republican Party is that it has extraordinary potential strength among business and professional leaders, and among voters in rural areas and small towns, but unfortunately too many of them are apathetic toward participation in politics.

"Unless these people are aroused to the necessity for active participation in politics at all levels of government, the party suffers—and the country suffers.

McCabe attributed the Republican defeat to a minority takeover and the failure of the majority to act soon enough and with vigor. But he is not emphasizing past mistakes nor launching crusades to drive any elements from the party.

He made his point humorously, telling of an elderly man who, at the end of an eventful and fun-packed life, was asked by his clergyman:

"Are you ready to make peace with your Maker and renounce the devil?"

"Well, Father," the old man said, "in the circumstances I'm not in a position to offend anybody."

"We're not in a position to offend anybody," McCabe said. "Our problem is that we haven't enough people in the party. We're a minority, and if you go to extremes on either side, you wind up a minority of the minority.

"We've made a serious political mistake in making extremists feel uncomfortable in our party. As long as these groups exist we must be skillful enough to utilize what strength they have.

"Until 1964, Democrats were far more prone to fight among themselves than we were and they had the happy faculty of uniting diverse elements when it came time to vote. Unfortunately, differences of political philosophy among Republicans have been more difficult to reconcile."

Having worked for Scranton for more than a year, McCabe nevertheless backed the entire Republican ticket after Barry Goldwater's nomination. In his philosophy, a member of a party who disagrees with his party's policies or candidates has but one sensible choice: To work from within to promote his own views, but not to desert his party.

"A party's strength depends on the loyalty of its members," he said. "During the 1964 campaign, many of my friends who came out for Johnson urged me to do the same. I told them:

" 'Of course not; I'm not going to run out on my party just because I don't agree with everything the nominee stands for. If I don't like things I'll try to change them—not scuttle and run.'

"Nowadays, some of my business friends complain that Governor Scranton is too liberal and my liberal friends think he is too conservative. I remind them that they expect a relatively higher performance from him than from a baseball player who is marvelous if he hits .300. They're asking him to hit 1.000 and nobody can do that."

Firmly, McCabe rejects the idea that diverse elements of the Republican and Democratic Parties should reorganize themselves into two new parties, one conservative, the other liberal.

"You can't do that if you want a really workable two-party system," he said. "The major American parties are strong because of their diversity and their skill in bringing different elements together. It would be impossible to create two new parties out of the Republicans and Democrats. It isn't practical and it isn't desirable."

One immediate problem for Republicans is the mushrooming growth of splinter groups within the party, representing conservative, liberal, and moderate elements. On the conservative side, disregarding such groups as the John Birch Society and the Reverend Billie Hargis Christian Crusade, are Americans for Constitutional Action, the American Conservative Union, the United Republicans of America and, most recently, the Free Society Association, a nonpartisan group headed by Goldwater.

Representing more liberal Republican elements are the Republican Citizens Committee, the Ripon Society, the Trumbull Society, and Republicans for Progress. They have formed a coordinating unit called the Council of Republican Organizations.

The multiplying outfits worry the national committee for a practical reason: they drain off money and research talent—but chiefly money—from the regular organization. National Chairman Ray C. Bliss said of them:

"Splinter groups don't assist in uniting a party. Anyone would be a novice to think that splinter groups don't drain off some funds from the regular party operations."

McCabe agreed that "it's preferable to finance activities through the regular Republican organizations." Otherwise, he's not too concerned about the organization explosion but rather with how to utilize their strength in a united effort.

"The moment we get strong leadership," he predicted, "these elements will disappear."

Turning to the Republican reconstruction project, McCabe admitted the party hit a low point in November and appears weak and ineffective. But to keep the gloomy picture in perspective, he recalled the defeat of 1936, when the party carried only two States for Alfred M. Landon.

Republicans elected only 140 Members to the House of Representatives in 1964 but in 1936 they elected only 102; only 32 Republicans sit in the Senate today; their ranks dwindled to 21 in 1936. Now they have only 17 Governors but in 1936 they had but 8.

"Our prospects looked dismal then but we came back and, of course, we can come back again," McCabe said. "We have an example here in Pennsylvania. During successive Democratic administrations the Republicans sank to a low ebb, until Scranton came along.

"A recent poll shows that his popularity with both Republicans and Democrats is growing steadily. He commands a tremendous following. He and other vigorous young Governors such as Nelson A. Rockefeller in New York, John A. Love in Colorado, George W. Romney in Michigan, and Mark O. Hatfield in Oregon have united all elements in our party. That's what all Republican leaders must do if they hope to win nationally.

"The legislative and administrative activities of the Scranton administration have recognized all the things that needed to be done in Pennsylvania to make it stronger by reducing unemployment, attracting new industry and stimulating industry to expand. Better health and welfare programs, better education—all these stamp Scranton as a progressive type of Governor. If we can do it in Pennsylvania, Colorado, Michigan, New York, and Oregon, we can do it in the country."

How? The major job, and McCabe calls it a colossal one, is to work at the grassroots in 1965 and 1966 and, in addition, have Republicans in Washington and State and local communities present constructive programs that will brighten the party's image.

"Just think what it would mean if JOHN V. LINDSAY could get himself elected mayor of New York, or if we could win the governorship of California. It would have a dramatic effect all over the country and would help revive the spirit of Republicans everywhere."

McCabe endorsed LINDSAY's decision to run "as LINDSAY" in a nonpartisan campaign, even though he was selected by the Republican leaders of New York's five boroughs. Goldwater criticized his strategy, arguing that "I would think a man who's registered as a Republican should be proud to run as Republican if it's a partisan election," McCabe disagreed.

"You've got to be practical," he said. "The Republican Party in New York City is a minority, with not more than one-third of the registered voters. To be realistic, LINDSAY must unite enough of the people to win.

"It adds greatly to his stature if he runs as a candidate of the Republican Party and is smart enough to select men to run with him from other segments of the electorate to strengthen the ticket.

"Look how Earl Warren used to win in California, drawing heavy support from both Republicans and Democrats, and how Senators THOMAS H. KUCHEL, CLIFFORD P. CASE, and HUGH SCOTT have won in States that frequently elect Democratic Governors.

"It can be done," Mayor William O. Cowger, of Louisville, told the national committee how he did it. The Democratic machine had ruled Louisville for 30 years. Republicans couldn't get anywhere simply by accusing Democrats of malfeasance. Cowger had a comprehensive, constructive program for the improvement of Louisville and used every conceivable, modern technique to put it before the voters.

"Robert T. Walker, an advertising man from San Diego, told us how Republicans carried their county against Johnson. They resorted to the most modern merchandising techniques by using computers to analyze information of thousands of voters, to sample opinion and get reactions. A tremendous force of volunteers made contact with the voters by telephone and personal calls. They even had cards showing the best way to approach each man and woman. The whole campaign was based on an entirely different technique from that of the old machine politician."

To present a new Republican program to the Nation, McCabe would rely heavily on the Republican Coordinating Council, set up early this year "to facilitate the broadest party representation and establishment of task forces for the study and examination of major national problems and issues."

It comprises 22 members: the Republican National Chairman; the 11 Republican leaders of the House and Senate; former President Eisenhower and the four former Republican presidential candidates—Goldwater, Richard M. Nixon, Thomas E. Dewey, and Landon, and five Governors. The latter, selected by the Republican Governors Association, are Govs. Robert E. Smylie, of Idaho, Love, Rockefeller, Romney, and Scranton.

Already the council has undertaken studies on human rights and responsibilities, job opportunities, the conduct of foreign relations, and Federal fiscal and monetary policy.

"The council can be a helpful, constructive force to evolve policies and programs," McCabe said. "We've got to develop far-reaching programs for winning at the grassroots. Republicans in Congress must continue to display sound, statesmanlike leadership.

"It's very important for us to listen more and more to the Republican Governors who are close to the grassroots. The Governors I have already mentioned are helping us to create the right image for the party."

"Image" is important to McCabe as a business executive and he is consistent in stressing its importance in politics. He once advised a group of business colleagues:

"We know the favorable public image is a valuable asset in attaining new business and in attracting capital and personnel. We know, also, that a corporate image that is not based on complete sincerity and integrity can be a serious deterrent to growth."

The same principles, he believes, apply to political parties.

"The Republican image is outdated and we've got to change it," he said, "but the moment you start using terms like conservative and liberal you're in trouble. I like to think I'm a reasonable conservative but I don't want to go back to some of the principles of the 19th century.

"Some extremists think you can turn back the clock to the days of McKinley or before, but you can't—politically, socially, or economically. We've got to be flexible enough to give the country the type of candidate and platform that are best for the age we live in. I don't mean that it's necessary to compromise on basic principles but I know that in dealing with people in business today you need a more modern technique than when I started out.

"We've got to create a more appealing image—one that accents youth—with candidates like LINDSAY in New York and Arlen Specter (candidate for district attorney) in Philadelphia.

"If we're willing to work for this new image and pay the price, and be more selective in our candidates, we can win. We must work incessantly, 12 months of the year, to build our strength at the grassroots. If we do well enough in the local, county, and State elections this year and next, I think we'll be on our way for 1968."

The Republican Party, far from bankrupt, faces the comeback trail with valuable assets, McCabe believes. He listed its achievements: The abolition of slavery and the preservation of the Union; the construction of continental railroads, and the opening of the West; a half century of leadership that produced economic and social gains; its promotion of competitive enterprise combined with protection against business monopolies and trusts.

"In administration," he said, "it has a proven record of performance not only when the party was in power but when Republicans served under Democratic administrations in the Second World War, and after. Even today, we have Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense; Douglas Dillon, until recently Secretary of the Treasury; and Stanley R. Resor, appointed a few weeks ago to be Secretary of the Army."

McCabe could have mentioned himself, but he didn't. He served in Government posts under a Democratic administration without compromising his political convictions—or being expected to. Asked about it, he said:

"President Truman invited me to the White House in 1948 and asked me to serve as chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. I told him: 'Mr. President, I don't think you know about my politics.' He kept right on talking for about 5 minutes, then smiled and said: 'Mr. McCabe, you don't think I'd ask you down here if I didn't know about your politics, do you?' "

Republican leadership, McCabe said, gives the party great potential power despite the overwhelming odds against it. Among signs of its vitality he cited Bliss' election as national chairman, and the appointment of Gen. Lucius D. Clay, senior partner of Lehman Brothers, New York investment bankers, as chairman of the party's finance committee.

The party, he said, "is bright with such luminaries as Scranton, LINDSAY, Rockefeller, CASE, KUCHEL, of California, and Governors Hatfield, John H. Chafee, of Rhode Island, Love and Romney, and Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., of Michigan.

He emphasized the differences between the two parties, not their similarities.

"The chief difference is their views on the centralization of power in Washington," he said. "Republicans believe States and local communities should have a greater opportunity to work out their own problems. More people can take a greater interest in politics and feel closer to the Government.

"In foreign policy, Republicans have shown firmness in contrast to the vacillating, free and easy approach of Democrats. John Foster Dulles was criticized for his tough policies but, looking back, many think now he was a good Secretary of State.

"President Kennedy was woefully weak and vacillating on Cuba at the time of the Bay of Pigs, although he stiffened during the missile crisis in 1962.

"In fiscal and monetary policy, especially in taxes, there's a great difference. It is not so great nationally now but it stands out locally and in the States. In Pennsylvania, Democrats violently oppose a sales tax but they don't offer practical alternatives, probably because their influence depends on Labor.

"For most of a century, there's been a tremendous difference in the parties' attitudes toward competitive enterprise."

It's much too soon, he concluded, for any one man to speak for the party. It will not follow any individual, he believes, until he has been elected to office or becomes its nominee for President.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, there are 9 captive nations in Europe, which with 17 million Germans in East Germany constitute about a quarter of Europe's total population. These nations, with a population just over a 100 million, live in countries extending from the Baltic to the Black Sea region. Nearly all of them had regained their freedom and independence after the First World War, and all of them had attained maturity during the two decades of the interwar years. Many of them had become valued members of the world community of free nations, but they were living, toward the end of the 1930's, in fear of losing their freedom. None of them, however, could have envisaged the cruel fate that was to be theirs during the war years, and especially since the end of the war.

Soon after the outbreak of the war the freedom of these nations was in jeopardy.

In the course of the war all of them—Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians, Poles, Czechoslovaks, Hungarians, Albanians, Bulgarians, and Rumanians—were engulfed and overwhelmed. All of them, like so many others, suffered bitterly as the result of war, but went through its horrors hoping for their eventual freedom. At the end of the war, however, the mighty Communist tide swept over the entire area of northern, central, and southeastern Europe. This sudden and stunning conquest took the democracies of the West by surprise; they were justly shocked when the grasping hand of Communists was out to cripple and strangle all freedom and independence in these countries. As the result of the Soviet Government's deliberate policy, they are all Soviet satellites, the captive nations of Europe.

Two decades have gone by since these nations were enslaved by Communist tyranny, and the leaders of the free world have been unsuccessful in their attempts to free them. But we have not given up our hope for their freedom; we intend to keep the issue of captive nations alive, and one of the best ways to do this is by observing 1 week each year, the third week of July, as Captive Nations Week. I am indeed glad to take part in the observance of Captive Nations Week.

ARTHUR GOLDBERG

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Goldberg is someone who knows that the world will never run out of problems but who is equally aware that reasonable men can reason together and therein lies the hope to the complex problems of this ever-changing world.

The United Nations still offers the best vehicle to a world of law, perhaps, it is a fragile vehicle, but it remains one capable of fulfilling man's hope and his dream of peace.

If we are to continue the human story on earth now that we have the means to bring it to an end, it is essential that the probe for peace continue through the United Nations. President Johnson is essentially a man who seeks world peace—a peace with honor. It is from this point of reference I am sure that he selected one of democracy's outstanding men to represent this country at the United Nations in these troubled times.

Arthur Goldberg is a brilliant man of outstanding ability, compassion and understanding. At a time when our Nation or the world cannot afford less, Arthur Goldberg represents America at its best. The President is to be congratulated for his selection. At the United Nations our country's interest and the cause of the free world will be in able hands, and the United Nations, itself will be enriched. In Arthur Goldberg President Johnson has found a worthy successor to Adlai Stevenson.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, in observing Captive Nations Week, we are sadly reminded that 100 million Europeans have been living under the heavy yoke of Communist tyranny for 20 years.

As a free people who have fought, and bled, and died for our own and others' freedom, it is always painful to reflect on the unhappy fact the forces of enslavement and oppression continue to threaten the peace loving peoples of the world. Twenty years ago, this Nation of freemen made massive sacrifices to release the peoples of Europe from the bondage and inhuman tyranny of totalitarianism. Today, Captive Nations Week serves as a painful reminder that for 100 million Europeans the awesome conflict of World War II resulted in the replacement of one tyranny by another.

But, Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week is not a time for negative reflection, but rather a period of postive rededication. It is a time to strengthen our appreciation of the blessings of freedom, democracy, and peace which we enjoy, and to reaffirm our resolute opposition to tyranny and slavery. In this age of conflict between the forces of freedom and Communist tyranny, Captive Nations Week is a time to manifest our awareness of the importance of these silent European captives, our noble allies in an age-old struggle. I am pleased to join my collegues in voicing my support of Captive Nations Week.

NEW YORK IN CRISIS—PART CXXXVI

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the article which follows deals with the growing crisis in jobs in New York and is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis." The article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on May 27, 1965, and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—CITY'S FIGHT FOR JOBS—A YEARS-LONG STRUGGLE

(By Barrett McGurn)

A 2-day top-level conference on New York's crisis in jobs for Negroes, Puerto Ricans and high school dropouts ended yesterday with the conclusion that the city must face up to a struggle of at least one or two decades as it attempts to cope with the problem.

Dr. Eli Ginzberg, chairman of the final session, said a new permanent city forum of business, labor, and government must be set up to study long-range economic development possibilities. He said $350,000, which has been mentioned as an initial investment in the businessman's Committee of 14 Help-New York is "ridiculously small."

"Three hundred thousand dollars," he said, "would be worthy of Squeedunk."

Dr. Ginzberg is director of Columbia University's project for "the conservation of human resources."

Paul S. Shaw, speaking for the Committee of 14, assured Dr. Ginzberg that the businessmen who are now organizing never have intended to limit themselves to $350,000 and will put up what is needed.

Two New York City commissioners found themselves on the spot as they told an intensely attentive audience of 100 economists, professors, labor leaders, businessmen, Federal officials at the Plaza Hotel why this city has not accomplished more in its effort to eliminate its unemployment rate of 14.5 percent among nonwhites in the prime work age of 25 to 44, and of 8.2 percent among whites.

ATTENTION

The high rate of joblessness among the Negroes and Puerto Ricans received almost all the attention of the conference since nonwhites who represent only 22 percent of the five borough population at present, will soar in coming years. The conference was told that the youth group (15 to 24), those who find job seeking hardest and violence easiest, will be 38 percent Negro and Puerto Rican inside the five boroughs 5 years from now.

One of the two commissioners, James J. McFadden, acting head of the city's labor department, told the conference that 50,000 jobs paying $100 to $200 a week are going begging in the booming high skill part of the city's economy. He conceded, however, that the 250,000 jobless are not now competent to fill them.

The other commissioner was Louis Broido, former executive vice president of Gimbels, who is the $1-a-year head of the city's department for commerce and industrial development.

Commissioner McFadden used his speech to plead for a $2 minimum wage in New York City, a 75-cent raise. He said that New York City is spending $1 billion a year to pad out the salaries of those who earn the present legal minimum or to finance those who have no work at all.

Commissioner Broido gave an emotional half-hour address listing the efforts he is making to hang on to badly needed low-skill factory jobs, which, he said, are being squeezed out by space shortages, taxes, and even by some other city do-good projects such as low-cost housing.

FIGHT

Commissioner Broido told how one factory operator wanted him to pay $1 million more than it was worth for his old small premises in a switch of sites inside the city, how he has had to fight a new high-rise just south of Greenwich Village which would wipe out 600 businesses employing 14,000 persons (50 percent of them Negroes and Puerto Ricans), and how he even had to use strong language about a sister community in New Jersey in an effort to head off a factory moving to Secaucus, N.J. ("I said to him, 'what do you want to move to that garbage heap for?' and he said 'because it cost only 75 cents a foot'.")

Efforts to emphasize the positive, such as New York's roles as a national management center, were balanced again for the second day by Herbert Bienstock, regional statistician for the U.S. Department of Labor. He pointed to distressing signs in the economy, not only of the five boroughs, but of the whole of the New York metropolitan area. Mr. Bienstock noted the following:

New York and northeastern New Jersey combined rank 17th in the country in terms of the rise and fall of manufacturing jobs over the last 5 years. The area has lost 6 percent of its jobs while Miami, Dallas, Atlanta, Washington, Minneapolis and St. Paul, Houston, Detroit, Los Angeles, and Paterson, N.J., have gained.

Taking gains in all nonagricultural jobs over the last half decade the New York City area (including northeastern New Jersey) ranks 11th, and the five boroughs by themselves are 16th. The New York region added 5½ percent and New York City gained 1½ percent. Small towns in the interior made the largest advances, but the New York region lagged behind the country's other five large metropolitan areas. America as a whole moved ahead 9½ percent, while the five other large metropolitan areas averaged a gain of 7½ percent.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART CXXXVII

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns the implementation of the poverty program in New York and is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis" which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune.

The article appeared in the Tribune on May 28, 1965, and follows:

New York City in Crisis—Poor Win a Larger Voice on Poverty Council

(By Marshall Peck)

("The term 'community action program' means a program which is developed, conducted and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served."—From the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.)

The New York Council Against Poverty, the structure set up to guide the city's poverty program, agreed yesterday that its present composition was lacking in representation of the poor and promised that 32 certified poor persons from 16 poverty areas would become members.

But the council, which presently has 52 of its 100 seats filled, almost all of the members being city officials, heads of voluntary agencies and top representatives of cityside organizations, did not give into a second demand, made by community groups, that one-third of the body be leaders from neighborhood action programs. The council agreed that it would add 10 persons in this category to membership.

These plans were announced by Dr. Arthur C. Logan, chairman of the council, after a 2-hour meeting of 45 council members at city hall. Dr. Logan announced also that the council voted unanimously to apply to Washington at once for funding. He explained that along with the request to the Office of Economic Opportunity would go "a covering letter" indicating the council was planning to broaden its membership to include representatives from the poverty target areas.

"Each side is fighting for a clear majority," Mr. Wingate said, "and nothing is going to stop the people. The law says the target people should run the program, and they're going to. There will be a landslide of opposition sent to Washington."

The numbers game that revolves around the council shapes up like this: 55 already named (Mr. Wingate is one of those named who is boycotting the present structure); 3 from the Central Labor Council; 32 poor from impoverished areas; 10 leaders from community action groups.

The opponents to this structure claim that it is not only unwieldy, but will not truly reflect the interests of the poor in compliance with the Economic Opportunity Act. Dr. Logan said yesterday that he did not think a membership of 100 would be a burden and emphasized his belief that, with the addition of other members of the council would meet the legal requirement of "maximum feasible participation" by the poor.

The council, the second formula devised by the city as a means of administering the poverty program, has been under acute harassment in the past few days from what Miss Ann Roberts, staff director of the city's Poverty Operations Board, calls "the Wingate coalition."

This was her description yesterday of the 15 or so neighborhood action program groups which held public rallies Monday and Wednesday to enforce their demands that "now that the Government has delegated responsibilities and moneys to the poor, the poor should have them." Livingston Wingate, executive director of Haryou—ACT, under fire himself recently from allegations of misadministration, has been a spokesman for this grouping.

Mr. Wingate, who announced Wednesday night that the council had agreed to "consider" demands for one-third poor and one-third community leadership, said last night that the council's partial concession "was not acceptable."

The squabble over control of adminstration of Federal poverty funds has seriously delayed the start of many programs and brought old rivalries to the fore. Initially, the city proposed that a private nonprofit corporation of the 11 members of its Poverty Board and six civic leaders be the key agency. This was criticized vigorously by Representative Adam Clayton Powell, Chairman of the House Labor and Education Committee, and by Mr. Wingate, a former aid to Mr. Powell. The city then recast the structure as a council of 100, along with a satellite, Economic Opportunity Corp., that will handle funding applications.

The conflict has forced the city right to the deadline in its application for $18 million, about $10.5 million of which will be for community action programs. Dr. Logan said his application to Washington had to be in by Memorial Day, as the grant must be made in the current fiscal year ending June 30, and Governor Rockefeller, under the law, must have 30 days to study and approve the grant.

FREE POSTAGE FOR FIRST-CLASS LETTER MAIL SENT BY MEMBERS OF U.S. ARMED FORCES WHO ARE ON ACTIVE DUTY IN VIETNAM TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Murphy] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I have today introduced a bill to provide for free postage for first-class letter mail sent by members of the Armed Forces of the United States, who are on active duty in Vietnam to the United States.

I can easily remember not too many years ago the difficulties in trying to seal an envelope after a week of heavy rain in Korea and the same problems these American soldiers in Vietnam during the monsoon season must have in trying to send a letter to their loved ones at home,

I think a great boost in morale to our servicemen in Vietnam would be to permit every first-class letter home to go by airmail. The funds for these mailings can be appropriated by a reimbursement by the Department of Defense to the Postmaster General.

ONE HUNDRED MILLION EAST-CENTRAL EUROPEANS STILL CAPTIVES OF THE RUSSIAN REGIME

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Irwin] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, this year the 20th anniversary of V–E Day was a joyous and memorable occasion for many people in Europe. For the 100 million people of east-central Europe, it could and should have been such an occasion, but it was not. When the Nazi tyrants were crushed it was hoped that the people of Eastern Europe would be liberated from oppression. Unfortunately for them, and their friends in the West, they were grievously mistaken.

Through the machinations and evil designs of the Soviet Government, East Europeans were not only denied their just claim for freedom and independence, but they were brought under the heel of Communist tyranny.

Today nearly all of east-central Europe is, for all practical purposes, part of the Soviet empire. Today about 100 million people in Europe, living in lands extending from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea, are captives of the Russian regime. They have been suffering under the Kremlin-imposed Communist dictatorships for more than 20 years. All the valiant efforts made by these people to free themselves and the strenuous efforts of all friendly governments in the free world have not altered the situation. There has been little perceptible change in the lot of these peoples.

Since the end of World War II, the nations of the West, following the leadership of the United States, have sought through diplomatic negotiations to better the lot of these captive nations. Innumerable conferences have been held with the Soviet authorities, and more than once the issue has been raised in the United Nations. Yet, these nations are held in captivity by the Soviet Union. And the prospect of freeing these nations in the near future seems dim at this writing. What the future holds in store for these gallant, freedom-loving people is, of course, anybody's guess, but for the present all we can hope is for some unforeseen eventuality that will greatly alter the situation.

Several years ago, this Nation and others dedicated to the restoration of freedom in the captive nations came to the conclusion that the best way to keep the flame of freedom flickering in the breasts of these oppressed peoples and to focus world attention on the continued tyranny of the Soviets was to keep the captive nations cause alive.

And so in 1959 I joined with my colleagues in the 86th Congress in unanimously adopting Public Law 86-90 which called for designating the third week of July as Captive Nations Week.

Thus, on this occasion, we are once again able to demonstrate our firm determination never to submit to the permanent captivity of these nations. Once again we are able to give expression to the yearnings of eastern Europeans and dramatize their quest for peace and freedom. Once again, we are able to appeal for the spiritual unification of Europe. And once again we can remind everyone who the real imperialists are in today's world.

ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of Ambassador Stevenson has evoked an outpouring of appreciation for the man and his contribution to America and the world. One of the finest tributes I have seen appeared in an editorial in the Carroll Daily Times Herald, of Carroll, Iowa.

I call it to the attention of my colleagues as a moving example of the deep respect Adlai Stevenson earned through his commitment to a peaceful world.

The editorial follows:

WORLD CITIZEN

It must be left to future historians to make a final assessment of the character and accomplishments of Adlai Ewing Stevenson.

He was too complex a man, the times in which he lived and worked are as yet so unsorted out, he fell so suddenly in full career, that we can do little more than mourn the loss of an immensely respected and valued public servant.

What marks Stevenson left on history are still obscure, as was the man himself to many Americans.

He was a politician, and at the same time a contradiction of the popular image of a politician. He was the despair of party bosses, yet won election to the governorship of Illinois in 1948 by the greatest landslide in that State's history.

It was, however, the only election he ever won.

His admirers saw in him the intelligence of Jefferson, the integrity of Lincoln and the idealism of Woodrow Wilson. To others he was an aloof and disturbingly superior man, imbued with an intellectual humor and seriousness many could not appreciate.

Born only a month after the 20th century began, Stevenson was one of the few men in our history who nearly reached the highest office in the land by not seeking it, at least in the beginning.

That was in 1952, when he was suddenly projected into the national limelight by his unexpected nomination for President by the Democratic Party.

We can only speculate on what turn history would have taken had his opponent been someone other than the enormously popular Dwight Eisenhower.

Only in recent years, since his appointment as Ambassador to the United Nations by President Kennedy, have we come to realize that Adlai Stevenson was far more than the man who was defeated twice for the Presidency.

Only now do we realize how long and how close and how vital was his association with the U.N., which he maintained, through every crisis that assailed it, was "the hope of the world."

He was involved with it from the very start, when in 1945 he was appointed Special Assistant to Secretary of State Stettinius to assist in the planning of the world body. In 1946-47, he served as a delegate to the General Assembly.

It was as Ambassador, however, the post he held from 1961 until his death, that Stevenson's stature as a statesman of the highest rank and his eloquent fitness as spokesman and defender of his country and the free world became impressively evident.

More than an American has passed. A citizen of the world—the world of today and the world we hope to build—is gone.

More than a nation is stunned. A world grieves.

JUSTICE ARTHUR GOLDBERG TO BECOME U.S. AMBASSADOR TO UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Justice Arthur Goldberg to become U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations is an act of remarkable foresight and wisdom. Justice Goldberg, throughout his varied career in service to his Nation, has demonstrated intellectual and political skills which equip him to meet the demands of diplomacy in a world of protracted tensions.

During his service as a labor mediator, and later as President Kennedy's Secretary of Labor, Justice Goldberg revealed gifts of sympathy, an ability to accommodate and reconcile conflicting claims, and a strength of commitment to overriding ideals. These gifts will make his presence in the United Nations particularly welcome by all parties. The complex process of international negotiation and consultation requires of a U.S. diplomat patience and perseverance. It is by these qualities that Americans have known Justice Goldberg for many years.

His brief career on the Supreme Court bench gave Mr. Goldberg the opportunity to formulate and express deeply liberal commitments designed to help build a progressive America. His opinions were motivated at once by high idealism and an intuitive feeling for the practical. These qualities are prerequisites for the job to which he is now turning.

The American commitment to the United Nations required an ambassador whose breadth of vision, and capacity to accommodate conflicting viewpoints are without blemish. Justice Goldberg is such a man. The country, the United Nations, and all men of peace have reason to celebrate his appointment.

GARY JOB CORPS TRAINING CENTER, TEXAS

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the Gary Job Corps Training Center is located in San Marcos, Tex., only 30 miles from my hometown of Austin, Tex., the capitol of our State. Camp Gary had been an abandoned Air Force base, and at one time had been a helicopter training base during World War II.

The Gary Job Corps Training Center was one of the first Job Corps centers established in this country under the Job Corps Program. Today we have over 1,500 enrollees at this center, and I believe that it is one of the best projects of its kind in the United States today.

It has been my privilege to visit the Gary Center on many occasions during the past year, and I have been impressed with the rehabilitation, the planning, the Administrators and faculty—and especially with the young men who are enrollees. This project was dedicated in April of this year, and I truly believe it was one of the most thrilling and satisfying moments of my life.

President Lyndon Johnson; the Honorable John Connally, Governor of Texas; Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity; and Dr. Otis Singletary, the National Job Corps Director; and others came to San Marcos to help dedicate that project.

The main auditorium on the campus was full to overflowing as the President and others expressed the hope that we can do something to salvage these young people of our Nation. But the most impressive of the entire ceremony was three speeches delivered by young men—elected by their fellow enrollees to student officials—who were enrollees and who spoke with such sincerity and logic that the entire auditorium gave the young men a standing ovation when they had finished their talks. This is the spirit and the dedication of the young men at the Gary Job Corps Training Center.

I would like to present to you some of the facts in connection with this particular project:

The Gary Job Corps Site is an impressive example of what is being done in the war on poverty. The Gary Center is somewhat of a pilot project and through the efforts of selfless and dedicated men has explored many new frontiers with successful results. The center is operated by the Texas education foundation, an independent, nonprofit corporation, established by the Governor and Legislature of the State of Texas, the honorable John Connally, as an agent in fact, of the State of Texas. This foundation has worked closely with the Texas education agency which has given us superb inspiration and cooperation.

At the present time, there are 1,500 enrollees at the Gary Center—and 2,500 to 3,000 are expected by September.

Of the 1,400 enrollees, 34 percent are Negroes; 10 percent are Latin Americans; and 56 percent are Anglo-Americans.

The young people get paid $30 per month, less income tax, for spending money.

Fifty dollars per month is put into the bank to pay for their transportation to their first job, and to pay for rent and food during the first month of their new job before they get paid.

Up to $30 of this $50 can be allocated to a dependent parent, which amount is matched by the Government.

The enrollee also receives a $75 clothing allowance one time while he is at the center so that he can have some decent clothes in which to go to church or on liberty.

The boys are also entitled to a leave home once each year.

There are 37 vocational classes, although there are only some 13 different types of classes, each of which meets twice a day. They include such subjects as: basic automobile lab, auto body repair, plant maintenance, sheet metal, retailing, commercial art, small engine repair, machine shop, electrical maintenance, food service, office occupation, photography, printing, heavy equipment, industrial landscaping, hospital aids, diesel mechanics, welding, drafting, and radio and TV repair.

This load is carried by 62 academic teachers and 61 vocational instructors and 13 administrators, under the direction of the able and dedicated superintendent, Dr. O. J. Baker.

The renovated facilities complete to date are: 127 dormitories, 108 units of family housing, 88 day rooms, 31 vocational shops, 16 academic buildings with 92 classrooms, 9 maintenance buildings, 6 administration buildings, 3 instructional material buildings, 2 dining halls, 2 swimming pools, 2 chapels, 1 gymnasium, 1 bowling alley, 1 theater, 1 infirmary, and 1 clothing issue.

The electrical and air-conditioning rehabilitation is aproximately 65 percent complete. Facilities still to be completed include: 22 dormitories, 20 classrooms and vocational shop buildings, 18 vocational shops, 18 buildings in hospital areas, 6 warehouses, 2 HPE buildings, 1 gymnasium, and paving of roads; and completion of the other 35 percent of the electrical and air-conditioning renovation.

There has been such complete cooperation between the Texas Education Foundation, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the architect, the local contractors, that the buildings and facilities have been developed exactly on the basis as planned and not one of the completion dates has been missed yet. We are ahead of schedule.

It is hoped that we can eventually offer twice this number of courses to the boys; and as fast as we can make adequate plans, find the instructors, and secure qualified trainees, we will more than double the number of classes offered.

Indeed, there is a temptation to give specialized courses now, but our administrators there feel that we should grow as cautiously as we can during these early months—and I agree with this position.

I would like to point out a particularly unique feature of the Job Corps Center at San Marcos. That project has established a nonprofit company known as "Opportunities, Inc.," which brings together a blue-ribbon team of nationally known Texas-based companies and associations to assist the Texas Education Foundation.

Directors of Opportunities, Inc., come from such companies as: Friedrich Refrigeration, Humble Oil Co., Collins Radio Co., Central Power & Light, Acme Brick Co., Texas Hotel & Motel Association, Frito-Lay, Inc., Brown & Root, Associated General Contractors, Central Forwarding, Inc., and approximately 25 other companies.

Members of Opportunities, Inc., are making their know-how and resources—including skilled professional and executive personnel—available on a cost basis to the Texas Educational Foundation to develop and carry out the expanded training program at the Gary center.

Responsibilities of the members of Opportunities, Inc., include: testing of enrollees, development of vocational programs and curriculum, procurement and installation of modern equipment, assistance in staffing, direction of housekeeping operations, and the very important aspect of job placement services.

These job placement services, along with the rapid progress of the boys, have already induced several industrial companies to commit themselves to hire as many boys as the center can put out in designated areas. While the skilled management and technical people are being made available on an actual costs basis, the companies participating are providing the counsel and guidance of their executive members of the board of directors without cost. It has therefore been possible to mobilize for the Gary project management skill that could not be assembled under ordinary circumstances for any amount of money.

"Opportunities, Inc.," has also brought some elements which cannot be calculated by a machine or measured on a dial which have nevertheless been very valuable to the continued success of this program. Our best business leaders in Texas are not just on-lookers in this program—they are positive participants. And remember these business leaders have offered to help every graduate secure a job when he has finished his course. These are the elements of human involvement and selfless human kindness shown by so many of the people who are working hard on this project and who have been touched by the glimmers of hope which they are beginning to see in these boys' eyes and the smiles which are occasionally breaking across their faces.

The boys are working on the campus, too. Some of these boys on their own initiative have accepted such jobs as: Working as counselors in dormitories on the student level, cutting grass and painting buildings, editing and contributing to the center's newspaper, and counseling with other prospective enlistees on their own experiences at the Gary center.

There have been problems, indeed, in the operation of this program, as there will be in any Job Corps program in the United States. We must remember that we are working with a young man who has already started off life as somewhat of a failure, since he is a dropout from school; he comes from a needy family; his opportunities have been limited; his discipline usually very lacking; his clothing and personal possessions very meager; and, worst of all, he has become cynical at an early age.

When the average boy first arrives at Gary Center, often he is somewhat distrustful of the other students and carries with him a sort of "chip on the shoulder." Some of them have "Beatle" haircuts—and all of them are dressed in clothing indigenous to all sections of the United States. They cannot believe—but they soon find—that the other fellow want to help him, that they have all they can eat, that they are expected to study and try, and that they must maintain set hours for work and study and recreation. It is tough at first and perhaps this accounts for the 13-percent dropout percentage figure we have there.

I believe that every boy realizes that for the first time in his life, he has a specific responsibility to make a good student at the center, because he knows that the success of that project and other projects throughout the United States depends in large measure on how he behaves and how he produces. The administrators and faculty spend long and extra hours in trying to secure these boys' confidence and trust. And I have the greatest respect for the teachers of that project.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we had an assistant camp director who literally gave his life for this Job Corps center. He was working approximately 15–18 hours every day, and his wife pleaded with him to slow down. His reply to her, however, was that "This is the first time in my life that I've ever been really happy and felt that I was doing some good for these boys".

It was a cruel realization for us to learn that by a heart attack, Ogden Baur was taken from us. But I believe that he left a great deal with each of the boys for the work that he did with them.

Our community has been concerned with both the reception and the conduct of these enrollees.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in this program, and I speak from some experience. I was a NYA director when I first got out of the University of Texas—and for 3½ years, I worked with young boys and girls on a program somewhat akin to the present Job Corps program. I know that young people need to have hope and faith, and I think our Government must give them that hope and faith through a program such as the Job Corps and other related opportunities under the economic opportunity program. I know that young men and women can be salvaged. I know that they can become productive citizens of our communities. I am extremely pleased that the business people of our State are working so closely with this project and have said to our administrators over and over "We will hire every boy who graduates from this campus."

Of course, some of these boys will go back to their own communities, as they should—but the businessmen of Texas have done more than extend a hand of welcome. They are giving them the hand of opportunity. I realize this is an expensive program. I know we will stumble as we plow our way through heartaches and disappointments, but I would like to say that I have the highest respect for Sargent Shriver, Dr. Singletary, and other members of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The very existence of a Job Corps program means that young men across our land know that our Government does provide a place to give them a second—and even third—chance. They are seizing on that opportunity and are working together—the Anglos, the Negroes, and the Latins—as a team. I think they are making a significant contribution to the well-being of our Nation.

I would like to invite Members of this Congress to go to the Gary Center and to see and inspect this project. I challenge any person in this Congress to visit with these boys and to see the warmth of feeling that comes from these boys as they say: "Thank you for giving us a chance to be good American citizens."

Whatever this program costs, as long as we can wisely administer it, it must be carried out.

DALLAS FEDERAL POST OFFICE AND COURT BUILDING FUNDED

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is most pleasing to me to note that the Senate included funds for the Dallas Federal Office and Court Building in the independent office appropriation bill which it passed on July 13.

This project is much needed and is long overdue. It was requested by the General Services Administration more than 10 years ago. Their original study and their continuing statements show conclusively that it will result in substantial savings to the Federal Government in rentals and also in the efficiency of the agencies operating in Dallas.

A review of the history of this project clearly shows an overwhelming endorsement of the need for a Federal Office and Court Building in Dallas. As I said before, this building was recommended and requested by the General Services Administration in 1954. Two years later, in 1956, the Public Works Committees of both the House and Senate authorized this project. In that same year, 1956, at a cost of $1 million, the Federal Government acquired the site for this building.

Civic and business leaders in Dallas recognized the need, underwrote and paid $464,000 of their own funds to keep the cost to the Federal Government within the maximum $1 million. This is indicative of the strong support expressed in Dallas for this facility. The plans for the building were financed by the General Services Administration at a cost of $745,000.

The project was eliminated from the budget by President Eisenhower in 1960, even though it had the strong support of the late Speaker Sam Rayburn. The action of President Eisenhower was endorsed by the incumbent Representative from Dallas at that time. Thus, the project has been dormant until now.

The present representative from Dallas County made this a campaign issue last year. He has strongly supported this project, and President Johnson has included the request for funds in his budget this year. The President's request and the support of Congressman CABELL are based on the need for this facility and the obvious justification for its immediate approval and construction.

I strongly support the President and Congressman CABELL in this view. I sincerely and respectfully urge the conferees on the part of the House to accept this amendment by the Senate which would allow the General Services Administration to move forward immediately with construction of this vital and worthwhile Federal Office and Court Building for Dallas.

For more than 10 years the executive branch has been aware of the obvious economy of moving ahead with this project. The Congress has waited long enough to voice its approval of a genuine move to economize in the operation of Federal Government agencies in Dallas. I sincerely hope that we will have to wait no longer.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

USDA: CONSUMER FRIEND—FOOD STAMPS BREAK POVERTY CYCLE

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to my colleagues' attention the fact that this summer about three-quarters of a million Americans are eating better than they did a year ago. Using U.S. Department of Agriculture food stamps, they are buying in stores of their choice the food their families need for growth and health. For many, this is the first time they have ever been able to buy enough of the right kinds of food.

By investing their own money, no matter how small the amount, low-income families can get on the average $10 worth of food for each $6 they invest. The latest complete reports show that in May of this year eligible families in 105 areas put nearly $6.5 million of their own money into food stamp coupons. They received free an additional $3.9 million in food stamps. This was the Federal Government's contribution to their food budget.

Such a program presents both a challenge and an opportunity. The challenge is for people to help themselves—to exercise independent judgment—to shop for food where and when they like.

The opportunity is to achieve a better diet, and with it better health, more energy and vigor.

The USDA food stamp program brings economic benefits to the entire community. Employers benefit because better fed employees do better work. Retail stores benefit because their customers have more food dollars to spend. Other business benefits because additional dollars circulate through the whole community.

Since passage of the Food Stamp Act in August 1964 the Department of Agriculture has been moving promptly and efficiently to extend the benefits of this program to as many areas requesting it as the budget will allow.

In less than a year USDA has increased the number of food stamp areas more than 2½ times. In August 1964 there were pilot food stamp operations in 43 areas. Today, 116 areas in 31 States and the District of Columbia are operating food stamp programs for the benefit of their low-income families.

Other counties will be entering the program in the months ahead.

The USDA's food stamp program represents a new approach to greater economic opportunity for low-income families. Its significance is that it enables disadvantaged people to put their own resources to work effectively to break the cycle of food poverty. I have great hope for the future of this program.

NOMINATION OF JUSTICE GOLDBERG AS AMBASSADOR TO UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my pleasure at President Johnson's nomination of Justice Arthur J. Goldberg as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

Throughout his career, Mr. Goldberg has demonstrated his deep compassion for his fellow man and his unswerving dedication to the rule of law. He has proven himself to be a brilliant mediator and a man of reason, firmly committed to liberty and justice for all.

I first became acquainted with Mr. Goldberg when he appeared before the House Judiciary Committee to testify in behalf of the Civil Rights Act. I was sincerely impressed by his plea for racial equality and his insistence that the rights given us under the Constitution be guaranteed to all Americans.

Mr. Goldberg knows well the art of compromise and conciliation. He fully recognizes that the United Nations remains our best hope for true and lasting peace and offers men the world over an opportunity for a better life.

Although Mr. Goldberg has served on the U.S. Supreme Court for only 3 brief years, he has made a deep and lasting imprint on the bench of this Nation's highest tribunal. I am confident that the outstanding ability he has shown as Justice of the Supreme Court will be demonstrated even more fully in the halls of the United Nations.

All of us mourn the passing of Adlai Stevenson and will be ever grateful for the many contributions he made toward achieving world peace and understanding. But I think that President Johnson's appointment of Arthur Goldberg as Ambassador Stevenson's successor will make our loss easier to bear. There are few people in the United States today capable of carrying on Mr. Stevenson's efforts. I believe Arthur Goldberg is one of them.

OKLAHOMA'S EDWARD KEEFE HEADS KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding record of an Oklahoman who has been accorded the high honor of being elected president of Kiwanis International, an organization of more than 270,000 civic-minded men in 5,300 clubs scattered around the globe, and an organization in which I am proud to hold membership.

This Oklahoman is Mr. Edward C. Keefe, of Oklahoma City, who is executive vice president of the Oklahoma Independent College Foundation, and who has attained this high position after 16 years membership in Kiwanis International. During these 16 years, Mr. Keefe has served as president of the Kiwanis Club of Oklahoma City, lieutenant governor and governor of the Texas-Oklahoma Kiwanis district, chairman of the Kiwanis International Committee on Key Clubs, and as a member of the Kiwanis International Committees on Boys and Girls Work, and Public and Business Affairs for the United States.

Mr. Keefe, however, has not confined his civic work to Kiwanis. During the years he has worked in Kiwanis, he also has served as publicity chairman for the Salvation Army in Oklahoma City, and the Black Beaver Council of the Boy Scouts of America. He has served as chairman of the Oklahoma Governor's Sports Day Committee and chairman of the Grady County chapter of American Red Cross. He has been a director of the American College Public Relations Association, and is currently a member of the executive committee of the Independent College Funds of America.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to salute this dedicated Oklahoman and American for his fine record of civic work, which resulted in his taking office as president of Kiwanis International this month at the Kiwanis golden anniversary convention in New York City.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. Cahill beginning July 26, 1965, for surgery (removal of cataract).

To Mr. Aspinall for July 23 to July 26, 1965, on account of official business.

To Mr. Evins of Tennessee for an indefinite period on account of death in his family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Brock) on July 22, for 10 minutes, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Chamberlain (at the request of Mr. Brock) on July 22, for 15 minutes, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Brock), on today, for 5 minutes, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Watkins (at the request of Mr. Brock), today, for 15 minutes, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Fraser (at the request of Mr. Moeller), on July 29, for 60 minutes, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Fino.

Mr. Krebs and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Jonas to include extraneous matter with his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. Buchanan to include extraneous matter with his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Brock) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. Reinecke.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Moeller) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Murphy of New York.

Mr. Brademas.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1148. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to utilize its employees more effectively and to improve administrative efficiency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1217. An act for the relief of Capt. Paul W. Oberdorfer;

H.R. 1314. An act for the relief of Foster Masahiko Gushard;

H.R. 1322. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ana Cristina Rainforth;

H.R. 1374. An act for the relief of CWO Elden R. Comer;

H.R. 1487. An act for the relief of Maj. Kenneth F. Coykendall, U.S. Army;

H.R. 1889. An act for the relief of Albert Marks;

H.R. 2881. An act for the relief of George A. Grabert;

H.R. 3625. An act for the relief of Alfred Estrada; and

H.R. 8484. An act to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of members of the Armed Forces on a change of permanent station.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 22, 1965, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1367. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of savings attainable by discontinuing nonessential bus transportation services at Hanford Works, Richland, Wash., Atomic Energy Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1368. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting an act to require operators of ocean cruises by water between the United States, its possessions and territories and foreign countries to file evidence of financial security and other information; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 408. An act to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future natural disasters; without amendment (Rept. No. 632). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 486. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 8310, a bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 633). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1196. An act for the relief of Wright G. James; with amendment (Rept. No. 634). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1644. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. Robert B. Gann; with amendment (Rept. No. 635). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6726. A bill for the relief of William S. Perrigo; without amendment (Rept. No. 636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRIDER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8212. A bill for the relief of Kent A. Herath; without amendment (Rept. No. 637). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8350. A bill for the relief of the successors in interest of Cooper Blyth and Grace Johnston Blyth otherwise Grace McCloy Blyth; with amendment (Rept. No. 638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8351. A bill for the relief of Clarence L. Aiu and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 639). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8641. A bill for the relief of Maj. Derrill deS. Trenholm, Jr., U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 640). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 9969. A bill to provide fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel, to improve the quality of teacher training programs, and to establish a National Teacher Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 9970. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the action that should be taken to preserve, develop, and make accessible for public use a portion of the Hudson River and related lands in the States of New Jersey and New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 9971. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, as amended by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, in order to provide a minimum payment for certain State administrative expenses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 9972. A bill to establish a Federal subbatical program to improve the quality of teaching in the Nation's elementary or secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9973. A bill to provide for a National Teachers Corps to attract and train able teachers for the children in the Nation's most deprived urban and rural schools and to provide employment opportunities for displaced teachers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 9974. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, optometry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 9975. A bill to authorize the shipment, at Government expense, to, from, and within the United States and between oversea areas of privately owned vehicles of deceased or missing personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 9976. A bill to amend the act of September 2, 1964; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 9977. A bill to modify the flood control project on the Minnesota River at Mankato and North Mankato, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9978. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to remove the income limitations for purposes of receiving pensions for veterans who are over 70 years of age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 9979. A bill to establish a Federal sabbatical program to improve the quality of teaching in the Nation's elementary or secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9980. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 9981. A bill to make the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act applicable to the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey and to limit the applicability of such laws so as to exempt certain aspects of the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9982. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of July 23, 1955 (69 Stat. 367, 368), and to authorize mining locations for certain mineral deposits; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 9983. A bill to amend the St. Lawrence Seaway Act to provide that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation shall not engage in publicity or promotional activities such as free or paid advertising; solicitation of cargoes; publication of ocean, rail, port, or motor carrier rate or service comparisons; or other activities that are actually or potentially disruptive to the flow of waterborne trade among ports in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 9984. A bill to provide fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel, to improve the quality of teacher training programs, and to establish a National Teacher Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 9985. A bill to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and hospitals or similar institutions in the District of Columbia of injuries caused by firearms or other dangerous weapons; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 9986. A bill to provide free postage for first-class letter mail matter sent by members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 9987. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply and water systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 9988. A bill to provide for judicial review of administrative findings of the Secretary of Labor under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, and chapter 23 (Federal Unemployment Tax Act) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 9989. A bill to provide that the proceeds of certain taxes shall be used to finance the Federal-aid highway program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.J. Res. 585. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim April 9, 1967, as Bataan-Corregidor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.J. Res. 586. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to article III, section 1 of the Constitution of the United States, limiting the tenure of office of members of the Supreme Court to 15 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Con. Res. 450. Concurrent resolution to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H. Res. 487. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 488. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

347. Mr. CUNNINGHAM presented a memorial of the Nebraska State Legislature urg-

ing the retention of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 9990. A bill for the relief of Moris Bakhash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Alabama:

H.R. 9991. A bill for the relief of Santa Giammalva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9992. A bill for the relief of Raymond Cheuk-Man Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 9993. A bill for the relief of Lam Hai Cheung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF (by request):

H.R. 9994. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Buffolino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 21, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, under the all-embracing canopy of Thy goodness and mercy which have followed us all the days of our lives, we come as children in our Father's house. In united prayer in this center and citadel of the Nation's life, we come seeking light upon our ways and strength within our hearts.

Quiet our minds of their fretting fears, allay the unhappy irritations and resentments of our spirits, and sanctify our lives through the grace of contrition and humility.

We pray for ourselves more earnestly because we are important to others who lean upon our strength. At this altar where we give utterance to our highest desires, we are thinking especially of our warrior boys, representing the will of our free land, as this very day they stand stalwartly in far and perilous places. We would remember in tender solicitude all who rely upon our fortitude of character, our fidelity in service, our power to endure, because our strength is their strength. As the winds blow harder, may our roots strike deeper. Whatever outward things these dangerous days take from us, as we risk all for truth's sake, by Thy grace, may they make us inwardly more adequate, wise, dependable, and strong.

In the Master's spirit we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 20, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1392. An act for the relief of Annie Gabbay;

H.R. 1627. An act for the relief of Esterina Ricupero;

H.R. 3292. An act for the relief of Consuelo Alvarado de Corpus; and

H.R. 7378. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1392. An act for the relief of Annie Gabbay;

H.R. 1627. An act for the relief of Easterina Ricupero; and

H.R. 3292. An act for the relief of Consuelo Alvarado de Corpus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7378. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Administrative Practices and Procedures of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Permanent Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar beginning on page 2.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated, beginning on page 2.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dr. Albert H. Moseman, of New York, to be Assistant Administrator for Technical Cooperation and Research, Agency for International Development.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Leonard H. Marks, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of David M. Bane, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Gabon Republic.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward Clark, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, over, by request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

The Chief Clerk will read the remaining nominations in the Department of State.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the remaining sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert M. White, of Connecticut, to be Administrator, Environmental Science Services Administration.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to express my wholehearted pleasure and approval at the nomination of Dr. Robert M. White, of Hartford, Conn., to head the Environmental Science Services Administration. This new office, which merges the Coast and Geodetic Survey with the U.S. Weather Bureau, demands the leadership of a man who is a top-rated scientist as well as a capable administrator. Dr. Robert White's notable contributions to the science of meteorology, and his fine experience as an administrator of meteorological research programs, eminently qualify him for this post.

Dr. White's career in the science of weather began when he studied geology as an undergraduate at Harvard, working at that time as a weather observer at the Blue Hill Observatory. After serving as a meteorological forecaster and instructor in the Air Corps during World War II, he continued his education at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, earning a master's degree in 1949 and a doctorate in 1950.

Dr. White began joining his scientific study to administrative responsibilities in 1952, when he became chief of the Large Scale Processes Branch of the Atmospheric Analysis Laboratory at the Air Force's Cambridge Research Center. During a year as head of the Meteorological Development Laboratory, Geophysics Research Directorate, of the Research Center, he provided technical direction for a team of scientists engaged in an extensive research program on the technique and dynamics of weather prediction. In 1959, he became a research associate at MIT, and resumed his private research into the problems of stratospheric meteorology.

In July of that year Dr. White joined the Travelers Insurance Cos., of Hartford, Conn., as director of this firm's weather research center and associate director of the research department. When the Travelers Research Center, Inc., was established in 1960, he became its president. He came to Washington at the request of President Kennedy in October 1963, to head the U.S. Weather Bureau.

Dr. White has represented the United States in the international scientific community in several capacities. A member of the Royal Meteorological Society, he is also the permanent U.S. representative to the World Meteorological Organization, and a member of its executive committee.

It would be hard to find a more qualified person to direct the new Environmental Science Services Administration. I am proud to join in support of this able son of Connecticut, respected and experienced public administrator, and eminent scientist.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of H. Arnold Karo, of Nebraska, to be Deputy Administrator, Environmental Science Services Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on today, July 21, 1965, he signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 627. An act to exempt oceanographic research vessels from the application of certain vessel inspection laws, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1217. An act for the relief of Capt. Paul W. Oberdorfer;

H.R. 1314. An act for the relief of Foster Masahiko Gushard;

H.R. 1322. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ana Cristina Rainforth;

H.R. 1374. An act for the relief of CWO Elden R. Comer;

H.R. 1487. An act for the relief of Maj. Kenneth F. Coykendall, U.S. Army;

H.R. 1889. An act for the relief of Albert Marks;

H.R. 2881. An act for the relief of George A. Grabert;

H.R. 3625. An act for the relief of Alfred Estrada; and

H.R. 8484. An act to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of members of the Armed Forces on a change of permanent station.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LAUSCHE, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S. 1588. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 497).

Mr. LAUSCHE subsequently said: Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1588).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H.R. 6097. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the President or the Vice President, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 498).

By Mr. KUCHEL, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 903. An act to add certain lands to the Kings Canyon National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 499).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2312. A bill for the relief of Arnold Maynard Carlson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN.

S. 2313. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1946, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2314. A bill to amend chapter 57 of title 39, United States Code, so as to authorize the free use of the mails in making reports required by law of certain payments to others; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 2315. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code so as to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces serving in Vietnam and other combat zones designated by the President; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. COTTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2316. A bill for the relief of Dr. Artemio M. Cuevas; and

S. 2317. A bill for the relief of Dr. Albert Victor Michael Ferris-Prabuh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT SPEECHES AND SELECTIONS MADE BY ADLAI E. STEVENSON

Mr. McCARTHY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 131); which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document a compilation, to be prepared by the Library of Congress, of representative published speeches, or selections therefrom, of Adlai E. Stevenson.

TRADEMARKS—INTENT TO USE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, some time ago I introduced Senate bill 1411 under the title, "Intent To Use Bill," which dealt with trademarks particularly. Since that time, the Chicago Bar Association Special Trade Mark Committee, the American Bar Association Committee, the National Coordinating Committee, and the Lawyers' Advisory Committee to the United States Trade Mark Association have done some additional work in this field and have suggested some revisions.

Accordingly, I introduce a new bill which deals with the same subject matter. I believe that it is a matter that can be more easily handled by a subcommittee of the full Committee on the Judiciary if it is in the form of a new measure.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be received and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2313) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1946, as amended, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FREE POSTAGE FOR CERTAIN REQUIRED TREASURY FORMS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today I am offering a bill to provide for payment by the Federal Government of postage costs in the required distribution of form No. 1099 information returns to individuals who receive $10 or more in interest or dividends.

In the Internal Revenue Act of 1962 there was included language requiring persons or institutions which pay interest or dividends in excess of $10 per year to furnish a statement of the amount paid to the payee and to the U.S. Treasury. Not only is there required a statement to the Treasury, but a statement must also go to the individual involved. There are currently some 60 million of these information returns being distributed to the recipients of interest or dividends, as well as the 60 million which go to the Treasury. The burden upon the financial institutions of the country—banks, savings and loan associations, insurance companies, credit unions, cooperatives, investment bankers, major corporations, and many others—comes to $3 million at 5 cents first-class postage for each one mailed to the recipient of dividends or interest. The cost is not so great for mailing the Treasury its copies, since they can be mailed in bulk, although still at first-class postal rates. This item comes to another $500,000. My bill would provide for free mailing of these returns both to the Treasury and to the individuals to whom they must go. The Post Office Department would be reimbursed for the loss of postage by the Treasury Department.

Mr. President, the reason for such a proposal is simple. Unlike many other forms mailed at the taxpayer's expense, the only beneficiary of these reports is the Federal Government. The Treasury Department has estimated that since the requirement that notices be sent to both the Internal Revenue Service and the recipient, tax revenues have increased as a result by about $2 billion annually. Yet the cost of producing this huge additional revenue is borne exclusively by the institution making the payment to the receiver of interest or dividends.

Free use of the mails for this purpose would still leave a heavy cost to be borne by the distributors of interest and dividends. They must maintain their records, compute the annual amount for each individual involved, and prepare the forms for mailing. While no estimate is available for this cost, there can be little doubt that it exceeds the cost of postage involved in this bill. In some cases preparation of the forms may run as high as 20 or 30 cents. The burden lies heavily upon financial institutions, and it is a different one from the preparation, for instance, of business census forms. There, the information is not only useful to the Government but it is highly useful to the businesses supplying the information.

Such a bill is not without precedent, since there are already free mailings for certain requirements under the Census Bureau. This bill, providing for assistance in the provision of information for the Government required by it for its own benefit rather than that of the person or firm which must do the preparing, is a fair treatment of what is presently an overly burdensome situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2314) to amend chapter 57 of title 39, United States Code, so as to authorize the free use of the mails in making reports required by law of certain payments to others, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

FREE POSTAGE FOR SERVICEMEN STATIONED IN VIETNAM

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill which is designed to extend the privilege of free postage to those in the Armed Forces serving in Vietnam.

During prior periods of hostility, the granting of free postage to members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones has been an established practice. In 1942 this privilege was extended to our servicemen fighting in World War II. In 1950 the Congress extended this allowance to those stationed in Korea. The same language used in these previous acts has been incorporated into the bill which I have introduced.

I call attention to the Senate, and shall call attention to the committee, that the bill is so drawn that it is not necessary for the President of the United States to officially declare Vietnam, or southeast Asia as a combat zone. It extends the privilege of free postage to those serving in Vietnam until such time as the President determines that it is an area in which the Armed Forces are no longer engaged in combat. It also allows the President to grant this privilege to other areas he may designate as combat zones.

When one contemplates the billions of dollars appropriated by this Congress each year, any cost of granting free postage to our servicemen in Vietnam would, indeed, seem small. I hope my colleagues will join with me in promoting this worthwhile and needed measure.

It is perhaps a small but very important service to our boys in Vietnam. I sincerely hope it will receive the prompt attention of the committee and brought to the Senate floor for action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2315) to amend title 10 of the United States Code so as to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces serving in Vietnam and other combat zones designated by the President, introduced by Mr. COTTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 362

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to S. 2300, the omnibus rivers and harbors bill, to incorporate the flood control project proposed for the Elizabeth River Basin, N.J., by the Army Corps of Engineers.

When the Senate Committee on Public Works held public hearings on projects for inclusion in this year's omnibus rivers and harbors bill, the Corps of Engineers had not progressed far enough with its preliminary work on the Elizabeth River flood control project to bring it before the committee. Nor was it possible to have the project acted on in the committee's executive session on the omnibus bill.

At this time, however, the corps has completed its work and the report of the Chief of Engineers has been cleared by all interested Federal and State agencies—the Bureau of the Budget, the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, and the Interior, the Public Health Service, and the New Jersey State Department of Conservation and Economic Development.

In view of the fact that Federal and State approval satisfy all requirements for congressional consideration, I believe it only appropriate that this project be considered by the full Senate for inclusion in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill.

The Elizabeth River and its tributaries drain a thoroughly urbanized area of about 23 square miles in Essex and Union Counties. The population of this area was estimated in 1960 at approximately 11,000 residents per square mile. Industrial development is concentrated primarily in the cities of Newark, Elizabeth, Linden, Bloomfield, Belleville, and in the townships of Union and Hillside. According to the 1958 census, there were 4,011 manufacturing enterprises in the area.

The number today is undoubtedly much higher. Farming activity and open space land, other than parks, are virtually unknown.

At this time, there are no Federal flood control improvements in the Elizabeth River Basin, and activity by the Corps of Engineers has been confined to navigation improvements. There are, however, channel improvements for flood control in Newark and Irvington which were constructed between 1933 and 1939 by the Works Progress Administration.

The Elizabeth River Basin is affected by both fluvial and tidal flooding or a combination of these. Although the largest known fluvial flood occurred in 1897, it is estimated on the basis of 1964 price levels that a recurrence of that flood under present conditions would result in damage approximating $3,700,000.

In recent years, however, the greater danger to the area results from tidal flooding caused by hurricanes. In September 1954, and again in September 1960, hurricanes Edna and Donna did substantial damage which, if they recurred today, would be estimated at $1,700,000 and $1,320,000 respectively.

Citizens of Elizabeth have long felt that sporadic flooding and its hazards to property and life have contributed to the deterioration of sections of the city along the river. Moreover, the declining commercial importance and value of the riverfront property come at a time when desirable sites for business and industry are increasingly sought after. Within the last few years, commercial traffic on Newark Bay has increased substantially and the forecast for the near future shows every indication that this growth will continue undiminished. Already the Corps of Engineers is awaiting Federal and State approval on extensive improvements on Newark Bay in anticipation of the bay's expanded commercial importance and its ports, such as Elizabeth.

It is, therefore, essential that this flood control project be undertaken at the earliest opportunity to enable the city of Elizabeth to contribute in full measure to the economic development of the area.

The Corps of Engineers has determined that the most practicable means of providing the needed flood control protection in the Elizabeth River Basin would be a local flood control protection project located primarily in the city of Elizabeth. The major elements of the project would consist of an improved channel, levees, floodwalls, an open flume, interior drainage facilities, appurtenant works and necessary bridge and utility changes at a total estimated first cost of $12,200,000.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors has concurred in this plan. The Board has, however, recommended that hurricane tidal flood protection should be a primary purpose of this project.

The effect of the Board's recommendation lowers the estimated costs of construction to the Federal Government from $10,075,000 to $9,769,000, and raises the non-Federal share to $2,431,000 for lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations and alterations, and a cash contribution presently estimated at $542,000. Annual charges estimated at $517,000 including $80,000 for non-Federal operation and maintenance, remain unchanged. Average annual benefits are estimated at $655,000 and the benefit-cost ratio is 1.3. The Chief of Engineers concurs in these views of the Board.

The need for this flood control project is not only critical but also long overdue. Already, years of delay have seen severe property damage and countless lives endangered. I trust, therefore, that the Senate will see fit to give its approval to this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment No. 362 will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 364

Mr. RANDOLPH submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2300, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 363

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to S. 600, the administration's higher education bill of 1965.

Mr. President, college and university faculties have expanded over 30 percent during the past 5 years, but even this substantial rate of expansion has not enabled the colleges and universities of this country to meet their staffing needs. A recent National Education Association survey of most colleges and universities indicates that the number of unfilled teaching positions is continuing to rise. The winter issue of the bulletin of the American Association of University Professors listed 175 institutions seeking over 200 college teachers. It is a fact that only a very small number of available positions are ever listed in the AAUP bulletin. Nonetheless, it is significant that so many institutions were listed there. The need is great; the graduate schools are unable to meet it.

To check the developing shortage of college professors, to improve the general state of instruction and research in all of our colleges and universities, to encourage graduate students to complete their work as quickly as possible, my amendment would provide a program of fellowships for completion of doctoral dissertations. This program would be available to all graduate students in good standing in accredited graduate schools that have satisfied all academic requirements for the doctoral degree except completion of their dissertation. The Commissioner of Education would be authorized to award up to 2,000 fellowships for the first fiscal year and up to 2,000 fellowships for the next 2 fiscal years. The fellowships would be awarded for such periods as the Commissioner would determine but not exceed 2 years. The stipend provided by each fellowship would be the same as is presently offered during the third year of the National Defense Education Act programs. Recipients of these fellowships would not be subject to a residence requirement. They will have the option of traveling to any library, archive, or research center in this country or elsewhere whose resources would facilitate completion of their dissertations.

Mr. President, the gravity of the problem that this program is intended to resolve has been recognized by the administration. The complexities, controversies, and economics of graduate education in the United States has been discussed, analyzed, and editorialized many times over. The failure of our graduate schools to produce graduated Ph. D.'s sufficient in number to meet current demands is a matter of great concern to all of us interested in educational excellence. The heart of the matter is that many more students begin graduate studies than complete them. They are, if you please, Mr. President, dropouts. While the reasons for dropping out are many, one of the most important reasons for serious students leaving graduate school is economic. Most of the direct assistance available to graduate students is available for the first year of study; the availability of direct grants diminishes as the student progresses through his second, third, fourth, and subsequent years. We have many programs encouraging students to begin graduate studies but very few to enable them to complete their work.

Recent amendments to the National Defense Education Act fellowship program have tried to do something about this situation. Grants available for 3 years need not be taken in 3 consecutive years. Students may be supported for 2 years as full-time students under the National Defense Education Act, then work as a teaching assistant and part-time student in a university for 1 or 2 years and then pick up the final year of their National Defense Education Act fellowship for a year of full-time work on their dissertations.

In addition, the remainder of vacated fellowships are now available for students engaged in dissertation writing. Helpful as the amendments are they are by no means a solution to the problem.

Over the past 4 years, approximately 23 percent of the fellowships have been vacated. Under the recent amendment, these vacated fellowships would be available for redistribution to students attending the school that had been awarded the fellowship that was subsequently vacated. If no fellowships were vacated, none would be available for distribution. Furthermore, these amendments apply only to schools and to programs and departments within schools that are participating in National Defense Education Act programs.

Mr. President, my proposal goes right to the heart of the problem. My proposal will make possible completion of what has been well begun. My proposal will provide fellowships for those that need them the most. My proposal promises the maximum result for the minimum expense. I hope that this amendment will be given the most serious consideration by the distinguished chairman and members of the Subcommittee on Education.

The PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and appriately referred.

The amendments (No. 363) were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR AREAS SUFFERING A MAJOR DISASTER—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 365

Mr. RANDOLPH submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1861) to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] may be added as a cosponsor to S. 2184, relating to laboratory procedures, and so reflect it at the next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ROBERT E. MAXWELL, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, July 28, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Robert E. Maxwell, of West Virginia, to be U.S. district judge, northern district of West Virginia, vice Charles F. Paul, deceased.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations, as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and myself, as chairman.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 21, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 627) to exempt oceanographic research vessels from the application of certain vessel inspection laws, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8775) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38 to the bill and concurred therein, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

THE AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I deeply regret that the staff of the Internal Security Subcommittee has issued a pamphlet entitled "The Techniques of Soviet Propaganda," in which there is a statement to the effect that the American Friends Service Committee is well known as a transmission belt for the Communist apparatus. Although I am a member of the Internal Security Subcommittee, I was not consulted concerning the publication of the pamphlet, and had no knowledge of its contents prior to its publication.

The statement quoted from the pamphlet is grossly unjust to the American Friends Service Committee. I have always admired the American Friends Service Committee for its great devotion and service to humanity and know that its aims and activities are in irreconcilable conflict with everything for which communism stands.

WE SHOULD RETURN SOLDIERS AND DEPENDENTS FROM WESTERN EUROPE: STOP THE OUTFLOW OF GOLD TO FRANCE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, since World War II we have spread our men and our resources across the world. Our Nation is, of course, the leader of the free world. In fact, we have more power militarily and economically than all other nations of the world combined. In order to "keep up with the Joneses" as the saying is, we have ambassadors, not ministers, in even the least populated and most backward of the emerging nations in Africa. Of course, it is inevitable that sometimes an ambassador turns out to be a pretty shoddy representative of a great nation. Also, ambassadors become from time to time the objects of hostility in the country to which they are accredited. It appears that Gen. Maxwell Taylor was in such a situation in South Vietnam before his resignation was suggested or accepted.

It would be well if top officials in the State Department, in giving instructions to our diplomats, would advise that they shun publicity and keep out of the glare of the spotlight whenever possible. Also, it would be advisable to emphasize that a good ambassador or consul should never be one, such as we have had from time to time, who makes the boast that he associates only with Americans and has never been in the home of a national in the country to which he is accredited.

It would be well to advise our ambassadors, particularly to nations in Africa, South and Central America and in the less powerful of the Asiatic countries, not to center their attention only on the groups with power and wealth in such countries, but also to find the side streets and side entrances to local places of opposition groups and the less fortunate economically as well.

They would do well to consider the words of John Gunther in his book, "Inside Europe Today." He was making reference to our continuing support, financial and military, of Fascist Dictator Franco, of Spain. He wrote:

> One lesson that may well be drawn from all this is that it is always dangerous for a democracy, like the United States, to become too closely involved with a dictator or semidictator, no matter how convenient this may seem to be. It is the people who count in the long run, and no regime is worth supporting if it keeps citizens down—if only for the simple reason that they will kick it out in time.

Another American author, C. L. Sulzberger, in his great book, "Unfinished Revolutions," made some suggestions which our officials from the Secretary of State down the line would do well to follow. Also, this goes for Secretary of Defense McNamara. His four cardinal rules or suggestions are:

> Keep the initiative, keep in with the outs, exploit the inevitable, then, if everything goes wrong, never stand between a dog and a lamp post.

Mr. President, in Europe there is growing concern that the English pound may be again devalued. Should this startling crisis develop, that certainly will have an adverse effect on the dollar and on our bonds abroad. Instead of ignoring this situation, it would be well right now for our Government to take all precautions possible to prepare our financial structure—our dollar—to meet even a slight strain that would inevitably come were the British pound to be devalued.

We must stop the outflow of gold to France and other nations. Here we are, more than 20 years following World War II, still maintaining huge military forces in West Germany, France, and other nations throughout the world. We have rearmed West Germany, and there is even talk that we may be sufficiently stupid to permit West Germany to become a nuclear power. Without delay we should withdraw most of the American 7th Army from Europe. We need no more than a few thousand of our Air Force and a few thousand advisory officers in France, West Germany, and Spain.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I shall not object at this time, but I think that we should observe the time limitation during morning business. I have no objection to the Senator from Ohio proceeding for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I shall try to deliver the remainder of my speech in less time than that. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. President, Defense Secretary McNamara, for reasons of economy that he gives, closes down military bases in this country and urges other steps in the name of economy in connection with our Reserves. At the same time he indulges in inexcusable extravagance and folly in maintaining overseas so many members of our Armed Forces and their dependents. Now we are confronted with the necessity, they say, of sending many thousands of additional combat soldiers to South Vietnam, apparently so the South Vietnamese forces may remain behind the firing lines and try to reorganize the rear echelon as their leaders now advocate.

To make this increased commitment in South Vietnam the logical thing is to withdraw most of the American 7th Army from Europe. A most important result of this would be to help stop the outflow of gold to Europe.

More than 20 years after the final hours of World War II we still have 340,000 men of our Armed Forces stationed in western Europe. In addition, approximately 320,000 dependents of these officers and men living there, many "living high on the hog", what with servants at low wages and excellent residences provided. In addition, there are hundreds of thousands of civilian workers and their dependents in western Europe. In West Germany alone we have 170,000 men with the 7th Army with 165,000 dependents. This is in addition to sizable Air Force units stationed there. A good way to stop the outflow of gold that is seriously affecting our economy would be to bring 150,000 to 200,000 servicemen and their dependents home.

In event of an emergency in western Europe, we have proven airlift capacity to transfer an entire division, land it and have it combat ready with all heavy equipment, in less than 48 hours. Consideration should be given to withdrawing immediately from De Gaulle's France 40,000 or 50,000 men of our Air Force, Army and Navy and their dependents, numbering approximately 80,000 additional Americans. With De Gaulle demanding and securing more of our gold and upsetting our balance of payments to the prejudice of our economy, why not "favor" France by commencing without further delay to withdraw the men in our Armed Forces and their dependents from that country? The anguished cries from French Government leaders would be heard loud and clear. They like our hundreds of thousands of Americans in Europe because Americans are always ready spenders.

Just this week De Gaulle rejected a proposal made by Secretary of the Treasury Fowler for a world conference aimed at improving the international monetary system. Here again is an instance of his refusal to cooperate in improving our balance-of-payments problem and that of nations throughout the world.

Another example of De Gaulle's animosity toward the United States was the public protest by the French Government just recently against the alleged intrusion of an American photo-reconnaissance jet in the forbidden airspace over the heart of France's nuclear-production facilities. This, in spite of the fact that our European command asserted that the plane had been on a prearranged flight and had not entered the prohibited zone. This despite the fact that we Americans consider France our ally and friend. Evidently that cannot be said for De Gaulle.

The protest by the French Government over this alleged incident does not represent the act of a friendly, allied nation. One would expect to hear such a public protest from the Soviet Union or the Red Chinese or from officials of other Communist bloc nations. It was shocking to hear an accusation of this nature from a supposedly friendly Chief of State to whose nation billions upon billions of American taxpayers' dollars have been given and in which thousands of American young men are stationed as a deterrent to any possible Communist aggression.

The time has come for us to strengthen the economy of our Nation instead of going all-out to bolster the economy of allied nations. Unfortunately, thousands of Americans who helped liberate France in the two world wars will never return.

Mr. President, the danger of aggression from the Soviet Union in western Europe has greatly diminished. The Soviet Union is now a "have" nation and is definitely veering away from Red China, a "have not" nation. Former Senator Barry Goldwater may have been correct in his prediction that 10 years hence Russia would be our ally in any conflict with Red China. Today our first line of defense against Communist aggression and imperialism is in the Far East. This is where the bulk of our troops should be stationed, not in western Europe, where the need for them in large numbers no longer exists and where their presence adds to our country's balance of payments problem.

Finally, Mr. President, I assert it is a fact that France is prospering as never before. That nation has a powerful navy, a mighty air force, and her army is well trained and well armed, so much so that the chief of state, General de Gaulle, has been manifesting delusions of grandeur and a napoleonic intent to make France the foremost military leader in Europe. Also, we have rearmed West Germany and even now are considering making it a nuclear power as is De Gaulle's France. We should refuse to continue to maintain huge armed forces in West Germany which is now prospering and powerful.

Let us return to the United States many, many thousands of our soldiers and their dependents. Let us thereby stop the outflow of gold from our country and build up a surplus toward our own prosperity and well-being. After all, our Nation does not have any mandate from Almighty God to police the entire world.

TRIBUTE TO ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on Monday the Nation mourned the passing of Adlai Stevenson.

Nothing I could say would better express my sentiments, and the sentiments of all who loved and respected Ambassador Stevenson, than to ask unanimous consent, which I now do, to have printed in the RECORD a beautiful tribute which was published in the Baltimore Sun of Thursday, July 15, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADLAI STEVENSON

Asked once in a BBC interview to imagine he had to write his own obituary, and what point he would like to stress, Adlai Stevenson said: "I should like most to be remembered as having contributed to a higher level of political dialog in the United States." Today, as others all over the world write obituaries of this extraordinarily civilized man, we can say that he will be so remembered, and we can say more. If there may be supposed in international affairs to be a plane on which dialog proceeds in terms of reason, sagacity, and vision, he contributed to that dialog too, and will be remembered for it.

Despite a long family tradition in State and National politics, politics was perhaps not Stevenson's natural bent. He entered politics by deliberate choice, because he believed it to be the "noblest career," and when an almost random course of events took him to a field larger than he had aspired to, nomination to the Presidency, an office whose burdens he said staggered the imagination, he assumed that effort also. He was overwhelmed by General Eisenhower, who ran not only as a war hero but also as a symbol of something that might help to calm—and for a while did help to calm—a desperately feverish country. Yet the Stevenson campaign of 1952, with its thorough, thoughtful discussion of specific issues above personalities and political expediency, stands as a model in our time of politics at its most intelligent and responsible.

His campaign 4 years later was different, tailored more to compromise and vote-wooing, and on the candidate's part it gave an impression of halfheartedness. Again he lost, of course, and his career in politics seemed over, and was over.

His career in the Nation's service was not. With the election of John Kennedy in 1960 there arose the possibility that Stevenson would become Secretary of State. Instead, Mr. Kennedy named him Ambassador to the United Nations. It was a wise choice. No one understood the United Nations, with its promises and its limitations, better than Stevenson did, for he had helped create it and had worked in it and watched it, and he knew intimately the tangled problems of the world. In that troubled forum over these past few years no American could have argued so eloquently, or more firmly, his Nation's position; nor could any man have espoused more loyally the policies determined by the two Presidents whose representative he was.

Some critics of Stevenson thought him too diffident, too self-deprecatory, too witty, too sophisticated, too literary. Let us say rather, as we sorrow at his passing, that he did lack personal ambition in any vaulting sense, that he did know himself and was incapable of pretending to be other than himself, that his witticisms were not wisecracks but bubblings from the well of wisdom and, in short, that like all highly civilized men he was a highly complicated man also. There are never enough of them. There is one fewer now.

THE PROGRESS OF THE JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, James Reston, the distinguished reporter and editor of the New York Times wrote an article which was published in the New York Times of June 27 which, I think, deserves the attention of all Senators. It is entitled "The Forgotten Shaft of Light" and is an objective analysis of what we really have been accomplishing in this country during the past few years. It is an endorsement of the Johnson administration—the same kind of endorsement being given to President Johnson by the great majority of Americans.

We tend to be preoccupied in this country with our problems. Although it is right to concern ourselves with what we have yet to accomplish, there is also a need to take objective cognizance of the encouraging facts. President Johnson, says Mr. Reston—and I quite agree—has us well on the road to a Great Society—and no society in the history of this planet has quite succeeded in that regard as we are succeeding today.

The President is guiding us toward social harmony. No one talks about how well we are getting along with one another in this country. Instead, emphasis is given to incidental conflict and localized unrest.

No one points out that the strides made in the field of education over the past 2 years rival those made during all the previous history of this great Republic. No one points out that in the most affluent nation on earth more people are benefiting from the natural abundance than at any other time in our history. In short, Mr. President, America is doing quite well. And cause for optimism carries far into the future.

The President, as a great political leader, is apt to be criticized occasionally, more on account of his political position than on the basis of his work. No President has worked harder than Lyndon Johnson, and we should pay some attention to the fruits of his labors—and, of course, of our own. Neither Congress nor the President will stop working while we take account of the accomplishments we are making.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record Mr. Reston's excellent article, which should help to determine where we are in the march to the Great Society. By knowing where we are, we should better be able to determine where we should go.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, June 27, 1965]

Washington: The Forgotten Shaft of Light

(By James Reston)

Washington, June 26.—The first half of 1965, despite the troubles abroad, has been a remarkable period in the development of the American Nation. All the old differences between North and South, labor and management, black and white, city and country, rich and poor, remain; but there has been an easing of tensions among all these contending forces during the last 6 months and a definite progress on the homefront toward "a more perfect union."

Nothing has been solved but many things have been improved. A start has been made in the battle against poverty in the city and rural slums. The state-church issue, long a barrier to effective Federal aid to education, has been modified by the ingenious compromises of President Johnson's education bill.

The old and the sick, long abandoned by a restless society, are now to get some relief under the modified medicare legislation, and the disenfranchised Negroes will have a better chance under the new voting rights bill.

THE UNEVEN GROWTH

Meanwhile, the States have made substantial progress toward a more equal distribution of voting power under the Supreme Court's order redistricting the State legislatures, and the national economy is booming along, with occasional spasms of doubt, toward higher levels of productivity and employment.

Ironically, the very poor, while better off now than at the beginning of the year and considerably better off than at the start of the 1960's, are steadily falling behind the rate of economic progress of the rest of the Nation. But the over-all trend is nevertheless upward, the middle class is growing, and the divisions over economic policy and theory are not as bitter or emotional as they were at the start of the tax debate only 2 short years ago.

This trend toward compromise and cooperation on the homefront has been blurred and sometimes even overwhelmed by a contrary trend toward contention, division and violence in the Nation's relations with other countries, but this is all the more reason for recognizing the progress where it exists.

THE COMMON AIMS

There seems to be a growing realization in the Nation that neither class or region or race can achieve its objectives in isolation from the rest, and that modern science, technology and education are challenging all institutions to adopt, in their own interests, a new spirit of interdependence.

Neither the Democrats nor the Republicans, for example, now think that they can win a majority of the Nation by appealing to sectionalism or factionalism. Goldwater tried it in the presidential campaign of 1964, and his monumental failure produced the Democratic majority that is now putting through the domestic social legislation Goldwater opposed. Thus, Johnson is now wooing Republican big business, and John Lindsay is running for mayor of New York, not as a Republican but as a fusion candidate. Meanwhile the trend toward compromise is going beyond either Goldwater's ideology or Johnson's "y'all come" invitation to consensus.

For example, the State Governors, long the symbol of State's rights and State pride, are now forming regional compacts and working together on regional problems that transcend State boundaries. The churches too, long in contention over the "true faith," are now minimizing their theological and denomination differences and concentrating on the things they agree upon rather than the things that divide them.

Universities and colleges are following the same trend. They are engaged in all kinds of new cooperative experiments. Working together on common regional development programs, exchanging students and members of the faculty, and permitting their teachers to spend time serving the Federal Government which the teachers then protest against when they return to the campus.

In short, there is a kind of roving experimental inquiry going on in the United States today. Things are changing so fast that nobody seems to be quite as confident or dogmatic as he used to be about his inherited ideas and prejudices; so everybody is shopping around for new answers to new problems.

JOHNSON'S ROLE

Fortunately, this new spirit of pragmatic experimentation on the homefront happens to fit precisely the temper of the presiding officer of the Nation. Lyndon Johnson would not have been comfortable in a period of vicious ideological warfare because he is not a doctrinaire man, but when everybody is searching and all factions are vaguely mixed up together, his political genius is most effective.

It would, therefore, be difficult to find another 6 months since the war when more progress was made at home than since the beginning of 1965. Maybe at the end of the decade Vietnam will still stand out as the historic issue of the Johnson administration, but maybe not.

More than likely the transformation of the domestic scene: The acceptance of the new New Economics, the redistribtuion of political power in the South and the cities, the progress in education and social legislation and the overall movement toward greater discussion between the races and religions, and classes, will take on a larger significance than they are given today.

MILITARY PAY INCREASE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon brought the welcome news that the House had voted overwhelmingly, 410 to 0, to increase the pay of our Armed Forces by approximately 10 percent.

I wish to express my wholehearted support for this measure, and I hope that the Senate will move promptly to approve it.

I recently had occasion to speak on this subject at the graduating class of the National War College. That our Armed Forces are sadly underpaid has been a matter of common knowledge.

But I must say that I was amazed to discover, in the course of preparing my remarks, how much damage this situation has already done to the combat efficiency and to the morale of our service people.

The low pay of our Armed Forces is a national scandal—a scandal on which we cannot afford to postpone action, because it goes to the heart of our national security.

In dealing with this subject, I wish to quote several paragraphs from my speech before the National War College last month:

> This situation has resulted in a dangerous—and increasing—rate of turnover.
>
> In the Navy alone about 130,000 men—about 20 percent of its entire personnel—must be replaced each year.
>
> Eighty percent of the enlisted men are lost after their first enlistment. As a result of this annual exodus, the Navy is losing 13 percent of its officer strength each year, and it is estimated that 80 percent of the officers leave the Navy before completing 10 years of service. To make matters worse, the supply of new officers seems to be dwindling. This year, I understand there are 20 percent fewer applicants than last year.
>
> The Army and Air Force are confronted with similar manpower problems. It is my understanding that over the last 5 years the annual rate of resignation of Army officers has increased by 50 percent, while the annual rate of resignation in the Air Force has increased by 150 percent.
>
> This is a situation that violates all the rules of efficiency and economy. A private business that suffered so large a turnover of trained personnel would go out of business in no time.
>
> To replace the 20 percent of its personnel who each year leave the service, the Navy must recruit another 130,000. To train this massive influx of new recruits, the Navy must assign 19 percent of personnel to education and training commands.
>
> What this adds up to is that at any given time, 39 percent of the entire personnel carried on the Navy's books are involved in the business of training—either as trainees or instructors.
>
> I shudder to think at the cost of this turnover for the taxpayer. For example, the estimated cost of replacing a pilot aboard an aircraft carrier is $150,000. But even more alarming is the damage it does to the combat efficiency of the Navy and to its general morale.

In closing my remarks, I want to reiterate the hope that the Senate will move rapidly to approve this long-overdue measure to provide our Armed Forces a more equitable scale of renumeration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the complete text of my remarks before the graduating class of the National War College.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Role of the Soldier in the World of Today and Tomorrow

(Remarks by Senator Thomas J. Dodd before the graduating class of the National War College, Washington, D.C., June 11, 1965)

Admiral Lee, members of the faculty and directing staff, gentlemen, I am profoundly honored by your invitation to address this year's graduating class of the National War College.

I am also grateful for this invitation.

In speaking about "The Role of the Soldier in the World of Today and Tomorrow," I am addressing myself to a subject to which I have given recurrent thought. But your invitation obliged me to sit down and do some concentrated research and thinking about the problem—to weave the many wandering strands of my previous thoughts into a coherent pattern—to add up the facts in full and draw the conclusions in full.

I knew that the problem was a big one. But now that I have had an opportunity to focus this kind of concentrated attention on the subject, I realize that the problem is far, far bigger than I previously estimated it to be. Indeed, I think it is no exaggeration to say that the role our society assigns to our soldiers in the world of today and tomorrow, the manner in which it treats them, can have a decisive bearing on our national security and on our survival as a free nation.

Recently a U.S. Army major resigned and wrote a bitter article for the Saturday Evening Post.

"After 13 years as an officer of the U.S. Army," the article said, "I recently resigned, frustrated and disillusioned. I was supposed to be guarding something grandly called the American way of life. But, by a cruel paradox, the society I had sworn to protect is a society that is indifferent and even hostile toward me and my comrades."

It has for me been frightening to discover that the sense of frustration and disillusionment—yes, even bitterness—of which this officer spoke is widespread throughout the Armed Forces, especially among our career officers.

It has resulted in a dangerous—and increasing—rate of turnover.

In the Navy alone about 130,000 men—about 20 percent of its entire personnel—must be replaced each year.

Eighty percent of the enlisted men are lost after their first enlistment. As a result of this annual exodus, the Navy is losing 13 percent of its officer strength each year, and it is estimated that 80 percent of the officers leave the Navy before completing 10 years of service. To make matters worse, the supply of new officers seems to be dwindling. This year, I understand there are 20 percent fewer applicants than last year.

The Army and Air Force are confronted with similar manpower problems. It is my understanding that over the last 5 years the annual rate of resignation of Army officers has increased by 50 percent, while the annual rate of resignation in the Air Force has increased by 150 percent.

This is a situation that violates all the rules of efficiency and economy. A private business that suffered so large a turnover of trained personnel would go out of business in no time.

To replace the 20 percent of its personnel who each year leave the service, the Navy must recruit another 130,000. To train this massive influx of new recruits, the Navy must assign 19 percent of personnel to education and training commands.

What this adds up to is that at any given time, 39 percent of entire personnel carried on the Navy's books are involved in the business of training—either as trainees or instructors.

I shudder to think at the cost of this turnover for the taxpayer. For example, the estimated cost of replacing a pilot aboard an aircraft carrier is $150,000. But even more alarming is the damage it does to the combat efficiency of the Navy and to its general morale.

This decline in the profession of soldiering and in the morale of our Armed Forces is all the more alarming because it comes at a juncture in history when our security depends perhaps more than ever before on the maintenance of a highly trained and motivated officers corps, in all branches of our Armed Forces.

This is so for several reasons.

It is so, first of all, because of the world situation and the mounting intensity of the cold war.

It is not Vietnam that is the chief target in this war, nor is it the Dominican Republic. It is the United States of America. Both Moscow and Peiping have made it abundantly clear that they regard us as the chief enemy. They have made it clear that they regard Vietnam and the Dominican Republic as skirmishes on the periphery, preliminary to the final assault, by subversion or force or by a combination of both, on our country, which they look upon as the central bastion of freedom and private enterprise.

Perhaps for the first time since the American Civil War, it may truthfully be said that our survival as a free nation is at stake.

In the old days of conventional warfare, an officer might see action in one war in the course of a 20-year enlistment. But conventional wars have now given way to the much more difficult, much more insidious, much more frequent wars of national liberation.

As of this juncture we have two such wars going full blast, in Vietnam and Laos. We have two new Communist insurgencies building up in the Philippines and in Thailand. We have just had to intervene to save the Dominican Republic from a Communist takeover.

And there is every reason to believe that things will become worse before they become better.

Instead of big wars every 20 years, therefore, the pattern of war has changed so that what we have today is a pattern of many minor or medium-sized wars of national liberation and Communist coups, occurring at such frequent intervals and in so many different parts of the world that they blend into one big, continuing, worldwide battle between the forces of communism and the forces of freedom.

The coming decades, I am afraid, will see no respite from this war. Our Armed Forces will have to be constantly on the alert, our soldiers constantly ready for action at a score of different crisis points.

The risks of your profession, therefore, are much greater today than they have been at any previous point in our history. Your profession calls for men who are prepared to assume these risks, together with all the creature discomforts and deprivation of personal life that go with them.

The increased need for a highly trained and motivated corps of career officers stems in the second place from the exceedingly complex nature of this new type of warfare.

In the old days, a soldier was a soldier, and if he learned his own profession well, he was doing his duty.

But the complex nature of Communist political warfare makes it necessary for the ideal officer of today to be an expert in many fields. In Vietnam today, for example, our military advisers in the field are frequently the only Americans in the area. In addition to being soldiers, they must be diplomats, rural development experts, statesmen, linguists, experts in psychological warfare, in propaganda, and many other things to boot.

All of this sounds like a tall order for any one man to fill. But I can assure you that we have many officers in Vietnam, at all levels, who do meet all of these qualifications. Needless to say, these are no ordinary men. They are men of altogether superior intelligence and dedication—the best that our country has to offer.

I cannot begin to tell you how impressed I was by the many officers I met in Vietnam, from General Westmoreland down to the rank of lieutenant. I felt both proud and humble in their presence.

That we have men of such rounded abilities available to us today is something for which the National War College deserves a large share of the credit. Regrettably, there are few of the general public who realize how broad the scope of your curriculum is and how much learning in how many different fields—political, historical, and psychological, as well as military and strategic—you cram into your brief 1-year sojourn at the National War College.

All of these courses are conducted in the best tradition of the free society, with no approved solutions, no school solutions, and with primary emphasis on the situation of intellectual curiosity and independent thinking.

This kind of curriculum and the kind of warfare for which it prepares you demands men of very superior ability. And the requirements are further compounded because the fantastic developments in modern weaponry place unprecedented demands on engineering and technological skills.

Men who are broad-gaged enough to meet all of these requirements are the kind of men who command a premium in the world of business and industry.

It is imperative that we attract such men to our Armed Forces and keep them there and motivate them.

But the sad fact is that we are attracting fewer of them and losing more of them.

This is a serious situation, and we must do something about it.

The third reason why we must have a highly trained and motivated corps of career officers is that, while we cannot afford to remain in a state of constant mobilization, the world in which we live compels us to be prepared for instant total mobilization, with all that this entails in terms of trained reserves and ready logistical support.

Our ability to deter war goes up in proportion to our capacity for rapid mobilization; and this capacity, in turn, is completely dependent on the size and quality of our corps of professional officers.

Our commitment is to peace and to the ways of diplomacy. But we are dealing with enemies who believe, in the words of Mao Tse Tung, that "power speaks out of the mouth of a gun." Under these circumstances our ability to implement our foreign policy and to pursue our commitment to peace, depends in the final analysis on our power. A major and decisive element of this power is military strength.

Let us have no illusions about it: if it were not for American military power, there would be no free world left today. The Communists understand this well. Our allies understand it, too. Even the so-called neutralists understand it. Confidence in American power indeed is the cement which holds the free world together. Without this cement, the entire structure of freedom would crumble in an incredibly short time.

WHY THEY LEAVE

Why is it becoming increasingly difficult to retain officers or, for that matter, to persuade enlisted men to reenlist?

Maj. Marion T. Wood, the Army officer whose words I have already quoted, said in his Saturday Evening Post article, that when he decided to resign from the Army, he wrote himself a letter to justify his decision. This is what he wrote:

"I want the opportunity to grow personally and financially, according to my own ability; I want to be part of a stable community; I want a home; but mostly I want my children to grow up in an atmosphere which will more adequately prepare them to face the future with confidence. The U.S. Army does not offer these possibilities now."

You all know, only too well, of the gross disparity between service pay and pay scales in other departments of Government, in industry, in business and in other sectors of our society.

The low pay of our Armed Forces at every level is a national scandal—a scandal on which we cannot afford to postpone action because it goes to the heart of our national security.

I shall not belabor your time by repeating details with which you are all familiar. But I can not tell you how impressed I was when I learned that a recruit in the armed services today receives less than a dropout recruit in the Job Corps, that a third-class petty officer aboard a Polaris submarine receives less than someone on relief in New York City. This is why I have said it is a national scandal, and I believe that it is.

The late President Kennedy felt very strongly about this matter. He said that we pay less to a man who is doing something for his country than to someone who is letting his country do something for him.

THE DOWNGRADING OF THE MILITARY

The hardships, the risks, the long periods away from home, the substandard housing, the grossly inadequate compensation, the incredibly long hours of work—all these things taken together should be sufficient to discourage even the most dedicated souls.

To me it is a miracle that despite the many heavy penalties they must pay for their desire to serve their country, and despite the fact that most of them could do infinitely better in business or industry, so many thousands of our officers still remain faithful to their service.

As for those who have left the service, I am convinced from many conversations that they would have been prepared to endure all the physical and financial hardships, but that they found it impossible to endure the constant harassment and downgrading and denigration to which our Military Establishment has been subjected in recent years—the feeling that their superiors and their society regard them with disdain, as some kind of necessary evil, the feeling that even in their own spheres of professional competence, their judgments are regarded as worthless by their military superiors.

This downgrading of the military profession stems from many sources.

First of all, I think anyone who has made a study of Communist tactics and Communist propaganda is aware of the fact that in every free country it is one of the major assignments of the Communist propaganda apparatus to seek every possible way of downgrading the military, by fanning popular distrust and official suspicion.

The official Communist propaganda apparatus in this country is small, and there are some who will say it is negligible; but this apparatus is like an iceberg—one-tenth of it above the surface, nine-tenths below.

Moreover, the Communists are past masters at exploiting non-Communists and even anti-Communists in the dissemination of their propaganda. And when it comes to disseminating antimilitarist propaganda in America, the Communists find the going rather easy, because our society has until recently been one of the least militaristic in the world, and because of the traditional suspicion of the military and the traditional emphasis on civilian control of the military, harking back to our own Declaration of Independence.

There have in recent years been a number of books and a number of films and many articles devoted to the task of downgrading our Military Establishment. In the past year alone we have had two major Hollywood productions, "Seven Days in May" and "Dr. Strangelove," both of which had some merit from a purely artistic standpoint, but which unquestionably had the effect of sowing a few additional seeds of suspicion and hostility toward our military in the public mind.

I am absolutely certain that the majority of those involved in the production of these antimilitary articles and books and films were not Communists but loyal American citizens, generally anti-Communist in their outlook, who sincerely believe that the military are not sufficiently restricted and that the military mentality constitutes a menace to our society. But I am just as certain that somewhere in the barrage of propaganda directed against the Military Establishment in the United States the hand of the Communist propaganda apparatus has been at work.

At this point I want to digress for a moment to distinguish between antimilitarist and antimilitary. I consider this distinction important because I consider myself an antimilitarist, while I am mortally opposed to those who conceal their attacks on the military profession behind the facade of antimilitarism.

To me the impact of this false antimilitarist propaganda has been a frightening demonstration of the ability of skilled propagandists to condition popular thinking.

A truly surprising number of decent Americans, as a result of the propaganda barrage of recent years, have come to regard our military professionals as warmongers and extremists, as a species of rightwing kooks with a special proclivity for pushing nuclear buttons. There has been a disturbing amount of criticism, from people of the highest rank and influence, devoted to the theme that our military are inept and irresponsible and that we must keep an eye on the Military Establishment, lest it get out of hand.

I find this criticism all the more outrageous, because I know so many military men intimately. I know that we have no body of men in our society more dedicated both to the things that America stands for and to the cause of peace. And they are for peace for the very good reason that, better than any other members of our society, they know the meaning of war.

To the extent that it is in my power, I want to promise you that I will do my utmost to direct the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to the problems that I have here discussed with you.

The second thing that one in my position can do—in a small way but I hope with some measure of effectiveness—is talk about this situation publicly so that the people of the country get a balanced, sane view of the vital role of our military people.

We have spoken about these matters in hushed voices in the past. The time has come to speak out about them frankly.

I congratulate all of you graduates who have completed this very difficult course of studies. Thank God we have you, because we need you badly; and, as I have already indicated, I am fearful that our need for you will grow more acute before it grows less acute.

REPUDIATION OF ATTACK ON AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a revised edition of "The Techniques of Soviet Propaganda," issued by the Senate subcommittee on Wednesday, July 13, 1965, carries the statement that the American Friends Service Committee is "well known as a transmission belt for the Communist apparatus."

As vice chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, I wish to disassociate myself from this statement, which I never saw and never approved, and which I consider most damaging and unfortunate.

Although I have strongly disagreed with some of the foreign policy positions taken by the Friends, I have the greatest respect for their organization and for the remarkable humanitarian work it carries on in so many parts of the world.

"The Techniques of Soviet Propaganda" was originally approved for publication by the Subcommittee on Internal Security in 1960. I joined in this approval because I considered it a study of exceptional merit. Because of a failure at staff level, the revisions incorporated in the current edition, contrary to committee custom, were not submitted for my approval or for the approval of the other subcommittee members before the study went to the printer.

On examining the study further, I found other passages of the revised edition which I consider equally objectionable. For example, on page 16, it is stated that:

> From the offices of numerous institutes in Asia and Latin America, subsidized by the respectable Ford Foundation, certain distinguished sociologists persistently abuse the United States and praise the U.S.S.R.

We have sought to make it a rule that the committee does not offer opinions, pro or con, on organizations which have not been the subject of formal hearings. I consider this sweeping condemnation of the Ford Foundation completely unwarranted and out of place in any publication of the subcommittee, in view of that fact that the foundation has not been the subject of any investigation before our subcommittee.

On page 42 of the study there is a passage which can be construed as meaning that the test ban treaty with Moscow was a supreme act of folly.

I, myself, supported this treaty, as did a very substantial majority of the Members of the Senate.

Unquestionably, there were some people who exaggerated the significance of the treaty. Unquestionably, too, those who oppose it are entitled to their opinions. For my own part, however, I am strongly opposed to incorporating a condemnation of this treaty, open or implied, in any study of "The Techniques of Soviet Propaganda."

I have written to Chairman EASTLAND to express my strong disapproval of these passages and of several other passages that appear in the revised text.

I have asked that it be made an ironclad rule that no study be published by the subcommittee without the authorization of the full membership of the subcommittee.

Finally, I have asked that distribution of the present edition of "The Techniques of Soviet Propaganda" be halted.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I associate myself with the statements just made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. I believe that counsel for the Internal Security Subcommittee is subject to justifiable criticism for what was done.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I wish to voice an objection today to the release of a study entitled, "The Techniques of Soviet Propaganda," by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security.

Although I am a member of this subcommittee, this study was published and released without my knowledge and without an opportunity to review the material or to register objections.

Mr. President, I have serious objections to some material contained in this study. It contains certain questionable allegations about organizations and public policy. I do not believe that such allegations should be distributed bearing my name, among others, when no opportunity has been given to review the material in question.

I wish to make it clear that if I had been given the opportunity, I would have refused to associate myself with this study. Several members of the subcommittee who share these views are publicly dissociating ourselves from this study which we never saw, never approved and which we consider damaging and unfortunate.

I am enjoining with Senator Dodd and other Members in requesting the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] to consider making a rule that in the future, no publications may be issued by the subcommittee without prior authorization of its members.

A number of highly questionable allegations appear in this particular publication to which I object and which I would not have approved had there been the opportunity to review the material in advance.

The American Friends Service Committee, for example, is described as "a well-known transmission belt for the Communist apparatus."

There are implications about the wisdom of grants by the Ford Foundation, an organization whose activities have never been the subject of such allegations by this subcommittee.

There are statements implying that the limited nuclear test ban treaty amounted to folly on the part of the United States.

Mr. President, I do not necessarily agree with all suggestions made by the American Friends Service Committee pertinent to foreign policy. But this public spirited group has made a significant contribution to our American way of life. I do not necessarily agree with all programs sponsored by the Ford Foundation. But, indeed, the foundation has sponsored many extremely helpful programs. While I strongly advocated adoption of the limited nuclear test ban treaty, I do not object to persons expressing a difference of opinion.

I do object most vigorously, however, to implications, allegations, or condemnations of organizations, persons, or policies in any study issued by this subcommittee when they have not been the subject of exploration by the subcommittee. I also object to such studies being issued bearing my name among others when there has been no opportunity to pass judgment on their contents.

TRIBUTE TO ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Adlai Stevenson was my friend and I his; yet there were many who knew him longer and had far better claims on his affection than I.

His capacity for friendship was unique. Few of us can claim as many as a dozen human beings to whom we are really close; but he counted in the hundreds the men, and the women too, whose eyes lighted up with a warm glow when he greeted them. And this warmth of feeling was reciprocated on his part with a sincerity so obvious that it could not be doubted.

Now that this vibrant and wholly admirable gentleman has left us forever, everything which needs to be said about him has been said a hundred times over both by those who loved him and by those many others who, now that he is gone, appreciate the respect in which he was held by millions of people all over the world.

It would be redundant to speak at any length of his idealism, his dogged clinging to what he believed to be right without regard to personal consequences, his wit, his humor, the inspiration that his words and his deeds gave to those of us who remain to grasp the torch he carried and to hold it high in his memory.

He awakened his generation from complacency and cynicism. He led us a few steps farther down the road blasted into the future by those great Americans who believed with all their hearts in liberty and justice and peace and compassion.

Abraham Lincoln was the American he admired most. The purpose and the aim of his life is well reflected in the thought expressed a hundred years before his death in the second inaugural address:

> With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we are in, to bind up the world's wounds, to care for those who have borne the brunt of the battle, and to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among all the nations of the world.

APPOINTMENT OF JUSTICE GOLDBERG AS U.N. AMBASSADOR

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I commend President Johnson for his appointment of Mr. Justice Arthur Goldberg as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. This choice was wise and fitting.

Mr. Justice Goldberg is a man of great ability, intelligence, compassion, and diplomacy. I was privileged to serve with him in the Cabinet of President John F. Kennedy, and came to know and admire his many talents. He is a fitting successor to Adlai Stevenson, and will serve our Nation with distinction in this most important post.

Few appointments have received such universal acclaim. I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record at this point a series of editorials and columns praising the appointment of Mr. Justice Goldberg.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 21, 1965]

The Goldberg Appointment

President Johnson achieved complete surprise with his announcement yesterday that Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg will succeed the late Adlai E. Stevenson as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. Once the initial shock of astonishment wore off, many an American must have wondered to himself why he hadn't thought of Justice Goldberg too—because the more one ponders this selection the more logical, even the more brilliant, it appears.

In his extraordinarily warm statement making the announcement, President Johnson emphasized that Arthur Goldberg "is an old and trusted friend and counselor" who will have "direct and ready access" to the President and the Secretary of State. These words underline both President Johnson's high estimate of the importance of the United Nations and his strong personal affinity with his new envoy.

The American representative at the U.N. must be a skilled and flexible negotiator, an effective advocate and an able politician in the best sense of the word. Justice Goldberg is all of these. His tact, persuasiveness, and ingenuity, his ability to arrange a compromise without sacrifice of principle, his activism, enthusiasm, and pragmatism—these are qualities as applicable at the United Nations as in the world of labor, the law, and government.

There is apt symbolism in the fact that Justice Goldberg, who rose from the slums of Chicago to his present national and international eminence, now goes to the United Nations as spokesman for all Americans. He personifies the continuing opportunity afforded by American democracy to its ablest sons. While it is true that he has had little experience in the complexities of international diplomacy—and his lack of background in this field is the very reason his name never appeared in speculation over Mr. Stevenson's probable successor—it is also true that he is not bound by prejudgments or inhibited by previous positions on most major questions of foreign policy. Of course he will be carrying out the President's orders, but his voice will be heard and respected at the White House as well as at the United Nations. He is a worthy successor to Adlai Stevenson.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, July 21, 1965]

Johnson's Sound Choice

(By David Lawrence)

Washington.—President Johnson made a wise choice in selecting Associate Justice Arthur J. Goldberg of the Supreme Court to become U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations to replace the late Adlai Stevenson. The President recognized the need for a man of national and international stature—someone who could carry on extemporaneous debate in the United Nations Assembly or the Security Council and make an effective impression with his words.

Another basic reason for Mr. Johnson's decision undoubtedly was Justice Goldberg's keen perception of the many legal questions that affect governments throughout the world in their relations with each other.

Justice Goldberg has spoken often before national and international law organizations here and abroad. While the United Nations has among its ambassadors from other countries men who are versed in diplomacy, some of those who have proved most effective in the past had a deep insight into international law.

Justice Goldberg's appointment could result in a new emphasis on law in the councils of the United Nations. This would be a significant change. President Johnson said he had asked the Justice to serve because there was no more important task ahead today than the achievement of "a world where all men may live in peace with the hope of justice under the rule of law." He added:

"Committed as we are to this principle and to this purpose, it is fitting that we should ask a member of our highest court to relinquish that office to speak for America before the Nations of the world."

Also, in the area of mediation and negotiation, Mr. Goldberg will bring to his new task an ability which he used successfully as a labor lawyer. Many labor lawyers naturally become masters of a kind of diplomacy in dealing with labor-management disputes which enables them in many cases to end strikes or to prevent them. They use well-balanced phrases in proposed agreements that must meet the tests of public opinion both inside and outside of the labor unions.

Justice Goldberg's willingness to leave the Supreme Court has caused many members of Congress to wonder why he would abandon a lifetime position for something else in Government. But there are some men who find that, while the service of a Supreme Court Justice is intensely interesting, there are in critical times other fields to which duty calls them.

James F. Byrnes, for example, had been Governor of the State of South Carolina and had served also in the Senate before President Roosevelt appointed him to the Supreme Court of the United States in June 1941. But when war broke out, Mr. Byrnes was called in October 1942 to take over the job of Director of Economic Stabilization and then was appointed Director of War Mobilization in May 1943. There was talk of nominating him for Vice President in 1944 instead of Mr. Truman. Upon becoming President, the latter appointed Mr. Byrnes as Secretary of State, a post in which he served effectively in a critical period in American history.

Justice Goldberg, in reaching his decision to leave the Supreme Court, may just possibly have thought that, with only a few years of service in the United Nations, he could achieve a position which would entitle him to consideration for a higher office in the country. Seven years hence, it would not be at all surprising to find him active in politics if he has made a good record in the United Nations and the country has come to know him through the numerous exposures he will have on TV. It will be recalled that in 1960 Henry Cabot Lodge, while serving as Ambassador to the U.N., was nominated for the Vice-Presidency by the Republican convention.

Mr. Goldberg's previous identification with the labor movement could be an important asset. Not only was he general counsel of the United Steel Workers Union—winning the respect of many of the men on the management side of the steel industry—but he also was able in his post as Secretary of Labor in President Kennedy's Cabinet to make his influence felt even further. This is a background which can be useful to him in his new post in the United Nations. For in many countries the labor problem has become more and more significant in its relation to national governmental policies.

On the whole, it could seem apparent that, since there was no one sufficiently outstanding on the diplomatic side to impress foreign governments, President Johnson came to the conclusion that he could add to the prestige of the United States at the U.N. by selecting a man from the highest court in the land.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, July 21, 1965]

GOLDBERG TO THE U.N.

"The main thing you must have," Arthur Goldberg once said, "is the ability to realize there are two sides to the story, and so to be generally calm and courteous in the handling of people in inflamed situations, but at the same time not relinquish a position of leadership, which on occasion will require the calmness and courtesy to be submerged in a show of vigor and strength and even anger."

He was discussing the collective bargaining function, but it's not a bad description of qualities needed by the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. Justice Goldberg's surprise selection for that post may, in fact, prove an inspired choice. A highly articulate man of exceptional brilliance, a quick, incisive debater, he also has proved himself highly skilled at the difficult art of finding that elusive common ground on which seemingly irreconcilable differences can be compromised without the sacrifice of essential principles.

On the negative side, of course, is his lack of experience in foreign affairs. His predecessors—Warren Austin, Henry Cabot Lodge, and Adlai Stevenson—were also nondiplomats at the time of their appointment, but all had had considerable exposure to the foreign policy field. Goldberg's experience, both private and governmental, has been entirely on the domestic front. But he clearly has the qualities of mind and spirit to grasp the requirements of his new post quickly.

His background as a leading advocate of the labor union movement, furthermore, could stand him in good stead in his confrontations with the Soviets, who like to style themselves as the chief defenders of the working man. Mr. Goldberg, who helped rid the CIO of its Communist infiltrators, who authored the constitution of the merged AFL–CIO and served as counsel both to that and to the Steelworkers, can speak with genuine credentials as the laborer's friend—while his own life story is a testament to the continuing vitality of the American dream.

His performance can hardly be judged in advance; and he moves into the seat of a man revered the world over. But in naming Justice Goldberg, the United States has put forward a man of national stature and immense ability, whose particular talents could prove of major service not only to the United States but to the U.N. as well.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, July 21, 1965]

JUSTICE GOLDBERG: ADLAI'S SUCCESSOR—IN HIS OWN IMAGE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson has chosen a man as nearly as possible in the image and likeness of Adlai Stevenson to succeed him as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

In my judgment, the President has chosen very well indeed.

Of Justice Arthur J. Goldberg, who is willing to give up a lifetime appointment to the Supreme Court because of his dedication to the U.N. and his sense of duty to the President. Mr. Stevenson's sister, Mrs. Elizabeth Ives, said: "He understood Adlai and his aims."

He also understands the aims and hopes and—as in Vietnam—the courage of the American people.

The significant fact is that Goldberg has qualifications in the field of foreign affairs which would not be immediately visible from the record of his public service—a distinguished and respected labor lawyer, skilled negotiator, one of the best Secretaries of Labor the Nation ever had, and Supreme Court Justice.

I offer a pertinent appraisal of Goldberg from one who during the past decade has known well more men in public life than most any other American.

Soon after the 1960 election, when he was writing his book, "Six Crises," and President-elect Kennedy was selecting the top people in his administration, Vice President Nixon remarked to one of his closest collaborators:

"Many of these same men would have been in my Cabinet if I had been elected. But I would not have made Arthur Goldberg Secretary of Labor. I would have made him Under Secretary of State."

Nixon's judgment was that Goldberg deeply understood the issues and pitfalls of the cold war and would not be misled by surface developments.

Since becoming a member of the Court, Justice Goldberg has traveled widely abroad to speak before jurists and has become personally acquainted with a considerable number of world leaders.

It is unusual for a President to turn to the Supreme Court for an appointment of this kind. But Mr. Johnson does not blanch at the unusual and his decision reflects his high regard for the United Nations and his hope that its capacity to keep the peace can be strengthened.

It is evident that the President had this prescription in mind as he searched for Stevenson's successor:

He wanted a man who had already attained public stature.

He wanted a man who had some of his own credentials to speak for his Government and who would not have to rely wholly on the credentials which come from the position.

He wanted a man deeply devoted to the cause of world peace whose very presence at the U.N. would underline the President's own dedication to trying to bring about both peace and justice under the rule of law.

From my knowledge of Justice Goldberg I would say that he hates war and believes that the failure to resist aggression is the most likely way of getting into war.

This is the viewpoint he will, I think, bring to the councils of the administration. As with Adlai Stevenson, he will be a member of the Cabinet and at the center of U.S. foreign policy formulation. He will be a source of strength—as well as unity—to the administration team of Rusk, McNamara, and McGeorge Bundy.

No one in our time can fill Adlai Stevenson's place. He was unique.

But in Justice Goldberg the President has not only made a surprise appointment but a superb one.

[From the Washington Post, July 21, 1965]

FROM THE COURT TO THE U.N.

The appointment of Justice Arthur J Goldberg to be the U.S. representative to the United Nations came as a shock to many who had supposed that he would spend the remainder of his life on the Supreme Bench. In nearly all cases the Supreme Court is a permanent assignment, and properly so. There are few other tasks which can justify taking from the Court one of its most energetic and brilliant members. Yet there are exceptions to all rules, and we surmise that this is one instance in which the country will heartily applaud the drafting of a Justice for a more difficult undertaking.

The Supreme Court's loss will be the United Nations' gain. The primary concern about filling this vacancy had been whether the President could find a man who would be a logical and worthy successor to Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson. A routine appointment, it was feared, might have the effect of deflating the prestige of the U.N. and of downgrading the U.S. relations to it. That danger has been entirely averted. When a man of Mr. Goldberg's stature leaves a lifetime position on the highest Court in the land to become U.S. spokesman at the U.N. it is a powerful testament to this country's belief in the world organization and in the orderly settlement of international differences.

In appraising Mr. Goldberg's qualifications for the task, however, it is more pertinent to recall his work as Secretary of Labor in President Kennedy's Cabinet and his previous career at the bar. From a highly competitive situation he emerged as one of the country's ablest labor lawyers; he repeatedly demonstrated great capacity as a negotiator and as a spokesman for the cause of labor. This background plus his resourcefulness as debater will be invaluable at the U.N.

Now that Mr. Goldberg has put aside his judicial robe it is well to remember also that there were many laments when he gave up his dynamic career as Secretary of Labor for the bench. Some wondered at the time whether his dynamism, his administrative ability and his skill as a mediator could not be used to greater advantage outside the judicial realm. There has been no suggestion since that he was not well adjusted to the cloistered life of a judge. But the other qualities which made him a formidable figure in the Cabinet have not been lost in the 3 years since he succeeded Justice Felix Frankfurter.

The willingness of Mr. Goldberg to leave his choice place in the judicial hierarchy for the rough scramble of international politics in New York tells much about the quality of his statesmanship. No one can seriously doubt that he accepted this more difficult assignment out of a sense of duty. Many years ago Justice Charles Evans Hughes permitted himself to be nominated for the Presidency and later Justice James F. Byrnes left the Court to become a wartime assistant to President Roosevelt for similar reasons. We think it can be stated as a simple fact that Mr. Goldberg would not have left the Court if he had not been convinced that his country has greater need of his talents at the U.N. than on the bench.

The problems he faces in the world organization are staggering. A man of his intelligence could have no illusions about that. But he sees his assignment as being intimately related to "the greatest adventure in man's history"—his search for peace and the rule of law. In this context it was no mistake but an act of great courage and faith to take the course he has taken. The problems that will bedevil him are not things that can be ironed out by any one individual, but there is much satisfaction in knowing that a man of Arthur Goldberg's talents and dedication will be directing the U.N. aspects of the American struggle for a more orderly world.

TRIBUTE TO ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Inez Robb has been a popular columnist for a long time.

On July 19, 1965, she wrote an article for the New York World Telegram & Sun which bears the caption, "Snub of Stevenson Wit No Laughing Matter."

It is a rather intriguing comment on the late Adlai Stevenson. I believe that it is both timely and proper that it be printed in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SNUB OF STEVENSON WIT NO LAUGHING MATTER

(By Inez Robb)

One of the most bewildering aspects of Adlai Ewing Stevenson's two unsuccessful bids for the Presidency was the deep antagonism his wit aroused in so many of his fellow citizens.

This wit did not defeat Stevenson; Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, the genuine folk hero who could not have been bested by Santa Claus, did that. But, surprisingly in a nation that takes belligerent pride in its sense of humor, Stevenson's wit infuriated Republicans and alarmed Democrats.

No other facet of the Democratic candidate annoyed so many persons in a country where the wisecrack has been elevated to an art form. For the first time it was obvious that we Americans are deeply supicious of wit except in paid clowns and stand-up comedians. We make millionaires out of such as Joe E. Lewis, Fred Allen, and Bob Hope and also-rans out of an Adlai Stevenson.

The Democratic standard bearer was the last man in the world to qualify as a "smart aleck" or a "wisecracker." Yet during the campaigns in 1952 and 1956 he was repeatedly dismissed as both by persons who were far more enraged by his explosive wit than by his eloquence.

Foreigners are in the habit of describing the United States as a nation whose people take nothing seriously and to whom nothing is sacred. Yet Americans by and large, found nothing funny in Stevenson's urbane wit. The level of the Stevenson campaign in 1956 never attained the brilliant intellectual pitch of 1952 because the party wheelhorses demanded a campaign on a lower plane.

Maybe the politicians knew best, but I am one of those who never believed that Stevenson talked over the heads of the American people. Maybe over the heads of the party hacks, but not over the heads of the people.

Anyway, there is a superb doctoral thesis awaiting the scholar who has the intellectual equipment to examine wit as a political asset or liability in the United States. (Another wit, John F. Kennedy, was roundly excoriated in 1960 as a "smart aleck" and barely made it to the White House.)

In my lifetime no politician, not even F.D.R., attracted such personal devotion from his adherents as Adlai Stevenson. He inspired a bone-deep faith and idealism in partisans of all ages. In the many political conventions I have attended, no demonstration in behalf of any candidate of either party was as moving or sincere as that for Stevenson at the Democratic convention that nominated John F. Kennedy.

Day and night throughout the convention, the hall was ringed by a steady parade of Stevenson disciples—young, old, and middlin'. These were obviously not paid claques. It was always a dignified, well-behaved group, the endless marchers including women pushing baby carriages, men carrying small children, collegians and oldsters. When the die was cast for Kennedy, they faded away, many in tears.

The day after the Kennedy nomination, a close friend of Stevenson took me to have lunch with the latter. The friend theorized that a defeated candidate is a deserted man who needs the affectionate presence of loyal comrades to cheer him up.

However, when we reached the Stevenson hotel suite, the outer rooms were crowded, the telephones ringing steadily and Stevenson both gay and patient with the hubbub. Eventually, seven of us sat down to luncheon in his private dining room, and sat and sat and sat. Under the impact of a national political convention, hotel service had gone to pot.

After what seemed an interminable wait and many telephone negotiations with room service, a waiter arrived with a pot of coffee and three club sandwiches.

With aplomb, Stevenson divided the sandwiches and coffee. As he did so he looked around the table at his guests, laughed and said, "This may be hard on you, but by this time I am accustomed to the half loaf."

COMMENDATION OF UNICEF

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, back in my days in the House of Representatives when we dealt with foreign aid there was at least one feature that always captivated my fancy, and to which I gave a great deal of time.

That was the United Nations' so-called children's fund activity. I received a small summation of the work of this agency on yesterday. I shall read it into to RECORD. It reads as follows:

The work of the United Nations Children's Fund, the only U.N. organization that focuses primarily on the needs of children throughout the world, is to be commended. In 1964, 112 countries received UNICEF aid in programs benefiting children and mothers. In its nearly 20 years of service, UNICEF has helped eradicate malaria; has given 162 million TB vaccinations; helped cure 37 million cases of yaws; treated 11 million for trachoma, and over 1 million for leprosy. The Children's Fund program is a self-help program—not a giveaway. The cooperative nature of the program is further illustrated by the fact that most countries receiving UNICEF aid not only match the aid on a dollar ratio of $2.50 to every UNICEF dollar, but also make a voluntary contribution to the central account. The United States can be particularly proud of its leadership in this worthy cause.

Mr. President, it will be one of the lasting, durable satisfactions of my life that I gave attention to this program for a great many years and sought, whenever necessary, to secure the funds to carry forward this great work in behalf of children in all parts of the world.

VIETNAM—LETTER FROM WIFE OF SERVICEMAN

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I seldom have individual letters printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. However, I have received an interesting letter from a mother in Nashville, Tenn. The letter is not very long.

It is dated June 25, 1965. I believe that it comes as something of a stimulus at this time when we hear such itinerant remarks over the situation in Vietnam.

The letter reads as follows:

NASHVILLE, TENN.

DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: I feel absolutely compelled to reach the ear of someone who can speak for me—and many thousands like me.

I am an Army wife, at present living in Nashville, Tenn., with my three children while my husband is in Vietnam. He volunteered for this assignment—it is what he has spent 13 years training for—the chance to serve his country.

I deplore, as does he, the fact that our country is at war, but at war we are.

I know of no Army wife whose husband is in Vietnam (and I know many) who wishes him back at the price of appeasing our enemy. Our enemy is global communism, be it from Red China, Russia, or the Vietcong.

Please, Senator, if we must fight, let us fight to win. The pacifists are so vocal—they, for the most part, are trained to be so. Why doesn't the President also heed the quiet voices of those of us who were raised to honor our country and have faith in her power to right wrongs.

If my husband should be called upon to give his life, let it at least be for something concrete—not a coalition that will necessitate my sons repeating this ordeal in the Philippines or elsewhere.

I wish I had your eloquence—I feel so terribly certain our only hope for the future is to finally stand firm and to let the world know we will not be swayed. Words alone won't accomplish this. We might win back some allies if they felt we had something in our arsenal besides fine words and a weasel.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. J. R. LANTHRUM.

Then there is a postscript which is irrelevant.

Mr. President, I thought that letter, coming from a mother who has three children and whose husband is fighting in Vietnam, was a hope and an inspiration for any and all people.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nomination of Edward Clark, of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward Clark, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to support the President's nomination of Mr. Edward Clark to be Ambassador to Australia.

There is little doubt among Texans who long have known him that Ed Clark is a top diplomat, for diplomacy is the art of getting along with people. Ed Clark's whole life and work have prepared him to be an excellent and effective representative for the United States.

He has reached the top in at least two fields—banking and law—and has done so by his ability to understand his fellow men. Not only is he chairman of the board of one of Austin's leading banks, but also he is president of a bank in his hometown of San Augustine and director of another Texas bank. His law firm is large and well respected by others in that profession.

Mr. Clark has been a county attorney, assistant to our State's attorney general, a secretary to Governor Allred, and later Texas Secretary of State. He was an army captain in World War II. He is a noted philanthropist.

Ed Clark is highly knowledgeable in many fields. He knows law, banking, petroleum, insurance, utilities, government, politics, history, and literature. He especially understands the inner workings of government and the motivations of people who work in public affairs.

He is blessed with an attractive wife who will bring to the Embassy in Canberra a special brand of hospitality that will make the Embassy seem more like home to the Americans in Australia and like a second home to the Australians.

He will bring to Australia special concern for the many problems and goals of Australia that also are and have been problems and goals for the State of Texas he knows so well. He will be at home in Australian ranch country with its water development needs; in Australian oil and industry expansion projects; in Australian efforts to shoulder an ever greater part of the defense needs of that part of the world.

He will bring to Australia the benefit of his special relationship with the President. In Ed Clark the Australians will have an Ambassador well able to interpret the decisions of our President and capable of seeing that Australia's interests are presented to our President whenever necessary.

And, in the process of his work for the United States, Ed Clark will make a lot of friends.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

MARINE BIOLOGICAL RESEARCH LABORATORY, CALIFORNIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 447, S. 1735.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1735) relating to the use by the Secretary of the Interior of land at La Jolla, Calif., donated by the University of California for a marine biological research laboratory, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1735

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to carry out the understanding between the Secretary of the Interior and the Regents of the University of California when the latter donated approximately two and four-tenths acres of land situated on the San Diego Campus of the University of California, for establishment thereon by the United States of a marine biological research laboratory, and in recognition of the restriction in the deed conveying the land to the United States which requires the land "to be used exclusively for research on the living resources of the sea or their environment; or for purposes compatible with activities of the * * * Scripps Institution of Oceanography (situated on said Campus) or for any other purpose expressly approved by the Grantor", the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to reconvey to the Regents of the University of California, or their successors, title to the donated land and the improvements constructed or placed thereon:

(a) Whenever he determines that the land and improvements are not in his judgment needed by the United States for the limited uses permitted by the deed, such determination to be made after receiving the views of other Federal agencies regarding their possible use of the land consistent with the limitations in the deed; or

(b) Whenever the United States ceases to use the land and improvements for more than two years exclusively for such limited uses.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 463), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, S. 1735, is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to reconvey certain lands to the University of California when these lands are no longer needed by the United States or when the United States ceases to use the land for more than 2 years exclusively for fishery and oceanographic research purposes. This measure fulfills the commitment made by the Secretary of the Interior to the University of California at the time when the university conveyed the land to the United States for the purpose of constructing a Federal marine biological research laboratory. This laboratory and its functions are briefly described in the following section of this report. The Secretary said in a letter to the university at the time of the conveyance to the United States the following:

"We recognize that the university does not wish to surrender its campus properties permanently. In view of this I am prepared to recommend strongly that the administration seek from the Congress special legislation to meet the requirements of the board of regents.

"I consider this a grave moral commitment and hereby so indicate to my successors."

On March 23, 1965, the Secretary of the Interior requested the introduction and favorable consideration of legislation to fulfill this commitment. His letter to the President of the Senate fully sets out the facts involved and is as follows:

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1965.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill relating to the use by the Secretary of the Interior of land at La Jolla, Calif., donated by the University of California for a marine biological research laboratory and for other purposes.

We recommend that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

The Department of the Interior has recently completed the construction of a new marine biological research laboratory at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography situated on the San Diego campus of the University of California. The laboratory was constructed on 2.4 acres of land that were donated to the United States by the regents of the University of California.

When negotiations with the university were started for a new building site, local representatives of the Department first proposed that the site would be leased to the United States for 99 years. This proved to be impractical, because Federal policy does not permit the construction of public buildings on leased land without specific statutory authority. The Department then proposed that the site would be conveyed to the United States with a reversionary clause under which the title would revert to the university at the end of 99 years, or earlier if the Government ceased to use the land for the research laboratory. The Department of Justice advised us that it could not approve the title to the land if the deed contained this reversionary clause. The Department of the Interior then asked the university to convey the land without the reversionary clause, but with the understanding that the Department would seek the enactment of legislation which would authorize a reconveyance of the land to the university at the end of 99 years, or earlier if it ceased to be needed for research laboratory purposes. The university agreed.

The deed which conveyed the land to the United States requires the land "to be used exclusively for research on the living resources of the sea or their environment; or for purposes compatible with activities of said Scripps Institution of Oceanography, or for any other purpose expressly approved by the grantor."

The deed also recited the following understanding:

"The Secretary of the Interior has pledged himself to seek the introduction of and to support legislation * * * empowering an officer of the United States to execute a deed reconveying the property to the grantor in the event of failure to use the property as specified herein; or failure to build a laboratory facility within 5 years from the date hereof; or at the expiration of 50 years from the date hereof, unless it is determined that the land is needed by the United States for specified purposes; or at the expiration of 99 years from the date hereof."

The deed was executed on March 22, 1962, after the following assurance was given in a letter dated February 15, 1962, from the then Under Secretary:

"We recognize that the university does not wish to surrender its campus properties permanently. In view of this I am prepared to recommend strongly that the administration seek from the Congress special legislation to meet the requirements of the board of regents.

"I consider this a grave moral commitment and hereby so indicate to my successors."

The legislation now recommended will carry out the understanding on the basis of which the land was donated and the laboratory was constructed, with one modification.

The United States now holds the title to the land subject to a limitation which prohibits the use of the land for any purpose other than specified kinds of research, or purposes compatible with the activities of the Scripps Institution, or for other purposes expressly approved by the regents of the university. If that use should be discontinued, the Government would have only two alternatives under the terms of the deed, aside from the understanding with the university: it could try to sell the land to someone else who would use the land for the limited purposes, or it could let the laboratory stand idle and unused. The first alternative is not a realistic one; moreover, it would be unfair to the university because another research organization should not be placed on the campus of the university without the university's consent. The second alternative is wasteful because it involves continuing expense to the Government in the form of maintenance, or it involves allowing the buildings to deteriorate and become unsightly, which in addition to being wasteful, would also be unfair to the university.

We, therefore, believe that if the Government's use of the land for the specified purposes should be discontinued the only reasonable and fair procedure is to reconvey the land to the university. The buildings would be included in the reconveyance. The Government would have received all of the benefit from the buildings that it could receive, inasmuch as it could not use them for any other purpose, and removal of the buildings would be impractical. The buildings would not, in fact, have any value to the Government at that time. The university was not responsible for placing the buildings on the land and should not be asked to pay for them.

The understanding with the university also contemplated that the title will be reconveyed at the end of 99 years, regardless of whether the Government has a continuing need for the property at that time. We have discussed further this understanding with the university, and with its concurrence have omitted the 99-year provision from the proposed legislation. If at the end of 99 years the Government has a continuing need for the property for the uses permitted by the deed, obviously there is no public interest that would be served by a reconveyance of the property to the university, because the Government would then need to acquire substitute property and facilities at additional cost in order to continue its program.

The original understanding was based on an assumption that the Government would get full value out of its investment over a 99-year period, and in a realistic sense would suffer no economic loss by reconveying the property at the end of that period. The arrangement would be the equivalent of construction of the laboratory on a 99-year leasehold, which is an accepted commercial practice. The difficulty with this assumption is that Federal governmental programs are not undertaken as economic ventures, with an amortization or writeoff of the capital investment at the end of a fixed period. If all governmental construction were undertaken on that basis, the entire construction program would need to be refinanced at fixed intervals.

In this respect the Federal Government and the various State educational institutions have a comparable need. When they construct buildings designed to be used by future generations they do so on land that will be available as long as their programs continue.

The university has agreed that its primary purpose will be accomplished by a reconveyance of the property when it ceases to be needed or used for the purposes permitted by the deed.

The proposed legislation amounts to a reciprocal application of the policy followed by the Federal Government when conveying Federal land to a State or public agency for educational, recreational, or conservation purposes. That policy is to restrict the use of the land to the specified purposes, and to provide for a reversion of title to the Federal Government if the land ceases to be used for those purposes. That policy was applied to the University of California by the act of September 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 546), which conveyed the former Camp Matthews to the university. The proposed legislation would permit the same policy to be applied by the State in the case of the land which it donated to the Federal Government for marine biological research purposes.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of the proposed legislation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, JR.,
Under Secretary of the Interior.

FISHERY-OCEANOGRAPHY CENTER, LA JOLLA, CALIF.

The $2.8 million Fishery-Oceanography Center on the campus of Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, at La Jolla, was dedicated on October 31, 1964. The Center, perched on a cliff 200 feet above the Pacific Ocean, consists of a four-building complex grouped around a central court. It contains approximately 50,000 square feet of usable space and rests on a 2.47-acre parcel of land deeded to the Department of the Interior by the regents of the University of California.

About 125 scientists and supporting staff are now housed in the Center. Eventually it is expected that 200 persons will be working here. The majority of these will be attached to the California Current Resources Laboratory or the Tuna Resources Laboratory, both operated by the Interior Department's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, and both of which formerly were the Bureau's laboratories in La Jolla and San Diego, respectively. The Center provides the means for consolidation of support services to these two Bureau laboratories as well as opportunities to increase cooperation among scientists carrying out fishery and oceanographic research programs. Smaller organizations such as the Scripps tuna oceanographic research group also work at the Center because their work is closely related to that being carried out by the Bureau.

The types of work currently underway by the consolidated laboratories include the following:

(a) Fish taxonomic and age and growth studies;

(b) Larval developmental studies;

(c) Chemical, physical, and biological oceanography;

(d) Fish physiology and genetics;

(e) Fish behavior;

(f) Fish forecasting; and

(g) Population dynamics.

A large number of species of fish are studied but emphasis is on the commercially important resources such as the anchovy, hake, sardine, and tuna.

AMENDMENT OF REVISED ORGANIC ACT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 449, H.R. 8721.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8721) to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the Government of the Virgin Islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 465), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 8721 is to vest in the government of the Virgin Islands the power to fix the salaries and allowances of members of its legislature and to provide for the payment of the same from local revenues rather than from Federal appropriations.

A companion bill, S. 2066, was also considered by the committee.

NEED

Subsection (e) of section 6 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 487, 499), as amended (14 U.S.C. 1572(e)) fixes the basic compensation of each of the 11 members of the Virgin Islands Legislature at $600 per annum and provides for payment thereof by the United States. In addition, each legislator who is away from the island of his residence receives $20 per diem while the legislature is actually in session and is reimbursed for actual travel expenses for eight round trips per calendar year between his home island and Charlotte Amalie, the territorial capital. These allowances are also paid by the United States. Additional travel expenses and per diem, if any, are paid by the Virgin Islands government.

The Legislature of the Virgin Islands is charged with responsibility for enacting all local laws. Its regular sessions may continue for 60 days per year. Special sessions not in excess of 30 days a year may be convened by the Governor.

Enactment of H.R. 8721 will permit the Virgin Islands Legislature to determine its own salaries and allowances subject, of course, to the usual veto power of the Governor. This will result in a modest savings to the Federal Government of about $14,000 a year. More important than this, however, will be the implicit recognition by Congress that the Virgin Islands Legislature is a body of responsible men and that the electorate can be depended upon to check its membership if, by any chance, it is tempted to abuse its powers. Enactment of H.R. 8721 will thus be an expression of faith in local democratic processes.

AMENDMENT OF ORGANIC ACT OF GUAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 450, H.R. 8720.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8720) to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of Guam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 450), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 8720 is to vest in the government of Guam the power to fix the salaries and allowances of members of its legislature and to provide for the payment of the same from local revenues rather than from Federal appropriations.

A companion bill, S. 2065, was also considered by the committee.

NEED

Subsection (e) of section 26 of the Organic Act of Guam (48 U.S.C. 1421d(e)) fixes the basic compensation of members of the Guam Legislature at $15 per day while the legislature is in session and provides for payment of the same by the United States. All other legislative expenses are paid by the government of Guam.

The Guam Legislature is composed of 21 members who serve 2-year terms. The legislature is charged with responsibility for enacting all local laws. Regular sessions are held annually and may not exceed 60 calendar days. Special sessions of not more than 14 days in length may be convened by the Governor.

Enactment of H.R. 8720 will permit the Legislature of Guam to determine and pay its own salaries and allowances subject, of course, to the usual veto power of the Governor. This will result in a modest saving to the Federal Government of approximately $23,000 a year. More important than this, however, will be the Congress recognition that the Guam Legislature is a body of responsible men and that the local electorate can be depended upon to check its membership if, by any chance, it is tempted to abuse its powers. Enactment of H.R. 8720 will thus be an expression of faith in local democratic processes in Guam.

CONVEYANCE OF REAL PROPERTY OF THE UNITED STATES TO STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 452, S. 1988.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1988) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 2, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "university land" and insert "University Lane"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the State of Maryland that tract of land situated on the campus of the University of Maryland at College Park, Maryland, which was heretofore donated to the United States by the State of Maryland, and which is more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the southeast corner of an original 20.56-acre tract of land conveyed to the United States by deed dated November 9, 1935, and recorded April 20, 1939, in book 521, page 43 of the land records of Prince Georges County, said corner being marked by a cross cut in an iron grating and the north side of University Lane and immediately north of Symons Hall of the University of Maryland;

thence with the east boundary of the original 20.56-acre tract, north 0 degrees 30 minutes 00 seconds west 681.94 feet to a point;

thence south 89 degrees 30 minutes 00 seconds west 701.88 feet to a point;

thence south 40 degrees 47 minutes 04 seconds west 406.34 feet to a point;

thence south 0 degrees 30 minutes 00 seconds east 376.60 feet to a point;

thence north 89 degrees 30 minutes 00 seconds east 970.00 feet to the point of beginning and containing 14.2452 acres, more or less, and being the total remaining acreage of the original 20.56 acres above mentioned now owned by the United States Government.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by the first section of this Act shall be subject to the condition that the State of Maryland pay to the United States an amount equal to the fair market value, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, of the fixed improvements on the tract of land to be conveyed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 468—explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Maryland approximately 14 acres of land on the University of Maryland campus at College Park, Md., which was donated by the State of Maryland to the United States in 1935, and now occupied by the Bureau of Mines and the Fish and Wildlife Service. The State would pay the United States the fair market value of the fixed improvements, but there would be no payment for the land.

Because of its unusual growth, the University of Maryland for several years has desired to occupy these lands and buildings. Only a few hundred students attended the university when the land was originally deeded, but enrollment today is in excess of 25,000.

Similar legislation was passed by the House in 1958 and by the Senate in 1962.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, S. 1988 provides for the conveyance to the State of Maryland of certain land belonging to the United States, which is located on the campus of the University of Maryland.

Although the land in question is to be conveyed gratuitously to the State, the bill does not violate the so-called Morse formula because the tract was originally donated to the United States by the State of Maryland and thus falls under the principle of "implied reversion" which was established in the case of the Roseburg, Oreg., land transfer of 1956 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 7, p. 9323).

Furthermore, Mr. President, the bill provides for the payment of the United States by the State of Maryland of the fair market value of the fixed improvements on the tract of land to be conveyed.

LABOR DEPARTMENT'S TREATMENT OF NEW JERSEY FIRM

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, earlier in this session, Congress voted to extend and expand the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. Those of us who have supported this legislation in the past and who supported it again this year have, I believe, a particular responsibility to see that the act is fairly and effectively administered. For nearly 2 years, I have felt some concern about how this legislation works in actual practice. I believe it would be helpful to the Congress to cite one example which has taken place in my own State.

After the legislation was enacted, a small business firm located in Levittown, N.J.—since renamed Willingboro—proposed to the Labor Department a project providing on-the-job training for 12 unemployed persons as building maintenance—floor—workers. The training was to include instruction in floor tile installation, rug shampooing, painting, glazing, and treatment of floors. The proposal was developed for the Wilco Floor Service by Charles W. Williams, who was troubled by the substantial number of unemployed men in the Trenton-Levittown area. They lacked jobs and the training necessary to obtain them. This situation was particularly hard on Negro workers and troubled Mr. Williams, a Negro himself.

Mr. Williams enlisted the interest of the New Jersey branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Assemblyman S. H. Woodson, of Trenton, then president of the New Jersey branch of the NAACP; the Levittown, N.J., Chamber of Commerce; and the Carver branch, YMCA, Trenton. He held meetings with our Governor, the commissioner of labor and industry of New Jersey and with several officials of the Federal Department of Labor.

From these sessions there appeared uniformly favorable reactions. There was every reason for Mr. Williams to believe that his proposal would be a useful contribution to reducing unemployment in a difficult area. His proposal was considered by the New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry and by the Federal Department of Labor and was approved by both. A contract was signed on July 22, 1963, to launch this modest pilot training project.

Suddenly, however, just 2 days before the program was to begin in August, the contract was suspended by this telegram from the Federal Department of Labor:

> CHARLES WILLIAMS,
> *Wilco Floor Service Co., Carver YMCA, Trenton, N.J.:*
>
> You are hereby notified in accordance with section 5 of contract NJ–J–5 executed July 22, 1963, between yourself, representing Wilco Floor Service Co., and Frank J. Neher, assistant regional director BAT, representing the U.S. Department of Labor, that your contract is suspended as of this date, August 15, 1963. Under terms of said contract you are not to incur any costs not already obligated up to date of suspension. A representative of the Department of Labor will contact you.
>
> FRANK J. NEHER,
> *Assistant Regional Bureau of Appenticeship Training, New York.*

No valid grounds for the suspension were then advanced. Nor have they since been forthcoming.

Since then, several Members of the Congress, myself included, have tried to find out why this project was suspended and, finally, more than a year after the suspension, canceled. It has been a tedious effort to pull out the truth, a word at a time, from the Department of Labor. In this match between a small business controlled in the main by Negroes and the large and powerful Federal Department of Labor, there has developed a strange history of delay, questionable decisions, and some real doubts as to whether regulations are being applied fairly.

My initial inquiry on this matter elicited from the Labor Department a statement that—

> The suspension of the project became necessary because of representations by responsible officers of the New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry that the project apparently did not meet all the requirements of the law, including notably the requirement that there be reasonable opportunity for employment upon completion of the training. The State agency so far has not been able to clarify that such reasonable opportunity would exist for this occupation in this area.

When I made this known to Mr. Williams, he responded:

> I have signed documents by New Jersey State Department of Labor officials stating there were employment possibilities for trainees and that we had met all requirements necessary to start the training program. The documents were not only signed by New Jersey State Department of Labor officials but by U.S. Department of Labor officials.

Subsequently, a member of my staff contacted the Labor Department official who prepared the original letter and was told that there were some personal questions about an associate of the firm which he would not put into writing. These related to claims of tax delinquency, which were freely admitted to a member of my staff and which resulted in part from the fact that limited capital was tied up in equipment and other preparations for the proposed training program. It is not clear what bearing this had on the suspension. In any case, why did it not trouble the Labor Department before the contract was signed?

On February 25, 1964, I wrote the Labor Department:

> As I think my office has made plain, I do believe that any person is entitled to a statement in writing as to why a project has been suspended. This is a matter of simple justice and should not be so long delayed. I should like to hear from you as to when you plan to give Mr. Williams such a statement.

In response, I was informed by the Labor Department that instructions had gone out that, "if for some reason the project cannot properly be reapproved, the reasons therefor should be stated clearly to the project sponsor." This commitment for a statement to Mr. Williams was not carried out.

By May of last year, Mr. Williams had been waiting 9 months without receiving a statement of the reasons for the suspension of his proposed training project. I sent a telegram to Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz outlining the unusual history of the project. It concluded:

> But there is no doubt that Mr. Williams, during these almost 9 months that have passed, has yet to receive a statement in writing giving all the reasons why the contract, which had been approved and signed by both the State and Federal Governments, had been suspended. Obviously, he needs such a statement before he can adequately respond.
>
> Simple justice suggests he should have had it long ago.
>
> My staff's investigation of this unusual delay has developed different reasons given at different times as to why the project was in suspension.
>
> It is, of course, grossly unfair to any person to suspend a contract without a prompt written statement of the reasons therefor, and this is doubly true when the person involved is a small businessman whose funds are tied up in the facilities purchased for the proposed training program. I believe this project should be evaluated on its own merits, but further delay in coming to a decision and inadequate opportunity for the affected organization to meet the views of your Department is unconscionable.
>
> I shall welcome an immediate remedy and a prompt report.

On June 19, 1964, the Department of Labor wrote, but the reply raised a whole new set of questions. The Department's letter stated:

> DEAR SENATOR: Secretary Wirtz has asked me to reply to your recent telegram and your letter of June 9, requesting a full report on the suspension of a contract under the Manpower Development and Training Act between the Wilco Floor Service, Inc., of Levittown, N.J., and the U.S. Department of Labor. This letter supplements our earlier report to you dated December 31, 1963, which was signed by David E. Christian, Assistant Manpower Administrator. Under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Secretary of Labor has responsibility, before selecting a person for training, to determine whether there is reasonable expectation for employment in the occupation for which the person is to be trained. Further, it is the Department's policy to adhere to the report of the conference committee which urged that administration of on-the-job training programs be closely coordinated with appropriate State agencies.
>
> The U.S. Department of Labor has made every effort in administering the MDTA to cooperate to the fullest with State agencies, thereby gaining the value of their first hand knowledge of local situations. This cooperation has resulted in considerable savings of staff time and money in New Jersey, as well as in other States.
>
> We were advised by the New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry that Wilco Floor Service, Inc. proposed a project to train 12 building maintenance porters in the Camden labor market area. This proposal was approved by the Burlington office of the New Jersey Employment Service and the U.S. Department of Labor. Subsequently, Wilco requested transfer of the project from Burlington to Trenton.
>
> As a result of shifting the proposed training to a different labor market area, the New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry found it necessary to determine whether there were job opportunities in the field of training for the Trenton labor market area. As a result of its surveys, the New Jersey Department determined that the proposed training project in the Trenton area did not meet the requirements of the law with regard to reasonable expectation of employment.
>
> Therefore, the U.S. Department of Labor suspended the contract until verification could be made by the New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry that there were job opportunities in such occupations, which is an essential requirement of any contract under the MDTA.
>
> The New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry conducted an area skill survey and as recently as June 4, 1964, we were advised that there is not reasonable expectation for employment in this area for Porter I job openings, nor are there employers in this area whose needs would absorb the trainees. I am enclosing a copy of a letter which Mr. Arthur J. Lynch, superintendent of the New Jersey Employment Service, sent to Mr. Charles Williams on June 4, which covers this basic point.

> The Department of Labor is most anxious to initiate training in every area where the requirements of law and the needs of the unemployed can be met. The suspension of the Wilco contract will be rescinded as soon as the Department receives the necessary verification from the New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry that there are reasonable expectations for employment opportunities in the proposed field of training.
>
> We appreciate the interest and concern you have shown in this matter. If you desire any further information on this project, or on any other operations of MDTA, I shall be happy to provide it for you.

Obviously, the letter did not respond to my continued question as to the reasons for the lengthy delay in giving the Wilco Floor Service, Inc., a statement in writing on the reasons for the suspension of the contract.

The Department of Labor's letter said, "Subsequently, Wilco requested transfer of the project from Burlington to Trenton." This, as I finally elicited 6 months later from the Labor Department, was a flat misstatement. In a letter on December 22, 1964, the Department admitted: "Our files do not show any documentation of a request by the contracting firm for the transfer of the project from Burlington to Trenton."

The June 19 Labor Department letter says, "As a result of shifting the proposed training to a different labor market area, the New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry found it necessary to determine whether there were job opportunities in the field of training for the Trenton labor market area." I asked whether such a survey was made before the New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry and the Federal Department of Labor gave their approval to the change of location. In the December 22, 1964, letter, the Labor Department admits, "The record does not show that a survey was made of job opportunities in the Trenton area."

Then the Department adds, "Periodic reviews of job openings in the Trenton, N.J., area disclose no shortage of available personnel or any anticipated future needs in the relevant job categories."

The last statement is a matter of contention, since Mr. Williams has confirmed as recently as March of this year that, "Letters from various prospective employers were received in which the employers stated within the year in question they would have need for over three times the number of persons that could be trained. The lack of training in this field has caused to the present date the loss of employment for many deserving individuals."

The June 19, 1964, Labor Department letter indicates that the contract was suspended until verification could be made and that there were job opportunities available. I then inquired when the first attempt was made to obtain such verification after the suspension was made on August 15, 1963. The Labor Department's letter of December 22, 1964, overlooks or ignores this specific question. I think the fact is important, for it would indicate whether prompt action was taken to clarify the suspension or whether the surveys were made only recently. The Department does leave some real questions on this point.

The Department's letter of June 19 attempts to suggest that the change in location was a major shift. In actuality, Levittown—now Willingboro—is only 12 miles from Trenton; many people who reside in Levittown work in the Trenton area. Indeed, I am informed that the Trenton office of the New Jersey Employment Service sends job applicants to Willingboro and other places in Burlington County.

Further, a number of sources have indicated to me that the reason Wilco was asked to move the project to Trenton in the first place was in fact to expand the potential job market for trainees—certainly not to curtail the market and terminate the program.

Since I was obviously dissatisfied with the June 19 letter, I addressed a series of further questions to the Department on July 7. In a letter dated September 3, 1964, the Department replied in part to my questions. Mentioned in passing was the fact that the contract had now been canceled, "in accordance with section 5 by reason of a finding that there was in that area no reasonable expectation of employment in the occupation for which the training was designed. Mr. Williams has been advised of that fact." I point out that the cancellation came more than a year after the contract was first suspended.

My questions were answered, again in part, by the Labor Department letter of December 22, 1964. In concluding, this letter suggests a belated recognition that the matter was not handled properly:

> In reviewing the record, it seems to me that some new approach is needed to determine the feasibility of a training program of the kind originally proposed by Wilco.

The Department then referred to one of its officials and said that he would get in touch with Mr. Williams "to see if a training program can be established." The letter said the official "will be in touch with Wilco right after the beginning of the new year."

Over 3 months later, after I had again written to the Department to urge it to carry out its promise to contact Mr. Williams, a Labor Department representative finally met with Mr. Williams.

Reports from those attending that meeting on March 30, 1965, indicate that the results were just as unsatisfactory as previous contacts between Wilco and the Labor Department had been.

The best that the Department of Labor could suggest was that Wilco submit a billing for expenses incurred in planning and preparing for the canceled project, then start all over with a new application for a different type of project.

More specifically:

First. Wilco was invited to submit a billing for expenses incurred.

Second. Mr. Williams was informed that Wilco could submit an application for an on-the-job training contract to train workers who then would be employed by Wilco.

Third. Mr. Williams was informed that an employers' association could submit a request for an OJT contract in behalf of its members, and that one company could be selected by the association to conduct the training for those members who do not have a training capability.

Fourth. State and Federal officials offered to provide assistance and advice.

In the meantime, Wilco has reported that ads seeking building maintenance men have appeared frequently in Trenton newspapers and that the firm, on its own, has trained several welfare recipients, indicating that there are individuals on welfare rolls willing to learn this trade and that jobs are available.

More recent evidence indicates that the Labor Department has succeeded in bypassing—not resolving—Wilco's problem.

Late last month, the U.S. Labor Department announced approval of a series of Manpower Development and Training projects for New Jersey totaling over $6.2 million. The new grants brought Federal Manpower Development and Training grants to a total of over $8,888,000 for fiscal 1964–65.

This prompted the following letter to me from Mr. Williams:

> Training proposed for the antipoverty program is the same as we proposed at less cost 3 years ago.
>
> Many of the training programs are now being sublet to janitorial service companies and waxing companies to train individuals and then hire same.
>
> Surely this is adequate proof that there are and always have been openings for these trainees as we have maintained.
>
> The program as developed and executed today under antipoverty gives very little aid in nonwhite areas.

So there the matter stands. Wilco has submitted a bill to the U.S. Bureau of Manpower Training and Development. But Mr. Williams' long efforts to produce a useful project for unemployed men in his area have been buried quietly in a 2-year-old snarl of excuses, redtape, and unexplained delay.

However, this does not end the story. Mr. Williams' problem has attracted statewide attention in New Jersey. After an independent investigation, the labor and industry committee of the New Jersey branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has concluded that the cancellation of the Wilco contract was "an act of discrimination."

Late in May, delegates from 44 branches of the New Jersey State Conference of the NAACP voted to turn over to the organization's national legal department their findings of "morally unjustifiable discriminatory handling" of the Wilco proposal. I am including the full text of the NAACP statement at the end of my remarks.

This abuse of one man by the Federal Department of Labor is cause for constant and persistent interest to see that his rights are recognized and protected. While I would like to believe that the handling of this particular project is not typical of all the projects, I am left with nagging doubts and questions. How many other struggling businesses and forgotten men have been lost in the files of the Labor Department?

Millions of Americans, including many of us in Congress, had and continue to have high hopes for the Manpower Development and Training Act. It would be tragic if its great potential for helping people in need were to be bogged down in a morass of boggled communications, questionable decisions, unreasonable delays, and incomplete answers to legitimate questions.

The text of the NAACP statement follows:

Delegates from 44 branches of the New Jersey State conference of the NAACP voted overwhelmingly at their conference Saturday, May 22, 1965, to turn over to the national legal department of the NAACP their findings of alleged bias toward the Wilco Floor training program for immediate action against the New Jersey Labor Department and the U.S. Labor Department and all concerned.

Cost and loss of business because of alleged bias in this case totaled a reported $78,000 which Wilco has billed both Government agencies for.

Representatives of the conference stated that their findings show morally unjustifiable discriminatory handling of the Wilco Floor proposal.

Every avenue of the Government's requirements was met and signed "approved" by the State officials before the suspension was ordered. The suspension was ordered 2 days before the starting date and was issued by the New Jersey State Labor Department officials.

The New Jersey Labor and Industry Committee of the NAACP, which is chaired by Nicholas Kourambis, upon investigation found that under no circumstances was the reason given for suspension valid.

A recommendation may also be made to have Governor Hughes request State labor officials take a polygraph test to prove without doubt that the Wilco case was unfairly handled with an alleged design to financially injure.

This case as seen by Senator CASE is a travesty on the just name of the State of New Jersey. If the facts as presented to and checked by Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE's office are made known a public outcry for justice by New Jersey citizens will be made.

Much of the manipulation pertaining to the Wilco Floor program was allegedly initiated within the New Jersey Labor Department and Governor Hughes' office. The State administration if the before mentioned is true must bear the responsibility for this dishonor to this great State.

STATE TECHNICAL SERVICES ACT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we are conquering outer space by learning the mysteries of our solar system and the other planets that make it up. We are plunging beneath the depths of the ocean to discover what life-giving plants and minerals lie there. We are finding ways to sweeten the salty brine of the seas. We are learning more about every facet of our own planet and everything that inhabits it.

From the information developed to provide space capsules that could survive unbelievable heat and cold as well as reentry, have come new kitchen utensils for American homes. Who knows what other applications will come from the vast quantities of information gleaned almost daily from scientific expeditions?

Some years ago Indiana University began operating with a Government grant a project to disseminate information gathered in space research and translating it into potential use by free, competitive American industry.

Yesterday, in passing the State technical services bill, S. 949, we broadened this principle in a nationwide program to feed into private enterprise the new and continuous findings by science and technology. As one who has been increasingly concerned about the concentration of our technological talent in a few places on east and west coasts, I applaud all moves to diffuse the knowledge so that all may share in it and the new applications for this knowledge. I applaud efforts to spread the prosperity and better living which our industrial geniuses are bringing us from this newfound knowledge.

I was pleased, therefore, to join with colleagues of the Commerce Committee and others as cosponsors of the Technical Services Act of 1965, and I am doubly pleased by the passage of the bill.

S. 949 will set up a 5-year program of matching-fund grants to the States with which technology may be shared and fed out to business and industry. This bill will enable all Americans not only to share the blessings discovered from the new knowledge, but to share the conversion of knowledge into consumer goods and to share the prosperity their manufacture will bring.

I am enthusiastic about the prospects for all Americans that will come with passage of this bill. I sincerely hope the other body will concur and that the bill will become law.

PROBLEMS OF A PACIFIC STATE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, in my current effort to stimulate a dialog in the Senate on the political future of the Pacific Trust Territory, I am pleased to report that much active discussion on this subject is taking place in my home State of Hawaii.

There, the proposal for eventual annexation of the western Pacific islands to the State of Hawaii—first broached by the junior Senator from the State of Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] to me and several others a few years ago—is receiving renewed attention.

An interesting and informative article, titled "Problems of a Pacific State," has been written by A. A. Smyser, the able managing editor of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin. I commend it highly to my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article by Mr. Smyser which appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of July 17, 1965.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin,
July 17, 1965]

PROBLEMS OF A PACIFIC STATE

(By A. A. Smyser)

If the United States ever forms a new Pacific State from Hawaii and the islands of the western Pacific, what will it be called?

Hawaii might object to abandoning the present name but the western islands might prefer something different.

This is just one of hundreds of problems that would be faced on the road to realizing the expanded State idea encouraged by Governor Burns.

The Governor himself thinks the creation of such State is years in the future, if at all, but he would like to see it studied.

The idea already has had some surprisingly favorable reaction in Washington. It is not likely to die soon, because it is one plausible solution to a problem that will grow in intensity as the years roll by.

That most of America has managed to be ignorant of the problems of Guam, Samoa and the trust territory won't make the problems go away.

The islands can not and will not remain forever in their present indeterminate status.

Sooner or later people out there are going to begin to yell "colonialism" and want to get either the whole way into the United States or the whole way out, unless we make some changes first.

If a colonialism furor breaks, it will be a defiance of the laws of political gravity if trade and diplomatic exchanges with Moscow and Peiping and other capitals don't help muddy the waters.

The number of choices for the islands is not very large.

In general they divide between independence and some form of affiliation with a richer, more powerful nation that can supply resources and protection.

The idea of a Pacific State as a form of affiliation with the United States thus looms importantly.

It offers an avenue of self-government and full participation in U.S. affairs that is probably more acceptable to Congress than a 51st State would be, or than some Puerto Rico-type commonwealth arrangement implying in this case a long-term U.S. dole.

It also may be more attractive to Congress than a grant of independence which might open the doors to unfriendly intrusions in the Pacific.

The discussion started by Dr. Y. Baron Goto of the East-West Center and encouraged by Governor Burns may help us to think through a thoughtful plan of development and pursue it, rather than simply reacting to what the future may bring.

At the practical housekeeping level the idea of a gigantic Pacific State built around the existing State of Hawaii poses all manner of problems.

For instance:

1. How do you run for statewide office?

Campaigning across 5,000 miles and 100 islands would tax the stamina of an athlete and pocketbook of a millionaire.

A ComSat communications satellite may indeed be a handy campaign aid, along with TV and radio tapes.

It may be that the State will have to underwrite a major portion of the campaign expense—possibly borrowing from the British to keep frivolous candidates from getting free travel and support. Britain requires candidates for office to post a bond which is forfeited if they fail to get a respectable minimum percentage of the votes cast.

2. How do you pass nondiscriminatory laws that apply equally to prosperous, developed Honolulu and remote, simple Kapingamarangi?

There is at least some precedent in laws already on Hawaii's books which deal with counties differently, based on population, taxable property value, and showing of need.

3. How could the people of Guam, Samoa, and the Trust Territory islands be protected against engulfment and dictation by the voters of the present State of Hawaii who outnumber them better than 4 to 1?

Some form of local autonomy might become a compact signed by both the State and United States, much as the Hawaiian homes program was made a compact in the Hawaii State constitution. Basic change requires the assent of both the United States and the State.

Certainly the western islands would need far more autonomy than our present four counties enjoy (despite vocal lipservice to home rule).

4. What would happen to the present $75-million-a-year Federal subsidy that goes to the western islands?

It would be possible for it to continue under one form of agreement or another.

It would remain in the Federal interest to help build the health, school system, and economy of the islands. First reactions to the Pacific State plan included comments that it was a generous offer by Governor Burns.

Congress could recognize this and help ease the burden at least in transition.

The longrun objective would be to reduce differences between the other islands and Hawaii through their development.

5. How would a Governor administer a State 5,000 miles wide, embracing five time zones and on both sides of the international date line?

One way would be through strong local leaders that a revised State constitution could provide.

6. How would the State deal with the many different languages and dialects in the islands?

Just as it dealt with these in its own background—by providing universal education in English.

The problem is not as difficult as it seems. Of the 33 western islanders elected to the Congress of Micronesia now meeting in Saipan, 31 speak English.

Schools already are spreading English facility through the entire area.

7. What about land ownership?

Native populations have well-based fears of aggressive outsiders taking over their homes and property. Ownership of land already is restricted in the western islands. This may need to continue. The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act again offers a precedent.

8. Why not make a new State or States instead of enlarging Hawaii?

Largely because Congress would hardly accept a population of 170,000 spread so widely and with such a weak economic and political foundation as sufficient base for a 51st State.

9. What about congressional opposition?

Governor Burns, who fought the Hawaii statehood bill through Congress, thinks Congress might eventually accept the idea.

In making Hawaii a State, Congress resolved forever the question of noncontiguity and accepting a predominantly nonwhite population.

10. What of United Nations opposition?

Other powers may object. In the end, a plebiscite might be decisive.

11. What of the people in the western islands?

Like the U.S. mainlanders, many have no clear idea of their political future. Guam has some statehood ideas of its own. The matter needs more inquiry and discussion before being either accepted or rejected.

12. How in the world would a Hawaii business firm do business statewide?

That would be the individual problem of each business. Hawaii banks already are branching out across the Pacific. Many businesses would pass up the added market, but some might try for it. The Honolulu Star-Bulletin would certainly try hard to solve problems of keeping a statewide readership.

BIG BROTHER: ON MADISON AVENUE

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, in the July 16, 1965, edition of Time, there was a most interesting article on the attempts of the Internal Revenue Service to assume a friendlier face by hiring the services of a Madison Avenue public relations firm.

I certainly wish the public relations experts the best of luck, but I believe that the hearings of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure indicate they have their work cut out for them.

I ask unanimous consent that the Time's article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Corporations: The Turnaround Boys

A little-known Manhattan company named Lippincott & Margulies, Inc., was hired by the Government last week for what seems an impossible task: putting a friendlier face on the Internal Revenue Service. At first L. & M. will simplify the tax forms, rewrite the IRS's standard letters and redesign its office signs—but after that, almost anything can happen. Turned free, L. & M. might design a new shade of ink for tax bills (affluence green? bankrupt red?), or tell the IRS to change its name to something like Friendly Funding, Inc.

For similar tasks, the firm this year will bill 300 major clients throughout U.S. business about $4 million. In the past 2 weeks, the company has discreetly signed up 10 clients that want to find or change their so-called corporate image, including a major glass company, a drug manufacturer, a food manufacturer, and U.S. Steel.

WHAT'S IN A NAME

A combination industrial designer and marketing consultant, 21-year-old L. & M. specializes in what it grandly calls "the corporate turnaround." Its executives believe that a company's image is affected by the most fleeting of public impressions, such as how people react to stationery or employee uniforms. To help create the right impression, L. & M. employs 130 people, including psychologists, sociologists and anthropologists. At the top are easygoing Chairman J. (for Joshua) Gordon Lippincott, 56, onetime product-development teacher at Brooklyn's design-oriented Pratt Institute, and courtly, French-born President Walter Pierre Margulies, 51, onetime chief designer for Statler Hotels. Say Margulies: "Designers in general have too high a taste level. Our aim is to speak the language of the consumer."

L. & M. finds that the consumer has trouble remembering lengthy corporate names and complicated trademarks. For U.S. Rubber, L. & M. conceived the worldwide brand mark "UniRoyal" (the psychologists said that foreign consumers react unfavorably to "U.S. anything"). It rechristened Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp. simply "Olin." At the invitation of Chrysler Corp., the designers dropped the dated "Forward Look" slogan, created the company's five-pronged Pentastar emblem, and spread Pentastars across Chrysler's signs and showrooms. Though these outward touches seem minor, many businessmen feel that they help to highlight a company's products and aims.

When Floyd Hall took over low-flying Eastern Air Lines in 1963, one of his first acts was to call for Lippincott & Margulies. They shortened the company name to "Eastern," and devised a new color for its planes and stewardess' uniforms, "ionosphere blue" (something between navy and royal blue). More than that, their researchers questioned 6,000 passengers, found them predictably disenchanted by flight delays, indifferent service, and noise in the planes. Floyd Hall gives L. & M. substantial credit for the fact that Eastern has much improved its service and reduced the noise levels inside the redesigned cabins of its "Whisperjets." Putting in a word for the sponsor, Gordon Lippincott says: "Turnaround programs can only be carried out under a talented and determined manager. Otherwise, it's just a cosmetic job."

RELIABLE RED, WHITE AND BLUE

Lately, the turnaround specialists have fashioned a new name for Cities Service Oil Co.—"CitGo"—and switched its corporate colors from green and white to reliable red, white and blue. (Psychologists contend white connotes strength and vitality; green is too soft.) Now the designing men are working on 16 other "corporate identity programs." Among them: Dun & Bradstreet, General Mills, New York Life Insurance.

In all this work, L. & M. calls upon such satellite companies as Image Research, Inc., and Names, Inc. Perhaps Lippincott & Margulies could use a name change itself. Mail sometimes arrives addressed to Margucott & Lippinlies, and one unguided missive was addressed to Apricot & Hercules.

MARYLAND AMERICAN LEGION POST NO. 110 ENDORSES S. 9, THE COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Monday, July 19, this body voted, by more than 4 to 1 the passage of the cold war GI bill, S. 9. This meritorious proposal has received the endorsement of groups throughout the United States.

The opponents claimed that veterans' organizations opposed the bill. As evidence to the contrary of that statement, I request that there be printed in the Record, at this point, a resolution passed on July 14, 1965, by the Huntemann-Huff Post No. 110 of the American Legion at Mount Rainier, Md., which not only endorses the principle of the cold war GI bill, but specifically endorses S. 9, the bill this body recently passed, and sets forth the specific arguments which were used on the floor of the Senate during debate on that bill as reasons for their endorsement by resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution of Huntemann-Huff Post No. 110, Inc., Department of Maryland, Mount Rainier, Md.

At the regular meeting of this post held on July 14, 1965, the following resolution was introduced and unanimously voted on and passed:

"Whereas only 44 percent of our draft-eligible young men ever serve their country in uniform; sacrificing 2 to 4 years of their lives at the crucial age of peak development;

"Whereas the 56 percent of their counterparts are using this time to further their careers and develop their education;

"Whereas these 44 percent are men who are least able to afford an education, who are least prepared for a civilian occupation, and who have to struggle the hardest to survive the competition of the future: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That Huntemann-Huff Post No. 110, Inc., the American Legion, Department of Maryland, Inc., does endorse the Cold War Readjustment Assistance Act of 1965, Senate bill 9, known as the cold war GI bill; and that three copies of this resolution be forwarded to the department adjutant, the American Legion, Department of Maryland, Inc., to be acted on at the 47th annual convention of the Department of Maryland; convening on the 21st of July through July 24, 1965, in the city of Baltimore, Md.; and be it further

"*Resolved,* If passed by the Department of Maryland Convention, this resolution will be forwarded to the national convention of the American Legion at the next convention to be held August 20–26 in Portland, Oreg."

Respectfully submitted.

Richard S. Calalano,
Commander.
Perry A. Martin,
Adjutant.

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON FREE FLOW OF MILK IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I recently cosponsored with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Mondale], Senate bill 1993, designed to eliminate unreasonable and unnecessary restrictions on the free flow of milk products in interstate commerce.

Since introduction of the bill, I have received several statements of support. One is from Pure Milk Products Cooperative of Fond du Lac, Wis., which represents 15,000 dairy farm families producing milk for markets in Wisconsin, Michigan, and Illinois.

William C. Eckles, PMC's general manager, has had many years of experience dealing with the conflicting, duplicating, and discriminatory milk ordinances which are so costly to both consumers and producers. He is highly qualified to describe the problems these ordinances create and to comment on this proposed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Eckles, written on behalf of Pure Milk Products Cooperative, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Pure Milk Products Cooperative,
Fond du Lac, Wis., June 30, 1965.

Hon. Gaylord A. Nelson,
U.S. Senator,
Room 404, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Nelson: In behalf of Pure Milk Products Cooperative, we wish to endorse bill S. 1993, known as the National Milk Sanitation Act, which you and several other Senators have introduced and which now is in the hands of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Conflicting, duplicating, and discriminatory milk ordinances have been costly to both consumers and producers. They are encouraged by local bureaucratic health agencies to perpetuate themselves, and by local milk distributors and producers to eliminate competition.

When local supplies are short, it is frequently necessary for distributors to come to Wisconsin for supplementary supplies, but shipment of such high quality grade A milk is often permitted only at the discretion of the milk inspection agency of the receiving market. Midwest plants making such supplementary sales, report having been subject to numerous local health agency inspections.

In our own area, we are faced with unnecessary duplicative inspections. Our members who have long met the grade A requirements of Milwaukee, find that they must also accept Chicago inspection if the bottler of their milk wishes to sell milk in Chicago, and northeastern Wisconsin farmers supplying the Green Bay grade A market as subject to the Michigan State inspection before the Green Bay handler can extend his distribution routes across the State line into the Michigan Upper Peninsula.

We urge that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare hold hearings and encourage passage of S. 1993 at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely,

William C. Eckles,
General Manager.

A FOOTNOTE ON THE SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a thoughtful article on the situation in the Dominican Republic, written by Jaime Benitez, chancellor of the University of Puerto Rico, appears in the current issue of the Saturday Review entitled "The Leadership Crisis."

Jaime Benitez, in addition to his standing as an academician, as a longtime educational administrator was active in the Dominican Republic during its recent upheaval in trying to secure a useful settlement consistent with democratic practice and purpose. His well-balanced views are therefore of interest, and I ask unanimous consent that his article, "The Leadership Crisis," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Leadership Crisis

(Editor's note.—The author of the following guest editorial is chancellor of the University of Puerto Rico. He has recently been closely involved in official efforts to find a solution to the Dominican problem.)

Our hemisphere is living through a crucial hour. The subtle web of concord and understanding is being dangerously torn asunder. Frequently, what is woven in the daytime is unwoven at night. And now a second Caribbean tragedy is developing, the tragedy of the Dominican Republic. This tragedy is much different from the previous one in Cuba, with which—because of thoughtlessness, or obsession, or faulty information—it was at first confused. One's sympathy must go out to the Dominican people in their present plight. Over the years the Dominican Republic has suffered a bloody fate. Civil struggles, interventions, dictatorships, coups d'etat, brief and unstable flashes of democracy followed by more coups d'etat, and more civil struggles and interventions have left a confused legacy of poverty, uncertainty, suspicion, rejection, and, in some Dominicans, a stubborn will to correct the past.

How can one help in such a precarious situation? What can one do without aggravating even more the bitter internal strife that troubles the Dominican people? None of the Spanish-speaking countries has been able to answer these questions effectively. Latin American solidarity has failed the Dominican Republic at a moment of need. Nor has the United States, with its unilateral intervention—precipitate at first and later hesitant and faltering—been able to solve the immediate problem or reassure the rest of the hemisphere about implications for the future of its present course. Nor has the OAS, with its heterogeneous membership of diffident democracies, military and semimilitary regimes, and shaky civilian governments (all showing various degrees of fear and suspicion of their dominant partner), been able to act with anything approaching the needed firmness and cohesion.

Intervention in the Dominican Republic has aroused animosity throughout Latin America. No Latin American government depending upon popular support can endorse it and expect to survive. (President Frei of Chile and President Leoni of Venezuela, both struggling against strong Communist opposition, have made their positions abundantly clear.) Only governments dependent for their stability upon the support of the United States rather than their electorate have been disposed, and that only after much prodding, to provide the minimum votes necessary to permit formal collective action.

In the United States the hard line seems to command the greater electoral support, and this fact promises, in the days ahead, to produce an even greater cleavage between the people of the United States and those of the rest of Latin America. We face a leadership crisis in this hemisphere. Basically, the crisis is traceable to the social revolutions in ferment throughout Latin America, which are steadily gaining greater momentum. The crisis also reflects the inability of the U.S. Government to define its proper role vis-a-vis the social upheavals and political convulsions at work in Latin America.

As the world's oldest and most powerful democracy, as well as the closest to Latin America, the United States is, in the minds and hearts of the great majority of ill-housed, ill-clad, and ill-fed Latin Americans, the nation most able to support the legitimate aspirations of the common man anywhere. Unfortunately, many forces and circumstances have blocked the understanding that is needed. The difference in means, resources, power, thought patterns, and cultural traditions makes confidence and cooperation extremely difficult. American policy in the Dominican Republic seems specifically designed to render life in Latin America more hazardous and continental relations more bitter and hostile.

Going through Santo Domingo these days, one sees many clear-eyed, earnest American young men. Attired in battle dress, they man the security zones, patrol the corridors, control or support the military. In the eyes of all Dominicans they are invaders. Others, fewer in number and less visible, work as Peace Corps volunteers in hospitals, slums, training centers. All Dominicans regard them as friends. Yet soldiers and Peace Corps workers have much in common. Both groups represent the United States; they carry out their difficult tasks with integrity and loyalty; and they embody the ambivalence of U.S. policy. If we must have them both, could not the ratio of soldiers to Peace Corps be reversed?

The outlook for the future is not reassuring. The OAS, never a strong instrument of Latin American policy, is now weaker than ever. It is possible, of course, that the protracted and unrewarding stand-still in the Dominican Republic may be ended through the formula of a provisional government followed by general elections under OAS supervision. But at best, this will be only a first step in a long and difficult road ahead.

—Jaime Benitez.

THE ROLE OF AMERICAN BUSINESS IN GUARANTEEING EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES—EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the important role—indeed the vital role—that American business plays in the guarantee of equal employment opportunities has again been emphasized by Vice President Hubert Humphrey.

The Vice President made his remarks at the opening of the "Fair Employment Is Good Business" exhibit at the Department of Commerce.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Vice President Humphrey's remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY OPENING OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE "FAIR EMPLOYMENT IS GOOD BUSINESS" EXHIBIT, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 21, 1965

I am delighted at this chance to visit the equal employment opportunity exhibit, and to pay tribute to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. My thanks to Secretary Connor and the Department of Commerce for making this occasion possible.

A lot has been been written and said about the important task that Chairman Roosevelt and the other Commissioners will perform. It is a challenging job and they will need all the help we can give them.

By "we" I mean all of us in this country. There is no such thing as "the Negro problem" or "the minority group problem." We have an American problem, and all Americans are working today to help solve it.

That is why, Secretary Connor, I was particularly pleased to hear you say that "the business of American business is America."

It has been my experience that the business community is more than willing to volunteer its resources to help solve problems of national concern. We have seen this recently, for instance, in the President's summer youth employment program and in the voluntary steps toward the solution of the balance-of-payments situation.

We have also seen it in Equal Employment Opportunity. In a recent meeting of some of the plans-for-progress companies in San Francisco, I reported the fact that companies with the highest productivity and profits have also provided great leadership in the field of merit employment.

I was also glad, Mr. Secretary, to hear you refer to the need to use education and training programs as a part of equal employment. Not only must we offer equal job opportunities, but we must be sure that all Americans have the chance to build a better life through equal opportunity for education and training. This is another great area where labor, business, and Government work together for the benefit of all.

The headlines that bring us news of unrest ignore the silent accomplishments of countless communities, companies, unions, and schools. The accomplishments of the past give us optimism that we will do still more in the future. Fair employment is good business because it is good sense.

USE OF OPTOMETRISTS UNDER MEDICARE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I was delighted that the medicare bill recently passed by the Senate made provision for the use of optometric services. Optometrists have long since established themselves as trained and skilled professionals in eye care. More than 70 percent of Americans who wear glasses rely on the services of the optometric profession. Let me emphasize that optometrists are not merely mechanical lens grinders, but educated, dedicated professional men. I think the so-called freedom of choice amendment allowing a recipient of medicare benefits to choose either an ophthalmologist or an optometrist was a wise proviso, and gave long-overdue recognition to the optometric profession.

I was particularly concerned that optometric services would be available to children given medical care under special project grants for the low-income children of school and preschool age. Therefore, I wrote to Secretary Celebrezze requesting that this point be clarified. In his reply to me Secretary Celebrezze said:

> It does require that projects must be comprehensive in nature. This would certainly include eye care. There is no doubt that the recipients of grants under section 532 of title V would have authority to include the services of optometrists in providing eye care.
>
> And it would seem certain that a great many, probably a substantial majority, of the eye examinations of children would be made by optometrists.

I am certain in making this statement Secretary Celebrezze is recognizing the clear intent of Congress, and I am delighted that children will benefit from the healing skills of the modern optometrists. It has too often been tragically demonstrated that the reason that Johnny cannot read is because Johnny cannot see. As a result many optometrists are already participating on a voluntary basis in medical care programs associated with Operation Head Start activities. The medicare bill will make optometric services more easily available to young children. I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Celebrezze's letter be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., July 16, 1965.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in response to your letter of July 7, 1965, regarding the provisions in H.R. 6675 relating to the use of optometrists.

The recognition of optometrists was very substantially advanced by a provision in the House-passed bill which requires that under the new medical assistance programs, if a State provides eyeglasses the individual shall have free choice between having an examination made by a physician skilled in the diseases of the eye or by an optometrist.

The Senate, before passage of the bill, adopted general language applicable to all titles of the Social Security Act which would accomplish the same result in relation to any services that optometrists are licensed to render. What action the conference committee will take on this amendment I, of course, cannot forecast, but there is no difference in the Senate and House-passed bills in the provision of the medical assistance programs relating to the use of optometrists.

The section 532 relating to special project grants for low-income children of school and preschool age, as you indicate, does not refer explicitly to either eye care or to optometrists. It does require that projects must be comprehensive in nature. This would certainly include eye care. There is no doubt that the recipients of grants under section 532 of title V would have authority to include the services of optometrists in providing eye care. And it would seem certain that a great many, probably a substantial majority, of the eye examinations of children would be made by optometrists.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY CELEBREZZE,
Secretary.

THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY AND THE PROBLEM OF VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I am encouraged by the statement of 67 American college and university professors, political scientists and others, who have come forth in the past few days to, as they put it, "dispel the notion that any small but active and vocal groups of teachers and students speak for the entire academic community on the problem of Vietnam."

As one who has spent his share of time in the academic halls, I spoke here in April, asking for professors and students who agreed with our President and with our Government's policies to come forth and be counted. I asked that they make a true dialog out of the so-called campus debate over the course of affairs in southeast Asia. This group of 67 Americans has. Many others have done likewise.

These distinguished academics have made it clear in their statement of support that they do strongly desire peace and "a political settlement of the war achieved through negotiation among responsible parties." And they make it ultimately clear that they firmly believe the President of the United States fully shares this desire.

Realistically, this group has taken into account, however, the limited number of alternatives facing the United States since it was confronted with the sharp escalation of Hanoi's aggression against South Vietnam. They have stated their belief that President Johnson and his advisers have chosen wisely from among the choices presented them. And they have rejected what they call the "bizarre political doctrine" that the President of the United States has special obligations to the academic community. I ask unanimous consent that their document of support, with names, and addresses be printed in the RECORD, along with an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday.

There being no objection, the document, names, addresses, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM BY POLITICAL SCIENTISTS AND OTHERS

To dispel the notion that any small but active and vocal groups of teachers and students speaks for the entire academic community on the problem of Vietnam, we the undersigned feel it necessary to make clear our support for the policies of President Johnson. We do not believe the U.S. policy in Vietnam has been free from errors, but its infallability is not at issue. At issue are its relevance, realism, and morality. We believe U.S. policy in Vietnam is consistent with the realities of the situation, the goals of American foreign policy, and the peace and freedom of South Vietnam.

We strongly desire peace in Vietnam and a political settlement of the war achieved through negotiation among responsible parties. We regret the involvement of American troops in a foreign war. We believe the President shares these commitments and regrets. We believe in the good faith of his reiterated desire to seek a political settlement of this war through negotiation, any time, anywhere, with any responsible parties.

We ardently support social, political and economic reform in Vietnam and elsewhere, and welcome all efforts to achieve representative institutions, economic opportunity, personal freedom and a higher standard of living for all. We believe that the present Democratic administration has made clear its dedication to progress in Vietnam by its very substantial development program and its promise of massive assistance when the cessation of hostilities makes possible full concentration of the Vietnamese people on the job of development.

We believe that war is a gruesome travesty on civilized decisionmaking and that the war in Vietnam is a hideous burden on the people of that nation. However, we also know—for this is a matter of evidence, not of opinion—that the war in South Vietnam resulted not from a spontaneous outburst of popular unrest, not from American invasion, but from the deliberate exportation by Hanoi of waves of troops trained in the tactics of terrorism and guerrilla warfare. Aggression from the north is not merely a cliche in a propaganda war; it is combat-ready soldiers, trained and equipped by Hanoi, armed with modern weapons, and Mao's strategy for the subjection of a peasant population. We regard it as exceedingly significant that no major population group in South Vietnam supports, or has supported, the Vietcong.

Confronted with the sharp escalation of Hanoi's aggression against South Vietnam, the U.S. Government had available a limited number of alternatives:

The United States might have sued for peace and met Hanoi's reiterated demand for withdrawal of all American support to South Vietnam. It would thereby have permitted South Vietnam to be integrated into the totalitarian leviathan to the north, and have abandoned tens of thousands of South Vietnamese who have resisted totalitarian expansion to liquidation as enemies of a new Communist ruling class.

The United States might have done nothing, and permitted its own forces and those of South Vietnam to be defeated by Hanoi's enlarged forces. This course would have added humiliation to withdrawal, would have enhanced the "paper tiger" image of the United States, as well as have consigned South Vietnam to totalitarianism.

The United States might have launched an all-out war against North Vietnam and destroyed that nation's cities and industrial capacity utterly and precipitously.

The United States might have begun a restrained increase of its militiary effort, designed to escalate the price of aggression and enhance the incentives for peaceful settlement.

Among the unsatisfactory and limiting choices available, we believe the President chose wisely. We support his continued efforts to find a political settlement that will achieve peace and freedom for South Vietnam.

Finally, we reject the bizarre political doctrine that President Johnson or his principal advisers have special obligations to the academic community. Obviously, the administration has obligations to explain its policies to the American people. But to suggest that some group of university professors has a right to a special accounting is as outrageous as to suggest that the corporation executives of America, the plumbers, the small businessmen, or the barbers have special claims on the Government and its principal spokesmen. It is a fundamental principle of democracy that all categories of citizens are equal under law, and that neither wealth, nor class, nor expertise entitles a citizen to preferred treatment by his Government.

Ulrich S. Allers, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Dean Stephen Bailey, Maxwell School of Citizenship, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y.; Comer Clay, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Joseph Cooper, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; George Demetrious, Director, Institute for the Comparative Study of Political Systems, Washington, D.C.; Martin Diamond, Department of Political Science, Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif.; Eleanor Lansing Dulles, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Valerie A. Earle, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; John T. Everett, Jr., Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Mark F. Ferber, Assistant Professor, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers—The State University, New Brunswick, N.J.; Victor C. Ferkiss, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Richard M. Fontera, Department of Political Science, Douglass College, New Brunswick, N.J.; Robert W. Fostor, Professor of Law, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; Carl Friedrich, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Wayne E. Fuller, Professor of History, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Stephen P. Gibert, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Walter I. Giles, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Joseph B. Graus, Department of Government, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Richard Greer, Executive Director, Operations & Policy Research, Inc., 4000 Albermarle Street NW., Washington, D.C.; Ernest S. Griffith, Dean of the School of International Service, American University, Washington, D.C.

George D. Haimbugh, Jr. Associate Professor of Law, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; Morton H. Halperin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; John F. Haltom, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Donald G. Herzberg, Professor of Political Science, Director of the Eagleton Institure of Politics, Rutgers—the State University, New Brunswick, N.J.; Samuel Huntington, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Jan Karski, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, Trinity College, Washington, D.C.; James E. Larson, Professor of Political Science, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; J. R. Leguey-Feilleux, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Karl H. Lerny, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Michael F. M. Lindsay, Professor, Far Eastern Studies, American University, Washington, D.C.; Benjamin E. Lippincott, Professor of Political Science, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; Seymour Martin Lipset, Professor, Political Science, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; George A. Lipsky, Professor, Political Science and Geography, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.; Kurt L. London, Professor, International Affairs, Director, Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.; Charles Burton Marshall, Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research, Washington, D.C.; Neil A. McDonald, Professor, Political Science, Douglass College, New Brunswick, N.J.; John H. McDonough, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Franz Michael, Professor, International Affairs, Associate Director, Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Warren Miller, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.; S. D. Myres, Professor, Department of Government, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; William V. O'Brien, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; George R. Osborne, Department of Political Science, Douglass College, New Brunswick, N.J.; Robert E. Osgood, School of Advanced International Studies of The Johns Hopkins University, Washington, D.C.; Roland I. Perusse, Associate Professor of Government, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Charles W. Procter, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Lucian W. Pye, Professor, Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.; George H. Quester, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Charles H. Randall, Jr., Professor of Law, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; Emmette Redford, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.; Warren A. Roberts, Professor, Political Science and Economics, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.; A. A. Rommer, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Harold W. Rood, Department of Political Science, Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif.; Paul Seabury, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Joseph S. Sebes, S.J., Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Warren Shearer, Professor of Economics, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.; August O. Spain, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Melvin P. Straus, Associate Professor of Government, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.

Susan Tallman, Political Analyst, Operations & Policy Research, Inc., 4000 Albemarle Street NW., Washington, D.C.; Donald Tacheron, Associate Director, American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.; N. H. Timmons, Professor of History, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Procter Thomson, Professor, Economics and Administration, Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif.; Richard L. Walker, Director, Institute of International Studies, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; Donald B. Weatherbee, Assistant Professor, Institute of International Studies, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; Clyde Winfield, Chairman, Professor of History, Texas Western College El Paso, Tex.; Gerard F. Yates, S.J., Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; I. William Zartman, Associate Professor, Institute of International Studies, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 20, 1965]

VIETNAM AND THE PROFESSORS

Despite some impressions to the contrary, not all college and university professors are alienated from the real world or lost in a fog of doctrinaire absurdities. There are important and numerous exceptions. This has been made abundantly clear by a group of 67 of them who have issued an excellent statement strongly supporting what our country is doing in an effort to save southeast Asia from Communist engulfment.

The group—made up chiefly of political scientists, historians and economists with a special understanding of Asian affairs—has left no room for doubt about its endorsement of that effort. Its words deserve to be quoted at some length: "We believe the U.S. policy * * * is consistent with the realities * * * and the peace and freedom of South Vietnam." Accordingly, it is necessary to "dispel the notion that any small but active and vocal groups of teachers and students speak for the entire community" on this issue. "We reject the bizarre political doctrine that President Johnson or his principal advisers have special obligations to the academic community. Obviously, the administration has obligations to explain its policies to the American people. But to suggest that some group of university professors has a right to a special accounting is as outrageous as to suggest that the corporation executives of America, the plumbers, the small businessmen, or the barbers have special claims on the Government and its principal spokesmen."

Well said. So well said, in fact, and so sensibly, that it should be circulated throughout the academic world, at home and abroad, where too much poisonous nonsense is being written and spoken about the fight for freedom in Vietnam.

SOUTH TEXAS PLANNED PARENTHOOD CENTER AT CORPUS CHRISTI ACHIEVES RESULTS WITH GRANT FROM OEO

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the South Texas Planned Parenthood Center in Corpus Christi was the first organization to receive a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity for the purpose of population control. In just 6 months time results have been sufficient to justify an extension of the program.

This is just one more drop in the steadily growing stream of evidence that Federal assistance in dealing with the problems of population growth can yield positive results. The need is clear for a concerted and coordinated Federal-level approach. The distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has been conducting a most informative series of hearings on his bill S. 1676, on which I am honored to be a cosponsor. The bill would create Offices of Population Problems in the Departments of State and of Health, Education, and Welfare to deal with domestic and international aspects of the population explosion. A long list of distinguished witnesses, including former President Eisenhower, have endorsed the bill.

The experience in Corpus Christi shows that positive results can be achieved in combating this problem if we put sufficient resources into the battle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Washington Post of July 15, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 15, 1965]

FEWER POSTABORTION CASES TREATED IN CORPUS CHRISTI: BIRTHS AMONG POOR ARE REDUCED IN PROJECT AREA

(By Jean M. White)

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., July 14.—The first Federal antipoverty grant for birth-control services among the poor has shown enough results in 6 months to justify an extension of the program, city officials and local supporters feel.

They point to figures showing a continuing drop in postabortion patients—an important indicator in an area with a strong tradition of midwifery among the Spanish-surname families—and in indigent births.

Neighborhood clinics opened with Federal funds have been in operation only 6 months, and it is too early to come up with figures showing direct results.

But doctors and local officials here emphasize they are convinced family-planning advice to avoid unwanted pregnancies will strike at one of the root causes of poverty—the overpopulated family.

Doctors point to figures showing a 41 percent drop in the number of patients treated at Memorial Medical Center after bungled abortions. The sharp decrease came over the last 5 years since a local Planned Parenthood chapter began operation. The Federal funds allowed this program to expand with four satellite neighborhood clinics spotted in the city's poverty strip.

Dr. J. M. Garrett, medical director of the Good Samaritan Clinic, reported postabortion cases dropped from 374 to 220 over the last 5 years at Memorial, which handles mainly charity cases.

Over the same period, births at the hospital dropped 28 percent, Dr. Garrett reported.

Two years ago the obstetrical clinic at the charity hospital had 805 patients during the first 4 months. This year the clinic had 505 patients during the same period.

Corpus Christi was the first city to get approval for a family-planning project as part of its antipoverty community action program. The Federal grant was a modest $8,500.

Within the last 2 weeks, the Office of Economic Opportunity has given the go-ahead for family-planning programs in four other cities: Austin, Tex.; St. Louis, Buffalo, and Nashville. Earlier, it also granted $29,424 to Oakland, Calif.

In Corpus Christi, the local Planned Parenthood chapter became a kind of subcontractor to administer the program.

The Federal money has been used to operate four 1-day-a-week clinics in the poor neighborhoods. At the first session, 10 women and 1 man appeared.

The Reverend Reynell M. Parkins, Episcopal priest in charge of St. Martin's Mission, stresses the need for "person-to-person talk."

"You can mail brochures to them, and it is like an illiterate receiving a letter," Father Parkins explains. "You have to sit down in small groups and talk to them."

Word of mouth has proved the most effective means of communication in the West Oso sections of low-income families.

At the Robert L. Moore Community Center yesterday, 15 women watched a film on birth control during the weekly clinic hours. A woman in the front row, with a baby on her lap, said she had come because a neighbor told her.

"I wondered why she hadn't had a baby this spring," she said.

Mrs. Tony Abarca, a former public health nurse, is executive director of the Planned Parenthood program. She speaks the language and knows the culture of the "Latin" families.

"They will tell me that they had two or three induced abortions," she says. "But they will never name the person because they don't want to cause trouble for the midwife."

The average patient at the Planned Parenthood clinics is 26 years old, has five living children, a third-grade education, and an income of about $35 a week.

Since the neighborhood centers opened, they have served 187 new patients. Two hundred twenty-eight other patients from the poverty areas have gone to the central clinic, where the main drawing card seems to be a "Pap" smear for cancer detection.

Federal funds cannot be used to give birth-control advice to unwed mothers.

"Unfortunately," says Father Parkins, "the unwed mother can't be helped except at the main clinic. The problem of the mother who has too many children isn't nearly as bad as that of the unmarried woman."

Although Corpus Christi has a large Catholic population, the Roman Catholic Church has offered no public opposition to the program. A family planning grant in Milwaukee has been held up because of Catholic opposition.

"REALITY AND VISION IN THE MIDDLE EAST"; AN ENLIGHTENED VIEW

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a highly informative article by Abba Eban, now Deputy Prime Minister of Israel and from 1950–59 Israel's Ambassador to the United States, appears in the July issue of Foreign Affairs.

Since the situation in the Middle East continues to be tense and is continually a potential danger spot in maintaining peace in that important area, the views contained in this Israeli's statements are worthy of attention.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Reality and Vision in the Middle East—an Israeli's View," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REALITY AND VISION IN THE MIDDLE EAST: AN ISRAELI VIEW

(By Abba Eban)

Since early March the Arab world has been shaken by an angry clash of views about its relations with Israel. Arab thinking on this subject had long been governed by what Whitehead once called inert ideas—that is to say, ideas that are merely received into the mind without being utilized or tested or thrown into fresh combinations. This inertia was suddenly broken by two closely related events. The Federal Republic of Germany sought the establishment of diplomatic relations with Israel, in conscious rejection of Arab pressure. And the President of Tunisia challenged the official Arab dogma about Israel's place in the Middle East. In statements which had a broad international resonance, Mr. Bourguiba indicated that Israel was a solid and entrenched reality with which the Arab nations would have to come to terms. To dream of sweeping Israel away in a torrent of violence was, in his view, sheer delusion.

The German initiative and the Tunisian pronouncements are, of course, important events. But they do not in themselves explain the volcanic emotion which spread from Cairo across the Arab world. Germany, after all, is not the 1st but the 95th governmen to establish diplomatic ties with Israel. In none of the 94 previous occasions did Arab governments go beyond a routine expression of grievance. And President Bourguiba's calm but reluctant vision of Israel as a "reality" is less heretical than Cairo spokesmen would have us believe. Indeed, President Nasser himself often gives eminent visitors the impression that his belief in Israel's disappearance is far from immaculate. The leading Egyptian publicist, Hassanein Heikal, recently told his readers that the modern world was no longer congenial to decisive local wars. An Arab-Israel conflict would, in his judgment, be followed by international intervention; and the forces opposed to Israel's liquidation were not confined to Israel alone. These sober words were written more than a year ago. Why, then, do President Nasser and Mr. Heikal now react to cautious statements about Israel's permanence like medieval theologians confronted for the first time by the suggestion that the earth may, however regrettably, turn out to be round?

If world opinion finds it hard to probe such anomalies it is because the official Arab attitude toward Israel has no point of reference in other international conflicts. In all other political tensions today the adversaries face each other from a basis of mutual recognition. Each may seek to impose its views or interests on the other. But none seeks victory in terms of the other's disappearance. The Indonesian claim to eliminate Malaysia may be an exception to this rule. But it is instructive that Indonesia finds it impossible to advocate the disappearance of a sovereign state while herself remaining within the political and conceptual framework of the United Nations system. The Arab governments which advocate Israel's disappearance find no such difficulty.

It is customary to describe the idea of Israel's liquidation as a whim of Arab emotion. Nobody, least of all in Israel, should ignore the intense rancor with which the Arab mind has been trained to react to Israel's very existence. But it is not a matter of emotion alone. The dream of Israel's submergence is nourished by a certain rationality capable of being exposed to the analysis of reason. To do this is no mere academic exercise. It is a deep therapeutic necessity. If we can explain why Arabs have believed that Israel would disappear, and why for 17 years this has not even begun to happen, we may open the way to a new Arab understanding of the present and future power balance in the Middle East.

II

The Arab refusal to acknowledge Israel's permanence is nourished by a constant appeal to the Middle Eastern map. Here the power relationship between the two parties seems to be marked by a vast disparity. Arab independence stretches through 13 sovereign States across 4 million square miles with a total population of 100 million. Israel is a single sovereignty established in a small area of 8,000 square miles with a population of only 2½ million. The Arab preponderance is thus reflected in territory, population, mineral wealth, strategic importance and a formidable capacity for diplomatic maneuver, especially in international organizations where numbers count. From this multiple advantage many Arab leaders draw the simple logic that Israel's survival depends on Arab consent, while the Arab nation stands in no corresponding need of peace with Israel. The appeal to geography is sometimes reinforced by a reference to the laws of history. Writing in these pages 13 years ago, Dr. Charles Malik affirmed that "history has not known an instance of a nation at permanent enmity with its immediate world. * * * I do not know of a single other instance in the world where there is such radical existential discontinuity across national frontiers." More recently Arab radicalism has taken heart from its successes in other fields. "Only yesterday," writes Muhammad Jamil Baihum, "we thought it difficult * * * to expel France by force from Morocco, Tunisia, and Algeria * * * or to expel Great Britain from Egypt. * * * But what was difficult became easy when the will was there and the circumstances were propitious."

This theme recurs constantly both in the propaganda and in the self-persuasion of Arab nationalism. A wave of history is destined to sweep all non-Arab elements out of the Middle East, restoring the region to its existential continuity.

To those who see the scales of geography and history in these terms, the experience of the past 17 years can yield nothing but astonishment and frustration. The plain truth is that Arab nationalism emerges from nearly two decades of uncompromising anti-Israel struggle in total strategic defeat. The map, with its self-evident picture of Israeli impotence, has somehow failed to assert itself. Arab policy, directed from Cairo, has pursued a series of clearly defined objectives: to prevent Israel's physical existence; to reduce her territory; to flood her with a wave of hostile refugees; to uproot Jerusalem from her midst; to thwart the development of her diplomatic relations; to bar her from international organizations; to prevent her growth as a trading unit with access to world markets; to frustrate her irrigation projects; to discredit her in world opinion; and, above all, to banish her from affirmative contact with the new world of liberated Africa and Asia.

Not one of these aims has been attained. None of them is even remotely in sight. Israel exists in growing strength and numbers. Her territory as defined in the 1949 Arab-Israel agreement is intact. She has not been swamped by Arab refugees. Jerusalem is an integral part of her national structure. She has a broader network of diplomatic relations than is usual for so small a state. Her flag flies in all the institutions which express the growth of world community. The Arab boycott has won some tactical successes, but has not prevented Israel from establishing commercial links with a hundred states or from expanding her exports by more than 1,000 percent in 17 years. The Huleh marshes have been drained and the waters of Lake Kinneret are irrigating southern fields. World opinion overwhelmingly supports Israel's rights to her independence and integrity which are, indeed, sanctioned by the law of nations and by specific commitments of friendly powers. And the majority of the emerging states maintain strong and intimate ties with her. These links go beyond diplomatic courtesies. They touch the central interests of the awakening countries in their quest for accelerated development.

Something appears to have gone wrong with the superficial testimony of the map. Nobody in Israel should assume that past success is a guarantee of future victory. But nor will Arab leaders approach self-understanding until they come face to face with the lesson of these years. There are manifestly forces at work in the history of our times and in the life of our region which balance, and even outweigh, the factors on which Arab nationalism has relied in its dream of Israel's eclipse. If the forces which have determined Israel's consolidation for the past 17 years can be presumed to endure for the next 17 years—and beyond—then Arab leaders can hardly evade the sort of intellectual adjustment which one of them, at least, has begun to undergo. T. S. Eliot once wrote that "Human kind cannot bear very much reality." But surely there is also a limit to the allegiance which men will give to unreal assumptions which fail, year after year, to vindicate themselves in any perceptible degree.

I now come to define the factors which refute the myth of inevitable Arab victory. The first of these is Israel's capacity to deter and contain the regional hostility by maintaining a balance of military strength. The commitment of 2 million Israelis to their own defense is more absolute and far more passionate than is the commitment of 100 million Arabs to Israel's destruction. For Israel, survival is a necessity. For the Arab nation, with its own survival assured on an almost imperial scale, Israel's submergence is, at best, optional. To this crucial issue of morale we must add the reinforcement of technology. In modern strategy the value of numbers tends to decline in comparison with the value of technical and scientific skills. As military technology develops, the quantitative element loses its decisive importance. The possibility of a small community holding its own against heavy demographic odds becomes increasingly tangible. This is not to say that it is preferable to be small. But it is at least a tolerable destiny. In Israel's national memory David's victory over Goliath was a result not of his smallness but of his compensating agility and talent for improvisation. Whatever has enabled Israel to succeed in deterrence and containment during the past decade seems certain to be operative for the next decade and beyond.

Moreover, the maintenance of a local equilibrium of security in the Middle East responds to broad international interests. The crises of our times usually have their origin in small nations which lack either internal stability or a local equilibrium of strength. Vietnam, the Congo, Cyprus, Yemen, and the Dominican Republic illustrate this truth. In each case a vacuum or imbalance of security in a small country draws the world community into perilous involvement. A local tension becomes an international peril. This experience helps to explain why there is more overt and effective support today than formerly for the maintenance of a prudent security equilibrium in the Arab-Israel area.

The Arab summit conferences, it is true, have shown a certain military inventiveness on the tactical level. They have produced the Joint Arab Command and the Palestine Liberation Organization. These, together with the threat to violate Israel's water rights as defined in the compromise unified plan of 1955, represent a tangible increase of tension and peril. But they do not testify to any serious thought about the strategic utility of the war which is evidently being planned. Would such a war really change the map? Nobody can doubt the fearful havoc and bereavement which it would inflict. But when it ended—probably in a short time—the loss, the ravage, and the eruption of armies beyond the present frontiers would not have been on one side alone. It is not absurd to imagine Arab leaders ardently urging "a return to the frontier of 1966 or 1967," just as they now urge a return to the frontier of 1947 which they once set aside by force. Wars have always been inhuman. They are now, in addition, highly ineffective. The idea that any conceivable war in the Middle East would substantially change the political or territorial structure deserves a more critical scrutiny by Arab minds.

The political factor in Israel's stability is no less cogent than the military prospect. The international scene is today commanded by respect for the existing territorial structure. The United Nations Charter is based on the political independence and territorial integrity of member states. The great powers have reached a doctrine of territorial conservatism out of their experience with the nuclear weapon. Even territorial arrangements originally regarded as temporary improvisations now seem preferable to any attempt to change them without consent. The exchange of notes between Moscow and Washington early in 1964 established a broad consensus in favor of maintaining existing frontiers. And the small nations which form the bulk of the international community have a manifest interest in the principle of sovereignty and the integrity of existing territorial agreements. With 98 percent of the human race now living under sovereign flags the doctrines of territorial irredentism have lost their appeal.

Beyond local military deterrence and international respect for the existing territorial structure, there is a theme of world opinion which makes the cry for Israel's liquidation discordant. This is not an age of crusades. Together with the multiplication of nations there goes a new ecumenical spirit nourished by revulsion from war. Most people and governments find the present "existential discontinuity" in the Middle East preferable to its correction by war. Arab opinion would also do well to give heavier weight to the special associations which Israel evokes in the world consciences as a result of the Nazi holocaust. History is not a web woven by innocent hands. It would be rash to predict an end to organized inhumanity. But when a world which has seen 6 million Jews thrown into the furnace is now invited to see the central bulwark of Jewish survival "thrown into the sea," a shudder runs through whatever exists or remains of historic decency. The point is that the more bellicose Arab slogans about Israel affront the conscience as well as the higher interests of contemporary mankind.

Even less likely than Israel's liquidation by war is her elimination by the weight of regional solitude. The effects of Israel's isolation from the Arab environment are regrettable and serious. But they touch the atmosphere of her life rather than her prospect of survival. In the new age of swift communications, nations are less dependent on their regional context than in former times. Israel's markets, friendships, scientific contacts, intellectual links, and international vocation can, if necessary, be found in Europe, the Atlantic community, and amongst the developing states beyond the Arab fence. The modern world is assuming the character of a close-knit urban society whose several parts are mutually accessible. Affinity is now more important than vicinity as the driving force of international relationships. Moreover, Israel since the dawn of history has received and exercised her major influences across the Mediterranean world, in which she is far from isolated.

We may now summarize the elements on the credit side of Israel's stability which counteract the physical evidence of the regional map: a proven capacity for deterrence and containment; technical and moral factors which offset numerical inferiority; the dominant international respect for the established territorial structure of states; specific commitments by friendly powers to Israel's independence and integrity; opposition of world opinion to warlike solutions; a special revulsion of world conscience against further outrage to Jewish survival; the unfeasibility of a prolonged and one-sided Arab assault capable of altering the political map; Israel's special place in the trust and confidence of the developing world; and her proved capacity to transcend her regional isolation by self-reliance and by a worldwide economic and diplomatic initiative.

Not all these factors can be graphically portrayed on a map. But in the example and performance of 17 years they have shown their weight. It is not likely that they will soon lose their force.

III

The question is whether and how a defensive stalemate can be transformed into a more affirmative relationship. The answer lies in the capacity of Arab minds to grasp the existential truth about the Near East as a region which can never be comprehended in Arab terms alone. The destination of this region lies not in an exclusive Arab unity, but in a creative diversity and pluralism. Three central issues must be resolved in Arab and Israeli thought before a new era can dawn: first, the image which the Arab world and Israel reflect each to the other; second, the tension between the idea of Arab unity and the more creative idea of Mediterranean cooperation; third, the idea of peace as a mutual necessity for both nations, and not as a gift of grace to be accorded by the Arabs to Israel.

The Arab obsession with an Israeli threat runs against all rational evidence. If the Arab nation were responsive to the truth of its recent history it would now be going forward in a thrust of hopeful energy. It has won its independence in 4,463,000 square miles. It is farfetched to believe that it cannot flourish without 8,000 more. Arab freedom in a subcontinent has been qualified, in a small area, by the liberation of another people which had centuries of Middle Eastern history behind it before the Arabic language or the Moslem faith saw the light of day. It has never been possible to convince world opinion that it is right for the Arab world to possess an empire—and wrong for Israel to exercise the peaceful possession of its tiny but cherished home.

There is no greater fallacy than to regard Israel as a "colonial" phenomenon. No state in the world expresses the concept of nationhood more intensely than Israel. It is the only state which bears the same name, speaks the same tongue, upholds the same faith, inhabits the same land as it did 3,000 years ago. Recently a group of young Israelis near the Dead Sea came across some parchment scrolls written 1,900 years ago. They are entirely intelligible to a young citizen of Israel today. Israel is not alien to the Middle East, but an organic part of its texture and memory. The long separation has had less effect on the region's history than the original birth and the modern renewal. Take Israel and all that has emanated from Israel out of Middle Eastern history—and you evacuate that history of its central experiences. Arab political and intellectual leaders have never made a serious effort to understand, even in reluctant mood, the tenacity, depth, and authenticity of Israel as a national reality with deep roots in the Middle East. They would do well to ponder Ernest Renan's definition of nationhood: "A nation is a soul, a spiritual principle. To share a common glory in the past, a common will in the present: to have done great things together; to wish to do them again—these are the essential conditions of being a nation."

There are so many common features in Arab and Israel nationalism, both caught up in the tension between past memory and future hope, that their reciprocal alienation today has the mark of authentic tragedy. It is not enough for Arab leaders to recognize Israel as an unpleasant "fact." They cannot long avoid asking themselves why Israel's restoration is, in the eyes of most of mankind, an event which, despite all imperfections, has an inner splendor and nobility. At any rate, the Arab portrayal of Israel as a dark conspiracy or as a rapacious colonial adventure is regarded by the opinion of mankind as an unacceptable caricature. A decisive phase will have been reached when Arab intellectuals begin to study Israeli nationalism in anything like a clinical, objective spirit.

I am aware that the Arab-Israel dialog is not distorted on one side alone. Hostility usually evokes an attitude in its own image. The Israeli vision of Arab life and culture has been eroded by years of separation. Israel must try, above the conflict, to see her neighbor as she has been in her greater moments—the heir and author of a rich culture, the bearer of a tongue whose echoes will always fill our region and without which a man is cut off from an inner comprehension of the Middle East.

Whether the Arab nations and Israel can reach an understanding of each other depends on how they conceive the nature and destination of the Middle East. For President Nasser and the main body of Arab nationalism, the dominant theme of the region's destiny is Arab unity. Much of Arab history is concerned with the tension between unity and regionalism. Union has been the exception, not the rule. There is, of course, a unifying energy in the Arab world which draws all men of Arab tongue together in a common identity. But there is also a strong tendency of Arab States to maintain their separate sovereignties against a claim to centralize hegemony from Cairo. Baghdad, Beirut, Damascus, and the North African States have never voluntarily acknowledged the political ukase of the Nile Valley.

For 12 years the efforts of Nasserism to impose a uniform control on the restless, varied stream of Arab life has led to uninterrupted crisis. Nothing has divided the Arab world more than the effort to unit it. Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Jordan, Sudan, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, and now Yemen have been successive arenas in which Nasserism has come to grips with the desire of Arab States to be independent—not only of foreign control but of each other. Today diversity, pluralism, and polycentrism are everywhere undermining the pretensions of monolithic blocs—from the Atlantic world to the Communist system, as well as across Africa and Latin America. It is doubtful if the Arab world with its deep-rooted diversities will tolerate a centralized control.

A Middle East in which separate Arab States could pursue their separate destiny, in a mood of tolerant variety, could more easily accommodate an Arab-Israel understanding than a homogenized Middle East convulsed by an Egyptian bid for centralized control. The Middle East is not an exclusive Arab domain. Its destiny lies in a pluralistic interaction of Asia, Europe and Africa. There are nearly as many non-Arabs as Arabs in the Middle East (the combined population of Israel, Iran, Ethiopia, Somalia, Turkey and Cyprus is 80 million; and the dream of a united Arab domain from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf offends the region's essential diversity.

There is a lesson to be learned from experiments in regional cooperation in other continents. In Western Europe the unity movement began from common interests, proceeding from coal and steel toward broader economic integration and free communications. Existing sovereignties are respected and the sensitive issue of political coordination is left until economic mutuality has been longer at work.

In the American republics the continental organization avoids racial or linguistic exclusiveness. It comprises every sovereignty within the defined region. Similarly, the new Organization of African Unity avoids centralization and hegemony. Neither in Europe, Latin America, nor Africa has the federal principle yet won any notable victory. The formula is one of growing integration and harmony in relations between separate sovereign states.

The Arab union movement directed from Cairo seems to involve every difficulty which other union movements avoid. It emphasizes political structures, such as federations and leagues, before the basis of economic interest is secured. It is ethnically and linguistically exclusive, inspired more by reaction to foes than by a positive impulse of self-realization. And it is frankly disruptive of existing sovereignties and anchored in a concept of centralized hegemony.

The world has generously come to terms with Arab nationalism. The question is whether Arab nationalism can now come to terms with regional and international concepts broader than itself.

The most fruitful and natural regional concept is that of Mediterranean cooperation. Mediterranean spirit, with the currents of thought and action which it has generated or evoked, lies at the origin of the technical and cultural transformation which has largely determined the cultural history of mankind. Egypt, Israel, Lebanon, Syria, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco are Mediterranean nations, while Jordan is oriented by trade and history toward the Mediterranean world. The Hellenic and Latin worlds, Turkey and the island republics of Cyprus and Malta are washed by the same waters. Every point in this littoral is swiftly accessible to every other. Three continents, Europe, Africa, and Asia, look out upon it will all their diversity of fate and outlook. Five great civilizations were born here—Judaism, Christianity, Hellenism, Rome, and Islam. It is a central compact world, congenial to the free interaction of commerce and ideas and alien to exclusiveness. In no other part of the globe does a similar variety of conditions exist in such close proximity or in such intensity of mutual influence. It is here that man first considered himself in the light of eternity. It is here that science broke loose from empiricism in search of broad unifying explanations of the natural order. And it is here, amidst all the conditions for a new emergence of human vitality, that we find statesmanship held down in implacable conflict.

The issue is whether the Arab and Jewish nations, which have been primary agents in the Mediterranean adventure, can transcend their conflict in dedication to a new Mediterranean future, in concert with a renascent Europe and an emerging Africa. A new impulse of thought, similar to that which inaugurated the European Community 15 years ago, could open this prospect to early view.

IV

Israeli leaders are often asked what Israel could contribute to a Middle Eastern settlement in return for what she would gain from the lifting of the siege. Although peace is not a condition of Israel's existence it clearly represents her highest interest. She is desperately hard pressed for territory. She is under no juridical obligation to reduce her area below the meager 8,000 square miles which she commands under the 1949 agreements; these were concluded under United Nations auspices and cannot be modified without the consent of the signatory governments. For the first time since the dawn of history, large Jewish communities no longer exist in the Nile and Euphrates Valleys, in the Arabian Peninsula, and parts of North Africa. These half-million refugees have been absorbed in Israel and not thrown onto the charity of the world community as have the Palestinian Arabs who underwent a shorter and less drastic migration, for the most part from one part of Palestine to the other—from what is now Israel to the Palestine territory embodied in the Arab states of Jordan and Egypt. It is the regional interest that Arab and Jewish populations should be integrated in environments akin to them in language, ethnic affinity, and national sentiment. All refugee problems since the Second World War, in Asia and Europe, have been solved by this principle.

In the Israeli conception the guiding motive of a peace settlement is not to change the character or structure of existing states, but to institute a dramatic and revolutionary change in the relations between them. The revolution of which I speak can best be expressed in terms of an open region. Israel's land is small but wonderfully central. It is a nodal point of communication. In peaceful conditions we could imagine railway and road communications running from Haifa to Beirut, Damascus, and Istanbul in the north; to Amman and beyond in the east; and to Cairo in the south. The opening of these blocked arteries would stimulate the life, thought, and commerce of the region beyond any level otherwise conceivable. Across the southern Negev communication between the Nile Valley and the fertile crescent could be resumed without any change of political jurisdiction. What is now often described as a wedge between Arab lands would become a bridge. The Kingdom of Jordan, now cut off from its natural maritime outlet, could freely import and export its goods on the Israeli coast. On the Red Sea, cooperative action could expedite the port developments at Elath and Aqaba which give Israel and Jordan their contact with a reviving east Africa and a developing Asia.

The Middle East, lying athwart three continents, could become a busy center of air communications, which are now impeded by boycotts and the necessity to take circuitous routes. Radio, telephone, and postal communications which now end abruptly in midair would unite a divided region. The Middle East with its historic monuments and scenic beauty could attract a vast movement of tourists and pilgrims if existing impediments were removed. Resources which lie across national frontiers—the minerals of the Dead Sea and the phosphates of the Negev and the Araba—could be developed in mutual interchange of technical knowledge.

Economic cooperation in agricultural and industrial development could lead to supranational arrangements like those which mark the European Community. The United Nations could establish an Economic Commission for the Middle East, similar to the Commissions now at work in Europe, Latin America and the Far East. The specialized agencies could intensify their support of health and educational development with greater efficiency if a regional harmony were attained. The development of arid zones, the desalination of water and the conquest of tropical disease are common interests of the entire region, congenial to a sharing of knowledge and experience.

The programs of technical cooperation maintained by Israel in 50 countries in America, Africa, and Asia, and the flow to Israel of over 1,500 young trainees from the developing countries every year, are an augury of what could be achieved by technical interchange between the Arab States and Israel. Israel could contribute to a solution of refugee problems by accepting the burden of international loans to finance her compensation undertaking. The payment of compensation would advance the resettlement of the refugees in areas of the Arab world. Regional water development would become a focus of cooperation, instead of a source of conflict. A detailed review of the position on the frontiers with a view to minor and mutual adjustment could remove anomalies and ambiguities which provoke tension.

In the institutions of scientific research and higher education on both sides of the frontier, young Israelis and Arabs could join in a mutual discourse of learning. The old prejudices could be replaced by a new comprehension and respect, born of a reciprocal dialog in the intellectual domain. In such a Middle East, military budgets would spontaneously find a less exacting point of equilibrium. Excessive sums devoted to security could be partly diverted to development projects.

Thus, in full respect of existing sovereignties and of the region's creative diversity, an entirely new story, never known or told before, would unfold across the eastern Mediterranean. For the first time in history no Mediterranean nation is in subjection. All are endowed with sovereign freedom. The problem is how to translate freedom into creative growth.

It may seem utopian to project such a vision in the summer of 1965, when the urgent concern is to reinforce the deterrents against armed conflict and to avoid a mischievous violation of water rights. But there is such a thing in physics as fusion at high temperatures. In political experience, too, the consciousness of peril often brings about a thaw in frozen situations. In the long run, nations can survive only by recognizing what their common interest demands. "Great ideas," wrote Albert Camus, "come into the world as gently as doves. Perhaps then, if we listen closely, we shall hear amid the roar of empires and nations, a faint flutter of wings, the gentle stirring of life and hope."

A DESERVED COMPETITIVE POSITION FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on the 4th of February I cosponsored with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] and others, S. 995, which seeks to amend the Clayton Act with certain provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act. As a member of the Senate Small Business Committee, I am familiar with the practices which seem to make this legislation desirable to assure to small business a deserved competitive position in the American economy.

On June 30 of this year an important friend of small business, Mr. George J. Burger, of the National Federation of Independent Business, presented a statement to the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee on this legislation. Because this statement is important to the small business community and, indeed to the membership of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Burger's statement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of George J. Burger, Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business, Before the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, Senate Judiciary Committee June 30, 1965, Subject: S. 995

I am George J. Burger, vice president, legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business. We are a national organization composed solely of smaller, independent business and independent professional people. Our home office is San Mateo, Calif. I am in charge of the Washington, D.C., office.

Presently we have 199,645 individual, directly supporting and participating members throughout all 50 States. This number is increasing every week. From the standpoint of number of directly supporting and participating members, we are the largest business-professional organization in the country.

Our main function is one of encouraging these independent enterprisers—who are the admitted backbone of our free enterprise system, and who are one of the strong pillars supporting our very liberties—to take a continuing, active, informed interest in Government affairs—State and National—and of providing them with programs to do so in an intelligent, effective manner.

I will not describe our method of operation. Most, if not all the members of this committee have become familiar with the federation over the 20 years of our Washington activities. I will say only that in the federation, members speak directly for themselves—in their statements, officers voice only the opinion of the membership. Through our the Mandate polls (regular reports on which have been furnished to you) we determine the majority position of the membership. This sets the federation's course. Through our special fact-finding surveys "How's Business With You?"—1962; "Let's Take Care of Our Business—Government"—1963; "Jobs"—1964," and our current survey "Small Business—Nation's Largest Employer," we make it possible for members to tell us, and through us all in Government the factual basis behind the many problems which are attacked by bills presented for vote in various issues of the Mandate.

As it relates to the 1962 survey, "How's Business With You?" of our entire membership, signed reports were received from 56,486 federation members in the 50 States, and to give you a breakdown of the overall competition facing independent retailers 23,720 cited discount house competition, with 18,128 advising discount house competition handled same goods below their cost; 17,512 reported competition with cooperatives with 8,411 advising cooperatives handled same goods below their cost; 21,286 reported unfair pricing by suppliers with 7,404 of this group advising of factory store competition, 10,181 reporting competitor price favoritism and 6,914 reporting unfair promotional allowance competition; 10,444 federation members reported Government competition with 3,751 advising military PX's ships stores were responsible for this competition—9,130 federation members reported import competition, with 5,586 advising they were primarily affected by price, and 713 reporting they were affected by style.

Now in 1963 a similar survey, "Let's Take Care of Our Business—Government" was made of our entire membership, with reports coming from 68,167 in all the 50 States, with federation members advising of the action needed to curb unfair price competition. Thirty-six thousand, seven hundred and twenty-six reported need for stronger use of present antitrust laws; 22,202 felt unfair price competition could be curbed by firm retail price proposal, while 21,459 believed unfair price competition could be curbed through firm manufacturer price proposal, and 38,435 believed that unfair price competition could be curbed through proposal to curb loss leaders.

At the time of the adoption of the Robinson-Patman Act efficient independent business both at the production and distribution levels were of the opinion that their Magna Carta had arrived, and it is self-apparent that the views held by independent business at that time were confirmed by major actions of large producers in their cancellation of contracts with mass distributors, and it is to be noted when these cancellations took place they were well noted by the Nation's press because of the importance of the published statements coming from the heads of these large suppliers who stated they "couldn't justify the price under the Robinson-Patman Act."

The Federal Trade Commission in 1939, where they found a violation of the Robinson-Patman Act involving a giant corporation and its customers, issued a cease-and-desist order, and it has been highly questionable when that order was ever vigorously enforced by the Federal Trade Commission. This was disclosed at the time the late Hon. Estes Kefauver was chairman of a Subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee, in a staff report to the chairman, "United States versus Economic Concentration and Monopoly."

It would appear that from that moment on, due to happenings within our economy, that something must be done to strengthen that law, such as previously proposed in S. 1815, S. 1935.

In 1963, through Mandate No. 288, the entire federation membership was polled on S. 1815, and particularly note the arguments presented "for" the proposition, and the arguments "against," with instructions to the members: "Before voting issues read these explanations":

"3. S. 1815. Make it possible for businessmen to go into court to protect themselves against competitors and suppliers who promote monopoly through sales at unreasonably low (loss leader) prices (Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota). Under present U.S. Supreme Court decisions, businessmen cannot sue privately under this section of the antitrust laws. Only Government is permitted to enter such suits. ( ) for, ( ) against.

"3. Argument for S. 1815: Unless businessmen have the right to take cases into court, on their own, under this section of the antitrust laws, monopoly will continue to increase. The fact is that Congress just will not, perhaps cannot, appropriate enough money for the Federal antitrust agencies to do the job that must be done. Sales at unreasonably low prices (loss-leader selling) are destructive of local competitors and therefore of the competitive system. Passage of this bill will be a slowdown signal for would-be monopolists.

"3. Argument against S. 1815: This bill could do nothing more than cause trouble in our courts, without particularly helping parties injured by cut prices. In the first place, the law in question is of doubtful constitutionality. The cost of fighting a case on this basis would be prohibitive. Secondly, there is always the problem of proving when a price is, or isn't, unreasonably low. The result: more time and more money involved, again with no reasonable assurance of results. Better nothing, than something that muddies the water."

The result of the poll of our nationwide membership was disclosed in Mandate No. 289:

"Here's the national summary of votes on issues in Mandate 288. This has been sent to all Congressmen and Senators, all congressional committees, and all agencies and individuals in the executive branch of our Government, for their information. It also has been sent to all State senators and Governors.

"[In percent]

	For	Against	No vote
1. S. 1226, H.R. 264. Curb labor union joint activities	94	5	1
2. H. Res. 104. Provide for investigation of U.S. State Department	78	17	5
3. S. 1815. Permit private suits for "loss leader" competitive damage	69	25	6
4. H.R. 918. Tax incentives for hiring of those over 45	64	30	6
5. Congress set time limit on foreign aid program	88	9	3"

In Mandate 301, this year, we polled our membership on S. 995, presently before your committee for consideration:

"4. S.995. Make it possible for businessmen to go into court and sue competitors and suppliers who violate the Robinson-Patman Act through sales at unreasonable low (loss leader) prices. (Senator SPARKMAN, of Alabama.) Under present U.S. Supreme Court decisions, businessmen cannot sue privately under this section of the antitrust laws. Only Government is permitted to enter such suits. ( ) for, ( ) against.

"4. Argument for S. 995: Businessmen must have the right to take these cases into court. Otherwise monopoly practices will increase. The Federal antitrust agencies are overloaded now, and individual, specific cases necessarily do not receive the attention they need. This measure would be most useful to the Nation's 2 million small retailers who are victims of loss leaders. Small manufacturers and wholesalers would also be able to take private action against cutthroat and predatory pricing tactics. This bill would provide a check to these unfair practices.

"4. Argument against S. 995: This bill would cause more long and drawn out trouble in our courts, without particularly providing immediate relief to the parties injured by the cut prices. The question of law is of doubtful constitutionality and fighting a court case would cost a lot of time and money. Also, it's very hard to prove when a price is, or isn't, unreasonably low. There's also a question that current antitrust legislation may be sufficient, if vigorously enforced to obtain results. Additional regulations and legal haggling may only serve to cloud the issue."

The result of the poll of our nationwide membership was disclosed in Mandate No. 302:

"Here's the national summary of votes on issues in Mandate 301. This has been sent to all Congressmen and Senators, all congressional committees, and all agencies and individuals in the executive branch of our Government, for their information. It also has been sent to all State senators and Governors.

"[In percent]

	For	Against	No vote
1. H.R. 533. Increase personal tax exemption from $600 to $1,000	83	16	1
2. H.R. 467. Mark imported goods to show they are foreign made	88	9	3
3. H.R. 2953. Permit "plowback" into business 20 percent of all earnings, tax deductible	82	15	3
4. S. 995. Allow businessmen to go to court to protest against "loss leader" sales	63	29	8
5. H.R. 3428. Eliminate earnings ceiling on social security recipients	65	32	3"

Finally, I want to remind you that the President has said that production of new job openings for our growing population is one of our prime national goals. I would remind you also that there is a concensus in Government that the Nation must depend in greatest measure on small business, particularly in the service and retail trades—to provide new and additional job openings.

In this connection, as part of our current factfinding survey ("Small Business—The Nation's Largest Employer") we point out that small business currently provides 30 million or more jobs for our people. We are finding strong indication that during the past year as many as 1,500,000 of our country's smaller firms expanded or modernized opening up in the process as many as 3 million or more new jobs.

The fact is that our country must look to small business expansion or modernization for the new and additional jobs it needs.

Our survey shows, however, that small business' rate of expansion, while desirable and welcome in any category—was lowest where the job-producing need is greatest—the rate being 47.7 percent of all respondents in the manufacturer category (for an average 4.4 new jobs per expansion or modernization) against 30.1 percent rate among retailers (average new jobs: 1 per expansion or modernization) and a 33 percent rate among wholesalers (average new jobs 1.9 per expansion or modernization).

You know as well as do we—and small business responses to all our surveys emphasize this fact—that the whiplash of monopoly malpractice is most keenly felt in these very retail and service trades—be it in the area of unjustified price or other preferentials, in the area of dual distribution, or whatever.

If our Nation is to achieve its goal in production of new and additional jobs, this monopoly malpractice must be curbed. S. 995 will help do this job. Again we urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, such constructive legislation must be adopted so that small business can take cases into court on their own under this section of the antitrust laws. Otherwise monopoly will continue to increase.

TRIBUTE TO ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, many eloquent, as well as highly deserved tributes, have been and are being paid to Adlai Stevenson. I knew him well; he was my friend. He visited me in Alaska.

We served as Governors during some of the same years and it was always a privilege and a pleasure to meet him at the Governor's conferences. He enlightened them with his wisdom and wit.

Though his eloquent voice is stilled, his moving utterances will become a part of the great American tradition and an imperishable legacy for future generations.

An excellent appraisal of Adlai Stevenson appears in the current issue of Newsweek. I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Adlai Stevenson of Illinois, 1900–65," be printed at this point in my remarks. Likewise I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Anchorage Times entitled "Stevenson's Spirit Belongs to the Future" and an editorial from the Anchorage News entitled "Adlai Stevenson and the World of the 60's" be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Newsweek magazine, July 26, 1965]

Adlai Stevenson of Illinois, 1900–65

Suddenly he was there, alone and blinking self-consciously in the convention spotlights, staring unbelievingly over the prancing delegates and up at the roaring galleries. Never had a man so unconventionally unambitious reached such a pinnacle. Never had a major-party candidate for President looked somehow so un-Presidential.

And then, miraculously, the transformation: freshness came over the lined, lived-in face; under the freckled bald dome, the dumpy figure grew almost jaunty; and the sad blue eyes glinted with relish at the incongruity of himself and this 1952 Chicago convention and these Democratic throngs in search of a leader.

Finally the words came, and then he was truly formidable. Rich and rousing they were, sword strokes to the mind, outwardly unexceptionable yet deeply communicative, especially to those for whom politics had never before contained immediacy. He swept up millions of thoughtful members of the postwar generation, this intellectual with warmth; simply by his act of participation he seemed to help many bridge the cool distance they had kept from their own government.

Even when he lost, his admirers were not desolate; they only marveled that he—and they—had achieved so much and still survived. But 4 years later, when he lost a second time and became abruptly a political relic, most of the more prominent moved to other candidates, other causes, and ultimately to victories he was never permitted fully to share. Yet he was the teacher; he was the catalyst. And last week, while his old followers still used but no longer followed him, he lay dying of a massive heart attack on a London sidewalk, only a minute's walk from the U.S. Embassy.

SUMMER EVENING

Adlai Ewing Stevenson loved the political turmoil, but also loved the pause. In such a pause, in the soft early evening after a sunny day in London, he invited his old friend and fellow U.N. representative Marietta Tree, for a stroll along Upper Grosvenor Street. Quite suddenly he dropped to the pavement. Mrs. Tree, sensing what had happened, quickly gave him mouth-to-mouth resuscitation; a nearby doorman rushed for a doctor, and later put his rolled-up uniform jacket under his head. Ambulance attendants applied oxygen on the way to the hospital, but Adlai Stevenson never recovered consciousness, and 25 minutes after his collapse he was pronounced dead.

He had been in England on a private visit, a respite with old friends, between U.N. business in Geneva the previous week and a return to the daily grind of his duties as Ambassador to the United Nations in New York. The job had become a drudgery by now; increasingly of late he had felt neglected, even humiliated, when his superiors in Washington failed to consult or even inform him on policy decisions. Yet this man who had suffered two heavy defeats from a soldier was, in his own way, a soldier himself. His last interview, taped on the very morning of his death, was a vigorous defense of his President's foreign policy.

That President responded, "The flame which illuminated the dreams and expectations of an entire world is now extinguished," he declared, and dispatched Hubert Humphrey at the head of a delegation to bring the body back to Washington.

DEEP REGRET

Tributes came from former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower, from all over the world, and from some surprising sources as well. Even the old reliable U.S. baiter V. Krishna Menon of India volunteered his regrets. In Paris Soviet Ambassador Valerian Zorin, whom Stevenson had so forcefully rebutted during the Cuban missile crisis, spontaneously phoned U.S. Ambassador to France Charles Bohlen to express his deep personal regret.

For the family, Stevenson's third son, 29-year-old John Fell said: "I think you all know my father's public record. All I can add is that he was a very good father."

In London, the Humphrey delegation, which now contained Stevenson's sons, two daughters-in-law, and a sister, Mrs. Ernest Ives, paid their respects to the Governor's body—he always preferred to be called Governor—where it lay on a crimson-covered catafalque in the front hall of the U.S. Embassy. Thousands of Englishmen—he was always Britain's favorite American statesman—watched outside. Four hours later, the coffin was airborne.

FOUR RUFFLES

Early Thursday evening Adlai Stevenson returned for the last time to Washington. President Johnson was there to meet him, so were Cabinet and diplomatic delegations. An honor guard marched forward. Band members played four ruffles and flourishes as the flag-draped pine coffin was carried off the plane.

The body was taken to the National Cathedral where it lay in repose all the night and next morning. Thousands lined up and silently moved by the honor guard and past the closed coffin. At 11 o'clock the funeral began, at the very altar where, only last January, Stevenson himself had stood to eulogize Sir Winston Churchill. In the afternoon the body was flown to Springfield, Ill., and for 24 hours lay in state on the plain oak table which had borne Abraham Lincoln's body a hundred years ago.

On Sunday, Adlai Stevenson made his final journey home to Bloomington, and on Monday, in a private ceremony, he was buried in the family plot.

From the beginning, he was a man of paradox. His aura was that of the aristocratic East, yet his roots went into Middle Western history of the 1830's. His maternal great-grandfather, Jesse Fell, was the first man to propose Abraham Lincoln for the Presidency. His grandfather, the first Adlai Stevenson, was the Middle Western, ticket-balancing Vice President in New Yorker Grover Cleveland's second administration. Though Stevenson was born in Los Angeles—where his father was managing some of the Hearst mining and newspaper interests—the family returned to Bloomington when he was 6, and there he grew up.

REPORT CARD

Paradoxically, this most cultured of political candidates was such a mediocre student at the local high school that he had to be sent to the Choate School in Connecticut before he could be admitted to Princeton. His college record was undistinguished, so were his 2 years at Harvard Law School; he finally took his law degree at Northwestern in 1926. In the next 2 years he practiced law in Chicago, married Ellen Borden, a Chicago heiress of literary inclinations. They had three sons, Adlai III, Borden, and John Fell. (They were divorced for "incompatibility" in 1949; neither remarried.)

For the next two decades Stevenson lived the sort of life associated with the better sort of English aristocrat. With the advantage of a private income, he was able to leave his law practice for long periods of time. During the early New Deal, he was one of Franklin D. Roosevelt's bright young lawyers. When the United States went to war, Stevenson went to Washington. Later, for F.D.R. he led a mission to Italy to plan occupation policies; next he served as one of the advisers to the original United Nations Conference, in San Francisco.

All this was technician's work, anonymous as far as the public was concerned. In 1947, when Stevenson, at the age of 47, returned again to Illinois, there was nothing in his record to forecast that in 5 years he would become one of the most beloved men in U.S. politics. But gnarled old Jake Arvey was about to enter his life. Progressive as only a pragmatic boss politician can be, Arvey wanted a pair of "class" candidates to turn out the dismal Republican wheelhorses then in the Senate and the Governor's office. For Governor he chose Stevenson—after a recommendation from Secretary of State James Byrnes; for Senator, Prof. Paul Douglas, of the University of Illinois. Stevenson would have preferred the senatorial nomination, but Arvey preferred to match Marine hero Douglas against the Marine hero-incumbent, and noncombatant Stevenson against Gov. Dwight Green, whose war record was almost equally modest. Arvey knew what he was doing. In the election of 1948, Stevenson led the ticket with a majority that exceeded half a million; Douglas was not far behind, and together the two amateurs pulled old pro Harry Truman to a 35,000-vote State majority.

NO MISTAKES

His margin of victory was Stevenson's only sensational accomplishment over the next 3½ years. But he was a successful Governor, efficient, hard working, mildly liberal, and he made no mistakes. He doubled State aid to schools, made corruption in government more difficult—though not by any means impossible—and built new highways. He advocated, but could not enact an FEPC code.

Thus Adlai Stevenson at 52, in the prime of political life—unexceptionable as a glass of decent Beaujolais. He was mature, and as ambitious as he would ever be; he wanted only a second term as Governor. His intelligence and executive capacity were clearly on record. Only one other trait—if it actually was a trait, not merely an accusation—was yet to come into focus: indecisiveness.

Harry Truman wanted him to be President. Stevenson did not want to be President. It was as simple as that. From Mr. Truman's point of view, Stevenson was very nearly irresistible—a middle westerner who had led his ticket in a swing State, who had both statehouse and foreign policy experience and whom nobody was angry at.

Stevenson's thinking was considerably more complicated: he did not consider himself mentally, temperamentally, or physically fitted for the office; he wasn't even sure that any Democrat should win the Presidency at that time. Twenty years out of power had bred irresponsibility into the Republican party, he thought. Perhaps they needed a term in office to get back to reality.

"LET THIS CUP PASS"

To Harry Truman, to Jake Arvey, to dozens of other influential democratic pros, such reasoning was not only illogical, it was immoral. They refused to listen, increased their pressure, organized their support, and in the end Stevenson came as near to being drafted as any candidate in history. And the tone of his acceptance speech was equally unprecedented. "I have asked the merciful Father, the Father of us all, to let this cup pass from me," he said. "* * * That I have not sought this nomination * * * that I would not seek it in honest self-appraisal is not to say that I value it the less. Rather it is that I revere the office of the Presidency of the United States."

This admission of his own tortured conscience, along with his vaunted erudition and wit, delighted huge numbers of voters through sheer force of novelty. Equally huge numbers were put off, and in later years antagonized. They wanted their leaders solid, stolid, larger perhaps, but not notably different, from themselves. Dwight Eisenhower, though a glamorous figure, was basically one of their own. But Adlai Stevenson, no matter how many holes his shoe soles bore, no matter how steeped he was in the lore of Lincoln, couldn't fool them. He wasn't folks.

EGGHEADS, UNITE

In particular, the self-deprecation in his humor made people uneasy. Lines like "Eggheads of the world, unite. You have nothing to lose but your yolks" had no appeal for noneggheads. And while Adlaiphiles were deeply touched by his 1952 concession message ("[I'm] too old to cry, but it hurts too much to laugh"), many others squirmed in embarrassment.

No Democrat could have beaten Dwight Eisenhower in the 1952 and 1956 campaigns. The most popular American war hero of the century rode into office on waves of his own popularity and disenchantment with Democrats; he stayed there because he satisfied the bulk of the electorate. Certainly Stevenson ran two hard campaigns, and two different ones. The second time around, he unblushingly campaigned for the nomination. When Senator Estes Kefauver took a lead in the early primaries, Stevenson stepped up his pace, erased the lead, and then, showing a pro's adaptability, accepted the Senator as his running mate. (By expressing no preference between Kefauver and Senator John F. Kennedy, he again opened himself to charges of indecisiveness.)

In the day-to-day campaigning he developed into a good journeyman handshaker and even stopped feeling that it was somehow unethical not to write all his own speeches. He also conquered his embarrassment at repeating the same speech and the same phrases over and over. (Last week in England he was still repeating his post-1952 quip, "A funny thing happened to me on the way to the White House.")

Earlier, he had already showed he could hit back with his counterattacks on McCarthyism—"this hysterical form of putrid slander." In 1956, he castigated not only Ike's policies but what he called the "part-time President" himself. In all, he ran a livelier, more classic campaign, though less pleasing esthetically to some of his admirers. Domestically, he still remained somewhat to the left of Eisenhower, especially in his approach to civil-rights legislation. But his main contributions were in foreign policy. He suggested avoiding a commitment to protect Quemoy and Matsu. He proposed a trial nuclear test ban. (To this Ike replied: "There is no political campaign that justifies the declaration of a moratorium on commonsense." But 2 years later Eisenhower made a similar proposal to the Russians.)

FLAWS

But Stevenson's main contribution was in tone, not topic. Indeed, it is doubtful that John Kennedy would have staged the sort of campaign he did, had not Stevenson directed the prolog. (Certainly JFK learned from his predecessor's "flaws"; his wit never came fully to light until he was safely in the White House.)

After 1956 came the long downhill run. Stevenson practiced law, made speeches to wipe out the party debt, and dutifully rebuffed the depleted ranks of his followers when they sought his permission to work for a third nomination. But at the 1960 convention, he stood hopefully through a last-minute demonstration, some dubious gallery-packing, and an impassioned nomination speech by Senator Eugene McCarthy ("Do not reject this man"). In its futility, it was a heartbreaking moment—to everybody but Republicans and Kennedys. Indeed, this performance may have led to the last and bitterest frustration of his career. For Stevenson desperately wanted to be Secretary of State, but John F. Kennedy relegated him to the subordinate office of Ambassador to the U.N. For Adlai Stevenson the clock moved back 20 years, and he was a technician working for the State Department again, a glorified mouthpiece who was rarely consulted, barely needed and often wasn't even advised. His prestige among foreign delegates, which was enormous when he entered the U.N., tumbled sharply during the Bay of Pigs. Then the Kennedy administration instructed him to deny American participation in the invasion—only later to admit that U.S. personnel had indeed been deeply involved.

On the surface the amenities were never violated. Both the Presidents he served so diligently were unfailingly courteous in their personal relations with him; but both seemed to forget him when policy decisions were taken. He was both unconsulted and unhappy about some aspects of the Dominican intervention. The most recent blow to his pride came at last month's 20th anniversary meeting of the U.N., in San Francisco. L.B.J. astonished Stevenson by making charges against Communist China that Stevenson had advised him to use on a less festive occasion. Deeply affronted, Stevenson complained to intimates, but never in public.

Such incidents alienated him, not only from the administration, but from his job. His unhappiness showed in his personal life. He became a restless partygoer, and allowed himself to be taken up by cafe society. And, as always in his periods of despondence, he ate more than was good for him, then tried to compensate by playing tennis, a rough sport for a man of 65. He grew heavier, gloomier. At one U.N. delegation party, Stevenson—the official host—was discovered sitting alone on the back steps, munching a sandwich and staring tiredly at his scuffed shoes.

Why then did Stevenson not quit? As far back as the summer of 1963, he asked President Kennedy to relieve him, and he had certainly made his feelings equally clear to President Johnson. But though neither President particularly sought his advice, both needed his prestige and debating skill; they kept him on. Recently, however, he had decided to prepare for his resignation with a series of public statements, clearly affirming his support of administration foreign policy.

FRIENDS

He arranged things this way first to discourage the efforts of some of his old friends, including a number of eminent academicians, who seemed to think he should resign in a protest against U.S. policies in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. Some even wanted him to head an ad hoc group to oppose U.S. policies publicly. These suggestions appalled Stevenson, who was personally in full agreement with U.S. strategic policy in Vietnam, and had only minor tactical dissents on the Dominican Republic. He was galled and deeply depressed that those whom he had respected were so bitter in their opposition—and possessed of so little understanding of the facts.

Thus he knew that any sudden resignation, no matter how clearly explained, would be taken as his rejection of U.S. foreign policy, so he lingered on. And in London, in his last week, he told his friend Eric Sevareid of the only life he now longed for. "I would just like to sit in the shade with a glass of wine in my hands and watch people dance."

[From the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily Times, July 14, 1965]

STEVENSON'S SPIRIT BELONGS TO THE FUTURE

Adlai E. Stevenson once described the United Nations in a sentence which combined Illinois wit with a clear picture of the international battleground on which he served his country with honor. "It is a sanctuary * * * the roughest sanctuary I have ever been in." As U.S. ambassador to the sanctuary of the world on the shores of the East River in New York, Stevenson proved an able representative of his government and all the people of his country.

Twice he campaigned to represent the country in the White House. Twice his bid for the presidency was rejected as the Nation turned instead to Dwight D. Eisenhower. He stood on the threshold of the Democratic nomination again in 1960, had something gone astray in the organized drive mounted for John F. Kennedy. When Kennedy eventually won his narrow victory over Vice President Richard Nixon, Stevenson recalled his own stunning defeats and said the Democratic triumph was "very sweet to me."

It was Kennedy who selected Stevenson as ambassador to the United Nations, overruling admirers of the former Illinois Governor who sought for him the more high honor of Secretary of State. As history shows, the U.N. role fitted like a tailored robe on the shoulders of this man. In the international arena of world politics, Stevenson's saber-edged speeches pricked the conscience of the globe in a way infinitely more telling than his campaign speeches pierced the voters of this country.

Stevenson's campaign efforts, which won the hearts of the intellectuals but dismayed some of his own political followers in the gut-politics level of the big city wards, were by no means amateurish—despite the size of the Eisenhower landslides. His wit won the hearts of many—including those who were stirred by his remarks, but still voted for Ike.

Alaska got a firsthand look at Stevenson and his impressive oratory in 1954, when he addressed a crowd of 5,000 at Mulcahy Park, highlighting a visit which took him to the Matanuska Valley and included a 4-day fishing excursion. He proved an ardent supporter of statehood, and his insight on Alaska's future was keen.

"If the people of Alaska in the present state of development want statehood, they should have it," Stevenson said. He punctured the argument that Alaska could not meet the costs of self-government and development. "I seem to recall that most of the 35 States taken into the Union were pronounced insolvent or worse before their admission. And look at them now."

"Statehood can provide a framework within which to build a stable, integrated economy, based not on a colonial policy of exploitation but on a democratic policy of joint endeavor and self-improvement," the future ambassador said.

On a far larger scale in the last 5 years of his life, colonial problems the world over concerned Stevenson, who moved in the center of storms of Communist oppression, border wars, crises without end. In his role as spokesman for the United States before the United Nations, Stevenson carried—in the words of President Johnson—America's most eloquent spirit, its finest voice.

Communism, in the view of this spokesman for the West, was nothing more than organized terror. "It is without spiritual content or comfort. It provides no basic security." His articulate voice was stilled today on a London street, his life ended in a London hospital. His spirit belongs to America's future.

Adlai Stevenson and the World of the Sixties

In attempting to eulogize Adlai Stevenson one encounters an obstacle created by Stevenson himself. He was the most compelling American orator of the generation, perhaps the century. Any words said for him seem insufficient.

To some, the brilliant use of language will remain his only achievement. This would be enough. Language is but a vehicle by which we convey thought. If his speech was brilliant and compelling, so was his mind. He held an audience with the substance of his message, not his showmanship.

But Stevenson, by fate more than design, did more to shape the 1960's than any other living American.

For nearly a decade he served as the leader of the liberal political movement in this Nation. It was a movement that sought to attack what seemed unassailable—the slums of the city, white-and-blacks-onlys of the South, the humiliation of the hospital charity ward. It attacked a rich nation for perpetuating poverty and individual inequity.

He led a movement that recognized the revolt of oppressed peoples all over the globe. A movement that believed that assistance to a new black African nation or an old Asian colony was both a gesture of human charity and an investment in the security of the United States.

In other words, for nearly a decade, Adlai Stevenson was the leader, the chief spokesman, the prime innovator and idol for a political movement that came to power with the election of 1960. A political movement that now commands both the Presidency and both Houses of Congress.

John F. Kennedy did not create this movement. He captured it. He both rode and led it to power. It drew its force, its basic motivating ideas, it sense of purpose from Adlai Stevenson.

He was the pivotal wellspring around which proposals and personalities surfaced.

Perhaps his work in the United Nations and achievements as Governor of Illinois will be remembered.

But if any one American molded the America of the 60's it was Adlai Stevenson. This is his achievement. It is even more impressive when one considers that he held no elective office during the period.

The Nation did not elect him as its leader. But it is following his lead—J.R.

THE BASIS FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on June 26, 1965, the Washington Evening Star published an excellent article by Max Freedman entitled "Four Principles for Peace in Vietnam."

I believe this article is an excellent background for understanding why we are there and what we are faced with in Vietnam today. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Four Principles for Peace in Vietnam

(By Max Freedman)

In the report on Vietnam that Secretary of State Dean Rusk presented to the American Foreign Service Association there is a clear statement of the terms on which the war can be ended. These principles are laid down by the Government of South Vietnam and are endorsed by Rusk on behalf of the Johnson administration. They do not seek to impose a settlement on the Communists. They are not alibis for more bombing. They are a clear and constructive statement of the principles which can lead to an honorable settlement. Within these principles the actual process of diplomatic bargaining can proceed so that a settlement can be reached on a basis of agreed and mutual concessions.

On June 22 the Foreign Minister of South Vietnam set forth the fundamental principles for a "just and enduring peace." They are:

1. An end to aggression and subversion.
2. Freedom for South Vietnam to choose and shape for itself its own destiny "in conformity with democratic principles and without any foreign interference from whatever sources."
3. As soon as aggression has ceased, the ending of the military measures now necessary by the Government of South Vietnam and the nations that have come to its aid to defend South Vietnam, and the removal of foreign military forces from South Vietnam.
4. Effective guarantees for the independence and freedom for the people of South Vietnam.

After quoting these declarations of policy, Rusk went on to say:

"These are fundamental steps. When they are carried out, we can look forward, as we have stated previously, to the day when relations between North Vietnam and South Vietnam can be worked out by peaceable means. And this would include the question of a free decision by the peoples of North and South Vietnam on the question of reunification. This forthright and simple program meets the hopes of all and attacks the interests of none. It would replace the threat of conquest by the hope of free and peaceful choice."

Unfortunately, there is no reason to believe that North Vietnam will accept these terms even as a basis for discussion. North Vietnam already has rejected the overtures of peace proposed by Secretary General U Thant for the United Nations; by the 17 nonalined nations; by Prime Minister Shastri of India; by Britain on numerous occasions and by Canada without publicity. Now it is extremely suspicious of the British Commonwealth's mission for peace.

This bleak record does not include the contemptuous rejection by North Vietnam of all offers by the United States to explore the prospects for a peaceful settlement. The evidence is overwhelming that North Vietnam is counting on a victory for aggression and has therefore widened and intensified the war. But it is essential to the American position that the whole world should know that the United States, and even as it resists aggression, is working for peace and wants North as well as South Korea to share in the development program for southeast Asia proposed in April by President Johnson in his Baltimore speech.

Rusk explained that the suspension of bombing attacks in May was made known to the Communists in advance through diplomatic channels to see if there would be a response in kind. Hanoi denounced this effort for peace as a "wornout trick" and Peiping called it a "swindle."

Now it is being said that the pause was too short since it lasted for only a few days. To these critics Rusk replied that "the harsh reactions of the other side were fully known before the attacks were resumed. And I would also recall that we held our hand for more than 4 years while tens of thousands or armed men invaded the south and every attempt at peaceful settlement failed."

It is worth some emphasis, too, that Rusk defended the air raids as having achieved no more and no less than had been intended when the attacks began. No one in a position of power in the Johnson administration ever thought that the bombing attacks by themselves would bring North Vietnam to the conference table. But they have imposed heavy strains on North Vietnam; interrupted its lines of supply; raised the contingent threat of wider bombings; and placed both North Vietnam and Communist China under urgent notice that no sanctuary on the model of the Korean war would be tolerated. All this had been done on the direct instructions of Johnson in ways that have kept the loss of life to the absolute minimum possible in the cruel necessities of war.

In defiance of logic and its self-interest, North Vietnam is intensifying its aggressions while China is becoming steadily more threatening. But Rusk surely spoke for the Nation when he said, "The American people want neither rashness nor surrender. They want firmness and restraint. They expect courage and care. They threaten no one. And they are not moved by threats of others."

SUMMARY OF MAJOR DECISIONS OF CONFERENCE COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE ON H.R. 6675, THE SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate conferees of the House-Senate committee on H.R. 6675, I am happy to announce the decisions of the conference committee on H.R. 6675, the Social Security Amendments of 1965, a summary of which I set forth herewith. It is expected that the conference report will be filed by midnight of Monday, July 26, and will be available in printed form on Tuesday, July 27.

A summary of the major decisions of the conference committee follows:

BASIC HOSPITAL INSURANCE PLAN

Benefit duration: House provided 60 days of hospital care after a deductible of $40 currently. Senate provided unlimited duration but with a $10 coinsurance for each day in excess of 60. Conference provided 60 days with House bill deductible—$40 currently—and with an additional 30 days with the Senate's $10 coinsurance feature.

Posthospital extended care—skilled nursing home: House provided 20 days of such care with 2 additional days for each unused hospital day but a maximum of 100 days. Senate provided 100 days but imposed a $5 a day coinsurance for each day in excess of 20. Conference adopted Senate version.

Posthospital home-health visits: House authorized 100 visits after hospitalization. Senate increased the number of visits to 175 and deleted requirements of hospitalization. Conference adopted House version.

Outpatient diagnostic services: House imposed a $20 deductible with this amount creditable against an inpatient hospital deductible which was imposed at the same hospital within 20 days. Senate imposed a 20-percent coinsurance on such services, removed the credit against the inpatient hospital deductible but allowed a credit for the deductible as an incurred expense under the voluntary supplementary program—for deductible and reimbursement purposes. Conference adopted Senate version.

Psychiatric facilities: House provided for 60 days of psychiatric hospital care with a 180-day lifetime limit in the voluntary supplementary program. Senate moved these services over into basic hospital insurance program and increased the lifetime limit to 210 days. Conference accepted the Senate version but reduced the lifetime limit to 190 days.

House excluded any extended care facility primary for the care and treatment of mental diseases or tuberculosis. Senate included such facilities but made both psychiatric extended care days and psychiatric hospital days subject to the lifetime limitation of days of care. Conference continued the House exclusion.

Christian Science services: House covered Christian Science sanatoria under hospital services—60 days with $40 deductible. Senate added coverage for extended care and visiting nurse services. Under the conference agreement, Christian Science services will be covered as follows: Christian Science sanatoria services, 60 days with $40 deductible plus 30 additional days at $10 coinsurance per day, as hospital service; plus an additional 30 days in a Christian Science sanatorium as extended care facility services with a $5 per day coinsurance feature.

Scope of services, specialists: House excluded M.D. services in the field of pathology, radiology, physiatry, or anesthesiology from basic hospital insurance benefit—but provided for their payment under supplementary medical insurance program. Senate included these services if billed through a hospital. Conference accepted House version.

Emergency services for areas immediately bordering the United States: Senate provided hospital services in border areas immediately outside the United States where comparable services are not as accessible in the United States for a beneficiary who becomes ill in this country. Conference adopted Senate amendment.

Interns: House included, under inpatient hospital services, the services of medical interns and residents under approved training programs. Senate extended this provision to dental interns and residents in hospitals under approved training programs. Conference accepted Senate addition.

Drugs: House limited drugs to certain standard drug formularies and to those approved by hospital pharmacy and drug therapeutics committees. Senate added the Homeopathic Pharmacopoeia to the list of formularies and added a provision to include combination drugs if their principal ingredient is listed in one of the formularies. Conference accepted the Homeopathic Pharmacopoeia provision but did not accept the Senate's combination drug provision.

Eligibility of aliens under transitional provision for the uninsured: House specified that such aliens must have 10 years of residence prior to filing of application. Senate added a requirement of permanent residence but reduced residence requirement to 6 months before application. Conference increased the residence requirement to 5 years and retained requirement of permanent residence.

Federal employees, under transitional provision for the uninsured: House excluded all persons who had been eligible under the Federal Employee's Health Benefits Act of 1959—FEHBA—if they, or some other individual, had had the opportunity to enroll under that program. Senate excluded only those who are actually covered under FEHBA. Conference limited the scope of the Senate provision so that individuals who retired before February 16, 1965, and were not covered then under FEHBA will be eligible.

Railroad retirement employees: House bill taxed railroad workers and their employers directly under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with major administrative duties to be handled by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Senate put financing feature under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act and Railroad Retirement account, and with primary responsibility for administration under the Railroad Retirement Board. Conference agreement provided that taxes would be collected under the railroad system but paid into the hospital insurance trust fund. Railroad Retirement Board would determine eligibility but the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would reimburse providers—except Canadian hospitals. Like the Senate amendment the conference approach would be effective only if the railroad retirement taxable wage base is equivalent to the Federal hospital insurance tax earnings base—but, unlike the Senate amendment, such equivalence would be a continuing requirement which, if not met, would mean the system would revert to the approach provided in the House bill.

Appeals: House limited appeal to a hearing examiner and judicial review to claims of $1,000 or more. Senate reduced this amount to $100. Conference provided that for claims from $100 to $1,000 there would be hearing examiner review but no judicial review. For claims above $1,000 there would be both.

State standard for institutions: Conference accepted (with technical amendment) Senate amendment relating to higher State standards than those necessary for hospital accreditation.

Conference rejected following amendments added by the Senate:

Providing for a comprehensive study and report, with recommendations, on extended care facilities and nursing home care.

Making certain requirements for use of State agencies in certification of facilities.

Relating to transfer agreement between facilities in different States.

Requiring personal notice to health care beneficiaries of benefit rights.

SUPPLEMENTARY MEDICAL INSURANCE

Effective date: House effective date July 1, 1966. Senate effective date January 1, 1967. Conference accepted House version.

Medical services: House bill limited to physicians. Senate bill extended program to dentists performing certain dental surgeon functions and to chiropractors and podiatrists. Conference adopted dental surgeon's services but rejected those of podiatrists and chiropractors.

Eligibility of aliens: House made aliens ineligible unless admitted for permanent residence. Senate added a requirement of 10 years of residence. Conference reduced requirement to 5 years of residence and made any individual eligible if he was eligible for social security.

Drug study: Senate authorized a study of the feasibility of extending the program to prescribed drugs. Conference rejected this provision.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE—NEW TITLE XIX

Administering agency: House required that the single State agency administering the medical assistance program must be the agency administering title I or XVI—the welfare agency. Senate provided that any single State agency may be chosen by the State to administer the program providing the agency administering title I or XVI be used to determine eligibility. Conference adopted Senate version.

Future termination of existing medical vendor programs: House required that all existing medical programs in the five titles of the Social Security Act would be terminated on June 30, 1967. Senate gave States the option of continuing under existing law or under new program. Conference would terminate existing programs on December 31, 1969.

Kerr-Mills for children: House provided that dependent children and specified relatives caring for them under the age of 21 could be included even though they did not meet requirements for need and age under the State plans for aid to families with dependent children, but were otherwise qualified. Senate included all individuals under 21 and adults caring for them. Conference adopted Senate provision as to the coverage of children under 21 but accepted House provision as to coverage of the adult caretakers.

Dental services for children: House made dental services for children under 21 optional. Senate made them mandatory. Conference accepted House version.

State participation in non-Federal share: House provided that there must be only State participation in non-Federal share of matching by July 1, 1970. Senate provided an alternative under which local funds could be used after that date with certain safeguards. Conference adopted the Senate version.

Rejected Senate amendments: First, imposing Federal standards as to fire and safety on participating institutions; second, requiring that an individual will be entitled to medical assistance from the provider of his choice.

OTHER AMENDMENTS RELATING TO HEALTH CARE AND WELFARE

Services for emotionally disturbed children: Senate authorized special project grants for emotionally disturbed children; and authorized a study on prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of emotionally disturbed children. Conference removed the added authorization for project grants, but approved the study.

Child welfare services: Senate removed earmarking provision of existing law for day care services and increased child welfare authorizations to levels provided in the bill for maternal and child health and crippled children's programs. Conference approved Senate addition and established January 1, 1966, as the effective date.

SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Retirement test—earnings limitation: House provided for expansion of the $1 deduction for each $2 of earnings band—above the fully exempt $1,200 in existing law—from $1,700 to $2,400. Senate version increased the fully exempt amount from $1,200 to $1,800 and extended the $2 for $1 band to cover earnings between $1,800 and $3,000. Conference increased the fully exempt amount to $1,500 and applied the $2 for $1 band on earnings between $1,500 and $2,700.

Provisions relating to the disability insurance program:

First. Definition: House provided that an individual would be disabled if his disability had lasted 6 months. It also reduced the waiting period by 1 month. Senate provided that the disability have lasted, or can be expected to last, 12 months for eligibility. It retained waiting period in existing law. Conference adopted Senate version.

Second. Blindness: Senate added an alternative for insured status for disability benefits of six quarters of coverage, acquired at any time, for individuals who meet liberalized definition of blindness. For insured status under existing law, an individual—first, must have at least 20 quarters of coverage in the 40 quarters ending with the quarter in which the disability begins, and, second, must be fully insured. Under the Senate definition for both the freeze and benefit purposes the following degree of blindness was deemed disabling: Central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye with the use of correcting lenses, or visual acuity greater than 20/200 if accompanied by a limitation in the fields of vision such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle no greater than 20°.

Under existing law, for benefit purposes, an individual must be precluded from engaging in any substantial gainful activity by reason of a physical or mental impairment. The following definition of blindness is deemed disabling for disability "freeze" purposes: Central visual acuity of 5/200 or less in the better eye with use of correcting lens. An eye in which the visual field is reduced to 5 degrees or less concentric contraction shall be considered as having a visual acuity of 5/200 or less.

Conference substituted the following two provisions for the Senate amendment:

First. Young workers who are blind and disabled: Establishes alternative insured status requirement for workers disabled before age 31 of one-half of the quarters elapsing after age 21 up to the point of disability with a minimum of 6 quarters. To qualify for this alternative the worker would have to meet the statutory definition of blindness for the disability "freeze" noted above. Worker will, however, have to meet the other regular requirements for entitlement to disability benefits, including inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity.

Second. Older workers who are blind and disabled: Provides that those individuals aged 55 or over who meet the statutory definition of blindness in the disability "freeze" could qualify for cash benefits on the basis of their inability to engage in their past occupation or occupations. Their benefits would not be paid, however, if they were actually engaging in any substantial gainful activity.

Third. Vocational rehabilitation for disability beneficiaries: Conference adopted Senate provision that State vocational rehabilitation agencies will be reimbursed from the social security trust funds for the cost of rehabilitation services furnished to individuals who are entitled to disability insurance benefits or to a disabled child's benefits, except that the total sums available for this purpose could not, in any year, exceed 1 percent of the disability benefits paid in the previous year.

Fourth. Offset for workmen's compensation: Senate provided that the social security disability benefit for any month for which a worker is receiving a workmen's compensation benefit will be reduced to the extent that the total benefits payable to him and his dependents under both programs exceed 80 percent of his average monthly earnings prior to the onset of disability, but with the reduction periodically adjusted to take account of changes in national average earnings levels. The offset provision will be applicable with respect to benefits payable for months after December 1965 on the basis of application, filed after December 31, 1965; Conference adopted Senate version except disability would have to commence after June 1, 1965.

Coverage provisions:

First. Cash tips: House provided for the coverage of tips reported by the employee to the employer—with the employer to report such income and withhold for income tax purposes. No liability would be imposed on the employer for tips that are not reported nor in cases where he does not have or is not given funds to cover the employee's share of the tax. Senate provided that cash tips received would be considered as self-employment income. Conference generally follows House provision for social security and income tax purposes with the major exception that no social security tax liability would be imposed on the employer.

Second. Coverage of doctors of medicine: House covered doctors of medicine effective for taxable years ending after December 31, 1965. Senate moved up the effective date to taxable years ending on or after December 31, 1965. Conference adopted Senate version.

Third. Ministers: Senate reopened to April 15, 1966, the period—which expired on April 15, 1965—during which ministers who have been in the ministry for at least 2 years may file waiver certificates electing social security coverage. Conference accepted.

Fourth. Coverage of employees of State and local governments:

First. House added "Kentucky" and "Alaska" as States which could provide coverage for State and local employees under the split-system provision. Senate and conference deleted "Kentucky."

Second. Senate reopened until July 1, 1970, a provision of law permitting the State of Maine to treat teaching and nonteaching employees actually in the same retirement system as though they were in separate retirement systems for social security coverage purposes. Conference accepted but limited option to July 1, 1967.

Third. Senate authorized the State of Iowa and the State of North Dakota to modify their coverage agreements to exclude from social security coverage certain service performed in any calendar quarter in the employ of a school, college, or university by a student if the remuneration for such service is less than $50. Conference accepted.

Fourth. Conference accepted Senate validation of past coverage of employees in certain school districts in Alaska.

The conference also adopted the following Senate amendments on social security:

First. Remarried widows: Benefits would be payable to widows aged 60 or over and to widowers aged 62 or over who remarry—the amount of the benefit to be equal to 50 percent of the primary benefit of the deceased spouse if that amount is higher than the wife's, or widower's, benefit as a result of the remarriage.

Second. Children's benefits:

(a) Included in definition of child is a child who cannot inherit his father's intestate personal property if the father had acknowledged him in writing, had been ordered by a court to contribute to his support, had been judicially decreed to be his father or had been shown by other satisfactory evidence to be his father and was living with or contributing to his support.

(b) An exception is provided so that child's benefits would not terminate if child is adopted by his brother or sister after death of worker. Under present law benefits terminate unless he is adopted by his stepparent, grandparent, uncle, or aunt after death of worker on whose earnings record he is getting benefits.

Third. Social security records. The Social Security Administration is required to furnish information to help locate deserting parent or husband to any welfare agency or court. Conference accepted amendment with modification that information must be transmitted through a welfare agency—if to a court—that an actual public assistance case must be involved, and that all nondisclosure provisions be complied with.

Fourth. Court fees. A court that renders a judgment favorable to a claimant in an action arising under the social security program is permitted to set a reasonable fee—not in excess of 25 percent of past due benefits which become payable by reason of the judgment—for an attorney who successfully represented the claimant. The Secretary would be permitted to certify payment of the fee to the attorney out of such past due benefits.

Conference rejected the following social security amendments added by the Senate:

Provision that the Secretary, rather than State agency, can make determinations of disability or cessation of disability where medical and other information or evidence indicates, on its face, that the individual is under a disability or that the disability has ceased.

Reducing from 62 to 60 the age at which an eligible worker could elect to start getting an actuarially reduced benefit.

Providing that the amount of the 1965 social security benefit increase would not be counted toward the Veterans' Administration income limitation.

Provision relating to reduction of total employer tax as to a worker employed consecutively by two affiliated corporations.

Expansion of disabled child's benefit to children disabled at age 18–21—now prior to age 18.

FINANCING OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND HOSPITAL INSURANCE PROGRAMS

Earnings base: The House bill established an earnings base of $5,600 a year in 1966 and $6,600 in 1971 and thereafter. The Senate provided an earnings base of $6,600 in 1966. The Conference accepted the Senate figure of $6,600 in 1966.

The following are the tax rates for the House, Senate, and conference for both systems:

OASDI tax rates

[In percent]

Years	Employer-employee rate			Self-employed rate, conference
	House	Senate	Conference	
1966	8.0	7.7	7.7	5.8
1967–68	8.0	7.7	7.8	5.9
1969–72	8.8	9.0	8.8	6.6
1973 and after	9.6	9.9	9.7	7.0

Hospital insurance tax rates

[In percent]

Years	Employer-employee rate			Self-employed rate, conference
	House	Senate	Conference	
1966	0.7	0.65	0.7	0.35
1967–70	1.0	1.0	1.0	.5
1971–72	1.0	1.1	1.0	.5
1973–75	1.1	1.3	1.1	.55
1976–79	1.2	1.4	1.2	.6
1980–86	1.4	1.6	1.4	.7
1987 and after	1.6	1.7	1.6	.8

The conference established the allocation to the disability insurance trust fund at 0.70 percent of taxable wages and 0.525 of self-employment income. The figures under existing law are 0.50 and 0.375 percent, respectively.

INCOME TAX PROVISIONS

The Senate had deleted the House provision which would have limited the deduction for medical care expense of taxpayers—or dependent parents—aged 65 or over to the amount in excess of 3 percent of adjusted gross income and which would have limited the amount of medicine and drug costs included in medical care expenses to the amounts in excess of 1 percent of adjusted gross income. The conference restored the House provision.

The Senate had also deleted the House provision which would have allowed all taxpayers to deduct one-half of the cost of medical-care insurance—up to $250 a year—outside the regular medical expense category. Conference restored House provision but reduced maximum deduction to $150 a year.

The conference accepted Senate amendment which eliminates all maximum limitations on the medical expense deduction for all taxpayers.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Effective date: House put effective date of increased Federal matching through formula change for all five public assistance programs at January 1, 1966. Senate advanced date to June 30, 1965. Conference adopted House version.

Income exemptions:

First. Aid to families with dependent children: Senate added an amendment which allows the State, at its option, to disregard up to $50 per month of earned income of any three dependent children under the age of 18 in the same home. Conference modified Senate amendment so as to put a family maximum of $150 in earnings per month not limited to three children but no child could have earnings of more than $50 exempted.

Second. Aid to the permanently and totally disabled and combined program (title XVI): Senate added an exemption of earnings, at the option of the State, for recipients of aid to the permanently and totally disabled. As is the case of the aged, the first $20 per month of earnings and one-half of the next $60 could be exempted. In addition, any additional income and resources could be exempted as part of an approved plan to achieve self-support during the time the recipient was undergoing vocational rehabilitation—essentially under existing law in the aid to the blind program. Conference accepted Senate provision.

Third. Income exemption for all public assistance programs: Senate allowed States, at their option, to disregard not more than $7 per month of any income in all five public assistance programs. Conference adopted Senate amendment but reduced figure to $5 per month.

Protective payments: House included a provision for protective payments to third persons on behalf of old-age assistance recipients (and recipients of combined adult program, title XVI) unable to manage their money because of physical or mental incapacity. Senate extended the same provision for protective payments to the programs of aid to the blind and aid to the permanently and totally disabled. Conference accepted Senate provision.

Children in school: Senate added an amendment broadening the definition of "school" in existing law (high school) to include any school or college at the State's option, with respect to continuing payments under Aid to Families with Dependent Children from 18 up to age 21 if they are attending such schools. Conference adopted Senate amendment.

Uniform matching: Conference accepted Senate amendment which would permit a State that has a medical assistance program under title XIX to claim Federal sharing in total expenditures for money payments under other titles, under the same formula used for determining the Federal share for medical assistance under title XIX.

MISCELLANEOUS

Conference rejected additional language added by Senate relating to optometrists' services under all titles of the Social Security Act. (House language on optometrists' services retained.)

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point actuarial data for Social Security Amendments of 1965, H.R. 6675, furnished by Mr. Robert J. Myers, Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration.

There being no objection, the data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Summary of 1st-year costs under H.R. 6675*

[In millions of dollars]

	Trust funds			General Treasury		
	House	Senate	Conference	House	Senate	Conference
Health care programs:						
Basic hospital insurance	2,190	2,403	2,210	275	295	290
Voluntary supplementary medical	[1] 600	[1] 600	600	600	600	600
MAA liberalization	----------	----------	----------	200	200	200
Total	2,790	3,003	2,810	1,075	1,095	1,090
OASDI:						
7-percent benefit increase	1,430	1,470	1,470	----------	----------	----------
Child school benefit	195	195	195	----------	----------	----------
Broader definition of "child"	----------	10	10	----------	----------	----------
Child disabled at 18 to 21	----------	10	----------	----------	----------	----------
Blind disability	----------	120	5	----------	----------	----------
Reduced benefits at 60	165	590	165	----------	----------	----------
Transitional benefits at 72	140	140	140	----------	----------	----------
Disability definition	105	40	40	----------	----------	----------
Retirement test	65	590	295	----------	----------	----------
Total	2,100	3,165	2,320	----------	----------	----------

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Summary of 1st-year costs under H.R. 6675*—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Trust funds			General Treasury		
	House	Senate	Conference	House	Senate	Conference
Public assistance and child health:						
Increase in formula				150	150	150
TB and mental exclusion				75	75	75
Coverage of MA					50	40
Maternal and child health				60	61	61
Miscellaneous				6	13	13
Total				291	349	339
Income tax changes				−82		−97
Total, all programs	4,890	6,168	5,130	1,284	1,444	1,332
Grand total, House			6,174			
Grand total, Senate			7,612			
Grand total, conference			6,462			

[1] Contributions of participants.

TABLE 2

OASDI TAX RATES

[In percent]

Years	Employer-employee rate			Self-employed rate, conference
	House	Senate	Conference	
1966	8.0	7.7	7.7	5.8
1967–68	8.0	7.7	7.8	5.9
1969–72	8.8	9.0	8.8	6.6
1973 and after	9.6	9.9	9.7	7.0

HOSPITAL INSURANCE TAX RATES

1966	0.7	0.65	0.7	0.35
1967–70	1.0	1.0	1.0	.50
1971–72	1.0	1.1	1.0	.50
1973–75	1.1	1.3	1.1	.55
1976–79	1.2	1.4	1.2	.60
1980–86	1.4	1.6	1.4	.70
1987 and after	1.6	1.7	1.6	.80

COMBINED OASDI AND HOSPITAL INSURANCE TAX RATES AND TAXES UNDER CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

	Percent		*Percent*	
1966	8.4	$554.40	6.15	$405.90
1967–68	8.8	580.80	6.40	422.40
1969–72	9.8	646.80	7.10	468.60
1973–75	10.8	712.80	7.55	498.30
1976–79	10.9	719.40	7.60	501.60
1980–86	11.1	732.60	7.70	508.20
1987 and after	11.3	745.80	7.80	514.80

TABLE 3.—*Change in actuarial balance of OASDI system, expressed in terms of estimated level-cost as percentage of taxable payroll*

[In percent]

Item	OASI	DI	Total
Actuarial balance of previous system	+0.14	−0.13	+0.01
Earnings base increase to $6,600	+.51	+.04	+.55
Revised contribution schedule	+.09	+.20	+.29
Extensions of coverage	+.01		+.01
7-percent benefit increase	−.59	−.05	−.64
Earning tests liberalization	−.14		−.14
Child's benefits to age 22 if in school	−.10	−.02	−.12
Reduced widow's benefits at age 60			
Disability definition revision		−.01	−.01
Transitional insured status at age 72	−.01		−.01
Broader definition of child	−.01		−.01
Total effect of changes	−.24	+.16	−.08
Actuarial balance of bill	−.10	+.03	−.07

TABLE 4.—*Actuarial balance of hospital insurance system expressed in terms of estimated level-cost as percentage of taxable payroll*

Item:	*Level-cost percent*
Hospital and extended care facility benefits	1.19
Outpatient diagnostic benefits	.01
Home health service benefits	.03
Total benefits	1.23
Contributions	1.23
Actuarial balance	.00

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, today is the midpoint of the 1965 commemoration of Captive Nations Week and if there has been one outstanding characteristic of this year's national observance it has been the lack of enthusiasm on the part of this administration. There has been almost no publicity on the event and it is highly likely that the week will slip quietly by and most Americans will be completely unaware of its significance. This lack of enthusiasm has manifested itself in both the present administration and the Democratic administration which immediately preceded it. It is almost as if the administration wished the formal resolution of Congress declaring the third week in July to be Captive Nations Week had never been signed into law by President Eisenhower.

There are those who still do not want to say anything that might aggravate the Communists in spite of the fact that we are spending billions of dollars and losing hundreds of lives each year for no other reason than that the Communists present a constant and aggressive threat to the free world. The Captive Nations Week proclamation issued quietly on July 3 in Austin, Tex., by the President does not even mention the Communists. It seems to me remarkable that we can dedicate ourselves to the just aspirations of enslaved people to be free in the captive nations throughout the world and never once mention the cause of their misery. This is a far cry from the initial intent of Congress and a far cry from the resolute proclamation first issued by President Eisenhower in 1959.

In 1959, President Eisenhower said:

> Many nations throughout the world have been made captive by imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism.

There was no room for doubt about the meaning of his proclamation and in fact it was this candid and courageous statement on behalf of captive peoples everywhere that was directly responsible for the now famous kitchen debate between former Vice President Richard Nixon and then Soviet Premier Khrushchev. Since that time, succeeding administrations have shown increasing reluctance to show similar candor in their proclamations.

Consequently, we note that President Kennedy in 1961 merely said:

> It is in keeping with our national tradition that the American people manifest its interest in the freedom of other nations.

And in 1962 that—

> The principles of self-government and human freedom are universal ideals and the common heritage of mankind.

Not once in the five proclamations issued by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson has Soviet or Chinese Communist imperialism been mentioned by name. In view of this watering down and soft-pedaling of the captive nations issue generally, and the Captive Nations Week proclamation in particular, I think it appropriate at this time to give a little background on the reason for celebrating Captive Nations Week.

The initial resolution passed by Congress proclaimed that some 20-odd nations had been robbed of their freedom and national independence by Russian communism. It recognized that these people continue to aspire to freedom and national independence and that these goals are precluded only because of the force of Russian arms and occupation. The resolution authorized an annual Presidential proclamation until all captive nations were free and independent and called for the support of our Government in the efforts of these people to achieve self-determination.

The initial resolution included those nations made captive at the close of World War II. These nations are Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, China, and East Germany. It also included those made captive by the Nazi-Communist Pact of 1939: Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Those made captive by Russian communism between World War I and World War II were also incorporated into the resolution: Byelorussia, Georgia, Azerbaidjan, North Caucusus, Idel-Ural, Cossackia, Ukraine, Armenia, and Turkestan. Those nations held captive by the Russians but not mentioned in the resolution are Cuba and Yugoslavia.

In addition to the Russian Communists, there are also those nations which have fallen under the hand of the Chinese Communists. These include North Korea, Tibet, North Vietnam, and, of course, the 700 million people of mainland China itself.

Mr. President, this matter has long been of serious concern to me as well as to millions of Americans. While serving in the other body of this Congress, I joined with a number of my colleagues in commemorating Captive Nations Week and made a statement which I believe to be still pertinent today. I therefore request unanimous consent that appropriate portions of my remarks of July 9, 1962, made from the well of the House of Representatives, be included in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Captive Nations Week

(Excerpts from statement by Senator Peter H. Dominick, in the U.S. House of Representatives, July 9, 1962)

The vast majority of Americans retain deep in their souls the fundamentals of human rights set forth in the Declaration of Independence and fortified in the Bill of Rights:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Millions of people from all over the globe have rushed to these shores in answer to this clarion call and have served with distinction in our Armed Forces in battles against tyranny over the world—battles which history has shown were necessary to preserve the right to liberty so deeply proclaimed by our heritage.

Yet today there are millions of people throughout the world held in bondage by the greatest conspiracy against freedom in the history of the world and we are doing relatively nothing. In Eastern Europe alone there are 22 countries with millions of inhabitants held in physical and spiritual slavery by a few hundred thousand Communist stooges backed up by the armed forces of the Soviet Union.

Lest we forget the inhuman nature of this slavery, it is worthwhile repeating some few facts which might otherwise be shrouded in the mists of time. Over 290,000 Latvian citizens were deported, murdered, or sent to slave labor camps by the Soviet Communists in the period from 1944 to 1950.

During the collectivization drive in 1948 and 1949, more than 287,000 Lithuanians were deported to Siberia. In a 3-day period in 1949 alone, over 30,000 people were deported from Estonia to Soviet slave labor camps with constant additional purges occurring in 1950 and 1951.

Witnesses have testified before our own House Select Committee on Communist Aggression that 1,692,000 persons were deported by the Soviet Communists from Poland during 1939–41 alone. Fifteen thousand prisoners of war, mostly Polish officers, were murdered in cold blood by the Soviets in the spring of 1940 at Katyn Forest. Millions of people in Hungary are prevented forcibly from the exercise of any fundamental human right by approximately 150,000 members of the Communist Party ruling by the force of guns, torture, slave labor, and the discipline of fear and hopelessness.

The ruthless display of power by the Soviets in subduing the Hungarian revolution and the East German youth revolt are still clear horrors in the minds of all of us. Rumanians, Bulgarians, Yugoslavs, and Germans are held in forcible subjection by a few thousand Communist thugs using machineguns, torture chambers, slave labor camps, and constant repetition of outright lies designed to brainwash the young, the gullible, and the unknowledgeable.

The minds, hearts, cultures, and beliefs of the people in the captive nations are still dreaming of their human right to freedom—of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Many are still risking their very lives to escape from the horror chambers imposed upon their minds and spirits. We should stimulate their feeling of independence—their drive for restoration of government based on self-determination. We should reiterate to the world our belief that the very spiritual forces which are largely responsible for this great country of ours will someday be available to the captive nations. We should cut off all aid to Communist governments and offer aid under our supervision to the people within the captive nations. We should establish the proposed freedom academy.

We should try to force through the General Assembly of the United Nations a thorough investigation of the methods used by the Communists to capture these countries, the methods used to keep the people in subjugation, the horrors perpetrated by the Communists on the millions from the captive nations who have been ruthlessly deported, placed in labor camps, liquidated, or tortured. We should give aid and assistance to refugee groups to maintain communications with the people within these countries. We should support all missionary groups trying to prevent the ruthless atheism of communism from taking over the souls of those within these areas.

We have in the people of the captive nations one of the greatest assets in our struggle for freedom—an asset which could literally start the downfall of the Communist empire if properly used.

We must not only reaffirm the basic human rights of these captive nation people by words, but we must make use of all available methods to act on these premises if we are to make progress in winning the cold war. We must move forward within our own basic tenets to give the opportunity to the people of this world to live with dignity and justice.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, one of the most knowledgeable and courageous exiles from communism we have in this country is the present Secretary General of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, Mr. Brutus Coste. While Mr. Coste's organization has a particular interest in the Captive European Nations, their sympathies, encouragement, and assistance have gone out to those citizens of captive nations in other parts of the world. Recently, Mr. Coste wrote an outstanding memorandum entitled, "The Road to Freedom in East-Central Europe," which I believe should receive the serious consideration of all Members of this body. While this rational and incisive analysis deals specificially with east-central Europe, its arguments are quite applicable to other Communist-dominated states. Because of its relevance to the philosophy behind the initial captive nations resolution, I request unanimous consent that the referenced memorandum dated March 24, 1965, be included in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Road to Freedom in East-Central Europe

I

The prevalent view in the West is that the situation in Europe has undergone a significant change for the better during the last 2 years. Fully absorbed by the rift with Red China, by difficulties with its Eastern European satellites and by domestic problems, the Soviet Union is supposed to have dropped any expansionist aim in Europe. Preoccupation with the war in Vietnam and economic prosperity, as well as an overoptimistic assessment of developments in east-central Europe, further feed the impression that Western Europe is not only secure but can look forward patiently to the gradual recession of Soviet influence.

The Assembly of Captive European Nations cannot share this optimistic evaluation of recent events in Europe. In the view of the assembly, one can at best speak of a change of Soviet tactics in Europe. The policy of intimidation, as symbolized by the Berlin ultimatum (1958–62), foundered on the shores of Cuba. The emphasis is now on political penetration through the old device of popular fronts. The new, nationalist and moderate, image some of the Western European Communist Parties are striving to project is likely to serve this purpose regardless whether or not it was a genuine emancipation from a rigid, Moscow-set course of policy. But this new emphasis on political penetration in no way excludes the danger of a return to the policy of intimidation. The possibility, indeed, that Moscow may revert sooner or later to the attempt of gaining ground by pressures, backed up by conventional military power, cannot be discarded. In this context, the practical deterrent influence the nations of Eastern Europe represent, to the extent they endanger Soviet lines of communication, constitutes a factor of Western European security which cannot and should not be neglected.

There can be no doubt that the Communist world is beset with troubles. The deepening Moscow-Peiping rift, the instability inherent in the collective-type of leadership the Soviet Union has had since the ouster of Khrushchev, the structural crisis of Communist agriculture, the more and more obvious inadequacy of rigid economic planning—are undeniably hampering Soviet expansionism.

But these developments should not obscure the fact that Communist aims have not changed; that Soviet military power remains deployed in East Germany, Poland, Hungary, and the Baltic States, that is, in the heart of Europe; that the apparently increased autonomy of the Communist Parties in Western Europe enhances their effectiveness; that the new projection of the satellites as genuinely independent removes an important obstacle to Communist advances through political penetration and internal subversion; that the widely heralded changes in Eastern Europe have not altered the nature of the Communist regimes of their basic, if less evident, dependence on Moscow; that these changes are designed to make the Communist system work and thus render it domestically more acceptable and internationally more respectable.

If one is mindful of the divergencies which have developed recently within the Western Alliance and of the slackening of the sense of danger in Europe under the impact of a rather optimistic view of the crisis the Communist world is undergoing, one can only conclude that difficulties are present on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Opportunities to gain ground, therefore, appear to be open to both the free and the Communist side.

It is the considered view of ACEN that if the free nations hold their ground in the next few years and continue to demonstrate their determination to help the people in East-Central Europe to recover full freedom and independence, while refraining from actions apt to lend prestige or to help the Communist regimes to solve their serious economic problems, necessity will compel these regimes to adopt more rational ways involving greater freedom of action for economically essential segments of the population, such as the technological and managerial elite and the peasants. Concessions induced by pressure and necessity might unleash an irreversible process of disintegration of the totalitarian pattern. The very nature of the Soviet regime, with its built-in crises of succession and civil war potential, might provide the opportunity for such a process culminating in acts of self-deliverance.

II

To further the process of national and human emancipation in Eastern Europe, it is essential to distinguish carefully between the peoples of east-central Europe, the potential allies of the West, and the Communist rulers who keep them in bondage.

It is imperative to avert any kind of actions apt to be construed as acceptance of the finality of the political status quo in Eastern Europe.

It is most useful to indicate by appropriate diplomatic actions awareness that uniting Europe in its natural borders and making politically, militarily, and economically self-reliant is, in the long run, the only sound and dependable foundation for peace and security in the key area of Europe.

It is necessary to show awareness of the fact that in spite of the differences from one eastern European country to another, their situation is fundamentally the same. Their relationship to the Soviet Union cannot be defined in terms of an alliance or a mutual security arrangement. The Soviet Government guarantees, indeed, the Communist regimes against their internal enemies rather than national territory against external aggression. The certainty of Soviet intervention acts as a deterrent upon the ruled and an assurance to the rulers. In such conditions the attitude of the majority toward the regimes remains one of mute hostility. This hostility and the pressures it causes, chiefly in the form of noncooperation and other types of passive resistance, is a proven source of positive changes, particularly when it goes hand in hand with steady pressures from without. It creates, moreover, for the Soviet Union a risk factor, which has played in the past and, given the growing nuclear stalemate, may again play in the future an important deterrent role to Soviet aggressiveness.

One can hardly stress enough that the diminution of unnecessary terror in east-central Europe, on the pattern adopted in the Soviet Union, does not mean a basic change in the Communist system. The dictatorial rule by a single party, a minority group, supported by police and military forces, remains the essential feature of the Communist regimes. The freedoms of speech, press, assembly, and association are still denied in East-Central Europe. There is no multiparty system, in spite of the nominal existence, in some countries, of sham peasant or democratic parties which have adopted the platform of the Communist Party and have acknowledged its leading role. The elections are still held with single governmental lists. There are no opposition candidates. This one-party system is basically the same in the nine captive countries, in spite of some differences in the degree of police control and of the operation of the economic system. Guarantees against arbitrary arrest and detention and the rule of law are still conspicuous by their absence. Religion and churches continue to be persecuted.

In all the East European countries the peasants constitute the majority of the population. But, with the single exception of Poland, they have been deprived of their freedom and their land by collectivization, which was enforced in most of the area during the last decade, after the death of Stalin. Consequently, the peasants are deeply hostile to the dictatorship of the Communist minority.

III

For all these reasons it is incumbent upon the Assembly of Captive European Nations to stress that, both in the short- and long-term perspective, the Western Powers have a vital stake in the friendship of the peoples of Eastern Europe and a clear interest in fostering among them the belief that there is for them reasonable hope of deliverance.

In this conviction, the assembly appeals to the governments and peoples of the free world, and particularly to the U.S. Government:

1. To reaffirm at every appropriate occasion the validity of the war time and postwar legal commitments and pledges with respect to Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Romania and to ask compliance therewith.

2. To call before the United Nations and in negotiation with the Soviet Union for an all-European settlement based on the right of self-determination and to seek the withdrawal of Soviet troops from east-central Europe, the restoration of political and human rights and free elections under international supervision.

3. To demand a United Nations inquiry of the state of human rights and fundamental freedoms in east-central Europe, including an investigation of conditions in prisons and forced labor camps.

4. To exact—as proposed by the executive council of the AFL–CIO in its statement of March 1, 1965—in return for whatever credits or other economic advantages the free nations may deem expedient to grant, commensurate concessions in the form of: (a) effective and self-enforcing measures to assure the exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms to the peoples of east-central Europe; (b) changes in the economic policies of the Communist regimes designed to foster social welfare and do away with the present, politically motivated but economically deficient course of policy, both in agriculture and industry; and (c) hard and fast commitments to put an end to Soviet economic exploitation by means of discriminatory prices in the foreign trade between the Soviet Union and the individual east-central European countries and thus make certain that Western credits will not indirectly subsidize the economy of the Soviet Union.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I hope that all of our citizens will be made aware of the significance of this Captive Nations Week. Each of us in Congress has the responsibility to bring this about and I am delighted to join with so many of my colleagues in this endeavor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHARTER ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The **Legislative Clerk.** A bill (S. 1118) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill, which had been reported with an amendment, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, subject to the retention by Congress of the ultimate legislative authority over the Nation's Capital which is granted by the Constitution, it is the intent of Congress to restore to the inhabitants of the District of Columbia the powers of local self-government which are a basic privilege of all American citizens; to reaffirm through such action the confidence of the American people in the strengthened validity of principles of local self-government by the elective process; to promote among the inhabitants of the District the sense of responsibility for the development and well-being of their community which will result from the enjoyment of such powers of self-government; to provide for the more effective participation in the development of the District and in the solution of its local problems by those persons who are most closely concerned; and to relieve the National Legislature of the burden of legislating upon purely local District matters. It is the further intention of Congress to exercise its retained ultimate legislative authority over the District only insofar as such action shall be necessary or desirable in the interest of the Nation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title I—Definitions

Sec. 101. Definitions.

Title II—Status of the District

Sec. 201. Status of the District.

Title III—The District Council

Part 1—Creation of the District Council

Sec. 301. Creation and membership.
Sec. 302. Qualifications for holding office.
Sec. 303. Compensation.
Sec. 304. Procedure for changes.

Part 2—Principal Functions of the District Council

Sec. 321. Board of Commissioners abolished and functions transferred to District Council.
Sec. 322. Functions relating to zoning and other agencies.
Sec. 323. Certain delegated functions.
Sec. 324. Powers of and limitations upon District Council.

Part 3—Organization and Procedure of the District Council

Sec. 331. The Chairman.
Sec. 332. Secretary of the District Council; records and documents.
Sec. 333. Meetings.
Sec. 334. Committees.
Sec. 335. Acts and resolutions.
Sec. 336. Passage of acts.
Sec. 337. Procedure for zoning acts.
Sec. 338. Investigations by District Council.

Title IV—Mayor

Sec. 401. Election, qualifications, and salary.
Sec. 402. Powers and duties.

Title V—The District budget

Sec. 501. Fiscal year.
Sec. 502. Budgetary details fixed by District Council.
Sec. 503. Adoption of budget.
Sec. 504. Budget establishes appropriations.
Sec. 505. Supplemental appropriations.

Title VI—Borrowing

Part 1—Borrowing for Capital Improvements

Sec. 601. Borrowing power; debt limitations.
Sec. 602. Contents of borrowing legislation; referendum on bond issue.

Sec. 603. Publications of borrowing legislation.
Sec. 604. Short period of limitation.
Sec. 605. Acts for issuance of bonds.
Sec. 606. Public sale.

Part 2—Short-Term Borrowing

Sec. 621. Borrowing to meet supplemental appropriations.
Sec. 622. Borrowing in anticipation of revenues.
Sec. 623. Notes redeemable prior to maturity.
Sec. 624. Sale of notes.

Part 3—Payment of Bonds and Notes

Sec. 631. Payment of bonds and notes.

Part 4—Tax Exemption—Legal Investment

Sec. 641. Tax exemption.
Sec. 642. Legal investment.

Title VII—Financial affairs of the District

Part 1—Financial Administration

Sec. 701. Surety bonds.
Sec. 702. Financial duties of the Mayor.
Sec. 703. Control of appropriations.
Sec. 704. Accounting supervision and control.
Sec. 705. General fund.
Sec. 706. Contracts extending beyond one year.

Part 2—Annual Post Audit by General Accounting Office

Sec. 721. Independent annual post audit.
Sec. 722. Amendment of Budget and Accounting Act.

Part 3—Adjustment of Federal and District Expenses

Sec. 731. Adjustment of Federal and District expenses.

Part 4—Annual Federal Payment to the District

Sec. 741. Annual Federal payment to the District.

Title VIII—Elections in the District

Sec. 801. Board of Elections.
Sec. 802. Elections to be held.
Sec. 803. Elective offices; terms of office.
Sec. 804. Vacancies.
Sec. 805. Election of candidates.
Sec. 806. Recall.
Sec. 807. Qualifications of voters.
Sec. 808. Registration.
Sec. 809. Nominations.
Sec. 810. Partisan elections.
Sec. 811. Method of voting.
Sec. 812. Recounts and contests.
Sec. 813. Interference with registration or voting.
Sec. 814. Voting hours.
Sec. 815. Prohibition of the sale of alcoholic beverages on election days.
Sec. 816. Violations.

Title IX—Miscellaneous

Sec. 901. Agreements with United States.
Sec. 902. Personal interest in contracts or transactions.
Sec. 903. Compensation from more than one source.
Sec. 904. Assistance of United States Civil Service Commission in development of District Merit System.

Title X—Succession in Government

Sec. 1001. Transfer of personnel, property, and funds.
Sec. 1002. Existing statutes, regulations, and other actions.
Sec. 1003. Pending actions and proceedings.
Sec. 1004. Vacancies resulting from abolition of Board of Commissioners.

Title XI—Separability of provisions

Sec. 1101. Separability of provisions.

Title XII—Temporary provisions

Sec. 1201. Powers of the President during transition period.
Sec. 1202. Reimbursable appropriation for the District.

Title XIII—Effective dates

Sec. 1301. Effective dates.

Title XIV—Submission of charter for referendum

Sec. 1401. Charter referendum.
Sec. 1402. Board of Elections.
Sec. 1403. Registration.
Sec. 1404. Charter referendum ballot; notice of voting.
Sec. 1405. Method of voting.
Sec. 1406. Acceptance or nonacceptance of charter.

Title XV—Delegate

Sec. 1501. District Delegate.

Title XVI—Board of education

Sec. 1601. Control of public schools.
Sec. 1602. Qualifications.
Sec. 1603. Per diem.
Sec. 1604. Amendments.

Title XVII—Initiative

Sec. 1701. Power to propose and enact legislation.

Title XVIII—Title of Act

Sec. 1801. Title of Act.

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

Definitions

Sec. 101. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "District" means the District of Columbia.

(2) The terms "District Council" and "Council" mean the Council of the District of Columbia provided for by title III.

(3) The term "Chairman" means the Chairman of the District Council provided for by title III.

(4) The term "Mayor" means the Mayor provided for by title IV.

(5) The term "qualified voter" means a qualified voter of the District as specified in section 807, except as otherwise specifically provided.

(6) The term "act" includes any legislation adopted by the District Council, except where the term "Act" is used to refer to this Act or other Acts of Congress herein specified.

(7) The term "District Election Act of 1955" means the Act of August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 699), as amended.

(8) The term "primary election" means an election held to nominate candidates of a political party for inclusion on the ballot in a general election.

(9) The term "political party" means an organization which qualifies as such under any provision of the District Election Act of 1955.

(10) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, association, joint-stock company, trust, or corporation.

(11) The term "capital project", or "project", means (a) any physical public betterment or improvement and any preliminary studies and surveys relative thereto; (b) the acquisition of property of a permanent nature; or (c) the purchase of equipment for any public betterment or improvement when first erected or acquired.

(12) The term "pending", when applied to any capital project, means authorized but not yet completed.

(13) The term "Board of Elections" means the Board of Elections created by section 3 of the District Election Act of 1955.

(14) The term "election", unless the context otherwise indicates, means an election held pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

(15) The term "domicile" means that place where a person has his true, fixed, and permanent home and to which, when he is absent, he has the intention of returning.

(16) The terms "publish" and "publication", unless otherwise specifically provided herein, mean publication in a newspaper of general circulation in the District.

(17) The term "municipal courts of the District of Columbia" means the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, the District of Columbia Tax Court, the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and such other municipal courts as the District Council may hereafter establish by act.

(18) The terms "Delegate" and "District Delegate" mean the Delegate from the District of Columbia provided for by title XV.

TITLE II—STATUS OF THE DISTRICT

Status of the District

Sec. 201. (a) All of the territory constituting the permanent seat of the Government of the United States shall continue to be designated as the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia shall remain and continue a body corporate, as provided in section 2 of the Revised Statutes relating to said District. Said Corporation shall continue to be charged with all the duties, obligations, responsibilities, and liabilities, and to be vested with all of the powers, rights, privileges, immunities, and assets, respectively, imposed upon and vested in said Corporation, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, any person appointed from civil life as a member of the Board of Commissioners of the District or the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

(b) No law or regulation which is in force on the effective date of part 2, title III, of this Act shall be deemed amended or repealed by this Act except to the extent that such law or regulation is inconsistent with this Act: *Provided*, That any such law or regulation may be amended or repealed by legislation or regulation as authorized in this Act, or by Act of Congress.

(c) Nothing contained in this section shall affect the boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia as the same was established or may be subsequently established under the provisions of title I of the Act of October 31, 1945 (59 Stat. 552).

TITLE III—THE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Part I—Creation of the District Council

Creation and Membership

Sec. 301. There is hereby created a Council of the District of Columbia consisting of nineteen members, one elected from each of fourteen wards and five elected at-large, all as provided in title VIII.

Qualifications for Holding Office

Sec. 302. No person shall hold the office of member of the District Council unless he (1) is a qualified voter, (2) is domiciled in the District and, if he is nominated from a particular ward, resides in the ward from which he is nominated, (3) has, during the three years next preceding his nomination, resided and been domiciled in the District, (4) if he is nominated from a particular ward, has, for one year preceding his nomination, resided and been domiciled in the ward from which he is nominated, (5) holds no other elective public office, (6) holds no position as an officer or employee of the municipal government of the District of Columbia or any appointive office, for which compensation is provided out of District funds, and (7) holds no office to which he was appointed by the President of the United States and for which compensation is provided out of Federal or District funds. A member of the Council shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this section.

Compensation

Sec. 303. Each member of the District Council, except the Chairman, shall receive compensation at a rate of $9,000 per annum, payable in periodic installments. The Chairman shall receive compensation at a rate of $10,000 per annum, payable in periodic installments. All members shall receive such additional allowances for expenses as may be approved by the Council to be paid out of funds duly appropriated therefor.

Changes in Membership and Compensation of District Council Members

Sec. 304. The number of members constituting the District Council, the qualifications for holding office, and the compensation of such members may be changed by Act passed by the Council: *Provided,* That no such Act shall take effect until after it has been assented to by a majority of the qualified voters of the District voting at an election on the proposition set forth in any such Act.

Part 2—Principal functions of the District Council

Board of Commissioners Abolished and Functions Transferred to District Council

Sec. 321. (a) The Board of Commissioners of the District, the offices of Commissioner, Engineer Commissioner, and Assistants to the Engineer Commissioner of the District, are hereby abolished.

(b) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, all functions granted to or imposed upon the Board of Commissioners of the District are hereby transferred to the District Council except those powers hereinafter specifically conferred on the Mayor.

Functions Relating to Certain Agencies

Sec. 322. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section—

(1) The Board of Education provided for in section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia", approved June 20, 1906 (34 Stat. 316), together with all teachers, officers, and other employees thereof, are hereby continued in the municipal government of the District of Columbia. To the extent that the Act of June 20, 1906, or any other act relating to the public schools of the District of Columbia refers to a Commissioner or Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the terms shall mean, after the effective date of this section, the Mayor or such other District officer or officers as he may designate.

(2) The Zoning Commission created by the first section of the Act of March 1, 1920, creating a Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia, as amended (D.C. Code 1951 ed., sec. 5–12), is hereby abolished, and its functions are transferred to the District Council.

(3) The first sentence of section 2 of the Act of June 4, 1948 (62 Stat. 339), is hereby amended to read as follows: "There is hereby established an Armory Board, to be composed of three members who shall be appointed by the Mayor by and with the advice and consent of the Council and who shall serve at the pleasure of the Mayor."

(4) All functions and authority vested in the President by the Act of June 12, 1934 (48 Stat. 930), as amended, are hereby transferred to and vested in the Mayor.

(5) The District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, a body corporate of perpetual duration, established by the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (60 Stat. 790), as amended, is hereby transferred to and continued in, the municipal government of the District of Columbia. Section 4(a) of said Act is hereby amended to read as follows: "The District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency is hereby established and shall be composed of five members who shall be residents of the District of Columbia and who shall be appointed by the Mayor by and with the advice and consent of the Council. Each appointee shall be a resident of the District of Columbia and at least three members shall be engaged or employed during tenure of office in private business or industry or the private practice of a profession therein. Appointees shall serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The members shall receive no salary as such, but those members who hold no other salaried public position shall be paid a per diem of $20 for each day of service at meetings or on the work of the Agency and may be reimbursed for any expenses legitimately incurred in the performance of such service or work; except that the amount authorized as per diem may be changed by Act passed by the Council."

(6) The Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia; the Recreation Board; the Board of Zoning Adjustment; and the Zoning Advisory Council are hereby abolished and their functions transferred to the District Council for exercise in such manner and by such person or persons as the Council may direct.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the agencies referred to therein, other than the Board of Education, shall, for a period of one hundred and eighty days from the effective date of this section, unless within such period the District Council shall otherwise direct, continue to exercise the functions imposed on them by the laws in effect on the effective date of this section, except that insofar as such laws refer to a Commissioner or Commissioners of the District of Columbia the terms shall mean, after the effective date of this section, the Mayor or such other District officer or officers as he may designate.

(c) In the case of the Board of Education continued under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section, the members of the Board serving as such on the date immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall continue to serve, and vacancies on such Board shall continue to be filled, in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of June 20, 1906, as it existed immediately prior to its amendment by this Act, until such time as the persons first elected to the Board of Education following such effective date have qualified to take office.

Certain Delegated Functions

Sec. 323. No function of the Board of Commissioners of the District which such Board has delegated to an officer or agency of the District shall be considered as a function transferred to the Council by section 321. Each such function is hereby transferred to the officer or agency to whom or to which it was delegated, until the Mayor or Council, or both, pursuant to the powers herein granted, shall revoke, modify, or transfer such delegation.

Powers of and Limitations Upon District Council and the Qualified Voters of the District of Columbia

Sec. 324. (a)(1) The legislative power granted to the District by this Act shall be vested in the Council, and in the qualified voters of the District of Columbia (as provided in section 1701 of title XVII of this Act).

(2) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the legislative power of the District shall extend to all rightful subjects of legislation within the District, consistent with the Constitution of the United States and the provisions of this Act, subject, nevertheless, to all the restrictions and limitations imposed upon States by the tenth section of the first article of the Constitution of the United States; but all acts of the Council and the qualified voters of the District of Columbia shall at all times be subject to repeal or modification by the Congress of the United States, and nothing herein shall be construed to deprive Congress of the power of legislation over said District in as ample manner as if this Act had not been enacted: *Provided,* That nothing in this section shall be construed as vesting in the District government any greater authority over the Washington Aqueduct, the Commission on Mental Health, the National Zoological Park, the National Guard of the District of Columbia, or, except as otherwise specifically provided in this Act, over any Federal Agency than was vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District prior to the effective date of part 2, title III, of this Act.

(b) Neither the Council nor the qualified voters of the District of Columbia may pass any act contrary to the provisions of this Act, or—

(1) impose any tax on property of the United States;

(2) lend the public credit for support of any private undertaking;

(3) authorize the issuance of bonds except in compliance with the provisions of title VI;

(4) authorize the use of public money in support of any sectarian, denominational, or private school except as now or hereafter authorized by Congress;

(5) enact any act to amend or repeal any Act of Congress which concerns the functions or property of the United States or which is not restricted in its application exclusively in or to the District;

(6) pass any act inconsistent with or contrary to the Act of June 6, 1924 (43 Stat. 463), as amended by the Act of April 30, 1926 (44 Stat. 374), by the Act of July 19, 1952 (66 Stat. 781), and the Act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 482), as amended, and the Council shall not pass any act inconsistent with or contrary to any provision of any Act of Congress as it specifically pertains to any duty, authority, and responsibility of the National Capital Planning Commission; except insofar as the above-cited or other referred to Acts refer to the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia or the Board of Commissioners of the District, the former of which terms, after the effective date of this part, shall mean the Mayor or some District government official deemed by the Mayor to be best qualified, and designated by him to sit in lieu of the Mayor as a member of the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council, and the latter term shall mean the Council.

(c) Every act shall include a preamble, or be accompanied by a report, setting forth concisely the purposes of its adoption. Every act shall be published within seven days after its passage, as the Council may direct.

(d) An act passed by the Council shall be presented by the Chairman of the Council to the Mayor who shall, within ten calendar days after the act is presented to him, either approve or disapprove such act. If the Mayor shall approve such act (which he shall do by affixing his signature thereto), he shall present the act to the President. If the Mayor shall disapprove such act, he shall, within ten calendar days after it is presented to him, return such act to the Council setting forth his reasons for such disapproval. If any act so passed shall not be returned to the Council by the Mayor within ten calendar days after it shall have been presented to him, the Mayor shall be deemed to have approved such act and he shall present the same to the President. If, within thirty calendar days after an act has been returned by the Mayor to the Council with his disapproval, two-thirds of the members of the Council vote to pass such act, the Chairman of the Council shall again present the act to the Mayor who shall, within five calendar days, present the same to the President.

(e) Any act which has been passed by the Council and which, in accordance with subsection (d) has been presented to the President, shall become law unless, within ten calendar days after it is so presented to the President, he shall, in accordance with this subsection, disapprove the same. The President may, if he is satisfied that any such act adversely affects a Federal interest, disapprove such act, in which event he shall return the act to the Mayor with his objections and, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, such act shall not become law. The Mayor shall inform the Council of any such disapproval.

(f) The Congress of the United States reserves the right, at any time, to exercise its constitutional authority as legislature for the District of Columbia, by enacting legislation for the District on any subject, whether within or without the scope of legislative power granted to the District Council and the qualified voters of the District of Columbia by this Act, including without limitation, legislation to amend or repeal any law in force in the District prior to or after enactment of this Act and any act passed by the Council or by the qualified voters of the District of Columbia.

(g) Upon the effective date of this title, jurisdiction over the municipal courts of the District of Columbia shall vest with the District Council in all matters pertaining to the organization and composition of such courts, and to the appointment or selection, qualification, tenure, and compensation of the judges thereof: *Provided,* That the Council shall not transfer or modify any function performed by the United States marshal or the United States attorney for the District on the effective date of this section. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to change the tenure of any persons occupying positions as judges of the municipal courts of the District of Columbia on the effective date of this part, except that their compensation may be increased.

(h) On or after the effective date of this part, any person appointed or elected to serve as judge of one of the municipal courts of the District of Columbia shall not (1) be appointed or elected to serve for a term of less than 10 years, or (2) receive as compensation for such service an amount less than the amount payable to an associate judge of the District of Columbia court of general sessions on the effective date of this part.

(i) Nothing in this section shall be construed to curtail the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or any other United States court other than the municipal courts of the District of Columbia.

(j) Nothing in this section shall be construed as prohibiting the Council from enacting legislation conferring upon the District of Columbia Court of Appeals exclusive jurisdiction to review orders and decisions of administrative agencies of the District denying, revoking, suspending, or refusing to renew or restore any license or registration to engage in any profession, vocation, trade, calling, or business, which under law is now or hereafter required to be licensed or registered.

Part 3—Organization and procedure of the District Council

The Chairman

SEC. 331. The District Council shall elect from among its members a Chairman who shall be the presiding officer of the Council and a Vice Chairman, who shall preside in the absence of the Chairman. When the Mayor is absent or unable to act, or when the office is vacant, the Chairman shall act in his stead. The term of the Chairman shall be for the remainder of his term as a member of the Council.

Secretary of the District Council; Record and Documents

SEC. 332. (a) The Council shall appoint a secretary as its chief administrative officer and such assistants and clerical personnel as may be necessary. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the compensation and other terms of employment of such secretary, assistants, and clerical personnel shall be prescribed by the Council.

(b) The Secretary shall (1) keep a record of the proceedings of the Council, (2) keep a record showing the text of all acts introduced and the ayes and noes of each vote, (3) authenticate by his signature and record in full in a continuing record kept for that purpose all acts passed by the Council and by the qualified voters of the District of Columbia, and (4) perform such other duties as the Council may from time to time prescribe.

Meetings

SEC. 333. (a) The first meeting of the Council after this part takes effect shall be called by the member who receives the highest vote in the election provided in title VIII. He shall preside until a Chairman is elected. Following each such election, but not later than December 15 of the year of the election, the secretary of the Council shall call the first meeting of the Council elected in such election for a date not later than January 7 of the next year.

(b) The Council shall provide for the time and place of its regular meetings. The Council shall hold at least one regular meeting in each calendar week except that during July and August it shall hold at least two regular meetings in each month. Special meetings may be called, upon the giving of adequate notice, by the Mayor, the Chairman, or any three members of the Council.

(c) Meetings of the Council shall be open to the public and shall be held at reasonable hours and at such places as to accommodate a reasonable number of spectators. The records of the Council provided for in section 332(b) shall be open to public inspection and available for copying during all regular office hours of the Council Secretary. Any citizen shall have the right to petition and be heard by the Council at any of its meetings, within reasonable limits as set by the Council Chairman, the Council concurring.

Committees

SEC. 334. The Council Chairman, with the advice and consent of the Council, shall determine the standing and special committees which may be expedient for the conduct of the Council's business. The Chairman shall appoint members to such committees. All committee meetings shall be open to the public except when ordered closed by the committee chairman, with the approval of a majority of the members of the committee.

Acts and Resolutions

SEC. 335. (a) The Council, to discharge the powers and duties imposed herein, shall pass acts and adopt resolutions, upon a vote of a majority of the members of the Council, unless otherwise provided herein. Acts shall be used for all legislative purposes. Resolutions shall be used to express simple determinations, decisions, or directions of the Council of a special or temporary character.

(b)(1) The enacting clause of all acts passed by the Council shall be, "Be it enacted by the Council of the District of Columbia:".

(2) The resolving clause of all resolutions passed by the Council shall be, "The Council of the District of Columbia hereby resolves,".

(c) A special election may be called by resolution of the Council to present for referendum vote of the people any proposition upon which the Council desires to take such action.

Passage of Acts

SEC. 336. The Council shall not pass any act before the thirteenth day following the day on which it is introduced. Subject to the other limitations of this Act, this requirement may be waived by the unanimous vote of the members present: *Provided,* That the members present constitute a majority of the Council.

Procedure for Zoning Acts

SEC. 337. (a) Before any zoning act for the District is passed by the Council—

(1) the Council shall deposit the act in its introduced form, with the National Capital Planning Commission. Such Commission shall, within thirty days after the day of such deposit, submit its comments to the Council, including advice as to whether the proposed act is in conformity with the comprehensive plan for the District of Columbia. The Council may not pass the act unless it has received such comments or the Commission has failed to comment within the thirty-day period above specified; and

(2) the Council (or an appropriate committee thereof) shall hold a public hearing on the act. At least thirty days' notice of the hearing shall be published as the Council may direct. Such notice shall include the time and place of the hearing and a summary of all changes in existing law which would be made by adoption of the act. The Council (or committee thereof holding a hearing) shall give such additional notice as it finds expedient and practicable. At the hearing, interested persons shall be given reasonable opportunity to be heard. The hearing may be adjourned from time to time. The time and place of the adjourned meeting shall be publicly announced before adjournment is had.

(b) The Council shall deposit with the National Capital Planning Commission each zoning act passed by it.

Investigations by District Council

SEC. 338. (a) The Council, or any committee or person authorized by it, shall have power to investigate any matter relating to the affairs of the District; and for that purpose may require the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and other evidence. For such purpose any member of the Council (if the Council is conducting the inquiry) or any member of the committee, or the person conducting the inquiry, may issue subpenas and may administer oaths.

(b) In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena issued to, any person, the Council, committee, or person conducting the investigation shall have power to refer the matter to any judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, who may by order require such person to appear and to give or produce testimony or books, papers, or other evidence, bearing upon the matter under investigation; and any failure to obey such order may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof as in the case of failure to obey a subpena issued, or to testify, in a case pending before such court.

TITLE IV—MAYOR

Election, qualifications, and salary

SEC. 401. (a) There is hereby created the office of Mayor of the District of Columbia. The Mayor shall be elected as provided in title VIII.

(b) No person shall hold the office of Mayor unless he (1) is a qualified voter, (2) is domiciled and resides in the District, (3) has, during the three years next preceding his nomination, been resident in and domiciled in the District, (4) holds no other elective public office, (5) holds no position as an officer or employee of the municipal government of the District of Columbia or any appointive office, for which compensation is provided out of District funds, and (6) holds no office to which he was appointed by the President of the United States and for which compensation is provided out of Federal or District funds. The Mayor shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this section.

(c) The Mayor shall receive an annual salary of $27,500, and an allowance for official reception and representation expenses, which he shall certify in reasonable detail to the District Council, of not more than $2,500 annually. Such salary shall be payable in periodic installments.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the method of election, the qualifications for office, the compensation and the allowance for official expenses pertaining to the office of Mayor may be changed by acts passed by the Council: *Provided,* That no such act shall take effect until after it has been assented to by a majority of the qualified voters of the District voting at an election on the proposition set forth in any such act.

Powers and duties

SEC. 402. The executive power of the District shall be vested in the Mayor who shall be the chief executive officer of the District government. He shall be responsible for the proper administration of the affairs of the District coming under his jurisdiction or control, and to that end shall have the following powers and functions:

(1) He shall designate the officer or officers of the executive department of the District who shall, during periods of disability or absence from the District of the Mayor, the Chairman, and the Vice Chairman of the Council, execute and perform all the powers and duties of the Mayor.

(2) He shall act as the official spokesman for the District and as the head of the District for ceremonial purposes.

(3) He shall administer all laws relating to the appointment, promotion, discipline, separation, and other conditions of employment of personnel in the office of the Mayor, personnel in executive departments of the District, and members of boards, commissions, and other agencies, who, under laws in effect on the effective date of this section, are subject to appointment and removal by the Commissioners. All actions affecting such personnel and such members shall, until such time as legislation is enacted by the Council superseding such laws and establishing a permanent District government merit system or systems, pursuant to section 402(4), continue to be subject to the provisions of Acts of Congress relating to the appointment, promotion, discipline, separation, and other conditions of employment applicable to officers and employees of the District government, to section 1001(d) of this Act, and where applicable, to the provisions of the joint agreement between the Commissioners and the Civil Service Commission authorized by Executive Order Numbered 5491 of November 18, 1930, relating to the appointment of District personnel. He shall appoint or assign persons to positions formerly occupied, ex officio, by one or more members of the Board of Commissioners of the District and shall have power to remove such persons from such positions. The officers and employees of each agency with respect to which legislative power is delegated by this Act and which, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, was not subject to the administrative control of the Board of Commissioners of the District, shall continue to be appointed and removed in accordance with applicable laws until such time as such laws may be superseded by legislation passed by the Council establishing a permanent District government merit system or systems pursuant to section 402(4).

(4) He shall administer the personnel functions of the District covering employees of all District departments, boards, commissions, offices, and agencies, except as otherwise provided by this Act. Personnel legislation enacted by Congress, prior to or after the effective date of this section, including, without limitation, legislation relating to appointments, promotions, discipline, separations, pay, unemployment compensation, health, disability and death benefits, leave, retirement, insurance, and veterans' preference, applicable to employees of the District government, as set forth in section 1002(c), shall continue to be applicable until such time as the Council shall, pursuant to this section, provide equal or equivalent coverage under a District government merit system or systems. The District government merit system or systems shall be established by legislation of the Council. The system or systems may provide for continued participation in all or part of the Federal Civil Service system and shall provide for persons employed by the District government immediately preceding the effective date of such system or systems personnel benefits, including but not limited to, pay, tenure, leave, residence, retirement, health and life insurance, and employee disability and death benefits, all at least equal to those provided by legislation enacted by Congress, or regulation adopted pursuant thereto, and applicable to such officers and employees immediately prior to the effective date of the system or systems established pursuant to this Act. The District government merit system or systems shall take effect not earlier than one year nor later than five years after the effective date of this section.

(5) He shall, through the heads of administrative boards, offices, and agencies, supervise and direct the activities of such boards, offices, and agencies.

(6) He shall, at the end of each fiscal year, prepare reports for such year of (a) the finances of the District, and (b) the administrative activities of the executive office of the Mayor and the executive departments of the District. He shall submit such reports to the Council within ninety days after the close of the fiscal year.

(7) He shall keep the Council advised of the financial condition and future needs of the District and make such recommendations to the Council as may seem to him desirable.

(8) He may submit drafts of acts to the Council.

(9) He shall perform such other duties as the Council, consistent with the provisions of this Act, may direct.

(10) He may delegate any of his functions (other than the function of approving or disapproving acts passed by the Council or the function of approving contracts between the District and the Federal Government under section 901) to any officer, employee, or agency of the executive office of the Mayor, or to any director of an executive department who may, with the approval of the Mayor, make a further delegation of all or a part of such functions to subordinates under his jurisdiction.

(11) There shall be a City Administrator, who shall be appointed by the Mayor and who may be removed by the Mayor. The City Administrator shall be the principal managerial aide to the Mayor, and he shall perform such duties as may be assigned to him by the Mayor.

(12) The Mayor or the Council may propose to the executive or legislative branches of the United States Government legislation or other action dealing with any subject not falling within the authority of the District government, as defined in this Act.

(13) As custodian he shall use and authenticate the corporate seal of the District in accordance with law.

(14) He shall have the right, under the rules to be adopted by the Council, to be heard by the Council or any of its committees.

(15) He is authorized to issue and enforce such administrative orders, not inconsistent with any Act of the Congress or any Act of the Council or of the qualified voters of the District of Columbia, as are necessary to carry out his functions and duties.

TITLE V—THE DISTRICT BUDGET

Fiscal year

SEC. 501. The fiscal year of the District of Columbia shall begin on the 1st day of July and shall end on the 30th day of June of the succeeding calendar year. Such fiscal year shall also constitute the budget and accounting year.

Budgetary details fixed by District Council

SEC. 502. (a) The Mayor shall prepare and submit, not later than April 1, to the District Council, in such form as the Council shall approve, the annual budget estimates of the District and the budget message.

(b) The Mayor shall, in consultation with the Council, take whatever action may be necessary to achieve, insofar as is possible, (1) consistency in accounting and budget classifications, (2) synchronization between accounting and budget classifications and organizational structure, and (3) support of the budget justifications by information on performance and program costs as shown by the accounts.

Adoption of budget

SEC. 503. The Council shall by act adopt a budget for each fiscal year not later than May 15, except that the Council may, by resolution, extend the period for its adoption. The effective date of the budget shall be July 1 of the same calendar year.

Five year capital program

SEC. 504. (a) Prior to the adoption of the annual budget, the Council shall adopt a five-year capital program and a capital budget.

(b) The Mayor shall prepare the five year capital program and shall submit said program and the capital budget message to the Council, not later than February 1.

(c) The capital program shall include:

(1) a clear general summary of its contents;

(2) a list of all capital improvements which are proposed to be undertaken during the five fiscal years next ensuing, with appropriate supporting information as to the necessity for such improvements;

(3) cost estimates, methods of financing and recommended time schedules for each such improvement; and

(4) the estimated annual cost of operating and maintaining the facilities to be constructed or acquired.

(d) The capital program shall be revised and extended each year with regard to capital improvements still pending or in the process of construction or acquisition.

(e) Actual capital expenditures shall be carried each year as the capital outlay section of the current budget. These expenditures shall be in the form or direct capital outlays from current revenues or debt service payments.

Budget establishes appropriations

SEC. 505. The adoption of the budget by the Council shall operate to appropriate and to make available for expenditure, for the purposes therein named, the several amounts stated therein as proposed expenditures, subject to the provisions of section 702.

Supplemental appropriations

SEC. 506. The Council may at any time adopt an act by vote of a majority of its members rescinding previously appropriated funds which are then available for expenditure, or appropriating funds in addition to those theretofore appropriated to the extent unappropriated funds are available; and for such purpose unappropriated funds may include those borrowed in accordance with the provisions of section 621.

TITLE VI—BORROWING

Part 1—Borrowing for capital improvements

Borrowing Power; Debt Limitations

SEC. 601. The District may incur indebtedness by issuing its bonds in either coupon or registered form to fund or refund indebtedness of the District at any time outstanding and to pay the cost of constructing or acquiring any capital projects requiring an expenditure greater than the amount of taxes or other revenues allowed for such capital projects by the annual budget: *Provided,* That no bonds or other evidences of indebtedness, other than bonds to fund or refund outstanding indebtedness shall be issued in an amount which, together with indebtedness of the District to the Treasury of the United States pursuant to existing law, shall cause the aggregate of indebtedness of the District to exceed 12 per centum of the average of the aggregate of the assessed values (as of the first day of July of the ten most recent fiscal years for which such assessed values are available) of (1) the taxable real and tangible personal property located in the District and (2) the real and tangible personal property referred to in paragraphs (A) and (B) of section 741(a) of this Act, the values of which shall be computed in accordance with the applicable provisions of section 741 of this Act, nor shall such bonds or other evidences of indebtedness issued for purposes other than the construction or acquisition of capital projects connected with mass transit, highway, water and sanitary sewage works purposes, or any revenue-producing capital projects which are determined by the Council to be self-liquidating exceed 6 per centum of such average assessed value. Bonds or other evidences of indebtedness may be issued by the District pursuant to an act of the Council from time to time in amounts in the aggregate at any time outstanding not exceeding 2 per centum of said assessed value, exclusive of indebtedness owing to the United States on the effective date of this title. All other bonds or evidence of indebtedness, other than bonds to fund or refund outstanding indebtedness, shall be issued only with the assent of a majority of the qualified voters of said District voting at an election on the proposition of issuing such bonds. In determining the amount of indebtedness within all of the aforesaid limitation at any time outstanding there shall be deducted from the aggregate of such indebtedness the amount of the then current tax levy for the payment of the principal of the outstanding bonded indebtedness of the District and any other moneys set aside into any sinking fund and irrevocably dedicated to the payment of such bonded indebtedness. The Council shall make provision for the payment of any bonds issued pursuant to this title, in the manner provided in section 631 hereof.

Contents of Borrowing Legislation; Referendum on Bond Issue

SEC. 602. (a) An act authorizing the issuance of bonds may be enacted by a majority of the Council members at any meeting of the Council subsequent to the meeting at which such act was introduced, and shall contain at least the following provisions:

(1) A brief description of each purpose for which indebtedness is proposed to be incurred;

(2) The maximum amount of the principal of the indebtedness which may be incurred for each such purpose;

(3) The maximum rate of interest to be paid on such indebtedness; and

(4) In the event the Council is required by this part, or it is determined by the Council in its discretion, to submit the question of issuing such bonds to a vote of the qualified voters of the District, the manner of holding such election, the manner of voting for or against the incurring of such indebtedness, and the form of ballot to be used at such election. The ballot shall be in such form as to permit the voters to vote separately for or against the incurring of indebtedness for each of the purposes for which indebtedness is proposed to be incurred.

(b) The Council shall cause the proposition of issuing such bonds to be submitted by the Board of Elections to the qualified voters at the first general election to be held in the District not less than forty days after the date of enactment of the act authorizing such bonds, or upon a vote of at least two-thirds of the members of the Council, the Council may call a special election for the purpose of voting upon the issuance of said bonds, such election to be held by the Board of Elections at any date set by the Council not less than forty days after the enactment of such act.

(c) The Board of Elections is authorized and directed to prescribe the manner of registration and the polling places and to name the judges and clerks of election and to make such other rules and regulations for the conduct of such elections as are not specifically provided by the Council as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section, including provisions for the publication of a notice of such election stating briefly the proposition or propositions to be voted on and the designated polling places in the various precincts and wards in the District. The said notice shall be published at least once a week for four consecutive calendar weeks on any day of the week, the first publication thereof to be not less than thirty nor more than forty days prior to the date fixed by the Council for the election. The Board of Elections shall canvass the votes cast at such election and certify the results thereof to the Council in the manner prescribed for the canvass and certification of the results of general elections. The certification of the result of the election shall be published once by the Board of Elections within three days following the date of the election.

Publication of borrowing legislation

SEC. 603. The Mayor shall publish any Act authorizing the issuance of bonds at least once within five days after the enactment thereof, together with a notice of the enactment thereof in substantially the following form:

"NOTICE

"The following Act authorizing the issuance of bonds published herewith has become effective, and the time within which a suit, action, or proceeding questioning the validity of such bonds can be commenced as provided in the District of Columbia Charter Act will expire twenty days from the date of the first publication of this notice (or in the event the proposition of issuing the proposed bonds is to be submitted to the qualified voters, twenty days after the date of publication of the promulgation of the results of the election ordered by said Act to be held).

"——— ———,

"Mayor."

Short period of limitation

SEC. 604. Upon the expiration of twenty days from and after the date of publication of the notice of the enactment of an Act authorizing the issuance of bonds without the submission of the proposition for the issuance thereof to the qualified voters, or upon the expiration of twenty days from the date of publication of the promulgation of the results of an election upon the proposition of issuing bonds, as the case may be, all as provided in section 603—

(1) any recitals or statements of fact contained in such Act or in the preambles or the titles thereof or in the results of the election of any proceedings in connection with the calling, holding, or conducting of election upon the issuance of such bonds shall be deemed to be true for the purpose of determining the validity of the bonds thereby authorized, and the District and all others interested shall thereafter be estopped from denying same;

(2) such Act and all proceedings in connection with the authorization of the issuance of such bonds shall be conclusively presumed to have been duly and regularly taken, passed, and done by the District and the Board of Elections in full compliance with the provisions of this Act and of all laws applicable thereto;

(3) the validity of such Act and said proceedings shall not thereafter be questioned by either a party plaintiff or a party defendant, and no court shall have jurisdiction in any suit, action, or proceeding questioning the validity of same, except in a suit, action, or proceeding commenced prior to the expiration of such twenty days.

Acts for Issuance of Bonds

SEC. 605. After the expiration of the twenty-day limitation period provided for in section 604 of this part, the Council may by act establish an issue of bonds as authorized pursuant to the provisions of sections 601 to 604, inclusive, hereof. An issue of bonds is hereby defined to be all or any part of an aggregate principal amount of bonds authorized pursuant to said sections, but no indebtedness shall be deemed to have been incurred within the meaning of this Act until the bonds shall have been sold, delivered, and paid for, and then only to the extent of the principal amount of bonds so sold and delivered. The bonds of any authorized issue may be issued all at one time, or from time to time in series and in such amounts as the Council shall deem advisable. The act authorizing the issuance of any series of bonds shall fix the date of the bonds of such series, and the bonds of each such series shall be payable in annual installments beginning not more than three years after the date of the bonds and ending not more than thirty years from such date. The amount of said series to be payable in each year shall be so fixed that when the annual interest is added to the principal amount payable in each year the total amount payable in each year in which part of the principal is payable shall be substantially equal. It shall be an immaterial variance if the difference between the largest and the smallest amounts of principal and interest payable annually during the term of the bonds does not exceed 3 per centum of the total authorized amount of such series. Such act shall also prescribe the form of the bonds to be issued thereunder, and of the interest coupons appertaining thereto, and the manner in which said bonds and coupons shall be executed. The bonds and coupons may be executed by the facsimile signatures of the officer or officers designated by the act authorizing the bonds, to sign the bonds, with the exception that at least one signature shall be manual. Such bonds may be issued in coupon form in the denomination of $1,000, registerable as to principal only or as to both principal and interest, and if registered as to both principal and interest may be issuable in denominations of multiples of $1,000. Such bonds and the interest thereon may be payable at such place or places within or without the District as the Council may determine.

Public sale

SEC. 606. All bonds issued under this part shall be sold at public sale upon sealed proposals at such price or prices as shall be approved by the Council after publication of a notice of such sale at least once not less than ten days prior to the date fixed for sale in a daily newspaper carrying municipal bond notices and devoted primarily to financial news or to the subject of State and municipal bonds published in the city of New York, New York, and in a newspaper of general circulation published in the District. Such notice shall state, among other things, that no proposal shall be considered unless there is deposited with the District as a downpayment a certified check or cashier's check for an amount equal to at least 2 per centum of the par amount of bonds bid for, and the Council shall reserve the right to reject any and all bids.

Part 2—Short-term borrowing

Borrowing to meet supplemental appropriations

SEC. 621. In the absence of unappropriated available revenues to meet supplemental appropriations made pursuant to section 505, the Council may by act authorize the issuance of negotiable notes, in a total amount not to exceed 5 per centum of the total appropriations for the current fiscal year, each of which shall be designated "supplemental" and may be renewed from time to time, but all such notes and renewals thereof shall be paid not later than the close of the fiscal year following that in which such Act becomes effective.

Borrowing in anticipation of revenues

SEC. 622. For any fiscal year, in anticipation of the collection or receipt of revenues of that fiscal year, the Council may by act authorize the borrowing of money by the execution of negotiable notes of the District, not to exceed in the aggregate at any time outstanding 20 per centum of the total anticipated revenue, each of which shall be designated "Revenue Note for the Fiscal Year 19 ". Such notes may be renewed from time to time, but all such notes, together with the renewals, shall mature and be paid not later than the end of the fiscal year for which the original notes have been issued.

Notes redeemable prior to maturity

SEC. 623. No notes issued pursuant to this part shall be made payable on demand, but any note may be made subject to redemption prior to maturity on such notice and at such time as may be stated in the note.

Sale of notes

SEC. 624. All notes issued pursuant to this part may be sold at not less than par and accrued interest at private sale without previous advertising.

Part 3—Payment of bonds and notes

SEC. 631. (a) The act of the Council authorizing the issuance of bonds pursuant to this title, shall, where necessary, provide for the levy annually of a special tax without limitation as to rate or amount upon all the taxable real and personal tangible property within the District in amounts which, together with other revenues of the District available and applicable for said purposes, will be sufficient to pay the principal of and interest on said bonds and the premium, if any, upon the redemption thereof, as the same respectively become due and payable, which tax shall be levied and collected at the same time and in the same manner as other District taxes are levied and collected, and when collected shall be set aside for the purpose of paying such principal, interest, and premium.

(b) The full faith and credit of the District shall be and is hereby pledged for the payment of the principal of and the interest on all bonds and notes of the District hereafter issued pursuant to this title whether or not such pledge be stated in the bonds or notes or in the Act authorizing the issuance thereof.

Part 4—Tax exemption—legal investment

Tax Exemption

SEC. 641. Bonds and notes issued by the Council pursuant to this title and the interest thereon shall be exempt from all Federal and District taxation except estate, inheritance, and gift taxes.

Legal Investment

SEC. 642. Notwithstanding any restriction on the investment of funds by fiduciaries contained in any other law, all domestic insurance companies, domestic insurance associations, executors, administrators, guardians, trustees, and other fiduciaries within the District of Columbia may legally invest any sinking funds, moneys, trust funds, or other funds belonging to them or under or within their control in any bonds issued pursuant to this title, it being the purpose of this section to authorize the investment in such bonds or notes of all sinking, insurance, retirement, compensation, pension, and trust funds. National banking associations are authorized to deal in, underwrite, purchase and sell, for their own accounts or for the accounts of customers, bonds and notes issued by the District Council to the same extent as national banking associations are authorized by paragraph seven of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes (title 12, U.S.C., sec. 24), to deal in, underwrite, purchase and sell obligations of the United States, States, or political subdivisions thereof. All Federal building and loan associations and Federal savings and loan associations; and banks, trust companies, building and loan associations, and savings and loan associations, domiciled in the District of Columbia, may purchase, sell, underwrite, and deal in, for their own account or for the account of others, all bonds or notes issued pursuant to this title: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed as relieving any person, firm, association or corporation from any duty of exercising due and reasonable care in selecting securities for purchase or investment.

TITLE VII—FINANCIAL AFFAIRS OF THE DISTRICT

Part 1—Financial administration

Surety Bonds

SEC. 701. Each officer and employee of the District required to do so by the District Council shall provide a bond with such surety and in such amount as the Council may require. The premiums for all such bonds shall be paid out of appropriations for the District.

Financial Duties of the Mayor

SEC. 702. The Mayor, through his duly designated subordinates, shall have charge of the administration of the financial affairs of the District and to that end he shall—

(1) prepare and submit in the form and manner prescribed by the Council under section 502 the annual budget estimates and a budget message;

(2) supervise and be responsible for all financial transactions to insure adequate control of revenues and resources and to insure that appropriations are not exceeded;

(3) maintain systems of accounting and internal control designed to provide—

(A) full disclosure of the financial results of the District government's activities,

(B) adequate financial information needed by the District government for management purposes,

(C) effective control over and accountability for all funds, property, and other assets;

(4) submit to the Council a monthly financial statement, by appropriation and department, and in any further detail the Council may specify;

(5) prepare, as of the end of each fiscal year, a complete financial statement and report;

(6) supervise and be responsible for the assessment of all property subject to assessment within the corporate limits of the District for taxation, make all special assessments for the District government, prepare tax maps, and give such notice of taxes and special assessments as may be required by law;

(7) supervise and be responsible for the assessment and collection of all taxes, special assessments, license fees, and other revenues of the District for the collection of which the District is responsible and receive all money receivable by the District from the Federal Government, or from any court, or from any agency of the District;

(8) have custody of all public funds belonging to or under the control of the District, or any agency of the District government, and deposit all funds coming into his hands, in such depositories as may be designated and under such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by act of the Council;

(9) have custody of all investments and invested funds of the District government, or in possession of such government in a fiduciary capacity, and have the safekeeping of all bonds and notes of the District and the receipt and delivery of District bonds and notes for transfer, registration, or exchange.

Control of appropriations

SEC. 703. The Council may provide for (1) the transfer during the budget year of any appropriation balance then available for one item of appropriation to another item of appropriation, and (2) the allocation to new items of funds appropriated for contingent expenditure.

Accounting supervision and control

SEC. 704. The Mayor, through his duly authorized subordinates, shall—

(1) prescribe the forms of receipts, vouchers, bills, and claims to be used by all the agencies of the District government;

(2) examine and approve all contracts, orders, and other documents by which the District government incurs financial obligations, having previously ascertained that moneys have been appropriated and allotted and will be available when the obligations shall become due and payable;

(3) audit and approve before payment all bills, invoices, payrolls, and other evidences of claims, demands, or charges against the District government and with the advice of the legal officials of the District determine the regularity, legality, and correctness of such claims, demands, or charges; and

(4) perform internal audits of central accounting and department and agency records of the District government, including the examination of any accounts or records of financial transactions, giving due consideration to the effectiveness of accounting systems, internal control, and related administrative practices of the respective agencies.

General fund

SEC. 705. The general fund of the District shall be composed of the revenues of the District other than the revenues applied by law to special funds. All moneys received by any agency, officer, or employee of the District in its or his official capacity shall belong to the District government and shall be paid promptly to the Mayor, or his duly authorized subordinate, for deposit in the appropriate funds.

Contracts Extending Beyond One Year

SEC. 706. No contract involving expenditure out of an appropriation which is available for more than one year shall be made for a period of more than five years; nor shall any such contract be valid unless made pursuant to criteria established by act of the Council.

Part 2—Audit by General Accounting Office

Independent Audit

SEC. 721. (a) The financial transactions shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with such principles and procedures and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. In the determination of the auditing procedures to be followed and the extent of the examination of vouchers and other documents, the Comptroller General shall give due regard to generally accepted principles of auditing, including consideration of the effectiveness of the accounting organizations and systems, internal audit and control, and related administrative practices. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the District and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians. The District of Columbia shall reimburse the General Accounting Office for expenses of such audit in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Mayor and the Comptroller General, and the amounts so reimbursed shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

(b) (1) The Comptroller General shall submit his audit reports to the Congress, the Mayor, and the Council. The reports shall set forth the scope of the audits and shall include such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep the Mayor and the Council informed of the operations to which the reports relate, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General may deem advisable. The reports shall show specifically every program, expenditure, and other financial transaction or undertaking which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law.

(2) After the Mayor and his duly authorized subordinates have had an opportunity to be heard, the Council shall make such report, together with such other material as it deems pertinent thereto, available for public inspection and shall transmit copies thereof to the Congress.

(3) The Mayor, within ninety days after the report has been made to him and the Council, shall state in writing to the Council, with a copy to the Congress, what has been done to comply with the recommendations made by the Comptroller General in the report.

Amendment of Budget and Accounting Act

SEC. 722. Section 2 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 2), is hereby amended by striking out "and the municipal government of the District of Columbia".

Part 3—Adjustment of Federal and District expenses

Adjustment of Federal and District Expenses

SEC. 731. Subject to section 901 and other provisions of law, the Mayor, with the approval of the Council, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, are authorized and empowered to enter into an agreement or agreements concerning the manner and method by which amounts owed by the District to the United States, or by the United States to the District, shall be ascertained and paid.

Part 4—Annual Federal payment to District

Annual Federal Payment to District

SEC. 741. (a) In recognition of the unique character of the District of Columbia as the Nation's Capital City, regular annual payments by the Federal Government are hereby authorized to cover the proper share of the expenses of the District government. On or before January 10 of each year, the Mayor shall, with the approval of the Council, submit to the Secretary of the Treasury through the Administrator of General Services a request for a Federal payment to be made during the following fiscal year, and the amount of such payment shall be computed as follows:

(1) An amount (to be paid to the general fund) computed as of January 1 of the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which payment is requested based upon the following factors:

(A) The amount of real property taxes lost to the District during the fiscal year immediately preceding the fiscal year for which the annual Federal payment is being requested based upon the assessed value and rate of tax in effect on January 1 of said preceding year, as a result of the exemption from real property taxation of the following properties:

(i) Real property in the District owned and used by the United States for the purpose of providing Federal governmental services or performing Federal governmental functions, but excluding parklands, museums, art galleries, memorials, statuary, and shrines, and also excluding to the extent to which it may be so used, property owned by the United States and used to provide a service or perform a function which would otherwise be provided or performed by the District, such as, by way of example and without limitation, public streets and alleys and public water supply facilities.

(ii) Real property in the District exempt from taxation by special Act of Congress or exempt from taxation pursuant to subsection (k) of section 1 of the Act approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1809), as amended (sec. 47-801a(k), 1961 ed.), and not eligible for exemption from taxation under any other subsection of said section 1 of the Act approved December 24, 1942.

(B) The amount of personal property taxes lost to the District during the fiscal year immediately preceding the fiscal year for which the annual Federal payment is being requested based upon the assessed value and rate of tax in effect on January 1 of said preceding year, as a consequence of the exemption from personal property taxation of tangible personal property located in the District and which is owned by the United States, exclusive of objects of art, museum pieces, statuary, and libraries. Tangible personal property located in the District owned by the United States may be estimated by one or more methods developed by the Mayor and approved by the Administrator of General Services.

(C) The amount obtained by multiplying by a fraction the actual collections, during the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the annual Federal payment is being requested, of corporation and unincorporated business franchise taxes, and taxes on insurance premiums and on gross earnings of financial institutions and guaranty companies. The numerator of such fraction shall be the total number of Federal Government employees whose places of employment are in the District, as estimated by the United States Civil Service Commission, and the denominator of which shall be the total number of other employees whose places of employment are in the District, as estimated by the United States Employment Service for the District, but excluding employees of the government of the District, employees in nonprofit activities, and domestics in private households, also as estimated by such Service.

(2) The amount of the charges for water services furnished to the Federal Government by the District during the second fiscal year preceding the year for which the annual Federal payment is being requested (to be paid to the water fund).

(3) The charges for sanitary sewer services furnished to the Federal Government by the District during the second fiscal year preceding the year for which the annual Federal payment is being requested (to be paid to the sanitary sewage works fund).

(b) After review by the Administrator of General Services of the request for Federal payment and certification by him on or before April 10 of the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the annual Federal payment is being requested that such request is based upon a reasonable and fair assessment of real and personal property of the United States and a proper and accurate computation of the factors referred to in section 741(a)(1) and is in conformity with the provisions of this section, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, not later than September 1 of each fiscal year, cause such payment to be made to the District out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to advance on or after July 1, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, without interest, such amounts (not to exceed in the aggregate the total payment in the previous fiscal year) as may be required by the District pending the payment of the amount authorized by this section.

(c) The Administrator of General Services shall enter into cooperative arrangements with the Mayor whereby disputes, differences, or disagreements involving the Federal payment may be resolved.

(d) For the first fiscal year in which this part is effective, the amount of the annual Federal payment may be computed on the basis of preliminary estimates: *Provided*, That such amount shall be subject to later adjustment in accordance with the provisions of this part.

TITLE VIII—ELECTIONS IN THE DISTRICT

Board of Elections

SEC. 801. (a) The members of the Board of Elections in office on the date when the Mayor first elected takes office shall continue in office for the remainder of the terms for which they were appointed. Their successors shall be appointed by the Mayor by and with the advice and consent of the Council. The term by each such successor (except in the case of an appointment to fill an unexpired term) shall be three years from the expiration of the term of his precedecessor. Any person appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of his predecessor. When a member's term of office expires, he may continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified. Section 3 of the District Election Act of 1955 is hereby modified to the extent that it is inconsistent herewith.

(b) In addition to its other duties, the Board of Elections shall also, for the purposes of this Act—

(1) maintain a permanent registry;

(2) conduct registrations and elections;

(3) in addition to determining appeals with respect to matters referred to in sections 808 and 811, determine appeals with respect to any other matters which (under regulations prescribed by it under the subsection (c)) may be appealed to it;

(4) provide for recording and counting votes by means of ballots or machines or both and, not less than five days before each election held pursuant to this Act, publish a copy of the official ballot to be used in any such election;

(5) divide the District into fourteen wards as nearly equal as possible in population and of geographic proportions as nearly regular, contiguous, and compact as possible, and establish voting precincts therein, each such voting precinct to contain at least three hundred and fifty registered voters, and thereafter, within six months after the publication by the United States Census Bureau of the population of the District at each decennial census or any more recent official census of the population of the District, redivide the District into fourteen wards, in accordance with the criteria in this paragraph;

(6) operate polling places;

(7) certify nominees and the results of elections; and

(8) perform such other functions as are imposed upon it by this Act.

(c) The Board of Elections may prescribe such regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, as may be necessary or appropriate for the purposes of this title, of title XIV and of section 602, including, without limitation, regulations providing for appeals to it on questions arising in connection with nominations, registrations, and elections (in addition to matters referred to it in sections 808 and 811) and for determination by it of appeals, and regulations permitting qualified voters for the purpose of voting in any election held pursuant to this Act, to register at times when such persons are temporarily absent from the District or in the case of persons not absent from the District but who are physically unable to appear personally at an official registration place, to register in the manner prescribed in such regulations: *Provided,* That the Board of Elections shall accept as evidence of registration any Federal post card application for an absentee ballot prescribed in section 204 of the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 584) when such application is duly executed and filed with the Board by any person included within one of the categories referred to in clauses (1), (2), (3), or (4) of section 101 of such Act.

(d) The officers and agencies of the District government shall furnish to the Board of Elections, upon request of such Board, such space and facilities in public buildings in the District to be used as registration or polling places, and such records, information, services, personnel, offices, and equipment, and such other assistance and facilities, as may be necessary to enable such Board properly to perform its functions. Subject to the approval of the Council, privately owned space, facilities, and equipment may be rented, or donations of such space, facilities, and equipment may be accepted for registration, polling, and other functions of the Board.

(e) In the performance of its duties, the Board of Elections shall not be subject to the authority of any nonjudicial officer of the District.

(f) The Board of Elections, each member of such Board, and persons authorized by it, may administer oaths to persons executing affidavits pursuant to sections 801 and 808. It may provide for the administering of such other oaths as it considers appropriate to require in the performance of its functions.

(g) The Board of Elections is authorized to employ such permanent and temporary personnel as may be necessary within the limit of funds therefor. The appointment, compensation, and other terms of employment may be set by the Board of Elections without regard to the provisions of section 402 of this Act: *Provided,* That the Council may set maximum rates of compensation for various classes of employees of the Board of Elections.

(h) In lieu of the compensation provided by section 4(b) of the District Election Act of 1955, each member of the Board of Elections shall be paid at the rate of $1,500 per annum in periodic installments, provided that the rate of compensation may be changed by act passed by the Council.

(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of the District Election Act of 1955 providing (1) that qualified voters shall register during the calendar year in which a Presidential election is held, (2) that the Board of Elections shall keep the registry open only during such calendar year, and (3) that the Board of Elections shall keep the registry closed during certain periods immediately preceding elections held under the District Election Act of 1955, the Board of Elections is authorized and directed, for the purposes of this Act, and of the District Election Act of 1955, to provide for permanent registration of voters, to keep the registry open as provided in this Act, and to permit qualified voters to register in accordance with applicable laws and regulations, at any time when the registry is open.

(j) No member of the Board of Elections may be a candidate at an election held under this Act.

Elections to be held

SEC. 802. (a) The Board of Elections, in addition to elections conducted by it pursuant to the District Election Act of 1955, shall conduct the following elections:

(1) A primary election to be held on the first Tuesday in May of each even-numbered calendar year commencing after this title takes effect.

(2) A general election, to be held on the first Tuesday following the first Monday in November in each even-numbered calendar year commencing after this title takes effect.

(3) Special elections and referendum elections held pursuant to sections 335(c), 602, 806, 812(b), 812(c), or 1701(b).

Elective offices; terms of office

SEC. 803. (a) The offices of the District to be filled by election under this Act shall be the members of the Council, the Mayor, the Board of Education, and the District Delegate.

(b) The term of an elective office on the District Council shall be four years beginning on January 2 of the odd-numbered calendar year following such election; except that of the members first elected following the effective date of this title, other than in the case of members elected at large, seven shall serve for terms of two years and seven for terms of four years. The members who shall serve for terms of four years shall be determined by lot.

(c) The term of office of the Mayor shall be four years, beginning on January 2 of the odd-numbered calendar year next following his election.

(d) The term of office of the District Delegate shall be two years beginning at noon on January 3 of the odd-numbered calendar year following such election.

(e) The term of an elective office on the Board of Education shall be four years beginning on January 2 of the odd-numbered calendar year following such election; except that of the members first elected following the effective date of this title, seven shall serve for terms of two years and seven for terms of four years. The members who shall serve for terms of four years shall be determined by lot.

Vacancies

SEC. 804. (a) If the office of Delegate becomes vacant, the Mayor, by and with the advice and consent of the Council, shall appoint a Delegate to fill the unexpired term.

(b) A vacancy in the office of Mayor shall be filled at the next general election held pursuant to this title for which it is possible for candidates to be nominated, under any procedure provided for in section 809 following the occurrence of such vacancy. A person elected to fill any such vacancy shall take office as soon as practicable following the certification of his election by the Board of Elections and shall hold office for the duration of the unexpired term to which he was elected but not beyond the end of such a term. Until a vacancy in the office of Mayor can be filled at a general election, as prescribed in this subsection, such vacancy shal be filled by appointment by the District Council.

(c)(1) A vacancy in the District Council shall be filled by appointment by the Mayor, by and with the advice and consent of the Council; except that in filling any vacancy in any of the at-large seats, the Mayor shall not appoint any person who is not a member of the same political party as that of the person who vacated the office to be filled by such appointment.

(2) A vacancy in the Board of Education shall be filled, without regard to political affiliation, by the Mayor, by and with the advice and consent of the Council.

(d) No person shall be appointed to any office under this section unless he is a registered voter and meets the residence and other qualifications required on the date of his appointment of a person filling such office. A person appointed to fill a vacancy under this section shall hold office until the time provided for an elected successor to take office, but not beyond the end of the term during which the vacancy occurred.

Election of candidates

SEC. 805. (a)(1) The candidates of each party receiving the highest number of votes validly cast for each office in each of the several primary elections shall be declared the winner, and his name shall be placed on the ballot in the next general election as the candidate of his party.

(2) The three candidates of each party receiving the highest number of votes validly cast for the offices of councilmen-at-large in each of the several primary elections shall be declared the winners, and their names shall be placed on the ballot in the next general election as the candidates of their party. In no case shall any one political party be permitted to have the names of more than three persons as candidates of that party for election to the offices of councilmen-at-large placed on such ballot.

(b) In the general election, the candidate receiving the highest number of votes validly cast for each office shall be declared elected.

(c) In the event two or more candidates receive the same number of votes validly cast for the same office, the winner shall be determined by lot.

(d) Subject to the provisions of section 812, the Board of Elections shall promptly announce to the public the results of every election and shall certify all such results to the Mayor and the Secretary of the Council. It shall also certify the results of all elections for the office of the District Delegate to the secretary of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Recall

SEC. 806. (a) Any elective officer of the District of Columbia shall be subject to recall by the qualified voters of the District. Any petition filed demanding the recall by the qualified voters of the District of any such elective officer shall be signed by not less than 25 per centum of the number of qualified voters of the District voting at the last preceding general election. Such petition shall set forth the reasons for the demand and shall be filed with the Secretary of the District Council. If any such officer with respect to whom such a petition is filed shall offer his resignation, it shall be accepted and take effect on the day it is offered, and the vacancy shall be filled as provided by law for filling a vacancy in that office arising from any other cause. If he shall not resign within five days after the petition is filed, a special election shall be called by the Council to be held within twenty days thereafter to determine whether the qualified voters of the District will recall such officer.

(b) There shall be printed on the ballot at such election, in not more than two hundred words, the reason or reasons for demanding the recall of any such officer, and in not more than two hundred words, the officer's justification or answer to such demands. Any officer with respect to whom a petition demand his recall has been filed shall continue to perform the duties of his office until the result of such special election is officially declared by the Board of Elections. No petition demanding the recall of any officer filed pursuant to this section shall be circulated against any officer of the District until he has held his office six months.

(c) If a majority of the qualified voters voting on any petition filed pursuant to this section vote to recall any officer, his recall shall be effective on the day on which the Board of Elections certifies the results of the special election, and the vacancy created thereby shall be filled immediately in a manner provided by law for filling a vacancy in that office arising from any other cause.

(d) The Board of Elections shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate (1) with reespect to the form, filing, examination, amendment, and certification of a petition for recall filed pursuant to this section, and (2) with respect to the conduct of any special election held pursuant to this section.

Qualifications of voters

SEC. 807. No person shall vote in an election held under this Act unless he meets the qualifications of a voter specified in this section and has registered pursuant to section 808 of this Act or section 7 of the District Election Act of 1955. A qualified voter of the District and a qualified elector of the District for the purposes of the District Election Act of 1955 shall be any person (1) who has resided in the District continuously during the six-month period ending on the day of the election, (2) who is a citizen of the United States, (3) who is on the day of the election at least eighteen years old, (4) who has never been convicted of a felony in the United States, or, if he has been so convicted, has been pardoned, (5) who is not mentally incompetent, as adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction, and (6) who certifies that he has not, within six months immediately preceding the election, claimed the right to vote or voted in any election in any State or territory of the United States (other than in the District).

Registration

SEC. 808. (a) No person shall be registered under this Act unless—

(1) he shall be able to qualify otherwise as a voter on the day of the next election; and

(2) he executes a registration affidavit by signature or mark (unless prevented by physical disability) on a form provided by the Board of Elections showing that he meets each of the requirements of section 807 of this Act for a qualified voter and if he desires to vote in a primary election, such form shall show his political party affiliation: *Provided,* That the Board shall accept as evidence of registration any Federal post card application for an absentee ballot prescribed in section 204 of the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 584) when such application is duly executed and filed with the Board by any person included within one of the categories referred to in clause (1), (2), (3), or (4) of section 101 of such Act.

(b) If a person is not permitted to register, such person or any qualified candidate, may appeal to the Board of Elections, but not later than three days after the registry is closed for the next election. The Board shall decide within seven days after the appeal is perfected whether the challenged voter is entitled to register. If the appeal is denied the appellant may, within three days after such denial, appeal to the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions. The court shall decide the issue not later than eighteen days before the day of the election. The decision of such court shall be final and not appealable. If the appeal is upheld by either the Board or the court, the challenged elector shall be allowed to register immediately. If the appeal is pending on election day, the challenged voter may cast a ballot marked "Challenged", as provided in section 811.

(c) For the purposes of this Act and of the District Election Act of 1955, the Board of Elections shall keep open, during normal hours of business, as determined by the Council, a central registry office and shall conduct registration at such other times and places as the Board of Elections shall deem appropriate. The Board of Elections may suspend the registration of voters, or the acceptance of changes in registrations for such period not exceeding thirty days next preceding any elections under this Act or under the District Election Act of 1955.

Nominations

SEC. 809. (a) Nomination of a candidate to be included on the ballot for a primary election shall take place when the Board of Elections receives a declaration of candidacy, accompanied by the filing fee in the amount required in subsection (f): *Provided,* That such candidate is duly registered as affiliated with the political party for which the nomination is sought and otherwise meets the qualifications for holding the office for which he seeks nomination.

(b) Nomination of an independent candidate who desires to have his name on the ballot in the general election shall take place when the Board of Elections receives a petition signed by the number of registered voters specified in this subsection and accompanied by a filing fee in the amount required by subsection (f). Petitions nominating an independent candidate for District Delegate or Mayor shall be signed by not less than five hundred qualified voters registered in the District. Petitions nominating a candidate for the District Council, other than a candidate for Councilman at large, shall be signed by not less than one hundred qualified voters registered in the ward from which nomination is sought. Petitions nominating an independent candidate for the District Council as a Councilman at large shall be signed by not less than five hundred qualified voters registered in the District. No person shall be barred from nomination as an independent candidate in the general election because he was a candidate for nomination in a primary election: *Provided,* That he complies with the requirements of this subsection.

(c) Nomination of a candidate for the Board of Education who desires to have his name on the ballot in the general election shall take place when the Board of Elections receives a petition signed by not less than one hundred qualified voters registered in the ward from which nomination is sought, and accompanied by a filing fee in the amount required by subsection (f).

(d) No person shall be a candidate for more than one office in any election. If a person is nominated for more than one office, he shall within three days after the last day on which nominations may be made notify the Board of Elections in writing, for which office he elects to run.

(e) A candidate may withdraw his candidacy in writing if his withdrawal is received by the Board not more than three days after the last day on which nominations may be made.

(f) Filing fees to accompany a declaration of candidacy in the primary election or a petition nominating an independent candidate for the Board of Education for inclusion on the ballot in the general election shall be $200 for a candidate for District Delegate or Mayor and $50 for a member of the District Council or a member of the Board of Education. No fee shall be refunded unless a candidacy is withdrawn as provided in subsection (d) or (e).

(g) The Board of Elections is authorized to accept any nominating petition as bona fide with respect to the qualifications of the signatories thereto: *Provided,* That the originals or facsimilies thereof have been posted in a suitable public place for at least ten days: *Provided further,* That no challenge as to the qualifications of the signatories shall have been received in writing by the Board of Elections within ten days of the first posting of such petition.

Partisan elections

SEC. 810. (a) Except in the case of candidates for election to the Board of Education, ballots and voting machines may show party affiliations, emblems, or slogans.

(b) The form of ballot to be used in any election under this Act shall be determined by the Board of Elections: *Provided,* That in any such election, the position on the ballot of the candidates for each office shall be determined by lot: *Provided further,* That the Board of Elections shall make provision on the ballot for voters, in their discretion, to vote for groups of candidates by a single mark or to vote separately for individual candidates, regardless of their group affiliations: *Provided further,* That a candidate's name shall not be included in any such group without his written consent filed with the Board of Elections.

(c) The second sentence of section 9(a) of the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1147), as amended, shall not be applicable to elections held under this Act or to political management or political campaigns in connection therewith.

Method of voting

SEC. 811. (a) Voting in all elections shall be secret.

(b) Each voter shall be entitled to vote for one candidate for the Council from the ward in which the voter is a resident and for five Councilmen-at-large, for one candidate for the Board of Education from the ward in which the voter is a resident, for one candidate for Mayor and for one candidate for District Delegate. The ballot shall, where applicable, show the wards from which each candidate for office as a member of the Council or of the Board of Education has been nominated.

(c) The ballot of a person who is registered as a resident of the District shall be valid only if cast in the voting precinct where the residence shown on his registration is located.

(d) Absentee voting under this Act shall be permitted to the same extent and subject to the same rule and regulations, including penalties, as absentee voting is permitted under the District Election Act of 1955.

(e) At least ten days prior to the date of any referendum or other election, any group of citizens or individual candidates interested in the outcome of the election may petition the Board of Elections for credentials authorizing watchers at any and all polling places during the voting hours and until the count has been completed. The Board of Elections shall formulate rules and regulations, not inconsistent with provisions of this title, to prescribe the form of watchers' credentials, to govern their conduct, and to limit the number of watchers so that the conduct of the election will not be unreasonably obstructed.

(f) If the official in charge of the polling place, after hearing both parties to any challenge or acting on his own with respect to a prospective voter, reasonably believes the prospective voter is not qualified to vote, he shall allow the voter to cast a paper ballot marked "challenged". Ballots so cast shall be set aside, and no such ballot shall be counted until the challenge has been removed as provided in subsection (g).

(g) If a person has been permitted to vote only by challenge ballot, such person, or any qualified candidate, may appeal to the Board of Elections within three days after election day. The Board shall decide within seven days after the appeal is perfected whether the voter was qualified to vote. If the Board decides that the voter was qualified to vote, the word "challenged" shall be stricken from the voter's ballot and the ballot shall be treated as if it had not been challenged.

(h) If a voter is physically unable to mark his ballot or to operate the voting machine, the official in charge of the voting place may enter the voting booth with him and vote as directed. Upon the request of any such voter, a second election official may enter the voting booth to assist in the voting. The officials shall tell no one what votes were cast. The official in charge of the voting place shall make a return of all such voters, giving their names and disabilities.

(i) A voter shall vote only once with respect to each office to be filled.

(j) Copies of the regulations of the Board of Elections with respect to voting shall be made available to prospective voters at each polling place.

(k) Before being allowed to vote the voter shall sign a certificate, on a form to be prescribed by the Board of Elections, that he has duly registered under the election laws of the District and that, to his best knowledge and belief, he has not since such registration done any act which might disqualify him as a voter.

Recounts and contests

SEC. 812. (a) The provisions of section 11 of the District Election Act of 1955 with respect to recounts and contests shall be applicable to any election or referendum held under this Act, except that in the case of any referendum, any qualified voter who has voted in any such election may petition the Board of Elections for a recount of the votes cast in one or more precincts under the same conditions required for a candidate for office under section 11(a) of the District Election Act of 1955.

(b) If, pursuant to this section, the court voids all or part of an election, and if it determines that the number and importance of the matters involved outweigh the cost and practical disadvantages of holding another election, it may order a special election for the purpose of voting on the matters with respect to which the election was declared void.

(c) Special elections shall be conducted in a manner comparable to that prescribed for regular elections and at times and in the manner prescribed by the Board of Elections by regulation. A person elected at such an election shall take office on the day following the date on which the Board of Elections certifies the results of the election.

(d) Vacancies resulting from voiding all or part of an election shall be filled as prescribed in section 804 unless filled by a special election held pursuant to subsections (b) and (c) of this section.

Interference with registration or voting

SEC. 813. (a) No one shall interfere with the registration or voting of another person, except as it may be reasonably necessary in the performance of a duty imposed by law. No person performing such a duty shall interfere with the registration or voting of another person because of his race, color, sex, or religious belief, or his want of property or income.

(b) No registered voter shall be required to perform a military duty on election day which would prevent him from voting, except in time of war or public danger, or unless he is away from the District in military service. No registered voter may be arrested while voting or going to vote except for treason, a felony, or for a breach of the peace then committed.

Voting hours

SEC. 814. Polling places shall be open from 8 o'clock antemeridian to 8 o'clock postmeridian on each day when elections are held pursuant to this Act.

Prohibition of the sale of alcoholic beverages on election days

SEC. 815. The second sentence in the second paragraph of section 7 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended (sec. 25-107, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended to read as follows: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, neither the District Council nor the Commissioners shall authorize the sale by any licensee, other than the holder of a retailer's license, class E, of any beverages on the day of the presidential election or of any election in the District of Columbia held under the District of Columbia Charter Act during the hours when the polls are open, and any such sales are hereby prohibited."

Violations

SEC. 816. Whoever willfully violates any provision of this title, or of any regulation prescribed and published by the Board of Elections under authority of this Act, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned for not more than six months, or both.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS

Agreements with United States

SEC. 901. (a) For the purpose of preventing duplication of effort or of otherwise promoting efficiency and economy, any Federal officer or agency may furnish services to the District government and any District officer or agency may furnish services to the Federal Government. Except where the terms and conditions governing the furnishing of such services are prescribed by other provisions of law, such services shall be furnished pursuant to an agreement (1) negotiated by the Federal and District authorities concerned, and (2) approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and by the Mayor, with the approval of the District Council. Each such agreement shall provide that the cost of furnishing such services shall be borne in the manner provided in subsection (c) by the government to which such services are furnished at rates or charges based on the actual cost of furnishing such services.

(b) For the purpose of carrying out any agreement negotiated and approved pursuant to subsection (a), any District officer or agency may in the agreement delegate any of his or its functions to any Federal officer or agency, and any Federal officer or agency may in the agreement delegate any of his or its functions to any District officer or agency. Any function so delegated may be exercised in accordance with the terms of the delegation.

(c) The cost to each Federal officer and agency in furnishing services to the District pursuant to any such agreement shall be paid, in accordance with the terms of the agreement, out of appropriations made by the Council to the District officers and agencies to which such services are furnished. The costs to each District officer and agency in furnishing services to the Federal Government pursuant to any such agreement shall be paid, in accordance with the terms of the agreement, out of appropriations made by the Congress or other funds available to the Federal officers and agencies to which such services are furnished.

Personal interest in contracts or transactions

SEC. 902. Any officer or employee of the District who is convicted of a violation of section 208 of title 18, United States Code, shall forfeit his office or position.

Compensation from more than one source

SEC. 903. (a) Except as provided in this Act, no person shall be ineligible to serve or to receive compensation as a member of the Council, or the Board of Elections because he occupies another office or position or because he receives compensation (including retirement compensation) from another source.

(b) The right to another office or position or to compensation from another source otherwise secured to such a person under the laws of the United States shall not be abridged by the fact of his service or receipt of compensation as a member of the Council or such Board, if such service does not interfere with the discharge of his duties in such other office or position.

Assistance of the United States Civil Service Commission in development of District Merit System

SEC. 904. The United States Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized to advise and assist the Mayor and the Council in the further development of the merit system required by section 402(3) and the said Commission is authorized to enter into agreements with the District government to make available its registers of eligibles as a recruiting source to fill District positions as needed. The costs of any specific services furnished by the Civil Service Commission may be compensated for under the provisions of section 901 of this Act.

TITLE X—SUCCESSION IN GOVERNMENT

Transfer of personnel, property, and funds

SEC. 1001. (a) In each case of the transfer, by any provision of this Act, of functions to the Council, to the Mayor, or to any agency or officer, there are hereby transferred (as of the time of such transfer of functions) to the Council, to the Mayor, to such agency, or to the agency of which such officer is the head, for use in the administration of the functions of the Council or such agency or officer, the personnel (except the members of Boards or Commissions abolished by this Act), property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations and other funds, which relate primarily to the functions so transferred.

(b) If any question arises in connection with the carrying out of subsection (a), such question shall be decided—

(1) in the case of functions transferred from a Federal officer or agency, by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; and

(2) in the case of other functions (A) by the Council, or in such manner as the Council shall provide, if such functions are transferred to the Council, and (B) by the Mayor if such functions are transferred to him or to any other officer or agency.

(c) Any of the personnel transferred to the Council, the Mayor, or any agency by this section which the Council or the head of such agency shall find to be in excess of the personnel necessary for the administration of its or his functions shall, in accordance with law, be retransferred to other positions in the District or Federal Government or be separated from the service.

(d) No officer or employee shall, by reason of his transfer by this Act or his separation from service under this Act, be deprived of a civil service status held by him prior to such transfer or any right of appeal or review he may have by reason of his separation from service.

Existing statutes, regulations, and other actions

SEC. 1002. (a) Any statute, regulation, or other action in respect of (and any regulation or other action issued, made, taken, or granted by) any officer or agency from which any function is transferred by this Act shall, except to the extent modified or made inapplicable by or under authority of law, continue in effect as if such transfer had not been made; but after such transfer, references in such statute, regulation, or other action to an officer or agency from which a transfer is made by this Act shall be held and considered to refer to the officer or agency to which the transfer is made.

(b) As used in subsection (a), the term "other action" includes, without limitation, any rule, order, contract, compact, policy, determination, directive, grant, authorization, permit, requirement, or designation.

(c) Unless otherwise specifically provided, nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as affecting the applicability to the District of Columbia government of personnel legislation relating to the District government until such time as the Council may otherwise elect to provide equal or equivalent coverage as provided in section 402(4).

Pending actions and proceedings

SEC. 1003. (a) No suit, action, or other judicial proceeding lawfully commenced by or against any officer or agency in his or its official capacity or in relation to the exercise of his or its official functions, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any provision of this Act; but the court, unless it determines that the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding is not necessarily for purposes of settlement of the questions involved, shall allow the same to be maintained, with such substitutions as to parties as are appropriate.

(b) No administrative action or proceeding lawfully commenced shall abate solely by reason of the taking effect of any provision of this Act, but such action or proceeding shall be continued with such substitutions as to parties and officers or agencies as are appropriate.

Vacancies resulting from abolition of Board of Commissioners

SEC. 1004. Until the first day of July next after the first Mayor takes office under this Act, no vacancy occurring in any District agency by reason of section 321, abolishing the Board of Commissioners, shall affect the power of the remaining members of such agency to exercise its functions; but such agency may take action only if a majority of the members holding office vote in favor of it.

TITLE XI—SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

Separability of provisions

SEC. 1101. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

TITLE XII—TEMPORARY PROVISIONS

Powers of the President during transition period

SEC. 1201. The President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to take such action during the period following the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the date of the first meeting of the District Council, by Executive order or otherwise, with respect to the administration of the functions of the District of Columbia government, as he deems necessary to enable the Board of Elections properly to perform its functions under this Act.

Reimbursable appropriations for the District

SEC. 1202. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to advance to the District of Columbia the sum of $750,000, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for use (1) in paying the expenses of the Board of Elections (including compensation of the members thereof), and (2) in otherwise carrying into effect the provisions of this Act.

(b) The full amount expended out of the money advanced pursuant to this section shall be reimbursed to the United States, without interest, during the second fiscal year which begins after the effective date of title V, from the general fund of the District of Columbia.

TITLE XIII—EFFECTIVE DATES

Effective dates

SEC. 1301. (a) As used in this title and title XIV the term "charter" means titles I to XI, both inclusive, and titles XV, XVI, and XVII.

(b) The charter shall take effect only if accepted pursuant to title XIV. If the charter is so accepted, it shall take effect on the day following the date on which it is accepted (as determined pursuant to section 1406) except that—

(1) part 2 of title III, title V, title VII (except part 4), and title XVII shall take effect on the day upon which the Council members first elected take office;

(2) section 402 shall take effect on the day upon which the Mayor first elected takes office; and

(3) part 4 of title VII shall take effect with respect to the first fiscal year beginning next after the Mayor first elected takes office and with respect to subsequent fiscal years.

(c) Titles XII, XIII, and XIV shall take effect on the day following the date on which this Act is enacted.

TITLE XIV—SUBMISSION OF CHARTER FOR REFERENDUM

Charter referendum

SEC. 1401. (a) On a date to be fixed by the Board of Elections, not more than four months after the enactment of this Act, a referendum (in this title referred to as the "charter referendum") shall be conducted to determine whether the registerd qualified voters of the District of Columbia accept the charter.

(b) As used in this title, a "qualified voter" means a person who meets the requirements of section 807 on the day of the charter referendum.

Board of Elections

SEC. 1402. (a) In addition to its other duties, the Board of Elections established under the District Election Act of 1955 shall conduct the charter referendum and certify the results thereof as provided in this title.

(b) Notwithstanding the fact that such section does not otherwise take effect unless the charter is accepted under this title, the applicable provisions of section 801 of this Act shall govern the Board of Elections in the performance of its duties.

Registration

SEC. 1403. (a) All registrations which were valid for the election held in the District of Columbia on November 3, 1964, shall be valid and sufficient for the charter referendum, subject to compliance by registrants with requirements prescribed by the Board of Elections sufficient to satisfy the Board that no such registrant shall, between November 3, 1964, and the date of the charter referendum, have become disqualified for registration or to vote under this Act.

(b) The Board of Elections shall conduct within the District of Columbia for a period of thirty days a further registration of the qualified voters commencing not more than sixty days after the enactment of this Act and ending not more than thirty days nor less than fifteen days prior to the date set for the charter referendum as provided in section 1401 of this title.

(c) Prior to the commencement of such further registration, the Board of Elections shall publish, in daily newspapers of general circulation published in the District of Columbia, a list of the registration places and the dates and hours of registration.

(d) The applicable provisions of section 808, notwithstanding the fact that such section does not otherwise take effect unless the charter is accepted, shall govern the further registration of voters for this charter referendum.

Charter referendum ballot: Notice of voting

SEC. 1404. (a) The charter referendum ballot shall contain the following, with a blank space appropriately filled:

"The District of Columbia Charter Act, enacted __________, proposes to establish a new charter for the District of Columbia, but provides that the charter shall take effect only if it is accepted by the registered qualified voters of the District in this referendum.

"By marking a cross (X) in one of the squares provided below, show whether you are for or against the charter.

☐ For the charter

☐ Against the charter".

(b) Voting may be by paper ballot or by voting machine. The Board of Elections may make such changes in the second paragraph of the charter referendum ballot as it determines to be necessary to permit the use of voting machines if such machines are used.

(c) Not less than three days before the date of charter referendum, the Board of Elections shall mail to each person registered (1) a sample of the charter referendum ballot, and (2) information showing the polling place of such person and the date and hours of voting.

(d) Not less than one day before the charter referendum, the Board of Elections shall publish, in newspapers of general circulation published in the District of Columbia, a list of the polling places and the date and hours of voting.

Method of voting

SEC. 1405. Notwithstanding the fact such sections do not otherwise take effect unless the charter is accepted under this title, the applicable provisions of sections 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, and 816 of this Act shall govern the method of voting, recounts and contests, interference with registration or voting, and violations connected with this charter referendum.

Acceptance or nonacceptance of charter

SEC. 1406. (a) If a minority of the registered qualified voters voting in the charter referendum vote for the charter the charter shall be considered accepted as of the time the Board of Elections certifies the result of the charter referendum to the President of the United States, as provided in subsection (b).

(b) The Board of Elections shall, within a reasonable time, but in no event more than thirty days after the date of the charter referendum, certify the result of the charter referendum to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

TITLE XV—DELEGATE

District delegate

SEC. 1501. (a) Until a constitutional amendment and subsequent congressional action otherwise provide, the people of the District shall be represented in the House of Representatives of the United States by a Delegate, to be known as the "Delegate from the District of Columbia", who shall be elected as provided in this Act. The Delegate shall have a seat in the House of Representatives, with the right to debate, but not of voting. The Delegate shall be a member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia and shall possess in such committee the same powers and privileges as he has in the House of Representatives, and may make any motion except to reconsider. His term of office shall be for two years.

(b) No person shall hold the office of District Delegate unless he (1) is a qualified voter, (2) is at least twenty-five years old, (3) holds no other public office, and (4) is domiciled and resides in the District and during the three years next preceding his nomination (A) has been resident in and domiciled in the District, and (B) has not voted in any election (other than in the District) for any candidate for public office. He shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this subsection.

(c)(1) Subsection (a) of section 601 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "from the Territories".

(2) Clause (b) of section 1 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended (70 Stat. 743), is hereby amended by striking out "from a Territory".

(3) The second paragraph under the heading "House of Representatives" in the Act of July 16, 1914 (2 U.S.C. 37), is hereby amended by striking out "from Territories".

(4) Paragraph (1) of section 302 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1929, as amended (2 U.S.C. 241), is hereby amended by inserting after "United States" the following: "and the District of Columbia".

(5) Section 591 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting "and the District of Columbia" before the period at the end thereof. Section 594 of such title is hereby amended by inserting after "Territories and Possessions" the following: "or the District of Columbia". The first paragraph of section 595 of such title is hereby amended by inserting after "from any Territory or possession" the following: "or the District of Columbia".

TITLE XVI—BOARD OF EDUCATION

Control of public schools

SEC. 1601. The control of the public schools of the District of Columbia is hereby vested in the Board of Education continued in the municipal government of the District of Columbia under the provisions of section 322(a)(1) of title III of this Act. Such Board shall consist of fourteen members, one elected from each ward, as provided in title VIII. Members of the Board of Education shall be elected on a nonpartisan basis.

Qualifications

SEC. 1602. No person shall hold the office of member of the Board of Education unless he (1) is a qualified voter, (2) is domiciled in the District and resides in the ward from which he is nominated, (3) has, during the three years next preceding his nomination resided and been domiciled in the District, (4) has, for one year preceding his nomination, resided and been domiciled in the ward from which he is nominated, (5) holds no other elective public office, (6) holds no position as an officer or employee of the municipal government of the District of Columbia or any appointive office, for which compensation is provided out of District funds, and (7) holds no office to which he was appointed by the President of the United States and for which compensation is provided out of Federal or District funds. A member shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this section.

Per diem

SEC. 1603. The members of the Board of Education shall receive no salary as such, but shall be paid a per diem of $20 for each day of service at meetings or while on the work of the Board and may be reimbursed for any expenses legitimately incurred in the performance of such service or work; except that the amount authorized as per diem may be changed by act passed by the Council.

Amendments

SEC. 1604. (a) The fourth paragraph of subsection (a) of section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia", approved June 20, 1906, is amended to read as follows:

"The Board of Education shall annually on the first day of October transmit to the Mayor of the District of Columbia an estimate in detail of the amount of money required for the public schools for the ensuing year and the Mayor shall transmit such estimate to the District Council, with such recommendations as he may deem proper."

(b) The first four sentences of subsection (a) of section 2 of such Act are hereby repealed.

(c) Subsection (b) of section 2 of such Act is hereby repealed.

TITLE XVII—INITIATIVE

Power to propose and enact legislation

SEC. 1701. (a) Subject to the provisions of section 324 of this Act, the qualified voters of the District shall have the power, independent of the Mayor and Council, to propose and enact legislation relating to the District with respect to all rightful subjects of legislation consistent with the Constitution of the United States and the provisions of this Act.

(b) In exercising the power of initiative conferred upon the qualified voters by subsection (a) of this section, not less than 10 per centum of the number of qualified voters voting in the last preceding general election shall be required to propose any measure by an initiative petition. Every such petition shall include the full text of the measure so proposed and shall be filed with the Secretary of the District Council to be submitted to a vote of the qualified voters. Any such petition which has been filed with the Secretary, and certified by him as sufficient, shall be submitted to the qualified voters of the District at the first general election which occurs not less than thirty days nor more than one year from the date on which the Secretary files his certificate of sufficiency. The Council shall, if no general election is to be held within such period, provide for a special election for the purpose of considering the petition.

(c) Upon receiving the certification of the Board of Elections (as provided in section 805(d) of this Act) of the results of any election held with respect to any measure proposed by an initiative petition, the Secretary of the Council, if such measure was approved by a majority of the qualified voters of the District voting thereon, shall, within five calendar days thereafter, present the petition containing such measure so approved, which was filed with him pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, to the President of the United States. Such measure shall become law unless, within ten calendar days after it is so presented to the President, he shall, in accordance with this subsection, disapprove the same. The President may, if he is satisfied that such measure adversely affects a Federal interest, disapprove it, in which event he shall return it, with his objections, to the Secretary and, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, such measure shall not become law.

(d) If conflicting measures proposed at the same election become law, the measure receiving the greatest number of affirmative votes shall prevail to the extent of such conflict.

(e) If, within thirty days after the filing of a petition, the Secretary has not specified the particulars in which a petition is defective, the petition shall be deemed certified as sufficient for purposes of this section.

(f) The style of all measures proposed by initiative petition shall be as follows: "Be it enacted by the People of the District of Columbia".

(g) The Board of Elections shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate (1) with respect to the form, filing, examination, amendment, and certification of initiative petitions, and (2) with respect to the conduct of any election during which any such petition is considered.

(h) If any organization or group request it for the purpose of circulating descriptive matter relating to the measures proposed to be voted on, the Board of Elections shall either permit such organization or group to copy the names and addresses of the qualified electors or furnish it with a list thereof, at a charge to be determined by the Board of Elections, not exceeding the actual cost of reproducing such list.

TITLE XVIII—TITLE OF ACT

SEC. 1801. This Act, divided into titles and sections according to table of contents, and including the declaration of congressional policy which is a part of such Act, may be cited as the "District of Columbia Charter Act".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a short quorum call, without time being allocated to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE UINTA NATIONAL FOREST IN THE STATE OF UTAH BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute on the time of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 451, Senate bill 1764.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1764) to authorize the acquisition of certain lands within the boundaries of the Uinta National Forest in the State of Utah, by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 9, after the word "acquire", to insert "at not to exceed the fair market value as determined by him"; and on page 2, line 15, after the word "exceed", to insert "$300,000"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That to promote in timely and adequate manner control of floods that may originate thereon and the reduction of soil erosion through the restoration of adequate vegetative cover and to provide for their management, protection, and public use as national forest lands under principles of multiple use and sustained yield, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire at not to exceed the fair market value as determined by him such of the nonfederally owned land in the area described in section 2 hereof as he finds suitable to accomplish the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 2. This Act shall be applicable to lands within the boundary of the Uinta National Forest described as follows:

SALT LAKE MERIDIAN

Township 5 south, range 3 east, sections 25 to 27, inclusive, and sections 34 to 36, inclusive.

Township 6 south, range 3 east, sections 1, 2, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 26.

Township 5 south, range 4 east, sections 27 to 35, inclusive.

Township 6 south, range 4 east, sections 2 to 10, inclusive, and section 16.

Sec. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for purposes of this Act not to exceed $300,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, my bill (S. 1764) would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase some 10,000 acres of privately owned land which lie within the Uinta National Forest boundary in Utah, and comprise part of the watershed of the Provo River above Provo City, the third largest city in the State. The land is also part of the watershed for a number of other smaller communities along the Wasatch front in Utah County, which has a total population of well over 100,000 and is growing rapidly.

It is most important that the Federal Government purchase this land to help protect the Provo City water supply from pollution, and the city itself from floods.

The land which the Federal Government will acquire is mainly mountainside land which has lost much of its ground cover through heavy grazing, and, therefore, is a potential flood hazard for the cities which lie below in Utah's cloudbust season. The Federal acquisition will be coupled with the purchase by the city of Provo of the bottomlands in the same privately owned tract. These bottomlands are suitable for summer home development, which city officials fear would lead to the pollution of the many springs in the area which, along with Provo River, are the source of the city's water supply.

The lands which the Federal Government will purchase will cost approximately $300,000. Provo City will spend an additional $200,000—all it can afford. The private lands in question have only recently come on the market, and this is the time to act.

The Federal purchase will bring under the excellent management practices of the Forest Service critically located acres on the Provo River watershed, and will assure their proper protection and the enhancement of their recreation and wildlife values.

This bill was unanimously reported by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. I ask that it pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 467), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REPORT No. 467

PURPOSE

The bill concerns itself with an area of approximately 10,000 acres located in the drainage of the South Fork of the Provo River, and intermingled or surrounded by national forest, and which would be used to promote flood control and to halt soil erosion. The South Fork drainage is the main source of domestic water for the city of Provo, and the city proposes to purchase 1,000 acres of bottomland to prevent pollution and to develop park and recreation facilities.

Also provided by the bill would be management, protection, and use of the acquired lands under multiple use and sustained yield as national forest lands.

CONCLUSION

Since some of the lands to which S. 1764 would apply have recently been placed on the market by the long-time owner, the committee feels there is some urgency for their acquisition and unanimously recommends S. 1764.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHARTER ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1118) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to suggest the absence of a quorum with the time not to be allocated to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call for the quorum be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Chair what the parliamentary situation is? The question pending is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick]; is that not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] are pending.

Mr. BIBLE. My understanding is that 1 hour has been allocated, to be equally divided, on those amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on my own time, I yield 2 minutes first to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] and then 15 minutes, on my time, to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ATTACK ON AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada for yielding to me.

Mr. President, yesterday, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] protested on the floor of the Senate in the strongest terms the comments contained in a study published by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee entitled "Techniques of Soviet Propaganda." These statements relate to the activities of the American Friends Service Committee.

Today, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] both of whom, like the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], are members of this subcommittee, also joined in the protest and indicated that they were not advised beforehand of the contents of the study and had no prior knowledge of its contents.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] stated specifically that the statement from the study was that the American Friends Service Committee "is well known as a transmission belt for the Communist apparatus."

This quotation is, as the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] stated, "grossly unjust."

Mr. President, I agree with the statement and with the other statements of the Senators to whom I have referred, and I join them in the protest against a great injustice to a fine American institution, and against an abuse of an instrumentality of the Senate.

I thank the Senator from Nevada for yielding to me.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHARTER ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1118) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Nevada for yielding to me.

Mr. President, over the past few sessions of Congress, a great deal has been said about the role Senators on this side of the aisle have played in the development of home rule legislation.

I should like to take just a few moments to assess the role the minority members of the District Committee played in shaping the bill now before the Senate. I am proud both of our efforts and our results in making this a better bill, and in the course of our deliberations, assuring a full measure of independence for the new Government while establishing some measure of protections for the Federal interest in the Nation's Capital.

At the executive session on this bill, some 20 amendments were offered by the members of the committee, half by the majority and half by the minority. Some 14 amendments were adopted. Remarkably enough, half of those adopted were offered by the minority, half by the majority.

Adopted was my amendment to bar appointed Federal officeholders from simultaneously holding the office of councilman.

Adopted was my amendment to require the Comptroller General to submit the audit of District finances he is required to make under the bill directly to the Congress.

Adopted was my amendment to expand the category of financial institutions authorized to deal in District obligations and to require fiduciaries to exercise due care when investing in District obligations.

Adopted was my amendment to insure that no compacts existing between the District of Columbia and other jurisdictions would be impaired by the adoption of this act.

Adopted was my amendment to authorize the new District Council to confer jurisdiction upon the District of Columbia Court of Appeals to hear appeals from administrative decisions of District agencies denying, revoking, suspending, or refusing to restore or renew any license or registration to engage in any business or profession.

And, most importantly, adopted was my amendment to protect and insure the retention of the same employee benefits of District employees which they enjoyed prior to enactment. This amendment is intended to guarantee full job security and employment rights, privileges, and benefits now enjoyed by public employees and to bar the new government from enacting or adopting any personnel ordinance, act, rule, or regulation to the contrary.

Adopted also were a series of amendments offered by Senator DOMINICK to insure a more thorough Federal review and voice in the calculation and computation of the Federal payment. His amendments gave the Administrator of General Services a say in determining the method of assessment for Federal personal property and gave him the power to review the District's assessments of Federal real property to determine if such assessments were fair, reasonable, and accurate and conducted in accordance with the procedures set forth in the act. Finally, Senator DOMINICK sponsored the amendment which authorized the Administrator to enter into cooperative arrangements with the mayor of the new government to resolve any disputes or disagreements relating to the Federal payment. This amendment was adopted.

Of course, there were other amendments which we offered which were not adopted.

It is manifestly clear that we attempted to retain the broad objectives of the legislation while amplifying and making more clear the retained Federal interest in the affairs of the National Capital. Ours was a constructive role. It was the product of much research, much time and effort, many long hours in conference with legislative counsel and with our colleagues. We were dedicated to the proposition that if the committee was going to report out a home rule bill, we wanted it to be a better bill than it was when introduced.

We sought to round off some of its sharp edges and define the ill defined; we sought to delineate the "understood" from the "supposed," the "known" from the "conjectured" and the discretionary powers from the mandatory. In my judgment the end result is a bill of better draftsmanship and clarity by far than the one which came to us from downtown.

Much has been said about this bill; much has been speculated about what it can do. Little has been said of what it is not.

It is not a panacea for all the District's ills, as some have claimed. In the period of transition, the already overwhelming problems of the District could very well gain additional footholds against the efforts to resolve them. The new government could not be expected to come into office with a full complement of knowledge and experince to meet every District crisis. Undoubtedly, in the first days Congress would still have to backstop the District's major emergencies with superior Federal resources and expertise.

Enactment of this bill would not eradicate crime in the District.

Enactment of this bill would not solve all the crises in our schools.

Enactment of this bill would not make Children's Hospital solvent.

Enactment of this bill would not meet every welfare need.

Enactment of this bill would not bring rapid transit to the District.

Enactment of this bill would not sweep poverty, misery, ignorance, and immorality from our community—let no partisan so delude you.

Enactment of this bill would throw all these problems in the laps of 20 men and women who had never held previous elective office.

I voted in committee to report this bill out for action by the Senate. I anticipate its adoption by the Senate.

Let me state a caution: too many people will place too much faith and trust in the promises and projections of those who have unqualifiedly endorsed this legislation.

In it are many dangers—many disappointments—many inadequacies, and inconsistencies—many frustrations for those who have labored so long and so arduously for its enactment. In it is a continued role for the Federal Government as a father to whose breast the insoluble problems and unmet needs of the citizenry will be brought when local efforts fail. The problems are too great to be resolved by a mere change in governmental form.

My vote for the bill is premised on this reasoning:

Title 14 of the bill provides that if the bill is passed by both Houses and receives the President's signature it will go before a referendum of the eligible voters of the District of Columbia. Presumably, if they reject it the Charter Act will not be given effect. If they accept the Charter Act it will be implemented.

The choice should be left to the people. Every reasonable effort was made to amend the bill to adequately protect the Federal interest. More could be done in this field, but the bill will pass. If the Federal interests are protected, the choice should be left to the people under the referendum. As my colleagues know, I am a believer in the discreet use of the referendum as a proper exercise of those powers reserved to the people.

During the hearings and in the hearing record an effort was made to elaborate the peculiar weaknesses in this bill. Some were corrected by amendment, others were not.

Once the weaknesses are stated and the full facts and specific legislative language are before the voters of the District, I will abide by their choice. Should they either accept or reject the charter, their say should be authoritative and final. I have worked on this bill in the hope and understanding that a fully informed and enlightened electorate will cast a reasoned, intelligent vote.

I would have preferred the creation of a Joint Congressional Committee to develop a plan of self-government for the District with the submission of that plan to both Houses of Congress and then to a referendum of the people. I am a little concerned over the technique we have followed of relying on the recommendations of the executive branch on how the legislative branch should delegate its governing powers over the District.

We are now beyond that point and have a bill sponsored by the executive branch before us. Such as it is, I am willing to have it submitted to the people. But, do not read my vote as an unqualified endorsement and soul rendering confession that this bill is the salvation of the District of Columbia. If enacted into law and accepted by the referendum it will only be a first, short step toward vesting in the citizens of the District not only the rights of self-government, and the full weight of its oppressive responsibilities.

Of course, there are difficulties when the national legislative body is required to perform local legislative duties. Of course, there were delays in implementing some programs in the District as a product of each Senator's and Congressman's burden of other duties.

We are a deliberative body. Most of us have held other elective office before we came to the Congress. Many of us were local or State legislators in our younger days. You might say that we have come up through the ranks. We are familiar with the legislative process of the cities and States, and it is in all candor that I say the only first effect of the adoption of this legislation will be to focus the protests, marches, demonstrations, claims, and recriminations downtown. It will not do one whit to remove the legitimate causes of any grievance.

It is my fond hope that some of those who have made the most impassioned supplications for home rule for the District will run for local office. When this cause is won, I hope they stick around to pay the bills of their victory. I hope they will share the burdens and the sorrows of running this great Capital. Then in 1970 or 1980 we can have them back before us and read their speeches to them and ask them if there are any corrections they wish to make for the permanent RECORD.

Mr. President, it is in this context that I will vote for the bill. When I voice my "yea" it will be done with mixed emotions—pride in the job that was done to improve the bill; uneasiness that perhaps not enough was done to make it work; and resolution that the people's will be done in their best judgment after a full exposition of all the issues.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Against whose time will the quorum call be charged?

Mr. BIBLE. I should like to have it charged to the time of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], because we are considering his amendments. However, I do not believe I can do that without his consent. Therefore I shall charge the time to my side. We shall make an adjustment later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum called be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield myself such time as I may need. For the present, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The pending amendments, which I sent to the desk yesterday, are complicated amendments.

It deals with a question of how to finance the separate school board proposed to be established by the bill in order to operate the schools within the District.

Before explaining the amendment, I shall explain briefly what the Committee on the District of Columbia did with regard to the District school system.

The committee provided for an elective school board in a nonpartisan election. The committee adopted an amendment to continue the present school board until the new elective board could take over.

That action is encouraged because the bill, as originally drafted, would have abolished the present appointed school board and would have made no provision for replacement. So, until we adopted the amendment, we were in the position of saying, "You will not have any school board until the new one is elected."

This has been changed. As the Senator knows, I have worked hard on both these amendments. Months ago—on March 4, to be exact—I introduced a bill to create an elective school board for the District of Columbia.

S. 1118, as reported by the committee, deals with school problems much more effectively than the original bill sent to us by the administration.

The amendment I now offer would go far in adding effectiveness to the District of Columbia School System. I believe it is essential in order to enable the school board to solve its most perplexing problems.

Stated quite simply, the adoption of my amendment would give the new school board an independent means of financing its programs and take the issue out of the political thicket. This is the essential difference between the committee bill and my amendment.

The amendment would give the new school board the power to cause to be levied—and I emphasize that term "cause to be levied"—real property taxes, personal income taxes, and sales taxes in the District of Columbia, the proceeds of which would be earmarked for the school board for public school purposes.

I desire to make it crystal clear that the school board would not be given independent power to levy taxes. The District government would continue, as in the present case, to levy all taxes.

I should also make it clear that the amendment would not envisage or authorize any new tax to be levied in order to provide for any increase in the present tax rate.

The funding provision in the amendment would work this way: The school board would empower the District Government to levy and pay over, first, up to 14 mills on real property tax—stated differently, up to $1.40 per thousand of assessed valuation.

The presently authorized District real property tax is 25 mills; or $2.50 per $1,000 of assessed valuation.

So an earmarking of 14 mills would bring in approximately $35 million out of a total of $68.7 million. This $35 million would go to the school board.

Second, up to 50 percent of the present authorized District of Columbia sales tax would be earmarked. This would bring in approximately another $35 million out of a total $71.8 million in sales taxes.

This $35 million would once again be earmarked for the school board.

Third, up to 50 percent of the present authorized District of Columbia personal income tax would be earmarked. This would bring in approximately $17 million out of a total of $35.5 million from this source, which is now raised, and this $17 million would then be earmarked for the school board.

The figures I have referred to are based on financial and statistical reports of the District of Columbia government for 1964.

The budgeted expenses of the District of Columbia school system in this report were as follows: Operating expenses, $68.5 million; capital outlay, $14.4 million; or a total of $82 million—just under, in fact, $83 million.

Under my amendment, if it were in effect, the school board would have available for its purposes for the same period up to $87 million, or $4 million more than the projected outlay at the present time.

One of the major problems faced by the District of Columbia school board is that under the present law it is proposed that the budget must clear two hurdles. First, it must clear the District Commissioners, where it has been consistently slashed. Then it must come to Congress, where further cuts have been made.

This amendment would establish a method of financing for the school board consistent with the home rule concept.

The separation of financing has worked extremely well in my State of Colorado, particularly in the city and county of Denver, where we have an independently governed school board.

It keeps the school system close to the people in the local areas where it belongs. It also has sufficient flexibility to meet unusual needs, and is tied to the three basic forms of taxation which are known and understood in this community.

I believe adoption of this amendment would further strengthen the home rule bill and give the District of Columbia school system, the children and their parents as well, a vehicle by which they could further a viable school system.

There is one provision in my amendment which I have not mentioned. Under certain circumstances, this provision would give the school board the power to float a bond issue for certain costs. To do so, this bond issue proposal would first have to be put to a vote of the people within the District. I am sure, as in most cities in most districts, there is reluctance to impose additional obligations on the people. Nevertheless, school bond issues, on a nationwide basis have, generally speaking, been approved because they affect the welfare of the children of the people.

Consequently, in addition to the other powers I would give them, it seems to me there should be a provision—and we have incorporated into this amendment such a provision whereby on an affirmative vote by a majority of the electors in a district a school bond issue could be floated.

It strikes me that the fears expressed in the committee, and the concern I have heard from various sources about the proposal I am submitting are not at all accurate because what was going on was misunderstood.

We are not trying to impose any special taxes. Nothing new is proposed. We are merely urging an elective school board which can take a look at the needs and requirements of the school system within the District of Columbia. They can determine what that need is and budget ahead of time for a year. Then they would be empowered to send to the District of Columbia council and mayor the mill levy requirement on taxes to be levied by the District of Columbia which are needed to be used for the school system, thereby assuring the amount of money which the budget calls for.

It is difficult in any municipal body or school board to attempt to set up a budget in which the entire year's operation is projected, including books, teachers' salaries, operational costs, and all the other items that enter into building a budget. It is prepared, it is ready to go, and it is submitted. First it is slashed by the District of Columbia, then, perhaps, it is slashed in Congress.

I would say, for that reason, that it would be extremely helpful to the proper operation of any school system to give the system some flexibility in its financing.

This is what this particular amendment would do.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield myself as much time as may be required to respond to the argument made by the Senator from Colorado on the pending amendments.

First, I commend the Senator from Colorado for the effective work he has done in improving the bill so far as the school board is concerned. It makes the bill much better.

I wish I could agree that the amendments which he now offers are good, but I do not feel that way about it, nor did the majority of the committee.

As the Senator has explained, the amendments would vest the board with certain financial authority as well as borrowing powers. It seems to me—and I think it occurred also to the majority of the members of the committee—that that, in effect, would create another layer of local government over and above the mayor and the city council, whose duty it would be to prepare the necessary budget, to levy the taxes, and to make the necessary borrowings. I understand from the Senator from Colorado that the plan he has suggested has been used in his State with some success. I do not question that is the fact so far as Colorado is concerned. In my own State of Nevada, independent financial authority and borrowing authority are not vested in our school boards or our boards of education, but come through elected county commissioners, in the case of county school problems, and through city councils and city framework, in the case of the governing boards of the cities in my State.

It seems to me that that is the way it should be. That is the proper clearinghouse and proper central authority for determining the amount of money that should go to the schools of the District of Columbia.

I do not share the worry of the Senator from Colorado about the new government that would govern the city providing adequately for the schools. I feel convinced that it would, based on my years of public service. It seems to me that the governing bodies of cities, counties, and States are always responsive, almost with first priority, to the cause of the school systems, whether they be county school systems or city school systems or State school systems.

I do not know what the national average is, but, as I recall, between 60 and 65 percent of every State, county, and city tax dollar is devoted to school purposes; and if the justification were made, I feel certain that that amount would be allowed in the District of Columbia.

The District of Columbia would have an elected council and an elected mayor, both responsible to the electorate of the District of Columbia. I am sure that if any groups could make their needs known, they would be the school board, the parent-teachers associations, and others.

My main objection is that the amendments would superimpose a second governmental structure upon the council and the governing authority of the District of Columbia which it is hoped would be created by the enactment of the bill. Accordingly, I must take a viewpoint different from that of the Senator from Colorado. I hope the Senate will reject the amendments.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes; then I think I shall be finished and ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

First, I wish to make crystal clear that by the creation of a separate school board in the bill, with or without my amendments, another governmental unit has already been created, and a separate one would not be created merely by my amendments. My amendments would give the separate governmental unit, the school board, control of school financing and authority to borrow. It seems to me that that is important.

I do not wish to be on record in any way, even by implication, as being critical of the proposed new District of Columbia Council, if, when, and as it is elected, prior to its creation; but, wherever possible, a school board ought to be created which is dedicated to the interests of the school system and the children of the District of Columbia, so as to provide them with the best possible education. I have grave doubts as to whether that would be done if the school system were kept in the middle of a political thicket, which it would be in by virtue of the type of operation provided by the bill.

Being realistic, I have an idea that the amendments would not be successful; but I wish to make a record on these amendments—and I believe I have done so between yesterday and today. If the home rule bill should pass and the District of Columbia Council and school board should be elected, a review should be made as soon as possible by the Senate and House Committees on the District of Columbia to determine whether additional steps should be taken to improve and strengthen the school board which would be elected under the bill. This is highly important.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I have no objection to a continuing review to see how the newly created city council would function. If it had defects and were not working correctly, Congress, under the bill, would have the right to make whatever improvements it desired. Congress would have complete authority; it would not have abrogated that authority.

Undoubtedly, as we move forward, and as I hope we shall move forward, into municipal government in the Nation's Capital, defects will appear from time to time. I do not believe the school system is an area in which problems will arise. I could be in error in the statement I make today, but it seems to me that as we start with true home rule in the Nation's Capital, we should not impose a second structure in the financial area which, in effect, would cripple the hands of the mayor and city council.

I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time, if the Senator from Colorado is prepared to yield back the remainder of his time.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BIBLE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendments were rejected.

Mr. BIBLE. I suggest the absence of a quorum. I have made a commitment to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that it is agreeable that at an early time this afternoon he offer his amendment which deals with the veto power of the President. I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be charged to my time; it is merely to alert the Senator from Oregon that we are prepared to move forward with his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 357

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 357.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 357), ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 92, in the table of contents, strike out the following:

"Sec. 810. Partisan elections."

and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 810. Nonpartisan elections."

On page 94, beginning with line 15, strike out all through line 20 and renumber succeeding paragraphs accordingly.

On page 151, beginning with line 17, strike out all through line 19.

On page 151, line 20, strike out "(2)" and insert "(1)".

On page 151, line 24, strike out "(3)" and insert "(2)".

On page 153, beginning with the semicolon on line 22, strike out all through "appointment" on line 2, page 154.

On page 154, line 3, beginning with the comma, strike out all through the first comma on line 4.

On page 154, beginning with line 15, strike out all through line 3 on page 155.

On page 155, line 4, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 805. (a)".

On page 155, line 7, strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(b)".

On page 155, line 10, strike out "(d)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

On page 158, line 12, beginning with "and", strike out all through "affiliation" on line 14.

On page 159, beginning with line 23, strike out all through line 5 on page 160.

On page 160, line 6, strike out "(b) Nomination of an independent" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 809. (a) Nomination of a".

On page 160, line 11, strike out "(f)" and insert "(e)".

On page 160, line 12, strike out "an independent" and insert in lieu thereof "a".

On page 160, line 18, strike out "an independent" and insert in lieu thereof "a".

On page 160, line 21, beginning with "No", strike out all through line 25.

On page 161, line 1, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)".

On page 161, line 7, strike out "(f)" and insert "(e)".

On page 161, line 8, strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)".

On page 161, line 13, strike out "(e)" and insert "(d)".

On page 161, beginning with line 17, strike out all through line 19 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(e) Filing fees to accompany a petition nominating a candidate".

On page 161, line 24, strike out "(d) or (e)" and insert "(c) or (d)".

On page 162, line 9, strike out "PARTISAN" and insert in lieu thereof "NONPARTISAN".

On page 162, beginning with line 10, strike out all through line 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 810. (a) Ballots and voting machines shall show no party affiliations, emblem, or slogan".

On page 162, beginning with line 24, strike out all through line 3 on page 163.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I shall not take too long on this amendment. However, I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment, because it is a rather important amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the amendment which I offer, if agreed to, would accomplish two objectives.

First, it would provide that the elections which the pending bill would place into effect would be conducted on a nonpartisan basis instead of on a partisan basis.

Second, it would require that the Hatch Act, which is in effect all over the country on election procedures, would remain in effect in this election. Under the pending bill, the provisions of the Hatch Act would be eliminated insofar as elections in the District of Columbia are concerned. The District of Columbia would be the only area in the Nation in which those provisions would be eliminated.

In the committee we were unanimous in agreeing that the School Board elections should be nonpartisan. However, there was a closely divided opinion in the committee as to whether the elections for Mayor and members of the Council should be partisan or nonpartisan.

The most informative witness on this particular issue during the course of the committee hearing was Mr. Patrick Healy, executive director of the National League of Cities.

Although Mr. Healy was understandably reluctant to formulate a position for the league on this issue, he did point out, on page 187 of the hearings:

> Detroit is nonpartisan, Los Angeles and San Francisco are nonpartisan. I think Philadelphia and New York are partisan, but I might comment here that in the opinion of a great many students of government, the local governments in California, the cities, are perhaps outstanding in the entire United States in their government, in their operation, their caliber of people that are attracted into the local government. The League of California Cities attributes this, among other things, to the fact that they have nonpartisan government out there. It is all nonpartisan, throughout the State of California, and I am going to have to say that they are outstanding as city government goes.

That is a quotation from Mr. Healy.

I also point out at this point that the proposed Model City Charter recommends not only that elections be held in odd numbered years or in the spring of even numbered years, to avoid conflict with State and national elections, but it also recommends nonpartisan municipal elections.

So to the extent that it is possible for any Senator to say, I would say that, by and large, the experts are on the side of nonpartisan elections and that I am talking on their team.

I do not understand why there is all this urge to have partisan elections. Here we have a city, the Nation's Capital, and we are trying to make it a good government so that the people of the States in all areas of the country may come to this community and be proud of the city and the way it is run.

Many of the people who will be coming here will be visitors. Some will be coming as temporary workers. They are going to be of all types of political persuasion; not only people who are members of both major political parties will be here, but some will not be affiliated with either party, and some will be affiliated with some of the smaller political parties. It seems wrong to me to tie up the government of the District of Columbia, the Nation's Capital, in a partisan political fight in the staggered systems we have taking place every 2 years in partisan political elections.

The home rule bill, S. 268, which was introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]—who, unfortunately, is not yet in the Chamber, but who is coming—also provided for nonpartisan elections for the mayor and council.

Mr. Healy, whom I previously referred to as the executive director of the National League of Cities, furnished the committee with rather complete information on the election procedures used in towns and cities throughout the Nation. For instance, table 3 on page 293 of the committee hearings indicates that of cities over 25,000 population, 414 have nonpartisan elections and 157 have partisan elections. As for the larger cities, according to the table on pages 289 and 290 of the hearings, nonpartisan elections far outweigh partisan elections. For example, 3 out of the 5 cities of over 1 million population, 9 of the 15 of 500,000 to 1 million population, 23 of the 31 of 250,000 to 500,000 population, and 12 of the 19 of 100,000 to 250,000 population have the nonpartisan form of election.

As I have said, the Model City Charter published by the National Municipal League in 1964 recommends the nonpartisan form of election.

From all of this information I believe I can truthfully say that nonpartisan elections are not only in the majority in all the cities and towns in the country at the present time, but they are the trend of the future; we are trying to produce better and better governments in our municipalities.

My amendment would also repeal section 810(c) of the bill, which grants an exemption from the Hatch Act for Federal employees in District elections. Of course, if the elections are to be nonpartisan, as provided under this amendment, I see no reason for exempting Federal employees from the Hatch Act. Even if the elections were to be partisan, I cannot see the justification nor the wisdom for such an exemption. In fact, the U.S. Civil Service Commission already has the power to grant an exemption from the Hatch Act if the proper circumstances are shown, so I see no real need for a specific exemption in the bill for that purpose.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Are both of these proposals embodied in the same amendment?

Mr. DOMINICK. They are.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Might it not create a difficulty with some of us who might want to vote for a system of elections that is nonpartisan but who would vote differently on the subject of the application of the Hatch Act? I would not want to remove the Hatch Act prohibition.

Mr. DOMINICK. I do not want to remove the Hatch Act prohibition. My amendment includes the Hatch Act prohibition. The bill takes it out. The bill would remove the Hatch Act prohibition. I propose to include the Hatch Act prohibition.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Can the two issues be separated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Any amendment that has two parts may be divided.

Mr. DOMINICK. What I was trying to do in combining the two provisions was to have in one amendment the problems as I see them with the elective procedure under the bill which has been reported to the Senate I was trying to get rid of them both in one amendment. Hatch Act problems are just as important as are the partisan and the nonpartisan election provisions.

I say that for this reason: There is on the calendar, as I pointed out yesterday, a bill which has been reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration, introduced by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], Calendar No. 401, S. 1474, a bill to create a bipartisan commission to study Federal laws limiting political activity by officers and employees of Government.

I can truthfully say to the Senator from Ohio, that, so far as I can remember—and I attended most of the hearings and read the record of them—there was no hearing on the effect which the elimination of the Hatch Act would have as a precedent to eliminate operation of the Hatch Act in elections in other areas of the country.

A brief bit of information was given to us by the Commissioners, I believe, in which they stated that such a large proportion of the District of Columbia consisted of Federal employees that it would be unfair to remove them from the opportunity either to participate in the election procedure or to campaign themselves for office. We received that statement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator understands the dilemma which I feel will confront some Senators. A Senator may not favor the proposal of the Senator from Colorado that it be nonpartisan, because he might wish a partisan election. On the other hand, I am in complete accord that the Hatch Act should apply in the District of Columbia, just as it applies in every other area of the Nation. Thus, a Senator may find himself in favor of one-half of the proposal of the Senator from Colorado and probably will be against the other half.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Ohio for bringing up his position and his point. It is probably a very good one from the standpoint of a practical, political end.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield for another question?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If it is placed on a non-partisan basis, will there be any limitation on the number of candidates whose names may go on the ballot, let us say, for the office of mayor?

Mr. DOMINICK. What would be done in that kind of situation would be to eliminate primaries completely in a nonpartisan election. In Colorado we have a runoff. If a great number of persons are seeking the office, it can be determined by an absolute majority having been given to one candidate. That is what happens in our State. If there is an absolute majority for a candidate, he is in, regardless of how many persons may be running.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, how would a person qualify to go on the ballot? Would he do so by filing a petition?

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would there be a runoff in the end, in order to insure selection of a mayor by majority vote?

Mr. DOMINICK. I would believe that so far as the council members were concerned, and the mayor, they would have to have a majority vote of all the electors who vote in order to elect anyone. Therefore, if no one had a majority, there would have to be a runoff.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his information.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield at that point?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is it not true that if the views of the authors of the present bill should prevail, and we had, let us assume, a Republican candidate, a Democratic candidate, and a candidate of the "Progressive" Party, the same result would follow. There would have to be a runoff if a majority was not obtained in the first instance.

Mr. DOMINICK. I would not think so, in such a case. I believe that if there were a regular political party system—

Mr. KUCHEL. The plurality might—

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes, a plurality vote might possibly elect the mayor. I believe that this might create some problems for the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is absolutely correct. Let me say to my good friend the Senator from Nevada that is one more reason, in my judgment, why the amendment of the Senator from Colorado would be most helpful, because it would guarantee that the will of the majority would be carried out; whereas, to the contrary, if, under the wording of the present bill, a plurality would be sufficient to elect a mayor of this great city of Washington, then I believe we would be frustrating away part of the warp and woof of American democracy.

Mr. DOMINICK. I very much appreciate the contribution made by the Senator from California. I have said from the beginning that the pending amendment has been advanced on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and myself, so that we are working together on it. He has had experience with this problem. California has been cited by Mr. Healy as the outstanding example of municipal government, which is all nonpartisan in California.

I can say to the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Nevada that the State of Colorado has nonpartisan city elections, town elections, and village elections. We have not had a partisan election—we are not permitted to have one under the law. I believe that this is generally true in the State of Nevada itself.

Mr. BIBLE. It is. I stated that yesterday in our colloquy on the same subject.

Mr. DOMINICK. So far as the States west of the Mississippi are concerned, the vast majority of them operate municipally in nonpartisan elections. There are a number of States that operate in the same way in cities that lie east of the Mississippi.

I hold in my hand a chart which perhaps will be of interest to Senators; it comes from page 289–290 of the record of the hearings, indicating cities by category of population. In the column under "City Council, Type of Election and Term of Office," there are the criteria—"NP" for nonpartisan, and "P" for partisan. It shows that there are a great many cities lying east of the Mississippi River which have nonpartisan elections.

Picking out a few at random, Louisville, Ky., is one; Miami, Fla., is another—I am trying to see what the situation is in Ohio—Toledo, Ohio, appears to be a city having nonpartisan elections.

Thus, it will be seen that they are scattered all the way through—west and east combined.

If we are to get the council off to a good start—and I hope that we shall—it seems imperative to me that when we elect the candidates for the first time—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DOMINICK. We not do it on a partisan basis when we get into the middle of the political thicket.

Also, in discussing the Hatch Act at this time, it does not seem necessary to me, and it certainly does not seem wise, to write special exemptions into the Hatch Act for a particular area. I know that there are large cities and counties in the country where there are large concentrations of Federal employees. Almost immediately they will be coming in asking for similar type exemptions. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], while we were in committee, brought up a request that in a certain area in Maryland Federal employees be taken out from under the Hatch Act prohibition. This request was rejected for the same reasons I have just been relating as to the District of Columbia, namely, that we did not wish to complicate the matter any further, and would prefer to wait until the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] was discussed and hearings were held and we could obtain more information as to what should be done.

If we are to change the Hatch Act, we should bring the entire subject of political participation by Federal employees into proper focus, instead of carving out an exemption for Federal employees who work and live in the District. According to the figures supplied to us by the Bureau of the Budget, approximately 105,000 to 110,000 Federal employees live in the District, or roughly 13 percent of the total population.

I am sure there are cities and counties in Maryland and Virginia with equally large concentrations of Federal employees. I do not know that anyone has ever made a broad study of the problem. However, I can well imagine that many communities throughout the Nation are similarly affected by the Hatch Act. If we carve out an exemption here, we are bound to have the same type of request made throughout the country wherever there are large concentrations of Federal employees.

The Hatch Act was designed for a specific purpose. Until we show that that purpose is not in operation in the District of Columbia, it does not seem to me that we should carve out an exemption for the District. Perhaps we should even go the other way and lean over backward to make sure that we shall have as clean and efficient government in the District of Columbia as we can possibly have.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The amendment which the Senator from Colorado has offered directs itself, as he has explained, to two different phases. The first phase is the question of partisan versus nonpartisan elections. We discussed this subject for a brief time yesterday. The committee reported provisions in favor of partisan elections, as opposed to nonpartisan elections.

There is no question that the majority of the municipal governments around the country, as shown at page 289 of the hearings, favor nonpartisan municipal elections.

However, a somewhat different situation exists in the District of Columbia, by the very nature of our Capital City. There is a combination of State, county, and municipal elections, all wrapped into one government of the District of Columbia, in the framework in which it operates. It is also interesting to note that in cities of more than 1 million population, two of the five have partisan elections. Therefore three have nonpartisan elections and two have partisan elections.

In cities with populations of one-half million to 1 million, which embrace 16 cities, as can be determined from page 289 of the hearings, 10 of those cities have nonpartisan elections, and 6 have partisan elections.

It is correct, as Mr. Healy, of the National League of Cities, stated that the great State of California is a very fine example of nonpartisan elections in its cities. It is also true that in my State of Nevada we have nonpartisan elections in city campaigns.

A contrary view to that expressed by Mr. Healy was expressed by Mr. John Gunther, executive director of the U.S. Conference of Mayors. His statement is as follows—and I should like to comment on it now, because there are a number of Senators in the Chamber:

> Politics should not be taken out of government. Indeed it is a misconception of both politics and government when there is an attempt to so sterilize the local situation. As an observer of elections in large cities, it is readily apparent that the party affiliation of the individual candidates is generally known and often plays an important role. Indeed, often the candidate for mayor of a large city in a nonpartisan election has in the past held partisan office as a member of the State legislature, a county official, or a Member of Congress, so that the nonpartisan nature of the election is more a fiction than a reality.
>
> On the other hand, the pretense of nonpartisanship often weakens the city executive in relation to the political machinery of his State and the Nation. It would seem particularly appropriate that in a strong mayor-council system that partisan elections would be desirable. In such a system the mayor needs to be a political leader and particularly here in the District of Columbia in many matters the mayor would be dealing directly with State Governors and nonpartisanship is not a characteristic of Governors.

Mr. Gunther is the spokesman for the Conference of Mayors.

A further point should be made, Mr. President. Of all the places in the entire world where there seems to be the flavor of partisanship, I should think it might possibly be in the Nation's Capital, where we occasionally do hear strong partisan views expressed, be they Democratic or Republican. We are a part of the world's business. We are a part of the Nation's business. To say that there is not a strong flavor of partisanship would be incorrect.

It has been indicated that there is a very much more enthusiastic turnout of voters in municipal elections when such elections are partisan, as contrasted with nonpartisan.

I said yesterday, and I repeat today, that in my own State that is certainly true. Our cities have nonpartisan elections. The turnout in those elections is very poor, both compared with those who are registered and compared to the total electorate. It takes an unusually bitter city election to bring out a bare majority to vote for those who govern the people of our cities.

I believe that the conclusion reached by Mr. Gunther, of the Conference of Mayors, is sound.

Based on each of those reasons, I suggest that the action of the majority of the Committee on the District of Columbia is the correct judgment, and that the amendment, insofar as it deals with partisanship versus nonpartisanship of the city council and mayor, should be rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. In support of the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Nevada, I believe it should also be pointed out that while ordinarily it does not make very much difference whether there is a nonpartisan or partisan election, because all over the country there are both kinds, the fact remains that if the citizens of the District of Columbia were not voting in national elections, there would be more reason to make the elections nonpartisan. However, inasmuch as we have now taken the position that they should be interested in national elections, and they will take part in national elections, I believe that to make the elections nonpartisan elections would be to accomplish nothing other than to create a facade, a fiction more than a reality.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Every citizen in California is qualified to vote in presidential and national elections. Every city in California has a nonpartisan government. How does the Senator equate such a situation with what he has just suggested ought to apply to the District of Columbia?

Mr. PASTORE. All I have said was that I agree that the elections can be either way. We have them both ways in Rhode Island. Fundamentally, I believe the appeal is made to partisan politics, whether on the surface it is nonpartisan or partisan. I am sure the Senator will agree with me on that as a practical matter.

All I have said was that if the citizens of the District of Columbia were not participating in national elections, there would be a better argument to make the municipal elections nonpartisan.

We have chosen to give them the power to vote. While we can do it either way, I support the committee in its recommendation that the elections be partisan elections.

Mr. KUCHEL. If I might hypothesize, it seems to me a little ludicrous.

Mr. BIBLE. I yield for hypothesizing purposes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Only?

Mr. BIBLE. Only.

Mr. KUCHEL. Were the Senator from Rhode Island a leading Democratic citizen of my own city of Anaheim and he desired to be mayor, I would not want the fact that my friend is a Democrat and I am a Republican to interfere with his ambition. Yet the provisions of the bill, as applied to my own city or any California city, would interfere. There ought not to be partisanship in municipal elections if we are interested in clean, honest, and forward-looking government.

Mr. PASTORE. Absolutely. In view of the very nice things that my friend from California has said about me in the past, if I were running for the office of mayor of the city of Anaheim, even though I am a Democrat, I would expect the distinguished Senator to vote for me.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield further for the continuance of this delightful colloquy.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am certain that my friend from Rhode Island is not inviting me to break the purity of elections laws. In a partisan primary election I would be unable to vote for my able friend. Early in the present century municipal governments in various parts of our State were crawling with fraud and corruption. Then a great Governor, and later a great Senator from our State, the late Hiram Johnson, successfully urged the legislature to eliminate party politics from local government. He did so. As my friend, the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] know, the quality of local government in my State is now excellent.

Mr. PASTORE. If partisanship leads to corruption, why not operate the State government on a nonpartisan basis? Why stop at the municipal level?

All I am saying is that the nonpartisan process is becoming a fiction. When a Democrat runs in a nonpartisan election, everyone knows that he is a Democrat. That happens in my State all the time. The fact that the candidate is running in a nonpartisan election does not make that much difference.

Mr. KUCHEL. I disagree. I believe it does.

Mr. PASTORE. In the world of politics, the substance, the strength and virility of our American system is the two-party system. I do not believe that it is less virile when it is used in elections on a municipal level. I realize that over the years the notion has been built up that nonpartisan elections are more honest elections. I cannot subscribe to that view. I believe that it is a ludicrous argument that because party labels are removed, the government is purified.

Mr. KUCHEL. I did not quite make that statement.

Mr. PASTORE. Oh, yes; the Senator did.

Mr. KUCHEL. I did not quite make that statement.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator did. The Senator did not mean to make that statement, but that is what he said, that nonpartisan government is excellent, whereas partisan government crawled with fraud and corruption.

Mr. KUCHEL. My friend is in error. My view is that adding partisan politics to local elections adds a potential element of city bossism and ward heeling that ought not to be permitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, in fairness to both of my wonderful, distinguished friends, from opposite sides of our great Nation, I shall yield later to them again.

First, I wish to make an observation. I believe the Senator from California said that if clean and honest government is desired, the board or council should be nonpartisan. We are all for clean, honest government. But it occurred to me that if the indictment is true, it would certainly be true of county governments, which I believe, by and large, are elected on a partisan basis.

Mr. KUCHEL. They are not in my State.

Mr. BIBLE. They are in my State, and I believe they are good, clean, and honest governments.

I also agree that, so far as I know on the State level, to carry it one step further, the governments are good, clean, and honest. I believe that we must recognize that we have bad apples in government, whether we have nonpartisan elections or partisan elections, whether they are in cities, counties, or State governments. Thank goodness, such cases are isolated, and do not occur very often.

The testimony and the reasons for partisan elections are very clearly in favor of the committee position.

I merely wished to get my own little oar in at that point, during my exuberance in yielding too freely. I now yield to the Senator from Florida, who previously asked me to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for yielding.

I approve the position taken by the Senator in charge of the bill and the majority of the committee, but for a different reason from what has been stated.

In my own State there are a large number of cities which have nonpartisan elections for the office of mayor and for city government officials. There are others that operate in the other way. In the District of Columbia, where the people are not used to having elections and where participation by way of registration and by way of voting has been very poor up to now, by all means the position of the committee is the sounder. It would be difficult enough for the two partisan organizations to get the people in this area who are not accustomed to voting, and who have not voted on the limited occasions given since the 23d amendment was adopted in anything like the proportions that any of us would wish. I believe that the partisan organizations are the best machinery for keeping the people interested and inducing them to register and vote.

I call attention also to the fact that, so far as bipartisanship is concerned, as contrasted with nonpartisanship, the ward system which is embraced in the proposed city charter now pending would almost surely provide some difference of opinion in the city commission along party lines.

I can be corrected by the distinguished Senator from Nevada if I do not understand the fact correctly, but as I understand, nine members of the city commission would be elected on a ward basis—that is, with only the citizens of that ward participating in the election.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator indulge an interruption at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. Certainly.

Mr. BIBLE. Rather than 9, the number would be 14.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought it was 5 on a citywide basis and 9 on the ward basis.

Mr. BIBLE. No; it would be 14 selected from 14 wards created in the District of Columbia and 5 selected at large, for a total membership on the council of 19.

Mr. HOLLAND. That emphasizes the point I have made. The wards would be smaller proportionately, and there would be assurance of the election of councilmen of different political philosophies with the ward system operating.

It seems to me that the committee has wisely determined that we are not deciding the question for all time. If we find that there is general and widespread interest in and participation in municipal elections—while I do not support the measure, but I believe it will pass—we may then change the system if we find good reason for doing so.

Congress is not surrendering its responsibility on the issue. It has a perfect right to amend the charter. But under present conditions my own point of view is that what we need to do is to encourage greater participation if we are to have a municipal government with greater interest than has been shown up to date. I believe that the system suggested in the bill would do that.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I appreciate the views of the Senator from Florida. They underscore the views that were given to us by Mr. Gunther when he said that we can expect stronger participation in partisan elections.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield for a question. May I ask how much time? I do not wish to yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. BIBLE. I should like to cover the second phase of the Senator's amendment on the question of the Hatch Act exemption, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Ohio. I prefer to do so after I have made an explanation of the Hatch Act exemption, which seems to me justifies and makes the position of the committee very sound.

HATCH ACT EXEMPTION

Section 810(c) provides that the Hatch Act provisions, which bar officers or employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government from taking an active part in political management or campaigns, shall not be applicable to elections held under the proposed Home Rule Act.

The distinguished junior Senator from Colorado proposed an amendment, during the committee's consideration of the bill, to strike from it the Hatch Act exemption provision. The amendment was defeated by the committee.

Actually, section 16 of the Hatch Act gives to the Civil Service Commission power to permit certain political activity in the National Capital area by Federal employees when special or unusual circumstances warrant such permission. The committee believes that the District of Columbia represents a striking example of the unusual circumstances anticipated in the Hatch Act.

The percentage of District residents 18 or over, who are Federal employees, is approximately 20 percent, and of eligible voters, probably substantially greater—possibly as high as 35 percent.

It seemed to the committee that to foreclose participation by such a large portion of this city's population from political activity would be to deny to the District of Columbia one of its major sources of capable individuals who would participate in the government of the District.

The committee was informed, as appears more fully in the hearing record, that the Bureau of the Budget feels strongly that the Hatch Act exemptions should be applied to elections within the District. Congress cannot grant home rule to 800,000 people in the city of Washington and by the same stroke of the pen sterilize 260,000 of the city's most capable individuals who would be of great assistance in their participation in local governmental activities.

Actually, for many years prior to the enactment of the Hatch Act of 1939, Federal employees residing in nearby Maryland and Virginia municipalities were permitted to be candidates for and to hold office in those municipalities. Permission was granted either by an individual Executive order or by action of the Commission based on an Executive order, and it remained in full force and effect until the passage of the act of August 2, 1939, which prohibited active participation in political management or in political campaigns without exception.

When this act was amended by the act of July 19, 1940, a new section was added whereby the Commission was authorized to promulgate regulations extending the privilege of active participation in local political management and local political campaigns to Federal employees residing in municipalities or other political subdivisions of the States of Maryland and Virginia in the immediate vicinity of the District of Columbia or in municipalities elsewhere in the United States, the majority of whose voters are employed by the Federal Government.

It was surprising to me, and perhaps it will be surprising to other Senators, that the privileges have been extended to 40 political subdivisions in Maryland, 9 in Virginia, 3 in the State of Washington, 1 in California, 2 in Arizona, 1 in Georgia, and 1 in Tennessee.

To summarize, the Bureau of the Budget advised the committee that the exemption sought in the bill for Federal employees in the District of Columbia is not inconsistent with the language of the Hatch Act. I submit that for really effective and general participation in any local government of the District of Columbia, Federal employees should be permitted to participate in that government as truly representative citizens.

Therefore, I urge that the amendment of the Senator from Colorado—and I understand a division will be called for—be rejected.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I go back to the subject of candidates for office. I observe that section 809 contains a provision for the nomination of independent candidates. It provides that the name of an independent candidate may be placed on the ballot by the filing of a petition containing the names of not less than 500 qualified voters registered in the District of Columbia. Was there any discussion in committee with respect to the danger of having a plethora of candidates because of the small number of names of petitioners that would be required to place the name of an independent candidate on the ballot?

Mr. BIBLE. My memory is hazy on that point, but I do not believe there was a discussion on this particular point. There may be validity in what the Senator says. As I understand, the thrust of his position is that he does not want to have the ballot loaded with the names of many candidates for either mayor or the city council. But in direct response to the Senator, to the best of my knowledge, this subject was not discussed either during the hearing or at the time of the markup of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand that under the present language of the bill one member of each of the two major parties would be running? That would be two candidates.

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then there might be as many as three candidates who were able to file petitions each containing 500 names?

Mr. BIBLE. I believe that would be the effect of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have not read the bill completely. Is there any provision for a runoff election, so as to insure government by majority expression? I do not believe there is.

Mr. BIBLE. Is the Senator limiting his question to independent candidates?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No, because the provision from which we are reading is contained in the particular section dealing with candidates for the office of mayor.

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us assume that a Republican, a Democratic, and five independent candidates are running at the regular election and that not a single one receives a majority of the votes. One has a plurality. Would he be declared elected with the highest plurality of the votes cast, and would the election be concluded?

Mr. BIBLE. I am frank to say that I have not studied the legal opinions. My answer is based upon my experience with this problem in my own State. It is fairly analogous, and I believe it would apply in the District of Columbia.

If there were a Republican, a Democratic, and five independent candidates for mayor, the one who received the greatest number of votes would be elected mayor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That answers my question.

Mr. BIBLE. I speak from memory, but I believe that is the situation.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BIBLE. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. President, one of the reasons why municipalities have turned to the nonpartisan basis of operation is the bossism that grew up in the cities on a partisan basis, whether it was Republican or Democratic bossism. All of us recall the great machines about which we heard so much—the Pendergast machine, the Hague machine, or one of the Republican machines—which grew up around municipal elections, and were controlled by partisan groups which were trying to gain control of the form of city government.

The Nation's Capital is the last place in this country where an opportunity should be provided for the same thing to happen. It strikes me that since we have been trying to induce more and more people to run for office, and trying to get people who will hold elective office, many of whom shy away completely if they have to become actively affiliated with a political party because they are worried about the political scars that will result, one of the best things we could do would be to involve them in municipal elections on a nonpartisan basis.

Also, I invite attention to the wording of the so-called Hatch Act exemption, which is contained in the bill. The wording of the act alone should be sufficient to convince.

From page 162, line 24, of the bill, I read:

> The second sentence of Section 9(a) of the Act entitled "An Act to Prevent Pernicious Political Activities", approved August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1147), as amended, shall not be applicable to elections held under this Act or to political management or political campaigns in connection therewith.

I feel that that type of provision ought not to be in the bill at a time when we are trying to present to the House of Representatives a clean bill, affording an opportunity to establish a government upon which the House, for the first time, may finally act.

I say to my colleague, the Senator from Nevada, that I do not particularly have anything more to say on this amendment. However, I should like to ask for a division of the amendment.

The yeas and nays have been ordered on the entire amendment. However, I should like to have the yeas and nays ordered separately on both sections of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). How does the Senator from Colorado wish to divide the amendment?

Mr. DOMINICK. The second part of the amendment is on page 3, lines 23 and 24. That is the portion of the proposed amendment which would deal with the Hatch Act. I should like to have a separate vote on that particular amendment.

Do I need unanimous consent for that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The Senator has a perfect right to make that request.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask whether the ordering of the yeas and nays on the original amendment would automatically cover each part.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would cover each part.

Mr. BIBLE. Therefore, the yeas and nays have been ordered on the Hatch Act provision and the provision relating to partisan versus nonpartisan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, if the Hatch Act provision were eliminated from the bill, would I be correct in my conclusion that Federal employees in the District of Columbia would be allowed to contribute to political campaigns, actually participate, and be completely removed from all the provisions of the Hatch Act?

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct. In addition, the employees could be candidates for elective offices.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What about the employers shaking them down for contributions of money to be used in a campaign in the District of Columbia? By employers, I mean superiors and heads of departments.

Mr. DOMINICK. It has happened before, and I am sure that it will happen again unless this amendment is adopted.

I appreciate the contribution of the Senator from Ohio on this point.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, would a unanimous-consent request that the time for the quorum call be not charged to either side be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senators yield back their time, they have the right to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, how many minutes have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado for yielding.

I had the privilege of serving on the Committee on the District of Columbia for 2 years. I have had occasion to study municipal government considerably during my service in the Iowa Legislature.

I have come to the conclusion over the years that partisanship in elections revolving around municipal government is not a necessary ingredient of good government.

To me the Nation's Capital and its proper operation transcend partisan politics. I have never had persuasive reasons presented to me for partisan elections in the District of Columbia.

I believe that, to the extent that we can relieve the operations of the government of the District of Columbia from partisan questions, it would be to the best interest of the citizens of the District and also of the country.

I hope that this amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I appreciate the contribution of the Senator from Iowa.

I know that the remarks of the Senator are based on considerable experience in the governmental field.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield that time back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Am I to understand correctly that the Dominick amendment has been reduced to two parts, and that there will be a separate vote on each part, one to follow the other?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. What part of the split amendment are we to vote on first?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first vote will come on that part of the amendment which begins on page 1, line 1, and extends up to and including line 22 on page 3.

Mr. KUCHEL. That deals with the subject of nonpartisan elections?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first part of the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 57, as follows:

[No. 193 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bennett
Boggs
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Fannin
Fong
Hickenlooper
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Miller
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Nelson
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—57

Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Moss
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell, Ga.
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—6

Byrd, Va.
Ellender
Hruska
Long, La.
Russell, S.C.
Tydings

So the first part of Mr. DOMINICK's amendment was rejected.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the first part of the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOMINICK. Will the Presiding Officer state what the subject of the second vote will be?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the second part of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. The vote will be on the second part of the amendment, which appears on lines 23 and 24, on page 3 of the amendment, and deals with the Hatch Act. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, am I correct in assuming that, if the second part of the amendment is adopted, the Hatch Act will be restored so far as elections in the District of Columbia are concerned?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair cannot answer that question. It is a question on a matter of substance, and not a parliamentary inquiry. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 57, as follows:

[No. 194 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Aiken
Allott
Bayh
Bennett
Boggs
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Fannin
Fong
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—57

Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—5

Byrd, Va.
Hruska
Long, La.
Russell, S.C.
Tydings

So the second part of Mr. DOMINICK's amendment was rejected.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendments (No. 360) and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendments will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendments offered by Mr. MORSE are as follows:

On page 106, line 12, strike out "he shall present the act to the President." and insert in lieu thereof "such act shall become law.".

On page 106, line 18, beginning with "he", strike out all through the period on line 19 and insert in lieu thereof "it shall become law.".

On page 106, line 22, beginning with the comma, strike out all through the period on line 24 and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "it shall become law.".

On page 106, beginning with line 25, strike out all through line 10 on page 107.

On page 107, line 11, strike out "(f)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)".

On page 107, line 21, strike out "(g)" and insert in lieu thereof "(f)".

On page 108, line 9, strike out "(h)" and insert in lieu thereof "(g)".

On page 108, line 17, strike out "(i)" and insert in lieu thereof "(h)".

On page 108, line 21, strike out "(j)" and insert in lieu thereof "(i)".

On page 185, line 11, immediately after the period, add the following: "Any measure so proposed by petition shall, if approved by a majority of the qualified voters voting thereon in such election, take effect and become law on the day following the day on which the Board of Elections certifies the results of such election or on the date provided for by such measure."

On page 185, beginning with line 12, strike out all through line 4 on page 186.

On page 186, line 5, strike out "(d)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

On page 186, line 8, strike out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)".

On page 186, line 12, strike out "(f)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)".

On page 186, line 15, strike out "(g)" and insert in lieu thereof "(f)".

On page 186, line 21, strike out "(h)" and insert in lieu thereof "(g)".

OPPOSITION TO REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may be permitted to yield to me without losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. The Nebraska State Legislature has adopted legislative resolution 60 opposing the Johnson administration proposal to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD that resolution, and following the resolution, a statement that I made before the Labor Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate on June 23, 1965.

There being no objection, the resolution and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 60, LEGISLATURE OF NEBRASKA

Whereas the people of the State of Nebraska in the year 1946, by initiative referendum adopted by a vote of 212,443 to 142,702 amendments to the constitution of the State of Nebraska now designated sections 13, 14, and 15 of article XV which provide in part that: No person shall be denied employment because of membership in or affiliation with, or resignation or expulsion from a labor organization or because of refusal to join or affiliate with a labor organization; nor shall any individual or corporation or association of any kind enter into any contract, written or oral, to exclude persons from employment because of membership in or nonmembership in a labor organization; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Nebraska in the year 1947 adopted sections 48–217, 48–218, and 48–219 of the statutes of Nebraska which provide in part that: To make operative the provisions of sections 13, 14, and 15 of article XV of the constitution of Nebraska, no person shall be denied employment because of membership in or affiliation with, or resignation or expulsion from a labor organization or because of refusal to join or affiliate with a labor organization; nor shall any individual or corporation or association of any kind enter into any contract, written or oral, to exclude persons from employment because of membership in or nonmembership in a labor organization; and

Whereas section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act of our Federal statutes provides that States may forbid agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment; and

Whereas President Johnson has recently sent to Congress a message urging the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which would have the practical effect of invalidating the right-to-work laws of Nebraska and other States having these statutes; and

Whereas the citizens of Nebraska desire to retain their right-to-work law and believe that each State should have the right of self-determination in this regard: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 75th session assembled:

1. That the Nebraska Legislature reaffirms its belief in the necessity of sections 13, 14, and 15 of article XV of the Nebraska constitution and the statutes implementing these sections.

2. That the Nebraska Legislature disagrees with the efforts of the present national administration to take from the States the right to self-determination in this area.

3. That the Nebraska Legislature forward printed copies of this resolution and the position of the State of Nebraska's Legislature to the Nebraska delegation in Congress.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR CARL T. CURTIS BEFORE THE LABOR SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, U.S. SENATE, JUNE 23, 1965

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am here today to represent the voters of Nebraska and, I believe sincerely, the majority of voters in most of the States. I am here to oppose repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act—a section of our code that reaffirms to the several States their rights and powers as delegated to them by the Constitution of the United States.

I am not here to discuss the issue of union shop or no union shop—or the merits of right-to-work legislation. Those issues have been analyzed here many times before and will no doubt be brought up again many times by others.

The issue to which I wish to direct my brief statement is in my opinion—and that of many of my colleagues—much more fundamental than that of the union shop. The issue which confronts this committee and the Congress is the issue of whether the vox populi shall continue to be heard and heeded in our land.

This basic issue also involves the rights and proper functioning of the governments of our several States as they discharge their share of responsibility in the partnership of State and National Governments which is the foundation of our Federal Republic.

My main concern, however, is for the people of the several States in whom final authority in all such matters must be vested. Few issues in our recent history have so often been placed before the people for them to decide. It is my concern that now the Congress is attempting to take from the people this right of decision.

In the 80th Congress when the Taft-Hartley Act was under consideration there were those in the Congress who wanted the union shop banned as a national policy. There were others who wanted the National Legislature to approve the union shop as an instrument of labor-management relations.

These discussions resulted in what I consider a fortuitous compromise and from this meeting of the minds came section 14(b).

At the time of the adoption of 14(b) there were those who claimed Congress was abdicating its authority in a vitally important matter. I say rather that the Congress then acted as it properly should have acted—it placed the responsibility for such decisions where it belongs, on the shoulders of the individual voters in each of the several States.

In my own State of Nebraska the voters had already taken direct action on the issue of union shop by approving a constitutional amendment in 1946 barring such conditions. Enactment of 14(b), therefore, confirmed for the people of my State that they had the right to act as they did.

Six other States have enacted such constitutional amendments, and in each instance the responsibility was that of the voters themselves. In other States, and I need mention here only Ohio and California as examples, the issue was put to the voters and the voters, discharging their responsibility as citizens of the Republic, voted in favor of union shops.

In each instance, the voters made their choice. And this is how it must be if our Republic is to survive as a form of government.

In nearly every State at one time or another the proposition to outlaw the union shop has been presented to the State legislature. In each instance the legislatures acted as they felt the people of their States would want them to act. As typical of this approach I might cite the State of Indiana. That State first adopted a so-called right-to-work law. On January 28 of this year that law was repealed. Between time of enactment and January 28, 1965, public sentiment on the issue obviously had changed in Indiana, and the legislature responded accordingly.

The point is, though, that it was the Indiana Legislature representing the people of Indiana, which acted in both instances.

In at least five other States, legislation was pushed, and pushed hard this year to repeal the right-to-work laws. In all five States the legislatures decided—sometimes after agonizing soul-searching—not to change the law.

Indiana decided to make a change. The other States did not.

In both cases it was the State which made the decision. It was not made for them. And this, Mr. Chairman, is as it should be. It is up to the people of each State to make these decisions.

By enactment of the Taft-Hartley law the Congress subscribed to this principle. It is a good principle and a sound one. It has been tried and tested in this country and it has been proved that it works. That principle is that the ultimate authority of government rests solely with the governed.

There were those when this Nation was founded who decried that principle and said it could never work. They said the people were not capable of governing themselves and would do foolish and irrational things.

It is a fortunate thing for humanity that those prophets of calamity were overridden by men of sounder judgment and men of greater faith. These men had faith that, given the chance, people would rule themselves wisely and well. Their judgment and their faith have been vindicated by this noble experiment we call the American Republic.

It ill behooves us now to become latter-day prophets of calamity.

It is my hope that the 89th Congress will take no action that will run counter to this fundamental American belief in the final authority of the governed.

I, therefore, urge, Mr. Chairman, that this committee not approve repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The people have a voice. Let us not take action here to still that voice.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHARTER ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1118) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I discussed my amendment yesterday. I shall only take 2 or 3 minutes today and then yield back the remainder of my time.

This is the amendment that I offered in committee and it was defeated.

It is the only amendment that I offered in committee that I have decided to offer on the floor of the Senate, because I feel that it is the only amendment that really involves a matter of basic governmental policy. The other amendments involved matters of reasonable choices on either side.

The pending bill in its present form seeks to give to the President of the United States power to veto an act of the city council of the District of Columbia that has been approved by the mayor, or to veto an initiative act the people of the District of Columbia may themselves adopt in an election.

The position that I took in committee and again yesterday, and today, can be put very briefly this way:

Under article I, section 8, of the Constitution, the ultimate legislative control of the District of Columbia rests in the Congress of the United States, not in the White House.

Section 8 states:

> To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government * * *.

I am at a loss to understand why we want to burden the President of the United States in the first instance with any responsibility to pass upon legislation passed by the city council. Let us face it. We all know how it would be administered. The President of the United States is not going to have time to evaluate every act of the city council or initiative proposals passed by the people.

He will assign it to an administrative aid, who will make a recommendation.

My objection to this is I do not think we ought to weaken our system of government whereby legislative powers under the Constitution are vested in the Congress.

The Congress has the residual power to decide what the policies in the District of Columbia will be if it wishes to exercise them.

It has the power, if the District of Columbia City Council violates a Federal interest, to reverse the city council. It ought to stay there. Then, the President under our separation of powers doctrine and our system of checks and balances has the authority to veto the act of the Congress.

But I wish to say I do not think we ought to superimpose the President of the United States into a position where he would pass upon an act of the city council or an initiative proposal passed by the people of the District of Columbia. That is our responsibility in the Congress.

If they pass an ordinance which it is thought interferes with the Federal interests in the District of Columbia, the two committees of the Congress should hold their hearings and there should be a record made, and an opportunity for the advocates of the proposed legislation to be heard. On the basis of that record Congress could decide, in the exercise of its control, whether to reverse the city council.

Then, let us say, Congress takes action to reverse the city council. The measure then goes to the President and he has the right to veto the act of Congress.

I do not think we should weaken that precious system of separation of powers with its checks and balances procedure, and that is why I have offered my amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to ask a question about that precious system. We are going to create a new State, with this exception: The Federal Government will finance it. Every State government has a Governor that vetoes powers of the State legislature. The Congress would have the power to veto the acts of that State. In order to veto such acts, there must be a majority of 435 Members of the House and 100 Members of the Senate, and the vote on the bill shows we could not get one-fourth of that number who wish to cater to what we are now doing. That is the precious State being created.

Mr. MORSE. All I want to say in closing is that in my judgment the proper procedure is for the Congress to exercise its constitutional authority under article I, section 8, to pass judgment on the acts of the city council or people in an initiative action, if it is decided they have interfered in a Federal interest.

Once Congress speaks, the President has his constitutional right and duty to exercise his veto if he desires, and Congress can override it if it has a two-thirds vote.

I know of no reason why we should interfere with what I think is a very precious pattern of constitutional government.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield to myself such time as I may require.

First, I ask the author of the amendment, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, if he desires the "yeas" and "nays" on the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Yes. That was the understanding yesterday.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask for the "yeas" and "nays."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BIBLE. I first yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania, who has a statement he desires to make on the bill itself.

Mr. SCOTT. Perhaps because of official business, I may not have an opportunity to vote for the bill on its final passage. I have arranged to have my position announced.

I have favored home rule generally and hoped to the able to favor the pending bill.

What is coming forth now is not so much home rule as political machine domination. What has been happening has caused me to change my mind and I shall vote against the bill or be recorded against this so-called home rule.

Every good government amendment proposed has been beaten down by a heavy majority. For example, we attempted to provide for nonpartisan elections.

For example, a proposal to provide for nonpartisan elections, which is increasingly becoming the custom in major American cities, was defeated. That indicates that this body wants partisan elections. The long tenure of office of one political party in the Federal Government indicates what party elections they want.

Do they want honest administration? A majority overwhelmingly defeated an attempt to apply the Hatch Act, so the future city fathers of the District of Columbia would not be bound by the ordinary restrictions that are applied to thousands of Federal employees in the United States. So I do not believe that good government or honest government or responsible government is wanted.

There is considerable opposition to allowing the President to have the veto power. No one would have veto power except two large bodies—bodies too large to act, too cumbersome to move, and too unwilling to act in any event.

Is anything wanted, then, but a political machine dominated by a handful of operators guided from up on the Hill as to what is to be done, and free to impose taxation, with not too much restriction by anyone?

The bill does not provide home rule, as I view it. It would create a political machine for one more city, a political machine providing all the opportunities for the kind of corruption that has just been exposed in my own cities of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, an opportunity for pressure, an opportunity for all the ills and faults that have infested and have become, again, the shame of the cities.

For example, the bill contains a clause—I believe it is still in the bill—that the local city council shall name the judges. If the local city council of my city, for example, were to name the judges, I know what would happen. Instead of having judges elected in the first place, every time some member of the city council got pressure from somebody to fix a zoning law, to sell legislation, to fix a traffic ticket, even, he would go to a judge. What judge? The judge whom he placed in office, the judge whom he named.

So there would not be a nonpolitical judiciary; there would not be a pressure-free judiciary; there would be a judiciary over which Congress had no control. The standards of the judiciary would be lowered. The judiciary would really be denigrated to where it would be nothing in the world but a group of political hacks named by another group of political hacks, for the purpose of granting favors to friends; and, if it were anything like the system in Philadelphia, for the purpose of selling justice. I am not referring to the judiciary of Philadelphia, but to the common council and the recent investigation of it.

Since a good government amendment is not wanted; since responsible administration is not wanted; since nonpolitical and nonpartisan elections are not wanted; I shall not vote for this sham, this farce, which is mistakenly called home rule.

This proposal is a child illegitimately born from legitimate aspirations, an unfortunate reject from an original concept which might have given the people of this city balanced home rule, balanced, reasonable self-government, balanced with respect to revenues with which to run the city, balanced with regard to a judiciary free from pressure, balanced with regard to the choice that might be made in selecting those who are to govern the city.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BIBLE. I yield 30 seconds more to the Senator from Pennsylvania. I am running out of time.

Mr. SCOTT. I shall not be moved by any irrelevant argument which tends to create an atmosphere that if a Senator votes against home rule for the District of Columbia, he must be categorized as being against any other proposals made before Congress. I am against a home rule measure which I feel is a total failure as presently drafted. If it goes back to the other body and comes out in final form in a more honorable state than it is now, I will change my mind.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield time to me?

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, before I yield to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, I should state that the committee thoroughly discussed the proposal contained in the last amendment. It was made abundantly clear that each of us wants a good, clean, honest government. The record was made clear that that will be done under the bill as it is presently drawn.

With reference to the Hatch Act, I commend to the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania a careful reading of the Record. The truth is that in 40 political subdivisions in Maryland today, 9 in Virginia, 3 in the State of Washington, 1 in California, 2 in Arizona, 1 in Georgia, and 1 in Tennessee, Federal employees are permitted to participate in local elections and to hold office in their city councils. I wanted to set the record straight on that subject.

In my considered judgment, this is a good bill. It is a bill to guarantee honest government in the Nation's Capital. I wanted to make that clear.

I now yield 3 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall support the present amendment, because, in my opinion, home rule means what it says. There is no necessity to have the President interject himself through the veto power in connection with local legislation. Nevertheless, I have much sympathy with the position taken by the committee. I commend the Senator from Nevada for the statement he has just made.

I deplore the action of my junior colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] who, I regret to say, has left the Chamber, in slandering his own home city.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator will yield, I will buy him a pair of glasses. The junior Senator from Pennsylvania is in the Chamber, on his feet, and is in direct opposition to what the senior Senator from Pennsylvania is about to say.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to see that my colleague has turned his face instead of his back to the debate now taking place.

I reiterate my strong dissent from the action of my junior colleague in the Chamber a moment ago in slandering his own home town of Philadelphia, and in saying unpleasant things about that other great city in Pennsylvania—Pittsburgh—and in indicating that after 67 years of nefarious outstanding Republican misrule, either of those cities is so badly governed as it used to be when my colleague's party was in control.

Mr. SCOTT. The cities were governed by competent persons.

Mr. CLARK. I refuse to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania declines to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I suggest to my colleague, in all good humor, that he remove the mote from his own party's eye in Northumberland County, where the notorious Henry Lark, with the most corrupt political machine in the State is now in power; and to take another look at the Republican machine in Delaware County, where the notorious John McClure misgoverned the county for some 50 years, before he makes the kind of charges he has made about his own city of Philadelphia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. My time has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will someone yield time to me to answer those damnable, inaccurate accusations?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. The statements made by my senior colleague are without proof and, so far as I know, without substance. He has brought in people by name, which I regard as being done because this is a form of trial through immunity.

I suggest that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania go to Northumberland and Delaware Counties and repeat his accusations there, where he will not have immunity. I would not guarantee his reception, but I should hope that it would be restrained.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, if I may now return to the pending amendment, which is the amendment of the senior Senator from Oregon concerning the question of the President's veto power, the committee has incorporated into the bill what it considered an important provision.

This provision would provide that the President of the United States could exercise an absolute veto of any act of the council which he found it desirable to prevent from becoming effective whenever in his judgment the Federal interest would be adversely affected.

I believe that the reasons for this provision are best set forth in the position of the Bureau of the Budget. There was specific testimony from the Budget Bureau as to this provision. On page 280 of the printed transcript of the hearings, five reasons are given for incorporating the veto power in the bill. It occurs to me, and I believe to the majority of the committee, that they are good reasons. These reasons are:

1. Since both the mayor and the council are elected by the residents of the District, the veto provides an effective means of protecting the broader Federal interest in the Capital.

2. The President can operate more expeditiously than Congress to nullify an act which adversely affects the Federal interest, particularly if it is passed when the Congress is not in session.

3. Denial of the veto would leave the President no avenue of participation in the legislative process of the District except when Congress exercised its legislative power, and would place the District Council in a position superior to the Congress viz-a-viz the President.

4. If Congress objects to the use of the veto respecting any District act, it can, of course, exercise its own legislative powers to enact the measure.

5. A precedent exists with respect to the territories, where the President could veto acts passed over the Governor's veto.

I believe that those are good and valid reasons.

I believe that the amendment of my distinguished friend the Senator from Oregon should be rejected.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, none of us should be surprised to find that the Bureau of the Budget advocates greater executive power. That happens to be the position of the Bureau of the Budget. It has nothing to do with what the legislative responsibilities of Congress are under the Constitution. I do not intend ever to ignore that fact.

As to the point that the President could handle it more expeditiously, which was the argument of the Bureau of the Budget, that is an interesting expression. What do we mean by "more expeditiously"? Discretionary power could be exercised without the certainty of a quick review, if one would call that handling a measure expeditiously.

Let us see what is necessary and what we would not have. Under the veto power of the President, as proposed in the bill, we would not have the opportunity to have hearings and make a record. Hearings ought to be held, at which people would have the opportunity to testify and state their case. That is the legislative process.

The House and Senate District of Columbia Committees deal with District affairs. They would have that responsibility. If they were to decide on the basis of the record that the Federal interest has been violated, they could proceed to pass legislation to set the ordinance aside. The President, if he disagreed, could veto that act of Congress. We would then have the precious system of the separation of the powers unviolated. The President could decide whether to veto the measure and the Congress could decide whether it should override his veto.

I see nothing in the position of the Bureau of the Budget which would justify setting aside the long-established system of the separation of powers for which I have been pleading.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Oregon. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is detained on official business, and if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 75, as follows:

[No. 195 Leg.]

YEAS—20

Aiken
Anderson
Church
Clark
Cooper
Douglas
Fannin
Gruening
Inouye
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Murphy
Nelson
Neuberger
Ribicoff
Simpson
Young, Ohio

NAYS—75

Allott
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—5

Byrd, Va.
Long, La.
Pearson
Russell, S.C.
Smathers

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 157, line 20, to strike out the word "eighteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty-one".

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the time I shall take in the presentation of my reasons why the amendment should be adopted will be very brief.

The bill qualifies to vote those who have reached the age of 18 or more. My amendment contemplates striking the word "eighteen" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty-one".

There are 50 States in the Union. In 46 of them the voting age is 21. In 4, it is less than 21. In Georgia and Kentucky it is 18 years. In Alaska I believe it is 19. In Hawaii it is 20.

The argument I wish to make is that 46 States have heard this subject debated for the last 30 years, and none of them except the 4 which I have identified has changed its concept of what the voting age should be. That is my argument.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for a matter which he seeks to discuss which is not immediately connected with my amendment.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his courtesy in yielding to me. I am entirely in accord with his amendment, because it seems to me to be the consensus of the Nation that 21 is the appropriate age to be followed, as 46 out of 50 States, by their basic legislation, require.

However, I have risen to speak on another subject.

I supported home rule for the District of Columbia for several years after I came to the Senate.

I have supported it not only by my vote, but also on one or more occasions by remarks on the Senate floor.

However, since I cannot and will not vote for the pending measure, I believe that I owe it to myself and to the Senate generally to explain why, some years ago, I changed my point of view, and why I now feel very strongly that I could not possibly support the pending measure.

In general, I have heretofore supported the principle of general participation of citizens in any area of America in decisions affecting their important governmental problems.

I supported that principle in my own State, in eliminating the poll tax requirement.

I supported it here as the author of the 24th amendment eliminating the poll tax in Federal elections throughout the Nation.

I supported the principle as a sponsor of statehood bills for Alaska and Hawaii.

I supported and voted for the 23d amendment giving citizens of the District of Columbia the right, for the first time, to participate in presidential elections.

I would be ready now to give to the citizens of the District of Columbia many of the powers of decision affecting their local problems, because I believe that not only would they be better qualified to discharge them, but also it would relieve Congress of the heavy burdens which, too often, it does not well perform.

But, Mr. President, in view of the bad crime record now existing in the District of Columbia, and the various questions connected therewith, I could not be a party to surrendering the responsibility of Congress to deal with that problem, or the responsibility of the Federal Government to have something directly to do with the solution of that problem.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska for a question.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator from Florida feel that Congress is doing a good job in preventing crime in the District of Columbia?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not. I feel that we should do a better job. I believe that we should be doing a worse job if this problem were turned over to a ward system of government in the District of Columbia, under which 14 wards would be established with 14 councilmen locally elected and 5 councilmen would be elected at large, with complete control of the Police Department given to that elective council.

Mr. President, I cannot think of anything more likely to greatly diminish the enforcement of criminal law in the District of Columbia than to take such a step.

I need not elaborate for the record on the distressing presence of crime at all sorts of dangerous levels now prevalent in the District of Columbia. It would be unnecessary repetition to discuss something everyone knows, to remind the Senate that crimes of murder, rape, robbery, burglary, larceny, and all kinds of acts of violence are so common in the District that safety is no longer enjoyed by our citizens.

It would be unpleasant to dwell further on this aspect of the problem, but I remind the Senate that only the day before yesterday the President himself recognized this terrible problem by inviting the attention of the District of Columbia in particular to its existence, by setting up a Crime Commission to deal as best it can with this pressing problem.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that within the past few weeks or days Congress has appropriated a substantial additional sum of money to increase the number of policemen in the District of Columbia. My recollection is that approximately 250 police officers have been added to the District police force.

We all know that is the condition which now exists. But, I do not believe these actions go far enough to discharge the responsibilities of the Federal Government. Let me say to my friend the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] that I am the first to recognize that Congress and the Federal Government have not handled responsibility too effectively simply by having the President inveigh against the existing situation and appoint a Crime Commission to look into the problem, or by having the Congress inveigh against it and supply a large addition to the police force of the District of Columbia.

I believe that our responsibilities under the Constitution are such that we should not be placing this burden on someone else's knee, particularly when we know that it would be under a setup which has not commended itself to good law enforcement in general throughout the Nation, because control of crime in cities which have the ward system handling their police departments has been far from complete in many instances, and far from capable and effective in many instances, that I do not have to comment further on that fact.

Yet, that is what we are being asked to set up, in approving this particular so-called home rule bill.

Further, I believe that we should not discharge our responsibilities complacently by merely enacting this so-called home rule bill. My own feeling is that we must recognize that we have a responsibility; and if we have not measured up to it well enough in the past, we should now bend every effort to try to do better.

Need I remind the Senate that acts of violence have occurred too frequently against our own employees, even against our own families. I remember this year, there have been at least three acts of violence against employees of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. There may be more which I have not heard of. There have all too frequently been occasions when visitors to the Nation's Capital—and several million visit us every year—were subjected to acts of violence—murder, rape, theft, and yokings.

Many of our citizens who come to visit the Nation's Capital are youngsters who look upon their visit as a pilgrimage to the shrine of their country. When they arrive here, they too often receive that kind of treatment.

Need I remind the Senate that there are too many of the citizens of the District of Columbia—and, of course, there are many fine citizens here, as good as any in the Nation—whose actions as citizens have shown too little of their duty realization and too little willingness to face the crime problem to make me believe that they would handle it any better if it were placed exclusively in their hands?

Need I remind the Senate that thousands of citizens have left the District of Columbia largely because of the crime situation?

Need I remind the Senate that in many instances recently, citizens have refused to cooperate with police officers, or with other citizens, when they have been asked to help in warding off violence that was imminent or which was then occurring?

Need I remind the Senate of the many crimes of brutality which have been alleged against police officers—who, it seems to me, have been remarkably patient in handling some of the difficult situations with which they have been confronted in recent months and years—and yet have been accused of these charges of brutality, which makes their enforcement of the law even more difficult.

Need I remind the Senate that in many instances citizens have been unwilling to testify? Senators will remember, when the child of one of our employees was stabbed to death a few years ago, in the presence of many of the local citizens, that not one was willing to come forward and testify as to what had happened.

Thus, the situation does not indicate to me a sense of fairness or of local responsibility which would justify our acting, with great complacency, to pass on this important field of enforcement of the law to the local citizenry, particularly under the ward system under which complete control of the police department would be given over to the elected mayor and the council.

I remind Senators that 14 of the 19 Members would be elected on a ward basis.

Mr. President, it seems to me that for those reasons and for one other that I shall mention we have a responsibility which we should not ignore.

The other reason which I mention has to do with the presence of more than 100 embassies and chanceries and the personnel sent here at the highest level, and at lower levels, of both friendly and unfriendly nations from all over the world.

Senators have read in newspapers and have heard personally of distressing cases of violence committed upon the high and the low among visitors who are here in a peculiarly privileged status, in which connection we are partially responsible for their safety.

I do not believe we can resign from that responsibility.

So, Mr. President, without longer detaining the Senate, while I would be willing to give many powers to the local citizenship, and while I have shown my willingness, by my support of the 23d amendment to the Constitution of the United States, as my remarks in the RECORD at that time will show, I am unwilling to give to this citizenship, under present conditions, and under the present deplorable criminal conditions in the District of Columbia, complete control over their police and law enforcement agencies. I do not believe it would be a proper discharge of our responsibilities and a proper protection of the people of the United States who come here by the millions, as well as the protection of the people who come here from other countries, and those who work for us, or, for that matter, those who are members of our own families.

I shall regretfully vote against the bill. I make this statement both because I have supported home rule on other occasions and because I do not know whether there will be a yea and nay vote on the bill, which I certainly hope we may have, because I believe Senators should have a right to put themselves on record.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] for permitting me to make this statement.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may not be charged to his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I should like to make some comments on the statements made by the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. These remarks are not directed to the pending amendment.

It seems to me that what the Senator has said was a rather harsh indictment of those of us who work on probably the most thankless job to which any Senator can be assigned; namely, the legislative Committee on the District of Columbia.

I believe that it is possible to count on half of one hand the number of Senators who seek to serve on this committee. I do not say this apologetically, because from the standpoint of hours of service, I believe I have devoted my very best effort in an attempt to draft appropriate legislation in a situation which I know is bad.

To be belabored goes a little deep, because this is really one of the most thankless jobs I can think of. We have spent a great many man-hours trying to arrive at a realistic solution to the crime problem. It is not easy.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I shall yield in a moment.

The chairman of this committee has found himself, hour after hour, day after day, presiding by himself in attempting to hear those who had suggestions to make, in an attempt to try to alleviate what we know to be a bad crime problem.

It is not all as black as the Senator from Florida has stated. We have done a great many things in our committee which we believe have been helpful, and some of it in the face of rigorous opposition.

When I first began to serve in the Senate I found myself—I do not know whether I had checked it out very carefully—on the Committee on the District of Columbia. I found myself in charge of fiscal affairs. I found myself in charge of a bill which would have added additional manpower to the juvenile court system. I admit that I am not very persuasive. I was not very persuasive in this instance, because I believe it took me 5 years to add two additional judges to the juvenile court system. This was done, but it was difficult to do.

We have increased the authorization for additional police officers in the city. We have armed the police as best we could, acting on the requests that they made of us.

Only recently we appropriated money to permit them to designate what are called trouble areas and to saturate them with police officers in an attempt to bring the growing crime problem to a halt.

The statistics, obviously, are not good. However, let us be fair. Let us say that the statistics on crime nationwide are not good. Testimony shows that the city of Washington compares favorably with any other city of comparable size. Still, this does not make it a good record. Those of us on the committee are doing our level best to attempt to correct some of these problems.

We have one of the finest police forces in the Nation. It is one of the highest paid police forces. I believe it is second only, from the standpoint of pay, to that of San Francisco. It is very high from the standpoint of pay. I believe the beginning salary is $6,000 a year. We also have instituted one of the best retirement systems.

In session after session we have come before Congress in an attempt to try to improve the situation and give to the chief of police the manpower he wants and which he has said he needs. He has repeatedly told us that one of his main problems lies in the fact that he cannot recruit all the men he wants on the police force.

I would indicate to the Senator from Florida that those of us who serve on the committee do our level best to bring this problem to Congress year after year in order to strengthen the hands of the police officers and in an attempt to make some effective inroads on the crime problem. This is on a short-range basis. Some of the long-range problems involve educational needs, housing needs, welfare needs, and recreation needs, which have been too long delayed in this community.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I shall close in a moment, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Florida.

I wished to say this in the presence of the Senator from Florida. We have moved forward in an attempt at a short-range solution of the problem. We are trying to move forward in the long-range solution of the problem.

I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make it abundantly clear that not only do I lay no fault at the feet of the distinguished Senator from Nevada, who works so tirelessly in his effort to be of service to the District of Columbia and the Nation; and I have repeatedly told him that I thought he was rendering an excellent service in this capacity. I have told him so privately, and I now say so on the floor of the Senate.

At this time I wish also to pay my tribute to other members of the committee who, in addition to the Senator from Nevada, are the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]; and on the other side of the aisle the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. Those Senators have labored tirelessly. I wish especially to say that what I have said applies particularly to the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] since I have frequently discussed District problems with them and in doing so I speak of my own knowledge.

I do not believe that under present crime conditions the Senator from Florida can vote to discharge his responsibility—and I am now making it personal—or to discharge the responsibility of Congress—and we are partly responsible for the present situation—merely by laying the load upon the knees of the citizenry of the District of Columbia.

The Senator from Florida knows a good many citizens in the District of Columbia, some of whom serve in humble positions, some in the Senate, some in the House of Representatives, some in the hotel where I live, and some in other spots—for example, taxicab drivers. Literally dozens of such humble citizens have come to me as though they were afraid to speak their real sentiments, just as so many persons have been afraid, apparently, to come to the aid of officers when they call for their assistance when they have been shot down or cut down and left unassisted. They come to me and say, "We do not want home rule because there is too much of the criminal influence that we cannot combat."

I believe I speak for a great many people in the District of Columbia, both of humble state and high state, when I say that I do not believe we should merely wash our hands of the responsibility in the field of law enforcement. It is not easy for me to make that statement, for two reasons:

First, at one time I served on the District of Columbia Committee. I got off of it as rapidly as I could, since I represent a State that is very active and which has many interests and many burdens. I did not feel that I could continue to carry that additional burden.

Second, I supported home rule, as I have stated, in the past. I feel that the present development leaves us in a situation in which we—or at least I, speaking only as one Senator—could not vote to try to relieve myself of the responsibility merely by saying that we are going to leave it to those good people in the District to work out. I do not believe we can. They are entitled to the help of Congress, and they must have the help of Congress if they are to improve the intolerable conditions which give Washington, D.C. such a black eye in all the world and in many parts of our own country, which inveigh against the pride in the Nation's capital which every American should have. It is only from that point of view that I have said what I have said.

I am not belaboring in any sense any member of this committee. The Senator from Nevada knows that I have complimented him on repeated occasions for carrying the heavy burden which he is carrying. He has carried it nobly, to his own hurt, physically and in every other way, and in such a way as to force him to give undue attention to this problem. So long as conditions remain as they are now, and so long as the attitude of so many local people remains as it is now, I could never vote for the home rule bill.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. BIBLE. I am very happy that the Senator has made that statement. He has expressed his sentiments to me on a number of occasions. I wish to make the record very clear as to some of the things we are doing in this area.

Under the terms of the bill the Congress could enact any additional legislation that it might feel necessary to deal with the problem. We are not getting out of this field by enactment of the bill. If that is the reason for a Senator voting against the home rule bill, that is a question for his own personal decision and his own personal judgment. There are adequate safeguards in the Congress of the United States which will authorize it at any time to enact necessary legislation in this field if it is indicated and needed.

Mr. President, I believe I had better return to the amendment, which is the pending business.

First, I should like to ask the Chair how much time I have remaining.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to speak in opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. BIBLE. First, I made a commitment to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson]. As soon as I have yielded to him, I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, my remarks will not require more than about 5½ minutes.

I am for the home rule bill. Nothing that I say in my prepared remarks should be construed in any way as a reflection upon any Member of the District Committee of either House, because I happen to believe that service on the District of Columbia Committee, here and in the other body, is the most demanding contribution of time, with the least reward, that is made upon Members of either House of Congress. The work that has been done by the distinguished Senator from Nevada, the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and the others who are members of the committee leaves the rest of us in their debt.

I have had a feeling that perhaps it would be a good idea to adopt a rule that all those who vote against home rule should be required to serve upon the District of Columbia Committee in either House until they change their minds.

It seems to me that all the arguments that can be made have been made this year, last year, the year before, and for many, many years by able spokesmen in behalf of home rule for the District of Columbia. I have little or nothing to add to any of the distinguished arguments that have been made, except to suggest that the U.S. Senate, the greatest deliberative body in the world, has done an honorable and important service in its past legislative consideration of District matters. Having served well, it deserves a rest.

Consider, for example, that we gave serious and well-merited Senate attention, last July, to the important matter of packaging cream in the Capital area. After due and thoughtful deliberation, and careful investment of Senators' time, we concluded that the old law required an amendment. Formerly, the Senate had duly required as a matter of law and grave public policy that bottles or jars used for the sale of milk or cream had to be of the capacity of 1 gallon, one-half gallon, 3 pints, 1 quart, 1 pint, one-half pint, or 1 gill.

This is and has been an important matter, but, as times change, so must the law. Having duly deliberated on this matter, last July, we concluded, as a matter of law, that in the District of Columbia, milk and cream could also be sold in cartons containing 1 ounce. I am happy and proud that this decision was taken. Now it is easy for the consumer to purchase those neat little containers of coffee cream, so usefully found in our best restaurants. Having done its job as a legislative body on this important matter, I believe the Senate and the Congress deserve a rest. Though one may disagree, and I would not want to argue the point at great length, I believe that with a certain patience and confidence and faith we may find that the District of Columbia itself can rule upon such weighty matters.

Let me add that at the same time we passed this law, we also legalized the sale of Eskimo Pies in the District. I will readily admit that arguments against this aspect of the legislation that the Congress considered may be more persuasive. I do not wish to predict that the District itself will be able to handle such questions without making dangerous mistakes. Nonetheless, I suppose that in any matter of high national policy there are risks that must be taken. But to live is to live with some dangers that one simply has to accept.

I want to say one or two other words of praise for the fine work the Congress has done in the past. It seems to me that our deliberation and study was most thorough in the period preceding our approval of legislation which eliminated the requirement that the District keep an alphabetical file of liens on motor vehicles and trailers. I hope that an independent District government will also consider such matters with a certain care.

Again, we did well indeed in changing the law so as to authorize the Association of Universalist Women to consolidate with the Alliance of Unitarian Women. Lest there be any confusion about this vital piece of legislation, let me point out that the Alliance of Unitarian Women was formerly known as the National Alliance of Unitarian and Other Liberal Christian Women.

During the years of the 88th Congress, we also enacted District laws to:

Raise the fee for learner driving permits from $2 to $5;

Not being used to dealing with large sums, Senators can see what a difficult decision that must have been for the Congress to make.

After long deliberation, Congress enacted a law to permit foreign life insurance companies to mail copies of their annual report to policyholders who live in Washington.

We also passed a law to permit condominium units to be located on more than one floor of a building.

Earlier this year, after due consideration, we passed a bill to allow the Veterans of Foreign Wars to rent an office in the District of Columbia. While there were many who questioned the wisdom of this action, there was no doubt in my mind but that we did the best we could.

I do have one quarrel with Congress' past treatment of the District, I must admit. In my opinion, the decision last year not to repeal the prohibition against flying kites, balloons, and parachutes was not well taken. Considering the many significant measures we did pass, however, I do not think anyone would be so harsh as to condemn us unduly for our laxity in this one instance.

All in all, Mr. President, I believe we have acted carefully and well on these questions; I am hopeful that a decision of this weight and magnitude can be made with prudence and wisdom by an independent District of Columbia. As for Congress, I feel that we have done enough. We deserve a rest.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Wisconsin does not realize how fortunate he has been. When the Senator from Rhode Island first came to the Senate in 1950 from the Governor's chair in Rhode Island, he had to decide, as his first responsibility on the Committee on the District of Columbia, exactly how large a rockfish one could fish out of the Potomac without being compelled to put it back. That is not a fishy story.

Mr. NELSON. It was a tough decision, too, for a man who is not a fisherman.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for putting this problem in its proper perspective in his delightful manner and way.

In mentioning the members of the legislative Committee on the District of Columbia, I did not intend that to be exclusive recognition, because as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I am aware of the work that the great Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] did as chairman of the Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations, on which he has just commented, and the hours that were required of him and the other members of the subcommittee who served with him. That is likewise true of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd], who is now chairman of that subcommittee, and the other members of his group.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Tydings in the chair). The Senator from Nevada has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. BIBLE. Again returning to the amendment at hand, relating to the question whether the voting age should be 18 or 21, this question is not new to Congress. It has come to us before. It came to us in the 87th Congress, at the time when we had before us a bill to determine the qualifications of voters who would participate in a presidential election. The bill as it came to us set the voting age at 18 years, and the residence requirement at 6 months, as being correct. There was considerable discussion on that subject. Many amendments were offered—five, as I recall. If I read the Record correctly, the vote to change the voting age from 18 to 21 was 38 to 36, which is, I believe, some indication of how close this question may frequently be.

One additional area that has not been mentioned is the territory of Guam, where voting is permitted at the age of 18.

The hearing record shows that on this particular point the recommendation came in these words. I refer to page 123 of the hearing record.

> The President has considered this matter carefully, and it is his conclusion that the age of 18 and the 6-months' residence requirement is the correct one, and he would like to support it.

I can say unequivocally and on authority that that is the position of President Johnson this day.

The late President Kennedy, in his first year of office, appointed a special commission to examine into the questions of voting age and voting residence. That national committee made its report and recommended a voting age of 18, with a 6-months' residence required for voting.

The statement I have just made appears in the RECORD. President Johnson was of exactly the same opinion and favors a voting age of 18 years.

This question has been discussed and debated in every State. A resolution is pending in the legislature of my own State of Nevada at the present time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Can the Senator from Nevada tell us what the age is for entering into a binding contract in the District of Columbia?

Mr. BIBLE. I have checked that. I believe I am correct in saying that the age for entering into a binding contract in the District of Columbia is 21.

Mr. MILLER. Can the Senator tell us the minimum age at which a person may convey a piece of real estate and enter into a deed which would be considered marketable?

Mr. BIBLE. I believe that it, likewise, is 21 years, in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MILLER. My only response is that it seems to me that the exercise of the voting franchise is as fundamental and precious a right as is the right to enter into a binding contract or to convey real property.

If the bill had provided a change in the law to permit 18-year-olds to enter into a contract or to convey real estate, it would have been consistent. But as it is now, it seems to me that until the law can be changed regarding the age at which binding contracts, the conveyance of real property, and many other items in the field of law can be handled by a person of the age of 18, we are probably jumping the gun a little by changing the voting age.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the sentiments of the Senator from Iowa. This argument is frequently made. An additional argument is that young men are fighting in the Armed Forces when they are 18 years of age.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And it is a binding contract.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was about to ask the age at which a person can be drafted.

Mr. BIBLE. I feel certain that those who are serving in Vietnam are convinced that it is not only a binding contract but a difficult contract.

I now yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. I feel, as has been said before, that if young men can be drafted into military service and go out and be prepared to die at the age of 18, they should be entitled to vote at the age of 18.

To say, as the Senator from Ohio does, that so far only four States have changed the voting age below 21 is not a convincing argument to me. We are constantly broadening the base of our democracy. That has been so throughout the course of American history and properly so. We should not desist from that desirable course.

It is rather interesting to observe that the four States which have changed the voting age below 21 years include one of the original 13 States—Georgia, whose distinguished junior Senator [Mr. TALMADGE] I observe in the Chamber; Kentucky, which entered the Union shortly afterward in 1792 as the 15th State; and the two youngest States, the 49th, my own State of Alaska, and Hawaii, the 50th State. The people of these four States both old and young have had the wisdom and progressiveness to allow their young men to vote at an earlier age.

I hope that the provision in the bill to establish the voting age as 18 will not be modified, and that the amendment to do so will be rejected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield time to me?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The argument about the age of 18 being young enough to vote to fight for the country and go into the Armed Forces, and that, therefore, one must be old enough to vote if he is 18, is not quite the point. If it were the point, every State in the Union would have long ago permitted 18-year-olds to enter binding contracts and to convey real property.

While hundreds of thousands of 18-year-olds from all 50 States have entered the armed services, only four States, as of now, as the Senator from Ohio has pointed out, have concluded that under 21 is an age at which voting can be done.

I might suggest that the figures will show, similarly, that most States require the age of 21 for entering into binding contracts or the conveyance of real estate. Merely because one is capable physically to fight for his country does not necessarily mean that he has the capacity to enter into a binding contract or to convey real property.

I suggest that the voting franchise is just as important as the entering into of a contract for the conveyance of real estate. I believe that it is even more important. So if we are going to do the job, I suggest that we change the bill so as to provide for the conveyance of real estate and for the entering into of binding contracts at the age of 18, and couple that provision with the provision for the change in voting age.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the only reason that I became involved in the debate is that when I was Governor of my State I recommended that there be a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age from 21 to 18.

I did that precisely for the reason that we are arguing here today, that if our country can call upon a young man to shoulder a gun and fight for this country, that young man ought to be able to decide who the man will be who is going to send him to war. I believe that is the test.

I believe that is the proper test, rather than the test as to whether a young man is sui juris at the age of 21 and can sign a contract. I believe the question is whether, if we are living in an age in which young people of 18 years of age are to be called upon to serve their country, they ought to be permitted to decide who the councilman shall be in the District of Columbia.

I believe that we can argue this question one way or the other. However, the argument that, if we are to lower the legal age for voting, we must lower the age for a young person to be able to act legally as an adult is fallacious. I do not believe that it applies. I do not believe that it compels us at this moment to revise all our statutory law in order to make this change.

The voting age has been changed by law in four States at the present time. I believe that in due time other States will get around to doing the same thing. Our boys and girls of the age of 18 years are conscious today of what is going on around them. They are better educated than their predecessors were. There is no magic in the age of 18 or 21.

I believe that in our modern society, as we look to our youth to sacrifice and fight for us, we should provide them with the power to decide who their President shall be, who their Senators shall be, and, under this bill, who their councilmen will be.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to supplement the views of the Senator from Rhode Island and the views of my chairman. However, one of the reasons why I have recommended in my State for a good many years the 18-year-old age limit is that I am satisfied that 18-year-old youths, as a result of the great improvement in our educational system during the last 100 years, are really better informed and better qualified to pass on questions of government than a good many millions who are many years older. They ought to be better qualified. If they are not, our whole educational process has broken down.

I always welcome an opportunity to support my President when I believe he is right. In spite of the whispered conversation from my good friend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], whom I have not found to be correct very often recently, I find the President to be correct in this instance. His witness at the hearing, Mr. Staats, who spoke on behalf of the President, said:

> The President has considered this matter carefully. It is his conclusion that the age of 18 and the 6 months' residence requirement is the correct one, and he would like to support that.

I ask the majority leader to see that the President is notified that I agree with him, and that I shall vote for the 18-year limitation and against the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me some time?

Mr. BIBLE. I have no time remaining.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield me a minute and a half?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield 1½ minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I offered a constitutional amendment in the State legislature when I was a member of the minority party. I offered that amendment 4 years in a row to try to have the age limit reduced from 21 to 18, as has been mentioned also by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

I thought the Senate would be interested to know that the majority party, the Democratic Party, refused to let the amendment out of committee.

I asked them why. They said, "We are sure that there are many responsible 18-year-olds who would vote, but, unfortunately, most of them would be Republicans. We do not want to give them the chance."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I expect to vote against the bill for several reasons, one of which is that under the terms of the bill, the Federal Government would have to pay to the District of Columbia government what is equivalent to an ad valorem property tax upon all of the Federal property in the District of Columbia used for governmental purposes. The Federal Government would have to pay a tax to the District on the Capitol of the United States and on the flagstaff and the flag displayed over the Capitol.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD extracts from page 142 to page 146, both inclusive, which sustain the accuracy of my observations.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PART 4—ANNUAL FEDERAL PAYMENT TO DISTRICT

Annual Federal payment to District

SEC. 741. (a) In recognition of the unique character of the District of Columbia as the Nation's Capital City, regular annual payments by the Federal Government are hereby authorized to cover the proper share of the expenses of the District government. On or before January 10 of each year, the Mayor shall, with the approval of the Council, submit to the Secretary of the Treasury through the Administrator of General Services a request for a Federal payment to be made during the following fiscal year, and the amount of such payment shall be computed as follows:

(1) An amount (to be paid to the general fund) computed as of January 1 of the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which payment is requested based upon the following factors:

(A) The amount of real property taxes lost to the District during the fiscal year immediately preceding the fiscal year for which the annual Federal payment is being requested, based upon the assessed value and rate of tax in effect on January 1 of said preceding year, as a result of the exemption from real property taxation of the following properties:

(i) Real property in the District owned and used by the United States for the purpose of providing Federal governmental services or performing Federal governmental functions, but excluding parklands, museums, art galleries, memorials, statuary, and shrines, and also excluding to the extent to which it may be so used, property owned by the United States and used to provide a service or perform a function which would otherwise be provided or performed by the District, such as, by way of example and without limitation, public streets and alleys and public water supply facilities.

(ii) Real property in the District exempt from taxation by special Act of Congress or exempt from taxation pursuant to subsection (k) of section 1 of the Act approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1809), as amended (sec. 47-801a(k), 1961 ed.), and not eligible for exemption from taxation under any other subsection of said section 1 of the Act approved December 24, 1942.

(B) The amount of personal property taxes lost to the District during the fiscal year immediately preceding the fiscal year for which the annual Federal payment is being requested based upon the assessed value and rate of tax in effect on January 1 of said preceding year, as a consequence of the exemption from personal property taxation of tangible personal property located in the District and which is owned by the United States, exclusive of objects of art, museum pieces, statuary, and libraries. Tangible personal property located in the District owned by the United States may be estimated by one or more methods developed by the Mayor and approved by the Administrator of General Services.

(C) The amount obtained by multiplying by a fraction the actual collections, during the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the annual Federal payment is being requested, of corporation and unincorporated business franchise taxes, and taxes on insurance premiums and on gross earnings of financial institutions and guaranty companies. The numerator of such fraction shall be the total number of Federal Government employees whose places of employment are in the District, as estimated by the United States Civil Service Commission, and the denominator of which shall be the total number of other employees whose places of employment are in the District, as estimated by the United States Employment Service for the District, but excluding employees of the government of the District, employees in nonprofit activities and domestics in private households, also as estimated by such Service.

(2) The amount of the charges for water services furnished to the Federal Government by the District during the second fiscal year preceding the year for which the annual Federal payment is being requested (to be paid to the water fund).

(3) The charges for sanitary sewer services furnished to the Federal Government by the District during the second fiscal year preceding the year for which the annual Federal payment is being requested (to be paid to the santitary sewage works fund).

(b) After review by the Administrator of General Services of the request for Federal payment and certification by him on or before April 10 of the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the annual Federal payment is being requested that such request is based upon a reasonable and fair assessment of real and personal property of the United States and a proper and accurate computation of the factors referred to in section 741(a)(1) and is in conformity with the provisions of this section, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, not later than September 1 of each fiscal year, cause such payment to be made to the District out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to advance on or after July 1, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, without interest, such amounts (not to exceed in the aggregate the total payment in the previous fiscal year) as may be required by the District pending the payment of the amount authorized by this section.

(c) The Administrator of General Services shall enter into cooperative arrangements with the Mayor whereby disputes, differences, or disagreements involving the Federal payment may be resolved.

(d) For the first fiscal year in which this part is effective, the amount of the annual Federal payment may be computed on the basis of preliminary estimates: *Provided*, That such amount shall be subject to later adjustment in accordance with the provisions of this part.

Mr. ERVIN. I reiterate that under the pending bill, the Federal Government would have to pay to the District of Columbia government on Federal property in the District what is equivalent to an ad valorem property tax. Such payment would have to be paid even upon the value of post offices in the District of Columbia. That is something that would not happen anywhere else in the Nation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield myself whatever time I may need within the time that still remains for my use.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator is recognized.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, at the beginning of my remarks on my amendment, I said that for the past 30 years the subject of what the voting age ought to be has been discussed in the various States.

I was elected Governor of Ohio in 1944. I served for 10 years. I visited universities, high schools, and other institutions of higher learning at a time when the subject of voting age was being discussed in every school of the State.

I was subjected to questions concerning why an 18-year-old should not be permitted to vote. The identical arguments that have been made on this floor during the last 45 minutes were made in those discussions. Some people said if a boy is capable of carrying a gun, and is subject to the carrying of a gun, why should he not have the right to vote? Others would say that if the boy has the right to vote at 18, why should he not be permitted to make a will disposing of his property at the age of 18? Some asked why he should not be permitted to make a contract to buy diamonds, furs, automobiles, and luxuries which contracts he would be obligated to perform and why he should not be permitted, if he has been the legatee of real estate, to sell that real estate and execute a deed?

There is no difference in the arguments that were made then and the arguments that are made today.

Forty-six States of the Union require a person to be 21 years of age before he is eligible to vote. Four States, as I have previously stated, do not have this requirement. The States of Kentucky and Georgia have a requirement that a person be 18 years of age or older. The State of Alaska has a requirement that a person be 19 years of age or older. The State of Hawaii has a requirement that a person be 20 years of age or older. However, we, the greatest deliberative body of the world—infallible in judgment, we say—proceed to tell 46 States that they do not know what they are doing.

I pause for a moment on this proposition. How many members of the senate and how many members of the house of the 46 States are there? In my State there are about 150 in both houses. I suppose, if one went through the list of 46 States, he would find that in all there are probably 6,000 legislators.

During all of the argument, with changing legislatures, year after year, no change has been made in the voting age. But we on this floor, gifted by the Creator with an infallible judgment, know. No one else, nowhere else, knows what is right but us. So we are going to tell the Nation that in the District of Columbia, with all of the crime that is supposed to be rampant—and I do not assert that it is as bad as it has sometimes been portrayed—with special money provided to take care of the school dropouts, where the birthrate of illegitimates is worse than in any city in the country, while other States, agricultural and otherwise, have said a citizen shall be 21 years of age before he can vote, we as a part of this great deliberative body are picking out Washington, D.C., as the example where 18-year-olds are to vote.

If past history and experience mean anything, they mean that we should use them to ascertain what people think. I respectfully submit to Senators that when 46 States have refused to change the law with respect to voting age, we are becoming a bit arrogant and haughty about our judgment and our intellectual ability and our infallibility in making this decision.

I do not wish to be critical, but I believe during the 9 years I have served in the Senate, I have learned one thing. The Congress of the United States believes that all intellectual richness resides here. We do not believe that people down on the Mahoning River, or on the Maumee, or the Scioto, or the Miami, or the Hocking, or those working on the farm have any intellect at all. We believe they do not know what is good for them.

Can anyone argue justly that, if the principle which has been argued for today, giving the right to vote to those who are 18 years of age, was sound, it would not have been adopted by more than four States in the Union?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate my colleague giving me an opportunity to oppose his point of view.

It was my responsibility, when a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, to offer a constitutional amendment bearing on this problem. I recall also that a witness at that time before our committee was the distinguished Governor of Georgia, Hon. Ellis Arnall. He came before us and was highly persuasive in his presentation of the reasons why young men and young women 18 years of age should have the right and the responsibility to vote.

As a Member of the U.S. Senate I have introduced similar legislation calling for an amendment to the Constitution which would lower the voting age to 18.

I am also happy to report that, although we have not as yet been able to move forward with that approach through the constitutional amendment route, the effort is being continued. In the State of West Virginia I have contacted on regular occasions the members within our legislative body, urging action on this problem.

On the most recent occasion we were almost successful in this effort in West Virginia. The attempt failed by a small margin. It is my belief that, in the legislative session of 1966, we shall be able to give this right and responsibility of the ballot to the youth of our State who are 18 and over.

I do not believe it is a matter of any special perceptive power which the Senate will assume if it enacts the home rule legislation as presented with the 18-year-old voting provision. Rather, it will be the Senate responding to the needs of the era in which we live—an era of change and of challenge. And, in a sense, our decisions with respect to the District of Columbia will be guideposts for action in other parts of our land. It is appropriate that the Nation's Capital serve as an example of just and responsive government—and it is my view that these qualities would receive added emphasis by the retention of the 18-year-old voting provision in the pending bill.

Perhaps it is wrong to speak too often of one's own family in public. However, I believe that those Members who have sons and daughters, as I do, would agree that their offspring are better prepared to vote at 18 than their parents were at 21. The two sons in our family have served to strentghen my convictions in this respect.

It is a truism that through modern methods of communication and procedures of education the youth of today are better qualified to vote than were their parents.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator intend to use? My time is running out.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I shall stop within 30 seconds. I feel that the Senator from Ohio is mistaken on this subject. I esteem the Senator from Ohio, and I often follow his logic. He has the same affection for our younger folk that the Senator from West Virginia has, but I believe he has failed to realize that the youth of today has a wider knowledge of public matters and is better able to participate and respond to the challenge of citizenship at the age of 18 than were his parents at the age of 21.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator require?

Mr. PASTORE. Two minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have to leave immediately after the vote, to return to my State to attend the funeral of a very distinguished Rhode Islander, Mr. Arthur Famiglietti, who passed away on Monday. For that reason, I shall not be in Washington when amendment No. 355 on the Federal payment, sponsored by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], will be voted upon.

I desire to be recorded in opposition to that amendment.

I also wish to be recorded as being in favor of passage of the bill itself. I have been in favor of home rule for the District of Columbia, and I wish the RECORD to indicate it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to be allowed to be absent from the Senate immediately after this vote, for the remainder of the week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEATH OF ARTHUR F. FAMIGLIETTI

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, Arthur F. Famiglietti was indeed a distinguished citizen of Rhode Island, prominent in its civic, educational, religious, political, and industrial life.

For many years he was alumni secretary of his alma mater, Providence College, and known nationwide to its graduates. He was on the college football team and on the staff of its literary magazine. In after life, Mr. Famiglietti became a newsman and member of the Rhode Island Press Club. He was past president of the Serra Club which fosters Catholic religious vocations, and past president of the Rhode Island Catholic Association of College Alumni. For many years he was secretary of the Aurora Civic Association and prominent in Italo-American activities.

In the OPA days Mr. Famiglietti entered public service as Assistant Director and ended his public service as secretary to Dennis J. Roberts when Governor of Rhode Island.

His political interest and involvement continued as he engaged in private business as proprietor of the Aylesworth World Travel Agency through which he attained a global acquaintanceship.

Despite all his community activities, Arthur Famiglietti remained the ideal family man, devoted father and husband and earned for himself a respect and affection rare in our times. He will be sadly missed from the Rhode Island scene.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHARTER ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1118) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I wish to use the minute given me to say that, in my judgment, my colleague [Mr. LAUSCHE] is just as right as any Senator can be in offering his amendment, and I propose to support him.

I differ with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. I readily concede that my colleague [Mr. LAUSCHE] and I, at the time we graduated from high school many years ago, did not attain as good an education as the average high school graduate of today. But I challenge the statement of the Senator from West Virginia, and I differ from him in his statement, which I believe is not factually correct, because, all things taken into consideration, when we were 21 years of age, we were just as able to vote as anyone who is now 21, and we were far more intelligent in government matters than a youngster getting out of high school today.

My colleague's amendment is a good amendment. With 46 States keeping the age at 21, I believe that we should stick to that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia was rather severe and harsh with me in emphatically declaring that I am as wrong as anyone can be, but I wish to submit——

Mr. RANDOLPH. I said on this subject——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Just one moment. I wish to submit as testimony in behalf of my cause that 46 State legislatures have been repeatedly importuned to change the law, but they have never deemed it advisable to do so.

I should like to know what the position of the Senator from West Virginia would be if I offered an amendment making it legal to sell liquor to 18-year-old children, and what the position of Congress would be if we proceeded to allow 18-year-olds to buy diamonds, automobiles, tapestries, and silks not needed——

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator has asked me a question. Will he allow me to——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Just one moment. I have already given the Senator his time——

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator has asked me a question, and——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield one-half minute to the Senator from West Virginia to answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would not vote for such an amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That answers the question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia has been driven into a corner, and in order to sustain his position on the 18-year-old voting right has been obliged to say that he would approve of the sale of liquor to 18-year-olds——

Mr. RANDOLPH. No, no——

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is—just one moment, please—that is at least my interpretation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. No——

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would not vote for that right.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I also declared that I would not vote for that right. I would take the position of the Senator from Ohio. I would not vote to sell liquor to 18-year-olds.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have been gladly yielding——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes remain to the Senator from Ohio at the time he asked his question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to yield to the Senator from Oregon——

Mr. MORSE. I knew that the Senator would.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Because he will convince me that my statement that we are the possessors of all intellect and knowledge is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has enticed me——

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator enticed me when he raised the liquor issue. How would the Senator vote on barring liquor from being served at all Senate functions in the Capitol?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would vote for barring it, most assuredly.

Mr. MORSE. Then I believe that I shall offer it as an amendment, in order to get the Senator's vote.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Ohio will recall that in almost all States a person is not sui juris, and cannot make a contract, until he is 21 years old.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. That has been argued for 50 years. Those who advocate the right to vote for 18-year-olds have never raised their voices to change the law from 21 to 18 under the right to contract.

I should like to know why. One seems popular and the other seems unpopular.

Mr. President, I do not believe that there is anything new——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield? I should like to address a question to him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. The question I should like to address to the Senator is: Has he stood before a senior high school class in the State of Ohio, in the past 2 or 3 years, and discussed the politics and the policies of the Federal Government, and the State governments, and then submitted himself to a question-and-answer period by the students?

That is my first question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is an excellent question. I was elected Governor of Ohio five times, and I have stood before hundreds of classes, immediately after World War II, in which we discussed the right to vote.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me then propound——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Just one moment—I wish to say categorically that at the end of each session, when I asked the class to indicate by show of hands whether they believed they should be given the right to vote, not one single class—throughout my experience in Ohio—made up of 16-, 17-, and 18-year-olds raised their hands in a majority who believed that they should have the right to vote.

Voting is something more than intellectual capacity. It deals with the impetuous tendency of youth.

Why do insurance companies charge higher premiums to 18-years-old drivers of automobiles than they do for those over 25? Why do we prohibit the sale of liquor to youths? We cannot put them in the same category.

Mr. TYDINGS. Would the Senator from Ohio agree with me, then—and I judge from his remarks that he would—that the knowledge in the field of government, politics, and national affairs of high school graduates today, not only in his State but throughout the Nation, is exceptional. That our young people generally have a pretty decent grasp of national and State affairs? Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Surely, they have a grasp of national and State affairs, but the fact still remains that with over 190 million people in the United States represented by 50 State legislatures, only 4 of them have seen fit to change the voting age.

I intend to give some credence to that fact. I am not going to impose my judgment over and above that. If we exclude Georgia, Kentucky, Hawaii, and Alaska, there are probably 180 million people who have not favored lowering the voting age, at least by a consensus.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, Kentucky is one of the four States which permit those under 21 years of age to vote. The voting age in Kentucky is 18.

It is probably correct to say that after World War II, the people of the State of Kentucky were moved by the sacrifices of boys 18 years old and over, and granted them the right to vote.

Let me tell the Senate how that came about. I believe that I can speak from experience, as can my colleague [Mr. Morton]. Granting these boys and girls of 18 years of age the right to vote has brought about a great, stimulating effect among the voters of Kentucky.

It is evident in the colleges. It is evident in the high schools. It is evident in the formation of political clubs. I may say that their interest and enthusiasm has spilled over and has given new interest and enthusiasm to the older voters.

The argument is made against 18 year olds voting that they do not have judgment and maturity.

We must develop judgment and maturity. I do not believe they have misused the right to vote. I do not want to be immodest, but I believe they have shown good judgment.

Their interest in political issues and activities all through my State has spilled over and has given new interest and enthusiasm to the older voters.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield me 1 minute?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have only 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the Senator yield me a half minute?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall yield that time to the Senator. All I wish to say at the end of it all is "Amen."

Mr. BARTLETT. The wisdom of those who drew up the Alaska constitution in lowering the voting age is amply demonstrated by the maner in which those young people have voted since that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche]. All time has expired. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Russell] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is absent on official business, and if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 66, as follows:

[No. 196 Leg.]

YEAS—29

Allott
Bennett
Curtis
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
McIntyre
Miller
Mundt
Robertson
Saltonstall
Simpson
Sparkman
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Young, Ohio

NAYS—66

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smathers
Smith
Symington
Talmadge
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—5

Byrd, Va.
Long, La.
Russell, Ga.
Russell, S.C.
Scott

So Mr. Lausche's amendment was rejected.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to make inquiry of the distinguished majority leader as to what the program is for the remainder of the day and what is proposed for tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by my distinguished friend, the minority leader [Mr. Dirksen], we have come to a tentative agreement. Insofar as we know, the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is the last amendment. We shall reach the third reading of the bill tonight. It is hoped that all Senators who have remarks to make on the bill and have not made them, will make them after the third reading.

Mr. President, if that is agreeable, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the pending legislation occur at 11:05 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair advises the majority leader that an agreement must be entered into which would waive the requirement for a quorum call. Under rule XII, a quorum call must be had before reaching an agreement setting a time for a final vote on the passage of a bill. Does the Senator ask that that provision of the rule be suspended?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; and I ask further that time be allowed between the conclusion of the prayer and the vote on the passage of the bill for a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the several requests are granted; and, without objection, the rule will be suspended.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That the Senate proceed to vote on final passage of S. 1118, to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, at 11:05 a.m., Thursday, July 22.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry. I did not hear the majority leader. Did he say there would be no more votes this afternoon?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be one more vote tonight. We shall get to a third reading tonight. It is hoped that Senators who have remarks will make them after the third reading and that the final vote will come at 11:05 tomorrow morning.

AMENDMENT NO. 355

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I call up my amendments No. 355.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendments.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; the amendments will be printed in the Record at this point.

The amendments offered by Mr. Dominick are as follows:

On page 142, beginning with line 3, strike out all through line 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 741. (a) In recognition of the unique character of the District of Columbia as the Nation's Capital City, regular annual payments are hereby authorized to be appropriated from revenues of the United States to cover the proper share of the expenses of the District government and such annual payments, when appropriated, shall be paid in the manner hereinafter provided. The annual payment authorization shall consist of the aggregate of the following amounts computed by the Mayor, with the approval of the Council:".

On page 145, beginning with line 15, strike out all through line 8 on page 146 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) The Mayor, with the approval of the Council, shall annually compute the amount of the Federal payment authorized to be appropriated under this section and the amount of such authorization so computed shall be submitted to the Congress along with any request for appropriation of such payment."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on my amendments I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The Chair has made every effort to obtain order. The Senator will suspend his remarks until other Senators and the staff are ready to do business. The Presiding Officer dislikes to point to specific Senators and members of the staff, but there will have to be order in the Senate.

The Senator from Colorado may proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that there be no limitation on debate after the third reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require. I shall start with 15 minutes, so that I will know how much time is available as we proceed.

This amendment is designed to correct what I believe is a basic, glaring error in the home rule bill at present. The amendment is simple. It merely provides that the formula setting forth the Federal payment to the District of Columbia shall be subject to annual appropriation.

I say in all sincerity to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that I do not believe that the House will give the bill serious consideration without the adoption of the amendment.

We ought to be clear about what we are proposing to do. By the adoption of section 741, part 4, entitled "Annual Federal Payment to District," we are proposing a novel and potentially dangerous method of dealing with the Federal payment to the District. This provision contains a built-in, automatic formula for computing the Federal payment, based upon amounts the Federal Government would pay in private taxes, personal property taxes, and business taxes, if it were a private industry. In addition, the Federal Government would continue to pay the District water and sanitary sewer charges.

Imagine for a moment some of the problems involved in assessing real and personal Federal property in the District. I was happy to have the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] bring up this point in connection with the consideration of another amendment.

For example, the District of Columbia Assessor would be called upon to place an assessed valuation on the U.S. Capitol and, indeed, on the very Chamber in which we are now sitting. How would he do that? What basis of value would he use? Would he use current market value, the original cost, or the cost of replacement at today's prices? All three are well recognized methods of valuation and probably could be used to justify either a high or a low assessed value, depending upon the whim of the District of Columbia government.

The District Assessor would also be empowered to place a value upon the White House, the Senate and House Office Buildings, the Supreme Court, the Library of Congress, the Smithsonian Institution, and even the buildings of the Internal Revenue Service.

We must not forget that personal property, with a few exceptions, would also be subject to similar valuation. One example would be the desks in this Chamber. The District of Columbia Assessor would be required to place a value on these desks, which have seen historical service of notable distinction. How would he appraise them? On the basis of replacement value, of historical value, of sentimental value, on what they are really worth to the Senators who sit behind them? I suggest that that is a problem which has not been solved, perhaps has not even been approached. Difficult problems will be encountered in the valuation area alone. We must remember that the basis upon which valuations are computed is within the judgment and discretion of the District Assessor. Under the present provisions of the bill, the only way Congress could change the assessment would be to pass a law in lieu thereof, which would put us back at the point where Congress would have to determine the Federal payment.

In my supplemental views in the committee report, I have set forth another factor that ought to be considered. I stated:

> Finally, the Federal payment formula will set a dangerous and far-reaching precedent for States and localities where there are large Federal property holdings. Those of us who come from the so-called public lands States are acutely aware of the drive to levy in lieu of taxes on Federal property. For instance, we have States like Alaska where the Federal Government owns over 98 percent of all the land in the State. There are examples where a certain percentage of the revenues from Federal lands are turned back to the States or counties, but nowhere is there a situation where not only are payments made in lieu of real and personal property taxes on Federal property, but also payments based upon hypothetical business income and related taxes as well. I think that the Federal payment provision in the bill is not wise and certainly will hamper eventual passage of the bill.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I wish to ascertain whether the Senator's interpretation of this aspect of the bill is similar to mine. As I interpret the bill, the Federal Government would have to make a payment to the District of Columbia government which would be tantamount to an ad valorem property tax, even on the post offices the Federal Government operates within the District of Columba.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is absolutely accurate.

Mr. ERVIN. The Federal Government would have to pay what is equivalent to an ad valorem tax upon the Capitol itself. Would it not even have to pay an ad valorem tax, or the equivalent of an ad valorem tax, on the flags that fly over the Capitol?

Mr. DOMINICK. It seems to me that that would be true, because the only exceptions I know of are certain classes of personal property plus memorials and museums and some of the contents of them.

Mr. ERVIN. Can the Senator give any justification for allowing the District of Columbia to impose, in effect, the equivalent of an ad valorem tax on post offices operating within the District of Columbia, and not extend that right to all the States and municipalities in which post offices are located?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is a point I was about to discuss.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the contribution to the debate made by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. If Fort Knox, Ky., were in the District of Columbia, would a tax be imposed on the Nation's gold reserves?

Mr. DOMINICK. I had not thought of that.

Mr. MORTON. The gold reserve is in trouble now; let us not tax it.

Mr. DOMINICK. We are already losing it so fast that I do not believe a tax ought to be imposed besides.

It is clear from what I have been saying that it would be unwise to proceed under the Federal payment formula set out in the bill. In addition, the bill provides for a permanent appropriation based upon this formula. I raised the point during the committee hearings that this might be an unconstitutional delegation of the appropriation authority of Congress. The Attorney General was asked for an opinion on this point and expressed the view that it is not an unconstitutional delegation of power. His complete opinion is contained in the hearings, pages 125 to 130. I shall discuss that in detail a little later. However, I wish to make some comments on it now. He relied on the instance in which Congress made a permanent appropriataion for sums necessary for the payment of final judgments and compromise settlements against the United States, with the approval of the Comptroller General, and in accordance with applicable laws relating to judgments and settlements.

I fail to see the analogy. He also relied on another law enacted by Congress allocating a portion of tax revenues from coconut oil produced in the Philippines to the Philippine Government.

Again the analogy is weak. At best, the Philippine Government has no discretion or had no discretion as to the amount of revenue it would receive. Such amount was readily ascertainable from production figures. Of course, nothing is readily ascertainable so far as values are concerned in trying to establish values of the White House, the property located therein, the Capitol, or the Senate and House Office Buildings.

My amendment would make the Federal payment, for these reasons, subject to annual appropriation by Congress.

It would leave the formula itself untouched. Thus, under my amendment, the District government would still compute the formula, but it would then be submitted to Congress for appropriation. This would certainly not mean that Congress would determine the entire District budget. However, it would provide an opportunity for a review of the formula and a method of determining the justification for the requested amount.

What we would be allowing under the pending bill, unless my amendment were agreed to, would be an appropriation from the general Treasury funds, with the amount to be determined by the District government under the formula—all without regard to the appropriation function of Congress.

The committee report mentions several times that the formula would encourage the District to utilize local taxes to meet local needs. However, it would work exactly to the contrary. The District would look to the Federal payment first, and then adjust other local taxes accordingly.

The Federal payment is practically guaranteed. Once they obtained a lock on such revenues, Congress would have to move heaven and earth to change the formula, unless my amendment were agreed to.

The Federal payment in 1964 was $37.5 million. Under the formula, the Bureau of the Budget estimates that it will be $57 million in the fiscal year 1966, with a projected increase to $71.2 million in 1970.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, if I correctly understood the Senator from Colorado, he indicated that the formula could not be changed if his amendment were not agreed to. Was not the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado in committee to require the Administrator of the General Services Administration to review the assessment made by the city assessor? I thought that part of the bill was unchanged by the present amendment. Perhaps I am in error.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct. The committee agreed to my recommendation on the General Services Administration.

Mr. BIBLE. I thought it was an improvement to the bill.

Mr. DOMINICK. We also brought up the question of constitutionality at that time.

Mr. BIBLE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. We received an opinion which held that it was constitutional so far as the Federal formula is concerned. Since then, we have had much more thought and analysis of what the opinion was based on and what would happen under the payment formula. Therefore, the whole scope of my amendment in this regard is merely to provide that the formula shall remain the same, but it would become subject to appropriations.

Mr. BIBLE. I wanted to be clear on that point.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator to the bottom of pages 143 and 144 of the bill. That part would provide for the taxation of tangible personal property. Would that part of the bill not impose an obligation upon the Federal Government to pay for the equivalent of an ad valorem property tax on all the furniture in all the Federal department buildings in Washington, including the furniture which Senators have in their offices?

Mr. DOMINICK. Without any doubt.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, let us assume the provisions of the bill were to remain intact and an assessment were to be levied on certain improved property in the District owned by the Federal Government, and that the formula then were to result in the rate of tax which would be assessed on the value of the property. Would Congress be required to appropriate a fixed amount of money to fulfill the obligation to the District of Columbia?

Mr. DOMINICK. If the bill were to remain unchanged, the amount of money owed, as so certified, would be sent up here and would be the automatic obligation of the Treasury, so far as I know.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I believe that is a correct statement. I believe that is the effect of the bill as it stands at the present time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, if my friend the senior Senator from Colorado will listen to this discussion, there are fixed obligations in law which the Congress of the United States has shunted aside. The last time the Congress of the United States has mocked a congressional mandate to pay was a few weeks ago, as my able friend the senior Senator from Colorado will recall.

The point I make is that I do not believe my able friend the junior Senator from Colorado can have his amendment attacked by those who oppose it on the ground that under his amendment Congress would be given discretionary authority under the wording of the bill. We cannot write language into law that ties the hands of Congress and makes Congress appropriate money even though prior to that time Congress has enacted a statute demanding that the money be appropriated.

The point I make, therefore, is that, to that extent, whether we adopt the language of the bill or the language of the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Colorado, Congress still would exercise its discretion, wisely or unwisely, in determining the amount of money which it will appropriate to the District.

Mr. DOMINICK. Under the bill as it is now written, Congress would have no authority whatsoever to determine what amount of money would be appropriated. It would be an automatic payment out of the Treasury. We would have to pass a law in order to change this. That is the reason that I say it should go through the appropriation process. That is what I am trying to provide in the bill, so that Congress would have the choice in determining the amount of money to be spent.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I do not want to denigrate the language of the bill, but is this what some people would call a back-door entrance to the Treasury?

Mr. DOMINICK. To me, it is complete.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it has been referred to as such. It is admitted that it falls into that particular category.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I thank my friend the Senator from Colorado for straightening me out on this point.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the Senator from California for raising the point. I believe that the colloquy has been helpful. It is helpful in showing what the bill would do, and what we hope the amendment would do if it were agreed to.

Before I yielded to the distinguished Senator, I was discussing the amount of money that has been appropriated over the past few years for the District and the increasing trend of the appropriations.

Where is the incentive for the District to use local revenues? It would commit funds for future capital projects based upon the anticipated Federal payment and it would be difficult, if not impossible, for Congress to change the formula when this process would get into full swing.

The committee report mentions on pages 12 and 13 that the House Appropriations Committee once used a formula in lieu of taxes in determining the Federal payment. But the formula used was not nearly so extensive as the one proposed in this bill. It did not include personal property or business taxes. And keep in mind that this was the Appropriations Committee figuring the value of Federal property, not the District government. There certainly is a great difference.

The report also mentions on page 13 that the Senate has previously approved a formula such as the one proposed here when it passed H.R. 6177 in 1963. Of course, the Senate did not prevail in conference. Nevertheless, my amendment, making the payment subject to annual appropriation, was taken almost word for word from the provisions of H.R. 6177, where the Federal payment was also subject to annual appropriation. Section 741(a) of my amendment is almost identical to section 101 of H.R. 6177, and section 741(b) of my amendment is substantially identical to section 102(a) of H.R. 6177. All I have done is to change the wording, but not the intent to conform to S. 1118.

Mr. President, the Senate just 2 years ago approved a provision almost identical to my amendment and I think it should do so again.

I would like to speak a few minutes more.

Mr. President, how much time have I used on my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 20 minutes.

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield myself an additional 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wish to speak on the Attorney General's opinion, citing the various precedents to support the right of Congress to allow a subsidiary government to tax the Federal Government, in effect.

The first one cited was the TVA case, as I recall, or it was one of the first that was cited as a precedent. One of the major differences between that act and this bill is that there the payments are made from TVA proceeds, and not from the general funds of the Treasury. General fund appropriations and general fund withdrawals of any kind are supposed to be acts of Congress, and not the act of a district assessor or council operating on what the district assessor has done.

In the TVA case all that was done was to take the money from funds generated by TVA itself, rather than from the general funds of the Treasury.

The next case that was cited as a precedent was the Columbia Basin project, which authorized the Secretary of the Interior to pay annual sums in lieu of taxation to States or subdivisions thereof out of the proceeds of leases. Again, it is out of the proceeds of leases rather than out of the general funds of the Treasury. So we really have no withdrawals from general funds of the Treasury involved, but in the present case we are dealing with general funds of the Treasury.

The next case cited as a legislative precedent is the act of July 27, 1956, providing for permanent and indefinite appropriations "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated" to meet Federal judicial judgments and settlements. In the only precedent cited where payment was made out of Treasury moneys, it is interesting to note that the act cited has the popular name of the "Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1956." In other words, the only precedent cited utilizing funds from the Treasury directly was in fact an appropriation measure heard, considered, and voted upon by the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate. Of course, no such procedure was followed in connection with the present bill.

The next case cited as a precedent is the atomic energy bill. The Atomic Energy Act is cited as a precedent for this type of payment. But in that case the Federal payment was only authorized and, by section 118 of the act, those authorizations were subject to annual appropriations.

So at least in the last two cases, the precedents cited by the Attorney General to approve the constitutionality of the Federal payment formula provide a complete precedent for the very amendment I am offering, which would make the Federal payment subject to annual appropriations. This is important, because I am sure that opinion will be cited. We should keep in mind that in every instance the money comes entirely from income derived from the installations or from annual appropriations.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am sure my distinguished colleague has given consideration to the Constitution, and I must concur in the distinctions he has made in the Attorney General's opinion that article I, section 9, provides that no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

Can the Senator find any precedent at all—and I think I know the answer to this question—for an appropriation to any person or anybody which has not been as a result of an appropriation duly made by Congress?

Mr. DOMINICK. I know of no such case.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator has touched upon the assessment of Government property. I see the distinguished Senator from Nevada present. His State is 85 percent federally owned, I think.

Mr. BIBLE. Approximately.

Mr. ALLOTT. The State of Colorado is 36 percent, generally, Federal property, and acquisitions later have raised that figure to almost 40 percent, I believe.

In addition, according to table 7: Public Land Statistics 1963, published by the Department of Interior, there are a dozen States with a higher percentage of their territory owned by the Federal Government. In fact, this table shows that the District of Columbia is below the national average.

If a local government can, by its own formula, tax the property of the Federal Government and fix the standards of valuation, is there any reason why the same principle, if this principle were to be followed, should not be extended to the States which have public lands?

Mr. DOMINICK. Not the slightest. I am positive that if we establish this precedent, that will be the first request that will be made.

Mr. ALLOTT. In the case of public lands, we build in all the troubles we are going to have here, except they are of a little different nature. If we follow this precedent we would tax our own post offices. We would tax our Federal buildings. We would try to determine some basis upon which to tax oil and gas in the Federal domain.

In Colorado there is an estimated 800 billion barrels of oil locked in oil shale on federally owned lands. At $3 a barrel, that would amount to $2.4 trillion. That would be the taxable base in that situation, plus what would be applied to gold, silver, lead, zinc, manganese, and many other ores. We have whole mountains of manganese oxide in Colorado. So the problems would be multiplied a thousandfold.

Let me ask this question, and I think the Senator is entirely right. If this principle is to be applied in the District of Columbia, in all fairness to the public land States should it not also be applied there?

Mr. DOMINICK. I would say one thing to point up the question. We should have in mind, for example, that the city and county of Denver might want to tax all the State property in the city and county of Denver. So there would be a triple law of taxation.

Mr. ALLOTT. I had not gone that far, but it follows the same principle, and we are not stretching the principle in order to make it applicable at all. It is not an expanded stretching. It is a direct consequence of what we propose to do.

I should like to ask the Senator if he knows of any country in the world which permits a tax upon its governmental properties?

Mr. DOMINICK. I do not know of any. Whether there are any, I do not know. I could not say, but I do not know of any.

Mr. ALLOTT. Do I understand correctly that once the bill is passed and the formula goes into effect, Congress has no appeal from the valuation placed on the buildings, or the rate of taxation or formula applied upon the payments, except to repeal a part of the bill which we are now acting upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DOMINICK. I would say that the Senator's understanding is completely accurate. We could pass a special law, I would presume, to repeal the act which they may have taken in the District Council, which would have the effect of placing a tax on the assessed valuation already determined by the District Assessor, but it would be cumbersome and might be too late.

Mr. ALLOTT. In other words, we would have to wait until Congress met and, in effect, repealed part of the law we are talking about enacting right now?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is absolutely correct. One other point which I believe is worthy to note, last night's Evening Star reported that the District was about to raise property taxes. Once we established the valuation of the buildings and all the property which the District will tax, the minute the rates are raised, we will have, in effect, by the simple act of perhaps one or two persons, or the District Council itself, placed another tax on the Federal Treasury and will have withdrawn so much more money.

Mr. ALLOTT. Let me continue with a further question. In response to my last question, my colleague said that it was true, the only way we could do it would be by repealing a portion of the bill we now propose to enact. In other words, we would be placing the Federal Government in an inferior position to any individual taxpayer in the United States who has the right, on the assessment of his property, to appeal to his board of county commissioners, or assessors—it varies in the separate States—and if he is not satisfied with that, he can appeal it to the courts.

I know that my colleague is a fine lawyer and will agree with me that this is the law in every State and is guaranteed; so that we would be placing the U.S. Government in a position which is inferior to any private citizen of the United States in the taxation of his property.

Mr. DOMINICK. Without a doubt, it seems to me; and I would pose a contrary point of view for just a moment—suppose the District Assessor valued the Capitol and the White House at $1 and then applied the tax on that valuation, I would suspect that every District taxpayer of private property would scream to high heaven on the ground that the Federal Government was not paying its fair share of the taxes, because the assessed valuation was not correct. Once again, Congress would have no power to do anything about it, unless and until it passed a special law to try to change the situation. Accordingly, I believe that we could work it either way. Either way, the project as it is now written is, to me, most inequitable and unfair.

Mr. ALLOTT. It is repugnant to the principles of government that we would permit an inferior government to tax the main government itself. I do not know of a situation where a county may tax a State, nor do I know of a situation where a municipality may tax a county. It is inconceivable to me that we would even consider such a thing.

Then, if my colleague will indulge me for one moment, I must say that as a member of the Apppropriations Committee and, having insisted always that every cent spent out of the Federal Treasury must be referred to the Appropriations Committee and acted upon by them, even though individually some persons might not agree with an appropriation which goes through the majority process, I could not possibly swallow this new concept of appropriation, as I see it.

I do not care how someone a few years out of law school might interpret this constitutional question. In my opinion there is no question but what it violates the appropriative process of the Federal Government. Even if this bill did pass the Senate—and I am under no misapprehension concerning it—when the people of America find out about it, they will rise up in arms that we have surrendered this power which will, in effect, permit the people of the District of Columbia to say to us, "Whatever we give to you, you have to accept."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. DOMINICK. I very much appreciate the colloquy I have had with my very distinguished colleague.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 35 minutes. He has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOMINICK. Does the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] wish to go forward now, or does he wish me to do so?

Mr. BIBLE. Either way, it does not make any difference.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as may be necessary to respond to the argument of the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized, and has 1 hour to respond.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, let me say that the Senator from Colorado went quite thoroughly into the subject yesterday. I said then, and repeat now, that it seems to me the provision to which the Senator from Colorado has addressed himself is one of the crucial sections in this proposed legislation.

The question of a Federal payment is one which Congress has labored over for many years, both on the authorizing side as a legislative committee, and on the Appropriations Committee as the appropriating committee. Over the years, it has caused us a great deal of concern.

From 1879 until 1920, the amount paid to the city of Washington was actually 50 percent. Thereafter, the amount authorized and appropriated dwindled, until today it is somewhere in the neighborhood of 13 percent, the remaining 87 percent coming from the residents of the District of Columbia.

In working with the problem, I thought it would assure stability more than any other kind of proposal in calculating the revenues and the expenditures which were to be made in the District of Columbia.

Further on the subject of Federal payment, let me say that, if there is one provision of the President's home rule bill which I believe is more essential to an effective elective system of government for the District than any other, it is the Federal payment formula. It would accomplish a fixed basis for the Federal Government to pay an in-lieu-of-tax amount annually for nontaxable Federal properties and the unique expenses required for a national capital city.

In brief, the President's formula calls for an annual Federal payment to the District that would be payable, without direct congressional action, from the U.S. Treasury. The formula would be based largely upon taxes lost to the District of real and personal property owned by the Federal Government and from taxes lost to the District from real property exempted by special acts of Congress.

A formula would assure the District of a fixed income from the Federal Government and thereby lift an annual task of determining the Federal payment from a busy Congress whose energies could be more wisely directed to the business of the entire country.

The Senator from Colorado has said that the formula is in the nature of backdoor spending, with Congress unable to keep the Federal payment controlled and Congress not having a line item authority over all city housekeeping details. My answer is that if Congress enacts the formula, it can also change that formula. After all, expenditures will be made here on the doorstep of the Congress where surveillance will not be difficult.

There are those critics who say that any in-lieu-of-tax formula would serve as a bad precedent since States and cities might seek to secure payments for federally owned real properties within their boundaries. Obviously, this could not be a precedent since Congress has voted in-lieu-of-tax payments annually to the District since 1879 and called it the annual Federal payment. An actual formula, as proposed here by President Johnson, would merely provide a more realistic approach.

Over the years the annual Federal payment has been used as something of a gap filler between tax revenues collected from the city's residents and projected expenditures. Capable and efficient planning to meet the problems of the central city of the country's fastest growing metropolitan area has been impossible. The Capital City has suffered in many ways.

The bill before us today grants self-government to the citizens of the District—in fact the same kind of self-government every city and town across the country enjoys. If self-government in fact, rather than in fiction, is to be had in the District, the city must control its own financial destinies unfettered by the Congress directly or indirectly controlling how, when, where, why, and for what every dollar is to be spent each and every year.

If the city does not or cannot master its own financial matters, then Congress can step in and change the formula, do away with it, or return the city to the control of the Congress as it is today. But, I submit that the District's citizens should and must be given a chance. I have confidence in the potential electorate of this city just as I do the wisdom of the electorate across the Nation under this bill. Congress will get reports from the Comptroller General of the United States on the District each year and Congress and the legislative committees can serve as oversight examiners over these matters to assure against financial debacles.

It is claimed that the amendment suggested by the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado, is to be preferred because it provides an annual Federal payment authorization and leaves the appropriating function each year with the Appropriations Committees of the Congress.

But, Mr. President, will, in fact, the Congress be deciding only the amount of the Federal payment each year—or will it in reality be deciding the District's entire budget; how each and every dollar is to be spent? Obviously, it will be the latter for it is the appropriation process that holds the whip hand, not the authorization as the District's Federal payment history will show.

The Congress by deciding some 13 percent of the annual budget will hold that whip hand over the elected District legislative council. In truth and in fact, if the Congress determines an adequate Federal payment appropriation, is not the

Congress really required to examine into every proposed District expenditure and exercise its control thereby? Actually, self-government under this obvious fact would become a hollow thing—an elective body without power, a political eunuch—Congress would have those purse strings just as it has today.

It seems to me that if we were to adopt the amendment, which would require the city government of the District of Columbia to come back to the Appropriations Committees to justify every line-by-line item, we would go a long way toward defeating the very purpose that we are trying to accomplish.

I have the greatest respect for the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. I am a member of the committee. I see also on the floor of the Senate the able chairman of the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee. I know of the tremendous work and effort that he has put into this field. It therefore seems to me that rather than require a line-by-line item justification of the amounts that are agreed upon when we emancipate the city, we would be directing our attention far better to passing the bill as reported to the Senate, making the Federal payment in accordance with the formula that remains unchanged in the bill.

The Federal payment would be subject to certification by the Administrator of the General Services Administration. In fact, the committee adopted an amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado, to nail down any belief that the District of Columbia government could arbitrarily set valuation figures on Federal property to compute the Federal payment. The amendment provides the Federal Government with a voice, in fact the final voice, in determining the manner in which the tangible personal property or the real and personal property of the Federal Government is to be estimated and assessed. In fact, I might call attention to page 116 of the committee hearings wherein the question was raised as to whether the formula would turn over to the local government the authority to fix the assessment on Federal buildings and Federal property. Mr. Elmer Staats, Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, testified that the Administrator of the General Services Administration had to make a certification of his agreement in the so-called assessed valuation, and that the Federal interest would be protected further by the fact that the Administrator of the General Services Administration could reduce the assessment figure, if he so chose.

In fact, another portion of an amendment offered and accepted in the committee by the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado, requires the Administrator of the General Services Administration to look beyond the new District government's technical computations so that he may pass judgment on the propriety, reasonableness, and fairness of the assessment and computations, thus insuring better Federal participation in the Federal payment plan.

Differences in opinion between the new District government and the Administrator of the General Services Administration are to be worked out, under a portion of the amendment to the bill by the Senator from Colorado which was adopted by the committee, providing a definite method of resolving differences of opinion and further providing that cooperative arrangements be carried out when disputes arise involving the Federal payment.

Under the formula proposal, it is estimated that the Federal payment to the District would be $57 million for fiscal year 1966 as compared to the amount appropriated by the Congress this year of $43 million. The present annual Federal payment authorization approved by the Congress is $50 million.

In forwarding Federal payment formula legislation to the Congress this year, President Johnson stated that its enactment "is essential to the proper assignment between the Federal Government and the local citizens of the responsibility of providing the necessary funds."

The committee, in approving the Federal payment, felt that this provision would provide an orderly basis for determining each year the appropriate level of Federal contribution to the District. The formula relates more directly to the District's needs and local resources and provides a standard which would seem fair to all parties concerned.

As chairman of the Senate District of Columbia Committee and as an Appropriations Committee member as well, I have advocated a Federal payment concept since 1960. It is my belief that this method will ease the difficult task for both the legislative and the appropriations committees in determining an adequate Federal payment by this city's largest industry, the Federal Government, when the imponderables of District tax revenue forecasts, borrowing authority totals and capital improvement requirements come into play.

The present lump-sum authorization has no direct relationship to local taxes or requirements. It does not reflect the proper share of the District's financial needs which should properly be borne by the Federal Government, which owns 44 percent of the total land area of the District, properly imposes building height limitations prohibiting office buildings that would bring to the District greater tax revenues, and grants tax exemptions to scores of educational, philanthropic, and patriotic organizations, not to mention the tax-exempted properties of foreign governments located here.

Mr. President, I hold the Senator from Colorado in great respect as a Senator and as a very fine lawyer.

I ask unanimous consent at this point to insert in the Record in full the inquiry I directed to the Attorney General of the United States under date of March 11, 1965, on the constitutionality of two specific provisions. I believe these questions were raised by the Senator from Colorado. The Attorney General has commented on those questions, and I ask unanimous consent that the Attorney General's reply and memorandum be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letters and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

March 11, 1965.

Hon. Nicholas deB. Katzenbach,
Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Attorney General: During the course of the hearings before this committee on S. 1118, a bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, certain questions arose with respect to section 741 dealing with the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia.

It would be appreciated if you would supply your Department's views as to whether such section is an unconstitutional delegation of taxing powers vested in the U.S. Government within the District of Columbia and/or an unconstitutional delegation of appropriation procedures of the Congress of the United States.

I am enclosing a portion of the transcript of the hearing of the above date, pages 40 through 69, wherein this subject was dealt with at some length, together with a copy of the proposed legislation in question.

It would be appreciated if this opinion could be supplied to this committee no later than Tuesday, March 23.

Cordially,

Alan Bible.

Department of Justice,
Office of the Deputy
Attorney General,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. Alan Bible,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: This is in response to your letter of March 11, 1965, requesting the views of the Department of Justice with respect to the constitutionality of section 741 of S. 1118, a bill "To provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

We have considered the two specific questions raised by your letter and the transcript of the hearing you enclosed: (1) whether section 741 violates the Constitution by permitting the District of Columbia to tax the property of the Federal Government; and (2) whether the section involves an unconstitutional delegation of Congress power over the appropriation procedure. We have concluded that section 741 does not authorize the District of Columbia to tax Federal property and, therefore, does not raise a constitutional question in this regard. Further, we have concluded that 741 is not an unconstitutional delegation of the appropriate power of Congress. A memorandum giving the basis for these conclusions is attached.

I hope that this memorandum is helpful to your committee. This Department will be happy to furnish all assistance possible with respect to this important legislation.

Sincerely,

Ramsey Clark,
Deputy Attorney General.

Memorandum Re Constitutionality of Section 741 of S. 1118, the District of Columbia Home Rule Bill

The District of Columbia home rule bill contains a provision which would establish a fixed formula for the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia. This provision, section 741, is in the nature of a permanent and indefinite appropriation of Federal funds to be paid to the District of Columbia from the Treasury of the United

States. The initial computation of the amount of the payment would be submitted to the executive branch of the Federal Government each year by the Mayor of the District of Columbia. The computation would be based on three factors: (a) the real estate taxes the District of Columbia would receive if property owned and used by the Federal Government and property exempted by special act of Congress were taxable; (b) the personal property taxes the District would receive if tangible federally owned personal property, with certain exclusions, were taxable; and (c) the business income and related taxes which the District could reasonably expect to receive if the Federal Government were a private employer with an equivalent number of employees.

Because of the nature of this computation and the manner in which the payment of funds is to be requested and approved, the constitutionality of section 741 has been questioned. The specific questions raised are as follows: (1) Does the section constitute an unconstitutional grant of authority to the government of the District of Columbia to tax Federal property; and (2) is it an unconstitutional delegation of the appropriation authority of the Congress of the United States?

On the basis of the principles and precedents discussed below, our answers to both questions are negative.

A. THE DISBURSEMENT PROCEDURES OF SECTION 741

Section 741 of S. 1118 authorizes an annual payment to the District of Columbia from general funds in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated. Payment would be effected in the following manner:

The executive branch of the District of Columbia government would make the initial computation of the annual payment based upon the three factors outlined above. In making the computation based on real and personal property tax equivalents, the government of the District of Columbia would assess the value of the Federal property and would utilize the applicable tax rate in effect in the District in the preceding calendar year. The computation based on the business tax equivalent would be made by multiplying the actual receipts of business taxes during the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the Federal payment is requested by a fraction, the numerator of which represents the total number of Federal employees employed in the District and the denominator of which represents the total number of other employees employed in the District (excluding District government and certain other employees). In addition, the computation of the Federal payment would include water and sewer service charges.

On or before January 10 of each year, the mayor of the District of Columbia, with the approval of the Council, would submit a request for a Federal payment based upon this computation. The request would be submitted first to the Administrator of General Services, who would review it. If the Administrator determined that the request conforms with the law, he would certify the request to the Secretary of the Treasury. Certification would be made on or before the April 10 preceding the fiscal year for which payment is requested.

If the request were duly certified, the Secretary of the Treasury would cause payment to be made on or before September 1 of each fiscal year. Further, he would be authorized to advance necessary funds between July 1 and the date on which the annual Federal payment is made.

Section 741 would make a permanent indefinite appropriation. As defined by the Attorney General, this means that the appropriation would not be limited in duration or in specific amount; 13 Op. A.G. 288, 292 (1870). The appropriation would, however, be limited by the formula established by Congress and adherence to that formula would be enforced by the officers of the Federal Government designated by Congress.

B. POWER TO TAX FEDERAL PROPERTY

Among the enumerated legislative powers of Congress is the power to exercise "exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District * * * as may * * * become the Seat of the Government of the United States* * * ." (Art. I, sec. 8, cl. 17.) That, pursuant to such authority, Congress may create a District government and provide the same degree of local autonomy that can be given to a territory, or in general terms, which a State may confer on one of its subdivisions, is no longer open to question; *District of Columbia* v. *John R. Thompson Co.*, 346 U.S. 100, 105–110 (1953).

However, the question has been raised whether, assuming that Congress can delegate to the District government the ordinary powers of local government, it can also authorize the District of Columbia to tax Federal property.

It is, of course, an axiom of constitutional law that the property and functions of the Federal Government are immune from State and local taxation. This immunity is not set forth specifically in the Constitution, but was inferred from the supremacy clause in *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, 4 Wheat. 316, 425–26 (1819), on the ground that possession of such a power of taxation by the States would be incompatible with, and repugnant to, the Federal laws under which such property was held and such functions performed. *Clallam County* v. *United States*, 263 U.S. 341, 344 (1923). It need not necessarily follow, however, that Congress may not permit such taxation if it does so explicitly; see *Van Brocklin* v. *Tennessee*, 117 U.S. 151, 175 (1886); *United States* v. *Allegheny County*, 322 U.S. 174, 177 (1944). We know of no instance in which Congress has permitted a direct tax to be imposed upon property or functions of the Federal Government, and this refusal is undoubtedly wise, because of possible embarrassments to the conduct of the Government which might arise from the subjection of such property or functions to the assessment and collection procedures of State and local law. But it has been by no means uncommon for Congress by statute to extend or to circumscribe the area of immunity which might otherwise be implied for Federal agents and instrumentalities; see, e.g., *Des Moines Bank* v. *Fairweather*, 263 U.S. 103, 106 (1923); *Pittman* v. *Home Owners' Loan Corp.*, 308 U.S. 21, 32–33 (1939); *Carson* v. *Roane-Anderson Co.*, 342 U.S. 232, 233–36 (1952); *Federal Land Bank of Wichita* v. *Kiowa County*, 368 U.S. 146, 149 (1961). However, we need not determine at this time whether Congress might constitutionally permit the District of Columbia to tax the property of the Federal Government, for it is clear that section 741 purports to grant no such power.

Section 741 indicates a congressional recognition of the "unique character of the District of Columbia as the Nation's Capital City," and a congressional intention to "cover the proper share of the expenses of the District government." The Federal Government owns and controls a large proportion of the land in the District of Columbia. Moreover, it has exempted other land, such as embassy property, from local taxation. The Federal Government is also the major employer in the District. These factors alone offer ample justification for the annual Federal payment to the district which compensates, in part, for lost taxes.

More importantly, however, the Federal Government has a unique responsibility for the District because it is the Nation's Capital. It retains ultimate legislative authority over the District and it directly influences the growth, development, and day-to-day operations of the District. This responsibility includes a financial responsibility as well. Section 741 is a recognition of this.

Nothing in the language of section 741 confers, expressly or impliedly, authority to tax the Federal Government. That section merely authorizes a regular annual payment to the District—a practice which has been in effect for many years. The difference between the present system and section 741 is that section 741 would constitute a permanent appropriation to be calculated under a fixed formula, whereas under the present system the District government annually requests a Federal payment, under a method of calculation which may vary from year to year, and Congress makes an annual appropriation which may or may not be related to that request.

Section 741 would establish a fixed formula upon which to base the request for Federal payment and the District government would be limited by that formula. Congress, of course, would not be bound by the formula since it retains authority to repeal or modify the formula at any time. It is true that the formula is based upon tax revenues which are lost to the District because of its status as the Nation's Capital, but this does not make the annual payment a tax. It merely represents a congressional judgment that this is a practical, efficient, and just method of computing the Federal payment. This is a basis of computation which Congress has found satisfactory in the past.

The District's situation is unique, but there are some analogous situations in which Congress has sought to ease the financial burdens occasioned by the presence of large Federal installations. For example, the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority is authorized to pay a certain percentage of its gross proceeds to States and counties in lieu of taxes which would be owing if TVA were a private business. The statute expressly indicates that these are payments in lieu of taxation and that no State or local government is authorized to tax TVA. Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, section 13, 48 Stat. 66, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 831. While these payments are made from TVA proceeds, rather than from general funds of the Treasury, the source of the funds has no bearing on whether or not the payments are taxes, and, indeed, Congress itself made an express distinction between payments in lieu of taxes and taxation. As a matter of justice it authorized such payments, while at the same time it expressly prohibited taxation of TVA. Nothing in the legislative history indicates any doubt as to the constitutionality of such payments. Nor, apparently, has this section been challenged in court on constitutional grounds, although it has been subject to court interpretation, *City of Tullahoma* v. *Coffee County*, 328 F. 2d 683 (C.A. 6, 1964); *Tennessee Valley Authority* v. *Polk County*, 68 F. Supp. 692 (E.D. Tenn. 1945), affirmed per curiam, 158 F. 2d 96 (C.A. 6, 1946). It must be presumed then, as with all acts of Congress, that this statute is constitutional.

A similar provision was made with respect to the Columbia Basin project. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to pay annual sums in lieu of taxation to States or subdivisions thereof with respect to real property, and the amount of the payment is not to exceed the taxes which would be payable if the property were not tax exempt. Again payment is made from the proceeds of leases rather than from the general funds of the Treasury. The Columbia Basin Project Act, section 5 as added, 57 Stat. 19, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 835c–1. The constitutionality of this does not appear to have been challenged.

An even closer analogy concerns the communities originally constructed by the Atomic Energy Commission at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Richland, Wash. These communities were originally Government-owned company towns, but in 1955 Congress determined that they should be sold and converted to regular municipalities. At the same time, Congress announced its purpose of providing for "the obligation of the United States" to continue financial support in a manner "commensurate with (1) the fiscal problems peculiar to the communities by reason of their construction as national defense installations, and (2) the municipal and other burdens imposed on the governmental or other entities at the communities by the United States in its operations at or near the communities * * *." Atomic Energy Community Facilities Act of 1955, section 13, 69 Stat. 472, 42 U.S.C. 2303.

This act provided that the Atomic Energy Commission would make an annual payment for a period of 10 years and such payment was to be based on the following factors: (1) the approximate real property taxes and assessments which would be payable if Government property were not exempt from taxation; (2) the amount necessary to maintain municipal services at a level which would not impede AEC recruitment; (3) a consideration of the peculiar fiscal problems resulting from the construction of a single purpose national defense installation; and (4) the municipal services and other burdens imposed by the United States in its operations. Provision is also made for an AEC recommendation for continued payments at the expiration of the 10-year period. (This period has not yet expired.) Section 91, 69 Stat. 481, 42 U.S.C. 2391. Apparently the constitutionality of this arrangement was not challenged in Congress nor has it been tested in the courts. Thus, this provision also must be assumed to be constitutional.

To sum up, therefore, the most that can be said against section 741 on this score is that it authorizes a Federal payment to the District figured on the basis of tax rates imposed by the District government, so that the amount of Federal payment is dependent on the actions of the District government. But over the years Congress has several times used the loss of tax revenues as a standard for computing the appropriate contributions of the Federal Government to a community upon which the Government has placed a special burden, even though any formula based in whole or in part on a calculation of lost tax revenues makes the Federal payment to some extent dependent on the local tax rate. Indeed, such a standard is implicit in the concept of a payment in lieu of taxes. Nothing in the Constitution specifically forbids use of such a formula, nor can any such prohibition, in our opinion, be fairly inferred. Even if it is assumed that Congress could not permit State or local governmental units to impose taxes on Federal property, there is nothing to prevent Congress itself from prescribing a formula for payments in lieu of taxes which utilizes existing or subsequent local tax rates, just as Congress in the Assimilative Crimes Act, 18 U.S.C. 13, adopted for Federal enclaves the existing and subsequently enacted criminal laws of the States, compare *United States* v. *Sharpnack*, 355 U.S. 286, 294 (1958). The payments to be made to the District under section 741 will be made not to satisfy any tax obligation imposed by the District government, but pursuant to a direction of Congress, a direction which Congress is at any time free to change.

C. RELATIONSHIP OF SECTION 741 TO APPROPRIATION AUTHORITY

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the Constitution provides: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law * * *." It has been suggested that section 741 may be an unconstitutional delegation of this congressional power.

As indicated above, section 741 is a permanent and indefinite appropriation and if enacted by Congress, it would be an appropriation made by law. On the other hand, the specific amount of each annual appropriation would not be set by Congress, even though the method of computation would be fixed by statute.

For the most part, appropriations made by Congress are limited to 1 year's duration and maximum monetary amounts are specified. Further, the general purposes for which such funds are to be expended are outlined in appropriation acts. This is not required by the Constitution, however, except that appropriations to raise and support armies must be limited to 2 years' duration (art. I, sec. 8, clause 12), and appropriations may be made only for the broad purposes recognized in article I, section 8, clause 1. All other restrictions on appropriations are the result of congressional action and may, accordingly, be changed by Congress.

This is not to say that Congress has never appropriated on a permanent and indefinite basis. For example, there is a permanent appropriation "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated" of such sums as may be necessary for payment of final judgments and compromise settlements against the United States. There is no limitation on the amount of total expenditure although the act is applicable only to individual judgments and settlements not in excess of $100,000 in any one case, and each payment must be certified by the Comptroller General and must be in accordance with the applicable laws relating to judgments and settlements. Act of July 27, 1956, section 1302, 70 Stat. 694, as amended, 31 U.S.C. 724a. It should be noted that the "computation" of the individual payments is left to the courts or the settlement authorities and payment is to be made when certified, without any requirement of direct congressional action. The reasons for this provision are obvious—specific appropriations for each individual judgment against the United States would be unduly burdensome to Congress and might, because of delay, result in injustice. Thus, Congress made a permanent and indefinite appropriation, governed by certain statutory requirements. The administration of the act and the authority to fix specific amounts, however, were left to others.

There are obvious differences between section 741 and the law discussed above, but both have certain factors in common: (1) permanence; (2) indefiniteness; (3) statutory limitation; and (4) a delegation of authority to set the specific amount of individual expenditures. Nothing in the Constitution expressly prohibits appropriation acts of this type and such acts appear to be within the permissible limits of congressional authority.

As long as the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia is authorized by an act of Congress, is computed on the basis which Congress itself establishes, is certified in accordance with law, and remains subject to legislative control, it would appear to comply with the requirement that all payments of public funds be made "in consequence of appropriations made by law."

It is true that the section 741 would leave to the District of Columbia government the power to allocate the annual payment to specific purposes. It has been held, however, that such authority may be delegated by Congress. The Internal Revenue Code of 1934 levied a tax on coconut oil and provided that tax revenues received on coconut oil of Philippine production would be turned over to the government established for the Philippines by act of Congress. A taxpayer challenged this as a violation of article I, section 9, clause 7, and also as an unconstitutional delegation of the legislative power of Congress over the Philippines. The Supreme Court indicated that Congress has the same authority over its dependencies that a State has over its political subdivisions and that authority may be delegated to dependencies to the same extent to which a State might delegate authority to a county or municipal government, *Cincinnati Soap Co.* v. *United States*, 301 U.S. 308, 317 (1937). Further, the Court noted that the Federal Government has a "moral obligation" to render financial assistance to dependencies and that it has wide discretion in prescribing the allocation of any disbursement made to the local government. The Court stated:

"The proceeds of the tax under consideration are to be paid into the treasury of a government which Congress itself thus created, to be expended by that government, except as the act otherwise directs, in accordance with its judgment as to specific necessities. The congressional power of delegation to such a local government is and must be as comprehensive as the needs." *Id.*, at 322.

The Court found this provision to be a valid appropriation of funds and a constitutional delegation of authority.

It seems equally clear that Congress may delegate to the District of Columbia government the authority to determine the objects for which the Federal payment to the District may be expended.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, one question frequently heard is whether such enactment would establish a precedent for payments in lieu of taxes in other jurisdictions in which the Federal Government owns property. Obviously, the Federal Government established this city as the seat of its government and therefore has unique responsibilities for the financial well-being of the Nation's Capital. For more than 75 years, Congress has recognized that responsibility by appropriating a share of the funds needed for the operation of the government of the District. Congress has fully understood that, because Washington is the Federal City and the seat of the National Government, its development and growth have been unusually affected by Federal Government operations.

Hence, the issue is not in any sense whether the Federal Government should contribute to the expense of government in the District, but only what measure can best be used to determine its fair share of the District's financial needs.

A formula approach based on the valuation of tax-exempt property of the Federal Government located in the District of Columbia, tax-exempt property of foreign governments, and others exempted by special acts of Congress, is not a new idea. The House Appropriations Committee, in the 86th Congress, used local tax-exempt properties in computing its recommendations on the Federal payment authorization for the 1960 fiscal year, and this bill might well be classed as an extension of the House Appropriation Committee's logic.

Further, history also provides authority for a Federal payment percentage, as I said previously. From 1879 through 1920, the Federal payment to the District of Columbia was a flat 50 percent of the General Fund appropriation. In other words, of each dollar appropriated to operate and maintain the District, the local taxpayer paid 50 cents with the remaining 50 cents being paid by the Federal Government.

In 1921 the Congress discontinued its 50 percent formula. Since that time, the percentage of costs borne by the Federal Government has fluctuated from a high of 39.5 percent on General Fund appropriations in 1924, to a low of 8.5 percent in 1954. Since 1956, the Federal payment has been slightly over 12 percent. The $43 million Federal payment voted to the District by Congress for fiscal year 1966 is approximately 13 percent of the General Fund estimate of a $300 plus million appropriation for the 1966 fiscal year to operate the District government.

Mr. President, the Federal payment formula concept contained in the bill is not new to the Congress. The Senate, when it passed H.R. 6177, a District revenue bill, on July 22, 1963, approved a Federal payment formula authorization for the District of Columbia. This was a formula authorization concept with the annual appropriation authority remaining with the Congress.

A home rule bill submitted by the late President Kennedy and the one submitted this year by President Johnson provide the Federal payment formula not only as an authorization but also as an automatic payment.

Mr. President, in my judgment the Federal payment formula provision represents what I believe to be the heart of the entire home rule proposal. If we are to grant the residents of this city the freedom to elect their governing officials, can or should the Congress continue to hold all the purse strings and with it, the actual power over the District's daily activities. I submit we cannot and should not grant actual home rule with one hand and pull it back with the other.

If the formula does not operate properly, the Congress can easily change that formula, but in the meantime the citizenry of the District will be placed on its own to run a local government as it sees fit. Both the late President Kennedy and President Johnson were and are fully committed to the Federal payment concept. I am hopeful that the Senate and the Congress will adopt it.

When the section of this bill providing for a Federal payment authorization appropriation is attacked as an inappropriate automatic appropriation and back-door financing, I believe that we must examine other precedents to ascertain whether this is as bad as it may sound, and I, for one, do not believe it is bad as the opponents would wish to make it.

A very good comparison I believe the Senate should examine is the 1950 Organic Act for the Territory of Guam and the 1954 Act concerning the Territory of the Virgin Islands.

It should be noted that automatic payments under Federal law for the use of the governments of the Virgin Islands and for Guam are now in effect without Congress or the Appropriations Committees passing on the individual use of these dollars.

Actually, residents of these two territories pay a tax which is the equivalent of the Federal income tax paid by District residents and other Americans. As an example, this tax total for fiscal year 1963 was approximately $7½ million and for the 1964 fiscal year was some $10½ million for the Virgin Islands. These income taxes were automatically paid under Federal law to the Virgin Islands government for the direct use of its 42,000 citizens.

The Territory of Guam, with its 70,000 to 75,000 residents, has a similar situation. Taxes equivalent to our Federal income taxes are reserved in a trust fund for the Guamanian government.

It is true that appropriations are made by the Congress to both the Virgin Islands and for Guam but that is merely for the salaries of top governmental officials and the judiciary, but not for the municipal housekeeping items of those territories.

Likewise, another example of direct payments without congressional appropriation are those totals paid to the governments of the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico in the form of excise taxes collected in the United States on products, now chiefly rum, shipped into the States from both the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico.

These funds are used by the two territorial governments without direct appropriation by the Congress from the Treasury to these two governments. Those estimated collections for fiscal 1966 are approximately $10 million for the Virgin Islands alone. Statutory controls over these expenditures are imposed by Congress with the Department of Interior as the administering agency.

Would those who oppose the District of Columbia Federal payment formula believe the citizens of the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam more properly should receive automatic payments without specific appropriations by the Congress and deny that same privilege of a Federal payment by the Congress to the citizens of the District of Columbia?

In brief, if Congress was as beneficent with the District of Columbia as it is with the Virgin Islands and Guam and return, in essence, every Federal income tax dollar to the District Government for its governmental use, I would predict some of the problems which make themselves tragically felt all to often would not now be with us.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. DOMINICK. I had the pleasure of serving on the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, both in the House and the Senate.

I may be in error, but I should like to ask if it is not a fact that the Federal payment is based really on what the individuals in those areas would otherwise have paid into the Federal Treasury in the form of income taxes?

Mr. BIBLE. I believe it is based upon the direct income tax that would have been paid into the Federal Treasury.

Mr. DOMINICK. It is not an ad valorem tax on governmental property, such as the one about which we have been speaking.

Mr. BIBLE. I know; but there is a tax on individuals that ordinarily would go into funds of the U.S. Treasury. Instead of going into the U.S. Treasury, it goes directly for the use of residents of Guam and residents of the Virgin Islands. That is the point I was making, and directing it to the point that here we have precedent for so-called backdoor spending.

Other examples of shared revenues without appropriations, include customs receipts going for agricultural research, custom receipts going to the Commercial Fisheries Bureau and for State marine schools and to the American woolgrowers. Likewise, there has been a permanent, indefinite appropriation in effect since 1917 in which the vocational schools around the country receive a grant on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis to pay teachers' salaries to teach other teachers agricultural trades, home economics, farm, and industrial subjects. Likewise, forest receipts and grassland receipts for grazing purposes are returned to the States for roads, schools, and so forth.

Mr. President, the Justice Department advised the committee in making a comparison between the Federal payment formula proposal with the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 and the Columbia River Basin Project Act, that both the latter authorize payments from proceeds of leases rather than from general funds of the U.S. Treasury as the District of Columbia Federal payment proposal would do. The Justice Department claims a closer analogy is the Atomic Energy Community Facilities Act of 1955 providing annual payments by the AEC to the Government-owned towns of Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Richland, Wash., and based upon Federal property exempt from taxation, and so forth.

Those are precedents which should be taken into consideration as we consider the amendments before the Senate. Congress is not unfamiliar with bills which have been introduced to make certain payments to States and municipalities for taxable property which has been withdrawn from those various municipalities. Bills have received committee consideration. If my memory is good, on one occasion such a bill was passed by the Senate. It was not enacted into law. I believe those are excellent precedents.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre].

Mr. McINTYRE. I thank the Senator. Will the Senator yield for 10 minutes?

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has 43 minutes remaining.

Mr. BIBLE. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I am glad of this opportunity to rise and buttress the argument of my distinguished chairman of the District of Columbia Committee in opposition to the amendment of our good friend, the Senator from Colorado.

I point out that the Federal payment formula is not simply a desirable feature for home rule, it is a necessary feature for home rule. There can be no home rule if there is no payment formula. The whole idea of home rule is that District of Columbia citizens have some real influence on the government of the District. In S. 1118, we are providing a government which will be elected by the people and which will be responsible to the people for the conduct of government. If the government which is elected is not responsive to the people, it should be voted out of office and another government voted in. Now the question is, "Can a government be responsive to its people if it does not have control over the use of its funds?" I know that from my experience as a mayor in New Hampshire that almost every important action costs money. Each members here knows this from the experiences we have had acting on appropriations for various agencies.

If the elected representatives of the District do not have the authority to spend funds, they do not have the ability to be responsive to the people. Instead of a governing body, they will become a recommending body bringing the recommendations of the people to the Congress for our approval. If a new clerk-typist position is needed for the school system, if a new medical doctor position is needed for a health clinic, the function of the District of Columbia government will not be to approve its establishment, instead its function will be to present, hat in hand, its request to the Congress for approval.

Mr. President, as a former mayor working with a city council, we could not have fulfilled our responsibility to meet the needs of the people who elected us if we had not had the right to vote moneys, to take a position, without sanction from a higher authority. If we could not have hired a policeman, or a teacher, or a city engineer without prior approval from above, we would not have been able to do our job effectively. I submit that the elected officers of the District will not be able to fulfill the responsibilities for which they are to be chosen if they do not have authority to establish even one position, or to vote one dollar, but must instead request the Congress to approve each action.

Mr. President, some of us are concerned that the District, with many years of disenfranchisement, may not be able to do an adequate job of running itself. I am sure that everyone who has had experience in city government is aware of the tremendous problems. However, I would like to suggest that it is time we let the District have a try at it. The condition of the District today shows that our present system has not eliminated all problems. In fact, it may be that local authority would have done better in some areas.

One area is schools. I have visited several, and in New Hampshire, we would have torn them down years ago. The buildings are old and dilapidated, and in many, children have to attend split sessions because there is not enough classroom space. Basement rooms designed for storage are now classrooms. Auditoriums are partitioned to take care of overflow. Schools are not being built or planned where they will be needed. We cannot blame this on the District, which has asked for funds up to the limit of the authorized Federal payment. We can only take the responsibility ourselves.

The Congress has been very responsive to the requests of the District for police and direct action on crime. We have not been so responsive to the needs for schools, welfare programs, urban renewal, housing, and thus over the years the seeds have been planted which today we reap. I suggest that a city which governed itself would be more likely to meet and respond to these needs as they occur, instead of having to wait and wait until a Congress, burdened with national and international affairs, could be convinced that action was necessary.

The authorization approach will not give the District of Columbia government the basis for planning which is necessary for orderly government. I would like to remind the Senate that the Federal payment now authorized for the District of Columbia amounts to $50 million. Yet the amount approved for fiscal year 1966 was $43 million. No one disagreed about the need for replacement of old schools, but on a priority basis, enough construction was deleted to keep the Federal payment below the total authorized.

If we take only the last 3 years—when $50 million was authorized—we find that $32 million authorized was not appropriated, and the $32 million would have gone a long ways toward meeting the need for new schools.

Mr. President, it has been said that the kind of Federal payment we are asking the Senate to approve would create problems, in that cities and States with substantial Federal buildings and property would feel they should receive similar payments. I suggest that this is really groundless.

This payment is not an abstract thing with no context; it is proposed in the context of the government of the Federal city over which the Congress has exclusive legislative control. And this is not a Federal handout which covers all the expenses of the District of Columbia. In fact, the payment will probably amount to about 15 percent of the total budget for the District, leaving 85 percent to come from taxes and revenues paid by the citizens of the District.

I would like to ask if anyone here knows of a city or State which, in return for 15 percent of its total budget, would like to turn over control of its future to the Congress. Is there any city or State which would like to give the Congress and the President veto power over every act of the council or legislature, for 15 percent of its budget? Is there any city or State which would like to give the Congress regular reports on its operations and programs and stand ready to explain to the Congress the reasons for taking one course of action rather than some other?

Mr. President, I know of no such city or State, and I do not believe any exists. What we are here recommending will set no precedents which will return to haunt us unless we do in fact approve a bill without the Federal payment formula.

Mr. President, I could not count the number of people of the District who have been in my office asking my support for this or that project or program or building for the District, or to urge me to take a certain position effecting the District of Columbia. And, if I understand correctly, the same experience is true for many of my colleagues. I would suggest that, if we pass a home rule bill without a Federal payment provision, we can expect many more people from the District to visit our offices to plead for their special interests—especially since the elected District of Columbia officials will have no option but to tell them that final approval rests not with them but with the Appropriations Committees and Congress.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McINTYRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I do not know the reason for the Senator's comment about passing a bill without a Federal payment provision. Nothing in my amendment would eliminate the Federal payment provision; the amendment merely makes the Federal payment subject to appropriation.

Mr. McINTYRE. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, it is proposed to repeat the present process, in that once the city council and the mayor of the District had proposed a budget, they would have to come to Congress for the approval and sanction of that budget. So, in effect, they would be coming to Congress, hat in hand, trying to have certain jobs done and certain positions filled. That is my understanding of how the Senator's amendment would work.

Mr. DOMINICK. It is not my understanding.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, under the Constitution, the Congress has special responsibility for the District. There is no question about this. However, we can exercise this responsibility by reviewing the reports of the District on its ongoing activities. On matters of importance, we can intervene directly in District of Columbia affairs, and if **home** rule does not work properly, and it cannot be changed to make it work, we can revoke it and return to the present way of running things.

I do not feel that we can tell the District that it has home rule and then require it to check every step with us for prior approval. If we have no faith in the ability of the District to run itself, then we should not grant home rule. We should not go to the trouble and expense of setting up an elective system.

If we pass a bill without a Federal payment provision, we will be deluding the people of the District by letting them think that they have home rule when really we will be weakening their position. The District of Columbia budget now comes to Congress with the support and endorsement of the administration. The President's prestige and concern are evident in its presentation. Under an emasculated home rule bill—and I can think of no more fitting word to describe the bill without a Federal payment formula—the prestige and support of the President would no longer be present. Instead, the people of the District would be coming before the appropriations committees without votes and without advocates.

Mr. President, it is abundently clear that the committees of Congress which have responsibility for supervision of District affairs are the District of Columbia Committees of the Senate and House. As a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I have full confidence in our ability to exercise such supervision under the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada. I have full confidence that the District, under home rule, will do a good job, provided it has the flexibility to use its funds where it sees fit, rather than having to check first to see if Congress agrees.

I urge that the Senate pass the bill with the Federal payment formula as proposed and that the amendment of the Senator from Colorado be rejected.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield me a few minutes?

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes; but I first promised to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] for having offered a significant and important amendment. His explanation is a valuable contribution to the understanding of the difficult and complex question of home rule.

We have heard in the hearings, and again on the floor of the Senate, that it is of vital importance to the independence of the local government that the Federal payment be retained. I have several comments on this point.

First, in the bill as it came to us and as it was reported to the floor, the Federal Government is asked to appropriate on a permanent basis an indefinite amount calculated on a rather abstract and complicated theory. The Deputy Attorney General, Ramsey Clark, submitted a memorandum to the committee supporting the constitutionality of the Federal payment section and acknowledged that it was the intention in the section to provide a "permanent indefinite appropriation."

The amount of the annual appropriation is to be computed by having the District government assess the value of all federally owned real estate and personal property and multiply its assessed amounts by the property tax rates then applicable to private property in the District. Additionally, a sum is to be appropriated for business taxes purportedly lost by the presence of the Federal business in the District. This amount would be equal to the total of business taxes collected in the fiscal year multiplied by the ratio of Federal employment to private employment.

As the bill came to us, the mayor would determine the method of assessing District personal property, and the District assessment office would make its own judgments on Federal real property assessments. The Administrator of General Services could do nothing more than to certify that the District Government had made such assessments in accordance with the procedures set out in the bill or in existing law.

By the time the bill left the committee, it contained significant and substantial amendments offered by Senator DOMINICK and me to give the Federal Government an opportunity to review these assessments to make sure that they were fair, reasonable, and correctly computed.

Granting the efficacy of these amendments, substantial problems remain in the Federal payment plan. How would one assess the Justice building? The White House? Or the Capitol? What parallels or analogies are there between these buildings and private property? What system of inventory would be imposed on the Federal Government so that the District could keep track of every pencil and every eraser?

Assuming that a set formula is advisable and workable, what kind of financial objective would be sustained by this approach? Would we appropriate to meet a need or to meet the demands of a cold formula?

The level of authorizations for the District of Columbia over the past years has been recomputed from time to time by Congress with an eye toward the needs of the District of Columbia. The Federal payment in the past has not been intended as a windfall. It is not a contribution. It is not hush money. The Federal payment should supplement the sources of revenue for the District only to meet specific District needs.

The District of Columbia is the Nation's Capital. To that extent, the Federal Government ought to contribute to its operation.

S. 1118 requires the Treasury to pay, not Congress to appropriate, annually an indefinite amount based upon a formula of dubious reliability and accuracy without regard to the District's needs. If the District's financial needs should exceed the Federal payment, there would be no mechanism to supplement existing resources. If the District did not need all of the Federal payment, there is no provision in section 741 for refunding any of that amount to the Treasury.

Mr. President, I have no doubt that the District of Columbia would find some way to spend every cent in the Federal payment, but it need not be wisely spent. It might be used to reduce local tax rates. It might result in the rest of the country subsidizing a municipal police or fire department in excess of local contributions to those essential services.

Finally, Mr. President, while the Deputy Attorney General, Ramsey Clark, supported the constitutionality of the Federal payment plan, he said nothing about its compliance with the rules of the House or Senate.

The House of Representatives has long considered the District of Columbia appropriations bill a general appropriations bill which must originate in the House—IV Hinds' Precedents, sections 3553, 4629; VII "Cannon's Precedents," section 1116. The House insists that the Senate may only initiate appropriations bills having single specific purposes. Clearly, S. 1118 is not such a bill. No committee of the House except the Appropriations Committee can report a bill containing a general appropriation without the risk of having a point of order raised against it.

So, Mr. President, it is quite conceivable that the House Committee on the District of Columbia would have to strike the Federal payment from the bill before it could be reported.

I note with interest that certain sectors of the local press have indicated that Charles Horsky, the President's adviser on District of Columbia affairs, is ready and willing to strike this section from the bill in order to get the bill through the House.

It would, therefore, seem timely, reasonable, and in consonance with the spirit of the House and Senate rules to adopt the Dominick amendment, remove any parliamentary questions now inherent in the section, and send this bill to the House in a form in which it would stand a chance of passage.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the helpful comments made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I know how hard he has worked on this bill, and I appreciate his support.

I now yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I support the amendment of the Senator from Colorado. I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations for 15 or 16 years. I know what it means to approve appropriation requests when we have no authority except to be a rubberstamp. There are certain financial obligations as to which we must be a rubberstamp. I think of bond interest, retirement allowances, and claims. In those cases, the Committee on Appropriations is rightly a rubberstamp with respect to the amounts that are owed by the Government.

But in the case of the District of Columbia it is a question of authority and a question of appropriation.

I have a memory of one instance in which the committee resented being used as a rubberstamp. The United Nations now prepares its budget in December and asks Congress to approve it in June or July. The members of the Committee on Appropriations resent having no alternative except to approve the budget recommended by the United Nations in December.

I read from page 10 of the committee report:

> The formula for a Federal payment to the District of Columbia established by this bill would be an amount equal to the sum of (1) the real estate taxes the District would receive if property owned and used by the Federal Government and property exempted by special act of Congress were taxable; (2) the personal property taxes it would receive if tangible federally owned personal property, with certain exclusions, were taxable; and (3) the business income and related taxes which it could reasonably expect to receive if the Federal Government were a private business with an equivalent number of employees.

It seems to me that those three bases on which taxes for the District of Columbia would be established and Congress requested to appropriate are utterly out of keeping with the status of the Capital City. Washington, D.C., represents to the other sections of the country the authority of the Federal Government. The President and Congress are located here. They act for the entire country; they do not act merely for the District of Columbia.

I disagree with the Senator from New Hampshire, who says that the District of Columbia is like a city in New Hampshire or Massachusetts or Colorado, where the mayor and the city council agree on the amount of money that is to be raised.

The statement that the District of Columbia would assess the buildings, the personal property, and the alleged business income that would arise if all these properties were under private operation, is, to my mind, utterly fallacious. How could one assess the value of the Smithsonian Institution? We appropriated $33 million for the new building. How would that be assessed? We would have the question of assessing the value of the building and then the personal property in the Smithsonian Institution or in the Archives. How could one value, with any degree of accuracy, the value of the Archives, the old documents from the early history of our Government, or the objects that are brought to the Smithsonian Institution for viewing by our people? Those objects are brought from all over the United States and from other parts of the world.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado would accomplish the purpose of an ordinary appropriation that would come before us. We have our authority on the military expenditures, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We would have authority to decide what is or may be necessary for a particular purpose. Then the question would come before the Appropriations Committee. The Appropriations Committee would decide for that year how much money should be appropriated for the purpose for which authority is given.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado would carry out the method of determining the amount of appropriation.

The city government expresses its estimate as to the money it feels is needed. Then we decide how much actually shall be appropriated.

In ordinary circumstances, I believe, we would appropriate very nearly what the city government would want and the authority which it would set forth. However, to say that Congress, in the Capital City of our country, the President in the White House, the Congress, and all the Government departments in this area shall have no authority over how much money shall be spent by the Federal Government for the purposes of carrying out the Government functions is, to my mind, utterly wrong.

I believe that it would be impossible to establish the basis on which to set up the system for assessing the real estate taxes and the personal property taxes which the District would receive if the property owned and used by the Federal Government were taxable. How can we assess the worth of the personal property in all the various buildings, and particularly in places like the Smithsonian and the Archives? How could one determine what business income might result from buildings such as those occupied by the Department of Labor or the Department of the Interior? We would say that if those were used for business purposes, the income from that property should be taxable.

I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Colorado will be agreed to. I believe that it would greatly improve the bill, and would certainly make it much easier for me as a member of the Committee on Appropriations to vote for the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall ask a question or two of the Senator from Massachusetts. I offered an amendment an hour or two ago which was overwhelmingly rejected. The vote was 29 for and 66 against what I proposed.

I went to the desk to see how the senior Senator from Massachusetts voted. I did so because I felt that if my views were in accord with his, I would feel consoled and convinced that what I was proposing was correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I say that very sincerely. The clerks at the desk will confirm that I examined the record. The U.S. Government owns land, real estate, and personal property in the District of Columbia. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The U.S. Government owns personal property and real property in the State of Ohio.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct. Ten years ago the U.S. Government owned real estate to the equivalent of everything east of Ohio, including Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would the rule that I was advocating in the pending bill be of equal and just applicability in the way of tax collection in the District of Columbia on the one hand, and the State of Ohio on the other hand, or would the District of Columbia receive preferential treatment on the basis of income that the Federal Government would pay to those two areas?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am not sure that I understand the question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Massachusetts read three conditions contained on page 10.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator referred to the real estate taxes that the District would receive if the property owned and used by the Federal Government and properly exempted by special act of Congress were taxable; the personal property taxes that the District would receive if federally owned personal property, with certain exclusions, were taxable; and the business income.

Does that same rule of the U.S. Government paying for the operation of local government in the District of Columbia apply to Cleveland?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would not, if I understand the Senator correctly. The Federal property in Cleveland, Boston, or any other city is free from taxes. I believe that is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the point that I am making.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I suppose there have been 10 million visitors to the District of Columbia this year. Under the provisions of the pending measure, the Federal Government would be paying in lieu of taxes an amount that the District might have received on federally owned property if the Federal

Government were not here. That rule does not apply to Denver, Colo., Chicago, Ill., or Buffalo, N.Y., or to Cleveland, Ohio. Am I correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct. The city of Washington has a great number of tourists because it is the Capital of our country.

My point is that it is utterly impossible to say that in the case of the Smithsonian Institution, of which I happen to be a regent, or the Archives, or other Federal buildings, one could determine what the business income would have otherwise been.

How could we go about determining this question? Would it be by the cubic foot, the square foot, the number of floors, or the number of elevators?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, am I correct that the bill as written contemplates that the District of Columbia shall be paid the amount of money that it would have collected if the property of the Federal Government were subject to taxation?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is of the belief that that is wrong because that rule does not apply to other areas of the country?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct. Also, Congress is responsible for the appropriation of the money that the Government will spend.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator. I concur in the views expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes to determine if any Senator wishes to say anything else. I am about ready to vote if the Senator from Nevada is.

Mr. BIBLE. I am in exactly the same position. If I have no further requests for time, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield back my time.

Mr. BIBLE. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Russell] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay" and the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is absent on official business and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] are detained on official business, and, if present and voting, would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 48, as follows:

[No. 197 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Hickenlooper
Hill
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Prouty
Robertson
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NAYS—48

Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—14

Byrd, Va.
Gore
Hayden
Long, La.
McClellan
Pastore
Pearson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Scott
Smathers
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

So Mr. Dominick's amendment was rejected.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The legislative clerk proceeded to a third reading of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the third reading of the bill be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Ohio was on the floor, standing, seeking recognition.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I will not ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair also instructs the majority leader that it is necessary that the adoption of the committee amendment, as amended, be rescinded, in order for the Senator from Ohio to offer his amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send my amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 107, lines 24 and 25 and on page 108 strike out the words "and to the appointment or selection, qualification, tenure, and compensation of the judges thereof".

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the pending bill as now written provides that the Council of the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction over the appointment, selection, qualifications, tenure, and compensation of the judges of the District of Columbia. In other words, the Council of the District of Columbia as constituted by the pending bill would have complete jurisdiction over the appointment, qualifications, tenure, and compensation of District of Columbia judges.

The District of Columbia is an integral part of the U.S. Government. It is not in the position of a segment of a State or municipality. It is a part of the U.S. Government.

The selection, appointment, compensation, and qualifications of judges in the District of Columbia, in my opinion, is of greater consequence than in any other area of the United States.

The bill as now written would remove from the general operation the limitation of the right to appoint U.S. judges, and would place that right in the Council of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield at that point?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. I ask the Senator to yield at that point because that is not my understanding of that section. It was the intention of the committee to apply only, as it says, to jurisdiction over the municipal courts of the District of Columbia. These are the Court of General Sessions, District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and the Juvenile Court for the District of Columbia. In general they compare with the justice courts as we know them in the various States. This has nothing whatever to do with the Federal district court system, which remains absolutely unchanged under the pending bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The answer given to me by the Senator from Nevada does not destroy what I have said. It is a court of competent jurisdiction within the limits prescribed in the bill. It is a U.S. court. It may not have the jurisdiction given to a district court, but it still is a U.S. court.

In my judgment, the appointment, the fixing of terms, and the compensation should not be turned over to the District Council but should be retained by Congress.

I say that because of the constant talk of the breakdown of morality of the people in this country—and in particular of the people of the city of Washington.

I do not subscribe to that argument, as I have previously stated, but, in my judgment, the appointment, qualifications, tenure, and compensation of judges should be retained by the President of the United States and Congress.

That is my presentation. I will not ask for a yea-and-nay vote, but will ask for a division on the amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the suggested amendment of the Senator from Ohio. I do so for a number of reasons.

Such an amendment was never submitted before the committee. The committee worked on this problem carefully, because it thought it would be in conformity with the general provisions applying to the municipal functions of courts in cities of this kind.

I read from the report of the committee on this point, in order to make it abundantly clear. It will repeat what I have said when I asked the Senator from Ohio to yield, which he kindly did:

> Jurisdiction over the municipal courts shall vest with the Council. Any person to be appointed or elected after the date of enactment of this act shall hold office for a term of not less than 10 years and receive a salary of not less than the amount payable to an associate judge of the municipal court on the effective date of this act.

What is the jurisdiction of the present court? The municipal court in the District of Columbia is comparable to a justice or people's court in the various States.

Over the years they have raised the jurisdictional limits for the municipal court, now the Court of General Sessions. The jurisdictional limit of that court was increased several years ago from $3,000 to $10,000. That court has jurisdiction over misdemeanors only. It is also vested by law with divorce jurisdiction.

I hope that the Senate will reject the amendment. It seems more appropriate to me to leave the future of that court to the mayor and city council to determine selection and qualification of the judges.

This is in full conformity with the general practice in other cities.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not correct to say that the District Court for the District of Columbia has much greater jurisdiction than other Federal district courts throughout the country?

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct. That is true because they try many cases of first impression, which are never tried by Federal courts in other jurisdictions.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do they not try all the felony cases?

Mr. BIBLE. The Senator is correct. I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not expect my amendment to be adopted. I have such deep conviction about the correctness of my judgment on this matter that I do want a standing vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche]. A division is called for.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I want to extend my great thanks to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible] for the expeditious manner in which he has handled the pending measure. Over the years, he has served and chaired the District of Columbia Committee and has freely given of his great skill and ability to the solution of the problems of the Capitol city. It was brought out during this debate that appointment to the District of Columbia Committee is not greatly sought after because the problems are so many, so broad, and so complex and the reward for personal effort almost nonexistent. The service of Senator Bible to these problems and the interests of the District of Columbia are embodied in the pending measure. I could not let this measure come to a final vote before I paid tribute to him—it is my opinion a reflection of the true and unselfish dedication of this man. To him especially, but to the entire District of Columbia Committee we all owe a well earned salute.

I want to pay a special thanks to the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] for his cooperation in expediting the completion of this bill. His criticism has been most constructive and effectively presented.

Again the Senate as a whole has demonstrated that a Labor Day adjournment is not unrealistic.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1966—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8775) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 8775, which was read, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38 to the bill (H.R. 8775) entitled "An Act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes", and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:
>
> In lieu of the sum stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert: "$809,000".

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38.

The bill as it passed the House recommended appropriations in the amount of $150,589,107. The House bill as it arrived in the Senate did not contain any funds solely relating to the Senate. The Senate bill recommended appropriations of $190,840,167 including $38,892,290 for exclusive Senate items. The House of Representatives on July 19 agreed on the floor to all of these Senate items and consequently they were not a subject of conference on the bill. The Committee of Conference has agreed upon an appropriation of $189,993,297. The largest single item deleted from the Senate bill was the $700,000 proposal of the Senate to restore the Old Senate Chamber and the Old Supreme Court Chamber. The conferees were in agreement that these two chambers should be restored but the majority of the House managers were adamant and felt that the work could be more efficiently and logically carried out when the west central front of the Capitol is rebuilt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have a table which reflects each individual item in the bill for 1965, the budget estimate for 1966, the amount included in the Senate and House versions of the bill and the final amount agreed to in conference. I ask unanimous consent to have this table printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows.

Legislative Appropriation Act, 1966

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1965 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1966 AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

Item	Appropriations, 1965	Budget estimates, 1966	Version of bill		Conference
			House	Senate	
SENATE					
Vice President and Senators:					
Compensation of the Vice President and Senators	$2,877,260	$3,285,985		$3,285,985	$3,285,985
Mileage, President of Senate and Senators	58,370	58,370		58,370	58,370
Expense allowance, Vice President, majority and minority leaders	14,000	14,000		14,000	14,000
Total, Senators and Vice President	2,949,630	3,358,355		3,358,355	3,358,355
Salaries, officers and employees:					
Office of the Vice President	154,970	155,440		155,440	155,440
Chaplain	15,000	15,000		15,000	15,000
Office of the Secretary	1,036,020	1,042,005		1,323,000	1,323,000
Committee employees	3,228,115	3,236,145		3,236,145	3,236,145
Conference committee:					
Majority	95,980	95,980		95,980	95,980
Minority	95,980	95,980		95,980	95,980
Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators	15,106,535	15,653,785		15,653,785	15,653,785
Office of the Sergeant at Arms	3,010,020	3,021,320		3,051,230	3,051,230
Offices of secretaries to the majority and minority	155,500	157,520		160,885	160,885
Offices of the majority and minority whips	35,630	35,630		35,630	35,630
Official reporters of debates	280,150	285,005			
Total, salaries, officers and employees	23,213,900	23,793,810		23,823,075	23,823,075
Contingent expenses:					
Senate policy committees	394,050	395,050		395,050	395,050
Automobiles and maintenance	42,540	42,540		42,540	42,540
Furniture	31,190	31,190		31,190	31,190
Expenses of inquiries and investigations	4,677,390	4,777,390		4,777,390	4,777,390
Folding documents	46,975	39,300		39,300	39,300
Mail transportation (motor vehicles)	16,560	16,560		16,560	16,560
Miscellaneous items	2,783,675	2,779,015		3,222,755	3,222,755
Postage	62,035	62,035		90,825	90,825
Stationery	255,600	255,600		255,600	255,600
Communications	15,150	15,150		15,150	15,150
Total, contingent expenses	8,325,165	8,413,830		8,886,360	8,886,360
Other, Senate:					
Legislative counsel	293,375	300,900		308,000	308,000
Beneficiaries of deceased Senators	52,500				
Senate procedure				4,000	4,000
Total, other	345,875	300,900		312,000	312,000
Total, Senate	34,834,570	35,866,895		36,379,790	36,379,790
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES					
SALARIES, MILEAGE FOR THE MEMBERS, AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCE OF THE SPEAKER					
Compensation of Members	12,381,500	14,138,975	$14,138,975	14,138,975	14,138,975
Mileage of Members and expense allowance of the Speaker	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Total	12,581,500	14,338,975	14,338,975	14,338,975	14,338,975
SALARIES, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES					
Office of the Speaker	115,100	[1] 116,700	116,700	116,700	116,700
Office of the Parliamentarian	101,875	101,875	101,875	101,875	101,875
Compilation of precedents of House of Representatives			10,000	10,000	10,000
Office of the Chaplain	12,500	[2] 15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Office of the Clerk	1,340,000	[3] 1,643,680	1,552,000	1,552,000	1,552,000
Office of the Sergeant at Arms	955,000	[4] 1,065,000	1,044,500	1,044,500	1,044,500
Office of the Doorkeeper	1,254,000	[5] 1,620,000	1,620,000	1,620,000	1,620,000
Office of the Postmaster	446,000	[6] 512,000	512,000	512,000	512,000
Committee employees (standing roll)	3,755,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
Special and minority employees (several items)	387,195	[7] 416,365	416,365	416,365	416,365
Official reporters of debates	254,770	254,770	254,770	254,770	254,770
Official reporters to committees	256,950	256,950	256,950	256,950	256,950
Committee on Appropriations (investigations)	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
Office of the Legislative Counsel	284,530	[8] 296,860	295,000	295,000	295,000
Total, salaries, officers and employees	9,862,920	10,799,200	10,695,160	10,695,160	10,695,160
MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE					
Clerk hire	24,700,000	30,500,000	28,500,000	28,500,000	28,500,000
CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE					
Furniture	340,000	340,000	140,000	140,000	140,000
Miscellaneous items	3,817,000	4,123,000	4,123,000	4,123,000	4,123,000
Reporting hearings	223,000	223,000	223,000	223,000	223,000
Special and select committees	4,540,500	4,525,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
Office of the Coordinator of Information	136,290	136,250	136,000	136,000	136,000
Telegraph and telephone	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
Stationery (revolving fund)	1,046,400	1,046,400	1,046,400	1,046,400	1,046,400
Attending physician's office	16,545	18,545	20,045	20,045	20,045
Postage stamp allowances	228,550	228,550	228,550	228,550	228,550
Folding documents	276,300	270,000			
Revision of laws	24,865	27,000	27,000	27,000	27,000
Speaker's automobile	12,200	12,200	12,200	12,200	12,200
Majority leader's automobile	12,200	12,200	12,200	12,200	12,200
Minority leader's automobile	12,200	12,200	12,200	12,200	12,200
New edition, United States Code	150,000				
New edition, District of Columbia Code	100,000				
Payment to widows and heirs of deceased Members	45,000				
Total, contingent expenses	13,381,050	13,374,345	12,880,595	12,880,595	12,880,595
Total, House of Representatives	60,525,470	69,012,520	66,414,730	66,414,730	66,414,730

See footnotes at end of table.

Legislative Appropriation Act, 1966—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1965 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1966 AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1965	Budget estimates, 1966	Version of bill		Conference
			House	Senate	
JOINT ITEMS					
Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures	$34,665	$35,165	$35,165	$35,165	$35,165
CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE					
Joint Economic Committee	265,080	265,510	360,000	360,000	360,000
Joint Committee on Atomic Energy	347,510	347,940	347,000	347,000	347,000
Joint Committee on Printing	150,845	151,275	151,000	151,000	151,000
Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies of 1965	265,000				
CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE					
Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation	390,000	390,000	390,000	390,000	390,000
Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy	24,100	120,300	120,000	24,100	24,100
Joint Committee on Defense Production	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000
CAPITOL POLICE					
General expenses	36,700	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Capitol Police Board	461,166	604,600	604,600	728,000	809,000
EDUCATION OF PAGES					
Expenses	85,712	85,712	85,712	85,712	85,712
OFFICIAL MAIL COSTS					
Expenses	4,723,000	[9] 6,512,000	6,512,000	6,512,000	6,512,000
STATEMENTS OF APPROPRIATION					
Preparation	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000
Total, joint items	6,876,778	8,655,502	8,748,477	8,775,977	8,856,977
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL					
Salaries, Office of the Architect	547,800	600,400	587,600	570,070	587,600
Contingent expenses	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Capitol buildings	[10] 1,764,300	1,640,000	1,640,000	1,640,000	1,640,000
Restoration of Old Senate and Old Supreme Court Chambers		700,000		700,000	
Extension of the Capitol	125,000				
Capitol Grounds	740,000	638,000	638,000	638,000	638,000
Senate Office Buildings	2,464,500	2,468,700		2,458,700	2,458,700
Senate garage	52,800	53,800		53,800	53,800
House Office Buildings	3,230,000	4,090,000	3,807,000	3,807,000	3,807,000
Acquisition of property, construction, and equipment, additional House Office Building (liquidation cash)	8,000,000	[11] 12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000
Capitol Power Plant	2,665,000	2,752,000	2,752,000	2,752,000	2,752,000
Library Buildings and Grounds:					
Structural and mechanical care	2,382,200	879,000	879,000	879,000	879,000
Furniture and furnishings	220,000	274,000	274,000	274,000	274,000
Total, Architect of the Capitol	22,241,600	26,645,900	23,127,600	26,322,570	25,640,100
BOTANIC GARDEN					
Salaries and expenses	500,000	467,000	467,000	467,000	467,000
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS					
Salaries and expenses	[12] 11,001,800	11,955,000	[13] 11,663,000	[13] 11,772,000	11,738,000
Copyright Office, salaries and expenses	1,914,200	2,021,000	2,021,000	2,021,000	2,021,000
Legislative Reference Service, salaries and expenses	2,412,800	2,524,000	2,524,000	2,492,000	2,524,000
Distribution of catalog cards, salaries and expenses	3,810,100	4,103,000	4,035,000	4,035,000	4,035,000
Books for the general collection	670,000	800,000	760,000	800,000	780,000
Books for the Law Library	110,000	125,000	120,000	125,000	125,000
Books for the blind, salaries and expenses	2,458,600	2,675,000	2,675,000	2,675,000	2,675,000
Organizing and microfilming the papers of the President, salaries and expenses	112,800	112,800	112,800	112,800	112,800
Preservation of early American motion pictures	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program):					
Payments in Treasury-owned foreign currencies	1,417,000	2,102,000	1,417,000	1,900,000	1,694,000
U.S. dollars	124,500	177,000	124,500	168,300	150,900
Total, Library of Congress	24,081,800	26,644,800	25,502,300	26,151,100	25,905,700
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE					
Printing and binding	18,000,000	20,500,000	20,500,000	20,500,000	20,500,000
Office of Superintendent of Documents, salaries and expenses	5,562,000	5,289,000	5,829,000	5,829,000	5,829,000
Acquisition of site and construction of buildings	2,500,000	[14] 49,640,000			
Revolving fund	(15)	(15)	(15)	(15)	(15)
Total, Government Printing Office	26,062,000	75,969,000	26,329,000	26,329,000	26,329,000
Grand total	175,122,218	243,261,617	150,289,107	190,840,167	189,993,297

---

[1] Includes increase of $1,600 in H. Doc. 162.
[2] Includes increase of $2,500 in H. Doc. 162.
[3] Includes increase of $249,180 in H. Doc. 162.
[4] Includes increase of $11,500 in H. Doc. 162.
[5] Includes increase of $339,200 in H. Doc. 162.
[6] Includes increase of $50,450 in H. Doc. 162.
[7] Includes increase of $6,400 in H. Doc. 162.
[8] Includes increase of $1,500 in H. Doc. 162
[9] Includes increase of $475,000 in H. Doc. 162.
[10] And reappropriation estimated at $66,000.
[11] Includes increase of $5,200,000 in H. Doc. 179.
[12] And $168,000 by transfer from National Science Foundation (of which $18,000 was for retransfer to the card service appropriation).
[13] And $174,600 by transfer from National Science Foundation (of which $18,000 is for retransfer to the card service appropriation).
[14] Includes increase of $4,853,000 in H. Doc. 162.
[15] Minor language only.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS AND MAINTENANCE OF GOLDEN SPIKE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 26) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands for, and to develop, operate, and maintain, the Golden Spike National Historic Site, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior shall acquire on behalf of the United States by gift, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, such lands and interest in land, together with any improvements thereon, as the Secretary may deem necessary for the purpose of establishing a national historic site commemorating the completion of the first transcontinental railroad across the United States on the site described on a map entitled "Proposed Golden Spike National Historic Site, Utah", prepared by the National Park Service, Southwest Region, dated February 1963. In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within the area depicted on such drawing, and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property in the State of Utah under his jurisdiction which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal. The properties so exchanged shall be of approximately equal value, but the Secretary may accept cash from, or pay cash to, the grantor in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

SEC. 2. (a) The property acquired under the provisions of the first section of this Act shall be designated as the "Golden Spike National Historic Site" and shall be set aside as a public national memorial. The National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall administer, protect, and develop such historic site, subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 525), as amended and supplemented, and the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666), as amended.

(b) In order to provide for the proper development and maintenance of such national historic site, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and maintain therein such markers, buildings, and other improvements, and such facilities for the care and accommodation of visitors, as he may deem necessary.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than $1,168,000, as may be necessary for the acquisition of land and interests in land and for the development of the Golden Spike National Historic Site pursuant to this Act.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, bills have been introduced in previous sessions of Congress to place the Golden Spike National Historic Site in Federal ownership and provide for a development program. None have received serious consideration, however, until my introduction of S. 26 this session.

My thanks go to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, under the chairmanship of Senator JACKSON, and the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation, under the chairmanship of Senator BIBLE, for the prompt and sympathetic consideration this bill has received.

Added impetus was given to the project by the new State administration in Utah, and the legislature which met early this year. Governor Rampton proposed, and the legislature approved, the creation of a Golden Spike Centennial Commission. Thus, for the first time, a major effort to improve the area is being made by the State.

Passage of this bill will mean that the expanded historic site will be ready for the celebration in 1969 of the hundredth anniversary of the driving of the golden spike itself—the event which completed the construction of America's first transcontinental railroad.

Working together, the National Park Service and the Golden Spike Centennial Commission will provide the setting and arrange the program for a fitting celebration of this historic event.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] was eager to be present when this amendment was taken up. I know he made a special effort to be alerted to the fact that when it was called up he would be summoned. He had been assured that there would be no more votes this evening and therefore had left the Chamber. The RECORD should so note. Insofar as I know, he concurs in the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that Senator BENNETT concurs. I have been waiting until the third reading of the pending bill, the bill dealing with home rule for the District of Columbia, was had and therefore it has become late in the day.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I had asked the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] to withhold consideration of this matter until after the third reading of the District of Columbia home rule bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS].

The motion was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHARTER ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1118) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to speak very briefly on the pending bill.

I am pleased to join with the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia and also with my colleague the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is cosponsoring the bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia.

As President Johnson pointed out recently in a special message on home rule for the District of Columbia, self government for the District would not be an innovation. Until 1871, the people of the District had local self government as the Founding Fathers had originally intended.

We in Maryland are particularly interested in the welfare of the District of Columbia. It constitutes the central city for hundreds of thousands of Marylanders who live in Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties. Many of the problems in the metropolitan area, such as those of transportation, water supply, and sewerage, must be resolved through intergovernmental cooperation on the local level. These problems of the District do not honor the District line. Many of the most pressing ones cross the District line. I refer also to interstate compacts on the Potomac River. Many other problems, such as traffic and crime, affect our State of Maryland, the State of Virginia and the District.

A responsible self government within the District would help solve the problem of intergovernmental responsibility and relationship. It seems to me that the pending measure strikes an exact balance between the local and national interests.

Under this bill the elected local officials would be responsible for the day-to-day activities of local self-government, which is a basic privilege of all American citizens. However, ultimate legislative authority over the Nation's Capital will be retained by the Congress. This is as it should be.

I would like to pay particular attention to that section of the bill providing an annual Federal payment to the District.

This regular annual payment is based on a specific formula which is spelled out in the legislation. This approach is a sound one—first, because it recognizes the unique character of the District of Columbia with its vast areas of nontaxable Federal property and second, because it will contribute to a sound budgetary process.

Mr. President, I commend particularly the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia for seizing once again the initiative in bringing this measure, which will mean responsible and viable self-government to the District of Columbia, to the attention of the Senate and this Congress.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I deeply regret that this particular home rule bill for the District of Columbia has been made so unsound that I cannot in good conscience support it.

It is a shame that the long-sought objective of a reasonable degree of home rule for the citizens of our Nation's Capital City has been spoiled by the ruthless and cynical power displayed on the floor of the Senate in the rejection of amendments designed to make this bill into a reasonable, sound, and model piece of legislation.

As a result of the defeat of these amendments, we are now presented with a bill which requires partisan elections for members of the city council. In my judgment, partisan elections have no place in the government of our Nation's Capital City. If anything, such elections can work to the detriment of the city and its people. If, for example, the city council is preponderately Democratic and the Congress is preponderately Republican, or vice versa, friction is almost sure to develop—friction which would never occur if the city council was nonpartisan. No one has presented any evidence showing how partisan elections could possibly benefit our Capital City.

This thoughtlessness has been compounded by rejection of an amendment making elections held under the provisions of the bill, or political management of political campaigns in connection therewith, subject to section 9(a) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," more familiarly known as the Hatch Act. Section 9(a) reads as follows:

> It shall be unlawful for any person employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, to use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof. No officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express their opinions on all political subjects and candidates.

This law applies to our Federal Government employees. Why should it not apply to the city council and their employees?

If this bill had been appropriately amended, it could have been supported by every Member of the Senate. And it would have had a good chance for action in the House. The failure to accept these amendments now places the bill in very questionable status as far as the House is concerned. It is too bad that reasonable home rule for the people of the District must continue to be delayed because the proponents cannot resist the temptation to overreach beyond the bounds of good sense and the demands of good government.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, at every previous opportunity since my coming to the Senate, I have lent my vote and my voice to the principle of home rule for the city of Washington.

The District of Columbia Committee of the Senate has, once more, reported a bill designed to give the residents of this Capital city a chance to run many of their own affairs. The arguments used against this measure are the same as those used previously against others in which I had a hand in drafting and reporting.

All Senators are well familiar with the legalistic and emotional arguments used by opponents of home rule. Questions have been raised about adequacy of tax rates, ability of citizens to govern themselves and the question of Federal payments in lieu of taxes.

Basically, the question is simple: Should some 850,000 Americans be told they cannot govern themselves?

The city of Washington must depend upon Congress for every minute detail of the law, using this body and its sister body as a City Council. None of us is able to devote the time and energy to this task without sacrifice of other attention to other legislation.

I served 6 years on the District Committee, and have thus learned first-hand the immense amount of detail that must be given to governing this city. With the legislative load being carried by the Congress these days, we cannot give the proper attention to government of the District of Columbia, if this should, indeed, be a function of ours.

We, who pride ourselves in our democratic processes and institutions, must hang our heads in shame. No other nation in the world denies the citizens of its Capital City the basic right of home rule.

The fact that the city of Washington itself is stripped of much of its land for Federal buildings and foreign embassies does deny tax base to a great city while imposing additional duties for the police and other agencies of that city. Thus, the Federal Government owes regular payments in lieu of taxes to the city government and should pay them promptly.

The city, too, has obligations to the Federal Government as its chief industry. These must be discharged with efficiency and dispatch. There should be adequate assurance of this.

But neither of these conditions can be used as an excuse to deny home rule.

Some years ago, that portion of the District of Columbia lying south of the Potomac was ceded back to the Commonwealth of Virginia and is now known as Arlington County. Should these people be denied local self-government?

NASA, the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Bureau of Standards, and other agencies have been moved outside the boundaries of the city of Washington. Others will be in the near future. Does their presence in Maryland and Virginia mean we should deny home rule to citizens of the communities to which they have been moved?

There are those in the Congress who have raised questions of civic responsibility among the citizens of Washington. These were effectively answered last November when Washingtonians for the first time voted for President and Vice President.

The results accruing from the passage of the 24th amendment were as should have been expected. The election in Washington was well run. A large percentage of the permanent residents registered and voted.

Indeed, the mood of the country for the right to vote may be measured by the speed with which this amendment was adopted by the States.

We have engaged in long and bitter argument this year about protection of voting rights for all Americans in all our States. The basic issue in passage of this measure by both Senate and House was how best to insure that no one be denied through subterfuge his unalienable right to cast his ballot in local, State, and national elections—a right denied to many because of their color.

There should now be no argument about extension of this fundamental right to the citizens of Washington. The right to vote for local officials should be restored to the residents of our Capital City—notwithstanding the fact that a majority of them are Negroes and not because most of them are Negroes. Rather, the right to vote is too precious to deny any American—especially in his home community.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial broadcast by station WANE at Fort Wayne, Ind.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> HOME RULE IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
>
> Thousands of vacationers, some from our own area, will visit the Nation's Capital this summer. They will feel some patriotic pride when they view the majestic Capitol dome, the stately White House with its big expanse of green lawn, the awe-inspiring Lincoln Memorial and the grandeur of the Washington Monument. But if they leave the beaten path, they will also be able to see some of the worst slums in America. They will see dilapidated business districts and dirty streets and they can hear stories of street violence.
>
> In Washington as in other cities, responsible citizens groups are working in various ways for better schools, better housing, more health services, better law enforcement. But in contrast to other cities, the citizens of Washington, D.C. have no public officials who are directly accountable to them. The District of Columbia is controlled by Congress and administered by congressional committees and federally appointed commissions. What District citizens think or say has little impact in the absence of a municipal government. They do pay taxes to help support their city. In fact, about 90 percent of government costs come from a general fund which is maintained by local taxation. But while they do enjoy taxation, they do not enjoy representation.
>
> Contrary to popular misinformation, this has not always been the case. It has been true only since the latter part of the 19th century. It need not remain the case, for a simple act of government can provide the citizens of Washington with local self-government.
>
> The Senate has passed bills granting home rule to the District of Columbia five times since 1948. But the House of Representatives has never had a chance to vote on such measures because they have remained bottled up in the House District Committee.
>
> Action in the House depends to a large degree on whether citizens in other parts of the country let their representatives know how they feel about self-government for the Nation's Capital City.
>
> We suggest that in the furor over voting rights in the South, Americans pay some heed to the voting and citizenship rights of nearly 800,000 people in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, home rule for the District of Columbia is a highly controversial issue in the Nation's Capital today. The subject is not new. In reality, it may be said to be as old as the District itself. In modern times, however, the resurgence of interest in home-rule and the drive to establish a form of self-government for Washington constitute a post-World War II development.

Central to the issue are two basic facts. On the one hand, District residents, although citizens of the United States, do not elect a single local official. On the other hand, there is the paramount interest of the Federal Government in the governing of the District arising from the very palpable reason that Washington is the Capital of the United States.

Viewed historically, the role of home rule for the District of Columbia is divided into two periods of almost equal length. Throughout the first period, beginning in 1802 and continuing for almost three-quarters of a century, District residents lived under varying degrees of self-government. Then came the political and financial crises of the 1870's and this privilege was taken away by Congress. The commission form, now in effect and substantially unchanged through the years, was installed during that period.

The political history of the District of Columbia government actually began before the District was created. It is rooted in section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States, which gives to Congress the exclusive legislative power in all cases over the area chosen as the site of the Federal Government.

When the Constitution was drafted in 1787, the location of the District had not yet been determined. In 1788 and 1789, the States of Maryland and Virginia, respectively, ceded sections of their own lands on either side of the Potomac River, and, by an act of July 16, 1790, Congress accepted the newly acquired territory "for the permanent seat of the Government of the United States." This law further authorized commissioners, appointed by the President, to survey and define precisely the boundaries of the District and to provide suitable buildings for the housing of the National Government. In 1800, President John Adams took up residence in Georgetown, and Government personnel and records were moved from Philadelphia to the District. In November of 1800, Congress met for the first time in the north wing of the Capitol, that being the only part then completed. In 1801, legislation was enacted designating the District territory on the Virginia side of the Potomac as the County of Alexandria and that on the Maryland side as the County of Washington. A circuit court was established, and the 1801 legislation provided for the appointment of judicial and law enforcement officers and certain other public officials. The legislation also provided that the State laws in effect in the ceded areas should continue to prevail.

The first real government for the District was created by the act of May 3, 1802. This government applied only to the city of Washington, inasmuch as other units of government were functioning in the District of Columbia at this time. For example, Georgetown and Alexandria continued to operate as independent cities with their own charters.

Under the 1802 statute, Washington was governed by a city council and a mayor. The city council consisted of 12 members elected by the eligible voters. The 12 members then chose from their own ranks 5 persons to serve in the second chamber, while the remaining 7 made up the first chamber. The mayor was appointed on an annual basis by the President. In 1812, legislation was passed making fundamental changes in the city government. The original 2-chamber council was replaced by an 8-member Board of Aldermen elected for 2 years and a 12-member Board of Common Council elected for 1 year. The mayor was no longer appointed by the President, but was elected annually by a majority vote of the aldermen and common council members.

Legislation was enacted in 1820 providing for the election of a mayor for a 2-year term by the vote of the people, who continued to elect the Board of Aldermen and the Common Council.

This basic form of government remained in effect without important change for more than 50 years, until the 1870's. The intervening years, however, were not wholly uneventful politically. For example, when the Whigs elected a mayor in 1840, a political quarrel developed with the Democratic Congress, and the city charter was placed in jeopardy. The corporate privileges of the District banks actually were suspended. Georgetown sought to be receded to Maryland, but the Maryland Legislature was not interested in taking on further financial burdens. The people on the Virginia side of the Potomac, however, were successful in bringing about retrocession of this area to Virginia, and, in 1846, Congress agreed to retrocession, and a presidential proclamation made retrocession effective, thus reducing the geographical area of the District from 100 square miles to the 68 square miles (approximately), which it today occupies.

The legislative actions of the 1870's, which deprived the District of Columbia of home rule and changed the fundamental character of its government, are of considerable importance to an understanding of the issue today. In 1871, Congress created a municipal corporation of the entire District, repealing thereby the separate charters of Washington and Georgetown and merging these communities. An entirely new government, territorial in form, was established, the office of mayor was abolished, and, in its place, there was a Governor appointed by the President for a 4-year term with senatorial consent. A four-member board of public works was created, its membership being appointed by the President. A two-chamber legislative assembly was made up of an 11-member Council and a 22-member House of Delegates, the former being appointed by the President, and the latter being elected by the people. The voters also chose a delegate to the House of Representatives who served on the District of Columbia Committee, but who could not vote.

This government lasted about 3 years. An act of June 20, 1874, placed the governing of the District in the hands of three commissioners appointed by the President and all elective offices were abolished. This was avowedly a temporary government, inasmuch as the act which established it provided for its termination by calling for a joint congressional committee to study and consider a permanent form of government for the District. This permanent government was created by the act of June 11, 1878, the organic law under which the District is governed today. The District was made a municipal corporation, and the administration of its affairs was the responsibility of three Commissioners chosen by the President and approved by the Senate.

Ergo, for the first 70-odd years of its history, the District of Columbia experienced some measure of home rule. In the 1870's, Congress took away this self-government and has not since restored any element of it.

It is essential to an understanding of the home rule story in Washington to ask why Congress acted as it did almost a century ago with regard to the District of Columbia government. There were several factors, among which were the rapid population growth of the city after the Civil War; the desire to transform Washington into a city of beauty, dignity, and attractiveness befitting the Nation's Capital; a serious and immediate need for greatly improved and expanded public works and services; racial problems; political differences; and financial difficulties.

It is to this last-named factor—financial difficulties—that I wish to direct emphasis at this point.

The acute stage of the crisis leading to the loss of home rule in the District of Columbia began under the administration of Mayor Sayles J. Bowen. Although property taxes had been raised considerably, money was lacking for basic and essential improvements which would have been possible only through the assistance of Congress. Local politicians were competing among themselves for favors, and, finally, it was revealed that the mayor had made payments to contractors in anticipation of tax collections.

James Whyte, writing in the Washington Star of May 11, 1958, stated:

> There was great dissatisfaction among the teachers, laborers, and other city employees, many of whom had not been paid for months. The city treasury was so empty that on one occasion the furniture in the mayor's office was seized because of the corporation's failure to pay a small bill.

The financial position of the District of Columbia in the early 1870's became very serious. The city's indebtedness more than doubled from 1867 to 1871, the debt having risen from $1,308,000 to $2,966,000, a per capita increase of roughly $14 to $27.

Whyte, in his book "The Uncivil War," states:

> When Emery [Bowen's successor] took over the city government the treasury was empty, and the amount of floating debt still to be determined * * * policemen and schoolteachers, as well as corporation laborers, had not been paid in months. Emery suggested on June 27 settling the claims of the corporation by issuing certificates of indebtedness for all taxes payable in 1870, 1871, and 1872, the last two classes of which would bear 6 percent interest. An immediate loan of $150,000 was necessary to pay the back salaries of teachers and District officials. In September, he was forced to raise the property tax rate from $1.40 to $1.80.

Under the territorial government, President Grant named Henry D. Cooke to the governorship, and Alexander Shepherd was appointed to the Board of Public Works. Shepherd quickly became the leading force on the Board, and it is reported that at 135 of 149 meetings recorded in the minutes of the Board, Shepherd was the only member present.

In September 1873, Cooke resigned as Governor, in the face of impending financial disaster, and Shepherd was appointed by President Grant to succeed Cooke. The financial panic that struck resulted in charges being made by irate property owners against the Board of Public Works, and a joint congressional committee investigated and charged the Board with numerous irregularities, including poor financial management, bad administration, and extensive waste. The territorial government was declared a complete failure, and the joint congressional committee recommended that it be replaced temporarily by three Commissioners. Legislation instituting the commission form of government was passed on June 20, 1874, shortly after the committee had urged it, and, during the next 4 years, various forms of government were considered but the commission form was made permanent by the law of June 11, 1878.

The ultimate decision, therefore, to retain the commission form of government was based in considerable measure upon, among other things, the necessity for keeping the District on a sound financial basis, and the experience of the 1870's is not, as I have said, without relevance to the home rule question today.

I favor the commission form of government for Washington, and I, therefore, shall vote against the proposed legislation before us. I recognize the appealing arguments advanced by home rule advocates, and I share with them the belief that, under normal rules of American government, all qualified citizens—and I emphasize the term "qualified citizens"—should be allowed to vote. I go even further to say that it is desirous that all qualified citizens not only be permitted to vote. They also have a duty to vote and should fulfill that duty to vote. I regret that it is often difficult to persuade qualified citizens to go to the polls and fulfill this duty of citizenship. But Washington is a city sui generis. The fact that it is the Nation's Capital gives it a unique status, and the normal principles of local self-government do not, therefore, apply. The overriding Federal interest in the District is everywhere conceded, and this interest would be compromised and diluted by home rule. The seat of the National Government and the District of Columbia are one and the same and inseparable, and to superimpose a home rule government on Washington would be artificial and a continuing source of friction.

Were this not the Federal Capital, the situation would be otherwise, and we would all join in supporting the principle of self-government. But the District of Columbia is impacted with Federal Government. The Federal Government asserts pressures and responsibilities on the District of Columbia that no other U.S. city has experienced. For example, about 43 percent of the city, by area, is in Federal title, and about 37 percent by value. It is almost as if every other building in the city were owned by the U.S. Government. A landlord of that size asserts quite a bit of influence whether or not he consciously exercises it. Moreover, the Federal Government is the city's chief industry. The people employed in Washington by the Federal Government equal one-third of the city's population. Of course, many Federal employees live in the suburbs, but much of their money finds its way into the District, as does much money from other Federal sources. For example, Federal grant-in-aid moneys poured into the District at the rate of $57 million in fiscal year 1964, $87 million in fiscal year 1965, and are estimated to amount to $107 million during fiscal year 1966. This is in addition to the Federal payment, authorized at $50 million annually, and concerning which $43 million has been appropriated for fiscal year 1966.

City-Federal relations work both ways, of course. The city, for instance, provides police under many circumstances for various governmental activities, such as the guarding of the President during his travels in the city. The Federal Government, on the other hand, provides many of the city's celebrities and, thus, stimulates most of the area's social life and conversation and news. The historical sites, museums, memorials, and Federal governmental activities attract over 9 million tourists to the District of Columbia annually, and these tourists spend on an average of approximately $50 each. Not only do they bring good business to the business establishments of the District of Columbia; they also contribute several million dollars in tax revenues. Hence, Washington has closer financial connections to the Federal Government than has any other major city. Against this historical and circumstantial background I base my opposition to the pending bill, and my opposition is largely for two reasons:

First. The bill would remove the District's financial and budgetary matters from the jurisdiction and review of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, and

Second. This being the Federal city, a city sui generis, it should remain under Federal control, as at present.

As to the first of these reasons, home rule, as envisioned in the legislation before us, would remove the operation of the city's finances from annual congressional scrutiny and would, therefore, increase the possibility that the errors of yesterday would be repeated tomorrow. I am afraid that home rule would introduce machine politics, a stranger to this city's administration under commission government. Machine politics, which thrives on the problems of cities, would probably, in turn, introduce its handmaiden, graft, also a stranger, by and large, to the commission form of government in the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia already has its financial problems, but under the pending legislation, I do not believe it would be long before its financial difficulties would be compounded manifold. Having served as the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations, I know, as perhaps no other Member of this body knows, the ineffable pressures which can be brought to bear in behalf of programs, various and sundry, sound and unsound, from groups which appear to be oblivious to the important question as to how the money will be raised or from where it will come. Often those who clamor the loudest for expensive programs are those who pay little or no taxes to support the present governmental functions and who would pay little or no taxes in support of the programs espoused. Yet, these same individuals who are a part of or who are represented by some of the pressure groups, while bearing little or none of the tax burdens necessary for the support of the spending programs espoused, would be allowed to vote for city officials under the pending legislation.

One can readily envision therefore, the multitudinous wild spending programs which would be urged upon luckless heads of the city government for whom resistence to such programs would mean sure defeat at the next election. As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, I have been the target of more abuse and scurrilous editorials than has any other Member of this body in recent years. I merely make reference to this today to say that elected officials can expect the same kind of vilification, vituperation, and abuse if they choose to oppose spending programs which will be promoted by groups which think little or nothing of the cost. In my own case, I brought down the wrath of pressure groups and some segments of the press because I sought to bring about the removal of ineligibles from the welfare caseloads and because I opposed what I am convinced would have been simply another relief program in the District of Columbia. I seriously doubt that such a welfare investigation would have been launched in this city if the pending legislation had been law. Moreover, I have no doubt that the relief program which has failed to receive approval of the Congress for 4 consecutive years would have been implemented if the pending legislation had been law, because the pressure groups which most vociferously pressed for that program had apparently closed their eyes to the ineluctable day of financial reckoning. Now, I realize that these groups have many fine, well-intentioned persons in their memberships, but the importance of counting the cost was long ago recognized by Jesus in the parable wherein He said:

> For which of you intending to build a tower, sitteth not down first, and counteth the cost, whether he have sufficient to finish it?

Of course, one can point to the fact that all other cities throughout the land have their budgetary problems at times, and, yet, their citizens vote and propose spending programs. This overlooks the fact that the city of Washington has no industry and, because of its geographical limitations, no prospects for the future development of an industrial tax base. Many of its individual taxpayers have fled the city and the exodus is continuing, the vacuum being filled by low-income, and often unemployed, illiterate, unskilled, nontaxpaying people. Moreover, the argument overlooks the fact that this is the one city of all cities in which the elected District officials, under the pending legislation, could, by their decisions and actions in determining the amounts of real and personal property taxes lost to the District based upon assessed values and rates of tax on federally owned properties, decide and control the amount of Federal appropriations which would be made annually in the form of a Federal payment. I favor larger Federal payments than have been provided, but under this bill, the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate would exercise no review of the spending programs of the District, programs which would affect the rate of property assessments and the size of the Federal payments. The Federal payment, in other words, made up of the tax dollars collected from citizens throughout the country, would be determined, as to its amount, by the elected city officials of the District of Columbia government, without any exercise of control or review by congressional appropriations committees. Indirectly, this would amount to the levying of a tax on all citizens by the city government of the District of Columbia.

All cities have their fiscal problems, but I maintain that a city council and mayor elected by the people of Washington, D.C., should not have the unique privilege of determining the amount of and exercising full control over the Federal moneys which will be appropriated toward the operation and administration of the Federal city, without the Appropriations Committees of the Congress having any opportunity to study the financial aspects of programs and activities proposed from time to time and no opportunity to scrutinize the efficiency and wisdom with which moneys are spent in support thereof.

The Federal payment, under the pending legislation, would be automatic, based upon the formula set forth in the bill, and is estimated to amount to $71 million by 1970.

I am also advised that the city's aggregate debt, including debt owed to the U.S. Treasury, can reach a limit of $586 million by 1970, a figure so high, in my judgment, that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to make full repayments under it.

Moreover, there is the very real possibility that a future Congress would legislate to reduce the amount of Federal payment to the District. Supporters of the legislation before us may not consider this to be a serious possibility, but the present Congress cannot bind succeeding Congresses, and should elected city officials be of a different political faith from that of the majority in Congress on some future day, one may very well see my prognostications materialize.

So, as to the financial aspects of the legislation before us, it is my sincere and considered opinion that the Congress will make a grave mistake if it enacts legislation which takes from the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses all authority, supervision, and jurisdiction over the spending programs of the Federal city and which delegates to elected city fathers the authority to what really amounts to the appropriation of Federal moneys, in the form of a Federal payment, for the operation and administration of the city's government.

Secondly, as I indicated earlier, I am opposed to this bill because I believe that, this being the Federal city, it should remain under complete Federal control. I have already stated that 9 million tourists from all over the country visit this city annually, and the number is increasing. These citizens visit the Federal city because it is the Nation's Capital, and all citizens should be encouraged to visit the Capital at some time during their lives. While they are here, they should have the protection of a police department that is not demoralized and under the control of city officials who would be influenced by pressure groups which have, in the past, raised charges of police brutality when the charges could not be substantiated. Moreover, time after time, in recent months, we have read press accounts of citizens who have walked away from the scene of a crime without giving any assistance whatsoever to the victim and who have not shown the good judgment and upright civic responsibility to even notify the police.

Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star on June 27, 1965, published an article by Miriam Ottenberg, entitled "How Area Residents Can Reduce Burglary." I read an extract therefrom:

> Last week on Capitol Hill, for instance, burglars struck the same house twice within 24 hours. They were seen hauling away a stereo set during the day. Late that night, they were heard dragging out a heavy object which turned out to be a 12-foot refrigerator. Although the owner was known to be absent and police would have had plenty of time to catch the burglars with the refrigerator, nobody called police.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIPS FROM POLICE—HOW AREA RESIDENTS CAN REDUCE BURGLARY

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Every homeowner and housewife can help reduce the vast number of housebreakings in the Washington area by following certain procedures to make them the eyes and ears of the police.

That is the consensus of ranking police officials trying to cope with housebreakings already running well ahead of last year's Washington record of a burglary every 56 minutes.

They base their urgent appeal for public cooperation on these fatcors:

Washington police are now solving less than a third of the housebreakings for lack of evidence. They recover less than 10 percent of the housebreaking loot.

Without an accurate description of the burglar or a timely call to police, detectives don't know where to start hunting. As long as they're stymied, the burglars are free to ply their trade.

BURGLARIES DOWN IN AREA

Burglaries have decreased, however, in the sections of the seventh and eighth precincts where neighbors have banded together to watch out for suspicious strangers and to alert police. Apparently the word is out among professional burglars to shun areas protected by the well-publicized "chain of watching eyes."

Although this neighborly mutual help pays dividends in fewer burglaries, police in other parts of the city cite case after case where housebreakers could have been trapped if a neighbor had bothered to call police.

Last week on Capitol Hill, for instance, burglars struck the same house twice within 24 hours. They were seen hauling away a stereo set during the day. Late that night, they were heard dragging out a heavy object which turned out to be a 12-foot refrigerator. Although the owner was known to be absent and police would have had plenty of time to catch the burglars with the refrigerator, nobody called police.

SUSPICIOUS SITUATIONS

Police analysis of the methods of operation of the typical housebreaker shows when a householder's suspicions should be aroused and what action should be taken.

1. If a stranger knocks at your front door and asks for Mr. Smith or wants to sell you a magazine subscription or offers to trim your lawn, take the time to jot down this information: When he called, what he wore, his race, approximate age and what he said.

It takes only 30 seconds to scribble a note like this: "At 2:05 p.m., a white man about 48, poorly dressed, green overalls, came to the front door and asked if he could cut the grass."

Your visitor probably had a legitimate mission but he could have been knocking on your door to see if the coast was clear for housebreaking. Your note would be a memory refresher if police later asked you if a stranger had come to your door that afternoon—possibly the man who looted a house down the street.

ODD-JOB SEEKERS SUSPECT

2. If somebody you've never seen before comes up on your back porch and says he's a friend of your maid or asks if he can do odd jobs for you, don't hesitate. Call the police.

In suburban areas particularly, would-be housebreakers start at the back of the house where they're more apt to be screened by shrubbery. If nobody answers the back door knock, the burglar can go to work.

Usually, handymen are known in a neighborhood. If you don't recognize this odd-job seeker or never heard of his friend the maid, the police want to know his identity. Don't think police are annoyed by such calls. Your call might solve a housebreaking or prevent one.

3. If you live in a section where few cars are parked on the street during the day, make a note of the strange car in front of the house next door. The color and make of the car are helpful but what police need most is the license number and the home State.

4. If you see a stranger at your neighbor's front door, watch him for a few minutes. In Washington, burglars enter most often by the front door. If he goes in the house, do not assume he has been admitted. He can jimmy a lock in less than a minute. Call the police or at least make a note.

5. If he emerges a short time later with a bulging suitcase or a television set, do not

assume he is a visiting relative or a television repairman. Some crooks take only cash and guns. Others, however, also take jewelry, clothing, and any appliance they can carry.

6. Do not be misled by a taxicab coming to pick up the stranger. Some burglars calmly call a cab to haul away the loot after they finish burglarizing the house.

7. If your see anything out of the ordinary, any situation that does not fit, do not ignore it. The stranger walking down the alley may be looking for an open garage door, from which to use the rear entrance to a house. The stranger leaning against a lamppost across the street could be a lookout man for his confederate inside the house. Most burglars operate in teams. Jot down what you see or call the police. Your house could be the burglar's next target.

APARTMENTS HIT MOST OFTEN

Nowadays, apartments are entered much more frequently than private homes, but so far this year, more than 850 residences in Washington have been the target of housebreakers.

The FBI's Uniform Crime Reports reflect that its sheer illusion to think the suburbs around Washington are free of housebreakers. The rate of housebreakings is going up much more sharply in surrounding Maryland and Virginia than in the District.

The housebreaking rate in the District increased by one and a half times between 1958 and 1964. But FBI compilation of police figures shows that the housebreaking rate tripled in Montgomery County, quadrupled in Prince Georges County, doubled in Arlington, and tripled in Fairfax. Only Alexandria showed a less sharp increase.

In the suburbs as in the city, police can use the help of householders to fight the housebreakers.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, this is but one of many stories which I could cite for the Record to indicate, as I have already stated, a laxity, a great unwillingness, and reluctance on the part of the citizens of the community to go to the aid of a victim, or to report incidents to the police or to offer themselves as witnesses to a crime.

The circumstances being what they are, I am confident that control of the police department by elected city officials in the District of Columbia would result in a demoralization of the police department, and diminish protection for the citizens, both white and Negro, of the District, and for the millions of Americans who annually visit this great city as sightseers and tourists. Additionally, the people of the country have to come to the District of Columbia to conduct much of their business. Lawyers must appear in courts and Federal agencies in this city, physicians and scientists attend research activities, conventions meet here, diplomats and representatives of foreign governments come here and live here, the presence of Governors and other States officials is required here from time to time, and the presence of Senators and Representatives and their families and staffs is also required here. If we are to provide police protection—uncontrolled by machine politics and uninfluenced by pressure groups—to the millions of Americans and to people from other countries who come to this city, the police department in the District of Columbia must not be placed under the control of elected city officials as would be the case if the bill before us were enacted into law.

I could develop my thesis further, but I shall not do so except to say, in closing, that this legislation, which provides for the popular election of a Board of Education, would, in my opinion, very likely result in the downgrading of education in the District of Columbia. One has only to recall the recent and continuing attacks on the track system to fully understand that the enactment of this bill would inevitably result in the domination of the educational programs within the District of Columbia by pressure groups which, in many instances, appear to be guided by emotions rather than by experience, training, and a full consideration and knowledge of the facts involved.

I certainly want to pay my tribute to the distinguished chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, the able and congenial senior Senator from the State of Nevada. I do not envy his task, but I do have a very high regard for the service which he always performs in his difficult assignment. I did not seek the chairmanship which I now hold, and I am sure that he has not sought the chairmanship which is now his, but we both view these assignments as responsibilities and duties which we, as Senators, must carry, along with many other responsibilities equally onerous. I hold only the highest personal esteem for the Senator from Nevada, who has made a very fine presentation in behalf of the bill. I share many of the thoughts and viewpoints that have been expressed by him and others who support the bill, but I have reached a different conclusion. I know that the Committee on the District of Columbia has toiled long and patiently in the development of this legislation, and I have waged no battle against the bill, but I believe that the viewpoint which I have expressed today in opposition to the legislation, albeit not a popular viewpoint, is one which carries with it the weight of difficult experience gained over a period of 5 years in dealing with some of the toughest financial problems of the District of Columbia. I, therefore, felt that I should express this viewpoint, hoping, indeed, that my comments might be of some benefit to my colleagues in this body and in the other body. I recognize that many of the citizens of the District of Columbia will differ with me, and I probably will be criticized by some, as I have been criticized a thousand times in the past. Nevertheless, I have stated my deep and honest convictions on the subject of home rule. I believe I am right in my opposition to this bill and justified in the reasons I have expressed. I shall, as I have stated, vote against it on final passage, realizing that this body will pass the bill. I love this Capital of our country, as we all love it, but I do not believe that the enactment of this measure will be in its best interests or in the best interests of the people of the area and the Nation.

I yield the floor.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized without the Senator from Wisconsin losing the right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. First, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it stand in adjournment until 11 tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the situation in Viet Nam, in the words of President Johnson, Secretary McNamara and others, is likely to get worse before it gets better. What the Secretary will report to the President as a result of his week in Viet Nam is, of course, not known; but it appears that the groundwork has been laid for a further intensification of the military effort in Viet Nam. Obviously, if this continues the American presence is going to assume the predominant role in that conflict.

There is talk of a reserve call up, extended enlistments, added defense appropriations and the like. It is even anticipated on our side that the war may go on for 4 or 5 or even 10 years and Ho Chi Minh, President of North Viet Nam, has stated in the last day or so that he is prepared for a war of 20 years duration.

It is interesting to note and not surprising that what is occurring in Viet Nam is now being called "an American war" by one columnist and another columnist states that in South Viet Nam: "It is real war there at last."

The President has gone down many tracks in an effort to enter into "unconditional discussions" to pave the way for negotiations which might end the hostilities in Viet Nam. He has met with silence or rebuffs at every turn. U Thant has endeavored in a quiet way to use the facilities of the United Nations. A proposed Commonwealth Group which would go to Moscow, Peking, Hanoi and Washington has been advocated and rebuffed. A representative of the British Government has gone to Hanoi. Mr. Mr. Harriman has gone to Moscow; all with no success.

It is my understanding that in the immediate past Ho Chi Minh has extended an invitation to President Nkrumah of Ghana to come to Hanoi but instead of Mr. Nkrumah going, he is sending Ghana's High Commissioner in London. A glimmer but only a glimmer of hope may come out of this meeting.

It is of interest, I think, to the American people to note the comments of General Nguyen Cao Ky, the present premier of South Viet Nam—one of a long line—in a recent TV program with Walter Cronkite. I do not have the complete copy of the interview but I am inserting at the conclusion of my remarks an article by one of the most competent foreign policy analysts in the nation, Mr. R. H. Shackford of the Washington Daily News.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that be allowed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. It does not make very reassuring reading. And if there is any complacency on the part of any American, it ought to be dispelled by an exposure to Premier Ky's comments.

What I have stated are grim facts. What the situation in Viet Nam confronts us with, however, is a grim fact. It is better to face up to this problem than to ignore it in the belief that it will wash away at the end of the Monsoons. The time for wishful thinking is past; the time for accepting the reality is now. Indeed it has been time for quite awhile. We are in, not for a summer of pain and difficulty but for an ordeal of indefinite duration and increasing sacrifice which will persist until the problem can be resolved at the Conference table.

Our policies so far have been mostly in the nature of holding operations, except for forays of our bombers over Viet Nam. The air raids have apparently failed to stop the infiltration of regular and irregular North Vietnamese units into South Viet Nam but instead, in my opinion, have hardened the position of the government and the people of the North and increased their commitment to this war. As evidence thereof, the estimates of the number of active armed Viet Cong has risen sharply since the beginning of the year, despite their reported severe losses.

As the war in Viet Nam increases in tempo, we should keep in mind the possibilities of Communist pressure against us in other parts of Asia and perhaps other parts of the world. I have in mind the uneasy truce which exists in Korea; the possibility of operations against Thailand and Laos and elsewhere.

At the moment the Soviet Union is furnishing a certain amount of assistance. The Chinese are providing some material aid to North Viet Nam although to the best of our knowledge no Chinese personnel have as yet entered the conflict. But if the war continues to escalate, Peking, Moscow and Hanoi will continue to be drawn more closely together despite any ideological or other differences which at the present time may exist.

As I see it, the chief beneficiary of what is going on in Southeast Asia at the present time is Mainland China. The Chinese are benefiting from events there at little cost and with little sweat. Chinese governments have long been adept at exercising the virtue of patience which they have in abundance. They can wait and wait and wait for events to develop to their interest.

During the past 10 or 11 years I have as one Senator, made a number of suggestions to our government as to what might or might not be done to stabilize the situation in South Viet Nam, in all Viet Nam, and also in Cambodia and Laos. The possibilities of further initiatives for peace become slimmer by the day, even as the alternatives become more restricted by the hour.

I would like to suggest once again, therefore, that the co-chairmen of the Geneva Conference of 1961, that is the Soviet Union and Great Britain, jointly reconvene the conference for the purpose of discussing the affairs of Laos, Cambodia, South Viet Nam and North Viet Nam to the end that all reasonable and honorable possibilities of peace and integrated economic reconstruction and development in the area may be investigated.

If it is not possible to call a conference covering all of the nations of Indochina, then I would suggest again that the two co-chairmen reconvene the Geneva Conference along the lines requested by Prince Norodom Sihanouk for the purpose of considering ways and means by which the Geneva signatories may at least guarantee Cambodia's independence and territorial integrity and this matter only. If Cambodia can be insulated from the growing conflict, that, in itself, would be a highly significant achievement for peace in Indo-China and Southeast Asia.

But I must say in all frankness, at this time, that a conference based on the consideration of the entire question and called by the co-chairmen would appear to me to be a more desirable alternative. I want to be clear, however, that if such a conference is not possible or feasible at this time, then I believe it is still desirable that a conference on Cambodia alone under the authority of the co-chairmen of the Geneva Conference of 1961 should be called.

There has long been a desire for such a conference on the part of Prince Sihanouk. He made his position on this question very clear some weeks ago in a letter to the New York Times and I ask unanimous consent that its text may be included at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit No. 2.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today, there are reports on the news ticker that Prince Souvanna Phouma of Laos has urged Britain to arrange a reconvening of the Geneva conference. In this connection I ask unanimous consent that the report referred to also be printed at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, finally, I would suggest that if there is reluctance or reservations or inabilities on the part of one of the cochairmen of the Geneva grouping of 1961, then in view of the gravity of the situation, the other would appear to me to be eminently justified in issuing the call for a reconvening of the conference on its own. The Geneva agreement of 1961 clearly provides for consultations when there are difficulties. It would, therefore, be entirely in order, in the light of the great difficulties at this time, for any participating nation, and particularly, one of the cochairmen to issue the call. I do not see how any State which recognizes the urgent necessity for peace and has eyes to see where the present course in Viet Nam is tending, can refuse to heed to call for a meeting of this kind. But in any event, there would still be some opportunity for the others to make a contribution to the restoration of peace if the conference is convened.

Perhaps the hour is late, but the old saying "better late than never" applies here and it applies with the greatest of force.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] for his patience and consideration in yielding to me.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 20, 1965]

GENERAL KY WANTS TO "REORGANIZE THE REAR": WINNING VIETNAM WAR IS GOING TO BE GI'S JOB

(By R. H. Shackford)

It is becoming more obvious each day that if the war in Vietnam is to be won—or even brought to a stalemate—American GI's are going to have to do the bulk of the job.

Each day brings further evidence that the South Vietnamese are in a bad way, militarily and politically. The unthinkable of a few months ago—Vietnam becoming an American war—is now routinely accepted here.

South Vietnamese Premier Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky has virtually admitted that the Americans will have to play a bigger and bigger role in the war if it is to go on.

He is the same man who talks with bravado about "liberating" North Vietnam while conceding that he cannot "liberate" the south.

General Ky is the flamboyant, high living chief of the Vietnamese Air Force who, for a month, has been the latest of a long line of unsuccessful Premiers.

He appeared over the weekend on a nationwide U.S. television show and gave some disturbing information about the status of his country.

First, General Ky conceded that the people of South Vietnam are "indifferent" about the war. Many, he admitted, will not participate in the war effort because they are disgusted with the continuous changes in government in Saigon and, thus, have no confidence in any government.

Second, he promised more confusion among the Vietnamese military and government hierarchy by promising another thorough purge of both.

This would be the umpteenth "purge" in the last 2 years—the Vietcong gaining ground on each one.

Third, more American GI's are needed, he said, so that the bulk of the South Vietnamese Army could "reorganize the rear." He suggested that U.S. troops hold "the perimeter"—apparently meaning do the fighting against the Vietcong.

The Ky TV interview was broadcast in the United States while Defense Secretary Robert McNamara was in Vietnam, receiving appeals from General Ky and U.S. military officials there for more American ground forces.

Mr. McNamara's Saigon trip appeared primarily to be a well-staged operation for preparing the American people for more bad news—because the decision to send more American troops to Vietnam was made long before Mr. McNamara left the United States last week.

The United States now has more than 75,000 uniformed men in Vietnam, plus another 20,000 off the shores of that country with the 7th Fleet.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff are understood to have recommended that the United States plan to have 179,000 men on the ground in Vietnam by the end of the year.

General Ky came closer to disclosing the dire outlook in Vietnam than any U.S. official. President Johnson has said the situation will get worse before it gets better. But no U.S. official has even hinted, as General Ky did, that the war is so close to becoming overwhelmingly an American war.

The Vietnamese manpower situation long has been deficient. For years there have been brave promises of major recruiting and conscripting—but each campaign has fallen short of goals.

The South Vietnamese Military Establishment usually is said to total 550,000 men. Less frequently it is explained that only 250,000 of those are Regular Army soldiers, the rest being various paramilitary units ranging all the way down to policemen.

The "numbers game" on the Vietcong goes on. Last week they were said to have 65,000 regulars, supported by 80,000 to 100,000 irregulars or part-time guerrillas.

U.S. officials claim that the rate of infiltration from the north, including Regular North Vietnamese Army units, has increased rapidly in recent months. Major "search and kill" operations, however, have failed so far to flush any large enemy groups for combat in the jungles.

In justifying the huge increase of U.S. ground forces in Vietnam and the plans for more, the United States emphasizes primarily the larger numbers invading from the north.

General Ky was the first to indicate—however indirectly—that another major reason for needing more GI's is the disintegration in the south.

EXHIBIT 2

SIHANOUK DISCUSSES CAMBODIAN CONFERENCE

To the EDITOR:

In your May 6 editorial (internal edition May 7) you analyze the reasons which impelled Cambodia to sever diplomatic relations with the United States.

You write that this decision stemmed from my convictions that I could avoid vassalage to China, by paying occasional "political tribute." A little further you say that I try to avoid Chinese interference in my country by making concessions to China in foreign affairs.

You attribute to me sentiments that are not at all mine, and thus you create an unfortunate confusion in the minds of your readers.

Last month I wrote in the monthly review Kambuja published in Pnompenh. I have never had the slightest illusion on the fate that awaits me at the hands of the Communists, as well as that which is reserved for my government, after having removed from our region the influence and especially the presence of the free world, and the United States in particular.

In an editorial which will appear shortly in this same review, I concede again that after the disappearance of the United States from our region and the victory of the Communist camp, I myself and the people's Socialist community that I have created would inevitably disappear from the scene.

I know the Chinese well enough to understand that they cannot be bought and that it is perfectly useless to bend before them, or to play their game occasionally in the hope of extracting some ulterior advantage. If I acted thus, I would be despised, and rightly so, by the Chinese people, who would not alter their plans one iota so far as my country is concerned.

But there is one thing that you Americans seem incapable of understanding. And that is that Cambodia has broken off with the United States of America not because it is a "pawn of Peiping," as you write, but for reasons of dignity and national honor that we have * * * placed on Cambodia, you display obvious spite in saying that the fault is mine and that because I allow myself to by "maneuvered by Peiping," the meeting may not take place.

As for the prospect of an international conference taking place on Cambodia, you let it be known that the fault lies with me because I allow myself "to be run by Peiping," that the meeting will not take place.

But then you immediately point out that this conference was intended "in part to provide a way for exploratory conversations on Vietnam." And this is repeated and emulated by all press of the free world. We Cambodians have come to the conclusion that the neutrality of Cambodia and our territorial integrity do not concern you at all and that this conference is simply, in your eyes, a good way to sound out the ultimate intentions of the Vietnamese and the Chinese in regard to South Vietnam and that you will link our problem to that of Vietnam, by refusing to give any guarantee whatever to Cambodia if the Communists remain intransigent on Vietnam.

The People's Republic of China, the Soviet Union, and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam have stated clearly their determination not to accept the government of Saigon as partner in an international meeting.

We, ourselves, are well aware that the government of Saigon has lost control of almost four-fifths of the Vietnamese border with Cambodia, and we are also aware of the fact that Saigon persists in claiming the coastal Khmères Islands, while the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam and Hanoi acknowledge our ownership.

Nevertheless—and in an effort to arrive at a solution in such a difficult context—I advised the British Prime Minister Harold Wilson, who had sent me on May 11 an urgent message, that Cambodia would accept the conference on two conditions:

First of all, that the conference should concern itself with the Cambodian problem to the exclusion of the Vietnamese or Laotian problem. Then, that the interested powers: Great Britain, U.S.S.R., the United States, France, and the People's Republic of China, should agree in advance on a solution which would satisfy all, on the problem of the representation of South Vietnam.

I pointed out to Mr. Wilson that there were four possibilities: (1) that South Vietnam should not be represented at the conference; (2) or should be represented by the National Liberation Front; (3) or be represented by the Government of Saigon; (4) or finally be represented bilaterally: one seat to the NLF, which is supported by the Socialist camp, and another seat to the Government of Saigon, which is backed by the free world.

I informed the British Prime Minister that Cambodia stands ready in advance to accept whatever solution regarding the representation of South Vietnam would be mutually approved by the great powers of the East and the West.

This will prove to you, I hope, that we are not the puppets of Peiping and that we do not put "spokes in any wheels" in order to defeat a project that the United States has put so long on "ice" and which now they discover has so many merits.

NORODOM SIHANOUK,
Head of State of Cambodia.

PNOMPENH, *May 16, 1965.*

EXHIBIT 3

LONDON.—Premier Prince Souvanna Phouma of Laos urged Prime Minister Harold Wilson today to help arrange new international talks on Indochina to negotiate for peace in Vietnam.

The neutralist Laotian leader, here on a 2-day official visit, met Wilson and other British Ministers at lunch in 10 Downing Street.

Diplomats reported Souvanna stressed that so long as the Vietnam war goes on the security of nearby Laos and Cambodia will remain in jeopardy.

North Vietnamese supply lines to the Vietcong in the south run through Laotian territory controlled by the Red-led Pathet Lao. This has attracted U.S. bomber attacks on Laotian territory bordering South Vietnam.

Informants said Souvanna, noting the failure of all efforts to date to bring about a Vietnam peace parley, suggested the British and Soviet cochairmen reconvene the 1954 Geneva Conference on Indochina. This dealt with Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos in separate settlements. Souvanna, who conferred in Paris yesterday with President Charles de Gaulle, claimed French backing for his idea.

Wilson and Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart were sympathetic to Souvanna's suggestion but were doubtful whether it would prove to be effective, the sources said.

DEAN RUSK, A GREAT SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at a White House press conference a few days ago, President Johnson was asked whether he contemplated a change in the office of Secretary of State. He replied:

> None whatever. I think you do a great damage and great disservice to one of the most able and most competent and most dedicated men I have ever known, Secretary Rusk. He sits to my right in the Cabinet room. He ranks first in the Cabinet and he ranks first with me.

This was an apt way of calling attention to the fact that we have as our present Secretary of State a man of rare ability, dedication, and character who brings true distinction to that highest of offices within our Cabinet.

The position now occupied by Dean Rusk is perhaps the most demanding next to the Presidency itself. As the study by the Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations—chaired by the able Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]—phrased it:

> A Secretary of State's duties are extremely heavy.

That study, part of the fine series on administration of national security, identified a number of responsibilities of the Secretary of State. Dean Rusk merits high marks for his performance in all of them.

The study calls attention to the Secretary's role as senior personal adviser to the President, both in private talks and at working sessions of the President's inner councils.

The President has often indicated how much he values Dean Rusk's advice in the innermost foreign policy councils of our Government. And understandably so, for our present Secretary brings to that responsibility a wealth of experience and training.

He was a brilliant student and, I am told, a very able basketball player, when, as a young man, he attended Davidson College in North Carolina. He attended Oxford University as a Rhodes Scholar and while there gave promise of his future profession by writing an essay which won the Cecil Peace Prize, an important university award. After a short period of college teaching he served with great distinction during World War II, primarily in the area of Burma, which gave him firsthand knowledge of a part of the world that has taken on increasing importance during his years as Secretary.

He joined the State Department after the war and rose rapidly to positions of high responsibility. In 1946–47 he served as Special Assistant to the Secretary of War, and in 1947, at the request of Secretary of State George C. Marshall, rejoined the Department of State as Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs, which later became the Office of United Nations Affairs. In 1949 he became the first Assistant Secretary for United Nations Affairs. In May 1949 he was appointed Deputy Under Secretary of State, and in March 1950 Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs.

Many of us who are relatively new in Washington lose sight of the fact that Dean Rusk gained this superb and firsthand experience in the State Department years ago, at a time when the State Department was operating under considerable stress.

The Jackson subcommittee study also notes the important role of the Secretary of State as "our ranking diplomat in dealing with foreign governments. As such he stands at the intersection of affairs: advocate of American policies to other governments, and official channel of suggestions and protests about American policies from other governments."

Dean Rusk excels as our ranking diplomat. As Secretary of State he has represented the United States at meetings of the NATO, SEATO, CENTO, and ANZUS treaty organizations, participated in meetings of the Organization of American States and the United States-Japan and United States-Canadian Economic Committees, and signed the limited nuclear test ban treaty in Moscow. He has met with the Foreign Ministers of nearly all of the 113 members of the United Nations. He accompanied President Kennedy on several of his official visits abroad and has participated in a number of President Johnson's meetings with foreign government leaders.

Dean Rusk's schedule each day is evidence of the workload associated with his role of ranking diplomat. A succession of Ambassadors, Foreign Ministers, and other dignitaries from other countries come to see him. The Secretary must prepare himself for each meeting, familiarizing himself with the problems of the country involved, reviewing the recent record of relations between that country and ourselves, and briefing himself on what the other country is apt to want from us—and we from them.

These are not simply ceremonial visits, but hard, working sessions, often filled with hard bargaining and exchanges that affect the foreign policy of our country and others. It is a measure of Dean Rusk's skill and poise, to say nothing of his hard work of preparation, that during the years of his stewardship of our foreign policy his meetings with Foreign Ministers and Ambassadors have been a quiet but unmistakable source of strength for American policies. He has won the respect of his counterparts in a wide range of countries, a respect that has survived disagreements by some countries with the policies he represents and expresses to them. His skill at quiet diplomacy has served our interests well.

The Jackson subcommittee study also calls attention to the Secretary's role as an "administration spokesman on American foreign policy to the Congress, to the country, and abroad."

This is a responsibility to which Dean Rusk brings an eloquent voice.

In speeches and informal statements, he has presented our policies and the principles in words that speak with clarity, vigor, and wisdom. There is no room for misunderstanding when Dean Rusk speaks. He has described our commitments in the kind of simple language that plain men can understand. As in these words from a statement during his first year as Secretary:

> It is not for us to fear the great winds of change that are blowing today. They are the winds we have long known and sailed with, the winds which have carried man on his unending journey, the winds of freedom.
>
> We don't have to argue with people in other parts of the world about what we are really after and what they are really after. Have you ever been able to find anyone who would rather be ignorant than educated? Or hungry than fed? Or sick than healthy? Or gagged instead of free to speak his mind? Or shut up behind a wall or barbed wire instead of free to move about? Or who relished the knock on the door at midnight which means terror?
>
> These simple ideas I have been writing about are the great power of the human spirit. Because they are central to our purposes, America at her best is admired and trusted; and America is at her best when she is true to the commitments we made to ourselves and to history in the Declaration of Independence. These are the ideas and ideals which give us allies, spoken or silent, among men and women in every corner of the earth. They are part of the unfinished business which is a part of our story. This is the basis of our confidence; this is the scope of our task.
>
> The revolution of freedom, which we have so proudly nurtured and fought for in the past and to which we pledge today, as in 1776, "our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor," is the true, enduring revolution, because it springs from the deepest, most persistent aspirations of men. History says this revolution will not fail.

Or these sentences from a speech to the National Press Club:

> Let us start from where we ourselves are and what we in this country should like to achieve in our relations with the rest of the world. Since World War II we have had more than one so-called great debate about foreign policy. Actually, the greatest debate of all occurred during that war, and the most eloquent voice was the war itself. Before the fighting was over we had concluded as a nation that we must throw ourselves into the building of a decent world order in which such conflagrations could not occur.
>
> The nature of that world order was set forth succinctly in the Charter of the United Nations, a charter backed by an overwhelming majority of the Senate and supported by an overwhelming majority of the Nation. It called for a community of independent nations, each free to work out of its own institutions as it saw fit but cooperating effectively and loyally with other nations on matters of common interest and concern. The inevitable disputes were to be settled by peaceful means; and let us not forget that the charter supposed that the tried processes of negotiation, mediation and adjudication were to be preferred over violent or fruitless debate. But parties in serious dispute were to seek the help of the broader international community in order that disinterested judgments could be brought to bear upon sensitive or inflamed issues.

Or these opening thoughts from a speech at the University of Tennessee:

> We live in an era when tremendous, often conflicting, forces are pressing for change. Among these is the force of scientific knowledge, expanding in a progression of endless and breathtaking momentum. We are learning at one and the same time the secrets of the more abundant life and of a more immediate destruction. For the first time in human history there is the possibility that the world can provide adequate resources to feed, house, and educate its people and to maintain their health and welfare. Yet this same science has brought about a radical change in the destructive potential of military weapons—with the power of offensive nuclear weapons for the present far outstripping the defensive.

Or this concluding thought from a speech to the American Historical Association:

> Perhaps it is a profession of faith to believe that the human story continues to show the power and majesty of the notion of political freedom. But the historian can find the evidence, and many have done so. The future historian will assess what we in our generation are doing to write new chapters in that story and how we emerge from this climactic period in which we sense we now live. Our commitments are deeply rooted in our own history, a history which links us in aspiration to the great body of mankind. If we move ahead with these shared commitments, we shall not lack company, for men at their best are builders of free commonwealths and a peaceful world community.

The Jackson subcommittee study also calls attention to the Secretary's fundamental role as head of the State Department and Foreign Service and notes that "he is 'Mr. Coordinator'—the superintendent, for the President, of most major activities affecting our relations with other countries."

In other words the Secretary of State is the general manager of our foreign policy, the executive responsible for making things work, for translating ideas into action and making sure the right people are at the right places at the right times to carry out our policies.

Dean Rusk brings great skill and experience to this responsibility as well. During his earlier period of service in the State Department he rose to the position of Deputy Under Secretary, traditionally the highest ranking career post. This gave him a solid grounding in the workings of the Department, and how they fit into the rest of the U.S. Government's operations in the foreign policy field. His expert handling of his own tasks as Secretary promptly won the respect of the professionals in the State Department.

This too has been a source of strength in operating the Department. Rarely in our history have the Department and Foreign Service been held in such high esteem. This is in large part due to Dean Rusk's expert hand at the helm.

What a record Dean Rusk has had. Let us consider that the first time since Stalin began the Communist expansionist policy, the West has stopped them cold in their tracks.

His policy of firmness and decisive action has blunted determined Communist expansionist efforts in Africa, Berlin, Latin America, and the Far East.

Many of his decisions during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations have been difficult, some of them have been dangerous and not a few of them have been unpopular.

But even those who have been critical of some of his policies have recognized the great ability and integrity of the man who took the major part in framing these policies.

Dean Rusk owed much of his early advancement to George C. Marshall, one of the greatest figures of modern American history. It is credit to this great man's memory that he so early discerned the remarkable qualities that are now at the service of our Nation in the position of Secretary of State.

I believe that for his quiet competence, his selfless dedication to duty, and for the eloquence of his language and thought Dean Rusk fully merits comparison to the greatness of George C. Marshall.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin in what he has said about Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk. I, too, admire him for his skill, for his courage, for his understanding, and for his sense of tolerance.

I compliment and commend the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin on the remarks he has made, because he has been speaking about a man who has served his country well, who is an outstanding public official, and a man who understands people as well as needs, and of whom we are all proud.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished majority leader. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and as the majority leader of the Senate, I believe his words should have very great weight with the country, particularly in this regard.

CHAPLAIN HARRIS' INSPIRING PRAYERS PRAISED BY UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am sure Senators will agree that the daily prayers offered in this Chamber by Rev. Frederick Brown Harris have provided both inspiration and challenge to us all.

The aptness, eloquence, and profound insight of the Reverend Harris' daily offering has consoled us in moments of suffering, uplifted us in periods of doubt and anxiety, restrained us from excesses during heated debate, and saved us from indulgent complacency.

A compilation of the Reverend Harris' prayers during the 87th and 88th Congresses has been published by the Government Printing Office, thus making available to the general public the offerings which have proven such an inspiration to us all.

An excellent review of "Prayers" was written for the summer edition of the Ukrainian Quarterly by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University.

I ask unanimous consent to insert Dr. Dobriansky's review in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAYERS

Offered by the Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1964, 313 pages.

This work is no ordinary book of inspirational prayers whose messages may or may not have pointed relevance to the dominant issues and problems of our time. It would be a grave mistake, indeed, to view it as such and thus deprive oneself of the rich and unusual opportunity of being intellectually enthralled by a unique combination of talents. Each prayer carries its inspirational value, to be sure, but this is magnificently blended with an overpowering elegance of style, a clear lucidity of penetrating thought, and a profound expression of innermost convictions and principles. It is not without solid and good reason that Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, is the Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, in reality the custodian or brotherly keeper of the souls of men in whose hands the destiny of this Nation largely rests.

For a full and appreciative understanding of the tremendous role played by Dr. Harris in our national affairs one must know the man himself. Through his weekly newspaper column the affable clergyman interprets many current developments in the light of theological and philosophical truths. He is constantly and acutely attuned to the throb and tenor of our outstanding problems. With genuine simplicity and humility his writings penetrate the essential core of the problem and demonstrate the numerous applications of faith and spiritual strength in its eventual solution. As many know, his knowledge of the captive nations and Shevchenko well exceeds the scope displayed by those whose official obligations require a bit more. In his foreword to the book, President Johnson pays fitting tribute to the man and his works when he says "Dr. Harris is a man who has enriched my life as he has enriched the lives of all who have listened to him."

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, the Democratic majority leader, and Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, the Republican minority leader, also furnish their eloquent forewords to this valuable compilation of prayers. Senator DIRKSEN by no means overstates the case when he points out, "I know this volume will bring an equal hope and assurance to many people everywhere." If others in the Senate were offered this same opportunity to express themselves, the book would unquestionably contain 98 additional forewords of glowing tribute. As it is, its size is impressive, including prayers delivered in the 87th and 88th Congresses or covering the period of 1961–64. Published by the U.S. Government Printing Office, the work was made possible by the passage of Senate Resolution 365.

Interweaving the complex questions of our day with the perennial teachings of the Christian tradition, the eloquent prayers offered here touch upon almost every conceivable subject of pressing importance. Freedom, interdependence, peace, bridges of understanding, materialism, patriotism, personal rights, captive nations, and numerous other subjects of current discussion are objects of deep insight and reflection in these prayerful messages. On patriotism, a prayer given on January 30, 1961, declares "We are grateful for the patriotism and fidelity of those honored by the Nation, who have stood as watchmen on the ramparts of our Republic in the perilous years through which we have been called to pass; statesmen who have given of their best and now, in the procession of history, step aside as the tumult and the shouting dies, and the captains and the kings depart" (p. 8).

Concerning the Communist conspiracy, Dr. Harris stresses in a prayer delivered on March 16, 1961, "In this dear land of our love and prayer, may we close our national ranks in a new unity, as sinister powers without Thee in awe plot to destroy the birthright of our liberty of worship, and of speech, and the sanctity of the individual" (p. 17). In a message the following month he extends this theme in these words: "We are conscious that it is a world where tyrants still deal in fetters and chains as they attempt to shackle the free spirits of men made in Thy image. We praise Thee for the multitude in every land with whom we are joined, who cherish freedom of body and mind more than life itself" (p. 22). At the end of this prayer, the chaplain emphasizes "In all our striving to defend the truth, preserve in us the grace of self-criticism, so that the living faith of the dead may not become the dead faith of the living."

In every sense of the word the author of these moving phrases is a clerical freedom fighter, whose deep-seated convictions on national and personal freedom are brilliantly reflected throughout the whole compilation of prayers. Just read these lines from a prayer offered on May 15, 1961: "In this day of global conflict for the bodies and minds of man we pray that Thou wilt purge and cleanse our own hearts that we may be found worthy to march with the armies of emancipation which bring both liberty and release from the want and woe which beset so many millions of Thy children and grind them into the dust of poverty" (p. 28). In another message on June 7, 1961, the author continues, "Unworthy though we are, Thou hast made us keepers for our day of the holy torch of freedom the Founding Fathers kindled with their lives" (p. 34).

Bridges of understanding and friendship also figure highly in the spiritual messages which are uttered almost every legislative day by the versatile Senate Chaplain. A prayer given on July 12, 1961, urges that "As this day, in this shrine of freedom, Western and Eastern hands are clasped in enduring friendship, and in mutual allegiance to the liberty and dignity of the individual under all skies, may there be strengthened and expanded bridges of understanding and cooperation which shall tie together in a resistless crusade peoples and lands, one in heart, though they be half a world away" (p. 45).

The theme of hope resounds in all of these prayers. "Grant that our hearts may be shrines of prayer," he prays, "and our free Nation a bulwark for the oppressed, a flaming beacon of hope whose beams shall battle the darkness in all the world" (p. 66). Such God-filled hope is indispensable for ultimate victory in the type of war we are engaged. Dr. Harris knows this all too well when in his supplication he avers, "Thou hast called Thy servants here who represent the choices and will of a free people to be servants of the Nation in a tense and tortured time, when the earth is plowed with violence, when brave freedom fighters have been met and temporarily subdued by the bayonets and walls of tyrants, and when wars and rumors of war vex the world" (p. 68).

Captive Nations Week couldn't be more properly initiated annually than with these prayerful words: "At the beginning of this yearly week set aside by this free land and sponsored by our national leaders, we would this day join in our supplications with those who pray from sea to sea for those whose sovereignty and culture and treasured traditions, whose individual dignity and self-determination, which are Thy endowment, are being trampled into the dust of servitude by the cruel might of oppressors who hold not Thee in awe" (p. 108). This long prayer, given on July 16, 1962, ends with the Biblical quote, "I am come to bring deliverance to the captives." A similar prayer on July 15, 1963, at the beginning of "this week of national remembrance," speaks of "the moaning of the captives and their wail, 'How long, O Lord, how long?' and we here vow never for expediency's sake to stifle Thy stern demand: 'Let my people go' " (p. 178).

As a permanent part of our Nation's history, these prayers register not only the faith and convictions of a great spiritual leader but also the throbbing conscience of a free people. This book is a valuable collection that every American should study in the quiet of his individual conscience.

Lev E. Dobriansky,
Professor of Economics,
Georgetown University.

TIME RIPE FOR 18-YEAR VOTE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there has been much interest in recent years, both in the Congress and the Nation, in various proposals to lower the voting age. Most of these proposals would have lowered the voting age to 18. We have only a few hours ago voted to provide eligibility for voting at age 18 in the District of Columbia.

There are many reasons for the steady growth of interest in lowering the voting age, but the primary one is that the military draft age was lowered to 18 during World War II and thousands of American youth from 18 to 21 have served our country during that war and the Korean conflict. Today, thousands more are serving in Vietnam and other parts of the world.

I have favored lowering the voting age to 18 for many years. As a member of the Wisconsin State Assembly in 1950, I introduced legislation to accomplish this.

Early this year, President Johnson supported lowering the voting age. A proposal to lower the age requirement for voting from 21 to 18 is pending in the Constitutional Amendment Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The question, "Should the Voting Age Be Lowered to 18?" was the topic for the eighth annual essay competition for Wisconsin high school senoirs.

The competition and the $1,000 scholarship offered as first prize were won by a Milwaukee youth, John E. Martin, of 2853 North Summit Avenue, a senior at St. John Cathedral High School. In his excellent essay, Mr. Martin argues his own case eloquently. I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Martin's essay into the Record.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Should the Voting Age Be Lowered to Age 18?

(By John E. Martin)

(Note: Winning essay, Thorp Finance Foundation, eighth annual competition.)

The right to vote is perhaps one of the most cherished rights of this democracy. The fact that this right has been upheld is probably because the American voter is a mature voter, who takes this duty seriously. This need for earnest concern in politics was no doubt taken into consideration by the leaders of this country when they drew up the Constitution in 1781. They bestowed the right to vote on the male, adult citizen of this country, and although suffrage has given women the rights to vote, it hasn't changed the need for adult thinking.

In this country's youth, a boy emerged from puberty to adulthood when he could carry a gun and march off to war. Today the laws have changed; a boy is an adult when he reaches 21. On the other hand, our draft laws say that a boy of 18 can go out and defend his country. This doesn't seem like good military procedure—sending boys to do a man's job. During World War II and the Korean conflict, thousands of boys died defending what they knew was right; they died fighting for American rights that were being endangered. It seems ironic that these young men should be giving their lives for a right which they didn't even possess.

Voting is a great privilege; it has to be taken seriously in order to achieve the high political ideals for which this country has strived. People who support the 21-year minimum voting age suggest that "this 18-year-old isn't mature enough to vote," that "he is given to rash decisions and immaturity." Yet a person who is rash and immature at 18 in many instances will still be rash and immature at 21. A young adult doesn't wake up on his 21st birthday bursting with mature concepts and logical answers to his problems, because mature thinking does not come with birthdays, but by responsibility.

The late teens are the most telling years of a young person's life. During these late adolescent years a person forms his ideals and approaches problems in an adult manner. Along with these ideals comes an eagerness to be responsible. Many people in their late teens have a very idealistic and avid interest in politics. If they see their desires and goals mirrored in a political candidate, they will wholeheartedly back him. Such political support was especially shown in the presidential campaign of 1964, when numerous youth groups zealously supported their candidate. This fact is even more evident when it was noted that both candidates took time to address these youth groups at universities throughout the country, although most of the audience was under voting age.

The acknowledgment of the teenager as a future voter shows that some people recognize the maturity that many older teens possess. If, then, this maturity and levelheaded judgment are found in a person 18 years old, and if the teens have and are still willing to prove themselves adult, adult rights should be granted them by lowering the voting age to 18.

THE PLOT TO STRANGLE ALASKA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in the May issue of the Atlantic Monthly an article by Paul Brooks entitled "The Plot To Drown Alaska," contained one of the attacks on the Rampart Dam project which is a part of a far-flung organized campaign to discredit that worthwhile and important hydroelectric project which has been under study by the Corps of Engineers for the last 4 years. The study is now nearly completed.

I requested space from the editor of the Atlantic Monthly to reply to this article and was permitted 3,000 words, which was somewhat less than half the length of Mr. Brooks' article. I entitled my article "The Plot To Strangle Alaska," and it appeared in the July issue. To my surprise the editor allowed Mr. Brooks a further rebuttal, and I felt it necessary to insist that I be able to refute his wholly incorrect interpretations of what I had said.

He began his reply by saying:

> I am happy to see that Senator Gruening does not question any of the facts of my article. He questions only the conclusions that I draw from them: conclusions that I regret to say still seem inescapable.

I have sent a reply to the Atlantic Monthly, which they expect to print in part but not in full. Therefore, I feel it necessary, in the interest of fair play, and of giving the opposing viewpoint an equal opportunity to be seen at least by some of the public, to place my reply in the Congressional Record, Mr. Brooks' article has already been printed in the Record; hence there is no point to my having it reprinted.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that my article entitled "The Plot To Strangle Alaska," Mr. Brooks' rebuttal, and my letter to the editor of The Atlantic Monthly be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Plot To Strangle Alaska

(By Ernest Gruening)

(Note.—Speaking from long devotion to Alaska and with high aspirations for its future, Ernest Gruening, Alaska's Governor from 1939 to 1953, and its Senator since it became a State, argues in favor of the proposed Rampart Canyon Dam, which Paul Brooks attacked in his article, "The Plot To Drown Alaska," in the May Atlantic.)

With Paul Brooks' aspiration to preserve the wonderful wilderness values, the fabulous scenic and other natural resources of Alaska, I am in complete sympathy, as my writings and utterances have long attested. When his "Alaska: Last Frontier" appeared in the September 1962 Atlantic, I inserted it in the Congressional Record for September 7, 1962, with the eulogistic comments I felt it deserved. To those who are Alaskans by deliberate choice, as I am, this priceless natural heritage, unequaled anywhere under the flag, with it togetherness of high mountains and sea, virgin forests, fjords, waterfalls, riotous flora, abundant wildlife—these, and the frontier friendliness of the people—proves irresistibly alluring.

Perhaps at this point I should qualify myself as a conservationist, and a fervent one. When I came to Alaska as Governor in 1939, I found that there was a bounty on the bald eagle. The fishermen's fear of its predation on salmon was reflected in this legislative bounty act. In my first message to the biennial legislature (1941), I urged its repeal, and on my third try, in 1945, I succeeded, securing thereafter that noble bird's protection. In the U.S. Senate I have strongly supported the wilderness bill and the impressive galaxy of national seashores and parks created by the 87th and 88th Congresses. I am a cosponsor of the wild rivers bill.

Where I differ with some of my fellow conservationists that in their zeal for the preservation of every feathered, furred, or scaled creature, they sometimes overlook the requirements of people. Man, too, requires a habitat, and unless it has an economy that will enable him to subsist, it is not a viable one. Let me amplify by saying, by way of example, that we should preserve moose (or any other wildlife) for its own sake, but so that man may continue to see moose, photograph moose, hunt moose, always in perpetual supply. Wise utilization, not mere preservation, is the essence of sane conservation.

Rampart Canyon Dam, I believe, is an important, desirable, and needed project and does not merit the active opposition which has been mobilized against it. The alternatives mentioned by its opponents do not remotely meet Alaska's needs. Rampart would bring in the wide diversity of industries which only its low-cost power can attract. In the controversy over Rampart, Mr. Brooks has swallowed the whole extremist-conservationist line; we have been hearing these exact figures, the very same laments and alarms, from the same sources which successfully indoctrinated him.

Mr. Brooks is quite correct in reporting that Alaska has economic problems, that gold mining and fisheries have been on the downgrade, that "the defense boom has tapered off." In short, Alaska needs a statewide economy to support its present and growing population.

To put Rampart in its proper perspective in relation to Alaska's overshadowing problem, some history is pertinent. Twenty-five years ago, Alaska, with a population of 72,225, was getting along comfortably with its two economic props: fisheries, principally salmon, and mining, principally gold.

World War II measures (order L–208 of the War Production Board) compelled the Nation's gold miners to shut down their operation, a restriction not adopted by any other of our allied nations engaged in gold mining; and thereafter Federal action compelled the industry—the only instance in our free enterprise economy—to hold to a price established in 1934 and to sell only to the Federal Government. With the rising costs of labor and equipment, these restrictions make continued operation impossible.

In 1940 under a government reorganization, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of the Department of Commerce was merged with the Biological Survey of the Department of Agriculture and transferred to the Interior Department as the Fish and Wildlife Service. Ira N. Gabrielson, who had headed the Biological Survey, became the new agency's director. It had complete control of the management of Alaska's fisheries and wildlife. As a result of the colonialist imposition wrought by Alaska's absentee-owned canning interests and their political power in Washington, the Organic Act of 1912 deprived Alaska—alone among the earlier territories—of the right to manage its own natural resources.

Mr. Gabrielson, though a nationally known conservationist, proved ill equipped for his Alaskan responsibility. An ornithologist, not an ichthyologist, he permitted the principal Alaskan resource and the Nation's greatest fishery resource, the Pacific salmon, to decline steadily. He disregarded the unceasing protests and remedial recommendations of Alaskans, who despairingly watched the salmon, and the dependent livelihood of the coastal communities, shrink steadily. From an annual pack of some 7 million cases production dropped in the 6 years of Gabrielson's incumbency to half that quantity, a decline continued under the sequent management of Albert Day, Gabrielson's assistant, so that in the last year of Federal control, 1959, the pack reached the lowest point in 60 years, some 1,600,000 cases. Meanwhile, in neighboring British Columbia, the same resource, though far less abundant, was adequately conserved.

As Ira N. Gabrielson is the principal factor in Alaska's plight and problem, past, present, and future, it is necessary to follow his activities further. One of his first acts as director of the Fish and Wildlife Service was to persuade Interior's Secretary Harold L. Ickes to withdraw 2 million acres, approximately two-thirds of the Kenai Peninsula not occupied by the Chugach National Forest, to establish the Kenai National Moose Range. Alaskans were denied a hearing. The figures indicated a moose population of 4,000, or 500 acres for each bull, cow, or calf. But along the thin fringe of land left for human habitat, between the Moose Range and the sea, only 160 acres were permitted to the homesteader with wife and children.

With gold mining nearing extinction and the fisheries disappearing—both the result of action by a distant Federal Government—Alaskans in 1957 sought a remedy in oil, which, it was believed, underlay the Kenai Peninsula, and invited some of the leading oil companies to begin exploration.

The proposal was savagely fought by the Wildlife Management Institute, whose director, since his retirement from the public service, was none other than Ira Gabrielson. The institute's bulletins unsparingly denounced the Alaskans—including me—who denied the institute's allegations that oil exploration would destroy the moose. Opposition was likewise voiced on the same grounds by the National Wildlife Federation. Those of us with a concern for Alaska's economic welfare knew that the incidental timber clearing would enhance, not diminish, the moose herd. One conservation society, the Isaak Walton League, dissented from its fellows, and, after much hesitation, Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton opened up a little less than half of the range to oil exploration. The result has been over sixty producing wells, three vast gasfields, extensive filings throughout Alaska, an oil refinery, an investment of over $300 million, and substantial revenues to the State. In short, the oil strikes saved Alaska from bankruptcy, a disaster which the extremist conservationists would have wrought had they prevailed.

As for the moose, they have multiplied and spread all over Alaska, becoming a problem in the Matanuska Valley, where they are eating the farmers' crops. They have reached Barrow at Alaska's northern tip and Kotzebue on Bering Strait. In fact, according to the knowledgeable Jim Brooks, head of the game division of the State department of fish and game, they are now too numerous. So the hunting season has been lengthened, and cows as well as bulls may be taken.

Though oil proved a lifesaver, Alaska still needed a Statewide economy. For although under the wise management of the State department of fish and game the salmon runs are being slowly rebuilt, and in the 4 years of State control have more than doubled, reaching 3.5 million cases in 1964, the population of Alaska has more than tripled since 1940, and is now estimated at 250,000.

The logical economic prop to which Alaskans could turn was hydro, of which only one-quarter of 1 percent of Alaska's potential is harnessed. As in the exclusion of Alaska under territorialism from the Federal highway aid, so in much else: while the older States had extensive hydro development, the only Federal project in Alaska is the 300,000 kilowatt installation at Lake Eklutna, which supplies electricity for Anchorage and a nearby REA cooperative.

The Rampart site on the Yukon in the geographical center of Alaska was long known as a great potential power site, probably the greatest under the American flag, with an installed capacity of 5 million kilowatts, two and a half times that of Grand Coulee. Rampart was estimated to generate electricity at the bus bar at 2 mills, which would at the time of its completion be the lowest cost power on the North American Continent.

In my first term in the Senate in 1959, I sought, and the Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, approved a $100,000 authorization for the beginning of studies by the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army. These inevitably must precede any attempt at authorization of such a project—engineering studies, marketability studies, fish and wildlife studies, and so forth. The studies included one let by the Corps to the Development and Resources Corp. of New York, nationally and internationally known hydro consultants. The firm was headed by David Lilienthal and others who organized and directed the Tennessee Valley Authority in its earlier days—probably the oustanding authorities in their field. They found that not only would all of Rampart's power be spoken for within Alaska as soon as generated, but that the demand would by 1990 exceed Rampart's capacity and require a whole river development.

While the studies were proceeding routinely, out of the blue came a condemnatory blast by Ira Gabrielson, which ushered in a nationwide campaign against Rampart. Conservation societies' bulletins inveighed against it and solicited funds to fight it. State fish and game commissioners were pressed to pass resolutions against it, and some did. Outdoor and sports magazines sprouted articles such as Paul Brooks' newspaper editorials repeated the message, all parading the same facts. Fish and wildlife officials proclaimed their opposition in public addresses.

So it was scarcely a surprise that the Fish and Wildlife Service's report, issued in April 1964, rehearsed, with amplification, the same chorus. The report echoes its concern for the already superabundant moose. Of course, it is conceivable that these intelligent mammals would not wait 18 years till rising lake waters submerged them but would amble out into Alaska's remaining 576,000 square miles. The small furbearers would probably do likewise. There is no certainty that the salmon—never before deemed important—would be destroyed. Indeed, the report expresses the belief that "a portion of the run could be perpetuated." However, in its place, or in addition to it, a great fresh-water fishery—commercial and sport, of lake trout, whitefish, and such other species as a truly creative and resourceful agency personnel could implant in the great lake—would far exceed the present "subsistence fishery," as the Wildlife report characterizes it. As for the birds, there is ample duck nesting ground in the vast swamps of northern, central, and western Alaska.

"Last, but certainly not least," Mr. Brooks worries about the people who live along the river. "Seven villages in the Flats would be drowned," he writes. Part of the campaign against Rampart is a persistent effort to convince the Indian inhabitants that Rampart would uproot them and worsen their fate. Representatives of the opposition have prepared a letter for distribution to the Congress signed by the village residents protesting against Rampart which repeats all the Fish and Wildlife allegations in words not utterable by these natives.

No informed person can sincerely contend that these allegations of injury to the river dwellers if Rampart is built are valid. (Let me say, in passing, that as Governor I sponsored and secured the antidiscrimination legislation needed to protect Alaskan Indians and Eskimos against their previous exclusion from various public places.)

Most of these villages exist on a bare subsistence economy supplemented by relief. Their children do not have a future such as every American child should rightfully expect. Rampart would benefit these villagers more than any other group of Alaskans. It would furnish ample varied employment: in the clearing of the timber from the area to be flooded and its processing in sawmill and manufacturing, in the guiding, boating, and fishing on the lake. Mr. Brooks complains that "no technical training program has been established for the native people." Quite right, and regrettably so. Neither Federal nor State funds have been sufficiently available, and President Johnson's antipoverty program is in its infancy. Rampart should and will supply the funds for the necessary training, but hardly before it has been authorized and the resulting work prospects are foreseeable.

In the relocated villages, at a location of the villagers' choice—either on the edge of the lake or on the river somewhere below the dam—because of the resulting flood control they will be free from the periodic flooding and will have better homes, better community facilities, a decent human habitat, and a livelihood which they have never enjoyed. Mr. Brooks probably does not know that no fewer than 20 native villages have moved voluntarily from their aboriginal location to secure a better environment.

The slanted and biased sensationalism of the Atlantic's presentation and the corresponding unjustified editorial verdict that Rampart is "an ill-conceived project" reflect little credit on the objectivity of Mr. Brooks and of his editor. The announcement in the April issue of the article "The Plot To Drown Alaska" shows a photograph of a cow moose swimming. The implication is, clearly that the moose is drowning. There is of course no "plot," and Mr. Brooks is unable to cite any evidence that the approach to the Rampart project differs from that which preceded the Tennessee Valley Authority, Boulder Dam, Grand Coulee, or any of the Nation's other great hydro projects. To create a lake which will occupy less than 2 percent of Alaska's 586,000 square miles is scarcely "drowning." Mr. Brooks should know that the cost of these hydro projects is repayable, both principal and interest, from the revenues of the generated electric current. If there is indeed a plot, it is a "plot to strangle Alaska" economically.

What is needed, and is so lacking in Mr. Brooks' last Atlantic article and in the attitude of Rampart's bitter end opponents, is a sense of proportion between benefits and possible losses. It is pertinent to note that Alaska has done well in the preservation of values that Mr. Brooks and I cherish. Our three superb national parks, Katmai, Glacier Bay, and Mount McKinley, approximate one third of the total national park area in the rest of the Nation. Each is different, and I rejoice in them. Even more striking is the fact that Alaska's wildlife ranges and refuges occupy an area more than double those of all the other 49 States, while our national forest area is the largest of any State. But the Yukon Flats—a mammoth swamp—from the standpoint of human habitability is about as worthless and useless an area as can be found in the path of any hydroelectric development. Scenically it is zero. In fact, it is one of the few really ugly areas in a land prodigal with sensational beauty. I believe that the great lake which would cover the flats would make a rare manmade improvement. But in the view of Mr. Brooks and his mentors, its present animal life renders it sacrosanct. The better opportunities for the residents of that area and of all Alaska are of no concern to them. The need and striving of a brave and gallant segment of the American people who have had to face unparalleled obstacles of both natural and manmade origin to work out their destiny are merely sneered at and traduced.

There is the true issue between us conservationists.

PAUL BROOKS REPLIES

I am happy to see that Senator GRUENING does not question any of the facts in my article. He questions only the conclusions that I draw from them: conclusions that, I regret to say, still seem to me inescapable.

I have no reason to doubt the Senator's appreciation of the wilderness values of the area with which he has been so long and so loyally associated, nor his claim to be a fervent conservationist—though some of his statements show less than complete understanding of what conservation is all about. His account of the decline of the salmon fishery, his attack on Ira N. Gabrielson, and his story of the Kenai National Moose Range are interesting but irrelevant. The question is simple: Would or would not Rampart Dam benefit Alaska and the United States as a whole?

Such points as the Senator does raise about Rampart and its critics have already been answered in my article. Though I do not happen to agree with him that no wildlife is worth preserving for its own sake, this is not the issue. It is not a matter of people versus wildlife. Wildlife is itself a vital part of the State economy. Hydropower may be another part. As I have stated, it is available elsewhere with minimum destruction of natural resources and without invading the rights or destroying the way of life of any native inhabitants.

Nowhere does the Senator even attempt to prove that Rampart Dam will accomplish any of the specific things claimed for it by it promoters—other, of course, than spending Federal money. There is no proof that it will attract the aluminum or any other industry to Alaska. The price of electricity of two mills at the bus bar assumes full-capacity use, which in this case is extremely unlikely, for reasons I have given. Glorying in "the largest hydro project in the free world," the Senator fails to mention that less spectacular projects may be not only less costly but more efficient.

A few points need clarification: (1) it is not a question of moose or ducks drowning, but of the destruction of their habitat, (2) equivalent habitat does not exist in Alaska's "remaining 576,000 square miles," (3) experts agree that the salmon run would be destroyed above the dam, (4) the timber in the flooded area cannot be economically marketed, (5) any mineral resources in the area would be lost forever, (6) the recreational values of the lake would be minimal, (7) the sale of the electric current will not pay for the dam unless there is a market for the current. As the report from the leading industrial consultants, Arthur D. Little, Inc., makes clear, Rampart would "produce a quantity of power many times the ability of present Alaskan industry, commerce and population to absorb."

Those of us who question the wisdom of Rampart Dam are not trying to strangle Alaska. We are trying to preserve the very values on which its future depends.

JUNE 30, 1965.

Mr. EDWARD WEEKS,
Editor, The Atlantic Monthly,
Boston Mass.

DEAR MR. WEEKS: Since the July Atlantic granted Paul Brooks a reply to my rebuttal: "The Plot To Strangle Alaska," to his twice as long article in the May issue entitled: "The Plot To Drown Alaska," I feel, in fairness, I should be given an equally displayed refutation because his reply is completely at variance with my presentation of my views.

Brooks starts by saying: "I am happy to see that Senator GRUENING does not question any of the facts in my article. He questions only the conclusions that I draw from them, conclusions that I regret to say seem to me inescapable."

On the contrary, I do question—indeed challenge—not merely "any of the facts" in Paul Brooks' article but virtually all of them.

I challenge his statement that the Rampart Dam and the reservoir would destroy most of the wildlife. On the contrary, I believe that with an imaginative and creative agency working for enhancement, not only would existing fauna not be destroyed, but new ones added. This great lake behind the dam, like other man-made lakes will breed trout, whitefish, and other valuable fisheries. The dislocated feathered and furred animals will find ample habitat in Alaska's vastness.

I challenge his statement that the account of the depletion of the salmon fishery under Ira Gabrielson's management and the story of the moose range are irrelevant. They are highly relevant because Gabrielson, who led off the attack on Rampart, stimulated the campaign against it, has set the tone and cited the case for the opposition, proved himself a complete failure when it came to conservation of the great Alaskan resource entrusted to him—the Pacific salmon—as well as a completely false prophet, when, in opposing oil drilling on the Kenai National Moose Range, he and his organization prophesied death and destruction of the moose, which, instead, multiplied. This is pertinent because it demonstrates on the record that the extremist conservationists opposing Rampart have been proved wrong both in the execution of their conservation function and in their forecasts. Hence, their gloomy predictions about the destruction of the wildlife if Rampart is built can be discredited on the basis of their past performance.

I challenge Brooks' statement that electricity is equally available elsewhere in Alaska. It is decidedly not at prices that will do what low-cost power can do, as it has done in Norway—namely, attract vital industries. Only lack of space prevented my describing that nation's achievements in securing them. They include nitrate and phosphate fertilizer production, magnesium from salt water, aluminum, petrochemical products, and much else.

I challenge his repeated allegation that Rampart is "spending Federal money." He should know that these hydro projects are repayable in principal and interest from the revenue generated by the sale of power.

I challenge his statement that the electric current will not pay for the dam, which he bases on the out-of-date Little report, which did not even deal with electric power except incidentally, but neglects the far more knowledgeable report by true experts and specialists in this field, namely, the Development and Resources Corporation, headed by David Lilienthal and the late Gordon Clapp, who are the outstanding authorities in the world.

I challenge his statement that the timber in the flooded area cannot be economically marketed. On the contrary, there is a very substantial market for it in the Orient.

I would point out that experience with manmade lakes elsewhere has demonstrated not merely enhancement of wildlife values but of scenic beauty, and among the voluminous testimony to that effect is the recent illustrated publication by the Department of the Interior entitled "Lake Powell—Jewel of the Colorado," which contains a eulogistic endorsement by Secretary Udall, whose credentials as a conservationist can scarcely be challenged.

In his foreward he says: "President and Mrs. Johnson have challenged us with an exciting new concept of conservation: Creation of new beauty to amplify the beauty which is our heritage as well as creation of more places for outdoor recreation. In this magnificent lake we have made such accomplishments."

While I do not claim that the lake back of the Rampart Dam will be surrounded by such beautiful scenery as at Lake Powell, since this whole area involved unfortunately is without scenic value now or potentially, the analogy is otherwise valid, and this brochure displays, on its first page, a poem by Gordon Michelle which reads:

> "Dear God, did You cast down
> Two hundred miles of canyon
> And mark: 'For poets only'?
> Multitudes hunger
> For a lake in the sun."

To sum up, I challenge virtually every fact and every implication in Brooks' presentation and refutation, including the ridiculous assumption that a reservoir occupying 2 percent of Alaska's area is a "plot to drown Alaska"; and reassert my conviction that nothing of value need be destroyed by the Rampart Dam; that on the contrary, human habitat, especially that of the resident Indians, and indeed of all Alaskans, will be enhanced; and that Rampart is a needed, wholly desirable and worthy project whose benefits would far exceed the fancied losses if those were truly endangered.

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.

ADDRESS BY WARREN DORN, SUPERVISOR FROM THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago I had the pleasure to join the Vice President in addressing the 30th Annual Conference of the National Association of Counties in San Diego, Calif.

It was a pleasure and honor to be host to our distinguished Vice President in my home State. It was also an honor to participate in the vital and important discussions of local, State, and Federal government conducted by the National Association of Counties.

One of the top speakers and one of the most stimulating was Warren Dorn, supervisor from the county of Los Angeles. Mr. Dorn's remarks were drawn from years of dedicated and exceptionally able service to southern California.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mr. Dorn's remarks be made a part of the permanent RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNTY LEADERSHIP IN SOLVING HUMAN PROBLEMS

(By Warren M. Dorn, supervisor, county of Los Angeles)

My fellow leaders of America's county governments, thank you for giving me this opportunity to join these distinguished colleagues on the platform to keynote the opening session of this human problems congress, the 30th annual conference of the National Association of Counties. The theme recognizes the changes taking place in the domestic problems of this Nation, as ever larger majorities of the people live in our metropolitan areas. The conference program includes workshops covering many of such urban intensified human problems. Housing, air and water pollution, waste disposal, public health, mental health, the war on poverty, civil rights, crime and delinquency, highway safety, and community planning and beautification.

Today we hear much about massive Federal programs to improve life for every American through the solution of these very problems. We realistically accept the fact that these problems are the joint concern and responsibility of the Federal, State and local jurisdictions. The result has been the countless partnership programs now in operation and the many new ones on the horizon.

All of these promise an improved life for every American. But, if this commendable goal is reached only through a shift to Washington of power and influence over our daily lives, then I am confident that I speak for all of us in local government when I say we want no part of such massive Federal intrusion.

The fundamental challenge confronting counties is to assert ourselves in matters that concern us. We must speak out against any unhappy arrangements that sap our vitality. We will accept State and Federal sponsorship only when such action demonstrates deep respect for our cherished principles of home rule.

In the partnership programs, decisionmaking must be shared, administration must be cooperative, and financing must fully recognize the ability to pay at each level of Government. Policies, administration, and financing terms cannot merely be at the will of some numerical majority in the legislature of any one level of Government. All the problems discussed at this conference have been and are fundamentally within the traditional orbit of county jurisdiction. In dealing with these problems, we use most of our employees, spend the most public funds, and get the most headaches. With the magnitude of this involvement, the voice of county government must be paramount.

We in county government enthusiastically support the four major concepts in the white paper approved by our association board of directors just a few months ago—charting out the role of counties as partners with other levels of government in solving these basic human problems.

These four concepts were: (1) a review of Federal, State and local finances to provide long-range solutions to the present imbalance, it being a fact that counties cannot participate fully in the solution of domestic problems without the necessary revenue sources; (2) that all national partnership programs have advisory bodies of State and local officials, so that local officials can participate in the administrative decisionmaking; (3) suggest that the President officially designate a White House appointee as a contact for county officials, so that county participation in national programs can be strengthened and made more meaningful; and (4) that our association meet with the council of State governments to develop suggested State legislation to strengthen county home rule and improve communication ties with State officials, it being recognized in many areas that State constitutions and statutes severely handicap progressive county government.

With these goals there can be no equivocation. Our challenge is to implement these goals. Counties must have a voice in the decisionmaking action as that action relates to county government in the partnership programs. We have the problems, we have the programs, we know the need—as it differs from community to community. We have the talent, the ability, and the desire to do the job. We don't have the revenue sources. What makes these programs costly, oftentimes controversial, and always a headache to every elected official in this room is that we have little or no voice in either the program content or the rules and regulations mandated from State and Federal bosses. We cannot administer, we can't innovate, we can't adjust to the community needs. We can't economize. We live in a straightjacket of Federal and State redtape—a straightjacket of rules we didn't write, can't change—and sometimes can't even discuss. We are required to spend money we don't have for things we don't need.

In my own county, the biggest headache is the massive welfare program. State administrative controls are so numerous and binding that the amount of local discretion is almost nil. Printed instructions for a single welfare worker weigh 105 pounds and stand 5 feet 2 inches high. Here they are. A shocking monument to bureaucratic inefficiency and waste. Each social worker's equipment weighs more than the equipment of a combat infantry soldier, battle ready. This is where the war on poverty should begin.

More than 2 years ago a blue ribbon commission was appointed in California to make a study of the State department of social welfare. Of major concern to the commission was the staggering proliferation of manuals, guides and regulations you see here. To date, not one of the reforms proposed by this commission has gone into effect. Their simplification alone could eliminate 300 employees in our county department. Once again, social workers could be caseworkers and not clerks—and clerks could at least be clerks, not robots.

We recognize that we must be held accountable for administering the program, but excessive bureaucratic controls can be self-defeating. Administrative machinery grinds to a halt like automobiles piled up on an overcrowded freeway. We must not spend the precious little money we have on such useless, meaningless effort—money that could otherwise directly contribute to the solution of human problems.

In addition to our participating in administrative decision and rulemaking in these partnership programs, we face the continuing specter of State legislature failures to give us the tools to do the job. Many State constitutional and statutory provisions affecting county government structure, powers and financing are of the 19th century vintage—totally inadequate for mid 20th century problems. Counties live in an era of the legal lag. If we fail to meet our problems, it is not by lack of leadership nor by default. To rationalize the power shift to State and Federal Governments for these reasons is totally false. We have not abdicated our responsibility or our desire to perform—rather, we are literally and physically unable to perform because of the status quo lethargy of the State capitol and the overeager fingers of Washington bureaucratic control.

It is true that, throughout our Nation, aroused county and other local officials are making some headway in reform legislation at the State capitals. In these partnership programs we don't want to be known as the "give me" unit. We want to be the "use me" unit. This we could be if State capitals will wipe out the restrictions that now render us ineffective. All we need from the Federal and State governments is the policy, and technical assistance. We will do the job—if they will only let us. Counties need broad grants of home rule. We want the right to do anything and everything necessary to solve the human problems in our communities. We need the right to cooperate with any other jurisdiction at any time on mutual problems. We resent having to battle for these fundamental rights and powers one by one, year by year from reluctant and uncooperative State capitols.

Perhaps an even more critical factor affecting county ability to effectively participate in the solving of human problems is the inadequate financing sources available at the local level.

The limited tax and revenue base permitted to county government has produced a budget squeeze unparalleled in county history. The property tax, the biggest single source of our revenue, has reached a practical ceiling.

We can assume certain fiscal obligations in the Federal-State-local partnership program. Historically, however, in view of our limited tax base, counties have never been viewed as the underwriter of such programs. Their financing is not our primary role—rather, we are the action partner. Unfortunately we now find ourselves becoming more and more substantial fiscal partners. I say that this trend must be reversed.

The money of our own local citizens should be collected and retained at the local level where the problems are, or should be returned back to that level without uncalled for restrictions, and deletions ordered by State and Federal bureaucrats.

It is pure fantasy to expect county government to assume additional financial burdens for the solving of these human problems—without property tax reform legislated at the State and Federal levels.

A case in point is the new war on poverty program—starting off at a 90 percent Federal-10 percent local financing arrangement. Later it drops to 50–50 percent. No amount of fiscal magic will produce 50 percent in my county. If this program is to continue and attain its national objective for a greater society, it had better stay 90–10 percent. It is unrealistic to expect the program to continue on any other basis.

My county is now facing the tightest budget squeeze in its history. Anticipating the problem, we developed months ago a comprehensive revenue program to present to the 1965 session of our California Legislature, which just adjourned. It was a well thought out program including new tax revenue source which we, locally, would assume the burden of imposing, adjustments in fees to be collected for personal services rendered, and to update State subventions and grants long in need of adjustment because of rising costs in State-county partnership programs. We entered this session with a $75 million program—all to relieve the property taxpayer—we came out with $775,000—a measly 1 percent of what we asked for: and these two bills are still on the Governor's desk for his approval or his veto. Since the property taxpayer has reached the limit of his burden, failure of our revenue reform program at the State capitol has caused a curtailment in many vital human problem action programs.

It is a foregone conclusion that the activation of the county's proper role in solving our human problems requires vast financial adjustments. Our challenge is to continue the frustrating task of getting them. We want the ability to collect and pay our fair share. It gets a little sickening to always be crying for Federal and State handouts. "A kept society can never be a great society."

My primary purpose this morning has been to motivate county leadership to achieve the remedies we need to make us effective partners in the partnership programs, and to diligently pursue our efforts at the State level to give counties the organizational and financial powers to meet the problems we face. The record shows that county leadership is ready to continue and expand its role in the solving of human problems. We cannot fail, for the very strength of our Nation and the welfare of our people, depends on the strength of our county government since it is the government closest to the people and therefore most responsive to their needs.

I have great confidence that you, the Nation's responsible county officials, will guarantee this urgently needed local government leadership. With such leadership, there is no power on earth that can stay our progress toward resolving humanities' problems of today and tomorrow. It was Emerson who said, "A civilization is not remembered by the size of its census, its cities, nor its crops, but by the kind of man it produces." Our civilization with great cooperative, action programs with full and proper participation by our Federal, State, and local government, directed at solving human problems shall sustain our unequaled American heritage and provide hope and inspiration to all peoples throughout the world.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am proud to join with the President of the United States and with the American people in observing annual Captive Nations Week during the week of July 18–24.

It is indeed fitting and proper that we recognize the plight of the 120 million people who are being forced to live under the dictatorial hand of Communist tyranny. By passing Public Law 86–90 in 1959, the Congress expressed its recognition of the need for freedom throughout the world, and the third week in July was set aside for appropriate recognition of Captive Nations Week.

I have consistently urged since coming to the Senate that the Congress act to call upon the United Nations to force the Soviet Union to end its enslavement of the Baltic and Eastern European States. I am confident the Congress will take such action, for I believe the Congress has a responsibility to do everything within its power to implement freedom and to keep hope alive.

I trust that our U.S. citizens, as well as others of foreign birth in our country, whose home nations are under Communist domination, will be patient with us. They may be assured that our Government is very deeply concerned with their problems and with the problems of their nations, and I, for one, look eagerly forward to the day when the observance of Captive Nations Week will no longer be necessary because freedom will reign throughout the world.

DUKE POWER CO. CASE PENDING BEFORE THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on June 30, July 7, and July 14, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD editorials, resolutions, and other materials indicating the stanch opposition of the overwhelming majority of people in South Carolina to the action by the Secretary of Interior on June 21. On June 21, Mr. Stewart Udall filed before the Federal Power Commission a petition of intervention opposing an application by Duke Power Co. for a license to construct a $700 million power generating complex in Pickens and Oconee Counties in South Carolina. By the way, this area has been designated by the administration as a poverty area under the Appalachia redevelopment impetus.

Since I presented the last material for insertion in the RECORD, Mr. President, Mr. Udall has indicated that he will restudy the matter and therefore he will evidently reconsider his petition of intervention before the FPC.

I am pleased that Mr. Udall is reconsidering. To help insure him of the reaction in South Carolina—which I am sure had a tremendous influence on the President of the United States and thus Mr. Udall—I offer for inclusion in the RECORD today many more editorials, resolutions, and other materials condemning Mr. Udall's action. I also offer an editorial commenting on Mr. Udall's decision to reconsider and also a statement by me commenting on this latest development.

I therefore ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the following material printed in the RECORD: An editorial from the Kinston, N.C., Free Press, dated June 26, 1965; a letter to Mr. Udall from the mayor of the city of Easley, S.C., Mr. B. L. Hendricks, Jr.; an editorial from the Charlotte, N.C., News, dated July 12, 1965, and entitled "The Public Interest Issue"; an editorial from the Abbeville, S.C., Press & Banner, dated June 30, 1965, and entitled "The Cause Is Finally Out in the Open"; an editorial from the Albermarle, N.C., Stanly News & Press, dated June 29, 1965, and entitled "Government versus Duke Power"; an editorial from the Carthage, N.C., Moore County News, dated July 1, 1965, and entitled "More of the Big Takeover"; an editorial from the Charlotte, N.C., News, dated July 7, 1965, and entitled "Bad Public Policy"; an editorial from the Durham, N.C., Sun, dated July 10, 1965, and entitled "Was the Senator Really Surprised"; an editorial from the Gastonia, N.C., Gazette, dated July 8, 1965, and entitled "Mr. Udall's 'Beliefs' "; an editorial from the Gastonia, N.C., Gazette, dated June 25, 1965, and entitled "Really, Big Brother, We'd Rather Do It"; an article from the Charlotte, N.C., News, dated July 9, 1965, and entitled "Udall Asked To End Duke Opposition"; an editorial from the Greenwood, S.C., Index Journal, dated July 8, 1965, and entitled "Not Competition"; an editorial from the Greer, S.C., Citizen, dated June 30, 1965, and entitled "A Step Toward Socialism"; an editorial from the Hendersonville, N.C., Times News, dated July 7, 1965, and entitled "Udall Argument Not Convincing"; an editorial from the Laurens, S.C., Advertiser, dated June 30, 1965, and entitled "Another Muzzle by Uncle Sam"; an editorial from the Richmond, Va., News-Leader, dated July 8, 1965, and entitled "Udall's Grab for Power"; an editorial from the Rock Hill, S.C., Evening Herald, dated July 5, 1965, and entitled "Unwanted Interference"; an editorial from the Rocky Mount, N.C., Telegram, dated June 27, 1965, and entitled "Free Enterprise Threatened"; an editorial from the Shelby, N.C., Daily Star, dated July 7, 1965, and entitled "Fallacious Intervention Position"; an editorial from the Spartanburg, S.C., Journal, dated July 8, 1965, and entitled "Udall Needs To Be Drawn Out"; an editorial comment from the Spartanburg Journal as printed in the Greenwood, S.C., Index Journal, dated July 7, 1965, and entitled "Comment"; an editorial from the Statesville, N.C., Record & Landmark, dated June 25, 1965; an editorial from the Westminster, S.C., News, dated July 1, 1965, and entitled "Duke Plans Are Hampered"; an editorial which was broadcast over Station WLOS-TV in Greenville, S.C.; an article from the News & Courier of Charleston, S.C., dated July 15, 1965, and entitled "Upstate Officials Ready To Fight for $700 Million Power Project"; an editorial from the Greenville, S.C., News dated July 15, 1965, and entitled "Udall Out on Socialistic Limb"; an editorial from the Greenville News, entitled "Skirmish Won in a Big War"; an article from the State of Columbia, S.C., dated July 16, 1965, and entitled "White House Pressure on Secretary Hinted in Duke Case: L.B.J. Reported Opposed to Udall Intervention"; and a statement by me dated July 17, 1965.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kinston (N.C.) Free Press, June 26, 1965]

We are not surprised that Duke Power Co., and Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall have clashed over the utility firm's proposal to erect a $700 million generating complex in northwest South Carolina. It is a matter that should be reviewed without prejudice by the Federal Power Commission, however, because private utilities are taxpayers—not taxeaters—to coin a phrase from the Great Society promoters in Washington.

CITY OF EASLEY,
Easley, S.C., July 14, 1965.

Re FECP No. 2503.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: We of the city government of this relatively small city, yet the largest city in Pickens County, are vitally concerned about the future of the proposed Duke Power Keowe-Toxaway project, but we are more concerned about the petition filed by your Department in opposition to this project. We, along with everyone in this area, shared with great pride this announcement by Duke Power Co. We were proud that we had, what we consider a local company, with the foresight and financial ability to undertake a project of this magnitude. At the time of this announcement we did not anticipate any problem in them securing a permit from the Federal Power Commission, and certainly least of all, we did not expect any opposition from a department of the Federal Government. We expect, and we endorse, the Federal Government developing areas such as this where it is not financially feasible for private enterprise to develop, but to deny private enterprise the opportunity to develop an area like this, seems to be a turn in a direction completely different from that which has made this country great.

The people of this area, and I am sure the people across this great land of ours, would greatly oppose this type action by our Federal Government; not because of this one project, but because it would violate the very principles that have made this country and this Government of ours the greatest.

At the present time we are included in the Appalachia depressed area, and we would question this classification at present time; however, if the Federal Government adopts a policy of denying private enterprise the permission to expand and develop as they deem necessary, then in short order we may rightly be classified as a depressed area. To declare an area depressed for the purpose of getting some funds in that area to spur the economy, and then to deny private enterprise the right to develop a project which would mean so much to the economy of this area, certainly does not indicate any consistency in policy. If the Corps of Engineers are desperate for a project, then may we suggest that they be utilized in another depressed area, and let this area thrive with a private enterprise project.

From the many factors involved in this situation, we certainly hope your Department will see fit to reconsider this project, and we trust you may find it possible to withdraw your opposition.

Sincerely yours,
B. L. HENDRICKS, Jr., *Mayor*.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) News, July 12, 1965]

THE PUBLIC INTEREST ISSUE

The remarkable thing about Secretary of the Interior Udall's attempt to thwart the Duke Power Co.'s Keowee-Toxaway power project is the absence of the familiar public interest issue.

Dispute between public and private power in the past have tended to be marked by Government contentions that the public interest would be frustrated in some way—or that public resources would be despoiled—by private enterprise. Not so, in this case. Nothing in Secretary Udall's intervention document challenges the Duke Power proposal on these grounds.

The fact is that the Keowee-Toxaway project is so plainly in the public interest that an attempted refutation would merely underscore the weakness of Mr. Udall's case. Keowee-Toxaway adds flood control, soil conservation, municipal water supply, public recreation, and wilderness preservation features to the generation of power. The Government's Trotters Shoals project that Mr. Udall supports—and that officials and the Legislature of South Carolina oppose—would supply only power.

What, then, is Mr. Udall's case for blocking Keowee-Toxaway? Apart from his gratuitous finding that Duke Power won't need the additional power it is willing to invest $700 million to get, Mr. Udall's case comes down to this: He thinks that the Flood Control Act of 1944 binds the Federal Power Commission to follow a rigid order of construction of projects in the Savannah River Basin. He thinks that this means that Trotters Shoals must be built first. Duke Power's proposal thus becomes contrary to basic policy adopted by Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1944.

There is considerable question about whether Mr. Udall is reading the Flood Control Act of 1944 as the courts will read it. He is depending upon certain language in a Supreme Court decision of 1953 in which Justice Frankfurter, speaking for the majority, wrote that Congress had apparently made a decision "on such questions as the location of projects, the purposes they are to serve, their approximate size, and the desirable order of construction."

But we must go to the substance of that decision to see how the court interpreted the entire act and, even more interestingly, how Oscar Chapman, a predecessor of Mr. Udall's, had construed it. The Court decided by a 7 to 2 margin that the Federal Power Commission had the authority to grant the Virginia Electric & Power Co. a license to construct a generating station at Roanoke Rapids. In so doing, the Court demolished the Government contention that Congress had withdrawn all sites mentioned in the Flood Control Act of 1944 from use by private enterprise.

Through the Secretary of the Interior the Federal Government was arguing in this case that Congress had stripped its agent, the Federal Power Commission, of any choice as to who would develop these 11 national power sites. Now a decade later another Secretary of the Interior is arguing that if the act didn't say that the Government had to develop all of the sites, it did say they had to be developed in a specific order. Thus, Mr. Udall contends, the FPC has no choice but to turn down the Duke Power proposal.

The Udall view runs counter to the evidence of history in power legislation. The FPC has been charged with the responsibility of seeing that power generation does not infringe on the public interest—that our rivers are not befouled and our natural resources are not squandered. At the same time, the FPC has the duty to grant licenses for private construction of hydraulic projects with appropriate safeguards to this interest.

Government's role in all this should remain that of the public agent capable of policing the efforts of private enterprise and willing and able to uphold the public interest by supplying power in areas where private enterprise will not or cannot perform.

This is a vital role, but it is a far cry from the one that Government has begun to visualize for itself of late. It is possible to suspect that behind Mr. Udall's insistence that Congress has tied the FPC's hands is the desire of big government to preempt the business of power generation.

We see little evidence that Congress intended to read private enterprise out of power development in the wholesale way presumed by Government spokesmen, most recently Mr. Udall.

[From the Abbeville (S.C.) Press & Banner, June 30, 1965]

THE CAUSE IS FINALLY OUT IN THE OPEN

The intervention of the Department of Interior under the name of Secretary Stewart L. Udall to the plan of Duke Power Co. to build its Keowee-Toxaway project in Pickens and Oconee Counties comes as a surprise. It brings into clear focus a fact long clear to many—the intent of the Federal Government today to completely socialize the power industry.

The only real surprise in the method of attack is that in making the move in this manner all doubt as to the intentions of the present administration is taken from behind the shroud in which it has been cloaked for lo these many years and laid naked before the people of this Nation. This one act pictures to a better degree than would a novel of a million words the depth to which we have permitted ourselves to become enmeshed in the slime of socialism.

It is now in the open—the cold war in which we have been involved within this Nation is now in the open and even a child can now see where we are headed.

If the Government can stifle the growth of this one great image of free enterprise, and thereby eventually place this one company at the mercy of the whims of bureaucrats, the day of privately owned power companies will be nearly gone. The squeeze can be added a little at a time, and gradually the Federal Government will take over the many satisfied customers of the company.

Perhaps those who have refused to admit the ultimate goal of the Federal Government until this time can now see the very real danger. Perhaps those who have permitted themselves to be brainwashed as to the ideals of free enterprise should be attuned to the effect Government ownership will have upon their individual pocketbooks.

This one proposed project of Duke Power Co. would result in payment by Duke Power of $20 million each year in State and local taxes, and $24 million each year to the Federal Government in Federal taxes. Think, then, how many, many millions of dollars in taxes the loss of just the Duke Power Co. to socialism would mean to the States of North and South Carolina and to the Federal Government.

Money to operate State and Federal Government must be had. The cost of operating both is increasing each year. If you destroy taxpayers such as the Duke Power Co., then where is all the money coming from? The answer to that is easy. The money is going to be raised by taking more and more from the small taxpayer—and that just happens to be each individual reader of this paper and every other individual in this Nation.

The day of pussyfooting by the bureaucrats and professional politicians (as opposed to the statesmen who are truly representatives of the people) is over. The declaration of intent to socialize has been sounded loud and clear. If this declaration is disregarded by the American people, the day of the complete socialization of this Nation is immediately upon us. Within one or two decades the truly American way of life—a life of guaranteed freedoms—will be a thing relegated to history. Children of this Nation will read of the "dark ages" in the history of the United States of America, when this Nation produced great men and when this Nation attained the position of the greatest Nation on the face of the earth.

But these people of the future will not be able to appreciate what has been lost, they will not know the joys of freedom, they will not understand why this Nation fought bloody wars in an attempt to retain its freedom. They will not understand why men went into Korea, Vietnam, Africa, etc., to attempt to block the spread of an idealism as old as man and which has been proven over and over again to be disastrous to the individual.

Citizens of a captive nation can never understand these things, and persons who have never experienced living standards on a par with those found only in these United States even today can never realize what has been lost to them.

If ever a marathon of letters should fall upon our Congress, it is now. The final battle for real freedom is shaping up right now, and we are not being unduly pessimistic when we say it now appears Duke Power and the people of this Nation are losing the battle.

Even though we lose, the transition will not be immediate. We will have an indeterminate number of years of freedom remaining, but look at the heritage we establish for those who will follow us. It should give each of us a feeling of failure and guilt. We can say it was not by our hand that these things were lost, but is it not by our hand that they are lost when we do nothing to prevent the loss?

[From the Albemarle (N.C.) Stanley News & Press, June 29, 1965]

Government Versus Duke Power

Duke Power Co. announced sometime ago plans for the expenditure of $700 million in construction of generating facilities in northern South Carolina.

Last week word came out of Washington that the Federal Government, through Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall, plans to intervene with the Federal Power Commission to block this project.

The intervention indicates that the Government wants to build generating facilities of its own in this area.

Previously, the Tri-State Committee, representing electric cooperatives in Georgia and the Carolinas, has filed an intervention document with FPC.

Thus the issues are being joined. The question is whether free, taxpaying, commerical enterprise shall be allowed to continue to grow, or whether it shall be stymied by a government which is determined to eventually socialize the power industry.

Secretary Udall claimed in his massage to the Federal Power Commission that Duke will not need the proposed generating facilities, and that it can supply its needs from Federal power projects. In other words, he would, under existing laws, make Duke dependent upon Government sources. Co-ops and municipalities have first call on federally produced power.

Duke's President W. B. McGuire said, "To the best of my knowledge this is the first time that the Secretary of the Interior or any other officer of the Federal Government has ever suggested that he knows more about our future power requirements than we do.

"It is also the first time, to my knowledge, that any agency of the Federal Government has ever taken the position that we should not build our own generating plants, but should buy our hydroelectric power from Federal Government plants."

The Government is planning construction of a hydro plant at Trotter's Shoals, below the one which Duke hopes to build. South Carolina officials have opposed the Federal project and prefer the Duke plan.

Indeed, it is a sad day for private enterprise when the Federal Government seeks to supercede the normal functions of business which are handled by private investment and financing. We cannot expect to continue our private, personal enterprise economic system if we array the forces of the Federal Government on the side of its destruction.

[From the Carthage (N.C.), Moore County News, July 1, 1965]

More of the Big Takeover

The latest chapter in America's march toward totalitarianism it seems, is going to be written in South Carolina. According to a news article published last week, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall is trying to block a Duke Power Co. proposal to build a $700 million electric generating complex in northwest South Carolina, in Pickens and Oconee counties, and has taken it upon himself to state that Duke Power Co. would have no need for the power that would be produced by their own project.

The action on Udall's part drew sharp comment from the president of Duke Power Co., and ought to bring even sharper comment from the Nation's taxpayers, even, or perhaps more so, from those who will not benefit directly, than from those directly affected in South Carolina. What seems to be upsetting the Secretary is the fact that the Federal Government has another power boondoggle of its own which it would rather force on the taxpayers in the form of a Trotters Shoals project, which Udall is currently recommending for approval during this session of Congress. Duke, he said, would have no need for their power plant, because sufficient power would be available through a 2 million kilowatt steam plant below Hartwell, concomitant with the Trotters Shoals authorization.

In effect, the Secretary is saying that Duke Power Co. should make itself dependent upon the Federal Government for supplying the future requirements of Duke's customers.

Both the South Carolina Governor and the South Carolina Legislature are said to have expressed firm opposition to the Federal Government's Trotters Shoals plant, and for very understandable reasons. Duke's project would generate some $20 million anually in State and local taxes, and around $24 million in Federal taxes, the other one, none.

We are firmly convinced that the Federal Government should step in where private industry cannot or will not provide services. But in this case, its intervention is totally uncalled for. It seeks to saddle the taxpayers of the entire country with a project that will cost rather than provide. When one considers not only the tax revenue that will be directly generated, but that which will be indirectly generated through dividend payments to Duke Power shareholders over the years to come, Udall's "intervention" is only further proof of his, and by association, the present administration's desire to kill that which has made this country great, the free enterprise system. We join our fellow South Carolinians and the officers of Duke Power Co. in the hope that the people of this country will not allow Udall and company to sneak this one over on us.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) News, July 7, 1965]

Bad Public Policy

Secretary of the Interior Udall plainly believes he has a legal ace in the hole in his opposition to Duke Power Co.'s Keeowee-Toxaway project. But what of the public interest? How will the public interest be served by Mr. Udall's intervention?

The legislative history of the appropriate sections of the Federal Power Act make clear its design as a stimulus to the private development of hydroelectric sites. The Federal role in power development is reserved to Congress and establishes as Congress adviser the Federal Power Commission—not the Department of the Interior.

It is to the FPC that Duke has applied for permission to build Keeowee-Toxaway, a huge, $700 million power complex in northwestern South Carolina. The project would meet power needs anticipated by the company in the next decade. It would provide soil conservation, municipal water supplies, flood control, and public recreation—the latter centering on a new lake with a 75-mile shoreline and hiking, riding trails, picnicking, camping, hunting and fishing. It would also supply millions of dollars of taxation annually to South Carolina—whose officials suport the project fully—and to the Federal Government.

It is in the face of this kind of public interest that Mr. Udall's objections fly. He makes bold to tell Duke's officials that they will not need the new power they say they will need. This ripe piece of presumption he bases on the ability of a Government project at Trotters Shoals to supply Duke's needs.

It is necessary to observe here that Trotters Shoals is opposed both by governing officials and the Legislature of South Carolina, that it has not been authorized and may never be authorized by Congress, and that even if it were built it could not guarantee to meet Duke Power's needs. Its first commitment as a Federal project would be to the cooperatives it would supply with cheap electricity and to municipalities.

These facts would seem to us to be sufficient to give the Duke Power venture all the support it needs. But it is necessary to ask the larger question as well: Why is there any doubt in anyone's minds about the right of private enterprise to venture a project that so plainly conforms with the public interest?

The answer lies in a serious erosion of the principle, bound up in the Federal Power Act, that Government should supply power only to fill unmet needs. Mr. Udall would in effect create a need for the Trotters Shoals project by blocking Duke Power's project. His opposition to the Duke project is based on fear that the need for Trotters Shoals will be lessened if Duke Power goes ahead with its plans.

That is what makes his talk about stimulating "competition" fall so flat. By blocking Duke Power's project and building Trotters Shoals, the Government would be directly benefiting only the power cooperatives which would have first call on cheap electricity. What has this to do with genuine competition?

Whether Mr. Udall can succeed in frustrating the Duke project remains to be seen. But even if it turns out that he has the heavier legal guns on his side, it will not justify his intervention. It will not make good public policy out of what is palpably bad public policy.

[From the Durham (N.C.) Sun]

Was the Senator Really Surprised?

Interior Secretary Stewart Udall is "a Socialist at heart" in the opinion of South Carolina Senator Strom Thurmond.

Thurmond was upbraiding Udall in a speech on the floor of the U.S. Senate for Udall's opposition to the proposed $700 million Duke Power Co. power project in two South Carolina counties and a western North Carolina county.

Secretary Udall favors a Federal power development on the Savannah River—the Trotters Shoals project—over the Duke Power proposal.

We have been under the impression for some time that socialism is no stranger to the Government in Washington. Surely Senator THURMOND must be just as aware of the thinking trends in the U.S. Capital. The Udall position should have come as no great surprise. We doubt that it did. But, it afforded the Senator from South Carolina an opportunity to get something off his chest.

As for the question the Senator posed in his speech concerning "How long President Johnson can keep such a man in his Cabinet," the answer would not seem to be too complicated.

President Johnson, who himself has shown a marked affinity for increased Federal power and controls, is unlikely to retain in his Cabinet anyone who does not go along with his own views. Conversely, he is likely to retain Cabinet members who act in accordance with his own views and wishes.

[From the Gastonia (N.C.) Gazette, July 8, 1965]

MR. UDALL'S "BELIEFS"

It is quite apparent that Interior Secretary Stewart Udall plans to stick by his original announcement to fight Duke Power's proposed $700 million project in northwestern South Carolina and southwestern North Carolina.

He came through loud and clear on the TV panel show "Meet the Press" Sunday. That is, he was loud and clear on TV; but his argument was as loud and clear as a wad of mud.

Somebody posed this question:

"In its petition to the FPC, the Duke Power Co. said that its project there would generate $18 million annually in State and local taxes and $24 million annually in Federal taxes. How can you justify a course of action that would deny the affected people and localities these benefits?

And his answer:

"Well, I would say this, because I have met with both recently. There are rural electric co-ops and municipalities that own their own power systems that believe that the Federal project will confer benefits on them that will be just as great, and really what is needed in this region of the country—the same thing we have in other parts of the United States—is a little competition between public power and private power. This is really needed."

Really?

It is, possibly, if you're the Interior Secretary talking, and you want to see your domain grow and you don't give a hoot about the private enterprise tax dollars that will roll into the State and Federal Treasuries as a consequence of private capital doing the building.

Now, Mr. Udall says he believes that the Federal project would concur benefits.

Duke power has set its plans down in black and white. It has stated what it will spend, and it has stated what will be the tax "take" on State and National levels.

Duke has taken the scientific approach; Udall has come forth with some suppositions.

If he has anything to offer, let him show it. Otherwise, he should keep his beliefs to himself until somebody calls for them.

[From the Gastonia (N.C.) Gazette, June 25, 1965]

REALLY, BIG BROTHER, WE'D RATHER DO IT

Just leave it to big brother, and he'll take care of all your problems.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall's intervening in Duke Power's proposed $700 million electric generating complex in South Carolina is an outstanding example of how far the Federal Government will go to put the bind around private enterprise.

Duke has applied for a license to build the Keowee-Toxaway projects in Pickens and Oconee Counties by 1971. "The projects will be needed," said Duke President W. B. McGuire, "to satisfy the needs of customers.

Now, along comes Secretary Udall with a typical bureaucratic intervention. He asked the Federal Power Commission, which must consider Duke's requests, that he be allowed to participate in any hearing held on the subject.

He said that Duke "has no need for the hydropower that could be produced by the project in 1971," because it can be met by the Government's Trotters Shoals project, which Udall currently is recommending for approval during this session of Congress.

Udall's petition, filed Monday, is the second indication of opposition to the huge Duke Power project. The Tristate Committee, representing electric cooperatives in Georgia and the Carolinas, filed an intervention with the Federal Power Commission March 20.

It is easy to read the handwriting on the wall. Udall, as Secretary of the Interior, has broad responsibilities in the area of land use and water development. The more Federal power projects he can get through Congress, the more feathers he will wear in his cap.

And as long as there is a possibility of spreading the rural co-op word—which isn't rural any more—you will find electric cooperatives like the Tri-State Committee saying that the Federal Government knows how to do it best.

Facts and figures don't quite prove this to be true, however.

It is difficult to understand why a governmental agency would try to hamstring private efforts, using private capital, taking private risks to build a giant generating plant that would be of incalculable value to the people in that area.

One has only to remember the book, "Atlas Shrugged," by Ayn Rand to find the answer. In this amazing look into the future of this country, she pointed out vividly just how the Federal Government is moving into private enterprise sectors, how, through pressures here and laws there, the free economy idea is being subjugated to the "interest of the public good," which, in most cases, is simply the interest of the bureaucratic hierarchy.

Duke's president said a mouthful when he stated: "It is the first time to my knowledge that any agency of the Federal Government has ever taken the position that we should not build our own generating plants, but should buy our hydroelectric power from Federal Government plants."

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) News, July 9, 1965]

UDALL ASKED TO END DUKE OPPOSITION

COLUMBIA.—Governor Robert McNair said today he has requested Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall to withdraw his opposition to a proposed Duke Power Co. power project development in South Carolina's Pickens and Oconee Counties.

And, the Governor said, he also has asked President Johnson to request Udall to withdraw his opposition.

Udall has filed an intervenor's protest against Federal Power Commission approval for the Duke proposal, on which Duke says it ultimately would spend $700 million.

In his letter to Udall, McNair said in part that "If Duke Power Co. feels that it is economically feasible to make this investment, I fail to see how the Government can offer opposition. This project would mean some $18 million in State and local taxes and some $24 million annually in Federal taxes."

[From the Greenwood (S.C.) Index Journal, July 8, 1965]

NOT COMPETITION

Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall has a closed mind on the proposed Duke Power Co. project in Oconee and Pickens Counties, U.S. Senator DONALD RUSSELL says. He reached this conclusion after reading a transcript of a Sunday TV interview in which Udall explained his position.

After reading press accounts which contained some of the transcript we have been unable to tell just what Udall was trying to say. He seemed to be making the point that competition is needed in the power field between Government and private projects. But if one of the competitors is going to set the rules such as how much power Duke needs and where it is going to get it, the element of competition has gone.

It would seem that while no good purpose would probably have come of the conference, there would have been no harm in sitting down with the Secretary of the Interior and explaining in some detail just what it means to South Carolina. Mr. Udall showed some lack of understanding and some lack of information on the project that Senator RUSSELL, Congressmen DORN and ASHMORE and the Senator from the two counties might have supplied.

[From the Greer (S.C.) Citizen, June 30, 1965]

A STEP TOWARD SOCIALISM

The Federal Government of the United States of America last week moved one more step closer to socialism with the blockage of independent business action of the Duke Power Co.'s proposed power complex in northwest South Carolina. Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall filed the necessary papers of intervention with the Federal Power Commission protesting Duke's application for a license for the Keowee-Toxaway project in Pickens and Oconee Counties.

We have watched with dismay the Federal takeover of individual rights and now we must stand by and watch the subsidizing of our businesses by the Federal Government. Castro did this in Cuba when that country went to communism. Can we be far behind when we see our Federal Government destroying private enterprise and taking more and more power away from our individual States?

Who's losing in this game? You, the people of America, you the individual citizen—you are being robbed of your rights and you are doing nothing about it. You are accepting as inevitable the Federal takeover, the Federal Government handouts, without realizing that each Federal dollar received is a sellout of rights.

Duke Power Co., proposed to building a $700 million electric generating complex. W. B. McGuire, president of Duke Power, said last week following Udall's actions, that "to the best of my knowledge this is the first time that the Secretary of the Interior, or any other officer of the Federal Government has ever suggested that he knows more about our future power requirements than we do. It also is the first time, to my knowledge, that any agency of the Federal Government has ever taken the position that we should not build our own generating plants, but should buy our hydroelectric power from Federal Government plants."

This is the second intervention of the proposed Duke Power project. The Tri-States Committee, representing electric cooperatives in Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina, filed an intervention last March 20. The Department of the Interior contends that Duke's power for the future needs could be supplied by the Government's proposed steamplant at Trotter Shoals and other projects, and by Duke's proposed steamplant at Middleton Shoals on the Savannah River.

In a further statement, Mr. McGuire declared, "the Secretary of Interior in saying, in effect, that Duke Power Co. should make itself dependent upon the Federal customers," and this would make "the will of the Federal Government even more broadly imposed upon the people of the State."

This is just one more big giant step in the Federal Government's takeover of rights from the States, businesses and individuals. How much farther are we going to allow the devouring monster of centralization to travel before we stop it? It's up to us, while we are yet free to speak.

[From the Hendersonville (N.C.) Times News, July 7, 1965]

UDALL ARGUMENT NOT CONVINCING

In offering the opinion the other day that a new department for urban affairs was not needed we said that what was needed was some better method of coordination of the many Federal policies and programs which frequently appear to be at cross purposes.

There appears to be at least an element of this in the intervention of Interior Secretary Stewart Udall in the application of Duke Power Co. to build an electric complex in northwestern South Carolina with some small extension into Transylvania County in this State.

Primarily affected in the Duke plans are the South Carolina counties of Pickens and Oconee, which, if we understand correctly, are included in the Appalachia development plans approved by Congress. In other words, the Federal Government finds it necessary to appropriate public money and to urge private capital to invest in the Appalachian area because the people of this area suffer from fewer economic opportunities than the remainder of the country.

Along comes Duke Power Co., a privately owned privately managed and tax paying utility with the proposal to spend some $700 million in a part of this area. The project would not only develop electric power but it would provide facilities which would increase the recreational potential and thus add to the general economy. But then comes Mr. Udall, who hails from the State of Utah and who probably has about as much first hand information on Oconee and Pickens Counties as we have about his native State, with an objection to the granting of a license to Duke.

Here we have one agency of the Government advocating one set of policies and another agency objecting. And, as is usually the case in these examples of cross purposes, the agency objecting does so because it believes some surrender of its authority is involved.

There is another example of this cross-purpose business in this case. The Federal Government, or some agency of the Government, has been urging private power companies to project their needs as far forward as 1980 and to plan now for meeting power requirements of that date. This is what Duke Power is undertaking to do in the Keowee-Toxaway project, but again Mr. Udall intervenes and gives it as his opinion that Duke will not have the need for this power potential, not by 1980 but by 1972.

Mr. Udall probably came closer to his real reason for intervening when he contended that, in any event, Duke could acquire all the power it would need from Federal sources.

We are inclined to agree with the statement by Duke Power President W. B. McGuire that "to the best of my knowledge this is the first time the Secretary of Interior or any other officer of the Federal Government has ever suggested that he knows more about our future power requirements that we do" and that it is also the "first time any agency of the Federal Government has ever taken the position that we should not build our own generating plants but should buy our hydro-electric power from Federal Government plants."

This, President McGuire said, would make Duke Power dependent upon the Federal Government for supplying the future power requirements of Duke customers in spite of the fact that Duke's contract to buy Federal power is limited to the excess not used by preference customers (cooperatives) and that even this agreement was limited to five years by the Secretary of the Interior.

Apparently, if Mr. Udall has his way, private power companies would not be permitted to anticipate and plan for future growth but would wait until there was an actual demand and then buy from the Federal Government—provided, of course, it was convenient for the Government to sell at that particular time.

This, as anyone familiar with business development knows, is not the way it works. Industrial and other development moves where it can be served from existing facilities.

It seems to be fairly obvious that Mr. Udall's real reason for opposing the license is that successful intervention will be but one more step in putting the Federal Government in the power business at the expense of privately owned, tax-paying companies. The Secretary's arguments aren't very convincing.

[From the Laurens (S.C.) Advertiser, June 30, 1965]

ANOTHER MUZZLE BY UNCLE SAM

We never cease to be amazed at some of the stands taken by the present—and preceding—administration in Washington, including the diabolical decisions made by the U.S. Supreme Court which, we concede, is not the creation of the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government but has proved to be a rubberstamp for most of its socialistic wishes in recent years.

Now we hear the usually quiet voice of Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall raised mightily in opposition to private enterprise. We agree with the label of "incredible" which Senator STROM THURMOND and other State Congressmen applied to Udall's opposition to Duke Power Co.'s proposed $700 million power complex in northwest South Carolina. It is another example of the Federal Government's continual grabbing for a greater stranglehold on the operations of private business. It sounds like another familiar tune in the repertoire of "the super state" envisioned by Karl Marx and others of his stripe.

How in the world the Secretary of the Interior or any other Government official could possibly know more about the future electrical power requirements of Duke or any other private power company is beyond our ken. Udall's position is that Duke could buy additional power from the U.S. Government's proposed Trotters Shoals hydroelectric plant on the Savannah River.

We become more and more convinced that L.B.J. and his colleagues, blowing the horn for the Great Society, are gradually—sometimes rapidly—but surely becoming the tools of the insidious Red machine which seeks ultimately to dominate the earth. Even if unknowingly, they are speaking and acting almost daily as spokesmen for communism, trampling or curtailing the democratic rights and privileges of freemen and private enterprise, espousing the cause of those who militantly and defiantly clamor, almost unrestrained at times, for unearned so-called rights for minority groups, and interposing the heavy hand of Government control wherever an opportunity presents itself.

We think it's high time the people ordered their Government—and that means Secretary Udall—to encourage, not stifle, free enterprise and to heed the voice of the majority who still believe in democracy and freedom. After all, this country was founded on majority rule, was it not?

[From the Richmond (Va.) News-Leader, July 8, 1965]

UDALL'S GRAB FOR POWER

Once again, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall has gotten himself in hot water over a hydroelectric power project, this time a proposed complex in South Carolina. Duke Power Co. has petitioned the Federal Power Commission for a license to build a $700 million complex on the Keowee and Toxaway Rivers in South Carolina, in order to meet projected power needs 5 years hence, when Duke must double its output. The company already owns the land on which the project would be constructed, in two counties declared depressed under the Appalachian Area Redevelopment Act. Duke's project would create a number of new jobs, and, when completed, would pay about $20 million annually in local and State taxes and about $24 million a year in Federal taxes.

But then Secretary Udall filed a petition of intervention with the FPC on behalf of the Department of the Interior. Duke, says Mr. Udall, "has no need for the power that could be produced by the project in 1971," because the company's requirements could be filled by the purchase of power from the $90 million Federal Trotter Shoals project on the Savannah River currently being considered by Congress. One Duke official remarked that this was the first time that a Federal official had suggested that he knew more about Duke's future needs than Duke did. It also is the first time that a Federal official openly has demanded that private power companies rely on federally generated power rather than on their own facilities.

Moreover, no assurance exists that Congress will approve the Trotter Shoals proposal, which has been rejected repeatedly in previous years. The Federal project is being vigorously opposed by State and local groups in South Carolina, although Duke's proposed complex has received enthusiastic statewide support. The Trotter Shoals project would take 23,000 acres of tax-producing land off the tax rolls; it also would flood 14 industrial sites.

The reason for Mr. Udall's opposition is not hard to find. If Duke receives the necessary approval from the FPC and builds its hydroelectric facilities, there will be no need for the proposed Federal project on the Savannah, and Mr. Udall would have one less dam under his thumb. The dispute now rests in the hands of the FPC, which will make the final decision. However, even with current trends heavily in favor of federalization whenever possible, it's difficult to understand how the FPC could decide other than in Duke's favor, and dismiss Secretary Udall's petition as nothing more than another bureaucratic grab for power.

[From the Rock Hill (S.C.) Evening Herald, July 5, 1965]

OTHER FOLKS SAY: UNWANTED INTERFERENCE

Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall opposes Duke Power Co.'s plans for a $700 million power and recreation complex in northwestern South Carolina and part of North Carolina.

Reason: Duke's project would interfere with the orderly development of the Savannah River.

This means that the Government prefers its own proposed $90-million Trotters Shoal Dam to the private enterprise project of Duke Power Co.

Ostensibly, Trotters Shoal is a flood control project, since the Government has no authority to construct dams for the production of electricity.

Though flood control is cited as the reason for Trotters Shoal, Army Engineers assign more than 90 percent of the justification to electric power.

The economic facts favor Duke.

The completed project would pay $24 million in taxes annually to the United States, $14 million per year to South Carolina, and an additional $6 million to Pickens and Oconee Counties.

Federal taxes paid by Duke would pay for the Trotters Shoal project in 4 years.

The Duke plant would provide the flood control necessary and meet all the power needs.

Secretary Udall assumes that only the Government can provide for orderly development of the Savannah River. The logical meaning is that he intends for the Government to nationalize development of the river in the name of flood control but in reality to obtain Government monopoly of the river's power potential.

U.S. Representative BRYAN DORN, a strong champion of private development, says that Udall has now openly revealed "his design to control the water and power resources of the Savannah Valley."

Senator THURMOND sees it conforming to the Government's efforts to "stifle our free enterprise system."

As Governor, Senator RUSSELL supported the Duke project. He has reiterated that support as Senator.

This seems a clear case of unwarranted and uneconomic Government interference where private enterprise is fully competent to do the job without cost to the taxpayer and with a promised $44 million tax plum to boot.—Florence Morning News.

[From the Rocky Mount (N.C.) Telegram, June 27, 1965]

FREE ENTERPRISE THREATENED

Senator STROM THURMOND has thrown the spotlight on a classic example of Federal interference with private enterprise, interference which is based on no solid reason and really offers no valid excuse.

Duke Power Co. has proposed to build a $700 million power project in South Carolina that would encompass three counties. For years Duke Power has been embarked on an expansion program, a program resulting only from long-range planning and close study of future needs in the South. This new proposed project was based on long-range future needs.

Now it seems that Stewart Udall doesn't like this project. Stewart Udall is Secretary of the Interior, and an ardent advocate of Federal power projects. So he has moved to choke off this free enterprise expansion plan.

What are the grounds for such a move? Apparently he feels he needs none. Senator THURMOND has told Udall such opposition is incredible. He reminded Udall in a telegram that the three counties involved in the project have been included in the administration's Appalachia and antipoverty programs.

"This project will cost the taxpayers nothing," pointed out THURMOND, "but rather will provide $18 million annually in State and local receipts and another $24 million for the National Government. In addition it would greatly help an area officially declared depressed by the Johnson poverty czars.

Udall's petition to intervene before the Federal Power Commission to oppose the Duke project is inconsistent with the two administration programs to fight poverty. It does seem to conform, however, to the administration's efforts to stiffle our free enterprise system.

How can Udall possibly know better than Duke Power Co. what the power needs of that company will be in the 1970s and on into the future? Duke has exercised cautious and sound judgment in planning for the future and in selecting this particular site in South Carolina where there is no question of any competing Federal power project.

Why should not Duke Power be permitted to risk a $700 million investment to develop a location where the Federal Government (and Udall) has not even proposed a Federal project which offers any advantages in power development, navigation, flood control, or recreational facilities?

Udall's opposition to the Duke project is an acknowledgment by Udall that a Federal dam at Trotters Shoals on the Savannah River is not needed for power. What it boils down to, simply, is that Udall is opposed to private power company operations and would, if permitted, stiffle any improvements and expansion by private power companies, regardless of the needs of the area, or in spite of the fact that such private activities would not be interfering with Federal projects.

[From the Shelby (N.C.) Daily Star, July 7, 1965]

FALLACIOUS INTERVENTION POSITION

Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall's attempted monkey-wrench work on Duke Power Co.'s Keowee-Toxaway power project is terrifyingly ridiculous.

Fallacious from the word go is his straight-faced contention that what this section of the country really needs "is a little competition between public power and private power. This is really needed."

That's pure, unadulterated hogwash.

Udall's asinine assessment of the southern situation is tantamount to arguing that what this section of the country really needs is complsory unionism (through repeal of section 14(b) of Taft-Hartley) to assure economic progress. Yet the fantastic industrial and overall economic progress realized in this area in the past decade is as vigorous, or more so, than gains made anywhere in the Nation.

The Secretary should know that competition in the market place is a keystone of the American economic system. But, traditionally, it has not been the Federal Government's function to provide that competition. The Federal Power Commission does have legitimate regulatory functions.

Equally as fallacious is the Udall argument—cast upon the waters during a Sunday "Meet the Press" interview on television—that Federal power projects generate as many benefits to an area as private power. This is not borne out by the experience of some areas adjacent to such as the Clark Hill project on the Savannah River between South Carolina and Georgia.

That reservoir certainly has not been a magnet to new industry. Impounded water certainly has not been made available to non-Federal interests free of charge as has been the Duke policy at each of its hydroelectric facilities. Tax revenue benefits certainly have not accrued to the State, local, or Federal treasuries.

The Government has not found it easy, through its Southeastern Power Administration, to market the power it has available. When the SPA's sale activities were much in the news in early 1964 a South Carolina newspaper reported: "Only five South Carolina towns * * * chose to sign the contracts from a number of eligible municipalities variously listed from 10 to 17. In North Carolina, the percentage was even less. Only 3 of 20 eligible towns (Shelby was on the eligibility list but declined) entered the contracts. But across the Savannah River in Georgia, 49 of 50 eligible towns signed contracts with the Government."

Although Georgia has consistently been more prone to embrace this sort of thing, the project at issue—Keowee-Toxaway—involves primarily South Carolina. And official bodies from the legislature down to and including the town boards of Seneca, Salem, Liberty, Clemson, Easley, Pickens, and Walhalla have endorsed the project.

Udall and company would be hard-pressed to match benefits statistics with Duke Power. Aside from contributing greatly to the industrialization of the two Carolinas, Duke Power offers residential customers an average rate which is 20 percent below the national average. Those customers use power at an average rate which is 41.8 percent above the national level. Last December 1, Duke filed a request for its 16th rate reduction, 4 of which were made in the last 4 years.

While projects of the type envisioned by Udall eat heavily into the public till, Duke Power contributes. The company reports having paid $540 million in Federal, State, and local taxes in the past 20 years. Taxes paid at all levels in 1963 amounted to 24 cents of each dollar of revenue.

If Udall's recently filed petition of intervention proves anything at all, it is that one of the things this section of the country really needs is less ill-conceived intervention by the likes of the Secretary of the Interior.

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Journal, July 8, 1965]

UDALL NEEDS TO BE DRAWN OUT

Secretary of the Interior Udall is either misinformed about the nature of the Duke Power development in the headwaters of the Savannah River in northwestern South Carolina and southwestern North Carolina or he is trying to launch a public power policy far ahead of anything ever approved by the Congress or suggested by an administration.

The now cancelled South Carolina conference with Udall could have been benefical in helping to pin down Udall's position.

The Duke development in the Savannah headwaters will in no way interfer with the existing Hartwell and Clark's Hill public power dams or the proposed Trotters Shoals. Just the opposite would be true. The Duke dams would help to stabilize the river flow, impound excess waters in flood periods and release these to maintain a normal stream flow in drought periods.

Specifications for Trotters Shoals have already been altered to make the big public power dam and a Duke stream plant compatible.

Now if Udall wants to force Duke to buy power from Government hydro projects, as has been reported, then he is opening up an entire new field which at this time lacks authorization. The quicker this is established the better.

[From the Greenwood (S.C.) Index Journal, July 7, 1965]

COMMENT

Udall's suggestion that Duke's power needs can be met through the proposed Government Trotters Shoals Dam on Savannah River is not enough. In fact it is impertinent that a Government agency should presume to tell a private power company how to run its business.

Trotters Shoals should be built if needed. But it has no connection with and should not be linked with the plans of a private company. Udall's interest should be confined to whether or not Duke's plans conflict with Hartwell, Clark's Hill, and the proposed Trotters Shoals and there has been no evidence that it does.

[From the Statesville (N.C.) Record and Landmark, June 25, 1965]

Wrong direction—Interior Secretary Stewart Udall has intervened with the Federal Power Commission in an effort to block Duke Power Co.'s plans to develop a $700 million generating complex in northwest South Carolina.

And here again, it seems to us, the Federal Government is moving in exactly the wrong direction. Instead of trying to get deeper into the power business, it ought to be trying to return the projects it now owns to the free enterprise system.

In trying to block a private power company from spending its own money in developing the natural resources of its own area, Udall is taking the position that the Government can do it better through the use of tax funds.

Not only that. He is saying that the Government knows what is best for Duke Power Co. He declares at one point in his petition that Duke "has no need for the hydropower that could be produced by the project in 1971"; and at another place he says Duke "has no need for steam electric power from a plant located on the Keowee Reservoir about 1972 or later."

Why? Because he is asking Congress for funds to develop the Trotters Shoals project, which could supply Duke with all the hydro and steam power it needs. In other words, Duke officials should not be allowed to anticipate their own needs if the Government can do it for them.

Thus, our Government moves deeper and deeper into the power generating business in competition with private power. Not only that, it is getting deeper and deeper into housing and urban affairs and, pretty soon, will be taking a hand in mass transportation.

These businesses are being nationalized through the back door at the very time when other countries, notably West Germany, are moving in the other direction.

At the end of World War II, West Germany found itself in possession of many businesses and industries which had been seized or developed during the reign of the Nazis. These included everything from power firms to automobile plants.

Ludwig Erhard, who guided West Germany's economic destiny for 14 years before becoming Chancellor, began to search for ways to get the ownership of these industries back into the hands of the people. In this, he had the ardent support of Hermann Lindrath, who had become Minister of federally owned property.

As a first step, it was decided to offer shares in PREUSSAG, a coal-oil-mineral combine employing 20,000 persons and doing a $200 million business, to the public.

"We anticipated 60,000 buyers," Lindrath said. "More than 200,000 signed immediately the lists were opened."

The first offering was so successful that a second was made, with like results. Finally, the Government ended up owning less than 25 percent of the total shares.

Under the terms of the public sale, the stock was made available to employees or others earning less than $4,000; and no one could hold more than one one-hundredth of the total.

Then the government decided to sell shares in the Volkswagen works, the biggest automobile producing firm in Europe. And here again the Government underestimated. More than 1,500,000 persons signed up for shares.

This summer the Government will sell shares in VERBA, a Government-owned coal and power firm doing an annual business of $112 million. And others will follow.

"True freedom," Lindrath said, in discussing the program, "is unthinkable without property. The possibility to dispose over personal property in its various forms assures the individual greater security and greater independence of the vagaries of life than the Federal Constitution is capable of doing. And it provides the basis for a special tie to and responsibility for the state and society."

Debating the issue in parliament, Werner Dollinger, who succeeded Lindrath, said:

"Public moneys, whether they come from the Federal, State or municipal budgets, are always tax moneys. To use tax moneys to fill the capital need of a federally owned undertaking means nothing less than to make the citizen poorer while making the state richer and more powerful.

"Without personal, freely disposable property, the preservation of our personal freedom against collectivism is in the long run not possible.

"Above all, we believe a man who owns something thinks differently from a man who does not. A man thinks and reacts with more responsibility when a decision involves his own property."

Oh, well. We are too busy building the Great Society to worry with such details as individual responsibility.

[From the Westminister (S.C.) News, July 1, 1965]

Duke Plans Are Hampered

It would seem that the Secretary of Interior has gone out of his way to oppose Duke Power Co.'s plans for developing on the Keowee and Seneca Rivers.

Recently announced opposition to the proposal by the Secretary seems to not be in keeping with the best interest of most people.

Duke has announced plans for building power generation facilities and will pay both State and Federal taxes in sizable amounts. In addition, if this project is approved, a tax bonanza for Oconee would be forthcoming. This, we assure you, is needed for our schools and other county needs.

Just exactly why the Secretary of the Interior has taken this position is not clear. Thus far, he has not given any substantial reason for this action.

We, along with others, have been led to believe that facilities at Trotters shoals, near Anderson, had been working out satisfactorily and in the best interests of both Duke and Government plans.

Now, the Secretary suggests that Duke purchase its power from the proposed Trotter Shoals Dam. Duke has contended this will not meet the ultimate needs of the growing Piedmont.

While we have believed all the while there is a need for both public and private development of power facilities, we do not hold the opinion that either should dominate the other.

We personally feel that Duke's proposal for a $700 million power complex in Pickens and Oconee is in keeping with the best interests of both the public and private enterprise.

We cannot, at this point, understand the Secretary's position. It is our sincere hope that reason will prevail in this situation, and that the best interests of all the people will be held above political dealing. Certainly every citizen of Oconee County should be greatly interested in whether or not this proposal is approved for construction. And there would be nothing wrong in letting officials in Washington know exactly how we feel concerning it.

This project can make a big difference in developing our potential—not only in South Carolina, but the entire Southeast.

WLOS–TV Broadcast, June 28, 1965

It seems incredible, but it's true. The Federal Government is attempting to block a $700 million private development in Oconee, Pickens, and Transylvania Counties.

Duke Power Co. has applied to the Federal Power Commission for a license to construct a giant steam and hydroelectric facility in northwest South Carolina. But the project promises benefits far beyond abundant power.

Duke Power has acquired almost 156 square miles of land.

Its holdings are wild, remote, and breathtakingly beautiful. Four bold streams cascade down from the highlands of North Carolina. Below, in South Carolina, the water would be captured in two huge lakes. Their surface area would total 28 square miles. Their shorelines would stretch for 300 miles. The lakes would be open to the public for fishing, boating, and swimming. Land around them would be leased to private developers for campgrounds, picnic areas, golf courses, dude ranches, tourist accommodations, and marinas. Areas of high scenic value, such as Whitewater Falls, would be preserved.

The recreational value of Duke's proposal staggers the imagination. So, too, do the economic benefits. Duke's investment of $700 million could be expected to generate an investment of $2 billion in new industrial enterprises. Employment opportunities would skyrocket.

In taxes alone, the completed complex would pay $24 million annually to the United States, $14 million a year to South Carolina, and $6 million a year to Oconee and Pickens Counties. Yet, the Department of Interior has moved to block all this. It has even failed to offer a single counterproposal.

Stopping this madness will not be easy. The most effective way to expose public sentiment is at a public hearing. But the Power Commission hearings will be held in Washington. Not many persons can take the time, nor afford the cost of traveling that far. Therefore, we recommend a series of petitions, signed by persons living in and near the proposed Duke Power development, protesting Federal attempts to halt the project. To this end, we urge the chambers of commerce in Pickens, Oconee, Transylvania, and neighboring counties, to get together and initiate the circulation of such petitions. Let's aim for at least 50,000 signatures.

We still hold to the old-fashioned theory that ours is a government of the people, for the people, and by the people. In our opinion, it's time that some men in Washington were reminded of that and made to respect it.

Let's stack up these petitions of protest on the Power Commission's desk in Washington. And let's get the Duke proposal underway.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, July 15, 1965]

Upstate Officials Ready To Fight for $700 Million Power Project—Udall Has Lost Other Skirmishes

(By Hugh E. Gibson)

SENECA.—Cautious optimism and determination to fight, if necessary, are the prevailing moods here as Oconee and Pickens County leaders await the Federal Power Commission's verdict on the $700 million Keowee-Toxaway power project.

The optimism stems from confidence in the Commission's fairness and in the commonsense logic of licensing the Duke Power Co., to go ahead with the massive project that will span both Oconee and Pickens.

Bolstering these hopes is the fact that Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall, who is opposing the project, has always drawn a blank in his efforts to promote public power over private power.

Oconee Senator Marshall J. Parker points out that Udall attempted to block the Kerr Dam in North Carolina, only to have the U.S. Supreme Court turn a deaf ear.

Pickens Senator Earle E. Morris, Jr., says Udall has lost two or three such battles since he came to the Cabinet. The senator hints, without going into specifics, that developments in Washington now are shaping toward another defeat for the Secretary.

"I am very hopeful and I feel Duke Power Co. ultimately will get this license," Morris says, "I just can't believe the Federal Power Commission * * * with the facts before them, will not grant this license."

If necessary, however, Duke Power should take its case all the way to the U.S. Supreme court, Morris declared. "And I'd back them all the way if I were a lawyer," he added.

Parker also expressed faith in the fairness of the Commission. "I have every confidence that the Federal Power Commission will make a just ruling," he said. "However, it will involve a lot of delay unless something is done by the President to get Udall to withdraw his objections. He ought to fire him."

The tall ex-marine said he planned to go to Washington "when the time is right" and seek an audience with the President to make a personal plea for White House action.

Meanwhile, both Senators were keeping in close touch with developments through South Carolina's congressional delegation and Duke officials.

"They have all been very cooperative," both legislators agreed.

The pair also expressed appreciation and satisfaction with the support coming from private citizens, business leaders and civic clubs throughout the State. Parker said a deluge of letters and telegrams have descended on both Udall and the White House.

The support is being generated by a realization that Keowee-Toxaway is the "biggest thing that ever happened in South Carolina," Parker says. It would, he says, be the world's largest generating complex when completed some 10 to 15 years hence.

Duke plans call for three dams in the Keowee Valley and a pump storage reservoir in the edge of the towering Blue Ridge Mountains. Power thus generated would serve Duke's customers across the upper third of the State and the resulting lakes in scenic Oconee and Pickens would make the region a vacation paradise for fishing, swimming, boating, and other water sports.

TAXPAYMENTS

Oconee and Pickens would share annual taxpayment from Duke estimated at about $6 million. South Carolina's share would be even larger—about $16 million annually.

The bonanza would be welcome to the county governments, offer some hope of local tax relief, and provide much-needed funds for improving recreational, educational, and similar programs.

Morris sees the project as creating jobs which would keep his county's young people at home, an "investment in the future" of incalculable value in this respect alone.

NEW INDUSTRY

The jobs would largely come with the advent of new industries, drawn here by the prospect of plentiful water and cheap electricity.

Both Parker and Morris report an unprecedented rash of industrial prospects since Duke unveiled its plans. Most of the inquiries coming to Pickens are directly related to Keowee-Toxaway, Morris says.

But these rosy prospects would vanish like smoke if Duke fails to win its license and both senators candidly concede this could happen. They see it as a national confrontation of the public versus private power interests with the issue far transcending their two counties or even South Carolina.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News]

Udall Out on Socialistic Limb

It was quite obvious from the time the contents of his petition of intervention were made public that the opposition of Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall to the Duke Power Co.'s proposed Keowee-Toxaway project was out of step with the public interest.

Stripped of legalese and extraneous arguments, it was apparent from discussions and developments which reached a peak a week ago that Udall's main purpose was to prevent private, taxpaying enterprise from developing the headwaters of the Savannah River basin with investor funds.

Instead, he said, the power potential should be developed at the public expense and under socialistic state ownership. Duke, if it were allowed to stay in business, or could continue to operate under such conditions, would have to buy its power from such uncompleted Federal projects as Trotters Shoals, for which not even feasibility studies are yet complete.

Udall, the leftist politician, set himself up as knowing more about the power requirements of this region, present and future, than the men who have spent their lives trying to keep up with the demand which has been growing by leaps and bounds.

Knowing that only bold, long-range planning and expensive building could meet these needs, Duke proposed to spend some $700 million in hydroelectric, steam, and perhaps nuclear facilities over the next 20 years.

Even if it were desirable the power needs of this region couldn't possibly be met by Federal projects at the rate they have been built and at their generating capacity.

If Mr. Udall had a leg to stand on, it was his claim that the Duke project was incompatible with the plan of the Army Corps of Engineers for the development of the Savannah River Basin. It is the engineers, not the officials of the Department of the Interior, who study the interstate rivers and make recommendations to Congress and the administrative agencies concerned.

The Federal Power Commission decides how the available power sites can best be developed. And the best way usually is by private enterprise.

In the light of this, it has been revealed within the last few days that Mr. Udall, besides being out of step with the public interest, also is out of step with his fellow bureaucrats.

Washington reporters of the Greenville News last Thursday discovered a report of the Army Corps of Engineers approving the Duke project, subject to conditions having to do with water management, pollution, and the like.

Duke had already anticipated these conditions and had met them in its planning, for they are a matter of commonsense and common and statutory law. Duke engineers have lived and worked with them throughout their careers.

The report knocked the props out from under Mr. Udall's arguments against Keowee-Toxaway, except his obvious desire to destroy private enterprise and extend the authority of the Federal Government to the ultimate.

Stewart Udall is left way out on his socialistic limb.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News]

Skirmish Won in a Big War

Riding, like so many political "surfers," the crest of the biggest and strongest wave of public opinion we have yet seen generated over such an issue, South Carolina's public officials have won a major skirmish in the battle against bureaucratic nationalization or socialization of the power industry.

But their success in getting favorable White House reaction and agreement from Interior Secretary Udall to reconsider his petition of intervention against the Duke Power Co.'s vast Keowee-Toxaway project in Pickens and Oconee Counties is not the end of the battle.

And the war is far from over.

Secretary Udall, obviously under great pressure, has merely agreed to review the situation. In his letter to Senator Donald Russell stating the plan for a factfinding study, the Secretary reiterated the position taken in the petition that his Department was determined to see that development of the Savannah Basin took place in an orderly manner.

To him and other advocates of publicly financed, federally subsidized power, this means Government construction of dams on every suitable site and bureaucratic control of the production and distribution of electric energy.

Secretary Udall can gracefully withdraw his objections as filed before the Federal Power Commission, which has regulatory authority over private power operations but not over Federal dams and electric cooperatives. These have reached, with Federal money, from rural areas into urban areas and have gone from purchase and distribution to the construction of steam-generating plants.

We are inclined to regard as a more serious threat to Duke's application for an FPC license to build on the Keowee and Toxaway Rivers, high up on the headwaters which feed the Savannah, the petition of intervention filed by the Tri-State Power Committee, a combination of cooperatives in the Carolinas and Georgia.

Like Udall and the Department of the Interior, these people, who soon found they did not speak for all of the cooperatives—at least not all in this State—based their opposition on grounds that the Federal Government should develop the Savannah's potential "in the public interest."

Like Udall also, they betrayed their real motives when they interfered in a project which does not lie on an interstate river and which could only remotely affect downriver development.

But unlike Mr. Udall, they are not merely one Cabinet officer with one governmental department and its several subsidiary agencies. They are the leaders of one of the most powerful, far-reaching and ruthless lobbies in the country.

They work in the Capitol in Washington, in the offices of the Senators and Representatives and in the legislative halls and administrative departments of the State capitals. They publish magazines and advertise with public funds.

They borrow the money from the Federal Government at rates below those paid by the Government itself and build facilities, on which they pay only token taxes, to compete with private companies which borrow at the going rate in the private money markets and pay the usual local corporate property and State and Federal income taxes.

And their taxpayer-subsidized advertising programs are on as big a scale as those of the private companies, which cannot charge off similar advertising as an operating cost for tax purposes.

It is these people, not the Department of the Interior, which have held up congressional approval of Duke's $300 million Middleton Shoals steamplant on the Savannah and forced its postponement. It was these people who said they had intervened merely to obtain a hearing for the public, when their petition revealed clearly that their purpose was to kill Keowee-Toxaway.

So, it is time that the towering wrath and righteous indignation that the public has shown over this fantastic outrage against its best interests be turned against its other foes also.

Duke is convinced to the extent that it is willing to invest a billion dollars of its stockholders' funds in Middleton Shoals and Keowee-Toxaway that this region will need the power they can produce by the time they are in production.

So are we. We are further convinced that the proposed Federal projects can't meet it, and that the deadening hand of bureaucracy on the supply of electricity will inhibit, not enhance economic development.

The history of public power over the last 35 years shows that clearly. Growth has been far more rapid in areas served by taxpaying, stockholder owned firms which give each other more than adequate "competition."

When it was speculated back in January that there might be opposition, then unidentified, to the Duke plans, the tightlipped Senator Marshall Parker in Oconee County said through clenched teeth, "Woe be unto anyone who tries to stop this project."

So be it.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, July 16, 1965]

WHITE HOUSE PRESSURE ON SECRETARY HINTED IN DUKE CASE—L.B.J. REPORTED OPPOSED TO UDALL INTERVENTION

WASHINGTON.—Interior Secretary Stewart Udall's official intervention against a proposed Duke Power Co. development in South Carolina is viewed as a blunder by President Johnson, according to a source close to the administration.

And the Secretary may be under White House pressure to withdraw his opposition later this summer when the dispute simmers down, it was reported.

According to inside information, Udall filed the petition for intervention in an FPC hearing on the Duke project on his own volition. The President reportedly was irked over the move, which touched off an angry protest by South Carolina leaders here and in the State.

The Chief Executive, so the story goes, felt that the Interior Department caused an unnecessary controversy by stepping into the case.

And, the word on Capitol Hill is that Udall is getting his knuckles rapped over the issue.

Duke Power is seeking a license from the FPC to permit the development of a huge power generating complex in Oconee and Pickens Counties. The hearing has not yet been scheduled.

Udall publicly challenged the proposal, declaring that it was unnecessary and that the private firm could purchase its future power from proposed Federal dams on the Savannah River.

Meanwhile, a House Public Works Subcommittee is scheduled to meet July 25, reportedly to discuss authorizations for public power projects.

And Members of the South Carolina House delegation point out that the controversial Trotters Shoals project may come up for discussion then. The proposed Savannah River dam is now under consideration by the Budget Bureau after it was favorably recommended by the Corps of Engineers.

The possibility of the matter being raised may have been behind the cancellation by Representative W. J. BRYAN DORN of a speaking engagement in Formosa. The Congressman was scheduled to address a rally at the invitation of the Nationalist Chinese Government on July 20 during the observance of Captive Nations Week there.

DORN officially said pressing legislative business prevented his going.

The lawmaker is a member of the Public Works, Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee which would be faced with the authorization for Trotter Shoals.

Meanwhile, there is some speculation here that the proposal may be quietly held up by the Budget Bureau because of the controversy surrounding it. It is bound to encounter bitter opposition if released this session, some point out.

The Budget Bureau officially reports that the matter is "under study."

DORN is strongly against the Federal power plan because he contends it would flood valuable industrial sites. But Georgia's Senators RICHARD RUSSELL and HERMAN TALMADGE and Representative PHIL LANDRUM favor the development.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STROM THURMOND, REPUBLICAN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, ON UDALL'S LATEST ACTION ON DUKE POWER CO. CASE PENDING BEFORE FPC

I am very pleased at what has been indicated as a reversal of a flatfooted stand by Interior Secretary Stewart Udall in the Duke Power Co. case pending before the Federal Power Commission. I have stated that if Mr. Udall's opposition was to be changed that it would be forced by the President's political sensitivity. Mr. Udall's decision to reconsider his blunder of judgment and politics was forced through the President by the tremendous reaction of South Carolina news media, public officials, civic groups, and citizens at the grassroots level. This reaction generated more heat than the proposed Duke power generating complex in Oconee and Pickens Counties could have produced upon completion and attracted nationwide attention.

This should serve to encourage all South Carolinians—and indeed, all Americans—as to the power of public opinion when it is crystallized and presented in such an overwhelming manner.

I hope that the backup which has been forced in this case will not serve to influence any future decisions of a political nature which may have to be made on Duke's proposed low dam at Middleton Shoals on the Savannah and the Federal Government's proposed high dam at Trotters Shoals on the Savannah. Congressman DORN has charged that Mr. Udall's opposition to the Duke project in Oconee and Pickens Counties was calculated to force withdrawal of opposition to the Trotters Shoals project, which Mr. Udall favors so strongly. Each of the two proposed projects on the Savannah—the Duke low dam to generate steam power and the Government's high dam to generate hydroelectric power—should be judged on their own merits.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Thursday, July 22, 1965, at 11 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 21, 1965:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Dr. Albert H. Moseman, of New York, to be Assistant Administrator for Technical Cooperation and Research Agency for International Development.

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Leonard H. Marks, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

David M. Bane, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Gabon Republic.

Edward Clark, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to Australia.

George J. Feldman, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Malta..

Parker T. Hart, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey.

John D. Jernegan, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria.

David D. Newsom, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Libya.

Hugh H. Smythe, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Syrian Arab Republic.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Robert M. White, of Connecticut, to be Administrator, Environmental Science Services Administration.

H. Arnold Karo, of Nebraska, to be Deputy Administrator, Environmental Science Services Administration, and to have the rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while holding such office.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Fortieth Anniversary of Yivo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, this year the Yivo Institute for Jewish Research celebrates its 40th anniversary. This unique institute was founded in 1925 in Vilna, Poland, as an academy for the study of all aspects of Jewish cultural life in eastern Europe. By 1939, the Yivo Institute had published important books of historical, sociological, linguistic, literary, and economic studies of eastern European Jewry. Its periodical publication, the Yivo Bleter, attracted worldwide attention, and Yivo was able to establish branch organizations in many cities throughout the world.

With the destruction of eastern European Jewry by the Nazis, Yivo's headquarters moved to New York City, where it has been located for the last 25 years. Today, Yivo conducts research into the past and present social, economic, and cultural life of Jews the world over. It is recognized as the world center for the study of the history and development of the Yiddish language and of Yiddish literature. It maintains a library of more than 300,000 volumes and a collection of over 2 million individual items documenting Jewish life. And it continues to publish and distribute studies on a myriad of Jewish subjects. This year, in connection with its 40th anniversary, Yivo plans to publish a new Yiddish-English and English-Yiddish dictionary by Uriel Weinreich and a long-awaited "Geshikhte fun der Yidisher Sprakh"—"History of the Yiddish Language"—by Maks Vaynraykh.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the Yivo Institute a hearty "mazl tov" on its 40th anniversary—may it enjoy many more productive years.

Canal Rights-of-Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to correct problems which have come to light since enactment of Public Law 561 in the 88th Congress. That law was enacted to provide compensation, including severance damages, for rights-of-way acquired by the United States in connection with reclamation projects on which construction commenced after January 1, 1961.

Under the act of 1890, rights-of-way for canals and ditches constructed under the authority of the United States were reserved—with few exceptions—on all public lands west of the 100th meridian. Under the 1890 act, owners of land—with title subsequent to 1890—west of the 100th meridian were not compensated for their property when taken for a reclamation canal; while owners of land east of the 100th meridian, or of land west of the 100th meridian patented prior to 1890, were fully compensated.

The Commissioner of Reclamation informed us that a problem relating to canal rights-of-way has become apparent since the passage of the act of September 2, 1964. A number of western States have reserved to the United States rights-of-way for canals and ditches constructed under the Federal reclamation program. At the present time, the United States is required to pay for canal rights-of-way utilized under the 1890 act reservation but cannot pay landowners for canal rights-of-way reserved in State patents. Therefore, I have today introduced amendatory legislation which includes a reference to these State statutes.

This amending legislation would also permit district courts to assume jurisdiction to determine just compensation in those instances where the United States and the landowner could not reach agreement on the value of rights-of-way utilized in accordance with the provisions of the act of 1890 as amended by Public Law 88-561.

In view of the need for clarifying and technical amendment, I feel this is a worthwhile bill. I hope that it can be acted upon before the adjournment of this session. It would not add to the liability or expenditures on the part of the Government with respect to what was the original intent of the Congress in enacting Public Law 561 in the 88th Congress. It is wise, in the opinion of attorneys, that the proposed action be taken.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, since the end of the war the U.S. Government, with the wholehearted support of our people and in cooperation with the governments of the free West, has been doing its utmost to help the enslaved peoples in Europe. By 1959, when it was clear that all efforts were of no avail, and the Soviet Union proved most unwilling to relax its stranglehold over these peoples, we felt that other ways had to be found at least to keep this humane issue alive. The establishment of Captive Nations Week was the result. This move was made in a joint congressional resolution and by a Presidential proclamation in July of 1959.

These captive nations of Europe, containing a good portion of Europe's population and occupying areas in Central and Eastern Europe, extending from the Baltic to the Black Sea regions, had been living freely and independently before the last war. Most of them had regained their freedom and sovereignty after the first World War, and all of them had earned their right as members of the community of free nations. Soon after the outbreak of the last war their freedom was in jeopardy. In the course of that world catastrophe all these nations—Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians, Poles, Czechoslovakians, Hungarians, Bulgarians, and Rumanians—were involved in the war. All of them went through the ordeal, under indescribable hardships and abominable conditions, but they all hoped for their freedom at the end of the war. Their hopes were shattered by the inhuman intentions and diabolical designs of the men in the Kremlin.

Even before the end of the war the Red Army swooped over these countries, with the clear intent of making them part of the Soviet Union's sphere of influence. This was shocking to the leaders of the West's democracies, but they could do nothing effective to halt the Soviet onrush to these parts of Europe. And the West's inability to deal with the issue at the time led to the captivity and enslavement of some 100 million Europeans as captive nations. Today, after 20 years, the leaders of the free world, and the Government of this country, have not ceased to work for the eventual liberation of these nations. With patience and fortitude we all hope that these nations will attain their goals and then live in peace in their respective homelands.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1965

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, since the end of the last war the Soviet Union has become the captor and oppressor of millions of peoples in Europe. As a matter of fact, even before the war was over some peoples in Eastern Europe, such as the Baltic peoples, had already been drawn within the Soviet network. Although both of these peoples and their sympathizers in the West had hoped that the end of the war would bring freedom for them, events took a turn sadly detrimental to democracies. Instead of succeeding in their attempt to free the tens of millions who by the end of the war were imprisoned behind the East-West line, the governments of the West witnessed the postwar enslavement of still more people such as the Czechoslovaks and Hungarians. The Soviet Government then lowered the Iron Curtain, effectively separating these captive nations, with a population close to 100 million, from the free world. But as the East German disturbances of 1953, the Polish uprisings in 1956, and the Hungarian revolt of 1956 proved, these peoples have not lost their love for freedom.

In our efforts to help these nations attain their freedom, we have done everything humanly possible, except resorting to the use of force. But as none of our efforts has brought about the desired result, we are determined to keep the issue of the captive nations alive. For the last 6 years we have been observing the Captive Nations Week with that in mind, and on this seventh observance we are resolved to mark Captive Nations Week until the last of the captive nations is freed from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

This week is Captive Nations Week, and it is a time to let the prisoners of communism know that we have not forgotten them and that we propose to do everything we can, consistent with international law, to assist in the liberation of the captive nations. And, most important, we must do all in our power to make certain that no other nations become captives of communism. I have never been able to understand, for example, how the U.S.S.R. can raise such violent protests over U.S. involvement in Vietnam when the Soviet Union itself is so heinously guilty of enslaving most of Eastern Europe.

I hope that Captive Nations Week will be observed this year by all Americans, and that it will be observed solemnly and prayerfully. I want the enslaved nations of the world to know that the American people believe each one of them will, in time, achieve independence.

Already there are signs and portents that independence behind the Iron Curtain is growing. Let us encourage this growth. Let us show the world that global freedom is our objective, and not the continuance of a divided and dangerous world.

The Federal Government and State of Ohio—Partners in Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the unfortunate partnership of the State of Ohio and the Federal Government in making Ohio gambling ripe picking for the mobs. If the Ohio and Federal Government would legalize and regulate gambling, its revenues could be made to work for the public good, but so long as they keep it illegal, and negligently allow the mob to reap the profits of illegal gambling, they will be partners in all the evil financed by mob gambling profits. So by their ignorance, the governments in Columbus and Washington will be partners in maintaining a multitude of sins.

Gambling is big business in Ohio. Last year, the parimutuel turnover came to $158 million. Illegal gambling is more extensive. Offtrack betting was estimated before the McClellan committee to be about $50 billion annually, and it was estimated that this was some 42 percent of the national illegal gambling total which would then be about $120 billion. On a population basis, Ohio's share of this amount would be $6.24 billion annually. The 10 percent of this turnover that stays in syndicate treasuries will finance a lot of crime. That 10 percent makes the joint negligence of the governments in Columbus and Washington cost about $600 million a year.

If Ohio would face up to the moral facts of life, it would cease to be a feeding trough for organized crime and gambling. Our States and Nation need government controlled and operated gambling to make gambling profits work for and not against the people. The best mechanism is a lottery.

Minimum Wage Should Be $2 an Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KREBS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1965

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, if the affluent millions of Americans today keep their eyes fixed on the gyrations of the stock market, the nonaffluent millions, a fourth of America, are looking in the direction of Washington this summer for developments on the proposal to amend the fair labor standards law to extend coverage and to provide a minimum wage of $2 an hour, as well as for developments on the poverty program.

What is emerging from the carefully documented testimony before the Select Subcommittee on Labor of the House of Representatives is that the popular impression of the people who live on the other side of the poverty line is a patchwork of myth and misconceptions.

For example, it is generally believed that the poor of the United States are overwhelmingly nonwhites, the very old, rural people, and people in families that do not have a male wage earner.

The reality is quite different.

Two million full-time male workers with year-round jobs in the United States are numbered among the poor who are the concern of the poverty program. They are poor not because of their sex, race, age, or residence. They are poor because they are paid starvation wages.

Seven out of ten of these workers are white. Fewer than 1 in 25 are over 65. Eight out of ten of these workers live in nonfarm areas. Forty percent of the 15 million children who live in poverty belong to these families with fulltime workers receiving poverty wages.

From time to time I hope to present additional facts to the Congress dealing with misconceptions about the poor among us.

But everything I shall have to say will deal with the central misconception that the antipoverty program implies an elaborate application of social worker techniques to deal with the personal problems of the poor.

As we examine the statistics that are now being accumulated, it is perfectly obvious that the wisecrack to the effect that all the poor need is money embodies a significant element of social insight.

What most of the poor need is an opportunity to work at standard jobs that pay standard wages.

A beginning and substantial inroad on poverty can be made now by the extension of the Fair Labor Standards Act coverage to the people in agriculture, in services, and in retail trade who are not now covered.

Simultaneously, if the minimum wage were increased to $2 per hour, the dimensions of the poverty problem would begin to come down to a manageable size.

The Fair Labor Standards Act is less than fair today. It needs to be amended by this Congress to end the unfairness to 5.4 million workers who are not now covered and to workers for whom the present minimum is economically out of date, socially inadequate, and morally unacceptable.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 22, 1965

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of grace and glory, when with each new day Thou dost spread the mantle of light about us as purple morning breaketh, fairer than morning, lovelier than daybreak, dawns the sweet consciousness we are with Thee.

Strengthen us, we pray, to carry our share of the burden of mankind's climb to the kingdom of Thy love and to the radiant realm where Thy righteous will shall be done in the life of the Nation and in all the earth.

Toward that shining goal our puny mortal might is unequal to the tests and tasks of the decisive days which loom ahead of us. We dare not trust our own devices and counsels.

From this lowly earth where our weary feet so often falter and stumble may the exultant notes of our faith and hope rise like the lark on morning wings, singing its lilting song at heaven's gate and Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 21, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

Thirty years ago, the Congress brought into being the Commodity Credit Corporation. In transmitting the report of this agency for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, as provided by section 13 of Public Law 806, 80th Congress, I feel it is appropriate to view, in summary, the three decades of the Corporation operations.

Over the past 30 years, the Commodity Credit Corporation has:

First. Enabled farmers to hold their crops for fair market prices.

Second. Minimized the depressing effect of surpluses by holding them off the market.

Third. Assured a stable flow of food to consumers, deterring inflationary pressures.

Fourth. Created a sound base for banks and other lending institutions which supply the credit needs of farmers.

Fifth. Provided in wartime the means of supplying our allies with food and fiber, and in the postwar period became the instrument which insured that food could also help keep the peace.

Sixth. Acted as the mechanism for executing the food-for-peace program, the International Wheat Agreement, and other similar international programs.

Seventh. Supported the rapid expansion of agricultural exports.

During fiscal 1964, the Commodity Credit Corporation reduced its investment in farm commodity inventories by more than $380 million. The wheat inventory was reduced by about 275 million bushels, and the supplies of dairy products were brought down to manageable levels.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is a creature of legislation. Its ability to fulfill our objectives for the future is no greater than the strength of legislation enacted by the Congress. It can function best when farm commodity programs are responsive to the conditions which exist in the agricultural economy. If these programs are in tune with the times, the Commodity Credit Corporation can perform its proper functions for farmers and for the public.

The legislation which I proposed this year, and which is now before the Congress, will help the Corporation to carry forward the objectives it should fulfill in the coming decade. These objectives are:

To continue the financial progress of our farmers;

To further reduce the Corporation's costs by bringing stocks of farm commodities down to more manageable levels;

To assure an abundant supply of high-quality, reasonably priced foods without fear of severe price fluctuations for our consumers;

To cushion the forces of the revolution in farm productivity which enable output to far exceed our capacity for use by balancing the growth in farm output with our ever-expanding food and fiber requirements;

To use our abundance as a force for peace and progress;

To rely more upon the marketplace as the primary source of fair farm returns.

Instruments of public policy can weight the scales of economic justice on the side of those who are disadvantaged, but they should enhance—not supplant—the equal opportunity for each person to obtain a decent livelihood from our economic system.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has an important place among the instruments of public policy:

Without the programs for which it acts as fiscal agent, the income netted by farmers would decline by half.

Without adequate income, the family farm system which dominates our agriculture would die.

Without family farms the vast abundance of food and fiber we all have come to expect as a natural condition of a highly productive economy would no longer be assured.

The Commodity Credit Corporation as a visible expression of our commitment to abundance continues to be a servant of all people. What began 30 years ago as an experiment to provide economic justice for the farmer has now become a tested instrument in the continuing experiment each generation performs to demonstrate the vitality of our democracy.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 22, 1965.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 26) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands for, and to develop, operate, and maintain the Golden Spike National Historic Site, and it was signed by the Vice President.

MODIFICATION OF UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous-consent agreement calling for a vote on the present measure to start at 11:05 a.m. be modified so that the vote will start at 11:15 a.m.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the reason for delaying the vote on the bill from 11:05 a.m. to 11:15 a.m. is that some Senators are at the White House attending a bill signing ceremony.

THE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following calendar measures, starting with Calendar No. 453, were considered and acted upon as indicated:

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC UNIONS AND ASSOCIATED UNIONS

The bill (H.R. 8862) to amend the act of August 7, 1935, to increase the authorized annual share of the United States as an adhering member of the International Council of Scientific Unions and associated unions was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 469), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

H.R. 8862 raises the ceiling on U.S. contributions to the International Council of Scientific Unions and its associated unions (ICSU) from $65,000 a year to $100,000 a year.

BACKGROUND

The United States has participated in the activities of ICSU since 1919 when the Council was originally organized. From 1935, when the Department of State was first authorized to defray the annual U.S. dues to the ICSU, until 1958 the legislative ceiling on U.S. contributions was $9,000 a year. The new ceiling of $65,000 a year enacted by Congress that year is now insufficient and the executive branch requested its removal in draft legislation submitted on May 17, 1965.

WHAT THE ICSU DOES

The ICSU's principal function is the coordination of the international scientific effort and the carrying out of scientific activities which are of an international character. More specifically, the ICSU organizes and coordinates scientific meetings; establishes internationally agreed standards, units, and nomenclature to insure meaningful international communications, cooperation, and comparison of results; disseminates scientific information; and plans and coordinates international collaborative programs, such as the International Geophysical Year of a few years ago and the International Years of the Quiet Sun now underway.

The 14 associated unions composing ICSU are:

International Astronomical Union (IAU).

International Union of Biochemistry (IUB).

International Union of Biological Sciences (IUBS).

International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC).

International Union of Crystallography (IUCr).

International Geographical Union (IGU).

International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics (IUGG).

International Union of Geological Sciences (IUGS).

International Union of the History and Philosophy of Science (IUHPS).

International Mathematical Union (IMU).

International Union of Pure and Applied Physics (IUPAP).

International Union of Physiological Sciences (IUPS).

International Scientific Radio Union (ISRU).

International Union of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics (IUTAM).

As can be deduced from their names, these unions deal with basic scientific information and not with technology or hardware.

In recent years, scientific activities on an international scale have increased greatly resulting in a dues revision by certain of these unions.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 34) to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison Diversion Unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

CHESTER HILL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 1908) for the relief of Chester Hill which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, after line 9, to insert a new section, as follows:

> SEC. 2. Ho Yee, a deceased United States citizen, shall be deemed to have resided in the United States prior to July 9, 1913, within the meaning of section 1993 of the Act of February 10, 1855 (Rev. Stat. 1878).

And, on page 2, after line 2, to insert a new section, as follows:

> SEC. 3. For the purposes of the said Act of February 10, 1855 (Rev. Stat. 1878), Koon Chew Ho shall be held and considered to be the natural-born son of the said Ho Yee, and shall be further held and considered to have been a United States citizen at all times since July 9, 1913: *Provided,* That the said Koon Chew Ho enters the United States for permanent residence within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Chester (Abramczyk) Hill and Koon Chew Ho."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 471), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of section 1 of the bill as amended is to facilitate the admission into the United States in a nonquota status of the alien child adopted by citizens of the United States. The bill has been amended to add sections 2 and 3, which would enable Koon Chew Ho, the son of a deceased U.S. citizen, to assume his status as a U.S. citizen based upon his father's residence in the United States prior to July 9, 1913, the date of Koon Chew Ho's birth.

MARIA LIBERTY BURNETT

The bill (S. 192) for the relief of Maria Liberty Burnett was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 192

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Liberty Burnett may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, and a petition may be filed in behalf of the said Maria Liberty Burnett by Donald M. Burnett, a citizen of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 472), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the entry into the United States in a nonquota status of an alien child to be adopted by a citizen of the United States.

ATHANASIA NIKOLOPOULOS AND SOTERIOS NIKOLOPOULOS

The bill (S. 245) for the relief of Athanasia Nikolopoulos and Soterios Nikolopoulos was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Act of September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 657), to provide for the entry of certain relatives of United States citizens, Athanasia Nikolopoulos shall be deemed to be within the purview of the twenty-fifth section of that Act.

SEC. 2. In the administration of the Act of October 24, 1962 (76 Stat. 1247), to facilitate the entry of certain relatives of United States citizens, Soterios Nikolopoulos shall be deemed to be within the purview of the first section of that Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 473), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable Athanasia Nikolopoulos to qualify for nonquota immigrant status under the provisions of section 25 of Public Law 87–301 as an alien whose second preference petition was filed prior to July 1, 1961. A further purpose of the bill is to enable Soterios Nikolopoulos to qualify for nonquota immigrant status under the provisions of section 1 of Public Law 87–885 as an alien who has a registration date prior to March 31, 1954, and whose fourth preference petition was filed prior to January 1, 1962.

ANA FOLJA

The bill (S. 1273) for the relief of Ana Folja was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1273

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ana Folja may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That suitable and proper bond or undertaking approved by the Attorney General be deposited as described in section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *And provided,* That the exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State and the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 474), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating to one who is feebleminded in behalf of the daughter of lawful permanent residents of the United States. The bill provides for the posting of a bond as a guarantee that the beneficiary will not become a public charge.

DR. OTON SOCARRAZ

The bill (S. 1325) for the relief of Dr. Oton Socarraz was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Oton Socarraz shall be held and considered to be lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of April 13, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report—No. 475—explaining the purposes of the bill.

The being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization on April 13, 1966.

NABHANE M. NICKLEY

The bill (H.R. 1987) for the relief of Nabhane M. Nickley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 476), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant second preference status to the adopted son of citizens of the United States.

KRYSTYNA STELLA HANCOCK

The bill (H.R. 1989) for the relief of Krystyna Stella Hancock was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 477), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill to facilitate the entry into the United States in a nonquota status of the alien child adopted by citizens of the United States.

DR. IGNACE D. LIU

The bill (H.R. 2012) for the relief of Dr. Ignace D. Liu was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report—No. 478—explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to provide that Dr. Ignace D. Liu may adjust his status to that of a lawful resident alien under the provisions of section 2 of the act of October 24, 1962, on the basis of a first preference visa petition filed prior to April 1, 1962.

TERESITA CENTENO VALDEZ

The bill (H.R. 2351) for the relief of Teresita Centeno Valdez was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report—No. 479—explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the entry into the United States in a nonquota status of the adopted child of U.S. citizens.

DR. ANTONIO R. PEREZ

The bill (H.R. 2360) for the relief of Dr. Antonio R. Perez was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 480), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Antonio R. Perez as of January 4, 1956, the date on which he first entered the United States as a nonimmigrant. The bill does not provide for a quota charge or for payment of the required visa fee, inasmuch as the beneficiary has been lawfully admitted for permanent residence, as a nonquota immigrant.

REMEDIOS OCAMPO

The bill (H.R. 2499) for the relief of Remedios Ocampo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 481), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the admission into the United States in a nonquota status of the alien child to be adopted by a U.S. citizen who is the natural father.

LT. THOMAS A. FARRELL, USN, AND OTHERS

The bill (H.R. 2913) for the relief of Lt. Thomas A. Farrell, U.S. Navy, and others, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 482), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve from liability a group of 17 officers, members of Patrol Squadron 4, U.S. Navy, whose permanent duty station was changed from Naha, Okinawa, to Barbers Point, Hawaii, effective on November 15, 1963, who were paid temporary lodging allowances for their dependents incident to that change and on the basis of the effective date specified in the order of the Chief of Naval Operations. The liability referred to in the bill arose incident to a subsequent determination that such allowances could only be paid from the date the service member was required to commence travel to the new station.

MRS. PHOEBE THOMPSON NEESHAM

The bill (H.R. 4131) for the relief of Mrs. Phoebe Thompson Neesham was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 483), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to provide that Mrs. Phoebe Thompson Neesham shall have complied with the requirements of section 301(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act as they relate to residence after the age of 14 years, thus enabling her to confer U.S. citizenship upon her son, who was born in Canada.

DR. ANGEL FERNANDO GOLDEROS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1389) for the relief of Dr. Angel Fernando Golderos which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Angel Fernando Golderos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 7, 1960.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 484), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill as amended is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization on October 7, 1965. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents.

DR. ENRIQUE RAMON DUCASSI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1449) for the relief of Dr. Enrique Ramon Ducassi which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Enrique Ramon Ducassi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 30, 1960.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 485), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization on September 30, 1965. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents.

ZENAIDA QUIJANO LAZARO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 2305) for the relief of Zenaida Quijano Lazaro which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 11, after the word "That", to insert "if the said Zenaida Quijano Lazaro is not entitled to medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250),".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 486), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating to one who has suffered a prior attack of insanity in behalf of the wife of a U.S. citizen. The amendment provides that the required public charge bond be deposited only if the beneficiary is not entitled to care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act.

DR. RAFAEL P. MARTINEZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1137) for the relief of Dr. Rafael P. Martinez which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the periods of time Doctor Rafael Pedro Martinez Torres has resided in the United States since his lawful admission for permanent residence on March 5, 1950, shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael Pedro Martinez Torres."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 487), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiary, who was lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on March 5, 1950, to file a petition for naturalization. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents and to reflect the beneficiary's full name.

CHUNG J. CLARK AND DAUGHTER ANNA MARIA CLARK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1170) for the relief of Chung J. Clark and her daughter Anna Maria Clark which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 3, after the word "That,", to strike out "(a)"; and after line 9, to strike out:

(b) In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anna Maria Clark, the daughter of a United States citizen who served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States, shall be held and considered to be within the purview of section 101(a)(27)(A) of that Act and the provisions of section 205 of that Act shall not be applicable in this case.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chung J. Clark, the widow of a United States citizen who served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States, shall be held and considered to be within the purview of section 101(a)(27)(A) of that Act and the provisions of section 205 of that Act shall not be applicable in this case.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Chung J. Clark."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 488), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to grant the status of a nonquota immigrant to Chung J. Clark which is the status to which she would be entitled were it not for the death of her U.S. citizen husband. The bill has been amended to delete the child beneficiary, since she is a U.S. citizen.

MICHIKO UEHARA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1186) for the relief of Michiko Uehara which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kris Ann Larsen may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act and a petition may be filed by Mrs. Margaret A. Larsen, a citizen of the United States, in behalf of the said Kris Ann Larsen pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Kris Ann Larsen."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 489), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the alien adopted daughter of a citizen of the United States to qualify for nonquota status as an eligible orphan upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents and to reflect the change in the beneficiary's name.

TERMINATION OF FEDERAL SUPERVISION OVER THE PROPERTY OF THE CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF COLVILLE INDIANS LOCATED IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON AND THE INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS THEREOF

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1413) to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Confederated Tribes of Colville Indians located in the State of Washington and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 4, line 13, after the word "all", to strike out "land and"; in line 14, after the word "to", to insert "trust or restricted"; on page 5, line 8, after the word "the", to insert "fair market"; in line 9, after the word "gas)", to strike out "in each unit" and insert "but the determination necessarily need not conform to the geographical boundaries of the surface units"; in line 15, after the word "cause", to strike out "reports" and insert "a summary"; in the same line, after the word "appraisal", to strike out "and determinations of values"; on page 6, line 23, after the word "selected", to strike out "at not less than the appraised value determined by section 6 of this act,"; on page 7, line 1, after the word "That", to insert "title to"; in line 2, after the word "that", to strike out "are offered for sale" and insert "need to be sold"; in the same line, after the word "be", to strike out "purchased" and insert "taken"; in line 3, after the word "Agriculture", to strike out "with" and insert "by publication of a notice in the Federal Register; and"; in line 4, after the word "funds", to strike out "that" and insert "for that purpose"; in line 9, after the word "amended", to insert "*Provided further,* That if the tribes are not willing to accept the appraised value of such tribal forest lands, as determined under section 6(b) of this act, the tribes may commence an action in the appropriate Federal court for a judicial determination of just compensation and such determination shall be made without regard to the appraisal standard contained in section 6(b):"; in line 17, after the word "guardian", to insert "or any person designated by the Secretary"; on page 8, line 20, after the word "section", to strike out "15" and insert "14"; in the same line, after the word "this", to strike out "Act" and insert "Act: *Provided,* That property which is held by the United States for the benefit of the tribes shall continue to have the status of tribal property until title is conveyed or transferred pursuant to section 6(f) or 7 (a) of this Act and the net proceeds are actually distributed to the individual members."; on page 9, line 14, after the word "follow.", to insert "Any tribal forest lands sold under this authority shall be purchased by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of subsection 6(f)."; in line 23, after the word "who", to insert "elect to withdraw from the tribes and"; on page 10, line 1, after the word "shall", to insert "upon the publication of the proclamation authorized by section 17(a),"; in line 2, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "thereupon"; on page 11, line 18, after the word "sold", to strike out "at not less than the appraised value thereof"; in line 22, after the word "land", to strike out "at not less than the appraised value thereof"; on page 12, after line 12, to strike out:

Sec. 10. (a) The Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 855), the Act of February 14, 1913 (37 Stat. 678), and other Acts amendatory thereto shall not apply to the probate of the trust and restricted property of the members of the tribes who die six months or more after the date this section becomes effective.

(b) The laws of the several States, territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia with respect to the probate of wills, the determination of heirs, and the administration of decedents' estates shall apply to the individual property of members of the tribes who die six months or more after the date this section becomes effective.

At the beginning of line 25, to change the section number from "11" to "10"; on page 13, at the beginning of line 8, to change the section number from "12" to "11"; at the beginning of line 19, to change the section number from "13" to "12"; in line 23, after the word "districts", to insert "and section 1 of the Act of July 29, 1954 (68 Stat. 580; 43 U.S.C., 499a), which relates to the transfer of movable property to irrigation districts or water users associations,"; on page 14, line 6, after the word "section", to strike out "18" and insert "17"; in line 17, after the word "lands", to insert "and non-Indian-owned lands"; in line 22, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to strike out "Indian"; on page 15, after line 2, to insert:

(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $11,596.25 for payment to the Colville Tribes with interest at 4 per centum annually as reimbursement for tribal funds used for irrigation construction and operation and maintenance benefiting non-tribal lands on the Colville Indian Reservation, such interest being computed from the dates of the disbursement of such tribal funds from the United States Treasury to the end of the fiscal year in which the appropriation is made.

At the beginning of line 13, to change the section number from "14" to "13"; in line 18, after the word "section", to strike out "18" and insert "17"; at the beginning of line 19, to change the section number from "15" to "14"; on page 16, line 14, after the word "thereof", to insert: "*Provided further,* That every trust created for any minor member of the tribe under this section shall contain a provision requiring the trustee to continue the trust after the minor reaches the age of majority under the laws of the State of his residence until the trustee can make a finding in accordance with the terms of the trust with respect to the need of such person for assistance in conducting his affairs:"; in line 22, after the word "*Provided*", to strike out "*further,*" and insert "however,"; in line 23, after the word "Secretary", to insert "or the trustee"; in line 25, after the word "such", to strike out "secretarial"; on page 17, line 1, after the word "the", to strike out "secretarial"; in line 4, after the word "Secretary", to insert "or the trustee"; at the beginning of line 9, to change the section number from "16" to "15"; at the beginning of line 16, to change the section number from "17" to "16"; at the beginning of line 22, to change the section number from "18" to "17"; on page 18, line 10, after the word "their", to strike out "jurisdiction." and insert: "jurisdiction: *Provided,* That the Secretary is authorized to continue beyond the date of said proclamation to exercise functions and authorities essential to the completion of the termination of Federal responsibilities under this Act, including but not limited to the probate of trust or restricted estates of deceased Indians, and the administration to their completion of contracts for the education program authorized by section 26 hereof, it being the intent of this proviso to authorize the Secretary to complete as speedily as possible all of the actions required under existing law and under the provisions of this statute in order to complete the Federal obligations authorized to be accomplished by this Act."; at the beginning of line 25, to change the section number from "19" to "18"; on page 19, line 1, after the word "section", to strike out "18" and insert "17"; at the beginning of line 11, to change the section number from "20" to "19"; at the begining of line 19, to change the section number from "21" to "20"; on page 20, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "22" to "21"; in line 4, after "(60 Stat. 1049)." to insert: "The governing body of the tribes as recognized by the Secretary is authorized to reserve from distribution, with the approval of the Secretary, adequate tribal funds to defray the cost of prosecuting tribal claims against the United States and the Secretary is authorized to continue supervision of such funds. Any balance remaining after such litigation has been concluded shall be distributed among all members whose names appear on the final roll, or their successors in interest."; at the beginning of line 12, to change the section number from "23" to "22"; at the beginning of line 22, to change the section number from "24" to "23"; on page 21, at the beginning of line 23, to change the section number from "25" to "24"; at the beginning of line 6, to change the section number from "26" to "25"; at the beginning of line 10, to change the section number from "27" to "26"; in line 11, after the word "section", to strike out "18" and insert "17"; and, on page 22, after line 5, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 27. Effective on the date a majority of the number of the adult members of the tribes voting in a referendum approve a termination of Federal supervision, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is authorized and directed (a) to conduct such studies as are necessary to determine present and anticipated health needs of members of the tribes and the resources that are available to meet them; (b) to work with appropriate State and local agencies and with the tribes for the purpose of arranging for participation by the tribes and their members in comprehensive health care programs, including, but not limited to, private voluntary health benefits plans, group insurance policies or contracts, or similar group arrangements provided by carriers; (c) to develop plans and make arrangements for the orderly assumption of financial responsibility by the tribes and their members, the State and the localities involved, in accordance with their respective abilities, with respect to environmental and preventive health services now authorized under the Act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674); and (d) to assure to the extent practicable, that adequate sanitation facilities (as described in section 7 of such Act) are provided on the reservation prior to the date on which a proclamation in accordance with the provisions of section 17 of this Act is issued.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sections of this Act shall become effective on the date a majority of the number of the adult members of the tribes voting in a referendum approve a termination of Federal supervision in accordance with those sections. The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a referendum to ascertain the wishes of the enrolled adult members within ninety days after the enactment of this Act in accordance with such rules and regulations as he may prescribe.

Sec. 2. The purpose of this Act is to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the trust and restricted property of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Indian Reservation, Washington, and of the individual members thereof, for the disposition of federally owned property acquired or withdrawn for the administration of the affairs of said Indians, and for a termination of Federal services furnished such Indians because of their status as Indians.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of this Act:

(a) "Tribes" means the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Indian Reservation, Washington.

(b) "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(c) "Lands" means real property, interests therein, or improvements thereon, and includes water rights.

(d) "Tribal property" means any real or personal property, including water rights, or any interest in real or personal property, that belongs to the tribes and either is held by the United States in trust for the tribes or is subject to a restriction against alienation imposed by the United States.

(e) "Adult" means a member of the tribes who is an adult according to the law of the place of his residence.

Sec. 4. At midnight of the date this section becomes effective the roll of the tribes shall be closed and no child born thereafter shall be eligible for enrollment: *Provided,* That the tribes shall have a period of six months from the date this section becomes effective in which to prepare and submit to the Secretary a proposed roll of the members of the tribes living on the date this section becomes effective, which shall be published in the Federal Register. If the tribes fail to submit such roll within the time specified in this section, the Secretary shall prepare a proposed roll for the tribes which shall be published in the Federal Register. Any person claiming membership rights in the tribes or an interest in the assets of the tribes, or a representative of the Secretary on behalf of any such person, may, within ninety days from the date of publication of the proposed roll, file an appeal with the Secretary contesting the inclusion or omission of the name of any person on or from such roll. The Secretary shall review such appeals and his decisions thereon shall be final and conclusive. After disposition of all such appeals, the roll of the tribes shall be published in the Federal Register, and such roll shall be final for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 5. Upon publication in the Federal Register of the final roll as provided in section 4 of this Act, the beneficial interest in tribal property of each person whose name appears on the roll shall constitute personal property which may be inherited or bequeathed, but shall not otherwise be subject to alienation or encumbrance before the transfer of title to such tribal property as provided in section 7 of this Act without the approval of the Secretary. Any contract made in violation of this section shall be null and void. Property which this section makes subject to inheritance or bequest and which is inherited or bequeathed after the effective date of this section and prior to the transfer of title to tribal property as provided in section 7 of this Act shall not be subject to State or Federal inheritance, estate, legacy, or succession taxes.

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall—

(a) within sixty days after this section becomes effective institute a program, to be completed within one year, to bring up to date all ownership records pertaining to trust or restricted lands on the Colville Indian Reservation; and immediately following completion of such program, jointly with the Secretary of Agriculture, determine what parts of the tribal lands are valuable chiefly for timber purposes, what parts are valuable chiefly for farming, what parts are valuable chiefly for grazing, and what parts are valuable chiefly for other purposes; and divide each such part into appropriate units for sale or management in accordance with the provisions of this Act;

(b) cause separate appraisals to be made by three qualified independent appraisers of the units designated under subsection (a) for the purpose of ascertaining the fair market value of each such unit. The fair market value of the timber assets shall be defined to be the market price that would be realized if the sale of the timber assets were made over a period of ten years. The Secretary shall determine fair market value by averaging the three appraisals;

(c) determine the fair market value of tribal mineral rights (including oil and gas) but the determination necessarily need not conform to the geographical boundaries of the surface units;

(d) determine the value to the tribes of the tribal hunting and fishing rights on each unit appraised, to the extent such value is not included in the appraisal;

(e) cause a summary of said appraisal to be delivered to all adult enrolled members of the tribes and within sixty days thereafter give to each member whose name appears on the final roll of the tribes an opportunity to elect to withdraw from the tribes and have his beneficial interest in tribal property recognized by section 5 converted into money and paid to him, or to remain in the tribes and participate in the tribal management plan to be prepared pursuant to subsection (g) of this section; in the case of members who are minors, persons declared incompetent by judicial proceedings, or deceased, the opportunity to make such election on their behalf shall be given to the person designated by the Secretary as the person best able to represent the interests of such member: *Provided*, That any member, or any heir or any devisee of any deceased member, for whom the Secretary has so designated a representative may (on his own behalf, through his natural guardian, or next friend) within one hundred and twenty days after receipt of written notice of such secretarial designation, contest the secretarial designation in any naturalization court for the area in which such member resides, by filing of a petition therein requesting designation of a named person other than the secretarial designee, and the burden shall thereupon devolve upon the Secretary to show cause why the member-designated representative should not represent the interests of such member, and the decision of such court shall be final and conclusive;

(f) select the portion of the tribal property which if sold at the appraised value would provide sufficient funds to pay the members who elect to withdraw from the tribes for their beneficial interest in the total tribal property, sell the property so selected and pay the proceeds of the sale to the withdrawing members: *Provided*, That title to any tribal forest lands that need to be sold shall be taken by the Secretary of Agriculture by publication of a notice in the Federal Register; and funds for that purpose are hereby authorized to be appropriated and such lands shall become national forest lands subject to the laws that are applicable to lands acquired pursuant to the Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended: *Provided further*, That if the tribes are not willing to accept the appraised value of such tribal forest lands, as determined under section 6(b) of this Act, the tribes may commence an action in the appropriate Federal court for a judicial determination of just compensation and such determination shall be made without regard to the appraisal standard contained in section 6(b): *Provided further*, That any person whose name appears on the final roll of the tribes, or a guardian or any person designated by the Secretary on behalf of any person who is a minor or an incompetent, shall have the right to purchase, for his or its own account but not as an agent for others, any other property in lots as offered for sale for not less than the highest offer received by competitive bid; any individual Indian purchaser who has elected to withdraw from the tribes may apply toward the purchase price up to 100 per centum of the amount estimated by the Secretary to be due him from the sale of his interest in tribal property: *Provided*, That title to lands purchased by using individual interest as collateral shall be withheld by the Secretary until distribution of the proceeds of the tribal estate as provided in this section; and if more than one right is exercised to purchase the same property pursuant to this proviso the property shall be sold to one of such persons on the basis of competitive bids;

(g) cause a plan to be prepared in form and content satisfactory to the members who elect to remain in the tribes and to the Secretary for the management of tribal property through a trustee, corporation, or other legal entity. If no plan that is satisfactory both to the members who elect to remain in the tribes and to the Secretary has been prepared six months before the time limit provided in subsection (b) of section 7 of this Act the Secretary shall adopt a plan for managing the tribal property, subject to the provisions of section 14 of this Act: *Provided*, That property which is held by the United States for the benefit of the tribes shall continue to have the status of tribal property until title is conveyed or transferred pursuant to section 6(f) or 7(a) of this Act and the net proceeds are actually distributed to the individual members.

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to execute any conveyancing instrument that is necessary or appropriate to convey title to tribal property to be sold in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of this Act, and to transfer title to all other tribal property to a trustee, corporation, or other legal entity in accordance with the plan prepared pursuant to subsection (g) of section 6 of this Act: *Provided*, That at any time prior to a transfer of such other tribal property to a trustee, corporation, or other legal entity, the Secretary may, upon request of a majority of the members who elected to remain in the tribes, sell such other tribal property and distribute the proceeds of sale among the members if he determines that such action is the more feasible and practical course to follow. Any tribal forest lands sold under this authority shall be purchased by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of subsection 6(f).

(b) It is the intention of the Congress that all of the actions required by sections 6 and 7 of this Act shall be completed at the earliest practicable time and in no event later than four years from the date this section becomes effective.

(c) Members of the tribes who elect to withdraw from the tribes and receive the money value of their interests in tribal property shall, upon the publication of the proclamation authorized by section 17(a), cease to be members of the tribes: *Provided*, That nothing shall prevent them from sharing in the proceeds of tribal claims against the United States.

SEC. 8. No funds distributed pursuant to section 6 of this Act to members who withdraw from the tribes shall be paid to any person as compensation for services pertaining to the enactment of this Act or amendments thereto and any person making or receiving such payments shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be imprisoned for not more than six months and fined an amount equal to the payment received by him plus not more than $500.

SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to transfer within four years from the date this section becomes effective to each member of the tribes unrestricted control of funds or other personal property held in trust for such member by the United States.

(b) All restrictions on the sale or encumbrance of trust or restricted interests in land, wherever located, owned by members of the tribes (including allottees, purchasers, heirs, and devisees, either adult or minor), and on trust or restricted interests in lands within the Colville Indian Reservation, regardless of ownership, are hereby removed four years after the date this section becomes effective and the patents or deeds under which titles are then held shall pass the titles in fee simple, subject to any valid encumbrances. The titles to all interests in trust or restricted land acquired by members of the tribes by devise or inheritance four years or more after the date this section becomes effective shall vest in such members in fee simple, subject to any valid encumbrance.

(c) Prior to the time provided in subsection (b) of this section for the removal of restrictions on land owned by one or by more than one person, the Secretary may—

(1) upon request of any of the owners, partition the land and issue to each owner a patent or deed for his individual share that shall become unrestricted four years from the date this section becomes effective;

(2) upon request of any of the owners, and a finding by the Secretary that partition of all or any part of the land is not practicable, cause all or any part of the land to be sold and distribute the proceeds of sale to the owners: *Provided*, That any one or more of the owners may elect before a sale to purchase the other interests in the land, and the purchaser shall receive an unrestricted patent or deed to the land; and

(3) if the whereabouts of none of the owners can be ascertained, cause such lands to be sold and deposit the proceeds of sale in the Treasury of the United States for safekeeping.

(d) The Secretary is hereby authorized to approve—

(1) the exchange of trust or restricted land between the tribes and any of the enrolled members;

(2) the sale by the tribes of tribal property to individual members of the tribes; and

(3) the exchange of tribal property for real property in fee status. Title to all real property included in any sale or exchange as provided in this subsection shall be conveyed in fee simple.

SEC. 10. The Secretary is authorized, in his discretion, to transfer to the tribes or any member or group of members thereof any federally owned property acquired, withdrawn, or used for the administration of the affairs of the tribes which he deems necessary for Indian use, or to transfer to a public or nonprofit body any such property which he deems necessary for public use and from which members of the tribes will derive benefit.

SEC. 11. No property distributed under the provisions of this Act shall at the time of distribution be subject to Federal or State income tax. Following any distribution of property made under the provisions of this Act, such property and any income derived therefrom by the individual, corporation, or other legal entity shall be subject to the same taxes, State and Federal, as in the case of non-Indians: *Provided*, That, for the purpose of capital gains or losses the base value of the property shall be the value of the property when distributed to the individual, corporation, or other legal entity.

SEC. 12. (a) That part of section 5 of the Act of August 13, 1914 (35 Stat. 687; 43 U.S.C. 499), which relates to the transfer of the care, operation, and maintenance of reclamation works to water users associations or irrigation districts, and section 1 of the Act of July 29, 1954 (68 Stat. 580; 43 U.S.C. 499a), which relates to the transfer of movable property to irrigation districts or water users associations, shall be applicable to the irrigation works on the Colville Reservation.

(b) Effective on the first day of the calendar year beginning after the date of the proclamation provided for in section 17 of this Act, the deferment of the assessment and collection of construction costs provided for in the first proviso of the Act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564; 25 U.S.C. 386a), shall terminate with respect to any lands within irrigation projects on the Colville Reservation. The Secretary shall cause the first lien against such lands created by the Act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 200, 210), to be filed of record in the appropriate county office.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to adjust, eliminate, or cancel all or any part of reimbursable irrigation operation and maintenance costs and reimbursable irrigation construction costs chargeable against Indian-owned lands and non-Indian-owned lands that are subject to the provisions of this Act, and all or any part of assessments heretofore or hereafter imposed on account of such costs, when he determines that the collection thereof would be inequitable or would result in undue hardship on the owner of the land, or that the administrative costs of collection would probably equal or exceed the amount collected.

(d) Nothing contained in any other section of this Act shall affect in any way the laws applicable to irrigation projects on the Colville Indian Reservation.

(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $11,596.25 for payment to the Colville Tribes with interest at 4 per centum annually as reimbursement for tribal funds used for irrigation construction and operation and maintenance benefiting non-tribal lands on the Colville Indian Reservation, such interest being computed from the dates of the disbursement of such tribal funds from the United States Treasury to the end of the fiscal year in which the appropriation is made.

SEC. 13. Nothing in this Act shall abrogate any water rights of the tribes and their members, and the laws of the State of Washington with respect to the abandonment of water rights by nonuse shall not apply to the tribes and their members until fifteen years after the date of the proclamation issued pursuant to section 17 of this Act.

SEC. 14. Prior to the transfer of title to, or the removal of restrictions from, property in accordance with the provisions of this Act, the Secretary shall protect the rights of members of the tribes who are minors, non compos mentis, or in the opinion of the Secretary, in need of assistance in conducting their affairs, by causing the appointment of guardians for such members in courts of competent jurisdiction, or by such other means as he may deem adequate without application from the member, including but not limited to the creation of a trust of such member's property with a trustee selected by the Secretary, or the purchase by the Secretary of an annuity for such member: *Provided*, That no member shall be declared to be in need of assistance in conducting his affairs unless the Secretary determines that such member does not have sufficient ability, knowledge, experience, and judgment to enable him to manage his business affairs, including the administration, use, investment, and disposition of any property turned over to such member and the income and proceeds therefrom, with such reasonable degree of prudence and wisdom as will be apt to prevent him from losing such property or the benefits thereof: *Provided further*, That every trust created for any minor member of the tribe under this section shall contain a provision requiring the trustee to continue the trust after the minor reaches the age of majority under the laws of the State of his residence until the trustee can make a finding in accordance with the terms of the trust with respect to the need of such person for assistance in conducting his affairs: *Provided however*, That, any member determined by the Secretary or the trustee to be in need of assistance in conducting his affairs may, within one hundred and twenty days after receipt of written notice of such determination, contest the determination in any naturalization court for the area in which said member resides by filing therein a petition having that purpose; the burden shall thereupon devolve upon the Secretary or the trustee to show cause why such member should not conduct his own affairs, and the decision of such court shall be final and conclusive with respect to the affected member's conduct of his affairs.

SEC. 15. Pending the completion of the property dispositions provided for in this Act, the funds now on deposit, or hereafter deposited, in the United States Treasury to the credit of the tribes shall be available for advance to the tribes, or for expenditure, for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the tribes and approved by the Secretary.

SEC. 16. The Secretary shall have authority to execute such patents, deeds, assignments, releases, certificates, contracts, and other instruments as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act, or to establish a marketable and recordable title to any property disposed of pursuant to this Act.

SEC. 17. (a) Upon removal of Federal restrictions on the property of the tribes and individual members thereof, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a proclamation declaring that the Federal trust relationship to the affairs of the tribes and their members has terminated. Thereafter individual members of the tribes shall not be entitled to any of the services performed by the United States for Indians because of their status as Indians and, except as otherwise provided in this Act, all statutes of the United States which affect Indians because of their status as Indians shall no longer be applicable to the tribes and their members, and the laws of the several States shall apply to the tribes and their members in the same manner as they apply to other citizens or persons within their jurisdiction: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to continue beyond the date of said proclamation to exercise functions and authorities essential to the completion of the termination of Federal responsibilities under this Act, including but not limited to the probate of trust or restricted estates of deceased Indians, and the administration to their completion of contracts for the education program authorized by section 26 hereof, it being the intent of this proviso to authorize the Secretary to complete as speedily as possible all of the actions required under existing law and under the provisions of this statute in order to complete the Federal obligations authorized to be accomplished by this Act.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall affect the status of the members of the tribes as citizens of the United States.

SEC. 18. Effective on the date of the proclamation provided for in section 17 of this Act, all powers of the Secretary or other officer of the United States to take, review, or approve any action under the constitution and bylaws of the tribes are hereby terminated. Any powers conferred upon the tribes by such constitution which are inconsistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby terminated. Such termination shall not affect the power of the tribes to take any action under their constitution and bylaws that is consistent with this Act without the participation of the Secretary or other officer of the United States.

SEC. 19. The Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to transfer title to cemeteries within the Colville Reservation to any organization authorized by the tribes and approved by him. In the event such an organization is not formed by the tribes within 18 months following the date this section becomes effective, the Secretary is directed to perfect the organization of a nonprofit entity empowered to accept title and maintain said cemeteries.

SEC. 20. The Secretary is authorized to set off against any indebtedness payable to the tribes or to the United States by any individual member of the tribes or payable to the United States by the tribes any funds payable to such individual or tribes under this Act and to deposit the amounts set off to the credit of the tribes or the United States, as the case may be.

SEC. 21. Nothing contained in this Act shall deprive the tribes of their constituent parts of any right, privilege, or benefit granted by the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049). The governing body of the tribes as recognized by the Secretary is authorized to reserve from distribution, with the approval of the Secretary, adequate tribal funds to defray the cost of prosecuting tribal claims against the United States and the Secretary is authorized to continue supervision of such funds. Any balance remaining after such litigation has been concluded shall be distributed among all members whose names appear on the final roll, or their successors in interest.

SEC. 22. Nothing in this Act shall abrogate any valid lease, permit, license, right-of-way, lien, or other contract heretofore approved. Whenever any such instrument places in or reserves to the Secretary any powers, duties, or other functions with respect to the property subject thereto, the Secretary may transfer such functions, in whole or in part, to any Federal agency with the consent of such agency and may transfer such functions, in whole or in part, to a State agency with the consent of such agency and the other party or parties to such instrument.

SEC. 23. The Secretary is authorized to issue rules or regulations necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act, and may in his discretion provide for tribal referendums on matters pertaining to management or disposition of tribal assets.

SEC. 24. All Acts or parts of Acts inconsistent with this Act are hereby repealed insofar as they affect the tribes or their members.

SEC. 25. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 26. Prior to the issuance of a proclamation in accordance with the provisions of section 17 of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to undertake, within the limits of available appropriations, a special program of education and training designed to help the members of the tribes to earn a livelihood, to conduct their own affairs, and to assume their responsibilities as citizens without special services because of their status as Indians. Such program may include language training, orientation in non-Indian community customs and living standards, vocational training and related subjects, transportation to the place of training or instruction, and subsistence during the course of training or instruction. For the purposes of such program the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts or agreements with any Federal, State, or local governmental agency, corporation, association, or person. Nothing in this section shall preclude any Federal agency from undertaking any other program for the education and training of Indians with funds appropriated to it.

SEC. 27. Effective on the date a majority of the number of the adult members of the tribes voting in a referendum approve a termination of Federal supervision, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is authorized and directed (a) to conduct such studies as are necessary to determine present and anticipated health needs of members of the tribes and the resources that are available to meet them; (b) to work with appropriate State and local agencies and with the tribes for the purpose of arranging for participation by the tribes and their members in comprehensive health care programs, including, but not limited to, private voluntary health benefits plans, group insurance policies or contracts, or similar group arrangements provided by carriers; (c) to develop plans and make arrangements for the orderly assumption of financial responsibility by the tribes and their members, the State and the localities involved, in accordance with their respective abilities, with respect to environmental and preventive health services now authorized under the Act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674); and (d) to assure to the extent practicable, that adequate sanitation facilities (as described in section 7 of such Act) are provided on the reservation prior to the date on which a proclamation in accordance with the provisions of section 17 of this Act is issued.

SEC. 28. Nothing in this Act shall affect the authority to make timber sales otherwise authorized by law prior to the termination of Federal control over such timber. If title to any of the lands comprising the Colville Indian forest is purchased by the United States, the administration of any outstanding timber sales contracts thereon entered into by the Secretary of the Interior as trustee for the tribes shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 29. All sales of tribal lands pursuant to this Act on which roads are located shall be made subject to the right of the United States and its assigns to maintain and use such roads.

SEC. 30. Any person whose name appears on the final roll of the tribes who has, since July 24, 1961, continuously resided on any forest lands purchased by the United States by this Act shall be entitled to occupy and use as a homesite for his lifetime a reasonable acreage of such lands as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may issue to safeguard the administration of the national forest.

SEC. 31. The costs required by this Act may be paid from tribal funds which are hereby made available for such purpose subject to full reimbursement by the United States and the appropriation of funds for that purpose is hereby authorized.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 490), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 1413, as amended, is to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Confederated Tribes of Colville Indians located in the State of Washington and the individual members thereof.

NEED

Section 5 of Public Law 772, 84th Congress (70 Stat. 626), provided that:

"The Business Council of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation shall, in accordance with Resolution Numbered 1955–33, dated April 8, 1955, of the Colville Business Council, submit to the Secretary of the Interior within five years from the date of enactment of this Act proposed legislation providing for the termination of Federal supervision over the property and affairs of the Confederated Tribes and their members within a reasonable time after the submission of such proposed legislation."

In compliance with the 1956 act, the tribal business council submitted proposed legislation providing for a two-stage termination program. That proposal was introduced in the 88th Congress as S. 1442.

In late October 1963, the then chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, Senator CHURCH, of Idaho, held hearings on S. 1442 at Spokane, Nespelem, and Seattle, Wash. Officials representing the tribal business council, and various organizations of Colville Indians, as well as individual Indians, and county and State officials gave testimony on and suggested amendments to S. 1442. The vast majority of those appearing to testify did not support S. 1442, but recommended a one-step termination process that would result in ending trusteeship at the earliest possible date.

Subsequently, S. 1442 was amended to provide for a referendum on the question of termination and would, if approved by a majority of the Indians, set into motion a terminal program patterned after the act of August 13, 1954, as amended, affecting the Klamath Tribe of Oregon. S. 1442 passed the Senate on August 18, 1964. However, due to the lateness of the session, it was not possible for the bill to be acted on by the House.

Senator JACKSON introduced S. 1413, as requested by the tribal governing body, on March 8, 1965.

On April 5 and 6, 1965, following receipt of executive department reports on S. 1413, the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs conducted hearings on the bill. Spokesmen for the tribal business council, representing the majority who support termination legislation, and minority members who oppose the bill, as well as representatives of the Colville Indian Association, the Petitioners Party, and individual tribal members, gave their testimony. Officials from the Department of the Interior were also heard. The printed hearings were distributed to members of the tribe.

The committee believes that a majority of Colville Indians want to dissolve the tribal entity and dispose of their assets. In recent tribal elections, candidates running on the termination issue have been elected, increasing the total number of councilmen supporting this course, further evidencing the desire of most members for termination. It is believed that these Indians should have the opportunity to express themselves on the question of termination, and S. 1413, as reported, would assure this opportunity by providing for a referendum, at which a majority of the adult members voting would determine if Federal supervision and control of these tribes would be brought to an end.

S. 1413 has been amended by incorporating several proposed clarifying and perfecting changes suggested by the executive agencies. It is believed that these amendments strengthen the legislation and will aid in avoiding the problems encountered in earlier termination acts.

AMENDMENT TO THE INDIAN LONG-TERM LEASING ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1938) to amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment in line 5, after the word "words", to strike out "the Pyramid Lake Reservation" and insert "the Pyramid Lake Reservation,"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 539), as amended, is hereby amended as follows: After the words "Fort Mojave Reservation", insert the words *"the Pyramid Lake Reservation,"*.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 491), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 1938, introduced by Senator BIBLE, is to permit leases of Indian land on the Pyramid Lake Reservation in Nevada for business and other purposes to be made for a term of 99 years with the right of renewal for another 25 years.

NEED

Enactment of S. 1938 is needed to permit a lease with a term long enough to enable a prospective lessee to obtain financing for the recreational development that is contemplated.

The Pyramid Lake Reservation is located in one of the Nation's fastest growing recreation areas. The 175-square-mile lake, located entirely within the reservation, offers excellent potential for water-oriented recreational development. Several proposals have been submitted for development contemplating the investment of large sums of money and the payment of substantial rents to the tribe.

After a long-term development lease is approved, time must be consumed in preparing development plans, securing requisite approval of those plans, negotiating financing, constructing developments, and marketing them. This means that under present leasing authority, which permits the equivalent of a 50-year lease, a lessee cannot possibly comply with the minimum legal requirements of a substantial segment of the lending community.

If enacted, S. 1938 will extent to the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation the same long-term leasing provisions which have been made applicable to the Agua Caliente, Navajo, Seminole, Colorado River, Southern Ute, and Fort Mojave Reservations. Assurance was given the committee that the Secretary of the Interior would approve a 99-year lease only if the extended period is absolutely essential and if it is consonant with the needs of the Pyramid Lake Indians.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1904) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the Pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Anna, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for school or administrative purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over temporarily.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO HEIRS OF ADAM JONES, CREEK INDIAN NOT ENROLLED

The bill (H.R. 70) to provide for the conveyance of approximately 80 acres of land to the heirs of Adam Jones, Creek Indian not enrolled was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 493), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 70 is to provide for the conveyance of a fee simple title to an 80-acre tract of land in Oklahoma to the heirs of Adam Jones, a Creek Indian.

NEED

In 1941, George Jones, a fullblood enrolled Creek Indian, conveyed 80 acres of restricted land to his son, Adam, a fullblood Creek, not enrolled. The deed of conveyance provided that the title would be held by—"the United States in trust for Adam Jones, * * * during his lifetime and then in trust for the Creek Tribe of Oklahoma, until such time as the use of the land is assigned by the Secretary of the Interior to a cooperative group organized under the act of June 26, 1936, or to an individual Indian, then in trust for such group or individual."

Adam Jones thus acquired a life estate to the property in question and upon his death a defeasible title was vested in the United States for the benefit of the Creek Tribe. Heirs of Adam Jones declare that he was unaware not only of the fact that he had only a life interest in the land but also of a further provision in the 1936 act that—"any royalties, bonuses, or other revenues derived from mineral deposits underlying lands purchased in Oklahoma under the authority granted by this Act * * *, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States, and such revenues are hereby made available for expenditure by the Secretary of the Interior for the acquisition of lands and for loans to Indians in Oklahoma as authorized by this Act."

No mineral royalties or bonuses from the land have been realized by members of the Jones family.

The heirs of Adam Jones have requested that the property be conveyed to them in fee simple and the council of the Creek Tribe, by resolution dated July 27, 1963, has recommended that the request be implemented, thereby waiving whatever rights the Creek Nation might otherwise have in the land or its mineral resources.

AMENDMENT TO LAW RELATING TO FINAL DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY OF THE CHOCTAW TRIBE

The bill (H.R. 5860) to amend the law relating to the final disposition of the property of the Choctaw Tribe was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report—No. 494—explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 5860 is to extend by 3 years the time within which certain provisions of the act of August 25, 1959 (73 Stat. 420), as amended by the act of August 24, 1962 (76 Stat. 405), are to be implemented.

NEED

The act of August 25, 1959, provided the rules governing completion of disposition of the assets of the Choctaw Tribe. The act of August 24, 1962, extended by 3 years the time for carrying out these provisions. Under the 1959 law the Secretary of the Interior was directed to dispose of the lands (except a one-half mineral interest) belonging to the Choctaw Tribe and held by the United States in trust for the tribe or subject to a restriction against alienation imposed by the United States. A legal entity was to be organized under the laws of Oklahoma, as the successor in interest to the Choctaw Tribe, to hold the reserved mineral interest, and if it so chose, to take title to the Choctaw lands.

In the course of carrying out the 1959 act the tribe has had to engage in several lawsuits in order to protect its claims with respect to the tribal lands. Although an additional 3 years were provided in the 1962 act, the task has not been completed and thus another extension is required.

IOWA TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA

The bill (H.R. 9041) to restore to the heirs of the Indian grantor certain tribal land of the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report—No. 495—explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 9041, introduced following receipt of an executive communication from the Secretary of the Interior requesting that this be done, is to grant a 2½-acre parcel of land to the heirs of Jack Small Lincoln, an Indian, who donated the same to the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma.

A companion bill, S. 1282, was also considered by the committee.

NEED

Before his death in 1936, Mr. Lincoln donated to the United States in trust for the Iowa Tribe the parcel of land referred to in H.R. 9041. A community building was constructed thereon by the tribe but is no longer in a usable condition. Since the tribe has no further need for the site, its business committee requested legislation conveying the land to Mr. Lincoln's heirs. This H.R. 9041 does by declaring the land to be held in trust for the parties named in the bill.

CERTAIN LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN LAND PATENTED TO THE STATE OF ALASKA FOR THE USE AND BENEFIT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

The bill (S. 1190) to provide that certain limitations shall not apply to certain land patented to the State of Alaska for the use and benefit of the University of Alaska was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1190

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the limitations of sections 4 and 5 of the Act entitled "An Act making an additional grant of lands for the support and maintenance of the Agricultural College and School of Mines of the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes", as amended (48 U.S.C. 354a (c) and (d)), shall not apply to the sale, lease, mortgage, or other encumbrance of lot 1, northeast quarter of the northwest quarter, and the north half of the northeast quarter, section 29, township 28 south range 56 east, Copper River meridian, Alaska, or to the sale or contract for the sale of any natural product derived from such lands.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report—No. 496—explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 1190 is to authorize the State of Alaska to make a negotiated disposal of lands in dispute between the University of Alaska and the Klukwan Iron Ore Corp. Involves 153-acre tract which Klukwan says should not have been patented to university because the corporation's placer mining filing was outstanding at the time. The act of January 21, 1929, prohibits the direct private sale of lands which the State of Alaska and the corporation wish to consummate, and S. 1190 would waive these limitations.

CONCLUSION

Both the University of Alaska and the Klukwan Iron Ore Corp., which filed suit in the State supreme court at Juneau, Alaska, to quiet its claim to the lands, decided to settle out of court. This bill will clear the way for agreement, and the committee feels this to be a reasonable solution. It unanimously recommends enactment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet until 12 o'clock noon today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHARTER ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1118) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I cast my vote against S. 1118, the District of Columbia home rule bill, with considerable reluctance because I firmly believe in the principle of home rule and local self-government.

When the proposed constitutional amendment to permit citizens of the District of Columbia to participate in presidential elections was before the Senate, I voted for it, and in addition I voted for the provision to permit citizens of the District to elect nonvoting delegates to the House of Representatives, which provision, of course, did not survive the Senate-House conference committee's action. I voted for these measures because I thought the hundreds of thousands of citizens of the District of Columbia were entitled to representation and to a more direct means of participation in their government. I will not detain the Senate with a lengthy statement of the reasons why I think we should make a further study in an effort to achieve a home rule system for the District of Columbia which does not do violence to the unique status of the District as the seat of the National Government and the Federal City. My principal objection to this bill is that the Federal payment formula in effect empowers the local government to tax Federal Government property in the District, and this to me seems a very dangerous precedent. I do not believe the Congress should so completely abdicate its responsibility in this area by providing for this automatic annual payment which requires no annual authorization legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the Senate will now proceed to vote on the passage of S. 1118, the so-called District of Columbia Home Rule bill. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Russell] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Russell].

If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] are necessarily absent, and, if present and voting, would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 29, as follows:

[No. 198 Leg.]

YEAS—63

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Smith
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—29

Bennett
Byrd, W. Va.
Curtis
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Long, La.
McClellan
Miller
Mundt
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Scott
Simpson
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—8

Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Fong
Mansfield
McCarthy
Pastore
Russell, S.C.
Smathers

So the bill (S. 1118) was passed.

(For text of Senate bill 1118, see Senate proceedings of July 21, 1965, pp. 17742-17754, Congressional Record.)

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an elected mayor, city council, Board of Education, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes."

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to thank those who have supported the concept of home rule. I believe that we have a good and workable bill.

I believe this portends to be a great day. The bill that will go to the House of Representatives is one that it can and should accept. It is a bill that can and should be enacted into law.

I would not want this opportunity to pass without expressing my thanks to my fellow members of the Committee on the District of Columbia. They have worked hard in this area of legislation for the District of Columbia. I express my thanks to them and to each of them.

The distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] has been a long, faithful, and dedicated champion of home rule. Much of this bill is his fine handiwork.

The capable junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] added greatly in fashioning this bill. As the former Mayor of Laconia in his home State, he brought practicality and understanding of municipal problems. I salute him.

The interest and vitality brought to our committee this year by the highly persuasive junior Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy] and the most capable junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] brought a new look to this bill with their fine amendments made a part of this bill. I congratulate each of them and hope to count on them for continued efforts in helping to solve the problems of this great city.

To my good friends and able coworkers, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] and the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], I pay my tribute. This bill is a better one for their fine work. The articulate presentation of floor amendments by the Senator from Colorado has given to the Senate and to the Nation a better understanding about the tremendous problems this Capital City has.

I also thank the District Committee staff members who spent much time and capable effort in giving to Senators a detailed analysis of the various provisions of this complex, 50-page bill. I believe that it is the most detailed analysis of a bill that I have ever seen in my years in the Senate.

This is the sixth time that a home rule bill has passed the Senate since 1949. I hope that it will be finally enacted into law.

I thank all the staff members of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia. I particularly single out the staff director, Chet Smith, for his long hours in working on the details of this bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe it has been at least 18 years since I was chairman of the House District Committee. I set up a special subcommittee and we there for the first time prepared and introduced a home rule bill for the District of Columbia. The House rules, of course, are quite different from those in the Senate. In the House there is what is called District Day, and it is only on specific alternate Mondays that such matters can be considered. Of course, if some Members engage in quorum filibusters, it is found that District Day has gone without being able to accomplish the purpose. I have seen times when the home rule bill was before the House of Representatives when there were 15 or 16 quorum calls in a single afternoon. When 435 Members of the House have to answer the roll, that is a considerable chore, and the clock finally stops it. I had an interest in home rule then. I still have an interest in it.

I am not happy about some of the provisions. I hope they can be worked out. I hope they can be considered by the committee of the House and the House of Representatives and a home rule setup can be consummated for the Nation's Capital.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator from Illinois. I share his views. I think it is a good bill. Perhaps it can be a better bill. I hope it will be finally enacted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I do not want the Senator from Nevada to take his seat at the conclusion of the consideration of the bill without the Senator from Oregon making a few remarks about him which are well deserved.

In my opinion, this is a great day for the Senate, the District of Columbia, and the Senator from Nevada, who, as chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, has worked valiantly for home rule in the District of Columbia.

It was a great pleasure for me to be associated with him in our battle for home rule. In my entire 20 years in the Senate I have fought for home rule for the District of Columbia. On four occasions in the past the Neely-Morse home rule bill was passed. Later I called it the Morse-Neely home rule bill, although the Senator from West Virginia was deceased at the time I offered what I called the Morse-Neely home rule bill. I thought, as a tribute to the late Senator from West Virginia who valiantly worked for home rule, that it should be so labeled.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] deserves great credit for the accomplishment which has occurred on the floor of the Senate with the passage of the home rule bill. I am not too optimistic as to what the final result will be, although I will not give up hope that a meaningful home rule bill will come from the House of Representatives through its regular legislative processes. I hope a bill will be reported from the District of Columbia Committee of the House and that action will be taken by the House of Representatives, so that a meaningful bill can be agreed upon in conference.

I close my remarks by saying that if it develops in the immediate future that on the House side there is no prospect of getting a meaningful home rule bill from the House District Committee, it would be wise for Members of the House to face up to the situation and proceed with a discharge petition, so the House can give consideration to a really meaningful bill.

After the fight the Senator from Nevada has made, I believe it would be most unfortunate if we were left with a bill that was so watered down that it would be a home rule bill in name only, but not in fact.

So I respectfully say to Members on the House side, "It is your responsibility." As I have said, the House should face up to its responsibility to discharge the House District Committee if it is necessary to obtain true home rule legislation. I do not believe it should pass a mock home rule bill.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his remarks. He has been a true champion in this field.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I join my colleagues in congratulating the Senator from Nevada and his associates on the District of Columbia Committee for a great accomplishment. Home rule and democracy are inseparable. I hope, as the Senator from Oregon has expressed the wish, that the House will follow through. In any event, so far as this body is concerned, it is a great historic achievement, and the members of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, and particularly the chairman of that committee, deserve the thanks of all of us and the thanks of lovers of freedom and democracy for bringing this legislation to this point.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to make only a brief statement. I once served on the District of Columbia Committee. The chairman of the committee deserves great credit for what he has done. The Senate has done its job on what I consider to be a bill competent to do the job. I believe the House will do its duty, and that the people of the District will do their part if they obtain the necessary legislative opportunity to do it.

The fact that this great city has not been able to govern itself in any way has long been a shame to this Nation.

The bipartisan achievement which has been accomplished by the Senator from Nevada is only one of many jewels in his diadem as a Senator and as a legislator.

I close my remarks by joining the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who has been a great champion in this field. I served under him, and I join him in the hope and expectation that the House will do its part, as the Senate has done all it can, and that the people of the District of Columbia will do their part in a patriotic and civic way, if we move to do whatever may be necessary for them to achieve self-government. We hope that the House version, like the Senate bill, will be a meaningful and effective measure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I, too, congratulate the able Senator for putting the bill through the Senate. The Senator stated that he hoped the House would be able further to improve the bill. One improvement I would like to see is that the appropriation for the contribution of the Federal Government to the District of Columbia be left in the hands of the Appropriations Committees of the Congress. I consider it vital not to let the Congress become a rubber stamp for a body that has no responsibility for appropriating money.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. I do not share his hope in that regard, as my statement on the last pending amendment yesterday showed. Why should not the District voters control their own budget when their taxes make up 87 cents out of every dollar spent on municipal services? I do not know whether the bill can be improved by the House or not. I think it is already a workable bill. I hope both Houses will work together on a bill that will finally bring home rule to the District of Columbia.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. McINTYRE. As a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I take this opportunity to congratulate the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. As one member of the committee, I know what a calm and patient man he is, and how difficult it is to work on this committee.

I believe the Senate and the people of the District of Columbia realize that in the Senator from Nevada they have a man who has worked hard to make Washington a better city in which to live.

On the occasion of the passage of the home rule bill, and as a member of that committee, I commend the Senator from Nevada for his excellent work. I am very glad to have played a small part in assisting him toward its passage.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his comments. There is no more faithful worker on the District Committee than the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from Nevada yielding to me and wish, first, to say how important I believe passage of the home rule bill will be for the District of Columbia but, really, also, for all of us.

Second, I commend the Senator from Nevada, who attended all the hearings during the period of the past 4 months. I join the Senator from New Hampshire in saying what a good friend the District of Columbia has in the Senator from Nevada. I have never seen greater patience or more diligent effort exhibited by anyone, than I observed on the part of the Senator from Nevada as he went through the hearings and dealt with all the other problems concerning the District of Columbia.

It has been an extremely impressive demonstration to me, and I believe impressive to all Senators who serve on the committee. Without his efforts, without his leadership, this legislation would not have been taken up.

However, this is only the beginning. All future legislation we shall be considering will be deemed even more worthy to be worked on because of the direction the Senator from Nevada has given to all of us through the legislation which has just been enacted on the floor of the Senate.

I believe that the people of the District of Columbia are fortunate that this legislation has passed. They are also fortunate in that the chairman of the District Committee is the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE].

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator from New York for his kind remarks. He is a most valuable addition to the committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE], and the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

The dedication of the Senator from Nevada to the affairs of the District of Columbia has been an inspiration to all of us who serve on his committee. He deserves great commendation for the tireless efforts he has put forth toward helping the citizens of the District of Columbia to govern themselves after so long a time.

It has been an honor for me to serve on his committee; and I hope that I shall be permitted to continue to serve on it.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, there are some words that must be said about the distinguished Senator from Nevada, the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, under whose leadership it has been my privilege to serve.

Although these words will be few I hope they will express fully my deep sense of gratitude to Senator BIBLE and convey, also, the lasting appreciation of the minority members of the committee with respect to his hard work, his contribution, his gift of understanding—all so manifestly displayed during consideration of the District of Columbia home rule bill both in committee and on the floor of the Senate.

When there were honest differences of viewpoint he sought to conciliate. When there was a need for extensive debate he permitted and encouraged such debate in the great tradition of a free society.

In following such a course my distinguished chairman, the able Senator from Nevada, added luster to the Senate and made possible the approval of the home rule bill which but for his qualities would have been characterized by significant deficiencies.

In the years to come when home rule is firmly established in the District of Columbia the historians will look back and say about ALAN BIBLE, "There was a man who had a job to do. He did it and did it well."

I know that I speak for the minority members of the District of Columbia Committee, the minority staff member, Robert Hall, and all those connected with the District of Columbia home rule bill when I say: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the privilege that it has been to work under your leadership."

I know that the chairman recognizes the great contribution made by the entire staff of the District of Columbia Committee to the development of the District of Columbia home rule bill and I salute them for their selflessness and the splendid caliber of their work.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the executive calendar, beginning with that of James F. Gordon, of Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Harold H. Greene, of Maryland, to be associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Gerald D. O'Brien, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Commissioner of Patents; and

Richard A. Wahl, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Commissioner of Patents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the executive calendar will be stated, beginning with that of James F. Gordon.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James F. Gordon, of Kentucky, to be a U.S. district judge for the Western District of Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Donald H. Fraser, of Georgia, to be a U.S. attorney for the Southern District of Georgia for the term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Thomas B. Mason, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the Western District of Virginia for the term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James P Coleman, of Mississippi, to be a U.S. circuit judge for the fifth circuit.

Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. MAGNUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, upon this nomination I wish to be heard. I shall seek a yea-and-nay vote on it. There are enough Senators in the Chamber, at the moment, and I therefore ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for one moment, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Washington, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LABELING OF CIGARETTE PACKAGES—TRANSLATION OF FRENCH AND GERMAN STUDIES

As in legislative session,

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on June 16, I asked and received unanimous consent to have the Library of Congress translate studies written by some French and German scientists and filed with the Committee on Commerce during the hearings on S. 547 and S. 559, bills to regulate labeling of cigarettes.

These translations have now been made, and I ask unanimous consent to file them with the Committee on Commerce as a part of the original records.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Ohio, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXCISE TAXES ARE ALREADY BEING KEPT BY VENDORS

As in legislative session,

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Congress recently enacted a bill to eliminate excise taxes on many commodities in this country. At that time, discussions were had to the effect that there would be a failure to pass on to the consumer the suspension of the tax and the gains attained from its elimination.

I am shocked to have received from an Ohio constituent clear verification of the apprehension of many of us that instead of savings being made to the consumer through elimination of the excise tax, by having it transferred on to the consumer, it is being picked up by the vendor.

I have a letter from a citizen in Dayton, Ohio. With the letter he enclosed a notice which he received from his bank. The notice reads:

> DEAR CUSTOMER: You will find that your bill for safety deposit rent is the same as last year.
>
> Although the Government has removed the excise tax on your box, we have increased the cost of your box by an amount equal to the tax. Thus you will pay no more or less than last year.
>
> We have taken this step because of increased personnel and operating costs and with the hope that it will inconvenience you less than an across-the-board increase.
>
> Cordially yours,
>
> FRANK S. ANGER,
> *President, Winters National Bank & Trust Co.*
>
> DAYTON, OHIO, July 1, 1965.

Mr. President, I believe that what has been done in this case is indefensible. I cannot understand how a banking institution can have the audacity to take a step of this kind, when it was clearly indicated that the purpose of removing the excise tax was to help the consuming public and the purchaser of services of this kind.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have called for the majority leader to return to the Chamber. I wish to discuss a procedural matter in his presence, but inasmuch as he is not present at this moment I hope that the Senator from New York will proceed and permit me to interrupt him later as soon as the majority leader comes into the Chamber.

Mr. JAVITS. Whenever the Senator is ready, I shall be glad to yield to him.

NOMINATION OF JAMES P. COLEMAN TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in raising the questions relative to the nomination of former Gov. James P. Coleman, of Mississippi, to be a judge of the Circuit Court for the Fifth Circuit, I wish it to be understood, first and foremost, that I do not take this responsibility lightly, nor is it at any time pleasant to have to oppose the nomination of a man who has served most of his life in useful public service; nor, from the vote in the committee, would it appear that I have, so far at least, been joined by many members of similar mind.

However, I believe that we face a portentous question. It is one of the most profound duties of a Senator to fulfill with conscience the requirement for advice and consent, and to use his honest judgment and discretion in giving such advice and consent. I feel it my duty to lay this question before the Senate—I hope with objectivity and due regard to the dignity of the office.

It has been recommended by the Judiciary Committee, on a divided vote, that the nomination of Governor Coleman be confirmed. I shall relate the facts and circumstances bearing upon my opposition so that the Senate may, with deliberation, act upon them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at that point?

Mr. JAVITS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the majority leader, so that I may raise a few parliamentary questions. I should like to be advised when the hearings before the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee on the nomination of former Governor Coleman were first available to Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair believes that the chairman of the committee is best qualified to answer that question.

Mr. MORSE. I have been advised that they were first available this morning. I had not seen them until 10 minutes ago. They were not on my desk. I had to send members of the Senate staff to obtain a copy of the hearings for me.

I wish to read the hearings. I say to the majority leader that, subject to discussion, my tentative thought is that we should seek to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to fix a time certain to vote on the nomination. I have no desire, I assure the majority leader, to hold up consideration of the nomination for any length of time.

On the other hand, I take very seriously my responsibility to advise on nominations, and I want to know what I am advising on when I vote. I wish to find a basis, if I can find it, for voting for the nomination. I am influenced by the fact that liberals on the Judiciary Committee, I understand, have voted for confirmation. They would not have done so if they had felt that there was not sufficient or adequate basis for their vote.

I do not like the idea of having the nomination called up for consideration in the Senate when we all know it is a controversial nomination, when a copy of the hearings was handed to me only in the past 10 minutes, and when I have had no opportunity to read the transcript of the hearings.

I do not think this is an appropriate procedure for us to follow.

To show my good faith, I am perfectly willing to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the nomination tomorrow at a time certain. However, I would not be inclined to vote on it until I have finished reading the hearings, even if it required me to read them aloud for my own edification, at least, in order to know what we are considering, before I vote, and so that I may know what is contained in the hearings.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have the floor. I wonder if the Senator will allow me to interrupt him at this point.

Mr. MORSE. I am at the mercy of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. No; not at all. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator. I should like to interrupt him when the Senator is ready to have me do so.

Mr. MORSE. Of course.

Mr. JAVITS. I handled most of the questioning before the subcommittee. Other Senators asked questions also. Perhaps I took the most time. I am not a member of the subcommittee, but a member of the full committee. I was treated with the greatest courtesy and respect, and given all the time I wished to take. There is no problem on that score. I have had full opportunity to examine the hearings in great detail. I had assumed, because I know nothing to the contrary, that perhaps there would be at the most three reasonably long speeches, including my own in respect of this matter, and that then there would be a vote on the nomination.

My plans will take me away from Washington tomorrow, and similarly on Monday they will keep me away from Washington until about 2 o'clock.

The record of the hearings is not very long, as the Senator will see. Perhaps I can highlight for the Senator the principal points, and the Senator might consider, while I am speaking, perusing the hearings; and after he has had an opportunity to browse through them perhaps we can vote on the nomination at 6 or 6:30 this evening.

Or, if the majority is willing, the vote could be had on Monday at approximately 2 o'clock in the afternoon. In that way I could meet a commitment which I made in all good faith. I have consulted with the majority leader and the minority leader and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and it was understood that consideration of the nomination could be concluded in a few hours.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would not be inclined to enter into any such unanimous-consent agreement. I shall read the record.

There are two principles involved. The first is that whenever the Senate is confronted with a nomination that involves the advice and consent of the Senate on a controversial matter, it should not be brought up on one day and voted on that day, when Members of the Senate may be in doubt and have not had adequate time to study the record.

I have not been wasting any time in my job in the Senate. I have been working for long hours each day.

I again say that my understanding is that the transcript of the hearings was not available until a short time ago.

In any event, if the hearings were available, they were certainly not available to the Senator from Oregon until a few moments ago. The responsibility is not mine to go out searching for the hearings. The responsibility is on the committee to put a copy of the hearings on my desk. The hearings were not on my desk at the time the nomination was called up. I intend to carry out my duty, and I want to know what I am voting on. That means that I intend to read the hearings.

I do not browse through material like this. I read it. I wish to be absolutely certain that my vote on this nomination is substantiated both by the hearings and by the debate that will take place on the floor of the Senate.

All I am asking for is a reasonable period of time to study the hearings, and for fixing a time certain to vote on the nomination. It is all right if the time is fixed for Monday or for tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I say to my friends from Mississippi that I do not believe any wrong would be done to anyone. No great wrong would be done to Mr. Coleman, I say to the Senators from Mississippi, if the vote were postponed until a time certain, either on Monday or tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has made a reasonable request. In line with his suggestion, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the Coleman nomination occur at 4 o'clock on Monday afternoon next.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object, because I have agreed on this—I ask the majority leader whether it would fit in with his plans, and if he would be gracious enough, to allow me to make my address in chief today. I am ready to do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to ask if the majority leader would be gracious enough to let me have perhaps 20 minutes on Monday before the vote; and that he use his best efforts in my behalf in that connection. I should like to summarize my argument at that time. I shall make my major argument today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall put forth my best efforts in the Senator's behalf.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sure the Senator will do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

> *Ordered,* That the Senate proceed to vote on the nomination of James P. Coleman, of Mississippi, to be U.S. circuit judge for the fifth circuit, at 4 p.m., on Monday, July 26, 1965.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the other nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to restate the unanimous-consent agreement. It is agreed that the vote on the Coleman nomination will occur at 4 o'clock on Monday afternoon; and that the yeas and nays which have been ordered will be applicable then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

VIETNAMESE REFUGEES

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the cruel logic of any military conflict carries in its wake a tremendous toll in human suffering. Nothing illustrates this more in South Vietnam than the mounting flood of refugees.

Some 300,000 to 400,000 men, women, and children are crowded into five reception centers along the South Vietnamese coast. Several hundred thousand additional South Vietnamese citizens are uprooted in the interior. Indeed, it has been estimated that the number of war orphans in South Vietnam is in the tens of thousands.

My purpose today is to bring before this body some of the information and facts concerning the South Vietnamese refugee problem, and to stress our need to anticipate at this time an almost certain escalation of the numbers and the needs of these refugees in the immediate future.

The Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees has been holding hearings during the past 10 days on Vietnam. During the course of these hearings, and from direct press reports from Vietnam, it is becoming increasingly clear that the mounting flood of refugees reflects a recent important change in emphasis in Vietcong tactics in the countryside.

While terror has never been absent, earlier Vietcong tactics stressed the careful wooing of villagers and the winning of their allegiance. This, apparently, has in large part recently given way to all-out tactics of calculated oppression, brutality, and terrorism.

Former Ambassador Leonard Unger, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs of the Department of State, in testimony last week before the subcommittee, described the terrorism and even actual attacks on otherwise peaceful Vietnamese villages. Ambassador Unger told the subcommittee that more than 2,000 local officials and civilians in South Vietnam have been murdered in recent months as part of this calculated buildup of terrorism.

Philip Geyelin, in the July 15, 1965, Wall Street Journal, reported that—

> In the Vietcong haste to make the most of the monsoons, their tactics have become tougher * * * efforts to ingratiate have given way to rough stuff—terrorism, assassinations and pillage—in order to collar recruits and gather supplies from the local populace.

Last Tuesday, Jack Langguth, of the New York Times, in a dispatch from Saigon, told the following story:

> Fifteen miles south of Pleiku, refugees arriving in a special forces camp told about Vietcong terrorism in the village of Pleibreng.
>
> They said that the Vietcong entered the town Saturday night and instructed the villagers to sing songs of the National Liberation Front, the political organization of the Vietcong. When the people, most of them mountaineers, refused, the Vietcong threw a grenade at them, killing 12 persons and wounding 26.

On Monday, John T. Wheeler, of the Associated Press, described the results of the strategic bombing of the South Vietnamese village of Bagia. The cruel dilemma of strategic necessity versus injury and uprooting of innocent villagers is cogently posed and I commend the article to the attention of this body.

Rutherford M. Poats, Assistant Administrator of AID for the Far East, summed up for the subcommittee last week the cause of the increased refugee flow as a flight from danger, "the danger of war, the danger of Communist terrorism, the danger of our counteraction against this Communist terror."

Whatever the cause of the flight, the effect of the refugee flow is the fostering of instability and confusion in the countryside, the overtaxing of relief facilities, and the clogging of roads which greatly hamper the movement of Government personnel and materials.

As Ambassador Unger pointed out in his testimony, caring for the refugees, providing them with food and other necessities, and protecting the asylum areas from guerrilla attacks and infiltration, is difficult and expensive—particularly in view of the increasingly successful interdiction of South Vietnam's supply routes and relief convoys by Vietcong forces.

Ambassador Unger was careful to emphasize that our economic aid programs—including aid to refugees—are just as important as our military aid to Vietnam.

Mr. President, added to the increasing military pressures, the political and economic strain of the refugee problem harbors seed of great crisis, which could substantially contribute to Vietcong efforts to undermine and destroy the morale and resistance of the Vietnamese people and the government in Saigon.

In his Wall Street Journal report, Mr. Geyelin quotes Mr. Richard Evans of the U.S. aid mission as saying that if the present trend in South Vietnam continues "everybody becomes a refugee."

Mr. Geyelin continues:

> And in that case, the real calamity to fear—the real payoff for the Vietcong's economic disruption campaign—would be a trek to the National Capital for help. "You could have 5 or 10 million marching to Saigon," Mr. Evans warns.

A serious related problem to the flight of the refugees is the trojan horse strategy used by the Vietcong. There is ample evidence to indicate that the refugee flow is providing Communist forces with a convenient vehicle to infiltrate government controlled areas with Vietcong cadres.

Richard Critchfield, in the July 18, 1965, Washington Star, reported that Brig. Gen. Nguyen Chanh Thi, the military governor of central Vietnam, recently issued an order forbidding the influx of any more refugees into the coastal towns and cities.

Critchfield explains that—

> Thi's fear was that the 300,000 refugees who had already fled to the coastal area, provided the Vietcong with a vehicle to infiltrate Government-controlled areas with Communist agents.

This problem, however, is not insurmountable and should not deter full-scale assistance to refugees, regardless of their number and attending problems. This must be an integral part of the U.S. commitment to South Vietnam, for humanitarian reasons in the first instance, but also to further this Nation's two-pronged effort to create conditions of security from direct and indirect aggression, and to improve conditions of stability among the Vietnamese people.

We must consider every possible alternative in efforts to assist and protect the refugees. We must take into account the real possibility of a doubling, even tripling of the number of refugees.

In this connection, testimony before the committee by both Government and private agency witnesses shows that the aid and assistance program to refugees in Vietnam until recent weeks was diffuse and operating on an ad hoc basis.

We are encouraged by the recent formation of a formal coordinating council in Vietnam, composed of Vietnam and United States Government and private agency personnel.

We hope some of the aid problems may be solved by this coordinating council, and that there can be greater central control over fiscal matters and increased planning of joint aid programs, so as to avoid duplication and lack of direction, and in some instances, diversion of needed food and supplies into unauthorized hands.

I do not wish to detract from the efforts now being made by USOM, the private volunteer agencies, and the South Vietnamese Government.

My purpose today is to direct the attention of this esteemed body to the mounting flood of refugees and the attendant increasing humanitarian needs and political ramifications.

The subcommittee on refugees and escapees is continuing hearings on this problem. We hope within the next few weeks to be able to file a report embodying some of our findings and suggestions.

May I conclude by saying that I cannot stress enough our need to be alert and attuned to the refugee problem in Vietnam, especially in light of an almost certain escalation of the numbers and the needs of these refugees in the near future.

The course of events in Vietnam in part depend on our efforts to help these hapless and needy people.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to commend the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for his diligence in alerting the Senate and the people of the United States to a very serious problem which could well affect the course of events in Vietnam.

It has been my privilege to serve on the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, of which the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is chairman.

During the past 10 days he has been holding extensive hearings. There has been testimony before the committee by many persons from private agencies who have just come from Vietnam. They have testified that the problem of the refugees is very serious, because in the event that the Vietcong terroristic tactics are sufficient to force great masses of refugees into the capital in Saigon, there could conceivably be severe diplomatic repercussions around the world, as well as military and economic repercussions in Saigon and Vietnam itself.

Therefore, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is performing a fine service by calling to the attention of the Senate and the administration this problem, which today, perhaps, may seem small, but in reality is of great import in the conduct of our effort in Vietnam, and the successful conclusion thereof.

I congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. His efforts are extremely worthwhile, and I hope that he will persevere in this area.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I thank the Senator.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JAVITS obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have made some inquiries of the Parliamentarian. I believe I mentioned this to the Senator from New York.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go out of executive session and return to legislative session.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Chair please state the request, because other Senators have spoken to me with respect to the question. Will the Chair state what the Chair is passing upon? I, myself, have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The majority leader has asked unanimous consent that the Senate go out of executive session and return to legislative session. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am sorry, but I missed the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana asked unanimous consent to have the Senate vacate or leave executive session and go into legislative session.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished majority leader his purpose in moving that the Senate go into legislative session There are rumors—and I think they are substantiated—that as soon as the Senate goes into legislative session, the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] my friend and my colleague, will then move to take up the American Legion baseball bill and will then, if he is successful, move to bring up his constitutional amendment, which I think should be called the "foul ball" amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from Illinois, if he wishes me to yield to him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. To which Senator from Illinois does the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The two Senators from Illinois are on the floor. I do not desire to take the floor from the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. If the senior Senator from Illinois wishes me to yield to him, I shall gladly do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I do not wish to have the Senator from New York yield to me; I should like to have him continue.

NOMINATION OF JAMES P. COLEMAN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I oppose the nomination of Gov. James P. Coleman, of Mississippi, to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. While I was not a member of the subcommittee which was appointed to consider the nomination, I am a member of the full

Committee on the Judiciary and was, through the courtesy of the chairman, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], permitted to attend the hearings and to question the nominee.

I approached the nomination with an open mind, as any lawyer should, but because of the serious questions which had been raised concerning Governor Coleman's background, I attended all the hearings and questioned witnesses extensively.

Thereafter, I reviewed the record thoroughly and gave further serious thought to the nomination before reaching my decision, since no Senator should lightly register his disapproval of a Presidential appointment.

At the outset, let me emphasize that neither I nor any of the witnesses who testified against Governor Coleman, so far as I could ascertain, had any information which would indicate that he is not an able lawyer, and a man of personal honesty and integrity. Rather, my opposition is based upon the belief that a man who has demonstrated by word and action that he harbors so relatively recently a deep-seated conviction contrary to the law of the land—namely, on the issue of the segregation of the races—should not be appointed to this high post; for, in my judgment, to speculate that any man having such an impressive set of segregationist credentials will change is a gamble that the Senate and the Nation should not be called upon to take.

Three factors have brought me to this decision: First, the critical importance of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals at this time; second, Governor Coleman's record on civil rights matters as a public official; and third, the precedent the Senate would be setting in confirming this nomination.

Taking these matters up point by point, the Fifth Circuit encompasses the States of Mississippi, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, and Texas. One-third of the Nation's Negroes live in those States, and the vast majority of civil rights cases come before the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. As one who has worked throughout my career in Congress for effective civil rights legislation, I believe strongly that judges whose impartiality and dedication to the U.S. Constitution have been demonstrated beyond peradventure should be appointed to this bench.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964, in its various aspects, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, when it is enacted, will be tested in the Fifth Circuit. Laws which Governor Coleman signed when he was the chief executive of Mississippi also will be tested in that circuit. I hasten to add that Governor Coleman commendably stated that he would disqualify himself from sitting in such cases; but I use the reference here only to point out the importance of the Fifth Circuit so far as Federal civil rights laws are concerned.

Convictions of civil rights demonstrators will be transferred to Federal courts and will be appealed, perhaps, to the Supreme Court of the United States, through this circuit.

It is regrettable, therefore, that when such a vital post is at stake, the Senate has been asked by the President to advise and consent to the nomination of a man whose personal convictions on these important matters run counter to the will of Congress and the decisions of the Supreme Court.

I now wish to refer to a letter contained in the hearings. At page 137 of the hearings is a letter from Mark DeWolfe Howe, a professor at the Harvard Law School. He opposes the confirmation of Governor Coleman's nomination and says in his letter:

> In view of the conditions which now prevail in the Fifth Circuit, however, I cannot persuade myself that an appointment to a judicial vacancy in that circuit is justified when it is based upon the hope that a political record already made will have no bearing on the judicial responsibility yet to be fulfilled.

I repeat those words for the Senate:

> * * * is based upon the hope that a political record already made will have no bearing on a judicial responsibility yet to be fulfilled.

It is hoped, of course, that if the Senate should confirm the nomination of Governor Coleman, he will administer the laws, including the civil rights laws, fairly and without diversion and delay. That has not always been the case with Federal judges in the Fifth Circuit. Nonetheless, I am willing to agree that Governor Coleman, as he testified before the committee, gave every appearance of being a man who in good faith intended to do his duty as a judge, even by these laws.

Our judgment must be based upon whether the convictions of Governor Coleman, as shown by the record, are so deeply built into his conscious personality as well as into his subconscious personality that he could really and truly be an exemplary judge in terms of the law as laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States and by Congress—laws which he has spent all his public life opposing, and, whether we have any right, under these circumstances, to pick him out, notwithstanding his ability as a lawyer, and to say, "You are the man whose nomination we will confirm to be a judge of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals."

For myself, I have answered that question, without any derogation whatsoever of the character, veracity, or good faith of Governor Coleman, decidedly in the negative.

Mr. President, the second point—and a critically important point—is the record of Governor Coleman. Numerous statements made by the Governor, which would seem to characterize him as a convinced segregationist, have been brought to our attention. Such statements are contained in the record. Indeed, the Attorney General of the United States was the first witness before the subcommittee, which is a most unusual procedure in the consideration of a judicial post of this character.

In testifying in support of the nomination, the Attorney General himself was conscious of the record of Governor Coleman as a declared segregationist and a person who believes in separation of the races in matters which are within the determination of law and public policy. Such conduct is contrary, in my judgment, to the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, the laws made by Congress, and the Constitution of the United States.

The Attorney General characterized those statements to us as statements which were made in the heat of a political campaign and which did not necessarily indicate the true character of the nominee.

Governor Coleman was faced with these statements. Where Governor Coleman had doubts about whether he uttered the statement, he told us of those doubts. I believe that what I am stating now is fair to him in terms of the statements which he agreed he had made and which he had every reason to suppose, according to his recollection, he did make.

I shall cover the dates from the time when Mr. Coleman became Governor, which was in 1955, through the time when he ceased to be Governor, which was at the very end of 1959, and during the political campaign of 1963, which is a fairly recent date, because Governor Coleman again sought to be Governor by running in a primary at that time.

At that time, Mr. Coleman again gave utterance to statements which I believe are of exactly the same character as that displayed when he was Governor of Mississippi. I point out, too, that this is really, in essence, what finally persuaded me.

Between 1963 and the last of his public utterances in July 1965 when he testified before the subcommittee, he had uttered no contrary views.

It was only when he testified before the subcommittee in an effort, naturally, to qualify himself for a post which he undoubtedly wants—quite legitimately and properly—that he uttered views different from the views which he had expressed during his public life up to that moment. Also—and this is very important—the best statement that he made to us was—not that he no longer entertained such views. He very carefully did not say that. He said rather, that he felt in all honesty—and I have already said that I believe he sincerely felt that way—that he could proceed in an objective way to pass on all of those laws in accordance with the decisions of the Supreme Court and the law as established by Congress, and that he could, in good faith, carry out his responsibilities as a judge in those respects.

I read the first statement, made on May 11, 1955:

> I here and now give the people of Mississippi my solemn pledge that if I am elected Governor there will be no necessity to abolish the public schools, nor will there be any mixing of the races in those schools.

That statement was made on May 11, 1955, roughly 1 year after the decision in the Brown against Board of Education case which determined that the separation of the races in the public schools was contrary to the Constitution.

On December 19, 1955, after the election, but just before he took office, he said:

> Let there be no misunderstanding. I am for segregation. Mississippi will never integrate.

On June 23, 1957, Governor Coleman said:

> I will be frank to say that I think the great majority of [Negroes in Mississippi] are not yet ready to vote. Those have been my views publicly and they still are.

Governor Coleman used the word "them." Under the context of the statement which I will read, it is clear that he was speaking of the Negroes in Mississippi.

I shall read the colloquy and then return to further references to the statements of the Governor in order to bring it up to the dates to which I refer.

On June 23, 1957, in an exchange on "Meet the Press"—which is certainly a prominent public program—between Mr. Lawrence Spivak—who is well known to us all as the panel member on that program—and Governor Coleman, a colloquy ensued. I have received this colloquy from the "Meet the Press" printed record. I referred to it in the hearings and suggested that it should be made a part of the record. Although the record was printed before this colloquy was actually made available. I make no complaint about that. The transcript is before us now. I read it into the RECORD:

EXCHANGE BETWEEN MR. SPIVAK AND GOVERNOR COLEMAN ON "MEET THE PRESS," JUNE 23, 1957

Mr. SPIVAK. Governor, as I saw the figures, there are about 900,000 Negroes in Mississippi today, is that correct?

Governor COLEMAN. That is about right.

Mr. SPIVAK. Yet, in the last election, only 7,000 voted.

Governor COLEMAN. Seven thousand is what we believe to be the correct number.

Mr. SPIVAK. Would you, as Governor, like to see all eligible Negroes in your State vote?

Governor COLEMAN. As far as that is concerned that is determined by the laws of the State of Mississippi and the constitution of our State which prescribes qualifications for everybody alike. Our election laws in Mississippi since 1890 have made no mention whatever of race or color.

Mr. SPIVAK. Isn't it strange that of almost an equal division in population—I think you have 1,200,000 whites and 900,000 Negroes—of 1,200,000 whites 411,000 voted while of the 900,000 Negroes only 7,000 voted? Isn't there something wrong in a democratic society when that happens that ought to be remedied?

Governor COLEMAN. The Republican Assistant Attorney General of the United States said last fall publicly for political purposes that he was going to make an example of Mississippi—that he was going to come down and attend to all of us who were keeping the Negroes from voting. Strange to say, after the elections were over, the grand juries met. Nobody has been indicted and no charges have been preferred. I assume, therefore, that the diligent Assistant Attorney General of the United States had no proof or he would have come forward with it. Therefore I think the answer is they are not being forceably kept from voting in Mississippi.

Mr. SPIVAK. Governor, why aren't they voting and why aren't you in a democratic society, as Governor of a great State, doing something to make sure that more of your Negroes vote.

Governor COLEMAN. I will be frank to say that I think the great majority of them are not yet ready to vote. Those have been my views publicly and they still are.

It seems to me that that is a very eloquent and clear exposition of the views of Governor Coleman. I respectfully submit that I have not seen those views canceled out by anything that Governor Coleman said before or during the hearings except that he said he thought that in good conscience—and I believe that he really conscientiously thinks so—he could make fair decisions even in cases involving integration.

On June 30, 1959, Governor Coleman said:

> I am well aware that a little handful of my political adversaries have tried to destroy my place in the affections of my fellow Mississippians by claiming that I am a moderate. Apparently, these people cannot tell a moderate from a successful segregationist. They have made a great sham of this, and every time they can get a chance they try to stir it up. I ask you to ignore what they say and look at what the record says * * *. I stand on a record of performance and I have delivered the goods. I am not entitled to be called a moderate, and I notice that none of my friends have called me that.

So we must assume that the word "moderate" in Mississippi was a word of opprobrium at that time and that the Governor was going to great pains to see to it that he was not a moderate, but a successful segregationist. In my version of the law at that time, in 1957, a successful segregationist was a man who, at the very least, condoned, if he did not actively help, the successful violation of the laws and the Constitution of the United States.

While it is possible that even such extreme statements made during political campaigns do not always indicate deep convictions, my own hesitation, about the nomination is based not only upon such statements but rather upon the acts of Governor Coleman which, in my mind, are far more illustrative of his beliefs. These can be illustrated by an examination of statutes which he signed into law while Governor.

I shall recite the statutes in detail. We all know that the State of Mississippi has done all it could, even since 1957, to twist and turn the laws, to impose the doctrine of nullification and do whatever else it could to prevent the State from being desegregated according to the decision of the Supreme Court and the laws of the United States.

It is extremely easy to be cynical and to be so hardshelled or so philosophic as to say, "He was a political official in the most ardently segregationist State. What do you think he is going to do? Commit hara-kiri in his home State as a politician."

Mr. President, that undoubtedly is the standard of the marketplace, but, at the same time, did the President of the United States have to select Judge Coleman to be a member of the circuit court of appeals of the United States? If he could not find a competent man in Mississippi, did he have to pick a man from Mississippi? There are four other States, Oregon, South Dakota, Alaska, and Hawaii, which have no representatives on the circuit courts of appeals. There is nothing in the law or in the conscience of the President of the United States that says he must find someone from Mississippi and make a compromise—I do not want to characterize this, because it is the President of the United States who is involved—upon this fundamental issue on which the President has spoken so eloquently and acted so well. Why compromise the issue with that kind of selection? I do not understand it. I am against it because I do not understand it.

In 1956 Governor Coleman signed into law chapters 273 and 288—General Laws of Mississippi—acts confirming a steadfast policy of racial segregation in the State's public schools and repealing the State's compulsory education laws—so as to be able to close individual schools within the State if required to desegregate by Federal court order. He also signed acts requiring railroad and bus companies to maintain separate waiting rooms and toilet facilities for the races traveling in intra-State commerce and requiring all intra-State passengers to use such separate facilities—chapter 258–60, General Laws of Mississippi, 1956. Criminal penalties of $1,000 and/or 1 year in jail for each violation of these acts were provided, and it was explicitly stated that an intra-State passenger arrested for violating the State-imposed segregation laws could have no action of false imprisonment against the arresting officer, nor could he recover damages from common carriers complying with these statutes.

I say, as a lawyer, that some of the laws would not stand up in court, but that does not change the fact that a distinguished and competent lawyer signed those statutes into law. I believe these acts have a grave bearing upon his competency and this compromise.

In 1956, Governor Coleman signed into law chapter 254, General Laws of Mississippi, 1956. The law sought to "give effect to the resolution of interposition, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 125, and to the principle of segregation of the races" by directing the Governor and the entire executive branch of the State of Mississippi "to prohibit by any lawful, peaceful, and constitutional means, the implementation of or the compliance with the integration decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, and to prohibit by any lawful, peaceful, and constitutional means the causing of a mixing or integration of the white and Negro races in public schools, public parks, and public waiting rooms."

Mr. President, this was self-contradictory at best, and it is not saved by the prior declaration that the means to be used were, as the statute says, lawful, peaceful, and constitutional, because there were no lawful and constitutional means which could be used to separate the races in that way. That is why I call the statement self-contradictory. But worse than that, he reaffirmed the violations of the laws of the United States and the Constitution by signing laws providing for separation of the races in that very State. I cannot conceive that the Governor was ignorant or had no knowledge of it when he signed into law what was in effect a resolution of interposition as cast by the Senate of Mississippi.

Governor Coleman also signed chapter 365, an act creating the State sovereignty commission of which the Governor was chairman. The duty of this body was to perform "all acts and things deemed necessary and proper to protect the sovereignty of the State of Mississippi, and her sister States, from encroachment thereon by the Federal Government"—chapter 365, section 5—which is nothing but the discredited doctrine of interposition which for much too long a time was used by allegedly competent lawyers as a fiction to avoid obeying the laws and policy of the United States.

Additional impediments to the fulfillment of constitutional rights are found in chapter 253, an act to prohibit the fomenting of litigation by making it unlawful to donate or receive funds for the purpose of filing or prosecuting lawsuits. This legislation was aimed at the legal defense fund of the NAACP and other organizations seeking to confirm by lawsuit the constitutional rights of Negro citizens.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to go through all the long, sad history about which we heard so much in the debate on the civil rights laws, when officials complained that the Negroes themselves were so intimidated or so poor as to make it impossible for them to go into the proper forum; and when they did, greater impediments were thrown into their way to blow out the tires of any such effort.

Governor Coleman also signed an enactment—chapter 257, General Laws, Mississippi, 1956—conferring upon all public businesses an absolute right to select their customers, and subjecting any person refusing to vacate a public place at the owner's request to a fine of up to $500 and/or imprisonment of up to 6 months. The custom of segregation by private individuals was further buttressed by the Governor's approval of chapter 256, a broad breach of the peace statute, covering "any person who shall enter any public place of business and create a disturbance or a breach of the peace in any way whatsoever including, but not restricted to, the making of threats or attempting to intimidate."

In 1956, Governor Coleman also signed legislation into the State's law books which almost made it impossible for local citizens to get lawyers from other States to defend them in Mississippi courts.

Again, this is a favorite technique used in Mississippi in order to prevent litigation from even being started in an effort to redress civil rights wrongs.

This legislation, chapter 255 of the 1956 General Laws of Mississippi, repealed the old section 8666 of the 1942 code which had permitted any attorney from any other State to appear in local courts. The only requirement was that the attorney be in good standing in his home State.

But the new Mississippi law set up elaborate procedures which an out-of-State attorney now must follow before he can represent anyone. Under chapter 255, a private group, the State bar association, is given the power of making the determination. Its only guideline for deciding is the vague phase of "the usages and customs of the State of Mississippi."

The real impact of this law can only be seen by considering the background in which it operates. It is virtually impossible to get white Mississippi lawyers to take civil rights cases. Even if the individual attorney would want to, his ordinary legal practice would be seriously hurt and socially he would become a pariah.

Of course, Negro attorneys in Mississippi will handle such cases, but there are only four Negro attorneys in the whole State of Mississippi.

Thus, chapter 255 as approved by Governor Coleman, makes it exceedingly difficult for Mississippi citizens to secure adequate legal protection of their civil rights against discriminatory practices.

In 1958, Governor Coleman signed into law chapter 311, a measure designed to cope with any attempts to desegregate Mississippi schools by authorizing the Governor to close any one or more or all schools of any or all school districts; coupling this with his approval of chapters 257 and 261 of the General Laws of 1958, acts providing that the Attorney General should offer legal assistance to any school district or executive officer, agency or commission of the State of Mississippi proceeded against in State or Federal courts or investigated by the Federal Civil Rights Commission.

Finally, in 1958, Governor Coleman approved the enactment of chapter 257 which authorized the State attorney general to defend "upon request and at his discretion" circuit clerks and registrars of various counties who are either sued or called as witnesses in State or Federal court by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, by the U.S. Government, or by any other Federal agency.

Time and again in recent years, suits have been brought against the above public officials because of their violations of the civil rights of American citizens as to voting. This legislation clearly has the object to permit Mississippi officials to continue their tactics of evading the law and through taxation to place the financial burden of legally defending these officials upon the very people whose rights have been violated.

I ask the Senate to consider the signing of those statutes—which, in my judgment, relate directly to making it far more difficult for Negroes to vote—with Governor Coleman's answer on the matter on June 23, 1957:

> I will be frank to say that I believe the great majority of them are not ready to vote, those have been guilty of violating things publicly and they still are guilty of violation.

Of course it will be argued that he was the Governor of the State of Mississippi, that he knew the temper and the climate of the State, that he was also a politician of the State, and that when the legislature sent him a statute he would most certainly operate within that frame of reference in signing a bill.

However, it strikes me that we have heard this cry from others who have said that they have done the most horrendous things because they were so directed by higher authority. The world has rejected those arguments. When a man is the Governor of a State, he is not directed by anyone to sign a State statute. If he signs it, we have the right to assume that in good conscience he believes every word in that statute and that he is putting his reputation—which is more valuable than his life—behind every one of the words he signs into law.

Another contretemps that was gone into at the hearing, one which troubled me greatly, was the case of a professor Clennon King, a Negro, who attempted—apparently during Governor Coleman's administration—to register at the University of Mississippi; in short, to desegregate the University of Mississippi. This took place in 1958. Professor King was promptly taken into custody, and committed to a mental institution.

When questioned about this matter during the hearings before the subcommittee in the Senate, Governor Coleman described in detail the behavior of King and indicated that in his opinion, there were legitimate grounds for wanting a mental examination. Indeed, the Governor produced a letter which he said was written to him by this same Professor King, in 1959, in which is a rather interesting letter and which I will read to the Senate in just a moment, because I believe that it bears upon the point I was about to try to make.

The letter which Governor Coleman read to the subcommittee, which he says he received from Professor King, then in California, in October 1959, reads as follows:

> I am deeply sorry for all the inconveniences caused when I was sufficiently fortunate to be a Mississippian, but did not appreciate the privilege. The chronic campaign to fake Mississippi as the sick State of America has never disgusted me more. And to think I have been a tool of this fraud.
>
> Mississippi is a great State, as all genuine Mississippians, black and white, well know. Many of the greatest Negro names are her daughters and sons. The terrible tragedy is that they are not able to speak their gratitude out loud.
>
> Again, I am sorry for the fodder which I furnished ill-trained guns. Had I unflinchingly stood my original ground, the Negro people who want the whole truth would have ultimately found in me a towering enlightenment. My solace before God is that my mistake came from the frailty of socially pressured human judgment and not the pure goodness of the heart.
>
> With much contrition, I am,
>
> Respectfully yours,
>
> CLENNON KING.

After reading that letter, perhaps one might say, "At best it is a cloudy matter; perhaps the Governor was right or perhaps he was wrong; but apparently we have some supporting evidence here from King himself. It had better be dismissed as being too confusing, at best, to be evaluated as a factor in connection with this subject."

I have stated this matter objectively and fairly, as a judge or as a lawyer would. I have considered it as a judge or a lawyer would consider the situation up to this point. However, what troubles me now is that notwithstanding this letter, in August 1963, when Governor Coleman was running in the primary election for Governor, he said the following:

> The point of this story—

That is, the Clennon King story—

> The point of this story is not the fact that one man was kept out of Ole Miss. Rather it shows that we know how to protect your rights in such a way that the Federal Government could find no excuse for putting hands on the State of Mississippi.

I ask: Does not this directly contradict the explanation that Governor Coleman gave to the members of the subcommittee? I believe it does. I believe that a man does not crow about an event of this character unless he carried it out for a purpose other than the substantive merits which were involved.

Even if he did not, I do not believe that a man makes a statement of that character unless he is willing to be charged with the fact that he contrived something that will commend him to the voters of Mississippi as a clever and able man because he kept Professor King out of Ole Miss.

If this is not, in fact, what I think it is, it is, at least, in taste so bad that I do not believe that a person who would advance that argument ought to be confirmed to be a judge of the circuit court of appeals.

During the hearings, Governor Coleman gave long explanations of his statements and his acts up to and including 1963, and stated that he now believes, for example, that Brown against Board of Education is the law of the land and he would apply it if he was confirmed. Unfortunately, however, we have only his declaration of change of view upon which to base an affirmative vote. The weight of evidence, in my judgment, is otherwise, since it consists of actual statements and deeds. His public record of performance for 20 years cannot lightly be dismissed by promises made in one afternoon. I am greatly troubled, and others should be, too, by the consistency of Governor Coleman's statements of his position on racial segregation in the gubernatorial primary election of 1963 in which he was a candidate, with the whole course of his public declarations and actions up to that time. Nor, do we have any contrary indication of his views between the fall of 1963 and the very time of these hearings in July of 1965.

One rather interesting point turned up in the hearing, to which I should like to direct the attention of the Senate. This is what I call "the Circular." This is a circular issued in the nominating campaign of Governor Coleman in 1963.

I hope Members of the Senate will look at it and read Governor Coleman's explanation of it. He is absolutely entitled to have it evaluated. I will give Senators my own judgment as to what it means. I hope Senators will follow me as I read the circular, so that they may follow my argument on it. There is no question that this was Governor Coleman's authorized issue, and he so testified, according to page 146 of the record. I asked him a question with respect to this matter. I said:

> Senator JAVITS. Now, in respect to this matter of desegregated education, I show you an advertisement which allegedly was used in your 1963 campaign, and ask you to notice especially what is written at the very bottom of the advertisement in very small print. I will ask you whether this is a legitimate and authorized advertisement of your primary.
>
> (A document was handed to Mr. Coleman.)
>
> Mr. COLEMAN. Yes, sir; this is an advertisement that was issued by my State campaign headquarters over the approval of my State campaign manager.

There can be no question about that. The circular states:

> Let's tell the whole truth, Paul.

The Paul refers to Lt. Gov. Paul Johnson, at that time Governor Coleman's opponent in the primary.

The picture shows Lt. Gov. Paul Johnson shaking hands with Mr. James McShane, who, it will be recalled, was Chief U.S. Marshal, who aided in the desegregation of the University of Mississippi.

Behind him is a police officer, and off to the left we see the head of what looks like a correspondent.

The circular continues:

> When the fist came down, the hand went out, and Meredith went in.
>
> Elect a man you can trust. J. P. Coleman, the man from Mississippi.

The legend at the bottom states that this was by authority of the State campaign manager.

I shall refer in the greatest detail to the Governor's own explanation. However, to me this demonstrates that Governor Coleman was making an argument to the people of the State of Mississippi that if he were elected Governor he would see to it that events like this did not happen, and that Mississippi University would not be desegregated, or, at the very least, that he would be more effective in frustrating the Federal law than would Paul Johnson.

That is what it means to me. This is what Governor Coleman says. I read from page 148 of the hearings:

> Mr. COLEMAN. Senator JAVITS, that campaign for Governor eventually revolved around two things. No. 1, my support of the Democratic ticket in the national campaign of 1960. It was made—that was made a great issue by my opposition.
>
> No. 2, the lieutenant governor said that since they put out a picture showing him with his fist up in Mr. McShane's face and he was saying, on that account he ought to be elected Governor of Mississippi. About 3 days before the crisis at Ole' Miss I was sent for and was asked for my advice about what ought to be done and the Governor said at that time, and I don't want to reopen any controversy with him, he beat me and that's it, and I have no further words to say about it, except he said he heard me in that conference advising the Governor and others to obey the court order and to let Meredith in the university which in the meantime as I say, he stood for us in this picture and we suggested that he tell the whole story about what went on in that gesture, but he didn't do it and that's a closed chapter. I got beat for Governor myself in Mississippi and that's all over with.

Later, I asked:

> Senator JAVITS. Governor, do you believe and feel that there is some other moral standard which you will have—which you had as candidate than what you will have as a judge?
>
> Mr. COLEMAN. If the Senator will allow me to say so, I doubt very much that I should go into moral beliefs and moral standards. As I understand our Government and our country, the church is separated entirely from the state from the church. I, of course, am a member of the Baptist Church, have been since I was 14 years of age. I have my moral beliefs and all, but I ascribe to every other American's right to his belief in the moral field, whatever they may be. I just propose, if I am a judge, to do my duty according to the Constitution of the United States, the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and the acts of Congress.
>
> Senator JAVITS. I only asked the question, sir, because it leads, it seems to me directly from the assertion that in the future—that in the turmoil and heat and opposition of a political campaign, views espoused with which to be the most charitable, in my judgment, the one who espouses them should not be charged 100 percent with their full import because he is in a political campaign and it is needed to win. Now, I am trying to find out whether that is or is not your attitude.
>
> Mr. COLEMAN. My feeling is that a campaign for Governor in Mississippi or any other State is quite a different matter to being selected for a judgeship of any court. One is partisan on the face of it and the other should be and in my book is nonpartisan and it depends entirely on preparations and qualifications for the office and the spirit with which you approach the duties of the office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, morning hour is concluded.

The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it seems to me that that statement only buttresses what I have argued before. It bears upon the proposition, as I see it—which I have decided in the negative—as to whether or not, notwithstanding the good faith feeling which I am perfectly willing to attribute to Governor Coleman, he can be a judge and judge cases objectively.

The entire record bears out the fact that even at this hearing he has not taken a position of conviction basically opposed to all the views which he expressed and upon which he acted as Governor in approving laws and during the entire time he was in public life up to the time of the subcommittee hearing.

I believe that this responsibility is so grave that we have no right to confirm the nomination of a man who even now cannot unequivocally say to the Senate of the United States, "I am not a segregationist; I do not believe in segregation; I do not believe in the separation of races in public schools; I believe that every Negro is entitled to vote; and that we must do our utmost to establish qualifications that are fair and fairly administered in bringing them into the voting fold."

He cannot bring himself to say that even now. The best he can say now is that he will be a fair judge.

Perhaps we should admire a man who has enough feeling about the things he has done and said in his life, so that even if his nomination for office is up for confirmation, he is not going to contradict those things directly.

It might be said that a man is a pretty good sport under those circumstances. But does that mean we should confirm his nomination as a judge of the circuit court of appeals? I say decidedly no.

Mr. President, my third point is that I believe the nomination should be rejected because it comes at a critical time and would set an unfortunate precedent for judicial nominations in the South.

Only this month Congress enacted legislation creating four new judgeships in the fifth circuit.

I must say in all honesty that I will do my utmost to oppose the appointment of segregationists to these critical seats. I define the word "segregationist" so that it will be known what I mean when I use the term. I do not mean it as a term of approbrium.

As much as I think these gentlemen are wrong and convinced exactly as I am on the other side. I am perfectly willing to say that; but I also say that my convictions are in accord with the law, the policy, and the Constitution insofar as the bodies we have entrusted with those responsibilities have declared them; whereas the segregationist point of view is contrary to the law and policy of the United States and the Constitution, as those bodies we have authorized to do so have declared them.

Therefore, I do not believe we can equate the two. I believe that segregationism is a disqualification.

Mr. President, in the past we have perhaps too perfunctorily approved nominees, and the results in some cases have been unfortunate.

One judge in the fifth circuit, for example, found as a fact that the University of Mississippi was not segregated in 1961 when James Meredith applied for admission. We have examples of district court judges in this circuit refusing to carry out mandates of the circuit court of appeals.

I ask unanimous consent to have the list of cases showing where that has occurred be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

See *Baldwin* v. *Morgan*, 149 F. Supp. 224 (N.D. Ala. 1957), rev'd, 251 F. 2d 780, 785 (5th Cir. 1958); *Stell* v. *Savannah-Chatham County Bd. of Educ.*, 318 F. 2d 425, 426 (5th Cir. 1963); *Armstrong* v. *Board of Educ. of City of Birmingham*, No. 20595, 5th Cir., July 12, 1963, pp. 4–6; *Kennedy* v. *Lynd*, 306 F. 2d 222 (5th Cir.), cert. denied, 371, U.S. 952 (1963) (10 days before district judge dismissed Attorney General's enforcement proceedings as abandoned fifth circuit handed down *Kennedy* v. *Bruce*, 298 F. 2d 860 (5th Cir. 1962)); *Woods* v. *Wright* (N.D. Ala. May 22, 1963), in New York Times, May 23, 1963, p. 1, col. 7, and Bickel, Civil Rights Boil-Up, The New Republic, June 8, 1963, pp. 11–12 (failure to follow *Dixon* v. *Alabama State Bd. of Educ.*, 294 F. 2d 150 [5th Cir. 1961]); *United States* v. *Dogan*, 314 F. 2d 767, 771 (5th Cir. 1963); reversing 206 F. Supp. 446 (N.D. Miss. 1962); *Kennedy* v. *Bruce*, 298 F. 2d 860, 862–863 (5th Cir. 1962).

Mr. JAVITS. One recent appointee has been reversed by the higher court at least half a dozen times in civil rights cases.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of those cases may be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

See *United States* v. *Wood*, 295 F. 2d 772 (5th Cir.), reversing 6 Race Rel. L. Rep. 1069 (S.D. Miss. Sept. 21, 1961) (Cox, J.); *Congress of Racial Equality* v. *Douglas*, 318 F. 2d 95 (5th Cir.) reversing 6 Race Rel. L. Rep. 1161 (S.D. Miss. Dec. 22, 1961) (Cox, J.); *Kennedy* v. *Lynd*, 306 F. 2d 222 (5th Cir. 1962), cert. denied, 371 U.S. 952 (1963) (Fifth Circuit vacated Judge Cox's order which denied in effect the U.S. Attorney General's application for an order for county voting record); *United States* v. *Lynd*, No. 19576, 5th Cir., July 15, 1963 (reversal of Judge Cox's denial in effect of the Government's motion for a preliminary injunction against alleged discriminatory voting registration practices); *Kennedy* v. *Owen*, No. 20634, 5th Cir., July 3, 1963 (reversal of Judge Cox's order denying production of county voting records). Judge Cox has been affirmed only once in a reported civil rights case. In re *Coleman*, 208 F. Supp. 199 (S.D. Miss. 1962), aff'd per curiam, 313 F. 2d 867 (5th Cir.), cert. denied, 373 U.S. 950 (1963). Yet this application by the U.S. Attorney General for an order for county voting records was "stalled for more than a year by judicial delays and stays." N.Y. Times, June 4, 1963, p. 25, col. 2. The ultimate disposition of two voting registration cases which Judge Cox has handled cannot be ascertained since there is no reported appeal in either of them at this time. For the district judge's disposition of these two cases, see *United States* v. *Daniel*, 8 Race Rel. L. Rep. 154 (S.D. Miss. Jan. 4, 1963); *United States* v. *Ramsey*, 8 Race Rel. L. Rep. 156 (S.D. Miss. Feb. 5, 1963).

Mr. JAVITS. There is the problem of delay in the disposition of civil rights cases. Delays may occur for example on motions for temporary injunction, by postponing trial dates, and by misinterpreting mandates of higher courts, thereby necessitating remands for other proceedings.

The Meredith case, which took 2 years, is replete with these problems.

The Meredith case came up in February of 1961. That term and the two summer terms of 1961, the two regular terms of the 1961, and two summer terms of 1962 all lapsed while the case was in litigation.

It is our duty to scrutinize very carefully nominees for any vacancies, as I have tried to do in this case, with more than ordinary care, notwithstanding the fact that the President names them. Again I state that I make no moral judgments for anyone but myself. But it is our duty not to be inhibited about voting against such nominations if we feel in good faith that our duty requires such action, and that justice will be served thereby. That is how I feel about this case.

I shall conclude in a moment. During the hearings I had a very interesting colloquy with the Attorney General of the United States. It was most unusual for Attorney General Katzenbach to appear in support of the nomination, and not only to appear, but to take account of the quotations and statements attributed to Governor Coleman, which, it seems to me, almost on their face would require, if he continued to hold such views, disqualification in respect to confirmation by the Senate, or even appointment by the President.

As I am a lawyer—and this is probably my dominant character in life—I did not wish to feel that I was proceeding in an arbitrary way to embarrass the life of another lawyer. I posed the moral question, so far as it affected opposition to the nomination. I put it to the Attorney General himself. Whatever may be the judgment of any Senator, pro or con, I think it is fair to say for myself—and the Attorney General had to agree with me—that if I felt as I did, it was my duty to oppose.

I should like to read that colloquy because it represents two honest men talking with each other honestly.

Senator Javits. Now there is only one real thing I would like to ask you about. I notice with great interest your statement: "Not all judges approve of all the laws they administer. Yet they apply them just the same."

That was the statement which the Attorney General had made in his testimony in chief. Continuing to read from the testimony—

I ask you, if you would, to test that statement in this qualitative way. Where we have a juror in a capital case where the State law permits capital punishment, it is the normal practice to ask him whether he believes in capital punishment, and if he does not, he is generally discharged. Now, in this case if we find—if we should find that the segregationist views of Governor Coleman are so deep as to amount to a conviction of the character that I have mentioned—just does not believe in mixing of the races, if you will—insofar as the laws which we have now passed, or the Supreme Court decisions have already stated to be the law of the land according to the Constitution, would you have as Attorney General, as a lawyer, any different opinion than the one you have stated, "Not all judges approve"—I emphasize the word "approve"—"of the laws they administer. Yet they apply them just the same"?

Attorney General Katzenbach. I would not recommend to the President, in this or in any other judgeship, a man whom I did not believe would faithfully apply and administer impartial justice irrespective of the parties, of their race and on any issue that he would support to the best of his ability the Constitution of the United States, and that he would fairly interpret it, and that he would follow the decisions of the Supreme Court in both spirit and letter.

Senator Javits. Then would you say, Mr. Attorney General, in fairness to us who are questioning this appointment—and I emphasize the word "questioning"—that the inquiry as to whether the views of the prospective appointee are a deep inner conviction or our question of approval or disapproval is neither a captious nor a capricious question but a real honorable question of fact upon which men may differ?

Attorney General Katzenbach. I am not sure that I quite get the question, Senator. Perhaps you can repeat it.

Senator Javits. I will be happy to try to make it more clear.

I ask you as a lawyer and Attorney General—because I respect your views—whether in view of what you have just testified, it is a legitimate rather than a capricious or captious question of fact for those of us who question this nomination to find out whether Governor Coleman approves or disapproves—we know he disapproves—of the decisions of the courts and the laws like the Civil Rights Act of 1964, et cetera, or whether this is such a deep inner conviction as to disable him, in the judgment of men who want to be just as fair as you do, from honestly and fairly enforcing the laws of the United States?

Attorney General Katzenbach. If you were to believe this was such a deep inner conviction that he could not fairly administer and judge the laws of the United States and the Constitution, then I would suppose that under those circumstances I should not have recommended him, and that is my conviction, and you would not consent to the appointment. I do think, Senator, I am satisfied myself with the record. I haven't any question about it. Even given a lesser responsibility than that of a Federal judge, the record is replete with examples of his devotion to the law and to its processes.

Senator Javits. I was just trying to test for myself the honorable character of the inquiry.

I deeply feel, in all conscience, as a lawyer and as a Senator, that the character of the inquiry was proper; that it had to be made; and that it has been made with all the fairness of which I am capable. I have done my best to state to the Senate, objectively and fairly, the pros and cons. In my own conscience, based upon my own beliefs, I feel that Governor Coleman, without any derogation of him as a man or as a lawyer, cannot met the test which the Attorney General himself has set, and on the basis which he says he would not have recommended him and does not feel that the Senate should consent to his appointment. For that reason, when the roll is called, I shall vote "Nay."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall not, at this time at least, address the Senate on this subject. I do point out that the members of the Committee on the Judiciary, who are charged with the first responsibility in matters of this kind, after some of them heard the testimony and after all of them considered the testimony taken at the hearings, voted 13 to 2 in favor of the confirmation of Governor Coleman's nomination and so recommended to the Senate in their report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement made by Hon. Nicholas Katzenbach, Attorney General of the United States, before the subcommittee that conducted the hearings.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Attorney General Katzenbach. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do have a brief statement which I would like to read if I may, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the committee for this opportunity to testify in support of the nomination of James P. Coleman to the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. Because some question has arisen concerning the ability of the nominee to administer the law fairly and impartially in accordance with the Constitution of the United States, and because of my own strong feelings on civil rights, I thought it might be helpful to give the committee the reasons for my recommendation to the President that Mr. Coleman be appointed to this position.

In making recommendations for Federal judgeships, the Department does not, of course, inquire into the private views of nominees on particular laws or court decisions. While it is essential that judicial officers at all levels respect and obey the law and administer it fairly, such an approach to the duties of the bench should be assumed in the absence of evidence to the contrary. Most of those appointed to high office, whatever their private inclinations, will carry out their constitutional duty and their oath to follow the law as laid down by the Congress and as interpreted by the courts. Not all judges approve of all the laws they administer; yet they apply them just the same.

The past years have witnessed tremendous activity in the field of civil rights and a great deal of that activity has involved litigation in the Federal courts. This is true particularly of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. That court hears many cases involving claims of racial discrimination and segregation—subjects in which personal feelings and background may easily be reflected.

For these reasons, and because of Mr. Coleman's political career in Mississippi and the statements and pronouncements he made in the course of that career, I thought it particularly important that the Department make a very careful and searching inquiry before recommending his name to the President. I am glad to share the general results of this investigation with this committee.

Mr. Coleman has made statements in defense of racial segregation. Of that there can be no doubt. Perhaps typical of his political statements is this excerpt from a speech made in 1957 in which he said:

"We intend to stand up to it. We in Mississippi have made up our minds we are not running any more, from any place, from any thing. We, of course, want peace and quiet, but if the time ever comes that we realize that such is not the case, then we will take appropriate action and we have never said what that action will be. I have said many times before and I may again—any schoolchild in Mississippi will not live long enough to see integration take place in our State."

On another occasion, Governor Coleman stated that any Mississippi white public school or college forced to accept a Negro student would be abolished immediately. He joined with the Governors of Georgia, Virginia, and South Carolina in a resolution calling for interposition, congressional action, and legal measures to prevent integration.

In 1958, he played a part in the arrest and subsequent incarceration of Clennon King who attempted to desegregate the University of Mississippi. At an early stage he dissuaded Clyde Kennard from attempting to desegregate Mississippi Southern College. And in 1963, during his campaign for a second 4-year term as Governor, he declared that for the 5 years in which he had been attorney general, he had not let racially mixed prizefights or baseball come to Mississippi despite pressures to do so.

This is a fair sampling, I believe, of Governor Coleman's political expressions in support of racial segregation, but of course there can be many more found.

But these statements are not the whole story or even its most significant aspect.

In the first place, they cannot be considered in a vacuum. They must be considered in the context of the society and the times in which they were made. In the second place, there is a full record of other actions taken and other pronouncements made by the same individual.

These other activities give perspective to the picture and alter the surface impression. When the full picture is considered, we see not the caricature of an unyielding white supremacist but a man who was frequently willing to take great political risks to support moderation and respect for law and order when the opposite course would have been the politically expedient one.

In 1955, in the context of a statewide furor over nullification, Mr. Coleman—who was then attorney general of his State—publicly expressed the view that this doctrine was "foolish" and "legal poppycock."

During the same period, he persuaded Governor White to appoint a first-rate special prosecutor to assist in the Emmett Till lynching case. '

While running for Governor, he was, according to Time magazine (Jan. 30, 1956), the "calmest, least racialistic"—that is Time's words, not mine—of the five candidates for Governor. He told an interviewer at that time:

"I believe in preserving segregation, but I don't believe in making war (over it). In the first place I am a loyal American, and in the second place you can't win. I am a southerner, all right, but I am also an American. This city of Jackson, our capital, was named after a man who said 'Our Federal Union must and shall be preserved.' That's what I believe."

Mr. Coleman consistently refused to become affiliated with the White Citizens Councils.

In the 1955 gubernatorial primary he was the only candidate who declined the support of the White Citizens Councils.

As Governor, he testified against a bill which would have channeled State and local funds to the White Citizens Councils in their effort to preserve segregation.

James Silver notes in his book "Mississippi: The Closed Society" (p. 35), that during Coleman's term the "extremists of the right were kept at arm's length * * *."

According to a Jackson newspaper, during Coleman's term in office, the State Sovereignty Commission "dwindled to virtually nothing."

In 1957, despite strong legislative opposition, he favored the donation of State land to an integrated veterans' hospital. This action was described in the Jackson press as the "Mississippi Munich."

In 1958, the White Citizens Councils brought strong pressure to purge State schools of textbooks which taught that prejudice is wrong. Governor Coleman refused to bend to this pressure. For this he was severely criticized by a State judge who also happened to be a politically powerful leader in the White Citizens Councils.

When, during this same period, other Governors of Southern States proposed banning the NAACP, Governor Coleman disapproved.

During the Little Rock crisis, Governor Coleman was conspicuous for his failure to support Governor Faubus and for his criticism of Faubus' course. Later, he publicly supported Representative Brooks Hays of Arkansas, a well-known moderate, in his reelection battle against an unyielding segregationist.

These actions, too, resulted in severe segregationist criticism. As recently as 1963, in fact, during his unsuccessful campaign for Governor of Mississippi, Mr. Coleman was strongly attacked by the present Governor for the stand he had taken on Little Rock.

The depth of the feelings in Mississippi on the subject of school desegregation was demonstrated in October 1962 with the entry of James Meredith into the University of Mississippi. A few days after the riots there, Governor Barnett recommended that the Mississippi House of Representatives investigate the violence at Ole Miss.

Coleman was to announce shortly thereafter his candidacy for the governorship, yet he did not hesitate to lead the opposition to the Barnett proposal in the legislature.

Coleman was counsel to six of the trustees of the University of Mississippi. While Governor Barnett and Lt. Gov. Paul Johnson defied the order of the court, Coleman advised the trustees to comply and to admit Meredith.

These moderate views took their political toll. When Mr. Coleman ran again for Governor in 1963, full-page advertisements widely distributed throughout the State charged him with moderate attitudes. They asserted that he did not have a positive prosegregation or States rights record. They attacked him for failing to support the Dixiecrat ticket in 1948 (whose vice-presidential candidate was a Mississippian) and supporting the nominees of the national Democratic Party in 1952, 1956, and 1960. And they generally opposed him for his stand on the racial issue.

Seeking to overcome these political handicaps in Mississippi, Mr. Coleman resorted to making segregationist speeches. He was nonetheless defeated by Paul Johnson who bore down heavily on race and segregation.

Some say that Mr. Coleman is a racial extremist. In the context of Mississippi politics, he could not be so classified in any sense of that term. But what is even more relevant to his nomination to a Federal judgeship is his consistent stand for law and order.

From 1948 to 1951, Mr. Coleman was a trial judge in Mississippi. Typical of his performance on the bench was the imposition of a sentence of life imprisonment on two white men who had murdered several Negroes—a sentence at odds with the general pattern then prevailing in Mississippi courts.

While attorney general, he publicly stated that segregation could not be maintained "by defying the courts. It must be by legal means."

In 1959, as Governor he invited the FBI to investigate the Mack Charles Parker lynching case. One of his reasons was that "I want to emphasize that the constitution of the State of Mississippi requires me to take an oath that all violations of laws will be properly prosecuted." He personally contacted local law enforcement officials to urge them to do everything possible to aid in the investigation.

Again, this stand for law and order was maintained at a heavy cost in popularity. As Time magazine of June 1, 1959, reported, calling in the FBI met with extremely unfavorable reaction. Handbills distributed during the 1963 gubernatorial campaign charged Governor Coleman with having invited the "Gestapo" into the State. Yet the Governor continued to defend the FBI's role in the case, although he acknowledged that it could cost him "the respect of the people of Mississippi."

In the context of Mississippi political life, with the highly emotional quality of the race issue in that State, these were acts of genuine political courage. They more than outbalance his prosegregation statements, not simply because they were so rare and unusual in the framework of the surrounding society but because they do provide a true measure of the man.

Experience teaches us that the test of a man's views is not oratory which is politically safe, but action which runs contrary to strong popular sentiment.

To support segregation in Mississippi during James P. Coleman's political career was merely a commonplace political platitude; to support moderation, to exalt law and order, and to counsel obedience to court decisions—these must be regarded as deliberate acts of conscience and devotion to principle.

It is not surprising that Mr. Coleman's activities have consistently been so evaluated by detached observers.

In November 1958, Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, said that Mr. Coleman indicated in an interview that while he did not necessarily accept the Supreme Court school desegregation decision, "it is the law." In the same interview Coleman stated that he agreed with the then Gov. Leroy Collins, of Florida, that the country would fall into chaos if citizens could disregard Supreme Court decisions with which they disagree. Mr. McGill then said he considered Mr. Coleman to be "* * * the only 'cotton South' political leader with the political courage and character to state that the Supreme Court decision was the law."

In May 1959, speaking in Jackson, Miss., NAACP National Secretary Roy Wilkins said that Coleman had shown in the Mack Charles Parker lynching case that "he does not believe in violence as a means of settling questions which involve the two races." While Coleman "is not on our side," Wilkins said, "he wants law and order, and for that we are grateful." The Wilkins speech has repeatedly been used by white supremacists to Coleman's political disadvantage.

In his book, Professor Silver lists James P. Coleman, along with James Meredith, Aaron Henry, William Faulkner, David L. Cohn, and Robert J. Farley as one of six "remarkable native Mississippians," who more than any others, influenced his thoughts and actions.

It is customary to consult members of the judiciary, on a confidential basis, with respect to the appointment of Federal judges. Ten members of the Federal judiciary were consulted prior to Governor Coleman's appointment. Without exception these men stated that they considered him to be well qualified by experience, character, and dedication to legal principle to be a member of the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. One of these judges whose record of support for the U.S. Constitution and Federal law is unsurpassed stated that he was aware of James P. Coleman's governorship of Mississippi, that he had never heard any of his associates criticize his intelligence, character, integrity, reputation, or association; that he considers Governor Coleman to be an extremely capable attorney who possesses the necessary background and abilities to handle the duties and responsibilities of a judge of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, and that he had personally recommended consideration of James P. Coleman in previous conversations with Justice Department officials.

It is easy for northerners, Mr. Chairman, to note some of Governor Coleman's statements on segregation, and to leap to the conclusion that he should not therefore be appointed to a Federal judgeship. For my part, however, the significant testaments are the judgments of those in the South who themselves have had the courage to take unpopular positions and to stand up for the Constitution and the law, and their judgment confirms my own that James Plemon Coleman has demonstrated that he is a man devoted to the Constitution and the law, and a man wholly qualified to sit as a Federal judge.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Ervin. Mr. Attorney General, I would like to say, first, that I do not get much chance to read my Bible, but I spend much time reading it into the Congressional Record. My recollection is that in the Gospel according to Matthew there is a very disconcerting, disheartening statement to the effect that we have to give accounting at the judgment for very idle word, but personally I appreciate your statement about the words which men speak in political campaigns, and I would like to say this. That in my observation that if every politician was to be condemned for every idle word that he spoke in connection with political campaigns, none of them would see salvation, including myself.

The record indicates that Governor Cole- the administration of justice either as a man has had almost 40 years of experience in practicing lawyer or as a judge or as a Governor of a State.

Attorney General Katzenbach. Thirty years approximately.

Senator Ervin. Yes, 30; 29 years to be exact. And during this time that he has occupied the office of district attorney, the office of circuit judge—which, as I understand it, in Mississippi is the presiding judge of the court of general jurisdiction.

Attorney General Katzenbach. Yes.

Senator Ervin. And commissioner of the supreme court of Mississippi, and attorney general.

I infer from your statement that the Department—that you as Attorney General—made careful appraisal of the manner in which Governor Coleman discharged his duties in these various aspects of his activities in connection with the administration of justice and that that was what led you to the conclusion that he is fully competent to discharge the office of U.S. judge in the court of appeals.

Attorney General Katzenbach. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Ervin. And you found in reaching this opinion—you stated that you had contacted 10 Federal judges and that they were unanimously of the opinion that he was admirably qualified for this position.

Attorney General Katzenbach. That is correct, Mr. Chairman. Of course, we contacted a great number of lawyers, a great number of other individuals who were in a position to know Mr. Coleman and to appraise him, and the opinion I stated was the opinion of virtually all those that were contacted. I do not remember an exception.

Senator Ervin. Now you stated what my own observation and personal experience has shown to be true; namely, that the overwhelming majority of the judges in this country in the performance of their duties ignore any personal opinions they may have and follow the law as these understand the law to be.

That is your observation also, is it not?

Attorney General Katzenbach. Yes; it is, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Ervin. I might state that I was privileged to serve for 15 years in the capacity of a judge, which a poetic judge, Walter Malone, of Memphis, Tenn., called judging one's fellow travelers to one tomb. As a trial judge and also an appellate judge, I very frequently was called upon to enforce laws with which I did not personally agree, both State laws and Federal laws, and I do not think that I have ever been accused by anyone of not performing my duties and enforcing those laws regardless of my personal opinion. And you are satisfied from your study of Judge Coleman's career that he would do likewise, are you not?

Attorney General Katzenbach. I am completely satisfied of that, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Ervin. Senator Hruska.

Senator Hruska. Mr. Attorney General, I think you have made a splendid statement. You have met head-on and forthrightly the issues that will probably be heard here by quoting from many of the speeches and many of the prior expressions of the nominee. That is characteristic of you, I have learned, as we have gone through similar hearings and in consideration of various pieces of legislation.

Attorney General Katzenbach. Thank you, Senator.

Senator Hruska. I would like to ask you, Mr. Attorney General, whether in your judgment, having made as complete a survey of the legal and political career of Governor Coleman, do you believe that he would have any difficulty in supporting the general constitutional principles set forth in the case of *Brown* v. *The Board of Education* which set the foundation for desegregation of public schools?

Attorney General Katzenbach. I do not think he would have any difficulty in that respect. I would assume that he would follow the decisions of the Supreme Court in his job as a judge of the court of appeals should he be confirmed by the Senate. I have no doubt as to that.

Senator Hruska. There are those who believe that if he is confirmed and sworn in as judge that he should disqualify himself from hearing any cases testing the constitutionality of any Mississippi statute enacted while he was Governor.

May I ask you what your views are on that subject?

Attorney General Katzenbach. I would think that if the constitutionality of a law enacted while he was Governor was directly questioned, that he would be well advised, though perhaps not required, to disqualify himself on that issue on a law that he had signed and had taken an official position as to.

Senator Hruska. Various Members of the Congress have been elevated to the Supreme Court or perhaps more accurately we should say transferred to the Supreme Court. Has it been the custom and the practice for them to step aside from the consideration of the constitutionality of laws that were passed while they were Members of the Congress?

Attorney General Katzenbach. No; it has not been. They have passed on the constitutionality of those laws. I think there is some difference in being one member of a large body such as the Senate or the House of Representatives, and in terms of being Governor, particularly with respect to a law that the Governor has urged.

Now, Attorneys General—and this perhaps illustrates the point—Attorneys General have disqualified themselves where they had previously passed upon the constitutionality, sometimes where an opinion of theirs is in question. Sometimes they have not, but there has been some practice of disqualifying themselves.

Senator Hruska. Of course, in recent times and in the memory of the witness as well as of this Senator, there has been one man who served in the White House as Chief Executive and later became Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Do you recall what his practice was in that regard?

Attorney General Katzenbach. With respect to the constitutionality of laws that he signed as President?

Senator Hruska. Passed during his time as President and to which he signed into law as Chief Executive.

Attorney General Katzenbach. I do not recall his practice on that. I do not know whether the issue came up with Chief Justice Taft, whether the laws were questioned or not.

Senator Hruska. Thank you very much.

Attorney General Katzenbach. I feel ignorant. I should have looked it up.

Senator Hruska. In asking the question I pleaded my ignorance. I think that is all at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Ervin. And it would not interfere with the administration of justice in the fifth circuit for any particular judge to disqualify himself for personal reasons in respect to particular cases because of the fact you have some eight or nine judges as I recall, and it takes only three of them to make a decision.

Attorney General Katzenbach. That is true, Mr. Chairman, and it seems to me that within the whole practice of disqualification the convenience of disqualifying is one factor to be weighed in the process; for example, if you take members of a small commission here, the disqualification of one man on the grounds that others might disqualify themselves in another context could change the result, and it could even be used by counsel as a device.

Senator Ervin. They have one advantage over the Attorney General and Members of the Senate and Governors of States and the Presidents in that they can disqualify themselves from having a decision made and without impeding the administration of justice, whereas we have to meet all our issues head on; is that not true?

Attorney General Katzenbach. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Javits. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question or two if I can.

Senator Ervin. Yes.

Attorney General Katzenbach. I will be happy to stay and answer these questions. Could I tell the Chair I do have to testify on some legislation in the other body? I am perfectly happy—I do not have to leave immediately, but I am a little bit pressed.

Senator Javits. I shall not take more than 5 minutes.

Mr. Attorney General, I would like to ask this question which you may feel free not to answer, but this name of Governor Coleman, did it originate with the President or with the Department of Justice?

Attorney General Katzenbach. The name of Governor Coleman originated with the Department of Justice. This vacancy existed for 20 months. He was one of the people under consideration and one of the people discussed with the Senators from Mississippi many, many months ago.

Senator Javits. Now, does every State of the Union have a representative or a citizen of that State on the circuit courts of appeal, or are there some States that do not?

Attorney General Katzenbach. There are some States that do not, Senator. In this particular circuit the only State that does not at the moment is the State of Mississippi.

Senator Javits. And it is fair to say that those other States are South Dakota, Oregon, Alaska, and Hawaii as far as you know.

Attorney General Katzenbach. Yes; I had thought there were more, but those four do not have.

Senator Javits. And if there are more——

Attorney General Katzenbach. There may be others.

Senator Javits. Now there is only one real thing I would like to ask you about. I notice with great interest your statement: "Not all judges approve of all the laws they administer. Yet they apply them just the same."

I ask you, if you would, to test that statement in this qualitative way. Where we have a juror in a capital case where the State law permits capital punishment, it is the normal practice to ask him whether he believes in capital punishment, and if he does not, he is generally discharged. Now, in this case if we find—if we should find that the segregationist views of Governor Coleman are so deep as to amount to a conviction of the character that I have mentioned—just does not believe in mixing of the races, if you will—insofar as the laws which we have now passed, or the Supreme Court decisions have already stated to be the law of the land according to the Constitution, would you have as Attorney General, as a lawyer, any different opinion than the one you have stated, "Not all judges approve"—I emphasize the word "approve"—"of the laws they administer. Yet they apply them just the same"?

Attorney General Katzenbach. I would not recommend to the President in this or in any other judgeship a man whom I did not believe would faithfully apply and administer impartial justice irrespective of the parties, of their race and on any issue that he would support to the best of his ability the Constitution of the United States, and that he would fairly interpret it, and that he would follow the decisions of the Supreme Court in both spirit and letter.

Senator Javits. Then would you say, Mr. Attorney General, in fairness to us who are questioning this appointment—and I emphasize the word "questioning"—that the inquiry as to whether the views of the prospective appointee are a deep inner conviction or our question of approval or disapproval is neither a captious nor a capricious question but a real honorable question of fact upon which men may differ?

Attorney General Katzenbach. I am not sure that I quite get the question, Senator. Perhaps you can repeat it.

Senator Javits. I will be happy to try to make it more clear.

I ask you as a lawyer and Attorney General—because I respect your views—whether in view of what you have just testified, it is a legitimate rather than a capricious or captious question of fact for those of us who question this nomination to find out whether Governor Coleman approves or disapproves—we know he disapproves—of the decisions of the courts and the laws like the Civil Rights Act of 1964, et cetera, or whether this is such a deep inner conviction as to disable him, in the judgment of men who want to be just as fair as you do, from honestly and fairly enforcing the laws of the United States?

Attorney General Katzenbach. If you were to believe this was such a deep inner conviction that he could not fairly administer and judge the laws of the United States and the Constitution, then I would suppose that under those circumstances I should not have recommended him, and that is my conviction, and you would not consent to the appointment. I do think, Senator, I am satisfied myself with the record. I haven't any question about it. Even given a lesser responsibility than that of a Federal judge, the record is replete with examples of his devotion to the law and to its processes.

Senator Javits. I was just trying to test for myself the honorable character of the inquiry.

Attorney General Katzenbach. Yes, Senator. I feel that on that, or on any issue for any reason at all, the Senate should believe that a man will not act as he should act as a judge, then they should not confirm him.

Senator Javits. And the Attorney General's own sampling, which was his sampling of previous statements, indicates that there is some factual basis for raising these questions in this case.

Attorney General Katzenbach. Because of the nature of the law and the recent developments in this area and because of its highly emotional content, I raised that question in my own investigation.

Senator Javits. And so we have a right to raise it in ours.

Attorney General Katzenbach. I would certainly think so.

Senator Javits. I thank the Chair and the witness.

Senator Ervin. Senator Hart.

Senator Hart. Mr. Attorney General, Senator Javits made some reference to the point that I wanted your reaction on. You believe that the nominee will apply the law, both the Constitution as he reads it and as the Supreme Court has said.

Attorney General Katzenbach. Yes; I do.

Senator Hart. And this is really what troubles me. Why is it necessary that there be a nomination given us which has to be explained in such detail?

Attorney General Katzenbach. Because there is some opposition to the nomination and that was the reason that I wished to make clear my convictions on this. I would have hoped and thought that it would have not been necessary to raise those questions at all because of the fact that Governor Coleman is a fine and able lawyer with a distinguished record and a man who, as I say, throughout that time of political life in the context of Mississippi stood up time and time again for the law and against extremist views within that State when it was politically unpopular to do so, and I believe that one act of that kind is worth a hundred campaign speeches, Senator; when people are taking what is the politically popular position for them to take, there is no risk whatsoever in their stating it, and when a man stands up for what he believes to be right and he does so in the context of strong opinion, strong popular views to the contrary, then I believe that is worth a great deal. That tells you a great deal about the integrity of that man and about his conscience and his capacities.

Senator HART. But the reason that such detail was developed to support and explain the nomination is because in addition to those courageous political statements, a great many statements were made by the nominee which when played back would suggest on their face that he had no business on the Federal bench. Is that not the reason that we have this detailed explanation?

Attorney General KATZENBACH. I do not think that is a completely fair statement of it, Senator, because on any nominee with respect to highly controversial questions of this kind, I believe that we would wish to satisfy ourselves that when put upon the bench, he would fairly administer the law, so that irrespective of those statements that were made in political context, in the political context of Mississippi where they were scarcely unusual, where they were always more moderate than the statements made by the opposition, they should be examined, as I have said, against the other acts that he took.

Indeed, I believe his moderation, and I believe his courage in this respect and his willingness to stand up for law really cost him a political career in that State.

Senator HART. Then this really gets back, I think, to the first question; moderate in the setting in which they were spoken. But what is the necessity that we go to that setting for this nomination? This and one other thing I want to raise with you troubles me, and I do not know how I shall vote.

Attorney General KATZENBACH. The issue of why we go to that particular setting, I take it, it is why should any judge from the State of Mississippi be appointed because of that setting.

Senator HART. Anyone who could have played back some of the music that we have read and heard here.

Attorney General KATZENBACH. If that were the standard that you were to apply, rather than the standard as to whether or not you believed he could fairly and impartially administer justice, it would penalize the State of Mississippi for its political views and the views that have been shared in that State, which I hope are now in part changing. You would penalize that State, you would penalize virtually everyone within it.

I believe it is important where possible that a State be represented on the court of appeals by one of its distinguished lawyers. There are some exceptions. They are relatively few.

I also think in terms of the problems faced by that circuit that it is important in getting popular acceptance of the law and of the Constitution, and it requires today that the people of that State be represented by a man—represented in the sense that he is a citizen of that State—by a man who is a distinguished lawyer from that State. I think it helps the acceptance of decisions.

I can recall President Kennedy pointing out at the time of the Meredith case an effort to secure compliance with the decision, an effort to avoid violence—I recall his pointing out that that decision had been rendered by the court of appeals by people who were born and raised in the South and that this was their view as to what the Constitution and the laws of the United States require.

Senator HART. Mr. Attorney General, is it fair then to assume that you feel that this nomination and appointment, confirmation, would advance, would assist those forces in Mississippi and elsewhere who seek to bring our practices in line with what the Supreme Court tells us the Constitution has said for a long time?

Attorney General KATZENBACH. Yes, I do, Senator.

Senator HART. Then this second and last thing that troubles me. You are convinced that the nominee would apply impartially the law, and if you will put yourself in our shoes, assume that I might believe that. Assume that I do, for purposes of this question. What is our obligation if large numbers of people, particularly in Mississippi, could not conceive that they could receive justice at the hands of the man you and I believe would give them justice?

Attorney General KATZENBACH. I believe that your obligation is to do what you believe is right.

Senator HART. Is it right or wrong to recognize the probability that there will be large numbers of people in Mississippi who simply cannot believe that—this is almost indelicate, and I apologize, but from a Governor of Mississippi, from an attorney general of Mississippi, the years 1950–60, that "I am not going to get a fair shake." Now, if there are large numbers of people that way, what would you say my obligation would be with respect to confirming the nomination?

Attorney General KATZENBACH. If you were persuaded as I am that he would fairly and impartially administer the law, I think you should advise and consent to that nomination.

Senator HART. Thank you very much.

Senator JAVITS. Would you allow me to ask one question of fact that fits into that question? Could you also give us a fair sampling of the laws signed by Governor Coleman which you would wish to explain as you did his campaign statements?

Attorney General KATZENBACH. Yes.

Senator JAVITS. You spoke of only campaign statements, and he signed a great many laws.

Attorney General KATZENBACH. Yes; I could provide that. I am sure that the Governor would be happy to tell you that. I might say this in looking them over. It is also important in any given time to take a look at the laws that were vetoed and to take a look at the laws which were not signed and the things which were not done in that political context.

Senator JAVITS. If the Chair would allow, would you give us your appraisal of that equally with the appraisal of the campaign statements?

Attorney General KATZENBACH. Yes; I will be very happy to.

Senator JAVITS. If the Chair will allow.

Senator ERVIN. Yes.

(The information referred to follows:)

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., July 16, 1965.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: In accordance with the request made by Senator JAVITS during the hearings on the confirmation of James P. Coleman as a judge of the court of appeals for the fifth circuit, I am submitting herewith the more significant laws dealing with racial matters enacted by the Mississippi Legislature during the years 1950–55 and 1956–59 while Mr. Coleman was, respectively, attorney general and Governor of that State. Not included in this compilation are statutes which, through routine appropriations and the like, acknowledge and maintain separate facilities for Negroes and whites. I am also listing some instances of opposition by Governor Coleman to bills proposed by the legislature.

Sincerely,
NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Attorney General.

1. An act to provide State aid for construction of school facilities. It is hereby declared that it is the intent and purpose of this act to equalize school facilities between the races and to provide that the determination of expenditures shall take into account the quality of existing facilities for each race. (Dec. 28, 1953—Senate bill 1204).

2. An act authorizing the boards of trustees of school districts to assign public schools or attendance centers (Mar. 10, 1954—House bill 45).

3. An act to appropriate funds to provide instruction in graduate and professional schools for qualified Negro students who are residents of Mississippi in institutions outside of the State, when such instruction is not available for them in the regularly supported Mississippi institutions of higher learning (May 4, 1954—House bill 979).

4. An act to amend section 3, chapter 13, of the extraordinary session of 1953 to provide additional emergency grants of $3 based on each Negro child in average daily attendance each year; and for other related purposes (Mar. 1, 1955—Senate bill 1202).

5. Acts to amend various election laws including implementation of section 244 of the Mississippi constitution dealing with literacy tests (Mar. 24, 1955—House bills 19, 24, 26, 95, 160, and Senate bill 1216).

6. In February 1956, Governor Coleman vetoed a bill designed to prevent FBI agents from making civil rights investigations in Mississippi. (He had originally proposed this bill.)

7. An act to require maintenance of separate acccommodations, toilet facilities, and waiting rooms for the races traveling in intrastate travel at railroad companies, bus companies, and other common carriers of passengers (Feb. 21, 1956—House bills 7, 12, 22).

8. An act to confer upon any person, firm, or corporation engaged in any public business the right to choose and select its customers, to refuse service, and to provide penalties for any person who refuses to vacate a public place when ordered to do so by the owner or an employee thereof (Feb. 21, 1956—House bill 21).

9. An act to repeal the compulsory education law (Feb. 24, 1956—House bill 31).

10. In 1956, the Governor spoke against a legislative proposal to deny tax exemptions to churches whose property was used on a nonsegregated basis.

11. An act to establish the State Sovereignty Commission (Mar. 29, 1956—House bill 880).

12. An act to provide imprisonment terms for interracial marriages prohibited by law (Apr. 5, 1956—House bill 975).

13. An act to give effect to the resolution of interposition(Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 125) and to the principle of segregation of the races, to define violations thereof, and to provide penalties for the violation of these provisions (Apr. 5, 1956—Senate bill 1870).

14. In April 1958, Governor Coleman spoke out against a bill authorizing the hiring of white citizens councils by cities and counties for the purposes of distributing propaganda.

15. An act to authorize the attorney general of Mississippi to advise and assist county, State, or school employees who are being sued or called as witnesses by the Commission on Civil Rights or other agencies of the United States for discharging their

duties under the Mississippi constitution and laws (Apr. 25, 1958—House bills 936, 937).

16. In April 1958, Governor Coleman vetoed a bill to place responsibility for voter registration in the hands of court-appointed registrars, a bill which was characterized as aimed at maintaining white supremacy at the ballot box.

Senator Ervin. Do you have any questions, Senator Kennedy?

Senator Kennedy. Just one very brief question, Mr. Attorney General.

I appreciate the detailed testimony which you have given this morning. One of the problems which the Justice Department is confronted with, in the variety of cases involving the recent Civil Rights Act, is a case which has been brought in the district court in which there has not been expeditious treatment. One of the remedies would be for a writ of mandamus to be given by the circuit court judges. I think the record of the past has indicated that there are reservations by certain members of that court in granting writs of mandamus and that this is the whole question of time being as important as it is involved in these civil rights cases. Are you completely satisfied, with these other questions which have been raised, that Governor Coleman will act responsibly and with enlightenment in seeing that expeditious justice is done in these cases, and as a member of a panel?

Attorney General Katzenbach. Yes, I am, Senator. I think you have accurately stated the fact that mandamus is an exceptional remedy. We have asked for it in the Department of Justice more times than we have gotten it. In fact I do not recall an instance where we have actually gotten any members of the court of appeals to issue a writ of mandamus so the issue is not certain members of that court having reservations. I think the issue would be that all members of that court, in fact all members of all circuit courts have reservations about mandamus, and about its procedure. I think that it is warranted in exceptional circumstances. I think the circumstances are exceptional that that court would give it.

One of our experiences has been often when we asked for mandamus, it becomes unnecessary for the court of appeals to decide that issue because the cause is expedited at the district court level.

Senator Kennedy. You requested that on several different occasions, have you not?

Attorney General Katzenbach. About five times, I think, in civil rights cases.

Senator Kennedy. And you felt that there were adequate reasons to request a writ of mandamus.

Attorney General Katzenbach. We felt that they were, but not all of the views that we express in any court are always accepted by that court even though I always think we are right.

Senator Kennedy. And you would be satisfied that the nominee would act in such a way that he would not have reservations in issuing such a writ.

Attorney General Katzenbach. I think he would have no different reservations any judge would have. I think it is an exceptional writ. I think in appropriate circumstances he would grant it.

Senator Kennedy. Thank you.

Senator Ervin. A writ of mandamus is a writ which is very rarely employed, is it not?

Attorney General Katzenbach. Very rarely.

Senator Ervin. And it is very rarely employed for the reason that it only lies to enforce the ministerial action and does not lie in a case that involves discretionary action.

Attorney General Katzenbach. That is correct, Senator. I think it would be accurate to say that courts of appeal do not like to tell the district judges how to exercise their discretion.

Senator Ervin. Most civil rights cases—in fact, virtually all of them—involve equity proceedings, and equity proceedings, inherently, ordinarily involve the exercise of discretion, do they not?

Attorney General Katzenbach. That is correct, but, Senator, I would not be honest with you if I did not think that in some courts there have been terribly unreasonable delays with respect to deciding cases.

Senator Ervin. That has been true for a long, long time. I believe, even back in Shakespeare's time, Hamlet complained about outrageous fortune, did he not?

Attorney General Katzenbach. I think there must be something in the Bible on it too, Senator.

Senator Ervin. You were asked questions about statements made by Governor Coleman in his political campaign. Did you ever read the debates between Judge Douglas and Abe Lincoln when they were opposing candidates for the U.S. Senate in Illinois in 1858?

Attorney General Katzenbach. A long time ago. I think you could have proved Abe Lincoln to be a segregationist.

Senator Ervin. Absolutely, and Abraham Lincoln made a great many very intemperate remarks concerning the Supreme Court in its decisions, especially the decision in the Dred Scott case, in that campaign, did he not?

Attorney General Katzenbach. Yes, he did, Senator.

Senator Ervin. And some of Governor Coleman's statements pale into insignificance almost in comparison with some of Abraham Lincoln's statements, do they not?

Attorney General Katzenbach. Yes, Senator.

Senator Ervin. Now, with reference to the analogy of my good friend from New York about a juror in a capital case. A juror does not undergo the mental discipline that a lawyer or judge undergoes, does he, in the sense that in the very mental discipline which one gets in the practice of law and in the administration of justice as the judge does, that he acquires the capacity through his mental discipline to lay aside what he would like for the law to be and be guided by what the law has been declared to be by an authority of decision, does he not?

Attorney General Katzenbach. Yes; I think so.

Senator Ervin. And even in the case of a juror who says he does not believe in capital punishment, is it not frequently that the question is asked whether or not his beliefs about capital punishment would deprive him of the capacity to try the case according to the law and the evidence and to accept the law from the court, and if he answers that in the affirmative, he is chosen to serve?

Attorney General Katzenbach. Yes.

Senator Ervin. Thank you very much, Mr. Attorney General.

Attorney General Katzenbach. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the statement speaks for itself, but it shows that it was made by the Attorney General after the most thorough and intensive investigation and consideration of all the pertinent facts.

Many persons who do not know Governor Coleman personally testified and commented during the hearing. It has been my privilege to know him intimately for more than a quarter of a century.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement that I made in introducing Governor Coleman at the hearings be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Hon. John C. Stennis, a U.S. Senator From the State of Mississippi

Senator Stennis. Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, it is a privilege to come here before this subcommittee. It is also a privilege to introduce and present to the committee the nominee.

I support this nomination—not because he is my friend—but because, being my friend, I have had the opportunity to learn and have learned that he is eminently qualified in every respect for this important office, and Mr. Chairman, I do speak of personal knowledge based on 30 years of continuous personal contact.

I am not only a supporter of his nomination; I was the first to recommend it to the President.

It is highly important that we make every effort to bring to the higher courts the finest and most qualified legal talent that is available.

The qualifications and skills which are necessary to make an outstanding jurist cannot be attained overnight. They are the results of years of painstaking study, hard work both in and out of the courtroom, and an unswerving dedication to the sound legal principles of our system and the majesty of the law. Governor Coleman has also superior qualities of character, honor, and integrity and these qualifications in full measure are essential.

He will bring to the court a wealth of legal knowledge as well as vital and practical experience in all fields and arenas of legal conflict. As a trial lawyer he sharpened his legal skills and talents in the courtroom—the laboratory and finishing school for practicing lawyers. I think that we could use more men in our judicial systems, Federal and State, who got the fundamentals of applied justice in the courtroom.

He hammered out the foundation of his professional career and future on the anvil of hard and grinding experience in the trial courtroom before judges and juries as well as in a heavy office practice.

Governor Coleman commenced his public career by being elected against difficult odds as district prosecuting attorney, then 25 years of age.

While he was district attorney and also engaged at the same time in private civil practice, he appeared in court many times in the circuit court where I was circuit judge. I saw him rapidly develop as one of the most effective and outstanding trial lawyers I have ever known. In fact, he is now one of the best in the South.

Later, I observed him while he served as a circuit judge. He is quick to grasp the fundamental legal questions involved in any given set of facts, and equally adept in supplying a sound and proper legal analysis and remedy. This natural and highly developed trait, plus his vast and varied experience in the legal profession and in governmental affairs, is a reason why I say he is an outstanding lawyer and will make an excellent judge.

After serving as district attorney, Governor Coleman was elected judge of the circuit court, a court of record and of unlimited jurisdiction. He went from the trial court to membership on the State supreme court, from whence he was soon called by the then Governor of the State to be attorney general. He was then elected to a full term to this office, where his services were outstanding.

Then, in 1955, I saw him win the Governor's race in an unusually strong field. He filled that office with distinction during a most difficult 4-year term, January 1956 to January 1960.

Governor Coleman is far more than a mere practitioner of the law and a former officeholder. He is a devout believer in the law. It is part of his personal philosophy that the courts are the fundamental instruments of a free and democratic people, and that law and order is the indispensable guarantee of a civilized society. He will take that philosophy with him if confirmed for the high office to which he has been nominated. He has all the attributes of intelligence, ability, and experience which are the marks of an outstanding jurist.

Furthermore, he is a man of personal courage. Moreover, he has to a high degree that natural quality of fairness and impartiality which is essential in the making of a splendid judicial officer.

I believe he should be and that he will be confirmed by this subcommittee, the full committee, and by the U.S. Senate, and that his career on the bench will be outstanding and of the highest order.

Gentlemen, as I say, it is a privilege to commend as well as present to you Governor Coleman.

NATIONAL AMERICAN LEGION BASEBALL WEEK

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, through the indulgence and graciousness of our distinguished majority leader, to put my request in proper perspective, I am permitted to move to call up Calendar No. 436, Senate Joint Resolution 66, and ask that it be stated, for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6 in 1965 as "National American Legion Baseball Week."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair first wishes to make an inquiry. Did the Senator from Illinois ask unanimous consent or move that the joint resolution be considered?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have moved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, first, I wish to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the motion subject to unanimous consent, or can it be brought——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Illinois has moved for the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is that in proper parliamentary order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order. The motion is debatable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Illinois had first asked for recognition for a discussion of the motion. If the senior Senator from Illinois wishes to discuss the motion, the chair will recognize the junior Senator from Illinois at this time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to my colleague from Illinois without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The junior Senator from Illinois should have the first inning. He should go to bat first.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But if my colleague has some comment to make——

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; my junior colleague should have the right to speak first.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. I had in mind to speak for about 2 or 3 minutes on the subject of Vietnam. I did not wish in any way to encumber my speech in chief on the Coleman nomination.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from New York for that purpose, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his always unfailing courtesy.

THE CRISIS IN VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, like so many of the rest of us, I am deeply troubled about the report of Secretary of Defense McNamara and deeply troubled by the indication, which we find on all sides, not only of the escalation of the struggle in Vietnam—let us assume that we have crossed that bridge—but of the vesting in the United States of, perhaps the primary, indeed, perhaps the sole, responsibility for carrying on the military struggle against the Vietcong and against the North Vietnamese in South Vietnam.

On many occasions I have laid before the Senate the proposition that the President does not, from the point of view of crystalizing the sentiment of the country upon this subject, have the kind of mandate for this type of action which, considering the character of the action, he ought to have. The August 1964 joint resolution, which gave the President the authority, if he needed any—he could have acted in any case as Commander in Chief—to use the Armed Forces of the United States in the struggle, is long since out of date by reason of events and by the interpretation of the authority that the President has put upon that particular mandate.

Everybody knows—I am not telling any secrets—that we are on the threshold not merely of escalation, but of really changing the basic character of the struggle in such a way as greatly to involve the United States.

I do not believe that Gallup polls are equivalent to considered debate by the people and the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States. I respectfully submit that it is a great mistake for the President not to come back to Congress for a new mandate and to let the people, through Congress, determine, with the President, what should be the limits, if any, to be placed upon this large scale and portentous involvement in the struggle in Vietnam.

On June 24, 1965, I introduced with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] a joint resolution, S.J. Res. 93, that would fully raise this question. Senator Randolph and I wrote to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee urging early hearings on the resolution. However, we received a reply which, I assume, reflects the policy of this administration, informing us that the committee refused to take any action on the resolution.

Since I believe the issue is so timely and the committee's decision is so portentous and so wrong, I shall read that exchange of correspondence into the Record.

July 7, 1965.

Hon. J. W. Fulbright,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: On June 24, we introduced Senate Joint Resolution 93, a resolution designed to supplement Public Law 88–480, the joint resolution of August 10, 1964, to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia.

We believe—and we know other Senators concur—that hearings, both open and executive, on Senate Joint Resolution 93 would have a significant and salutary effect on the conduct of our policy in southeast Asia.

We are aware of the reported preference of the administration to rely on the August 10, 1964, resolution and on other indications of congressional approval and support for our current policy. Nevertheless, we are convinced, for the reasons set forth on the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 93 and asserted on other recent occasions by Members of Congress, that constructive discussion and reasoned debate, carrying the duty of positive congressional action on specific legislative language, would make a valuable—indeed, a necessary—contribution to putting the people and the Congress behind a specified course in Vietnam.

We know the extent of congressional power and responsibility in the field of foreign policy, and the extent to which the exercise of that power seems in recent times to have become in many ways more restrained and the fulfillment of that responsibility less complete.

In these troubled and dangerous days, we are not discharging our duty to ourselves, to our constituents, or to our country, unless we make every effort to guide our own destiny as a nation. In the current situation in southeast Asia, decisions on decisive actions may be taken at any time, and once taken can commit our Nation and our people. We therefore urge your favorable consideration of this request for hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 93 at the earliest practicable time.

Sincerely,

Jennings Randolph.
Jacob K. Javits.

July 13, 1965.

Hon. Jennings Randolph,
Hon. Jacob K. Javits,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senators: At a committee meeting on July 12, your letter of July 7 advocating open and executive hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 93 was discussed.

The committee has reviewed the situation in Vietnam in executive session 11 times since January 1965. On several occasions, interested Senators not members of the committee have participated in these meetings, including on two occasions all members of the Committee on Armed Services who were available. The committee expects to keep itself constantly and currently informed on developments in Vietnam.

The nomination of Mr. Lodge to be U.S. Ambassador to Vietnam will shortly be considered by the committee at which time there will be additional opportunity to review the situation in Vietnam.

Under these circumstances, it was the consensus of members that it was not advisable at this time to schedule either open or executive hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 93.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

Mr. President, with the greatest respect and the greatest esteem for the committee chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and his colleagues, I submit that we have done all that we can. The door is closed on any expression of congressional opinion arrived at in the way that our Constitution, in my judgment, expects us to debate, to hear debate on, and to consider this very grave responsibility.

The President, as I view it now, proposes to carry on alone and not to ask Congress, and, through Congress, the people to proceed with him.

When it appears that the entire matter will be placed on a different plateau, involving the greatest portentousness and the greatest danger, and affecting very profoundly the future of the United States, I would not be true to myself as a Senator if I did not protest against this action. I believe it is unwise.

While I naturally and loyally support our President's actions, I must, at one and the same time, protest what I consider to be a very unwise course of procedure in not again submitting this matter to Congress.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

NATIONAL AMERICAN LEGION BASEBALL WEEK

The Senate resumed consideration of Mr. DIRKSEN's motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6 in 1965 as "National American Legion Baseball Week."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 66.

Mr. DIRKSEN. On my motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It has not yet been made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The motion to proceed to its consideration is now pending.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, until it is made the pending business, obviously no substitute or amendments could be offered. It may well be that some Senator will wish to make a comment on the matter. Therefore, momentarily, at least, I shall be glad to yield the floor until this measure is made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I determine if my understanding is correct? If it is incorrect, I hope that my junior colleague will correct me. I understand that when Senate Joint Resolution 66 is once made the pending business, my junior colleague will proceed to move to substitute his constitutional amendment, the precise nature of which we do not at present know, but, which, in its previous forms, has provided for a constitutional amendment to be submitted to the States to permit one house of the various State legislatures to be apportioned on a basis other than population, and, therefore, to reverse the decision of the Supreme Court in the Alabama case.

With all courtesy, I ask my friend and colleague—and I hope he is my friend as well as my colleague——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask my colleague whether I have understood his intention correctly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, my senior colleague has correctly understood me, with one exception. This would not be a reversal of the decision of the Supreme Court. However, in all other respects, the Senator is correct. I propose to offer this joint resolution looking toward a constitutional amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his frankness. I have always enjoyed most friendly relations with my colleague. We have not always agreed, although, in the past year or so, we have agreed a larger percentage of the time. I have always had the most kindly feelings toward my colleague.

Those of us who are opposed to the constitutional amendment have decided not to oppose the motion to proceed to the consideration of the National American Legion Baseball Week joint resolution. We are as much in favor of the proposal as is my junior colleague—perhaps a little more so. We really want the National American Legion Baseball Week measure passed.

We want to encourage junior league baseball. We hope that the joint resolution can pass unencumbered by so grave and portentous an amendment as may be offered. We are for baseball on its own merits. We would regret having a blow struck at baseball by moving to lay aside the American Legion baseball measure and having a constitutional amendment substituted for it.

As I say, we shall not oppose the motion to take up this measure. We will, however, oppose a motion to substitute his constitutional amendment for the baseball week. We are in favor of baseball, pure and undefiled. We shall be prepared, not to filibuster, but to discuss the measure in the proper depth. No more important issue is before the country than this measure.

We regret that this will be introduced at a time when a good deal of pending legislation is before us, when the inevitable insertion of such a proposed constitutional amendment as this would delay the consideration of other measures.

We believe that this is a disruptive move so far as the calendar of the Senate is concerned. While my colleagues on the Committee on the Judiciary will speak at greater length and with more information upon the fact that this is a blow to the Committee on the Judiciary itself, I hope that I may, in a preliminary fashion, be permitted to sound that note.

My able colleague sought to get his constitutional amendment through the Committee on the Judiciary. I thought that he was going to accomplish that purpose. Very frankly, had it not been for some alert members of the Committee on the Judiciary, he would have succeeded. However, we had some very capable members of the Committee on the Judiciary, and gradually the force of their argument was such that my able colleague was unable to secure, at least in his judgment, a majority. The newspaper reports say that there would have been a vote of 8 to 8 and the motion would have failed of a majority and would die in committee. Therefore, my able colleague proposes—if I may mix metaphors from baseball and football—to make an end run around the Committee on the Judiciary and to bring this measure directly to the floor.

I have participated in somewhat similar moves in the past on other measures. I do not reprimand my colleague for doing so. However, I believe that there are other Senators who, on matters involving civil rights, are jealous of the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, and who have opposed presenting matters to the Senate which have been adversely passed upon by the Committee on the Judiciary.

I touch that note to remind them of their past positions before they propose to support this measure.

I have referred to this as an end run around the Judiciary Committee. Perhaps, if I may go back to baseball analogy, with all deference to my colleague, I would say this is a foul ball. It is a proposal to consider the gravest constitutional issue without adequate consideration by the Judiciary Committee. This is probably the most important question that will arise and it needs to be thrashed out in committee.

I remind my colleagues that it requires only the control of one house of a State legislature in order to exercise the veto power upon legislation which is before that State legislature. We have just had an experience of this nature in our own State of Illinois, where my colleague's party controls the senate and my party controls the house because of a huge popular majority. The Illinois House passed a great deal of legislation which I think the judgment of history will record as being in the public interest, only to have the measures defeated in the senate and the program of the Governor disrupted.

There was a somewhat similar situation, according to the newspapers, in the State of Colorado.

History is replete with instances where one house can negate the decisions of the people and then force either a compromise or complete defeat of needed and approved legislation.

This is a grave matter before us, one that we should discuss in depth—and not filibuster. We will not oppose the motion to take up Senate Joint Resolution 66, but we will oppose the forthcoming motion to substitute an amendment.

Mr. President, if I have the floor, I shall be glad to yield to the very able Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], who has been chairman of the subcommittee considering the amendment, for such comments as he may care to make.

Mr. BAYH. I thank the Senator from Illinois. He has made a significant contribution—and he certainly has had much more experience in this body than has the Senator from Indiana—in pointing out the intricacies of the astute parliamentary move of our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

However, I should like to propound a question to the Chair to make the RECORD clear as to what the specific issue is on which we are about to make a determination.

Am I correct in my judgment that the question the Senate is being asked to consider is whether or not to consider Senate Joint Resolution 66, which provides for the designation of "National American Legion Baseball Week" during the period August 31 through September 6?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion pending before the Senate at this time is the motion by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 66.

Mr. BAYH. I believe I am correct in my judgment that this joint resolution would in effect establish the period to which I have referred, August 31 to September 6, as "National American Legion Baseball Week."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of a period from August 31 through September 6, 1965, as "National American Legion Baseball Week."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Am I privileged to make a point of order that there is no quorum present without losing my right to the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator would have to obtain unanimous consent for that purpose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall ask for that directly, but while my distinguished senior colleague is present—and he has alluded, of course, to a mixed metaphor with respect to baseball and football—I can only say that when he speaks of an end run, I say, in the most complimentary fashion, that he no longer is playing in the ranks of the amateurs; he is a great professional.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank my colleague for placing me among the professionals. I have had a long struggle in trying to acquire a professional status for 17 years. I am glad I have been added to the ranks of the professionals.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If this were in Old Blighty, I would tap the Senator on both shoulders and say, "I dub thee professional."

Mr. President, there need be no solicitude about the American Legion Baseball League. Long ago I was a district commander in the American Legion. Long ago I was a county commander in the American Legion. I will yield to nobody in my devotion to that great organization. But I call my colleague's attention to the fact that they are not asking for this designation until the week of August 31 to September 6. It so happens that the joint resolution is a matter for a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee that has only two members. Incidentally, it is the only subcommittee of the Senate of which I am aware of which a Republican is chairman; and I happen to be that Republican.

Whenever I want to have a meeting of that subcommittee, I can have it in a telephone booth, either in the Democratic cloakroom or in my own cloakroom, because I would call the other member of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and say to him, "The subcommittee is in session," and then we would consider the resolution.

I may say it is one of the most expeditious committees in this body.

I told the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who was the author of this proposal, that I would see to it that in good time we would take care of the American Legion Baseball Week, because I, too, am vitally interested in the matter.

So have no concern, weep no tears, express no solicitude, because that, too, will be taken care of in good time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I congratulate the distinguished Senator on making this move. Second, I remind him that the situation now is somewhat similar to the one when we took up the Senate joint resolution establishing a national monument to the memory of Alexander Hamilton, who, I believe, means much to the party on the other side of the aisle, as well as to all Americans.

The purpose there was to attach what is now the 24th amendment to the Constitution to that joint resolution, and to move ahead to the submission of that amendment to the States, which has since been ratified and has become a part of the U.S. Constitution.

I recall that the same question arose then: Are we hindering something quite popular, designed to revere the memory of Alexander Hamilton? Indeed, with not as much assurance behind it as has been put behind this one by the Senator from Illinois, but with complete good faith, several of us gave assurance to the Senators from New York that that matter would be cared for and at an early date.

I see present on the floor the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] who, I am sure, can bear witness to the fact that we gave completely prompt action, in adherence to our assurance, by the early passage of the Alexander Hamilton joint resolution.

I congratulate my friend for bringing up this present measure. It is a very distinct civil rights step. It is inconceivable to me that anyone who is informed is happy that in such States as Nevada, Arizona, Hawaii, and Alaska, under the present Supreme Court decision, complete control and domination of both houses of the legislature could be placed in either one county, as in the case of Arizona and Hawaii, or in two counties, as in the case of Alaska and Nevada. How could anyone wish to deprive the people in the great open spaces of those four States, who would be left virtually unrepresented under the present Court ruling, from having at least an opportunity to consider setting up one house of their own legislature on a basis which would recognize their legitimate hopes and dreams of development and of the building of finer communities?

Therefore, I congratulate the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and assure him that he will not be without comfort and support on this side of the aisle in quite substantial numbers. I hope that we will be able to go ahead with this desirable objective, whether it be baseball, football, or just Senate procedure. I believe that his course, as now outlined, is strictly in accordance with well established Senate procedure.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wonder if my courteous colleague, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], would permit me to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand that S.J. Res. 66 is now the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And my junior colleague is not going to introduce a proposed substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No amendment or substitute for the pending business has been offered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am most heartily in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 66, and do not raise any opposition to its consideration, but I await with interest the proposal to set it aside and introduce a constitutional amendment.

I congratulate my colleague on his parliamentary skill in thus getting a measure—which has not been approved by the Judiciary Committee and which would have failed of passage in the

Judiciary Committee—to the floor of the Senate.

My colleague is, indeed, a magician. However, sometimes magicians produce the wrong ball when it comes up.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me observe that such feeble parliamentary skill as I possess I may have learned in considerable measure from a former distinguished Member of this body, who now occupies the huge white structure at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

I remember when he called up the bill for the relief of the Stella Reorganized Schools in Missouri. Who knew what that was? We knew, of course, in the Committee on the Judiciary, that it was a claim, but we also knew that the appropriate interceptors were standing at the door and, in due course, when the civil rights bill came in, it was hooked on to the Stella Reorganized Schools bill.

I remember an incident in January of 1961, when my friend the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] and his former colleague, Mr. Keating, offered a joint resolution to make the old dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton a national monument. I remember when the distinguished Senator from Florida made several parliamentary inquiries on that subject, because I have the whole case with me now.

When it comes to parliamentary skill, I admit my feeble shortcomings in that field; but I pay high tribute to the distinguished, tall, tanned, and terrific Senator from Texas, who used to sit in the majority leader's chair on occasion, when I sat to his right on this side of the aisle.

While I am about it, I pay the highest compliment that any Member of this body can pay to another when I express my appreciation and gratitude to the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], for being so gracious, so tolerant, and so kind, on the plea of the minority leader, that this issue should have a hearing, that I should be permitted, in one way or another, to bring it before the Senate.

Later I shall allude to what turned out to be a stalemate in the Senate Judiciary Committee, but I am afraid my distinguished colleague [Mr. Douglas] is a little too naive if he says that was only because of comprehension, knowledge and understanding, without a few little factors like extraneous pressure having something to do with the stalemate.

Without losing my right to the floor, I yield to——

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my colleague, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], and then, directly, to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the courtesy of my colleague in yielding to me. I am delighted with the tribute he has paid both to the present majority leader and to the previous majority leader, the former Senator from Texas, now the distinguished President of the United States.

The former Senator from Texas was a magnificent majority leader, although I did not always agree with him.

He is a magnificent President of the United States. I do not believe that anyone could do the job as well as he.

I believe however that my colleague somewhat underrates himself in his assessment of a feat of legerdemain which the former Senator from Texas, able as he is, was never able to perform when he sat at the desk of the majority leader.

The majority leader is always recognized first by the chair when he arises. It was therefore relatively easy for the majority leader to bring up the subject of the Stella Reorganized Schools, and other measures, like a children's locomotive with a trainload of legislation attached to it. But my junior colleague has performed a much greater feat of legerdemain because he does not sit in the majority leader's seat, he sits in the minority leader's seat.

It is, therefore, extraordinary that the minority leader can bring up this proposed legislation. I compliment him and say that in my 17 years in the Senate I have never witnessed such a performance. That is why I say that he is not only the professional of all professionals, but he is also a magician par excellence.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can only say, in response to my gracious colleague that, first, that is the humility streak in me and, second, that the Senator from Montana is a gracious leader. I try to cooperate with him always. I come on bended knees with a request—after all, a great deal of work has been done on it—with the request that this proposal should come before the Senate in its entirety.

Let me express my thanks to my distinguished colleague for not undertaking what is sometimes called a filibuster, but which is really extended discussion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That has not yet begun. The Senator has been successful in his mission of making American Legion Baseball Week the pending order of business without opposition, but this is only the preliminary move on the chess board. He has moved up a pawn, but he will soon be moving in his heavy artillery.

This is only skirmishing at this point until we get into the main discussion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. After a while, I shall read to my distinguished colleague, an editorial from the Chicago Daily News, one of his favorite newspapers, which always supports him——

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, no. Not at all. It generally opposes me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The title of the editorial is "Wrong Time for a Filibuster."

Mr. DOUGLAS. There will be no filibuster. There will be discussion in depth.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall read that later but, first, I wish to yield to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as one of the coauthors of the Dirksen amendment, I compliment the able Senator from Illinois for the steps he is taking to bring this matter before the American people. This is the paramount issue in America today. It will be very hard for those who oppose the amendment to explain to the American people why one body of Congress can be apportioned on a basis other than that of population, as is the U.S. Senate, but not a body of the legislature of a State.

I hope the Senate will take action on this question. I hope it will be submitted to the American people. Let the American people express themselves. This is a very important question facing us today.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, without losing my right to the floor, I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to ask the Senator a question. As I understand, the Senator from Illinois will be proposing a substitute for the joint resolution that is now pending. His substitute would deal with reapportionment.

Does the Senator understand that, in order to adopt the substitute that he will be proposing, a majority vote of the Senate will be required?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator not only understands it, but he finds great comfort in that fact.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the substitute is adopted, what will be the situation regarding a majority versus a two-thirds vote on the adoption of the joint resolution?

Mr. DIRKSEN. On the final vote, a two-thirds vote would be required.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We could adopt the proposal of the Senator from Illinois by a majority vote, and then there would be another vote on the joint resolution as amended by the substitute, and that would require a two-thirds vote. Is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. My esteemed colleague from Washington is correct.

I do not wish to keep the Senate breathless any longer. Since we have the pending business before us, I send to the desk an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 66. The amendment would strike out everything after the resolving clause and substitute in lieu thereof the modified language which I propose for Senate Joint Resolution 2. In accordance with rule XXIII, as detailed on page 482 of "Senate Procedure," I shall move, after the passage of the joint resolution, to strike the preamble of Senate Joint Resolution 66, and after that I shall move to amend the title by substituting the title of the proposed constitutional amendment. I believe that this procedure follows the rules of the Senate.

Accordingly, I offer a complete substitute for the Senate joint resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder if the clerk will read the amendment, and if we may have additional copies of it printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, strike everything after "*assembled*" in line 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(*two-thirds of each House* *concurring therein*), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" 'ARTICLE—

" 'SECTION 1. The people of a State may apportion one house of a bicameral legislature using population, geography, or political subdivisions as factors, giving each factor such weight as they deem appropriate, or giving similar weight to the same factors in apportioning a unicameral legislature, if in either case, such plan of apportionment has been submitted to a vote of the people in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution and has been approved by a majority of those voting on that issue. When the first plan of apportionment is submitted to a vote of the people under this section there shall also be submitted, at the same election, an alternative plan of apportionment based upon substantial equality of population.

" 'SEC. 2. Any plan of apportionment which has been approved under this article shall be resubmitted to a vote of the people, or, another plan may be submitted under the provisions of section 1, at the November general election held two years following each year in which there is commenced any enumeration provided for in section 2 of article I, and upon approval by a majority of those voting thereon, such plan of apportionment shall continue in effect until changed in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution.' "

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, without losing my right to the floor, I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. I have an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment which has been read.

I ask the Chair whether it is in order under the procedure which is being followed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be in order if the Senator chose to offer it.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the first vote come on the amendment in the nature of a substitute if and when I have an opportunity to propose it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote would come in reverse order as the amendments are offered.

Mr. JAVITS. The vote would come first on the amendment in the nature of a substitute. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If such an amendment were offered, the last amendment offered in this case would be the first one to be acted on.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Chair. It is my intention to offer such an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the pending substitute. I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall presently suggest the absence of a quorum. Before I do so, with respect to what my distinguished senior colleague from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] mentioned a moment ago about the extended discussion as coming later, so that we understand where we are, and whether we are playing for keeps, I wish to read from a decision of the Chair, made on January 26, 1950, in the 81st Congress:

> On the question of whether an amendment to the Constitution must be submitted in the form of a joint resolution or in the form of a bill, the only requirement of the Constitution is that the question shall be submitted by a two-thirds vote. It does not require that it be done by joint resolution. It may be done in the form of a bill. Therefore, the Chair holds that, since the amendment offered is a substitute for a joint resolution, in the form of a bill, the point of order is not sustained.
>
> The Chair has looked into the matter, anticipating that the question might be raised, as it has been a number of times in the past, and the Chair has found it to be held that a bill before the Senate may be amended to make it a joint resolution. In one case a joint resolution was before the Senate and the Presiding Officer held that it could be changed to a bill by an amendment or a substitute. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe that that decision was rendered on January 26, 1950, by Hon. Alben Barkley, of Kentucky, late a Vice President of the United States.

The purpose in bringing the measure to the Senate is this: If anyone has any doubt that I am playing for keeps, he had better dismiss it from his mind, because we are not going to adjourn tomorrow; we are not going to adjourn the next day; and I apprehend that we are not going to adjourn for quite awhile.

God willing, and the junior Senator from Illinois has the vitality and the energy to do it, if I am defeated this time, I say with the greatest of kindliness to my distinguished friend that I shall be here to hook the measure onto any bill or resolution that comes before the Senate—and I can now anticipate some very important proposed legislation.

This morning I sat in a discussion of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. The House will consider that measure on Monday, with 2 hours of debate permitted under a restrictive rule.

If I am alive and present when a bill to repeal section 14(b) comes to this body, I shall be here with this joint resolution to hook it on to that measure, because the rules and the precedents say I can do so. What it will be when it gets to the other body will be another question, but so long as it is here, whatever comes along, I intend to pursue this cause because I think it is one of the most fundamental issues of our time.

I expect to meet the issue with whatever weapons are in the arsenal and as best I can.

Mr. President, my ham sandwich has been sitting in the cloakroom for exactly 1 hour and 30 minutes. Being an old baker, I am sure the bread has lost all of its hydration and will not taste so good. A boiled egg is out there, and it probably has shrunken by now. There is some custard there. It has probably gone to water.

I am about to ask unanimous consent, without losing my right to the floor, to interpose a quorum call, and I want it live so I shall have time to eat my lunch without having to go back to the hospital.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My colleague the junior Senator from Illinois is well advised to ask for a quorum call—we all wish to hear him speak—as a means of saving his strength for the great struggle which will shortly be upon him. We want him to be in full vigor for that.

Many of us feel as intensely on this subject as my colleague does. We do not desire to interrupt the business of the Senate, as my colleague has virtually served notice that he intends to do. But we shall fight it out, if it takes all summer, all fall, and all winter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am for that.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. As one of the newest Members of this body, and one who has tried to keep in close contact with his constituents in his home State of California, I assure both the junior Senator from Illinois and the senior Senator from Illinois that there is no question which is more important to be under consideration for the people of the State of California than the question now to be resolved. I bring notice again that a bipartisan committee has been working for some time. That committee is made up of the leader of the minority party and the leader of the majority party. I should like to aline myself with my leader on the minority side. I shall make arrangements to be here all summer, whether the eggs are smaller or larger, and whether the bread is fresh or stale.

I congratulate the Senator, and I aline myself with him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am deeply grateful to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without losing my right to the floor; and I suggest to the Senate attachés that the quorum call will be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Illinois will retain the floor. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 199 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara

Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). A quorum is present.

The junior Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] came to me and said he had a speech that probably would take an hour or more to deliver and that it was quite imperative that it be made today. I shall gladly yield to him with the understanding that I shall not forfeit my right to the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. **BAYH**. Mr. President, I do not object. I ask my friend the Senator from Illinois or my friend the Senator from Pennsylvania if I may be permitted to ask a question of the Senator from Illinois concerning a matter to which he alluded in his earlier remarks.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. **BAYH**. Mr. President, I look forward with a great deal of interest to what I know will be a comprehensive presentation on the part of the Senator from Pennsylvania, who feels very strongly about the matter.

I have had a great deal of experience in seeing this matter unfold in the subcommittee and in the full committee.

I should like to get the thought of the Senator, if I can, concerning a matter which he mentioned. I believe that this is such a serious matter that we should debate it on the floor and make a determination up or down.

I should prefer, as the Senator knows—and I have discussed this matter at some great length—that the measure go through the normal committee procedure. However, since that has been circumvented, I see no other alternative than to have a full and comprehensive discussion about it.

I am concerned about the reference made by the Senator from Illinois to section 14(b). He alluded to any issue that might be coming down the pike, so to speak. Would it not be best if I, as an insignificant junior Senator, were to suggest that, rather than looking in the future at any and every bill as another battleground, we agree to do battle at this particular time and thus, not in dilatory manner, logjam the Senate once the decision has been made.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I would be perfectly agreeable to joining issue and doing battle.

I am perfectly agreeable also to accommodating myself to the imperative needs of the Senate. For example, I should certainly not want to stand in the way of a defense appropriation bill when we stop to consider what is going on 12,000 miles away from here in Vietnam.

I try to be circumspect about these things. However, I tried to make two things emphatic. The first is that I play for keeps. The second is that I use whatever weapons are in the rule book.

I have had that rule book under my arm, and the House rule book also, for the past 32 years. A grizzled old Texan said to me the third day after I came to Congress, "Young man, if you expect to be useful around this place, you take that rule book home with you every night." Every night, I took the rule book home. That is the "Bible." Of course, therein are the weapons, and therein we will find allusion to the precedents. I have to do battle in the best way that I can.

Mr. **BAYH**. Mr. President, I want the record to show that I recognize that the Senator from Illinois is an extremely worthy adversary. I having been in the rather undesirable position of confronting him on opposite sides of one or two issues, as well as having been on the same side on others.

I want to make sure that the best interpretation of the battleground and of the rules would be the use of the rule book to the full extent in a battle. Once the issue has been joined and has been decided, we should then proceed to the consideration of other important matters which face the Senate and the country.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I emphasize point No. 2. One battle does not make a war. I may lose the first battle. I approach it with a high degree of hope. However, if I lose the first battle, I must fight on and on until the victory is won. This is only the first battle. If, perchance, destiny will let the laurels of success perch upon my lamps and my shields, I shall be happy. If not, I must gird myself again and get the energy reservoir filled with what it takes to drive one on. I must look at the arsenal of weapons, take my choice, and continue the fight in the only way that I know, on the floor as these things come along.

I have all the precedents very carefully analyzed as to what I can or cannot do. Because of my fidelity to the State-Federal system that our forefathers gave to us, and because I believe that there is such a thing as sovereign power in the States and that there are some rights in the States, I propose in my feeble way to undertake to protect them as best I can.

Mr. **BAYH**. Mr. President, as the Senator from Illinois knows, the junior Senator from Indiana is in agreement with the junior Senator from Illinois on most of the things to which he has alluded. I know that the Senator from Illinois does not have the reputation of being dilatory in doing battle. I look forward to a full discussion of this matter.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. I trust so. And I trust that finally we can render a conclusion.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, may I say for the benefit of my colleagues that I shall occupy the floor for some time, possibly between 1 and 2 hours. I suspect that few, if any, of my colleagues will share my own enthusiasm for the subject which I intend to discuss which is full employment and international finance.

I consider this to be extremely important subject. However, it is not the kind of subject which I expect would cause very many of my colleagues to remain in the Chamber and listen to it.

I hope that some of them will read the speech. It deals with an important matter. I make these comments with the thought that some of my colleagues might prefer to leave the Chamber.

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **CLARK**. I yield.

Mr. **GRUENING**. Is a speech on international finance in conformity with the germaneness rule which the Senator has so stoutly advocated in the past?

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, it has always been my view that we play the game in the Senate according to the rules which are in effect at the time the whistle blows. The time for the germaneness rule to take effect expired at 2 o'clock today. So it is not necessary for me to seek permission.

Mr. **ERVIN**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. **CLARK**. I yield.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. **ERVIN**. Mr. President, are we about to witness a filibuster by the nonfilibusterers?

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, a point of order.

The Senator from North Carolina has not propounded a proper parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, must I yield for a point of inquiry?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator has the floor. He does not have to yield.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, I refuse to yield to my friend the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. **CASE**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, I yield for a parliamentary inquiry, if the Senator from New Jersey behaves himself in connection with propounding it.

Mr. **CASE**. Mr. President, the Senator would not insist that I return to my seat, would he?

Mr. **CLARK**. No.

Mr. **CASE**. I thank my colleague.

I ask if it is in order to raise the question of germaneness because I believe the Senator from Pennsylvania is incorrect in stating the period of germaneness has expired for this session. I understand it does not expire until 3:30 p.m. or thereabouts. It seems to me, if I may say so before yielding to the Chair to answer my question, that it is a little strange if it is impossible to interrupt a Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In response to the parliamentary inquiry raised by the Senator from New Jersey, under section 3 of rule VIII, the 3-hour germaneness period starts to run at the conclusion of the morning hour or after the unfinished business or pending business has first been laid before the Senate. Since the pending business of the Senate today was first laid before the Senate at approximately 11:05 a.m., the 3-hour period was over at 2:05 p.m. Therefore, the germaneness rule is not now in effect.

Mr. CASE. Is it in order to interrupt a Senator, regardless of his wishes, to raise the question of germaneness?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The second point is well taken. Although a Senator who has the floor does not have to yield for a point of order, the germaneness rule would be meaningless unless a Senator could interpose an objection that the speaking Senator was not observing the rule of germaneness and, therefore, under rule XIX a Senator may call the Senator who is addressing the Senate to order at any time.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator from New Jersey is happy, I would like very much to proceed.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from New Jersey did not intend to make the point of order. He just wanted to know if he could.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as I said earlier, newspapers are full of references to high-level conferences which are taking place at the White House between the President and Secretary of Defense McNamara and other policy advisers.

The question has been raised in the press, in a number of articles which appeared this morning, as to what our war aims in South Vietnam are and what the rationale is on the basis of which we continue to fight in that country and, indeed, continue to build up American forces in that part of the world.

I ask unanimous consent that three articles, first, an editorial entitled "American Honor in Vietnam," which appeared in the New York Times this morning; the second, a column by Walter Lippmann entitled "The Larger War," which appeared in the Washington Post this morning; and the third, an article entitled "U.S. Professor Reports Flexibility in Hanoi Stand," under the byline of a well known international reporter, M. S. Handler, which appears on page 3 of the New York Times of this morning, may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 22, 1965]

AMERICAN HONOR IN VIETNAM

Speaking of Vietnam in a recent press conference President Johnson said: "Our national honor is at stake. Our word is at stake." It was not the first time that the administration has taken this position, but the emphasis and the timing of Mr. Johnson's remark gave it special importance.

The commitment involved in the President's statement is so portentous that it deserves careful examination. Obviously, if the honor of the Nation is at stake to such a degree that American aims must be achieved, then the struggle is a war to the finish whatever the cost. If the United States were to lose its honor in Vietnam it would lose its predominant place in world affairs, while the Communist bloc would win a victory of staggering proportions. This, clearly, would be unacceptable.

But the question does arise whether the honor of the United States is at stake in such a drastic and precise sense of the word. It the United States were to give up, pull out of Vietnam and leave the country to its fate there would, of course, be a loss of honor—but very few Americans would argue for such a solution today. Between doing that and forcing Hanoi to sue for peace on American terms there is a whole gamut of possible settlements that would not be at all dishonorable to any except those demanding a complete "victory" over the Vietcong and North Vietnam.

A statement like the one Mr. Johnson made arouses uneasiness because of its categorical nature. The stakes in the Vienamese conflict are being raised steadily. The Vietnamese conflict—and no one needs to tell this to Washington—holds within it the possibility of a war with Communist China and a world war.

It is neither cynicism nor appeasement to point out that the word "honor" is not a scientific but an emotionally charged term of very high voltage. If President Johnson means that Americans would not accept a defeat so humiliating that it represents a loss of national honor, he is right. The risk comes in determining when, if, or how honor would be lost. There are even such things as honorable defeats and dishonorable victories. And in between there are all kinds of compromises that are neither one thing nor another—but sensible and realistic.

In international politics it is wise to avoid extreme positions. American honor must by all means be preserved; it should, however, be given a reasonable connotation.

[From the Washington Post, July 22, 1965]

THE LARGER WAR

(By Walter Lippmann)

Secretary McNamara's return from Saigon has set the stage for a decision which has been anticipated for a long time. Ever since it has become evident that the air strikes would not bring the Indochinese war to an end, it has been virtually certain that the American troop commitment would be greatly increased.

The air strikes were tried out as a relatively cheap and easy way of compensating for and covering up the defeat of the South Vietnamese army. In the past 6 months the plight of the Saigon army has become worse and worse, and today its reserves are used up, its troops are deserting in masses, the villages from which it could draw new recruits are in Vietcong hands, communications with the few centers that it still holds are substantially cut.

The decline of the South Vietnamese army has gone so far that President Johnson is confronted with the question of waging an American war. The crucial question which has to be decided is not how many more American soldiers shall be put ashore in Vietnam. Although this question is of enormous importance to the men themselves and to their families, although Congress and the country are vitally interested because it is certain to involve at least a partial mobilization, the crucial question nevertheless is what the President intends to ask this large American army to do. Will he give it a mission that can be accomplished? Or will he send it on a fool's errand, as all our previous missions in South Vietnam have proved to be—the conquering and occupation of the villages and the countryside by American soldiers?

There is no indication as yet that the President has reached a decision on this fundamental strategic issue. The buildup of American forces does not decide the issue—which is whether the troops are going ashore in order to affirm the American presence during a negotiation for a political settlement, or whether they are the vanguard of a crusade to push communism back of the 17th parallel, to teach China a lesson, to prove that Americans always win their wars. This is the issue that has to be decided, and in a self-respecting free society it would now be soberly and gravely debated.

The President has said enough to keep open his own power to choose. He has often said that he wants a limited war and a negotiated settlement. But again and again he has resorted to the hot slogans which, if taken at face value, would mean not a limited war but a total war. There is no assurance that the country will not be nudged and jostled—as it has been for a decade in Indochina—until it slithers and slides into a total war.

We are now in sight of a total war. We shall be much nearer the brink if we transform our intervention to help the Saigon government into an American war against the Vietcong and Hanoi. For with the crumbling of the Saigon army, with the defeat of the Saigon government in almost the whole territory of South Vietnam, with the corrosion and corruption of the government in Saigon itself, we are confronted with the proposal to replace the South Vietnamese with Americans, to replace our advisers, and to take command of the war, and—inevitably as a result—to establish an American military government in Saigon to rule the native politicians and generals.

Can there be any serious question that such an expansion of American military power on the Asian mainland is likely to mean a war to the bitter end, not only against the Vietcong and Hanoi, but against China as well?

This is the point on which the country needs to be informed. It needs to be assured from the President himself that we are not enlarging our troop commitment in order to fight an Asian war with an American army and an American command and a military government. For on what terms would we fight such a war, and where could it end? It is too late in the day to worry about protocol, about consulting the United Nations or about consulting Congress and the people. But it is not too late, though it is the 11th hour, to ask and be told whether this is still to be a limited war.

[From the New York Times, July 22, 1965]

U.S. PROFESSOR REPORTS FLEXIBILITY IN HANOI STAND—JERSEY MAN TELLS OF TALKS WITH REDS IN ALGIERS, PARIS, AND SAIGON

(By M. S. Handler)

A New Jersey economics professor reported yesterday, after a visit to Saigon and other capitals, that the North Vietnamese had demanded U.S. agreement in principle on a withdrawal of forces from Vietnam, and not an actual withdrawal, as a precondition for negotiations.

The professor, Robert Brown, of Fairleigh Dickinson University, said this fundamental distinction had been emphasized to him in Algiers by a counselor of the Hanoi mission during a 2-hour discussion. He added that the official's version had been confirmed in Paris by unofficial representatives of the North Vietnamese Government before the professor proceeded to Saigon, where he arrived July 4.

Professor Brown made his trip as a member of a three-man mission sent to Saigon by the Inter-University Committee for Debate on Foreign Policy, a group with headquarters in Ann Arbor, Mich.

The two other members of the mission, who met him in Saigon, were Prof. Jonathan Mirksy of the University of Pennsylvania, and Carl Oglesby, president of Students for a Democratic Society.

According to Professor Brown, the Hanoi representatives insisted that the "withdrawal" section of Hanoi's program for negotiations had been widely misinterpreted.

The three other sections of the four-point program call for a cessation of U.S. air attacks in North Vietnam, a return to the 1954 Geneva accords limiting military activity in Vietnam and providing for a national election, and a political settlement in the south according to popular wishes.

Professor Brown said that on the last night of a visit to Saigon by 12 leading American clergymen, representing the Fellowship for Reconciliation, they had heard the following peace proposals from an agent of the National Liberation Front, parent movement of the Vietcong:

An immediate cease-fire, with a freezing of current military position.

Adjudication by an international body in districts where control is in dispute.

U.S. preparation and execution of a troop withdrawal over a 6-month period.

A district-by-district election campaign from which a coalition government would emerge.

Professor Brown, who spent the period 1958 to 1961 in Vietnam as a U.S. aid official, speaks fluent Vietnamese. He said yesterday that the internal situation in South Vietnam had deteriorated so seriously that if the U.S. Government were to withdraw its armed forces suddenly the Saigon regime would vanish overnight.

Professor Brown said that he still believed the United States should withdraw but that the withdrawal should be planned carefully.

In several meetings with powerful Buddhist and Roman Catholic leaders, intellectuals, high Government officials, students and peasants, the professor said, he found a widespread feeling that Vietnam was being sacrificed to a struggle between the United States and Communist China.

This feeling was shared, Professor Brown said, even by those who were favorably disposed toward Americans.

The Buddhists and the others, he continued, feel that peace is the most important order of business if the country is to escape devastation. Saigon intellectuals, though protected from the hardships of the war, are passionately opposed to it, he said, and have no confidence in the Government, which they consider an American puppet. Although they are anti-Communist, the professor added, the intellectuals are apparently convinced that the Saigon leadership is hopeless and that the Communists are the only element in the country that have a strong national following.

Mr. CLARK. These three articles raise the following questions, which I would hope President Johnson would explore with the Congress and the American people after the executive conferences have concluded and he has made up his mind what to do with respect to the recommendations made to him by Secretary McNamara as a result of his recent visit in South Vietnam:

First. Is it really true that our national honor is at stake in South Vietnam; and if so, why?

Second. Is it true that the plight of the Saigon army has become worse and worse during the past 6 months; and if so, why?

Third. Is it true that the reserves of the Saigon army are used up and that there are few, if any, remaining reserves?

Fourth. Is it true that the Saigonese troops are deserting in masses, creating a very real problem not only of manpower but of discipline?

Fifth. Is it true that the villages from which the army commander of Saigon could draw recruits are largely in Vietcong hands, thus making it difficult, if not impossible, to draft more recruits into the Saigonese army?

Sixth. Are the communications of the few centers still held by the South Vietnamese and Americans cut, so that communications between them are interrupted as a practical matter?

Seventh. What mission does President Johnson intend giving to the larger American forces which the papers indicate are likely to be committed to South Vietnam? Is this mission to be the conquering and occupation of the entire country, including the villages and countryside, by American soldiers?

Eighth. Are we about to engage in an effort to push communism back to the 17th parallel in order to teach the Chinese a lesson, to prove that Americans always win their wars?

Ninth. What is the view of the administration as to whether the contemplated activities create a real risk that (a) the entire North Vietnamese army under the command of General Giap will be committed to ground warfare in South Vietnam; and (b) what is the appraisal by the administration of the chance that the commitment of substantial additional American forces will bring Communist China into the land war?

Tenth. And in many ways the most important. What is the appraisal of the Defense Department and of the Army as to how many American casualties we can anticipate during the remainder of this year if the plans approved by the President are carried into effect?

Eleventh. What is the best prognosis which can be given Congress and the American people as to how long the war will last, if the plans approved by the President are efficiently carried into effect?

With respect to the third insertion which I have just made in the RECORD, I invite the attention of the Senate to the statement made by Prof. Robert Brown, of Fairleigh Dickinson University at Rutherford, N.J., an individual who speaks fluent Vietnamese and who was a part of our AID mission in South Vietnam. Professor Brown has recently returned from a trip which took him to Algiers, to Paris, and to South Vietnam.

During the course of that trip, he had an opportunity to talk with unofficial representatives of the North Vietnamese Government. According to Professor Brown, the Hanoi representatives insisted that the withdrawal aspect of Hanoi's program for negotiation, which has been frequently reported in our press, has been widely misinterpreted.

Professor Brown stated that he was told that the condition for negotiations laid down by the North Vietnamese was an agreement in principle that after a settlement—which in all likelihood would restore the Geneva Convention agreement of 1962—the Americans would, in due course, remove their Armed Forces.

This condition, however, has been represented to many of us as being quite different. We have been told that the North Vietnamese insisted on the immediate evacuation of American Armed Forces, a condition which I strongly oppose.

I do not believe that we can scuttle and run under such demand. I believe that we must stay in South Vietnam until an honorable peace can be negotiated. I strongly feel—and I hope that the President does also—that, in due course, we should provide for an appropriately neutralized Vietnamese Government, and that then American troops could well be withdrawn.

FULL EMPLOYMENT AND INTERNATIONAL FINANCE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, my purpose is to develop the road we should take to solve the growing problem of adequate monetary liquidity to finance a constantly growing world trade.

My interest arises, in large part, from the connection between adequate international liquidity and full employment, with maximum production and reasonable price stability in the United States. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have become convinced that a flourishing and growing international trade is essential to the reduction of our presently unsatisfactory rate of unemployment in this country. This is primarily because our exports have always, in recent years, exceeded our imports. This excess means more jobs for Americans. We must keep it that way. With the growing spread of technology, automation and cybernation, and with the huge predictable increases in our labor force during the next decade, we require a flourishing international trade based on both exports and the employment created by imports to find jobs in this country for men and women who want them.

Moreover, an international financial crisis which might result in devaluation of the pound or even of the dollar would destroy that price stability on which our present prosperity depends.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield at that point?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my good friend the Senator from Indiana, to whom I am most grateful for taking the keen interest he has in the subject matter of my speech.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator will recall that a few years ago, in 1959 and 1960, we served on a committee concerned with unemployment problems in the United States.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. I remember it well.

Mr. HARTKE. At that time, we visited some of the areas in Pennsylvania, and other States in the Nation, and talked with persons who were suffering from unemployment. It is important for us not alone to consider what the domestic problem is at the moment, so far as jobs are concerned, but also to give increasing concern to problems which affect international trade, because it is an important element in keeping our people working at home.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. I believe that this is one aspect of the employment problem which does not receive enough attention. Many of our markets are overseas, and our labor force is growing so rapidly that unless we can acquire and keep new international markets we shall never be able to keep everyone in a job back home.

Mr. HARTKE. I commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for taking this kind of leadership, which is unique in a way—that is, leadership in the field of considering employment and jobs which are so vital to the people at home and relating it to an international situation which sometimes is not easily understood at home. The clarity and emphasis with which the Senator from Pennsylvania is making his points are such that I believe they should be well followed in this body, as well as in the rest of the Nation.

The difficulty is that by the time some of the effects, for example, of international liquidity are translated back home to the man who works in the factory, it is too late to do anything about the international situation. That is why I commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate and the country at this time, and to say that one out of every seven workers employed on the production line today depends directly or indirectly on what the Senator intends to talk about in the Senate today.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend the Senator from Indiana for his helpful intervention. I point out that with the inevitable increase in the labor force, as the war babies reach working age, we will need to increase the proportion of the total labor force devoted to foreign trade to avoid mass unemployment.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Let me say to the Senator from Indiana that in a certain sense the luck of the draw has given me a unique opportunity in the Senate to acquaint myself with the subject, because I am not only chairman of the Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, but I also serve on the two subcommittees of the Committee on Foreign Relations which have to do with international organization affairs, and economic and social policy affairs, so far as foreign relations are concerned, so that one would have to be very dumb, indeed, if serving in those areas the interrelationship between employment at home and international trade were not brought home to him.

As a member of the Subcommittee on International Organization Affairs and Economic and Social Policy Affairs, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I have become gravely concerned with the adequacy of the present international monetary system in meeting the foreseeable needs of international trade. In my judgment, the recent increase in the capital and lending power of the International Monetary Fund, necessary though it was, is hardly adequate to the task. Unless we can develop more sophisticated plans and procedures for providing monetary resources to finance international trade on a sound basis, I fear we may be headed for serious trouble—trouble which would inevitably have an impact on our domestic economy, on price stability, and on our full employment commitments to our people.

It is most encouraging to note that Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, understands the need for increased international liquidity. In a speech delivered at Hot Springs, Va., on July 10, Secretary Fowler called for a new international monetary conference to consider steps which might be jointly taken to secure substantial improvements in international monetary arrangements. He spoke of a series of bilateral and multilateral conferences which are currently taking place to develop a program around which a consensus can develop. He pointed out that three crucial facts make such a series of conferences highly desirable:

First. The U.S. balance of payments is approaching equilibrium.

Second. There is a rising tide of informed opinion that monetary arrangements can and should be substantially improved, building on the structure of the International Monetary Fund.

Third. Technical studies, notably the Bernstein and Ossola reports, necessary to give a thorough understanding of the problem and the various alternatives which might be followed have been completed.

I am delighted that Secretary Fowler is taking the initiative in this important international effort to solve a problem which threatens the prosperity of the free world. I regret that the French have, for the time being, said, "No," but their refusal to join us can be no more than temporary. The urgencies of the problem will, in due course, require them to join us in working out a solution.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator makes a very important point. The urgency of the problem will in due course of time require the other nations to join us. It is also necessary for us to point out that a few short months ago, before the reversal in our balance-of-payments situation, which is now in a surplus position of over $1 billion on an annual basis, the French were more or less encouraging an international monetary conference. They have now done an about-face, because they may feel that the atmosphere is one which is more favorable to the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. I believe the Senator is correct. I also wish to point out what he and I were told not too long ago—namely, that there is good reason to believe that the French do not seem to know what they want to do, because General de Gaulle goes one way, the Finance Minister goes another way, and the director of the Central French Bank has a different view. Perhaps the French wish to get their own position straightened out before they are willing to come to a conference.

Mr. HARTKE. Yes. The point is that all nations will ultimately find themselves in the same house, so to speak. They will have to learn to live together or they will have to live separately. If they live separately, of course, ultimately it will be not only to their own detriment, but to the detriment of all people around the world. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. There is not too much time to get the new program going. If we do not look out, we may be doing too little too late.

Mr. HARTKE. That is what I intended to bring up. With respect to the urgency of calling a conference, even if we could call one, it could not be completed in less than 2 years, perhaps.

Mr. CLARK. We would be fortunate if we could do that.

Mr. HARTKE. That is probably the shortest period of time. There will be some problems in the fall, I believe, when the British may well have some anxiety in regard to their own currency. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; I am sure that there will be that situation. I do not wish to overemphasize their problems. However, the most optimistic Englishman, I am sure, is concerned about what may happen in the fall.

Mr. HARTKE. We have been in a remarkably good position. Our balance of trade has been extremely favorable. We had a big increase in exports until this year. But now our imports are rising and our exports are not. Therefore we are not in a position where we can toss caution aside. We must be continually alert.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is absolutely correct. The one thing that worries me a great deal about the escalation of the war in Vietnam is the strongly adverse effect this will have on our balance of payments as we push more and more assets out of our country and into southeast Asia.

Mr. HARTKE. The net result, so far as our present position is concerned, is that it might make the rest of the world feel that perhaps we are not in a strong position, and therefore the necessity for the conference has passed, and, in addition, that we could not make a real contribution. Is that true?

Mr. CLARK. That is absolutely correct. The surplus seems necessary to our bargaining position, but all the time, international liquidity is drying up.

Mr. HARTKE. What we are doing, in effect, is creating a depression overseas, which could ultimately come to haunt us in America. It would be a great tragedy if world prosperity were to collapse, even as a world conference to defend it were underway. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. HARTKE. I should like to make one further point. Without quarreling with anyone, I would say that we are still the biggest trader in the world.

Mr. CLARK. Certainly.

Mr. HARTKE. I believe that our gross national product constitutes about 40 percent of the gross national product of the world.

Mr. CLARK. It is very high, indeed. It will be well over $600 billion this year.

Mr. HARTKE. The net result is that we are the leader in the world, and we cannot surrender the leadership in this field, even if we wished to do so. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. That is why I am so happy that the Treasury, perhaps a little slowly, has taken up the cudgels in support of bringing all the central banks of the world together, to plan ahead for what now looks like an inevitable crisis. We do not know quite when it may occur.

Mr. HARTKE. The Secretary of the Treasury is to be commended not only for taking up this matter as an adviser to the President, but also for bringing it to the attention of the Nation and to the attention of the world, as he did in his July 10 speech, to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with the Senator from Indiana. I suspect that he agrees with me, too, that while this is a very intricate and technical subject, in our pluralistic democracy, the more people know about it, the better; the more discussion there is about it, the better; and in that way a more informed public opinion can be brought to bear.

Mr. HARTKE. Discussion of the type that we are having is intended to keep the people informed, and at the same time it gives encouragement to the Secretary of the Treasury that since he has taken this step forward, he should continue to accelerate this type of leadership, to which America is accustomed.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator. I trust that the Secretary of the Treasury and his leading assistants are regular and avid readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because I fear they will not find this colloquy in any other publication.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator.

THE U.S. BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the fact that the United States has recently been, on an overall basis, a debtor rather than a creditor nation in terms of international balances has vastly complicated the international monetary situation. The further fact that we seem to be on our way to remedy this deficiency will complicate it even more. The short-term debt, accumulated as a debtor, will, when paid off, cut down needed international liquidity once we become again a creditor nation as we have been for so long.

The causes which resulted in our running for some years a substantial deficit in our international balances are not hard to identify. Primarily they result from our heavy military and foreign aid commitments overseas which required the export of dollars in an amount substantially greater than the excess of our exports over our imports.

I depart from my text to comment that it is true that we have arranged to have something like 80 percent of our foreign aid consist of materials and supplies which are produced in the United States, and hence these do not adversely affect our balance of payments.

Nevertheless, that 20 percent remains, and it is a significant factor. As I pointed out a few moments ago, the more money that pours into military aid in South Vietnam, the more difficult we make our balance-of-payments problems. Not that I believe that that particular factor should override considerations of important foreign policy, national honor, and the like. But we ought to count the cost of what we are about to do—and it is a very real cost—for every $100 million we pour into South Vietnam, we accelerate the difficulties of our balance-of-payments problem.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HARTKE. The so-called balance-of-payments problem, which began about 1958 and continued up to the first part of the present year, was not something that we could not understand. The Federal Government understood it. We knew what was making the major contribution to that problem. Is that not true?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. HARTKE. If we considered only our trade—how much we export and how much we import—it could be seen that we have been running a substantial surplus.

Mr. CLARK. My recollection is that last year it was almost $6 billion.

Mr. HARTKE. Which indicates that we have always been able to sell more to the rest of the world than we buy from the rest of the world, which means more jobs back home.

Mr. CLARK. It is these extracurricular activities that get us into trouble.

Mr. HARTKE. That is the price of world leadership. That is what the Senator has alluded to. He has stated that he does not wish to condemn the positions we have taken—what we are going to do in the field of international responsibility and national honor, for example. Those decisions must be made by the President with his advisers, considering the long-range view of what will happen in the political world as well as the economic world.

Mr. CLARK. And all the factors involved, of which the one we are speaking about is only one.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator is correct. That is important for the rest of the world to know and our people at home to know. We are not in the present situation with our eyes closed. Our eyes are open. We understand what is contributing to the problem. If we were concerned only about our pocketbooks, we could pull out from Vietnam, France, Germany, and the rest of the places overseas. We could bring our fleet back home. It would be no problem to put our own pocketbooks in order.

Mr. CLARK. From an economic point of view, we could live happily ever afterward. But what would happen in our foreign policy is something else.

Mr. HARTKE. We might live under a dictatorship.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Another major cause of the deficit was, until a few months ago, the huge and continuing investment of American capital in business enterprises overseas. This, too, for the short run creates a drain on dollars, although in the long run it will work the other way.

Again I depart from my prepared text to point out that the long-run benefits to our economy of the investment of American capital overseas are very great, because as that investment begins to yield profit, a profit in the form of dividends or other credit arrangements comes back here to help our balance of payments instead of hurting them. That is why, in a way, it is too bad that in order to bring our balance of payments or our international payments into balance we must engage in a voluntary program of urging American businessmen not to invest any more money in Europe or anywhere else otherwise. While that program would help in the short run, it would not help in the long run. I do not know how long we shall be able to continue that voluntary program successfully. I believe it is wonderful. So far our private business has cooperated. But how long can we rely on that to solve our problems?

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator makes a valid point, one which must be considered. We live in a free society. The President asked for a voluntary restraint on the business community. The free enterprise system has responded. It has responded almost too well, as the Senator said.

The result is that at least temporarily we have eliminated the fear which was occasioned by the balance-of-payments deficit. We have gone into a surplus position. As the Senator has pointed out so well—almost fearfully I think he has pointed out—we have demonstrated now that we can do this in a free society. We did not need to have cooperation to do it. Let us not overdo what we have done. Let us consider now the long-range effect of our action. If we continue to run balance-of-payments surpluses, we are sure to produce a problem far more serious than the deficit problem we have just solved. The sooner that point is understood and the quicker it is taken into consideration, the better it will be for the long-range economic condition of our country, and not only the United States but also the rest of the world.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with the distinguished Senator from Indiana. I wonder if the Senator does not agree that international financial judgments being as they are today, and the conservatism of central bankers being as great as it is, we shall probably have to maintain our international payments in balance for at least a year and perhaps more before we can convince our friends that we have done the job. The real problem is not the strength of the dollar, but how much money they will have to engage in the international trade which they need.

Mr. HARTKE. I would hope it would not take that long. As the Senator has pointed out, the damage which might occur from a continuation of that policy might be of such magnitude within a year's time that we might in effect be exporting a depression.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree. I hope that in due course President Johnson will be able to exercise on our French friends the approach which he has used so successfully in Congress: "Come, let us reason together."

Mr. HARTKE. In some areas it has other definitions, but I believe I understand what the Senator means.

Mr. CLARK. I return to my text.

Presidents Kennedy and Johnson have moved to protect the dollar from foreign attack and thus overcome the balance-of-payments deficit by a series of wise moves which appear on their way to achieve their objective. There is no need to detail these many different measures. It is enough to say that they appear at the moment to be achieving the end result of bringing our international payments into surplus.

Results for the first 5 months of 1965 indicate that we have turned the tide with respect to our balance-of-payments difficulties. We showed a surplus for the months of March, April, and May. We have certainly not reached the end of the road; but we can hope that if the present strenuous efforts are continued, our balance-of-payments problems will be solved in the foreseeable future.

This is the view of former Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, as expressed in a speech at the commencement exercises at Middlebury College on Monday, June 14.

He believes, and most economists agree with him, that the wise actions we have taken since 1961 to return our payments to balance will eventually put very substantial pressure on the flows of international trade and investment. Any significant slowdown in those flows would severely injure our own economy with harsh repercussions on both employment and profits. It would also substantially retard the growth of the developing countries which depend on international trade for the sale of their commodities.

I was delighted with the recent news that President Johnson has asked Mr. Dillon to head an advisory committee on the international monetary problem. In effect, the committee, which contains a number of other monetary experts, has been asked to take a new look at the U.S. position on this problem and to recommend a new approach.

I regret that the recent joint statement of Secretary of the Treasury Fowler and Chancellor of the Exchequer James Callaghan, as reported in the press, appeared to lay such stress on maintaining as a matter of national patriotism the preeminence of the dollar and the pound as international reserve currencies. Such a nationalistic approach is all too apt to make a sound international solution of the problem substantially more difficult.

We do a disservice to ourselves and to the trade of the free world with such a posture.

The opportunity is now before us to assure full employment, maximum production and reasonable price stability at home, while fostering the growth of trade abroad. But that opportunity can be realized only by promptly improving the international monetary system so that it is no longer based on the currency of one or two nations but relies instead on an international monetary unit not essentially tied to any national currency.

In recent months we have seen a dramatic demonstration of why this is necessary.

The fact has been brought home to us that, as the United States succeeds in wiping out its deficit in international payments, a necessary result is to dry up that major source of world credit and liquidity which consists of dollar holdings abroad.

My view is that no one country should be asked to limit its domestic freedom of monetary action in order to provide international liquidity for others. A corollary is that means should be found to prevent domestic liberty of action from visiting economic tribulations on dozens of other nations.

That is why I believe the time has come to lessen the shackles which tie the fortunes of the American economy to the status of the dollar and also of the pound on the international money markets. The world's liquidity requirements must be established on some basis other than that of the two reserve currencies.

It is, therefore, important to analyze the relationship between the U.S. balance-of-payments problems and the need to maintain, and indeed to increase, international monetary liquidity to enable a constantly growing international trade to be adequately financed.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator from Pennsylvania has now clearly identified in this portion of his speech the situation as it exists today and has identified the necessary results which will occur if something is not done. In addition, he has made clear that the world still depends on the rather limited form of currency which is available—that is, either the dollar or the pound.

Mr. CLARK. And the credit based thereon.

Mr. HARTKE. And the credit based thereon. He has brought the attention of the public to this point: The necessary consequence of our trying to put our own house in order is the shortage in the availability of currency and credit overseas.

Mr. CLARK. This is true, and it is the principal burden of what the Senator from Indiana and I are trying to get across in this colloquy.

Mr. HARTKE. Exactly. No international trade can be conducted on a strictly cash or barter basis in the modern world. Is that not so?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Indiana is exactly correct, particularly if we refer to the more advanced countries.

It is true that the Communist bloc seems to be able to get along with barter deals, largely because their currency is not acceptable outside their own borders. But that is a quite clumsy way of doing business. Only a limited amount of barter of that sort is feasible.

Mr. HARTKE. Present indications, if any real indices whatsoever exist concerning what is going on inside Russia, are that the Russians gross national product has not increased as it should have, certainly not so fast as ours. Russia is not enjoying the kind of prosperity that the free world is enjoying, and the weakness of the Russian economy is principally responsible for the political shakeup.

Mr. CLARK. It is rather sardonic that Russia is plagued with a rather serious unemployment problem.

Mr. HARTKE. That means that Russia's political institutions are not capable of dealing with the monetary problems, economic problems, and other international problems which must be dealt with if a country is to continue to be a leading nation of the world.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct, despite the fact that the Soviet Union is one of the two primary sources of gold in the world.

Mr. HARTKE. That is important. Before I came to the Chamber, I was asked the question: What would happen if we depleted our gold supply? But the strength of the American dollar is not dependent upon our gold reserves. It is dependent upon a strong economic system at home, upon prosperity, and upon continued confidence in the American ability to produce and to continue this system in operation as we have in the past. If we had at Fort Knox all the gold we need, and had it sealed up to support the dollar, nevertheless, if we had a depression, no one would want the American dollar.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is, of course, completely correct.

THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY SYSTEM

The international monetary system is still based on the so-called "gold exchange standard." "Money" is the sum of the gold supply plus the hard currencies based on it, plus the credit extended to those who hold the gold and such currencies. That is to say, in the end, a borrower must be prepared to pay his debts in gold or in one of the reserve currencies which can be converted into gold at the will of the holder.

The supply of gold is not growing fast enough to permit the needed increase in reserve currencies and hence access to the credit required to finance world trade. Unless some way can be found to increase the money supply, international trade financed on a gold exchange monetary foundation will shrink and wither. The short supply of money is quite capable of bringing on a worldwide recession with disastrous results for ourselves as well as the rest of the world. That is why, in the long run, the gold exchange standard is obsolete. It has served its purpose in freeing money from the tyranny of gold. It should now stand aside in favor of a monetary system more responsive to the needs of the modern world.

The Senator from Indiana will recall that we were on the old-fashioned gold standard, which is quite different from the gold exchange standard, at the time the depression hit the county in 1930. Later, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in what I think was a stroke of economic genius, took the United States off the gold standard. Even those gold pieces that we liked to give away at Christmas were taken from the people.

The Supreme Court sustained the position of President Roosevelt that American currency did not have to be redeemed in gold itself. So we went to a gold exchange system, which is quite different.

Mr. HARTKE. The truth is that instead of causing the economic condition of the country to become worse, that movement, instead, gave a part of the impetus, at least, to move out of the great depression into better times.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is quite correct. If there had not been that fiscal monetary wisdom in 1933 and 1934, the country would have been many long years in getting out of the trough of the depression, which lasted long enough, anyway.

Mr. HARTKE. It has demonstrated that worshiping the golden calf in the field of religion or worshiping the golden calf in the field of monetary policy has about the same end result.

Mr. CLARK. In both instances it is a pagan myth.

Mr. HARTKE. That is quite true.

The principal reserve currencies at the moment are the dollar and the British pound, both pegged to the price of gold at $35 an ounce. Access to credit is also, in the long run, tied to this price of gold because of the gold exchange system. The supply of gold is accordingly the ultimate limiting factor which prevents the needed increase in the supply of money. And private international speculators as well as some central bankers are always buying and selling gold in the hope of making money in the event its price is changed because of pressure on the pound and the dollar. The pound is, of course, more heavily under attack than the dollar.

While our balance of payments was running a deficit and dollars flowed abroad, foreigners began to demand payment of their dollar balances in gold. In fact they are still doing so. In some circles this caused, over the years, some fear that our stocks of gold might not be able to meet the demands made upon them. Now that our payments appear to have been brought in balance, at least for the time being, there should be no serious worry about a long continued run on our gold supplies. Earlier this year, Congress took steps to remedy this situation to an extent deemed sufficient by the Treasury by eliminating the gold coverage on deposits in Federal Reserve banks, thus making $4.8 billion of additional gold available for export without adversely affecting our domestic monetary requirements.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Senator, of course, realizes that, at the same time, we still kept the gold cover on our notes.

Mr. CLARK. I thought that was a mistake at the time. I filed supplemental views to the report of the Committee on Finance.

I believe that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] felt the same way. However, the Treasury, for reasons which I do not know, did not want to go whole hog. I believe we would have been in better shape now if we had.

Mr. HARTKE. Possibly their reasoning was that the psychological effect of removing all of the gold cover at the same time might have been adverse. Since we have looked into such a position, would this not be an appropriate case in which to take an additional step?

Mr. CLARK. I believe so.

Mr. HARTKE. That step could be taken now—now when we are not in a position in which we are fearful of a run on gold, but when we have the opportunity to put our own house in order—to demonstrate that the gold cover, for all intents and purposes, is rather useless in the modern world.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with the Senator. I believe that the Treasury would say that we had better keep our payments in balance so that it would not appear that we would be doing this because of a fear of a run on the dollar.

Mr. HARTKE. I believe that a continuation of the problem of a running surplus in the balance of payments situation could create a problem which could be more serious and have economic consequences which would be much more serious than the old problem in regard to the deficit. If we should return to a deficit, the Treasury might feel that the psychological effect of removing the gold cover in its entirety might again be detrimental to the overall confidence in the American dollar.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. However, there is a factor to be taken into consideration. That factor is that while the Senator from Indiana, I, Secretary Dillon, Secretary Fowler, and others are convinced of the validity of the major premise that international liquidity is shrinking at an undesirable rate, I believe that the central bankers in Europe do not admit that as yet.

I do not believe that they look too far in front of their noses. However, until they become convinced that we need substantial additional international liquidity, we shall probably not be able to make much progress in solving the problem because we cannot do it alone.

Mr. HARTKE. Perhaps their nearsightedness could be corrected with a new pair of bifocals if they were to begin to see that the effect of the present policy will possibly cause a decline in their stock markets and a decline in their prosperity. If they foresee that situation soon enough, perhaps they will be willing to get a new prescription immediately.

Mr. CLARK. I believe that there is much merit in what the Senator has said. Of course the real pinch comes when they look around to find dollars to finance their own international trade and discover that there are no dollars around.

Mr. HARTKE. That may happen sooner than they expect.

Mr. CLARK. Some believe that it might happen this fall.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, this is an understandable position as far as the so-called financial experts of Europe are concerned. The central bankers of Europe are not in agreement with the views of the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Indiana.

In view of that situation, there is a tendency on the part of our own people, the Secretary of the Treasury and others, to recognize that we live in a world in which we must live together, and that there must be more nearly a meeting of the minds before additional steps are taken in this direction.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. I believe that the Senator would agree with me that we should not yield to the importunities of the central bankers of Europe by raising our own interest rates and making our money tighter and thus affecting our domestic economy. That is something about which the central bankers of Europe could not care less. However, we must maintain our position and not take deflationary action as long as there are idle hands and machines.

Mr. HARTKE. That is an important thing for us to remember. Perhaps some of the countries in Europe do not have this situation. For example, western Germany does not have a labor surplus.

Mr. CLARK. There is no unemployment of any significant degree in Europe today.

Mr. HARTKE. They have more jobs than they have people to fill the jobs.

Mr. CLARK. Germany has been importing coal miners from Italy.

Mr. HARTKE. The net result is that they are not faced with the situation that we are faced with. We have many people that we must put to work. A gap exists.

Mr. CLARK. We have more than 4 million unemployed.

Mr. HARTKE. So long as those people are unemployed, there is no real danger of inflation.

Mr. CLARK. I believe that is correct.

Mr. HARTKE. And as long as we have not completely utilized our productive capacity, there would still be an opportunity for expansion of our own economic machinery.

Mr. CLARK. I believe that there is a qualification that should be pointed out. With a rapid spread of automation technology, it is conceivable that unemployment could increase, and yet the industrial capacity could be used up because it would not take as many men to operate the machinery as it formerly did.

Mr. HARTKE. The question of inflation is, of course, not quite that simply put. I do not want to say that inflation could not occur while there was some unemployment. However, in the entire picture which the Senator from Pennsylvania is presenting today, dealing with the relationship of the jobs to the monetary system, and the liquidity in the world, we must think not of what will happen in 1965, but what will happen in 1985, which is not far away.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has put his finger on the most important factor, which is that we must get Congress and the country and—to a lesser extent, because I believe they do appreciate it to some extent—the executive branch of the Government to appreciate that in this complex, modern world of ours, we must plan ahead.

One reason why the annual appropriation procedure in Congress is so unsatisfactory is that we cannot plan ahead.

Mr. HARTKE. The point is that no enterprise in the world would do business as we do it, and not keep a separate capital budget.

Mr. CLARK. If it did, it would be bankrupt in short order.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator for making this point on the floor, as he has done before. A statement was made by one of the presidential economic advisers that there was a dearth of ideas for planning ahead. The person I refer to is a wonderful man. I call to his attention the fact that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania is advocating an idea for planning ahead. I hope that fact will be noted.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

The Treasury still has a real problem in curbing the gold outflow; but it is vigorously directing itself to this end, and there can be no real doubt that it will be successful so long as we keep our balance of payments under control. The shrinkage in foreign-held dollars which is resulting from balancing our payments will cause foreign bankers and individuals to use their remaining dollar balances as reserves with which to finance their international trade rather than converting these dollar balances into gold.

There are still some economists, but not many, who advocate the old-fashioned way of solving the shortage in international exchange, that is to say, devaluation of reserve currencies—the pound and the dollar—by increasing the price of gold. Thus, if the $35 per ounce present price were doubled, the amount of reserve currency secured by gold which could be issued would also be doubled and the amount of international reserves thus increased. It would, of course, be possible to devalue the pound without requiring the dollar to follow suit.

However, history proves that devaluation causes more problems than it solves. Devaluation has historically led to increased domestic prices, inflation at home, and a temporary stagnation of world trade. To some extent, it would put us in the control of the principal gold-producing countries, that is, South Africa and the Soviet Union. It would give the private gold speculators a field day. It would, in all likelihood, set in motion a substantial inflation with the consequent hardship to those living on fixed incomes and pensions.

Another conventional remedy presently advocated by the Treasury is to give still more lending authority to the International Monetary Fund. This will of course work for a while. But the difficulty with this solution is that it leaves the pound and the dollar as the major reserve currencies, although the currencies of a number of other Western European countries and of Japan are beginning to be in a position to carry part of the load. The British pound is already under attack and may have difficulty in surviving the annual fall crisis to which it seems to be subjected. Unless the improvement in the balance of payments in the United States is continued throughout the summer and fall the dollar might also become vulnerable, as will our remaining gold supply, on which France has recently drawn in a substantial amount.

Yet, as noted above, as soon as we rectify our balance-of-payments deficit, as we seem to be on our way to do, by the mere act of so doing we both protect our gold supply and intensify the shortage of money to finance international trade. Thus, many economists believe that the pending increase in the International Monetary Fund's lending capacity will not solve the long-range problem of adequately financing world trade.

So one of the principal difficulties with the present situation is that the United States is on the horns of a dilemma.

We need an expanding world trade to maintain full employment, maximum production, and reasonable price stability. Yet, in our own interests, we must also eliminate the deficit in our balance of payments in order to prevent a successful attack on the dollar and its $35 an ounce price pegged to gold. The two objectives may well be inconsistent. Devaluation, as noted above, creates many more problems than it solves. The traditional method of raising interest rates to attract foreign capital would put a crimp in our domestic growth. Accordingly, it is important, not only in our own interests but in those of all the trading nations of the world, to find a satisfactory way out of this dilemma which will not at the same time affect adversely our domestic prosperity.

PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

The best way to resolve our dilemma, in my opinion, is to convert the IMF into a sort of central bank for central banks. The analogy to our own Federal Reserve System is inexact but useful. This suggestion would encompass authorizing the IMF to receive deposits from the central banks of its members—much as the Federal Reserve banks do—up to 20 percent of their national currency reserves, against which deposits the IMF could issue its own notes. Thus the dollar and the pound would no longer be the medium for the monetary reserves of other countries. These deposits would bear interest which would be payable out of the earnings of the IMF. The notes of IMF would take their place. These earnings could be increased by permitting the IMF to engage in open market operations much as the Federal Reserve System now does.

As a concession to conservative thinking the reserve currency deposits could be made redeemable in a gold exchange currency at any time.

Thus the IMF would have very substantial additional assets with which to finance world trade. A new unit of international money, a composite reserve unit, sometimes called the CRU, could be issued by the IMF—a unit based on all "hard money" reserve currencies which the national central banks would commit themselves to accept at face value for international settlements.

The plan should authorize the IMF to increase or decrease the supply of international money—its own notes or CRU's—without regard to the supply of gold in proportion to the increase or decrease in international trade with perhaps an annual ceiling of, say, 3, 4, or 5 percent above or below which the increase or decrease could not go. This ceiling would calm the misgivings of those conservative international bankers who live in fear of monetary inflation through the printing press.

At the same time the United States, Great Britain, and the other industrial countries should forbid the use of their national currencies as monetary reserves by central banks or individuals abroad. They would require notes or CRU's of the IMF to settle their balances. Thus would the dilemma of the dual role of the dollar be resolved by eliminating it as a primary medium of international exchange. We could then concentrate on manipulating our domestic supply of money in the light of our own domestic economy requirements, tightening it when domestic inflation threatened, relaxing it when unemployment and slack production occurred. We would no longer need to fear that the short term balancing of our international payments and receipts would threaten desirable international monetary liquidity in the interests of financing an expanding world trade.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from New York, but first let me make one comment. Some exception may be taken to my use of the word "manipulating" in connection with our domestic supply of money; yet I point out that it is really quite an acceptable term which has been accepted by William McChesney Martin, Governor of the Federal Reserve Bank, who admitted publicly some years ago that of course the Federal Reserve manipulated the supply of money, increasing it when a recession threatened and decreasing it when inflation threatened. So really we have been living in a manipulated money market, certainly since the Federal Reserve System was established in the Wilson administration.

Mr. JAVITS. First, in an entirely nonpartisan way, I compliment the Senator from Pennsylvania for addressing his talents, which are very great, and his mind and that of his staff, to the problem which is one of those secret revolutions that can overturn all calculations, including everything we are doing, not only economically, but also militarily and politically, because there is a great upheaval going on in the world of finance, attributable, as the Senator has so properly stated, to the drying up of the U.S. imbalance in international payments.

That is hard on the British at the moment. They are most vulnerable because of the great pressure on the pound and the problem which they have to sustain a huge international establishment on a fairly slim economy. We must never forget—and I have not read every word of the Senator's speech, but perhaps he covers it, although I know that he agrees with me, that as we stand in Vietnam, the British stand in Malaysia. If they were not there, perhaps we would have to be there, or someone else like us.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I agree with the Senator on the fundamental proposition that it is high time the basis of the world's credit should cease to be sterile gold. He has properly taken into account, notwithstanding how we as a government feel—and we must take into account the views of the central bankers and other financial people in the world—the proposals of such eminent economic experts as Triffin, Bernstein, and Stamp.

Let me ask the Senator this question, because it is extremely important, and I know that he is helping Senators like myself, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and others who wish to see an international monetary conference called: Is the Senator as disquieted as I am by the fact that the administration's proposal for a call is merely a call, and that the administration does not seem to be prepared as yet—and I emphasize that word "prepared" so that perhaps we can nudge them into it—to lay before the countries of the world some profound proposal? In view of this, I ask the Senator whether he does not believe that we should, with the same forthrightness and with the same vigor, considering the power of our economy, nudge the administration into thinking seriously about whether it should make a major proposal upon which the world will meet. Then we shall have a meeting, instead of the danger of an economic conference such as the one President Roosevelt contemplated in 1933 which never came off.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator. As he knows, the ways of international bankers are sometimes weird, with a "mystique" all their own. Not only I, but also Representative REUSS of Wisconsin, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and other Senators, have been after the Treasury on this subject for several years. When that able individual, Mr. Roosa, was Under Secretary of the Treasury, we were pushing him hard. At that point, the story was that we could not get it until we had put our balance of payments house in order, because the European central bankers would say that we were trying to run away and put a tackle on the dollar. We were, therefore, to put our house in order, and then come over and talk with them about changing the international monetary setup. Of course, in the meanwhile, they were reasonably content, because they had the dollars and pounds to use as reserve currency.

I do not believe that I am telling any tales out of school when I say that the present Secretary of the Treasury is working hard on this problem and has indicated informally, subject to changing his mind, that he personally intends to confer, over the next few months, with all the central bankers from hard-currency countries.

We have also had the report of the Senator from New York, the Bernstein report, and the Ossola report, which has not been made public; but I have been advised that the Ossola report does contain an erudite technical discussion of the various methods by which additional international liquidity could be made available.

The Secretary of the Treasury has assured me that he and his experts are hard at work on the problem which the Senator from New York has raised.

Mr. JAVITS. I have a feeling that we have been rather timid in pressing for international monetary reform. I believe that the voluntary restraint program announced by the President in February was ill advised in terms of the long-range interests of the United States. We acted with too much haste.

Mr. CLARK. I made that point earlier, but I also made the point that there is no other feasible way of bringing our international payments into balance than this temporary voluntary restraints on investments abroad, because of our commitments in Vietnam, and the military establishment overseas, and that relatively small portion of the foreign aid program which does not consist of goods and services produced or acquired in the United States.

As the Senator from Indiana pointed out, before the Senator from New York came into the Chamber, we have a fine surplus of exports over imports. If that were the only problem, nothing would bother us, but it is the extra curricular activities, because we are a world power with commitments all over the world, which get us into trouble.

Mr. JAVITS. With the world so largely underdeveloped, and with these amounts relatively marginal—in short, in a $44 billion export and import trade, we are talking about the fact that we need $4 billion more a year at the most in export surplus to eliminate our balance-of-payments deficit. With a $600-plus billion economy, we are talking about a $44 billion export-import trade, which is infinitesimal compared to the great powers in relationship to their own economies.

Mr. CLARK. To their own gross national product.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes. The question I should like to ask is: Does the Senator feel, with me, that there is a certain timidity apparent on the part of the United States in its policy so far? The international bankers are licking their chops over the fact that they made us conform to their views in reefing in our sails on the balance of payments. They have not asked themselves yet what they will do because of that, and where they will get their future reserves from as a result. We are permitting ourselves to be intimidated by the lowest common denominator. It seems to me—and I shall make my prescription for this in a speech with the same consideration and thoughtfulness that the Senator from Pennsylvania has shown—that the time has come for us to do a little creative thinking, that we might break out of this timidity with some move on the part of the United States which would be of an affirmative character and would take on the problem, not with a view toward the fact that we will be in distress because we are reefing in our sails, or because the bankers have told us that that is step A. They do not know what step B will be, but they will find later we are pushing out in a way which the world absolutely demands.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator that the average banker—and before I came to the Senate I used to represent several banks as a lawyer—is fundamentally a timid individual. He has to be, because he is dealing with other people's money.

The Senator from Indiana and I have made the point of timidity as strongly as we can. On the other hand, the Secretary of the Treasury is moving as rapidly as he can, under the circumstances. One purpose for making my speech is to prod him a little to keep on moving.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I hope all Senators who are thoughtful about this question—and there are quite a number of us who are—would also be thoughtful about the voluntary restraints program, because, on balance, as the Senator knows—and I do not wish to belabor the obvious—we have done very well in the field of international investment, both by way of hard assets and in the return, because, as the saying goes, we are lending long and borrowing short. I am sure the Senator is acquainted with that parlance from his own personal experience.

It seems to me that the voluntary restraints program, although all right for a little while, will be harmful and deflationary, and can deal the American economy a hard blow, and can deal the world economy a hard blow. The British—who are most vulnerable—can be dealt a hard blow, unless we very soon find a way to lift it, without at the same time running the gamut of all the perils. Therefore, I believe a little courage will be needed in that regard.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator, but I would like to ask him this question. Does the Senator have any prescription as to what we can do when we are escalating expenditures in Vietnam which may well result in the progress we have made in the first 5 months of this year being wiped out?

Mr. JAVITS. Whether our involvement in Vietnam will have an adverse effect on our balance of payments will depend on how much of what we buy we will be buying abroad.

The Senator asked me a question, which I should like to answer. The United States still has enormous resources with which to defend the dollar. The position which the United States has taken so far has been out of fear that the dollar may not be defendable.

When I say courage, I mean for example, our strength in investments abroad and our credit standing in the world.

Perhaps we can give the bankers a choice between being set adrift or sticking with the dollar and helping to prop it up. Some time ago they put together a $6 billion fund almost overnight, or mighty fast, when that was needed in order to deal with the international situation. That is what I mean by courage.

I am not counseling foolhardiness. I am counseling that those of us who are thoughtful and have the liberty of speaking freely, and are not hemmed in by the need of the administration, naturally, to be very circumspect about what is proposed, should be perfectly free in making our proposal, of the kind that I shall make and no doubt others will make also—and I intend to make mine next week—in order to bring us to realize that we have to do something affirmatively, and that it will take a little courage to do it, and with our backing it probably can be done.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator in principle. The difficulty is that as long as the dollar is redeemable in gold at $35 an ounce, and as long as billions of dollars are held not only by the central banks, but by speculators as well, overseas, who can call on the dollar, we must watch very closely our dwindling gold supply. I believe that supply is adequate, but if we play too much poker with our friends overseas, they could follow the lead of General de Gaulle, whose action did cause a bit of embarrassment a little while ago.

Mr. JAVITS. May I answer that question?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. General de Gaulle is sui juris, as we lawyers say. We may have to pay him out in full. As has sometimes happened in international affairs, the person who collected has been the first to go broke. Other than that, we have been remarkably successful in making the central banks relieve us of that fear. I do not believe, however, that the central banks of the world have gone "nuts" in terms of jeopardizing the very dollar upon which they depend. I shall submit my own prescription, and I hope that the Senator will consider it and engage in some discussion of it.

Mr. CLARK. I hope to be able to do so. I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. Before the Senator from New York leaves the floor, I should like to say that the statement made by the Senator from New York is very encouraging. That is exactly what we are talking about. We shall have to have courage to demonstrate leadership. This is so very vital. I believe the Senator has put his finger on another point, and that is, although the bankers put up about $6 billion in a hurry not so long ago, the English are in a position where they may have another crisis—and I am not anticipating it necessarily. It is not something that is not talked about. They may have another serious crisis in the fall. We cannot wait for the international monetary efforts to solve this immediate problem.

I agree with the Senator from New York that a voluntary program would perhaps have good consequences in demonstrating the American free enterprise can bring its own house in order.

Mr. JAVITS. And is patriotic.

Mr. HARTKE. And is patriotic. However, a continuation of that program can only bring disaster not alone to our friends but also to us.

I do not believe that should cause us to fall down and be as fearful as the Senator from Pennsylvania has indicated, and that we must have a complete equilibrium in the balance of payments. Perhaps it is to the advantage of the United States to run a deficit of perhaps a billion dollars on an annual basis, not because we must, because of our commitments, but because it is to our advantage to do so.

Mr. JAVITS. I am refreshed and sustained by the thoughtfulness and the creativeness which I have seen in this speech of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and in the discussion. I hope we shall constitute ourselves an informal group to see if we cannot come up with something creative, uninhibited as we are, are contrasted with the necessary position of the administration.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] is not present, but he shares this same apprehension and the same anticipation that we do.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, much of the foregoing is the plan suggested to the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress as long ago as 1959 by Prof. Robert Triffin, of Yale. Some of it is adapted from the suggestions of Edward Bernstein. No doubt much of it is intelligently discussed in the OSSOLA report recently submitted to the central bankers of the free world. The plan has had a cool reception through the years both at the Treasury and from overseas central bankers. The objections to it fall into three broad categories.

First. So radical a scheme is unnecessary.

Second. It implies a degree of internationalization of the world supply of money which it is thought neither world opinion nor the central bankers are now prepared to accept.

Third. It so downgrades the function of gold as the basis of all sound currencies that it would prove unable to engender the necessary confidence in the new money used to finance international trade. In my opinion, none of these objections is tenable. Let us consider them in turn.

First. As to the lack of necessity, there are writers of repute who are concerned that a successful effort to bring the U.S. balance of payments into surplus will cause a substantial shrinkage of international liquidity as early as the end of 1965. For example, Peter Drucker, writing in the May issue of Harper's magazine under the title "A Crash Next Year? Why It's a Real Danger and How It Can Be Avoided" says:

> Even the most traditionalist banker in the free world is becoming convinced that something will have to be done fast to head off a liquidity crisis. But it is very late—much too late, for sure, to go on drifting.

The tools with which the IMF and the central banks control international exchange today are primitive indeed in the light of the increasing volume and complexity of world trade. It will take several years at the earliest to modernize these tools to be able to deal with the foreseeable liquidity problems of the future. Any serious shortage of dollars and pounds as reserve currencies, any loss of confidence in the pound or the dollar, could create an international monetary crisis in a matter of weeks. The time to create the new mechanisms to deal with the situation is now before the threat of a crisis is upon us, not next year or the year after when there may not be time before disaster strikes.

Second. It is true that the plan requires some modest yielding of national sovereignty to an international monetary authority. Also, in the minds of monetary patriots, it would downgrade the pound and the dollars into mere national currencies instead of maintaining their proud status as the principal reserve currencies of the world to which both the worldwide free enterprise system and the central banks of the developed nations turn with gratitude. But it makes no economic sense to wrap the flag around ourselves and proclaim we are unwilling to see the dollar eliminated as a key international currency when that is exactly what our domestic economy needs if it is not to become bogged down by efforts of the monetary patriots to force the dollar to play two quite inconsistent roles at the same time. The inevitable result would be that the goal of full employment in our country will become unattainable because we have to tighten money and raise interest rates at home to protect the status of the dollar abroad. In the management of any world central bank the United States would have a powerful voice. There is no basis for the fear that we would become the slaves of the bankers of Europe.

Again, it will take several years to change the present pattern of international banking thought. The time to start is now. We should not wait until international trade is thrown into the same shambles American trade found itself in in 1789 before Hamilton persuaded a reluctant Congress to agree to the assumption of State debts by the newly created Federal Government. Nor should we, with our eyes open, move again toward the disaster which overtook the London Economic Conference in 1933 when Franklin D. Roosevelt refused to go to the rescue of the pound and pushed through the elimination of the convertibility of dollars into gold. A stitch in time saves nine.

Finally, it is true that the plan in effect downgrades the gold exchange system although it pays lipservice to it by permitting the national depositors with the reorganized International Monetary Fund to withdraw the 20 percent of their reserves which they are to deposit in the International Monetary Fund in gold or its equivalent. But the worship of gold as a basis for international exchange is one of the least useful myths of our essentially pagan international monetary system. There is not now, and in all likelihood there never will be, enough gold in the world to provide the ultimate base for international money, unless we are prepared to go again through the economic misery of devaluing the dollar, the pound and, probably, a dozen other currencies. We did ourselves a longrun national service when we abolished gold convertibility in the thirties. We struck another blow for freedom when we repealed the requirement of a gold coverage for deposits in Federal Reserve banks earlier this year. It is a shame that while we were at it we did not go all the way and eliminate the necessity of maintaining a gold reserve behind our Federal Reserve notes. The elimination of private speculation in gold, which would result from the plan, would certainly be a net gain in terms of stability for international exchange.

There may not have been much economic sense in William Jennings Bryan's famous peroration in 1896:

> You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns. You shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold.

But if a successor to Bryan were to speak the words today in connection with international trade he might well be right. Why should we permit General de Gaulle to stage a run on our dwindling gold supply—perhaps in an effort to bring down the dollar? Under any sensible monetary system he would have no use for the gold when he got it, and we would have no occasion to feel concerned when he claimed it.

In the last few weeks we have pretty well got rid of the silver myth by substantial elimination of the silver content in most of our coins. Why not complete the job by getting rid of the gold myth and giving the IMF the authority to regulate international liquidity on the basis of the needs of international trade, rather than on the amount of gold held in Fort Knox and the vaults of central banks?

Obviously we are a long way from persuading the central bankers of the world to eliminate gold as an ultimate medium of exchange and to substitute an international currency unit to be issued by a world bank in amounts determined in relationship to the volume of international trade from time to time. Nevertheless, the time has come to make a start. Gold is an utterly unrealistic basis for currency in the modern world.

In the meanwhile, of course, we must protect ourselves against a run on our own gold supply. Given the fact that our balance of payments has improved enormously since the first of the year, this might not be too difficult a task. The important thing is to arrange as soon as possible for substantial additional international liquidity.

I return to ex-Secretary Dillon's Middlebury College speech, in which he spoke of a "great and growing urgency—the compelling need to improve and strengthen the international monetary system. This is a problem—which—must concern all of us, for unless we and our free world partners can agree on how to make the needed improvements in the system, the consequences for the economies of all free countries, including the United States, will be most serious."

Secretary Dillon believes that the recent increases in the assets of the International Monetary Fund, while helpful in meeting the needs of an expanding free world economy, are not enough and that further action is needed in the relatively near future.

Secretary Dillon is not concerned, nor am I, that the world will lose confidence in the dollar with a resulting sharp decline in international liquidity. The danger is the other way; that is, that confidence in the dollar plus our necessity to shrink its availability internationally in order to keep our payments in balance, will cause such a contraction in international trade and investment as to bring on a world recession.

Free movements of capital are an essential element of rapid growth. Our first necessity is to convince a skeptical world that the United States has both the capacity and the will to balance its accounts with the rest of the world and to keep them balanced. This we are in the process of doing without tightening money or increasing interest rates at home.

But now that we appear to be succeeding in righting our own balance of payments by our own actions, there is a further important and pressing need: It is to strengthen the international monetary system so as to insure that the needed increases in international reserves will be forthcoming to finance a growing international trade. That is the real problem which confronts us today if we are to prevent a slowing down of the economic growth in individual countries which would soon threaten a worldwide recession.

There is enough time left to do the job fully and carefully; but no time to dally. We need to develop an international monetary system capable of financing international trade now, before the heat goes on, not after it becomes too hot to stay in the kitchen.

I conclude, as I began: Domestic prosperity, full employment, reasonable price stability, and maximum domestic production all require a flourishing international trade with an excess of exports over imports. Growing international trade requires adequate international liquidity to finance it. We must take the lead in providing that liquidity if we are to protect our own economy. The time to start is now, not next month or next year. We cannot allow the France of General de Gaulle to stand in the way.

I congratulate Secretary Fowler for his Hot Springs speech and his suggestion that an international monetary conference should be promptly convened. I urge him and his colleagues in his own words "to move ahead, carefully and deliberately but without delay."

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. **HARTKE**. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Pennsylvania upon one of the finest statements I have heard in the field of the relationship of international finance to full employment at home. These issues must be opened up. It is time that they be discussed.

The proposition that we should discuss these problems does not necessarily mean that any one person might have the ultimate solution. The solution proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania may perhaps be rejected; it may be accepted. It may be a solution which the administration would want Congress to support; it may be one that it would want Congress to reject.

We cannot in any way come to any type of conclusive thought on either the acceptance or the rejection of basic ideas until they are put on the table.

I believe that there is great merit to this proposal. But, I believe that no matter what happens, it would be at least 2 years before we could have a conference and reach a successful conclusion. It would more likely be closer to 5 years, if we were to reach one at all.

Precisely because it will take so many years before we can accomplish a fundamental reform of the international monetary system, it is my belief that the United States must take the initiative today. The United States, as the most powerful economy in the world, must act to keep the machinery of the world's monetary system running, until we have the time to overhaul or replace it.

The United States today is in balance-of-payments equilibrium; the President's emergency program has worked brilliantly. These are the reasons why I have urged that the United States fulfill its responsibility and protect its own prosperity by moving, now, to defend the world's prosperity. With a strong trade surplus and the President's emergency program always at hand, a balance-of-payments deficit of as much as $1 billion is fully consistent with a position of balance-of-payments equilibrium. We cannot afford, as our British friends would say, to be penny wise and pound foolish. This is exactly what we will be if, by running balance-of-payments surpluses today we produce a worldwide recession tomorrow.

I hope this is not the last statement that the Senator from Pennsylvania will make on this subject. I hope the Senator will continue to press forward with the same kind of courage and conviction that he demonstrates in the Senate on every issue on which I have had a chance to witness his activity.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, I thank my friend the Senator from Indiana for his kind words, and welcome him as an ally in this cause.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I, too, wish to commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for one of the most thoughtful addresses to which I have listened in a long time.

It challenges the attention of every Member of the Senate. It challenges also the attention of every citizen of the country who is concerned with the economic welfare and the position of the United States in the world community.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank my old and dear friend the Senator from Tennessee, for his kind comments.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR AREAS SUFFERING A MAJOR DISASTER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 443, S. 1861.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1861) to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments on page 2, after line 8, to strike out:

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to refinance a borrower's indebtedness under programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration where he finds such refinancing necessary because of property losses sustained by such borrower as a result of a major disaster. Any loan so refinanced may provide for the repair or construction of structures and for the purchase of building sites when the original sites cannot be utilized as a result of such disaster. The interest rate on any loan refinanced under this subsection may be reduced to a rate not less than 3 per centum per annum, and the term thereof may be extended for such period as will provide a maturity of not to exceed forty years: *Provided,* That the Secretary may authorize a suspension in the payment of principal and interest charges on, and an additional extension in the maturity of, any such loan for a period not to exceed five years if he determines that such action is necessary to avoid severe financial hardship.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to refinance a borrower's indebtedness under programs administered by the Rural Electrification Administration, where he finds such refinancing necesary because of loss, destruction, or damage of property resulting from a major disaster. The term of such loan may be extended for such period as will provide a maturity of not to exceed forty years: *Provided,* That the Secretary may authorize a suspension in the payment of principal and interest charges on, and an additional extension in the maturity of, any such loan for a period not to exceed five years if he determines that such action is necessary to avoid severe financial hardship.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 3. (a) Where such action is found to be necessary because of loss, destruction, or damage of the property, or impairment of the economic feasibility of the system, of borrowers under programs administered by the Rural Electrification Administration, resulting from a major disaster, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to adjust and to readjust the schedules for payment of principal and interest on loans to such borrowers, and to extend the maturity dates of such loans to a period not beyond forty years from the dates of such loans. The authority herein conferred is in addition to the loan extension authority provided in section 12 of the Rural Electrification Act.

On page 4, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)"; after line 21, to strike out:

(d) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to refinance any loan made by the Veterans' Administration where he finds such refinancing necessary because of the loss, destruction, or damage to property securing such loan as the result of a major disaster. The interest rate on any loan refinanced under this subsection may be reduced to a rate not less than 3 per centum per annum, and the term thereof may be extended for such period as will provide a maturity of not to exceed forty years: *Provided,* That the Administrator may authorize a suspension in the payment of principal and interest charges on, and an additional extension in the maturity of, any such loan for a period not to exceed five years if he determines that such action is necessary to avoid severe financial hardship.

(e) Loans made pursuant to paragraph (1) of section 7(b) of the Small Business Act, as amended (15 U.S.C. 636(b)), for the purpose of replacing, reconstructing, or repairing dwellings damaged or destroyed as a result of a major disaster may have a maturity of not to exceed forty years: *Provided,* That the Administrator of the Small Business Administration may authorize a suspension in the payment of principal and interest charges on, and an extension in the maturity of, any such loan for a period not to exceed five years, if he determines that such action is necessary to avoid severe financial hardship. The provisions of section 7(c) of such Act shall not be applicable to any such loans which have a maturity in excess of thirty years.

(f) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration may authorize for a period not to exceed five years a suspension in the payment of principal and interest charges on, and an extension in the maturity of, any loan made to small business concerns pursuant to section 636(a) of the Small Business Act, as amended (15 U.S.C. 636(a)), if he determines that such action is necessary to avoid severe financial hardship resulting from loss or damage incurred by a major disaster.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(c) Section 1820 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The Administrator is authorized to refinance any loan made or acquired by the Veterans' Administration when he finds such refinancing necessary because of the loss, destruction, or damage to property securing such loan as the result of a major disaster as defined in subsection 1855(a) of title 42, United States Code. The interest rate on any loan refinanced under this subsection may be reduced to a rate not less than 3 per centum per annum, and the term thereof may be extended for such period as will provide a maturity of not to exceed forty years; except that the Administrator may authorize a suspension in the payment of principal and interest charges on, and an additional extension in the maturity of, any such loan for a period not to exceed five years if he determines that such action is necessary to avoid severe financial hardship."

(d) In the administration of the disaster loan program under section 7(b) of the Small Business Act, any application for a loan thereunder in an amount of $30,000 or less in the case of a homeowner, or $100,000 or less in the case of a business concern, may be granted, if such loan is for the repair, rehabilitation, or replacement of property damaged or destroyed as the result of a major disaster, without regard to whether the required financial assistance is otherwise available from private sources.

(e) In the administration of subtitle III of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, relating to emergency loans, any application for a loan thereunder in an amount of $30,000 or less may be granted, if such loan is for the repair, rehabilitation, or replacement of property damaged or destroyed as the result of a major disaster, without regard to whether the Secretary of Agriculture finds that the required financial assistance can be met by private, cooperative, or other responsible sources (including loans the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make or insure under any other provision of law).

On page 7, at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "(g)" and insert "(f)"; on page 8, after line 2, to strike out:

REFINANCING OF OUTSTANDING MORTGAGE OBLIGATIONS

SEC. 4. (a) For the purpose of enabling any State which has suffered a major disaster to refinance outstanding home mortgage obligations or other real property liens which are not insured or guaranteed by any Federal agency and which are secured by one- to four-family homes which have been severely damaged or destroyed by such disaster, the President is authorized, upon application, to make matching grants to such State on a 75 per centum Federal 25 per centum State participating basis, any funds provided by such State to pay the costs of refinancing such mortgage obligations or real property liens.

(b) Any application for a grant under this section shall—

(1) be in accordance with a plan submitted by the State, to be approved by the President, for the implementation of the purpose of this section;

(2) designate the State agency for carrying out the plan;

(3) provide assurances that any loan made for the purpose of refinancing any mortgage obligation, or other real estate lien, shall have a maturity of not to exceed forty years and bear interest at a rate not to exceed 3 per centum per annum: *Provided,* That the State agency may authorize a suspension in the payment of principal and interest charges on, and an extension of the maturity of, any such loan for a period not to exceed five years, if it determines that such action is necessary to avoid severe financial hardship;

(4) specify that no loan for refinancing the outstanding debt secured by any single property shall exceed $30,000;

(5) provide assurances that equitable treatment will be accorded to all eligible property owners; and

(6) set forth such further information as the President may by regulation require.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

GRANTS TO STATES FOR ASSISTANCE TO HOMEOWNERS AND BUSINESSES

SEC. 4. (a) The President is authorized in accordance with the provisions of this section to provide assistance to the States in developing and carrying out comprehensive and practicable programs for assisting homeowners and business concerns suffering property losses as the result of a major disaster. For the purposes of this section, the term

"State" includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(b) From the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (1) the President is authorized—

(1) to make grants to any State, upon application therefor, in an amount not to exceed 50 per centum of the cost of developing a program referred to in subsection (a): *Provided*, That the total grants made to any State under this paragraph shall not exceed $250,000; and

(2) to make grants to any State, upon the basis of an approved State plan, to pay not to exceed 50 per centum of the cost of carrying out such a program.

(c) Any State desiring to participate in the grant program under paragraph (2) of the preceding subsection shall designate or create an agency which is specially qualified to administer such a disaster relief program, and shall, through such agency, submit a State plan which shall—

(1) set forth a comprehensive and detailed State program for assistance to homeowners and business concerns suffering property losses as a result of a major disaster;

(2) specify that the homeowner or business concern will assume 25 per centum of the property loss sustained by it as a result of such a disaster, and the State will agree to pay 25 per centum of such loss;

(3) provide that no homeowner or business concern shall be eligible to participate in such a State program unless the damage to the property of such owner or concern resulting from such a disaster exceeds 5 per centum of the value of such property prior to such a disaster, or $100, whichever is the greater;

(4) specify that the maximum amount of loss to be shared jointly by the homeowner or business concern, the State, and the Federal Government under such a program shall be $30,000 in the case of a homeowner, and $100,000 in the case of a business concern;

(5) provide a means of appraisal to establish the fair market value of the property of such owner or concern damaged or destroyed as a result of such a disaster;

(6) provide assurances that equitable treatment will be accorded all eligible property owners;

(7) contain satisfactory evidence that the State will adequately supervise such program;

(8) provide such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as the President deems necessary; and

(9) set forth such further information as the President may by regulation require.

(d) The President shall approve any State plan which complies with the provisions of subsection (c) of this section.

(e) No grant may be made under this section—

(1) for any loss for which private insurance is available and collectible in such State at reasonable rates;

(2) for any loss in a State which does not have approved flood-plain zoning controls or other similar preventive measures in force; and

(3) to any public agency or organization for the loss of any property owned by such agency or organization.

On page 12, at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(f)"; at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "(d)" and insert "(g)"; at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "(e)" and insert "(h)"; at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "(f)" and insert "(i)"; on page 15, after line 9, to strike out:

SEC. 6. (a) Section 203(h) of the National Housing Act is amended to read as follows:

"(h) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to insure and to make commitments to insure any mortgage secured by a property upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single family residence, where the mortgagor is the owner and occupant and establishes (to the satisfaction of the Commissioner) that his home which he occupied as an owner or as a tenant was destroyed or damaged to such an extent that reconstruction or replacement is required as a result of a natural disaster determined by the President to be a major disaster pursuant to the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes', approved September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855–1855g).

"(2) To be eligible for insurance under this section, a mortgage shall—

"(A) not exceed $20,000; and

"(B) not exceed (i) 100 per centum of the appraised value of the property, or (ii) the sum of the estimated cost of restoring the property and the Commissioner's estimate of the value of the property before restorations: *Provided*, That in no case involving refinancing shall such mortgage exceed the estimated cost of restoring the property and the amount (as determined by the Commissioner) required to refinance existing indebtedness secured by the property;

"(C) bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance and service charge, if any) at not less than the annual rate of interest determined, from time to time by the Secretary of the Treasury at the request of the Commissioner, by estimating the average market yield to maturity on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States, and by adjusting such yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum; and

"(D) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such terms as the Commissioner may prescribe, but not to exceed forty years from the beginning of the amortization of the mortgage.

"(3) The property covered by any mortgage insured under this subsection shall comply with such standards and conditions as the Commissioner may prescribe (having due regard to the purposes sought to be achieved by this subsection) to establish the acceptability of such property for mortgage insurance."

(b) Section 305 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(i) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Association is authorized to make commitments to purchase and to purchase, service, or sell, any mortgage which is insured under section 203(h) of this Act: *Provided*, That the total amount of purchases and commitments authorized by this subsection shall not exceed $ ".

On page 17, at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "(c)" and insert "Sec. 6."; in the same line, after the word "of", to strike out "such" and insert "the National Housing"; in line 19, after the word "subsections", to strike out "(a) and (f)" and insert "(a), (d) (2), (d) (3), (d) (6), and (f)"; on page 18, after line 3, to strike out:

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMPLIANCE WITH PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized in the case of any farmer in any area which has suffered a major disaster to reopen or extend, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, the period prescribed for participating in any program being administered by the Department of Agriculture, if the Secretary determines that (1) such action is necessary to help such farmer avoid severe financial hardship which has or will likely result from such major disaster, (2) such farmer would have been eligible to participate in such program if he had made timely application for participation therein; and (3) such action is feasible and will not materially defeat the purpose of such program.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS IN MAJOR DISASTER AREAS

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make grants to farmers whose farmlands or livestock have been damaged as the result of a major disaster. Such grants shall be made (1) for the purpose of assisting such farmers to prepare such lands for cultivation and to restore such lands or livestock to normal productive capacity, and (2) only in the case of lands on the farm normally used in the production of an agricultural crop. No grant shall be made hereunder to assist in restoring lands or livestock to production unless the Secretary determines that the cost of preparing such lands for production has been increased as a direct result of such major disaster.

(b) The amount of the grant authorized under this section in the case of any farmer shall not exceed an amount determined by the Secretaary to be equal to two-thirds of the total cost of preparing the damaged lands for cultivation and restoring them to normal productive capacity, and in no event shall the amount of any such grant in the case of any farmer exceed $10,000.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to impose such reasonable terms and conditions on the making such such grants as he determines necessary to carry out effectively the purposes of this section.

(d) such sums as necessary to carry out its provisions of this section are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

On page 20, line 8, after "Sec. 9.", to insert "(a)"; on page 21, line 8, after the word "disposal", to strike out "systems" and insert "systems, water systems,"; in line 12, after the word "service", to insert "which the Secretary determines to be"; at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "150 per centum of"; in the same line, after the word "the", to strike out "average"; after line 16, to insert:

(b) Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

After line 21, to strike out:

SEC. 10. (a) The Act of September 23, 1950, Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress, as amended (20 U.S.C. 631–645), is amended by inserting immediately after section 15 of that Act the following new section:

"SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE IN MAJOR DISASTER AREAS

"SEC. 16. (a) If the Commissioner determines with respect to any local educational agency that—

"(1) (A) such agency is located in whole or in part within an area which has suffered a major disaster, as determined by the President pursuant to section 2(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1855a(a)), and

"(B) the Governor of the State in which such agency is located has certified the need for disaster assistance under this section, and has given assurance of expenditure of a reasonable amount of the funds of the government of such State, or of any political subdivision thereof, for the same or similar purposes with respect to such catastrophe;

"(2) public elementary or secondary school facilities of such agency have been destroyed or seriously damaged as a result of this major disaster;

"(3) such agency is making a reasonable tax effort and is exercising due diligence in availing itself of State and other financial assistance available for the replacement or restoration of such school facilities; and

"(4) such agency does not have sufficient funds available to it from State, local, and other Federal sources (including funds available under other provisions of this Act), and from the proceeds of insurance on such school facilities, to provide the minimum school facilities needed for the restoration or replacement of the school facilities so destroyed or seriously damaged,

he may provide the additional assistance necessary to enable such agency to provide such facilities, upon such terms and in such amounts (subject to the provisions of this section) as the Commissioner may consider to be in the public interest; but such additional assistance, plus the amount which the Commissioner determines to be available from State, local, and other Federal sources (including funds available under other provisions of this Act), and from the proceeds of insurance, may not exceed the cost of construction incident to the restoration or replacement of the school facilities destroyed or damaged as a result of the disaster.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Pending such appropriation, the Commissioner may expend from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accordance with other sections of this Act such sums as may be necessary for immediately providing assistance under this section, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriations authorized by this subsection when made.

"(c) No payment may be made to any local educational agency under subsection (a) except upon application therefor which is submitted through the appropriate State educational agency and is filed with the Commissioner in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, and which meets the requirements of section 6(b)(1). In determining the order in which such applications shall be approved, the Commissioner shall consider the relative educational and financial needs of the local educational agencies which have submitted approvable applications. No payment may be made under subsection (a) unless the Commissioner finds, after consultation with the State and local educational agencies, that the project or projects with respect to which it is made are not inconsistent with overall State plans for the construction of school facilities. All determinations made by the Commissioner under this section shall be made only after consultation with the appropriate State educational agency and the local educational agency.

"(d) Amounts paid by the Commissioner to local educational agencies under subsection (a) may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Commissioner may determine. Any funds paid to a local educational agency and not expended or otherwise used for the purposes for which paid shall be repaid to the Treasury of the United States.

"(e) None of the provisions of sections 1 to 10, both inclusive, other than section 6 (b)(1), shall apply with respect to this section".

(b) The Act of September 30, 1950, Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, is amended by inserting, immediately after section 303 of that Act, the following new section:

"ASSISTANCE FOR CURRENT SCHOOL EXPENDITURES IN MAJOR DISASTER AREAS

"SEC. 304. (a) If the Commissioner determines with respect to any local educational agency that—

"(1)(A) such agency is located in whole or in part within an area which has suffered a major disaster, as determined by the President pursuant to section 2(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1855a(a)), and

"(B) the Governor of the State in which such agency is located has certified the need for disaster assistance under this section, and has given assurance of expenditure of a reasonable amount of the funds of the government of such State, or of any political subdivision thereof, for the same or similar purposes with respect to such catastrophe; and

"(a) such agency is making a reasonable tax effort and is exercising due diligence in availing itself of State and other financial assistance, but as a result of such major disaster it is unable to secure sufficient funds to meet the cost of providing free public education for the children attending the schools of such agency,

he may provide to such agency the additional assistance necessary to provide free public education to the children attending the schools of such agency, upon such terms and in such amounts (subject to the provisions of this section) as the Commissioner may consider to be in the public interest. Such additional assistance may be provided for a period not greater than a five-fiscal-year period beginning with the fiscal year in which the President has determined that such area suffered a major disaster. The amount so provided for any fiscal year shall not exceed the amount which the Commissioner determined to be necessary to enable such agency, with the State, local, and other Federal funds available to it for such purpose, to provide a level of education equivalent to that maintained in the schools of such agency during the last full fiscal year prior to the occurrence of such major disaster. The amount, if any, so provided for the second, third, and fourth fiscal years following the fiscal year in which the President determined that such area has suffered a major disaster shall not exceed 75 per centum, 50 per centum, and 25 per centum, respectively, of the amount so provided for the first fiscal year following such determination.

"(b) In addition to and apart from the funds provided under subsection (a), the Commissioner is authorized to provide to such agency an amount which he determines to be necessary to replace instructional and maintenance supplies, equipment, and materials (including textbooks) destroyed or seriously damaged as a result of such major disaster, and to lease or otherwise provide (other than by acquisition of land or erection of facilities) school and cafeteria facilities needed to replace temporarily such facilities which have been made unavailable as a result of the major disaster.

"(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Pending such appropriation, the Commissioner may expend from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accordance with other sections of this Act, such sums as may be necessary for immediately providing assistance under this section, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriations authorized by this subsection when made.

"(d) No payment may be made to any local educational agency under this section except upon application therefor which is submitted through the appropriate State educational agency and is filed with the Commissioner in accordance with regulations prescribed by him. In determining the order in which such applications shall be approved, the Commissioner shall consider the relative educational and financial needs of the local educational agencies which have submitted approvable applications.

"(e) Amounts paid by the Commissioner to local educational agencies under this section may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Commissioner may determine. Any funds paid to a local educational agency and not expended or otherwise used for the purposes for which paid shall be repaid to the Treasury of the United States".

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 10. (a) The Act of September 23, 1950, Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress, as amended (20 U.S.C. 631–645), is amended by inserting, immediately after the last section of that Act, the following new section:

"SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE IN MAJOR DISASTER AREAS

"SEC. 16. (a) If the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning determines with respect to any local educational agency that—

"(1)(A) such agency is located in whole or in part within an area which, after the date of enactment of this section and prior to July 1, 1967, has suffered a major disaster as a result of any flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe which, in the determination of the President pursuant to section 2(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1855a(a)), is or threatens to be of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant disaster assistance by the Federal Government, and

"(B) the Governor of the State in which such agency is located has certified the need for disaster assistance under this section, and has given assurance of expenditure of a reasonable amount of the funds of the government of such State, or of any political subdivision thereof, for the same or similar purposes with respect to such catastrophe,

and if the Commissioner determines with respect to such local educational agency that—

"(2) public elementary or secondary school facilities of such agency have been destroyed or seriously damaged as a result of this major disaster;

"(3) such agency is making a reasonable tax effort and is exercising due diligence in availing itself of State and other financial assistance available for the replacement or restoration of such school facilities;

"(4) such agency does not have sufficient funds available to it from State, local, and other Federal sources (including funds available under other provisions of this Act), and from the proceeds of insurance on such school facilities, to provide the minimum school facilities needed for the restoration or replacement of the school facilities so destroyed or seriously damaged; and

"(5) to the extent that the operation of private elementary and secondary schools in the school attendance area of the local educational agency has been disrupted or impaired by such disaster, such local educational agency has complied with the provisions of section 7(a)(3) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), with respect to provisions for the conduct of educational programs under public auspices and administration in which children enrolled in such private elementary and secondary schools may attend and participate,

the Commissioner may provide the additional assistance necessary to enable such agency to provide such facilities, upon such terms and in such amounts (subject to the provisions of this section) as the Commissioner may consider to be in the public interest; but such additional assistance, plus the amount which he determines to be available from State, local, and other Federal sources (including funds available under other provisions of this Act, and from the proceeds of insurance), may not exceed the cost of construction incident to the restoration or replacement of the school facilities destroyed or damaged as a result of the disaster.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Pending such appropriation, the Commissioner may expend from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accordance with other sections of this Act such sums as may be necessary for immediately providing assistance under this section, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriations authorized by this subsection when made.

"(c) No payment may be made to any local educational agency under subsection (a) except upon application therefor which is submitted through the appropriate State educational agency and is filed with the Commissioner in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, and which meets the requirements of section 6(b)(1). In determining the order in which such applications shall be approved, the Commissioner shall consider the relative educational and financial needs of the local educational agencies which have submitted approvable applications. No payment may be made under subsection (a) unless the Commissioner finds, after consultation with the State and local educational agencies, that the project or projects with respect to which it is made are not inconsistent with overall State plans for the construction of school facilities. All determinations made by the Commissioner under this section shall be made only after consultation with the appropriate State educational agency and the local educational agency.

"(d) Amounts paid by the Commissioner to local educational agencies under subsection (a) may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Commissioner may determine. Any funds paid to a local educational agency and not expended or otherwise used for the purposes for which paid shall be repaid to the Treasury of the United States.

"(e) None of the provisions of sections 1 to 10, both inclusive, other than section 6(b)(1), shall apply with respect to this section."

SEC. 2. The Act of September 30, 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting, immediately after section 6 of that Act, the following new section:

"ASSISTANCE FOR CURRENT SCHOOL EXPENDITURES IN MAJOR DISASTER AREAS

"SEC. 7. (a) If the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning determines with respect to any local educational agency that—

"(1)(A) such agency is located in whole or in part within an area which, after the date of enactment of this section and prior to July 1, 1967, has suffered a major disaster as a result of any flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe which, in the determination of the President pursuant to section 2(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1855a(a)), is or threatens to be of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant disaster assistance by the Federal Government, and

"(B) the Governor of the State in which such agency is located has certified the need for disaster assistance under this section, and has given assurance of expenditure of a reasonable amount of the funds of the government of such State, or of any political subdivision thereof, for the same or similar purposes with respect to such catastrophe,

and if the Commissioner determines with respect to such local educational agency that—

"(2) such agency is making a reasonable tax effort and is exercising due diligence in availing itself of State and other financial assistance, but as a result of such major disaster it is unable to secure sufficient funds to meet the cost of providing free public education for the children attending the schools of such agency, and

"(3) to the extent that the operation of private elementary and secondary schools in the school attendance area of such local educational agency has been disrupted or impaired by such disaster, such local educational agency has made provision for the conduct of educational programs under public auspices and administration in which children enrolled in such private elementary and secondary schools may attend and participate: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment under this Act of religious worship or instruction,

the Commissioner may provide to such agency the additional assistance necessary to provide free public education to the children attending the school of such agency, upon such terms and in such amounts (subject to the provisions of this section) as the Commissioner may consider to be in the public interest. Such additional assistance may be provided for a period not greater than a five fiscal year period beginning with the fiscal year in which the President has determined that such area suffered a major disaster. The amount so provided for any fiscal year shall not exceed the amount which the Commissioner determines to be necessary to enable such agency, with the State, local, and other Federal funds available to it for such purpose, to provide a level of education equivalent to that maintained in the schools of such agency during the last full fiscal year prior to the occurrence of such major disaster, taking into account the additional costs reasonably necessary to carry out the provisions of subparagraph (3) of this section. The amount, if any, so provided for the second, third, and fourth fiscal years following the fiscal year in which the President determined that such area has suffered a major disaster shall not exceed 75 per centum, 50 per centum, and 25 per centum, respectively, of the amount so provided for the first fiscal year following such determination.

"(b) In addition to and apart from the funds provided under subsection (a), the Commissioner is authorized to provide to such agency an amount which he determines to be necessary to replace instructional and maintenance supplies, equipment, and materials (including textbooks) destroyed or seriously damaged as a result of such major disaster, and to lease or otherwise provide (other than by acquisition of land or erection of facilities) school and cafeteria facilities needed to replace temporarily such facilities which have been made unavailable as a result of the major disaster.

"(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Pending such appropriation, the Commissioner may expend from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accordance with other sections of this Act, such sums as may be necessary for immediately providing assistance under this section, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriations authorized by this subsection when made.

"(d) No payment may be made to any local educational agency under this section except upon application therefor which is submitted through the appropriate State educational agency and is filed with the Commissioner in accordance with regulations prescribed by him. In determining the order in which such applications shall be approved, the Commissioner shall consider the relative educational and financial needs of the local educational agencies which have submitted approvable applications.

"(e) Amounts paid by the Commissioner to local educational agencies under this section may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Commissioner may determine. Any funds paid to a local educational agency and not expended or otherwise used for the purposes for which paid shall be repaid to the Treasury of the United States."

On page 37, line 1, after "(42 U.S.C. 1855a(a)),", to strike out "shall be" and insert "may be as much as"; in line 6, after the word "appropriated", to insert "from the general fund"; in line 7, after the word "exceed", to insert "$50,000,000"; in line 8, after the word "exceed", to insert "$50,000,000"; after line 9, to strike out:

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NECESSARY EMERGENCY FLOOD PROTECTION

SEC. 12. In the case of any individual, partnership, corporation, or other entity, which has requested proper local governmental authorities to provide protection against flooding in major disaster areas, and which has incurred emergency expenditures for the purpose of preventing damage from such flooding, and which expenditures were necessitated by the inability or failure of local governmental authorities to provide such protection, the Office of Emergency Planning is authorized, upon certification by proper local governmental authorities that such protection would have been provided except for contingencies caused by the emergency, to reimburse such individual, partnership, corporation, or other entity not to exceed 50 per centum of the total cost expended for such protection against flooding.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

PRIORITY TO CERTAIN APPLICATIONS FOR PUBLIC FACILITY AND PUBLIC HOUSING ASSISTANCE

SEC. 12. In the processing of applications for assistance—

(1) under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, or any other Act providing assistance for the repair, construction, or extension of public facilities; or

(2) under the United States Housing Act of 1937 for the provision of low-rent housing;

priority and immediate consideration shall be given, during such period as the President shall by proclamation prescribe, to applications from public bodies situated in major disaster areas.

On page 38, after line 13, to insert a new section, as follows:

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PUBLIC WORKS EXPENDITURES

SEC. 13. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to repair, restore, or reconstruct any project completed or under construction for flood contol, navigation, irrigation, reclamation, public power, sewage treatment, water treatment, watershed development, or airport construction which has been damaged as the result of a major disaster, and which has been specifically authorized by Act of Congress, without regard to any other statutory limitation on the amount which may be appropriated in connection with such project.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to repair, restore, or reconstruct any public highway, road, trail, street, or bridge determined by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning to be damaged or destroyed as the result of a major disaster and which is not eligible for repair or reconstruction under section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code. The Federal share of the cost of any such repair, restoration, or reconstruction shall be determined by such Director and may be as much as 100 per centum of the cost thereof.

And, on page 39, after line 9, to insert a new section, as follows:

DUPLICATION OF BENEFITS

SEC. 14. The head of each department or agency of the Government administering any program providing financial assistance to persons, business concerns, or other entities suffering losses as the result of a major disaster shall administer such program in a manner which will assure that no such person, concern, or other entity will receive such assistance with respect to any part of such loss as to which he has received financial assistance under any other such program.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Disaster Relief Act of 1965".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act, the term "major disaster" means a major disaster as determined by the President pursuant to the Act entitled "An Act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes", approved September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855–1855g).

FEDERAL LOAN ADJUSTMENTS

SEC. 3. (a) Where such action is found to be necessary because of loss, destruction, or damage of the property, or impairment of the economic feasibility of the system, of borrowers under programs administered by the Rural Electrification Administration, resulting from a major disaster, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to adjust and to readjust the schedules for payment of principal and interest on loans to such borrowers, and to extend the maturity dates of such loans to a period not beyond forty years from the dates of such loans. The authority herein conferred is in addition to the loan extension authority provided in section 12 of the Rural Electrification Act.

(b) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to refinance any note or other obligation which is held by him in connection with any loan made by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, or which is included within the revolving fund for liquidating programs established by the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1955, where he finds such refinancing necessary because of the loss, destruction, or damage to property or facilities securing such obligations as a result of a major disaster. The interest rate on any note or other obligation refinanced under this subsection may be reduced to a rate not less than 3 per centum per annum, and the term thereof may be extended for such period as will provide a maturity of not to exceed forty years: *Provided,* That the Administrator may authorize a suspension in the payment of principal and interest charges on, and an additional extension in the maturity of, any such loan for a period not to exceed five years if he determines that such action is necessary to avoid severe financial hardship.

(c) Section 1820 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The Administrator is authorized to refinance any loan made or acquired by the Veterans' Administration when he finds such refinancing necessary because of the loss, destruction, or damage to property securing such loan as the result of a major disaster as defined in subsection 1855a(a) of title 42, United States Code. The interest rate on any loan refinanced under this subsection may be reduced to a rate not less than 3 per centum per annum, and the term thereof may be extended for such period as will provide a maturity of not to exceed forty years; except that the Administrator may authorize a suspension in the payment of principal and interest charges on, and an additional extension in the maturity of, any such loan for a period not to exceed five years if he determines that such action is necessary to avoid severe financial hardship."

(d) In the administration of the disaster loan program under section 7(b) of the Small Business Act, any application for a loan thereunder in an amount of $30,000 or less in the case of a homeowner, or $100,000 or less in the case of a business concern, may be granted, if such loan is for the repair, rehabilitation, or replacement of property damaged or destroyed as the result of a major disaster, without regard to whether the required financial assistance is otherwise available from private sources.

(e) In the administration of subtitle III of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, relating to emergency loans, any application for a loan thereunder in an amount of $30,000 or less may be granted, if such loan is for the repair, rehabilitation, or replacement of property damaged or destroyed as the result of a major disaster, without regard to whether the Secretary of Agriculture finds that the required financial assistance can be met by private, cooperative, or other responsible sources (including loans the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make or insure under any other provision of law).

(f) Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR ASSISTANCE TO HOMEOWNERS AND BUSINESSES

SEC. 4. (a) The President is authorized in accordance with the provisions of this section to provide assistance to the States in developing and carrying out comprehensive and practicable programs for assisting homeowners and business concerns suffering property losses as the result of a major disaster. For the purposes of this section, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(b) From the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (i) the President is authorized—

(1) to make grants to any State, upon application therefor, in an amount not to exceed 50 per centum of the cost of developing a program referred to in subsection (a): *Provided,* That the total grants made to any State under this paragraph shall not exceed $250,000; and

(2) to make grants to any State, upon the basis of an approved State plan, to pay not to exceed 50 per centum of the cost of carrying out such a program.

(c) Any State desiring to participate in the grant program under paragraph (2) of the preceding subsection shall designate or create an agency which is specially qualified to administer such a disaster relief program, and shall, through such agency, submit a State plan which shall—

(1) set forth a comprehensive and detailed State program for assistance to homeowners and business concerns suffering property losses as a result of a major disaster;

(2) specify that the homeowner or business concern will assume 25 per centum of the property loss sustained by it as a result of such a disaster, and the State will agree to pay 25 per centum of such loss;

(3) provide that no homeowner or business concern shall be eligible to participate in such a State program unless the damage to the property of such owner or concern resulting from such a disaster exceeds 5 per centum of the value of such property prior to such a disaster, or $100, whichever is the greater;

(4) specify that the maximum amount of loss to be shared jointly by the homeowner or business concern, the State, and the Federal Government under such a program shall be $30,000 in the case of a homeowner, and $100,000 in the case of a business concern;

(5) provide a means of appraisal to establish the fair market value of the property of such owner or concern damaged or destroyed as a result of such a disaster;

(6) provide assurances that equitable treatment will be accorded all eligible property owners;

(7) contain satisfactory evidence that the State will adequately supervise such program;

(8) provide such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as the President deems necessary; and

(9) set forth such further information as the President may by regulation require.

(d) The President shall approve any State plan which complies with the provisions of subsection (c) of this section.

(e) No grant may be made under this section—

(1) for any loss for which private insurance is available and collectible in such State at reasonable rates;

(2) for any loss in a State which does not have approved flood-plain zoning controls or other similar preventive measures in force; and

(3) to any public agency or organization for the loss of any property owned by such agency or organization.

(f) The President shall prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary for the effective administration of this section, and to prevent the waste or dissipation of Federal funds.

(g) Each State receiving assistance under this section shall, through its designated State agency, make such reports as the President may require, and each such agency shall, upon request of the President, make available its books and records for audit and examination.

(h) The President may exercise the powers conferred upon him by this section either directly or through such Federal agency as he may designate.

(i) Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

SHELTER FOR DISASTER VICTIMS

SEC. 5. (a) The President is authorized to provide dwelling accommodations for any individual or family whenever he determines—

(1) that such individual or family occupied a house (as an owner or tenant) which was destroyed, or damaged to such an extent that it is uninhabitable, as the result of a major disaster; and

(2) that such action is necessary to avoid severe hardship on the part of such individual family; and

(3) that such owner or tenant cannot otherwise provide suitable dwelling accommodations for himself and/or his family.

(b) Such dwelling accommodations, including mobile homes, as may be necessary to meet the need, shall be provided through acquisition, acquisition and rehabilitation, or lease. Dwelling accommodations in such housing shall be made available to any such individual or family for such period as may be necessary to enable the individual or family to find other decent, safe, and sanitary housing which is within his or its ability to finance. Rentals shall be established for such accommodations, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe and shall take into consideration the financial ability of the occupant. In cases of financial hardship, rentals may be compromised or adjusted for a period not to exceed twelve months, but in no case shall any such individual or family be required to incur a monthly housing expense (including any fixed expense related to the amortization of debt owing on a house destroyed or damaged in a disaster) which is in excess of 25 per centum of the individual's or family's monthly income.

(c) In the performance of, and with respect to, the powers and duties conferred upon him by this section, the President may—

(1) prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this section;

(2) exercise such powers and duties either directly or through such Federal agency or agencies as he may designate;

(3) sell or exchange at public or private sale, or lease, any real property acquired or constructed under this section;

(4) obtain insurance against loss in connection with any such real property;

(5) enter into agreements to pay annual sums in lieu of taxes to any State or local taxing authority with respect to any such real property; and

(6) include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this section, such conditions and provisions as he deems necessary to assure that the purposes of this section will be achieved.

(d) Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION—INSURED DISASTER LOANS

Sec. 6. Section 221 of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "or as a result of governmental action", in subsections (a), (d)(2), (d)(3), (d)(6), and (f), and inserting in lieu thereof ", as a result of governmental action, or as a result of a major disaster as determined by the President pursuant to the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes', approved September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855–1855g)".

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS IN MAJOR DISASTER AREAS

Sec. 7. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make grants to farmers whose farmlands or livestock have been damaged as the result of a major disaster. Such grants shall be made (1) for the purpose of assisting such farmers to prepare such lands for cultivation and to restore such lands or livestock to normal productive capacity, and (2) only in the case of lands on the farm normally used in the production of an agricultural crop. No grant shall be made hereunder to assist in restoring lands or livestock to production unless the Secretary determines that the cost of preparing such lands for production has been increased as a direct result of such major disaster.

(b) The amount of the grant authorized under this section in the case of any farmer shall not exceed an amount determined by the Secretary to be equal to two-thirds of the total cost of preparing the damaged lands for cultivation and restoring them to normal productive capacity, and in no event shall the amount of any such grant in the case of any farmer exceed $10,000.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to impose such reasonable terms and conditions on the making of such grants as he determines necessary to carry out effectively the purposes of this section.

(d) Such sums as necessary to carry out its provisions of this section are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

DISASTER WARNINGS

Sec. 8. (a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to utilize the facilities of the civil defense communications system established and maintained pursuant to section 201(c) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2281(c)), for the purpose of providing needed warning to governmental authorities and the civilian population in areas endangered by imminent natural disasters.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of subsection (a).

ASSISTANCE TO UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITIES

Sec. 9. (a) The Act entitled "An Act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes", approved September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855), is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end of section 2(e) a comma and by adding the following: "and includes any rural community or unincorporated town or village with respect to which the head of the Federal agency concerned determines that (1) there is a need for assistance under this Act, (2) the furnishing of such assistance is feasible, and (3) it will be effectively utilized".

Section 306 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1926) is amended by adding the following new subsection (c): "In areas which have suffered major disasters the Secretary is authorized without regard to the limitations of subsection (a) or (b), to make or insure loans to associations, including corporations not operated for profit and public and quasi-public agencies, for the acquisition, construction, improvement, or extension of waste disposal systems and other public facilities providing for community services in rural areas, when the Secretary determines that such action is necessary for the rebuilding of a community or a portion thereof damaged by a disaster. The Secretary is also authorized to make construction grants not to exceed 50 per centum of the cost of waste disposal systems, water systems, and other public facilities providing for community services in these areas in any case in which repayment of a loan for such purposes from income would require a charge for such service which the Secretary determines to be beyond the ability of a majority of the users who might be served thereby to pay such charges and if such charge would exceed the cost for such services in comparable communities in the State.

(b) Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN DISASTER AREAS

Sec. 10. (a) The Act of September 23, 1950, Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress, as amended (20 U.S.C. 631–645), is amended by inserting, immediately after the last section of that Act, the following new section:

"SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE IN MAJOR DISASTER AREAS

"Sec. 16. (a) If the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning determines with respect to any local educational agency that—

"(1) (A) such agency is located in whole or in part within an area which, after the date of enactment of this section and prior to July 1, 1967, has suffered a major disaster as a result of any flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe which, in the determination of the President pursuant to section 2(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1855a (a)), is or threatens to be of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant disaster assistance by the Federal Government, and

"(B) the Governor of the State in which such agency is located has certified the need for disaster assistance under this section, and has given assurance of expenditure of a reasonable amount of the funds of the government of such State, or of any political subdivision thereof, for the same or similar purposes with respect to such catastrophe,

and if the Commissioner determines with respect to such local educational agency that—

"(2) public elementary or secondary school facilities of such agency have been destroyed or seriously damaged as a result of this major disaster;

"(3) such agency is making a reasonable tax effort and is exercising due diligence in availing itself of State and other financial assistance available for the replacement or restoration of such school facilities;

"(4) such agency does not have sufficient funds available to it from State, local, and other Federal sources (including funds available under other provisions of this Act), and from the proceeds of insurance on such school facilities, to provide the minimum school facilities needed for the restoration or replacement of the school facilities so destroyed or seriously damaged; and

"(5) to the extent that the operation of private elementary and secondary schools in the school attendance area of the local educational agency has been disrupted or impaired by such disaster, such local educational agency has complied with the provisions of section 7(a)(3) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), with respect to provisions for the conduct of educational programs under public auspices and administration in which children enrolled in such private elementary and secondary schools may attend and participate,

the Commissioner may provide the additional assistance necessary to enable such agency to provide such facilities, upon such terms and in such amounts (subject to the provisions of this section) as the Commissioner may consider to be in the public interest; but such additional assistance, plus the amount which he determines to be available from State, local, and other Federal sources (including funds available under other provisions of this Act, and from the proceeds of insurance, may not exceed the cost of construction incident to the restoration or replacement of the school facilities destroyed or damaged as a result of the disaster.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Pending such appropriation, the Commissioner may expend from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accordance with other sections of this Act such sums as may be necessary for immediately providing assistance under this section, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriations authorized by this subsection when made.

"(c) No payment may be made to any local educational agency under subsection (a) except upon application therefor which is submitted through the appropriate State educational agency and is filed with the Commissioner in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, and which meets the requirements of section 6(b)(1). In determining the order in which such applications shall be approved, the Commissioner shall consider the relative educational and financial needs of the local educational agencies which have submitted approvable applications. No payment may be made under subsection (a) unless the Commissioner finds, after consultation with the State and local educational agencies, that the project or projects with respect to which it is made are not inconsistent with overall State plans for the construction of school facilities. All determinations made by the Commissioner under this section shall be made only after consultation with the appropriate State educational agency and the local educational agency.

"(d) Amounts paid by the Commissioner to local educational agencies under subsection (a) may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Commissioner may determine. Any funds paid to a local educational agency and not expended or otherwise used for the purposes for which paid shall be repaid to the Treasury of the United States.

"(e) None of the provisions of sections 1 to 10, both inclusive, other than section 6(b) (1), shall apply with respect to this section."

Sec. 2. The Act of September 30, 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting, immediately after section 6 of that Act, the following new section:

"ASSISTANCE FOR CURRENT SCHOOL EXPENDITURES IN MAJOR DISASTER AREAS

"Sec. 7. (a) If the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning determines with respect to any local educational agency that—

"(1)(A) such agency is located in whole or in part within an area which, after the date of enactment of this section and prior to July 1, 1967, has suffered a major disaster as a result of any flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe which, in the determination of the President pursuant to section 2(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1855(a)), is or threatens to be of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant disaster assistance by the Federal Government, and

"(B) the Governor of the State in which such agency is located has certified the need for disaster assistance under this section, and has given assurance of expenditure of a reasonable amount of the funds of the government of such State, or of any political subdivision thereof, for the same or similar purposes with respect to such catastrophe, and if the Commissioner determines with respect to such local educational agency that—

"(2) such agency is making a reasonable tax effort and is exercising due diligence in availing itself of State and other financial assistance, but as a result of such major disaster it is unable to secure sufficient funds to meet the cost of providing free public education for the children attending the schools of such agency, and

"(3) to the extent that the operation of private elementary and secondary schools in the school attendance area of such local educational agency has been disrupted or impaired by such disaster, such local educational agency has made provision for the conduct of educational programs under public auspices and administration in which children enrolled in such private elementary and secondary schools may attend and participate; *Provided*, That nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment under this Act for religious worship or instruction, the Commissioner may provide to such agency the additional assistance necessary to provide free public education to the children attending the school of such agency, upon such terms and in such amounts (subject to the provisions of this section) as the Commissioner may consider to be in the public interest. Such additional assistance may be provided for a period not greater than a five fiscal year period beginning with the fiscal year in which the President has determined that such area suffered a major disaster. The amount so provided for any fiscal year shall not exceed the amount which the Commissioner determines to be necessary to enable such agency, with the State, local, and other Federal funds available to it for such purpose, to provide a level of education equivalent to that maintained in the schools of such agency during the last full fiscal year prior to the occurrence of such major disaster, taking into account the additional costs reasonably necessary to carry out the provisions of subparagraph (3) of this section. The amount, if any, so provided for the second, third, and fourth fiscal years following the fiscal year in which the President determined that such area has suffered a major disaster shall not exceed 75 per centum, 50 per centum, and 25 per centum, respectively, of the amount so provided for the first fiscal year following such determination.

"(b) In addition to and apart from the funds provided under subsection (a), the Commissioner is authorized to provide to such agency an amount which he determines to be necessary to replace instructional and maintenance supplies, equipment, and materials (including textbooks) destroyed or seriously damaged as a result of such major disaster, and to lease or otherwise provide (other than by acquisition of land or erection of facilities) school and cafeteria facilities needed to replace temporarily such facilities which have been made unavailable as a result of the major disaster.

"(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Pending such appropriation, the Commissioner may expend from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accordance with other sections of this Act, such sums as may be necessary for immediately providing assistance under this section, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriations authorized by this subsection when made.

"(d) No payment may be made to any local educational agency under this section except upon application therefor which is submitted through the appropriate State educational agency and is filed with the Commissioner in accordance with regulations prescribed by him. In determining the order in which such applications shall be approved, the Commissioner shall consider the relative educational and financial needs of the local educational agencies which have submitted approvable applications.

"(e) Amounts paid by the Commissioner to local educational agencies under this section may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Commissioner may determine. Any funds paid to a local educational agency and not expended or otherwise used for the purposes for which paid shall be repaid to the Treasury of the United States."

HIGHWAY ASSISTANCE IN DISASTER AREAS

SEC. 11. (a) Section 120(f) of title 23 of the United States Code, relating to the Federal share in emergency highway relief, is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence a colon and the following: "And provided further, That the Federal share payable on account of any repair or reconstruction of any Federal-aid highway necessitated by a major disaster, as determined by the President pursuant to section 2(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1855a(a)), may be as much as 100 per centum of the cost thereof".

(b) Section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code, relating to emergency highway relief, is amended by striking out the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "There is authorized to be appropriated from the General Fund not to exceed $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and not to exceed $50,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter for the purposes of such fund".

PRIORITY TO CERTAIN APPLICATIONS FOR PUBLIC FACILITY AND PUBLIC HOUSING ASSISTANCE

SEC. 12. In the processing of applications for assistance—

(1) under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, or any other Act providing assistance for the repair, construction, or extension of public facilities; or

(2) under the United States Housing Act of 1937 for the provision of low-rent housing; priority and immediate consideration shall be given, during such period as the President shall by proclamation prescribe, to applications from public bodies situated in major disaster areas.

AUTHORIZATION FOR PUBLIC WORKS EXPENDITURES

SEC. 13. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to repair, restore, or reconstruct any project completed or under construction for flood control, navigation, irrigation, reclamation, public power, sewage treatment, water treatment, watershed development, or airport construction which has been damaged as the result of a major disaster, and which has been specifically authorized by Act of Congress, without regard to any other statutory limitation on the amount which may be appropriated in connection with such project.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to repair, restore, or reconstruct any public highway, road, trail, street, or bridge determined by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning to be damaged or destroyed as the result of a major disaster and which is not eligible for repair or reconstruction under section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code. The Federal share of the cost of any such repair, restoration, or reconstruction shall be determined by such Director and may be as much as 100 per centum of the cost thereof.

DUPLICATION OF BENEFITS

SEC. 14. The head of each department or agency of the Government administering any program providing financial assistance to persons, business concerns, or other entities suffering losses as the result of a major disaster shall administer such program in a manner which will assure that no such person, concern, or other entity will receive such assistance with respect to any part of such loss as to which he has received financial assistance under any other such program.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the Report No. 459, explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 1861, as amended, is to—

1. Provide Federal loan adjustments where an extreme financial hardship would result to the individual, partnership, corporation, or others without such relief.
2. Provide for a program which would allow for grants to States for assistance to homeowners and businesses.
3. Provide emergency shelter for disaster victims.
4. Provide Federal Housing Administration-insured disaster loans.
5. Provide grants to farmers in major disaster areas to restore production.
6. Make available the civil defense communications system for use in warning of impending natural disasters.
7. Provide assistance to unincorporated communities.
8. Provide for school construction assistance in major disaster areas.
9. Make available assistance for current school expenditures in major disaster areas.
10. Provide for highway assistance in disaster areas.
11. Provide priority for applications for public facility and public housing assistance.
12. Provide authorization for public works expenditures for the repair, restoration, or reconstruction of such facilities.
13. Provide that no duplication of benefits can be received with respect to any part of such a loss suffered.

THE NEED FOR A DISASTER RELIEF ACT

Under current legislative status, whenever a major natural disaster strikes it is necessary for the Congress to pass special legislation to provide the needed relief to the stricken area. Such action takes considerable time at a time when relief is needed immediately. This bill will provide the necessary standby authority which will be automatically engaged when the President so designates an area as a "major disaster area."

During the past 6 years three disaster bills have been required to provide relief for the major disasters experienced during this period. However, during this spring alone three major disasters have struck various sections of the country, which would have resulted in three separate relief bills had not S. 1861 been introduced and under serious consideration.

Because such major disasters are completely unexpected and in most cases strike an area totally unprepared or capable of recovery without outside assistance, provisions must be made to have assistance readily available for immediate relief. Alaska, in 1964 for example, suffered earthquake damage to 2,398 properties, totaling $62,808,000. The Pacific Northwest, later in 1964, also suffered extensive flood damage, estimated at $461,500,000. In both these instances, separate relief legislation was required before the victims could receive much-needed aid.

As stated earlier, in every case these individual bills include most of the same provisions for relief which are to be found in S. 1861. During the hearings on S. 1861 the enormity of the damage caused by the major disasters this past spring was dramatically brought home to the committee.

In Minnesota, for example, Governor Rolvaag testified that disasters in 1964 and 1965 have caused an estimated $243 million in damage. Tornadoes alone in less than 3 hours killed 14 people, injured 650 seriously enough to be hospitalized, and destroyed 1,200 homes, while causing an estimated $34.5 million in damage. These figures alone are staggering enough, but become even more shocking where they were preceded by floods which did $96.5 million of damage in 65 of Minnesota's 87 counties. Such damage cannot be borne alone by the areas which have suffered, but must be spread over the entire country if the area is to survive and rebuild itself. Minnesota is not unique in its suffering; Indiana and Michigan are now only emerging from the shock and extreme damage recently suffered as a result of tornadoes. In 1 small area of Indiana, 60 people suffered tornado damages amounting to over $1 million, almost half of which was a total loss, as no assistance was available to cover it. In 1 day, 138 were killed, another 1,369 injured, 1,251 homes were destroyed, 1,055 farm buildings destroyed, and another 3,875 families suffered losses less than total. Damage in Wisconsin due to tornadoes and flooding is estimated to exceed $15 million, with over three-fourths of it ineligible for aid under existing relief programs.

In Colorado, during the June floods, 125,000 people had to be evacuated from their homes, 17 bridges and grade separations on the Interstate System were destroyed, and damage is estimated to exceed $102 million.

These examples are by no means exhaustive, but are only cited as indications of the kinds and magnitude of the destruction which is visited upon relatively small areas.

As mentioned earlier, the speed with which these disasters strike and the tremendous damage they inflict indicates the vital necessity for providing the means for creating fully operational and completely prepared disaster relief programs under the several States, in cooperation with the Federal Government. With this purpose in mind the Public Works Committee has worked to further develop S. 1861 as a complete vehicle to provide the means for prompt and efficient assistance to disaster victims.

GENERAL STATEMENT

S. 1861, the Disaster Relief Act of 1965, was referred to the Committee on Public Works, by unanimous consent of the Senate. The committee recognizes that some of the contents of this bill encompass jurisdiction of other committees. However, the committee has limited itself to consideration of the effects of natural disasters and means of alleviating hardship to individuals and communities as a result of those disasters.

In considering this bill, the committee held 2 days of public hearings and received testimony from 30 witnesses, and was most concerned by the facts brought out during these hearings. Of particular concern to the committee were the apparent gaps in the assistance to disaster victims and the inability of disaster-struck areas to recover without substantial outside assistance.

Another area of concern was the critical timelag which exists from the time a disaster occurs until the time when major outside assistance becomes available to the victims. This, coupled with the almost universal lack of a coordinated disaster relief program, pinpointed the widespread need for such a standby program.

Toward this end, the committee reviewed the various individual disaster relief acts which had been previously enacted and, as a result, was able to develop a general pattern or framework which these bills followed. These basic items, plus other needs which were brought out in the public hearings and in discussions with the victims. Federal State, and local officials, and others were incorporated into an all-inclusive Disaster Relief Act.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

The committee hopes that passage of S. 1861 will remove the necessity for special authorizations following natural disasters as has been the custom. In so doing, the Congress will still have an opportunity to review the costs of such assistance without delaying badly needed aid.

Since essentially the same provisions are put into all the disaster relief acts it seems sensible to have a national policy. The policy which the committee deems best is one where there is a Federal-State partnership. Thus the committee has included a section which enables the establishment of a Federal-State plan to meet disaster needs.

Creation of such a plan by a State should further shorten time between the disaster occurrence and the beginning of assistance to those stricken.

The committee does not feel that individuals and businesses in States which fail to avail themselves of Federal-State planning should be penalized as a result but the executive branch should necessarily take cognizance of the measure of the assistance necessary when no State plan exists.

A major desire of the committee is that relief should be rapid and toward this end it emphasizes that applications for disaster loans should not be delayed while the applicant proves that non-Government money was not available.

The provisions of this bill also were designed to provide equal treatment as near as possible to homeowners, farmers, and businessmen; to cities, villages, and rural areas.

However, the agencies administering this act will have to exercise sound judgment since a great deal of discretion is available insofar as the size of this program is concerned.

The committee feels that the best guideline is that no individual or community should be worse off but that the provisions are not intended to provide windfall benefits or accomplish what is denied under other legislation.

COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS DISASTER RELIEF

Following each previous major national disaster separate bills were needed to provide the necessary relief for the disaster areas. All previous legislation enacted contained in each individual bill the following provisions:

(a) Federal loan adjustment assistance;

(b) Grants for assistance to homeowners and businesses;

(c) Assistance for public facilities destroyed or damaged;

(d) Assistance to restore or rebuild Federal-aid highways destroyed or damaged; and

(e) Assistance to repair or restore primary and secondary educational facilities.

Depending on the type of natural disaster, additional assistance has been granted by Congress, such as—

(a) Shelter for disaster victims, and

(b) Assistance to farmers.

Enactment of S. 1861 allows the President this same authority on a permanent basis, to be exercised only following a major disaster, providing the area is designated a major disaster area by the President.

Certain other assistance has never been available under previous legislation, but will be provided for under S. 1861. This assistance is as follows:

(a) Assistance to unincorporated areas, and

(b) Assistance for the repair and reconstruction of roads, streets, and bridges under a nonfederally aided category.

Previous legislation has provided for assistance to unincorporated urban areas and federally aided roads; thus, the above new provisions extend similar aid to previously uncovered areas.

MONETARY AUTHORIZATION

This act provides for no specific dollar authorization, except that in section 11(b), where it authorizes funds to be appropriated not to exceed $50 million each fiscal year from the general fund for the repair, restoration, or reconstruction of Federal-aid highways.

The amount of funds ultimately needed under the other nine sections can only be determined by the disaster inflicted and the degree the executive branch feels should be included in a rehabilitation program.

The authorization is:

Sec.	Purpose	Funds required
3	Federal loan adjustments	Authorizes such funds as may be required for each disaster.
4	Grants to States	Up to a maximum of $250,000 per State for 50 percent of the planning requirements.
	Program	Authorizes such funds as may be required for each disaster but limits Federal portion to 50 percent of total.
5	Shelter for disaster victims	Authorizes such funds as may be required for each disaster.
6	Insured disaster loans	Do.
7	Grant assistance to farmers	Authorizes such funds as may be required for each disaster, with a maximum of $10,000 per victim.
8	Disaster warnings	Authorizes such funds as may be required for each disaster.
9	Assistance to unincorporated communities	Authorizes such funds as may be required for each disaster. Individual grants up to 50 percent of the cost involved.
10	School assistance	Authorizes such funds as may be required for each disaster.
	Replacement and repair of facilities	Office of Education estimates $750, 000 per year.
	Assistance for current operating expenses	Estimates are for an annual cost of $750,000.
11	Highway assistance	$50,000,000 maximum annually from the general fund.
12	Priority to disaster area applicants for public facility and public housing applications.	No additional funds required.
13	Authorization for public works expenditures	Authorizes such funds as may be required for each disaster.
14	Duplication of benefits	No funds required.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, it is my privilege today to present to the Senate S. 1861, the proposed Federal Disaster Relief Act of 1965, for myself and more than 40 of my colleagues.

In the past year and a half, Mr. President, hundreds of thousands of Americans have been victims of an incredible series of natural disasters.

From January 1, 1964, until July 1, 1965, 41 disasters have been declared by the President of the United States. Sixteen have been declared this year alone. This Government has allocated nearly $84.7 million in disaster assistance to these areas during this period.

The unusual concentration of disasters—one seemingly coming on the heels of the last—may be seen when we realize that 36 declarations of disaster are currently active.

Actually, all these disasters have occurred within the short span of 16 months—beginning with severe storms and flooding in my own State of Indiana and the neighboring State of Kentucky, which were declared disaster areas on March 17, 1964, through July 1 when similar problems resulted in a disaster declaration for the State of New Mexico.

And, although some States, like my own, have been unfortunately and tragically struck by more than one disaster within this 16-month period, the devastation from earthquakes, tornados, floods, hurricanes, and other natural phenomena has been unbelievably widespread.

Mr. President, from Vermont to California, from Florida to Washington, no fewer than 32 States—32, Mr. President—have been stricken by disasters of one kind or another to the extent that the President of the United States designated them as disaster areas. I might add that in addition to the disasters declared in the several States, the President also declared disasters in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Island, and in the trust territories.

Mr. President, I can give facts and figures. I can tell you about the millions upon millions of dollars in damages throughout the Nation to public and private property. I can tell you about the death and suffering. In Indiana alone, 139 men, women and children perished as a result of the tornados. Nearly 1,400 others were injured. Some 4,000 homes and buildings were destroyed or severely damaged. And these figures can be multiplied over and over when we remember the devastation of earthquakes in Alaska and Washington; when we recall the torrential floods in the Ohio Valley, the Pacific Northwest and the Middle West; when we remember the tidal waves sweeping over California; when we consider the hurricanes battering Louisiana, Georgia and Florida; when we know that even today, flood waters stand rooftop deep in some areas of Missouri that have not yet been declared officially as disaster areas by the President.

But these are merely figures, Mr. President, and they do not capture the pathos, the suffering, the emptiness that comes to the hearts and souls of human beings caught in a major disaster.

Two Indianapolis reporters, Mr. Boyd Gill and Mr. Don Wallis, Jr. of United Press International, did capture the shocking human tragedy of the Midwestern tornadoes in a remarkable series of articles carried by many newspapers in the Middle West. I would like to quote briefly from one of these articles:

> For a little girl 8 years old and going on 9, the coming of Spring is a marvelous thing. The winter had been a good one for Rose Ann Sweet of Wabash, Ind. She loves to practice ballet and she likes to read and that's what she did in the winter. But in the spring she could go outside and play, and what's more she was going to be 9 years old on Easter Sunday.
>
> (She) got ready to visit her grandmother in Greentown. It was Palm Sunday, and after spending a week with her grandmother the two of them would return (from Greentown) to Wabash for (Rose Ann's) birthday celebration.
>
> Her grandmother, Mrs. Omma Ellen Sweet, 63, drove over to Wabash from Greentown early that Sunday morning * * * Toward evening, Rose Ann and her grandmother started out for Greentown * * * They never made it * * * Rose Ann later recalled it as a sort of fairy tale * * * like the story of the Wizard of Oz "when Dorothy's house was picked up and carried to a far distant land." What actually happened was all too real.
>
> "The tornado, moving due east from Kokomo, caught up with Rose Ann and her grandmother just before they reached Greentown * * * The winds picked up the car and carried it about 500 feet into a farm field. Rose Ann can recall it well * * * "I remember the car turning around and around," (she said). "The next thing I remember was when I woke up out in the field. I was covered with mud and so was Grandma. I got up and went to Grandma. We could hear people calling for help * * * Grandma wanted me to stay with her."
>
> Rose Ann's grandmother died the next morning * * * Mrs. Sweet was the oldest person to die at Greentown when the killer tornado struck.

Mr. President, this small slice of life—and death—was the rule and not the exception. There are other stories of people losing their homes, their belongings, everything in these terrible storms. The story can be told over and over in most of our 50 States from floods and earthquakes and other forms of natural disaster.

I request unanimous consent that several samples of the series of articles by Mr. Boyd Gill and Mr. Don Wallis Jr. be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I already have indicated what all of us know—that we have some Federal provisions for disaster aid and these, by and large, have been administered fairly and, as far as they go, have proved helpful.

I submit, Mr. President, that existing provisions do not go far enough in available assistance to communities and individuals to meet the needs—the pressing needs—imposed upon people, cities, and States through no fault of their own.

It took special acts of Congress to provide reasonably adequate assistance to Alaska after its terrible earthquake, and to the Northwest States which were struck by floods.

The simple fact that we have to resort to special, sectional acts of Congress to provide relief for some disaster areas is indication enough that present provisions are inadequate.

This approach not only consumes the time of Congress and not only prolongs the delay in granting desperately needed financial assistance, but it also results in a hodgepodge approach to the problems created by disasters and the relief of those problems.

To rectify these shortcomings, a group of Senators joined to reach a general consensus on how to extend and modernize our existing disaster laws. We painstakingly consulted each and every governmental agency involved for their thoughts and their recommendations.

We had emphasized when the bill—S. 1861—was first introduced on April 30, and we reiterated at the committee hearings which began on June 21 that we were wed to no specific language. The agencies were not only cooperative but made a number of suggestions which we incorporated into the bill as additions or substitutes because they seemed to us to be a better means to accomplish the same ends.

To demonstrate the existing shortcomings in present disaster relief provisions—and to illustrate the disappointment and disillusionment that results among the victims of a disaster, I would like at this point to ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article that appeared in the July 12 issue of the Indianapolis News written by Mr. Pat Redmond.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Indianapolis News, July 12]

TORNADO VICTIMS SAY AID IS LONG IN COMING

(By Pat Redmond)

Dissatisfaction and disillusionment linger in the minds of many victims of Palm Sunday tornadoes in Indiana.

They say they have received little help in rebuilding their shattered homes, despite promises of financial aid from Government agencies and from the Red Cross.

Today in Washington, Senator BIRCH BAYH, Democrat of Indiana, told the Senate Public Works Committee an Indiana State police survey of 60 storm victims in Indiana showed they lost $1,308,696 in real estate and personal property. They received $811,468 in insurance reimbursement; $763 in Red Cross rehabilitation grants and $575 from local donations, the police sampling showed.

Of the 60 Hoosiers interviewed, only 6 were fully covered for both real estate and personal property losses.

BAYH, who emphasized he was not being critical of any agency, said he wants Federal regulations revised to broaden the Government's aid program to victims of disasters.

To qualify for low-interest loans from the Small Business Administration, storm victims must first be turned down by local lending agencies.

"In other words, you have to be a bum," said one farmer in the Russiaville area. "You have to have no credit rating or reputation for paying your bills, it seems to me.

"It is funny that the Government can send all of that money overseas, and not be able to help people here."

At Kokomo, officials and workers in the Howard County chapter of the Red Cross have been tracking down rumors of Red Cross inequities. Stories that the Red Cross has been charging storm victims for food and clothing and has been only loaning money for rehabilitation are baseless, chapter officials say.

Yet, the stories persist. At Russiaville, which was nearly leveled by the April 11 storm, one resident said tersely:

"The Red Cross? That is getting to be a dirty word here."

At Greentown, where 106 homes were demolished, a plan commission member announced angrily:

"We are taking a survey of homeowners here to see if they have received help from the Red Cross or the SBA in rebuilding their homes. My guess is that we are going to come up with some big fat zeroes."

At Dunlap in Elkhart County, where the storm chewed through a collection of modest homes, killing 29 persons, an official of a religious group which is donating labor to rebuild the homes said with a sigh:

"I wish the Red Cross could have done more."

At last count, $468,837 had been collected and turned over to Indiana chapters of the Red Cross to aid the storm victims. A tally last month showed that $327,476 had been distributed in the form of food and clothing, building repairs or replacements, household furnishings, medical aid, and occupational tool replacements.

The oversubscription has created a fund at the Red Cross national headquarters to be used in future disasters in Indiana.

To date, 523 families in Indiana have received some form of rehabilitation aid, according to Virgil Sheppard, chairman of the Indianapolis Area Red Cross office. He said 545 to 550 persons had applied for help.

Those who didn't receive aid either were ruled ineligible by a Red Cross reviewing board or were sent to other agencies for help, he said.

The Red Cross also has spent—at last count—$32,363 across the State for feeding 45,630 victims and volunteer workers in the disaster areas.

Sheppard said he and his fellow chapter workers were amazed that so few requests for rehabilitation had been received. He said State and national officials reasoned that a high rate of insurance coverage kept loss figures down.

Red Cross officials around the State believe that most of the reports of discontent have stemmed from a misunderstanding of what the Red Cross can and can't do.

Some storm victims balked at revealing their finances, as is required by the Red Cross before rehabilitation aid is given. Many couldn't understand why their losses were not entirely replaced through Red Cross aid.

Rehabilitation aid is given to storm victims on the basis of need, not necessarily the amount of loss they sustained.

Families which have diligently maintained good credit ratings, have accumulated savings and have the ability to recoup their losses do not get the consideration that families with less substantial backgrounds get from the Red Cross.

In smaller communities, where everyone knows everyone's background, such decisions are hard for storm victims to understand.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that the sponsors of this bill and the members of the Senate Committee on Public Works were guided by certain objectives and self-imposed limitations in drafting the bill now before this body.

For one thing, we took care not to discourage in any way sound business practices or private charity. We took care not to impose the Government into the insurance business nor to discourage individual incentive. We were vitally interested, however, in getting Government involved in matters which, because of their magnitude, cannot be coped with by individuals alone. We were vitally interested that the National Government face up to its responsibilities in matters where city and State governments need a helping hand.

And that is what this bill does—extend a helping hand to people and to their local and State governments only where they were unable to help themselves. For example, S. 1861 provides a mechanism for Federal and State grants to homeowners and business people to replace property destroyed in a declared disaster area. I will discuss this and other provisions more fully in just a moment. But the point I wish to make here is that these grants would be available only where private insurance was unavailable or uncollectible in the States involved for the type of disaster which occurs.

The bulk of this proposal, Mr. President, involves revision of Government loan programs in time of disaster, as I will discuss shortly. In this type of assistance, all we are seeking is to make it easier for disaster victims to secure Government loans and take advantage of more reasonable terms. It is an awful spectacle to see men and women who have just lost everything they own turned away by Government agencies when they seek loans so they can lift themselves by their bootstraps and reestablish themselves as contributing citizens. They are not turned away because they are credit risks, but because loans may be available elsewhere—in some cases at interest rates up to 8 percent.

We are seeking only to help people who were not able to protect themselves through insurance at reasonable rates. We are seeking only to help people get back on their feet by giving them easy-to-get loans at reasonable terms—all of which they must repay with interest.

Indeed, it would seem ironic if the Congress would not see fit to provide such assistance for disaster-stricken citizens of the United States. In the past decade, the United States has extended disaster assistance to dozens of foreign nations in the amount of nearly $800 million. When portions of Chile were devastated by an earthquake, we gave Chile an outright grant of $20 million. In addition, we gave them a loan of $100 million on which we suspended repayment of principal for 10 years. We set the interest rate at three-fourths of 1 percent.

We are a Nation of compassionate men and women and our expenditures of billions of dollars in foreign aid to keep our neighbors around the world economically and militarily sound bears testimony to that. Surely, it is not too much to ask that we spend an amount of money, infinitesimal compared to foreign aid, on our own people at a time when they are desperately in need of a helping hand.

Surely, it is not unreasonable to suggest that logic, compassion, and necessity demand that we provide more adequate assistance to Americans—hard-working, wage-earning Americans—who, suddenly, through no fault of their own, find themselves without a home, without possessions, and heavily in debt.

Briefly referring to the general subjects covered in the bill, let me summarize quickly.

The bill gives additional authority to the Rural Electrification Administration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Veterans' Administration to provide relief to individuals, groups, or businesses having direct loans with these agencies and having suffered losses to these mortgaged properties in a major natural disaster. The relief is in the form of refinancing, adjustment, or readjustment of principal and interest payment schedules, and the extension of maturity dates where an impairment of the economic feasibility of the loan, or an extreme financial hardship would result without such relief.

We recognized that the Small Business Administration and the Farmers Home Administration has the necessary authority to grant the needed assistance to disaster victims; however, to expedite matters a section has been included in the bill to waive the requirement that the victims first have to try to get private financing before applying for assistance to these agencies.

A new section 4 has been written into the bill to provide grants to States for assistance to homeowners and businesses.

It provides assistance to States in developing and carrying out comprehensive and practicable programs to assist homeowners and business concerns suffering property losses as a result of a major disaster.

Funds are provided to the States to develop and carry out a disaster plan on a standby basis to become operational should a major disaster strike. Assistance under this program is 50 percent Federal, 25 percent State, with the individual or business concern absorbing 25 percent of losses suffered.

A provision is included to provide housing for disaster victims who are without adequate accommodations as a result of a disaster.

Assistance is also provided disaster victims in moderate income groups by making them eligible for the same assistance available to moderate income and displaced families under urban renewal.

Grants are provided to farmers to repair and restore their fields, herds, fences, or crops damaged or destroyed by the disaster, with a maximum grant of $10,000. The farmer must absorb the first 25 percent of any such disaster loss.

Authorization is provided to make the civil defense communications system available for use as a warning system for impending natural disasters.

Assistance which in the past has been limited to incorporated areas for the repair, restoration, or reconstruction of public facilities will be extended to include rural unincorporated areas.

Provision is made for additional relief where schools have been damaged or destroyed, including a provision to enable private school students to attend classes in public institutions until such time as their own facilities are back in operation. This aid is in the form of additional payments.

Federally aided roads are provided relief up to 100 percent, based on criteria to be developed by the Federal highway administrator.

Public housing and public facility loan applications from disaster areas are provided priority treatment under the act.

Authorization is made to provide funds to repair, restore, or reconstruct public works authorized by act of Congress and it further provides up to 100 percent grants for the repair, restoration, or reconstruction of public roads or bridges not eligible for aid under section 125 of title 23, United States Code. The basis for the percentage of assistance will be the criteria developed by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

The final section prohibits any duplication of benefits to victims of a disaster.

Our people look to us in time of disaster for adequate assistance. Unfortunately, they do not receive it. Our job is to see that they do from now on.

For, as in so many of our national programs, we are not suggesting a handout. We are suggesting that we help people to bounce back onto their feet after being knocked down by the unpredictable forces of nature. We are suggesting that we provide means to help people so they may be in a position to help themselves.

This, Mr. President, is in the best tradition of our Nation, of its people, and of this Congress.

Exhibit 1

Diary of a Disaster

(By Boyd Gill and Don Wallis, Jr.)

CHAPTER V. KOONTZ LAKE

The series of tornadoes that swept across Indiana started in Lake County. But the brutal path of violent death did not begin until the belt of storms reached the small resort town of Koontz Lake, about 25 miles south-southwest of South Bend.

Before it reached Koontz Lake, the storm was destructive and already a disaster for many Hoosiers. But at and near Koontz Lake the tornado became a killer, claiming 3 of its eventual 139 victims and injuring about 30 more.

There, the winds wrecked a charming summer resort area. People were attracted to Koontz Lake by the pretty little lake, good for swimming and boating and water skiing, and by the thick, green groves of oak trees that lined its shores.

The oak trees are gone, blown away, many of them into the lake. For weeks after the storm hit, the lake was so full of debris it was closed to all boating, swimming, and water skiing. Some said it would never be as attractive as it once was.

Farther ahead in the storm's path lay Lapaz and Dunlap and another resort, Rainbow Lake, and there the winds would cause greater damage and kill more people. But for Koontz Lake, the devastation was great enough.

It was about 5:45 when the tornado touched down at the lakeside village. Mrs. Velda Singleton had just served supper to nine relatives in her home on the town's west edge. Then, she recalls, she heard a "terrible rumbling noise."

She sent her son, Lawrence, outdoors to look. What he saw was frightening. A funnel cloud, twisting and whirling and extending from the ground high into the sky was heading for the house.

Larry dashed back into the house and shouted a warning. But by that time it was simply too late for everyone to take cover in the basement.

"I told everybody to get in the living room and sit down," Mrs. Singleton said. "We sat around in a circle and held on to one another and began praying."

As the tornado came closer and the rumbling noise became a violent scream, Mrs. Singleton screamed, too. "My God. My God. It's going to hit us," she shrieked.

As they sat praying, the winds swept the roof away, hurled the walls in all directions and splintered the furnishings. All the occupants were hurt, but none were killed.

Across the lake, Ray Trinosky, 63, and his wife, Gertrude, had just returned from Florida for the warm weather season in Indiana. They were in their lakeshore home when Trinosky heard the tornado sweeping across the water.

"It sounded like one of those big four-engined airplanes," he said. "And it sounded like it was in trouble.

Trinosky was the one who was in trouble. He stepped out the kitchen door and saw a huge brownish cloud coming across the bay.

"There was a whole side of a house swinging around in it and I shouted for my wife to run," he said. Mrs. Trinosky ran to the basement. Her husband followed. He found her standing by a work bench. Both fell flat to the floor.

At that moment, a basement window gave way, showering them with glass. Trinosky was cut on the hand and his wife was hit on the leg by collapsing masonry.

"There was a howling like I've never heard before," Trinosky said. "The air was full of debris. I could feel the pressure and when I looked up, we didn't have anything."

By the time the tornado had done its damage, there was a consistent path of destruction around the lake's south shore and up its east end. The damage totaled a million dollars, and many homes were blown into the lake. About 100 houses were destroyed.

But the winds passed over, finally, leaving dead three Walkerton area persons, Everett James, 50; Mrs. Tillie Bayorinan, 71; and Finley Patterson, 73. Thirty others had painful injuries.

The tornado could be seen for many miles around, and Robert Halt watched fascinated on his farm 2 miles west of Lapaz and about 7 miles past Koontz Lake. As it came closer, he could see it in greater detail.

"I watched four giant waves, upside down," Halt recalled. "You know what waves look like? Well, these were waves, but with their crests down, not up."

Halt watched the "waves" for about 3 minutes as they swept toward him in an irregular path. One crest was headed directly for his home but still was about a mile away when it touched down at the residence of Finley Patterson. Halt could see the winds as they destroyed Patterson's house, and he made a quick decision. He decided to get going.

"My house is 87 years old and the basement is very, very small," Halt said. "Violent thunderstorms would shake it. I saw the Patterson place destroyed, and I put my family in the car and drove south on Pine Road toward Route 6. I thought I could get out of its path."

Halt shouted to his wife to get their three youngsters and they piled in the car and fled south. But they never made it to Route 6. As they drove by a big barn on a country road, the winds splintered the walls of the barn and the timbers fell onto the Halt car with an ear-splitting crash.

Halt said he did not lose consciousness and it was all over in 30 seconds.

"I got my door open and lifted out my two boys, Jerry and John. I pulled my daughter, Kristy, off the floor and put her in the back seat. Then I went around to the other side of the car and tried to help my wife."

But there was no helping Madelyn Halt, 42. She lay in agony near the car, and died of her injuries within a few minutes.

The others were given first-aid treatment and an ambulance came for Halt and Kristy, who had multiple injuries. They were in the ambulance a long time.

"The traffic was so bad, it took us an hour and a half to get through," Halt recalled.

A week later, Halt was able to leave South Bend Memorial Hospital, but Kristy remained in the intensive care unit. The boys, meanwhile, stayed with neighbors.

The irony of it was the most agonizing part.

Robert Halt will never forget the split-second decision he made to try and outrace the tornado.

For when he returned to his home, the one he so frantically abandoned, he found the tornado had not touched it at all.

It stood, undamaged, just as it had for 87 years.

Diary of a Disaster

(By Boyd Gill and Don Wallis, Jr.)

CHAPTER XIV. RUSSIAVILLE

It is impossible to adequately recount the tornado disaster at Russiaville on Palm Sunday. The winds struck, literally, every house, every building in the town. Only seven houses survived the storm in a condition that could be described as livable. The rest were either destroyed or damaged so badly that major repair was needed before they could again be used.

It is impossible to adequately recount the disaster at Russiaville, then, because it is so difficult to believe. About an hour after the tornado hit the town, Ted Miller, 29, told a United Press International reporter at Frankfort: "Russiaville is gone." He added that his own house was blown away as he hid in the basement. He said he saw the winds pick it up and carry it away.

When the UPI reporter telephoned Miller's account of the tornado to the State bureau at Indianapolis, a veteran news editor made a note of it but then disregarded the information.

"This quote is too strong," the newsman said. "The man is apparently shook up. It can't be that bad."

But it was.

The storms hit at 7:28 in Russiaville. Two minutes before, at 7:26, the sky was so dark everyone knew a storm was coming. Many Russiaville residents were in church. Others were at home and some were out driving.

The tornado approached the west edge of town, hugging close to the ground. It seemed to skip upwards just a little, and then it dropped down two houses south of the Gilbert Lewis residence. Five minutes before it touched down, Mr. and Mrs. Lewis had heard a television warning that tornadoes may hit sometime during the next hour in the area. Later, Lewis recalled that he believed the short warning was the reason why many people were not in their basements when the storm struck.

Lewis looked out his window when he heard the tornado coming.

"You couldn't see the sky, really. There was a huge red cloud over the town and at each extremity a funnel came down," he recalled.

The Lewises ran for the basement. A son, Gary, home on vacation from Franklin College, started for the basement but the wind coming through the house picked him up and hurled him down the basement stairs. He suffered a broken nose.

The storm took Gary's car and smashed it to bits. The hardware store that Lewis owned downtown was demolished a few seconds later. But the Lewis house was one of the seven that were livable in Russiaville after the winds passed through.

There were 51 people at the First Baptist Church in Russiaville. Rev. Milton E. Barkley was conducting a Palm Sunday evening service and was about half way through when he stopped suddenly.

"I heard a big train approaching. It seemed to be coming right down Main Street," he recalled. "And then I remembered there aren't any railroad tracks down Main Street."

Mrs. Elmer Rushing was in the congregation with her husband and four children. She said everyone in the church began to head toward the basement.

"But God didn't allow us to get to the basement," she said. Before they could reach the basement entrance, the floor caved in. Any persons underneath would surely have been crushed. As it was, everyone huddled under pews in the church. No one was injured. The church was destroyed.

At the Friends Church in Russiaville, the Palm Sunday service was interrupted by a neighborhood boy, Gene Carter, who had been watching television and listened to the tornado warnings that only a few others seemed to have heard. He ran into the church and shouted that a tornado was coming. Then the low, dull, ominous, rumbling sound could be heard in the distance.

The congregation of about 75 persons fled quickly downstairs. A few seconds after the last group reached the basement the church walls wavered and then the top was blown away. The church was reduced to rubble, but only a few persons were hurt and no one was injured seriously.

Otis Oliver saw the storm coming before many people did. He shouted to his wife. She yelled to their three children. The family piled in the car and Oliver drove them out of town and out of the path of the tornado.

"It was right behind us," recalled Mrs. Oliver. "We're lucky. At least we're alive."

Oliver returned after the storm had passed to find his house demolished. He accepted the close call with a shrug.

"It was the only thing to do," he said. "I figured something was coming. We just took off."

In their trailer home, Ralph and Virginia Ratcliff didn't stand much of a chance of surviving the storm. Some persons living in trailer homes did manage to survive the tornadoes, but most of them sought refuge somewhere else. Those who stayed in the trailers were buffeted about unmercifully. Trailers were lifted up, slammed against trees, houses, against other trailers, or against the ground. An unmoored trailer is possibly the very worst place to be in a storm, and anyone who comes out of one hit by a tornado with less than serious injuries has beaten the odds.

The Ratcliffs did not beat the odds. Their bodies were found in the ruins by friends after the tornado had passed.

Another victim, 8-year-old David Evans, was in a bad spot, too. He tried to run for shelter, but the vicious winds caught him outside, as he ran between two houses. He was unprotected, and was killed when struck by flying debris as the houses shattered into splinters.

Remarkably, the Ratcliffs and the Evans boy were the only fatalities at Russiaville. When the winds died down and people came out to survey the ruins, everyone would remember the sight and later exclaim with wonder what a miracle it was that no more were killed. People who had lost their homes and their possessions were grateful that they lived through it.

But the storm, now past Russiaville, was just beginning to destroy and kill in its central path. Many other towns lay ahead, their residents for the most part unsuspecting, directly in the path of the storm. As Russiaville's residents stared in shock and awe at the devastation of their town, the same horrible story was beginning to unfold in more Hoosier cities, towns and villages lying to the northeast.

DIARY OF A DISASTER

(By Boyd Gill and Don Wallis, Jr.)

CHAPTER XVIII. GREENTOWN

For a little girl 8 years old and going on 9, the coming of spring is a marvelous thing. The winter had been a good one for Rose Ann Sweet, of Wabash. She loves to practice ballet and she likes to read and that's what she did in the winter. But in the spring she could go outside and play, and what's more she was going to be 9 years old on Easter Sunday.

It's understandable, then, that when spring finally started to appear in Indiana during the second week of April, Rose Ann Sweet was on top of the world. She had a few days vacation from school and to take advantage of it, she packed her favorite dolls and her ballet shoes, in case the weather turned cold again, and got ready to visit her grandmother in Greentown. It was Palm Sunday, and after spending a week with her grandmother the two of them would return to Wabash for her birthday celebration.

Her grandmother, Mrs. Omma Ellen Sweet, 63, drove over to Wabash from Greentown early that Sunday morning. She spent the day with her son, Robert, Rose Ann's father, and Rose Ann's mother. Toward evening Rose Ann and her grandmother started out for Greentown. It was a little after 7 o'clock and Mrs. Sweet hoped they would get home in time to watch part of the Walt Disney program on television before it was time to go to bed.

They never made it to Greentown.

Rose Ann later recalled it as a sort of fairy tale, the kind of fantasy Walt Disney might have presented that night on television.

"It seemed like the story of the Wizard of Oz when Dorothy's house was picked up and carried to a far and distant land," Rose Ann said later from a bed in the Wabash County Hospital.

What actually happened was all too real. The tornado, moving due east from Kokomo, caught up with Rose Ann and her grandmother just before they reached Greentown. Mrs. Sweet, driving north on Indiana 22, saw the tornado coming. She turned off the road into a private driveway just as the winds picked up the car and carried it about 500 feet into a farm field.

Rose Ann can recall it well.

"The wind was moving very fast. It picked up the car. I was on the floor.

"I remember the car turning around and around. The next thing I remember was when I woke up out in the field. I was covered with mud and so was Grandma. I got up and went to Grandma. We could hear people calling for help.

"I wanted to go to the highway for help, but Grandma wanted me to stay with her. It didn't seem like we were in the field for a very long time, but Daddy told me later it was 45 minutes."

Rose Ann's grandmother died the next morning in the hospital. She underwent surgery the night of the storm but died in her sleep afterwards. Rose Ann suffered multiple cuts. And two of her favorite dolls were blown away.

Mrs. Sweet was the oldest person to die at Greentown when the killer tornado struck. Tamara Lynn Harvey, who was only 2 weeks old, was the youngest victim. In all, 10 persons were killed at Greentown—a rate of about 1 person every 11 seconds, for the storm took less than 2 minutes to move through the small town. And yet when it was over, there were many people who said it was a miracle more did not die.

Perhaps it was, for some. Jim Calaway, the basketball coach at Eastern High School in Greentown, lives near the school and he could hear the tornado as it destroyed the building.

"It sounded like an enormous explosion," Calaway recalled. "I was with my wife and kids in the basement. I was huddled over the top of them and I remember saying out loud, 'Well, we are all going but we are going together.' Then I put my arms around them and heard the twister slam into the rear of the house. It sounded like two jet planes. I just knew we were gone."

Calaway said he could not believe his eyes when he looked up after the terrible noise was gone.

"I looked out the back and looked all around. I told my wife I couldn't see a house standing to the east of us. It's a sight you just can't imagine."

From his house Calaway usually could see the high school, but this time when he looked he could see nothing. Later, he saw that the gymnasium had been reduced to such ruins that the only way it could be identified as a gym was that a basketball goal, its glass backboard and netting undamaged, lay in the midst of the wreckage.

There were other miracles.

Ray Hardin saw the ugly funnel clouds coming.

"But it was too late to do anything," he said. "I started to get my wife and my daughter—she's only 6 years old—and get them all in the car. There was no time for that. Besides, where do you go?"

Hardin and his wife and daughter went to a closet, huddled inside, and closed the door. "We just waited for it to hit," he recalled.

It hit, tearing away the house, splintering the walls. The only thing spared by the winds was the closet—the closet where the Hardins hid. They were not injured.

"I guess the clothes in the closet padded us or something," Hardin said. "We would have been killed sure anywhere else in that house."

But at Greentown miracles didn't save everyone. Victor and Josephine Werner, of Logansport, had been visiting that day at Connersville and they were driving back toward home when the tornado caught them a few miles south of Greentown. Werner tried to pull off the highway onto a farm lane.

"It was like a big wall. Everything was coming at me," he recalled. The tornado rolled the car into the farmfield, and Werner and his wife were tossed out. The impact broke his right leg but he managed to crawl to the highway 300 yards away. Half an hour later someone picked him up, but Mrs. Werner wasn't found until later. She was dead of a fractured skull.

In Greentown, Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Sheffler grabbed their two young children and ran to their garage and lay on the floorboards of their car. The winds blew the house away, ripped up the garage, picked up the car and sent it spinning into the basement. Sheffler and the two children were hurt badly but later recovered. The wife and mother, 30 years old, was killed.

Besides Mrs. Omma Sweet, the 2-week-old Harvey infant, Mrs. Sheffler, and Josephine Werner, six others were killed by the tornadoes in Greentown and vicinity. Many were injured and hospitalized.

Ten had died, and still there were persons calling it a miracle that more were not killed. Like the man who, running from the storm, fell down in the hallway of his house and lay there, helpless, as the winds blew everything away.

Everything, except the hallway.

DIARY OF A DISASTER

(By Boyd Gill and Don Wallis, Jr.)

CHAPTER XXIV. THE RECOVERY

Arthur Miller has lived all of his 54 years in Boone County, and he likes to tell people who ask him where he has spent his life: "I've never been more than a mile away from home."

Then Miller, smiling, will explain that he has, indeed, always made his residence within a mile of the house in which he was born. He was born and reared in a house just down a country road from where he lives now—or, rather, where he used to live—and for a few years, back in the thirties, he lived in a house that is just up that same road in the other direction.

Miller speaks jokingly about never being more than a mile away from home, but a couple of months ago it was no joke; then, Arthur Miller was seriously thinking about moving away from the area for good. He had just lost his house, barn, hog house, farrowing barn, tool shop, corn crib, workshop, garage, chicken house, brooder barn—everything he had—when the southernmost belt of the Palm Sunday tornadoes ripped through Boone County.

Fortunately, Miller and his wife and their daughter and her husband were not hurt in the tornado that touched down on their property. They saw it coming and took shelter in their basement. As the funnel cloud approached, Miller watched from a basement window.

"It hit my barn," he remembered, "and it was just like someone exploded dynamite inside it. Then it came on and hit the house. I ducked, and then there was a loud crack—that's all, just a clean, quick crack—and the house was gone. It stood all these years. I can't believe that it just went like that, in a split second."

But it had. And after the storm had passed Arthur Miller and his family crawled out of the ruins of what had been their home. They looked around, and everywhere was debris and rubble and worthless hunks of splintered wood and mangled metal. Right then, there were neighbors to see about, to help if they had been injured, so nobody thought much about the loss. But later that night it occurred to him: What was he going to do?

His first thought was to quit. "I just didn't really consider anything else," he recalled. "Everything was gone, and I didn't think we could ever rebuild all that again."

The next day, though, an amazing thing happened to the Millers. Before they could even begin to try and clean things up on their property, scores of neighbors—some who knew the Millers well, some who knew them only slightly, and some, Miller says, that he had never seen or heard of before—gathered on the Miller property and went to work. One man brought Miller a mobile home to live in until his house was rebuilt.

"Boy, you sure find you've got a lot of friends when something like this happens," Miller recalled, shaking his head in wonder. "People who didn't know us from a load of hay drove miles and miles to help us out."

"One man came over here, started loading his truck with a bunch of my corn that had been strewn all over the place when the barn went. Then he drove away. Later he came back and walked up and said, 'Here's your ticket, mister,' and then he left. He had taken my corn down to the grain elevator and then brought me back the ticket so I could go get paid for it. How about that?"

Miller says there must have been 50 men helping him out that he didn't even know. And the work was hard. As Miller put it:

"There was debris all over the place. Everywhere. There wasn't one piece of anything that you couldn't pick up with one hand."

After the cleanup was over, Arthur Miller had second thoughts about quitting. Perhaps it was the lift he got when everyone pitched in and helped him out. Perhaps he was over the shock of the storm and his loss and could think things out. Perhaps it was because of his son.

As Miller explained, "My son Karl and I had a long-range plan for the farm. He's got a dairy operation on his place, and I've got 160 acres, and we rent another 160 acres. It takes two men working hard to do it. I thought I better stay."

So, in the end, Arthur Miller decided to remain within a mile of home, after all, and rebuild all that he built up through the years. He is one of hundreds of Hoosiers who made the same decision in the days and weeks that followed the Palm Sunday disaster. Many others didn't—they decided to leave, to abandon their farms and homes for new dwellings, somewhere else. But many stayed, and Arthur Miller of Boone County is typical of those who will spend the next 5 or 10 years or longer trying to get back to where they were on Palm Sunday, 1965.

The first thing Arthur Miller had to do was return to work in his fields.

"I was already behind, because of the cleanup and everything, and then we had two big rains and that put me further back. But I'll salvage something, I guess."

When he does get started on his rebuilding, the first thing to be done is the house. The one that was shattered by the winds was on the property when he bought it in 1941, but it was located about a hundred yards west of the spot where it stood when the storm hit.

"Maybe I should have left it where it was," Miller said. "If it had been left there the tornado would have missed it."

The house is his biggest financial problem, too, for his insurance will cover only about one-half the cost of the new house he will build to replace it. "I had plenty of coverage," he explained, "but not enough, because you just can't buy a used house."

He can buy used equipment, though, and so his insurance will cover the loss there. For the rest, he'll have to borrow. He has talked to several bankers, but was not encouraged about what he found out.

"I heard they were going to offer loans at 3 percent for tornado victims," Miller said. "That would be great. But I've looked around, and there isn't any such thing. At least not now. I'm going to have to borrow it at 6 percent. I could afford twice as much if I could get it at 3 percent. And I sure could use it."

Fencing, too, is a problem. Despite claims to the contrary, fencing is not covered by insurance. Miller said he estimated it will cost him $5 per rod to replace his fencing, and he'll need 750 rods of fence.

But Arthur Miller—and all the others who face the same agonizing task of rebuilding their lives—will get the job done, no matter what the cost or how much time it takes or how much work. The trouble is that even when all the rebuilding is finished, when the recovery is complete, it just won't be the same. The Palm Sunday tornado disaster has left scars that cannot be erased by anything, not even time: the memory of a loved one who died, the memory of a treasured keepsake that was blown away by the winds.

Arthur Miller and his wife summed it up: "Well, we lived through it, and we're thankful for that. And we are in a position to rebuild okay, and we're thankful for that.

"But every day since the storm," Mrs. Miller went on, "every day I've thought of something I used to have—maybe just a little something, but something I treasured and loved and something that meant a lot to me and to us—I think of it and then I think, 'Well, that's gone, I'll never see that again.' "

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, as both a sponsor of the bill, S. 1861, before the Senate for consideration, and as a member of the Committee on Public Works, which conducted the hearings on this proposed Disaster Relief Act of 1965, I want to voice my support for passage of this important bill. I also want to pay tribute to the effort and thought of the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] who introduced S. 1861 and who worked in the committee and in the Senate to develop a comprehensive, useful set of programs that would help to meet the needs of citizens and communities struck by natural disasters.

In my own State of Kentucky, where we know the terrible effects particularly of floods, and where we have seen communities work to rebuild their life and economy over long years of almost annual disasters in some areas, this bill will provide assistance and direction when it is needed most. The Federal agencies involved in the existing disaster programs have provided important and sympathetic services in times of great need, not only in communities and for citizens in Kentucky, but from time to time in States all across the Nation. This bill would revise existing Federal disaster loan programs established by the Congress, and it will make it more possible for local governments to rebuild their communities and respond to the needs of their people following a natural disaster.

In addition to revising and coordinating existing programs, homeowners and farmers and businessmen will now have the chance to use a program to replace property destroyed in a declared disaster area. Through the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Small Business Administration, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Veterans' Administration, and the Farmers Home Administration, among others, programs of loans and assistance will be more readily available directly to the individuals affected. The States would also be eligible for grant assistance to help people to restore homes and farms and businesses, and schools, highways, and vital community facilities will not have to go unattended for lack of funds for reconstruction to enable them to be again used by the people who live in the areas struck by disaster. I believe this is an important bill, I am glad the Senate is taking it up today, and I hope it will be passed and become law.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and to be read a third time.

The bill (S. 1861) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am very pleased and grateful at the passage of S. 1861, the Comprehensive Disaster Relief Amendments Act.

It was not until we had experienced the awesome damage to the Northeast and the Palm Sunday tornado and floods in the Midwest, that we found deficiencies in current laws dealing with natural disaster. This measure liberalizes and clarifies disaster aid programs of the Farmers Home Administration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Small Business Administration to provide immediate relief and long-term adjustment with loans for reconstruction of farms, homes, businesses, and public utilities.

I commend my colleagues and thank them for swift passage of this measure which means much to Americans in the Midwest and the Northwest—hard hit by disaster. By passing this bill, the Congress helps to answer the needs of people in distress. I know that my colleagues join me in the prayer that there is never a necessity to use the provisions of this bill again.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO GIVE TO THE INDIANS OF THE PUEBLOS OF ACOMA, SANDIA, SANTA ANA, AND ZIA THE BENEFICIAL INTEREST IN CERTAIN FEDERALLY OWNED LANDS HERETOFORE SET ASIDE FOR SCHOOL OR ADMINISTRATIVE PURPOSES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 476, S. 1904.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** A bill (S. 1904) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the Pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for school or administrative purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 2, at the beginning of line 2, to insert "and improvements"; and in line 22, after the word "lands", to insert "and improvements"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 1904

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That when the following identified lands (other than the mineral interests specifically excluded in the identification), which were set aside for school or administrative purposes, are no longer needed by the United States for the administration of Indian Affairs, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to declare, by publication of a notice in the Federal Register, that the title of the United States to such lands and improvements shall thereafter be held in trust for the Indians of the Pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia as follows:

(1) Acomita day school site comprising three and five-tenths acres, more or less, to the Indians of the Pueblo of Acoma;

(2) Sandia school site comprising sixty-three one-hundredths of an acre, more or less, to the Indians of the Pueblo of Sandia;

(3) Santa Ana school site comprising two and eighty-one one-hundredths acres, more or less, excluding mineral interests therein, located within the El Ranchito grant, to the Indians of the Pueblo of Santa Ana; and

(4) Administrative site in the Borrego grant, comprising four hundred and twenty-eight acres, more or less, excluding minerals therein, to the Indians of the Pueblo of Zia.

SEC. 2. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of lands and improvements placed in a trust status under the authority of this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 492), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 1904, introduced by Senators ANDERSON and MONTOYA, is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give in trust to the Pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia in New Mexico the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands and improvements when they are no longer needed. The lands (approximately 435 acres) were set aside for school or administrative use. The value of the lands and improvements is approximately $31,000.

The property to be donated is described as follows:

ACOMITA DAY SCHOOL SITE, ACOMA PUEBLO

This tract, comprising 3.5 acres within the Pueblo grant, was acquired through condemnation proceedings in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Mexico in 1920 at a cost of $350 for the construction of a school building. The land was never used for school purposes. A revocable permit was given to the Pueblo of Acoma, which authorized the pueblo to use the tract for agricultural purposes. The present estimated value of the land is $560.

SANDIA SCHOOL SITE, SANDIA PUEBLO

This day school site comprising 0.63 acre, more or less, was acquired by the United States in 1930 at a cost of $126 through condemnation proceedings. It was acquired as a site upon which to erect Government buildings for the use and training of Indians attending the school at the Sandia Pueblo. The operation of a day school at this pueblo was discontinued on July 1, 1960, and the Sandia children now attend public school. The present estimated value, including improvements, is $14,227. These improvements consist of one school building and teacher's quarters, pumphouse, storage building, warehouse, building for bathhouse, garage, dispensary, and sewer and water system. Under a revocable permit the Sandia Indians use the buildings on this site for a meeting place for the tribal council and for other community gatherings as the need arises. A portion of the school site will continue to be used for a health clinic and a school for Public Health Indian sanitarian aids, and no conveyance of land or buildings used for these purposes will be made to the tribe without the approval of the U.S. Public Health Service.

SANTA ANA SCHOOL SITE, SANTA ANA PUEBLO

This day school site is situated in the El Ranchito grant of the Santa Ana Pueblo and was acquired by the United States in 1920 at a cost of $140.50 through condemnation proceedings. It was acquired as a site upon which to construct a school building for the Indians of the Pueblo of Santa Ana. The operation of a day school at Santa Ana Pueblo was discontinued on July 1, 1960. Since that time the Santa Ana Indian children have been attending public school. The present estimated value of this land, including improvements, is $13,747. The improvements located on this former school site consist of a school and quarters building, storage building, garage and storage building, bath and storage building, a pumphouse, and the water and sewer system. Under a revocable permit covering the use of all buildings and facilities at the Santa Ana Day School site, issued on August 28, 1960, the Pueblo of Santa Ana plans to use the school site as a meeting place for the tribal council and for other community gatherings as the need arises. A portion of the school site is being used by the Public Health Service as a location for its clinic. No conveyance of land or clinic buildings will be made to the tribe without the approval of the U.S. Public Health Service.

The United States holds title to the minerals in the El Ranchito grant, which embraces the school site, and it is not proposed to convey the minerals in this parcel of 2.81 acres.

ADMINISTRATIVE SITE IN BORREGO GRANT, ZIA PUEBLO

This administrative site in the Borrego grant comprises 428 acres, more or less. The entire Borrego grant in Sandoval County, N. Mex., was purchased by the United States in the submarginal land purchase project. Jurisdiction of the Borrego grant was transferred from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior in 1938. All of the Borrego grant, excluding minerals and excepting this administrative site of 428 acres, became trust land of the Pueblo of Zia pursuant to the act of August 13, 1949 (63 Stat. 604). The entire Borrego grant of 16,079.80 acres was purchased by the Government for $68,239.40, or an average per acre cost of $3. This would make the cost of the administrative site $1,284. There are no improvements on the site. The Borrego grant is used by members of the Pueblo of Zia for livestock grazing purposes and the administrative site would likewise be used for livestock grazing. The present estimated fair market value of this administrative site is $2,568.

The United States holds title to the minerals in the remainder of the Borrego grant, and it is proposed to retain the minerals in the administrative site.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and to be read the third time.

The bill (S. 1904) was read the third time and passed.

GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside temporarily, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 454, Senate bill 34.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 34) to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 2, line 7, after the word "revised", to strike out "May 1963" and insert "February 1965"; and in line 9, after "Sec. 2.", to strike out the following:

The Secretary is authorized in connection with the Garrison diversion unit to construct, operate, and maintain or otherwise provide for basic public outdoor recreation facilities, to acquire or otherwise to include within the unit area such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present or future public recreation use, to allocate water and reservoir capacity to recreation, and to provide for the public use and enjoyment of unit lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with other unit purposes. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with Federal agencies or State or local public bodies for the operation, maintenance, and additional development of unit lands or facilities, or to dispose of unit lands or facilities to Federal agencies or State or local public bodies by lease, transfer, conveyance, or exchange, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote the development and operation of such lands or facilities in the public interest for recreation purposes. The Secretary shall notify the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of any such proposed disposition to a State or local public body by transfer, conveyance, or exchange, or by lease for twenty-five years or more, and no such transfer, conveyance, or exchange shall be effectuated and no such lease shall be executed prior to sixty calendar days (which sixty days, however, shall not include days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain or an adjournment sine die) from the date of such notification. In connection with the foregoing undertakings and developments for the enhancement of fish and wildlife resources on the Garrison diversion unit: (1) Federal costs incurred specifically for land and basic facilities shall be nonreimbursable; (2) joint costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, other than those hereafter specified, shall in the aggregate be nonreimbursable to the extent they do not exceed the sum of $13,000,000 plus 4 per centum of the cost of joint use land and facilities of the unit in excess of $100,000,000; (3) joint costs allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement which are attributable to migratory waterfowl production habitat benefits shall be nonreimbursable; and (4) other Federal costs, including separable joint costs, allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement shall in the aggregate be nonreimbursable up to a limit of $2,500,000. Provision shall be made for the reimbursement, for the contribution by non-Federal interests, or for the reallocation of costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement in excess of the foregoing limit under one or a combination of the following methods as may be determined appropriate by the Secretary: (1) provision by non-Federal interests of land or interests therein or facilities required for the unit; (2) payment or repayment, with interest at a rate comparable to that provided in section 4(a) of this Act, pursuant to agreement with one or more non-Federal public bodies; (3) reallocation to other project functions in the same proportion as joint costs are allocated among such functions. Costs of means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to fish and wildlife shall be treated as unit costs and allocated to the other unit purposes. For the purpose of this Act, "joint-use land and facilties" shall mean land and facilities serving two or more unit purposes, one of which is recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement. Nothing herein shall limit the authority of the Secretary granted by existing provisions of law relating to recreation, development of water resource projects, or disposition of public lands for recreational purposes.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(a) Subject to the provisions of subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) of this section, the Secretary is authorized in connection with the Garrison diversion unit (i) to construct, operate, and maintain or provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of public outdoor recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement facilities, (ii) to acquire or otherwise to include within the unit area such adjacent lands or interests in land as are necessary for present or future public recreation or fish and wildlife use, (iii) to allocate water and reservoir capacity to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, and (iv) to provide for the public use and enjoyment of unit lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with other unit purposes. The Secretary is further authorized to enter into agreements with Federal agencies or State or local public bodies for the operation, maintenance, and replacement of unit facilities, and to transfer unit lands or facilities to Federal agencies or State or local public bodies by lease or exchange, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote the development and operation of such lands or facilities in the public interest for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement purposes.

(b) All costs allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement and incurred in connection with waterfowl refuges and waterfowl production areas proposed for Federal administration shall be nonreimbursable.

(c)(1) If, before commencement of construction of the unit, non-Federal public bodies agree to administer for recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement or for both of these purposes pursuant to the plan for the development of the unit approved by the Secretary land and water areas which are not included within Federal waterfowl refuges and waterfowl production areas and to bear not less than one-half the separable costs of the unit allocated to either or both of said purposes, as the case may be, and attributable to such areas and all the costs of operation, maintenance and replacement incurred in connection therewith, the remainder of the separable capital costs so allocated and attributed shall be nonreimbursable.

(2) In the absence of such a preconstruction agreement recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement facilities (other than minimum facilities for the public health and safety at reservoir access points and facilities related to Federal waterfowl refuges and waterfowl production areas) shall not be provided, and the allocation of unit costs shall reflect only the number of visitor days and the value per visitor day estimated to result from such diminished recreation development without reference to lands which may be provided pursuant to subsection (e) of this section.

(d) The non-Federal share of the separable capital costs of the unit allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement shall be borne by non-Federal interests, under either or both of the following methods as may be determined appropriate by the Secretary: (i) payment, or provision of lands, interests therein, or facilities for the unit; or (ii) repayment, with interest, within fifty years of first use of unit recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement facilities: *Provided,* That the source of repayment may be limited to entrance and user fees or charges collected at the unit by non-Federal interests if the fee schedule and the portion of fees dedicated to repayment are established on a basis calculated to achieve repayment as aforesaid and are made subject to review and renegotiation at intervals of not more than five years.

(e) Notwithstanding the absence of preconstruction agreements as specified in subsection (c) of this section lands may be acquired in connection with construction of the unit to preserve the recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement potential of the unit.

(1) If non-Federal public bodies agree within ten years after initial unit operation to administer for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement pursuant to the plan for development of the unit approved by the Secretary land and water areas which are not included within Federal waterfowl refuges and waterfowl production areas and to bear not less than one-half the costs of lands acquired therefor pursuant to the subsection and facilities and project modifications provided for those purposes and all costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement incurred therefor, the remainder of the costs of such lands, facilities, and project modifications shall be nonreimbursable. Such agreement and subsequent development shall not be the basis for any allocation of joint costs of the unit to recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement.

(2) If, within ten years after initial operation of the unit, there is not an executed agreement as specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Secretary may utilize the lands for any lawful purpose within the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, or may transfer custody of the land to another Federal agency for use for any lawful purpose within the jurisdiction of that agency, or may lease the lands to a non-Federal public body, or may transfer the lands to the Administrator of General Services for disposition in accordance with the surplus property laws of the United States. In no case shall the lands be used or made available for use for any purpose in conflict with the purposes for which the project was constructed, and in every case preference shall be given to uses which will preserve and promote the recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement potential of the project or, in the absence thereof, will not detract from that potential.

(f) Subject to the limitations hereinbefore stated, joint capital costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement shall be nonreimbursable.

(g) Costs of means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to fish and wildlife shall be treated as unit costs and allocated among all unit purposes.

(h) As used in this Act, the term "nonreimbursable" shall not be construed to prohibit the imposition of entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees or charges.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the general plan for the Missouri-Souris unit of the Missouri River Basin project heretofore authorized in section 9 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), as modified by the report of the Secretary of the Interior contained in House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session, is confirmed and approved under the designation "Garrison diversion unit," and the construction of a development providing for the irrigation of two hundred and fifty thousand acres, municipal and industrial water, fish and wildlife conservation and development, recreation, flood control, and other project purposes shall be prosecuted by the Department of the Interior substantially in accordance with the plans set out in the Bureau of Reclamation report dated November 1962 (revised February 1965) supplemental report to said House Document Numbered 325.

SEC. 2. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) of this section, the Secretary is authorized in connection with the Garrison diversion unit (i) to construct, operate, and maintain or provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of public outdoor recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement facilities, (ii) to acquire or otherwise to include within the unit area such adjacent lands or interests in land as are necessary for present or future public recreation or fish and wildlife use, (iii) to allocate water and reservoir capacity to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, and (iv) to provide for the public use and enjoyment of unit lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with other unit purposes. The Secretary is further authorized to enter into agreements with Federal agencies or State or local public bodies for the operation, maintenance, and replacement of unit facilities, and to transfer unit lands or facilities to Federal agencies or State or local public bodies by lease or exchange, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote the development and operation of such lands or facilities in the public interest for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement purposes.

(b) All costs allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement and incurred in connection with waterfowl refuges and waterfowl production areas proposed for Federal administration shall be nonreimbursable.

(c)(1) If, before commencement of construction of the unit, non-Federal public bodies agree to administer for recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement or for both of these purposes pursuant to the plan for the development of the unit approved by the Secretary land and water areas which are not included within Federal waterfowl refuges and waterfowl production areas and to bear not less than one-half the separable costs of the unit allocated to either or both of said purposes, as the case may be, and attributable to such areas and all the costs of operation, maintenance and replacement incurred in connection therewith, the remainder of the separable capital costs so allocated and attributed shall be nonreimbursable.

(2) In the absence of such a preconstruction agreement recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement facilities (other than minimum facilities for the public health and safety at reservoir access points and facilities related to Federal waterfowl refuges and waterfowl production areas) shall not be provided, and the allocation of unit costs shall reflect only the number of visitor days and the value per visitor day estimated to result from such diminished recreation development without reference to lands which may be provided pursuant to subsection (e) of this section.

(d) The non-Federal share of the separable capital costs of the unit allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement shall be borne by non-Federal interests, under either or both of the following methods as may be determined appropriate by the Secretary: (i) payment, or provision of lands, interests therein, or facilities for the unit; or (ii) repayment, with interest, within fifty years of first use of unit recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement facilities: *Provided,* That the source of repayment may be limited to entrance and user fees or charges collected at the unit by non-Federal interests if the fee schedule and the portion of fees dedicated to repayment are established on a basis calculated to achieve repayment as aforesaid and are made subject to review and renegotiation at intervals of not more than five years.

(e) Notwithstanding the absence of preconstruction agreements as specified in subsection (c) of this section lands may be acquired in connection with construction of the unit to preserve the recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement potential of the unit.

(1) If non-Federal public bodies agree within ten years after initial unit operation to administer for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement pursuant to the plan for development of the unit approved by the Secretary land and water areas which are not included within Federal waterfowl refuges and waterfowl production areas and to bear not less than one-half the costs of lands acquired therefor pursuant to this subsection and facilities and project modifications provided for those purposes and all costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement incurred therefor, the remainder of the costs of such lands, facilities, and project modifications shall be nonreimbursable. Such agreement and subsequent development shall not be the basis for any allocation of joint costs of the unit to recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement.

(2) If, within ten years after initial operation of the unit, there is not an executed agreement as specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection the Secretary may utilize the lands for any lawful purpose within the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, or may transfer custody of the land to another Federal agency for use for any lawful purpose within the jurisdiction of that agency, or may lease the lands to a non-Federal public body, or may transfer the lands to the Administrator of General Services for disposition in accordance with the surplus property laws of the United States. In no case shall the lands be used or made available for use for any purpose in conflict with the purposes for which the project was constructed, and in every case preference shall be given to uses which will preserve and promote the recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement potential of the project or in the absence thereof, will not detract from that potential.

(f) Subject to the limitations hereinbefore stated, joint capital costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement shall be nonreimbursable.

(g) Costs of means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to fish and wildlife shall be treated as unit costs and allocated among all unit purposes.

(h) As used in this Act, the term "nonreimbursable" shall not be construed to prohibit the imposition of entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees or charges.

SEC. 3. The Garrison diversion unit shall be integrated physically and financially with the other Federal works constructed or authorized to be constructed under the comprehensive plan approved by section 9 of the Act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented. The Secretary shall give consideration to returning to the Missouri River to the fullest extent practicable such of the return flows as are not required for beneficial purposes.

SEC. 4. (a) The interest rate used for computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the capital costs allocated to interest-bearing features of the Garrison diversion unit as authorized in this Act shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction is initiated, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue.

(b) From and after July 1, 1965, the interest rate on the unamortized balance of the investment allocated to commercial power in facilities constructed or under construction on June 30, 1965, by the Department of the Army in the Missouri River Basin, the commercial power from which is marketed by the Department of the Interior, and in the transmission and marketing facilities associated therewith, shall be 2½ per centum per annum.

SEC. 5. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water from the project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the Garrison diversion unit as authorized in this Act, the sum of $207,000,000, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved herein. There are also authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be required for operation and maintenance of the unit.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 237.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 237 be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 237) to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 470), explaining the purposes of Senate bill 34, which is similar to the bill now passed.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF MEASURE

S. 34, which has the bipartisan sponsorship of Senators BURDICK and YOUNG, of North Dakota, and MCGOVERN and MUNDT, of South Dakota, reauthorizes the initial stage of the multipurpose Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin, which was originally authorized by the 1944 Flood Control Act.

The unit would irrigate some 250,000 acres, supply industrial and municipal water for 14 towns and cities, make possible full development of fish and wildlife and recreation potential (the prairie potholes country of the high plains of North Dakota is a principal breeding ground for migratory waterfowl in the United States), and afford additional flood control in the Missouri-Mississippi Basin.

The benefit-cost ratio is the favorable one of 2.51 to 1.

Section 6 of S. 34 provides for an appropriation limitation of $207 million for new construction. The greater part of this amount would be repaid, as set forth below in this report.

THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The committee amended S. 34 by striking out section 2 in its entirety in lieu thereof substituting the language of section 2 of the House-passed bill, H.R. 237. This amendment is in accord with the recommendation of the Department of the Interior. It makes applicable to the Garrison unit the guidelines for fish and wildlife and recreation enhancement facilities established by the recently enacted Federal Water Project Recreation Act (Public Law 89–72). While the new section 2 of S. 34 and the language of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act are not identical, they are similar in substance, and there is nothing in the new section 2 of S. 34 that is in conflict with Public Law 89–72.

Subsection (b) of section 2 of the bill is in complete harmony with the exception in section 9 of the Water Project Recreation Act making nonreimbursable costs allocated to waterfowl refuges and waterfowl production areas under Federal administration. The benefits from these refuges and breeding grounds, which are, as pointed out, among the most important in the country, are nationwide. Evidence at the hearings shows that, as a matter of fact, the adjacent areas derive very little, if any, revenue from them, and that expenditures in connection with their development are properly not to be assessed against the local water and power users.

BACKGROUND AND NEED

The facts and statistics in the feasibility report on the Garrison diversion unit show conclusively that it is economically as well as technically sound. Not only is each of the functions feasible in itself but the unit will be of benefit to the entire upper Missouri Basin, with the Federal Government receiving full value for the amounts it advances as an investment.

In addition to its soundness as an investment, moreover, construction of the Garrison diversion unit would do simple, long-delayed equity to the region. The several Missouri Basin projects that have been built on the main stem and which have greatly benefited lower Missouri Basin States by providing flood control and water for navigation have taken vast acreage out of production in North and South Dakota. Testimony was presented at the hearings showing that a million acres, much of it rich bottom lands, have been flooded in the two States. Farm income has been sharply reduced with consequent loss of tax revenues and volume in business activity generally.

At the time these main stem projects were proposed, it was recognized that the losses to the States in which they were located would more than offset benefits from power and recreational facilities. Accordingly, the upper and lower Missouri Basin States were divided, with the former alined behind the so-called Sloan plan, Senate Document No. 191, 78th Congress, for irrigation and reclamation, and what was known as the Pick plan, House Document No. 475, 78th Congress, for a navigation channel in the lower river which might require water from other uses.

There was sharp controversy between the proponents of the two plans. The upper basin feared that it might be drained of its water to support a flowing navigation channel for the lower river. The Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation were sometimes very critical of each other's development plans.

The controversy in the basin was resolved by an agreement worked out by then Senators O'Mahoney and Millikin which was embodied in the Flood Control Act of 1944. The O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment provided that beneficial consumptive uses of water in States lying wholly or partly west of the 98th meridian should take priority over navigation.

The 1944 act, authorizing both the Pick and Sloan plans after some adjustments to eliminate overlaps (S. Doc. 247, 78th Cong.), and containing the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment, thus became the embodiment of the agreement or compact between the upper and lower basins and the passage of the act was its ratification by Congress. The act delineated the projects which were to be undertaken in both ends of the basin. In some instances, projects were included on which there had been little more than reconnaissance studies. They were sometimes incorporated by a one-line reference in the supporting documents—House Document 475, Senate Document 191, and Senate Document 247.

The blanket authorization of a multibillion-dollar, total basin plan was unprecedented, but at the time it was felt unnecessary to spell out the agreement in detail. The Interior Committee has been disturbed on more than one occasion by the dissimilarity between the projects authorized in the act of 1944 and those finally undertaken after thorough engineering studies. Funds authorized for construction in the basin are now limited by Congress to projects underway or new starts only if they have been authorized or reauthorized by current Congresses.

In view of the great modifications of some of the project proposals, the committee believes it is difficult to quarrel with this procedure. The Missouri Basin Survey Commission in 1953 described the Flood Control Act provisions as a "framework rather than a blueprint." At the same time, however, the fundamental commitment of the Flood Control Act of 1944 should be recognized. It amounted to a compact, ratified by Congress, assuring the upper basin States that their sacrifice of productive lands to provide benefits for the lower basin would be compensated for by the full development of other potentialities in the upper basin States.

The Garrison project is a major feature of the agreement ratified in 1944 which "makes whole" and provides a measure of benefits from the Missouri Basin program to the two States which have contributed a lion's share of assets to the development program.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in behalf of the proposed legislation.

The Garrison diversion project will utilize water from the Garrison Reservoir in west-central North Dakota to irrigate croplands and to supply water for recreation, municipal, industrial uses, and fish and wildlife purposes. Presently, the use of the reservoir is limited to flood control, power generation, and navigation. This diversion unit project was anticipated in the original Garrison Reservoir authorization by the Flood Control Act of 1944.

The first 15 years of development in the Missouri River Basin has emphasized main-stem reservoir construction, with benefits for flood control, navigation, and pollution abatement accruing primarily to lower basin States.

The initial irrigation project will involve 250,000 acres on which the principal crop grown today is wheat. Crop production varies with the years, and the economy of the area fluctuates in direct proportion to the success of the yearly wheat crop.

Irrigation with the Garrison waters will enable the farmers of the area to diversify their crops and stabilize the economy of the region. Completion of the project will not bring additional land into crop production but will make it possible for farmers to change from dry farming of wheat, a surplus crop, to others which will support cattle raising and yield higher incomes.

Utilization of the Garrison Reservoir for flood control, navigation, and power generation has resulted in the loss of valuable fertile farmland in North and South Dakota. Action on the irrigation project will fulfill a longstanding obligation to the people of these two States. More land, now dry farmed, will be irrigated to replace the fertile lands that have been submerged.

Irrigation has not kept pace with other authorized project purposes. Irrigation phases of the basin project, with particular emphasis on development of North Dakota, should proceed as planned without further delay, in equity to our State which has given up and lost so much valuable land to main-stem reservoirs.

Studies indicate that over a 50-year period the increased income from individual farmers in the project area would yield Federal income tax revenues $160 million higher than at present. Combined with $25.5 million that would be returned to the Government from the irrigators and conservancy district, 98 percent of the cost allocated to irrigation would be covered. In addition, more than $160 million will be available from surplus power revenues. The benefit cost ratio for the project is estimated at 2.51 to 1. These returns in the Federal Treasury far exceed the investment in the project.

Mr. President, to those who are concerned about agricultural surpluses, I want to emphasize that no new land would be placed in agricultural production by this project. The land sought to be irrigated already is in cultivation and indeed the effect of the project will be to reduce wheat surpluses by converting the land normally seeded to wheat into other crops.

North Dakota State University estimates that 85,000 acres presently devoted to wheat and other small grains would be diverted to forage and other livestock feed products. Experience on irrigated acres indicated furthermore that importation of feed grains often is necessary to provide adequate supplies to livestock industry based on irrigated land.

In addition to the statistical and background information on the Garrison diversion project, I want to emphasize that the people of North Dakota are solidly in support of this project.

One indication of that support is the enactment of legislation authorizing 25 counties to levy taxes to help pay construction and operation costs. Eight irrigation districts containing over 370,000 acres of irrigable lands have already been formed and organized. The landowners are now waiting for water to serve their irrigation. Twenty-nine statewide organizations and 207 local groups have endorsed the project.

The Garrison diversion project has the full support of this administration as it did from the previous one. This endorsement stems from the recognition that in adopting a wise and sound program for utilization of land and water resources, as is possible under the Garrison diversion unit, we can materially enhance the economic growth of the entire upper Midwest region which is lagging behind the national growth rate.

In commenting on the project, the late President John F. Kennedy made the following statement:

> As indicated in my message to the Congress on natural resources, wise investment in a resource program today will return vast dividends tomorrow and failure to act now may be opportunities lost forever. The investment to be made now in the upper Missouri River Basin will in the future bring to the people of the Dakotas and the Nation great benefits in the form of a sound agricultural economy, improved recreational facilities and perhaps most important of all, the region will be able to retain and support its greatest resource, the young people who have in recent years been forced to leave farms in the area in alarming numbers.

Mr. President, in commending the Garrison diversion project to my colleagues for their support, I want to say finally that we in North Dakota are asking only for our fair share of the benefits of the Missouri River Basin project. This will give us the opportunity to make a valuable contribution to the growth and strength of our Nation and my State, and our country will be better off because of it.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, this is the most important legislation affecting my State of North Dakota in the more than 20 years I have served in the Senate.

It will have far-reaching effects in stabilizing our economy and providing badly needed future water supplies for our major cities and greatly enhancing both fish and wildlife benefits as well as recreation.

Actually, Mr. President, this is only a reauthorization of the original authorization bill that was a part of the Flood Control Act of 1944. Under the Pick-Sloan plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin, North Dakota lost approximately 550,000 acres of land. In a large measure this will compensate for this great loss to North Dakota.

The Sloan or reclamation part of the Pick-Sloan plan was always recognized as of great importance to our area. In fact, for a long period of time during the construction of Garrison Dam many of our North Dakota people wanted the pool level elevation of Garrison Dam and Reservoir to be maintained at 1,830 feet rather than the 1,850 feet proposed under the Pick-Sloan plan.

The only reason why I, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, finally agreed to the 1,850-foot pool level elevation was that it would make feasible the Garrison diversion irrigation project. The higher level pool elevation not only provided approximately 6 million additional acre feet of water, but it provided for the most part, a gravity flow of water for irrigation and other needs in the eastern part of North Dakota.

For almost 75 years, North Dakotans have diligently sought a means to divert water from the Missouri River to the central and eastern areas of the State. Although many proposals were advanced in the first half century of this effort, it was the authorization of the Missouri River Basin project by Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1944 that gave the needed impetus to the proposal.

North Dakota interest and support for a Missouri River diversion project was greatly intensified during the drought period of the 1930's when the importance of water was so dramatically emphasized.

During much of the 1930's and at several times since, we have gone through severe drought periods that had a very adverse effect on agricultural production. You can better understand the importance of water and the potential of irrigation to North Dakota when you consider that we often have years or marginal rainfall. Since agriculture is responsible for the production of about 80 percent of all the income of the State of North Dakota, irrigation is badly needed both to expand and stabilize farm income and the general economy of the area.

I believe that the hearing and report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs provide sufficient information to justify the project as sound and feasible from both an economic and an engineering standpoint. In my brief remarks, I would like to emphasize two points.

First. This project was previously authorized by Congress. All that is being sought here is a reauthorization based on the incorporation of new and pertinent recommendations of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Second. As a part of the overall Missouri River Basin development program, North Dakota has lost over 550,000 acres of fine river bottom land. This land can never be reclaimed. It is lost forever as a productive asset for the citizens of the State and as a tax base for State and local governments.

Bureau of Reclamation investigations of the project have resulted in the recommendation of certain modifications to the original authorization of diversion from the Missouri River in the Flood Control Act of 1944. I wish to emphasize, Mr. President, that this project has been authorized and we are merely seeking to incorporate the modifications proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation. These proposals change the original plan primarily with regard to the point of diversion and the location of lands to be served. The investigations conducted in the course of arriving at these decisions have also established the fact that the project is thoroughly sound and feasible from both an economic and engineering standpoint.

The Missouri River basin project, as it evolved and was authorized by Congress in 1944, recognized the needs of the entire basin area and the contributions each of the States would or could make to the project and the economy of the Nation.

Beneficial use of water for irrigation, municipal, and industrial purposes in the upper basin States was an integral part of the plan and represented their primary interest. Flood control and navigation represented the principal interest of the lower basin States. To accomplish these latter objectives, it was recognized that large main stem dams and reservoirs would be required upstream to control and store floodwaters. There was no alternative but to flood millions of acres of valuable river bottom land in the upper basin States for these reservoirs. In North Dakota over 550,000 acres were acquired for the Garrison and Oahe Reservoirs.

It was our understanding from the start that this great acreage loss would be partially offset by irrigation that would be possible through development of the Garrison Diversion Unit. When the Senate Appropriations Committee was considering funds to start the construction of Garrison Dam, I told the committee, and this appears in the hearing record, that if North Dakota did not one day attain a sizable irrigation project, the Garrison Dam and Reservoir itself would be a net loss to North Dakota. We were willing to make this sacrifice, but always with the understanding that the Pick-Sloan promise of irrigation was just as important as the other benefits to be accrued from the Missouri River basin program such as flood control, hydroelectric power, and navigation.

To date, the greater part of the benefits accruing from the Garrison Dam, including flood control, navigation, and power generation, have gone to areas outside North Dakota. Irrigation development in the upper basin, North Dakota's principal interest, has not kept pace with other project functions. Approval of this legislation which will authorize the initial 250,000-acre phase of the potential million-acre Garrison Diversion Unit, will pave the way to correct this situation.

The multiple-purpose Garrison Diversion Unit will serve a number of important needs. In addition to providing water for irrigation, municipal, and industrial uses, it will open new recreation opportunities and fish and wildlife resources will be enhanced.

Project costs allocated to each function appear to be reasonable, particularly when compared to the extensive benefits that will be derived from each of the imporant services from the project. Over 80 percent of the total investment required for the Garrison Diversion Unit is reimbursable and will be repaid to the Federal Treasury by the water users, the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District and surplus Missouri basin power revenues. The 250,000-acre initial phase of the Unit has a very favorable 2.51-to-1 benefit-cost ratio as reported in the Bureau of Reclamation supplemental report on the project dated November 1962 and revised February 1965.

The citizens of North Dakota are solidly behind this project. Virtually every statewide farm, civic, and conservation organization in the State has endorsed and supported the project. The Greater North Dakota Association, city, and county governments, chambers of commerce, and other local farm and civic groups have added their collective voices urging approval of the Garrison Diversion Unit.

The North Dakota Legislature has created the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District to further the project. This district now includes 25 counties. The district has the authority to contract for certain aspects of the project and finance these contracts through a general tax levy that will be spread over all property in the counties of the district. The ability to tax indirect beneficiaries to the extent contemplated through the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District is a unique feature of this district.

The farmers who own irrigable land have voluntarily organized 10 irrigation districts within the diversion unit area. These districts and the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District have substantially agreed to contracts that will be negotiated with the Bureau of Reclamation for the construction and operation of the project.

Today we are seeking approval of the changes to the originally authorized Missouri River diversion project in North Dakota, now designated the Garrison diversion unit, so that its development can proceed. By approving the modified plan we will be making an immeasurable contribution to the economic health of North Dakota, the Upper Great Plains region and the entire Nation.

Although this legislation will authorize only one-fourth of the originally proposed project, I very strongly urge its enactment. We ask only for our fair share of the benefits from the overall Missouri River Basin project and the opportunity for our State to make its full contribution to the growth and strength of our Nation.

I earnestly hope that the Senate approves this legislation.

Mr. President, on behalf of the people of North Dakota, I would like to thank all of the members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and especially my colleague Senator BURDICK, the ranking Democrat, and Republican members of this committee, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], for all of the time and effort they put forth in making this project possible. The unanimous approval of this committee, I am sure, will make possible the passage by the Senate of the Garrison diversion project today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 34 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? Without objection, the bill will be indefinitely postponed.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Shipments Insured by the Foreign Credit Insurance Association and the Export-Import Bank

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that shipments to Yugoslavia insured by the Foreign Credit Insurance Association and that Bank, under the short term export credit insurance program, totaled $126 for the month of June 1965; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Shipment, at Government Expense, of Certain Privately Owned Vehicles

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the shipment, at Government expense, to, from, and within the United States and between oversea areas of privately owned vehicles of deceased or missing personnel, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mandatory Reporting of Certain Injuries in the District of Columbia

A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and hospitals or similar institutions in the District of Columbia of injuries caused by firearms or other dangerous weapons (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report on Activities Under Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on activities under the Federal Property and Administratives Services Act of 1949, for the calendar year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Amendment of Section 202(b) of Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 202(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reports of Acting Comptroller General

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential supplementary report on displacement of commercial dollar sales of tallow to the United Arab Republic (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on questionable grant of corn to the United Arab Republic under title II, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (commonly known as Public Law 480), Agency for International Development, Department of State, dated July 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on disposal of good serviceable furniture due to inadequate management action, Internal Revenue Service, Treasury Department, dated July 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary interest costs incurred by advancing funds to U.S. air carriers for transporting mail of foreign countries, Post Office Department, dated July 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need to strengthen regulatory practices and study certain trading activities relating to commodity futures markets, Commodity Exchange Authority, Department of Agriculture, dated July 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on failure to recover needed aircraft parts previously determined to be Government surplus, Department of the Army, dated July 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on deficiencies in motor vehicle maintenance, use, and replacement practices, Atomic Energy Commission, dated July 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on displacement of commercial dollar sales of tallow to the United Arab Republic, Department of State, Department of Agriculture, Agency for International Development, dated July 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on savings attainable by discontinuing nonessential bus transportation services at Hanford Works, Richland, Wash., Atomic Energy Commission, dated July 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Certain Activities of Geological Survey

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on certain activities of the Geological Survey in areas outside the national domain, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1965; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. Monroney and Mr. Carlson members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 1766. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply and water systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 500).

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 1270. A bill to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (Rept. No. 504);

S. 2294. A bill to amend section 2 of the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949 (Rept. No. 505); and

H.R. 8620. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to take into consideration floods and other natural disasters in reference to the feed grains, cotton, and wheat programs for 1965 (Rept. No. 502).

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment:

S. 1271. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for two additional years the provisions permitting the lease of tobacco acreage allotments (Rept. No. 503).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

H.R. 5508. An act to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 506).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 7. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area, in the State of West Virginia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 507).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution to provide for the development of Ellis Island as a part of the Statue of Liberty National Monument, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 508).

REPORT ENTITLED "CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 501)

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 265, 88th Congress, 2d session, I submit an annual report entitled "Constitutional Rights," and ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from North Carolina.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 2318. A bill to amend chapter 13 of title 38, United States Code, in order to increase the dependency and indemnity compensation rates payable under such chapter to widows and children of veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ribicoff when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PELL (for himself and Mr. Pastore):

S. 2319. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the tariff classification of braided rugs composed of tubular braids with a core; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 2320. A bill to complement the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT ALL FLOOR REMARKS BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN TRIBUTE TO THE LATE ADLAI E. STEVENSON

Mr. GRUENING submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 43) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of all floor remarks by Members of Congress in tribute to the late Adlai E. Stevenson, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Gruening, which appears under a separate heading.)

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS OF VETERANS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the dependency and indemnity compensation payable to the widows and children of servicemen who die from service-connected causes. This increase is badly needed.

The present system of dependency and indemnity compensation payments was enacted August 1, 1956, effective January 1, 1957. At that time the monthly payment to which the widow of a deceased serviceman was entitled was set at $112, plus 12 percent of the monthly basic pay received by a serviceman whose rank and years of service were the same as her deceased husband. In 1963, the $112 was increased to $120, where it is today. Thus under today's law, the widows of such gallant men as those who went down with the *Thresher*, or who are dying in the war in Vietnam, receive $120 a month plus 12 percent of their husband's basic pay.

The average monthly widows' benefit is only $150.15.

Mr. President, this is not enough. A country as rich and strong and powerful as ours can do more and should do more. Our country has enough heart to do more for those who have given so much.

My bill would increase that $120 a month by $50—to $170 a month.

This is an increase of about one-third over the present level of benefits. But in the period between 1956 and 1964, the American standard of living has gone up dramatically, with an increase in the median family income of 37.3 percent. Farmers' income, for example, increased 58 percent. The median family income of those in manufacturing was up 39 percent; in business and repair services—49.6 percent; in personal services—54.5 percent; and in professional services—48.4 percent. The median income of craftsmen increased 36.7 percent and of salesworkers, 43.6 percent.

The widows of American servicemen killed in the line of duty should not be shut out of our increased prosperity. Their right to share in America's plenty is, if anything, strengthened by the sacrifices of their husbands.

I recognize, of course, that under the 12-percent formula each time that there is a military pay raise there is automatically a slight increase in widows' benefits. Last year, for example, military pay was raised about 2.6 percent. This automatically raised widows' benefits by 12 percent of the increase, or 0.3 of 1 percent. Put another way, it takes a raise of $8 in active duty pay to raise widows' benefits $1. Therefore, a cost-of-living raise to the military does not automatically provide equitable treatment to the widows of those who have died. It merely underscores the inequity if nothing else is done.

Mr. President, my bill would make another change in the present formula. At present the 12-percent computation is made on the basis of basic compensation. Men who undergo actual hostile fire in designated combat zones for 6 days in a month get an extra $55 hostile pay. Hazardous duty pay is also paid in recognition of extra dangers accepted daily by some of our men—deep-sea divers and submariners, glider and paratroops, demolition experts and pressure chamber operators, acceleration test subjects and others.

None of this is now included as pay for purposes of computing a widow's monthly benefit.

We ask our men to undertake these extra risks, but for their widows who are left when something goes wrong, we give no recognition of the exceptional sacrifice that has been made.

My bill would include hostile fire pay and hazardous duty pay in the computation of the widow's payments if the man died of an injury received while drawing that pay.

If we are going to ask our men to undertake these exceptional hazards, the least we can do is assure him that his widow will be a little better provided for because of his sacrifice.

My bill would also increase the benefits payable for the care of the children of deceased servicemen. Where a widow has two or more children, she may get up to $28 a month for each child in excess of one. My bill would raise this amount to $40.

Where there is no widow entitled to benefits, one child receives $77 a month; two children, $110; three children, $143, and each additional child, $28. The total is divided equally among the children.

My bill would provide $105 for one child, $145 for two, $180 for three, and $40 for each additional.

Certain payments are available for children over 18. A helpless child over 18—who became permanently incapable of self-support before age 18—receives $77 a month. My bill would increase this to $105. If there is no widow entitled to benefits, however, a helpless child over 18 gets the same rate as a child under 18 plus $28. I would change this $28 to $40.

Each child between 18 and 21, attending school, but not receiving benefits under War Orphans Educational Assistance Act, now gets $39 a month if the widow is receiving dependency and indemnity compensation payments. The bill increases this to $55.

Mr. President, I estimate that these increases which I have just enumerated can be provided at a cost of about $95 million a year.

This is a modest bill. The benefits are modest and the costs are modest. It is deliberately so, because I consider this to be stopgap legislation.

I believe the whole economic status of the survivors of American servicemen who have died in the defense of their country should be thoroughly reviewed.

Our servicemen are not paid enough to build up a substantial estate to care for their widows and children.

Even if they were paid more, many die before they have a chance to accumulate an estate.

I believe that America is grateful enough and compassionate enough to care well for the loved ones of those who have given their very lives for their country.

I propose that the increases are the very least that we can do. I would hope that the Congress could act quickly with regard to this measure, giving some immediate increases which are unquestionably deserved, while it goes on to make a more thorough investigation directed toward more comprehensive legislation.

The 140,000 widows and 64,000 children of American veterans will be grateful.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for 10 days for cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The bill (S. 2318) to amend chapter 13 of title 38, United States Code, in order to increase the dependency and indemnity compensation rates payable under such chapter to widows and children of veterans, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

TO COMPLEMENT THE VIENNA CONVENTION ON DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to complement the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary of State dated July 9, 1965, as well as with the sectional analysis of the bill, in regard to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and sectional analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2320) to complement the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Diplomatic Relations Act of 1965."

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The purpose of this Act is to promote the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States by specifying the privileges and immunities to which foreign diplomatic missions and the personnel thereof are entitled and by authorizing the President to regulate, consistent with treaties and other international agreements of the United States, customary international law and practice, and this Act, the granting of such privileges and immunities.

The letter and sectional analysis presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, July 9, 1965.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Department of State encloses a draft bill entitled "Diplomatic Relations Act of 1965." The draft bill has been prepared to complement the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, signed April 18, 1961, which is now pending in the Senate for advice and consent to ratification (Sen. Exec. H., 88th Cong.), and which is presently in force between 40 countries. A sectional analysis of the draft bill and a copy of the convention are also enclosed.

The Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations was prepared under United Nations auspices and is a codification of the rights, privileges and immunities of all members of permanent diplomatic missions and of their families and private servants, and of the rights and obligations of the state on whose territory they perform their functions. For the most part, the convention is a restatement of principles so universally observed by governments in their practice that they had come to constitute international law. In areas where practice was not uniform, or where it appeared that existing practice should be changed, the convention establishes new rules. For example, the convention provides that members of the administrative and technical staff of the mission and their families who are not nationals or residents of the receiving state will have complete immunity from criminal jurisdiction, that said members will have immunity from civil jurisdiction only with respect to official acts, and that diplomatic agents and their families will no longer enjoy immunity from civil jurisdiction with respect to certain private matters. In the Department's opinion, these new rules are desirable in the light of present conditions.

The present statutory basis for diplomatic immunity in the United States is contained in sections 4063–4066 of the Revised Statutes (22 U.S.C. 252–254), which are derived from an act of Congress approved April 30, 1790 (1 Stat. 117). Section 252, which provides that any writ or process whereby the person of any ambassador or public minister, or any domestic or domestic servant of any such minister, is arrested or imprisoned, or his goods or chattels are distrained, seized, or attached, shall be deemed void, has been held to be declaratory of the law of nations. Sections 253 and 254 provide penalties for acts in violation of section 252, with certain exceptions relating to citizens and inhabitants of the United States, and domestic servants.

Sections 4063–4066 of the Revised Statutes have been interpreted as according complete immunity from both criminal and civil jurisdiction to diplomatic agents and their families and to members of the administrative and technical staff, and as not according any immunity to the families of the latter category of mission members. For this reason the draft bill provides for the repeal of these sections, and the substitution therefor of provisions of law which can be applied in a manner consistent with the convention.

The Vienna convention conforms substantially to the views of the Department of State as to the standard of treatment which a receiving state is or should be required by international law and practice, as a minimum, to accord to diplomatic missions and the personnel thereof. The convention is self-implementing with respect to diplomatic missions and the personnel thereof of states parties to the convention. Legislation is necessary, however, in order to permit the United States to accord this standard of treatment to missions and personnel of states not party to the convention. In order to assure that American diplomatic personnel in the territory of a state not party to the convention will enjoy comparable privileges and immunities, the draft bill accordingly grants the President discretion to determine which categories of such state's personnel in the United States will be entitled to specific privileges and immunities.

In two particulars, the proposed legislation will assist the Department of State in adequately meeting the needs of American diplomatic missions and their personnel. In the Department's opinion, all members of a diplomatic mission, regardless of nationality of residence, should have immunity from jurisdiction with respect to official acts, and all members of the administrative and technical staff, other than nationals or permanent residents of the receiving state, should enjoy customs privileges throughout their sojourn. The draft bill therefore authorizes the President to accord, under such terms and conditions as he may determine, to the personnel of certain diplomatic missions exemption from certain Federal taxes and greater immunity from jurisdiction than is required by the convention. In the administration of this provision, consideration will be given to reciprocity or other appropriate quid pro quo.

The Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations deals only with permanent diplomatic missions and the personnel thereof, and has no application to foreign heads of state, and heads of government, and foreign ministers. Such privileges and immunities as have been accorded these three classes of high officials on an ad hoc basis rest generally on the law of nations and custom and comity and, when applicable, on the doctrine of sovereign immunity. While no serious questions have thus far arisen with respect to the status of these persons, the Department of State is of the opinion that the matter should be clarified by statute. There can be no doubt that heads of state and heads of government are entitled to no less consideration than an ambassador or minister who is the personal representative of the head of state, and who receives his instructions from his head of government and his foreign minister. Accordingly, the draft bill provides that for the purpose of the bill the phrase "foreign diplomatic mission and the personnel thereof" includes foreign heads of state and heads of government, and, when they are on an official visit to the United States, foreign ministers, and members of the official parties accompanying such persons.

In summary therefore, the draft bill has several purposes: (1) to provide statutory authority for according the privileges and immunities specified in the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations to diplomatic missions and the personnel thereof of states not parties to the Vienna Convention; (2) to authorize according more favorable treatment to foreign diplomatic missions in the United States and their personnel, depending, inter alia, on reciprocal treatment of U.S. diplomatic missions and their personnel in the territory of the sending state concerned; (3) to clarify the status in the United States of foreign heads of state and heads of government and special envoys, and to specify the privileges and immunities to which they and members of their official parties shall be entitled during their sojourn; and (4) to repeal Revised Statutes 4063–4066, sections 252–254 of title 22 of the United States Code.

The Department of State has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

A letter similar in content is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

Section 1. Title: This may be cited as the "Diplomatic Relations Act of 1965."

Section 2. Statement of purpose: This states the purpose of the bill, which is to promote the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States by specifying the privileges and immunities to which foreign diplomatic missions and the personnel thereof may be accorded, and by authorizing the President to regulate, consistent with treaties and other international agreements, customary international law and practice, and this proposed legislation, the granting of such privileges and immunities.

Section 3. Definitions: This defines the phrase "foreign diplomatic mission and the personnel thereof" as including not only members of permanent diplomatic missions, their families, and their private servants, but also heads of foreign states and heads of foreign governments, whether in the United States for official or personal reasons, foreign ministers when on an official visit to or in transit through the United States, and persons on special diplomatic mission to the United States, together with the members of the official parties accompanying all such persons. The definition also includes diplomatic couriers. This broad definition is desirable for several reasons. The Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations has reference only to permanent diplomatic missions, and, in limited respects, to diplomatic couriers. The repeal of sections 4063–4066 of the Revised Statutes (22 U.S.C. 252–254) will remove from the books the present statutory basis for according diplomatic immunity to persons on special diplomatic mission. The privileges and immunities which are everywhere accorded to visiting heads of state and heads of government should have some basis in the statutory law of the United States.

Section 4. Authority of the President: Paragraph (a) of this section authorizes the President, under such terms and conditions as he may from time to time determine:

1. to apply the treatment prescribed by the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, or any part or parts thereof, to foreign diplomatic missions and the personnel thereof of states not parties to the convention. The articles of the Vienna Convention which are particularly relevant to this provision are those which define the categories of mission personnel and specify the privileges and immunities to be enjoyed by persons in each category. These are articles 1, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, and 47.

2. to extend more favorable treatment than is required by the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations to foreign diplomatic missions and the personnel thereof with respect to (a) exemption from Federal taxes; and (b) immunity from criminal and civil jurisdiction for members of the administrative and technical staff and the service staff of the mission. The taxes to which section 4 applies will be those imposed by or pursuant to acts of Congress. This provision will enable the United States to continue to accord, in return for an appropriate quid pro quo by the sending state, (1) the exemption from Federal taxes presently enjoyed by duly accredited diplomatic officers and members of the administrative and technical staff who are nationals of the appointing state, (2) complete immunity from criminal jurisdiction to members of the service staff who are not nationals or residents of the United States, and (3) immunity from civil and criminal jurisdiction in respect of official acts to members of the administrative and technical staff who are nationals or residents of the United States.

The draft bill does not contain specific authorization to accord to members of the administrative and technical staff exemption from customs duties and internal revenue taxes imposed upon or by reason of importation because statutory authority now exists to accord such exemptions on the basis of reciprocity (Tariff Schedules of the United States, 19 U.S.C. foll. 1202, schedule 8, part 2, headnote 1, subpart C, headnote 4, and item 822.30). In the case of many countries, section 4(a)(2) of the draft bill, if enacted, and the pertinent portions of the Tariff Schedules would merely authorize the continuance of long-existing arrangements where, by custom or agreement, subordinate personnel at American diplomatic missions are accorded more favorable treatment than is required by the Vienna Convention.

Paragraph (b) of section 4 reaffirms the primacy of the executive branch's determination with respect to entitlement of a particular foreign diplomatic officer or employee to immunity from civil or criminal jurisdiction; the making of such a determination would presumably be delegated to the Department of State pursuant to section 6, and the certificate of the Secretary of State or his designee would be transmitted by the Attorney General to the appropriate court.

Paragraph (c) of section 4 adopts the notice feature of 22 U.S.C. 254, with these changes: the names of all persons entitled to immunity pursuant to the Vienna convention or the draft bill will be made of public record, instead of just those persons presently listed in the so-called White List; the names of entitled persons will be published in the Federal Register rather than posted in the office of the marshal for the District of Columbia; and the variable treatment of foreign diplomatic missions and their personnel authorized in section 4(a) will be made a matter of public record for the application of applicable laws and regulations, and for immunity purposes.

Section 5. Judicial matters: Paragraph (a) provides that any writ or process sued out or prosecuted against a person or the property of any person entitled to immunity from such process shall be deemed void. Paragraph (b) provides that any person who knowingly obtains, sues out, prosecutes, or assists in the execution of such writ or process may be fined or imprisoned, or both. Similar provisions are contained in 22 U.S.C. 252–254.

Section 6. Exercise of functions: This is a standard delegation of authority provision.

Section 7. Effective date and repeals: Paragraph (a) provides that the Diplomatic Relations Act of 1965 will be effective upon entry into force of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations with respect to the United States. Paragraph (b) provides for the repeal of sections 4063, 4064, 4065, and 4066 of the Revised Statutes (22 U.S.C. 252–254), upon the effective date of the abovementioned act. Paragraph (c) is a clause regarding legal acts done or rights accrued, or proceedings commenced in any civil cause before the repeal of the several statutes referred to in paragraph (b) above.

TO PRESERVE THE CONGRESSIONAL TRIBUTES TO ADLAI E. STEVENSON

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in order that there may be preserved as a memorial to the dedicated life of the late great Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, the tributes paid to him on the floor of the Senate and House of Representatives, I have today submitted a concurrent resolution authorizing that all remarks together with their insertions by Members of the Congress which constitute tributes to his life, character, and public service shall be printed and bound as directed by the Joint Committee on Printing.

The resolution directs that in addition to the usual printing of 1,500 for library use that there shall be printed an additional 4,120 copies for the use of the Senate and an additional 8,780 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, thereby providing each Senator with 40 bound copies of the tribute and each Member of the House of Representatives with 20 bound copies. The cost of the printing, I am advised, would be modest.

I ask that this resolution be printed in the Congressional Record at the conclusion of my remarks and that it lie at the desk for 10 days to enable those of my colleagues who wish to do so to cosponsor it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the Record and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 43) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed with an illustration as a Senate document all remarks by Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives in the Halls of Congress which constitute tributes to the life, character, and public service of the late Adlai E. Stevenson.

Sec. 2. There shall be printed and bound as directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, 12,900 additional copies of such document, of which 4,120 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 8,780 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OREG. (S. DOC. NO. 43)

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated June 2, 1965, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DESIGNATION OF "NATIONAL AMERICAN LEGION BASEBALL WEEK"—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 366

Mr. DIRKSEN proposed an amendment to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6 in 1965, as "National American Legion Baseball Week," which is pending.

AMENDMENT NO. 367

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendment proposed by Mr. Dirksen to Senate Joint Resolution 66, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE BILL 1808

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I wish to announce that an ad hoc subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee has rescheduled its hearings on S. 1808, to amend section 4082 of title 18, United States Code, to facilitate the rehabilitation of persons convicted of offenses against the United States, for Thursday, July 29, 1965. The hearing will be at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building. The subcommittee consists of Senator Burdick, Senator Hruska, Senator Scott, and myself as chairman.

NOTICE OF JOINT HEARINGS ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEES OF A FREE PRESS AND A FAIR TRIAL AND ON S. 290

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, for myself as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, and for the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings], as chairman of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce that joint hearings will be held by the two subcommittees on the constitutional rights of a free press and a fair trial and S. 290—a measure authorizing the use of Federal contempt power to punish the improper distribution of information in Federal criminal cases.

The hearings are scheduled for August 17, 18, and 19 at 10:30 a.m. in room 2228 of the New Senate Office Building. Any person who wishes to testify or submit statements pertaining to this measure should communicate with the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 22, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 26) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands for, and to develop, operate, and maintain, the Golden Spike National Historical Site.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 88–606, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Rogers of Texas as a member of the Public Land Law Review Commission, to fill an existing vacancy thereon.

Mr. GORE obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Montoya in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR DIRKSEN FOLLOWING MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of morning business tomorrow, and as soon as the pending joint resolution has been laid before the Senate, the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

APPOINTMENT OF JUSTICE ARTHUR GOLDBERG TO BE U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Nation's press has voiced praise for President Johnson's choice of Justice Goldberg to fill the position of U.S. Representative to the United Nations. Just Wednesday all three Washington newspapers editorially endorsed this selection with praise for Arthur Goldberg. In this time of world tension, surely there is no more important position in our Government than our representative in the councils of the United Nations. President Johnson's choice of Justice Arthur Goldberg was surprising. Justice Goldberg's willingness to accept this difficult assignment was gratifying. Citizens of this country and of the world are grateful to both of these distinguished Americans.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a number of editorials reflecting the strong and appreciative response by the public to this appointment.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 21, 1965]

Goldberg Fills the Bill

Arthur Goldberg will bring to the United Nations a fresh and keen intelligence at a time when the organization desperately needs new ideas.

He has long been known as a skilled behind-scenes negotiator. And a major part of the U.N. Ambassador's work consists in day-to-day negotiation with the 113 other member nations on complex and many-sided issues.

The very fact that he has not had long experience on the diplomatic scene should prove an asset in his new post. For he will approach U.N. problems with a more flexible viewpoint than if his attitudes had been hardened by years of dealing with them.

In addition, he should prove a superb spokesman for the cause of American liberty before the world. As a son of Jewish immigrants and one who rose from poverty to high position, he exemplifies the way of life this Nation hopes to make possible for all mankind.

The U.N.—and the country—will not soon forget Adlai Stevenson. But in Justice Goldberg President Johnson picked a man who could prove a worthy successor.

As the President said in announcing the appointment, the United States seeks above all else a world of law and justice. So he has assigned to the task of achieving it a distinguished jurist of wide experience and exceptional capability.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 21, 1965]

From the Court to the U.N.

The appointment of Justice Arthur J. Goldberg to be the U.S. representative to the United Nations came as a shock to many who had supposed that he would spend the remainder of his life on the Supreme Bench. In nearly all cases the Supreme Court is a permanent assignment, and properly so. There are few other tasks which can justify taking from the Court one of its most energetic and brilliant members. Yet there are exceptions to all rules, and we surmise that this is one instance in which the country will heartily applaud the drafting of a Justice for a more difficult undertaking.

The Supreme Court's loss will be the United Nations' gain. The primary concern about filling this vacancy has been whether the President could find a man who would be a logical and worthy successor to Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson. A routine appointment, it was feared, might have the effect of deflating the prestige of the U.N. and of downgrading the U.S. relations to it. That danger has been entirely averted. When a man of Mr. Goldberg's stature leaves a lifetime position on the highest court in the land to become U.S. spokesman at the U.N. it is a powerful testament to this country's belief in the world organization and in the orderly settlement of international differences.

In appraising Mr. Goldberg's qualifications for the task, however, it is more pertinent to recall his work as Secretary of Labor in President Kennedy's Cabinet and his previous career at the bar. From a highly competitive situation he emerged as one of the country's ablest labor lawyers; he repeatedly demonstrated great capacity as a negotiator and as a spokesman for the cause of labor. This background plus his resourcefulness as a debater will be invaluable at the U.N.

Now that Mr. Goldberg has put aside his judicial robe it is well to remember also that there were many laments when he gave up his dynamic career as Secretary of Labor for the bench. Some wondered at the time whether his dynamism, his administrative ability, and his skill as a mediator could not be used to greater advantage outside the judicial realm. There has been no suggestion since that he was not well adjusted to the cloistered life of a judge. But the other qualities which made him a formidable figure in the Cabinet have not been lost in the 3 years since he succeeded Justice Felix Frankfurter.

The willingness of Mr. Goldberg to leave his choice place in the judicial hierarchy for the rough scramble of international politics in New York tells much about the quality of his statesmanship. No one can seriously doubt that he accepted this more difficult assignment out of a sense of duty. Many years ago Justice Charles Evans Hughes permitted himself to be nominated for the Presidency and later Justice James F. Byrnes left the Court to become a wartime assistant to President Roosevelt for similar reasons. We think it can be stated as a simple fact that Mr. Goldberg would not have left the Court if he had not been convinced that his country has greater need of his talents at the U.N. than on the bench.

The problems he faces in the world organization are staggering. A man of his intelligence could have no illusions about that. But he sees his assignment as being intimately related to "the greatest adventure in man's history"—his search for peace and the rule of law. In this context it was no mistake but an act of great courage and faith to take the course he has taken. The problems that will bedevil him are not things that can be ironed out by any one individual, but there is much satisfaction in knowing that a man of Arthur Goldberg's talents and dedication will be directing the U.N. aspects of the American struggle for a more orderly world.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 21, 1965]

Ambassador Goldberg

Some of the comment on the selection of Arthur J. Goldberg to succeed Adlai Stevenson as our Ambassador to the United Nations has dwelt on resemblances between the two men. And this may be justified in terms of intellect, outlook, and human sympathies. But in other respects the President could have searched far and wide without finding two more dissimilar men.

Mr. Stevenson, with all of his talents, was a rather diffident, introspective man—a man not given to aggressive self-assurance. Mr. Goldberg is cut from a different pattern. His long climb up the ladder from abject poverty as a child in Chicago instilled in him, and rightly so, a notable confidence in himself and his abilities. After his experience as a topflight labor lawyer, as a troubleshooting Secretary of Labor, and as an "actionist" member of the Supreme Court, it could hardly be otherwise. The Russian or other anti-American delegate who elects to cross verbal swords with him in the U.N. will quickly discover that he has taken on a formidable opponent. This is not to suggest that Mr. Goldberg, with his independent turn of mind, will always be in accord with every word of the fine print in American foreign policy. But his differences of opinion, if and when they arise, will be argued out within the administration. He must be in full sympathy, however, with the basic policies which our Government has been advocating in the U.N. Were it otherwise, the President would not have appointed him, nor would Mr. Goldberg have accepted the appointment.

Some wonderment has been expressed as to why the new ambassador would give up a lifetime seat on the Supreme Court to take a post in which he will serve at the pleasure of the President. His reduced salary—$9,500 less in the ambassadorial post—is offset at least to some extent by the perquisites that go with the position. But money could not have figured importantly in the decision.

As a member of the High Court, it could hardly be said that Mr. Goldberg was cabin'd, cribb'd, and confined by the traditions of that institution. There is, however, reason to believe that he chaffed under such mild restraints as his judicial status imposed upon him. Furthermore, at 56, he can reasonably look forward to a long and rewarding future. One of these rewards lies in the opportunities for service which will be open to him in this new assignment. He can be expected to serve with distinction, and the President has done well to give him the chance.

The new ambassador and his lady will be missed in Washington. But this entire community wishes them well as they enter a new phase in their productive lives.

THE HAGUE PROTOCOL TO THE WARSAW CONVENTION

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senate is soon to consider the Hague protocol to the Warsaw Convention relating to international transportation by air. In my view, this is of major significance per se, but its implications are even more important.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee is about to address the Senate on a very important matter which evidently did not receive very much consideration in the Committee on Foreign Relations, or, at least, not the kind of consideration that I hope it will receive on the floor.

I associate myself with the Senator from Tennessee. I hope that I can be of some help in presenting the true facts relating to this matter to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator. I shall welcome his aid.

Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that serious consideration be given to three points.

First, this protocol, and the convention which it amends, does not concern the U.S. Government directly. Rather, it deals with relationships between the airlines and people who use them. And it does so in a grossly inequitable manner. Its real purpose is to limit, by treaty, the liability of airlines and their insurance companies in tort actions growing out of death or injury of passengers due to negligence on the part of airline employees.

Second, the effect of this entire document is to repeal and override domestic law. Now, I do not object to the high standing given treaties by the Constitution and by the Supreme Court. Nor do I object to the Court's 1920 decision in Missouri against Holland. What I do object to is the casual way in which the Congress, in approving the Warsaw Convention in 1934, legislated by treaty on a domestic matter. I would like to point out at this time, also, that we will shortly consider a whole series of treaties which will have the effect of altering domestic tax law. These international agreements must be given due consideration and only approved by the Senate, if approved, with the full knowledge of the purport and extent of the proposal.

Third, this protocol has been only halfheartedly endorsed by the administration. Indeed, its endorsement has been made conditional on the enactment of legislation which is itself of questionable propriety, but which has not yet been cleared by the committee considering it. In my opinion, enactment of the proposed legislation is quite doubtful. As I understand the official position of the State Department, it is that in the event the bills are not enacted, we should denounce the basic Convention and withdraw from it. It would seem hardly necessary to point out that we should enact such legislation before we give new life to the Convention by approving the protocol.

If what I have just stated is correct, we have three courses of action open to us.

First, the Senate can refuse to give its consent to this Protocol. The State Department can then denounce the Convention and withdraw from its terms. "Denounce" may seem like an ugly word, but in this case it is not. A specific provision covering this procedure is set out in the Convention itself.

Second, Senate action can be withheld pending disposition of the accompanying compulsory insurance legislation recommended by the State Department, but opposed by the airlines.

Third, the Senate can approve this protocol, thereby giving an outdated and harmful treaty a new lease on life, thereby continuing indefinitely a situation which nearly everyone agrees is undesirable, but which is excused on various grounds.

The first course of action is clearly preferable. The second is the least we can do. The third is, to me, unconscionable.

Let me explain as briefly as possible just what is involved.

In 1929, when international aviation was in its infancy, and practically nonexistent so far as the United States was concerned, a Convention was negotiated to provide for the standardization of certain procedures with respect to the handling of passengers, baggage, and freight. But the really important feature was the limitation on the amount which could be recovered from the airline in the event of negligence resulting in injury or death of passengers. This figure was placed at $8,300. A greater recovery could be effected only upon proof of the grossest negligence, and the degree of negligence depended on the interpretation of a French term unknown to American law.

Although this ran counter to all American legal concepts, the President in 1934 asked the Senate to approve this Warsaw Convention, and the Senate did so.

In an effort to ascertain the views of Senators at that time, I sought to read the Senate debates. There were none. On June 15, 1934—legislative day June 6—the Senate gave its "advice" and "consented" to 12 treaties. There was some discussion of a Mexican claims matter, but none whatsoever of this Warsaw Convention.

So I felt it would be well to examine the Foreign Relations Committee report and hearings. My staff reported that they could not locate these documents. This sounded a bit strange, so I asked one of the experts at the Legislative Reference Service to obtain these documents for me. I was told that after a thorough search of the records of the Library of Congress, an inquiry of the Department of State Treaty Division and of the National Archives nothing of this sort could be found. There is only the barest account of the Senate action in the Executive Journal and in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am thus forced to the conclusion that the Senate acted in 1934 in the most routine fashion on a matter deemed to be of no particular importance.

And yet, a few years later the lovely singing star Jane Froman was to be horribly crippled and denied recovery of more than $8,300.

And only a few years later former U.S. Senator Capehart was told that his grandchildren would be limited to a total recovery of either $8,300 or $16,600, even though his son and daughter-in-law had been killed as a result of the gross negligence of the crew of the plane in which they were flying. Because of the determination and resourcefulness of our former colleague, this particular incident had a somewhat brighter ending eventually through court action. But the airlines and their insurance companies have taken note of the ways in which American courts have begun to get around the specified limits and these interests have sought to make it even more difficult to avoid the specified recovery limits by altering and making more stringent the degree of gross negligence in this protocol. I shall have more to say about this point shortly.

But now we are being asked to do something much worse than the Senate did in 1934. We are being asked, in the light of the full knowledge of the inequities wrought over the past 30 years by the Warsaw Convention, to ratify the Hague protocol to this convention which will, although it increases the specified recovery limits to $16,600, so tighten the language of this treaty that, in the words of an attorney who specializes in this field, a plaintiff will "have to prove essentially that the pilot wanted to commit suicide" in order to recover more than the specified $16,600 treaty limit.

Perhaps the Senate of 1934 could not be expected to foresee the consequences of its action.

I must confess my inability to understand why Senators today, when international aviation has reached prominence and great proportion, and after the inequities of the convention are so well known, would approve such a grossly unfair proposition.

There is always a certain amount of tenderness involved in dealings between or among governments, and I am fully appreciative of this fact. The United States is and must be, if there is to be such, the leader of the non-Communist world. To do this, we must have due regard for the sentiments of other governments, and I would yield doubts in favor of upholding the President when an agreement negotiated by the State Department and involving other governments is before the Senate. That is not to say that I would or will always support anything the State Department negotiates. But only overweening reasons would likely overcome my natural inclination to support my Government in negotiations involving other governments.

But what we are dealing with here is relationships which shall exist between airlines and people who use them. In the words of the spokesman for the State Department who presented the case for ratification, as recorded on page 1 of the Foreign Relations Committee hearings on May 26, 1965:

> The principle [sic] subject matter of the Warsaw Convention and of The Hague protocol is the liability of air carriers in international transportation for loss of life or injury to passengers and cargo.

This could hardly be more clearly stated. This is not a treaty among governments concerning their official acts. It is essentially legislation affecting private rights by way of treaty.

So let us not be misled by any false notions that we will be in some way forfeiting part of our internationalism if we apply ordinary rules of commonsense and equity to this matter. If we find that the Senate did not fully comprehend the nature of its action in 1934, or if we find that conditions have so changed as to require some new course, let us not hesitate to alter our course.

Something should be done about the Warsaw Convention. It no longer properly serves its intended purpose. But The Hague protocol is not a solution, as even the State Department openly admits.

I think it is appropriate to point out these things. We should examine this Convention and protocol as we would examine a bill coming out of the Commerce Committee which would limit liability in negligence cases involving domestic airlines.

The Constitution and the Supreme Court have given high standing to treaties. Treaties can override domestic law. Domestic laws can be enacted on the basis of a treaty provision which might go far beyond any powers the Federal Government could legally claim under the Constitution. This has been clearly stated by the Supreme Court, and not by the Warren court, either, but by the staid, if not reactionary, Court of 1920, in Missouri against Holland.

I am not objecting to this, but I want my colleagues to understand the full import of the proposed action.

More than 2 million Americans travel across international borders by air each year. Americans account for about 60 percent of international air travel.

Of all international commercial air travel, Americans constitute 60 percent. Such a tribute to the eminence of our country. Such a tribute to the verve, the drive, the leadership of the people of our country. But remember, when the Senate ratifies a treaty such as proposed, 60 percent of the people whose rights will be limited thereby are, under present conditions, American citizens.

Furthermore, when a ticket from Los Angeles to London by way of New York is purchased, the portion of the flight from Los Angeles to New York is generally covered by the Warsaw Convention.

I wish you to note this point, Mr. President. An American traveling from Dallas to Washington or New York with a ticket for London may be injured or may be killed because of the negligence of an airline in landing in New York or Boston or Washington; and yet, under this treaty, he may be able to recover only $8,300, even though his hospital bills might reach $100,000 or more. Or, if he is killed, his wife and children may find themselves coldly comforted by the grand award of $8,300. Why? Because of this treaty, which supersedes domestic law. And it is proposed by the protocol to tighten the opportunity of recovery made, even though the limit of $8,300 goes to $16,600.

This is contrary, in my opinion, to the whole system of American law under which one who is harmed through negligence of another is entitled to be made whole. Is that not the law in Alaska?

Mr. GRUENING. It is law in Alaska. We hope it will be law everywhere continuously.

Mr. GORE. I thank my friend.

Ordinary domestic air travel carries with it no such protection for the airlines and their insurors and no such penalty against passengers. International airlines do not need this kind of protection and our citizens traveling abroad, many of whom may not be aware of the Warsaw Convention, should not be penalized by it.

This proposition would be ludicrous if it were not so serious. All responsible airlines carry liability insurance, even if they are under the umbrella of the Warsaw Convention. If we remove that umbrella and return to our citizens the rights to which they are entitled, rights they enjoy when traveling on domestic flights, with foreign extension of their ticket, the additional cost of the insurance the international airlines would have to carry in order to protect themselves from more equitable judgments or settlements would be equivalent, it has been estimated, to the grand sum of 62 cents on a ticket from New York to London.

Let me repeat. When we get right down to bare facts, we are talking about 62 cents versus the rights American air travelers have at home and ought to have, but are denied under this Convention and protocol, when traveling to London or elsewhere abroad.

This would be ludicrous if so much tragedy were not involved—tragedy such as Jane Froman and the children and grandchildren of Senator Capehart suffered.

Of course, these 62-cent increments mount up, and I can understand why the airlines want this protocol approved. And I can understand, up to a point, the State Department's position. The State Department simply cannot bring itself to withdraw from an international agreement, even an unrealistic one that is admittedly contrary to the best interests of American citizens.

Although the Warsaw Convention has never been understood by most Americans—indeed, its existence is not known by many who come under its terms—it was sufficiently well and unfavorably known for some considerable pressure to be applied for either its revision or its denunciation. A liability limit of $8,300 is just so unthinkable that even the courts were searching for ways to avoid that limit.

So, the Hague protocol was negotiated, dated September 28, 1955. It was signed on behalf of the United States on June 28, 1956. The State Department took some time about sending it along its way to the Senate for advice and consent—and I am not sure whose advice was ever requested. But former Secretary Herter finally, on July 2, 1959, transmitted it to President Eisenhower who, in turn, sent it to the Senate on July 24, 1959. It languished here until hearings were held on May 26 and 27 of this year.

If this protocol were really going to accomplish any good, that 10-year period from its negotiation to the present time would look awfully long. But I think it is a mischievous agreement, an unsound and unfair agreement.

It would appear that someone had trouble justifying this protocol, for in 1961 this whole matter was restudied by an interagency group. This group produced one of those committee camels—and this protocol came out more closely resembling the hump than the legs.

For the base of this 1961 new-look solution was a compulsory $50,000 insurance policy to be carried by U.S. airlines on all international passengers. This requires legislation we have not yet enacted and which we, in my opinion, may never enact, and, indeed, ought not to enact.

The State Department spokesman told our committee:

> The present administration and its predecessors have recognized this shortcoming—

He was referring to the low limit on liability—

> and have debated whether the Hague protocol provides an adequate answer.

After further discussion, he stated that the State Department supported "two basic related recommendations," ratification of the Hague protocol and enactment of legislation to require American international airlines to carry automatic $50,000 policies for everyone. He then went on to say that "adequate protection" would not be provided "until both of these recommendations are given effect."

I wish my colleagues would read the testimony given at the hearings. Here is another statement of the State Department spokesman—and I am not criticizing him. He made out the best case he could. Indeed, how could a spokesman for the administration make out a strong case for a procedure which the Government itself abjures? For, when this protocol is ratified, all governments joining in this treaty will be notified that it does not apply to air travel where the Defense Department charters an airplane for its own use. The Defense Department, wisely in my opinion, will not impose the burden of this inequitable liability limit on our troops.

I applaud the Department, but why should the Senate approve a protocol which applies to all American citizens using international airline service? I do not believe that it should be imposed on any of our citizens.

I doubt the advisability of enacting the proposed insurance legislation, as I said. In the first place, it would cover only U.S. international airlines. Second, it violates all our legal concepts and rules in tort actions. It would provide the same payment for the death of a child of 13 or a condemned criminal as for the death of an executive in the midst of his prime earning years. And it would not be related to negligence in any way whatsoever. Third, and I do not know how much weight to give to this point, it has been suggested that this automatic insurance might give rise to more sabotage. Airline saboteurs have generally been caught through their purchase of insurance, but if everyone on the plane has automatic insurance no clue will be provided there.

Regardless of my personal views, however, I think it is safe to suggest that the proposed legislation is not likely to become law. Bills were introduced in 1964. No action was taken on them. S. 2032 and H.R. 8386 were introduced this year, and were referred to appropriate committees. No action has been scheduled. No action has been taken. I see no sign that any action will be taken on the proposed legislation, which it is alleged must accompany the proposed treaty in order to achieve a degree of equity. It seems to me that we should have legislation before we ratify the protocol.

During the past several years, the U.S. courts, appalled at the $8,300 liability limit in the Warsaw Convention have found ways to render justice in some cases despite the convention. Attorneys who specialize in such cases are now getting some decent judgments for their clients. The grandchildren of Senator Capehart were finally given, after years of litigation, some $50,000 each for the death of their parents—and it would appear that there was the grossest kind of negligence in that instance.

But in the Jane Froman case the judge gave a charge to the jury under which it was almost impossible to go beyond the $8,300 limit. It might come as a surprise to some that the airlines support this protocol which would double the limits of their liability, but the answer is to be found here. In clarifying the Warsaw Convention language regarding willful misconduct which would allow recovery above the treaty limits, the Hague protocol uses the language of the jury charge in the Jane Froman case. This would make it virtually impossible for a plaintiff to recover beyond the treaty limits if we ratify this Hague Protocol.

What sins are committed in the name of "clarification" and "technical amendments"?

Mr. President, the United States ought to withdraw from the Warsaw Convention. This convention may have served some useful purpose in its early years, when international aviation was in its infancy and one very large judgment might have wiped out an airline. But this situation no longer obtains. The larger airlines are making huge profits and all carry insurance, in addition. Airline protection, if it was ever a valid reason to deny U.S. citizens their legal rights, is no longer persuasive.

The other reason advanced for keeping the Warsaw Convention alive by adopting this protocol is that it is to the advantage of the traveling public to have uniformity of ticketing and handling of shipments. There is something in this argument, but not much. There is now an effective airlines association through which such matters are worked out in practice. Furthermore, many countries are not parties to this convention, including several Latin American nations important to the United States. No difficulty is now being experienced in operating through these countries, so far as I am aware.

As I said in the beginning of my remarks, the preferable action at this time is for the Senate to refuse to agree to this protocol. That action would, I hope, encourage the State Department and the President to denounce the Warsaw Convention under the provisions laid down in the Convention itself. American citizens who are damaged by the negligence of international airline employees could then pursue legal remedies in U.S. courts, and under U.S. law.

Even if the State Department could not bring itself to denounce a treaty, however outdated and inequitable, American citizens would fare better with the

Warsaw Convention in effect, with its $8,300 limit, than they would under The Hague protocol, with its $16,600 limit, but with its much tougher language governing the degree of negligence necessary to avoid the stated limit of liability. It is necessary to prove an almost deliberate act, amounting practically to pilot suicide, in order to recover under The Hague protocol.

There is one other procedure we could follow at this time. The Senate could return this matter to the Foreign Relations Committee with instructions to hold it in abeyance until the compulsory insurance bill, which the State Department says is necessary if The Hague protocol is to prove adequate, is enacted into law.

It is my hope, then, that the Senate will either defer consideration of the protocol or reject it.

Mr. GRUENING. I compliment the Senator from Tennessee on the noble work he is doing in defending the rights of American citizens who are traveling, against the inequities proposed in the treaty.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY AT THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday, the Vice President of the United States addressed the White House Conference on Education. He made what I consider to be one of the most brilliant speeches on the subject of education that the Vice President and former Senator from Minnesota has ever delivered in his many years of dedicated public service.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, I wish to say that when the Vice President was a Senator from Minnesota I could always count on him for unfailing support in behalf of all legislation which it was my responsibility to present to the Senate and to seek to have the Senate pass.

The speech he gave to the White House Conference on Education yesterday, in my judgment, will stand to his everlasting credit as a statesman. I urge my colleagues to read it. I merely wish to read three short paragraphs from it in paying my thanks to him for making this brilliant speech. At the end of his speech he said:

> Let us proceed, then, to let quality in education enhance the quality of life. Let opportunity in education lend opportunity to all mankind.
>
> We shall be known as teachers, not warriors; as educators, not conquerors. Our legacy will not be the wealth of our Treasury, but the richness of man's culture.
>
> No, man cannot be both ignorant and free. There is little doubt in my heart—or mind—that this Nation can, as in the past, lead the way to freedom.

To this and to everything else he said in his speech, I say "Amen."

I ask unanimous consent that this great speech by the Vice President of the United States be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION, JULY 21, 1965

I am honored to participate in this historic White House Conference on Education. I am told your discussions have been productive and stimulating. I am confident that your efforts will provide ideas and insights into a great and exciting task: the task of educating young minds.

For education is the keystone in the arch of man's freedom.

I suspect every person in this room shares the opinion of Thomas Jefferson, expressed when he sought support for his University of Virginia: "What service can we ever render to our country equal to promoting education? * * * The exertions and mortifications are temporary; the benefit eternal."

President Johnson has left no doubt concerning the exertions this administration is willing to make to provide every American child entering life with an unfettered opportunity for education and training—an opportunity limited only by the capacities and initiative of that child.

And in the 88th and 89th Congresses the mortifications have been remarkably few. We have passed historic legislation for education, and we will pass even more before adjournment this fall—including the Higher Education Act and the President's proposed, new Teaching Professions Act of 1965.

Yet, despite our successes, we cannot be wholly satisfied with the condition of education in this country.

Today we see great ferment and tumult in American education—students rebel against faculty * * * faculty rebels against school administration and school administration calls down a plague on both houses.

Parents demand rearrangement of school boundaries, other parents protest what they feel are threats to the neighborhood school, and local elected official and school administrators find themselves squarely in the middle.

Our era sometimes appears to be one of walk-outs, sit-ins, sit-outs, teach-ins, picketing, threats, and a general debate over educational policies and practices in all sections of the United States.

The American people have made the schoolroom a focal point of controversy, debate, and commotion.

The essence of the situation is this: Parents want greater educational opportunity for their children.

Our young Americans, too, have greater goals and ambitions.

These go beyond education.

Today's young Americans seek opportunity, in general, to lead more meaningful and productive lives—not just for personal gain, but also to pursue a more peaceful and just world.

Today, the American people realize that the future of our democracy—and perhaps the future of mankind—is related directly to the education available to the people of this country and the world.

We need not agree with the form some of today's educational ferment has taken.

No responsible person condones violence or the violation of laws. No responsible person advocates actions which endanger the civil peace of our local communities or our college campuses. And no one supports forms of irresponsibility and immaturity which foster dissension and chaos for their own sake.

The processes of debate and reexamination of our educational policies cannot escape from our common obligations to preserve the processes of democracy and the rule of law.

But let us be honest with ourselves and recognize this: Despite the dedication and hard work of American educators, there are deficiencies in American education. We must correct them.

We must, for example, continue eliminating obsolete and outmoded teaching methods and curriculums—methods and curriculums which stunt the development of creative thinking and understanding.

We have begun to emphasize the importance of understanding the basic structures of mathematics, languages, and the physical and biological sciences.

As you know far better than I, new approaches in these subjects show that our young people have astounding capacity for learning when they are truly challenged and excited by the learning process.

Let us make the learning process exciting, too, in teaching of the humanities, the social sciences, and the arts.

For these are the disciplines at the heart of creative expression and, indeed, of free political institutions.

These are the disciplines which perpetuate the priceless value of our civilization and guarantee that men will remain the masters of science.

We must have the courage and foresight to use new mechanisms and devices to help the learning process. We cannot afford to waste educational research and development because we are timid or lack the imagination to use what is new.

Visual aids, educational TV, and teaching machines, for instance, have not yet been used to their full potential.

We must, of course, balance and integrate these approaches with the experience that only a skillful teacher can provide. But ample evidence exists to suggest that such balances can be achieved in almost every subject area.

We must also accelerate our attempts to improve the training and preparation of teachers * * * to explore more efficient patterns of local school organization * * * and to develop additional sources of money available to our States and localities to pay for better education.

Yes, we have an obligation to adapt our educational system to meet the challenges and demands of a changing world. In the past few years we have come a long way toward meeting these challenges and demands. But we still have great ground to cover.

For example, there is one overwhelming task among the great challenges facing education—a task in which I have personal responsibility:

What about education for the poor and deprived? How can we muster greater courage and imagination in combatting this most difficult problem? How can we halt this tragic waste of human resources?

This administration is working hard to provide our States and localities with some of the tools needed to accomplish this mission.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Economic Opportunity Act, the vocational education amendments, and the Manpower Training and Development Act have opened new horizons for young people who most need them.

Now, the President has called for a Teaching Professions Act which would create a National Teachers Corps to provide outstanding teachers "with a sense of mission" to serve in both urban and rural slums. Those who enlist in this Corps will be sent to schools that most teachers regard as bad assignments—where children tend to be undisciplined, poorly dressed, and too often poorly taught, as well.

Here is the chance to dispell forever the myth that children from deprived areas are just unable to learn—that schools can only provide some form of custodial care for them until they drop out and become unemployed or delinquent.

Here is the chance to prove that children—regardless of their immediate environment—do respond to determined and creative efforts to illuminate their lives.

Our schools can rescue millions of youngsters caught in the downward spiral of second-rate education, functional illiteracy, delinquency, dependency, and despair.

Our schools can also help demolish the slums and ghettoes themselves.

For each child is an adventure into a new tomorrow—a chance to break the old pattern and make it new.

Today we have the chance to make that new pattern one of self-esteem, self-respect, ambition, and responsibility.

We have the chance, through education, to transform decayed and decaying neighborhoods into places where people can live and work in safety and health, and lift themselves to something better.

Let all levels of the American educational system—Federal, State, and local; public and private—join hands to make slum schools centers of educational excellence in our country.

Isn't it time, for instance, for our great universities—many located in or near these decaying urban neighborhoods—to seek cooperative arrangements with local school systems in these areas?

And isn't it time, too, for universities to do more in service for the local community, State government, and Nation?

The Higher Education Act of 1965 will place new emphasis on community service programs. And it will also assist in raising the academic level of colleges—colleges with desire and potential—which have been held back for lack of money or other reasons. Passage of this act will carry them beyond the year-to-year struggle for survival and bring them within the main currents of academic life—so that they can, in turn, better serve their home communities.

The tools which the Federal Government has provided to assist in this process of education, and in this struggle against poverty, rely on the initiative of our States and localities. They seek, too, to take full advantage of the intellectual resources of the private sector.

For we realize that no amount of Federal money or Federal direction will provide either better education or win the war against poverty—unless there is a determination at local level to do better than is being done.

If we need—as we do—to avoid the conflagrations that could consume our society, we need hearts afire with the adventure of teaching all pupils—in all neighborhoods—and at all academic levels.

If we need—as we do—new techniques, new instruments, and new methods to assist in the process of education, we also need something old—something eternal—the spirit of personal commitment.

Personal commitment will be needed, too, for tasks in education which go beyond those in our own country and which serve more than our own purposes.

We Americans face, and must defeat, ignorance, illiteracy and hunger existing in the midst of our own rich society. But we must equally face—and, equally, must help defeat—these same enemies where they exist in other, less fortunate places.

This conference has dealt most largely with improvement of education here at home, in the United States. This is the immediate task before us.

But we must recognize the truth in the words of H. G. Wells: "Civilization is a race between education and catastrophe."

As our American wealth and American energy are turned to the important work of education in this Nation, they must also be turned to the work of education where it is even more needed—in the two-thirds of the world waiting on the outside for a chance, too, for something better.

As we develop our American human resources, those resources must be used for greater good than our own.

The American educator and American citizen must think in larger terms * * * more ambitious terms than we have even yet begun to contemplate.

The lessons we learn at home must be applied in other places.

We of this American generation have the chance to be remembered, as Toynbee says, not for crimes or even for astonishing inventions, but as the first generation to dare to make the benefits of civilization available to the whole human race.

And the surest way to that goal is the way of education. Through investment in education we can begin to close the gap between rich and poor.

Yes, we can be remembered for our generosity, for our humanity, for our sense of commitment to our fellow man.

Our weapons can be schoolhouses and books. Our soldiers can be teaching volunteers. Our victory can be the victory of the human spirit over hopelessness and despair. Our monument can be a society of free and creative peoples, living at peace and with the knowledge that each new day can be a better day.

Let us proceed, then, to let quality in education enhance the quality of life. Let opportunity in education lend opportunity to all mankind.

We shall be known as teachers, not warriors; as educators, not conquerors. Our legacy will not be the wealth of our treasury, but the richness of man's culture.

No, man cannot be both ignorant and free. There is little doubt in my heart—or mind—that this Nation can, as in the past, lead the way to freedom.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the celebration of Captive Nations Week expresses our determination to keep alive the hope for freedom in the hearts of the captive peoples of Europe. The passage of Public Law 86-90, of which I was a cosponsor, by the 86th Congress, designating the third week of July as Captive Nations Week, points up the fact that the people of the United States, through their Congress, wish to set themselves firmly on record as being in strong sympathy with the national aspirations for liberty and the individual desires for freedom of those enslaved by Communist tyranny behind the Iron Curtain.

United States ties with these people are not only bonds of sympathy and understanding. They are ties of family and culture for millions of our citizens who trace their origins to these lands. They are also ties of history and tradition, for not only is the history of our own war of independence graced by the names of heroes from these nations, such as Kossuth, Pulaski, and Kosciusko, but the captive nations themselves have derived inspiration and assistance from the United States in their own historic quest for national independence.

We have just concluded our own Independence Day celebration; it is therefore timely and fitting for us as freemen to reaffirm our continuing fight for the return of self-determination to those nations forcibly denied this right.

Mr. President, there has been some complaint in some quarters. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the New York Daily News of July 19, 1965, may be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Back in 1959, Congress by a joint resolution authorized and requested the President to designate the third week in July of each year as Captive Nations Week, until all the captive nations of the world should be free.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower had no hesitation about pointing a finger, in his Captive Nations proclamations, at Soviet Russia as the champion slaveholder nation of the world and the slaveholder that Congress had in mind when it adopted the joint resolution.

President John F. Kennedy discontinued the Eisenhower practice of calling the Kremlin what it was (and is). He contented himself with pious proclamations voicing the hope that someday all captive nations would be liberated.

President Johnson has now repeated the Kennedy procedure. His 1965 Captive Nations Week proclamation, issued July 2, does not carry the word communism, or name any captive nations, or say what nation is holding others captive.

We're surprised and disappointed that the big man from Texas should pussyfoot in this manner. We recall that the late H. L. Mencken once urged that all U.S. Reds be sent to Texas—whose citizens would promptly kill them to the last scrubby man and scrofulous woman.

Anyway, the week which began yesterday is Captive Nations Week; and the big enemy still is Soviet Russia; and demonstrations staged this week by the Assembly of Captive European Nations and kindred organizations deserve, we believe, the cooperation and applause of all patriotic Americans.

Mr. JAVITS. I would say for the President of the United States that he has a great many problems which may very well have been before him in respect to a proclamation of this kind at this time. But I feel there is no question about my affirmation, and I deeply feel that it represents the general feeling in our country that we are dedicated as a people to help and promote in every way possible, by peaceful means, the attainment at long last of the self-determination and freedom which these people of central Europe, who are now the captive nations, should by all right enjoy, and which were taken from them by unlawful and unjust means. We will pray and work with them in every peaceful way for that happy day when their desires and expectations may be fulfilled and they may again be restored to the rolls of the free.

THE GENOCIDE AND HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last March 11 it was my privilege to address the first national conference of the ad hoc Committee on the Human Rights and Genocide Treaties at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in Washington.

The ad hoc committee was established in the spring of 1964 by 35 major national organizations. Its affiliates cut across the broad spectrum of American life and include the principal church, civic, labor, and service groups as well as the leading civil liberties and civil rights organizations.

The ad hoc committee serves primarily as a clearinghouse for information on the treaties and as a springboard for the national educational programs carried on by its member agencies. In its efforts on behalf of U.S. ratification of the treaties the ad hoc committee is guided by President John F. Kennedy's message to the Senate in July 1963 when in asking for ratification of three international human rights conventions, he declared:

> The United States cannot afford to renounce responsibility for support of the very fundamentals which distinguish our concept of government from all forms of tyranny.

The Washington Conference signaled a renewed drive on behalf of these treaties which have lain dormant for a decade or more. Sparked by an aroused public interest in human rights generally, the ad hoc committee is dedicating itself to the proposition that the United Sates must once again reassert its historic role of championing international human rights and the rule of law on a world scale.

Particularly during International Cooperation Year, the ad hoc committee is determined to mobilize the efforts of voluntary organizations in a broad educational program to achieve ratification.

Mr. President, I think it is high time that the Senate got around to taking action on the Human Rights and Genocide Treaties. Because of the very great importance I attach to this matter, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the text of my statement before the conference of the ad hoc committee on the Human Rights and Genocide Treaties, and a list of the organizations represented at the conference.

There being no objection, the statement and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED TO RATIFY THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION AND OTHER U.N. CONVENTIONS ON HUMAN RIGHTS

(Remarks of Senator THOMAS J. DODD before the conference of the ad hoc Committee on the Human Rights and Genocide Convention, Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., Thursday, March 11, 1965)

Mr. Bingham, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, I have accepted your invitation to address this conference out of a sense of duty because I believe there is no more important item of unfinished business on the calendar of the Senate than the ratification of the Genocide Convention.

It is now 17 long years since the Genocide Convention, with strong American backing was approved by the U.N. General Assembly. And it is 15 years—almost 16 years—since it went to the Senate for ratification in June 1949.

The Convention has been ratified by 67 nations to date, including all the members of the Communist bloc in the U.N. But for some strange reason, the great United States of America, which has done more to extend the frontiers of freedom than any other nation, has not ratified the Convention.

In June of 1949, President Truman submitted the Genocide Convention to the Senate with his own enthusiastic endorsement.

In January of 1950, a Special Genocide Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee under the chairmanship of a great Connecticut Senator, Brian McMahon, conducted public hearings. It was my privilege to testify in favor of ratifying the Convention before this committee. I say it was my privilege not only because of the great importance I attach to the Convention but because of the exceptionally distinguished body of citizens, representing more than 50 national organizations, who took the witness stand with me to urge ratification.

In its report to the full Foreign Relations Committee, the McMahon subcommittee strongly recommended ratification of the Convention. But despite extensive hearings, despite the declared approval of all the major religious, ethnic, civic, and veterans organizations, the covenant still languishes in the Foreign Relations Committee without affirmative action.

Fifteen years, 16 years, is a long time to wait for the ratification of any agreement or convention. The long lapse of time, has, I am afraid, blurred our memories and obscured the issues and dulled our conscience. There have been times in our history when the Government has needed prodding, and other times when Congress has needed prodding or intervention from citizens and citizens' organizations. I believe that this national conference, representing as it does every sector of the American community and embracing organizations which can claim to speak for 100 million Americans, constitutes a citizens' intervention in the highest American tradition.

Those of you who have initiated this conference and those of you who have come here to participate in its deliberation will, in my opinion, merit the thanks of coming generations of Americans. This conference, from what I have already seen of it, will unquestionably serve to bring the issue of genocide to life again. And you will, I hope, be able to clear away the intellectual cobwebs that have obscured the issue and encourage the Senate to take the long overdue action of ratification.

What is the Genocide Convention about? In my opinion, there could be no simpler or more fundamental moral issue written into a convenant between the nations of the world.

Essentially, the Convention establishes that genocide is a crime under international law; and it defines genocide as the destruction of a racial ethnic or religious or national group, or part of that group, committed with the specific intent to destroy this group, in whole or in part. It includes the actual killing of members of the group, or causing them serious bodily or mental harm, or deliberately inflicting conditions of life on them calculated to bring about their physical destruction, or forcefully transferring children of the group to another group. It states that these acts are punishable, as well as conspiracy to commit genocide, to direct or publicly incite to commit genocide, or complicity in genocide.

Under article 5 of the Genocide Convention, the contracting parties undertake to enact, in accordance with their respective constitutions, legislation which would give effect to the provisions of the Convention and which would establish penalties for persons guilty of acts of genocide.

It seems to me that nothing could be clearer than this.

For me the Genocide Convention has a special personal meaning because as executive trial counsel at Nuremberg I had spread before me, in nightmarish detail, the whole incredible story of Nazi barbarism, of its fiendish persecution of the Jewish people, and of the gas chamber and crematoriums that snuffed out the lives of more than 5 million Jews and of millions of Ukrainians and Poles and other Europeans.

The convicted Nazis were charged with crimes against humanity. The word "genocide" had not yet come into common usage at that time. But to a very large degree this is what the Nuremberg trial was about. For the first time there was spread on the record of an international tribunal the details of massive crimes involving millions of victims—crimes perpetrated not against individuals but against entire peoples and ethnic groups.

While I was at Nuremberg I learned about other acts of genocide that were not made part of the trial record.

I learned of the mass deportations of the Volga Germans and the Kalmuks and the Chechens and other Soviet minority people during the war years.

I learned the true facts about the massacre in the Katyn Forest of 10,000 Polish officers who had been prisoners of the Soviets.

I learned of the mass deportations of scores of thousands of intellectuals and community leaders from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia in the period following the Soviet occupation.

I learned, in short, that Communist totalitarianism, like Nazi totalitarianism, uses genocide as an instrument of policy, and that the death of nazism did not necessarily mean that we had put an end to the problem of genocide.

Although 67 nations have ratified the Genocide Convention, it has, by and large, remained ineffective and inoperative and without the necessary authority because the United States has thus far refused to add its ratification.

The years that have elapsed have witnessed situations where genocide has unquestionably been perpetrated and other situations where there were strong prima facie evidence of genocide.

In the case of Hungary, the massacre of 25,000 Hungarian freedom fighters by the Red Army and the subsequent mass execution and imprisonment of scores of thousands of Hungarian intellectuals, brought the charge from many quarters that the Soviets were guilty of genocide.

One year later, the Chinese Communists crushed the Tibetan revolution with such ruthless measures that the International Commission of Jurists, in its report on the question of Tibet, made the unequivocal statement that Red China had been guilty of the crime of genocide.

In recent years, we have witnessed in the Soviet Union a systematic campaign against the Jewish minority and the Jewish religion. While there have been no mass killings of Jews, it is clear that the objective of this campaign is the early and total obliteration of the Jewish religion and of Yiddish culture. Is this genocide within the meaning of convention? This is a matter that might have to be decided by some properly constituted authority. But certainly the allegation of genocide in this case merits the most careful consideration.

In each of these instances the conscience of America has been shocked. We have cried out in protest. Our leaders and our spokesmen have described the mass killings, and in some cases, they have even used the term "genocide" in referring to the crimes perpetrated by the Communists in these countries.

But the impact of our protest is weakened and our ability to intervene effectively remains seriously restricted so long as we ourselves have not ratified the Genocide Convention, which makes such acts an international crime.

What is more, I feel that our entire moral position, and our claim to leadership in the fight for freedom and justice and human decency, is prejudiced by our failure to ratify the Genocide Convention and the three other United Nations Conventions dealing respectively with the abolition of all forms of slavery, the abolition of forced labor, and the political rights of women.

What an irony it is that this Nation, which abolished slavery almost 100 years ago, which does not practice genocide at any level of Government, which long ago put an end to forced and indentured labor, and whose women enjoy the broadest political rights, should abstain from ratifying these four basic United Nations documents dealing with the rights of man, while the Communist nations, which are guilty on every score, have ratified all of these Conventions or most of them.

What a false image of the United States our persistent failure to ratify these conventions projects to the world.

Needless to say, the Communists are clever enough to make use of our failure for the purpose of challenging our commitment to freedom and blackening our reputation. Among the newly emerging nations of the world, regrettably, the most widely believed facts about the United States are frequently those purveyed by Radio Moscow or Peiping

For example, in January of 1964, there was a debate in the U.N. Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities. The Soviet member strongly opposed the establishment of international machinery for reporting upon and encouraging the elimination of racial and ethnic discrimination. At every point he was on the defensive. Finally, he decided to go over to the offensive.

The Soviet spokesman suggested that it was rather hypocritical of the American delegate to charge the Soviet Union with resisting the establishment of implementation machinery when "the United States had not ratified the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide or the Convention on Slavery."

The American delegate had to reply in embarrassment that he could only "regret, of course, that my country has not ratified the Convention on Genocide."

I am certain that as this exchange was reported over Radio Moscow and Radio Peiping, primitive peoples around the world were led to believe that the United States was opposed to ratification because it practices slavery and practices genocide.

It is time—high time—that we put an end to this invidious situation.

In the words of our martyred President, John F. Kennedy, "The United States cannot afford to renounce responsibility for support of the very fundamentals which distinguish our concept of government from all forms of tyranny."

There is only one way out of this dilemma. The Senate of the United States must at the earliest opportunity act to ratify the Genocide Convention and the Conventions on Slavery, Forced Labor, and the Political Rights of Women.

I know that some Senators have expressed the opinion that these measures will fail of ratification because we cannot get two-thirds of the Members of the Senate to vote for them. With this point of view I strongly disagree.

This conference has demonstrated in the most dramatic possible manner that the American people, in their overwhelming majority, favor the ratification of the four U.N. conventions dealing with the rights of man. I am confident that, given the necessary leadership, and given a patient exposition of the facts to the Members of the Senate, the Senate will not only ratify these measures, but will do so by a very substantial majority.

And I want to pledge to you that during the months to come I shall make this one of my chief objectives both within the Foreign Relations Committee and within the Senate itself.

There is one final proposal I would like to make. Looking forward to the time when the Genocide Convention has been ratified, I think we must start thinking in terms of practical measures to make it effective.

As the convention now reads, each nation ratifying the convention undertakes to enact legislation to implement the convention, and it also provides that any person charged with commission of an act of genocide should be tried by a court of the state in whose territory the act was committed.

These articles of the convention, in my opinion, constitute the most effective answer to those who charge that ratification of the convention would result in a surrender of our sovereignty to some unnamed and nonexistent international tribunal. But the articles leave something to be desired because it is questionable whether any Communist states can be trusted to prosecute their own nationals for the crime of genocide. And it is also questionable whether any state, Communist or democratic, will, in our lifetime, voluntarily agree to submit matters of such significance to the judgment of an international tribunal. I believe this is so despite the fact that no democratic state has practiced genocide or will practice it.

How then can we give effect to the Genocide Convention?

There is an approach to this problem which would involve no surrender of national jurisdiction, but which would be more effective as a deterrent to genocide than the present provisions of the treaty.

The United Nations has been at its best when it has been a matter of setting up an investigative committee to establish the facts in countries like Greece, or Hungary, or South Africa, or Borneo, or Vietnam. Invariably, these committees have reported objectively and fearlessly.

When the Genocide Convention is ratified, I would like to propose that serious thought be given to establishing a continuing investigative mechanism within the United Nations, under which serious allegations of genocide would lead to the appointment of special committees with the instruction to investigate and report back.

The member nations of the U.N. would be obligated to cooperate with such committees in any investigations conducted on their territory. The committees would have no juridical power, nor would the U.N. itself. But the mere power of investigation—the power to seek out the facts and bring them to public light—would, in my opinion, operate as a powerful deterrent to genocidal crimes and to other violations of human rights.

If the U.N. could be endowed with this responsibility by the consent of its member nations, it would give the world organization new meaning and a new lease on life.

I submit these thoughts for your consideration because I am confident that the Genocide Convention will be ratified, and the time is, therefore, arriving when we must begin to think of next steps.

I wish you Godspeed in your deliberations.

Organizations Represented at National Conference, Ad Hoc Committee on the Human Rights and Genocide Treaties, Washington, D.C., March 1965

All Americans Council.
All Friends Unitarian Church.
American Association of University Women.
American Civil Liberties Union.[1]
American Ethical Union.
American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL–CIO.[1]
American Friends Service Committee.[1]
Americans for Democratic Action.[1]
American Humanist Association.
American Jewish Committee.[1]
American Jewish Congress.[1]
American Library Association.
American Parents Committee.
American Veterans Committee.[1]
B'nai B'rith—Anti-Defamation League.[1]
Catholic Association for International Peace.[1]
Concerned Citizens, Delaware Leadership Council.
Division of Christian Citizenship, Department of Christian Social Relations of the Episcopal Church.[1]
Division of Peace and World Order, General Board of Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church.[1]
Friends Committee on National Legislation.[1]
Georgetown University School of Foreign Service.
Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America.[1]
Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO.[1]
International League for the Rights of Man.
International Rescue Committee.[1]
International Union of Electrical Workers, AFL–CIO.[1]
Jewish Labor Committee.[1]
Jewish War Veterans.[1]
League for Industrial Democracy.[1]
Lutheran Church.
National Community Relations Advisory Council.[1]
National Conference of Christians and Jews.[1]
National Council of Churches.[1]
National Council of Women.
National Organization of Negro Business and Professional Women, Inc.
National Council of Jewish Women.[1]
National Spiritual Assembly of the Bahais of the U.S.A.
National Women's Conference—American Ethical Union.
National Women's League.
Quaker U.N. Program.[1]
Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.[1]
Ukrainian Workingmen's Association.
Union of American Hebrew Congregations.[1]
Unitarian Universalist Association.
United Automobile Workers—AFL–CIO.[1]
United Church of Christ.[1]
United Nations Association.
United Presbyterian Church.
United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO.
United World Federalists.
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.[1]
Workmen's Circle.[1]
World Jewish Congress.
World Veterans Federation.
YWCA—National Board.[1]

SENATOR ROBERT KENNEDY'S SPEECH ON PROBLEMS OF COUNTERINSURGENCY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on July 9, Senator ROBERT KENNEDY made an exceptionally perceptive address to the graduating class of the International Police Academy on meeting the challenge of wars of insurgency. There is altogether too much tendency in this country to believe that these struggles are primarily military in character and can be put down by sufficient application of military force. This is a dangerously oversimplified view of the problem. As Senator KENNEDY of New York correctly pointed out:

---

[1] Ad hoc committee member organizations.

> I think the history of the last 20 years demonstrates beyond doubt that our approach to revolutionary war must be political—political first, political last, political always. Where the needs and grievances of the people begin to be met by the political process, insurgency loses its popular character and becomes a police problem—as it did in Venezuela and Colombia, in the Philippines and Malaya.

I ask unanimous consent to have this significant and well-reasoned address by Senator KENNEDY of New York printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY, INTERNATIONAL POLICE ACADEMY COMMENCEMENT, JULY 9, 1965

It gives me great pleasure to meet once again with a graduating class of the International Police Academy. It is just over a year since I spoke with the first graduating class, and its members have already made their marks in their countries. Colonel Huerta is now a general and Chief of the Carabineros in Chile. Mr. Oryema holds a similar post in Uganda—the first native Ugandan to do so. And the others, from as many countries as are represented here today, have also done brilliantly.

I know you will do the same. You do credit—and will do more credit in the future—to all those who have been involved in your training here: to Mr. David Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development; to Bryon Engle, Director of the Office of Public Safety; to Michael McCann, who has headed your training program. But more than to them or to this country, you are a credit to your countries, to the police forces of which you are members—and, most of all, to yourselves; for your performance in a difficult training program has been outstanding.

Today I would like to speak with you about a problem of common concern to all of us, of central concern to all the world: the question of revolutionary wars, sometimes called "wars of national liberation," or insurgency.

President Kennedy said in 1961, technology has made all-out war highly unlikely because if it comes it means the end of civilization as we know it. And we are faced instead, he said, with "another kind of war—new in its intensity, ancient in its origin—war by guerrillas, subversives, insurgents, assassins, war by ambush instead of by combat; by infiltration instead of aggression, seeking victory by eroding and exhausting the enemy instead of engaging him."

This war has worn many faces.

It has been a war for independence from external domination, as in Algeria and Cyprus and Hungary.

It has been a war for regional or tribal identity, as in Burma or Iraq or in the Naga Hills of India.

And it has been a war for communism, as in Malaya or Venezuela or South Vietnam.

All these wars, of which there have been more than a score since World War II, offer us lessons for the future, for the decades of revolutionary war which are the challenge ahead.

At the moment, our most prominent problem is in Vietnam. We must realize, however, that Vietnam has become more and more an open military conflict as well, in which military action on our part is essential just to allow the Government to act politically.

What I say today is in the hope that the lessons of the last 20 years will be applied in other places—so that we are able to win these wars before they reach the stage of all-out military conflict now apparent in South Vietnam.

I am a citizen of a nation which itself was born in a war for national liberation. It would be against our deepest traditions to oppose any genuine popular revolution. But acts of aggression, masquerading as national revolutions, pose a difficult problem. Revolutionary wars carried on with the outside support of the Soviet Union, or of China, or of others of their allies, offer the greatest threat to the world order of free and independent states to which all nations pledged themselves in the charter of the United Nations.

But if these conflicts are called wars, and have deep international consequences, they are at the same time not wars—and their outcome is determined by internal factors. For their essence is political—a struggle for the control of government, a contest for the allegiance of men. Allegiance is won as in any political contest—by an idea and a faith, by promise and performance. Governments resist such challenges only by being effective and responsive to the needs of their people.

Effective and representative government can, of course, take many forms. What is right for the United States may not be right for your countries, and others would have still other convictions on the precise form government should take—on ownership and control of the means of production, on the distribution of riches and the level of taxation, on the range of domestic and international policy. These questions must always be for each nation and people to decide for itself. So long as their choice is their own, not imposed from outside or by dictatorship of left or right, it must be respected by all others. If we wish to encourage the spread of democracy and freedom, primary reliance must be on the force of our example: on the qualities of the societies we build in our own countries—what we stand for at home and abroad.

In the 1960's, it should not be necessary to repeat that the great struggle of the coming decades is one for the hearts and minds of men. But too often, of late, we have heard instead of the language of gadgets—of force-ratios and oil-blots, techniques and technology—of bombs or grenades which explode with special violence, of guns which shoot around corners, of new uses for helicopters and special vehicles.

Men's allegiance, however, and this kind of war, are not won by superior force, by the might of numbers or by the sophistication of technology. On the tiny island of Cyprus, the British Army had 110 soldiers and policemen for every member of EOKA, which never numbered more than a few hundred terrorists; yet Britain had to surrender control of the island within 5 years after the rebellion began. In the Philippines, by contrast, Ramon Magsaysay had an army of only 50,000 to fight 15,000 Huks who were at the gates of Manila when he took office as Defense Minister. His forces had no special modern armament; yet within 4 years the Huk rebellion was crushed and its leaders had surrendered.

But why are mere numbers, or the possession of advanced weapons, not conclusive? And how can these conflicts be won without such force, or modern technology?

One answer lies in the character of military force itself. Conventional military force—and all our advanced weapons technology—is useful only to destroy. But a government cannot make war on its own people, cannot destroy its own country. To do so is to abandon its reason for existence—its responsibility to its people—and its claim to their allegiance. Suppose, for example, that a government force is fired upon from a village, or that rebels have forced the village to fly the insurgent flag. A government which attacks that village from the air, or with heavy artillery, abandons all pretence of protecting the people of the village—abandons the first duty of any government worthy of the name.

There is another side to this coin. When an insurgent uprising threatened to unseat Jerome Bonaparte, his brother Napoleon told him, "use your bayonets." Jerome replied, "Brother, you can do anything with bayonets—except sit on them." That is still true today.

Guns and bombs cannot build—cannot fill empty stomachs or educate children, cannot build homes or heal the sick. But these are the ends for which men establish and obey governments; they will give their allegiance only to governments which meet these needs.

In the Philippines, for example, Magsaysay pursued the Huks vigorously. But he offered much more than conflict to the people. First, he insured an honest election throughout the country; Gen. Edward Lansdale has said that this election marked the turning point of the war. Second, a thorough land reform was begun; and it was enforced through such devices as special landlord-tenant courts which were held from jeeps so that the judges would be available to peasants in isolated rural areas. There followed many other reforms directed at the welfare of the people.

We all know the necessity for this political dimension to our actions. Too often, however, it is not given the priority it demands, for as we allow the military dimension to become more urgent and insistent. But reform, and the hope it brings, cannot be postponed. For insurgents of the modern variety continually institute at least a facsimile of such reforms in every area they control. In Vietnam, in China, in Cuba, to name but three, Communist insurgents have abolished landlordism, organized adult education classes, established courts, and in all areas they occupied—even in many which they controlled only at night. They have thus entered into direct competition with the established government. When the defenders have ignored reform, the hopes of the people could only center on the insurgents. And when a victorious government army is followed by landlords collecting back rents from the peasants, we should not wonder that the insurgents often attract the allegiance of the peasants. It does little good to warn that the end result of communism will be dictatorship and exploitation; the deeds of today speak most loudly—if not most truly—on whose promises will be kept tomorrow.

A second reason for the inadequacy of military action is that it can give no hope. Force is neutral, it has no program. Every insurgent movement lives not primarily on force, but on a dream—of independence, of justice, of progress, of a better life for one's children. For such dreams men will undergo great hardship and sacrifice—as we have done for our dream, as you have done and are doing for your own. Without a vision of the future to offer, a government can demand no sacrifice, no resistance to insurgent terror or blandishments.

Not only is the military approach deficient in itself. More dangerously, it tends to obscure and prevent essential political action. In conventional war the aim is to kill the enemy. But the essence of successful counterinsurgency is not to kill, but to bring the insurgent back into the national life. In Malaya the British achieved great success by distributing photographs of prisoners—half-starved and ragged when captured, well-fed and smiling after internment. Bonuses were given for arms turned in to the Government, with no questions asked; amnesty was offered to rebels who would surrender. Such devices were carried further in the Philippines; there Huks who surrendered were settled with their families on newly cleared agricultural land of their own. George Marshall once said, "Let's not talk about this matter too much in military terms; to do so might make it a military problem." Too often, we forget that wisdom.

Another central need of counterinsurgency effort is for adherence to fundamental rules of law and fair dealing. It may seem strange to assert that a legal government should bind itself by restrictions, such as the Geneva Convention, in the midst of an assault on its existence. But the government is competing with a rival administration, which often ruthlessly enforces its own rules of fair dealing with the people: no excessive taxation, no stealing (except from the rich), no physical maltreatment (except of those who aid the government). The government must match and overmatch the insurgents in this respect, punishing and rewarding wisely and consistently—as in Malaya, where villages were carefully graded on their help to the rebels, and food and equipment were distributed accordingly. Such a precise system of rewards and penalties is characteristic of civilian and political action—not of military force.

Actions such as these are necessary to success. But they are not the kind of measures which follow from thinking of insurgency as conventional war: rather they assume that the insurgents are fellow citizens who can be and should be returned to the political process. President Kennedy once said that the peace we must seek is "not the peace of the grave or the security of the slave, [but] genuine peace, the kind of peace that makes life on earth worth living, the kind that enables men and nations to grow and to hope and to build a better life for their children." That is what we must offer insurgents as well.

It is sometimes said that political methods are ineffective against terrorists—as in Vietnam, where the Vietcong have cruelly assassinated over 16,000 local officials. But even the use of terror is limited by political considerations—and can be sharply limited by political action. Surely it is significant that unprotected Americans of the International Volunteer Service—who work for the direct benefit of the people—have not been molested even in the Vietcong areas, and that of several thousand AID officials who have served in the countryside there, less than a dozen have been harmed. Similarly, terrorist action in the last Venezuelan election failed because public reaction was unfavorable; and it was abandoned.

It has also been said that an insurgency cannot be put down as long as it is supplied from, and can seek sanctuary in, a neighboring country. No matter what assistance they receive from outside, however, insurgents stand or fall on their political success. Without popular support, they become conventional invaders—and can be dealt with by conventional means.

I think the history of the last 20 years demonstrates beyond doubt that our approach to revolutionary war must be political—political first, political last, political always. Where the needs and grievances of the people begin to be met by the political process, insurgency loses its popular character and becomes a police problem—as it did in Venezuela and Colombia, in the Philippines and Malaya.

Military force of varying intensity will undoubtedly be a major component of a revolutionary war. I would like, in this connection, to make an important distinction. Just as mere military force cannot win political victories, so military aggression cannot be defeated by solely political means. If guerillas are infiltrated into a country from outside, that aggression, like any invasion, must be met by armed force of sufficient power to defeat it. Where the threat is partly political and partly military, it must be met on both fronts at once. Each threat is unique—each country is different—and aggression takes many forms. Each threat must be met on its own grounds, with a response measured to its scope. To meet the political threat of revolutionary war, then, what are the essential forms of political action?

At the outset must be restated the need for effective and responsible government. Especially is this true in the rural areas in which live from 75 to 90 percent of the people of the developing nations. John Mecklin, formerly the Public Affairs Officer in Saigon, has told of a Vietnamese village which freely gave its allegiance to the Vietcong. For hundreds of years, the women of the village had had to circle around a rich man's land to reach the only village well. The Vietcong cut a path across this land—and in that simple fashion made a major change in village life. No money was required—no elaborate equipment—simply a sensitivity to the village need, and the will to meet that need.

Most important, we must impart hope—hope for progress, fulfilled as quickly as circumstances permit. In many countries, land reform is the essential need of the vast majority of the people; it must receive central priority. Education is always vital—not just for the cities, not even only for children; but for every peasant who can learn to read, or drive a tractor, or even use a hoe instead of a forked stick.

For what we must build, after all, is a nation—a nation in which, as in the scriptures, "Your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions. And where there is no vision, life shall perish from the earth."

We must also build all the other structures that help to make up a stable society—such as labor unions, and farmer cooperatives for those who work with their hands and their backs: student groups for the nation's new emerging leaders; political parties to give all men a voice in the councils of government. The political coloration of these groups is less important than the fact of their existence; simply by being organized, by being there, they add stability and permanence. Thus the British in Malaya did not attempt to break up the Communist labor union movement, so long as it did not engage in active subversion.

Moreover, these groups can be a great force for reform, progress—and action. The truce in the Bolivian tin miners' strike, for example, was arranged by two student leaders. Major social-action programs in rural Peru are being undertaken by students from the cities, as are similar programs in India. These student activities are especially important because as much as one-half the population of the nations concerned is under the age of 25, and the young are often the progressive and dynamic leaders. Magsaysay, Mboys, Nyrere, Belaunde—and Castro and Nkrumah as well—were leaders of national stature in their thirties. These young men must have the scope to act within the society—or else they may turn to action outside the established order.

And then there is your role—the role of the police. Everything I have said thus far—every consideration of political action—depends in large part on you. For if pure military force is not to dominate the scene, you must be the major element in the keeping of order. In your hands will rest the responsibility for security against terrorism. On your shoulders will be the burden of deciding what activity is dangerous agitation and what is healthy reform. For many, perhaps thousands of people, you will represent the government—you will be the government. If you do justice, you will build a just and stable order. If you act to improve the lives of your people—with a schoolhouse or a small bridge, a road to market or a shorter path to the well—then your government will be effective and responsive. We have been talking of political action—and the words "political" and "police" come from the same root, "polls"—the community and its people.

In your great task, we must work together. We can help you build a road for defense and administration, as in northeast Thailand. We can help you dig wells and bring electricity and—as in this course—work with you for improvement of your police capabilities as well. What we cannot do—what only you can do—is bring to your people the leadership and the hope and the understanding they need if your countries are to succeed. Our acts, no matter how intelligent or well meant, are from the outside. It is your actions that will make a society.

But one last word of caution: no less than military action, political action in an unjust cause is lost. It is not enough to stand for anticommunism—or for stability—or for order. We all have a responsibility to stand with the people for justice, for understanding, for progress. If we meet that obligation, we need have no fear for the future, no worry over wars of revolution. I think you will meet that obligation—that you will have the fortitude and wisdom and patience to "bear the burden," as President Kennedy said, of the "long twilight struggle, year in and year out, 'rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation' "—and I am proud, as much as I can, to share that burden with you.

THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this week, a conference was held in Washington, sponsored by the Associated General Contractors of America, to mark the nearing of the halfway point in the building of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. I have the privilege of serving on the Senate Public Works Committee, as the ranking Republican member of the full committee, and of the Subcommittee on Roads, which has original jurisdiction of legislation authorizing the Interstate System and our Federal-aid highway programs. As with any undertaking having the importance, size and cost that this system does, many complex problems remain to be solved before the system will be completed. The Congress has required its financing on a pay-as-you-go basis, and the establishment of a separate trust fund, and I believe these requirements will be maintained. State and local governments, the private sector of our economy, as well as the Members of the House and the Senate, have given every support to the objectives set by the Congress. The New York Times of Monday, July 19, 1965, carried an article by David R. Jones. It is a good summary of the system's progress to date, and the problems ahead. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFERENCE TO ASSAY PROGRESS ON $46.8 BILLION HIGHWAY PROJECT — CONSTRUCTION NEARS MIDPOINT IN DRIVE FOR 16-YEAR GOAL

(By David R. Jones)

WASHINGTON, July 18.—More than 250 of the Nation's leading highway proponents, ranging from Congressmen and State officials to contractors and their suppliers, will gather here tomorrow for a 2-day conference to celebrate the nearing of the "halfway point" in the contraction of the $46.8 billion National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

There is good reason to celebrate the interstate road program, which has been described as history's biggest public works project.

The Federal aid program has unsnarled considerable automobile traffic, has enhanced the influence of its proponents, and has poured over $10 billion into the pockets of contractors since it began in 1956.

This week's celebration, called by the Associated General Contractors of America, is manned by the fact that the 41,000-mile Interstate System is not half completed, even though 9 years of the 16 year plan have passed.

Highway authorities are increasingly coming to the conclusion that the program will miss its 1972 deadline, perhaps by 3 or 4 years.

COST OF DELAY

Each year the program costs the public over $3 billion a year in State and Federal taxes. Any delay would mean an extension and possible increase in that tax load.

Also, some economists expect the roads to have as great an impact on the Nation as the railroad building boom of the 19th century.

The status of the Interstate System is particularly pertinent right now because the Johnson administration is seeking congressional approval for increased truck taxes and a 5-month stretchout of the tax period to help finance a $5.8 billion cost rise.

However, key members of the House Ways and Means Committee have shown a decided lack of enthusiasm about the prospect. Many have voiced doubt that the committee will act on the legislation before 1966. This would delay the program.

The powerful road lobby is already planning to convince Congress to continue Federal aid to highway building and to maintain related taxes at least at the present level—and possibly higher—through 1985.

This is coming at a time when there is increasing talk here that the Johnson administration is groping for a unified transportation policy, which could conflict somewhat with the road lobby's interests.

PLAGUED FROM THE OUTSET

The Interstate System has been plagued from the outset by political bickering and corruption in several States. Federal investigators may disclose more evidence of scandal early in 1966.

The problem the system faces at the moment is keeping on schedule, particularly in face of mounting criticism from the public in urban areas where new roads are upsetting neighborhood patterns.

The interstate program was begun in mid-1956 to improve transportation, aid defense readiness, and buoy the economy.

By the time the vast project is completed, contractors will have excavated enough material to cover Connecticut knee deep in dirt. Enough concrete will have been poured to build six sidewalks to the moon.

The Bureau of Public Roads supervises the program, with private contractors doing the work under direction of State highway departments. The Federal Government pays 90 percent of the cost, and the States pay the remaining 10 percent.

SCOPE OF PROJECT

The road complex will link 90 percent of U.S. cities having 50,000 or more population with wide ribbons of limited-access highway, thereby sharply reducing travel time.

The Bureau estimates that the completed system will save 8,000 lives and $11 billion in travel costs annually, and will carry nearly 25 percent of all highway traffic on less than 1.5 percent of the Nation's road and street mileage.

The Interstate System was originally expected to cost $27.6 billion. But that estimate has risen steadily to the present $46.8 billion figure, and most experts expect the bill to run at least $3 billion higher before it is completed.

The Federal share is financed by the highway trust fund, which pays for the program on a pay-as-you-go basis from a batch of highway user taxes due to expire October 1, 1972.

This infusion of Federal funds into the Interstate System has raised total spending for highways and streets in the United States above $14 billion a year, from $9 billion in 1957. The total is expected to rise to $18 billion by the 1970's.

UNEVEN DEVELOPMENT

Work appears to have been moving along at an impressive pace, mainly because ambitious States have moved aggressively ahead of normal schedules and consumed appropriations left unclaimed by laggard States.

Also, much of the work done to date has been concentrated in rural areas, where costs are lower and the building is faster.

The ability to divert money from laggard States to ambitious ones is being diminished as the latter States near completion of their programs.

Much work remains to be done in the urban areas, which will consume nearly half of the program's money and present more of a building obstacle. Militant antiroad groups have snarled progress in several key cities.

Rex M. Whitton, the Federal Highway Administrator, says the interstate program is "substantially" on schedule and will be completed by its 1972 deadline. But he adds that he is "not naive enough to think there may not be a mile or two uncompleted in 1972 in some urban area."

The bureau estimates that about 19,470 miles, or nearly 48 percent of the 41,000-mile system, was open to traffic at June 30. This seems close to the halfway mark, but it includes over 5,200 miles of toll roads and other highways that for the most part do not meet present interstate standards.

This means that only about one-third of the mileage has been completed to full and acceptable standards in 9 years.

TASKS TO BE COMPLETED

The interstate mileage completed to full standard has averaged less than 2,500 miles annually since 1956. There remain 26,600 miles to finish to full standards by 1972.

The completion rate for the next 7 years would have to run 50 percent faster to hit the 1972 goal.

Most highway experts doubt this can be done because much of the work that remains in such troublesome urban areas as New York, San Francisco, Baltimore, and Washington, D.C.

Less than 15 percent of the interstate mileage will lie in urban areas, but these roads will carry 41 percent of the system's traffic and represent 47 percent of its cost.

One bureau official estimates it will take more than 5 years to build some urban highways after locations have been fixed.

Edward H. Holmes, the Bureau's Director of Planning, says he expects more rural sections and circumferential highways around major cities to be completed by 1972. He suggests it would be wrong to consider the system unfinished merely because some roads through the hearts of these cities had not been completed.

But Lowell K. Bridwell, Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, disputes this.

"You build a highway system to meet the traffic requirements, and half of the national traffic requirements are in the urban areas," he says. "So merely supplying a superior highway facility to the edge of the city does not, in my opinion, meet the requirements of most of the people using the system."

Bureau officials report that, on average, the States have already obligated an average of 41 percent of their interstate highway funds for fiscal 1966, which began last July 1.

The figure is buoyed by several States—such as Texas, Florida, Missouri, Connecticut, Oregon, Ohio, and New York—which have actively pursued their goals.

But about 13 States are lagging in obligations, with New Jersey having obligated only 4 percent of fiscal 1965 funds, and Maryland, only 52 percent of fiscal 1964 funds.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962 made it mandatory for cities seeking Federal highway money after the start of this month to have a comprehensive transportation planning process assuring cooperation between State and local interests. Fifteen cities covered by the Interstate System have not yet complied.

Mr. Holmes says that where an interstate road needs only a bridge or small connection for completion, the bureau will provide aid even though there is no planning process.

ROADBLOCKS FOR STATES

But he predicts significant delays, and perhaps complete suspension of interstate road money, for any city that seeks new funds without such a plan. Those cities affected include New York, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Omaha, Shreveport, and San Francisco.

The Bureau has estimated that the program will cost $5.8 billion more than the $41 billion previously forecast. Increased revenues will bring in an added $2 billion to the trust fund through 1972, the Bureau says, but an additional $3 billion in Federal money is needed to meet increased costs.

Because Interstate System costs are already outstripping revenues, the quarterly apportionment set by the Bureau for the States last August was not released until last month, 3 months behind schedule.

Should the House Ways and Means Committee fail to enact legislation increasing taxes for the program until 1966, another 3-month delay in appropriations could result. This is slowing work in some of the more advanced States.

The House committee, which may hold hearings on the matter later this month, is reported reluctant to raise truck taxes.

Highway sources report that the committee might propose a patchwork tax program, including an extension of the tax period and use of 1 percent of the automobile excise tax to finance the added costs.

STRETCHOUT OF PROGRAM

Alfred E. Johnson, executive secretary of the American Association of State Highway Officials, estimates that failure to obtain the $3 billion in added money would amount to a 1-year program stretchout.

The prospect of a stretched out interstate program does not appeal to State highway officials and contractors, who would face layoffs and reduced operations. They want to keep the project going full blast, and to follow it up with another massive road program.

Most experts agree future spending should be concentrated in urban areas. There is also considerable sentiment for standardizing the Federal share of Federal-aid highway projects at around 65 to 70 percent of costs.

The Government's share of federally aided road programs normally was 50 percent before the interstate project, and the Government continues to spend only 50 percent on most of its noninterstate road programs.

JOHNSON APPROACH

There are serious misgivings within the Johnson administration, however, about the propriety of this approach to determining transportation needs. Some transportation experts within the administration favor a comprehensive study of the proper balance of funds that should go into all modes of transportation.

Most transportation experts here believe that Alan S. Boyd, named last month as Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, has been given a mandate by President Johnson to put transportation spending on a more rational basis.

Such a move, in the view of most economists, would include cost-benefit studies, which weigh spending against the value derived from it.

"I can assure you that we're going to build roads on the basis of cost-benefit studies, which I hope will be the logical and rational approach to it," Mr. Boyd has stated.

Most sources believe President Johnson to be an ardent Interstate System supporter. They doubt that he would shape any policy to bring about a sharp dispute with the strong petroleum, automobile, trucking, and construction interests in the road lobby.

VIETNAM—THE IMPORTANCE OF MAINTAINING A LARGE AND READY MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, recent difficulties involving the shipment of vital war material to Vietnam have pointed up, once again, the importance to our national security of maintaining a large and ready merchant marine.

Last week the Department of Defense embarked upon a program of reactivating vessels from the U.S. Reserve Fleet. These reactivated vessels will be used to transport defense cargo to southeast Asia.

This emergency action contains several lessons for those concerned with maritime policy. First, some of the shipyards contacted about the work necessary to reactivate the older ships have reported that, due to the decline in the industry, skilled workers are simply not available. As a result, the reactivation of these vessels might be delayed. The necessity of maintaining a strong shipbuilding industry could hardly be more dramatically illustrated.

Second, newspaper reports indicate a shortage of qualified engineers to man these ships. It is apparent that a fleet which has fewer and fewer vessels under American flags will find difficulty in retaining a sufficient number of qualified seamen. This is precisely the situation in the American fleet.

The U.S. merchant marine numbered over 2,300 vessels at the end of the Second World War. It ranked as the world's leading maritime power. Today, the fleet has shrunk to barely 900 vessels. This country ranks fourth in the free world—and may soon be surpassed by the Soviet Union as well. Employment of seamen on American-flag vessels has fallen by 25,000 in the past 10 years. This decline in the U.S. fleet contributes to the American balance-of-payments problem and works to the detriment of the 100,000 workers in the maritime industry. What is of greater urgency at the moment, however, is the fact that the shipping and shipbuilding capacity of the United States has declined to the point where it adversely affects our national security. In a world which will very likely see an increasing need for the sea transportation of military goods to combat Communist aggression, we must maintain a merchant marine equal to the task.

A very perceptive article dealing with this disturbing situation appears in this week's America magazine. The author points out that American shipping requirements during the Korean war called for some 600 carrier vessels. Given the present state of American shipping, it is inconceivable that similar requirements could be filled by the U.S. fleet today. As a result, we find ourselves faced with the necessity of shipping vital military carge on foreign-flag vessels. Such a situation is obviously undesirable from a national security point of view; yet, the present sad state of our maritime industry leaves us no alternative.

I submit, Mr. President, that these recent events are but another indication of the aimless drift which seems to characterize our present merchant marine policy, a policy which—unless it is changed—may cause serious disruptions to our military efforts in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from America to which I referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEAK SPOTS IN OUR DEFENSES

(By Rear Adm. John D. Hayes)

(Since Korea, our country's share of world shipbuilding has dwindled to a mere 5 percent and 85 percent of our merchant ships are now over 20 years old. Perhaps, the author suggests, the struggle in Vietnam is going to bring us a nasty moment of truth.)

At the opening of the Korean hostilities, the U.S. merchant marine, although its ebb had already set in, was still the greatest the world had known. Its quiet, effective service made that war appear logistically easy and gave rise to the dangerous assumption that the United States would have little trouble conducting limited wars overseas. Today, it is difficult to see how the residue of that once great fleet can properly support our present commitment in Vietnam—soon to be 100,000 troops, the South Vietnamese forces and an enlarged 7th Fleet.

If military operations in Vietnam are allowed to expand even to the extent of the Korean war, we must be ready to accept severe and lasting strains in our economy and foreign relations. For we do not have now, as we had in the similar situation in 1950, the merchant shipping under our own flag to carry on a major overseas campaign.

A few figures are sufficient to describe the changed situation. In 1950, the United States had 3 400 relatively new merchant ships. Half of these were then in active service, carrying our domestic and 40 percent of our foreign trade, plus Marshall plan aid and much needed coal for Europe. Today, American flag merchantmen are carrying only 9 percent of the country's seaborne trade. In 1950, U.S. tankers were bringing in 53 percent of our petroleum imports; they haul only 5 percent today.

The anomaly is that the United States still has the world's largest merchant marine. Of the ships that compose it, however, 85 percent are now 20 years old; they are slow and unfit for military operations. The only section of U.S.-flag shipping in any state of health is the subsidized liner fleet composed of about 300 ships built since World War II. But if these ships are withdrawn from their present established routes for military purposes, maritime countries will eagerly move in to capture this last vestige of our foreign trade still under the U.S. flag.

It was the Marshall plan, beginning in 1948, that revived the ancient craft of shipbuilding in Europe, and the Korean war proved to be another Marshall plan, in this regard, for Japan. Shipbuilding in the United States, however, was not correspondingly stimulated. The Suez crisis, too, stimulated shipbuilding but little in the United States. As a result, the average age of the fleets of the maritime nations is around 10 years. Today, only 5 percent of world shipbuilding is being done in the United States.

While the American people and the U.S. naval profession allowed the U.S. merchant marine to decay, world seaborne trade has been increasing. Since 1951 it has doubled; indeed, the movement by sea of petroleum—the lifeblood of modern industrial economy and of modern war—has tripled. Much is heard these days about air movement of troops, and this form of military transport is bound to increase. But the giant jet aircraft that will do this work are insatiable consumers of fuel, which must be transported overseas to their terminals. Airlift, instead of easing the shipping problem, will augment it in the area where we are most vulnerable, the tanker fleet.

How much shipping will be needed for support of our Vietnam commitment? I suspect that Pentagon planners do not know. In view of the successful support of the Korean war, the present demands appear easy to meet; but logistics for the affluent U.S. Armed Forces have a way of ballooning. The tonnage required for Korea in 1952 equaled that for the entire Pacific operations of the last year of World War II. It is not unrealistic to expect that the tonnage required for Vietnam will reach the Korean figure.

To support 500,000 men in Korea, half of them Americans, a daily supply of 20,000 tons of dry cargo and 125,000 barrels of petroleum products (full loads for 2 standard dry cargo ships and 1 tanker) had to be transported across 6,000 miles of ocean. For this, 350 ships were needed in the trans-Pacific supply line, as well as 250 more in the Western Pacific for troop movements and support from Japan.

Where are ships in such numbers to come from, today? Neither our mothball nor subsidized fleets can provide them. They must therefore come from the same source that is carrying our normal seaborne trade, namely foreign-flag ships of the traditional maritime nations and the American owned flag-of-convenience fleet.

To envision how grave this military predicament is, the lay reader may imagine the United States turning over responsibility for ground, naval or air defense to a foreign country without even protection of treaties or compacts. Because we have to depend on chartered foreign shipping to support our military operations, we have lost our freedom of action to control and use the seas in the cold war. Without such control, we have no seapower, despite a Navy that includes a nuclear carrier and Polaris missile submarines.

Columnist Raymond Moley (Newsweek, May 17, p. 112) calls attention to the fact that while our military policy in southeast Asia is now more in tune with geography and reality, we are nevertheless still not using the most effective tool against North Vietnam—a blockade. Any small-scale map will reveal that the only way for sizable shipments of arms to reach that country is by sea, and Moley mentions 201 ships entering the ports in 1964. In my opinion, the reason we are not blockading is simply the likelihood of protests from our friends, who must make their living from the sea and who oppose restrictions of any sort on seaborne traffic. The open reluctance of the British to join in an economic blockade of Cuba should be fresh in American minds.

There remains to us, then, the American-owned flag-of-convenience fleet (whose bulk cargo types could possibly fill our petroleum needs for Vietnam, though not our dry cargo needs). A Panamanian or Liberian flag flying from the stern of a giant modern tanker or ore carrier is a common sight in U.S. ports. Chances are one in four that such a ship, manned by a foreign crew, is American owned. Although she is a contribution to our economy that is not costing the American taxpayer one dollar, she is not legally a U.S. vessel.

In the case of a flag-of-convenience ship, a citizen of one state uses the nationality of another state for private purposes. The seas are free for all to use, but international law requires that a ship, like a person, have nationality. Some small states choose to use their rights to the sea to gain revenue by allowing shipowners of other countries to register under their flag. The shipowners thereby avoid their own country's restrictive maritime laws, high taxes and labor costs. Prime users of the flag of convenience are American oil, steel and aluminum companies. This legal expedient, however, is not popular with traditional maritime countries nor with U.S. seafaring unions.

The concern of Americans generally should be whether the availability of such ships under flags of convenience is certain in any national emergency. Agreements for their return to the U.S. flag have been made with the owners, though only tacitly with the countries of present registry. By virtue of these agreements, the Navy Department and Maritime Administration claim they have effective control over these ships, but there are some Members of Congress who doubt this. The right of transfer of flag between belligerent and neutral has never been definitely settled in international law, and our relations are not good with one flag-of-convenience country, Panama. Our need for foreign shipping to support the Vietnam operation could give the European maritime countries a lever for checking this American practice.

Finally, the Soviet Union has both a large submarine force and a growing merchant marine, which in a decade may be among the world's largest. With its increased interest in maritime law, it may be expected to be heard from in the not too distant future on the touchy subject of the flag of convenience.

The threat to our commitment in Vietnam portends a far more ominous danger: a decline in U.S. seapower. Unless steps are soon taken to improve our alarming maritime position, the United States might well become a second-rate or third-rate power early in the 21st century. For a historical analogy, we need only remember Spain in the 17th century after her greatness in the previous one, and what has happened to Great Britain in little more than a generation.

The American economy now devours 50 percent of the world's raw materials. Until World War II, most of what the Nation required was found within our own borders, but 60 years of accelerating economic progress and two world wars have levied a severe drain on our forests and minerals. By 1980, the United States may be one of the world's poorest nations in high-grade ores. Our country, which too many Americans still think of as a rich heartland, is in fact fast becoming an industrial island, depending increasingly on imports from overseas and forced to compete with other areas demanding a larger share of the earth's resources.

Our seaborne trade is made up of two separate and unlike segments: importing of raw materials and exporting of processed goods. The import segment is by far the more important, for it is part of our basic industries and essential to our economic life. The bulk-carrier ships that bring these vital necessities to our shores are almost all under foreign flags. The largest and most automated ships being built in foreign yards are of this type, but a bulk-ore carrier has not been built in a U.S. shipyard in 20 years. Our laws require that a ship, to fly the American flag, must be built in the United States.

American sea communications are vulnerable in another area, or what is sometimes called noncontiguous shipping. The new State of Hawaii is overseas, and so is populous Puerto Rico. Alaska is virtually so. These outlying areas are just as much parts of the United States as Virginia and Iowa, but unlike the latter they must depend on overseas shipments for their necessities of life. The sealanes to them are exposed not only to the submarine but also to the perhaps more dangerous long-range, jet-powered, rocket-armed, land-based aircraft. Should the sealanes to the State of Hawaii be cut, those islands would be on short rations within a month.

Americans are not a sea-minded people, and these facts of life do not disturb them. When we think of our merchant marine at all, it is with a feeling of annoyance at its apparently insoluble troubles. Our national character has not been formed by the sea around us, and so we do not know what it offers, what it can deny, what must be forced from it. Even our statesmen give evidence of not comprehending seapower and the Nation's need for it, and the U.S. naval profession has not tried very hard to make it understandable.

A shipping crisis over Vietnam would be a blessing in disguise; for only a near disaster will expose and dramatize the Achilles' heel of American greatness, and awaken the American people to the imminent peril that want of a fourth arm of defense poses to their national security and way of life. A sensational disclosure of our inability to conduct military operations in southeast Asia without the aid of foreign ships may goad Congress into action.

TRIBUTE TO G. MENNEN WILLIAMS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Gov. G. Mennen Williams of Michigan, was one of the best appointments made by President Kennedy, following his election in 1960. As Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Governor Williams has done a fine job of intelligently interpreting African interests. He has gained wide respect among responsible leaders in Africa, just as he has always enjoyed that respect in his own country. On July 20, a biographical sketch of Governor Williams appeared in the New York Times. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFORMAL DIPLOMAT: GERHARD MENNEN WILLIAMS

WASHINGTON, July 19.—Late in 1960, when Gerhard Mennen Williams was preparing to leave the Governor's office in Lansing, Mich., to take up his new duties as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, newspapermen in the capital composed a little farewell ditty that began:

> "Far across the ocean blue,
> Kasavubu waits for you,
> Bye, bye, Soapy."

Today it became known through friends that after 4½ years of dealing with the problems of Congo President Joseph Kasavubu and other African leaders, Mr. Williams is thinking of turning back across the ocean blue to Lansing and a possible return to Michigan politics.

It was no surprise to anyone who knew the 56-year-old crewcut former Governor. His love for Michigan politics is as strong and enduring as his addiction to the polka-dotted green bow tie that is his personal trademark.

STAID ATMOSPHERE

Indeed, to many it had seemed that Mr. Williams carried the habits and customs of his political career into the normally more staid atmosphere of Foggy Bottom.

It was not just a matter of his wearing the polka-dot bow tie to even the most formal diplomatic affairs. It was also his serving as caller for a rollicking square dance for African diplomats in Washington—the same kind of square dance at which he would delight the Grange wives in Michigan.

On his frequent swings through Africa, he would shake hands, pose for photos, and exchange souvenirs with everyone from the prime minister to the women pumping water at the village well.

He crammed his office in the State Department's executive wing with so many treasures of his African tours that it began to resemble a corner of the Museum of African Art. It was all an expression of the enthusiasm and empathy that made Mr. Williams the unbeatable champion of Michigan politics from his first race in 1948 until his voluntary retirement in 1960.

Mr. Williams also carried into his diplomatic post the capacity for long hours of dogged study and effort he had displayed as Governor. State Department career men who were skeptical at first of his talents came gradually to admire his relentless pursuit of American policy goals on the turbulent continent.

His introduction to the new job was rough. He stirred a political storm on his first trip to Africa in 1961 with a remark about believing in "Africa for the Africans." On his second journey, he was hit in the jaw by a white resident of Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia.

But in the long Congo crisis and in subsequent African problems, Mr. Williams proved his capacity and his staying power. President Johnson commissioned him to draft a blueprint for long-term American policy in Africa last spring, and took occasion to express his personal confidence in the man who had strongly opposed his selection as Vice President in 1960.

Through all this period of immersion in African affairs, Mr. Williams has never lost touch with Michigan politics. He could be seen—all 6 feet 3 inches, 235 pounds of him—carrying a Johnson banner as a member of the Michigan delegation on the floor of the Democratic National Convention in Atlantic City last August. For most of the last 2 months of the campaign, he was back in Michigan, plugging steadily in union halls and township meetings for the Democratic ticket.

G. Mennen Williams was born February 23, 1911, in Detroit, a grandson of the Gerhard Mennen who founded the soap and toiletries concern. Inevitably, he acquired the nickname, "Soapy."

HAS PHI BETA KAPPA KEY

He graduated with a Phi Beta Kappa key from Princeton University in 1933, where he was president of the Young Republican Club, and 3 years later completed law studies at the University of Michigan. Frank Murphy, the Democratic Governor of Michigan, made him assistant attorney general and, incidentally, converted him to the Democratic Party.

After wartime service in the Navy, Mr. Williams returned to Michigan and was appointed to the State liquor board by Republican Gov. Kim Sigler. A year later, in 1948, he defeated Mr. Sigler in a major upset and began his record tenancy in the governorship—12 years.

Mr. Williams and his wife, the former Nancy Lace Quirk, have year-round homes in Georgetown and Grosse Pointe, a suburb of Detroit, and a summer residence on Mackinac Island.

Their son, G. Mennen, Jr., known as Gary, lives with his wife and son, G. Mennen 3d, in Detroit. Their elder daughter, Nancy, graduated from Smith College in June and their younger daughter, Wendy, is entering the University of Michigan this fall.

ALASKA IS PROUD

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, last week it was my privilege to meet two brave men, Alexander Galanin and Alexay Merculief. These two men received the valor award of the Department of the Interior and the medal was presented to them by Secretary Udall himself.

At great personal risk and with extraordinary skill these men rescued two persons trapped by a rising tide under perilous cliffs on the coast of St. George Island in the Bering Sea. These men are Alaskans, citizens from the Pribilof Islands. Alaska is proud of them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary's citations for these two awards may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the citations were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Citation for Valor Award to Alexander Galanin for Courageous Action Involving a High Degree of Personal Risk in the Face of Danger

On the afternoon of March 31, 1963, Alexander Galanin and Alexay Merculief, employees on St. George Island on the special Government Pribilof Reservation, participated in a group volunteer search-and-rescue effort on behalf of two men hopelessly trapped beneath sea cliffs on the Bering Sea coast. Escape routes were blocked by perpendicular lava cliffs; coldness of the water, below 40° F., made distance swimming in ocean swells impossible; unstable, crumbling rock precluded attempt at rope-lift up the 300-foot sheer wall. Spring storms are unpredictable, sudden, violent, and snow laden. Surf builds up in an hour or two that makes the narrow beach inaccessible for days, and would expose the stranded men to wetting and temperatures they might not survive. After the lost pair were located, haste was imperative in removing them. Mr. Galanin and Mr. Merculief ran their personal outboard motorboat 3 miles down the coast from the nearest launching site and attempted to run ashore between increasing 6-foot swells. The maneuver failed—boat and motor swamped. Drowning or injury threatened, but skill of the boatmen avoided all but a soaking. Landing having been proven impossible, the rescue was finally accomplished by removing the motor and drifting the skiff into the surf on a line from a launch which had arrived later and lay offshore. The considered risk of this selfless adventure was undertaken on Sunday outside the line of Mr. Galanin's duty and using his personal equipment. In tribute to his courage, the Department of the Interior proudly confers upon Mr. Galanin its Valor Award.

Stewart L. Udall,
Secretary of the Interior.

Citation for Valor Award to Alexay Merculief for Courageous Action Involving a High Degree of Personal Risk in the Face of Danger

On the afternoon of March 31, 1963, Alexay Merculief and Alexander Galanin, employees on St. George Island on the special Government Pribilof Reservation, participated in a group volunteer search-and-rescue effort on behalf of two men hopelessly trapped beneath sea cliffs on the Bering Sea coast. Escape routes were blocked by perpendicular lava cliffs; coldness of the water, below 40° F., made distance swimming in ocean swells impossible; unstable, crumbling rock precluded attempt at rope-lift up the 300-foot sheer wall. Spring storms are unpredictable, sudden, violent, and snow laden. Surf builds up in an hour or two that makes the narrow beach inaccessible for days, and would expose the stranded men to wetting and temperatures they might not survive. After the lost pair were located, haste was imperative in removing them. Mr. Merculief and Mr. Galanin ran their personal outboard motorboat 3 miles down the coast from the nearest launching site and attempted to run ashore between increasing 6-foot swells. The maneuver failed—boat and motor swamped. Drowning or injury threatened, but skill of the boatmen avoided all but a soaking. Landing having been proven impossible, the rescue was finally accomplished by removing the motor and drifting the skiff into the surf on a line from a launch which had arrived later and lay offshore. The considered risk of this selfless adventure was undertaken on Sunday outside the line of Mr. Merculief's duty and using his personal equipment. In tribute to his courage, the Department of the Interior proudly confers upon Mr. Merculief its Valor Award.

Stewart L. Udall,
Secretary of the Interior.

ELECTORAL REFORMS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, as a result of the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decisions in Baker against Carr and Wesberry against Sanders, litigants across the country are now preparing to take to the Supreme Court further lawsuits to redress grievances connected with the franchise.

As recounted in a Washington Post editorial of July 2, 1965, many of these suits seek to test the constitutionality of the "winner-take-all" system of counting electoral votes.

If I have had doubts about the wisdom of the Supreme Court having plunged us into the political thicket of legislative reapportionment, I have none at all about the necessity for correcting deficiencies and archaic customs prevalent in our electoral system.

But, Mr. President, as one who has sought to enact such reform since I served in the House of Representatives, I sincerely believe the initiative for such reform should be taken by the legislative branch of Government.

For only when legislators act can doubts be dispelled about the intent and depth of the corrective action to be taken. Therefore, we should begin now to vote out a constitutional amendment containing comprehensive reforms in the national election process which will insure to all voters the right not only to select a President and Vice President by direct primary, but to have those votes counted for the candidate of their choice in the general election.

Accordingly, I have reintroduced in the 89th Congress a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to effect reform in several areas of a system riddled with loopholes and inequities. It is identical in two respects with a proposal I laid before the 88th Congress and similar to bills which I have introduced since July 27, 1948, when I was a Member of the House.

The first provision of the resolution calls for a nationwide primary to select presidential and vice-presidential candidates, thus ending that quadrennial madhouse known as the national convention.

The second would abolish the electoral college and establish in its place a process by which the electoral votes of every State would be divided among the candidates, based on the percentage of popular vote received by each in the general election.

Originally my proposal also dealt with the subject of presidential disability and succession, but because the Congress in its wisdom has at long last adopted and sent to the States for ratification an amendment dealing with this vital issue, I intend to modify by resolution in accordance with this action.

When the Senate voted on July 6 to adopt the conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 1, it set in motion a reform that regretfully was given new meaning by the tragic assassination of our beloved President Kennedy.

The Congress well knew of the woeful gap in our laws in the event of presidential inability. For 14 long months after President Kennedy's death we were without a Vice President. The specter of presidential inability during those months came home to all of us.

As a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 1, I strongly believe that we have acted in a timely way to clear up this question. There is no doubt in my mind that the language of the conference report covers the question of presidential inability as well as can be done within the limits of the English language.

Having so acted, I believe it is equally imperative to turn to the other longstanding deficiencies in our electoral system which I have heretofore enumerated.

Mr. President, I am not one of those who would rush to the Constitution with another shirttail amendment on every issue. But the question of electoral reforms relates directly to the action of the Senate on July 6.

There will be nearly a 2-year interval before the presidential inability amendment is ratified. Many of our States, having adjourned their legislatures, will not reconvene their legislative bodies until 1967.

It would be wise, I believe, to use this interval to complete action on my proposals so that the several legislatures could ratify at one sitting what could be the most comprehensive set of improvements in our Federal structure since the adoption of the Bill of Rights.

I need not lecture my colleagues on the misconception that electoral customs are immutable legacies handed down to us by the Founding Fathers. In a nation moving toward the fullest use of the popular vote, the existing impedimenta are about as sacred as high button shoes and are remarkable in their value only as antiquarian curiosities.

Only a few days ago former President Eisenhower, commented on the foibles of that noisy, protracted amalgam known as the national convention. Indeed, the worldwide export of that curious pageant via television and the Early Bird satellite would hardly help a troubled world understand that Americans are capable of judiciously choosing their national leaders.

States which have employed the direct primary system have been remarkably free from the tainted image of the "smoke-filled room" and charges of manipulation by a handful of politicians.

Certainly there is preponderant evidence to show that in national elections the same salutary results could be obtained. By adopting a uniform method of handling the national primary, the nomination of a presidential or vice-presidential candidate would be a direct mandate from the people. Both major parties would be fully active in each State and there would be increased voter participation.

Since coming to the Senate, I have introduced a number of bills on nationwide primaries, beginning with Senate Joint Resolution 125 in 1952, and continuing through the present.

On January 31, 1952, I joined with the distinguishd senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in introducing S. 2570, a bill authorizing the Attorney General to conduct preference primaries for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President. The bill was favorably reported to the Senate floor, but no action was taken.

On June 10, 1953, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 85, which was referred to the Judiciary Committee but was not reported to the floor.

On January 6, 1955, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 9, again referred to the Judiciary Committee, where hearings were held, but no action taken.

I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 14 in January of 1957, and in January of 1959, Senate Joint Resolution 4—each of which was referred to the Judiciary Committee and no action taken.

Senate Joint Resolution 13 was introduced in the 88th Congress; and this year, Senate Joint Resolution 28.

There has been voluminous testimony on the nationwide primary. The preservation of the convention system has been challenged by many thoughtful students of political science, and it would appear that time enough has been spent on preserving outmoded ways. There are plenty of examples of other election reforms now taken for granted. The secret ballot, for instance, is assumed to be of ancient lineage, whereas not until the late 19th century did many of our States guarantee the so-called Australian or secret ballot.

Traditionalists, of course, are willing to put up with the hoopla of the national convention on the grounds that it imparts drama to the political process which outweighs the discomfort to the participants. For these people, it is enough to call the convention "the Fourth of July of American politics."

But even Fourth of July celebrations have progressed. As a nation we have concluded that the riproaring fireworks of yesteryear had a greater toll in life and limb than commonsense could tolerate.

We need a safe and sane way of choosing our national leaders, too.

Certainly people like to see drama and excitement. But the modern convention, covered in minute detail by television, submerges drama in endless hours of padded programing.

The TV spectator is left nodding in front of his set and the delegates, weary and sweaty, find themselves serving as extras in a television production—sitting on a convention floor behind a battery of electronic eyes which see what is going on while the delegates are in utter bafflement.

If the modern convention has any of the fascination that H. L. Mencken once saw, it can only be that of the horror sideshow.

Mr. President, turning now to the electoral college, we find an even more timely area of reform. If there can be said to be general public acceptance of the "one-man, one-vote" theory, it can be said that public desire for a change in the electoral college system is even greater and of longer duration.

Three times in history—Adams in 1924, Hayes in 1876, and Harrison in 1888—that the electoral college system has elevated to the highest office in the land candidates who received fewer popular votes than their leading opponents.

Providentially, the Nation has sailed on. But the spectre of abuse still hangs over the system. It is hardly an example of democracy in action to have voters cast 49 percent of the vote for a particular candidate and find that, because their candidate did not receive a majority, their votes count for nothing because of the use of the present system.

The Founding Fathers, of course, contrived the electoral college to retard the danger of excesses in popular rule. Today, when education is a major national goal, there is a well-founded belief in the capacity of a free people to render sound judgments—a belief which must therefore reject the electoral college principle.

If my amendment is enacted, the people will have a direct voice—the candidate who gets 49 percent of the electoral vote will be the man who received 49 percent of the popular vote.

It will change the system in accordance with other recent constitutional amendments—all of which have been intended to further extend the franchise on a broader basis.

The movement to enlarge the voting privilege was bolstered in 1870 with the 15th amendment, assuring the right to vote regardless of race or color; with the 17th amendment in 1913, which provided for popular election of Senators; with the 19th amendment in 1920, which provided suffrage for women; with the 23d amendment in 1960, which gave to the District of Columbia the right to vote for President and Vice President, and the 24th amendment, authored by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], which last year abolished the use of the poll tax in Federal elections.

Each of these established within the framework of the Constitution legitimate expansion and protection of the right to vote. And I might say, parenthetically, that this is the right and proper course for all legislative effort dealing with the franchise. It was only because the recently passed voting rights bill collided with the Constitution that I regretfully opposed it; not because I am against laws to prevent discrimination against all persons who want to register and vote.

If, however, we are to subscribe in full measure to popular government we should use the Constitution as the proper vehicle to extend to the people the unfettered right to select those who hold high office and who make and enforce our laws.

The Congress has moved to correct, via the Constitution, the deficiency which beclouds the problem of Presidential inability. When the State legislatures of these United States act, our Constitution will be amended so that this Nation need no longer agonize over the incapacity of the President—as happened for more than 80 days during President Garfield's term, for some 16 months during President Wilson's service and on two occasions when President Eisenhower was in the White House.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am hopeful that Congress will delay no longer on these other needed reforms.

In his state of the Union message of January 7, 1965, President Johnson unequivocally advocated reforms in the electoral college. Former President Harry S. Truman endorsed national primaries and more recently former President Dwight D. Eisenhower has also criticized the national nominating convention procedure.

By acting on these reforms now and sending them to the States for ratification, Congress will have thwarted any preemption of its powers by another branch of Government. The record will have been set straight.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial from the July 2, 1965, edition of the Washington Post entitled "Obsolete Electoral System."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBSOLETE ELECTORAL SYSTEM

An interesting challenge to the present method of electing the President is taking shape as a result of the Supreme Court's one-man-one-vote ruling in the apportionment cases. Projecting the reasoning of the Court into the presidential elector system, some lawyers have concluded that there is no constitutional justification for the practice of giving all of a State's electoral votes to the presidential candidate winning a majority of the popular vote in that State. The challenge is to be carried to the Supreme Court.

One suit is being prepared in Arkansas. A group of Republicans in that State will contend that they are disfranchised because the "general ticket system" has given all of Arkansas' electoral votes to the Democratic candidate in every election since the Civil War. Republican votes in Arkansas, they say, never count for anything in the election of the President.

Another attack will come from Delaware. There the argument is that the "general ticket system" gives an unfair advantage to the big States with large blocs of electoral votes. In a case before the Supreme Court some months ago, Justice Brennan remarked that a legislative districting plan might be unconstitutional if it should minimize or cancel out the voting strength of racial or political elements of the voting population. This is said to be what the "general ticket system" does in presidential elections.

In our view the possibility that the Court might intervene to upset the general ticket system is remote. The Constitution is very specific in authorizing each State to appoint its presidential electors "in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct." Nevertheless, these challenges to the existing system are significant for two reasons. First, they emphasize the many deviations from the one-man-one-vote concept in our constitutional system, thus perhaps encouraging Congress to go forward with its proposed amendment to restore to the States the right of distributing seats in one house of their legislatures on the basis of political units rather than population. Second, they center attention once more on the necessity of reforming our presidential election machinery.

Last January the Johnson administration introduced a proposed constitutional amendment to abolish the electoral college and let the people vote directly for presidential and vice-presidential candidates. Those receiving a majority vote in each State would carry the electoral votes of that State. Not much has since been heard of this proposal. Although it has some serious technical defects, it would have the virtue of eliminating the electors, who may sometimes be in a position to thwart the will of the voters in the naming of the President.

The best way to attack our obsolete presidential election system is through the amendment process rather than through the courts.

EDITORIAL BY DRURY BROWN ON VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, one of Idaho's newspaper publishers who has made a real effort to learn about the issues involved in the Vietnamese conflict is Drury Brown, the editor and publisher of the Blackfoot, Idaho, News. Mr. Brown has run a series of thoughtful editorials on Vietnam, including one entitled "The Escalating Viet War," published in the July 12 issue. I ask unanimous consent to have this provocative editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ESCALATING VIET WAR

(Editorial by Drury Brown)

When one sifts the many conflicting statements by spokesmen for the Johnson administration, the achievement of stalemate in the war in South Vietnam seems to be the prime objective agreed on by the consensus.

There still appear to be certain ground rules governing the steady expansion of the undeclared war. Not necessarily in the order of their importance they are:

1. The people of the United States would not support another Korea-like ground war in the jungles of Vietnam.

2. The honor of the United States is at stake. We are committed to protect the people of South Vietnam, a nation that was created at the end of the French Vietnamese war by the big nations that sat in on the peace treaty at its conclusion. South Vietnam was arbitrarily created to provide a haven for the minority of French-oriented Vietnamese at the conclusion of the war of revolution. (It was as artificial a division as that which divided East and West Germany at the conclusion of World War II.) Then we and other signatories to the treaty guaranteed protection to South Vietnam.

3. As long as the North Vietnam invaders think they are winning the war it will be impossible to negotiate an honorable peace with them.

4. By applying airpower, in which we are supreme, to bombing of guerrilla jungle installations, to supply routes, bridges, depots, and troop encampments in North Vietnam, we may force the invaders to conclude that the game isn't worth the candle and they will become willing to negotiate.

5. Once convinced there is no future in subversion, the entire population of South Vietnam will turn to sweet reasonableness and will in democratic elections elect a civilian government that will represent all the people but will still be anti-Communist.

6. To achieve these objectives it will be necessary to keep the U.S. casualty lists low, but at the same time feed enough U.S. marines and other ground fighters into battle to be sure that our reluctant Vietnamese allies do not give way before the attacks of the more spirited and determined Cong.

I hope these apparent objectives represent the inner thinking of the administration. And that the administration will hold to them. But there are disturbing signs that events, which have moved the administration from previously announced positions will continue to do the same in the future.

Let those who think we cannot be escalated into a major war over Vietnam consider these items.

Half the budget items provided by the Associated Press wire service yesterday dealt with the Vietnam situation. As is customary of news from the scene of fighting, our air successes in shooting down opposition planes was emphasized. But the report on ground fighting told of the Vietcong smashing a South Viet convoy in territory considered safe for our ally. The Lodge-Taylor shift indicates all is not well on the diplomatic front. The new South Viet leaders say a civilian legislature would be unrealistic. The boss of home mobilization in case of war says the United States is prepared to its last bootstrap for any emergency.

It is unfortunate that the ground rules covering the war we are waging in Vietnam are based on so many fallacies.

Under the leadership of John Foster Dulles we helped create the artificial division of South Vietnam against the wishes of a majority of the people, both North and South. Our participation in the war is unpopular with other guarantors of South Vietnam. Only Australia has contributed a token handful of troops to fight beside us.

Diem, the puppet ruler that we set up knew that his government was unpopular and would not survive a democratic election. Therefore one was never held.

Our years of military and economic support to South Vietnam have built up a fat and enriched class of officials in Saigon who are reluctant to fight for themselves, but spend their time intriguing for higher position and self-preservation. Meanwhile, they draft the farm boys and Montagnards to do the fighting and dying in the jungles, secure in the knowledge that the anti-Communist sentiment that has been the key to U.S. foreign policy will not let them be overturned.

It is unfortunate that people in the United States do not understand that Ho Chi Minh, leader of the Vietnamese revolutionaries that threw the French out, is a hero to most of the people of South Vietnam.

Few South Vietnamese outside Saigon and a few coastal cities have anything to be thankful for to the United States. Through our presence there they have found neither peace nor an improved condition of living. Their impression of the United States has been formed by the bombers flying overhead, the napalm bombs dropped on jungle villages; the regimentation imposed by whatever government was in the saddle in Saigon.

But once committed to a foreign policy, it has been rare for any major government to admit its policy is based on mistaken premises.

And there is within the United States today a vocal minority of ideological zealots, who like the religious zealots of other centuries, would prosecute a war against anything with a Communist tag, regardless of what a majority of the people involved might desire.

THE OMNIBUS FARM BILL AND THE PROPOSED REPEAL OF THE RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, according to news reports in two South Carolina newspapers, The State, of Columbia, S.C., and the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY are currently engaged in trying to employ the tactic of political coercion on Members of Congress who represent States which have farming interests. According to these news reports, what they are attempting to do is to force farm-State Congressmen to support the President's effort to repeal State right-to-work laws in exchange for getting a farm bill passed by the Congress this year. These Congressmen have been bluntly told by Vice President HUMPHREY that unless enough of them vote to insure repeal of the State right-to-work laws, there may be no omnibus farm bill which carries, in addition to various farm legislative items, the continuation of the one-price cotton system which is of interest to the domestic textile industry.

The President even plans to call up the right-to-work law for action in the House of Representatives before the farm bill is acted on with the hope of coercing the farm-State Congressmen into supporting his efforts to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes State right-to-work laws.

Indications are strong, however, that most of our southern Congressmen and also our domestic textile industry are going to stand by their position in favor of State right-to-work laws. This is as it should be, and I am confident that our farm population will agree that such a brash tactic as political intimidation should not be permitted to succeed under any circumstances.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the following articles: an article from The State, dated July 17, 1965, and entitled "Dixie Solons May Have To Back Right-To-Work Repeal"; another article from The State, dated July 21, 1965, and entitled "Right-To-Work Laws Fight: No Compromise Seen"; an article from the Greenville News, dated July 17, 1965, and entitled "Rural Congressmen Put On Spot: H.H.H. Ties In Farm Bill, Right-To-Work Repeal"; another article from the Greenville News, dated July 20, 1965, entitled "Reports Confirmed: L.B.J. Seeks Coalition To Pass New Labor Bill"; and an editorial entitled "There's a Word for This," published in the Atlanta Times of July 20, 1965.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The State, Columbia, S.C., July 17, 1965]

DIXIE SOLONS MAY HAVE TO BACK RIGHT-TO-WORK REPEAL

WASHINGTON.—Southern Congressmen were told Friday that they may have to drop their opposition to the repeal of the right-to-work provision (14–B) of the Taft-Hartley Act if they want a farm bill this year.

That word came directly from Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY during a breakfast meeting arranged by the Agriculture Department through House Agriculture Committee Chairman HAROLD COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina.

The session was called for the purpose of briefing the lawmakers on the provisions of the omnibus farm measure put together earlier this week by the House committee. It embraces a 4-year extension on the one-price cotton program sought by growers and the Dixie textile industry.

But HUMPHREY, in backing the bill as essential to the farm economy, reportedly made a point of stressing it couldn't pass without the help of a lot of city Congressmen, including those from heavy labor districts.

And he made it clear they would expect to be paid back with support for legislation they want.

He said this was one of the legislative facts of life and, according to some of those present, left no doubt in anybody's mind that the repeal of the right-to-work law, which labor is seeking would be one of the areas in which the payoff would be expected.

About 50 House Members, mostly from the South and Midwest, were invited to the session.

Among the States represented were the Carolinas, Georgia, and Florida—all right-to-work States. Early indications have been that most of their delegation members planned to vote against the 14–B repeal.

Even as the meeting was held, there were indications that a race might develop between the farm and labor blocs to see which measure can be brought to the floor first.

The farm bill is due to go to the House Rules Committee about the middle of next week for consideration.

That same committee, dominated by Chairman HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia, is currently sitting on the right-to-work repeal plan but cannot hold it beyond next Friday under the 21-day rule now in effect.

Thus, it will probably rest which of the two bills come out first for floor debate and—if the vote swapping develops—who is going to have to make the initial payoff.

[From the State, Columbia, S.C., July 21, 1965]

RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS FIGHT—NO COMPROMISE SEEN

WASHINGTON.—U.S. Representative JOHN L. MCMILLAN predicted Tuesday that southern Congressmen would steadfastly refuse to compromise their opposition to the proposed elimination of State right-to-work laws.

The South Carolinian said pressure is growing on the Dixie bloc in the House to support repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act in exchange for the backing of urban members on the omnibus farm bill.

MCMILLAN, a member of the House Agriculture Committee which hammered out the farm package as it now stands, said most southerners are too strongly committed on the right-to-work issue to switch their positions.

He pointed out that 82 percent of the U.S. Representatives come from big-city areas and that their help is obviously needed in the passage of any farm bill. But if vote swapping is necessary, he added, it will have to be done on an issue less controversial than the repeal of section 14(b).

Close floor battles are anticipated on both the Taft-Hartley revision and the farm legislation.

The agriculture bill is expected to go to the House Rules Committee this week for consideration and may reach the floor, according to MCMILLAN, within the next 2 weeks.

It includes a provision calling for a 4-year extension of the one-price cotton program.

Other members of the Palmetto State House delegation, however, said they weren't certain what rural legislators would do in a showdown.

Representative W. J. BRYAN DORN agreed that southerners would have to cooperate with metropolitan Representatives to get the farm bill they want. But he added that he didn't know whether any would go so far as to cooperate on a matter as hot as the Taft-Hartley proposal.

Representative ROBERT ASHMORE pointed out that Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY has been suggesting that some concessions would have to be made by farm area lawmakers over the labor question.

And he called this idea "dastardly." He said the Vice President is trying to "hook" southern Congressmen into voting against their convictions for a price.

ASHMORE said, "I don't know whether he will be successful. I hope not."

Representative TOM GETTYS said that both the farm bill and the right-to-work repealer were too important to consider vote swapping.

He joined MCMILLAN in forecasting that nobody will change their minds on those bills.

The South Carolinians, meanwhile, are giving only tentative support to the farm measure. They say several changes are necessary to make it a bill they would favor.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, July 20, 1965]

REPORTS CONFIRMED—L.B.J. SEEKS COALITION TO PASS NEW LABOR BILL

(By Lee Bandy)

WASHINGTON.—A spokesman for Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY Monday confirmed reports the Johnson administration is trying to put together a city-country coalition in Congress to assure passage of labor's right-to-work repealer and the omnibus farm bill.

Robert Jensen, the Vice President's press secretary, said it is true HUMPHREY met with rural Congressmen Friday and urged they approach organized labor for help on the agriculture measure.

However, he added, no pressure was exerted nor were the lawmakers asked to support repeal of right to work.

A House Member, attending the meeting, said "he—HUMPHREY—didn't have to ask for our support for repeal. We got the message."

The Congressman added, "we were told the administration doesn't have the votes to pass the farm program and that if we wanted it approved we should go to organized labor for help. However, HUMPHREY told us not to go unless we could deliver."

He pointed out the Vice President did not mention repeal of right to work, but the lawmaker added, "the message was quite clear. Why else should we be going to labor. In other words, if we want the farm bill, we are going to have to go to organized labor and promise to support repeal of 14(b)."

That is the provision in the Taft-Hartley Act which allows States to pass right-to-work laws banning the union shop.

A Washington newspaper reports HUMPHREY has held a similar meeting with urban Congressmen and labor representatives.

The Vice President, according to the story, tells the city boys there won't be a right-to-work repealer unless they get help from the farm bloc.

He tells rural lawmakers they can't pass a farm bill without city support.

Supposedly, the House farm bloc has a team captain from each State to bargain with urban Representatives.

HUMPHREY tells the city members rural Democrats and deliver 50 to 60 votes for repeal of 14(b).

The Vice President was quoted by the newspaper here as saying:

"Your labor bill is in trouble unless you come through for the farm bill. If you do, I'll see that the farm boys come through for you on 14(b)."

If the coalition is successful, it will be one of the few times since the late President Franklin Roosevelt and the city boys worked with the American Farm Bureau Federation to bridge the wide rural-city gap.

In the Friday meeting with rural Congressmen, HUMPHREY reportedly warned the lawmakers they might lose next year if a farm bill is not passed in this Congress.

The implication drawn by many House Members was that farmers would return someone else capable of getting an agriculture measure approved.

Several lawmakers got the impression HUMPHREY was more interested in getting votes for the right-to-work repealer than for the farm bill.

The session was attended by Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, July 17, 1965]

RURAL CONGRESSMEN PUT ON SPOT—H.H.H. TIES IN FARM BILL, RIGHT-TO-WORK REPEAL

(By Lee Bandy)

WASHINGTON.—Rural Congressmen have been put on notice by Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY that if they want a farm bill this year they had better support repeal of right-to-work laws.

According to reliable sources, the notice was served Friday at a closed breakfast meeting of lawmakers representing farm areas. Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman attended.

The conference was held in the Presidential Room of the Congressional Hotel, just within the shadows of the Capitol.

The gist of HUMPHREY'S talk, summarized by a House Member who attended the meeting, went something like this:

The administration doesn't have the votes for its farm program and thus has turned to organized labor—specifically United Auto

Workers President Walter Reuther and AFL-CIO President George Meany—for help.

The hope is they will be able to persuade urban Congressmen to support the agriculture bill.

The Johnson leg men, however, can't do this alone. Assistance from the rural lawmaker is needed and urged.

It is recommended rural Congressmen approach organized labor and the big city boys for help on the farm bill, but "not unless you can deliver."

Though HUMPHREY did not specifically mention right-to-work, lawmakers leaving the meeting got the impression that was what he was talking about.

A South Carolinian summed it up this way: "If we want the farm bill, we're going to have to go to organized labor and promise to support repeal of 14(b)."

That's the provision of the Taft-Hartley Act allowing States to pass laws prohibiting the union shop.

"If you are expecting them (organized labor) to help you, you better be prepared to help them," he said in drawing the implication from the Vice President's speech.

HUMPHREY, according to sources, also told the Members they will not be back next year if there is no farm bill in this Congress.

Implication was farmers would return someone else able to get a farm measure passed.

The sources also quoted the Nation's No. 2 leader as saying, rural America can't pass anything, without the help of labor and the big city boys. The two must work together, they said, in recounting HUMPHREY's talk.

A Congressman said he got the impression the vice president was pumping votes for repeal of 14(b) more than he was for the farm bill.

Labor leaders say repeal of right-to-work is their top priority item on a long list of legislation they hope to push through Congress.

Repeal of it has been a perennial aim of the AFL-CIO, but the campaign has never made any headway.

However, union leaders now think there is a real chance since they have the backing of President Johnson. They claim they have a four-vote margin in the House.

The Senate, which they once thought safe, is now considered a question mark.

A threat of a filibuster is now being talked in some quarters. And it's believed it would be extremely difficult to get the necessary two-thirds vote to cut off debate against repeal.

There are right-to-work laws in 19 States, including all Dixie States except Louisiana. Most of the southerners would be expected to join in any talkathon against repeal.

[From the Atlanta Times, July 20, 1965]

THERE'S A WORD FOR THIS

The well-known brand of L.B.J. armtwisting, with the twisting this time being done by Vice President HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY, was in evidence this past weekend.

According to some Congressmen who attended a breakfast meeting of rural and farm area lawmakers, the Vice President said that if these Congressmen want a farm bill this year they had better support repeal of right-to-work laws.

Evidently the administration believes it does not have sufficient support to pass its farm program and has turned to the big union bosses for help. Specifically, the administration wants these labor leaders to persuade urban Congressmen, who jump to the unionists' tunes, to support the agriculture bill.

However, the labor bosses, in exchange for their help on the farm program, want the rural Congressmen to promise their assistance in repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act—otherwise called the right-to-work section.

According to the congressional sources of the story, Vice President HUMPHREY added a fillip to the armtwisting by implying the administration would not support these rural Congressmen for reelection next year if no farm bill is passed.

As one South Carolinian reportedly put it: "If we want the farm bill, we're going to have to go to organized labor and promise to support repeal of 14(b)."

Thus does the Johnson administration work its wondrous skill. It entices A to belly-crawl for something A wants by getting him to help B in B's program in return for B's assistance to him—and all this in spite of A's dislike of B and B's program.

There's a two-syllable word for this kind of machination. The word begins with "black" and ends with "mail."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, this is Captive Nations Week. It is a week set aside by law for the purpose of restating our national commitment to the ultimate liberation of the people of the captive nations of Europe.

But if one were to believe some of the statements that have been made over the course of the past year, there are no captive nations. According to these statements, the Communist nations of central Europe have been moving progressively toward more freedom and more independence from Moscow.

On the occasion of Captive Nations Week, I think it might be well to abandon wishful thinking and to reexamine the situation in the satellite nations in the light of certain hard facts.

To those who talk of the increasing independence that Hungary and Poland and the other satellite nations have been displaying in recent months, I would point to one hard and recent fact.

It has been customary for the Soviet Government and the Communist governments of central Europe, during the period of the so-called detente, to send top-ranking government officials to the July 4 receptions at the American Embassies.

This year, the Soviet Government downgraded our July 4 reception by sending along the Deputy Foreign Minister, a man whose name commands virtually no recognition abroad. And, remarkable to relate, every other Communist government in Europe decided to downgrade our July 4 reception to precisely the same level by also sending along their Deputy Foreign Ministers.

Even on so small a matter, the evidence indicates that Communist policy in Europe is still highly centralized, and that it is Moscow that calls the tune.

As for all the talk about liberalization, I would refer my colleagues to a publication entitled "S O S from Hungary" which recently came to my attention. According to this study, the Hungarian people have become so despondent about the future that they are slowly committing suicide as a nation through recourse to legalized abortion.

Let me quote two paragraphs from this study to you:

> Since the revolution about 1,500,000 unborn babies were torn from the bodies of Hungarian mothers and thrown into incinerators. This figure, taken from official government statistics, corresponds to 15 percent of the country's present population.
>
> By comparison, a similar bloodletting in the United States would have involved 28,500,000 abortions in the same period.

The study quotes a young Communist writer, Karoly Jobbagy, as writing in the literary periodical Elet es Irodalom:

> I would not have believed that, scarcely 8 years (after the legalization of abortions), we would be looking at this freedom with doubt, struggling with the monstrous possibility of the extinction of our nation. * * * The fact is that the Hungarian nation is growing weaker. An unexpected world crisis, an unknown epidemic may come when strong peoples will survive, while smaller and weaker ones will fall. And then our history and our literature will be but a memory, stuff for scholars.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the complete text of the article "S O S from Hungary."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S O S FROM HUNGARY

This is a distress call conveyed from Hungary, where beneath the clamor of liberalization the lifeblood of a thousand-year-old nation slowly ebbs away. The country is facing a population catastrophe unprecedented in its history. This new tragedy, an aftermath of the 1956 revolution, is as yet unnoticed by the world, but Hungarians back home and abroad are deeply alarmed by its dire future effects.

In the 2 years preceding 1956, Hungary's population had a natural increase of 229,259, a growth rate of 12.6 per thousand inhabitants. By 1962–63 this fell to 54,370, a growth rate of 2.1 in 1962, virtually the lowest in the world. Scientifically speaking, this is a "below unity" reproduction rate, which indeed portends a net decline in population, as even the Chief of the Hungarian Bureau of Statistics recently had to admit. The average size of the Hungarian family has shrunk to 3.2 persons, an alltime low, clearly insufficient to sustain the present population.

The sharp decline after the revolution went hand in hand with an incredible increase of surgical abortions, some 200,000 annually. (Between 1950 and 1952 surgical abortions averaged 1,700 per year.) Since the revolution about 1,500,000 unborn babies were torn from the bodies of Hungarian mothers and thrown into incinerators. This figure, taken from official government statistics, corresponds to 15 percent of the country's present population.

By comparison, a similar bloodletting in the United States would have involved 28,500,000 abortions in the same period, a number equal to the combined population of New York City, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Boston, Detroit, Philadelphia, plus that of the entire State of Texas.

This lethal form of birth control, completely uncalled for in underpopulated Hungary, was legalized by a 1956 government edict permitting, even encouraging surgical abortions without medical justification. The unscrupulous implementation of this edict has inflicted such an irreparable loss on Hungary's population that the Nation's future seems stark indeed. Many Hungarians call the process "cold genocide." However, since the element of physical coercion is missing, this may not be the proper term. It is rather state-induced suicide of a people still in despair over being utterly abandoned in their heroic fight for freedom in 1956. Surgical scissors, designed to save lives, are used as tools of death, killing off unborn babies assembly-line style. According to a Hungarian weekly, Kortars, an average of 647 abortions are performed in state hospitals every day.

In the United States and the Western World, where surgical abortion as a means of birth control is illegal for both medical and moral reasons, a massacre of such proportions would be unthinkable. Still, since 1956 it has been a way of life, or rather way of death leading Hungary toward an inglorious exodus from history.

This picture is already grim, and grows even more so if viewed from the historical perspective of the last 20 years, during which Hungary had enormous losses in population. According to official estimates, Hungary suffered 650,000 casualties in World War II. To this we must add the Jews deported and liquidated by the Nazis, and a large segment of ethnic Germans expelled from Hungary after the war. This comes to another loss of 650,000. Then there are approximately 300,000 refugees who fled to the free world to escape the fate of tens of thousands who died in prisons and concentration camps during the Stalin-Rákosi terror. In the 1956 uprising 30,000 Hungarians were killed in action, many thousands deported by the Russians, and about 200,000 mostly young people, fled the country, decreasing anew the already decimated population of Hungary. The total decline approaches the 2 million mark, without even counting the ethnic loss of Hungarian minorities in the neighboring countries, especially Rumania, which is practicing a ruthless assimilation policy in Transylvania.

A proportionate decline in the United States would amount to a population loss of 38 million people.

Hungary's losses through war, liquidation, deportations, mass exile, revolution, caused a biological blood-letting that warranted an extraordinary national effort to raise population growth well above the average. But quite the opposite has happened. When lifesaving new blood was most needed, the regime launched a murderous abortion campaign, putting the nation on the road of gradual extinction.

This road is marked by staggering statistics. At the turn of the century the country had a birth rate as high as 45 per thousand and between the two world wars still maintained a relatively high rate of about 25 per thousand. But as we noted, by 1962 this fell to a catastrophic 12.9, less than enough to sustain the present population. (The world average is 38 according to the latest U.N. Yearbook.) Abortions in Hungary, 200,000 per year on the average, exceed births almost two to one. Official statistics show that one sixth of childless women, one-half of the women with one child and three-quarters of the women with two children undergo abortion. In the largest Hungarian cities, such as Budapest, Pécs, Szeged, the birth rate is already lower than the death rate. Hungary's growth rate is dwarfed by all her neighbors: The Soviet growth rate, 16.6, is eight times the Hungarian; Poland has a growth rate of 11.7, Yugoslavia 13.6 and Rumania 8.8, about four times the Hungarian rate.

But this is still not the full story. The multitude of unborn babies slain in the womb are not only victims of the abortion madness ravaging the land. Many thousand Hungarian women have had their health permanently impaired by surgical abortions. Leading medical authorities of the nation started sounding the alarm years ago over the abnormally high number of premature births, spontaneous abortions and increasing sterility among women, and the increase of retarded children born to mothers who had surgically interrupted pregnancies. A recently held conference sponsored by the University of Medical Science in Pécs, made public irrefutable statistics proving that in Hungary: (a) The ratio of premature births almost doubled, (b) more than half the retarded children were born prematurely, and (c) every third woman who became sterile had previously undergone surgical abortion. The participating doctors all agreed that the regime's abortion edict should be drastically revised.

Protests are mounting not only from doctors, but also, and most notably, from Hungarian writers, who played such a key role in the revolution. As living seismographs of the nation, they sense the premonitary rumblings of an ethnic landslide in the Carpathian Basin in the not so distant future. The best known authors, such as János Kodolányi, Péter Veres, Gyula Illyés, Pál Szabó Károly Jobbágy and others are raising the specter of Hungary's downfall in that landslide sparking an ethnic tidal wave from the east, north and south, which could bury the nation. The dean of Hungarian writers, János Kodolányi, was among the first to sound the tocsin, in a literary magazine called Kortars:

"No woman has the right," wrote Kodolányi "to destroy her unborn child. If she does, she destroys herself and ultimately contributes to the destruction of her people. Once a tree ceases to grow a new ring, it dies. Once a nation ceases to grow, it condemns itself to death. One must not suppress life, because suppression of life means death."

A young Communist writer, Károlv Jobbágy, who applauded the legalization of abortions in 1956 and at first pooh-poohed the alarm of his colleagues, wrote this in the February 8, 1964 issue of Élet és Irodalom:

"I would not have believed that, scarcely 8 years (after the legalization of abortions), we would be looking at this freedom with doubt, struggling with the monstrous possibility of the extinction of our nation * * *. The fact is that the Hungarian nation is growing weaker. An unexpected world crisis, an unknown epidemic may come when strong peoples will survive, while smaller and weaker ones will fall. And then our history and our literature will be but a memory, stuff for scholars."

The article, which was reprinted in full in English in the April, 1964, issue of East Europe, was one among the many (27) printed in Elet és Irodalom which initiated a long debate on the subject last spring. In the paper Szabad Föld, another well-known writer Pál Szabó, thus echoed the sentiments of his colleagues:

"It should be clear to everyone that through the countrywide extermination of unborn children we are not only snuffing out their lives, but also are reducing our own to a temporary subsistence. A life without tomorrow can no longer be called life."

At the end of his article Pál Szabó submitted a program, demanding the immediate suspension of the regime's abortion edict, the replacement of the "antifamily" campaign with a new one stressing healthy family planning, an adequate nationwide nursery system, and improvement in social conditions for working women.

The protests of Hungarian doctors and writers are strong, but their voice is weak, because their appeals appear mostly in small journals, while in papers of wide circulation the subject is virtually taboo. Outspoken condemnation of the State-aided mass abortions can be found only in the free Hungarian press abroad, which has been giving the subject top priority.

So far, the Hungarian Government has turned a deaf ear to appeals, except for comments by some minor officials who try to justify the abortion policy by hypocritical statements on a woman's right to rid herself of unwanted children. In such pronouncements they also blame the fast pace of urbanization as a factor contributing to the plummeting birth rate. But cabinet members maintain an ominous silence on this vital problem—as if they were acting or rather inacting under duress. This silence nurtures the suspicion of many Hungarians, that the Kadar government is just a pawn in this matter and the mass abortions performed in Hungary are really part of a scheme hatched by Stalinist-racist elements to weaken the Magyar race in a strategic area long coveted by Russian expansionism.

In any case, this policy of the Kádár government jibes with a pattern of action against the interest of the Hungarian people. First, through ruthless collectivization, the regime destroyed the Hungarian peasantry, always the strongest link in the chain of national procreation. In consequence, hundreds of thousands of young people were practically driven from their ancestral villages to find work in overcrowded cities, at factories supplying goods for the Soviet economy. Lack of adequate housing has kept most of them from settling down to a normal family life. Nowhere behind the Iron Curtain was collectivization so ruthlessly and completely (97 percent) enforced as in Hungary after the 1956 revolution. National production was geared primarily to the requirements of Soviet planning. Since the strained economy could not serve both Russia and the interests of the Hungarian family, the Kádár government chose the ghastly solution of cutting off the natural flow of children through mass abortions and other means.

As a deterrent to family growth, social allowances for children were set at a ridiculously low level—1.4 billion forints per year, when the estimated real need is about 12 billions annually. The savings thus achieved are diverted to the needs of the Soviet-coordinated economy. Instead of providing adequate housing, hospitals, nurseries, all the regime could offer was state-aided abortions at a nominal charge. With religious teaching suppressed, a nationwide campaign also set out to popularize birth control and a new antifamily morality, a morality in reverse, as Peter Veres, a prominent Hungarian writer, put it. "Enjoy the pleasures of today—there is no hope for tomorrow" sounds the bittersweet tune of a new morbid fad, luring youth from tradition, patriotism, responsibility, and family life to the third-rate dolce vita rampant in Hungary today.

Visitors from abroad seldom, if ever, see the real face of Hungary behind the smiling but delusive facade of an artificial prosperity and gaiety in the cities. The present trend of liberalization becomes a shadow mockery by contrast with the devastating accomplishment of the Kádár regime in cutting the nation's lifeline to the future. Due to progressive losses through mass abortion, Hungary within a decade or two, may face the ethnic Stalingrad of her history. By then the shrinking population—as even official statistical estimates confirm—will have caused a dangerous shift in age groups, resulting in half as many people in a country with twice the usual proportion of old people. This would lead to an economic collapse compounding the population catastrophe. In the 1980's the increasing lack of productive manpower would drastically reduce economic capacity, when a thin segment of the population faces the impossible task of providing goods and services for an abnormally large unproductive segment. Alluding to that prospect, the dean of Hungarian poets, Gyula Illyés reasoned with bitter irony in a poem last summer: "If today we kill off unborn children because as unproductive elements they would burden our economy, tomorrow, using the same morbid logic, we could liquidate the older generations as well."

It should be evident from the foregoing that the antifamily campaign and the wholesale extinction of unborn babies in Hungary cannot be correctly classified as simple birth control and a purely domestic affair of the Kádár government. Birth control in proper form, at the proper time and place is meant to promote sound family planning and benefit the nation as a whole. In Hungary, it has been used in the wrong way, at the wrong time, and with devastating results on the Hungarian family in which the future of the country lies. It has been used as a tool of death, handed to a people being driven through socioeconomic coercion to what amounts to national suicide.

Whether this be a scheme pushed by non-Magyar racist elements in a country still under foreign occupation, or a sign of moral bankruptcy in an inept government, is almost immaterial at this moment. What really matters is, that this is an outrage against humanity which clamors to be brought to the attention of the outside world. Wholesome societies that abhor the idea of suicide and make every attempt to prevent it in individuals, cannot remain indifferent when an entire nation is led to self-destruction, especially if this nation is Hungary, which fought so heroically for the ideas of the free world, though abandoned in her gravest hour in 1956. The present population catastrophe can be traced directly to the defeat of the Hungarian revolution amid whose ruins the nation seems to have fallen into despair.

While it may be argued that assistance in 1956 to Hungary would have been too risky for the free world, a helping hand in the present crisis would involve no risk whatsoever. The purpose of this appeal is to move the American public not so much to political as humanitarian involvement, a field where this country has no peer among the nations of the world.

A massive exposure and condemnation by the information media and statements and telegrams from prominent American personalities could compel the Kadar government sensitive to foreign criticism, to withdraw its genocidal abortion edict. Such a step alone would not only save countless thousands of unborn children from extinction but save the health of many mothers. By way of a follow-up American compassion and generosity could find ways and means to send material aid to needy Hungarian families through private organizations.

But the most powerful aid to the Hungarian people could be rendered by the U.S. Government, now being wooed by the Kadar regime for a normalization of relations and long-term loans. A strange turn indeed from a regime that promotes "abnormalization" in Hungary by disintegrating the Hungarian family, which will gravely affect the country's economic capacity and thus make Hungary a poor credit risk in the coming decades.

Still, the Hungarian people desperately need assistance, so long overdue on the part of the United States. Since the war we have sent thousands of millions of dollars all over the globe, to nations almost unknown and not always loyal to our cause. As a sad paradox, the Hungarian people who sacrificed everything for the ideals cherished by America never were among the recipients or our aid. Now there is a unique opportunity for the U.S. Government to help the valiant people of Hungary, and remedy the damage done to them since the revolution. Such a humanitarian breakthrough across the Iron Curtain would be a triumph not only for American generosity but a victory for U.S. foreign policy as well.

PROPOSED NATIONAL GUARD-ARMY RESERVE REALINEMENT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, several months ago the Secretary of Defense announced a plan to merge the Army Reserve and Army National Guard. This plan would have required a drastic realinement of local Reserve and guard units throughout the United States. I am sure that every Member of the Senate has closely studied the plan in terms not only of the big picture—the overall combat readiness of all our Armed Forces—but also in terms of the morale and effectiveness of the individuals who would be affected.

Necessarily, each of us has had to consult with experts in military administration and policy making, as well as with the Reserve and guard members who would be directly affected.

I believe that most Members of Congress have now given the Secretary's ideas enough consideration to be able to make a judgment as to the soundness of the merger plan. I am positive that such is the case insofar as the junior Senator from Mississippi is concerned. No Member of the Senate has given this complicated and difficult subject more attention than Senator JOHN STENNIS.

You will recall that the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, of which Senator STENNIS is chairman, held hearings on this matter a few weeks ago.

Senator STENNIS also has had to grapple with this problem in his role as acting chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. This matter could not have been placed in better hands. His experience and his wisdom in matters relating to the posture of our national defense, of our preparedness, have been instrumental in many major decisions of national importance during his tenure in the Senate.

Because of his expertise, the statement which Senator STENNIS made yesterday concerning the proposed Army Reserve and Army National Guard merger is of great significance to the many thousands of reservists and guardsmen over the country who have anxiously been awaiting congressional reaction to the Secretary's plan.

Senator STENNIS' position regarding this matter reflects my own thinking, my own judgment, on it. I believe he made his statement at a time that it will be most effective in promoting a higher esprit de corps among Reserve and Guard units throughout the Nation.

I wholly agree with Senator STENNIS that the existing international situation militates against a sweeping reorganization of Reserve and Guard forces at this time. And the Congress, in my opinion, should make a clear expression on the matter. This would be in keeping with the position of the Secretary of Defense when he asserted that he felt a program of such magnitude should have legislative approval or disapproval.

Naturally, journalists quickly related the statement of Senator STENNIS to the more serious situation in South Vietnam which Secretary McNamara has indicated as a result of his recent tour of inspection there. Such interpretations appear valid, and also timely.

Senator STENNIS' statement deserves close study, and along with it, knowledgeable press dispatches concerning it are worthy of widest possible attention. For these reasons, I request unanimous consent to have the wise and welcome statement of the junior Senator from Mississippi placed in the RECORD at this point, to be followed by the first-available press dispatch thereon, from the Washington Post, under the byline of Mr. Howard Margolis.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHN STENNIS, ACTING CHAIRMAN, DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, RE PROPOSED NATIONAL GUARD-ARMY RESERVE REALINEMENT

The subcommittee hearings on the fiscal year 1966 defense appropriation bill will soon be concluded and we will commence the markup of the bill within a few days.

One of the issues to be faced in marking up the bill is Secretary McNamara's controversial proposal to realine the Army National Guard and Army Reserve components. A decision on this matter cannot be delayed. It must be made in this bill.

Legislative proposals in connection with the realinement plan are now pending in the House of Representatives. However, I am convinced that it is too late in the session for legislation on this subject, particularly in view of the controversy surrounding it.

The National Guard and Army Reserve need a definite decision as to their status as soon as possible in order that the necessary planning can proceed. This is particularly true in view of the fact that our commitments in South Vietnam have increased to such an extent that apparently it will be necessary to call National Guard and Army Reserve units and personnel to active duty.

In my view the existing international situation is so tense as to make a merger of the National Guard and Army Reserve inadvisable at this time.

Therefore, I am going to recommend to the Defense Subcommittee that, in making the fiscal year 1966 appropriations for the Army National Guard and Army Reserve, we follow the same pattern laid down in fiscal year 1965 and prior years, with the present actual strength of about 650,000.

CRISIS DEFERS RESERVE LINK WITH GUARD

(By Howard Margolis)

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's proposal for merging the Army Reserve into the National Guard appeared to have been indefinitely postponed yesterday.

The blow came from Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, who said that the existing international situation is so tense as to make a merger inadvisable at this time.

As acting chairman of both the Armed Forces and Defense Appropriations Committees of the Senate, STENNIS is the most powerful single congressional voice on defense matters.

STENNIS said that the Appropriations Committee would include language in the annual defense money bill providing for a separate Reserve and Guard.

He also said that, in view of the lateness of the session and the controversy over McNamara's plan, there would not be time for the Armed Services Committee to consider the legislation McNamara reluctantly requested in support of the merger.

McNamara never conceded that he needed explicit legislation to go through with the merger, but under heavy congressional pressure he agreed to hold up the plan until Congress had considered the legislative requests.

LEFT UP TO CONGRESS

At his news conference last week, McNamara implied that he wanted to move ahead promptly with the merger, but he noted that the action that will be taken will depend on further action by the Congress.

Thus the effect of STENNIS' statement yesterday, in the light of McNamara's own remarks on the need for congressional action, would be to at least postpone implementation of the plan.

It now seems that the earliest possible date for the merger will be the spring of 1966.

This target would be based on the assumption that Congress would take up McNamara's legislative requests early in the next congressional session.

The prospects for McNamara eventually winning his fight to reorganize the Reserves have generally been considered good.

No major congressional figure has come out against the proposal, and the controversy has been primarily about whether McNamara needed congressional action to put through the merger and if so, in what form.

Stennis' statement yesterday avoided implying any position, either for or against the substance of the plan. He only argued that the time for it was not now.

McNamara's somewhat vague reply at his press conference on his current position on the merger appears to have reflected his awareness of the practical difficulties of going ahead with the merger with a Reserve callup in the air.

The problem is that a merger would give large numbers of reservists an opportunity to resign, something clearly undesirable not only because it would risk losing many men who did not want to risk being called, but put a disproportionate risk of being called on those who chose not to resign.

Thus as a practical matter the merger could not be put through at least until after whatever callup is being considered had been made. And even after the initial callup, the risk of further callups would make the coming months an awkward time for the merger.

On net then, the Stennis statement yesterday could hardly be called pleasant news for McNamara, but it would be premature to see it, either in intent or in effect, as much of a blow to McNamara's plans beyond what the Vietnam emergency has imposed anyway.

DESIGNATION OF JUSTICE ARTHUR GOLDBERG AS AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the appointment of Arthur Goldberg as Ambassador to the United Nations came as a complete surprise to most Americans. However, reflection clearly indicates this action a most pleasant surprise.

President Johnson has said repeatedly that he wants the best men to serve in this Government. Surely, he could not have found a better man than Justice Goldberg to tackle the intricate problems of diplomacy at the United Nations.

The nomination of Arthur Goldberg has been widely hailed by the columnists and editors of the Nation's press. Almost without exception they say this Johnson appointment is a continuing step forward toward world peace and understanding.

As Roscoe Drummond pointed out in the July 21 Washington Post:

> President Johnson has chosen a man as nearly as possible in the image and likeness to succeed Adlai Stevenson as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.
>
> In my judgment the President has chosen very well indeed. * * *
>
> No one in our time can fill Adlai's place. He was unique. But in Justice Goldberg the President has not only made a surprise appointment but a superb one.

David Lawrence, in the Washington Star of June 20, referring to the Goldberg appointment, noted:

> Goldberg's appointment could result in a new emphasis on law in the councils of the United Nations.

Mary McGrory called Goldberg "a man of infinite resourcefulness and unremitting good cheer. He believes simply that there is no situation beyond solution."

Certainly every American should appreciate Justice Goldberg's willingness to answer the call to duty. President Johnson has indeed made a wise choice and the United States and the world will be the beneficiaries of that decision.

At this time I ask consent to include these editorials in their entirety in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 21, 1965]

GOLDBERG TO THE U.N.

(By Roscoe Drummond)

APPOINTMENT CALLED SUPERB

President Johnson has chosen a man as nearly as possible in the image and likeness of Adlai E. Stevenson to succeed him as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

In my judgment the President has chosen very well indeed.

Of Justice Arthur J. Goldberg, who is willing to give up a lifetime appointment to the Supreme Court because of his dedication to the U.N. and his sense of duty to the President, Mr. Stevenson's sister, Mrs. Elizabeth Ives, said: "He understood Adlai and his aims."

He also understands the aims, and hopes and—as in Vietnam—the courage of the American people.

The significant fact is that Goldberg has qualifications in the field of foreign affairs which would not be immediately visible from the record of his public service—a distinguished and respected labor lawyer, one of the best Secretaries of Labor the Nation ever had and Supreme Court Justice.

I offer a pertinent appraisal of Goldberg from one who during the past decade has known well more men in public life than most any other American.

Soon after the 1960 election, when he was writing his book, "Six Crises," and President-elect Kennedy was selecting the top people in his administration, Vice President Nixon remarked to one of his closest collaborators:

"Many of these same men would have been in my Cabinet, if I had been elected. But I would not have made Arthur Goldberg Secretary of Labor. I would have made him Under Secretary of State."

Nixon's judgment was that Goldberg deeply understood the issues and pitfalls of the cold war and would not be misled by surface developments.

Since becoming a member of the Court, Justice Goldberg has traveled widely abroad to speak before jurists and has become personally acquainted with a considerable number of world leaders.

It is unusual for a President to turn to the Supreme Court for an appointment of this kind. But Mr. Johnson does not blanch at the unusual and his decision reflects his high regard for the United Nations and his hope that its capacity to keep the peace can be strengthened.

It is evident that the President had this prescription in mind as he searched for Adlai's successor:

He wanted a man who had already attained public stature.

He wanted a man who had some of his own credentials to speak for his Government and who would not have to rely wholly on the credentials which come from the position.

He wanted a man deeply devoted to the cause of world peace whose very presence at the U.N. would underline the President's own dedication in trying to bring about both peace and justice under the rule of law.

From my knowledge of Justice Goldberg, I would say that he hates war and believes that the failure to resist aggression is the most likely way of getting into war.

This is the viewpoint he will, I think, bring to the councils of the administration. As with Adlai, he will be a member of the Cabinet and at the center of U.S. foreign policy formulation. He will be a source of strength—as well as unity—to the administration team of Rusk, McNamara and McGeorge Bundy.

No one in our time can fill Adlai's place. He was unique.

But in Justice Goldberg the President has not only made a surprise appointment but a superb one.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 20, 1965]

GOLDBERG APPOINTMENT HAILED

(By David Lawrence)

President Johnson made a wise choice in selecting Associate Justice Arthur J. Goldberg of the Supreme Court to become U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations to replace the late Adlai Stevenson. The President recognized the need for a man of national and international stature—someone who could carry on extemporaneous debate in the United Nations General Assembly or the Security Council and make an effective impression with his words.

Another basic reason for Johnson's decision undoubtedly was Goldberg's keen perception of the many legal questions that affect governments throughout the world today in their relations with each other.

Goldberg has spoken often before national and international law organizations here and abroad. While the United Nations has among its ambassadors from other countries men who are versed in diplomacy, some of those who have proved most effective in the past had a deep insight into international law.

Goldberg's appointment could result in a new emphasis on law in the councils of the United Nations. This would be a significant change. Johnson said he had asked the Justice to serve because there was no more important task ahead today than the achievement of "a world where all men may live in peace with the hope of justice under the rule of law." He added:

"Committed as we are to this principle and to this purpose, it is fitting that we should ask a member of our highest court to relinquish that office to speak for America before the nations of the world."

Also, in the area of mediation and negotiation, Goldberg will bring to his new task an ability which he used successfully as a labor lawyer. Many labor lawyers naturally become masters of a kind of diplomacy in dealing with labor-management disputes which enables them in many cases to end strikes or to prevent them. They use well-balanced phrases in proposed agreements that must meet the tests of public opinion both inside and outside of the labor unions.

Goldberg's willingness to leave the Supreme Court has caused many Members of Congress to wonder why he would abandon a lifetime position for something else in Government. But there are some men who find that, while the service of a Supreme Court Justice is intensely interesting, there are in critical times other fields to which duty calls them.

James F. Byrnes, for example, had been Governor of the State of South Carolina and has served also in the Senate before President Roosevelt appointed him to the Supreme Court of the United States in June 1941. But when war broke out, Byrnes was called in October 1942, to take over the job of Director of Economic Stabilization and then was appointed Director of War Mobilization in May 1943. There was talk of nominating him for Vice President in 1944 instead of Harry S. Truman. Upon becoming President, the latter appointed Byrnes as Secretary of State, a post in which he served effectively in a critical period in American history.

Goldberg, in reaching his decision to leave the Supreme Court, may just possibly have thought that, with only a few years of service in the United Nations, he could achieve a position which would entitle him to consideration for a higher office in the country. Seven years hence, it would not be at all surprising to find him active in politics if he has made a good record in the United Nations and the country has come to know him through the numerous exposures he will have on TV. It will be recalled that in 1960 Henry Cabot Lodge, while serving as Ambassador to the United Nations, was nominated for the Vice Presidency by the Republican Convention.

Goldberg's previous identification with the labor movement could be an important asset. Not only was he general counsel of the United Steelworkers Union—winning the respect of many of the men on the management side of the steel industry—but he also was able in his post as Secretary of Labor in President Kennedy's Cabinet to make his influence felt even further. This is a background which can be useful to him in his new post in the United Nations. For in many countries the labor problem has become more and more significant in its relation to National Government policies.

On the whole, it would seem apparent that, since there was no one sufficiently outstanding on the diplomatic side to impress foreign governments, Johnson came to the conclusion that he could add to the prestige of the United States at the United Nations by selecting a man from the highest Court in the land.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 21, 1965]

THE INEVITABLE CHOICE—THE MAN, JOB GO TOGETHER

(By Mary McGrory)

Now that Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg has been named Ambassador to the United Nations, he seems not just the only possible choice, but inevitable. No man has a greater reputation for inducing the lion and the lamb to lie down together.

The exuberant gregarious Justice knows everybody in the Government and everybody knows him. He has no better friend in the White House than President Johnson. Actually the first person to mention his name to the President was the Harvard economist, author, and erstwhile Ambassador to India, John Kenneth Galbraith.

Galbraith went to call at the White House last Friday after Adlai Stevenson's memorial service at the National Cathedral. He proposed to the President that what was needed in the United Nations job was "someone who knows the mood of the American people, and someone with standing in the United States. Diplomatic experts are a dime a dozen," he said.

The President considered 20 to 35 prominent Americans for the post, and he talked to many people over the past few days before making his final selection.

The President called Goldberg some time on Saturday to sound him out on the possibility of succeeding Stevenson on the East River. The Justice assured the President he could not refuse to do whatever Johnson asked him to. But for a poor Jewish boy from the West Side of Chicago, who helped his father, a fruit-wagon peddler, the Supreme Court represented a dream come true, and he was truly torn.

The Justice by Saturday night had asked an old friend about the possibility of serving with him on the U.N. staff.

His friends have claimed that "Arthur cannot stand to be away from the action," and that he chafed at the monastery atmosphere of the High Court. He visibly fretted during its long vacations.

When President Kennedy appointed him to the Supreme Court in August 1962, and named Willard Wirtz as his successor as Secretary of Labor, Goldberg and Wirtz held the most rapturous press conference in Capital annals. And while on the Court, although he interested himself in any number of other projects and was called in by two Presidents to use his matchless talents as a negotiator, he was a most meticulous and dedicated member.

The regret he expressed at his press conference yesterday was genuine.

But he never doubted that he would take the ambassadorship once it was offered. The President, having broached the matter, suggested that he and the Justice could discuss it fully on the plane on the way to Stevenson's funeral service in Bloomington on Monday.

The President talked Monday afternoon with Secretary of State Dean Rusk while Rusk was in New York for U.N. memorial services for Stevenson, and Rusk felt very favorable toward the suggestion that Goldberg get the assignment.

At 10 Monday night, Goldberg got a call at George Washington Hospital, where he and Mrs. Goldberg were visting the latter's 82-year-old mother, Mrs. Louis Kurgans, ill of a heart condition. The call was from the President, and it made pretty plain that Goldberg was the choice for Stevenson's shoes.

Then the final call to Goldberg at 9:57 yesterday morning, formally tapping him. The President said:

"I want you. Bring Mrs. Goldberg right on down to the office."

It was done, and the appointment was announced to the Nation.

CHOICE ACCLAIMED

The choice was immediately acclaimed. The matter of his inexperience in formal diplomatic dealings was brushed aside by the President's staff and by members of the press who have watched the Justice in deadlock situations. Even the Arabs, whose resentment over the naming of a Jew to the world forum was anticipated, are expected to yield to the persistent Goldberg charm.

He is a natural to settle the strike of the nondues payers, France and the Soviet Union. He settled more strikes than any Secretary of Labor in American history.

He confided his formula to a reporter just before he went into action on the Metropolitan Opera strike in answer to a soprano plea from Leontyne Price: Find out the facts; hear out both sides; get in responsible people who can make decisions; look for somebody in the entourages who can be talked to; search for mutual friends on the outside.

People who were a week ago predicting the demise of the United Nations, are just as surely predicting today that Goldberg will bring it back to life. When Goldberg puts his mind to article 19 and sets about persuading the debtors—or finding a face-saving exit for the other nations—something will give. It always has. During the airline strike in the winter of 1961, during a 4-month deadlock, he made himself available around the clock to the contesting parties. He surely will do the same among the nations.

ALWAYS AT HIGH NOON

He is a man of infinite resourcefulness and unremitting good cheer. If Stevenson's personality had a dappled-sunlight quality, Goldberg's clock is always at high noon. He believes simply that there is no situation beyond solution. And he shares with Stevenson, according to Wirtz, a good friend of both, capacity of infinite interest in whatever is going on at the moment.

Against his dismay at deserting his colleagues on the High Court, is balanced his oft-expressed feeling that all domestic problems are subsidiary to the questions of war and peace.

Now through an appointment that has brought Johnson more huzzahs than any he has made so far, he can become mediator to the world.

If any man can enjoy the job, it will be Arthur Goldberg.

AERIAL BOMBING AGGRAVATES GUERRILLA WAR

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, some Republican "air hawks" urge more bombing as a solution to our problems in Vietnam. But, as any student of guerrilla war knows, aerial bombing is much like swatting at gnats with a sledge hammer. Often, the result is that more innocent villagers are killed than enemy soldiers. The crucial struggle in a guerrilla war is to win the support of the people; in such a war, a rifle is a much more suitable weapon than a plane.

I worry that we may be making the same mistake that the French did in the first Indochinese war. By killing innocent villagers through the careless use of air power and artillery, the French turned the surviving relatives and friends into supporters of Ho Chi Minh's rebels.

An article by John T. Wheeler calling attention to this problem was published by the Washington Post on July 19. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Bombs Kill Viet Village Innocents

(By John T. Wheeler)

BAGIA, SOUTH VIETNAM, July 18.—The wailing of women and the stench of burned bodies greeted the column of troops as they marched wearily into Bagia.

They were searching for a Vietcong force which earlier had overrun a nearby government strongpoint. It turned out the search was fruitless.

Four men carrying a pallet with a wounded man stared hatefully at American advisers accompanying the Vietnamese marines and the cries of a woman sitting in the middle of a dirt road cradling a baby and flanked by two other small children caused some of the Vietnamese troops to turn aside.

Surveying the shattered stucco and bamboo homes and the machinegunned Catholic church, one U.S. adviser said:

"That's why we are going to lose this stupid damn war. Senseless, it's just senseless."

Bagia, with a high percentage of Catholics, was considered a pro-government village. It was hit 3 days running with bombs, rockets, and cannon fire from American and Vietnamese fighter bombers.

The first time was after the nearby outpost, headquarters of the 51st Regiment was overrun by the Vietcong and two 105-millimeter howitzers were taken. The second time was following a rebel attack the next night.

The third, as an American Air Force officer expressed it, was an insurance measure to clear the way for government troops moving back into the area in a sweep to try to catch the Vietcong.

The sweep was launched some 24 hours after the Vietcong regiment had pulled out of the area, one American adviser said later.

Because the 51st Regiment was understrength due to previous maulings at the hands of the Vietcong and because Vietnamese troops normally fail to patrol aggressively and set out night ambushes, the Vietcong had been able to come into the village in strength.

The villagers risked torture and death if they tried to warn the outpost, so Bagia like countless other villages in Vietnam, was caught in the middle and paid a terrible price, not for its politics but for its physical location.

Asked how many had been killed and wounded, villagers shrugged and replied "many."

On the floor of one home was a can of cottonseed cooking oil with the clasped-hands emblem of the U.S. aid program. Nearby was a destroyed schoolhouse which villagers said had been only recently built, presumably with American aid money.

"The Americans have given and the Americans have taken away," one U.S. Army adviser said later in describing the situation.

In explaining the bombing, a U.S. Air Force officer said: "When we are in a bind like we were at Bagia, we unload on the whole area to try to save the situation. We usually kill more women and kids than we do Vietcong but the government troops just aren't available to clean out the villages so this is the only answer."

A U.S. Air Force spokesman at Saigon, commenting on air strikes in general, pointed out that targets are selected by Vietnamese commanders and that American strikes are only fulfilling requests from an ally.

PROGRESS OF BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROGRAM

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, nearly 6 months ago, the President announced a program of action for reducing the continued large deficit in this country's balance of international payments. This program included, in addition to certain fiscal measures to be followed by the Government, requests for voluntary action by lenders, investors, and others to reduce the flow of dollars abroad.

During March, following the announcement of this program, the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee held a series of hearings on the problems of the country's balance of payments. These hearings included statements by responsible Government officials, by representatives of banking and business, and by economists. The proceedings, together with other analyses of various aspects of the problem, were published by the committee.

Another hearing was conducted in May, and others are being scheduled beginning August 3, and again on August 17, to review progress of the program and other developments since March, and to consider problems that may lie ahead. These hearings will include statements by the Secretary of Commerce, by a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, by other businessmen and bankers, and in conclusion, by the Secretary of the Treasury, who will testify August 18.

Recently a number of statements have been made by officials and businessmen as to the progress of the program. I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of my remarks, there be inserted in the RECORD the following speeches: "Investment Planning, Financing Abroad, and the U.S. Balance-of-Payments Program," by Andrew F. Brimmer, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Affairs, before the New York Society of Security Analysts, Inc., July 15, 1965; "The Stake of U.S. Business in the Voluntary Balance-of-Payments Program," by Albert L. Nickerson, chairman of the board of directors, Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., and "The Future of the International Drug Field and the Direct Investment Issue," by Richard C. Fenton, president, Pfizer International, before the American Market Association, New York, June 15, 1965.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Investment Planning, Financing Abroad, and the U.S. Balance-of-Payments Program

(Remarks by Dr. Andrew F. Brimmer, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Affairs, prepared for delivery at luncheon before the New York Society of Security Analysts, Inc., at the NYSSA headquarters, New York City, July 15, 1965)

I greatly appreciate the opportunity to visit with you to discuss some of the ways in which U.S. industrial and commercial corporations are responding to the President's request that they make an extraordinary effort to help eliminate the deficit in the Nation's balance of payments. In this discussion I wish to focus primarily on that part of the President's program which is the responsibility of the Secretary of Commerce. I am certain that you are aware of the contributions being made by commercial banks and other financial institutions in cooperation with the Federal Reserve System. I also know that you are familiar with the several legislative proposals which centered on the broadening of the applicability of the interest equalization tax and modification of the duty-free customs allowance for travelers returning from abroad. All of these are vital parts of the President's program, but I think it would be appropriate for me to confine my remarks essentially to the phase of the overall program with which I am personally associated.

In appearing before this distinguished audience, I realize that most of you are primarily concerned with a wider understanding of the basic factors which are likely to shape the financial performance of the corporations in whose securities you and your clients have a vital stake. While I cannot report to you anything about the detailed plans of individual corporations as far as their overseas activities are concerned, I can review with you the way in which many of the companies are responding to several of the guidelines recommended by the Secretary of Commerce in his letter of March 12:

"In particular, a sizable number of companies is finding it possible to cancel or postpone direct investment projects in developed countries. We now have a rough indication of the nature of these modifications in direct investment.

"While many companies have found it necessary to proceed with their investment plans, they are making a determined effort to finance them with funds obtained abroad. Here also we have a rough impression of the extent to which they are meeting with success.

"We realize, of course, that borrowing abroad may be difficult for many companies. Consequently, within the Government we have given some thought to this situation; it occurred to me that you may be interested in the results of that reflection.

"The Secretary of Commerce also asked companies to be as economical as possible in managing their work and capital requirements abroad; he also asked them to repatriate short-term foreign financial assets held abroad in excess of such needs. I am certain you would be interested in the way companies are responding to this request."

Before I look at the above items in greater detail, I think it would be helpful if I were to give you a brief report on the current overall balance-of-payments situation.

CURRENT BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS SITUATION

We do not have the actual figures on the balance of payments during the second quarter of this year, but the preliminary evidence certainly does indicate that we achieved a surplus. Such an achievement, even though related to a few months, is welcome news after years of continuous deficits. Secretary Fowler's announcement last Saturday that the Government feels the circumstances now warrant the calling of an international monetary conference undoubtedly is also a welcome development.

But, do these new circumstances or events signal the need for changes in the U.S. balance-of-payments program?

We want to be as emphatic as possible in stressing the need for a continuation of the voluntary effort. We are certainly glad that the situation has improved, but we would not want to conclude too hastily that the basic problem of the deficit has been solved.

For one thing, the second quarter upsurge in exports after the dock strike early in the year inflated the trade surplus in more recent months. Furthermore, we have benefited from some of the most quickly effective measures under the balance-of-payments program. Funds that had been sent abroad mainly for slightly higher yields on time deposits and other short-term investments were readily and easily reduced. In short, we are seeing the results of unusual circumstances that just now are largely favorable. To a considerable extent they reflect reactions to highly adverse circumstances during the last quarter of 1964 and in the first 2 months of this year. They do not provide the evidence necessary to demonstrate a basic change in the U.S. balance-of-payments situation. Consequently, the urgent need for the special measures continues, and we must, in fact, press harder for benefits from other parts of the program. These will be more difficult to obtain than the recent favorable turns based on trade results and reductions or reversals in short-term financial outflows.

Under the Federal Reserve program there has been a sharp reduction in the rate of expansion of bank credit to foreigners. As the banks that were overcommitted adjusted the level of their foreign loans based on 105 percent of the amount outstanding at the end of 1964, there was some overall reduction in outstanding amounts early in the second quarter. However, for the banking system as a whole, there is still room for expansion within the general guideline, and there may be a further—though perhaps moderate—increase in credits to foreigners during the rest of 1965.

NEED FOR RESTRAINT ON DIRECT INVESTMENT

I would now like to turn to a review of the basic reason why corporations were asked to exercise as much restraint as possible on direct investment abroad. You may recall that in formulating the guidelines, Secretary Connor did not ask companies to cease making investments in their affiliates abroad. Rather, he suggested that, wherever possible, companies cancel or postpone marginal investments in developed countries. In doing this, he left it to the individual corporations to decide what is marginal.

However, the Secretary was convinced that, if each firm made a careful review of all foreign investment plans, they would be able to find ways to limit or postpone some proportion of their planned expenditures abroad, at least during 1965 and 1966. At the same time, the Secretary was sensitive to the fact that each company would want to do this with due consideration of the long-range profitability of the firm and in the light of its own competitive needs. Yet, it was felt that if a careful and systematic review of plans were made, a sizable amount of investments might be rescheduled to reduce their balance-of-payments impact, while retaining projects that are clearly vital to the long-range development of the company.

Why the Secretary felt such a recommendation was necessary is abundantly clear: in the period immediately preceding the announcement of the President's balance-of-payments program on February 10, private investment outflows rose to near record levels. In 1964, total private capital outflows were nearly $6½ billion, and direct investment outflows climbed to $2.4 billion. In the fourth quarter of 1964 alone, direct investment outflows were at an annual rate of $3.3 billion; in the first quarter of 1965, they rose to an annual rate in excess of $4 billion.

Behind the sharp rise early this year were several key factors. Among these was the transfer of funds abroad by companies to insure the completion of a greatly enlarged volume of plant and equipment expenditures abroad which had already been scheduled for 1965. For example, our preliminary figures collected by the Office of Business Economics indicate that plant and equipment outlays abroad by U.S. affiliates may rise by as much as $1 billion this year from the level of about $6 billion in 1964. In fact, if the final results bear out the earlier indications, the rise may be as high as 20 percent. Such an increase would be the largest registered so far during any single year.

This expansion of plant and equipment outlays would significantly exceed the annual increase normally expected in retained earnings and depreciation allowances generated internally by foreign affiliates. Thus, in the absence of special efforts, such a prospective rise in plant and equipment expenditures would be expected to lead to a considerable expansion and in the rate of capital outflows from the United States in 1965 compared with 1964.

Fortunately, an effort is being made by a number of companies to plan their direct investment expenditures with the balance-of-payments problem in mind. It is of critical importance that this effort be pursued with vigor. We hope that each proposed project will be examined to assure that the additions to capacity are needed and that they are needed at the time scheduled for completion. To the extent that the firms are as frugal as possible in terms of spending their foreign investment dollars, controlling working capital, and limiting cash balances, they may help the U.S. balance of payments without any adverse effects on their foreign operations.

The responses from the participating firms indicate that some of them have set up special balance-of-payments committees of their board of directors that perform a careful and systematic review function. Although we did not ask for a specific report, over 40 firms have informed Secretary Connor that they have canceled or postponed investment projects. These range from a brief mention of general plans to the submission of detailed schedules of postponed projects.

It is not possible to make a firm quantitative estimate of the dollar savings which might result from such reschedulings. However, in the aggregate, the amount of reduction in direct investment which could result is in excess of $100 million. But the effort at modification is broadly based, with changes ranging from a few thousand dollars to a surprisingly large postponement by one company.

THE SEARCH FOR FOREIGN FINANCING

In deciding on the general and flexible approach, of course, we clearly appreciated the fact that many companies would not be able to cancel or postpone investment commitments. Because of this probability, the Secretary suggested that in those cases, where the appropriate company decision calls for continuation of investment plans, the impact on the U.S. balance of payments should be minimized through alterations in financial techniques. In particular, it was suggested that companies try to borrow as much of their requirements as possible in developed countries. This of necessity implies a search for funds in Western Europe.

A substantial number of companies cooperating in the voluntary program have indicated a general willingness to make the added effort and to pay the normally higher costs associated with foreign borrowing. This effort is being made despite the fact that these companies typically have large deposits in U.S. banks at home or have ready access to other domestic sources of funds—at interest rates appreciably below the rates prevailing abroad.

To date nearly 100 companies have mentioned specifically that they have arranged foreign loans or intend to do so to expand their facilities abroad. Since we did not ask for reports in the details of proposed borrowing abroad, we do not have a systematic body of information to measure the success of this part of the program. However, we have been able to piece together a fairly good description from the letters and other material submitted to the Secretary.

In table 1, attached, I have summarized as far as possible the salient characteristics of corporation plans to borrow outside the United States, in response to the Secretary's request. It will be noted that the aggregate amount which companies have told us they hope to borrow is over $300 million. While we can say very little about the terms of such borrowing, we have been able to identify a few characteristics in a number of cases.

Type of borrowing: Apparently, a fairly large proportion of the borrowing will be effected through the sale of bonds, which accounts for $125 million of the $181 million of loans which can be identified according to type. Bank loans, including overdrafts, will undoubtedly account for a substantial amount.

Maturity of loans: In many cases the extension of loans will be for the short and intermediate term. While we have little comment on the actual maturity of loans, a fairly large number seem to fall in the 3- to 5-year range. Moreover, some companies have reported that they will arrange for short- and intermediate-term supplier credits. On the other hand, some companies will make a serious effort to obtain long-term funds, and we now have some cases of new corporation issues offered publicly.

Geographic distribution: We do have somewhat more information about the geographic areas in which the companies have indicated they will search for foreign finance. As shown in table 1, companies have reported that they intend to borrow about $244 million in Western Europe. A substantial part of this will be sought in Western Germany and the United Kingdom. Quite a few companies also plan to borrow in Canada, primarily to finance the operations of their Canadian subsidiaries. Several companies have also obtained funds in Australia, and the amount they have in mind clearly exceeds the $16 million figure in the table because that figure does not include the large amount actually borrowed by the Ford Motor Co. quite recently.

TYPICAL EXAMPLES OF BORROWING ABROAD

As mentioned earlier, we cannot disclose the details of individual company plans because of the confidential nature of the information we have received. To keep within this limitation and still provide some of the flavor of the companies' efforts, the following synthetic cases have been developed from the letters and other material:

MINING

A number of firms has commitments in large mining ventures where the total costs range from $100 million to $200 million. In the typical case they expect to obtain about one-third of the total requirements abroad. They have had some success in getting loan commitments from banks in the host countries. However, because the local capital markets are still in the early stages of development they may not be able to raise any sizable amount beyond what they have already obtained. The typical company also mentions borrowings of over $20 million in Europe, but there are indications that they are in serious competition with other United States as well as foreign borrowers in the money markets of Western Europe. Some financing is available in Japan, but it is tied to Japanese equity in some of the ventures.

MANUFACTURING

Quite a few manufacturers of durable goods will individually attempt to borrow from $3 to over $20 million abroad through local foreign banking and other credit facilities. Funds will be sought primarily in the United Kingdom, Germany, Canada, Belgium, and Switzerland. In cases where commitments were listed, a total of $10 million will be borrowed in Belgium, $4 million in the United Kingdom, and $2 million in Germany. It was noted by several firms that overseas borrowing by foreign subsidiaries has become difficult because of heavy previous borrowing.

RUBBER

Rubber companies already have borrowed substantial amounts of funds abroad. A typical company hopes to borrow about $20 to $30 million abroad in 1965 to finance new construction, expansion, and modernization of foreign affiliates. Funds will be obtained largely through bank credit in host countries.

TRANSPORTATION EQUIPMENT

Manufacturers of automobiles, automotive products, and other transportation equipment will borrow heavily abroad during 1965. Funds will be secured primarily from Germany, France, and the United Kingdom. For some companies, in keeping with traditional policy, foreign expenditures will be restricted to amounts which can be financed through loans in local currencies and cash flows generated abroad. One company has already floated a large issue in Australia.

PETROLEUM

The international oil companies have large outstanding foreign loans, but only a few companies expect important net increases. Where increases are indicated, they will involve drawings under standby agreements with British, Dutch, and Swiss banks. A large corporate bond issue has already been sold in the German market.

CHEMICALS

Some chemical firms have given a good deal of study to foreign borrowing and have investigated a variety of arrangements. Borrowing by local affiliates is being buttressed by parent company guarantees in the case of one major firm. Insurance company loans, leaseback arrangements and mortgage possibilities have been considered in addition to bank loans. A firm with an active investment program underway has substantial loan commitments from Italian, British, and French banks. Typical borrowing mentioned by chemical companies were for small net increases in bank credit used extensively in this industry, including sales in some of the countries, such as Spain, with less developed capital markets.

RECENT TRENDS IN BORROWING ABROAD

In asking U.S. companies to borrow abroad if they find it necessary to expand their facilities, I think it is important to note that the Secretary is not asking all of these companies to venture into totally unchartered territory. Rather, and this I stress, the record clearly shows that foreign borrowing has been a substantial source of funds over the years for direct investment in most areas and for many types of firms. A second important point is that the percentage of direct investment financed abroad is not only high but has also been rising.

In table 2, I have summarized figures from the Office of Business Economics which document this conclusion. This table shows the amount and percentage of funds obtained abroad by U.S. corporations to finance direct investment abroad in the years 1961, 1962, and 1963. Comparable figures for 1964 will not be available until this fall. One point not covered in the table is the fact that not only is the volume of investment financed abroad large in absolute terms, but it is larger in some cases than the amount obtained from other more readily obvious sources. For example, for manufacturing firms in all areas, foreign sources in 1963 accounted for a larger volume of funds than did depreciation allowances and funds obtained in the United States.

The heavy reliance on local funds is particularly strong in Western Europe. For during the 3 years studied—both in manufacturing and petroleum industries—U.S. firms financed on the average almost 30 percent of their direct investment with funds obtained from local sources. Moreover, in both of these sectors, foreign sources were the largest single origin of funds in 1963. The amount raised locally was as large or larger than either net income, funds from the United States, or the sum of depreciation and depletion allowances. That direct investment in Western Europe would be financed to such an extent by the use of funds obtained there is clearly understandable—given the more developed state of European capital markets. But as the figures in table 2 show, the reliance on local funds is also increasing in Latin America and other areas.

The evidence of the resort to foreign sources cited so far is of necessity only aggregate evidence. However, we have made a special effort to identify somewhat more sharply the sources of foreign funds obtained by U.S. corporations in 1962 and 1963. The results are presented in table 3. It will be noted that loans from financial institutions abroad, including commercial banks and other organizations, were in the neighborhood of $400 million. Of this amount, about $150 million on the average was obtained in Western Europe. Thus, for all areas such loans accounted for roughly 20 to 25 percent of the total funds obtained abroad in those 2 years.

Perhaps what is equally striking, net sales of equities in subsidiaries to foreign stock holders (recorded as a change in the subsidiaries' capital stock) also amounted to approximately $300 to $400 million. While most U.S. corporations active abroad seem to prefer to keep the ownership of their subsidiaries in their own hands, it is evident that a substantial number has also sought joint ventures with citizens of the countries in which they have made direct investment.

It may be recalled that one of our guidelines suggest that, where appropriate to the company and the country, sales of equity in foreign subsidiaries is one way to register an improvement in the balance of payments. In passing, I should say that some companies are doing this, and a few have indicated that they intend to explore this technique of raising funds abroad. As a matter of fact, there are some outstanding examples of equity financing involving public issuance of the stock of foreign subsidiaries. We also have a few cases where the parent company has reported changes in plans to purchase the minority interest in its existing affiliates and in one case to encourage further local ownership. Moreover, some American companies are making efforts to list the parent company's stock on foreign exchanges and to promote its sale.

SPECIAL EFFORTS TO SELL BONDS ABROAD

But in many cases equity financing is not desirable from the point of view of the company, and it will be more appropriate for the firm to borrow directly or to sell debt securities.

Perhaps you would allow me to mention two outstanding cases of bond sales abroad (with which I know that you are certainly familiar) which aided our balance of payments.

The first example is the borrowing by Socony Mobil through the sale of 15-year bonds by a subsidiary. As you may recall, the company's board chairman is Mr. A. L. Nickerson, who is also chairman of the Commerce Department Advisory Committee on the Balance of Payments. This borrowing was undertaken explicitly as part of the company's efforts to improve its balance-of-payments position, and we think it is an excellent case study which can be quite instructive in pointing the way for other companies who might wish to pursue this course.

To effect the loan, which amounted to about $28 million, Socony Mobil established a wholly owned subsidiary in Luxembourg. The bonds were floated in the name of the new firm but they are also guaranteed by the parent company. The issue was subscribed by banking firms in London and Frankfurt. The bonds will be quoted on the London, Luxembourg, Amsterdam—and probably later on the Frankfurt—stock exchanges. This is truly a European issue, and it is also the type of securities transaction that undoubtedly helps to accelerate the development of a more viable European capital market.

Another example of a foreign bond sale which greatly assisted our balance of payments is the issue recently floated by the Ford Motor Co. of Australia.

This issue, denominated in Australian pounds, amounted to roughly $22.4 million. It involved serial bonds maturing in 5 to 12 years. This is a very large issue in terms of the capacity of the Australian capital market. Yet, the success of the flotation clearly demonstrates the potentialities inherent in a much broader use of this technique to raise foreign capital even in a market still in the early stages of development.

Let me say again that we believe it is highly desirable that companies make even greater efforts to obtain funds abroad. In stressing this, we are not unmindful of the fact that it has been easier and normally less costly for companies to use their regular American financial connections to carry out their direct investment projects. But as already indicated, many commercial and industrial concerns have been relying on local foreign sources to assist them in developing productive facilities which will be of lasting benefit to the host countries. We think these local institutions are capable of broadening these functions and of extending more credit to U.S. firms operating within their particular borders. While, for the U.S. companies involved, these steps may often entail higher interest cost and additional operating problems, we also think something is to be gained by developing closer connections with financial institutions in the countries where these firms operate. Moreover, such contacts between U.S. firms and local financial institutions will give added impetus to the further evolution of local capital markets—especially in Western Europe.

Meanwhile, we recognize that it may very well be a bit more difficult for a smaller or a relatively little-known American company to borrow funds abroad. Again we also recognize that it will take considerable patience and effort to prepare the ground work and develop favorable conditions for borrowing. And, again we know that borrowing abroad virtually always involves higher interest costs than those prevailing in the United States. Nevertheless, we think the need to improve our balance of payments is so pressing that it continues to warrant suggesting to U.S. corporations that they venture along this course as far as they can if they must proceed with direct investment projects.

SOME OBSTACLES TO EXPANDING BORROWING ABROAD

While we have stressed the need to search for alternative sources of funds, we have not been blind to some of the real obstacles which companies face in trying to obtain such loans. Among these is the problem proposed by the taxation of interest income from the ownership by many foreign citizens of debt securities sold by American companies or their subsidiaries.

More particularly, one obstacle in the path of such borrowing arises because the foreign subsidiaries are not able to sell their securities as easily as the securities of the parent company could be sold. But some companies are reluctant to attempt to sell abroad the obligations of the headquarters company because:

The board of directors of the parent company often does not care to have its name associated with the high-interest rates attached to a offering of bonds in a foreign capital market.

If the borrowing is made by the U.S. parent company, tax problems will arise as far as the foreign security holders are concerned. For example, by holding the U.S. securities, these foreign owners might have to file U.S. income tax returns or the interest paid to them might be subject to the U.S. withholding tax.

There appears to be a feeling among foreign investment underwriters that this potential liability under the U.S. income tax system is often detrimental to the successful flotation of a new issue.

However, borrowing abroad need not mean the loss of the ability to make use of the more prestigious name of the U.S. parent company. As I mentioned at the outset, we in the Government have given some thought to this problem.

I understand that, in appropriate circumstances, the Internal Revenue Service would be willing to consider situations in which the U.S. parent company acts as a guarantor or accommodation maker to aid their foreign subsidiaries in selling the latter's securities abroad.

I understand that in appropriate circumstances, the Internal Revenue Service might find that involvement of the U.S. parent company would not affect the treatment of the interest paid by the foreign subsidiaries to the foreign securities holders. This seems to mean that there would be no requirement for withholding of U.S. income taxes or reporting of the transaction to the Internal Revenue Service whatsoever.

What I am trying to say is that, for a company interested in trying to sell bonds abroad, there is much room for imaginative planning if flexibility of thinking is maintained. At the same time, however, I realize that this is an extremely complex issue, and I do not wish to invade the preserve of the tax expert. Rather, let me withdraw quickly with the suggestion that the Internal Revenue Service is ready and willing to discuss this range of problems with companies who may wish to raise them.

PROGRESS UNDER THE VOLUNTARY COOPERATION PROGRAM

At this point, I think it would be helpful if I were to give you a brief report on the progress we seem to be making under that part of the program which is the responsibility of the Secretary of Commerce. You may recall that the Secretary recommended a series of guidelines that suggested how the companies might improve their net contribution to the U.S. balance of payments by 15 to 20 percent in 1965 compared to 1964. But this improvement was to be defined in terms of a selected number of transactions primarily with developed countries. These efforts include export expansion, repatriation of earned income, reduction of short-term financial assets held abroad, restraint on direct investment and expanded use of foreign financial resources. Since the latter recommendation has already been discussed at some length, we need not consider it further.

As I said at the outset, the effectiveness of the program is already evident; and if the cooperating firms are able to carry through their planned improvements, the longer term prospects are also encouraging. Collectively, these companies expect to increase their contribution this year by some $1.3 billion in terms of the performance recorded under a selected list of their foreign transactions during 1964. In addition, they anticipate making an immediate and substantial contribution to improving the balance of payments by reducing short-term funds held abroad. This latter reduction will be a one-time improvement whose effects will be evident only at the time of the repatriation. Consequently, it is not included in the basic set of transactions listed in our worksheet and used to estimate the improvement of $1.3 billion which I just mentioned.

In a guideline dealing specifically with the treatment of short-term financial assets, Secretary Connor asked that during 1965 the participating firms reduce their foreign holdings at least to the amounts outstanding at the end of 1963. If this were accomplished, the contribution would amount to some $240 million. By adding that one-time improvement, which might be realized in 1965, to the improvement that could result from other transactions, the total contribution by the corporate sector toward assisting the balance of payments would exceed $1.5 billion.

From the regular balance-of-payments statistics collected by the Office of Business Economics, it appears that all U.S. industrial and commercial firms drew down their holdings of foreign short-term assets by about $200 million in the first quarter of this year. A large proportion of these withdrawals were from accounts with Canadian banks, but a sizable share was also repatriated from Western Europe.

These figures are quite consistent with the data reported directly to us by the companies participating in our voluntary program. Replies from 354 companies that were tabulated this week show a total reduction of $115 million in the companies' holdings during the first quarter. These statistics are recorded in table 4. However, certain crosscurrents are also observable in the table. The companies actually reduced their balances held in Canada by $186 million, but this was partly offset by an increase of $71 million in the amounts held directly by parent companies in other areas. There is every indication that reductions continued during the second quarter. There probably will be further decreases in the last half of the year, although the rate of repatriation may ease off.

I have found it particularly interesting to examine the pattern of change in the holdings of short-term foreign financial assets by companies in different circumstances. One aspect of this differential pattern of behavior is shown in table 5. In that table, I have separated the 354 companies according to the amount of short-term assets held at the end of December 1963 and 1964, and at the end of March 1965. The first thing to note is that almost half the companies did not hold any such assets on any of the dates under review. Moreover, 10 companies which had $28 million of short-term assets at the end of 1964, had liquidated them completely by the close of the first quarter, 1965. In contrast, 12 companies, which owned no assets of this type at the end of last year, had added $18 million by the end of March. Further, 27 companies expanded their holdings by $24 million during the first 3 months of this year.

Finally, 133 companies, which owned collectively the overwhelming proportion of the short-term financial assets on each of the three dates, cut back their positions by $129 million during the first quarter.

While it is not possible to provide a detailed explanation of these changes in the holdings of short-term assets abroad, several factors have undoubtedly influenced the pattern. We know that a fairly sizable proportion of such holdings represents the ordinary working balance required for the smooth operation of the companies' foreign business. On the other hand, a fairly large amount probably also reflects the movement of funds abroad in search of slightly higher investment yields. Finally, a good bit of the movement earlier this year probably can be attributed to some apprehension about the kind of program which might be adopted to cope with the deficit in the balance of payments. It was especially to the companies in the latter two categories that the President and the Secretary of Commerce addressed their appeal to repatriate such funds. Fortunately, companies are responding to their appeal.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

In closing my remarks, let me say that we feel confident that the companies cooperating with us are making a sincere effort to help reduce the deficit in our balance of payments. Many of them are exerting restraint on direct investment, while others which feel they must proceed with projects are attempting to finance them by borrowing abroad. And many of them are succeeding. Undoubtedly the companies are repatriating short-term financial assets which they do not need for the orderly conduct of their business abroad.

But at this stage of the program it seems evident that the basic improvements in the companies' balance-of-payments position which will be required later in 1965 and beyond will depend heavily upon their abilities to make gains with respect to transactions other than changes in holdings of short-term balances. Aside from potential improvements in exports, the firms will have to look primarily to the repatriation of investment earnings and the restraint on direct investment. Alternatively, they may find it necessary to make significant alterations in the techniques of financing and implementing their foreign projects.

But as they proceed in this search, it seems clear that the gains from their efforts must be registered for a number of quarters, back-to-back, before we can conclude that the balance-of-payments deficit has been eliminated.

TABLE 1.—*Selected characteristics of plans to borrow abroad by U.S. corporations*[1]

[In millions of dollars]

Characteristic:	*Amount specified*
Type of borrowing:	
Bank overdraft	51
Other bank loans	35
Bonds	125
Total where specified	181
Maturity of loans:	
Short term	10
Long term	44
Total where specified	54
Geographical distribution:	
Europe	244
Canada	35
Australia	16
Other countries	2
Total where specified	297
Total of the amounts mentioned	310

[1] This table has been compiled from the comments contained in letters to the Secretary of Commerce. Companies were not requested to report specifically on plans to borrow abroad. Thus, it is not possible to describe the details of such plans, except that most comments did include a general reference to the geographic area of intended borrowing.

TABLE 2.—*Amount and percentage of funds obtained abroad by U.S. corporations to finance direct investment abroad*

[Amounts in millions of dollars]

	1961			1962			1963		
	Total sources	Obtained abroad		Total sources	Obtained abroad		Total sources	Obtained abroad	
		Amount	Percent		Amount	Percent		Amount	Percent
All areas: Total	8,217	1,391	16.9	8,677	1,521	17.5	10,306	2,146	20.8
Mining	813	113	13.9	906	107	11.8	875	102	11.7
Petroleum	3,696	301	8.1	3,765	506	13.4	4,667	777	16.6
Manufacturing	3,708	977	26.3	4,006	908	22.7	4,764	1,267	26.6
Canada: Total	1,852	220	11.9	2,106	320	15.2	2,363	332	14.0
Mining	390	140	35.9	389	15	3.9	347	70	20.2
Petroleum	535	20	3.7	570	84	14.7	768	100	13.0
Manufacturing	927	60	6.5	1,147	221	19.3	1,248	162	13.0
Europe: Total	2,578	723	28.0	2,447	593	24.2	3,220	1,109	34.4
Mining	8	−2	0	9	(1)	0	12	−1	0
Petroleum	770	130	17.9	747	198	26.5	1,068	431	40.4
Manufacturing	1,800	595	33.1	1,691	395	23.4	2,140	679	31.7
Latin America (total)	1,781	186	10.4	1,794	222	12.4	1,903	146	7.7
Other areas (total)	2,006	262	13.1	2,330	386	16.6	2,820	559	19.8

[1] Less than $500,000.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Business Economics, Survey of Current Business, October 1964, p. 12.

TABLE 3.—*Selected sources of funds obtained abroad by U.S. corporations, 1962 and 1963*

[In millions of dollars]

Source of funds	1962	1963
Loans from financial institutions abroad	410	385
In Europe	165	145
Net sales of equities in subsidiaries to foreign stockholders	400	320
Other funds obtained abroad	711	1,441
Total funds obtained abroad	1,521	2,146

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Business Economics.

TABLE 4.—*Foreign short-term financial assets held by firms participating in the voluntary program with the Department of Commerce*

[Summary data reported for 354 firms. In millions of dollars]

	Amount outstanding—		Changes during 1964
	Dec. 31, 1963	Dec. 31, 1964	
A. Held directly and through U.S. banks in all foreign countries:			
Total all countries (including less developed countries)	882	1,171	289
1. Developed countries except Canada	269	291	22
2. Canada	584	841	257
3. Less developed countries	29	39	1
B. Held by reporting firms' foreign affiliates:			
Held in all developed countries	1,785	1,896	111
1. Developed countries except Canada	1,065	1,247	182
2. Canada	720	649	(71)

TABLE 4.—*Foreign short-term financial assets held by firms participating in the voluntary program with the Department of Commerce*—Continued

	Amount outstanding, Mar. 31, 1965	Changes during 1st quarter, 1965
A. Held directly and through U.S. banks in all foreign countries:		
Total all countries (including less developed countries)	1,056	(115)
1. Developed countries except Canada	364	73
2. Canada	654	(186)
3. Less developed countries	38	(2)
B. Held by reporting firms' foreign affiliates:		
Held in all developed countries	2,079	181
1. Developed countries except Canada	1,430	170
2. Canada	664	15

TABLE 5.—*Detailed pattern of change in short-term foreign financial asset held directly and through U.S. banks: 354 firms*

[Millions of dollars]

Number of firms	Dec. 31, 1963	Dec. 31, 1964	Mar. 31, 1965
161	0	0	0
6	18	0	0
7	0	15	0
3	8	13	0
6	17	0	10
6	0	0	8
27	0	86	110
138	839	1,057	928
354	882	1,171	1,056

THE STAKE OF U.S. BUSINESS IN THE VOLUNTARY BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROGRAM

(By Albert L. Nickerson, chairman of the board of directors, Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., before the American Marketing Association, New York, N.Y., June 15, 1965)

This is a particularly opportune time to talk about the voluntary balance-of-payments program and a particularly appropriate audience before which to do so. This subject is directly relevant to many of us in our day-to-day work and to all of us as American citizens.

I should like to try to give you a broad view of the voluntary balance-of-payments program, and to tell you why it seems to me clearly to be in the best interests of the U.S. business community to cooperate with the Government in this program. To do this, it should be helpful to set the problem itself in perspective.

The United States presently finds itself in a peculiar situation: It has a strong balance of trade, but a weak balance of payments. Our exports of goods and services from this country exceeded imports by over $8 billion last year, yet our overall accounts with the rest of the world were in deficit, and we have been losing gold.

More importantly, the deficit in the U.S. international payments, which amounted to about $3 billion last year, is of long standing and has aggregated about $24 billion in just the past 7 years. In fact, our country has had a surplus in its international accounts in only 1 year in the past 15. That was in 1957, and it amounted to only about half a billion dollars.

In the fourth quarter of last year, when there occurred a particularly large deficit in the U.S. balance of payments, the United States began losing gold at a disturbing rate. When these losses continued into early 1965, the U.S. Government had to undertake some prompt measures to stem the outflow.

As you know, in February of this year the administration announced its program.

It applied the interest equalization tax to bank loans and extended it through 1967. This tax was first applied in 1964 to foreign stocks and bonds sold in this country. In 1965 the administration has introduced tax legislation to facilitate foreign investment in U.S. securities.

Additionally, the Government urged efforts to increase exports, and pledged itself to try to reduce overseas military and foreign aid expenditures.

It requested commercial banks to hold loans abroad this year to an increase of 5 percent over yearend 1964, which meant virtually no increase over the first-quarter levels.

Finally, the Commerce Department announced it would seek the cooperation of business firms in limiting the dollar outflow for direct investment abroad, particularly in the so-called developed countries, and in repatriating liquid assets held in those countries. Secretary Connor appointed a Balance of Payments Advisory Committee of the Department of Commerce, to counsel him in this program. The members of the Advisory Committee are Carter Burgess, of American Machine & Foundry; Fred Borch, of General Electric; Carl Gilbert, of Gillette; Elisha Gray, of Whirlpool; Ward Keener, of B. F. Goodrich; George Moore, of the First National City Bank of New York; Stuart Saunders, of the Pennsylvania Railroad; Sidney Wienberg, of Goldman, Sachs; and myself. The committee held its first meeting in late February.

At that point, some proposals were under consideration that those of us from business felt were far too specific and detailed, and in some ways unrealistic. Companies were to be asked for the equivalent of a "source and use of funds" statement—including information on just how each company expected to make an improvement. It was suggested also that companies should make quarterly forecasts of their balance-of-payments transactions and that prior notification to the Government be required for any overseas investment of $10 million or more.

The advisory committee, on the other hand, advocated the simplest possible reporting system for private companies, with the maximum degree of realism. We favored unanimously a minimum of forecasting and a truly voluntary system in which each chief executive officer would set his own company's goal, in terms of a single, overall target for percentage improvement in that company's net balance of payments contribution.

The committee made its recommendations to Secretary Connor on this basis. The Secretary's faith in the voluntary cooperation of businessmen with their Government, and his awareness of the virtues of simplicity and realism, led him to adopt the committee's recommendations rather than the original suggestions for more detailed reporting and forecasting.

This marks the beginning of an unusual experiment for all of us in working with Government in a program that is voluntary in nature yet quite specific in its objectives. Each of some 600 companies has been asked to review and to total the effects of its exports, overseas investments and repatriated and unrepatriated earnings abroad in the developed countries in 1964. The Secretary has stated that the Department of Commerce is thinking in terms of a total, industrywide net improvement in 1965 of 15 to 20 percent in the balance of payments. Some companies, of course, will probably exceed 20 percent. Others will not be able to achieve a 15-percent improvement.

Each company's voluntary target for its own improvement will consist of a single figure entered on a form supplied by the Department of Commerce: the company's projected net contribution to the U.S. balance of payments in 1965, compared with 1964. It is anticipated that each company will be filing these reports quarterly, so each will have opportunities to revise its target for 1965 as events may warrant. It is further anticipated that later this year, each participating company will project its target for 1966. Secretary Connor has recently sought the cooperation of about 3,000 additional companies, though without asking this latter group to report periodically in writing.

Late in April, the Advisory Committee completed a second series of meetings during which the Secretary reported to us on the goals set by the chief executive officers of 334 companies representing 35 percent of U.S. exports in 1964 and about 80 percent of U.S. direct investment abroad in the same year. Most of the remaining companies among the original 600-odd have reported since we last met. It is much too early to draw any conclusions from these reports, but I can say that the expectations of these executives give a definite basis for our belief that the program is off to a good start.

In formulating this program, what did the Secretary of Commerce and the Advisory Committee see as opportunities for such a broad voluntary program to make a quick and major contribution to the balance of payments without hurting exports or affecting imports in any substantial way?

First, we all felt that if top management of each company reviewed its specific programs for new plant, working capital, and cash balances overseas, some reductions and postponements could be made with only a slight adverse effect even on long-range profitability. At the same time, I think Secretary Connor would agree that none of us wants a postponement of plant expansion programs that are genuinely vital to the competitive position of American business firms operating overseas.

We cannot afford, from the Nation's viewpoint any more than from the business viewpoint, to forgo market opportunities that, having repaid the costs of expansion, will provide continuing returns for many years to come. Neither can we afford to skimp on projects for modernization, new technology, and increasing the scale of plant operations abroad to a level that gives real efficiency. Our European and Japanese competitors are making such improvements, and we cannot afford to lag behind. It certainly does not appear to be our Government's intention to discourage truly profitable investment overseas, and it is leaving the definition of "profitable"—or, if you like, "essential"—in our hands.

Nevertheless, we must search for cash economies—by reviewing construction and expenditure schedules to be sure that they are realistic and well timed; by reviewing capacity estimates to be sure we actually need the amounts that are programed; and by improving our control of overseas working capital and holding overseas cash balances to a reasonable minimum. This is going to require that each of us inspire the maximum effort from our controllers, treasurers, facilities-planning groups, and others.

Second, we felt that if top management expressed a willingness to give up moderate interest advantages, two things could be accomplished: a significant volume of treasurers' short-term investments overseas could be repatriated in an orderly fashion. Also, a larger proportion of expenditures could be financed through overseas sources of funds. We are well aware that in many cases overseas financing is easier to suggest than to accomplish. Most European capital markets, though improving, are still inadequate for the kind of financing we are used to in the United States. There is a limit to the number of public borrowings that can be undertaken.

Consequently, most of us will have to use our commercial banking connections in Europe more intensively than before, and the negotiations will not always be easy. Using these capital sources is going to involve more negotiations, delay, frustration, and higher interest cost than if we utilized U.S. sources of financing. The other side of this coin, however, is that utilization of these sources of capital may bring closer contacts with the European financial community and a beneficial involvement of banks there with the problems and opportunities of U.S. companies. In any event, we must persevere in such efforts, and to make them succeed we are going to have to manage our total working capital requirements very carefully.

Third, it seemed likely that a thorough review under top management direction would probably unearth some new opportunities to promote U.S. exports and to utilize U.S. travel or other services—particularly if top management made clear its willingness to accept slightly higher costs on some of these items. None of us is under any illusion that it will be easy to increase export sales. In the past year, we achieved a very high level of U.S. exports from which to make further improvements. Moreover, the voluntary restrictions on both new bank credit and new direct investment are going to reduce the dollar funds available in some of our key export markets.

The Advisory Committee has been assured, however, that every effort will be made by the Commerce Department and the Federal Reserve authorities to see that financing is available for exports from the United States. It is going to be up to us, as businessmen, to maintain the export drive under these new conditions and promptly to bring any difficulties resulting from credit restrictions to the attention of the government people concerned. Thus it is clear that the members of the American Marketing Association involved in overseas marketing operations have a key role in the campaign substantially to improve the U.S. balance of payments.

The approaches just outlined do not add up to an easy program for business to undertake. The program surely involves extra work, and it may involve additional costs. It did seem to the Advisory Committee, however, that most managements would consider the additional costs involved in any combination of these approaches to be slight in comparison with the alternatives. Certainly they are slight compared with the long-term cost of more-direct government actions that would impair our freedom to make decisions on when and where private company funds move abroad. And it is hardly necessary to remind you of the importance—to our respective companies, to our economic system, and to our country—of keeping the detailed and final decisionmaking in private hands.

We face three basic choices: We can have a temporary program that is largely voluntary in nature, definite in its objectives but not detailed as to methods, and involving only a little additional reporting of data to the Government—in short, the program we have now. Or, second, we can have a mandatory program of tightly administered controls. Or, third, we might have new legislation—particularly tax legislation—that would permanently change the rules for doing business abroad.

The first of these choices—the present voluntary program—seems so clearly preferable to the other alternatives that it needs no defense. This conviction has been the guiding impulse in the work of the Balance of Payments Advisory Committee.

The key word in this program is "voluntary." The other key element of the program is its short-term nature. No one high up in the administration has indicated that he views this program as permanent or even of long duration. Secretary Connor appears to share our belief that over the long run, rising exports and increased net returns from direct investment overseas will tend to overcome the present U.S. payments problem. Of course, there is more involved here than just the private sector. There is the need to control Government expenditures of all types, especially overseas expenditures, and for firm monetary and fiscal policies in support of the total effort. This program is not, and cannot serve as, a substitute for sound monetary and fiscal policies. It can only supplement them.

One of the most encouraging factors, overall, is the high degree of price stability the United States has maintained in recent years. Without such wage-price stability, private-sector exports from our country could hardly have risen by $4.5 billion since 1961 to exceed $22 billion in 1964. Since still greater exports are critically important to the U.S. payments balance, it follows that wage-price stability now and in the years ahead will be even more important than in the recent past. One of the challenges to management is to continue to resist wage settlements or restrictive work practices that would drive costs up, and to guard against any letdown in efficiency. Recent wage settlements and reported wage offers are a disturbing reminder that we can never take wage-price stability for granted.

Now to summarize. Our country has a real problem in the deficit in its international payments. While private direct investment is not responsible for this deficit, we have been asked to make a major contribution toward its solution. We have been given the opportunity to do so on a voluntary, largely informal, simple basis in a program that will hurt us very little if limited to a year or two. The alternatives open to us are distasteful and could be very damaging to our country.

This is going to be a hard job and, a continging job, throughout 1965 and probably 1966. We must not become overconfident if one or two quarters show considerable improvement, nor should we be discouraged if we see a temporary reversal in the favorable trend of this program. The challenge is to make a steady improvement in the private capital sector and thus to accelerate the longer run solution of the balance-of-payments problem. I am confident the U.S. business community will rise to this challenge.

The Future in the International Drug Field and the Direct-Investment Issue

(Remarks by Richard C. Fenton, president, Pfizer International, American Marketing Association, June 15, 1965)

I am going to talk first about the so-called direct-investment issue. Referring to a point that Mr. Nickerson made in talking about the balance of payments at lunchtime, he said that the cooperation of business firms in limiting the dollar outflow for direct investment abroad, particularly in the so-called developed countries, is one of the aims of the balance-of-payments program which the President announced in February of this year.

These words of Mr. Nickerson were very well chosen, and I want to draw your attention to the fact that he did not say that the cooperation of business was sought in limiting direct investments What he said was the cooperation of business was sought in limiting the dollar outflow for direct investments. There has been a great deal of misunderstanding about this point.

Direct investments are, essentially, investments by corporations such as your company and mine in plants, warehouses, and offices abroad. These are the so-called manufacturing direct investments. There are also other types: Investments in oil deposits, mineral deposits, refineries, public utilities, and so on.

What is not sufficiently appreciated is the fact that direct investments as a whole, both manufacturing direct investments and the others, make a very substantial contribution to the plus side of the U.S. balance of payments. In fact, the very manner in which the statistics are usually presented by the Commerce Department and elsewhere has tended to reinforce what the First National City Bank described some months ago as the tacit implication that our payments deficit stems from private capital investment abroad. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Many people seem to believe that the real plus in our balance-of-payments picture is the favorable balance of exports over imports and the real minus is the outflow of private capital, and in particular direct investments in developed countries. The impression has also got around that direct investments in developed countries are somehow harmful to the balance of payments, while direct investments in underdeveloped countries should be encouraged.

The plain facts are that direct investments are the most favorable factor in our balance-of-payments picture, when considered in their total effect, and manufacturing investments in developed countries have a very favorable total impact on the balance of payments. The point is that you have to look at the total effect of these direct investments and not consider solely the capital outflows and profit dividend inflows, etc. You must also take into consideration the exports which are generated by these direct investments in our operations abroad.

I can illustrate by referring to my own company. We have about 56 plants abroad in 29 countries. Some of our products are wholly manufactured in some countries, the largest countries. But in no country do we wholly manufacture everything that we sell. And there is always at least some intermediate of some product that we have to import from one of our U.S. plants. Furthermore, much of the equipment in our plants abroad has been purchased from the U.S. equipment manufacturers, and many of the materials that we use, when they are not made by ourselves, are made by other U.S. suppliers. When we purchase materials and equipment locally, there are often components which are imported by the local company from the United States. It is for these reasons that, since we started working outside of the United States in 1951, Pfizer operations have made a net contribution to the plus side of the U.S. balance of payments of no less than $370 million, in spite of leaving the 56 plants behind in the 29 countries. Last year alone we made a net contribution to the plus side of the U.S. balance of payments of $40 million.

The significant factor that I want to draw to your attention is that the major portion of our surplus—almost $270 million out of the $370 million—has come from our exports of U.S. made goods and equipment to our oversea plants, without counting the exports that we have generated indirectly through other companies. You will readily understand that most of these exports would not have been possible without our prior direct investments in the facilities.

You also understand, as marketing people, that it would be very foolish of us to set up a marketing operation in France without first assuring ourselves that we can make our products available there for our marketing people to sell, and it has long been the fact in France, in our field, that we couldn't import finished goods but must manufacture them locally. In many countries, if we do not invest in a plant, we cannot export to it from the United States; similarly, if a plant is working at full capacity, our marketing people are going to be disappointed if they can sell more and we fail to expand that plant. We cannot postpone the investment in expanding the plant without losing our position in the market. Mr. Nickerson made the point that "none of us wants a postponement of plant expansion programs that are genuinely vital to the competitive position of American business firms operating overseas."

We are typical of many other companies operating abroad. When I said that direct investments, when seen in their total effect, make the greatest contribution to the plus side of the balance of payments, I was rereferring precisely to that effect on exports. The official statistics issued by the Department of Commerce do not group exports with direct investments, but it is possible to rearrange the figures to make the picture reasonably clear. We can take the capital inflows and outflows relating to operations abroad and then add to them the current account effect, imports and exports to and from the direct investments, just as I did with our Pfizer statistics. If we do this for 1962 we find that the total surplus on balance-of-payments account of all direct investments abroad was no less than $3 billion. And in 1963 it was $3.2 billion. The picture for manufacturing direct investments alone is actually a little better than this because the so-called "other" categories—oil and so on—imported a little more than they exported, so their favorable capital account was offset to some extent by an unfavorable current account. I repeat, the total effect was a substantial surplus of inflow to the extent of $3.2 billion in 1963.

U.S. manufacturing direct investment in Western Europe alone, which has acquired the reputation of being the real culprit in the balance-of-payments picture, contributed a balance-of-payments surplus of over a billion dollars in each year 1962, 1963. These latter figures are taken directly from Department of Commerce statistics. The other figures that I have quoted were mostly derived from the Department of Commerce statistics, except for an estimate of the imports from oil and the rest of the nonmanufacturing category into this country. All of the figures have not yet been published for 1964, but the capital account effect of direct investments has been published and was a little more favorable than in 1963, and we would guess that the current account effect was at least as good as in 1963, so the overall surplus was probably a little better than in 1963.

To show you the other side of the picture, the so-called visible trade items, which are erroneously believed to account for the largest part of inflow, if we take out Government-financed shipments going to the underdeveloped countries, for example, in the form of aid, which does not produce dollars nor, therefore, make a contribution to the plus side of the balance of payments—and if you take out imports and exports, which actually arose from direct investments—we find a somewhat different picture from the conventional one. In fact, we find that the surplus on trade in nonmilitary and nonaid goods was only about a billion dollars in 1962 and about a billion dollars in 1963. The true fact, therefore, is that direct investments contributed more than 3 times as much to the plus side of the balance of payments as visible trade adjusted as I have described.

Secretary Connor and his colleagues at the Department of Commerce are well aware of this, although other Government officials appear not to be. In the original statement which he made at the White House meeting on the balance of payments on February 18, Secretary Connor said, "We fully recognized that your business activities have resulted in substantial net gains in our payments position * * *. We also are aware that our export position would not be as strong as it is today if you have not made the investments." What then is the voluntary program all about, so far as direct investments are concerned? As we understand it, we are in effect being told: "You are doing fine. You are making a great contribution to the balance of payments, but please, in the interest of the country, try to do better. Put on an efficiency drive and bear in mind the balance of payments every time you make decisions in your operations abroad. Help in every way you can without curtailing the growth of your businesses and without doing yourselves real harm." Such an appeal is irresistible, and I am sure all of us will do our best to cooperate. Pfizer is certainly doing so.

Let me come back for a moment to a point that I made at the beginning of this discussion—namely, that the purpose of the voluntary program is not to curtail direct investments, but to curtail the dollar outflow for them as much as possible. In other words, we should finance as much of our needs as possible from foreign borrowings and earnings. In fact, looking at direct investments in their total effect in the way I have described, we most surely conclude that all talk about discouraging direct investments, discouraging foreign operations, curtailing them or even postponing them, is dangerous. Because such talk is misunderstood, it may discourage companies from going abroad to operate seriously. It is an old notion that you can build an international business by running an export operation from New York, without risking investment abroad in marketing organizations, warehouses, factories, and so on. We certainly know enough today to recognize that this is not the way to build an international business. What concerns me is that there appear to be only 500 or 600 companies with significant overseas direct investments, and it is only this number of companies which is playing an active part in the voluntary program. The pharmaceutical industry is very well represented.

They have done a fine job in the international field in the last 20 years. I understand, however, that there are about 300,000 manufacturing companies in the United States. It seems to me that one way, and possibly the only way, to solve the balance-of-payments problem in the long run is to actively encourage more of these manufacturing companies to venture abroad. I would find it hard to believe that there is not at least 1 percent of all manufacturing companies with proven products and know-how which could do a good job of operating abroad, if they knew it was in the national interest that they should go abroad in a serious way. Of course, their initial investments would be a net drain on the balance of payments. But if you include the exports that most of them would probably generate immediately after their installation abroad, I would guess that the turn-around time on these investments would be very rapid. But the turn-around time must be calculated on the total effect including the exports, and not simply in terms of the profits and dividends basis. In fact, my suggestion would be that, as a contribution to the long-term solution to the balance-of-payments problem, a real effort should be made to find the successful companies in all branches of industry and enlist the support of groups such as the American Marketing and American Management Associations to show them how to establish themselves abroad. Here I am speaking not of 500 nor of 1,000 or 2,000 companies—but of perhaps 10,000, not a very large number out of the 300,000 manufacturing enterprises.

I wonder if such a suggestion made in Japan or Switzerland or Germany would sound at all strange. There must be a much higher proportion of Japanese and Swiss and German companies operating around the world today than there are of American companies.

Companies should look at the entire world today as their potential market and not just at the United States. You may know that there are in the United States today 190 million people; outside there are over 2 billion in the free world. I am told there are 250,000 doctors in the United States; outside there are over 1 million. U.S. sales of the ethical pharmaceutical industry total over $2.5 billion dollars at manufacturers' prices. Outside the United States, and excluding the Communist countries, the figure is estimated at nearly $4 billion. The purchasing power of the people around the world is going up all the time. More and more governments are financing the purchase of drugs. The market cannot help but expand. Another interest of many of our firms is in agriculture. A few figures may interest you. In the United States there are 100 million herd of cattle; in the rest of the world there are 700 million. There are 35 million sheep in the United States, and over 700 million in the rest of the world. In the United States 360 million poultry, 2 billion in the rest of the world. All of this provides a tremendous potential market, only the surface of which has been tapped in many countries.

Abroad, as you know, marketing is not as developed as it is in the United States. We have had to train our people overseas in marketing techniques. I am sure your companies have done the same thing, but I would like to make a few comments about this. How do we use U.S. skills in marketing? We can't do it simply by exporting. We can't do it by setting up the base for our overseas marketing teams here in the United States. How would you like to conduct a sales program in the United States if your marketing director were located in Tokyo or how would our Japanese friends here like to run their business in Japan with their marketing director based in New York?

And yet some companies try to do just this. In our opinion, the only way to undertake marketing seriously is to locate your marketing people and make your marketing decisions inside the countries in which you want to market. The world is not yet one market. Perhaps it will be in 50 years but it is not today. There is not even a Common Market in Europe for most goods. Each market is different: in language, in consumer preferences, and in drugs, and even in such things as color, odor, and taste preference, in the preference for injections or oral medication.

Certainly the government regulations from country to country are all different, both the regulations to comply with before marketing and the regulations to comply with after marketing. Labeling regulations are different. Advertising regulations are different. Price controls exist in most countries. We even have to put price stickers on the product labels in many countries. Social security regulations regarding drugs provided by health insurance programs are different.

Some countries have planned economies, such as Egypt, or semiplanned economies like India. It is obvious that there are different diseases from one part of the world to another, different behavior of the same diseases. You cannot possibly analyze your markets and then direct your marketing efforts anywhere except right in the countries. You need local marketing, supported by local marketing research, local product development, local finishing plants, all directed as much as possible by nationals of the country familiar with the national characteristics.

What then of the American expert—how can we get the benefits of your skills? Well, I think the answer is obvious. One way is for you to join the international division of your company. But if you do so, you have to face up to the fact that you will not work for long in your home offices. You will have to go abroad. If you don't want to do that for a substantial period of time, then we in the international field would appreciate your help in training our foreign nationals. At Pfizer, we take a tremendous amount of time of our long-suffering U.S. marketing people in training the nationals whom we bring in from all over the world.

We have found that this is very effective and we are grateful for it. I would appeal to those who have not been sympathetic to the use of their time to become more so.

I would draw your attention to the fact that Mr. Nickerson, chairman of the board of Socony Mobil, spent a good deal of his working life on the international side of his business. Mr. Powers of my own firm, who has recently become president of the U.S. parent company, Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., has spent a good part of his working life in the international field. I understand that Mr. Roche, the president of General Motors, has spent a good deal of his life on the international side of his business.

So, gentlemen, look at the world. Your career may prosper from it.

VALOR AWARD TO GEORGE L. PRESLEY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, newspapers today are properly filled with accounts of heroism of our men in military service. Too often, however, acts of selfless bravery outside of the services, go unnoticed.

On July 15, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall presented the Interior Department's highest award to a young Idaho man.

The courage that George Lee Presley demonstrated in rushing into a blazing helicopter crash to rescue two men is graphically summarized in the citation for valor that accompanied his award. His brave act deserves more than cursory acknowledgement and for that reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Department of the Interior Citation for Valor Award to George Lee Presley be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION FOR VALOR AWARD TO GEORGE L. PRESLEY FOR COURAGEOUS ACTION INVOLVING A HIGH DEGREE OF PERSONAL RISK IN THE FACE OF MOMENTARY DANGER ON AUGUST 3, 1963

Mr. Presley, assistant fire control officer for the Shoshone Grazing District of Idaho, was supervising the loading of a helicopter transporting personnel to a nearby fire. The helicopter crashed on takeoff and burst into flames about 30 seconds later. The pilot was seriously injured but managed to escape from the crashed helicopter. The two passengers were both stunned, though not seriously injured. One was lying on the ground behind the craft and the other tangled in his safety belt. Mr. Presley reached the craft within seconds and dragged the man on the ground clear; he then returned to the helicopter and crawled underneath it to untangle the other passenger and then dragged him from the wreck. Just as Mr. Presley cleared the wreck, it exploded into flames. This feat was performed with full knowledge that the helicopter would probably burst into flames at any moment, but was carried out without hesitation. As a fitting tribute for his courageous deed, performed at great personal risk to his own life, the Department of the Interior is proud to confer upon Mr. Presley its Valor Award.

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE—PARAGUAY AND WESTERN NEW YORK

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in the July 20 issue of the Buffalo Courier-Express be printed in the RECORD.

This article tells of the meeting of civic and industrial leaders in the Buffalo metropolitan area on Monday, July 19, to explore the possibility of establishing the partnership between Paraguay and western New York under the Partners of the Alliance program of AID.

I can think of no more worthwhile way in which the people of the United States, in this case the people of western New York can communicate their ideas and esteem to the people of Paraguay than through the Partners of the Alliance program.

As a result of the meeting held Monday, a program development team will be formed and will go to Paraguay to find ways in which the peoples of these two areas can mutually help each other.

I commend to my distinguished colleagues this article and the efforts of the people of western New York and the promise that their activities hold in furthering the relations between the United States and Latin America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AID PLAN IS DISCUSSED

Civic and industrial leaders of the Buffalo metropolitan area discussed on Monday the possibility of establishing a mutual aid partnership with Paraguay under the Partners of the Alliance of the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID).

The meeting in the Buffalo club was arranged by Dr. Clifford C. Furnas, president of the State University of Buffalo. The University of Buffalo now is in the eighth year of a 10-year program of assistance to medical education at the University of Asunción in the capital of the nation.

John P. Wiley, director of the AID mission to Paraguay, and James H. Boren, director of the Partners of the Alliance, told the group that the University of Buffalo work will provide an excellent base for expansion of a program by private interests here and in Paraguay, which will benefit both communities.

George F. Rand, Jr., vice president of the Marine Trust Co. of Western New York, volunteered his services in the establishment of a local committee to work with a group of Paraguayan businessmen and civic leaders to set up a program.

DESIGNATION OF JUSTICE ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG AS AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President—

> President Johnson achieved complete surprise with his announcement that Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg will succeed the late Adlai E. Stevenson as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. Once the initial shock of astonishment wore off, many an American must have wondered to himself why he hadn't thought of Justice Goldberg, too—because the more one ponders this selection the more logical, even the more brilliant, it appears.

This lead paragraph from the July 21, New York Times editorial is typical of the reaction throughout the Nation to the President's appointment of Justice Goldberg to the United Nations.

It is not surprising that the leaders of business, Government, and influential editors of the Nation's press have heartily endorsed President Johnson's choice to represent the United States in the U.N. The caliber of America's U.N. Ambassador must be of the highest. Justice Goldberg meets this test. His long experience in Government in negotiations between labor and management, his interest and participation in international affairs and his adeptness in the rule of law make him the logical choice.

I was most pleased to read the remarks of several New York papers and without exception they support President Johnson's appointment. I now ask consent to have four of these editorials published in the Record. They are: "The Goldberg Appointment," from the New York Times: "Goldberg to the U.N.," from the New York Herald Tribune; and "Good Choice" and "Hail L.B.J.'s Choice as Proof He Won't Downgrade U.N.," from the New York Journal-American.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 21, 1965]

The Goldberg Appointment

President Johnson achieved complete surprise with his announcement yesterday that Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg will succeed the late Adlai E. Stevenson as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. Once the initial shock of astonishment wore off, many an American must have wondered to himself why he hadn't thought of Justice Goldberg too—because the more one ponders this selection the more logical, even the more brilliant, it appears.

In his extraordinarily warm statement making the announcement, President Johnson emphasized that Arthur Goldberg "is an old and trusted friend and counselor" who will have "direct and ready access" to the President and the Secretary of State. These words underline both President Johnson's high estimate of the importance of the United Nations and his strong personal affinity with his new envoy.

The American representative at the U.N. must be a skilled and flexible negotiator, an effective advocate and an able politician in the best sense of the word. Justice Goldberg is all of these. His tact, persuasiveness and ingenuity, his ability to arrange a compromise without sacrifice of principle, his activism, enthusiasm, and pragmatism—these are qualities as applicable at the United Nations as in the world of labor, the law and government.

There is apt symbolism in the fact that Justice Goldberg, who rose from the slums of Chicago to his present national and international eminence, now goes to the United Nations as spokesman for all Americans. He personifies the continuing opportunity afforded by American democracy to its ablest sons. While it is true that he has had little experience in the complexities of international diplomacy—and his lack of background in this field is the very reason his name never appeared in speculation over Mr. Stevenson's probable successor—it is also true that he is not bound by prejudgments or inhibited by previous positions on most major questions of foreign policy. Of course he will be carrying out the President's orders, but his voice will be heard and respected at the White House as well as at the United Nations. He is a worthy successor to Adlai Stevenson.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, July 21, 1965]

Goldberg to the UN

"The main thing you must have," Arthur Goldberg once said, "is the ability to realize there are two sides to the story, and so to be generally calm and courteous in the handling of people in inflamed situations, but at the same time not to relinquish a position of leadership, which on occasion will require the calmness and courtesy to be submerged in a show of vigor and strength and even anger."

He was discussing the collective bargaining function, but it's not a bad description of qualities needed by the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. Justice Goldberg's surprise selection for that post may, in fact, prove an inspired choice. A highly articulate man of exceptional brilliance, a quick, incisive debater, he also has proved himself highly skilled at the difficult art of finding that elusive common ground on which seemingly irreconcilable differences can be compromised without the sacrifice of essential principles.

On the negative side, of course, is his lack of experience in foreign affairs. His predecessors—Warren Austin, Henry Cabot Lodge, and Adlai Stevenson—were also nondiplomats at the time of their appointment, but all had had considerable exposure to the foreign policy field. Goldberg's experience, both private and governmental, has been entirely on the domestic front. But he clearly has the qualities of mind and spirit to grasp the requirements of his new post quickly.

His background as a leading advocate of the labor union movement, furthermore, could stand him in good stead in his confrontations with the Soviets, who like to style themselves as the chief defenders of the workingman. Mr. Goldberg, who helped rid the CIO of its Communist infiltrators, who authored the constitution of the merged AFL–CIO and served as counsel both to that and to the Steelworkers, can speak with genuine credentials as the laborer's friend—while his own life story is a testament to the continuing vitality of the American dream.

His performance can hardly be judged in advance; and he moves into the seat of a man revered the world over. But in naming Justice Goldberg, the United States has put forward a man of national stature and immense ability, whose particular talents could prove of major service not only to the United States but to the U.N. as well.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, July 21, 1965]

Good Choice

In naming Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg the new U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., President Johnson has picked one of the most skilled and patient negotiators in the country.

Many will be surprised at the appointment because Justice Goldberg is mostly thought of as a lawyer and not for his prowess on the international scene.

However, Mr. Goldberg has a brilliant mind and is a good speaker (a must for the U.N. job), so we believe him adequately equipped to talk to the Communists.

In taking the ambassadorship, Mr. Goldberg suffers a salary cut from $39,500 to $30,000 a year.

Surely a strong sense of patriotism must motivate him to give up a lifetime job with all the dignity that goes with it to take over an assignment at the U.N. which will be full of harassment. There is, however, no worthier cause than peace.

We wish him well in his new, and very trying post.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, July 20, 1965]

Hail L.B.J.'s Choice as Proof He Won't Downgrade U.N.

(By Pierre J. Huss)

United Nations, July 20.—Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg's appointment today as the new U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations immediately ruled out prevalent fears here that President Johnson would downgrade the U.N.

First reaction was that hardly anyone in the United States has had more rich experience in tough negotiation with "the other side" than Justice Goldberg, who has dealt with knotty labor relations for more than 30 years.

Justice Goldberg's first words in accepting the U.N. post—"grant us peace"—were seized upon as the probable keynote of his coming activities in the cold war arena at global headquarters.

Although he is far less known abroad than was his predecessor, Adlai Stevenson, it is felt here that his long-demonstrated sense of fairplay and justice will help him at the U.N. to overcome the first obstacles and enable him to bring his experience to good use in the international field.

Justice Goldberg's appointment was announced as members of the Security Council convened to discuss the Dominican situation, paid tribute to Mr. Stevenson, Deputy Soviet Ambassador Platon Morozov opened the session by calling for a minute of silence in Mr. Stevenson's memory. It was the first Soviet tribute to Mr. Stevenson here since his death.

A quick canvassing of U.N. diplomats pointed to a general welcoming for Justice Goldberg, although the Arab countries may hold certain reservations because he is Jewish.

Sources close to Ambassador Stevenson recalled that in recent months he had privately hinted about retirement and had stressed seemingly at random his close friendship with Justice Goldberg.

> One of the first tasks for Justice Goldberg will be to tackle the paramount issue of financial bankruptcy facing the world organization.
>
> Ambassador Stevenson had his heart set on solving that problem, which paralyzed the 19th session of the General Assembly, before the 20th session began in September.
>
> Justice Goldberg will have to acquaint himself in the first week at the U.N. with the backlog of behind-the-scenes maneuvers and negotiations underway between East and West on finding a solution to the debt crisis.
>
> The crisis arose because of the refusal of the Soviet Union, France, and other nations to contribute to the cost of peacekeeping operations in the Middle East and the Congo. The debt now stands at about $90 million.

KUDOS FOR THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, public support for the Peace Corps continues to be very pronounced throughout the country. Representative of this support is the excellent editorial which appeared in the Idaho Falls Post-Register on July 8. This newspaper, which is one of the largest in my State, is published by Edwin F. McDermott and edited by Robb Brady. The editorial comments on the New York University study which shows the good will built up by the Peace Corps among the people of Colombia. As noted in the editorial:

> If the Colombia survey is typical of reactions in other places in the world where the Peace Corps is at work, this face-to-face, shoulder-to-shoulder program may prove to be the best foreign investment (some $179 million in the past 4 years) this country has ever made.
>
> The dividends in international peace, progress, and understanding could keep coming in for generations.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KUDOS FOR CORPS

> The image of the "ugly American" is undergoing a facelift in at least one country.
>
> An investigation by New York University of the impact of the Peace Corps on the people of Colombia shows a rise in pro-American sentiment. The organization has been in this South American nation since the fall of 1961, when 60 volunteers arrived to launch the corps' first rural community development program.
>
> The survey, the first to be made using modern polling techniques, was conducted by Dr. Morris I. Stein, professor of psychology at NYU.
>
> "The results show," he says, "that the volunteers had a positive effect on the people's lives by helping Colombians improve conditions in their communities through such things as sanitation projects and building schools and roads."
>
> Ninety-two percent of the Colombians had favorable attitudes toward the United States. The most frequently given reason was simply that the United States "helps."
>
> If the Colombia survey is typical of reactions in other places in the world where the Peace Corps is at work, this face-to-face, shoulder-to-shoulder program may prove to be the best foreign investment (some $179 million in the past 4 years) this country has ever made.
>
> The dividends in international peace, progress, and understanding could keep coming in for generations.

DEATH OF NEIL J. CURRY, FORMER PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this is a sad week for transportation, for the country, and for the close friends of Neil J. Curry. His sudden passing on Tuesday morning has left those of us who have known him with a sense of shock and with an unfillable void in our hearts. He was not a great man because he was an American but rather was the type of man who made America great. His qualities of leadership, loyalty, and his unbounding devotion to charity and the cause of others were his hallmarks. Whether in business, sports, or on behalf of his country, he lent not only his considerable talents but his unending energies to the task at hand. And more than often these efforts were expended, not in his own behalf, but for the advancement of a principle in which he believed or a cause which needed leadership.

Neil Curry's first love was the trucking industry. He entered the trucking business in 1942 and a short while later formed his own company, California Cartage Co. With the dedication he applied to all his undertakings, he rose rapidly in trucking affairs in his home State of California. He became a director and member of the executive committee and president of the California Trucking Association. His driving spirit soon led him to leadership on the national trucking scene. In 1954 he was elected president of the American Trucking Associations and the following year he was named chairman of the board of directors of the national trade association. But achievement of high position was not his goal. His primary interest was in the betterment of the trucking industry and the advancement of transportation generally. As a tribute to his dedication and contribution, they named him chairman pro tem of the ATA executive committee, a position he held until his untimely death.

While he was, as he once described himself, "first of all a trucker," he also lent his talents to the whole of transportation. He served on the Senate advisory committee studying transport problems; the late President Kennedy named him to be a member of the President's Committee on Traffic Safety on which he remained under President Johnson; he was a director of the Transportation Association of America, a member of the Advisory Committee on Finance of the National Capital Transportation Agency and many other groups.

His sport was horse racing and even in this he rose to the top. With his wife, Connie, he raised thoroughbred horses and became one of the most renowned men in the field. In 1959, Governor Edmund G. Brown, appointed Mr. Curry to be chairman of California's State Horse Racing Board. In 1963 he was chosen to be president of the National Association of State Racing Commissioners and as recently as last month was heralded as the "Horseman of the Year" by the Horsemen's Benevolent & Protective Association.

It would be difficult to relate the events in the life of an ordinary man in these few minutes; it is impossible to review with any thoroughness the many accomplishments of a great man. His achievements in business are documented for all to see but his role as a benefactor is less obvious. Neil Curry sought to help his fellow man not for the glory in it but because he deeply felt their needs. He contributed generously of himself and his funds to aid the poor and the sick and was especially interested in the welfare of children.

He will be sorely missed by those of us who had the good fortune to count him as a close friend. His spirit and memory will live on as an inspiration to all of us.

The effect of Neil Curry's life and unfortunate death is best summed up by the warm tribute paid to him by William A. Bresnahan, managing director of the American Trucking Associations:

> The untimely death of Neil J. Curry is a body blow to countless friends and colleagues throughout the country who will mourn his passing.
>
> Those who knew him best, loved him most. He was a man of many talents and a multitude of interests, but first and last he was a truck man. He enhanced the pride of all the rest of us in the fact that we, too, are truck men. He modestly accepted victory as an expected fruit of effort, and he calmly faced defeat as a signal for redoubled effort.
>
> Those of us who were privileged to work at his side, and to share the victories and defeats, have lost a valiant champion. But most of all we have lost a dear friend.
>
> He walked with kings and never lost the common touch. Now he is gone, suddenly and without warning. He will be sorely missed, but never forgotten. His great spirit will remain as an inspiration to all of us who are left behind to carry on with the work to which he gave the best years of his life.
>
> For as long as there is a trucking industry, the men who fight its battles will speak with reverence of Curry from California.

INFORM THE PUBLIC ABOUT VIETNAM

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, we are all aware that the President and his advisers are meeting now to consider carefully all the factors involved in the war in Vietnam.

Our thoughts and our prayers are with them. To say that the decisions coming out of these discussions will be far-reaching understates the case. Vietnam has assumed an awesome role in the history of the world. What happens in this small country will affect the course of freedom everywhere, in the near future and beyond.

My only regret about the discussions now underway is that they were not held sooner. The basic facts of the situation have not changed. We are faced with the same difficult decisions now which existed months ago.

I am greatly concerned that the seriousness of our position in Vietnam, and its effect on our interests at home and abroad, is not adequately understood by the public at large. It is my sincere hope that as a result of these high-level meetings now underway, the President will outline as clearly as possible exactly what our aims in Vietnam are and what will likely be required to achieve them. Only if the American people are as fully informed as is possible, consistent with national security, can they be expected to support fully our policy in Vietnam and southeast Asia.

SENATOR CHURCH AND REPRESENTATIVE FORD DISCUSS VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, ABC's fine program, "Issues and Answers," featured as guests on Sunday, July 18, House minority leader, Congressman Gerald Ford, and our colleague, Senator Frank Church. Senator Church and Congressman Ford were interviewed on the crisis in Vietnam by the distinguished ABC diplomatic correspondent, Mr. John Scali.

While the two guests took differing points of view on the challenge posed by the war in Vietnam, each one presented his views in an articulate and effective manner. Certainly, discussions of this kind help to sharpen our understanding of the vital issues at stake in the Vietnamese struggle.

I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the program be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Issues and Answers, July 18, 1965

Guests: Senator Frank Church, Democrat, of Idaho, and House minority leader, Representative Gerald Ford, Republican, of Michigan.

Interviewed by: John Scali, ABC diplomatic correspondent.

The Announcer. Vietnam, No. 1 issue facing America today. How will it end, at the conference table or on the battlefield?

Senator Frank Church, Democrat, of Idaho, calls for negotiations. Representative Gerald Ford, Republican, of Michigan, demands more bombings.

Are we drifting into world war III over Vietnam? Is Congress split into hawks and doves? Can the President retain bipartisan backing on Vietnam?

For the answers to the issues, Senator Frank Church, Democrat, of Idaho, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the House minority leader, Congressman Gerald Ford, of Michigan.

Here to interview Senator Church and Congressman Ford is ABC diplomatic correspondent, John Scali.

Mr. Scali. Gentleman, welcome to "Issues and Answers."

Let's start off by looking ahead a bit. From all signs, the administration is about to order tens of thousands of additional American combat troops into Vietnam. There is a prospect, I think, that before the end of the year we will have double the 75,000 Americans who were either in Vietnam there now or on the way.

First of all, do you approve of this? Let's begin with Senator Church.

Senator Church. Well, John, I have always held to the position that we can't "cut and run" in southeast Asia. We have committed American prestige, we have made commitments that have to be kept. So I have always supported the position that we should seek a negotiated peace, but we have to stay the course in Vietnam.

Now I think we are at that stage in the war where it will be necessary for us to demonstrate to Hanoi that we are not going to be driven out of South Vietnam and therefore, I am afraid, that added troops must be sent into the south where the guerrilla war does in fact exist and where the solution has to be found. Now at the end of the monsoon season or after this buildup takes place perhaps then Hanoi will realize that we are there to be reckoned with and then perhaps the prospects will improve for a negotiated settlement.

Mr. Scali. Congressman Ford, what is your view?

Representative Ford. John, I would say that—the Republicans also agree—the end result must be negotiation. The problem is when you should do it and under what circumstances you should do it.

I think the Congress has a responsibility to await and receive the recommendations of Secretary McNamara and the President himself before making a determination as to whether or not 100,000 more U.S. forces are needed in South Vietnam.

The Congress has the responsibility of asking questions such as: if this additional 100,000 U.S. military personnel are needed there for the purpose of protecting our bases and our personnel that are already there, I am certain, I am positive, that the Congress will give wholehearted endorsement to the request. But I think the Congress also has the responsibility to make certain what our long-range plans are.

Does this mean there is to be a change in the strategy and the tactics? If this means the increase of 100,000 U.S. military personnel there, that we have made the decision to go into a large-scale ground war, then I think the Congress better ask some very pertinent questions of the President and Secretary McNamara.

Mr. Scali. Senator Church, do you believe that the basic American strategy in Vietnam—at least militarily—should change to allow American troops to spearhead offensive action instead of relying now on the South Vietnamese for this and using American troops as an emergency standby and to guard vital American installations?

Senator Church. I would be satisfied with the present strategy, John, insofar as my personal view is concerned.

I think we have to realize that this is a Vietnamese war. It involves different factions of Vietnamese and the objective of the war is to determine what the political structure of Vietnam is to be. Now that is the kind of war that can only be settled in any durable, satisfactory sense by the Vietnamese, themselves. Therefore, I would hope that we would avoid turning this into an American war. I was out in Asia during the second World War as an officer, in India, Burma, and China, and the one thing I found all Asians had in common was an abiding and deep-seated resentment against the white man, because of the long colonial experience, and if this war becomes a war pitting white Western American forces from the opposite side of the globe against Asians in Asia, then I think that we will never find any durable solution. So I hope our strategy will take this into account.

Representative Ford. John, I would like to add this, and I think it is very, very important: It is true this is a war for the Vietnamese themselves to resolve, and I think they may have to make a bigger effort, but there is a factor that too many people don't realize: there are countries in southeast Asia—the South Koreans, the Philippines, the Australians, the New Zealanders and perhaps others—who have a vital stake in making certain that Communist aggression in all of southeast Asia doesn't overrun them as well as South Vietnam and I think it is very, very important for the administration to maximize its effort in seeking to get bigger commitments, stronger forces, more men to fight alongside with the South Vietnamese and the U.S. forces.

I feel very strongly that the United States ought to maximize those areas of military power, in the air and on the sea, and we ought to let the South Vietnamese and perhaps the other nations in southeast Asia take advantage of those areas where they have a special competence on the ground.

If we combined these two operations, I am confident that we can convince the Chinese Communists and the Vietcong that it is foolhardy, it is too expensive for them to continue this aggression against South Vietnam.

Senator Church. John, may I just say in that respect, I think the President has for many, many months, been making every effort to secure maximum participation on the part of these other Asian countries. So this has been a task that certainly has not gone unattended and we are getting as much support as these other countries are willing to give. We can't force them in if they are not willing to come. I doubt very much, Jerry, that your proposal, for example, to extend the bombing in the north and to strike the missile bases is a sound one. That is something I think we ought to discuss.

Mr. Scali. I would like to discuss that but I am not quite sure, Congressman Ford, how you come down on the position: should American troops be used, in the future, to spearhead offensive operations.

Representative Ford. Well, I am very clear on that, John. At the present time the U.S. military policy is not for the U.S. ground forces to undertake the so-called spearhead operation. The President has informed me personally that this was not our policy. But there is always a possibility that there will be a change and that our ground forces that will be there in substantially greater numbers may adopt new strategy and if this is a change in strategy then I think the President has a responsibility to talk to the legislature leaders in the Congress and perhaps to the American people to inform them the reasons why we have to change our strategy. And I certainly expect to raise questions. If we are going to involve 100,000, 200,000 more U.S. Forces on the ground in a jungle, swamp war, why we haven't maximized our utilization of our air power and our sea power.

We are at the present time bombing military installations, significant ones in North Vietnam. I fully approve of that. But, the question is, certainly in my mind, why don't we do more, faster. If this is a way in which we can convince the Vietcong that it is too costly for them to continue their aggression on the ground against the South Vietnamese.

Mr. Scali. Then I gather that both of you are satisfied with the present strategy on the ground, which is to rely on the South Vietnamese to spearhead offensive military operations and I gather, if there is a change in this, you would want to discuss it very intensively in Congress?

Senator Church. Let me settle, if I can, this one point. I think, if there is to be a change in strategy, the President will consult fully with the Congress and will take his message to the American people. He has always done that in the past and I am sure he will do it in the future.

(Announcement.)

Mr. Scali. Congressman Ford, you have urged and advocated that the United States bomb the Soviet antiaircraft missile sites in the Hanoi area on the ground that these weapons are now a threat to Americans in Vietnam.

On this program last week Secretary Rusk was against this on the grounds that these antiaircraft missiles are not now a threat to Americans.

What do you say in answer to that?

Representative Ford. These surface-to-air missile sites that the Soviet Union has constructed around the Hanoi area in my judgment are significant military targets and I am confident that eventually the administration will take the view that they must be destroyed.

I think it is foolhardy for us to see these missle sites being constructed, made operational, and we do nothing about it until the first American aircraft is shot down and we lose several American pilots in the process.

I would like to go back to what Secretary Rusk said on this program last week. He said there are no sanctuaries in North Vietnam, in Red China. He implied no sanctuaries anyplace.

Mr. Scali. That is right.

Representative Ford. In my judgment his statement goes much, much further than anything I have said. He has said by implication if not directly, that any target, civilian or military in North Vietnam or elsewhere, is on the list of targets for the U.S. aircraft and Navy planes. This, I think, is a much, much further extension of military strategy and it opens up the possibility, as far as the Secretary of State is concerned, that civilian targets might well be bombed.

I'd like to ask Senator Church whether he agrees with the Secretary, whether there are no sanctuaries, and does he endorse that position?

Senator Church. Well, I should say first of all that warning the North Vietnamese or the Chinese against stepping up the war and indicating to them that if they do that, they can't expect that we will then respect certain sanctuaries, is a very prudent policy and it is quite different from the recommendation that we should now strike at the missile bases.

I would like to talk about that. Those missile bases are situated around Hanoi. We know the weapon, we know its range, we know its purpose: that is to defend Hanoi against bombing raids.

Now our purpose—up until now—isn't and has never been to strike at the population centers of North Vietnam, to inflict tens of thousands of casualties upon the Vietnamese people. Our purpose in the bombing has been to interdict the supply routes, the supply depots, the railroad centers, the bridges that Hanoi is using to help supply the Vietcong in South Vietnam.

I think that the missile sites, as things now stand, do not interfere with that objective and therefore I see no military reason for striking at these missile bases at the present time.

Now I can see lots of reasons for not doing it. The foremost one is that if we begin to bomb close in to the population centers, we have put the war up another notch. And when we put the war up another notch, then the pressure will be on Ho Chi Minh to do likewise. How is he going to respond? If he can't respond in the air or on the sea, he has to respond on the ground, and he has 300,000 well-trained disciplined troops that have not yet been committed to the war in Vietnam.

Now what are we going to do, Jerry, when he sends those troops southward?

Representative Ford. Are you saying we should wait until the first American aircraft is shot down by one of these missile systems before we do anything to destroy them?

Let me just make this point, if I may.

These five surface-to-air missile systems that are developed around the Hanoi area are quite distinct from the population center of the city of Hanoi itself. We, with our pinpoint bombing, can and have destroyed military targets that are as significant as these without touching any of the civilian population. So it is no excuse for anybody to say that if you bomb the sites you automatically bomb the city of Hanoi. That is an untrue statement.

The sites can be picked off and destroyed without touching a civilian population in the city of Hanoi.

Senator Church. Well, my point is that the sites do not presently interfere with the American bombing mission. It is not at all clear that any of the sites are even within range of the targets we intend to strike. Why, then, further aggravate the situation—and assume a further risk of retaliation—by beginning to bomb close in to the population centers in North Vietnam?

If Ho Chi Minh sends his army south, make no mistake about it, the only thing that will then save Saigon is an immediate and unlimited American intervention on the ground on the scale of the Korean war, and that I thought, Jerry, was the thing you wanted to avoid.

Representative Ford. I certainly do, and I am convinced that if we expedite, if we intensify our air and sea power in South Vietnam, we can convince Ho Chi Minh that it is too costly.

Senator Church. In South Vietnam, yes, but accelerating and expanding the war in the north, as you have suggested, by striking the missile sites will not accomplish that objective.

Representative Ford. I think it will and I am furthermore of the opinion that as the flow of war materiel comes into the ports of Hyphong and otherwise we ought to take some steps to prevent this shipping which is being used to supply Ho Chi Minh and the Vietcong with tons and tons and tons of war materiel.

This is one way to stop his activity. We can do it on the sea and we can do it in the air to a greater degree than we have been doing recently. And my point is that we must use our military superiority, which is in the air and on the sea, in order to avoid, as long as we possibly can, a greater involvement by the United States in a ground war.

Mr. Scali. Congressman Ford and Senator Church, what do you think of the argument that we should avoid bombing these Soviet antiaircraft missile sites because at this stage we don't want to kill Russians—meaning perhaps the Russian technicians who are installing and who would be manning these?

Representative Ford. Well it is my judgment, John, that the Soviet Union when it took the initiative to escalate the war by sending their personnel, their military and civilian, that they took a certain risk. And when they are there and they are building a military target, a significant military target in North Vietnam, they undertook a risk which they certainly know that we couldn't let go by indefinitely without taking some military action against them. It just would be pure folly for us to wait until those operational missile systems destroy American aircraft.

Senator Church. I just think that your very question suggests that this is another dimension to the risks we take in striking these missile bases, and since they do not now interfere with our mission in the north, I think that the strategy of the President and his advisers is sound. Under present circumstances, I think it would only increase our risk for general acceleration of the war and accomplish no military objective, to begin striking at these missile bases close to Hanoi.

Mr. Scali. Congressman Ford, I gather you think concern over this point should not be a major factor in our decisions on air bombings; is that correct?

Representative Ford. I don't think so because when the Soviet Union took the initiative, supplying materiel and personnel and scientists and technicians to install these military targets, they must have known the risk. They were the ones that escalated the war.

Senator Church. I think this is the chicken-and-the-egg argument. You can go back to our initiation of the bombings in the north and each time we take a step then there is going to be a counterstep. They started the thing a long time ago by moving into South Vietnam. Then there have been countersteps. So the acceleration goes on, on both sides. Now, if you strike the missile bases that doesn't put an end to the situation or solve the problem. What is next? What is the next step: striking Hanoi, bombing China? Where do you draw the line? You have to draw it, I think, at a place that makes sense for the United States of America, and I think that, at this juncture, there is no military need nor any good advantage to be gained by striking the missile bases.

Representative Ford. I am sure you will find there are many, many military people in the Pentagon, in the administration, who would violently disagree with your viewpoint because they feel these missile sites are significant military targets and they ought to be destroyed before they become operational.

Senator Church. They can give their advice and no doubt have, but the prevailing opinion has thus far been against them.

Representative Ford. I think the prevailing opinion, however, of the State Department has overridden some of the military advice in this particular area.

Mr. Scali. Senator Church, what do you think of Congressman Ford's suggestion that perhaps bombing should be accelerated, more raids against military targets and more planes and just a faster, all-around operation?

Senator Church. Well, I have indicated what I think the risks are. The risks are that North Vietnam will have to retaliate on the ground and then we are in the very kind of mean, widespread jungle war that all of us hope to avoid. I don't know of a single war that has ever been won from the air. It didn't happen in Korea, it didn't happen in Germany. There hasn't been a single case where bombing alone has broken the spirit of resistance, and when an army begins to march, there never has been an instance where that army has been stopped from the air. The only way we will stop the North Vietnamese Army, if it begins to march, is with the introduction of a complete American Army on the ground in South Vietnam.

Mr. Scali. Congressman Ford, what do you say to that?

Representative Ford. I think your argument is in contradiction, Frank, to the philosophy and the program and the policy of this administration. Because the President and Secretary McNamara have a schedule of military bombing, aerial attacks against significant military targets, and their whole program is based on the destruction of these significant military targets in North Vietnam.

Now you are raising a——

Senator Church. These missile bases don't fit that category.

Representative Ford. Oh, yes, they are on the schedule.

Senator Church. In what way do they interfere with the interdiction of the supply routes to the south, which is the major reason for our bombing?

Representative Ford. They could, any day. The minute they become operational, and some are operational today, or will be very shortly.

Senator Church. Within a 30-mile range from Hanoi?

Representative Ford. We are already bombing military targets within that area, already. Civilian targets excluded, military targets included. And one of these days there will be a Soviet manned or Soviet trained surface-to-air missile system destroy an American plane and then we will retaliate, and we will have lost one or more American lives and I think this is a risk we don't have to take and we shouldn't take.

Senator Church. If we get involved in a full-scale war in South Vietnam, we will be losing tens of thousands of American lives. We lost 50,000 Americans in Korea and 150,000 casualties and, at the end, we finished at the bargaining table settling for the status quo, for a stalemate.

Now I hate to see a repeat performance in Vietnam. I think the President is bombing with great restraint and I commend him for that, and I hope he resists the pressures to expand the bombing in North Vietnam because the risks aren't worth the candle.

Representative Ford. But the Secretary of State on this program last week enunciated a policy, which goes beyond anything I have said, or others have said in the Congress. He says there are nc sanctuaries, and by implication says that military targets exist every place, not only in North Vietnam but in China, itself.

Mr. Scali. Gentlemen, we will resume this discussion in just a moment when we will be back with more "Issues and Answers."

(Announcement.)

Mr. Scali. Gentlemen, there are signs that President Johnson may have to call up reserves in order to send more troops into Vietnam. How do you stand on this, Senator Church?

Senator Church. I think I have already indicated that in the answer to the first question, that this is a stage in the war where we have to demonstrate that we are in South Vietnam and we won't be driven out, and when Hanoi realizes this, then I think we can look forward to a satisfactory basis for a negotiated settlement. But the war exists in South Vietnam, and a solution will have to be found there, not in North Vietnam, not in China, or elsewhere. Not in an expanded war, which is the way in, but by concentrating in the south, which is—ultimately—the way out.

Representative Ford. Well, John, as you know, I strongly feel that we must stay there and prevent Communist aggression against free nations of the world.

The question of whether or not the President ought to call up reserves to active duty, extend the enlistments of others, is one the Congress ought to look at very, very carefully.

Last week, I was at a meeting with the Secretary of Defense, and he was telling us that this administration has increased the counterinsurgency forces by a thousand percent. We have increased the combat-ready divisions from 11 to 15. It seems to me that before we give carte blanche authority to the President to call up reservists we ought to look and see whether these programs of the President in strengthening our armed forces have been adequate.

Mr. Scali. Thank you very much, gentlemen, for being with us today on "Issues and Answers."

The Announcer. Our guests this week have been Senator Frank Church, Democrat, of Idaho, and House Minority Leader Gerald Ford, Republican, of Michigan. They were interviewed by ABC State Department Correspondent John Scali.

Next week at this same time the American Broadcasting Co. will bring you another program of "Issues and Answers." We hope you will be with us.

LOAN AND SALE OF NAVAL VESSELS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on April 27, 1965, the Secretary of the Navy submitted to the Congress recommendations for the enactment of three bills: First, to lend one destroyer and two destroyer escorts to China, two destroyers to Turkey and one destroyer escort to the Philippines; second, to lend two submarines to Italy and one helicopter carrier to Spain; and, third, to sell or lend three destroyers to Argentina, four destroyers to Brazil, two destroyers each to Chile and Peru and one submarine to Venezuela.

These bills have been reported favorably by the House Armed Services Committee. They are now pending before the Senate Armed Services Committee. Also pending before that committee is a bill introduced by Senator Russell on July 15, providing for the loan of one helicopter carrier to Spain and two destroyers to Turkey which presumably is to take the place of the first two bills previously mentioned.

The Committee on Foreign Relations is naturally deeply interested in the military assistance program. Since these loans and sales of naval vessels sometimes involve U.S. funds derived from the military assistance program and since, in the words of the Secretary of the Navy, these loans and sales are "related to the mutual defense and development program," I wrote the Secretary of Defense on May 21, 1965, and asked for a report on this program. Mr. Peter Solbert, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, replied by letter of June 16, 1965. He described the terms of the loans and sales made under this program which has involved the outright grant of 9 destroyer escorts, the sale of a submarine to Venezuela and the loan of 71 ships to 18 countries since the inception of the program in 1951.

This is not the same program as the loan of naval vessels not larger than destroyers to friendly foreign nations in the Far East and Europe under the authority of Public Law 83–188 as amended by Public Law 84–948. Loan agreements under this authority can be extended under the authority of section 503 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. The Department of State is now in the process of exchanging notes with the Japanese Government extending for 5 years the loan of seven U.S. minesweepers which were originally turned over to the Japanese in January 1955 under the authority of Public Law 83–188. The committee has received two letters, dated June 14 and July 19, from Mr. John Funari, Legislative Programs Coordinator of the Agency for International Development, regarding these negotiations with the Japanese Government. Mr. Funari points out that title to the ships remains in the U.S. Government. He states that it is his belief that the transfer of these minesweepers was, and still is, a loan and not a grant and that therefore the extension of the loan should not be construed as conflicting with section 620(m) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 which prohibits assistance on a grant basis to any economically developed nation.

I believe the Members of the Senate will be interested in reading the letters from Mr. Solbert and Mr. Funari, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

May 21, 1965.

Hon. Robert S. McNamara,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: I refer to the program of the executive branch of lending, pursuant to various legislation, naval vessels to certain friendly foreign nations.

The most recent legislation of this nature was Public Law 88–437, approved August 14, 1964, which applied to 12 countries and 40 vessels. On April 27, 1965, the Secretary of the Navy submitted to the Congress three additional recommendations for enactment of bills (1) to lend three vessels to China, two destroyers to Turkey, and one destroyer escort to the Philippines; (2) to lend two submarines to Italy and one helicopter carrier to Spain; and (3) to sell or lend three destroyers to Argentina, four destroyers to Brazil, two destroyers each to Chile and Peru, and one submarine to Venezuela. This legislation is pending before the Armed Services Committees.

As you know, the committee has been deeply interested and quite concerned over the military assistance program, and especially the programs in Latin America. Since these loans and sales are funded by MAP funds and since, in the words of the Secretary of the Navy, they are "related to the mutual defense and development program" the committee would appreciate having an overall report on this foreign aid type of activity; the number of countries involved, the number and type of vessels, the costs of the loan or sale, the duration and terms of these loans, and the justification for them.

I do not believe that this request in any way intrudes on the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committees in this matter.

Your consideration of this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
J. W. Fulbright,
Chairman.

Assistant Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C., June 16, 1965.

Hon. J. W. Fulbright,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: With further reference to your letter of May 21 to Secretary McNamara, which was acknowledged by Mr. McGiffert's interim reply of May 26, I am glad to make available to you and your committee the following information which I believe will satisfy your interest in having an overall report on the transfer by the executive branch of naval vessels to certain friendly foreign nations. The 18 countries which have participated in the program, together with a list of 71 ships presently on loan, costs involved and delivery and expiration dates, are set forth at enclosure 1.

Eleven public laws relating to the ship loan program have been enacted since 1951. Under the authority of these laws the following has been accomplished:

(a) Nine ships were transferred outright under military grant aid in 1951 to: France, two destroyer escorts; Denmark, two destroyer escorts; Peru, three destroyer escorts; Uruguay, two destroyer escorts.

(b) Seventy-two ships have been loaned. The aircraft carrier *Belleau Wood*, loaned to France from 1953 to 1960, was returned at the request of France when no longer needed. Enclosure 1 is a tabulation of all 71 ships on loan to foreign countries.

(c) One submarine was sold to Venezuela in 1960. The price of $2,400,000 included the cost of rehabilitation/overhaul as well as the cost of title to the ship. Being an outright sale, loan arrangements were not applicable.

For those ships loaned, the loan agreement between countries must be concluded by the Department of State within time specified in the authorizing legislation. All loan agreements provide that:

(a) The recipient country shall use the vessels solely to maintain its legitimate self-defense and to fulfill the policies and purposes of NATO, SEATO, CENTO, the Mutual Security Act, or any bilateral agreement as applicable.

(b) The titles to the vessels remain in the Government of the United States, but the recipients may place the vessels under their national flags.

(c) The period of loan of each ship is 5 years from date of delivery to the recipient government. In some instances the public laws that either authorized the original loans or extended existing loans provided for a 5-year extension without further reference to Congress.

(d) The Government of the United States may request the return of the vessels at a date earlier than that specified by the loan agreement if such action is necessitated by its own defense requirements.

The ship loan program has evolved over the years following World War II when the inventory of warships exceeded defense needs. The mothballed fleet made it apparent that selected ships, actively operating in the hands of friendly foreign navies were of much greater value to the United States than was represented by their potential value in the Reserve Fleet. Accordingly, in order to strengthen free world navies and give selected countries the capacity to fill defense gaps which the United States could not reasonably fill around the world, certain ships in the Reserve Fleet not currently required for U.S. defense were transferred to foreign navies. This is the basic policy and concept of ship loans. Public Law 82–3 originally signed into law on March 10, 1951 and subsequently codified 10 United States Code 7303 requires congressional authority to loan combatant navy ships.

In each case the loan originates at the "country team" level and is approved by the Unified Commander, Departments of Defense and State and the Bureau of the Budget before submission to Congress. Thus, each loan is in consonance with U.S. national policy with respect to each recipient country and the naval tasks approved for that country.

The proposed ship loan legislation before the current Congress is as follows:

S. 2027: Loan (no cost to the United States); H.R. 7812: Spain, one helicopter carrier; Italy, two submarines.

S. 2028: Loan (credit sale or grant aid); H.R. 7813: Turkey, two destroyers; China, one destroyer, two destroyer escorts; Philippines, one destroyer escort.

S. 2029: Sale/loan (no cost to the United States); H.R. 7811: Argentina, three destroyers; Brazil, four destroyers; Chile, two destroyers; Peru, two destroyers; Venezuela, one submarine.

S. 2027: This bill proposes the loan of a helicopter carrier to Spain at no cost to the United States. This loan supports the 1963 base rights agreement, which, in turn, supports U.S. strategic posture. With this carrier and its embarked helicopters, the Spanish will add a significant antisubmarine warfare capability to free world forces in an area of high strategic significance.

The bill also proposes the loan, at no cost to the United States, of two submarines to Italy which are to replace obsolete Italian submarines that are now beyond economical repair. This loan would provide NATO-committed Italian antisubmarine warfare forces with submarine target services that are a requisite to maintaining readiness and proficiency. Competent Italian antisubmarine warfare forces enhance our posture in the Mediterranean.

S. 2028: This bill would authorize loan of three destroyers and three destroyer escorts to countries on the periphery of the Communist world, Turkey, China, and the Philippines. Costs would be borne by grant aid or credit assistance. These ships would appreciably strengthen the navies of those countries whose policies ally them so closely to U.S. objectives.

A portion of the funds necessary to implement this bill is being requested in the current foreign aid appropriations bill before this session of Congress. The remaining funds required will be requested in subsequent foreign aid requests if Congress approves these proposed loans.

S. 2029: This bill, containing the proposed loan or sale of 11 destroyers and 1 submarine to South American countries, at no cost to the United States, provides the most economical and effective means by which the United States can assist these navies to improve their forces.

The vessels contained in the bill would enable Latin American navies to continue replacement of obsolete ships and standardize on general purpose units suitable and effective for peacetime surveillance of coastal waters, support of counterinsurgency operations in coastal areas and wartime patrol of convoy routes along their coasts. Since U.S. naval forces are insufficient to allow the U.S. Navy solely to assure the antisubmarine warfare role in these areas, the vessels provided under this bill will allow the Latin American navies to augment the U.S. Navy in this important role. The annual United States-South American antisubmarine warfare training exercises (UNITAS series) have demonstrated the value of standardizing equipment and training to improve the collective strength of United States-South American naval forces.

Concomitant with the ship loans under the 1958 bill, South American countries scrapped, laid up, or inactivated tonnage far beyond that received in loan. Information received informally from the country teams indicates that additional obsolete ships would be scrapped should the Congress approve the proposed legislation. The alternative appears to be a growing obsolescence of their ships, a degrading of the Latin American naval role, and perhaps their turning to other countries for support.

In this bill, the South American countries would have the option to purchase the ships. Under that option, the ships involved would be stricken from the Navy list, and sold for not less than $1 million each over and above the costs of activation, overhaul and modification. Upon full payment by the recipient, such sales would be final and no recall of the ships would apply.

In each of these three bills it is proposed that the authority to sell or lend vessels terminate on December 31, 1967. This period of time is needed to provide for negotiations and the orderly planning of activations and overhauls. All previous new loan authority has expired.

In addition, the new 5-year loan proposals contain a provision for authority to renew the loan period for an additional 5 years at the discretion of the President without further reference to the Congress. Congress would be kept informed of all loans and sales granted under this authority.

The costs of rehabilitation, overhaul, and modernization are estimated as follows:

(a) S. 2027: The Spanish helicopter carrier rehabilitation would cost $10 million plus an additional $10 million for the embarked helicopters. The estimated costs for the two Italian submarines would be $0.5 million for austere reactivation work done in U.S. yards. Subsequently complete overhaul and modernization would be done in Italian yards for which estimates are not available. All of these costs will be paid by the recipient countries.

(b) S. 2028: It is estimated that the maximum costs of rehabilitation, overhaul and modernization of the six ships for Turkey, China and the Philippines will be approximately $17 million. These costs will be charged to grant military assistance funds or to the recipient government through appropriate credit arrangements. We plan to negotiate with the countries involved to have them take on the maximum overhaul themselves, which will reduce substantially the cost to MAP.

(c) S. 2029: The costs of preparing these ships for service is estimated to vary from a minimum of $38 million to a maximum of $80 million, dependent upon the extent of overhaul and modernization desired, and whether title to the ships is purchased by the recipient country. All work of rehabilitation/overhaul/modernization will be done in U.S. shipyards and the costs will be borne by the recipient countries.

It seems to me that Secretary Nitze stated the case for the ship loan program clearly and succinctly when he said: "The worldwide commitments of the United States require assistance from our allies. The U.S. Navy alone cannot fulfill all free world naval requirements. The forces of our allies, large and small, must help accomplish these naval tasks. It is to enable them more adequately to help us while helping themselves that these ship loans or sales are intended. The proposed legislation supports U.S. policy, strengthens free world forces, enhances U.S. forward security and improves U.S. balance of payments. Last, and most important, it converts the potential of a portion of the Reserve Fleet to actual operating naval strength, strategically dispersed and operational in the hands of our allies, at minimum cost to U.S. resources."

If the foregoing report, together with the information contained in enclosure 1, do not fully satisfy the interest of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in this matter, I hope you will let me know so that I may provide you with any additional information or discussion you desire.

Sincerely,

PETER SOLBERT,
Deputy Assistant Secretary.

Ships on loan to foreign countries, May 21, 1965

Country	Ships loaned	Rehabilitation costs borne by—		Date delivered	Date of expiration
		Recipient	MAP		
Argentina	2 submarines	$952,000		Aug. 11, 1960	[1] July 11, 1970
	3 destroyers	7,500,000		Aug. 14, 1961	Aug. 14, 1966
Brazil	2 submarines		$3,095,000	Jan. 18, 1957	[2] Jan. 18, 1967
	do		5,000,000	Sept. 7, 1963	[1] Sept. 7, 1968
	do		6,126,000	Dec. 15, 1959	[1] Dec. 15, 1969
	do		5,000,000	July 20, 1961	[1] July 20, 1966
Canada	1 submarine	877,000		May 12, 1961	[1] May 12, 1966
Chile	do		2,500,000	Jan. 23, 1961	Jan. 23, 1966
	do		2,500,000	Jan. 12, 1962	Jan. 12, 1967
	2 destroyers	2,000,000		July 26, 1962	July 26, 1967
Colombia	1 destroyer		1,750,000	Jan. 23, 1961	Jan. 23, 1966
Germany	do	4,700,000		Jan. 17, 1958	Jan. 17, 1968
	5 destroyers	21,949,345		Apr. 12, 1960	[1] Apr. 14, 1970
Greece	1 submarine		4,000,000	Aug. 10, 1957	Aug. 10, 1967
	do		4,000,000	Apr. 22, 1958	Apr. 22, 1968
	do		4,620,000	Feb. 26, 1965	Feb. 26, 1970
	3 destroyers		16,659,000	Oct. 1, 1959	[1] Oct. 1, 1969
	1 destroyer		5,553,000	Feb. 15, 1960	[1] Feb. 15, 1970
	2 destroyers		5,400,000	Sept. 27, 1962	Sept. 27, 1967
Italy	do		7,480,000	Jan. 31, 1955	[1] Jan. 31, 1970
	1 submarine		4,928,000	Jan. 9, 1960	[1] Jan. 9, 1970
Japan	do		797,000	Aug. 15, 1955	[1] Aug. 15, 1970
	2 destroyers		2,827,000	Oct. 19, 1954	[1] Oct. 19, 1969
	do	(3)	(3)	Mar. 10, 1959	[1] Mar. 10, 1969
	2 destroyer escorts		3,162,000	June 14, 1955	[1] June 14, 1970
Korea	1 destroyer		5,360,000	May 16, 1963	May 16, 1968
	2 destroyer escorts		2,933,000	Feb. 2, 1956	Feb. 2, 1966
	1 destroyer escort		2,413,000	June 19, 1963	June 19, 1968
Netherlands	2 submarines		7,611,000	Apr. 21, 1953	[1] Apr. 21, 1968
Pakistan	1 submarine		3,250,000	June 30, 1964	June 30, 1969
Peru	1 destroyer		1,900,000	Dec. 15, 1960	[1] Dec. 15, 1970
	do	1,050,000		Oct. 8, 1961	[1] Oct. 8, 1966
Portugal	2 destroyer escorts		2,284,000	Feb. 7, 1957	Feb. 7, 1967
Spain	1 submarine		5,492,000	Dec. 24, 1959	[1] Dec. 24, 1969
	2 destroyers		4,225,000	May 15, 1957	May 15, 1967
	1 destroyer		5,667,000	July 1, 1959	[1] July 1, 1969
	2 destroyers		730,000	Dec. 4, 1960	[1] Dec. 4, 1960
China	do		3,200,000	Feb. 26, 1954	[1] Feb. 26, 1969
	1 destroyer		1,600,000	July 28, 1955	[1] July 28, 1970
	do		2,640,000	Feb. 16, 1959	[1] Feb. 16, 1969
Thailand	1 destroyer escort		1,530,000	July 22, 1959	[1] July 22, 1969
Turkey	2 submarines		4,566,000	Oct. 23, 1954	[1] Oct. 23, 1969
	1 submarine		5,492,000	Oct. 18, 1958	[1] Oct. 18, 1968
	2 submarines		9,568,000	Apr. 20, 1960	[1] Apr. 20, 1970
Total (71 ships)		39,028,345	155,858,000		

---

[1] Applicable law authorizes the President to extend the loan for an additional 5 years.

[2] Brazil will return these 2 submarines to the United States during calendar year 1965.

[3] None; in country overhaul.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., June 14, 1965.

Dr. CARL MARCY,
U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CARL: In view of the committee's interest in ship loan activities under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and of Senator CHURCH's interest in section 620(m) I want to apprise you of the current negotiations to extend the loan by the United States to Japan of seven minesweepers.

The seven minesweepers were first loaned to the Government of Japan in 1954, under authority contained in Public Law 83–188, as amended by Public Law 84–948. Public Law 83–188, as amended, did not set any time limitation on the duration of the kinds of loans it authorized, but the agreement with Japan set a 10-year limit on the loan. This agreement is about to expire, and the U.S. Embassy in Japan is now negotiating with officials of Japan to extend the loan. Section 503 of the Foreign Assistance Act provides the authority for an extension of this loan.

As you know, section 620(m) of the Foreign Assistance Act states that no "assistance shall be furnished on a grant basis" to any economically developed nation. We believe that the transfer of these minesweepers constitutes a loan to Japan and not a grant, even though Japan does not pay a rental charge for these ships.

Under the terms of the arrangement, title to the ships remains in the U.S. Government. The United States can take possession of the ships any time they are needed, even though Japan must pay the costs of maintaining the ships.

The proposed extension of the loan should not be construed as an attempt to evade the provisions of section 620(m). The original agreement was entered into 10 years ago, and what is now being negotiated is simply a continuation of the same arrangement.

The same proposed extension of the agreement could be effected under existing military statutory authority. This procedure, however, would be considerably more time consuming than an extension made under authority of the Foreign Assistance Act.

If I can provide more information or if you wish to discuss the matter further please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

JOHN FUNARI,
Legislative Programs Coordinator.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., July 19, 1965.

Dr. CARL MARCY,
Chief of Staff, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CARL: I am writing to confirm and to clarify my letter of June 14, regarding the extension of loan of seven minesweepers to the Government of Japan.

As I pointed out, the statutory authority for the original loan was section 4(a) of Public Law 83–188. We are continuing the loan of 14 vessels (7 in the class of destroyer type or submarine and 7 minesweepers). Authority of Public Law 88–437 covers the seven larger vessels and the authority contained in section 503 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is not involved in the continuation of the loan of these seven larger vessels.

At the time when the original loan was planned, Japan and the United States had not yet concluded a mutual defense assistance agreement. Consequently, Public Law 83–188, as amended by Public Law 84–948, was the legislative authority for the original loan of the seven minesweepers as well as five of the seven larger vessels mentioned above. The original loan agreement negotiated in 1954 set a 10-year limit on the loan of the vessels; this 10-year limit was reached following an extension in 1959 of the initial 5-year loan period. At the time of the 1959 extension, the Mutual Security Act of 1964, as amended, was used as the authority for the loan of the seven minesweepers.

The main concern in calling to your attention the new agreement to continue the loan of the seven minesweepers under the authority of section 503 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 was the relationship of this loan to section 620(m) of the FAA of 1961. This section states that no "assistance shall be furnished on a grant basis" to any economically developed nation. We believe that the transfer of these minesweepers is a loan to Japan, not a grant, even though there is no rental charge for these ships. The Government of Japan does pay for the cost of maintaining the ships. Extension of the loan will be at no cost to the U.S. Government; whatever cost there was to the United States was borne at time of the original agreement in 1954. Title to the ships remains with the United States. The extension of the loan, therefore, should not be construed as being in conflict with the provisions of section 620(m).

There are statutory authorities, of course, other than section 503 of the FAA of 1961, as amended, for lending U.S. naval vessels to foreign governments. These are administered by the Department of Defense. I understand you and your staff have been in touch with representatives of the Department of Defense concerning these programs.

Sincerely,

JOHN FUNARI.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, July 23, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 22, 1965:

THE JUDICIARY

Harold H. Greene, of Maryland, to be associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions for the term of 10 years, vice Mildred E. Reeves, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 22, 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

James F. Gordon, of Kentucky, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Kentucky.

Donald H. Fraser, of Georgia, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Georgia for the term of 4 years.

Thomas B. Mason, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Virginia for the term of 4 years.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 22, 1965

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

Rev. Father Americo Dinorcia, St. Bernadette Church, Silver Spring, Md., offered the following prayer:

Dear God, Our Father, through Jesus Christ, Your Son in the Holy Spirit, we ask you today and at all times to send guidance and aid to these your dedicated and devoted servants who have chosen to contribute their talents and efforts selflessly to the cause of their fellow man and more specifically to the salvation of our beloved Nation, a nation founded on principles which are a manifestation of Your divine will.

To say that we are living in troubled times is to repeat the obvious to You who knows our every need. However, our constant awareness of that truism will keep our prayer to You ever fervent. For we are all too aware that of ourselves we are nothing, but with You all things are possible.

Dear God, let this thought of Your omnipotence fill the souls of our country's servants in this 89th Congress with hope for a brighter tomorrow. Let this thought prevent discouragement, and enable them to face apparent failure with the consoling knowledge that You can draw good from all things.

God grant them the serenity to accept the things they cannot change, the courage to change the things they can, and the wisdom to know the difference. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On June 24, 1965:

H.R. 214. An act to amend section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the time for filing certain claims for mustering-out payments, and, effective July 1, 1966, to repeal chapter 43 of title 38 of the United States Code;

H.R. 1732. An act to extend the act of September 26, 1961, relating to allotment and assignment of pay, to cover the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8464. An act to provide, for the period beginning on July 1, 1965, and ending on June 30, 1966, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

On June 28, 1965:

H.R. 3165. An act to authorize the establishment of the Pecos National Monument in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6767. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7717. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7762. An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, with respect to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

On June 30, 1965:

H.R. 4493. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1967, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap;

H.R. 5988. An act to provide that Commissioners of the Federal Maritime Commission shall hereafter be appointed for a term of 5 years, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6032. An act to amend the act authorizing the Mann Creek Federal reclamation project, Idaho, in order to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for such project (act of August 16, 1962; 76 Stat. 388);

H.R. 7060. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7105. An act to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8147. An act to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the exception from duty for returning residents, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 541. Joint resolution to extend the Area Redevelopment Act for a period of 2 months; and

H.J. Res. 553. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes.

On July 7, 1965:

H.R. 3994. An act to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling and paying certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. aircraft at Wichita, Kans.;

H.R. 3996. An act to amend provisions of law relating to the settlement of admiralty claims;

H.R. 4525. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for the continuation of authority to develop American-flag carriers and promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs;

H.R. 6507. An act to make section 1952 of title 18, United States Code, applicable to travel in aid of arson; and

H.R. 6848. An act to amend section 35 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to the imparting or conveying of false information.

On July 8, 1965:

H.R. 5283. An act to provide for the inclusion of years of service as judge of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska in the computation of years of Federal judicial service for judges of the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska; and

H.R. 8131. An act to extend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961.

On July 9, 1965:

H.R. 3415. An act to equalize certain penalties in the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933.

On July 14, 1965:

H.R. 3708. An act to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging."

On July 15, 1965:

H.R. 2. An act to protect the public health and safety by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs and counterfeit drugs, and for other purposes.

On July 16, 1965:

H.R. 1236. An act for the relief of Salvador Munoz-Tostado;

H.R. 1306. An act for the relief of Loretta Negrin;

H.R. 3634. An act for the relief of CWO Edward E. Kreiss;

H.R. 5184. An act for the relief of the port of Portland, Oreg.; and

H.R. 6453. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

On July 21, 1965:

H.R 5874. An act to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, with respect to the construction of school facilities for children in Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, or the Virgin Islands for whom local educational agencies are unable to provide education, to amend section 6(a) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, relating to conditions of employment of teachers in dependents' schools, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8720. An act to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of Guam; and

H.R. 8721. An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of the Virgin Islands.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1735. An act relating to the use by the Secretary of the Interior of land at La Jolla, Calif., donated by the University of California for a marine biological research laboratory, and for other purposes;

S. 1764. An act to authorize the acquisition of certain lands within the boundaries of the Unita National Forest in the State of Utah, by the Secretary of Agriculture; and

S. 1988. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Maryland.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 26. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands for, and to develop, operate, and maintain, the Golden Spike National Historic Site.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8775) entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 38 to the foregoing bill.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE LESLIE C. ARENDS, MINORITY WHIP

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to call attention of the House to an honor being paid next week to one of our colleagues.

On next Monday, July 26, the many friends of our beloved minority whip will pay him a unique and well-deserved tribute.

They have planned a full day of social activities and political speaking in Bloomington, Ill., to honor the ever-youthful dean of the Illinois delegation, the Honorable Leslie C. Arends.

Appropriately, they have designated this event the "30-17 Bull Whip Stag and Barbecue" in recognition of the 30 years that Les has represented the 17th District of Illinois in the Congress of the United States.

On the Republican side of the aisle, only our distinguished former Speaker [Joe Martin], outranks Les Arends in seniority.

Of this great body's full authorized strength of 435, only 7 Members have been here longer than Les.

None stands higher in the affection and esteem of his colleagues.

Les was first elected to Congress in 1934. He was a freshman in the 74th Congress, along with his great and good friend, our former minority leader, Charlie Halleck.

It is most fitting, therefore, that on Monday night Charlie will have the privilege of giving the address of appreciation to Les Arends for his 30 years of service to the Nation.

I will be there. I would not miss it.

The able Senate minority leader, Illinois' own Senator, Everett McKinley Dirksen, will be there.

Many of our colleagues in the House will be there.

And so will such prominent Republicans as our 1964 candidte for Governor, Charles H. Percy, and the two highest Republican officials of the State of Illinois, State Treasurer William J. Scott and State Superintendent of Public Instruction Ray Page.

It will be a wonderful program for a wonderful guy.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the remarks that have been made by our colleague from Illinois [Mr. Springer]. I am very happy to learn that the constituents of our distinguished and beloved minority whip are going to pay him a well deserved tribute in his district.

In honoring Les Arends, they are honoring themselves. Les is one of the most beloved men in this House. He is a tower of strength among us. He is a man of character, judgment, and vision. He is a man of steel when the going is hard. He is a man of velvet when kindness is required.

Les Arends is a big man in every sense of the word. He is a fine man. In working with him over the years, I have learned not only to respect him but to love and admire him.

I join his many friends in the House, in his district, and across the country in this word of tribute to a great American.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like very much to concur in the expressions that have been made in reference to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends], my counterpart in the minority party. I have worked with him a long time. He has been a friend. He is not only a man of ability but he is a man of great honor and integrity. He is beloved by Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, who has served so long with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the encomiums so capably and aptly expressed by my colleagues here this morning. Mr. Arends and I have served on the Committee on Armed Services since its inception.

He is a man of great dedication and patriotism, loved by all of his friends. I congratulate the people of his district and the State of Illinois for sending Mr. Arends to us, and also for paying him the tribute to which he is so justly entitled. If I had received an invitation for this great event, I would be tempted to attend. Les Arends is a great American, he is a great man, and his party is fortunate in having him serve so long and so well.

I congratulate him.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there are so many tributes flowing to our friend, Les Arends, from the Democratic side of the aisle that it is almost impossible, so to speak, to get into the act. But I think the bipartisan character of the tribute we are paying Les Arends speaks volumes about the kind of man he is.

It is a pleasure for me as a relatively junior Member of this body to participate in this tribute along with those who have known him throughout his long and distinguished career here in the House of Representatives. I know of no man who has been more helpful to me in my own career in this House than has Les Arends. As has been mentioned, he is the minority whip, a job involving the summoning of loyalty to party. It is significant, however, that the performance of those duties has brought him a reputation as a man of honor and gained for him the love and respect of all Members.

I take pleasure in joining in this tribute to the very distinguished Representative of the 17th District of Illinois. For many years he has served as the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Armed Services. In this highly responsible post he has discharged the solemn responsibility of authorizing the billions of dollars necessary to keep our Defense Establishment ready to carry out its mission of providing us with national security. He has proved time and time again how knowledgeable he is in this very important and complicated field. Because of his knowledge and seniority in service here in the House his advice has been sought on innumerable occasions by high officials in our Government.

I have already referred to his services as the whip of his party. His indefatigable energy has time and time again been responsible for victory for his party even when he led a band of Republicans who were greatly outnumbered. His leadership and skill have not been employed in a narrow partisan sense. Les Arends has always put party in front of self, but he has always put his country first—ahead of either party or personal ambition.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no finer thing that I could wish for the good people of the 17th District of Illinois than this: That they continue to enjoy the services of Les Arends as their Congressman for many years to come.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to participate in this tribute to my friend and our distinguished Republican Whip, Leslie Arends. It is certainly fitting that the Republicans, under the auspices of the McLean County Republican Central Committee, are honoring Les Arends at a stag outing, reception, and dinner Monday, July 26.

Les Arends' popularity among his constituents has been demonstrated by the overwhelming vote which he has received since 1934 as a Member of Congress.

This public following is matched by his popularity among Members of the Congress.

An effective Republican Party Whip, Les Arends is also an effective and influential Congressman in committee and in debates on the House floor. He served as ranking minority member of the House Armed Services Committee until he stepped down a notch on the committee a few months ago to devote more of his energies to his leadership role in the Congress. In addition to his unswerving loyalty to the Republican Party, Les Arends is first and foremost a patriotic American.

It is entirely appropriate that Les Arends' many friends should gather to honor him at the Les Arends Stag Day. I commend these and other remarks in his behalf to my colleagues in the House, to the American public and more particularly to Bill Braid, Chairman of the McLean County Republican Central Committee and the many friends who will be gathered at the Bloomington Livestock Commission Company grounds on Monday, July 26, to do honor to this sturdy and outstanding Republican, Congressman Les Arends of Illinois.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. It is a great pleasure for me to join with the Members of the House in paying tribute to our friend, the distinguished minority whip, Les Arends. Particularly I wish to associate myself with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Anderson] who has expressed my thoughts exactly. As a woman Member of the House, I find it particularly appropriate to speak of his never failing courtesy, always seriousness with which he does his job. I commend him for the balance he gives his life by getting onto the golf course now and again, doing us all proud. I suggest this makes him a better Congressman. Too few of us get out enough. We get into a pretty narrow rut I fear.

I commend him for his fairness, for his great ability not only as our whip but also in his outstanding work on the Armed Services Committee.

I thank him so much for all he has done for me and for what he is continuing to do in such enthusiastic spirit for the rest of us.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this discussion of the merits of our great minority whip. Perhaps it is well he is not present at this time, since his great modesty would cause him to blush at these eulogies.

Mr. Speaker, our beloved colleague "Les" Arends is one of the few men to whom we can accurately apply the description "a legend in his own lifetime." "Les" Arends is known to all of us as a most dedicated Member of Congress, dedicated not only to the people of his district and his responsibilities as ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee and his responsibilities as Republican whip, but above all dedicated to the effectiveness and great traditions of our legislative branch of Government.

"Les" Arends is known throughout the United States as one of the great legislative leaders of all times. He is respected, I am sure, by Democrat Members and revered by his Republican colleagues. As a Member from Illinois, I have been aided and counseled by "Les" Arends, who gives special attention to those of us from his home State and advises us in a very effective and fatherly fashion.

This afternoon as we take proper notice of his 30 years of congressional service, we all thus recognize this figure of strength among us and the contribution he has made on behalf of the people of his district to the progress of our Nation.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak for all the members of the Democratic delegation from Illinois in expressing our deep affection and our great esteem for the indestructible Les Arends. For 30 years he has served in this body in the finest tradition of Abraham Lincoln, Adlai Stevenson, and the other great sons of Illinois. I join with the good men and women of Ford County, which is associated with the sentiment of my earlier life, and the other counties in his district in warm congratulations and best wishes always to the veteran and indestructible Les Arends.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and also ask unanimous consent that the other members of the Illinois delegation on the Democratic side may extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, since Illinois was admitted to the Union, only two former distinguished Members from our State have served longer in this House than the very fine and affable gentleman we honor today, Les Arends.

We, in the Illinois delegation, are proud of his illustrious career of 30 years in the Congress, and particularly of the distinction which has come to him by virtue of his selection as our party's whip for the past 22 years.

Les Arends epitomizes the very best in a legislator; his demeanor has always been above reproach, and every Member of this body, regardless of his political persuasion, holds him in highest esteem and I am happy to add my tribute to this great patriot and ever so glad that the people of his 17th Congressional District will be recognizing his feats of public service next Monday. It gives promise of being a very significant occasion and a number of us look forward to participating in order that we might pay personal tribute to this outstanding American whom we are proud to call our friend and neighbor.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, next Monday the people of the 17th Congressional District of Illinois will be honoring Les Arends, their most distinguished citizen and Representative in Congress for the past 30 years. It is indeed a special tribute not only to Les but to the wisdom of the people of his district that he is now serving his 16th consecutive term in Congress and that his seniority in this great House of Representatives is exceeded by only 7 other Members.

To me, Les Arends is almost legendary—for as long as I can remember he has been to us in Illinois the perfect image of the ideal legislator—dedicated, conscientious, and able. To me, also, when I became a member of the Illinois delegation, it was gratifying to find that all the good things I had heard about him were confirmed; and it has been a sincere pleasure and a privilege to have the opportunity to work with him here in Washington on matters of mutual interest to our State. His devotion to the principles of good government, sound legislation, and concern for the general welfare have won for him the admiration of countless friends everywhere, and we take particular pride that one of our native sons commands such high esteem and genuine affection both as a Congressman and a legislative leader in his party. I am sure all of you join with me in congratulating Les on this significant milestone in his distinguished career in public service, and we wish him continued success and happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my colleagues today in paying special tribute to a special man—Leslie C. Arends, Representative in Congress from the 17th District of Illinois since January 1935. Les Arends has built a record in this House that is hard to match. He has served his district and his country well for 30 years as a Member of Congress; he has served his party well as Republican whip for 22 of those 30 years; and he has served as ranking Republican member on the Armed Services Committee, an important and responsible position to be sure.

Mr. Speaker, a group of Les Arends' friends have planned a special day next Monday to express to him their appreciation of all that he has done for his district, his State, and his country. There is a good chance, I understand, that he may not even be able to be with them because of the call of duty on the floor. This is typical of the response Les has always given to the call of leadership. We are proud to claim him as a son of Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the people of the 17th Illinois Congressional District on July 26, are recognizing the exceptional and longstanding public service that has been rendered by the Honorable Leslie C. Arends. The event will be a "bullwhip stag and barbecue" near Bloomington, and it is my hope and intention to be present for this great occasion.

LES ARENDS has become a byword throughout Illinois and he richly deserves the recognition being accorded him by his home district. But his influence is not limited to that area and he has become one of the great leaders of the party of Lincoln and a great personal friend of all of us who have served on the minority side in the House of Representatives. The esteem in which he is held by his colleagues is shown by the regularity with which they return him to the high position of minority whip. His vigor, keen interest in all that goes on on Capitol Hill grows with the years.

To me, he has been a great counselor and friend since the very first day that I became a candidate for Congress. His advice has always been good and his example has been an inspiration to me and a source of encouragement. We all wish him the best of success and many more years of public service.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I was raised in Bloomington, Ill., and LES ARENDS was my Congressman. My mother and father are still constituents of his. One of my brothers was appointed to the Military Academy at West Point by Congressman ARENDS. I know that my brother and my family still feel deep gratitude for his consideration.

I am pleased to say that my experience with him since it has been my privilege to serve in the Congress has been a happy one. I am very grateful for the help he has rendered, as a former constituent of his, on this side of the aisle.

His long and distinguished tenure in this body might be accepted by some unkind person as a major reason why I left Bloomington, Ill., and moved to Oregon, but I assure you that is not so, and I assure you that my parents are grateful for the distinguished service he has rendered to my former district over the years.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I should like to join the tributes to LES ARENDS. He has been a member of the NATO Parliamentarians Committee, of which I have had the honor to be chairman for a number of years. He has made a signal contribution to better understanding with our NATO allies. He is always genial and gracious on the floor. I am proud to have him for a friend.

I believe that a good part of his success in life he can attribute to his beautiful, gracious, and lovely wife, who came originally from my district. I am proud that we in eastern Ohio have been able to make that contribution to LES ARENDS.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD respecting LES ARENDS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the Committee on the Judiciary have permission to sit in executive session today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 195]

Arends
Ashley
Bonner
Bow
Evins, Tenn.
Halleck
Harvey, Ind.
Karth
Keogh
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Murray
Pepper
Pool
Powell
Reid, N.Y.
Rivers, Alaska
Roncalio
Rumsfeld
Scott
Shipley
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Waggonner
White, Idaho

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 407 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THE HOUSING BILL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on H.R. 7984, the housing bill, have until midnight to file a report thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the Committee on the Judiciary have permission to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER OF PUBLIC LAND REVIEW COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from the Public Land Law Review Commission:

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 22, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have been elected as Chairman of the Public Land Law Review Commission. Under the provisions of Public Law 88–606, the Chairman is the 19th member, selected by the 18 members whose composition is set forth in section 3(b), paragraphs (i), (ii), and (iii) of the law. I am therefore resigning as a member of the Commission from the House of Representatives appointed by you, effective July 22, 1965.

Sincerely yours,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 88–606, the Chair appoints as a member of the Public Land Law Review Commission the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] to fill an existing vacancy thereon.

REPORT OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1964—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

Thirty years ago, the Congress brought into being the Commodity Credit Corporation. In transmitting the report of this agency for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, as provided by section 13 of Public Law 806, 80th Congress, I feel it is appropriate to view, in summary, the three decades of the Corporation operations.

Over the past 30 years, the Commodity Credit Corporation has:

First. Enabled farmers to hold their crops for fair market prices.

Second. Minimized the depressing effect of surpluses by holding them off the market.

Third. Assured a stable flow of food to consumers, deterring inflationary pressures.

Fourth. Created a sound base for banks and other lending institutions which supply the credit needs of farmers.

Fifth. Provided in wartime the means of supplying our allies with food and fiber, and in the postwar period became the instrument which insured that food could also help keep the peace.

Sixth. Acted as the mechanism for executing the food-for-peace program, the International Wheat Agreement, and other similar international programs.

Seventh. Supported the rapid expansion of agricultural exports.

During fiscal 1964, the Commodity Credit Corporation reduced its investment in farm commodity inventories by more than $380 million. The wheat inventory was reduced by about 275 million bushels, and the supplies of dairy products were brought down to manageable levels.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is a creature of legislation. Its ability to fulfill our objectives for the future is no greater than the strength of legislation enacted by the Congress. It can function best when farm commodity programs are responsive to the conditions which exist in the agricultural economy. If these programs are in tune with the times, the Commodity Credit Corporation can perform its proper functions for farmers and for the public.

The legislation which I proposed this year, and which is now before the Congress, will help the Corporation to carry forward the objectives it should fulfill in the coming decade. These objectives are:

To continue the financial progress of our farmers;

To further reduce the Corporation's costs by bringing stocks of farm commodities down to more manageable levels;

To assure an abundant supply of high-quality, reasonably priced foods without fear of severe price fluctuations for our consumers;

To cushion the forces of the revolution in farm productivity which enable output to far exceed our capacity for use by balancing the growth in farm output with our ever-expanding food and fiber requirements;

To use our abundance as a force for peace and progress;

To rely more upon the marketplace as the primary source of fair farm returns.

Instruments of public policy can weight the scales of economic justice on the side of those who are disadvantaged, but they should enhance—not supplant—the equal opportunity for each person to obtain a decent livelihood from our economic system.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has an important place among the instruments of public policy:

Without the programs for which it acts as fiscal agent, the income netted by farmers would decline by half.

Without adequate income, the family farm system which dominates our agriculture would die.

Without family farms, the vast abundance of food and fiber we all have come to expect as a natural condition of a highly productive economy would no longer be assured.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, as a visible expression of our commitment to abundance, continues to be a servant of all people. What began 30 years ago as an experiment to provide economic justice for the farmer has now become a tested instrument in the continuing experiment each generation performs to demonstrate the vitality of our democracy.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *July 22, 1965.*

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 8283 with Mr. Rooney of New York in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through section 7 under line 18, page 4 of the bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. Before commenting on the bill, I think it is appropriate to recognize the fine job that the great Committee on Education and Labor has performed in managing this bill and bringing it to the floor. I congratulate its distinguished chairman and other members. Mr. Chairman, we who have served in the House a long time are always reassured by the fact that whenever the occasion arises and duty calls, new Members rise to responsibilities of leadership in tune with the highest tradition of the House. I think all Members will join me in commending the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons], for the competent and dedicated management he has given to this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the debate on this bill has been good. For the most part it has been constructive.

I do feel, however, that most of the criticism has related either to exceptional cases or to mistakes in administration.

We have heard that at one center a number of women got drunk and were dismissed. Of course, we did not hear about the thousands of young women who are using this program to further their education and to give themselves an additional chance in life. We heard, probably with some degree of humor, that someone was told, when calling somebody in the administration, that he or she should relax. Such an answer was perhaps uncalled for, but it certainly does not go to the question of the merits of this important legislation. I think my good friend from Minnesota talked yesterday about a telephone directory, whether the administration had one and if it had one, whether it was a good one. I am for telephone directories, I am for good telephone directories, but I really do not think that goes to the merits of this issue.

In my opinion, from what I know of this program, and I have examined it in my district and in my State, no program has done more in less time for humanity than the antipoverty program which we passed only a few months ago. This program is under the direction of one of the greatest and finest administrators in the Federal Government. He has proved that in his administration of the Peace Corps program. He had to put this program on the track before he had set up his office establishment. Before he had organized his staff, he was receiving calls from thousands of people, from hundreds of communities across the land. That has been inevitable because it is a human relations program.

It is a program that goes to every part of the country and in which many, many citizens are interested. Give the Honorable Sargeant Shriver a chance, and I sincerely believe that when we come back here next year we will find this one of the best administered programs in the country. I think the affirmative side of this issue completely overshadows any mistakes that may have been made in administration.

The big thing about this program is that in the first year of its operation, several millions of our most unfortunate fellow citizens have been touched and have been given new hope—3,000 American communities have responded to the challenge to assist their poor.

Over 300,000 boys and girls have sought a new chance through the Job Corps and the job centers. Over 10,000 Americans have already been given this chance.

Over 1 million teenagers are already working through neighborhood youth centers.

Over 20,000 Americans have applied to participate in VISTA which is the American home variety of the Peace Corps. Hundreds of thousands of low income children are already enrolled in the Head Start program.

Over 10,000 American groups and individuals under the auspices of this program are creating new jobs and new businesses for the American poor.

In 9 months of operation, I have been advised that this program has helped nearly 6 million Americans in some aspect of their lives—and this is only the beginning.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that I am speaking in pious platitudes when I say that this issue has a moral origin. I think the work that can be done through this bill, even if we attain only half of our goals, will be worth twice the money. I think it will strengthen American homes and American family life. I think it will help us to lift up individual American citizens. I think it is in line with the highest traditions and practices of our country. Certainly, it was that spirit—that emphasis on the individual and his dignity, that caused our forefathers to write the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights and the Emancipation Proclamation. It was in that same spirit that we enacted last year the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It is in the same spirit that we come here today. We believe that the great educational programs sponsored by President Johnson and supported in many instances on both sides of the aisle will help uplift individual Americans and will help to give dignity to the individual man. This it seems to me is the great thrust of the 89th Congress. If we do nothing more than to help those who need help the most to become self-respecting and self-supporting individuals who can hold their heads high among their fellows, history will vindicate the 89th Congress. Thousands who follow us for a hundred years will call us blessed and will say our job was well done.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. This bill is right. This bill is just. This bill should be passed. This committee should be supported and I hope that this great new emancipation proclamation—emancipation from poverty and ignorance—will have resounding support from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to speak for an additional 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of the House to a proposal under this program which has been presented by the Community Action Organization of Scioto County, Ohio under the auspices and leadership of the United Consumers of Ohio.

This committee was first organized by designating certain people on the committee without their consent or knowledge. Then a number of meetings were called without advance notice to some members serving on the committee, and in some cases without adequate notice, so that many of those selected on the committee knew nothing of the meetings or knew nothing of the organizational procedure. Then everything—lock, stock and barrel—was turned over to the United Consumers of Ohio to direct, manage, and operate.

They have now presented the Office of Economic Opportunity with two programs.

First. They are going to conduct a survey of the impoverished people in the area, and they will start out with a staff director and secretary and two clerical aids, and they are going to have a salary of $9,412. These will be supplied by the United Consumers of Ohio, I assume.

Second. This organization says in its brochure that the number of impoverished people can be ascertained from the census data, yet they are going to make this determination and charge the Federal Government a fee of $6,250, representing $1 for every impoverished family in the area. Apparently, they already know how many there are. They already have the data. As their brochure indicates, they will get this from census information, yet they are going to charge the Federal Government $1 per family to make this determination and tabulation and to explain to the staff what this figure means.

This organization was organized as a nonprofit organization but considerable profits will be reaped by it if this application is approved.

The next program calls for a consumer education program. They are going to teach the poor people in this community how to spend their money.

I should like to make inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio, or possibly some Member on the other side, in regard to this.

Can the gentleman from California advise me whether the instruction of the poor people on how to spend their money is a proper function under this program? I thought that one of the problems was they did not have any assets or money to spend, that the purpose of the program was to teach them a vocation or trade so they would be able to sustain themselves. Why should money and effort be wasted teaching them how to spend something they do not have?

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. In answer to the gentleman's question, that is a part of the program, to educate poor people.

Mr. HARSHA. Education is one thing but instruction on how to spend your money which they do not have is another thing. It would seem to me they could better serve a purpose by teaching them vocations or giving them basic education, rather than instruction on how to spend something they do not have.

This is how they propose to go about it. They submitted a budget. It contains salaries of $14,600. They set forth in their brochure that they are going to encourage neighborhood meetings and encourage that these meetings be held in the homes of the various individuals around, so that there will be a more intimate atmosphere and a less formal atmosphere and the necessity of travel will be eliminated. Yet they have in their proposal $29,000 for travel. That is a lot of traveling in any neighborhood.

I am giving this as an example of how the taxpayers' money is going to be used.

They also have in their application $50,000 for space cost and rentals, $45,000 of which is for the rental of meeting places. There are in that community meeting places which are available free of charge, in sufficient numbers to be running out of their ears.

Who is going to get this $45,000? Does the gentleman know the practice, in this procedure? Furthermore, if they are going to conduct these meetings in neighborhood homes as the summary of the proposal suggests why is it necessary to spend $45,000 of the taxpayers' money for meeting places. Or is this money going to be used to compensate some politician for past or future favors?

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, it might be better if you were to ask that question of the other side of the aisle.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. Yes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Has this application been approved?

Mr. HARSHA. No, sir. And in all fairness I should say I contacted the Office of Economic Opportunity and requested that they hold it up and make a further investigation, and they have done this.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think, if the gentleman will yield further, the answer to his question is, if the review is made, much of what you are talking about will be eliminated.

Mr. HARSHA. I should certainly hope so, but let me point out that they go on further in the program with $28,000 for consumer supplies. I suppose that will be the material and the propaganda that the people will be served or indoctrinated with.

Now, here is an interesting item. Other costs, $24,000. Included in these other costs are administrative overhead, personnel operating expenses of $1,500 per unit for six units, which is a total of $9,000, which this nonprofit organization, the United Consumers of Ohio, are going to get as a fee in addition to the salaries and other funds available to them in here. In addition to that, they have another item in the sum of $8,200 which they represent as 10 percent for reserves in the event they have not figured their costs accurately.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. Surely.

Mr. MOELLER. A moment ago the gentleman stated that this program had not been approved. It does not seem to add to the value of our discussion to deliberate on what someone has proposed. I know this same organization. It has been repudiated in my area of the State. It has attempted to solicit support to do the same thing in my congressional district, but it has been given a cold shoulder. It is an isolated case where someone thought he had a chance to get in on a program and make a little extra money. I am sure that your people are wise enough not to accept it and my people are wise enough not to accept it. Therefore, I do not feel it contributes anything to our discussion.

Mr. HARSHA. I disagree with my good friend from Ohio in this respect, because I think if we can call these cases to the attention of the OEO they will be placed on guard for some of the outlandish proposals and I hope will have the good judgment to deny any expenditures of this kind. Nor is this an isolated case because United Consumers of Ohio have indicated they will attempt similar programs in 10 Ohio counties—that is far from being isolated. It serves this purpose. At least it will put the Office of Economic Opportunity on guard for applications of this kind. If it is going to be done in 10 different instances, it will involve a lot of money. For example, they have $8,250 in there for deviation costs. They have $9,000 for fees on top of the $6,200 for fees, on top of $9,400 in salaries plus other items plus the $45,000 for renting space. This is an unconscionable waste of the taxpayers' money. I hope that the Office of Economic Opportunity will look at this in the proper light. Certainly from this application the impoverished people of this area are not going to benefit any from this program whatsoever. In fact, the poverty stricken people are going to be the scapegoats of this, and some outfit like the United Consumers of Ohio will reap the profits. This one proposal alone involves over $250,000, yet only a small part of this sum is ever going to reach the impoverished people—and that in the form of $28,000 in consumable supplies.

This is a device for some enterprising concern not to make war on poverty but upon the poverty stricken. The poor people are going to be completely disillusioned by these types of programs. The promises held out to these unfortunate people that this legislation will be such a great salvation are as empty as last year's bird nest.

I trust the OEO will have the good judgment to deny any concern the opportunity to reap such profits at the expense of the taxpayer and impoverished people of this Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to section 7, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 19:

"DISAPPROVAL OF PLANS

"SEC. 8. Section 209(c) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by (1) inserting 'of part B' before 'of title I' and (2) striking out 'and such plan has not been disapproved by him within thirty days of such submission' and inserting in lieu thereof 'and such plan has not been disapproved by the Governor within thirty days of such submission, or, if so disapproved, has been reconsidered by the Director and found by him to be fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of this part'."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AYRES

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AYRES: Beginning with line 19 on page 4, strike out everything down through line 3 on page 5.

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, practically every member of the Committee has received a communication from his Governor. This is the so-called amendment that would restore the veto power to the Governors of our various States. It is a very simple amendment but it is certainly one of the crucial ones. It is important not only to the operation of this act but to the future direction of Federal-State relations.

The amendment merely retains the existing veto power of State Governors in two key programs under this act. Under the act, as it now stands, the Governor can veto the following projects in his State:

First. Location of a Job Corps camp or residential center.

Second. A work-training project known as the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Third. Community action project.

In addition, the Governor must approve of the sending of a list of volunteers into his State.

The bill, Mr. Chairman, for all practical purposes, destroys the veto power as applied to work-training projects and the community action projects.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Will the gentleman tell me, as a member of the Committee, whether the amendment he proposes requires the Governor to exercise the absolute power he is given pursuant to any criteria contained in his amendment or any part of the bill, or might the Governor simply exercise the veto because he did not particularly like the mayor of a particular city or city council or had some reason other than the purpose of this legislation?

Mr. AYRES. As the gentleman from Michigan knows, Sargent Shriver, the Director, said that he has gotten along very well with the program with the language that is in the present act. All my amendment does is leave the language as it is now in the act.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. That is not my question, if the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. AYRES. I understood the gentleman's question very well, and I am not about to say that your Governor or my Governor or any other Governor is going to make those decisions. If the gentleman will permit me to proceed, at the end of my statement perhaps we can have a discussion on that issue.

In fact, if the present language prevails this would remove the last vestige of control over the tangled, confused, and controversial community action programs.

This is not a partisan issue. As Governor King, Democrat, of New Hampshire, has pointed out, the mere existence of the veto power gives the Governor some leverage in assuring that these vast new Federal programs do not conflict with and injure the existence of the efforts in such vital fields as education and public health and welfare.

As Governor King put it:

> The existence of the veto power has already made it possible to tailor projects to specific needs of New Hampshire.

The veto has been used only a few times, the first use having been made by President Johnson's good friend, Governor Connally, of Texas. Let me emphasize this point. The President of the United States did not oppose tampering with the veto power, nor for that matter did Sargent Shriver, who told members of our committee that he could administer these programs with or without the veto power as it is found in the act.

This amendment was adopted by our committee on motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS], who, as far as I can determine, was acting only for himself.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Would the gentleman care to state to the House the grounds on which the Governor of Texas exercised his veto power, and tell the House whether he thinks this is a proper exercise of the veto and that we should do nothing about it in the House?

Mr. AYRES. I have no way of knowing what motivated the Governor of Texas to veto the program.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman does have a way of knowing. It is a matter of public knowledge and record.

Mr. AYRES. If the gentleman from California knows why the Governor of Texas vetoed it, I would ask the gentleman to explain why he vetoed it since the Governor is a member of his party and not a member of mine.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I do not say that everyone in my party is always right. But in this particular instance the Governor very clearly exercised his veto in a manner which had nothing to do with the merits of the project but which unfortunately had racial overtones and therefore had nothing to do with the basic rightness of the project itself.

It seems to me we should find language—and I believe the committee has found such language—so as to make sure that the veto must be within the concept of the bill and the rightness of the project.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I think we ought to set the record straight on this. As I have looked at the Governor of Texas' veto, he raised the question of the Farmers' Union having a Neighborhood Youth Corps program. He looked at this organization as too political to handle a Neighborhood Youth Corps program.

Mr. Chairman, the Governor of Montana has done the same thing for the same reason.

This it seems to me is a question for the Governor to decide. If he feels that the organizations are too political in their States, that is their business. The law now only says that no political party should be running any of these programs.

But if the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] could see any racial overtones in the Farmers' Union, I surely fail to see any of it. The Governor of Texas' veto had nothing to do with the interracial balance of the project.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think the gentleman will find in all of the comment that has been made about it, it was done primarily because the Farmers' Union project was going to be a biracial project and that, therefore, it was opposed not because it was the Farmers' Union project but because the Farmers' Union project followed a nonbiased basis all the way through.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. There is just no proof whatsoever about that.

There have been projects accepted in State after State in the South that are interracial. In fact the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity would not be doing his duty if he permitted any project to be set up that was not interracial.

Mr. Chairman, to claim that the Governor is going to veto every project that is interracial just is not true.

You can throw out the suspicions all the time and start waving the racial flag and thereby condemn every southerner just because he is a southerner. I think we should get over that attitude. We now see many Federal programs that are interracial in the South.

Mr. Chairman, we passed a civil rights law last year and I think most southerners have made the decision that they are going to live by the law. But just to condemn them because they happen to come from the South, I do not feel is fair at all.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman from Minnesota has pinpointed the issue very clearly. All programs financed under this act must be racially integrated and must be nondiscriminatory. It is required by the Civil Rights Act. Furthermore, each of the Governors who has exercised a veto power has also declined to veto other programs under this act, all of which are nondiscriminatory and all of which are racially integrated in their operation.

Governor Smylie, of Idaho, chairman of the Republican Governors' conference, has sent me a copy of the resolution that was adopted on May 5 in which the Governors who are Republicans support our amendment to restore the veto power.

Yesterday I had the privilege of talking again with my friend from California, Governor Brown, and I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] for making it possible for me to have a little chat with him.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. I want to point out that the gentleman is certainly correct, that our very fine Governor of California, whom I believe is a very fairminded Governor and is doing a great service for the people of California, in testifying before our committee on the Minimum Wage Act amendments, the question was brought up as to how he felt about the Governors' veto power being repealed under the Poverty Act. The Governor stated, and I quote him:

> Now, I know this may not be the position of my colleagues on the Democratic side, but I think it would be fundamentally wrong to take away the Governors' veto power.

Mr. AYRES. I thank the gentleman from California. The Governor said practically the same thing to me. In fact, he said, "Congressman, I hope your amendment prevails."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am authorized to say on behalf of the Governor of California that he did not realize in his statement that there was a provision in the bill as written. He has authorized me to say he fully supports the provisions of the bill as written in spite of the remarks he made before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment and, like my friend from Ohio, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much having had to object to the request of my friend from Ohio, but some of us on our side of the aisle also want to have the opportunity to address ourselves to this particular amendment.

At the outset, let me say a word about the statement that has just been made by the gentleman from Ohio with respect to the position of the President of the United States and with respect to the position of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity on the question of the Governor's veto. I can say to my friend from Ohio that night before last I had a conversation with the President of the United States in which he indicated his full suport of the committee bill as written. I can also say to the gentleman from Ohio that, when I introduced my amendment providing for a modification of the Governor's veto, I did so with the full knowledge and support of Mr. Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. So I want to be very clear that the inference of the gentleman from Ohio that neither the President nor Mr. Shriver supports the committee bill is not accurate.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio and in doing so I want to say a word about the law as it now stands.

The present act provides that a Governor may veto any program or project of assistance proposed to be undertaken in his State by the Office of Economic Opportunity in conjunction with any public agency or any private institution or organization other than an institution of higher education.

The veto power, the absolute veto power, in the present law affects the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the community action program, the adult basic education program, the VISTA volunteers, and the Job Corps. The veto power as it is in the act is total and absolute and extends to every section of the act. The committee amendment to the act, section 8, provides that applications for programs or projects by local communities for a community action program, Neighborhood Youth Corps, or adult basic education program must still be submitted to the Governor of that State for his approval. The Governor has 30 days within which to express an opinion on the program. If the 30-day period ends without the Governor having expressed disapproval of the program, it goes into effect. In those rare cases where a Governor should decide to disapprove a program, under the committee amendment, it must be reviewed and reconsidered by the Office of Economic Opportunity in light of the comments of the Governor, if he has made any. He is not, under the present act, required to give any reasons whatsoever for his veto. Under the committee bill, however, where the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity finds reason to support a Governor's disapproval, then the application will be denied. Where, however, after review of the facts, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity makes the determination that the application is fully consistent with the law and with the purposes and policies of the act, then those projects and proposals may be permitted to go forward in spite of the Governor's disapproval.

I want to reiterate, Mr. Chairman, that this review of the Governor's veto applies only to the community action program, the adult basic education program, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps program.

The committee amendment in no way changes the existing absolute veto power of the Governor with respect to the Job Corps program or the VISTA volunteers.

Now, Mr. Chairman, our committee came to the point of view that the Governor should be provided with an effective voice concerning programs going on within his State. The committee recognizes that Governors may have knowledge, information, insight, and wisdom as to the desirability of particular projects and recognizes that Governors should have an opportunity to address themselves to any problems these projects may present to that State under State law. It understands that the Governors should have a method which enables them to bring their knowledge, competence, and prestige to bear on these programs.

The committee amendment allows for all of these factors while at the same time closes existing avenues of possible abuse under the present law under section 209(c). It affords us a method of review of vetoes that might be arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory. It protects the right of local communities to a self-determination that is consistent with the policy of State and local law throughout this Nation and with the Economic Opportunity Act.

Now this retention by State Governors of their power to approve or disapprove the establishment of Job Corps centers and the assignment of VISTA volunteers to their particular States never came into contention in our committee.

The committee felt that the involvement of Governors in the decisions affecting applications for Job Corps centers and for VISTA volunteers present considerations substantially different from those applicable to the veto as it now stands under section 209(c).

Let me make my point clear.

In the case of the VISTA program, volunteers are trained and selected at Federal expense and even after assignment or referral retain a special Federal status—they come from outside the community to conduct a Federal program. This status, and the possible need for a special check by the States, has not been in issue and was recognized in the original bill submitted by the administration last year.

Secondly, in the case of the Job Corps centers these programs also involve a direct Federal activity as distinguished from assistance to local programs or community agencies. A Governor's veto power over Job Corps programs in no way impinges upon the normal legal or governmental framework within the State. It does not operate to transfer to the Governor control over any matter which would normally be assigned elsewhere by State law.

To a great degree, Mr. Chairman, the committee amendment as it is now written provides for a return to orthodoxy. It was primarily concern for the traditional, constitutional, and statutory relationships of Governors to State officers, such as educational officials, and to communities within the State that convinced the members of the committee of the need to amend the act. The Governor's power with respect to adult basic education programs under title II–B of the act is a good example. Inasmuch as that program operates under the traditional State plan scheme and since the plan is prepared by the State education agency, the Governor's influence will sometimes control and will always be felt. The committee felt that power to exercise the veto in some States operated to shift legal power or responsibility for education programs to an official—the Governor—other than the one designated by State law, such as the director of the State education agency.

Of primary concern to the committee, however, was the unlimited power of the Governor to veto programs and projects under title II–A of the act, community action programs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me cite five major reasons why our committee was disturbed with the Governor's absolute veto power over essentially local, community oriented programs as distinguished from the essentially Federal programs, the Job Corps, and VISTA volunteers.

First, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] pointed out—and I note he failed to get any response to the question he directed to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ayres]—there are no standards and there are no criteria established under present law for the exercise of the veto. The law in its present form does not prescribe any criteria to be followed by the Governor in the course of his decisionmaking. The power of the Governor under section 209(c) is absolute. It may be exercised without any of the restrictions or restraints that would have been reasonably provided by a State legislature drafting a similar State statute and seeking to satisfy the concern of representatives anticipating its possible use in connection with programs in their own communities.

Second, the Governor's power of control over these federally assisted programs is far greater than that which they enjoy with respect to action of their own State governments. In some States, the Governor has no veto at all, but there is no State where the Governor's veto of the legislative process cannot be reversed by the State legislature. Nor can the Governor of any State veto the action of a city or municipality acting within its charter or conducting admittedly local affairs. In States with home rule provisions in their constitutions, not even the State legislature could confer the kind of power over essentially local matters which the Congress has provided Governors in 209(c) as now written.

So the committee felt that the veto power in the hands of the Governor would give him a control over local programs and local affairs, over which, under State law, he normally would have no direct control and for which he is not responsible.

Third, the veto power as it is now written in the present law is without precedent in any Federal program where Federal assistance is given without a State contribution to the local community project. There are now many programs under which the Federal Government and a municipality interact with one another directly.

I refer, for example, Mr. Chairman, to such programs as community facilities, urban renewal, public housing, and Federal aid to airports. We do not give the Governor a right to veto an urban renewal project. This is because it is essentially a local community project.

A Governor's veto power, we all understand, would in no way contribute to the advancement of such essentially local programs and indeed might inhibit their effectiveness.

Fourth, the existence of an absolute veto in the hands of a Governor was deemed by the committee to be inconsistent with the philosophy of the Antipoverty Act. To take a case in point, the community action program is based on the thesis, as the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Hawkins] said so eloquently yesterday in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie], that broad-based and representative bodies of public and private agencies and organizations can best determine the needs of their own community, assess and coordinate local resources, and determine the best program for the eradication of poverty in their area. The Governor's absolute veto over local antipoverty programs is contradictory to this approach.

Fifth, the present veto allows completely arbitrary action. The veto could be based on prejudice, political rivalry, misunderstanding, or whim. It could be exercised for any reason, or no reason. Individual Governors, therefore, have it within their power to frustrate the purposes and policies of the act.

Rather than attempt to define the criteria which would govern the exercise of the gubernatorial veto, the committee devised the review process now in section 8 of H.R. 8283. This provision prevents only arbitrariness. If the Governor uses his power under State laws to limit a community program, it will not be because we have provided him with a license to do so. Review will provide the sort of balance that has proved so valuable in maintaining the democratic process.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that my very good friend from California mentioned the fact that he had a private conversation with Governor Brown, of California. I certainly would have no reason to doubt his explanation of it.

However, I wish to point out that before the committee Governor Brown made it very clear he opposed the elimination of the Governor's veto. Further than this, another member of the committee subsequent to this, while the Governor was still testifying, brought up the question as to specifically whether the Governor or other members of the committee understood the way the bill would be applied, and Governor Brown said nothing, or said nothing to indicate that he did not. I immediately attempted to clarify the matter to the Governor and the other members of the committee, and no comment was made by the Governor to the committee to the effect that he did not understand how the Governor's veto operated.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I should like to ask the gentleman from Indiana how his own Governor feels about this veto?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am delighted to be able to tell the gentleman from New York, my very good friend, with whom I have worked on many bills, that the Governor of Indiana, a great Democrat, a distinguished Governor, Roger Branigin, fully suports the committee bill as written.

I might say further to the gentleman from New York that on the 13th of May, I believe it was, when I offered my amendment to this bill the first time, the committee adopted the amendment.

On the 20th of May, in committee, I offered a modification of my original amendment, the modification was adopted and is now to be found in the committee bill which we are discussing.

The Governor of Indiana, Mr. Branigin, sent me a telegram on the 20th of May in which he said that he was opposed to a ban on the Governor's veto. His telegram to me came in the afternoon after we had already adopted the modified amendment that same morning. I thereupon wrote a letter to Governor Branigin explaining the modification of the original amendment.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I would like to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. BELL. I believe you have answered the gentleman's question.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am saying the Governor of Indiana fully supports the committee amendment in H.R. 8283.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Have I answered the question clearly?

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

In respect to the claims that certain individuals support the bill, of course they support the bill, but that does not mean they would not support the bill if the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio were adopted.

The Director of the program, Mr. Shriver, was before the minority one day and he said that he did not care how it was. He said, "Congress can make up its own mind." Let us permit Congress to make up its own mind on something, for once.

I might say, if the Congress wants the governors to have the veto, I think this is the inducement we ought to make. Just because the Governors exercised their veto in the last year shows there is some value to this proposal. If nobody had used it at all, perhaps there would not have been any value at all to it.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to pay any tribute to the administration of this poverty program in Illinois, but I do want to support our Governor of Illinois, who sent me a telegram, which reads as follows:

> CHICAGO, ILL.,
> *May 18, 1965.*
>
> Hon. ROBERT McCLORY,
> *House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> I strongly oppose amending the Economic Opportunity Act to delete the power of the Governor to veto certain projects proposed under the program. The veto power is imperative if we are to have proper cooperative effort and if we are to insure proper implementation of the program.
>
> OTTO KERNER,
> *Governor.*

In reply I sent him this communication.

> MAY 20, 1965.
>
> Hon. OTTO KERNER,
> *Governor, State of Illinois,*
> *Springfield, Ill.*
>
> DEAR GOVERNOR: I appreciate having your telegram stating your opposition to amending the Economic Opportunity Act to delete the power of the Governor to veto certain projects under the program.
>
> I strongly support your position in this matter.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> ROBERT McCLORY,
> *Member of Congress.*

I think the Governor has expressed himself very wisely, and it is consistent with our system of government. He happens to be a Democrat, but he is a good friend of mine and I respect his judgment on this issue. I have stated to him that I would support a retention of his authority to veto as it is in the bill at the present time.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

While I oppose this particular amendment proposed by the gentleman from Indiana, I cannot help but think that it is quite appropriate that it would come before the Congress. We have all manner of things which are not really so. We have tax increases which are not tax increases. We have reciprocal trade which is not reciprocal trade. We have tax cuts which are not really tax cuts. We have Federal aid to education without control but with all forms of control in it. I think it is very appropriate that we should have a veto here which is not a veto.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I simply cannot resist the observation that Members on the other side are fond of quoting Governors who agree with them, but when the Governors do not agree with them, they make an argument that Congress should use its own discretion in these matters. I want to reiterate, to be as clear as possible, that the Governor of Indiana specifically supports the committee amendment as it is written in the bill, because I called his office and asked him if he did.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, may I use this time to correct the RECORD, as it has been confused by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL]. As he indicated, during the hearings on the wage bill in the House Education and Labor Committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] posed a question to the Governor concerning the poverty program and asked whether or not the Governor of the State of California agreed that there should be a Governor's veto. That is all he asked. The Governor, not realizing that the committee did not take away the veto, said "I do agree there should be a gubernatorial veto." That is all he said. At that point I asked for recognition and, also being told I was out of order as much as the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL], I proceeded to ask the Governor whether or not he realized the committee bill did not take away the Governor's veto but merely provided for a review by the administration, and he said no, he did not. Before he could explain any further, the chairman rightfully ruled both the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] and myself out of order, because this was merely a question used in order to trap the Governor without fully presenting and faithfully presenting the question as it should have been presented and in a hearing not on the poverty subject at all. I think it is unfair for the answer given by the Governor to be so used today, when certainly I think the opposition knows they are not presenting the full facts as to what actually happened in our committee.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I think I have about one moment left, and I would like to make a brief statement before I yield any further.

The essence of what we are talking about here can be found in the committee report on page 13, where it says:

> What Congress has done in section 209(c) is to confer upon the Governors more power of control over a federally assisted program than the Governors enjoy with respect to State action of their own governments.

In other words, we have given the Governors power to inject themselves into the local affairs of cities throughout this country, in the spending of money raised by local taxation, in a way that the laws and constitutions of the several States of this country would prohibit. The committee bill will correct this error made in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and restore once again to the cities, the sovereignty which they enjoy with respect to the spending of the money they raise through local taxation.

To give you an example, in my State of Michigan we have a Governor who has played fast and loose politics with the poverty program. As a matter of fact, he does it not only in the State of Michigan but throughout the country. He is currently engaged in building a national image of himself, so he talks one way about the poverty program in New York and another way about it in the State of Michigan. And within the State itself he talks differently. He is a conservative when he is in Cadillac, Mich., and a liberal when he is in Livonia, Mich. But in any event he has been sniping at the program outside of the State of Michigan ever since it was enacted, while taking credit within the State of Michigan for everything the program is doing.

Quite recently he went to the city of Detroit which has about $10 million of projects under way, $1 million of which represents the tax money of the people of the city of Detroit—raised under their city charter, voted by them and levied against themselves and collected from them, and ostensibly to be spent by their city council. The Governor of the State of Michigan had before him a proposal to retrain 1,800 Detroit policemen. He stated to a newspaper reporter in Lansing—and I quote from the Detroit News:

> Romney said a State Governor can veto a project but, once it has been approved, has little control over its operation.

The article also said, quoting the Governor:

> I am concerned about some things I hear about a few projects in the State being used for purposes other than poverty.

And then the article goes on to say the Governor was reluctant to identify the projects. We finally discovered what he was doing. He was threatening Mayor Cavanagh, of Detroit, with the veto of a program to retrain 1,800 police officers unless the mayor of the city of Detroit made specific provisions in the city's plans for this training.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] has expired.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just simply want to support what my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] said, and in further support of what was said about the Governor of Michigan and by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS]. When Governor Brown was asked this question it was not made clear to him what was in the bill, in any way, shape, or form and it was not a germane subject matter to the hearing. He was caught completely by surprise, I am sure inadvertently, by my good friends on the other side of the aisle who did not mean to do this, but that is what happened.

I want to say that he has been a supporter of the local programs, and I think he did not realize, as he said shortly afterward, that all that was being taken away was the unlimited veto of the community action programs, and that the Job Corps veto remained. He was very happy to abide by the result of the committee's action and support the committee's amendment.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, to pursue the program in Detroit just a little bit further. I would like to point out that the police retraining program is a 90–10-percent program; 90 cents out of every dollar coming from the appropriations that you gentlemen in this Congress authorize as Representatives to the Federal Government's legislative body, and 10 percent of the cost of that program, or the entire balance, comes from the taxpayers of the city of Detroit. These funds must be appropriated by the duly elected local officials of the city council. But the Governor of the State of Michigan is telling the mayor of the city of Detroit and the common council of the city, not only what kind of program he will permit them to spend the local tax dollars on, but he is telling them in specific detail that unless the specific training of the police officers follows the exact course that he dictates from Lansing he will exercise a veto.

So I will say to the Members of this body, on the other side of the aisle, that they are kidding when they try to talk about the specific vetoes that have in fact been exercised, because that is only part of the iceberg that was above the water. The part that is sinking the ships of progress in the local communities is the implied threat by the Governors of some of the States of this country, who are playing politics with poverty, and who are using this to subvert the true purpose of the act, and take away from locally elected officials the power that the people have conferred upon them by election.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman. I realize because I am not a member of the committee it is difficult to secure time so as to participate in this debate.

Mr. GOODELL. I think a short answer to the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] is the fact that we have a veto from the Governor of Texas who is not a Republican. I think among the vetoes that we have had is one by Governor Wallace, of Alabama, and he is not a Republican. It comes I feel rather in bad grace from the gentleman from Michigan to accuse the Republican Governors of using politics. I would further point out that the Democratic Governors have been beseeching us just as the Republican Governors have in support of this veto, and are on record in favor of retaining the veto so that they will have some role through their State agencies in these programs.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, in spite of the clarification, and the reclarification of the position of the Governor of California, I am still not sure how he would feel about the language proposed by the committee.

In any event, I would like to direct the attention of the members of the committee to the fact that at the western Governors' conference, held at Portland, Oreg., in June—and I assume the Governor of California is a member of that conference—there was a strong statement adopted in favor of retaining the Governors' veto which reads in part as follows:

> If the States are to remain as active parties, it is vital that they retain their present power to approve or veto the various projects under the Economic Opportunity Act.

The gentleman from Indiana pointed to some serious flaws—what he considers to be serious flaws—in the present veto power of the Governor.

I would suggest that the committee amendment does not correct any of those flaws.

He admits—and I would fully support him—that the State Governors should be provided with an effective voice in the formulation and execution of these federally financed programs which we are not now providing. Surely we are not providing governors with an effective voice through the veto power. Admittedly, it is a very crude power but it is certainly better than nothing.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly that the only way—whether they use an implied veto or an active veto—that there can be any kind of meaningful participation by the States is to maintain and perhaps improve the veto power.

Mr. Chairman, it is essential that we recognize that a serious problem is involved here which does need attention and improvement.

The gentleman from Oklahoma, the majority leader [Mr. ALBERT], made a very eloquent statement about the fact that he has not heard much criticism regarding the merits of this legislation. I trust that he is still listening to what is being said. We are, I hope, making some very meaningful suggestions about what needs to be done.

I fail to understand how wrapping ourselves in the American flag accomplishes very much. It is not enough simply to say because this money is doing somebody some good we need not look with care at the kinds of programs we are financing.

As a case in point, the gentleman from Oklahoma says that nearly 6 million Americans are being benefited one way or the other because of what has been done thus far. The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity disagrees very sharply with the gentleman about the numbers benefited. In a letter to me only a few days ago Mr. Shriver, in what I thought was patting himself on the back, suggested that perhaps nearly 3 million were being benefited. I put this particular letter from Mr. Shriver to me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 12. It appears on page 16526 of the RECORD on that day.

Obviously, we could get into some real differences of opinion about what is actually being done in behalf of those in need, and also how much is going toward lining the pockets of those who do not need it.

In this discussion of what constitutes a reasonable role for the State governments and, of course, the local governments, we are hitting on a very fundamental objection to the change in the law as is being proposed by the committee.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I would emphasize that in the debate last year the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] led the forces on this side of the aisle who were trying to do more than just put in what we considered to be a rather negative and sterile approach to States rights. We did not like simply telling the States that the only power they had was the veto program. We wanted the States to have a positive power in order to cooperate in developing these programs from the beginning.

We still hold to this position. Yesterday an amendment was offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] that would have brought the States in at an early stage in a positive and constructive way. The only power in the States, as the legislation stands, is through this veto power. It is being utilized. The gentleman from Michigan made the point it is being utilized. The reason it is being done in that way is because it is the orderly way to do it.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 1:15.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 1:15.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that this amendment should be defeated for the reason it is giving a power to the Governors such as was used in Montana in violation of the act. The Governor of Montana said he would not approve a particular project because it would place Federal funds in the hands of a nonprofit organization.

Granting the veto power is giving the opponents of this program another opportunity to sabotage this program—another opportunity to sabotage America.

In June of this year, the Governor of Montana vetoed a neighborhood youth corps program sponsored by the Farmers Union. There was not just that private nonprofit organization included, but many local municipalities and small nonprofit charitable organizations; 1,200 young men and women were to have jobs; $563,100 was to be the payroll.

What happened?

The veto has kept 1,200 young men and women idle all summer.

Some of them were dropouts who could have earned and learned and perhaps returned to school.

But no.

The Governor said, "No."

His flimsy reason? He "didn't think a private organization should be entrusted with Federal and State funds."

Despite the will of Congress, he vetoed. He did not criticize the project.

In the following days, he granted to a private, nonprofit organization the management and expenditure of Federal and State funds of the public health care Kerr-Mills program.

But no—for 1,200 youths.

They still are idle—they walk the streets.

Oh, yes, now he has become the chameleon who would change his colors and petition for a program. But June 30 went by—the end of a fiscal year—a program vetoed.

He knows he cannot save the destruction he wrought for this summer.

Please, folks, do not give the opponents another cut at this program.

I wish to express my strong support for the bill as written and submitted, and subscribe to the statements of my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS], which would give the Director of the OEO the power to overrule the veto of a State Governor on any OEO project.

All of the recipients of this program would have come from families with incomes below $3,000 annually. Our great Nation can hardly afford to miss the opportunity to do away with this type of waste.

The veto by the Governor of my State has stirred up an extensive protest over the State. By permission heretofore granted, I would like to enter into the RECORD at this point editorials from the Great Falls Tribune of Great Falls, Mont., and the People's Voice, of Helena, Mont., which do a fine job of expressing the extent of the dissatisfaction of the people of my State with the action of the Governor:

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, June 23, 1965]

GOVERNOR BABCOCK'S VETO DASHES HOPES 1,200 YOUTHS HAD FOR SUMMER JOBS

A harsh note of disapproval rang out from the Governor's office in Helena Monday. The sound dashed the hopes about 1,200 young Montanans had to get summer jobs.

Gov. Tim Babcock announced Monday afternoon he had decided to disapprove a proposed Farmers Union Neighborhood Youth Corps. If he had approved the proposal, youths from 16 to 21 participating would have drawn $563,100 in summer wages. The money would have been contributed by the Federal Government's war on poverty program.

Some of the 1,200 young persons who had hoped to earn money this summer to help pay high school and college expenses may get other jobs. They will if they are lucky. A high percentage of them won't because jobs for the young simply aren't dangling from trees in this age of growing automation. Several thousand youthful Montanans will be glad to tell the Governor they are ready, willing, and able—and still without jobs.

About 200 young persons the Farmer Union program would have helped are high school dropouts. The sponsors hoped these dropouts would learn and earn enough this summer to encourage them to return to school. Many dropouts this program might have helped may never return to school. We wonder if the Governor thought about how many dropouts the program might have helped will wind up spending much of their future on welfare and unemployment rolls. Those are the destination points for the unskilled and uneducated as automation advances.

"My most important reason for denying approval is my belief that no private organization should be granted the authority to administer and spend Federal or State funds," the Governor explained.

The Governor, who has the reputation of looking askance at most Federal programs, said if the Neighborhood Youth Corps proposal had been made by school district, city or county that he would have approved it without hesitation.

Governor Babcock said he had received full information on the Farmers Union proposal only Monday morning. He vetoed it that afternoon.

The Farmers Union proposal was approved by the Federal Government June 8. News about the proposal was published many weeks before that. On June 11, the Farmers Union asked for a speedup in the Governor's consideration. A Governor's aid complained then that the Governor needed more information before acting.

On a program as significant as one that promises to provide summer jobs for 1,200 young Montanans, we think the Governor's office could take advantage of the telephone to query the Farmers Union or the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington. He could have saved the State a long distance call last week when he was in Washington appealing for the atom smasher plant.

If the Governor had deep convictions against any private organization having the authority to administer and spend Federal or State money, he should have announced that earlier. We think he should have taken the leadership his office gives him to encourage governmental units to set up Neighborhood Youth Corps.

It takes a great deal of time to set up a program even to apply for Federal support of a Neighborhood Youth Corps. Much of the summer will have vanished before programs could be organized now to provide summer work for as many youths as the Farmers Union program would have helped.

That's the tragedy connected with Governor Babcock's veto. There'll be a lot of youthful idle hands this summer because of the veto.

[From the People's Voice]

GOVERNOR HAS NO COMPASSION FOR PEOPLE

The lack of compassion for the needs of young people exhibited by Montana's Governor last week when he vetoed the Farmers' Union-sponsored neighborhood youth corps program, has drawn both sharp condemnation and a smattering of praise. Some examples:

The Missoulian, a stanch backer of the Governor, bluntly stated in its editorial headline, "Babcock Makes a Bad Decision," and charged that "the Governor's action was politically based and hard to justify. The point of the youth program is not who handles it but the young people involved."

Continuing, the Missoulian said that "the Farmers' Union project would have brought $563,100 in summer pay for rural young people in this State. Now the 1,200 youngsters who would have benefited must find something else to do. In many cases that will mean idle whiling away of time, time that could have been spent learning and working and earning. Idleness breeds delinquency * * *. In balance, the decision was a bad one."

The Great Falls Tribune editorially condemned Babcock's negative action, pointing out that he had "dashed the hopes about 1,200 young Montanans had to get summer jobs," and noted that of the 1,200 about 200 of those who would have been helped are high school dropouts. "The sponsors hoped these dropouts would learn and earn enough this summer to encourage them to return to school * * *. We wonder if the Governor thought about how many dropouts the program might have helped will wind up spending much of their future on welfare and unemployment rolls. Those are the destination points for the unskilled and uneducated as automation advances."

As to the Governor's excuse for delaying action on the program due to lack of information, the Tribune pointed out that the Federal authorities had approved the proposal June 8—some 14 days before the veto, and that "on a program as significant as one that promises to provide summer jobs for 1,200 young Montanans, we think the Governor's office could" have taken "advantage of the telephone to query the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington. He could have saved the State a long-distance call last week when he was in Washington appealing for the atom smasher plant."

Sharp disappointment was also expressed in Thompson Falls by State Representative Henry Gill and Mayor Orin Kendall, and the editor of the Sanders County Ledger summed up the effect of the veto in a terse statement that "the Governor's refusal to approve the project thus knocked out work for at least 34 youths in the Thompson Falls area." Mayor Kendall emphasized that the project would not only have given young people something to do, but would have made possible city beautification and other works for which the town does not have funds in it regular budget.

State Democratic Chairman Fred Barrett opined that "if the Governor spent some time in his office thinking about the problems of young people and less time dreaming of his political ambitions for the U.S. Senate, our young people wouldn't be forced to leave our State to seek employment opportunity."

"Babcock's action," he continued, "again shows how far he is from the mainstream of political thinking in the United States and how unqualified he is for public office." In a final thrust he charged that "it is certainly unfortunate that our chief executive's callous attitude has deprived our youth of summer jobs that are so desperately needed."

Barrett's statement brought forth a half-hearted defense of the Governor by Republican State Chairman Mel Engles, who avoiding the crucial youth unemployment problem in Montana, said that Barrett's "ill-tempered tirades * * * show clearly that the real purpose of the camp would have been political."

Another belabored defense of the Governor's action came via editorial comment in the Helena Independent Record, which as usual wordily castigated the Farmers Union, and then said "we applaud Gov. Tim Babcock for his veto of the Federal plan to drop a half million dollars into the lap of the Farmers Union for alleged training of jobless youth * * * Babcock was right, but wasn't he an old meanie to say what he said?"

The net effect of the Governor's veto was summed up in a press statement by National Farmers Union President James G. Patton (see story elsewhere), when he said: "Depriving these youth—who are our most important commodity—the opportunity to work in summer employment which would enable them to return to school this fall clearly indicates that Governor Babcock would condemn many of his constituents to live in poverty."

Various comments have been made as to this veto being another manifestation of the Governor's antifederalism mania. But, as Yellowstone Democratic Chairman Chet Blaylock pointed out in last week's Voice, Montana's trucker-Governor is not consistent in this regard, particularly as concerns those Federal projects where hauling cement may be a possibility.

Actually, while this latest example of Babcock's contempt for human beings is grounds for deep disappointment, it is in line with his general attitude toward people, as shown so graphically in the last legislative session. Remember:

It was he who vetoed the bill which would have made possible a greatly expanded vocational education program in Montana schools.

It was he who vetoed the air pollution control bill, thereby condemning many Montanans to lingering respiratory illnesses and shortened lifespans.

It was he who vainly attempted to force the legislature into passing a $5 head tax which would have borne most heavily on the aged, the disabled, the unemployed, the kid who, if lucky enough, has a summertime job.

It was he who vetoed the bill, which would have permitted nurses to collectively bargain for much-needed improvements in wages and working conditions.

Only one question remains, How soon will the people of Montana awaken to the fact that this political charlatan is for all intents and purposes a pawn of powerful reactionary interests; that he is vindictive to the nth degree, and that he has only disdain for the needs, desires, and aspirations of Montana people?—H.L.B.

There is great reason why the people of my State are not happy with the Governor's actions. The Neighborhood Youth Corps is the work-training program established by the Economic Opportunity Act for disadvantaged young men and women between the ages of 16 and 21. It is developed and directed by local people who understand local problems—unfortunately a few Governors lack such understanding. There are approximately 232 rural projects involving 51,522 people in 33 States now successfully being conducted. Several States have expanded their programs. I repeat, we cannot afford to waste our greatest resource, the young people of our Nation. And, we cannot afford to throw the opportunity to salvage the thousands of these young people who might otherwise be faced with a life of personal poverty and lack of ability or opportunity to make any large contribution to their Nation. The unilateral decision of a Governor to veto a project based on political reasons is what I object to. The need and end results are more important than a Governor's partisan analysis of a project—the young man or woman in poverty does not understand the sophisticated political decisions of any Governor that prohibits their opportunity to succeed.

This is why I am concerned—this is why I want the need of the individual to be considered aside from the purely partisan considerations. The need of the individual must rise above any of our political differences. This is why I support the amendment of my colleague from Indiana.

I would like to enter into the Record, with prior permission, an editorial contained in the Montana Farmers Union News. This editorial does a fine job of stating the farmers union position and indicates that the Governor did not read too closely the application which he vetoed:

Kenfield Comments on Governor's Action—Youth Corps Veto Dashes Hopes of Many Youngsters

Great Falls.—"Governor Babcock's denial of a job opportunity program for a thousand disadvantaged Montana youth is very regrettable and impossible to understand," Leonard Kenfield, president of the Montana Farmers Union, said Tuesday in response to the Governor's veto of the farm organization's application to sponsor a rural Neighborhood Youth Corps.

"More than 1,200 young people, 16 through 21 years of age, and 167 local organizations in 71 Montana communities have indicated a strong interest in the proposal," Kenfield declared, "which would not be a job camp but work experience provided by local community groups near the trainees' homes."

"Montana Farmers Union sponsorship has been approved by the U.S. Department of Labor and a wide cross-section of Montana residents and community leaders," he indicated.

"This unexpected turn of events, not only dashes the hopes of these many young people, but it is a disappointment, I am sure, to many community leaders who were looking to the statewide rural Neighborhood Youth Corps as a means of upgrading the future of unemployed youth who are in need of funds and worthwhile occupation."

FARMERS UNION SHOULD BE A BANK

"Babcock's peculiar anti-federalism is clearly evident," Kenfield said. "While he is critical about the possibility of private farmers unions handling Federal funds, he isn't disturbed apparently by the private banks that handle Federal funds all the time; nor by his own way of handling Federal contract funds. Many other private organizations handle Federal funds including General Dynamics Corp., which is already administering some of the poverty program. And, has the chief executive of Montana forgotten that only a few days ago we were told his own administration is hiring a private medical agency to administer the new Kerr-Mills law that is heavily loaded with Federal funds?"

"What does he mean by a 'quasi-political' organization?" Kenfield asked. "The Montana Farmers Union neither endorses nor finances anyone's political campaign. While referring to the situation in Texas, Babcock does not have the generosity to say that the Governors of Illinois, Indiana, and Arkansas have approved rural Neighborhood Youth Corps programs sponsored by the farmers union organizations in those States.

"If he had read our application," the Montana Farmers Union president said, "Babcock would have seen that a private Great Falls bank would have been custodian of the Federal Neighborhood Youth Corps funds, that the Neighborhood Youth Corps accountants would have been amply bonded and that a certified public accountant would have audited the project books periodically.

"Montana Farmers Union sought the application for sponsorship simply because no one else was doing so in the rural areas where most of the poverty exists. This would not have been necessary if Montana's Governor, instead of being one of the last holdouts in the Nation, had appointed a full-time coordinator to keep citizens informed on possibilities under the economic opportunity program as it has been developing since last August.

"While Montana Farmers Union has no stake in the proposed program, we are disappointed in the lost opportunities for the rural people this summer," the farm leader stated. "With the gathering depression in rural Montana, here was a challenge to do something worthwhile for our most important resource, the oncoming generation of our State. Here was something more than chasing atomic rainbows on these numerous and costly gubernatorial gallops across the country."

"Montana Farmers Union will be glad to assist local public agencies and private nonprofit organizations prepare applications for Neighborhood Youth Corps projects, although there is hardly time now for anything effective this summer. Perhaps enough planning can be done, however, to put into operation a hundred or more local projects for the new school year," Kenfield concluded.

It is important to note that the Montana Farmers Union sought the application for sponsorship simply because no one else was doing so in the rural areas where most of the poverty exists.

But the amazing fact to me is that the Farmers Union of Montana informed the Governor that they had applied for the neighborhood youth corps program for Montana, both by letter and telegram, copies of which I have seen, several days before the program was vetoed. The officers of the Montana Farmers Union offered to discuss any aspect of the program. Apparently the Governor was not interested in any modification of the program. He vetoed it without even calling in the Montana Farmers Union officers.

This is only one example, from one State, Mr. Chairman, but since the issue at stake here is of such vital importance to the effectiveness of the entire poverty program, I feel it is adequate justification for the passage of the amendment offered by my colleague from Indiana, removing the final decision on an OEO State program from a Governor's hands.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the floor and he may yield to whomever he pleases.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DENT. No. I yield the gentleman from Montana the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY].

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, we have two well intended institutions in my State that are not working very well. One institution is the U.N. Security Council on the East River. It has the veto, it does not work very well. The other institution is the Republican administration on the Hudson River which also has the veto in Albany. That does not work very well either. When the Governor of New York was on his way to his vacation in Venezuela, one of his last acts was to veto a matter which nearly cost my State $19 million. The poor in my State need help and we cannot stand that kind of nonsense.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CABELL].

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I wish the record to reflect my resentment and my opposition to the implication that the Governor of the State of Texas vetoed a project because of its biracial nature. That is incorrect. Projects presently operating in Texas are biracial. I believe that the gentleman from California with his usual sense of fairness and propriety will either prove his implication or will retract it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I opposed the veto last year. Events have shown that it has been used time and again to prevent poverty programs from reaching the people.

The bill before us, H.R. 8203, amends the present act with respect to the Governor's veto which I strenuously opposed when the legislation was before us last August. It provides that the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity may reconsider any community action, adult basic education, or work-training plan disapproved by a Governor, and may carry it out if, upon reconsideration, he finds it to be fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of the Economic Opportunity Act. This is an important change, for it removes the absolute veto over community action, neighborhood youth corps, and adult basic education programs. However, the absolute veto is retained over Job Corps and VISTA projects.

Instead of seeking to circle a way around the Governors, we should deal directly with their powers. The war on poverty is a national struggle, not to be nullified by local politicians for their own political purposes. We should act—now—to completely abolish the Governor's veto power.

Certainly, the Governor's veto power over Job Corps centers and VISTA volunteers in his State should not be retained.

Last year we established a single centralized agency to combat a national problem with a nationally planned solution. We recognized that concerted action was necessary.

But, by giving State Governors program veto powers, the decision for concerted action was turned over to the State authorities. By giving the Governors veto powers, Congress allowed them to stand between the poor and opportunity; Congress allowed them to decide who in their States would benefit from our farsighted legislation, and who would, for lack of opportunity and motivation, be relegated to the dole. The Federal Government pays the bill for poverty through public assistance. It should be the means of providing motivation and training in order to change conditions for this and future generations.

As I pointed out last year, in many of the areas where the need for Federal assistance is greatest, State and local authorities are hostile to our antipoverty effort, both in concept and substance. The intent of the original legislation was to reach those whose plight local and State governments were either indifferent to or incapable of solving.

Last year it was said that no Governor would exercise this veto. But, if no Governor was going to use it, why was it written into the law in the first place?

Mr. Chairman, Governors have used the veto power, and without hesitation. Governor Wallace, of Alabama vetoed a Birmingham community action program. Project Head Start programs were vetoed by Governor Wallace, of Alabama, Governor Johnson, of Mississippi, and Governor Burns, of Florida. In my own State, Governor Rockefeller threatened to use the veto to keep over $16 million from New York City.

It is not surprising that southern Governors dominate this list; nor can we afford not to learn a lesson from the fact. Where a Governor is opposed to integrated programs or fears their success, racial discrimination denies the most poverty stricken, the most needy of an opportunity for hope.

The bill before us would prevent a Governor from completely blocking a program, as the above Governors attempted to do, but it would do nothing toward preventing the use of a veto as a delaying tactic. Furthermore, it does not apply to the veto of Job Corps centers or VISTA volunteer projects. Both Governor Babcock, of Montana, and Governor Connally, of Texas, have vetoed Job Corps projects for their States. One million dollars of antipoverty money has been kept away from the people of Montana and Texas because of their Governors' actions.

We must put an end to these actions. Poverty is a national problem. Let us meet it nationally, without interference from the whims of local authorities.

I am not suggesting that we ignore the States. I support title II of the original legislation, which looks to State participation when it says:

> The Director shall establish procedures which will facilitate effective participation by the States in community action programs.

We have neither, in the original legislation nor in the bill before us, bypassed the States as a source of valuable resources. The community action program which we have formed and strengthened is in every way a self-help device.

But we cannot allow a Governor to veto a local community's effort to mobilize its own human and material resources. Nor should we allow a Governor to veto Federal assistance to local communities, aimed at helping these communities solve their own problems.

The Governor's veto is not reliance on responsible local action. It is merely obstruction. If we are to have an effective national antipoverty program, we must end this obstruction, in all its forms. For the poor, governmental delay might just as well be complete governmental inaction. Let us end the possibility of both and defeat the amendment which is now before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I do rise in support of the amendment. I think this is a tempest in a teapot. All this argument back and forth seeks to show that this is a tremendous issue here when, as a matter of fact, the Governor's veto has been exercised only three times. On both sides of the aisle we often say that, even though we are doing things from here in Washington, we still want to leave as much control locally as possible. Here we have a chance to leave a little control in local hands. I hope the amendment will be supported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment also and to say that once more we see the Democrats endeavoring to concentrate all the power that they can here in Washington and resisting all efforts to leave in the hands of the people at home and their properly elected officials their own discretion and authority over these matters.

One of the real trends in the last 5 years has been completely to do away with the concept of grants-in-aid, the time-honored concept that we have in the Hill-Burton programs and other programs, and concentrate power here in Washington and then to compound this by calling a veto a veto when it absolutely is not.

The recommendation of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] in his own statement very well indicated the fact that the veto is really not a veto.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AYRES. We have had quite a bit of discussion here.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, under the rules I demand recognition for a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I will make a point of order that the gentleman is not permitted to yield any more than I was.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin has yielded to me—and I presume my half minute is up.

Mr. DENT. I presume the same thing and I did not have it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ayres].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, we have had quite a bit of discussion here regarding a wire sent out by the Governor of Indiana. I do not know what wire was sent to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas], but here is a wire that came to a Republican Member from Indiana, dated May 20, after the date that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] received his wire:

> We urge you return Governor's veto power in review of Economic Opportunity Act projects. It can prevent conflicting programs and yet protect local initiative.
>
> Roger D. Branigin.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Frelinghuysen].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that what should be a serious debate has already turned into a circus.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Edwards].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Bell].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to clarify my remarks and those of the gentleman from California [Mr. Hawkins] by reading from the last part of the record of the hearings held yesterday, during which Governor Brown was present and I now quote directly from the hearings:

> Mr. Hawkins. I assume you are clarifying it to the extent that you say that the Governor can still veto, but his veto would be subject to review by the Office of Economic Opportunity.
>
> Mr. Bell. It would certainly be subject to review, but I am pointing out to the gentleman from California that Washington makes the final decision, not the Governor, if need be. If it comes down to a final analysis, the decision will be resting with Washington, not with Governor Brown.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the 1964 act gave to the Governors of the States powers over local ordinances and regulations which they do not ordinarily have. The Ayres amendment would continue this inequity; I therefore oppose the Ayres amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Conable].

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, on the positive side, quite apart from political attacks made upon him here, I should like to state that our Governor and our State administration of New York have shown a compassionate interest in this program. More than 200 Federal poverty projects have been approved by Mr. Rockefeller. Seven State employees have spent a great deal of State time working out State obligations under the economic opportunity program and investigating a number of worthy projects.

We would have avoided an unfortunate situation in the city of Syracuse had the veto power applied there, with respect to university projects. I urge support of this amendment, on the grounds that it will help insure continued State participation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I feel that this program should be carried out by cooperation between the local communities involved and the Federal Government. I oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, the Members on the other aisle seem to have the opinion that the local communities are some autonomous bodies separate from the State, but there is not one existing except for the State. They do not have the same relationship to the States that the States have to the Federal Government. Therefore, the Governors has responsibilities toward local political subdivisions which the Federal Government does not have toward the States.

I showed yesterday a letter from one of the counties in my district, where the OEO threatened to circumvent them by setting up a separate organization. The only protection a local governing body has to prevent the Federal poverty czar from circumventing them is the Governor's veto.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger].

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OTTINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The first point I want to make—and apparently my friend from Ohio does not understand Hoosiers when they talk—is that the Governor of Indiana sent me a telegram on the 20th of May, using exactly the same language as the telegram to which the gentleman referred. I wrote the Governor of Indiana on the 20th of May explaining the modified amendment. I had no response from him complaining about the modified amendment.

On the 20th of July, 2 months later, I talked with the office of the Governor, and they assured me the Governor supports the committee bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas].

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, to reiterate, the Governor supports the committee bill. Governor Branigin supports the Brademas amendment.

Secondly and finally, to sum up, I read from a letter written on June 28 by the distinguished Speaker of the House [Mr. McCormack]; the distinguished majority leader [Mr. Albert]; and the distinguished majority whip [Mr. Boggs]. In explanation of H.R. 8283, they say:

> The Governor's veto is modified, preserving his right to veto programs that are strictly Federal in nature, but limiting his review of those programs that are strictly local in nature and which are in compliance with the Economic Opportunity Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Scheuer].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, our colleagues on the Republican side have consistently tried to brand this bill as one which would extend the long arm of the Federal Government in Washington into local communities across the country. The fact is that this bill is structured to do exactly the contrary. It is structured to enable local communities to have vitally needed resources and tools to work out their own destinies, their own programs, their own projects which best reflect their thinking. The poverty program leaves it to the cities to decide how they can best meet their special local needs and problems and achieve their own image of their own future.

In too many cases, particularly in my own State, Governors have failed to act upon proposals and information in their possession for many weeks and months, have greatly delayed the orderly growth of the poverty program, have confused and disrupted orderly processing procedures, and have failed to resist the temptation to muddle and meddle in local problems and local areas where they have no proper concern.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. I do not believe a Governor should have the authority to exercise a veto over a local poverty program in which the State makes no financial program, at such time as the several States recognize the State's obligation in this critical area and appropriate funds to supplement the Federal and local contributions, we can reconsider our action.

Up to the present time, State governments have been generally indifferent with respect to the special problems of the poor and the poverty areas in which the poor reside. As long as the States refuse to be contributing partners to the solution of the problems of poverty, they merit no right to review or veto programs which are developed and paid for with Federal and local funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, with all this discussion about what the Governor said or did not say, my conversation with Governor Brown was not on the record but was an informal discussion. Governor Brown, I believe, had the same conversation with the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT]. According to what he said to me personally, he would like to have the bill remain as it now is. To override his veto does not mean that he really has the veto, and that is what the present language will do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I reiterate again what I read very rapidly a few minutes ago which is the last part of the transcript of the hearings held yesterday. In the presence of Governor Brown, with the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] and myself participating, which concludes with the clear understanding as to where the responsibility clearly lies.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON].

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, the correct vote on this motion is to vote "No," because the Governor's veto is amply protected in the strictly Federal programs—the Job Corps and VISTA. What we are trying to correct is an unwarranted intervention and an unusual amount of power this Congress inadvertently gave the Governors to meddle in local affairs last year. I urge all my colleagues to vote "No."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD].

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the question now before the House is not whether the Governors shall or shall not have the veto, but the question is whether that veto can be exercised without any right of review. All we are seeking to do is give the right of review, to local people who feel aggrieved by arbitrary or capricious exercise of the veto power.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington, [Mr. MEEDS].

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Ayres amendment.

I would like to say that for years and years the minority has been urging local control. This is local control. Now evidently they are afraid of it. This bill really guarantees that we will prevent arbitrary action.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to make clear that the Governors do maintain absolute veto on this bill in every single title. In this particular title, we are merely saying that where there are circumstances such as have been evident, then the director has the right to override that veto. But the Governor still maintains all veto powers even in this title, and I ask that this amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. AYRES) there were—ayes 110, noes 97.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. AYRES and Mr. POWELL.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 150, noes 155.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill has not as yet been read.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN: On page 5, after line 3, insert:

"Section 209(c) is further amended (1) by inserting ', or by any institution of higher education,' after 'any private institution or organization', and (2) by striking out ': *Provided, however*, That this section shall not apply to contracts, agreements, grants, loans, or other assistance to any institution of higher education in existence on the date of approval of this Act'."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the members of the Committee that the language which I would modify appears on page 37 of the committee report. This is another aspect of the veto power now provided the Governors. Let me say I regret very much that we are not going to retain the veto power now in the law.

My amendment would strike the proviso in the final section of 209(c) which excludes from the Governor's veto any grants, contract, agreement, or loan, or other assistance to institutions of higher education. I suggest this because, on the basis of the experience thus far under the OEO, serious problems have developed with respect to certain demonstration grants made to universities.

Let me mention a few of the grants that have already been made, and single out two of them in particular.

A grant of $1,168,099 has been made to Tufts College to demonstrate how a comprehensive health service can be provided more effectively.

NYU in New York had a grant of $314,031, to develop a program to train low-achieving potential high school graduates to be teachers for their own kind.

Two particular projects deserve special attention. The one to the University of Syracuse for $314,329 has been much criticized by the press and by the authorities in Syracuse.

The reason for this particular project was to demonstrate, and I quote, "the development of effective democratic organization of low-income areas."

The Republican task force on economic opportunity heard testimony from the mayor of Syracuse with respect to this program. Mayor Walsh was concerned on several points. In the first place, the grant was made to the university without any consideration of how the local community might feel about this grant. The use to which the grant has been put has been described by the mayor of Syracuse as a dangerous social experimentation.

To put it bluntly, this would seem to be a kind of Federal financing of projects to fight city hall, in this case a progressive administration already actively engaged in fighting poverty, with programs financed by the Federal Government in part.

Another project, for $188,250 to the University of Michigan, has also received much critical comment. Testimony was heard before our Republican task force from representatives from Ypsilanti, Mich., with respect to the inadvisability of this particular grant.

This grant is not exactly the normal kind—if there is such a thing as a normal kind of demonstration grant. Let me cite to you the purpose for which this money is to be made available. I quote from a federally subsidized pamphlet called WRAND Round-Up which defends and describes what they believe the purpose of this program to be:

> This is not a grant as it applies to the poverty of Appalachia. This grant is for a quite different purpose. It is not an antipoverty measure as such but is for the purpose of discovering how a community like ours helps itself to a more secure way of life for itself and a happier one for its children, how people try to come to grips with problems which are too large for a single individual to handle by himself. Can a commu-

nity do this for itself if given some help? Or does it wait for someone else to do it for them?

I will skip one paragraph and continue.

The purpose is to give them a calling card into the Great Society. We have been selected here in the Willow Run area to show the country that working people like ourselves are ready and able to help ourselves upward. That is why the grant is such a small one.

I repeat, a grant totaling $188,252 has been made to develop this kind of interest. To me that sounds like a considerable amount of money.

When we go back into the House, Mr. Chairman, I will ask permission to include from the current issue of True magazine, a publication which I do not normally read, an article entitled "A Prosperous Town Is Forced To Accept U.S. Poverty Money."

The article follows:

A PROSPEROUS TOWN IS FORCED TO ACCEPT U.S. POVERTY MONEY—ZEALOUS POVERTY FIGHTERS SAY MICHIGAN'S YPSILANTI TOWNSHIP NEEDS $188,252 TO GET ON ITS FEET—AND THEY WON'T TAKE "NO" FOR AN ANSWER

(By Gene Caesar)

YPSILANTI TOWNSHIP, MICH.—On January 17, 1965, speaking at Johnson City, Tex., the President of the same name announced the approval of 88 new antipoverty grants. One of them, in the amount of $188,252, was for a demonstration project in the Willow Village area of southeastern Michigan.

On January 18, a slim, soft-spoken fellow named Roy Smith picked up a newspaper and stared at it incredulously. He had no connection with the war on poverty. He was and is supervisor of Ypsilanti Township, which lies in Washtenaw County, the highest income county in Michigan. To be sure, the subdivisions of Smith's district weren't comparable to some of the prestige neighborhoods of nearby Ann Arbor, where the University of Michigan is located. A good share of his constituents were hourly rated employees or lower grade executives in the automobile industry. But he was certain his township could boast average family earnings of more than $7,000 a year. So he had no connection with any impoverished area, either.

Even so, he had good reason for being stunned upon learning Willow Village had been designated an official poverty area to the tune of a sizable hunk of the taxpayers' money. For one thing, there wasn't any such place as Willow Village. For another, where most of Willow Village had once existed, the recently built homes and schools, parks, and glistening new shopping center stores of Ypsilanti Township were now standing.

Ironically enough, Roy Smith had been warned of what was coming. He'd simply refused to believe it was possible.

Some 8 weeks earlier, he'd received an inch-thick manuscript in the mail, along with a letter from Mr. Hyman Kornbluh of the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations—one of the numerous research groups supported by Michigan's tax-supported universities. "Under separate cover, I am sending you a copy of the proposal we have submitted to the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington," the letter had explained. And it had gone on to request the township's cooperation in a project of mutual interest.

Roy had begun reading the manuscript. And in doing so he'd also begun what was to be, for him, a long, lonely journey into a bureaucratic-academic fantasyland—a world where reality was regarded as of so little importance by officious-sounding officials that he would more than once find himself doubting his own sanity. What was labeled a report to the Federal Government from a famed and respected university sounded more like some amateur novelist's attempt to write a Michigan version of "Tobacco Road."

"By almost any standards," the script insisted, "Willow Village is an impoverished community." Actually, Willow Village was the name of a World War II housing project erected for the workers at the big Willow Run bomber plant, a project the Federal Government had abandoned to be torn down by Ypsilanti Township and replaced by privately built housing. The name still existed only on some low-rent but extremely attractive apartments that lay just over the line in Superior Township. And by any standards whatsoever, income for the designated area ran well above the national average.

OFFICIAL ANGERED WHEN HIS TOWN IS FALSELY CALLED IMPOVERISHED

Industry had passed by the core of this depressed community, the report continued, and the few folks fortunate enough to find work were in service and menial jobs. The truth was that the smoke of five gigantic automobile factories could be seen from the area's center, and the personnel manager of one of them had recently commented that anyone who could pass a physical could find employment there.

"Willow Village is a community without social services," the report went blithely on. "There is no medical facility, no newspaper, no self-government, no recreational or cultural or even entertainment facility. There are no stores in the area, and schools are a bus ride away."

Roy Smith had to shake his head hard and wipe his glasses before rereading that passage. The area not only received the social services of all Ypsilanti Community Chest agencies but even contained the headquarters of some of them. Ridgewood Hospital was just 1 mile to the north, and 3 miles to the southwest was the Beyer Memorial Hospital to which the township had paid $58,000 last year to guarantee that none of its residents could be denied a bed. Furthermore, a busy doctor's office shared the new Sunrise shopping center with a supermarket, a discount department store, and several other shops, all within sight of a library and a bowling alley and some of the parks where the township's $10,000 summer recreation program had been carried out. Four different newspapers were delivered daily in the area. All but a few of the children walked to school because they lived so close they were specifically prohibited from receiving bus rides under Michigan law. And if there was no self-government, Roy was forced to wonder, just who the h—— had elected him?

Even more fantastic was the constant flow of phrases like "the present ghost town appearance" or "brush has overgrown the streets and roads." The report never quite claimed the inhabitants of this brush-choked ghost town were starving. Instead, it suggested "establishing a community vegetable field—to be run by the residents on a cooperative basis—with the produce available to the residents for their own consumption."

Starving or not, the manuscript noted, the impoverished people had formed a self-help group of about 400 to 500 members called the Willow Run Association for Neighborhood Development—WRAND, for short—and immediately appealed to the University of Michigan to help them. After a thorough study, the university was submitting a proposed budget covering the community's needs. What the poor people needed most, it seemed, was the services of some "professional directors" with salaries up to $11,000 a year. Except for such items as $8,970 for the first year's publication of a community newsletter the only thing clear about the vaguely worded budget, all of which was subject to "university overhead," was that it was just the beginning. The report suggested, for example, that Willow Village Apartments be granted enough further "Title IV" funds to permit the building of "several hundred additional units."

Wondering whether to laugh or cry, Roy Smith closed the book of 90-odd pages and stared dully at the plywood walls of his office. He vaguely remembered hearing of WRAND. Someone had buttonholed him for a $20 donation the summer before and, believing the group to be a normal community-betterment organization, he'd thoroughly approved of the idea. But the WRAND headquarters were over in Superior Township and, as far as he knew, so were its members. Yet all but a small portion of the area designated in the report was in Ypsilanti Township. Since the accompanying letter said "a proposal we have submitted," it was apparently too late to keep the university from making an incredible and perhaps embarrassing blunder. But he telephoned the man who'd written that letter anyway.

"Mr. Hyman Kornbluh? This is Roy Smith out in Ypsilanti Township. If you're going to write about this area, why don't you drive the 10 miles out here and look at it? That report of yours is just plain garbage."

The voice on the telephone sounded extremely upset, but it finally said something about a matter of opinion.

"No, it's not," Roy asserted. "If you'd said there were few stores or inadequate facilities and so forth, that might be a matter of opinion. When you say there's no this, that and the other thing—all of which are located in the area—there's no question of opinion involved. Look, you come out here, any time, at your convenience, and I'll drive you around. I want you to try defending that report while you're seeing what's here with your own eyes."

Hyman Kornbluh finally agreed and promised to call back soon. But that call never came. Roy showed the weird manuscript to several citizens allegedly living in a grown-over ghost town. And it brought laughter instead of indignation from everyone who read it.

"Why, there isn't an unpaved street in any of these three subdivisions of ours they've listed," they said. "There isn't a house in the entire area more than 10 years old."

"Why worry about it?" everyone chuckled. "They'll read that in Washington and toss it in the nearest wastebasket. The war on poverty is for places like Appalachia. If they send someone out here from the Federal Government, then some professors will have some fast explaining to do. But that's not your problem."

Running into this same reaction everywhere, Roy Smith soon began wondering if he wasn't taking the ridiculous report too seriously. By the time the new year began, the manuscript was lying forgotten in his crowded files.

But on January 17—without any attempt at prior investigation, with entire sentences from the ghost town report being repeated word for word in a White House press release—Willow Village was awarded an antipoverty grant.

For 4 full days, Roy remained silent and did some soul searching, chiefly while walking the streets of what was now an official poverty area. He didn't dispute the fact that there were a few scattered folks on those streets, as on almost all streets, who weren't very well off. Roy wasn't opposed to the antipoverty program; he was all in favor of the Government helping poor people in any way it could.

Back in the depression, as a kid on a Tennessee farm, Roy Smith had eaten Government sowbelly the same as everyone around him was doing and been plenty glad to get it. He'd come a fair distance from that Tennessee farm, though. He'd been in the Marines in World War II and after the war had attended the University of Michigan on the GI bill. Then he'd worked in the automobile industry and, in 1959, had entered politics, where he'd been quite successful. He is a moderate Republican and, along with George Romney, was one of the few members of his party to survive the 1964 Johnson landslide.

But Roy Smith had never forgotten the depression. If there was the slightest chance that any portion of that $188,252 might eventually filter down to help folks who needed it, he certainly didn't want to ruin that chance.

For four straight evenings, at home, with his wife sensing a crisis and hushing his three children, he went over the proposed budget again and again. And absolutely nothing was really being promised there. Beneath all the long-winded descriptions of what "might" be done, the hard fact was that some nonteaching fellows at the University of Michigan were being given a good-sized piece of public money to do with as they pleased as a reward for branding his township a poverty area. On January 22, he finally telephoned the nearest newspaper and mentioned some of the falsities in the institute report.

The local papers, published in the shadow of the powerful university, were extremely wary of the story. They mentioned only a few of Roy's charges, then answered them with institute statements that "some errors of detail in describing the physical elements and population statisics of the area did occur * * * but none of these errors was fundamental."

"Willow Village is of course not totally impoverished," Hyman Kornbluh was quoted as saying. "But it does contain pockets of poverty."

Smith couldn't help wondering if this was the same Kornbluh who'd sent him the report saying, "By almost any standards, Willow Village is an impoverished community." But press objectivity seemed to be picking up in direct ratio to the distance from Ann Arbor, "Federal Government says it's impoverished; area says it's thriving" the Detroit Free Press reported. And the little Redford Record put it even more bluntly: "U. of M. dreams up poverty ghost town." But it was a Detroit TV commentator, Larry Carino of WJBK, who got to the heart of the matter.

He made a very sensible suggestion: "Let the University of Michigan explain exactly what it intends to do with the $188,000—or send it back with apologies."

But the institute parried even this thrust. "The program has not yet been spelled out." Hyman Kornbluh explained, "because the cardinal point of a demonstration project is to demonstrate that the community can assess its own needs." Whether the community had assessed a need for them or not, it was also announced that the hiring of a staff of about 12 would begin immediately.

Supervisor Roy Smith had understandably expected a cry of outrage to come from the folks who were being branded impoverished. But the issue had been so clouded and confused by academic doubletalk that only 10 people brought complaints to a township board meeting on February 2, and most of these were merely ladies who were miffed because friends were phoning and offering to send them CARE packages. Furthermore, their young township clerk, Tilden R. Stumbo, kept urging them to "Wait and see."

"Sure, they got the grant by falsifying a document," he argued. "But some good could still come of the grant itself—new roads or parks."

Roy Smith could only hope that none of the youngsters who might play in such parks were listening to his elders' moral logic, and he said as much 2 days later when he got off a letter to Dr. Harlan Hatcher, president of the University of Michigan. After listing two pages of the fraudulent claims made in the institute report, then adding that this was only a sampling, that the entire report lacked reality, he invited Dr. Hatcher to tour the area with him at any time and make his own comparison. "We teach our children to tell the truth," he mentioned. "If funds have been received on the basis of false statements, those funds should be returned."

Word of the controversy had reached Washington, but there was still no hint that any investigation would be made. "We didn't force that money on those people," an Office of Economic Opportunity spokesman told newsmen. "They themselves asked for it. Four or five hundred of them formed this WRAND organization and requested the University of Michigan to apply for and administer the grant in their behalf."

Thus assured, the demonstration project proceeded as scheduled. The planting of the communal vegetable garden couldn't begin until the spring thaw, of course. But calling itself the WRAND roundup the community newsletter, for which $8,970 of antipoverty money had been allotted in the proposed budget, appeared immediately—with headlines saying "Who Says We're Impoverished?" above a story insisting the grant was only an expression of admiration for local initiative. WRAND further explained on February 8 that the grant was needed because the designated area, although not really impoverished, was not being served by the Ypsilanti Community Chest. On February 9 WRAND announced that yesterday's press release was "in error" since the area had always been served by the community chest.

It seemed strange to Roy Smith, reading the next day's papers, that an organization of area residents could make such a mistake. But before he could carry this curious inconsistency to its inevitable conclusion, he was interrupted by something even stranger. Three gentlemen from the university were ushered into his office. One was introduced as a full dean. Another described himself as merely an observer and was actually, Roy later learned, a recognized authority on, of all things, syphilis research. The third, a plump man wearing the look of a fellow being forced to endure petty indignity, was the long-awaited Hyman Kornbluh.

Instead of discussing the matter in his office, Roy loaded the delegation into his 3-year-old Chevrolet and spent more than 2 hours touring every street of the alleged poverty area. He didn't run into any brush, but he did stop regularly to read aloud sentences from the report for comparison with what lay outside the car windows. The dean made a gallant attempt at keeping the interview genial and friendly, under formidably difficult circumstances. Chain-smoking nervously, Mr. Kornbluh remained silent most of the time, as did the syphilis expert. Not until they'd returned to the township hall did Roy hear anything resembling an admission that the area wasn't a ghost town after all.

"Suppose instead of 'no' stores, we say 'few' stores?" Hyman Kornbluh offered then. "Suppose instead of 'no' facilities, we say 'inadequate' facilities?"

"Suppose you apologize to the people here and return the grant," Roy suggested instead. "If you can get another one by writing an honest report, the best of luck to you."

Kornbluh countered with the accusation that the whole affair was a political publicity stunt, asserted that he himself wouldn't be in politics for anything, and walked out. That was the last Roy Smith saw of him.

Roy Smith had some questionnaires made up to be circulated in the designated poverty area, requesting residents to return them unsigned. He wanted some statistics on the average income, and to learn what percentage favored the grant and how many were members of the mysterious WRAND organization that had requested it in the first place.

On February 16, a surprise resolution was introduced at a township board meeting, and Roy found himself standing totally alone. Five to one against him, his fellow board members voted to condemn the poverty label but to welcome the poverty money.

Everyone seemed to be saying exactly what Clerk Tilden R. Stumbo had said—"Sure, they got the grant by falsifying a document, but let's keep it anyway"—including, fantastically enough, the Federal Government itself because a tall, distinguished-looking man named William Lawrence was ushered into the township hall the next day and introduced as a consultant to the community action program of the Office of Economic Opportunity. And he soon made it clear that he'd come not as an investigator but as a peacemaker.

"I've already been around the area," he insisted, declining the offer of another tour in Roy's Chevy. "Now I want to know what sort of proposal, satisfactory to you, I can take to the university. What would satisfy you, Mr. Smith?"

"Why didn't you make the 2-hour flight out here before the grant was given?" Roy couldn't help wondering.

"We're tremendously understaffed," Lawrence explained. "But I want to assure you and every citizen that no antipoverty grant will ever again be given without an on-the-spot inspection of the area."

"Michigan has a State antipoverty director," Roy Smith persisted. "Couldn't his office have been asked to check out the proposal?"

William Lawrence further explained that the poverty program permits the Federal Government to deal directly with universities. After all, he reminded Roy, the original appeal had come from the area residents themselves. By reporting on the area and offering to administer a grant, the University of Michigan was, in effect, the agency checking out the appeal for the Federal Government.

"Well, now that you've seen the area," Smith asked, "what are you going to do about it?"

Lawrence launched into an involved dissertation on the intricacies of antipoverty grants. Contracts had already been offered to professional directors, it seemed, and other commitments had been made. But the Office of Economic Opportunity would most certainly demand that the university correct the "errors" in the report, redefine it and update it before activating the project. "Would that satisfy you?" he asked hopefully.

"All that will satisfy me," Roy Smith told him, suddenly feeling very tired, "is the return of any poverty money intended for Ypsilanti Township and a public apology to the people here."

William Lawrence went away worriedly predicting that "the university won't go for anything like that." And the university didn't.

Meanwhile, the Willow Village demonstration project had already demonstrated one thing—the ease with which antipoverty funds could be obtained. And predictably enough, what followed was like a run on the bank. The Washtenaw County Committee on Alcoholism decided to try for $39,900; everyone knows poor people drink too much. The local chapter of the Planned Parenthood League wanted $26,290 because statistics show the impoverished do something else too much. The Ypsilanti public schools decided to go all out and ask $375,000 for providing "compensatory education" for everyone from deprived preschoolers to the indigent aged. Before long, fully 20 poverty money requests were being feverishly prepared, and a 36-member citizen's committee was itself requesting $54,501 merely for acting as a clearinghouse for other requests. All this was going on in just 1 county, the highest income county in Michigan, one of the 10 wealthiest States in the Union.

Nor was the national picture particularly different. The controversy was bringing Roy Smith a surprising amount of mail from people in some farflung places. Ministers and other citizens of Chicago and Cleveland and New York were claiming that their own antipoverty grants had served no purpose except as patronage plums for local political machines. West Virginians were writing to ask if Roy saw anything strange about the way the poverty money was being parceled out. After all, the late President Kennedy's shock at what he'd seen upon carrying his primary campaign into that State had been one of the prime factors in creating the national mood that resulted in the war on poverty. Why then, West Virginians were wondering, had their antipoverty allotment so far been little more than $400,000, while the high income State of New Jersey had already received $12½ million?

But folks from New Jersey were writing as well, and they weren't happy with all that money. People in Monmouth County, for example, had received a $67,000 grant, only to learn that $52,000 of it had already been budgeted for the salaries and administration expenses of the professional directors. The whole State had been startled to hear that Antipoverty Director John C. Bullitt would be getting a salary of $25,000 a year and would have a pair of $19,000 assistants. But Bullitt had insisted these wage rates were not out of line, and in a sense he was right. This was less than his poverty-official superiors in Washington were getting and slightly more than was being paid city poverty officials. In Newark alone there were seven poverty fighters in the over-$10,000 bracket, but the top wage was just $23,000. Hearing of this, the corps of poverty fighters assigned to Paterson, where the highest salary was a mere $18,500, were about to request a pay raise, but they finally decided against it. After all, the mayor of Paterson was getting only $17,500.

Even so, Roy's chief concern was his own township, and he was pinning a large share of his hopes on the president of the University of Michigan. He still expected Dr. Harlan Hatcher to make a person comparison of the fraudulent report and the area it supposedly described, then crack down on those responsible with all the righteous wrath that might be expected of so distinguished an educator. But on March 2, when Roy Smith finally received an answer to his letter of nearly a month earlier, it was the most mystifying and disappointing development of the entire nightmarish affair. Dr. Hatcher described himself as "satisfied that the University of Michigan and its representatives acted in good faith and in accordance with recognized procedures, both in submitting the program and in accepting the grant" because "many of the alleged errors to which reference has been made occurred in a background document which was not submitted to Washington."

Numb with amazement, Roy searched his files for the original letter from Kornbluh, dated November 25. It still read, "I am sending you a copy of the proposal we have submitted to the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington," just as it always had. For fully 6 weeks the report had been the subject of incessant public controversy, mentioned in both news stories and editorials, and Roy himself had discussed it with both university and Federal Government officials. At no time in those 6 weeks had there been the slightest suggestion from anyone that the "background document" hadn't been submitted.

"We didn't force this money on those people," the OEO was still telling newsmen. "They themselves formed this WRAND organization and requested the university's assistance in getting a grant."

Pondering that statement that he'd heard and read so often, Roy Smith suddenly realized there was something very strange about it. Some 257 of the questionnaires he'd distributed had been returned by then, showing average family income so far of $7,961 in the "depressed community" and turning up just 10 people who approved of the antipoverty grant. But more interesting yet, only four people had identified themselves, even unsigned, as members of WRAND. Roy had met the president and current spokesman of the group—a young junior high school teacher named Gerald Foley. But Foley himself admitted he'd joined the group months after its formation and had taken no part in the original request to the university. And the few other WRAND members who could be located locally said exactly the same thing. Who, then, had made that request? Who had started WRAND in the first place?

There was a way to find out. Any such organization had to file articles of incorporation with the county clerk, and any citizen had a right to examine those articles. Roy Smith availed himself of that right. And all of a sudden, the whole puzzling business wasn't so puzzling any longer.

The Willow Run Association for Neighborhood Development had been founded by just 6 people—not one of whom lived anywhere near the neighborhood they intended developing, all of whom were well-to-do residents of Ann Arbor. The "self-help" group that had asked the University of Michigan to help it help itself to some antipoverty money had been formed by one University of Michigan official, one University of Michigan professor, two wives of university professors, one prominent lawyer and the manager of the Willow Village Apartments—for which additional title IV antipoverty funds had been suggested in the resulting proposal.

At this writing, with the university already privately estimating its "overhead" at 32 percent, the antipoverty grant gained by the invention of an imaginary ghost town is still in effect. In fact, on April 27—speaking at Detroit, Mich., and still quoting the falsified phrases and statistics of a report that was supposedly never submitted to Washington—War on Poverty Director R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., threw his personal prestige behind the Office of Economic Opportunity's attempts to save face in the controversy by publicly praising the Willow Village demonstration project. (If he'd ventured just 30 miles farther, he might have seen what he was calling "an urban-fringe pocket of poverty." But he didn't.) And the OEO is still stubbornly sticking to its story that the "erroneous background material" was "not germane" to a proposal that "clearly met the criteria for demonstrations as developed by this office."

But Government glibness no longer bothers Roy Smith the way it once did—chiefly because his struggle isn't a long one any longer. Roused by the realization that the entire scheme was both conceived and carried out by outsiders, the people of the designated area have begun battling back with every bit as much ingenuity as was used in calling them impoverished in the first place. A group of them have decided to play the alphabet game themselves by forming a rival self-help group called REPLY—which stands for Return Every Penny and Leave Ypsilanti Township. Petitions making the same demand have so far been signed by 80 percent of the area's residents, and a similar resolution received an 87½-percent favorable vote at the annual township meeting. Recognizing the fact that as leaders of the people they'd do well to follow them, four of Roy's fellow Township board members, Tilden R. Stumbo included, have reversed their earlier stand and joined him in demanding the return of the grant.

To dramatize the situation, signs have been erected informing visitors that they are entering an official poverty area where their tax dollars are hard at work. And a young man named Gordon Mattson, chairman of REPLY, even rented a horse and a Paul Revere costume, then braved a late snowstorm to go galloping through the streets shouting, "The bureaucrats are coming." He was followed by both a honking motorcade and what seemed an apt symbol of the incredible affair from its clouded beginning to its as yet undetermined end—a circus clown.

"Maybe that's the only answer for this kind of insanity," Roy Smith laughingly reflects. "A good sense of humor. But you know what worries me most? The way that fellow from Washington acted when he came out and saw for himself how the Government had been taken. He didn't get mad, and he didn't seem surprised. He wasn't even interested. All he kept asking was what would satisfy me—which meant what would shut me up, I guess. Do you think what happened here could be the rule and not the exception? That this sort of thing is going on all over the country?"

That's an interesting question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD].

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I rise to oppose the amendment because once again we have here an attempt to confer on the Governors of the several States powers which would be inconsistent with powers they now have under the constitutions of the several States and the statutes pursuant thereto.

I am glad the gentleman mentioned the University of Michigan as an example, because the University of Michigan is a constitutionally created institution within our State. It has a constitutionally created board elected directly by the people and it would be a clear violation of the constitution of our State for either the legislature or the Governor to attempt to dictate the terms of any program of education or any extension program under the direction of that university.

The people of my State and many other States have attempted to protect the sanctity of the educational institutions within their States by providing for this separate responsibility for education in the several States.

To have the Governors exercise such power would be wholly inconsistent with the educational structure of the several States.

With respect to Willow Village, which is once again rearing its ugly political head, I should like to correct the gentleman from New Jersey. It is not RAND, but it is WRAND, Willow Run being the situs of a World War II surplus housing project still occupied by 163 families on direct relief and 60 families who live by ADC.

The gentleman from New Jersey quoted as an authority a gentleman who came to appear before the extralegal hearings held by the Republican Party after the committee had concluded its hearings on this bill, who said that there was no poverty at Willow Village. He was totally apparently unaware of the more than 200 children of Willow Village who will be fed tonight with Federal, State, and local funds, as a result of being of relief, and aid to dependent children.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY].

Mr. CAREY. Frankly, I am shocked and surprised to see this amendment originate in the able hands of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], who in my experience I have always known to be a good friend of academic autonomy and academic freedom in this land.

I suggest that the adoption of this amendment would reverse the entire course of academic autonomy and academic freedom which has been known in Western education since the 12th century, when, under the edict of a reigning Pope Clement, the universities of the Western World then in existence had removed from them all temporal, spiritual, and political interference in their disciplines and affairs.

This would bring into conflict and confrontation with university officials, State officials, and the political order who would review, decide, suggest, and veto disciplines, and programs originating in the academic world.

For instance, in New York City this would be a direct interference between the Governor's office with the city university, which is free and able to conduct its own affairs and does an outstanding job in originating programs to help the poor in my city.

This amendment should be anathema to the gentleman from New Jersey, in the light of his great record as a defender of academic freedom and academic autonomy.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] who has done such an exceptional job in the field of higher education.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It is inconceivable to me that the presidents of the great universities in the State of New Jersey—and I am thinking of Princeton and others—that these college and university presidents would possibly approve of a veto on any of their programs by the Governor.

From that side of the aisle in the last few days I have heard a great deal of debate about political implications and political involvement in this program. This amendment invites political involvement over institutions, private and public, which do not want to be subject to political power.

I am in complete agreement with the gentleman from New York. If there is anything the universities and colleges of this country really treasure, it is academic freedom and individual autonomy over their programs and institutions. In my State private universities are not under the Governor of the State in any way. In reference to public colleges, members of the board of higher education oftentimes oppose the Governor and his views. The board of higher education is the policy body—not the Governor.

I would certainly oppose in the strongest terms the adoption of this sort of amendment, which would do great damage to the academic freedom and the autonomy of both public and private institutions of higher education.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we hear a good deal of talk about academic freedom with respect to this amendment. I should like to say that the research projects engaged in under this sort of program have very little to do with academic freedom.

I should like to recount to Members a little more about a matter touched on by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]; that is, the condition of things in the city of Syracuse. Before I begin I should like to say that I, myself, am planning to support this bill on final passage.

I am concerned about administration. The administration of this act has become a matter of substance in some areas.

I would say it has in Syracuse. Mayor Walsh, of Syracuse, is a man who is a trained social worker and who has done graduate work as such. He has been a social worker most of his life and was a great supporter of the poverty program when it first came up. Previous to that he was active in the President's Council on Juvenile Delinquency. He was instrumental in getting Syracuse started on a fine poverty program which was funded to the extent of about $900,000 this past year. This program has been a constructive program. It is one which is doing good work in the city. Following that the University of Syracuse, through one of its departments, requested and received a $300,000 grant which has been described by the gentleman from New Jersey. Mayor Walsh appeared before our task force and discussed this second program financed, as the first was, through poverty funds. He testified effectively that this grant in effect vitiated a good deal of the virtue and benefit coming from the first grant; $900,000 was fine, but $1.2 million largely canceled itself out.

Now, my distinguished colleagues from the Democratic Party, I say to you that this kind of administration becomes a matter of substance determining the effectiveness of this act. We cannot afford to have this sort of thing going on. It would not have happened had the Governor had the veto power over this program and been able to receive advance notice of it so as to see it was going to be in conflict with an existing program of considerable virtue.

This amendment, were it put into effect, would probably have avoided the problems which arose as a result of the failure of the poverty program director to investigate fully the impact of the second program.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONABLE. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman. I would like to add it seems evident, if we do not extend this veto power, in the name of academic freedom, it would be possible, as has been the case in Syracuse and in Ypsilanti, Mich., for one Federal agency to undercut what another agency is doing. As the gentleman pointed out, Syracuse already has a very farsighted umbrella poverty program partly financed with Federal funds. However, this useful project now has competition which in effect undercuts or attempts to undercut what is already being done.

If we do not provide some kind of a veto power, and do not provide for any participation by the local government, we are saying in the name of academic freedom that there is no way we can prevent a clash between the two efforts. There is not only a failure to coordinate but a real conflict between the two. The only way of improving these programs is to provide some kind of check. It must be a keen embarrassment for the University of Syracuse to have involved itself in what is obviously political activity—not academic activity but political activity—in this so-called poverty field. As a result, quite understandably, there has been a sharp clash with the local authorities who are attempting to do a good job themselves.

Mr. CONABLE. I thank the gentleman, and I would like to say that we are proud of our poverty program in the city of Rochester. We hope nothing of this sort comes along to cripple it. It seems a real tragedy for one good program to be canceled out by another.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the city of Syracuse, which I am privileged to represent, was among the first communities in the Nation to submit appropriate application to the Office of Economic Opportunity that it might enjoy the fruits of this legislation. In addition to the local government, two great educational institutions, Syracuse University and Le Moyne College, indicated desire to participate.

It was with a great sense of pride that I observed the expedient and sensible manner in which the legislation was evaluated and the local programs formulated. As a result of this foresight and good planning, the community has been the recipient of the necessary funds to support three substantial programs, the local government program, known as the crusade for opportunity; the Syracuse University program, known as the community action training program; and at Le Moyne College, the summer study school.

Each program serves the intent of the legislation.

We must not lose sight of the enormity and newness of this program, and along with these factors, the susceptibility to defect, which can only be corrected by trial and error.

Bear in mind that the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 was the first courageous, positive piece of legislation ever directed to upgrade the status of our less fortunate Americans by elimination of the causes rather than the symptoms of poverty. Hopefully it will result in a decline in our ever-expanding welfare costs.

A controversy arose in this community between two of the programs, the local government program and the one sponsored by Syracuse University, and thus, unfortunately, a shadow of doubt was cast over all antipoverty activities.

Some weeks ago I was privileged to participate in a hearing on the poverty program in Syracuse at the invitation of our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER], of the education and labor ad hoc committee. This hearing attracted great community interest which resulted in about 6½ hours of testimony by officials of local government, principals in the poverty program, and other interested individuals.

Analysis of this testimony indicates general acceptance and approval of the concept of the program, in fact, enthusiasm. The area of defect seems to revolve around inadequate communications between two of the local programs. When communications are improved, the merit of the numerous aspects of both programs will be better understood, and thus any controversy will be resolved.

This past Friday I was privileged to inspect in Syracuse the Le Moyne College summer study program, a truly great program designed to show the potential high school dropout the other side of the coin; to rekindle hope for the future in the minds of these less-than-fortunate students. I am pleased to report that this fine program is moving along in exemplary fashion, and it is reasonable to believe that the future of many high school students is going to be enhanced by this program, and thus many substantial citizens produced who otherwise would have capitulated to the misfortune of their environment.

What better investment could be made?

The Office of Economic Opportunity has been attacked for standing firmly behind its demonstration program. The research, demonstration, and training program proposes to demonstrate that the development of effective democratic organization in low-income areas will support and motivate the poor to engage in self-directed courses of action on their own behalf. The intent of the project is to bring low-income persons into active and productive communication with the community action program and other groups in the community. This can only be done if the poor are given an organized forum through which they can be represented. Organization is seen as a means of enabling the poor to play a responsible role in the community.

The aims of this project are in complete accordance with the goals of the community action program. Section 202 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 states that among other things, a community action program is a program which is "developed, conducted and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served."

The guide to demonstration grants under section 207 of the Economic Opportunity Act lists first under types of programs which will receive preference in funding:

> Demonstrations which help to prepare and enable low-income people to take a more active role in the management and decision-making process of community affairs.

The grant which is under attack is a grant to a responsible institution of higher education, Syracuse University, to respected professional leadership, a mature community. The program Syracuse University is administering is aimed at examining in depth, and in the national interest, the process of developing indigenous leadership and organization, and this is being carried out with the backing of a great university.

The Syracuse program is attacked with the charge that it is "inciting the poor to riot." It is our feeling that riots will not occur if low-income people are given adequate opportunity for self-representation and given responsible roles in the community. This project is aimed at providing opportunities for the poor to become involved in the decisions concerning their fate, their destinies, the programs undertaken in their behalf.

While we have been given visions of disaster, of "storming city hall," this has not occurred. The poor have not stormed city hall, they have gone to city hall to make legitimate requests as responsible citizens. They have made requests to the housing authority to meet and discuss their grievances. They have done all this within the framework of their legal rights.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

I would emphasize that I do not believe there is any intent here or any effect here of limiting academic freedom.

Mr. Chairman, we seem to have an assumption throughout this debate that any responsibilities left in State officials are wrong on the face of it, that State officials for some reason or other are ogres. We might as well enact an amendment to this act to say that as far as any provisions of this act are concerned the State government shall not exist because we do not want to have anything to do with them.

Mr. Chairman, all of our basic Federal programs, prior to the poverty program, with very few exceptions, to help the poor and less fortunate in this country, are set up with State plans, with State officials helping to administer the programs.

This is simply an amendment to see to it that all the programs are coordinated, so that when a program is adopted in a community by the officials there, with an umbrella agency, a community action group, that the university cannot step in and start a program that is in conflict with the existing program that has been approved by the official organization.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize here that the city of Syracuse should be very proud of its administration. I appreciate the words said by the gentleman who preceded me in the well of the House. Mayor Walsh was one of the first ones down here, a Republican mayor, who came down and testified in favor of many provisions contained in this bill last year. He felt they had programs like those in Syracuse which could utilize this money and they were one of the first cities to move forward in this program.

Mr. Chairman, this year he came down and he was not given a hearing before the official committee. Reference was made to extralegal Republican task force hearings. They were held so people like Mayor Walsh could be heard, with their constructive criticisms. Mayor Walsh testified here very vehemently about the impact of this $314,000 grant from Syracuse University that completely conflicted with the program in Syracuse that was being operated by the officials in charge.

Mr. Chairman, let me just read to the members of the Committee some quotations about what Mayor Walsh said.

He charged:

> It was a misuse of public funds for the Office of Economic Opportunity to finance such a project to stir up demonstrations, rent strikes, and marches on city hall.

He documented some of the alleged troublemaking activities of trainees of the Syracuse University project, sponsored by OEO. He said one trainee had started a campaign to get a prisoner released from jail as a victim of poverty. Mr. Walsh described him as a vicious, habitual criminal, whose record included cases of rape, sodomy, and brutal assault. He read a full letter written by one of the trainees asking that this gentleman be released from jail because he was poor and he had not had a chance to defend himself, and then Mayor Walsh went down the record of what this particular individual had done in his life and the official charges and convictions involved.

Mayor Walsh charged trainees had stirred up so much unrest among residents of the Federal housing project that the city housing director had written to President Johnson demanding an investigation.

He noted further that employees of one Federal agency were stirring up trouble for another Federal agency.

He also charged that there were some registration drives in housing projects and in slum areas of the city in an effort to get the poor to register as Democrats. They put out a little pamphlet in the Syracuse University project and it was for the use of those individuals going into the public housing projects. Their instructions were when they rang the doorbell to say, among other things, that "we are here to strengthen democratic institutions and organizations." The word "democratic" in the pamphlet was not capitalized. But, Mr. Chairman, when you speak the word "democratic" you do not capitalize or uncapitalize it. They went into these housing developments saying, "We are here to strengthen democratic organizations."

Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of thing that was going on there.

I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle—and I respect very much their concern for academic freedom and I, too, have great concern for academic freedom—if these were projects of an academic nature, if they involved an intellectual investigation and some kind of research procedures that belong in the academic community, I would say "Yes."

When the academic unit goes into an action program, when they are moving into areas in conflict with existing programs set out under the community action program, I say they should be coordinated through the State officials.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and section close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have another amendment at the Clerk's desk which will affect this section and I hope we will have more than 10 minutes to discuss the amendment which has not been offered.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GLENN ANDREWS].

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I will simply say, as Oliver Goldsmith stated:

> Who, born for the universe, narrowed his mind
> And to Party gave up what was meant for mankind.

This is a program that has a great potential, the poverty program. Many of us on this side sincerely want to have many of these programs put into operation. But we decry the fact there is so much waste of human resources.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VIVIAN].

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

The amendment could seriously impede some of the most necessary and productive efforts of the economic opportunity program.

A few minutes ago, while speaking in favor of the amendment, the gentleman claimed that a demonstration grant program being carried on now in Superior and Ypsilanti townships of Washtenaw County, Mich., in my district, is an example of a type of program that should be prevented by adoption of this amendment. I disagree.

The project in question is demonstration project No. 283.

Week after week, since the initiation of this project, efforts have been made to discredit the project, its sponsors, and the Office of Economic Opportunity, by a handful of persons who comprise a group that calls itself REPLY—which stands for Return Every Penny and Leave Ypsilanti.

This small group has obtained the attention of the Nation's news media by pressing an attack on the persons and procedures involved in this project. A few moments hence, I will have more to say about this group.

But first, I would like to describe for the distinguished Members of this House, just what this project is, and what is being accomplished. You will quickly see that the project is a constructive effort, an effort of which the Office of Economic Opportunity and the community can both be proud.

The project was initiated on January 17, 1965, when a grant was made from the Community Action Program Department of the Office of Economic Opportunity, in the amount of $188,252, to the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations of the University of Michigan and Wayne State University—two of the great public universities of the Midwest. The grant was made to conduct a demonstration program in the Willow Run area. Willow Run Village was the area of homes and apartments constructed over two decades ago, to serve the famous World War II bomber plant at Willow Run Airport, 30 miles west of Detroit, Mich.

The area lies within Ypsilanti and Superior Townships of Washtenaw County, Mich., and contains some 5,000 residents. The project was requested and initiated to find, first, the reasons why several persistent "pockets of poverty" in the Willow Village area continue to exist, in spite of increasing employment and generally rising prosperity in the area; and, second, to try and to assess various techniques for alleviating and correcting this situation, to determine how similar pockets of poverty elsewhere might be handled. The sponsors were particularly interested in trying various "self-help" approaches, which would closely involve the residents in the operations of the project.

Families would be helped to improve their own economic and social positions, and to increase their participation in civic affairs.

The work in progress under the project comprises two principal efforts: First, a community action program; and second, a research program. The community action program has, as proposed, been assigned for day-by-day supervision to a neighborhood organization known as WRAND—standing for Willow Run Association for Neighborhood Development. The specific projects now underway by this group are as follows:

First. A day-care, preschool program: This program, started originally by the WRAND organization prior to the award of the grant, is being continued and expanded to include additional children plus additional services for the children now registered. Typical preschool training is being given, and also an attempt is being made to discern what health and emotional problems each child may have which will require correction. A total of 25 children are now receiving assistance—half of whom were selected from families classified as low-income families. The number of students is to be increased as rapidly as competent teachers become available.

Second. A tutorial program for elementary school children: This program also was already in existence prior to award of the grant, under the sponsorship of WRAND, and it is being continued and expanded to include junior high school as well as elementary school children. The tutors will be drawn from Eastern Michigan University nearby. The tutorial program is directed toward upgrading the educational background of those children who had limited educational opportunities.

Third. Job opportunities training: This demonstration work-training program is being begun to serve youths whose families are in economic need and who have dropped out of school. The initial effort will be the renovation of the WRAND community center building, which had deteriorated from lack of community sponsorship. Some 20 youths are currently enrolled. Remedial academic classes will be given to these youths, and job openings have already been found for some youths, both Caucasian and Negro.

Fourth. Adult education program: Adult classes are being formed in personal health and hygiene, and in family dietary needs, for residents of the area, particularly housewives, who have not been exposed to modern concepts in dietary or home economics practices. A further purpose of this adult education program is to accustom some of the less fortunate residents to classroom and learning situations—situations which had not been a part of their previous experience. As soon as the first classes have created adequate community interest, the enrollees will be offered courses in simple economics and English, and eventually an effort will be made to assist these people to complete a high school level of training. An adult education program in typing has been started for those able to cope with language requirements.

Fifth. Recreation program: A community recreation program has been begun, utilizing the limited facilities now existing, plus facilities being created under the job retraining effort mentioned a moment ago. Several baseball leagues are in operation for youths in the community, and an arts and crafts program is being started. A drill team and a majorette team are being initiated to interest the teenagers.

Sixth. Training in community activities and neighborhood cooperation: An attempt is being made to train selected residents of the community sufficiently so that they will be able to teach in the ongoing programs—first, the recreation programs; and second, the education programs. A newsletter is being published regularly to distribute information to the community on the progress of the entire project, and also to train the interested residents in the communication arts. Residents are being asked to participate in community self-surveys, so they will have a better comprehension of the interests, the problems, and the needs of the community.

The research portion of the overall program is proceeding concurrently with the above listed action programs. A professional research staff is observing all aspects of the operations of the various programs described above; and a report will be prepared containing case histories, plus evaluations of the processes involved in developing this community effort.

The above efforts comprise the principal efforts under the project.

Now, Mr. Chairman, some of the detractors of this project have said, "This area is not poor; it is prosperous; we don't need this project."

Well, from personal experiences, including personal visits last fall to and into many homes in the area, I know that, in spite of the prosperity evident in much of the surrounding community, nevertheless "pockets of poverty" do exist in the area; they are very real, and very much in need of attention.

True, most of the geographic area of the two townships is becoming a very attractive community. However, I personally have walked along a street in the affected area where house after house was boarded shut because it had been repossessed. I have been in homes in the area where the furnishings and household equipment, the general condition of the home, showed very obviously that the occupants were not only financially ill off, but perhaps equally important, had not assimilated from our culture some of the essential habits required of a homeowner to maintain property in a creditable condition.

Many of the breadwinners in this immediate area have had, at best, very erratic employment. Their hourly wages have been low, and they have not been able, either through lack of opportunities of their own limitations, to maintain constant employment.

Many are reciving welfare assistance. During the month of February 1965, some 163 residents were eligible for surplus food; and 60 families were receiving funds under the aid to families with dependent children program.

Many will continue to do so, will continue to absorb welfare tax funds, unless some program such as this one can be made effective.

I repeat, this is a demonstration program aimed at learning how to ameliorate pockets of poverty in an otherwise prosperous area—a program being run by a famous institution which has a reputation for very effective research.

Next, detractors of the project have claimed that the local community overwhelmingly opposes it.

Those Members who have read a statement on page A3540 of the daily RECORD, made by a disaffected area resident and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member of the other body, will find a sentence which reads as follows:

> We—

Here referring to Mr. Arthur Amolsch and Mr. Gordon Mattson, identified as the chairman of the REPLY group—

> represent at least 75 percent of the residents of Willow Run Village. We are shocked at the highhanded methods employed by the OEO in our community.

I would like to point out that, to the best of my knowledge, neither of the gentlemen identified holds any official position which qualifies him to state that he represents 75 percent of the residents of that area. Moreover, individuals who previously belonged to the REPLY group have left the group, disappointed at its methods and performance, and have now associated themselves with the WRAND organization. For example, Mrs. Donna Helton, of Ypsilanti, Mich., formerly secretary of the REPLY group, has made public a letter dated June 11, 1965, in which she states:

> The attacks on WRAND and the Federal grant have been vicious, unjustified and unfair. I was secretary of REPLY until recently when I realized the truth.
>
> REPLY held only three meetings. By the third meeting the attendance had dwindled to only 10 people. That was months ago. It now consists of its three officers. It speaks for these three people. No membership meetings have been held to endorse their attitudes or their actions.
>
> At first most of us thought that REPLY was going to serve the community. People became disgusted when the leaders began to deal only in politics and attacking WRAND and the grant. I really doubt that REPLY could get its members back because of what they, the leaders, have done.
>
> I would never work with REPLY again unless it changed from politics to trying to help people.
>
> I have recently gone to the WRAND building, saw for myself what was going on. I found that WRAND was using the money carefully and in the most worthwhile way. After finding out the truth I am going to work with WRAND to better our community.

Next, some persons who are engaged in political affairs in the area have objected because this demonstration grant was awarded from Washington directly to the research organization. They have objected that this procedure did not permit the local political power structure to veto or to dominate the project.

I have repeated before and must reiterate this grant is a demonstration grant to a research organization. This type of grant does not normally go to a local governmental agency not experienced in the conduct of research projects.

Furthermore, I am sure, from conversations with officials of the sponsoring institutions, that these organizations will be more than pleased to work constructively with the local governmental units. The local governments certainly are not being prevented or deterred from participation in the project. Local officials who have offered to participate on a constructive basis—rather than for the purpose of damaging the prospects of the fulfillment of the project—have been welcomed.

Perhaps the saddest single comment I can make is that a distressing number of local residents have objected to the grant award upon the basis that it implies that everyone in the community will be labeled as being "poor." I can only feel a sense of sorrow that there exist so many individuals who, in order that their own shining prosperity not be tarnished, attempt to deny aid to those nearby who are in dire need.

Furthermore, I am forced to point out a fact which is not disclosed in the statements frequently encountered; that is, that the neighborhood of principal concern is practically a Negro ghetto.

In fact, I have found that many of the residents of the surrounding area who have complained about this project have never been on the streets of the most depressed area—it just was not part of their world.

Next, the authors of the statement quoted earlier have claimed that the award was obtained "under false pretenses," that the award was the greatest swindle since the Roman era. They protest that the grant was awarded on the basis of an 88-page initial document, which document they claim contained a very large number of inaccuracies. I would like the Members to know that the document to which they refer was an initial first draft—a draft which, in fact, in my opinion did contain some inappropriate material. But all persons directly concerned with the negotiation of the award have repeated time and again that this document did not serve as the basis for the grant.

Contrary to the accusations made, the document submitted for funding purposes was in fact a shorter document which contained virtually none of the particular material to which they objected.

I would like to read the text of a telegram sent, on February 15, 1965, to Dr. Harold Dorr, dean of statewide education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., by the Acting Director of the Community Action Program of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Richard W. Boone:

> Re demonstration project No. 283.
>
> The Office of Economic Opportunity would like to assure the university that the charge that has been leveled that the grant was obtained under false pretenses is, in our opinion, untrue. The Office of Economic Opportunity clearly understood that the employment situation in the Willow Village area had changed since the 1960 census. This grant was made under section 207 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as a demonstration program. The project was seen as an effort to ally a major university with an area which is regarded as in need of assistance in the development of self-help employment, health, and child care program.
>
> The Willow Village area or portions of it are typical of hundreds of areas across the country which may fall outside of the usual development of an areawide community action program. The proposed project as submitted by the University of Michigan and supported by the Willow Run Association for Neighborhood Development clearly met the criteria for demonstration as developed by this office. The 1960 background statistics were not germane to that decision. The project will be testing a technique of developing self-help programs and the rendering of technical assistance to a small community. Knowledge gained from the successful carrying out of this project is deemed important to the conduct of hundreds of other community action programs in areas like Willow Village. In addition, in our judgment, the upgrading of portions of a community like Willow Village reaps benefits for the larger communities of which they

> are a part. We have full confidence in the university and its capacity to carry out an effective demonstration.

As the director of the WRAND Association has said:

> We are fervently hoping that those who have less need will join in with us to help those who have most need, and in so doing make a better community for all. We feel that this kind of effort is in the best spirit of American democratic tradition.

My own attitude toward this particular project, is best summarized and expressed by words spoken on the matter by Emory Mulholland, the supervisor of the principally affected township—Superior Township—and, I might add, a bona fide long-term member of the so-called political power structure in the area. Mr. Mulholland recently remarked to a reporter from the New York Times:

> If all units of Government would unite and back up the WRAND project, there would be a lot of good come out of it.

I, for one, agree with his philosophy, Mr. Chairman. For, in spite of whatever mistakes have been made long after the publicity seekers have gone, long after those who fancy insult have forgotten, or been diverted to newer fads, long after the partisan battle has subsided, most of my constituents in the Willow Run area will continue to live there, and die there, will continue to have children, will continue to dream that the pursuit of happiness applies to all. Our obligation is to aid them to help themselves. This program does just that. If it is successful, we will also learn how we can similarly help others, in like situations in other communities, throughout the Nation. Let us not be diverted by this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment for the same reason I opposed the Governor's veto amendment. In our State, we have just heard the Governor has seven employees charged with examining all aspects of our antipoverty program, and all local proposals for local projects anywhere in the State. That job cannot be done with seven employees and as a result the Governor has not been able to do his homework. Our programs in New York State have been delayed month after month, after the Governor has had knowledge of pending proposals as they were being developed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. This question came up in the Rules Committee, when I was appearing before the Rules Committee in support of my bill. At that time the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] suggested that perhaps we should cut out this section of the act because under this section of the act headstart programs were able to get started in his particular congressional district down there. If you adopt this amendment, you are going to, in effect, slow down the Head Start program in areas of the United States where it is difficult to get them started.

I do not believe the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] knew what he was doing when he offered this amendment, but I want the House to know what it is doing when it votes on this question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, all I can say is the gentleman from Florida has put his finger right on the Caucasian in the wood pile.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PUCINSKI

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. PUCINSKI: Page 5, after line 3, insert the following:
>
> "NOTICES
>
> "SEC. 9. Section 209 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:
>
> "'(e) When the Director receives an application from a private nonprofit agency for a community action program to be carried on in a community in which there is a community action agency carrying on a number of component programs, he shall, within five days, give notice to such community action agency of the receipt of such application.'"

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It is designed to let the left hand know what the right hand is doing in many aspects of this antipoverty program. The amendment provides that when a city, or a group of cities, or a county, or a group of counties or State, or a group of States, organize a community action agency to try to coordinate and marshal the resources of their respective area to wage a war against poverty, that particular community action agency shall be notified by the OEO whenever the OEO receives an application for a community action program from a private agency in the area under the jurisdiction of the particular community action agency.

It is designed to let local people waging the war against poverty know what is going on in their respective communities. One of the most frequent criticisms we have heard of the antipoverty program is that local officials are not kept sufficiently posted on project applications in their own area being filed with the OEO in Washington. Several mayors have told me they have to learn from the newspapers what private agencies are being considered for community action programs in this area.

I think this will help local governments cooperate more effectively with each other and have a better understanding with respect to the program. Under the amendment, the OEO must notify the official community action agency within 5 days that it has received a request for funds from the OEO from a private agency in the area. This means that hereafter when private agencies bypass their local community action agency and try to get funds directly from Washington, the OEO must notify the local community action agency within 5 days that it has received such an application. This gives the local CAA an opportunity to either comment on such application or contact the private agency and invite it to join the local community action program.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. I would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, a member of our committee, for this amendment and say that we have no objection to it whatsoever.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. Would this include grants to universities?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes. It would include all applications by private agencies where there is a community action agency existing in the area. Whether they are universities or social service groups, unions, churches, or whoever else requests funds from the OEO.

Mr. GOODELL. Does it include a university or college if they are applying for funds—and the OEO receives this application?

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct; yes.

Mr. GOODELL. It applies to both State universities, public universities, and private universities?

Mr. PUCINSKI. It would apply to anyone seeking funds from the OEO for a community action program.

Mr. GOODELL. You used the words "private agencies and organizations." I think the record should indicate it include all types of universities.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman's point is well taken. It would include all such institutions and organizations, regardless of their nature. If they seek funds for a community action program, the nature of their request must be transmitted to the local community action agency within 5 days.

Mr. GOODELL. I will say to the gentleman, I do not think it is going to do very much good, but it is a short step in the right direction.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], for his acceptance of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GLENN ANDREWS

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GLENN ANDREWS: On page 5, after line 3, insert:

"POLITICAL DISCRIMINATION AND POLITICAL ACTIVITY

"SEC. 9. Section 209 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e)(1) No officer or employee of the executive branch of the Federal Government shall make any inquiry concerning the political affiliations or beliefs, except as to such membership in political parties or organizations as constitutes by law a disqualification for Government employment, of any person who is employed by or associated with any public or private agency, organization, or institution which is a recipient of or an applicant for any assistance under this title, or of any person who is himself a beneficiary or an applicant for benefits under this title. No discrimination shall be exercised, threatened, or promised by any person in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or by any person whose salary is paid in whole or in part from funds appropriated under section 221 of this Act, against or in favor of any person who is a recipient of or an applicant for benefits under this title, or who is employed by or associated with any public or private agency, organization, or institution which is a recipient of or an applicant for any assistance under this title, because of his political affiliations or beliefs, except as may be specifically authorized or required by law.

"'(2) No funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this title shall be used in whole or in part for any activity involving political management or a political campaign, or which interferes with or is designed to influence the outcome of any election, and no employee of any private or public agency, organization, or institution who receives a salary paid in whole or in part from these funds shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns or use his official position or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express, in their private capacities, their opinions on all political subjects and candidates.

"'(3) Whenever the United States Civil Service Commission finds that any person has violated the foregoing provisions, it shall, after giving due notice and opportunity for explanation to the officer or employee concerned, certify the facts to the Director with specific instructions as to discipline or dismissal or other corrective actions.'"

And renumber the sections which follow accordingly.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, as I stated in the general debate two days ago, I am very favorably inclined to this interesting, though experimental educational bill for the very poor. But I wish to keep it an educational bill, not a charity bill, or a political bill. I concede that a worthwhile component of education is political education. The evidence, however, is in from all over the Nation that the principal course to be offered in the curricula of many community centers being set up under the community action program is political science. I shy away from political education at taxpayers' expense whether being conducted by Communists as was indicated or suggested yesterday, or just plain partisans.

Great stress has been made on what is called involvement of the poor or in the language of the bill itself—the development of indigenous leadership. Yesterday it was proposed that this indigenous leadership dominate the community action program. I shy away from letting those who have been unable to earn a living dominate spending billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. I shy away from domination by these unfortunate people of great areas of the politics of our Nation. I never cared particularly for any kind of domination.

A friend and colleague of mine 2 days ago, when I complained of Tammany Halls all over America, advised me that Tammany Hall was originally a charitable organization. Now I have no real objection to Tammany Hall but there is one notable difference between the common conception of Tammany Hall and the halls apparently projected under the community action program. These modern-day Tammany Halls are at taxpayers' expense. I have happily paid my $10 to the distinguished ranking minority member of my committee for his thoughtful telegram of yesterday. I discovered last night that my principal opponent in 1966 is organizing and is a leader in a community action program.

My amendment has the purpose of specifically barring political activity, threats, or favoritism from the community action programs.

The amendment closely parallels language already in the act—in section 107—which bars political discrimination and political activity in the conduct of the Job Corps. Of course, it is not in the Job Corps that one would expect to find political activity, but in the community action programs. The present act contains no language to prohibit usage of community action programs. My amendment supplies that missing language.

The amendment does two things: First, it prohibits Federal employees or others who are paid salaries from these funds from exercising any discrimination for or against anyone affected by the program because of that person's political affiliations; Second, it prohibits funds appropriated for community action being used for political management or political campaigns, and it prohibits persons paid a salary from these funds from taking an active part in political campaigns.

In short, my amendment—assuming the law would be enforced—takes community action out of the political arena.

Mr. Chairman, I surely hope that the managers of this bill will accept this amendment. I hope at any rate that the House will adopt it. If this amendment is rejected, the proponents of this legislation are saying—loud enough for all the world to hear—that the war against poverty is a political war for political advantage.

The action we take on this amendment will speak louder than any words as to the true intentions and good faith of those who propose to wage a war on poverty. The issue is clear: it is whether this is a war to help the poor, or merely a scheme to help the party.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, but before I talk on the amendment I think I must tell my colleagues that Mr. GLENN ANDREWS of Alabama was a member of the subcommittee that went with me and went through the areas of the United States but primarily and practically entirely within the South. He is a very fine traveling companion and works hard on these trips. I look forward to working with him again, so it is not with any animosity that I rise in opposition to his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have studied the gentleman's amendment. He was kind enough to furnish me a copy of it. I have researched the question, and I do not believe his amendment is necessary. We already have sufficient Federal laws on the statute books to prohibit what he is attempting to prohibit. We have the Hatch Act and quite a few other acts on this subject. I do not believe that the amendment is necessary or germane. In fact, if the amendment were adopted—and I do not believe it will be adopted—it would be almost impossible for us to speak to each other in this Chamber or to anyone else that we saw on the street, because it would practically be making criminals out of all of us. I know he does not intend that, but that is what it does. You would never know when you were violating this law, because it is so broad and so sweeping. As I say, there are already sufficient statutes on the books to prohibit this.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Would the gentleman explain to us why practically the same thing was put in section 107 of the bill and purposely, for some reason or another, deleted from the second section of the bill?

Mr. GIBBONS. I read your amendment over, and I had a hard time understanding the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GLENN ANDREWS]. I found in the first sentence there were 90 words and 5 commas, and I really could not tell which hole you were coming in from and going out of. In the second sentence you had 108 words and 9 commas. These sentences are so long that it is almost as long as the Gettysburg Address in just two sentences. As a lawyer, I have real difficulty in reading the amendment and understanding what you are trying to do in your amendment.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. I am confused as to the implications of how this amendment would affect the tremendous number of volunteers who have come forward to lend their talents, skills, and time to the poverty effort.

For example, in the community action programs we have had 30,000 citizen leaders across the country who have volunteered to participate. The work-study program has produced 500,000 volunteers this summer; 100,000 of them full time and 400,000 of them part time. Fifty thousand doctors, nurses, and other professionals have volunteered their services. At the rate of $1.50 an hour for this voluntary time of professionals and leading citizens in local communities across the country, over $90 million worth of time and effort and talent has been contributed to the poverty program.

Would this amendment mean that these people who are contributing their time and talents to their local communities would have their careers placed in jeopardy?

Mr. GIBBONS. I think the gentleman has illustrated the predicament in which we could find ourselves. If your wife were doing volunteer work, when you go home, you had better not talk to her about any political beliefs, if this amendment is adopted.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. In answer to the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER], this amendment has nothing to do with volunteers at all. It states specifically they must be salaried members directly connected with these programs.

Mr. GIBBONS. I should like to correct the gentleman. It says "or associated." "Associated" covers the complete waterfront.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield.

Mr. SCHEUER. Citizen volunteers may have official involvement in these programs on a volunteer, noncompensated basis. I would suggest to my colleague from Alabama that if there are politically motivated people across the country who want to solidify their roots in their communities and achieve proper recognition for constructive community work, they probably are working as volunteers in these programs. Are we going to foreclose them from being active participants at some future time in the political arena because of the recognition they receive for doing honest, legitimate constructive community service?

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I urge that this amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GLENN ANDREWS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have in hand a booklet entitled "War on Waste" which was issued by the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, and contains on the cover page this quotation from President Johnson:

> I pledge a war on waste * * * And I ask you to help me to fight that war.

On page 52 of this booklet issued by the Executive Office of the President there is this quotation:

> Experience indicated that increasing dependence on the cost-plus-fixed-fee (CPFF) type of contract had failed to gain the results desired in controlling programs after the contracts were placed. Major criticisms of this type of contract were lagging program schedules, performance failures, massive overruns in costs, and the general lack of incentives for contractors to turn in a better performance at lower cost. The reason for this was obvious: total reimbursement of all allowable costs and a negotiated fee were guaranteed. This is gradually being changed.

Despite the professed dim view which the Johnson administration takes in connection with the waste and extravagance in using contract operators, I see no real signs of change. I hope some member of the committee on the Democrat side of the aisle will explain to me why the Johnson administration is now entering into additional multi-million-dollar cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts in this poverty program with some of the largest corporations in the United States. This at the very same time when the "War on Waste" booklet, issued with the approval of the President of the United States, says that such contracts ought to go, that we ought to get out of cost-plus-fixed-fee contract business. Only a few days ago, the Defense Department told us it is reducing its fixed-fee contract business in the next fiscal year and expects to save $35 million by so doing. Yet here is a new program which is going head over heels into the use of such contracts.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman a member of the committee?

Mr. SICKLES. Yes, I am.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SICKLES. I was a little concerned about the same general subject matter. I have not read that document in the gentleman's hand and I am not sure that I can necessarily satisfy the gentleman in the well. But let me tell the gentleman what I did find out. The kinds of contracts which have been awarded by OEO are of a little bit different variety than those which have been negotiated before.

The percentage which is paid is 4.7 percent of expended costs but is not a true cost-plus contract.

It is true that based upon the costs that are expended, 4.7 percent is what is paid to the corporations. But the first thing that is done is that an estimated cost is determined. The Government determines that this is a proper estimated cost. Since this is a cost reimbursement plan if less than the estimated cost is spent, then of course the company receives less.

Mr. GROSS. Please do not take quite all of my time.

Mr. SICKLES. I just want one more point and I shall be concluded.

Mr. GROSS. All right.

Mr. SICKLES. If the cost goes over the estimated amount then there is no increase in the fee which is paid. In other words, the maximum they can receive would be 4.7 percent of the estimated cost.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, you have a contract that pays 5 percent—4.7, almost 5 percent—on top of lush salaries paid to these contract outfits.

The gentleman will not deny that there are some fancy salaries paid in these big corporation and their subsidiary contracting outfits?

Mr. SICKLES. If the gentleman will yield further, I am not aware of any excess salaries that are being paid in connection with these particular contracts.

Mr. GROSS. Well, has the gentleman or his committee made an investigation to determine whether that is true or not?

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, briefly.

Mr. GIBBONS. I made an investigation of this because the matter came up before our committee at one time. I found that the corporations with whom contracts have been made apparently are offering the best price to the Government that we can get from any agency to conduct this type of business. Their overhead costs were five times as small as the overhead costs of the best universities that we could get interested in coming into this field.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for 30 seconds?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, that briefly.

Mr. SCHEUER. Is my colleague aware of the fact that some of the large corporations which have undertaken research projects, an examination of the history and observation of the program on an input-output basis, are doing this for the OEO for 4.7 percent but yet were receiving for similar work from the armed services fees ranging from 7 to 10 percent? This is what the testimony discloses.

Mr. GROSS. But, my friend, this is supposed to be a poverty program.

Mr. SCHEUER. The figure of 4.7 percent is a rather close one.

Mr. GROSS. I want to see all the money saved that can possibly be saved in the Department of Defense and we have been assured that Defense is moving to cut down on service and management contracts.

I have been opposed to this contracting out of work that could be done in-house cheaper. I say again that this is supposed to be a poverty program and I wonder why all of this expense.

Mr. SCHEUER. This represents the cost of the overhead.

Mr. GROSS. Why should the Government be paying 4.7 percent on top of the fancy and lush salaries to those employed by the corporations, and there are some of the biggest in the business to which you are contracting out management of the poverty program? I thought the Democrats were opposed to fattening the big corporations.

When I came to Congress the Democrats were sweating and bleeding at every pore on the subject of the big, bad corporations in this country.

Yet here you are with a poverty program ladling out multimillion-dollar contracts on a fixed-fee basis and all of these contracts——

Mr. SCHEUER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Wait a minute. And it is my understanding that all of these contracts, involving millions upon millions of dollars, have been negotiated, that not one of them has been entered into on a competitive-bid basis.

Mr. SCHEUER. There are very few companies in this country that qualify for this kind of work.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I am glad the gentleman from Iowa has brought up this very significant point and that he has directed this colloquy especially to some member of the committee. There is the question as to whether or not there are built-in protections against exorbitant profits in these contracts which are similar to the Renegotiation Act as it pertains to the armed services or the process of redetermination of defense contracts.

Is there any protection against exorbitant profitmaking?

Mr. GROSS. I know of no protection against what amounts to exorbitant profitmaking in these poverty contracts. No standards have as yet been developed by the Office of Economic Opportunity to measure a contractor's costs or efficiency. It is easily possible that these big corporation contract holders, with their cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts, will be able to recoup from the poverty program the financial losses sustained through a reduced number of contracts in the Defense Department.

Mr. GUBSER. What is in there to preserve these costs?

Mr. GROSS. I say again that poverty program officials made no determination, so far as our subcommittee could find, of the actual cost of these contracts.

I want to point to another cute little gimmick that is used in this alleged poverty business. That is the training of lawyers to represent the poor.

Listen to what Mr. Julian R. Dugas, director of the neighborhood legal services project, says in announcing an expenditure of thousands of dollars in the Washington, D.C., area alone:

> Our experience has taught us that the (legal) staff needs to be acquainted with law that deals specifically with the problems of the poor. The emphasis in law school is on serving the rich.

How do you lawyers like that indictment? How do you like this indictment of the entire legal fraternity, that lawyers have to be especially trained to represent the poor? The universities and colleges are not turning out lawyers who are competent to defend the poor as well as the rich.

You lawyers in the House ought to have some small concern about this indictment of your profession. And so the poverty program is spending some $36,000 in the District of Columbia alone to train lawyers to take care of the poor. I thought every lawyer was trained to represent both poor and rich. Have we made a mistake in writing the law wherein we give a judge authority to appoint a lawyer to defend an indigent? I do not believe the law says anything about the lawyer having to be especially trained to represent the poor. Perhaps we had better amend the law to say that no judge can appoint a lawyer to defend an indigent in the future unless that lawyer has been especially trained and holds a certificate qualifying him to practice in a poor court.

Our universities and colleges are turning out only attorneys to do what? To represent the rich. What an indictment of the law colleges of this Nation. I wish some Member on this side of the aisle would get up and defend this use of poverty money for the education of lawyers.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, while I do not always agree with my good friend from Iowa, I think he did a great service today by pointing out the serious problems that will come of this program. It was very difficult to let contracts on a competitive basis when this started. You did not know the kind of a contract to bid on or to ask bids on. Therefore, a negotiated contract was the sensible way to proceed. But within a short period of time from now—this should be a part of the record—the Committee on Education and Labor should either provide for some return of undue profits, although I am against that because of the detail and redtape it sets up, or we should serve notice that we will do everything we can to see wherever a competitive contract can be called for, that it will be called for under this act.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell] criticized the Head Start program in the District of Columbia because one of his children had been invited to join one of the programs. The House is entitled to know the facts of this matter, which I have had occasion to ascertain.

This particular Head Start project is being conducted on the premises of the National Child Research Center, which is donating its facilities, buildings, and grounds for the purpose. The program is being operated under the direction of two parent-teachers associations, one from a school composed largely of white children and the other from a school composed largely of Negro children. Their joint decision was that it would be desirable for the summer preschool project to include a small number of white children from the neighborhood and that the presence of these children would be of benefit to the other children. The parents of these white children—8 out of a total of 60—are paying a fee for the course. In addition, the sponsors of the project have obtained private contributions very substantially in excess of the requisite 10 percent. The Federal Government is contributing $8,200 to this program. Private foundations and private individuals are contributing $2,750, and this does not include the value of the land and school facilities being contributed. Thus, the fees charged and the supplemental private contributions more than cover the cost of including the eight white children.

If the gentleman from New York was familiar with these facts, he did not reveal them to the House. If he was not familiar with them, it is because he had not taken the trouble to investigate.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. How much does a parent, who is not a poverty-stricken parent, pay in the way of a fee for his or her child?

Mr. BINGHAM. The fee for each child is $35 for the program.

Mr. QUIE. For the 2-month program?

Mr. BINGHAM. It is a 7-week program.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a little later I will offer an amendment. My amendment is a simple one and I thought I would like to bring it up now for the benefit of the Members of the House so that they can give some thought to it.

As I said, my amendment is a very simple one. It provides that not more than 10 percent of the funds appropriated under this program be spent for the purposes of administration and salaries.

Obviously, if we are going to have a poverty program worth the name, we must see that it helps those who need the help rather than establishing a large new crop of aristocrats by patronage.

Because I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, some might say I am concerned about our Nation's money—and I am, as every legislator certainly should be. But I am even more concerned with the poor. I want to see that they get the benefit of these programs rather than some armchair appointees picked for their political performance.

Mr. Chairman, as the House considers the poverty program, let us make our decision based on three important views; first, our own views as legislators; second, the views of our Nation's poor; and third, the convictions and feelings of the citizens of the United States, who will pay the bill for this program. Since these views cannot be set apart in every respect, let us see how they affect each other and intermingle to form our basis for considering the legislation that is before us.

We know that the poverty-stricken of America need the full benefit of this program. Let us make sure we have a stable program that can do this before we waste fantastic amounts of appropriated money on side-benefactors and shirttail money grabbers who may be taking advantage of the poverty program.

We want to help the poor people of our Nation. We want to aid them through effective and proven patterns of economic assistance. Let us do this. Let us finish building the ship before we load the cargo. In this way, if the ship sinks, we will not lose that cargo. One and a half billion dollars is quite a cargo load, in my estimation.

Much of the "cargo" we loaded last year was lost, far out on some ocean of waste and bureaucracy. It never got to port to benefit the Nation's poor.

As I was uncovering information concerning this legislation, I ran into a very unique and vague phrase—"administratively confidential." This phrase describes the information locked in the OEO offices that enumerates and accounts for the administrative and advertising expenses of the poverty program. I ask you, gentlemen—Do you want to approve more tax dollars for an agency that cannot or will not tell you what has been done with the last appropriation?

The OEO Director, Mr. Shriver, pointed to a pertinent fact in a recent Time magazine quote:

> These local programs are gambles, all of them. We don't know, and the community doesn't know, if every single one of these projects will work, or if any particular assortment of projects is exactly the right combination to eliminate poverty today, tomorrow, or the next day.

I certainly have reservations about spending $1½ billion on gambles. I do, however, hope that soon some of these gambles will prove to be sure bets. At that time, our taxpayers will not be cheated, and our poor will not be used as guinea pigs any longer. Let us remember that Mr. Shriver's gambles are misusing a sizable portion of our Nation's budget and the people who need help just simply are not getting it. We need performances rather than promises.

The misuse of the poverty funds has been a topic of much discussion in the committees of this body and on the floor itself. During hearings by the Education and Labor Subcommittee on the war on poverty program, charges were made against the excess wages paid to poverty program employees. Mr. Shriver answered these charges with some interesting but hardly comparable facts. He reported that the United States has 4,789 people making more than $15,000 in the space program, and only 71 people in this wage bracket at poverty headquarters. Quite a difference? Not to anyone who knows of the immensity of our space program.

Of the 1,072 people at poverty headquarters, Mr. Shriver proudly boasts that only 71 are making more than $15,000. But what about those outside of headquarters, who make $10,000 or more a year supposedly administering the OEO programs in the field?

I do not question the advisability of having trained, experienced Government employees administering the program here in Washington. However, I do object to the politically appointed chiefs, the office directors in a small and forgotten office somewhere in a corner of a city or State, who receive ridiculously high wages for doing the work that the poor themselves in many cases could do and thereby diminish the amounts available to help those people who are supposedly the reason for this program.

On June 30 of this year on the floor of this body, the remarks of my friend and colleague, Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN of New Jersey, informed us of the excessive wages paid to some instructors in the Head Start program. Jobs paying $8 to $9.20 per hour for a 25-hour week are totally out of line with what most teachers get in America and seem to be a poor way to fight poverty. These funds could be used far better to supplement the normal teacher's already far too low wages.

Examples of the poverty program's waste and poor judgment have come up in my own State of North Dakota. An Indian reservation in my district was allotted $53,189 from the community action program. The money was to be made available to their duly elected tribal council. I have here quotes from some of the letters that the chairman of the Tribal Council has sent me concerning the ridiculous developments in this program. I quote the elected tribal chairman from a letter dated June 19, 1965:

> I am writing asking for help. And this one time I will need your help, and I am also writing to Senator MILTON R. YOUNG. I need you both. We do have a poverty program in action on our reservation. But your program director is a no good person.
>
> And what I want is to stop this program for a time until an investigation is made because there are a lot of things Mr. X has done, things which he is not authorized to do.
>
> Mr. X has abolished the community garden program, which was very good for our people. Community garden project was approved by officials in Washington and funds were to be used on garden project only. Grand total $9,246. And now Mr. X has abolished this garden project and is not using these funds on other jobs where our people could have benefited from them.

The tribal chairman goes on to explain where the money for the garden project went, and lists several expenditures, such as paying a non-Indian to cut hay, pay for Mr. X's telephone bill, hiring three men to plant five trees in 1 week, and so on. Then the letter goes on to say:

> And Mr. X is sitting back there in town in his law office and drawing $10,000 a year from this poverty program. Mr. X should have his office on the reservation, but he has refused to do it because he says, "I have a lot of business in my office every day," which is true. Because I, as chairman, used to have a little to say about our poverty program. But now I don't have one thing to say. I used to go in almost every day to see Mr. X but was unable to see him because he was busy with other business.
>
> He does come to Tribal office about 4 times a month and gets a check for $750 for doing nothing for us Indians. We only have one Indian person working under the program.

As the tribal chairman explained, the program director is also a lawyer in a nearby city. Thus he divides his time between two jobs. This seems to be the pattern all the way up the ladder in the OEO agency.

So you see, the people who themselves should be the recipients of this type of program are cognizant of the waste of money, the extravagance, and the poor management of the poverty program.

This advice and comments from the poor themselves—from the people the poverty program should be aiding—should guide our decision on this legislation more than anything else. Let us iron out the wrinkled spots in the poverty program with the aid and advice of the poor themselves. Let us use their comments and help so they can help themselves out of poverty with the aid of a strong, proven program that has no waste—that gives the poor effective help without giving some Government-paid executive something for nothing.

Certainly if we are sincere about this program, no thinking person would object to a 10-percent limit on the amount spent for administrative purposes.

We must not allow the misuse of the poverty program. We must allow it to grow and prove itself before we take the chance of pouring any more money into a bucket that is too full of holes already. Let us give the bucket time to get its holes patched up. Let us establish firm guidelines to make this program more effective and then implement it with our tax dollars.

Mr. Chairman, we must give serious consideration to the way the program is going before we continue headlong with a wastefully expensive program that renders ineffective our tax dollars needed in fighting this poverty war.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN: On page 5, after line 3, insert:

"EXERCISE OF GOVERNOR'S DISAPPROVAL

"SEC. 9. Section 209 of such Act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(e) In exercising his power of disapproval as provided in subsection (c) the Governor may disapprove of a particular project or activity that forms a part of a comprehensive community action program or plan without disapproving such program or plan in its entirety.'"

And renumber the sections which follow accordingly.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California reserves a point of order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It would provide, in the exercise of a veto by a Governor, the right of that Governor to veto part of a broad plan or program.

The advisability for writing specific language into the existing legislation arose out an incident with respect to the Governor of New York and the program which was to be made available in New York City. Members will recall that late in June Governor Rockefeller wrote a letter to Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, saying he found it impossible to endorse the allocation of some $5,642,687 of funds to New York City. He had certain objections with respect to the duplication of services which he saw would result from use of these funds. He also referred to the potential for these centers developing into political clubhouses.

In answer to this letter of Governor Rockefeller, Mr. Shriver wrote a letter indicating that, in his opinion, under the present law a Governor does not have a power to disapprove individual elements of a single grant.

As I have indicated, the money to be made available, and which has since been made available, to New York City, was a very considerable amount, $5½ million.

It seems quite obvious to me—and I hope entirely noncontroversial—that we should make it possible to exercise disapproval over what might be a relatively small portion of a big program. Thus, an item veto would let the city or governmental unit or agency seeking money to receive the balance of the funds. It would be most unwise if the existing language in the act should be interpreted as it was interpreted by Mr. Shriver last month. Such an interpretation would make it impossible for a Governor to exercise what I have already described as an admittedly crude power to influence the types of programs to be set up in his State.

The gentleman from Indiana, in his discussion of the veto power, indicated the advisability of trying to provide Governors with an effective voice, of trying to bring experience at the State level to bear on the program to be financed at the Federal level.

This amendment, allowing a more refined use of the Governor's veto, would allow a Governor to exercise his power on an individual basis instead of either accepting everything—the bad apple included with all the good ones—or having all the funds taken from an area which was seeking the Federal money.

I trust that my amendment is reasonably clear and that it will be accepted.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If I understand it correctly, this amounts to a line veto. Would it still be subject to a review by the Director of the economic opportunity program?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. My amendment does nothing with respect to the language in the committee bill which gives the Director of the OEO the opportunity to review any veto by a Governor.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. So the Director would still have the opportunity to review the Governor's veto?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The answer to that question is "Yes."

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. All you are asking for is a line veto within that veto?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That is exactly right, I would say to the gentlewoman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk. Page 5, line 4:

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAMS—PAYMENTS; FEDERAL SHARE

Sec. 9. Section 216(b) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966," and inserting in lieu thereof "and each of the two succeeding fiscal years,".

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAMS—TEACHER TRAINING

Sec. 10. Part B of title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended—

(1) by striking out "From the sums appropriated to carry out this title" in section 213(a) and inserting in lieu thereof "From so much of the sums appropriated or allocated to carry out this part as is not reserved pursuant to section 218"; and

(2) by redesignating section 218 as section 219 and inserting immediately after section 217 the following new section 218:

"TEACHER TRAINING PROJECTS

"Sec. 218. Not to exceed 5 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated to carry out this part for any fiscal year may be reserved and used by the Director to provide (directly or by contract), or to make grants to colleges and universities, State or local educational agencies, or other appropriate public or private nonprofit agencies or organizations to provide training to persons engaged or preparing to engage as instructors for individuals described in section 212, with such stipends and allowances, if any (including traveling and subsistence expenses), for persons undergoing such training and their dependents as the Director may by or pursuant to regulation determine."

VOLUNTARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR NEEDY CHILDREN

Sec. 11. Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out part C thereof, and by redesignating part D as part C and section 221 as section 220.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to H.R. 8283 offered by Mr. Quie: Page 6, strike out lines 11 through 14, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

"Sec. 11. (a) Part C of title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"'PART C—PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS

"'*Purpose*

"'Sec. 219. It is the purpose of this part to provide a comprehensive preschool program for children of low-income families.

"'*Grants to States*

"'Sec. 220. (a) From the sums appropriated to carry out this title, the Director shall make grants to States which have State programs approved by him under this section.

"'(b) Grants under subsection (a) may be used, in accordance with regulations of the Director, to—

"'(1) assist in the establishment of a preschool program to prepare children from low-income families to successfully undertake the regular elementary school program, and may include incidental health, remedial, and developmental services; and

"'(2) assist in meeting the costs incurred by local educational agencies in carrying on such programs.

"'*State plans*

"'Sec. 221. (a) The Director shall approve, for purposes of this part, of a plan of a State which—

"'(1) provides for administration thereof by the State educational agency;

"'(2) provides that such agency will make such reports to the Director, in such form and containing such information, as may reasonably be necessary to enable the Director to perform his duties under this part and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Director finds necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"'(b) The Director shall not finally disapprove of any State plan submitted under this part or any modification thereof, without first affording the State educational agency reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"'*Allotments*

"'Sec. 222. (a) (1) From the sums allocated for grants to States under section 220 for any fiscal year, the Director shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine, and shall allot such amount among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs, for assistance under this part. From the remainder of such sums the Director shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the product of—

"'(A) the population aged 3 through 6 (both inclusive) of the State, and

"'(B) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under paragraph (2)),

bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

"'(2) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 100 per centum less the product of (A) 50 per centum, and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per child aged 3 through 6 (both inclusive) for the State by the income per child aged 3 through 6 (both inclusive) for the United States, except that the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than 33⅓ per centum or more than 66⅔ per centum. The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Director between July 1 and August 31 of each even-numbered year beginning with the calendar year 1966, on the basis of the average of the incomes per child aged 3 through 6 (both inclusive) for the States and for the United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Each such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period ending July 1 next preceding such promulgation.

"'(b) The portion of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for a fiscal year which the Director determines will not be required, for the period such allotment is available, for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this part shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such period as the Director may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other

States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum which the Director estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such period of carrying out its State plan approved under this part; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallocated among the States whose proportionate amounts are not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

"'Payments

"'SEC. 223. (a) From a State's allotment available for the purpose, the Federal share of expenditures, under its State plan, for the purposes set forth in section 220(b) shall be paid to such State. Such payments shall be made in advance on the basis of estimates by the Director; and may be made in such installments as the Director may determine, after making appropriate adjustments to take account of previously made overpayments or underpayments; except that no such payments shall be made for any fiscal year unless the Director finds that the amount available for expenditures for preschool programs and services from State sources for such year will be not less than the amount expended for such purposes from such sources during the preceding fiscal year.

"'(B) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the Federal share for each State shall be 90 per centum. For the succeeding fiscal year the Federal share for any State shall be 50 per centum.

"'Operations of State plans; hearings and judicial review

"'SEC. 224. (a) Whenever the Director, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency administering a State plan approved under this part, finds that—

"'(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 221, or

"'(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Director shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this part (or in his discretion, that further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments may be made to such State under this part (or payments shall be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

"'(b) A State educational agency dissatisfied with a final action of the Director under section 221 or subsection (a) of this section may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Director, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Director thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Director or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record, the Director may modify or set aside his order. The findings of the Director as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Director to take further evidence, and the Director may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Director shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Director's action.

"'Miscellaneous

"'SEC. 225. For purposes of this part—

"'(1) the term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if different, the agency or officer primarily responsible for supervision of pre-school programs in public schools, whichever may be designated by the Governor or by State law, or, if there is no such agency or officer, an agency or officer designated by the Governor or by State law;

"'(2) the term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State, except that if there is a separate board or other legally constituted local authority having administrative control and direction of pre-school programs in public schools, it means such other board or authority.'

"(b) Part D of title II of such Act is amended by striking out 'SEC. 221' and inserting in lieu thereof 'SEC. 226'."

Mr. POWELL (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the gentleman from Minnesota, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD in full.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I agree.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to set up by statute provision for preschool programs. We have a Project Head Start operating in the summer. We do not know how far it is going to go; whether there is going to be any preschool program this coming year or to what extent there will be any such program. The desire for preschool education is evidenced by the fact that whereas the Office of Economic Opportunity expected 100,000 young people to take part, better than 500,000 are taking part in this program. A one-shot deal I do not believe is sufficient.

I think if we are going to reach the people who are poverty stricken, who one generation after another find themselves in the same straits, we need to help them when they are young. Studies that have been made, as I have mentioned before, indicated that age 3 is the time when they need to be reached for social and cultural improvement.

The proposed amendment would provide preschool programs to be set up for children of low-income families. The money would be allocated to the States based on the population of children ages 3 to 6 within the State, using the same allotment ratio that we have in the National Defense Education Act.

The amount of title II money that the Director could allocate for this would be at his discretion. He has allocated money for Project Head Start, and he would have authority to allocate the amount that he wanted. It should be allocated, however, through the State education agency and the State education agency then would coordinate the programs with the local school districts. The grants to the States then would be made after a State plan was submitted to the Director.

The program, I believe, would be of tremendous importance in reaching the hard core of the poverty stricken. I attended yesterday morning a session of the White House Conference on Education on preschool education and some experts in the field who have been studying it for a good period of time were in attendance; also there were individuals from various parts of the educational sphere who were there as well. To a person they agreed that more is needed to be done for preschool education; that the young people who were attending the first grade, if they came from a culturally and socially deprived environment, were incapable of assimilating what was being taught them at the first-grade level; that if they were not able to assimilate at that level they were going to fall further behind each year rather than catching up with the children who come from middle-class families.

It is true that every socially and culturally deprived child does not come from a low-income family, but they predominate in that area. Studies that were presented, and the position papers indicated that this was true. It was found in some cases that parents have no influence on their children after age 3. Anybody who has been brought up in a family where they had good family relations finds that hard to understand. But one can visit parts of the country, in the very severely affected areas of the cities especially, where they can see that in existence.

There is really nothing in the law today that sets up a program for preschool children. In the elementary and secondary school bill that was passed there was really only just passing reference to it, and that was all.

Mr. Chairman, in the bill here we have been told that projects of this nature could be set up under title II. We saw project Head Start begin. Project Head Start, with all the people who are working in it—and it takes a tremendous number to handle the 500,000-plus students—there are very few of the individuals who will be instructors and who will have any training in working with socially and culturally deprived children. If we undertake a one-shot deal like that without well-qualified individuals, Head Start may end up with a bad name like so many of the rest of the OEO programs.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota is the ranking member of the ad hoc Subcommittee of the War on Poverty, of which I am chairman. The subcommittee held extensive hearings and the gentleman never raised this lengthy amendment of 8 pages before. I knew nothing about it whatsoever.

I therefore ask that the amendment be defeated, and I move that the House do now close debate on this amendment.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] that debate now close on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-one Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill before us do close, and all amendments thereto, at 5 o'clock.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the chairman of the committee also include in this motion that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any place?

Mr. POWELL. I would be happy to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, has the bill yet been read in its entirety and, if not, is such a motion in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's request is to dispense with further reading of the bill and that all debate close at 5 o'clock.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALL. Did the gentleman from New York make such motion before he made the request?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York accepted the modification to his request suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and has now put it to the Committee.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, would the Chair restate the motion, please?

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point and that all debate on the bill and amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock.

Is there objection?

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, would the gentleman be willing to submit as a proviso to his unanimous-consent request that all amendments currently pending at the desk—that for all amendments currently pending at the desk the person offering that amendment be allowed 5 minutes to present his case?

Mr. POWELL. As long as we conclude all debate and all amendments by 5 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman is it my understanding—and I address myself to the distinguished Chairman of the Committee—that his motion that the bill be open to amendment applies only to those portions of the bill which the Committee has not yet covered? Is my understanding correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, if it is in order, I would hope that the Chairman of the Committee might further clarify his reply to me of a few moments ago and state whether or not he would be willing to say that he personally is willing to allow recognition of those who have amendments at the desk at this time on a priority basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be recognized for 5 minutes as long as there is time.

Mr. GOODELL. Are we going to be proceeding to a situation where only those who are now standing will have time?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to get this plug in. There are a lot of us on this floor interested in passing the bill but we have difficulty in getting recognition. This is a most important bill and to cut off debate at 2 hours, when you have 10 more pages, I think is unfair, just because you have the votes. I want to vote for this but if you close off debate, I am going to vote against it and I think I will have reason to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, a few minutes ago in the Committee of the Whole, there were 38 Members standing, seeking recognition on a very important amendment. At that time there was objection to the request to limit debate, then upon motion being made to limit debate, it was limited to 15 minutes which provided approximately 30 seconds for each Member standing and seeking recognition.

Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that this is a travesty upon the legislative processes and procedures of the House of Representatives and I am constrained to object.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment. As much as any amendment that has been offered, this symbolizes the approach that we on our side of the aisle feel should be taken in this war on poverty. Many of us on our side have believed for many years in what now is called the Head Start program. We believe, as in the eloquent words of the gentleman from Georgia last year, we must prevent the child of poverty from becoming the father of poverty. In a degree the Head Start program, the preschool program—is able to do this, to help the child get on the track early in school so he can respond to the existing facilities and personnel to help him.

But what are we doing in this poverty program? In the first place, there is nothing in the legislation that guarantees any money will go for the Head Start program. It is all in the discretion of the Poverty Director.

He can put whatever money he wants to in the program. Or he can deprive the program, if he wishes.

In the second place, the present program is set up by the Poverty Director acting directly with the local communities. He can set it up with a local private agency if he wishes and in some instances this has been done. He does not have to get permission of the local school authority. But given all this, we feel if there is one area that the States have been active and where they have the primary responsibility, and in our debates generally, this has been so stated, it is in the field of education. Even those on the Democratic side of the aisle have at least said that they believe the States should retain primary responsibility in the field of education. We have said the States should retain this authority in education. Why do we not insist that the Head Start program be run through the States and through experienced educators—the people who have the talent and who have the experience to do this? After they have done it in the local school systems a little while, I think we can anticipate that they will make this a regular practice and be putting it on as part of their regular curriculum and see to it that these children from deprived families are given attention and put on the track early in the school system.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BELL. I want to compliment the gentleman in the well for his position on this amendment as well as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE]. I want to say I believe it is administratively sound and it pins the program down more specifically. There is and there was information time and time again during the hearings of a direct connection between the father and the mother who are living in poverty and the child who is living in poverty and then eventually becoming a dropout because he had not had that pre-education period of training so that the child could be able to get along and associate with other children in the public schools.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman for his comments. What the Quie amendment does is to say that the poverty Director shall allocate how much money he thinks ought to go into the Head Start program nationally. When he allocates that total amount, it will be divided among the States and go into the State education departments under the program that the poverty Director feels is adequate in the Head Start programs operating in all those States. It is very similar if not identical to the way most of our Federal-State programs are operating today.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. I can appreciate the sincerity of the gentleman, but does the gentleman not feel that this is the wrong place to start dissecting this legislation? Furthermore, under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that we recently passed, the States can expend funds for preschool programs. But there is no guarantee in that legislation that it will reach the areas in which it is needed. Furthermore, in certain States the law does not permit the expenditure of funds for children below 5 years. This will necessitate a change in State law and delay the program. This legislation on the other hand will reach all the areas in the country. The amendment will hamstring immediate inauguration of preschool programs and should be defeated.

Mr. GOODELL. I know of no States that cannot set up preschool programs. The gentleman refers to age requirements for entry in the school system itself. That is quite a different thing.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

During the course of debate on this measure we have heard many criticisms; some are directed against the program itself, others are directed against the manner in which the program is being administered.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to question the sincerity of our colleagues who have uttered such criticisms, nor is it my purpose to deny categorically that the war on poverty has experienced any of the usual "growing pains" common to programs of this nature and scope.

Rather, I should like to address the program's opponents and proponents alike and emphasize its tremendous social impact and far-reaching significance in very State of the Union. The war on poverty has worked, and is continuing to work in my own State of Hawaii. And there is no valid reason why it cannot be made to work in every other State.

The war on poverty program in Hawaii is being administered under the able leadership of former Congressman Thomas P. Gill. One of the practical approaches he has instituted is to carry the program to the people who need the help but who, for one reason or another, will not come to the program. This certainly is a new, dramatic, and far-reaching concept.

Mr. Gill is instituting, in a soft-sell fashion, an approach to the problem of the poor which departs from some accepted ideas on social service. He says that, for one thing, the people who must be reached will not come to the program—the program must go to them.

This drive to reach people who really are in need also leans heavily on self-participation. Under imaginative leadership, the Hawaii office is organizing community councils with half the members professionals and half the members actual beneficiaries. The membership of these councils assures getting disadvantaged children in school and jobs and older persons in programs which will help them to improve their own economic status.

This concept of self-help leans more to the practical approach, rather than that of the professional do-gooder. As stated by Mr. Gill:

> There is too great a misconception that we are handing out money—giving something for nothing. That's a mistake because what we are doing is putting professionals to work helping people better their own economic status.

Mr. Gill's staff has been urging agencies involved in the program to move rapidly and with imagination. Mr. Gill has admitted that the demand for movement, more rapid than usual, has had a shock effect on some agencies involved with his office. But, on the whole, he is well satisfied that the program is moving forward rapidly towards the desired objectives. Again, I quote him:

> We started from scratch on something entirely new and we now have 17 funded projects involving close to $3 million during the coming fiscal year. We will have 14 more projects approved shortly. It's a big job, but I think it is moving well.

Mr. Chairman, I have presented some of the highlights of the program in Hawaii to show what able, imaginative, and sincere leadership at the State level can do in accomplishing the legislative obectives of the war on poverty.

If we have faith in the future of our great Nation, let us express our faith in our fellow men, that they who are involved in this great program will carry out its intent to the best of their ability, and bring about a measure of success. Let us pass the committee bill without crippling amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III—SPECIAL PROGRAMS TO COMBAT POVERTY IN RURAL AREAS

Cooperative association—Prohibition of loans to assist manufacturing

SEC. 12. Section 305(f) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following proviso: ": *Provided,* That packing, canning, cooking, freezing, or other processing used in preparing or marketing edible farm products, including dairy products, shall not be regarded as manufacturing merely by reason of the fact that it results in the creation of a new or different substance".

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I shall not take all the time, but since we were cut off in the debate, to keep the record straight, in response to the comments made by my distinguished friend from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins], I believe his comments point up the real problem of those of us who believe in preschool and early school programs.

Under the Education Act we enacted this year it is possible to get preschool programs. These can come about under the Head Start program.

Mr. PERKINS. In some States by law they prevent the expenditure of funds for that purpose.

Mr. GOODELL. I will yield to the gentleman a little later.

We have the poverty program, under which it is also possible to have the Head Start program.

Under this poverty program, however, there is no relationship to the States and no relationship necessarily to local educators. They can do it with whatever resources they believe the most effective.

This is a classic example of the way the Federal Government should not operate. If the Head Start program and the preschool and early school training programs are good ideas, as I deeply believe, as the gentleman knows, this should be one program coordinated and handled nationally. It should utilize the experience and knowledge and background of all of our wonderful educators all over the country in our educational system.

The way to do that is not through direct grants from a poverty czar in Washington. We should do it the other way, through the State plan the gentleman from Minnesota offered. It would work quite effectively. I do not understand why the gentleman objects to doing it that way.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I merely wish to straighten out one point, which the chairman brought up.

This is of less importance now, since the amendment has been defeated.

I did present my amendments to the author of the bill [Mr. Gibbons] who was handling the bill during general debate, so that he could see it for all the 3 days of debate.

Also, as the gentleman in the well and others in this body know, I have been striving to get into legislation for a long period of time a program for preschool education. I tried to do it in the poverty bill last year. I tried to do it in a more effective way with respect to elementary and secondary schools, when that bill was considered.

The facts are before us, for us to see. This is an area of education being neglected. There is an insufficient amount of research and study going into it. We do not have enough qualified teachers. There are very few qualified teachers to teach the culturally and socially deprived children aged 3 to 6.

We have had more experience with the mentally retarded children. A child who is culturally and socially deprived is just as handicapped as a mentally retarded child. Unless that child is reached by a knowledgeable teacher, he will be lost for his lifetime.

I believe it is a crime when recoverable children are lost in this way. Just to have a goodhearted person work with him is not sufficient. People working with culturally and socially deprived children must be knowledgeable. We have seen this with respect to the mentally retarded children. When goodhearted mothers were taking care of mentally retarded children, they were happy, but the children did not progress very far compared to those who had the help of well-qualified teachers.

One of the most heartening things a person can see is a class of mentally retarded children where the teacher is knowledgeable. There we see the results which have occurred from the instruction of the teacher. It is one of the most amazing things and one of the most heartwarming things a person can see.

We know that in the slums and the rural depressed areas there are children who are culturally and socially deprived who could be recovered with the use of a small amount of money, under the kind of program which I proposed in my amendment that was defeated. I say that we are missing our best bet to stop poverty and to finally get an end to poverty when we ignore preschool children.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman makes an excellent point.

It is frustrating for those of us who develop what we consider to be good ideas in our committee—and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and I worked on this, as I indicated yesterday, as long ago as 3 years before the administration adopted it—to see that a good idea has to be overlapped, contradicted, and put into so many different programs, which compound the difficulties of administration, with the end result of wasting human resources. We know there is a great shortage of professional or experienced or qualified personnel to help the less fortunate in our midst; their time and their energies are precious assets or, if you will, precious resources. They should not be wasted as they are, all too often, under the present program.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the headstart program, per se, is proof of the pudding. The purpose of the preschool program in the Economic Opportunity Act is to reach the culturally deprived youngster.

Mr. GOODELL. I understand that. The gentleman knows full well I understand that.

Mr. PERKINS. Otherwise he will not be reached, if we channel this program through State agencies, because there are a few State statutes which were enacted many years ago which will not permit the expenditure of funds within the States for children attending school if the children are under 5 or 6 years of age.

I will agree that we should assume some responsibilitiy in seeing that permanent preschool programs are established for the disadvantaged youngsters in America, and I will join with my colleague in the Committee on Education and Labor to see that this problem is thoroughly considered by the committee at an early date. In view of the great record of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity in reaching the areas that need preschool programs the most, I feel that we will bring to a halt the effectiveness of the program by the adoption of the amendment, the local school people by and large are administering the Head Start program, and creating the climate and sentiment that will make all the States feel the necessity for programs of this type. The amendment should be defeated.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8283, a bill to expand the Nation's war against poverty and provide adequate funds to extend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 for an additional year.

The amendments and the appropriation recommended by the House Committee on Education and Labor does not escalate the economic opportunity program. It does provide funds to keep the program operating at the level originally contemplated by Congress when it passed the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. During the past fiscal year, we have witnessed the organization of the Office of Economic Opportunity under capable direction and the mobilization of local talent to implement programs to combat poverty at the local level.

As Members of this distinguished body, we have a responsibility to represent all Americans, including those who have no organized lobby in the Halls of Congress—the poor and underprivileged people of America. This legislation does not provide for a Government handout program but represents a sincere attempt to help the underprivileged to help themselves. It represents a new and challenging venture bringing about a partnership between our local, State, and Federal Governments, and for all Americans who want to give a helping hand to those less fortunate. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 8283.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ASSISTANCE FOR MIGRANT AND SEASONALLY EMPLOYED AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYEES

SEC. 13. Section 311 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"MIGRANTS AND SEASONALLY EMPLOYED AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 311. The Director is authorized to develop and implement a program of loans, loan guarantees, and grants to assist State and local agencies, private nonprofit institutions, and cooperatives in establishing, administering, and operating programs which will meet, or substantially and primarily contribute to meeting, the special needs of migratory workers and seasonal farm laborers and their families in the fields of housing, sanitation, education, and day care of children."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SICKLES

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to H.R. 8283 offered by Mr. SICKLES: Page 7, after line 16, insert the following:

"CONTINUATION OF INDEMNITY PAYMENTS TO DAIRY FARMERS

"SEC. 14. Section 331(c) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "January 31, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1967'."

And renumber the sections which follow accordingly.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, section 331 of the Economic Opportunity Act, unless extended, will terminate on June 30, 1965. This section authorizes indemnity payments to be made to dairy farmers who, through no fault of their own, have had their milk barred from commercial markets because the milk contained minute residues of pesticides that were approved for use by the Federal Government at the time of their use. It is imperative that the Congress not let this pesticide indemnity law die on June 30 but act immediately to extend it to June 30, 1967. There is an even greater need for this law this year than there was during the past year since the full effects of the use of certain pesticides, which were approved by the Federal Government when they were used, will only begin to be felt by dairy farmers not only in Maryland but in other States across the Nation. Even though the Department of Agriculture has canceled the registration of heptachlor for use on alfalfa and the registration of dieldrin for use on alfalfa and clover, it is highly possible that incidents of contamination may still occur since these chemicals remain in the soil for a number of years. This means that there could be a carryover of residues in the soil which is large enough to contaminate the feed grown there and thereby be transmitted into the milk. Moreover, there are a number of pesticides which are still registered and recommended for use by the Federal Government which could result in excessive residue in milk and subsequent seizure of that milk.

Less than $300,000 has been paid out to about 175 dairy farmers. Although there have not been a large number of dairy farmers involved in this problem, it is only equitable that as long as it is possible for only one dairy farmer to be forced to dump his milk because of the presence of minute traces of pesticides which are now or ever have been recommended for use by the Federal Government, it is essential that the indemnity payment program be in effect. It is grossly unfair that any dairy farmer be penalized simply because he followed the recommendations of a Federal agency. In view of these facts section 331 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 should be amended so as to be extended through June 30, 1967.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this amendment, which comes from our good friend from Maryland, is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offering the amendment desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, this is an attempt to extend the Economic Opportunity Act in another direction, which I think was actually an oversight by our committee. I must confess it was partly my fault, because I had put in the bill to provide for the extension of this part of the poverty bill, but it was not done in the committee and it was merely my purpose here to do this. I am distressed that the chairman of the committee has raised the point of order.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SICKLES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to point out that this language is currently in the present law and is part of the poverty program as now in existence. This is section 331(c)(1) of the present Economic Opportunity Act. It has been carried in the law for the last 12 months. It is a part of the poverty program as we know the poverty program now.

Mr. SICKLES. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I think what really happened is, because the Office of Economic Opportunity was not concerned with the administering of this portion of the act that it was merely a legislative oversight, and it was not included. I would appreciate it if the gentleman from New York would consider withdrawing his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, this law expired on June 30. It is not part of the law now.

Mr. SICKLES. The whole law expired.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ROONEY of New York). The gentleman offers an amendment at page 7 after line 16 with regard to the continuation of indemnity payments to dairy farmers. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] raised a point of order against the germaneness of this proffered amendment. It would appear to the Chair that this bill does not have anything to do with this particular subject with regard to indemnity payments to dairy farmers. Therefore, the Chair is constrained to rule that the amendment is subject to the gentleman's point of order and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment, and feel that it is entirely justified. This amendment would extend indemnity payments to dairy farmers whose milk has been removed from the market because of contamination by pesticides which the Agriculture Department previously approved for use. The chemicals in question are primarily heptachlor and dieldrin, compounds which the Agriculture Department actually recommended until 1964, when the Food and Drug Administration ruled that they were unsafe. Indemnity payments to affected dairy farmers were then authorized under last year's act until January 31, 1965.

Under that provision, $103,443 was paid to 24 producers in my congressional district alone.

Recent tests by the University of Maryland and others have revealed that, rather than disappearing, residues of these harmful chemicals have remained in the ground and will contaminate new feed grains crops. It is only just, therefore, that these indemnity payments be continued.

I have introduced a bill to extend payments until June 30, 1967, and support this amendment, which would have the same effect.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee has seen fit to object to an amendment which would continue a program which was a part of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This provided for an indemnity to dairy farmers whose milk was rejected because of tests showing unacceptable levels of pesticide residue. Since the Congress saw fit to provide for indemnity to dairy farmers who suffered losses prior to June 30, 1965, it seems only just that the dairy farmers who have suffered identical losses after June 30, 1965, be indemnified on the same basis. The only opportunity now for equivalent treatment of all dairy farmers would be for the other body to include this amendment when they consider legislation.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 17:

"AMENDMENT TO TITLE V—WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAM

"SEC. 14. Section 502 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended (1) by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'Workers in farm families with less than $1,200 net family income shall be considered unemployed for the purposes of this title' and (2) by striking out of the last sentence the following: 'for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965.'.

"AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION"

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUBSER

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUBSER: On page 8, after line 2, insert:

"LIMITATION OF USE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

"SEC. 15. Section 602(e) of such Act is amended by striking the semicolon at the end thereof and inserting:

" ': *Provided, however,* That the Director is not authorized to utilize, with or without compensation, members of the Armed Forces on active duty.' "

And renumber the sections which follow accordingly.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, when the Economic Opportunity Act was passed some 9 months ago, section 106(e) was included which allowed the employees of other departments, including the military departments, to be loaned to the Office of Economic Opportunity on a reimbursable basis. Though perhaps some case could have been made that that section was properly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services, no one raised the point because at that time it was not very signifiant. At that time the war in Vietnam had not enlarged to the present extent and we were not faced with the possibility of committing some 75,000 to perhaps 100,000 American men to that conflict. We were not faced with the possibility of having to call up our Reserves or of increasing our draft calls and asking family men to leave civilian life to fight in Vietnam.

Circumstances have changed. I admit that only 12 officers in the military services are currently employed by the Job Corps. But, Mr. Chairman, there is a war on in Vietnam and these 12, small though the number may be, mean simply that 12 more civilians have to disrupt their everyday lives in order to fight that war in Vietnam while 12 career military people, are working for the Job Corps. I cannot believe that going out and replacing 12 people is going seriously to jeopardize the war on poverty. I am sure that Mr. Shriver, who now has this program in operation, will be able to replace his military people. Under the present circumstances in Vietnam he should be required to do so.

It will not hurt the program, but it would carry out what I think this House should do on a very basic principle, which is this: In time of war—and let us face it, that is what this is—do we have the right to take career military people and place them in a civilian agency of the Government and then ask civilians to take their place on the field of battle?

I hope Members can support this amendment because it will not hurt the Job Corps.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that any person with a reasonable amount of intelligence would realize that the armed services is not made up of all gun-bearing and fire-spitting men, but that it is made up of all kinds of citizens who serve in the armed services, statisticians, scientists, bookkeepers, teachers, all types of persons.

Mr. Chairman, this is a war on another kind of enemy, a war on poverty, in which the best men and the best possible brains in the country fit into the best slot that can fight in this war are to be enlisted.

Mr. Chairman, I would hate to think that of 1 million or more men in the armed services of the United States, we cannot take 10 or 12 without impairing the defenses of this Nation.

I would hate to think any person in this House would try to represent that we are weakening the defense of America by taking those men best equipped to give their services to this program which is just as vital a war as the war being fought in Vietnam.

I would hate also to think that because of a war, as he calls it in Vietnam, we have reached the end of our resources and we have to eliminate our civil and domestic programs to prosecute a localized eruption in Vietnam.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Not at this time; I am trying to get across to the gentleman that I do not believe we have become so bankrupt in this Nation of ours, that we have to stop the use of any person within it for the services that are required of the people in the war on poverty because of his fear that we will not be equipped to do that which we must anywhere in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like particularly the inference that 12 men have to break up their routine of living to take the place of the 12 men that are being used in the OEO organization.

I do not mind his little bit of playing with words for consumption back home. Send it back home, but do not feed it to us.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I thank the gentleman for that statement. However, in reality, we are strengthening the defenses of this country rather than weakening them by providing for the benefits to be derived under this program. As a result hundreds of thousands will receive basic education and training that will enable them to serve their country in many ways.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. I must advise the distinguished gentleman from California that one cannot rise to a point of personal privilege in the Committee of the Whole.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 3:

"VISTA VOLUNTEERS—ASSIGNMENT; APPLICATION OF OTHER PROVISIONS AND FEDERAL LAWS

"SEC. 15. (a) Subsection (a) of section 603 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out everything in paragraph (2) following the clause designation '(C)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'in connection with programs or activities authorized, supported, or of a character eligible for assistance under this Act.'

"(b) Subsection (d) of such section is amended to read as follows:

" '(d) (1) Each volunteer shall take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by section 104(d) of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such oath or affirmation; but, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, volunteers shall not be deemed to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

" '(2) All volunteers during training and such volunteers as are assigned pursuant to paragraph (2) of subsection (a) shall be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 106 (b), (c), and (d) of this Act, except that for purposes of the computation described in paragraph (2)(B) of section 106(c) the monthly pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS–7 under the Classification Act of 1949.' "

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: Page 8, after line 2, insert the following:

"DIRECTOR—QUALIFICATION FOR HOLDING OFFICE

"SEC. 15. Section 601(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after the second sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'The Director shall hold no other office or employment under the Federal Government.' "

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is to require that the Director shall hold no other office or employment under the Federal Government. That means the present Director will have to chose whether he will remain as Director of the Peace Corps or Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

This is an amendment that is very simply understood and I do not think I have to spend much time on it. I know of no other Federal agency which has a Director who also heads another Federal agency. In some areas of Government we have seen fit to prohibit this being done. With all the capabilities of Sargent Shriver, and they have been spelled out many times, it is humanly impossible for a person to be at two places at the same time. If we look at the chaos in many parts of the program in the Office of Economic Opportunity, I would say the first thing we should start with, if we want to correct the situation, is to have a full time Director. I think that is of paramount importance.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. What it comes down to is not a question of ability, integrity, attitude, or approach of any individual. Either you are going to have an all-out, full-time war on poverty or you are not going to.

In this instance, many of us feel that the war on poverty is very important. We have documented many things that have been going on, such as waste of human resources, money, and time, that should be going to help people who are unfortunate in their circumstances. We feel the Peace Corps has great problems that demand full time and attention.

I commend the gentleman for offering the amendment. I believe this is a decision we should make in the Congress. Both of these jobs should have full-time directors.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I, too, should like to commend the gentleman. We should remember the words of our majority leader when earlier today he described Mr. Shriver as one of the finest administrators this Government has. He pointed out that Mr. Shriver proved himself as Director of the Peace Corps. Yet the majority leader himself pointed to one of the present weaknesses of the OEO program when he said they have problems with administration. He then went on to say, "Give the Honorable Sargent Shriver a chance."

The only way we can give Mr. Shriver a chance is to allow him to prove his administrative ability by worrying more about the OEO. He should take on as a full-time responsibility his job as Director of the poverty program, or as a fulltime responsibility his job as Director of the Peace Corps. Especially when one of these two programs is admittedly in trouble, and the majority leader admitted it was in a certain amount of trouble, it is unwise to ask far more than we should ask of one individual.

Mr. QUIE. I listened to the gentleman from Maryland yesterday and I read his remarks today to see if he could convince me not to offer this amendment. I must say to the gentleman he has not convinced me at all.

I still believe that a year from now, when the Congress will again debate this program, we will be presented with a better record by the OEO if there is a full-time Director handling the program this coming year.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I would like to ask the gentleman to reconsider his amendment as being one that is very dangerous to us at this very critical time. We are, in fact, engaged in an all-out war on poverty and as it has been often observed, and I think with a great deal of truth, that the generals conceive and execute great battles, but it is the sergeants who win the war.

Mr. QUIE. The program of the Office of Economic Opportunity does not put this country in an all-out war on poverty. Before this program was ever begun, this country was spending about $100 billion a year through Federal, State and local and private sources. We have been having a war on poverty for a long time and I think it is going to be quite a period of time again before we rewrite the Bible to show that there will not be any more poverty.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHEUER. Does not the fact that we have been spending this $100 billion a year without eliminating poverty and its patterns—alienation, hopelessness, and despair—indicate that something is wrong with what we have been doing up to now; that we have not reached the root causes of poverty; that we have not made a dent on the problem? Does that not show us that we have to experiment thoughtfully but boldly to devise new methods, new tools, new techniques, and new approaches to the perplexing and infinitely complicated problems of poverty to meet this perplexing national problem in a more effective way.

Mr. QUIE. I would say that we have done some good in the past. Let me cite some figures. In 1950, 30 percent of the people in America were in poverty, using the same bench mark that the OEO uses today. In 1960 poverty had gone down to 21 percent. This shows that we must have been conducting ourselves, between the period 1950 and 1960, in such a way that we were doing more to eliminate poverty than we have done under this program. If these programs of OEO continue as at present, there will be plenty of war but little actually on poverty.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] rise?

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I shall not take up too much time because I think the issues are rather clear and were discussed at length on yesterday.

It has been stressed, again and again, today that there is no question about the qualifications, education, and background of the present director. It seems to me, therefore, certainly, nobody is complaining about the director. This amendment is in reality a slap at the President and the President's prerogative to determine who he is going to use to perform the duties of the various offices under his responsibility. Of course, the ultimate responsibility is with the President of the United States. He cannot delegate that responsibility.

But this amendment would not be effective even if it were to be adopted. It would not affect the incumbent director, Sargent Shriver, at all. We dwelled on that point at length yesterday. The incumbent now in office cannot be removed by this legislative device. This amendment could only be prospective and operative with respect to the future. So long as the current situation exists. So long as Sargent Shriver is happy to wear two hats and so long as the President of the United States is happy with his doing so, nothing will change.

If my colleagues will recall, I read into the RECORD yesterday a letter from the Attorney General where the Attorney General said that this amendment could not be effective immediately and in which he said:

"The only constitutional way in which the Congress can bring about removal of an executive officer without abolishing his office is by way of impeachment, a process which involves a trial by the Senate and conviction by two-thirds of the Senators present."

So that even if we adopted this amendment, it could not be effective and could only affect the future.

Mr. Chairman, everybody has been praising the present incumbent of this office and how well he has been doing his job. I do not think anybody in this House really believes that the Office of Economic Opportunity is in a shambles. I do not think anybody is really concerned because they could not find a telephone book or because a particular letter was not answered. This does not get to the heart of the problem. This is a new agency and they are trying their best to do a job. The agency and the director of that agency need help. They do not need a lot of carping.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this kind of amendment would not solve any problems and it is not offered for that purpose.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will only take 30 seconds. I think the gentleman's argument may well be true. This amendment may not have a direct effect on the present incumbent. I think, however, if the amendment is passed, it will make unmistakably clear what the Congress feels should be done. It is within the power of the present director and the power of the President to recognize this feeling of the Congress as expressed in this amendment, and if they do so we feel you would have a better program because you would have a fulltime director of both the Peace Corps and the poverty program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROUDEBUSH

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROUDEBUSH: Page 8, after line 2, insert the following:

"JOB CORPS—FURNISHING OF HEALTH SERVICES

"SEC. 6. Section 602(d) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by changing the semicolon that follows the word 'thereof' to a period and adding the following sentence: 'Notwithstanding this or any other provision of law, no Job Corps enrollee shall be given a physical examination, hospitalized, or otherwise given medical treatment in any Veterans' Administration hospital or facility;' "

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I, believe this amendment to be an excellent one.

I might say that actually there are three amendments exactly the same at the Clerk's desk, the other two being offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY], but they were kind enough to yield to me to offer this amendment.

This is actually a simple amendment. I might say it is not designed for home consumption. It is nonpartisan, and I believes it deserves the support of every Member of this body today.

Th amendment is directed to section 602(d), which defines the authority of the Director. I believe Members are all familiar with the furor which was created by the hospitalization of Job Corps personnel in Veterans' Administration hospitals. This amendment merely would remove the authority of the Director to send Job Corps personnel to the Veterans' Administration hospitals.

According to the Veterans' Administration figures, which I have currently, 14 Job Corps men have been hospitalized for a total of 168 days. Treatments and examinations totaling 2,241 have been given. At the Indianapolis Veterans Hospital we had seven Job Corps men receiving hospitalization with veterans on the waiting list.

In order to summarize my remarks, I will say that the recent closure of VA hospitals plus the fact that the war clouds hang heavily over the Near East certainly puts a tremendous burden on our existing hospital system. We need every bed for our war veterans. It is not right for a war veteran to have to take his place in line behind a Job Corps man.

I hope that this amendment will receive the bipartisan support of this body.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this just simply is not so. There is no terrific strain on the veterans hospitals as a result of the five Job Corps men who are in them now. That is all there are. In fact, there have been only 14 since the program has been in existence.

If that represents a terrific overloading of the veterans hospitals, in which we have so many beds, then some of us are not well informed.

I wish to say that I investigated this matter after I saw the gentleman's remarks in the RECORD the other day on this particular subject. I learned at that time that there were only 5 Job Corps men presently in the hospitals, and only 14 had been in the hospitals since the inception of this program.

The Veterans' Administration controls whether or not a Job Corps man will be admitted to the hospital. The Veterans' Administration can reject any Job

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Corps man as to admittance to a hospital. They are only put in the hospitals when there are vacancies.

This involves the same type of hospital the President thought it wise to close down because of insufficient use. This merely helps to get a better utilization of the hospitals, which there was some talk about closing down.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I thank the gentleman for his observation. As I say, I am not trying to play politics with this amendment.

In answer to the gentleman's statement, I wish to say that seven Job Corps men have been hospitalized at our Veterans' Administration facility in Indianapolis. This information was given to me by the manager there. At the same time that these Job Corps men were entered into the veterans hospital at Indianapolis, there was a lengthy waiting list for the VA hospital at Indianapolis.

I believe the gentleman will agree that they did take a veteran's bed, under those circumstances.

Mr. GIBBONS. The Veterans' Administration can control this. They have the power to refuse to admit any of these people and to send them to another more convenient hospital or to a nongovernmental hospital.

It is my information—and I have checked with the Job Corps and checked with the Veterans' Administration—that the only time a Job Corps man is put into these hospitals is when there is a vacancy and it involves only a utilization of space.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I should like to ask the author of the amendment, if he knows, how many of the gentlemen who have been treated in veterans hospitals are in fact veterans; and, if he knows, how many of the people in the age brackets eligible for this program are veterans; and whether he would propose that his amendment exclude a person without regard to whether or not he is in fact a veteran.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me, I will be very happy to respond.

Mr. GIBBONS. I will very briefly.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Certainly this amendment would not exclude men eligible by reason of military service.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. But your amendment reads while he is a member of the Job Corps he would be prohibited from it.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. No. The amendment reads thusly, and I did not explain it thoroughly, but I have a copy here.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further. The gentleman used his 5 minutes. All I can say is there are five people presently in Veterans' Administration hospitals, and I do not think they are overburdening those hospitals. The Veterans' Administration can refuse to admit them any time they want to.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this year many Members of this House came before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and stated vehemently that they thought the closing of certain veterans hospitals, as proposed by the President, ought not to take place. The record of the hearings is replete with statements made by Members of this body pointing out in instance after instance how we needed every bed for veterans that we now had available. Subsequently the President, on reviewing his decision to close these hospitals along with other veterans facilities, appointed a commission which made a study of this matter. That commission, after diligent study and investigation recommended to the President that about half of those proposed for closing should remain open. The President and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs have followed this recommendation. The reason for this action is that we need every bed we have for veterans of the Nation's combats.

Now, there are in the United States at this time we are told, thousands of veterans awaiting entrance to veterans hospitals. Support of this amendment simply says we believe hospitals constructed and operated for the use of veterans should be used for veterans. There are other facilities which are available for Jobs Corps applicants or enrollees. They can go to Public Health Service hospitals. They can go to military installations.

I would urge the members of the committee strongly to support this proposal to preserve, as many of you have urged heretofore, veterans hospitals for veterans purposes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. While not bearing directly on this amendment, does not the gentleman think perhaps the time has come to give greater attention to the unification and to cease the overlap between veterans hospitals, military hospitals, and Public Health Service hospitals so that we have the opportunity to and can do a better job of Government service in these areas?

Mr. ADAIR. I would say to the gentleman this is a question which has been before the Congress and specifically the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House for some time. The committee answered the gentleman's question in the negative and I concur in that conclusion. We have felt it was highly desirable that a system of hospitals solely for the use of veterans be maintained. There is a point of view in the country that we should submerge our veterans hospitalization program in other broader Federal but not exclusively veterans programs. However, those who have studied it as members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs have felt otherwise and are convinced that we should preserve and strengthen our veterans hospitalization program.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORSE. Do I understand from the gentleman that Veterans' Administration hospitals have been made available to people who are not eligible for admission to those hospitals?

Mr. ADAIR. Not eligible as veterans.

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. ADAIR. Eligible as members of the Job Corps under an administrative regulation; not under the law.

Mr. MORSE. What authority in law is there for admission of these people?

Mr. ADAIR. There is no statutory authority for such admission. It is only a matter of regulation.

Mr. MORSE. Would it not follow that that regulation is inconsistent and contrary to the laws enacted by this Congress?

Mr. ADAIR. I think it is inconsistent with the statutes we have enacted. I will say to the gentleman in all frankness that I do not believe it is contrary to any laws that we have enacted. I think it is out of character with the laws and the whole approach that we have taken toward the question of veterans hospitals.

Mr. MORSE. I quite agree with the gentleman, and as one who has had some responsibility for administration of Veterans' Administration hospitals I would urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROUDEBUSH) there were—ayes 43, noes 71.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROUDEBUSH and Mr. GIBBONS.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 61, noes 113.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUBSER

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUBSER: On page 8, after line 2, insert the following:

"ADMINISTRATION—REIMBURSEMENT FOR SERVICES OF MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

"SEC. 15. Section 602(d) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ', but where under this paragraph or any other law the Director utilizes the services of members of the Armed Forces, the military department concerned will be reimbursed for the entire cost to such department of making such services available to the Director, including, but not limited to, the cost of providing medical care and retirement benefits for the members of the Armed Forces concerned'."

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that one of the most basic and the most fundamental rights that distinguish a free people under a free government is the right to dissent and the right to disagree. And, so I hope, that as I offer this amendment, that the revulsion which some seem to feel at a Member's right to exercise his American right to disagree will not be labeled as a lack of good faith and that my motivation will not be challenged.

The House has made its decision that military personnel can be used for the Job Corps, and as a person who believes in the democratic process, I accept that decision. I reluctantly say the House has agreed we are so bankrupt for talent that out of 180 million people we cannot find 12 individuals to do the job that 12 military people are presently doing. I have more faith in the American people than to say those 12 can only be gotten from the military departments. But the House has made its decision.

Now, we come to a matter of accounting and how the Defense Department should be reimbursed for the use of these military people. At the present time, Mr. Chairman, the principle of military retirement is under very serious attack. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I know a good deal about that subject. I am interested in seeing to it that military retirement is preserved and not done away with. There is danger it will be done away with or seriously minimized.

In a memorandum from one of the counsels of the Committee on Armed Services with respect to the manner of reimbursement to the Defense Department for military personnel used by the Job Corps, it is stated:

> It is significant that no reimbursement is made for such compensation items as were identified by Secretary McNamara as being part of the cost of the military payroll. For example, no effort is made to reimburse to the Department for retirement benefits, medicare and so forth.

When Secretary McNamara testified before the Committee on Armed Services on the military pay bill, he went through each of these so-called fringe benefits and ascribed a dollar value to them. So it is possible to determine how much should be charged to the Jobs Corps for use of military personnel, for the fringe benefits that continue to accrue to the officer in the form of medicare, retirement credit, and other fringe benefits.

All this amendment will do is to require that the Job Corps reimburse the Defense Department for the total compensation cost to the Department of Defense for the use of that person. It is a fair amendment, it is no more than good, honest, and fair accounting procedure. It is something we should adopt.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close now.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 16. Section 605 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking "fourteen" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty".

AFFIDAVITS

SEC. 17. Title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out section 616 thereof.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WILLIAMS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS: On page 9, strike out lines 12, 13, and 14.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, when the Economic Opportunity Act was originally passed, the Congress, by a vote of both Houses, included certain language which is being deleted by the language contained in the lines I would strike out.

My purpose in offering this amendment is to retain a protection which is in the present law against possible Communist subversion of this program. The committee, through the language I would strike, seeks to take out the requirement that the recipients of these funds swear that they are not members or do not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force and violence or illegal or unconstitutional means.

Now I have searched the hearings meticulously in an attempt to find some basis for deleting this protection. Unfortunately, I could find no discussion on the part of any members of this committee of the reasons for taking this language out. There is a recommendation by the agency that a qualifying oath should be brought in line with the oaths taken by certain other governmental groups. Except for this, they gave no reason for requesting its deletion, nor did they take a position in objecting to the language that was approved by the Congress.

There is quite a bit of difference taking an oath to support the Constitution, and swearing that a person is not a member of the Communist Party or any other group that seeks to overthrow the United States by force or violence.

We have had an experience, as I related a day or so ago, down in the State of Mississippi where known Communists have been seen coming and going from the headquarters of the Head Start project at Mount Beulah. I do not know whether these people are on the Federal payroll or not. But under the present law, if the present law stands, and this language is not taken out, then any funds that these people would draw certainly would be illegal; and if the committee bill stands as it is there is no prohibition against Carl and Ann Braden and their other fellow Communists and fellow travelers drawing funds from this program.

Mr. Chairman, we are dealing here particularly in the VISTA and in the Head Start programs with economically deprived people. The unfortunate people with whom we are dealing here, the poverty stricken and the culturally deprived, are particularly susceptible to the influence of Communist teachings if we are to believe the arguments advanced for the passage of other programs designed to fight the encroachment of communism, such as foreign aid and others. Unless some protection is kept in this act, this program provides a fertile ground for sowing the seeds of communism in the United States. While American boys are fighting and dying fighting Communists in Vietnam, I think the least we can do is to retain this protection against Communist infiltration here within the United States.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in the hearings that indicates this oath is or has been difficult of administration. So far as we know the agency has not shown that there is any reason why this protection should be taken out. They simply say they would like to bring it in line with an oath that is taken in other agencies of Government. I say, yes, let us impose both oaths. Let us be doubly safe that we are not providing Federal funds that might finance a Communist foothold within our own borders.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS) there were—ayes 54, noes 77.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers, Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. GIBBONS.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 79, noes 113.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 15:

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 18. (a) (1) The first sentence of section 131 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out 'two' and inserting in lieu thereof 'three'.

"(2) The second sentence of such section is amended to read as follows: 'For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $412,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the sum of $825,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.'

"(b) (1) The first sentence of section 220 of such Act (as so redesignated by section 11 of this Act) is amended by striking out 'two' and inserting in lieu thereof 'three'.

"(2) The second sentence of such section is amended to read as follows: 'For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $340,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

30, 1965, and the sum of $680,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.'

"(c) (1) The first sentence of section 321 is amended by striking out 'two' and inserting in lieu thereof 'three'.

"(2) The second sentence of such section is amended to read as follows: 'For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the sum of $70,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.'

"(d) (1) The first sentence of section 503 of such Act is amended by striking out 'two' and inserting in lieu thereof 'three'.

"(2) The second sentence of such section is amended to read as follows: 'For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the sum of $300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.'

"(e) (1) The first sentence of section 615 of such Act is amended by striking out 'two' and inserting in lieu thereof 'three'.

"(2) The second sentence of such section is amended to read as follows: 'For the purpose of carrying out this title (other than for purposes of making credits to the revolving fund established by section 606 (a)), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the sum of $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.'"

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GURNEY

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment to H.R. 8283, offered by Mr. GURNEY: On page 9, line 23, strike out "$825,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$412,500,000".

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, now we come to the meat of the bill, and that is the money part of it. Actually, of course, I suppose the proponents of the bill would say that the amendment proposes to cut the authorization for the youth programs in half. And I suppose when the proponents of the bill rise in opposition to the amendment it will be said that our side is seeking to cut the bill by one-half. Well, that is one way of putting it. And, yet, I would prefer to put it this way. Actually, what we propose to do on the Republican side is to carry on these youth programs at the same level of spending as they were carried on in the first year of this program. That is exactly what we propose to do—the sum of $412,500,000, indeed a large sum—and conduct the program at the level of last year's spending.

We do this not out of opposition to the war against poverty and certainly not out of opposition to the youth programs. We actually favor the continuation of the programs at the same level of spending as last year. But we do indeed feel that with a new, experimental, untried program of administration we ought to continue it at the same level of spending and give it a chance to succeed at that level.

As a matter of fact, I think it is worth while pointing out that even cutting it in half, at $412 million, it is $46 million in excess of what was spent last year by this program. So, if you want to look at it one way it really is not cutting it at all, much less in half.

We talk about this being a new program, and indeed it is. I would like to turn for a moment to the hearings themselves and point this out to you. The major part of the youth program, as you know, is in the Job Corps. Here is what the testimony said; here is what the statement said submitted by the poverty war people, if you will listen to it for a moment.

Speaking of the Job Corps, they said:

> The task confronting the Job Corps on October 8, 1964, was difficult.
>
> It had no national or regional staffs, no teachers, counselors, programs, materials, camps, equipment, or, for that matter, even any applicants for what it hoped to offer. It had an appropriation, an idea and goals. And with those, it had to establish a widely dispersed, residential, educational and job-training system—a system without parallel in American education.

As a matter of fact, when the committee had its hearings just a few short weeks ago, indeed all these fears that were expressed at the outset of the program were shown in the evidence adduced at the hearings to have been realized. The program did indeed get off to a bad start.

We have plowed the ground of St. Petersburg a number of times, and I do not intend to go over that again. It is an example of the Job Corps in action, at least the women's division part of it. But I think it is well to point out that down in St. Petersburg in Florida, my home State, in this operation you have 122 staff members which oversee a total, at least as I get the report, of 237 Job Corps people, a ratio of better than 1 to 2.

I know there are some people in the House who attended a university in Massachusetts they call Harvard. It is the oldest and wealthiest in the country. And, at that particular place, you have a faculty ratio of about 1 to 6. The Job Corps is doing a pretty good job with this 1-to-2 ratio.

Mr. Chairman, it is estimated that the cost of the program runs some $6,000 to $7,000 a year per enrollee in the particular Job Corps project in St. Petersburg, Fla. This has been brought out.

I believe it has been pointed out with good emphasis that, certainly, while the aims of the particular Job Corps project at St. Petersburg—and I think that is true of others too—may be very well, certainly an extravagant expenditure of this sort makes little sense in this program.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I think the committee ought to be aware of the fact that even the administration has not asked for $825 million in title I. All they are going to ask of the Committee on Appropriations in fiscal year 1966 is for $535 million.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I shall support the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, in these long days of debate I have seen evolve a familiar pattern, one factor of which is concerned with people who on one hand stand up and say we are for it, and on the other hand offer crippling amendments that are going to hamstring the administrator. If unsuccessful in that, they try to reduce funds so they can keep the program from accomplishing its purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I am interested in all programs designed to help people help themselves but I am particularly interested in this one because we once before had a Job Corps—a program similar to this in that it was designed to help young people.

I was interested enough to go back into the files of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to read the debates that preceded passage and that took place when the extension of that program was under consideration.

Before this honorable body, on March 29, 1933, a Member declared:

> Only a few thousand boys, seeking adventure and freedom from home and civil restraints, will volunteer.

But, Mr. Chairman, 300,000 did volunteer.

The scene now moves to May 11, 1937, and the debate again took a turn familiar to us in 1965. One Member said:

> The proportionate cost will not be reduced as the number of men is reduced. There will be too many political leeches hanging on. It is setting the Government up in business. Get the Government out of business, cut down Government expenses, and reduce political jobs.

If something equally familiar is needed it came later that day in a statement saying the Job Corps of that day was just making work for people of the kind that would serve no useful purpose.

Again, echoing what was yet to be heard in far-off 1965, on May 11, 1937, there was talk of spending America into exhaustion. One honorable Member of this body warned:

> The condition of the Government bond market indicates that we are fast getting to the end of our rope and that we must economize. It costs more money to send a boy to a CCC camp than it would to send him to college.

Mr. Chairman, these were not constructive things to say then, as history has proven. And they are not conducive today to the efforts to conquer a problem that we have long had with us, as future history will attest.

Mr. Chairman, was it not ridiculous to say that it would cost more money to send a boy to the CCC camps than it would to send him to college? Is it not equally unbecoming to advance such an argument in 1965, when the money under discussion relates to only a small part of the whole situation?

Mr. Chairman, I have heard comments as to whether programs of the Job Corps type are going to be helpful. And in 1937 Members heard precisely the same kind of comments, coupled to dire predictions.

May I ask my distinguished colleagues to listen carefully here, because I have a story to tell. It is quite brief and concerns a 17-year-old boy who in the depths of the depression got out of high school. He had nothing to do and no place to go and the cause of his poverty was simple: There was not enough available to feed the farm family of 10 of which he was the oldest.

His Government offered him an opportunity to help himself by letting him go to a Civilian Conservation Corps camp. In the CCC he found many kinds of opportunity. He found opportunity to extend his formal education. He learned to cook for his camp and keep books and to appreciate the value of orderliness. He learned also possibly the most important lesson of all, how to live with and get along with other people. In the process he learned that humility that is necessary for lasting achievement through coming to have confidence in his fellows.

I could go on and on in telling you of benefits that came to that 17-year-old youngster. Time is not available so I will skip to the scene when it came time to leave the CCC.

Mr. Chairman, that youngster was able to put CCC-learned skills to work to the end that he became immediately a producing member of the community. He was not only able to work effectively at gainful employment but he found himself temperamentally inclined to serve with and work with people.

All this I know from personal experience, for this is not a fiction story. This is a true story about what that boy was able to do because of the skills he gained in the CCC—the Job Corps of the 1930's.

There were still rough times ahead, but he never again knew black despair. For with all the other CCC-taught lessons he learned the technique of looking about him when he thought his situation was bad. Always he found those worse off than himself—people in need of, and deserving of, whatever aid he could give.

Because of the CCC, the Job Corps of its day, I repeat, that boy gained the initiative to try to make something of himself. He increasingly widened his field of employment, his field of help for others. In time that boy was honored with election to the office of auditor general for his native State of Michigan. And then he was selected by his neighbors to serve in Congress, where today he asks you to give to others the advantages that the Congress of the 1930's granted him.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you now know, I am that boy. I know what happened to him can happen to others. I pray that this honorable body take advantage of the great opportunity to practice Americanism that lies before it.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that this afternoon we would be spared further belated episodes in the much-belabored St. Petersburg story. Yet, we have been treated to a seemingly unending flow of the same pious, sanctimonious protestations of virtuous affection for the poverty program—marred only by a sorrowful reluctance to give it minimum funding to breathe life and forward thrust into its constituent elements. Their ambivalent attitude can be summed up in the couplet:

> Mother, may I go and swim?
> Oh, yes, my darling daughter;
> Hang your clothes on yonder limb
> But don't go near the water.

We have heard allegations that it costs more to send a youngster to the Job Corps than it does to Harvard. When we consider the contribution that endowment funds make to the cost of a college education that is not paid for by the student, the tuition fee covers only a fraction of what society pays to send a kid through Harvard. Society has made an enormous investment in that child before he goes to Harvard.

I want to inform my colleagues on the other side of the House that the young people in the Job Corps and in the Neighborhood Youth Corps have not enjoyed the education, care, and concern necessary to prepare them for college. Society has failed them by failing to make this investment.

Indeed, society has not provided for these youth any meaningful participation in the educational process. That is why they are high school dropouts. That is why they need our help today.

Under this crippling amendment you would not be operating the program as it operated last year. Last year's operation was for only 9 months. This year it is for 12 months. Last year it went from zero to 100 percent of the current level of operations. What we want to do is to maintain the current level, not return to an average of last year's operation only midway in the buildup from zero to the current level of programs cut already by one-third this year, with 12 months instead of only 9 months to function. We do not want to cripple the program. This amendment and others scheduled to follow would cut 20,000 young people from the Job Corps, it would cut 100,000 young people from the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

It would deprive 17,000 illiterate adults of the benefits of learning reading and writing skills that would help to make them productive citizens, not only to get and hold jobs but also to become good informed citizens able to participate intelligently in the political life of our Nation.

It would cut 275 individual community action projects.

It would deny 175,000 communities that now have community action programs pending from any participation whatsoever in the community action program.

I say to my colleagues, if they have ever seen one of these programs in action—if they have ever seen these subprofessionals functioning, the ex-truck-driver, the ex-ditchdigger and the ex-house painters, the married women with children who know what life is all about—if they could see those people—motivated, dedicated, concerned, having had expert help to learn how to help their neighbors; going back to their neighborhoods to the side streets and back alleys to help those neighbors and motivate and stimulate and inspire them, they would come away with the same feeling I have—that maybe it is not appropriate to cut this program, but to enhance it and increase the level of operations.

We have repeatedly heard that only 3 percent of the poverty-stricken peoples of our country have felt the uplifting touch of the poverty program. Is that not a modest proposal? Only another 6 percent are even being treated indirectly.

Of the one family out of every four rural families that is poverty stricken, we are helping only one-tenth of 1 percent with rural loans. Shall we further reduce that program? Is it not a sufficiently modest proposal?

Of 2½ million teenage unemployed dropouts who desperately need the help offered by the neighborhood youth corps, Job Corps, and work study programs, only 16 percent of them are involved. Shall we further gut that program? Is it not sufficiently modest as compared to the need?

Four hundred and fifty thousand children desperately need help under the Head Start program this summer before going through the schoolhouse doors this September to participate in the educational process meaningfully and pridefully. The program holds out no hope for them. Shall we enlarge this number?

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford not to continue to wage this war in full battle dress. We cannot afford not to spend $1,895 billion in the coming year, with a great deal more to be required in the coming years finally to win the war. It is estimated that it will be necessary to spend a sum equivalent to two current defense budgets to raise those 35 million people now in poverty from their subsistence standard of living.

We will be making a hard-headed investment in the future when we continue adequately to fund the current level of programs of the Economic Opportunity Act. We can spend $4,200 once now to send a boy to the Job Corps or we may spend $4,100 every year for many years to keep this boy in a penal institution because he did not have anything else to do but get into trouble.

We can spend $1,500 today for job training for a father whose children are living on welfare or spend $2,500 year in

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and year out just to keep that family barely afloat in our economy.

We can spend $500 to provide a summertime job for a teenager to enable him to continue his schooling and thus have a chance to earn a decent living. Or we can spend approximately $100,000 to maintain him and his family on relief for the rest of their lives and lose another $13,000 in taxes which this individual would have paid had he been a wage earner.

The economic loss to this country caused by such unemployment is staggering. It has been estimated that national unemployment is costing us $30 to $40 billion each year in unused goods and services.

We can stop this yearly drain and make life worth living for millions of people by continuing the war on poverty. We have taken a first step, but only a first step. We have a long way to go.

Mr. Speaker, we are really choosing what kind of America we want to pass on to our children and grandchildren. One choice is an America in which 15 million children will grow up without adequate food, clothing, shelter, or education.

An America in which welfare rolls will continue to grow and the long-term unemployed will forever give up the hope of being gainfully employed.

An America in which 2 million teenagers will be out of school and unable to find jobs.

An America in which crime and delinquency among these teenagers will become a chronic, endemic, insoluble national issue.

An America in which one-third of the young men will continue to be rejected as unfit for entry into the U.S. Army because they will not have the education or health to pass the minimum standards.

Do we want to vote for this kind of America, or will we vote for job training for young men who never learned vocational skills in school, for remedial education to help young Americans complete high school, for special work-study programs to help the unemployed learn new trades, and for community projects to employ out-of-work teenagers on civic improvements?

Mr. Speaker, this is the choice now before us. At stake is the quality of American life tomorrow.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, just let me complete my thought, if I may, because I think it is one that really goes to the meat and the heart of the bill we are considering.

No one disputes the arguments made by the gentleman who just left the well of the House and the gentleman who preceded him, so far as all of us having a deep compassion for the resolving of this question of poverty. That is not what we are arguing about on this side of the aisle. What we are arguing about really are numbers. Numbers are cited again and again. It is said there are X numbers in this program and there are X numbers in that program and unless the total authorization is provided, it will not be that many of X numbers.

Well, that is probably true. But this is not what we are arguing on this side. What we are saying is this, simply taking X numbers out of a hat and saying you are going to do the job for them does not get the job done.

What we are saying is, let us take a few less numbers and do a good job for those few less numbers. This is the point I am trying to make so desperately here.

If I can refer to St. Petersburg once again and let us leave Harvard out of the argument.

The St. Petersburg Times is a great newspaper in the State of Florida and one which is almost always on the side of the administration and is certainly eminently fair to it. That paper wrote an editorial as well as several other articles on this project in St. Petersburg. I will simply read a sentence from the editorial. It is as follows:

> The shortcomings of the center as administered to date are serious.

This is the point that we are making over here.

Although I am on the committee, I did not serve on the subcommittee that held the hearings. But I have looked through the hearings. If any of you look through the hearings, you will be startled by the fact that most of the 700 or 800 pages are filled by stuff put in by the poverty war headquarters—self-serving kind of documents. Very little of the hearings is taken up by testimony or hard questioning of people who run these centers and other people who have looked into this and have found shortcomings.

All we are saying on this side is—Why in Heaven's name do we not as a House of Representatives have the courage to do the job I think we should be doing?

We have a joint committee on investigation of the Congress, but it seems to me what we ought to be doing much more of is taking a long, hard look at some of these programs and, instead of spending 6 days and giving this thing a lick and a promise approach here, that we should spend 6 weeks and all of the 6 weeks looking into the program and really finding out what makes them tick and what does not make them tick and then come to the floor of the House with something that we can honestly sell to the House of Representatives, to the entire Congress, and to the people of the Nation.

This is the point we are trying to make on this side of the aisle. We believe if we can keep the spending at the level of last year the administrators running this poverty program can get it under control and a better job will be done.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I repeat what I said at the end of the comments of the gentleman from Florida, when he had the floor; that is, the Office of Economic Opportunity is not asking for $825 million in title I. All they will go to the Committee on Appropriations for is $535 million.

The total amount of money appropriated last year has not yet been spent. They have committed funds, but those funds have not all been spent. Next year they will be able to spend for the programs being operated—not only the $412.5 million the gentleman from Florida would have us authorize under the amendment but also what has not been spent but was appropriated and obligated in the past fiscal year.

All we say is that the OEO should go slow enough to be certain of their work. We have seen them jump into the programs and make mistakes all over the place.

Members have brought up St. Petersburg. We could talk of Tongue Point and many other places where newspaper accounts of scandalous problems exist.

Let us have them use the money prudently as was done under the Manpower Development and Training Act. Under the Manpower Development and Training Act the Department of Labor did not go ahead as fast as some thought possible, when the program was first enacted by the Congress. They moved much more slowly. People were not able to assimilate the program as quickly as some believed possible. Because the MDTA moved slowly and was sure of the ground, we are now able to pass extensions of the Manpower Development and Training Act with support from both sides of the aisle.

If we continue to have these completely controversial programs, with some really outlandish costs, with things happening in communities where the people want to get rid of the program, it will be to the detriment of all. We should support the amendment of Mr. GURNEY.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon was granted permission to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment which has just been offered, and to any other amendments which may be offered to cut the funds in this war on poverty program.

I believe some of the criticisms we have heard during the past 3 days are justified, and I disagree with those people who pretend that everything is going superbly well. This is not true.

I am also aware that surely the people downtown know that all of the programs in the war on poverty are not working out as they had hoped, and surely they are just as much concerned as we are, because if the problems which Members have pointed out in the past few days are not resolved, surely the entire program will be placed in jeopardy within a year or two.

I should like to bring to the attention of the House some figures, which I believe are relevant to the debate today. I

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

asked the House Committee on Armed Services and the Library of Congress for some figures with respect to other programs.

They have advised me that they have compiled data showing that over $6 billion in projects have been canceled over the past 10 years. Many times these involve experiments which have not worked, which have failed. However, some of the expertise which was gained from these experiments has given them information so that then they can move ahead and can have a program which is indeed successful.

Let me give some examples. This also is true in the Space Administration.

There was the Dyna-Soar space plane. I am told it is pronounced like "dinosaur," and it is just as dead. Over $400 million was spent on this program. No prototype was built and it was killed in 1963.

There was the XB-70, the controversial mach 3, long-range supersonic bomber designed to replace the B-52's. That involved more than $1.5 billion, and was spent with two flyable planes emerging. The program was junked 2 years ago. This alone is almost as much as we are asking for the war on poverty program this year.

There was the Skybolt missile. I am advised this cost $440 million before it was canceled in 1963.

There was the mobile Minuteman. This was a $100 million plan before it was canceled in 1962.

There was the nuclear-powered aircraft. The Committee on Armed Services figures this cost $500 million before it was dropped in 1961.

There was no prototype available. The Snark intercontinental guided missile—was something like a guided missile airplane bomb. It was operational for about a year and then phased out quickly in 1962. The price tag on that was $675 million. And the Vanguard, which was a missile that kept blowing up on the launching pad. It was rated to have cost several hundred million dollars. The hope was to put America's first satellite in orbit, but this was finally accomplished, I am told by the Jupiter C.

Those of you who want to cut this program today but are willing to spend $20 or $40 billion on the race to the moon on a crash basis, are you sure, are you absolutely sure, that every single part of that program is going to be successful and that it is going to work and that every experiment in it is justified—that it is going to be worth the money, the effort? And that it will, indeed, be the spectacular success of the 20th century? And you who are willing to spend billions of dollars on highways, on defense, are you unwilling to spend less than $2 billion on one-fifth of our population which today is mired down in poverty and ignorance and oftentimes illness? Is not the war on poverty of equal concern to this democracy? What about "This Other America"—that Michael Harrington wrote about so eloquently and so persuasively?

Some of the programs are new and untried, and I certainly admit it. Some have already succeeded and admirably well. Others show great promise. Some have serious problems, as several colleagues have pointed out. They do have serious problems and need immediate attention, and I hope they are receiving that attention downtown. But it seems to me that the needs in this country are too great, too important, and too critical for us to do anything other than to try to do our very best to correct them.

Now, I am not deliriously happy over some of the reports from the Job Corps centers; and I am very concerned about a question which was raised by the gentleman from Iowa earlier this afternoon about negotiated contracts with big corporations on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. I hope attention will be given to that problem downtown and here in Congress. And I am not satisfied with the rationalization used to defend this procedure.

And I am not enthusiastic about sending troublesome and troubled kids from Portland, Oreg., to St. Petersburg, Fla., and sending troubled kids from St. Petersburg, Fla., and Georgia up to Portland, Oreg. I think there are some economies that could be made and which should be made in this program. And I do not like it a little bit when I or my office get cocky answers from cocky people downtown—who are so sure they know all the answers.

Furthermore, I would like to see more of the lessons learned from the CCC program applied to this. I would like to see some of the military discipline and more real work incorporated in the Job Corps program in this country at the present time. But outside of modifications in the present program I do not have an alternative and I have not heard better alternatives in these last 3 days. Sure we have the alternative of letting these kids stand on the street corners. We do have the alternative of putting the troublesome ones in barracks or labor camps or putting them in domiciliary institutions with no rehabilitative programs and 10 or 20 years from now they will be there and they will still be wards of society and we will still be paying for their keep.

We complain today about the junkyards bordering our highways and we willingly zone our communities so as to exclude these junkyards and dumps and sightly nuisances. But these young people, these dropouts from our schools, these unemployed and unemployable, are in effect junked and tossed on the human scrap heap. And we had better do our best to salvage as many of them as we can. I have heard about failures at Tongue Point in Oregon. Certainly we have heard about St. Petersburg, Fla., and other places. But did we ever really expect that we could salvage every one of these people who have known nothing but failure all their lives? We are not talking about "your" children. We are not talking about the well educated and highly motivated and well adjusted children. We are not talking about the most affluent section of our society. We are talking about children many of whom, through no wish of their own, were born into families which did not care. Many times they were children who were not wanted. They were youngsters who were exposed to indifference and neglect, yes, and brutality from the time they were very young. They were children in whose homes, if you want to call them that, children who come from houses where they were never exposed to the great moral and spiritual values we talk about in such self-righteous terms on the floor of this House.

I can recommend alternatives for the 4-year olds—and the war on poverty does—the war on poverty does this in the Head Start program; and I must say to the gentleman from Minnesota that I supported his amendment, and I wish that this whole program paid more attention to 3- and 4-year olds when I think we could do something about them instead of when they are 18, 19, and 20 and their pattern has been set. I thought that was a good amendment and I hope more consideration will be given to it in calmer moments. Better programs must be designed for the disadvantaged first graders and third graders—so they would not be applicants for the Job Corps—or the detention home—or the penal institutions when they are 17 or 18 or 20. So I could offer attractives for this age youngster.

And I can suggest an investment in kids in the same way that we are willing to invest in dams and reclamation projects, on a cost-benefit ratio; and those benefits can be measured and proven and should have been recognized by this Congress many, many years ago.

I can suggest an investment by society when that unwanted, uncared-for child is 5 or 6 years of age. But I cannot suggest better alternative programs for the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old kid who is unemployed and on the street corner and whom James B. Conant has described as social dynamite, ready to explode at any moment.

Let me say that I completely reject the philosophy which says we can afford $20 billion or $40 billion on a race to the moon, but we cannot afford to provide adequate educational opportunities on this planet to make life here on earth enriched and meaningful to our own children.

I reject the philosophy which says we must spend hundreds of millions to again break through sound with a still faster supersonic airliner—otherwise our national prestige will be hurt—but we cannot afford the money to help break through the walls of prejudice, indifference, neglect, and opposition so that decent opportunities will become available to every child, to every young boy and girl, regardless of race, creed, color, or sex.

Finally, let me close by quoting a statement made some time ago by one whom we all mourned only last week, Governor Stevenson, Ambassador Stevenson. He said this:

> I doubt that any society in history has faced so great a moral challenge as ours, nor needed more desperately to draw on the deepest sources of courage and responsibility.

> Ours is the first human community in which resources are so abundant that almost no policies lie beyond our capacity for purely physical reasons. What we decide to do, we can do. The inhibitions of poverty, lack of resources, lack of capital, lack of power—do not hold us back.

And so I say we must not be held back today by cutting the dollar appropriations that are in this bill, but rather that we move ahead by improving and building on what we have started.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will not adopt any amendment that materially reduces Job Corps funds that are worthwhile and needed funds.

I would first address myself, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] in response to statement which I believe he made earlier this afternoon, in that portion of the debate that concerned itself with the Governor's veto. I think he referred to some of the Neighborhood Youth Corps projects in Texas and he said he understood, or quoted some authority, that our Governor had vetoed them because the projects were biracial.

I would like to say to the gentleman that this is not the case. I do not wish to be impolite, but the gentleman from California just does not know what he is talking about in this instance.

Mr. Chairman, let me read to the members of the Committee a statement released by the Governor of our State in connection with the projects in south Texas, and I read it at this point:

Governor Connally today disapproved the Neighborhood Youth Corps grant of $331,480 to the Texas Farmers Union which had been previously approved by the U.S. Labor Department.

The Texas Farmers Union had proposed to operate an NYC program in 33 small school districts in eight South Central Texas counties, employing some 790 students part time. The application was approved in Washington on April 12, but, under provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act, must also be approved by the Governor.

At the Governor's request, the Texas Education Agency on April 26 and 27 contacted the 33 school districts involved in the TFU application. Of the 33 contacted, only 2 stated they wanted to enter the Texas Farmers Union program. The others stated that they preferred to work through the Texas Education Agency, or that they would prepare an application themselves for participation.

I fully agree with the objectives of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program and want to assure these schools and students of my desire to make this work experience available to them. I have therefore already requested the Commissioner of Education, Dr. J. W. Edgar, to immediately send field consultants from his agency to the schools concerned to confer with the school superintendents and assist them in preparation of individual applications for summer programs for their students should they desire to apply.

The Governor said:

In regard to his disapproval, the Governor made the following comments in his letter to Neighborhood Youth Corps National Director Jack Howard:

> I cannot approve of school districts entering into third-party contracts with quasi-political organizations for work-training programs. School districts are structured by statutes to provide a legal basis to promote educational programs requiring administrative, supervisory, and instructional personnel. I do not believe this responsibility can be delegated successfully to a third party who has no legal responsibility for discharging such duties. I further believe that students who participate in work-training programs generally should be employees of the school district only and that the payments they receive should come from the school district.

In reference to his statement that the Texas Farmers Union was a quasi-political organization, the Governor noted that the application of the Texas Farmers Union states that "the Texas Farmers Union is a general farm organization which has as its regular activity the organization of Texas farmers for the purpose of obtaining certain legislative goals."

The Governor also noted that the administrative costs of such a third-party arrangement are unusually high. The application proposed that the Farmers Union would employ a director of the project to be paid $15,000 per year, a deputy director to be paid $5,800 per year, and secretarial help at $4,200 per year.

Additional reasons for disapproval cited in the Governor's letter to Howard include: First, the application proposed that the sponsor should have the full authority to discontinue the enrollee's participation or to reassign the enrollee to another school when his performance was unsatisfactory; second, the project does not provide any real assistance from the sponsor to the schools in the supervision and administration of the program.

The original application for the program by the Farmers Union was made December 28, 1964, and was under consideration in Washington for almost 4 months. The application called for the project to run from January 4, 1965, to June 30, 1965. As approved in Washington, the project was extended through the summer to September 3, 1965.

The Governor's office noted that since approval has come so late in the school year, the summer program was the only feasible program now available and that this program will still be available through individual applications made by the school districts with TEA assistance.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from California that the impression was left, though I am sure it was not intentional, that our Governor was a segregationist or a racist and that he had not made progress in this field. Just the opposite is true.

Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege to work with the Governor many years ago in the old NYA program. I was a part of that program. He was a part of that State program. Together we, and at that time working with the same organization that our President set up when he was State Director of the National Youth Administration, traveled our State. We set up NYA projects that were worthwhile and even then they were biracial.

Mr. Chairman, the Governor of Texas, John Connally, has appointed to our State offices Negro citizens, appointed them to the highest State offices in the power of his command to do so. He has done this for Latins.

Mr. Chairman, we enjoy in Texas I believe the most healthy, desirable race relations of any State in the Union, including California.

I just hope, if the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] has some authority for his statement, I would welcome it. If he has not, I ask that he look into the matter and see that the RECORD is corrected in that respect.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKLE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am happy to say to the gentleman from Texas that of course I meant no reflection upon the Governor of Texas as an individual in any manner. And, if there was any such intimation, I certainly withdraw it.

May I say to the gentleman from Texas that this information was given to me on the basis of reports made by these particular districts, and I shall attempt to verify this information, which was to the effect that in these districts there were no biracial programs. If this information is wrong, I think the record speaks for itself, and I am happy to have it corrected.

Mr. PICKLE. I thank the gentleman from California very much.

Mr. Chairman, the big majority of our NYC programs are biracial. I have 3 or 4 of them in my district, and I know that for a fact, and this has been approved and encouraged by our Governor.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words about the Job Corps. I have listened to debate for some 2 or 3 days, and I would like to say this from experience. I have a Job Corps Center in my district, the Gary Job Corps Training Center, which is located 30 miles from the capital of my State, Austin. Today we have 1,500 enrollees in that project. If we can maintain our scheduled participation, we hope to have 2,500 to 3,000 by September. This is a project sponsored by the Texas Education Agency, and it was made available and possible because the Governor of our State cut through redtape and asked the permission of our attorney general and our legislature to set up this agency as an agent of the State.

Mr. Chairman, we have the full force of the Texas Education Agency behind us. It is a going, healthy, and I dare say it is the largest and most successful Job Corps program in the United States today, bar none.

Mr. Chairman, I have been to this project at least 6 to 10 times myself, and I have talked to hundreds of kids. We do have a very successful project now going on at San Marcos, Tex. And speaking of the races, Mr. Chairman, we have this kind of biracial participation at that project.

The Anglos are 52, Negroes 36, Latins approximately 12. I have looked in these boys' eyes and believe me they appreciate the fact they are given a second or even third chance to make good, to make something out of themselves.

Let me tell you about another project we have instituted in San Marcos. We have organized an Opportunity, Inc., program. This is a concern of some 30 to 35 top businesmen of Texas, representing the biggest firms we have, including Southwestern Bell, Humble Oil, Fredrick Airconditioning, Texas Instruments, Brown & Root, and others. They have agreed, at the request of our Governor, to set up this program so that we can coordinate the planning and later the placement. These top men operate at absolute cost. We do not go through a private agency like a lot of the other Job Corps. They outline the shops, they plan the training, they recommend the best and most practical equipment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. Pickle) he was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, these men have said that these boys are worth saving. They have said to the boys, "If you finish this course, we will hire every one of you." That is without equivocation and they will do it. These are the biggest men, if you want to say our most successful businessmen, the most successful business firms of our State. They are not being onlooker, they are participants in this program.

I say to you if you get your business people organized to cooperate on that basis, you could have a better project and these boys would have the assurance if they do good they will graduate and have a job.

This is a most worthwhile program. I have been there, I know, I have seen, I have looked into their eyes and I ask you not to cut these funds. It is one of the most promising programs we have going in America today.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw that motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the motion is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I offered that motion because about 150 Members of the House have asked me when we are going to stop talking about this thing and vote. We have spoken on this bill now for 3 days. If we can reach some kind of an agreement as to when we are going to vote, I think most of the Members of the House would appreciate it, if we know how many amendments we have up there at the desk and who will present them.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, speaking from the viewpoint of those on the committee, and I recognize there are those who are not on the committee who have amendments, I have 5 amendments here and I plan to take about 10 seconds apiece on them.

I want to offer them for the Record. I think they are amendments that follow in order and once one is defeated, obviously not much time will have to be taken up with the others.

The gentlemen from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] I believe has three amendments and I believe the gentleman from California [Mr. Bell] has one amendment.

We agreed from the beginning that we want to offer these amendments and take as little time as possible just to explain the amendment and then to sit down. I do think at least the members of the committee on this side should have a chance to offer their amendments.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the situation, the members of the committee had anticipated and had more or less made an informal arrangement that we would try to get through at 5 o'clock. It is a little after 5 o'clock now. I requested the gentleman from Florida to withdraw his motion because I do want to see these amendments properly disposed of. But could we not get an agreement as to a reasonable length of time?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. What are we going to do tomorrow? We are spending 3 days on a billion dollar bill—is that smart?

Mr. ALBERT. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri, I will try to get him some time.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. All I am trying to do is to try to legislate in a reasonable way and in a reasonable order. Why, on a bill of this importance we ought to have a whole week. But we always cut things off at the last minute so nobody can talk. So there is no debate on vital parts of the bill. I do not subscribe to that and I am not going to join in any coalition to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gurney].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons] rise?

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on section 18 and all amendments thereto close at 5:20 p.m.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk will report the preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Jones of Missouri moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I realize this bill is going to be passed here today regardless. We have seen during the last 2 days here voting to remove from the present law an anti-Communist oath and nobody on either side would admit or take sponsorship of removing that from it. We were told there was no debate in the committee and that there was nothing in the hearings showing why it should be deleted. But here they march down the line like a bunch of lambs going to slaughter—people I know are against Communists and who would be in favor of leaving that in this bill.

You have here involved a bill that some of us know little about. I know very little about it. I came here and I have been on the floor of the House pretty regularly. I have had some experience with this program. I think I know some of the things that can be improved about it and I have tried to offer some amendments that I think would improve it.

The members of the committee on both sides have monopolized all the time. The people who are trying to help in this program by making constructive suggestions are not given any consideration at all.

I am announcing this now, because I know we will not have time when the time is limited. You will vote in just a short time.

Some of you should be ashamed of trying to call yourselves legislators, when you are not willing to say here on this floor and are not willing to debate the issues, and are not willing to stand up for what you know is right.

I am talking to you from my heart. Your conscience is going to hurt you later on. You know it. I know it.

We have a duty to perform here, and some of us today are not performing that duty, because we feel bound to go down the line. I do not belong to any group like that. I at least have charge of my own vote. I have charge of my soul and of my conscience. I can go to sleep tonight and know that I have tried to do something to help improve this program. But in my opinion, a majority is not interested in improving the program.

I will ask the Chairman of the subcommittee right now: Can you name for me, Mr. Gibbons, the man who was responsible for taking the anti-Communist oath out of this bill? Can you do it? I will yield to you to give me the name of the person who did that.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Jones, I introduced the bill, and I will accept the responsibility for it. And I despise anyone who impugns my honesty, my integrity, or my patriotism.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am not impugning your motives. I am trying to find out who was responsible for that, because I do not believe a majority of the people here are in favor of doing that. A lot of people went down that aisle today. I have talked to some of them and they said, "We did not know what we were voting for." They said, "We were with the committee."

Well, I am not with the committee.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this bill, but I cannot help but

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

understand English. The gentleman was impugning the motives of every single Member who voted for that amendment.

I knew what the amendment was, and I did not walk down the aisle like a sheep. I walked down because I wanted to vote that way.

What is the gentleman doing, standing up to say that everybody who disagrees with him is a sheep or lamb? Or, if you agree with him, are you a goat? Or what would you be?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I did not impugn the motives of any Member who knew what he was doing, but I have talked to Members of the House who admitted they did not know what they were voting for when they walked down that aisle.

Mr. HAYS. You wanted Mr. GIBBONS to name somebody. Why do you not name the Members with whom you talked?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I do not name them. He did not name who was responsible for that.

Mr. HAYS. You do not name them. Well, I do not want to impugn your motives. I know what the rules are here.

I say that the people who are voting on this bill know what it is all about.

As for staying here, if it is necessary, I will stay here tomorrow and I am sure the gentleman will stay here, because the Interparliamentary Union is not meeting and he does not have anywhere to go.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The preferential motion was rejected.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all pending amendments and amendments thereto, for this section only, cease at 5:30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Florida how many committee amendments are pending. I have an amendment which I consider very important, and I have circulated this amendment around to the Members of the House. You have adopted the procedure of reading the bill in toto. In a case like that any latter part of the bill would not be subject to amendment or debate. How many committee amendments are there?

Mr. GIBBONS. There are no committee amendments to it.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto cease at 5:30.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Florida yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from Florida could have had at least one amendment out of the way if the Chair had recognized a Member who wanted to offer an amendment and if we had not gotten into the last colloquy which consumed nearly 10 minutes. You could have had at least two or three other people recognized and those amendments taken care of. I respectfully say and suggest, if you want to proceed and get things done and have the least amount of irritation, that the gentleman withdraw his motion and let the Chair recognize people who have bona fide amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GERALD R. FORD) there were—ayes 143, noes 89.

So the motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BELL

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to H.R. 8283, offered by Mr. Bell: On page 10, line 10, strike out "$680,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$340,000,000".

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Will the Chair announce who has time in the 10 minutes we have for the discussion of four or five or six amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not the slightest idea who has amendments.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Does not the Chair have a list of who has time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not have a list.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I ask, is it not the usual procedure that such a list is available when time is limited?

The CHAIRMAN. Not necessarily.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It has always been the custom, as far as I recall, that a list has been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman realizes that the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] has 5 minutes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am amazed at the change in procedure that has taken place in this instance.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I shall try to be brief. This amendment actually, as you know, is a very simple one. It cuts the amount back to $340 million from $680 million in the present bill.

There have been many problems, as you know, with the community action program. It has meant constant trouble to us. I think we should also consider that almost 75 percent of the funds budgeted for adult basic education, for example, this year, were not used. These funds carry over to next year. Then why do we need to double the fund?

I know there has been, as I have said before, a considerable amount of trouble with this program. I think that before we double this amount we ought to stop, look and listen. I recall that somebody made a comment about the amount of money we are spending on other things. We must remember that we are spending today $32 billion a year on other programs to fight poverty. This with the money to be spent in this bill is a considerable amount of money to be spending. I think we should give ourselves more time to work out the bugs in the programs that are giving us trouble before we double the expenditures. Let us be sure that the baby can crawl before we try to make him run.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to take some time to explain the remaining amendments that are going to be offered on our side after the amendment of the gentleman from California which is to reduce the funds in title II to the amount that is in the present law. The same type of amendments will be offered in the remaining titles, which have as their purpose to hold the authorization to present levels.

I might add, for instance, that all the OEO is going to ask for title V is $150 million, and we are doubling that.

In title III all OEO is going to ask for is $55 million rather than the $70 million in this bill.

The remaining amendments are going to transfer the portions of this act that are being administered by other departments of the Government.

There are portions of this act presently being administered by other departments of the Government. We think we should not have duplications of the activities in the OEO. For instance, we already have the higher education bill coming to the House which will transfer the work-study program to Health, Education, and Welfare. The work training program, called the Neighborhood Youth Corps, should be in the Labor Department which is handling it now.

The same with the rural poverty program. That should be transferred to the Department of Agriculture and handled by the FHA without OEO influence.

These are the amendments we are going to offer.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very unfortunate parliamentary situation we are in because of the unfairness to those who are not members of the committee and who have not had a chance to debate these amendments that are at the desk. I obviously am going to have no chance to explain my five amendments when they are offered, so I take this opportunity to mention them quickly. I shall offer amendments to hold the work experience title V expenditures at the present level; the administration's VISTA title VI at the present level; amendments to transfer the adult education program to HEW, as well as the work experience program for unemployed fathers to HEW, and to transfer small business loans to the SBA.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, perhaps this should be in the form of a parliamentary inquiry, but I think these amendments to which the minority members of the Education and Labor Committee have just referred should be offered after the time has elapsed so that those who are not members of the committee can have the remaining minutes in which to offer their amendments.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have at the desk is an important one. It is the amendment which I explained earlier in the day. It will call for limiting expenditures for running the program to not more than 10 percent of the total fund appropriated. This will maximize the benefits to the needy and will remove any possibility of wasteful amounts being spent on the administrative level.

I think it is understandable and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, just a little less than a year ago we were here in a similar situation initiating a bold new program to attack what one of the earlier philosophers of our days, Euripides said breeds evil. It was he who said that poverty is a disease; it teaches men evil.

At the time about 9 months ago many of the same charges flaunted today and almost all the same fears expressed today were being expressed at that time.

I must say as the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] has stated in her most eloquent address to the committee a few minutes ago, that I have been concerned about some of the disappointments in this program and some of the mistakes that have been made.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to understand that we will continue to make mistakes because we have human beings engaged in the program and as long as we are dealing with the human element we are going to continue to make mistakes.

But, Mr. Chairman, let us not make the mistake of turning our backs upon the great new program that we launched a year ago to remove from the scenes of this country, not poverty in money, but poverty in soul and spirit, poverty in mind, poverty that deprives citizens of participating in the full benefits of citizenship, a disease that prevents them from discharging their responsibilities of full citizenship.

Mr. Chairman, it was just a few days ago that this House with the enthusiastic approval of a large number of the opponents of this bill again moved to secure the voting franchise to thousands of Americans, who for one reason or another had been denied that right.

Now, all we are doing here today is to continue in motion a program designed to provide those citizens with the opportunity to learn how to discharge that voting responsibility intelligently, to discharge it for the benefit of a great country that is destined to lead toward a hoped-for freedom throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a time to quibble over mistakes. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania so appropriately asked, with whom are we dealing? What class of citizens is this program designed to reach? What is it we are trying to cure? Of course, we are going to continue to make mistakes. We have people engaged in this program who know nothing but evil, who have no reason to understand or appreciate the educational and cultural horizons that are being lifted for them.

Let us not for one moment reject the notion that we cannot here marshall the resources, of this great country financially, scientifically, legislatively, morally, and educationally, and lift these horizons for deprived American citizens, preparing them for full citizenship responsibilities and let them too join in our efforts to secure universal freedom.

This bill ought to be passed without further quibbling. The Members sent here to represent constituencies where the disease of poverty and its resulting evil is eating into the core of those constituent societies ought to be ashamed not to stand up and say, Yes, I am willing to give more because more is needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, in establishing the poverty program Congress created new dreams, new hopes, and the opportunity for a new future for hundreds of thousands of Americans. It should be our objective to insure that these aspirations can be realized.

Accordingly, I intend to vote for the authorization of additional funds for the acceleration of the work of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Where are the people who need the assistance provided by this act? Certainly New York City is one area where poverty is prevalent. In New York, the victims of poverty are of all ages. Some of them are abandoned, unwanted, or uncared for children. Many of these underprivileged children accept their condition as normal, for they have known no other existence. Some are teenagers who dropped out of school, were not able to find work, and are now roaming the streets, destined for serious trouble.

In New York City 247,000 people are unemployed; 77,000 of them are school dropouts.

Many of those who need the assistance provided by this bill are the parents of school dropouts. They, too, are unable to find employment.

Other adults, although employed intermittently, can maintain themselves and their families on a subsistence level.

Finally there are the aged; those in their sixties and seventies who cannot find work because of their age or whose health makes work impossible. In all, approximately 1.5 million persons in New York City are classified as living in poverty and one-half million of these are receiving welfare payments.

Most of New York's poor live in 16 so-called islands of poverty which comprise 30 percent of the city's population. Seventy-five percent of the people in these areas are nonwhites. The unemployment rate is 40 percent higher than in the rest of New York.

I speak of New York because the district I represent is there. The problem however, is not limited to New York. Increasingly, we are becoming a nation of huge urban complexes. As these centers evolve, the prevalence of urban poverty, and all of its contingent problems, increase immeasurably.

The need to act has been great and will become even greater.

I am proud to say that I was one of the 228 Congressmen whose vote made possible the enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act.

This legislation set into motion a massive campaign against poverty. I am not unaware of some of the problems which have arisen in formulating the programs under the act and in its administration. Much of this is inevitable in any crash program. But I think we should look at this rather affirmatively—we should look at the good that these programs are doing for human beings rather than condemning the entire noble effort because it falls short of immediate perfection.

Again, let me turn to the area I know most about—New York City.

Today in New York, many teenagers whose only sense of accomplishment had been winning street fights are now being taught to believe in themselves, to believe that the constructive application of their ability is worthwhile and a promising goal. Through the Jobs Corps they are participating in educational, work training, and physical improvement programs.

Eight thousand five hundred others in the 16 to 21 age group are going to have some jobs this year because of an $8,041,750 neighborhood grants. These young people will be working full or part time in varying capacities such as cleaning up parks, serving as orderlies in hospitals, sorting books in libraries, helping teachers in summer schools, and lending a hand in recreation centers.

Thus, through the Neighborhood Youth Corps, young people are enabled to stay in school, and also to have the feeling of dignity which comes with gainful employment in the summer months.

Many New Yorkers who thought that an advanced degree was economically impossible for them are continuing their

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

education through college work-study programs.

In the spring, 21 grants, totaling $317,000, were made available through this project, and during this summer, 20 grants, totaling $595,662, are being used to help New York City students work their way through college.

Were it not for Project Head Start, many of the city's youngsters could never dream of college. Behind this program is $4,772,874 which provides financing for communities to organize and operate preschool child development centers. These are designed to create an environment which will bring poor children to their full potential by improving their health and physical abilities, in developing their self-confidence, increasing their ability to relate to others, and building their verbal and conceptual skills.

In the city, 59 separate agencies and welfare groups will offer services at 228 centers in school buildings and settlement houses in support of the Head Start program. A typical center will serve 30 to 60 children, per teacher for every 15. There will also be dietary aids and others who perform specific tasks in helping the children embark in healthier and happier lives.

Not only the city's poverty-affected youth are being afforded opportunities for hope but adults also are being given direct assistance through programs provided through the Economic Opportunity Act.

Two work experience projects financed by grants totaling $1,500,500 provide help to needy persons, particularly unemployed parents with dependent children. These people gain constructive work experience and training. They also attend basic literacy classes, are given vocational instruction, and derive benefits from a wide range of social services.

What is probably the single most important source of assistance to New York City's poor have been the community action programs.

These projects are aimed primarily at the 16 islands of poverty in the city.

As part of this extensive effort, which involves both public and private nonprofit agencies, 5,000 more people will be hired to help other poor people. A system to provide family-type ties between New York City residents and recent migrants from Puerto Rico is currently being evolved. Other community action projects are now helping to ease tensions and develop economic improvement in the Negro slums.

These, then, are a few examples of how the EOA has come to the aid of impoverished New Yorkers.

The work done so far is only a beginning in the long and hard war against poverty. We must assure that it will be continued, and where necessary, expanded. We must do this so that those who are poverty stricken today may soon reach the proud position of being able to declare, "I don't need help any longer, because I now can stand on my own two feet."

That, Mr. Chairman, is why I strongly support this bill. That is why I will vote again for an investment in the future of hundreds of thousands of deserving underprivileged Americans.

Mr. Chairman, one final point should be made, and that relates to the question of the Governor's veto. Last year when speaking about the poverty bill on the floor of this House, I indicated that I had grave doubts about the advisability of giving Governors the extensive veto powers that the present Economic Opportunity Act now gives them. I suggested that a middle ground be struck. The current bill accomplishes just that. It is true that a Governor should be willing and able to participate in all programs which involve Federal assistance to the people of his State. Section 8 of the bill before us today enables all Governors to continue full participation in the Federal assistance programs which relate to the poverty stricken persons of their State. Section 8 of the bill continues to permit and moreover fully encourages the Governor of a State to review all poverty grant applications or plans under part B of title I and title II of the act as they affect his State. He is still permitted to disapprove of any such plan or proposal before the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity is authorized to approve any such plan or award any grant. I do not agree with those here who suggest that section 8 as reported by the committee permits the Federal Poverty Administrator to ignore the comments of the State Governors. The Administrator is not bound by those views but it would be the height of folly for him to fail to give careful consideration to them. Mr. Chairman, I, therefore, support the bill as reported out in this respect.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8283 to authorize funds for the Office of Economic Opportunity. Although it is only in its infancy, the war on poverty promises to root out the fundamental causes of poverty and deprivation in this Nation.

I am particularly encouraged by the progress being made in my own district under the Project Head Start program. This phase of the war on poverty permits local community groups to plan and execute their own programs to help disadvantaged children of preschool age prepare for school. This project is being carried out in my district by the Latin American Civic Association. I think it is an excellent example of how a group of citizens with a common background and need can work together to fight one of the basic causes of poverty in their own community.

Such local planning, cooperation, and dedication is essential to the success of the antipoverty program, and it is imperative that we continue to emphasize the need for this type of local participation and leadership.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly urge and hope that this House will speedily approve this measure before us, H.R. 8283, the Economic Opportunity Amendments Act of 1965.

Through the enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 this Congress and this country, less than a year ago, declared war upon the poverty of millions of citizens in a nation of abundance. The measure before us now is designed to carry on and expand the programs that were then initiated for the successful conduct of the war.

To those who entertain serious and sincere criticisms and skepticisms about various features of the overall operation of this great antipoverty program, let us give earnest and conscientious attention but let us also timely remind them that in every great war some weaknesses are bound to develop and even some battles may be lost. However that may be, in this crusade for the poor and despairing among us, let us willingly accept wholesome improvements of majority will and, above all, let us get on with the war.

I very deeply believe the consensus here in this body is that this national mission, basically to help the poor and the deprived to help themselves, is truly the most noble experiment and objective in which this Nation has ever engaged.

Embodied in this experiment and mission is the first real projection in our history of purposeful cooperative action on all governmental and private organizational levels, to help our poorer families reach for self-independence, to take young people off the street corners and train them for steady employment and encourage the uncertain to remain in classrooms until they earn their diplomas.

Mr. Chairman, the original legislation initiated projects and programs to inspire our communities to create appropriate measures to eliminate the evil roots of poverty at the local level; to enlarge opportunities for our youth to obtain the basic education, skills, and experience they must have to take a proper place in our society and become responsible parents in the future; to provide a better base for the revitalization of poorer areas in our great metropolitan cities by expanding small business activities; to assist destitute rural families in achieving improved living standards through the extension of capital grants and loans; to project selective plans to benefit undereducated adults and migratory agricultural workers; to motivate more States to utilize public assistance as a means to help families help themselves; to throw off the discouragements of poverty and to recruit and train volunteers to carry out the war on poverty.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be commonly agreed here that an objective assessment of the programs and projects, as a whole, initiated by the original legislation appear now to have been very soundly conceived and that they have been faithfully and efficiently carried on.

Our business then today is to remedy and repair weaknesses that can be demonstrated and provide for the continuation and expansion of this war to eliminate deprivation and dependency in this great Nation. At this point, Mr. Chairman, it may be well and in order to remind ourselves that the American taxpayers are still making great sacrifices of life and resources for the promotion of peace, progress, and prosperity throughout an uncertain world. Let us then, in accord with out duty and tradition, demonstrate our legislative concern for our own people, which is our primary responsibility, and especially for those of the less fortunate among us by promptly approving this historic legislation.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to rise in support of H.R. 8283, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965, and to urge its passage without the crippling amendments that are being offered by our Republican critics.

The war on poverty, less than a year old, has been well begun. We rightly boast of our affluent society and yet we have permitted one-fifth of our people—some 35 million—to live in poverty and on the outskirts of hope. The thrilling new war on poverty has given them for the first time a chance to escape from their plight and share in the promise of this Nation.

It is captious and unreasonable to expect that pioneer programs of such magnitude and complexity could be carried out without any difficulties or failures. I submit that the record of the past 11 months since the enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act justifies pride and confidence in its wisdom and effectiveness. The war against this deep-rooted domestic enemy cannot be won overnight, but the important thing is that at last it has been undertaken. Now that the organizational setup has been completed, the program will proceed with increasing effectiveness, provided that no drastic revisions of the operating provisions are written here today. It is ironic that the critics of the past year's achievements would deny us a large enough arsenal of weapons to win this war that demands the mobilization of all our resources. The crippling amendments offered by opponents of H.R. 8283 would prevent us from moving forward this most worthwhile campaign to save lives.

In his message on poverty in March 1964, the President stated:

> We are fully aware that this program will not eliminate all the poverty in America in a few months or a few years. Poverty is deeply rooted and its causes are many. But this program will show the way to new opportunities for millions of our fellow citizens. It will provide a lever with which we can begin to open the door to our prosperity for those who have been kept outside. It will also give us the chance to test our weapons, to try our energy and ideas and imagination for the many battles yet to come. As conditions change, and as experience illuminates our difficulties, we will be prepared to modify our strategy.

Those words hold true today. The Nation can afford no longer the demoralizing and dehumanizing effects of poverty. I urge that we build upon the experience of the past year and proceed with the great unfinished task of eliminating the causes of poverty in America. The distressed, the hungry, and the hopeless of this Nation look to us today to give them a chance to help themselves through the antipoverty programs. Let us not fail them.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, several revelations have been made during this debate concerning the virtual impossibility of getting any information from the princes who control the various subprograms set up under the predecessor to this bill. When any inquiry is made by letter concerning any particular project or application, the letter is still unanswered after weeks and months have elapsed. When the inquiry is by telephone, the person desired is either out of the building, or is on another telephone. The nice secretary who gives this information, sweetly promises to have the call returned at once. The call is not returned, and after several such attempts, and some days have passed, one finally loses patience and demands attention, but then receives only inconclusive and unsatisfactory answers to the questions posed. With the scores of high-salaried bureaucrats and their hundreds of expensive consultants and advisers, as revealed thus far in this debate, it does seem that better service could be rendered to applicants, and to Members of Congress who are trying to get information for their constituents.

I had a recent case which I believe relevant to this debate, and which I will outline for you at this time.

On April 30 of this year, there went out from the Department of Labor, over the signature of its Secretary, a letter to the principal of C. L. Simon High School, at Cushing, Tex., inviting the participation of his school in a program called athletes in temporary employment as agricultural manpower, called A TEAM for short.

The school promptly replied, naming one of its teachers, Norwood E. Golden, as school team coordinator, as requested in the Labor Secretary's letter, and expressing a desire to have a group of its students participate in the project, as outlined in the Secretary's letter, promising summer employment, together with proper housing and meals and good pay, together with a good salary for the team coordinator.

May 15 came the reply from the Department of Agriculture, Office of the Secretary, signed by the project coordinator, Mr. Fornos, advising the school that a local representative would contact the school to assist in forming the A TEAM at the school. Also sent to the school was a pamphlet stating that the members of the A TEAM would be provided housing and transportation, and that there would be no maximum on the wages received, but in no case would the pay be less than $1.15 to $1.40 per hour.

Under these conditions, Mr. Golden had no difficulty in recruiting the necessary number of boys for the team. He and the boys were promised a trip to California, and that the program was to begin June 7. Mr. Golden abandoned his plans for different summer employment; the boys, and there were 34 of them in this team, invested in necessary clothes, most of it on credit to be paid for out of their promised earnings; some of them turned down other employment on account of the glamorous promises made them in the Department's literature. Mr. Golden made financial commitments on the basis of the program's promises; the boys and their parents accepted the Department's promises as true, partly, at least, because of their confidence in Norwood Golden.

Came June 7; the team received no instructions about where to report, and could get no information as to the cause. After some days, Mr. Golden called Mr. Fornos' office, and thereafter a number of such calls, all at his own expense, to no avail.

Finally, the summer almost half gone, on June 28, he wrote to me, stating his difficult, and soliciting my aid. On June 30, upon receipt of the letter, I forwarded same to the Secretary of Labor with a letter from myself, seeking an explanation and relief for the Cushing A TEAM.

Some days later, having no reply to my letter, I began trying to communicate by telephone. After 2 or 3 days of not having my calls returned, I told the secretary who was answering the telephone that I knew it was not her fault, and then explained to her my thoughts about the situation. This resulted in my talking with Mr. Fornos, but I could get no satisfactory answer as to why such promises were made to the Cushing A TEAM and its coordinator, nor could I get an explanation why the school was being ignored, and being kept on the hook, when it was obvious that there would be nothing for the team.

I asked why something had not been provided, according to promises, and was told that this was a team composed of Negro boys—which I already knew—and that there were a number of teams of white boys that wanted jobs, too. I did not deem this to be a satisfactory reply, because I do not believe the inquiries from the Negro team should be ignored, merely because it was a Negro team.

In truth, I believe it more reprehensible to make promises to the Negro boys than to white boys and their coordinators. The white boys would be less apt to be misled by the puffing and bloated promises made to them, and less apt to swallow such bait hook, line, and sinker. I do not mean by this that I condone false and misleading promises from the Federal Government to anyone, but do believe there are degrees of such evil.

At any rate, during our conversation, I told Mr. Fornos if he was not going to provide anything for this A TEAM the Department had promoted, that he ought to write Mr. Golden and let him know, rather than keeping them dangling from the hook all summer. He promised to do so, and to send me a copy of his letter. That was approximately 3 weeks ago; I have not yet received such letter, and can only assume it has not been written.

The American people are paying, and paying dearly, for better service than this. Their inquiries should not be ignored. Assuming that this is not an isolated case, and I must so assume because I know of similar others, it is long past due that attention be given thereto, rather than permitting it to become progressively worse, by appropriating additional moneys for some more of the same.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday my colleague from the Second District of Ohio, whose district contains part of Cincinnati as does mine, attacked the war on poverty. His claim was that the program does not attack the basic problem, that of hunger; that the program is not using the correct means to arrive at the goal of ending poverty; that the structure which is set up is failing to work; that more power should be given to the States to deal with the problems of poverty; and that more power should be given to the Governors of the States than would be permitted by the amended bill. He supports much of his statement by relying on the newspaper accounts of comments by Juvenile Court Judge Benjamin Schwartz, of Cincinnati, who was one of the original members of the Community Action Commission in Cincinnati which seeks to implement the fight against poverty in the Cincinnati area. Unhappily, the remarks made by my colleague about Judge Schwartz have been printed for the whole Nation to read, even though they are incomplete, inaccurate, and, as the judge himself protested in public letters, entirely distort his meaning.

In the opening paragraph of the public letter of Judge Schwartz of July 15, which was widely printed in the press, and which condemns the newspaper interpretation relied upon by my colleague to build his case, Judge Schwartz said:

> Unfortunately my recent comments in a newspaper regarding the war on poverty and the Community Action Commission were misconstrued by those reporting them in such a way that misunderstandings and errant opinions were the result. In this letter I would like to make emphatic the fact that this court has never disagreed with the philosophy and goals of the war on poverty because we have fought long and hard ourselves for many years to alleviate the misery of the poor.

Further, he praised some portions of the program:

> We recognize that such programs as "Project Head Start" and the emphasis on education and jobs are excellent and can be a large step forward.

About the problems of hunger in Cincinnati he said:

> This court has seen only too graphically the procession of the results of hunger and need. The hostility and delinquent behavior of youngsters and the despair of parents demonstrates time after time the old truism that "hunger is the mother of crime and revolution" so we are firm in our belief that hunger and the other basic needs must be alleviated before many of the other programs of the war on poverty can succeed.

This is the core problem of Mr. Schwartz' difficulties with poverty. Hunger to him is at the base of many of the cases he handles in his court; and he says that much could be solved by an increase in State payments:

> The general relief program is basically a State responsibility, but with the shortage of funds, scarce and underpaid staff minimum needs of the less fortunate are still left unmet in many ways. This is why over 8,000 children in our schools were found to be without lunch, and after all efforts had failed with agencies and schools, we were ultimately forced to take this problem to dedicated citizens within the community, who have helped so often before, to obtain temporary assistance until a more permanent solution was found later on after the "countryside had been aroused." The entry of the food stamp program of the Welfare Department of Hamilton County has helped locally in some respects, raising the percentage of the minimum needs being met from 70 percent to approximately 80 percent, but obviously this is still not sufficient, and many of the youngsters and their families are still "slipping through the cracks" of the community structure.

There is the rub, Mr. Chairman. The very core of the criticism of the general poverty program is essentially a problem caused by the Governor of the State of Ohio, who has invoked an austerity program upon the poor of the State. Disregarding this, my colleague uses a misstatement of Judge Schwartz' criticisms to serve as the basis for his criticism of a Federal Government program. Why does my colleague not attack the program which is the core problem for Judge Schwartz? Why does he not raise his voice in criticism of the Governor of Ohio? He is a member of the Governor's party, and should have some influence. I have looked in vain in my files for a criticism by my colleague against the Governor. Can it really be that he does not understand the implication of Judge Schwartz' criticisms—that at bottom it is the fault of the Governor of Ohio?

It is true, of course, that Judge Schwartz criticizes some portions of the Federal Government war on poverty—we all criticize it with a view to improving it. But what my colleague does not mention about the resignation of Judge Schwartz from the Community Action Commission is that he attended only the first meeting of that body and sent a delegate thereafter. It is unfortunate that my colleague's case should be built on attendance of the judge at one meeting. What do the other prominent persons from Cincinnati think about the resignation?

Dr. Campbell C. Crockett, dean of the University of Cincinnati Graduate School, commented:

> It is unfortunate that the judge didn't choose to work out within CAC the problems that are the crucial ones. It's pretty easy to stand outside, criticize, and then resign, and I regret that we will not have his resources to work with.

Dr. Thomas J. Hailstones, dean of the college of business administration at Xavier University, commented:

> I don't see why, if he has some good ideas, the judge doesn't attend our meetings more frequently and express them. There is a substantial difference of opinion between the feelings of the judge and the rest of the commission. The only way for us to whip poverty is for all to work together, pool our ideas, and tackle problems with cooperation and vigor.

Mr. Stanley G. McKie, president of the Cincinnati Board of Education said that he was "disappointed that Judge Schwartz offered his resignation. I think the judge might help more by staying on. I would hope he would reconsider."

Another point should be considered about the speech of my colleague. For years he and the members of his party, at the local, State, and National level, have been complaining about the Federal power grab, using this myth to carry on a sterile, political monolog with the voters. Now we are using a program device which will assure decentralization of decisionmaking, assuring to the local people the opportunity to make local decisions, administering what are Federal funds with the greatest amount of local freedom. We of the majority party want this program of local responsibility to work. It will not be stopped by Congressmen who, now that they have the kind of program structure they have been calling for all these years, do not know what to do with it and refuse to assist in any way. It will not be stopped by persons who come out for the war against poverty only when they know it will be carried on and will be successful. It will not be stopped by persons who have never before spoken about the issue, who have not challenged the leadership of their State, local, and Federal party groups when in fact they have prevented any kind of war against poverty when they were in power. No, Mr. Chairman, happily for these United States, the people are more intelligent, and are led more ably, than my colleague knows, and they will support our efforts.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I will support H.R. 8283.

It is too soon to make a meaningful assessment of the impact and administration of the poverty program. To be sure we have been alarmed by excessive political involvement in some cities, by the haste with which some programs have been undertaken, by unfortunate experiences where applicants have not been adequately screened. Nevertheless, it can be said that important strides have been made.

In the Fifth Massachusetts District, which I am honored to represent, two institutions of higher education are now participating in the college work-study program: The Lowell Neighborhood Youth Corps is performing vital community tasks never undertaken before. The large Head Start program in Lawrence shows hopeful signs of bringing underprivileged youngsters to a level where they can compete effectively with other children when they begin school in the fall. Seven other Fifth District communities are also conducting Head Start programs.

There is no doubt that there is ferment in many communities around the country. Perhaps this was the predictable result of an effort to change the traditional patterns of social and economic organization which have, in some instances, prevented Americans from progressing as far as their character and ability will take them. This fact makes it imperative that the Office of Economic Opportunity permit local communities to do the job themselves. It should never interject itself into the decision-making process at the local level.

As I said, I think that it is too early for a meaningful assessment of the program. But I think that the Congress will be remiss in its duty if it does not conduct a thorough study of the program early in 1966. By that time, we will have enough data on which to base an inquiry. The Office of Economic Opportunity, like all agencies, should be held to a strict accounting of its use of funds and the standards of achievement should be set high. The results of such a study should be given great weight in determining the necessity or wisdom of additional legislation at that time.

If we fail to provide diligent oversight over this program we will not be living up to our responsibility to see that Federal money is spent wisely, nor will we be serving the cause of the unfortunate Americans for whom this program is conducted.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, last Sunday I spent 3 hours at the Job Corps center at Camp Kilmer in my district. This was my third visit to the center and I have been consistently impressed with what I have seen. The 1,000 young men between 16 and 21 years of age are a cross section of the Nation. They come from Georgia, Louisiana, Alabama, Kansas, Pennsylvania; in fact, they are from every corner of the country. They are getting the counseling, the morale-building, and the other help they need under a program run by one of our largest industries. Along with some wonderful men from Rutgers University, representatives of Federal Electric of I.T. & T. with tremendous experience in job training are doing an excellent job with the trainees.

This particular project has attracted national attention from the start. The top people in the AFL–CIO in educational and economic opportunity work have visited the camp and have indicated that they like what they see. The president of the National Hotel & Restaurant Workers has stated that they will need 150,000 men to work in cooking and baking. They have made some suggestions and they generally have endorsed the program.

There is also a tremendous shortage of men to serve the motorist in gas stations and doing automotive repairs that do not require the training of an automobile mechanic. Private industry has donated over $100,000 in machinery and equipment so the young men may be trained and become employed.

The National Boy Scout headquarters are in the area and four Explorer Scout troops are being organized. A 4–H program is being started with the help of the Cornell Dairy Farm and the Farmer's Cooperative Association of New Brunswick. Through this program the young men will have vegetable and flower gardens and will be trained to do landscaping.

Many of our early fears concerning discipline and the behavior of the young men have faded away. Actually, the communities have embraced these young men so that they are enjoying social advantages they never had before. Many of our good people are simply showing some love, a commodity which many of the young men have never received.

I spoke to instructors whom I know who took employment here on leaves of absence from their regular jobs and they tell me that there is a ray of hope and of light. These young men have grown and they have a new social outlook. They now realize that they can become good citizens and that there is a place in society for them. Our people in all walks of life are interested in them. This is a hard job and is one which requires dedication and patience. If we pursue it, it will be well worth our while.

Yesterday as I listened to some of the opponents of this bill talk, I was made to feel that it was a crime to be poor. I have checked out what I am about to tell you; namely, that many in the group of enrollees are good, healthy, normal, intelligent young men and that they will profit greatly from this program. They are moral and they are industrious. Unfortunately, many come from impoverished backgrounds where they could never dream of the equal opportunity we hope to give them when they complete their training course. It is no crime to be poor; it is a crime to refuse help to those who need it when we ourselves live in a state of accelerating affluence.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of record that I voted against the so-called Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. I would like to add—for that same record—that I did so with reluctance, and with the hope that my reservations about the efficacy of this historic effort to eliminate poverty in our land would prove to be ill-founded, because I fully recognized the laudable ambitions of those who supported the passage of that act and the need—an urgent need, I might add—for innovation and improvement in the then-existing programs for cooperative Federal, State, and local attacks on the causes of self-perpetuating poverty.

What might be called the preamble to the 1964 act—by which I refer to section 2, thereof—sets forth a lofty goal, and one with the appropriateness of which there can be no dispute:

> It is, therefore, the policy of the United States to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty in this Nation by opening to everyone the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity.

We have heard, here, these past 3 days, many echoes of those challenging words. But that same section goes on to say—in its final sentence:

> It is the purpose of this act to strengthen, supplement, and coordinate efforts in furtherance of that policy.

Have we succeeded?

As those of us who served in the last Congress can testify, last year's act was passed in a spirit of urgency, if not of haste, and those of us who sought to submit or to support amendments designed to improve or to clarify the hastily and loosely drawn product of the committee's enthusiasm—which action we felt was required of us as responsible legislators—or those of us subsequently felt compelled to vote against that bill on final passage because we were still so troubled by so many of its provisions, were wrongly charged at a later date as being either woefully blind to the fact of the existence of poverty in America, or wilfully callous to the plight of those who suffered from the blight of being poor.

However, it is apparent that even the most ardent supporters of last year's bill feared, at least in some degree, that certain of our questions concerning the wisdom and workability of the various programs set up thereunder had validity. This is borne out, for instance, by reference to the first sentence of the first paragraph of the report accompanying this year's bill, wherein the committee majority states that the 1-year authorization granted in connection with the 1964 act was "a control technique developed by the Congress in order to require a close check and reevaluation of this new program."

Congress, in its wisdom, having approved of this declaration of war on poverty—which approval was evidently thereafter ratified by the electorate—I am perfectly willing to abide by that decision.

I am equally willing, Mr. Chairman, to vote the necessary funds to carry on that war as well as to escalate it, where such escalation is indicated as being required on the basis of such combat experience as we have now had.

However, the pertinent question, here, as I see it, is whether or not we have yet acquired, at the level of action, a sufficient experience with this program in all its various aspects to financially escalate it to twice the current level, as recommended in H.R. 8283. In my judgment, we have not.

Another pertinent question revolves around our continuing responsibility as legislators to "reevaluate"—for that is the word used by the committee majority in its report—a program which, of necessity, is experimental in nature. Have we carried out that responsibility? In my judgment, again, the answer has to be we have not.

Let me refer, again, to the committee report. In the second paragraph on page 1 of the report, it stated that certain "on-the-spot field investigations" were undertaken by an ad hoc subcommittee of the full committee. This was evidently in addition to the 6 partial days of hearings held by that special subcommittee here in Washington. But, the report then sets forth this admission:

> A more complete investigation was not possible because of the very heavy congressional legislative schedule during the early part of the 89th Congress.

And it is added:

> It was not possible to completely judge some of the programs of this great new approach to the elimination of poverty because the program is only in its initial stages of operation.

And, Mr. Chairman, with respect to those 6 or so days of formal hearings here in Washington, the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] stated at the outset, and this appears on page 3 of the hearings:

> These hearings will be brief. There will be no filibusters allowed. We will rigidly adhere to the 5-minute rule. Witnesses will be cut to a minimum list. We intend to pass this bill out by the 1st of May.

A quick run-through of the hearings will indicate, to anyone who is willing to look, that the hearings were, indeed, brief and the list of witnesses was, indeed, cut to a minimum.

Thus we have before us, now, as so many of my friends on this side of the aisle have been attempting to point out, a woefully inadequate lack of basic information on which to justify, either to ourselves, or to the taxpayers of America, or even to the poor, themselves, who must depend upon us to make this experiment bear fruit, a virtual doubling of the funds with which to carry on this war.

As for myself, I am convinced that there has been far too much emphasis on fast action in and by the Office of Economic Opportunity, and too little emphasis on skilled and sensitive planning, as well as—in Chairman POWELL's own words—too many "giant fiestas of political patronage" at the local or community level, and too much political infighting and duplication of effort as well as overlapping of goals.

Some of this is understandable. Perhaps, in view of the experimental nature and the very magnitude of the effort, some of this is even excusable. But will we—can we—help to eradicate such unfortunate aspects of our experience with the program so far by bailing in twice the amount of funds as are now in use? I do not see how.

We share a common burden of responsibility to those of our fellow citizens who are poor—but we have an equal responsibility, for which we must answer to all whom we represent, for legislating in a manner befitting a deliberative body—something this particular Congress all too often seems to be not—and of applying to the problem we face and to the decision we must make as much commonsense as we can muster, in order that we can truly serve the constructive purposes this program offers.

In conclusion, then, Mr. Chairman, unless this bill can be held at a reasonable and appropriate level of authorization under existing circumstances, I shall feel constrained to vote against it.

I shall do so, in essence, because I believe it unwise to fire the second barrel of what has up to now been a rather tragic kind of shotgun blast at poverty, until we are sure that our first shot has found at least some portion of the target.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, on March 8, 1965, I addressed the House with regard to a serious problem which confronted our State with regard to the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I pointed out that our State was most interested in erasing the causes of poverty in this Nation. I pointed out that our State had established within the office of the Governor a division of economic opportunity staffed with competent professional personnel, to coordinate and assist in this program. Such cooperation, it was felt, could bring the full resources of our State and its agencies to bear on these problems.

In spite of this cooperation and intent, the State cabinet felt compelled to pass a resolution in which they noted that projects under the Economic Opportunity Act, which were subject to the approval of the Governor, had been negotiated directly by the Washington Office of Economic Opportunity and other Federal agencies having delegated responsibilities under the act. I considered this to be a breach of the intent of the program and urged at that time that this matter be cleared up. We have not seen much improvement.

I would further point out that we have seen some rather serious problems develop with regard to this program. Poverty is a relative matter, and it is my opinion that the millions we are spending are not really getting to the heart of the matter. Of course, there have been successes in the program, but there have been some notable cases of bungling.

I voted for this program last year and said at that time that I would review my decision and expected that we would see some substantial strides in administration and accomplishment if I were to vote to continue this particular attack on poverty. I would point out that the Office of Economic Opportunity is not the only Federal program that seeks to help the poverty stricken, for in our agriculture, area development, education, and health programs we are attempting to seek out the causes of poverty and eliminate them.

I feel quite strongly that this program has not met the basic needs and that it should be revamped and that more cooperation should and must be shown to State governments like Florida, where progressive people can cooperate and work for the very ends for which this program was established.

Mr. Chairman, the House last year authorized $947.5 million for the Office of Economic Opportunity and its program for combating poverty in this country. This year H.R. 8283 is requesting an authorization of $1.895 billion, about double that which was authorized in the last fiscal year. It seems to me that this program has not progressed to the point where it can efficiently be doubled in 1 year and achieve the maximum amount of efforts toward the combating of poverty without an unusual amount of waste and duplication and inefficient use of tax dollars.

I am also somewhat disappointed, Mr. Chairman, that the Office has not made further advantages of the Job Corps training which, in my opinion, can be one of the greatest services to this country in teaching young men and women skills that are so needed. I feel that this is where the heart of the program should be and that not enough effort and emphasis is being placed in this particular field.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, the House will undoubtedly approve H.R. 8283, doubling the appropriation for the administration's war-on-poverty program, thus bringing its spending authority to $1.9 billion. Unfortunately, H.R. 8283 also proposes to abolish the Governor's veto power over the community action programs.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 authorized appropriations for the poverty program for 1 year. This 1-year appropriation was authorized to insure the operational record of the program's first year would be carefully reviewed, administrative procedures reevaluated, and the effectiveness of the program in accomplishing legislative objectives carefully appraised.

However, after a cursory and, in my opinion, inadequate consideration of only one of the 10 programs of the poverty war, the House Education and Labor Committee abruptly terminated hearings on the program, though many witnesses remained to be heard, and reported this bill to double appropriations for the program.

In practice, the poverty program has been beset with administrative difficulties, by controversy among local governments and existing service agencies, by charges that highhanded bureaucratic methods have completely bypassed local agencies and administrations. These charges and difficulties should be investigated. Congress should have full and adequate information as to how these difficulties can be resolved with the existing war-on-poverty strategy.

Furthermore, I take issue with the proposal to abolish the Governors' veto power over community action programs. Already those programs sponsored by an institution of higher education are exempt from the approval of the Governors. The Governors' veto power is to assure that programs are coordinated with the array of local-State-Federal programs administered by State agencies. Not only should this power be maintained, it should be extended.

Certainly, local bickering, political boondoggling, and administrative difficulties, do not tell the whole story of the poverty program. Despite its experimental nature and its short duration, the poverty program has garnered the interest and assistance of well-meaning citizens who are aware of some of the problems of low-income families and who wish to help alleviate some of these problems. In my district in Kansas local response has resulted in a number of headstart programs successfully underway this summer, four of our colleges are assisting college students from low-income families under the college work-study program. In western Kansas, programs to assist migrant farmworkers and their children continue.

As the record of the poverty program now stands, confused, inadequately evaluated, rampant with administrative delay and controversy, instead of escalating the poverty war to twice its present size by doubling appropriations authorizations with this bill, Congress should know where this money is be spent and how the shortcomings of the program are to be eliminated. We cannot ignore the problems and difficulties inherent in the poverty program as it now operates. We cannot simply pump twice as much money into the program and expect these difficulties to resolve themselves. It is the responsibility of Congress to investigate these difficulties and take necessary legislative action if we expect this Economic Opportunity Act to in any measure achieve its noble objectives.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I have heard it argued by opponents of this bill that the achievements of last year's act cannot yet be ascertained. But, the facts are that the economic opportunity program has already relieved many sections of our country where aid was badly needed. Although a total appraisal is not possible, the evidence thus far dramatically indicates the real worth of the economic opportunity program.

In the 1 year since its creation the economic opportunity program has made available to Miami, Fla., nearly $4 million, which has been effectively used to increase employment, particularly that of young people, to aid students, to provide for adult education and increased educational opportunities for migrant workers, and to develop community welfare programs.

Much of the credit for the effective utilization of funds in Miami must go to the Economic Opportunity Program, Inc., of Dade County. This nonprofit organization, established by community leaders, has developed a system of program priorities and has coordinated the activities of the various groups that receive aid. It has also worked to disseminate in Dade County information about the poverty program.

In the area of employment, the Miami Youth Opportunity Center of the Florida State Employment Service announced recently that 25 percent of the 12,000 Dade County high school graduates have already secured permanent jobs. The State employment service has helped by administering tests and selecting students with skills in various areas.

The Youth Opportunity Center has sent letters to employers in the area in an effort to spearhead a drive to hire young people. A welcome addition to the services performed by these two organizations is that of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, established under the OEO. It provides jobs for youngsters in families with incomes under $3,000.

The adult education programs—as well as work-study plans at local colleges—which enable students to complete their education by providing them with part-time jobs, help to uplift the educational level of Dade County.

Despite the overall success of the program in the Miami area, one large sector of the population there has not fully shared in all the benefits of the program. These are the Cuban refugees who have entered the United States in their effort to flee the plague of Castro communism. Since 1961, almost 200,000 of them have entered the United States through Miami with almost half that number residing there at present. While we welcome these individuals, their presence has placed an extraordinary burden on the social, educational, and welfare agencies of Dade County.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my esteemed friend and colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], for offering the amendment cosponsored by me and my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], which permits young Cuban refugees to participate in the Job Corps and neighborhood youth program. In addition, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], for his assistance in allowing this amendment to come to the floor of the House of Representatives for a favorable vote.

It is readily apparent that the war on poverty has had a successful start in Miami. Clearly, then, the bill now under consideration will strengthen last year's legislation and should be enacted.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8283, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965.

Though only a short 10 months old, and not without its share of the normal administrative difficulties in getting started, the economic opportunity program has already proved that it has the potential of becoming a valuable and effective tool in mobilizing the Nation's human and financial resources to attack the basic causes of poverty and high unemployment among America's 30 million disadvantaged citizens.

As one of the original congressional sponsors of President Johnson's war on poverty, I am confident that we will all be the beneficiaries of this promising new approach to solving the tragic paradox of extreme poverty in the midst of an alltime record high prosperity for most Americans.

In addition to the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps which offer basic education and job training for young people who are both out of school and out of work, the war on poverty includes a work-training program to keep teenagers from dropping out of high school, a work-study program to help needy college students continue their education, a comprehensive community action program to assist local groups in antipoverty projects tailored to special community needs, and the VISTA program, the domestic version of the world famous Peace Corps, composed of highly qualified volunteers who serve in areas of intense urban or rural poverty.

The antipoverty program represents a national commitment to the elimination of deprivation and dependency in the United States. It has been rare in peacetime that so many agencies, public and private, Federal, State, and local, have joined together with such singleminded purpose. Certainly, never before in our peacetime history has such a large and complex program gotten underway so successfully and in such a short period of time.

This program is not directed just at the symptoms of poverty, but rather at its causes. It is a program which seeks not merely to ameliorate and alleviate, but to prevent and rehabilitate. It seeks not to support the poor or make them dependent upon the generosity of others. It seeks instead to provide them with hope, with training, and, in short, with a chance to help themselves.

Understandably, the war on poverty places great emphasis on the young, and on education and job training. There is provision, of course, for a great variety of other services, other aids, designed to help people lift themselves from poverty. In fact, the range of services and types of assistance that are possible under this program and available to the poor are, in a very real sense, limited only by the ingenuity of those designing local programs for the poor.

With the tremendous support this program has received so far from all parts of the country, I am confident we will meet the solemn commitment undertaken last year to eliminate want, deprivation, and need, in this, the richest Nation on earth.

Already we can point to major accomplishments: 10,000 youths currently in training for employment in 48 Job Corps centers, with more than 50 new centers soon to be opened; 275,000 young students given part-time employment allowing them to remain in school; 37,000 illiterate adults being trained in 40 States; 550,000 preschool youngsters getting Head Start training this summer; and 87,000 family heads with 270,000 dependents receiving intensive training and guidance that will eventually enable them to become self-supporting and get off welfare rolls.

The legislation before the House today provides authorization for approximately $1.9 billion to expand the war on poverty and increase the effectiveness of its programs.

Administration officials have indicated that these new funds will be sufficient to support the following program levels for the fiscal year 1966: Job Corps, 80,000; community action, 1,100 grants to some 700 communities; VISTA, 5,000 volunteers; Neighborhood Youth Corps, 300,000 teenagers in 500 communities, plus an additional 100,000 during the summer of 1966; college work-study, about 145,000 students in 1,300 colleges; adult basic education, 70,000 trainees in 50 States and 4 territories; work experience, 224,000 participants also in 50 States and 4 territories; and rural loans, $36.8 million for 22,000 individual loans and $8.2 million for 400 co-op loans.

Mr. Chairman, these figures represent the first real concerted nationwide attack ever made against the root causes of human poverty and high unemployment in America.

In this affluent society of ours, we have a serious obligation to support this unique and extremely promising effort to assure all our citizens of the opportunity to earn their rightful share of the material blessings this Nation has in such rich abundance.

Therefore, I strongly urge the Members of the House to express their confidence in the President by voting in favor of the passage of H.R. 8283, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, even the strongest supporter of H.R. 8283, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1963, would be among the first to agree that the war on poverty has had a very painful beginning in its first year.

No one can seriously deny that many of the criticisms directed against the program in the past several days are quite meritorious.

Perhaps it is true that too much attention has been paid to planning and not enough to program operation.

It is certainly correct that standards or yardsticks to evaluate whether the various programs are a success or a failure are woefully inadequate.

It would surely be reasonable to place a stronger emphasis on the goal of increasing the proportion of expenditures that directly benefit the poor, as opposed to the initially high costs of administration. There is no reason why salaries provided to workers in the war on poverty should be higher than those for individuals doing substantially the same work in other fields. In addition, the evidence indicates that those administering programs ought to take greater care not to spend money for items that in the past have been made available without charge or at lower prices.

Moreover, it is reasonable to request administrative officials of OEO to show greater awareness that efforts to oversell or overpublicize the program may do irreparable psychological injury to those who are deserving and yet must be turned away in direct denial of the promises made to them in publicity.

We must recognize that out in the field there have been some controversies among Governors and mayors and even among the poor themselves. But by the same token we should recognize there are amendments contained in H.R. 8283 which will minimize these conflicts in the future and that many of these difficulties will ease themselves out over the coming months through the simple fact of experience in cooperation.

Nevertheless, none of us who believe in the basic underlying purposes of the poverty program want to see the community action program dominated by selfish persons whose sole objective is to use the programs for personal advantage.

It is, therefore, most important that precedents be established to guarantee that the poor be included and have a voice in the formulation and enactment of policy. It is equally important that the word "consultation" among all groups be made meaningful through policy directives.

Governing boards should not be composed entirely of those who do not live in the impoverished areas affected. Local neighborhood advisory groups must have some voice not only in the formation of policy but in the direction of program.

Moreover, community action programs should not be left entirely in the hands of social workers. Trained social workers serving as advisers may be helpful if they are not permitted to dominate the program, but the point that there exists in many cities a gigantic social welfare machine is well taken.

In the ensuing year there must be new emphasis on methods that are creative enough or militant enough to really help the poor and deliver a knockout blow to those who are always ready to criticize but never ready to provide constructive or positive assistance.

Yet the scene is not totally bleak. In fact, we have been making startling progress in the past half year or more.

As Representative of the Fourth Missouri District which contains seven rural counties, I have discussed the rural program with several ministers and school officials. I have been assured that while the program may not be perfectly organized at the moment, it will become efficiently operative and effective within the coming year.

Those of us who are fair enough to frankly admit the earlier shortcomings of the program, supported the recent investigations which will serve to strengthen the program in the future. Those weaknesses were fully ventilated.

Now, let us look at the other side of the coin, or, if you please, the plus side of the ledger. The program seems to be soundly conceived. I have confidence that the administration in the months ahead will be handled well and faithfully carried out. The Office of Economic Opportunity is now in the process of establishing a system of seven regional offices. After these develop and expand, many of the current difficulties will surely disappear. No one will be able to say the existence of these offices will mean a less significant role by the State agencies.

The most eloquent argument for the continuance of the war on poverty is to appraise its record of accomplishment in the 9 short months since its establishment.

Despite the fact that the OEO had to be organized from scratch, and despite the President's decision to postpone projects until after the November election, by the end of fiscal year 1965 programs under the umbrella of the OEO had directly reached out to 1,167,000 persons and had indirectly benefited another 1,943,000 individuals. By the time all the funds allocated for fiscal year 1965 are actually expended, the total number of persons directly and indirectly affected will swell from 3,110,000 to 5,872,000.

Such a record of accomplishment in a 9-month period is almost unparalleled in the history of the Federal Government. Let us look at some meaningful statistics: 10,000 persons are now receiving training in the Job Corps; 265,000 persons are already as of this date participating in the Neighborhood Youth Corps; 35,000 older persons previously unable to complete their schooling are now a part of the adult basic education program; 88,000 persons are enrolled in the work-experience program, and another 85,000 students in the work-study program are able for the first time to earn money while pursuing their education.

Under the rural loan program, 11,000 persons have been assisted to break the credit barrier in agriculturally impoverished areas of the country.

This bill will permit expansion of these programs to affect twice as many persons.

It is estimated that this authorization will be sufficient to provide 1,100 community action grants in 700 communities; adult basic education programs affecting 70,000 undereducated adults; work experience for 224,000 participants; training in the Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps for 480,000 enrollees; and rural poverty loans to 22,100 individuals and to 410 sponsoring organizations.

Progress has definitely been made in the special programs to combat poverty in rural areas. Although the program in our congressional district in west-central Missouri is just beginning to function, I am optimistic that it will soon become well established and prove out as a workable program. I have confidence that unselfish leadership will come forward and also confidence that the program when it does grow will relieve the poverty of the small farmer. Low-income rural families can and surely will benefit by the grant and loan programs provided by this measure.

We must remember that the poverty program did not become a reality until the bill was signed last August. That first measure had a lofty purpose, to fight toward the ultimate elimination of deprivation and dependency. Everyone knew this would require a monumental effort. It was heralded as an effort to help people help themselves. The program was not one just for the support of the poor which would continue to leave them dependent upon the generosity of others. One of the central themes of the program is that of training to give the poor a chance to help themselves. The provisions for education and training are worthy of the highest praise.

The amendments that we are going to adopt in this present bill will provide for a great variety of aids to help people lift themselves out of their poverty. There are no really built-in limitations upon the range of assistance. It has been appropriately said that under portions of this program progress is limited only by the ability of those who design the local program for the benefit of the poor. When we all become willing to absorb the criticism directed against the program since last August and turn our faces forward, determined to improve the administration of the program, its potential will become almost unlimited.

This measure will not be a final solution to all problems of poverty but one would have to be a determined pessimist to insist administration of the program will not become more alert and efficient in the year ahead. Certainly no one can deny this measure will provide the tools to eliminate most deprivation and to move forward in a militant fight for the eradication of poverty.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, no nation can or should continue to endure when on one side the streets are lighted, and on the other side they are darkened, and while on one side of the streets the children sleep in comfort and are well fed, on the other side of the streets the children go to bed hungry, to awaken to another day of hunger and want.

No nation can or should continue to endure that does not make an honest, an exhaustive to the point of sacrifice, effort to eliminate pockets of poverty.

If there is poverty anywhere, there is poverty everywhere, for the influences, either harmful or beneficial, that originate in any segment spread to all segments.

As a people we are very closely bound together. The land to which we live is an abundant land. The Lord of our creation has given us a wealth of blessings never equaled in richness and in number. Are we worthy if we falter because of selfishness or timidity or just plain blindness in our lack of faith? Are we worthy if we falter in the fight to put a curb to poverty? Are we worthy if we accept any but a resounding negative to the question, Must little children always go to bed hungry because they live on the darkened side of the street, must there always be men and women and children who are underprivileged in a land that God has made so fertile and that man has so richly developed?

The enactment of the Economic Opportunities Act was a brave and inspiring start in a war on poverty that cannot halt until it has reached its full objective. That objective is the emancipation of all the American people from the bondage to poverty, with all its limitations on opportunities and all its cruel denials of rich fullness in the living of normal lives.

Human nature is not perfect. If it were, poverty in a world of plenty never would have had its beginning. In all our programs that look toward the heights of human contentment we learn from experience. If we are to attain the goals of our dreams there must be no backward steps. Every step will be a forward step, every step will carry us toward the sunshine, if the mistakes that now and then we make are spurs to our redoubled effort.

Our beloved majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, told us that the Economic Opportunity Act had brought hope and a share in the riches and fuller life to 6 million underprivileged American youth. Someone on the other side of the aisle, who with a few others seemed to be carrying on a delaying action with no hope of prevailing, questioned the 6 million figure. He advanced the thought that the figure was closer to 2 million.

Why he would have ended and crushed to earth a program that had brought hope and a share in better things to at least 2 million underprivileged American youth he did not attempt to explain. If he did, I could not follow him.

If but one American youth had been lifted from despair to hope, if but one American youth had been lifted from the hopeless, hopeless sands of the desert to a firm footing on the threshold of a useful and purposeful life through education and training, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the program had been worthwhile.

If to 2 million American youths, as the opposition I understand now acknowledges, has come this blessing, I can only say "blessed, blessed is the day; blessed, blessed is this program."

I am voting for this good bill. I could not live with my conscience if I voted to close the door of opportunity on the underprivileged youth of my country. In a world of plenty there is no room for poverty. Whatever the causes of poverty they can be removed, and though the fight is hard and long this country of ours with God's help and the prayers and work of our people will prevail in its holy crusade to end for all time the ills, the cruelties, the waste, and hopelessness of poverty in all its forms and in all its manifestations.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, a great deal continues to be said by the Republicans about a so-called secret list of OEO consultants. These master sleuths claim to have brought to light a list which no one else knew about or could obtain.

Nothing could be farther from the truth. The listing of consultants which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was prepared by the Office of Economic Opportunity at the request of the General Accounting Office. The listing was furnished to the GAO as a result of that organization's receiving the request from an unnamed Congressman. OEO would have furnished this information directly to the Congressman should the request have come directly to the OEO. There is nothing classified or secret about the listing, as this type of information is prepared upon request from any responsible source. Because it is not the type of detailed information normally required for management reports it did require a special compilation.

Previously, similar although not identical information was submitted to the Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee. This information contained biographical sketches on all of the key officials of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Also, the statistical information of the number of consultants at each level of compensation was provided.

The only reservation maintained about the furnishing of names and home addresses of Federal employees is that Federal employees may become the prey of those who make their living by compiling mailing address lists. It is normally preferred that only official addresses be used, however, since the request was for home addresses they were furnished by the OEO.

Introduction of the list by the Republicans, which contained some 400 names and the salaries being paid, was meant to convey the impression that the biggest beneficiaries of this great program are the privileged few on its high-level payroll.

The gentleman who introduced the list would have us believe that the program has become a haven for jobseekers. Or, there were innuendos of dark misdoings. There were charges that a disproportionate amount of appropriated funds are bulging the pockets of antipoverty officials, rather than helping to eliminate pockets of poverty. There was sketched a picture of consultants featherbedding on public funds. And in a followup telegram, it was even hinted that these positions are being used by consultants to build political machines.

These gross distortions must be corrected. Let us examine that list a little more closely.

Now, their salaries range from $35 to $100 a day—that makes a range of about $9,000 to $26,000 annually. Certainly $26,000 is a good salary. But is it a boon to those drawing it? The facts show clearly that it is not. Right at the top of the list is the name, Holmes Brown. Mr. Brown is an assistant director at OEO in charge of public affairs. In order to take this job, he resigned as director of public relations at the Martin-Marietta Corp., where he drew an annual salary of $50,000. This means that he is now making a little over half of his previous salary—and this is not to mention the stock options and other benefits he has lost.

Then there is the case of David Salten, a Community Action program adviser. He had been superintendent of schools in Rochester, N.Y., at a salary of $30,000.

In the Job Corps program, there is an adviser named Milton Katz pulling down the sum of $70 a day. Before joining OEO, he was a research psychologist earning $100 a day.

Thaddeus Higgins now earns $14,300 as a VISTA consultant. Formerly, he was a business executive in Pittsburgh earning $20,640. And Charles Chong took a pay cut of more than $3,000 to give his services to VISTA.

Mr. Speaker, the consultants who have made financial sacrifices to work in the antipoverty program are too numerous to specify here. The list is long and impressive.

It should also be remembered that the men and women in those positions have been working long and guelling hours ever since the program started. They are paid a 5-day week, but most of them, I am assured, put in 6- and 7-day-weeks—working days that often run far into the night.

As far as the political springboard charge is concerned, I would point out to the Members that every consultant is governed by the Hatch Act, which prohibits political activities while in service.

I have previously mentioned the long list of people who are giving their time and energy free of charge and I have placed this list in the RECORD. And I mean people of distinction; people who are great successes in their own fields, with great talents to contribute; people who have done so simply because they believe in the program, and want to help it succeed.

Mr. Chairman, let us look at the whole picture. The program needs the best talents it can get, and I believe it is getting the best available.

Attached is the list of paid consultants of OEO and their previous employment as of the date this report was submitted to the GAO.

Current full-time consultants as of date submitted to GAO

Name	Date of appointment	Salary	Organization	Duty station	Previous employment
Brown, Holmes M	Oct. 12, 1964	$100	Public affairs	Washington, D.C	Director of public relations, Martin Marrietta Corp., $50,000 per annum.
Elwell, Richard R	Nov. 30, 1964	65	do	do	Evaluator, U.S. Peace Corps, $17,000 per annum.
Masters, Peter F	Oct. 26, 1964	60	do	do	Self-employed, design partnership, $15,336 per annum.
Gross, Ernest	Dec. 7, 1964	60	do	do	Public relations consultant, New York State Labor Department, $15,000 per annum.
Moss, Edward K	Apr. 1, 1965	75	do	do	Owner, Edward K. Moss International, $25,000 per annum.
Maguire, Francis X	Oct. 26, 1964	50	do	do	Director of program development, $325 per week.
Miller, Harry J	do	50	do	do	Accountant executive, Darcy, Bush & Osborne, Inc., $9,500 per annum.
Wright, Dale R	Jan. 5, 1965	60	do	do	New York State Commissioner for Human Rights, $15,890 per annum.
Ellis, Garrison M	Dec. 28, 1964	60	do	do	Associate, Earl Newsom Co., $11,000 per annum.
Williams, Joan	Apr. 12, 1965	50	do	do	Information office, United Nations, $770 per month.
Van Doren, Ronald R	Nov. 8, 1964	65	do	do	Staff writer, the Arizona Republic, $7,500 per annum.
Allott, Patricia A	Dec. 29, 1964	35	do	do	Commercial artist, Kaufman Associates, $6.500 per annum.
Doherty, James E	Nov. 8, 1964	35	do	do	Assistant instructor, Spanish language program for the blind, $5,500 per annum.
Hughes, Eleanor P	May 5, 1965	50	do	do	Women's editor, $21,000, per annum.
Tait, Pauline W	Apr. 29, 1965	50	do	do	Director, public affairs, Kennedy Center for Performing Arts, $12,000 per annum.
Michaels, Anna M	May 3, 1965	50	do	do	Account coordinator, Edward K. Moss International, $100 per day.
Roddy, Robert	Feb. 15, 1965	60	VISTA	do	Industrial relations consultant, Minneapolis Hospital Services Association, $14,000 per annum.
Price, Gary	Oct. 26, 1964	55	VISTA	do	Executive director, SAAC, New York City, $14,800 per annum.
Weatherford, Willis, Jr	do	70	VISTA	do	Associate professor, Swarthmore, $15,000 per annum.
Constable. Elinor	do	35	VISTA	do	English Institute, University of Honduras, $14,800 per annum.
Guskin, Alan E	do	50	VISTA	do	Consultant, President's task force.
Long, Lewis M. K	Jan. 18, 1965	60	VISTA	do	Supervisory clinical psychologist, chief, $12,170 per annum.
Carter, Charles A	Dec. 1, 1964	40	VISTA	do	Counselor, Howard University, $8,200 per annum.
Hutchinson, John G	Oct. 26, 1964	50	VISTA	do	Admiristrative Officer of Peace Corps, $10,650 per annum.
Gerson, Richard I	Oct. 20, 1964	75	VISTA	do	Chief, Southeast Asia project, Bureau of Education and Cultural Affairs, $17,600 per annum.
Higgins, Thaddeus F. X	May 10, 1965	55	VISTA	do	General manager and executive vice president of BBB in Pittsburgh, $20.640 per annum.
Blackburn, John J	Oct. 26, 1964	55	VISTA	do	Pastor, $14,200 per annum.
Chong, Charles	Nov. 23, 1964	50	VISTA	do	Assistant to president of American Federation of State, City and Municipal Employees, $16,111 per annum.
Parsons, Arch	May 24, 1965	65	VISTA	do	Assistant foreign editor, Los Angeles Times, $325 per week.
Rantane. Bruno	Feb. 15, 1965	50	VISTA	do	International representative, American Federation, State, County and Municipal Employees, $10,500 per annum.
Sill, Maurice L	Nov. 17, 1964	70	VISTA	do	Director, research and evaluation, Appalachian Youth, Inc., $17.000 per annum.
Baker, Robert N	Dec. 10, 1964	60	Job Corps	do	Manager. American Machine & Foundry Co., $13,500 per annum.
Huntington, Haskins	Dec. 31, 1964	70	do	do	Staff director. Department of Commerce, $16,000 per annum.
Healy, Edward P	Oct. 26, 1964	90	do	do	Consultant NS, Office of Education, $75 per day.
Woodard, Anola F	Apr. 21, 1965	40	do	do	Senior psychologist social worker, UCLA, $9,060 per annum.
Pulakos, Milton	Jan. 4, 1965	50	do	do	Associate director. Lower East Side Neighborhood Association, New York, $11,500 per annum.
Brashears, Benjamin S	Dec. 17, 1964	45	do	do	Social science research analyst, Department of Labor, $8,945 per annum.
Eigen, Lewis D	Oct. 26, 1964	85	do	do	President, Program Committee Institute.
Troutman, John E	Mar. 25, 1965	70	do	do	Vice president, Elec. Teaching Lab.
Gottlieb, David	Oct. 26, 1964	70	do	do	Associate professor, Michigan State University, $11,500 per annum.
Stellwagon, Walter R	Jan. 3, 1965	70	do	do	Associate professor, Michigan State University, $15,700 per annum.
Katz, Milton S	Apr. 26, 1965	70	do	do	Supervisory research psychologist, $100 per day.
Levine, Stanley	May 10, 1965	70	do	do	Vice president, Training Systems, Inc., $17,000 per annum.
Gillis, James C., Jr	Oct. 26, 1964	55	do	do	Assistant director of recruitment, $50 per day.
Sexton, Brendon	Nov. 30, 1964	100	CAP	do	Director, leadership studies center, U.A.W, $13,500.
VandenHeuvel, William	Dec. 3, 1964	100	CAP	do	Deputy campaign manager, Robert Kennedy, $20,000 per annum.
Bohrson, Ralph G	Apr. 5, 1965	80	CAP	do	Director, Rocky Mountain area, $13,500 per annum.
Ross, Elizabeth H	Nov. 9, 1964	65	CAP	do	Consultant on dependency, $13,115 per annum.
Rauh, B. Michael	Apr. 26, 1965	60	CAP	do	Regional coordinator, $250 per week.
Bass, William H	Dec. 14, 1964	60	CAP	do	Field officer, USDA-ORAD.
Moore, Robert N	Dec. 8, 1964	60	CAP	do	Administrative assistant, Congressman Joe L. Evins, $13,900 per annum.
Cotton, Mello	Nov. 23, 1964	55	CAP	do	Advanceman, $12,500 per annum.
Ben-Ami, David Z	Apr. 25, 1965	50	CAP	do	College instructor, Temple Emanuel of Ironde Court, $10,000 per annum.
Drake, Charles H	Nov. 9, 1964	50	CAP	do	Director, Fryburg Academy, $1,000 per month.
Salett, Stanley J	Oct. 26, 1964	45	CAP	do	Expert, Official of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, $33.28 per day.
Wickland, Roger F	Nov. 3, 1964	65	VISTA	do	Project manager, Youth Opportunity Board, $15,000 per annum.
Johnson, James E	May 5, 1965	60	VISTA	do	Field representative. National Urban League, $11,000 per annum.
Alexander, Alan A	Oct. 26, 1964	50	MGMT	do	Director, English language service, $12,500 per annum tax free.
Paynter, David H	Jan. 18, 1965	90	Job Corps	do	Superintendent of Schools, Simi, Calif., $20,500 per annum.
Stuck, Harry W	do	40	do	do	Superintendent, Nevada Girls Training Center, $12,000 per annum.
O'Hare, Thomas J	May 17, 1965	50	do	do	Superintendent of training and education, $8,840 per annum.
Diener, Charles L	Nov. 29, 1964	40	do	do	Director, teacher education, Fort Lewis College, $7,500.
O'Callaghan, Donald N	Nov. 8, 1964	65	do	do	Director, health and welfare, $15,120 per annum.
Keating, Raymond F	Dec. 14, 1964	50	do	do	Education consultant, educational research service, $1,000 per month.
Wilkins, William D	Jan. 11, 1965	75	do	do	Professor of education, $16,000 per annum.
Schima, Marilyn E	Oct. 26, 1964	60	do	do	Health education consultant, Great Neck Public Schools, $10,000.
Hall, C. Mitchell	Jan. 18, 1965	75	do	do	Directorate of facilities, $16,965 per annum.
McConnell, William A	Jan. 4, 1965	50	do	do	Lieutenant Colonel, USAF (materia!), $1,190 per month.
Ferlo, Virgil J	Dec. 10, 1964	45	do	do	Special Assistant, Peace Corps, $10,970 per annum.
Garofalo, Dominic G	Mar. 22, 1965	50	CAP	do	State director, $8,500 per annum.
Palmour, Claire T	May 10, 1965	50	CAP	do	Commercial manager, WDUN, Gainesville, Ga., $9,200 per annum.
Fox, Lester J	Feb. 1, 1965	60	CAP	Atlanta, Ga	Associate director, $12,000 per annum.
Sasaki, Tom T	Jan. 21, 1965	60	CAP	New Mexico	Associate professor, New Mexico University, $13,000 per annum.
Stocks, Donald M	Apr. 19, 1965	50	CAP	Washington, D.C	Attorney adviser, HEW, $10,600 per annum.
Eldred, Philip H	Mar. 22, 1965	45	CAP	Yakima, Wash	Ordained minister, Assemblies of God, $500 per month.
Oliveo, Jack J	May 11, 1965	45	CAP	Washington, D.C	Attorney, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, $9,000 per annum.
Cosgrove, Thomas S	Nov. 30, 1964	70	CAP	do	International education director, Federation of State, Country, $10,000 per annum.
Lucas, Jane M	Apr. 28, 1965	40	CAP	do	Attorney-adviser. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. $7,560 per annum.
Fallon, Vincent	Mar. 19, 1965	60	CAP	do	Associate director, Catholic Charities, $13,000 per annum.
Rainey, Virginia	Mar. 14, 1965	45	CAP	do	Administrative assistant, ICA, Washington D.C., $7,425.
Richmond, Julius M	Feb. 2, 1965	100	CAP	do	Dean and professor Upstate Medical Center, $20,000 plus.
Spickler, Martin W	Feb. 28, 1965	60	CAP	do	Psychologist, Montana school system, $11,000.
Balzer, Franc	Apr. 16, 1965	50	CAP	do	Director research demonstration project, Junior Village, $12,075.
Sadow, Sue	Feb. 23, 1965	50	CAP	do	World affairs lecturer, $10,000.
Lowe. Roger D	Apr. 5, 1965	50	CAP	do	Self-employed, business insurance.
Darlington, Alice	Mar. 22, 1965	40	CAP	do	Director. Board of Education, Chicago, Ill.
Lewis, Joan D	Apr. 8, 1965	45	CAP	do	Test development examiner, $8,560 per annum.
Hunter, Gertrude T	Apr. 12, 1965	50	CAP	do	Research physician, $8,840.
Fogg. Betty L	Mar. 1, 1965	50	CAP	do	Child development specialist, $7,900 for 195 days.
Terris, Shirley D	do	50	CAP	do	Director, Holy Comforter Service, volunteer.
Blaylock, Marilyn J	Apr. 5, 1965	45	CAP	do	Child development specialist, $5,735.
Aguirre, Humberto	May 3, 1965	45	CAP	do	Junior high vice principal, $5,800 per annum.
Heller, Adele R	Mar. 22, 1965	40	CAP	do	Music teacher, $10 per hour.
Martin, John A., Jr	Apr. 17, 1965	50	CAP	California	Assistant secretary YMCA, $10,302 per annum.
Goodwin, James C	May 24, 1965	50	CAP	do	Legal editor, Bancroft, Whitney Publishing Co., $8,000 per annum .
Hyman, Milton	May 10, 1965	60	CAP	Chicago	Associate director, Joint Youth Development Committee $15,000 per annum

Current full-time consultants as of date submitted to GAO—Continued

Name	Date of appointment	Salary	Organization	Duty station	Previous employment
Williams, Robert E	Apr. 6, 1965	$60	CAP	Chicago	Associate professor, Chicago Teachers College, and associate director, Woodlawn Organization, $17,076.
Mehlberg, Wallace L	Apr. 21, 1965	60	CAP	do	Director of Land Conservation, Department of Agriculture, $16,500 per annum.
Jordan, Vernon E	May 20, 1965	60	CAP	Atlanta	Assistant executive director, Southern Regional Council, Inc., $10,500 per annum.
Lesser, Saal D	Apr. 19, 1965	60	CAP	New York	Executive director, Encampment for Citizenship, $12,500 per annum.
Nieves, Josephine	do	60	CAP	do	Acting project director, Puerto Rico Forum, $17,000.
Hanan, Thomas M	Feb. 23, 1965	35	CAP	do	Representative, Warner-Chilcott Laboratories, $8,000.
Stack, Michael J	Mar. 22, 1965	65	CAP	Washington, D.C	Self-employed lawyer, $20,000-plus.
Collins, Raymond C	Apr. 26, 1965	50	CAP	do	International relations officer, State Department, $9,945.
Rhine, Earl R	Apr. 16, 1965	45	CAP	do	Development officer, AID, $9,945.
Burns, Robert J	do	50	CAP	do	Student, U.S. Army Infantry Center, $630 per month.
Oliver, Barbara J	May 24, 1965	50	CAP	do	Executive director, Bloomingdale neighborhood conservation assistance, $9,375.
Ramirez, Lorenzo	May 23, 1965	45	CAP	do	Relocation officer, Urban Renewal Agency, $7,000.
Golatz, Helmut J	Dec. 28, 1964	60	CAP	do	Head, Department of Labor Education, Penn State University, $14,500.
Stenson, Kiernan F	Apr. 5, 1965	100	CAP	do	Director, Mayor's Commission on Human Development, Philadelphia, $16,000.
Salten, David G	Apr. 14, 1965	100	CAP	do	City superintendent of schools, Rochester, $30,000.
Bernstein, Jerome S	Dec. 30, 1964	70	CAP	do	Research coordinator, $14,000.
Hymes, James L	Feb. 16, 1965	90	CAP	do	Professor of education, University of Maryland, $12,900 per academic year.
Morris, Dudley E	Oct. 26, 1965	40	CAP	do	Correspondent, Time, Inc., $925 per month.
Williams, J. Earl	Jan. 27, 1965	85	CAP	do	Director, Southern Rural Training, National Share Corp., $20,000.
Shovell, William L	Feb. 16, 1965	70	CAP	do	President's Commission on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime.
Haddad, William F	Jan. 18, 1965	90	Office director	do	Consultant, Westinghouse Electric Corp., $150 per day.
Walsh, Ira P	Feb. 23, 1965	75	do	do	Public Relations director, Hearst Publications, $24,000-plus.
Yette, Samuel F	Nov. 29, 1965	70	do	do	Executive secretary, Peace Corps, $13,000.
Cahn, Edgar S	Oct. 26, 1964	70	do	do	Attorney, Justice Department, $10,000.
Radler, D. H	May 16, 1965	70	do	do	Division of information, Democratic State Committee, $18,500.
Zagorin, Ruth K	Oct. 26, 1964	40	do	do	Consultant, World Universalist Service, $10,000.
Clampitt, Robert H	Feb. 5, 1965	70	Inspections	do	Public affairs supervisor, Western Electric, $17,400.
Brown, E. Wayles, Jr	Apr. 1, 1965	75	do	do	Economist, Antitrust and Monopoly, U.S. Senate, $19,167.
Ximenes, Vincente T	Feb. 26, 1965	70	do	do	National coordinator, Democratic National Committee, $17,200.
Smilen, Kenneth B	Feb. 9, 1965	60	do	do	Division of Market Analysis, New York, $15,000-plus.
Williams, John C	Feb. 19, 1965	55	do	do	Assistant city manager, Rochester, N.Y., $12,147.
Boasberg, Emanuel	Dec. 21, 1964	50	Interagency relief	do	Attorney, private law firm, San Francisco, Calif., $850 per month.
Keville, Maurica L	Apr. 19, 1965	50	General counsel	do	Consultant, Washington representative for New York, $15,000.
Murphy, John C	Mar. 29, 1965	60	do	do	Association lawyer, covering Burling Co., District of Columbia, $11,250.

Current intermittent consultants

Name	Date of appointment	Salary	Organization	Duty station	Previous employment
Temko, Francine S	Dec. 1, 1964	$75	General counsel	Washington, D.C	Consultant, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, $50 per day.
Prentice, Edward S	Apr. 26, 1965	100	Program planning	do	Economist, First National Bank, New York, $28,000 per annum.
Williams, Walter	do	60	do	do	Associate professor of economics, University of Kentucky, $13,000 per annum.
Watts, Harold W	do	70	do	do	Associate professor of economics, University of Wisconsin, $15,000 per annum.
Delo, David A	Feb. 1, 1965	70	do	do	Market research specialist, Palos Verdes, Calif., $15,000 per annum.
Donvito, Pasqual A	Feb. 9, 1965	70	do	do	Economics consultant, $125 per day.
McNeil, Donald R	Apr. 1, 1965	50	VISTA	do	Special assistant to president, University of Wisconsin, $19,500 per annum.
Sonnenfeldt, Marjorie H	Apr. 20, 1965	40	VISTA	do	Editor, Trade Talk, $35 per day.
Porter, Douglas	Oct. 26, 1964	65	Job Corps	do	Assistant professor and research associate at Harvard University, $9,500 per annum.
Trautman, Ray L	May 24, 1965	70	do	do	Professor, Columbia University, School of Library Services, $15,000 per annum.
Geis, Gilbert	Jan. 13, 1965	55	do	do	Fellow in law and sociology, Harvard Law School, $12,040, 9 months.
Cohen, Martin A	Apr. 5, 1965	100	CAP	do	President, Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, $25,000 per annum.
Walden, David C	Mar. 31, 1965	90	CAP	do	Self-employed, consultant, $19,500 per annum.
Notkin, Herbert	Apr. 12, 1965	100	CAP	do	Assistant professor, College of Education, Temple University, $10,300, 10 months.
McNiven, High G	Nov. 9, 1964	50	VISTA	do	Associate research assistant, University of Pittsburgh, $11,800 per annum.
Noble, Lindsley H	Feb. 4, 1965	50	Management	do	Deputy assistant, postmaster general and controller, $20,000 per annum.
Hall, Clifton	Mar. 23, 1965	75	do	do	Accountant, Office of Budget and Affairs, District of Columbia, $17,210 per annum.
McAlister, Glendon H	Nov. 29, 1964	40	Job Corps	do	Reading supervisor, Walpole Public Schools, Massachusetts, $9,100 per annum.
Hughes, Calvin C	do	40	do	do	YMCA, executive secretary, Miami, Fla., $6,800 per annum.
Kauffman, Joseph F	Jan. 4, 1965	90	do	do	Director, higher education services, American Personnel and Guidance Associate, $20,000 per annum.
Schreiber, Daniel	Jan. 25, 1965	75	do	do	Director, school dropouts project, NEA, Washington, D.C., $18,500 per annum.
Barberis, Sister Francetta	Mar. 11, 1965	75	do	do	President, Webster College, St. Louis, Mo.
Smiley, Marjorie B	do	70	do	do	Professor of education, Hunter College, $15,200 per annum.
Soldwedel, Bette J	do	70	do	do	Associate professor, New York University, $15,000 per annum.
Weaver, Ella H	Apr. 16, 1965	70	do	do	Assistant professor of speech and director of clinical practice, $13,000 per annum.
Shelden, Miriam A	May 19, 1965	75	do	do	Dean of women, University of Illinois, $16,750 plus expenses.
Keyser, Stephney J	Apr. 12, 1965	60	do	do	School social worker, Baltimore, Md., $780 per month.
Mansfield, Jack P	Feb. 1, 1965	60	CAP	do	Director, special project development of North Carolina Fund, $14,000 per annum.
McConnell, Beatrice	Feb. 5, 1965	50	CAP	do	Deputy Director, Women's Bureau, Washington, D.C., $27,500 per annum.
McEvers, Charles L	Jan. 17, 1965	45	CAP	do	Indian Education Section, Seattle, Wash., $8,190 per annum.
Goldberg, J. R	Mar. 12, 1965	100	CAP	New York	Executive director, Wel-Met Camps, New York, $27,000 per annum.
Rendon, Gabino	Mar. 15, 1965	45	CAP	Washington, D.C	Research assistant, University of Colorado, $255 per month (part time).
Goble, Dorothy Y	Mar. 21, 1965	45	CAP	do	Member, Citizen's Advisory Committee on Migrant Labor Problems.
McConnell, Beverly B	Mar. 22, 1965	50	CAP	Pullman, Wash	Assistant reemployment officer, Welfare Department, California, $600 per month.
Jager, Oscar	Jan. 11, 1965	70	CAP	Washington, D.C	Director of publications and public relations, AFL–CIO, District of Columbia, $14,000 per annum.
Henderson, Vivian W	Apr. 22, 1965	50	CAP	do	Professor and chairman, Department of Economics, Fiske University, $12,000 per annum.
Stone, L. Joseph	Apr. 19, 1965	100	CAP	do	Prof., Vassar College, $20,000 per year.
Ozer, Ann T	Mar. 25, 1965	40	CAP	do	Child development specialist, $4,000 per year.
Wegman, Myron E	Mar. 8, 1965	100	CAP	do	Dean, University of Michigan, $30,000 per year.
Maggen, Donald L	Mar. 9, 1965	100	CAP	do	President, Butler Maggin Corp., $25,000 per year.
Kolberg, Rosemond M	Feb. 3, 1965	40	CAP	do	Head teacher, nursery and kindergarten, $20 per day.
Allen, Rebecca B	Feb. 10, 1965	40	CAP	do	Editor, Parent Cooperative Preschools International, WOC.
Cooke, Robert E	Mar. 28, 1965	100	CAP	do	Professor of pediatrics, $30,000.
Ornati, Oscar	Feb. 1, 1965	100	CAP	do	Professor, new school of sociology research, New York, N.Y., $12,750 per months.

Current intermittent consultants—Continued

Name	Date of appointment	Salary	Organization	Duty station	Previous employment
Georges, Thomas W	Apr. 2, 1965	$100	CAP	Washington, D.C	Assistant professor of medicine, Temple University, $18,000.
Reader, George G	Apr. 1, 1965	100	CAP	do	Professor of medicine, Cornell Medical Center, $22,000.
Roessel, Robert A., Jr	Nov. 9, 1964	70	CAP	do	Director, Indian Education, Arizona State University, $16,000.
Duckrey, Marjorie E	Apr. 5, 1965	60	CAP	do	Deputy director, community development, $13,000.
Rein, Martin	Feb. 15, 1965	60	CAP	do	Associate professor, Bryn Mawr College, $12,000.
Silcott, T. George	Jan. 11, 1965	60	CAP	do	Director, Springfield College Guidance Center, $11,800.
Smith, Hilda W	do	50	CAP	do	Contract writer, U.S. Public Health Service $940 per pamphlet.
Hicks, Florence J	May 10, 1965	45	CAP	do	Develop, Health Aid for HEW, $8,500 per year.
Gallen, Elizabeth M	Apr. 16, 1965	60	CAP	do	Superintendent, kindgerarten and primary grades education, $12,000 per year.
Malmborg, Eleanor D	do	45	CAP	do	Staff associate, elementary and secondary education, $8,000 per year.
Parsons, Thomas S	May 3, 1965	75	CAP	do	Owner, Community Education Association, $12,000 per annum.
Bevis, Donald D	Apr. 16, 1965	65	CAP	do	School services coordinator, $13,500 per year.
Brown, Milton A	Apr. 5, 1965	70	CAP	do	NEIGH: Services dir, Community Progress, Inc., $16,500 per year.
Lazar, Irving	do	85	CAP	do	Executive director of Neumeyer Foundation, $15,000 per year.
Bers, Melvin K	Apr. 16, 1965	60	CAP	do	Associate professor of eocnomics and management, University of Denver, $13,125.
Plumer, Stephen B	Apr. 5, 1965	50	CAP	do	Assistant professor progressive administration of social welfare, $11,000.
Seessel, Thomas V	do	50	CAP	do	Community Progress, Inc., New Haven, Conn., special assistant, $11,000.
Bennett, George	do	95	CAP	do	Manpower director, Community Progress, Inc., $16,500.
Scheirbeck, Helen M	Dec. 7, 1964	40	CAP	do	Professional staff, U.S. Senate Judicial Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, $9,800.
McKinley, Francis	Feb. 1, 1965	50	CAP	do	Assistant director, Indian education, Arizona State University, $8,000.
Donovan, Ronald	Dec. 28, 1964	50	CAP	do	Associate professor, N.Y. State School of Industry and Labor Relations, $12,000 per annum.
McCollum, John W	May 3, 1965	80	CAP	do	Senior consultant, development mortgage research studies, $17,000.
Dowdy, Richard S	Mar. 1, 1965	60	CAP	do	Part-time consultant, human relations, $5,000.
Reiner, Janet S	Feb. 1, 1965	50	CAP	do	Director of housing and physical environment.
Barr, Sherman	Mar. 17, 1965	55	CAP	do	Assistant chief, Mobilization for Youth, New York City, $13,100 per annum.
McAndrew, Jordan L	Jan. 25, 1965	55	CAP	do	Director, Leorning Institute, $18,000 per year.
Simmons, James E	May 3, 1965	45	CAP	do	Executive director, independent schools talent search program, Massachusetts, $9,000.
Allen, Curtis C	Mar. 28, 1965	75	CAP	do	Professor of economics, $17,000 per year.
Kreps, Juanita M	Apr. 29, 1965	75	CAP	do	Associate professor of economics, $11,000 per year.
Smith, Mildred Beatty	Apr. 14, 1965	55	CAP	do	General elementary consultant, $11,000.
Ginsberg, Mitchell I	Apr. 25, 1965	85	CAP	do	Associate dean, Columbia School of Social Work, $20,000.
Strakhovsky, Ivan L	May 18, 1965	60	CAP	do	CBS–TV.
Berman, Jack D	Apr. 6, 1965	60	CAP	do	President-owner, Jack D. Berman Co., $15,000.
Flowers, Charles	May 9, 1965	40	CAP	Baltimore, Md	City hall reporter, Baltimore Sun, $170 per week.
Keat, James F	do	50	CAP	Washington, D.C	Editorial writer, Baltimore Sun, $10,500.
Krumlauf, Alfred C	May 20, 1965	40	CAP	West Hollywood	Manager, sales department, National Cash Register, $8,400
Witherspoon, Ralph	May 10, 1965	100	CAP	Tallahasse, Fla	Professor and director, Florida State University, $18,000.
Lispen, Zel E	Apr. 26, 1965	50	CAP	Washington, D.C	Staff assistant, Carl Elliot, Member of Congress, $12,000.
Casey, John J	Apr. 28, 1965	50	CAP	New Orleans, La	Account executive, Alen Johnson & Associates, $100 per week.
Bird, Robert S., Jr	May 23, 1965	25	CAP	Baltimore, Md	Reporter, Morning Sun (Baltimore), $190 per week.
Winters, Bruce M	May 9, 1965	45	CAP	do	Political writer, Baltimore Sun, $165 per week.
Davis, Thomas I	May 23, 1965	65	CAP	Selma, N.C	President and publisher, The Johnstonian, $16,000.
Clifford, George E	Mar. 15, 1965	50	Inspections	Washington, D.C	Sports columnist, Washington, Daily News, $240 per week.
McKay, Martha C	Feb. 23, 1965	50	do	do	Self-employed; volunteer activities, $5,200.
Lefkowitz, Gary	Feb. 16, 1965	45	do	do	Consultant, Western Electric Corp., $50 per day.
Swit, David A	Mar. 9, 1965	60	do	do	Consultant, Peace Corps, $50 per day.
Jacobson, Gershon	Feb. 7, 1965	45	do	New York	Staff correspondent, Day Publishing Co., $9,500.
Engle, Robert V	Feb. 18, 1965	60	do	Washington, D.C	Newsweek cover director, $20,500.
Jackson, Bernard H	Feb. 19, 1965	50	do	do	Lawyer Dyett, Alexander & Dienkins, $10,000.
Eldridge, Lawrence	Feb. 12, 1965	60	do	do	Consulting psychologist, $30,000.
Seaton, David L	Feb. 19, 1965	50	do	do	Promotion copywriter, $11,000.
Forrest, Robert A	Feb. 8, 1965	55	do	do	Television executive, Medallion TV executive, $500 per week.
Nichols, William B	Feb. 25, 1965	75	do	do	President, T. V. Packaging Co., $500 per week.
Stupay, Arthur M	Feb. 11, 1965	50	do	do	Senior economic analyst, American Canning Co., $11,000.
Egan, Robert J	Mar. 9, 1965	45	do	New York	Attorney, Gardner, Poor & Havens, $9,600.
Martin, Robert L	Feb. 15, 1965	60	do	Washington, D.C	Attorney, Western Electric, $14,900.
Rostopulos, Nicholas P	Apr. 13, 1965	70	do	do	Broker, Consolidated Investment Services, $35,000.
Petit, Donald Raphael	Mar. 14, 1965	65	do	do	Campaign manager, Senator HOLLAND, $300 per week.
Berle, Peter A	Mar. 2, 1965	45	do	do	Attorney, Paul, Weiss, Rifkino, Wharton, Garrison, $9,000.
Klein, Elihu B	Feb. 8, 1965	60	do	do	Reporter, New York World Telegram & Sun, $300 per week.
MacLean, Hugh D	Mar. 24, 1965	40	do	do	Columnist, Washington Daily News, $13,000.
Kelly, Thomas V	do	50	do	do	Reporter, Washington Daily News, $12,600 per annum.
Parker, Joseph Ross, Jr	Mar. 30, 1965	45	do	do	Reporter, News & Observer Publishing Co., $12,800.
Peasinger, Charles W., Jr	Apr. 7, 1965	65	do	do	Partner, Merchandise Advertiser, Omaha, Nebr., $15,000.
Park, Darragh A	Feb. 14, 1965	40	do	New York	Acting principal, Unitarian Christian Conference, Sierra Leone, $3,000.
Robins, Leurs	Apr. 2, 1965	60	do	Washington, D.C	Author, Marsh Pierce Co., $35,000.
Lipsen, Charles P	Apr. 19, 1965	70	do	do	Legislative representative, Retail Clerks International Association, $18,000.
Brenner, Clifford J	Apr. 22, 1965	70	do	New York	Deputy general counsel, New York, $16,100.
Patrick, C. B	Apr. 26, 1965	55	do	Glenview, Ill	Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army Intelligence, $13,250.
Prial, Frances J	Mar. 27, 1965	45	do	Washington, D.C	Reporter, World Telegram & Sun, $10,400.

Current full-time experts

Name	Date of appointment	Salary	Organization	Duty station	Previous employment
Macomber, John Z	Mar. 16, 1965	$60	Public affairs	Washington, D.C	Staff assistant to executive vice president, Curtis Publishing Co., $17,500 per annum.
Robinson, Wade M	Oct. 26, 1964	100	Job Corps	do	Executive director, Harvard University, $14,500 per annum.
Wynne, Edward	Mar. 21, 1965	50	do	do	Consultant, General Counsel, NLRB, $50 per day.
Clay, Ozzie	Mar. 1, 1965	40	do	do	Professional football, Redskins, $12,500 per annum.
Sanders, Lonnie	do	40	do	do	Professional football, Redskins, $15,500 per annum.
Marley, Frederick H	June 14, 1965	60	do	do	Lieutenant colonel, U.S. Air Force.
Devlin, John R	Oct. 26, 1964	50	do	do	Treasurer-president of E. S. Delvin Co., $56 per day.
Moretton, Ernest R	Jan. 4, 1965	50	do	do	Superintendent of Boys Ranch, $12,315 per annum.
McDaniel, Linwood	do	50	do	do	Field officer, Peace Corps, $10,500 per annum.
Spector, Sidney	Mar. 8, 1965	50	Management	do	Director, field division, Metro Auto Rental, $20,000 per annum.
Wilson, Wilbur	May 13, 1965	65	Job Corps	do	Assistant to to Chief of Staff, Force Development, $15,000 per annum.
Holman, William G	do	65	do	do	Research analyst for Silver Users Association, $13,000 per annum.
Donahue, Joseph P	Apr. 19, 1965	45	do	do	Deputy Attorney General and Chief Attorney General, Military Personnel Division, Army, $885 per month.
Merrill, Keith W	Apr. 9, 1965	60	do	do	Resident OB-GYN, George Washington University Hospital, $275 per month.
Johnston, Robert W	Mar. 19, 1965	35	do	do	Flight control coordinator, National Air Carrier Association, $650 per month.
Brewer, Harold E	Dec. 1, 1964	100	do	do	Area director, employee relations, I.T. & T., $37,000 per annum.
Pines, Marion W	June 7, 1965	50	do	do	Planning Association of Health & Welfare Council, $1,000 per month.
Halsey, Maxwell	May 24, 1965	50	do	do	Traffic safety consultant, $40 to $75 per day.
Svenson, E. V	Feb. 23, 1965	80	do	do	Associate director, University of California Extension, $15,700.

Current full-time experts—Continued

Name	Date of appointment	Salary	Organization	Duty station	Previous employment
Flaherty, Thomas F	Mar. 29, 1965	$60	Job Corps	Washington, D.C	Resident physician, $800 per month.
Arndt, William F	Feb. 28, 1965	60	do	do	Associate professor, preventive medicine, Georgetown University, $13,200 per annum.
Magovern, Thomas F	Apr. 12, 1965	60	do	do	Medical doctor, Maryland, $20,000 per annum.
Marlow, John L	Apr. 1, 1965	60	do	do	Resident physician, George Washington University Hospital.
Giordano, Louis W	Apr. 9, 1965	60	do	do	Resident physician, $800 per month.
Mermel, John F	Apr. 1, 1965	60	do	do	Resident physician, $8,500 per year.
Gering, Henry S	Apr. 12, 1965	60	do	do	Resident physician, Georgetown University Hospital, $4,000 per annum.
Wieneke, Karl F	Apr. 1, 1965	60	do	do	Resident in surgery, $3,500 per annum.
Dean, John	Apr. 8, 1965	50	CAP	do	Program officer, African-American Institute, $10,500 per annum.
McMillan, Eldridge	Mar. 17, 1965	45	CAP	Atlanta, Ga	Resource visiting counselor, Atlanta public schools, $7,600 per annum.
Wilms, Edward G	Mar. 22, 1965	70	CAP	Washington, D.C	Executive director, New Jersey Democratic State Committee, $15,000 per annum.
Ellington, Betty	Mar. 17, 1965	50	CAP	do	Assistant executive director, Washington State Nurses Association, $615 per month.
Barksdale, Marie C	Feb. 23, 1965	45	CAP	do	Assistant director, Women in Community Service, $35 per day.
Chayes, Kitty Torch	Feb. 8, 1965	50	CAP	do	Private law practice, $10,000 per annum.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ICHORD

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ICHORD: On page 10, line 2, add the following after the word "law": "*Provided*, That none of the sums so appropriated shall be used to remunerate enrollees in a work-training program at a rate of pay higher than the locally prevailing wage for similar services or the statutory minimum wage, whichever is higher".

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROOSEVELT to the amendment offered by Mr. ICHORD: After the words "similar services or the" insert "higher of either the particular State or the United States".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDREWS OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota: On page 11, after line 23, insert:

"LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

"SEC. 19. Such Act is amended to add a new section as follows:

" 'SEC. 617. Of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available under the authority of this Act, not more than 10 per centum shall be expended for the purpose of salaries and the cost of administration.' "

And renumber the sections which follow accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] rise?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODELL

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: On page 11, line 7, strike out "$300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODELL

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: On page 11, line 19, strike out "$20,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Minnesota rise?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 10, line 20, strike out "$70,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$35,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 11, after line 23, insert the following:

"TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

"SEC. 19. Title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS TO SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

" 'SEC. 617. (a) All functions of the Director under part C of title I are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

" '(b) So much of the personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds employed, held, used, available, or to be made available, in connection with functions transferred by subsection (a) as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine shall be transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.' "

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 11, after line 23, insert the following:

"TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

"SEC. 19. Title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS TO SECRETARY OF LABOR

" 'SEC. 617. (a) All functions of the Director under part B of title I are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Labor.

" '(b) So much of the personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds employed, held, used, available, or to be made available, in connection with functions transferred by subsection (a) as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine shall be transferred to the Department of Labor.' "

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 11, after line 23, insert the following:

"TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

"SEC. 19. Title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS TO SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

"SEC. 617. (a) All functions of the Director under title III are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture.

" '(b) So much of the personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds employed, held, used, available, or to be made available, in connection with functions transferred by subsection (a) as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine shall be transferred to the Department of Agriculture.' "

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODELL

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: On page 11, after line 23, insert the following:

"TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

"SEC. 19. (a) Section 501 and section 503 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are each amended by striking out 'Director' and, inserting in lieu thereof 'Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare'.

"(b) Section 502 of such Act is amended by striking out 'Director is authorized to transfer funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the purposes of this title to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enable him' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to utilize funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the purposes of this title'."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODELL

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: On page 11, after line 23, insert the following:

"AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI—TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

"SEC. 19. Title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS TO ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

"'SEC. 617. (a) All functions of the Director under title IV are hereby transferred to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

"'(b) So much of the personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds employed, held, used, available, or to be made available, in connection with functions transferred by subsection (a) as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine shall be transferred to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.'"

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODELL

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a final unexplained amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: On page 11, after line 23, insert the following:

"TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

"SEC. 19. (a) Section 501 and section 503 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are each amended by striking out 'Director' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.'

"(b) Section 502 of such Act is amended by striking out 'Director is authorized to transfer funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the purposes of this title to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enable him' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to utilize funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the purposes of this title'."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 10, line 2, amend section 18, on page 10, line 2, by substituting a semicolon for the period, and adding the following proviso:

"Provided that no part of such appropriation is authorized to be used in the payment of salaries, wages, or other compensation to any individual which is in excess of the prevailing wage for identical or comparable employment in the community where such services are performed."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri) there were—ayes 76, noes 119.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 1:

"AMENDMENT TO NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT—MORATORIUM ON STUDENT LOANS TO VISTA VOLUNTEERS

"SEC. 19. (a) Paragraph (2)(A) of section 205(b) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (20 U.S.C. 425(b)(2)(A)) is amended by striking out 'or' before '(iii)' and by inserting before the proviso and after 'Peace Corps Act' the following: ', or (iv) not in excess of three years during which the borrower is in service as a volunteer under section 603 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964'.

"(b) The amendments made by this section shall not apply to any loan outstanding on the effective date of this Act without the consent of the then obligee institution."

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, pursuant to House Resolution 431, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. QUIE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. QUIE moves that the bill, H.R. 8283, be recommitted to the Committee on Education and Labor with instructions that the bill be reported back forthwith with the following amendments:

"Beginning with line 19 on page 4, strike out everything down through line 3 on page 5, and renumber the following sections accordingly.

"On page 9, line 23, strike out '$825,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$412,500,000'.

"On page 10, line 10, strike out '$680,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$340,000,000'.

"On page 10, line 20, strike out '$70,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$35,000,000'.

"On page 11, line 7, strike out '$300,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$150,000,000'.

"On page 11, line 19, strike out '$20,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$10,000,000'.

Mr. QUIE (interrupting the reading of the motion to recommit). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the motion to recommit be dispensed with. All this is to reinstate the Governor's veto as it is presently in the act and to have the authorization this coming year exactly as the authorization bill for this past year was, $945 million.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I support the recommittal motion because I favor the objectives of the poverty program. In my judgment, approval of the recommittal motion will strengthen the program, encourage sounder administration, prevent the waste and duplication of funds and efforts, and help insure more responsible control at the local level.

When I voted last year to originate the war on poverty, I did so—as I indicated at the time—with some misgivings. I was encouraged to go ahead and to take the risk in the interest of the high purpose of the program by virtue of the fact that the 1-year authorization would enable Congress to evaluate the operation of the Office of Economic Opportunity before committing new funds for a longer period.

Regrettably, Congress has not fully utilized this opportunity to make the kind of study we need if we are to base our decision today on careful analysis of all the facts. What we do know, however, should give us cause for both hope and disappointment—disappointment in the all-too-frequent examples of inept administration, questionable appointment of personnel, overly delayed decisions, poor coordination, and the triumph of youthful but inexperienced idealism over the sounder demands of commonsense; and hope in the unassailably noble objectives of the program, the undeniably worthy commitment of those who are running it, and the frequently promising results already achieved from place to place.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, like many of our colleagues, I am of mixed mind. The poverty program is too important, too badly needed, to scrap. I have watched the beginnings of the Job Corps program in my own State of New Jersey and I have cooperated in the undertaking of local poverty programs in the congressional district I represent. I am proud of the commitment people are making to help those less fortunate than themselves, and I am deeply pleased to see that those who have never had a real chance before are responding to opportunity with the determination to help themselves.

Yet, at the same time, there is too much evidence of waste and politics and bureaucracy and conflict—all of which threaten the ideals of the poverty program—to give it an unconditional vote of confidence.

The recommittal motion, Mr. Speaker, provides a sound and responsible way of dealing with this difficult situation. By limiting the authorization to the level of funds provided for the program's first year, we can help assure the time and conditions required for more stable administration and more orderly operation. And by continuing the role of the Governors of the 50 States in the poverty program, we can encourage more effective coordination of the program with State and local agencies of government having similar or related responsibilities.

The poverty program does not and cannot exist in a vacuum. It is an integral part of many efforts and numerous activities aimed at eliminating poverty, easing suffering, and creating new opportunity for the economically, socially, and culturally deprived.

The war on poverty is an inspiring ideal and the challenge before us now is to help give this ideal life and strength and impact. The poverty program, in order to justify its existence and be equal to its aim, must be soundly planned and wisely administered as well as vigorously pursued. Approval of the recommittal motion can bring these objectives closer to fruition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 178, nays 227, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 196]

YEAS—178

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callaway
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Everett
Findley
Fisher
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McDowell
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morton
Mosher
Nelsen
Passman
Pelly
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Satterfield
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Selden
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tunney
Tuten
Utt
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

NAYS—227

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Aspinall
Baldwin
Bandstra
Barrett
Beckworth
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conyers
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harris
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Krebs
Landrum
Leggett
Lindsay
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDade
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mathias
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Secrest
Senner
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tupper
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
Weltner
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—28

Arends
Ashley
Blatnik
Bonner
Bow
Colmer
Evins, Tenn.
Halleck
Harvey, Ind.
Keogh
Kirwan
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
O'Neal, Ga.
Pike
Redlin
Roncalio
Rumsfeld
Scott
Shipley
Tenzer
Thomas
Toll
Ullman
Waggonner
White, Idaho
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Waggonner for, with Mr. Kirwan against.

Mr. Roncalio for, with Mr. Evins of Tennessee against.

Mr. O'Neal of Georgia for, with Mr. Thomas against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against.

Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Ashley against.

Mr. Pike for, with Mr. Tenzer against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Shipley against.

Mr. Mailliard for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Redlin against.

Mr. Harvey of Indiana for, with Mr. White of Idaho against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Ullman with Mr. Rumsfeld.

Mr. HUNGATE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CABELL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 245, nays 158, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 197]

YEAS—245

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Aspinall
Baldwin
Bandstra
Barrett
Beckworth
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Carter
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray

Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harris
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Landrum
Leggett
Lindsay
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mathias
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Secrest
Senner
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Taylor
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Tupper
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
Weltner
White, Tex.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—158

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Callaway
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Cooley
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Findley
Fisher
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Herlong
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
King, N.Y.
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Morton
Mosher
Murray
Nelsen
Passman
Pelly
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Satterfield
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Selden
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stanton
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

NOT VOTING—30

Arends
Ashley
Blatnik
Bonner
Bow
Carey
Colmer
Evins, Tenn.
Halleck
Harvey, Ind.
Keogh
Kirwan
McVicker
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
O'Neal, Ga.
Pike
Redlin
Roncalio
Rumsfeld
Scott
Shipley
Tenzer
Thomas
Toll
Ullman
Waggonner
White, Idaho
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Waggonner against.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee for, with Mr. Roncalio against.

Mr. Thomas for, with Mr. O'Neil of Georgia against.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Tenzer for, with Mr. Halleck against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Arends against.

Mr. Pike for, with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts against

Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Mailliard against.

Mr. Shipley for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Rumsfeld.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. McVicker.

Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Redlin.

Mr. Ullman with Mr. Bonner.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter, tables, and charts, on this bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF CONGRESSMAN OTTO E. PASSMAN ON THE FREDERICK L. HUMPHREY MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, in April of this year it was brought to the attention of Members of this body by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, the Honorable WILLIAM COLMER, that a young law enforcement officer by the name of Frederick L. Humphrey had been murdered in cold blood in the city of Hattiesburg, Miss., while performing his duties as a peace officer. He left a wife and young son without any means of support.

Some of us who have had experience in raising funds suggested that it would be desirable to create a memorial fund for the young son of the murdered peace officer. I was selected as secretary of the fund, the Honorable Luther A. Smith, former justice of Mississippi, as treasurer, and the Honorable WILLIAM COLMER, of Mississippi, as coordinator.

The three of us who assumed the responsibility of creating this memorial fund extend our heartfelt thanks to those who have contributed to this worthy cause, and Mrs. Humphrey, the widow of the young peace officer, has asked me to extend her gratitude and appreciation to the contributors. On some subsequent date, when her young son is old enough to realize what has happened, he, too, will be privileged to see the list of contributors and will know that there were those who desired to be helpful to his mother in her hour of great distress. On behalf of the committee, the mother, and the young son, I want to personally thank all contributors for the generous manner in which they responded to our appeal.

I now submit a detailed report on the memorial fund, giving the names and addresses of the individuals and organizations that have contributed:

Contributor	Address	Amount
Otto E. Passman	2108 Rayburn Office Bldg., Washington, D.C.	$100.00
Luther A. Smith	1733 16th St. NW., Washington, D.C	100.00
Walter Harnischfeger	4400 West National Ave., Milwaukee, Wis.	50.00
Anonymous	2111 Rayburn Office Bldg., Washington, D.C.	50.00
Do	512 Brightseat Rd., Landover, Md	40.00
John Bell Williams	2370 Rayburn Office Bldg., Washington, D.C.	25.00
Thomas G. Abernethy	2371 Rayburn Office Bldg., Washington, D.C.	25.00
Prentiss Walker	409 Cannon Office Bldg., Washington, D.C	25.00
Martha K. Williams	1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va	25.00
H. R. Gross	2368 Rayburn Office Bldg., Washington, D.C.	15.00
Thomas W. Sandoz	1536 Connecticut Ave. NW., Washington, D.C	10.00
O. K. Hammons	111 Wheelis St., West Monroe, La	10.00
Gary D. Adams	4828 67th Ave., Hyattsville, Md	10.00
Henry Hadley	Route 1, Box 12, Arkadelphia, Ark	10.00
Pearl Rosenfeld	1204 South 34th St., Birmingham, Ala	10.00
Edward L. Yeager	Care of Postmaster, West Blocton, Ala	10.00
C. F. Kleinknecht	10118 Brunett Ave., Silver Spring, Md	10.00
Ruth E. Addison	1600 South Joyce St., Arlington, Va	$5.00
Iva A. Heath	110 D St. SE., Washington, D.C	5.00
A. Dalton Bryson	No. 9 Fourth St. NE., Washington, D.C	5.00
Norman W. Sederberg	38 North Idlewild, St., Memphis, Tenn	5.00
Mrs. Roy Lockwood	13984 Whitcomb, Detroit Mich	5.00
LaVerne M. Andres	19186 Pennington, Detroit, Mich	3.00
William Ray Sherer	Post Office Box 243, Hamilton, Ala	2.50
Ernest T. Sturgis	5355 Knollwood, Memphis, Tenn	2.00
R. H. McClurg	12740 Fenkell Ave., Detroit, Mich	2.00
Nathan Cohen	In care of Postmaster, Helena, Ark	2.00
W. W. Noblen	1731 Wells Station Rd., Memphis, Tenn	1.00
R. L. McDaris	3879 Central, Memphis, Tenn	1.00
LaVerne M. Andres	19186 Pennington, Detroit, Mich	1.00
Margaret A. Forbes	16831 Fielding St., Detroit, Mich	1.00
George O. Baird, Jr	424 College St., Shreveport, La	1.00
Janet L. Stallworth	1408 Ardsley Place, Birmingham, Ala	1.00
Mrs. Iris H. Welborn	1138 Mullins St., Memphis, Tenn	1.00

Contributor	Address	Amount
William C. Colmer	2307 Rayburn Office Building, Washington, D.C.	$50.00
P. W. Schmidt	In care of Postmaster, St. Louis, Mo	30.00
Jamie L. Whitten	2413 Rayburn Office Building, Washington, D.C.	25.00
Bob Sikes	2269 Rayburn Office Building, Washington, D.C.	25.00
Spencer M. Thomas	418 Olive St., St. Louis, Mo	25.00
Philip Kay	4211 16th St. NW., Washington, D.C	17.00
K. Z. Simpson	Box 8546 (Pine Hill Cemetery), Ensley, Ala	15.00
Eugene J. Reardon	46 Ancell St., Alexandria, Va	5.00
Viola Haney	1299 South McKnight Rd., St. Louis, Mo	5.00
Fey Jane Dawson	425 Fourwynd Dr., Creve Coeur, Mo	5.00
H. B. Coker	In care of Postmaster, Demopolis, Ala	5.00
Catherine D. Murphy	447 Bluff St., Alton, Ill	3.00
Russell Patton	447 Woodlawn Estates, Kirkwood, Mo	2.00
Wayne A. Johnson	501 Dana Lane (Box 19177), Houston, Tex	2.00
W. A. Johnson	Post Office Box 19177, Houston, Tex	1.00
J. W. Baton	2307 Rayburn Office Bldg	1.00
Robert Kuzman	1 Harding Dr., Rye, N.Y	1.00
Mildred M. Cox	1085 South McKnight, St. Louis, Mo	1.00
Maude M. Wylie	424 Summit Ave., Crookston, Minn	1.00
Charles E. Webber	213 Broad St., Salem, Va	100.00
John B. Tomhave	201 Dupont Ave. South, Minneapolis, Minn	50.00
Edgar Cordell Powers	3800 North Charles St., Baltimore, Md	25.00
Thomas J. Kelly	1028 Connecticut Ave. NW., Washington, D.C.	25.00
Frank L. Thompson	Drawer 2278, Lakeland, Fla	25.00
Earl O. Dailey	Box 1369, Balboa, C.Z	10.00
Edward J. Franta	Care of postmaster, Langdon, N. Dak	10.00
Scott S. Leiby	Box 26, Harrisburg, Pa	10.00
W. B. Massey	127 Church St., Bonne Terre, Mo	10.00
Scottish Rite bodies, Okinawa.	URASOE, Post Office Box 20, Okinawa	100.00
Paul F. Mullin	5843 West Heatherbrae, Phoenix, Ariz	2.00
George W. Andrews	2466 Rayburn Office Bldg., Washington, D.C	10.00
Omer W. Clark	7514 Old Chester Rd., Bethesda, Md	10.00
Mrs. Fred Briegel	1464 Grandville, Detroit, Mich	1.00
Roy W. Wells	In care of Langdon Scottish Rite Bodies, Langdon, N. Dak.	25.00
Fred W. Clark	Post Office Box 301, Mobile, Ala	25.00
A. A. Hedges	Box 2645, Juneau, Alaska	25.00
Joe W. Seacrest	926 P St., Lincoln, Nebr	20.00
Dee A. Strickland	2016 Island Dr., Monroe, La	10.00
Mrs. Dansby A. Council	833 North 21st St., Fort Smith, Ark	10.00
Claude Harrison	Loop Rd., Monroe, La	10.00
H. C. Shipman	230 East Elmwood, Shreveport, La	10.00
Rose Smith Heyer	Rosehue, Box 725, Covington, La	5.00
W. S. Peck, Jr	In care of Postmaster, Sicily Island, La	5.00
George E. Rogers	314 Shady Oaks Dr., West Monroe, La	5.00
L. T. McKinney	301 Laurelann Dr., Dayton, Ohio	5.00
Mary G. Rice	21091 Mahon Ave., Southfield, Mich	5.00
R. W. Baird	Box 19813, New Orleans, La	5.00
L. U. Fourmy	1100 Speed Ave., Monroe, La	2.00
Mrs. C. E. Wadley	512 Eason Pl., Monroe, La	2.00
J. D. Lindsey	Care of Postmaster, Bernice, La	100.00
Edwin Grafton	Post Office Box 1715, Helena, Mont	25.00
Bert Roberts	6915 33d St. NW., Washington, D.C	25.00
John M. Stewart	1616 North Edgewood, Arlington, Va	25.00
Brig. Gen. A. Moross	119 Pembroke St., Brooklyn, N.Y	25.00
A. E. Harris	1023 Forrest St., Gadsden, Ala	10.00
A. O. Buckingham	630 Mississippi Ave., Bogalusa, La	5.00
W. M. Elliott	Care of Postmaster, Grayson, La	5.00
D. Peter Laguens, Jr	333 St. Charles Ave., New Orleans, La	5.00
James R. Williams	Post Office Box 4566, Monroe, La	5.00
E. L. Boyles	Care of Oriental Consistory, Yankton, S. Dak.	200.00
Roy L. James	3424 Porter St. NW., Washington, D.C	200.00
Sidney L. Powell	Box 877, Newport News, Va	50.00
J. R. Dewey	Post Office Box 285, Danville, Va	50.00
Frank Davison	1214 North 25th, Boise, Idaho	25.00
Mrs. James H. Ware	Route 1, Box, 239, Opelousas, La	$25.00
Capitol Broadcasting Co	Post Office Box 9583, Raleigh, N.C	25.00
Ralph Loe	Post Office Box 671, Tallulah, La	20.00
Lincoln G. Kelly	608 Walker Bank, Salt Lake City, Utah	20.00
C. E. Gwinn	Post Office Box 371, Jena, La	20.00
M. James Stevens	2300 Beach Dr., Mississippi City, Miss	15.00
Robert Y. Wood, Jr	Post Office Box 1335, Natchez, Miss	10.00
Do	do	10.00
M. L. Womack	In care of Postmaster, Jonesville, La	10.00
J. O. Cagle	In care of Pearl River Electric, Columbia, Miss.	10.00
Mrs. M. R. Briney	Box 118, Jonesboro, La	10.00
A. F. Walvoord	403 East Mulberry, San Antonio, Tex	10.00
B. F. Bauman	Route 1, Columbia, La	5.00
Mrs. E. L. Edmonds	228 Allen Ave., Jonesboro, La	5.00
S. E. Rhodes	In care of Postmaster, Covington, La	5.00
Scottish Rite Bodies	1229 Polk Ave., Houston, Tex	100.00
Scottish Rite Bodies, Alexandria, Va.	4201 Fairfax Dr., Arlington, Va	50.00
John T. Weaver	5614 Woodlawn Pl., New Orleans, La	5.00
Thomas L. Jackson	Care of Postmaster, Sicily Island, La	5.00
Miss Velva Joiner	602 East Park, Hammond, La	5.00
J. E. Patterson	117 Sherry Dr., Hammond, La	5.00
R. P. French	Post Office Box 112, Opelousas, La	5.00
L. T. Germany	Post Office Drawer 130, Jena, La	5.00
Capt. H. C. Brote	Military Rd., Covington, La	2.00
Mary K. Thompson	Care of Postmaster, Oak Grove, La	2.00
Miss Jonesville	Care of Postmaster, Jonesville, La	1.00
G. Gilbert Miller	2912 West Leigh St., Richmond, Va	213.72
O. C. Fisher	Room 2407, Rayburn Office Bldg., Washington, D.C.	50.00
Harry M. Margolin	Post Office Box 567, Yankton, S.D	50.00
Speedy O. Long	Room 1627, Longworth Office Bldg., Washington, D.C.	10.00
Edna G. Weaver	Care of Postmaster, Lacombe, La	10.00
Lorelle H. Gaugh	6910 Rolando Knolls, LaMesa, Calif	5.00
Mrs. Mary Gholsen	218 North 42d St., Belleville, Ill	38.00
Mrs. Grace Fortune	Care of postmaster, Alton, Ill	5.00
J. J. Nichols	5506D Forest Blvd., St. Louis, Mo	5.00
Mrs. Lois F. Petersen	Care of postmaster, Alton, Ill	5.00
Dr. Charles W. Robinson	5952 Bancroft, St. Louis, Mo	5.00
Mrs. Lucille Neudling	232 Clearpoint, St. Louis, Mo	3.00
Rose Turner	Care of postmaster, Ferguson, Mo	3.00
Belton Y. Glover	Care of postmaster, Olney, Ill	2.00
W. C. Heidenreich	Care of postmaster, St. Louis, Mo	2.00
Leslie Hoffman	1015 Jackson, St. Charles, Mo	2.00
Jim H. Wachter	221 Deane Ct., St. Louis, Mo	2.00
Mildred J. Schoonover	Care of postmaster, St. Louis, Mo	1.00
Edward E. Tharp	Care of postmaster, St. Louis, Mo	1.00
James M. Hay	119 Karem Rd., Waco, Tex	50.00
Joe D. Waggonner, Jr	Room 1237 Longworth Office Bldg., Washington, D.C.	10.00
Mrs. Charlie L. Chapple	3316 Huges St., Lincoln AFB, Nebr	5.00
Mrs. Albert Davis	Post Office Box 481, Port Neches, Tex	5.00
Mrs. Mary C. Nesbit	4613 DeRussey Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md	5.00
J. C. Whichard	Post Office Box 11181, Norfolk, Va	100.00
William H. Colonna (33d)	Box 877, Newport News, Va	31.00
Marion T. Lipp	Care of Franklin Sun, Winnsboro, La	5.00
Mrs. Sam Basile	Care of Postmaster, Mandeville, La	5.00
John McKee (33d)	717 Merc. Cont. Bldg., Dallas, Tex	100.00
J. B. Andrews (33d)	Post Office Box 2468, Roanoke, Va	50.00
Harry O. Schroeder (33d)	110 Clarke Pl., Frederick, Md	25.00
Charles P. Rosenberger	Post Office Box 2236, Tulsa, Okla	20.00
Scottish Rite Bodies	Post Office Box 521, Lynchburg, Va	50.00
Do	301 West Missouri Avenue, El Paso, Tex	50.00
C. E. Fitzgerald (33d)	Post Office Box 1274, Mobile, Ala	38.00
Henry C. Clausen (33d)	234 Van Ness, San Francisco, Calif	100.00
Total		3,546.22

Faithfully submitted,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Member of Congress.

MEMORIAL FOR THE DEAD OF THE SPANISH AMERICAN WAR

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am authorized by my friend of many years and my fellow member of Columbia Camp in Chicago, Sam Black, the commander in chief of the United Spanish War Veterans, to invite all my colleagues in the House to attend the dedication services on Saturday of the first monument erected in the National Capital in memory of the dead of the Spanish American War. As a special treat on that occasion, one of our colleagues whom I regard as one of the last great orators of America, the gentleman from South Carolina, WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, will be one of the speakers. The ceremonies will be held on the south side of Memorial Avenue, the National Capital Park area, at 2 o'clock Saturday afternoon. I hope all my colleagues will be present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished and beloved majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I believe that every Member of the House who is serving in this year 1965 is elated that we still have among us one of the most courageous of that group of men who, much more than a half century ago, carried the colors for the United States in what is known as the Spanish American War. I refer, of course, to the distinguished, articulate, and lovable gentleman from Illinois who is addressing the House.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I might say to our majority leader that his State, Oklahoma, is deep in the affection of the veterans of the Spanish American War. One of the past commanders is chief of the United Spanish War Veterans, a fine comrade and a great leader, whose patriotic influence long has been felt and long will continue to be felt, is from Oklahoma. And our Spanish War veterans never have had a better friend in this Chamber than the distinguished majority leader. We all have a great love for Oklahoma.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS IS CRITICAL PROBLEM

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FUQUA**. Mr. Speaker, it is a difficult problem to excite the American people to the problem which our continued deficit in our balance of payments which foreign nations is having on our Nation.

I appreciate the strong appeal of the President in this regard and his determination that this problem will be solved. We must never forget that the ability of this Nation to succeed in its difficult and demanding role as leader of the free world—that all the political, diplomatic, and military resources at our command—depend upon a strong and stable American economy and a sound dollar. The dollar is the most widely used international currency. It is the strength and soundness of the American dollar that serves as the foundation of the entire free-world monetary system.

Since 1949 this Nation has suffered a balance-of-payments deficit in every year except 1957. I would point out that we have made some progress, but in spite of this progress, our deficit last year totaled over $3 billion.

This year the cycle has been reversed, and we are reportedly making progress. However, a few months of surplus is meaningless in the overall context of this problem, for it must be solved.

One measure that would help, I believe, would be early passage of a bill which I have introduced, asking that France make repayment of the billions she owes this Nation in wartime debts. One of the reasons for our problem has been the foolhardy course of the French Government, demanding gold to deplete our stocks, completely disregarding the damage this course does to an old ally that gave its all to free France from Nazi rule.

I emphasize as strongly as I know how to this body, that this problem must be solved. The American people must be made aware of the serious consequences that we face unless it is solved.

It is no idle question, and one which we need to give more consideration to.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE INDUSTRY AND THE F-105

Mr. **WOLFF**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WOLFF**. Mr. Speaker, today's news bulletins bring reports that our F-105 fighter-bombers struck yesterday to within 25 miles of Red China on a mission against the Vietcong.

While efforts toward a peaceful resolution of the Vietnam conflict continue, and while we must again and again exhaust every avenue at our command toward bringing peace to this troubled area, and though we hope that the necessity for the use of weapons of war is brought to a quick end, nevertheless it is reassuring that we have in our arsenal a weapon like the F-105.

Repeated news reports indicate that the F-105 is bearing the brunt of the toughest task in Vietnam. It is carrying out the most important missions. It is living through fusillades of small arms fire, absorbing 37 millimeter antiaircraft shells—and is bringing our boys home safely.

The Republic F-105 Thunderchief is an extremely powerful supersonic fighter-bomber that was conceived and initially produced to carry nuclear weapons. Later the F-105 was modified to perform as a limited war weapon of power and versatility in addition to its original role. This aircraft is a descendent of the P-47 Thunderbolt, known as the "Jug," renowned in World War II for doing a job and getting the pilot home.

My purpose in calling attention to the outstanding performance of this weapon is to acknowledge a debt we all owe and sometimes forget. Our fighting men in Vietnam have been supported by weapons invented and produced by American industry. To industry in general we should say "well done." We in New York are proud of the role of our industry in the defense of our Nation, and today we say to the engineers, designers, and builders, to all who helped in the development and production of the "105" at Republic Aviation Corp.: "Thanks for a fine product; we are proud of you." We are fortunate in having this superior weapon, and indeed also fortunate to have the leadership of President Johnson who continues to pursue every possible diplomatic and political effort toward peace.

APPOINTMENT OF JUSTICE GOLDBERG AS AMBASSADOR TO U.N.

Mr. **FARBSTEIN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FARBSTEIN**. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate the President of these United States on the appointment of Justice Goldberg as our Ambassador to the United Nations. I know this is a bit tardy and belated. Nevertheless, I think it bears restatement, especially in view of the fact that we are beginning to hear from some of the Arab countries about the advisability of the appointment of Mr. Justice Goldberg as our Ambassador to the United Nations. Let me tell them that if they will deport themselves with the sense of justice to all people, to all men, and to all nations, that will be made evident by Ambassador Goldberg, they will certainly have no cause for complaint. Just so long as they will show the milk of human kindness, they will recognize the existence of that trait in Justice Goldberg as a representative of our Nation.

I might say that Justice Goldberg is going there as a spokesman for all Americans and, indeed, for all people everywhere who love freedom and justice. The prestige and stature and significance which this Nation attaches to this international forum where strife can be adjudicated and peace can be striven for will be added to by Justice Goldberg's own prestige and stature.

Justice Goldberg has acquitted himself both as Secretary of Labor and as Justice of the Supreme Court with honor, ability, and distinction.

He is to be greatly honored for answering the call to duty by his President.

I am certain he will prove a worthy Ambassador of his country to the United Nations. His skill in negotiating and persuasion, his tact, his ability to arrive at acceptable compromise, his dedication to law and moral principles will, I am sure, redound to the benefit of all humanity.

I am proud to stand on this floor to applaud the President on his appointment of Justice Arthur J. Goldberg as our Ambassador to the United Nations.

CANCELING THE AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM TO UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. **HALPERN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HALPERN**. Mr. Speaker, today I have called upon the President of the United States to rescind his authorization to renew the remaining portion of our agricultural assistance program to the United Arab Republic. I have asked that whatever portion remains of the $37.5 million program be suspended.

There should be no qualms about this. We now have concrete evidence of the perpetration of fraud, on the part of the United Arab Republic, which makes it incumbent on us to stop this aid. The charge comes from no less a source than GAO.

Yesterday, on this floor, I cited the GAO's report to this House which revealed that almost half of the 186,000 tons of corn given by the United States to the United Arab Republic in 1961, ostensibly for distribution to the needy, was sold by Nasser's government.

I repeat, today, this is a clear-cut case of fraud and corruption. When Egypt sold food provided by America as a gift for the needy, she forfeited any further qualification for inclusion in such programs. Egypt withheld this food from the hungry masses and used it for ends of power, profit, and greed. This surely is a cynical exploitation of food intended for relief of the poor.

For years, many of us have insisted that the Department of State and the aid agencies verify the need for, and the distribution of, our assistance. We have warned that these supplies were being diverted into other hands, but our protestations were ignored.

The report of the GAO discloses that this shipment of corn to the United Arab Republic valued at $23.7 million was given to Egypt on the basis of that Government's representation that a famine would follow an anticipated crop failure. The report further states that, in fact, no such crop failure took place. In spite of this, the distributing agencies made no effort to investigate the use to which this food was put.

In view of this startling revelation by our Government's own Accounting Office, I urge the immediate suspension of any portion of the $37.5 million remaining under the agricultural assistance program to Egypt.

MEMORIAL TO THE PASSING OF SILVER MONEY FROM OUR CURRENCY SYSTEM

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I feel it only fitting and proper after the passing of silver money from our currency system, that a proper memorial to the architect of this policy be voted by the House.

I propose by this bill that Lyndon B. Johnson's likeness be graven on the new silverless coin that will soon replace the once proud quarter. Certainly we should not taunt the memory or taint the sound money reputation of George Washington by continuing his image on the literally worthless pieces.

The Government has apparently made extensive tests to determine that these coins would pass safely and surely through the slots of vending machines delivering the bubble gum and other oddments that such devices vend. I am wondering if proper testing has been done to determine their usefulness in fuse boxes. It is apparent that the current inflationary trend in our Nation today, coupled with the basic lack of intrinsic value of these copper gaskets, may soon make their use in fuse boxes one of the few practical applications for the American public.

I would like to further urge that the new quarter sandwich coin bear the legend "consensus coin" and an appropriate motto such as "In Clad We Trust."

This is a solemn and portentous occasion. The President's signature on the Coinage Act of 1965 marked the passing of the jingle in a man's pocket and the arrival of the klunk.

Out in Montana we mine gold and silver and are known as the Treasure State. We also produce a lot of copper, but we know where it belongs—in wires and tubes, in pots and pans, industrial uses and pennies. It has been said that the old order changeth and apparently the old change passeth also.

Passage of the Coinage Act ended a tradition of 173 years that began with enactment of our first coin laws while George Washington was President.

George Washington was also renowned for never having told a lie. The George Washington quarter containing 90 percent silver may not be worth quite a quarter's worth of silver but George could be accused of only a little white lie compared with the hoax the Treasury Department has perpetrated and which the Congress has imposed on the people of this country.

So let the new and shiny but worthless two-bit piece bear the likeness of the man who sounded taps for a sound and proud American tradition so that historians may one day recall exactly the time the United States went from the age of silver back to the copper age. We may yet see the day we import our coins from the Yap Islands where stone is still used for coins.

Out in my country, we regard the new coins much as did Charles Mackay, when he wrote:

> Whenever a rascal strove to pass
> Instead of silver, a coin of brass,
> He took his hammer, and said with a frown,
> "This coin is spurious, nail it down."

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of my bill.

NOMINATION OF ARTHUR GOLDBERG AS AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in expressing my compliments to the President on his choice of Justice Arthur Goldberg as Ambassador to the United Nations.

The 20th century, more than any other, has witnessed violence and excess done in the name of the Nation-State. The lesson of the two World Wars is the need to limit the historical rule of "might makes right." The system of international law and the institution of the United Nations are at present the most viable means to infuse order and restraint into the relations between modern nations.

It is most important, therefore, that the representatives of each nation be men of talent and esteem, of intelligence and dedication. Arthur Goldberg fulfills these qualifications. His background in labor and in law, and his competence as a negotiator are of vital import for the duties which he will assume. For while no true world community of law or international means of sanction exists, the maintenance of peace becomes even more dependent on mediation, on the bringing of conflict into a discussion in a representative body.

It is my sincere feeling that the appointment of Justice Goldberg is a fine one. It is a further highlight of Mr. Goldberg's illustrious career of service to his country and one which will preserve the American commitment to the continuing strength of this world organization.

Again, the wisdom of President Johnson's selection is to be noted and praised.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF JULY 26, 1965

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of asking of the distinguished majority leader the program or schedule for the remainder of this week and next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will my distinguished friend yield to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the minority leader, we do not plan any further legislative program for this week, and it will be my intention to ask to go over until Monday following the announcement of the program for next week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday, H.R. 77, repeal of right-to-work provisions. This is the so-called Taft-Hartley 14(b) provisions.

Monday is District Day and there are five bills: S. 1317, penalties for dishonored checks; S. 1321, attachments before judgment; H.R. 7067, D.C. Administrative Procedure Act; H.R. 3329, incorporate Youth Councils on Civic Affairs; House Joint Resolution 397, transfer of title of real property from United States to Redevelopment Land Agency.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to advise Members there will probably be important votes on Monday.

On Tuesday: Conference report (H.R. 6675), Social Security Act Amendments of 1965; conference report (H.R. 7984), Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965; H.R. 77, repeal of right-to-work provisions—continued from Monday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished majority leader indicate how far we intend to go on Monday on this particular bill?

Mr. ALBERT. We are certainly going to adopt the rule and we may dispose of a part of the general debate, but we do not plan to vote on that bill until Tuesday.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week, the program will be as follows:

House Joint Resolution —, continuing appropriations, August; H.R. 8856, amendment to section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954—open rule, 2 hours debate; H.R. 9026, to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended—open rule, 2 hours debate; H.R. 8310, Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965—open rule, 2 hours debate; H.R. 8469, civil service retirement annuity adjustments—open rule, 2 hours debate, waiving points of order; H.R. 6845, correction of salary inequities for teachers overseas—open rule, 1 hour debate; H.R. 1153, joint labor-management programs—open rule, 2 hours debate.

This announcement, of course, is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later. I am advised in addition to the conference reports which have been announced on the program, we are certain that there will be other conference reports next week. We have a very heavy schedule for next week, and it is hoped that we can expeditiously dispose of it.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, JULY 26

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I now ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is a little bit difficult to understand why the House is now going over until Monday in view of the numerous amendments that were offered to the bill just disposed of, for which there was no opportunity for an explanation. I am surprised, in view of that, I would say, rather brutal action in shutting off debate, that the House would go over until Monday when there is another day available for work.

Mr. ALBERT. I would advise the gentleman that there is no connection between the proceedings on the bill disposed of today and our going over until Monday. It had been our plan all along, if we could finish the antipoverty bill today, that we would go over until Monday. Had we finished it earlier, we would have taken up the atomic energy amendments.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, if you are going over tomorrow, you are precluding any business tomorrow.

Mr. ALBERT. We have no business for tomorrow.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but the day was available for the reasonable disposition of a number of important amendments to the bill just disposed of.

I am a little bit surprised under the circumstances that the House is eliminating tomorrow as a business day, as I say, under those circumstances.

Mr. ALBERT. I would say to the gentleman that we had 3 full days on the bill. It had been my understanding that the committee had agreed to try to dispose of that bill by 5 o'clock today. It was considerably later before we were able to do so.

Mr. GROSS. I would say to the gentleman that the business of the House is not always run by any particular committee of the House. I think the Members and all of the Members ought to have something to say about how the business of the House is disposed of.

Mr. ALBERT. It did; it was the House that ultimately worked its will. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. GROSS. I am not interested in agreements made by members of any particular committee.

Mr. ALBERT. I only gave that as a predicate to the fact that it was the House that finally disposed of these amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS NEXT WEEK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON THE HOUSING BILL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency have until midnight July 23 to file a report on H.R. 7984, the Housing bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, am I to understand that the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] has agreed to this arrangement?

Mr. ALBERT. I have been so advised.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have until midnight July 23 to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 2984.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman give us the title of the bill?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, it is the extension of the Research Facilities Act. It is a unanimous report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

MENTAL HEALTH AND RETARDATION BILL

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have until midnight, July 23, to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 2985.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, what is the nature of the legislation?

Mr. HARRIS. The bill has to do with the extension of the staffing provisions of the mental health and retardation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 510

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have until midnight to file a unanimous conference report on the bill S. 510, which is Public Health Service, community health services extension amendments, which expires this year.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RE-REFERRAL OF BILL

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, H.R. 9743, be re-referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE ROBERT J. BULKLEY

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I learn today of the death last night of former Congressman and Senator Robert J. Bulkley, of Ohio.

Senator Bulkley first entered the Congress of the United States as a Representative in Congress, in 1910, from the 21st District of Ohio, which I now represent. In the 62d Congress he served with great distinction as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, where he participated in the drafting of the first Federal Reserve Act and the Farm Loan Act.

In 1930 he was elected to the U.S. Senate. In 1932 he was reelected to the U.S. Senate and led the ticket in Ohio. He was a close friend and admirer of President Franklin D. Roosevelt and vigorously supported the President's programs.

The citizens of Ohio will always be grateful for the tremendous contribution of this distinguished and honored citizen.

U.S. ROLE IN VIETNAM "HOPELESS," SAYS ALLEGAN DOCTOR

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUTCHINSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, no issue faced by this Nation in recent years has been more confusing to the American people than our role in Vietnam.

It is an ideal of this Republic that momentous national decisions are debated and resolved on the floor of the

House. Although it is regrettable that there has not been a full debate here as far as Vietnam is concerned, we cannot say that debate on the subject has been lacking.

The issue is being debated; if not by the Congress, then by the American people, in the press, on the radio, in barber shops, and on street corners.

The views of one American who spent 6 years as a surgeon in Vietnam and only recently returned to start private practice in Michigan are set forth in an article in the Grand Rapids Press issue of June 18, which under leave to extend, I insert at this point in the Record:

U.S. Role in Vietnam "Hopeless," Says Allegan Doctor

(By Neil Munro)

Allegan.—"Anybody who isn't confused by the Vietnam situation isn't informed," says Dr. Ray Smith, Jr.

Dr. Smith was in South Vietnam for 6 years, and for 4½ of those years he was the only American surgeon there. He was employed by the American construction company that builds all the foreign aid projects but also treated many South Vietnamese and many American servicemen.

He has been practicing in Allegan since March, but his frustration and indignation over the Vietnam situation have not left him.

"I knew," he says, "2 years ago, and Army intelligence knew, that the Vietcong had mortars and ammo at Da Nang Airbase to blow it up. And then when they finally did, the big brass came and said they wondered how it all happened."

Dr. Smith has a long string of similar "horror stories" and he likes to get them off his chest. Since coming back to the United States with his wife and five children he has told his stories before many service clubs in this area.

The Da Nang incident is, he says, "typical of our war effort over there."

He adds that "all the nations who have embassies there—and there are a lot of them—have nice, big embassies with big yards with walls around them.

"But not the United States. We have to have a dilapidated old building in the middle of town. So all the Vietcong have to do to blow it up is to drive a car to within 6 feet of the door and blow the car up."

Dr. Smith explains, "I could have been there. I went there many times; almost wore a hole in the elbow of my coat leaning on a counter just inside the door, just 6 feet from the car."

The Vietcong, he says, can do anything they want anywhere they want to do it.

He lived in the American compound at Saigon International Airport, supposedly the most secure area in the country.

"But one day 10 men—10 men—came to the door and said they were there to check the telephone. My wife checked their identification cards, which seemed all right, so they checked the phone and left.

"I realized, when she told me, that the phone company doesn't have 10 repairmen. And I hadn't called them. The phone company hadn't sent them," he recalls.

He explains it later turned out they were Vietcong who entered the compound, past four guard houses, just to see what they could get away with.

They also drove a truck loaded with dynamite into an airbase and blew it up, he says.

"Seven members of the base security guard were in on that.

"We have no secrets over there. The Vietcong are everywhere. We might as well distribute the proceedings of our top-secret conferences in pamphlet form," Dr. Smith says.

Americans in the United States have some big misunderstandings on what's going on in South Vietnam, he believes.

"The conflict between the Buddhists and the Catholics is not a religious conflict like most people think. Here's the real background. Most of the Catholics, at least this is my impression, are still more Buddhists than anything else. Their Catholicism is a veneer.

"And most of the Catholics in South Vietnam," Dr. Smith says, "are from North Vietnam. They are refugees the Navy shipped down there after the country was divided by the 1954 Geneva agreement. Even former President Diem and all his cabinet were from North Vietnam."

He says, "The first thing the South Vietnamese knew, the North Vietnamese were running the country. It was very disturbing to them. The South Vietnamese are peasants and farmers. The North Vietnamese are more personally aggressive."

Dr. Smith also believes Americans have the wrong idea of the attitude of the South Vietnamese toward the war effort.

He reports that few of them seem to care who rules them "because the concept of loyalty to a government is nonexistent."

"Never in 10 years have we ever gotten any of our aid down to the peasants," he charges.

"We have been shipping surplus foods over there; but the peasants don't get it. My family paid good money in stores to buy cans of food which were labeled 'Donated to the people of South Vietnam by the people of the United States of America: Not to be sold'."

"The South Vietnamese, he says, "don't know which side to be on."

"We're trying to jam our good will down their throats and they don't like it. Their attitude is, 'You can give us your money but don't tell us how to spend it. And if you take it away we can get it somewhere else'," he says.

"The Vietnamese can drive us crazy," he says. "We try to be so polite to them and try to advise them of what to do—respecting the sovereignty of their country—and they laugh at us and think it's a sign of weakness. And then they're likely to go and do just the opposite of what we advised."

Dr. Smith says the South Vietnamese don't understand the democratic processes at all.

"The only way we could handle them—and I'm not advocating this—is to boss them around the way the Communists do," he says.

"As for the war itself," he says, "It's been getting worse day by day but the American officials are trying to put it in a good light. They said once, 'The attacks are more frequent but seem to be getting less effective.' "

He adds that the "big, tough United States" lost whatever prestige or "face" it once had in Vietnam when it let its people be bombed and murdered without retaliating.

"We should have started the bombing 3 years ago," Dr. Smith believes.

He says the whole confusing Vietnam situation has a sort of Alice in Wonderland atmosphere and it is "hopeless" to think of the United States ever coming out on top.

TO EQUALIZE TAXATION ON REDEMPTION OF PREFERRED STOCK

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced an amendment to section 302(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 dealing with the income tax treatment of the proceeds received in the redemption of preferred stock. To the extent that the proceeds do not exceed the amount paid in to the corporation on the issuance of such stock, the amendment provides that these proceeds shall be treated as a distribution in part or full payment in exchange for the stock and not as a dividend.

My amendment to the Internal Revenue Code is made necessary because of the distinction now made between the proceeds of preferred stock in differing situations. Under the present law, in certain cases, redemption of preferred stock is treated for tax purposes as return on capital, while in others this redemption on the same stock is treated as dividends and taxed accordingly. This distinction is based only upon whether the owner of preferred stock owns in addition a substantially proportionate ratio of common stock. If he does, the proceeds on the preferred stock are treated as dividends for tax purposes, while if he does not, these same proceeds are treated as return on capital. My amendment would remove this arbitrary distinction and permit proceeds on preferred stock, insofar as it represents capital invested in money or goods, to be treated as a return of capital.

Preferred stock is in reality a cross between common stock and bonds. However, the same reasoning which underlies the present distinction among owners of preferred stock and common stock does not apply to holders of both bonds and the common stock, so long as the bonds represent true indebtedness and the equity capital is sufficient for the needs of the corporation.

The present taxation of the income derived from the redemption of preferred stock as dividend income turns some corporations, especially closely held family corporations, to debt financing rather than equity financing when further investment is needed. A change in the system of taxation of the redemption proceeds of paid-for preferred stock would have the beneficial effect of making equity financing more attractive to the corporation and, in the long run, produce greater tax revenues.

The taxation of capital return as distinguished from interest or dividends paid on that capital is contrary to our Constitution. This amendment would assure proper tax treatment for the redemption of all preferred stock.

LATEST BATTLE OF BUREAUCRACY AGAINST RURAL AMERICA COMES FROM THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the latest battle of bureaucracy against rural America comes from the Post Office Department. Recent arbitrary decisions by the Department prove conclusively that this so-called servant of the people has turned on rural America with a vengeance and now threatens the very foundation of our national strength.

The Department claims that plans to terminate mail hauling and handling contracts with railroads operating in Minnesota and transfer such service to trucks on star routes are being carried out to provide better service at lower cost. I say they have jammed an unworkable plan down the throats of the public and that actually it is a drastic reduction of service that threatens to cost rural communities their economic lives.

The people of Minnesota have protested by the hundreds, businessmen from small towns and metropolitan areas alike have expressed alarm, and the local and State governments are on record against this move. But the thinkers in Washington have turned a deaf ear on their pleas.

The Post Office Department officials conducted a public meeting on the subject on June 24 at Thief River Falls, Minn. This meeting was held just 6 days before the new plan went into effect, and it was obvious that the Post Office Department officials arrived with a closed mind, disregarding the wishes of the public.

Under the new star route system, towns in northwestern Minnesota will receive their incoming mail later in the morning, will be forced to post outgoing mail as early as midafternoon and will lose Sunday and holiday service.

A typical example is noted in one community near the Canadian border. This town used to have dependable 7-day-a-week service with mail in their post office boxes by 8:30 in the morning. Five years ago, they had their service upgraded through the use of the star system so the arrival time of mail varied by as much as 5 hours. Two years ago they lost the Sunday delivery, so their Sunday papers now come on Monday. Now, with the new July 1 overall plan for Minnesota their mail arrives at 9:30 or later in the morning and they have to post outgoing mail by 3:15 in the afternoon, a period of less than 6 hours. I would hardly call this progress. Now the State is extending this program of reduced service to the whole State.

The regional postal director's report to Washington actually admitted there would be at least a slight impairment of service to post offices north of Thief River Falls, Minn. That report gave us a big clue as to Departmental thinking when it said:

> In general these offices are in the $2,000 or less per annum class, so a relatively small number of patrons will be affected by the later receipt (of mail).

Apparently the Post Office Department considers residents in sparsely populated areas as second-class citizens who do not merit the same services as their brothers in the cities.

My files are bulging with letters from businessmen as well as other private citizens who express concern for the economic future of their communities if bureaucratic meddlers are allowed to continue their relentless assault on rural America. These businessmen depend on reliable mail service such as they had. They must be able to drop their orders into the mail at the end of the day and be assured that their suppliers in the Twin Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul will have their orders on the way back the next day. The new system will disrupt this workable relationship. The Chambers of Commerce of both Minneapolis and St. Paul have joined with rural communities in protesting the change, but their protests also have fallen on deaf ears. I even have letters from hospitals, that depend on the mail service for lifegiving drugs and blood from the metropolitan centers. These people, dealing with human lives, are frightened by dictatorial orders from the Post Office Department that fail to consider their needs.

The loss of mail-carrying revenues by the railroads will also add fuel to their arguments to discontinue passenger service entirely to rural areas. These railroads are already petitioning to remove these passenger trains, which represent the only public transportation in and out of so much of rural America.

I have held a series of meetings in Washington with Post Office Department officials in an effort to reverse the decision to remove the mail from the trains. Their complete misunderstanding and misrepresentation of facts is truly astounding. I am completely dissatisfied with their explanation and am appalled by their lack of concern for the people in rural America. It is obvious that they do not want to consider anything that interferes with some idiodic master plan worked out in a plush Washington office. As to their claim that the Department cannot consider the problems faced by these communities, this is pure hogwash. I say that every Government department or agency, regardless of its individual function, has a responsibility to consider all aspects and effects of their decisions. You can be sure that I will continue to communicate that message to the Post Office Department in the days ahead. And I will demand a more satisfactory answer to the questions of why mail service to rural America is being reduced.

I feel sorry for the rank and file postal workers of America, who are forced to work under such questionable decisions. Many have expressed their concern to me and I can truly appreciate that the deteriorating conditions of America's postal system are caused by decay at the top and not by the dedication of the men and women across the Nation who now, as always, conduct their activities with dedication and devotion.

D. J. BRITTAIN

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Duncan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, July 24, the citizens of Oliver Springs, Tenn., and surrounding areas will gather to pay tribute to one of this Nation's most outstanding educators—D. J. Brittain. I call this event to the attention of my colleagues because of each one's vital interest in education—and more specifically, the educator—those responsible for determining the future of today's youth.

There is none more prominent in his field than Mr. Brittain—having served as an untiring educator in east Tennessee for 50 years.

His career began after graduation from Maryville College in 1910. During his half century of devotion and dedication to the field of education, Mr. Brittain served in many capacities—teacher, principal, superintendent, and coach—attesting to his outstanding and varied capabilities.

He retired in 1957 from the Roane County School system, continuing, however, as an instructor in the University of Tennessee Extension Division. His public service was not always limited to accomplishments in the area of education—having served two terms in the Tennessee State Legislature. Mr. Brittain is a World War I veteran.

It is only fitting that the citizens of Oliver Springs, the State of Tennessee, and Nation, who have had the good fortune and opportunity of receiving his guidance and leadership, honor this respected public servant—D. J. Brittain.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO EXTEND FREE FIRST-CLASS POSTAL SERVICE TO MEMBERS OF THE U.S. ARMED FORCES SERVING IN VIETNAM

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Minshall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to extend free first-class postal service to members of the U.S. Armed Forces serving in Vietnam.

This is the same allowance granted to our men during World War II and Korea.

Our troops in Vietnam already are receiving combat pay and have been granted tax exemption on their gross incomes in conformity with practices in effect during the periods 1942–45 and 1950–52. Free postage is a small but important recognition Congress can grant our servicemen who are fighting a grim and lonely war. All of us who ever served in overseas combat know the role the mails played in our lives then.

I hope that this bill will receive the prompt attention of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DIAPER SERVICE IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call the attention of the House to a most interesting phase of the poverty program. I understand the Labor Department is going to spend $141,854 of the Manpower Development and Training Administration's funds to train 700 men in the art of diaper service.

It may come as a shock to some that the Government has uncovered a great shortage of didee service personnel. I do not believe it is the Government's responsibility to train personnel for this industry.

But, of course, I realize that the poverty program must cover the waterfront. In this case it is pinning its hopes on a business that is in its infancy, but is generally picking up. Although there is continual danger of its folding at any time and, of course, if the bottom drops out, we will have an awful mess on our hands. There is, of course, the opportunity to clean up a bundle, as they say in the trade.

I bring this matter to the attention of the House solely to help us all get to the bottom of this problem—at least in the infant wear division.

There may be some who claim that the Government is being rash by stepping into the diaper business and I tend to agree.

In conclusion, may I leave with you a thought borrowed from the slogan of the diaper industry—ladies and gentlemen. it's time for a change.

THE AMERICAN MONARCHY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the Members of this body a very excellent editorial which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on July 18, 1965. It is entitled "The American Monarchy." This Congress has bent over backwards to divest itself of the constitutional responsibilities it has to the American people. More and more we have seen the liberal philosophy downgrade the Congress and urge all power to the President.

It has been seriously suggested during the past 4 years that we turn even more power over to the President. Many want to give the President power to raise or lower taxes when he sees fit. He has received additional power over tariff, the farmer, and all businessmen. It is time that we call a halt to this. This article pretty well points out the direction in which we are heading.

THE AMERICAN MONARCHY

Henry Fairlie, a journalist traveling in the United States, reports to the Sunday Telegraph of London what most of the American people do not appear to perceive—that the American system no longer is representative government but an elective monarchy. Lyndon Johnson, by the power he has concentrated in the Presidency, has made it so.

"It is now accepted by constitutional experts," Fairlie says, "that the American Constitution makes an almost indefinite 'grant of power' to the President. Political, social, and economic circumstances, and the personality and skill of the President himself, have insured that this grant of powers is interpreted more widely than ever before. Insofar as the constitution of the free world finds its focus of power and decision in the Constitution of the United States, it is some significance that America is ruled now by a popular monarch."

The effect may be as the British writer describes, but it is certainly not sustained in the provisions of the Constitution. That document was intended to create a balance of power by establishing three coequal branches—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. The people exercise choice over the personalities who shall fill the chief executive positions and who shall constitute the legislative branch.

The powers of the President are limited under the Constitution. It does not say that he shall decree the laws, but that he shall faithfully execute them. He has some initiative in the making of treaties and in setting the course of foreign policy, but he is to have the advice and consent of the Senate in entering treaties, and both branches of the national legislature can, in theory, put the brakes on foreign policy by denying funds for its execution or withholding authority for war. Beyond that, the President is a figurehead Commander in Chief and has certain powers of pardon and appointment.

If we are confronted with a Lyndon I, it is not because the Constitution sanctions the result, but because Congress and the people have failed to resist the perversion of the Constitution. The disposition of the Supreme Court to federalize everything has also contributed to the concentration of power in Washington and, particularly, in the Executive.

The Presidency has become what it is under Johnson in consequence of usurpation and the exercise of raw political power. As Fairlie states, the Congress runs at Johnson's heels. He has fed the voters with what Fairlie calls "a blatant practice of 'stomach politics'" in the form of something-for-nothing schemes, and by "openly bribing them" with what are represented as tax cuts.

Mr. Johnson also fortifies his position by discipline. Patronage and Federal projects can be withheld from dissenting members of his party. Objection is not tolerated among members of his staff.

"Symbolically," Fairlie writes, "President Johnson treats his personal staff as Edward VII when he was prince of Wales treated his servants. 'As Your Highness pleases,' said a butler when Edward poured a tureen of soup over his head."

White House power is also fed by the progressive reduction of the States to slavish dependence. Fairlie observes:

"Every act of social legislation which the President has launched has increased the dependence of the individual States, counties, and cities on Federal money—and where there is Federal money there are the Federal 'guidlines.'

"Wherever you look it is the same. Federally financed schools and universities, federally financed poverty programs and medicare, federally financed roads and housing, federally supported industries and a federally directed economy: none of it may seem startling to countries used to such centralized government, with appropriate institutions to cope with it. But in America it confers on the party in power an immense patronage.

"The local party boss has given way to the local representative of the party in power at the center which can dispense such popular bribes. It is a spoils system for the masses."

While this abomination grows and feeds up itself, the Republican Party, which is supposed to form the opposition, is dazed and silent. We have a republic in name only, and a monarchy in fact.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week is a commemoration that has growing significance in the free world struggle to roll back communism and produce freedom and peace for all the peoples of the world.

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University, writing in the July 19 edition of the Washington Report of the American Security Council, discusses the importance of Captive Nations Week in a most timely and dramatic fashion. Dr. Dobriansky is an internationally known spokesman for all the captive peoples enslaved by Communist tyranny. This analysis is of such significance that it merits the attention not only of the Members of the House but especially those consistently befuddled administrators of our Department of State. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in this Captive Nations Week, 1965, I recommend this penetrating article to those bureaucrats in Foggy Bottom who are loudly proclaiming the erroneous Johnsonian principles of coexistence and "bridges of understanding" with Red tyrants.

CAPTIVE NATIONS VERSUS RED STATES

What about the freedom aspirations of 17 million captive North Vietnamese? Will we subsidize the Red totalitarian economies of

Eastern Europe so that they can more effectively support wars of national liberation in Asia, Africa, and Latin America? When will we begin to focus the spotlight of world attention and opinion on the total breadth of Sino-Soviet imperio-colonialism? These and similar questions dealing with basic U.S. policy will be raised and discussed during the 1965 Captive Nations Week.

The week falls on July 18–24. As in previous years, this seventh observance will be held across the country and internationally. In the United States, Congress authorized the annual event through its 1959 Captive Nations Week resolution. Signed into Public Law 86–90 by President Eisenhower, it calls upon the President to issue a proclamation "each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

Successive Presidents have fittingly proclaimed the Week and, in the growing movement, over half of our Governors have regularly issued inspiring proclamations. The mayors of most of the largest cities in America also have observed the Week and several, as in Chicago, New York, and Buffalo, officially sponsor citizens' activities during the period. In Congress the event is annually observed with prayers, addresses, and concrete proposals aimed at the eventual freedom of the captive nations, with about one-third of the membership of both houses actively associated with the National Captive Nations Committee in Washington, in guiding the yearly observance.

Internationally, the observance has taken root in the Republic of China, South Korea, and the Philippines. In fact, the most outstanding single observance occurs year after year in Free China, where the entire week is filled with a variety of activities dedicated to the freedom of all the captive nations. Similar observances are being proposed in Turkey, West Germany, Canada and in other countries where citizen groups have organized themselves to commemorate the Week with us.

AN OBJECT OF CONSTANT RED ATTACK

These facts are necessarily mentioned because in large measure they explain the persistent and vehement opposition of Moscow, Peiping and their respective satraps to Captive Nations Week. It is not just a matter of their not liking the institution; they deeply fear it because of its enormous possibilities for psychopolitical implementation.

Each year since 1959 the Red totalitarians have sharply attacked the week, at times maligning it as "a propagandistic trick of the American enemies of the freedom and independence of Nations" and on other occasions pleading behind their deceptive mask of peaceful coexistence: "Is it not high time to discontinue the 'Captive Nations Week' in the United States?" Last year, for example, the July 15 issue of Izvestia complained, "With every passing year 'Captive Nations Week' becomes a nuisance." It failed to indicate specifically for whom.

While many of our own people still have not grasped the meaning and significance of the week, Communist leaders have, and by every available means they have sought its liquidation. Well aware of the strength of symbols and words, they see in the week a moral symbol which works against both their tactics and strategy. Highly skillful themselves in propaganda and cold war education, they view the week as a threat to their chief psychopolitical efforts.

In addition to being a moral symbol, the week unremittingly emphasizes the unlimited power of our "nuclear" spiritual weapons: personal liberty, political freedom, and national self-determination. As President Kennedy stated so well before his tragic assassination: "This country must never recognize the situation behind the Iron Curtain as a permanent one, but must, by all peaceful means, keep alive the hopes of freedom for the peoples of the captive nations." What better medium for such fixed nonrecognition exists in our country today than the week?—authorized by Congress, proclaimed by Presidents, Governors, and mayors, and conducted by free citizens. And not only for the captive peoples behind the European Iron Curtain but also for those behind the Asian Bamboo Curtain and Cuba's Sugar Curtain.

PERILOUS MYTHS ABOUT THE RED EMPIRE

In his timely 1965 Captive Nations Week proclamation, which was issued on the very eve of our own Independence Day, President Johnson urges all Americans "to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty." This obviously means all the captive nations. Such devotion, if it is to be sound and moving, must be based on an understanding of realities in the totalitarian Communist Empire rather than on the sands of wishful myths.

There are four outstanding myths circulating in this country that could have perilous longrun consequences for our position in the cold war. The first is the uncritical identification of the captive nations with the Red regimes. This mythical conception receives constant expression in such terms as "Communist nations," "nationalistic satellite governments," and "different Communist governments with peculiar national characters." Some writers and commentators have even gone so far as to portray the Red totalitarian Ho Chi-Minh as a Vietnamese George Washington, Gomulka as a popular leader of Poland, and the bloodstained Kadar as a hero of the Hungarian people. The truth remains that, despite contrived appearances and gestures aimed at exacting more productive work and acquiescence from the captive populace, no Red state with its totalitarian Communist Party has attained any degree of legitimacy or popular representation through genuine democratic processes. Nor, in the very nature of things, could any even attempt this. To arbitrarily identify the captive nations—the peoples themselves—with the unrepresentative governments commits not only a grave injustice to these nations in their struggle against an imposed, oppressive regime but also a foolish error that can only produce a heavy handicap for our own psycho-political efforts.

A derivative of this myth is the second which holds that the nationalism of the satellite regimes in central Europe has provided grounds for the West to wean them away from Russian domination. This myth may well become the colossal illusion of our period. Those who disseminate it are invariably unfamiliar with Russian non-Russian relations within the U.S.S.R. and Moscow's long experience in the exploitative manipulation of national symbols and forces. As two random examples: 20 years ago Stalin succeeded in ramming into the United Nations two puppets as original charter members on the basis of Ukrainian and Byelorussian nationalism; later, in response to subminimal Western interest in Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism within the U.S.S.R. Khrushchev spent many a moment mouthing the independence of Georgia, Armenia, Ukraine, Lithuania, and other captive non-Russian nations in this primary sphere of Moscow's empire.

Related to this second myth is that expressed by such terms as "polycentrism," "the distintegrative Titoist forces in the bloc," and "the crackup of the Soviet monolith in central Europe." It may surprise some to learn that the Soviet Union itself has never been a monolith. If because positive external pressure has been absent, the chinks there have been tolerable for Moscow, the appearance of similar "nationalist" cracks in the secondary sphere of its empire are not only tolerated but put to effective use as open economic windows for strategic imports from the West. As to polycentrism, the superior might and gross imperial product of the U.S.S.R.—close to $300 billion—exceeds those of all other totalitarian economies combined. In terms of ultimate survival, each Communist regime depends on the Russian center, this despite the so-called Titoist deviation and the Red Chinese rift.

The fourth persistent myth, for which we Americans are notorious, is that the Soviet Union is Russia and with this "powerful nation" we must at all costs coexist. How ludicrous this myth is can be gleaned from reading this example pertinent to our topic: "The active participation of Ukraine and Byelorussia in international relations is proof of the strengthening of the Soviet Republics and a convincing rejection of the provocative 'Captive Nations Week' proclaimed annually by the American President." (Ukrainsky Istorychyny Shurnal, February 1965.)

REALITIES AND REALISTIC THEMES

Under the heat of realities in the Red empire these myths melt away. No genuine freedoms have been or could be gained anywhere in the empire with its one party totalitarian regimes, state police control, and the virtual assurance of ineffectual western interest in the captive nations. Gestures of liberalization and the introduction of "capitalist methods" are clearly designed to solve numerous economic problems and to strengthen further the individual Red state and thus the empire as a whole. Economic determinists in our midst might well prepare themselves for an even more intense cold war struggle resulting from these developments and changes in the Communist empire.

Realities call for realistic themes that underscore the interrelated nature of all these phenomena. Foremost among those in the 1965 Captive Nations Week Observance are (1) peace with justice and freedom, emphasizing that strong support of all the captive nations is one of our most powerful deterrents against a hot global war; (2) complete support for U.S. actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic which have prevented an extension in the long list of captive nations; (3) full exposure, in the U.N. and elsewhere, of Sino-Soviet imperiocolonialism, concentrating especially on the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.; and (4) a trade policy toward the Red empire based on political concessions. To avoid a world holocaust and to severely curb the Red empire's cold war operations in the free world, these goals necessitate the cessation of a psycho-political sanctuary for the Red totalitarians on their imperial terrain. During this Captive Nations Week we can begin to concentrate on the freedom aspirations of 17 million captive North Vietnamese, and, from there, on those of all other captive nations. Steadily growing insecurity in the Communist empire will insure the security and peace of the free world.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, at the urging of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Congress 6 years ago, took note of the brutal enslavement of people behind the Iron Curtain and set aside a week as Captive Nations Week.

Unfortunately, since then succeeding administrations have watered down their observances of this week, until it can officially be spelled "weak." But we in the Congress must reiterate and renew the purpose of this week—and can do so by passing House Resolutions 14 and 15, which would set up a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

It was reported that Nikita Khrushchev was infuriated by our remembrance of Captive Nations Week. For then we recognized just who were the enslavers of millions, and the President's declaration stated that it was Soviet communism, pure and simple, that held people in bondage, that was destroying the national identity of once free and proud countries, and that was claiming freedoms that do not exist.

Today, the Presidential declaration of Captive Nations Week is a pallid exercise in formality, a token document issued without fanfare, just to be on the record to avoid political kickback from the millions of Americans who trace their ancestry, or whose original homeland was one of the captive nations.

A toothless declaration of vague interest in eventual freedom for all peoples is little less than a dousing of the hope of liberation, a burning out and shameful deterioration of our national purpose. It is a reflection of the sophistry of a state department that attempts to establish gradiations of communism, and chooses to ignore the worldwide conspiracy against freedom of the Communist movement.

Just recently, Members of this Congress were barred from attending the opening of a children's hospital in Poland, built with U.S. foreign aid dollars. Where is the benevolent Government that those who believe in coexistence claim for the captive nations?

Captive Nations Week should be a flaming challenge to communism, hurled by a determined free world. It should be expanded to include those nations enslaved by the Chinese Communists as well as those overrun by the Soviets.

The weeping Willies and handwringers who talk of delicate balances of protocol and fear any affront to the belligerent despots who rule Communist governments with force and fear, do not like Captive Nations Week. They, like Ferdinand, would rather sit and smell the flowers.

I do not believe that the free world can any longer view the Communists as unruly international delinquents, try to bribe them into being good, or pretend that they are only huff and puff. The reality of the situation is that they intend to take over the world—one way or another. They use every diabolical weapon of intrigue, treachery and armed aggression. When infiltration, indoctrination, and internal disruption fail, they do not hesitate to initiate open warfare.

This is the message that Captive Nations Week should impress on the American people. And to those who are under the jackboots of the tyrants, the message that the United States does not intend to let communism rule the world, or continue perpetually to keep peoples in bondage, should ring through loud and clear.

Congress makes the laws of our land. Any timorous stand of the administration toward Captive Nations Week should not diminish the observance all over our land of recognition of Communist infamy and renewal of our pledge that its cancer shall not spread further, or remain secure in its ill-won reign over innocent and freedom-loving peoples.

SALUTE TO ETHIOPIA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for myself and all my associates on that subcommittee I extend to Emperor Haile Selassie, to his coworkers in government and all the men, women, and children of Ethiopia, congratulations on this happy birthday occasion and every good wish for a rich future of peace, contentment, and plenty for the Government and the people of Ethiopia.

May I say to the able and popular Dr. Getachew, the chargé d'affaires of Ethiopia, that the ties that bind his country and the United States are strong and enduring. Ethiopia in the test of war and in the test of peace has proved her friendship to the United States and to the West.

Emperor Haile Selassie is the head of the oldest government in the world and he is as modern as this morning's newspaper. History will record him as one of the great figures in the period of the world in which he lived and ruled. His leadership in the movement for African unity, which has gained tremendous momentum since the creation in 1963 of the organization of African unity is a continuance in the changing world of today of the good works and the statesmanship of Emperor Haile Selassie.

Ethiopia is bounded on the north by the Sudan and the Red Sea, on the east by French Somaliland and the Somali Republic, on the south by Kenya, and on the west by the Sudan. The area totals about 460,000 square miles—roughly equal to the combined areas of Texas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico. The capital, Addis Ababa, has a population of about 450,000. Asmara, Ethiopia's second largest city, has approximately 130,000 inhabitants.

The Government of Ethiopia is a constitutional monarchy. Ethiopia's first Constitution was promulgated by the Emperor in 1931. All Ethiopians by birth, regardless of sex, who have reached the age of 21 years are entitled to vote for Deputies from the electoral district where they reside. Elections are held once every 4 years. The system of voting is secret and direct.

Ethiopia is a Christian kingdom which has existed for centuries in the highlands of east Africa. Herodotus, the Greek historian of the 25th century B.C., described Ethiopia in his writings. The visit of the Ethiopian Queen of Sheba to Jerusalem is recorded in the Old Testament, and the ruling house of Ethiopia claims descent from Menelik I, the son of King Solomon and the Queen of Sheba. Christianity was introduced in the fourth century.

Being an ancient kingdom with a long tradition of independence, Emperor Haile Selassie has shown great interest in Pan-Africanism and rose to the forefront of the movement for African unity through his sponsorship of the Conference of African Chiefs of State in Addis Ababa in May 1963 and his espousal of a charter for the Organization of African Unity. Addis Ababa is the seat of the Permanent Secretariat of the OAU.

Ethiopian Air Lines, an air transport company owned by the Ethiopian Government and operated under a contract by Trans World Airlines, services more than 25 domestic airfields and has international connections in Germany, Greece, Italy, Spain, Egypt, the Sudan, and west Africa. Efficiently run and with an impressive safety record during its more than 16 years of operation, it now has jet aircraft. Ethiopian Air Lines has been a major factor in Ethiopia's development.

The primary objectives of the Ethiopian Government might be said to include, first, the continuous improvement of the governmental structure and internal administration; second, the improvement of economic and social conditions within the country; third, the adherence to the policies of nonalinement and the right to judge each issue on its merits; fourth, support of the United Nations and the principle of collective security; and fifth, progress toward African unity.

United States-Ethiopian relations have long been amicable, dating back to the first treaty between the two states in 1903. After World War II the ties between the two countries grew steadily closer. This trend was exemplified by the signing on June 16, 1951, of a general technical assistance agreement which has provided the basis for the numerous projects of economic development currently underway.

In May 1954 Emperor Haile Selassie visited the United States and made a 5-week good will tour of the country. Vice President Nixon visited Ethiopia in March 1957. The Emperor made a second, week-long state visit in October 1963. In the following month he returned briefly to Washington to attend the funeral of President Kennedy.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, July 23, marks the birthday of Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia. It is a tribute to the outstanding accomplishments of this courageous and progressive-minded leader of his people that this occasion is observed as a national holiday in Ethiopia. I consider it a real pleasure to send my best wishes to the people of Ethiopia on a day that holds great significance for them.

Emperor Haile Selassie ascended the throne in long-independent Ethiopia in 1930. He immediately set about speeding the process of modernization in his country. He promulgated a new constitution in 1931, which admirably combined Ethiopian traditions of government and principles of modern constitutionalism. He concentrated his attention on schools, hospitals, and administrative services for his people, sending Ethiopian students abroad when necessary to acquire skills vital to the development of their country.

Much had been already accomplished when the labors of the Emperor were interrupted by one of the most lamentable events of the interwar period. The independent and peace-loving state of Ethiopia was invaded by the Fascist troops of Mussolini's Italy. While the Emperor led a glorious resistance, the League of Nations and the great democracies debated what measures they could take to aid Ethiopia, and in the end proved themselves incapable of effective action.

For 5 long years the Emperor was forced to live in exile and to watch his people suffer under a foreign occupation. It was only with the coming of World War II and the opening of the Africa campaign that the Ethiopian people regained hope. The Emperor led combined British and Ethiopian forces into Ethiopia in January 1941; by January 1942, the Fascists had been swept from the country.

It is a measure of Emperor Haile Selassie's strength of character and devotion to peace and international cooperation that his experience with the League of Nations did not leave him permanently embittered. Instead, he has made it a cardinal principle of Ethiopian foreign policy to give unqualified support to the United Nations and to participate fully in the work of its many agencies. The contribution of Ethiopia has been especially notable in the 18 Nations Disarmament Committee. Under Haile Selassie's leadership, Ethiopia has also played a prominent role in the historic struggle for independence in Africa and in the movement for African unity. It is only appropriate that Addis Ababa, the capital of Ethiopia, should have been chosen as the seat of the Organization of African Unity.

While pursuing an active and enlightened foreign policy, the Emperor has also found time to continue his efforts to improve the welfare of his people. In 1955, he promulgated a revised constitution that took Ethiopia far along the road to parliamentary government. He still attaches great importance to education as a means to spur development and has worked unceasingly for the improvement of agriculture—the mainstay of his country's economy. Today, the results of hard work, stability, and progressive leadership are there for all to see. I salute the Emperor of Ethiopia and his people on the joyous occasion of his birthday.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, July 23 is the officially designed Independence Day of Ethiopia, a land famed in the most ancient of writings. Herodotus wrote of the Ethiopia of the 25th century B.C.; the Bible tells of the visit of the Ethiopian Queen, Sheba, to King Solomon; by the fourth century A.D. the Nation was famous as a Christian kingdom.

All the free world was inspired by the heroic actions of Emperor Haile Selassie when his country suffered invasion in 1935 and there was rejoicing when on May 5, 1941 he reentered Addis Ababa at the head of the resistance forces.

It is particularly gratifying to Americans that our friendship with this proud, ancient land has never been seriously put to strain, and over the years has steadily grown. It has been our privilege to encourage and assist the economic and social development of this, our African friend.

Mr. Speaker, to tell of the affection Americans have for the land, its people and its constitutional monarch is to repeat history familiar to most of us. For who can forget the affection shown the Emperor on his 1954 good will tour, or his State visit in 1963? But even better remembered is the appearance of sincere grief he exhibited at the funeral of our beloved President, John F. Kennedy, a short time later.

On this day I believe we unite in wishing the best of all good fortune to this friendly land and its people and to Prime Minister Aklilou Habtewold and Minister of Foreign Affairs Ketema Yifru as well as to the hero-Emperor Haile Selassie I.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the birthday of His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie I. This date has also been set aside as the national holiday of Ethiopia, since its recent history has been so greatly influenced by the personality of the Emperor. Although Ethiopia can trace its history back to the year 1000 B.C., it did suffer a brief period of occupation during the 20th century. The determination of Haile Selassie to liberate his people was fulfilled in 1941 when he returned from a 5-year exile to lead the army back into the country. Following the victory of the resistance forces, the Emperor asked his people to forego reprisals against the thousands of Italians who were trapped in Ethiopia. Not only did the successful liberation prove Haile Selassie's military leadership, but his treatment of the defeated occupation forces displayed the high level of his personal ethics as a ruler and, moreover, as a person.

The history of Ethiopia, or Abyssinia as it was once called, dates far back into pre-Christian civilization. Herodotus, the Greek historian of the fifth century B.C., described Ethiopia in his writings. The present ruling dynasty traces its ancestry to King Solomon and the Queen of Sheba. Their son, Memelik I, began the line of 255 rulers of the 30-century-old dynasty which is described in the Kebra Negast, the "Glory of Kings." Christianity was introduced into the East African kingdom in the fourth century A.D.

Ethiopia is one of the original signers of the United Nations Charter and has been quite active in that organization. Ethiopia provided troops as part of the United Nations forces in both Korea and the Congo. Ethiopia is such an ancient independent kingdom that it has not felt as strongly the surge of nationalism so prevalent throughout most of Africa. However, Emperor Haile Selassie has shown great interest in Pan-Africanism and supported the movement for unity by sponsoring a conference of African chiefs of states in Addis Ababa in May 1963. Addis Ababa is now the seat of the Permanent Secretariat of the Organization for African Unity.

Emperor Haile Selassie has worked to raise the standard of living of all Ethiopians. Both he and the late Empress were vitally interested in the improvement of educational facilities. There are 2 institutions of higher education in the capital city of Addis Ababa and more than 40 technical institutions throughout the country.

American relations with Ethiopia have long been amicable, dating back to the first treaty between the two states in 1903. Since World War II the ties between our countries have grown steadily closer. This trend was exemplified by a general technical assistance agreement which has been the basis for numerous projects of economic development currently underway, and the Treaty of Amity and Economic Relations of September 7, 1951. Another agreement regularizes the existence and operations of the U.S. Army communications relay station at Asmara.

The United States has been honored by state visits of Emperor Haile Selassie on two occasions, May 1954 and October 1963. In November 1963, the Emperor returned in mourning to the United States to attend funeral services for the late President John F. Kennedy.

The United States is happy to salute His Imperial Majesty, Haile Selassie I as he celebrates another year of his long and fruitful life. We commend the people of Ethiopia on this occasion and wish for them the continued peace and prosperity of their ancient kingdom.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so have 5 legislative days in which to join me in a tribute to Ethiopia on her birthday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MAJOR OFFICIALS OF MAJOR OIL COMPANIES HAVE PRACTICALLY ASKED SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE THAT FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION SHOULD FIX GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the press, in reporting on hearings before the Industry Offices Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee with respect to appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission, brought to light some rather disturbing testimony by the Commission's Chairman. The Chairman told the Senate Subcommittee that major officials of major oil companies have practically asked the Federal Trade Commission to fix gasoline prices. I am sure that the public as well as I interpreted this to mean that all of the major oil companies and the Government were getting together to fix gasoline prices, and the consumer would have to pay more for gasoline.

The Commissioner stated that these requests were made during a recent Federal Trade Commission hearing or inquiry into the competitive problems of marketing gasoline; I looked into the record of these hearings to discover that instead of the statements attributed to them all but one of the major oil companies, and many of the smaller companies, actually opposed any Federal Trade Commission action which would fix gasoline prices or mitigate the effects of competition to the injury of the consumer. I am sure that the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission would agree to this clarification of the record.

NEW CLASS OF AIR CARRIERS DESIGNATED AS "SUPPLEMENTAL AIR CARRIERS"

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in 1962 the Congress passed legislation that created a new class of air carriers designated as "Supplemental Air Carriers." There was concern at this time that this class of carrier might not bring to air transportation the high level of responsibility so necessary when public need is being served.

Recent events widely noted in the press point to the wisdom of the congressional action of 3 years ago. I refer to the following case:

A travel agency in Boston was employed by a private group to arrange pro rata chartered flights from Boston, New York and Philadelphia, and return. The air carrier was World Airways, the largest of the supplemental carriers, with its home base in Oakland, Calif.

After several groups had been flown to Florida and Hawaii and several other groups were making preparation for their forthcoming vacations, Northeast Airlines obtained an injunction against the travel agency, thus forcing the agency into bankruptcy and curtailing all further travels for these people. One thousand two hundred people were stranded in Miami and Honolulu, and 2,000 others not only found their vacation plans canceled, but were informed that they could not be totally reimbursed for the funds they had paid to the travel agency.

Edward J. Daly, president of World Airways, took immediate action. He obtained court permission to fly empty jets to Florida and Hawaii and return the passengers home. In the case of the 2,000 whose funds had not been returned, Mr. Daly personally put up $152,000 of his own money to add to $122,500 in the bankruptcy court fund so that all people might receive full payment. It is to be noted that the legal and moral obligation of World Airways did not exceed the amount of $90,000.

At the time the repayment was enacted, Mr. Daly stated:

> The sad events of last winter which deprived these would-be vacationers of trips for which many had saved for years, were not the responsibility of those who had made the deposits. Since we were to be the air carrier, we were anxious that the disappointed travelers get back every penny that they paid in. This includes deposits for hotels, land transportation, food and other services which World Airways does not provide. Although payment for these services was never made, full reimbursement to those depositors is covered by the drafts which I am today signing and sending to these disappointed people.

Mr. Daly's actions have been commended by the press. The New York Times of May 28 ran the headline: "2000 Get Refunds In Air Tour Fiasco; Airline Head Puts Up Own Money To Make Up Deficit In Tour Agency Funds." The headline of Travel Agent magazine of May 31 read: "World Proves It Has A Heart, Refunds $150,000 On Its Own." Travel Weekly, on June 1, stated: "Carrier Refunds All Payments on 1,900 Canceled Vacations."

Mr. Daly has also received many personal letters from those who were reimbursed, and from the public, commending him on his service. Mr. Edward W. Brooke, the Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, sent Mr. Daly his congratulations and deep appreciation for the high sense of public responsibility which had been demonstrated.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, the complete text of Attorney General Brooke's letter to this fine supplemental air carrier and similar letters commenting on this great achievement. I also ask to include in my remarks typical letters of the scores received by World.

While the people concerned live on the east coast of the United States, I take deep pride in pointing out that World Airways, who voluntarily rendered this public service, is based in my congressional district at Oakland, Calif.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Boston, May 25, 1965.

Mr. EDWARD J. DALY,
President, World Airways, Inc.,
Oakland International Airport,
Oakland, Calif.

DEAR MR. DALY: I am delighted to learn that on May 27, 1965, World Airways will be mailing checks to 1895 customers with claims aggregating $336,358, which represents repayment to them, in full, for the canceled vacation tours booked through Nationwide Charters & Conventions, Inc. This is an extraordinary achievement.

This repayment was possible only because World Airways has displayed an unusual dedication to the public interest in furnishing the additional funds needed to insure full repayment.

When, in February, my office entered the litigation stemming from Nationwide's financial reverses, I was doubtful whether the hundreds of people owed money by Nationwide would ever be fully repaid. Judge Good asked Assistant Attorney General Levin H. Campbell of my staff to explore the situation with the parties, and it was during his meetings with your representatives that we were first encouraged to believe that the matter might be resolved. World's offer to put up an additional $152,500 became the basis for the complex plans and arrangements which are now being carried out with such success under the supervision of the Federal court.

As a national concern based in California, World might have taken the position that it would pay only the obligations that a court might impose. The vacation tours were, after all, arranged by Nationwide, with World as the chartered carrier, and World's maximum legal exposure was probably limited to the flight portion of the total tour costs. In view of the hundreds of relatively small claims involved with claimants scattered in many locations, World could undoubtedly have kept its liability at a minimum had it adopted a "hard-boiled" attitude. The result of such an attitude would have been to inflict severe hardship upon hundreds of individuals in and out of Massachusetts.

Instead, World took the lead in devising and financing a plan that will result, by the end of this week, in full repayment of most, if not all, of Nationwide's customers.

I think that you and the members of your organization can take great pride in what is being and has been accomplished. I wish to extend to you and to them my congratulations and deep appreciation for the high sense of public responsibility which you have demonstrated.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD W. BROOKE.

KIERNAN, CONNORS, KENYON & WILEY,
Providence, R.I., June 10, 1965.

WORLD AIRWAYS,
International Airport,
Oakland, Calif.
Attention: Mr. E. J. Daly.

DEAR SIR: I was one of your passengers who was to have taken a charter trip, the Boston Charter Group, which case as you know wound up in the bankruptcy court in Boston as a result of an injunction of Northeast Airlines.

I want to tell you how much I appreciate the return of our deposit upon this trip. I am fully aware that your company had no obligation whatever in the premises, but I was struck by the care that you took of even prospective passengers. If you take care of your passengers' interest as well as you do even of people who intended to become your passengers, it certainly speaks very well of your airline. I shall have very good feelings toward your airline as a result of this transaction. This is certainly a real example of public service. You are to be sincerely complimented and I will be more than pleased to use your facilities in the event I am anywhere in the area of your operations. I did not get to Hawaii as planned, but I did get to make the acquaintance of the airline. I am certain that all of the others who received their deposits back through your courtesy and interest, feel exactly as I do.

Very truly yours,
Leo T. Connors.

M. Melvin Goldberg,
Boston, Mass., June 21, 1965.
World Airways, Inc.,
Oakland International Airport,
Oakland, Calif.
Attention: E. J. Daly, president.

Dear Mr. Daly: Just a note to express my gratitude to you and World for the return of the $200 which I had on deposit with Nationwide. I am fully cognizant of the fact that you had no obligation whatsoever to make these refunds, so I am doubly grateful. First, to get back the $200, and secondly, it is a gratifying and heartwarming experience to have had a large corporation go to the trouble and expense to make these refunds possible to so many people.

Of course I won't benefit directly from this $200. You see, my wife opened the mail at the house one morning and called me at the office to tell me the check had arrived. She also told me that I was donating it to my favorite charity—"your wife."

Seriously, though, I didn't want to let this pass without saying—thank you very much.

Sincerely,
M. Melvin Goldberg.

The Society for the
Propagation of the Faith,
Boston, Mass., June 14, 1965.
Mr. E. J. Daly,
World Airways, Inc.,
Oakland International Airport,
Oakland, Calif.

Dear Mr. Daly: Believe me, that I am very grateful to you and to World Airways, Inc. for having made it possible for me and the other travelers from Boston to receive full repayment for the money which we paid to Nationwide Charters & Conventions, Inc. I write to acknowledge receipt of the World Airways, Inc., check in the amount of $471. I am indebted to your organization for such an outstanding act of public service. May I simply say that I hope and pray that God's blessings will be granted to all of you who had such sympathy for hundreds of the ordinary rank and file of the general public.

With every best wish, I am
Sincerely yours in Christ,
Rt. Rev. William F. Glynn,
Archdiocesan Director.

Somerville Catholic
Charities Centre,
Somerville, Mass., June 9, 1965.
Mr. Edward Daly,
World Airways, Inc.
Oakland International Airport,
Oakland, Calif.

Dear Mr. Daly: Just a brief note to express my personal gratitude to you and your company for extending yourselves in behalf of those who were scheduled for our trip to Hawaii on your aircraft through Nationwide Charters, Inc.

We appreciate the fact that your company was in no way legally responsible to extend yourselves as you did. If the opportunity is available in the future to direct business toward your company, you can be assured I will make every effort to do so.

Gratefully yours,
Rev. Francis G. O'Sullivan,
Director.

Clayton Lay Thomas, M.D.,
Wilbraham, Mass., June 10, 1965.
Mr. Edward J. Daly,
World Airways, Inc.,
Oakland, Calif.

Dear Mr. Daly: I merely want to express my great admiration in your assuring the customers of Nationwide Charters and Conventions, Inc., of a refund. Despite the rather large sum involved, I'm certain you will be rewarded many times over—whether it be tangibly or otherwise.

With best wishes for the success of your endeavors in the future.

Sincerely yours,
Clayton L. Thomas, M.D.

Abington, Mass.,
June 4, 1965.
E. J. Daly,
President, World Airways, Inc.,
Oakland International Airport,
Oakland, Calif.

Dear Mr. Daly: We thank you for sending us full repayment of the deposit we made for our vacation tour which was canceled.

We appreciate the fact that your action was over and beyond the call of duty, and we are grateful to you.

May your great airline continue to prosper.

Yours truly,
Melba and Charles Smith.

Michael D. Dunne,
Indian Orchard, Mass., June 8, 1965.
Re Nationwide Charters and Conventions, Inc.
World Airways, Inc.,
Oakland International Airport, Oakland, Calif.
(Attention of Edward J. Daly).

Dear Mr. Daly: Thank you for your efforts and contribution in making available a full return of the deposit we made with Nationwide Charters for a trip to Hawaii. Your attitude and behavior in the entire matter is appreciated and highly commendable. I might say that early in the proceedings, I made oath that I would never travel by World Airways at any time, anywhere, feeling that your company was a part and parcel of the entire matter. It is my desire that you be informed of a change in my position. At any time in the future, wherever I may have occasion to go, if World Airways is available to me, I will give it preference over any other airline or mode of travel. You have created a lifetime of goodwill with me.

Thank you again.

Very truly yours,
Michael D. Dunne.

Norwood, Mass.,
June 3, 1965.
World Airways, Inc.,
Oakland International Airport, Oakland, Calif.
(Attention of Mr. Edward Daly, president).

Dear Mr. Daly: Thank you, thank you, thank you.

We received our check for the money we had deposited for the trip to Hawaii that was scheduled for January 4, 1965. Needless to say it was a welcome sight and we want to express our appreciation for everything you have done. It has been a trying time and sometimes discouraging but thanks to your perseverance it all ended well.

More power to World Airways.

Gratefully yours,
Mr. and Mrs. Coleman F. Conroy.

Cohasset, Mass.,
June 2, 1965.

Dear Sir: Received your check for my refund as of Nationwide Charters and I wish to say I will put myself out to try and travel by World Airways, Inc., and never by Northeast.

Thank you again.

I remain,
Sincerely,
Clare R. Krantzberg.

The Puritan Network,
Lynn, Mass., June 1, 1965.
Mr. E. J. Daly,
President, World Airways, Oakland International Airport, Oakland, Calif.

Dear Mr. Daly: I received your letter of May 27 in which you enclosed your bank draft in full repayment of an amount we paid to Nationwide Charters and Conventions Inc., as a deposit for our canceled vacation tour.

I thought I would drop you this note because I fully admire the businesslike way in which you handled this transaction. I've written you at least 3 or 4 times regarding this repayment and each time you mailed me a personal reply with full explanation and encouragement.

I can only say that this has enhanced your image greatly in our eyes and there is no question that sometime in the future there will be a possibility whereby my friends and I can be of some service to World Airways.

Cordially yours,
Theodore Feinstein,
President.

Commonwealth Sales,
Newton, Mass., June 2, 1965.
Mr. E. J. Daly,
President, World Airways, Inc., Oakland International Airport, Oakland, Calif.

Dear Mr. Daly: We certainly appreciate your very generous action with regard to the recent problems of Nationwide Charters and Conventions. We understand completely your limited responsibility in this matter and the fact that you folks at World Airways leaned over backward to do the right thing. We certainly will remember World Airways whenever we are again planning group vacations.

I don't know how many people will take the time to write to you. However rest assured that I think they are all grateful. I am writing to you for all the people in our little group who were planning this trip—namely, Mr. and Mrs. Averbuck, Goldstein, Snyder, and my wife and myself.

Yours very truly,
Irving L. Feinzig.

Belmont, Mass.,
June 1, 1965.
World Airways, Inc.,
Oakland International Airport,
Attention: Mr. E. J. Daly, President.

Gentlemen: Mrs. Howalt and I wish to express our sincere appreciation to World Airways, Inc., for the refund in full of our deposit with Nationwide Charters and Conventions, Inc.

We feel this action by your company should create more goodwill than any like sum spent through any of the media of advertising. This will undoubtedly create for your company a number of grateful, well-satisfied individuals who will always remember and praise World Airways for their integrity and concern for their potential customers and passengers.

May this bread which you have cast on the waters come back cake to you.

Gentlemen, we thank you.

Very truly yours,
F. Harvey Howalt.

Smithcraft Corp.,
Chelsea, Mass., June 2, 1965.

Mr. J. E. Daly,
President, World Airways, Inc., Oakland International Airport, Oakland, Calif.

Dear Mr. Daly: Your bank draft in full repayment of the amount which we deposited with Nationwide Charters and Conventions, Inc., as a deposit for our canceled vacation trip was indeed welcomed as well as a surprise.

There are many things that can be said for your organization, but I think that just the fact that I am sending a letter to you to express our extreme gratification will be sufficient. I also feel that the cost to World Airways of $150,000 will be well made up for in a short time, in the good image I feel certain will be held by all of the people involved in the vacation cancellations.

For myself, personally, I assure you that it will not be forgotten and if at any time our organization sponsors any kind of a trip, you can be assured that World Airways, Inc. will be considered.

Once again, our very sincere appreciation for all your efforts and conclusions in this very unfortunate situation.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. I. Bernstein,
Newton Center, Mass.

Dewey & O'Brien,
Worcester, Mass., May 27, 1965.

E. J. Daly,
President, World Airways, Inc., Oakland International Airport, Oakland, Calif.

Dear Mr. Daly: Thank you for your letter of May 27, which I have received today, together with the enclosed check for $200, reimbursement for my deposit with Nationwide Charters for their February 1965 Hawaiian tour.

Being a lawyer, I thoroughly understand that there was no obligation of your company to see that this refund was paid in full. I am sure it will create a lot of goodwill for your company, as it has with me.

I do hope in the early future to avail myself of using World Airways.

Sincerely yours,

Edward P. O'Brien.

CALL FOR FEDERAL ACTION ON TRAFFIC SAFETY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues an astounding fact: More Americans have perished as a result of car accidents on the highways and byways of our land than have suffered death in all the wars in which America has fought since our independence—189 years ago. This is an astonishing, almost incredible tragedy, but the statistics speak for themselves. From our War for Independence through our present struggle in Vietnam, we have lost 972,000 lives. Yet, since the turn of the century, marking the beginning of the auto age, already 1.5 million Americans have been the fatal victims of automobile accidents.

Mr. Speaker, I have long advocated a more active governmental role in encouraging traffic safety. When I was a member of the New York State Senate, I served as chairman of the Joint Legislative Committee on Motor Vehicles. In that capacity, I had the opportunity to study this problem in depth. I am proud to come from a State that has such a fine record in the field of automobile safety. New York was among the first to require seat belts in new cars. Moreover, we have in New York State, one of the finest driver education programs, along with a program of periodic inspection of our cars. But I am speaking today of the dire need for Federal action—so long overdue—to help stop the increase in highway deaths.

So much of the death and injury that results from car travel can be traced to the car itself. Today, our cars may be safer than they were in the past, but are they safe enough? The development of safe automobiles has a long history, which is still continuing, and which has a long way to go. State governments, private study groups, and the automobile industry itself have all made substantial contributions, but the problem of safety on the highways perdures.

We must realize the tremendous role that the automobile plays in American life. The car is supreme as our most popular means of travel. Let us take the case of people who make overnight trips or travel to points at least 100 miles from home. Eighty-nine percent of them travel by car. One of the most frequent trips people make is between 50 and 100 miles from home, and 95 percent of these travelers go by automobile. The most frequent trip of a day or more is between 100 and 200 miles; 93 percent of the people making this jaunt use cars. The car is also of great use to commuters and 82 percent of them get to work by means of an automobile. Moreover, the part that the automobile plays in American life is growing by leaps and bounds. In 1963 motor vehicles, including passenger cars, buses, and trucks, traveled 801 billion miles. In 1964 this figure jumped to 838 billion—an increase of over 4 percent. Yet, highway traffic deaths in 1964 increased 9 percent over 1963. The ratio of deaths to miles of vehicle travel has been increasing for the past 5 years. It is simply becoming more and more dangerous to drive. Were I to take a trip to California, I would much prefer the safety of a suborbital rocket than the human death chamber that the car has become.

Not only is automobile usage increasing, but the car is becoming more and more a means of interstate travel. While at the present, roughly 10 percent of vehicle mileage is on the Interstate Highway System, by 1975 cars, buses, and trucks will cover 25 percent of their distances on this interstate network.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no doubt as to the interstate nature of automobile travel. Of course, we must have effective State laws, but if ever there is an interstate instrument it is the automobile, and there should be no question of Federal authority in this field.

The automobile industry has failed to provide new and better safety devices in cars. The industry spokesmen themselves have admitted that in order to innovate safety measures they must sell safety. Until the public cries out for certain safety devices, manufacturers will refrain from incorporating them in their models. Admittedly, price competition in the car industry is very strong and the additional cost and decreased sales that would result from safety innovations are hardly incentives to produce them. Nevertheless, it is sad that they have not taken more initiative to promote safety through their own advertising campaigns. Donald Frey of Ford recently stated that "the amount of product innovation successfully introduced into the automobile is smaller today than in previous times and is still falling." The need for external regulation by the States and Federal Government has been amply demonstrated by the recent Senate hearings on auto safety.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 9629, to allow the Federal Government to help the States, in programs for highway traffic safety, and to help them establish and improve driver education and motor vehicle inspection.

Each year brings many new drivers of a tender age. Soon there will be 10 million drivers under the age of 20. With Federal help, the States would be able to expand the benefits of driver education so that these young drivers will not be involved in accidents to the disproportionate extent that they are now. Drivers under 20 constitute less than 10 percent of the total number of drivers, but they are involved in 15 percent of the accidents. Twenty-eight States already have driver education programs, and they would be assisted in doing even better by this bill. The other 22 States would get Federal help to get them off the ground in this important educational project.

Vehicle inspection is a very important factor in maintaining automobile safety. The Federal Government would be able to help the 30 States that do not have periodic inspections establish this vital program. If one State has very high standards in its inspection program, and the State next door has none at all, then the drivers native to the State which has passed strict inspection laws are suffering at the hands of the driver whose car may have a poor or unchecked braking system.

This bill, which Senator Ribicoff and I are cosponsoring, would also establish a National Highway Traffic Safety Center in the Department of Commerce. This proposal would consolidate the research to improve safety on the highways that various organizations are undertaking, and help publicize the results. Recently, a top official in an executive office told me that no Federal agency gathers highway accident statistics, and these are so vital in determining the causes of such mishaps. The bill would also authorize the Secretary of Commerce to coordinate all Federal study programs in the field of traffic safety. From the Post Office Department to the Pentagon, these programs are going off in various directions and could accomplish a great deal more if they were coordinated.

Most important, with such authority as this measure delegates to the Department of Commerce, tremendous progress can be made in standardizing rules governing highway traffic safety throughout our 50 States.

All these activities are rightful responsibilities of the Federal Government and they are so drastically needed to improve our safety record on the highways.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am terribly saddened by the yearly increase in auto accidents and resultant deaths, because this carnage on our highways could be lessened by proper research and legislation. As Americans, we are very proud of the tremendous strides we have recently taken in space travel. How ironic it is that so much is left undone in improving our means of getting around on old mother earth.

Therefore, I strongly urge the Committee on Public Works to hold hearings on this bill and I call upon my colleagues in the House and Senate to devote themselves to the passage of this long-overdue measure.

FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the lateness of the hour here precludes more of my colleagues being present. While I have requested a special order for 15 minutes, I certainly do not intend to utilize that full period of time. Nonetheless, the message that I have I believe is of sufficient importance so that I do want to take a few minutes of the time of my colleagues to express my views on this subject matter.

Mr. Speaker, last month I was in South Vietnam with the special subcommittee of our Armed Services Committee. We traveled some 2,500 miles within that country and were in many of the areas that have figured prominently in the news during the past few weeks: Dong Xoia, Ben Hoa, Danang, Pleiku. I have come back with a full realization that this is not a cold war—but a red hot war.

Although I was deeply concerned about reports of free world shipping to North Vietnam long before our fact-finding mission, after actually seeing what our servicemen are up against in this torn-up country, I am convinced that something must be done without delay to halt this traffic with the enemy.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], is certainly to be commended for his efforts in calling this matter to the attention of the Congress, and I have joined him in sponsoring legislation that would stop this trade by our so-called friends. However, I really do not believe that the Congress is sufficiently aware of the extent of the shipping traffic to North Vietnam on the part of free world nations or of its full significance and I take this time to underscore this shocking situation.

According to unclassified figures available through Defense Department sources, 401 ships flying the flags of the free world nations called at North Vietnam ports during 1964. Just think about this—our friends sent more than a ship a day last year to supply our enemy. And despite the publicity given the matter, through June of this year it has been reported that 74 free world ships visited ports of North Vietnam. I call your attention to the following unclassified data showing free world arrivals in North Vietnam in 1964, both by country of the vessels' registration and by month:

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the free world ships arriving in North Vietnam in January 1964 and the free world arrivals at North Vietnam January through June 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

FREE WORLD SHIPS ARRIVING NORTH VIETNAM

[Name of ship, flag, gross tonnage, date arrived]

JANUARY 1964

Aegaion, Greek, 7,239, January 31.

Alaska, Lebanese, 6,989, January 8.

Amoy, British, 5,371, January 5.

Belinda, British, 1,909, January 11.

Belinda, British, 1,909, January 25.

Blissful, British, 3,370, January 25.

Constaninos, Greek, 7,131, January 4.

Daikei Maru, Japanese 4,901, January 30.

Eastern Queen, British, 8,644, January 8.

Eugenia, Lebanese, 6,975, January 28.

Hawk, Panamanian, 7,127, January 15.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, January 7.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, January 14.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, January 21.

Kana Maru, Japanese, 2,749, January 14.

Kingford, British, 2,911, January 1.

Kingford, British, 2,911, January 19.

Kishni, British, 1,335, January 1.

Kishni, British, 1,335, January 9.

Kishni, British, 1,335, January 21.

Kushiro Maru, Japanese 2,536, January 17.

Mariannina, Lebanese, 5,548, January 20.

Samodra Mas, British, 3,827, January 27.

Severn River, Panamanian 7,158, January 7.

Shanghai Maru, Japanese, 2,674, January 13.

Tadjouri, French, 2,878, January 5.

Thermopylai (tanker), Greek, 8,311, January 8.

Tong Wee, British, 4,373, January 25.

Vassiliki, Lebanese, 7,192, January 6.

Yamaasa Maru, Japanese, 4,906, January 17.

FEBRUARY 1964

Adelaide Breeze, British, 4,070, February 6.

Belinda, British, 1,909, February 5.

Blissful, British, 3,370, February 26.

Constantinos, Greek, 7,131, February 21.

Daikei Maru, Japanese, 4,901, February 3.

Daiun Maru, Japanese, 2,869, February 10.

Daphne, Greek, 6,032, February 18.

Eastern Queen, British, 8,644, February 2.

Eastern Queen, British, 8,644, February 28.

Gardvik, Norwegian, 4,598, February 23.

Golden Zeta, British, 4,474, February 24.

Harrier, Greek, 7,030, February 11.

Hock Lee, Norwegian, 2,330, February 26.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, February 10.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, February 21.

Kana Maru No. 1, Japanese, 3,297, February 22.

Kishni, British, 1,335, February 3.

Kishni, British, 1,335, February 10.

Kishni, British, 1,335, February 17.

Kushiro Maru, Japanese, 2,536, February 7.

Milford, British, 1,889, February 24.

Muroran Maru, Japanese, 2,493, February 21.

Nichinan Maru, Japanese, 4,246, February 11.

Samodra Mas, British, 3,827, February 11.

Shanghai Maru, Japanese, 2,674, February 9.

Shinsho Maru, Japanese, 12,176, February 28.

Tailungshan, British, 2,711, February 25.

Tarseus, Lebanese, 5,023, February 19.

Tegean, Panamanian, 7,314, February 25.

Yamahagi Maru, Japanese, 3,571, February 11.

Yuzan Maru, Japanese, 2,013, February 7.

Zuiko Maru, Japanese, 5,617, February 11.

MARCH 1964

Admiral Hardy, Norwegian, 1,929, March 18.

Aungthitsa, Burmese, 5,661, March 7.

Belinda, British, 1,909, March 9.

Belinda, British 1,909, March 21.

Blissful, British, 3,370, March 4.

Blissful, British, 3,370, March 23.

Boscombe Down, British, 3,361, March 6.

Cardross, British, 2,313, March 31.

Eastern Queen, British, 8,644, March 8.

Elbow River, British, 5,179, March 19.

Fortune Wind, British, 3,376, March 31.

Hock Lee, Norwegian, 2,330, March 21.

Hoi Ying, Norwegian, 3,951, March 12.

Hugo Stinnes, W. German, 10,967, March 11.

Hui An, British, 5,365, March 26.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, March 3.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, March 21.

Kazutama Maru, Japanese, 2,032, March 22

Keiyu Maru, Japanese, 6,931, March 3.

Kushiro Maru, Japanese, 2,536, March 27.

Marina G. Parodi, Italian, 7,158, March 20.

Markus (*ex-Aungthitsa*), Finnish, 5,661, March 21.

Milford, British, 1,889, March 21.

Muroran Maru, Japanese, 2,493, March 3.

Peking Maru, Japanese, 2,673, March 13.

Peking Maru, Japanese, 2,673, March 21.

Rochford, British, 3,324, March 28.

Rodos, Lebanese, 7,244, March 27.

Ryuwa Maru, Japanese, 4,918, March 15.

Samodra Mas, British, 3,827, March 24.

Sansho Maru, Japanese, 2,395, March 24.

Shinsho Maru, Japanese, 3,668, March 11.

Shofuku Maru, Japanese, 6,981, March 1.

Selat Sunda, Panamanian, 1,279, March 28.

Semporna Bay, British, 5,771, March 25.

Slembe, Norwegian, 2,427, March 29.

Susanne, Norwegian, 2,503, March 9.

Tong Wee, British, 4,373, March 3.

Yamahagi Maru, Japanese, 3,571, March 10.

APRIL 1964

Aleppo, Swedish, 10,191. April 4.

Belinda, British, 1,909, April 3.

Belinda, British, 1,909, April 26.

Blissful, British, 3,370, April 16.

Cardross, British, 2,313, April 1.

Cardross, British, 2,313, April 14.

Cormorant, Liberian, 7,247, April 16.

Crawford, British, 2,232, April 1.

Dana, Norwegian, 2,752, April 6.

Daikei Maru, Japanese, 4,901, April 12.

Elbow River, British, 5,179, April 17.

Fortune Wind, British, 3,376, April 28.

Gannet, British, 923, April 23.

Golden Zeta, British, 4,474, April 12.

Golden Zeta, British, 4,474, April 30.

Hock Lee, Norweigian, 2,330, April 17.

Hui An, British, 5,365, April 17.

Irene X, Lebanese, 7,210, April 1.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, April 2.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, April 10.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, April 20.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, April 29.

Kapetan Andreas, Greek, 7,279, April 7.

Kana Maru No. 1, Japanese, 3,297, April 28.

Khios Belle, Greek, 8,453, April 11.

Kishni, British, 1,335, April 3.

Longford, British, 2,865, April 7.

Mui Finn, Norwegian, 1,391, April 25.

Muroran Maru, Japanese, 2,493, April 6.

Panaghia Lourion, Lebanese, 2,742, April 8.

Parmarina, Lebanese, 6,721, April 19.

Peking Maru, Japanese, 2,673, April 10.

Prominent, Norwegian, 1,960, April 8.

Prominent, Norwegian, 1,960, April 22.

Ranghild Brovig, Norwegian, 3,128, April 24.

Rochford, British, 3,324, April 4.

St. Demetrius, Lebanese, 7,198, April 20.

Sanana, Netherlands, 1,874, April 7.

Sansho Maru, Japanese, 2,395, April 25.

Selat Sunda, Panamanian, 1,279, April 2.

Slembre, Norwegian, 2,427, April 1.

Tai Koo, British, 812, April 19.

Tailungshan, British, 2,711, April 10.

Tailungshan, British, 2,711, April 18.

Tailpoohong, British, 3,373, April 1.

Tong Hong, British, 3,844, April 30.

Thebean, Greek, 7,257, April 9.

MAY 1964

Amoy, British, 5,371, May 21.

Ardsirod, British, 7,025, May 17.

Blissful, British, 3,370, May 2.

Blissful, British, 3,370, May 23.

Cesco Corrado, Italian, 7,151, May 30.

Elbow River, British, 5,179, May 13.

Fortune Wind, British, 3,376, May 23.

Golden Delta, British, 5,279, May 27.

Golden Zeta, British, 4,474, May 17.

Happy Seafarer, British, 6,768, May 18.

Hienrich Jesen, Danish, 3,388, May 13.

Hock Lee, Norwegian, 2,330, May 30.

Hugo Stinnes, West German, 10,967, May 5.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, May 7.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, May 19.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, May 25.

Kapetan Andreas, Greek, 7,279, May 15.

Khios Belle, Greek, 8,453, May 11.

Kishni, British, 1,335, May 9.

Kishni, British, 1,335, May 27.

Mui Finn, Norwegian, 1,391, May 24.

Mui Heng, Norwegian, 1,398, May 2.

Muroran Maru, Japanese, 2,493, May 9.

Prominent, Norwegian, 1,960, May 12.

Prominent, Norwegian, 1,960, May 30.

Ruthy Ann, British, 7,361, May 9.

Sambas, Netherlands, 1,874, May 17.

Sansho Maru, Japanese, 2,395, May 28.

Shanghai Maru, Japanese, 2,674, May 14.

Thalis, Liberian, 7,252, May 20.

Thermopylai (tanker), Greek, 8,311, May 17.

Tong Hong, British, 3,844, May 27.

Varild, Norwegian, 4,070, May 19.

JUNE 1964

Aeakos, Greek, 7,300, June 30.

Apollonian, Panamanian, 7,284, June 6.

Apostolos Andreas, Greek, 5,405, June 12.

Belinda, British, 1,909, June 16.

Blissful, British, 3,370, June 14.

Happy Mariner, British, 959, June 29.

Hellas, Greek, 7,176, June 1.

Ichiyo Maru, Japanese, 1,830, June 14.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, June 4.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, June 10.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, June 20.

Kishni, British, 1,335, June 8.

Panaghios Lourion, Lebanese, 2,742, June 18.

Ragnhild Brovig, Norwegian, 3,128, June 4.

Ragnhild Brovig, Norwegian, 3,128, June 15.

Ruthy Ann, British, 7,361, June 26.

Tailungshan, British, 2,711, June 26.

Thebean, Greek, 7,257, June 22.

Varild, Norwegian, 4,070, June 2.

Viminale, Italian, 6,955, June 27.

JULY 1964

Adelaide Breeze, British, 4,070, July 7.

Apostolos Andreas, Greek, 5,405, July 15.

Belinda, British, 1,909, July 30.

Benadir, Italian, 3,348, July 31.

Brake, West German, 3,172, July 29.

Calliopi Michalos, Greek, 7,249, July 11.

Calliopi Michalos, Greek, 7,249, July 28.

Cardross, British, 2,313, July 16.

Denny Rose, British, 6,656, July 16.

Daigetsu Maru, Japanese, 2,848, July 15.

Daikei Maru, Japanese, 4,901, July 20.

Eftychia, Greek, 7,223, July 1.

Elbow River, British, 5,179, July 17.

Happy Mariner, British, 6,959, July 27.

Hellas, Greek, 7,176, July 11.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, July 7.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, July 20.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, July 28.

Kawana, British, 7,308, July 17.

Kishni, British, 1,335, July 17.

Kishni, British, 1,335, July 30.

Nisso Maru, Japanese, 1,567, July 14.

Paul Rickmers, West Germany, 7,910, July 27.

Polyniki, Greek, 7,122, July 26.

Ragnhild Brovig, Norwegian, 3,128, July 22.

Sambas, Netherlands, 1,874, July 9.

Sletfjord, Norwegian, 1,902, July 5.

Tailungshan, British, 2,711, July 27.

Thebean, Greek, 7,257, July 1.

Varild, Norwegian, 4,070, July 7.

AUGUST 1964

Agia Elpis, Liberian, 6,877, August 25.

Ardrowan, British, 7,300, August 7.

Belinda, British, 1909, August 4.

Belinda, British, 1,909, August 16.

Brake, West German, 3,172, August 9.

Brake, West German, 3,172, August 25.

Cardross, British, 1,313, August 5.

Cardross, British, 1,313, August 31.

Daigetsu Maru, Japanese, 2,848, August 15.

Golden Zeta, British, 4,474, August 31.

Greenford, British, 2,964, August 25.

Happy Mariner, British, 6,959, August 17.

Hermod, Norwegian, 2,882, August 14.

Hui An, British, 5,365, August 15.

Jarmina (tanker), Norwegian, 13,996, August 19.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, August 5.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, August 22.

Kishni, British, 1,335, August 8.

Kishni, British, 1,335, August 16.

Kishni, British, 1,335, August 28.

Muroran Maru, Japanese, 2,493, August 1.

Muroran Maru, Japanese, 2,493, August 17.

Nisso Maru (tanker), Japanese, 1,567, August 9.

Ole Bratt, Norwegian, 7,144, August 19.

Pacific Breeze, British, 7,256, August 17.

Ragnhild Brovig, Norwegian, 3,128, August 11.

Ragnhild Brovig, Norwegian, 3,128, August 21.

Ruthy Ann, British, 7,361, August 14.

Sabang, Swedish, 6,030, August 17.

Sambas, Netherlands, 1,874, August 7.

Sanrocco, Panamanian, 6,872, August 27.

Shun Fung, British, 7,148, August 17.

Slembe, Norwegian, 2,487, August 10.

Thames Breeze, British, 7,878, August 19.

SEPTEMBER 1964

Belinda, British, 1,909, September 4.

Belinda, British, 1,909, September 23.

Brake W. Ferman, 3,172, September 14.

Bunguran, Indonesian, 900, September 22.

Cardross, British, 1,313, September 3.

Daigetsu Maru, Japanese, 2,848, September 28.

Dartford, British, 2,739, September 20.

Denny Rose, British, 6,656, September 7.

Elbow River, British, 5,179, September 2.

Giang Seng British, 533, September 15.

Hua An, British, 5,365, September 3.

Isabel Erica, British, 7,105, September 27.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, September 15.

Jinsan British, 1,261, September 28.

Kishni, British, 1,335, September 21.

London Breeze, British, 7,897, September 4.

London Breeze, British, 7,897, September 26.

Muroran Maru, Japanese, 2,497, September 23.

Nisso Maru (Tanker), Japanese, 1,567, September 7.

Norway Maru, Japanese, 5,333, September 1.

Peking Maru, Japanese, 2,673, September 24.

Probitas, Italian, 7,155, September 2.

Probitas, Italian, 7,155, September 24.

Ragnhild Brovig Norwegian, 3,128, September 26.

Ragnhild Brovig, Norwegian, 3,128, September 2.

Sambas, Netherlands, 1,874, September 26.

Seiyo Maru, Japanese, 1,999, September 23.

Sletfjord, Norwegian, 1,702 September 20.

Thebean, Greek, 7,257, September 9.

Tozai, Maru No. 5., Japanese, 3,733, September 7.

Tozai Maru No. 5., Japanese, 3,733, September 29.

Trader, Liberian, 7,091, September 9.

OCTOBER 1964

Admiral Hardy, Norwegian, 1,929, October 31.

Anastassis, Greek, 7,177, October 6.

Belinda, British, 1,909, October 25.

Brake, W. German, 3,172, October 29.

Calliopi Michalos, Greek, 7,249, October 17.

Cardross, British, 2,313, October 6.

Cresta, Liberian, 7,135, October 1.

Daigetsu Maru, Japanese, 2,848, October 24.

East Breeze, British, 8,708, October 29.

Euro, Italian, 7,210, October 10.

Fengning, British, 3,464, October 2.

Golden Alpha, British, 5,031, October 21.

Golden Delta, British, 5,279, October 17.

Golden Zeta, British, 4,474, October 29.

Hellas, Greek, 7,176, October 9.

Hellas, Greek, 7,176, October 29.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, October 10.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, October 22.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, October 31.

Kana Maru, Japanese, 2,749, October 29.

Kana Maru No. 1, Japanese, 3,297, October 7.

Kana Maru No. 1, Japanese, 3,297, October 25.

Kingford, British, 2,911, October 10.

Polyniki, Greek, 7,122, October 1.

Probitas, Italian, 7,155, October 1.

Ragnhild Brovig, Norwegian, 3,128, October 19.

Ruthy Ann, British, 7,361, October 22.

Shanghai Maru, Japanese, 2,674, October 21.

Sletfjord, Norwegian, 1,702, October 9.

Sletfjord, Norwegian, 1,702, October 28.

Surabaya Maru, Japanese, 7,057, October 26.

Tarantella, Swedish, 3,816, October 7.

Tokushima Maru, Japanese, 407, October 11.

Trader, Liberian, 7,091, October 6.

Tritonia, Liberian, 7,165, October 27.

Wishford (*Ex-Fengning*), British, 3,464, October 27.

NOVEMBER 1964

Alcyonis, Greek, 7,365, November 4.

Astir, Lebanese, 5,234, November 11.

Belinda, British, 1,909, November 11.

Belinda, British, 1,909, November 29.

Calliopi Michalos, Greek, 7,249, November 30.

Daikei Maru, Japanese, 4,901, November 21.

Daikyo Maru (tanker) Japanese, 13,224, November 21.

East Wales, British, 7,359, November 4.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, November 13.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, November 22.

Keekring, Netherlands, 4,963, November 7.

Kingford, British, 2,911, November 1.

Kishin Maru, Japanese, 1,963, November 26.

Mansei Maru, Japanese, 1,595, November 12.

Maria Despina, Lebanese, 7,254, November 12.

Milford, British, 1,889, November 27.

Muroran Maru, Japanese, 2,493, November 13.

Muroran Maru, Japanese, 2,493, November 30.

Rochford, British, 3,324, November 7.

Rochford, British, 3,324, November 28.

Ruthy Ann, British, 7,361, November 1.

Ruthy Ann, British, 7,361, November 30.

Sansho Maru, Japanese, 2,395, November 11.

San Francesco, Italian, 9,284, November 1.

Santa Granda, British, 7,229, November 21.

Seacob, Panamanian, 7,276, November 9.

Seacob, Panamanian, 7,276, November 20.

Settemari, Italian, 7,181, November 29.

Sletfjord, Norwegian, 1,702, November 8.

Spalmatori, Greek, 7,310, November 2.

Thebean, Greek, 7,257, November 11.

Tokushima Maru, Japanese, 407, November, 11.

Tozai Maru No. 5, Japanese, 3,733, November 13.

Troyan, Lebanese, 7,243, November 21.

DECEMBER 1964

Amoy, British, 5,371, December 1.

Astir, Lebanese, 5,324, December 23.

Barbarino, Greek, 7,084, December 29.

Caprera, Italian, 7,189, December 27.

Crawford, British, 2,232, December 11.

Daigetsu Maru, Japanese, 2,848, December 11.

Dana, Norwegian, 2,752, December 17.

Dicoronia, Liberian, 7,260, December 14.

East Wales, British, 7,359, December 20

Elbow River, British, 5,179, December 17.

Elbow River, British, 5,179, December 29.

Golden Alpha, British, 5,031, December 7.

Golden Zeta, British, 4,474, December 14.

Helmos, Lebanese, 5,236, December 27.

Hermod, Norwegian, 2,882, December 2.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, December 5.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, December 23.

Katerina, Greek, 7,155, December 21.

Kishin Maru, Japanese, 1,953, December 2.

Ikuta Maru, Japanese, 2,095, December 27.

Longford, British, 2,865, December 15.

Maritsa, Lebanese, 7,234, December 17.

Milford, British, 1,889, December 7.

Muroran Maru, Japanese, 2,493, December 19.

Ruthy Ann, British, 7,361, December 26

Sambas, Netherlands, 1,874, December 24.

Santa Granda, British, 7,229, December 23.

Seisho Maru, Japanese, 2,257, December 28.

Sletfjord, Norwegian, 1,702, December 22.

Tertric, Lebanese, 7,045, December 16.

Toula, Lebanese, 4,561, December 7.

Unkai Maru No. 6, Japanese, 3,411, December 16.

Vergmont, British, 7,381, December 21.

Yuzan Maru, Japanese, 2,013, December 1.

January through June 1965 free world arrivals North Vietnam—Summary of arrivals by flag

JANUARY

British	10
Japanese	1
Greek	1
Norwegian	---
Dutch	---
Lebanese	2
Total	14

FEBRUARY

British	15
Japanese	1
Greek	2
Norwegian	---
Dutch	---
Lebanese	---
Total	18

MARCH

British	6
Japanese	---
Greek	2
Norwegian	2
Dutch	3
Lebanese	1
Total	14

January through June 1965 free world arrivals North Vietnam—Summary of arrivals by flag—Continued

APRIL

British	1
Japanese	---
Greek	1
Norwegian	3
Dutch	---
Lebanese	---
Total	5

MAY

British	7
Japanese	---
Greek	3
Norwegian	4
Dutch	---
Lebanese	1
Total	15

JUNE

British	5
Japanese	---
Greek	3
Norwegian	1
Dutch	---
Lebanese	---
Total	9

Free World Ships Arriving North Vietnam

JANUARY 1965

(Name of ship, flag, gross tonnage, date arrived)

Aiolos II, Lebanese, 7,256, January 26.

Cardross, British, 2,314 January 29.

Elbow River, British, 5,179, January 7.

Golden Zeta, British, 4,474, January 7.

Hakuyo Maru, Japanese, 6,430, January 9.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, January 1.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, January 10.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, January 17.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, January 25.

Longford, British, 2,865, January 1.

Panagos, Lebanese, 7,133, January 28.

Saronis, Greek, 7,271, January 25.

Santa Granda, British, 7,229, January 21.

Wakasa Bay, British, 7,040, January 16.[1]

FEBRUARY 1965

Bidford, British, 2,865, February 5.

Cardamilitis, Greek, 7,163, February 7.

Cardross, British, 2,314, February 15.

Dartford, British, 2,739, February 7.

Elbow River, British, 5,179, February 17.

Fortune Wind, British, 3,376, February 15.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, February 1.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, February 14.

Jinan, British, 1,261, February 23.

Jinsan, British, 1,261, February 28.

Longford, British, 2,865, February 23.

Meiwa Maru, Japanese, 4,975, February 15.

Newglade, British, 7,368, February 11.

Rochford, British, 3,324, February 20.

Stanwear, British, 8108, February 23.

Syros, Greek, 7,176, February 7.

Wakasa Bay, British, 7,040, February 23.

Wishford, British, 3,464, February 27.

MARCH 1965

Bidford, British, 2,865, March 5.

Cardross, British, 2,314, March 4.

Dukat, Norwegian, 1,401, March 2.

Dukat, Norwegian, 1,401, March 15.

Elbow River, British, 5,179, March 4.

Golden Alpha, British, 5,031, March 7.

Hollands Diep, Dutch 9,631, March 31.[1]

Longford, British, 2,865, March 27.

Nissos Paros, Greek, 1,953, March 4.[1]

Rahiotis, Greek, 7,138, March 23.

Sambas, Dutch, 1,874, March 14.

Sambas, Dutch, 1,874, March 25.

Santa Granda, British, 7,229, March 27.

San Spyridon, Lebanese, 7,260, March 13.[1]

APRIL 1965

Grecian Isles, Greek, 9,173, April 23.

Mui Heng, Norwegian, 1,398, April 29.

Santa Granda, British, 7,229, April 12.

Sletfjord, Norwegian, 1,705, April 4.

Sletjford, Norwegian, 1,705, April 13.

MAY 1965

Antarctica, British, 8,785, May 21.

Cardross, British, 2,313, May 5.

Cardross, British, 2,313, May 29.

Fortune Wind, British, 3,376, May 6.

Gisna, Norwegian, 6,030, May 5.

Gisna, Norwegian, 6,030, May 29.

Herborg, Norwegian, 3,312, May 21.

Irena, Greek, 7,232, May 21.

Kawana, British, 7,308, May 27.

Nancy Dee, British, 6,547, May 31.[1]

Nymfea, Greek, 7,176, May 1.

Phoevos, Greek, 9,949, May 16.

Shirley Christine, British, 6,724, May 30.

Sletfjord, Norwegian, 1,705, May 6.

Yanxilas, Lebanese, 10,051, May 3.

JUNE 1965

Avisfaith, British, 7,868, June 7.

Alkon, Greek, 7,150, June 6.

Cardross, British, 2,313, June 28.[1]

Helena, Norwegian, 2,529, June 21.[1]

Kyvernitis, Greek, 9,360, June 1.[1]

Newheath, British, 5,891, June 13.

Newmoat, British, 7,151, June 29.

Phoenician Dawn, British, 8,708, June 13.[1]

Strovili, Greek, 7,181, June 5.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, study this information carefully and ponder the billions of dollars in aid we have given these countries. As a matter of fact, I am told by our Appropriations Foreign Operations Subcommittee that since World War II we have given almost $41 billion in aid to the countries that have been carrying on this trade with North Vietnam. But even more astounding is the fact that the foreign aid authorization bill for the coming fiscal year—and now in conference—proposes to give aid to six of the countries whose ships have been carrying cargoes to North Vietnam during the first half of this year. How can we go home and face the American taxpayers and ask them to foot the tax bill to pay for the war in Vietnam, and at the same time ask them to contribute their tax money to aid the countries that are supplying our enemy? This is so inconsistent that it can never be explained. Our men are dying in Vietnam—over 500 have been killed by enemy action—and our friends, by supplying the enemy, are helping to kill them.

These are unclassified figures only—let me assure you that the classified reports are even more alarming. I have seen them, and you should see them. Every member of this Congress has a legitimate right, and I believe a moral obligation, to become informed about this matter, and I hope that each of you will request the classified information on this astonishing situation.

But equally shocking is the report that I have just received from the Maritime Administration listing the foreign vessels which called at North Vietnamese ports between January 1, 1964 and June 5, 1965, and have also called at our own U.S. ports.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the Rec-

---

[1] Estimated.

ORD a list of those vessels, the flag, the registered owner, port of call, and date of call.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FARNUM). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the list I referred to is as follows:

Foreign vessels which allegedly stopped at North Vietnamese ports during 1964 and through June 5, 1965

Name of vessel	Flag	Registered owner	U.S. Port of call	1964	1965
Aegaion	Greece	Sapphire Cia., Nav., S.A., Panama	Newport News, Va		Feb. 22
Agia Elpis	Liberia	Cia Marvalia Nav., S.A., Panama	Tampa, Fla		Feb. 16
Alcyonis	Greece	Herculiana Cia. Mar., S.A., Panama	Jacksonville, Fla	Jan. 6	
Do	do	do	Charleston, S.C	Jan. 10	
Do	do	do	Philadelphia, Pa	Jan. 15	
Do	do	do	Cleveland, Ohio	Apr. 21	
Do	do	do	Detroit, Mich	Apr. 24	
Do	do	do	Bay City	Apr. 28	
Do	do	do	Chicago, Ill	May 1	
Do	do	do	Detroit, Mich	May 13	
Aleppo	Sweden	Rederi-A/B Fraternitas, Goteborg	Newark, N.J	Sept. 8	
Do	do	do	Brooklyn, N.Y	Sept. 9	
Do	do	do	Poughkeepsie, N.Y	Sept. 11	
Do	do	do	Camden, N.J	Sept. 12	
Do	do	do	Philadelphia, Pa	Sept. 13	
Do	do	do	Port Arthur, Tex	Sept. 20	
Anastassis	Greece	Resurreccion Cia. Nav., S.A., Panama	Jacksonville, Fla		Apr. 6
Do	do	do	Baltimore, Md		Apr. 19
Do	do	do	Norfolk, Va		Apr. 22
Do	do	do	San Diego, Calif	Apr. 1	
Do	do	do	Los Angeles, Calif	Apr. 2	
Do	do	do	San Francisco, Calif	Apr. 10	
Cesco Corrado	Italy	Corrado Societa di Navigazione, Genoa	Providence, R.I	June 4	
Do	do	do	Los Angeles, Calif	Apr. 6	
Constantinos	Greece	Conquistador Cia. Mar., S. A., Panama	Houston, Tex	Sept. 28	
Cornorant	Liberia	San Pedro Cia. Armadora, S. A., Panama	New Haven, Conn	Jan. 22	
Do	do	do	Norfolk, Va	June 22	
Do	do	do	Houston, Tex	Aug. 4	
Demetrius	Lebanon	26th October Maritime Co., Ltd., Monrovia	New Orleans, La	July 4	
Dicoronia	Liberia	Bahia Salinas Cia. Nav., S. A., Panama	Boston, Mass	Mar. 29	
Do	do	do	Tampa, Fla	Sept. 15	
Do	do	do	Galveston, Tex		Mar. 13
Do	do	do	New Orleans, La		Mar. 6
Eftychia	Greece	Margaronis, Dem. P., & Sons, Athens	Norfolk, Va	Sept. 22	
Hugo Stinnes	West Germany	Stinnes, Hugo, G.M.B.H., Mulheim/Ruhr, Germany	Baton Rouge, La	Nov. 10	
Do	do	do	San Francisco, Calif		Apr. 9
Do	do	do	Oakland, Calif		Do.
Do	do	do	San Francisco, Calif		Apr. 10
Do	do	do	Sacramento, Calif		Apr. 13
Jarmina	Norway	Aksjeselsk, Kosmos	Baltimore, Md		Mar. 13
Do	do	do	New York, N.Y		Apr. 21
Katerina	Greece	Marsigura Cla. Nav. S.A., Panama	Los Angeles, Calif	May 23	
Khios Belle	do	Pioneer Shipping Development, Inc., Panama	San Juan, P.R	Aug. 20	
Do	do	do	New Orleans, La	Sept. 9	
Marina G. Parodi	Italy	Enrico Parodi	New York, N.Y	Jan. 7	
Do	do	do	Baltimore, Md	Aug. 3	
Do	do	do	Newport News, Va	Aug. 4	
Do	do	do	Norfolk, Va	Aug. 5	
Do	do	do	Baltimore, Md	Oct. 19	
Do	do	do	Norfolk, Va	Oct. 28	
Do	do	do	Newport News, Va		May 6
Nisso Maru	Japan	Kuwana Kaiun K.K., Ehime	San Francisco, Calif	Feb. 29	
Do	do	do	Los Angeles, Calif	Mar. 1	
Do	do	do	do	Apr. 29	
Do	do	do	Eagle Harbor	June 12	
Do	do	do	Seattle, Wash	June 13	
Rodos	Lebanon	Orient Shipping Corp., Monrovia	San Pedro, Calif	Dec. 10[1]	
Do	do	do	Panama City, Fla	Dec. 29[1]	
Do	do	do	Tampa, Fla	Jan. 12	
Severn River	Panama	International Navigat. Corp., Monrovia	Richmond, Va	Mar. 29	
Do	do	do	Norfolk, Va	Apr. 7	
Do	do	do	New York, N.Y		Mar. 4
Spalmatori	Greece	Spalmatori Cia. Nav., S.A., Panama	Houston, Tex	July 4	
Do	do	do	New Orleans, La	July 12	
Do	do	do	Tampa, Fla	July 17	
Do	do	do	Lake Charles, La		Jan. 16
Tarantella	Sweden	Salenrederierna A/B	New York, N.Y	Nov. 30	
Thalis	Liberia	Cia. Okeania de Nav., S.A., Panama	Boston, Mass	Jan. 6	
Do	do	do	Tampa, Fla	Sept. 8	
Do	do	do	Houston, Tex		Jan. 14
Trader	do	Bahia Salinas Cia. Nav., S.A., Panama	New Orleans, La	Jan. 17	
Tritonia	do	Cia Mare Nostrum, S.A., Panama	Boston, Mass	May 18	
Do	do	do	Tacoma, Wash	Aug. 20	
Do	do	do	San Francisco, Calif	Aug. 31	
Do	do	do	Philadelphia, Pa		Jan. 21

[1] 1963.

There are 24 ships, I am told, that have hauled their cargoes to North Vietnam and also have used our own U.S. ports to further enhance their profit. Apparently this is an arrangement that pays off pretty well for I am told that these 24 ships have called a total of 75 times in our ports since January 1964. Our colleague from Florida, Mr. ROGERS, has introduced a bill, which I have also joined in sponsoring, which would deny the use of our ports to these vessels which are also trading with North Vietnam. How can we let ships haul their cargoes to North Vietnam and then use the ports of this country at a time when we are spending $350 million a year to subsidize our own merchant marine that today hauls less than 10 percent of our export trade?

I hold no brief for the argument that the cargoes being unloaded in North Vietnam by our friends are not of a military value. I take violent exception to the report of the Department of State dated June 9, 1965, on H.R. 6154 and H.R. 6301, both bills to curb this traffic, which said in part:

> Free world ships carry a substantial share of North Vietnam's total sea-borne imports, but the goods carried are virtually all nonstrategic in nature, comprise only a small part of that country's economic availabilities and are of secondary importance to its war capabilities. Moreover, if free world ships were removed from this trade they could eventually be replaced by Communist bloc vessels.

I say to you that any goods that are wanted in North Vietnam ports help our enemy and help defeat our national objectives to stop Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

I have written to President Johnson asking that he give his personal attention to this incredulous state of affairs. I urge all Members of Congress to join in helping to find some means to stop this trading with the enemy that defies any explanation. Something must be done immediately. How can we send more and more young men to Vietnam—and how can we talk of calling up the Reserves—when we Members of Congress sit on our hands in this House of Representatives and tolerate this national scandal.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I certainly want to compliment the gentleman from Michigan for whom I have the greatest esteem for bringing this so forcibly, as well as so eloquently, to the attention of the House this evening.

As a fellow member of the Committee on Armed Services, I would like to associate myself with everything that he has said. I appreciate that he has withheld security and classified information while revealing this tragic and terrible unclassified list of ships of foreign flags.

I would submit, of course, that we are in a marine engineers' strike which involves our own flagships to the point where the Deputy Director of Transportation for Defense has had for the first time to notify all shippers that they may use foreign flagships.

But this still does not excuse those ships from making ports of call in the Communist countries and coming back to our own ports. We could use foreign flags which are strictly neutral or strictly friendly.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I should like to ask the gentleman in the well of the House, who has taken the trouble to visit Vietnam and made such a strenuous trip, on which we have had a prior report, if he does not consider that petroleum, oil, and lubricants—POL—are considered vital materials of war.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Indeed they are. My colleague is well aware of this. There is much that could be said about it. Again, we have security problems.

Mr. HALL. Up a very tenuous river with the name of Cao there is a huge POL depository, including refineries and storage tanks, above and below ground, on a very tenuous artery which can be reached by canals, by train, and so forth only from the ocean, the canal for which has to be dredged constantly along the Cao River. Would it not seem that at least these foreign flag vessels which carry POL to this lone refinery in North Vietnam should be interdicted if we are in truth interested in preventing the further spread of and the further mobilization of the North Vietnam aggressor in South Vietnam?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am in complete agreement with the gentleman's observation.

Mr. HALL. I am certainly in agreement with what the gentleman has said, and I appreciate what he has brought to the floor of the House tonight. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am grateful for the contribution the gentleman has made to this very delicate problem.

EXCISE TAX REDUCTION TO PURCHASERS OF BUSINESS EQUIPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FARNUM). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, recently, I placed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of business machines which are currently on the Purchase List by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Ralph Roberts. At that time I pointed out that up to 89 percent of the amount of the excise tax reduction was being retained by business machine companies instead of being passed on to the consumer, in this case, the Congress of the United States.

In reply to these charges the International Business Machines Corp. indicated that they had passed into effect a price increase as of October 1964 which could not take effect for contract customers like the Federal Government until the new contract year, beginning July 1965.

In further researching this problem, I have determined that the Excise Tax Committee of the Business Equipment Manufacturers Association presented a statement to the Ways and Means Committee on July 24, 1964. It is my understanding that at that time and to the present time the IBM Corp. was an active participant in and was represented by the statement made by the Business Equipment Manufacturers Association to the Ways and Means Committee at that time.

In summary, Mr. R. Stanley Laing, representing the Business Equipment Manufacturers Association stated on page 372 of the Ways and Means hearings, volume 3:

> It is, therefore, primarily on behalf of the users of business equipment and their customers that the manufacturers of these products advocate repeal of this discriminatory tax. [B]y far its worst feature [i.e., the excise tax] is that it constitutes a direct charge on the cost of doing business and to that degree, tends to discourage capital investment in equipment designed specifically to improve the productivity and efficiency of American business. Either directly or indirectly the tax is passed on and pyramided through all layers of distribution as an added cost to virtually all products and services in the country.

Mr. Laing further added on page 381:

> American business would invest the funds so released in capital expenditures whether in the form of new production facilities, machine tools, or business machines.
>
> The existence of the excise tax on business machines results, therefore, in a corresponding reduction in the unit volume of capital equipment purchased. By reducing unit volume the total employment opportunities of all capital goods manufacturers are adversely affected.

The total effect, from what I can gather, from the testimony presented before the Ways and Means Committee on the subject of excise tax reduction was that it was the intention of the major business manufacturers to pass on the excise tax reduction to the consumer. Contrary to this statement, I.B.M. subsequently released a schedule of price increases which seems calculated to create a total washout of the benefits of the tax reduction. Both the small businessman and the large corporation, who according to the Business Machine Association were to be assisted in purchasing additional equipment with these added funds are no longer the beneficiaries because of the program of price increases which I.B.M. and other manufacturers have put into effect.

The promises before the Ways and Means Committee have become meaningless.

I am including in the RECORD at this point a copy of the letter which I have sent to Mr. Lawson B. Knott, Acting Administrator of the General Service Administration, in which I ask him to determine the possibilities of renegotiating the contract agreements with all business machine manufacturers so that the contract prices can reflect the excise tax reduction.

JULY 22, 1965.

Mr. LAWSON B. KNOTT,
Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KNOTT: In view of the fact that current Government prices on business machine equipment fail to reflect any substantial reduction because of the recent repeal of Federal excise taxes, as you can readily see in the table which I submit herewith as Exhibit A, I recommend that your office enter into a renegotiation of contract agreements with all business machine manufacturers so that the Government itself may become a recipient of the full measure of the excise tax reduction recently enacted by the Congress of the United States.

During hearings before the Ways and Means Committee last year, and specifically on July 24, 1964, Mr. R. Stanley Laing, chairman of the Excise Tax Committee of the Business Equipment Manufacturers Association, stated in his argument for a repeal of the excise tax on business machines, as follows:

"It is, therefore, primarily on behalf of the users of business equipment and their customers that the manufacturers of these products advocate repeal of this discriminatory tax. By far its worst feature—i.e., the excise tax—is that it constitutes a direct charge on the cost of doing business and to that degree tends to discourage capital investment in equipment designed specifically to improve the productivity and efficiency of American business. Either directly or indirectly the tax is passed on and pyramided through all layers of distribution as an added cost to virtually all products and services in the country."

The manufacturers referred to in Exhibit A are members of this organization and the Federal Government has a right to assume that the benefits of excise tax reductions would also be made applicable to Federal procurement.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. VANIK,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of this body the third study recently completed by my office of the prices of representative consumer items affected by the excise tax reduction in retail outlets in the Washington metropolitan area.

As I have promised, I wish to point out to the American consumer those areas in which compliance has been readily forthcoming to the excise tax law of this year, as well as those areas in which difficulty with passing on the reductions to the consumer has arisen. I continue to note with dismay that in almost each instance camera equipment, binoculars, lawn equipment, sporting goods equipment, as well as many items sold in the discount outlets still do not reflect the excise tax reduction.

I insert the following list of representative prices of items affected by the excise tax reduction and let this record speak for itself. I plan to insert the results of the third pricing survey of Cleveland area stores very shortly:

WOODWARD & LOTHROP (WASHINGTON, D.C.)

Item	Percent of excise tax removed	Description	Pre-tax-cut price [1]	July 8 post-tax-cut price [1]	July 19-20 price [1]
APPLIANCES					
Air conditioner	10	AMC, 8300BTU, C837585	$229.00	$215.00	$215.00
Dryer (gas)	5	Premier, DG4820	219.00	211.00	211.00
Refrigerator	5	Kelvinator, KS4N	700.00	700.00	675.00
FURS					
White mink	10	Galle original	214.00	195.00	195.00
Gray fox	10	Le Mademoiselle	108.00	99.00	99.00
HOME RECREATION EQUIPMENT					
Phonograph records	10	Patti Page: "Hush, Hush, Sweet Charlotte"	2.99	2.99	(2)
Television	10	RCA color, HF853	769.95	719.95	719.95
JEWELRY, SILVER, AND WATCHES					
Monet charms	10	Sterling silver religious charms (cross and star of David)	[3] 3.39	[3] 3.09	[3] 3.09
Men's ring	10	10 carat square signet, 5560-48042	45.20	39.00	39.00
Swank cuff links	10	Indian head pennies	6.60	6.00	6.00
Sterling knife	10	Reed & Barton, Cellini engraved	10.45	9.50	9.50
Men's watches	10	Longines "all proof"	87.45	79.50	79.50
LEATHER GOODS					
Ladies' purses	10	Dolfan Co., black, French mode leather	25.30	23.00	23.00
Do	10	Golay, black plastic	6.60	6.00	6.00
Men's wallets	10	Lord Buxton "Statesman"	5.50	5.00	5.00
Ladies' luggage	10	Lark custom, palamino tan tote bag, No. 540	30.25	27.50	27.50
Do	10	American Tourister, "Little Miss Everything"	24.90	21.95	21.95
CAMERAS AND BINOCULARS					
Camera	10	Argus 260 Instamatic	55.00	55.00	55.00
Binoculars	10	TASCO 20 by 60 mm., No. T-63-0866	55.00	49.95	60.00
TOILET ACCESSORIES					
Perfume	10	My Sin (spray) by Lanvin	5.50	5.00	5.00
Mascara	10	Revlon "Fabulash"	2.75	2.50	2.50
Arden for men	10	Traveling kit (deodorant, soap, after shave)	6.02	5.50	5.50
English leather	10	Travel-type kit	5.50	5.00	5.00
PEN					
Fountain pen	10	Parker "75"	27.50	25.00	25.00

KANN'S DEPARTMENT STORE (WASHINGTON, D.C.)

Item	Percent of excise tax removed	Description	Pre-tax-cut price [1]	July 8 post-tax-cut price [1]	July 19-20 price [1]
CAMERAS					
Movie projector	5	Revere, 8 mm	109.50	109.50	109.50
Movie camera	10	Kodak, Instamatic M4	74.50	74.50	74.50
FANS					
Rollabout fan	5	Emerson RA181	[7] 44.95	44.95	44.95
LAWN EQUIPMENT					
Electric lawn trimmer	5	Black & Decker V-278	34.88	34.88	34.88

LANSBURGH'S (WASHINGTON, D.C.)

Item	Percent of excise tax removed	Description	Pre-tax-cut price [1]	July 8 post-tax-cut price [1]	July 19-20 price [1]
JEWELRY AND LIGHTERS					
Diamond pendant	10	1 carat	[4] 275.00	275.00	(5)
Silver dollar key ring	10	"Lucky Buck" by Swank	[3] 5.17	5.13	5.13
Lighter	10	Zippo 250	4.75	4.75	(5)
TOILET ACCESSORIES					
Lipstick	10	Cover Girl	1.65	1.50	1.50
Foundation makeup	10	Revlon Moondrop	3.30	3.00	3.00

HECHT CO. (WASHINGTON, D.C.)

Item	Percent of excise tax removed	Description	Pre-tax-cut price [1]	July 8 post-tax-cut price [1]	July 19-20 price [1]
APPLIANCES AND LAWN EQUIPMENT					
Dehumidifier	5	Duracrest D-17	89.99	85.88	85.88
Dishwasher	5	Kelvinator, UP9	300.00	300.00	274.50
Dryer (clothes)	5	Norge, DCF1536	162.99	162.99	162.99
Range-oven	5	Kelvinator, RP9	600.00	600.00	561.25
Rotisserie oven	5	RE RT30	69.99	69.99	[6] 66.99
Electric lawnmowers	5	Sunbean PRE1500 16 inch, ⅓ horsepower	49.99	49.99	47.89
RADIOS AND TELEVISIONS					
Color TV, stereo and radio	10	Magnavox, 2RT562	[7] 1,195.00	1,195.00	1,195.00
Color TV, 21 inch	10	Magnavox, IT550	[7] 498.50	498.50	498.50
Stereo console	10	Magnavox, 1ST682, GE1025	[7] 475.00	475.00	(5)
AM-FM transistor table radio	10	GE1025	139.95	139.95	129.95
AM-FM radio	10	Zenith, K731	79.00	79.00	64.95
Clock radio, AM-FM	10	Magnavox, FM44	[7] 54.95	54.95	54.95

See footnotes at end of table.

HECHT CO. (WASHINGTON, D.C.)—Continued

Item	Percent of excise tax removed	Description	Pre-tax-cut price [1]	July 8 post-tax-cut price [1]	July 19–20 price [1]
SPORTING GOODS					
Golf clubs	10	MacGregor, putter, 3, 5, 7, 9 irons	31.95	31.95	31.95
Pool table	10	Sportcrest 81-inch Deluxe Champion	169.00	169.00	(5)
Tennis racket	10	Spalding "Pancho Gonzalez"	18.99	18.99	17.49
WATCHES					
Ladies' watches	10	Longines white gold, oval face	110.00	100.00	100.00

ZAYRE DEPARTMENT STORE (SEVEN CORNERS, VA.)

Item	Percent of excise tax removed	Description	Pre-tax-cut price [1]	July 8 post-tax-cut price [1]	July 19–20 price [1]
RADIOS AND TELEVISIONS					
Radio	10	Grundig 2440 (4 channels)	$89.99	$87.18	$87.18
Radio, AM–FM	10	Zenith T325	52.95	51.39	51.39
Do	10	Zenith H845	85.88	(5)	83.30
Do	10	GE T285	45.88	44.50	44.50
Radio, AM	10	GE T295	22.88	22.17	22.17
Television, black and white	10	Emerson 19PO8 (portable)	123.00	123.00	123.00
Do	10	GE, M205AVY (portable)	139.88	132.10	132.10
Do	10	Motorola, 23K138W	198.88	185.48	185.48
Television, color	10	Motorola, 23CK303AD	578.88	578.88	544.00
Do	10	Motorola, 23CS307BW	539.88	539.88	507.00
Do	10	Zenith, 5317WV	498.88	471.52	471.52
Phonograph	10	GE, RP–2219 (portable)	66.88	66.88	66.88
AIR CONDITIONERS AND FANS					
Air conditioner	10	GE, RF506	239.88	227.79	227.79
Fan	5	GE, W18	28.88	[3] 26.74	[3] 17.69
Do	5	GE, W12	18.88	[3] 17.69	[3] 17.69
Do	5	Dominion, 2074	17.88	17.34	17.34
Do	5	Toastmaster, 5325	17.88	17.34	17.34
APPLIANCES					
Clothes dryers	5	Norge, DEF–1536	163.88	163.88	160.22
Do	5	RCA Whirlpool, LME–340	124.88	121.88	121.14
Freezers	5	Norge, UFE–1150	189.88	189.88	174.65
Do	5	RCA Whirlpool, EMV–11C	169.88	[3] 156.00	164.78
Do	5	GE, CA276Y	299.88	292.08	292.08
Refrigerators	5	GE, TB303Y	222.88	216.58	216.58
Do	5	GE, TB12MA	189.88	[3] 185.00	185.00
Do	5	RCA, Whirlpool ELT–12–C	198.88	[3] 192.21	179.88
Do	5	RCA, Whirlpool ELL–11–C	159.88	153.96	153.96
Oven-ranges	5	GRE 1305, Norge (gas)	149.95	[3] 149.95	145.72
Do	5	GRE 7306, Norge (gas)	149.88	149.88	149.88
Do	5	Magic Chef 2140–A7W	159.88	158.88	150.00
Do	5	GE J325Y	218.88	183.38	183.38
SPORTING GOODS					
Golf clubs	10	Wilson, D6850	35.88	35.88	33.99
LAWN MOWERS					
Lawn mower	5	Mow-N-Kleen, 153	59.88	59.88	59.88
Do	5	Mow-N-Kleen, L–951	39.88	39.88	39.88
Do	5	Mow-N-Kleen, M–12541	74.89	74.89	74.89

S. KLEIN CO. (ROUTE 236)

Item	Percent of excise tax removed	Description	Pre-tax-cut price [1]	July 8 post-tax-cut price [1]	July 19–20 price [1]
RADIOS AND TELEVISIONS					
Television, black and white	10	Motorola, 23BS171A	229.88	229.88	229.88
Television, color	10	RCA, 6F637W; 21-inch	549.88	549.88	[3] 529.88
Do	10	Motorola, Y23CK38W	619.88	619.88	[3] 569.88
Radio, AM–FM	10	Zenith, 516	33.88	33.88	33.88
Radio, clock	10	Zenith, 30001	198.88	198.88	169.89
FANS AND AIR CONDITIONERS					
Air conditioner	10	Philco 7AC53	199.88	199.88	179.88
Do	10	RCA AMMC 6020	174.88	169.88	169.88
Fan, window	5	Marvin, 10-inch, No. 110	10.88	10.88	10.34
Do	5	Hunter 22-inch, W–22	56.88	56.88	54.04
Fan, floor	5	GE 20-inch, W–13	25.88	25.88	25.58
Fan, table	5	Westinghouse 12-inch 12L5A	19.99	19.99	19.99
APPLIANCES					
Stoves	5	Norge, ERE 1606	189.88	184.18	184.18
Do	5	Norge. GRE 1306	149.88	145.38	145.35
Driers	5	Norge, DGF 1536	179.88	174.48	174.48
Do	5	Norge, DEF 1220	139.88	135.68	135.68
Freezers	5	Kelvinator, V–707N	299.88	291.38	158.00
Do	5	RCA, EMV13SWR	219.88	213.28	213.28
Refrigerators	5	Kelvinator. 777N	429.88	399.88	399.88

KORVETTE'S (LEESBURG PIKE, BAILEYS CROSSROADS, VA.)

Item	Percent of excise tax removed	Description	Pre-tax-cut price [1]	July 8 post-tax-cut price [1]	July 19–20 price [1]
RADIO AND TELEVISION					
Radio	10	GE T1020A	82.89	79.89	(5)
Do	10	Zenith M507	19.89	19.29	19.29
Television, color	10	Zenith 21 inch, 5758(c)	568.89	568.89	568.89
Television, black and white	10	Zenith 19 inch, 2231	249.89	221.89	221.89
Do	10	Admiral 15 inch, 1530	109.89	103.87	103.89
Television, color	10	RCA 21 inch, GF703(c)	529.00	529.00	(5)

See footnotes at end of table.

KORVETTE'S (LEESBURG PIKE, BAILEYS CROSS ROADS, VA.)—Continued

Item	Percent of excise tax removed	Description	Pre-tax-cut price [1]	July 8 post-tax-cut price [1]	July 19-20 price [1]
AIR CONDITIONERS AND FANS					
Air conditioners	10	Philco, 5AC51	$144.89	$134.40	$134.40
Do	10	Admiral, 455A8	99.89	92.60	(5)
Fans:					
Portable	5	Capri, CP20B	20.89	20.49	20.49
Desk	5	GE 12-inch, PG12	19.89	(5)	(5)
Do	5	Westinghouse 10-inch, 10LA4	13.89	13.69	13.69
SPORTING GOODS					
Tennis racket	10	Lee "Dreadnaught"	14.89	14.89	14.89
Golf clubs	10	Wilson, D8342	39.89	39.89	38.49
Do	10	Spalding, "Jones registration"	74.89	74.89	74.89
APPLIANCES					
Stoves:					
Gas	5	Roper, 1324	159.89	154.89	154.89
Electric	5	Hotpoint, RB 375	319.89	(9)	(5)
Do	5	Kelvinator, RF392MC	299.89	294.89	294.89
Clothes dryer, electric	5	Norge, DEE 152D	159.89	152.89	152.89
Do	5	RCA, IKE 890-0	199.89	192.89	(5)
Refrigerators	5	15.4-cubic-foot RCA ELR15S	279.89	271.89	271.89
Do	5	15.7-cubic-foot Philco 16 RM46	299.89	291.89	291.89
Freezers	5	Norge, UFE1640 15.7-cubic-foot electric	249.89	242.89	242.89
Do	5	Kelvinator, V706, 13.13 cubic-foot	229.89	222.89	222.89

[1] Minus local sales tax unless noted.
[2] Not in stock.
[3] Including District of Columbia sales tax.
[4] Plus 10 percent.
[5] Sold out.
[6] A model change from RT30 to R30.
[7] Prices lowered in anticipation of the tax cut.
[8] Sale price.
[9] No price found.

ISSUANCE OF DANTE COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on March 26 last, I commented on the fact that significant anniversary ceremonies would be held throughout the Nation this year honoring Dante Alighieri, one of the world's greatest poets. On that occasion, I advised this House that we honored this past year another great Italian, Giovanni da Verrazano, with a U.S. commemorative stamp, and urged that Dante be similarly honored as a gesture of our admiration and respect.

I was particularly pleased that, as recommended, this renowned and most distinguished Italian literary figure of all time was, in fact, memorialized by the issuance of a stamp commemorating the 700th anniversary of his birth. This commemoration was observed at a dedication ceremony held in San Francisco last week on the first day the stamp was offered for sale.

Sponsored by the Dante Alighieri Commemorative Stamp National Committee, it was a moving and deserving tribute attended by many notable persons from all walks of life. Several of our distinguished colleagues served on the honorary committee, of which the senior Senator from Rhode Island, [JOHN O. PASTORE], was chairman. Dr. Edward D. Re, Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, who served at the request of Postmaster General Gronouski as national chairman of the committee, read the message of President Johnson in honor of the occasion.

Presiding at the ceremonies which took place at the Fairmont Hotel in San Francisco, was the Honorable John A. Ertola, supervisor of the city and county of San Francisco. The invocation was delivered by the Most Reverend Joseph T. McGucken, archbishop of San Francisco, and the pledge of allegiance led by the Honorable George Cerasi, member of the Advisory Committee of the Department of Veterans' Affairs for the State of California.

Greetings were extended on behalf of Mayor Jack Shelley by Hon. Peter Tamaras, supervisor of the city and county of San Francisco. In addition to the remarks by Dr. Re, as national chairman of the committee, speakers on the program included Postmaster John F. Fixa and Judge Lawrence S. Mana, chairman of the Dante Centenary Committee of the San Francisco Bay Area.

The significance of the stamp was explained in an address by Assistant Postmaster General Ralph Nicholson representing the Postmaster General. Mr. Nicholson also made several presentations of Dante commemorative stamp albums. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the stamp was designed by Mr. Douglas Gorsline, of New York City, the artist who designed Shakespeare's commemorative stamp issued last year by the Post Office Department. It is an attractive representation of Dante wearing the usual laurel wreath which is symbolic of poetry, the language in which Dante was at his best. In fact, his best known poem, the "Divine Comedy," is incorporated in the stamp by an allegorical reference to the flames of Hell about which he wrote so vividly in that work.

Among those serving on the national committee were Judge Ruggero Aldisert, national president, Italian Sons and Daughters of America; Mario J. Cariello, president, Borough of Queens, New York, N.Y.; Mayor Ralph G. Conte, of Bloomfield, N.J.; Dr. James DiRenna, president, UNICO National; Paul D'Ortona, president, City Council of Philadelphia; John N. LaCorte, president, Italian Historical Society of America; Edward T. Lagonegro, mayor of Elmira, N.Y.; James J. LaPenta, Jr., Deputy Assistant Postmaster General; Albert V. Manicalco, president, Borough of Richmond, New York, N.Y.; Judge Juvenal Marchisio, national president, American Committee on Italian Migration; Dr. Edward J. Martola, president of Pace College, New York; Charles G. Notari, national president, Federazione Figli di Colombo; John Ottaviani, supreme venerable, Order Sons of Italy; Fortune R. Pope, president, Columbus Citizens' Committee; Dr. Peter Sammartino, president of Fairleigh Dickinson University, New Jersey; Paul R. Screvane, president, City Council of New York; Frank J. Lucia, commissioner of sanitation, city of New York; Salvatore A. Locurto, deputy commissioner of sanitation, city of New York; Joseph J. Perrini, deputy controller, city of New York; and Paul P. Rao, Jr., tax commissioner, New York City.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to include the texts of Dr. Re's statement and the messages of President Johnson and Postmaster General Gronouski:

REMARKS OF DR. EDWARD D. RE

Mr. Mayor, Assistant Postmaster General, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, we have gathered at these impressive ceremonies to pay tribute to the memory of one of the great literary figures of all time.

The entire world commemorates this year the 700th anniversary of the birth of Dante Alighieri, one of the world's greatest poets. Though a Florentine by birth, Dante Alighieri belongs to all peoples and to all nations. A genius whose vision and wisdom have long been recognized everywhere, Dante's works have neither been forgotten nor their influence diminished by the passage of time. Rather, they have assured his standing as a universal poet, as Shakespeare—a writer for men and for all times. As one of the giants of the Renaissance, Dante has left an indelible mark upon the world.

On this centenary celebration, therefore, we pay tribute to a man who also belongs to all ages. That he still lives in the hearts and minds of men everywhere is eloquently expressed by your presence at these ceremonies.

It is particularly appropriate that all Americans, and not merely Americans of Italian heritage, should honor Dante by this commemoration. For the genius of Dante honors not only the land that gave him birth but honors all humanity as well.

It is also fitting that this tribute should be in the form of a commemorative stamp which knows neither boundaries nor time—a commemoration which may be shared by all peoples and all nations everywhere. What better memorial, therefore, could serve to remind all humanity of the contributions of this great poet to the world's literary masterpieces? But in commemorating the birth of Dante, the stamp issued today recognizes more than the outstanding contributions of one man in one country. Rather, it serves to emphasize the contributions made by all peoples and by all nations in the forward march of mankind everywhere.

Those of us privileged to be Americans are particularly aware of this truth, for no other nation can compare with the American landscape as a vast mosaic, composed of varied heritages and cultures. Only by the combined efforts, talents, and labors of all Americans, regardless of their race or national origin, has this Nation grown and prospered.

But the contributions of all Americans to the growth and development of our Nation were only made possible by the equality of opportunity that America guarantees to all citizens. America today strives to attain that goal for all Americans realizing that without equality and justice under the law, no nation can be truly great, and no society can be truly free. These principles, inspired by his love of justice, can be found in Dante's works. To Dante, the concept of a just world was God's greatest gift to mankind. The torment of a man, dismayed and outraged by the violence and disorder of his day and by moral injustices often ending in bloodshed, was, in part, the "leitmotiv" of the "Divine Comedy." Throughout the comedy we see the supreme artist ceaselessly striving for the triumph of his ideals of peace and justice—a peace through justice. The first artistic giant of the modern age, marking in literature the boundary between medievalism and modern times, it has been said that with Dante "the human spirit had taken a mighty step toward the consciousness of its own secret life."

Although renowned primarily for his literary works, Dante was an active man who was forced by events to become a prominent figure in Florentine politics. Dante held important public offices and carried out diplomatic missions on behalf of his government. Although it may be said to be unfortunate that he ended his life in exile from the Florence he loved, it was during this period that he wrote one of his most inspirational works, the "De Monarchia," his blueprint for attaining universal peace through justice. It was through his writings that Dante was able to express effectively his hopes for a spiritual and civic revival of all humanity. From that revival may we draw inspiration for our continuing efforts to achieve a better community at home and a just peace in the world.

As national chairman of the Dante Alighieri Commemorative Stamp Committee, I should like to express my appreciation to Postmaster General Gronouski for the privilege of participating in these impressive ceremonies. The Postmaster General who was unable to attend these ceremonies has asked me to read the folowing letter:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *July 14, 1965.*

DR. EDWARD D. RE,
Chairman, Dante Alighieri Commemorative Stamp National Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. RE: I am most grateful for your invitation to attend the Dante Alighieri commemorative stamp first-day-issue ceremonies in San Francisco, but a prior commitment, unfortunately, prevents me from accepting. Therefore, I have asked Mr. Ralph Nicholson, my able Assistant Postmaster General in charge of Finance and Administration to represent me and the Department.

The issuance of the Dante Alighieri stamp is a fitting tribute to the immortal Italian-born poet, who, by virtue of his genius, belongs to the whole civilized world. But as we observe the Dante Alighieri anniversary we do more than honor one man, however great he was. We honor a rich Italian heritage, which is also our heritage, thanks to millions of Americans of Italian descent. They added to our culture, our traditions, and our greatness, and we would be a lesser nation without them. They instilled in us love for music, arts and sciences, and the immortal value of humanity.

This is one of the many reasons why our country should keep its door open to those sons of Italy who can contribute further to our cultural and economic growth. Our present discriminatory immigration laws must be replaced by enlightened legislation proposed by President Johnson which will respect the needs of our country and at the same time welcome to our shores those who continue to bring with them the heritage of mankind's greatest intellectual, moral, and political creativeness.

Only by the fusion and combined strength of all heritages have we been able to make of this blessed land "one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Please convey my best wishes to all members of the Dante Alighieri Commemorative Stamp National and San Francisco Committees as well as to the entire Italo-American community on this memorable occasion.

With best personal regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
JOHN A. GRONOUSKI,
Postmaster General.

I should like to acknowledge the contribution of all those whose combined efforts culminated in the issuance of the Dante commemorative stamp. A word of appreciation is also due the Dante Centenary Committee of the San Francisco Bay area and its president, Judge Lawrence Mana, and also to Mr. John A. Ertola and his committee, who arranged so expertly the many details of this program.

It is now my happy privilege to read on this historic occasion the message of the President of the United States:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 15, 1965.

Hon. EDWARD D. RE,
Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States

DEAR CHAIRMAN RE: It gives me pleasure to join the millions of our citizens paying tribute to the immortal memory of Dante Alighieri on the 700th anniversary of his birth. A commemorative stamp in honor of this great son of Italy is a fitting tribute to the universal contributions of an illustrious man who belongs to every age and to people of all ages.

Through his genius and creative achievement, Dante became forever a citizen of the world. Poet, philosopher, musician, political scientist, and psychologist, Dante's renowned accomplishments are a lasting testament to his fully and richly rewarding life.

Dante's immortal "Divine Comedy," with its sublime message of faith and hope, is his best known and most widely respected work. But for those who are charged with administering their nation's affairs, his provocative political ideas, expressed in his other literary masterpieces, have enduring meaning and significance.

I am both proud and happy to express at this time my congratulations to our entire Italian-American community for sustaining in their new home the revered ideals and traditions of the old. You have my personal good wishes on this memorable occasion.

Sincerely,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

AMERICA DOES NOT FORGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is well that this third week in July has been set aside by Congress as Captive Nations Week, to commemorate the brave and liberty-loving peoples enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

For the past 6 years, we have been setting aside this week, and, let all the world know, we will continue to do so until, in the words of our joint congressional resolution, "such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

America has not forgotten these peoples—the Poles, Hungarians, Rumanians, Czechs, East Germans, and others who have been deprived of their national freedom by the imperialistic might of the conquering Soviet armies. Nor has American given up as lost the causes of those other peoples—the Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, and Ukrainians—who had to undergo the further degradation of being openly swallowed up by the Russians and made unwilling so-called integral parts of the Soviet Union itself.

America will continue to support these peoples in their drive for national self-determination, for we have a moral responsibility to do so. We are the symbol of freedom the world over. Almost 200 years ago, we fought for our own representative form of government. Now, we cannot let these people down in their fight for theirs.

But we have more than a moral responsibility to these people; we have a tie of blood which demands that we continue our support. Yes, a tie of blood. We owe much to our ancestors of European stock. Let us pay back this debt by aiding their present-day countrymen.

Often we are told that the captive peoples are becoming more favorably disposed toward their governments as they receive more and better material goods. Well, this is simply not the case. If the captive peoples are so happy, then why in the year 1965 do the Communists still keep their Berlin wall? Why are the borders of these states surrounded with mine fields, barbed wire, and machinegun posts? Why aren't the people freely permitted to travel outside the Soviet bloc? The people—not the trusted party elite—but the people.

No, the people are not happy with their Communist governments. Some day they will again be free. And I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will then be able to say that our annual commemoration of Captive Nations Week in some way helped them achieve that freedom.

TRIBUTE TO ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, we loved his wit—his freshness of mind—his ability to laugh with us at our mistakes and at his own.

He had spent almost 40 years in government service of one kind or other. Now he is gone.

Yet the grace of Adlai Stevenson's spirit and the splendor of his mind have turned this, the last of his defeats, into victory.

"What endures out of all this," he once said, "is the extent to which one can penetrate the minds of people and influence the thinking of our times; and if I succeed in doing that, it's compensation enough."

After he had spoken, the dialog of democracy never sounded the same again. He literally changed the face and tone of American politics. His successors used the bold ideas he had given them, and they put to work the superior breed of men he had attracted to public service. For almost a decade he was the sparkplug and intellectual leader of his party. He kept alive the issues and programs now becoming a practical reality in the present Congress. Without him—without the loyalty he inspired and the magnificent eloquence that gave it all meaning and purpose—this would not have been possible. If any one man was a godfather to the challenges of the New Frontier and the Great Society, it was Adlai Stevenson.

Today the volunteer and citizens groups—the clubs organized to discuss issues and reform politics—are permanent fixtures of our political system. They owe their very existence to him. He had swept up millions of thoughtful members of the postwar generation and helped them to bridge, seemingly by the very act of his participation, the cool distance they had kept between themselves and their own Government. It was Adlai Stevenson, the catalyst and the teacher, who told them there was room for intelligence and idealism in public life; and it was he who demonstrated that there was meaning, if held in the right hands, to the old saw that says the best government is the best politics.

Ever conscious of his own human limitations on the one hand, and the complications of the world situation on the other, he urged an injection of sense into political talk. And he, more than most, had the capacity of mind and the rare gift of eloquence to talk sense. He spoke with a clarity of conviction few men had the courage to match.

"Where we have erred," he said, "let there be no denial; where we have wronged the public trust, let there be no excuses."

He had earned the respect, admiration, and affection of all for his extraordinary qualities. The grief we feel for the death of this man, however, is the grief for the loss of a man and more. In truth, Adlai Stevenson had come to symbolize for us a hope for peace as well as an ideal: all that which is excellent and admirable in men and holds the promise of a better future. Through the flow and ebb of his role in public life, there remained this image of him—part myth and part truth—that was as common among the veteran diplomats he served with in the United Nations as among the public at large.

Death came with stunning suddenness. Fitting are the words he used on the passing of Bernard Baruch a month earlier:

> I bid goodbye to an old friend with sorrow and gratitude for his useful life.

ADLAI E. STEVENSON

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, many of us found ourselves at a loss for words to express adequately our feelings of shock and sorrow over the death last week of a beloved and great American, our United Nations Ambassador, Adlai Stevenson. Our Nation has lost one of its most distinguished citizens, a leading statesman and a humanitarian whose good works have left a lasting mark on his own country and throughout the world.

Adlai Stevenson was a tireless worker for world peace and a true champion of human rights and human dignity for peoples in all parts of the world. He will be deeply missed by all who knew him personally and the millions more who so admired him.

Mr. Speaker, the Macomb Daily, a newspaper published in my congressional district, carried an editorial tribute to Adlai Stevenson in its edition of last Thursday. Under unanimous consent I place the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

ADLAI E. STEVENSON: A MAN OF WORDS

Adlai Stevenson, one of this Nation's true statesmen, is dead and his passing leaves us poorer.

A man who wanted to be President and Secretary of State and attained neither, Stevenson accepted a lesser post—ambassador to the United Nations—and served the country well.

The articulate representative defended the United States against attack in that world body with his most handy weapon—words. He could be glib or profoundly serious. Always he said the proper thing.

The fact that death came to Ambassador Stevenson while he was in a foreign land after completing another mission for his country lends a sad but significant glow to his long and dedicated career. He served to the end.

Now the task is left to us—and our words are inadequate.

Suffice to say we and the entire free world grieve.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART CXXXVIII

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns the fight against the slums in New York.

The article is part of the series on New York City in Crisis and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on May 30, 1965, and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: CITY'S UPHILL SLUM BATTLE—REMOVING ROOM VIOLATIONS

(By Alfonso Narvaez)

On March 30, 1965, Commissioner of Real Estate Frank Lazarus filed a sworn affidavit with the city rent and rehabilitation administration.

The purpose: to certify that all violations had been removed from 1342 Fulton Street, Brooklyn—of which his department had been named receiver on February 20, 1964, by court order—and to request a restoration of rents on the building.

"All of the violations, as listed in the above proceedings, on said premises have been removed," he said in his notarized statement. And * * * "all services for which rental reductions have been issued in the past have been restored."

On Friday, however, just 2 months later, Commissioner Lazarus admitted that he had erred in signing his name to the document. He acknowledged that at least three violations of long standing had not been complied with and that 43 other violations were still pending against the building at the time he signed the statement.

When asked how he could sign his name to an affidavit which was obviously not true, Commissioner Lazarus answered that he had acted on information supplied to him by contractors and by inspectors in his department.

"We're not perfect," he said. "We did 84,000 repair and maintenance jobs last year and maybe there were some that were overlooked or not done. Sure, there may have been cases where the contractors did not do the work properly or where it was shoddily done, but I'm sure that this didn't happen in even 1 percent of the cases."

A STANDARD PRACTICE

He said that the three violations of long standing consisted of failure to have a guardrail on the roof, failure to provide garbage can covers and storing garbage cans in the public halls—a standard real estate department practice.

Mr. Lazarus noted that the cans were left in the hallways because the tenants would not go into the street to put their garbage in them but would leave it strewn in the halls.

Of the 43 other violations pending against the building, Commissioner Lazarus said that 26 of them had been placed on the building at the time of the last inspection—March 19—and that many had been caused by a fire which gutted one of the apartments.

He said that 15 of the other violations had been complied with but that building department inspectors had not been able to gain access to the apartments. Two other violations, he said, were in vacant apartments and therefore did not have to be repaired until they were rented.

Although Commissioner Lazarus said that most of the other violations in the dilapidated 5-story, 14-apartment tenement had been complied with, a visit to the building on Friday proved otherwise.

NOT REPAIRED SINCE 1956

Violations numbered 188 and 189 in the building department's file on the building were for torn and dangerous carpeting or linoleum on the third and fourth floor land-ings. On Friday, these areas were still torn and dangerous, and the linoleum on the other landing was also torn.

Commissioner Lazarus had noted that according to his records these items had been repaired continuously over the past year but that they were marked "A" or no access in the building department's file—even though they are in the public halls.

Mrs. Sylvia Kearse, who lives in apartment 3R, said that the linoleum had been down since 1956 and that no one had repaired any of the holes or had done any work on the hallway floors since then.

Other tenants in the building—just two blocks from the scene of last summer's rioting in Bedford-Stuyvesant—echoed her complaint and added complaints of their own.

Mrs. Rosa Chestnut, who lives in apartment 5L with her seven children, was particularly bitter about how the city has treated her. She said that in late April she had received two notices from the Rent and Rehabilitation Administration.

One advised her that Commissioner Lazaruz had "issued a sworn statement indicating that all violations against these premises have been removed or corrected and all services for which rental reductions have been issued in the past have been restored."

The other told her that because the violations had been removed, her rent would go from $28.22 to $56.45 a month.

She then pointed to the ceiling in her kitchen and bathroom where gaping, black holes showed evidence of a recent fire.

"That's been like that since the firemen chopped holes in the ceiling to fight the fire in the next apartment," she said. "No one's been around to fix it since then."

The fire was on March 8, 1965.

Across the hall, in apartment 5R, Mrs. Sherrie Jenkins also pointed to signs of the fire. Her kitchen ceiling had a 4-foot hole in it but she too had received the notices from the RRA that violations had been removed or corrected. Her rent jumped from $15.68 back to its former $62.75.

FOUR MONTHS TO FIX TUB

One of the violations—pending since July 1962—has apparently been finally complied with but the tenant is far from satisfied. Mrs. Marie Gibbs, of apartment 3RR, said that her apartment had finally been painted early this year, but that water from the fire in the fifth floor apartment had ruined it.

"The water didn't leak down," she said, "it poured down. We had a flood in our apartment and everything was ruined."

However, this did not seem to bother her too much. What did bother her was that since last September workmen have been fixing her bathroom. She said that for 4 months her bathtub stood in the hall while the men would come around every once in a while and put some tiles in the bathroom.

She said that the tub was then put back in the bathroom, but it is still not completely installed. She said that the men put bricks and boards under it to prop it up and then left it that way.

Her rent goes from $10.60 to $39.42, effective June 1.

In the past, the rent and rehabilitation administration has accepted the department of real estate's sworn statement as the basis for allowing rent adjustments.

A spokesman for the building department said, however, that his department now usually certifies the compliance with building violations. He said that his department had not been asked to certify whether the work done on this building had been completed or if it complied with building department regulations.

Despite all the complaints, not all the tenants found fault with the department of real estate's handling of the building. Mrs. Sylvia Kearse, despite complaining about the unrepaired hall linoleum, thinks the DRE is doing a wonderful job with the building.

"You should have seen this place before they took it over," she said. "It was a real pigsty. A lot of it's the fault of the tenants and the people in the neighborhood. The workmen can only bring enough material that they can use in 1 day, otherwise someone will steal it."

She said that on one occasion the workmen's clothes were stolen and they had to go home in their work clothes. She also said that she does not mind paying the new rent—which went from $9.70 a month to $38.81—because the men from real estate department were fixing her apartment.

On Thursday, they put a new floor in her kitchen and told her that after she had put in linoleum, they would put molding around the edges and new door saddles.

The two workmen who did the job said that they were part of the DRE's maintenance crew, but when asked if they would make repairs on other apartments in the building they said they did not know.

LARGE RESPONSIBILITIES

"I've got nothing on them," the foreman said. "I don't go into any apartment I'm not ordered to. I've got 20 buildings to take care of and I go where the boss tells me to go."

And where the boss tells him to go can be any one of the 29,000 pieces of property the DRE handles or any one of the 81 buildings it administers under the receivership law.

Under the terms of the law, the city or a private individual is named as receiver and acts in the place of a landlord who is incapable of or who refuses to maintain his property. Of the more than 600 buildings checked into by the courts for receivership, the city has been named in only a very few.

Commissioner Lazarus has said that the city had to be selective in the buildings it takes under receivership because it could go bankrupt trying to repair them and then wait for payment from the landlord.

The landlord remains as owner of the property but any money spent on repairs becomes a lien against the property and must be paid.

However, the DRE's stewardship of these buildings has brought it more headaches than any of the other operations it has.

A CHALLENGE

The New York Young Republican Club's president, Charles Moerdler, has challenged Commissioner Lazarus' action on 1342 Fulton Street as well as on two adjoining buildings—1338 and 1346.

Mr. Moerdler demanded that the State investigation commission look into "rent-gouging and housing law violations" at city-operated buildings, and urged that Commissioner Lazarus resign "forthwith."

In a letter to the commission, Mr. Moerdler noted that "inaction and indifference" on the part of the city administration has "been a major contributing factor to the disorders, demonstrations, and the like which have plagued this city for too long."

In a 16-page report accompanying the letter, the Young Republican president showed "documented proof" of conditions in the four buildings in Brooklyn, as well as another at 751 East Fifth Street, which was the subject of one of the "New York City in Crisis" daily documentations of a city in trouble.

Mr. Moerdler said that he would try to have criminal charges brought against the DRE for its operation of the buildings and for its statements to the RRA.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART CXXXIX

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns urban renewal in New York and is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis."

The article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 2, 1965, and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: RENEWAL GROUND BROKEN—IT TOOK ONLY 4½ YEARS

(By Jerome Zukosky)

The rejoicing over the start of construction of a middle-income cooperative on Manhattan's upper West Side yesterday was like the relief that comes after an aching tooth is pulled.

Goddard Tower, a 27-story building was started.

The event easily justified the presence of Mayor Wagner and a host of city housing officials as well as the steel band and tumbling team from Goddard-Riverside Neighborhood Center, the settlement house that is sponsoring the co-op.

The building, to be built on the east side of Amsterdam Avenue, between 94th and 95th Street is:

The first sponsored by a neighborhood group within an urban renewal area. The city has been recommending this policy for 4 years to ease criticism of renewal from people faced with relocation. Some 40 families and single persons who lived on the site of the building have bought apartments in it. Most will benefit from a special arrangement that keeps their monthly charges at $18 a room a month.

The first new housing, except for public low-rent projects, to be built at all within the West Side urban renewal area, for which planning began in 1956.

GLACIER LIKE

The time taken to get Goddard Tower to ground breaking illustrates the problems of the glacier-like West Side project, the city's pioneering effort at large-scale reconstruction of a blighted neighborhood.

The area, between Central Park West and Amsterdam Avenue, 87th to 97th Streets, is to be rebuilt with new low-rent, middle-income, and luxury housing, and an investment of $200 million in public and private funds. It is the first and furthest advanced of the new look in renewal that replaced slum clearance projects of Robert Moses after 1960.

It was on May 1, 1962 that Milton Mollen, then chairman of the housing and redevelopment board, announced that stage one of the project, including Goddard Tower, would take 2½ years to complete after final plans were approved.

Final plans were approved later that year and the city, on February 1, 1963, took title to the land. Now, about 2½ years later, only the first of about 15 proposed privately sponsored buildings is being started. Only five others are expected to be started this year. Three are middle-income co-ops similar to Goddard and also sponsored by neighborhood groups; one is a large middle-income rental project on 96th to 97th Streets, between Amsterdam and Columbus Avenues, sponsored by a private group of builders and investment bankers; the fifth is a small building for the elderly.

NO PROGRESS

The future of five "luxury" apartment buildings in Stage One, not yet drawn, is in doubt. The builders and backers of these buildings were formally named sponsors by Mayor Wagner nearly 4½ years ago.

Even before Mayor Wagner named Goddard-Riverside sponsor of its buildings, a store-front office was soliciting applicants and informing neighborhood families about the building in the hope of keeping many of them from leaving permanently. Mrs. Florence Robinson, a neighborhood housewife who has managed the project office since the start, estimated that about 60 families had signed for apartments canceled by others during the long wait.

"That's not as bad as we were told to expect," she said yesterday as volunteers were blowing up some 500 balloons for the groundbreaking ceremony.

Mrs. John W. Nields, a board member of the settlement house and president of the cooperative, said that the delays were at least understandable. "This is the first time this kind of coordination has been tried," she said, "and every step has been pioneering and had to be hashed out with our people, city people, Federal people."

Officials who worked on the Goddard co-op factory said there were delay-causing basic changes in the West Side plan itself, as proposals moved from the housing and redevelopment board to Federal housing agencies and to the planning commission and board of estimate. At first, the co-op was to relocate families on the site and demolish structures; then the city's new relocation department and the real estate department took on the job. Land appraisals and carrying charges were changed. And each change meant meetings and conferences for months.

"It took us 6 months at the housing and redevelopment board to solve the problem of how to pay our architect," said one source who wished to be anonymous on the day of celebration. The architect demanded payment for working drawings and specifications; the co-op corporation could not use the money deposited by prospective buyers until regulations were changed.

Experiences like this, however, were recently described by Herbert Evans, chairman of the housing and redevelopment board as one reason it is looking more closely at the finances of potential community group sponsors.

He said "adequate working capital" would be required in the future, and also more professional management of projects such as Goddard Tower. Complicating the plans for Goddard and several of the other neighborhood-sponsored co-ops in recent months was the dismissal of builders of two of the projects.

HELEN HAYES JOINS FIGHT FOR HUDSON

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, over the past 7 months since I introduced the first Hudson River legislation, many voices have been raised in support of Federal participation in the development and protection of this great resource.

Last night a new and beloved voice was added by the "first lady" of the American stage, Helen Hayes. At a special meeting held by the Rockland County Board of Supervisors in preparation for the hearings of the National Parks and Recreation Subcommittee, Miss Hayes spoke movingly of the life that she and her husband, Charles MacArthur, enjoyed along the river. Noting that when they first moved there 34 years ago, there was much talk about cleaning up the area, Miss Hayes pointed out that nothing was done then or since.

Her eloquent plea for action now should reach a broader audience:

Statement by Miss Helen Hayes at the Rockland County Board of Supervisors Hearing, July 21, 1965, at the Rockland County Center in New York City, N.Y.

It is terribly important for all of us who care deeply about the Hudson to ally ourselves with efforts to preserve and restore this once lovely river. There can be no doubt that the Hudson has declined. River towns have, in most cases, turned their backs on the Hudson.

Many of us learning of the Federal Government's interest in aiding river communities to rehabilitate their shorelines have thought first about our own backyards and have had our fears exaggerated by those who would have us believe the Federal Government intended to confiscate our property and restrict our free use of it. Nothing of the sort will happen. Rather, the Federal Government will work closely with State and local governments to plan for the highest and best use of this once great river.

And the time has come when we must concern ourselves with those who are less fortunate than we; those who do not have homes along the river, those who may not be able at the present time to buy boats and sail on the river—these people and their families have just as much right to recreational opportunities along the Hudson as any of us.

But no one—and I include myself—will really want to use this Hudson until it is cleaned up and made desirable.

So, for many reasons—to cleanse the polluted water, to heal the wounded shoreline, to reclaim for the Hudson its great nobility—I would like to express my support for Federal efforts to achieve these goals.

WAR ON POVERTY MUST GO ON

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8283, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965. This legislation extends the commitment Congress made last year to undertake a massive program attacking the root causes of poverty.

The war on poverty was begun only 9 months ago. It has experienced difficulties—some expected, some unexpected. But I am satisfied that on the whole, the poverty war has shown a record of progress and good performance. It must continue and it must be expanded.

I am particularly proud of the response of communities in my district, the 25th Congressional District of New York, to our call for local programs to combat local poverty.

Many were shocked a year ago when the Westchester Council of Social Agencies released the statistics it had compiled on poverty in Westchester. Those who knew that Westchester was the third wealthiest county in the Nation on a per capita basis, also discovered that 1 Westchester family in 12 lives in abject poverty on less than $3,000 a year; that 1 out of 4 nonwhite families lives in abject poverty, and half the nonwhite families live on less than $5,000 a year; that 1 family in 4 headed by a person 65 or older lives on less than $3,000.

In the city of Yonkers alone, nearly 5,000 families—10 percent of the entire population—lives in abject poverty.

Yonkers has made a real effort to meet the challenge. It has received grants for a community action program to get at the roots of its poverty problems. It has received grants for two Project Head Start programs to enable children of low-income families to receive valuable preschool preparation. It has received two grants for Neighborhood Youth Corps projects that will enable youngsters to get vocational training.

Other communities in the 25th Congressional District have been actively planning to combat poverty.

Ossining received a Project Head Start grant and just recently a community action program grant. Ossining has 800 families with incomes under $3,000. It has a frighteningly high dropout rate. In 1964, more than 1,000 youngsters left school. Community leaders developed a comprehensive program to give Ossining a new lease on life.

Greenburgh also received a Project Head Start grant. Its community action program is under study by the Office of Economic Opportunity. I know the community is anxious to commence the effort to give new hope to its less fortunate citizens.

Peekskill has Project Head Start and Neighborhood Youth Corps programs underway. It too, has planned a community-wide effort to attack poverty.

Mr. Speaker, the important thing about these programs is that they were developed and established locally, by local citizens, to meet local needs. They were not dictated by some imaginary poverty czar in Washington, nor were they dictated by Albany. It has always been my philosophy, and that of the Office of Economic Opportunity, that initiative for antipoverty programs begin and remain in local hands.

For this and other reasons, I oppose the amendment which would give Governors unlimited veto power over local antipoverty projects. For one thing, it is openly inviting the Governors of Southern States to effectively bar programs which would raise the economic and social status of the Negro. This would have an undeniably serious effect on the civil rights movement to which this Nation and this Government is dedicated.

In the second place, it would vitiate the role of local communities in developing and administering their programs. Governors could put pressure on communities to conform to their—the Governors—ideas of how programs should be established and run by threatening to use the veto. They can hold up programs to obtain political concessions.

Finally, I want to make it clear to my colleagues that the bill before us today does not take away the Governors' veto power. It merely give the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity authority to override such a veto if he finds that a Governor's objections are not meritorious—and then only with respect to the locally oriented programs. There would still be an unquestionable veto power with respect to the statewide programs of VISTA and the Job Corps.

I have been assured that the Director of OEO would use this authority judiciously and only after the most careful, painstaking investigation of all the circumstances. Additionally, the attendant glare of publicity concerning a Governor's veto and possible reversal by the Director of OEO would go a long way toward preventing abuses.

Mr. Speaker, for too long we have ignored the plight of our Nation's poor. Our goal is clear, our commitment is firm. I urge my colleagues to approve the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965.

THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE—IN SICKNESS AND IN HEALTH

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. merchant marine has seen better days than it is seeing today. The following comparative figures will illustrate the problem:

The total merchant fleet has decreased from 3,421 ships in 1949 to 2,529 ships today.

Our domestic fleet of dry cargo and passenger ships has dropped from 192 ships in 1949 to 93 ships today—excluding tankers.

Our shipyards are operating at only 42 percent of capacity.

We now possess only four old ore carriers, built in the first 4 years following World War II.

Not a single new tramp ship has been built since 1956.

In 1950 we had 45 active combination passenger-and-cargo and passenger ships. Today that number has dwindled to 29 ships.

Obviously, this is not a picture of a healthy shipping industry. It is a picture of a sick shipping industry, and one that has been sick and deteriorating for many years. Unfortunately, on top of its ills the shipping industry is also suffering from a 36-day-old strike. This strike has idled 104 ships, delayed an estimated $200 million in cargo, and put 10,000 seamen out of work.

Fortunately for the shipping industry and for the American economy the Administrator of the Maritime Administration is Nicholas Johnson. No one, to my knowledge, has isolated our shipping problems and exposed them to public view as well as Mr. Johnson. No Maritime Administrator has been as quick to understand these problems or as ready to try to solve them. Our shipping fleet today is in a serious state of disrepair. Rebuild it we must. As Nicholas Johnson said:

> The merchant ships under our control are vital elements in our power as a trading nation. We must have a strong voice in international shipping circles, and maintain an impact on world shipping rates. Our national security, in wars both hot and cold, requires the availability of U.S.-flag merchant ships for many support services. Our shipping policies affect virtually every department in our Federal Government in some way.
>
> It is plain, therefore, that any serious diminution in our merchant seapower is a matter of grave national concern.

Yet, the hard fact is that our fleet is growing smaller and more expensive. The Federal subsidy to this vital industry is increasing year by year at an alarming rate, and has already reached a substantial height. For example, for 1964:

The operating differential subsidy was $203 million.

The construction differential subsidy was $97 million.

The cargo preference subsidy, being the difference between United States and foreign costs paid on Public Law 480 cargo, was $81 million.

Trade in allowances provided by the Federal Government amounted to $11 million.

The cost to the Federal Government of operating training schools for merchant marine officers, such as the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y., and State schools, was $6 million.

These items represent a total Federal subsidy of $398 million for the year 1964. Not included are the costs to the Federal Government of extending such benefits to the shipping industry as Government guaranteed mortgage insurance similar to FHA, cabotage, tax deferences, Public Health Service Hospital medical care for seamen, and vessel exchanges.

There is no doubt that without Federal subsidies our shipyards would have gone out of the merchant ship business. Probably our entire shipping industry would be now bankrupt. We have continued to support this industry for two reasons:

First. For what we have considered to be the need for shipbuilding capacity.

Second. For our need for ships.

It is a fact, however, that it is much more costly to build ships in domestic shipyards than it is in foreign shipyards. It is another hard fact that foreign countries are pulling ahead of the United States, or have already pulled ahead of us, in shipbuilding and in shipping. Russia has not had, in the past, any supremacy in the area of world shipping. But it is estimated that Russia will surpass the United States in merchant shipping capability within the next 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, I have recited these unhappy facts in order to bring to the attention of my colleagues in this House and to the American people the seriousness of the plight of the U.S. merchant marine. This industry is simply not a source of pride or profits. In the area of shipping, we are being outwitted and outtraded. Failure to arrest this trend can mean economic disaster for America. As the present Maritime Administrator has said, the American merchant marine is at the crossroads. It cannot long remain "the Appalachia of the seven seas."

Nicholas Johnson has been the first Maritime Administrator to face these matters fully and to work toward their solution. It is apparent to me that some changes in our basic approach need to be made.

With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a most thoughtful and thought-provoking speech given by Nicholas Johnson before the Mid-Gulf Conference on Transportation and Industrial Modernization for Profit and Growth, February 9, 1965.

I am also inserting a story from the July 16, 1965 issue of Time magazine; an editorial from the New York Times, July 16, 1965; an editorial from the Wall Street Journal, July 21, 1965; and a story from the Baltimore Sun, July 20, 1965:

THE AMERICAN PARTNERSHIP: THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

(By Nicholas Johnson, Maritime Administrator, U.S. Department of Commerce)

Problems of modernization in the transportation industry are among the most exciting and potentially rewarding facing the United States today; and, of course, I think that those confronting the maritime industry present many of the most fascinating challenges of all.

The shipping industry has only recently commenced to be attuned to modernizing and mechanizing the fleet. And now, when the pace of technological advance has picked up, we discover that modernization is not alone a question of technology. It is a search for new perspectives.

This search has been an exciting one for me, for I have been seeking the ideas, experience and judgment of those who know the shipping business and of the laboring men who serve it. It has, I think, been exciting for the industry as well. We have stumbled over a few myths and misunderstandings, and found new truths.

Some of our problems remind me of the fellow who joined the Navy and found himself on a training ship. When he lost his hat overboard one day, he was told he would have to pay for it. He protested, and said, "Suppose I had borrowed a jeep and it had been stolen, would I have to pay for that?" The supply officer patiently explained that in the service one paid for all the Government property lost. "My Lord," gasped the boot, "now I understand why captains go down with their ships."

This story has a special point for Americans, for as a nation we do have to pay for our ships, and although in doing so there is not yet any question of going down with our ships, our problems have certainly diminished our stature as a maritime nation.

These are serious problems, for the merchant marine is an essential part of our economy and of our whole national life.

We are the world's largest trading Nation, supplying some 315 million tons of imports and exports each year—99 percent of which go by ship.

Nearly six out of every hundred workers in this country make their living on farms and factories providing goods for export. Last year America's 3.5 million farm families produced and sold over 1.6 billion bushels of grain for export. Most of the major cities of the United States, and scores of others, are ports. One ton of general cargo handled in a port generates between $15 and $20 for the economy of the surrounding area—close to $1 billion per year in our port communities.

The shipping industry generates about $1.5 billion of gross national product, and pays about $75 million in Federal and local taxes; its workers pay over $80 million in personal income taxes. It provides employment for about 200,000 men, including longshoremen.

The merchant ships under our control are vital elements in our power as a trading Nation. We must have a strong voice in international shipping circles, and maintain an impact on world shipping rates. Our national security, in wars both hot and cold, requires the availability of U.S.-flag merchant ships for many support services. Our shipping policies affect virtually every Department in our Federal Government in some way.

It is plain, therefore, that any serious diminution in our merchant seapower is a matter of grave national concern.

In part, it is a problem which can be met by American shippers simply understanding the benefits—to them and to our Nation—of shipping on American vessels. Our liner service is better than any in the world, and yet offers rates as low as on foreign ships.

Because the merchant marine is an essential part of our economy, very early in our national life there was created a uniquely American partnership of industry and government, a partnership whose goal was to create and maintain an American merchant marine. In times of crisis that partnership has produced miracles—like the 50 million gross tons of ships built during World War II. But even in times of calm the need continues.

As one partner, it is my job to report to you the facts, problems, and alternative solutions—for solutions there are. It is our job together to make the choices that will rebuild our fleet—for rebuild we must. All my energies are presently committeed to that end.

A few figures will suggest the depth and immediacy of our problem. Our foreign trade liner fleet is composed of some 315 subsidized and about 100 unsubsidized liner ships. The subsidized ships are as fast and modern as any in the world, and although there have been some alterations in the original replacement schedule, the fleet nevertheless is being renewed.

Of the 100 unsubsidized ships, however, all but 5 date from World War II. Yet no provision has been made for the replacement of this fleet. Unless we alter course, these 100 ships will disappear from the American-flag merchant marine over the next 5 to 10 years.

To grant applications for operating subsidy on these old ships would require an additional subsidy of about $50 million per year. To replace them under present programs would cost the Government on the order of an additional $600 million.

We are not faced with an easy choice. Look at the result if we do not replace these ships. In 1963 the total amount of Government-sponsored cargo moving on American liner ships was about 7.2 million tons. Without the unsubsidized liners all of this cargo will have to go on the subsidized ships, and the percentage of purely commercial cargo on these ships will then decline to at most 40 percent. What would be left of our purely commercial merchant marine?

If we look at the dry bulk segment of our fleet, the situation is even more serious. We now carry about 5 percent of our total dry bulk trade: wheat, coal, iron ore, and so forth. In the next 20 years the amount of dry bulk cargo in the international trade of the United States will leap from 140 million to 380 million tons. Meanwhile, our capacity to carry that trade will decline from today's small 7.8 million tons to a puny 3.9 million tons—about 1 percent of the total.

The tramp fleet is composed of about 130 vessels. Only seven of these ships were built since World War II. They are inadequately maintained. An American in India recently wrote to me that some were in such dreadful condition he was ashamed to see them flying the American flag. Last month off the coast of Florida one simply sank. Over the next 5 or 10 years the rest of this fleet will be unable to meet class requirements—or will just break down forever in some foreign port.

Today we are paying $80 million a year in subsidy through cargo preference freight-rate differentials to perpetuate this fleet. There presently exists no program to replace it. To put 100 modern dry bulk carriers under operating subsidy probably would cost the taxpayers on the order of $30 to $40 million a year in operating subsidy. To build them in American yards probably would cost the Government an additional $400 to $500 million.

I will not burden you with more figures on the decline of our fleet. The same sad story could be told about our domestic fleet. But it must be plain by now that our problems are acute: our fleet is growing smaller and more expensive.

There is an almost unavoidable human tendency to act as my daughter did the other day when she and a friend were deciding who would ride the friend's new bicycle. Finally my daughter suggested, "Let's take turns. You have it today." The friend agreed, and began to walk away with the bike. "Wait," my daughter said, "Now we are playing it's yesterday."

In many ways we are playing it is yesterday: boasting of our fleet even as it sinks.

Let us for a moment play that it is tomorrow. What alternatives remain open for America?

It is appropriate to begin with our shipbuilding industry, for although little understood, many of the problems of the merchant fleet can be traced back to policies regarding the yards.

The Maritime Administration's Office of Ship Construction is the largest in the agency, administering $100 million in subsidy for shipyards each year.

The need for a shipyard subsidy derives from the statutory requirement that all subsidized ships in the U.S. merchant marine must be built in American shipyards. It costs more than twice as much to build a ship in the United States. The Government pays the excess over world market price. Without the build American requirement, however, shipowners would be free to build where they chose and would not require $1 of construction subsidy.

The United States is the only major maritime nation in the world to require all of its subsidized commercial ships to be built at home. Under Russia's massive merchant fleet expansion program only 30 percent of the new ships are being constructed in the Soviet Union. Norwegian shipowners build over 80 percent of their ships abroad.

Nor is any other American transportation industry required to purchase its equipment in this country. Other American businessmen may purchase and operate in the U.S. airplanes, locomotives, automobiles, trucks, and pipeline which were manufactured abroad.

What have been the reasons for our shipbuilding policy?

Under ordinary conceptions of American free enterprise and world trade our shipyards would have gone out of the merchant ship business. Why have we prevented this happening? The experience in the First and Second World Wars was that a substantial shipbuilding capacity was required. During World War II, for example, we built over 5,600 vessels at a cost of more than $15 billion. That experience is still fresh in our minds.

But do similar needs exist today? A great deal has changed since 1945—in both war and transportation. Perhaps today's needs are centered more on a fleet in being, quickly responsive to emergency needs, and less on long-term shipbuilding capacity. In any event, the magnitude of the need for shipbuilding capability ought not to be confused with the magnitude of the need for ships. They are significantly different needs. For example, it could be that both civilian and military requirements would suggest a larger fleet than we presently posses, even though the present level of shipbuilding capability were sufficient for emergency needs. The lack of relationship between ships and shipyards is further emphasized by the existence of our national defense reserve fleets, which provide for immediate expansion of the fleet without any new building at all.

In fact, the relationship between the shipping subsidy and the shipyard subsidy is no more inevitable than that between the farm subsidy and a subsidy for the farm tractor industry.

What does the maritime shipyard subsidy mean to American shipyard workers and owners?

The total Government-sponsored input into Navy and private shipyards in this country runs to about $3 billion each year—mostly new construction and repair for the Navy. Thus, subsidized commercial shipbuilding represents less than 7 percent of the total. And of the 21 American private yards capable of constructing merchant vessels, only 5 are participating in subsidized shipbuilding. For example, America's largest yard, Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., which employs 19,500 men and presently has $511 million of work under contract, has not built a subsidized merchant ship for 2 years, and appears to have no plans to do so. Even among the five yards which are doing subsidized commercial work, an average of 50 percent of their income is generated by the Navy.

Not only is the statutory restriction prohibiting subsidized shipowners from purchasing ships abroad doing little for the plight of the American shipyards, but it has had a devastating impact on the growth of our merchant marine.

Our total merchant fleet has decreased from 3,421 ships in 1949 to 2,529 today. Even after discounting the decrease resulting from the sale or scrapping of war-built ships, our active commercial fleet has declined by 25 percent during the same years.

Why is this so? It is in part because the build-American requirement means in practice that once the annual shipbuilding subsidy has been spent, no more ships will be built. Unless the Congress were to provide an unlimited appropriation for subsidizing American shipyards, the size of the fleet inevitably will be a function of the construction appropriation. And the cost of American construction is so high—over double world rates—that the restriction has been severe.

Few Americans realize how severe our ship replacement needs are today. The 15 subsidized companies have a contractual obligation to replace their 317 ships. If the ships had been replaced at the end of their statutory 20-year lives, the operators would have built an additional 80 to 90 ships by now. In addition, the 100 unsubsidized liners have applied for subsidy—and subsidized replacement. Our domestic fleet, 192 dry cargo and passenger ships in 1949, has dwindled to but 93 ships today (excluding tankers). Our 120 tramp ships require replacement, and applications for 9 new bulk carriers are pending before the Maritime Subsidy Board. Thus, hundreds of ships are required simply to hold our own. Expansion would require more than that.

Nor does there appear to be much prospect for the costs of ship construction being reduced. American shipyards are relatively among the least competitive, by European standards, of all U.S. industries. A study of 44 major American industries, using productivity in the United Kingdom as a base, revealed that many were 300 to 500 percent more productive than their foreign competitors—a difference fully adequate to offset higher wage costs. By this standard, our shipyards were ranked 44th—about equally as productive as the foreign competition. Today our yards charge about 220 percent of foreign ship prices, and yet reap relatively low profits. American shipyard owners are good businessmen, and shipyard workers are as efficient as any others. But shipbuilding is not readily adaptable to automation (about 750,000 man hours may go into a ship), and with the relatively few ships each year, and the 21 yards operating at only 42 percent capacity, there is little incentive for extensive capital improvements.

These are some of the basic facts. What are our alternatives?

1. We could continue the status quo: require all subsidized merchant ships to be built in American yards and appropriate enough money to replace our fleet at the present level of 16 to 18 ships per year. We thus accept the fleet's continued decline, and at a faster rate than today because of the bloc obsolescence of the war-built ships.

2. We could continue the build-American requirement but increase the appropriation well beyond the present $100 million level.

3. Finally, we could determine our national security or other needs for shipbuilding capacity, and spend sufficient money in addition to naval construction to insure that this capacity is maintained. Beyond that the fleet could be expanded to its economic limits by permitting American ship-owners to purchase ships wherever they wish.

This third alternative, of course, carries with it an impact on the American shipyard workers. While the dimensions of the impact are far from inconsequential, they must be viewed in perspective. It is a fact that there are about 100,000 shipyard workers. It is also a fact, however, that all of the subsidized merchant shipbuilding put together creates no more than 7,600 jobs. So that the dimensions of this particular problem relate to 7,600 jobs—to which serious consideration must be given. Finally, preservation of these jobs may result in the loss of an even greater number of shipboard jobs if present policies continue.

That these are difficult decisions makes them no less inevitable.

How about our bulk fleet? I spoke a few moments ago about our diminishing dry bulk capacity in contrast to the enormous growth of this element of our trade. Upon closer examination the inadequacy is even more disturbing. For example, in 1965 we will export about 45 million long tons of coal. We now possess only four aging ore carriers built in the first 4 years following World War II. By 1975 our coal exports will have jumped to 72 million long tons, and—if present policies continue unchanged—not a single ore carrier will be built to carry that coal.

There have been a number of suggestions that an extension of the cargo preference principle is the answer to the problems of the dry bulk fleet. For example, quotas for American-flag carriage of ore imports have been suggested. Yet I think the experience of the past decade raises serious questions about this conclusion.

In 1954 a series of temporary and individual cargo preference requirements finally culminated in the adoption of Public Law 664—a permanent, general cargo preference statute requiring that 50 percent of government-sponsored cargo be shipped in American ships. The Senate and House committee reports make it clear that the cargo preference principle was chosen as a means of implementing the objective of carrying a substantial portion of our foreign commerce in American ships.

Considerable controversy surrounded this legislation, and in 1956 the Secretary of Commerce, at the request of the President, reviewed the situation. His report supported the cargo preference principle. It pointed out that early fears the legislation would produce restrictive shipping legislation in other countries had no foundation; it countered the argument that cargo preference was undesirable as an indirect subsidy on the grounds that it was, quite plainly, a direct subsidy; and finally, the report speculated that the permanence of the Public Law 664 legislation would provide an incentive for the construction of a "modern and efficient" dry bulk fleet.

Unfortunately, our experience since that report has not borne out the predictions of its authors. Since 1956, 15 countries have adopted restrictive shipping legislation, and most of the maritime world points to U.S. practice as the cause. Whatever may be said regarding the futility of such laws for the countries in question, and their impact on American trade, it seems clear they are not in the best interests of American shipping. As a subsidy, direct or indirect, cargo preference has been a miserable failure: Not a single new tramp ship has been built since 1956, and the cost of keeping the old ones in existence climbs higher and higher. A converted 10,000-deadweight-ton Liberty employed in the grain trade costs the taxpayers about $700,000 in freight-rate differential payments annually. By contrast, our most modern liner ships, with 40 percent more carrying capacity and twice the speed require an average of only $500,000 per year; this means an equivalent shipping capability at 25 percent of the subsidy cost.

Here, too, the American people are faced with a number of alternatives.

1. Present programs could be continued—at least so long as there is an agricultural surplus disposal program. The result would be a steady rise in subsidy cost as these vessels become increasingly inefficient, followed by a rapid decrease in the cost as the subsidy disappears with the ships.

2. The tramp fleet could be eliminated more quickly by simply eliminating the cargo preference program.

3. Cargo preference could be continued, but supplemented with construction subsidy for replacement ships. Because the present production of 100 tramp ships easily could be matched with only 22 modern dry bulkers, however, any meaningful dry cargo fleet cannot be hitched alone to the cargo preference grain trade. The future of the dry bulk fleet, like the rest of our merchant marine, necessarily depends upon the capacity to compete for commercial cargoes. Moreover, adding construction subsidy on to the existing cargo preference system would provide subsidy without any provision for mandatory ship replacement, for reserve funds, for recapture, or for any of the other safeguards of the public interest built into the 1936 act.

4. Cargo preference could be eliminated gradually, no faster than some form of direct operating subsidy is substituted for it, making it possible for these ships to compete for commercial cargoes at world rates. Dry bulkers are more simple ships than liners, and proposals have been made to construct, for example, a 30,000-ton ship for as little as $9 million, and operate it with a small crew and only $300,000 to $400,000 in annual operating subsidy. In order to give you some idea of what these figures mean, if the present $80 million per year spent on cargo preference freight-rate differentials were all paid in operating subsidy to such new ships, we could maintain about 200 modern dry bulk carriers, with a total capacity about eight times our present dry bulk fleet. Even with reduced crews on highly mechanized ships it is obvious where the greatest long-term job opportunity is to be found.

Necessarily, in making these choices the number of competing interests is too great to satisfy everyone completely. In discussing various new ideas with members of the industry, I sometimes feel like the fellow whose wife bought him two ties for Christmas, one red and one green. He expressed delight with both, and when she appeared skeptical about the genuineness of his feelings, he put on the red one to prove it. "What's the matter," she said, "don't you like the green one?"

This kind of a reaction is especially common in discussions about our passenger ships.

American operators have 13 remaining passenger ships, staffed with crews ranging from 260 to 1,000. In 1965 these ships will absorb almost one quarter of the total money available for operating subsidy—about $46 million. And if they are expensive to run, they are even more expensive to build. The Government's share of replacing the SS *United States* today, for example could run to about $100 million. Like any other major investment the benefits derived from these ships—to the industry and to the Government—deserve the closest examination. The arithmetic is striking.

In 1962 the then 15 passenger ships produced a loss, before subsidy, of about $44 million. The subsidy amounted to $48.7 million, or more than 10 times the after-subsidy profits for the 15 ships. In 1963, financial results were little better. The subsidy bill was nine times the companies' profits after subsidy. Eight of the fifteen ships lost money even after subsidy, and two others did little better than break even.

By contrast, comparable figures for general cargo ships show a subsidy bill only two or three times profits after subsidy. For the companies operating both passenger and general cargo ships, the gross revenue from cargo operations was three times that for passenger operations, and profits after subsidy were more than seven times as high.

It is not surprising that shipowners have shown little inclination to replace their passenger ships.

Nor do the passenger ship operators have much hope for improved profits. The productivity of cargo ships has increased in recent years. But 73 percent of the crew on a passenger ship are stewards—cooks and waiters—and mechanization can do little to increase their productivity. Indeed, it is this personal service which tends to attract those relatively few people who travel by ship rather than air.

Even if passenger ships are not a profitable business for the owners or the Government, it is often argued that they are of great benefit to us as a nation. If so, they are surely worth the investment. But what are these alleged benefits?

How about their balance-of-payments contribution? In 1963, the net balance-of-payments contribution of U.S.-flag passenger ships was about $47 million. Since we spent about $46.3 million in subsidy to secure that saving, you can see that it was bought rather dearly. By contrast, in 1962 the international commercial airline industry contributed $128 million to our balance of payments from passenger fares alone—and without the necessity of any contribution from the taxpayers. Or compare the like figures for general cargo ships. In 1963 the net balance-of-payments impact of the 285 subsidized cargo ships was about $204 million—at a subsidy cost of approximately $135 million. Thus, even by standards of return on shipping subsidy, the balance-of-payments impact of one dollar of subsidy spent on a cargo liner is almost double the impact of a dollar spent on a passenger ship.

Prestige is also said to be a benefit of passenger ships. Of course, prestige is an elusive thing. Our present operating subsidy expenditures for passenger ships would support close to 100 modern liner ships, which might well do more for our prestige around the world than a few passenger ships known to be highly unprofitable.

Moreover, two important reasons for having a merchant marine—trading leverage and stability of freight rates—are virtually unaffected by passenger ships.

Finally, there is national defense. Historically, passenger ships have played a major role in our defense efforts. During World War II, for example, most of our troops were transported in ships which once sailed as commercial vessels. By the time of the Korean hostilities, however, the situation had changed and only one passenger ship was removed from commercial service for troop carrying to the war zone. Three small passenger ships under construction were transferred to MSTS but were fitted primarily as passenger ships for military dependents. All other troops were carried by MSTS troop carriers or by air.

Our defense needs today still call for a passenger ship capability. But the development of new aircraft, like the C–141 and the recently announced 600-passenger plane, is eroding the justification of heavy Government investment in constructing and maintaining commercial passenger ships.

To some extent modern cargo liners could be converted to effective troopships if necessary. Even commercial passenger ships must be converted to troop-carrying conditions—increasing their troop-lift capacity sevenfold. But this takes time, and insofar as we still need conventional passenger ships it might better safeguard our national security if the conversion were done in advance, and the ships preserved in the reserve fleet in a high degree of readiness—at about one-tenth the present annual cost.

But all of this analysis really adds little to the stark economic reality that American businessmen have little desire to build and operate passenger ships at a loss. Unless some presently unforeseeable change comes about, some 5,500 jobs will disappear from these ships over the next 10 years, irrespective of how the Government feels about the wisdom of this $50 million subsidy account.

The question before us is not whether the 5,500 jobs will be affected, but whether any ships and jobs will be substituted in their place.

Of the 5,500 men on passenger ships, about 4,000, or 73 percent, are stewards who can find ready transferability of their skills in the hotel and restaurant trades. But what of the 1,500 deck and engine men? Their jobs are not as easily transferable. If the $42 million passenger ship subsidy were used for cargo liners—even the most highly mechanized now imaginable—we would need about 3,000 men to operate them. The road to true job opportunity seems clear.

Finally, I want to say a few words about two aspects of our present system of paying operating subsidy.

First, the trade route idea.

At the present time the Maritime Administration has designated 30 trade routes and 3 services as essential to the foreign trade of the United States. A subsidized shipping company wishing to move from one trade route to another is required by law to undergo a long and arduous public hearing, effectively eliminating its ability to respond rapidly to competitive pressures. In addition, an operator's activities on any particular trade route—the frequency of sailing and the ports at which his ships call—are all subject to the approval of the Maritime Administration.

Many questions are called to mind. Is it not strange to have this high degree of protectionism for American operators against only a small part of their competition? For U.S. trade route restrictions obviously do not affect the foreign companies carrying about 70 percent of our liner cargo. What is the impact of these restrictions on the behavior of American shipping companies? What are the supposed benefits of the system, and how real are they?

It is usually urged that the trade routes underlie the service concept of the 1936 act, and that they serve to prevent cutthroat competition. Each of these assertions requires close examination.

As for the first, to my knowledge there is not a single American operator serving a trade route because he was ordered to do so by the Maritime Administration. In each case the operator requested permission to serve that route because there was cargo to be carried. Look, for example, at the number of foreign companies, which may come and go much as they please, serving small ports on regular schedules because the existence of cargo makes it profitable for them to do so. Look at the American companies providing regular service to Alaska, Hawaii. and Puerto Rico for the same reason. There is no reason to expect that American companies in foreign trade would act very differently even if not bound by the strictures of the trade route concept.

And if there is not sufficient cargo to justify shipping services at all, I doubt very much whether the framers of the 1936 act intended that American companies be compelled to service ports at a loss to themselves as well as the taxpayers. For example, if it is cheaper to ship cargo by barge from a smaller to a larger port and then out by ship, that is probably the way the cargo ought to move. That is the basic principle underlying the new Lykes Sea Barge Clipper concept.

I doubt, therefore, if a relaxation of the present rigorous trade route requirements would undermine adequate service for American shippers—quite the contrary.

Many shipowners have told me that the tortuous procedures necessary to gain permission to operate on a different trade route, even for a short time, have forced them to forgo many attractive commercial opportunities—to the benefit of the merchant fleets of other nations. This reminds me of the story about the Cape Cod garbage collector, whose weekly charge was 25 cents. One newcomer, seeking to do a little better, asked for his monthly rate, "$1.50," was the reply. When the newcomer inquired why the monthly rate should be so much higher than four times the weekly rate, the old man replied, "The extry is for bein' tied down." I rather suspect that we may be paying "extry" for tying down our shipowners, too.

We turn, then, to the question of cutthroat competition. Whenever I hear that term, I am reminded of a story an old Texan used to tell about the general store in the small town where he grew up. The store had a monopoly for many years, but as the town grew it began to attract new business, and in due course a competitor opened his doors across the street from the general store. The old proprietor began to bemoan his fate to the town at large, and one young man, recently back from a freshman economics course at the local college said, "But sir, isn't that just competition?" "Oh no," he replied, "its worse than competition." Some shipowners have expressed similar sentiments to me, explaining that they have competition now, and that relaxing trade route restrictions would be worse.

Since trade route restrictions have no impact on the activities of foreign shipping companies, the danger arising from a relaxation of the trade routes must be seen to come from the competition of other American shipping companies. Some shipowners feel that a new American company will come on the route and take one-half of the "American" cargo, putting them both out of business.

But, by and large, an established steamship company will tend to stay on its old routes, since it is costly and time consuming to develop new trade relations. Moreover, such a company will consider carefully whether it can make a sufficient dent in the foreign market on a new trade route. With such high capital costs, few shipping companies would be foolhardy enough to enter a wholly new competitive environment solely with the idea of taking away from a preexisting American company most of its established business.

Moreover, shipping conferences will tend to act as a moderating force. For example, foreign-flag companies would seem to be in much the same position vis-a-vis each other as would American companies in the event of a relaxation of trade route restrictions. Yet there have not been a series of protracted rate wars.

There is, of course, a perfectly legitimate basis for fearing the activities of an irresponsible "raider," an operator with no interest in establishing any sort of trade relations, whose sole aim is to skim off the cream of the trade at the peak of the season with exceptionally low rates. But this problem can be solved without abandoning the whole idea of trade route flexibility. There would seem to be no reason why a procedure could not be designed to sift the serious competitor from the fly-by-night.

The present rigid system prevents companies from taking advantage of fluctuations in world trade. And to the extent that it is an effective shield against competition, it tends to insulate the companies on the trade route from the salutary effects of competition. Finally, the present system puts into the hands of the Government too much of the question whether a shipowner will change trade routes.

Finally, I would like to say a few words about what has come to be called an "incentive operating subsidy." I have spoken about this issue at length in the past, and there is no reason to belabor it here. But there is one common misconception which I would like to clear up.

A number of people have told me of their impression that the incentive subsidy is an economy measure—that we will somehow end up with a lower subsidy bill. Nothing could be further from the truth. An incentive subsidy may result in increased productivity, higher profits and wages, and relatively less need for subsidy. But whatever the needs for subsidy may be they must be met if the industry is to continue. No one argues with that basic truth.

I think that $380 million is a substantial sum and, as Maritime Administrator, I feel an obligation to insure that it is spent in the most productive way possible. If it is being spent under a system which could be improved, then that standard has not been met. If it is producing one less ship than it could, and I remain silent, I am not doing my job.

In the shipping business, like most others, profits may be increased by cutting costs or increasing revenues. But operators have little incentive to reduce subsidizable costs under the present system, for the Government will simply pay them less in subsidy. This puts a responsibility on the Government alone to maximize the public's return from its subsidy bill. Often Government is forced to take positions which segments of labor and management find objectionable. But under the present system it is inevitable.

On the other side of the profit picture, one of the chief means for most businesses to increase the utilization of their capacity is by reducing rates.

The conference system, however, precludes this. It would seem obvious then that the system could be substantially improved, especially by providing some meaningful incentive to management and labor to cut costs—removing the Government from the process.

As I see it, and as I hope you do, as well, there are many alternatives open to the American merchant marine. Each of our problems has at least one solution. Some require the expenditure of much larger sums of money; others seem to spell the continued decline of the fleet. Still others seem to promise more shipping capability at a relatively lower cost—even though perhaps pointing the way to larger total expenditures.

The American merchant marine is at the crossroads. Basic decisions must be made. They must be made by you, and every American concerned about our trade and economic growth. We cannot hope to make every decision exactly right, but when the alternatives are clear before the people their record is pretty good.

The problem is worthy of our effort.

[From Time magazine, July 16, 1965]

Shipping: Bailing Out the Fleet

Spyros Skouras, who as boss of 20th Century-Fox from 1942 to 1962 brought out such sagas as "Lifeboat" and "Titanic," last week took the lead in another kind of sea drama. At a Washington press conference, the 72-year-old argonaut announced that the Prudential Lines, a seven-ship company that he heads, had applied to the Maritime Administration for a subsidy to help build a $250 million fleet of 16 freighters. While new forms of transportation were being devised elsewhere, Skouras showed off designs for vessels intended to cut shipping costs and vastly speed up cargo-handling methods, which have been basically the same since Phoenician times. It took considerable showmanship for the head of a relatively small line to make such grandiose proposals, but the U.S. Maritime Administration is seriously considering them.

The Prudential freighters would never have to dock. Each would carry its cargo in 50 large barges stowed in its hold; when the mother ship approached port, giant deck cranes would lift off the barges, which would then easily maneuver into port. Meanwhile, the mother ship would lift on a fresh load of barges and turn right around for another voyage. By this method, Prudential estimates, cargo would be loaded at the rate of 1,000 tons an hour, compared to 1,000 tons a day loaded on conventional cargo ships.

Skouras says he is willing to put in some $20 million of his own, has large financing from Marine Midland Trust Co. and Chase Manhattan Bank, and wants the Government to ante up about $125 million. The cost is stiff—but anything would be a bargain if it could help rescue the U.S. merchant marine. The once proud fleet is being pushed into increasingly rough straits by low efficiency, high-labor costs, and fierce foreign competition.

PASSENGER COMPLAINTS

Listening approvingly at Skouras' elbow was the man who has prodded all the shipping executives to search for new solutions: Nicholas Johnson, a 30-year-old landlubber and former law professor (at the University of California), who was named Maritime Administrator, 18 months ago, by Lyndon Johnson (no kin). Nick Johnson has been suggesting ideas that are more drastic than any ever voiced by his predecessors, including the first head of the Maritime Administration, Joseph P. Kennedy.

To bail out the fleet, Nick Johnson has proposed that:

American lines should be permitted to order ships in foreign yards, where costs sometimes run only one-third as much as in U.S. yards.

The Government ought to gradually rescind laws that require at least half of all U.S. foreign aid cargoes to be carried in U.S. bottoms. By shifting the loads to foreign fleets, Johnson says the Government could save considerable money—which it could use to bankroll the building of modern U.S. ships.

All new ships should have a high degree of automation in order to qualify for subsidy.

Drastic solutions are obviously needed. Despite Federal subsidies of nearly $400 million a year, the U.S. merchant fleet is declining—from 1,212 ships in 1949 to 910 at present—and its share of U.S. foreign trade has fallen from 23.5 to 8.5 percent in the past decade. As for the passenger companies, they are beset by plentiful complaints about poor service at sea. Of the six U.S. passenger lines, none is showing a profit. Says an executive of one of the biggest lines: "The traveling public uses American ships only as a last resort."

BASIC PROBLEM

Johnson sees no future in the passenger business and wants U.S. shipping men to concentrate on cargo operations, but neither he nor the owners can do much about the industry's basic problem: U.S. labor. At sea, on the docks, and in the shipyards, American labor costs 2 to 5 times as much as its foreign equivalent. Management at times has been less than enlightened in dealing with labor, but creative bargaining can be hard. These unions distrust the owners, feud with each other, fear automation, and walk out with almost tidal regularity.

Last week the industry was tied up in the fourth week of a strike by three of the industry's eleven unions. Though one of the unions came to terms at week's end, some 70 vessels remained idle, and five passenger ships were forced to cancel lucrative summer sailings. The gut issue is the demand for higher wages and pensions—to offset the effects of automation of the kind that Johnson and Skouras purpose.

The Government is growing impatient with the unions. Commerce Secretary John Connor has criticized the key union in the strike, the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, for making "unreasonable and inflationary" wage demands. Too often, say some Washington officials, the shipping executives give in to such demands because they know most of the costs will be carried by the Government. In fact, almost 75 percent of the seamen's wages are paid by Federal subsidies. Critics believe that if the Government would spend less to subsidize wages and more to subsidize modernization and automation, it might have a solution.

[From the New York Times, July 16, 1965]

The Intolerable Shipping Strike

The interminable strike of marine engineers and other ships' officers has obliged the Department of Defense to patch together what amounts to a commandeered naval auxiliary of fast cargo vessels to insure delivery of adequate military supplies for the war in Vietnam. Strikebound ships are being moved out of the mothball fleet under charter to the Navy's Military Sea Transportation Service.

Using American ships in this way is a practical alternative to shipping military cargo in foreign bottoms, as the Government has been doing since a large part of the merchant fleet was immobilized by the engineers' walkout a month ago. Yet, the entire procedure is an outrageous endproduct of one of the most senseless of all the strikes that perennially disrupt American shipping.

A central issue is the insistence of the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association that the ship operators continue to leave all contract disputes to binding decision by an arbitrator in whose fairness they have lost confidence. Obviously, the proper way out of this impasse in arbitration—the selection of a new impartial chairman by the American Arbitration Association.

The other issues focus on manning and pay scales for automated vessels. They involve the danger of featherbedding and excessive labor cost on ships to be built and operated with Federal subsidies. Blame for the decay of the merchant marine is traceable in part to willingness of the operators to underwrite huge labor bills and then pass the dominant share of the cost to Washington.

The one healthy development in the current tangle is that it has been accompanied by signs that Secretary of Commerce Connor, Maritime Administrator Nicholas Johnson, and the Maritime Subsidy Board are finally ready to resist this incubus of inflation—not only as applied to the contracts now in controversy but also to some on which subsidy will be sought under previously negotiated pacts.

Instead of calling for Administrator Johnson's removal, the operators and unions ought to join unreservedly in attempts to bring costs and productivity into balance. The last thing the merchant marine needs is another settlement that will bring "peace" by adding to the burdens that have already made it noncompetitive in so much of world trade.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 21, 1965]

A Multimillion-Dollar Understanding

A maritime union leader the other day called for the ouster of Nicholas Johnson, who heads the Maritime Administration and the Maritime Subsidy Board. The union man's contention in effect was that Mr. Johnson misunderstands the problems of the industry, a sizable portion of which is now idled by yet another strike.

A day or so later, the Subsidy Board announced that some of the labor contracts the unions have squeezed out of the industry in recent years have been too costly. These contracts, in addition to pushing wages and fringe benefits of the ailing industry ever higher, have helped to freeze the featherbedding arrangements that require companies to retain men who serve no useful function.

Some of the items in the excessively expensive contracts, the Board went on to say, will not be offset by Government subsidy payments to the merchant marine. Over the years, the Government has handed out many millions of dollars in such payments in an unsuccessful effort to stem the steady decline of the industry, but now it proposes to be less wasteful.

In view of all this, it may be doubted that Mr. Johnson actually misunderstands the difficulties of the merchant marine. It could be that he grasps the basic problem far better than his union critics.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, July 20, 1965]

Marine Boss Is Defended—White House "In Agreement" With Nicholas Johnson

Washington, July 19.—The maritime administrator, Nicholas Johnson, recent target of harsh criticism from labor and management, has been defended by one of the most powerful sources possible—the White House.

Official Government silence in the controversy was finally broken here with a statement that the President and the Maritime Administrator are "in complete agreement" on maritime policies.

The message was contained in a letter signed by Lee C. White, special counsel to the President.

SENT TO CURRAN

Postmarked July 14, the letter was sent to Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union (AFL–CIO).

Curran has been one of the most vocal opponents of the maritime administrator in the past, but his attacks became more direct last week, when he sent a letter to the President calling for the resignation of Nicholas Johnson.

In that letter, Curran charged the 30-year-old Johnson with being "incapable of carrying out the duties of his office."

Similar charges were also directed against the Administrator by the American Merchant Marine Institute and other industry executives.

"IN COMPLETE AGREEMENT"

The White House reply to Curran was couched in terms which made it quite obvious where the President stands in the current debate.

"The Maritime Administrator and the President," it said, "are in complete agreement as to the importance of the merchant marine to our country and the desirability of our taking steps to strengthen this important industry."

The latest attacks against Nicholas Johnson—who was appointed by the President—have been much more serious and bitter than the previous ones, and were triggered by remarks he allegedly made in San Francisco earlier in the month.

The Administrator was quoted at that time as having said that an American merchant marine is not really needed.

The maritime official later said that his remarks were taken out of context and that inferences drawn by certain reporters were not correct.

"INACCURATE INFORMATION"

In referring to those alleged remarks, the White House letter said that it believed Curran "may have inaccurate information."

It then proceeded to offer direct quotes which it said Johnson did make and suggested a more careful appraisal of the Maritime Administrator's remarks.

Conflicting stories have surrounded those remarks, which were made at the press conference in San Francisco and at a question-answer period at the Commonwealth Club, there July 1 and 2.

DEDUCTION OF CERTAIN EDUCATION EXPENSES OF TEACHERS

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct certain inequities which confront our teachers in their pursuit of higher education.

Under existing regulations of the Internal Revenue Service we have a very definite inequitable situation which needs clarification. The purpose of this bill is to correct this inequity. Under the regulations, presently in force, a teacher can deduct educational expenses only if this additional education is a necessity to the teacher to maintain a current teaching position. On the other hand, teachers who voluntarily return to college to obtain a higher level of education to become better qualified teachers cannot obtain a deduction of their education expenses.

Through my bill, I propose to correct this confusing situation by providing that deductions by teachers for educational purposes be based upon the Internal Revenue Code. As defined in this bill, education expenses shall be: First, any tuition charges and fees; second, travel expenses directly related to attendance at an institution of higher learning; and third, up to $100 annually for books and materials directly related to the subject under study. This legislation would affect both full-time and part-time teachers.

There are three beneficial factors involved in this bill:

First. Teachers would be encouraged to upgrade their skills by making it easier for them to acquire the necessary additional academic training.

Second. The extension of the allowance to part-time teachers would permit graduate students teaching undergraduate courses to advance their teaching knowledge.

Third. The allowance of a deduction for travel necessary in conjunction with a course of study or work on an academic degree would help the teacher working on a thesis or dissertation which requires field research or experimentation away from the school.

The legislation provided for in this bill can make a very significant contribution toward the promotion of excellence in education through the upgrading of skills of the teachers, which are the most significant cog in our school systems.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that this measure will find favor with the committee having jurisdiction over it and take early action upon it so that the Members of this House will have an opportunity to consider it during this session of Congress.

THE JOHNSON SCORE RISES HIGHER

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of the House a column which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Saturday, July 17, 1965, written by a very knowledgeable veteran columnist, Gould Lincoln. "The Johnson Score Rises Higher" is a realistic appraisal of both the Presidential and congressional record over the period 1964–65. It offers rational perspectives and avoids nitpicking. In my view Mr. Lincoln has performed a public service by offering us this fine and accurate report:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 17, 1965]

THE JOHNSON SCORE RISES HIGHER

(By Gould Lincoln)

President Johnson's score in domestic and foreign affairs—as Chief Executive of the United States and as the leader of the Democratic Party—continues to rise. It is an almost incredible record of important—wise or unwise—legislative accomplishment.

Johnson's recommendations to Congress resulted in 1964 in enactment into law of the Civil Rights Act, breaking down and making illegal discrimination against Negro citizens in many fields of activity, and an income tax reduction measure relieving the taxpayers of $11 billion of their Federal tax burden. And now with the first session of the 89th Congress approaching a conclusion, the record shows already written into law the first Federal aid school bill for elementary and secondary schools; a Federal aid bill for Appalachia, a section of the United States affected by great changes in the country's economy; a constitutional amendment providing presidential continuity; an excise tax reduction law of $4.1 billion extent, an important drug controls measure; and in the last stages of legislative action, a bill for medical care for the aged and a bill to assure voting rights to all citizens of the United States, white or Negro.

On the foreign side of the ledger, Johnson has shown to the world that he is devoted to the cause of peace in so convincing a manner that many of the so-called noncommitted countries—neutral in the cold war between the allied free world and the allied Communist nations—have been strongly impressed.

He has shown, too, that he is willing to fight for a just peace and unwilling to submit to Communist aggression anywhere. This he is doing in Vietnam and has done in the Dominican Republic.

The great mass of Americans, as shown by tests of public opinion, approve his service as President—including his actions in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic. In both these areas, the President has sought and continues to seek peaceful solutions in conferences. In the Vietnam war, the Communists have rejected all his efforts to bring about an unconditional peace conference. In the Dominican Republic, the President, by his swift action in landing armed forces, saved the lives of hundreds of Americans and other foreign nationals, and also defeated an attempted takeover by a revolutionary group dominated by Communists.

This Johnson score has been rolled up notwithstanding attacks upon and criticism of the President and his policies—some of the most virulent from members of his own political party. More recently the criticisms of the President in the press have turned not only on his policies and his execution of those policies but his relations or lack of relations with the newspapers and their representatives in Washington.

No President from Washington to Lincoln and from Lincoln to Kennedy and Johnson has been free of stings and barbs in the press. Nor should they be.

Bulwer-Lytton in his play entitled "Richelieu" quoted the great cardinal and leader of France as saying "the pen is mightier than the sword." Many authors, including Shakespeare, have used other words to express the same thought. But not all in praise of the pen wielders. Lord Byron, writing of the pen, called it "that mighty instrument of little men." And as such, the pen has been used to belittle and even to coat with mud, men of action entrusted with the job of running the Government of the United States. A pen wielder can be wrong, with personal impunity. A government leader cannot afford to be wrong; there is no impunity for him, nor immunity. So it is with Johnson.

Congress and its leaders—Democratic and Republican alike—hope to be able to close this session by Labor Day, September 6. It could happen, although much will depend on whether the President insists on passing the right to work repeal bill, a farm bill and several other measures on his program, among them an air pollution control measure that already has gone through the Senate.

Whether all of the measures are passed before adjournment or not the 89th Congress—and President Johnson—have both made their records. The President's idea is to get as much of the program enacted into law as possible this session, so that the legislators may wind up next year's session early, enabling all Members of the House and one-third of the Senate to go home and campaign for reelection. It is an idea.

INCREASED WHEAT INCOME MEANS CITY JOBS, SURVEY SHOWS

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, in the very near future, an omnibus farm bill will be taken up by the House. As chairman of the Wheat Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, my special concern has been the problems of the wheat farmer.

As a part of my study of the problems faced by our wheat farmers, I conducted a survey to determine what the impact might be on industry and unemployment should the price of wheat for domestic consumption be increased to full parity, or approximately $2.50.

To participate in this survey, I selected 625 farmers in 10 of the leading wheat producing States. They were selected as farmers who depend, to a large extent, on wheat for an income. The size of the farms polled ran from 30 acres to slightly over 3,000 acres. The average size was 590 acres.

A total of 466 farmers representing 275,000 acres responded to my inquiries. This represents about six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the Nation's wheat farmers and about one-half of 1 percent of the wheat acreage planted this year. This would compare favorably with the sampling system of the national opinion polls who may use as few as 1,500 families to get an expression of national opinion.

My inquiry was particularly directed to the investment these farmers have in farm machinery. Among other things, I wanted to know the age and condition of their equipment; what equipment needed replacement; and what effect the price of wheat would have on their plans to replace wornout equipment.

The survey confirmed what many organizations representing farmers and other rural interests have been telling the Congress. Farmers are living off of their equipment depreciation and are not replacing old and wornout equipment when it needs replacing.

The questionnaire asked the farmers to estimate what equipment would be replaced if wheat were to remain at the present price levels. They were next asked what purchases of farm machinery might we reasonably expect if the price of wheat for domestic consumption were increased to full parity.

The response, though not proof of what will happen if the price of domestic wheat were increased, was most interesting and a good indication of what I believe we might reasonably expect.

At the present price of wheat, this group of farmers plans to replace only $835,930 worth of equipment. On the other hand, with a reasonable increase of income to include full parity on domestic wheat, these same farmers would replace $7,883,617 worth of equipment.

Translating these figures into industrial jobs, I used statistics developed by the Department of Labor recently. Their study tends to prove that for every $10,000 of additional farm machinery purchased by the farmer, one additional industry job is created. Realizing that my survey reached less than 1 percent of the Nation's farmers, it did indicate that an additional 700 jobs would be created by the few farmers touched by this survey if we increase the price of domestic wheat to a reasonable level.

Obviously this has real meaning to industry and labor. If the results of this survey could be translated into statistics that reflect the potential of all agriculture, it would be evident that the American economy is being denied the benefits it would be getting if farm income were closer to parity.

The Congress has been rightfully concerned with the problems of those Americans who are caught in the grasp of poverty by circumstances beyond their control. Many of those expressing special concern about these problems are from the cities where so many of these poverty stricken Americans live.

Mr. Speaker, I share these concerns. But I am also concerned about these problems in rural America.

I read recently where the problems of poverty are particularly acute in New York City where approximately one in every eight of its residents lives in poverty. Spectacular statistics like this tend to make us forget that half of the poverty of this country is located in rural America where only 30 percent of the people live. There are, for example, more substandard, deteriorating homes in the rural parts of our country than in all the cities of the Nation put together.

There are those who join the bread trust who would try to stamp the label of bread tax on the efforts of the Congress to improve farm income. To justify their arguments, they express a johnny-come-lately concern about consumer costs. Actually, the reverse is true. They are not concerned about consumer interests, but are representing their own selfish interests. Where has the concern about consumer prices by the bread trust been the last 15 years when they were busy raising prices to protect their own interests?

These same people who are so quick to make the phony charge of bread tax on the consumer fail to recognize that the reverse is true. We have, in effect, been taxing our farmers by the practices of our unique private-public economy. We drive the price of farm products down, and, at the same time, increase the farmer's cost of production.

Thanks to the skill and ingenuity of American agriculture, Americans are receiving the benefits of an abundance of the best food in the world for a smaller share of our income than in any other society in the world, past or present.

Unfortunately, the farmer has not received the benefits of his skill in relation to the rest of the economy. His share of a loaf of bread is only 2.7 cents, the same he received more than 15 years ago. At the same time, a 1-pound loaf of bread which only cost him 12.7 cents 15 years ago now costs him 20.7 cents. All goods and services required by the farmer have gone up—but farm income has not increased to meet these higher costs.

We in the Congress hold the key to farm prices. We have continued to hold down the price of farm commodities in the face of sharply increased costs of farm production. We can continue to tax the economic capacity of farmers by failing to increase his income—or we can recognize the plight of the farmer and the benefits which will accrue to our overall economy from a strong rural economy and pass the omnibus farm bill, including the increase in the price of domestic wheat.

CONTROLLING WATER AND AIR POLLUTION

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the purpose of encouraging the construction of treatment works to control water and air pollution.

For many years I have been active in efforts to pass water pollution control legislation. I was one of the sponsors of the 1961 act which, among other things, authorized grants for community sewer construction. During the last Congress I introduced a bill to allow the owners of private industrial plants to deduct expenses incurred in the construction, erection, or installation of water pollution control machinery.

Today, I am introducing a similar bill which will give industrial plant owners an economic incentive to install what otherwise would be very expensive equipment. We cannot be content merely to warn private industry of the dangers of uncontrolled pollution of our air and water. The simple fact is that it costs a great deal of money to install proper machinery to stop this pollution. The equipment, unlike plant expansion or improvements in production facilities, does not pay for itself by bringing in added revenue. It is not designed to do this. It is designed to protect the health and welfare of the general public, and it is only fair that the public share the burden of the large costs involved.

Our tax laws already provide economic incentives in other fields. Research expenditures, farmland clearance, and soil and water conservation costs all receive special treatment. It is time to do the same with air and water pollution control.

At the present time a company owner who purchases machinery for pollution control takes a depreciation deduction over the years of the equipment's useful life. My bill, on the other hand, would allow this same owner to deduct the cost of his equipment over a period of 36 months. Thus, instead of taking 20 years or more for the owner to recover his losses, he will be able to do so in 3 years.

This 36-month provision marks the major improvement over the bill I introduced in the last Congress. Under that measure the owner could claim a deduction at the normal rate of depreciation. Under the new bill he will be able to claim this deduction at an accelerated rate. It is difficult to say how many taxpayers will take advantage of this benefit, but the bill gives the owner an opportunity to act in the public interest at a very small cost to himself.

To take advantage of this tax benefit, the owner need only notify the appropriate State pollution authority that he has installed the proper equipment. The State authority would then certify to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that the newly installed equipment meets all requirements. The Secretary would in turn notify the Secretary of the Treasury that the owner in question was eligible for this benefit.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to take specific steps toward a solution of the problems of air and water pollution. We spend thousands and millions of dollars yearly to help beautify our cities and our countrysides. Surely we can afford to purify our air and our water. We spend this much each year to try to cure cancer and other diseases. Air pollution is a killer also. Should we not spend a little money to rid the air we breathe of the dangerous impurities caused by our factories and industrial plants?

THE INEFFICIENT MR. WARD

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, too frequently Government employees are the subject of ridicule and criticism and it often seems that only the wasteful, the incompetent or the criminal actions of public servants make their way into the newspaper columns. I was particularly pleased, therefore, to see that the unusual performance of Ray Ward, a former Bureau of the Budget employee and staff director of the Donable Property Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, had been recognized in an editorial, "The Inefficient Mr. Ward," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on July 21, 1965. Mr. Ward committed the unpardonable blunder of returning to the Government $27,645.98 out of a budget of $33,000. Mr. Ward is indeed to be congratulated and it is to be hoped that his action will be contagious.

The editorial follows:

THE INEFFICIENT MR. WARD

It is unfortunate but true that there are appointees placed in charge of Government agencies who not only spend their budget appropriations down to the last penny and then some but also keep their agencies alive and growing long after they should have been interred. However, Ray Ward is not among them.

Mr. Ward, a former Bureau of the Budget employee, was appointed by President Johnson to head the Temporary Alaska Claims Commission created in March 1964, to settle disputes between the Government and the State of Alaska involving property valued at several millions of dollars. The parties had been squabbling for 5 years and getting nowhere.

By October of the same year the Commission had brought about a settlement and disbanded, setting some sort of track record for Federal Commission operations. But the full extent of the Commission's achievement did not come to light until the other day when Mr. Ward filed his group's final financial statement.

Given a budget of $33,000, Mr. Ward had spent only $5,354.02, returning $27,645.98 to the Government. He was not just thrifty; he was downright frugal. For instance, instead of having a lot of fancy stationery printed up, when the Commission wanted to write a letter it typed its name on a plain sheet of paper.

Chronicling this unorthodox performance in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Representative THOMAS CURTIS, Republican of Missouri, wryly observed. "It is an inefficient bureaucrat who cannot spend $33,000 and come in for a supplemental or two and cannot find many reasons to prolong the life of a temporary assignment to approximate his own."

The least Mr. Johnson can do now, besides awarding Mr. Ward an appropriate medal, is to assign him to some other Federal agencies in hopes he can infect them with his rewarding kind of inefficiency. Even though we suspect that long exposure to federalitis has made most of them immune.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. McVICKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to join a number of our distinguished colleagues in introducing a new version of the bill to establish a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

This bill is similar to H.R. 2619, which I introduced in January, with a few minor technical changes which were suggested by the Special Subcommittee on Labor. Provisions for grants-in-aid to workshops are added. The Director of the National Gallery of Art and the Chairman of the Commission on Fine Arts are added to the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities.

In addition, a section designed to improve the teaching of the arts and humanities in our elementary and secondary schools has been added to this bill.

This bill will not cost the taxpayers much, but it can enrich their lives immeasurably. The encouragement of the arts and humanities is vital in working toward that improved quality of life that is the essence of the Great Society.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS—ACHILLES HEEL OF THE RED EMPIRE

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, our esteemed colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] was the recipient of a well deserved award tendered last evening by the Assembly of Captive European Nations at a dinner in our Nation's Capital. Our colleague was honored for his intelligent and unstinted advocacy of the cause of the captive nations and for his determined fight to establish a House Special Committee on Captive Nations. No one has done more for this urgent cause, in or outside the Chamber of the House, than our distinguished colleague "DAN" FLOOD.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague delivered an outstanding address before the assembly and distinguished guests who honored him. The title of his address is "The Captive Nations—Achilles Heel of the Red Empire" which I am sure my colleagues will be happy to read and which follows:

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS—ACHILLES HEEL OF THE RED EMPIRE

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and friends of freedom, I am deeply honored and moved by this award tendered by the Assembly of Captive European Nations. I accept it most gratefully and humbly in behalf of our mutual cause—the steady liberation and freedom of all the captive nations.

In the past 6 years it has been my privilege to lead the Captive Nations Week observance in the House of Representatives. Invariably, year after year, many ask me: "Why Captive Nations Week?" My answer to this question has not required too much revision over these years. And it is this that I want to discuss with you tonight—for our own clarification about the Achilles heel of the totalitarian Red empire and, I might say, for the necessary edification of uncounted fellow citizens.

The answer to the recurring question is a multiple one. We observe Captive Nations Week because it is legally provided for in Public Law 86–90. Moreover, the week is a tremendous moral symbol signifying that we Americans will never forget the captive nations or accommodate ourselves to their permanent captivity. It also concentrates on our nuclear spiritual weapons, offering the most powerful paramilitary deterrent against overt Sino-Soviet Russian aggression in Europe, the Middle East or Asia. Furthermore, it is a stimulating and effective educational medium about all the captive nations, Sino-Russian imperio-colonialism, and the cold war.

The week also affords a countrywide forum for the discussion of issues affecting our national interest and security. And, finally, it consistently leads to the crystallization and advocacy of concrete measures of action. These reasons constitute, in essence, the answer to the question: "Why Captive Nations Week?"

THE FAMILY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS

As all of you know, it was with ample cause that Congress passed the Captive Nations Week resolution. For the first time our Government recognized the existence of all the captive nations, meaning the majority of them in the Soviet Union and in Asia. In effect, it recognized the crucial fact that the threat confronting the free world did not emerge in 1940 or in 1947, but had originated in 1917–18 with the first conquests by Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. By this act Congress also recognized communism as an instrument, a tool of ideologic deception which this force exploits in part for its takeovers of free and independent states.

A TOWERING MORAL SYMBOL

All of us should recall the words of President Kennedy: "This country must never recognize the situation behind the Iron Curtain as a permanent one, but must, by all peaceful means, keep alive the hopes of freedom for the peoples of the captive nations." On the basis of the resolution, it is not only those behind the Iron Curtain but also the captive nations behind the Bamboo and Sugar Curtains that we must support in the cause of freedom.

Anyone who has followed closely Moscow's deceptive peaceful coexistence policy over the past 10 years cannot but be impressed by one of its chief goals; namely, our acquiescence to the permanence of the Red Empire. It has pursued this goal so successfully that many in the free world talk as though Poland were independent, Kadar a popular hero of the Hungarian people, Ho Chi Minh a George Washington of Vietnam, and the U.S.S.R. a rapidly capitalist-bound "nation." One of the main obstructions of the free generation of these and other myths has been the Captive Nations Week observance, which Moscow and some in this country seek to eliminate.

It has been known for a long time that Moscow, Peiping, and their respective underlings have vehemently opposed the week and have worked toward its abolition. However, President Johnson stated explicitly in his 1965 Captive Nations Week Proclamation that "the United States of America has an abiding commitment to the principles of independence, personal liberty, and human dignity," which means toward all the captive nations—in Central Europe, the Soviet Union, Asia, and Cuba. Despite the propaganda and diplomatic pressures of the Communist regimes, we will stand pat on these principles.

My friends, the week is also a massive expression of what some have called our nuclear spiritual weapons. The first theme of the 1965 Captive Nations Week observance is "Peace With Justice and Freedom." An observed concentration on all of the captive nations serves this primary goal more than any other nonmilitary action, including even the economic. If one views the captive nations in toto, approximating 1 billion people, he can then begin to appreciate the source of insecurity and threat they represent for the various totalitarian regimes in the Red Empire.

POWERFUL DETERRENT AGAINST GLOBAL WAR

It is no exaggeration that the captive nations in toto, in the aggregate, constitute our most powerful paramilitary deterrent against open Sino-Soviet Russian aggression and thus a hot, global war. A psychopolitical concentration on all of the captive nations would mean a grave deepening of the insecurity of all the totalitarian regimes in the empire and also a long stride toward the avoidance of a worldwide conflagration. But it would also be a major stroke for justice and freedom. We have not even really begun to take up the challenge of the Red cold war as concerns the terrain of the Red empire. Unstinted and methodical support of the continuous pressures for freedom in that empire would result in a complete hopelessness of so-called Socialist and potential Communist management that in time a genuine revolution for freedom and national independence would inevitably spread from the Danube to the Pacific. Moreover, it would greatly undermine the subversive cold war operations of Moscow and Peiping in the free world and preclude situations where, as in Vietnam, some 75,000 Americans find themselves already in a shooting stage, but few Russians or Red Chinese can similarly be found.

AN EDUCATIONAL MEDIUM

Both Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy emphasized the need for an intensive study of the captive nations. The week's observance continually reemphasizes this need and stimulates a great deal of educational interest in all of the captive nations, in the fundamental phenomena of Sino-Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, and in the numerous aspects of the cold war itself. Truly as an educational medium, it throws an annual spotlight on certain dangerous myths concerning the Red empire and brings into balanced focus the major developments in that vast empire.

For example, one of the most colossal myths is that we can wean the totalitarian Red regimes in Central Europe from the domination of Moscow. This grand illusion is propped by subsidiary myths which hold that the so-called satellite regimes are becoming increasingly nationalistic, that their states are growing more independent, and that a polycentrism prevails in the Communist world, with Titoism and revisionism gripping several of the satellite regimes.

Some even go to the extent of imputing a widespread popular base for the regimes of Tito, Kadar, Gomulka, Mao Tse-tung, and others. Wishfully, they envision a pervasive fragmentation of the Red empire and simplistically bid us to be patient, to perceive the good in some of these totalitarian rulers, and to assist them in overcoming many of their economic and political problems.

The fundamental trouble in all this mythmaking is that those guided by gestures and appearances have no comprehension of the Russian nationalities technique which was applied to the non-Russian republics in the U.S.S.R. even under Stalin. The technique is one of exploiting nationalist symbols and forces for the accomplishment of Red totalitarian objectives and the reduction and perhaps elimination of the persistent cold war between the people and the regime. For years Khrushchev flounced about the U.S.S.R. telling Azerbaijani, Georgians, Ukrainians, Turkestani, and others how nationally independent and free they are. Because of legalistic differences, the technique is being used even more effectively in the so-called satellite area of the empire.

Realism demands that we face some stern facts.

One, on the scale of total power, the U.S.S.R. has been and for some indefinite time will continue to be the center, the power base, of the Red empire.

Two, every other totalitarian Red regime, including Peiping and Belgrade, depends for its ultimate survival on Moscow.

Third, the appearances of liberalization in Central Europe are well checked by the realities of totalitarian rule and control in each of the Red states, with evidence mounting daily as to new oppressive measures in the U.S.S.R., Poland, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and elsewhere in this game of check and countercheck.

Fourth, these liberalizing appearances are also designed for the acquisition of necessary free world economic assistance in the further rapid buildup of the cold war economies of the Red states, both individually and collectively.

Lastly, when the chips are down anywhere, as in Vietnam or the Dominican Republic, the basic, indispensable unity of this empire pattern shows itself clearly as practically all parts of the Red totalitarian network rush to the aid of its besieged members.

This seventh observance of Captive Nations Week is a most fitting occasion to express overwhemingly our support for the President's positive actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. Had he not taken these courageous steps, we would certainly have two more victims added to the long list of captive nations. The President's decisions in both areas have precluded Communist imperialist takeovers.

Captive Nations Week projects a totalistic concept of the captive nations, which is anathema to both Moscow and Peiping and beyond the comprehension of some of our opinionmakers.

The record on this is perfectly clear. To mention some examples:

In 1963, Moscow's the New Times implored: "Is it not high time to discontinue the 'Captive Nations Week' in the United States?" Pravda that year excoriated President Kennedy and stressed: "The President of the United States losing his sense of reality, has declared a 'week of the Captive Nations' and is trying to turn attention away from the struggle of the Negroes for their liberation."

In 1964, Izvestia railed: "With every passing year 'Captive Nations Week' becomes a nuisance," not mentioning to whom. Khrushchev again could not resist another condemnation of the week when on the eve of his removal he shouted: "In the United States a farce entitled 'Captive Nations Week' is held every year. The people's democratic system has been in existence for 20 years, but the imperialists still rumble on with nonsensical ideas of 'liberating' the nations of eastern Europe."

Speaking of imperialists, it should be noted that one of the main themes in the 1965 observance deals with the last remaining imperio-colonialist systems in the world. Indeed, Captive Nations Week provides a forum for discussion. The themes this year do credit to the National Captive Nations Committee, both for their formulation and dissemination.

First, we urge peace with justice and freedom, knowing that the support of all the captive nations is one of our most formidable deterrents against a hot global war.

Second, we stand in full support of U.S. actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, but we also stress: "What about the freedom aspirations of 17 million North Vietnamese?"

Third, we advocate a poltrade policy toward the Red Empire, that is trade based on political concessions.

Fourth, we seek a complete exposure of Sino-Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism in the United Nations, during a much-needed concentration on the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

Fifth, we continue the fight to create a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations, which is more necessary now than ever before.

The ramifications of these and other themes in terms of concrete and forthright action are extensive, to say the least. Many of the themes propose just the first steps that must be taken if we are to obviate more Dominican Republics and Vietnams in what the Red totalitarians call holy wars of national liberation. The techniques used in these and other cases have been employed over and over again against countries that today form the long list of captive nations. By concentrating on the captive nations, how they became what they are, we cannot but learn more and more about Red techniques of political warfare which defy both nuclear armaments and economic aid.

World developments demonstrate more and more the urgent need for us to support to the maximum psychopolitical extent the freedom aspirations of all the captive nations. Whether behind a facade of peaceful coexistence or not, the avowed enemy must not be allowed to enjoy any psychopolitical sanctuary in his imperial domain. A virtually guaranteed security there means an increased insecurity in the free world and as he relentlessly pursues his strategy of supporting so-called wars of national liberation. One of the most effective paramilitary means of curbing this pursuit and thus preserving global peace is to further the freedom goals of all the captive nations.

I have absolutely no doubt that the future rests with us—provided we continue the good fight, with conviction, faith, and perseverance. For we know, deep in our hearts and minds, that the captive nations, in toto, are the Achilles' heel of the Red Empire.

NOMINATION OF JUSTICE GOLDBERG AS AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Justice Arthur J. Goldberg of the Supreme Court upon his selection by President Johnson to succeed Adlai E. Stevenson as the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. The choice came as a surprise to many, but is being welcomed in both diplomatic and political circles.

Justice Goldberg brings to his new post experience gained in a long career of negotiations. He was the key figure in the merger of the AFL–CIO 10 years ago. He settled more strikes as Secretary of Labor than any other Secretary in American history. While it would be presumptuous to assert that this mediating skill will be able to solve all the United Nation's current problems, including the conflict over article 19, Justice Goldberg's skill as a conciliator and forger of industrial peace certainly bodes well for his future as a diplomat.

Like Abraham Lincoln, like Adlai Stevenson, Justice Goldberg is from Illinois. But it is not in this respect that he continues their great tradition; rather it is in the aspirations for human dignity and decency that are clearly evident in the public careers of all three.

Like Adlai Stevenson, Justice Goldberg epitomizes all that is best in American life; we can be sure that, like Adlai Stevenson, he will light the United Nations with his example.

It is being said in certain quarters that the Arab nations will grumble over the President's selection of a Jew as our Ambassador. The President has displayed the courage of putting such ethnic thinking beyond his deliberation. I am confident that our new Ambassador's fairmindedness will soon outweigh such considerations among the Arab States as well.

I congratulate Justice Goldberg upon his appointment and look forward to his bringing his many talents to the problems of the United Nations.

APPOINTMENT OF ARTHUR GOLDBERG AS THE U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate President Johnson on his appointment of Mr. Arthur Joseph Goldberg to succeed Mr. Adlai Stevenson as the U.S. representative to the United Nations.

During his law career, in his service as Secretary of Labor and as a Supreme Court Justice, Mr. Goldberg has proven himself to be an individual of exceptional ability. He is a man of courage, conviction, independence and, as was indicated by his moving acceptance speech, a man of deep humility.

Mr. Goldberg's parents, Joseph and Rebecca Goldberg, emigrated from Russia to this country. Their son rose from the streets of Chicago to Cabinet office and then to the highest Court in the land. His career is an affirmation that the American dream can be achieved. Each man can rise to the limit of his abilities.

Mr. Goldberg's willingness to serve is indicative of his dedication to his country and to mankind. I have every faith that he will serve us with the excellence and distinction which Mr. Stevenson bestowed upon the office of Ambassador to the United Nations.

THE MOST DELICATE POSSESSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, last year, more than 200,000 Americans died of strokes. It ranks third as a cause of death in the United States, not far behind the toll exacted by cancer.

At least 2 million now alive in the United States have suffered a stroke. About 80 percent of all stroke victims survive the initial attack, but until recently, most of them were neglected and forced to live out their remaining years in a seriously disabled condition. For too many years stroke has been incorrectly viewed as irreversible, and the health professions and the public generally have shown little interest in it.

This negative attitude toward stroke is undergoing a gradual and hopeful change. The report of the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer and Stroke, issued last December, challenged the prevailing pessimism toward strokes. The report noted that three out of four patients with occlusive stroke have symptoms that forewarn of a disabling attack. Furthermore, the majority of stroke victims suffer a narrowing of the blood vessels supplying the brain. In most cases, this condition can be corrected by modern surgical techniques. Dr. Michael E. DeBakey, Chairman of the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer and Stroke, and one of the world's greatest surgeons, has performed more than 1,000 operations in which he has restored stroke victims to productive living.

The Commission report expressed "genuine hope for stroke victims, both present and future." I have co-sponsored legislation providing Federal aid in the development of regional medical complexes designed to bring the latest life-saving techniques in the field of stroke, as well as heart disease and cancer, to every American wherever he may live. I am delighted that the House Interstate Commerce Committee, under the leadership of its distinguished chairman, Representative OREN HARRIS, is holding hearings this week on the heart disease, cancer, and stroke legislation. I am confident that it will receive an overwhelming affirmative vote in the House.

As an illustration of the new hope in the field of stroke, I would like to include the following article which appeared in the July 11 issue of This Week magazine. It tells the story of Patricia Neal, a 39-year-old Hollywood actress who suffered three strokes within a relatively short period of time. Surgery was performed upon her and she is showing a remarkable recovery. She is now with her family in England and her doctors say there is every reason to believe she can be fully rehabilitated and returned to her profession.

[From This Week magazine, July 11, 1965]

THE MOST DELICATE POSSESSION, YOUR BRAIN, SENSITIVE, FRAGILE, AND SO IMPORTANT—ITS ENEMY: THE STROKE

In general, the term "stroke" refers to sudden brain damage caused by a hemorrhage of a blood vessel in the brain; a thrombosis or clot formed by hardening of the vessel walls; or an embolus, a clot that gets into the blood stream from another diseased or injuried part and blocks a brain artery. The brain area affected stops functioning and causes the symptoms related to this loss of function. Stroke affects not only older people; a high percentage hits people between 30 and 64.

In ancient times, victims of a stroke were thought to have been "struck down by God." Today, one eminent scientist says that the affliction is often only a stroke of bad luck and the patient may live a useful life for many years.

It is estimated that more than 1,800,000 people in the United States have been crippled by strokes caused by the blood vessels supplying the brain alone. Strokes take more than 170,000 lives a year. Hardening of the arteries in the brain, which is related to stroke, is the second leading cause of first admissions to state mental hospitals.

HOW A STROKE "STRIKES"

Here is what happens in a stroke. For example, if a small clot lodges in the lung, the lung is not severely handicapped because all parts perform the same function and can enlarge to compensate. In the brain, a small closure in an artery relating to such a specialized function as speech or movement of limbs can destroy that function. Victims often survive because auxiliary blood vessels quickly appear to send life-giving blood to the injured part. However, extensive research has shown little, if any, recovery capacity of the brain.

An often unsuspected cause of mental and physical incapacity is a series of "little strokes." These may start when a person is in the 30's or 40's, striking silently at night or passing almost unnoticed as a sudden dizzy spell, a momentary blackout, or just a few moments of confusion. The stroke itself is not severe enough to compel the patient to seek medical aid, but some permanent brain damage does remain.

A kind, gentle person may suddenly become impatient and irritable. Judgment is often impaired. A strong man may become weak and prone to tears. Suspiciousness is common. Some become sloppy in dress, others lose their moral sense. Some lose interest in family and friends.

CITY LIVING CONFUSES

When symptoms are mild, surveys show that a sufferer of cerebral vascular disease can get along better in the slower-going farm and small-town areas. Fast city living serves only to confuse a tired, slowed-up mind and body, and city dweller often are reluctant to admit they want to slow down.

Our lack of natural defenses for the brain makes the problem of a series of small strokes difficult. The most popular experimental approach is finding ways to prevent strokes. Tentative results show that scientists may be on the right track in recognizing early symptoms and treating them so that disastrous effects can be avoided for many years.

Brain hemorrhage, because of its abruptness, may cause death in a short time. But experts feel that if a patient can be treated quickly, he may enjoy a long, useful life. In studies made, 80 percent of stroke victims had had high blood pressure, seeming to indicate vital artery breaks after long pounding by too much pressure. No cure for high blood pressure has been found. However, several new drugs do lower blood pressure and a calm way of life will lessen both tension and hypertension. People with a family record of hypertension and cerebral hemorrhage should take precautions long before their blood pressure climbs dangerously, such as regular medical supervision, diet and weight control, carefully considered activities, and moderation in all phases of living.

The other fairly common cause of massive brain hemorrhage is a ruptured aneurysm or break in the wall of an artery which was not properly formed before birth. In a study of 143 ruptured aneurysms, ages of patients ranged from 18 to 89, with almost half between 40 and 59 years. One-third died within the first 48 hours after their stroke.

Since the number of breaks rises with age, these doctors suspect that it often takes hypertension and arteriosclerosis to batter down the weakened vessel. With modern X-ray techniques giving knowledge of blood vessels and lymphatics, aneurysms can now be detected when they first cause trouble, and measures taken to prevent recurrence.

If a hemorrhage has occurred, the problem is similar to that of any foreign body and can sometimes be treated surgically. Since certain heart, lung, and other conditions are known to throw off clots that may lodge in the brain, they can often be anticipated and prepared for.

THROMBOSIS—SLOW STROKE

A thrombosis or closing of a cerebral artery by a clot caused by arteriosclerosis comes comparatively slowly, incapacitating the patient gradually over a period of a day or two, in contrast to the instant striking of a hemorrhage.

The stroke problem is almost overwhelming because of its many facets and its conflict with our modern, urban way of life. Only a beginning has been made in the recognition of types of cerebral disease, in treatment, and in application of rehabilitation measures. But with the great strides that have been made with coronary disease—which in some ways is similar—the full weight of scientific effort and knowledge is behind the research against one of man's oldest and most feared afflictions.

TWENTY-ONE HOUSE MEMBERS SPONSOR BILL FOR TECHNOLOGICAL BREAKTHROUGH FOR URBAN MASS TRANSIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, our cities today are confronted with an extremely serious transportation problem. People are forced to rely primarily on automobiles for intracity travel. As a result, urban traffic is highly congested. It is a long and frustrating experience to travel from one part of a metropolitan area to another. Where public transportation does exist in the form of a bus or subway system, the urban traveler rarely can go from origin to destination without transferring or walking some distance to complete the trip.

While the Federal Government is sponsoring research to develop new systems of intercity ground and air travel, it has undertaken no significant research program to develop a new system of intracity transport.

In order to rectify this imbalance, 20 Members have joined me in sponsoring legislation—H.R. 9200—setting up a 2-year, $20 million program to achieve a technological breakthrough in the development of new modes of urban transportation.

Eight other Representatives from metropolitan areas introduced identical bills when I introduced H.R. 9200 on June 17: the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CABELL], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. More recently the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN] introduced identical bills.

Today, 10 more Members are introducing the legislation: the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCCARTHY], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RONAN], and the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

H.R. 9200 AMENDS MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT

H.R. 9200 would amend the Mass Transportation Act of 1964, the only Federal program directed at alleviating the urban transport problem, by authorizing an appropriation of $10 million a year for each of 2 years—fiscal 1966 and fiscal 1967, the remainder of the life of the mass transit program—and making it mandatory that the research be undertaken. The program contains a mandate to develop new systems of urban transport, rather than merely to find ways of improving existing ones. It is designed to supplement the efforts of the existing mass transit program which, because of funding limitations, can do little more than help cities put polish on an old system.

The Mass Transportation Act of 1964 authorized a total grant appropriation of $375 million over a 3-year period. The funds are given to communities to meet part of the cost of improving mass transit facilities and equipment. The law also stipulates that of the $375 million, up to $10 million a year can be appropriated for a program of research, development and demonstration projects in all phases of urban mass transportation which it is believed will alleviate urban transit needs.

Because the demand for actual transit system is so great, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which administers the program, has found it necessary to apply all of the annual $10 million for research, development, and demonstration to demonstration projects—existing facilities—rather than research into new systems.

CORNELL REPORT LISTS DEVELOPMENTS TO DATE

A report by the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Inc., of Cornell University, Buffalo, N.Y., for the Office of the Under Secretary for Transportation Policy in the Department of Commerce reviews new urban transportation systems still in the drawing board stage. The study on which the report was based was contracted as part of the Department's analysis of transportation needs in the northeast corridor running from Washington to Boston between now and 1980 and designed to forecast new highway technology which might be utilized in that area. The report, filed with the Department on October 2, 1964, was released in April 1965.

According to the Cornell report, an urbmobile system which gives the city traveler "individual freedom, dispersal of origins and feeder capability on the street networks, coupled with a capability to reach the city center under automatic control on a high density track system," is the mode of urban transport which should be developed. As an example of the urbmobile, the report cites the starrcar devised by Alden Self-Transit Systems Corp., and the commucar conceived by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and to which I referred in my speech on June 17 when I introduced H.R. 9200.

The commucar is a small, lightweight vehicle which carries two to four passengers. It can travel along guideways, getting its power from an electric siderail, or it can be driven independently under its own power. Besides safety and speed, the commucar has the advantage of taking its passengers directly to their destination without the necessity of transfer, and of being easily parked.

The starrcar, for self transit rail and road car, is quite similar to the commucar in most respects except that Alden conceived it as a vehicle which, when one person finished using it, would be picked up and used by another person, thus minimizing the number of cars needed.

H.R. 9200 sets up a research program which could determine the feasibility of drawing board versions of the urbmobile such as the commucar and the starrcar. The program will also be designed to insure that any new system fulfills the following goals:

SPEED—SAVES TIME

Anyone who travels a bus for 45 minutes each morning to cover the 4 or 5 miles from home to work-place knows the advantage of an urban transport system which moves its passengers rapidly from origin to destination. This advantage was made strikingly vivid to the residents of the Boston area on Monday, December 30, 1963, when from 4 p.m. until 9:15 p.m. the in-going and outgoing traffic arteries of that city were so crowded that cars were brought to a standstill. A partially automated, individual transport system that touches every corner of the city could move its passengers as fast as, or faster than, any modern subway system.

SAFETY—SAVES LIVES AND PROPERTY

In 1964 there were 14,500 deaths from motor vehicle accidents in urban areas and 980,000 personal injuries. During the same period, the total cost of accidents resulting from motor vehicles—valued in terms of damage to property, medical expenses, insurance payments, etc.—amounted to $4.6 billion, while the cost of property damage alone was $2.6 billion. This needless slaughter and injury of human beings and wasteful wreckage of valuable property should be stopped. One way to help stop it is to develop an automated system of urban transportation.

ECONOMY—LOWERS THE COST OF LIVING

Individual automobiles are expensive to operate. Counting all related expenses—depreciation, maintenance, repairs, fuel, and insurance—a car costs between 10 cents and 12 cents per mile to run. Furthermore, the construction of additional urban freeways puts greater pressure on the National, State, and city budgets, and on the checkbook of the taxpayer. Urban land is so expensive now that it is not unusual for a city freeway to cost between $10 million and $15 million a mile to construct. Some stretches have run as high as $45 million a mile. With expenses like this, the cost of living in urban areas rises. A new intracity transport system could cut the transportation costs of the city and of the commuter alike.

HEALTH—MINIMIZES AIR POLLUTION

Day after day we are confronted with evidence that air pollution is taking a greater and greater toll in illness and death from allergies, respiratory diseases, and other ailments. Since the principal contaminator is the automobile, we need a vehicle for use in urban areas which does not rely on the gasoline combustion engine. The problem of air pollution by automotive exhaust was graphically described by Donald E. Carr in his current book, "The Breath of Life." In his concluding chapter, Carr says:

> Of all the sources of hazardous air pollution, the automobile in urban centers is so overwhelmingly the cause of trouble that one can in non-coal-burning communities regard it essentially as the only source.
>
> The sensible and workable solution (to the automotive smog problem) is a massive substitution in urban centers of the electric automobile powerplant for the internal-combustion engine.

Urbmobile systems such as the starrcar and the commucar could be powered by electricity whether the vehicle was driven independently or attached to the automated guideway, thus relieving our cities of ever worsening pollution.

CONSUMER PREFERENCE—MEETS THE DESIRE OF AMERICANS FOR INDIVIDUAL TRANSPORT

One of the realities of present-day transit life is that people do not like mass transit systems as we know them today—the conventional bus and subway systems. The conventional system does not cover the metropolitan area thoroughly enough to take the urban traveler directly where he wants to go. Nor is it ready to leave promptly, when he is.

The Cornell report concludes that a new urban transport system "must, to a high degree, be immediately compatible with people and their established way of life, else it will not even survive its childbirth and growing pains." Therefore, it suggests, the "direction for development in commuter transportation that appears to hold more promise is that of an automated system of small individual urban vehicles." The report concludes:

> The automated portion of the system could properly be routed and integrated with existing streets and urban expressways to best serve the origin-destination requirements of both the suburban and the urban population. This system would, at least in its initial applications, be designed to supplement the existing street system rather than replace it.

GOOD CITY PLANNING MINIMIZES FREEWAYS AND PARKING LOTS

Los Angeles, with its sprawling network of freeways and parking lots is a prime example of how an inadequate urban transport system can detract from the beauty of a city. About 70 percent of downtown Los Angeles is paved over. The development of a new urban transport system utilizing the most up-to-date technology and getting the maximum use from minimum space would enable cities to put some of their road and parking area to other purposes—perhaps parks which would make the city a more attractive place to live and work in.

ONLY A FEDERAL PROGRAM CAN DEVELOP A NEW SYSTEM

The new system I am suggesting can be developed, but it will take a substantial program of research supported by the Federal Government. Private industry cannot carry the burden of this research alone—as it is expected to do now.

The U.S. Government today is involved in a total annual research and development program amounting to $15.5 billion. Most of the funds are earmarked for the defense and space programs, but some funds go for research to improve transportation systems. For example, in fiscal 1963 the Federal Government spent $275 million for aviation research, $24 million for highway research, $15 million for water transportation research, and $7 million for research into intercity rail problems. However, there was no significant amount spent on research into new modes of urban transport.

We need to employ the same approach now with regard to urban transportation as we did in the Manhattan project, which produced our first atomic bomb and thus nuclear power for civilian use as we know it today.

We need to follow the same approach we are now using in the development of the supersonic transport. The supersonic transport project, recently tagged for an additional $140 million in Federal research and development funds for the next 18 months, when completed in the 1970's will have produced for the air traveler the most advanced airplane technology can build—one which can fly 1,800 to 2,000 miles an hour.

In the supersonic transport program, the Federal Aviation Agency is insuring that it covers all the technological ground possible by contracting with two airframe manufacturers to construct prototype airframes, and two engine manufacturers to construct prototype engines.

I am suggesting we solve the intracity transportation problem in the same manner—develop under Federal sponsorship the most technologically advanced system possible, utilizing all the technological resources at our disposal.

The report of the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory also concludes that the Federal Government should undertake such a program. Among its major recommendations for improving transportation along the Northeast Corridor it says:

> Initiate a program to define, design, and develop an experimental prototype urban individual transportation system employing a specialized form of vehicle and guidance.

The report goes on to point out that many of the technical and system aspects of new urban transport systems still in the drawing board stage have not yet been solved. Consequently, it says:

> Technical study in greater depth, accompanied by experimental development, is necessary before the technical feasibility, economics, and public acceptance can be realistically evaluated.

The research program proposed under H.R. 9200, although sponsored by the Federal Government, would in all likelihood be carried out by universities with exceptional technological expertise, the electrical industry for the development of motors needed to propel the new vehicles, the aerospace industry for the development of the systems which will guide the vehicles from origin to destination, the automobile industry to contribute significantly in the design and construction of the vehicles themselves.

NEW INTRACITY AS WELL AS INTERCITY TRANSPORT NEEDED

The administration has committed itself to the development of new high-speed ground transportation systems for between-city travelers at an estimated cost of $90 million over a 3-year period. The Commerce Department, which has charge of the program, originally submitted a request to Congress for $20 million for fiscal 1966 to carry out the project, of which half was earmarked for research and half for demonstration units and the gathering of statistics. Later the Department submitted a supplementary estimate stating its intention to request $35 million for each of the second and third years of the program. In fiscal 1967, $25 million would be slated for research, $7 million for the demonstration project, and $3 million for the gathering of statistics. In fiscal 1968, $29 million would be earmarked for research, $3 million for the demonstration unit, and $3 million for the gathering of statistics. This legislation—H.R. 5863—is currently under consideration by the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

In order to persuade the administration to exert its energies on the problems of intracity travel as well as intercity travel, on June 29 I appeared before the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics to offer an amendment to H.R. 5863 specifying that both problems should be worked on at the same time by adding language to insure that any funds appropriated pursuant to the legislation be "divided equally between research and development of intercity and intracity transportation methods."

MIT DEAN RECOMMENDS URBAN TRANSPORT RESEARCH

Following me as a witness before the subcommittee on June 29 was William W. Seifert, assistant dean of engineering and director of Project Transport at MIT. Project Transport has been undertaken by MIT, with the support of the Department of Commerce, to look broadly at the problems and possibilities involved in developing a new form of high-speed ground transportation for travel between cities—in other words, it is the preliminary work for the task that would be undertaken pursuant to H.R. 5863, the intercity transportation bill.

As part of other duties at MIT, Dean Seifert guided a student effort to develop a new type of urban transportation system, which resulted in the drawing-board version of the commucar.

During his testimony in support of H.R. 5863, Dean Seifert observed that if full benefit from new intercity transportation systems was to be realized, it would also be necessary to couple the system effectively with intracity transportation systems, "so as to minimize the transit time of passengers having a wide range of origins and destinations." Thus, he added:

> We must somehow obtain better coordination of urban and intercity systems than has been achieved in the past.

Dean Seifert went on to say:

> Simultaneous funding of both aspects of the transportation research program (intercity and intracity) will permit development of an integrated system having the balance that must be achieved if it is to be truly effective.

A similar argument was made by Karl G. Harr, Jr., president of the Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., in a statement he submitted to the subcommittee on July 1. The aerospace industries, of course, have substantial technological know-how to contribute to the solution of intracity transportation problems. The association's statement concluded by saying:

> It is our firm conviction that the time has come, not only for beginning research and development in high-speed ground transportation, but for launching a comprehensive effort toward the development of an integrated transportation system which will make efficient use of all modes of transportation and will help meet the growing transportation needs of the Nation.
>
> Therefore, in supporting this legislation, we propose that the bill be expanded so that research and development can be undertaken to explore all forms of high-speed transportation systems. For it is only in a comprehensive approach and in thinking that does not restrict itself to any one mode of transportation that we can begin to find the solutions for one of the most increasingly complex problems of our times.

H.R. 9200 has received vigorous support since its introduction on June 17. It has 21 sponsors in the House. It has been welcomed by highly competent technological universities, and by the aerospace industry. It has received editorial support from newspapers in several metropolitan areas.

Once launched, this program could be known as Project SMART—Scientific Mass Automatic Rapid Transit. Until someone suggests a better name this one will do.

The time to launch the program is now. The demand is present. The technological expertise is available. The administration should get behind H.R. 9200, and Congress should enact it.

RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM FOR METROPOLITAN AREAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my good friend Mr. Reuss for the bill concerning mass rapid transit he introduced and coauthored today.

As a Los Angeles Congressman, a prime concern of mine is to assure an adequate rapid transit system for major metropolitan areas—to relieve traffic and parking congestion; to offset the inability of our present freeway systems to meet the onslaught of the increasing number of cars; to help alleviate smog; and to contribute to the economic growth of our major cities and the communities they support.

Last year Congress passed the Mass Transit Act of 1964. But this act can do little more than help cities purchase new buses or replace wornout subway cars. No substantial research is being sponsored by the Federal Government in an attempt to develop new, dynamic systems which will provide urban dwellers with good public transport.

We should be spending at least as much on research to provide whole new systems of moving people about within our cities rapidly, safely, economically, and efficiently, as we are on research into other modes of transportation.

Today, nearly three-quarters of our population lives in urban areas. All of these people must move about in the cities in which they live. They need quick, economical, and safe ways to get to work, to shop, and to visit. They cannot forever depend on existing transportation systems. Therefore, it is the responsibility of our Government to promote the development of systems which will supplement existing methods.

In view of this need, I have introduced a bill to amend the Mass Transit Act of 1964. The measure would require the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to undertake a research program aimed at achieving a technological breakthrough in the development of new modes of urban transportation.

The advantages which truly effective and efficient urban transportation systems would offer cities are numerous.

Air pollution, caused by automotive exhaust which continues to aggravate city dwellers and to injure their health, would be reduced. Accidents as a result of transportation would be reduced.

Good mass transit systems would reduce commuter costs. Automobiles are expensive to operate. Including depreciation, maintenance and repairs, fuel, insurance, and other related expenses, a car costs between 10 and 12 cents per mile to run.

What we need are new systems based on the most advanced technology which can carry people through and about their cities quickly, safely, and economically. In order to achieve this breakthrough in urban transportation development, however, we are going to need a federally sponsored research program, for private industry cannot be expected to carry the burden alone.

While the accomplishments of the Mass Transit Act of 1964 are considerable, the program—largely because of financial limitations—has not been able to help cities acquire all the buses they need, let alone devote some of its funds to research into new systems of urban transportation.

In introducing this bill it is my hope that cities, like my own of Los Angeles, will exert every effort to supplement the proposed Federal program. Our major cities must not look upon this legislation as substitute for their own commitment and activity to meet their mass transportation problem.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Vanik, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Pucinski, for 60 minutes, on Monday, July 26, 1965, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Rooney of New York, for 20 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, July 28, 1965.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALL) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOSMER, for 40 minutes, on July 26, 1965.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER) for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER) for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER) for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER) for 30 minutes on Tuesday, July 27, 1965, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MACHEN.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana to include extraneous matter in his remarks in the body of the RECORD in Committee of the Whole.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. COOLEY.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1735. An act relating to the use by the Secretary of the Interior of land at La Jolla, Calif., donated by the University of California for a marine biological research laboratory, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1764. An act to authorize the acquisition of certain lands within the boundaries of the Unita National Forest in the State of Utah, by the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1988. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Maryland, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 8720. An act to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of Guam.

H.R. 8721. An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of the Virgin Islands; and

H.R. 8775. An act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 26. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands for, and to develop, operate, and maintain, the Golden National Historic Site.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 26, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1369. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1370. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of increased costs incurred by Government purchase of credit reports rather than insistence that lenders submit acceptable credit reports, Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1371. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of uneconomical use of Federal funds in the reorganization and expansion of the Chicago employment offices, Illinois State Employment Service, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1372. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of inadequate supervision of payroll activities, District of Columbia Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 641. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1317. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe penalties for the handling and collection of dishonored checks or money orders; with amendment (Rept. No. 642). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1321. An act to amend section 501(e) of title 16 of the District of Columbia Code relating to bond requirements in connection with attachment before judgment; without amendment (Rept. No. 643). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 1742. An act to authorize the U.S. Governor to agree to amendments to the articles of agreements of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 644). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 3329. A bill to incorporate the Youth Councils on Civic Affairs, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 645). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 7067. A bill to prescribe administrative procedures for the District of Columbia government; with amendment (Rept. No. 646). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 397. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District; without amendment (Rept. No. 647). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 45. An act for the relief of Maj. Raymond G. Clark, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 648). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 97. An act for the relief of Lt. Raymond E. Berube, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 649). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 134. An act for the relief of Lloyd K. Hirota; with amendment (Rept. No. 650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 149. An act for the relief of Benjamin A. Ramelb; with amendment (Rept. No. 651). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 263. An act for the relief of Honorata A. Vda de Narra; without amendment (Rept. No. 652). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 572. An act for the relief of Robert L. Wolverton; with amendment (Rept. No. 653). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 919. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. William T. Schuster, U.S. Air Force (retired); with amendment (Rept. No. 654).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1008. An act for the relief of Ottilia Bruegmann James; without amendment (Rept. No. 655). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1068. An act for the relief of Fred E. Starr; with amendment (Rept. No. 656). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1138. An act for the relief of Lt. Robert C. Gibson; with amendment (Rept. No. 657). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1267. An act for the relief of Jack C. Winn, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 658). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1221. A bill for the relief of Betty H. Going; with amendment (Rept. No. 659). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1395. A bill for the relief of Irene McCafferty; with amendment (Rept. No. 660). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1892. A bill for the relief of M.Sgt. Richard G. Smith, U.S. Air Force, retired; with amendment (Rept. No. 661). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2571. A bill for the relief of Ralph S. DeSocio, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 662). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3684. A bill for the relief of Maj. Alexander F. Berol, U.S. Army, retired; with amendment (Rept. No. 663). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3770. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Navy at the Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 664). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4078. A bill for the relief of William L. Minton; with amendment (Rept. No. 665). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4596. A bill for the relief of Myra Knowles Snelling; with amendment (Rept. No. 666). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5121. A bill for the relief of James P. Bradley; with amendment (Rept. No. 667). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5903. A bill for the relief of William C. Page; with amendment (Rept. No. 668). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5915. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harley Brewer; with amendment (Rept. No. 669). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7282. A bill for the relief of Richard D. Walsh; with amendment (Rept. No. 670). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8218. A bill for the relief of Walter K. Willis; with amendment (Rept. No. 671). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRIDER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8352. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 672). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8640. A bill for the relief of Chief MSgt. Robert J. Becker, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 673). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8642. A bill for the relief of Col. Eugene F. Tyree, U.S. Air Force (retired); without amendment (Rept. No. 674). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRIDER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4603. A bill for the relief of Lt. (jg.) Harold Edward Henning, U.S. Navy; with amendment (Rept. No. 675). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 9995. A bill to amend the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide for additional technological research; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 9996. A bill to amend the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide for additional technological research; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9997. A bill to amend the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide for additional technological research; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 9998. A bill to amend the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide for additional technological research; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 9999. A bill to amend the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide for additional technological research; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 10000. A bill to amend the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide for additional technological research; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 10001. A bill to amend the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide for additional technological research; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 10002. A bill to amend the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide for additional technological research; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.R. 10003. A bill to amend the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide for additional technological research; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 10004. A bill to amend the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide for additional technological research; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 10005. A bill for the relief of the Kensal School District, North Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 10006. A bill to amend the Coinage Act of 1965 to provide that the quarter dollars therein authorized to be minted shall bear the likeness of President Lyndon Baines Johnson; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 10007. A bill to amend the Judicial Code to permit Indian tribes to maintain civil actions in Federal district courts without regard to the $10,000 limitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 10008. A bill to increase the punishment for robbery, and armed robbery, on buses, taxis, and other carriers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 10009. A bill to provide assistance to certain States bordering the Mississippi River in the construction of the Great River Road; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 10010. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of certain redemptions of preferred stock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 10011. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for members of the Armed Forces in Vietnam, and reduced postage rates for the air shipment of small parcels to members of the Armed Forces in Vietnam; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 10012. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations and volunteer rescue squads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10013. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 10014. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1954, relating to office space in the districts of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 10015. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for deduction of certain education expenses of teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 10016. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept, in his discretion, donations of easements; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10017. A bill to increase the amount authorized by the joint resolution of October 4, 1961, to be appropriated for the preservation and protection of certain lands in Prince Georges and Charles Counties, Md.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10018. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to remove certain abandoned ships from the Potomac River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARTIN of Alabama:

H.R. 10019. A bill to provide for the designation of a highway between Lanett, Ala., and Ardmore, Tenn., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. MAY (by request):

H.R. 10020. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 968), providing for the preparation of a membership roll of the Indians of the Yakima Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10021. A bill relating to the individual rights of members of tribal organizations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 10022. A bill to authorize the negotiation of purchases and contracts for property and services in situations where it is likely that a valid claim against the United States for patent infringement will otherwise be made; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 10023. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 10024. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the action that should be taken to preserve, develop, and make accessible for public use a portion of the Hudson River and related lands in the States of New Jersey and New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10025. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on club dues, initiation fees, and lifetime memberships; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 10026. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, optometry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 10027. A bill to amend section 8(b) (4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with respect to strike at the sites of construction projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 10028. A bill to grant the masters of certain U.S. vessels a lien on those vessels for their wages and for certain disbursements; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 10029. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 10030. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the percentage depletion allowance on coal to 15 percent of the gross income from mining; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McVICKER:

H.R. 10031. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 10032. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Council to be known as the National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 10033. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit pension and profit-sharing plans to provide contributions or benefits on a nondiscriminatory basis for certain self-employed individuals without special limitations on the amount of contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 10034. A bill to amend section 725 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Veterans' Administration to conduct certain medical examinations and special tests in connection with applications for new insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10035. A bill to amend section 3101 of title 38, United States Code, to prevent consideration of proceeds of, or transfer of proceeds of, U.S. Government life insurance, and national service life insurance for Federal estate tax purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10036. A bill to amend section 715 of title 38, United States Code, to permit certain veterans with service-connected disabilities, who have $5 per $1,000 total disability income provisions included in their national service life insurance policies, to obtain the $10 per $1,000 total disability income provision; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10037. A bill to limit the Administrator's authority to adjust premium rates on insurance issued under section 725(b) of title 38, United States Code, and to authorize the payment of dividends on such insurance after 5 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 10038. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for first-class letter mail sent by members of the Armed Forces of the United States in Vietnam; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 10039. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; and to amend such act to strengthen and protect fundamental legal and civil rights of individual workers required to join a union as a condition of employment; to prohibit discrimination on account of race, color, or creed where employment is conditioned upon union membership or payment of moneys to a union; to prevent the use for political purposes of union dues and moneys paid by workers subject to compulsory union membership agreements; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H. Res. 489. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 10040. A bill for the relief of Rosa Cataldo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 10041. A bill for the relief of George Bombardiere; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10042. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Constantino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 10043. A bill for the relief of Kalliope Kostides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 10044. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Angileri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10045. A bill for the relief of Maria Klapsi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10046. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Soriano Mauban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 10047. A bill for the relief of Antero Dos Reis Rodrigues; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 10048. A bill for the relief of Alfred Hugh Stanton Candlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

249. Mr. STRATTON presented a petition of the Board of Management of the Geneva, N.Y. Chapter of the Federation of Homemakers requesting that the U.S. House of Representatives create a Standing Committee on Health and Safety which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Current Era in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MASTON O'NEAL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 22, 1965

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it was with great interest we all noticed the remarks of our irrepressible Vice President, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, at the White House Conference on Education on Wednesday, July 21.

At least the Washington Star reported the remarks were prepared for delivery. They reported this way back on page 12, and the Washington Post did not report them at all the next morning; so—not having been invited—I am not sure they were made.

If they were so made, I congratulate the Vice President and say in that connection that my only disappointment is, first the remarks did not get the front page headline they deserved, and second, they were not made by the same distinguished gentlemen several years ago when they were first needed.

The Star reported the remarks in part as follows:

> Debate and reexamination of American educational policies cannot escape from our common obligations to preserve the processes of democracy and the rule of law.
>
> The current era in education seems to be one of walk-outs, sit-ins, sit-outs, teach-ins, picketing, threats and a general debate over educational policies and practices.
>
> We need not agree with the form some of today's educational ferment has taken.

No responsible person condones violence or the violation of laws. No responsible person advocates actions which endanger the civil peace of our local communities or our college campuses. And no one supports forms of irresponsibility and immaturity which foster dissension and chaos for their own sake.

USDA—Consumer Friend—Cotton, Wool Become New Fabrics of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call to your attention that research conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture is helping the American housewife get more for her clothing and fabric dollar. Cotton and wool have been used for thousands of years, but now USDA scientists are giving them new 20th century properties for the comfort and convenience of consumers.

Almost every American consumer is familiar with wash-and-wear shirts and blouses—which, among other advantages, are easy to launder and reduce the ironing chore for the lady of the house. The Department helped pioneer the development of these wash-and-wear finishes.

Stretch socks, slacks, and underwear made of a new stretch cotton are the result of another clothing advance from USDA laboratories. Stretch cottons are now fashion leaders in women's and girls' casual clothing.

These new fabrics have many uses. They are ideal for upholstery and slipcovers. Consumers can now buy all-cotton stretch materials as piece goods. A recent extension of the process gives an added look of richness and depth to inexpensive cotton lace.

The Department has also developed processes for making cotton fabrics oil and water repellent. USDA flameproofing treatments are widely used on cotton and wool going into draperies, uphostery, and rugs. And new processes perfected by USDA scientists are adding weather and rot resistance to cottons used in awnings, tents, and tarpaulins.

The newest clothing development on the market—shrink-resistant wool—is also a USDA achievement.

The new Wurlanized wool—the name is derived from USDA's Western Utilization Research Division—can be machine washed without shrinking and matting. This means that skirts, slacks, sweaters, socks, and blankets with complete launderability, and needing only slight pressing afterward, will soon be widely available to consumers.

All-wool stretch fabrics produced by a USDA process are also on the market, as are woolen garments with permanent creases and pleats.

Consumers can look ahead to further advances in these time-honored fabrics. They can expect improved all-wool stretch fabrics, wools that resist soiling and wear, and wool more effectively mothproofed. As for cotton, USDA scientists are making excellent progress in new processes which will give wash-and-wear cotton increasing durability and life.

The development of cotton and wool materials with new convenience properties is a significant contribution by which USDA scientists are helping consumers to take better advantage of the American age of abundance.

Potomac River Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1965

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced three bills dealing with the Potomac River which flows through my congressional district. When I came to the Congress in January, I carried with me the same strong devotion to finding solutions to the problems of the Potomac River that I felt during the decade I served the people of Prince Georges County, Md., in the Maryland General Assembly. This devotion has not wavered—but instead has been buttressed by the great interest that President Johnson has exhibited in the Potomac River. The President's proclamation that he wants the Potomac River to serve "as a model for the entire country" finally ended years of ignorance by official Washington of the problems endangering the river which flows virtually right under our noses. What has developed since the President's announcement is a concensus that in order to revive, preserve, and make the Potomac a model, there must be a concerted Federal-State cooperative movement. Happily this movement is shaping up on both levels. Concerned State officials in Maryland have taken the lead among the States bordering the Potomac. Interior Secretary Udall has geared up his experts into task forces which will propose programs for the river in a year and a half, but what happens in the meantime? Are we to allow the conditions to become more and more critical? I should hope not, and that is why I am offering the measures which I have introduced today.

The first one is a bill to increase the authorization for purchase of land at Piscataway Park, across the river from George Washington's Mount Vernon home. The status and future of the Piscataway Park is now in a critical period, and I predict that all will go for naught if the Congress does not take immediate steps to increase the authorization for purchase of the remaining riverside property at this parksite. The history of this park goes back to 1961 when the Congress passed a joint resolution which became Public Law 87-362 authorizing an 1,152-acre park in Prince Georges County along the undeveloped riverside and on Piscataway Bay across from Mount Vernon. The action was motivated by proposed construction of a sewage treatment plant on Mockley Point in the Potomac, the construction of which would have ruined the view that Washington cherished. The Congress authorized appropriation of $937,600 for purchase of approximately 586 acres at Piscataway Park with the understanding that about 566 more acres would be donated. The law also authorized acquisition of an additional 2,596 acres by donation of scenic easements on land adjacent to the 1,152 acres. As a result of the measure, the Federal Government purchased 97 acres on Mockley Point, forcing the sewage plant inland and out of sight, and the Accokeek Foundation—headed by the gentlewoman from Ohio—donated 151 acres on Piscataway Bay. The Alice L. L. Ferguson Foundation has donated 91 acres. Altogether, a total of 345 acres are committed for donation to the United States by private owners, and 521 acres remain to be purchased. It is most encouraging that I am able to report that landowners holding property in the Piscataway Park area have agreed to donate more than 120 scenic easements covering more than 850 acres within the authorized scenic easement area of the park.

These scenic easements in effect mean that the United States holds the development rights to more than 850 acres, thus preserving the natural beauty of the park without additional appropriations and without forcing homeowners off the property they rightfully own. What is looming over the horizon is the simple fact that we may lose everything that has been accomplished so far at Piscataway Park except for the 97 acres on Mockley Point that the Government has purchased. The reason is that the deed conveying the 151 acres from the Accokeek Foundation to the U.S. Government contains a reversionary clause which states the property will revert back to the foundation if the United States does not acquire sufficient lands or interest in lands "to establish the proposed park" in 5 years from the date of the deed. It is dated August 8, 1962, which means that it will expire—so to speak—on August 8, 1967. This is little more than 2 years from now. To make the problem more serious, the more than 850 acres under donated scenic easements will also be affected if the park is not established according to Public Law 87-362. These scenic easements also have clauses which require the Government to fulfill its obligation or else lose control of the development of these tracts. It is obvious to practically everyone—and particularly to my colleagues on the appropriations subcommittee on the Interior Department and related agencies—that the $544,493 remaining out of the original authorization of $937,600 is totally inadequate to purchase the remaining property at Piscataway Park. Therefore, I have introduced a bill to increase the authorization from $937,600 to more than $3.5 million. I firmly believe that we have an obligation to finish the work that we have started at this park and to stand by the prior commitment to preserve the view from historic and beloved Mount Vernon. In order to do it we must act soon, before the 1967 reversion clause goes into effect and before we have negated all that has been accomplished at Piscataway Park.

Recent newspaper articles have pointed out the alarming rate at which land values are climbing in the Accokeek-Piscataway area. For example, some property tax bills down there were from 400 to 500 percent higher this year than last. And this is for property that is primarily rural and undeveloped. Farms are selling up to $3,000 an acre, far above the $1,600 an acre which was authorized in Public Law 87-362. The rising land prices indicate to me that this scenic land is on the verge of higher density development—which is exactly what the Congress has indicated it does not want to happen across from Mount Vernon.

Secretary Udall stated in testimony last February:

> We have an ongoing problem opposite Mount Vernon * * * We need additional authorizing legislation.

It must be made clear that my bill does not set a price for the Piscataway property that remains to be acquired. If this authorization is increased, prices will be negotiated as usual within the framework of the law.

There is a phrase which I have mentioned repeatedly so far: It is scenic easements. A major portion of the Piscataway Park project is the securing of donated scenic easements to the U.S. Government. Many persons concerned with open spaces, recreational areas, and proper land development are watching this aspect of the Piscataway Park project very closely. If the U.S. Government can successfully convince many private landowners that it is in their best interests and in the best interests of their county, State, and Nation to donate the development rights to their land toward preserving the natural beauty and open character of an area, then a giant step has been taken for the future. We all know that land prices are skyrocketing. The demand for high-density development is evident in practically every urban, suburban, and rural area. The shorelines along our rivers are threatened and urban encroachment is placing growing responsibilities on our local and State governments to plan and zone intelligently—not for any special interest group and not for any official and not just for the sake of adding to the tax base. In some respects this means that local and State agencies must stand pat—must stop development threatening in some areas so that all available land will not be eaten up with buildings. It is the increasing land costs that are giving some local and State governments the biggest headaches and causing the greatest pain in their purses. As every day passes, they see land prices rise to a point of no return. What they wanted to buy for parkland and open spaces has given way to development because costs were so high to already hard-hit governing bodies.

And this is where the scenic easement comes in. The scenic easement is an instrument whereby a private landowner can donate or sell his property's development rights to his local, State, or Federal Government, thereby preserving the natural beauty of his property and preserving it from high density development which might be deleterious to his whole neighborhood. I am pleased to see that the use of the scenic easement is being recognized more and more as the instrument through which many of our goals for open spaces and preservation of natural beauty can be realized without gigantic expenditure of public funds. But I was somewhat distressed to discover that apparently no one in the U.S. Government is in a position to accept the donation of a scenic easement if it were offered, say, along the shoreline of the Potomac River, unless the donation was specifically authorized in legislation. There is, to my best knowledge, no general authority invested in a U.S. official to accept, in the name of the U.S. Government, such a donation. Therefore, I have introduced today a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept on the behalf of the United States, at his discretion, any donation of an easement.

The possibilities of this measure, if enacted, are many. It could mean that the Interior Department, or some other agency, would be in a position to carry out a campaign of attempting to secure scenic easements donations along our rivers, streams, and lakes, and other areas where we feel we must keep natural beauty in its status quo, where we must continue to allow landowners to reside on their property, and where we cannot afford gigantic spending for the purchase of this property.

I believe that the future of the scenic easement is practically unlimited. My bill does not authorize the Secretary to acquire scenic easements or expend any sums because I feel these authorities must continue to rest with the Congress. Instead, here is an opportunity for the citizen landowner to play a major role in the national campaign for natural beauty. Donation to the Federal Government or to a State or local government of a scenic easement does not mean that there is a public right-of-entry to one's property. It is a recognition of the need for orderly planning and development within the limits of logic, reason, commonsense, and with an eye toward the esthetic values inherent in natural beauty. The Federal Government does not have enough money to purchase the whole shoreline of the Potomac River and I doubt that such authorization would ever come out of the Congress. But property owners of Virginia and Maryland can, through donated scenic easements, do their share toward keeping the shoreline in its natural State between the parks and parkways which the Congress has authorized so that we can say, after pollution has been abated and a water supply established for future generations, that the Potomac River is in fact a model for the whole country.

The third measure I introduced today is a bill directing the Secretary of the Army to remove from the Potomac River the more than 100 abandoned World War I hulls which are floating in Mallow's Bay in Charles County, Md., and at Wide Water, Va., below Quantico. The reason I have offered this bill is because these hulls have to be removed from the river and because the Federal Government has taken a very limited attitude toward its responsibility for these hulls. Admittedly they are abandoned and are no one's property. However, they were originally owned by the Federal Government and were used as World War I troop carriers. In 1922, they were sold for salvage at Mallow's Bay, Charles County, but unfortunately, the job was never completed.

Later, in 1936, the Maryland Court of Appeals held that they were legally abandoned. Since then, these hulls, ugly and rotting, have been wallowing in accumulating silt and sediment which forms around such objects in the water. At least one of them is believed to have caused a person's death because it floated out of the little bay and into the Potomac River channel, colliding with a small boat. The Corps of Engineers disclaims any responsibility except for making certain they remain within the corral of piles to which the hulls are tied in Mallow's Bay.

The citizens of Charles County have been trying to get some action on these eyesores and have had noticeably little success. The hulls are still on view daily on the Potomac River for any passing boats and ships. Now is the time for Congress to take direct action by forcing the Federal Government to remove and destroy these vessels it once owned. I have made provision in my bill for the Secretary of the Army to accept any contribution which the State of Maryland may want to make toward the costs of this project. Since we who are devoted to the interests of the Potomac River have entered the arena of Federal-State cooperation in solving these problems, I see no reason why the State should not want to assume at least a partial financial responsibility for the removal and destruction of these hulls.

There is the potential for a great future in store for the Potomac River. It can be realized with the strong support of President Johnson, his administration, the Congress, and the States and local jurisdictions which border the river. The lessons we learn in making the Potomac a model river can be applied to the other great waterways in the United States. They may also signal a new public awareness of what may have been taken for granted too long and too lightly. This project is not one that will benefit only a single area or a single jurisdiction. Its benefits are for everyone.

Assembly of Captive European Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 22, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, last night I and other Members of this House were privileged to attend an event of particular significance to the free world. I refer to the Captive Nations Week dinner at the National Press Club in Washington. The occasion was held in commemoration of Captive Nations Week, the third week of each July, which was so designated by unanimous approval of the Congress of the United States in 1959.

The whole significance of Captive Nations Week came poignantly to the fore last evening. The ceremonies and the speeches were rich with incisive thought, which I know is of particular interest to my colleagues at this time. For that reason, I would like to relate some of the evenings events.

The highlight of last night's function, which was sponsored by organizations dedicated to the restoration of freedom in the captive nations, was the presentation of the ACEN Award to Edward R. Murrow—posthumously — Representative Gerald R. Ford, Jr., Republican of Michigan, and Representative Daniel J. Flood, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

Recipients of the ACEN Award are selected by the Assembly of Captive European Nations, which brings together exile leaders from nine east central European countries and which is one of the three sponsors of Captive Nations Week. The other two sponsoring organizations are the American Friends of the Captive Nations and the Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent.

The award consists of a plaque surmounted by the flags of the nine east-central European nations at present under Communist control.

The award to Mr. Murrow reads:

> To Edward R. Murrow, trail-blazing reporter and commentator, eloquent friend of truth and tolerance, foe of tyranny, in posthumous recognition of his proven concern for the Communist-enslaved nations of East-Central Europe and his consistent support of their freedom goal.
>
> Assembly of Captive European Nations.
> Washington, *July 21, 1965.*

Donald M. Wilson, once Mr. Murrow's Deputy at the U.S. Information Agency, accepted the award on behalf of Mrs. Murrow.

Speaking of Murrow, Wilson said in part:

> Integrity, idealism, and devotion to the truth were nowhere better exemplified in Ed Murrow's life than in his deep and abiding interest in the fate of the peoples of Eastern Europe.
>
> If, as a reporter, American citizen, and man, Ed Murrow had become better aware of Eastern Europe, its peoples, it history, and its hopes, than most of his countrymen, as Director of the U.S. Information Agency, he entered upon duties which gave him an opportunity to translate that awareness into action. In his activities as Director, he was particularly conscious of the need to maintain the links between America and the peoples of Eastern Europe and to do what he could to strengthen and expand them. He was a bridge builder.

Representative Daniel J. Flood, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, called the observance of Captive Nations Week a most fitting occasion to express support for President Johnson's activities in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic.

He said:

> Had he (the President) not taken these courageous steps, we would certainly have two more victims added to the long list of captive nations. The President's decisions in both areas have precluded Communist imperialist takeovers.

Congressman Flood also stated that the United States would stand pat on the principles of independence, personal liberty, and human dignity for all nations, "despite the propaganda and diplomatic pressures of the Communist regimes."

> World developments demonstrate more and more the urgent need for us to support to the maximum psychopolitical extent the freedom aspirations of all captive nations—

Congressman Flood continued:

> The avowed enemy must not be allowed to enjoy any psychopolitical sanctuary in his imperial domain. A virtually guaranteed security there means an increased insecurity in the free world as he relentlessly pursues his strategy of supporting so-called wars of national liberation. One of the most effective paramilitary means of curbing this pursuit, and thus preserving global peace, is to further the freedom goals of all the captive nations.

The award to Congressman Flood bears the following inscription:

> To Daniel J. Flood, Member of Congress, jurist, civic leader, legislator, in grateful recognition of his active concern for the victims of Communist aggression and tyranny, his forceful advocacy of policies apt to advance the cause of freedom and his tireless leadership of movements to create a special committee of the U.S. House of Representatives on the captive nations.
>
> Assembly of Captive European Nations.
> Washington, *July 21, 1965.*

Representative Gerald R. Ford, Republican, of Michigan, House minority leader, spoke of the significance of Captive Nations Week in the context of current international developments.

Congressman Ford's award reads:

> To Gerald R. Ford, Member of Congress, jurist, sailor-soldier, legislator-fighter with a heart, in grateful recognition of his neverflagging concern for the peoples of the Communist-subjugated lands in the eastern half of Europe and his forceful championing of policies and strategies designed to make certain that freedom will prevail.
>
> Assembly of Captive European Nations.
> Washington, *July 21, 1965.*

One of the highlights of the dinner was an explanation of the failings of communism by Monika Flidr. Prior to the presentation of the ACEN awards, Monika Flidr and two other speakers who have recently arrived in the West from east-central Europe, spoke of conditions in Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Lithuania.

Miss Flidr had taught Russian and Czechoslovakia at a high school in Usti nad Labem, one of the more important cities in Czechoslovakia. During a bus excursion last New Year's Day from Prague to Vienna, Austria—one of the few opportunities the Czechoslovakia regime offers people who wish to visit the West—Miss Flidr and her mother decided to stay in the free world. She came to the United States only a month ago and hopes to qualify for a teaching position.

Miss Flidr said that for young people life in Czechoslovakia offered few challenges. Uniformity, regimentation, and boredom have become the unwanted companions in a young man's and woman's daily grind.

She said, in part:

> A typical example is the manner in which the regime handles a so-called spontaneous demonstration. When I was a teacher at a high school in Usti nad Labem, we had to take part in the annual celebration of the Bolshevik Revolution. The principal would call in all the teachers, brief them on the modus operandi, and charge them with the task of insuring the largest possible attendance by the pupils. Attendance at all these events was in fact compulsory, and few were willing to risk official displeasure by failing to show up. I remember that my pupils would often try to stay away from these demonstrations by claiming illness, but they had to substantiate their excuse by a doctor's certificate.
>
> There is a ferver among Czecholsovak youth to travel, to learn about the West, to read books by Western authors, and see plays by Western playwrights. They are tired of the stereotype, run-of-the-mill forms of art sponsored by the regime. When a Czechoslovak author or playwright comes out with something that is even slightly nonconformist, he is an instant hit with the youth.
>
> To see foreign lands is probably the most ardent wish of a young Czechoslovak boy or girl. They resent the regime's restrictions on travel and say: If capitalism is that bad, why don't they let use see that for ourselves?
>
> My fellow teachers at school, as well as my other friends, have often told me how tired they were of the unending stream of false claims by the regime. "How can you take those people at their word," one of them said to me. "You read in the papers that production plans have been fulfilled, then you go to a store and try to buy this or that item and they'll tell you it's not available. The same with food. The collectivized agriculture is supposed to work out just fine, but when you go to market you'll find that they don't carry many of the items you need."
>
> Young people in Czechoslovakia, as probably young men and women everywhere, want things the regime cannot or will not provide. The same Marxist doctrine that not too long ago had some fiery advocates among young Czechoslovak intellectuals, is greeted today by young men and women with a contemptuous shrug and, at best, by a yawn.
>
> By trying to suppress individuality, by offering regimentation and boredom instead of new visits, communism has failed dismally with the younger generation in Czechoslovakia.

Monika Flidr was followed by two other speakers who had recently come to the free world. Both these men were born in the United States and both had spent many years in prison and labor camps when they returned to the country of their fathers.

John Carja, 42, was born in West Virginia, but was educated in Rumania and lived there from the age of 5 until last May. A former newspaperman, he was arrested in 1949 and sentenced to imprisonment in the infamous Danube-Black Sea Canal extermination camp, where tens of thousands of Rumanians have lost their lives. Released in 1954, he was again arrested in 1959 and sentenced to 10 years. The Rumanian regime's aim was to prevent Carja from seeking repatriation to the United States. During his confinement he was repeatedly tortured to make him confess to espionage on behalf of the United States. In July 1964, after serving 5 of his 10-year sentence, Carja was released. In reprisal for Carja's efforts to seek repatriation to the United States he was kept unemployed until he finally secured an exit visa in May 1965.

Alfons Milukas, 54, is a native of Philadelphia. In 1920, his entire family moved to Lithuania. In 1947, Milukas took steps to reclaim his American citizenship. He was arrested the following year. He was sentenced to 25 years and sent to a labor camp near Vorkuta—the notorious "deep-freeze" camp in the U.S.S.R. near the Kara Sea. When German prisoners of war returned home in 1954, they told newsmen and the authorities that an American by the name of Milukas was still being detained in a Siberian labor camp. Released in 1956, Milukas tried in vain for the next 9 years to obtain an exit permit. In March 1965, he was at last allowed to leave Lithuania, where he had lived since his release.

Roscoe Drummond, the noted columnist, presided at the dinner, which began with an invocation delivered by Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate.

Vasil Germenji, chairman of the Assembly of Captive European Nations—ACEN—started the proceedings by brief introductory remarks on the importance of this year's Captive Nations Week.

The dinner came to a close with the benediction by the Right Reverend Monsignor John Balkunas, president of the Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent.

Skybus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with Congressman Reuss and 19 other House Members in the introduction of legislation for a massive research effort designed to achieve a technological breakthrough in developing new transportation systems for urban areas such as Pittsburgh.

I would note that Skybus, to be inaugurated soon for a trial run in South Park, Allegheny County, Pa., is one example of the type of creative thinking that must be applied to help solve urban transit problems.

If we can spend billions of dollars to send a handful of Americans into space, we surely can afford $20 million for an effort that could provide safe, rapid transit for millions of Americans. Skybus may be the answer for some areas, but we must undertake this research program to prove the worth of this and other systems that may be devised in order to meet the differing types of urban transit needs.

The legislation introduced today provides for a 2-year, $20 million research program looking toward new transit systems designed to carry people safely, quickly, and economically from place to place within urban areas, without polluting the air and in a way that would meet the needs of the people for individual transportation while also contributing to good city planning.

Skybus, or transit expressway, developed by Westinghouse Electric Co., Pittsburgh, uses lightweight automated vehicles operating singly or in trains on a lightweight electrified roadway which can be built at ground level, above ground level, or below ground level.

Westinghouse developed this new system in an effort to provide flexible train or single car schedules operating efficiently, comfortably, and safely 24 hours a day at costs substantially below those of a conventional transit system. This is the first significant new development designed from the ground up for its intended purpose—efficient use of modern equipment and techniques for the continuous movement of people in urban areas.

Remarks by Hon. Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, Before the Virginia State Bar Association, July 10, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address delivered by the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, before the 75th annual meeting of the Virginia State Bar Association at Hot Springs, Va., on July 10, 1965. Secretary Fowler's address concerns recent attempts to secure improvements in international monetary arrangements, and the related importance of maintaining a stable dollar to insure world liquidity.

The address follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE HENRY H. FOWLER, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE THE VIRGINIA STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

For a Virginian, the honor of sharing in this 75th annual meeting of the association is exceeded only by the pleasure of seeing so many old friends of my native Roanoke and my adopted home of Alexandria.

For an erstwhile lawyer, the privilege of speaking to this distinguished bar, including most notably the 14 life members, is surpassed only by the temerity of choosing international monetary problems as a subject for discussion. But Virginians have always been heavily concerned with and leaders in providing for the United States an appropriate role in international affairs. And Virginians have in this century made notable contributions to and set high standards for the conduct of public financial affairs.

For a Secretary of the Treasury from Virginia, this is a welcome opportunity to pay tribute to two great living Virginians who bear heavy national responsibilities in the fields of finance, taxation, money, credit, and banking, holding two of the most important posts in the U.S. Congress in these areas. I refer to Senator Harry Byrd and Senator Willis Robertson, who serve the Commonwealth and the Nation with distinction and dedication as chairmen of the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate Banking and Currency Committee respectively. No other State is represented by two Senators whose influence and prestige exceeds their seniority by so great a margin. As chairmen of the two committees with which the Treasury, acting for the executive branch, has most of its dealings with the Senate, I am indebted to them for their constant courtesy and their impeccable fairness.

They carry on the tradition of an earlier national statesman from Virginia in the field of public finance in this century, namely, Carter Glass. His service, both in the Congress and as Secretary of the Treasury, is particularly remembered throughout the world of financial affairs. He contributed in a major way to the creation and development of the Federal Reserve System which served to correct many of the outstanding defects of the preexisting national financial arrangements which in many ways find their counterpart in the international financial world of today.

It is to these international financial problems that I would direct your attention this evening.

We have all heard or read a great deal in recent months about the problem this Nation faces in its balance of payments and about the need for the nations of the free world to move toward agreement on ways of assuring the financial resources needed to support increasing international trade and development.

Indeed, world financial questions have never occupied a more prominent place in public discussion than they do today. But to most Americans, I suspect, these problems still seem rather remote from their daily lives and labors—rather unrelated, even, to the other national and international events that engage so much of our interest and our concern. Nor is it unnatural that they should pale beside events such as those in Saigon or in Santo Domingo.

But we must never forget that America's ability to succeed in its difficult and demanding role as leader of the free world—that all the political, diplomatic, and military resources at our command—depend upon a strong and stable American economy and a sound dollar.

We must never forget that our lives can be vitally affected, not only by the events in Saigon or Santo Domingo, but by such apparently far removed occurrences as the outflow of American gold and dollars abroad.

For the role of the dollar as the most widely used international currency is part and parcel of America's leading role in the free world—politically, economically, militarily. More than any other single factor, it is the strength and the soundness and the stability of the American dollar that serves as the essential underpinning of the entire free world monetary system through which the interdependent nations of the free world have fashioned their awesome economic accomplishments of the past several decades.

The solution of our balance-of-payments difficulties and the strengthening of the international monetary system are thus far more than merely arid economic exercises. They are crucial matters which must deeply concern—for, in a broad but very real sense, they deeply affect—not just bankers and businessmen and economists, but every American in every walk of life.

What, then, is our balance-of-payments problem? Why is it so important that we solve it?

Since 1949, the United States has had balance-of-payments deficits every year except for 1957—when our exports soared as a result of the Suez crisis. During that first postwar decade—up until 1958—those deficits were little cause for concern, for they were simply the counterpart of our effort to help rebuild a Europe laid waste by war. Our vast outpouring of dollars was the essential sourcespring for replenishing the reservoir of international reserves and liquidity required by a western Europe and a Japan whose financial, as well as physical, resources war had drastically depleted.

Under the Marshall plan and other programs, we furnished some thirty billions of dollars in grants and loans to help put the economies of Europe back on their feet again. With the recovery of Europe, we turned more and more of our dollars toward aiding the underdeveloped countries of the world. We also sent dollars abroad to support large military forces and furnish military aid essential for the defense of the free world.

These measures were eminently successful. By the mid-50's the economies of Europe and Japan were strong and growing, controls and restrictions on trade and payments were being progressively dismantled, and in 1958 external convertibility of the leading European currencies was restored.

But this progress was accompanied by other developments that led to U.S. balance-of-payments deficits far larger than Europe required and than we could live with indefinitely. Rising prices in this country had weakened our competitive position at a time when Europe and Japan had once again become a formidable competitive force in world markets. At the same time, the strength of Europe's economic resurgence and its new-won financial stability began to attract growing amounts of American capital abroad.

Thus, beginning in 1958, things changed—and more swiftly perhaps than most people realized. The dollar shortage which Europe had suffered in the early postwar years was fast disappearing.

During the 7 years 1950–57, our deficits averaged only $1.5 billion a year—and at the end of that period our gold stock amounted to about $22 billion, or more than a third larger than the total volume of dollars held by all foreigners.

Yet over the next 3 years—1958–60—our balance-of-payments deficits averaged almost $4 billion a year. Other countries found their dollar holdings growing more rapidly than they wished, and our gold began flowing abroad in much greater volume—roughly $5 billion in 3 years.

That was the situation that confronted us in early 1961, when we launched a strong and sustained effort to move our international payments into balance once more.

Over a period of 4 years—1961–64—we achieved substantial improvements in many separate accounts entering into our balance of payments, including: a $900 million gain in our commercial trade surplus—those not financed by Government—making it a record $3.7 billion in 1964; a $400 million cut in the dollar outflow as a result of foreign aid; a cut of nearly $700 million in net military dollar outlays despite rising costs abroad; a $1.6 billion rise in our earnings from past private foreign investments.

Simply as a matter of arithmetic, those gains were enough—all else being equal—to have given us virtual balance in our payments last year. But all other things were not equal. Instead of approaching the vanishing point, with the $3.9 billion deficit of 1960 being absorbed by these gains in particular sectors of our payments totaling $3.6 billion, our deficit in 1964 was in fact reduced by a net total of only $800 million to $3.1 billion.

We incurred that deficit—despite 4 years of real and lasting progress—primarily because of a drastic deterioration in the one major area of our balance of payments which our programs had not yet effectively reached in a comprehensive way—the area of private foreign investment outflows.

In 1964, the outflow of private capital abroad reached the $6½ billion mark—more than twice the size of the deficit and up over $2 billion from 1963 and over $2½ billion from 1960. That outflow reflected a variety of causes—including the drive by American business to stake out a claim in the rapidly growing and seemingly highly profitable European markets. But, to a very large degree, the accelerating outflow had its source in the marked disparity that had long existed between European capital markets and our own—a disparity in size and scope and facilities that led borrowers in other countries to tap our market for a large share of their capital requirements. The United States had often enough called attention to this disparity and urged its European friends to expand and improve their markets. But their progress in that endeavor had simply not been large and rapid enough, and we had passed the point where we could sustain the huge drain of capital which that disparity entailed.

We had to act. We had not only to intensify the efforts already underway in other sectors of our balance of payments, but to extend those efforts to include comprehensive curbs upon private capital outflows. It had become abundantly clear that to restore balance to our payments once more we had to attack our deficit on all major fronts simultaneously. President Johnson launched such an attack with his February 10 message to Congress on the balance of payments. The heart of that message was the call to arms of America's businesses and banks—the call to join voluntarily in a national effort to curb the outflow of dollars abroad, while preexisting programs were intensified.

That call has been heard—and heeded. After a bad start in January, our balance of payments improved in February following the President's message and showed a surplus in March, in April, and in May.

Thus we are off to a good beginning, but—let there be no mistake—it is no more than a beginning. Let no one think that a few months of apparent surplus—a surplus purchased only through extraordinary and temporary measures—can suffice.

The likelihood of a surplus in the second quarter of this year does tell us that we are moving in the right direction—that our current measures can turn our deficit into a surplus. But the big job—the job that remains—is for us to demonstrate that we can sustain equilibrium through these measures as well as the longer term measures inaugurated since 1961. We must maintain those extraordinary measures in full force until rising returns from past private investment abroad, our improved climate for domestic employment of capital, enlarged availability of capital in markets abroad, and growth in our trade balance—which requires that we maintain our excellent record of price stability—place our accounts securely in equilibrium.

It is imperative not simply to reach balance in our payments for a quarter or two, or even for a year, but to sustain equilibrium over time. The reasons are clear. Our 14 years of deficits have resulted in a large outflow of dollars to the rest of the world. Because there is worldwide confidence in the stability of those dollars and because they are convertible into gold at the fixed price of $35 an ounce, those dollars are widely used to finance international transactions, and other countries hold them alongside gold in their official reserves.

Today, those dollars—some $27 billion—account for a major share of the international liquidity that sustains the growing free world economy. Some $12 billion of those dollars are in official reserves, while the remainder serve to support growing world trade and investment. Thus, it is essential to the viability of the international monetary system as it exists today that the usefulness and value of those dollars remain unquestioned throughout the world. And, whatever changes might be introduced into that system, the dollar will have to continue to carry a heavy burden as a reserve currency.

If we allowed our deficits to continue, or if we lapsed back into prolonged deficit after a brief period of surplus, we would undermine world confidence in the dollar and impair its usefulness as a world reserve and leading currency. Dollars would return to our shores as claims on our gold, thus depleting instead of supplementing world financial resources. To prevent such a contraction in world liquidity and the widening circles of deflation and restriction that would surely follow, we must reach and maintain equilibrium in our payments as a matter of the highest national priority, along with sustaining the economic advance that has marked the last 53 months.

The paradox is, therefore, that the very increase in official foreign dollar holdings that has fueled so much of the growth in world liquidity in the past—and has thus helped support the growth in world trade—can no longer by allowed to continue if current international liquidity is to be protected. Yet without additions to the reserve dollars that our deficits have so long supplied, the world will need a new and assured source of growing liquidity to support increasing world trade and investment.

This, in a nutshell, is what the issue of world monetary reform is all about. It is to assure ample world liquidity for the years ahead that the United States, in cooperation with other leading financial powers, is seeking workable ways of strengthening and improving international financial arrangements.

For several years now the essential laying of the technical groundwork has been underway as the United States has joined with other major countries in comprehensive studies of the international monetary system—its recent evolution, its present effectiveness and its future. An early conclusion was that there are two elements in international liquidity; on the one hand the more conventional reserves of gold and reserve currencies and on the other hand the ready availability of credit facilities for countries in need of temporary assistance.

As long ago as 1961 the 10 major industrial nations, now known as the Group of 10, negotiated with the International Monetary Fund a so-called general arrangements to borrow whereby the 10 nations agreed to lend to the IMF up to $6 billion should this be necessary "to forestall or cope with an impairment of the international monetary system." That arrangement was activated last December and again this May in order to provide a part of a $2.4 billion drawings from the IMF on the part of the United Kingdom.

On the credit side, also, the members of the International Monetary Fund have now agreed to support a 25-percent general increase in IMF quotas. This 25-percent increase, plus special increases for some 16 countries, will raise total aggregate quotas from $15 billion to around $21 billion. The Congress last month approved a $1,035 million increase in the U.S. quota.

Meanwhile, the Group of 10 and the International Monetary Fund have been continuing their studies of the future course of world liquidity. Deputies of the Group submitted a comprehensive report on the problems involved last August. In their ministerial statement last August, the Group of 10 stated that while supplies of gold and reserve currencies are fully adequate for the present and are likely to be for the immediate future, the continuing growth of world trade and payments is likely to require larger international liquidity. While they said that this need might be met by an expansion of credit facilities, they added that it may possibly call for some new form of reserve asset.

A study group was set up "to examine various proposals regarding the creation of reserve assets either through the IMF or otherwise." The efforts of that group have culminated in the so-called Ossola report, submitted to the deputies of the Group of 10 on June 1 of this year, which exhaustively examines, with all their promises and pitfalls, the possible paths to the creation of reserve assets.

Now for the first time in 4 years we are confronted by the happy concurrence of three crucial facts:

1. The U.S. balance of payments is approaching an equilibrium and the executive branch, the Congress and the private sector, including industry, banking and labor, have mounted a program that makes unmistakably manifest our determination to keep it that way.

2. Evidence is accumulating of a rising tide of opinion in many knowledgeable and influential quarters in the free world, private and public, that our international monetary arrangements can and should be substantially improved, building on the basis of the International Monetary Fund and the network of more informal international monetary cooperation that has marked recent years.

3. The completion of technical studies necesary to give a thorough understanding of the problem and various alternative approaches to solution on the part of those at the highest levels of government who must ultimately make these decisions.

We have now reached the moment which President Johnson had in mind when in speaking of new international monetary steps he said: "We must press forward with our studies and beyond, to action—evolving arrangements which will continue to meet the needs of a fast growing world economy. Unless we can make timely progress, international monetary difficulties will exercise a stubborn and increasingly frustrating drag on our policies for prosperity and progress at home and throughout the world."

In taking office, I described this as "the major task facing our Treasury and the financial authorities of the rest of the free world in the next few years."

In recent weeks we have moved beyond the plane of hope and technical studies toward the prospect of more conclusive negotiations from which alone solution can emerge. I met last week with the British Chancellor of the Exchequer James Callaghan and we exchanged preliminary and tentative views on the subject of international liquidity.

Next week I hope to have the pleasure of informal discussions with the Japanese Minister of Finance, Takeo Fukuda, in connection with the Joint Cabinet sessions of the United States-Japan Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs.

Both before and after the scheduled meeting of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank in late September, I expect to visit ranking financial officials of other Group of 10 countries, to ascertain firsthand their views on the most practical and promising ways of furthering progress toward improved international monetary arrangements. We must not only be prepared to advance our own proposals, but to carefully consider and fairly weight the merits of other proposals. As Congressman ROBERT ELLSWORTH, of Kansas, in discussing this subject recently remarked: "We must appreciate that if we wish a strong Europe it must be a Europe strong enough to look upon an American proposal as merely one among many possible solutions—all of which will be reviewed together. If we wish their partnership. we must treat them as partners."

Already your Government is engaged in an intensive internal preparation for these bilateral meetings and multilateral negotiations that should follow. In addition, so that the Government may have the benefit of some of the expertise and experience outside the Government in this highly technical area, President Johnson has accepted my recommendation and announced creation of an Advisory Committee on International Monetary Arrangements which includes as its Chairman the former Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, and a distinguished group of experts including Robert Roosa, former Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs; Kermit Gordon, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget; Edward Bernstein, economic consultant specializing in international monetary policy; Andre Meyer, of the investment banking firm of Lazard Freres; David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and Charles Kindleberger, professor of economics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

With their help and that of many others who will be consulted including, particularly, many well informed members of the appropriate committees of Congress, we shall constantly seek a comprehensive U.S. position and negotiating strategy designed to achieve substantial improvement in international monetary arrangements thoroughly compatible with our national interests. In the various proposals which have and will be made we must determine those which will be acceptable to the United States, those which are entirely unacceptable, and those which may well be appropriate for negotiation.

There will be an initial meeting of the Advisory Committee on International Arrangements on July 16. Hearings are planned before the International Finance Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee under the chairmanship of Congressman HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, to obtain various private and organizational points of view. These hearings and the reports of the commitee will be of great value, together with those of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress and the International Finance Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee under the chairmanship of Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, of Maine.

I am privileged to tell you this evening that the President has authorized me to announce that the United States now stands prepared to attend and participate in an international monetary conference that would consider what steps we might jointly take to secure substantial improvements in international monetary arangements. Needless to say, if such a conference is to lead to a fruitful and creative resolution by some of the free world's monetary problems, it must be preceded by careful preparation and international consultation.

To meet and not succeed would be worse than not meeting at all. Before any conference takes place, there should be a reasonable certainty of measurable progress through prior agreement on basic points.

Our suggestion is that the work of preparation be undertaken by a preparatory committee which could be given its terms of reference at the time of the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund this September.

The United States is not wedded to this procedure nor to any rigid timetable. I shall exchange views with my colleagues in Europe and elsewhere, as well as with the senior officials of the International Monetary Fund, on how best to proceed. The point I wish to emphasize here is that the United States is determined to move ahead—carefully, deliberately—but without delay. Not to act when the time is ripe can be as unwise as to act too soon or too hastily.

We are, therefore, moving ahead—and we are making progress. But we must be aware that the issues involved are complex, and they raise basic questions of national interest. It is not, therefore, easy to arrive at the degree of international consensus we must have for any workable reform of the international monetary system. We can expect no overnight solution—but only patient exploration of the alternatives with our trading partners in a spirit of mutual cooperation. This is the course we are now pursuing.

As we move ahead, we will do well to remember that the existing international financial system has successfully financed an unparalleled expansion in world trade and payments. We have also done much in recent years to strengthen that system. The need now is not to start all over again, to move in a completely new direction. Rather, we must move once more to strengthen and improve the existing arrangements.

And while we proceed solidly and surely toward international agreement on the problems of world liquidity, we in this country must keep ever before us the present and pressing need to protect the existing international payments system by maintaining a strong, sound, and stable dollar. First things must come first. We are bringing our own payments into equilibrium and we must keep them in equilibrium. By resolutely shouldering that responsibility we will preserve the foundation upon which must rest all efforts to assure free world growth in the years ahead—the monetary system that has served the free world so well in the past.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 23, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mankind, as we pause in this moment of supplication to lift our Te Deum for the emancipated realm in which our lot is cast, a land where the people rule, we would remember in our thought and prayer the fettered lands where freedom is but a haunting memory and an agonizing hope.

By our remembrance of them we would send our assurance through and across any curtain or wall that no threats of their present ruthless masters will make America break her vow to keep alive the remembrance of perpetrated atrocities until the enslaved peoples are free from the spoiler's clutch and their soil is no longer defiled by his abominations. Give us the solemn realization that to pray for our own progress and prosperity and at the same time to keep silent, to pass by unheeding on the other side, while the plots of a diabolical scourge cut the very roots of a dozen nations' future fate, is to forfeit all right to our own high privilege and heritage. Help us in these days of crisis and destiny to face the searching eyes of that One who took as His holy mission the proclamation of liberty to the captives and deliverance to those who are bound. And so this dedicated week in the name of the God of Justice we would make ourselves the captives of the captive nations and beseech Thee to use our lips and our breath to sound forth a trumpet that shall know no retreat until all men are free from the tyranny of despots.

In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 22, 1965, was dispensed with.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN HIGH-SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 481, S. 1588.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1588) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the bill be temporarily postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PENALTIES FOR ASSASSINATION OF THE PRESIDENT OR THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 482, H.R. 6097.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6097) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the President or the Vice President, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 3, line 22, after the word "shall", to strike out "preclude" and insert "suspend"; at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "to such extent as the Attorney General of the United States shall direct." and insert "until Federal action is terminated."; and at the top of page 4, to insert:

> (i) Violations of this section shall be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Assistance may be requested from any Federal, State, or local agency, including the Army, Navy, and Air Force, any statute, rule, or regulation to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 498), explaining the purposes of the bill and the need for this much desired proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as amended, is to rectify the omission in Federal law by making it a Federal crime to kill, kidnap, or assault the President, the President-elect, the Vice President, or, if there is no Vice President, the officer next in the order of succession to the office of President of the United States, the Vice-President-elect, or any individual who is acting as President. In addition, it makes it a Federal crime to attempt, or to conspire, to kill, or kidnap any of the individuals designated.

STATEMENT

There was no Federal criminal jurisdiction with respect to the assassination of the President on November 22, 1963. It is anomalous that Congress has legislated in other ways to protect the safety of the Chief Executive and other Federal officers, but has never made the murder of or an attack on the President a Federal crime. Under existing Federal criminal law, title 18, United States Code, threatening harm to the President is a Federal offense (sec. 871), as is advocacy of the overthrow of the Government by assassination of any of its officers (sec. 2358). The murder of Federal judges, U.S. attorneys and marshals, and many other specifically designated Federal law enforcement officials is a Federal crime (sec. 1114); as is conspiracy to injure any Federal officer on account of, or while he is engaged in, the discharge of his official duty (sec. 372).

Notwithstanding these various criminal provisions covering other officials in Federal service, the Federal law today fails to assure full and complete Federal investigative and prosecutive jurisdiction over acts designed to harm the Chief Executive of the United States.

A primary advantage resulting from the enactment of this measure would be the assurance of clear Federal jurisdiction in the investigation and prosecution of Presidential assailants. Clear Federal jurisdiction in this area would minimize the conflict and confusion growing out of concurrent jurisdiction of Federal and State agencies. Enactment of this bill would mean that investigation of the acts covered and of any possibility of a future attempt would be conducted by Federal law enforcement officials. At present, Federal agencies participate only at the sufferance of local authorities. Enactment of the bill would also insure that the detention and protection of suspects accused of committing any of the acts against the President and Vice President would be under Federal control. A further value of such legislation would be that suspects would be protected by Federal practices and procedures in their trial and prosecution.

A committee amendment provides that the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have jurisdiction over investigations of violations of this act and such investigations be the fixed responsibility of one agency. From the standpoint of investigative experience and expertise the Federal Bureau of Investigation has demonstrated that it has the know-how and the talent to conduct these investigations. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has demonstrated through its present close association with police departments throughout the country that it is able to work in concert with all law enforcement agencies.

It is self-evident that the murder of the President of the United States is a crime against the National Government. The committee restricted the coverage of the bill to the President and Vice President, and, in the absence of the Vice President, to the officer next in order of succession. (The bill also applies to any individual acting as President under the Constitution and laws of the United States and during the period between election and inauguration, to the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect.) The committee considers it unnecessary to require that the hostile act occur while the victim is engaged in (or because of) the performance of official duties. The injury suffered by the United States as a consequence of an assault on any of the officers specified in the bill does not bear any relationship to the activities of the victim at the time of the assault nor to the motives of the assailant. In this connection, the committee adopts the following statement made by Senator George F. Hoar in the 1902 debate on legislation seeking to make the assassination of the President a Federal crime:

"What this bill means to punish is the crime of interruption of the Government of the United States and the destruction of its security by striking down the life of the person who is actually in the exercise of the Executive power, or of such persons as have been constitutionally and lawfully provided to succeed thereto in case of a vacancy. It is important to this country that the interruption shall not take place for an hour."

This bill is designed to implement recommendations for a Federal criminal statute on the subject made in the "Report of the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy." After a thorough and painstaking investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy, the Commission urged that the Congress adopt legislation which would: "Punish the murder or manslaughter of, attempt or conspiracy to murder, kidnaping of and assault upon the President, Vice President, or other officer next in the order of succession to the Office of President, the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect, whether or not the act is committed while the victim is in the performance of his official duties or on account of such performance" (at p. 455).

There have been a number of efforts in the past to make the assassination of the President a Federal crime. All such efforts have failed. A number of bills were introduced immediately following the assassination of President Kennedy. Approximately 50 measures on this subject have been introduced in the 89th Congress. A judiciary subcommittee of the House of Representatives conducted 2 days of hearings on May 26 and 27, 1965, in which the Deputy Attorney General and the Under Secretary of the Treasury, the former counsel to the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy, a representative of the American Bar Association, and congressional sponsors of this legislation appeared and testified.

The committee believes the need for this legislation is manifest and recommends the bill do pass.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senate will approve today H.R. 6097, "An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the President or the Vice President, and for other purposes."

This bill, which will become law when signed by the President, represents substantially one of the recommendations made by the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy, on which I had the honor to serve. I ask unanimous consent that the recommendations made by the Commission, which will be found on pages 454, 455, and 456 of the Commission's report, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Commission's review of the provisions for Presidential protection at the time of President Kennedy's trip to Dallas demonstrates the need for substantial improvements. Since the assassination, the Secret Service and the Department of the Treasury have properly taken the initiative in reexamining major aspects of Presidential protection. Many changes have already been made and others are contemplated, some of them in response to the Commission's questions and informal suggestions.

ASSASSINATION A FEDERAL CRIME

There was no Federal criminal jurisdiction over the assassination of President Kennedy. Had there been reason to believe that the assassination was the result of a conspiracy, Federal jurisdiction could have been asserted; it has long been a Federal crime to conspire to injure any Federal officer, on account of, or while he is engaged in, the lawful discharge of the duties of his office. Murder of the President has never been covered by Federal law, however, so that once it became reasonably clear that the killing was the act of a single person, the State of Texas had exclusive jurisdiction.

It is anomalous that Congress has legislated in other ways touching upon the safety of the Chief Executive or other Federal officers, without making an attack on the President a crime. Threatening harm to the President is a Federal offense, as is advocacy of the overthrow of the Government by the assassination of any of its officers. The murder of Federal judges, U.S. attorneys and marshals, and a number of other specifically designated Federal law enforcement officers is a Federal crime. Equally anomalous are statutory provisions which specifically authorize the Secret Service to protect the President, without authorizing it to arrest anyone who harms him. The same provisions authorize the Service to arrest without warrant persons committing certain offenses, including counterfeiting and certain frauds involving Federal checks or securities. The Commission agrees with the Secret Service that it should be authorized to make arrests without warrant for all offenses within its jurisdiction, as are FBI agents and Federal marshals.

There have been a number of efforts to make assassination a Federal crime, particularly after the assassination of President McKinley and the attempt on the life of President-elect Franklin D. Roosevelt. In 1902 bills passed both Houses of Congress but failed of enactment when the Senate refused to accept the conference report. A number of bills were introduced immediately following the assassination of President Kennedy.

The Commission recommends to the Congress that it adopt legislation which would:

"Punish the murder or manslaughter of, attempt or conspiracy to murder, kidnaping of and assault upon the President, Vice President, or other officer next in the order of succession to the office of President, the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect, whether or not the act is committed while the victim is in the performance of his official duties or on account of such performance."

Such a statute would cover the President and Vice President or, in the absence of a Vice President, the person next in order of succession. During the period between election and inauguration, the President-elect and Vice-President-elect would also be covered. Restricting the coverage in this way would avoid unnecessary controversy over the inclusion or exclusion of other officials who are in the order of succession or who hold important governmental posts. In addition, the restriction would probably eliminate a need for the requirement which has been urged as necessary for the exercise of Federal power, that the hostile act occur while the victim is engaged in or because of the performance of official duties. The governmental consequences of assassination of one of the specified officials give the United States ample power to act for its own protection. The activities of the victim at the time an assassination occurs and the motive for the assassination bear no relationship to the injury to the United States which follows from the act. This point was ably made in the 1902 debate by Senator George F. Hoar, the sponsor of the Senate bill:

"What this bill means to punish is the crime of interruption of the Government of the United States and the destruction of its security by striking down the life of the person who is actually in the exercise of the executive power, or of such persons as have been constitutionally and lawfully provided to succeed thereto in case of a vacancy. It is important to this country that the interruption shall not take place for an hour."

Enactment of this statute would mean that the investigation of any of the acts covered and of the possibility of a further attempt would be conducted by Federal law enforcement officials, in particular, the FBI with the assistance of the Secret Service. At present, Federal agencies participate only upon the sufferance of the local authorities. While the police work of the Dallas authorities in the early identification and apprehension of Oswald was both efficient and prompt, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, who strongly supports such legislation, testified that the absence of clear Federal jurisdiction over the assassination of President Kennedy led to embarrassment and confusion in the subsequent investigation by Federal and local authorities. In addition, the proposed legislation will insure that any suspects who are arrested will be Federal prisoners, subject to Federal protection from vigilante justice and other threats.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Senator knows that this is one of the recommendations made by the President's Commission which investigated the assassination of the late President Kennedy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed, and it is on the basis of those recommendations that the proposed legislation is now before the Senate.

Mr. COOPER. I know that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

KINGS CANYON NATIONAL PARK, CALIF.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 483, H.R. 903.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 903) to add certain lands to the Kings Canyon National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, H.R. 903, passed by the House and reported to this body by the Interior Committee with a recommendation to pass, authorizes the addition of approximately 5,500 acres of land to the Kings Canyon National Park in California. All of the acreage, with the exception of 80 acres which is private land, is already in the ownership of the Federal Government. The additional 80 acres would cost the Government only $5,100.

The land was not originally included in Kings Canyon Park so that studies could be made to see if the area was suitable for water or power development. The studies have been completed and all are in agreement that it would not be feasible for water storage projects, and there is no local objection to including the area in the park system. As a matter of fact, over half of the property is already being administered by the National Park Service under an agreement with the Forest Service.

The area lies on the South Fork and Middle Fork of the Kings River, is an awe-inspiring vista similar to Yosemite Valley, and is a logical addition to a magnificent park.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 499), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 903 is to enlarge the boundaries of the Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., to include two areas, Cedar Grove (about 2,880 acres) and Tehipite Valley (about 2,740 acres), which are now excluded from it.

NEED

Kings Canyon National Park was established by the act of March 4, 1940 (54 Stat. 41). When its boundaries were fixed at that time, the Cedar Grove and Tehipite Valley areas, though recognized to be of national park stature, were omitted because of the possibility that they might be useful for water storage projects. Studies in the meantime have indicated that such developments shall not be undertaken, and the opposition to inclusion of these two areas in the national park has evaporated.

The inclusion of these two areas in the park will assist in protecting and preserving them and will, in addition, enhance the attractiveness of the park to the public. The Cedar Grove area, now a part of the Sequoia National Forest, provides an entrance to the park. It is already being administered by the National Park Service under a memorandum of understanding with the Forest Service and was visited by nearly 150,000 persons during 1964. The Tehipite Valley area, on the other hand, is a part of the Sierra National Forest. It has been described as "an unaltered wilderness gem, accessible only to hikers and horsemen." It is expected that it will continue to be administered without any development except, possibly, trails.

All but 80 acres of the land within the Cedar Grove and Tehipite Valley areas is already in the ownership of the Government. The estimated cost of acquiring the 80 acres of private land is about $5,100. The committee recommends strongly that the National Park Service acquire these 80 acres and such other inholdings as exist within Kings Canyon National Park at as early a date as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RURAL WATER FACILITIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 484, S. 1766.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1766) to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply and water systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments on page 3, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "40" and insert "50"; in line 5, after the word "area", to insert "or"; in line 10, after the word "living", to strike out the comma and "or (iii) that part of the development cost of a facility constructed by a public body which is in excess of the costs which can be financed within the amount of obligations or levies permitted by law for which alternate revenue financing is not available" and insert ": *Provided, however,* That in determining the ability of a public body to repay, consideration shall be given to any applicable legal debt ceiling or tax or assessment limits and to any other improvements contemplated to be financed within those limits"; on page 4, line 16, after the word "loan", to insert "or grant"; in line 23, after the word "to", where it appears the second time, to strike out "any public body or such other agency" and insert "public bodies or such other agencies"; on page 5, line 2, after the word "which", to strike out "does" and insert "do"; and in line 6, after the word "area", to strike out "not included within the boundaries of any incorporated or unincorporated city, village, or borough" and insert "primarily engaged in or associated with agriculture and not"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The Secretary is also authorized to make or insure loans to associations, including corporations not operated for profit, and public and quasi-public agencies to provide for the application or establishment of soil conservation practices, shifts in land use, the conservation, development, use, and control of water, and the installation or improvement of drainage facilities, and recreational developments, all primarily serving farmers, ranchers, farm tenants, farm laborers, and other rural residents, and to furnish financial assistance or other aid in planning projects for such purposes.

"(2) The Secretary is authorized to make grants aggregating not to exceed $25,000,000 in any fiscal year to such associations to finance specific projects for works for the storage, treatment, purification, or distribution of water in rural areas. The amount of any grant made under the authority of this paragraph shall not exceed the lesser of (i) 50 per centum of the development cost of that portion of the facility necessary to enable the project to serve the area which can be feasibly served by the facility and to adequately serve the reasonable foreseeable growth needs of the area, or (ii) that portion of the development costs which are above the probable ability of the association to repay a loan for such purposes from income or assessments levied at a rate or charge for service within the ability of a majority of the users to accept and pay for such service and maintain a reasonable standard of living: *Provided, however,* That in determining the ability of a public body to repay, consideration shall be given to any applicable legal debt ceiling or tax or assessment limits and to any other improvements contemplated to be financed within those limits.

"(3) No grant shall be made under paragraph 2 of this subsection in connection with any facility unless the Secretary determines that the project (i) will serve a rural area which is not likely to decline in population below that for which the facility was designed, (ii) is designed and constructed so that adequate capacity will be or can be made available to serve the present population of the area to the extent feasible and to serve the reasonable foreseeable growth needs of the area, or (iii) is necessary for orderly community development consistent with a comprehensive community water development plan of the rural area and not inconsistent with any planned development under State, county, or municipal plans approved as official plans by competent authority for the area in which the rural community is located. Until October 1, 1968, the Secretary may make grants prior to the completion of the comprehensive plan, if the preparation of such plan has been undertaken for the area.

"(4) The term 'development cost' means the cost of construction of a facility and the land, easements, and rights-of-way, and water rights necessary to the construction and operation of the facility.

"(5) No loan or grant shall be made under this subsection which would cause the unpaid principal indebtedness of any association under this Act and under the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended, together with the amount of any assistance in the form of a grant to exceed $4,000,000 at any one time.

"(6) The Secretary may make grants aggregating not to exceed $5,000,000 in any fiscal year to public bodies or such other agencies as the Secretary may determine having authority to prepare official comprehensive plans for the development of water systems in rural areas which do not have funds available for immediate undertaking of the preparation of such plan.

"(7) Rural areas, for the purpose of water systems, shall include any area primarily engaged in or associated with agriculture and not having a population in excess of five thousand inhabitants."

Sec. 2. Section 308 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by—

(1) striking out "$200,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$450,000,000";

(2) in clause (a) striking out "except that no agreement shall provide for purchase by the Secretary at a date sooner than three years from the date of the note"; and

(3) striking out clause (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "(b) may retain out of payments by the borrower a charge at a rate specified in the insurance agreement applicable to the loan".

(b) Section 309(e) of such Act is amended by striking out "such portion of the charge collected in connection with the insurance of loans at least equal to a rate of one-half of 1 per centum per annum on the outstanding principal obligations and the remainder of such charge" and inserting in lieu thereof "all or a portion, not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the unpaid principal balance of the loan, of any charge collected in connection with the insurance of loans; and any remainder of any such charge".

(c) Section 309(f)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "$25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$50,000,000".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 500), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF BILL

In general, this bill would provide for grants and increased loans for water facilities in rural agricultural areas. It would also expand the Farmers Home Administration insured loan authority and provide means of making such loans more attractive to investors through better yields and repurchase agreements.

With the committee amendments, it would—

1. Replace the present $500,000 limit on direct loans, and $1 million limit on insured loans, to any association under section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act with a $4 million limit on loans and grants to any association under that section. Loans under that section are made for soil conservation, changes in land use, water use and control, drainage, and recreation, primarily serving farmers, ranchers, and other rural residents. Construction grants are not now authorized, but would be authorized by the bill for water systems;

2. Authorize grants of up to $25 million per fiscal year to associations to finance water facilities serving rural areas. No grant could exceed either 50 percent of the development cost or that part which is in excess of the association's ability to finance. No grants could be made for facilities to serve areas with populations likely to decline below that for which the facility is designed, facilities with inadequate capacities, or facilities which are not needed or are inconsistent with State, county, or municipal development plans;

3. Authorize grants of up to $5 million per fiscal year for assistance in preparation of comprehensive plans for development of water systems in rural areas;

4. Define "rural areas" for the purpose of water systems as areas primarily engaged in or associated with agriculture and not having a population in excess of 5,000;

5. Increase the limit on loans which may be insured under subtitle A of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act (real estate and similar loans) in any one year from $200 million to $450 million;

6. Repeal the provision prohibiting agreements by the Secretary to purchase such insured loans in less than 3 years from the date of the note;

7. Permit the Secretary to fix the insurance charge retained by him from borrowers' payments, and the portion of such charge deposited in the insurance fund (instead of at least one-half of 1 percent of the outstanding principal obligation in each case). The portion of the charge deposited in the fund could not exceed one-half of 1 percent of the outstanding principal balance; and

8. Increase the amount of loans made from the insurance fund which the Secretary can hold at any one time for future sale to $50 million (from $25 million).

NEED FOR THE BILL

All over the United States and particularly in the dairy areas farmers are finding it increasingly difficult to meet the high sanitary requirements for food production with old-fashioned supplies of water.

Not just any water will do these days—it must be clean and chemically acceptable.

Rural communities, some 30,000 of them, need new water systems for food processing, for preparing vegetables for market, for fire protection, for maintaining local industries, and for household uses.

Until this need is met, these communities cannot grow and make their proper contribution to the overall growth of the Nation.

Until this need is met, they cannot absorb their part of the increasing population of our country—estimated at 100 million gain within the next generation.

Many communities where a new water supply would result in increased population and an expanded economy are presently unable to meet the cost by themselves.

The Senate has already approved authority for grants to political bodies to assist in providing water facilities for urban people. Our citizens in rural areas have the same need and are entitled to the same degree of assistance. The Farmers Home Administration has the experience and knowledge necessary to solve the special problems involved in providing water to rural areas.

In its implementation of this law, the committee understands that the Farmers Home Administration will establish guidelines or standards of economic feasibility which will assure the most economical use of the Federal funds available to carry out the purposes of this legislation; and will also establish technical and engineering standards to assure proper construction of the facilities being financed under this law.

The need for the expanded insured loan authority provided by section 2 of the bill is described fully in the report of the Department of Agriculture on S. 709. In addition, the Department has advised the committee that applications for $84,024,395 in farmownership loans were held over from fiscal 1965 because of lack of funds, and that it estimates new applications in fiscal 1966 for farmownership loans which would be made but for lack of funds at $345,975,605, or a total demand for farmownership loans for 1966 of $430 million. It also estimates applications for association loans under section 306 in its present form during fiscal 1966 at $361,071,850, making a total demand by qualified applicants of over $791 million.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is gratifying to know that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has reported favorably S. 1766, the rural water facilities bill. The need for this legislation is known to all of us as evidenced by the number of Senators who have joined in sponsoring the measure. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Vermont, the principal sponsor of S. 1766, for his active leadership and perseverance in moving this vital proposal to fruition. There are approximately 30,000 rural communities in the United States which require new water systems for industry, farming, fire protection, household purposes, and many other uses. This is a critical situation in West Virginia where over 60 percent of the people are rural residents. This is a matter which often receives little recognition due to the fantastic expansion of urban areas—a problem which has commanded considerable attention and effort from public and private agencies. But for continued social and economic progress and our national growth we cannot serve our cities to the exclusion of rural citizens. The requirement is for coordinated development of rural and urban areas. As the Senator from Vermont cogently pointed out when he introduced this legislation, "America must spread out. Instead of continuing the drain from rural America to the urban areas, we should make the conveniences of the cities, provided for with public funds, also available to the smaller cities, the town and rural communities." The unprecedented increase in population cannot be absorbed by our metropolitan areas alone; it will require large cities and rural communities. To meet the needs of an expanding America we must not fail to exploit the growth and development potential of our rural areas. I support S. 1766 and I am confident it will receive early Senate approval.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1766) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Aiken bill was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

DIRKSEN AMENDMENT—ONE MAN—TEN VOTES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a column entitled "Dirksen Amendment: One Man—Ten Votes," which was published in the Washington Post this morning by the eminent and impartial political commentator Mr. Roscoe Drummond.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 23, 1965]

DIRKSEN AMENDMENT: ONE MAN—TEN VOTES

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The proposed Dirksen amendment is visibly losing support in Congress.

Its purpose is to reduce the effect of the Supreme Court decision that State legislatures must be reapportioned roughly on the basis of one man, one vote.

Its method is to amend the Constitution to allow voters in each State, if they so choose, to have one house apportioned on a basis other than population.

Here is what the argument is all about:

When in one county 30,000 people elect 2 State senators, for example, and a neighboring county of 300,000 elects 2 State senators, then the votes of the 30,000 count 10 times as much as the votes of the 300,000.

This was typical throughout the Nation at the time the Supreme Court ruled that such a practice violated the Constitution. Until the Court started reapportionment, a minority of the voters in 40 States elected either one or both houses of their legislatures. In effect, the Court said: "Give the larger counties more representation or the smaller counties less representation."

The Dirksen amendment, which aims to permit the voters of each State to keep one house from being reapportioned on a population basis, seems to many to be self-evidently reasonable. But is it? Let me raise some questions in the interest of reflecting about it.

Under the Constitution every eligible citizen has the right to vote for State officials as well as Federal officials. Should this right be diluted by any action which has the effect of saying that, while every citizen has the equal right to vote, some citizens are not to have the right to an equal vote?

Isn't the right to the vote and the right to cast an equal vote as precious as the right of free speech? Or free assembly? If so, should we amend the Constitution to allow the voters in even one State to deprive a citizen of any of these rights?

Is there any evidence that allowing unequal representation in one house will produce better State government? I haven't seen the advocates of the Dirksen amendment produce any such evidence.

During the past half century, as the flow of population has moved massively into the cities and suburbs, most State legislatures have been dominated by minority representation. The legislators have violated their own State constitutions by refusing to reapportion and have perpetuated such egregious distortions that the Supreme Court had no choice but to provide relief.

How is it that the election of one house on a basis other than population suddenly becomes so meritorious? Where were the advocates of minority representation when the cities were in the minority and the rural population the majority?

It is sometimes suggested that the Federal system is applicable to the States, that just as the States, regardless of size, are equally represented in the U.S. Senate, so should counties regardless of size be equally represented in State senates. Plausible, but one answer is that, while the Federal Government is composed of sovereign States, the States are not composed of sovereign counties.

Fortunately, there will be plenty of time for reflection before the amendment gets to the point of ratification—if it ever does.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the first paragraph of the column states:

> The proposed Dirksen amendment is visibly losing support in Congress.

That is the first paragraph. In the final paragraph the following statement appears:

> Fortunately, there will be plenty of time for reflection before the amendment gets to the point of ratification—if it ever does.

The subject is so important that we await with interest the speech of the minority leader, my junior colleague [Mr. DIRKSEN] in support of his amendment. I hope that there will be very thorough discussion of the issue in the hours and days which are to follow.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. I remind the Senator that I am speaking under the 3-minute limitation rule.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand. I was about to commend the Senator from Illinois for asking unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the column to which he referred. I planned to do the same thing.

The title of the column, it seems to me, is an excellent title for the Dirksen amendment. It is entitled "One Man—Ten Votes." Of course, it could also be called "One Man—One-Tenth of a Vote." I believe that that is an even better title than "The Rotten Borough Amendment."

Mr. DOUGLAS. In some cases it would be one man—a thousand votes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois is correct. I hope that in looking at the article Senators will have an opportunity to read the three vital questions which are asked by Mr. Drummond in the course of his excellent column. To wit:

First. Under the Constitution every eligible citizen has the right to vote for State officials as well as Federal officials. Should this right be diluted by any action which has the effect of saying that, while every citizen has the equal right to vote, some citizens are not to have the right to an equal vote?

Second. Is not the right to the vote and the right to cast an equal vote as precious as the right of free speech? Or free assembly? If so, should we amend the Constitution to allow the voters in even one State to deprive a citizen of any of these rights?

Third. Is there any evidence that allowing unequal representation in one house will produce better State government? I have not seen the advocates of the Dirksen amendment produce such evidence.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 8720. An act to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the Government of Guam;

H.R. 8721. An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the Government of the Virgin Islands; and

H.R. 8775. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S.J. RES. 75

Joint resolution to memorialize the U.S. Congress to reject the pending amendments to the Federal Firearms Act (bill S. 1592, 89th Cong.)

Whereas pending before the Senate of the United States is bill S. 1592, 89th Congress, to amend the Federal Firearms Act; and

Whereas said proposal, while attempting to prevent a recurrence of the unfortunate events which tragically climaxed in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, would have the effect of drastically limiting the privilege of every responsible American citizen to purchase hunting and sporting small arms, which privilege is inherent in the constitutionally guaranteed "right of the people to keep and bear arms"; and

Whereas the sportsmen of Wisconsin have been traditionally opposed to registration of small arms now proposed by S. 1592, 89th Congress; and

Whereas said proposal, by requiring license fees of $500, not only would force many small, independent businesses out of existence, but would also make it impractical for the sportsman to reload cartridges for his own use and that of his friends; and

Whereas said proposal extends Federal regulation into an area in which the States themselves have already taken the initiative of most careful regulation, as witnessed by the provisions in the statutes of this State pertaining to reckless use of weapons under sections 941.20 to 941.24, and pertaining to machineguns under chapter 164: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate, the assembly concurring, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully memorialized to reject bill S. 1592, 89th Congress, in its present form, because said proposal places the enforcement emphasis on availability and possession of arms rather than on the reckless or criminal use of arms; and be it further

Resolved, That duly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, to the Chief Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to every Member of the congressional delegation from Wisconsin.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 251. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 509).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated July 13, 1965, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 2321. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1964 (78 Stat. 751), relating to the satisfaction of scrip and similar rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. JACKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. CLARK):

S. 2322. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for others purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. CLARK when they introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 2323. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to adjudicate a claim to certain lands in Washington County, Ala.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2324. A bill for the relief of Samardzic Boja (also known as Mary Warnick); and

S. 2325. A bill for the relief of Franca Mandarino, Marisa Mandarino and Franco Mandarino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2326. A bill to establish a uniform national policy concerning proprietary rights in inventions made through the expenditure of public funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S.J. Res. 100. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6 in 1965, as "National American Legion Baseball Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

SATISFACTION OF SCRIP AND SIMILAR RIGHTS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, a bill submitted and recommended by the Secretary of the Interior relating to the satisfaction of scrip and similar rights.

In the last Congress legislation was enacted which at that time was believed to be all that was necessary to authorize the Department of the Interior to resolve the troublesome problem relating to scrip. However, the Congress has been advised by the Secretary that additional legislation is necessary to provide for the satisfaction of claims arising out of these particular land rights.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter submitted by the Under Secretary of the Interior be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2321) to amend the act of August 31, 1964 (78 Stat. 751), relating to the satisfaction of scrip and similar rights, introduced by Mr. JACKSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. JACKSON is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., June 11, 1965.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of August 31, 1964 (78 Stat. 751), relating to the satisfaction of scrip and similar rights.

We recommend that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we urgently recommend that it be enacted.

Section 7 of the Taylor Grazing Act provides that the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to examine and classify any public lands which are proper for acquisition in satisfaction of any outstanding scrip rights and to open such lands to selection for disposal in accordance with such classification. The act gives no legislative guidance as to the types or value of land that may be proper for acquisition. Absent such guidance, there has been little progress over the years toward satisfying scrip rights. The main problem has been one of land value. As a general rule scrip holders have selected the highest value lands. The Department has been reluctant to patent such high value lands.

Realizing that the final satisfaction of all outstanding scrip, some of which, issued more than a century ago, was desirable both from the standpoint of the holders of scrip and of the Government, this Department, in 1963, proposed legislation to establish a value standard for lands proper for acquisition in satisfaction of such outstanding scrip. This proposal, as amended, culminated in the enactment of Public Law 88–545 to provide for the satisfaction of claims arising out of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights.

It was the Department's proposal that the land offered in satisfaction of scrip would be "* * * of a value per acre of at least the average price received for land sold under the Small Tract Act during the 3 years prior to the date of appraisals of the offered lands." The average value of small tracts in 1963 was roughly $200 per acre.

Throughout consideration of the proposed legislation this Department constantly urged that a value standard be adopted, preferably a specific maximum dollar figure per acre. We proposed that the act provide that "no property having a value greater than $ ——— per acre of scrip right to be satisfied under this act shall be conveyed by the Secretary under this act."

The Department is now faced with a dilemma in implementing Public Law 88–545. The act sets a minimum value but no maximum value of the lands which may be offered in satisfaction of the scrip. Preliminary appraisals of lands patented for Valentine scrip indicate a minimum value on the order of $1,250 per acre. We are concerned that this figure may be substantially in excess of what Congress was led to believe it would have been under the formula adopted. During consideration of the bill we advised the Congress, upon the limited information then available, that the value of lands patented in satisfaction of the Valentine scrip was about $750 per acre.

The act is being interpreted by scrip holders as placing no upper limit on the value of land for which they may apply. One pending application covers land having a fair market value of approximately $4,000 per acre. In view of the legislative history of Public Law 88–545, we have grave doubts that the Congress contemplated or intended this result. We did not envision any such result. One Valentine scrip holder testified before the House Public Lands Subcommittee indicating payment for Valentine scrip at about $500 per acre.

While we have hesitated heretofore to recommend a specific figure to the Congress, we now believe that a maximum value of $500 per acre, an amount equal to that cited in testimony, would be equitable both to scrip holders and to the Government.

We believe there are two other areas in the 1964 act which require modification. In order to give finality and definiteness, which we think was intended, the determination of average values should be based on the value of lands patented over the period from August 5, 1955, to August 31, 1964, the date of the enactment of Public Law 88–545. The alternative, of course, would be a moving average value, which would tend to creep upward in view of the statutory floor. Neither the law nor the committee reports advert to a cutoff date. Our suggested amendments include, therefore, a cutoff so that the value of lands patented under the 1964 law will not continually change the minimum standard. An appropriate amendment is suggested in the proposed bill.

Another question which has arisen is a possible interpretation of the law that does not permit a scrip holder, who may wish to acquire a particular piece of land, to do so if its value is below the minimum value standard. There may well be situations where it may be to the advantage of a scrip holder to obtain a piece of land of a value less than the minimum value standard. For example, a scrip holder seeking to consolidate his landholdings may be highly desirous of acquiring a specific tract despite the fact that such tract has a value which is less than the minimum value standard. We think that scrip holders should be permitted to acquire such tracts and have included a proposed amendment to the effect.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, Jr.,
Under Secretary of the Interior.

(Enclosure.)

S. 2321

A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1964 (78 Stat. 751), relating to the satisfaction of scrip and similar rights

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of August 31, 1964 (78 Stat. 751), an Act "To provide for the satisfaction of claims arising out of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights," is amended by—

(a) Inserting in section 2 between the period following "designate" and "The Secretary" the following: "Such lands may have a value less than the average fair market value prescribed in section 3 of this Act."

(b) Deleting in sections 3(a) and 4 the phrase "since August 5, 1955" and substituting therefor "from August 5, 1955, to and including August 31, 1964".

(c) Adding thereto a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 7. Notwithstanding any provision of this Act to the contrary, no public lands having a value in excess of $ ——— per acre shall be patented under this Act in satisfaction of any claim or holding recorded under the Act of August 5, 1955 (69 Stat. 534, 535), and no payment in cash made under this Act shall exceed $ ——— per acre for any such claim or holding."

THE GOVERNMENT PATENT POLICY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce at this time, for appropriate reference, a bill dealing with the Government patent policy.

This bill is urged by the American Bar Association and the American Patent Law Association. It is very similar to the flexible approach taken by S. 1809, introduced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], and, I believe, differs on only two significant points. First, it differs on the granting of exclusive licenses by the Government. S. 1809 authorizes the grant of exclusive licenses by the Government. When we consider all of the research in this country that is Government sponsored, and the possibility that most inventions might be affected by the bill, the implications on Government domination and control of private industry and of the selection of favorite manufacturers to receive licenses, which are implicit in such a provision are manifest.

On the other hand, the bill urged by the American Bar Association and the American Patent Law Association provides in effect for dedication to the public of the right in situations where private ownership of such a right is inconsistent with the public interest.

Turning to the second point, S. 1809 requires Government ownership of all inventions made in Government approved contracts "for exploration into fields which directly concern the public health, welfare or safety." These categories are so broadly defined that they might be used by agencies in many more situations than the public interest requires. The bar-sponsored bill avoids such language because almost all inventions made in Government-sponsored research contracts could be considered to fall into one or another of these categories. The bill also provides for compulsory licensing of an invention if the developer does not satisfy the public demand and so prevents any possible withholding of such inventions from the public that might result from private ownership.

I hope the provisions of this bill will be carefully considered as the committee deliberates, in its wisdom, to devise the most appropriate and proper way to deal with this difficult problem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2326) to establish a uniform national policy concerning proprietary rights in inventions made through the expenditure of public funds, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Dirksen, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL AMERICAN LEGION BASEBALL WEEK

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a funny thing happened to my last Senate joint resolution on its way to the Senate.

In view of the fact that Senate Joint Resolution 66 has been borrowed by the distinguished minority leader I am reintroducing a joint resolution to honor the 40th anniversary of the American Legion baseball program by authorizing and requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the period from August 31 through September 6, 1965, as National American Legion Baseball Week and inviting the Governors of the several States to issue similar proclamations.

When I introduced this joint resolution originally on March 25 I pointed out that we South Dakotans are proud of the fact that Milbank, S. Dak., is the birthplace of American Legion junior baseball and that this year, to commemorate the inception of this worthy program, the annual American Legion National Championship World Series will be held in Aberdeen, S. Dak., during the week beginning August 31.

Because this program is a nationwide event and because it has benefited young Americans all these years, I think it is fitting that American Legion Junior Baseball Week should be a national event. I was gratified to hear, in yesterday's debate, that so many of my colleagues, including the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], share this view. I am sure that their support will be appreciated when this renumbered resolution reaches the Senate floor again. I am hopeful, of course, that it will travel a little more direct route the second time around.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 100) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6 in 1965, as National American Legion Baseball Week, introduced by Mr. Mundt, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BEFORE THE POSTAL AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Affairs of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I wish to announce that public hearings will be held to take testimony on H.R. 2035 at 10 a.m., Thursday, July 29, in room 6202 of the New Senate Office Building.

This legislation would provide for cost-of-living adjustments for star route contractors. Anyone wishing to testify may arrange to do so by calling 225-5451.

CHICAGO BIBLE SOCIETY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on September 19, 1965, the Chicago Bible Society, with the cooperation of the membership of all the churches, will distribute some 1,100,000 copies of the Gospel of Mark to each home in Chicago as a special feature of its 125th birthday.

It was just 173 years ago that our Founding Fathers in Congress, September 12, 1782, wholeheartedly approved and authorized the printing of the first Bible published in English in America. This was the first and only time that Congress ever recommended such a printing.

That Bible, now known as the Aitken Bible, was printed in 1782 by Robert Aitken, and is being carefully preserved by the Chicago Bible Society in its headquarters at 310 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago. This Bible, plus many other valuable Bibles, will be shown the public at a September 19 open house, and I am sure that many Chicago students and researchers of the Bibles, and I hope Members of Congress in the area at that time, will visit the Chicago Bible Society for a look at the special exhibit. It will be inspiring.

The purpose of the Chicago Bible Society, according to its executive secretary, Dr. Melvin E. Soltau, and the president of its board of managers, Dr. K. Everett Munson, in distributing copies of the Gospel of Mark to each home is to reawaken an interest in the Bible in homes where the Bible is a stranger or the Bible as the source of answer to human problems might have been forgotten.

Since 1940, the Chicago Bible Society has distributed an estimated 15 million Bibles, Testaments, or portions of the Scriptures in more than 70 languages with at least half of this total freely given to the sick, the aged, the poor, the outcasts, prisoners, fighting men, fallen women, and displaced persons from many lands.

I am so impressed and moved by the great inspiration behind this effort in Chicago that I ask unanimous consent that this citation be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Chicago Bible Society

Whereas on September 12, 1782, "the United States in Congress assembled highly approved the pious and laudable undertaking of Mr. Aitken, as subservient to the interest of religion, as well as an instance of the progress of arts in this country, and being satisfied from the above report of his care and accuracy in the execution of the work, they recommend this edition of the Bible to the inhabitants of the United States, and hereby authorize him to publish this recommendation in the manner he shall think proper"; and

Whereas the Chicago Bible Society retains this original copy of the Robert Aitken Bible, and encourages its recognition to the peoples of the United States; and

Whereas the Chicago Bible Society with the cooperation of the membership of all religious denominations making effort on September 19, 1965, to encourage the ownership of the Bible in every home in Chicago as its 125th birthday celebration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved in the U.S. Congress on this —— day of July 1965, That we reaffirm our impression of Mr. Aitken's work in the publication of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and join in solemn tribute to the spiritual significance of the occasion, and that this reaffirmation be a part of our official record.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I understand that a nomination is at the desk. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

A. Ross Eckler, of New York, to be Director of the Census; and 260 postmaster nominations.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Arthur J. Goldberg, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance:

Theodore Tannenwald, Jr., of New York, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States; and

Mrs. Penelope Hartland Thunberg, of Maryland, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination which is at the desk.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Arthur J. Goldberg to be the representative of the United States to the United Nations with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. PATENT OFFICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have just learned that two nominations for the U.S. Patent Office are on the Executive Calendar. I ask that those nominations be considered at this time, as well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gerald D. O'Brien, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Commissioner of Patents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard A. Wahl, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Commissioner of Patents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nominations.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

APPOINTMENT OF ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the whole country is greatly pleased by the nomination of a distinguished American and my fellow Illinoisan, Arthur Goldberg, as U.S. representative to the United Nations. It has been my privilege to have known Mr. Goldberg for 35 years. I have always regarded him as one of the most brilliant, conscientious, energetic, and resourceful men with whom I have ever had the good fortune to become intimately acquainted. He had a distinguished legal career before he was appointed Secretary of Labor by President Kennedy. In the brief period in which he served in that office, he conducted an energetic program of internal reorganization and he was extremely useful in mediating difficult strikes and industrial disputes, the solutions of which were seemingly impossible.

During his tenure as a member of the Supreme Court, Justice Goldberg wrote opinions of great brilliance and deep insight. It is somewhat unusual for a Justice of the Supreme Court to resign; but I remember that Senator James F. Byrnes, after serving a long term in this body and having been appointed to the Supreme Court, resigned that position to become Director of War Mobilization.

Mr. Goldberg is making a financial sacrifice in stepping out of the Court and into the United Nations. But this is a time of great strain, and America needs an eloquent, moving voice to succeed the voice of Adlai Stevenson, another great Illinoisan who served with much honor and distinction in the United Nations. Mr. Goldberg will represent fully, brilliantly, and with all his mind and soul the interests of the United States; but he will also work for world peace and world freedom. I believe he will also make an especial appeal to the new nations of Asia and Africa, which are somewhat resentful of the older established nations of the West, but which exercise, under the unit system of voting, a strong power in the Assembly of the United Nations. Mr. Goldberg will have a reconciling influence upon those countries and will be able to interpret the true ideals of this country perhaps more effectively than other persons might be able to do.

The position of an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States is one of the most important in the whole country. I regard it as being more important than membership in the Senate, membership in the Cabinet, or membership in the House of Representatives. There will be a great gap on the Supreme Court, a gap which we hope and believe the President will fill worthily. But we are sending our very best to the United Nations. We wish Mr. Goldberg well in his new post. The country is fortunate in having his services, and the Nation is the gainer by reason of his assuming his new duties.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I commend President Johnson upon his appointment of Arthur Goldberg to be U.S. representative to the United Nations. It is an admirable choice. Ambassador Goldberg will be taking this position at a difficult time—a time of crisis for the United Nations, a time of crisis for the United States, and a time of crisis for the whole world. But I am satisfied that with his intelligence, his ability, and his energy, this may be the beginning of a new and better day for the United Nations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Vermont and the distinguished Senator from Illinois in their statements about the confirmation by the Senate of the nomination by President Johnson of former Supreme Court Justice Goldberg, and to say that I believe a better choice could not have been made.

I would express the hope, however, that Ambassador Goldberg—because that is what he is now—will be allowed a certain degree of discretion in the responsibilities which he will assume, because it is a most difficult position that he will fill. It will call for all his skills—and he has them in abundance. But I have no doubt that he will represent the United States with dedication, vigor, honesty, and integrity. I have no doubt that the other members of the United Nations, regardless of the part of the world from which they come, will look upon Arthur Goldberg with respect and will honor him for the work which he will do.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Montana, the majority leader, has aptly expressed what we all think of Arthur Goldberg. I know that he has two good feet and will stand on them.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I, too, join my colleagues in commendation of the appointment of former Supreme Court Justice Goldberg to be U.S. representative to the United Nations. The country is aware of his fine intellectual qualities, his capacity for work and his ability and patience in negotiations.

But he has other qualities which will make him an effective ambassador and representative of this country. He has an awareness of issues, he has sensitivity, and he has human qualities that are felt and understood in the United Nations.

Long ago, I had the honor to serve with the majority leader in the United Nations. I believe it would be agreed that there is a certain communication between the Chief Executive of the United States, the State Department, and the representative in the United Nations. That is necessary, because the Ambassador must represent the interests and the policy of the United States. But another type of communication also is necessary. The Ambassador must interpret to the Secretary of State and to the President the mood or interest which he has observed and learned as the Representative of our country there.

I believe that the new administrator will be able to do that in a very effective way. I am very glad that the has been named.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Holland in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949 AND THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938 TO TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION FLOODS AND OTHER NATURAL DISASTERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 485, H.R. 8620.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 8620) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to take into consideration floods and other natural disasters in reference to the feed grains, cotton, and wheat programs for 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 8620) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 502), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to permit farmers in disaster areas to comply with the technical requirements of acreage reduction agreements, if floods or other natural disasters prevent them from planting the crops involved, and thus to be eligible for the benefits to which they are entitled under such agreements.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Provisions of law relating to acreage reduction programs for cotton, wheat, and feed grains, in effect for 1965, provide that when a farmer agrees to reduce his plantings of any of these commodities below his acreage allotment or base acreage, he shall be entitled to certain benefits, including certain payment-in-kind or certificates on the normal production of the reduced acreage he "planted for harvest" in 1965.

If a farmer plants his permitted acreage for harvest in 1965 under any of these agreements and, after he has planted his acreage, a flood or other natural disaster destroys the crop, he is eligible for the benefits called for under his contract, including the payment-in-kind or certificates for the normal production from his permitted acreage, even though the crop may be totally destroyed and he may harvest nothing from such acreage.

The only effect of this bill is to provide that if the natural disaster occurs before the farmer has planted his crop so that he is prevented from planting at the appropriate time, instead of occurring after the ground has been planted, he will be considered as having planted the crop for purposes of the contract entered into with the Government.

In such cases, the Government will be getting all that it contracted for, and even more, for instead of reducing his crop the farmers affected by this bill will harvest no crop whatever in that particular commodity for 1965 and will not be permitted to plant on the acreage any other price-supported crop.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there have been rumors that some kind of filibuster is taking place. I want to make it clear that to the extent that an issue is being discussed before the Senate in depth, there is no intention on the part of anyone on our side, that I know of, to delay any legislation. No one associated with us, that I know of, wants to delay any bill, and I stress the word, any, any bill, any time on any subject. We want to expedite, to help, to accelerate the President's program.

If the leadership wishes to call a measure up at any time, we shall be delighted to have the measure considered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. Any measure that is called up will have the clearance of the joint leadership and will receive the approval of every Senator interested before action is taken.

TWO-YEAR EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS PERMITTING LEASE OF TOBACCO ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 486, Senate bill 1271.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1271) to amend the Agricultural Readjustment Act of 1938 to extend for 2 additional years the provisions permitting the lease of tobacco acreage allotments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment in line 4, after "(7 U.S.C.", to strike out "1314(a)" and insert "1314b (a))"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first sentence of section 316(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1314b(a)) is amended by changing "and 1965" to read "1965, 1966, and 1967".

(b) The last sentence of section 316(a) of such Act is amended by changing "or 1965" to read ", 1965, 1966, or 1967".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 503), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to authorize, for 2 additional years, the transfer, by lease, of tobacco acreage allotments from one farm to another within the same county. The law does not apply to burley tobacco or cigar filler and cigar binder, types 42, 43, 44, 53, 54, and 55. It is not applicable to Maryland (type 32) tobacco unless at least 75 percent of the allotment for the lessor farm has been planted on that farm during each of the preceding 2 years.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

In many areas, tobacco acreage allotments have become so small that producers holding such allotments frequently, in any particular year, neglect to plant their allotment because it is an uneconomic operation, or for other reasons.

For the crop years 1966 and 1967 only, this bill would authorize the holders or such small allotments to transfer their allotments to another tobacco producer in the same county if they choose to do so.

EXTENSION FOR 2 YEARS THE DEFINITION OF "PEANUTS" WHICH IS NOW IN EFFECT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar order No. 487, Senate bill 1270.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1270) to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last paragraph of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes", approved August 13, 1957 (7 U.S.C. 1359 note), is amended by changing "and 1965" to read "1965, 1966, and 1967".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 504), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill extends for 2 years the present exemption of peanuts for boiling from marketing quotas. The present exemption, which has been in effect since 1957, would otherwise expire with the 1965 crop.

The report from the Department of Agriculture favoring this legislation is attached.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2 OF INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT ACT OF 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 488, Senate bill 2294.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 2294) to amend section 2 of the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2294

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended to change "July 31, 1965" in the first sentence to read "July 31, 1966".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 505), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

This bill would extend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949 to cover the 1-year extension of the International Wheat Agreement heretofore approved by the Senate.

The letter of the Department of Agriculture requesting enactment of this bill is attached.

Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C., July 7, 1965.
Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There is transmitted herewith for consideration by the Congress draft legislation which would amend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949, as amended, to extend the authority contained in the act to implement the protocol for the extension of the International Wheat Agreement, 1962. Senate gave its advice and consent to the ratification of the protocol on June 15, 1965.

Enactment by the Congress of this proposed legislation is recommended. Under its provisions certain action is authorized which would continue to secure the benefits and discharge the obligations of the United States under the agreement, upon the expected entry into force of the protocol with respect to the operational aspects of the agreement, on August 1, 1965, and during the ensuing 12 months.

The price range and the obligations of exporting or importing member countries as contained in the International Wheat Agreement, 1962, are not altered by the protocol—only the expiration date is extended to July 31, 1966. The agreement covers trade in wheat and wheat-flour between member exporting and importing countries, but only "commercial transactions." As defined in the agreement, this excludes such exports as those pursuant to Public Law 480, bilateral barter, and credit sales if the terms do not conform with terms prevailing commercially.

The International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949, as amended, authorizes the President, acting through the Commodity Credit Corporation, to make available or cause to be made available, such quantities of wheat and wheat-flour and at such prices as are necessary to exercise the rights, obtain the benefits, and fulfill the obligations of the United States and to take certain other action necessary in the implementation of the agreement. Pursuant to this authority the Commodity Credit Corporation has made wheat available by making export payments on wheat and wheat-flour to commercial exporters, and by the sale to commercial exporters of wheat acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation under its price support program; all in connection with commercial exports to importing countries which are members of the wheat agreement. All transactions are reported to the International Wheat Council for recording.

The International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949, as amended, also authorizes to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to make payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation of its estimated or actual net costs of carrying out its functions under the act in connection with the International Wheat Agreement, 1962. The draft legislation would have the effect of making this existing provision for the payment of net costs similarly applicable to the period of extension inasmuch as Article I of the protocol continues the International Wheat Agreement, 1962, in force until July 31, 1966.

The President's budget for the fiscal year 1966 assumes that the protocol extension will enter into force, and a proposed appropriation of $27,544,000 is included for this purpose in the budget. The appropriation requested is $54,294,000 less than the 1965 appropriations, primarily because the latter includes a supplemental appropriation of $50 million for prior year costs.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

A similar letter is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,
Orville L. Freeman,
Secretary.

PROVISION TO FACILITATE THE WORK OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 489, H.R. 5508.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 5508) to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 506), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to make several relatively minor changes in the laws relating to the administration of the Department of Agriculture. Each section of the bill deals with a separate administrative action and each section is explained in detail in the summary and justification accompanying the executive communication, which appears later in this report.

SHORT EXPLANATION

This bill, which was requested by the Department of Agriculture, makes a number of changes in laws relating to the administration of that Department. It would—

1. Authorize the Department to erect structures on land not owned by the Government if it has the right to use the land for the estimated life of, or need for, the structures and the right to remove the structures thereafter; and authorize the Department to lease lands for such purposes;

2. Authorize grants for research to State agricultural experiment stations and others to implement the programs of the Department (thereby expanding the existing authority for basic research grants and extending it to applied research; existing authority, Public Law 85-934, is restricted to grants to nonprofit institutions of higher learning or where primary purpose is research);

3. Authorize the Department to purchase insurance coverage on its vehicles in foreign countries (thereby extending authority now applicable to the Foreign Agricultural Service, and providing protection for the employees operating such vehicles);

4. Authorize assignment of agricultural attachés and related personnel for duty in the continental United States, without regard to the civil service laws and without reduction in grade for not more than 3 years;

5. Authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to release for other purposes funds set aside for agricultural market development under section 104(a) of Public Law 480, where 5 percent of the proceeds is larger than the

amount needed for the market development program;

6. Permit employees of the Department, while temporarily involved in a transfer to a State activity under the act of August 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 934), to preserve their health benefits in the same manner as benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Group Life Insurance Act are retained;

7. Permit advances to the Department's working capital fund by agencies of the Department for whom central services are furnished through use of the fund;

8. Authorize the Department of Agriculture to make appropriate adjustments between funds available to any agency of the Department where more than one fund is available for the same purpose; and

9. Repeal of a provision prohibiting, except in specified cases, the shipment of grain from public grain warehouses to other warehouse without cancellation of warehouse receipts (to avoid conflict with other laws regulating warehousemen).

SPRUCE KNOB-SENECA ROCKS NATIONAL RECREATIONAL AREA, W. VA.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 490, Senate bill 7.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 7) to provide for the establishment of the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in the State of West Virginia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments on page 2, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "not to exceed in the aggregate one hundred thousand acres in such unit or units as he may determine, to include but not be limited to Spruce Knob, Smoke Holes, and Seneca Rocks, and lying primarily in the drainage of the south branch of the Potomac River" and in lieu thereof to insert "comprised of the area including Spruce Knob, Smoke Holes, and Seneca Rocks, and lying primarily in the drainage of the South Branch of the Potomac River, the boundaries of which shall be those shown on the map entitled 'Proposed Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area', dated March 1965, which is on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture"; in line 25, after the word "Act.", to insert "For the purpose of section 6 of the Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 897, 903), the boundaries of the Monongahela National Forest, as designated by the Secretary pursuant to section 2 of this Act, shall be treated as if they were the boundaries of that forest on January 1, 1965"; on page 4, line 17, after word "of", to strike out "renewable"; and after line 20, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws. The Secretary may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment, and shall issue regulations after consultation with the Department of Natural Resources of the State of West Virginia.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to provide for the public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment thereof by the people of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in the State of West Virginia.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the "Secretary") shall—

(1) designate as soon as practicable after this Act takes effect the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area within and adjacent to, and as a part of, the Monongahela National Forest in West Virginia comprised of the area including Spruce Knob, Smoke Holes, and Seneca Rocks, and lying primarily in the drainage of the South Branch of the Potomac River, the boundaries of which shall be those shown on the map entitled "Proposed Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area", dated March 1965, which is on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; and

(2) publish notice of the designation in the Federal Register, together with a map showing the boundaries of the recreation area.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall acquire by purchase with donated or appropriated funds, by gift, exchange, condemnation, transfer from any Federal agency, or otherwise, such lands, waters, or interests therein within the boundaries of the recreation area as he determines to be needed or desirable for the purposes of this Act. For the purpose of section 6 of the Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 897, 903), the boundaries of the Monongahela National Forest, as designated by the Secretary pursuant to section 2 of this Act, shall be treated as if they were the boundaries of that forest on January 1, 1965. Lands, waters, or interests therein owned by the State of West Virginia or any political subdivision of that State may be acquired only with the concurrence of such owner.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Federal property located within the boundaries of the recreation area may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for use by him in implementing the purposes of this Act.

(c) In exercising his authority to acquire lands by exchange the Secretary may accept title to non-Federal property within the recreation area and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property in the State of West Virginia under his jurisdiction.

SEC. 4. (a) After the Secretary acquires an acreage within the area designated pursuant to paragraph (1) of section 2 of this Act that is in his opinion efficiently administrable to carry out the purposes of this Act, he shall institute an accelerated program of development of facilities for outdoor recreation. Said facilities shall be so devised to take advantage of the topography and geographical location of the lands in relation to the growing recreation needs of the people of the United States.

(b) The Secretary may cooperate with all Federal and State authorities and agencies that have programs which will hasten completion of the recreation area and render services which will aid him in evaluating and effectuating the establishment of adequate summer and winter outdoor recreation facilities.

SEC. 5. The administration, protection, and development of the recreation area shall be by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to national forests, in such manner as in his judgment will best provide for (1) public outdoor recreation benefits; (2) conservation of scenic, scientific, historic, and other values contributing to public enjoyment; and (3) such management, utilization, and disposal of natural resources as in his judgment will promote, or is compatible with, and does not significantly impair the purposes for which the recreation area is established.

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws. The Secretary may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment, and shall issue regulations after consultation with the Department of Natural Resources of the State of West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to express my gratitude to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Senator ELLENDER, and to the ranking minority member of that committee, Senator AIKEN, and to the other members of that committee, for reporting S. 7 on Wednesday. I also wish to express my gratitude to the Senator from Mississippi, Senator EASTLAND, chairman of the subcommittee which handled this bill. Upon several occasions I wrote to these Senators urging favorable consideration of the bill, and I also discussed the measure personally with them from time to time. I also thank the majority leader, with whom I talked yesterday, and the minority leader for their prompt clearance of this bill for floor action.

The advancement of this bill to the voting stage culminates an effort which goes back to March 7, 1963, when I introduced a similar bill, S. 1022, for myself and my esteemed colleague, Senator RANDOLPH, to provide for the establishment of the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in the State of West Virginia. The bill was not acted upon in the 88th Congress and, consequently, I reintroduced it in behalf of Senator RANDOLPH and myself on January 6, 1965, at the beginning of the 89th Congress. Earlier this year, the senior Senator from Minnesota, Senator McCARTHY, very graciously conducted a hearing on the measure, at which time Senator RANDOLPH and I presented testimony in behalf of the bill. Other supporting testimony was submitted by the Honorable William McCoy, Jr., member of the West Virginia House of Delegates, from Pendleton County; the Honorable George I. Sponaugle, prosecuting attorney of Pendleton County; Mr. Crede Sions, representing the Izaak Walton League of America, Petersburg, W. Va.;

and Mr. Robert R. Bowers, West Virginia Department of Commerce, who represented our State's Governor, Hulett C. Smith. Supporting letters and memoranda were presented for inclusion in the hearings record from the Honorable Hans McCourt and the Honorable Carl Gainer, members of the West Virginia Senate. All of the testimony was helpful, and Senator RANDOLPH and I are most grateful to all of these persons for the assistance they gave.

It should also be stated that President Johnson has indicated his strong support for the establishment of the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in West Virginia.

The proposed recreation area is located on the upper reaches of the Potomac River, and it is to encompass 100,000 acres of land, of which 74,000 acres lie within the Seneca Rocks perimeter and 26,000 acres are adjacent to Spruce Knob. Portions of these lands are already a part of the Monongahela National Forest, and others will be acquired by the Federal Government as the national recreation area is developed. Present plans are for this development during the first 5 years so that provision is made for sufficient basic recreation facilities and principal scenic access roads to accommodate 1 million visitors annually. Subsequently, facilities would be expanded to meet the demands of increasing visitations estimated to reach a capacity of 5 million annually prior to the year 2000.

But all the usages of the area would not be touristic and recreational in orientation. Scenic and/or conservation easements would be used to the greatest extent possible to facilitate private ownership, management, and utilization of resources and lands compatible with the national recreation area. As an example, scenic strips would be established and maintained along roads and trails, but present uses of the lands for farming and grazing, the production and harvesting of timber, the usage of private lands for public commercial services, and the granting of public hunting and fishing rights would be continued in a manner consistent with applicable Government programs.

The scenery in the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks part of the Allegheny Mountains is superb, and there are limitless opportunities for hiking, for camping and picnicking, for riding and touring, and for restful enjoyment of the forest and pastoral scenes. Over 27 million people live within a 150-mile radius of this area. Over 60 million people live within a 300-mile radius. The development of this recreational area is an extension of the constructive purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act, and the natural linking of the recreational lands through new highways and continued improvement of present highways and access roads will offer inspiration, health, and spiritual renewal to those residents of the nearby urban areas and will provide increased economic opportunities for those residents of the area who have not yet been granted the means to develop the assets of their Appalachian locale.

As I stated in bringing this bill to the Senate for action, I believe that the establishment of the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area is in the long-term interest of all of the people of the United States. It will conserve and develop the natural beauty of a lovely sector of our country. It will conserve and develop and make available to increasing numbers of people opportunities for healthful and enjoyable outdoor recreation. It will help conserve our natural resources so that part of our legacy to our Nation will be, not ugliness and depletion, but enhanced beauty and wise conservation of nature's vital and irreplaceable resources.

In years to come, visitors from the States and the world over will come to West Virginia to enjoy the scenic beauty that abounds in the area surrounding Spruce Knob. By acting today to preserve this area, the Senate will guarantee for these generations the joy that comes from seeing nature at its finest.

I wish to thank my colleague, Senator RANDOLPH, for having joined with me in support of this legislation. We believe that Senate passage of the bill today will make possible its prompt enactment by the House of Representatives and its signature into law by President Johnson before this session ends. I have talked with Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS, of the Second Congressional District of West Virginia, in which the recreation area will be located, and he is already enthusiastically pressing for action in the other body, he having introduced a similar bill there.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, for each of us concerned with the preservation, utilization, and development of this Nation's vast potentials in recreational resources, this is a decisive time. The complexity and rapidity in modern living, coupled with the tensions of world events, create new problems daily for mankind. Not merely change, but the widening scope of change, is a fact of the sixties.

Expanding population is a valid example of a problem which is accelerating at an ever-increasing rate. Since 1940 the population of the earth has grown from approximately 2.5 billion to approximately 3.2 billion. This 700 million increase, in 25 years, exceeds the total estimated population of the world in the year 1800.

In the United States we have a substantial rate of population growth, with our 193 million inhabitants expected to increase to 225 million by 1975; then to about 322 million in the year 2000, and by 2050 we could reach 700 million. The implications of such growth are obvious. Need for citizen services and facilities also will increase by geometric progression. The demand will be tremendous.

Consider yet another symptom of our time—the rapid migration of population from rural areas to an urban or metropolitan environment.

Approximately 7 out of 10 Americans now live in areas designated by the Bureau of the Census as metropolitan. These areas, which constitute less than 10 percent of our total land, accounted for 84 percent of the population increase between 1950 and 1960. In 50 years the United States has changed from a predominantly rural and agrarian nation to one in which nearly three-quarters of our people live in urban communities, and are employed in industry, trade, or specialized services.

The 1960 census revealed that we are 70 percent city dwellers. By 1980, according to forecasts by the Urban Land Institute, our population will be nearly four-fifths urban. The institute further predicts that metropolitan areas will absorb all of the 70 million population growth in the decade 1970–80.

These revealing statistics make it clear that more and more Americans will be traveling—seeking the beauty and inspiration of the out of doors, and the recreational opportunity it can provide.

Yet another consideration, equal in importance to increased population and urbanization, is the fact that added prosperity and mobility, and the increase in available leisure time will influence greater utilization of available recreational facilities. Wages and earnings are up; daily hours and the workweek are growing shorter; automobiles are the property of nearly every family. In large numbers the outdoor enthusiasts and serious campers will seek the beauty and serenity of the American wilderness; families will gather at areas where resource development has been carried forward, and where attractive facilities have been constructed. National, regional, State, county, and city parks—all will feel the impact of millions of recreation seekers.

In the Mountain State of West Virginia more attention is being focused on the development of the park system. Literature most requested of our office here in Washington describes the beauties of our parks and public forests, and the attractions which they offer.

I use this personal reference as an example. But it is clear that utilization of public recreational facilities is skyrocketing everywhere, and that the time for imaginative action is at hand.

In response to the need, President Johnson has delivered to Congress a comprehensive and imaginative message on natural beauty. He has urged every citizen to participate in creating a "new conservation" to meet the converging problems of our modern society.

In his message, the President said:

> Our conservation must be not just the classic conservation of protection and development, but a creative conservation of restoration and innovation. Its concern is not with nature alone, but with the total relation between man and the world around him. Its object is not just man's welfare but the dignity of man's spirit.

This is the new conservation.

It draws into sharp focus what we must do if we are to preserve the heritage of a beautiful America for the generations following us. It is the first such message of this thrust and scope presented by a President, and it should serve to stimulate our action on the needs and problems we now face and will face.

This exciting approach to conservation follows closely achievements of the 88th Congress. That Congress passed more than 30 important conservation bills, including the land and water conservation fund, the Wilderness Act, and the Outdoor Recreation Act. In the last 2 years we established continental America's first new national park in 17 years, 23 new national park areas, 4 new national seashores, and a national riverway.

The establishment of the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area is a logical and needed supplement to this effort. The sheer beauty and beckoning recreational potentials of the Seneca Rocks and Spruce Knob region have attracted and inspired generations of West Virginians and their neighbors. It is fitting that these natural wonders in Pendleton and other counties should be added to the fund of resources set aside to promote the physical and spiritual fulfillment of all Americans.

The location of West Virginia is an additional advantage in creating the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area. The National Park Service has stated:

> West Virginia's recreation resources are so attractive that, if properly preserved and developed, they will serve not only the population of that State but also many millions of persons from adjacent States.

These words are particularly thought-provoking when one considers that West Virginia is within 500 miles of four of the five major markets in America—New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Detroit—and within reasonable traveling distance of Washington, D.C., Baltimore, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Columbus, Cincinnati, Louisville, Knoxville, Charlotte, and Richmond. The tourism potential for West Virginia, with its proximity to such centers of population, is extensive, and it is a potential which must be developed in the public interest.

And so, Mr. President, I wholeheartedly endorse S. 7, and express the conviction that its ultimate passage by Congress will result in significant long-range benefits for the Nation and our people. The Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area should be an important part of informed congressional response to the pressing need for public recreational capability and the safeguarding of our precious natural heritage and resources. I am gratified to have had the opportunity to have joined with my colleague, Senator Robert C. Byrd, who introduced the legislation for us in the 88th Congress, and again this year on January 6, 1965. I commend his perception, his diligence, and his devotion to the best interests of our State and to the conservation and recreation needs of our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 507), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This bill directs the Secretary of Agriculture to establish the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in the State of West Virginia.

The area would consist of about 100,000 acres within and adjacent to, and which would be part of, the Monongahela National Forest. It would include Spruce Knob, Smoke Holes, and Seneca Rocks.

The Secretary would be authorized to acquire lands within the area, provide outdoor recreation facilities, and administer the area in accordance with the laws applicable to national forests so as best to provide for (1) public outdoor recreation benefits, (2) conservation of scenic, scientific, historic, and other values contributing to public enjoyment, and (3) such management, utilization, and disposal of natural resources as is compatible with recreational purposes.

The area is one of scenic beauty and high recreational value. Scenic attractions include mountains, valleys, caverns, and spectacular rock outcrops. Recreational possibilities include scenic drives, camping and picnicking, white water canoeing, hiking, rock climbing, horseback riding, hunting, fishing, cave exploring, and winter sports. Twenty-seven million people live within 150 miles of it, and 60 million people live within 300 miles. It is an area of high unemployment, economically depressed, and part of Appalachia. The Forest Service estimates that by 1970 annual use of the area will amount to 1 million visitor-days and will bring $6.5 to $10 million to the area. Thirty-nine percent of the lands are now in Government ownership.

COMMITTEE DELIBERATIONS

The committee's Subcommittee on Soil Conservation and Forestry held hearings in April on this bill, and the hearings have been printed. All witnesses favored enactment. Witnesses included the bill's sponsors, the Forest Service, the Governor and other officials of West Virginia, local residents, the Izaak Walton League, the National Wildlife Federation, and the American Automobile Association. Following the hearings and favorable report by the subcommittee, the committee considered the bill and raised several questions which were submitted to the Department of Agriculture and answered as follows:

"Question. How many of the acres to be acquired are outside the forest boundaries, as of January 1, 1965?

"Answer. 4,000 acres are outside the present Monongahela National Forest boundary.

"Proposed acquisitions: Fee simple, 500 acres.

"Scenic or conservation easements for most of remaining 3,500 acres.

"The land and water conservation fund is not now available to acquire these needed lands and easements, but provisions contained in Department's recommended amendment would extend such authority to them.

"Question. How much is total cost of the project? Acquisition-development.

"Answer. The projected costs are as follows:

"Acquisition costs:	
1st 5 years	$1, 200, 000
Subsequent to 1st 5 years	2, 300, 000
Total	3, 500, 000
Development costs:	
1st 5 years	8, 450, 000
Subsequent to 1st 5 years	7, 830, 000
Total	16, 280, 000
Combined acquisition and development costs:	
1st 5 years	9, 650, 000
Subsequent to 1st 5 years	10, 130, 000
Total	19, 780, 000"

[In acres]

	Inside forest boundary	Outside forest boundary
Gross area	96, 000	4, 000
Present Federal land	40, 000	0
Non-Federal land	56, 000	4, 000
To be acquired in fee and easements: [1]		
1st 5 years	11, 000	4, 000
Subsequent to 1st 5 years	30, 000	0

[1] Estimated to be 60 percent in fee and 40 percent in easements. Sites with high recreation potential would be acquired in fee. Scenic or conservation easements would be used to extent feasible to facilitate private ownership, management, and utilization of resources and lands compatible with the purposes of the national recreation area. Such instruments would be employed to maintain scenic strips along roads and trails, continue present uses such as farming and grazing, harmonize production and harvesting of timber, use of private lands for public commercial services, and to obtain public hunting and fishing rights.

Development during the 1st 5 years would consist of providing sufficient basic recreation facilities and principal scenic access roads within the national recreation area to accommodate 1,000,000 visitors annually. Subsequent facilities would be provided to meet the demands of increasing visitations estimated to reach a capacity of 5,000,000 annually prior to the year 2000.

"Question. How does this relate to Appalachia bill? To what extent can Appalachia funds be used?

"Answer. The Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area would complement the Appalachia program by providing recreation opportunities and facilities. The Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 provides for various activities in the Appalachian region but contains no authority for the establishment and development of national recreation areas. Appalachia funds are not available for carrying out the purposes of S. 7.

"Question. Relation of land and water conservation fund bill to this measure. Could it be established under that act?

"Answer. The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 does not contain authority for the establishment of national recreation areas. It establishes the land and water conservation fund. Moneys in this fund may be appropriated for use in part for the acquisition of lands for certain Federal purposes. The fund is available for these purposes only when it is appropriated under regular appropriation procedure. Lands which may be acquired with such appropriations include those within the boundaries of national forests as they existed on January 1, 1965. They must be primarily of value for outdoor recreation purposes. Lands within a national recreation area would meet this qualification. In order to make appropriations from the land and water conservation fund available for the acquisition of the needed lands and scenic easements within the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area which are outside the present boundaries of the national forest the Department of Agriculture recommended an amendment to section 3(a) of S. 7. This amendment is set forth on page 4 of the Department's report of March 26, 1965."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to suspend further proceedings under the quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, further proceedings under the quorum call are suspended.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] may proceed for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is in the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish the Senator to be recognized during morning business?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the request is granted. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

FARMERS FOOLED BY COTTON PROGRAM ARCHITECTS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the House Committee on Agriculture has recently reported the Cooley bill—H.R. 9419, now H.R. 9715. The designers of the proposed program would fool the farmer. Apparently this is to be done in order that other groups in the cotton industry may prosper.

The Cooley bill would slash the loan rate from the current 29 cents to 21 cents for the 1966 crop. A short 2 years ago the price support was 32.47 cents per pound. It is clear to all that such actions would drop domestic cotton market prices by approximately the same amount. This kind of a price drop established by dumping Government cotton on the market would put almost every grower who operates in the free market in the red. They must pay domestic prices for the things they buy. Yet the 21-cent price would be less than 50 percent of the parity price for cotton.

The Cooley bill will substitute compensatory payments to farmers to bolster their incomes, to entice them to make big cutbacks in plantings, and in some instances to go out of business entirely. The lure of Federal payments has been designed so attractively that they amount to economic hobbles. They further tie the grower to this Government and its bureaucracy. His survival as a farmer would depend upon the annual appropriations of this Congress—with about one-third of his gross income to come directly from the Government.

This is an example of how the program would work:

To participate a farmer with a 100-acre allotment must cut back to 85 acres, or 85 percent of the allotment.

A domestic allotment would be 65 acres or 65 percent.

Not in excess of domestic allotment payment rate would be 21 cents plus 14.6 cents, or 35.6 cents per pound.

In excess of domestic allotment but not more than 115.4 percent rate would be 21 cents plus 13.0 cents, or 34.0 cents per pound.

Not in excess of 130.8 percent of domestic allotment rate would be 21.0 cents plus 11.4 cents, or 32.4 cents per pound.

If a producer planted no cotton he would be paid 50 percent of the loan rate on the projected yield of 15 percent of the farm allotment and could release the balance of his allotment.

The Cooley bill hobbles for the cotton farmer would be added to the tightly controlled acreage allotments and mandatory marketing quotas on each cotton farm. They would foul the cotton farmer in an intolerable fashion.

The Wall Street Journal of July 9, 1965, contained several interesting comments upon the way parts of the Cooley bill were put together. Apparently Members from wheat and feed grain areas forced conclusions on cotton.

Provisions to buy up cotton acreage allotments to encourage permanent farmer retirement were apparently aimed at the small growers—usually termed less efficient in the Carolinas, Georgia, and Alabama.

The Wall Street Journal describes the horse trading effort at the other end of the cotton spectrum. I quote:

> As a lure to influential California growers, the bill would lift all acreage restrictions for producers willing to operate without any Federal price supports or bonus payments.

Since the demand for cotton is relatively inelastic, one bale added to the supply by those who seek a "fair advantage" will require some farmer elsewhere to reduce his plantings to make room in the marketplace.

Having fouled the farmer, whom would the architects for cotton seek to benefit? Apparently it would be cotton merchants and textile mills.

Merchants through a heavily financed Committee for a Free Cotton Market have attacked the current cotton program repeatedly in paid ads, lobbying tactics, and a host of public relation maneuvers. Should cotton firms with international spreads and brokerage houses that gamble in commodity prices be permitted to take over as makers of cotton policies?

The Wall Street Journal notes:

> Cotton brokers and dealers also figure to benefit because the legislation promotes price speculation and encourages the placement of cotton crops on the open market rather than under Federal price shelters.

Again, I should like to quote the Wall Street Journal as to the textile mill's stake in the new design for cotton:

> The legislation would assure cotton textile mills of low-cost raw material. A Federal subsidy that started with the 1964 crop is designed to keep mills' costs down to the world market level paid by foreign competitors, but the subsidy arrangement has cost the Government far more than expected. In effect, the House committee's bill would channel the subsidy to growers instead of mills.

In sharp contrast to the cotton program designers in the House of Representatives, cotton producer leaders have come up with realistic proposals in their testimony before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am sure these will be considered carefully by the Senate committee and the administration.

This Nation, dedicated to stability and growth, must find ways to broaden the markets for cotton as it cuts down accumulated stocks owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Cutbacks of some 35 percent on cotton farms would shatter the business activity in many towns and thousands of communities across the land from the Carolinas to California where cotton is a major enterprise. Are we to fight poverty on one front and create local depressions on others under the guise of reductions in Government costs?

It is almost unthinkable that huge cuts in cotton farmers' income should become a main approach to cut Government costs.

This would be a primrose path toward liquidation of cotton as a major industry in these United States. Cotton is a basic pillar of strength to the whole of our economy. Millions of jobs, with the accompanying incomes, are dependent upon it, and billions of dollars are invested in its production and processing.

The cotton farmers, as the result of these artificially high support prices, has already lost a large segment of his market to the synthetic fibers.

The cotton program enacted a couple of years ago has cost over $500 million and has been a dismal failure.

This program was enacted 2 years ago to replace a previous failure. Today the administration is recommending another cotton subsidy program to replace these earlier failures, and the present programs, if possible, is even worse than either of the other two.

Under this program, with a price range from 21 cents and no controls to 36 cents and rigid controls, while it may be described as a voluntary program, in effect it is a mandatory program for every potential cotton farmer.

The farmer who elects to operate as an independent unit will go broke in selling his cotton in competition with Government-subsidized cotton.

It in effect will force the farmers either to come in under the Government umbrella of controls and supports or to get out of cotton farming.

This in reality is the objective of the planners of the Great Society, and ultimately it is their hope to force every segment of American agriculture under Government controls.

Do not forget that just a couple of years ago a similar formula was recommended for corn and certain other commodities, and if the Great Society is successful in pushing this bill through the Congress it will be the opening wedge to the destruction of the capabilities of the American farmer to operate as an independent segment of our free enterprise society.

In my opinion, the solution to the cotton program and to the programs for other farm commodities is that, instead of expanding the power and control of the Government toward agriculture, we should start an orderly reduction of the present high supports and the gradual withdrawal of the Federal Government from the agricultural market.

As long as we continue the high support programs, the Government will continue to have huge warehouse inventories.

The Government's accumulation of huge inventories of specific commodities has the mathematical effect of making these support prices become ceiling prices.

To prove that point, I have only to cite the fact that those agriculture commodities which are in greatest trouble today are the ones which have had the benefit of the largest Government subsidies and the highest support prices in recent years.

No one is advocating the outright repeal of these farm programs. Such action in the face of present Government inventories would be foolhardy and create chaos in both domestic and international markets.

But we can start an orderly reduction in these high supports accompanied by a gradual liquidation of Government inventories.

Farmers need some protection, but the administration's plan is not the way to do it.

As both the American Farm Bureau and the National Grange, our leading farm organizations, have pointed out, the real problem affecting the net income on most farms is the high cost of modern equipment needed on our farms and not enough land available for efficient use of this equipment. Any program designed to idle acres while setting artifically high price supports is not going to solve the problem for the smaller farmers. It only further increases the advantages to the large corporate type of operations.

Let no one harbor the idea that the work of designers who would foul the cotton farmer will go by unnoticed in the Congress. Let no one harbor the idea that a design for the promotion of poverty in hundreds of communities from the Carolinas to California will not become a burning issue as the facts become known.

DECEPTIVE PRACTICES IN ADVERTISING

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for 10 minutes in the morning hour.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have several items of some importance which I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate and have placed in the Record later.

The first is an item involving the question of deceptive advertising practices.

On June 9, as chairman of the Commerce Committee, and by their direction, I sent a letter to the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Paul Rand Dixon, asking him to explore more deeply the causes and conditions of poverty in the United States relative to deceptive advertising practices. I said:

> As we explore more deeply the causes and conditions of poverty in the United States, we are reminded again and again that the poor, in addition to their other afflictions, are the prime victims of consumer fraud.
>
> In a recent report, Esther Peterson, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, brought forcefully to our attention the unhappy fact that such practices as "bait and switch," referral selling, misrepresentation of price, and substitution of inferior goods flourish among the poor.
>
> Surely, as we accelerate our national attack on the roots of poverty, we can no longer afford to ignore the commercial exploitation of this unfortunate segment of our population.
>
> The FTC has plenary jurisdiction in the District of Columbia to police all forms of deceptive practice. The Commission has also recently recognized its responsibilities in affording State regulatory agencies the benefit of its expertise by creating its new Office of Federal-State Cooperation.
>
> I should like to see the FTC develop a model program for policing those unfair and deceptive practices to which the poor are particularly susceptible. To this end, the Commission might well consider the creation of a pilot enforcement program in the District of Columbia, designed to develop the most efficient and meaningful techniques for rooting out these practices.

Mr. President, I have received a reply today from Mr. Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, in which he expresses his hearty accord with the proposal in my letter. The Commission is setting up a Consumer Fraud Agency in the District in the charge of one of their fine lawyers, J. Robert Vendel, and a staff will be available to protect the citizens of the District of Columbia against deceptive practices.

I see my good friend the Senator from Illinois standing, and I anticipate somewhat what he is about to say. I am in hearty agreement with his sentiments. I do not suppose that deceptive practices in the small loan field are more abused in the United States than in this area.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from Washington for his statements and his action. I am very glad that he mentioned abuses in the field of small loans. There are also abuses in the field of installment credit and the purchasing of durable consumer goods, without stating what the interest charges will be in terms of money, or the true annual rate.

Some of us have been trying for 5 years to obtain action on this matter, with little success, because it has been bottled up in the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. Possibly some of these abuses may be ventilated in the District, which will constitute a real contribution toward educating public opinion.

Again, I congratulate the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me say to my friend the Senator from Illinois, and other Senators in the Chamber, that one of the real deceptive practices perpetrated on our citizens is that of obtaining personal mortgage loans. If the borrower signs up for a certain amount of interest, other charges are added which circumvent the usury laws.

I have found a few cases recently in which a citizen who applied for such a loan accepted the charges for 18 months because he was desperate at the time. He saved all his money so that he could take care of the loan, and was able to do so in 8 months instead of 18. He went to the loan company and said, "I should like to pay off my loan," but they said, "Oh, you signed up for 18 months." They showed him the paper which he signed, and he was unable to pay it off in less than 18 months, even though he had the money to pay it off before that time. Of course, that is because the loan company wants all the interest.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When Joe Valachi was questioned in the Cosa Nostra case, he stated that they made their money on the interest and other charges, and not on the principal.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not on the principal; that is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That they did not wish the principal repaid.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They wish to keep a man perpetually in debt to them, so that they would receive large amounts of "juice" in monthly payments and keep him in debt.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is the sort of thing the able Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Mr. Dixon, will take a look at.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the Chairman's letter to me dated today, as well as an excellent pamphlet which the Commission has published, entitled "Fight Back—The Ungentle Art of Self Defense, as recommended by the Federal Trade Commission." Tragically, most of these practices are pushed upon the poorer people of this country.

There being no objection, the letter and pamphlet were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1965.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: The Commission is in hearty accord with the proposal in your letter of June 9 that concentrated effort be made to eradicate from the District of Columbia unfair and deceptive trade practices which victimize the poor.

The Commission has jurisdiction to participate in this effort under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act which directs it to prevent, by cease, and desist order, unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce whenever such action would be in the public interest. The jurisdiction extends specifically to methods, acts, or practices used in the District of Columbia.

The Commission's jurisdiction to prevent false advertising of food, drugs, medical devices, and cosmetics, to require truthful labels as to content on wool, fur, and textile products, and to prevent the sale of dangerously flammable wearing apparel fabrics, also may be involved.

This effort will extend to any type of practice which is likely to mislead or deceive appreciable numbers of the public. But special emphasis will be given to practices which prey upon the aged, the uneducated, and the poor who suffer most heavily when misled or deceived in the spending of limited incomes.

From 50 years of experience in protecting consumers and honest businessmen from unfair and deceptive trade practices, the Commission has observed many types of practices which commonly are used to victimize poor and aged persons. These include:

Bait advertising, or the advertising of an attractive offer, not in good faith, for the purpose of obtaining leads. When the prospects respond, the salesman disparages the advertised product in order to sell more expensive models.

Referral selling, or the promise of commissions on sales made to friends, relatives or neighbors. Very seldom does the amount of commissions measure up to expectations.

False claims that prospect has been specially selected as part of an advertising or introductory promotional program, or that offer will be in effect for limited time only.

Deceptive pricing, or false claims that the product regularly sells for a much higher price.

Misleading guarantee, or mention of guarantee without disclosing its limitations.

Misrepresentation of credit or finance charges or arrangements.

Selling used or reconditioned products as being new.

False claims as to safety, health benefits, quality or performance of product.

Misbranding of textile and fur products.

To carry out this program, the Commission's staff which monitors advertising has intensified its critical examination of advertisements used in the District of Columbia, to ferret out representations which, on the basis of experience, are most likely to lead to deceptive practices.

The Commission on July 19 opened a special consumer complaints office in the Star Building, 1101 Pennsylvania Avenue NW. Commission attorneys will be on duty in this office from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. to receive complaints from the public by telephone or in person. Consumers who have been victimized by unfair or deceptive practices in their business dealings are urged to report their experiences. This office at the Star Building is in room 7714; the telephone number is 347-6538. The attorney in charge is J. Robert Vendel.

The staff of the Commission's field office in Falls Church, Va., will promptly investigate any matter appearing to involve a violation of laws administered by the Commission. The field office additionally will be exploring various sources of information to ascertain whether unfair and deceptive practices not otherwise coming to the Commission's attention are prevalent in the District of Columbia.

In this project the Commission will cooperate closely with other agencies having related functions, such as the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia in his enforcement of the District of Columbia fraudulent advertising statute; the Post Office Department and Department of Justice in their investigations and prosecutions to prevent fraudulent use of the mails and fraud by radio, television, telephone, or other wire communications; and the Food and Drug Administration in its actions to prevent adulteration and misbranding of food, drugs, devices, cosmetics, and hazardous household substances. We will also cooperate with business self-regulatory agencies, such as the better business bureau; and we will coordinate our efforts with those of the United Planning Organization's neighborhood legal services project and the District of Columbia government.

The Commission will thus endeavor to make sure that its legal authority and available personnel are most fully and effectively utilized to protect poor people, the aged or uneducated, and other members of the public, from that small percentage of the business community who engage in unfair and deceptive selling practices.

The enclosed leaflet "Fight Back" is among the Commission's publications intended to help people who feel that they have been victimized by such practices.

Your continued interest in and support of our work is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Paul Rand Dixon,
Chairman.

Enclosure.

Fight Back—The Ungentle Art of Self-Defense as Recommended by the Federal Trade Commission

How can you avoid being gypped? And, if you have been, what you can do about it?

Here are some answers to both questions. The advice is based on the experience of attorneys for the Federal Trade Commission who have been tracking down business cheats for more than 50 years. Assisted by the vast majority of merchants who are honest, the FTC's gyp hunters have become experts on how fly-by-night and overly eager sellers bilk consumers.

The bait is presented in countless disguises, but always its purpose is the same: to trick you, the buyer, into thinking you are getting much more for your money than you had dared to hope—a bargain too amazing to be offered by reputable stores. Thus, you end up paying too much for what you get or not getting what you pay for. And your companion in sorrow is the honest merchant who has had your business siphoned away from him by the cheat.

The first line of defense against the gyp artists should be manned by you, the consumer. No governmental policing is as effective as the chin-pinching purchaser who is willing to shop for what he wants and who is intelligent enough to judge what quantity and what quality he should receive for the price he pays. Just plain old coldblooded shopping makes it tough on the gypsters. And reputable businesses welcome the buyer who gives honest merchandising the favorable consideration it deserves.

The second line of defense is manned by consumers with enough courage to make themselves heard after they have been gypped in their purchases, or even when they have succeeded in avoiding a trap set for the less sophisticated. Certainly it is not enough to silently chalk up to experience a purchase about which you were misled, or simply to congratulate yourself on not having been duped the way others might be. In these United States you can make your indignation heard, and gyp artists do not thrive on such attention. It might surprise you to find out how much good can be accomplished by a citizen with a legitimate complaint who will take the trouble to invite attention to it.

A good starting point is to protest directly to the seller (if you can find him). Possibly the misrepresentation was done without his knowledge, in which case, he can take steps to assure against its repetition. There is even a chance he might square himself with you.

If, however, the fast-buck operator shrugs you off, you can carry your indignation further by registering your complaint with the organizations in your community devoted to maintaining proper conduct for business. A good example is the Better Business Bureau. And certainly your cause would be served if your complaint, backed by hard facts, went to the newspaper or radio or TV station that carries advertising for the product. It wouldn't take many such letters to deprive the huckster of his innocent readers and listeners. Truth in advertising is too important to these media to risk gaining a reputation for carrying phony ads.

A third line of defense is your local government. This is particularly important because most of the things you buy are marketed only locally, and the seller is not engaged in interstate commerce. The result is that you have to depend not on the Federal Government but on your city or State for protection. Nearly all of the States have statutes aimed at misrepresentation of products and services. And in some States these laws are enforced with vigor.

Certainly it behooves you to find out what kind of State (or city) protection is available to you. And if none is, you might want to help improve the situation.

Your fourth line of defense is the Federal Trade Commission. Congress gave it the broad responsibility to halt "unfair methods of competition in commerce and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce." Thus, not only were all the known deceptive practices outlawed but any new ones that might be invented. Other responsibilities of the FTC include policing the labeling of furs, woolens and other textile products, and guarding against the sale of dangerously flammable wearing apparel.

With this much authority for the FTC, you might wonder why the Federal Government could not handle the entire job of protecting consumers from being cheated. There are good reasons why it cannot, the principal one being that Congress never intended to establish the huge Gestapo that would be needed to police every store and salesman in the country. Not only would the cost be prohibitive but businessmen have demonstrated that, with very few exceptions, they are quite capable of policing themselves. Indeed, the FTC provides valuable guidance to them in this self-policing effort.

The FTC's fight against consumer deception is directed at gyp schemes that have an actual or potential impact on the public, as distinguished from actions to settle private controversies. In short, it has neither the staff nor the money to tackle cases that do not have sufficient public interest. Also, the FTC has concentrated its force on halting law violators who do at least some of their selling across State lines.

Thus, while the FTC cannot undertake to settle your private or purely local difficulties, it does stand ready to halt important instances of deception—and at no cost to the one who brings the complaint. The reason for this is that the FTC never brings an action on behalf of an individual; instead, it must itself investigate the matter and then act only if there appears to be sufficient public interest in stopping it. Nevertheless, alert consumers perform a valuable service to FTC by inviting its attention to deceptive practices that should be investigated.

The way to do this is simple: Just write a letter to the Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C. The letter should give as many facts as you have available, including any evidence of the chicanery, such as a copy of misleading advertising used to sell the product or the service. (Too many applications for complaint are long on indignation and short on facts that would help the FTC to determine whether the matter warranted investigation.) In writing this letter you have FTC's assurance that your identity will be completely protected. If the deception has sufficient public interest and the FTC is the appropriate authority to tackle the job, your obligation is ended. The FTC will take over the matter from that point on. You will, of course, be advised of what disposition is made of your application for FTC action.

What kinds of action might the FTC take? Depending on the gravity of the law violation, it could be settled by the violator giving FTC assurance and evidence that the improper act would be immediately discontinued. (And this would be no empty assurance because the violator would be in no doubt that a second offense would bring quick formal action.) The FTC, however, might well decide the violation was too serious to be settled by such an assurance of discontinuance, in which case it would issue a formal complaint looking to the issuance of a cease-and-desist order forever prohibiting the respondent from engaging in the illegal act. Should the order be violated thereafter, the FTC would bring action in court seeking a fine of up to $5,000 per day for each violation of the order.

Thus, the FTC provides you, the consumer, with a final defense against many instances of deception in the marketplace. But it is important to remember that you can do a great deal for yourself by following this advice:

1. Shop more before you buy.
2. Bring your complaint first to the seller.
3. Report false advertising to the media carrying it.
4. Report deception to local organizations concerned with better business standards.
5. Write the facts to the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, of course they can go to the corporation counsel, and he tries to do the best job he can, or they can go to the Better Business Bureau. They are told, "Make a complaint in writing. Spell it out to us."

Some of these people do not know how to do it. They accept the situation. This is the sort of thing that we are fighting.

PROHIBITION OF INTERSTATE TRAFFIC IN STOLEN HOUSEHOLD PETS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill that is designed to put an end to a criminal, but lucrative, practice of traffic in stolen household pets, including dogs and cats.

Our noteworthy achievements and increased activity in the medical sciences research fields are extremely important. However, in pursuing the most worthy objectives that we seek in research, we must not in the process permit our humanity to be diminished.

It has come to my attention that the need for animals in research, particularly dogs and cats, has become great, and as a result, a primary source of these animals has become a thieves market of household pets. Apparently unscrupulous persons lure household pets into their control, and through various marketing mechanisms, sell them to research units, by the pound.

Not only is this inhumanity deplorable, but the anguish and misery caused to the owners of the stolen dogs, often young children, is the worst kind of cruelty.

Accordingly, the proposal which I now place before the Senate will provide for the policing and regulation of the acquisition of research animals by the research facilities.

Mr. President, I hope we can halt this disgraceful practice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wonder if I could pose a parliamentary inquiry. If the hour of 1 o'clock arrives, will the Senate still be in the morning hour, and will I be able to transact some morning business? I understand that the morning hour will terminate at 1 o'clock. I should like to introduce a bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that unless it is concluded sooner, the transaction of morning business will continue until 2 o'clock.

Mr. CLARK. I have no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I merely wished to introduce this bill. Several House Members have introduced similar bills. I ask that it be appropriately referred.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, by a curious and happy coincidence, I was waiting to obtain the floor in order to send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation of certain animals in commerce and the handling of such animals, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure that the Senator from Pennsylvania and I can join in this laudable effort to stop this disgraceful practice.

The bill will come to our Committee on Commerce. So far as I am concerned, I should like to ask unanimous consent to call it the Clark-Magnuson bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am very happy to have those cheering words, and I join the Senator in the introduction of his bill. I wonder if the Senator would permit me to make a brief statement regarding this subject. I shall look forward to early hearings on the bill by the Committee on Commerce, which is presided over with such distinction by the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator. I yield for that purpose, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last week a dalmatian dog belonging to a Slatington, Pa., family was stolen from a street in that town by an animal profiteer. After passing from one dognapper to another and being taken into another State in this illicit traffic, the family pet finished her days on an operating table in a New York City hospital, the victim of an experiment which was later determined to be futile.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that in our presumably civilized country, in the summer of 1965, it should be possible for Americans to feel that their family pet dogs and cats are free from the threat of abduction from their owners for the purpose of being sold at a profit to laboratories for scientific experiments.

For this reason, Mr. President, I join the Senator from Washington in introducing a bill for the regulation of the commerce in dogs and cats used for experimental purposes. Enactment of this bill would make it a Federal offense to steal a family pet for sale to a laboratory; in addition, all dealers in dogs and cats who supply animals for laboratories would be required to be licensed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture; all users of animals for experimental purposes would be required to buy those animals from licensed dealers; dealers in laboratory animals would be required to maintain set standards of care; and, finally, violation of these regulations would carry a penalty of a $10,000 fine and 1 year in prison.

It is ironic that the Federal Government as the major supporter of scientific experimentation in a very real sense subsidizes the purchase and encourages the traffic in stolen pets. For example, it is widely reported that 65 percent of all dogs and cats used for medical research are stolen animals. The need for this legislation is further emphasized by the fact that dealing in animals for laboratory purposes is big business. One dealer in my home State of Pennsylvania reported a net income of $700,000 in 1 year.

Mr. President, if the funds for experimental grants come from the Federal Government, surely the Federal Government has not only the right but the obligation to require that dogs and cats used in laboratory experiments be purchased through legitimate means. Only a naive, indifferent or irresponsible researcher could be led to believe that a well cared for dalmatian is a stray mongrel that has been caught by a dogcatcher's net and subsequently disposed of as unwanted or unsought for. Let the Federal Government cease to be a party, wittingly or unwittingly, to this unlawful practice of pet snatching.

There is nothing in this measure which in any way interferes with the use of dogs and cats for scientific purposes. Indeed, we all recognize that experimentation with animals has furthered our scientific knowledge. Let me now assure my good friends engaged in research that this is not an antivivisectionist measure. It is a bill intended to put an end to the illegal and inhumane practice of procuring dogs and cats for medical experiments by stealing family pets, often out of their backyards or out of their owners automobiles. I ask for a tough law to punish these thieves who make a living this way. Let us make dognapping—and catnapping too—a crime.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2322) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. CLARK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

POWER LAWNMOWER SAFETY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, one day last summer in Seattle, a 13-month-old girl sat on the porch steps watching her mother mow the lawn. The mother was using a popular type of rotary blade power lawnmower, 30 to 40 feet away. Suddenly the child cried and slumped over, blood coming from the left side of her neck. The mother remembered hearing the sound of the mower striking a hard object. When the little girl was taken to Children's Medical Center in Seattle, doctors discovered that a piece of rusty wire, slightly more than 2 inches long, had passed into her neck and was lodged near her shoulder blade. Miraculously, it had missed her windpipe, vital blood vessels and nerves, and could be removed without complications.

This child was only one of the more than 80,000 people in this country injured, permanently maimed, or killed by power lawnmowers last year. During the summer months, 110 power mower injury victims were rushed to Seattle hospital emergency rooms. In Dayton, Ohio, emergency rooms were treating 22 to 25 such patients per week. These figures reveal nothing of the many injured who were treated by private physicians or who did not receive medical attention at all.

As the summer of 1965 proceeds, there is little to indicate that such injuries will decrease. It is time we realized that such an apparently simple and safe operation as lawn mowing presents great danger to thousands of users of power mowers and innocent bystanders every year. Over 22 million power mowers are now in use; 4 million more will be sold this year. Ninety percent of them will be rotary blade mowers—the most hazardous type. Rotary power lawnmowers have been called by the Public Health Service's Division of Accident Prevention "probably the most dangerous machine you can have around the home." Some physicians have even suggested power mowers be outlawed.

The blades on these mowers rotate up to 4,000 times a minute and have a force of over 10,000 pounds per square inch—more than enough to shear through heavy shoe leather and to pull wayward feet and hands into the cutting area. The blades can throw up objects buried in the grass at speeds up to 300 feet per second—a speed equal to that of shell fragments and approaching that of a bullet. That does not give anyone much time to duck—in fact, most people never see what hits them. Objects may be hurled long distances and still inflict injury. In one case, a boy was standing on a bench 55 feet from the place where a power lawnmower was being operated and 7 feet above the ground. A rock thrown out by the mower struck him in the head, gashed his scalp, and knocked him unconscious.

In the past few years, there have been improvements in handle controls, wheel diameter, height of cut, mower housings, gas and oil gages, starters, and blade shapes that should add to the safety of power lawnmowers. The industry organization, the Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, continues to sponsor safety standards and research for safety improvements. One such study is now going on at the University of Iowa, in conjunction with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In spite of these commendable efforts to introduce safety improvements, one study found that 70 percent of the accidents in its area involved machines less than 3 years old. The University of Iowa investigators reported that "the machine that can perform with ease, power, and optimum safety has yet to be put on the market," and that "today's machine is potentially as dangerous as the first model." In fact, William V. White, of the Public Health Service's Division of Accident Prevention, has warned that manufacturers' emphasis on new safety improvements may give power mower operators a false sense of security and safety, thus making them careless of those very great hazards which still exist and have not been corrected.

I think the industry has tried to overcome this. The members of the Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Inc., which includes 95 percent of all power lawnmower manufacturers, have sponsored safety specification standards published by the American Standards Association. These are periodically revised to include new developments. The institute also has cooperated with public and private bodies in putting on an educational campaign for the public. This has been helpful in alerting people to the danger of power lawnmowers.

Nevertheless, one may ask if the institute's safety campaigns have been substituted for efforts to improve the mowers themselves. In radio spot announcements, the institute states that "virtually all power equipment accidents result from human carelessness," and further states that injuries from objects picked up and hurled out by the machine are due to "your failure to properly clean the lawn." Although a quick tour of the lawn to check for debris might be a reasonable precaution, it seems to me that if one has to go over an entire lawn to remove every small stone and 2-inch piece of wire that might be embedded in the grass, one might as well cut the lawn with scissors. And operators are hardly able to follow completely the institute's advice to "get people, especially children, out of the way" when power mowers are capable of hurling objects well into a neighbor's yard.

Power lawnmowers have become big business. New sales this year will total over $400 million. The institute claims it is willing to add safety devices when research shows what kinds are needed. The preliminary report of the University of Iowa investigators offers several suggestions which manufacturers can follow up now to demonstrate private creativity and concern for public safety.

The report recommends provision of a rotary power mower design that will intercept the flight of an object thrown out by the blades from under the mower or through the discharge chute. A minimal beginning here would be the elimination of center discharge chutes which most often throw up debris injuring the operator. It also recommends provision of a single lever for simple adjustment of wheel cutting height; simple and standard controls for all riding mowers; and a safe and simple method for removal or attachment of blades.

The report further suggests that, important as safety education programs are, the manufacturers must accept more responsibility in improving their mower designs:

> For years, educators have warned mower operators to turn off the motor when leaving the machine or making adjustments—yet we continue to find the rotating blade a factor in many injuries. Obviously then, the blade should be designed to stop automatically any time the operator releases the handle or leaves the seat. He is already accustomed to a similar device for his safety when opening an automatic washing machine, dishwasher, clothes dryer. The challenge lies in designing equipment to take over a task we know man should do for his own safety.

Continuing research into the causes and prevention of power lawnmower injuries is necessary. But there are many safety improvements which we already know are needed right away. I trust that the industry will follow these suggestions and provide machines with the necessary safety devices, making sure that only machines with such safety improvements are sold.

Lawn mowing has been a family activity for most Americans—it goes on around the home, during the summer, when people may be hot, tired, or easily distracted; where children may be playing, and where young people may be operating the machines.

Mr. President, self-regulation in the power lawnmower industry appears to have lagged seriously behind the need for it. I have instructed the Commerce Committee staff to monitor the progress of the industry in raising safety standards. Should the alarming volume of accidents continue unabated through this year, then the Commerce Committee will be prepared to develop legislation to protect the millions of operators of power lawnmowers and their families.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following material be inserted in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks:

Article on power lawnmower injuries, from the Washington Post, June 6, 1965.

"Power Lawnmowers Are Dangerous Weapons," article by Abraham B. Bergman, M.D.

Excerpts from a speech distributed by the Division of Accident Prevention, U.S. Public Health Service, entitled "Power Mower Safety and You."

Summary, pages 35–37, from the Institute of Agricultural Medicine, University of Iowa, Bulletin No. 9, entitled "Epidemiology of Rotary Power Lawnmower Injuries."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 6, 1965]

POWER MOWERS HURT 80,000 IN 1964

(By Jerome Brazda)

Warm spring weather is bringing out millions of Americans in pursuit of an activity that injured 80,000 persons last year, a public health official says. Skate boarding? Stock car racing? No, lawn mowing.

More than $400 million worth of power lawnmowers are sold to the U.S. public every year. And even the fanciest types potentially are as dangerous as the first rudimentary power mowers built during World War II.

These devices, according to William V. White of the Public Health Service's Division of Accident Prevention, are capable of hurling a stone, a piece of wire or a broken blade half as fast as a bullet, or about the same speed as a piece of shrapnel from a hand grenade.

The result may range from a cut or a bad bruise to death. Thousands of persons have lost toes, fingers, and hands to power mowers.

A Washington suburbanite junked his power mower earlier this year when it sliced into a chunk of stone which nearly cut off his son's finger. The boy was lucky. His hand was over his stomach at the time.

Don't power mowers have all sorts of safety devices? Yes, says White, but not enough. A report that resulted in a study now underway at the University of Iowa concluded that "today's machine is potentially as dangerous as the first model."

The report, made to White's Division of Accident Prevention, said that despite all the fancy doo-dads, "you have essentially the same design: High velocity, rotating mass, flying objects * * * and the operators have a false sense of security."

The report attributed this feeling of security partly to "the great advertising machine which gives the public the idea that rotary mowers are safe."

"They are not safe. There are thousands of injured people to testify to this fact," it said.

"The average user finds it hard to believe that just inches away from him, or her, is a blade of the type which mutilated, blinded, amputated, shredded, killed, sheared, lacerated, or otherwise injured thousands of people last year," the report said.

The industry has shown interest in the Iowa study, which began earlier this year under the direction of L. W. Knapp, Jr., an assistant professor in the Agricultural Medicine Department.

But one of the great problems is the dependence of nearly all power mowers on the whirling blade principle. Even if a skirt attachment on the rear protects the operator or if the operator is riding atop the mower, there is a constant hazard to innocent bystanders.

Until someone comes up with a safer design, however, even attention to basic safety rules would help, White said. Many of the 80,000 accidents last year occurred simply because someone got careless.

[From Northwest Medicine, 1965]

POWER LAWNMOWERS ARE DANGEROUS WEAPONS

(By Abraham B. Bergman, M.D., Seattle, Wash.)

Accompanying the increasing use of modern labor-saving mechanical devices is a growing catalog of unique injuries for the physician to treat. Such evidence of "progress" is demonstrated by the tide of accidents caused by power lawnmowers. The vast majority of accidents occur with the rotary mower, which is also the most popular type in use.[1]

Accidents occur either as a result of direct contact with the moving parts or as a result of objects propelled by the rotating blade. Those of direct type cause shearing or crushing injuries to hands or feet. Hurled objects cause penetrating injuries, often at a distance from the machine. The cutting blade of a rotary mower rotates from 2,400 to 4,000 revolutions per minute, and objects can be hurled with velocities up to 300 feet per second.[2] The cause of injury may be overlooked unless the physician is alert to the possibility of power mower injury and includes it in differential diagnosis.[3]

Examples of both types of injury were graphically portrayed by two children seen recently at Children's Orthopedic Hospital & Medical Center.

CASE REPORTS

Case 1: A 13-month-old girl was sitting on the porch steps watching her mother mow the lawn. The mother was using a popular type of rotary power mower and was 30 to 40 feet away from the child. Suddenly the child cried and slumped over, blood coming from the left side of her neck. The mother remembered hearing the sound of the mower striking a hard object. The child was taken to her physician's office and referred immediately to Children's Medical Center.

On admission, she seemed to be in some pain when she moved her head, but was not acutely ill. There was a 2-millimeter penetrating wound in the midportion of the left sternocleidomastoid muscle with a small amount of blood coming from it. In addition, there was an embedded object protruding under the skin of the left scapula. There were no other findings. X-ray showed a 6-centimeter piece of wire lying outside the rib cage on the left side passing from beneath the sternocleidomastoid to the scapula.

The patient was taken to surgery where the dirty piece of wire was removed from the left side of the neck It lay adjacent to the trachea, and the vital nerves and blood vessels in the area but amazingly, had not struck any of them. Her postoperative course was uneventful and she was discharged on the second hospital day.

Case 2: A 3-year-old boy was following in the path of his 12-year-old brother who was operating a popular type, riding, rotary mower He came close to the machine just as the operator shifted to reverse. His left foot was struck by the blade, shearing off almost the entire anterior portion. He was taken to the Mary Bridge Hospital in Tacoma where a Syme amputation of the left foot was performed. He is now attending the prosthesis clinic at Children's Medical Center.

The problem in King County

In an attempt to gain some picture of the incidence of power mower injuries in our community, the Seattle-King County Safety Council conducted a survey through the mowing season of 1964. The safety council requested the assistance of the Seattle Area Hospital Council and through its cooperative efforts, 32 hospitals were contacted and requested to notify the safety council of all power mower injuries seen between May 7, 1964, and October 4, 1964. (This was the second time the Seattle Area Hospital Council had effectively cooperated with the safety council in developing statistical incident reports regarding injuries. Prior to the power mower survey, the hospital council reported the number of glass door injuries to the safety council.)

During this 5-month period, 110 power mower injuries were seen in the emergency rooms of 20 hospitals; 34 of these patients required admission. Nineteen occurred in children under 14 years of age. There were no fatalities. No attempt was made to record the number of patients treated by physicians in their offices.

Discussion

Since World War II the Outdoor Power Equipment Institute estimates that manufacturers in the United States have shipped approximately 45 million power lawnmowers, of which about half are currently in use. Annual shipments for 1964 were slightly more than 4 million units, the approximate level that has pertained since 1958. About 92 percent of shipments have been of the rotary-type mower.[4]

It is logical to assume that unless there is a sudden bend toward physical fitness programs among American families manifested by a return to the hand lawnmower (which judging by history is most unlikely), urgent measures are required to curb the rising tide of power mower injuries.[5]

There are several actions by both the consumers and manufacturers that would markedly reduce the number of power mower injuries. First of all, besides promoting collateral coronary artery circulation, there is no safety substitute for an old-fashioned hand mower, particularly if children are present. If a power mower is necessary, reel mowers are by far the safest variety.[6]

When using a power mower, the ignition should be interrupted before ever putting the hands near the blade. Heavy shoes should be worn; the operator should never go barefoot or wear sneakers.

If a rotary mower is to be used, there are several design features which would greatly add to its safety. The vent should be on the side so that grass is thrown away from the operator, and not at him. A significant proportion of missiles are propelled through the vent. A heavy canvas grass catcher, reinforced with wire mesh would stop them. A skirt of chain mail dragging on the ground around the mower would stop missiles from flying out underneath and tend to keep errant feet away from the blade.

There are two avenues of approach, then, to reducing the injury toll: consumer education and production safety standards in the power mower industry. Public awareness of the magnitude of this problem will eventually result in safer power mowers being produced. Physicians can actively catalyze this process, both individually through education of their patients and collectively through medical society action.

(NOTE.—I wish to thank Walfred Johnson, M.D., and Alvin J. Novak, M.D., of Seattle for their permission to report case 1, and Donald F. McKay, M.D., of Tacoma, for permission to report case 2. I am also indebted to Mr. Al McGee of the Seattle-King County Safety Council who conducted the hospital survey and provided many helpful suggestions.)

POWER MOWER SAFETY AND YOU

(Excerpts from a speech distributed by the Division of Accident Prevention, U.S. Public Health Service, Washington, D.C.)

Power mower injuries happen both to persons doing the mowing and to bystanders, to experienced operators as well as neophytes. They may take the form of severe bruises, perforations, torn ligaments, punctures, fractures, amputations, and sometimes even eye injuries.

The power mower most often responsible for injuries is the rotary mower, although reel type mower accidents are not uncommon. The rotary mower is equipped with sharp, flat, cutting blades which rotate horizontally on a vertical shaft that ordinarily turns at rates up to 3,600 revolutions per minute. Any object thrust into such blades is cut horizontally. A tragic number of feet and toes are lacerated or even severed in this manner.

---

[1] McClure, J. N., "Power Lawnmowers: New Hazard," Lancet 78:356 (August) 1958.

[2] White, W. L., "Menace of Rotary Lawnmower," American Journal of Surgery 93:674–675 (April) 1957.

[3] Chazen, E. M., and Chamberlain, J. L., "Missile Injuries Due to Power Lawnmowers," New England Journal of Medicine 266:822 (Apr. 19, 1962).

[4] Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Washington, D.C., personal communication.

[5] McClure, J. N., Power lawnmower injuries are preventable, South Med. J. 52: 1254–1257 (October) 1959.

[6] The hammer knife type may be a close second.—Ed.

The blades of the rotary mower have a tremendous propulsive force as well as powerful direct hitting force. They are capable of propelling objects which may get in their way, such as stones or nails, at speeds up to 300 feet a second. Stop and think what that means. It is equal to the speed of many shell fragments and approaches the speed of a bullet. So fast is such a blow that frequently a person who has been struck by a flying object propelled in this fashion is unaware for a time that he has been hit. A blade, or a portion of a blade, may become detached and also act as a missile.

* * * * *

Most injuries happen to operators of machines, but an unfortunately large number also occur to people who just happen to be standing or passing nearby. Too often these are children. While operators may be injured by the cutting blade or flying objects projected by the machine, bystanders are most often injured by objects thrown by the blades. As might be expected, more accidents happen to men than women, simply because more men use the machines. But a disproportionately large number of accidents happen to persons under 21 years of age, indicating that this is not a machine to put into the hands of children.

How do power mower accidents happen?

According to the best information we have available, nearly 70 percent of mower injuries are incurred through direct contact with the mower blade, while the remaining 30 percent are caused by foreign objects thrown by the machine, usually by the blade: nails, rocks, bones, wires, and pieces of wood, metal, or glass. A great many people are injured while attempting to adjust or repair their machines while motors are running, or while operating their machines on unstable surfaces, such as banks. Some meet their difficulties while starting the motor. Some slip on wet grass and into the path of the mower; others pull a mower backward over the feet; some walk in front of a machine while it is running—and it runs into them. Many attempt to remove grass or other material clogging the machine without turning off the motor.

* * * * *

When we consider the kinds of injuries sustained in these circumstances, we discover that over 90 percent of those injuries due to direct contact with the mower are injuries to the toes, fingers, feet, and hands, in that order. Legs and ankles are also frequently injured. Women suffer many more hand and finger injuries than men, and young persons more hand injuries than adults.

Most injuries produced by rotary blades to operators of machines have resulted from the introduction of the foot or the hand into the cutting area. Shoe leather offers no protection under these circumstances for the force of the rotary blade is estimated to be in excess of 10,000 pounds per square inch. Since the bar revolves so rapidly, it is practically impossible to remove the foot or hand from the cutting zone until it has been struck by the edge of the blade several times. This often results in shredding of tissues, tearing asunder, and sometimes amputation.

Injuries to the toes occur most often when a machine is being operated on an incline and the machine is pulled up over the shoetop or the foot slips into the cutting area, producing a shearing injury.

Amputation of the fingertips happens most often when the operator tries to pull grass or other material from the machine which has engaged the blade so that it will not rotate. If the motor is still running, the blade will turn rapidly and engage the hand when the grass or other substance is removed.

A machine most often throws a flying object in one of two ways. Usually the blade picks up an object in its path and hurls it. It travels through a rising trajectory, quite often hitting the legs of the operator. Pieces of wire or nails or the like, thrown in this manner, frequently become embedded in the leg and must be removed by surgery. Large objects, such as rocks, may cause severe and painful bruises, or even fractures.

Occasionally, a part of the machine—a bolt, perhaps—comes loose, possibly because of the vibration, and flies into the air and falls into the path of the blade and is propelled upward. Sometimes a blade itself becomes detached and flies through the chute.

Flying objects sometimes travel surprising distances only to strike bystanders, usually in the upper torso, sometimes in the head or eye. We have the record of one Florida woman who was killed by a whirling cutter blade flung from a power mower being used over 50 feet away in a neighbor's yard. The woman was standing in a room when the accident occurred and the blade came through a glass window.

[From bulletin No. 9 of the University of Iowa, Institute of Agricultural Medicine]

EPIDEMIOLOGY OF ROTARY POWER LAWNMOWER INJURIES

SUMMARY

Limitations of information: The principal purpose of this study was to develop injury-related data on accidents involving the rotary power lawnmower and not to test hypotheses or theories on lawn-mowing accidents. Our objective throughout these series of investigations and final analyses was to define the injury problem. This, we felt, would provide sufficient information for the establishment of initial safer lawnmower design.

Such data as was secured could not be used to establish exposure rates for the operators, determine incidence rates, or measure equipment factors. These items and procedures would require a much more detailed, time consuming and expensive research project. We did, however, consider these items before proceeding with the study as carried out, and suggest the following as information that would be necessary in solving the major design problems for the reduction of rotary power lawnmower injuries:

1. The number of rotary power lawnmowers by size and type within a given area.
2. The motor speeds at which operators use their machines.
3. The actual amount of horsepower required to cut grass.
4. The minimum tip speed of a rotary mower blade which will cut grass cleanly.
5. The maximum diameter of a blade to minimize throwing of objects.
6. The effect the amount of suction designed into different rotary mower blades has upon the tendency to throw objects at the operator.
7. The least hazardous location of a discharge chute on a mower.
8. The type of mower housing design that prevents the expelling of objects between the two rear wheels.
9. The minimum safe height setting for mowing grass.

Obviously, there are geographic limitations to this type of study; however, the information here recorded is probably typical of the Midwest. Other regions of the United States would vary. For example, in the Southeast, a longer growing (mowing) season prevails; different varieties of grass would be found in lawns; different makes of machines would be distributed through retail outlets, and homeowners may place a somewhat different value on lawn appearance.

It should be kept in mind that the analysis of data appearing in this bulletin concerns only the investigation of reported accidents. Furthermore, the reported accidents represented only those which required medical treatment. It is reasonable to assume that there may have been additional cases requiring treatment which were missed by the reporting system used in this study.

Implications for design change and safety education: The operator of the mower is the person generally injured when mowing his lawn, and the lower extremities of the body are the parts most often affected. This indicates that a major reduction in the overall number of injuries associated with this equipment would be affected by an industry design standard that would prevent objects from flying out from under the mower between the two rear wheels.

Wheel adjustment on hand-propelled mowers and the increasing number of riding mowers will, in the future, require greater attention to human engineering by the designer. Adjustment of cutting height by a single lever and standardization of controls for riding mowers are needed.

For years educators have warned mower operators to turn off the motor when leaving the machine or making adjustments—yet we continue to find the rotating blade a contributing factor in many injuries. Obviously then, the blade should be designed to stop automatically any time the operator releases the handle or leaves the seat. He is already accustomed to a similar device for his safety when opening an automatic washing machine, dishwasher, or clothesdryer. The challenge lies in designing equipment to take over a task we know man should do for his own safety.

A perusal of other current safety rules for the operation of a rotary power lawnmower will indicate that some are greatly overemphasized when viewed with respect to the total injury problem. On the other hand, some rules which have been in existence for a number of years deserve a great deal more emphasis, such as not pulling the mower backwards or mowing on a sloping terrace. It has been a source of amazement in many of these investigations to find people guilty of unsafe acts when it has been generally assumed that everyone knows better.

Each year several million youngsters reach an age when they will have their first experience at operating a mower. We have a continuing obligation not only to teach them safe operation, but also to create a safer lawnmower for their use.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). The chair announces, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 36, the appointment of the following Senators as members to the White House Committee on International Cooperation to be held in November of this year: The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON].

POLICY FOR FRIENDSHIP SOUGHT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I listened with interest and amazement to a network show last night in which the former Administrator of the FAA described the position of the Dulles International Airport in our air commerce picture.

The former Administrator, Mr. Halaby, stated that Dulles International Airport was a magnificent facility. I agree. He stated that Dulles should be utilized. I agree.

But he went on to say that all Washington transport over which the Federal Government had any control whatsoever should be directed to Dulles; that all Government personnel should be flown in and out of Dulles and Dulles alone; that all Government cargoes should be directed to Dulles; and that Dulles should be designated by the FAA or CAB as the only international airport serving the Washington metropolitan area.

He then accused the Senator from Maryland, my distinguished colleague [Mr. TYDINGS], and our colleague in the House, Representative SAMUEL FRIEDEL, of protecting the interests of Maryland's international airport, Friendship.

We happily plead guilty to this charge.

For many years people of Maryland have supported Friendship International Airport, which was constructed principally with funds derived in Maryland and the people of Baltimore City, with very limited Federal contribution.

We do not ask preferential treatment.

We maintain, and very properly so, that the Washington metropolitan complex should be served by three airports: Friendship, Washington National, and Dulles.

We believe the traveling public should have the right to select that airport which best serves their own personal immediate needs.

We believe that industry should be able to select that carrier and airport which is most economical for them to use.

We would like to see Dulles prosper, but we vigorously object and call it sheer folly for the Federal Government to say that only one airport shall serve Washington.

A great many of the people in the Washington metropolitan area prefer to use Friendship International Airport for the reason that it is closer to them. Traveling distance from the Capital under normal traffic conditions is quicker to Friendship than it is to Dulles. We argued with all the vigor at our command that the Federal Government, through the two independent agencies, FAA and CAB, should be impartial.

It is too late to undo what has heretofore been done; namely, the large investment in Dulles in excess of $100 million.

The taxpayers have a great investment in Dulles Airport in Virginia. The investment should be protected, but protected fairly.

It would probably be better if the regulatory agencies, the FAA and CAB, were not in the operational business.

In other words, the rulemaker should not be the same agency or person that is carrying out the rules, or is being regulated.

It would be better if an independent agency of some sort operated Dulles International Airport and Washington National Airport.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 3 minutes of the Senator have expired. Does the Senator wish an extension of time?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BREWSTER. It would be better if the regulatory agencies, the FAA and CAB, regulated each airport fairly and squarely with the same rules applicable to all instead of—as we have now heard openly from the former Administrator—attempting to favor the one airport that was constructed with Federal funds.

On behalf of my colleague [Mr. TYDINGS] and Representative FRIEDEL, we take vigorous exception to Mr. Halaby's comments. He is correct in his statement that, as representatives of Maryland, in all fairness we should do our very best to protect Maryland's investment in Friendship. In doing so, we believe that we are serving the best interests of all the people of the metropolitan complex of Washington.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, recently I have read serious allegations concerning the hiring policy of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. I was very disturbed by these allegations, and I am sure that other Members of the Senate would be much interested in the letter which I have received on this subject from Chairman Stevens.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter which I received from Chairman Stevens and the letter which he received from the president of the Metropolitan Opera Association be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR
THE PERFORMING ARTS,
Washington, D.C., July 22, 1965.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: This letter is in response to your inquiry of July 6 about certain questions that have been raised regarding the policy of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts with respect to discriminatory practices.

As one of our trustees, you are aware that the policy of the Center has always been one of complete nondiscrimination in every way. Its very purpose, that of recognition and stimulation of artistic achievement, would be falsified by any other position. In the arts, perhaps more than in any other area of human life, there is recognition of individual merit and achievement, regardless of race, creed, national origin, or sex. Since unnecessary and unwarranted allegations have been made regarding the policy of the Center in this respect, however, the Board of Trustees at its next meeting will formalize and clarify what has always been the Center's policy.

The Center has operated on this policy both before and since the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and regardless of coverage by that act. A question has been raised about the applicability of title VI of the act to the Center. This question is immaterial because the Center's policy has been one of compliance regardless of its technical position under title VI. Because the question was raised, counsel advises me that title VI is not applicable to the Kennedy Center for the reason that the entire legislative history of the Center indicates congressional intent that the Center, like the Smithsonian of which it is a bureau, remain a quasi-public, quasi-private entity.

It may be that the critic of the Center has confused title VI with title VII of the act, dealing with equal employment opportunity. The Center has been scrupulous in the inclusion in contracts made since the passage of the act of all requisite provisions regarding equal employment opportunity by its contractors. The Center will continue its compliance with this title, as with all other applicable Federal law. Before the passage of the act there was full compliance with the regulations of the President's Committee on Equal Employment.

In conclusion, with specific reference to the Center's sponsorship of the National Opera Company with the Metropolitan Opera, I have received assurances by the president of the Metropolitan Opera that the charges of discrimination and segregation by that organization are completely false. I am further assured that the National Company will operate on the same nondiscriminatory basis as is true of the Metropolitan. I should add that the Center's financial contribution to the National Company was in any event made from private funds, and that these funds were not a part of those certified for purposes of matching the Federal appropriation for the Center. I enclose a letter from Mr. Arthur A. Bliss, president of the Metropolitan Opera.

I greatly regret the attack made upon the Center, but welcome the opportunity to set the record straight upon the basis of the Center's firm and permanent policy against discrimination.

Very sincerely yours,
ROGER L. STEVENS,
Chairman.

METROPOLITAN OPERA,
METROPOLITAN OPERA ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N.Y., July 19, 1965.

Mr. ROGER L. STEVENS,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STEVENS: In regard to the accusations by Mr. Thomas A. Waggoner that the National Company is discriminating against Negroes, we think you might point out to the gentleman that the National Company is a subsidiary of the Metropolitan Opera Association, and its policies are guided by the board and management of the Metropolitan Opera.

The Metropolitan Opera, and this is a matter of public record, has probably done more than many other cultural organizations in the field of desegregation. During Mr. Bing's tenure of office, a considerable number of Negro artists have been and are employed at the Metropolitan Opera. The Metropolitan Opera has insisted on desegregation of audiences on its spring tour, including the South, and has ceased to visit cities that have not complied with this condition.

The National Company, of course, completely subscribes to the same policies, and it is malicious to insinuate otherwise; but, just as the Metropolitan, the National Company, too, while not refusing to hire anybody for his race, creed or color, will also not hire anybody just because he or she happens to be a Negro.

Yours sincerely,

ANTHONY A. BLISS,
President.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. Stevens makes it clear that there is no discrimination in the John F. Kennedy Center or the Metropolitan Opera Association.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to pay tribute today to the people of the captive European nations—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania—and express the hope that the freedom they are striving for will someday be realized. Captive Nations Week, designated by Congress in 1959 as the third week of July, offers an ideal opportunity to reflect on the problems and present situations of these nations.

Recently we have been urged to deemphasize the plight of these peoples. We are told that good relations between East and West and opportunities to take advantage of the Moscow-Peiping split may be adversely affected by focusing attention on the captivity of those behind the Iron Curtain. Then, too, we are informed of liberalizations within these countries and movements toward independence vis-a-vis Moscow.

It is true that changes have been effected. But have these modifications altered the relationship between the people and the state or caused greater freedoms to be granted to the peoples?

What remains of the much-publicized liberalization of Poland in 1956 is some tolerance toward the church, slightly decollectivized agriculture, and some alleviation of tension in the country. Temporary changes were brought about only to forestall an imminent revolt by the Polish people.

Liberalization in other countries has proceeded along the same lines as changes made in the Soviet Union. Release of political prisoners, softenings in literary controls, and termination of indiscriminate terror mirrored de-Stalinization measures taken by the Soviet Union. Thus relaxation seems to have been effected either as a necessity or as an action consistent with the present thinking of the Soviet Union.

Nations cited for their independence vis-a-vis Moscow—Albania and Rumania—have achieved such a reputation only by refusing to liberalize in the wake of the de-Stalinization measures of the Soviet Union and, instead, insisting on carrying out a hardline policy toward their populations.

What has not changed, then, despite some liberalization and assertion of independence, is the absence of the fundamental freedom of choice—the freedom to choose a system of government, the freedom to select leaders, the freedom of press, speech, and assembly.

The desire for these freedoms continue to exist. The attitude of the populace has remained hostile to the regimes. Communist attempts to win youth to its side have failed. The Hungarian Revolution of 1956 exemplified anti-Communist sentiment.

We founded our country on democratic principles and today our commitment to freedom is worldwide. Captive Nations Week draws our attention to the specter of Communist tyranny and the ceaseless resistance of enslaved peoples. We honor their past endeavors and encourage their every effort for further freedom.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION TO MRS. BETTY NELSON OF THE AIR FORCE SENATE LIAISON OFFICE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, last evening a group of Senators and Senate staffers paid tribute to Mrs. Betty Nelson, a member of the Air Force Senate Liaison Office. The surprise reception was unique in that a wonderful person was honored, not because she was retiring, having a birthday or an anniversary, but rather because so many felt the desire to express their personal appreciation to her dedication for superior assistance and amazing faculty of getting things done for so many people.

Betty Nelson is not only outstanding in her long and sustained performance of getting things done, but she is a truly remarkable person for the manner in which she does get things done. She has that extremely rare trait of making persons asking her for a favor feel that they have actually done Betty a favor by asking her to do a favor for them. How much more could a person be so dedicated to making others happy?

Although there was a very large and warm turnout for Betty, I know that there are many, many others besides the attendants at the reception, who desire to join in this tribute to Betty and that I speak their sentiments in these observations that I make.

SALUTE TO ETHIOPIA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, today I would like to take a few moments to pay tribute to the remarkable leader of a remarkable country—His Imperial Majesty Emperor Haile Selassie I of Ethiopia. Since 1930, when he ascended the throne, the Emperor has consistently provided his country with wise and forward-looking leadership. Thus we can well understand why July 23—the day of the Emperor's birth—is a very special day for the Ethiopian people and why they celebrate this day each year with feelings of pride and gratitude.

Ethiopia is a country with a long and fascinating history that can be traced back to the second millennium B.C. and with a distinct culture that reflects the mingling of peoples and civilizations through the ages. Today it is possible to visit impressive architectural remains at Axum, the capital city of ancient Ethiopia, to see at Lalibela monolithic rock-hewn churches dating from the 12th and 13th centuries, and to wonder at the mystery of the gigantic structures of still another age to be found at Lasta.

Ethiopia is also a country with a strong tradition of independence. At the height of the period of Western colonization of the African Continent, Ethiopia was almost alone in being able to maintain its independence in the face of repeated threats. It was only in the 20th century that Ethiopia was conquered and its people subjugated by Fascist Italy. But even when confronted by the overwhelming superiority of the enemy's arms, Ethiopian resistance was fierce and aroused world public opinion.

The Italian occupation lasted only 5 years. In 1941, Ethiopia regained its independence and Emperor Haile Selassie returned to devote himself with renewed energy to promoting the welfare of his people. Under his leadership, the process of modernization has proceeded rapidly in Ethiopia. The number of schools at all levels grows steadily. Social services which are built on the Ethiopian traditions of self-help and of cooperation among neighboring communities are expanding. Agriculture—and especially the production of coffee—is benefiting from the introduction of modern methods of cultivation and processing. The program of the highway authority—aided by loans from the World Bank and the International Development Authority—has been an outstanding success. And although Ethiopia is basically an agricultural country, industries that can exploit the principal agricultural commodities of the country are being fostered.

Much of the credit for the steady progress of Ethiopia belongs to Emperor Haile Selassie who has been able to provide his country with a stable government while at the same time playing an active role in the United Nations and in the Organization of African Unity. It is a pleasure to send greetings to him and to his people on their national holiday.

CALIFORNIA COMPENSATES VICTIMS OF CRIMES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this week Gov. Edmund Brown of California signed into law the first statute in this country providing compensation to innocent victims of crimes of violence. I salute the legislators of the great State of California for their wisdom and foresight in enacting this progressive legislation.

Recently I introduced S. 2155, the criminal injuries compensation bill. The bill would set up a Violent Crimes Compensation Commission to award compensation to persons who suffer losses as a result of their being a victim of a crime of violence. I hope that the Federal Government will not lag too far behind the State of California in enacting such meritorious legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Washington Post of July 23, 1965, and the California statute be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and statute were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 23, 1965]

CRIME VICTIM COMPENSATED IN CALIFORNIA

California has become the first State to provide financial compensation for victims of violent crimes and the families of murder victims.

A bill creating a compensation fund administered by the State department of social welfare was signed into law this week by Gov. Edmund G. Brown.

New Zealand has a compensation system and Great Britain is experimenting with a similar system. A bill creating a Federal compensation board has been introduced by Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas.

The most prominent American supporter of the compensation idea is Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg, who has been named Ambassador to the United Nations.

[A California Statute]

CHAPTER —

(*An act to add section 1500.02 to the Welfare and Institutions Code and to add section 11211 to division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code as proposed by assembly bill No. 1682, relating to aid to families with dependent children*)

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 1500.02 is added to the Welfare and Institutions Code, to read:

1500.02. Aid shall be paid under this chapter, upon application, to the family of any person killed and to the victim and family, if any, of any person incapacitated as the result of a crime of violence, if there is need of such aid.

The department shall establish criteria for payment of aid under this chapter, which criteria shall be substantially the same as those provided for aid to families with dependent children, provided, however, that aid shall be paid regardless of whether or not the applicant meets the property qualifications prescribed for that program. In no event shall expenditures under this section for the 1965–1966 fiscal year exceed one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000).

Upon conviction of a person of a crime of violence resulting in the injury or death of another person, the court shall take into consideration the defendant's economic condition, and unless it finds such action will cause the family of the defendant to be dependent on public welfare, shall, in addition to any other penalty, order the defendant to pay a fine commensurate in amount with the offense committed. The fine shall be deposited in the indemnity fund in the State treasury, which is hereby established, and the proceeds in such fund shall be used for the payment of aid under this section.

This section shall not constitute part of this State's plan for participation in any aid program under the Federal Social Security Act, and shall be financed entirely by State and county funds. In all other respects, it shall be administered in the same manner as any other provision of this chapter.

SEC. 2. Section 11211 is added to division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code as proposed by assembly bill No. 1682, to read:

11211. Aid shall be paid under this chapter, upon application, to the family of any person killed and to the victim and family, if any, of any person incapacitated as the result of a crime of violence, if there is need of such aid.

The department shall establish criteria for payment of aid under this chapter, which criteria shall be substantially the same as those provided for aid to families with dependent children: *Provided, however,* That aid shall be paid regardless of whether or not the applicant meets the property qualifications prescribed for that program. In no event shall expenditures under this section for the 1965–1966 fiscal year exceed one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000).

Upon conviction of a person of a crime of violence resulting in the injury or death of another person, the court shall take into consideration the defendant's economic condition, and unless it finds such action will cause the family of the defendant to be dependent on public welfare, shall, in addition to any other penalty, order the defendant to pay a fine commensurate in amount with the offense committed. The fine shall be deposited in the indemnity fund, in the State treasury, which is hereby established, and the proceeds in such fund shall be used for the payment of aid under this section.

This section shall not constitute part of this State's plan for participation in any aid program under the Federal Social Security Act, and shall be financed entirely by State and county funds. In all other respects, it shall be administered in the same manner as any other provision of this chapter.

SEC. 3. Section 2 of this act shall become operative only if assembly bill No. 1682 is enacted by the legislature at its 1965 regular session, and in such case at the same time as assembly bill No. 1682 takes effect; at which time section 1500.02 as added to the Welfare and Institutions Code by section 1 of this act is repealed.

PIONEER DAY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, tomorrow the people of my State join with the people of our sister State, Utah, to pay tribute to the early pioneers on the 118th anniversary of the settlement in our region. These early settlers were members of a uniquely American religious group, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

It was on July 24, 1847, after 102 days on the trail, that the first Mormons arrived in a canyon overlooking the Great Salt Lake Valley. Their leader, Brigham Young, surveyed the valley and said simply, "It is enough. This is the place."

In the era of manifest destiny, the Mormon pioneers were among the first to attack the hardships of the expanding western frontier. As Prof. William Mulder has said:

> In their westward movement they were like the fine filament preceding the thread as it seeks the eye of the needle. They were part of the vanguard of settlement that was already making the Oregon and California Trial a dusty highway.

These early Mormons were also in the forefront of the American scene in other ways. Religiously, the Mormon faith expressed the new liberal optimism in the ability of many to better himself, to attain greater perfection.

The LDS also possessed a deep commitment to social justice. In fact, some of the early Mormons, through the practice of consecrated property, sought economic equality by deeding all property to the church and then allotting the returns from this property to members according to their needs. While this is not practiced today, the Mormons still have a comprehensive welfare program that reaches all corners of the Mormon community, assuring that none shall want.

Shortly after arriving in Utah, the Mormons began to develop the land and attempt colonization of the surrounding territory. In 1855 they pushed northward and founded Fort Lemhi, the first major attempt at settlement in my own State of Idaho. Then, in 1860, the Mormons founded Franklin, the first permanent settlement in the State of Idaho.

Like Thomas Jefferson, the Mormon settlers had an enduring faith in the value of agricultural labor. As the first Anglo-Saxon people to practice extensive irrigation, the Mormons were able to transform a semiarid region into a land of green and productive valleys.

During the latter part of the 19th century, the Mormons were a persecuted people. But today they occupy a prestigious position in American life; one of their members is considered a possible candidate for the office of President of the United States. Others have played a prominent role in Congress and have held such important executive positions as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Treasurer of the United States, Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Commissioner of Education, and Secretary of the Interior, under Democratic and Republican Presidents alike.

The Mormons have attained this position of prestige, I think, because of their strong commitment to the clean and wholesome life. They maintain one of the few organized religions without a paid clergy. Church activities permeate the social structure of the communities where the Mormons live, drawing people from all stations of life into shared experience. Programs for Mormon youngsters are well designed to help prepare young men and women for the responsibilities of adulthood.

The Mormon tabernacle choir, besides being a source of accomplishment for the Mormons, is certainly one of the finest choirs in the world. At the request of President Johnson, this choir sang at the 1965 Presidential inauguration.

Aside from the laudable social and religious activities of the Mormons, they have also gained respect for their endeavors in the field of education. They have established several outstanding institutions of higher learning, the largest being Brigham Young University. In my own State they operate a fine junior college at Rexburg, Ricks College. The Mormons are strongly committed to the enlightenment of the people through education, and they devote a large portion of their resources to it.

Today people throughout my State pause in their daily activities to pay tribute to the Mormon pioneers. Their courage, their valor, their fidelity to a common cause has set a standard for all. For these qualities and for the contributions made by their descendants, they have my respect and admiration. I am proud to join with the people of my State and the people of Utah in paying tribute to these sturdy Americans.

TRIBUTE TO ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, those of us who attended the final services for Adlai Stevenson last Monday in Bloomington, Ill., were privileged to hear a moving and appropriate tribute to him by Dr. Dana McLean Greeley, president of the Unitarian Universalist Association of North America.

I ask unanimous consent that this tribute be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Tribute to Adlai Stevenson

(By Dr. Dana McLean Greeley, president, Unitarian Universalist Association (of North America))

The very presence of this company speaks more eloquently and more tenderly than anything that we can say or sing. But here in the community and the church of his childhood and of lifelong associations, we pay to Governor Stevenson our most intimate and final tribute, recognizing also the lasting bereavement of all mankind.

Many of those who have loved him the longest and most dearly are with us, and each in the privacy of his own thoughts offers his own prayer; yet the larger company at Washington's National Cathedral bowed as reverently in his honor; and statesmen and the common people alike, the world around, have taken him to their hearts, and will mold his memory into their own images of the best life and prophecy of America in the 20th century.

Adlai Stevenson was destined by his heritage and his own nature for public service. And although in moments he shrank from that role, he also thrived upon it. It was at once a bitter cup that he had to drink, and the elixir of life that lifted him to the fulfillment of his own powers. He may not have thought that he had accomplished enough, for there were bitter disappointments, public and private, and yet unmistakably he was called to greatness; and the God that shines in the firmament of the heavens was radiant in his person and resonant in his voice. Not either ancient Israel or modern New York could produce a more articulate spokesman for justice and the right. If Winston Churchill could turn a phrase as well, it was not to liquidate the empire, but to keep the past upon her throne, whereas Governor Stevenson undertook the tougher task primarily of persuading a nation to minimize its sovereignty and to merge its hopes and fears with those of other nations. In his own words his attempt was "to defrost a * * * segment of the opaque window through which we see others and others see us," and thereby to increase understanding and fraternity among men.

He added very recently that change is not the great enemy of men, but violence is that enemy. If political success is to raise the level of the national debate and of the world's dialog, to make truly qualified people feel more at home in public life, and to influence one's country and mankind for good, then he achieved success emphatically and dramatically. We shall remember his combination of greatness and goodness.

We salute him for his modesty and his ambition, for his ability and his affability, for his wisdom and his wit, and for his failures and his successes. His mind was extraordinarily free from prejudice, and subservient to the truth. If at times he was deliberate in the making of decisions, it was because he sought the moral context for the workable answer.

He was a philosopher and a politician. All men counted with him, but none too much. He was an American, but he died in England. He was a Democrat, but his family newspaper, of which he was a principal owner, is Republican. He was a Unitarian, but in our Nation's Capitol his flag-draped casket lay fittingly before an ecumenical Episcopal altar. In the climax of his career he was an Ambassador to the United Nations, with strong convictions of his own, and with an unflinching fidelity to his country and his President. If there ever seemed to be contradictions in his life, Emerson's explanation is applicable, "to be great is to be misunderstood." He was not just an American, or only a Democrat, or exclusively a Unitarian, or solely an Ambassador. He was also always the universal citizen. His patriotism was intense, but it had no bounds. His politics were both purposeful and personal. And the cardinal principles of his religion were freedom and human dignity.

My colleague, his cousin, Robert Richardson, reminds me that their great-grandfather, Jesse Fell, would be very proud to have us say that the Governor was truly Lincolnesque in his idealism, his integrity, his compassion, and his humor, as well as in his love of the State of Illinois. He was a devoted son, and brother, and father, and grandfather. He was a loyal friend. And he was a servant to all the children of men. In that "distant day when nobody rattles a saber and nobody drags a chain," his name will shine with an ever-increasing luster.

He understood not only democracy and communism, but likewise the "moving forms and shadows of a world revolution." He was not cowed by complexity, but kept his eye on the goals that he knew to be worth every effort that could be bent in their direction. He believed in a better world that we ourselves can and must create here and now. Characteristically, a decade ago, with his friend Albert Schweitzer and Prime Minister Nehru, he was a prophetic advocate of a nuclear test ban treaty. "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that publisheth peace." G. K. Chesterton once said that if we only had more visionaries among our statesmen, we might get something really practical done. Adlai Stevenson was that kind of a statesman.

Though there was a poignancy in his life that matched the hungers of his heart and the sensitiveness of his being, he had a faith that was greater than any problem or peril or defeat. And he was able to say with Esdras, "Great is the truth and mighty above all things."

"The memorial of virtue is immortal because it is known with God and with men. When it is present, men take example at it, and when it is gone, they desire it. It weareth a crown and triumpheth forever, having gotten the victory, striving for undefiled rewards."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this week we are observing Captive Nations Week. It is a week when all of those in the world fortunate enough to live in freedom should be reminded of those many millions for whom freedom is only an unreal dream or a word without meaning.

The Iron Curtain which descended over so many once free nations after World War II has not been raised. For more than 20 years tens of millions of people have suffered the despotic rule of Soviet colonialism. Poles, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Czechs, Ukrainians, Rumanians, Armenians, and others have all felt the iron heel of Soviet domination. Economic exploitation, religious persecution, expropriation of property, terror, purge, and imprisonment have in varying degrees become part of their daily lives.

But seeds of unrest and change are present in Eastern Europe. Freedom's flame still burns brightly in many hearts. It is up to us to do everything that we can to keep that flame alive until all of these peoples, from the Baltic to the Black Sea, achieve freedom and the right to govern themselves.

PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION—REJECTION BY THE LEGISLATURE OF COLORADO

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, several States have already acted with dispatch and wisdom to ratify the proposed 25th amendment to the Constitution pertaining to the continuation of the executive department of this Government in competent hands should disability strike our President at any time. But one State, Colorado, has acted with similar haste to reject the amendment on the specious grounds, as expressed by one member of its State senate, that the United States of America has done without this amendment for 175 years and can still do so.

In truth, Mr. President, I think virtually all of us are aware of the fact that the United States of America has been lucky in the past and cannot afford to flirt with the danger of political chaos which could arise out of a crisis over Presidential succession. As the Washington Post said editorially on Thursday:

> On many occasions the country has been only one heartbeat away from potential chaos because of the absence of any mechanism for replacing the Vice President.

It is, indeed, rather shocking, as the Post has said, Mr. President, to note such complete unawareness of the problems of Presidential succession and disability as that manifested in Denver. But, in all fairness, Mr. President, I would add that I doubt in all seriousness if the action of the Colorado Senate, taken, apparently, in some haste, represents in fact the thinking of the people. I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post editorial, "Reaction in Colorado," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Reaction In Colorado

Colorado's rejection of the proposed 25th amendment to the Constitution merits some kind of note in the annals of political stagnation. This projected reform, designed to make certain that the office of President of the United States will always be occupied by an able-bodied and competent person, had majority support in Denver as elsewhere. But a handful of Republican State senators denied it the necessary two-thirds vote on the ground that the United States had done without it for more than 175 years and could still do so.

This argument advanced by L. T. Skiffington could be made with equal force against any governmental reform at any time. It could be made with equal force against the act giving statehood to Colorado. It is an essentially unenlightened plea for the status quo with no regard for the changed conditions which have made improvement of our machinery of government imperative. Indeed, the premise on which the argument is based is itself a betrayal of ignorance. The country passed through perilous times while President Garfield and later President Wilson were stricken and could not be temporarily relieved of their onerous duties because of the existing defect in the Constitution. On many occasions the country has been only one heartbeat away from potential chaos because of the absence of any mechanism for replacing the Vice President.

It is rather shocking to note such complete unawareness of the problems of Presidential succession and disability as that manifested in Denver. Fortunately, three other States—Wisconsin, Nebraska, and Oklahoma—hastened to ratify the proposed 25th amendment. We have no doubt that 35 additional States will complete the ratification process. In the end Colorado may wish to erase the negative distinction it has acquired by a minority response to any argument based on blind reaction.

A CHALLENGE TO EXTREMISTS IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Columnist Max Freedman has paid the State controller of California, Alan Cranston, a much deserved tribute in the Washington Evening Star for Thursday.

Mr. Cranston, Freedman notes, has spoken out importantly about extremists in his State, expressing the view which none can challenge that the extremist makes his greatest gains when moderate, responsible people remain silent or act timidly. And he makes the very valid point that extremists, whether of the left or right, are one of a kind, really. The point is well made by Cranston, and by Freedman in his column, that both types of extremists are fundamentally destructive of the democratic process, though the rightwing variety enjoys a fundamental advantage in that many Americans honestly believe they are defending American ideals and freedoms.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Freedman's column, "Californian Challenges Extremists," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 22, 1965]

Californian Challenges Extremists

(By Max Freedman)

It could not have been easy for State Controller Alan Cranston to make his recent important speech on extremist groups in California. Had someone from outside California spoken in these harsh and challenging terms, he would have been charged with maligning the State as a paradise for extremists. Cranston accepted that risk because he believes that the extremists make their greatest gains when the moderate and responsible people are silent or timid.

What fails to emerge from Cranston's analysis, otherwise so admirable, is an explanation of why California should be so open to the appeal of the extremists. Their supporters are found among young people as well as among the old and the retired taking counsel from their frightened prejudices. We must apparently reconcile ourselves to the curious fact that the liberal and progressive traditions of California are crossed by a more raucous and extreme strain.

Cranston begins by citing documentary proof that the Communists and the John Birchers often say the same thing. For example, the monthly magazine published by the leftwing Progressive Labor Party charges that President Kennedy was assassinated on orders from big business. The John Birch Society claims that Kennedy was killed because he was not a good enough Communist. Both denounce President Johnson and Walter Reuther as conspirators afraid to avow their real purposes or to disclose their real masters. Both denounce the American press as an organized conspiracy against the truth.

The major difference between the leftwingers and the John Birchers is that one group thinks the United States is headed toward fascism and the other claims the United States is moving toward communism. It is not much of a difference for people who believe in freedom.

Cranston cited evidence that 3,000 groups in the United States are now spending $30 million a year promoting rightwing extremism. Last year the John Birch Society alone spent an estimated $3 million and is now planning to add 38,000 new members in California. Robert Welch, the society's president, devotes about half his time to enlarging the California membership.

Another rightwing extremist, Carl McIntire, a deposed Presbyterian minister now conducting a disreputable anti-Catholic radio campaign, grossed an estimated $1.5 million in 1964.

Welch has said, "Democracy is merely a deceptive phrase, a weapon of demagoguery, and a perennial fraud."

The one thing common to all extremist groups is their inflexible conviction that they are right and their opponents are evil. Acting on this principle, they are no longer open to reason, no longer willing to respect the wishes of the majority. What makes them dangerous is neither their ugly political technique nor their contempt for the facts. They are fundamentally destructive of the democratic process itself. They create a climate of fear so that their doctrines of hate may prevail. The vicious personal attack on the reputation of Senator Thomas Kuchel, Republican, of California, an attack to which he responded with rare courage, is only one example of the evil weapons they will use against a public man of whom they disapprove.

Yet the rightwing groups, as Cranston has shown, enjoy one vast advantage always denied to the Communists. Many Americans do honestly believe that these extreme rightwingers are defending American ideals and values. They see them owing no foreign allegiance and parading their claims as superpatriots. If the rightwingers are rough with their opponents, it is a roughness justified by the cause being served. That is the basic appeal of the extremists, in California as elsewhere. Yet the warning by the Los Angeles Times is profoundly true that subversion remain subversion whether it comes from the right or the left.

The extremists probably have made life a misery for Cranston since he denounced them. But other public officials will no doubt follow his courageous example. A concerted exposure of the false assumptions and dangerous methods of the extremist groups is the best way to discredit them utterly.

CHICAGO SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA SUCCESS IN ALASKA

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Chicago Symphony Orchestra enjoys an international reputation for excellence. I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the overwhelming success it enjoyed at Fairbanks, Alaska. This was the first event in which a major orchestra had appeared in the city, and I am glad to read that thunderous applause acclaimed the performance.

I ask that the articles from the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner and New York Times be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner, May 25, 1965]

First Major Concert Thrills Fairbanks, Symphony Lauded

(By Prof. Charles Davis, head, music department, University of Alaska)

Last evening's capacity crowd accorded the Chicago Symphony a tremendous ovation as it concluded the first of two concerts in Hering Auditorium.

To residents of the Fairbanks area it was a truly memorable evening as one of the world's foremost symphonies conducted by the internationally known Jean Martinon became the first major orchestra ever to present a concert in the farthest North city.

With meticulous precision and ensemble the orchestra recreated the mood and contrasts of Beethoven's Symphony No. 6—the "Pastoral." At the outset, the vagaries of the acoustics of the Hering stage caused momentary uncertainties in the thinly scored section of the first movement. Quickly adjusting to the situation, the ensemble demonstrated its virtuosity in painting colors from the quiet pastels of countryside to the thunderous storm which interrupts the restful quiet of "the Brook."

DELICACY OF LINE

In opening an orchestral program with the "Pastoral" the first two movements in their predominantly restrained dynamics seem somewhat overlong. This reviewer might have preferred a degree of anticipation in the "Andante Molto Moto," as the tempo seemed to suggest too great a degree of repose. The serenity of this second movement was characterized by great delicacy of line and phrasing.

Certainly the third movement of the symphony is a welcome change of mood, with its Landler dance rhythm. From this movement the heightened tension builds to its ultimate climax in the "storm." Here the instruments combined with a sonority of tone that overwhelms, still maintaining an exactness and balance characteristic of great ensemble playing. The final Allegretto was a consummate portrayal of joy and peace.

Following the intermission, the orchestra turned to a composition in a contemporary idiom—"Orchestra Variation on a Theme of Paganini"—by Blacher. Announced by solo violin in its original form, the theme, disguised and altered, moves to various sections of the orchestra with accompaniments in widely contrasting rhythm and sonorities. The complexities of rhythm combined with a modern harmonic usage create highly entertaining program fare.

Concluding the program was the familiar tone poem "Don Juan" by Richard Strauss. This composition, typical of the early Strauss writing, exploits all sections of the orchestra in intricate melodic motives and contrasting stentorian harmonies. Once again the orchestra demonstrated great virtuosity with its precision of ensemble, its delicate maneuvering from one solo instrument to another or to the full complement of players as Conductor Martinon deftly recreated the score.

THUNDEROUS APPLAUSE

Accorded a thunderous, standing ovation by the audience, the orchestra responded with the bombastic "Rakoczy March" by Hector Berlioz. Still reluctant to accept the end of a thrilling evening, the audience kept Conductor Martinon returning for repeated acknowledgments.

Tonight, the symphony promises an equally exciting evening with Associate Conductor

Irwin Hoffman conducting a program including Schubert's "Symphony No. 5," the "Harry Janos Suite" by the contemporary Composer Zoltan Kodaly, and the Brahms "Symphony No. 2," Hoffman, a protege of the late Serge Koussevitzky, was formerly conductor of the Vancouver, British Columbia Symphony and has appeared as guest conductor of leading orchestras throughout the United States, Mexico, and South America.

[From the New York Times, May 27, 1965]

Chicago Symphony Cheered in Alaska

Fairbanks, Alaska, May 26.—Monday evening's capacity crowd accorded the Chicago Symphony a tremendous ovation as it concluded the first of two concerts in Lathrop High School auditorium.

To residents of the Fairbanks area, it was a memorable evening as one of the world's foremost symphonies conducted by Jean Martinon became the first major orchestra to present a concert in the farthest north city.

With precision and ensemble the orchestra recreated the mood and contrasts of the chief work, Beethoven's Symphony No. 6—the "Pastoral." At the outset the acoustics of the Lathrop stage caused momentary uncertainties in the thinly scored section of the first movement. Quickly adjusting, the ensemble demonstrated its virtuosity in painting colors from the quiet pastels of countryside to the thunderous storm which interrupts the restful quiet of the brook.

Accorded a standing ovation, the orchestra responded with the "Rakoczy March" by Berlioz.

At the end of the concert the audience made Mr. Martinon return for repeated acknowledgments.

The symphony played again Tuesday night before going on to Winnipeg, Manitoba, for another concert.

THE 14(b) ISSUE—RIGHT-TO-WORK LEGISLATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the question of the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is before the Senate in S. 256 and action is imminent in the House on the companion bill, H.R. 77, which was reported favorably on June 22.

Over the years, the right-to-work question surrounding the issue has drawn forth literally millions of words, engendered bitter feelings, caused the expenditure of untold sums of money by those who contend for and against, and shaken the entire electorate in such States as Ohio and California when the issue appeared on the ballot there. Advocates and proponents are to be found in this body, and we can look forward to strong expressions of differing views before the roll is called on the repeal bill.

I support the bill for repeal. I have sought to look at the question rationally rather than emotionally, and I have come to my conclusion as a result of the persuasiveness of the facts surrounding the situation.

On Monday of this week, Hobart Rowan, of the Washington Post, examined the question in his column appearing on the business page of that paper. His article is penetrating, and as a business editor his views are worthy of attention. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Economic Impact: Smokescreens Obscure Right-To-Work Issue

(By Hobart Rowen)

The battle over repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act—those unfortunate few words that allow an individual State to ban the union shop—is about to be resumed, this time on the House floor. The public will thus be treated again to an appalling amount of hokum and buncombe on this issue.

Those individuals and organizations that want to preserve the right-to-work laws permitted by section 14(b) ought to quit shadowboxing, and say forthrightly that they're against the whole idea of labor unions.

Right or wrong, at least that position would end the pretense that they are losing valuable sleep over the question of individual liberty.

At the present time, 19 States have taken advantage of section 14(b) by prohibiting any agreement between an employer and a union specifying membership in a union as a condition of employment. Even if a company and a union should desire a union shop, it would be illegal in these 19 States.

But while the chamber of commerce and others weep crocodile tears about the loss of liberty in the other 31 States, the basic motive of the right-to-work crowd is to attract industry with the promise of cheap, nonunion labor.

And as the AFL–CIO has ably documented, the less respectable of the antiunion band have a close alliance with the ultraright-wing John Birch types, whose bias on this score is merely one aspect of a longer record of antiquated, antisocial, 19th century prejudices.

Organizations like the chamber, which are eminently respectable, if behind the times, fail to see the inconsistency between their avowed support of the principle of collective bargaining and their demand for continuance of section 14(b).

They are saying, in effect, that an employer should have to bargain with his workers (that's what collective bargaining means)—provided they haven't formed an effective union. If one can make sense out of the chamber position, it is that employers should strive to return to that nostalgic era when they could deal with their employees individually.

Well, maybe it would be nice—the way some people look at it—to do without unions. But the chamber better forget it, and take a look at the calendar. It is 1965.

Most of the really influential leaders of American industry have taken a more sophisticated approach. They know that the "individual freedom" propaganda is just that—a line created by the same imaginative public-relations men who thought up the misleading right-to-work phrase.

Actually, the real leaders of American industry couldn't care less about repeal of section 14(b). Some, it is true, wish that President Johnson had staved off AFL–CIO president George Meany's request. But policymakers in the U.S. business community deal regularly with unions and the union shop.

By and large, they'd be panicked if they weren't assured of well-organized, responsible labor unions to provide a steady flow of manpower for them.

One of L.B.J.'s Texas aids confides: "When a big national company comes in down home, they generally ask: 'Where's the union?' If it's not there, they're disappointed. They want one right on tap."

But the local wheels are generally nervous. They are skeptical of union organizers, who are equated to invaders, men who want to upend precious States rights. Above all, the local men, often pillars of small-time chambers of commerce, feel they can keep wages low if the union is kept out. They freely advertise and solicit on that basis.

The unions have floated their share of baloney, too. Repeal of section 14(b) is not a do-or-die proposition for union organization, because they can and do survive in the right-to-work States.

And despite denials, it is true that the notion of a union shop involves a certain element of compulsion. This ought to be freely admitted, because the compulsion is justifiable. Where collective bargaining is the law of the land, a man who is deriving benefits from union representation ought to join the union. At least, he ought to pay dues, which is all the law requires.

The unions want to do away with section 14(b) because it is a bone in the throat. The Wagner Act established the principle of collective bargaining, and then the Taft-Hartley Act partially reneged. For 18 years this has invited antiunion harassment. Both management and labor could turn their attention to more useful and productive endeavors if section 14(b) were scrapped.

RUSSIAN ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am glad to have been a cosponsor of the resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, which Senator Ribicoff introduced last February and in which 67 Members joined him. That resolution expressed the sense of the Congress, in part, that "the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses, and fully permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders."

The Senate passed that resolution by a unanimous rollcall vote on May 14, and it was passed by the House with amendment last week, on July 12.

The importance of this resolution, and the indisputable facts which called it forth, are underlined by an article appearing in the current issue of the noted nondenominational religious journal, the Christian Century. Under the title "Cultural Genocide in Russia," its former editor, Dr. Harold Fey, now a professor of social ethics at the Christian Theological Seminary in Indianapolis, discusses the extent of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. He warns that success of the efforts being made against the Jewish faith in "an officially atheistic state" "will have demonstrated that it has perfected a pattern of cultural genocide which can be used against other religions when their turn comes."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Cultural Genocide in Russia

(Note.—By measures threatening the continuance of Jews as members of a religious entity, the Soviet Union courts designation abroad as champion of that anti-Semitism it once abhorred.)

(By Harold E. Fey)

This is not a propitious time to raise issues which could worsen relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Such action could narrow the widening gap between the Russians and the Chinese and push both of them deeper into the Vietnamese war, which already perils world security. But one recalls that since there was never a really propitious time to challenge Nazi Germany, persecutions of the Jews developed into atrocities, then into war and genocide. Later the recollection of silence prolonged too long became a source of shame and regret. Now that measures being taken in Russia against 3 million Jews approach the level of cultural genocide, it is time to protest, whether or not the time is propitious.

Too few Americans are aware that in Russia, government pressure and discrimination has reduced the number of synagogues from 3,000 to fewer than 100. In a number of cities with large Jewish populations no synagogues are left, and Jewish believers are persecuted for attending meetings for worship in homes. And they are victims of many other disabilities Jews have not known on a large scale since Hitler. Identity papers necessary when a person seeks employment, housing, or education or wishes to enter any other important relationship have the word "Jew" written on them, thus opening the way to discrimination.

This designation is used because Jews constitute one of more than 100 subgroups of Soviet society called nationalities. Other groups find designation of nationality status on identity papers an asset; for the Jews it is a liability. When the czarist regime collapsed in 1917, several nationalities tried to gain independence by revolution. To draw them back and hold them within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Communists promised that nationalities would enjoy "self-determination of peoples" within the Soviet state, retaining their own languages, schools, newspapers, identities and locations. Jews are identified as a nationality but are denied the privileges accorded that status.

I

This denial violates the Soviet constitution and the stated policy of the Communist Party. Article 123 of the constitution declares that "equality of rights of citizens of the U.S.S.R., irrespective of nationality or race, in all spheres of governmental, cultural, political or other public activity is an indefeasible law"—a law incapable of being made null and void. This article also states that restriction of rights on account of race or nationality "as well as advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness or hatred and contempt is punishable by law." As recently as October 1961 the 22d Congress of the ruling and only legal party of the U.S.S.R. declared: "The Communist Party guarantees the complete freedom of each citizen to speak and to rear and educate his children in any language—ruling out all privileges, restrictions or compulsions in the use of this or that language." The Soviet criminal code sustains these positions of constitution and party—in words, but not in practice where Jews are concerned.

Radio Moscow has not failed to make propaganda out of the terms of the nationalities law. One broadcast boasted: "The complete solution of the problem of nationalities and that of the cooperation of nations in the U.S.S.R. is of world historic importance. It is a model for all the peoples who are struggling for their liberation from imperialist aggression." How square such evidence of self-esteem with the actual situation?

The Jews, 11th largest nationality group in the Soviet Union, are permitted to have no institutions on a national level, as do the Moslems, the Russian Orthodox, Baptist and Armenian churches and the Lutheran churches of Latvia and Estonia. Without help from a central national organization, local Jewish communities are isolated and crushed one by one.

Other nationalities have their own languages recognized, but Hebrew has been a forbidden tongue since 1917. Yiddish, the popular Jewish language, has not been taught in the schools since 1948, yet in the latest census (1959) 472,000 Soviet Jews listed Yiddish as their mother tongue. When the state of Israel was formed, Stalin closed Jewish schools, newspapers, theaters and research institutes. Later some Jews were executed after secret trials for the crime of proposing that Jews be treated as are other nationalities. However, since Stalin's death some momentary relaxations of cultural repressions have been recorded. In 1959 and 1961 six Yiddish classics were published in editions of 30,000 each. A bimonthly Yiddish literary journal has appeared, with a circulation of 25,000; it is expected to become a monthly this year. A Hebrew-Russian dictionary and a book of poems have been published. But all this represents merely a remnant of a once prolific cultural life.

Among the Jewish publications banned is the Hebrew Bible, of which no copies have been printed in Russia since 1917, and no Russian translation has been permitted. Since the 1920's only one press run of 3,000 copies of the Jewish prayer book has been authorized. It is impossible to obtain replacements for equipment, apparel, and foods required by Jewish ritualistic practices. In contrast, the Orthodox and the Baptists have published editions of their Bibles running respectively to 50,000 and 10,000 each, and the Baptists and Lutherans have obtained permission to bring out new hymnals. The Moslems have printed more than 9,000 copies of the Koran in Arabic—a language which is not spoken in the U.S.S.R. but which like Hebrew has liturgical significance. Yet the official reason given for banning publication in Hebrew is that it is not spoken in the country.

Though nearly all of the rabbis, serving the remaining synagogues are in their seventies or eighties, the student body of the one remaining Yeshiva or theological seminary has been limited by state action to only two or three students. The Moslems are allowed to operate institutions for the training of mullahs for their mosques. The Orthodox Church has two academies and three theological seminaries left, although it too has suffered losses (it had eight seminaries in 1959). Estimates are that there is one Baptist preacher for every 500 members and one Orthodox priest for every 1,100—but only one rabbi for every 15,000 to 16,000 Jewish believers. Jews may not be sent abroad for training in the rabbinate, though Moslems and Baptists may and do go abroad for religious training.

II

More than half of the persons executed in recent years in the Soviet Union for so-called "economic crimes" have been Jews. The evidence is strong that in this regard Jews are again being made scapegoats, for such crimes are generally manifestations of the rise of a middle class in Soviet society—a phenomenon which Marx and Lenin did not anticipate or understand and with which the present masters of the Soviet Union are not prepared to cope. Marxist fundamentalists regard the operation of a free market with horror and seek to suppress it as the blackest heresy. Whenever a synagogue is closed the closing is attributed to the economic machinations of Jews who are officers or members and is accompanied by noisy anti-Semitic propaganda campaigns branding a whole people with suspicion. One wonders what must go through the minds of Soviet leaders who once declared anti-Semitism a crime particularly associated with capitalism as they repeat the charges made so recently by Hitler and move to destroy culturally the very people against whom the German dictator directed his deadly hatred.

To their honor the Jews, who worship God, are not an assimilable element in any totalitarian society. Discovering that fact, as did Hitler less than a generation ago, the Soviet Union turns, as did Hitler, to eliminating them as Jews. The Germans used gas ovens; the U.S.S.R. is pursuing the same end through cultural genocide practiced over a long period. If it succeeds Christians may anticipate that, group by group, their turn will come next.

Statistically—a poor measure in such cases—Russian destruction of the Jews as Jews is about two-thirds complete. Those who break with Judaism, who drop their communal ties with other Jews, who abandon their ties of language and ethnic identity, probably suffer little—except in their souls. They become alienated, uprooted, bereft of their birthright as human beings, accepting the faceless existence which the state decrees. And apparently abandonment, even denunciation, of Judaism does not guarantee first class citizenship; the proportion of Jews in higher education continues to decline, as does the number of those in high posts where security is a factor.

On the basis of the evidence now available, it is apparent that the treatment Jews are receiving in the U.S.S.R. transgresses the official policy on nationalities, even though that policy has been recently reaffirmed by the Communist Party. It violates the Soviet constitution, breaks Soviet criminal law. It contradicts the Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations and the customary standards of civilized states. It is a major survivor of Stalinism in a land where Stalinism has been officially denounced. It continues even though it creates internal disruption, blackens the Soviet name abroad, makes mockery of claims to cultural freedom.

III

In spite of what the Soviet Government proclaims as its policy, the actual policy is to destroy Judaism as a religion, to scatter, demoralize and annihilate a major cultural community, to deprive Jews of their legal status within the Soviet system. By so doing, an officially atheistic state will have demonstrated that it has perfected a pattern of cultural genocide which can be used against other religions when their turn comes.

Some signs, however, indicate that the course may be arrested before it proceeds to its tragic end. Now and again intimations reach the world from the recesses of this closed society that at least some of the Russian people know what is happening and are alarmed by it. Protests from abroad may help increase their disquiet and prevent the total destruction of the second largest Jewish community in the world. The few voices which have been raised in Russia and abroad in behalf of an enlightened public policy and responsible public behavior have not gone unheard. Maurice Friedberg wrote in the January 1965, issue of Commentary that it was world interest that shielded Boris Pasternak from reprisals by the Soviet police; that publicity about cultural deprivation moved the authorities to promise that Sovietish Heimland, the Yiddish cultural journal, would be permitted to increase its frequency of publication to monthly; that foreign concern probably prevented the staging of show trials for alleged Jewish economic offenders and led to a toning down of the blatant anti-Semitism in part of the official press; that charges of religious prejudice in the armed forces caused the government to reveal, nearly 20 years after the event, that more than 100 Jewish soldiers had received Hero of the Soviet Union awards during or after

World War II. Expressions of concern do result in some good.

Freedom to worship, to maintain their own identity, to teach their children their own majestic and meaningful history, to speak and teach the language of their fathers, to operate central institutions to serve the needs of all Russian Jews and maintain contacts with coreligionists in the outer world—these aspirations of Soviet Jews are not unreasonable or excessive. The Jews seek no special privilege. They ask only to be accorded the rights possessed by other nationalities. Communist Poland does not interfere with such rights; it even permits Jews to make pilgrimages abroad or to emigrate. Why does great Russia fear to do what a smaller state does with impunity? It would gain, would serve its own best interests, if it would grant the rights due its Jewish citizens, if it put a stop to anti-Semitic bigotry by officials and returned to its early program of campaigning against anti-Semitism in any form.

On the other hand, if the U.S.S.R. persists in official perpetration of outrageous injustice, sooner or later that course will bring its own penalties—first in isolation from the civilized world, eventually in the judgment which no man and no nation, however powerful, can finally evade. Justice will come. This is not a threat; it is an affirmation that there is a moral order in the universe. We hope and pray that the nation which has officially declared war on God is not driven by the death wish implicit in that nihilistic policy to destroy itself, beginning with the Jews.

PRESIDENT ORDERS CONTINUED FIGHT ON OCEAN FREIGHT RATE DISCRIMINATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it was gratifying to those of us at the Joint Economic Committee who have been concerned over the past 2 years about the existence of discriminatory ocean freight rates to learn of the reappointment of Adm. John Harllee as Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission. As I have told this body before, Admiral Harllee has been doing a fine, conscientious job, and his reappointment will provide assurance that the Commission will continue to investigate this complicated question of freight rate differentials and their adverse effects upon American exports.

It is deeply gratifying, too, to note that the President has given a clear, resonant mandate to the Maritime Commission to continue its important work on trade barriers that derive from discriminatory ocean freight rates. The President's words add up to very clear sailing orders, and surely we shall have occasion to recall them in the future as we continue our work on this problem.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that the President's remarks on freight rate discrimination, excerpted from his July 20 statement at the swearing-in ceremony, be included in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> In all that must be done, the great Maritime Commission has a key role to play—and I am looking to these men to continue to assume that challenge in their leadership at this great Commission.
>
> The Commission has my strongest support for continuing efforts to eliminate all the barriers to U.S. trade now presented by discriminatory freight rates. Likewise, the Commission has my support for its efforts to convince our allied trading partners that we welcome them to our shores to share in the prosperity that our commerce helps create for the free world.
>
> In world trade, this country seeks no special favoritism. But we do seek equality of treatment. We do seek the elimination of unfair or unlawful discriminatory prejudices or predatory practices.

PROPOSED APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR ERVIN TO THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article which appeared in the Raleigh News & Observer on Thursday, July 22, 1965, concerning the endorsement of Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., for appointment to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Governor Moore, of North Carolina, has strongly urged the President to appoint my colleague, the senior Senator from North Carolina, and I wholeheartedly join with him in this endorsement.

There is no man in the United States who is better qualified to serve on the Supreme Court than Senator Ervin. He has unexcelled qualifications in terms of his character, integrity, temperament, and ability. No finer appointment could be made than that of Sam J. Ervin, Jr.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ervin Plugged for High Court by Governor Moore

Governor Moore put in a plug Wednesday for Senator Sam J. Ervin, of Morganton, as a replacement for Justice Arthur Goldberg on the U.S. Supreme Court.

Moore sent President Johnson a telegram strongly recommending Ervin to the seat vacated Tuesday by Goldberg to become U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

The text of the telegram was released by the office of Governor Moore, who is vacationing out of the State.

"By temperament and experience he is eminently qualified for this position," Moore told the President. "Senator Ervin would acquit himself with distinction and honor on the Nation's Highest Court as he did as a justice of the North Carolina Supreme Court and as he is doing as a U.S. Senator. As Governor of North Carolina, I earnestly request you appoint this distinguished American to the U.S. Supreme Court."

The name of the 68-year-old Ervin has crept into speculation previously regarding a Supreme Court appointment.

Senator George Smathers, of Florida, went to bat for Ervin last summer during a western stop by Moore's Democratic campaign caravan.

Moore and Ervin were on the platform as Smathers called for the appointment during a rally in Sylva, Moore's long-time home. Ervin's immediate comment was: "I don't think we have to worry about that."

Ervin was one of Moore's earliest supporters in the 1964 gubernatorial campaign.

He went to the Senate in 1954 by appointment of the late Gov. William B. Umstead when Senator Clyde R. Hoey died in office. Ervin has had no major opposition winning reelection in 1954, 1956, and 1962.

His career before becoming a Senator included service in the general assembly, on the Burke County and State Democratic executive committees, on the superior court and State supreme court benches, and in Congress from the 10th district in 1946–47.

Ervin graduated from the law schools of the University of North Carolina and Harvard.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK: AN ANNIVERSARY TO REMEMBER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in 1959 the Members of the House and Senate passed a joint resolution, authorizing and requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July as Captive Nations Week, and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

This is the sixth year of that observance. For 6 years the President has been proclaiming Captive Nations Week, and we here in the Senate, and our colleagues in the House, have declaimed against the injustices visited on the captive nations and peoples. Yet basically their status has not changed. They are still captive. I can see the cynics saying now that this is all farcical, that we are paying lip-service to a lost cause.

But Mr. President, the cynics are wrong, as they are so often wrong about so many things. To whom can the captive peoples turn, if not the United States? Since when has this country shrinked from denouncing injustice, simply because that injustice is difficult to rectify? If the subversion and aggression we are fighting in Vietnam are worth the struggle, then certainly the least we can do is to reaffirm, here and now, our commitment to freedom for those earlier captives of communism, the people of the Baltic States, and of the nations of southeastern Europe. In a sense this is a commitment to the people of Russia too, for they were the first to lose their freedom. The point is this: the United States champions the free way of life.

We lead that portion of the world that professes to believe in liberty and the dignity of the individual above all else. Hope is sustained in the hearts of all the millions behind the Iron Curtain because they know that as long as America refuses to accept their servitude as final, it is in fact, not final. There is a chance that they may some day rejoin the brotherhood of free men. But if the United States, by word or deed, sanctions the status quo for the victims of Communist aggression and subversion, then indeed their doom is sealed. Moreover, whatever claim we may have to moral leadership of the free world would be utterly bankrupt.

There is no call here to roll back frontiers. I do not advocate any global crusade against communism. But I do say that America's position, her stance, if you will, matters gravely to those who place their trust in us. I say that if we remain firm in that stance we may find that the cracks in the Communist monolith will widen into fissures, the fissures into great gaps, and that eventually the structure will collapse from self-erosion.

For the winds of change are blowing even through the frigid Communist world. The Soviet Union and China see very few matters, these days, from the same perspective. Tito's defection from absolute fealty to Moscow dates from 1948, and 1956 witnessed the ousting of Stalinists in Poland and the revolution in Hungary. Despite a temporary clampdown, Poland's intellectual classes obviously yearn for closer contact with the West, and the hearts of her people are unquestionably with us. In economic matters, Rumania has asserted and maintained an independent policy which has brought her remarkable growth. There is no doubt that youth behind the Iron Curtain hankers for broad contact with the West, and is enamored of much of the same things as youth everywhere. This same need for cultural fulfillment has even been noted in Russia, whose Nikita Khrushchev may now regret the Pandora's box he opened with his denunciation of Stalin.

The Communist governments have had to meet these needs of their people to some extent, simply because the West, led by the United States, exists, and has not caved in under Soviet pressure. The continued reiteration of our belief in man's freedom and dignity may arouse the ire of the Muscovite rulers, but by the same token it forces them to recognize that these values have an appeal to their own populations, which they must, in some measure, satisfy. But if we fail to commemorate anniversaries such as Captive Nations Week, this might well be interpreted in Moscow as a signal that we did not really care what happened to the people they have subjugated, and the breath of freedom might be quickly stilled in Eastern Europe. I suggest that in this indirect way, our remembrance of Captive Nations Week serves not only the cause of human liberty, but contributes to the dialog or detente with the Soviet Union as well.

This detente, as we are well aware, is threatened by events in Vietnam. As we manifest our determination to prevent a Vietcong victory there, the Soviet line is bound to harden against us, as indeed, it has already been doing. This may well mean that the captive nations will be in for a harder time, as Russia struggles to rebuild her monolithic image through the suppression of cultural contacts with the West, at home and throughout Eastern Europe. But the people of the captive nations, who have borne their burden with exemplary fortitude, will understand. For by their own actions they have demonstrated that the revolutionary drive has gone out of communism in Europe. They know that Moscow, for all its bluster, recognized the imperatives imposed by the thermonuclear age. They know that communism has now shifted the focus of its action to the underdeveloped areas of the world. They want no captive nations in Asia to share their plight.

I believe that on this observance of Captive Nations Week, the peoples of the Soviet empire would want attention directed, not only to their own plight, but to the loss of freedom which threatens so many millions in Asia, Africa and Latin America, unless the United States can contain the thrust of communism in those areas as we contained it in Europe. They would recognize that we are fighting in Vietnam not only to prevent the immediate takeover of another country by communism, but also to buy time to construct a new Asian security network which could replace the vacuum left by the departure of the old colonial powers, and which, with our help, could offer a counterbalance to the expansionist thrust of Communist China.

The late Congressman, mayor of New York, and Administrator of UNRRA, Fiorello La Guardia, had a motto from which we might all draw a moral, "patience and fortitude." These qualities have been displayed by the people of the captive nations for two decades. As we commemorate their captivity we feel more closely linked with them, for now is the testing time for the patience and fortitude of the American people as well.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum; and it might be "live."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL AMERICAN LEGION BASEBALL WEEK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6, 1965, as "National American Legion Baseball Week."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of the joint resolution.

WASTEFUL TRANSACTION WITH THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC UNDER AID PROGRAM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, under date of July 16 the Comptroller General submitted to the Congress Report No. B-146820, in which he calls our attention to another glaring waste under our AID program.

In 1961 the United Arab Republic applied for a grant of 200,000 tons of corn to alleviate what was described as a severe crop failure in that country and to alleviate a prospective famine.

The facts are that in this same year the United Arab Republic harvested a bumper corn crop, and over 40 percent of the 7 million bushels of corn which was given to that country was actually sold.

Ultimately 186,000 tons of corn was delivered under this contract, representing an outright gift of $23,700,000 to the United Arab Republic.

Over 40 percent, or over $9 million, of this amount is known to have been sold rather than distributed for relief as intended. To what extent the other 60 percent was sold is at this moment undetermined.

A review of this transaction is as follows:

On October 19, 1961, the United Arab Republic requested the United States to grant 200,000 tons of corn for human consumption to meet an emergency crop failure.

On November 19, 1961, the United Arab Republic filed a supplemental report stating that their 1961 corn crop had suffered an estimated loss of about 20 percent.

On November 30, 1961, the American mission in Cairo informed AID in Washington that the United Arab Republic's November 19 statements substantially explained and justified the need for 200,000 tons of corn as emergency assistance and recommended that this grant be made with the understanding that the corn was to be distributed free to famine victims.

Under this free grant 186,000 tons of corn arrived in the United Arab Republic between February 12 and July 22, 1962.

Thus far this appears to be a normal transaction with our Government giving the United Arab Republic about 186,000 tons of corn with a market value of approximately $23,700,000 to relieve a famine in that country which was resulting from a crop failure of the 1961 corn crop. That, however, is not the case.

The record shows that the 1961 corn crop of the United Arab Republic was actually a bumper crop. I quote from the Comptroller General's report:

> In 1961 the United Arab Republic actually had a bumper corn crop for the area planted.

They had reduced their acreage somewhat, but the increased yield from this bumper crop offset the acreage reduction.

This grant was made in the midst of their harvest period. The first application for this $24 million gift of free corn was filed on October 19, 1961, and it was finally approved on December 28, 1961, on the basis of our mission's concurrence that there was a crop failure and threat of famine. The harvest period for the corn crop in the United Arab Republic is November and December; therefore, there was no reason why our mission should not have been aware of the fact that instead of a crop failure the United Arab Republic was harvesting a bumper crop.

In fact, all of the statistics of the United Arab Republic and our own Department of Agriculture attaché confirmed this bumper crop and none of the official statistics referred to the crop failure.

Shipments of this grain began in early 1962, and shortly thereafter our Embassy was alerted to the fact that this corn was being sold by the United Arab Republic Government instead of going to the needy people to relieve a famine.

This information was called to the attention of our American officials in

April 1962, and at that time about 87,000 tons, or over 3 million bushels of this corn had not arrived in the United Arab Republic. There was ample time to have stopped the shipments; but no effort was made to do so, nor were any steps taken to protect the American taxpayers' interests.

It should be noted that during this same 1961–62 period the United Arab Republic was supplying material and equipment to the Congolese rebels and creating a lot of trouble in that area for our Government and its allies.

Therefore, the effect of this transaction is that we gave the United Arab Republic this corn and then permitted them to sell it and thereby obtain the exchange to pay for weapons to be used against Americans fighting in the Congo.

The irony of this ridiculous transaction is that the State Department still thinks that it was all right, even though the Comptroller General in his report raises a serious question as to whether the transaction was not actually in violation of Public Law 480 as approved by the Congress. The Comptroller General has suggested that if the State Department wishes to repeat this type of transaction as a part of our international diplomacy the law should be amended.

The State Department is reluctant to accept the explanation that this $9 to $10 million worth of corn which was diverted from its intended use and sold by the United Arab Republic Government may have been used to purchase military equipment or supplies which were used against the interests of our Country. However, if this explanation is not accepted, the only other explanation could be that this corn was diverted and sold in commercial channels, which means that criminal laws would have been violated.

It is definitely established that the corn which we gave to that country to relieve a famine was sold, and certainly someone, either the Government itself or others, got the money. To whom the corn was sold and where it went is as yet not established.

This is the second instance of glaring abuse of Public Law 480 sales or grants. A couple of years ago we had 24 million bushels of grain disappear while en route to Austria. Today we find over 3 million bushels of corn given to the United Arab Republic Government to alleviate an expected famine resulting from an imaginary crop failure, being diverted and sold, with the proceeds accruing to an unfriendly government.

I ask unanimous consent that the Comptroller General's letter of July 16, 1965, accompanying this report be printed in the RECORD, and I strongly recommend not only that the entire report be read by the Members of the Congress but also that it should also be required reading for officials of the State Department.

If results are to be expected, the taxpayers, who pay for these ridiculous transactions, should likewise read these reports and express their opinions to the officials responsible.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., July 16, 1965.

B-146820.

To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

In our examination of the food donation program to the United Arab Republic under title II of Public Law 480, we found that the Agency for International Development granted about 186,000 metric tons of corn costing over $23,700,000 in December 1961 on the basis of representations made by the United Arab Republic that a famine would occur as a result of crop failures.

The grant was made without adequate verification of the actual need for the requested assistance. Official statistics of the United Arab Republic, which were subsequently accepted by United States agencies, showed that the corn crop had not failed and most of the corn was undelivered many months after it arrived in Egypt.

In addition, responsible U.S. agencies did not check on the distribution of 85 percent of the corn and do not know whether this quantity of corn ever reached intended recipients. The limited distribution checks which were made disclosed that substantial quantities, which the United Arab Republic had agreed to give to needy people, were sold. The Agency for International Development took no action to determine the extent of the corn sales and to initiate a claim against the country until we suggested that this be done. A subsequent audit of the records of agencies of the United Arab Republic disclosed that over 80,000 tons had been sold.

The Agency for International Development advised us that its approval of the title II program was based on a major shortfall in the corn and cotton crops. This approval was based not only on representations of the United Arab Republic, but also on the observations and estimates of United States officials then stationed in the United Arab Republic. We evaluated these observations and estimates and found that they were not based on any factual evidence and were contradicted by statistical evidence. Our evaluations are contained in the report.

The Department of State advised us that the decision to approve the grant of title II corn was justified on the basis of information that there had been a widespread crop failure in the United Arab Republic. The Department also advised us that the willingness to consider a title II program coincided with a conscious effort to improve relations with the United Arab Republic, its geopolitical importance, and the part it played in assuring peace and stability in the Near East. In our opinion, these foreign policy considerations were the underlying reasons for the grant of corn to the United Arab Republic and the reasons for the failure of responsible agency officials to adequately verify the need for title II commodities before approving the grant of corn.

We believe that there is a need to clarify, in existing legislation, the conditions under which the executive branch can donate surplus agricultural commodities to achieve political objectives. Public Law 480, as presently written, makes no specific provision for such donations. The Congress may, therefore, wish to consider enacting legislation which would require that commodities be donated under title II of Public Law 480 only upon certification by the U.S. chief of mission that he has verified the need for such commodities or upon the determination by the Secretary of State that such food donations are in the interests of the United States.

The Congress may also wish to consider whether it would be more appropriate to require that the expense of providing surplus agricultural commodities to foreign governments to meet U.S. foreign policy objectives be met from appropriations made available to the Department of State or the Agency for International Development rather than from Department of Agriculture appropriations.

We are issuing this report to the Congress because it may wish to consider the enactment of appropriate legislation to better control the administration of Public Law 480 programs.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States; the Secretary of State; the Secretary of Agriculture; and the Administrator, Agency for International Development.

FRANK H. WEITZEL,
Acting Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding that the order was entered that I be recognized, the Chair recognize the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed on another matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOME VIEWS ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, within the next few weeks the Senate will be considering another farm bill. Hearings on the administration's proposed bill were recently concluded by the Senate Committee on Agriculture. It is difficult to forecast what form the bill will take by the time the committee considers various amendments which will be taken up by the time both the House and Senate have considered it. However, I believe it is timely to call attention to the Senate certain facts, which I have obtained from the committee hearings and elsewhere, and some of my views on agriculture.

THE AGRICULTURE PICTURE

Net income per farm has increased during the last few years, but the number of farms has decreased. In 1960 there were 3,949,000 farms, but by the end of 1965 it is estimated that the number will have dropped by 566,000. I might add that this includes a decline of 19,000 in my own State of Iowa, which amounted to over 10 percent.

Total net farm income for 1964 was $12.9 billion—the same as for 1961. But the 1961 dollar had a purchasing power of 46.4 cents compared to a 1939 dollar worth 100 cents; whereas in 1964 the dollar's purchasing power had fallen to 44.8 cents. Thus the real dollar net income of our farmers for 1964 was less than for 1961. In Iowa, total cash receipts of farmers was $2,541,841,000 for 1961. This increased by $84,763,000 to $2,626,604,000 for 1964. But due to inflation, the real dollar value of the gross receipts for 1964 was $2,695,632 less than for 1961. Inflation cost the farmers of Iowa some $87 million in their cash receipts for 1964 alone.

From 1960 through 1964, 2,600,000 farmers and their families left their farms. This included 920,000 farm owners and operators and hired hands.

These figures lead to the conclusion that our farmers have not been sharing fairly in the national net income. The reason they have not is that the cost-price squeeze has worsened. From 1961 through 1964, costs of farm production increased by over $2.3 billion. Parity is at 79 today, but it has been down to 74 and 75 during most of the last 12 months—the lowest since the depression days of the 1930's. For example, live weight marketings of meat animals were up 4 percent for 1964 over 1963; but cash receipts were down 3 percent.

During the last 4 years, the indebtedness of our Nation's farmers increased by $13.5 billion—from $24.8 to $38.3 billion. While it is true that farm land values have increased, they have not increased nearly as much as the mortgage debt.

Farmers are pleased that livestock prices are good today. But they are going to have to stay good for a long, long time to make up for the low prices which prevailed during 1963 and 1964.

EXPORT

The export picture for our agricultural products improved during 1964 over 1963, increasing from $5.58 to $6.25 billion. The short-range outlook is generally good. This is of deep significance for the future of agriculture. From my own State of Iowa we exported some $600 million of goods during 1964, and $330 million of these consisted of agricultural products—mostly sold for hard dollars. One of every 4 acres of farm production in Iowa move overseas.

Well over $2 billion of American agricultural produce went to Western Europe for hard dollars during 1964, and of this 60 percent went to the Common Market countries. During the so-called Kennedy round of negotiations in Geneva, we have made it clear that any agreements regarding reductions in tariffs must include agricultural products. This is very important because of the discriminatory tariffs on imports of agricultural products levied by the Common Market countries. But the outcome of these negotiations is most uncertain.

Meanwhile, however, it is good to note that for 1964 feed grain exports from the United States to England, West Germany, The Netherlands, Italy, Belgium-Luxembourg, and Greece were up substantially—offset, in part, by a substantial drop in Spain. Our exports of soybeans continued to increase. For example, England took $19.5 million—up $4.5 million over 1963; West Germany took $81 million—up $20 million; the Netherlands took $85 million—up $31 million; Italy took $28 million—up $4 million; and Belgium-Luxembourg took $23 million—up $8 million. Japan, our biggest customer, took around $150 million of our soybeans—up $7 million.

I have consistently supported an extension of Public Law 480 under which our country sells surplus agricultural commodities for soft currencies abroad under our food for peace program. Such sales result in a loss to the Commodity Credit Corporation, which acquired these items under price support programs, but this is a most humane way for us to implement our foreign aid program. Shipments under Public Law 480 during 1964 had a value of $1.7 billion, and I might point out that $42 million came from Iowa—up from $36 million the year before.

INFLATION AND FARM COSTS OF PRODUCTION

It is about time that farmers realize why their costs of production have increased. Inflation is a major factor.

The November 1964 issue of the Farm Cost Situation, published annually by the Economic Research Service of the Department of Agriculture, shows an increase in the index of costs of goods and services used in production from 103 to 108 from 1960 through 1964. Feed, farm machinery, seed, and wages showed the largest increases.

In 1960 our dollar was worth 46.9 cents. Today it is down to 44.2 cents in its purchasing power. When the purchasing power of the dollar goes down, one cannot blame the wage earner for asking for a wage increase. Since all of his dollars are worth less, he needs more dollars to meet his family responsibilities. A good many farm machinery factories operate under an escalation clause which provides that when the retail consumer price index goes up, wages automatically go up. The net result of all of these reactions is an increase in farm costs of production.

The foundation for inflation is laid by the action of a majority of the Members of Congress voting to spend billions of dollars more than our revenues, year after year. For calendar years 1961, 1962, 1963, and 1964, inflation totaled some 28 billion; and during this same period, a majority of the Members of Congress ran our country $28 billion deeper into debt. There may be some cynics who say that $7 billion of inflation a year is nothing to worry about, but I think it is serious. In terms of a sales tax, the loss of purchasing power of the people of my State of Iowa equaled that of a 2½ percent sales tax. It was worse in other States. And it is growing more serious, because during the first six months of 1965, we had inflation of $6.5 billion. If things continue as they are, the people of my State will, for all practical purposes, have a 4 percent sales tax—in addition to the regular 2 percent sales tax—on their backs to pay for the multibillion dollar deficit spending activities of a majority of the Members of Congress.

FEED GRAINS PROGRAM

The basic reason why farmers have not received fair prices for their produce is that production and consumption are not in balance—supply exceeds demand. There is a buyer's market.

Federal farm programs have been adopted to reduce production so that a balance between production and consumption will be reached, thus giving rise to fair prices. In 1961, the administration's so-called emergency feed grains program was enacted. In 1962 the program was extended to cover the 1963 crop year with some alleged improvements; and it was further extended with some alleged improvements to cover the 1964 and 1965 crop years. The stated purposes of these programs was to reduce surpluses, improve farm income, and lower costs to taxpayers. The Secretary was given the discretionary power to sell off CCC stocks at 105 percent of the support or loan price plus reasonable carrying charges. Commencing in December 1961 and running through June of 1962, massive sales of CCC stocks were made; and these were repeated from January through June of 1963. It is quite apparent that these sales had a depressing effect on the market. Thus, while stocks were substantially lowered, thus saving storage costs to taxpayers, it was at the expense of lower prices to our farmers. And the lower prices of feed grains were, of course, accompanied by lower prices for livestock. Doubling of imports of beef and veal had a further depressing effect on livestock prices.

Since 1961, as I have earlier pointed out, real dollar net income of our Nation's farmers has gone down. At the same time, costs to taxpayers have increased, because the savings in storage costs have been more than offset by a $700 million increase in the cost of the feed grains program for 1964 over 1963. Production of corn, grain sorghums, and barley for 1961 totaled 124.4 million tons. It increased to 126.6 million tons in 1962; and to 140.7 million tons in 1963. In 1964, a year characterized by abnormal drought conditions, the total was 122.8 million tons. Thus, since 1961, production increased 16.9 million tons. The inescapable conclusion is that the improvements made to the program of 1961 have failed in their objectives and we have actually gone backward.

We have now been asked by the administration to continue this program with some more improvements in the form of discretionary powers to be given the Secretary of Agriculture to determine whether and to what extent price supports, diversion payments, and payments in kind are desirable or necessary, with no guidelines to be established by the Congress for him to follow. Further, the administration has asked the Congress to give the Secretary the discretionary power to permit the growing of soybeans on acres diverted from feed grains production—this at a time when the soybean industry is getting along exceedingly well, without any need for Federal Government assistance or controls. In my judgment, it is wrong for the Congress to turn over to any individual such great powers over the income and future of our farmers and their families.

WHAT IS NEEDED

We are not faced with a choice between the administration's program and no program. Few, if any, Members of Congress advocate doing away with farm programs. Studies by research economists at Iowa State University, Cornell University, Penn State University, and Oklahoma State University make it clear that without Government farm programs, net annual farm income would fall from $12 billion to $6 billion, and this would have a disastrous effect on all segments of our economy.

Nor do we have to make a choice between a voluntary farm program and a mandatory farm program.

Our choice is from among various types of voluntary programs.

One of the defects in the administration's proposed program is the continued power of the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of CCC stocks at 105 percent of loan price plus reasonable carrying charges. The Department interprets this to mean 105 percent of $1.10 for 1964 corn, for example, obtained by redeeming certificates, or $1.15½. Its interpretation of reasonable carrying charges is interesting. These are computed at 1½ cents per month, starting in October and running through July, with nothing for August and September. Then the charges are dropped and the 1½ cents starts all over again the following October. Thus, using the $1.15½ as a base, the Department is able to add from 1½ cents to 15 cents per bushel on its disposal price. The price can vary from $1.17 to $1.30½. There are many who believe this has both a depressing and unstabilizing influence over the market, and I am one of them. This is why I have recommended that the law be changed to prohibit CCC sales for less than 120 percent of the loan price, which would be a stable price of $1.32 under the above example. I believe that it would help to improve the market. The argument advanced against this is that the Secretary would not have as much power to force farmers to volunteer to come into the program. There are two answers to this: First, let us give it a try and see. I do not believe that the difference between a disposal price fixed at $1.32 and a price which can vary up to $1.30½ is enough to change the mind of many farmers about coming into the program; and second, if this is to be a voluntary feed grains program, let us keep it that way in fact.

COSTS AND SUBSIDIES

Another defect in the administration's program is that considerable marginal land is being retired from production, and this is why there has been an increase rather than a decrease in production. We need to have a long-range land retirement program under which farmers will be paid good prices for retiring good productive land—preferably on a competitive bid basis, with a limited amount of productivity to be retired in a community area to protect small town business interests. If we do not do something like this, how are we going to reduce production? Until production and consumption are brought into balance, how are farmers going to obtain fair prices for what they produce? I do not say that this is going to cut the costs to taxpayers right away; but, as consumption increases, we can look forward to lower costs of land retirement. Meanwhile, with better market prices, there will be less need for farmers to rely on Federal Government payments.

If they understand the facts about our agricultural economy, I do not believe that the American taxpayer should or would complain about the costs to the Federal Government which are needed to help provide a decent living for our farmers and their families. Throughout our history, the American public has been abundantly supplied with food and raw materials for manufacturing, and prices of these goods have been low. Our farmers have furnished large quantities of food for the relief of hunger in other countries. Last year, only 19 cents of our disposable dollar was spent for food. Ten years ago it was 22 cents. Last year it was 30 cents in Western Europe, 50 cents in Russia, and up to 90 cents in some of the underdeveloped countries. In short, our national farm policy has provided both abundance and rapid technical progress, which are of great value to the Nation. But it has failed to provide our farmers with rewards commensurate with the hard work, managerial competence, initiative, and enterprise characterizing American agriculture in comparison with other segments of our economy.

In conclusion, I want to say a word about subsidies. The annual cost of appropriations for the U.S. Department of Agriculture runs in the neighborhood of $5 billion. Farmers receive only about half of this through the various farm programs. But, last year, American business received subsidies of almost $1.5 billion; and American labor received subsidies totaling almost a half billion dollars. One could point to the billions of dollars in Federal Government contracts as a source of income for American business; and billions of dollars are being spent on numerous programs designed to meet the needs of the poverty and low-income sectors of our society. In short, when there is talk about subsidies, let us make sure it is carried out in perspective.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL AMERICAN LEGION BASEBALL WEEK—LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6 in 1965, as "National American Legion Baseball Week."

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the had the privilege of serving as Governors of their States. I know they share my concern over the problems confronting our States and the changing nature of the relationship between the Federal Government and the respective 50 State governments.

Because of this concern, I joined with those who cosponsored the proposed constitutional amendment offered by the distinguished minority leader. The Arizona Legislature has memorialized the Congress on behalf of this amendment, and I know that many other State legislatures have officially expressed similar views.

Mr. President, I am persuaded there is no other single issue of more widespread significance before this Congress than the amendment now under consideration. It is the issue of constitutional government as the shield against arbitrary power.

The issue posed by this amendment cuts through to the foundation of our concept of the States as sovereign bodies except in those matters specifically reserved to the Federal Government by the Constitution.

All of us are aware that the majority opinions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the cases of Baker against Carr, and Reynolds against Sims had a profound impact upon thhe States. With these decisions, the Court usurped the power of the people to determine how their State legislatures shall be apportioned.

This amendment will simply provide a means of repairing the damage which has been done—and the Congress has both the authority and the responsibility to suggest modification of a judicial decision which runs contrary to the public interest. In fact, it is the prerogative solely of the people of the States, or through their elected representatives in the Congress, to rectify such a judicial determination. Certainly it is not the job of either the executive or the judiciary.

All this amendment does is restore to the people a right which the Supreme Court has wrongfully taken away from them.

In his dissenting opinion in *Baker* v. *Carr* (369 U.S. 301) the late Mr. Justice Frankfurter pointed out that the Court had no legitimate cause to interfere in what essentially is a political question, and that the decision represented an assault upon the States.

There is only one basic constitutional question at stake in this argument. Who has the right to determine how State legislatures shall be apportioned? The answer should be clear. Only the people of the States have that right.

The constitutions of all 50 States, in one form or another, recognize this principle. It is well stated, for example, in the constitution of Indiana, which declares:

> All power is inherent in the people and all free governments are founded on their authority and instituted for their peace, safety, and happiness; for the advancement of these ends, they have at all times an inalienable and indefeasible right to alter or reform their government in such manner as they may think proper.

I would like to ask either or both of the distinguished Senators from Indiana if they disagree with this language of their State constitution in any respect, and if so, why?

All of us know that it is the recognition and acceptance of this principle that has made American constitutional government the most effective and perfect means ever devised by man to achieve social progress and preserve liberty.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter's dissent in Baker against Carr was prophetic as well as eloquent. He accurately foretold what would be the consequences of the Court's decision when he warned that:

> The massive repudiation of the experience of our whole past in asserting destructive, novel judicial power foreshadows deeper, and more pervasive difficulties and consequences.

In the last 2 years we have seen how right he was. Many of our States have been bogged down in the muck of legal confusion resulting from the Court's opinion.

It is not at all farfetched to assume that a logical next step might be a Supreme Court decision to void all acts of a State legislature which was organized in accordance with the mandate of the people but contrary to the mandate of the Court.

There are those who are apparently willing to junk the collective wisdom of the Founding Fathers and do away with the States as political entities. In the present scheme of things, these critics see the State governments as obsolete and unnecessary appendages to the body politic. According to this misguided view, all we need anymore is the Federal Government and a local disbursing bureaucracy at the community level.

Although this philosophy currently flies under the flag of liberalism, it is far removed from the true liberals of our national political heritage. Not for 1 minute would it have been advocated by Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, Lincoln, or any of the other giants of our past.

It is fashionable in some circles today to downgrade the competence and achievements of State government. As one who knows better and has witnessed governmental performance at the State level, I must challenge this notion.

Indeed, in many major legislative fields, it has been the States who pioneered and paved the way with measures which later became incorporated into Federal statutes.

In the matter of women's suffrage and some provisions of labor legislation, for example, States were ahead of the Federal Government. In my own State of Arizona, two other specific examples come to mind.

In its constitution of 1912, Arizona became one of the first States in the Union to provide for a system of compulsory workmen's compensation. And again in 1952, 2 years ahead of the Supreme Court's decision, Arizona moved voluntarily to desegregate its public school system.

To be sure, the Federal function in distributing public money comes first in many instances. But this situation has developed largely because of Federal preemption of available revenue sources and the limited income remaining to the States through their own devices. I might add that if the States had more funds, we would not suffer the customary attrition that accompanies the roundtrip travel of money from the States to Washington and back again.

We have heard much from the opponents of this amendment about the danger of so-called "rotten boroughs." I am not sure I follow this line of reasoning, and I would be interested in learning from the junior Senator from Maryland of one specific example of what he has in mind by referring to the "rotten borough" which he apparently believes would develop if this amendment were adopted.

It is a matter of fact, however, that the most corrupt and scandalous chapters in our political history have been written in the one-party, boss-dominated machine politics of some large cities.

At this point I want to cite the view of the Chief Justice of the United States which he expressed when he served as Governor of the State of California. In 1948 he made a speech in which he said:

> Many California counties are far more important in the life of the State than their population bears to the entire population of the State. It is for this reason that I have never been in favor of restricting their representation to the State senate to a strictly population basis.

In this same speech then Governor Warren added that he thought the present system of balanced representation had served the people well and was strictly in accord with the American tradition and the patern of our National Government.

I also wish to commend the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], who served many terms as the Governor of his State and before that as mayor of a great urban, industrial community. Speaking on the floor of the Senate on August 18 last year, the Senator from Ohio made the following observation:

> I was mayor of Cleveland. If the city bosses were to get control of the legislature, I would fear it greatly. We need the influence of the rural man, the man who works in the soil. He is down to earth. Of course, we also need the influence of the city man. But the combination of the two is the blending of good government.
>
> Some city leaders would spend the Government into bankruptcy so quickly that we would not realize that it was happening.

Yet the opponents of this amendment ask the people to believe that government will somehow become better and more efficient by concentrating more power in some areas at the expense of others.

The restraining balance of this amendment would protect the people against the evils spawned by rotten political subdivisions where government so often becomes a vicious game of pitting one racial minority against another, of paying favors to friends and punishing enemies, of tampering with the voter rolls and even the ballot counting, and of lining the pockets of the unscrupulous with the people's money.

The alternative is to rely upon our time-tested system of checks and balances—a system which has both respected and protected the rights of minorities against the shifting winds of superficial political change. It might be well to remember, in this regard, that each of us is a member of one or more minority groups, whether of personal, economic or professional interest.

It is difficult for me to understand how anybody who believes in the principles of democratic government can oppose this amendment. To me, the opposition arguments seem to indicate a basic lack of faith in the democratic process.

As elected representatives of the people, how can we tell the people they have no right to make their own decisions because they cannot be trusted to make the right ones?

Are the elected servants wiser than their masters? Are the elected to be the masters of the electorate? Is this what the opponents of the amendment desire?

This amendment has wisely provided safeguards to insure its fairness. It specifically states that no apportionment plan can be based on race or color, and it follows that such discriminatory factors could not be used. It further provides for automatic and continuing resubmission to the voters after each 10-year census.

Furthermore, the one-man, one-vote principle so dear to the opponents of this amendment is surely protected and preserved, since a statewide referendum is required for approval of any plan which departs from the population factor for one legislative house. I shall not voice any disapproval if this is what the people want.

In plain language, I have yet to hear any sensible answer to the question of what is wrong with letting the people decide this issue on a one-man, one-vote basis.

Mr. President, I repeat: There is only one fundamental question before us. That question is: Who has the sovereign power to determine how legislators shall be apportioned and how the diverse interests of a State can best be represented? Is it the people of the State? Or is it the Supreme Court? I submit that only the people have this power.

In conclusion, I remind Senators that an ancient Greek philosopher once said:

> The people must fight for the law as they do for the city wall.

The law has been breached by the Supreme Court in this instance, and the people should have the opportunity to repair the breach. For the benefit of the people of my State—and equally for the benefit of the people of the other 49 States—I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe at the outset that I should pay a personal compliment to the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH]. He is chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments. When this matter was first presented to him, he was extremely diligent in summoning witnesses from all over the country.

That is a testimony to the importance of the proposal before us. It is, at once, a testimony also to his interest, his willingness, and his patience to carry on a long hearing at which everyone had a fair opportunity to be heard. While he does not share my conviction on this subject, I pay him that personal compliment. I thank him for the kindly way in which he has dealt with the joint resolution in the subcommittee, and for his conduct in the Committee on the Judiciary.

What happened after this measure reached the full committee was rather interesting. The subcommittee met in my office. My office happens to be a very convenient place. I regard it as something of an appendage to the Senate Chamber. If any subcommittee wishes to utilize the facilities of my office, I am delighted to have them do so.

It was there that we voted this measure out of the subcommittee by a vote of 6 to 2. I thought on the basis of that vote that the measure was entitled to prompt consideration by the full Judiciary Committee and that there should be no delay in presenting the measure on the floor.

Two weeks ago this coming Monday, there was a meeting of the full Committee on the Judiciary. It is my custom, as a reasonably good battalion commander, to take a look and see where my troops are. One cannot deploy his troops effectively unless he knows where they are and is reasonably sure that good lines of communication are intact.

I noticed quickly that three of my votes were absent. However, notwithstanding that, I thought there would be no difficulty in obtaining a favorable vote in the full committee because I had a few convenient proxies in my pocket. I then discovered that, under the committee rule, I could not vote a proxy.

Accordingly, I told the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that I should like to have the executive secretary make very careful notes of what would transpire throughout the executive session.

I was willing to vote at 11:45 a.m. at the first subcommittee meeting, before the bells intoned the beginning of the Senate session. I was not even going to wait long enough for the morning hour to be completed under the new rule, or for the unfinished business of the Senate to be laid before the Senate.

There was objection. Then, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] suggested, "Suppose we meet in 1 week and have an understanding that we shall vote at that time." There was objection. Then the distinguished Senator from Nebraska suggested that we might add an additional week if we could have an understanding that we could vote. There was objection.

I knew then what I was up against. I knew that I had some work cut out for me.

I believe that, to make sure of doing justice to myself in whatever may be said about this matter, I should read into the RECORD at this point the notes made at the executive session of the Judiciary Committee.

I read the notes into the RECORD at this point as follows:

> The chairman brought up for consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 2, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution.
>
> Senator HART stated that he had not read the final draft of the resolution that has come out of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments—that perhaps some members of the committee would want to discuss this final draft—and that for this reason he would feel compelled to ask that this resolution go over.

Mr. President, I interpolate to say that the distinguished Senator from Michigan was entirely within his rights, and that it is the custom, on the request of a single Member, that a matter go over for a week.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HART. I ask the Senator to yield because I have a 2:30 appointment. I was about to leave the Chamber. I am very glad that the Senator from Illinois made the comment that he did.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Senator was entirely within his rights. I have done the same frequently through the years. The Senator was fully entitled to do so, and the Chair should respect his wish that it go over.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I continue to read:

> Senator DIRKSEN stated that he would like to have an agreement that at the regular meeting of the committee next Tuesday, Senate Joint Resolution 2 will be taken up by the committee and voted upon at that time. Senator DIRKSEN stated that he believed he was entitled to have a vote on this very important resolution.
>
> Senator DIRKSEN stated further that if it cannot be agreed to having a vote on this resolution at that time he was serving notice that he would avail himself of whatever is in the rulebook with respect to bringing this matter before the Senate.

I interpolate. I do not act on the basis of surprises. I do not like unduly to take advantage or to astonish people who are unaware. If there is any distinction in the terms, I suppose I can illustrate by telling what I told the galleries the other day. When Mrs. Noah Webster caught Noah kissing the maid, she said, "Noah, I am surprised." He said, "No, Madam; you are astonished. I am the one that is surprised."

So, whether it is astonishment or surprise makes no difference.

I continue to read:

> Senator HART stated that he was availing himself of the practice that upon request the resolution go over until the next meeting without any conditions attached.
>
> The chairman stated that Senator HART was within his right to ask that the resolution go over—that any member of the committee may make such a request on any matter—and that as a matter of courtesy any such request has always been recognized.

I interpolate at that point to say that I am fully aware of that. I have served on that committee for many years.

I continue to read:

> Senator TYDINGS inquired of Senator DIRKSEN when the majority report of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments will be ready for the whole committee to study.
>
> Senator JAVITS stated to Senator DIRKSEN that he was hopeful that before the meeting next Tuesday of the full committee, the Senator from Illinois would make available to the committee a definitive draft of what will be proposed by Senator DIRKSEN before the full committee.

I continue reading from the executive secretary's memorandum:

> Senator DIRKSEN stated that he had made certain additions to the draft resolution but that he would see to it that each member of the committee gets a copy of it with such changes.
>
> Senator TYDINGS stated that he would object to any agreement being made at this time with regard to a vote on this resolution.

I emphasize the fact that the distinguished Senator from Maryland stated that he would object to any agreement for a vote.

I continue to read:

> Senator DIRKSEN stated that he wanted to make it perfectly clear that if the committee could not get to a vote at its next meeting, there are other avenues available to the Senator from Illinois for getting action on this resolution and that he intended to pursue all these other avenues.
>
> Senator BAYH stated that as far as he was concerned he would probably cast his vote in the same manner in which he cast it in subcommittee—that, further, he personally does not want to participate in any arbitrarily long discussion on the resolution.
>
> Senator DIRKSEN pointed out that every equity in this matter has been under discussion—even as far back as last year; that it has been discussed in the press and editorially, and he did not know of any reason for any prolonged discussion.
>
> Senator DIRKSEN repeated that he wanted the committee to know that what he finds in the rulebook he is going to use—and that he has looked into the rulebook now for some 32 years.
>
> Senator DIRKSEN stated further that he was protesting the matter going over unless it can be agreed that there be a vote on this resolution at the next meeting of the committee.
>
> Senator TYDINGS moved that the resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 2, go over for a week.
>
> The chairman stated that under the practice of the committee the resolution had gone over for a week.

Further discussion followed.

Senator Hruska inquired why the committee could not agree to having a vote on this resolution by not later than the second subsequent meeting of the committee—that certainly it can be discussed and voted upon in two meetings.

Senator Hruska stated that in fairness to every member of the committee he would like to move that it is the sense of the committee that a vote be taken on Senate Joint Resolution 2 after two more meetings of the committee.

Senator Tydings voiced objection to this motion.

Senator Tydings stated that he would be glad to amend Senator Hart's motion—and take the matter up in 2 weeks.

Several members of the committee opposed such action.

In answer to a question by Senator Hart, the chairman stated that Senate Joint Resolution 2 has gone over for a week.

Senator Dirksen again repeated that he would avail himself of whatever action is available to him if the committee does not get to a vote in a reasonable time, and he would regard 1 week as a reasonable time.

Senator Dirksen stated that he wished Mr. Chrissos, the stenographer taking the executive minutes, to make a note of the above comments, and that he, Senator Dirksen, be supplied with a copy of this portion of the minutes.

They were supplied to me. So there was a hope that in a week we could reach a vote. There was a hope and a request that there be an agreement to vote in 2 weeks. We could get neither. I am aware of the fact that time is running out. Adjournment fever is in the air.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. I compliment the Senator, as I did in the committee the other day.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And I just complimented my distinguished friend from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. I am sorry I was not present to hear the compliment, because I am sure no other Member of this body can do a better job of complimenting than can the Senator from Illinois.

I appreciate the accuracy with which the notes of the meeting before last of the Judiciary Committee were transcribed. The Senator has read them into the Record. To keep the Record straight, he might care to incorporate into the Record a similar detailed transcript of the last meeting of the committee, at which we tried our best to have a vote on the subject to which the Senator from Illinois referred.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall be delighted to do so. I even alluded to it a moment ago, because at the last meeting things had happened. Pressures were being applied. I know where they were being applied. I would dislike to relate on the floor one particular incident I followed through very carefully. I would not do it under any circumstances and reflect upon a Senator. But I know what has been happening. Looking up and down the committee table, I discovered that the distinguished Senator from Florida was absent from the meeting. He was attending another committee meeting.

That was one of my votes. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] was absent. He sits across from me in the committee. He had a committee meeting of his own to attend. That was one of my votes. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] was absent. That was another of my votes.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The best I could get even then, still having good capabilities of vision, was an eight to eight vote in the committee.

Notwithstanding the fact that the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] was one of the original sponsors of the resolution, he came to me and said, "I hope you will not be offended if I take my name off, because I believe in this, but I should like to introduce my own resolution."

I said, "You have all the rights and prerogatives of a Senator. All you have to do is say that you wish to have your name taken off."

I should be offended? I would be the last man in the Senate to be offended, knowing what the rights of Senators are.

I knew that the Senator from New York was readying a substitute. I knew, also, that he was to hold a press conference.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was quite sure that I would not get that vote.

Mr. President, I know that when we make an affirmative motion and we get a pair, we are lost. But I say that one swallow flying low does not make a summer, and one battle does not make a war.

When I saw what I was up against, I reiterated in the memorandum I have read that I was going to use whatever weapons were available, and I used a weapon.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall thank the distinguished majority leader the longest day I live for his kindness, for his grace, for his patience, for his indulgence, and for his sense of fairness, because I went to him in his office and I said, "Mike, I think I am entitled to a vote, and I am going to weep on your shoulder today. I have a vehicle, and I am going to attach this resolution to that vehicle, God willing, and you call it up, or if you will indulge me, let me call it up."

I would never usurp the prerogatives of the majority leader who operates the business of the Senate, because he is in command of the majority of this body.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I respect his every right in that regard.

I am happy to yield to my friend the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. I thank the Senator from Illinois. I hope later to be able to make some remarks of my own. I did not wish unnecessarily to interrupt my friend from Illinois, except that it seemed, on this particular point, it would be well to have the Record straight.

As the Senator from Illinois knows, I do not know the thought processes which have been indulged in by the Senator from New York, but I hope that there is no Senator whose mind is closed when he comes into the Chamber in the morning. We are all willing to listen to what other Senators will have to say on the merits of this or any other subject.

As I intend to say in my remarks later, I hope that we can come forth with some kind of program which will permit us to have some leeway. The Senator from Illinois and I differ on the starting point, but I should like to say as a relatively inexperienced Member of this body that I am certain, if I live to be 100 years old, I will never have a greater honor than the honor I have had these past 3 years to serve in this Chamber and listen to the Senator from Illinois, the minority leader, and to my leader, the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], and in following their leadership. But what I should like to dwell on in my remarks—and I will terminate this interruption, and thank the Senator from Illinois for his indulgence—is that my experience in the State legislature taught me at a tender age, some 12 or 13 years ago, that we cannot have a representative form of government in a legislative body that will result in anything but anarchy unless we have a steadfast and determined committee system.

In all fairness, the Record should show that on two occasions the Committee on the Judiciary did, in fact, have the matter which we are now discussing before it; and on neither of those occasions were there sufficient votes in committee to pass it. It is not the committee's responsibility to see that all Senators are present. It seems to me that this is the responsibility of each individual Senator and the individual trying to propose legislation.

I sympathize with the Senator from Illinois for being in such a position that his supporters were not present, but I do not understand why, merely because Senators who are for legislation were not at their post when the race began, we should then do an end run on the committee system and penalize the entire Senate because of it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to my distinguished friend from Indiana that one soon discovers the difference between orbital theory and political reality.

Sitting here, once upon a time, was the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield]. I spent an hour with him this morning. But I remember the day when a civil rights bill came through that door and it was intercepted. Suddenly, out of a clear blue sky, it was appended to an innocuous bill that meant very little to most Senators, entitled "For the relief of the Stella Reorganized Schools in Missouri," and the civil rights bill was hooked onto that.

Then we made the welkin ring with thunderous fulmination about circumventing the committee, about doing end runs—even though baseball was involved—and my dear colleague [Mr. Douglas] mixed his metaphors.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Intentionally, let me say—intentionally, my dear friend.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know—I know. So I had to put him to rights——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no—no, sir.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I had to put him to rights and advise him of that, when he paid tribute to my skill in the parliamentary field. I used the same terminology to tell him that he lost his amateur standing long ago. He is a professional of the first water when it comes to the rule book and using his skill in this parliamentary body. I say that complimentariwise, as he well knows.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I said that I admired the skill of my colleague [Mr. Dirksen] who, although he sits in the minority leader's chair, is dictating the course of legislation. I said that I had never witnessed such a feat of political magic in all my 17 years in the Senate. I pay high tribute to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe I should say for the record it is unfortunate that the distinguished Senator from Illinois was not at the meeting yesterday morning of those who are opposed to the Dirksen amendment.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor; but even if I did lose my right to the floor, I would be glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana, because I know that I would get it back any time.

Mr. BAYH. We would all be penalized if the Senator from Illinois lost his rights to the floor, because I enjoy listening to every word he says, and I am sure that Senators learn a great deal from him. I know that we are learning right now about a new step in the legislative process, if the distinguished Senator from Illinois is determined to pursue his efforts to circumvent the committee.

I know that the minority leader would be the last one in the Senate to try to transgress the rules. The rules are there. He is perfectly within his rights. But I do not believe that the record will show a precedent concerning the Stella Reorganized Schools which, according to my information, has never been relieved since it was removed from that bill. In that particular case, we were dealing with a subject which we knew, if it ever got to committee, would never be discussed. Here is an issue which has been discussed in the committee, and the very Senator who did not wish to bring it to a vote in the committee is now trying to bring it to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me ask my distinguished friend, why does he think there is a discharge rule to discharge a committee? I am not so blind as not to know when I am up against a stacked deck.

Mr. BAYH. Will the Senator explain what he means by a stacked deck?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is a common expression. Let everyone interpret it for himself.

Mr. BAYH. As the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. Eastland] said, it depends on whether a Senator has the votes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I knew what votes I lost. I knew how I had lost them. I know who brought pressure to bear.

Mr. BAYH. The Senator has alluded to three Senators who were not present.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I could have brought them there if I had known that I had lost the necessary vote to get the measure out of committee.

Do I sit around and waste my substance and my energies trying to beat a stacked deck? Not I. I have been around these "diggings" too long. I know how these things happen. I have seen it. I have been pressured. I am no amateur in this field. That was the story. Why should I wait? A caucus was held. Senators were summoned. They summoned their leader to the caucus on adjourning. When that happens, I look at the clock, too.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I look at the clock. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. What caucus? Not on this subject.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; not on that subject. On the subject of adjournment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. A Democratic conference.

Mr. BAYH. Yes. I thought it had something to do with the stacked deck or the pressure to which the Senator referred. This was a discussion of the order of business in the Senate. The minority leader himself has discussed the subject matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the deck is stacked, I look at the clock, and also the calendar. I see where Christmas and Thanksgiving are. One begins to wonder when the adjournment curtain will come down. I was up against that problem last year. I knew the weakness in my case last year, when I came here with a legislative proposal. What did I encounter? I encountered a filibuster. My senior colleague was in the forefront. He was, like Leonidas, of old, in the forefront of the Greek phalanx, charging down the hill, to stop it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The simple logic of the situation compelled my junior colleague to retreat in disorder.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should retreat?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator was compelled to retreat.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I never retreat. I have learned from the Apostle that when the trumpet gives forth an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to do battle? When retreat is sounded, one does not prepare for the battle. I have never known the trumpet of retreat; not now, or at any other time. I never shall, until this voice is muted and I can no longer convey my sentiments to my fellow men and to my colleagues in the Senate. These fundamental battles go on. They must go on. I wished to clear the decks for action; that is all. I do not know how long this will require.

Of course, I never get time to prepare a manuscript that I can read to the Senate or give to the press. Therefore, all I can do while burning the midnight oil is to make some squiggles on paper. I see that the other night I put down the name of John Jay. That could mean only one thing to me. He was the first Chief Justice of the United States. He was appointed by the first President, George Washington. Since his time there have been 13 Chief Justices, if my arithmetic is correct. There have been, since his time and until the present Court, 83 Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

That happened in 1789. Therefore, if my arithmetic is correct, that would be 176 years ago.

In 176 years, until June of 1964, that high tribunal has not laid a hand upon the sovereign power of a State legislature and the people of sovereign States to determine the legislative destiny of the people until now. It began with the case of Baker against Carr. How I love these legalistic speeches that are studded with cases. It bewilders me, even as a lawyer.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the Senator's comment about the Supreme Court never rendering a decision similar to the one in Reynolds against Sims, does the Senator realize that every State which has been admitted to the Union, from Maine in 1790 to Montana in 1890, was admitted with a constitution wherein the legislative apportionment was based substantially on population?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes; I do. After a while I shall read into the Record a speech delivered on the House side before its committee by a very distinguished law school professor. It has many figures in it. I will place it in the Record.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator also knows, I am sure, that under the provisions of the Northwest Ordinance, which provided for the admission of States into the Federal Union, a basic requirement for each State constitution was that it contain a provision for trial by jury, for habeas corpus, for courts based on the common law, and for representation in the State legislature based substantially upon population?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the provision apply to both bodies?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be happy to read the language to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should be happy to have the Senator do so.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Northwest Ordinance, adopted by the Continental Congress under the Articles of Confederation of 1787 provided:

> The inhabitants of said territory shall be always entitled to the benefits of the writ of habeas corpus; of trial by jury; of an apportioned representation of the people in the legislature, and of judicial proceedings according to the course of the common law.

I hope the Senator will bear with me for one more question. Is it not a fact that the problem of malapportionment of State legislatures did not begin until the latter part of the 19th century, when the industrial revolution caused a great migration of people off the farms into urban and suburban areas? Until that time the legislatures were almost without exception based substantially on population. When a county grew too big, as has been the case in my State of Maryland, the legislature would have new lines drawn and in that way create another county. The real problem of malapportionment did not begin until the latter part of the 19th century and the early 1900's.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall read into the RECORD—and probably I shall not get around to it today—exactly what the basis was for all of the Thirteen Original States, because I wish to make the RECORD complete. Therefore, I will read the history into the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

So it will be read into the RECORD and made a part of my remarks.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. First, I wish to say that I did not find out anything about the legislative branches in the Northwest Ordinance.

Mr. TYDINGS. The language, which I shall repeat, is as follows "of a proportionate representation of the people in the legislature."

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. Since my distinguished colleague from Maryland brought up the subject of the Northwest Ordinance, and since my State of Indiana happens to be one of those States, including the State of the Senator from Illinois, affected by that ordinance, I should like to refer to a question which was posed by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN]. Unfortunately, just prior to his posing the question, I was called to the telephone. The Senator stated:

> There is only one basic constitutional question at stake in this argument. Who has the right to determine how State legislatures shall be apportioned? The answer should be clear. Only the people of the States have that right.
>
> The constitutions of all 50 States, in one form or another, recognize this principle. It is well stated, for example, in the constitution of Indiana, which declares—

Then the Senator went on to recite from that great document, as follows:

> All power is inherent in the people and all free governments are founded on their authority and instituted for their peace, safety, and happiness; for the advancement of these ends, they have at all times an inalienable and indefeasible right to alter or reform their government in such manner as they may think proper.

I should like to ask either or both of the distinguished Senators from Illinois if they disagree with that language. I thank the Senator from Illinois for answering the question of the Senator from Arizona. I cannot disagree. The language is clear. But the Senator from Arizona left out that part of the Constitution which requires that both houses of the legislature be apportioned according to population only.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But it was done by the people of Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then we have no quarrel.

Mr. BAYH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is all I ask. But it is not what the Senator from Indiana asks. The Senator desires to do it under the aegis of the Supreme Court, and the Senator wishes to take the right away from the people of Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. I should like to proceed one step further. The principle of the constitution of Indiana, under which both of our houses of the legislature were supposed to be apportioned on a one-man, one-vote basis, or, we might call it, according to population, which is the language in the constitution, was violated by the State legislature for 40 years. Now many legislators are alarmed. I served with some of those distinguished gentlemen. They have suddenly awakened to the fact that the Supreme Court, the highest Court in the land, has now said that Indiana, Illinois, and other States must answer to the Federal Constitution. For 40 years we have not even been paying attention to the provisions of the constitution of the State of Indiana.

Mr. DIRKSEN. By taking that much out of the 14th amendment, namely, equal protection of laws, the Supreme Court made it the foundation for the Reynolds against Sims decision. The Court was blasted and castigated by one of its members. In my judgment, it was done by the most scholarly member of the Court in his dissent—John Marshall Harlan.

Mr. BAYH. While I dislike to disagree with the Senator from Illinois, if the Senator will get in line with my thought, the Senator will be at liberty to disagree.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator has a long way to go.

Mr. BAYH. The Senator has every right to disagree. But does the Senator agree with me that had it not been for the rather consistent and almost universal practice on the part of State legislatures not to adhere to their own constitutional requirements in respect to apportionment, the Supreme Court probably would not have gotten into the field?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The people of the Senator's State can change it. The people can change it.

Mr. BAYH. That was not the question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But that was the import of it. That is the point I have constantly made. That is the difference.

Mr. BAYH. The point that I am trying to make—and though I cannot speak for the Senator from Illinois, I should like to get his thoughts—if the representatives of the people do not follow their constitutional responsibility in relation to reapportioning, the Supreme Court might not have gotten into it. I wish they had not done so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It put the onus on their people.

Mr. BAYH. They were within their bounds to do so. Had the legislators attended to its constitutional duties, the Supreme Court would have had no reason to get into the question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The State of Nebraska has a unicameral system; and in its constitution it provides for factors other than population. The constitution was submitted to the people of Nebraska. They approved it.

Now, the Supreme Court has said, "We do not care what you approve. You are going to abide by a one-man, one-vote decision."

What did Colorado do? There the constitution set up factors other than population. The people approved it. What happened? They have been up and down the hill, goodness knows how many times, because it is not going to be approved. But this was done by their people. That is the essential thrust here.

Mr. BAYH. Does the Senator from Illinois have any opinion on the abuses of State legislatures which enter into this issue?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. I knew there were abuses.

I knew there were abuses in Tennessee.

Mr. BAYH. For 70 years, was it not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Seventy years. I have some proprietary interest there. I have a daughter, a son-in-law, and two grandchildren down where my esteemed friend—and I say it most affectionately—"Estes the bestest" lived. I used to visit there quite often. I have heard about those abuses; they existed for 70 years.

Where are the people of Tennessee? Where are the authorities from Tennessee? Where is the legislature in Tennessee? Why must they come on all fours to the Nation's Capital to say, "Get us out of the hole because somehow we have lost our capacity to do it?"

They waited 70 years before Baker against Carr came to the Supreme Court and then, of course, the only issue was whether or not there was a justifiable issue. That was the essence of Baker against Carr.

But the case of Reynolds against Sims, from Alabama, was quite a different story.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Would the Senator tell me what remedy the people of a State have or would have if a legislature refused to reapportion in any fair manner, as was the case in State after State after State, even when those States had constitutional provisions requiring such reapportionment?

It happened in my State when I was in the State legislature, as in the State of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] because the Senate even refused to call a constitutional convention for fear such a convention might take up the problem of fair apportionment. What remedy do the people of the State have? What remedy did they have until Reynolds against Sims?

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the matter with the constitution of the Senator's State? What is the matter with the initiatory powers of the legislature? What is the matter with the people leaving those who aspire to public office at home if they do not respond to the desires of the people in a case of this kind?

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator sincerely believe that, in any legislature where one house is severely malapportioned, as is the case in a great many legislatures, including that of my own State, the members of the malapportioned house will vote themselves out of office?

Mr. DIRKSEN. First, the Senator begs the question when he talks about a malformed legislature. I do not agree with the academic premises that have been set up.

Consider Ohio. Two professors who did long work on the problem said that from the standpoint of fair representation they had the best representation of any State in the Union. Yet they are for this amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Ohio?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Ohio. I will read the professors' statement into the Record when I get around to it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I question the statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator will not after I read it.

Mr. BAYH. Will the Senator from Maryland indulge me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. This has been a problem I dealt with quite a while directly.

The record shows that the Indiana State Legislature has been far from the worst, so far as apportionment is concerned—in fact, we have been one of the better States—but we did not adhere to this constitutional amendment.

Nevertheless, we did not fear this constitutional provision. Some of us thought it was time we took stock of the situation in Indiana and swept up our own house. I, and some others of my colleagues in the House and others in the Senate, beseeched our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to help us to enforce our State constitution so that the Federal court in Indiana would not tell us what to do.

How can a legislature be made to enforce such a decision? When a minority of a legislature has a majority of the votes, what alternative is there to equal representation than to wait for the Supreme Court to say what to do?

For example, in California 8 percent of the people decide who are to be elected to one house of the legislature.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator puts his statement entirely on an academic basis of one man, one vote. This is as good a time as any to read into the Record the editorial entitled "Apportionment in the Real World," published in the Wall Street Journal. Has the Senator read it?

Mr. BAYH. No.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then it will be edifying.

Mr. BAYH. Even if I had read it, I would enjoy the way the Senator from Illinois would interpret it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not propose to interpret it; I shall let the Senator from Indiana interpret it.

Note the caption: "Apportionment in the Real World": Not a chimerical world, not a fantasy world, not a Disneyland, but a real, practical world. So here we go; I hope the Official Reporter will include the caption: "Apportionment in the Real World."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have noted with interest the various references to the Northwest Ordinance and to the creation of the States thereunder. The Northwest Ordinance provided that not less than three nor more than five States should be created from the Northwest Territory. Five were established.

I have not heard any discussion of the provision in the Northwest Ordinance—and it was there stated for the first time, so far as I am advised—that new States formed therefrom—and the same provision has been used in the formation of other new States since then—shall be in all respects "on an equal footing with the original States." Remember that many of the original States had a different basis of apportionment of the seats in the two houses of their legislatures.

I am wondering if the distinguished Senator from Illinois does not believe that the term "equal footing with the original States, in all respects," included a right to establish two houses based upon different methods of distribution of the membership.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; if it means anything, it means absolute parity between them and all other States.

Mr. HOLLAND. In other words, it means that they had exactly the same rights that had been claimed for themselves by the States under the Confederation and carried over into the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and thereafter continued following the adoption of the 14th amendment. They had exactly the same rights as the Thirteen Original States in that regard.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I continue to read from the editorial published in this distinguished journal:

> The Supreme Court's reapportionment edicts, some naive souls still try to tell us, guarantee the lofty principles of majority rule and "one man, one vote" representation in State legislatures. First off, it ain't so. Second, many who realize as much are growing skeptical about the whole idea of judging apportionment by abstract principle rather than actual prospects of fostering good government.
>
> That's a big reason, we think, behind the surprising congressional support for Senator Dirksen's proposed constitutional amendment allowing States to keep one legislative house based on something other than strict population. The proposal emerged from a Senate subcommittee the other day with a 6-to-2 endorsement, and full committee approval is not unlikely.

The editor was speculating a little at that point, because we did not wait to get that far.

> And if the plan fails on the Senate floor, it apparently will not be for want of substantial backing, but because certain "liberals" resort to the filibuster they have so often berated.

Mr. President, at this point I must say that the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] and the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] paid me the honor of a visit late yesterday and indicated that they had no desire to protract this discussion unduly.

I said that we had no undue desire to do that, either, and that we would keep open our lines of communication in the hope that as soon as we had informed the country a little, we could proceed to vote. I thanked them for their visit and for their gracious good will. I am confident that on that basis we can reach a reasonably early solution for a vote and not unduly impede the progress of important legislation in this body.

Mr. BAYH. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his indulgence in allowing the passage of the legislation which has passed in the last 24 hours, since this matter was first suggested for discussion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. The situation is not entirely open, which is to say that a time will come when, I am sure, I may have to erect a barricade; and, of course, in the verities of the situation, the Senator from Indiana will fully understand that that is still within the compass of the rules of the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I, too, express appreciation, as has the Senator from Indiana, for the gracious, cooperative spirit in which the distinguished Senator from Illinois has approached the debate. I hope that, when the time comes to vote, we shall not find ourselves in the position in which the Committee on the Judiciary found itself last week, when the proponents of the amendment were themselves trying to delay a vote, rather than those who were actually opposed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This matter has been discussed off and on on the floor of the Senate; and, frankly, Mr. President, I have said little. I have committed to paper no speeches that I could send out all over the country. So I have to use the weapons of time and understanding to have the full story told.

I continue to read from the Wall Street Journal editorial:

> If the Dirksen amendment were, as some paint it, a crackpot scheme by Republican pariahs and bumpkins, no filibuster against it would be needed in a Congress with the current ideological balance. While the plan's mechanics might profit by further improvement, they refute charges that its thrust is antidemocratic. It requires not only that any nonpopulation apportionment be approved by a statewide referendum, but also reapproved every 10 years. In short, the amendment would make it highly unlikely that the will of a statewide majority would be long denied.

That sentence could very well be underscored. I continue to read:

> Despite all the myths and easy assumptions, a majority can very well be thwarted under apportionment following the Court's dictates. Equal population districts, to start with, do not insure that every man's vote will be reflected equally in the State capitol. Our elections (wisely, we happen to think) let the winner take all in each district. If a citizen votes for the losing candidate, his

> vote is not reflected at all in legislative chambers; it is in effect counted for the man he voted against.
>
> Consider the implications for majority rule. Legislative control requires half the seats, presumably representing some 50 percent of the citizens. But to win those seats it is enough to win a majority within each of the districts comprising that 50 percent, or something less than 26 percent of the statewide popular vote.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the Senator has been a member of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Judiciary Committee and has studied this matter for a suitable length of time, not an arbitrarily long time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And I paid a compliment to the Senator from Indiana today.

Mr. BAYH. I appreciate that. The Senator was very helpful in our deliberations. However, in my position as chairman of that subcommittee, perhaps unwisely, but nevertheless in an effort to try to stimulate the thought process of all or some of our witnesses, I played the part of the devil's advocate. I tried to discover the weak points in the arguments of both sides.

This very argument was presented, as I recall it, by a representative from the chamber of commerce. It is a patently weak argument. For it to stand, we must go ahead and say that in those legislative districts of the minority, the majority does not get any votes at all. This majority of the legislature gets 26 percent of the votes for those seats that are enough to produce a majority in the legislature. However, we would then have to assume that they do not get any in any of the other districts at all, which I think is a most unusual situation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What does the Senator say about the electoral college, in which if one gets one over a majority in a State, he is the winner and gets all the electoral votes, and the loser gets exactly none?

Mr. BAYH. Perhaps I did not make my argument clear. Perhaps we could find a better way to finally register the will of our people than under our present electoral college system. However, this argument is based on the fact—as I recall it from what the Senator from Illinois read from the Wall Street Journal argument and the testimony of the witnesses—that really 26 percent of the people can control a legislature. In other words, 51 legislators, of a house of 100, could be elected by capturing a majority of the votes in each of the legislative districts, which would be 26 percent.

This argument would ignore the fact that at the same time they are capturing the 26 percent of the vote and thus obtaining enough seats to win, they also capture some of the votes for the house seats in the legislature. That is the same as with the electoral process, is it not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Surely. Let me proceed a little further. I continue to read:

> In fact, the theoretical percentage could be substantially lower if more than two candidates ran in some districts, or if some had especially low voter turnout.

That would enter into it, too, if we are to discuss the academic principle of one man, one vote. I think of it in the broader perspective of fair representation, for one thing, a representation of a variety of institutional and/or organizational interests, and State, as well, for that matter. I shall deal with that question later, when I get around to the testimony of the professor from California.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I apologize once again for interrupting the Senator. I hesitated for a moment and then my better judgment was displaced temporarily and I interrupted him for the reason that I believe the Senator well knows that to a great extent we are on common ground. I know of several strong arguments. It is merely the opinion of the junior Senator from Indiana that that argument is not one of the strongest. Therefore, I disliked to let the argument go uncontested. I do not believe the argument stands up nearly as well as some of the other arguments of the Senator from Illinois and some arguments that others on his side will present.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe it speaks for itself.

Mr. President, I resume reading:

> In actual practice, of course, no party's votes are so ideally concentrated, but legislative control with some 40 or 45 percent of the popular vote is far from impossible. It's especially possible, and especially distressing, where reapportionment gives decisive weight to a large city oppressed by a tight political machine.

We are coming pretty close to home when we talk about that.

I continue to read:

> The chance for a machine to control a majority of the legislature without a majority of the popular votes should not be forgotten when big-city liberals belabor the amendment in strains of indignant morality.

I must interpolate at that point. One could take the largest county in my State and add perhaps five other counties to it, making a total of six. Those six metropolitan counties would determine and dictate what the remaining 96 counties would have to do.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If one uses the naked one-man, one-vote principle and carries it out to its logical conclusion and assumes that that power will be used, it can become despotic, it can become tyrannical, and it can become inequitable to the point at which it becomes a real burden upon many of the people of the State.

I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. In our hearings there was testimony by the distinguished mayor of the large metropolitan city to which the Senator from Illinois referred. He pointed out that under the present apportionment conditions, quite the opposite is true, and that, indeed, the largest city in the State—which comprises almost half the people of the great State of Illinois—is at the mercy of many less populated areas.

What I have been striving for, and I still ask the Senator from Illinois to go along with my premise, is to try to find some compromise on this measure. We have not been able to agree on that. However, I believe that if the Senator from Illinois would permit us, we could start out on an equitable population basis, and then give each State some leeway with which to adjust to conform to its people, its desires, its habits, and its needs. We would be much closer to equitable treatment of the people in these large metropolitan areas than we are today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, my distinguished friend the Senator from Indiana should have been present at the great political wrestling match and work of legerdemain that took place there 2 years ago. As a result, in a statewide election, a ballot with 236 names was submitted for the lower house all running at large, from which ballot 177 were to be elected. This was done on a statewide basis. They were placed on an orange-colored ballot.

There were 177 to be elected, as I recall, on that ballot that were picked by the 2 sides, and the 10½ million people in that State were left to guess who was on the ballot. Never has there been such confusion in the State of Illinois. But the outcome could be spelled out long before election. The Senator's party's majority, in the house of representatives, or the general assembly, in the State of Illinois, is so great that I suppose the Senator's party could give us half of them and we still could not stop his party. And who is in control? The great metropolitan center on the lake—and I refer to Lake Michigan—the city of Chicago.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. Has this been the case in this session of the legislature?

Mr. DIRKSEN. In this session this year; they were elected in 1964. They are still in bewilderment.

Mr. BAYH. That is an unfortunate situation. I say this with no disrespect for our sister State across the line, but it is another good example of what happens when State legislators themselves do not recognize that they have the responsibility to do the reapportioning. If they did it, there would not be a statewide referendum with the names of 170 candidates on the ballots; and the Supreme Court would not have to do it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us get to a statewide referendum, and the situation will take care of itself.

Mr. BAYH. May I take this one step further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. BAYH. There has been a great deal of discussion in our committee as to whether supposedly monolithic metropolitan areas—I have heard them described in many ways—are to penalize rural areas. I have heard the opposite argument advanced, just as vociferously, that the rural areas would put a stranglehold on the metropolitan areas. Not to get into the question of just which is the case in actuality, but in the last legislative session, when the large metropolitan area in Illinois controlled, by sizable numbers, the House of Representatives, does the Senator from Illinois have any specific examples of punitive legislation which was imposed on rural areas? This is a very important point.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is not a question of punitive legislation; it is a question of asking things for themselves that will ultimately constitute a burden upon all the people of the State, including those downstate.

Let me make myself clear. The distinguished mayor appeared before the Senator's committee. He appeared also before the House committee. He was quizzed. Finally he said, "I have difficulty with the Illinois Senate." The Senate happens to be Republican.

"What is your problem?"

"I want some special tax authority for the city of Chicago."

"What kind of tax authority?"

"I would like to have a separate city tax on cigarettes. I would like to have a special city tax on distilled liquor. I would like to have a special city tax on this and on that."

"How much would it amount to?"

"$50 million."

"What are you going to do with the money?"

"Well, I am going to spend so much for this and I am going to spend so much for that and I am going to spend so much for the other."

"That still leaves you $25 million. What are you going to do with the $25 million?"

There was no ready answer. But who pays the bill?

Mr. BAYH. Will the Senator answer the question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I am asking the Senator from Indiana. The Senator asked whether the laws are punitive. It is a far more subtle situation.

Mr. BAYH. The people of Chicago would have to pay the tax on cigarettes and liquor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Anybody who came to Chicago would have to pay it. Whoever got a drink of bourbon, for example, would have to pay the tax on it. If one bought a package of cigarettes that "taste good like a certain cigarette should," he would pay the tax on it.

Mr. BAYH. I do not suppose the people of downstate Illinois drink too much Chicago bourbon. I suppose they would drink some, but the tax would not do much damage to them. It is primarily the people who live in Chicago day by day who will have to pay the bill, and if they do not like it, they can take care of the situation at the next election.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the people have not asked for it.

Mr. BAYH. But the people could make the final decision.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, but after the damage is done. After the horse is stolen, the stable door is locked.

Mr. BAYH. But if the Senator is arguing for a referendum for the people, I cannot see why the Senator cannot be consistent and say that all of us who occupy public office should be subject to a referendum of the people and be subject to be recalled when we let things get out of hand.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The mayor was not asking for a referendum. The Senator knows how cute the mayor is.

Mr. BAYH. I looked at him, but I did not notice—

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator knows how cute he is. He is a friend of mine. He is an ardent partisan Democrat. I like Dick Daley, but Dick Daley is a partisan Democrat. He is a fine family man. I daresay he has been a pretty good mayor for the city of Chicago. But that is quite beside the point. I am thinking in terms of principle, and not in terms of one man who happens to be mayor of a metropolitan center.

Mr. BAYH. I am afraid we are getting a bit far afield from the thrust of the Senator's argument; but how would the Senator from Illinois suggest that the people of Chicago initiate tax programs and street building programs and hospital programs unless they elect a mayor to use his initiative to start such programs? Is there a referendum for that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The people did not send him down here. He needs the revenue.

Mr. BAYH. I wanted to find out if there had been punitive or undesirable legislation passed by the Democratic controlled house of representatives which had been imposed on the people of Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We had a system in which the people had approved the composition of the two branches of our State legislature, and we have done pretty well with that system. Now comes the Court, which says, in effect, "We are now going to compel you to put in the hands of the Illinois Supreme Court the business of monitoring this matter to get it straightened out." That is our problem.

Mr. President, I am having quite a time reading this editorial.

Mr. BAYH. I apologize.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Think nothing of it.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I do not want to interrupt the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield to a distinguished former Governor of Wyoming, and a great Senator from Wyoming, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Senator. I may say that flattery on his side will not get him anywhere. I am already on his side.

I rise to speak in behalf of Senate Joint Resolution No. 2. In considering this vital question of legislative apportionment, I am one of those who contend that our first consideration should be ways of achieving fair representation. It is my further contention that fairness cannot always be safely embodied in this one-man, one-vote theory of which we have all been hearing so much. In these few minutes I hope to prove this point in a completely realistic manner.

My premise is that our American system of representative government is far too complex and far too expressive to be encompassed by the cry of one man, one vote. Our society is composed of too many interests, too many groupings, and too many shades of opinion to make the achievement of fair representation such a simple and easy matter. To me fairness in governmental representation can best be achieved through political experience, not through some over-simplified slogan. The drafters of our Constitution knew this when they first gave consideration to the structure of our Government. They saw clearly that the way to achieve fairness in representation was to live with the problems of truly representative apportionment as they actually exist. They chose and insisted upon restraints and balance rather than full reliance upon the dictates of majority rule.

In a nation as large and as diverse as ours, I doubt whether any single set of standards for State representation could ever be drafted that would be completely applicable to all States. I believe that we do well enough in this area when we call for complete adherence to our National Constitution and then allow the people of the several States some latitude in adjusting representation to their own diversity. This is all that the proposed amendment would do. To look upon this problem otherwise is, to me, an oversimplification which dangerously ignores the political balances that have enabled our country to keep strong and keep growing.

I have heard it generalized that a two-house State legislature in which one house represents geography as well as people cannot keep pace with the social progress required in this fast growing Nation. My answer is that many of the States with the best records in support of urban renewal, area redevelopment, manpower retraining, water conservation, water pollution control, education, protection of working men and women, and in many other areas of popular concern, are States that have long had just such representation.

On this question of fairness in representation, I believe that we face the question of right things being done for the right reasons and wrong things being forced into the open by full and representative discussion. This can happen only when the majority practices self-restraint and permits both necessary representation and full discussion. How else, let me ask, can proper discussion and evaluation take place in regard to the many facets of such problems as conserving natural resources, improving highways and transportation, conserving and developing efficient water usage, regional planning and many other evolving programs which will vitally affect the future of each of our States in its entirety. If we are to do needed things in our States both for today and for the future, it is imperative that we have representation which can speak freely and without a feeling of hopelessness induced by roughshod dominance by urban bosses.

Let me digress a moment, Mr. President, to say that I am very pleased that

I have induced two of my dear friends to come over to this side of the aisle to listen to me. It is most encouraging.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I shall speak for myself, and then let the Senator from Maryland speak for himself, but the acoustics in the Chamber being what they are, I would not wish to lose any of the thoughtful presentation now being made by the Senator from Wyoming. I appreciate the fact that the Senator has welcomed us to this side of the aisle, if only for a few moments.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would welcome both Senators here any time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Indiana. I have enjoyed the company of the Senator from Wyoming in the past, and I hope to do so in the future, even though I may not be on the same side of the aisle.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Senator from Maryland for his comments and reciprocate his feelings. I enjoy my association with him very much.

Mr. President, without this amendment, it can be taken for granted that the political machine of one or two big cities will soon be unleashed in some of our States in a manner entirely new to the voters of this generation. In other States, combinations of power can be foreseen which can grow so strong that they need give neither recognition nor consideration to pleas based upon geographical groupings or minority desires.

Our opponents tell us that big city bosses will be just as fair and just as restrained as rural blocs have been. This, in some instances, might well be true, but I point out that any restraint on their part would be voluntary instead of in keeping with the planned dictates of the permissive, balanced system of representation under which many of our States have lived and developed.

Today, in almost every State in the Nation, we find leaders in the throes of trying to straighten out a representative problem the like of which has never before confronted any of us.

To our desks each day come letters and telegrams pleading for a continuance of rights which the small groupings within our States have long enjoyed. To our desks each day also come demands that our big cities be allowed the all-powerful voice which recognition of population alone would provide.

The other day, I heard the distinguished Senator from Colorado say that an urban area in his State amounting to 3.5 percent of the land in his State contains 53 percent of the State's population.

Startling comparisons such as this can be developed for other States. To all of us, I believe they raise a warning of where we are heading if we abandon Senate Joint Resolution No. 2.

It is not my purpose to dwell upon this alarming situation insofar as individual States are concerned, but I point out what this theory of one-man, one-vote could head us toward were it to be applied at the national level.

Using the 1960 census figures, let us assume that the Senate of the United States would be apportioned on a one-man, one-vote basis. The total number of votes to be considered would represent something over 178,500,000. Because of its population, New York State would be given nine Senators, Pennsylvania would be given six, California would be given nine, Illinois six, Texas five, and Ohio five. Let us stop right there. I have listed just 6 States with 40 votes. Next let us add four for Michigan, three for New Jersey, three for Florida and three for Indiana. At this point my story is told—10 States and 53 votes—a clear majority.

It may help to know that in working out these tabulations, we found ourselves giving the four States, Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Colorado, a combined total of three Senators. We found ourselves giving Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma a combined total of five Senators, and the States of Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Montana would get a total of only two Senators.

Let me list some of the other highlights of this compilation. Alabama and Mississippi together would be represented by three Senators, Alaska and Washington would be represented by two, Arkansas and Louisiana by three, Connecticut and Rhode Island by two, Delaware and Maryland by two, Idaho, Oregon, and Hawaii by two, and Maine and New Hampshire by one.

Frankly, I believe that I have made my point. In their wisdom, the founders of this Nation demanded fair representation. What the one-man, one-vote theory would do to our existing senatorial representation was considered unfair in their time, just as it would be unfair today. Yet, in the final analysis, it is hardly more startling than some of the conditions which will be generated within individual States should we fail to give passage to this resolution. Let us not let anyone oversimplify the issue. It is far too serious a matter not to be faced in a realistic fashion.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for an observation?

Mr. SIMPSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. I should like to tell the Senator from Wyoming that although there are some parts of his speech with which I do not agree, I do wholeheartedly concur in his closing remarks. It is imperative that we do not fall afoul of those who would greatly oversimplify the issue. This is not a simple issue. It is a very complex issue. It is one which will have a great influence on the future of our country.

Mr. SIMPSON. I appreciate what the Senator from Indiana has said. No one has worked harder in his own right to do what is needful with respect to the knotty problems to be worked out. Although I happen to be in disagreement with him in respect to this joint resolution, I am always impressed with the fairness and persuasivenes of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me state to the Senator from Wyoming that I can assure him at least that I would fight any effort to amend the Federal Constitution which would upset the Federal compromise agreed to in 1787 in the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, which provided that the Constitution could never be amended to take away the equal representation of the people in the U.S. Senate, without the agreement of the States themselves involved.

I assure the Senator from Wyoming that I would resist any attempt to amend the Constitution to upset the Federal compromise reached at that time as ardently as I shall attempt to resist the present constitutional amendment, which is the subject of debate.

I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Wyoming. The Senator is aware, is he not, of the circumstances surrounding the Constitutional Convention and the debate between the proponents of the Virginia plan and of the New Jersey plan, and how the great compromise was reached?

He will recall that under James Madison's Virginia plan, it was provided that both Houses of the Federal Congress would be based substantially upon population. Twice in the Constitutional Convention this measure carried. However, when the New Jersey plan was proposed, and the States of Delaware and New Jersey, in a calm, deliberate, and dispassionate manner advised the other delegates to the Convention that they would not ratify the Convention, and, in effect, implied that they might even enter into agreements with foreign nations—France and others—the great compromise was agreed upon that summer. That great compromise provided that, in one House or the other of the Federal Congress, representation would be based on population, and in the other House each State would be sovereign and each State would have the same representation, and that the Constitution could never be amended to take that representation away, because these States are sovereign, without the permission of the State itself. That is the fundamental provision in our Federal Constitution.

Therefore I do not believe that what we are discussing today is really analogous, because there is no possibility of any of the situations which the Senator has described coming into being, with, for example, New York State having nine Senators or Indiana three Senators, or something like that, because that question was taken care of and fixed for all time in the summer of 1789.

Mr. SIMPSON. I might say that there is much to what the Senator has said. I would like to enlist his bleeding heart, however, for the States, because many of the State legislatures are patterned after the Federal system. For 175 years no one ever thought of challenging the State pattern of apportionment. I am still fearful that the new type of representation that I have spoken of can be foisted on the people of the United States with the selection of senators under the one-man, one-vote policy.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator realizes, of course, that a county is a creature of the State legislature. The State legislature can do as it wishes insofar as drawing a line or redrawing a boundary line of individual counties is concerned. When a county has gotten too big, most State legislatures have, historically, drawn a line dividing it into two counties, or more, thus keeping up, basically, representation based on population.

In the U.S. Senate, on the other hand, the Congress has no authority and no power to draw any line dividing any State or creating a new State, without the State's permission. I believe that is true in only one case, in the case of the State of Texas. A State legislature, as in the case of the Maryland Legislature, or in the case of the Wyoming Legislature, can redraw the lines of any county, if both houses of the legislature agree to do it, and it can divide a county into two or more counties as it pleases.

Mr. SIMPSON. In many of the States, as the Senator knows, particularly in the Western States, a county cannot be divided without the consent of the county. I believe the Senator should recognize the fact that nearly every State in the Union has been attempting to do a reapportionment job. The Legislature of the State of Wyoming was called into special session. It became involved in party politics. The result was that nothing was done at that session. In the regular session it passed a reapportionment bill which was vetoed by the action of the Court.

It is not an easy thing, as we both recognize. It seems to me that this is the place where the people should have an opportunity to be heard and to vote upon it in a referendum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN HIGH-SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 481, Senate bill 1588.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1588) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed consideration of the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, consistent with the objective of promoting a safe, adequate, economical, and efficient transportation system, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation, including, but not limited to components such as materials, aerodynamics, vehicle propulsion, vehicle control, communications, and guideways.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized to contract for demonstrations in high-speed ground transportation for the purpose of contributing to the development of more efficient and economical intercity transportation systems. Such demonstrations shall be designed to measure and evaluate such factors as the public response to new equipment, higher speeds, variations in fares, improved comfort and convenience, and more frequent service. Contracts for demonstrations under this section shall make provision for financial participation of private industry to the maximum extent practicable as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is authorized to collect and collate transportation data, statistics, and other information which he determines will contribute to the improvement of the national transportation system. In carrying out this activity the Secretary shall utilize the statistics and data available from Federal agencies and other sources to the greatest practicable extent. The information collected under this section shall be made available to other Federal agencies and to the public insofar as practicable.

SEC. 4. In carrying out the purposes of section 2 of this Act, the Secretary shall provide fair and equitable arrangements, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, to protect the interests of railroad employees involved in operations which are the subject of such demonstrations. Such protective arrangements shall include, without being limited to, such provisions as may be necessary for (1) the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits (including continuation of pension rights and benefits) to such employees under existing collective-bargaining agreements, or otherwise; (2) the continuation of collective-bargaining rights; (3) the protection of such individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment as the result of such demonstrations; (4) assurances of priority of reemployment of employees terminated or laid off; and (5) paid training or retraining programs. Such arrangements shall include provisions protecting these individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment as the result of such demonstrations which shall in no event provide benefits less than those established pursuant to section 5(2)(f) of the Act of February 4, 1887 (24 Stat. 379), as amended. Such contracts entered into pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of this Act shall specify the terms and conditions of the protective arrangements.

SEC. 5. In exercising the authority granted in sections 1 and 2 of this Act, the Secretary may lease, purchase, develop, test, and evaluate new facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods and conduct such other activities as may be necessary.

SEC. 6. In exercising the authority granted under this Act, the Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements and to contract with public or private agencies, institutions, organizations, corporations, and individuals, without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529, 41 U.S.C. 5). The Secretary is further authorized to appoint, subject to the civil service laws and regulations, such personnel as may be necessary to enable him to carry out efficiently his functions and responsibilities under this Act. The Secretary is further authorized to procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 3, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, unless otherwise specified in an appropriations Act.

SEC. 7. In exercising the authority granted under this Act, the Secretary shall consult and cooperate, as he deems appropriate, with the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and other departments and agencies, Federal, State, and local. The Secretary shall further consult and cooperate, as he deems appropriate, with institutions and private industry.

SEC. 8. The Secretary shall report to the Congress and the President the results of his evaluation of the research and development program and the demonstration program authorized by this Act, and shall make recommendations with respect to such future action as may be appropriate in the light of these results and the objective of promoting a safe, adequate, economical, and efficient transportation system.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this Act, not to exceed $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; and $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. Such appropriation, when so specified in an appropriation Act, shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 10. This Act shall expire on June 30, 1969, except for section 3. The termination of this Act shall not affect the disbursement of funds under, or the carrying out of, any contract, commitment, or other obligation entered into pursuant to this Act prior to the date of such termination.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the bill was introduced by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], by myself, and by several other Senators. The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development and demonstrations in high-speed ground transportation and for other purposes.

The bill is supported by all Government agencies interested, including the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of Commerce, the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, the Comptroller General, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Department of Justice, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I am not aware of any objection to the bill as amended by the Committee.

I believe that all Senators are in favor of the bill, the immediate purpose of which is to authorize funds amounting to $90 million over 3 years for research on high-speed transportation, including the possibility of early improvement of speeds on the rails up to 150 or 160 miles an hour, and perhaps later very much higher speeds, using exotic and as yet undeveloped systems.

The bill also involves the authorization of demonstration projects involving swifter, better train service on the rails of the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad and the Pennsylvania Railroad. These pilot programs would be undertaken on the run from New York to Philadelphia and Washington, and possibly on the Boston-Providence run. These immediate demonstrations, I believe, hold great promise for the improvement of our transportation system.

Senate passage of the high-speed ground transportation bill will be a landmark in man's long history of striving for faster and more efficient ways to transport himself and his goods. We are opening up a new era—an era in which high-speed ground transportation will draw our great urban centers ever more closely together.

I am particularly pleased that this bill, which we strengthened in the Commerce Committee, includes provisions for demonstration programs to determine if improved equipment can be used in connection with existing routes and facilities in high-speed transportation systems. This conforms with my proposal to the Commerce Department that first priority be given to development of high-speed passenger railroad service in our congested urban corridors using existing routes and facilities wherever possible.

More exotic systems should and must be explored, but we cannot wait 20 or 30 years for their development while many of our urban corridors, such as that between Boston and Washington become one big 24-hour-a-day traffic jam.

I urge the Senate to act both favorably and promptly on this important proposed legislation.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, as we reflect on the purposes of this bill it is easy to visualize sleek, streamlined trains moving effortlessly across the countryside. Passengers are comfortably seated in contour chairs, soft music plays in the background. With a slight, almost imperceptible lift, the train takes off down a gleaming metal tube, swiftly gaining speed until it reaches a steady 400 miles per hour. Cars are spun off and new ones added at intermediate cities without slackening speed.

Transportation of this kind, more often found in the pages of Popular Mechanics, or science fiction, may be the eventual, long-range outcome of the legislation before us today but it is not the direct goal of this bill, nor will it be its immediate result.

Because the popular imagination is so taken with concepts of this kind of Buck Rogers travel, I think it is important to put the bill in proper perspective. What are the problems with which this bill deals? What does the bill do? What things are beyond the scope and focus of the bill? These are down-to-earth, pedestrian questions that the Senate must consider and resolve in dealing with this measure.

Briefly stated, the bill authorizes a 3-year program of research into the problems of high-speed ground transportation, and a 3-year program of demonstrations in fast train service, at a total cost of not more than $90 million. And the demonstration projects are to take place in the Boston-Washington corridor, the busiest, most densely populated area of the Nation, though the experiments may have direct application in other heavily populated sections of the Nation.

President Johnson, in submitting this proposal to the Congress, stated his concept of its need:

> We face an imminent need for improved intercity transportation in the densely populated area along the east coast—between Washington and Boston—where travel is expected to increase by 150 to 200 percent between 1960 and 1980. Freight shipments during the same period may nearly double.

Others have pointed out that this area now contains over 20 percent of our total population—nearly 40 million people—accounts for almost 30 percent of our manufacturing, and pays 27 percent of our Federal income taxes. They point to declining intercity rail passenger services—the Baltimore & Ohio abandoned Washington-New York service in 1958, the Pennsylvania Railroad has had periods of low income, and the New Haven Railroad returned to receivership in 1961, with losses to the Federal Government which may exceed $40 million.

What President Johnson and others fail to mention is that most of these statistics have little real bearing on the problem. The volume of passenger traffic through the densest section of the Boston-Washington corridor is estimated to be about 50,000 passengers a day, not a large number in terms even of existing capacity. A two-track railroad alone can easily handle this many passengers in a single hour.

And travelers along this corridor are not limited to the railroad system. Limited access, high-speed highways cover virtually the entire distance between Boston and Washington, and a number of alternate highway routes are available, many of them also of a limited access character. In terms of air service, there were almost 943,000 aircraft flights between airports in the Boston-Washington corridor in 1962. Both the number of flights and their capacity has increased since then.

I do not believe there is another 450-mile stretch in the world which has transportation facilities to match those of the Boston-Washington corridor in capacity or variety. As a matter of fact, the White House task force on Transportation in the Northeast Corridor in 1962 stated that "the passenger capacity of the existing intercity transportation system greatly exceeds the current demand for passenger service."

If this is the case, why bother with all this legislation, why spend $90 million of the taxpayers money just to chase a will-o'-the-wisp? Aside from the general aim of improved transportation, there is one reason:

Federal, State, and local governments are planning large expenditures for transportation facilities in this corridor in the next 10 to 15 years, and the only realistic basis for the investment of public funds is a sound analysis of transportation requirements and coordinated planning based on such analysis. The Federal Government's investment programs include the Federal-aid highway system, aid to airports, improving the air navigation system, and improvements to harbors and waterways. The projected requirements just for airport improvements for the northeast corridor as a whole are estimated to cost from $750 million to $1 billion by 1980.

The bill, as amended by the committee, is designed to supplement this analytical objective in two ways. First, demonstration projects would be authorized to measure and evaluate things like the public response to new equipment, higher train speeds, variations in fares, and improved comfort. These demonstrations will enable the Secretary of Commerce to determine the extent to which improvements in rail service can attract passengers and avoid the necessity for additional public expenditures on other forms of transportation.

Second, the bill authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to undertake an improved program for the collection of transportation statistics. While enormous quantities of transportation statistics are now collected by various agencies of the Federal Government, this information contains some critical gaps. For instance, information on the origin and destination of either passengers or freight is not currently available, nor is much other data of a critical nature in assessing the future needs of the Nation for specific kinds of transportation services. The programs contemplated by this bill will remedy much of this.

A third provision of the bill authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to undertake a program of research and development into the components of high-speed ground transportation.

Mr. President, at this point let me make a brief reference to the form and language of the bill before the Senate. As submitted by the President, this legislation was a blank-check bill. It contained no guidelines, no dollar limits, no time limits. The purpose and extent of the programs were not defined or specified except in the most general terms. With the cooperation of the Secretary of Commerce, who frankly acknowledged the shortcomings of the bill, the Committee has completely redrafted and revised the measure, to provide effective guidelines and dollar limits.

The bill has also been amended to require the Secretary of Commerce to report to the President and Congress the results of his efforts under the bill, and to make comprehensive, overall recommendations for improved transportation systems. Such recommendations of the Secretary should take into account other research and development work, such as the development of efficient short-haul aircraft which are capable of meeting the transportation needs of areas like the east coast of the United States.

It should be noted also that the studies of the northeast corridor, which would be furthered by this bill, are not limited to transportation from Boston to Washington. The northeast corridor studies will encompass the transportation needs of much of Maine and New Hampshire since this area contributes significantly to the transportation demands at Boston and along the entire east coast.

The bill authorizes a sound, constructive study of the problems and needs for improved rail transportation services, particularly in the northeast corridor. But it will not jump us straight into revolutionary concepts of transportation nor outmode any of our present transportation facilities for the foreseeable future. It is easy to get carried away by the far-out prospects for high-speed transportation, but the hard realities of costs and competition cannot be overlooked.

In this connection, it may be appropriate to comment briefly on the new, high-speed train put into operation by the Japanese National Railways. The new Tokaido Line is an engineering and transportation marvel which does credit to the skill and ability of its builders, but a similar installation in the United States would face vastly different and more difficult problems.

For instance, the 320 miles covered by the new Tokaido train runs through the Tokyo-Osaka corridor of Japan, an area containing 40 percent of Japan's population—39 million people—and 70 percent of its industrial output. In America, the 450-mile Boston-Washington corridor accounts for only 20 percent of our population—40 million people—and only about 25 percent of our industrial output.

In Japan, 75 percent of intercity travel is by train, and only 6 percent by private car. Taking the train is the customary way to travel in Japan. In the United States, 90 percent of our travel is by private car, and less than 3 percent by train. Here, people drive their own cars.

The cities of our east coast are connected by an extensive network of high-speed, multiple-lane highways and bypassed by such highways for the through motorist or trucker. In Japan, Tokyo and Osaka are connected with a single, two-lane highway which passes through every city and town along the way. No wonder the Japanese ride the train.

It might also be noted that the new Tokaido Line was built and is operated by the Government-owned Japanese National Railway. Nothing in this bill, and for this we may be thankful, contemplates or permits Government ownership or operation of railroads in the United States.

The Japanese operate the high-speed Tokaido trains with a two-man crew. It might also be noted that, according to the latest figures I have seen, the Tokaido Line is running a deficit of 10 percent.

Because of practical, down-to-earth considerations like these, I think it is important that we put this bill in the proper perspective, and not regard it as driving the first spike for construction of a Japanese-type high-speed train between Boston and Washington.

The need for improvement in transportation is real, but progress must be based on a clear knowledge and understanding of the facts and the economics involved. Such an understanding is the goal of this bill and the basis of my support for it.

Mr. MAGNUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, the research and development program in this bill marks the beginning of high-speed surface transportation networks throughout the Nation. There is a need for high-speed intercity surface service between the cities of the Pacific Northwest, the urban center of California, the Milwaukee-Chicago-South Bend-Cleveland area, as well as the northeastern areas.

The program authorized under this bill will have application to all parts of the country. The research activities will be conducted in various parts of the country. The statistical collection program will be national in scope. While the initial demonstrations are planned in the Northeast, their success would be important for operations all over the country. The gas turbine, self-propelled car which might be put into operation on the Boston-Providence run in high-frequency service could be put in service, for example, between Pacific Northwest cities.

In Japan and also in Europe, new technology has been applied to high-speed ground transportation to halve the travel time between cities. Much of this advanced know-how was developed right here in America. Our own high-speed transportation continues to lag badly, however. I know that we can and will not only equal but excel these other countries with our advanced technology.

I urge passage of this measure, an administration-request bill, which had the strong backing of Secretary of Commerce in his testimony before the committee. I want to commend the chairman of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] for his fine efforts in conducting the hearings and in strengthening and improving the provisions of this measure.

This measure will apply to the movement of passengers and on freight here on earth the same skills and technology which have been so successful in putting a man in orbit in the skies above.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 417) explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INTRODUCTION

S. 1588 authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development and to contract for demonstrations in high-speed intercity ground transportation as well as to secure transportation data, statistics, and other information for the improvement of the national transportation system. The program is limited to 3 years and a total cost of $90 million. The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary to carry out these activities relating to the development of high-speed ground transportation, thereby contributing to the improvement of the national transportation system. The long-range goal of this bill is to determine how public transportation funds can be most effectively invested.

NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Modern intercity surface transportation service is vital to both our national economic growth and to our national defense. To meet America's transportation needs, we must bring scientific and technical talent to bear on this increasingly important area of transportation, not previously subject to intensive, continuing inquiry. This bill will enable the power of science and technology, demonstrated so well in the evolution of air and highway travel, to be utilized in the development of high-speed ground transportation.

By the end of the 20th century, the Nation's metropolitan population will double, and homes, highways, and other facilities must be provided equal to all those built since our country was first settled. The increasing density of population, together with greatly increased travel, will result in serious overburdening of our intercity transportation facilities.

In the last 50 years, intercity freight tonnage has risen four times, and passenger travel has increased 25-fold. In 1960, Americans traveled over 600 billion passenger miles, exclusive of local trips. That figure will more than double by 1980.

The intercity transportation problem has been sharpened by the pronounced shift of population toward metropolitan areas that has taken place in the United States in the last two decades. In the northeast corridor, for example, population density is today 854 people per square mile. This population density is expected to rise to about 1,100 by 1980. In some major areas of the corridor population densities presently exceed 4,200 per square mile. Other regions of the Nation will have become almost as densely populated by 1980, when as much as 76 percent of our population may live in metropolitan areas.

The northeast corridor extending from Maine to Virginia; Seattle-Tacoma-Portland; the east coast of Florida; Milwaukee-Chicago-South Bend-Cleveland; San Francisco-Los Angeles, and other thickly populated areas face the prospect of critical intercity transportation problems which require the application of advanced technology to ground transportation systems.

National research and development in high-speed ground transportation has been quite meager. For example, while aircraft manufacturers spent $379 million in 1961 on research and development, railroad equipment suppliers accounted for $15 million. The Federal Government in fiscal year 1963 spent for research and development in aviation, $275 million; in highways, $24 million; in water transportation, $15 million; and in demonstrations of local metropolitan rail transit facilities by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, $7 million.

In 1962, Senator Pell suggested that steps be taken to provide high-speed intercity rail service in the densely populated megalopolis stretching from Washington, D.C., to Boston, Mass. Senator Pell introduced at that time and reintroduced in the 88th Congress, a bill authorizing the negotiation of an eight-State public authority to provide such service. Thereafter, an interagency task force was assigned by President Kennedy to survey this problem. The task force concluded that a systemative evaluation of the transportation needs of the northeast corridor should be made before any sizable amount of public capital investment funds were committed. This study contemplated a careful weighing of social benefits against economic costs for various proposed systems, and combinations of systems.

Preliminary appraisals by the Department of Commerce turned up number of problem areas. The Department found that there are major gaps in the available information about how people and goods move, and a lack of data on the demand for a high-quality intercity rail service.

The term "high-speed ground transportation" as used in the proposed legislation means the movement of people and goods, by land, on special purpose rights-of-way, along which vehicles are guided. The important characteristic of this kind of transportation is its capability for moving large volumes of passenger and freight traffic, while imposing relatively low requirements for space. Another advantage is its high reliability under adverse weather conditions. The conventional railroad is the only existing form of high-speed ground transportation now in commercial operation, under this definition of the term.

The proposed legislation is not designed to benefit or to concentrate solely on one particular kind of transportation. Wholly new kinds of vehicles, guideways, and operational and control systems may evolve from concentrated technological research in high-speed ground transportation. Such results can be foreseen within the scope of present and foreseeable technology. A new high-speed ground transportation system could differ radically from passenger trains and railways as we know them today.

The President's proposal embodied in the present measure would attack our intercity transportation problem on three basic fronts:

1. Research and development in different forms of high-speed ground transportation, including railroad;
2. Demonstration projects to measure public response to improvements in intercity rail passenger service utilizing present technology; and
3. A national program to improve the scope and availability of transportation statistics.

The research and development activity to be carried out under the proposed legislation would be accomplished in cooperation with all relevant elements of our present transportation system, whether privately or publicly owned and operated.

The initial demonstration projects utilizing present railroad technology would be conducted with Federal participation. Such projects would involve relatively low-cost improvements in present rail service for the purpose of measuring market response to higher rail speeds, variation in fares, greater travel comfort and convenience, and more frequent service.

The transportation data and statistics that would be collected are essential in arriving at sound policy decisions in the future regarding high-speed ground transportation as well as other decisions on the improvement of the national transportation system. This program would (a) collate data collected by diverse Federal agencies, (b) collect new data to fill specific information voids, and (c) systematize and make accessible to a broad range of users transportation statistics of many different kinds.

Enactment of the proposed legislation would provide a forceful statement that cooperation by the Federal Government in research and development of high-speed ground transportation is in the public interest. The committee anticipates that the work performed during the next 3 years will be sufficient to permit decisions to be made concerning future activities in high-speed ground transportation. Clearly there could continue to be a need for carrying on fundamental research and development in ground transportation systems as well as to continue collection of adequate transportation statistics. There could also be a basis for pioneering development of new ground transportation systems in the northeast corridor and in other areas of the Nation. Our transportation network represents nearly one-fifth of our gross national product. Measured against this huge contribution to our economic wealth, the authorization under the proposed legislation of $90 million for a high-speed ground transportation program would be a relatively modest, but meaningful, investment that will yield a very significant return to our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE and Mr. PELL], who are attending to important business outside the city today, I ask unanimous consent that statements which they have prepared on S. 1558 be inserted in the RECORD. I make the same request for the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS].

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PELL

The Senate's consideration today of S. 1588, the administration's bill authorizing demonstrations, research, and development in high-speed ground transportation, is a significant milestone in the development of public transportation policy.

It is also, I might add, an occasion of special meaning and significance to me personally. More than 3 years ago, I set out on what turned out to be a long, and at first lonely, course, arguing that we should act now to preserve and modernize our intercity rail passenger facilities and that we should provide efficient, 100-mile-per-hour average service especially in such areas as the crowded northeast megalopolitan corridor between here and Boston.

It was in June of 1962 that I introduced what might be regarded as the legislative grandfather of today's legislation, a Senate joint resolution authorizing an eight-State public authority to maintain and operate high-speed rail passenger service up and down the northeast corridor. I might say that I have reintroduced this resolution in the two succeeding Congresses in the belief that it offers the best method of organizing high-speed ground transportation on a permanent basis.

In December of 1962, President Kennedy, with direct reference to my proposal, requested the Department of Commerce to begin studies of the whole northeast corridor transportation complex. The first phase of these studies culminated last summer with a recommendation for the substantially expanded demonstration, research, and development program now being considered by Congress.

I will be frank to say that I quite often felt like a voice crying in the wilderness during these 3 years. But, gradually, it became apparent that there were strong currents of support for my proposal. The culmination came last January when President Johnson incorporated and expanded my concept and made it part of his design for the Great Society, and at that time made the recommendations which have come before the Senate in the form of S. 1588.

Clearly, the President's program in many respects goes beyond the terms of my original proposal. It provides substantial support for basic research and development in transportation science that may lead to totally new techniques and systems of ground transportation. This is sorely needed because the railroad industry, in particular, has lacked the capacity to risk resources in this kind of speculative but very necessary research—while other modes of transportation, notably automobiles and aircraft, have forged ahead to new levels of technical excellence.

I commend the administration for the breadth of its vision and wisdom in putting forward this future-oriented aspect of the program. And, I might emphasize that the benefits from this and the other two elements of the program will, in the years to come, flow widely to all parts of the country and not just to the northeast corridor.

The second phase of the program is of special concern to us from New England because it provides for immediate demonstration grants to help finance new high-speed passenger equipment to use on existing trackage. The objective of these demonstration projects will be to test consumer response to the revitalized service that this equipment will offer. We in New England are badly in need of such demonstrations, for they will help us to plan a long-range program of support and rehabilitation for our ailing railroads. I sincerely hope that the Secretary of Commerce will give priority consideration to these demonstrations in New England.

In particular, I hope he will bear in mind the special technical problems which exist in the northern end of the corridor, where my own State is served by a trunkline which is not electrified. There is a real need—and an excellent opportunity here—to test some exciting new principles in railroading in this area. I have in mind, in particular, the adaptation of aircraft turbine engines as high-speed propulsion units for new lightweight railroad cars. Recently, information came to my attention showing that such engines have a weight-to-power ratio of less than 1 to 1, whereas conventional diesel engines have a weight-to-power ratio of 20 to 1 or more. In other words, a gasoline turbine engine weighing only about 300 pounds can generate over 400 horsepower, while a diesel engine generating the same amount of power would itself weigh 8,000 pounds. There are other distinct economies, I understand, in the durability of turbine engines for continuous, long-term service.

Clearly, the adaptation of such new principles to railroading would constitute a real breakthrough in public transportation and should be given full support under this program. In particular, I am gratified that the Department of Commerce is planning to use the excellent stretch of right-of-way between Providence and Boston for demonstrations which may involve just this sort of equipment. I hope the Department will give special priority to this part of the project.

Finally, the program envisioned in S. 1588 contemplates a nationwide collection and analysis of travel statistics and data, showing how many people are traveling between given points and by what means. This is the raw material of public policy for the future, and we have been lamentably short of it, as I have found to my own dismay while foraging for facts to buttress my thesis in recent years.

In conclusion, I wish to commend the Senate Commerce Committee for its speedy action and for their wisdom in rewriting the bill so succinctly and clearly. I fully support the bill as reported and I hope that it will soon be given final passage and signed into law.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PASTORE

I wish to express my wholehearted support for the President's plan to undertake research and development in the field of high-speed ground transportation.

As a cosponsor of S. 1588, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake this project, I urge its speedy approval by the Congress.

High honors, however, belong today to my colleague, Senator CLAIBORNE PELL. He originally conceived the idea. His efforts have made the public aware of the great potential of rapid ground transportation.

The Pell proposal will inaugurate rapid rail travel through the northeast corridor. I believe that the President's decision to commence a pilot project in this area is a wise one. Lessons learned from the demonstration program proposed for the eastern seaboard will, of course, apply to transportation corridors throughout the country. This pilot project in the northeast corridor will be the prototype for steamlined train service throughout the Nation.

Secretary of Commerce Connor has stated that up to 50 new individually motored, electrically propelled cars capable of speeds approaching 150 miles an hour will be put into operation in the corridor to test the market for such high-speed transportation. We expect the demonstration program to commence by the middle of next year. The Secretary also envisions a demonstration project between Providence and Boston involving gas-turbine, self-propelled cars providing a high frequency of service.

I believe that the successful completion of these demonstrations will lead ultimately to swift, safe transportation between cities and urban centers throughout the United States.

This is, therefore, a historic moment in the history of our transportation industry. I urge my colleagues to support S. 1588.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LAUSCHE

The bill which was ordered reported unanimously by the Senate Commerce Committee would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development, to contract for demonstrations in high-speed ground transportation, and to collect transportation statistics for the improvement of the national transportation system.

The Surface Transportation Subcommittee heard over 20 witnesses in 3 days of hearings on this bill requested by the administration. No one appeared in opposition to the bill, but some witnesses suggested amendments.

The bill before the Senate is a considerably improved bill over the draft submitted to the Congress. The bill approved by the committee specifically defines the authority granted to the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development, to contract for demonstrations, and to collect statistics. The committee bill limits the authorization, in time, to June 30, 1969; and, in money, to $90 million: $20 million for the current fiscal year, and $35 million each for the next 2 fiscal years.

The Nation's critical intercity transportation problems require the application of advanced technology to high-speed ground transportation systems. By high-speed ground transportation, I mean the movement of people and goods, by land, on special purpose right-of-way, along which vehicles are guided. The important characteristic of this kind of transportation is its capability for moving large volumes of passenger and freight traffic, while imposing relatively low requirements for space. Another advantage is its high reliability under adverse weather conditions. The conventional railroad is the only existing form of high-speed ground transportation now in commercial operation, under this definition of the term.

Present research and development in high-speed ground transportation is quite meager. In 1961, aircraft manufacturers spent $379 million on research and development, while railroad equipment suppliers accounted for only $15 million.

The Federal Government in fiscal year 1963 spent $275 million on aviation research and development; spent $24 million on highway research and development; spent $15 million on water transportation research and development; but in high-speed ground transportation spent only $7 million in demonstrations of local metropolitan rail transit facilities by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The Secretary of Commerce testified before the Surface Transportation Subcommittee that private capital has been inhibited in spending funds on research in high-speed ground transportation because of the large risks involved in the development of systems which must depend upon public decisions for their adoption.

I want to emphasize that the funds authorized under this bill are for research and development, demonstrations, and collection of statistics. They are not subsidy funds for existing operations, and they will not involve the Federal Government in any commitment to furnish or subsidize intercity rail passenger service, or the plants and equipment of any railroad.

The Secretary of Commerce testified that the contracts for demonstrations would be tests of the market for transportation, and would be carried on by the railroads involved as a regular part of their service. Federal funds would be expended to cover part of the cost of new equipment during the test period only, and for statistical operations necessary to measure public response.

Section 2 specifically provides that contracts for demonstrations under this legislation shall make provisions for financial participation of private industry to the maximum extent practicable as determined by the Secretary of Commerce.

I would like to briefly summarize the bill section by section. Section 1 would authorize the Secretary of Commerce, consistent with the objective of promoting a safe, adequate, economical, and efficient transportation system, to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation, including, but not limited to components such as materials, aerodynamics, vehicle propulsion, vehicle control, communications, and guideways. In brief, this section would authorize a careful program of research and development to push forward transportation technology.

Section 2 would authorize the Secretary to contract for demonstrations in high-speed ground transportation for the purpose of contributing to the development of more efficient and economical intercity transportation systems. The demonstrations are to be designed to measure and evaluate such factors as the public response to new equipment, higher speeds, variations in fares, improved comfort and convenience, and more frequent service. The financial participation of private industry to the maximum extent practicable, as determined by the Secretary, would be required in each demonstration. After a determination of passenger response has been made, a demonstration would cease. The Secretary assured the committee that it was not contemplated that any money authorized would be used for the subsidization of reduced fares; that is, fares below the level of a fair return on out-of-pocket expense.

Section 3 would authorize the Secretary to collect and collate transportation data, statistics, and other information which he determines will contribute to the improvement of the national transportation system. This section specifies that the Secretary shall utilize the statistics and data available from Federal agencies and other sources to the greatest practicable extent, and shall make information collected available to other Federal agencies and the public insofar as practicable. In his testimony before the committee, the Secretary of Commerce testified that this statistical collection program was needed because existing programs do not meet the requirements of a large number of users, especially those charged with responsibility for public investment policy. He further testified that, by a carefully and systematically developed information system, the reporting requirements presently imposed upon the transportation system could be reduced.

Section 4 provides for the incorporation in demonstration contracts of fair and equitable arrangements, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, to protect the interests of railroad employees involved in operations which are the subject of such demonstrations. Representatives of labor sought broader labor protective conditions. The language incorporated in section 4 was supplied by the Department of Commerce, and limits protective arrangements to the interests of railroad employees involved in operations which are the subject of demonstrations authorized under section 2 of this legislation.

Section 5 would authorize the Secretary in undertaking research and development under section 1, and in contracting for demonstrations under section 2, to lease, purchase, develop, test, and evaluate new facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods, and conduct such other activities as may be necessary.

Section 6 authorizes the Secretary to appoint necessary personnel subject to the civil service laws and requirements; employ needed personnel and experts on a consulting basis; and contract for demonstrations and perform research and development without regard to section 3648, which prohibits advanced payments to contractors, and section 3709, which requires advertising for proposals from prospective contractors. The Secretary indicated that these provisions were appropriate and necessary to this type of legislation.

Section 7 provides that the Secretary shall consult and cooperate, as he deems appropriate, with the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency; other departments and agencies, Federal, State, and local; and with institutions and private industry in exercising the authority granted in this bill. A number of witnesses testified to the desirability of the Secretary consulting and cooperating not only with Federal, State, and local agencies, but also with institutions and private industry.

Section 8 provides that the Secretary shall report to the Congress and the President the results of his evaluation of the research and development and demonstration programs authorized by this bill, and shall make recommendations with respect to future action. The Secretary indicated in his testimony that he would have no objection to submitting such reports to the Congress.

Section 9 provides for a $90 million total authorization, of which not to exceed $20 million is for this fiscal year, and $35 million each is for the next 2 fiscal years. These yearly authorization limits are the estimates stated by the Secretary in his testimony.

Section 10 provides for an expiration date of June 30, 1969, except for section 3 of the bill. No termination date was put on the statistical collection program authorized under section 3 of this bill because the Secretary presently has broad authority to gather and distribute statistical information which would continue after the expiration of the remainder of this legislation.

This bill would focus technology on the increasingly important area of high-speed ground transportation. I urge favorable consideration of this measure.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

I compliment the able Senator from Ohio and the Commerce Committee for their excellent work on this legislation. When I testified in support of this bill before the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation I stated that in my view this bill was a necessary part of our Nation's long-range transportation policy. My views have not changed. S. 1588, in the form before the Senate today, is vital legislation.

The troubles in our transportation system run deep. Increasing population demands coupled with our increased travel needs are overburdening our intercity transportation facilities. In the last half century passenger travel has increased 25-fold and intercity freight tonnage fourfold. Future demands on our facilities will be still greater. And these demands cannot be met solely by increased use of the automobile. Forecasts indicate there may be 100 million cars registered by 1975. And nearly one-half of all mileage covered by these cars will be moving over 10 percent of our Nation's roads—within and between our metropolitan areas. Within the next decade our northeast corridor alone will be involved with the mass transit of 15 million people in an area covering less than 2 percent of our country.

Similar statistics could be produced from other corridors, such as San Francisco-Los Angeles or Seattle-Tacoma-Portland. They illustrate the fact that the problems necessarily involved in moving people to and from work, and between growing metropolitan areas have reached a stage of national concern. Without question we must develop forms of rapid transportation technology and equipment to accommodate these future needs and we must start developing them now.

Of course there is no simple answer to these problems. No simple set of rules. But it is just because the problems are so complex and the solutions so critical to our domestic economic growth, productivity, and progress that we need this legislation authorizing basic research and development into the problems of high speed ground transportation.

This bill would authorize Federal support for basic research and development in this area. It will bring scientific and technological talent to bear here for the first time. Hopefully, the results of such research and development will produce in the railroad industry great advances in technology. Such advances are long overdue.

The bill also provides demonstration grants to develop better intercity transportation systems on existing routes. Those of us from New England and from the cities along the northeast corridor have long been interested in this type of project. In Massachusetts, thanks to a Federal demonstration grant, we were able to develop a transit authority with funds to develop the Boston commuter service and become the first authority in the country to obtain a major grant under the Mass Transit Act.

We in New England are delighted that it is our rail passenger routes that have been selected by the bill for further demonstration projects. It is my understanding that with a relatively small investment by the Federal Government, rail service can be considerably improved in the northeast corridor. Through these demonstration projects those of us in New England concerned about this crisis in transportation will be able to engage in the long-range planning necessary to the future of our region.

But the benefits from such projects will not be confined to New England. The results of such projects would be useful to all the other interurban complexes developing elsewhere in the country and of considerable assistance to our cities.

I would also like to thank the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] for the enormous effort he has made in developing the evidence in support of this project. It is due in large measure to his industry and efforts over the last 3 years that we have this wise legislation before us today.

We should pass this bill in its present form and do so without further delay.

Statement by Senator Williams of New Jersey

Action by the Senate in regards to the High-Speed Transportation Act is a historic step forward. It marks the beginning of a serious and practical attempt to build a 20th century transportation system. While we are reaching for the moon we have been inclined to neglect the more mundane but more important task of moving our growing population rapidly and efficiently from place to place. Like his predecessor, the late John F. Kennedy, President Johnson has shown a farsighted recognition of the need for a modern technology of transportation. Although this measure is immediately directed toward the northeast corridor, of which my own State of New Jersey is an integral part, the knowledge we develop will ultimately aid the entire Nation.

I am happy to have been a cosponsor of this historic bill, and I am delighted at the swift action the Senate will take.

Statement by Senator Kennedy of New York

I am delighted to support S. 1588, which will facilitate research in high-speed rail transportation.

The increased mobility of the American people, combined with the ever-increasing density of population in the Northeast section of the country, makes it imperative that we act now to explore every possibility for quicker and more convenient travel among the metropolitan areas of the Northeast.

S. 1588 will authorize the Secretary of Commerce to engage in research and development in a broad-ranging way in order to arrive at a feasible high-speed ground transportation system. The results of this research and development activity may take a technological form that none of us can now foresee, and that is even more reason for starting now with Government help. Thus, the interest of the Federal Government in this problem which is evidenced by the pendency of S. 1588 is most gratifying. I urge the Senate to give its approval to this vitally needed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research, development, and demonstrations in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I should like to be recognized merely for the purpose of expressing my appreciation to the majority leader and to the minority leader for making it possible to dispose of the bill at the present time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Pennsylvania beat me to it. I was about to express my appreciation to the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for their cooperation and courtesy.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I was delighted that the Senate passed S. 1588 which provides for a 3-year program of research and development in the field of high-speed ground transportation in the northeastern United States. Enactment of this legislation will be a step in the right direction for the future of the passenger railroad industry and I was glad to vote for it.

But, as I have stated elsewhere and now repeat, I think this measure will provide much too little Federal financial assistance toward both our immediate objective of improved conventional high-speed passenger service and our long-term objectives involving the more exotic means of ground transportation. We must meet the needs both of the next decade and of the next century. And while the bill is designed to provide some assistance in meeting both objectives, a far greater effort will be required in order to reach real solutions. I am disappointed that the bill was not substantially strengthened by the Commerce Committee.

I point out, too, that nothing in the bill even purports to help with the problem of providing effective mass transportation systems for our urban and suburban areas. The problem in this regard involves not only a shortage of Federal financial aid, but also a slowness on the part of our States in providing the needed leadership which would justify increasing Federal assistance.

ADLAI E. STEVENSON

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the wide range of admiration felt for the late Adlai E. Stevenson has been expressed in tributes of many kinds since the news of his sudden death reached the public. An editorial in a West Virginia newspaper expressed the essence of this loss, I believe, in its opening line.

I ask unanimous consent to place this editorial in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Adlai Stevenson

The Nation and the world has lost an eloquent and able spokesman for the cause of a truly civilized society in the death of Adlai Stevenson. Provincially, it can be said of him that he was from Illinois. But in a broader and less provincial sense he was from wherever the hearts of men longed for the rule of reason and justice, for a civilized society. He combined wit, eloquence, and character in magnificent proportions, and in doing so raised political morality to a new ascendency. It was his lot to seek the Nation's highest honor in an era when the Nation wanted a national hero to be its leader. He, more than his legion of admirers, understood this. He said something in 1952 that still lingers in our memory. If, he said, a party could be in power too long, was it not also true that a party could be out of power too long? It was his self-deprecating way of saying that a Republican victory in 1952 might be a good thing not only for the Republicans but for the Democrats as well, even though he would be the principal personal loser in the victory that was to follow for the Republicans.

"This above all," the poet said, "to thine own self be true." No better epitaph could be written for Adlai Stevenson. It is because of this that the world feels such a keen sense of loss in his passing.

FROM JUSTICE TO AMBASSADOR

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the death of Adlai E. Stevenson left a tremendous void in the ranks of our Nation's public servants. I am gratified to note, however, that the personal selflessness of Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg in accepting the appointment as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations will provide our Nation with strong continuity in its excellent representation in that body.

As an example of the reception within my State of West Virginia of the news of President Lyndon B. Johnson's appointment of Ambassador Goldberg, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a newspaper editorial printed in the July 22, 1965, edition of the Fairmont, W. Va., Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Goldberg Appointment

Only total dedication to his country and the cause of peace could have prompted Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg to accept appointment as Ambassador to the United Nations succeeding the late Adlai E. Stevenson. He had attained his fondest hopes when he was named to the Nation's highest court with all the security and prestige that appointment meant.

President Johnson, as he has done on many other occasions, completely surprised the soothsayers when he selected Justice Goldberg, whose name hadn't been openly mentioned in connection with the vacant job. In fact, most Washington commentators had it all figured out that Secretary of State Dean Rusk would succeed Stevenson.

After the initial surprise wears off, however, the only wonder is that no one had thought about the jurist. And the more consideration is given the appointment, the sounder, more logical and brilliant it seems.

As an old and trusted friend and counselor, Ambassador Goldberg will have ready and direct access to the President and Secretary of State. This close relationship is necessary, and all signs indicate that the justice has everything the President needs in a personal representative at the international tribunal.

Moreover, Justice Goldberg has demonstrated in his career to date that he is a skilled and flexible negotiator and an effective advocate. His long experience with one of the major labor unions developed his abilities in that area. He also is an astute politician, a characteristic which will stand him in good stead in an arena where world politics is played to the hilt.

Justice Goldberg's lack of experience in the complicated field of international diplomacy could actually prove a blessing as he enters his new work without any preconceived notions or prejudices. A man of his intellectual attainments will not be long picking up the subtleties as well as the mechanics of his new job.

Time, we believe, will demonstrate the wisdom of the selection of another distinguished citizen of Illinois as the successor to the eloquent Stevenson.

SCIENCE AND GOD

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the notable remarks on science and God by Dr. Wernher von Braun, of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, deserve wide circulation. They were printed in an article, "Why I Believe," in the Sunday supplement, This Week, published by the Washington, D.C., Star, on July 18, 1965.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Why I Believe: Wernher von Braun Talks About Science and God

Science and faith are the two dominant forces in this century. We must try to understand their nature if we are to comprehend some of the most serious problems of the era in which we live.

The mainspring of science is curiosity. Since time immemorial, there have always been men and women who felt a burning desire to know what was under the rock, beyond the hills, across the oceans. This restless breed now wants to know what makes an atom work, through what process life reproduces itself, or what is on the far side of the moon.

But also, there would not be a single great accomplishment in the history of mankind without faith. Any man who strives to accomplish something needs a degree of faith in himself. And whenever he takes on a challenge that requires more moral strength than he can muster with his own limited mental and spiritual resources, he needs faith in God.

One of the most crucial issues of our time lies in the fact that modern science, along with miracle drugs and communications satellites, has also produced nuclear bombs. It cannot be denied that science has failed to provide a practical answer on how to cope with them. As a result, science and scientists have often been blamed for the desperate dilemma in which mankind finds itself today.

Science, by itself, has no moral dimension. The drug which cures when taken in small doses may kill when taken in excess. The nuclear energies that produce cheap electrical power when harnessed in a reactor may kill when abruptly released in a bomb. Thus, it does not make sense to ask a scientist whether his poison or his nuclear energy is "good" or "bad" for mankind.

And so, the realization that science is unable to control the possible abuse of the forces it has made available, has led hundreds of millions in the world to a new interest in religion. This religious revival shows that there is a widespread realization that in the nuclear age man has a desperate need for stronger ethical control of the immeasurable physical forces he has unleashed.

OUR BATTERED CHURCHES

But many people find the churches, those old ramparts of faith, badly battered by the onslaught of 300 years of scientific skepticism. This has led many to believe that science and religion are not compatible, that "knowing" and "believing" cannot live side by side.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Science and religion are not antagonists. On the contrary, they are sisters. While science tries to learn more about the creation, religion tries to better understand the Creator. While, through science, man tries to harness the forces of nature around him, through religion he tries to harness the forces of nature within him.

Science may not have a moral dimension. But I am certain that science, in its search for new insights into the nature of the creation, has produced new ethical values of its own. Most certainly science has fostered veracity and humility. Again, it is a mark of all true science that its findings are valid and objective for all times and all peoples; that these findings demand unconditional acceptance and that once proved correct, they are universally embraced. If man has ever come close to finding an answer to Pontius Pilate's question, "What is truth?", science has shown the way. Personally, I believe in the ultimate victory of truth. I am confident that to the extent that we shall learn more about nature, we shall not only arrive at universally accepted scientific findings, but also at a set of universally accepted rules and standards of human behavior.

The materialists of the 19th century and their Marxist heirs of the 20th, tried to tell us that, as science gives us more knowledge about the creation, we could live without faith in a Creator. Yet so far, with every new answer, we have discovered new questions. The better we understand the intricacies of the atomic structure, the nature of life, or the master plan for the galaxies, the more reason we have found to marvel at the wonder of God's creation.

But our need for God is not based on awe alone. Man needs faith just as he needs food, water or air.

With all the science in the world, we need faith in God, whenever faith in ourselves has reached its limit.

TRIBUTE TO SENATE MAJORITY LEADER MANSFIELD

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I share with all of my colleagues a profound admiration and respect for Mike Mansfield, of Montana, as a gentleman, a scholar, a U.S. Senator, and Senate majority leader.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a newspaper column written by Mr. Holmes Alexander and carried in the July 16, 1965, issue of the Welch, W. Va., Daily News, which pays a well-deserved tribute to our distinguished Senate majority leader.

There being no objection, the newspaper article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Welch (W. Va.) Daily News, July 16, 1965]

Mansfield: The Quiet One

(By Holmes Alexander)

Washington, D.C.—The first thing every morning, usually before 8 o'clock, Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield turns up at the old office which he occupied as a mere Montana Senator. There he reads the mail from home and as many as 14 newspapers from his State.

Mike has the lean and hungry look that Caesar distrusted in Cassius, but in Mansfield it signals a man who thinks of power and politics but without a trace of personal ambition.

Last year, when many of his colleagues were scrambling to get under the mistletoe for the embrace that meant the vice presidential nomination, Mansfield announced that he wouldn't accept the place if it were given him. One reason why he comes first to his personal senatorial office, rather than to his much more swanky and prestigious suite of majority leader, is that he is the rare man who does look back upon the rungs of the ladder that lifted him to eminence. He is nothing, he says, if he is not a Senator from Montana.

By 9:30 or 10 he crosses to the Capitol and goes to the attractive, old-fashioned suite, just off the Chamber floor, from which he runs the U.S. Senate in a manner that was described by Booth Tarkington when he wrote: "That which does not pretend at all, has style enough."

Mike wouldn't know how to be pretentious. It's typical of him that he calls his place of business the John F. Kennedy room. It was here that JFK conducted the multitudinous matters of being Democratic nominee for the Presidency while still serving in a post-convention session of the Senate. Down the hall, off another corner of the Senate Chamber, is a much larger suite, glittering with chandeliers and sumptuous with fine carpetry and impressive art on the ceilings. It is also part of a majority leader's domain, but Mike uses it only for ceremonial occasions. He calls it the Lyndon B. Johnson room—where L.B.J. reigned when he held this job that Mike holds.

Mansfield's first daily act in the role of majority leader is to confer with Everett

DIRKSEN, who heads the Republican membership of the Senate. Although MIKE controls more than twice the number of troops that DIRKSEN does, and is the superior office by rules and traditions which both men honor, it is the majority leader who goes back into the hallway and walks to the minority leader's office for their meetings.

"It gives me a little exercise," is MANSFIELD's casual way of explaining this courtesy. Actually, he is paying respect to a man who is his senior in years and Capitol Hill service. During DIRKSEN's frequent absences because of illness, Senator KUCHEL, of California, the GOP assistant or whip, is in Republican command. But MIKE doesn't take the walk to call on KUCHEL. He sends for KUCHEL or discusses matters with him in the Chamber.

It is tiresome, as every writer and reader of newspapers knows, to make the inevitable comparison between MANSFIELD and Lyndon Johnson, who led the Democratic Senators—and often the Republicans, too—with motions that sometimes resemble an orchestra leader and sometimes a chariot driver. But there is no way to discuss one man as majority leader without mentioning the other.

MIKE never raises a baton or a lash and rarely his voice. The Senate has always been in theory, a peerage of lofty equals. Under Johnson it was, in fact, a citadel with its inner sanctum where only the select sat down to "wheel and deal" with the leader.

Under MANSFIELD, the Senate is, in fact, a microcosm of privileged democracy. No Senator, regardless of seniority or reputation, rates above another in MANSFIELD's even-handed management. He would regard it as an insult to individual dignity to hector a colleague for his vote, to reward him with plushy junkets to Paris or punish him with snubs and disapproval. This was once the way. Not any more.

No longer is the Senate a place of drums and horns and cymbals, but there's music just the same. It's the harmony of concerted energy, which is much less exciting to hear, much more difficult to report, but forceful and rhythmic for all that.

MANSFIELD, the leader, is MANSFIELD the stylist. When this interviewer asked what had become of he famous Senate "establishment," MANSFIELD smiled around his pipestem.

"I prefer the word institution," was the way he explained the transformation.

NATIONAL AMERICAN LEGION BASEBALL WEEK—LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6, 1965, as "National American Legion Baseball Week."

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I support the right of the Senate to discuss the issue of the proposed constitutional amendment on State legislative apportionment.

Under present proceedings, we are not now considering the merits of the proposed constitutional amendment, rather whether to accept the substitute offered by the distinguished minority leader to Joint Resolution 66 on National American Legion Baseball Week in order that we may have that discussion.

Before concluding as to the merits of the revised Dirksen amendment, I would hope that said amendment could be discussed thoroughly on the floor of the Senate. Therefore, I shall vote to substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 66 the amendment offered in order that the merits of the proposed constitutional amendment can be discussed in detail.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is nothing further to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 26, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

The executive nominations received by the Senate July 23, 1965:

U.S. MARSHAL

Forrest F. Walker, of Virginia, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Virginia for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Doyle W. Foreman, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

U.S. ATTORNEY

David M. Satz, Jr., of New Jersey, to be U.S. attorney for the district of New Jersey for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

UNITED NATIONS

Arthur J. Goldberg, of Illinois, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the 19th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, vice Adlai E. Stevenson, deceased.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Maj. Gen. Glen W. Martin, 1955A, Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be general

Gen. Robert Jefferson Wood, O18064, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

John K. Leydon.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Henry J. Rotrige.

DENTAL CORPS

Maurice E. Simpson.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Lillie T. Dixon, Hatchechubbee, Ala., in place of B. L. Dixon, retired.

Ocie C. Wingard, Jr., Prattsville, Ala., in place of J. R. Hinton, transferred.

Odessa M. Smith, River View, Ala., in place of T. M. McGinty, retired.

Annibel E. Gartman, Wilmer, Ala., in place of Vira Cox, retired.

ALASKA

Louise F. Grys, Healy Fork, Alaska, in place of J. F. Hollis, retired.

Harold Bremner, Yakutat, Alaska, in place of J. G. Williams, removed.

ARIZONA

Elmore H. Husband, Flagstaff, Ariz., in place of H. L. Worischeck, retired.

Henry A. Rechlitz, Sun City, Ariz. Office established July 2, 1962.

Leona L. Crabtree, Tacna, Ariz., in place of M. N. Parkhurst, resigned.

Lindell V. Cornelison, Tuba City, Ariz., in place of M. F. Fleischauer, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Gertrude M. Grammer, Aguanga, Calif., in place of A. E. Bergman, retired.

Joseph S. Land, Arnold, Calif., in place of F. L. Carroll, retired.

Leonard L. Enger, Buellton, Calif., in place of G. S. Downs, retired.

Alfred R. Houle, Eureka, Calif., in place of W. H. Lambert, retired.

Parino Di Fabio, Huntington Beach, Calif., in place of L. E. Mitchell, retired.

Lawrence A. Stogsdill, Lagunitas, Calif., in place of K. S. Birch, resigned.

James M. O'Malley, Mountain View, Calif., in place of R. A. Petty, retired.

Gwennydd R. Pietrick, Myers Flat, Calif., in place of M. G. Mosby, resigned.

Glenn L. Oleson, Pala, Calif., in place of E. J. Mathis, resigned.

Stanley J. Henriksen, Santa Barbara, Calif., in place of C. W. Gartrell, retired.

Harry R. Pulver, Scotia, Calif., in place of A. R. Knupp, retired.

COLORADO

Byron M. Jacobsen, Ault, Colo., in place of D. B. Venable, retired.

Young L. Wollard, Lamar, Colo., in place of H. H. Hunter, retired.

Vincent P. Trainor, Ordway, Colo., in place of C. F. Matthews, retired.

Frances Erker, Roggen, Colo., in place of Daniel Sanders, transferred.

Beryl E. Lambert, Yuma, Colo., in place of H. L. Grauerholz, deceased.

DELAWARE

Ollie F. Loose, Smyrna, Del., in place of M. S. Goldsborough, retired.

GEORGIA

William D. Porterfield, Comer, Ga., in place of C. L. Adair, retired.

John L. Callaway, Covington, Ga., in place of E. L. Stephenson, retired.

Kathleen W. Voyles, Maysville, Ga., in place of J. T. Miller, retired.

Alleene E. Woodcock, Pooler, Ga., in place of L. B. Roberts, retired.

IDAHO

Donald G. Zigler, Rathdrum, Idaho, in place of H. P. Golding, retired.

ILLINOIS

Byrel F. McFarland, Allendale, Ill., in place of B. F. Price, retired.

Herman R. Savage, Jr., Farmer City, Ill., in place of W. D. Herrick, retired.

Kenneth G. Kuper, Ingleside, Ill., in place of M. E. Burleigh, retired.

Clayton E. Saunders, New Boston, Ill., in place of S. B. Bond, retired.

Joe E. Brooks, Perry, Ill., in place of M. H. Bradbury, retired.

Elmer B. Keller, Stewardson, Ill., in place of R. S. Zalman, retired.

INDIANA

James F. Artley, Bristol, Ind., in place of Ray Long, retired.

Robert G. Konopasek, Griffith, Ind., in place of A. L. Hess, retired.

IOWA

John D. Meyer, Calmar, Iowa, in place of A. N. Huber, retired.

Eugene F. Meyen, Dundee, Iowa, in place of G. H. Pogue, transferred.

Leland E. Jesse, La Porte City, Iowa, in place of G. C. Teeter, deceased.

Ralph R. Ramsey, Manilla, Iowa, in place of L. V. White, deceased.

KANSAS

Florence W. Kelley, Chanute, Kans., in place of L. R. Nelson, retired.

Alice M. McNary, Gaylord, Kans., in place of B. E. Carter, retired.

Effie M. Dunn, Meriden, Kans., in place of R. E. Deveney, retired.

Wilma F. Majors, Russell Springs, Kans., in place of W. E. Matheny, retired.

KENTUCKY

Frederick Nahm, Jr., Bowling Green, Ky., in place of B. R. Elrod, retired.

Richard W. Blue, Hanson, Ky., in place of Hattie Koenen, retired.

Hartman Webster, Sulphur, Ky., in place of P. R. Fisher, retired.

Richard W. Sadler, Trenton, Ky., in place of M. E. Maynard, resigned.

MARYLAND

John E. Quillen, Federalsburg, Md., in place of J. R. Carroll, retired.

Edna C. Walker, Millers, Md., in place of M. R. Leister, retired.

Margaret B. Cooper, Saint Inigoes, Md., in place of S. E. Raley, retired.

Harry O. Baker, Willards, Md., in place of E. M. Dennis, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Clifton F. Robinson, East Sandwich, Mass., in place of J. R. Raymond, retired.

Matthew J. Ruggeri, Greenfield, Mass., in place of C. J. Akey, retired.

Joseph R. Mongrain, Orange, Mass., in place of J. E. Roche, retired.

Donald F. Haines, Petersham, Mass., in place of R. P. Coombs, removed.

James N. Collins, Salem, Mass., in place of J. F. Tobin, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Ward L. Walker, Capac, Mich., in place of R. B. Bolton, retired.

Richard E. Schaules, Chelsea, Mich., in place of C. J. Mayer, retired.

Verne L. Elliott, Elk Rapids, Mich., in place of N. N. Coy, retired.

Paul A. Jorgensen, Parma, Mich., in place of N. I. Walls, retired.

MINNESOTA

Angelo M. Smieja, Cushing, Minn., in place of C. I. Jacobson, retired.

Lee H. Folland, Halma, Minn., in place of D. H. Halbert, deceased.

Einar R. Sundin, Ray, Minn., in place of C. M. Breneman, deceased.

Winton M. Logan, Zumbrota, Minn., in place of G. H. Carrell, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Joe A. Wood, Hazlehurst, Miss., in place of Vivian Bass, retired.

MISSOURI

LaVerne Henderson, Lonedell, Mo., in place of A. L. Williams, retired.

Billy G. Cox, Platte City, Mo., in place of E. L. Johnson, retired.

James A. Wheatley, Rich Hill, Mo., in place of E. F. Wiek, retired.

NEBRASKA

Clarence J. Heywood, Hooper, Nebr., in place of D. L. Stecher, transferred.

Oscar D. Marrs, Merriman, Nebr., in place of J. J. Marshall, removed.

Don D. Leibert, Sargent, Nebr., in place of B. S. Amos, retired.

Daniel C. Hoch, South Sioux City, Nebr., in place of R. P. Kilzer, transferred.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Victor J. Dean, New London, N.H., in place of J. E. Shepard, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Ruth E. Schreiber, Adelphia, N.J., in place of S. M. Chester, retired.

NEW YORK

E. Miner Farwell, Belmont, N.Y., in place of L. W. Pike, retired.

Doris R. Swartz, Breesport, N.Y., in place of R. E. Traynor, retired.

Jerome P. Meyer, Corfu, N.Y., in place of Celestine Reynolds, retired.

Albert T. Matthews, East Islip, N.Y., in place of J. S. Panuska, deceased.

Jessie W. Campbell, Georgetown, N.Y., in place of J. S. Walrod, retired.

Guy Applebee, Fort Byron, N.Y., in place of Rosemary Hearn, retired.

Albert G. Evans, Saratoga Springs, N.Y., in place of J. T. Bryant, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Roy R. Ludvigsen, Grantsboro, N.C., in place of A. L. Bennett, retired.

Thomas W. Cahoon, Swanquarter, N.C., in place of Louella Swindell, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Robert M. Jesswein, Beulah, N. Dak., in place of N. M. Held, retired.

Elsie V. Barden, Noonan, N. Dak., in place of F. R. Makee, retired.

OHIO

Stanley E. Rolfe, Bainbridge, Ohio, in place of H. M. Barrett, resigned.

Rhoderic G. Mills, New Lexington, Ohio, in place of T. J. Holden, retired.

Robert C. Ladd, Pemberville, Ohio, in place of I. H. Menter, deceased.

Joseph E. Binni, Powhatan Point, Ohio, in place of W. F. Mock, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Cecil W. Mackey, Dover, Okla., in place of H. D. Gerber, transferred.

William C. Hibler, Hammon, Okla., in place of W. O. Dodson, transferred.

OREGON

Glenn E. Ross, Harrisburg, Oreg., in place of G. E. Crakes, deceased.

Lynn C. Ranney, Pendleton, Oreg., in place of J. R. DeSpain, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Doris L. Oldham, Fishertown, Pa., in place of Faye Wolfe, resigned.

Andrew P. Stallsmith, Hadley, Pa., in place of R. S. Feather, deceased.

Lena I. Snyder, Quincy, Pa., in place of J. W. Wagaman, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

B. Lewis Barnett, Woodruff, S.C., in place of R. V. Lanford, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Charles R. Kingsbury, Martin, S. Dak., in place of W. H. James, retired.

Mildred A. Lanz, Saint Francis, S. Dak., in place of C. J. Kills in Sight, retired.

TEXAS

John O. Towler, Baird, Tex., in place of J. B. Jones, retired.

Jewell C. Lewis, Pottsboro, Tex., in place of J. B. Dickey, retired.

Calvin D. Conder, Powderly, Tex., in place of R. G. Cochran, transferred.

J. Edward Dangler, Seabrook, Tex., in place of N. M. Edgeworth, retired.

Gwendolyn S. Bailey, Simonton, Tex., in place of L. E. Smith, retired.

VERMONT

Alfred S. Crowley, Healdville, Vt., in place of E. M. Flynn, retired.

Bruce G. McGregor, West Burke, Vt., in place of M. M. Duval, retired.

VIRGINIA

Jack D. Pollock, Crozet, Va., in place of A. G. Rosenkrans, retired.

L. Harold Hutchinson, Rocky Mount, Va., in place of W. M. Greer, retired.

WASHINGTON

Elvin T. Van Slyke, Graham, Wash., in place of A. G. Thorsen, retired.

Agnes C. Koukal, Moclips, Wash., in place of Joanne Allen, deceased.

Charles W. Arnold, Neah Bay, Wash., in place of W. W. Washburn, III, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA

Eddie V. Kessinger, Athens, W. Va., in place of B. D. Wiley, retired.

WISCONSIN

Edward Wolfarth, Camp Lake, Wis., in place of R. A. Fornera, resigned.

William E. Schmidt, Downing, Wis., in place of C. A. Hopmann, resigned.

Arthur A. Wellner, Hancock, Wis., in place of S. F. Hamilton, transferred.

Donald H. Walter, Rio Creek, Wis., in place of W. H. Gaulke, deceased.

WYOMING

Opal E. Backer, Midwest, Wyo., in place of E. E. Carson, retired.

Verne S. Parman, Sinclair, Wyo., in place of C. H. Massey, retired.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate July 23, 1965:

I withdraw the nomination sent to the Senate on June 7, 1965, of Irene L. Murphy to be postmaster at Hicksville, in the State of New York.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 23, 1965:

UNITED NATIONS

Arthur J. Goldberg, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

U.S. PATENT OFFICE

To Be Assistant Commissioners of Patents

Gerald D. O'Brien, of Maryland.

Richard A. Wahl, of Virginia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 26, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture:

Galatians 6: 2: *Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ.*

Almighty God, as we seek Thee in the fellowship of prayer, lift us out of all dull, cold, and rebellious tempers of mind, lest we be too gloomy and indifferent to hope and too willful to learn and be obedient to Thy will.

If we have failed to minister unto any who are held by the clutch of difficult tasks and have turned away from any whose heavy burden we might have helped to make lighter, wilt Thou forgive us, though we may not forgive ourselves.

Thou knowest that our minds and hearts are often so self-centered and we have memories that trouble us because of our failure to bear one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ and thus fail to experience the joy of doing good and living a useful life.

Inspire us daily to give a good account of life and help us to meet its many needs and demands faithfully and courageously.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 22, 1965, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 70. An act to provide for the conveyance of approximately 80 acres of land to the heirs of Adam Jones, Creek Indian not enrolled;

H.R. 237. An act to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior;

H.R. 903. An act to add certain lands to the Kings Canyon National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1987. An act for the relief of Nabhane M. Nickley (Nabhane M. Karam);

H.R. 1989. An act for the relief of Krystyna Stella Hancock;

H.R. 2012. An act for the relief of Dr. Ignace D. Liu;

H.R. 2351. An act for the relief of Teresita Centeno Valdez;

H.R. 2360. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio R. Perez;

H.R. 2499. An act for the relief of Remedios Ocampo;

H.R. 2913. An act for the relief of Lt. Thomas A. Farrell, U.S. Navy, and others;

H.R. 4131. An act for the relief of Mrs. Phoebe Thompson Neesham;

H.R. 5508. An act to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5860. An act to amend the law relating to the final disposition of the property of the Choctaw Tribe;

H.R. 8620. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to take into consideration floods and other natural disasters in reference to the feed grains, cotton, and wheat programs for 1965;

H.R. 8862. An act to amend the act of August 7, 1935, to increase the authorized annual share of the United States as an adhering member of the International Council of Scientific Unions and Associated Unions; and

H.R. 9041. An act to restore to the heirs of the Indian grantor certain tribal land of the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1908. An act for the relief of Chester (Abramczyk) Hill;

H.R. 2305. An act for the relief of Zenaida Quijano Lazaro; and

H.R. 6097. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the President or the Vice President, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 7. An act to provide for the establishment of the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area, in the State of West Virginia, and for other purposes;

S. 192. An act for the relief of Maria Liberty Burnett;

S. 245. An act for the relief of Athanasia Nikolopoulos and Soterios Nikolopoulos;

S. 1118. An act to provide for the District of Columbia an elected mayor, board of education, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes;

S. 1137. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael Pedro Martinez Torres;

S. 1170. An act for the relief of Chung J. Clark;

S. 1186. An act for the relief of Kris Ann Larsen;

S. 1190. An act to provide that certain limitations shall not apply to certain land patented to the State of Alaska for the use and benefit of the University of Alaska;

S. 1270. An act to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938;

S. 1271. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for 2 additional years the provisions permitting the lease of tobacco acreage allotments;

S. 1273. An act for the relief of Ana Folja;

S. 1325. An act for the relief of Dr. Oton Socarraz;

S. 1389. An act for the relief of Dr. Angel Fernando Golderos;

S. 1413. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Confederated Tribes of Colville Indians located in the State of Washington and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 1449. An act for the relief of Dr. Enrique Ramon Ducassi;

S. 1588. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research, development, and demonstrations in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes;

S. 1766. An act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply and water systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes;

S. 1861. An act to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster;

S. 1904. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the Pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for school or administrative purposes;

S. 1938. An act to amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act; and

S. 2294. An act to amend section 2 of the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 36, had appointed Mr. CLARK, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. MILLER, and Mr. PEARSON as members, on the part of the Senate, to the White House Conference on International Cooperation to be held in November 1965.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An Act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government", had appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate for the Disposition of Executive Papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 66-1.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to strike out "two hours" in line 11, page 1, of House Resolution 437 and to insert in lieu thereof "five hours".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the distinguished majority leader explain the purpose of this unanimous-consent request?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if my friend will yield, I should be glad to. The resolution under which the so-called right-to-work repeal provisions will come to the House provides for 2 hours of general debate. This unanimous-consent request extends the time of general debate to 5 hours.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Would it not be the ordinary procedure that if and when the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized, during consideration of that rule, he would ask that this authority be granted?

Mr. ALBERT. It could be done that way. He could do it by motion or amendment. It was thought that this was the most expeditious manner of handling it and that the matter would be settled before we commenced the actual consideration of the resolution.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as much as I favor the extension of the time for debate—and I believe it is mandatory that it be done—I strongly feel that it would be better if this matter were brought up and an opportunity be given at that time for its consideration.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, of course, the gentleman can insist upon that. But in my discussions with the gentleman from Michigan, I perhaps did not explain just how the matter was to be done. But I did understand that the gentleman from Michigan was agreeable to it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. There is no doubt that I agreed to an extension of the time for debate. But it seems to me that the entire issue of the contents of the resolution or the rule sponsored by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] ought to be considered as a whole rather than piecemeal. I suggest to my distinguished friend from Oklahoma that we wait until the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized.

Mr. ALBERT. Does the gentleman from Michigan wish me to withdraw my request?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I think it would be better to do so until the full issue comes before the House.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma withdraws his unanimous-consent request.

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MONTH OF AUGUST

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Wednesday of this week to consider a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the month of August.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has discussed this matter with me and we both agree that this is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Texas in the request and hope that the House will give favorable consideration to the same.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 198]

Ashley
Aspinall
Blatnik
Bonner
Bow
Cahill
Colmer
Conyers
Cramer
Devine
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Ichord
Keogh
McVicker
Olson, Minn.
Pirnie
Rogers, Tex.
Scott
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 411 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of clause 23, rule XI, I call up House Resolution 437, providing for the consideration of H.R. 77, which has been pending before the Committee on Rules for more than 21 calendar days, without being reported by the said committee.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 437

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705 (b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield for a question?

Mr. POWELL. For a question; yes, sir.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I asked the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor whether it is his intention under his resolution to divide equally the 1 hour's time that is provided here so that those who feel differently from him have an equal time to present their position.

Mr. POWELL. On the rule, you mean, sir?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. On the rule.

Mr. POWELL. I shall do my best to accommodate the distinguished leader of the minority.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor knows from his many years of service in this body, any rule that comes from the Committee on Rules provides, in effect, that those in the minority shall have equal time to discuss the rule.

Mr. POWELL. I will do my best under this rule to divide the time. I will do my best, sir.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am sure the gentleman from New York is acting in good faith, but I think it would be very helpful for the proper and adequate consideration of this important rule if the gentleman from New York could extend us the courtesy to have at least one-half of the time for the discussion of this rule.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Could we not work this out in this manner—to have the distinguished minority leader furnish a list to the chairman of the committee and I am sure that the time could be divided substantially equally?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Certainly, we can submit a list right at this moment of the names of people who would take 30 minutes. I appreciate the interest of the distinguished majority leader, in trying to be helpful, so that we can proceed in an orderly and proper way and have a fair opportunity for all to participate in this debate.

Mr. ALBERT. I am sure that the time will be divided to the satisfaction of the gentleman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POWELL

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Powell: On page 1, line 11, strike out "two hours" and insert "five hours."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the House well know, we in the minority have many reservations concerning this particular resolution sponsored by the gentleman from New York. We feel that there are two basic defects to this rule.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The parliamentary inquiry would be simply this: Does the amendment of the gentleman to the resolution provide that there can be amendments offered to the bill itself, that will be meaningful, that will be constructive in their application; or is his amendment to the rule limited only to the extension of time for debate?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the pending amendment relates in no way to any other amendments which might be germane under the resolution. This amendment would extend the time for general debate from 2 hours to 5 hours, if the amendment is adopted.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Do I correctly understand that the gentleman's amendment to the resolution precludes the offering of any amendment such as that sponsored by the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green]?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the resolution is in accordance with the standing rules of the House, and any amendment that is germane under the standing rules of the House would be in order. The standing rules of the House would determine the germaneness of any amendment that might be offered.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Has the minority leader concluded his parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. For the time being, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I have an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] which would be germane. Would it be in order to offer at this time an amendment to strike out "five hours" and to insert "eight hours"?

The SPEAKER. That is a matter for the gentleman from New York to determine. The gentleman from New York has control of the time.

Mr. GRIFFIN. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. If the gentleman from New York will yield to me for that purpose, could I offer such an amendment?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. Would the gentleman from New York yield for that purpose?

Mr. POWELL. I do not yield for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York controls the floor.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. It is not a question of reserving a right to object. There is an amendment before the House.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to offer to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield for that purpose?

Mr. POWELL. I decline to yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York declines to yield for that purpose.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. POWELL. For what purpose does the gentlewoman rise?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. To offer the amendment which I discussed with the very distinguished chairman of the committee, an amendment to the rule.

Mr. POWELL. I decline to yield, because I will lose the floor if I yield. That is why I shall have to pursue debate at this point.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but I did not hear the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. POWELL. I decline to yield.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Did he say he declined to yield for the purpose of an amendment to be offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon?

Mr. POWELL. Yes, sir. I decline to yield because if I do I will lose the floor, and I intend to maintain control of the floor for this 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain this.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. POWELL. I decline to yield.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. POWELL. No; I do not.

Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to divide the time equally and I will yield, after we have finished our opening remarks, to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the ranking member of the Rules Committee on the Republican side, 30 minutes for debate only.

The SPEAKER. For the purposes of debate?

Mr. POWELL. Only.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized, and the time is running.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, may I express my appreciation and gratitude to the gentleman. We discussed this matter rather thoroughly in the last day or two.

The question involved here is not the question whether or not section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed but rather under what kind of a rule will we consider this very perplexing problem here on the floor of this House. I have been a member of the Committee on Rules for 20-odd years. I have seen many rules written. I have seen some that were rather strange and some that were not too generous in time. Yet it has been my policy and the policy of most of us on that committee, regardless of how we feel personally about legislation, to grant a sufficient length of time on any particular bill that involves a great issue for the American people so that it might be debated and considered fully on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I had intended to offer an amendment to this resolution to provide for 6 hours of general debate, thinking perhaps that it might be a compromise to give a fair amount of time to discuss the issue involved. However, the House has seen fit to agree to an amendment granting 5 hours of debate instead of 2 hours as was in the original resolution.

Now, on this 21-day rule, when it came before the House on January 4 of last year, we were told that it would liberalize the rules of the House and give an opportunity to the Members of the House, greater than ever before, to work their will freely and to bring to the floor any legislation that they might desire. The fact of the matter is that this resolution, brought up under the 21-day rule, written and introduced the day after the bill itself was reported, is one of the most restrictive rules we have had before this body for a long, long time. Not only does it restrict the amount of time during which this matter may be discussed, but it also restricts what legislation may be considered in the way of an amendment. This resolution is very cleverly drawn; I want to draw your attention to that fact, so that practically no amendments may be offered to the resolution which could be held germane unless certain amendments to this resolution are voted by this House. Later on, with the permission of the gentleman from New York—and I hope he will give that permission—I intend to offer an amendment on page 2 of the resolution.

I want to read this to the House now, if I may, for its consideration.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio offers the following amendment to House Resolution 437: On page 2, after the period following the word "rule" insert the following sentence: "It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the text, or any part thereof, contained in the bills H.R. 8962 and H.R. 4350 as an amendment or amendments to the bill."

Very simply, very directly, and very honestly I want to tell you exactly what the amendment would do. This would permit at the proper time the offering of amendments based on the material contained in those two bills, one of which is the so-called Green bill and the other the so-called Griffin bill. This would permit the House to decide for itself whether or not it wanted to make any changes in connection with the present law as well as to repeal the text of section 14(b), or whether it wanted to reject all amendments and accept only the repeal of 14(b). This is a matter that ought to be settled by a vote of each and every Member of this House, and each and every Member of this House ought to have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to express his will and his own position and to say to the House and to the country where he stands on these important issues, if he wishes to do so, and to have his colleagues in this body discuss as frankly and as fully as possible the suggestions he might make and the amendments that he might offer under the provisions of this amendment.

Of course, I understand fully the parliamentary situation: that unless the gentleman will yield for the purpose of offering the amendment as I have requested, I may not be permitted to offer it; it may be ruled out of order. But I believe it is in order and I believe it should be permitted and that the House should be permitted to work its will.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOODELL. Under the present situation is it true that any amendment to this rule is in order if offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] and that if any other Member of the House wishes to offer an amendment to the rule he must be yielded to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] for that purpose?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized under the Standing Rules of the House of Representatives. Under the Standing Rules of the House of Representatives the gentleman from New York may yield to another Member for the purpose of offering an amendment to the pending resolution. If he yields he loses the floor. The gentleman from New York is proceeding under the Standing Rules of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement of the Speaker in answer to the parliamentary inquiry, I would like to announce that the only way I know under the parliamentary procedure that we can get a separate vote on the amendment I have suggested or on any change we might want to make in the limited time in which this issue will be debated, would be to vote down the previous question. The previous question should be voted down. Then if

I am recognized by the Chair, as I hope I will be, as the opponent of the resolution, I shall control the time on the resolution itself, at which time amendments may be offered, and I certainly shall give consent for the offering of any amendments that I believe are proper in any way.

Then the House will be able to work its will once that resolution, whether amended or not, is adopted. In other words, if the resolution, as I offer my amendments to it, is accepted, then the control of the time during the general debate on the resolution goes back to the Committee on Education and Labor, with the gentleman from New York controlling half the time, representing the majority, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], representing the minority, controlling the other half of the time.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. Under the rule that is pending before us, amendments are in order as long as they are germane. Amendments are in order.

In my 21 years of service in this House of Representatives I have never seen an amendment that was allowed which was not germane.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Let me say to my dear friend from New York, the amendment which I propose to offer to the resolution, in case I have the opportunity to offer it, will settle that question without any doubt whatsoever, as to what sort of amendments may be considered.

The question that the gentleman has raised will not be raised on the floor of the House. The usual matter of germaneness, of course, will obtain, but as I said a moment ago, action making consideration of certain legislation in order is another matter.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman from Ohio has stated the issue, I think, correctly. All rules that come to the House come under exactly the same procedure that we are considering here, and, unless a special rule is provided, all are open rules. This rule comes under the regular standing rules of the House and amendments to resolutions can only be made when the person who is managing the time yields for that purpose, or when the previous question is voted down.

This is the ordinary rule which is used in bringing practically every bill to the floor of the House and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. My beloved friend from the great State of Oklahoma has been here nearly as long as I have and he knows that this is a very, very well drawn document. But I am sure he is aware of the fact that this measure is so drawn that practically any amendment can be ruled not germane under the provisions of this particular resolution. But this is not a rule that is typical of the kind of rules reported to the House of Representatives by the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives.

Let me point out further to the gentleman some of the facts that I am sure he knows as well as I do, that the Committee on Rules has been rather generous in recent years in granting rules on questionable legislation.

I, for one, and other members of the committee, have voted to report bills and have granted long periods of time for their consideration under the rules that we did not agree with personally. But they were of such great importance to the country as a whole that we believed they should be debated fully and frankly and, therefore, we provided long hours of general debate so there could be no argument about it. Yet, Mr. Speaker, suddenly we are presented here with a rule that the gentleman from Oklahoma says is a typical rule, which it is not, and, which the gentleman and I know is not.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. A typical rule, granting only 2 hours to debate this important issue, and also eliminating many meaningful amendments, is not the usual procedure.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on the matter of this bill being well drawn?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I concede that point. I think it is typical of the good draftsmanship that we are getting in the 89th Congress. But I must say to the gentleman from Ohio that of the 69 resolutions which have come out of the Committee on Rules making bills in order on the floor of the House, 62 of the 69 have come out under an open rule exactly like the rule which we are considering today. Four have come out of the Committee on Ways and Means under a closed rule and only three have come out making special nongermane amendments in order.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that he reads the rules that come out of the Committee on Rules a little differently than I do, and I have read them assiduously because I have been required to pass upon all of them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1949, the day I was first sworn in as a Member of this body, we voted at that time on whether or not the House rules should be amended to have a provision comparable or reasonably comparable to the 21-day rule that is being used today.

On that occasion I voted for the 21-day rule. I did so because I had heard allegations to the effect that the Committee on Rules over a previous period of time had been dictatorial, had been autocratic, had precluded legislation from coming to the floor of this body. I believed the charges that the Rules Committee was gagging Members from participating in the submission of amendments that were bona fide, that were legitimate.

In the last 16-plus years I have found the contrary to be true. I believe the Committee on Rules over that period of time has generally been very helpful in seeing to it that legislation came to the floor of the House.

May I say that during the 89th Congress the Committee on Rules has been very generous in seeing to it that legislation was reported out of the Committee on Rules and, more importantly, there has been no effort on the part of the Rules Committee this year to gag the minority. The Committee on Rules, in addition, has specifically authorized amendments that we thought were legitimate, bona fide proposals.

Under the rules that were reported out, as a matter of fact, the Committee on Rules has bent over backward to give Members of the House the opportunity to present what have been constructive amendments on legitimate alternatives.

Amendments have been offered, and the rule appropriately provided for them. But today we find ourselves in the position with a resolution, House Resolution 437, drafted by the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, drafted according to what he thought the House ought to consider. We also have in this resolution the time controlled by the gentleman from New York, chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. Under the parliamentary procedure we are following today any amendments to this resolution are controlled by the gentleman from New York, chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. That practice is under the standing rules of the House; that is true of every resolution that comes to the House. The time is controlled by the Members representing the majority, 30 minutes are yielded to the minority, just exactly as has been done here. The offering of amendments is controlled by the Member handling the resolution. This is no different from any other resolution. This comes, as the Chair ruled earlier, under the standing rules of the House.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Yes, this situation today is under the rules of the House as approved January 4, 1965. But it is very unique that the rule itself was drafted by the gentleman from New York, the time is controlled by the gentleman from New York, and whether or not amendments to the rule can be included is controlled by the gentleman from New York.

This is a one-man gag rule situation both as to the content of the rule, as to the time available, and as to the amendments that might be considered.

Now, what we want on the minority side is precisely this—and I think it is a fair opportunity—first, to extend the time for debate to 6 or 8 hours. We appreciate the 5 hours that the gentleman from New York has allocated under his change of heart.

Our principal objection to the resolution of the gentleman from New York is its rigid and limiting effect on the right to offer amendments. I am sure we will find that when we go to the consideration of the bill itself that there will be a very restrictive, limited interpretation so that, in effect, no meaningful amendment can be offered because of the rule of germaneness. The net result is that we cannot under any circumstances offer amendments that will attack problems of certain areas that need attention. These amendments, such as those authorized by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], are as vital, if not more so, than the consideration of repeal of section 14(b).

So I urge my colleagues on my side particularly to vote "no" on ordering the previous question. In that way we can offer a substitute resolution, to be offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] which will permit, under his substitute resolution, the offering of meaningful amendments—amendments that will improve the situation in the labor-management field today.

But if you vote "yes"—if Members vote "yes" on ordering the previous question, you in effect will be putting your stamp of approval on a gag rule, a rule drafted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] where the time is controlled by the gentleman from New York and where the right to offer amendments is controlled by the gentleman from New York.

I say the House of Representatives deserves better consideration. Those of you who voted for the 21-day rule on January 4 of this year were not voting for a gag rule. You were voting for full and fair consideration of amendments by the House of Representatives as a whole. I say that this rule today is a misuse of the 21-day rule. We ought to vote—Democrats and Republicans—against ordering the previous question.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I do not want to belabor this issue, but I do want it made clear that the distinguished minority leader in condemning the procedure which we are following today as constituting a gag rule is condemning the standing rules of the House because we are operating today under the Standing Rules of the House of Representatives. The procedure that we are following today is the procedure we follow in practically every resolution that is brought to this floor from the Committee on Rules.

When a resolution is brought from the Committee on Rules, the Member designated by the Committee on Rules to call up the resolution has charge of the time. Only that person has the authority to offer amendments to the resolution or to yield for that purpose.

This is the regular procedure of the House of Representatives. There is nothing different about it. There is nothing unique about it. It is the standard procedure of the House of Representatives under which we have operated 62 times out of 69 times this year. The House has full control of this matter. The House has the power to vote up or down the previous question. In the meantime, we are proceeding under the rules of the House.

I trust and hope that the House will support the distinguished gentleman from New York, who has brought this matter to the floor under a rule of the House adopted at the beginning of this session by a substantial majority of the Members. He has brought it, I repeat, under the standard rules of the House. I trust that the previous question will be adopted and the rule agreed to so that we may proceed to the consideration of this matter on the merits.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to ask the distinguished member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], to take such time as he may desire, because he is a member of the Rules Committee. With due respect to the leader of the opposition, shall I say, the gentleman from Indiana is a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, during the 80th Congress we witnessed a million-dollar lobby converge on Washington to enact the Taft-Hartley law.

That bill included the "fine print section" known as 14(b) which permits antilabor States to nullify the Wagner National Labor Act and outlaw collective-bargaining and labor-management agreements.

During the last few months another million-dollar lobby, with an organized newspaper, television, letter and telegram campaign, has converged on Congress to retain section 14(b).

On Thursday of last week the Evening Star, on page A-2, quoted Republican leaders as accusing the Johnson administration of resorting to "gag and steamroller tactics" on the pending bill.

I quote verbatim from this article:

> Congressman FORD pointed out that the administration chose to bring the measure to the floor under the 21-day rule, thereby bypassing the House Rules Committee.

Nothing could be more untrue than that accusation.

During the last month, several Democratic members of the Rules Committee, including myself, on a number of occasions requested hearings for a rule on the repeal of 14(b). During these requests in executive session, the Republican members at no time joined our request for Rules Committee hearings. I am satisfied that if we only had one or two of the Republican members join with us, Chairman SMITH would have called the committee for hearings. I do hope Minority Leader FORD will make a connection of that newspaper article in last Thursday's Washington Star. The Johnson administration was opposed to presenting this legislation through the 21-day procedure.

EFFECTS OF 14(b)

Section 14(b) has made it possible for thousands of factories and industries to close their businesses and operations in States requiring living wages and good working conditions, and move into so-called low-wage "right-to-work" States. "Right-to-work" is in reality a tricky or phony label—a better label would be "14(b)" States.

By reason of these runaway industries and an influx of newly established industries into antilabor areas, millions of factory workers are underpaid and, in most cases, are submitting to the same working conditions as in the early part of this century. These workers today are not in the market for $3,000 to $4,000 automobiles or $200 to $300 refrigerators, or thousands of other products which are manufactured in living wage States. Economists agree that the big depression in the early thirties was brought about by reason of lack of buying power for millions of workers and farmers in America.

The low buying power of millions of consumers closed many factories and unemployment became rampant until over 14 million were walking the streets of our Nation looking for work in the early thirties.

THE 80TH CONGRESS

If the Republican leaders want to talk about "gag procedures and steamrollers" I had some "front seat" experience and observation 14(b) in the 80th Congress.

I was a member of the Education and Labor Committee during the 80th Congress and, for the information of the especially newer Members of this body, I am going to review briefly a few of the gag and steamroller methods that were applied by the powerful lobbyists which converged upon Washington at the beginning of that session. The passage of the Taft-Hartley Act with section 14(b) turned the clock back on collective bargaining and labor-management relations and has caused bitterness and commercial piracy among the States.

Early in January of that session, Chairman Fred Hartley, of New Jersey, called the Labor Committee into session and proceeded on several weeks of intensified hearings to pass the Taft-Hartley Act and section 14(b). The first few days the committee hearing room was crowded with television, klieg lights, radio apparatus, and newspaper reporters from throughout the Nation. Millions of dollars were spent by lobbyists in the spring of that year, all centered on shackling the progress of organized labor throughout the country. Antilabor testimony and propaganda poured out of the hearing room for the first week of the hearings. The first 26 witnesses called by the chairman of the committee to testify were antilabor witnesses. Never in the history of congressional legislation did a committee leadership exercise its authority to poison the public minds as occurred in the first week of the Taft-Hartley meetings. The actions of Chairman Hartley in his unfair using of television and radio in a completely one-sided propaganda campaign was the major reason former Speaker Rayburn abolished television and radio broadcasting in the House of Representatives.

After several weeks of hearings, the committee went into executive session. After all testimony was recorded Chairman Hartley saw fit to exclude all members of the committee who opposed the Taft-Hartley law from his secret committee hearings. Chairman Hartley and the committee members favorable to the Taft-Hartley law drew the iron curtain and went underground for a period of 2 weeks in private sessions and wrote the Taft-Hartley law. Theodore Iserman, a Wall Street lawyer and representative of Chrysler Corp., consulted and advised the secret sessions in writing the 68-page, typewritten Taft-Hartley bill. After 2 weeks I received a call on a Thursday morning that the full committee would meet in executive session and vote on the newly created, secretly prepared Taft-Hartley bill. The bill was set for the consideration of the floor of the House on the following Monday. The only recognition given the members of the Labor Committee opposed to the Taft-Hartley bill was the privilege of filing a minority committee report. The Taft-Hartley law with 14(b) was created under the most flagrant gag and steamroller methods in the history of Congress.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN AND SENATOR TAFT

I mention this for the information of the newer Members of this body today for them to realize that the Taft-Hartley law, including section 14(b), was steamrollered through the Congress without any recognition or consideration being given to Members who opposed the bill in the Education and Labor Committee. President Truman vetoed the bill and it was passed over his veto. That veto contributed more to the reelection of President Truman in the following election than any other one issue. The Taft-Hartley bill enactment in that Republican-controlled 80th Congress was the spark that helped create the explosion which, after one session, returned control of the Congress to the Democratic Party. Some commentators at the 1948 and 1952 Republican Conventions reported that the dark shadow of Taft-Hartley legislation was the barrier that defeated Senator Taft for the Republican presidential nominations.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

President Lyndon Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY told the American people last fall that they were foursquare behind a return to the freedom of collective bargaining throughout our Nation, free of the so-called State right-to-work laws which outlaw union security agreements between labor and management. The Nation endorsed them on this statement to the tune of a record-breaking over 16 million majority. The Indiana Legislature and many other States have recently repealed or rejected the right-to-work law, alias 14(b).

CANDIDATE GOLDWATER

The Republican candidate for President last fall entered politics in Arizona in 1946 as chairman of the retail merchants section of a campaign that saddled Arizona with a compulsory open-shop law.

Last fall Candidate Goldwater said if elected President he would impose the so-called right-to-work law on every State by Federal law. As a Senator he sponsored Senate bill 87 which, among many other crippling anti-collective-bargaining devices, would make the union shop illegal in every State—a national right-to-work law. He could accomplish this economic upheaval under 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. Today during the debate some Members will speak to retain 14(b) but I hope the majority of Congress repeals 14(b) and forever buries the antilabor Goldwater philosophy.

TWO ISSUES INVOLVED

The issues involved in the repeal of section 14(b) is as simple as any bill ever presented to Congress.

NO. 1

If a Member of Congress believes that 19 States in the Nation can openly disregard the rights and working conditions of working men and women as set out in the Wagner National Labor Relations Act he should vote to retain 14(b).

NO. 2

If a Member of Congress believes that the 31 States who reject the phony labeled "right-to-work" law and that labor is a part of the American economy with the right to collectively bargain as an integral body on wages and working conditions, he should in conscience vote for the repeal of 14(b). All the excuses and doubletalk we hear in this Chamber today will not change the above two simple propositions.

U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT

The John Birch Society, National Association of Manufacturers, and other special privilege groups, can continue to shed crocodile tears about the loss of liberty in the 31 States who recognize labor's economic rights, but everyone with commonsense knows that the right-to-work group's only goal is to attract industry with the promise of cheap nonunion labor. If this trend continues, millions more will be in the cheap-labor bracket and buying power will be lower, bringing on unemployment and depression in both right-to-work States and fair-wage States.

The U.S. News & World Report magazine of December 21, 1964, printed a 5-page article on why industry and factories are moving or establishing in right-to-work States, and on page 85 they have a table of percentage gains in right-to-work States. I hereby quote from some of those statistics:

Gains—10-year period

	Percent
Factory employment:	
Right-to-work States	Up 18
Rest of United States	Down 5
Value factory output:	
Right-to-work States	Up 92
Rest of United States	Up 49
Factory payrolls:	
Right-to-work States	Up 72
Rest of United States	Up 40
Construction contracts:	
Right-to-work States	Up 74
Rest of United States	Up 34

KEEP PROSPERITY

You Members realize that the low wages paid in the right-to-work States do not possess the buying power that exists in "living wage" labor States. The factories and industries in Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and other localities are suffering from the loss of buying power of low-paid millions in the right-to-work States. All Members of Congress from the New England States realize that section 14(b) caused the ruination of the textile industry in that area.

The magazine, on page 85, states:

> What many businessmen call a "favorable labor climate" are cited as important advantages in right-to-work communities for companies seeking a plant site.

That statement reveals the real reason for the highly financed lobby to retain section 14(b). The reason is "profits at the expense of wage earners in 19 States of this Nation."

If industry continues to locate and escape to the cheap labor States, the Nation's buying power will continue to lower unemployment and depression in all 50 States is sure to follow.

If this low-wage expansion continues the market for autos, refrigerators, furniture, clothing, foods, and thousands of other products will collapse at the factories and retail stores.

Let the $660 billion gross national product continue to expand.

Keep prosperity—avoid another depression.

Repeal section 14(b).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from Indiana has disparaged the way in which the Taft-Hartley Act was considered in the Committee on Education and Labor in 1947. He has condemned the procedure which was used all along the line. He castigates the legislation itself.

Mr. MADDEN. This is on my time. I am yielding for a question.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. My recollection is that our President, who at that time was a Democrat——

Mr. MADDEN. I yield just for a question only.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Was a Member of the House of Representatives who voted for the Taft-Hartley law and voted to override the then President of the United States who vetoed the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not yield further, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I think you have seen here on the floor of the House today a perfect reason and a perfect example of why those of us who serve on the Committee on Rules have such great love and affection for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Of course, it is true that he sometimes becomes so confused that he confuses his colleagues on the Committee on Rules and I am afraid he is mixed up on the bill that he has discussed here today.

When he talks about the action of the Rules Committee on legislation, he may have had in mind the Quality Stabilization Act which he was able to put through the Congress. For some reason or other, the bill was not reported for months and months, in spite of the fact that the Republican minority loves the gentleman from Indiana as we do, and all supported the idea that the bill ought to be brought to the floor of the House and considered.

I would like to call to the attention of the gentleman that his facts are wrong. Not long ago he joined with others to pack the Rules Committee by adding 3 new members to guarantee that the administration could work its will in the Rules Committee. To this day this administration and the gentleman's group in the Rules Committee that he leads, and he leads them very well, controls the action of the Rules Committee, and they could have reported this bill out any time they wanted to, and they would have had Republican support for it.

Why did they not make some move to report the bill? The bill was filed on June 22, and the next day the 21-day resolution we are now discussing was filed. Nobody on the Democratic side of the table made any attempt to get this bill out, including the gentleman from Indiana. Now he turns around and indicates it is the minority side that is responsible for that situation.

I hope he will correct the Record when he gets this voluminous material together that he has with him today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, if the voting records on labor legislation were compared between the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Madden] and myself, and my voting record on labor legislation would compare very favorably with his. I happen to favor repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. However, I hope to offer an amendment if we are not precluded from offering such amendments by a prearranged parliamentary procedure. It seems to me that the matter of religious conviction, the matter of individual conscience, is something that should not be forced to give way to the rights of the State. It has only been within the last few weeks that this Congress itself reaffirmed this position when the Committee on Ways and Means came out with amendments to the Social Security Act and in that bill made special provision that "members of certain religious sects may be exempt from the tax on self-employment income and from social security coverage upon application, which would be accompanied by a waiver of benefits rights."

Mr. Speaker, it does seem to me that religious liberty has always been a matter of the highest priority and I always thought of highest importance to this Congress. In the military service we make allowance for the conscientious objector. In this country we take great pride in religious liberty—religious freedom.

Let me read a telegram sent just this weekend signed by Rev. Cameron Hall, director, Commission on the Church and Economic Life, National Council of Churches of Christ; Msgr. George G. Higgins, director, Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference; Rabbi Richard Hirsch, Central Conference of American Rabbis, which states:

> The agencies represented by the undersigned have already presented testimony to the House Subcommittee on Labor opposing section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, which section of the act H.R. 77 would repeal. We wish to reiterate the positions taken on this matter in our respective statements to the subcommittee. At the same time we urge the Congress to take such steps as may be necessary to guarantee the religious liberty of those workers who, as a matter of religious belief, cannot join or support any organization other than their own church, except for the State.
>
> The agencies which we represent do not share the position of these groups on this matter. On the contrary, we look upon bona fide collective bargaining between management and organized labor as a constructive method of handling industrial relations. Nevertheless our devotion to the principle of religious liberty compels us to defend the rights of those who find it impossible as a matter of religious belief to join or support outside organizations including labor unions.
>
> In calling upon the Congress to guarantee the rights of those who hold to this position, we wish to emphasize again our own support of bona fide trade unionism and our opposition to section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act. In our judgment, it should be possible for the Congress, in considering 14(b) to find a formula which simultaneously guarantee the legitimate rights of organized labor and the rights of those workers referred to above whose religious beliefs make it impossible for them to join or support a labor organization.

Let me repeat that one sentence:

> In our judgment, it should be possible for the Congress, in considering 14(b) to find a formula which simultaneously guarantee—

Those words are important—

> simultaneously guarantee the legitimate rights of organized labor and the rights of those workers referred to above whose religious beliefs make it impossible for them to join or support a labor organization.

This is the matter I would like to discuss, but no time is allowed. We should not legislate nationally so that certain individuals of certain religious persuasions have their economic livelihood placed in jeopardy; we should make sure their religious convictions are protected under the guarantees of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on this floor not as an opponent of labor, but as a friend of long standing. I have been a union member—out of choice, not out of necessity. I have a withdrawal card at the present time. I have never crossed a picket line in my life. So the amendment I hope to offer is not offered to weaken the labor movement. On the contrary, in the eyes of the public, I am convinced the labor union image would be enhanced if they would lead the fight for this amendment; I believe the labor unions would be strengthened. Let me say that at first I discounted the reports that certain individuals of certain religious groups lost their jobs at the end of 30 days when union shop agreements went into effect. Why did they lose their jobs?

My office staff checked very carefully, and I was convinced that their church teachings, their religious convictions, prevented them from joining the union. At the end of that 30-day period, their jobs were gone.

This is not right in a free society. My proposed amendment is not for the so-called freeloader. It is not for the antiunion spokesman. It is only for the "bona fide members of a religious sect or division thereof, the established and traditional tenets and teachings of which oppose a requirement that a member of such sect or division join or financially support any labor organization."

We worked with labor lawyers and lawyers from NLRB in drafting the amendment.

Furthermore, no person would financially benefit by this provision—and the church groups involved are perfectly willing to support the additional provision that any such "conscientious objector" would pay sums equal to the initiation fees and periodic dues required either to a charity (mutually agreed upon) or a scholarship fund—or to the U.S. Treasury.

The proposed amendment reads as follows:

> Page 1, strike out lines 5 and 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "(b) The first and second provisos of paragraph 3 of subsection (a) of section 8 of such Act are amended to read as follows:".
>
> Page 2, line 16, insert after the colon the following:
>
> "*Provided further,* That no employer shall justify any discrimination against an employee for nonmembership in a labor organization (A) if he has reasonable grounds for believing that such membership was not available to the employee on the same terms and conditions generally applicable to other members, (B) if he has reasonable grounds for believing that membership was denied or terminated for reasons other than failure of the employee to tender the periodic dues and the initiation fees required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership, or (C) if such employee (i) is a bona fide member of a religious sect or division thereof, the established and traditional tenets and teachings of which oppose a requirement that a member of such sect or division join or financially support any labor organization and (ii) has either paid to the Treasury of the United States pursuant to regulations to be established by the Secretary of the Treasury sums equal to the initiation fees and periodic dues uniformly required as a condition of acquiring and retaining membership in a labor organization which is representative of the employee, or made alternative payments mutually agreed upon by such employee and such labor organization."

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is germane and I hope it will be accepted by this Congress.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Fulton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague [Mrs. Green] and say that I sincerely regret the House is unable to consider her bill, H.R. 8962, as an amendment to H.R. 77.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, it was my privilege to participate in the writing of the 1965 Social Security Amendments wherein we excluded those persons who, by reason of religious conviction or faith, found participation contrary to their beliefs and faith.

H.R. 8962 would extend this exclusion to persons to whom union membership is contrary to their religious convictions and faith.

This problem goes much deeper and is much broader than simply section 14(b) which now applies to 19 States. This involves every State in the Union.

I deeply regret that we will not be able to consider this question while we undertake the question of section 14(b). I am, however, gratified by the expressed assurances of the Committee on Education and Labor that this matter will be given expeditious and thorough consideration this session. It is my hope that this matter will be cleared in the immediate future.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Griffin].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious we are moving close to what may well be the crucial vote in the debate on this important legislation. There is no question but that the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert] was correct when he indicated that what is going on here is within the Rules of the House of Representatives. It is legal; but it must be a far cry from the kind of procedure that those who voted for the 21-day rule earlier in this session—those who wanted to assure the House full and fair and free debate on controversial and important measures—it must be a far cry from what they thought they were voting for.

I want to make it clear, following the excellent presentation of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] that her amendment dealing with the matter of religious convictions as well as my amendments, referred to earlier by the gentleman from Ohio, are not new or recently introduced. These same amendments were considered throughout the hearings of the Thompson subcommittee which held rather exhaustive hearings on this subject. These same amendments were considered germane throughout the deliberations of the Thompson subcommittee and the deliberations of the full Committee on Education and Labor. These were amendments, these alternatives were before the committee; many of the witnesses testifying before the Thompson subcommittee addressed their testimony to the provisions of my bill and to the provisions of the bill of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green]. These amendments were offered in the committee and they were voted on. It was altogether reasonable, I submit, Mr. Speaker, to expect that when this matter of legislation came to the floor of the House of Representatives, that it would be brought up under a rule or resolution that would be broad enough to make those amendments, which were major matters of discussion in the committee, matters for consideration on the floor of the House. To be sure, the resolution of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] could easily have been drawn to make these amendments germane, but it was restricted, apparently, so that such amendments would not be germane.

As a result, instead of having a full and fair debate, under the 21-day rule, which is being used today for the very first time, we find we are confronted with a gag rule, a resolution that does not say that we have less than a fair and free opportunity to discuss this very important measure.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Madden] said, in effect: "Oh, this is a very simple bill. This is nothing at all here. It just repeals a few lines from the Taft-Hartley law dealing with the power of the States to enact right-to-work laws." I might say parenthetically it was not the Taft-Hartley law that gave the States the right to enact right-to-work laws. Actually, there were 12 State right-to-work laws on the books under the Wagner Act, before the adoption of the Taft-Hartley Act. In fact, section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law merely wrote into statute law what already had been the common law.

But be that as it may, there is no question but that the legislation before us does more than tamper with the existing authority of the 50 States to legislate in this area—we are also tampering with the basic human individual rights of American workers. Repeal of section 14(b) cannot be separated from what it does to the people who are going to be affected by it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Indiana, for excluding me from membership in the "gagging gang" by virtue of the fact that I am a new Republican Member. As a matter of fact, when I came here in 1961, the first magic words I heard were: "Let the House work its will." The first substantive vote I cast in this House was a vote in favor of enlarging the Committee on Rules. It was a hard vote, but it was the right vote. In the 88th Congress I voted to make that enlargement permanent so that the majority could work its will. This year I voted for the 21-day rule which I thought then and I think now was the right vote because it placed the authority to move legislation in the hands of the majority. And I would vote that way again. But with this authority, there is a correlative responsibility—the responsibility to insure full and free debate.

Under the rule before us there cannot be full and free debate.

For example, I am interested, and the people I represent are interested, in the Green amendment, with which we are all generally familiar. I have prepared and would like to offer and have debate on an agency shop amendment. But neither amendment is likely to be considered under this rule. Both are worthy of discussion and debate, and might determine some Members' decisions as to final passage of H.R. 77.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias].

At the beginning of this session of the Congress, I voted in favor of adoption of the 21-day rule for the purpose of bringing a freer flow of legislation to the floor and stopping obstructionism.

I strongly favor repeal of 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act and shall vote for repeal; notwithstanding, I cannot vote to limit discussion on a matter of this consequence nor to deprive colleagues from offering amendments. To do so would be foreign to everything I have been saying since coming to the House in favor of a more responsive and responsible Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton] and only 30 seconds.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those people who voted for the Taft-Hartley law, and I must say it has been used sparingly by the Presidents. I feel it has many good features.

I do not believe the Taft-Hartley law was passed because there was any group or cabal that came up with something in secret session and put it over on the House. I would have to disagree with that.

Taft-Hartley passed by the will of the people, not by some secret group. Many of us of independent mind voted for the Taft-Hartley law, including the current President of the United States. In fact, two-thirds of the Members—of both parties—voted for the Taft-Hartley law and overrode the President's veto in both the House and Senate.

I am one of the more progressive Members on the Republican side, and I feel that the vote was right, and that I was right in voting to overrule the President's veto.

In my opinion, the Taft-Hartley law went too far in some instances, but I have always been open to correct any provision which I felt was needless, too cumbersome, or which went so far in protecting certain points of view that they resulted in an imbalance.

Under these circumstances I have always felt with Senator Taft and others, including then Senator Hubert Humphrey, now Vice President, that further adjustment from time to time with improvements could well be made. We are at present at one of those times when consideration should be given to the provisions affecting the rights and freedoms of collective bargaining of both management and labor.

We should recall that the provision of the Taft-Hartley Act in the original section 9(e)(1) requiring a secret vote on union shops in every instance, even though voluntarily agreed to by the union and company officials, turned out to be impractical. This resulted because of the fact that in almost every election that was held, the vote was overwhelming for the union shop.

Both Senator Taft and then Senator Humphrey united in an amendment to repeal that section. This was an example of bipartisan cooperation in labor-management affairs that was an outstanding example. We should approach labor-management changes in the Taft-Hartley law on a bipartisan basis in order to obtain the acceptance of the American people, the U.S. economy, and also the wholehearted cooperation of labor, management, as well as stockholders of corporations, and the owners and partners in business establishments.

We should approach this problem of section 14(b) in this spirit as we are seeking justice and a good balance between labor and management, not partisan or party advantage for electioneering purposes. The American people want a spirit of fairness in these labor-management laws and they should require this standard from their Representatives in the House as well as in the Senate of the United States.

The Republicans ought to remember what happened in Ohio in 1958 on the constitutional amendment, and likewise in California in 1958. It almost ruined the party.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I ask the gentleman from New York if he will yield me some time?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I will be equally fair, and yield the gentleman 30 seconds.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. It will be interesting to review the history of the union shop provision in one of the large industrial areas of the country covering the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board regional office for the western half of Pennsylvania and the northern industrial region of West Virginia. I made a check through Mr. Henry Shore, regional director for the National Labor Relations Board, and I found that from 1947 to 1951 there were votes on whether the people who worked in these companies in western Pennsylvania and northern West Virginia wanted a union shop. The following are the results of those elections under section 9(E)(1) of the Taft-Hartley law:

Region 6

Calendar year	Number of elections	Percent elections in which majority of employees voted to authorize union shop	Number eligibles	Percent eligibles voting	Votes cast			Percent in favor
					Total	In favor	Against	
1951	289	98	74,207	83	61,584	56,623	4,961	92
1950	181	96	302,666	80	240,929	197,200	63,729	82
1949	135	93	28,062	85	23,933	21,901	2,032	92
1948	906	97	119,084	86	102,527	97,751	4,776	95
1947	7	----------	----------	----------	----------	523	8	----------

Question on ballot: "Do you wish to authorize the (name of bargaining agent) to enter into an agreement with your employer which requires membership in such union, as a condition of continued employment?"

Over the period of 18 years of Taft-Hartley, there have also been elections in union shops under what was until 1951 section 9(E)(2) of the law. This provision requires secret elections on the question of a union shop when a petition is presented signed by 30 percent of the employees, both union and nonunion in the company or particular bargaining unit. From 1947 to 1965 only 14 of these petitions were filed and the results of those ensuing elections are as follows:

FOURTEEN PETITIONS FILED

Question on ballot: "Do you wish to withdraw the authority of your bargaining representative to require, under its agreement with the employer, that membership in the union be a condition of employment?"

June 26, 1950: 6–UD–1, no election held, petition withdrawn.

November 23, 1951: 6–UD–2, no election held, petition dismissed.

December 27, 1951: 6–UD–3, no election held, petition withdrawn; 6–UD–4, eligible 144: Yes, 56; no, 77.

January 29, 1954: 6–UD–5, eligible 14: Yes, 7; no, 7.

July 8, 1955: 6–UD–6: eligible 54: Yes, 32; no, 13.

February 27, 1957: no election held, petition withdrawn.

November 12, 1957: 6–UD–8, eligible 32: Yes, 19, no, 12.

June 24, 1960: 6–UD–9: no election held.

July 27, 1960: 6–UD–10: eligible 18: Yes, 18; no, 0.

May 9, 1963: 6–UD–11: no election held, petition withdrawn.

October 5, 1964: 6–UD–12: eligible 37: yes, 25; no, 5.

January 27, 1965: 6–UD–13: eligible 16: yes, 15; no, 0.

March 12, 1965: 6–UD–14: no election held, petition withdrawn.

June 17, 1965, Henry Shore's office advises a majority is required.

MEMORANDUM

Shore advises that the Pittsburgh region covers the tri-State area including the western half of the State of Pennsylvania and the northern part of West Virginia, but does not go into Ohio. He advises that the region goes to Dauphin County in Pennsylvania with the heavy industrial part of West Virginia, including Wheeling, and estimates the total population at approximately 4 million.

Shore pointed out to J.F. especially section 9(e)(1) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which provides for the union authorization election (see p. 326 of the 16th annual report of the National Labor Relations Board).

Shore advised that in October of 1951 this was repealed, and pointed out the congressional history on the repeal introduced by Taft and HUMPHREY, the debate, etc. He advised Public Law 189 is the repealer and pointed out particularly the Highland Park case.

Shore pointed out that the A.F. of L. had to be in compliance, and the Board took a contrary interpretation.

The amendment was put in to make it unnecessary to run the elections over to take care of this technical defect.

Taft, himself, and HUMPHREY introduced the amendment in 1951.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act they needed a majority of eligibles, not just of votes.

Shore pointed out in connection with his résumé that the 1950 elections in the Pittsburgh region actually covered plants of J. & L. Steel, Bethlehem Steel, and United States Steel from all over the United States.

Shore also pointed out that in larger companies a larger percentage of employees are apt to be away and not voting. He reiterated that the 1950 figures do involve persons out of Pennsylvania and the Pittsburgh region.

J.F. and Shore got into a discussion over the figures of the 5-year period that the law was in effect and the results of the union shop votes. The question came up regarding the 77½ percent figure on page 10 of the annual report, when J.F. said the figure actually should refer to the percentage of eligibles rather than the percentage of those voting.

Shore pointed out that after 1951 there was an amendment to the law providing that people can file a petition to take away the authority for a union shop. He pointed this out as section 9(e)(1) (formerly section 9(e)(2)) after section 9(e)(1) had been repealed.

He stated that since 1947 there had only been 14 such petitions filed in the Pittsburgh region and that it takes 30 percent of the employees to authorize the filing of these petitions.

Where there is a union contract in effect in the bargaining unit covered by the contract, 30 percent of the employees can file a petition to rescind the union shop agreement clause even if it is in the contract. A group of employees can file a petition to rescind the authority to have a union shop and take the union shop clause out of the contract.

In nearly 18 years since 1947 in our Pittsburgh region, only 14 such petitions have been filed, but Shore did not have the results of these petitions.

I favor uniform bargaining procedures and industrywide collective bargaining on a national basis. This has been, combined with the union shop in contracts freely negotiated, the overwhelming pattern in the major industries of the United States, such as steel, coal, aluminum, manufacturing, fabricating, and refining industries.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Now he likes me better.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to be more than eminently fair, and I yield another 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Perhaps my friend from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] will yield some additional time later.

I believe the conservative approach is to permit this freedom of contract and right of making agreements freely arrived at by management and labor representatives through the collective bargaining process. I believe any other rule is restrictive of the rights and freedoms of individuals, corporations, unions, and union members in the well established collective bargaining process.

What is wrong with management and labor arriving at uniform pay scales, hours, and conditions of employment, as well as fringe benefits, overtime, holidays, and so forth? The reason that some people object to this process is clearly that they do not want to pay the standard wages of the industry which are common everyday practice in the more advanced industrial regions of the country.

Also the right-to-work States, counties, and cities advertise in Pennsylvania with glowing accounts of their regions as to natural resources, water, utilities, taxes, and climate which is legitimate. But I feel that when so many of these advertisements of right-to-work States, counties, and cities appearing in Pennsylvania trying to lure our local industry away, with the glaring statement in large type that they are in right-to-work States clearly says to our industry, management, and workers that the pay scales are low, the fringe benefits are lower, the working conditions are not as good, and the company is lured by the prospect of undercutting in a right-to-work State, even its own branches in Pennsylvania, and the more industrially advanced States.

For my part I want a good day's work for a good day's wage, and will oppose strongly the attempt by right-to-work States to entice Pennsylvania industry to leave my good State of Pennsylvania on the basis of better right to competition, lower wages, poorer working conditions, and imposition of unfair restrictions on activities of the union which the majority of employees have chosen under the Taft-Hartley law as their recognized bargaining agent.

Now, I am part of the Bill Scranton organization in Pennsylvania. Our State of Pennsylvania does not have right-to-work laws, and both our State administration and the Democratic Party have opposed these laws. Gov. Bill Scranton has said he will veto any right-to-work law. I agree with that and I believe it is right.

As events are developing, this issue is not a straight labor-management issue or conservative liberal issue. I am finding labor and management groups on both sides of the question.

For example, big business management and national labor unions have long favored industrywide or national collective bargaining procedures under single contract provisions. The right-to-work laws encouraging variations in 19 States with multiple unions, committees, and even individual employees dissents from collective bargaining agreements voluntarily arrived at by management and labor, are strongly opposed by these groups.

Senator Hugh Scott, Republican, of Pennsylvania, on October 9, 1964, in his successful, hard-fought campaign for reelection stated that he favored the repeal of 14(b). Recently the Republican County Commissioner of Allegheny County, Blair Gunther, former judge of the Superior Court of Pennsylvania, publicly stated in Pittsburgh that he strongly favors repeal of section 14(b).

It remains to be pointed out that section 9(E)(1) still remains in the act that 30 percent of the employees in a union shop can file petition so that, though management and labor officials bargain for a union ship, the employees themselves can in a secret election set aside a union shop agreement. This provision remains and the rights of collective bargaining are not restricted by law in individual States.

While I realize that tempers are hot and feelings and emotions run high on the House floor today, I hope this issue will be considered and decided according to the free will of the representatives of the American people in Congress on a judicious and reasonable basis.

We should even examine methods of compromise to prevent this deep split of opinion and the disruption of the U.S. economy, which might endanger our continuing U.S. progress.

A knockdown and dragout fight among the various States and between management and labor at this time would be an expensive risk to run with our U.S. security at stake in Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, Cuba, Berlin, Africa, and so many other necessary points of defense of the free world.

We should, therefore, unite in our stand against the expansion of communism and stand shoulder to shoulder together in this time of peril, whether management, labor, union, or nonunion employees, instead of appearing a nation divided before the world into warring, spiteful, and name-calling groups at home. I put the security of the country first and hope that some compromise by amendment can be worked out on a friendly basis that will unite the American people in protecting our U.S. security and our good economic progress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. May I thank you.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in the 90 seconds remaining to me, I wish to take this opportunity to express to the gentleman from New York my appreciation for the courtesies he has extended to me today. I may say that I can understand why he yielded the last minute to the minority, and I cannot blame him therefor.

May I say in conclusion of the debate on this side that the whole question before the House now—and the only vote we will have at the present time—is on the previous question, as to whether the Members of the House want to bind and gag themselves under this rule, so that certain amendments—probably any amendments—cannot be considered to this legislation, or whether they feel, regardless of their position on section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, that there should be generous time to debate this issue and also that there should be an opportunity for Members to offer any amendments which they believe should be considered by the House and are desired by their constituents.

That is the whole issue, as to whether we are for the right of the House to work its will, by voting down the previous question. Then the vote will come on the resolution, and we can do as we see fit on the resolution.

Of course, we can adopt it or defeat it. If we defeat it, I will offer amendments, as I have said here. So, Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that the House will believe in the freedom of its own body and try to work its own will and vote down the previous question and give us the opportunity to discuss the resolution on its merits.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York for a question only.

Mr. REID of New York. The chairman knows that I voted to report H.R. 77, the repeal of 14(b), out of the committee. In anticipation of repeal of 14(b) I introduced five bills, along with Senator Jacob K. Javits in the other body, to keep union responsibility abreast of any enhanced union authority. I would ask the chairman specifically whether assurances can be given today to this House with regard to prompt hearings and a serious effort to report these bills to the House. The bills in question would amend the Labor-Management Relations Act to give the Federal courts jurisdiction to enforce provisions of collective bargaining agreements containing no-strike, no-lockout clauses if such jurisdiction is specifically accepted in the contract; amend the National Labor Relations Act to insure, when requested, a secret ballot election in union representation cases; give the President new powers to protect the public health and safety in national emergency strike situations; and amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to give the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission administrative enforcement and investigatory powers and to stress equal opportunity access to apprenticeship programs with quarterly reports to the Congress thereon, which the distinguished chairman reported from his committee today.

Mr. POWELL. I appreciate the support of the gentleman on the resolution before us, and I will assure him that I will consult with the three subcommittee chairmen and a few of the labor-minded members of the committee and we will give prompt consideration and immediate consideration to your suggestions.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act because I believe it is in the best interests of the people of my district, my State, and indeed, of every citizen in this country. However, I am very much opposed to the manner in which this legislation comes to the floor of the House under the 21-day rule which restricts debate and prevents amendments which I had hoped could be offered to protect the individual.

The question of whether or not to repeal section 14(b) is without a doubt one of the most controversial and misunderstood questions before the American people today, and I believe that these factors require us, their Representatives in Congress, to give the subject as thorough an explanation as possible.

Many of our colleagues intend to introduce amendments to H.R. 77 which they honestly feel would be in the best interests of every American citizen, and I think the House should have an opportunity to fully explore the merits of and necessity for each amendment. To do otherwise will preclude the full and honest consideration that this important legislation deserves.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that while I support the bill, I intend to vote against the resolution which provides insufficient time for debate—only 5 hours—and, as I said, limits Members from freely amending it. I think in considering important and controversial legislation, restrictions such as are inherent under this proposed resolution are wrong and therefore, I intend to vote against the previous question on the rule offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, in advance of the coming debate I should like to cite a case history of a combination of runaway industry and unfair working conditions resulting from section 14(b).

It seems a number of Members of this House have been receiving a form letter from a South Carolina firm, asking our opinions on the proposal to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The letter dangles some kind of bait before our eyes.

The company, through its president, Johann Frohlich, would have us believe that by voting against repeal of 14(b), we can somehow share the bounty of a large industrial development. Apparently this is to be a kind of competition among Members of the House for some kind of plant location, or relocation.

The company is the Bommer Spring Hinge Co., whose general offices and plant are at Landrum, S.C. Its letterhead states that there are sales offices and warehouses at Brooklyn, N.Y., and Chicago, Ill.

This company's letter begins:

> Our plant has been thinking of opening a branch office in your State. Before we, however, make a final decision if we are going to locate in your State, we would like to have your opinion concerning the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. Frohlich says he is strongly opposed to said repeal, as it "limits the choice of an individual and reduces personal liberty and State rights." The letter closes by asking individual Members of this House how they are planning to vote on the proposal to repeal the section.

I should like to tell my colleagues on both sides of this venerable aisle of comity a little bit about the Bommer Spring Hinge Co. Since it ran away from my home borough of Brooklyn, N.Y., I am well acquainted with this firm.

The company very possibly is planning to leave its present home in Landrum, S.C. I have no information to prove otherwise.

The Bommer Spring Hinge Co. moved to Landrum, S.C., in 1953, after it secured a great many tax and utility benefits from the State of South Carolina and the city of Landrum. It packed up and ran away from Brooklyn, apparently to avoid bearing the equalized tax and other obligations of a free enterprise operation.

The performance of the Bommer Spring Hinge Co. reminds me quite a bit of the favorite American "sport" turned big business known as baseball. In 1953, the same year as the Bommer company ran off, the baseball team known as the Braves developed itchy feet. After hornswoggling the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors into spending $8½ million of public tax money for a magnificent sports palace, which was turned over for a pittance of annual rent to the Braves, the team went to Milwaukee. The county is still in debt for the Braves stadium. Now, in 1965, the Braves are moving again, this time to Atlanta, where even more concessions—a euphemism for a giveaway of public funds to a private enterprise—are being offered. Is the team to stay in Atlanta, or will it in 1977 find another home? Once there was a baseball team in Brooklyn—the Dodgers. It moved west—even though many millions of public dollars were offered to provide the team a home—to Los Angeles.

The reasons are all the same—to mooch as much governmental benefit for a private enterprise as possible. Should one government be in bidding with another?

The management of the Bommer company seems to have a little regard for the welfare or economic well-being of its employees. Its wages are about the lowest in the area. The starting wage for men and women is the Federal minimum—$1.25 an hour. I am not aware of any women paid more than $1.35 an hour. Most of the men receive less than $1.50 an hour. Only the top maintenance men receive over $1.75 an hour. The employees have no paid holidays, no severance pay, no pension plan. They must work at least 5 years before receiving a 2-week paid vacation. The group insurance program is paid for mostly by the employees, with only a small company contribution.

A paragraph out of the company's employee handbook illustrates the 20th century sweatshop mentality of this company's management. It says:

> Management reserves the right to discharge employees for any cause or reason that to management may be just and reasonable and in the best interests of the company.

This company's president is trying to imply that there is a "right to work."

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I cannot see where the employee of the Bommer Spring Hinge Co. has any right or personal liberty in his employment there. I would like to have someone explain the right that each of the present 250 employees has in case the Bommer company decides to move.

My feelings toward the Bommer company are not sour grapes. I personally feel Brooklyn is better off without a manufacturing plant run in such a feudalistic fashion.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, through testimony and public statements I have made my position on the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act quite clear. I oppose H.R. 77 because it is a direct attack on the freedom of the individual. However, we may soon be witnessing events that are even worse than this basic flaunting of principle and which go far beyond the actual yea-or-nay vote on H.R. 77.

We all know that early in the session the House passed legislation which sharply curtailed the effectiveness of the House Rules Committee. The passage of the 21-day rule made it possible for any Member of the House to introduce a resolution setting his own requirements for House debate on the issue in question.

One can easily see the harm in these "stop watch" tactics, but this is past history. What is present and more important is that H.R. 77 will be the first legislation to be affected by this rule, and the consequences are frightening.

By calling for a 2-hour debate—later amended to 5 hours—and eliminating the chance for any amendment which the chairman does not recognize as pertinent to the subject, the 435 elected Representatives will have less than 1 minute each to discuss the issue, and may not consider any of the proposed amendments to qualify or restrict that section concerning the 14(b) rule.

This basic concept which regards debate and discussion, and which allows for important changes in the text of any legislation is simply tossed away.

Mr. Speaker, how do we justify an action that treats one of the most vital and controversial pieces of legislation thus far considered with the barest nod of formality? How can we abandon the duties vested in this Congress as the embodiment of the highest democratic legislative process on earth? Mr. Speaker, I can think of no way in which we can justify or explain this rubberstamp action to ourselves, or, more important, to those who sent us here as their voice in Government.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, two decades ago Florida voters enacted an amendment to the constitution of Florida, which said:

> The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union, or labor organization: *Provided*, That this clause shall not be construed to deny or abridge the right of employees by and through a labor organization or labor union to bargain collectively with their employer.

The Florida State Legislature submitted this provision in 1943, and it was adopted in the general election of 1944.

It has always been my view that a constitutional provision of a State should not be set aside by Federal legislation, which this legislation before the House of

Representatives today would do. Any needed changes in this provision of the Florida constitution should be made by the qualified voters of Florida, not by the Congress. I am therefore voting against the repeal of section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in considering the resolution before us, we should keep in mind the historic nature of this debate. We are considering action under the 21-day rule for the first time since its readoption last January.

I have fought for the 21-day rule since my election to Congress. I was fully aware of its adoption by the 81st Congress and of the record it enabled that Congress to make. By use of the 21-day rule, an antipoll-tax bill was brought to the floor for a successful vote. It forced action on housing and minimum-wage bills. In fact, seven of the eight measures brought to the floor by use of the 21-day rule passed the House. Unfortunately, in the 82d Congress the conservative coalition prevented the 21-day rule from being readopted.

In 1963, during the debate over the permanent enlargement of the Rules Committee, I pointed out that mere enlargement of the Rules Committee had not prevented it from bottling up in the 87th Congress President Kennedy's proposals for Federal aid to education and a Department of Urban Affairs, as well as 22 other important bills.

I urged the House to enact more basic reforms, including readoption of the 21-day rule.

I was highly gratified to see the 21-day rule adopted by this Congress.

But a rule is just a string of empty phrases unless it is used. It was intended to be used, and there is no better time to do so than right now. The need is clear. The chairman of the Rules Committee has refused to hold hearings on the repeal of section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act. The House has been stymied for a full month because of his personal advocacy of right-to-work laws.

I sponsored the only bill in the last Congress to repeal 14(b). I want to see this legislation passed without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is not only whether H.R. 77 shall be debated, but also whether obstructionist tactics on the Rules Committee shall deprive the House of the opportunity to work its will. I call upon my colleagues, whatever their views on right-to-work legislation, to vote for this resolution, so the issue can be fully debated.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the distinguished author of this bill and the chairman of the subcommittee that handled this legislation, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Thompson], 3 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there has been considerable discussion with respect to the problem of religious liberty. I might point out to the Members of the House that there is legislation pending before the committee, separate legislation, on this subject. I have given assurances to its sponsors and to the groups involved that it will get prompt consideration.

Now, the gentlewoman from Oregon read a telegram which was sent to all of the Members on Saturday. All of the Members have been here, or most all of them, since early today, but you will find in your offices the following telegram, which seeks to cure a misunderstanding about the position of the three signers:

July 27, 1965.

Representative Frank Thompson, Jr.,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

On Saturday afternoon Rev. Cameron Hall, of the Commission on the Church and Economic Life of the National Council of Churches of Christ, Rabbi Richard Hirsch, of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, and the undersigned, representing the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference sent a telegram to Congressman Frank Thompson, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Labor, reiterating our opposition to section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, and at the same time urging the Congress to take such steps as may be necessary to guarantee the religious liberty of those workers who, as a matter of religious belief, cannot join or support any organization other than their own church, except for the State. It has since come to our attention that this telegram is being interpreted to mean that we are advocating an amendment to the rule proposed in H.R. 437 which would open H.R. 77 to unlimited debate and amendment. This was not the intention of our telegram. As a matter of fact, we deliberately refrained from trying to tell the Congress, in specific terms, how to handle the religious liberty issue referred to above. Our only purpose was to record our support of the principle of religious liberty while reiterating our opposition to section 14(b).

Rt. Rev. Msgr. George G. Higgins,
Director, Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important, in case any Member of the House did not hear what the distinguished Member from New Jersey was saying, to point out that these three great religious leaders have clearly indicated as of 12:30 today—and a telegram is on the desk of each Member of this House—that they are not backing the amendment which the gentlewoman from Oregon proposed.

I would like to say as chairman of the committee that in due course we will consider such an amendment before the committee.

At this time I would like to yield 1 minute to the distinguished member of our committee from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate the point made by the distinguished majority leader. The resolution providing an order of business for this bill is the standard open rule provided for in the vast majority of Rules Committee resolutions that come before this House. Any amendment germane under the rules of the House can be offered, debated, and voted upon. We are not debating a gag rule or a closed rule. It is the standard open rule that we have been accustomed to for many years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Olsen of Montana). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield to me?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the distinguished chairman if the bills we discussed in the previous colloquy are reported out of committee whether he would be prepared to act within the 21-day rule to report the bills to the floor?

Mr. POWELL. Yes, with the cooperation of the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. The chairman will recall that when Mr. Meany, president of the AFL–CIO was before the committee, we had considerable discussion on how the NLRB elections are being held. Does the chairman feel, in the event that section 14(b) is repealed, our committee should take a good look at how this machinery is being handled to make certain that these union elections are held as they ought to be?

Mr. POWELL. Absolutely; I agree 100 percent; and I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid].

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the previous question.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 248, nays 171, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 199]

YEAS—248

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Ayres
Bandstra
Barrett
Bennett
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halpern
Hamilton

Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Leggett
Lindsay
Love
McCarthy
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Poage
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schweiker
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
Weltner
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Selden
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Stephens
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

NAYS—171

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Baldwin
Baring
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Callaway
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Findley
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hall
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
May
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Murray
Nelsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pelly
Pickle
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Schneebeli

NOT VOTING—14

Aspinall
Blatnik
Bonner
Bow
Cahill
Colmer
Keogh
McVicker
Pirnie
Rogers, Tex.
Scott
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Willis

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Teague of Texas against.

Mr. McVicker for, with Mr. Bonner against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Willis.

Mr. HARSHA changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, under rule 17, clause 1, of the rules of the House, dealing with the previous question, would a motion be in order at this time to refer the pending resolution to the Committee on Rules with instructions to report it back to the House within 10 days, and with amendments making in order my bill, H.R. 4350, and Mrs. GREEN's bill, H.R. 8962?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will inform the gentleman that under the rules of the House the motion would not be in order.

The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Upon the conclusion of District of Columbia business today, will the following business of the House be the business of the resolution just adopted?

The SPEAKER. That will be the next order of business after the conclusion of District of Columbia business.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PENALTIES FOR HANDLING OF DISHONORED CHECKS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill S. 1317 to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe penalties for the handling and collection of dishonored checks or money orders, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1317

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to prescribe and impose as a penalty, in addition to any other penalties provided by law, an amount to be paid by any person who gives or causes to be given a check or money order in payment of any tax, assessment, fee, charge, or other obligation due the Government of the District of Columbia, and such check or money order is subsequently dishonored or not duly paid. The amount of the penalty shall be prescribed from time to time by the Commissioners and shall be based on the approximate cost borne by the District of Columbia in handling and collecting such dishonored or unpaid checks or money orders. Upon imposition, such penalty shall be collected in the same manner as the original obligation due the District of Columbia and any receipt theretofore given in reliance upon such check or money order shall be null and void and no other receipt shall be given for the payment of the original indebtedness until the penalty has also been paid. This Act shall not apply to a check which is not paid because of the death of the drawer thereof.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "or money order".
Page 1, line 9, strike out "or money order".
Page 2, line 4, strike out "or money orders".
Page 2, line 7, strike out "or money order".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe penalties for the handling and collection of dishonored checks."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, as amended, is to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe penalties for the handling of dishonored checks which have been presented to the District government by persons in payment of a tax, assessment, or other District government obligations.

BACKGROUND FOR LEGISLATION

During the past several years, the District government has been concerned with the substantial and steadily increasing number of dishonored checks tendered by persons in purported payment of obligations due the District. The number of such checks received by the District has increased from a total of 3,082 in fiscal year 1956 to a total of 4,754 in fiscal year 1964. The face amount of these defective instruments totaled $384,498 in fiscal 1964.

The Finance Office of the District government conducted a cost study in fiscal 1963, and determined that the average cost to the District for processing and collecting each defective check amounted to $6.42. On an annual basis, this cost to the District was estimated at between $25,000 and $30,000. The study made by the Finance Office also revealed that in fiscal 1963, of the 4,394 instruments received, three-fourths were dishonored because the drawer's bank balance was insufficient to meet the amount of the drawn check.

A number of States and municipalities in recent years have deemed it essential to enact laws and ordinances to combat the cost problems involved in handling dishonored checks. Essentially all local banks in the District have found it necessary to assess service charges against its customers who draw defective checks to recover their handling costs. The Federal Government, under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—26 U.S.C. 6657—likewise penalizes, under certain conditions, persons who tender checks which are not duly paid.

Under the provisions of S. 1317, the District Commissioners would be authorized to prescribe from time to time a penalty in an amount which will approximate the cost to the District of processing and collecting the dishonored or defective check. Upon imposition of the penalty by the District government, the collection of such penalty would be in the same manner as the original obligation due the District. The bill also provides that any receipt theretofore given in reliance upon such dishonored check shall be null and void, and that the original indebtedness will not be considered paid until the penalty charge provided for in this bill is also paid. The provisions of the bill are made inapplicable to a check which is unpaid due to the death of the drawer thereof.

This bill was requested by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade has stated that it has no objection to the measure. The bill was approved by the Senate on May 11, 1965.

The following is the letter from the President of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, under date of February 5, 1965, requesting this legislation:

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, February 5, 1965.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit a draft of a bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe penalties for the handling and collection of dishonored checks or money orders.

The purpose of the bill is to vest in the Commissioners authority to prescribe and impose penalties upon persons who give or cause to be given a check or money order in payment of any tax, assessment, fee, charge, or other obligation due the government of the District of Columbia, and such check or money order is subsequently dishonored or not duly paid. The penalty is to be assessed in addition to any other penalties provided by law and is to be prescribed from time to time by the Commissioners in an amount as will approximate the cost to the District of handling and collecting such dishonored or defective checks or money orders. However, the bill is not applicable to any check which is not duly paid because of the intervening death of the drawer thereof. The bill also provides that, upon imposition, the penalty shall be collected in the same manner as the original obligation due the District; that any receipt theretofore given in reliance upon such check or money order shall be null and void; and that the original indebtedness will not be considered paid until the additional penalty charge is also paid.

The Commissioners are greatly concerned over the substantial and steadily increasing number of dishonored checks tendered by persons in purported payment of obligations due the District. The number of such checks and money orders received by the District has increased from a total of 3,082 in fiscal year 1956 to 4,754 in fiscal year 1964. The face amount of these defective instruments totaled $385,498 during fiscal year 1964. A detailed study conducted by the Finance Office of the District government for the 1963 fiscal year indicates that the average cost to the District for handling and collecting each such defective check was $6.42. The study also revealed that of the total number of 4,394 such instruments received in 1963, more than three-fourths were dishonored because the face amount thereof exceeded the drawer's account balance.

A number of States and municipalities in recent years have deemed it essential to enact laws and ordinances to combat the cost problems involved in handling dishonored checks and money orders. All local banks in the District have found it necessary to assess service charges against its customers who draw defective checks to recover their handling costs. The Federal Government, under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 6657), likewise penalizes, under certain conditions, persons who tender checks and money orders which are not duly paid.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia, for the foregoing reasons, strongly recommend enactment of the bill in order that they may have authority to take protective measures necessary to offset the rising cost to the District of handling defective checks and money orders and in the expectation that such penalties as may be imposed will discourage the issuance and decrease the number of such instruments received each year.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,
WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia.

BOND REQUIREMENTS—ATTACHMENT BEFORE JUDGMENT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] to call up the next bill.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill S. 1321 to amend section 501(e) of title 16 of the District of Columbia Code relating to bond requirements in connection with attachment before judgment, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1321

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 501(e) of title 16 of the District of Columbia Code is amended by inserting, immediately before the period at the end thereof, a semicolon and the following: "except that in any case in which the plaintiff states in his affidavit that the value of specified property to be levied upon is less than the amount of his claim, the court may set the amount of such bond in an amount twice the value of the property being attached, and, notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (f) of this section, only the property so specified shall be levied upon: *Provided,* That the United States marshal may, in his discretion, when levying upon such property, have the same appraised by an independent appraiser retained by the marshal at the expense of the plaintiff. Any such appraisal shall be made at the time the marshal levies upon the property, and the appraiser shall accompany him for such purpose. If such appraisal has been made, then only such property as may have a value not exceeding one-half of the amount of the bond shall be attached. In the event the appraised value of the property shall be more than one-half of the amount of the bond, the marshal may refuse to execute the writ unless and until the amount of the bond is increased so as to be at least twice the value of the property to be attached".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend the provisions of section 501(e) of title 16 of the District of Columbia Code relating to attachments before judgment. The bill permits the plaintiff in such an action to take out a bond in an amount twice the value of the property attached rather than twice the value of the claim against the defendant when the property to be attached is of less value than the total claim. When this provision is invoked only that specific property under the bond may be levied upon. The smaller bond is not to cover the general property of the defendant and general property cannot be levied upon.

BACKGROUND FOR LEGISLATION

Section 501 of title 16 of the District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition, sets forth the manner and procedure by which a plaintiff, in an action to recover specific personal property, a debt, or damages for breach of an express or implied contract, may attach the defendant's property before a judgment is rendered on the merits of the case.

Such attachment may issue only where the plaintiff avers that at least one of five conditions is met, namely:

First, the defendant is a foreign corporation or not a resident of the District of Columbia and has been absent for at least 6 months;

Second, he evades the service of ordinary process by concealing himself or temporarily withdrawing from the District;

Third, he has removed or is about to remove some of his property from the District so as to defeat just demands upon him;

Fourth, he has assigned, conveyed, or disposed of, or secreted, or is about to do any of the aforementioned, to defraud his creditors; or

Fifth, he fraudulently contracted the debt or incurred the obligation respecting which the action is brought.

Subsection (e) of section 501, which this bill amends, requires the plaintiff to file with the clerk's office a bond in twice the amount of his claim to make good to the defendant all costs and damages which may result from a wrongful suing out of an attachment before judgment.

The present language of subsection (e) is designed to protect the defendant against loss or damage to his property because of wrongful attachment. A bond related in amount to the property attached rather than the amount of the claim would not diminish this protection. It would, however, avoid placing undue burden on a plaintiff who finds that the defendant has insufficient property in the District of Columbia to satisfy plaintiff's claim. The District Bar Association reports that the court has required a bond in an amount twice the value of the property where the property attached exceeds the value of the claim. This bill would extend the logic of this practice for the benefit of the plaintiff by permitting the plaintiff to file a bond in twice the amount of the property in lieu of a bond in twice the amount of the plaintiff's claim.

This bill gives the U.S. marshal, on whom may fall some burden for wrongful attachment, the discretion to employ an appraiser at the cost of the plaintiff. It further empowers the marshal to attach property in value not exceeding one-half the amount of the bond and permits him to decline to exercise a writ of attachment where the property exceeds one-half the value of the bond, unless and until the bond is increased to at least twice the value of the property to be attached.

Two provisions of existing law protecting the interest of the defendant are not affected by this legislation. One such provision, section 505 of title 16 of the District of Columbia Code, provides that the defendant may apply to the court for an order requiring the plaintiff to give additional bond if the defendant is not satisfied with the original bond. A second such provision, section 510 of such title, provides that the defendant may obtain a release of the property from attachment by giving an undertaking with security to be approved by the court.

This measure has the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and of the District of Columbia Bar Association. The bill was passed by the Senate on May 11, 1965.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows—new matter is enclosed in black brackets, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman:

(77 Stat. 543)

§ 16–501. Attachment before judgment; affidavit and bond

(a) This section applies to any civil action in the United States District Court of the District of Columbia or the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, for the recovery of:

(1) specific personal property;

(2) a debt; or

(3) damages for the breach of a contract, expressed or implied.

(b) In an action specified by subsection (a) of this section, the plaintiff, his agent, or attorney, may file an affidavit as provided by subsections (c) and (d) of this section either at the commencement of the action or pending the action.

(c) The affidavit shall comply with the following requirements:

(1) show the grounds of plaintiff's claim;

(2) set forth that plaintiff has a just right to recover what is claimed in his complaint;

(3) where the citation is to recover specific personal property, state the nature and, according to affiant's belief, the value of the property and the probable amount of damages to which plaintiff is entitled for the detention thereof;

(4) where the action is to recover a debt, state the amount thereof; and

(5) where the action is to recover damages for breach of a contract set out, specifically and in detail, the breach complained of and the actual damage resulting therefrom.

(d) The affidavit shall also state one of the following facts with respect to defendant:

(1) defendant is a foreign corporation or is not a resident of the District, or has been absent therefrom for at least six months;

(2) he evades the service of ordinary process by concealing himself or temporarily withdrawing himself from the District;

(3) he has removed or is about to remove some or all of his property from the District, so as to defeat just demands against him;

(4) he has assigned, conveyed, disposed of, or secreted, or is about to assign, convey, dispose of, or secrete his property with intent to hinder, delay, or defraud his creditors; or

(5) he fraudulenty contracted the debt or incurred the obligation respecting which the action is brought.

(e) Before a writ of attachment and garnishment is issued, the plaintiff shall first file in the clerk's office a bond, executed by himself or his agent, with security to be approved by the clerk, in twice the amount of his claim, conditioned to make good to the defendant all costs and damages which he may sustain by reason of the wrongful suing out of the attachment; [except that in any case in which the plaintiff states in his affidavit that the value of specified property to be levied upon is less than the amount of his claim, the court may set the amount of such bond in an amount twice the value of the property being attached, and, notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (f) of this section, only the property so specified shall be levied upon: *Provided,* That the United States Marshal may, in his discretion, when levying upon such property, have the same appraised by an independent appraiser retained by the Marshal at the expense of the plaintiff. Any such appraisal shall be made at the time the Marshal levies upon the property, and the appraiser shall accompany him for such purpose. If such appraisal has been made, then only such property as may have a value not exceeding one-half of the amount of the bond shall be attached. In the event the appraised value of the property shall be more than one-half of the amount of the bond, the Marshal may refuse to execute the writ unless and until the amount of the bond is increased so as to be at least twice the value of the property to be attached.]

(f) If the plaintiff files an affidavit and bond as provided by this section, the clerk shall issue a writ of attachment and garnishment, to be levied upon as much of the lands, tenements, goods, chattels, and credits of the defendant as may be necessary to satisfy the claim of the plaintiff.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks in explanation of the bill and otherwise with reference to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 7067) to prescribe administrative procedures for the District of Columbia government, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 7067

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Administrative Procedure Act".

OTHER AUTHORITY

SEC. 2. This Act shall supplement all other provisions of law establishing procedures to be observed by the Commissioners and agencies of the District government in the application of laws administered by them except that this Act shall supersede any such law and procedure to the extent of any conflict therewith.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) "Commissioners" means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or their designated agent;

(2) "District" means the District of Columbia;

(3) "agency" includes both subordinate agency and independent agency;

(4) "subordinate agency" means any officer, employee, office, department, division, board, commission, or other agency of the government of the District, other than an independent agency or the Commissioners, required by law or by the Commissioners to administer any law or any rule adopted under the authority of a law;

(5) "independent agency" means any agency of the government of the District with respect to which the Commissioners are not authorized by law, other than this Act, to establish administrative procedures, but does not include the several courts of the District and the District of Columbia Tax Court;

(6) "rule" means the whole or any part of any Commissioners or agency statement of general or particular applicability and future effect designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy or to describe the organization, procedure, or practice requirements of the Commissioners or of any agency;

(7) "rulemaking" means Commissioners or agency process for the formulation, amendment, or repeal of a rule;

(8) "contested case" means a proceeding before the Commissioners or an agency in which the legal rights, duties, or privileges of specific parties are required by any law (other than this Act), or by constitutional right, to be determined after a hearing before the Commissioners or before an agency, but shall not include (A) any matter subject to a subsequent trial of the law and the facts de novo in any court; (B) the selection or tenure of an officer or employee of the District; (C) proceedings in which decisions rest solely on inspections, tests, or elections; and (D) cases in which the Commissioners or an agency act as an agent for a court of the District;

(9) "person" includes individuals, partnerships, corporations, associations, and public or private organizations of any character other than the Commissioners or an agency;

(10) "party" includes the Commissioners and any person or agency named or admitted as a party, or properly seeking and entitled as of right to be admitted as a party, in any proceeding before the Commissioners or an agency, but nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the Commissioners or an agency from admitting the Commissioners or any person or agency as a party for limited purposes;

(11) "order" means the whole or any part of the final disposition (whether affirmative, negative, injunctive, or declaratory in form) of the Commissioners or of any agency in any matter other than rulemaking, but including licensing;

(12) "license" includes the whole or part of any Commissioners or agency permit, certificate, approval, registration, charter, membership, statutory exemption or other form of permission;

(13) "licensing" includes process respecting the grant, renewal, denial, revocation, suspension, annulment, withdrawal, limitation, amendment, modification, or conditioning of a license by the Commissioners or an agency;

(14) "relief" includes the whole or part of any Commissioners or agency (A) grant of money, assistance, license, authority, exemption, exception, privilege, or remedy, (B) recognition of any claim, right, immunity, privilege, exemption, or exception, and (C) taking of any other action upon the application or petition of, and beneficial to, any person;

(15) "proceeding" means any process of the Commissioners or an agency as defined in paragraphs (6), (11), and (12) of this section; and

(16) "sanction" includes the whole or part of any Commissioners or agency (A) prohibition, requirement, limitation, or other condition affecting the freedom of any person; (B) withholding of relief; (C) imposition of any form of penalty or fine; (D) destruction, taking, seizure, or withholding of property; (E) assessment of damages, reimbursement, restitution, compensation, costs, charges, or fees; (F) requirement, revocation, or suspension of a license; and (G) taking of other compulsory or restrictive action.

ESTABLISHMENT OF GENERAL PROCEDURES

SEC. 4. (a) The Commissioners shall, for themselves and for each subordinate agency, establish or require each subordinate agency to establish procedures in accordance with this Act.

(b) Each independent agency shall establish procedures in accordance with this Act.

(c) The procedures required to be established by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall include requirements of practice before the Commissioners and each agency.

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION

SEC. 5. (a) The Commissioner shall publish at regular intervals not less frequently than once every two weeks a bulletin to be known as the "District of Columbia Register," in which shall be set forth the full text of all rules filed in the office of the Commissioners during the period covered by each issue of such bulletin, except that the Commissioners may in their discretion omit from the District of Columbia Register rules the publication of which would be unduly cumbersome, expensive or otherwise inexpedient, if, in lieu of such publication, there is included in the Register a notice stating the general subject matter of any rule so omitted and stating the manner in which a copy of such rule may be obtained.

(b) All courts within the District shall take judicial notice of rules published or of which notice is given in the District of Columbia Register pursuant to this section.

(c) Publication in the District of Columbia Register of rules adopted, amended, or repealed by the Commissioners or by an agency shall not be considered as a substitute for publication in one or more newspapers of general circulation when such publication is required by statute.

(d) The Commissioners are authorized to publish in the District of Columbia Register, in addition to rules published under authority contained in subsection (a) of this section, (1) cumulative indexes to regulations which have been adopted, amended, or repealed; (2) information on changes in the organization of the District government; (3) notices of public hearings; (4) codifications of rules; and (5) such other matters as the Commissioners may from time to time determine to be of general public interest.

(e) This section shall become effective thirty days after the date of approval of this Act.

PUBLIC NOTICE AND PARTICIPATION IN RULEMAKING

SEC. 6. (a) The Commissioners and each independent agency shall, prior to the adoption of any rule or the amendment or repeal thereof, publish in the District of Columbia Register (unless all persons subject thereto are named and either personally served or otherwise have actual notice thereof in accordance with law) notice of the intended action so as to afford interested persons opportunity to submit data and views either orally or in writing, as may be specified in such notice. The publication or service required by this subsection of any notice shall be made not less than thirty days prior to the effective date of the proposed adoption, amendment, or repeal, as the case may be, except as otherwise provided by the Commissioners or the agency upon good cause found and published with the notice.

(b) Any interested person may petition the Commissioners or an independent agency, requesting the promulgation, amendment, or repeal of any rule. The Commissioners and each independent agency shall prescribe by rule the form for such petitions, and the procedure for their submission, consideration, and disposition. Nothing in this Act shall make it mandatory that the Commissioners or any agency promulgate, amend, or repeal any rule pursuant to a petition therefor submitted in accordance with this section.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, if, in an emergency, as determined by the Commissioners or an independent agency, the adoption of a rule is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, safety, welfare, or morals, the Commissioner or such independent agency may adopt such rule as may be necessary in the circumstances, and such rule may become effective immediately. Any such emergency rule shall forthwith be published and filed in the manner prescribed in section 7 of this Act. No such rule shall remain in effect longer than one hundred and twenty days after the date of its adoption.

FILING AND PUBLISHING OF RULES

SEC. 7. (a) Each agency, within thirty days after the effective date of this Act, shall file with the Commissioners a certified copy of all of its rules in force on such effective date.

(b) The Commissioners shall keep a permanent register open to public inspection of all rules.

(c) Except in the case of emergency rules, each rule adopted after the effective date of this Act by the Commissioners, or by any agency, shall be filed in the office of the Commissioners. No such rule shall become effective until after its publication in the District of Columbia Register, nor shall such rule become effective if it is required by law, other than this Act, to be otherwise published, until such rule is also published as required in such law.

COMPILATION OF RULES

SEC. 8. (a) As soon as practicable after the effective date of this Act, the Commissioners shall have compiled, indexed, and published in the District of Columbia Register all rules adopted by the Commissioners and each agency and in effect at the time of such compilation. Such compilations shall be promptly supplemented or revised as may be necessary to reflect new rules and changes in rules. At least once every five years the Commissioners shall publish in the District of Columbia Register a complete and accurate compilation of all rules in effect on the date of publication.

(b) Compilations shall be made available to the public at a price fixed by the Commissioners.

(c) The Commissioners must publish the first compilation required by subsection (a) of this section within one year after the effective date of this Act and no rule adopted by the Commissioners or by any agency before the date of such first publication which has not been filed and published in accordance with this Act and which is not set forth in such compilation shall be in effect after one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

DECLARATORY ORDERS

SEC. 9. On petition of any interested person, the Commissioners or an agency, within their discretion, may issue a declaratory order with respect to the applicability of any rule or statute enforceable by them or by it, to terminate a controversy (other than a contested case) or to remove uncertainty. A declaratory order, as provided in this section, shall be binding between the Commissioners and the agency, as the case may be, and the petitioner on the state of facts alleged and established, unless such order is altered or set aside by a court. A declaratory order is subject to review in the manner provided in this Act for the review of orders and decisions in contested cases, except that the refusal of the Commissioners or of an agency to issue a declaratory order shall not be subject to review. The Commissioners and each agency shall prescribe by rule the form for such petitions and the procedure for their submission, consideration, and disposition.

CONTESTED CASES

SEC. 10. (a) In any contested case, all parties thereto shall be given reasonable notice of the afforded hearing by the Commissioners or the agency, as the case may be. The notice shall state the time, place, and issues involved, but if, by reason of the nature of the proceeding, the Commissioners or the agency determine that the issues cannot be fully stated in advance of the hearing, or if subsequent amendment of the issues is necessary, they shall be fully stated as soon as practicable, and opportunity shall be afforded all parties to present evidence and argument with respect thereto. Unless otherwise required by law, other than this Act, any contested case may be disposed of by stipulation, agreed settlement, consent order, or default.

(b) In contested cases, except as may otherwise be provided by law, other than this Act, the proponent of a rule or order shall have the burden of proof. Any oral and any documentary evidence may be received, but the Commissioners and every agency shall exclude irrelevant, immaterial, and unduly repetitious evidence. Every party shall have the right to present in person or by counsel his case or defense by oral and documentary evidence, to submit rebuttal evidence, and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts. Where any decision of the Commissioners or any agency in a contested case rests on official notice of a material fact not appearing in the evidence in the record, any party to such case shall on timely request be afforded an opportunity to show the contrary.

(c) The Commissioners or the agency shall maintain an official record in each contested case, to include testimony and exhibits, but it shall not be necessary to make any transcription unless a copy of such record is timely requested by any party to such case, or transcription is required by law, other than this Act. The testimony and exhibits, together with all papers and requests filed in the proceeding, and all material facts not appearing in the evidence but with respect to which official notice is taken, shall constitute the exclusive record for order or decision. No sanction shall be imposed or rule or order or decision be issued except upon consideration of such exclusive record, or such lesser portions thereof as may be agreed upon by all the parties to such case. The cost incidental to the preparation of a copv or copies of a record or portion thereof shall be borne equally by all parties requesting the copy or copies.

(d) Whenever in a contested case a majority of those who are to render the final order or decision did not personally hear the evidence, no order or decision adverse to a party to the case (other than the Commissioners or an agency) shall be made until a proposed order or decision, including findings of fact and conclusions of law, has been served upon the parties and an opportunity has been afforded to each party adversely affected to file exceptions and present argument to a majority of those who are to render the order or decision, who, in such case, shall personally consider such portions of the exclusive record, as provided in subsection (c) of this section, as may be designated by any party.

(e) Every decision and order adverse to a party to the case, rendered by the Commissioners or an agency in a contested case, shall be in writing and shall be accompanied by findings of fact and conclusions of law. The findings of fact shall consist of a concise statement of the conclusions upon each contested issue of fact. Findings of fact and conclusions of law shall be supported by and in accordance with the reliable, probative, and substantial evidence. A copy of the decision and order and accompanying findings and conclusions shall be given by the Commissioners or the agency, as the case may be, to each party or to his attorney of record.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 11. Any person suffering a legal wrong, or adversely affected or aggrieved, by an order or decision of the Commissioners or an agency in a contested case, is entitled to a judicial review thereof in accordance with this Act upon filing in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals a written petition for review, except that orders and decisions of the Board of Zoning Adjustment, Commission of Mental Health, Public Utilities Commission, Redevelopment Land Agency, and the Zoning Commission shall be subject to judicial review in those courts which review the orders and decisions of those agencies on the day before the date of enactment of this Act but such judicial review shall be in accordance with this Act. If the jurisdiction of the Commissioners or an agency is challenged at any time in any proceeding and the Commissioners or the agency, as the case may be, take jurisdiction, the person challenging jurisdiction shall be entitled to an immediate judicial review of that action, unless the court shall otherwise hold. The reviewing court may by rule prescribe the forms and contents of the petition and, subject to this Act, regulate generally all matters relating to proceedings on such appeals. A petition for review shall be filed in such court within such time as such court may by rule prescribe and a copy of such petition shall forthwith be served by mail by the clerk of the court upon the Commissioners or upon the agency, as the case may be. Within such time as may be fixed by rule of the court the Commissioners or such agency shall certify and file in the court the exclusive record for decision and any supplementary proceedings, and the clerk of the court shall immediately notify the petitioner of the filing thereof. Upon the filing of a petition for review, the court shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding, and shall have power to affirm, modify, or set aside the order or decision complained of, in whole or in part, and, if need be, to remand the case for further proceedings, as justice may require. Filing of a petition for review shall not in itself stay enforcement of the order or decision of the Commissioners or the agency, as the case may be. The Commissioners or the agency may grant, or the reviewing court may order, a stay upon appropriate terms. The court shall hear and determine all appeals upon the exclusive record for decision before the Commissioners or the agency. The review of all administrative orders and decisions by the court shall be limited to such issues of law or fact as are subject to review on appeal under applicable statutory law, other than this Act. In all other cases the review by the court of administrative orders and decisions shall be in accordance with the rules of law which define the scope and limitations of review of administrative proceedings. Such rules shall include, but not be limited to, the power of the court—

(1) so far as necessary to decision and where presented, to decide all relevant questions of law, to interpret constitutional and statutory provisions, and to determine the meaning or applicability of the terms of any action;

(2) to compel agency action unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed; and

(3) to hold unlawful and set aside any action or findings and conclusions found to be (A) arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion or otherwise not in accordance with law; (B) contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity; (C) in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations or short of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations or short of statutory rights; (D) without observance of procedure required by law, including any applicable procedure provided by this Act; or (E) unsupported by substantial evidence in the record of the proceedings before the court.

In reviewing administrative orders and decisions, the court shall review such portions of the exclusive record as may be designated by any party. The court may invoke the rule of prejudicial error. Any party aggrieved by any judgment of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals under this Act may seek a review thereof by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in accordance with section 8 of the Act entitled "An Act to consolidate the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, to be known as 'The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia', to create 'The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia', and for other purposes", approved April 1, 1942 (D.C. Code, sec. 11–773).

REPEALS

SEC. 12. Subsections (e) and (f) of section 7 of the Act entitled "An Act to consolidate the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, to be known as 'The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia', to create 'The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia', and for other purposes", approved April 1, 1942 (D.C. Code, sec. 11–772), are hereby repealed. This section shall take effect one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 9, section 8(a), strike out the last sentence.

Page 13, immediately after line 19, insert the following new subsection:

"(f) Unless required for the disposition of ex parte matters authorized by law, members or employees of an agency responsible for rendering a decision in the contested case, or for making findings of fact and conclusions of law therein, shall not communicate, directly or indirectly, in connection with any issue of fact, with any person or party, nor, in connection with any issue of law, with any party or his representative, except upon notice and opportunity for all parties to participate. However, the Commissioners may communicate with each other, and an agency member may communicate with other members of the agency and both Commissioners, and members of an agency may have the aid and advice of one or more personal assistants."

Page 14, line 3, strike out "Utilities" and insert in lieu thereof "Service".

Page 17, strike out "(D.C. Code, sec. 11–773)" and insert in lieu thereof "(56 Stat. 196. D.C. Code, sec. 11–321; sec. 17–101, 102, 103, 104)".

Page 17, strike out section 12, lines 7 through 15 inclusive.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, Subcommittee No. 4 of which I am chairman, devoted considerable attention to H.R. 7067, and determined that the legislation embodied therein is much needed in the District of Columbia.

For the information of the Members, I should like to give some of the background of and precedents for this legislation, as well as offer a section-by-section analysis of H.R. 7067 as reported:

BACKGROUND

Since 1956 legislation similar to the reported bill has been introduced, considered, and modified in an effort to prescribe definite administrative procedures for the District of Columbia government.

The adoption by the Congress in 1946 of the Federal Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237), covering the Federal Administrative agencies, set the pattern for many of the States to follow. Thus far, the following 19 States have adopted a State Administrative Procedure Act, or portions thereof; guaranteeing minimum standards of fair administrative procedure:

Arkansas.
California.
Georgia.
Illinois.
Indiana.
Maine.
Maryland.
Massachusetts.
Michigan.
Missouri.
North Carolina.
North Dakota.
Ohio.
Oklahoma.
Pennsylvania.
Rhode Island.
West Virginia.
Wisconsin.
Virginia.

The reported bill is based upon the model act for administrative procedures in the States, approved by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. However, it has been modified and adjusted by the Administrative Law Committee of the District of Columbia Bar Association, and by subcommittees of your committee, to embrace the functions of the District, which operates sometimes as a State, sometimes as a city, sometimes as both. Obviously, all the provisions of the usual model State Administrative Procedure Act may not successfully be applied literally to the varied operations of the many different administrative agencies in the District of Columbia. Hence, the model act has been revised in many respects to meet local conditions, so the reported bill is well developed and provides a comprehensive District of Columbia Administrative Procedure Act.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 7067

SCOPE OF THE STATUTE

Section 2 provides that the act shall supplement other provisions of law relative to procedures to be observed by the agencies covered, but provides that the act supersedes any such law or procedure if there is a conflict.

DEFINITIONS

Section 3 defines the statutory terms, such as "party," "contested case," "independent agency," "licensing," and "sanction." The definition of "contested case" has been drafted so as to exclude administrative functions traditionally nonsusceptible to application of the process of adjudication, such as inspections, tests, elections, etc., and where generally no hearing is expressly or implicitly required by any other law.

PROCEDURAL RULES

Section 4 provides for the establishment of rules of procedure, including, but not limited to, rules of practice before each agency and allows for supplementing such rules by descriptive statements for the assistance of interested persons.

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION

Section 5 provides that the Commissioners shall publish the District of Columbia Register at regular intervals in which rules of the agencies of the District of Columbia are to be published; provides that the courts are to take judicial notice of such published rules; and provides that other matters of public interest, codifications of rules, notice of public hearings, etc., are to be published in the District of Columbia Register.

PUBLIC NOTICE AND PARTICIPATION IN RULEMAKING

Section 6 requires public notice prior to the adoption of rules or proposed rule changes to be listed in the District of Columbia Register, so as to afford interested parties the opportunity to submit their views. In the case of an emergency requiring immediate adoption of a rule, then the rule shall be valid without notice if, thereafter, all the provisions of the act are met within 120 days of its adoption.

FILING AND PUBLISHING RULES

Section 7 provides that within 30 days of the effective date of the act, each agency shall file a certified copy of its rules with the Commissioners. No rule, except an emergency rule as referred to in section 7(c) of the act, adopted after the effective date of the act shall become effective until after its publication in the District of Columbia Register.

COMPILATION OF RULES

Section 8 provides that rules in effect at the date of the enactment of this act shall be compiled, indexed, and published in the District of Columbia Register, together with all those meanwhile adopted and in effect at such time of compilation. It is further provided that compilations shall be supplemented or revised to reflect new rules or changes in rules. Your committee believes that for the purpose of compilation, a continuing publication in looseleaf form will suffice. Hence the amendment to this section striking out the requirement of publication every 5 years in the Register.

DECLARATORY ORDERS

Section 9 provides that the Commissioners or an agency may issue, upon the petition of an interested person, a declaratory ruling deemed necessary to terminate a controversy or remove uncertainty, and review of such a ruling may be pursued in the same manner prescribed for decisions in contested cases. The refusal to issue a declaratory order, however, shall not be subject to review.

CONTESTED CASES

Section 10 provides that reasonable notice of hearings be given in any contested case, as defined in section 2(8) of the bill; that the proponent of a rule or order shall have the burden of proof; that before any final decision the record shall be read by a majority of those rendering decisions, and that any adverse decision shall state findings of fact and conclusions of law. Findings of fact and law shall be supported by and be in accordance with reliable, probative, and substantial evidence. Material facts not appearing in the evidence but with respect to which the agency has taken notice must be included in the record serving as the basis for the order or decision.

Section 11 states that any person adversely affected or aggrieved by an order may petition for review and prescribes the powers of review with guidance for their exercise by the District of Columbia Court of Appeals and, in a few specified instances, by the U.S. Court for the District of Columbia. In general, the standards of judicial review set forth in section 11 are identical with those found in the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946, and as developed by controlling decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and of the lower Federal courts.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, since 1956 legislation similar to the reported bill has been introduced, considered, and modified in an effort to prescribe definite administrative procedures for the District of Columbia government.

The adoption by the Congress in 1946 of the Federal Administrative Procedure Act—60 Stat. 237—covering the Federal administrative agencies, set the pattern for many of the States to follow. Thus far, the following 19 States have adopted a State Administrative Procedure Act, or portions thereof; guaranteeing minimum standards of fair administrative procedure: Arkansas, California, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Virginia.

The reported bill is based upon the model act for administrative procedures in the State, approved by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. However, it has been modified and adjusted by the Administrative Law Committee of the District of Columbia Bar Association, and by subcommittees of your committee, to embrace the functions of the District, which operates sometimes as a State, sometimes as a city, sometimes as both. Obviously, all the provisions of the usual model State Administrative Procedure Act may not successfully be applied literally to the varied operations of the many different administrative agencies in the District of Columbia. Hence, the model act has been revised in many respects to meet local conditions, so the reported bill is well developed and provides a comprehensive District of Columbia Administrative Procedure Act.

CONCLUSION

The need for an Administrative Procedure Act for the District of Columbia to reform administrative process has been established to the satisfaction of your committee.

The District must achieve uniformity of administrative rules and rulemaking procedures and insist on a common, published repository of such rules, so that the person affected by them, as well as his attorney, may learn at least of their existence.

The time for enactment of such a law as H.R. 7067 is now.

The arguments advanced in opposition to the bill are the same arguments which were advanced by the Federal administrative agencies in opposition to the enactment of the Federal Administrative Procedure Act.

Only the Congress can resolve the issue and by a bill such as H.R. 7067 guarantee in the day-to-day operations of an administrative agency those procedures due any litigant.

Your committee believes the reported bill will improve orderly communications between the public at large and the agencies of the District of Columbia government. It would formalize needed procedures and end the informal, across-the-counter type of actions which have characterized too many decisions of some agencies of the District and resulted in too many complaints to and hearings by your committee in years past.

The passage of this bill, your committee believes, should increase the confidence of the public in the operations of administrative agencies of the District of Columbia and thereby add to administrative efficiency, to the benefit of all concerned. The confidence of the public and the bar can only be captured and retained if there are provided definite, objective, statutory standards of fair administrative procedure to guide, and if necessary to control the administrative powers of rulemaking and adjudication, and to assure a full right to judicial review when such powers have been abused or exercised in an unlawful manner.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina who it is that wants this bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. The bar association has sent this bill here year after year during the past 10 years in an effort to get some orderly procedure in the courts. The Commissioners have never disapproved the bill but they keep waiting for more information. So we decided to go ahead and give the Congress an opportunity to vote on this bill.

There are 18 or 19 States already which have this type of procedure.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I note in the hearings the Commissioners of the District of Columbia say there is no public demand or need for this act. It is stated in the report that it is the opinion of the Commissioners that H.R. 7067 would impede rather than improve the orderly communications between the public at large and the District of Columbia and so on and so forth.

I do not understand, with the Commissioners being opposed to this bill, why it should be here at all.

Mr. McMILLAN. The district bar association drew up the bill and representatives of that association appeared before the committee during hearings.

It seems to me that there is no reason why a bill of this nature should not be enacted.

Mr. GROSS. It is going to result in increased costs, is it not?

Mr. McMILLAN. There will be no increased costs insofar as I can ascertain.

Mr. GROSS. But there is no estimate of the cost in the hearings.

Mr. McMILLAN. No estimate of any increased cost.

Mr. GROSS. Sir?

Mr. McMILLAN. No estimate of any increased cost for this type procedure.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOWDY. I chaired the subcommittee which held the hearings on this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I can scarcely hear the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOWDY. There could possibly be a small additional cost involved but it will not be appreciable. We struck from the bill a provision contained therein which would have cost some additional amount of money but after that amendment there should not be any appreciable amount of cost.

The necessity for this bill, of course, is that the Commissioners say they have the authority and probably they do, to do what the bill proposes to do, but for 10 years they have failed and refused to take such action to get these rules and regulations for the governing of the various agencies in the District of Columbia into one place where a lawyer or a citizen can find the rules and regulations that will govern when he has a contest with one of the agencies involved.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand there is an estimate of $90,000 annual cost that has been taken out of the bill by virtue of an amendment?

Mr. DOWDY. The big cost that would have been called for in this would have been a republication in the District of Columbia Register every 5 years of the entire rules and regulations of the District of Columbia for some 93 agencies. We struck that and provided in the report they should have a loose-leaf book containing the rules and regulations so when they change a rule or a regulation they would change only a page.

Mr. GROSS. I have an estimate of $90,000 cost plus, for office equipment, plus other equipment, and so forth. Does the gentleman say that these figures are in error?

Mr. DOWDY. I feel they are.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman used "appreciable cost" a while ago. What does my friend from Texas mean by "appreciable cost"?

Mr. DOWDY. I cannot see where there should be any additional cost. My answer is that the Commissioners at the present time have an office where you can go and they will dig out the regulations that will apply to any given agency. This bill would require them to codify and get those rules and regulations in one place in the same office. They already have that office, and there is no reason for any additional cost.

Mr. GROSS. There may not be any reason, but I would like to have assurance from someone, since this apparently is a lawyer's bill unwanted by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, I would like to have assurance from someone that it is not going to result in any costs now or in the future.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. The figures the gentleman is referring to are based on the fact the bill contained a provision requiring the publication in full of all the rules and regulations every 5 years. That has been eliminated from the bill. There will be no appreciable additional cost in operation. I think the gentleman should understand what we are trying to do is to establish a uniform procedure. First, it will require a compilation and publication of all the rules that apply to these cases so that everybody will know what they are. There are 93 administrative agencies in the District of Columbia today that issue these rules and regulations. There is no one place where you can find them. This bill intends to put those rules and regulations in one place.

The second major purpose of the bill is to provide an opportunity to all persons in contested cases to get a full and complete hearing, and the third, and very important purpose of the bill, is to provide for a uniform manner of reviewing by the courts of what these agencies may determine, with the exception of a few instances where there is no court review provided for.

Mr. GROSS. The Commissioners in stating their opposition say they already have the authority, page 85 of the report:

> The Commissioners are therefore of the opinion that H.R. 7067 should not be enacted because (1) the Commissioners now have authority under Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952 to carry out the objectives in the bill—

And so forth.

Will someone tell me why the Commissioners are opposed to this bill?

Mr. MULTER. Probably because they do not want to exercise the authority that they have, and this bill will say "you have the authority, and we expect you to exercise it."

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman says "probably."

Mr. MULTER. I cannot read their minds, but I assure you this is a good bill in spite of their opposition.

Mr. GROSS. In stating that this is a good bill, and I certainly respect the gentleman's judgment, I still would like to know why the Commissioners are opposed to it?

Mr. MULTER. May I say, the members of the local bar association who are practicing before these agencies and who are practicing in the local courts, I think are better judges as to whether or not this will make for better administration of the law in the District of Columbia than the Commissioners who are opposed to this bill.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] for the very careful attention he has given to this legislation as he does to all legislation. The gentleman has brought up some interesting questions in connection with this legislation. But I can say, on the basis of personal experience, I feel this bill is supported by the bar of the District of Columbia on the basis of its merit. I do not believe there is going to be a substantial cost. I think the reason the District Commissioners are opposed to it is because they did not feel in their minds that there was an established need for minimum standards of administrative procedures. But on the other hand, the lawyers who have to deal with the problem and who are practicing law before the administrative agencies of the District do feel the need. They feel it daily and they feel it is a need that must be met today. Therefore, they are supporting this kind of legislation.

Second, of course, the District Commissioners feel if anything is to be done they should do it. They have the rulemaking power as delegated to them by the Congress and it lies within their judgment. But the fact of the matter is that it has not been done to the degree that members of the bar in the District of Columbia feel is absolutely necessary.

I would refer to the statement, virtually a joint statement, made by Mr. Paul F. McArdle, president of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia, and Alfred L. Scanlan and Manual J. Davis, who are members of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia who are familiar with this subject. This is not any new or novel idea. In the committee report on page 5, we have the number of States and the names of the States which have substantially similar laws. There ought to be some changes made in the model act which was proposed by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and those changes are made necessary by the unique situation of the District of Columbia which is a city-State, so to speak, and to which all of the apparatus of the normal nationwide model act will not apply.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman agree with the gentleman across the aisle that this will not blossom out into a bill of expense for the District of Columbia?

Mr. MATHIAS. That has not been the experience in the States that have adopted the model act and I feel confident that it will not be so in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide an Administrative Procedure Act for the District of Columbia, covering the more than 93 administrative governmental agencies operating in the District, and the laws which those agencies administer.

The bill makes mandatory the establishment by the District of Columbia Commissioners, for themselves and for all of their subordinate agencies, rules governing the formal and informal procedures prescribed or authorized by the bill, and likewise requires that each independent agency of the District establish such rules for itself.

It is designed to meet the long-admitted need in the District of Columbia for the reform of administrative process and the achieving of uniformity of administrative rules and rulemaking procedures—paralleling the adoption by the Congress of the Federal Administrative Procedure Act covering the Federal administrative agencies.

The reported legislation is the result of many years of careful work by a number of lawyers in your committee and in the District of Columbia. It has the endorsement of the District of Columbia Bar Association, as well as of the State Division of the Administrative Law Section of the American Bar Association.

Full hearing was accorded interested parties by Subcommittee No. 4 on July 6, 1965.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

In essence, the bill has three primary features.

First, it provides for the compilation and publication in the District of Columbia Register of all rules and regulations of the administrative agencies of the District of Columbia which are currently in effect. In addition, it would require that prior to the adoption of any rule, or the amendment or repeal of any rule, a notice of such intended action must be published in the District of Columbia Register. The bill thus would afford interested persons the opportunity to submit data or facts on proposed rules or changes in administrative rules before final action is taken by the agency.

Your committee was advised that 14 of the 22 boards and commissions under the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia Department of Occupations and Professions alone had no procedural rules at all. Among rules that are published, it is claimed that many contain "little or no exposition of one's rights, few procedural details, inadequate references to the availability and types of hearings, no hint as to appellate review, vague or incomplete statements as to applicable standards, and no references to statutory citations."

The second major purpose of the bill is to provide the opportunity of a hearing for all parties in "contested cases," as specifically defined in the proposed bill, and to require that a transcript of the record be kept in all such cases. In addition, the bill would minimize the possibilities of an agency relying on information dehors the record in reaching a decision in a contested case. While the bill is not as explicit as the Federal Administrative Procedure Act in curtailing opportunities for ex parte consultations, it should suffice until trial and error shows that it does not go far enough.

Under the present procedure within the Department of Inspections and Licenses, for example, when a hearing is requested by a licensee or an applicant for a license, the Department transmits the record to the Board of Appeals and Review, but does not forward to the Board, "confidential intradepartmental or interdepartmental correspondence or documents or information of a confidential nature." These it transmits, instead, separately to the Assistant Corporation Counsel who represents the Department of Inspections and Licenses in the particular case and on whose advice the Board most surely will heavily rely.

In recent years, the press has reported that there have been a number of complaints made by applicants who were denied, or had revoked, licenses as pawnbrokers, cabdrivers, automobile salesmen, and practical nurses, to mention just a few, on the grounds that the particular licensing board or commission concerned based their denial or revocation on evidence not found in the record before the agency. Under H.R. 7067, this could not be done.

Similarly, recent complaints have been voiced that the Board of Zoning Adjustment and the Zoning Commission have, on occasion, based their decisions on some hidden reservoirs of alleged facts or knowledge not set out or referred to in the record of the proceedings before the agency.

The third important general purpose of the bill is to provide for a uniform means, whereby the final determination of any agency, other than certain rules or decisions expressly excepted by other provisions of the act, may be reviewed in court in accordance with traditional standards, as enunciated in the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and the other Federal courts of appeal, controlling judicial review of administrative action.

Although the judicial review of the decisions of many agencies of the District of Columbia government now is provided for or at least permitted, it is not systematized, and in other instances no clearly defined avenue or channel of judicial review of administrative action is established. Certainly, the Congress will agree that unless parties and litigants have judicial recourse they are, in practical effect, at the mercy of the administrative agencies to whom they must come in seeking vindication or important personal and property rights.

For example, in a zoning decision of some interest, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia ruled that the denial of a petition to rezone must be accompanied by findings of fact justifying the reversal, *Donovan* v. *Clark* (222 F. Supp. 634 (D.C., 1963)). The Donovan decision thus reaffirmed and applied an elemental principle of fair administrative procedure so far as appeals from decisions of the Zoning Commission to the district court are concerned. However, because of the variety of review channels that exist for appeals from actions of the many various boards and agencies of the District of Columbia, there is no insurance, in the absence of an overall statutory requirement, that the principle that requires administrative findings to accompany administrative decisions will be protected in all future cases.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia concede the need for the reform of the administrative process in the District. However, they do not consider that the representations of the bar association and other groups, complaining of existing administrative practices and procedures, establish a public demand or need for an Administrative Procedure Act for the District. Through the Corporation Counsel's Office, they urge that such reforms as are needed can be achieved by rules or orders of the Commissioners, or by the agencies themselves, thus obviating the need for legislation.

Admittedly, some of the conditions complained of have been remedied, in part, by the issuance of rules of procedure in some instances where none existed before.

But while there has been improvement in rulemaking and the promulgation thereof, during the past 10 years of advocacy of reforms in District of Columbia administrative procedures, there has been no improvement in, and the Commissioners are powerless to provide. uniform judicial review, or judicial review of and appeals from quasi-judicial agencies. For example, decisions of the District of Columbia Board of Appeals and Review, to which administrative appeals lie from the various constituent agencies within the District of Columbia

Department of Licenses and Inspections, must be brought to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. On the other hand, within the District Department of Occupations and Professions there are a significant number of constituent boards, commissions, and committees from whose rulings appeals lie to several different courts and, in at least one case, must be brought to the Board of Commissioners themselves, whose action purports to be final (2 D.C. Code, sec. 1305 (1961)). We have listed the specific of this statutory maze in the footnote—review by Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, final review by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit: Board of Barber Examiners for the District of Columbia, section 2–1110; Commission on Licensure To Practice the Healing Art in the District of Columbia, section 2–129; Physical Therapists' Examining Board, section 2–463; Practical Nurses' Examining Board, section 2–434. Revocation by District Court for the District of Columbia upon motion of the Board: Board of Dental Examiners, sections 2–311, 2–312; Board of Podiatry Examiners, sections 2–701, 2–708; Commission on Licensure To Practice the Healing Art in the District of Columbia, section 2–213; Nurses' Examining Board, section 2–407. Review by Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit: Board of Examiners and Registrars of Architects, section 2–1028. Appeal from revocation by Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia: Board of Examiners of Veterinary Medicine, section 2–810. Review by Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia: Board of Pharmacy, section 2–606. Appeal to the Board of Commissioners only and purporting to be final: District of Columbia, Board of Cosmetology, section 2–1305. Review by District Court for the District of Columbia: District of Columbia Board of Registration of Professional Engineers, section 2–1809; Real Estate Commission, section 45–1409.

Only Congress, through a bill such as H.R. 7067, can unravel such complexity and simplify the review procedures in question.

INCORPORATING THE YOUTH COUNCILS ON CIVIC AFFAIRS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield at this time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy] to call up a bill.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 3329) to incorporate the Youth Councils on Civic Affairs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 3329

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that Dr. Eleanor Weiss Flick, of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Herbert J. Johnson, Junior, of Erie, Pennsylvania; Honorable John E. Santora, of Jacksonville, Florida; Frederic Sondern, Junior, of Cornwall Bridge, Connecticut; Frederick W. Thoben, of New York, New York; Honorable Ronald H. Tills, of Hamburg, New York; and their successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate of the District of Columbia, where its legal domicile shall be, by the name of the Youth Councils on Civic Affairs (hereinafter referred to as the corporation), and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained.

Sec. 2. A majority of the persons named in section 1 of this title are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the adoption of a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with this chapter, and the doing of such other acts (including the selection of officers and employees in accordance with such constitution and bylaws) as may be necessary for such purpose.

Sec. 3. The purposes of the corporation shall be: To promote an interest, study, and participation in all civic matters affecting the youth of America, emphasizing the American heritage and the responsibilities of young people to their community; to offer an organization through which the youth of a community may benefit both themselves and their community through an exchange of mutual problems and programs; to initiate programs and projects to afford the youth of a community an opportunity to meet and effectively deal with the problems of school dropouts, youth employment, vocational guidance, youth offenders, and other youth problems and establish a means of communication between the youth and adults of the community; and to provide youth the opportunity to practice democracy to better prepare for the responsibilities of adult citizenship.

Sec. 4. The corporation shall have power—

(1) to have succession by its corporate name;

(2) to sue and be sued, complain, and defend, in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(3) to adopt, use, and alter a corporate seal;

(4) to choose such officers, managers, agents, and employees as the business of the corporation may require;

(5) to adopt, amend, and alter a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or any State in which the corporation is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs;

(6) to admit to membership and charter, as its constitution and bylaws may provide, local organizations whose purposes are consistent with those of the corporation;

(7) to contract and be contracted with;

(8) to take by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest from any private corporation, association, partnership, firm, or individual and to hold any property, real, personal, or mixed necessary or convenient for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership property by, a corporation operating in such State;

(9) to transfer, convey, lease, sublease, encumber, and otherwise alienate real, personal, or mixed property;

(10) to borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, deed of trust, pledge, or otherwise, subject in every case to all applicable provisions of Federal and State laws;

(11) to publish a magazine and other publications;

(12) to do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry out the objects and purposes of the corporation.

Sec. 5. (a) The principal office of the corporation shall be located in Jacksonville, Florida, or in such other place as may be later determined by the board of directors, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place, but may be conducted throughout the various States, territories, and possessions of the United States.

(b) The corporation shall have in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation; and notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

Sec. 6. (a) Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights, privileges, and designation of classes of members shall, except as provided in this chapter, be determined as the constitution and bylaws of the corporation may provide. Each member of the corporation shall have the right to one vote on each matter submitted to a vote at all meetings of the members of the corporation.

(b) No organization which limits its membership on the basis of race or creed shall be eligible for membership in this corporation. Each organization which is a member of the corporation as provided in the constitution and bylaws thereof shall be entitled to all the benefits of incorporation under this chapter, but such benefits shall cease immediately either upon its resignation from the corporation, or in the event that its membership in the corporation is canceled or otherwise terminated by the board of directors, as provided in the constitution or bylaws of the corporation.

Sec. 7. (a) Upon the enactment of this chapter, the membership of the initial board of directors of the corporation shall consist of those named in section 1 of this title who shall serve until their successors are elected and have qualified.

(b) Thereafter the board of directors of the corporation shall consist of such number as may be prescribed in the constitution of the corporation, and the members of such board shall be selected in such manner (including the filling of vacancies), and shall serve for such terms, as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

(c) The board of directors shall be the managing body of the corporation and shall have such powers, duties, and responsibilities as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

Sec. 8. (a) The officers of the corporation shall be a president, one or more vice presidents (as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation), an executive director, a secretary, a treasurer, and such other officers or assistant officers as the board of directors may from time to time determine.

(b) The officers of the corporation shall be elected in such manner and for such terms and with such duties as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

Sec. 9. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any of its members, directors, or officers as such, or be distributable to any of them during the life of the corporation or upon its dissolution or final liquidation. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the payment of compensation to officers of the corporation in amounts approved by the board of directors of the corporation.

(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its officers, directors, or employees. Any director who votes for or assents to the making of a loan to an officer, director, or employee of the corporation and any officer who participates in the making of such loan, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

Sec. 10. The corporation, and its officers and directors as such, shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for public office.

SEC. 11. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

SEC. 12. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock or to declare or pay any dividends.

SEC. 13. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of the proceedings of its board of directors, and committees having any authority under the board of directors; and it shall also keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member entitled to vote, or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose at any reasonable time.

SEC. 14. (a) The financial transactions shall be audited annually by an independent certified public accountant in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by the depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians, shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the Congress not later than six (6) months following the close of each year for which the audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a verification by the person or persons conducting the audit of statements of (1) assets and liabilities, (2) capital and surplus or deficit, (3) surplus or deficit analysis, (4) income and expense, and (5) sources and application of funds. Such report shall not be printed as a public document.

SEC. 15. The corporation, and its duly authorized chapters or association of chapters, shall have the sole and exclusive right to use the name of Youth Council on Civic Affairs, and the initials "YCCA" as representing a youth organization and such seals, emblems, and badges as the corporation may lawfully adopt.

SEC. 16. Upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, after discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets, if any, of the corporation shall be distributed in accordance with the determination of the board of directors of the corporation and in compliance with the constitution and bylaws of the corporation and all Federal and State laws applicable thereto.

SEC. 17. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this chapter is expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 4, line 3, strike "property" and insert in lieu thereof "of property".

Page 4, strike all of lines 21 through 24, and on page 5, strike all of lines 1 and 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) The corporation shall have in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept service of process, notice, or demand for the corporation, and service of such process, notice, or demand required or permitted by law to be served upon the corporation may be served upon such agent. The corporation shall file with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent a statement designating the initial and each successor registered agent of the corporation immediately following any such designation."

Page 5, line 20, strike "chapter" and insert in lieu thereof "Act".

Page 9 following line 15, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 17. As used in this Act the word 'State' includes the District of Columbia."

Renumber SEC. 17 as SEC. 18.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to grant incorporation in the District of Columbia to the Youth Councils on Civic Affairs, whose legal domicile shall be in the District of Columbia.

The bill prescribes the names of the incorporators, who shall constitute the initial board of directors, and also sets forth the purposes, powers, procedures, and membership requirements of the corporation, as well as various other details relating to its officers and directors.

While the bill provides that the principal office of this corporation shall be in Jacksonville, Fla., or in such other place as may be later determined by the board of directors, it is stipulated also that it shall have at all times a designated agent in the District of Columbia, authorized to accept service of process for the corporation.

Your committee is informed that the purpose of this proposed corporation shall be to promote interest, study, and participation in all civic matters affecting the youth of America, emphasizing the American heritage and the responsibilities of young people to their communities; to offer an organization through which young people may benefit both themselves and their communities through an exchange of mutual problems and programs; to initiate programs and projects to afford the youth of a community an opportunity to meet and deal effectively with such problems as school dropouts, youth employment, vocational guidance, youth offenders, and the like, and to establish means of communication between the youth and adults of the community; and to provide youth the opportunity to practice democracy so as to prepare more effectively for the responsibilities of adult citizenship and leadership.

This organization had its origin in Jacksonville, Fla., in 1962. Like many other American cities, Jacksonville at that time was experiencing a rising tide of school dropouts, unemployed vagrant youth, and increasing acts of vandalism by young people. There was a definite tendency on the part of the general public, with the exception of a few "crusaders," to ignore the problems of school dropouts and out-of-work youth, with the inevitable consequences of increasing juvenile offenses such as intoxication and petty larceny. This situation led to the foundation in Jacksonville of a somewhat unique manner of dealing with youthful offenders. This is known today as the youth jury system, whereby young people who have gotten into trouble must explain their action before their peers—a panel of young people like themselves. This youth jury serves in an advisory capacity to the judge of the Jacksonville municipal court, who is quoted as stating that this jury has been the sole reason for a decrease of more than 50 percent in the number of youths appearing on the docket of his court. The effectiveness of this system seems to lie in the fact that this jury has devised new types of sentences for offenders convicted in the court, such as streetsweeping, work in local charity hospitals, essays, work in the city's parks, and other similar sentences.

As a consequence of its success in Jacksonville, this youth jury program has been adopted in other cities throughout the country.

Through the impetus of this and other successful youth programs, the Youth Councils on Civic Affairs evolved and was incorporated under Florida statute in March 1963.

Since this time, the organization has grown in scope, and in seeking a Federal charter the Youth Councils on Civic Affairs proposes to become a national "clearinghouse" to encourage the formation of local youth councils in communities throughout the country and to help existing youth councils in all possible ways. Your committee is informed, however, that this organization does not propose to dictate in any way—to force establishment of youth groups, or to establish rules and regulations other than those which may be necessary.

It is the view of your committee that the objectives sought to be achieved through this incorporation are praiseworthy and should be encouraged through the enactment of this bill.

The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia expressed their approval of the purposes of this bill, but recommended several amendments, all of which have been incorporated into the bill as reported by your committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, we are constantly confronted with demands by the District of Columbia for more and more money to finance the District of Columbia out of the Federal Treasury. I would like to know whether this bill will cost any additional money?

Mr. DOWDY. No. This is a bill to incorporate a group which is promoting certain patriotic programs. It is purely an incorporation of a group. There is no money cost.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not anticipate that this will take flight and Congress will be asked to appropriate additional money for the District of Columbia?

Mr. DOWDY. Not at all.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, the Youth Councils on Civic Affairs is an organization that was begun in my home district of Jacksonville, Fla., in 1962, by a group of young people interested in bettering themselves and their community by participating in projects and activities of a civic nature. These young people of the Youth Councils on Civic Affairs, put into practice an old but little practiced idea of allowing youth full responsibility to deal with youth problems and opportunities.

These young people met with our local municipal judge, the Honorable John E. Santora, and through this wise jurist's efforts, put into practice a program known as the youth jury. This youth jury sits in the municipal court of Jacksonville, dealing with all teenagers under the age of 21 going before that court. Prior to the youth jury the municipal court either fined the young person or sent him to jail. Since the youth jury concept was established, a young person must meet a panel of his peers and can expect to be sentenced to some type of community labor instead of a fine or imprisonment. As a result, according to Judge Santora, the incidence of teenage crime has dropped in Jacksonville. According to the young people of the Youth Councils on Civic Affairs, there have been only four repeat offenders in almost a 3-year period of time.

The youth council in Jacksonville has undertaken many projects to better their city. Many projects were designed to acquaint, through practice, young people with the American way of life, showing each young person that he has a responsibility to his community, State, and Nation, and that he must be willing to work unceasingly as a citizen in order to preserve our great democracy.

As a result of the work of these young people, the Reader's Digest and 17 other national magazines picked up this story and carried it over the entire United States. Consequently, the youth council immediately began to take shape in over 125 different communities over the country, almost simultaneously. To date, there are almost 700 youth councils in the United States.

Each youth council is designed to benefit the community, to teach young people citizenship responsibility. These youth councils have joined together to form an association to work on a national level to better the opportunities of the young people of our country and to give them a share in the responsibilities of improving the future of their communities and their beloved country. These young people are seeking a congressional charter to establish their organization on a permanent, national basis. It was with great pride and pleasure that I introduced a bill to incorporate the national Youth Councils on Civic Affairs. It has been approved by the committee and I strongly urge each of you to give these young people your support, by favorably approving this measure before the House of Representatives today.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments. The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING TRANSFER OF TITLE TO CERTAIN LAND IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FROM THE UNITED STATES TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 397) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District, and ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES 397

Whereas, pursuant to the applicable provisions of Acts of February 12, 1901 (31 Stat. 767), and February 28, 1903 (32 Stat. 909), hereinafter referred to as the "Union Station Acts", certain streets within the District of Columbia were "completely vacated and abandonded by the public and closed to public use" and "vacated, abandoned, and closed", and the use thereof granted to the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, the terminal company provided for in section 10 of such Act approved February 12, 1901, and the Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington Railroad Company, the latter company having thereafter leased said street area to the Pennsylvania Railroad Company under a nine hundred and ninety-nine-year lease (said companies collectively being hereinafter referred to as the "railroads") for the railroad use prescribed in the Union Station Acts, subject to taxation by the District of Columbia; and

Whereas said grant by the Congress of the use of these street areas was, in part consideration for the dedication by the railroads to the District of Columbia for street and highway purposes of certain land owned in fee simple by the railroads; and

Whereas the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (60 Stat. 790), as amended (title 5, chap. 7, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.) (hereinafter referred to as the "Redevelopment Act"), requires the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency (hereinafter referred to as the "Agency") to carry out duly adopted urban renewal plans, and the duly adopted urban renewal plan for Southwest urban renewal project area C requires acquisition by the Agency of certain properties within and abutting said street areas and redevelopment of said properties for other than railroad use; and

Whereas, for value received, the railroads sold to the Agency the fee simple title to those portions of said properties owned by them in fee simple, as well as all right, title, and interest in the former street, alley, and other United States-owned reservations vested in them by the Union Station Acts; and

Whereas, notwithstanding that sale by the railroads, the United States continues to own bare legal title to said properties covered by the Union Station Acts and. in order for the Agency to exercise its responsibilities and duties under said urban renewal plan and said Redevelopment Act, it is necessary that title to these properties be transferred to, and vested in, the Agency for subsequent sale or lease for private development. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with the provisions of this joint resolution, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, consistent with their approval of the urban renewal plan requiring such action, are authorized and directed on behalf of the United States of America to transfer to the Agency all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following real properties in the District of Columbia:

(a) Part of Maryland Avenue Southwest, of Thirteen-and-a-Half Street Southwest, and of Thirteenth Street Southwest, described as follows:

Beginning for the same at the intersection of the northerly line of Maryland Avenue Southwest, with the east line of Fourteenth Street Southwest, and running thence along the said northerly line of Maryland Avenue in a northeasterly direction 256.25 feet to the west line of Thirteen-and-a-Half Street Southwest;

thence along the said line of Thirteen-and-a-Half Street due north 251.67 feet to the south line of D Street Southwest;

thence due east 70.0 feet to the east line of Thirteen-and-a-Half Street;

thence along the said east line of Thirteen-and-a-Half Street due south 226.50 feet to the northerly line of Maryland Avenue;

thence along the said line of Maryland Avenue in a northeasterly direction 256.50 feet to the west line of Thirteenth Street Southwest;

thence along the said west line of Thirteenth Street due north 140.92 feet to the south line of D Street;

thence due east 110.0 feet to the east line of Thirteenth Street Southwest;

thence along the said line of Thirteenth Street due south 101.67 feet to the northerly line of Maryland Avenue;

thence along the northerly line of Maryland Avenue in a northeasterly direction 255.85 feet;

thence leaving the said line of Maryland Avenue and running along the arc of a circle, the radius of which is 811.27 feet, a central angle of 1 degree 40 minutes 55 seconds, deflecting to the left an arc distance of 23.82 feet;

thence south 70 degrees 00 minutes 00 seconds west 592.28 feet;

thence south 64 degrees 54 minutes 00 seconds west 146.81 feet;

thence along the arc of a circle, the radius of which is 60.0 feet, a central angle of 60 degrees 36 minutes 40 seconds, deflecting to the right an arc distance of 63.47 feet to a point of tangent;

thence south 60 degrees 36 minutes 40 seconds west 184.47 feet;

thence north 51 degrees 37 minutes 00 seconds west 38.0 feet to a point of curve;

thence along the arc of a circle, the radius of which is 47.0 feet, a central angle of 51 degrees 37 minutes, deflecting to the right an arc distance of 42.34 feet to a point of tangent;

thence due north 30.06 feet to the point of beginning, containing 61,786.20 square feet;

all as shown on plat of survey recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in survey book 173, page 458.

(b) Part of Thirteenth Street Southwest, closed, part of Thirteen-and-a-Half Street Southwest, closed, and part of E Street Southwest, closed, as per plat recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in book 140, page 73, described in one piece, as follows:

Beginning for the same at a point in the southerly line of Maryland Avenue Southwest, said point being south 70 degrees 28 minutes 40 seconds west 361.01 feet from the intersection of the west line of Twelfth Street Southwest, with the said southerly line of Maryland Avenue, said point being also the northwesterly corner of original square 299; and running thence along the east line of Thirteenth Street Southwest, closed, due south 409.71 feet;

then due west 95.59 feet;

thence north 71 degrees 17 minutes 15 seconds west 15.21 feet to the west line of said Thirteenth Street closed;

thence along said line due north 79.47 feet to the south line of E Street Southwest, closed, said point being also the northeast corner of original square 270;

thence along the south line of said E Street closed due west 234.62 feet;

thence north 71 degrees 17 minutes 15 seconds west 106.13 feet;

thence north 51 degrees 37 minutes 00 seconds west 90.15 feet to the north line of said E Street closed;

thence along said line due east 94.12 feet to the west line of Thirteen-and-a-Half Street Southwest, closed, said point being also the southeast corner of original square east-of-267;

thence along the west line of said Thirteen-and-a-Half Street closed due north 85.83 feet to the said southerly line of Maryland Avenue;

thence along said line north 70 degrees 28 minutes 40 seconds east 74.27 feet to the east line of said Thirteen-and-a-Half Street closed, said point being also the northwesterly corner of original square 269;

thence along the east line of said Thirteen-and-a-Half Street closed due south 110.65 feet to the north line of said E Street closed;

thence along said line due east 241.66 feet to the west line of said Thirteenth Street closed;

thence along said line due north 196.33 feet to the southerly line of said Maryland Avenue;

thence along said line north 70 degrees 28 minutes 40 seconds east 116.71 feet to the point of beginning, containing 80,206.53 square feet;

all as shown on plat of computation recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in survey book 183, page 81.

(c) Part of Maryland Avenue Southwest, described as follows:

Beginning for the same at the intersection of the west line of Twelfth Street Southwest, with the southerly line of Maryland Avenue Southwest, said point being also the northeasterly corner of original square 299; and running thence along the said southerly line of Maryland Avenue south 70 degrees 28 minutes 40 seconds west 889.79 feet;

thence north 53 degrees 21 minutes 10 seconds east 104.83 feet;

thence north 72 degrees 43 minutes 00 seconds east 790.21 feet to the point of beginning, containing 13,733.95 square feet;

all as shown on plat of computation recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in survey book 183, page 81.

(d) Parts of Third Street Southwest, Fourth Street Southwest, and Virginia Avenue Southwest, abutting square 537, described in one piece as follows:

Beginning for the same at the intersection of the north line of E Street Southwest, with the west line of Third Street Southwest, said point also being the southeast corner of said square 537, and running thence along the said line of Third Street, due north 122.08 feet to the southerly line of Virginia Avenue Southwest;

thence along said line of Virginia Avenue in a northwesterly direction 598.0 feet to the east line of Fourth Street Southwest;

thence along said line of Fourth Street due south 323.33 feet to the southwest corner of said square 537;

thence due west 13.0 feet;

thence due north 373.68 feet;

thence in a southeasterly direction, parallel with and 16.0 feet southwestwardly at right angles from the centerline of track numbered 1 of railroad of the Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington Railroad Company, 633.12 feet.

thence due south 160.60 feet;

thencce due west 19.36 feet to the point of beginning, containing 33,698.44 square feet;

all as shown on plat of survey recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in survey book 174, page 413.

(e) Parts of Third Street Southwest, Virginia Avenue Southwest, and public space abutting square N–583, described in one piece, as follows:

Beginning for the same at the intersection of the north line of E Street Southwest, with the east line of Third Street Southwest, said point also being the southwest corner of square N–583, and running thence due west 20.42 feet;

thence due north 135.50 feet;

thence in a southeasterly direction, parallel with and 16.0 feet southwestwardly at right angles from the centerline of track numbered 1 of railroad of the Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington Railroad Company 390.04 feet;

thence due south 4.23 feet;

thence due west 225.71 feet to the southeast corner of said square N–583;

thence along said square due north 40.0 feet to the southwesterly line of Virginia Avenue Southwest;

thence along said line in a northwesterly direction 128.33 feet to the said east line of Third Street;

thence along said line due south 82.67 feet to the point of beginning, continuing 18,229.36 square feet;

all as shown on plat of survey recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in survey book 174, page 413.

(f) Part of Virginia Avenue, Sixth Street, and public space abutting square S–463, described as follows:

Beginning for the same at the intersection of the west line of Sixth Street, southwest, with the northerly line of Virginia Avenue, said point of beginning being also the most southerly corner of square S–463; and running thence along the said west line of Sixth Street due north 75.33 feet;

thence due east 9.25 feet;

thence due south 106.15 feet;

thence in a northwesterly direction along the line 25.90 feet from and parallel to the said northerly line of Virginia Avenue north 70 degrees 17 minutes 40 seconds west 522.42 feet;

thence due north 20.0 feet;

thence due east 134.24 feet to the northwest corner of said square S–463;

thence along the west line of said square due south 40.58 feet to the said northerly line of Virginia Avenue;

thence in a southeasterly direction along the said northerly line of Virginia Avenue south 70 degrees 17 minutes 40 seconds east 370.0 feet to the point of beginning, containing 16,461.50 square feet;

all as shown on plat of survey recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in survey book 176, page 372.

(g) Part of D Street and Maryland Avenue, southwest, described as follows:

Beginning for the same at the southeast corner of square 386, and running thence due south 14.26 feet;

thence due west 605.71 feet to a point of curve;

thence along the arc of a circle, the radius of which is 600.0 feet, deflecting to the left an arc distance of 125.58 feet;

thence north 70 degrees 28 minutes 00 seconds east 774.97 feet;

thence due south 47.51 feet to the northeast corner of said square 386;

thence along the northwesterly boundary of said square in a southwesterly direction 432.25 feet to the northwest corner of said square;

thence due south 40.0 feet to the southwest corner of said square;

thence along the southerly boundary of said square due east 407.42 feet to the point of beginning, containing 39,922.0 square feet;

all as shown on plat of survey recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in survey book 173, page 396.

Sec. 2. The Agency is hereby authorized in accordance with the Redevelopment Act, to lease or sell, as an entirety or parts thereof separately, to one or more redevelopment companies or other lessees or purchasers, such real property as may be transferred to the Agency under the authority of this joint resolution.

Sec. 3. The Agency is authorized to transfer to the government of the District of Columbia all right, title, and interest of the Agency in that portion of the right-of-way formerly occupied by the railroads, which is now a part of the land included in the District of Columbia highway system, for which the Agency compensated the railroads and acquired the interest of said railroads, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized in this instance to pay the Agency the sum of $82,896 for said sites, which are described as follows:

(a) Part of Thirteen-and-a-Half Street Southwest, and E Street Southwest described in one piece as follows:

Beginning for the same at the intersection of the east line of Thirteen-and-a-Half Street Southwest with the northeasterly line of Maine Avenue Southwest; and running thence north 51 degrees 37 minutes 00 seconds west 119.22 feet to the southerly line of said Thirteen-and-a-Half Street and E Street closed by plat recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in book 140, page 73;

thence along said line south 71 degrees 17 minutes 15 seconds east 106.13 feet to the south line of said E Street;

thence along said line due west 7.04 feet to the east line of said Thirteen-and-a-Half Street;

thence along said line due south 40.0 feet to the point of beginning containing 1,990.50 square feet;

all as shown on plat of computation recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in survey book 174, page 308.

(b) Part of Thirteenth Street Southwest, described as follows:

Beginning for the same at the intersection of the east line of Thirteenth Street Southwest with the northeasterly line of Maine Avenue Southwest; and running thence north 71 degrees 17 minutes 15 seconds west 116.14 feet to the west line of said Thirteenth Street;

thence along said line due north 42.37 feet to the southerly line of Thirteenth Street closed by plat recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in book 140, page 73;

thence along said line south 71 degrees 17 minutes 15 seconds east 15.21 feet;

thence still along said line due east 95.59 feet to the said east line of Thirteenth Street;

thence along said line due south 74.75 feet to the point of beginning containing 6,209.20 square feet;

all as shown on plat of computation recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in survey book 174, page 308.

Sec. 4. No transfer or donation of any interest in real property under the authority of this joint resolution shall constitute a local grant-in-aid in connection with any urban renewal project being undertaken with Federal assistance under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended.

Sec. 5. As used in this joint resolution, the terms "Agency", "lessee", "purchaser", "real property", "redevelopment", and "redevelopment company" shall have the respective meanings provided for such terms by section 3 of the Redevelopment Act.

PURPOSES OF THE RESOLUTION

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of this joint resolution are twofold, as follows:

First, to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, on behalf of the United States, to transfer title to certain real property in Southwest Washington from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency; and

Second, to authorize the Redevelopment Land Agency to transfer to the District of Columbia, for a consideration of $82,896, title to the land now occupied by the Southwest Expressway.

BACKGROUND OF LEGISLATION

Pursuant to acts of Congress approved on February 12, 1901 (31 Stat. 767), and on February 28, 1903 (32 Stat. 909), referred to as the Union Station Acts, certain public streets in Southwest Washington were closed and abandoned, and perpetual use of these areas was granted to the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co., the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., and the Terminal Co. Title to these lands, however, remained in the United States. This grant was made to these railroads by the Congress in consideration for the exchange and transfer to the United States of certain land in the District then owned by the railroads.

The areas of land involved in this use grant to the railroads are comprised of six parcels which together contain 272,237.60 square feet of land, and are located in squares 268, 299, 386, S–463, 537, and N–583.

For many years, these lands were used by the railroads for such purposes as switch tracks, freight warehouses, loading platforms, open-air storage, truck-loading areas, produce stalls, et cetera. During this time, also, the railroads paid taxes on this land to the District of Columbia.

The urban renewal plan for Southwest project area C, approved by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners on November 30, 1956, requires that the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency acquire these parcels and sell or lease them to private enterprise for the development of commercial facilities in accordance with the plan. Accordingly, during the period from 1958 through 1962, the Redevelopment Land Agency purchased the rights and interests of the railroad companies in these parcels. The purchase price, which totaled $1,521,635, was based upon the opinions of disinterested appraisers with whom the Agency contracted for appraisal services.

In view of the value of the land which the railroads had transferred to the United States in consideration for the right to use the parcels in question, and of the taxes the railroads had paid on these parcels over the years, it was the opinion of the appraisers that the value of the railroads' rights and interests in these parcels was equivalent to the value of the land had the fee simple title been in the railroads. In fact, the Redevelopment Land Agency also purchased some adjacent lands owned in fee simple by the railroads for the same price per square foot paid for the rights and interests in the land referred to above.

At the time of purchase of the rights and interests of the railroads, the Agency believed that, pursuant to the Street Readjustment Act of 1932, the District Commissioners could transfer to the Agency title to the land in the closed streets owned by the United States. On January 7, 1960, the Commissioners entered an order transferring to the Agency fee simple title to part of the areas involved; that is, former 13th Street, 13½ Street, and E Street SW., all in square 299. On the strength of this street-closing plat and Commissioners' Order No. 60–9, the Agency has paid real estate taxes to the District since the effective date of the order transferring that land.

Following discussions between representatives of the Agency and of the District government, including the Corporation Counsel's Office, doubt was expressed as to the authority of the Commissioners, under the Street Readjustment Act, to transfer to the Agency title to the properties in which the railroads had rights and interests pursuant to the acts of Congress referred to above. In the absence of a solution to this problem, the Agency in a letter dated August 27, 1963, requested the opinion of the Attorney General as to the proper method of effecting transfer to the Agency of title to the properties. On October 22, 1963, the Assistant Attorney General, Lands Division, Department of Justice, advised the Executive Director of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency that "the General Services Administration, through the Administrator, may assume control of the Government's interests in the real estate as surplus property and dispose of it under the provisions of the Surplus Property Act." The letter stated that if this procedure could not be followed, "it may be necessary for Congress to specifically authorize some department or agency to take control of and convey the interest of the United States."

In a letter dated April 3, 1964, the General Counsel of the General Services Administration concluded "that the Congress has retained to itself the authority to take any further action with respect to the vacated streets."

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The authority which would be granted by the enactment of House Joint Resolution 397 is needed, therefore, to facilitate the ultimate disposition by the Redevelopment Land Agency of these parcels of land to developers who will construct necessary parking facilities, office space, and retail facilities in project area C, by perfecting the Agency's title to the land.

The land referred to in section 3 of this joint resolution, comprising those parts of former streets in square 299 presently being used by the District Government as part of the right-of-way for the Southwest Expressway, is one of the parcels referred to earlier in this report. Thus, by the provisions of sections 1 and 2, the Redevelopment Land Agency would acquire valid title to this land, which the language of section 3 would permit the Agency then to sell to the District of Columbia. The authorized price of $82,896 represents the amount paid by the Agency to the railroads for their rights and interests therein.

Your committee is informed that the District of Columbia Commissioners, the Department of Justice, and the Bureau of the Budget have concurred in approval of this proposed legislation. At a public hearing conducted by Subcommittee No. 4 on March 29, 1965, no objection to the resolution was expressed.

Following is the report of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, expressing their approval of this measure:

March 30, 1965.

Hon. John L. McMillan,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. McMillan: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have for report House Joint Resolution 397, 89th Congress, a joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District.

The primary purpose of the resolution is to authorize the Commissioners to transfer to the Redevelopment Land Agency the bare legal title now held by the United States to certain properties located in the southwest section of Washington. Use of the properties in question was granted to various railroads by the Union Station Acts, although legal title remained in the United States. Subsequently, the railroads sold to the Redevelopment Land Agency all right, title, and interest held by them in said properties. Approval of the resolution, therefore, will enable the Agency to perfect title to these properties for purposes of subsequent sale or lease to developers and permit the Agency to move forward with the redevelopment of portions of the Southwest area affected.

The resolution further provides, in section 3, authority for the Agency to transfer to the District of Columbia government its right, title, and interest in certain sites within the southwest area formerly occupied by the railroads which now form part of the land included within the District highway system, and for which interest the Commissioners are authorized to pay the Agency the sum of $82,896.

The Commissioners conferred closely with officials of the Redevelopment Land Agency and others with respect to the content of the joint resolution and favor its basic objectives. In the belief that approval of the resolution is in the best interests of the District of Columbia, the Commissioners recommend its enactment.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the District of Columbia business.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of bills on the District Calendar.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 200]

Arends
Aspinall
Blatnik
Bonner
Bow
Cahill
Colmer
Derwinski
Dickinson
Diggs
Evins, Tenn.
Hanna
Harsha
Holland
Irwin
Keogh
Long, La.
McVicker
Roberts
Rogers, Tex.
Rumsfeld
Scott
Steed
Taylor
Toll
Watson
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 404 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD during debate on House Resolution 437, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF RIGHT-TO-WORK PROVISIONS

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I make a point of order against the motion offered by the gentleman from New York on the ground that the House report, Report No. 540, on H.R. 77, fails to comply with the provisions of paragraph 3 of rule XIII of the rules of the House under the Ramseyer rule, in that it does not correctly indicate the changes proposed in the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, Public Law 101, 80th Congress.

Page 5 of the report of the Committee on Education and Labor, Report No. 540, dated June 22, 1965, entitled "Repeal of Right-to-Work Provisions," purports to set forth changes in existing law made by the bill, H.R. 77, as reported. However, the report inaccurately states that it complies with clause 3 of rule XIII.

I call attention to the fact that the matter in italics on page 5 of the report reads: "or in any constitution of law of any State or political subdivision thereof."

Reference to the bill, H.R. 77, will indicate that the language of the bill reads: "or in any constitution or law of any State or political subdivision thereof."

The language, as set forth in the report, makes the words "of law" seem to modify or explain what kind of a constitution should be affected, which is a different interpretation from the language in the bill.

I call the attention of the Speaker to a similar point of order made by Congressman La Guardia, of New York, at one time.

Although a bill proposed but one minor and obvious change in existing law, the failure of the report on the bill to indicate this change by typographical error was held in violation of the rule. The Speaker said:

> It is perfectly apparent to anyone reading the bill that its language is not exactly in the form prescribed by the Ramseyer rule.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Speaker sustain the point of order against the motion of the gentleman from New York and that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair will state that this situation has arisen on several occasions in the past.

Speaker pro tempore Cooper, on April 15, 1940, having a similar question presented to him on a point of order, ruled that "it is the opinion of the Chair that the duty does not devolve upon the Chair to analyze every word of existing law or to pass upon the sufficiency of compliance with the provisions of the so-called Ramseyer rule." The Chair then was of the opinion that the committee reporting the bill had made an effort to comply with the provisions of the Ramseyer rule, and the present occupant of the Chair expresses the same opinion and makes the same ruling, that is, that the committee made a substantial effort to comply with the requirements of the rule.

Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with Mr. O'BRIEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] will be recognized for 2½ hours, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] will be recognized for 2½ hours.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to explain the provisions of H.R. 77 which would repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

The sole purpose of H.R. 77 is to establish a uniform Federal rule governing union security agreements. It does this by a simple repeal of section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, and by related technical adjustments required in other provisions of the act. The law as it now stands gives the right to the States to pass the so-called right-to-work laws prohibiting employers and labor unions from freely contracting with each other to require membership in the union as a condition of continued employment.

We must now decide whether it is wise to permit the States, in contracts which are otherwise governed by Federal legislation, to restrict union-security agreements as now provided by the Taft-Hartley Act. The issue, stated concisely, is this: Should Congress, in the light of the experience gained under the statute, eliminate the special treatment given to this small but significant part of the field regulated by the act and remove this one statutory exception?

The Taft-Hartley Act, passed in 1947, tightly regulates union security arrangements. First, a union may not enter into a collective bargaining agreement at all unless the union is representative of a majority of the employees.

Secondly, the Federal act specifically bans the closed shop outright; that is, any arrangement whereby only union members may be hired.

Third, it forbids any preference in hiring to union members. However, the Federal act does permit a union and an employer, if they wish, to include in a collective bargaining agreement a provision requiring that employees join the union 30 days after hiring.

As a further safeguard, a majority of employees represented by the union may expressly revoke the authority of the union to negotiate an agreement in a secret ballot election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board. The present provisions of the existing Federal law will not in any way be rendered less effective by the repeal of section 14(b) nor will unions be given unjust advantages in their negotiations with employers.

Is it wrong to ask a new employee to pay his fair share for the benefits he receives both indirectly from the protection of the Federal legislation, and directly from the contract reached through the collective bargaining process?

It is important to point out that section 14(b) has been seized upon by interests which have sought to promote so-called right-to-work laws by representations that they will attract industry to particular States. In these campaigns, some literature explicitly stated that right-to-work laws will provide competitive advantages in the form of weak unions with low wages and low labor costs.

These right-to-work contests have not only "divided Americans in various States" as the President stated in his message, but have set States against States in this struggle to attract or retain industry.

To permit States to compete for industry on the ground that they will keep unions weak and wages low is contrary to the basic principle established in 1789 that this country must constitute an economic unity. To that policy, economists ascribe America's phenomenal economic growth and prosperity.

It is the national labor policy of this country to encourage and promote collective bargaining in the interest of a strong and peaceful national economy. To the extent that 19 State right-to-work laws are controlling in the area covered by the National Labor Relations Act, to that precise extent they collide with national labor policies established by that act.

Experience with the impact of these State laws on union security has satisfied the Committee on Education and Labor that there is no longer any justification for permitting this single departure from the rule of uniformity.

What we want is a law that will give every State equality; industry equality competitively and labor equality protectively. In the committee's judgment, the time has come for removing this issue from the political area and returning it to the bargaining table where it belongs.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, the author of this legislation and the chairman of the subcommittee that handled this legislation [Mr. THOMPSON], such time as he may desire.

PREFACE

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law, and the State right-to-work laws it permits, will not:

First. Deny anyone a right to work.

Second. Force anyone to join a union.

Third. Require anyone to attend union meetings.

Fourth. Force anyone to strike or picket.

Fifth. Prevent anyone from resigning union membership.

Sixth. Deny any employee the right to vote against collective bargaining by a union.

Seventh. Deny any employee the right to vote against a union security agreement.

Eighth. Deny any employee his freedom of speech, press, and assembly.

Ninth. Deny any employee his religious liberties.

Tenth. Deny any employee the right to compete—to excel on his job.

Eleventh. Create compulsory unions.

Twelfth. Deny to any employer the right to hire any worker he chooses.

Thirteenth. Deny to any employer the right to refuse to negotiate a union security agreement.

Fourteenth. Restrict the employer any freedoms.

Fifteenth. Decrease the freedom of anyone.

The repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law will do one thing only: it will permit unions and employers in the 19 States where this right is now denied them, to sit and negotiate a union security agreement requiring all employees—hired by the employer and represented by the union—to pay their fair share of the union costs under the collective bargaining contract.

THE WITNESSES

Good people can make invalid arguments, and bad people can make valid arguments. With this note of caution, and without passing any individual judgments, I believe the Congress would be interested in some information about the identity of those who testified for and about the identity of those who testified against the repeal of section 14(b).

A. THOSE TESTIFYING FOR REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) AND HENCE AGAINST RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

Those testifying for repeal of section 14(b) include spokesmen for: first, the administration; second, all elements of organized labor; third, the three major religious groups; fourth, the major civil rights organizations; fifth, industrialists with long experience in dealing with unions; sixth, individual Congressmen; seventh, the State commissioners of labor in those States which, after a trial period, rejected right-to-work laws; and eighth, representatives of the family farmers.

First, the administration:

Repeal of section 14(b) was a plank in the Democratic Party platform in 1964.

President Johnson included in his labor message the need to repeal section 14(b).

Secretary of Labor Wirtz was the leadoff witness.

Second. All elements of organized labor:

George Meany, AFL-CIO.

Sidney Zagri, Teamsters.

A. C. Skinner, Mine Mill & Smelters.

Don Mahon, National Federation of Independent Unions.

There are many issues that divide organized labor, but on this issue there was no division.

Third. The three major religious groups:

Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch, Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. George G. Higgins, Director, Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Rev. J. Edward Carothers, Secretary of Commission on the Church and Economic Life, National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

There was some opposition to the appearance of these witnesses. Congressman GRIFFIN, for example, told the Reverend Carothers that:

> I bitterly resent the fact that the National Council of Churches in involving itself in an issue such as this, which is not a moral issue as such, but which is a legislative issue (record, pt. 2, p. 653).

Fourth. The major civil rights organizations—Clarence Mitchell, director of the Washington bureau, NAACP, presented a statement on behalf of and approved by:

Martin Luther King, Jr., Southern Leadership Conference.

A. Phillip Randolph, Negro American Labor Council.

James Farmer, Congress of Racial Equality.

Dorothy Height, National Council of Negro Women.

Roy Wilkins, NAACP.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I want to make it clear that while the gentleman from New Jersey quoted me correctly, I indicated my resentment as a member of a church which is affiliated with the National Council of Churches. I do not know whether that is clear in the gentleman's remarks but I want to make it clear at this time.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. No, it was not. That colloquy appears in the record in part II on page 653 of the hearings.

Mr. Mitchell was asked by Messrs. GRIFFIN and ANDREWS why he, as a Negro, should want to repeal section 14(b) and thereby help unions when unions were responsible for some discrimination against Negro job opportunities. He was also asked about the Griffin proposal to deny unions which discriminate the right to sign "union shop" agreements.

Mr. Mitchell said he was for repeal of section 14(b) without any provisos because:

> We are not idiots as Negroes. We know when there is more to a proposition than meets the eye (record, pt. 1, p. 244).
>
> I am past the stage in my life when I am deceived by things that are done up in pretty ribbons and fancy paper because all too often when we open the box there is nothing inside (record, pt. 1, p. 248).

He explained that:

> Where there is a bona fide labor union administered by constructive people, and most of them are, opportunities for Negro

employment definitely increases (record, pt. 1, p. 249).

Fifth. Industrialists with long experience in collective bargaining:

Harold A. Webster, National Electrical Contractors Association.

Joseph Moore, Associated Garment Industries of St. Louis.

Milton J. Shapp, president, Jerrold Electronics Corp., Philadelphia.

National Skirt and Sportswear Association.

Their testimony was that a union shop agreement creates responsible unionism and encourages constructive bargaining—with security, the union need not process every alleged grievance, and can work out constructive approaches concerning the employer's problems.

This testimony is in accord with a survey made some years ago by Newsweek which showed that employers who had experienced the "union shop" generally favored it; whereas those employers who lacked such experience generally were opposed to it.

Sixth. Individual Congressman:

Congressman Thaddeus J. Dulski, of New York—pirating business.

Congressman Paul A. Fino, of New York—pirate industry.

Representative Jacob Gilbert, of New York.

Edward A. Garmatz of Maryland—three times in Maryland with emotional results.

Seventh. State commissioners of labor—not testifying, but their statements against right-to-work laws referred to on two occasions:

Commissioner Bastemeyer, of Nebraska.

Commissioner Lowe, of Iowa.

Commissioner Butler, of Indiana.

Commissioner Jolly, of Nevada.

Commissioner Vocelle, of Florida.

Commissioner Martin, of Maine.

Their statements are in the record, part 1, at page 545–546.

Eighth. Farm groups: James C. Patton, National Farmers Union.

Now, there were a number of witnesses testifying against this legislation and I might say at this point that the gentleman from Michigan and I agreed to the extent possible on reasonable time limitations in order to give everyone who wanted either the opportunity to appear in person, subject only to our 2-week agreement, or in lieu of being able to testify personally, to submit statements for the record.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I wish to agree with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. Although he and I disagree violently on the merits of this proposition and although, I suppose, it might have been well to have held more hearings around the country, I believe he has been very fair in conducting the hearings on this legislation. The hearings were scheduled so as to allow 1 week for the proponents and 1 week for the opposition.

I believe the subcommittee has compiled an excellent record, a record I will say again that includes a great deal of testimony about my bill, H.R. 4350, and amendments which I seek to offer, as well as the amendment which the gentlewoman from Oregon seeks to offer. But it is a good record on this subject, and I commend it to all Members of the House for their serious study.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman.

B. THOSE TESTIFYING AGAINST REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) AND IN FAVOR OF STATE RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

The committee heard much testimony against repeal of section 14(b). These so testifying were mostly, first, politicians from the South, second, representatives of low-paying, unorganized industries, third, the chamber of commerce, fourth, the National Association of Manufacturers, fifth, representatives of the large farmer, sixth, the right-to-work law committee, seventh, a few individual ministers, and eighth, individuals with individual grievances against unions.

First. Politicians from the South:

Dan K. Moore, Governor of North Carolina.

Howard H. Callaway, Congressman from Georgia.

Dan McLeod, attorney general of South Carolina.

Paul Johnson, Governor of Mississippi.

Albertis S. Harrison, Jr., Governor of Virginia.

Second. Representatives of low-paying, unorganized industries:

Mid-South Cotton Ginners Council.

Carbonated Beverage Industry.

National Canners Association.

Independent Meat Packers Association.

National Oil Jobbers Council.

Third. The chamber of commerce:

Howard Jensen, Lone Star Steel Co., Texas.

William L. Gatz, Wonder State Manufacturing Co., Arkansas.

Frank Flick, Flick-Reedy Corp., Illinois.

Robert Anderson, Standard Plywood Co., South Carolina.

Louis Weiss, Midland Metalcraft, Inc., Kansas.

Otto Bowden, Florida Chamber of Commerce.

Fourth. National Association of Manufacturers: Kenneth C. Kellar.

Fifth. Representatives of the large farmer:

Walter Randolph, American Farm Bureau.

National Apple Institute.

Sixth. National Right-To-Work Committee: Reed Larson, Frederick Fowler, and S. D. Cadwallader.

Seventh. A few individual ministers:

Rabbi Morris Hershman, Joliet, Ill., Chamber of Commerce.

Rev. John D. Bower, McLouth, Kans.

Eighth. Individual "soreheads" with grievances:

Godfrey P. Schmidt, National Association of Orchestra Leaders.

Bernard Simunich—cannot get grievance processed.

Velio Iacobucci—Philadelphia projectionist who cannot get into union.

Meriam P. Thompson—plaintiff in Allen case.

C. WITNESSES NEITHER FOR NOR AGAINST REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b)

There were a number of witnesses from the minor religious denominations who testified neither for nor against the repeal of section 14(b) but wanted protection in any event for their religious beliefs.

First. Frederick Walker, Plymouth Brethren.

Second. W. Melvin Adams, Seventh-day Adventists on behalf of: Christian and Missionary Alliance, 62,000; Old German Baptists; Amish; Christodelphians.

Third. Guy Hershberger, Mennonite Church.

SECTION 14(b) AND THE RIGHT-TO-WORK STATES

The issue of so-called right-to-work laws has been a matter of official concern for almost 20 years, since the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947.

I would like to touch briefly upon the provisions of the law which make this issue possible, the States which currently have such laws, and the States which have rejected these laws.

A. SECTION 14(b): ITS LANGUAGE

Section 14(b) provides as follows:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization in any State or territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or territorial law.

B. SECTION 14(b): ITS HISTORY

Section 14(b) in principle has a long history. It goes back at least to 1903, when the business associations in the steel industries, shortly aided by the National Association of Manufacturers, began a crusade for the open shop.

1. 1903 OPEN SHOP DRIVE

The open shop drive was supposed to signify a shop open to all employees, union and nonunion alike. This was in contrast with the closed shop, where only union members could be employed. In fact and actuality, the so-called open shop was open only on nonunion men. The records of that day demonstrate this clearly.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I may be mistaken, but it was my impression at the time the Taft-Hartley law was passed there were some 12 States with right-to-work laws.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman will hear about that as I go on. We are talking about 1944 which was indeed before the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law and during the days of the Wagner Act.

2. AMERICAN PLAN DRIVE, 1920

The issue lived on. In the early 1920's the same business groups began a clamor for the American plan. The American plan contemplated a plant or factory where all Americans could be employed, whether or not they belonged to a union. In fact and actuality, no union men were hired under the American plan.

3. RIGHT-TO-WORK DRIVE, 1944

The issue was raised again during World War II, when the CIO began an organizing drive amongst the citrus workers in Florida. This time the name was "right to work." The alleged theory was that every man should have a right to work, whether or not he belonged to a union.

Florida enacted the first right-to-work law in 1944. The rural legislators, at the urging of the Farm Bureau, the packing shed, and processing manufacturers, passed the law. I would like to note, however, that the legislators voting against the law represented more constituents than those voting for the law. Had the one-man, one-vote, principle then been in effect, the law would have been defeated.

Arkansas was next in line, with a similar law in the same year. In 1945, Mississippi passed such a law; and in 1946, Arizona, South Dakota, and Nebraska are primarily agricultural States, with little firsthand experience in labor-management problems.

4. TAFT-HARTLEY AMENDMENTS OF 1947

There was a serious constitutional issue concerning these State laws. Under the supremacy clause of the Constitution and the doctrine of Federal preemption, when a Federal law and a State law deal with the same subject matter, the State law must yield unless Congress indicates that it intends and desires State supremacy.

This congressional intention was made in section 14(b) of the 1947 Taft-Hartley Act.

Congressman Hartley had a provision in the House version of the Taft-Hartley law authorizing these State right-to-work laws to exist. When the bill went to the Senate, this provision was defeated. The conference committee agreed on the House version, and this time section 14(b) was passed in the House, and in the Senate with the late and beloved Senator Alben Barkley leading the fight against it.

C. STATES WITH EXISTING RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

There are now 19 States which have taken advantage of section 14(b) and have enacted laws prohibiting unions and employers from exercising their free collective bargaining rights to negotiate for and sign union shop agreements.

First. States of the Old Confederacy: Every State from Virginia to Texas, with the exception of Louisiana, has a right-to-work law on its statute books: Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Tennessee, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Texas.

Second. States of the Great Plains: As indicated, the agricultural producing States of the northern Great Plains were early enactors of right-to-work laws. They now include: North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, and Iowa.

Third. States of the Rocky Mountains: The remaining States with right-to-work laws are found in the Rocky Mountain area: Arizona, Utah, and Nevada.

D. COLORADO AND WISCONSIN UNION SHOP ELECTIONS

Two other States have laws which concern union security agreements, although they cannot be classified as right-to-work States.

In Colorado and Wisconsin, union security agreements are prohibited unless an election has been held and a certain percentage of the employees have voted in favor of the agreement. Colorado requires a three-fourths vote of the employees in the bargaining unit; Wisconsin requires a two-thirds vote of those voting—such two-thirds must also constitute at least a majority of the employees in the bargaining unit.

This is reminiscent of the Federal provision in the law from 1947 until 1951 requiring a secret ballot election prior to the negotiation of union security agreements. The requirement was eliminated in 1951 at the request of Senator Taft when the results of 6 million voters showed that almost 92 percent of the workers voted for the union shop, with 97 percent of the elections in favor of the union shop.

E. STATES WHICH HAVE EXPERIENCED AND THEN REJECTED RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

A number of States have enacted right-to-work laws, and then rejected them when the experience was unsatisfactory. These States include: Delaware, Hawaii, Indiana, Maine, and New Hampshire.

Louisiana at one time had a right-to-work law aimed at industrial and craft workers. This law was repealed, so as to exempt industrial and craft workers and make it applicable only to agricultural workers. This amendment followed a strike by thousands of sugarcane workers in several Louisiana parishes.

F. STATES WHICH HAVE REJECTED RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

The right-to-work issue has been before the people of the States for referendum vote, or before the legislatures of the States, and has been defeated in the following States: California, Colorado, Idaho, Maryland, Ohio, Oklahoma, Vermont, Washington, and Wyoming.

There were other States, including Oregon, Montana, and Pennsylvania, where the right-to-work advocates worked hard, but were unable to secure sufficient signatures to put the issue on the ballot.

SUMMARY

The issue of right to work has been before this Nation since the NAM open shop drive in 1903. It was before Congress in 1947 when section 14(b) was passed. It has been before the people and legislatures of at least 40 States.

The recurrent problem presented by right-to-work legislation has caused great public debate. It takes 23 typewritten pages to list the articles carried on the subject by various periodicals.

Yet the high emotional intensity engendered by these debates has never been matched by a corresponding degree of knowledge.

A Northwestern University law professor asked his class whether a union and a company should be permitted to agree voluntarily that all employees represented by the union in the plant should pay dues to the union. Of the 125 students, 84 answered yes and 41 no. Yet when the same question was asked in different terms, viz, "Are you in favor of right-to-work laws?" there was a complete turnabout. Eighty answered, "yes" and 45, "no."

A public member of the Wage Stabilization Board, commenting on 1,350 letters he received when the issue of union security was pending before the Board, tells us that these letter writers "perhaps the majority, knew little or nothing about union security, and much of what they think they know is wrong."

There is a reason for this misunderstanding. It is deliberately calculated by those who want to decide this issue on an emotional basis; on slogans, if you please.

We had a prime example of this during our hearings.

Mr. S. D. Cadwallader, president of the National Right-To-Work Committee, brought up a new slogan. He said about union security and union shop agreements:

> Good unions don't need it; bad unions don't deserve it.

This was picked up by Congressman GRIFFIN in his minority report.

It is reminiscent of the surface-appeal sloganism—the open shop of 1903; the American plan of 1920, the right-to-work slogan of 1944—which sounds good to the ear but which has no relation to the problem we are dealing with.

Let me explain:

Right-to-work law Cadwallader, and Congressman GRIFFIN say: "Good unions don't need it."

The implication is that good unions can get 100 percent dues payments by good results.

This would be true if "good unions" only represented "good people."

But this is not true. Good unions represent good people, bad people, and people who are sometimes good and sometimes bad.

It is in the economic self-interest of the employee to keep the dues payments in his wallet, and let George pay for the benefits.

A minority of the employees follow their economic self-interest and refuse to carry their share of the load.

Good unions need it when they represent bad people and this is almost always the situation.

But we are not only concerned about unions.

We are concerned about union members, and they want the union shop too.

We are concerned about industrial peace, and there is no doubt that the free rider is the cause of dissension within the plant, and between the unions and management as collective bargaining.

We are concerned about the employer, and his freedom to solve production problems and the causes of friction in any way he deems legitimate within the bounds of the law.

We are concerned about artificial trade barriers; and the right-to-work laws are used and devised to give some States and sections an artificial trade advantage over more responsible States and sections of our Nation.

Another slogan, one of wider currence, is that repeal of section 14(b) would result in compulsory unionism.

The appeal against compulsory unionism meets the heart, just like the "good unions do not need it" slogan. But it too is just as empty.

I believe the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara] had some thoughts on this subject.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-three Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 201]

Anderson, Ill.
Arends
Aspinall
Blatnik
Bonner
Bow
Cahill
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Derwinski
Diggs
Evins, Tenn.
Findley
Fisher
Halleck
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Holland
Kee
Keogh
McClory
McVicker
Michel
Pirnie
Powell
Rogers, Tex.
Rumsfeld
Scott
Springer
Toll
Willis

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'Brien, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 77, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 400 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Griffin] had been recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I was not responsible for the quorum call. I regret any inconvenience to the Members. However, I believe this is important legislation, and certainly—so far as the gentleman now in the well is concerned—we are not assuming all votes of this vital issue are decided. I do not accept the view that there is nothing to be gained by further debate of this very important issue.

At the outset, I wish to indicate that for whatever reasons others may oppose this legislation—and I realize that there are various reasons why people take the positions they do on this legislation—as for me I oppose the outright repeal of section 14(b) because of the violence it would do to individual basic human rights of workers. There should be no mistake about it: in a Congress which has been greatly concerned with civil rights and with human rights it will be a grave mistake blithely to repeal section 14(b) without any consideration whatsoever to effect of such action on the individual basic rights of the workers.

Surely, in my humble opinion, the vote on final passage, now that these amendments have been precluded, is going to separate what I would consider to be true liberals—liberals who really believe in individual freedom and individual liberty—from those who are pseudo liberals; those who espouse liberal principles but are willing supinely to go along with the dictation of some union leaders.

As has already been indicated in the previous debate, it is well known that I have a bill, H.R. 4350, which I introduced early in February. My bill would repeal section 14(b), but under certain conditions and with certain limitations which would protect the fundamental rights of the workers who might be required, as the result of repealing 14(b), to join unions in order to hold their jobs. I shall, of course, endeavor to offer my bill as a substitute to H.R. 77 despite the vote on the previous question. I believe it is germane and ought to be ruled it is germane. However, obviously that will be an uphill battle.

In the absence of House adoption of my amendments, I must oppose H.R. 77 on final passage. This bill will remove all of the authority, not just of 19 States, but of 50 States, to legislate in this particular area. It will take that authority away from the States the first time because until this bill becomes law, if it does, the States have always had the authority to outlaw or restrict union-shop agreements. As I pointed out earlier, even before the enactment of 14(b) and the Taft-Hartley law in 1947, 12 States had so-called right-to-work laws on the books. So it is not just 19 States that will be affected by this bill. The power of the people of 50 States will be affected.

Now, I would be willing to take that power away from the States, as I have indicated by the introduction of my bill, if the Congress would substitute effective Federal safeguards to make sure that certain basic human rights would be protected.

To be specific, I feel very strongly that any union which has authority to enter into a union shop requiring union membership or the payment of dues as a condition of employment, should be effectively prohibited from discriminating on account of race, color, or creed. I further believe that any such union should use the dues collected under a union-shop agreement for collective bargaining purposes with respect to wages, hours and working conditions, and should be effectively prohibited from using those dues for politics or for other purposes that have no relationship to wages, hours, and working conditions.

Such a union should not have the power to fine or discipline a worker who disagrees with union policy or who exercises any legal or civil right that he would have if he were not a union member. And yet, those individual rights, which are basic and fundamental—which should not be voted away by majority rule—will not be protected under the outright repeal of section 14(b) with no safeguards whatsoever.

This matter of racial discrimination by unions, or course, is not academic. The chairman of the great Committee on Education and Labor—I regret I do not see him on the floor at this time—indicated earlier in the year that he did not favor the repeal of section 14(b) unless there were effective action taken to make sure that an end was put to union discrimination, particularly with respect to apprenticeship training.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The chairman of the committee may well have said that, but——

Mr. GRIFFIN. Or words to that effect.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. But at no time did he say, to my knowledge, that he would insist that such action be taken as part of this legislation. There is legislation, which we reported this morning, which will do that.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a matter of record that the chairman did make a flat statement about a pocket veto of this legislation until something was done—that he would put it in his pocket and he said that until this question of discrimination was solved we were not going to have any 14(b) legislation. I think he did go on record pretty clearly with the committee and with the public on that point.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That may be so, but the fact is that the chairman was here moving it today; and if that is so, his presence here today, his moving it today is evidence of that satisfaction.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I asked the gentleman to yield because I should like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey who referred to legislation before the committee the question, can he tell us when he expects this to clear the committee, because many people are asking the question?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It cleared this morning by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New Jersey contradicted the previous statement that he made that the chairman never said that it was a condition that we take care of this discrimination problem before we got 14(b) legislation. I think he very clearly did say this at one stage. This was a fast moving situation, and he obviously changed his mind, for other reasons, later on.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, in order to put the action taken by the committee this morning in perspective, I want to point out that only last week, as I understand, the Roosevelt subcommittee had come to an informal understanding, at least, that consideration of the bill, H.R. 9222, would be put over until next year, because it is an amendment to the Civil Rights Act; and it seemed somewhat ridiculous, perhaps, to try to amend a portion of that act even before it became effective; and furthermore, that there should be experience under the Civil Rights Act before an amendment could be seriously considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. But, Mr. Chairman, in spite of that fact, I understand that this morning about 9:30 or 10 o'clock the Roosevelt subcommittee met and quickly reported out this 33-page bill; that at 10:30 the full committee met and reported it out, so that there could be a report by 12 o'clock noon to the Members that that bill had been reported out prior to the consideration of this bill.

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, reporting a bill out of the Committee on Education and Labor and having it become law are two different things.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I will in just a moment, when I have finished with this one thought.

I want to say this further word. The bill which the gentleman from New York, Chairman POWELL, has sponsored, in my opinion takes two small steps forward and a big step backward. It does help so far as certain exemptions are concerned; it does speed up procedures.

However, Mr. Chairman, the bill goes in the wrong direction to the extent that it gives the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission not only the power to receive and investigate complaints and to prosecute complaints, which it has now under the law, but also the power to adjudicate those complaints.

Mr. Chairman, when Congress gives one politically appointed commission the power to investigate, prosecute, and adjudicate, I believe we go too far, whether one is talking about civil rights, the National Labor Relations Board, or any other area. This approach puts the person or the agency charged with discrimination, whether it be a labor organization or an employer or anyone else, in the position of having to prove that he did not discriminate, when the burden should always be on the person who charges discrimination.

Mr. PEPPER. Now, Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished and able gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, the able gentleman from Michigan has been addressing himself to the question of whether section 14(b) now preserves the individual rights of individual workers.

I wonder if the able gentleman supports the minimum wage legislation that we now have pending?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Well, I have supported minimum wage legislation in the past.

Mr. PEPPER. And if the gentleman will yield further, under the minimum wage legislation, will the able gentleman say whether or not the worker is free to bargain and to work at whatever wage he is willing to work?

Mr. GRIFFIN. No, he is not.

Mr. PEPPER. So he has lost his individual freedom under that law, has he not?

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is right, to an extent.

Mr. PEPPER. Now will the able gentleman yield further?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Under the present law, if the National Labor Relations Board certifies that a majority of the employees at a given plant have chosen to give a union as their bargaining representative, then the union bargains as to wages and hours and working conditions and the like for all of the employees, whether they are members of the union or not, does it not?

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. If the gentleman will yield further, suppose when a new man comes to work in that kind of a plant where that kind of contract prevails and he is told about it, is it not the duty of the employer where such a contract exists to tell him that "you may work in this plant but you cannot fix your own wages by bargaining with your employer. Under the law your wages and your working conditions will be fixed by the union."

Now, is that a violation of the individual's rights?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Yet, that is in the law, is it not?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I understand the gentleman's argument and I would like to respond.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the able gentleman yield further so that I may pose one other question?

I thank him for his courtesy.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Is the gentleman going to a different point?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, but on the very same principle.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I should like to address myself to the point the gentleman has already made.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. GRIFFIN. And then perhaps I shall yield further.

The gentleman from Florida is, of course, raising, at least in substance, the traditional "free rider" argument. I would say that there is no claim made by me, at least, that workers or citizens are completely free in all matters. I submit, however, that there are some individual rights which ought not be subject to majority rule.

The matter of setting wage rates, the matter of working conditions, and so forth, are not in that category.

Let me make the point in this way: The gentleman from Florida is probably familiar with the provision in section 9 of the Taft-Hartley Act which provides that when a majority of the employees of an establishment vote to be represented by a union, the union must represent not just the employees who care to join the union, but all the employees of that bargaining unit, whether they are union members or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will look at that section of the Taft-Hartley law, it imposes an obligation on the union in such a situation to bargain for all the employees "with respect to wages, hours, and working conditions." The crucial question in my whole argument is, For what purpose does the union represent employees under a union shop agreement?

In my State of Michigan it is required that a lawyer, in order to practice law, must belong to the bar association, and pay dues. I have no choice, if I want to practice law I join the bar association and pay my dues. It takes away my freedom to do certain things. But I do not think that is necessarily un-American, in my point of view. However, it would be un-American if the bar association required me to be a member, and required me to pay dues, and then used my dues for purposes that were not related to bar association business. If my dues were used for politics, if my dues were used to support candidates or a political party. It would be un-American for the bar association to discriminate on the basis of color or creed. It would be un-American for the bar association to fine or discipline a member for exercising his legal or civil rights.

These fundamental rights are not subject to majority rule. Yet no protection whatsoever is provided if Congress repeals 14(b) and provides no accompanying safeguards.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Would the gentleman also agree it would also be un-American if we were to legislate in this House so that he either loses his job and his chances for economic livelihood or he is forced to violate his religious convictions and follow a procedure in violation of his own conscience?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I do.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Would the gentleman yield further?

By the adoption of the previous question this morning, would the gentleman agree that we are precluded from offering any amendments on the floor, that we have in fact a closed rule, and there seems to be general agreement that on all amendments offered a point of order will be raised as to germaneness, and they will be declared to be not germane? Would the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. GRIFFIN. It is my understanding that the amendment which the gentlewoman has sponsored and the amendments which I have offered will probably be ruled as not germane. Obviously, if the chairman had been willing to have them considered germane, he could very easily have accepted an amendment to his resolution and any question could have been erased.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. May I say this is my chief objection to the procedure we are following today. As I tried to say earlier, historically—religious liberty and the matter of the individual conscience have been matters of highest priority—and not to be considered lightly when legislation is being formulated.

This Congress, in the last few weeks, reaffirmed this view and made an exemption for certain religious groups in the social security legislation—the medicare bill of 1965.

I need only remind our colleagues of the conscientious objectors' clause in the military service.

Let me also read from Supreme Court decisions. The first: Abraham Braunfeld against Albert N. Brown.

Mr. Justice Stewart in a very eloquent view on this said:

> Pennsylvania has passed a law which compels an orthodox Jew to choose between his religious faith and his economic survival. That is a cruel choice—it is a choice which I think no State can constitutionally demand.
>
> For me this is not something that can be swept under the rug and forgotten in the enforced Sunday togetherness.
>
> I think that the impact of the law upon these appellants grossly violates their constitutional right to the free exercise of their religion.

If safeguards are not placed in this legislation, we offer the same cruel choice to many members of the Mennonites, the Seventh-day Adventists, the Plymouth Brethren, the Amish, the Old German Baptists, the Christian and Missionary Alliance—and some groups in the National Association of Evangelicals. I do not belong to any one of these groups, but I do respect their views—their religious convictions—as I expect them to respect mine.

May I quote from another case, Adell Sherbert against Charlie Verner. Mr. Justice Douglas in his concurring statement said this and I would like to call it particularly to the attention of my liberal friends.

Mr. Justice Douglas said:

> Religious scruples of Moslems require them to attend a mosque on Friday and to pray five times daily. Religious scruples of a Sikh require him to carry a regular or a symbolic sword.
>
> Religious scruples of a Quaker compel him to refrain from swearing and to affirm instead.
>
> Religious scruples of a Buddhist may require him to refrain from partaking of any flesh, even of fish.
>
> The examples could be multiplied including those of the Seventh-day Adventists whose Sabbath is Saturday and who is advised not to eat some meats.
>
> These suffice, however, to show that many people hold beliefs alien to the majority of our society, beliefs that are protected by the first amendment but which could easily be trod upon under the guise of police or health regulations reflecting majority views.

Justice Douglas continues:

> The result turns not on the degree of injury which may indeed be nonexistent by ordinary standards. The harm is the interference with the individual's scruples on conscience—an important area of privacy which the first amendment fences off from the Government.

And so members of these seven religious groups to whom I referred may hold religious beliefs not shared by the majority in this House—but beliefs that should be protected and not trod upon by any legislation we pass this week which, as I said, gives them that "cruel choice" of losing their jobs or violating the teachings of their church and the dictates of conscience.

Unless an exemption is made for these church members—it seems to me, by the action that we are being urged to take—we are in effect saying and legislating in total disregard of the individual's right of conscience in favor of the right of the labor union. Right of conscience should never be forced to give way to the right of the state. This is what separates the democratic society from the totalitarian. I happen to believe that religious liberty is far more important to our democratic values than any single piece of labor legislation that is before this Congress. And I regret that some labor leaders and certain labor lawyers are urging in strongest terms that there cannot be—that there must not be any accommodation—any modification in the law which they now insist that we pass.

It seems to me also that somehow the Rules of this House of Representatives should be such that we could find a formula so that we could consider the repeal of section 14(b) while simultaneously protecting the individual's right of conscience.

If the gentleman in the well would yield for just one further comment.

This morning I attempted to read the full telegram from the religious leaders of three great faiths—Rabbi Hirsch, Monsignor Higgins, and Cameron Hall of the National Council of Churches.

Then a statement was read which said that really was not the intent. But in the telegram—nevertheless—which was sent to some of the Members of the House, myself included—concluded by saying:

> In our judgment, it should be possible for the Congress in considering 14(b) to find a formula which simultaneously guarantees the legitimate rights of organized labor and the rights of those workers referred to above whose religious beliefs make it impossible for them to join or support a labor organization.

I have personally received no message from any one of the three—retracting that statement.

After that was read, a letter was read from Monsignor Higgins saying that this was not the intent. I must say the chairman of the subcommittee stated that it was from Monsignor Higgins but later the House was told that this was signed by all three—that it was signed by Monsignor Higgins, and Cameron Hall, and by Rabbi Hirsch. I hope the Record is corrected.

Mr. Chairman, the only typewritten copy I have been shown was the one signed only by Monsignor Higgins. I tried to get the floor at that time to point it out and I was refused. Later I was told, "Well, I will correct it in the Record." In the meantime the vote was taken on the previous question.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the genteman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I must yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Jew Jersey. The gentleman from New Jersey read that telegram and in the course of reading it, the Record will show that before the vote was taken the gentleman from New Jersey said that it was signed by Monsignor Higgins. Any implication that the gentleman from New Jersey was trying to be deceitful is not only unwarranted but unfair.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I did not suggest that the chairman of the subcommittee was making any such implication. If you will go over the Record, I just said that the chairman of the subcommittee made it clear that it was only from Monsignor Higgins but that later in the debate it was said that this was signed by all three. I do not and I did not question for one moment the gentleman from New Jersey and the way he read the statement from Monsignor Higgins.

The mistake—and I must assume it was unintentional—was by another. Nevertheless it created the wrong impression.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentlewoman. The Record is now clear.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. A comment was made about integrated bar associations. Is it not true that the integrated bar in Michigan is a creature of the State legislature?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes, it is.

Mr. JONAS. That is the case in North Carolina. Is it not also true that there is absolutely nothing analogous between an integrated bar association created by the people of a State acting through their legislature and the situation with which we are confronted here, when we are asked to tell the States they cannot act in this field at all?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I believe it is an important distinction, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Oregon, and I also compliment the gentleman from Michigan for a very fine statement.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. It seems to me the gentleman from Florida hung himself on his own analogy a few minutes ago. He made the point that the minimum wage laws take away the right to collective bargaining and that this is acceptable and a good idea. Of course, what is happening now is that the gentleman from Florida is arguing that State laws which take away the right to collective bargaining in the instance of right-to-work laws are wrong. He likes to take away a collective bargaining right when it serves his own purposes, but he does not like it when it does not serve his own purposes.

I believe the gentleman from Florida has no dispute with the gentleman in the well as to an intention of trying to help people and as to a belief in collective bargaining.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. The gentleman from Florida was trying to answer the argument made by the able gentleman in the well, who was complaining about the loss of individual liberty on the part of the individual worker.

The gentleman from Florida was trying to point out that under the minimum wage laws the individual worker does not fix his own wage in negotiation with his employer. That is fixed by law.

The next case put was that the individual worker does not fix his wage or working conditions in relation to his employer when the union is certified by the NLRB as being the bargaining agent.

This proposed repeal of 14(b) is to guarantee collective bargaining—to give management and labor, where a union exists in a plant, the right to bargain over the kind of contract they will have and as to whether or not the members who are employed in that place should be members of the union. That is collective bargaining between them, the certified agent and the employer.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the gentleman for his point. I recognize his argument.

The point I have been making is that there are certain fundamental rights relating to citizenship, religion, and so forth, which are of a high order.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I believe there is very little distinction between a minimum wage and the type of situation with which we are confronted.

In enacting a minimum wage the Congress, or any other legislative body, says, in effect, it is against good social policy to ask anyone to work for a wage below that particular amount in a given industry.

Considering the hypothetical individual of the gentleman from Florida, if he really wished to keep his freedom he would not have to work in an industry covered by a minimum wage—but of course that is a little absurd.

Actually, the point the gentleman was trying to make I believe falls down completely when one considers the fact that society does have a right to speak up to protect its citizens. The same is true with respect to a bar association. A bar association is made up of individuals who are servants of the court. They are officers of the court, and society decrees that no one be represented by anyone in a court unless that person has passed the necessary examinations and has the necessary qualifications to so represent a member of society. Let us not become confused on these particular issues.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield once more? He has been very kind.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Very briefly I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad the able gentleman put it on the basis of social policy. It is exactly what we will determine by the way we vote on this bill. Is it good, sound social policy where a union is already the certified bargaining agent of the employees in a plant, that those who thereafter become a part of the employee group should affiliate themselves with the general mass of employees and in a democratic way determine the conduct and the course of those employees, and should each member of that employee group at least pay the fair value of the bargaining services he gets from the union? The gentleman is right. We are stating a matter of social policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just one additional point?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Of course, the social policy is also present in State governments. In other words, a State government has the right to adopt a social policy; 19 States said in effect that it is against the public policy of those States to enact union shop contracts. To me it is rather important that this Congress in looking at the social policy we adopted not ride roughshod over the social policy adopted by the 19 sovereign States of the Union.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for those comments.

Now, I wish to return to the contribution made by the courageous gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green], concerning the matter of religious conviction. I will confess when I began earlier this year to draft my legislation I did not include that provision, and I should have. Certainly the hearings of the Thompson subcommittee established beyond any question that this is the kind of a fundamental right thought ought not be subject to majority rule. Incidentally, on last Thursday, I introduced a revised bill, H.R. 10039, which adds the gentlewoman's amendment to the provisions my earlier bill, H.R. 4350.

In view of this colloquy concerning the support of the various religious organizations, it is interesting to note the testimony of Reverend Carothers who appeared before the subcommittee on behalf of the National Council of Churches. His testimony begins at page 648 of the committee hearing. Although his prepared statement when he appeared before our subcommittee indicated that the National Council of Churches supported H.R. 77, under close questioning following the presentation of his statement, some very interesting points were developed. First of all, I questioned him about the use of union dues for politics. After a good deal of discussion I said, "Finally, does that mean you would support the provisions of my bill which conditions the repeal of 14(b) on the requirement that union dues not be spent for politics?" And he said, "I would personally, yes."

Then, later on it developed that National Council of Churches had expressed some reservations and conditions in connection with its support of the repeal of 14(b). In his testimony Reverend Carothers referred to the official position of the general board of the national council, and said:

> This is in a section that you do not have before you, but you did not want to have too long a paper. Maybe I should have put it in.

Then he said:

> The following additional safeguards should also be required under any circumstances where union membership is established as one of the conditions of employment, that is, wherever there is a union shop contract.

Then he goes on further to say:

> Such protection should include open membership with freedom from discriminations of race, creed, color, national origin, and sex.

Then he talks about the importance of adequate protection against arbitrary or discriminatory treatment of those who hold minority opinion on union policies and practices.

And then he points to the concern of the gentlelady from Oregon: adequate protection for those individuals who for reasons of religious belief cannot participate in the conditions of membership.

We went on as follows:

> Mr. Griffin. I wish you wouldn't conserve our time on those very important conditions, because those are important conditions, aren't they?
>
> Reverend Carothers. I feel they are. I feel they are fundamental.
>
> Mr. Griffin. Fundamental?
>
> Reverend Carothers. I do.
>
> Mr. Griffin. And are they important enough that they should be protected in the law?
>
> Reverend Carothers. This was the opinion of the general board at the time this was adopted on December 2, 1959.
>
> Mr. Griffin. That they should be incorporated in the law?
>
> Reverend Carothers. The national council's statement regarding safeguards reads as follows:
>
> "Individual members should be protected against abuses by the union through provisions in union constitutions. If such constitutions are adopted the provisions should be enforcible in the courts."
>
> Mr. Griffin. So your advocacy of the repeal of section 14(b) is conditioned upon adequate protection in the law of all of those conditions?

The Reverend Carothers said, "Yes, sir."

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield.

Mr. GOODELL. Are any of those conditions met in the bill before us today?

Mr. GRIFFIN. No, they are not; certainly not the condition that the gentlelady from Oregon is concerned about.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. The gentleman said that Reverend Carothers stated you did not want too long a paper. Who did not want too long a paper?

Mr. GRIFFIN. He was referring to the subcommittee, I suppose. I do not know why he said that or had that impression, because I am sure the subcommittee would have been glad to receive a statement as long as he cared to submit.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Was he instructed by someone?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Not that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], has again expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to my colleague from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me briefly?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] was more than generous in yielding, and I am grateful to him, so that we might get some of these things into the colloquy. His generosity is typical of him. In the course of his discussion he was interrupted at a point when he was talking about being a member of the Michigan bar as is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]. That is an integrated bar; in other words, one which requires membership as a condition of practicing law. Of course, this is the equivalent in labor-management law to a closed shop, which is specifically outlawed.

I might point out that there are 28 States which have integrated bars, and of the right-to-work States, 13 of the 19 right-to-work States have integrated bars. I take no position one way or the other except the fact that they do amount to closed shops in the same manner as does membership in the American Medical Association as a precondition to a physician's ability to practice in certain hospitals. That is their system. That is their equivalent of an integrated bar or a closed shop.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me briefly?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman, in calling these statistics to our attention, is not suggesting that it would be all right if the bar association were to use dues for politics or things that were not related to the professional functions of the bar association? The gentleman is not suggesting that would be all right, because that is the point that I am making?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Indeed not. As a matter of fact, there was a case which went to the Supreme Court of Wisconsin on the very point, where a member of that integrated bar objected to the use of his part of the dues for political purposes. No, I do not approve of it. I know of bar associations which do it and, of course, the American Medical Association does it. But I do not approve of it.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, before we get away from this question, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentlelady from Oregon and to express to her my regret that it will be impossible to vote on her amendment.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] will yield again to me, the obvious question to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] is, "Well, do you approve of unions using their funds for those purposes?"

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, first of all I do not approve of the labor-management analogy to the AMA or an integrated bar which would be a closed shop. I do approve thoroughly of the right of unions to use, subject to the consent of their members, moneys for educational purposes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Subject to the members' consent? Do they have to consent as to whether or not they are going to pay their dues?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It is illegal to use dues money for political purposes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Oh, it is?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I shall later in the debate document the fact that that is not so.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Well, the gentleman will have to change the law.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman is expressing a very naive view when he says it is illegal. We will not take the time of the gentleman from Michigan to go into it further at this point.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman from New York is being charitable.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have heard the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] described in many ways, but I want to say to my friend from New York [Mr. GOODELL] that it is the first time I have heard him described as being naive. I hope the gentleman will have an opportunity to reply to that statement later on in the debate, although not on my time.

Mr. GOODELL. Appearance may be different than substance. I am not sure it was naivete.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Again, the gentleman is being charitable.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I think that one way we can get this debate back on the track—and I reluctantly say that I think it has gotten somewhat off the track—is an attempt to determine just what we are and are not doing. Anyone who can read the papers and the full page advertisements frequently contained therein may have grown to understand this question as one of compulsory unionism. It has been said that if we repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act we will compel workers to belong to unions, and that if a union refuses to accept them or expels them or punishes them, or if they later quit that union that they will lose their jobs and will be unable to feed their wives and children.

Mr. Chairman, that is the charge which has been made against the bill to repeal section 14(b).

Mr. Chairman, that statement is categorically untrue and those who make it do so out of ignorance or out of a desire to mislead Members of Congress with respect to what this bill provides.

The plain fact of the matter is that in the 31 States that today do not have right-to-work laws, no worker can be compelled to join a union, to remain in a union, to attend a union meeting or to submit to union discipline. He cannot be compelled to fill out an application for membership. He cannot even be compelled to refrain from attempting to destroy the union. None of these actions will cost him his job or justify any discrimination against him in the terms of his employment. That is provided for in the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

All we are doing in those 31 States which do not have right-to-work laws is saying that if the employer and the labor organization, after that organization has been certified by the National Labor Relations Board as the bargaining representatives of that unit of employees, agree that they shall have a union shop, and the employees do not later, following a petition and election, reject the terms of the union shop agreement, then there shall be a union shop agreement.

But no worker in that unit may be discriminated against in terms of his employment, or be discharged or in any other way suffer wrong at the hands of his employer or the organization for any reason except the refusal and failure to offer to pay the union whatever reasonable and nondiscriminatory amount might constitute the regularly assessed dues for workers in that bargaining unit. In other words, all that can be required is that someone working in a union shop may be required to pay his share of the freight, no more or no less than any other employee who is a member of the union.

The Taft-Hartley Congress, the National Labor Relations Board, and the courts are all in agreement that when a union-shop agreement is negotiated and signed, no employee can be discharged from his employment for any reason "other than the failure of the employee to tender the periodic dues and the initiation fees uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining union membership."

To close all loopholes on this score, Congress made it an unfair labor practice for a labor union to charge fees or dues "which the Board finds excessive or discriminatory under all the circumstances."

A few of the decisions point up the fact that there can be no compulsory unionism under the Taft-Hartley union shop.

In *Union Starch & Refining Co.* v. *NLRB*, 186 F. 2d 1008 (7th Cir. 1951), the union and the employer signed a union shop agreement. An employee refused to take the union oath of admission because of his religious beliefs, and was thereby discharged from his employment.

The court of appeals held that this was wrong; that the employee could not be discharged under the union shop contract because he refused to join the union. As long as the employee tendered the uniform and nondiscriminatory dues, he could not be discharged.

In *NLRB* v. *Eclipse Lumber Co.*, 199 F. 2d 684 (9th Cir. 1952), an employee refused to picket while the union was on strike. He was expelled from the union, and subsequently discharged from his job. The court said that this was wrong; that the employee could be expelled from the union, but not from his job, as long as he tendered the dues.

In *NLRB* v. *Bell Aircraft Corp.*, 206 F. 2d 235 (2d Cir. 1953), an employee crossed the picket line while the union was on strike. After the strike was over, the strikebreaker was expelled from the union and discharged from his job. The court held that this was wrong, that the union expulsion was permissible, but the job discharge was error, as long as the employee tendered his dues.

An interesting and perhaps extreme case is *Kingston Cake Co.*, 97 NLRB 1445 (1952). This situation arose after the AFL–CIO expelled the old bakers union and chartered a new bakers union. You will recall that there were many raids at that time by the new bakers union on the local unions of the old bakers union. A man named Williams was involved in those raids and in this case.

Williams was an official of the old bakers union at the Kingston Cake Co., and was working secretly for the rival union, the new bakers union. The open and active organizers for the new bakers union secured authorization cards from 30 percent of the employees and petitioned the NLRB for an election.

The old bakers union decided that it too wanted to be on the ballot, but at that time a union could not get on the ballot unless all officers of the union signed the non-Communist 9(h) affidavit.

Williams decided to throw the election to the new bakers union, so he refused to sign the non-Communist affidavit. The result was that the union, in which he was an officer, was prevented from being on the ballot.

The employees, however, could vote "No," and this they did in large numbers. The result was that no union was selected. But it was apparent that the employees wanted the old union as their representative, so the employer recognized it, and signed a union shop contract.

Williams was expelled from the union, and pursuant to the union shop contract, was discharged from his job.

Williams had continued to tender his dues, and filed charges against the employer with the Labor Board. The Board agreed that an employee cannot be fired under a union-shop agreement after he is expelled from his union for obviously just reason, so long as he tenders his reasonable and nondiscriminatory union dues.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I think the statutory language and the decisions by the Labor Board and the reviewing courts make it more than abundantly clear that:

First. Under the limited Taft-Hartley type of union-shop agreement, the unions and their leaders have no say whatsoever concerning who is to be hired, and who is to be fired. That decision is and remains in the hands of the employer.

Second. The applications of the existing Federal law in the 31 States where there is no right-to-work law has not, and under existing law, could not, result in compulsory unionism.

Third. Repeal of section 14(b) would put the 19 right-to-work States on equal footing with the rest of the Nation, and as there is no compulsory unionism in these 31 States, there would be no compulsory unionism in the 19 right-to-work States after section 14(b) is repealed.

Fourth. Compulsory unionism is a bogey which has no legitimate place in the debate on this issue.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Would that sum include only a pro-rata share of the expenditure of the union for bargaining purposes, or would it be possible on the dues which other members pay? Is there any formula the gentleman is aware of?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. It would require him to offer to pay the same amount that is levied as dues on the regular members of the union.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. So that if the union is in fact using its dues for union purposes, the individual who pays that sum in lieu of dues would be paying his money for political purposes?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. The person who pays the sum in lieu of dues, in the nature of a fee for services rendered, would not have to say anything about what particular use that particular fund was put to. He can make sure it is not used for any political purposes. The Taft-Hartley amendment to the Corrupt Practices Act forbids use of union dues to influence any campaign for any Federal office or on any Federal issue. The question arises in a particular State where a union is not forbidden by State law to use dues money for a State campaign. Under the decision of Street against I.A.M. if he does not want his dues used for political purposes he has to simply signify that fact and they cannot be so used and he can recover the pro-rata share.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. It comes to my attention that the gentleman inadvertently, perhaps, and also the gentleman from Florida, have made the remark that only a certified union could enter into a union shop agreement. Under the Taft-Hartley Act a certified union carries the connotation there has been a secret ballot election. I want to make that clear, as a matter of technical law. Although there should be a requirement there be a secret ballot election before the union is authorized, as a matter of fact there is no requirement in the law.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I might point out in the past 15 years there have been eight Board decisions on the matter of secret elections by card, where a bargaining order was issued. The gentleman knows the act of repeal in 1951 eliminated the need for a secret ballot election. In 97 percent of the cases the elections carried, and 92 percent of the total vote cast was in the affirmative, in favor of the union to establish an agreement.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The Board increasingly is relying upon card checks rather than secret ballot elections. There is no requirement of certification. I am not sure the gentleman intended to make that point, but I wanted to make it clear there is no such requirement.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. The requirement is under section 8(a)(3), which authorizes union shop agreements and provides the union must be the representative of the employees, as provided in section 9(a). Section 9(a) prescribes how you authorize a bargaining agent. In the vast majority of cases, certification results from an NLRB-conducted election. It is only under exceptional circumstances where that determination is made on the basis of card checks.

At any rate, I think we ought to make it clear all over again that there is no question of compulsory membership in a union in this bill repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. It simply does not exist. No one who does not wish to become a member of the union will be required to do so. No one who wants to get out of the union will be compelled to stay in. No one who disagrees with the union's decisions will be required to abide by those decisions except, of course, as to the terms of the collective bargaining agreement.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] has mentioned this and I might bring it to your attention. He made the point that his bill repeals section 14(b) just as the bill introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] does. His bill, however, goes on and has several provisions which he deems to be essential to the repeal of 14(b).

One, it repeats the protections against racial discrimination already contained in title 7 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

It provides that they may be enforced in court just as they may be under the provisions of title 7 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

It also provides an administrative remedy that does not now exist under title 7 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

So it would not be fair to say that the gentleman's bill does not provide anything that we do not already have under title 7 of the Civil Rights Act. It provides an administrative remedy in an action before the NLRB.

However, the bill that was reported by the Committee on Education and Labor this morning does that, I think, in a much more sensible and rational way and has the added advantage that while the provisions with respect to racial discrimination contained in the bill of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] apply only to labor organizations, the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the amended version, if those amendments are adopted, would apply to both employers and labor organizations.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I want to make it clear unlike the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] who has a bill amending the Civil Rights Act, I believe the provisions in my bill relating to racial discrimination should be enacted in addition to the provision of the Civil Rights Act which do apply generally, to labor unions generally, to employers generally and to employment agencies generally. I want to make the point further that it seems to me a much higher degree of responsibility that should be imposed upon a union which has the privilege of imposing membership as a condition of employment.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I decline to yield further, the gentleman is again talking about imposing membership as a requirement.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Well, the payment of dues then.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. We just finished discussing that. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I will say to the gentleman in response to that point, it is a very academic point because once a carpenter or a musician loses his union card, he has a hard time finding a job after that. You make the point as to paying dues—that is a very academic point because as a practical matter he does have to belong to a union and he better be a member in good standing or he is not going to get any work.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Is the gentleman contending that this bill makes any difference in that situation?

Mr. GRIFFIN. No, but I am only saying that when we are talking about compulsory unionism, it is not altogether inappropriate.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], my distinguished friend and colleague, is really saying that the existing law is ineffective and that this section would not go to anything which might correct abuses and faults which he claims for it.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I am not really against anything to assist in further providing against discrimination on the basis of race, but I do not think this is the place to do it or the way to do it. I think we will have an opportunity to do so in a much more comprehensive way very shortly.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. The able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] assumed that the gentleman from Florida had erred in his supposition that a labor organization which was authorized to represent the employees had the approval of a certification by the NLRB. Technically the gentleman from Florida was in error, but not substantially, for the reason, as I understand it, that a union to represent employees in a given plant can do so only as a result of an election held by the NLRB or if the employer finds by evidence satisfactory to him that the union does represent a majority of the employees. If a question is raised by any of the employees as to the propriety or correctness of that decision on the part of the employer, then a complaint may be made to the NLRB and the NLRB would hold an election to determine whether or not the union did represent the employees.

Basically, after all, representation by a union is pursuant to the authority of or the acquiescence of the NLRB.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the indulgence of the other members of the committee, so that I may complete a few sentences and then quietly take my place.

In addition to repealing 14(b) and in providing for some further fair employment practice protection, the bill offered by the gentleman from Michigan would restrict the uses to which union dues might be put. I believe others will comment on that later.

Finally, it would reenact, in effect, the bill of rights provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act, on which we had such heated debate some 6 or 7 years ago.

I should like to point out in closing that even the gentleman from Michigan, the leader of the opposition on this bill, seems to agree that section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act ought to be repealed. I would not quarrel with him on that score. I am happy to find myself in agreement with him. I just do not happen to believe, as he does, that the other provisions he suggests in addition to repeal of 14(b) would accomplish the results he apparently seeks.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I will not belabor the point now. We will document it further in the debate.

The gentleman from Michigan reiterated the point that no union organization can influence political matters, and that this is already forbidden in the Taft-Hartley Act.

We have in the record of the hearings, on page 798 and thereafter, a list of some of the contributions which were listed by the UAW, a union fairly well known to the gentleman from Michigan. I will read a few of them to get this naivete out in the open.

Citizens for DOUGLAS, $500.

Citizens for Kerner, $2,500.

Democratic Party of Cook County, $1,000.

Freeman for Governor Volunteer Committee, $2,000.

Liberty Party in New York, $5,000.

This is the list of the UAW of its own contributions. I believe the gentleman's statement should be a bit more carefully qualified.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. If the gentleman would listen a little more carefully, he would understand I said that dues money could not be used for the purposes of influencing a Federal election. I did not have any reference to voluntary contributions through the so-called buck drives or COPE drives conducted by many organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. This list of contributions was prepared by the union. This was union money, as I understand it, paid from compulsory union dues. Voluntary contributions are clearly acceptable to everybody. They are not at issue here.

Incidentally, on page 14 of the report there is a colloquy which all Members of the House should read, as shown in the footnotes, between Mr. GRIFFIN and Mr. Zagri of the Teamsters Union. I will read the concluding portion with reference to union dues:

> Mr. ZAGRI. I can't speak for the expenditures in any State because those expenditures would be more within the confines of special knowledge of the director of politics in that State.
>
> However, assuming for the sake of argument that this was done, that there was a contribution of union funds in a State election or in a local election, I will not concede that this is not a proper activity, because I believe that the welfare of a union, whether it is at the State, local or national level, is directly affected by decisions made by city council, State legislatures, or this Congress. * * *
>
> Mr. GRIFFIN. As I understand your testimony, then, although you are not prepared to make statements on specific candidates, you acknowledge that in general the Teamsters Union funds are used to support candidates in elections at the State and local level, and you think that is a proper use?
>
> Mr. ZAGRI. I say we would be derelict in our duty to our membership if we didn't.

I think that the RECORD should be fairly clear that the prohibition now in the Taft-Hartley Act with reference to political activities is completely ineffective and compulsory dues are used on a large-scale basis throughout this country for political activity.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly for a clarification of that?

Mr. GOODELL. I certainly will.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Union dues money under the Taft-Hartley Act cannot be used to influence the outcome of a Federal election or an election for Federal offices.

Mr. GOODELL. I think you are stating it quite differently now. Nonetheless, the indirect ways of funneling contributions to Federal candidates are so obvious as to make it ludicrous for anyone to contend they do not occur.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. If the gentleman has found that union dues money has been used for such purposes, he should bring this to the attention of the proper authorities.

Second, I would like to point out it is up to State law as to whether or not union dues funds shall be used to assist a candidate at the State or local level. I do not know what the laws of all the 50 States are with regard to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think we are on a very important point here, and I do not want to leave the Record incomplete. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara], if he believes it is legal for a labor organization to contribute dues money collected under a union shop agreement to such an organization as the Americans for Democratic Action. Does he know, for example, that such contributions are made?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would see no reason why not if they did not go into a political campaign. I think they could even support the John Birch Society with their dues money if they wanted to.

Mr. GRIFFIN. And it would be just as wrong.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I think it would be just as right, with the emphasis on "right."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I want to indicate that the records of the Clerk of the House and other records available indicate that the ADA does make contributions to candidates running for office, and a considerable portion of their funds are received directly from unions.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I think the gentleman from Michigan stated his proposition quite differently a few moments ago than he did from the well of the House. He did not confine this as limited to Federal elections. It is very obvious the unions are not restricted by State laws in political contributions. The list that I read here and gave here included such groups as the Liberal Party of New York and the Democratic Party for Cook County. When you mix the money and commingle the money used for things of this nature which are political with a separate intervening group, it is impossible thereafter to determine whether that group made contributions in a Federal election.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes. Then I understand that the Committee will rise.

The point should be made—and I want to emphasize it—that the bill which I have introduced, H.R. 4350, and the amendment I will offer tomorrow, include a proviso making it clear that there is nothing to prevent unions from contributing funds for political purposes or any other purpose so long as those funds are collected on a voluntary basis. In other words, I would put a restriction only on a union that requires membership as a condition of employment. When a union requires membership or the payment of dues as a condition of employment, then such a union, in my opinion, should not be allowed to use the dues for politics or for any purpose other than those purposes for which the union is authorized by law to represent the employees, namely, collective bargaining with respect to wages, hours, and working conditions.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to compliment the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green], for taking a very courageous stand on a very fundamental issue—religious liberty. One of the most serious questions raised during the debate is whether or not we will permit full religious liberty to continue in this country.

In December of 1963, I was privileged to accompany one of my Democratic friends, Jim Wright of Texas, as we spoke to leaders of Central America in San Jose, Costa Rica. I will read a part of the remarks made in my speech:

> Buenas dias senores y senoras.
>
> Our visit here in San Jose, Costa Rica, today with our friends in Central America is truly an exciting experience. It is my hope and desire that when we leave your country to return to the United States, we will have left you with a better understanding of your brothers serving in the U.S. Congress.
>
> For some reason, the image we leave with our friends throughout the world is not always the best. Part of the problem, I am sure, comes from a lack of communications, partially caused by the language barriers.
>
> Many Americans have too little understanding of your history, your culture and, most important of all, your desires, goals and objectives to help your people to a better way of life. Also, it has been said that we Americans tend to be aloof or domineering. Let me say here and now, the vast majority of the Members of Congress and the American people do not fit this description.
>
> Why do I say this? Because the American people, by and large, are Christians—Catholics and Protestants, Baptists, Lutherans, Greek Orthodox, Methodists, Unitarians, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Seventh-day Adventists, Mormons, Quakers are but a few of the religious denominations in our country—all Christians as you and I. Further, we have many other practicing faiths such as the Jewish and Moslem. It is truly remarkable that we live, work and play together in such a harmonious manner.
>
> The reason, without question, for this success must be traced to the great work of our Founding Fathers in the writing of our Constitution, a framework of laws designed to form a more perfect union among the various States, to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.
>
> In my judgment, the greatest contribution to the social progress of mankind, anywhere on earth, has come as a result of these established guidelines. Of all the constitutional amendments, I personally believe the first amendment has been the most constructive and productive.
>
> It reads as follows: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.
>
> There are two basic freedoms that I believe have done more to raise the standard of living in the United States than all others—the freedom of religious opportunity and the freedom of economic opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, the freedom of religious opportunity is one of our most cherished freedoms. It has permitted each individual to worship or not to worship—each individual has the right to promulgate his religious beliefs in the manner that he or she, alone, chooses.

Throughout the world, chaos and controversy are seemingly the order of the day. I would suggest to my colleagues that the basic problems causing conflict are because of the lack of full religious liberty. In Vietnam, the Buddhist and Catholic politicians in government have been fighting each other for control of the government in Saigon. Many other faiths and denominations have privately expressed their disenchantment. Gentleman, let us be completely honest about this. The underlying problem in Vietnam is a lack of religious liberty. Those people could have stable government if they would separate church and state matters. The first amendment to the Constitution of our great Nation has been the prime reason for the political tranquillity we have enjoyed as our country has developed—it has guaranteed the full religious liberty of which I speak.

The fact that a Baptist minister, the Reverend Adam Clayton Powell, chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, has not permitted Mrs. Green to advance her position is indeed beyond my comprehension. Mrs. Green is a Democrat who has stanchly championed the causes of labor and it is inconceivable to me that she is receiving the deaf ear on this vital issue. I want to again compliment her for her valiant effort and pledge to her my full support.

Also I want to fully associate myself with the excellent comments of the very astute gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], who is without question the most able legislator in the Congress on labor law. His arguments are sound and very wise. It is regrettable that more Members are not on the floor to listen open mindedly to his reasoning. I am sure an open-minded evaluation of his testimony would lead to acceptance.

Congressmen Griffin, Quie, Goodell, and Bell have developed excellent views on 14(b) repeal. In order to associate myself with the remarks I want to add them to my comments, as follows:

For 30 years, beginning with the passage of the Wagner Act in 1935, it has been an acknowledged principle of Federal labor law and labor policy that each of the 50 States has unquestioned authority to prohibit or limit collective-bargaining agreements which compel employees to join a labor union in order to hold their jobs. In fact, prior to the enactment in 1947 of section 14(b) as part of the Taft-Hartley Act, 12 States had either amended their constitutions or adopted legislation prohibiting or limiting labor-management agreements requiring union membership as a condition of employment. At the present time 19 States have such legislation on their books. H.R. 77, if enacted, not only would nullify those 19 State laws but it would also deprive the 50 States of their regulatory powers in this important area. Surely, State power to protect individual workers should not be eliminated unless and until adequate Federal safeguards are substituted.

Substantial considerations have been advanced by the proponents of H.R. 77 in favor of a uniform national policy permitting a limited type of compulsory union membership. We are aware that some of these considerations are meritorious. However, it cannot be denied that union shop agreements do impose restrictions on the freedom of choice of individual employees and compel them to make payments to labor unions in order to hold their jobs.

With the exception of labor unions and a few organizations such as some bar and medical associations, private institutions in the United States do not possess the power to compel membership and the payment of fees by those who prefer to remain nonmembers. In our democratic society, such a power, which is equivalent to the sovereign power of taxation, is exclusively a prerogative of government.

Some advocates have argued that there exists a substantial and proper analogy between labor unions and government in this respect. They assert that the services rendered by unions to employees in the area of collective bargaining justify a mandatory requirement of union membership on all employees in the bargaining unit as well as the right to compel all such employees to help pay the costs of the union's bargaining activities.

However, these spokesmen have not been entirely consistent in maintaining this position. When it suits their purposes they have argued with equal vehemence that labor unions are purely private nonprofit organizations and hence should be largely free from government regulation, interference, or control. This was the view often expressed during the debates which led to passage of the Landrum-Griffin Act of 1959.

We conclude, however, that adoption of Landrum-Griffin constituted a complete refutation of the argument that labor unions are purely private institutions which should be immune to governmental regulation. Such a conclusion is particularly compelling in the case of unions which require membership as a condition of employment. Landrum-Griffin does establish some elementary, legal protections for union members against certain abuses and inequities on the part of their unions and union officials. True, these safeguards represent an inadequate minimum, and their enforcement during the 6 years of their existence leaves much to be desired. But they firmly establish the principle that the Federal Government has a legitimate concern in the proper functioning of labor unions, particularly in their relationships with employees and union members, and an obligation to implement its concern in appropriate legislation.

We are convinced that if compulsory unionism is made universal by the repeal of 14(b) as contemplated by H.R. 77 the scope of the governmental obligation is necessarily broadened and that such repeal should be conditioned on the simultaneous enactment of necessary additional safeguards which are presently either wholly nonexistent or entirely inadequate. Just as Governments, both State and Federal, in our political system, provide guarantees for the individual through constitutional bills of rights as well as through legislation clearly defining and limiting Government authority, labor unions exercising the sovereign power of compelling membership, and a power equivalent to the levying of taxes should be subject to statutory requirements designed to safeguard fundamental individual rights.

Consistent with this view we offered or supported in committee a number of amendments designed to fulfill this broadened obligation of the Federal Government. Unfortunately, each and every such amendment was rejected by a majority of the committee.

The amendments we offered or supported in committee would merely have established a number of essential safeguards for individual employees who are, or would be subject to union security agreements requiring, as a condition of employment, that they join a union and pay initiation fees and periodic dues.

FREEDOM FROM RACIAL OR RELIGIOUS DISCRIMINATION

The first of these amendments would have made it unlawful for such a union to deny, limit, or otherwise restrict membership in the union, or any of the rights or privileges pertaining to membership, or participation in any apprenticeship or training program on account of race, color, religion, or national origin.

The need for such a safeguard is so obvious as to require little discussion. A few comments, however, are not inappropriate.

While impressive strides have been made toward political equality in recent years, this progress has not been altogether comforting for the American who cannot get a job because of his color. To be sure, the "Equal Employment Opportunity" title of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which is applicable generally to unions, employers, and employment agencies, can be a useful instrument in the eventual attainment of its stated goal. However, a higher standard and stricter enforcement are justified and necessary in the case of a union which requires membership as a condition of employment.

It is unfortunate, but true, that discrimination by labor unions is often a more serious problem for the Negro than discrimination by employers. This is particularly true so far as apprenticeship and training programs are concerned. Where compulsory union membership is not a requirement, Negroes can often find it easier to obtain a job, or an opportunity for training.

Obviously, if Congress, without providing effective safeguards, should repeal 14(b) and thereby sanction compulsory unionism in the 19 States which have so-called right-to-work laws, the Congress, by its very action, would bring about a reduction in the economic opportunities available to Negroes thereby increasing the difficulties they face.

Surely, a Congress that is truly concerned about poverty and the economic plight of the Negro, will not deliberately extend compulsory unionism into the very States, in some cases, where discrimination problems are the most serious—unless individual workers are effectively protected against discrimination.

FREEDOM OF POLITICAL CHOICE

The second amendment offered in committee would have made it unlawful for a union which requires membership or the payment of dues as a condition of employment to use, directly or indirectly, any part of the dues, assessments, or other moneys collected for political purposes or for any other purpose not directly related to the statutory function of the union; viz, to bargain collectively concerning "rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment" as set forth in section 9(a) of the National Labor Relations Act.

This amendment was carefully drafted so as not to prohibit a union from using union funds for lobbying or other activities to promote or defeat legislation directly related to such collective bargaining purposes. Moreover, the amendment also provided that it would not prohibit a union from establishing and administering a separate contributory fund for political purposes or for any other noncollective bargaining purpose, if the contributions to the fund were voluntary and collected separately from union dues, fees, and assessments.

Thus, our deep concern for another fundamental civil right is appropriately reflected in this amendment. Individual citizens—including those compelled to join a union—are entitled to political freedom. Moreover, they are entitled to meaningful assurance that union dues paid under such circumstances will not be used for purposes foreign to a union's function as collective bargaining agent.

Those who advocate compulsory unionism and oppose State right-to-work laws frequently advance the "free rider" argument. Within limits, this argument has some merit; it goes like this: Under the law, when a union is selected by the majority of employees in a bargaining unit, that union is required by law to represent, not just those employees who voluntarily join the union, but all employees in the unit. Since the union must represent all employees, and since all employees theoretically benefit from the union's services as bargaining agent (so the argument goes), it is only fair that all employees should be required to pay dues. Employees who do not pay dues are referred to as free riders.

This argument has considerable appeal in the case of a union which uses its dues only for those purposes for which it is required by statute to represent all of the employees. However, it is very important to note that section 9(a) of the National Labor Relations Act provides that a labor organization selected by a majority of employees "shall be the exclusive representative of all the employees in such unit for the purposes of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment.

Obviously, the free rider argument rings hollow when it is sounded by spokesmen who vigorously oppose any effective legislation to prevent the use of union dues for political or other purposes not related to a union's statutory function as bargaining agent.[1]

---

[1] In this connection the colloquy which occurred during the hearings between Congressman GRIFFIN and Mr. Sidney Zagri testifying on behalf of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters is most illuminating:

Mr. GRIFFIN. I want to know whether you agree that the dues that are collected under a union shop contract should be spent only for the purposes of collective bargaining.

Mr. ZAGRI. I think the dues collected by the union under the union shop should be spent for the purposes of that union. The purposes of that union are defined by the constitution and bylaws of that union.

Mr. GRIFFIN. In fact, a few years ago, about 4 years ago, as I recall, there was a lot of publicity in Michigan about the fact that the Teamsters Union in Michigan had contributed dues money to a candidate for

As for us, we agree with Mr. Justice Douglas, of the U.S. Supreme Court, when he stated:

"The collection of dues for paying the costs of collective bargaining of which a member is a beneficiary is one thing. If, however, dues are used, or assessments are made, to promote or oppose birth control, to repeal or increase the taxes on cosmetics, to promote or oppose the admission of Red China into the United Nations, and the like, then the group compels an individual to support with his money causes beyond what gave rise to the need for group action."

And Mr. Justice Douglas went on to say:

"I think the same must be said when union dues or assessments are used to elect a Governor, a Congressman, a Senator, or a President. It may be said that the election of a Franklin D. Roosevelt rather than a Calvin Coolidge might be the best possible way to serve the cause of collective bargaining. But even such a selective use of union funds for political purposes subordinates the individual's first amendment rights to the views of the majority. I do not see how that can be done, even though the objector retains his rights to campaign, to speak, to vote as he chooses. For when union funds are used for that purpose, the individual is required to finance political projects against which he may be in rebellion (*International Machinists* v. *Street,* 376 U.S. 740)."

It is worthy of note that other forced associations are not altogether uncommon or alien to our American way of life. For example, in some States an attorney is compelled to join and pay dues to a bar association in order to practice his profession.

However, we are confident that few Members of Congress would oppose a proposition to preclude the bar association, where membership is compulsory from, first, discriminating against Negroes, or, second, using its dues for purposes not related to its professional function or, third, penalizing members for exercising constitutional or other legal rights.

PROTECTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL OR OTHER LEGAL RIGHTS

The third amendment offered in committee and rejected by the majority would have made it unlawful for such a union to fine, suspend, expel, or otherwise penalize or threaten any member for exercising, or attempting to exercise any legal or civil right guaranteed to any person under the Constitution or any Federal law.

This amendment reflects our serious concern about the ability of a union member to exercise the constitutional and legal rights available to other American citizens.

Unfortunately, there seems to be a noticeable trend on the part of the NLRB and some courts to downgrade and subordinate the legal and constitutional rights of individuals when they become union members subject to union discipline. It is disturbing when any union member is relegated to the status of a second-class citizen. However, this is an alarming and intolerable situation as it affects those who are compelled to be union members in order to work.

Union members have been penalized by union officials for speaking out on political issues in opposition to union policy.

Union members have been fined for not engaging in concerted activities of a union even though section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act specifically confers upon every employee "the right to refrain from any and all such activities."

According to the strange rationale recently applied by the NLRB, such rights are protected when exercised by an employee—but not when exercised by an employee who is a union member.

Under recent Board decisions, a union member who is fined for violating union policy is not necessarily left with an option to pay the fine or drop out of the union. He can be compelled to pay the fine, even if it means garnishment of his wages or attachment of his property.

Surely, if compulsory unionism is to be sanctioned by the Federal Government throughout the 50 States, the right of dissent without reprisal must be guaranteed. The words of Justice Douglas speak eloquently to this point:

"If an association is compelled, the individual should not be forced to surrender any matters of conscience, belief, or expression. He should be allowed to enter the group with his own flag flying, whether it be religious, political, or philosophical; nothing that the group does should deprive him of the privilege of preserving and expressing his agreement, disagreement, or dissent, whether it coincides with the view of the group, or conflicts with it in minor or major ways, and he should not be required to finance the promotion of causes with which he disagrees."

These three amendments, which were offered in the committee en bloc, i.e., as a substitute for the committee bill, also provided not only for the repeal of section 14(b) but also for certain enforcement procedures designed to assure the maximum of effectiveness in protecting the fundamental rights which we have described.

Thus, where a union was found to have committed any of the three unfair labor practices set forth above, those provisions of its collective bargaining agreement requiring membership in the union as a condition of employment, would have been rendered illegal and unenforcible. Moreover, any person who suffered damages or injury by reason of such violations of the law would have the right to sue in a Federal court for appropriate relief including injunctions against the offending union.

In addition to the foregoing amendments we offered or supported several others which suffered the same fate at the hands of the majority.

FREEDOM OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF AND CONSCIENCE

One was a proposal, which in essence, would have safeguarded the freedom of religious belief and scruples of conscience of those employees whose religious affiliations are governed by doctrines which forbid them to be members of or contribute to the support of any labor organization.

There are several bona fide religious sects in the United States, among them the Plymouth Brethren, Seventh-day Adventists, and Mennonites, whose creed prohibits their members from being formally associated with or giving support to any organization or association which includes what they refer to as "nonbelievers." "Nonbelievers" are individuals who are not members of the particular religious sect. It was established during the hearings that a number of employees who belong to one or the other of these religious sects have lost their jobs in non-right-to-work States because they have refused to join the union as required under a compulsory union membership agreement.

Witnesses who have appeared in behalf of these religious groups emphasized that they are not proemployer or antiunion, that they do not oppose the repeal of 14(b), and that they have no desire to be "free riders" in the sense of merely seeking a means to evade the financial expense involved in paying union fees and dues. To the contrary, they seek national recognition, embodied in Federal law, of their fundamental right to adhere faithfully to their religious beliefs and the demands of conscience, by refraining from joining or supporting a labor union or any other association of "nonbelievers." They are perfectly willing to have this right conditioned on their payment of sums equivalent to union dues and fees into the U.S. Treasury or to an appropriate charity.

It should be emphasized here that there is ample precedent for an exemption of this type. Under our conscription laws, genuine conscientious objectors are excused from the obligation of military service even in time of war, an obligation which many believe the paramount duty of a citizen. Then again, only a few months ago, the House passed the Social Security Amendments of 1965 (H.R. 6675). This bill exempts from the payment of social security taxes those individuals who, as members of a recognized religious sect, conscientiously adhere to teachings of the sect which prohibit the acceptance of benefits under any private or public insurance plan (including the benefits of the Social Security Act) providing payments for death, disability, old age, retirement, or medical care.

A public policy which makes allowance for the free exercise of religious conscience to the extent of exempting individuals from the obligation to pay taxes or to serve in the Armed Forces even in time of war, can scarcely refuse to recognize the same right to be free from the obligation to join or make payments to a private organization such as a labor organization.

ASSURANCE OF GENUINE MAJORITIES

Another amendment offered in committee was designed to assure that any union entering into a collective bargaining agreement requiring membership as a condition of employment would clearly represent a genuine majority choice by the employees in the bargaining unit covered by the agreement.

Under the existing provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, a union security agreement is valid only if the union involved has been designated by a majority of the employees in the unit as the exclusive bargaining representative of all the employees in that unit. Although the act provides for an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board as one method of determining the majority status of a union, it is not the only method by which the NLRB determines majority status. A procedure frequently used is the submission to the employer of individual cards signed by a majority of the employees designating the union as their bargaining agent. Employers who are convinced that such a showing of cards genuinely reflects majority sentiment among their employees are at liberty to recognize the

---

prosecuting attorney. I think his name was Mr. Olson.

* * * Do you agree and concede that the Teamsters did contribute substantial sums of money to that candidate for prosecuting attorney in that election, and are they contributing funds to candidates for election in other State and local elections * * * and do you consider this consistent with your advocacy of the repeal of 14(b)?

Mr. ZAGRI. I can't speak for the expenditures in any State because those expenditures would be more within the confines of special knowledge of the director of politics in that State.

However, assuming for the sake of argument that this was done, that there was a contribution of union funds in a State election or in a local election, I will not concede that this is not a proper activity, because I believe that the welfare of a union, whether it is at the State, local, or national level, is directly affected by decisons made by city councils, State legislatures, or this Congress. * * *

Mr. GRIFFIN. As I understand your testimony, then, although you are not prepared to make statements on specific candidates, you acknowledge that in general the Teamsters Union funds are used to support candidates in elections at the State and local level, and you think that is a proper use?

Mr. ZAGRI. I say we would be derelict in our duty to our membership if we didn't.

union and to enter into a union security agreement with it. However, they run the risk in doing so of committing an unfair labor practice should it subsequently be charged and proved in a Labor Board proceeding that the union, in fact, did not represent a majority of the employees.

Cognizant of this danger, and aware of the fact that in some situations such a card check may not be accurate, employers have often refused to recognize the union and have insisted that the Labor Board conduct an election. The Board has ruled that such insistence is proper only if the employer has a good faith doubt of the union's majority. In a number of recent decisions the Board has found an absence of good faith, held that the employer has violated the law, and ordered him to bargain with the union, even though the bargaining may include a demand for a compulsory union membership provision in the contract.

Inasmuch as one of the chief arguments advanced in support of the principle of compulsory membership is that the inclusion of such a requirement reflects the will of the majority of the employees, and is therefore entirely democratic, we believe that the genuineness of the claimed majority should be established beyond any possibility of challenge. The only method of achieving this objective is by way of an election by secret ballot supervised by the National Labor Relations Board. In committee, therefore, we offered an amendment to limit the right to enter into union shop agreements to those unions which had established their majority status by means of a Labor Board election conducted pursuant to section 9(c) of the National Labor Relations Act. The right of unions and employees in the building construction industry to enter into prehire, 7-day union security agreements under section 8(f) of that act would remain unaffected.

PROTECTION AGAINST COMMUNIST-DOMINATED UNIONS

The final amendment offered in committee and rejected by the majority, was designed to guard American workers against the possibility that their labor union dues and fees might be used to strengthen pro-Communist organizations or to further Communist causes or objectives. This possibility is particularly disturbing where the worker cannot manifest his objection to such misuse of his money by resigning from the union. Unfortunately under existing law workers are without protection against such abuse.

Up to 1959, the Taft-Hartley Act provided that as a condition of securing a Labor Board election in a representation case or of lawfully entering into a compulsory union membership agreement, each of the officers of the union must submit a non-Communist affidavit to the Labor Board. In 1959 the Landrum-Griffin Act repealed this requirement and substituted for it a provision making it a crime for members of the Communist Party to hold union office. A short time ago the Supreme Court of the United States struck down this provision as unconstitutional.

The result is that our present Federal labor laws lack any provisions designed to exclude Communist Party members from exercising leadership in unions of which they manage to seize control. That such seizure is no idle fear is demonstrated by the fact that in 1950 the CIO expelled from its ranks almost a dozen unions with a total membership of almost a million because they were either Communist led, Communist dominated, or Communist controlled.

A number of these unions still survive and continue to operate; under existing law they are regarded as the lawful collective bargaining agents of several hundreds of thousands of American workers. Where such unions have compulsory membership agreements, thousands of loyal Americans are compelled, in order to work, to pay dues to such a union despite their profound distaste for having the money they contribute used for purposes which they abhor. None of these unions have been readmitted to the AFL–CIO which still regards them as under Communist influence. In this connection, attention is called to the testimony given during the hearings by the Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers' Union, one of the labor organizations expelled from the CIO. Attention is also directed to the appendix of the committee hearings which contain excerpts extracted from a report of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee dealing with the Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers.

For these reasons we offered and supported an amendment to the committee bill restoring the non-Communist affidavit for union officers as a condition for entering into a union shop agreement. With respect to a union insisting upon membership therein as a condition of employment, this amendment would have restored the legislative scheme which prevailed under the Taft-Hartley Act prior to its repeal by Landrum-Griffin in 1959, and it would fill the vacuum created by the decision of the Supreme Court.

We believe all of these amendments to be not only essential but fair and reasonable as well. We recognize merit in some of the arguments in favor of the union shop; however, we believe these amendments are essential to safeguard basic individual rights, which are, at the very least, of equal importance.

It may be that extreme partisans in the ranks of both labor and management will not applaud our approach. However, we are confident that the vast majority of thoughtful Americans, both in and out of Congress, will not abandon or ignore the sound principles which this approach represents.

ROBERT P. GRIFFIN,
ALBERT H. QUIE,
CHARLES E. GOODELL,
ALPHONZO BELL,

Combined Report on Repeal of Section 14(b).

Mr. Chairman, responsible unions representing the interests of working people are an important and essential part of our economic system—they have been an integral cornerstone in America's growth.

Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, as you may know, permits each State to decide whether union shops shall be permitted or outlawed in its jurisdiction. Those who favor retention of section 14 (b) contend that it is the best way to keep a union responsible. If the union must depend upon voluntary participation, the argument goes, it will either perform in the interest of employees or lose membership.

We in California have, for the most part, developed responsible local labor leaders. The action of the Congress on this legislation will not affect the working men and women of California. The issue was settled by the people of our State in 1958. This is as it should be.

With the experience of the last 30 years, I think most of us can say sincerely that we would like to see responsible unions develop more rapidly in the South and other areas of the country. I think this would raise the standard of living in these areas and would help California in its efforts to compete economically with the low-wage rate areas.

Granted, this may well be a long-term effect of repeal of section 14(b). However, if we were to repeal it, we in Congress have an obligation to see that the Federal law is fair and protects the rights of all concerned, especially those who are required to join unions.

It does not seem to me that it is fair to require a worker to pay dues in support of political activities of the union against his wishes. Nor do I think it is fair or right that a union can punish a worker because of his political activities as a citizen and invoke the power of Federal courts to enforce that punishment.

If we are to repeal section 14(b) and require every worker to join a union and pay dues after a majority of his fellow employees have voted for that union, then the same Federal law should guarantee every union member in America the following protections:

First, that a member's union dues will be used only for collective bargaining purposes. Misuse of union funds, political contributions and political activities financed by compulsory union dues, speculative investments, and other questionable uses of money employees must pay to hold their jobs should be outlawed. Obviously, union members must be protected in their right to contribute to all of these causes as they desire, but solely on a voluntary basis, as citizens with the same rights as anybody else.

Second, that a union member cannot be punished, by fine or otherwise, by the union for exercising his rights as an American citizen. This would eliminate situations, of which there are many specific examples, where unions have disciplined members for debating public issues or taking political sides in opposition to union policies.

Third, that a union member will not be discriminated against by the union on the basis of race, religion, or color. If Federal law is going to make union membership a requirement to hold certain jobs, then certainly we must see to it that civil rights guaranteed under the U.S. Constitution are respected.

Fourth, that an exemption will be granted to those individuals whose religious convictions prevent their joining an organization. In this day, as we are attempting to extend equal and civil rights to all Americans, it does not seem proper to be enacting legislation that would restrict the rights of some.

I do not believe that any of our responsible local labor leadership would argue against these elementary guarantees for the working men and women in this country. I believe the labor movement has reached a stage of development where these guarantees are necessary and important to the average man and woman. I shall vote against repeal of 14(b) unless these minimal guarantees are given to our working people by the same Federal law that takes away existing rights.

My concern is primarily with what effect legislation has on people—in this case, the working man is my chief concern. Many times he feels like speaking out but is afraid of the consequences if he does. Well, I am not afraid of the consequences and he has elected me to speak for him. That is why I am expressing myself as I am. The only mail I have received in support of retaining 14(b) has come from labor leaders. Ironically, the only mail I have received opposing this position comes from either workingmen who proudly tell me their point of view or people concerned about the effect on their personal religious beliefs.

Unless these safeguards are provided, to protect these people, they will be engulfed in an expansion of "mobocracy" instead of democracy, at the expense of individual freedom and liberty. My vote will be cast for the little man who is rapidly losing his voice in matters of personal concern. I have great respect for the individual workingman's ability to make the right decision, if permitted to have all the facts and the opportunity to express himself without coercion.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'BRIEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke during the debate today and in Committee of the Whole have permission to revise and extend their remarks; and that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the pending legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER'S VETO OF THE NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATURE'S DIRECT PRIMARY BILL

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Governor Rockefeller's veto of the New York State Legislature's direct primary bill represents a grave setback for democracy in New York. The veto is a reactionary move which works against the traditions of democratic procedure in this country, and in so doing places Governor Rockefeller outside the mainstream of American politics.

On behalf of all those New Yorkers who oppose the Governor's step, and to dramatize our State's commitment to the direct primary ideal, I am submitting today a joint resolution calling for a constitutional amendment which would provide that no person shall be elected a U.S. Senator from any State who had not previously been a candidate for election to that office in a direct primary.

This century of American history has witnessed a gradually increased democratization of our election procedures. The air has been cleared in the smoke-filled rooms of party conventions where, history tells us, leaders of this country were once selected or rejected by a handful of powerful men, in little way responsible to the people at large. Our presidential candidates show increasing interest in State-primary campaigns which give voters the opportunity to select individual candidates as well as to choose between final nominees.

In our statewide elections as well, the anachronism of political conventions is being systematically erased. Direct primaries are now very often the rule rather than the exception in selection of party candidates for Congress.

This gradual development of the direct primary system represents a healthy contribution to the operation of American democracy. The convention system has almost always failed to provide for adequate representation of the electorate at large. Nor is the convention necessarily a truly deliberative body. More often than not, it is a makeshift coverup for the conspiracies of political autocrats who have as little concern with public issues as they do with the desires of the voting population. The direct primary seeks to minimize the dangers of a calcified political party which systematically tries to exclude new talent and divergent viewpoints. By providing full opportunity for many men to seek the prize of political nomination, the direct primary increases the number of choices open to the individual voter—choices between policies and programs, as well as choices between individuals. Finally, the direct primary serves an important role in informing the public, in presenting them with alternatives, and, through the excitement of campaigns, adding to the general political sophistication of the American electorate.

The nomination of U.S. senatorial aspirants has become increasingly subject to the direct primary procedure. Only two States—New York and Indiana—nominate their senatorial candidates in conventions. Delaware also nominates in convention, but has the option for "direct primary." Six other States—Colorado, Connecticut, Idaho, Massachusetts, New Mexico, and Utah—hold preprimary conventions at which candidates are elected or endorsed. Generally, other candidates may enter the primary to oppose these candidates if they receive a certain percentage of votes at the nominating convention, or, often, if they file nominating petitions with the requisite number of signatures.

Where there are no such direct primaries, however, the goals of democratic elections are severely obstructed. It is completely fitting that the Congress act to provide constitutional assurance that the selection of senatorial candidates be made through the process of direct primaries. What 48 States already provide should be certified in the Constitution, which gives Congress, in article I, section IV, the right to set standards for the manner of choosing Senators. The failure of the remaining States, including my own of New York, to meet clearly accepted standards for democratic election must be corrected. The citizens of New York suffer an insult when they are denied the exercise of a voice in the selection of State candidates.

It is altogether proper for the Congress to act in this sphere. The Constitution itself provides authority for Congress to require the selection of nominees for U.S. Senators at primaries rather than in conventions. The U.S. Supreme Court has supported and amplified this authority in *United States* v. *Classic*, 313 U.S. 299 (1941). As Mr. Justice Stone said in "Classic," supra, 316–17:

> That the free choice by the people of representatives in Congress, subject only to the restrictions to be found in sections 2 and 4 of article I and elsewhere in the Constitution, was one of the great purposes of our constitutional scheme of government cannot be doubted. We cannot regard it as any the less the constitutional purpose, or its words as any the less guarantying the integrity of that choice, when a State, exercising its privilege in the absence of congressional action, changes the mode of choice from a single step, a general election, to two, of which the first is the choice at a primary of those candidates from whom, as a second step, the representative in Congress is to be chosen at the election.
>
> Nor can we say that that choice which the Constitution protects is restricted to the second step because section 4 of article I, as a means of securing a free choice of representatives by the people, has authorized Congress to regulate the manner of elections, without making any mention of primary elections. For we think that the authority of Congress, given by section 4, includes the authority to regulate primary elections when, as in this case, they are a step in the exercise by the people of their choice of representatives in Congress.

Support for this exercise of authority could also be gained from article I, section 8, clause 18, of the Constitution.

Action on this issue, therefore, seems completely in accord with the best traditions of this country and with the spirit of the Constitution. The direct primary represents the democratic process at its healthiest, invigorating our politics and serving to improve and expand the participation of all our citizens in political life.

DO-NOTHING CONGRESS OR RUBBERSTAMP CONGRESS?

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to speak out on behalf of the House of Representatives. Perhaps these remarks that I am about to make should come from one with more experience in this great body than myself. Nevertheless, I feel compelled to speak. For it has been a matter of great concern to me—as I am sure it has been to my colleagues in the House—that the House of Representatives and the Congress have so often been characterized as the "do nothing" or "rubberstamp" branch of Government. Too often we hear it said that the legislative branch is incapable of leadership, that it cannot even perform its primary constitutional function of legislating but can only follow the lead of the executive branch.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to the membership, that the history, the experience, and the performance of Congress does not back up any such finding. Only this week, hearings to take place before the Joint Economic Committee will highlight a crucial area where legislative leadership has been paramount—that of international monetary reform. In matters of monetary reform in general and liquidity reform in particular, legislative voices—among the most prominent of whom have been Congressmen REUSS and ELLSWORTH, members of the Joint Economic Committee, and members of the Banking and Currency Committees of both Houses of Congress—have long preceded those of the Federal Reserve Board, the Treasury and other executive agencies in calling for an aggressive, positive policy to be enunciated and implemented in this vital area by the United States. Special tribute must go to our distinguished colleague and one of this Nation's most able economic thinkers, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS]. It should be appreciative by the entire Nation that the hearings on international monetary reform which begins tomorrow before the International Exchange and Payments Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee are in great part the result of the tremendous efforts of Congressman REUSS in their planning and preparation. Because of the increasingly probable danger of a world-liquidity crisis unless our international monetary system is soon put in order, these hearings will greatly benefit the entire world. Under Congressman REUSS' able chairmanship, they will provide a vast fund of knowledge from which we can draw the tools to build the international monetary institutions which the world desperately needs to finance an ever-expanding volume of international trade. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Congressman REUSS and other knowledgeable Members of Congress for their outstanding and imaginative leadership in the field of international monetary reform. They are performing a truly valuable service not only for this Nation but for the world.

These Members of Congress also have provided a classic example where congressional leadership, and especially the leadership of this House, has moved out ahead on a program ultimately followed by the administration. Congressman REUSS commenced his studies of defects in the present international monetary system and began calling for their correction over 2½ years ago. It was not until 2 weeks ago that the administration caught up to Mr. REUSS. The administration has finally come out for a positive solution to the world's fundamental monetary problems.

Mr. Speaker, when I was serving in the California State Legislature, I often had occasion to refer to the fact that the Governor was a great "pie stealer." He waited until the legislature had prepared the ingredients, baked the pie, and taken it out of the oven; then while the pie was cooling on the window ledge the Governor would make off with it and take credit for all the work.

Since coming to the Congress, even in the short time that I have been here, it has been my sad experience to note that the administration has similarly indulged in stealing pies from the Congress. We are, of course, delighted that the administration now has the pie of international monetary reform. We hope that they will do something positive with it. But we also hope that credit for its baking will go where credit is due.

FIGHT CONTINUES TO PROTECT SERVICEMEN FROM LOAN TRANSACTION ABUSES

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on July 19, 1965, I called to the attention of my colleagues the investigation being conducted by the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee into the operations of the Federal Services Finance Corp., a worldwide lending organization that is primarily engaged in the business of making personal and automobile loans to servicemen. I also read a letter that I had sent to the Honorable Norman S. Paul, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower at the Pentagon.

At this time I would like to inform my colleagues that Mr. Paul has answered my letter.

I have also received a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States with regard to the Federal Services Finance Corp. The Veterans of Foreign Wars is deeply concerned about the morale and the welfare of our country's servicemen and this outstanding veteran organization has expressed its interest and support in our subcommittee's investigation.

The concern of the VFW in this matter is shared by the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States. Dr. James F. Greco, commander of the Filippo Mazzei Post No. 1, Illinois, Italian-American War Veterans, in a recent letter to me has supported the continuation of our investigation of Federal Services Finance Corp.

Mr. Paul's letter, the letter from the VFW, and Dr. Greco's letter follow:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 21, 1965.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ANNUNZIO: This will acknowledge your letter of July 6, 1965, concerning Federal Services Finance Corp.

In my statement before the committee, I pointed out that I had established an interservice committee which is currently considering remedial measures that can properly be taken by the Department of Defense consistent with the responsibilities of the Federal and State authorities primarily charged with regulating credit financing. I indicated some of the measures which were being considered by the committee.

This afternoon this interservice committee held its fourth session and completed a proposed directive designed to protect servicemen against the types of abuses in loan transactions to which the House Subcommittee on Domestic Finance has so usefully directed public attention. Tomorrow when the clean drafts of the proposed directive are available, I will send them to the three military departments and appropriate OASD offices.

When the coordinated procedures have been concluded and a tentative final draft is drawn up, it is planned to solicit the views of interested Federal agencies. Finally, of course, we will submit the draft to the committee and will welcome its suggestions.

As to placing of off limits, as presently written, the proposed directive authorizes such action under certain prescribed procedures. The directive is a comprehensive one which applies to lending activities which affect servicemen. It is designed to establish an effective and constructive program of raising the standard of consumer credit programs as they affect military personnel.

It is not contemplated at this time that the Defense Department will place the Federal Services Finance Corp. off limits.

I hope you will support us in the program we have undertaken, and that you will accept my assurance that the Department of Defense views its effort in this matter as a most serious one and intends to perform thoroughly its responsibility to protect servicemen against sharp lending practices.

Sincerely,

NORMAN S. PAUL,
Assistant Secretary of Defense.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City, Mo., July 22, 1965.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you very much for your letter of July 20 with copy of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Monday, July 19, 1965, which includes your remarks concerning the Federal Services Finance Corp. (on pp. 17218 and 17219), which have been read and noted for future reference.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is deeply concerned with the morale and welfare of our active duty servicemen. Our organization has been watching closely the hearings and other actions being taken by the Banking and Currency Committee with respect to the operations of this finance corporation and to "fast buck" methods, which are so detrimental to many of our servicemen.

Thank you for placing this information in the RECORD and bringing it to everyone's attention. You may rest assured our organization will support any and all legislation intended to keep our fighting forces at its highest peak of efficiency and effectiveness.

May I take this opportunity to wish you continued success as a most distinguished and valued Member of the 89th Congress.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

FILIPPO MAZZEI POST NO. 1,
Chicago, Ill., July 23, 1965.

Congressman FRANK ANNUNZIO,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: I was interested in reading your timely comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, July 19, 1965 regarding the vicious practices of the Federal Service Finance Corp. I commend you for your fearless and unalterable position in exposing the usurious practices of this organization. It is not pleasant to "lock horns" with people in influential positions, but I am pleased to see that you are more concerned with doing the right thing than being comfortable.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. GRECO.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit the report of the resolutions committee which was adopted by the 52d annual national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington June 8–11, 1965.

The resolutions committee, of which I had the honor and pleasure of again serving as cochairman, together with my colleague and cochairman, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. JOHN YOUNG, consisted of one delegate from each State and insular possession.

The members gave careful and painstaking consideration to the matters before them, made many constructive suggestions, proposed numerous changes in the draft of the resolutions presented to them, and reached agreement thereon.

The convention was attended by a record high of 624 registered delegates and their wives from 49 States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the District of Columbia, in addition to several score unregistered delegates, guests, visitors, and representatives of the press, radio, and television. Florida was in first place with 82 delegates; Texas was second with 56; Ohio was third with 34; and North Carolina was fourth with 32.

These delegates were from all sections of the country, representing both legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government; State, city, county, and other local governmental agencies and interested groups; commercial, waterway, flood control, and reclamation associations; agricultural, labor, industrial, and trade organizations; and transportation interests; with memberships totaling several million.

We believe this expression of representatives of such different interests and pursuits is strong evidence of the general sentiment of the people of the United States concerning the matters dealt with in these resolutions.

The membership of the resolutions committee is as follows:

COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS

Representative W. R. HULL, Jr., House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. (Home: Weston, Mo.), chairman.

Representative JOHN YOUNG, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. (Home: Corpus Christi, Tex.).

COCHAIRMAN

E. W. Easterling, attorney, Beaumont Navigation District and Lower Neches Valley Authority, 711 Beaumont Savings Building, Beaumont, Tex., secretary.

MEMBERS

Alabama: George L. Cleere, Coosa-Alabama River Improvement Association, Post Office Box 32, Montgomery.

Alaska: Representative RALPH J. RIVERS, 1540 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C. (Home: Fairbanks, Alaska).

Arizona: Victor I. Corbell, president, Salt River project, Post Office Box 1980, Phoenix.

Arkansas: John P. Morrow, Jr., White River Association, 875 East Main Street, Batesville.

California: F. E. Hopkins, city of Redondo Beach, Post Office Box 270, Redondo Beach.

Colorado: Richard Eckles: coordinator of natural resources, State capitol, Denver.

Connecticut: Charles W. Cooke, Greater Hartford Flood Commission, 11 Asylum Street, Hartford.

Florida: Tom Adams, secretary of state, Tallahassee.

Georgia: R. S. Howard, Jr., Post Office Box 587, Albany.

Hawaii: Walter O. Watson, Jr., 3676 Sierra Drive, Honolulu.

Illinois: Charles Covington, Rend Lake Conservancy District, 1818 Isabella Avenue, Mount Vernon.

Iowa: R. N. Russo, city of Dubuque, Dubuque.

Louisiana: Roy Snyder, Delhi.

Maine: Ronald W. Green, commissioner, department of sea and shore fisheries, Augusta.

Maryland: Capt. Alfred W. Kabernagel, Maryland Port Authority, pier 2, Pratt Street, Baltimore.

Michigan: Robert A. Briggs, the Detroit Edison Co., 2000 Second Avenue, Detroit.

Minnesota: Patrick E. Sweeney, Construction & General Laborers' Union, 117 Fourth Street, Southeast, Minneapolis.

Mississippi: Hon. Francis Zachary, Hattiesburg.

Missouri: William E. Kemp, 810 Commerce Building, Kansas City.

Montana: John J. Burke, Metals Bank & Trust Co., Post Office Box 1960, Butte.

Nebraska: Warren D. Fairchild, Lincoln.

Nevada: State Senator Warren Monroe, editor, Elko Independent, Elko.

New Hampshire: Frederick M. Auer, Department of Public Works and Highways, Post Office Box 483, Concord.

New Jersey: Peter J. Gannon, chief, Bureau of Navigation, Department of Conservation and Economic Development, State of New Jersey, Trenton.

New York: Cecil E. Heacox, secretary, New York State Conservation Department, State Office Buildings Campus, Albany.

North Carolina: L. C. Bruce, North Carolina Ports Authority, Post Office Box Drawer 149, Raleigh.

North Dakota: Milo W. Hoisveen, State engineer, 1301 State capitol, Bismark.

Ohio: Henry J. Crawford, attorney at law, 1857 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland.

Oregon: Donel J. Lane, executive secretary, State water resources board, 500 Public Service Building, Salem.

Pennsylvania: A. J. Sommerville, chief engineer, water resources development, Department of Forests and Waters, room 491, Education Building, Harrisburg.

Rhode Island: Henry Ise, chief, division of harbors and rivers, Department of Public Works, State of Rhode Island, Providence.

South Dakota: J. W. Grimes, State engineer, Pierre.

Tennessee: Edward Nave, senior engineer, division of water resources, Department of Conservation and Commerce, 201 Cordell Hull Building, Nashville.

Texas: E. Jack Turner, Dow Chemical Co., Freeport.

Utah: Harold E. Wallace, 530 Judge Building, Salt Lake City.

Virginia: Col. Donald C. Hill, USA (retired), chief engineer, Virginia State Ports Authority, 1600 Maritime Tower, Norfolk.

Washington: Dorsey M. Martin, Dayton.

West Virginia: Litz McGuire, Logan.

Wisconsin: John F. Sainsbury, Brown County Harbor Commission, courthouse, Green Bay.

Wyoming: C. H. "Cliff" Davis, Gilette.

Puerto Rico: Jose Ysern de la Cruz, Post Office Box 3508, San Juan.

Virgin Islands: Senator Frits Lawaetz, St. Croix.

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE TO THE 52d NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

FOREWORD

We believe that the future of our Nation and its people will have to depend in large degree on an adequate supply of fresh water. Realizing this our congress, now and as in years past, rededicates its best interests to the development of projects proposed by our Federal agencies for the purpose of conserving and expanding the natural resources of our Nation. The time has come for a full realization of the potentials that are evident and our interests are hereby dedicated to the fruition of a full program of such development.

FLOOD PLAIN INFORMATION

Man's encroachment on the natural flood plains of our Nation's streams has, in many ways, lacked economic justification when such encroachment is considered in the evaluation of flood control projects. The Federal program for advising local governments and communities of flood damage prevention through wise and adequate planning for flood plain regulations has been consistent with the funds thus far available for the purpose. We suggest that the Federal appropriation for flood plain information studies be increased, in fact, from the present amount of $1 to $3 million which will permit assistance to localities now in need of help in solving their local problems related to flood plain encroachment.

SMALL NAVIGATION PROJECTS

The program for small navigation projects authorized by section 107, of the River and Harbor Act approved July 14, 1960, has provided many communities in the Nation with projects which otherwise would have had to wait a matter of years in some instances for specific congressional authorization. The success of the program is limited, however, by annual appropriations. It is appropriate to suggest to our National Congress that the amount for individual projects be increased to $500,000 and that the annual appropriation be increased to $5 million. This would permit the adoption by the Chief of Engineers of more worthwhile projects which are for consideration under this authority granted to him.

BANK STABILIZATION

The Federal and State, local and private investment in levees, transportation facilities, bridges, docks, and industrial complexes is so great that it behooves Congress to become alert to the requirements for additional funds to provide a systematic program of bank stabilization in and along our streams.

EXPEDITE THE PROGRAM

Lack of funds or inadequate funds have long been a delaying factor in the development of our land and water resources. Such delays are costly because of price increases over a long construction period. Moreover, early completion provides for realizing benefits sooner and a return on the Federal investment. Increased appropriations to the extent of the Federal agencies' capability to use them are indeed appropriate.

USER CHARGES

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress reaffirms its opposition to the imposition of charges in any form on the waterways of our Nation. The elimination of the historic free use of these waterways can only result in a reduction if not the extinction of this valuable asset to our economy. In effect the imposition of taxes or charges for the use of our waterways is glaringly inconsistent with the basic principle that tax reductions stimulate our economy. This resolution is not applicable to the St. Lawrence Waterway, the Panama Canal, or any other international waterway supported wholly or partially by user fees.

MANNING AND INSPECTION OF TOWING VESSELS

This Congress is opposed to any legislation which would require the inspection and certification of certain towing vessels and give the U.S. Coast Guard authority to specify the number of crew members for such vessels. The present system of self-policing by the towing industry on inland waters has worked well and should continue.

POLLUTION CONTROL

Whereas adequate water supplies of satisfactory quality are vital to the economic and social well-being of every American; and

Whereas pollution abatement has long been a primary concern of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress; and

Whereas the continued degradation of our water resources by pollution is a barrier to the Nation's full social, economic and recreational growth and its scenic beauty; and

Whereas this degradation of water resources is most prevalent in the urban areas of the country; and

Whereas the construction grants program of the Water Pollution Control Act has demonstrated its value by stimulating the building of treatment works; and

Whereas the existing program does not meet present-day needs; and

Whereas the present allocation formula and dollar ceilings on construction grants limit participation by local governments especially in urban areas where waste treatment facilities are most needed; and

Whereas the States should retain responsibility and authority for setting standards of water quality for waters within their boundaries and cooperatively with other States and the Federal Government for interstate streams: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Rivers and Harbors Congress recommends:

1. Legislation to amend the Water Pollution Control Act to provide for allocation of funds among the States so as to reflect more adequately the needs for pollution abatement facilities.

2. Legislation to amend the Water Pollution Control Act to eliminate existing discriminations against large cities and urban areas and to encourage States and localities to take decisive action to end water pollution.

3. Legislation to amend the Water Pollution Control Act to require that States establish acceptable standards of water quality as a prerequisite to the approval of Federal grants-in-aid for water pollution abatement facilities.

4. A substantial increase in Federal appropriations for grants-in-aid of local water pollution abatement facilities.

The resolutions committee has considered the proposed North American water and power alliance program and requests the executive vice president to submit available information on the project to the members of the board of directors prior to the next annual meeting in order that the board may recommend appropriate action on this comprehensive project.

NATIONAL DEFENSE BENEFITS OF INLAND WATERWAYS

It is resolved, That, while the national defense benefits of inland navigation have long been recognized in principle they have not been accepted in fact to the extent the National Rivers and Harbors Congress believes to be justified.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress, therefore, recommends that national defense benefits be included in the evaluation of inland and intracoastal navigation projects.

THE 200-BILLION-ELECTRON-VOLT ACCELERATOR

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, because of the great interest regarding the location for a proposed 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator, I introduced into the record on July 9 a list of 110 proposals that the Atomic Energy Commission had received recommending sites for the location of this proposed facility. Today I wish to up-date that list by adding seven additional proposals that have been received by the Atomic Energy Commission since that time. I ask that the list of additional proposals be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I mentioned in my July 9 statement that the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Berkeley, Calif., under the direction of Dr. Edwin McMillan, had completed a design study for a 200 Bev accelerator. Summaries of that design study will soon be on their way to the proposers of a site for this accelerator facility. According to the LRL design study the total construction authorization required for this facility is now estimated to be $348 million. The report on Policy for National Action in the Field of High Energy Physics submitted to the Joint Committee by President Johnson in January 1965, estimated the cost for this facility at $280 million; the policy report, however, did indicate that a more firm construction cost estimate would be available at the time that the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory studies were completed. Included in this $348 million estimate is an estimate of $40 million for initial research equipment for this facility.

I would like to reiterate what I said in my July 9 statement, the proposed 200 Bev accelerator has not been authorized for construction nor has it been authorized for engineering design work. The current fiscal year 1966 Atomic Energy Commission authorization does permit, however, a continuation of research and development on this accelerator. I do not anticipate that a request for authorization of engineering design for this facility will come up before the Congress prior to next year's authorization hearings on the Atomic Energy Commission's Fiscal Year 1967 budget. The report on Policy for National Action in the Field of High Energy Physics does not contemplate a request for construction funds until fiscal year 1968.

Mr. Speaker, I am making these comments and entering this additional list of site proposers because I know of the great interest in this proposed facility by many Members of the House of Representatives. I shall continue to try to keep this House fully advised as to the developments that occur in the consideration of this project.

The additional seven proposals are from Colorado, Mesa County; Kentucky, Carrolton, Murray, Paducah; Minnesota, Duluth; New Jersey, Millville, Warren Grove.

HUMANE TREATMENT OF LABORATORY ANIMALS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to provide for the humane treatment of laboratory animals. The bill which I am introducing has the endorsement of the Nation's largest humane organizations, the American Humane Association and the Humane Society of the United States. Without restricting or reducing much-needed medical research this new legislation will require a high standard of humane treatment of animals used in research, thus fulfilling the moral obligations of our society.

All Americans have been shocked by the deplorable conditions existing in some laboratories, and the manner in which these animals are acquired, transported, and kept. We are all aware of the sometimes cruel and endlessly repetitious experimentation. A society which adopted humane slaughter legislation years ago to curb abuses and unnecessary cruelty in the meat-processing industry cannot sit by any longer and permit these conditions to exist in a field which justly prides itself in trying to relieve pain and sufferings of humans through research. The great failure has been in the inability of any responsible authority to provide minimum standards of care which would insure the daily humane treatment of these animals, and which makes this legislation necessary.

My bill would establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare, which would be headed by a Coordinator and would be responsible for insuring that adequate humane procedures are followed in the handling, care, and use of laboratory animals which are used in research financed through Federal Government funds.

Leading laboratories have already discovered that the proper care and treatment of animals greatly aids research and actually reduces costs. These researchers are as concerned about this problem as the American public, and I am sure will join in the support of legislation to regulate those in the industry which seek to profit from the sufferings of animals in their custody.

It is of primary importance that this country's many vital research projects continue their fight to prevent disease and eliminate human suffering. It is also of importance that we guarantee humane treatment of laboratory animals used in this research. Responsible researchers agree that these two goals are not incompatible. It is my sincere hope that the legislation which I am introducing today will be an effective step toward the achievement of these objectives.

KEEP 14(b) ALIVE

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened intently to the debate on adoption of the rule for consideration of H.R. 77, to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. The arguments on both sides have been impressive. However, I believe the Cleveland Press, one of my hometown newspapers, has very succinctly "hit the nail on the head" with an editorial entitled "Keep 14(b) Alive." Believing my colleagues will be interested in reading this editorial, I include it as part of my remarks:

[From the Cleveland Press, May 19, 1965]

KEEP 14(b) ALIVE

> The Press believes that labor unions, honestly run, perform valuable service for their members, the community and the country.
>
> But this newspaper also favors keeping alive the principle of freedom of choice in an increasingly regimented world.
>
> For both these reasons, this newspaper urges Congress not to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which permits States to pass so-called right-to-work laws barring compulsory union membership.
>
> When the question of right-to-work arose in Ohio in 1958, the Press vigorously led the fight which kept it from being the law of the State. Yet the Press believes that voters in every State should be allowed to decide this—as Ohioans decided—for themselves.
>
> Section 14(b) has been denounced by labor leaders as a death blow to union organizing drives. It has been sanctified by antiunion employers as a magna carta for their employees. Since it was enacted 17 years ago, it has been the target of more hot air from both sides than almost any other piece of legislation within memory.
>
> Using official Government statistics, it can be "proved beyond doubt" that workers in the 19 States with right-to-work laws are: (a) moving faster economically than those in States without them, or (b) falling behind the employees in the 31 other States. What is "proved" depends on the preconceived point of view.
>
> The fact is that section 14(b) is neither as bad as its opponents claim nor as effective as its supporters pretend. It does not prevent unions from organizing every worker in the United States if they are able to do so. Conversely, it neither grants the right to work to anyone nor gives Federal sanction to union busting anywhere.
>
> What it does is simple. It says that a State, if it wishes, may pass a law forbidding union membership as a condition of employment—in other words, barring anyone from being forced to join a union in order to hold a job.

WAR ON WASTE

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, since this administration is waging wars on so many fronts, I would like to suggest a massive escalation in its alleged war on waste. The confusions, conflict of programs, and lack of policy are most clearly revealed by only two examples of waste and dollar loss in the foreign aid program. While our Government tries to limit overseas travel and purchases by Americans, the Government itself wastes millions of our dollars and contributes to the outflow of gold.

In Brazil, we paid $3.8 million for the shipment of Brazilian sugar to other AID recipients, when we had Brazilian currency which could have been used and the dollars saved.

In the United Arab Republic where we had sold millions of dollars worth of tallow for American dollars, our AID agency through Public Law 480 has replaced the dollar payments by giving the Arabs surplus tallow for soft currencies which we cannot use.

In Brazil we gave away dollars. In the Arab Republic we displaced $5.3 million of transactions which would have improved our balance of payments and our gold reserve.

Though the methods they use are diverse, they are consistent in their ability to waste our gold. If the administration wants more than a fictional war on waste, there is no better place to start than right in the foreign aid program, and no more appropriate time than now.

I am preparing a resolution designed to stop such absurd and wasteful contradictions.

VIETNAM

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, to all of us keeping a cautious eye on our foreign policy, the news today from Vietnam is particularly ominous. Saturday's downing of an Air Force Phantom, 40 miles west of Hanoi, would in any event be sobering news; yet in this instance, the news is chilling, for the Phantom was probably shot down by a Soviet surface-to-air missile. Should this prove true, Americans will have to face the fact that our Government has long known of the Hanoi area SAM sites, yet has never seen fit to destroy them. Members of Congress and responsible citizens throughout the country have repeatedly called for the destruction of these sites. Why should it require the loss of American lives and American planes to awaken us?

The downed Phantom was engaged in a bombing mission against the Lang Chi explosives plant 55 miles northeast of Hanoi. I have long been among those advocating this type of offense as the surest means of preventing an escalated all-out war. Recent reports of stepped up activity in this area are, of course, heartening. But more important, I would hope that they are an indication of our Government's decision to attack other military targets in North Vietnam and to establish a naval blockade around the North Vietnam ports. For these are the sort of tactics that, when used in support of our regular forces, can prevent this war from becoming an all-out ground war with its frighteningly heavy cost of American lives and material.

The President is today said to be reassessing his policies in light of the weekend events. Let us hope that he will call upon every means at our command—economic, military, and diplomatic—to defeat Communist aggression and thereby prevent this war from becoming an all-out land war.

RURAL YOUNG PEOPLE FROM 32 COUNTRIES TO ATTEND INTERNATIONAL FARM YOUTH EXCHANGE CONFERENCE AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY, MANHATTAN, KANS.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as my State of Kansas, and Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans., in the Second Congressional District, are hosts this week to more than a hundred young men and women from 32 countries at the 12th annual midpoint conference of the International Farm Youth Exchange, I feel that it is appropriate for me to join in the Kansas welcome to them and to pay tribute to this program which has done so much to bring representatives of the family of nations together in the interest of better understanding and the advancement of learning.

The 108 young men and women to attend have spent up to 3 months in the United States, living and working with rural families. Each IFYE has been in one State. Following the conference, each participant will go to a second host State in a different part of the country. IFYE's live with about four host families in each State.

The midpoint conference, July 28 to August 4, gives the IFYE exchangees an opportunity to meet young people from other countries of the world. They also review the operations, procedures, and objectives of the program, as well as making plans for their second State visit.

Climax of the conference will be an international night dinner and program in which IFYE alumni, sponsors, host families and friends from throughout Kansas will be guests. The dinner will feature foods of other lands and recreation from the exchangees' countries.

Other highlights will include a discussion of the IFYE's observations of life in the United States, a talk on "World Challenges" by Dr. A. B. Webber, of Kansas State, Tuesday, August 3, and a tour, Sunday, August 1, of the Eisenhower home and library at Abilene, Kans., and the Kansas State 4-H Club camp.

The 12th midpoint conference is sponsored by the National 4-H Club Foundation and the Cooperative Extension Service of Kansas State University. IFYE is conducted by the 4-H Foundation in behalf of the Cooperative Extension Service of the State land-grant colleges and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The program is privately sponsored in the United States with funds raised by 4-H clubs and local organizations within the States matched about 2 for 1 by contributions to the national 4-H sponsors council by banks, foundations, business, cooperatives, and industrial firms. Major support has been given this year by the Danforth Foundation, Trans World Airlines, and Standard Oil Co., New Jersey.

A number of companies and foundations are providing sponsorship for exchanges with specific countries: Archer Daniels Midland, Mexico; Creole Foundation, Venezuela; Ford Motor Co. Fund, Brazil, Germany, Italy, Norway, and Jamaica; General Foods Corp., Germany; Gerber Baby Foods Fund, Italy; International Minerals & Chemical Corp., India; International Harvester, Australia; Kellogg Co., Germany; New Holland Machine Co., France; Pittsburgh Plate Glass Foundation, Scotland; and Sears, Roebuck Foundation, Costa Rica.

Kansas leads all States in its participation in this exchange program. Through 1964, Kansas had sent 133 delegates overseas and had played host to 267 exchangees. In 1965, four more delegates from Kansas have gone overseas and three more will leave in late September. They are: Miss Glorida Bartholomew, Alton, who is in Japan; Gerald H. Schmitt, Kinsley, in Tunisia; Miss Karen Chitwood, Wichita, in Brazil; and Thomas R. O'Dell, Elk City, now in Turkey. In September, Richard Hawkins, of Atwood, will leave for India; Miss Mary Munson, of Junction City, will go to India and Miss Barbara Simms, Atchison, will leave for Jamaica.

Fourteen exchangees from thirteen different countries are now visiting in Kansas. They are: Miss Ilma T. Arns, Brazil; Alvaro Aguirre, Mexico; Eladio Saldivar, Paraguay; Matti K. Sipila, Finland; Miss Annemarie Weber, Germany; Shailendera K. Pathak, and Miss Arati Sahana of India; Miss Gabrielle M. Gowing, Ireland; Dante Losco, Italy; Miss Marit Valstad, Norway; Aziz Fuozal, Tunisia; Miss Nedret Sevim Sener, Turkey; Raul G. Bratschi, Uruguay; and Eduardo J. Vasquez of Venezuela.

IFYE IS A PIONEERING EXCHANGE PROGRAM IN 1965 JUST AS IN 1948

The International Farm Youth Exchange—IFYE—is well into its 18th year, making it one of the most experienced of youth exchange programs. It has pioneered the family living exchange visits in the United States and the cooperating countries, and is one of the major rural youth exchange programs of the world. Sixty-nine countries have participated in IFYE.

A total of 104 U.S. delegates are IFYE's to 32 countries this year. Their counterparts are 108 young people now visiting this country. IFYE's visit their host countries during the peak agricultural seasons, so 43 of the U.S. delegates will not depart until mid-September. The other groups left in April and June.

The 1965 program is very different from that of the first U.S. delegation in 1948, when 17 U.S. young people visited 6 countries of Western Europe. The number of exchanges grew rapidly in the early 1950's as 4-H Clubs expanded their interest in 4-H international programs. The numbers of cooperating countries and participants have remained relatively stable in recent years. Now every State—except two—and Puerto Rico have participated in IFYE.

The program is conducted by the National 4-H Club Foundation in behalf of the Cooperative Extension Service of the State land-grant colleges and universities and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This means the 4-H Foundation makes the arrangements with the State 4-H programs and with rural youth groups and other cooperators in the host countries. This includes raising more than two-thirds of the money.

The extension services of the land-grant institutions handle the program within the States, including the selection and training of delegates and host families, and securing funds for a portion of the expenses.

In each cooperating country, the 4-H Foundation conducts IFYE with a 4-H or other rural youth program, the Ministry of Agriculture, or another responsible agency. This includes the selection of the exchangees, arrangements for hosting the U.S. delegates, and raising the reciprocal funds for the program.

IFYE is a privately supported program. Business and industry, banks, foundations, cooperatives and other groups provide the finanicial sponsorship as a part of their corporate citizenship. They support IFYE because they believe it is in the best interests of their country as well as their organization. Their contributions place them in cooperation with 4-H Clubs and other local groups that provide funds at the State level. The U.S. Government has encouraged the IFYE program with a number of lesser developed countries, by making available foreign currencies to assist with transportation and certain expenses in the cooperating countries.

What are some of the objectives of the IFYE program? Why does the Cooperative Extension Service have IFYE as a part of its youth education program?

First, IFYE is dedicated to the principle of personal understanding, thus the visits of delegates and exchangees with host families are very beneficial. Not only is it important that IFYE's live with families offering a wide variety of experiences, but there is also the educational value of having an IFYE in the family home. The IFYE program could be considered successful for the opportunities offered to host families, let alone the effect upon the actual exchange participants. Throughout the world, host families have broadened their horizons by having offered hospitality to an IFYE.

Yet IFYE's are not limited to a "family" living experience. In many countries the host group is an agricultural or home economics school, or an extension training center. This enables the IFYE's to be in close contact with the people of the community. Whether it be a family, a school or some other group, the IFYE's have a tie in each community; they are not merely visitors from afar, but they become a part of the community.

Second, the program is affording delegates and exchangees alike an opportunity to pursue their own special interests in their host country along with the common bonds of agriculture and rural youth programs. These interests cover a wide range of topics, from foods to music to elementary education to farm management to family life to entomology to recreation to clothing to real estate practices and many others.

A depth study of these personal interests helps the IFYE to learn more about his host country. He becomes intimately acquainted with a facet of life in which he is deeply interested. While this has been an informal part of IFYE from the very beginning, the new emphasis makes this study more effective. It is hoped that over the years, the IFYE's contacts and interests in the host country will be more valuable because of this important link.

Third, IFYE is seeking to strengthen and expand the contacts between 4-H in the United States and rural youth club programs of other countries. These groups now exist in at least 75 countries of the world; many of them have been fostered by the IFYE program. Nearly all are patterned after the 4-H program of the United States, taking the "learn by doing" concept and adapting it to the people and culture of the country. The principles of 4-H are at work under the four-leaf clover banner around the world.

Through IFYE, the contacts are strengthened. The members and leaders of rural youth clubs in other lands are eager for guidance from 4-H'ers in the United States. Thus, a whole new group of 4-H international activities has been established. Most prominent are the 4-H Peace Corps projects in Brazil, with 4-S clubs; Venezuela, with 5-V clubs; Sarawak, with 4-H clubs; and Uruguay, with MJA clubs. Other Peace Corps projects give assistance to 4-H type programs, too.

A new international program has been initiated this year for young people who are still 4-H members. IFYE's must be between 20 and 30 years old, thus most delegates actually are alumni. The 4-H Foundation conducted the first nationwide exchange this summer with 22 4-H members from 12 States qualifying to visit in Europe. They left the United States on June 29 and returned on August 28.

The 4-H Foundation also offers special study opportunities in 4-H programs for leaders of rural youth club programs of other countries. In many instances this is conducted through the IFYE host family experiences. In others, special programs are set up for the leaders to fit their particular interests and needs in the methods and techniques of 4-H club work. Such programs have already been conducted this year for rural youth program leaders from Mexico, France, and Iran.

The interest that IFYE has developed in people of other lands has become an important aspect of local 4-H club programs. They serve as hosts of IFYE exchangees, help sponsor IFYE delegates, use international themes for their parties, cook international dinners, and partake in many other activities as they learn about others. Many clubs have adopted "sister clubs" in other lands, exchanging scrapbooks and other 4-H materials that will be useful and informative. These international activities have also encouraged 4-H members to take part in similar projects outside of 4-H club work.

Eighteen years ago, IFYE was only an untried idea. Today it is the core for a wide range of 4-H international programs that are broadening the horizons of young people around the world.

LIBERIA'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today, the 26th of July, is Liberia's independence day. As chairman of the African Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for myself, the members of the subcommittee, and I am sure all Members of the House, I extend warmest congratulations to President William V. S. Tubman, his associates in the conduct of government, to the people of Liberia, and to Ambassador S. Edward Peal, than whom there is not an abler, more dedicated, and more popular member of the diplomatic corps in Washington.

The heart, Mr. Speaker, of the United States is very close to the heart of Liberia. President Tubman is one of the strong friends of the United States, and has been outspoken in his counsel, as a true friend should be, when the occasion demanded. Such an occasion presented itself in the early days of the independence of Guinea. I well remember, as doubtless does my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY], our conversations on that subject with President Tubman during our visit to Liberia. Time has shown the accuracy of his judgment.

The Republic of Liberia lies at the southwestern extremity of the western bulge of the continent of Africa. Its area, estimated at 43,000 square miles, is about the size of Ohio; and it has a 370-mile-long coastline.

The people, numbering 1,068,000, are all of the African race. Approximately 25,000 are referred to as American-Liberians, that is, descendants of emancipated slaves who settled in the country.

The Republic of Liberia had its origin in 1816 when the American Colonization Society was given a charter by the Congress of the United States to send freed slaves to the west coast of Africa. The country was first settled in 1822, the American Government under President Monroe furnishing funds and assisting in the negotiation for the cession of land by native chiefs.

In 1839 the settlers united to form the Commonwealth of Liberia under a Governor appointed by the American Colonization Society. In 1847 the free and independent Republic of Liberia was constituted, it being the only independent Negro Republic in Africa. The constitution was modeled after that of the United States. Great Britain officially recognized the Republic in 1848, France in 1852, but not until 1862 did the United States grant recognition.

In one sense Liberia presents a booming economy based on accelerating production of iron ore and rubber, with the prospects of government revenues doubling or tripling within the next decade. Liberia's economic base consists of three natural resources: iron ore, rubber, and timber. The development of the first two resources is being accomplished rapidly and on satisfactory terms. The timber resources of Liberia are excellent and only beginning to be farmed; hardwood and plywood production are expected to become major industries in the next few years.

Notable gains have already been made in the development of Liberia's infrastructure. This has been a major area of U.S. assistance. Projects completed with the help of American grants or loans include the Free Port of Monrovia, Roberts Field airport, part of the Central Province road and the Western Province road to Sierra Leone, and Monrovia's water supply and the initial phase of its electric power system.

Human development has assumed its proper place as the top priority of the government. The United States is giving its full support to the government in the attempt to create the educational, training, and health facilities that are urgently required. This is the crucial area, where the problems are at once the greatest and the most stubborn.

The Peace Corps has sent volunteers to teach in Liberia's schools and to assist in the governmental administration.

The Government of Liberia has as one of the basic tenets of its international policies the belief that the future of such small nations as Liberia can be best served by cooperative efforts. For this reason it was one of the charter members of the United Nations and remains one of the stanchest supporters of that organization, participating in many branches of the United Nations.

In pan-African affairs Liberia has been an active leader. The Government has been represented at all of the important conferences of African leaders and has frequently taken the initiative in encouraging such gatherings. President Tubman is an exponent of the peaceful settlement of international disputes and has used his offices on occasion to encourage moderation.

Relations between the United States and the Republic of Liberia have been friendly since the very inception of the Republic in 1847. American official policies toward Liberia are based upon the desire to maintain and strengthen the close ties already existing between the two countries. At the same time the United States continues to give assistance and support to the efforts of Liberia to improve the welfare of its people and to strengthen its representative government. Additional support of these Liberian efforts has been given by American business, missionary, and educational organizations, which have continued to be very active in the country.

Again, Mr. Speaker, do I lift my hat in the salute of appreciation and affection to the brave and proud Republic of Liberia, the roots of which were in the dreams of liberty and freedom of freed American slaves almost a century and a half ago. May I remark that under God and the noble efforts of man those dreams have come true.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in 1847 the free and independent Republic of Liberia was constituted, then being the only independent Negro republic in Africa. I am proud to note that the constitution of Liberia was modeled after that of the United States.

Today, Liberia has a booming economy based on three natural resources: iron ore, rubber, and timber. The Government of Liberia's open-door investment policy has attracted large amounts of private investment capital, and larger amounts are expected in the future. Liberia also has three major projects for internal improvement: a network of farm-to-market roads, low-cost housing in the capital, and combined school-clinic construction throughout the interior.

Liberia has always been an active leader in pan-African affairs. Its domestic policies have been dedicated to rendering essential services to its people for their continued enlightenment and freedom. Internationally, Liberia was one of the charter members of the United Nations and remains one of the stanchest supporters, participating in many branches of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to extend my warmest greetings to the people of Liberia on this day which marks another year of independence, and it is my fond hope that each year will strengthen Liberia's prosperity and growth in the world community.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, the entire world knows of the peculiarly close relationship between Liberia and the United States, initially formed as an offshoot of America's Negro population. The country was, in its early days, the only independent Negro republic in Africa. Today, Mr. Speaker, we celebrate the anniversary of Liberia's Independence, a day made all the more appropriate by our own attempts to bring full life and equality to our own Negro citizens.

The Government of Liberia, has in recent times, adhered firmly to the policy of international cooperation. The country was one of the charter members of the United Nations, and remains a stanch supporter of this organization. It has participated in the operations of many international bodies and has taken an important and responsible role in the development of inter-African cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I think it appropriate that we celebrate with particular awareness, Liberia's day of independence.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise today to congratulate the Republic of Liberia as it celebrates its 118th Independence Day.

The free and independent Republic of Liberia was founded on this day in 1847, with a constitution modeled much after our own. It is located in West Africa on the north Atlantic coast and is comprised of nine countries. Monrovia, one of the coastal cities, is the capital of this country of over 1 million people.

Liberia has every reason to be proud of its many years of independence. Its economy is booming, based on natural resources of iron ore, rubber, and timber. Many private American business concerns have been interested in Liberia. Our own Peace Corps volunteers are now helping in Liberia, primarily in schools and in governmental administration.

A character of Liberia that is much to be admired, is its interest in Pan-African affairs and international relations. Liberia was a charter member of the United Nations and has always been a stanch supporter of that organization. It is a member of the International Parliamentary Union, the International Postal Union, and other international organizations. Liberia has always been an active leader in its relations between the states of Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I know our colleagues join me in extending congratulations to President William Tubman and the citizens of the Republic of Liberia as they celebrate 118 years of independence and we extend to them every good wish for the future.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, July 26, 1965, marks the 118th anniversary of Liberia's achievement of independence. I would like to join in congratulating the people of Liberia and their government on this occasion. They have every reason to be proud of the fact that Liberia is by far the oldest independent republic of Africa and the only African nation with an unbroken history of independence and freedom. The day of independence came only 25 years after the American Colonization Society had established a colony for freed slaves. Thus the ideal of freedom that was growing in the United States played a part in the establishment of the Liberian republic.

In her long history Liberia has experienced all of the problems as well as the benefits of independence. As an underdeveloped country dependent upon outside support Liberia has gone through those difficult times which so many of the younger independent African nations are experiencing.

But since World War II there has been a remarkable economic upsurge and the achievement of political stability. The Government's income was eight times greater in 1960 than in 1950. A contributing factor was the "open door" policy of Liberia toward foreign investment. Monrovia, the capital, is a free port and many foreign businesses have shown their faith in Liberia's future by investing in mines and plantations.

National unity is another impressive achievement of Liberia on a continent where this seems to be the exception rather than the rule. There are 28 tribes in Liberia and 3 basic west African language groups. In addition to the tribal religions, there are large numbers of Christians and Moslems. Many Liberians are descendants of the original settlers from the United States. It is a tribute to the effective and farsighted leadership of President William V. S. Tubman that this nation of diverse peoples has enjoyed two decades of peace and harmony.

In its relations with other African nations Libera has consistently worked for African unity and for the dignity, independence and freedom of all African peoples and nations. She has taken the initiative in opposing South African apartheid and Portuguese colonialism. Liberia was the first sub-Saharan African nation to be elected to the United Nations Security Council.

Liberia has made an impressive record in diplomacy and domestic achievement. I am happy to salute this fine nation on its 118th birthday.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all of my colleagues who so desire may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in tribute to this great country of Liberia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VOTING RIGHTS

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, once again the Congress has been accused of dragging its feet in the passage of the 1965 voting rights bill and has been threatened with public demonstrations if it does not pass this act within a specified deadline.

On July 21, Hosea Williams, Director of Summer Community Organization and Political Education Project—SCOPE—of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, threatened massive demonstrations in 70 counties if a voting rights bill is not passed by August 1. In making this statement, Williams said:

> Now the Great White Fathers who are entrusted with making our laws have delayed the passage of a strong voting law long enough.

May I say only one who is ignorant of the legislative processes could make the charge that this bill is moving through the Congress with anything other than great speed and only one who is quite irresponsible could threaten the Congress with mob action if it does not do the will of this organization by a certain date.

WIDNALL CRITICIZES SCHLESINGER AND OTHERS FOR UNDERMINING PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN HIGH ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS WITH "INSTANT" HISTORY; SUGGESTS THE NEED FOR REFORM

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks there has been an avalanche of so-called historical accounts of the Kennedy administration that are damaging the reputations and effectiveness of those still holding high office within the Johnson administration.

Either the Congress or the President should hereafter place sound limitations on former White House and executive department personnel concerning revelations to the public of privileged conversations and the background of key decisions.

This suggestion was triggered by the Arthur Schlesinger account currently appearing in serialized form in Life magazine, "A Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House," wherein Secretary of State Dean Rusk was pilloried in an incredibly insulting fashion. Here are just a few examples of reaction that are being carried in front pages of newspapers throughout the world this week:

> He [Rusk] was unembarrassed by banality.

> At times one wondered whether the harshness of life—the seething planet of revolutionary violence, ferocity and hate, shadowed by nuclear holocaust—ever penetrated the screen of cliches, ever shook that imperturbable blandness.

> Rusk would sit calmly by, with that Buddha-like face, and his half-smile, often leaving it to Bundy or to the President himself to assert the diplomatic interest.

> He [J.F.K.] would say to Jacqueline, "Dammit, Bundy and I get more done in 1 day at the White House than they do in 6 months in State."

> He [Rusk] rejoiced in the role of tedium in diplomacy.

What is most disturbing to me is the fact that Secretary Rusk is caught in a position where he cannot defend himself. Moreover, for obvious reasons, the President himself can do little more than reassert his faith in his Secretary of State—doing so only at the risk of creating still more worthless as well as damaging Washington gossip. Additionally, for political reasons, members of the Democratic Party will hesitate before criticizing Mr. Schlesinger and others formerly in the Kennedy administration for what can best be termed "instant history, untempered by time."

I always thought the mark of a truly liberal mind was supposed to be fairness to the individual, respect for office, dislike for kicking a man when he is unable to answer because of his office, and distaste for commercial profit at the expense of others.

Even if one totally ignores the damage already done to the position of our Secretary of State, think of the effect these accounts are having within the highest councils of the administration. At a Cabinet meeting, can anyone speak his piece without fearing that another in the same room may be shooting for next year's cover of Life or the Saturday Evening Post?

Theodore Sorensen's forthcoming book, "Kennedy," raises several of the same questions, plus the possibility of a serious breach of security, in his account of the CIA's decisionmaking process surrounding the Bay of Pigs disaster. Other books by former Kennedy White House aids are soon to be published, including some by individuals currently serving on the White House staff.

If Congress pays their salary, Congress has the responsibility to guard against this commercialization of the byproducts of having had the privilege to serve in a sensitive position.

VOTING RIGHTS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I encourage House voting rights conferees not to let the bill be weakened.

After 4 months of bitter, grinding work, the House Judiciary Committee presented to the House a comprehensive and effective bill to guarantee the right to vote.

During 4 days of intense floor debate, we beat down many weakening amendments to H.R. 6400. The undesirable Boggs amendment, which had been defeated in committee, was decisively rejected by the House by a vote of 262 to 155. The House also overwhelmingly endorsed the committee language establishing a statutory ban on poll taxes.

Now it appears that these hard-won gains may be undone in conference between the Senate and the House. I urge my colleagues in conference not to let the bill be weakened. I urge them to stand firmly on the House position, to reject again the Boggs amendment and a weaker poll tax provision, and to hold out for an agreement consistent with the directive which the House gave when it passed H.R. 6400 by the tremendous vote of 333 to 85.

To settle for less would be to undermine our great committee and the House.

PHOTO-PLANE INCIDENT OVER FRANCE A SERIOUS BLUNDER

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a penetrating comment on the importance of the recent incident in which a U.S. military plane took pictures of France's chief atomic plant was written by Edgar Ansel Mowrer, noted foreign correspondent, and published today by the Bell-McClure Syndicate. The affair was treated lightly by some of the U.S. press but it may emerge as a serious blunder.

Mr. Mowrer believes the incident will give President de Gaulle one more argument to use in convincing the French people that they are "in American eyes a second-class ally." It will also give him a good excuse, if, as many fear, De Gaulle desires to reduce U.S. influence in Europe.

Here is the text of Mr. Mowrer's comment:

U.S. Affronts French Yet Courts Russians

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Back before World War II, according to Gen. Bedell Smith, an American general expressed the devout hope that in case of involvement in another great war, the United States would wage it "without the incumbrance of allies."

Certainly, the American officer who instructed that U.S. military plane to take pictures of France's chief atomic plant at Pierrelatte was doing his best to bring this about. For if, as many fear, President de Gaulle desires to destroy, or to eliminate the United States from the NATO alliance, that officer was giving him another good excuse.

Every student of international affairs now knows that although the roots of the Franco-American coolness to go back to FDR's preference for the Vichy Government, since the war ended the chief, the decisive cause of quarrel has been the American determination, while helping Great Britain, to prevent France from becoming a nuclear power.

That preposterous purpose, incompatible with any true alliance, has of course failed. France today has an abundance of A-bombs and is well on the way to produce nuclear bombs—and precisely at Pierrelatte.

DOMINEERING SCIENTISTS

Yet so frantically determined to halt the spread of these weapons are the guilty U.S. scientists who have dominated American policy in this respect that they still cannot reconcile themselves to the fact that France is, and will remain a nuclear power so long as other countries possess these monstrous weapons. So, in my opinion, will Red China (unless we speedily decide to destroy its atomic plants) and several other countries.

The best American solution today is to cease appealing to Moscow, oh please, to work with us against our alleged allies in this matter, and instead help European countries like Britain and France and Germany, to create together a European nuclear arm of their own—and then pool this arm with our own in a firm Atlantic defense force.

But this is something to which no postwar American administration can seem to resign itself. Nor, apparently, can certain American military in Europe who apparently share the views of that anonymous American general quoted by Bedell Smith about the "encumbrance of allies."

But, readers may wonder, what is really so wrong in an American military plane flying over even a restricted area of a (still) allied country like France and photographing its chief atomic plant?

UNEQUAL EQUALS?

Just this: To be acceptable any alliance, political, military or just plain business, must be reciprocal. The members must enjoy qualitatively equal rights. The United States, accordingly to French sources, has never permitted representatives of its allies to visit, still less photograph, our nuclear plants—lest they learn how to make those nuclear bombs.

Yet the purpose of the American aerial photographs was to reveal exactly how close France is to the production of nuclear weapons, which I am told, can be learned in this way. In short, it was the assumption by the United States of unilateral rights over an ally.

In itself, fortunately, the incident, even the interception of the American plane by a French fighter and France's grabbing of the plane's film, is not very important. Both Governments seem to have agreed to say no more about it. But in my judgment, the affair will not end here. It will be just one more argument which President de Gaulle will use in convincing the French people that they are in American eyes a second class ally. Therefore, they should follow their proud President in reestablishing full diplomatic "independence."

If this is what the U.S. administration wants, then it is on the right track. If not, it could still mend its ways, beef up NATO and try discriminating against its Soviet enemy for awhile.

The Washington Sunday Star, a few days after brushing off the incident lightly in an editorial, came around to this sober interpretation:

France: An Overflight

France on Monday charged that a U.S. reconnaissance plane flew over its nuclear installation at Pierrelatte, without permission, and took 175 photographs. The United States, after first denying it, admitted the action and apologized.

President de Gaulle has always been a bit difficult to get along with, for friend and foe alike. His fellow Europeans and we Americans can bear witness a' go go on this point.

Having made this observation, it must be pointed out that, of late, we have not really bent over backwards to ingratiate ourselves with the leader of France or with the French people, for that matter. Call it midsummer madness or simply the clumsiness of a nervous country cousin on a visit with his kinfolk in the city, but consider these two July items:

A sailor aboard an American aircraft carrier anchored off the Riveria turns the wrong valve and spills 3,000 gallons of fuel oil into the blue Mediterranean and onto the beaches of Cannes during the height of the tourist season.

Three days later, a U.S. Air Force plane, based in Germany, flies through a forbidden zone without permission and takes pictures of a French nuclear production complex which produces enriched uranium for De Gaulle's "force de frappe" or atomic striking corps.

Now, the gaff by the sailor obviously was unintentional and the Navy rebounded beautifully by cleaning up the sands and surf in 24 hours. Still, it obviously would have been far better if it had not happened.

EMBASSY APOLOGIZED

We cannot get off so easily on the overflight of the nuclear plant at Pierrelatte. We have long made known our unhappiness over the fact that the French are proceeding with the building of their own atomic deterrent force. We have refused to help them in any way. Now, we have been caught with our fingers in the cookie jar.

The French, having protested publicly our transgression, sat back for a few days and watched us wriggle. They had us cold, one of their aircraft having intercepted the U.S. F-101 photo plane. They demanded the photographs even before the American aircraft returned to its base. We turned them over—175 of them. But the U.S. military command in Europe had already denied that the plane had entered the prohibited zone. It said a thunderstorm had caused it to deviate from the flight plan as filed. Later, the State Department said the plane did not intend to violate the zone around Pierrelatte. Finally, on Thursday, our Embassy in Paris officially acknowledged the violation, said it was accidental, expressed regrets to the French Government and promised it would not happen again.

After that the French became magnanimous. They said unofficially that the whole thing was a "minor" affair and officially that they considered the matter closed.

But this may not be the last we will hear of it. The United States has an agreement with France for a maximum number of training flights over French territory each month—reportedly 20. As De Gaulle continues to put the squeeze on NATO, it is feared by some Americans that one day he will either cut down or cut out such flights and cite our transgression as the reason.

The New York Times of July 21 carried this news interpretation:

DE GAULLE AND U.S. PLANE—CASE OF FLIGHT OVER ATOM PLANT CLOSED BUT MAY BE USED LATER AGAINST NATO

(By Henry Tanner)

PARIS, July 20.—If President de Gaulle plans a wrecking campaign against the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as almost all observers here believe he does, his hand has been strengthened by the incident involving the appearance of the U.S. reconnaissance plane over France's first nuclear factory plant. Informed French sources said tonight that the Government had no desire to exploit the incident in any way against the United States.

But they added pointedly that the President might wish to argue at some future point that the presence of foreign, particularly U.S. troops on French soil was incompatible with French sovereignty. If so, the incident would fit neatly into his argument, wouldn't it, they asked.

The impression that the case had been put on record for future use was enhanced by the way the Government and the newspapers handled it.

The Government, after having pondered the matter over the weekend, evidently found it serious enough to lodge a formal protest with the U.S. Embassy.

"BAD MILITARY INCIDENT"

But immediately afterward French officials said that having set forth the facts as forcefully as they could, they now felt that "the less said about this bad military incident, the better."

They added that they hoped it would not lead to more strain on French-United States relations.

The French press adopted a similar attitude today. It recorded the facts as the French Government had cited them, but its comments were restrained.

Even L'Humanite, organ of the Communist Party, confined itself to reporting. La Nation, the Gaullist daily, declared:

"This sort of minor incident between allies has no bearing on such old relationships as those that exist between the United States and France. The incident is closed."

The incident appeared to stir no deep or burning indignation among French newspaper readers. But there it was, as one Frenchman said, "another annoying case of misbehavior by a foreigner who feels he is at home in our house."

The same reaction was felt by many Frenchmen a week ago when the aircraft carrier *Shangri-La* accidentally dumped black fuel oil into the Mediterranean a mile or so from some of the most crowded beaches of the Riviera.

True, its crew cleaned up the mess in little more than 24 hours. But to the average Frenchman it was annoying that it could have happened in the first place.

A similar feeling was reported by a Frenchman who motored along a country lane in the heart of France recently along mile after mile of barbed wire and an occasional sign telling him, in English, to "keep out" because this was a U.S. military base.

THE DE GAULLE ARGUMENT

These are the feelings to which President de Gaulle is likely to appeal if he launches a campaign against the foreign military bases created under NATO, and perhaps against the North Atlantic Treaty itself.

The Presidents' policy on the Western military alliance, like his stand during the current crisis of the European Economic Community, or Common Market is dominated by his opposition to the establishment of permanent international structures that threaten to supplant the institutions of the member states.

He is known to feel that NATO, with its integrated military headquarters and its large bases with U.S. forces on French soil, was conceived at a moment in history when France was weak.

He does not reproach his overseas allies for having stepped into the postwar vacuum in Europe. He simply argues that things have changed, that the vacuum no longer exists and that the Western defense system must be adapted to this new balance of power.

PRESIDENT SHOULD BLOCK COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM SALE TO SUKARNO

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today asking President Johnson to halt State Department plans for the sale of a highly sophisticated military communications system to Indonesia.

Recently I took part in the House Republican factfinding mission to Paris. There I learned that the U.S. Government has refused to sell needed military equipment to France.

In my letter to the White House, I said:

If we sell critical military items to hostile governments like Indonesia, but refuse our allies, this curious but cruel contradiction is bound to deepen the difficulties that afflict NATO.

President Johnson should rescind any tentative arrangements that may have been made and inform the Governments of Malaysia and Great Britain that clearance will not be given for the sale of a communications system or any other critical items to Indonesia so long as that nation maintains policies hostile to the United States or any of our allies.

Full text of my letter:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Honorable WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, Republican, of Michigan, reports that the State Department wishes to encourage the sale of a highly sophisticated military communications system to the Government of Indonesia.

Known as a tropospheric scatter system, the equipment would provide Premier Sukarno's army with a point-to-point highly accurate network which is difficult to intercept and monitor, and is considered to be virtually jamproof.

As you know, the Indonesian Army has been engaged in hostilities against Malaysia, a member of the British Commonwealth. Sukarno plainly aims to take over Malaysia and with it the highly strategic free world port of Singapore. His links with Red China and the Soviet Union are well known. It is reasonable to assume that Indonesia's recurrent border actions are part of the Communist grand design in southeast Asia, and may be the prelude to a Vietnam style operation against Malaysia.

Whether or not wideopen war between Indonesia and Malaysia develops, the sale of a superior communications system to Sukarno's army would seem absolutely contrary to U.S. interests.

I am informed by Representative BROOMFIELD that negotiations with Indonesia are well "down the pike" but I have also learned they are not fully consummated. I have checked with both Commerce and State Departments and have learned that no export license has been issued. Therefore, prompt action can stop the sale. I respectfully urge that you instruct the State Department to rescind any tentative arrangements that may have been made with Sukarno's army and inform the Governments of Malaysia and Great Britain that clearance will not be given for the sale of a communications system or any other critical items to Indonesia so long as that nation maintains policies hostile to the United States or any of our allies.

The news that negotiations are underway was widely reported both in Britain and Malaysia. A news report in Malaysia indicated that the sale, if consummated, might be considered an unfriendly act.

The incident raises disturbing questions about the degree to which we consult with our NATO allies. In the interest of good relations with Britain and our other friends, any transaction with a hostile government should be thoroughly discussed by the NATO Council and dropped if objection is raised. I assume from the surprised reaction in Malaysia and Britain that no prior consultation occurred.

That the United States would seriously consider providing a hostile government with an important military tool is especially incredible, when viewed against policies we have followed with a friend and ally of long standing like France.

Recently, I was in Paris as chairman of the Republican factfinding mission studying problems of NATO. There I was informed that France recently sought to purchase from the United States a mechanism needed as part of a weapons delivery system. The request was rejected. France shopped around and ultimately purchased the identical U.S.-made item in Sweden.

If we sell critical military items to hostile governments like Indonesia, but refuse our allies, this curious but cruel contradiction is bound to deepen the difficulties which afflict NATO, which—by any measure—is the free world's most essential institution.

QUESTIONNAIRE 1965

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Quillen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, my 1965 legislative questionnaire was a tremendous success. I mailed out questionnaires to some 126,000 families in the First District of Tennessee and, to date, have received 28,983 responses for a total 28-percent response.

I feel sure that my colleagues, as well as all those who read the Record, will be interested in the tabulation of the views of 28,983 interested American citizens, and I am happy to insert a news release which I issued on the results. This tabulation of returns has received widespread coverage all over the First District:

Washington, July 24.—Congressman James H. "Jimmy" Quillen disclosed today that the people of the First District favor stepping up the U.S. participation in Vietnam, according to the results of the questionnaire, which he recently sent to 126,000 families throughout the district's 14 counties.

At the same time, the people overwhelmingly are opposed to the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, with the returns showing a total of 60.9 percent against repeal, only 22.8 percent for repeal, and 16.3 percent having no opinion.

There were 28,983 opinions returned, making a 28-percent response of the number mailed out. The national average in returns is less than 15 percent.

"This is approximately a 12-percent increase in returns over my last questionnaire, and I am real pleased at the wonderful response," Quillen said.

The First District Congressman earlier this year introduced a bill to reduce income taxes by increasing the exemptions from $600 to $1,200 for a spouse and dependents. In reply to a question as to whether or not the people favored such a tax cut as Quillen proposed, the answer was 83.8 percent for, 10.4 percent against, and 5.8 percent with no opinion.

Also, 71.8 percent of those replying were for allowing parents to deduct from their income tax the amount they spend in sending their children to college, while 19.1 percent were in opposition and 9.1 percent had no opinion.

One of the highest percentages tabulated for any issue was on the question as to whether or not the United States should insist that Russia pay up her U.N. dues before having the right to vote—93.1 percent answered "Yes"; 1.6 percent, "No"; and 5.3 percent had no opinion.

Only 20.1 percent wanted medicare under social security, while a staggering 63.4 percent wanted eldercare, which provided additional benefits by amending the Kerr-Mills law; 34.4 percent said "No" to medicare, and only 7.9 percent opposed eldercare; 45.5 percent had no opinion on medicare and only 28.7 percent were silent on eldercare.

The people turned thumbs down on eliminating the Federal excise taxes on furs, jewelry, toilet preparations, luggage and handbags, with 48.3 percent saying "No," and 37.4 percent answering "Yes," and 14.3 percent having no opinion.

Elimination of the excise tax on telephone and telegraph service was overwhelmingly approved.

The people are opposed to Federal aid to private and parochial schools, with 65.9 percent registering opposition, 11.6 percent favoring, with 22.5 percent having no opinion.

On a question, "Do you favor a constitutional amendment to provide that one house of a State legislature may be apportioned on some other basis as determined by the people of the State?" the answer was that 45.8 percent favored, 25.5 percent opposed, and 28.1 percent had no opinion.

The poll was conducted by mail and drew a recordbreaking response, notwithstanding the fact that the participants had to provide the postage to return their completed questionnaires to the Congressman's Washington office.

Many sent letters expanding on the answers they had given on the questionnaire form, which included some 27 questions, dealing with the many vital and controversial issues before Congress.

"It is extremely gratifying to me, personally, that such a large number of people in the district responded to my questionnaire," Quillen said, after the returns were tabulated in Washington by Data Management, Inc.

"People of the First District are still concerned, as I am, about deficit spending and the Federal Government taking over States rights," stated Quillen.

Answers were received from people in all walks of life as well as all vocations in the First District.

Some took time out to ask about their VA pensions, social security checks, a job, and a hundred-and-one other problems.

Quillen said he was pleased with the thousands of letters and comments received by him from constituents who supplemented the "Yes or No" type questions with explanations and expressions of opinion.

"I found these of particular interest," said Quillen, "for I realize that it is extremely difficult to give an answer on many of these issues with a simple yes or no."

"Among the many comments written on the questionnaires were 'Excellent,' 'Congratulations, you are doing a good job as our Congressman,' and it was especially gratifying to read time and time again, 'It is the first time I have ever had the feeling someone would care about my opinion, and I appreciate the questionnaire so much.'

"Hundreds presented their ideas on the major issues now facing the Congress, and I enjoyed reading them very much. I answered each individual questionnaire personally with a letter, thanking them for their response, and it is heartwarming to know that the people are eager to take part in their National Government," Quillen said.

Quillen stated that he prepared and distributed the questionnaire as a means of obtaining a cross-section of opinion on some of the major issues of the session. The questionnaire went out to 126,000 families irrespective of political affiliation, and the replies were from members of both parties.

"This tabulation confirms generally the views that are expressed in daily correspondence and during my trips to the district, and will be of great value to me in the consideration of the problems before the Congress.

"They do provide a very helpful guidance, but I want to make it clear, that I do not consider this a mandate in any sense, and in the final analysis, it is my responsibility to cast the vote, and I shall exercise my best judgment on legislative questions as they arise. The questionnaire is one of many contributing factors to help me," Quillen pointed out.

The questionnaire tally, expressed in terms of percentages, is as follows:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Taxes;			
1. Do you favor a Federal income tax reduction this year by increasing from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness)?	83.8	10.4	5.8
2. Do you favor allowing parents to deduct from their income tax the amount they spend in sending their children to college?	71.8	19.1	9.1
3. Do you favor the repeal of the 10-percent Federal excise taxes on—			
(a) Furs, jewelry, toilet preparations, luggage, and handbags?	37.4	48.3	14.3
(b) Telephone calls and services, toll telephone services, and telegraph services?	63.4	23.4	13.2
(c) Electric, gas, and oil appliances, including hot water heaters?	71.5	17.5	11.0
Foreign affairs:			
1. Should we insist that Russia pay up its U.N. dues before it has the right to vote?	93.1	1.6	5.3
2. Do you favor continued United States opposition to the admission of Red China to the U.N.?	77.1	10.3	12.6
3. In the light of our current situation in South Vietnam, do you favor—			
(a) Complete withdrawal?	16.4	32.3	51.3
(b) Stepping up our participation?	47.6	8.9	43.5
(c) Maintaining our present position?	23.0	16.4	60.6
4. Do you favor continuance of trade with Communist countries?	18.0	62.4	19.6
Social:			
1. What program for financial aid to people over 65 for medical care do you think best—			
(a) Medicare under the social security plan?	20.1	34.4	45.5
(b) Eldercare which provides additional benefits by amending the Kerr-Mills law?	63.4	7.9	28.7
2. Do you believe the present limitation of $1,200 on outside earnings for those receiving social security benefits should be raised?	69.0	21.5	9.5
Education:			
1. Should loans to college students under the present Federal program be expanded?	52.8	23.2	24.0
2. Do you approve of—			
(a) A major program of Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools?	47.4	37.0	15.6
(b) Federal aid to private and parochial schools?	11.6	65.9	22.5

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Fiscal:			
1. Do you believe that the Federal Government must operate within a balanced budget?	83.0	8.1	8.9
2. Should gold backing for U.S. currency be eliminated?	10.7	65.1	24.2
Agriculture:			
1. Do you favor a shift from the present acreage allotment and marketing quota program for tobacco to an "acreage-poundage" basis?	16.2	48.5	35.3
2. Do you believe the Federal Government should initiate action to withdraw gradually from the price support program in agriculture?	45.1	32.7	22.2
3. Do you believe the United States should sell surplus farm commodities to Soviet Russia and other Communist countries at subsidized prices which are lower than the prices at which U.S. consumers can buy these commodities?	5.0	87.2	7.8
Labor:			
1. Under sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, the individual States have the right to pass right-to-work laws to ban the compulsory union shop in those States. 20 States, including Tennessee, have passed such laws. A bill has been introduced in Congress to repeal sec. 14(b) thereby making it illegal for a State to have a right-to-work law. Would you favor repeal of section 14(b)?	22.8	60.9	16.3
General:			
1. Do you favor the proposed closing of various Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliaries throughout the United States?	15.4	69.6	15.0
2. Should the Army and Air Force Reserve units be eliminated by absorption in the National Guard?	24.2	45.7	30.1
3. Do you favor repeal of our present draft law?	22.0	48.6	29.4
4. Last year, the Supreme Court ruled that both houses of a State legislature had to be apportioned according to population. Do you favor a constitutional amendment to provide that 1 house of a State legislature may be apportioned on some other basis as determined by the people of the State?	45.8	25.5	28.7

BETTS CONCERNED BY RISING FOOD COSTS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I share the concern of so many Americans over the constantly rising cost of food. Prices on such basic commodities as potatoes and other vegetables have risen as much as 15 percent in the past few months, according to figures which have come to my attention. The persons who are affected the most by increased prices are those who can least afford it. They are the lower income family, people on relief, and the older citizen receiving social security payments.

Last year a bipartisan commission was created to study the food industry, food imports, and farming production. The National Commission on Food Marketing has received strong support from farm leaders, consumer groups, and retail groups as well as from the Congress. Because this Commission is studying all aspects of food costs and prices, I wrote to its Chairman, Phil S. Gibson, to express my hope that appropriate recommendations could be expedited. In his reply, Chairman Gibson said the Commission will not release its findings in a piecemeal fashion and that the full report will be assembled for release July 1, 1966.

Twelve months is a long time to wait for the results of these studies. I wish to call this to the attention of my colleagues who share my feelings on this subject, for, perhaps, there are other avenues to pursue in order to bring relief to the American consumer in the meantime.

I insert the full text of my correspondence with Judge Gibson with these remarks:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 25, 1965.
Hon. PHIL S. GIBSON,
National Commission on Food Marketing,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GIBSON: This is to express my concern over the rapid increase in food prices in recent months and to urge that the National Commission on Food Marketing expedite completion of current studies and prepare appropriate recommendations for presentation to the President and the Congress so necessary corrective action can be undertaken.

It is disturbing to me that prices on agricultural commodities, particularly fruits and vegetables, so essential to a balanced diet, have risen as much as 15 percent this year. This situation is particularly adverse to those living on limited incomes, social security, and persons unemployed or receiving welfare assistance. Many of my colleagues have presented evidence of causes for these increases, such as farm labor shortages, imports, droughts, production taxes, and many other factors. While many of these contentions have much merit, I am anxious to review your studies on the production, marketing and distribution of farm products from the farm to the consumer.

I would be pleased to have a status report on your progress together with any conclusions which may have been reached. I am also interested in knowing whether present trends will be reflected in your final report for I believe it highly important that the reasons for recent food price increases be closely examined. The legislation authorizing creation of your Commission appears to be broad in scope, which I hope will allow for the presentation of all related factors involved in bringing farm commodities to the consuming public.

Sincerely yours,
JACKSON E. BETTS.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON
FOOD MARKETING,
Washington, D.C., July 9, 1965.
Hon. JACKSON E. BETTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BETTS: Thank you for your letter of June 25 in which you express concern over the recent advance in food prices.

As you suggest, the apparent reasons for the increases are numerous and intertwined. The Commission is very interested in knowing to what extent the higher retail prices are due to a changed farm supply situation and to what extent they are due to wider price spreads between the farmer and consumer. The Commission is further interested in knowing why farm supplies have changed and whether wider price spreads are justified by higher costs.

The Commission does not expect to make recommendations in piecemeal fashion but will, instead, assemble all its facts and submit its final report by July 1, 1966. You may be sure that the reasons for price behavior such as experienced this year will be fully discussed.

Sincerely yours,
PHIL S. GIBSON,
Chairman.
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE SO-CALLED NEW ECONOMICS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article "Some Observations on the So-Called New Economics" by Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier is very appropriate at the present time and worthy of study. Dr. Saulnier is currently professor of economics at Barnard College, Columbia University. He formerly was Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers and served on the Council from 1956 to 1961:

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE SO-CALLED NEW ECONOMICS

(By Raymond J. Saulnier)

We have heard increasingly in recent months about the so-called new economics. By that I mean the point of view, and the analysis underlying it, that the growth of the American economy in the last few years has been due not just primarily, but to all intents and purposes exclusively, to the aggressive use of fiscal policy and to a more or less continuously easy monetary policy, with attendant large increases in the use of credit. Fiscal and monetary expansionism is a perfectly good alternative term for it. As an approach to economic policy it is gaining admirers from all quarters, and for its more exuberant disciples what it all comes to is that a kind of intellectual breakthrough has been achieved in the field of economic policy, that it was a failure to understand the benefits of fiscal and monetary expansion that prevented our having a faster rate of growth in the 1950's, that at long last, however, we now know how to "manage" our economy, and that henceforth we can expect a very much better performance from it. This enthusiasm is customarily accompanied by unreservedly confident statements about the future course of business—near term, intermediate term and long term.

Now, if this is a correct explanation of the good performance of the American economy in the first half of the 1960's and a reliable guide for policy in the remaining years of this decade, it would be a grave mistake for anyone, and least of all for an economist, not to recognize it as such. My object is to try to help to sort out what is useful in the new economics and at the same time to help understand its limitations. There is much that is useful in it, though what is useful is mainly not very new; and its limitations are considerable.

Let me begin with a summary of what is to follow. Without meaning in the least to disparage the use of fiscal policy, or of any other branch of policy, to help improve the performance of our economy, I shall argue, first, that the basic condition accounting for the good performance of the American economy since 1960, and the condition lacking which a good rate of growth with price stability would have been impossible, was not a new understanding of fiscal and monetary policy but a favorable relationship between the rate of increase in hourly labor costs and the rate of improvement in productivity.

This favorable relationship virtually eliminated any pressure on prices from the side of costs, certainly as an average across the manufacturing economy, and made it possible for Government to follow an easy fiscal policy and for the Federal Reserve system to follow an easy monetary policy with, until recently at least, minimal inflationary impact on prices and maximum expansive effect on employment, hours of work, and production.

In other words, for the record of good growth with relatively little price inflation of the past 4 years, the new economics gives too little credit to the stability of unit production costs.

Second, I shall argue that the new economics, in its comments on economic policy in the latter half of the 1950's, ignores the fact that in that period there was an entirely different and unfavorable relationship between cost increases and productivity gains, that this was precisely the inflationary problem with which policy had to cope, that economic policy dealt successfully with it, that it did this without recourse to direct controls, that a broadly favorable relationship between cost increases and productivity improvement was achieved by 1961, and that it was this favorable cost-productivity relationship, and its maintenance to date (with significant slippage only recently), that made possible the good performance of our economy in 1961–64.

To support this point of view, I will, of course, cite evidence mainly from the experience of the United States; but, as I will show, the economies of Western Europe and Japan provide vivid evidence to the same end.

The record of productivity, employment cost and price developments is traced in published official figures. A May 1, 1965, Department of Labor release entitled "Comparisons of Indexes of Labor and Nonlabor Payments, Prices and Output per Man-Hour in the Total Private Economy and the Private Nonfarm Sector, 1947–64" is a convenient source. There are also pertinent data in the annual reports of the Council of Economic Advisers. In table 12 (p. 109) of the January 1965 report, for example, you will see that in the years 1955 through 1960 the average of trend productivity improvement rates for the total private economy was 2.7 percent while the average of annual increases in total compensation per man-hour was 4.5 percent. From an analytical point of view, this is the important "gap," namely, the difference between productivity gains and cost increases. It was greatest in 1956–57, when trend productivity rates averaged 2.7 percent and we were having our own version of a "wage explosion," with hourly employee compensation rates increasing annually at an average of 6 percent.

BETTER RELATIONSHIP ACHIEVED BY 1961

By 1961, in an almost unbroken sequence of steps, this "gap" had been closed, partly by an improvement of annual rates of productivity improvement, and partly by a slowing down in the rate of annual labor cost increases. In 1961, the annual productivity improvement was 3.4 percent and the labor cost increase was 3.6 percent. The picture varies depending on whether one uses annual or trend figures and on what concept and scope of productivity and cost changes one has in mind, but the conclusion remains: The wide gap that obtained in the midfifties was narrowed as the decade progressed; it had been virtually eliminated, and balance established, as the 1960's began. Fortunately, this balance has been pretty well maintained. We have tended to lose it a bit of late, which must be one of the critical points in any appraisal of the present economic outlook.

The economic consequences of the relation between cost increases and productivity gains are plain to see. In the mid and later fifties the deficiency of annual productivity gains below labor cost increases resulted in annual increases in labor cost per unit of output. Naturally, these unit cost increases tended to slacken as the deficiency (or gap) was narrowed; something very close to unit-cost stability was reached by 1961.

Increases in unit production costs in the mid and later fifties had their effect on prices, of course, and a serious effect it was. The index of wholesale prices of nonfarm, nonfood products rose 5 percent a year in 1955 and in 1956. The increase was checked in 1957–58, but it resumed again, though fortunately at a somewhat lower rate, when the recessionary effect of that period was over. By 1959, and reflecting the virtual stability that by that time had been reached in labor cost per unit of manufacturing output, the wholesale price level began to stabilize and, until very recently, remained flat.

There was a reflection of these same forces in consumer prices. In the 2 years preceding the 1957–58 recession, the Consumer Price Index was rising at a rate close to 3.5 percent a year; as the decade closed, however, the rate of increase had slackened to the 1 to 1.5 percent that has obtained to this date.

No wonder that a favorite title for Sunday supplement articles on economics in the midfifties was "The Age of Inflation: What It Means to You," or words to that effect. And no wonder that an "inflationary psychology" developed, with which policy had to cope.

On the investment side of the economy, these cost-price developments were reflected in a distinct narrowing of profit margins. Profits per dollar of sales dropped 25 percent in the second half of the 1950's. Stock prices rose, but not because corporate profits were improving. On the contrary, the volume of corporate profits, after taxes, was lower in 1960 than it had been in 1955, despite a 12-percent growth in real GNP and despite a 26-percent increase in current price GNP.

Before I move to the policy implications of this economic context, let me recall the cost-productivity relationship that has obtained in the sixties, to date.

Since 1960 the moderate rate of increase of hourly employment costs that had finally been achieved by the end of the 1950's has been broadly maintained, certainly until recently. In 1961 the productivity improvement rate was 3.4 percent and the employment compensation increase was 3.6 percent. The January 1965 Economic Report of the President (p. 57) describes it this way:

"The moderate gain of about 3.6 percent a year in hourly compensation in the total private sector during the present expansion [1960–64] compares with an advance averaging 3.9 percent a year in 1957–60 and 4.5 in 1953–57.

"Gains in output per man-hour in the private sector in 1960–64 averaged 3.5 percent a year, compared with 2.5 in 1953–57 and 2.7 in 1957–60," (brackets supplied).

Reflecting these conditions, labor cost per unit of output in manufacturing industries has drifted downward since 1961, in contrast to its upward trend in the second half of the 1950's; labor cost per dollar of gross national product, which is our broadest measure of unit labor cost of production, has been stable, in contrast to its rise in the second half of the 1950's. Understandably, the ratio of price to unit labor cost since 1961 has been either stable or rising; profits per dollar of sales have trended upward; and, jointly with increased sales, this improvement of margins has yielded a higher and higher volume of corporate profits. Stock prices have responded favorably. More important, so has the growth of our economy; and so has the real level of living of the American people.

NEED SKEPTICAL VIEW OF MANY NEW CLAIMS

Here is the key to a correct understanding of the 1950's; and to a correct understanding of what has happened in the 1960's, to date. Let what you hear about a breakthrough into new approaches to economic policy, of a casting-off of old mythologies, of escape from enthrallment by obsolete ideas and all the rest go in one ear and out the other. Keep your eye on the fundamental condition of balance in an enterprise economy, which is a relationship between hourly labor cost increases and productivity improvements such that labor cost per unit of production is held broadly stable. This is the sine qua non of vigorous, sustainable, inflation-free economic growth.

The policy implications of an economic context in which labor costs per unit of production are rising as compared with a context in which they are either stable or declining are clear. When unit production costs are rising there is a genuine upward pressure on prices, and economic policy must at some point resist this trend. Fiscal and monetary expansion, the new economics if you will, can be carried to excess even when cost conditions are broadly favorable, but it is nothing less than a recipe for disaster when it is applied to a situation in which cost conditions are unfavorable. For fiscal and monetary policy to give leeway, to give encouragement, to give impetus to an upward trend of costs and prices is an open invitation to inflation, and ultimately to a serious economic and financial setback. Under these conditions monetary and fiscal policy must be held taut.

As for fiscal policy, it is not a question of wanting—in principle and without regard to economic conditions—to avoid a deficit in the Federal budget, or of wanting—in principle and without regard to economic conditions—to reduce the national debt, however constructive that might be. The point is: an imbalance between cost increases and productivity improvements and the consequent push of unit production costs on prices is not a viable condition for any economy. Least of all, it is not a viable condition for a market economy the freedom of which one aims to maintain. The imbalance has to be corrected and it can only be worsened by a permissive, let alone by an aggressively expansive, monetary and fiscal policy.

One can argue with details of monetary, fiscal, and debt management policy in the 1950's, but to assert that all that was needed was a large dose of monetary and fiscal expansionism, a la the style of the "new economics," represents a total failure to understand the economic context of that period.

And when tax reduction and Federal spending increases under any and all circumstances are enshrined as a kind of "intellectual breakthrough," we are on our way to a serious case of national self-deception.

Nowadays, the exercise of fiscal and monetary restraint as a means of overcoming cost and price inflation is referred to as a "stabilization program"; and it is widely recognized that such a program will almost inevitably entail a slowing down in the rate of economic growth. Naturally, one would prefer that this was not the case and there were ways and means—which Government will, of course, utilize to the full—for minimizing the growth-retarding effect. Naturally, also, Government can counsel moderation in labor contract settlements and, to the extent that it is successful in this effort, it will reduce the need for fiscal and monetary restraint, and thus reduce the risk of retarding growth. Indeed, it was precisely in order to avoid a retardation of the growth rate that repeated calls were made in the 1950's, and in the second half especially, for moderation in labor contract settlements. Let me recall some words on this point from the January 1957 Economic Report of the President (p. 44):

"To depend exclusively on monetary and fiscal restraint as a means of containing the upward movement of prices would raise serious obstacles to the maintenance of economic growth and stability. In the face of a continuous upward pressure on costs and prices, moderate restraints would not be sufficient; yet stronger restraints would bear with undue severity on sectors of the economy having little if any responsibility for the movement toward a higher cost-price level and would court the risk of being excessively restrictive for the economy generally."

In this day of numerically expressed and fully spelled-out wage and price guidelines, the above may seem to be an overly moderate statement. But the analysis of the economic situation which it reflects was vigorously denied at the time. I recall my own dialogs on the question with certain congressional committees. I also recall that the inclusion of the moderate statement reproduced above from President Eisenhower's January 1957 Economic Report was protested, in advance of the report's publication, by a delegation that came to my office from one of what we may call the "cognizant" Federal departments to tell me that to say such a thing was not only politically indiscreet but technically incorrect. What a long way it has been from there to here. If there has been an "intellectual breakthrough," it has been to recognize the essentiality for stable, inflation-free, and vigorous economic growth of a balanced relationship between employment cost increases and productivity gains.

Unfortunately, the restraints that in the end helped eliminate the imbalance between cost increases and productivity improvements that had developed in the midfifties did retard the rate of the economy's growth. But as I have argued elsewhere, under more favorable circumstances recession might have been avoided in 1957–58; there were more imbalances in our economy at that time than the imbalance between cost increases and productivity gains. And the 1960–61 recession was held to much narrower limits than the downturns immediately preceding it. Note: when the period ended the basis had been set for sustainable growth.

CONTROLS AND GUIDELINES DESCRIBED AS WRONG PATH

The question is often raised whether the retardation of growth in the second half of the 1950's might not have been avoided by recourse to direct controls, perhaps by a system of numerically expressed guidelines, or by something more clearly mandatory. I doubt that it could have been, at least not without the controls having been very repressive, but the point is there was no disposition in the 1950's to take this route. A primary objective in General Eisenhower's administration was to eliminate controls, not to multiply them. The object was to free the market process, including the collective bargaining process, not to hamstring it.

On every appropriate occasion the President called on the leadership of labor and industry to practice restraint in wage settlements, along the lines of the quotation reproduced above. But there was no setting-up of numerically expressed guidelines, and there was a minimum of direct intervention in collective bargaining. The limits within which wage settlements could be made without unfavorable economic effects were stated only in qualitative terms; but they were stated clearly enough to give all the guidance that was needed, and at the same time to keep government as much as possible out of the collective bargaining process.

Two paragraphs from the January 1959 Economic Report of the President (pp. 5, 6) state the point of view on this question in government at that time:

"It is not the function of government in our society to establish the terms of contracts between labor and management; yet it must be recognized that the public has a vital interest in these agreements. Increases in money wages and other compensation not justified by the productivity performance of the economy are inevitably inflationary. They impose severe hardships on those whose incomes are not enlarged. They jeopardize the capacity of the economy to create jobs for the expanding labor force. They endanger present jobs by limiting markets at home and impairing our capacity to compete in markets abroad. In short, they are, in the end, self-defeating.

"Self-discipline and restraint are essential if agreements consistent with a reasonable stability of prices are to be reached within the framework of the free competitive insituations on which we rely heavily for the improvement of our material welfare. If the desired results cannot be achieved under our arrangements for determining wages and prices, the alternatives are either inflation, which would damage our economy and work hardships on millions of Americans, or controls, which are alien to our traditional way of life and which would be an obstacle to the Nation's economic growth and improvement."

When President Eisenhower's administration was completed, not only had a balance been established between cost increases and productivity conditions are unfavorable. able to sustained, high-level growth, but the collective bargaining process was as free as it had ever been. Although the importance of labor cost-productivity improvement relationship was well known earlier, the age of numerically expressed guidelines did not begin until later.

As stated above, fiscal and monetary expansion is capable of being carried to excess even when cost-productivity conditions are favorable, but this is doubly so when cost-productivity conditions are unfavorable. Recent developments in Western Europe and in Japan illustrate this very well.

Briefly, the story is this. In the 1950's, growth rates in Western Europe, with the exception of Great Britain and certain of the Scandinavian countries, were very much better than ours. In almost all cases, governments there were following easy fiscal and monetary policies, with large deficits in their budgets and a heavy and rising use of credit throughout their economies. To the wonderment of all, on the other hand, prices were remarkably steady. France's history in this period is complicated by currency devaluation; but you will find that the Belgian and German wholesale price indexes rose only 1 and 2 percent, respectively; that the Italian index declined 2 percent; and that the Japanese index fell 1 percent.

Beginning in 1961, however, the situation changed completely. Prices began to rise in Western Europe and in Japan at a rapid rate, and growth rates began to be retarded. In other words, the history of Western Europe and of Japan in the second half of the 1950's and in the first half of the 1960's as regards price changes and growth rates has been exactly the reverse of ours.

REASON FOR DISPARITY IS COST-PRODUCTIVITY GAP

What was behind this reversal? It cannot be explained in terms of shifts to a higher level of utilization of capacity in Western Europe and in Japan as compared with opposite changes in the United States. The fact is that we are all operating at high levels of capacity utilization. Nor can it be explained in terms of having guidelines or not having guidelines. The fact is: Western Europe has had guidelines all along.

What then accounts for the difference? Guidelines or not, the fact is: a change came about in Western Europe and in Japan in the early 1960's in the relation between annual labor cost increases and annual productivity improvements. They began to produce an unfavorable "gap" between the two just as we began to eliminate our gap. Beginning in 1960, and accelerating in 1962 and 1963, labor cost per unit of output in Western Europe began to rise, putting a strong upward pressure on prices.

Italy provides perhaps the clearest example. In 1960 and 1961, labor costs per unit of output were actually lower by nearly 10 percent than they had been in 1958 and in 1959. This reflected the fact that hourly labor cost increases had been held well within the limits of productivity improvements. But in 1962 and 1963 hourly labor costs rose by close to 15 percent a year. I have no data on Italy's rate of annual productivity improvement, but it is hard for me to believe that it exceeded 7 or 8 percent, though owing to the special circumstances and stage of development of the Italian economy, it is possible that this high rate may have been achieved.

In any case, the excess of labor cost increases over productivity gains in Italy in 1962 and 1963 was so great that prices there increased by about 8 percent in each of these 2 years. This was possible, obviously, only because—in the face of an egregious imbalance between labor cost increases and productivity improvements—monetary and fiscal policy continued to be easy, in the style, if I may say so, of the new economics.

Of course, this inflationary process could not be permitted to go on indefinitely. Before very long the inflation of costs and prices required that stabilization programs be launched not only in Italy but in every one of the Western European economies. And note that these stabilization programs, essential as they are to the long-term health of the economies involved, have been carried out only at the expense of a slowing-down of growth rates. Italy has had a kind of stabilization recession; France has suffered a pause in its growth; and so have nearly all the other Western European continental economies. Only the United Kingdom, on that side of the world, continues in a state of total domestic prosperity and vigorous expansion, but it is caught in a still-unsolved international financial predicament.

LESSONS TO BE LEARNED FROM FOREIGN NATIONS

As for Japan, our friends there did not invent the term "new economics" but they did give us the word "overheating," which will assuredly find its place in the same general area of the economic thesaurus. And I must say that the Japanese have demonstrated some of the more spectacular dangers of monetary and fiscal expansionism, persisted in side by side with cost inflation.

If we are of a mind to do so, we can learn a good deal from these experiences of other countries. In many ways their most instructive value is to show us what heavy doses of the new economics—applied when fiscal and monetary restraint is called for—can do to the institutional framework of a society. Here I want to make two points:

First, indicative planning, as it is called, did not prevent inflation in Western Europe. I hope its admirers in this country will take note of that fact. Second, monetary and fiscal expansionism, in the mode of the so-called new economics, has led almost everywhere abroad to incomes policies which are becoming increasingly specific and mandatory and are reaching far into the area of price and nonwage income determination. They are having a profound effect on market institutions. There is a real danger that, in the end, an "incomes policy" will prove to be only a euphemism for a system of broad market controls. And the more determined the application of monetary and fiscal expansionism—the more determined, that is, the application of the new economics—the greater is that danger.

There was no disposition to court this risk in the 1950's. Our paramount object was to achieve the purposes of the Employment Act within the framework of an enterprise system and of a labor market with maximum freedom. The guiding concept was the concept of a free society. Fiscal responsibility was, and remains, an essential means to this end.

I have no wish to diminish anyone's estimate of what a prudently expansive fiscal and monetary policy can do to promote vigorous and stable economic growth. My object is only to argue the case that such a policy is possible only when a balance is maintained between cost increases and productivity improvements, and that it can be carried to excess, even then. If you conclude from this that there is less that is new in the new economics than its enthusiasts seem to believe, and more that is contingent and risky, then I will have made my point.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE LESLIE C. ARENDS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Gerald R. Ford] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today out in Bloomington, Ill., the minority whip, the Honorable Leslie C. Arends, is being honored by his many friends with a full day of social activities and political speaking in recognition of and gratitude for the 30 years he has so faithfully and effectively served the people of the 17th District of Illinois. I want to join in this tribute to my good friend and colleague.

During 22 of his 30 years in Congress, "Les" has given of his time, his talents, and energies in building a whip organization for the Republicans which has set many outstanding records of party unity and won many victories for the Republicans in the House of Representatives who have been outnumbered, but never outfought. The most outstanding accomplishment of the whip organization he has built is the high degree of party unity displayed on this side of the aisle during the 87th, the 88th, and the 89th Congresses. For his personal loyalty to me as minority leader in the 89th Congress I am particularly grateful, and I thank him from the bottom of my heart.

"Les" Arends has established a reputation among all of his colleagues as a man of keen perception, courage, astuteness, and natural humor, a man who places loyalty to his party and country above self-interest, and one who has skillfully practiced the philosophy of Theodore Roosevelt, "speak softly, but carry a big stick."

Since first coming to Congress in 1934, "Les" has dealt with national defense matters, first as a member of the House Committee on Military Affairs and then, with the merger of this committee with the House Committee on Naval Affairs under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee. During the years 1957 through 1964, "Les" served as the ranking Republican on this committee. During the 85th Congress, "Les" was appointed by former Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., as one of the members of the Select Committee on Science and Astronautics which recommended the creation of a standing committee of the House on Science and Astronautics to oversee the space exploration program which has expanded so greatly during the past 6 years.

I commend the people of the 17th District of Illinois for their good judgment in continuing to reelect as their representative this man of great dedication and patriotism, the Honorable Leslie C. Arends.

THE PRESENT OVERABUNDANCE OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Andrews] may extend his remarks at this point in the record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this morning I read an editorial in one of my North Dakota newspapers, the Dickey County Leader, that I thought did an excellent job of pointing up the problems involved in the present overabundance of Federal programs. Certainly there must be a way to help the Nation's poor without having a whole group of new bureaucrats get 50 cents out of every dollar which should be used to benefit the needy.

I thought my colleagues would be interested in seeing these editorial comments by M. D. Goddard:

[From the Ellendale, N. Dak., Dickey County Leader, July 22, 1965]

Pot Shots

(By M. D. G.)

Observing the Federal Government's approach to any given problem reminds us of an inexperienced garage employee's technique in solving some minor malfunction in an automobile.

If the customer complains of difficulty in starting his car's engine, the novice mechanic may sell him a new battery, starter overhaul job, breaker points, spark plugs, and induction coil.

One of these things might be responsible for the motorist's problem, and, if so, fine. The car owner has his problem solved and is now only unhappy with the tremendous repair bill he has to pay.

The mechanic pats himself on the back for having not only fixed the car, but also chalked up a pocketful of profit on new parts.

The only fly in the ointment develops when the original problem was not caused by a faulty electrical or ignition system. Perhaps, instead, the fuel system was at fault.

If that is the case, the mechanic can gleefully proceed to start replacing fuel pumps, gas tank caps, and carburetor parts. The technique undoubtedly pleases the serviceman, but hardly satisfies the customer who has to pay the bill.

A more experienced garage man might proceed logically from one test to another until he locates the problem and repairs that one thing. The customer in this case is very happy and probably will be back the next time he needs some work done—and this may compensate the mechanic for the profit he "lost" on not selling "the works" the first time.

In similar fashion, the Federal Government always operates on a grand scale. Any given problem is met with massive doses of assistance, piling one expensive new program on top of another, with interlocking and overlapping fields of operation, until no one can tell where one program starts and another ends.

Uncle Sam then sits back with a satisfied smile, rolls down his sleeves, and proclaims the problem is solved.

Maybe it is and maybe it isn't. No one will really ever know—nor will it ever be apparent which new program was successful.

When so many new remedies are attempted all at one time, there is no way to know which was the proper one.

THE COMPLEXITIES OF MONETARY POLICY

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, critics of the Federal Reserve Board very often fail to take into account the immense complexities facing those who have been entrusted with the regulation of the Nation's money and credit. Within the past month, we have seen several illustrations of how sizable private and governmental transactions may impinge on monetary policy.

In order to develop information on how such transactions complicate the tasks of the monetary authorities, I wrote to Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve on June 22, 1965. I received his reply to my questions on July 1. Because the exchange of correspondence would be helpful to the Congress and the public's understanding of the factors affecting monetary actions, under unanimous consent, I insert my letter and Chairman

Martin's reply in the Record at this point:

JUNE 22, 1965.

William McC. Martin, Jr.,
Chairman, Federal Reserve Board,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Chairman Martin: Most thoughtful people are, I am sure, aware of and understand the tremendous responsibilities which the Congress has delegated to the Board of Governors in supporting American hopes for a stable and growing economy. Perhaps not everyone appreciates the many variable factors which must be taken into account by a central bank in its actions from day to day affecting the credit system of the Nation. Three sizable incidents in the past 10 days, I believe, illustrate the variety and size of some of these matters which must be taken into consideration by the monetary authorities.

I think it would be helpful to me and to many other observers of the monetary process if you would give us a paragraph on how each of these sizable transactions impinge on monetary policy. It would be especially helpful to know if the monetary authorities have advance notice of items of this size so that appropriate smoothing actions may be taken.

Two of these items are clearly private decisions which I judge would significantly affect the amount of reserves available to the banking system as well as the individual bank, and the third item involves a decision on the part of a Government agency which, I understand, would be tantamount to the sale of a similar amount of Government bonds by direction of the Open Market Committee. The items I refer to are:

1. Chase Manhattan Bank: $250 million, 4.60 percent capital notes due 1990.
2. First National City Bank: $266,307,500, 4 percent convertible capital notes due 1990.
3. Federal National Mortgage Association: $525 million participation certificates in Government mortgage liquidation trust.

I think your explanation of these transactions as they affect open market operations would be helpful to the public's understanding of the variety and size of the factors which must be taken into account currently in planning proper monetary actions.

Sincerely yours,
Thomas B. Curtis,
Member of Congress.

Board of Governors
of the Federal Reserve System,
Washington, July 1, 1965.

Hon. Thomas B. Curtis,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Curtis: In response to your letter of June 22, the Federal Reserve does undertake a large volume of operations that can be called "smoothing" actions. These operations are mainly in response to the inevitable and sometimes sharp day-to-day and week-to-week fluctuations in such items as currency in circulation, bank float (reflecting essentially checks in the process of collection), and required reserves of banks. I will not burden you with technical explanations of the genesis of these items, but variations in them affect bank reserve positions.

To smooth out the impact of these factors, the System undertakes offsetting open market operations so that the money and credit markets will not be subject to undue short-run strains or excesses merely as a result of seasonal or other temporary factors that influence bank reserve positions. In this way, interest rates and other credit conditions will be responsive mainly to underlying forces of supply and demand stemming from the saving flow in the economy from the overall stance of monetary policy, and from the credit demands of business and consumers as they seek to finance investment outlays.

Of course interest rates in credit markets will always fluctuate. Rates will tend to rise, for instance, when there is a bunching of large capital market issues. This was the case in the recent period when the Chase Manhattan Bank, the First National City Bank, and the Federal National Mortgage Association issues among others, were all marketed within a few weeks of each other, after provision of the usual advance notice to the market by the respective issuers. While the Federal Reserve does not smooth the market in response to large private and agency security issues, our efforts to offset the technical reserve factors, noted earlier, do enable credit markets to absorb such issues on the basis of longer-run supply-demand conditions. If market participants can judge these conditions without interference from sharp day-to-day fluctuations, the ability of the market to accommodate large borrowers is enhanced and interest rate adjustments may tend to be reduced.

Issuance of private securities does not affect bank reserves since the reduction of deposits in commercial banks by the buyers of these securities is offset by the increase in commercial bank deposits of the sellers. Issuance of agency securities by the Government, such as the FNMA issue you mention, does result in a transfer of funds from private deposits in commercial banks to Treasury deposits at the Federal Reserve. This would reduce bank reserves if that were all that happened. But the Treasury attempts to keep its deposits at the Federal Reserve at a relatively stable working level, and they would therefore redeposit excess funds with commercial banks. In practice, then, payment for Agency securities does not have any effect on commercial bank reserves and therefore is not similar to security sales by the Federal Reserve.

I hope these remarks will, as you suggest, prove helpful to an understanding of the factors that affect monetary operations.

Sincerely yours,
Wm. McC. Martin, Jr.

THE PRINCIPLES OF U.S. TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on July 15 in Dusseldorf, Germany, Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations Michael Blumenthal spoke before the Chamber of Commerce and Industry on "World Trade and the Kennedy Round."

In his excellent speech Ambassador Blumenthal reaffirmed four principles on which U.S. trade negotiations are proceeding. They are: universality, global reciprocity, nonreciprocity for developing countries, and the most-favored-nation principle. These principles are well worth summarizing.

By "universality," Ambassador Blumenthal means that the negotiations cover all products entering international trade with as few exceptions as possible. This means also that all kinds of trade barriers used to establish economic differentials between countries are open to negotiation: tariff as well as other-than-tariff barriers.

In discussing universality Ambassador Blumenthal explained how exceptions of products from negotiations by important trading nations can impair—in fact void—the value of the negotiations for other trading countries.

How does this work? Each major participating country has industries which it finds hard to expose to international competition. There exists, therefore, a strong tendency to exempt items produced by these industries from barrier-cutting negotiations. But when one country exempts an important item another country's interest is hurt.

For example, if the United States were to exempt "chromium widgets" from the negotiations and thus not lower U.S. tariffs on them, Denmark, the major exporter of "chromium widgets," would see little advantage to reducing Danish tariffs on "brown bulls." The Danes would thus be sorely tempted to exempt "brown bulls" from the negotiations. And when the Danes exempt "brown bulls," the Australians might find that they would have to exempt "antelope hides." On and on the chain of events goes, and suddenly one finds that many important products are removed from tariff cuts, and consumers in all countries have to continue paying higher prices than necessary for goods they use.

The second principle emphasized by Ambassador Blumenthal is that of global reciprocity. This means, he said, that "a country is expected to give only as much in concessions as it will receive. No major participant is expected to make a greater effort or deeper or more sweeping reduction than any other major participant." This is perhaps an obvious principle, yet it needs restatement. In effect, Ambassador Blumenthal was telling our trade partners that for whatever concessions the United States gives, especially in the difficult area of nontariff barriers, it expects to receive an equally important concession in turn.

Perhaps more importantly, though, Ambassador Blumenthal stressed that the final package of U.S. offers will be balanced not according to categories of exports but as a whole. Thus the U.S. package can consist of unequal parts of agricultural, industrial, and non-tariff-barrier concessions. Balance does not have to be established for each sector or part of trade. In other words, a country may well provide greater benefits in one area as long as it receives offsetting benefits in another area and the total package is an equal one.

The third principle, a new and extremely important one, is that developing countries will not be expected to extend concessions to developed countries in return for concessions developed countries make to them. In other words, developed countries can lower their barriers against the goods of developing countries without expecting similar access to developing country markets for their products.

This principle emerges from the effort to increase the stake of the developing countries in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. It has great importance in light of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and its demands for radical changes in the GATT rules of fair international trade practice that have governed trade among the major free world trading nations since World War II.

The fourth principle of U.S. trade negotiations is the most-favored-nations principle—that is, that a trade concession extended to one nation is a concession to all nations. This principle is being seriously questioned in many quarters. Developing nations are demanding preferential duty-free access for their manufactured products into developed country markets that could result in special and discriminatory preferential systems in violation of the most-favored-nation principle. Some observers in the United States have asked whether it may be worthwhile to abandon the most-favored-nation principle, in favor of establishing a treaty among the major world trading nations which would reduce all barriers to trade in stages over a stated period of time.

The most-favored-nation principle is one of the keystones of the present world trade system, one which has served us very well indeed. Those who wish to abrogate it should weigh very carefully what they consider to be the imperatives that require its change. It may seem futile to cling to a principle when the objective which the principle is supposed to attain can be accomplished by other means. But I question whether there is now truly a better means to achieve the greatest possible trade and commerce among nations than through perfecting the machinery we are now using and through adhering to the principles on which it is based.

Ambassador Blumenthal closed his speech by saying that "courage, patience, and wisdom will be needed in the months ahead." The high skill and preparedness of his negotiating team will have material impact on the success of the negotiations. But more than anything else, determination will be required of our negotiators, especially considering the present disruption within the European Economic Community. In many respects our trade negotiation effort may serve what may be a historic purpose by bludgeoning the EEC into agreement and continued progress at a time when severe stresses threaten to rip it asunder.

Under permission granted, the text of Ambassador Blumenthal's speech follows:

OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

WORLD TRADE AND THE KENNEDY ROUND

(Address by the Honorable W. Michael Blumenthal, Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, to the Dusseldorf Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Dusseldorf, Germany, July 15, 1965)

I

The Kennedy round is the most ambitious effort to liberalize world trade ever undertaken. All the world's trading nations stand to gain from the success of this effort. And yet these negotiations involve much more than trade and economics. They are a unique and singular opportunity to give added strength, vitality, and meaning to the political as well as economic ties that unite Europe, North America, and the other trading nations of the world.

President Johnson expressed this idea recently when he said: "We in the United States look upon these negotiations as an important opening to a better world. If we act together with dedication and purpose, all can gain and none need lose. Not only the major commercial nations, but all the countries of this shrinking world—poor and rich alike—have the right to expect success from our endeavors."

The importance of the Kennedy round is widely recognized in many parts of the world and among a large number of countries negotiating in Geneva. This is particularly true here in the Federal Republic. No one is a greater champion of liberal trade policies than Chancellor Erhard, who as Minister of Economics participated in the first Ministerial meeting in May of 1963. He can justly be called one of the fathers of the negotiations.

President Hallstein of the European Economic Community also has given the Kennedy Round high priority. He has characterized the negotiations as "probably the most important thing that has ever occurred in the foreign relations of our Community." Only recently the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) ministers meeting in Vienna again emphasized their view that the success of the negotiations is of vital importance to all the member countries of EFTA. One could go on in a similar vein quoting leading statesmen in important world trading countries whether from the European Economic Community (EEC), Canada, Japan, or from many of the developing nations of the world.

There is, therefore, a remarkable degree of unanimity that the Kennedy round is important, and that it is in the common interest of all nations to have the talks succeed. And there is a firm shared commitment among all the principal nations involved to translate the objectives of the Kennedy round into concrete reality.

When Heinrich Heine was asked why, in his time, they no longer built cathedrals like the one at Amiens, he replied, "Men in those days had convictions, the moderns have opinions and it requires something more than an opinion to build a Gothic cathedral."

There is both opinion and conviction that the Kennedy round should succeed.

Why is this so? Why the common commitment to leave no stone unturned to make the negotiations succeed? Why the great effort and expense expended in Geneva for so long?

Is the Kennedy round merely another—the sixth, in fact—in a continuing series of tariff talks conducted under the GATT since the end of the war? Or, does this particular negotiation differ from others? What is our joint stake in the success or failure of this effort?

What are the basic principles underlying the Kennedy round? What are the conditions, traditions, and framework of international trade which we are trying to preserve, perfect, and adapt?

What has been accomplished in the trade negotiations thus far? Why has it taken us so long to get to the present stage of our negotiations? Has our progress been satisfactory?

The Kennedy round has now been underway for 2 years. The negotiations will be entering their vital phase this fall when the preparations and preliminaries will have been completed and the offers tabled, clarified, and discussed. Countries will have to be ready to make important decisions. In other words, we will soon be moving toward the stage in the negotiations which will determine their success or their failure.

With the August recess in sight, this is an opportune moment to answer these questions, to take stock, to review where we stand, and to look frankly at where we are going and what problems lie ahead.

For some of you, as leaders of German industry, certain aspects of this review may be familiar. But perhaps some of the thoughts which I shall express today may be new and, hopefully, provide useful material for fruitful discussion and for illumination of the task still ahead of us.

II

What is the Kennedy round? Simply stated, it is the most ambitious undertaking of the postwar period to reduce all kinds of barriers that hamper international trade. The goal is to halve tariffs wherever possible and, at the same time, to attack nontariff barriers. Virtually all products entering world trade—agricultural and industrial, raw materials, and manufactured goods—are included in this effort. What does this mean to the European businessman in Germany, in France, in Italy, and elsewhere?

In the first instance, the negotiations are concerned with access to world markets. We are negotiating on the conditions of access to a rapidly growing American market. The gross national product of the United States last year exceeded the $600 billion mark and is expected to reach a thousand billion dollars by about 1975. In 1963 our trading partners found markets for $17 billion of their exports in the United States. This figure has been rising steadily. If we cut American trade barriers in half, how will this affect opportunities for exporting to the United States? Similarly at stake are the markets of Japan with present imports of over $5 billion and of Britain and the rest of EFTA with a sum total of imports of about $24 billion—$8 billion from the EEC alone. And, of course, there is the market of the European Economic Community, with imports from third countries running at $24 billion.

But much more is involved in the Kennedy round than even these imposing trade statistics imply—more is involved economically and politically—for these negotiations occur at a particularly important moment in world history when a number of far-reaching developments are underway.

In particular the European Economic Community is establishing the pattern of its world trading relationships. This is a most significant aspect of the Community's participation in the Kennedy round both as an exporter and as an importer—for the extent to which the Kennedy round succeeds in lowering world trade barriers must necessarily be heavily influenced by the actions of the world's largest trading unit—the European Economic Community. The Community has a great interest in the development of world trade, and it has a responsibility to contribute to this development—a responsibility explicitly recognized in article 110 of the Treaty of Rome.

The negotiations also occur at a moment when the nations of the European Free Trade Association are moving toward full implementation of their trading arrangements. A successful Kennedy round can greatly facilitate the harmonious expansion of trade between the EFTA countries and other nations, not least the Community.

The developing nations are now justly pressing for action to improve the expansion of their exports and export earnings as a part of their economic development efforts. As with so many of the world's problems and pressures, the trade aspirations of the developing nations can—with foresight and effort—be dealt with constructively. Otherwise less constructive solutions will inevitably be forced upon us.

Finally, there are other countries, including some in Eastern Europe, now seeking to expand their commerce and to fit into a wider pattern of international trade. Some of these see in the Kennedy round one means of achieving this objective.

The outcome of the Kennedy round may well set the tone for the conduct of world trade for many years to come. For a number of reasons, some accidental, these negotiations may greatly influence our long-run commercial, economic, and, in part, also political relations. That is why the stakes are high; that is why so many nations are determined that these negotiations shall succeed.

The importance of the Kennedy round can, perhaps, be summarized by two propositions:

First, the outcome of the negotiations will have a major, and perhaps decisive, influence on the conduct of world trade. A successful Kennedy round will strengthen and extend the pattern of liberal, multilateral trade based on comparative advantage and nondiscrimination—that is, the principle of most-favored-nation treatment. It is not an exaggeration to say that this framework of liberal, multilateral trade has provided an indispensable foundation for the economic growth and prosperity which the major industrialized countries have now enjoyed for almost two decades. On the other hand, if we are not successful in the Kennedy round, it would be naive to expect our trading patterns—and the dynamism of our national economies—to be unaffected. If we should fail in the Kennedy round, we would risk sliding back into restrictionism and bilateralism. This, history should have taught us to avoid.

The second proposition is a corrolary of the first. While the outcome of the Kennedy round—for better or worse—will have broad economic and political significance for all of us, it can also have a major direct impact on the future markets and profits of individual firms and industries. The more extensive and comprehensive the reductions of trade barriers which emerge from the Kennedy round, the greater the new markets for us all to share. Conversely, to the extent we fall short of this goal, potential markets will not develop; and restrictive solutions to pressing immediate problems may threaten existing markets.

Businessmen in all countries—and particularly those interested in export markets—would do well, therefore, to pay close attention to the conduct of the negotiations over the coming months. We in the United States have established procedures through which businessmen and the Government can conduct a useful exchange of views and information on Kennedy round matters. I assume that business leaders here in the Federal Republic as well as in other countries maintain similar contact with thier negotiators.

III

Every multilateral negotiation must have ground rules to set the framework and provide the guidelines for the conduct of the talks and for the nature of the commitments being discussed. The Kennedy round is no exception. We are guided by certain principles—some established GATT rules or negotiating tradition of long standing, others quite new and far reaching. Their meaning for the success of the Kennedy round and for the shape of the world trade relations may be considerable. I should like to recall four of these fundamental principles today—four principles which seem to me among the most important for they show the direction in which we must move in the solution of our remaining problems.

The first basic principle of the Kennedy round negotiations is its universality. All trade is included in the talks. Our effort to reduce trade barriers applies to all products, agricultural and nonagricultural, manufactured, semimanufactured, and raw materials. Exceptions must remain at a bare minimum. No sectors or industries where export markets or participants are at stake should be left out. This is the letter and the spirit of one of the key decisions taken by GATT Ministers in May 1963.

The principle of universality, and the ministerial decisions to this effect, are clear and straightforward; but as negotiators we have not always found this an easy rule to implement in practice. Yet we in the United States are more than ever convinced, as we hope you are, that here lies one of the keys to the success or failure of the Kennedy round.

This is so because practically every omission of a product or industry or sector of trade from real trade liberalization vitally affects one negotiating partner or another having important export interests in these areas. This leads to their removing other products from the negotiations—products which they import—so as to square the balance, or they may even drop out of the negotiations altogether. Once the principle of universality is violated, therefore, we can no longer be sure that a large number of countries can participate effectively in the talks or that a sufficient balance of advantages involving deep reciprocal reductions of trade barriers can be established by the various participants. For an undertaking as far-reaching and ambitious as the Kennedy round, it is essential that the widest number of countries participate. Only in this way can the objectives of this negotiation be achieved.

Lest it be felt that this emphasis on the universality of coverage of the negotiations is belaboring an obvious point, let me assure you that this is not so. We have already had evidence of recurrent temptations to overlook this principle. Each country, after all, has some difficult areas which it would just as soon not subject to a real reduction of trade barriers. For some countries, for example, effective liberalization of agricultural trade may be difficult. Yet it is clear that the omission of even a few major agricultural product groups would, in most cases, have a serious impact on countries exporting these commodities. For many, the major benefits of the negotiations will flow precisely from the degree of liberalization achieved in agriculture. Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, and Denmark fall into this category. Others, like the United States with more than $6 billion in agricultural exports amounting to a quarter of our total exports, could hardly be content with a negotiation which failed to make progress in the key agricultural commodities—for trade negotiations and the exchange of concessions cannot be confined into neat and distinct compartments.

The economy of the Federal Republic, as you are well aware, requires export markets. German exports, which are primarily industrial goods, comprise about 15 percent of your gross national product. Yet here in the great industrial center of the Ruhr, you must also be interested in agricultural trade liberalization as one of the keys to success of the industrial negotiation. Unless we work to resolve our agricultural as well as our industrial trade problems, the impact on industrial trade will be inevitable. I have but to mention one case, a situation which I sincerely hope will be the last of its kind—the fate which has befallen exports of American broilers to the Community and trucks to the United States.

Restriction breeds counter-restrictionism in other fields. Hence, trade liberalization in agriculture and industry must go hand in hand. It is equally important, of course, that all parts of the industrial sector be included in the talks, apart from making certain minimum exceptions of individual products. Each country has certain industries or sectors in which trade liberalization presents particular problems. If we exclude from real liberalization, say steel, to please one country, or chemicals because they are a problem for another country, or textiles to accommodate a third, the effects would be felt well beyond any one sector of trade. Exporters of these commodities would be obliged to scale down their own offers to bring them in line with the reduced opportunities for their exports in other markets. We must conclude, therefore, that the ministers were wise to establish the principle of the all-inclusiveness—of the universality—of the negotiations, even though implementation of this principle requires great effort and courage.

Let me emphasize also that the inclusion of all trade, of course, means inclusion for the purpose of genuine reductions of presently existing trade barriers. Offering theoretical rather than real rates of protection for cuts has little value to exporters who look for real reductions of presently existing rates of protection or of trade barriers actually in effect.

A second principle of importance is the concept of global reciprocity. What does it mean? In general terms, global reciprocity means that a country cannot be expected to extend to its trading partners as a group a package of trade-liberalizing concessions which it regards as more valuable than the package of concessions it receives.

More specifically, it means the following: a country is expected to give only as much in concessions as it will receive. No major participant is expected to make a greater effort or deeper or more sweeping reduction than any major other participant.

This would appear at first glance to be a rather simple concept, almost a self-evident one. Yet its implications are considerable, and almost no week goes by when we do not have to reflect on them in our discussions in Geneva. For example, if the EEC asks the United States for some particular concession—in the nontariff barrier field, for example, we are entitled to ask, "What will you give us in return?" I should add that nontariff barriers are a rather fruitful field in this regard. It has become clear from our discussions so far that all of us are quite experienced constructors of nontariff barriers.

Reciprocity must be global. It must apply to the final package as a whole. Balance does not have to be established for each sector or part of trade. In other words, a country may well provide greater benefits in one area as long as it receives offsetting benefits in another area and the total package is an equal one. Failure to respect the global character of reciprocity would mean that concessions in each sector would have to be perfectly balanced, thus reducing the level of all concessions to the lowest common denominator—to the slowest ship in the convoy.

Reciprocity must not only be global as between products, but between countries as well. In other words, it must be measured among the sum total of all countries participating in the Kennedy round. We do not need to work for a bilateral balance between any two countries. This, too, is designed to maximize the sum total of concessions exchanged in the Kennedy round.

Such multilateral reciprocity, of course, is a logical concomitant of the multilateral nature of international trade itself. Here, however, a qualification is in order. While bilateral balancing is to be avoided, it is clear that the major participants in the talks—I am referring principally to the Community, Britain, Japan, and the United States—must make roughly equivalent efforts. No doubt, you would not find it easy to offer trade concessions of greater importance than those agreed to by the United States. We would find ourselves in a similar position. This, of course, has a direct relevance to the size of the exceptions lists of the key countries: In the end, each one of the major negotiating partners will adjust his list to make sure that the importance of its concessions is substantially equivalent to those of the other major trading countries. That is why it is so important that all of us seek to reduce our lists to a bare minimum.

The third general principle of the negotiations is an entirely new one, introduced into GATT trade negotiations for the first time. I am referring to the decision that the requirement of full reciprocity is to apply to the developed countries only.

This concept of less than full reciprocity for developing countries breaks new ground. It embodies the recognition that no developing nation should have to make reductions in its trade barriers which are inconsistent with its development efforts, while welcoming and, in fact, encouraging the fullest possible participation of such countries in the negotiations. This principle permits developing nations to be full participants and to negotiate for maximum benefits for their export trade while making their own contributions in accordance with their particular needs and stage of development. It is by this means—and by making every effort to keep off our exceptions lists the products of special interest to the developing nations—that we hope to implement our important objective of making the Kennedy round a real factor in promoting the trade objectives of the many new and growing nations in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

This leads to the fourth and in many ways the most important general principle underlying the negotiations. As I mentioned a few moments ago, one of our main stakes in the Kennedy round is the strengthening and extension of the pattern of liberal multilateral trade relations based on the most-favored-nation (MFN) principle. MFN—the concept that a concession to one nation is a concession to all and that, for a given product, all GATT countries have the right to be accorded the same treatment by importers—is the bedrock on which the present highly beneficial structure of world trade has been built. Stated inversely, MFN means nondiscrimination. We must not underestimate the importance and the value of this principle.

All the major industrialized countries are under pressures of various sorts, or have been tempted at one time or another, to depart from MFN in this or that area. We must resist this temptation. We must be particularly careful not to vitiate the MFN principle in our search for expedient solutions to immediate problems.

There has been considerable discussion of departing in one way or another from MFN in an effort to improve the export opportunities of developing countries. The issue of tariff preferences for developing countries raises the question of whether the MFN principle should apply to this trade.

While this is not the forum in which to discuss this matter in detail, I would like to make a brief comment. The more nations depart from the concept that trade should be conducted on the basis of comparative advantage, the more we risk this trade being stifled and distorted by increasingly political rather than economic determination of trade patterns. Moreover, the actual trade benefits from preferences seem highly questionable.. If a developing country is an efficient producer of a particular product, it may have much to gain from lower trade barriers but no need for preferential treatment. If a developing country is not an efficient producer, tariff preferences may not help it compete with the domestic industry in the import market, particularly where the latter is a large industrialized one. And this is by no means a complete case against preferences. My purpose, however, is merely to point out that in my view, preferences appear to be neither a politically nor economically justifiable departure from MFN.

If we fail in the Kennedy round to strengthen the pattern of liberal, multilateral trade through the significant reduction of trade barriers on an MFN basis, we risk slippage of trade relations more and more into a restrictive mold. The MFN system is founded on an underlying common interest in the expansion of trade which we must have the wisdom, determination, and patience to protect and perfect.

These then are what seem to me to be the four key principles on which the Kennedy round is based. Universality: The negotiations involve all products, all countries are welcome to participate. And, of course, the inclusion of the broad range of world trade in these talks is for the purpose of a genuine and extensive reduction in the obstacles to trade. Global reciprocity: World trade is multilateral and is based on comparative advantage. Narrow balancing of concessions between specific products or individual countries is, therefore, inconsistent with the essential structure of world trade. Special provisions for the developing countries: These nations can contribute to world trade while spurring their own development. Their actions in the field of commercial policy must be consistent with their development needs. And, finally, of course, MFN: The most-favored-nation principle must remain the foundation of our trade relations.

IV

As I have already pointed out, these principles have not proven easy to implement in Geneva. An outside observer may have gained the impression from occasional press reports that the Kennedy round was witnessing much maneuvering but little progress. In fact, this has not been true. We have made very important progress.

Let me be specific.

We have worked out a new formula for worldwide tariff reductions—the linear cut. The depth of the linear cut for all industrial goods was set at 50 percent.

The major trading nations tabled unprecedented offers for tariff cuts in industrial products last November. While we must work to reduce exceptions to this linear offer, we have reason to be pleased with the importance of the offers which have been made.

Procedures for the participation of the developing countries based on the concept of less than full reciprocity have been agreed. These countries are now actively engaged in the negotiations in Geneva.

In agriculture, a method for negotiation by specific groups of commodities has been worked out. Concrete offers were made on grains, and negotiations on these offers now have begun.

For other agricultural products, preliminary negotiations have been completed; and offers are expected to be tabled in Geneva in the early fall.

Negotiations are underway on a number of nontariff barriers.

How much longer will the Kennedy round go on before it can be brought to a successful conclusion?

Much detailed and arduous work has already been done, but much remains—especially in the agricultural area. Nevertheless, the outlines of a final package should begin to emerge by next winter. And during the year of 1966 we will have before us the complex, often delicate, but tremendously important task of shaping up a final Kennedy round agreement.

Courage, patience, and wisdom will be needed in the months ahead—the courage of our convictions, the patience to seek meaningful solutions, and the wisdom to move forward in the building of a world community—for a successful Kennedy round is part of the stone and mortar of a better, free world.

PRESENT EEC DEADLOCK HAS SERIOUS KENNEDY ROUND IMPLICATIONS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, since my June 2 report to the House of Representatives on the progress of the present round of tariff negotiations in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—developments in the European Economic Community—EEC—threaten to jeopardize the hope for real progress that I then saw.

The present crisis in the EEC is essentially about the organization's political development as a supranational entity. Most of us are aware that behind the EEC goal of economic integration is the objective of true political integration. Without this promise of political unity among the major European powers the United States would not so enthusiastically have endorsed the Common Market or have held the success of the Common Market to be one of the first objectives of its foreign policy.

France under De Gaulle has balked at several points along the path toward closer political and economic union with the Six. Most often in the past, however, the advantages of membership in the EEC and the sheer momentum of its existence resulted in French acceptance, often in compromise form, of new common measures.

The present crisis stems from the proposal by the EEC Commission last May for the financing of the Community. In public reporting of this proposal and the present crisis stemming from it, I find very little depth of understanding; it may thus prove worthwhile to explain the reasons for the crisis in some thoroughness here.

The Commission' financing proposal has three parts. The first relates to the use of funds accruing from the collection of levies on agricultural imports into the EEC. Most of these levies are now of the "variable" levy type, though some are still of the ordinary tariff type. The second relates to the use of funds resulting from collection of duties on industrial imports. The third relates to the Commission's proposal that the European Parliament approve the community budget drawn and proposed by the Commission. The new financing proposals would if approved take effect on July 1, 1967.

The Community has provided an agriculture fund since 1962. This fund has three specific uses: To subsidize EEC exports of farm commodities, to support farm prices when they fall below certain predetermined levels, and to promote production of certain products. The fund is applied in its uses, however, only to those commodities included in the common EEC farm policy drafted in 1962.

The EEC agriculture fund has been contributed yearly partly by the EEC Commission and partly by EEC member countries. The 1962 EEC regulation establishing the fund required that adequate permanent means for financing the agriculture fund by the Commission alone be reached by June 30, 1965. It was from this requirement that the overall EEC financing proposal stemmed. The new financing proposal provides that moneys received from imposition of agriculture levies be used to support the agriculture fund.

France, in particular, has benefited from the EEC agriculture fund, because France is the largest EEC producer of farm products and a large farm exporter. From 1962 to 1964 French farmers received about 86 percent of all EEC agriculture fund moneys allotted for export subsidies and price supports. Thus the French treasury and French farm groups have been strongly in favor of continuing the agriculture fund.

The receipts from duties on agricultural and industrial imports could total slightly more than $2.3 billion annually. This would increase by $85 million if the duties collected by the European Coal and Steel Community—ECSC—were included after the proposed EEC-ECSC-Euratom "merger of communities." Under the Commission's financing proposal this money would be approved by the European Parliament, based on budgets presented by the Commission, thus giving the Parliament a new measure of importance which would represent a step toward creation of a ECC government. The Parliament-approved budget would be administered by the Commission to finance the agriculture fund, the EEC social fund, and the operation of the Community itself. Surplus funds would be allotted to the member countries.

French objections to the financing proposal have been obliquely expressed. Their opposition has been based on the argument that the Commission had no instructions and therefore no jurisdiction to propose an all-inclusive financing proposal. The French were therefore willing to discuss only the agriculture fund portion of the overall financing proposal. When this had been discussed, the meeting of the Council was closed by French Foreign Minister Couve de Murville, who presided, on the grounds that agreement on the rest of the financing proposal was impossible. Since that time the French have boycotted EEC Commission and Council meetings.

The French have therefore not explicitly based their refusal to consider further the Community's financing on the issue of the supranational growth of the Community's administrative and executive organs. But this consideration has been implicit in these events and is considered the central issue at contest.

The French position and its repercussions on the functioning of the Community casts long shadows on the Kennedy round. Much of the optimism I expressed in my report to Congress stemmed from the EEC decision last May to table its grains offer—that is, to begin bargaining on grains. This was to me an indication that the EEC planned to meet the September 16 deadline for the tabling of offers on other agricultural products. As I have pointed out, the tabling of remaining EEC agriculture offers is necessary if we are to begin bargaining on industrial items and thus obtain real progress in the Kennedy round.

The present EEC deadlock over financing causes me to doubt seriously whether the EEC will be able to make the difficult internal decisions that will enable it to meet the September 16 tabling date. Thus it would appear to me that real bargaining on industrial and agricultural items will not proceed this fall as hoped, unless the United States should decide to adopt a new bargaining strategy. In this regard let me reaffirm what I said in my June report to the House: I believe U.S. strategy remains correct in insisting that industrial, agricultural, and nontariff barrier bargaining proceed together. But in order to continue our insistence on this bargaining strategy we will have to accept that substantial progress in the negotiations will be further delayed. And this further delay can only cause us to begin to prepare for the day when renewal of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 will be necessary.

THE PRESIDENT CALLS FOR VIGOROUS AND PROMPT ENFORCEMENT OF THE HOUSING CODE IN THE DISTRICT of COLUMBIA

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in his message to the Congress on the District of Columbia on February 15, 1965, President Johnson said:

> The District's urban renewal program must make a major effort in the years ahead to provide decent housing for low- and moderate-income families. * * * There must be vigorous and prompt enforcement of the housing code, particularly in those areas where continuing deterioration may escalate irrecoverable slums. Too little effort has been exerted to assure that violations are detected and corrected promptly. Both tenants and landlords must be made aware of their responsibilities as well as their rights.

I have today introduced a bill which would authorize the District Commissioners to make repairs on uninhabitable Washington slum dwellings and charge the landlords for the work. In addition to allowing the city to repair substandard rental housing and charge the owner, the bill, H.R. 10079, would prohibit slum landlords from evicting or raising the rent for tenants who have complained about housing conditions. Also, the bill would provide relocation payments by the city of up to $200 to tenants forced to move because a residential building is condemned or is being repaired. The bill was prepared with the cooperation of the Neighborhood Legal Service project of the District's United Planning Organization.

Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey, will introduce a companion measure today in the other House.

I have long been interested in code enforcement as a major tool in the rehabilitation process. I authored the workable program provisions of the Housing Act of 1954; the code enforcement and rehabilitation provisions of the Housing Act of 1964; and the rent certificate and rehabilitation provisions of the Housing Act of 1965, $400 million was authorized for the rehabilitation loan program in this year's Housing and Urban Development Act.

An important weapon was added earlier this year to New York City's arsenal for warring on slums after Harlem residents staged a sit-in at city hall to complain about lack of heat and hot water. More recently, Governor Rockefeller signed a bill, approved by the New York State Legislature, which provides that the State will reimburse the city's building department for half of its expenditures on enforcing the housing code. In an editorial on this development, the New York Times stated:

> Among the key influences in determining how low income and relief families live is the vigor with which the housing code is enforced. Rubbish in hallways, plumbing leaks, inadequate hall lights and holes in ceilings, floors or walls rob slumdwellers of health and dignity alike.

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 provides Federal aid on a two-thirds, one-third formula to localities for code enforcement outside of urban renewal areas, with the proviso that the locality will maintain during the period of the contract, in addition to its expenditures for planning and carrying out any program assisted, a level of expenditures for code enforcement activities at not less than its normal expenditures for such activities prior to the provision of such Federal financial assistance. This is a major step forward.

The problems in the District of Columbia in the field of code enforcement were highlighted in a recent book, "The Girard Street Project," published by All Souls Unitarian Church of Washington, D.C. The church charged that the department of licenses and inspections gives ordinary citizens the runaround but is lax in enforcement against landlords, while the corporation counsel's office follows an ineffective policy of "friendly collaboration and gentle persuasion" when it comes to landlords cited for code violations.

The book notes that overcrowding in Washington is caused by the lack of housing at reasonable prices for Negro families. Barred by racial discrimination from settling in the suburbs, displaced by the urban renewal and highway programs, Negroes find the areas of Washington where they can live squeezed smaller and smaller. As a result, a Negro family pays higher rent for its substandard housing than a white family does for an up-to-date, new apartment in a pleasant neighborhood.

According to the Washington, D.C., Evening Star report of April 21, 1965:

> Under these circumstances it is reasonable to expect the municipal authorities to enforce the minimum standards of the housing code vigorously and efficiently. The opposite seems to be true of the approach adopted by the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

The report draws the conclusion that "to be a slum landlord is a lucrative occupation in the District of Columbia."

The Washington, D.C., Post of July 14, 1965, reported that frustration was the theme at a recent discussion of the city's housing shortage held by the members of more than 25 housing organizations, civil rights groups, and public agencies who had gathered to "do something" about the housing crisis. The District of Columbia Coalition of Conscience has been trying to put up a tent for a family of 13 which was recently evicted and cannot find new quarters.

In a recent series of articles on the crisis in housing in the District of Columbia, the Evening Star makes these points.

First. Thousands of Negroes are trapped by the shortage of housing, the wording of the law, the practices and attitudes of slumlords, the procedures and attitudes of the District government, and, basically, by their own inability to make more money. The artificial barrier of racial discrimination aggravates this shortage. Suburban resistance to Negro occupancy, though declining, prevents the normal outward expansion of a large portion of the city's population and thus places additional pressure on the low-income market.

Second. Housing is coming to be regarded as the core of the poverty question. Anita Bellamy, director of the Urban League's Neighborhood Development Center, states that the center's efforts to work with slum families have been met with demands by the people to focus on housing as the primary issue. She states that most requests they receive for help involve some sort of housing problem.

Third. In a recent experiment the National Capital Housing Authority purchased 10 houses in the Cardozo and Northeast areas, rehabilitated them and rented them to large families. This rehabilitation program has proven to be faster and cheaper than building new projects. Time was cut by about two-thirds and cost was reduced by 25 percent per unit over new construction of the conventional type of public housing units.

Fourth. The District's housing code and the penalties provided for violations "are potentially the most powerful tools immediately available" to improve slum conditions. During the past fiscal year, 55,724 buildings that were cited for violating the housing code were brought into conformity.

Fifth. Correction of code deficiencies can be delayed for unreasonable lengths of time by property owners.

Sixth. Inspectors, enforcement officers, and the corporation counsel, while relaxing their rules for owner-occupants, are not using the discretion that is theirs to promote efforts toward better low-income housing.

I include as part of my remarks the following items: First, a memorandum and synopsis of H.R. 10079 provided by Julian R. Dugas, director of the Neighborhood Legal Services Project of the United Planning Organization—the UPO coordinates distribution of Federal antipoverty funds in the District of Columbia; second, the text of H.R. 10079; and third, recent newspaper articles on the housing crisis in the District of Columbia:

MEMORANDUM OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD LEGAL SERVICES PROJECT, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Memorandum from: Mr. Julian R. Dugas, director, Neighborhood Legal Services Project.

In August 1955, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia promulgated regulations to prevent and arrest the growth of slums caused by deterioration of residential buildings. However, in spite of the regulations and the penalties provided for their violation, the growth of slums has been on the increase since 1955. Landlords and owners of leased premises used for dwelling purposes have used various maneuvers in order not to keep their properties in conformity with code standards. Moreover, the Department of Licenses and Inspections, which is charged with the administration and enforcement of the Housing Regulations, has followed a policy of friendly cooperation with the landlord which has worked against enforcement of the regulations. Other factors such as retaliatory eviction and retaliatory rent increases, following the filing of a complaint with the Housing Division, make code enforcement a difficult task. This bill is designed to deal with these problems by providing that the District of Columbia may repair leased property where the owner refuses to do so, by prohibiting retaliatory evictions and rent increases, and providing for relocation payments.

The bill (H.R. 10079) is designed so that it can be administered by the Department of Licenses and Inspections. Consequently, no new agency need be created to execute the bill, and the problems of duplication of work and overlapping of authority are bypassed. For example, sections I and II of the bill, providing for inspection and notice, were modeled after sections 5-501 and 5-502 of the Unsafe Structures Act (District of Columbia Code secs. 5-501, et seq.) and can be administered in the same manner.

The Bill (H.R. 10079) follows closely the review procedures used in condemnation proceedings (District of Columbia Code secs. 5-616 et seq.). The Condemnation Review Board is charged with the responsibility of reviewing under this bill. This Board was chosen because of the similarity between its present function of reviewing condemnation proceedings and what its function would be in reviewing under the bill. Also, the present workload of the Board is such that it could accept the additional work placed on it by the bill. Another consideration in placing the responsibility for review on the Condemnation Review Board, is the policy of utilizing established agencies to administer the bill.

Under the housing regulations, the Board of Appeals and Review is charged with the responsibility of reviewing orders issued thereunder, and thus that body would seem to be more of a logical choice to review violations under the bill. The problem is, however, that the Board's workload is greatly increased by the additional function of reviewing cases involving the denial of licenses to operate a housing business. A review before this Board may be pending anywhere from 6 months to 1 year before it will be heard. If the added burden of reviewing orders under the bill was undertaken by the Board, the time between filing a review and the hearing would probably be stretched to over 1 year. This would bog down processes under the bill and render it ineffective. Of course, the propriety of using the Condemnation Review Board as a review vehicle under the bill, is based upon the assumption that it can easily handle the increased workload. If this, in fact, is not the case, the bill can provide for the establishment of a review board similar in organization to the Condemnation Review Board.

Two words are crucial to the effectiveness of the bill. They are: "residential building" and "uninhabitable."

One of the criticisms of the draft bill was that it applied to nonresidential and residential buildings alike and that nonresidential buildings need not be suited for habitation. Under the present bill, nonresidential buildings are no longer covered. Section I of the bill limits its coverage to residential building. "Residential building" is defined similar to the term "housing accommodations" in the Rent Control Act (District of Columbia Code, sec. 45-1611), so that only buildings rented for living or dwelling purposes are included—premises used for these purposes by the owners are not covered either.

Under the draft bill, the term "unhabitable" is defined to mean in violation of the housing and building codes. It was stated that this definition was too broad and vague since both the housing and building codes prescribe standards for buildings which have very little to do with habitability. Although the validity of this criticism depends upon what is meant by habitability, the housing and building codes do involve a myriad of regulations which would make the bill very difficult to administer.

The habitability of a building involves many factors, e.g., maintenance, repairs, utilities and services, cleanliness, and sanitation. With these factors in mind, the present bill defines "uninhabitable" as being in violation of specific sections of the housing regulations. These sections of the housing regulations, along with the appendix, are incorporated into the bill by section 15.

Chapter I of the housing regulations is applicable to all premises used for residential purposes. It deals with heating, toilet floors, and yard drainage. Sections 1301 and 1302 of chapter I are not incorporated by section 15 of the bill because those two sections deal with notice, appeal, and hearing, under the regulations, and are inconsistent with the procedures provided for in the bill. Chapter 2 of the regulations is entitled, "The Housing Code of the District of Columbia." Sections of this chapter deal with light, ceiling height, utilities, maintenance, and repair. Sections 2701–2704 of chapter 2 were omitted because they deal with notice, variances, and appeals. Chapter 3 involves general licensing regulations applicable to the operation of housing businesses. Sections 1301–1303 of this chapter were omitted from incorporation because they deal with revocation of licenses and penalty, an area that is outside the scope of the bill. Chapters 4–8 of the regulations are not incorporated because (1) they deal with the licensing of specific housing business, e.g., boarding houses, convalescent or nursing houses, and (2) chapter 1–3 deal adequately with habitability and maintenance and repair. The appendix contains miscellaneous regulations affecting residential buildings. By defining "uninhabitable" in terms of specific code violations, the constitutional mandate of certainty is satisfied.

One of the reasons given by the Commissioners against the basic concept of (H.R. 10079) is that enough power is already available to force compliance with the building code and housing regulations. However, the accuracy of this position can be adjudged by the blighted slum conditions which actually exist in the District of Columbia.

The Department of Licenses and Inspections has taken the position that overcrowding in housing is a major factor that contributes to code enforcement problems and that any measures which require strict enforcement of the housing regulations should be opposed, since it would necessitate strict enforcement of the ban against overcrowding and result in families left homeless. Opposed to this view, it must be pointed out that mere housing violations such as leaky roofs, poor plumbing, electric wiring, and faulty stairways have little or no relationship to overcrowding, and their correction should not be dependent on strict enforcement of the overcrowding provision. Certainly minimal housing standards should be required, regardless of overcrowding.

It is recognized that a dwelling unit which is overcrowded will deteriorate faster and will be in need of repairs more often and sooner than if it were not overcrowded. To offset this increased rate of deterioration, a general practice of landlords in the District of Columbia is to charge an increased rental when dwelling units are overcrowded. This increased rental more than compensates for the increase in repair costs. Further, the overcrowding provisions of the housing regulations are used to evict tenants when landlords for some reason decide to do so.

The correct approach to the overcrowding problem which is caused by a shortage of low-income housing is not to disregard the other provisions of the housing regulation. Rather, urban renewal programs should be geared toward remedying the low-income housing shortage. Enforcement of the fair housing laws should be stepped up: Discrimination in housing has forced Negroes to live in neighborhoods which are already overly populated.

SYNOPSIS OF H.R. 10079

Section 1 of the bill provides that after a rented residential building has been inspected and found to be "uninhabitable"—in violation of certain sections of the housing regulations—the owner will be notified and informed as to what conditions on his leased property violate the housing regulations, and ordered to rectify such conditions. The owner or landlord may comply with this order, have it reviewed, or do neither. In case the latter course is followed, the Commissioners are empowered under section 2 of the bill to correct the housing violation, assess the cost upon the property, and collect the cost as taxes (this procedure of collecting expenses by the District government is used in defraying the cost of removing condemned buildings, District of Columbia Code, secs. 5–616, et seq., and shoring up or tearing down unsafe structures, District of Columbia Code, secs. 5–501, et seq.).

Section 3 of the bill entitles the owner to a review by the Condemnation Review Board. If the review is determined adversely to the owner, he may appeal to the District court. If the owner does not appeal, he must comply with the decision of the Board. If the owner does not comply with the Board's decision, nor appeal it, the Commissioners may proceed, pursuant to section 2, to make the property habitable. Section 3 of the bill provides that the pendency of an appeal or review, stays the operation of section 2 of the bill.

The District court is directed to give precedence to appeals from the Condemnation Review Board's determinations. If such an appeal is affirmed or modified, but not reversed, the owner must comply within a reasonable time to be set by the court; or if the owner refuses to comply, he may be cited for contempt and the Commissioners may proceed under section 2 of the bill to comply with the court's decision. Of course, if an order is reversed on review or appeal, the owner need not comply with it.

Section 8 provides for service of notice and the content of the notice. This section was taken from the Unsafe Structure Act, section 5–505, before it was amended in August 1965, and section 5–625 of the Insanitary Building Act. Section 9 is a prohibition against retaliatory eviction. Most of this section was taken from the Rent Control Act (District of Columbia Code, sec. 45–1605. Section 10 is a proscription against retaliatory rent increases, and has its genesis in the Rent Control Act also. Relocation payments are provided for in section 12. This section authorizes relocation payments when a tenant is displaced because a building is condemned, or the building is being made habitable under the bill. Section 11 provides for appropriation, by Congress, for relocation payments. This section is taken from section 5–715 of the District of Columbia Code. Section 13 directs the Recorder of Deeds to make public all determinations that any residential building is uninhabitable. Section 15 incorporates most of the first three chapters of the housing regulations, providing standards whereby a determination of habitability can be made.

H.R. 10079

A bill to provide for repair by the District of Columbia, at the expense of the owner, of buildings violating the District of Columbia housing regulations, and to make tenants evicted from unsafe and insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia eligible for relocation payments

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "Commissioners" means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent or agents.

(2) The term "Condemnation Review Board" means the Condemnation Review Board established by section 2 of the Act of May 1, 1906 (D.C. Code, sec. 5–617).

(3) The term "habitability" means the condition of a building relating to whether such a building should be used for living, sleeping, cooking, and eating by human occupants. Such conditions include: the extent and degree of deterioration or delapidation, maintenance of the building, the condition of toilet, bathing and washing facilities, heating, protection against fire hazards, lighting and ventilation, and other conditions relating to sanitation and safety of the premises.

(4) The term "habitable" means not uninhabitable as determined under sections 2 and 3.

(5) The term "housing regulations" means the Housing Regulations of the District of Columbia, established by the Commissioners' Order, dated August 11, 1955, as amended.

(6) The term "improvements" means valuable additions made to property which are intended to enhance its value, beauty, or utility and not required by an order issued pursuant to the authority granted in sections 2–6.

(7) The term "owner" means one or more persons, jointly or severally, in whom is vested all or any part of the beneficial ownership, dominion, or legal title to property; the committee, conservator, or legal guardian of an owner who is non compos mentis, a minor child, or otherwise under a disability; or a trustee elected or appointed, or required by law, to execute a trust, other than a trustee under a deed of trust to secure the payment of a loan. "Owner" shall also mean the designated agent of such owner, landlord, lessor, sublessor, or other persons entitled to receive rent for the use of a residential building.

(8) The term "person" includes one or more individuals, firm, partnership, corporation, or association and any agent, trustee, receiver, assignee, or other representative thereof.

(9) The term "rental" means the consideration, including any bonus, benefit, or gratuity, demanded or received per day, week, month, year, or other period of time, as the case may be, for the use and occupancy of a residential building or any part thereof.

(10) The term "repair" means to restore to a sound or good state or as directed by an order under sections 2–6 of this Act.

(11) The term "residential building" means any building, part of any building any room or unit within any building, or any structure or part thereof, which is used or offered to be used for living or dwelling purposes for a rental by human occupants (including, but without limitation, houses, apartments, hotels, rooming or boarding houses) together with all services supplied in connection with the use or occupancy of such property.

(12) The term "tenant" means any human occupant who for a rental, occupies a residential building for the purposes of living or dwelling with the consent, actual or implied, of the owner of said building, except a life tenant.

(13) The term "uninhabitable" means in violation of one or more sections of the Housing Regulations incorporated by reference in section 16 of this Act: *Provided, however,* That such section or sections require compliance therewith by the owner or licensee.

SEC. 2. If in the District of Columbia any residential building or part of a residential building shall be reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections as uninhabitable, then the Commissioners shall inspect said building, and if same or any part thereof is found to be uninhabitable but not unsafe, they shall immediately notify the owner of such residential building that such building is uninhabitable and order the same to be made habitable. The owner shall be allowed fifteen days, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, following the service of such notice, in which to employ sufficient labor and to commence taking action so as to comply with such notice.

SEC. 3. If the owner of a residential building found to be uninhabitable, having been notified, shall refuse or neglect to comply with sections 2, 4, 5, and 6, the Commissioners shall proceed to make said building habitable. After the Commissioners have commenced to make such building habitable, the owner may not make the building habitable, or in any way interfere with the authorized agents of the District of Columbia in making such building habitable, without first obtaining the written consent of the Commissioners. The cost and expense of such work shall be assessed by the Commissioners as a tax against the premises on which such residential building is situated; such tax to be collected in the same manner as general taxes are collected in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 4. Any owner of a residential building adversely affected by an order to make such residential buildings habitable under the authority contained in sections 2 and 3 shall be entitled to a review of such order and an opportunity for an oral hearing by the Condemnation Review Board upon making an application to said Condemnation Review Board, in writing, within fifteen days, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, following the service of notice of such order. The Condemnation Review Board shall be authorized by the Commissioners to affirm, modify, or vacate any order issued under section 2. The pendency of any review pursuant to this section or an appeal pursuant to section 5 shall stay operation of any order or decision issued under sections 2 and 5. The Condemnation Review Board shall give precedence to all reviews filed under this section. Section 2(d) of the Act of May 1, 1906 (D.C. Code, sec. 5–617(d)), shall be applicable to proceedings conducted under this section.

SEC. 5. The owner of any residential building ordered to make the same habitable under the provisions of sections 2 and 3 may, within fifteen days, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, from the date on which such owner receives notice that such order has been reviewed by the Condemnation Review Board, and has been sustained or modified by such Board—

(1) appeal to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for modification or vacation of the decision of said Board, or

(2) comply with the provisions of the order as sustained or modified by the Board. If the owner does not comply with either paragraph (1) or (2), the Commissioners may proceed pursuant to the authority under section 3 to make such residential building habitable as required by the decision of the Condemnation Review Board sustaining or modifying the original order reviewed from.

SEC. 6. (a) If the owner of any residential building found uninhabitable shall appeal a decision of the Condemnation Review Board in the United States District Court, such district court shall give precedence to any such case, shall hear the testimony adduced therein, may view the residential building or part thereof found to be uninhabitable, and thereafter, shall affirm, modify, or vacate the decision of the Board. In any proceeding instituted in accordance with the provisions of this subsection, such proceeding shall be conducted by the judge only, and nothing herein contained shall be construed as authorizing or entitling the owner of property adversely affected by a determination under sections 2–6 to a trial by jury.

(b) The decision of such court affirming or modifying the order appealed from shall be complied with by the owner within a reasonable time to be set by the court; or if said decision is not complied with within the time specified, the appellant shall be required to show cause why he should not be cited for contempt; and the Commissioners may proceed under the authority of section 3 to comply with such decision.

SEC. 7. The Commissioners may authorize the performance of the duties imposed on them by sections 2, 3, and 5 by such officers, agents, employees, contractors, employees of contractors, and other persons as may be designated, detailed, employed or appointed by the said Commissioners to carry out sections 2 and 3. The Commissioners or their designated agent or agents are authorized to investigate, through personal inquiry or inspection, into the condition of any residential building in the District of Columbia, except such as are under the exclusive control of the United States. The Commissioners, and all persons acting under their authority and authority contained in sections 2 and 3, may, between the hours of 8 ante meridian and 5 post meridian, peaceably enter into and upon any and all land and residential buildings in the District of Columbia for the purpose of inspecting the same.

SEC. 8. No person may interfere with the Commissioners in the discharge of duties, nor hinder, prevent, or refuse to permit any lawful inspection or the performance of any work authorized by sections 2 and 3. Any person violating, aiding or abetting in violating this section shall, upon conviction thereof in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, upon information filed in the name of the District of Columbia, be punished by a fine of not more than $300 or by imprisonment for not more than 90 days. Each day on which such unlawful negligence continues shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

SEC. 9. Any notice required by sections 2 and 5 to be served shall be deemed to have been served if delivered to the person to be notified, or if left at the usual residence or place of business of the person to be notified, with a person of suitable age and discretion then resident therein; or if no such residence or place of business can be found in the District of Columbia by reasonable search, if left with any person of suitable age and discretion employed therein at the office of any agent of the person to be notified, which agent has any authority or duty with reference to the land or tenement to which said notice relates; or if no such office can be found in said District by reasonable search, if forwarded by registered mail to the last known address of the person to be notified and not returned by the post office authorities; or if no address be known or can by reasonable diligence be ascertained, or if any notice forwarded as authorized by the preceding clause of this section be returned by the post office authorities, if published on three consecutive days in a daily newspaper published in the District of Columbia; or if by reason of an outstanding unrecorded transfer of title the name of the owner in fact cannot be ascertained beyond a reasonable doubt, if served on the owner of record in the manner hereinbefore in this section provided. Any notice to a corporation shall, for the purposes of sections 2 and 5, be deemed to have been served on such corporation if served on the president, secretary, treasurer, general manager, or any principal officer of such corporation in the manner hereinbefore provided for the service of notices on natural persons holding property in their own right; and notice to a foreign corporation shall, for the purposes of sections 2 and 5, be deemed to have been served if served on any agent of such corporation personally, or if left with any person of suitable age and discretion residing at the usual residence or employed at the usual place of business of such agent in the District of Columbia.

Every notice under this section shall be written; shall be addressed by name to the person to be notified; shall state the location of the residential building said to be uninhabitable; shall describe with certainty the specific conditions deemed to be uninhabitable; shall state the time within which the person notified must correct such conditions or to petition for review.

SEC. 10. (a) No tenant or occupant of any residential building or any part thereof shall be required to surrender possession of the same, and no lease or occupancy shall be terminated or refused to be renewed or extended because such tenant or occupant has reported, in good faith, that such residential building or any part thereof was uninhabitable.

(b) Within nine months after a tenant or occupant has, in good faith, reported or proposed to report that a residential building is uninhabitable, no action or proceeding to recover possession of such residential building shall be maintainable by the owner against such tenant or occupant so long as such tenant or occupant continues to pay the rent to which the owner is entitled, unless—

(1) the tenant is committing a nuisance or using the residential building or part thereof for an illegal purpose or for other than living or dwelling purposes;

(2) the owner seeks, in good faith, to recover possession of the property for his immediate and personal use and occupancy as a dwelling;

(3) the owner has, in good faith, contracted in writing, to sell the property for immediate and personal use and occupancy as a dwelling by the purchaser and that the contract of sale contains a representation by the purchaser that the property is being purchased by him for such immediate and personal use and occupancy;

(4) the owner seeks, in good faith, to recover possession for the immediate purpose of substantially altering, remodeling, or demolishing the property and replacing it with new construction, the plans for which altered, remodeled, or new construction, having been filed with, and approved by the Commissioners, or for the purpose of making the property habitable under sections 2, 5, and 6;

(5) the owner seeks, in good faith, to recover possession for the immediate purpose of discontinuing the housing use and occupancy for a continuous period of not less than one year; or

(6) the owner, being a recognized school or accredited nonprofit university, has a bona fide need for the premises for educational research, administrative, or dormitory use.

(c) Any person from whom possession has been recovered in violation of this section shall be entitled to recover threefold the damage by him sustained, and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

SEC. 11. (a) No owner of a residential building shall demand or receive an increased rental from a tenant of such residential building nor charge, assess, or levy an amount against such tenant based upon the cost of repairs made pursuant to sections 2, 3, 5, and 6 or because such tenant has reported under section 2, nor shall said owner by lease, contract, rental agreement, warranties or covenants cause such tenant to pay directly or indirectly or to be liable in any manner for the cost of such repairs: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to proscribe the owner of the residential building from increasing rental if—

(1) the owner has made a substantial capital improvement on the leased premises; or

(2) the owner has become liable for a substantial increase in taxes, except where such increase in taxes is the result of assessment made pursuant to section 3, or a substantial increase in other maintenance or operating costs not associated with the notice and order issued under section 2; and such increase in taxes, maintenance or operating costs, or such capital improvement, was incurred or made not earlier than three months prior to the servicing of notice under section 2.

(b) Any adjustment of rent pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall not exceed an amount equal to the net increase in taxes, maintenance, or operating costs chargeable to each rental period, prorated within the residential building among each dwelling unit which is the subject of such increased taxes, maintenance, or operating costs.

(c) Any adjustment of rent pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall not exceed an amount equal to the straightline depreciation that may be claimed with respect to the improvement for each rental period, prorated among each dwelling unit within the residential building so improved.

(d) Any person from whom there has been collected rents in excess of the amounts permitted by this section, or to whom services have been withheld in violation of this section, shall be entitled to recover threefold the damages by him sustained, and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

SEC. 12. The Commissioners may make relocation payments to individuals and families for their reasonable and necessary moving expenses and for any actual direct losses of property caused by their displacement from a residential building because of an eviction from such residential building as a result of the finding of such building as uninhabitable under section 2, or as a result of such building's being made habitable pursuant to an order issued under this Act. No such payment shall be made in any case where a payment for a similar purpose is authorized by any other Act. Such relocation payments shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioners and shall not, for any one relocation, exceed $200.

SEC. 13. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the

Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, whatever is necessary to the Commissioners to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) Taxes assessed against the premises under section 3 of this Act, as collected, shall be used to reimburse the Treasury of the United States for any moneys appropriated to cover the cost of making residential buildings or parts of residential buildings habitable.

SEC. 14. (a) In the event there is a change in the ownership of a residential building ordered to be made habitable under sections 2, 5, and 6, the new owner shall be deemed to have notice of such order as if he were the owner at the time such order was issued.

(b) The Recorder of Deeds shall be notified, by the Commissioners, that such property has been found to be uninhabitable and shall record and make public such determination: *Provided,* That if such a determination is not recorded, the new owner shall not be charged with notice thereof, except where he has actual notice of such a determination.

SEC. 15. Except as herein otherwise authorized, all expenses incident to the enforcement of sections 2–11 shall be paid from appropriations made from time to time for that purpose in like manner as other appropriations for the expenses of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 16. The following sections of the Housing Regulations of the District of Columbia are hereby incorporated into this section and made a part hereof:

Chapter 1, sections 1101–1121;

Chapter 2, sections 2201–2206; sections 2302–2610; sections 2801–2803;

Chapter 3, sections 3101–3212;

Appendix.

Any provisions in the Housing Regulations of the District of Columbia relating to notice, the granting of variances, appeal, hearing, and penalties which are inconsistent or in conflict with the provisions of this Act are hereby superseded.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 23, 1965]

Housing Crisis Census in District of Columbia To Take Week—1,000 Volunteers Gathering Data in War on Poverty

(By Betty James)

A massive grassroots "citizens census" of substandard and slum housing in the District was launched today as more than 1,000 volunteers fanned out through the poverty pockets of Washington to gather data on the scope of the housing problem.

More than 90,000 families will be interviewed in a weeklong campaign.

The campaign was initiated by the Citizens Advisory Council of the United Planning Organization, the local agency responsible for the war on poverty.

UPO officials have found housing one of the most critical needs cited by the poor who have turned to the poverty war program for help.

The census launched today is expected to be the beginning of a drive by UPO against conditions that have created the housing crisis. The material gathered by the census takers will provide the data on which future recommendations and action can be based.

SERIES IN THE STAR CITED

The Star this week ran a series of articles on the crisis proportions that have been reached by the lack of housing for low-income families.

William J. Grinker, executive assistant to James G. Banks, executive director of UPO, who is out of the city, said today, "The housing series in the Star highlighted the problem very well. It provoked much interest in the community, and is partly responsible for the drive."

The survey is being conducted in all eight of the District areas where Neighborhood Advisory Councils are assisting UPO in the war on poverty.

These councils send delegates to the Citizens Advisory Council which in turn advises the UPO board. The council elects three representatives of poor areas to the board. UPO is providing technical assistance.

The chairman of the Citizens Advisory Council, Stephen C. Sheppard, 1222 Girard Street NW., who is on the UPO board, said the main purpose of the campaign is "to document carefully and thoroughly all details and dimensions of the housing problem in the Nation's Capital."

Existing data is stale, incomplete, and inadequate," Sheppard said. "Almost everyone living in Washington is aware generally that we are confronted with a housing problem which is growing more serious day by day. But now we want the facts. The unvarnished and whole truth will give us a realistic basis to solve the problem.

"Now the citizens living the these areas have volunteered to go out personally, interview their neighbors and then collect the information which will help us define our goals and strategies. What we need now is more decent, safe housing that low-income people can afford.

"This is a burning issue with us. We feel that poor housing is one of the strongest contributing causes of poverty," he said.

The census is being conducted in three neighborhoods in the Cardozo area of Northwest Washington; in the neighborhood around Friendship House, 619 G Street SE.; in the neighborhood around Southeast House across the Anacostia River, 2283 Mount View Place SE., and in two areas in the Northeast.

One is in the near Northeast, bounded by New York Avenue, Mount Olivet Road, M Street, and the Anacostia River. Another is in the far Northeast, bounded on two sides by the Prince Georges County line, and by Fort Dupont Road and the Anacostia River, and a third in urban renewal area Northwest No. 1 around Union Station.

A five-page survey form includes questions on the number of people living in a dwelling, their income, rent, and mortgage schedules. Interviewers will seek information from renters about landlord-tenant relationships, lease patterns and eviction problems.

They will pinpoint the actual physical conditions of each dwelling unit, sanitary conditions, the state of repair or disrepair, heating facilities, and trash and garbage collection service.

Interviewers have been organized into area teams by the neighborhood advisory councils.

Data gathered will be tallied from August 4–7. A report will be issued to the community August 8. This is expected to be followed by an action program based on the recommendations.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 20, 1965]

Compliance on Repairs Is Often Long Delayed

Both landlord and tenant complain about the lack of a clear standard for enforcement. The landlord says different inspectors use different criteria for spotting violations, and the tenants complain that the lack of quality control permits landlords to use cheap materials in repairs. The code specified only that a "workmanlike" job be done.

Neighborhood workers attempting to help slum dwellers with their housing problems have been annoyed by the housing division's policy of allowing only landlords and tenants to see violations records. Mallon said he was making an exception to his rule when reporters, after filling out detailed forms requiring both Mallon's and the Corporation Counsel's signatures, were permitted to see the records.

All the division's records are filed by street address. There is no central file listing violators by name. The inspectors become familiar with habitual offenders, but there is no easy way to determine any owner's entire history of code violations.

But mostly it is the long delays and the constant threat of retaliating evictions that frustrate slum dwellers seeking to get repairs in their homes. And perhaps it is the delays that have led to the suspicion by the tenants that inspectors can be bought off by landlords.

One real estate man said that years ago, owners and agents always provided the inspectors with generous Christmas gifts.

"We all used to do it," he said, "but then one time an inspector came by to get his gift, and I saw his car was packed full of whisky so I cut it out."

The agent said he now occasionally will ask an inspector to come by one of his properties to advise him about repairs that will be necessary to meet the code. "I usually give them $5 or $10 for the favor," he said, "but I've only done this a couple of dozen times in the past 25 years."

S. Tudor Strang, deputy superintendent of the housing division, said: "If we knew the point where slum landlords will leave the market and be replaced by people not interested in exploiting tenants. But stepped-up enforcement, as Mallon points out, would require considerably more inspectors.

Several weeks ago, District Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner suggested what he calls a "reformulation" of the code. He agrees with many slum landlords—that the minor aspects of the code should not be emphasized.

Tobriner fears that with strict enforcement and lower profits "the landlord either evicts the tenants, rehabilitates the property and rents to high income groups, or evicts the tenants, razes the building and converts the land to some other use."

"There is a dilemma," Tobriner said. Tough enforcement could have the unintended effect of reducing the housing supply rather than improving housing conditions.

Still other complaints about slum housing center on the Landlord and Tenant Court. Cases handled there last year amounted to more than 96,000 and Chief Judge John Lewis Smith, Jr., estimates the figure will exceed 100,000 this year.

The proceedings in the court are summary, usually without extensive argument. More than 95 percent of the cases in the court deal with nonpayment of rent while most of the others involve housing code violations.

In the nonpayment cases, Smith said, if the tenant admits having not paid the rent, the only judgment possible will be in favor of the landlord. The law does not give the tenant the right to withhold his rent because his landlord has failed to make repairs or improvements, Smith said.

The wording of the law and the role of the judges in enforcing the law have led slum dwellers to complain that the court is merely a collection agency for landlords.

Civil rights organizations and antipoverty officials in Washington are now seeking changes in the law, but Smith said that whatever reforms are made must come through legislation or appellate court decisions, not from the Landlord and Tenant Court.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 14, 1965]

Potomac Watch—City's Housing Shortage the Target, Frustration the Theme at Discussion

(By George Lardner, Jr.)

Frustration was the theme.

The city's shortage of low-cost housing was the target. The audience sounded aroused. But the members of more than 25 housing organizations, civil rights groups, and public agencies who gathered to try to "do something" about the housing crisis seemed to realize they were punching futilely at the same old paper bag—full of exorbitant rents, dilapidated homes, slumlords, and the bureaucratic delays facing almost any attempt at improvement.

"We seem to be moving backwards," said Stephen J. Pollak, president-elect of the Washington Planning and Housing Association which called the meeting.

"A tent on the Mall would be an enormous improvement for more people than I care to think of," said Harris Weinstein, the association's housing committee chairman.

The District of Columbia Coalition of Conscience has been trying to put up a tent for a family of 13—with two working mothers—who were evicted last month, but can't find new quarters. The emergency housing program the city loudly promised in May for predicaments like this may take another 3 months to get started, according to city officials who are not accustomed to rushing.

Forty-five real estate agents and nine public and private agencies had been called, said Coalition Co-Chairman Walter E. Fauntroy, but none could come up with a single unit that the family could afford.

The tent, of course, is a gimmick—but an appropriate one. As Mr. Fauntroy said, "we have to create pressure to effect the cures."

One WPHA worker who helps families in the Cardozo area told of an eight-room house worth $17,600 that produces gross rentals of $600 a month for its owner.

The worker, Tom Firor, also told of another landlord who "for the 40th time in the last 6 months has evicted or threatened to evict families because they called the city's Housing Division" to get needed repairs ordered.

Another WPHA worker, Belvie Rooks, broke into tears when she described how her organization had to pay $300 a month in back rent to "one of the worst slumlords in the city" to save a mother of seven from eviction from a house with broken-down plumbing and inadequate heating. The family, Miss Rooks said, had been living there for 3 years when the old owner died. Suddenly, she said, the rent went up from $50 a month with utilities to $100 a month—without utilities.

The audience had plenty of suggestions—ranging from rent controls, to tougher enforcement of the housing code to easing the housing code's restrictions against overcrowding.

Mr. Fauntroy suggested that citizens' organizations start scouring the suburbs for sites—a suggestion that should be well worth pursuing under the administration's rent subsidy program before Congress. He proposed that "we move into the surrounding area and, if necessary, purchase land to relieve the (city's housing) need."

But no one followed through with the thought. Despite the suggestions, the meeting reflected, primarily, a feeling of exasperation at all the years gone by without any substantial progress.

"What we called victories really just switched people around the slums," said Lillian Secundy of the Washington Urban League.

The WPHA had drafted a statement calling for more low-income housing in the city and action on several long-stalled projects, but the audience didn't bother to endorse it.

"Pious paragraphs," said one speaker. "Too wishy-washy," said another.

Pollak agreed, but added: "I'm wondering what we can do." He suggested development of a "plan of action" backed by a federation of all interested organizations. But no one could do anything right away. They've got their boards of directors to check with.

Everyone, it seems, is saddled with his own bureaucracy—which brings us back to the District Building.

District Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner has suggested "an emergency in low-cost housing" might be declared—so the Commissioners could temporarily lift relatively minor housing code requirements in rundown neighborhoods.

The suggestion was sincerely made, but it hardly seems an adequate response to an emergency. If it had any noticeable effect, it would probably benefit the landlords more than the tenants, and promote slums rather than decent housing.

If the Commissioners can agree there's an "emergency"—and there is—perhaps they might try promoting some one- or two-block urban renewal projects—for public housing. It might not work, but it seems worth the attempt. It'll take a while to get to the suburbs.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 15, 1965]

NEW GROUP TO PUSH LOW-INCOME HOUSING

(By Benjamin Forgey)

An informal District organization calling itself the Ad Hoc Committee on the Housing Crisis was formed last night to seek an increase in low-income housing.

Representatives of about 20 housing, civil rights, labor, political, welfare and church organizations endorsed the program, but left the exact nature of the new group in doubt as they returned to report to their own organizations.

Harris Weinstein, chairman of the housing committee of the Washington Planning and Housing Association, said he hoped action on some of the proposals would begin this week.

The most "immediate and substantial need," Weinstein told the group, was to lobby for balanced residential use of the Anacostia-Bolling and National Training School sites. Competing proposals for use of these tracts, the last large, available publicly owned sites in the District, are being discussed in Congress.

The group also voted to urge the District Commissioners to use "whatever powers they now have" to make repairs on slum properties and charge the repairs to landlords.

According to the resolution, the Commissioners will also be asked to seek legislation preventing "retaliatory" evictions and rent increases.

Also proposed was a "housing crisis weekend" during which clergymen will focus their sermons on the need for low-income housing and a tour of the District's slums for interested public officials.

The meeting was the result of a WPHA effort to "bring the housing needs of the District before the public," and was a follow-up to an initial session held last Thursday.

FOREIGN POLICY MISMANAGEMENT

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the continued deterioration of our conduct of foreign affairs is seen in many parts of the world. However, the spineless handling of the Nasser administration in Egypt certainly is fully indicative of foreign policy mismanagement.

When are we going to wake up and realize that we are being taken for a ride? Egypt is doing a good job of making a fool out of the United States. Less than a month ago, Egypt's Nasser took full advantage of American willingness to hand out free wheat. Now, we find out that the Agency for International Development gave Egypt over 23 million dollars' worth of corn in 1961 on the basis of an out-and-out misrepresentation.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN], has called attention to the report of the General Accounting Office that a shipment of 186,000 metric tons of corn to Egypt under the auspices of AID was obtained under false pretenses. The grant was made on the basis of reports from the Communist-sympathizing country of a potential famine because of a serious crop failure. It was later disclosed that no crop failure occurred and much of the corn had been sold by Egypt.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] further disclosed that AID officials found out Egypt was selling some of the corn even before the whole grant was shipped. With over $11 million worth still in the hands of U.S. officials, AID apparently made no attempt to hold the shipments until the matter could be investigated. The GAO report charged that AID did not check on distribution of over 85 percent of the corn, and it has been substantiated that at least 80,000 tons have been sold by the Egyptian Government.

This report confirms what I have been saying for years. The administration will spend taxpayers' dollars to give aid to any country which stretches out its hand. I want to commend the General Accounting Office on its alertness. I hope this report opens some eyes in Washington. If it does not, it seems we will continue to help a country that openly degrades the United States and is critical of our policy.

What is needed is action by the Congress to insure that any future grants would be made only when it is assured that all the aid goes for the purpose for which it was intended. Apparently, the Agency for International Development does not do this now.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee which has been dutifully rubberstamping administration measures for years, I would hope that the committee would recognize its legislative responsibilities and concentrate on implementation of a foreign policy whereby we would reject the blackmail pressures from rulers such as Nasser.

Nasser is using anti-Israel statements as a smokescreen for his domestic failures, and there is no reason why we should prop up his administration, which is carrying on an aggressive military action against the legitimate government and people of Yemen.

MEMBERS OF THE JOINT COMMISSION ON THE COINAGE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89–81, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Commission on the Coinage the following

Members on the part of the House: Messrs. EDMONDSON, GIAIMO, CONTE, and BATTIN.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2984) entitled "An act to amend the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities by extending the expiration date thereof and providing increased support for the program, to authorize additional assistant secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2985) entitled "An act to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7984) entitled "An act to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 510) entitled "An act to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes."

TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY OF COMMUNIST CONQUEST OF CUBA POSES A THREAT TO AMERICA AS GREAT AS THE THREAT IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 12 years ago today Fidel Castro and his brother, Raul, with 101 others overran the Moncada Army Barracks in Cuba. This was the beginning of Castro's war to overthrow Batista. It was the beginning of Castro's betrayal of the Cuban people by permitting the Soviets to establish the first Communist regime in the Western Hemisphere. This day is now celebrated by the Communists as the 26th of July movement.

Two years ago Members on both sides of this aisle joined in presenting to the House a series of addresses about a plan "to fight the cold war and to win back Cuba for democracy."

Today, 2 years later, here we are on dead center. We face the same problem: "What to do about Cuba?"

For the record, let us review the situation in that beleaguered island only 90 miles from the eastern coastline of the United States.

Cuba, once a prosperous country with one of the highest standards of living in Latin America, has been reduced to a primitive society. There is no freedom of the individual, no free press or radio. Letters received by Free Cuba Radio from Cuba tell of hunger, insufficient clothing, few daily necessities—the paralysis of much industry. Marxism dominates school curriculum from the nursery up through university level. The army is Soviet trained and the people are terrorized by informers in the so-called defense committees. Even the children are forced to spy on their parents. Conservatively, 80,000 Cuban men and women are now in jail, forced to live under indescribable conditions. Daily executions are commonplace.

Despite a good sugar harvest this year, the economy is at rock bottom. Castro has few dollars for exchange. Diseases have reached epidemic proportions among both people and livestock. Medicines and qualified doctors are scarce, health measures deplorable. Child mortality continues to mount. Out of a population of approximately 7 million, 500,000 have left the country. It is estimated that 230,000 Cubans hold passports and visas and are eager to leave. More than 400,000 others have filled out request forms. It is reported that from 85 to 90 percent of the people in Cuba are against the Communist regime.

How and why then do the Communists stay in power? The answer is that with 500,000 men and women under arms and with a highly trained secret police, the G–2, the Cuban people live in constant terror and under suppression of these spies and guns.

Castro's aim was not to free the Cuban people from Batista's dictatorship. His whole design was to create an arsenal and launching pad for Communist subversion to carry on their "wars of liberation" in Latin America. The New York Times in a recent editorial, put it this way:

> The wars of liberation are aimed primarily against the United States. Anywhere in the non-Communist world, a gain for the East is a loss for the West and the United States is the major power in the free world.

For the past 2 years there has been comparatively little talk about Cuba. Vietnam has crowded Havana from the front pages. Many well-meaning Americans have been lulled to complacency by the coexistence line and that Cuba is no threat to the United States. In the meantime, Communist propaganda and subversion emanating from the Cuban launching pad are defeating our foreign policy. On March 10 Hewson A. Ryan, associate director for policy and plans of the U.S. Information Service, before a Senate Committee, pointed out the direction the propaganda of the Communist nations is taking:

> Communist propaganda strategy for Latin America is directed toward the destruction of U.S. power and influence in the area and ultimately to the imposition of Marxist-Leninist regimes throughout the hemisphere. In a Pravda editorial of January 14, 1965, and in the subsequent communique on the Havana meeting of Latin American Communist Parties, Moscow has made it clear that in Latin America it will use "all forms of struggle, both peaceful and nonpeaceful" to further the goals of international communism. While the U.S.S.R., Red China, and Cuba differ little on their ultimate aims in Latin America, their short-term propaganda strategy and tactics do vary somewhat.
>
> The major themes in Cuban propaganda are "independence from Yankee imperialism" and the "advantages of a Socialist economy."
>
> To carry on their propaganda activities in Latin America the Communists utilize in varying degrees all the modern communications media. Radio Havana is broadcasting 125 hours weekly in Spanish, 14 hours in Creole for Haiti, 7 hours each in Portuguese and English, an hour and 20 minutes in Guarani for Paraguay, and 30 minutes in Aymara. Cuba's Spanish service includes a regular program for Venezuela, which has been used by members of the Venezuelan Armed Forces of National Liberation exiled in Cuba to broadcast direct appeals for insurrection against the Venezuelan Government. Turncoats from Nicaragua, Honduras, Guatemala, Peru, and Dominican Republic broadcast frequently to their respective home countries from Cuba, also. The Cuban service even includes a weekly half hour program entitled "The Voice of Free Dixie" and is directed to the American Negro population.

Although not generally known until Pravda reported it on January 14 of this year, Central and South American Communist Party leaders, together with Moscow agents and Castro, and his aides, met in Havana in late November 1964, to plan their combined strategy for further subverting Latin America.

The report of the Special Consultative Committee on Security of the Pan American Union—April 12–May 7, 1965—derived the following conclusions from the conference of the Communists:

> That, for the present, Cuba agrees to continue to follow Moscow's lead.
>
> That the Castro regime will continue to serve as the principal tool of communism for the subversion of the Americas.
>
> That an increase of Communist subversive activities in the Americas is to be expected.

At that meeting, they selected as their prime target for subversion, in a virtual declaration of war, Venezuela, Colombia, Guatemala, Honduras, Paraguay, and Haiti. They omitted the Dominican Republic, their pilot project, for which battle plans already had been drawn.

Also, in the early part of March 1965, a world conference of representatives of Communist Parties was held in Moscow. Representatives of 19 countries participated, including those of old Communist Parties of Argentina and Brazil and the new United Socialist Revolutionary Party of Cuba, as the sole representative of Latin America. This shows the importance that Moscow attributes to the Cuban party in world conference.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the implementation of these principles.

First, we all know what took place in Santo Domingo. On June 13 Jeremiah O'Leary, Latin American writer for the Washington Star, capsuled a report from an official U.S. paper compiled by intelligence sources, expert in Communist activities.

The report, chronologically and in narrative form, describes the day-by-day activities in Santo Domingo between April 24 and May 5 of 77 known Communists. Many of the 77 were previously identified as participants in the revolt by U.S. Government sources on May 6, but the new document gives intimate details of their participation before and after the American intervention.

The document discloses that at least 45 of the extremists had been deported from the Dominican Republic a year before and that most of them had received guerrilla warfare training in Cuba before they began drifting back into the Dominican Republic last October. Cuba's principal agency for promoting revolutionary activities in Latin America, the General Directorate of Intelligence—DGI—had for some time been providing financial support to two of the three Dominican Communist parties—the 14th of June Political Group—APCJ—and the Dominican Popular Movement—MPD. The other Dominican Communist group which cooperated in the rebellion is the Dominican Popular Socialist—PSPD—party which follows the Moscow line.

The revolt may have been started by some dissident army officers, but the Communist leaders of all three parties issued orders to their members to incite the civilian crowds gathering in the streets, and to stage rallies and demonstrations. We all have read of the violence, wanton damage, and loss of life that ensued.

It is interesting that the Cuban DGI officer who handles revolutionary operations for the Dominican Republic is Roberto Santiesteban Casanova, deported by the United States for engaging in espionage in 1962 while serving with the Cuban delegation to the United Nations.

Time is too short to present further evidence but let us review what has been happening in Latin America since the November meeting of the Latin American Communists.

Venezuela: According to a report issued by the Special Consultative Committee on Security of the Pan American Union on May 7:

> Communist activities, which have been on the wane at the end of 1964, have broken out again and may be expected to increase with the assistance that Cuba has promised to continue to provide to the Armed Forces of National Liberation.

Cuba is also continuing to provide considerable amounts of money to support subversion in Venezuela.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I compliment the gentleman on his very provocative statement. I would also ask the gentleman if the very tactics that are now being used in Latin America are not essentially the same as have been carried out by the Vietcong in Vietnam.

Mr. PUCINSKI. They are the very same tactics. That is why I think this 12th anniversary is of more than passing interest to the American people. There has been too little said about what has been happening in Cuba. There are those who, for instance, criticized our own Government for taking strong action in Santo Domingo in the Dominican Republic. The fact of the matter is we have now recorded indisputable proof of Communist exploitation of subversion which Castro has been engaging in was to be tried in Santo Domingo.

We can all, as Americans, regardless of what our party affiliations may be, thank the good Lord that we have a President who moved decisively to stop this coup in Santo Domingo.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I would agree completely with the gentleman, and I am not a member of either the gentleman's party or the President's party. I am convinced in my own mind that had we not taken this quick and decisive action, we certainly would have had another Cuba in this Western Hemisphere. Would the gentleman have any suggestions as to what he believes should be done by the administration in Cuba, however?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I will as I continue my analysis here, because actually it is no longer enough to look at Cuba alone. Our problem of Communist subversion is hemispheric. I think, as I relate here, the serious subversion and exploitation of terrorism from Cuba, we can then see how vastly important is this problem and how large the problem is.

Colombia: With Cuban support, the guerrillas, terrorist groups, and bandits, in alliance with professional Communists, continue their pattern of murders and depredations. In January 1965 the President of the Republic disclosed the existence of a large-scale subversive Communist plot against the government, which was to be launched under cover of a nationwide labor strike. The Communist Youth League of Colombia, a Soviet-oriented group, was implicated in the plan. At the present time Communist leaders, taking advantage of Colombia's political, economic, and social crisis, are formulating terrorist plans and promoting violence in the hinterlands.

Also, the Communist slate won easily in elections 2 months ago for members of the Executive Council of the National Federation of University students known as FUN, the first national organization of students in this country. FUN now claims to represent the students in the 25 Government-supported universities throughout the country. Although the majority of the students are not Communist-oriented, FUN is in control of student political activities.

Guatemala: From Mexico City this month Daniel James reported in the Latin American Times that Castroite guerrillas, formerly confined to rural areas, have recently moved their operations to Guatemala City in a change of strategy designed to generate chaos and disorder there and to force Col. Enrique Peralta Azurdia, the chief of state, to fall. The shift has been accompanied by renewed terror and violence which began a few weeks ago with the fatal machinegunning of the Under Secretary of Defense, Col. Ernesto Molina Arreaga.

Also, on June 7, bombs were hurled at the homes of two newsmen and a Guatemalan political leader. That same night four other bombs exploded at the embassies of Brazil, Costa Rica, Honduras, and Nicaragua—all countries which have sent troops to join the Inter-American Peace Force in Santo Domingo.

Honduras: In February, the authorities discovered a cache of weapons and subversive propaganda material and arrested several Communists. Shortly afterward in March an armed group led by a Cuban-trained Communist, attempted to destroy the El Canaveral Dam.

Haiti: On July 19 Miss Virginia Prewett, writing in the Latin American Times, noted that President Duvalier has told the OAS that Castroite infiltrators have moved against him from the Dominican Republic. She said that Duvalier for his own purposes has permitted a "smart, tough, and experienced group of dedicated Communists to become entrenched in his government." Duvalier is ill and as things stand now, any succeeding government will be in control of his Communist aids.

Paraguay: The Associated Press reported early this month that the Paraguayan Government had announced that it had crushed a Communist plot to begin a guerrilla warfare campaign and "make Paraguay a second Cuba." The National Chief of Police told a news conference that "many Communist agents" had been arrested after infiltrating from Argentina, Brazil, and Chile. He also said the Communists had set up guerrilla training camps on Argentine and Brazilian territory near the Paraguayan border.

Activities in other countries include:

Argentina: The Communists have attempted to infiltrate some major parties and in the elections held in mid-March of this year, they supported the "Peronista" Popular Union Party.

Brazil: The establishment of the new government in Brazil put a halt to the spread and infiltration of communism. However, efforts are still being made to create a state of guerrilla warfare and to unleash a campaign of terrorism.

Chile: Early in 1965 the Minister of the Interior described acts of terrorism there as very grave and attributed them to groups financed with foreign funds.

Ecuador: Early this year riots occurred in Quito at the end of a march organized by the Federation of University Students of Ecuador during which the National Palace was pelted with stones and Molotov cocktails. Shortly afterward, the authorities discovered a cache of weapons, explosives and propaganda material in the hands of Communists linked with Cuba.

Nicaragua: Last year authorities discovered a large-scale subversive plot, directed from Havana, designed to establish a Communist government.

Panama: In December 1964, the Governor of Colon declared that:

> Personnel trained in Communist China, Cuba and Russia have attempted a coup against our democratic system and the Communists are trying to deceive the masses in the hope of seeing Panama converted into the second American Republic under the heel of a foreign army.

Peru: Toward the end of January, a typical Communist attack was launched against the U.S. military mission. And in the July 17 Latin American Times, Jay Mallin reported:

> Communist guerrillas in Peru, rampaging and ambushing, have served to spotlight a growing Castro-Communist threat throughout the hemisphere which for several months had been obscured by the Dominican crisis.

In a dispatch to the New York Times from Lima on July 21, Juan de Onis reports that:

> President Fernando Belaunde Terry said today that Cuba and the Soviet Union were helping Communist "gangsters" bring unrest to his country.
>
> Mr. Belaunde said that in Peru, as in Venezuela, the Communists had adopted extremist tactics of guerrilla action and terrorism "because we are making real social and economic gains, in obvious contrast to Cuba's situation."
>
> In other Latin American countries where "there is inflation and so many other problems," the Communists use less drastic tactics, Mr. Belaunde suggested.

These are some of the terrorist incidents which have erupted in almost every Latin American country with varying intensity. Many of the uprisings are fomented by students, always a fertile field for agitators. As one American diplomat described the current wave of leftist, Communist-inspired disorders, assassinations, and terrorism.

"Somebody is giving the whole place a shake."

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. What the gentleman is saying is that our fundamental problem in the Western Hemisphere is one of developing tactics to counter the political warfare that is actually taking place.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. In years past, of course, we had the Monroe Doctrine that was available as our reason for keeping this particular hemisphere secure. It seems to me, if something is going to be recommended, we need to have a similar concept to that which was available for military purposes adopted so as to amend the Monroe Doctrine in order to counter this political warfare problem we have. Would the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think the gentleman is correct. I think President Johnson's decisive action in Santo Domingo in the Dominican Republic certainly has brought our country and the free nations in the Western Hemisphere back into the orbit of thinking along the lines of the Monroe Doctrine.

Although the OAS agreed in 1964 to defend the rights of individual member nations against aggression through subversion, there has been no action. Yet, many of these OAS members, as I said previously, whose countries have been victims of Communist subversion debate the right of the United States to stop Communists from making the Dominican Republic another Cuba. A year ago today the members of the OAS, with the exception of Mexico, voted to break diplomatic and trade relations with Cuba when it was discovered and proved that the Venezuelan charges were substantiated. Because of the Dominican Republic crisis an inter-American peace force is being formed. It is hoped plans for establishing a permanent peace force from the American nations will be formalized and voted on at the foreign ministers meeting in Rio de Janeiro. I think this is one of the high points of our decisive action in the Dominican Republic. I think that that action has given the OAS new courage, new meaning, new direction, and new strategy. If nothing more came out of that action than the creation of a pan-American or inter-American military peacekeeping force, we would have gone a long way toward turning back to the security of the Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Does the gentleman feel that the OAS is reacting rapidly enough in order to permit this same concept in any future uprisings?

Mr. PUCINSKI. They are not acting rapidly enough, but I think that the problems I have enumerated here should give you a clue to their own problems. Our problem here is understanding that many of these South American governments are not very stable because of the extent of subversion that exists in those countries. Many of those governments can be toppled overnight. So it is not enough for us to say that they ought to move faster. I think we Americans, first of all, have to recognize that there is a problem. Let us stop kidding ourselves. There is a real serious problem in South America. The analysis I have presented here today indicates the extent of subversion that is now going on in practically every nation in South America.

So what we have to do, it seems to me, is to firm up the political governments of these South American countries and then firm up the OAS; and I think we ought to try and develop this inter-American peacekeeping force as quickly as possible so that these nations that want to stand with us will know that if there is a plot of subversion from Cuba against any one of these countries they will be able to fall back quickly on an inter-American peacekeeping force without suffering the possibility of losing the cohesiveness and continuity of their respective governments.

This is one of the problems ahead of us.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. The gentleman is suggesting then that through this beefing-up process we in effect are going to have to sponsor political organizational information and in effect develop a political offensive where the Federal system of government, that has worked successfully in this country, can be implemented in those areas. But it is going to require people who understand the Federal system of government to assist in implementing this concept in those areas where the problem exists.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think the gentleman is correct. Some of these points are covered in my statement.

At the present time, according to the State Department, the major instrument of U.S. policy toward Cuba is a systematic program of "economic denial," although this process is not likely to bring down the present regime. Information from Cuba indicates—and this is extremely important—that this economic boycott is relatively successful but cannot be completely effective unless other free world countries cease trading with Cuba.

For example, from 1963 to 1964 Japan's trade with Cuba increased 240 percent; Spain's by 300 percent. England—one of our most notable and loyal allies—has increased her exports to Cuba by 130 percent.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. It could be said that with friends like this who needs enemies?

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman is quite correct.

Cuba is a bad economic risk for any trading nation.

As early as 1963 Cuba's trade balance with bloc nations started to deteriorate with their deficit of $625 million. It was estimated that she owed the Soviet bloc more than $900 million in trade alone. In addition her debt for technical aid, arms, and so forth, is $1.5 billion to Russia; $430 million to Czechoslovakia; $250 million to Poland; $85 million to Hungary; $70 million to Rumania, and to several countries in the Western Hemisphere another $165 million.

In 1963 the trade balance of Cuba with Western countries was favorable in the amount of $65 million. However, this had to be used for other necessities, so Cuba is now almost with no dollar reserve. Last year she had only $20 million in reserve and this year her financial situation will be much worse.

The U.S.S.R. made two loans to her of $50 million and $16 million each at the end of 1964 to cover her letters of credit with Western countries and to buy basic materials necessary to the sugar and nickel industries. At the end of 1964 Cuba had exceeded her budget for imports by $300 million, and the outlook for 1965 is far worse in spite of a normal sugar harvest.

The biggest job we have ahead of us is to convince our free world allies that by trading with Cuba they are helping perpetuate the Communist regime of Fidel Castro and holding the people of Cuba in a state of slavery and desperation. Not only that, they are financing and supporting Communist propaganda and subversive activities originating in Cuba.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Could the gentleman tell me what the State Department thinks of this comment? Are they doing something about this to follow what the gentleman is now suggesting?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I should like to lay these facts before the coordinate branch of the Government, the legislative branch of the Government here, this body.

I should like to lay these facts before this body, as I am doing today on this 12th anniversary, in order to show my colleagues and the American people the full toll of letting the Communists remain in Cuba.

It is my hope we will then be able to explore the reactions from the State Department and the other interested agencies.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Well, the gentleman has certainly provided Members of Congress with an excellent record. My only regret is that there are not more Members on the floor to hear the gentleman. We have less than six Members on the floor, in my judgment. It is very regrettable, because I believe every Member of Congress should have heard this fine special order that the gentleman has taken the time to prepare.

Could the gentleman tell me if it is possible to reveal the sources of the gentleman's information?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Much of this information is obtained from, as I have said before, newspaper reports, reports of reliable newspapers, published both in the United States and in South American countries. Much of this information is available from publicly documented sources that have come to our attention in the Cuban Freedom Committee, and much of this information is made available through the sources and the people who write to us, not only from Cuba but people who hear our broadcasts in other parts of South America and who have to rely in many instances upon these broadcasts sponsored by the Cuban Freedom Committee which, incidentally, is a committee made up exclusively of American citizens, people, many of whom have never been to Cuba, although the executive director had been a teacher in Cuba before the Communists took over, as well as from informed letters which we receive from other countries in South America written by people who hear our broadcasts.

As I stated earlier, our broadcasts may serve in many instances as the only source of straight reliable world news, because this is primarily all we broadcast. We broadcast news from the world and the people of Cuba and the people of other South American countries who hear these broadcasts which emanate from Miami, from Florida, and from New Orleans, these people have learned to rely on our broadcasts, because we do not engage in propaganda, and we give them the truth. We give them news over the wire services, the same news that Americans and the people of all the free world are receiving. And these people have learned to respect us for our integrity, and as a result they write in and most of the information that we get is from these very reliable sources.

I wonder, if I may, just touch on this point because it may be of interest to the gentleman from California? The point I was going to make was this——

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. It is of interest to me because I have met the worthy organization which the gentleman is discussing and, furthermore, I have had some personal contacts with people in these various countries of the world through a missionary program with which I worked for a number of years.

Mr. PUCINSKI. And, of course, the missionaries very often are excellent in their analyses.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. It seems to me that the people should know more about what is going on in these areas than the State Department.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think the gentleman would be interested to know that just a week ago radio Havana in a broadcast to Latin America—the gentleman asked me how we get this information—said:

> We wish to inform you that starting July 26 we will increase the number of frequencies through which we broadcast in Spanish to Latin America, North America, and Central America. Besides the normal frequencies you will be able to hear us on 25, 16, and 7 megacycles.

On July 21, Ramiro Puertas, Director of the Cuban Institute of Radio, announced over CMQ Havana, that this year the Institute will install a 150,000-watt station in Havana and another of the same power in San German, Oriente; two other 60,000-watt stations in Camaguey and Oriente Provinces for radio Rebelde network. On July 26, another 10,000-watt station will be inaugurated in Guantanamo; still another 60,000-watt station will be built in Cacocum, Oriente, for radio Progreso network, which will have an additional 5,000-watt station in Baracoa.

Also, they are installing French TV equipment to improve reception between Camaguey, Guaimaro; and Victoria de las Tunas. It is important to know that this is French equipment—equipment being supplied to Communist Cuba by our supposed ally, France.

To show Cuba's importance to the Communists' dream of world domination, I will read you another news dispatch:

> The French Press Agency reported from Cairo on July 16 that the Cuban Ambassador to Egypt, before leaving for home, had announced that a conference of popular movements of three continents will be held in Havana on January 6, 1966. It had been decided at the Fourth Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference in Accra in May to extend the movement to Latin America. Representatives of popular movements of six Latin American countries will participate in the preliminary planning meetings which will begin in Cairo on September 1. The countries are: Cuba, Mexico, Venezuela, Uruguay, Chile, and Guatemala. The planning committees also will includes delegates of five African countries: Egypt, Algiers, Morocco, Guinea, South Africa, and six Asian countries—the People's Republic of China, the U.S.S.R., India, Indonesia, Japan, and South Vietnam.

There you have it, Mr. Speaker, in the bold, broad strokes of Communist takeover under our very noses. Two years ago the United States seemed to be at least in some measure awake to the Cuban danger. Today, I fear we are letting the immediate and close-to-home problem take a secondary position in our planning and our defense. Mr. Speaker, I affirm to this House that in such a course lies hemispheric disaster.

FREEWHEELING DISARMAMENT BINGE ENDANGERS NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, disarmament fervor runs high in Washington today. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency's—ACDA—budget has ballooned several hundred percent since its inception in 1961. Friends of Disarmament from intellectual and academic circles in large numbers have enlisted voluntarily in the cause. Prof. Jerome Wiesner, the former White House science adviser, recommends developing "a cadre of people whose full-time occupation" is to reorient public attitudes. He wants them "to create a vested interest in arms control"—whatever that may mean.

Unless forces in the United States who recognize the danger of unrestrained disarmament quickly organize and articulate their position, the administration's cadre of dedicated disarmers soon will take the Nation past the point of no return on its flight from the proven strategy of arming to avoid trouble to the yet unproven strategy of disarming to avoid it.

DISARMERS WORK QUIETLY AND EFFECTIVELY

The disarmers carry on their work unobtrusively. As yet the public is not conditioned to disarmament. The majority of Americans still believes world peace as well as national survival depends on strength coupled with negotiation rather than negotiation alone. The average person is scared half out of his wits when some enterprising writer digs out and publicizes facts on various ACDA-sponsored disarmament studies. This was the case when things came to light as the study on togetherness with Russia and its study suggesting self-imposed limitations on intelligence gathering efforts.

The work of Washington's disarmers is being made easier by the seemingly calculated elimination of top military spokesmen capable of communicating authoritatively with the American public. Such popular figures as Admiral

Arleigh "31 Knot" Burke and cigar-chomping Gen. Curtis LeMay are on the retired rolls. No successors have been permitted to develop public prominence. Probably not one person in a thousand can even name our present Chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

A tribute to the steady progress of the disarmers came recently in the form of a lack of outcry when a U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., the late Adlai Stevenson, promised a further softening of the American position on test ban treaty safeguards. When negotiations for a comprehensive treaty broke off in 1963, U.S. demands for annual inspections in Soviet territory had been whittled from 20 to 7. Khrushchev still adamantly maintained "three or four" would be ample. Stevenson promised that the Johnson administration now "is willing to explore" further what constitutes "an adequate inspection system."

Public apathy toward the possible consequences of the promise has encouraged and accelerated preparation of many other advanced disarmament positions, some of which President Johnson is expected to offer the Soviets when the 18-nation Disarmament Conference reconvenes in Geneva tomorrow.

These include:

U.N. MULTILATERAL NUCLEAR UMBRELLA

This proposal calls for pledges by nuclear have-not nations to refrain from seeking nuclear capabilities in exchange for pledges from the U.N.'s nuclear "haves" to aid them if they fall victim to atomic aggression. Whether the occurrence of "aggression" is to be determined by the U.N.'s frequently paralyzed General Assembly, its veto-ridden Security Council, the nonnuclear victim or the nuclear pledgegiver is uncertain.

TOTAL TEST BAN TREATY

This proposal to enlarge the present limited test ban treaty to include a bar against tests underground as well as in other environments would be based on "splitting the difference" between United States and U.S.S.R. inspection demands and fixing the number at five annually. Professor Wiesner and ACDA believe "five inspections per year will provide adequate security against clandestine nuclear testing." However, hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy cast considerable doubt on this optimistic assessment. Additionally, they raised monumental doubts whether even unlimited opportunities for inspection could penetrate the precautions of a determined cheater. This is because the Soviets insist on severe limitations on factors affecting the quality as well as the quantity of inspections. These include tight restrictions on size and composition of inspection teams, allowable inspection techniques, permissible equipment, mode and freedom of travel and communications, length of the inspection period and the like.

DESTRUCTION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Several years ago the disarmament concept of "we'll burn our bombers and you burn yours" was seriously considered. Its current adaptation is expected to take the form of a proposal that the United States and U.S.S.R. junk many of their strategic delivery systems on a reciprocal basis and actually dismantle nuclear warheads in a ratio of three U.S. warheads to two U.S.S.R. warheads.

The destruction of warheads would continue until 60,000 kilograms of fissionable material were recovered from U.S. warheads and 40,000 kilograms from Soviet warheads. The countries would agree to use this material only for peaceful purposes. It would be a security violation for me to suggest how many U.S. nuclear warheads might be destroyed in a deal of this kind. However, based on data contained in a book by the French nuclear chemist, Bertram Goldschmidt, it can be calculated that up to 4,000 Soviet warheads might have to be dismantled to obtain 40,000 kilograms of fissionable material. By comparison, the same kind of calculations indicate all nuclear tests to date by all five nuclear powers might have involved no more than around 5,000 kilograms of the material.

Only under the assumption that the two nations' stockpiles of nuclear warheads exist in a 3 to 2 ratio, and that their defense requirements exist in the same ratio, could such a scheme be carried out without disadvantaging one or the other. It would be militarily foolishness for any country to go into this kind of a deal blindly. Therefore, if Russia does so, we can be certain that her intelligence agents have determined that these, or some more advantageous ratios, exist. The converse is not true for the United States. Our initiative can stem less from cold military assessment than from the emotional attitudes toward disarmament fostered in the United States by ACDA and others. For this purpose they rely heavily on the alleged "kilo-horrible potentialities for mega-woe" if additional nations get atomic weapons.

PANIC OVER PROLIFERATION

Senator ROBERT KENNEDY made his maiden speech in the Senate on the subject of nuclear proliferation. ACDA's Director, William C. Foster, predicts that "nuclear anarchy" will soon result unless disarmament measures are negotiated quickly to "move us substantially toward our goal of halting nuclear proliferation." The year 1968 is seen as the last year for stopping "a runaway spread of nuclear weapons." An American official who declines to be identified states that at that time "as many as 20 countries will be able to manufacture cheap but deadly atomic bombs." Foster and his allies in disarmament regard the consequences of proliferation as deadly and intolerable. "We would seem justified in accepting rather large costs in an effort to prevent it," he says.

These costs are indeed high. Interference with the exploitation of the atom for peaceful purposes and man's benefit is one of them. The erosion and eventual dissolution of NATO and other free world alliances could be another. Already U.S. efforts to develop a posture of nuclear pacifism have dictated the virtual elimination of several new and promising defense systems. An example is Project Orion, aimed at space propulsion utilizing small nuclear explosions. Another is the apparent paralysis of neutron bomb development which would give the free world a quantum jump ahead of the Communists in military defenses—or create the reverse situation should the Soviets get N-bombs first.

NUCLEAR DOMINO THEORY

To support Foster's position, many of the same intellectuals who violently dispute the "falling domino theory" that loss of Vietnam will cause other Far East countries to fall to the Communists have come up with a "nuclear domino theory" of their own. They contend that Red China's atomic devices inevitably will cause one country after another to seek and achieve similar nuclear capability. There are many who, believing the theory—or disbelieving it but regarding it as a plausible scare technique for promoting disarmament schemes—are utilizing every opportunity to invade official thinking in all branches of Government. An article by Mr. Foster in the July issue of Foreign Affairs Quarterly details the possibilities and dangers of proliferation. He uses them as support for his stanch recommendation of several disarmament schemes.

The Foster article, like so many others written by Government officials, appears to be a trial balloon. If it results in the same lack of public opposition as did Adlai Stevenson's pronouncements, President Johnson probably will dramatically offer the disarmament proposals I have mentioned.

AMEND THE DISARMAMENT AGENCY'S CHARTER

The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is the focal point of our accelerated effort to disarm. It prods the President and his Secretaries and coordinates the zealous crusades of its ever-growing cadre of nonofficial supporters occupying key opinionmaking posts in private life. Neither was the Agency established for such purposes nor do the legitimate opponents of its policies and objectives enjoy similar tax-paid-for logistics support. It is time ACDA be brought to heel and placed on a reasonable leash.

For this purpose, I am introducing H.R. 10051 to get ACDA out of the policy and propaganda business and confine its activities solely to the research functions which it was established to perform. This bill realistically recognizes an important distinction which ACDA consistently overlooks and ignores. This is the distinction between the possible desirability of some carefully thought-through arms control efforts in today's world of ever-present danger versus the irresponsibility of willy-nilly efforts toward total and complete disarmament.

This bill will do the following things:

First, confine the Agency to "arms control"—not "disarmament"—and limit its authority to research.

Second, take the Agency away from the State Department's futuristic planners and make it responsible to Congress.

Third, give access to all reports and recommendations of the Agency to the chairman and senior minority members of key committees such as Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Fourth, require the President to indicate to Congress, at least 30 days prior, his intention to reduce or eliminate military strength.

Fifth, limit the Executive's unilateral disarmament powers and spell out the agreements and measures affecting national security requiring affirmative action of Congress.

These are all wise and reasonable precautions in the interest of national security and free world survival. I hope they will have the support of the Members of Congress and all other patriotic Americans.

YOUTH OPPORTUNITIES CAMPAIGN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a telephone call from Mr. John Macy, Jr., Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. Mr. Macy told me his office today undertoook investigations of the Minneapolis and Philadelphia regional post offices, to determine their use of political patronage in filling jobs under the President's so-called youth opportunities campaign. This was pursuant to a request I made of Mr. Macy on Friday, July 23, asking for a nationwide investigation of the use of patronage in filling these summer postal positions under the so-called youth opportunities campaign. I had called this matter to the attention of my colleagues in a speech which appears in the RECORD of June 10.

Mr. Macy indicated to me that a national investigation may be forthcoming. He said that the Minneapolis and Philadelphia regional offices are now being investigated because of reports that they have continued to take political patronage appointees since last Tuesday, July 20. It was on that date that Mr. Macy and the White House itself ordered that the use of political patronage in filling the jobs should be ended. That order was given on July 20. Prior to that time, the use of political patronage in filling these jobs was used throughout the entire Post Office Department, as acknowledged by Mr. Macy, by the White House, by the Vice President, and by a high-ranking source within the Post Office Department itself.

Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with political patronage. It has been a part of the American political scene since the days of that great Democrat, Andrew Jackson. However, the use of political patronage in filling so-called youth opportunities campaign jobs is not rooted in the same philosophical vein of "to the victors go the spoils." The "youth opportunities campaign" was to be quite a different thing.

On May 23, President Johnson announced the so-called "youth opportunities campaign." He said the Federal Government would provide 25,000 extra summer jobs and asked private industry, local and State governments, and private organizations to provide an additional 475,000 jobs. He said the jobs should go "insofar as practicable to economically and educationally disadvantaged youth." The President tied his "youth opportunities campaign" to his war on poverty.

It is this fact which makes the use of political patronage in filling these "youth opportunities campaign" jobs in the Post Office Department, so different from other political patronage.

For the President has told us many times that the war on poverty is the moral responsibility of the American people. I believe that, as the President announced the program—to aid economically and educationally disadvantaged young people—this was a good idea and a good program.

But, when we find that the Post Office Department used its 7,500 jobs under the program as political patronage and that jobs went to many young people who come from upper-income homes and who are not educationally disadvantaged, I believe the program has been perverted. If the war on poverty is the moral responsibility of the American people and if the so-called youth opportunities campaign is part of the poverty fight, then the Post Office Department acted immorally in using the jobs for political gain and by allowing political patronage appointments to go to young people who do not need them.

Mr. Speaker, following is extensive material indicating the extent to which the Post Office Department used political patronage in distributing so-called youth opportunities campaign jobs. As I have said, the Post Office share of these jobs was 7,500, which represents 30 percent of the Federal commitment of 25,000 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, following is the telegram which I sent Mr. Macy on July 23:

JULY 23, 1965.

Mr. JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman, Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D.C.:

It is my understanding that you are now aware of the Post Office Department's use of political patronage in hiring for the President's youth opportunities campaign, which I deplored in a speech on the House floor on June 10. I respectfully request that you start an immediate investigation. I suggest that the following points be especially considered: Why patronage appointments to summer postal jobs were offered Congressmen and job quotas assigned to Democratic Congressmen; why the Post Office Department ignored the May 25 Civil Service directive which ordered that State employment rosters be used as "prime" sources in finding jobs for needy persons; how many postal jobs have been filled Nationwide by congressional referrals and of these, how many of the young people are needy; if patronage has been used by other departments or agencies of the Government in filling "youth opportunity campaign" jobs. What are the roles of officials of the administration, outside the Post Office Department, who contacted Congressmen and assigned them job quotas; how many jobs were filled from congressional referrals and how many from State employment service referrals on July 20. Also, in its defense the Post Office Department has said that it had filled just 5,000 of the 7,500 jobs in question on July 20, when it was ordered to take no more Congressional referrals. I believe the investigation should show the accuracy of that figure.

ALBERT H. QUIE.
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, following is the acknowledgement I received from Mr. Macy, in addition to his followup telephone call this morning:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1965.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. QUIE: I have your telegram and appreciate your concern.

As soon as reports reaching us indicated the possibility of political patronage in youth opportunity campaign jobs in post offices, this was brought to the attention of Post Office Department officials. The Department has been instructed and has agreed to follow the Civil Service Commission's procedures for recruitment and selection.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, Friday I called a press conference to announce that I was requesting the Civil Service investigation. I believe that the following newspaper reports give examples of why I believe that such an investigation is fully warranted. The following is the dispatch transmitted by United Press International:

JULY 23, 1965.

WASHINGTON.—Representative ALBERT H. QUIE, Republican, of Minnesota, today called for an investigation of the Post Office summer job program. He charged the administration with using political patronage to fill the temporary positions.

In May President Johnson announced the Post Office would hire 7,500 youths to help deliver letters and handle sacks as part of the youth opportunity campaign. The jobs were to go to needy persons.

Instead, QUIE charged the "lion's share" were used as political patronage by Congressmen and local politicians.

He said at a news conference he had asked John Macy, Civil Service Commissioner, to conduct an investigation of the program to find out—

Why patronage appointments to summer postal jobs were offered to Congressmen and why quotas were assigned Democratic Congressmen;

Why the Post Office Department ignored a May 25 Civil Service directive which ordered that State employment rosters be used in finding jobs for needy persons; and

How many postal jobs have been filled nationwide by congressional referrals and how many of these are needed.

In Minnesota, QUIE said 64 percent of the persons hired were recommended by Republican and Democratic Congressmen.

He said he supported the program, but said it should be free of political strings.

Mr. Speaker, the following article is the report from the St. Paul Pioneer Press:

POLITICAL PATRONAGE SEEN—QUIE HITS POSTAL SPOILS

(By Ann Terry)

WASHINGTON.—Democrats have been caught distributing political patronage in the Post Office and apparently compounding their error by denying the whole thing, according to Representative ALBERT H. QUIE, Republican, of Minnesota.

QUIE brought the matter out in the open Friday by asking for a Civil Service Commission investigation of what he described as the "Post Office spoils system."

QUIE charged that the lion's share of summer Post Office jobs intended for needy persons all over the country were being given instead to persons recommended by Senators and Congressmen.

To prove his point Quie cited figures supplied to him by the Minneapolis Post Office regional office which show that two-thirds of the people recommended by Congressmen in Minnesota, Wisconsin, North and South Dakota, have been hired.

Liberal Democratic Senators, who decline to be named, argue that Post Office jobs always have been given out under political patronage and that Post Office jobs are the only patronage jobs left for them. They point out patronage exists under both Democratic and Republican administrations.

But liberals admit the Post Office summer jobs should not have been placed under the poverty program.

President Johnson last May 23 announced that the Post Office would hire 7,500 extra people for the summer as part of his summer youth opportunity program, an arm of the war on poverty. The President also asked that 475,000 other jobs be made available during the summer by other agencies and private industry.

Quie said he first learned about the Post Office Department's political patronage last June 10 when the Minneapolis Regional Director Adrian Winkel informed him that Democratic Senators and Congressmen had been given quotas of names for Post Office jobs, but that the Republicans had not.

He said Minnesota Senator Eugene McCarthy was allowed to submit 20 names and Senator Walter Mondale, 15, and each Representative was allowed to name 10 persons.

He said that to the best of his knowledge the Democrats had filled their quotas. Quie said Republicans never were informed of quotas but that after the June 10 incident, Republicans were telephoned by Post Office personnel and told they could send in referrals.

"And I know of one or two cases where Republicans did send in names," Quie conceded.

Quie emphasized that he approved of giving summer jobs to needy young people (which he defined as any one having financial difficulty at home, rather than limiting it to those with incomes below $3,000 a year) but he objects to using political patronage and filling jobs with persons from the upper middle and wealthy income brackets.

Quie said that even though White House Press Secretary Bill Moyers was quoted earlier this week as saying that Postmaster General John Gronouski had been ordered to end the practice of patronage hiring, he still wants an investigation by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Speaker, the following is the story which appeared on July 24 in the Baltimore Sun. I believe it is especially interesting, since the Sun developed a local angle on the story and points out the extent to which patronage influenced selections of youths for jobs in Baltimore City and Maryland as a whole:

CONGRESSMEN'S REFERRALS GIVEN MOST SUMMER JOBS

WASHINGTON.—About 50 out of 93 Baltimore Post Office summer jobs under the Federal Youth Opportunity campaign were filled through offices of Congressmen, a Post Office Department official said today.

The figures were given out after Representative Quie, Republican, of Minnesota, charged that the Post Office Department had made the administrative-backed program a political patronage deal.

Representative Quie, who also charged that Democratic Members of Congress were assigned quotas of jobs, said the jobs were supposed to be filled by State employment agencies.

MANY HELD NOT NEEDED

He said many of the youths who got the jobs through Congressmen were not needed at all.

For the entire State of Maryland, the breakdown was about 104 congressional referrals out of a total of 193 jobs under the program designed to give summer jobs to needy youths, the official said.

A spokesman for the Post Office Department in Washington admitted that the majority of positions were taken by youths referred to the Department by Congressmen, and he gave this reason why.

"One of the problems we faced in this program was that the U.S. Employment Service was rather slow in submitting names to us, while the Congressmen were extremely prompt.

"MANY UNQUALIFIED

"And this problem was compounded by the fact that many of the names submitted by the U.S. Employment Service were found to be unqualified for the type of work involved.

"For these reasons and because we wanted to fill the jobs as soon as possible to meet a very pressing human need, we placed more youths from congressional referrals than we did through the U.S. Employment Service."

The statement referred to jobs in all post offices across the country.

In Baltimore the U.S. Employment Service works closely with the State department of employment security.

President Johnson said in May that for every 100 employees then in Federal services, there should be at least 1 youth hired for the summer under the program.

The Post Office Department spokesman said today that a later Civil Service Commission directive ordered that the jobs should be filled through State employment agencies and similar agencies "as much as possible or words to that effect."

Representative Quie said that when the program was first started, Democratic Congressmen were given a quota of the jobs to fill.

"That is emphatically not true," said a Post Office Department spokesman.

INQUIRY ASKED

Representative Quie said he sent a telegram to John Macy, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, asking that the Post Office "spoils system" be investigated.

The Congressman who has served as a Representative since 1948, said that he had investigated the program in 4 States—Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin—and found that of 631 youths referred by Congressmen, 218 were placed. Of 1,325 referred by the U.E. Employment Service, he said, only 85 were placed.

Frank J. Brizzi, assistant to the regional director of the Washington region of the Department—a region that includes Baltimore—gave out the Baltimore figures, adding that they were rough.

In the statement given out by the Department spokesman, the Department said jobs to be filled under the program in Post Offices required a higher degree of ability.

The spokesman said, "the Department has aimed its summer recruitment at high school graduates who need the money to enter college in the fall and at college students who need money to continue their education.

"The jobs are given on the basis of need, but the criterion for need is somewhat different from that of the rest of the youth opportunity program.

"In its efforts to recruit young men and women of the caliber needed, the Department turned not only to the U.S. Employment Service but to Members of Congress."

LATE START CITED

"The summer program did not even materialize until late in the spring, and we had to explore every possible avenue to make sure that the jobs were filled.

"This was not a patronage program. This was a request to Congressmen to help us help the deserving youth in their States and districts."

The youths are paid $2.29 an hour instead of the $1.25 paid most youths under the program in other agencies, he said.

Mr. Brizzi said that of the 93 Baltimore jobs, about 20 were hired through other agencies or organizations. For the State, about 45 were hired through these sources—including civic organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I believe a good summary of the situation was presented in the July 24 edition of the Des Moines Register, which also reports something new in this case—that Mr. Louis Levine, Director of the U.S. Employment Service, says that it could have provided qualified youths for the jobs from rolls of economically or educationally disadvantaged young people, contrary to the Post Office Department's contention. Mr. Speaker, this is the article from the Des Moines Register:

POST-OFFICE YOUTH HIRING PROBE URGED—CONGRESSMAN RAKES SPOILS SYSTEM

(By Nick Kotz)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Representative Albert Quie, Republican of Minnesota, asked Friday for a Civil Service Commission investigation of the Post Office Department's patronage distribution of jobs in President Johnson's Youth Opportunity summer hiring program.

Quie sent a telegram to Civil Service Commission Chairman John Macy asking that the Post Office spoils system be investigated.

Quie said he strongly disapproves of the Post Office Department's action in distributing "the lion's share" of 7,500 youth jobs as congressional patronage.

"I approve of the intent of the President's program to provide jobs for needy youths," said Quie, "but this program should have been carried out as intended, through the U.S. Employment Service rather than as congressional patronage."

The White House and Macy earlier this week ordered Postmaster General John Gronouski to stop patronage and to fill the remaining postal jobs with needy youths selected through the Employment Service.

Presidential and Civil Service directives had ordered these procedures, but the Post Office Department ignored them, Macy said.

A CHALLENGE

In another development, Louis Levine, Director of the U.S. Employment Service, challenged the Post Office Department explanation of why it has hired more youths through congressional referrals than through the Employment Service.

A spokesman for Gronouski had contended the Employment Service was slow in submitting names of youths and that many referred were not qualified.

"I would say that that is an extremely unfortunate generalization," said Levine. "The Employment Service has a great deal of experience in placing youths in summer jobs. Our problem is finding enough jobs for the large number of applicants."

Levine said he "finds it difficult to believe" the Post Office Department explanation.

"I would have guessed that if Mr. Gronouski found that the Employment Service was not meeting his needs he would have let the Employment Service and Mr. Macy of the Civil Service Commission know about it. I didn't know about this until I read it in Thursday's newspaper."

TRIES TO GET NAMES

Quie also criticized the Post Office Department's refusal to make public names of the summer employees or its other employees. Quie said he was attempting to get names of all youths hired.

Quie asked the Civil Service Commission to investigate the following points:

Why patronage appointments to summer postal jobs were offered to Congressmen and why quotas were assigned to Democratic Congressmen.

Why the Post Office Department ignored a May 25 Civil Service directive which ordered that needy youths be hired through the Employment Service.

How many postal jobs have been filled nationwide by congressional referrals and how many of these youths hired were needy.

Has patronage been used by other Federal agencies in filling the youth opportunity summer jobs.

What were the roles of other administration officials outside the Post Office Department in assigning the postal jobs to Congressmen?

White House Aid Mike Manatos assigned job quotas to Minnesota's two Democratic Senators, Eugene McCarthy and Walter Mondale. An assistant to Vice President Hubert Humphrey informed several Minnesota Democratic Congressmen of their opportunity to place youths in the jobs.

Quie said he basically opposed the patronage system used by the Post Office Department to elect postmasters and rural mail carriers, but believes applying patronage to the youth jobs "is carrying things too far."

Quie said a survey he has received from the Post Office Department shows that in Minnesota, Wisconsin, North Dakota, and South Dakota, the Post Office hired two-thirds of the youths recommended by Congressmen and only 6 percent of those recommended by the Employment Service.

The regional postal director in St. Louis, Mo., has declined repeated requests to supply similar information for Iowa.

Seven Iowa Congressmen have said they recommended a total of about 75 youths for the jobs in Iowa. The Post Office said 100 of the youth jobs were available in Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, as indicated in Mr. Macy's reply to my telegram, he had immediately ordered the Post Office Department to cease the practice of political patronage, as soon as it came to his attention. That was, according to an Associated Press dispatch in the July 22 edition of the Washington Star, on July 20. Until that time, the Post Office Department was steadfastly denying that it had practiced any political patronage. That is now refuted by a number of sources. In fact, it had been earlier refuted by the Vice President. Let us develop exactly how this disclosure developed.

This matter first came to my attention early in June, when I was called by the Minneapolis Tribune and asked if I had received my quota of jobs under the so-called youth opportunities campaign as being conducted in the Post Office. I had not, but later I was again called by the Minneapolis Tribune and told I could expect a call from the Post Office Department. That was forthcoming the same afternoon, with a call from the Minneapolis Regional Post Office. I was not offered a quota but was simply told I could submit names for consideration. However, neither was anything said about the youths being economically or educationally disadvantaged.

As I pointed out in my speech of June 10, I did not avail myself of this opportunity, for I believe that a program such as this should not be conducted with political patronage. I believed that the U.S. Employment Service was the correct agency to provide names of people who could properly fill these jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the following article explained why I was offered no quota. The article appeared in the June 4 edition of the Des Moines Register:

Tie Patronage to Youth Jobs

(By Nick Kotz)

Washington, D.C.—Some Federal jobs in President Johnson's youth opportunity campaign are being distributed as congressional patronage.

The President's campaign aims at finding 500,000 jobs for youths this summer, including 25,000 in Federal Government.

FLAT OFFERS

The President ordered Federal agencies to help and requested business assistance in coping with problems of 2 million 16- to 21-year-old youths flooding the job market this month. Vice President Hubert Humphrey is in charge of the program.

Interviews reveal that high administration officials have been offering a set number of Post Office jobs to Democratic Congressmen and Senators from Iowa and other Midwest States.

No Republicans from these States were contacted until late Thursday. After the Post Office Department was questioned about its summer hiring practices, postal officials moved hastily to contact Republicans as well as Democrats.

An Iowa Republican Senator and three Minnesota Republican Congressmen received calls late Thursday from regional post office officials offering them the opportunity to submit names for jobs.

However, the earlier offers to Democrats came from ranking officials in Washington, including a White House aid, and were much more specific.

Senators Eugene McCarthy and Walter Mondale, both Minnesota Democrats, were informed by Mike N. Manatos, administrative assistant to the President, that they should submit names for Post Office jobs.

White House Aid Manatos, whose duties include congressional patronage, spoke with assistants of the two Minnesotans. He told McCarthy to submit 19 names and Mondale to submit 15 names.

CAN'T ADVERTISE

Frederick Belen, Deputy Postmaster General, has contacted a number of Congressmen, including Iowa Democrats John Hansen and Stanley Greigg. Hansen said Belen told him he could select 10 youths for jobs.

"He told me this is the kind of thing you can't advertise—just contact your people," said Hansen.

Within the space of 30 minutes late Thursday, Iowa Republican Senator Jack Miller and Representatives Albert Quie, Odin Langen, and Ancher Nelsen, all Minnesota Republicans, received long-distance telephone calls from regional postal officials.

All were told to submit any names they wanted to for postal jobs.

The Post Office Department has a quota of 6,000 youth opportunity campaign jobs. under President Johnson's guideline of hiring 1 youth for each 100 regular employees. The youths are to be be paid $2.29 an hour from June 20 to Labor Day.

CRASH DRIVE

Vice President Humphrey and other administration officials have been engaged in a crash drive to accomplish the program since the President first announced it on May 22.

On May 25, Humphrey, in a conference telephone call with the personnel directors of all Federal agencies, ordered them to meet their quotas and to do so quickly.

Within a day or two, White House aid Manatos, Deputy Postmaster General Belen, and Michael Monroney, post office congressional liaison officer, began contacting Democratic Congressmen.

Ira Kappenstein, special assistant to the Postmaster General, was interviewed Thursday concerning the Post Office Department's recruitment practices in the youth hiring campaign.

When first questioned about the hiring procedure, Kappenstein said the Post Office Department had instructed its regional offices to hire the youths from special lists being prepared by State employment offices.

NO POLITICS

The directive to regional postal officials, said Kappenstein, included a sentence stating that all appointments should follow civil service procedures and be made without regard to race, religion, sex, political, or personal favoritism.

Questioned as to whether Congressmen had been contacted for nominees, Kappenstein replied that postal officials had called Congressmen and Senators who previously told us they were looking for jobs.

He added that the congressionally submitted names would be considered along with all other names on the employment service lists.

Kappenstein said the Post Office Department was contacting both Democrats and Republicans.

He said Republicans contacted included Senator Frank Carlson, of Kansas, Senator Hiram Fong, of Hawaii, and Representatives Robert Corbett, of Pennsylvania, and Silvio Conte, of Massachusetts. Carlson and Fong are the ranking Republicans on the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Corbett is ranking Republican on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Kappenstein was asked how many Congressmen had been called by Deputy Postmaster General Belen. He replied that Belen had mostly called members of the House and Senate Post Office Committees. Democrats Greigg and Hansen are not members of the committee.

H. R. Gross, Republican, of Iowa, second-ranking Republican on the House committee and an irritant to most administrations, said he had not been contacted.

"It's utterly unbelievable that they would do this," said Gross. "It's inconceivable that they would pay these kind of wages to people without any qualifications. This has appearances of being worse than the leaf raking days in the 1930's."

Kappenstein said the 6,000 youths would be employed as mail handlers and sorters. The youths will take the place of regular personnel on vacation, he said.

Youths must be age 16–21 to be eligible for the jobs. They will work 30–40 hours a week at $2.99 an hour with maximum total wages of $1,602.

Mr. Speaker, a further article, from the July 5 edition of the Minneapolis Tribune, further clarified the situation:

Job Need Directive Is Reported Ignored

(By Nick Kotz)

Washington, D.C.—Post Office and White House officials offering youth opportunity campaign summer jobs as congressional patronage have not followed President Johnson's directive that the jobs should be aimed at disadvantaged youths.

President Johnson's campaign aims at finding 500,000 summer jobs to meet the problem of 2 million youths flooding the job market this month. As part of the campaign, he ordered that Federal agencies hire 25,000 youths—one for each 100 regular employees.

In announcing the Federal Government's hiring role in the youth opportunity campaign, the President stated on May 22:

"These opportunities will be given, so far as this is practicable, to boys and girls under

21 who need them the most because of economic or educational disadvantages."

Following up this directive, Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, the Civil Service Commission and some Federal agencies, have stressed that the Federal jobs should go to disadvantaged youths. The State employment offices are supposed to prepare rosters of needy youths from which the Federal agencies can select job applicants.

However, White House aids and Post Office officials in Washington have in some cases not mentioned the need criteria in telling Congressmen they could place youths in post office jobs.

Mike N. Manatos, administrative assistant to the President, has informed various Senators, including Minnesota Democrats EUGENE MCCARTHY and WALTER MONDALE, they could submit 15 to 20 names for post office jobs.

Manatos did not mention to at least several Senators that the jobs were on a need basis. Deputy Postmaster General Frederick Belen and Michael Monroney, congressional liaison official for the Post Office, also have told Congressmen they could submit names for the jobs. These officials also did not mention to some Congressmen that the job program emphasized needy youths.

HUMPHREY's office alerted Minnesota Democratic Representatives that post office jobs might be available for youths. HUMPHREY's office did not emphasize that the jobs were primarily intended for disadvantaged youths.

After the Post Office was questioned about distribution of the jobs through Democratic congressional patronage, regional post office officials hastily called all four Republican Representatives from Minnesota and Senator JACK MILLER, Republican of Iowa, to inform them that they could submit names for the jobs.

The Minnesota Republican Representatives said no mention was made to them that the emphasis of the program was on helping disadvantaged youths.

An aid to Representative CLARK MACGREGOR, Republican of Minnesota, said he specifically asked the regional Post Office official who called him whether the youths were to be selected on the basis of economic need.

The MACGREGOR aid said the postal official replied that economic need was not a criteria—that the only qualifications were for the youth to be between ages 16 to 21.

Mr. Speaker, in light of this information, plus my personal experience in receiving a telephone call from a regional post office official, I sent on June 10 the following telegram to Postmaster General John Gronouski:

JUNE 10, 1965.

Hon. JOHN GRONOUSKI,
Postmaster General,
Post Office Department,
Washington, D.C.:

I would appreciate receiving an explanation of the policy being followed by your Department in making available summer jobs under President Johnson's youth employment campaign. Also please answer the following questions: If the 6,000 jobs to be filled do not involve political patronage, why do the regional offices have authority to advise local postmasters which applicants are to be appointed after Executive Assistant Monroney stated to the press that individual postmasters would assist with the hiring? Why were certain Senators and Congressmen given specific quota numbers of jobs to be filled while others were simply told that they could submit a list of names when personnel directors are not supposed to indicate to the postmasters, who are supposed to make the final decision, whether an applicant has been endorsed by a Congressman or Senator? Why were members of the majority contacted by high officials of your Department concerning these choice available appointments, while members of the minority were contacted by lower echelon personnel days later and only after the press began asking questions? What happens to the qualified applicants already on the civil service eligible register who are waiting for summer jobs in post offices throughout the country? If this program is not being operated on a political patronage basis, why in many cases are county Democratic committees consulted for recommendations and clearances? Why did high officials of your Department, in soliciting patronage appointments for certain Members of Congress, fail to point out that the President had designated these jobs as being created for economically and educationally disadvantaged young people? Why is the Post Office Department not working through State employment offices when other agencies are supposedly following such procedure? Will qualified young ladies be given appointments as well as young men? I shall appreciate your early reply.

ALBERT H. QUIE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I received the following reply, signed by Mr. Michael Monroney, Executive Assistant to the Postmaster General. You will note that it amounts to a categorical denial of the contention that political patronage was actually used:

JUNE 11, 1965.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As we discussed on the telephone this morning, because the Postmaster General is out of town today, I am writing in reply to your telegram to him of June 10 in which you ask certain questions about the Department's procedures on the filling of summer jobs in post offices around the country.

First of all, I am enclosing the directives which have been sent to our regional offices outlining the procedures for handling the Department's summer employment program in the field, and I believe that the information in these directives will supplement the following information:

Last year the Department filled approximately 1,500 summer jobs around the country. This year the President asked each Federal agency to hire 1 summer employee per each 100 regular employees in addition to the number of summer employees hired last year. As a result, because the Department has approximately 600,000 regular employees, we are faced this summer with finding an extra 6,000 qualified summer employees in addition to the 1,500 employed last year.

Meanwhile, a number of congressional offices had already contacted the Department, inquiring about the possibility of summer jobs in the field for certain individuals. It was thus decided to call these offices to inform them of the procedures which we were setting up in order that they could forward their recommendations to the regional offices. Then, the Postmaster General instructed the Congressional Liaison Office to relay information concerning this summer employment program to all congressional offices—Republican and Democratic—whenever we were in contact with these offices. Almost simultaneously, it was decided to relay this information to Republican and Democratic Members of the House and Senate Committees on Post Office and Civil Service. Other Department officials in contact with congressional offices on other matters also relayed to them information on this program.

In discussing the program with various Congressmen and Senators, the question was often asked, "How many jobs will there be in my district?" We answered these questions by giving a rough estimate of the number of jobs to be filled in the Congressman's district, and these figures are the ones which have been misinterpreted as quotas. However, in all cases we have attempted to impress upon the Congressman or Senator that, while there would be a certain quota of jobs for his district or State, those candidates he recommended for selection would be given equal consideration with other candidates from other sources, including those recommended by State employment offices.

All applications for summer employment at each post office where summer job are necessary are being placed in a general file and the regional director has been given the authority to select the best qualified from that particular post office file. The Postmaster General is extremely anxious to make sure that no political emphasis is placed upon these selections, and it has been our experience that postmasters are most susceptible to local political influence because, in many cases, they have been recommended for the postmaster appointment by local political organizations. It was because of this fact that the Postmaster General placed authority for selection of summer employees in the hands of the regional directors, and this occurred following my statement to the press that postmasters would make the final decision on the selection of summer employees.

Some of the initial contacts with Members of the House and the Senate—Republicans and Democrats—were made by Department officials, but when it was decided to contact all Members of the House and the Senate, it was necessary to utilize the efforts of what might be described as lower echelon personnel. Telephoning 535 congressional offices proved too time consuming for the few departmental officials available.

I might add, Congressman, that a period of less than 2 days elapsed between the time that it was decided to inform congressional offices of these procedures whenever we were in contact with them on any other matter and the time when it was decided that we should contact all 535 offices.

Let me also emphasize that we have learned generally that the type of young person who writes to his Congressman, expressing an interest in summer employment with the Government, is a high-caliber person, and we have benefited from these recommendations from Members of Congress of both parties in the past.

You have asked, "What happens to the qualified applicants already on the civil service eligible register who are waiting for summer jobs in post offices throughout the country?" There is no civil service eligible register for summer employment in the postal service. Those persons on civil service eligible registers for postal employment are seeking permanent employment, not summer employment.

You have asked, "Why in many cases are county Democratic committees consulted for recommendations and clearances?" We have received no indication that Democratic county committees have been consulted but, as this possibility always exists, I can assure you that the Postmaster General would be interested in any information to this effect. On this point, in no instance did we intend that congressional offices actively recruit summer employees. Our calls were made so that, if a Congressman received a letter from a young person soliciting help in obtaining a summer position, the Congressman would know that there were post office jobs available in his district and he would know the procedures to use in submitting names for consideration.

You have asked why officials "fail to point out that the President had designated these jobs as being created for economically and educationally disadvantaged young people?" The 7,500 summer post office jobs in the field will be used to substitute for regular mail handlers, letter carriers, and postal clerks who take their vacation time during this period. These jobs do not involve manual labor, gardening, or other less technical work, and, as a result, the postal service is primarily interested in obtaining the highest qualified young people available.

In answering to your question about the Post Office Department "not working through State employment offices when other agencies are supposedly following such procedures." I believe the attached copy of a telegram which has been sent by all regional offices to State employment service offices will answer your question.

Finally, you have asked whether "qualified young ladies will be given appointments as well as young men." As I mentioned earlier, a vast majority of the 7,500 summer postal jobs involve substituting for mail handlers, letter carriers, and clerks. For the most part, these young people will be doing work which is normally done by male employees such as handling heavy mail bags and working as letter carriers. It is not the type of work which, in the normal course of events, is done by women, but there is no prohibition against employment of young women for these jobs. We simply do not believe that, if offered the opportunity to work as a mail handler, letter carrier, or postal clerk, many young women would accept such a job.

I have tried to answer your questions as completely as possible, Congressman, and I hope that, if you have any further comments or inquiries, you will not hesitate to get in touch with us.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely,

MICHAEL MONRONEY,
Executive Assistant to the Postmaster General.

JUNE 4, 1965.

To all regional directors:

Wire immediately each State employment service office where post office will employ summer seasonal assistants. Include following information in your wire:

"The post offices in the principal cities in the areas served by your office are participating in President Johnson's youth program to make summer jobs available for deserving youngsters, 16–21 years of age, who need employment.

"Please refer applications of qualified youngsters to be considered for employment during July, August, and September to regional director (your mailing address). Include completed Federal application standard form 60 or standard form 57 with each referral.

"Job information: Include here post office location, title, seasonal assistant, salary $2.29 per hour.

"I would appreciate receiving as many of these referrals as possible before June 11 in order that they may be fully considered, together with other referrals received, before initial selections are made. Referrals received after June 11 will be considered for any subsequent selections that might be made.

"You will be advised of any placements made as a result of your referrals.

"(Signed)
"Regional Director."

Questions concerning employment of summer seasonal assistants should be directed to the Assistant Postmaster General.

RICHARD J. MURPHY.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note the fourth to the last and second to the last paragraphs of Mr. Monroney's reply. In the former, he says:

> These jobs do not involve manual labor and, as a result, the Postal Service is primarily interested in obtaining the highest qualified young people available.

In the latter, he seems to contradict himself, as he writes:

> For the most part, these young people will be doing work which is normally done by male employees such as handling heavy mailbags and working as letter carriers.

Mr. Speaker, if the 7,500 jobs in the Post Office Department did not involve manual labor, what does Mr. Monroney consider the type of work which requires handling of heavy mailbags?

It is also interesting to note that in admitting that the Post Office Department had sough job referrals through Congressmen, Mr. Monroney admitted that the Post Office Department had disregarded a civil service directive of May 25. This directive said, in part:

> State employment service offices have been advised to establish special youth opportunity rosters of boys and girls aged 16 through 21 who want to work this summer. Federal hiring officials should contact and use these offices as the prime source for filling summer trainee jobs. In order to insure employment on a timely basis, any local organizations concerned with alleviating youth problems should also be used.

Mr. Speaker, never did the civil service directive mention congressional political patronage.

Mr. Speaker, next to recognize the ill-advised use oi political patronge was Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. The following article appeared in the June 16 edition of the Des Moines Register:

HUMPHREY: POST OFFICE WRONG ON YOUTH JOBS

(By Nick Kotz)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY said Tuesday that the Post Office Department used bad judgment in starting to distribute youth opportunity campaign summer jobs as Democratic patronage.

The Vice President commended in an interview concerning the Department's handling of President Johnson's campaign to find jobs for 500,000 youths this summer. The Department has been assigned 6,000 of the 25,000 Federal jobs included in the campaign.

NEEDY YOUTHS

HUMPHREY, who is in charge of the program, also said that primary emphasis should be given to hiring disadvantaged youths. The Department has not made this emphasis in requesting names of job candidates from Congressmen.

High-ranking postal officials and a White House aide originally contacted a number of Democratic Congressmen and told them they could each submit a specified number of names for the summer postal jobs.

After the Department was questioned about the practice, postal officials hastily started contacting Republican Congressmen as well.

HUMPHREY said the youth job program should not be handled as patronage.

"We don't want to look at this program as a way to take care of the 'family,'" he said.

PRESIDENT'S ORDER

HUMPHREY also was questioned concerning the Department's ignoring the President's emphasis of giving the jobs to needy youths.

In announcing the program, the President said of the Federal jobs:

"These opportunities will be given, so far as this is practicable, to boys and girls under 21 who need them the most because of economic or educational disadvantages."

Representative ALBERT QUIE, Republican, of Minnesota, last week sent a telegram to Postmaster John Gronouski asking a number of questions concerning the program. He questioned why postal officials did not mention the President's emphasis on needy youths when contacting Congressmen.

Replying to QUIE's question, Michael Monroney, executive assistant to the Postmaster, stated.

"These jobs do not involve manual labor, gardening, or other less technical work, and, as a result, the postal service is primarily interested in obtaining the highest qualified young people available."

Monroney, however, appeared to contradict himself on the job qualifications in answering QUIE's question as to whether jobs were available for girls.

HEAVY WORK

Stated Monroney, "For the most part, these young people will be doing work which is normally done by male employees, such as handling heavy mail bags and working as letter carriers."

The Vice President said he believes the emphasis still can and should be on hiring needy youths.

"You can have a highly qualified person that might be needy," said HUMPHREY. "I would make it crystal clear that where there is a choice between equally qualified persons, the jobs should be given to youths who most need jobs."

Mr. Speaker, even with the Vice President recognizing the use of political patronage and denouncing it, the Post Office Department stuck to its guns and continued to deny any part of it. Following is a so-called fact sheet which the Department began to distribute in July:

FACT SHEET ON SUMMER EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM, JULY 1965

While the Post Office Department's summer program is a very definite part of the President's youth opportunity program, certain basic differences exist because of the nature of the work.

By and large, the youth opportunity program is aimed at finding jobs for school dropouts and other unskilled young people who would be unemployed throughout the summer. These jobs, generally, are very basic ones, of the laboring type, and pay $1.25 an hour.

The Post Office Department, on the other hand, requires a higher degree of skill from its summer employees, and certain qualifications, besides. It requires the ability to sort mail, to learn basic schemes, and to perform duties related to collection and dispatch of mail. In addition, it requires that all employees pass a security investigation, which precludes all youths with police records. Because of these higher requirements, postal summer jobs pay $2.29 an hour.

For this reason, the Department has aimed its summer recruitment at high school graduates who need money to enter college next fall, and at college students who need money to continue their education. The jobs are given on the basis of need, but the criteria for need is somewhat different from that of the rest of the youth opportunity program.

In its effort to recruit young men and women of the caliber needed, the Department turned not only to the U.S. Employment Service, but to Members of Congress. The summer program did not even materialize until late in the spring, and we had to explore every possible avenue to make sure that the jobs were filled. This was not a patronage program. This was a request to Congressmen to help us help the deserving youth in their States and districts.

One of the problems we faced in this program was that the U.S. Employment Service was rather slow in submitting names to us, while the Congressmen were extremely prompt. And this problem was compounded by the fact that many of the names submitted by USES were found to be unqualified for the type of work involved. For these reasons, and because we wanted to fill the jobs as soon as possible to meet a very pressing human need, we placed more youths from congressional referrals than we did through USES.

Furthermore, the figures used by some newspaper accounts do not reveal the full extent of the program. To date, about 5,000 of our 7,500 quota has been filled. It is to be expected that many of the remaining positions will be filled from the qualified names sent to the Department by the USES.

Mr. Speaker, with my interest whetted even more by this denial on the part of the Post Office Department of what had already been admitted by the Vice President, I thought some facts and figures were in order. I wrote to Mr. Adrian Winkel, director of the Minneapolis regional office, asking him for statistics on so-called youth opportunities campaign referrals in his four-State region of Minnesota, Wisconsin, South Dakota, and North Dakota. Following is the part of his reply containing the desired statistics and related information:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
MINNEAPOLIS REGIONAL OFFICE,
Minneapolis, Minn., July 12, 1965.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUIE: Thank you for your interest in the Post Office Department's policy in hiring seasonal assistants for the summer. I regret the delay in answering your inquiry; however, we felt it necessary to virtually complete the program before preparing a résumé of the placements.

In order to give you a breakdown of the number of seasonal assistants employed in the Minneapolis postal region and the source of referral, I have developed the following information. Of the total of 301 applicants placed 72.4 percent were from congressional referrals and 27.6 percent from the U.S. Employment Service offices and other sources.

TOTAL REFERRALS—ALL SOURCES

	Total received	Placed on rolls	Percent placed
Minnesota	651	105	16.1
Wisconsin	950	137	14.4
North Dakota	191	30	15.7
South Dakota	164	29	17.7
Total	1,956	301	15.4

CONGRESSIONAL REFERRALS

Minnesota	117	75	64.1
Wisconsin	444	91	20.5
North Dakota	28	26	92.9
South Dakota	42	26	61.9
Total	631	218	34.5

REFERRALS FROM U.S. EMPLOYMENT SERVICE AND OTHER SOURCES

Minnesota	534	30	5.6
Wisconsin	506	46	9.1
North Dakota	163	4	2.5
South Dakota	122	3	2.5
Total	1,325	83	6.3

These assistants have been placed in the following offices:

Minnesota: Brainerd, Chaska, Detroit Lakes, Duluth, Ely, Fairmont, Hibbing, Hopkins, Minneapolis, Moorhead, Rochester, St. Cloud, St. Paul, South St. Paul, Virginia, Waseca, Willmar.

Wisconsin: Appleton, Ashland, Beloit, Brookfield, Cudahy, Eagle River, Eau Claire, Fond du Lac, Green Bay, Hales Corners, Janesville, Kenosha, Madison, La Crosse, Marshfield, Milwaukee, Manitowoc, Marinette, Menasha, Menomonee Falls, Menomonie, Neenah, Oshkosh, Portage, Racine, Rhinelander, Ripon, Sheboygan, Superior, Watertown, Waukesha, Wausau, West Bend, Wisconsin Rapids.

North Dakota: Bismarck, Devils Lake, Dickinson, Fargo, Grand Forks, Jamestown, Minot, Valley City, Williston.

South Dakota: Aberdeen, Belle Fourche, Brookings, Huron, Madison, Mitchell, Mobridge, Pierre, Rapid City, Sioux Falls, Watertown, Yankton.

Thank you again for your interest and for the opportunity to give you this information.

Sincerely yours,
ADRIAN P. WINKEL,
Regional Director.

Mr. Speaker, these statistics clearly show the extent to which congressional referrals were preferred over those of USES. The following article from the July 21 edition of the Minneapolis Tribune gives further evidence of the extent to which patronage outweighed other sources and how some of the jobs were offered to young people who are by no means disadvantaged:

POST OFFICE LEANS ON PATRONAGE—MOST U.S. AGENCIES OBEY L.B.J. YOUTH HIRING ORDER

(By Nick Kotz)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Most Federal agencies in Minnesota appear to be following President Johnson's youth opportunity program directives by hiring needy youths through the U.S. Employment Service lists.

However, Post Office Department statistics show that the Post Office Department has hired few youths referred by the Employment Service but many from congressional patronage lists.

U.S. Employment Service officials in Minnesota and three other upper Midwest States disputed the Post Office Department's explanation of why it hired youths recommended by Congressmen rather than those referred by the Employment Service. In the upper midwest area of Minnesota, western Wisconsin, North Dakota, and South Dakota, the Post Office hired about two-thirds of congressional referrals and only 6 percent of Employment Service referrals for summer jobs for youths.

President Johnson said Federal jobs in the summer youth program should go mostly to needy youths. Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY and the Civil Service Commission directed Federal agencies to hire most youths through the U.S. Employment Service, which prepared special rosters for that purpose.

The Post Office Department issued a statement in Washington explaining that more congressional referrals were hired because the Employment Service was slow in recommending youths, and many of those recommended were unqualified.

In contrast, the Department said, Congressmen were prompt in submitting names, and their recommendations were better qualified.

Robert J. Brown, commissioner of the Minnesota Employment Security Department, said Tuesday the Employment Service met both the Post Office Department's deadline for applicants and followed its qualification requirements.

On request, Brown made available statistics showing that the Post Office Department hired about 5 percent of youths recommended by the Employment Service in St. Paul and Minneapolis while other Federal agencies hired almost 100 percent of Employment Service recommendations.

For example, Brown said, the employment service recommended 353 youths for postal jobs in Minneapolis. Of this total, 17 were hired.

In contrast, other Federal agencies requested youths to fill 66 jobs. Brown said the agencies were given names of 131 youths from which to choose and that 58 were hired.

Brown said the employment service recommended 56 youths for postal jobs in St. Paul, and 4 were hired.

In contrast, other Federal agencies in St. Paul requested youths to fill 46 jobs. Brown said the empolyment service referred 61 youths for the 46 jobs, and 46 youths were hired.

Federal agencies hiring the employment service referrals in Minneapolis and St. Paul include: Internal Revenue Service, Bureau of Customs, Agriculture Department, Bureau of Public Roads, Federal Aviation Agency, General Services Administration, Department of the Army, Selective Service Commission, Air Force, Geological Survey, Federal Housing Administration, U.S. attorney, and the Navy.

Post Office Department statistics for the entire State show that the Department hired 75 of 117 youths recommended by Minnesota Congressman and Senators. The post office hired 30 of 534 youths recommended by the employment service.

The Post Office Department in Washington has refused to disclose the names of youths hired for the summer program or the names of any other postal employees.

A spokesman for Postmaster General John Gronouski has cited a postal regulation forbidding disclosure of the names or salaries of any of the Department's 600,000 employees.

Newspapers and a television station in Madison, Wis., Gronouski's home State, have reported that some of the postal jobs have gone as congressional patronage to sons of Democratic politicians, including a former Federal judge.

Directors of the State employment services in Wisconsin, South Dakota, and North Dakota also expressed surprise at the Post Office Department's comments concerning the employment service role in the youth hiring program.

P. J. Maloney, commissioner of the South Dakota State Employment Service, said. "It would seem extremely unlikely that only 3 of 122 youths recommended by the employment service were qualified."

* * * * *

In contrast to its lack of success in placing youths with the Post Office Department, Maloney said the employment service readily placed youths in jobs with the Internal Revenue Service, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and other Federal agencies.

"Our kids were qualified and the names were submitted promptly to the Post Office Department," Maloney said.

J. R. Hahn, assistant to the director of the North Dakota Employment Service, criticized the Post Office's procedure in hiring youths.

Hahn referred to the fact that the Post Officer—almost alone among the Federal agencies—hired youths through it regional rather than its local offices.

"It would have been easier if our people could have submitted the names to the local post offices rather than sending them to the regional office in Minneapolis," Hahn said.

Michael Monroney, director of congressional relations for the Post Office Department, explained in Washington several weeks ago why the Department was hiring through its regional offices.

Monroney's explanation was that the Post Office Department sought to avoid political pressures in the youth appointments. Local postmasters would be subject to far more political pressures than would regional officials, Monroney said.

Francis Walsh, director of the Wisconsin State Employment Service, said he believes his agency referred youths meeting the specifications of the Post Office Department.

Walsh said he did not know whether congressional referrals reached the Post Office Department before those from the employment service, but added:

"I suspect that in contrast to congressional referrals, our referrals would have been based on calling these people in and interviewing them."

Congressmen have followed a variety of procedures in recommending youths for the jobs.

In many cases, as Walsh presumed, the upper Midwest Congressmen merely forwarded to the Post Office Department the names of all youths who wrote for help in getting the jobs.

In other cases, Congressmen had their district offices select youths or collect names of interested youths and refer them to the Post Office Department.

A certain amount of confusion exists concerning whether the Post Office Department is following the Presidential directives on hiring needy youths.

In announcing the program, the President stated: "These opportunities will be given, so far as this is practicable, to boys and girls the most because of economic or educational disadvantages."

In explaining its position—why it hired congressional recommendations rather than those from the employment service—Post Office Department officials said it had higher job-skill requirements than other Federal agencies.

Youths would require the ability to sort mail, to learn basic mail schemes, and to perform duties related to collection and dispatch of mail.

Therefore, Department officials said, college students and high school graduates were needed and Congressmen have supplied more youths with these qualifications than has the employment service.

Congressmen, whose youths have been hired, report that many of them are driving trucks, slinging mail bags, and delivering mail.

In an interview, HUMPHREY said that youths could have brains and ability to perform such jobs and still be needy and disadvantaged.

A Post Office Department statement describing the need for youths with top skills, also refers to the fact that Congressmen supplied more information about youths.

* * * * *

White House Press Secretary Bill Moyers was asked at Tuesday's press briefing whether the Post Office Department was following directives of the President and Civil Service Commission.

Moyers replied that the Post Office Department "feels confident that the aims of the President's objective will be largely realized."

But on the questions of the desirability of congressional patronage and the emphasis on needy youths, Moyers' answers were less clear.

Moyers said, "The thrust of this program is primarily for those who have dropped out of school and are likely to and for those whose families are in the poverty category."

But concerning youths hired by the Post Office through congressional referral, Moyers said, it was his understanding that the youths mostly were college students and high school graduates who will start college this fall.

Asked how the President feels about the Post Office Department hiring youths by quotas assigned to Congressmen, he replied:

"I haven't discussed that with him so I have no knowledge of his reaction."

* * * * *

Moyers also said that the Post Office Department has not yet concluded its program, which will total 7,500 youths.

The Post Office Department made the same point in a press release explaining its position. The department stated that many of the remaining jobs will be filled by youths recommended by the employment service.

The Post Office Department assigned a total of 38 jobs to Minnesota, Wisconsin, North Dakota, and South Dakota. In his report to Representative ALBERT QUIE, Republican, of Minnesota, Regional Postal Official Adrian Winkel said that 301 youths have been hired in the four-State region. The Post Office Department said that 301 youths have been hired in the four States.

If the remaining 86 jobs were assigned entirely to youths recommended by the employment services, the Post Office Department still will have filled the majority of jobs with youths recommended by Congressmen.

Mr. Speaker, finally even the White House ordered an end to the political patronage, as did Chairman Macy. I believe that both the White House and the Civil Service should be commended for this action. Following is an article which appeared in both the Des Moines Register and the Minneapolis Tribune, which explains the action. The Associated Press carried a similar dispatch on the same day, July 22:

WASHINGTON.—The White House has ordered the Post Office Department to distribute the remainder of its youth opportunity program summer jobs to needy youths, and to stop distributing the jobs as congressional patronage, administration sources said Wednesday.

The administration sources said that the White House considers the Post Office Department's patronage distribution of the jobs to be a perversion of the President's program.

White House officials have personally criticized Postmaster General John Gronouski for the patronage procedures and have slapped some hands, the administration sources said.

Furthermore, the sources said that John Macy, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, was livid to discover Tuesday that the Post Office Department originally planned to distribute all 7,500 of its youth jobs on a quota basis to Congressmen.

The Minneapolis Tribune-Des Moines Register disclosed several weeks ago that ranking officials of the Post Office Department and a White House aide were assigning quotas of the post office jobs to Democratic Senators and Congressmen from Iowa, Minnesota, and other Midwest States.

After the Post Office Department was questioned about the practices, the Post Office Department hastily told Republican Congressmen they could submit job candidates, but the Republicans were not given specific quotas.

The President's program aimed at relieving youth unemployment this summer by finding 500,000 youth jobs, including 25,000 in the Federal Government. The President said the Federal jobs were to be given "so far as practicable to youths who need them the most because of educational or economic disadvantages."

The Civil Service Commission and Vice President HUMPHREY ordered the Federal agencies to use the U.S. Employment Service as their prime recruitment source of youths. The Employment Service offices prepared special rosters of youths needing jobs.

The White House considered the Post Office Department to have perverted the intent of the President's program because it was not following these two directions, administration sources said.

Namely, Post Office Department officials did not even tell Congressmen that the jobs were for needy youths, and the Post Office hired most youths on congressional recommendation rather than going through the Employment Service.

In the upper midwest area of Minnesota, Wisconsin, North Dakota, and South Dakota, the Post Office Department hired about two-thirds of youths recommended by Congressmen and only 6 percent recommended by the Employment Service.

Regional postal officials in St. Louis, Mo., say they do not have final results of how many youths recommended by Iowa Congressmen were hired.

* * * * *

Post Office officials have told the White House that 2,500 of the 7,500 jobs are still available, administration sources said.

The sources said Postmaster General Gronouski has been directly ordered to fill the remainder of these jobs with needy youths.

In Iowa, at least 76 of 100 jobs assigned to the State already have been filled. In the four-State Upper Midwest area, at least 301 of 387 jobs assigned to the area already have been filled.

A spokesman for Postmaster General John Gronouski replied "no comment" when questioned whether the White House had Tuesday ordered the Department to change its hiring procedures.

However, the Gronouski spokesman said the Department would hire needy youths for the remaining jobs and would hire them through the Employment Service and local agencies who can refer needy youths to the Post Office.

He said that no more of the youths recommended by Congressmen would be hired.

Administration sources said that President Johnson was not aware that the Post Office Department was distributing the jobs as congressional patronage.

The administration sources were questioned about the role of the White House in the patronage practices, since a White House aide had informed at least two Senators of their job quotas.

Mike N. Manatos, administrative assistant to the President, had told Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota, he had a quota of 19 jobs and told Senator WALTER MONDALE, Democrat, of Minnesota, he had a quota of 15 jobs. Manatos, in relaying the information to aides of the two Senators, made no mention that the jobs were for needy youths.

Manatos had been informed about the jobs by the Post Office Department but did not have any idea that the jobs were part of the President's youth opportunity program, explained administration sources.

The administration sources said Manatos thought that the jobs were merely the normal summer hiring program and thus followed normal procedures.

Manatos handles some patronage matters in the White House. He calls Democratic Congressmen and Senators with announcements they can make about Federal grants awarded to their areas.

Mr. Speaker, there is still a question concerning this use of political patronage and that is why was it done in the first place?

I believe that question is partially answered by some Democratic Capitol Hill aides, who talked to Mr. Walter Pincus of the Washington Star. Mr. Pincus reports their comments in an article which appeared in today's edition of the Star:

POST OFFICE IS REBUKED ON YOUTH JOB PATRONAGE

(By Walter Pincus)

The Post Office Department has been slapped down publicly by the administration for supposedly trying to use the summer job program of the Youth Opportunity Campaign to bolster the sagging amount of patronage available to Democratic Congressmen and Senators.

Under the administration program, announced by President Johnson on May 22, 475,000 summer jobs were to be found for the 2 million needy youths out of school and looking for work. But 763,347 jobs are reported filled now. Federal agencies were to supply 25,000 of the jobs, and the Post Office Department's share was put at 7,500. So far it has filled 5,000 jobs.

The other jobs were supplied voluntarily by business and industry.

Top Post Office officials, assisted by at least one White House aide, and in the best patronage tradition of the Department, called House and Senate Democrats to encourage them to send names to regional postal headquarters.

CALLED CRASH PROGRAM

According to one liberal House Democrat, "They asked me to submit up to 10 names . . . said that they would get favorable consideration, but they were careful not to promise the jobs."

He added, "They did say it was a crash program to help deserving kids get money to go to college."

But as it turned out, many of the jobs reportedly went to well-to-do children of local politicians.

"It was strictly patronage," one Senate aide said. "The Post Office traditionally has operated on patronage" in terms of postmasters.

"The mistake on this program," he added, "was that they placed it under the poverty program."

GETS SECOND CALL

A second mistake, according to another Democrat, was that some House members talked to Nick Kotz, a Washington correspondent for the Cowles Publications, who asked whether Republicans had been brought into the program.

Although some GOP members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committees had been called, most Republicans had not.

In the wake of Kotz' first stories, the Post Office Department decided to call all Republicans. For that job, officials of the regional offices were pressed into service.

"Around this time a Post Office official called me again," one Democratic aide said, "to say some House Members had talked and the Department was flooded with phone calls from Republicans. 'Don't worry,' he said, 'it won't reduce your quota.' "

Representative ALBERT QUIE, Republican, of Minnesota, said Friday a survey of jobs distributed within the Minneapolis post office region "shows that two-thirds of the people recommended by Congressmen—some of them with influential political affiliations—have been hired."

In the wake of stories publicizing the Post Office calls to Democrats, Civil Service Commission Chairman John W. Macy, Jr., said, "It was clearly the intent in this special program that political patronage was not to apply in any form or by any implication."

As is the case in exposure of most practical political operations of this sort, a shadow game has now been undertaken for public consumption.

INVESTIGATION URGED

The Post Office Department has announced it hadn't meant to imply patronage was involved in its calls, it was only exploring "every possible avenue to make sure that the jobs were filled."

QUIE, who also knows the realities of patronage, has sent a telegram to Macy "asking that the Post Office 'spoils system' be investigated."

Mr. Speaker, this is why I have requested a complete civil service investigation of the use of political patronage in hiring under the President's so-called youth opportunities campaign.

Was it a mistake to link this program to the war on poverty, as Mr. Pincus quotes a Democratic aide as saying? I do not think so. I believe that this could have been a good program to aid our economically and educationally disvantaged young people, just as President Johnson outlined the program.

The mistake was that of the Post Office Department in callously turning this program into a spoils system, without regard to the economically and educationally deprived young people. The mistake was that of at least one White House aide who helped call Democratic Senators.

Mr. Speaker, the published reports which I have introduced into the RECORD indicate that not only the Minneapolis and Philadelphia postal regions are involved, but also the Washington, D.C., region, as reported by the Baltimore Sun, and the St. Louis region, as reported by the Des Moines Register. I have been given information to the effect that the Providence, R.I., Journal will tomorrow publish a story indicating that the Boston postal region is involved. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation has been involved in all 13 postal regions.

I wish to commend Chairman Macy for undertaking the investigation of the Minneapolis and Philadelphia regions and I am confident that his findings will lead him to undertake a national investigation.

CANCER CURE—METHOTREXATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the July issue of Ladies Home Journal contains an article on one of the most dramatic cures of cancer in the entire annals of medicine.

Entitled "Peggy Was Dying," it tells the story of a 24-year-old wife and mother suddenly stricken with cancer of the womb. After several operations, including a hysterectomy, physicians said there was no further hope for Peggy Longoria. The cancer had spread to her lungs and she had lost 40 pounds.

At that point, she was given a massive injection of a drug which had never before been tried against this form of cancer—methotrexate. The injection was given at the clinical center of the National Cancer Institute, which had pioneered in the use of drugs against various forms of cancer. After subsequent larger dosages of the drug, the hemorrhaging stopped and she was released from the clinical center as cured, 4 months after the beginning of the treatment. She is alive and happy today—10 years after the initial administration of the drug methotrexate.

Although cancer of the womb is fairly rare, it does occur once in every 25,000 pregnancies. I wonder how rare it seems to the husband and children of a woman in whom it occurs.

Since its success with Peggy Longoria, the National Cancer Institute has treated more than 100 cases of cancer of the womb. Of these, about 80 percent have been cured through the use of methotrexate and even more powerful chemical agents.

The chemical treatments originated at the National Cancer Institute are now being used all over the world against this form of cancer, and this is of tremendous lifesaving importance to women in the underdeveloped countries where cancer of the womb is 10 times as common as in the United States.

We have had other triumphs against cancer through the use of drugs pioneered either at the National Cancer Institute or through the research grant program of that Institute. Chemical agents are in many cases effective against cancer of the kidney in children, cancer of the retina, and leukemia. Through the use of chemical agents against leukemia alone, 90 percent of its victims can be brought into a state of remission and the survival time from this once immediately fatal disease has been multiplied six times over the past decade.

But statistics do not tell the whole story. What price the life of Peggy Longoria? To the statisticians, her type of disease was rare, but to her husband and child, this disease had an incidence of 100 percent. I am proud of the role of the National Cancer Institute in saving her life and in saving so many other lives. I think we in the Congress have made no finer investment over the years than in the medical research which has made these lifesaving miracles possible.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the body of the RECORD the article "Peggy Was Dying" from the July issue of the Ladies Home Journal.

"PEGGY WAS DYING"—WORLD'S FIRST CANCER CURE BY DRUGS: A MILESTONE IN MEDICINE

(By Walter Sanford Ross)

"If I have to die," the young mother told her husband quietly, "I don't want to go to a hospital. I want to be home with my baby."

"But maybe," her husband pleaded, "maybe you don't have to die."

Neither of them believed it. She was 24 years old, and she had advanced cancer—a rare and highly malignant condition that had never been cured.

Their world was crashing—and only a moment ago it seemed that everything was going their way. Peggy Longoria, a small, fragile girl with hair the color of freshly minted pennies, had given birth to their first child, a daughter, less than 2 years before. The proud father, Bob, a tall, dark-haired Texan, made little money as a Navy dental technician. There was not even a telephone in the tiny Philadelphia apartment that had been their first home. But Bob and Peggy had each other, and now there was Alicia Ann and the future. And they were very young.

A year after Alica's birth, Peggy, blue eyes glowing, told Bob she thought she was pregnant again. Her husband gave a Texas-sized whoop of joy. The next day, he made an appointment for her at the naval hospital where he worked, and the doctor who examined her reported that she was, indeed, going to have a second child.

During the next 5 months, the Longorias played exciting guessing games about the new baby—boy or girl? copper hair or dark?—and Peggy, happily watching her slender waistline expand, went to the naval hospital for monthly prenatal checkups. At first, the morning sickness seemed a normal part of pregnancy. But after 5 months, though she was still gaining weight in the right places, Peggy was sick much of the time, and her hands and feet had begun to swell. The hospital took X-rays, and the films revealed the terrible truth: No bone structure of a baby was developing in the womb.

The hospital advised surgery at once. Mrs. Longoria nodded a dazed consent to the operation. It was performed successfully on August 3, 1955, and when Peggy was strong enough to ask, the surgeon told her, as gently as he could, "It wasn't a baby, Mrs. Longoria."

She made herself blurt out: "What was it?"

"A tumor," the doctor replied—and, seeing her face, added hastily, "but not cancer. It was large—weighed 10 pounds—of the type we call hydatidiform mold."

Peggy was horrified, but the surgeon knew exactly what to say. "Of course you'll be able to have more babies; the uterus is healthy and intact."

"Thank God," whispered Peggy, sinking back into her pillow. Everything was going to be all right now.

But the shadows refused to disappear. Routine chest X-rays had disclosed lesions on Peggy's lungs; the doctors were not sure what they were—perhaps scar tissue resulting from an old attack of pneumonia, perhaps something else. Peggy was told that she would have to report for X-rays every two weeks for the next two years.

Puzzled and uneasy, Peggy and Bob forced themselves not to talk about it. She felt strong and healthy after the operation—strong enough to move into the house they had been hoping for and dreaming about since their wedding day, nearly 3 years ago. Their first real home—a small bungalow in Rockville, Md., with four rooms, including a nursery for Alicia, and maybe, later, a baby brother or sister.

Bob had been transferred to a dental repair school in nearby Bethesda; with this training, he could receive a higher rating, a better job, and more money. Excited and happy, the couple started shopping for furniture—they wanted the bungalow modern and bright, like the future they had to believe lay just ahead. Peggy dutifully reported on time for a checkup at the naval hospital in Bethesda, as the Philadelphia doctors had ordered. Two doctors examined her, had blood and other tests done, and X-rays made. When they saw the results, they called Peggy in and told her she would need another operation, at once. There was another tumor in the uterus—and this time they would have to perform a complete hysterectomy.

It was barely a month since Peggy's first operation—since the day another doctor had said, so reassuringly, "Of course you'll be able to have more babies."

I couldn't believe that things had changed so," Peggy remembers. "I was so sure they were wrong. I felt perfectly fine—and told them so. I said I didn't want the operation.

But the doctors were sure, too. They insisted that the hysterectomy had to be done—that it was urgent. Desperately, the Longorias asked the hospital to call in an outside specialist; they would pay for it, somehow.

The Navy called in a well-known civilian gynecologist from nearby Washington. He examined Peggy and looked over her test results. The Longorias waited for his verdict, in an agony of suspense. But when it came, the blow was almost too much to bear. The hysterectomy, said the specialist, must be performed at once. The uterus was cancerous.

"I was only 24 years old," Peggy says. "Cancer. I couldn't even realize what it meant. I said, 'No. I won't have a hysterectomy. I want more children.' "

Bob Longoria hid his shock with all the Texas reserve he could muster. "He never lets me know when he's worried," Peggy says. "But he knew, better than I did, what the doctors were really saying." Bob worked in a hospital; he understood doctors and disease. And so he told his wife, "Peggy, it's God's will that you have the operation. Listen to the doctors. You've got to stay alive to take care of the baby we've got."

The Longorias are deeply religious Catholics. When they have a problem, the simple act of kneeling and praying for guidance helps them feel stronger. That is what they did the night after the specialist delivered his judgment.

At last Peggy Longoria was convinced; she would have the hysterectomy. They drove Alicia to Pittsburgh and left her with Peggy's parents—for a few days, they kept telling themselves.

Peggy entered Bethesda Naval Hospital and was prepared for surgery. She meant to be so brave, for Bob's sake, but all she could think about was that it meant never having another baby. Bob, his mouth tense, had to be strong enough for both of them.

"He kept telling me just to worry about getting well," Peggy remembers.

A few days after the operation, Peggy's two doctors visited her room while her husband was there. They asked her how she was feeling, and she said, cheerily, "Fine. I'm not sick at all."

The men nodded, but did not smile.

"Is it——" her voice broke.

The doctors began assuring her that the operation had been a complete success. But Peggy knew something was wrong. "What does that mean?" she demanded. "I want to know the truth."

What they told her, in essence, was that she had an unusual kind of cancer called choriocarcinoma that occurs once in about 25,000 pregnancies in the United States. They had biopsied the uterus to make sure.

"Well," said Peggy, still clutching for straws, "but you took it out."

Yes, they had taken it out. But the disease had already spread to her lungs. No further surgery was possible.

"I didn't understand right away," Peggy says. "I guess I shut a part of my mind to it. But finally I had to make myself hear the words. Each one was like a blow of some gigantic hammer. They told me I had only a few weeks or maybe a few months to live. It sounded absolutely crazy—unreal. I was recuperating from an operation. My appetite was enormous. I had plenty of energy. It couldn't be true.

"But they said none of that made any difference. That the only thing they could do was to give me X-ray therapy."

X-ray is often used against advanced cancer, and sometimes with excellent results. There are many cases on record of inoperable cancers cured by X-ray. But Peggy Longoria's disease was so extensive and deep-seated it was doubtful that X-ray could penetrate the cancer effectively, without destroying too much healthy tissue.

By now, Peggy recalls, a kind of defiant anger had begun to cover the shock and the fright. "I said if it was that hopeless, the sooner I got out of that hospital and brought my baby home, the better." She found herself flailing blindly at all the mystifying cruelty of the world. "Why should I waste my time here, getting X-rays that won't help me," she cried. "I want to go home."

Bob Longoria urged his wife to try the radiation; at least it was something. But Peggy was adamant. At her wish, she was discharged from the hospital early in October 1955. Her parents drove down from Pittsburgh with Alicia. Peggy threw herself into the routine of running her house, pouring out as much furious, exhausting energy as she could—so there would be no time or strength left to think about herself, or about what might happen tomorrow.

She walked the 2 miles into town, pushing Alicia in a stroller. She cleaned incessantly and cooked enormous meals. But the shadow was always there, and the voices of the doctors were always echoing in Peggy's mind.

The next weekend, they drove to her parents' house for a happy visit—hoping that a change of scene and other loving faces besides Bob's might shake them free of the gnawing, constant fear.

It seemed to help, a little. But no sooner had they returned to Bethesda than a new terror struck. Eating an apple in the kitchen, Peggy had an attack of intense chest pain. She took a couple of Navy-issue APCs and went to bed. The next morning the pain was gone, but it returned frequently. Her appetite disappeared and she began to lose weight. Then, for the first time, Peggy found herself facing the one thought that she had never permitted herself before—the thought that she might die.

And Bob—her strong, protective husband—had to face it, too.

Seven days of agony went by, as the Longorias tried to teach themselves to live with the thought of death constantly between them.

And then, suddenly, incredibly, Bob came home one night smiling. His voice shook, and he could hardly control his excitement. One of the Navy doctors had called him and told him that they had a new experimental drug—one that might help Peggy—at the National Cancer Institute.

Peggy would not even listen. "I don't want to go to another hospital," she said, "If I have to die, I want to be home with my baby and you."

Bob had to plead with her to accept the gift of hope. "The drug may work. If it doesn't, Alicia is going to be without a mother. At least you ought to give it a chance."

"It's an experiment, isn't it?" Peggy said doubtfully. "I don't want to be a guinea pig."

That upset Bob for the first time. He said, "Even if it doesn't help you, they may learn something that will help another mother with a young baby."

Suddenly, Peggy felt that she was being selfish. "All right," she said at last, "I'll go and talk to them."

The next morning she went to see the Navy doctor. He drove her to the nearby National Cancer Institute and introduced her to a young Chinese-born specialist, Dr. Min Chiu Li, attending physician in the endocrinology branch.

The National Cancer Institute, part of the National Institutes of Health, is a Federal hospital entirely devoted to clinical research. It does not accept just any cancer patient; it seeks out those who suffer from conditions it is researching. Patients who are admitted get the finest medical care at no cost.

Dr. Li explained that one of the diseases that the NCI was beginning to investigate happened to be choriocarcinoma, the rare disease Mrs. Longoria had. It usually starts in pregnant women in the placenta, the membrane that transfers food and oxygen from the mother to her unborn child. Dr. Roy Hertz, in charge of endocrinological research at the Institute, had become interested in this disease.

One of the symptoms of choriocarcinoma, Dr. Li told Peggy Longoria, is the secretion of a hormone, also found in normal pregnancies. It is called chorionic gonadotropin, and can be measured in the patient. Shortly before Peggy came to his office, Dr. Li had happened to recall an unusual experience which he had once had with this hormone. This recollection proved to be crucial to her survival.

When the doctor had served at Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research in New York City some time previously, a patient with a cancer known as malignant melanoma had been secreting the chorionic gonadotropin hormone. Given a new, highly poisonous anticancer drug called Methotrexate (which is called an antifolic, since it acts opposite to folic acid), the patient stopped secreting the hormone, even though the melanoma was not cured.

Nobody knew why this had happened, but Drs. Li and Hertz had decided to try Methotrexate on choriocarcinoma patients who could not be helped by any other means. Was Mrs. Longoria the proper patient to pioneer this treatment? The doctors thought so, and Dr. Li offered Peggy the chance to be the first such patient in medical history to try it, if she so chose. Would she take the chance? And if she did, what if she got worse instead of better?

Peggy Longoria trusted Dr. Li. She feared the drug, but was willing to try it on his recommendation. Yet she stubbornly refused to enter the hospital.

Dr. Li said, "This drug is poisonous, and we don't know very much about how it works. We have to have you in the hospital for your own safety."

Mrs. Longoria was as unwilling to hope as she had been to despair. "I really gave him a rough time," she said recently. "If I'd been Dr. Li, I'd have said, 'OK, then, go on home and stop bothering me.' But he was very patient."

Finally, a plan was worked out: Mrs. Longoria would ask her parents to come for Alicia. She would enter the hospital, on the condition that she could go home every day between four in the afternoon and midnight to stay with her husband.

She began coming to the hospital on October 12. She walked in looking healthy and feeling well except for those occasional stabs of chest pain. However, Dr. Li had seen her X-rays, and these revealed a shocking picture of her true condition. They showed "extensive bilateral pulmonary metastases, which were rapidly enlarging." Unless these cancers in her lung were stopped, they would soon kill her.

It wasn't long before they almost did.

Without warning, on October 22, 3 days before her third wedding anniversary, Peggy Longoria was in the hospital when she was stricken with an almost unbearable pain on the right side of her chest. She had been sleeping with her arm under the pillow, and she could not even bear moving it. She could scarcely breathe. Summoned by a nurse, Dr. Li sent for the X-ray unit and called the staff for consultation. The films, developed immediately, showed that her right lung had been perforated by the tumor and was hemorrhaging badly. Although she was immediately given blood transfusions, the hemorrhage was draining blood faster than it could be replaced. Her condition worsened so quickly that the surgeon did not think he could operate; he doubted that she could survive anesthesia. None of the usual measures could be used to help her. Sadly, the doctors came to the one seemingly inescapable conclusion: Peggy Longoria was dying.

Dr. Li stepped into her room and softly asked where he could reach her husband.

"You can't call him," she whispered. "He's in class."

"We need him here," the doctor said. "You're on the critical list."

In spite of her pain, Mrs. Longoria gasped, "You won't get his number from me." Stubbornly, she didn't want Bob to lose ground in his schoolwork, no matter how much she longed to have him at her side. Dr. Li left the room; 15 minutes later he had tracked Bob down, not far away, and had him brought to the hospital.

Now there was only one slender hope left, Dr. Li knew. This was Methotrexate, the powerful poison. He had not yet had time to try it, and there was almost no time left. Quickly, he consulted Dr. Paul Condit, the staff pharmacologist. The two men decided the only way to use the drug effectively and in time was to inject it directly into a vein.

This was as desperate a last-ditch decision as any doctor has ever been forced to make. True, Methotrexate was not a new drug. It had proved useful in slowing the progression of leukemia and of some other types of cancer. But it had never cured a human cancer. It had never been tried against choriocarcinoma. Moreover, the approved ways of giving the drug were by mouth, or intramuscularly. It was so toxic that injecting it intravenously in a large dose might kill the patient.

Nevertheless, Dr. Li felt he simply had to take the risk. He wanted Mrs. Longoria to get Methotrexate while she still had a chance to live. He had had no experience with this chemical. But Robert Longoria had authorized him to do what he felt was right. And Dr. Hertz had put him in complete charge of the case, which meant that Hertz approved any reasonable decision Li had to make.

Dr. Li's dilemma was almost impossibly agonizing; it seemed no matter which choice he made, he risked instant death for his patient.

"I remember exactly how I felt," Dr. Li said recently. "Here was a dying woman; the surgeons were not able to operate to stop her bleeding. If she continued to hemorrhage, she would certainly die. On the other hand, if I gave her an experimental and poisonous drug, and she died afterward, I might be blamed for her death. Yet I felt that if I used the drug under such desperate circumstances, I would at least be making an attempt to save her life. So I decided that I would rather take the chance of being blamed for her death than do nothing and let her die.

"Dr. Paul Condit worked out a possible dose that might be injected safely into the vein. Then we prepared the injection and gave it to her intravenously. It was a massive dose. This was in the late afternoon. I watched her as long as I could, then it became necessary to see other patients who needed attention."

Dr. Li visited Mrs. Longoria frequently; each time he could see her gasping for breath. When he left the hospital at 1 in the morning, she was still fighting for her life in an oxygen tent; she was getting constant blood transfusions to counteract hemorrhage. She was very cyanotic—her skin was bluish in color, meaning that her body was not getting enough oxygen.

"I lived across the street from the clinical center in an apartment with my family," Dr. Li recalled. "I went home, but I could not sleep that night; I was thinking about Peggy Longoria. Wondering if the drug might help her. When I came back to the hospital at 7 in the morning, she was still alive, and her general condition had improved slightly. I visited her many times throughout the day. She continued to hemorrhage, but there was some reason to hope. She was holding her own long after one might expect."

The next day, another cruel decision had be made: to quintuple the dose of Methotrexate, and again to give it intravenously. Now there was a much greater chance than ever of poisoning Mrs. Longoria, but there was no choice: she had to be moved out of the critical stage in the shortest time. Again Dr. Li did what he felt was right. He remembers: "To our gratification, the larger dose did not affect her adversely. In fact, it made her much better.

"The following day Mrs. Longoria was definitely improved. At that time we had the laboratory report on the titer (amount) of chorionic gonadotropin in her urine. There was a tremendous drop, from about 20,000 international units of the hormone down to about 500 units, almost normal. This was a sign. Then I knew that the drug was going to work. It was a feeling of tremendous elation. But she was still bleeding, and needed more transfusions."

Mrs. Longoria was aware that she was barely among the living. "The pain never let up; they kept giving me some kind of painkiller," she recalls. "It made me very dopey—at one point I woke up and 2 days were gone out of my life, a complete blank."

Mrs. Longoria knew, however, that she was very far from being out of danger. The Roman Catholic priest visited her, and asked her if she wanted the last rites of the church. Naturally, this frightened her greatly. "I had it in my mind that if you got the last rites," she says, "that was the end." But the priest told her it was customary to give the rites to patients on the critical lists; that many recovered after having gone through the ceremony. Mrs. Longoria gasped out her assent. The rites were then administered at 10 minutes to midnight; at 12, the doctor told her later, the hemorraging stopped.

"To tell the truth, I think that's what did it," Peggy now says. "That's certainly the way it happened. Ten minutes after the priest blessed me, an X-ray showed I stopped bleeding."

Miraculously, the improvement continued. "Mrs. Longoria left the oxygen tent on the fourth day," Dr. Li says, "and from that time her tumors began to shrink."

Mrs. Longoria now seized upon the doctor's new hope with all the strength left within her. Her husband visited her every day. He and her family prayed for her. But recovery was slow and uncertain. She had five courses of Methotrexate during the next couple of months. The doctors could see clinical improvement, but because of toxic reactions to the drug Peggy Longoria couldn't keep her food down. She was too weak to get out of bed. Finally, around the middle of November, she was able to sit up. Then talk began about her getting up.

"Dr. Li said I could have Thanksgiving dinner with my husband in the room. Then Bob could wheel me to the elevator and up to the top floor. We could go out if the weather was nice."

As Peggy grew increasingly excited about the prospect of this treat, the nurse took her temperature. She was running a high fever. The doctors told her she had a kidney infection.

"I had to lie down in bed again, and when Bob came for that wonderful Thanksgiving dinner, there I was. He tried to cheer me up, but I didn't know what to think. It didn't seem that I was ever going to get out of bed, much less get well. And the pain in my chest never let up."

The long, listless, bedridden days did not seem to want to end. Peggy was very weak. She had lost 55 pounds. Most of her auburn hair had fallen out—a side effect of Methotrexate therapy.

Then one of the staff doctors suggested she might like to see her daughter. For the first time in weeks, Peggy's blue eyes grew bright, "Yes," she whispered. "I want my baby."

Her parents were called and drove to Bethesda. As they entered her hospital room, Peggy Longoria held out her emaciated arms, and the child was placed next to her. Alicia whimpered a little—it had been so long since she had seen her mother—but she did let Peggy hug her. For a few minutes, Margaret Longoria forgot her pain.

Somehow, her baby gave her strength. As soon as Alicia had left, Peggy rang for the nurse and said, "I want to try sitting up." And she did.

Each day she would sit up a little longer. Then she began dangling her feet over the side of the bed. At last came the day when she stood on her feet. "I was weak, but not dizzy," she recalls. "I walked over to a chair and sat down. Then I began to get the big idea that I could go home for

Christmas dinner. I began to pester Dr. Li and the others to let me."

The doctor, now really encouraged, told her, "When you can walk the length of the hall, you can go home for a weekend."

In a week, on her husband's supporting arm, Peggy Longoria was able to navigate the distance. And one night her husband found her waiting for him at the elevator.

"How did you get here?" he asked, surprised.

"I walked," she said proudly, "all by myself."

Still, there was danger of hemorrhage and death if she left the hospital, and her Christmas visit was postponed until New Year's. In anticipation, she washed what was left of her hair. Even this small symbol of a return to normal life proved too much of a strain for her weakened resistance. She began to sniffle, and when Bob came to fetch her, he was shocked to find her in an oxygen tent with a heavy cold.

It seemed that no matter how hard she tried to get on her feet, some malevolence was always crushing her. Yet the stimulation of her daughter's visit and her husband's unflagging support spurred her to try again.

When she left the oxygen tent this time, her appetite began to return. At last she could eat and retain food. Dr. Li ordered thick milk shakes for her. "There was one always beside my bed," she remembers, smiling. "I can't stand the sight of a chocolate milk shake to this day. I was down to 62 pounds from 117. I had practically no hair. My mouth was sore from the drug. It seemed I would never leave my bed, or my room, or the hospital."

Doggedly she pushed herself to begin walking again. Soon she could traverse the hall two and three times. She began asking when she could go home. She wanted so much to be there for Alicia's second birthday on February 10.

When Peggy Longoria had gained 2 pounds and continued to show no recurring signs of cancer, Dr. Li said she could be discharged.

"After all those setbacks, I kept my fingers crossed," she says. "I would not let myself be sure until the day he signed the release." That day was February 1, almost 4 months after she had entered the hospital.

"We had to keep Mrs. Longoria in the hospital until we were reasonably sure of her recovery," Dr. Li explains. "There had never been a case like her. We had nothing to go on. The disease was in complete remission, but we never knew when the drug might lose its effect, as it had in other cancers."

Both Longorias remember February 1 as a cold day, but bright with sunshine. "Maybe it just seems sunny now," Peggy reflected recently. "We were so happy. To be walking out—and I could walk—alive, on my own two feet."

"It was the greatest day of our life," Bob Longoria recalls, "when I came to get her in the car, and I knew she could leave for good."

He brought her a warm suit. "I began dressing for the first time in 4 months," Peggy said. "Bob had brought my nylons and, when I pulled them on, I began to cry. My legs were so skinny—like canary legs. The stockings hung like bags." Then she began to think that nothing, nothing in the whole world, was really as important as one incredible fact: She was going home. "No matter how I looked, I was leaving," she says. "I hurried into my skirt. Pulled it over my head and it dropped to my ankles. There was nothing to hold it up—no flesh. But this time I laughed. I was on my way home with my husband."

A good many of the hospital staff dropped what they were doing to watch this living testimonal to medical progress walk out of the hospital in which she had almost died. There were smiles, tears, pats—and then Robert Longoria put his arm around his wife's thin shoulders and guided her to the elevator. On the main floor he wrapped her in a blanket, and they walked to the car.

When they reached their cottage, Bob insisted that his wife lie on the sofa while he cooked a steak for dinner. "When I saw him stumbling around in the kitchen, I couldn't stand it," Peggy Longoria said. "I got up and did the cooking. I let him wash the dishes."

It had taken Mrs. Longoria more than a month to gain 2 pounds in the hospital. At home she put on 8 pounds the first week, and today, leading a happy, completely normal life, she is waiting to rejoin her husband at his latest Navy post overseas.

"It is more than 9 years since she left the hospital and ended her medication," Dr. Li reported not long ago. "We checked her once a week for the first 6 months, then less often. Her lungs healed of themselves, without an operation. The hospital still measures her hormone titer every 6 months—she has been free of choriocarcinoma since December 1955." Ever since 1956 she has also had a full head of hair, and today so much more is known about the dosage of Methotrexate that hair loss has almost been eliminated as a side effect of the treatment that was pioneered in her case.

Encouraged by their success with Mrs. Longoria, quite literally the first cancer patient ever to be cured with a chemical, the National Cancer Institute sent out calls across the country for more cases of choriocarcinoma and related tumors. In about 6 months they had admitted five more women with advanced cases of the disease—all, in fact, were considered terminal.

All five did as well as Margaret Longoria: Although they had been near death, they showed complete eradication of cancer (although one patient later died of drug-poisoning).

Since then, the hospital has treated more than 100 cases of choriocarcinoma. About half were cured with Methotrexate. Those who do not respond to this drug are now given a powerful antibiotic called Actinomycin–D, which cures an additional 25 percent. And still more of the stubborn cases are cured with a third chemical: Vincaleukoblastine, made from the periwinkle.

Thus, today, according to Dr. Roy Hertz of NCI, about 80 percent of all cases of choriocarcinoma, including the most advanced cases, treated with drugs at the National Cancer Institute are being cured. The treatments originated at NCI are now being used all over the world, and this has tremendous importance for women in other countries; for, in underdeveloped areas, choriocarcinoma is a common disease, perhaps 10 times as common as in the United States.

New tests have been developed to find choriocarcinoma in its early, preinvasive stage, so it can be cured with drugs alone, without a hysterectomy. Women alive today have had healthy babies after recovering from choriocarcinoma.

Peggy Longoria says of her case: "It was a miracle." She is right—but it turned out to be only the first of many, for Mrs. Longoria's miraculous recovery is one result of years of painstaking research by literally thousands of scientists. The drug that saved her life was discovered in another place, by someone she never knew, for another purpose. And now it is one of about 25 anticancer drugs that have been developed—all in the last 18 years.

Unhappily, very few cancers are actually cured with chemicals. But, in an increasing number of cases, they prolong life and diminish pain. Perhaps even more important, about 50,000 substances a year are being checked out for possible effectiveness against various types of cancers. Too, chemotherapy remains only one aspect of cancer research. Other techniques offer still more hope of eventual cures or possibly even prevention of cancer, so in time to come, the anguish and final triumph of Peggy Longoria will be, even more than now, a milestone in a history of hope and courage.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART CXL

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns the effort to bring new business concerns to New York.

It is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis" and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on June 4, 1965.

The article follows:

New York City in Crisis—Businessman Seeks Idea Agency

(By Barrett McGurn)

New York State will take a page out of the books of eager beaver areas such as Atlanta, Boston, and Chicago in an effort to drum up new business, according to the terms of a bill the speaker of the assembly, Anthony J. Travia, of Brooklyn, is introducing in the legislature.

The bill calls for a special government department to hunt up ideas for new and expanded businesses. The purpose is to combat a serious decline of much of the New York metropolitan economy relative to the rest of the Nation.

Behind the bill is the acting labor commissioner of New York City, James J. McFadden, who said yesterday:

"Why the h—— hasn't this been done before? That's a good question. But the point is to do it now."

FIVE MILLION DOLLARS

The agency will cost $5 million the first year. The AFL–CIO is behind it so legislative passage is considered a good possibility. Backers of the measure are at work now trying to guarantee that Governor Rockefeller will sign the bill.

The gist of the measure is to provide for the small businessman the same sort of opportunity-tracking agency which large corporations consider an integral part of their own operations. Commissioner McFadden cites General Motors, Du Pont, and Alcoa as having their own built-in research programs as an essential part of growth and planning. The new group will be, in effect, the poor businessman's research bureau.

Behind the move is frank admiration for the way Boston has lured whole blocks of highly capitalized advanced research corporations to areas near the campuses of Harvard and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

A BOOM

Also back of it is an admission that a business-sparked revolution in Atlanta has begun to boom that Georgia City in part at the expense of New York, and a confession that Chicago's studies of growth possibilities in the areas of plastics, new metals, electronics, biomedical engineering and vacuum technology have set the greater city of New York an example of how to fight decline and woo expansion.

Part of the plan is to tap the research talents of the many New York State colleges and universities (thus emulating Atlanta, which called on Georgia Tech for much of the brainpower in the hunt for growth areas).

The bill will state as a legislative finding that 350,000 residents of New York State pound the streets every month hunting for jobs and that "many more" do not even bother. "(They) have given up the search for work because the labor market has no place for them."

THE JOBLESS

Behind the legislation is a double consideration: that New York City has a quarter of a million unemployed on the one hand and 50,000 high-skilled jobs going begging on the other.

Rather than try to find handyman jobs for the hundreds of thousands of illiterates, high school dropouts and skill-scant Negroes and Puerto Ricans, the business-fostering council will work at the other end, trying to generate additional high-salaried, high-talent tasks for New York, Commissioner McFadden said.

The thinking behind this apparent anomaly is that the many college and universities in the megalopolis Boston-to-Washington area centering on New York ought to be harnessed more effectively. If they get work, jobs will be created automatically for those further back in line, the commissioner calculates.

SHOTS IN ARM

Attempted shots in the New York arm are not new. As a matter of fact, Speaker Travia had to change the name of his bill to omit the phrase "job development council" because New York State already has a $100 million program with precisely that name. The latter is a device for long-range low-interest loans to business. It does not include an idea-generating agency such as the one at the core of this scheme.

Back of all this is frank concern about business and industrial trends in the New York metropolitan area. New York City has 1 out of 16 American jobs, an impressive total, but in the last 5 years the city has added only 1 job for every 99 created elsewhere in the country. Figures of that sort, collected by the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics, excited Commissioner McFadden's interest in a hunt for new business possibilities.

The McFadden-Travia plan is in a sense one political answer to a problem which has provoked the formation of a businessman's self-measure in the same field, the "Committee of 14," top corporation executives who are studying the same critical issues in a search for solutions.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART CXLI

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article on New York City's continuing education crisis.

The article is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis," and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 7, 1965.

The article follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—OUR SCHOOLS: STAGGERING PROBLEMS

(NOTE.—There are more than 1 million public school students in the greatest city in the world—and their educational complex is in turmoil. The intensity of cross-pressures has brought about the ouster of both the school superintendent and the chairman of the board of education. In this, the first of five articles on "New York City in Crisis: The Schools," education editor Terry Ferrer and education writer Joseph Michalak examine the system's awesome problems.)

(By Terry Ferrer and Joseph Michalak)

There are children who cannot count up to six.

There are pupils in academic high schools who do advanced computer work and pupils in those same schools 8 years behind in reading.

There are Puerto Ricans—more than in the capital city of San Juan—who come here and cannot even speak the English they are supposed to learn to read.

There are slum children who go to school primarily to eat a hot lunch, because they're hungry at home.

There are Park Avenue children, Red Hook children, Harlem children; a few of the very rich, many of the very poor and a shrinking percentage of those in the middle, intellectually as well as economically.

Put them all together into one gigantic school system. Try to run its 850 schools from one central headquarters in Brooklyn. Find and put into effect a curriculum equally suitable for a ghetto child in Harlem and a budding Einstein in Queens. Arrange for almost 47,000 teachers to use this curriculum intelligently. Find 7,500 new teachers each year. Beg or bludgeon city hall and Albany into providing a billion dollars a year to pay the bills.

And, most important, teach more than a million pupils—a staggering number that exceeds the total population of three States, Vermont, Wyoming, and Nevada.

For it is these million-plus—as heterogeneous a cross section of children as can be found anywhere in the world—who are the million and more reasons why New York City's schools always seem to be in a state of crisis.

Obviously, there are more reasons: a public blindness to the fact that good schools need huge sums of money to be good; past city administrative tendencies to give the schools what's left after the myriad of other demands on the city's treasury have been met; dragging the school system into both Democratic and Republican politics; the mushrooming influx of unprepared southern Negro and Puerto Rican pupils; the accelerating flight of the whites to the artificial suburbs that ring the city and leave its center to rot like a cancer in the body politic.

To compound these crisis-laden educational and civic problems, the city's school system has just been through the worst 5 years in its 111-year existence. The culmination has come this past school year when the triple issues of integration, growing teacher militancy, and a redtape-choked bureaucracy combined to wrack the schools with almost unbearable tensions. The strained system snapped so violently that both the first outside school superintendent, Dr. Calvin Gross, and the president of the board of education, James Donovan, were toppled from their jobs.

Whatever the capabilities or shortcomings of either of the two men may be, their roundabout but firm ousters were the climax to a declining public confidence already brutally assaulted in the last half decade. The school-construction scandals of 1961, topped by the ouster of the old school board by the State legislature during an election year; the recent profiteering by school custodians with the funds allotted to them in lump sum; two teacher strikes, and talk of another next September; three boycotts by civil-rights groups and one by white parents. The list of seemingly endless crises grew and grew.

TOO DEFENSIVE

As Acting Superintendent Bernard E. Donovan said in a recent interview: "We have been subject to constant attack from various quarters, and these attacks have put us on the defensive. We spent so much time on defense that we had no opportunity to act to improve the schools, no time to convince the public of excellence."

It is true that most of these crises did not involve the day-to-day teaching and learning, the heart of any school system. But even the process of education suffered from lack of funds, from lack of vision about the special and neglected needs of the slum child, and from the blackeyed image of the schools that repelled good teachers here and across the country.

As a result, many a New Yorker was ready, like the slum child, to write on the wall: "School stinks."

Just how bad are the New York City schools? And how soon will it be before the question becomes: How good are the New York City schools?

The debits are still high:

A State education department survey found that, from elementary through high school, city pupils fell below those elsewhere in the State in such subjects as reading and mathematics in 30 of 32 tests. The average vocational high school student is 2 years behind in reading—a skill that should be perfected in elementary school.

School vandalism reached its peak this year, to the tune of $1.27 million.

One of every four schools is more than 50 years old—the age at which most schools are considered about ready for razing.

Blackboard jungles still exist in schools corroded by community deterioration. The board of education itself has revealed that pupil assaults on teachers now average one a day.

There is a Harlem school where 95 percent of the pupils are 2 years behind in every subject, and there are others almost as bad.

Hundreds of classes in the city system have a complete turnover of students during the course of a school year, as slum-area children move from one one-room apartment to another. Last year, 295,000—28 percent of the total enrollment—didn't finish the year in the school that they started in.

There are not enough textbooks to go around in many schools, and some of them, including science texts, were published 25 or more years ago.

One of every four high school pupils drops out before finishing—at a time when there is no room in the job market for the unskilled.

Finally, there has been enough teacher turnover in the last 6 years to staff the entire city school system afresh. Furthermore, 3 out of every 10 teachers are substitutes—not even licensed to teach regularly.

THE OTHER SIDE

The credits, too, are high, although the public at large may not believe it. Some of the finest high schools in the country are in this city, and that goes beyond such special schools as the Bronx High School of Science. For example:

City high school pupils take far more than their per capita share of such national competitions and college scholarship programs as the Westinghouse science talent search and the Woodrow Wilson national fellowships for a year's graduate study for those considering college teaching. In Westinghouse prizes, this city, with 1.7 percent of the Nation's high school students, has had 22 percent of the winners in the 24-year history of the competition. In Woodrow Wilson fellowships, the figure is 6.5 percent.

For the first time in half a century, first-graders—60,000 of the 85,000—are receiving a full 5 hours of instruction. And short-time instruction is on the decline throughout the grades—and is expected to be eliminated in elementary schools by 1967.

The vandalism bill may be high, but New York City ranks only fifth in the Nation in per pupil damage. Richmond, Va., for example, has double this city's rate.

One in every three of the city's schools has been built in the last 6 years—primarily in ghetto areas, which need new schools most.

Despite the cruel battles of integration, the city's higher horizons program has become a national example of excellence in raising the sights of culturally deprived children to college and beyond to a rightful place in society.

The prekindergarten program administered by Dr. Martin Deutsch for the children of the ghetto was cited by President Johnson in his education message of last January as the kind of outstanding program in preschool training that all deprived children should have.

The per pupil expenditure for textbooks has more than doubled in the last 3 years, and, budget permitting, will jump to $8.95 next year, against the $2.81 spent in 1961-62

Dropout prevention programs have cut the rate from one in three 3 years ago to one in four now.

The city does experiment with such new methods as team teaching—in 147 of its 850 schools; nongraded school organization; foreign language starting in the fourth grade, new science and mathematics curriculums, and educational television. The board of education will open its own educational television station, UHF station 25, next September in the Westinghouse Vocational High School in downtown Brooklyn.

This year, the number of substitute teachers dropped more than 1,500 from last year's record high of 15,000. And school officials, licensing regular teachers at a record pace as salaries improve rapidly, predict that the trend will be accelerated in the years ahead.

Finally, the board has set policies and begun plans in the last few months that bid fair to provide valid, long-range solutions for as much integration as is possible in the city; to break up the giant bureaucracy headquartered at 110 Livingston Street, Brooklyn; and to enlist the aid of the city's teachers in improving schools rather than constantly face their strikes.

DECENTRALIZATION

Parents, whether white, Negro, or Puerto Rican, have often complained—with ample justification—that there is no way for them to get their individual school complaints heard, let alone remedied, at board headquarters. So they have boycotted for and against integration speed and scope, picketed board headquarters endlessly, and taken to the newspaper and the television screen all of their bitterness and frustration.

Beginning this fall, they will be able to take their problems to 1 of the 30 districts into which the city system will be split. Each district will have its own superintendent with new powers and its own local school board, serving about 28 schools and 35,000 pupils. The huge million-pupil school system will be broken up into segments each the size of Jersey City's system.

To spread maximum integration, the 50-year-old structure of the city's schools will be changed within the next 7 years. The present 6-3-3—6 years of elementary school, and 3 years each of junior and senior high school—will be regrouped into a projected 4-4-4 pattern. This means 4 years of elementary school—preceded by kindergarten and new prekindergarten programs—4 years of a brand-new intermediate school replacing outdated junior highs, and—for the first time—4-year comprehensive high schools, serving academic, vocational, and general pupils under one roof. (The single-trade vocational high schools, such as printing and maritime trades, and the four special schools for the gifted, like Stuyvesant High School, will continue.)

Even as threats of a third teachers' strike increase from the United Federation of Teachers—sole bargaining agent for the city's teachers since 1962—the board has been working behind the scenes with the UFT to enlist its aid in a long-term program to secure still more funds from the city, the State, and the Federal Government.

Such joint board and UFT efforts could do much to remove the city's schools from the political jockeying that has surrounded past negotiations and strikes, when the UFT has scurried secretly to both Democratic Mayor Wagner and Republic Governor Rockefeller to get extra funds to sweeten teacher raises.

Past attitudes of both government and ordinary citizens in New York City have been on the level of "maybe we won't need schools next year," says Dr. John H. Fischer, president of Teachers College, Columbia University. Dr. Fischer—who was head of the State Education Commissioner's special integration committee that produced, a year ago, the integration blueprint that the board has adopted—said in a recent interview:

"People in this city judge the whole system by the school that their child is in. If the child happens to be in a poor school, they feel the whole system is poor. But they have a right to feel that way, because as far as their child is concerned, the poor schooling is the only schooling he will get. But for improvement, we must concede that education's needs go on from year to year. We must get away from the attitude that 'maybe we won't need schools next year.' Expenditures for education have to be viewed differently from paving the streets and collecting the garbage. Education should be a long-term capital investment.

"When we need new airports and bridges," Dr. Fischer continued, "we get them because we know that we can't get along without them. We tend to give the schools what's left over. We start with the answer and try to reword the problem to fit the answer. Thus the problem gets worse."

ALLEN ENCOURAGED

But Dr. Fischer said, "a number of things are moving now, and very much in the right direction. There is more encouragement than in a long, long time."

State Education Commissioner James E. Allen, Jr., is equally encouraged. "The city has more money from the city, the State and the Federal Governments, including new poverty money. I'm more encouraged than I ever have been since the advent of the new board of education in 1961. Everything isn't rosy—it never will be in New York City. But Acting Superintendent Donovan is grabbing hold of things, and he and the board are moving forward realistically in educational matters."

Everything isn't rosy, and all of the city's schools are not yet on the broad highway to excellence. But for the first time within memory, they have turned the corner from crisis to solution, from despair to hope.

YEAR 1960 VERSUS YEAR 1965

Enrollment: then, 977,531; now, 1,054,201.

Ethnic composition: then, whites, 633,582 (64.8 percent); Negroes, 197,517 (20.2 percent); Puerto Ricans, 146,432 (15 percent); now, whites, 567,775 (54.5 percent); Negroes, 286,401 (27.3 percent); Puerto Ricans, 190,465 (18.2 percent).

Teachers: then, 38,850; now, 46,502.

Substitute teachers: then, 10,970 (28 percent); now, 13,617 (29 percent).

Teacher salaries: then, $4,500 (minimum), $8,700 (maximum); now, $5,300 (minimum), $11,025 (maximum).

Operating budget: then, $553.4 million; now, $910.2 million.

State aid: then, $188.2 million (34 percent of budget); now, $277.2 million (30.4 percent).

Per-pupil expenditures: then, $541, now $752.

Capital budget: then, $72.6 million; now, $181.9 million.

H.R. 10050: A STEP FORWARD IN ALLEVIATING THE SUFFERING OF LABORATORY ANIMALS

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill, H.R. 10050, to provide for humane treatment of laboratory animals. This new and progressive bill has made it possible for the first time to bring together in a united front with respect to laboratory legislation, the two largest national humane societies, the Humane Society of the United States and the American Humane Association.

Practically every important action taken by the Congress is based upon what I would like to call the public conscience. In our hearts, we, the people of the United States, have strong feelings about what is right and what is wrong; and we seek to promote the right and right the wrong by passing laws which require the minority of people whose conscience is difficult to awaken to get in step with the conscience of the majority.

One wrong—and a very grievous wrong it is—that has been weighing heavily upon the conscience of many people who are familiar wth the problem, is the tremendous amount of suffering to which millions of animals are subjected each year, in the medical and pharmaceutical laaborities of this country.

Part of the suffering is unavoidable. Our conscience tells us that it is better for a few hundreds—or even thousands—of animals to undergo pain if this may result in the alleviation of suffering and improvement in the health of millions of human beings. Only a comparative handful of so-called antivivisectionists believe that it is morally wrong to use animals in such ways for the benefit of humans, and I and most other humanitarians are not numbered among them. But the demonstrated fact is that a great deal of the suffering of laboratory animals is not necessary for any legitimate reasons connected with the advancement of human welfare, that it is avoidable suffering which has become a part of our medical experimentation and the production and testing of drugs, largely because we have been too preoccupied with helping humans to take the trouble to help the animals.

This problem has been greatly accentuated by the tremendously rapid growth in the use of animals in laboratories in recent years, spurred primarily by the great increase in financial support by the Federal Government to medical experimentation, and by the success of our drug manufacturers in developing new remedies which have resulted in large profits, a part of which have been channeled into additional research and development. Over $1 billion is appropriated by the Federal Government annually for medical research. It has been estimated that the number of animals used each year runs into the hundreds of millions. With the increased use of laboratory animals and its attendant suffering there has come a growing realization on the part of humanitarians, many scientists, the general public, and the Congress that no civilized society can permit the continuance of the appalling amount of needless cruelty to the animals who contribute so much to human welfare, and which have suffered mutely unprotesting, for our benefit.

In this and in the preceding Congress I introduced bills designed to provide for the protection of laboratory animals without impairing legitimate medical research. Other bills, which contained what many humanitarians considered to be weaker provisions, were introduced by other Members of the Congress, in an attempt to satisfy critics of the proposed legislation who were fearful that it would interfere with medical research or the freedom of those conducting the research.

These criticisms were especially directed at certain provisions which have become shibboleths of some scientists. In my opinion, much of this criticism was uninformed and emotional. It related in large part to things which were matters of form rather than substance. But this did not prevent its standing in the way of obtaining passage by Congress of the desired legislation, which increasingly seemed to be pushed far into the future, perhaps by decades. Meanwhile, the animals would continue to suffer.

This above all, I have not wished to happen. Together with others, one of whom was my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers], I have tried to cooperate with the leading humane societies of this country to find a solution for this problem. A tremendous amount of work and thought has gone into this effort.

We now feel confident that we have found such a solution. We have been able to prepare a bill which eliminates the principal features of other bills which were anathema to the scientific community, without weakening the essential principles designed for the protection of animals. In fact, on an overall basis the bill we have come up with, when it is passed, should do more to protect the animals against avoidable suffering than any other bill that has been introduced in the past, including the ones sponsored by me, yet great care has been exercised to protect the research laboratories and pharmaceutical manufacturers against punitive and cumbersome interference with their operations.

The substance of this bill has made possible obtaining the concurrence of Mr. Rogers, who is an influential member of the House of Representatives Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which will have to pass on any such legislation before it is considered by the House as a whole, and who is chairman of a committee investigating the operations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

My distinguished colleague from Florida [Mr. Rogers], has introduced H.R. 10049, as a companion to my bill. I am confident, also, that all other Members of Congress who have shown concern over this problem by introducing bills or otherwise will now find that in this new proposal we can all unite to protect the laboratory animals without in any way hamstringing the efforts of the scientific community to find new ways of attacking human health problems.

This new approach to the problem utilizes the essential and reasonable protective features of the original Pepper bill, but incorporates them in a different form and with some excellent new features. In formulating this new approach we have utilized a great deal of information and experience that was not available at the time the original Pepper bill was written. Among these is the recently published British Report of the Department Committee on Experiments on Animals, headed by Sir Sydney Littlewood, which deals exhaustively with the experience under a law which has been operative in Great Britain since 1876, nearly a hundred years. This committee gave full opportunity to scientific and medical as well as humane organizations to make known their views on those matters, based on actual experience rather than just theory.

The Rules of the House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker, do not provide for cosponsorships of bills, but it is customary and highly desirable for Members of the House who wish to strongly indicate their connection with and support of proposed legislation to introduce the same bill under different numbers. Knowing that other House Members have been so interested in this problem, I hope and expect that they will contribute to the passage of the bill by also introducing it under their names.

There is no pride of individual authorship here, either on the part of Members of Congress or the individual humanitarians and humane societies that participated. We are all part of a common effort to live up to our public conscience by doing everything possible to prevent suffering of the laboratory animals without preventing the benefits to mankind that stem from their use.

I am proud, indeed, to have had a part in this joint effort. And I wish to compliment all others who have had a part in this achievement, including my good friend, Mr. Rogers, for the patience, reasonableness, ingenuity, and effective hard work which has gone into what I feel confident will prove to be the successful accomplishment of an important humane goal toward which we have all been struggling for so long.

It would be impossible for me in this brief statement to review all of the features of my new bill and compare them with those of the original Pepper bill. However, I would like to mention one important item.

In the original Pepper bill administration of the proposed act was placed in an agency which would have been established in the Department of Justice. This was based on the belief by many humanitarians that placing such an agency in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, where from an administration point of view it might seem to belong, would subject those charged with enforcement of the act to pressures from other important agencies in the Department concerned with animal experimentation and the decisions of the Secretary coming strongly under the influence of such other agencies.

Scientists, however, maintain that they could not be expected to have technical matters related to medical research and drug production and testing decided by a lawyer in a Department concerned with law rather than health problems. This presented an impasse which long has stood in the way of obtaining effective regulation of animal usage in the laboratories.

We finally have been able to work out language, which is incorporated in the new bill which Congressman Rogers and I have introduced, which would remove any legitimate objections on this point from either side to the controversy. There would be established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an independent Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare, headed by what we have called a Coordinator of Laboratory Animal Welfare, who would be appointed by the President. The language establishing this office is, in effect, identical with that which established the Military Court of Appeals in the Department of Defense. The actions and decisions of this court of appeals are not subject to reversal by the Secretary of the Department of Defense, and the court reports directly to Congress in justifying its budget.

In short, the Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare is truly an independent agency, but placing it in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will give ample opportunity for the constant mutual contacts and interchange of technical information which are essential to intelligent and reasonable enforcement of the proposed act. For the record, I wish it to be known that this is the intention of the framers of our new bill, and legal experts in this field assure us that it will be the effect of the wording which has been used in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for this opportunity to make what I hope has been a sufficiently clear statement of my reasons for substituting for the original Pepper bill, H.R. 3036, my new bill, H.R. 10050, which I believe to be much superior to the old bill and which I fervently hope will receive early passage now that we have removed the reasonable objections to the original bill and have worked out a proposed act which should effectively eliminate the avoidable suffering of laboratory animals without in any way interfering with legitimate research and the production and testing of drugs required to improve the well-being of mankind.

NATIONAL PARKINSON WEEK RESOLUTION

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today I have written our good friend and colleague, EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, about a House Joint Resolution 571 which I introduced on July 8 which proclaims the week of October 25 of each year National Parkinson Week. I am offering that letter to my colleagues so that they may know the importance of legislation in the field and I hope they will join with me in introducing the same resolution.

Letter to Hon. EMANUEL CELLER is as follows:

JULY 26, 1965.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to emphasize the importance of the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 571, which I introduced on July 8. This resolution would authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning October 25 in each year as National Parkinson Week. Parkinson's disease, which strikes without warning and is still a mystery to the medical profession, has afflicted more than a million and a half Americans. Too often these individuals are forgotten by all but their families and close friends, because most people, if they have heard of the disease at all, know only that it is incurable. Parkinson's disease affects each individual differently, sometimes taking a number of years to bring helplessness, sometimes moving much more quickly. The person with Parkinson's disease suffers little physical pain, but much mental anguish, for he no long controls all movements of his body, and his frustration increases as the disease progresses. Sometimes drugs help, but all too often doctors can only shake their heads in despair.

But it is far too early to give up hope for an eventual cure. We have seen time after time that incurable diseases finally succumb to the weapons of modern science and the investigation of determined and dedicated men and women. Today, thousands of men and women are attacking the problem of Parkinson's disease on two fronts: rehabilitation of the individual who already has the disease and research into the causes of the disease and possible cures. These committed scientists and lay workers know that there is always a solution to even that most heartbreaking and hopeless problem.

The National Parkinson Foundation has been in the forefront of the fight against the disease for almost 10 years. In 1962, the foundation opened the first Parkinson rehabilitation, diagnosis, and research institute in the world. This institute, located in my own city of Miami, serves every patient who has the disease. Many medical disciplines are united as a team in order to individualize treatment for each patient. This is essential, for the disease takes many differenct courses and affects each person in a different way. The institute also serves as a great research tool, for it is a reservoir of Parkinson patients available for direct information, and the institute staff has also compiled useful statistics about each patient.

Mrs. Jeanne Levey, founder of the National Parkinson Foundation, deserves the thanks of every one of us concerned for the welfare of those with the disease. She became aware of Parkinson's disease, and the lack of adequate medical knowledge to treat it, when her own beloved husband, S. Jay Levey, president of Chicago's Beck-Lee Corp., developed a strange tremor in his hands. After consultation with many specialists, the Leveys finally learned that Mr. Levey had Parkinson's disease. Mrs. Levey, with rare courage and fortitude, began the struggle to gain national support for a program to conquer Parkinson's disease. Her efforts have met with notable success: certainly there is much more to be done, and Mrs. Levey and her friends still push ahead with determination, but the past few years have seen the growth of the National Parkinson Foundation, the beginnings of the institute, and a great increase in research and rehabilitation efforts.

Mrs. Levey has received help from many people in all walks of life. I am glad that the National Parkinson Institute has received two Hill-Burton hospital grants from the Federal Government, with the assistance of Florida health officials. Bob Hope, whom we know as a warm and very funny man, has donated his services to the National Parkinson Foundation many times, and his efforts have brought in thousands of dollars. Many individuals have contributed time and money to the foundation, enabling it to expand operations and to grant even more money for research at universities across the country and at their own institute.

Parkinson's disease was first described in the early 19th century, but until recently it has been ignored by society as a whole. Through the efforts of those like Mrs. Jeanne Levey, Parkinson's disease is now fought with all the weapons of modern medicine. Much has been accomplished, but Parkinsons disease still ranks third in the number of people struck down each year.

House Joint Resolution 571 is necessary to bring the full light of national publicity to bear on Parkinsons disease. We have always found that national attention and concern focused on a serious problem will eventually lead to a solution. National Parkinson Week would be the start of a national campaign to control this disease, uniting the medical profession, the press, and all agencies and individuals interested in a national program for the control of Parkinson's disease. Certainly this proposal is in full accord with President Johnson's program to eradicate disease and improve the Nation's health.

In closing, I would like to emphasize again the importance of the work being done by the National Parkinson Foundation, through their institute, through their research grants, and through their program of public information and special help for those suffering from the disease. Organizations like the National Parkinson Foundation illustrate once again the importance, indeed the necessity, for the work of private groups, and dedicated individuals, in the health field.

You would do me the favor of requesting the various departmental reports and if I or my office can be of any assistance to you or to your staff please do not hesitate to call or write.

Warm regards, and believe me,

Very sincerely,

CLAUDE PEPPER,
Member of Congress.

THIRTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my fellow Members of the Congress a most enlightening and thought-provoking speech by Gov. Robert Sanchez Vilella of Puerto Rico on July 25, 1965, on the occasion of the 13th anniversary of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. It was my pleasure to be among the guests attending the anniversary ceremonies in San Juan. I was delighted to be there, as I always am to visit Puerto Rico.

I would like to thank the distinguished Resident Commissioner, Hon. Santiago Polanco-Abreu, and his charming wife, for the many courtesies extended during our all too brief visit to Puerto Rico.

Gov. Sanchez Vilella reminded his listeners of the great strides the people of Puerto Rico have made during the past 13 years of self-government. I commend the Governor for his illuminating speech, and I take this opportunity to express my personal interest in the welfare of the Puerto Rican people and extend to them my good wishes on this anniversary.

Gov. Sanchez Vilella's speech follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY GOV. ROBERTO SANCHEZ VILELLA ON THE 13TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO, JULY 25, 1965

Honorable Representative of the President of the United States; distinguished guests of honor; honorable visitors; members of the three branches of government, friends, and fellow citizens, today we commemorate once again the greatest act of political creativity which our peoples have accomplished. Exactly 3 years ago, on a similar occasion, two historic letters were made public. Former Gov. Muñoz Marín wrote to the late President John F. Kennedy that our people should again be consulted on their political relations with the United States of America. The late President was in total agreement with this aspiration. On that same occasion, we were honored to have among us the man who is now President of the Nation. Lyndon B. Johnson said then that the exchange of letters constitutes: "a historic reaffirmation of our belief in the self-determination of peoples, when exercised with the acceptance of the responsibilities of freedom."

As a result of that exchange and that belief, a commission was created—composed of American citizens from Puerto Rico and from the continent, and with representation from all sectors of opinion—to study all the aspects of our relations with the United States of America. The Commission is making this study because we are proud of our present relationship with the United States, and because we want to improve it. It is also making this study because we want finally to liberate the energies of our people from the narrow dilemma of political status. We will succeed.

I am confident that the work of the Commission and the subsequent acts of our people and of Congress will result in the reaffirmation of our will, expressed time and again in the ballots: the will to associate with the United States on the basis of a compact of political equality. But regardless of the deliberations and studies made by the Commission, the Commonwealth now is a way of life which is beyond the determination of any Congress or any Commission. It is, and it has been for 13 years, our way of life.

LET US TAKE AN INTROSPECTIVE LOOK

We have no doubts about the meaning of Commonwealth status for our people. We know what it is; we live what it is. It has never been defined better than in the few words pronounced here 2 years ago by its main architect and exponent. Luis Muñoz Marín said then: "Commonwealth is not a theory that is described and proposed to me; Commonwealth is what I am living in my body and in my spirit every day of my life; it is what I am living and feeling in my work, in my hope, in the development of the future of my children; Commonwealth is this and nothing less than this."

In the past, we have heard on similar occasions many voices congratulating us on this breakthrough from narrow nationalism and on our contribution to the constitutional life and thought of the hemisphere. But today let us alter the direction from which we have traditionally regarded our creation on days such as this. While our relationship with the United States is being studied, let us, for the first time in 13 years, look introspectively at our Commonwealth.

Let us ask ourselves what use have we made of the powers obtained 13 years ago. Let us reply to ourselves how this constitutional system—an essential part of our creation, a system called "beautiful and formidable" even by the greatest opponents of association as a solution to our political status—serves our people. Let us see how we are developing democracy in our self government and how this process will continue in the future.

WHAT LEADERSHIP MEANS

Our government and party system is a real democracy; it has a solid base: we are responsible to the people, not as an idea or an abstraction, but to 2½ million human beings each one as important as the other. We have chosen this system of parties and elections as the means of expression of popular opinion. But the popular will cannot be unanimous. When voting, the voter does not mean to say that he is in absolute agreement with all of the platform or all of the actions of his party. The mandate is consensus, not unanimity. The parties, the government itself, is and should be a reflection of that reality. So that this system may produce the greatest benefit for our people, we must maintain an harmonious relation of consensus among the three branches of government and among all parties, a relation of common direction, of common purpose. We have to fulfill the people's mandate.

The exercise of power is necessary to achieve the common purpose, to fulfill that mandate. It is necessary and healthy that there be strong leadership; leadership that marks the route clearly; leadership that offers alternatives and gives the reasons for the selected course of action; the leadership of reason. It is necessary and healthy that such authority be exercised by the executive. It should be used to the maximum and continuously, without evasion and without encumbrances. But it is the authority of the law, the authority of the institutions, and the authority that our people delegated to their executive in the constitution. Absolute power does not educate in democracy. Limited power does. We have to account to the people for the exercise of that authority which is in reality and in the last instance, exclusively their own.

Our people will produce excellent leaders from among themselves. But we must seek excellence in normality. We must become accustomed to normality in the nature of men and in the functioning of institutions. We must search for and promote excellence in normality, because the gigantic stature of Luis Muñoz-Marín will not be repeated in our history.

The exercise of constitutional authority must be accompanied by the exercise of political power. But to engage in politics does not mean politicking. Political power is an instrument whereas moral principles are goals. If the cost of exercising political power is the surrender of basic principles that one sustains, it is too high a price, and it is a price which people never demand.

LET US GO TO THE PEOPLE

The people of Puerto Rico, our people, understand this far more and far better than has ever been recognized. In our recent history, economic and social progress took precedence over political development; and political development was confused with the question of our status, our relationship with another country. It is one of the tasks of this new era to equate our political development with our economic and social development. It is a task of this new era to continue purifying our democracy.

The collective wisdom of the people is always greater than that of the leaders that represent them, or that of political organizations. People have prevailed over hundreds of political machines, men and structures through the centuries, and they always reject those that depend on mere politicking. The intraparty dialog or the search for a consensus in our country cannot be founded on the basis of norms imposed by certain structures or groups. The enormous majority of our people reject the assumption that he who differs is an enemy. They already know that there is always more than one alternative, and that they are really the only final judge.

We must go directly to the people. The ballot will always prove their wisdom. The people entrust their government with the solution, not the evasion of their difficult problems. And all of us in government are required to assume the responsibility of solving them. In recent years, some did not assume their responsibility to do their jobs, because the colossal figure of a great leader could respond for them before the electorate. Times have changed. We are widening the base of our government and each one must assume his corresponding task. Our people are going to ask each one of us, every 4 years: How many difficult problems did you aid me to solve? What did you do to help me?

IDEAL FUNCTIONING OF OUR THREE BRANCHES

So that we can answer to their satisfaction, I want to leave with you today some thoughts on the ideal functioning of our system of self-government.

The executive branch must determine priorities among the collective needs, and it must remain continuously sensitive to the human relations of which they are evidence. It must remain always alert to the new and old problems of the country in order to propose solutions. It must prevent at all costs complacency, bureaucratization and self-deception. We must devote to this task the highest degree of imagination and initiative. The people are going to judge the extent to which the executive initiates and directs, with dedication and capability, the solution of their collective problems.

The legislative branch must in turn vigorously represent its respective constituents in establishing a clear consensus; and it must firmly demonstrate its self-respect. It must give the most profound and careful study to the problems of the country, with a clear vision of our common purpose. It must at all costs avoid superficiality, politicking, and the pettiness of conflicts of interests. We must provide it with the means to devote the greatest possible time to its work and to attract to its ranks the best of human quality. The people are going to judge the extent to which it collaborates, with vision and depth, in the successful solution of their collective problems.

The judicial branch must firmly express its independent criteria, and assume the responsibility for its effective operation as well as the efficient administration of its functions. It must foster mutual respect among its components and an harmonious relation with those that represent the people's will. It must at all costs avoid idleness, politicization, and disorder. It must be provided with all that is necessary to inspire maximum respect and dignity. And will itself be judged on the extent to which it can guarantee, day by day, to our citizens the sacred rights of the law.

In the relationship among the branches, in spite of the functional separation which constitutional order obliges us to maintain, there must exist a close and hormonious collaboration of spirit. There must be all the agreement permitted us within the limits set by the people in their Constitution. There must exist communication without intervention.

THE FUNCTION OF POLITICAL PARTIES

The picture of our self-government would not be complete were we to omit mention of the function of political parties. On this subject, it is sufficient to repeat the prophetic and illuminating words of Luis Muñoz Marín. Long before becoming Governor, he gave us the rule to follow when he said:

"The best public administration can only be achieved if it acts on the basis of a clear idea of the relations in a democracy between politics and public administration.

"We all know what the ideal function of minority parties is: a mission to criticize all that they honestly feel should be criticized and corrected; and to cooperate in all that they honestly feel deserves promotion and support.

"The government and the majority party, both being expressions of the people, must have a common purpose: the establishment and development of the program of public action approved by the people in the elections. But the political party and the government have different things to do, as a result of their common origin in the people, and as instruments of their common objectives for the people.

"The political party is created to propose and discuss solutions before the people and to facilitate the exercise of voting rights. Beyond that, the political party cannot intervene determinatively without risking, in the long or the short run, good public administration.

"This is due to the fact that behind the political party is the people; that the interest of the people must always be dominant over the interest of the political party as such; and that in the interest of the people is the best possible public administration."

THIS IS OUR GOVERNMENT

That is the illuminating word. Here is our reality: We have begun since last January 2, the healthy process of differentiation in action. The function of the three branches of the government and the parties is seen now without the presence of a charismatic leader. We see in action the total dimension of our constitutional system. It is our system of self-government, and it deserves to be so under any political status. It is a democratic government. It means that there is a popular mandate, and that we are responsible only to the people. I have described the role which I think corresponds to each of us who works in government. Our respective oaths give us that responsibility, and we assume the duty to fulfill it. Our people, on the other hand, will assume their own duty.

I am determined to serve honorably to fulfill my duty. I shall never do my own will, but that of my fellow citizens. Our democratic system provides that the people shall judge every 4 years. And judge they will. The people of Puerto Rico will respond to the confidence that I have deposited in them, and they will give me their confidence for as long as necessary, until we fulfill our final purpose: greatness for Puerto Rico.

The institution, the system that will serve us as the means to this goal, is the one we are honoring today. It is the Commonwealth, it is our constitution. Let this day serve to repeat with love, the phrase that is the essence of self-determination and freedom. Let this day serve to reiterate with dedication the phrase that expresses the obligation of each one of us, of every Puerto Rican. Let us all say, with pride: "This is our government."

Thank you.

POTATOES

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Hathaway] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Monagan], should demand low prices on potatoes at a time when this administration is trying to alleviate poverty in this country—Record, July 21, 1965, page 17691. For over 10 years my distinguished colleague has had his wish and the consumer has had low prices on potatoes. One would say that this is well and good. Yet, does the Representative from Connecticut realize that these low prices were the cause of intense poverty in many areas of Maine? My colleague feels that each potato he buys simply makes some Maine farmer rich. This is far from the truth. The vast amount of debt accumulated in the past decade by the Maine potato industry is just beginning to be paid.

The Representative from Connecticut said that he had no complaints when the prices were low because he thought them satisfactory. Of course, he had no complaints; the price was so low that often, it did not even cover the cost of production. If potato prices had been truly satisfactory in past years, certainly no one would have complained, but I emphasize that the prices have not been satisfactory. Rather, prices have been disastrously low.

My colleague makes an unusual statement:

> When prices rise and luxury items start moving into Maine and Idaho, then comes the time to ask questions.

I believe that it is the Maine and Idaho farmers who have the questions to ask. Does the Representative consider Maine and Idaho areas which should never see a new car or a television set? Does he believe that Maine and Idaho should remain in the backwash of the general prosperity? Perhaps he would prefer hunger and poverty in some areas of the country in order that other areas can profit? Profiting at the expense of another's misery is surely not a worthwhile objective.

Certainly there is a shortage in the potato market, as pointed out by my colleague. But, this shortage was caused by severe growing conditions last fall. Since we in Congress cannot as yet control the weather by legislation, we may as well get used to less-than-perfect conditions in the commodity markets. The only alternative is Government-set prices and I doubt that my colleague would be satisfied with these as they would have to be high enough to give the farmer a fair return and thus would be higher than the satisfactory prices of past years.

Maine farmers have subsidized the potato-buying public for almost 15 years with such low prices on potatoes that they were not even profitable to produce. It is high time these farmers obtained a reasonable return on their investment. It is time that the Representative from Connecticut realized that the Maine farmer cannot grow potatoes at a loss indefinitely just so everyone else can enjoy unreasonably low-priced potatoes.

It is time the Maine farmer shared in this era of prosperity. To begrudge him the only period of prosperity he has enjoyed in many years is unjust and to call for the previous low prices does a disservice to the hard-working farmer.

ROYD RAY SAYERS (1885–1965): PHYSICIAN, SCIENTIST, AND ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Congress from one of our greatest mineral producing States, Pennsylvania, I have long followed the careers of those who have made significant contributions to the mineral industries and the safety and well-being of our miners. Few have done more in these respects than the late Dr. Royd Ray Sayers, who, so far as I have been able to ascertain, was the only physician ever to serve as the Director of the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior.

It was, therefore, with the greatest interest that I read the biographical sketch of this eminent scientist by Charles Will Wright and Arno C. Fieldner, distinguished authorities in mineralogy in the June–July 1965 issue of the Bulletin of the Cosmos Club of Washington, D.C.

In order that the indicated sketch of Dr. Sayers may be recorded in the permanent annals of the Congress, I quote it as part of my remarks:

[From vol. 18, Cosmos Club Bulletin, June-July 1965]

Royd Ray Sayers (1885–1965)

Royd R. Sayers, M.D., a member of the Cosmos Club for over 42 years, died of cancer on April 23, 1965, at the Bethesda Naval Hospital following a disability suffered in an automobile accident a year and a half ago. An unusually gracious gentleman and physician, Dr. Sayers was a recognized world authority on many industrial medical problems. He was distinguished for the variety and scope of his studies and for his initiative and leadership in the field of industrial hygiene. He had a truly remarkable career.

After finishing public school in Crothersville, Ind., where he was born on October 25, 1885, he entered Indiana University. There he was made an assistant in the chemistry laboratory and took "all the chemistry there was," graduating with an A.B. degree. In 1907 he took his A.M. degree and was appointed electrochemist for the U.S. Mining, Smelting & Refining Co. at Gisella, Ind., and later the same year became chief chemist for Gould Storage Battery Co. at Depew, N.Y. In 1910 he started medical studies at the University of Buffalo School of Medicine and the next year was appointed professor of electrochemistry and physical chemistry at the university, teaching these subjects while studying medicine. After a year's internship at Buffalo's Marine Hospital he took his M.D. degree in 1914. Soon thereafter he was commissioned assistant surgeon in the U.S. Public Health Service, his first assignment being with the contagious disease ward at Ellis Island.

In 1917, following a tour of sea duty on the Coast Guard cutter *Comanche,* Sayers began a remarkable 16-year detail with the U.S. Bureau of Mines, his work starting with an investigation of the unusual prevalence of tuberculosis among the lead and zinc miners in Missouri's Joplin district and particularly with an accompanying occupational disease known as "miner's con." He found that it was silicosis of the lungs caused by the inhalation of silica dust produced by the drills operating in the quartz crystals prevalent in these mines. He instituted a system for periodic X-raying of the miners and initiated development of wet-drilling methods to prevent the formation of silica suspensions in the air the miners breathed.

During this period he served also as chief of the Bureau's health and safety division and as chief surgeon, and his activities spread over many of the mining, metallurgical, coal, and petroleum investigations of the agency. He made extensive studies of the effects of high temperatures and humidities in metal mines on the health and working ability of miners and recommended remedial measures. He investigated the extent of lead poisoning in the smelters handling lead-containing ores. He and his associates studied the asphyxiating action of carbon monoxide, hydrogen sulfide, and other poisonous gases resulting from mine fires and explosions; and in the 1920's they began experimenting with oxygen-helium mixtures to minimize the hazards of caisson disease in deep sea diving. While the investigation was in progress the Submarine 51 sank off Newport, R.I. The oxygen-helium mixture was used and proved that henceforth it would play an essential part in eliminating the bends.

Dr. Sayers directed the physiological work of pioneering investigations on the effect of ethyl gasoline and its combustion products on public health. He directed a study of the addition of chemical warning agents to nonodorous natural gas, and as a result most natural gas is now odorized. In connection with the Bureau of Mines investigation of the proposed ventilation of the Holland vehicular tunnels under the Hudson River, he directed the medical aspects of the experimental tunnel driven into the Pittsburgh coal at the Bureau's experimental mine near Pittsburgh that proved out the method adopted. He and his coworkers developed a valuable new method for the quantitative determination of carbon monoxide in air and in the blood, and they were leading advisers in ventilation operations of subsequent vehicular tunnels.

In 1933, Dr. Sayers was recalled to the Public Health Service, where for 7 years he served as medical officer in charge of the Office of Industrial Hygiene and Sanitation, and then, in 1940, President Roosevelt appointed him Director of the Bureau of Mines. As wartime Director, he inspired the Bureau staff to give full cooperation to the military and defense agencies with respect to minerals and mineral products. Particular attention was given to statistics on production and availability of strategic minerals, developing low-grade domestic deposits, increasing the production of fuels for war work and helium for aircraft, and research and development of pilot plants for the production of synthetic liquid fuels from coal and oil shale, and fortification of our relations with Canada and Latin America with respect to mineral supplies and mineral surveys.

In 1947, Sayers returned to the Public Health Service and also became chairman of the Medical Advisory Board of the United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund. After he retired from the Service in 1950, he served as senior medical supervisor for occupational diseases for the Baltimore City Health Department.

Dr. Sayers was a voluminous contributor to the literature of industrial medicine and hygiene, beginning in 1920 with an article on first aid. He published many technical papers on mine-rescue standards, silicosis among miners, carbon monoxide in blood and air, mine dusts and gases, pulmonary diseases, ventilation, lead and mercury poisoning, accidents and injuries, explosions, anesthesia, food fumigation, etc. He was active in many medical and scientific organizations, nationally and internationally—too numerous here to enumerate. Among the many medals and awards he received in recognition of his outstanding accomplishments and services were the Knudsen Award in 1941, the highest honor in the field of industrial medicine; the award of the National Commission on Rehabilitation, in 1949; and the highest honor award and medal of the U.S. Department of the Interior—the Distinguished Service Award—in recognition of 34 years of outstanding Government service.

CHARLES WILL WRIGHT (1904).
ARNO C. FIELDNER (1919).

PANAMA CANAL ZONE: REPREHENSIBLE JOURNALISM

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, students of Panama Canal problems learn early in their experience to recognize fallacious propaganda in respected organs of the mass news media.

The latest example of such effusions is a column written from the Canal Zone by a Washington journalist, Charles Bartlett, published in the June 24, 1965, issue of the Washington Evening Star. Because this writer, is grossly inaccurate in his statements and conclusions, presents a prejudiced point of view acquired from someone who is highly anti-American, does not tell crucial facts about the gravely important canal questions that ought to be revealed, and quotes me out of context, I feel impelled to comment upon it at greater length than perhaps the article merits. Discussions of a number of its excerpted assertions follow:

First. Assertion: "Animosities bred by the Canal Zone residents are being countered at last by unselfish exertions of the Peace Corps."

Comment: This is an unwarranted aspersion against loyal civilian employees of the United States who bear the principal burdens for maintaining, operating, sanitating, and protecting the Canal Zone and Panama Canal in a land of endless bloody revolution and political instability. Our citizen employees on the isthmus have always had Panamanians among their friends. The missions of the Peace Corps are not in the zone and this Corps bears no responsibility for the Panama Canal but is engaged in bestowing money and services to Panamanians paid for by U.S. taxpayers. The author's comparison is both irrelevant and invidious.

Second. Assertion: "Peace Corps volunteers in Panama have standing instructions to minimize their contacts with the Canal Zone and its residents."

Comment: This is a most interesting allegation, and I have requested full information from the Director of the Peace Corps.

Third. Assertion: "Everything that the Peace Corps hopes to achieve in Panama is at loggerheads with the attitudes and demeanor of the 'Zonians'."

Comment: "This is another slur against U.S. citizen employees that raises questions as to the nature of the alleged conflicts. I have requested full information on this matter.

Fourth. Assertion: "The surprise is that Canal Zone employees have made no serious effort in the 18 months since their unpopularity exploded into bloodshed."

Comment: The alleged unpopularity of our employees was not the cause of the January 1964 Panamanian Red-led mob assaults on the Canal Zone. These assaults were planned well in advance and were largely the work of trained revolutionaries whose objective, based on spurious claims of sovereignty over the Canal Zone, was, and still is, wresting control of the Panama Canal enterprise from the United States.

Fifth. Assertion: "The instinct of the Zonians to expand their comforts without thought of the natives on the other side of the street fence."

Comment: This is an illiberal assault on loyal U.S. employees that is unpardonable on the part of a supposedly experienced Washington journalist. Canal Zone towns are comparable to well managed towns in the United States. Zone houses are not palaces, but clean, modest homes as required for life under oppressive tropical conditions, and may be likened to homes in the United States for people performing similar services. This propagandist does not compare the slums of Panama with the palatial residences in Panama City. Does he wish the Canal Zone transformed into a slum rather than to serve as a standard for emulation?

Sixth. Assertion: "Many strips of zone land could be returned to Panama without impairing the canal. Beautiful Balboa Hill where the Governor's residence overlooks the city, could be returned to its sovereign owners."

Comment: This statement reflects sheer ignorance in that this columnist apparently does not know that the only sovereignty that Panama possesses is that of a reversionary nature in the sole event the United States should abandon the Panama Canal. Nor does he seem to understand that the United States purchased at liberal prices all land and property in the zone, including Balboa Heights from individual owners, making our jurisdiction one based upon private ownership as well as on the grant of exclusive sovereignty. Since the Governor's residence is located on the side of the Acon, not Balboa Hill, in an area known as Balboa Heights, this columnist is obviously confused or mendacious.

Before this journalist attempts another article on the Panama Canal question, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he look up the comprehensive bibliography on the "Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States—Documentation, 1955–64," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prepared by my colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON] and do some homework and consult some authorities on the subject rather than merely act as a mouthpiece for anti-American sources. If he would prepare himself in this manner, he would learn precisely what I have frequently stated and shall continue to assert: that where there is responsibility there must be authority, that our sovereign status in the Canal Zone has been confused by the ill-advised display of two flags in the zone, that our sovereignty over the zone should be clarified and reaffirmed, and that, instead of reducing the zone, its area should be extended to include the entire watershed of the Chagres River—all this not for oppressive purposes but solely to enable the United States to carry out its treaty obligations to the world at large, including Panama to maintain and operate the canal in adequate fashion for world commerce.

In brief, as previously indicated, the columnist named is guilty of making statements that are grossly fallacious. They do no credit to him, his country, his paper, or his profession. The Panama Canal and those who have successfully maintained and operated it have suffered too long at the hands of such fly-by-night publicists who, wittingly or unwittingly, seem to have no purpose in mind except to further the policy of revolutionary communism with respect to the canal and, in so doing, employ the usual Red practices of absolute distortion and misrepresentation.

In the course of my addresses in the Congress, I have repeatedly stated that I have no quarrel with any just claim of Panama in the premises and I have opposed claims that are unrealistic, revolutionary, wholly destructive of our Government's authority to maintain and operate the canal and which, if they were granted, would destroy Panama as a nation.

In order that the Congress and the Nation at large may have the full text of the above indicated article, I quote it as part of my remarks.

[From the Evening Star, (Washington, D.C.), June 24, 1965]

CONTRASTS IN AMERICANS OVERSEAS

(By Charles Bartlett)

PANAMA CANAL ZONE.—The happy contrast between the new and old styles of American life overseas is nowhere more striking than in Panama, where the animosities bred through the years by the Canal Zone residents are being countered at last by the unselfish exertions of the Peace Corps.

Peace Corps volunteers in Panama have standing instructions to minimize their contacts with the Canal Zone and its residents. This is absolutely necessary, because almost everything that the Peace Corps hopes to achieve in Panama is at loggerheads with the attitudes and demeanor of the "Zonians."

The unbustling helpfulness of these young volunteers as they go about the impoverished villages of the interior is having its effect. They are deeply sensitive to the impact of their conduct.

A Peace Corps couple was arguing at breakfast in a restaurant in Santiago. The husband said he did not want to spend $2 to buy material for dresses for the little girls in their village. Their vacation in Peru had left them flat broke. The wife gently replied that she had the money and was going to buy the cotton. But the volunteers cannot even freely indulge in the joy of giving because they know that a cultivation of the spirit of self-help is more lasting than charity.

In justice to the Zonians, it should be said that they come here to maintain a canal and not to make friends. The surprise is that they have made no serious effort at friendlier dealings in the 18 months since their unpopularity exploded into bloodshed. "They hate us more than ever," said one distinguished Panamanian.

The obduracy of the old outlook among these 32,000 Americans was indicated by the testimony of the Canal Zone Governor, Robert Fleming, to Congress in April. Justifying $200,000 for a second swimming pool, Fleming declared, "There are no beaches in Panama, you know." The fact is there are three beaches close to downtown Panama but they are rigidly preempted by Americans. One is even reserved for officers. A Panamanian has to drive for an hour to enjoy the nearest beach that is open to him in his own country.

Fleming justified an operating deficit of $60,000 for the Tivoli Guesthouse, a Zonian social center, by saying, "It is essential to have a guest facility."

Panama now has splendid hotels that make it questionable to maintain this huge anachronism, which served as a fortress in 1964 and is viewed bitterly by the Panamanians.

Fleming requested $30,000 to build a glass-enclosed announcer's booth at the high school football field. This structure will be located almost within sight of thousands of Panamanians who live in the most wretched cardboard housing in the hemisphere. The glass booth, the Tivoli deficit, and the new pool are minor items in the canal budget but they symptomize the instinct of the Zonians to expand their comforts without thought of the natives on the other side of the steel fence.

These fences themselves are thoughtless irritants. They have no relation to the canal whose locks alone are vulnerable. Many strips of zone land could be returned to Panama without impairing the canal. Beautiful Balboa Hill, where Fleming's residence overlooks the city, could usefully be returned to its sovereign owners.

These small gestures are extremely important because the large ones are complicated and slow to materialize. The rotation of the canal workers to populate the zone with less colonial-minded residents would be a valuable but difficult step. The controversial commissaries, hated by all classes of Panamanians and a corrupting source of contraband, presumably will be closed by the new treaty. But even this step will have to be taken slowly because it will cost the jobs of about 6,000 Panamanians.

The security job classifications, which reserve the best jobs for Americans, are a problem. The security label is regarded as a slur by the natives and the preferential hiring of Americans, which facilitates Zonian nepotism, creates many frictions. Changes can be made but the Canal Company now has less than 1,500 Americans in security jobs and nobody suggests that they should all be replaced.

The winds of change are blowing hard in Panama. Representative Daniel J. Flood, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, maintains that the mere negotiation of a new Panama treaty is a cowardly act of appeasement. The unpleasant fact is that if a new treaty is not signed and if it does not reflect more of the Peace Corps spirit than the Zonians, the United States will have an unpleasant mess on its hands.

ONE NATIONAL LABOR POLICY, NOT FIFTY

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Minish] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I favor passage of H.R. 77. I was opposed to right-to-work laws before I was a Member of this body. I campaigned in support of our party's pledge to repeal section 14(b) in 1960 and in 1964. I support it now.

As a former official of a labor organization, I might be assumed to be naturally disposed to favor repeal of section 14(b). However, I would favor such repeal under any circumstances.

May I explain, Mr. Speaker. This Federal Republic established a labor policy in 1947. The policy was to permit the union shop, and to prohibit the closed shop.

I cannot honestly say I feel prohibiting the closed shop was a wise or a necessary step. But I am not standing here to defend the closed shop or to criticize the 80th Congress. Wiser men than I have already done both, in words which I cannot hope to rival. With respect to the 80th Congress, I would add, "or would dare to repeat."

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that we have had a national labor policy since 1947, nearly 20 years. It has become a part of our labor-management relations system. It has worked, not entirely to my satisfaction, but it has worked.

And then we have had section 14(b) for nearly 20 years also.

This was supposed to preserve the rights of the States to further restrict union security. It permitted the States to prohibit the union shop, the maintenance of membership shop, and the agency shop. In fact, section 14(b) permitted only one kind of shop—the sweatshop.

That was, I say, nearly 20 years ago. Since then we have had millions of dollars and millions of words wasted and we are about where we were then with these laws. Some 19 States now have right-to-work laws. Several others have enacted them and repealed them. Several have considered such laws and turned them down.

Since 1958 only one State, Wyoming, has passed such a law. Indiana repealed her law this past January. The voters in Oklahoma and New Mexico recently turned down such a law.

In other words, even the States themselves have not shown any substantial interest in section 14(b). Most of the right-to-work laws do not provide for any machinery, except appeal to the courts, for their enforcement. The States with such laws have appropriated practically no money to administer them. The tradition not to spend any money on labor problems, except for State police and special deputies, is too strong in the right-to-work States to permit even enforcement of right-to-work laws.

Mr. Speaker, I think this experiment in undercutting a national policy in the name of State's rights has proven itself to be worthless. They say these laws protect the rights of the individual worker. Three-quarters of all industrial workers live in States without such laws. Nearly 90 percent of all union members live in States without such laws.

States are repealing these laws, not passing them. Where they exist, they are not enforced. Who really benefits from these laws? Not the workers, certainly.

This policy is bankrupt. Let us get back to the fundamental principle that we have one national labor policy. One policy—the same in each State. Not 50 policies and a license for employers to hunt for a hole to hide in to get away from the union.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that if I were able to speak directly to my fellow members, I would say to those Representatives from the right-to-work States—you do not need section 14(b). There is not 1 State among the 19 which will not live and prosper without it.

Does the State of Florida think it can not grow oranges and attract tourists without it? California can and does. Does Tennessee need it to prosper? Does Kansas? Does Iowa? Does Georgia? Does North Carolina? Does the great State of Texas?

It is not a union question, Mr. Speaker. It is a question of national policy. We ask for responsibility in labor-management relations. Let us start by giving all unions in all States the right to negotiate contracts which permit them to be responsible. Most union contracts contain union shop clauses. Let us make it national policy for all of them to be able to do so. One policy for all unions, for all States, for all our citizens.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, last week we observed the seventh annual Captive Nations Week, authorized by Congress in Public Law 86–90, passed in July 1959. In connection with this observance, the Christian Science Monitor, published an editorial on Saturday, July 24, entitled "Captive Nations Week." I ask unanimous consent permission to have this editorial printed with my remarks in the RECORD:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

This year, as every year since 1959, the third week in July is being observed in the United States as "Captive Nations Week." The lands referred to are the nine smallish countries of Eastern Europe (excluding East Germany and Yugoslavia) now included within the Soviet bloc.

As in the past, the Assembly of Captive European Nations seeks to remind the world that some 100 million Europeans live under an alien rule imposed from without and which they would not have chosen through a free vote. The Assembly also hopes to convince the free world that the latter has a continuing obligation not to forget those lands and peoples and to do whatever is feasible to speed their independence.

It is impossible not to feel a deep sympathy for the hopes and efforts of the Assembly. Communist control of Eastern Europe is far away the greatest and brutalest example of imperialism and colonialism on the face of the globe today. While the oftenberated West has been freeing one colony after another, Communist colonialism has shown not the slightest intention of following suit.

But, while agreeing with the Assembly's assessment of the tragedy of Communist colonialism and while regretting that this colonialism is not following the more enlightened example of the West, we believe that there is greater hope for the captive nations of Eastern Europe than at any time since Communist hegemony was established following World War II. This does not—at least as yet—forebode an early end to Communist control. But there are multiplying signs that both an individual and a national impulse toward freedom is making itself increasingly felt.

Police control, while oppressive by freedom's standard, is less harsh and arbitrary. Governments are feeling a greater obligation—or necessity—to provide a more comfortable life for the average citizen. Nationalism, as contrasted with unthinking subservience to Russia, is on the rise. There is greater travel both into and out of the Communist lands of Eastern Europe.

All of this must have its long-range effect upon Communist control. This control may not, at least for an extended period, be shaken off. But it may well be greatly modified.

Furthermore, there is general agreement that the peoples of Eastern Europe feel a rising desire for closer relations with the countries and peoples of Western Europe, and that, within limit, this desire is shared by most of the Eastern European governments. Thus, slowly but steadily, there is a drawing-together of the two great divisions of Europe. We doubt if, on the long pull, anything can halt this process.

A MOMENTOUS APPOINTMENT

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram carried an admirable editorial on July 22 concerning President Johnson's appointment of Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg as Ambassador to the United Nations succeeding the late admired Adlai E. Stevenson. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial entitled "A Momentous Appointment," included with my remarks in the RECORD:

A MOMENTOUS APPOINTMENT

President Johnson's choice of Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg as Ambassador to the United Nations has been met with enthusiasm in Washington, wonder in U.N. circles in New York, and at least fleeting regret by Justice Goldberg. It was an unexpected but excellent choice.

In Washington, where Justice Goldberg is best known, he enjoys tremendous respect and popularity as a tireless negotiator of undimmable optimism, a man of great intelligence and energy. Although he is not experienced in foreign policy, he is a man of the world, familiar with international problems, and we expect his strangeness to the international group in New York will soon be dispelled.

In fact, it should reassure the United Nations people that President Johnson has chosen a man of action rather than a diplomatic figurehead to succeed Adlai Stevenson, and furthermore a man matching Stevenson's intellectual caliber. The United Nations will not discourage Goldberg; his admirers feel that if anyone can break the stalemate on U.N. dues payments, he is the one.

We believe Justice Goldberg's statement that he wished the President hadn't asked him to step down from the Supreme Court to take this post should be taken for a frank recognition of the nature of the change and left at that. Though the U.N. ambassadorship is of Cabinet rank, it is temporary and political in nature and carries far more prestige than power. Justice Goldberg, however, is said to feel that the opportunity to serve in the cause of world peace outranks the sinecure of the Supreme Court. He is patriotic enough to do his President's bidding, and it must be presumed that he supports the foreign policy that he is now assigned to defend in the court of world opinion that is the United Nations.

It is also possible that Justice Goldberg, young and dynamic as he is, will find satisfaction in the difficult challenges of the United Nations that are missing on the Supreme Court bench, and that this role may even bring him back into the mainstream of political activity. If the latter comes true, however, it will reverse the trend that has found the U.N. post to be a prestigious retreat from political leadership.

Justice Goldberg's presence at the United Nations will revive American interest in the organization and perhaps help raise the cloud of gloom that frustration has cast over it. He is an effective person going to a post where it is supremely difficult to get anything done.

ARA AND HOOSIERS MAKE WINNING TEAM

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, Independence Day may have passed us a few weeks ago, but I believe it is still most appropriate and timely to talk about the American dream. Specifically, I should like to address myself to an economic development in Knox, a community in northern Indiana.

A few years ago two foremen at the now closed Studebaker plant in South Bend quit their jobs to form their own metal stamping company, the Arrowhead Engineering Corp. Through a combination of hard work, help from their wives, and great determination and ingenuity, they slowly developed a modest stamping business. Their ambitions, however, transcended this accomplishment. Bill Skinner, the president, and Frank Sabo, the vice president, did not want to run what they deemed to be "just another small metal stamping shop."

At one point in the development of their firm, these men, the first of whom is of Dutch ancestry and the other of Hungarian descent, attempted to negotiate a new project with the General Electric Co. They were advised at that time that in order to obtain any success with GE they would have to come up with a one-piece pulley. It seems that everyone except Skinner and Sabo thought such a pulley was virtually impossible to produce. After many hours of labor and countless experiments, these two men developed a method for slitting a steel disk and making a pulley from one piece of metal.

With their invention in hand, they sought the funds necessary to finance production. Time and again they met discouragement. When an offer of the necessary money came, it was coupled with a stipulation calling for them to surrender control of their company. Fortuitously, they were introduced to the Area Redevelopment Act field coordinator. He guided them in putting a package together which wed their patents to the economic stimulation of a depressed area.

The Small Business Administration and ARA considered the pulley project and determined that the small company satisfied their requirements for industrial and commercial loans. Funds were made available under section 5(b) of the Area Redevelopment Act. In a short time, the $700,000 necessary to break ground for a plant was raised. ARA loaned $455,000, for 15 years at an annual interest rate of 4 percent, the Farmers Bank & Trust Co. of Knox provided $140,000, the Starke County Development Corp. invested $70,000, and the firm itself put up $35,000, in addition to $115,000 in working capital.

The result of community initiative, Government assistance, and two determined, talented individuals is an important economic advance for this locality. In Knox, Ind., they are making a better pulley, and the world is beating a path to their door.

Arrowhead Engineering has orders from Ford, Simplicity Tractor, Whirlpool, and other firms. The Bendix Co. has approached Arrowhead with significant purchase orders. We have reaffirmed the effectiveness of the American enterprise system.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MILLS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill, H.R. 6675, to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Bonner of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. Albert) for the rest of the week on account of illness.

Mr. Watson of South Carolina (at the request of Mr. Ashmore) for an indefinite period on account of illness in the family.

Mr. Scott of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. Albert) for the rest of the week on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Quie, for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Rosenthal (at the request of Mr. Meeds) for 1 hour, on August 2; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Diggs (at the request of Mr. Meeds), for 1 hour, on August 2; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Fogarty (at the request of Mr. Meeds), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Fraser (at the request of Mr. Meeds), for 60 minutes, on August 3; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Ryan (at the request of Mr. Meeds), for 15 minutes, on July 27; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Flood (at the request of Mr. Meeds), for 1 hour, on July 29; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Bennett.
Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Don H. Clausen) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Mize.
Mr. Laird.
Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Stanton.
Mr. Saylor.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Meeds) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Multer.
Mr. St. Onge.
Mr. Barrett.
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts.
Mr. Todd.
Mr. Rodino.
Mr. Sickles.
Mr. Yates.
Mr. Udall.
Mr. Pucinski.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 7. An act to provide for the establishment of the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area, in the State of West Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 192. An act for the relief of Maria Liberty Burnett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 245. An act for the relief of Athanasia Nikolopoulos and Soterior Nikolopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1118. An act to provide for the District of Columbia an elected mayor, board of education, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

S. 1137. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael Pedro Martinez Torres; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1170. An act for the relief of Chung J. Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1186. An act for the relief of Kris Ann Larsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1190. An act to provide that certain limitations shall not apply to certain land patented to the State of Alaska for the use and benefit of the University of Alaska; to the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1270. An act to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1271. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for 2 additional years the provisions permitting the lease of tobacco acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1273. An act for the relief of Ana Folja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1325. An act for the relief of Dr. Oton Socarraz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1389. An act for the relief of Dr. Angel Fernando Golderos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1413. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Confederated Tribes of Colville Indians located in the State of Washington and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1449. An act for the relief of Dr. Enrique Ramon Ducassi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1588. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research, development, and demonstrations in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1766. An act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply and water systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1861. An act to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1904. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the Pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for school or administrative purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1938. An act to amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2294. An act to amend section 2 of the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 70. An act to provide for the conveyance of approximately 80 acres of land to the heirs of Adam Jones, Creek Indian not enrolled;

H.R. 237. An act to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project by the Secretary of the Interior;

H.R. 903. An act to add certain lands to the Kings Canyon National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1987. An act for the relief of Nabhane M. Nickley (Nabhane M. Karam);

H.R. 1989. An act for the relief of Krystyna Stella Hancock;

H.R. 2012. An act for the relief of Dr. Ignace D. Liu;

H.R. 2351. An act for the relief of Teresita Centeno Valdez;

H.R. 2360. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio R. Perez;

H.R. 2499. An act for the relief of Remedios Ocampo;

H.R. 2913. An act for the relief of Lt. Thomas A. Farrell, U.S. Navy, and others;

H.R. 4131. An act for the relief of Mrs. Phoebe Thompson Neesham;

H.R. 5508. An act to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5860. An act to amend the law relating to the final disposition of the property of the Choctaw Tribe;

H.R. 8620. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to take into consideration floods and other natural disasters in reference to the feed grains, cotton, and wheat programs for 1965;

H.R. 8862. An act to amend the Act of August 7, 1935, to increase the authorized annual share of the United States as an adhering member of the International Council of Scientific Unions and Associated Unions; and

H.R. 9041. An act to restore to the heirs of the Indian grantor certain tribal land of the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that committee did on July 23, 1965, present to the President, for his approval bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8720. An act to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of Guam;

H.R. 8721. An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of the Virgin Islands; and

H.R. 8775. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 27, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1373. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of audit of financial statements of St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, calendar year 1964, Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 247); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1374. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Acting Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 29, 1965, submitting a report together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of the report on Cedar River Harbor, Mich., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted July 20, 1959, and August 14, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 248); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1375. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 2, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim survey of Elizabeth River Basin, N.J., in partial response to an item in section 206 of the Flood Control Act approved July 3, 1958 (H. Doc. No. 249); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

1376. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of a violation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665 (i)(2)); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1377. A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting reply to the Comptroller General relative to report (B-151613) on improper obligation practices followed by the Agency for International Development during fiscal year 1963; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1378. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of proposed disposition of hyocine now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to the provisions of section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, 50 U.S.C. 98b(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1379. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for period July 1964 to May 1965, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1380. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize project grants for construction and modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1381. A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting reply to the Comptroller General relative to a report (B-146820) on unnecessary dollar costs incurred in financing purchases of commodities produced in Brazil; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1382. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of significant dollar savings available in financing foreign sales agents' commissions on surplus agricultural commodities exported under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1383. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of weakness in management of vaccines stored for the civil defense medical stockpile, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1384. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of the use of Government-owned aircraft by the Army Mobility Command and Army Tank-Automotive Center, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1385. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1386. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that no claims were paid by the Office of Emergency Planning during fiscal year 1965, pursuant to section 2673 of title 28, United States Code (Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of July 22, 1965 the following conference reports were filed on July 23, 1965:

Mr. HARRIS: Committee of conference. S. 510. An act to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 676). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee of conference. H.R. 2984. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities by extending the expiration date thereof and providing increased support for the program, to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 677). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee of conference. H.R. 2985. A bill to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers (Rept. No. 678). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee of conference. H.R. 7984. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities (Rept. No. 679). Ordered to be printed.

[Submitted July 26, 1965]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 7372. A bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956; with amendment (Rept. No. 680). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI: Committee on Public works. Senate Joint Resolution 81. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to apportion the sum authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; with amendment (Rept. No. 681). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 6675. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 682). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 10049. A bill to provide for the best care, welfare, and safeguards against suffering for certain animals used for scientific purposes without impeding necessary research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 10050. A bill to provide for the best care, welfare, and safeguards against suffering for certain animals used for scientific purposes without impeding necessary research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 10051. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, to restrict the application of that act to arms control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BANDSTRA:

H.R. 10052. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply and water systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 10053. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide wartime rates of disability compensation for veterans disabled from injury or disease incurred or aggravated by overseas service and free insurance protection for members of the Armed Forces serving overseas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 10054. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax for a portion of amounts paid for certain educational expenses incurred at an institution of higher learning or vocational training; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 10055. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct programs to reduce the impact of droughts on rural residents, small municipalities, agriculture and livestock enterprises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 10056. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit employer contributions to labor organizations to assist their educational or recreational activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 10057. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10058. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 10059. A bill to abolish the death penalty under all laws of the United States, and authorize the imposition of life imprisonment in lieu thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 10060. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit contracting for the construction of vessels for the U.S. Navy at places outside of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.R. 10061. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for deduction of certain education expenses of teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 10062. A bill to amend section 407(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to clarify the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board to examine the books and records of persons controlled by, or under common control with, an air carrier, or of service organizations controlled by groups of air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 10063. A bill to amend section 308(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 as it relates to the grant of exclusive rights at airports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 10064. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply and water systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 10065. A bill to more effectively prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 10066. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code (relating to medical and dental care of members of the uniformed services and their dependents) to provide for obstetrical care for wives of certain former members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10067. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemption (including the exemptions for dependents and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness) to $1,200 for 1966 and succeeding years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 10068. A bill to provide fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel, to improve the quality of teacher training programs, and to establish a National Teacher Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 10069. A bill to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 10070. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove certain limitations on the amount of deduction for contributions to pension and profit-sharing plans made on the behalf of self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 10071. A bill to provide for the registration in the District of Columbia of names, marks, and devices placed on certain linens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 10072. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, in order to provide a price-support program for coffee produced in the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 10073. A bill to establish a Federal sabbatical program to improve the quality of teaching in the Nation's elementary or secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 10074. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit contracting for the construction of vessels for the U.S. Navy at places outside of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 10075. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, optometry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 10076. A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the Hemis-Fair 1968 Exposition to be held at San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H.R. 10077. A bill to amend the Judicial Code to permit Indian tribes to maintain civil actions in Federal district courts without regard to the $10,000 limitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 10078. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply and water systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 10079. A bill to provide for repair by the District of Columbia, at the expense of the owner, of buildings violating the District of Columbia housing regulations, and to make tenants evicted from unsafe and insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia eligible for relocation payments; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 10080. A bill to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, relating to school construction assistance in federally impacted areas, so as to provide for assistance when a school district suffers a sudden and substantial increase in enrollment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 10081. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the loan provisions relating to directors, members of the supervisory committee, and members of the credit committee of Federal credit unions; to increase the unsecured loan limit that a member can borrow from a Federal credit union; and, to require each Federal credit union to establish an education committee; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 10082. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 10083. A bill to improve Federal employee travel, transportation and subsistence allowances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 10084. A bill to establish the Great Basin National Recreation Area in the State of Nevada, and for other pruposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 10085. A bill to prohibit labor organizations and corporations from making political contributions or expenditures in connection with State and local elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 10086. A bill to authorize assistance under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 for renewal of blighted areas of a locality containing war housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 10087. A bill to more effectively prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.J. Res. 587. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit States from imposing the death penalty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.J. Res. 588. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require candidates for the office of U.S. Senator to be chosen by primary election; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.J. Res. 589. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the period from August

31 through September 6 in 1965 as "National American Legion Baseball Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE:

H. Con. Res. 451. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the "The Prayer Room in the United States Capitol"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. Con. Res. 452. Concurrent resolution to endorse the concept of World Farm Center; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

340 (pt. II). By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, transmitting a copy of the Legislative Journal for July 14, 1965, relative to ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

348. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to water pollution; to the Committee on Public Works.

349. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, commending the 89th Congress for passing the 1965 Federal aid to education bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

350. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relative to the pending amendments to the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRIDER:

H.R. 10088. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands at the Old Hickory lock and dam, Cumberland River, Tenn., to the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Inc.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 10089. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain public land held under color of title to B. Frank Chenault of Decatur, Ala.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10090. A bill for the relief of Jesse W. Stutts, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 10091. A bill for the relief of Montano Di Benedetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 10092. A bill for the relief of Dr. Benjamin Cruz Atanacio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10093. A bill for the relief of Omrie Symester; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 10094. A bill for the relief of Theodora Gouloumis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 10095. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Marciano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10096. A bill for the relief of Umberto Ettore Minore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 10097. A bill for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 10098. A bill for the relief of Alexander Ratto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10099. A bill for the relief of Soon Young Ahn, his wife Myung Sook Ahn, and their minor children, Julie Kun Shik Ahn and Douglas Wuy Shik Ahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALLAWAY:

H.R. 10100. A bill for the relief of Ralph H. Dean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10101. A bill for the relief of Jesse C. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 10102. A bill for the relief of Mr. Panagiotis Konstantopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10103. A bill for the relief of Mr. Angelos Vourvahis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

250. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Fishing Bridge Station, Wyo., relative to appointing a new Justice to the U.S. Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

251. Also, petition of the Grand Lodge of the State of Illinois, Order Sons of Italy of America, relative to making Columbus Day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 26, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who art in heaven, in the earth, and in the hearts of men, hallowed be Thy name. At the beginning of the week's demands and deliberations we would lift our perspective to a sense of towering, eternal verities and values. Make us conscious of the ageless realities which the blasphemies of deluded men can never touch. We pause in reverence with a deep sense of responsibility as servants of the public welfare as we pray for courage to attempt, patience to endure, and power to achieve.

In these agitated times grant us the untroubled calm and confidence which illumines faith in the final triumph of every true idea let loose in the world. In the global battlefield where truth and falsehood, freedom and serfdom are locked in mortal combat, bar our own hearts to all cynicism and hatred. As we fight the good fight under all skies, may our strength be as the strength of 10 because our hearts are pure.

Enable each of us in the place where we stand to live greatly in a world so grave, as we are granted light enough for the next step amid the encircling gloom.

We bring our prayer in the spirit and name of the Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 23, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On July 22, 1965:

S. 21. An act to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning.

On July 23, 1965:

S. 2080. An act to provide for the coinage of the United States.

On July 24, 1965:

S. 571. An act for the relief of Denise Hojebane Barrood;

S. 956. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to extend construction authority for facilities at Guam and the Virgin Islands of the United States (76 Stat. 87; 19 U.S.C. 68);

S. 998. An act to amend section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make loans for the financing and refinancing of new and used fishing vessels, and to extend the term during which the Secretary can make fisheries loans under the act; and

S. 2154. An act to amend the act establishing the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR UNDER RULE VIII

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the legislative calendar under rule VIII was dispensed with.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the Bureau of the Census.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Oren Harris, of Arkansas, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern and western districts of Arkansas, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Arthur J. Goldberg, of Illinois, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 19th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with that under the Bureau of Census, will be stated.

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of A. Ross Eckler, of New York, to be Director of the Census.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed.

TAX COURT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Theodore Tannenwald, Jr., of New York, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Mrs. Penelope Hartland Thunberg, of Maryland, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Overobligation of an Appropriation

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation within that Department; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Publication of Notice of Proposed Disposition of Certain Hyoscine

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 2,100 ounces of hyoscine now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Department of Defense Procurement From Small and Other Business Firms

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the period July 1964–May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Savings and Loan Holding Company Amendments of 1965

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 408 of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of savings and loan holding companies and subsidiary companies (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Requirement for Operators of Ocean Cruises To File Evidence of Financial Security

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to require operators of ocean cruises by water between the United States, its possessions and territories and foreign countries to file evidence of financial security and other information (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1965

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize project grants for construction and modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Reports of Acting Comptroller General

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on significant dollar savings available in financing foreign sales agents' commissions on surplus agricultural commodities exported under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (commonly known as Public Law 480), Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, dated July 1965 (with an accompanying report; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on increased costs incurred by Government purchase of credit reports rather than insistence that lenders submit acceptable credit reports, Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated July 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on inadequate supervision of payroll activities, District of Columbia government, dated July 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on weaknesses in management of vaccines stored for the civil defense medical stockpile, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated July 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on uneconomical use of Federal funds in the reorganization and expansion of the Chicago Employment Offices, Illinois State Employment Service, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor, dated July 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reply to Comptroller General

A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of that Agency's reply to the Comptroller General of the United States, relating to his report on improper obligation practices followed by the Agency for International Development during fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Disposition of Geothermal Steam and Associated Geothermal Resources

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Subversive Activities

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report under the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, for the year ending May 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COURT OPINION AND FINDINGS IN CASE OF THOMAS R. MACKIE *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the court's opinion and findings in the case of *Thomas R. Mackie* v. *The United States,* Cong. 18–58 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"SENATE MEMORIAL 1188

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting a continuation of national policy employing private enterprise to provide goods and services for the space and defense programs which was promulgated by the administration of President Dwight David Eisenhower and continued under the administration of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy

"Whereas all segments of the private enterprise system, large and small, in all aspects and phases of the space and defense programs, when called upon to meet the Nation's needs, have performed diligently and dutifully, having, through tireless effort, great personal sacrifice and patriotic devotion, brought this Nations' space and defense program to its present greatness and preeminence in full cooperation with all agencies of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas private industry has exerted ceaseless efforts to further qualify, educate, train and sharpen the performance of employees throughout the programs, being fully cognizant and desirous that the beneficiaries of such efforts can only be the citizens of this sovereign Nation, the protection and defense of whom private industry and the Federal Government have heretofore been solemnly and jointly pledged to uphold; and

"Whereas as a result of an apparent change of governmental policy, the Defense Department and other agencies of the Federal Government which have previously enjoyed the vigorous and dutiful support of the aforementioned segments of private industry, do now seek to invalidate the said cooperative pact by severing from the governmental-private enterprise joint space and defense effort many of the products and services including approximately 6,000 industry jobs and contract business worth over $100 million from private industry to the non-tax-paying sector of the public; and

"Whereas the faithful employees of private industry have established homes in Brevard County and other areas of central Florida and have become integral parts of the church, civic and social activities of these communities; and

"Whereas such a policy on the part of the Federal Government would be tantamount to declaring these companies and their employees surplus commodities and depriving them of their livelihood after long and faithful service: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida,* That this legislature does hereby memorialize Congress urging a continuation of the national policy regarding the use of private enterprise in providing goods and services in the Nation's space and defense programs as promulgated under the administration of President Dwight David Eisenhower and reaffirmed under the administration of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy to the end that this Nation continue to progress in the field of space exploration and defense by remaining the world's stalwart exponent of freedom through free enterprise."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"SENATE MEMORIAL 917

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States urging the preservation of the dual banking system and defeat of any measure requiring a State bank to become a member of the Federal Reserve System

"*To the honorable Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:*

"Whereas the several States throughout the United States recognize the importance of the dual banking system; and

"Whereas during recent years legislation has been passed by the Congress of the United States encroaching upon the rights of State banks and their protection by State law; and

"Whereas in recent years there has been a determined effort by Federal agencies to expand the scope of national bank charters without regard to existing State law; and

"Whereas Federal legislation is now being sought to further reduce the true meaning and effectiveness of the dual banking system; and

"Whereas the dual banking system serves a vital function in stabilizing banking services necessary to and in the best interest of the public; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States should take immediate and appropriate steps to preserve the dual banking system: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida,* That the honorable Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States be and are hereby requested to take appropriate steps to preserve the dual banking system of State and Federal banks: Be it further

"*Resolved,* That the honorable Members of the Congress be and are hereby memorialized to defeat any measure coming before them which has for its purpose the requirement that each State bank shall become a member of the Federal Reserve System; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States; to the President of the U.S. Senate; to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; to the ablest congressional delegation in the U.S. Congress, the Florida delegation; and to the Governor of the great State of Florida."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Commerce:

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 1850

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States urging the Congress to fulfill the objectives of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936

"Whereas the experience of two world wars and subsequent emergencies has proven that a strong American-flag merchant marine is essential to our national defense and is a vital factor in the economy of our Nation, State, and individual communities, providing jobs, encouraging a favorable trade balance and stemming the gold drain, and

"Whereas U.S. ships today carry less than 9 percent of total U.S. waterborne foreign commerce because of the failure of our Government to give our merchant marine the support and protection which every other maritime nation gives its ships; and

"Whereas the active American-flag merchant marine today consists of some 900 vessels, fewer than we had before World War II, and our shipbuilding capacity likewise is smaller than before the war while the dangers we confront and the responsibilities we have undertaken in the world steadily mount; and

"Whereas the Soviet Union has risen to a position nearly equal to, if not actually surpassing, our own maritime strength and is feverishly building to fulfill its vow that it will become the greatest maritime power in the world by 1970, while we continue to let our maritime strength dwindle; and

"Whereas the concern of many responsible officials of Government has been directed not toward improving the dangerous and deplorable state of our merchant marine, but rather toward further curtailing necessary expenditures for this merchant marine and weakening the already inadequate safeguards which have been established for it: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida,* That this State legislature does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States urging all action to fulfill the objectives of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which made it national policy that the United States shall have a merchant marine, citizen owned, citizen manned, and under the U.S. flag, adequate to the commercial and industrial needs and responsibilities of this Nation, adequate to serve as an auxiliary of the armed service and adequate to express our strength and prestige as a leader of the free world. That is still the law of the land, it is time that it is properly enforced; be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States, to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to the National Maritime Union of America."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"SENATE MEMORIAL 1182

"Memorial to the President of the United States of America, urging construction of an urban male Job Corps Training Center at Camp Blanding, Fla.

"Whereas the Congress of the United States declared war on poverty by its approval of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which was a plan proposed by President Lyndon B. Johnson; and

"Whereas such act was signed into law by the President, thereby creating the Office of Economic Opportunity; and

"Whereas the community of Starke, Fla., has expressed its sincere desire to cooperate in establishing an Urban Job Corps Training Center at a site located at Camp Blanding, Fla.; and

"Whereas the community of Starke has since March of 1964 been working toward preparing the citizens of the area for such social change that a Job Corps Training Center may bring to the area; and

"Whereas the Governor of the State of Florida, the entire State cabinet, all of the local county public officials of the Bradford-Clay County area and most of the Florida congressional delegation as well as many civic, fraternal and business organizations of the area have expressed support for and interest in the establishment of a male Job Corps Training Camp at Camp Blanding, Fla.; and

"Whereas the Florida State Armory Board has agreed to grant the use of a section of raw land (640 acres) for the construction of such a school; and

"Whereas a joint proposal to operate such a school at Camp Blanding, Fla., has been submitted by the Northrop Corp. (a California-based company) to the Office of Economic Opportunity in cooperation with the Bradford County Development Authority of Starke, Fla., and Florida State University; and

"Whereas the Office of Economic Opportunity has not yet announced plans to establish a male Job Corps Training Center in the South or the Southeastern part of the United States; and

"Whereas the dropout rate in Florida appears to be in excess of 18,000 students annually; and

"Whereas the Bradford-Clay area is presently located in one of America's poverty pockets and is in need of realizing economic benefits that the establishing of such a center could provide; and

"Whereas all of Florida as well as Georgia and Alabama could more actively enter into the war on poverty by upgrading employee skills among the many dropouts of the tristate area if such a center were located at the Camp Blanding site: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida*, That the President of the United States is hereby requested to urge the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to approve the request of the State of Florida to establish and construct an urban male Job Corps Training Center at Camp Blanding, Fla.; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be transmitted forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House in the U.S. Congress, each Member of the Florida delegation to the Congress of the United States, the secretary of state of the State of Florida, and to the Administrator of the Office of Economic Opportunity; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be spread upon the Journals of both the Senate and the House of Representatives."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 72

"Whereas the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his Office was adopted by the 89th Congress of the United States in the following words, to wit:

"'JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY AND VICE-PRESIDENCY AND TO CASES WHERE THE PRESIDENT IS UNABLE TO DISCHARGE THE POWERS AND DUTIES OF HIS OFFICE

"'*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"'"ARTICLE—

"'"SECTION 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

"'"SEC. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

"'"SEC. 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

"'"SEC. 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

"'"Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within 4 days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within 48 hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within 21 days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within 21 days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise; the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office."' Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved* by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 75th session assembled:

"1. That the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office adopted by the 89th Congress of the United States be and the same is hereby ratified.

"2. That copies of this resolution duly certified by the Secretary of State with the Great Seal of Nebraska attached thereto shall be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the Administrator of General Services, Washington, D.C., and to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

"______ ______,
"*President of the Legislature.*
"HUGO F. SRB,
"*Clerk of the Legislature.*
"PHILIP C. SORENSEN,
"*Acting Governor.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 24

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that membership in both houses of a bicameral State legislature must be apportioned according to population and has thus asserted Federal judicial authority over the basic structure of government in the various States; and

"Whereas this rule denies to the people of the respective States the right to establish their legislatures upon the same pattern of representation deemed advantageous for the Congress of the United States and provided by the Federal Constitution; and

"Whereas this action of the Supreme Court goes so far as to restrict the ability of the citizens of the respective States to designate the manner in which they shall be represented in their respective legislatures, thereby depriving the people of their right to determine how they shall be governed; and

"Whereas the implications of this action by the Supreme Court raised serious doubts as to the legality of the present form of the governing bodies of many subordinate units of government within the States; and

"Whereas the 17th Biennial General Assembly of the States, meeting at Chicago, Ill., December 3, 1964, has adopted a resolution urging that the Congress propose an amendment to the U.S. Constitution which would provide that (1) any State which has a bicameral legislature may utilize factors other than population in apportioning one house of its legislature if the plan of apportionment is specifically approved by vote of the electorate of the State, and (2) any State may determine how governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned; and

"Whereas the 17th Biennial General Assembly of the States has proposed that the legislatures of the several States take immediate and uniform action, in accordance with article V of the Constitution of the United States, to apply to the Congress to convene a constitutional convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution as herein set forth: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"'ARTICLE —

"'SECTION 1. Nothing in this constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by the vote of the electorate of that State.

"'SEC. 2. Nothing in this constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

"'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.'; be it further

"*Resolved*, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"PRESTON SMITH,
"*Lieutenant Governor,*
"*President of the Senate.*
"BEN BARNES,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Approved:

"JOHN CONNALLY,
"*Governor.*"

A copy of the Legislative Journal of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, containing, on page 2362, a motion of ratification of the 25th amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to Presidential succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Rule 15, section 2 of the Rules of the Nebraska Legislature provides: 'Resolutions which propose amendments to the State constitution, propose the ratification of amendments to the Federal Constitution * * * or require the approval of the Governor, shall be considered and adopted in the same manner as bills. (Const. art. III, secs. 13, 14; art. XVI, sec. 1)'.

"L.R. 72 is of such a nature as to require presentation to the Governor. Article IV, section 15, constitution of Nebraska; report of Attorney General, 1963-64, page 49.

"In *Stadle* v. *Battle Creek, Twp.* (*Mich.*), 77 N.W. 2d 329, the term 'enactment' was defined as giving legislative sanction and executive approval whereby a bill becomes an act or law. Accordingly, it cannot be said that L.R. 72 was enacted (in the sense of having force and effect under Nebraska law) until July 13, 1965, at 10:19 a.m.

"Be that as it may, it can very properly be said that the 25th amendment to the Constitution of the United States was in fact ratified by the Nebraska Legislature on July 12, 1965, notwithstanding the fact that such ratification did not become effective until the signature of the Acting Governor was affixed to L. R. 72 on the following day. By the terms of L. R. 72, it is resolved that the 25th amendment to the Constitution of the United States 'be and the same is hereby ratified.' The official Legislative Journal attests to the fact that L. R. 72 was adopted on July 12, 1965, by a vote of 47 ayes, 0 nays (2 not voting). Also, the resolution itself bears the certification of the clerk of the legislature to the effect that the resolution was 'originated in and passed by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska' on said date.

"The fact the certification of the secretary of State was not made until later does not militate against the conclusion that the legislative act of ratification occurred on July 12, 1965; as such certification merely serves to impart verity to the authenticity of the physical document.

"Very truly yours,
"CLARENCE A. H. MEYER,
"Attorney General.
"C. C. SHELDON,
"Assistant Attorney General."

A resolution adopted by the Minnesota State Bakers Association, Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against the enactment of legislation to require persons and companies in the flour milling business to purchase from the U.S. Government certificates in connection with their purchase of wheat, as proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted at a meeting of the Traverse County (Minn.) Democratic Farmer-Labor Party, held at Wheaton, relating to the improvement of farm prices; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted at the 56th annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, held in Denver, Colo., relating to economic advancement; to the Committee on Appropriations.

The petition of George B. Bonniwell, of Minneapolis, Minn., relating to the draft, and the use of the Army Reserves and National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners, Lake County, Minn., protesting against the abandonment of Duluth, Missabe & Iron Range Railway right-of-way within the corporate limits of the city of Duluth; to the Committee on Commerce.

Resolutions adopted by the AMVETS Department of Maryland Annual Convention held in Frederick, Md.; the National Executive Committee of Washington, D.C., AMVETS Post No. 11, of Takoma Park, the Department of Maryland Amvets in convention on June 20, 1964, and June 22, 1963, all in opposition to the taking over by the Federal Government of lands on Assateague Island, Worcester County, Md.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Madison, Wis., favoring the defeat of Senate Joint Resolution 2, relating to reapportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Lubbock (Tex.) Typographical Union No. 888; the Fifth Annual Convention of the Arkansas State AFL-CIO, at Hot Springs, Ark.; and the Rockford, Ill., United Labor AFL-CIO, all favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1781, to prohibit the interstate trafficking in strikebreakers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A proclamation issued by the mayor of Phoenix, Ariz., proclaiming the week of May 16 through May 22, 1965, as Jobs for Youth Week; and also supporting the jobs for youth campaign; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Executive's Club of Louisiana, Inc., protesting against any attempt to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., of New York, N.Y., signed by Ralph E. Casey, chairman of the Committee for Companies, and Agents, Atlantic and gulf coasts, enclosing an advertisement signed by eight U.S.-flag ship lines, relating to the present maritime strike; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 489. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Pig War National Historical Park in the State of Washington, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 510); and

S. 1088. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Touchet division, Walla Walla project, Oregon-Washington, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 511).

By Mr. SIMPSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 625. A bill to authorize the sale of isolated or disconnected tracts of lands (Rept. No. 512).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 8111. An act to establish the Herbert Hoover National Historical Site in the State of Iowa (Rept. No. 515).

By Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

H.R. 6622. An act to exempt the postal field service from section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952 (Rept. No. 513).

FIVE-DAY WEEK FOR POSTMASTERS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 514)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H.R. 1771) to establish a 5-day workweek for postmasters, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the individual views of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Texas.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 2327. A bill to amend the Recreation and Public Purposes Act pertaining to the leasing of public lands to States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 2328. A bill for the relief of the city of Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 2329. A bill to amend section 408 of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of savings and loan holding companies and subsidiary companies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. ROBERTSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (by request):

S. 2330. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the loan provisions relating to directors, members of the supervisory committee, and members of the credit committee of Federal credit unions; to increase the unsecured loan limit that a member can borrow from a Federal credit union; and, to require each Federal credit union to establish an education committee; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 2331. A bill to provide for repair by the District of Columbia, at the expense of the owner, of buildings violating the District of Columbia housing regulations, and to make tenants evicted from unsafe and insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia eligible for relocation payments; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2332. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Wabash River National Parkway in the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am introducing by request of the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board a bill to amend section 408 of the National Housing Act, to be cited as the Savings and Loan Holding Company Amendments of 1965. I introduced a similar bill by request last October.

I am taking this action at this time so that the bill may be available for study and comment by interested persons. It appears very doubtful that the Committee on Banking and Currency will be able to take final action on the bill this year, but its introduction will enable the committee to circulate it to interested agencies in the executive department for study and comment, and to make it available to interested members of the public.

I am advised by the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board that his Board is studying the question of bank holding companies and may request general legislation on that subject next session.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the letter from the Chairman of the Board transmitting the bill and the Board's analysis of the draft.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2329) to amend section 408 of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of savings and loan holding companies and subsidiary companies, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The letter and analysis presented by Mr. ROBERTSON are as follows:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD,
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1965.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft for a bill to amend section 408 of the National Housing Act, as amended.

The provisions of the draft are summarized and explained in an analysis which is transmitted herewith.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that the enactment of the proposed legislation would be consistent with the administration's objectives.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. HORNE.

ANALYSIS OF DRAFT DATED JULY 14, 1965, PROPOSING THE AMENDMENT OF SECTION 408 OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, AS AMENDED

Briefly stated, the major provisions of the draft legislation are as follows:

1. The definition of "company" would include any corporation, limited partnership, trust, joint-stock company, or similar organization (subsection (a)(1)(C));

2. Control of one insured institution by any company would make that company a "savings and loan holding company" for purposes of the bill (subsection (a)(1)(D));

3. The scope of the statute would be extended to "subsidiaries" of savings and loan holding companies, and to "affiliates" of insured institutions, as defined in the draft (subsections (a)(1) (F) and (G));

4. A "person" (i.e., any individual or company) would be deemed to have "control" of an insured institution or of any other company, if the person directly or indirectly or acting in concert with one or more other persons, or through one or more subsidiaries, (a) owns, controls, or holds with power to vote, or holds proxies representing, more than 10 percent of the voting shares of such insured institution, or more than 25 percent of the voting shares or rights of such other company, or (b) controls in any manner the election or appointment of a majority of the directors of such institution or of the directors or trustees of such other company, or (c) is a general partner in or has contributed more than 25 percent of the capital of such other company (subsection (a)(2));

5. Savings and loan holding companies would be required to register with the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, to maintain prescribed books and records, to file periodic reports, and to submit to examination by the Corporation (subsection (b));

6. In general, savings and loan holding companies would be prohibited from engaging in any activity or rendering any service on behalf of an insured institution which, if performed by the institution, would be a violation of law or regulation, or from commencing, or continuing for more than two years after the enactment of the proposed bill, any business activity other than that of an insured institution or that which is related to or is determined by the Insurance Corporation to be a proper incident to the operations of insured institutions (subsection (c));

7. Certain specified transactions would be prohibited between an insured institution in a holding company chain and any of its affiliates (i.e., any person or company which controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with, an insured institution); moreover, the institution would be prohibited, except with the prior approval of the Corporation, from engaging in any transactions with its affiliates involving the purchase or sale of assets, or from entering into any agreements under which any affiliate is to render management, consultant, or other services of any kind for the institution (other than those which may be exempted by the Corporation), unless the consideration or payments made thereunder do not exceed the dollar limitations set out in the draft (subsection (d));

8. A savings and loan holding company would be prohibited from (a) acquiring control of an insured or uninsured institution, or retaining control of such an institution as set forth in subsection (e), (b) acquring by purchase or otherwise, or retaining for more than 1 year after enactment of the bill, any of the voting shares of an insured institution or of another savings and loan holding company, which is not a subsidiary of such holding company, or more than 5 percent of the shares of any company not a subsidiary which is engaged in any business activity other than those specified in subsection (c)(2) of the bill, (c) acquiring, by merger, consolidation, or purchase of assets, another insured or uninsured institution or a savings and loan holding company, unless such acquisition has been given prior approval by the Corporation for supervisory reasons, or (d) retaining, for more than 3 years after enactment of the bill, control of any out-of-State insured institution; it would also be unlawful for any company (not a savings and loan holding company) to acquire or retain control of more than one insured institution (subsection (e));

9. The Corporation would be authorized to conduct investigations to determine whether the requirements of the act are being complied with by savings and loan holding companies and subsidiaries and affiliates thereof, and to apply to a U.S. district court to compel compliance with the provisions thereof (subsection (f)); and

10. Criminal sanctions would be provided for the willful violation of any of the provisions of the proposed bill (subsection (g)).

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE DRAFT

Subsection (a), definitions: As defined in the present statute, the term "company" includes any corporation, business trust, association, or similar organization. Section 408(a)(1). Under the draft, a "company" would be defined as "any corporation, limited partnership, trust, joint stock company, or similar organization." This latter definition is deemed to be the more realistic of the two because it encompasses the types of entities which, because of their unlimited duration or limited liability, would be most likely to be able to raise the necessary capital to finance the acquisition of savings and loan associations and to engage in holding company operations.

Control of one insured institution by any company would make that company a "savings and loan holding company" under the draft.

A "subsidiary" would be defined as any company which is controlled by a person (i.e., an individual or a company) or by a company which is a subsidiary of such person. Any person which controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with, an insured institution would be an affiliate of that institution. For example, if insured institution A and company B were both controlled by savings and loan holding company C, which in turn was a subsidiary of company D, then B, C, and D would be affiliates of A, and transactions between A and B, C, or D would be subject to the restrictions on transactions between subsidiary insured institutions and affiliates imposed by subsection (d) of the draft.

The definition of "control" in the proposed bill would be more comprehensive, and it would spell out more specifically what constitutes "control," than the definition in the present statute. Under subsection (a)(3) of section 408, a company is deemed to have control of an institution or other organization if such company owns, controls, or holds with power to vote more than 10 percent of the stock of such institution or other organization, or if the Federal Home Loan Bank Board determines, after notice and opportunity for hearing, that such company directly or indirectly exercises a controlling influence over the management and policies of such institution or other company.

Under paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of the draft, a person would be deemed to have control of an insured institution or of any other company, if the person directly or indirectly or acting in concert with one or more other persons, or through one or more subsidiaries, (A) owns, controls, or holds with power to vote, or holds proxies representing, more than 10 percent of the voting shares of such insured institution, or controls in any manner the election of a majority of the directors of such institution, or (B) owns, controls, or holds with power to vote, or holds proxies representing, more than 25 percent of the voting shares or rights of such other company, or controls in any manner the election or appointment of a majority of the directors or trustees of such other company, or is a general partner in or has contributed more than 25 percent of the capital of such other company.

Accordingly, for example, if company A owned, controlled, or held with power to vote, or held proxies representing, more than 25 percent of the voting shares of company B, or controlled in any manner the election of a majority of the directors of company B, and the latter owned, controlled, or held with power to vote, or held proxies representing, more than 10 percent of the voting shares of insured institution C, or if company B controlled in any manner the election of the majority of the directors of institution C, company A would be a holding company with respect to institution C, company B would be both a holding company and a subsidiary of A, and both A and B would be deemed to have control of institution C.

Subsection (b), registration and examination: Within 180 days after enactment of the proposed bill, or within 90 days after becoming a savings and loan holding company, whichever is later, each holding company would be required to register with the Corporation and to furnish such information with respect to its financial condition, ownership, operations, management, and intercompany relationships as the Corporation may require. Paragraph (1).

In addition, each holding company and each subsidiary thereof would be required to file periodic financial reports with the Corporation and the Federal home loan bank of the district in which its principal office is located (paragraph (2)), and to maintain such books and records as the Corporation may require. Paragraph (3). Moreover, each holding company and subsidiary thereof would be subject to such examinations as the Corporation may prescribe. Paragraph (4).

Subsection (c), holding company activities: This subsection of the draft would restrict the nature of the activities or business which could be conducted by a savings and loan holding company. Specifically, the draft would prohibit any holding company or subsidiary thereof from—

1. Engaging in any activity or rendering any service for or in behalf of an insured institution which, if performed by the institution, would constitute a violation of law or regulation; or

2. Commencing, or continuing for more than 2 years after the enactment of the bill, or for more than 180 days after becoming a savings and loan holding company or subsidiary thereof (whichever is later), any business activity other than—(A) the business of an insured institution, (B) furnishing or performing management services for a subsidiary insured institution, (C) conducting an insurance agency or an escrow business, (D) holding or managing or liquidating assets owned by or acquired from a subsidiary insured institution, (E) holding or managing properties used or occupied by a subsidiary insured institution, or (F) furnishing or performing such other services or engaging in such other activities as the Corporation may prescribe by regulation as being a proper incident to the operations of insured institutions and not detrimental to the interests of savings account holders therein. Upon a showing of good cause, the Corporation could extend, from year to year, the time for compliance with the above-mentioned provisions for a period not exceeding 5 years, if the Corporation finds such extension would not be detrimental to the public interest.

In sum, subsection (c) of the draft would make it unlawful, for example, for a holding company or any of its subsidiaries (1) to solicit withdrawable capital for its controlled insured institution in any manner prohibited by applicable law or regulation to such institution, or (2) to commence, or continue for more than 2 years after the enactment of the bill, the business of an uninsured institution, or any other business or service other than those set out in subsection (c), or those permitted by regulation of the Corporation.

Subsection (d), prohibited transactions by subsidiary insured institutions: Subsection (d) of the attached draft is designed to curb transactions between an insured institution in a holding company chain and any of its affiliates. Accordingly, the draft would make it unlawful for a controlled insured institution to (1) invest its funds in the stock, bonds, debentures, notes, or other obligations of any affiliate, (2) accept the stock, bonds, debentures, notes, or other obligations of any affiliate as collateral security for any loan made by the institution, (3) purchase securities or other assets or obligations under repurchase agreement from any affiliate, (4) make any loan to any affiliate, or to any third party on the security of any property purchased from any affiliate, or with knowledge that the loan proceeds are to be paid over to or utilized for the benefit of any affiliate, or (5) guarantee the repayment of or maintain compensating balances for any loan to any affiliate by any third party.

Subsection (f) of section 408 contains prohibitions similar to those provided in clauses (1) through (4) above. Clause (5) is designed to prohibit transactions such as one which has recently come to the attention of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board involving the purchase of certificates of deposit by a subsidiary insured institution under an arrangement whereby such certificates were to serve as compensating balances for bank loans to other subsidiaries of the holding company.

Paragraph (6) of subsection (d) represents an attempt to regulate transactions which could result in the use of insured institutions for the benefit of their affiliates through devices such as management or service contracts or the purchase or sale of assets. Thus, except for the prior approval of the Corporation, it would be unlawful for any subsidiary insured institution—

(A) To engage in any transaction with any affiliate involving the purchase or sale of assets in any case where the aggregate amount of the consideration given or received by such institution for all such transaction during the preceding 12-month period exceeds the lesser of $100,000 or one-tenth of 1 percent of the institution's total assets at the end of the preceding fiscal year; or

(B) To enter into any agreement under which any affiliate is to (i) render management or advertising services for the institution, (ii) serve as a consultant, adviser or agent for any phase of the operations of the institution, or (iii) render services of any other nature for the institution, other than those which may be exempted by regulation or order of the Corporation, unless the aggregate amount of the consideration required to be paid by such institution in the future under all such existing agreements cannot exceed the lesser of $100,000 or one-tenth of 1 percent of the institution's total asset at the end of the preceding fiscal year; or

(C) Make any payment to any affiliate under any agreement referred to in (B) above where the institution has previously paid to affiliates during the preceding 12-month period, pursuant to any such agreement, an amount aggregating in excess of the lesser of $100,000 or one-tenth of 1 percent of the institution's total assets at the end of the preceding fiscal year.

The exception from the requirement of prior Corporation approval of those transactions and agreements where the consideration or payments made thereunder do not exceed the above-mentioned dollar limitations would, of course, relieve the Corporation of the necessity of passing upon numerous applications for its approval of matters of a routine nature or of little or no consequence. Where prior approval is required, the draft provides that the Corporation shall grant approval if, in its opinion, the terms of the transaction or agreement, or the payment by the institution, would not be detrimental to the interests of its savings account holders or to the insurance risk of the Corporation with respect to the institution.

Subsection (e), acquisitions: The draft would extend the proscription of the present statute against further acquisitions of insured institutions (see subsection (c) of section 408) by making it unlawful for any savings and loan holding company or subsidiary thereof—(1) to acquire control of an insured or uninsured institution, or to retain control of such an institution acquired or retained in violation of the section as heretofore or hereafter in effect, (2) to acquire by purchase or otherwise, or to retain for more than 1 year after the enactment of the proposed bill, any of the voting shares of an insured institution or of a savings and loan holding company, not a subsidiary, or more than 5 percent of the voting shares of any company not a subsidiary which is engaged in any business activity other than those specified in subsection (c)(2) of the draft, (3) to acquire, by the process of merger, consolidation, or purchase of assets, another insured or uninsured institution or a savings and loan holding company, or all or substantially all of the assets of any such institution or holding company, unless such merger, consolidation, or purchase of assets has been given prior approval by the Corporation because of supervisory considerations, or (4) to retain, for more than 3 years after the enactment of the proposed bill, control of an insured institution the principal office of which is located in a State other than the State which the holding company shall designate, by writing filed with the Corporation, as the State in which the principal savings and loan business of such holding company is conducted. Subsection (e)(1).

Subsection (e)(2) would prohibit any company (not a savings and loan holding company) from acquiring or retaining control of more than one insured institution. This provision is similar to subsection (c)(1) of the present section 408 and is designed to prevent the creation of new holding company systems by the simultaneous acquisition of control of a number of insured institutions.

Subsection (f), Administration and enforcement: The Corporation would, under subsection (f)(1) of the draft, be authorized to issue such rules, regulations, and orders as it deems necessary or appropriate to enable it to administer section 408 and to require compliance therewith.

Under paragraph (2), the Corporation could make investigations to determine whether the provisions of section 408 and rules, regulations, and orders thereunder are being complied with by holding companies and subsidiaries and affiliates thereof. For the purpose of any hearing, investigation, or other proceeding, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or any member thereof, or a designated representative of the Corporation, could administer oaths, issue subpenas and subpenas duces tecum, and require the attendance of witnesses from any place in the United States. The Corporation could apply to a U.S. district court for the enforcement of such subpenas.

The Corporation would also be authorized to apply to the U.S. district courts for orders enjoining the commission of any acts or practices in violation of the proposed section 408, or any rule, regulation, or order thereunder, or enforcing compliance therewith. Thus, for example, if the Corporation determined that a savings and loan holding company or a subsidiary thereof had acquired control of an insured institution in violation of the act, or was engaging in or performing proscribed activities or services, the Corporation could apply to the proper U.S. district court for an appropriate order of divestiture of such control or for an order requiring compliance with the provisions of the act—Paragraph (3).

All expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board or of the Corporation under section 408 would be considered as nonadministrative expenses—Paragraph (4).

Subsection (g), Prohibited acts: Subsection (g) of the draft would prevent any holding company or director or officer thereof, or any person owning, controlling, or holding more than 10 percent of the voting shares of such holding company, from (1) holding, soliciting, or exercising any proxies in respect of any voting rights in an insured mutual institution, (2) serving at the same time as a director or officer of an insured institution, other than a subsidiary of such holding company, or (3) acquiring control, or retaining control for more than 2 years after the enactment of the proposed bill, of any insured institution, other than a subsidiary of such holding company. The above-mentioned prohibitions would be consistent with the provisions of the present statute and of the proposed amendment thereto prohibiting holding company acquisitions of any additional insured institutions.

It would also be unlawful, under subsection (g), for any individual, except with the prior approval of the Corporation, to serve or act as a director, officer, or trustee of, or become a partner in, any savings and loan holding company after having been convicted of any criminal offense involving dishonesty or breach of trust.

Subsection (h), Penalties: For the willful violation of any provision of the proposed section 408 or any rule, regulation, or order thereunder, the offending company or individual would be subject to criminal sanctions and, upon conviction, the company would be subject to a fine of not more than

$1,000 for each day the violation continued, and the individual would be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Moreover, every director, officer, partner, trustee, agent, or employee of a holding company would be subject to the same penalties for false entries in any book, report, or statement of such holding company as are applicable to officers, agents, and employees of insured institutions for false entries in any books, reports, or statements of such institution under 18 U.S.C. 1006. This provision corresponds to section 8 of the Bank Holding Company Act. See 12 U.S.C. 1847.

It is anticipated that the congressional committees giving consideration to the proposed bill will, by appropriate provisions added by the bill to the Internal Revenue Code, afford tax relief to savings and loan holding companies and shareholders thereof comparable to that afforded to bank holding companies and shareholders thereof by section 10 of the Bank Holding Company Act. See 26 U.S.C. 1101–1103. The Board will consult with the Treasury Department with regard to this matter.

REPAIR OF UNINHABITABLE BUILDINGS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for repair by the District of Columbia, at the expense of the owner, of uninhabitable buildings in the District, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk until Friday, July 30, for cosponsors.

Under current law, neither the District Commissioners nor poverty-stricken families have any real weapon with which to fight against the apathy, inertia, or outright refusal of owners of slum property to bring it up to minimum standards for human occupation.

My bill would authorize the District Commissioners to make repairs on uninhabitable Washington slum dwellings and charge the landlords for the work.

In addition to allowing the city to repair substandard rental housing and charge the owner, the bill would prohibit slum landlords from evicting or raising the rent for tenants who have complained about housing conditions. Also, the bill would provide relocation payments by the city of up to $200 to tenants forced to move because a building is condemned or is being repaired.

Recent articles in the Washington Evening Star and Washington Post called attention to what has been described as Washington's "housing crisis." I ask unanimous consent that the articles be inserted in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey, and the articles will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2331) to provide for repair by the District of Columbia, at the expense of the owner, of buildings violating the District of Columbia housing regulations, and to make tenants evicted from unsafe and insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia eligible for relocation payments, introduced by Mr. CASE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The articles presented by Mr. CASE are as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, July 18, 1965]

CRISIS IN HOUSING: TENANTS PAY DEARLY TO LIVE IN THE SLUMS

(By John Stacks and Benjamin Forgey)

(NOTE.—The lack of housing for low-income families in the District has reached crisis proportions, according to experts in the field. Reasons for the shortage and steps being taken to alleviate it will be examined in this four-part series.)

In a small, rundown house near North Capitol and P Streets NW., just outside the Northwest 1 urban renewal area, a Negro woman quietly told of the morning she awoke to find two large rats cavorting on her bed.

"I've called the landlord half a dozen times about this," she said, "but nothing happens."

Next door an elderly woman told of the day she was washing out her bathtub and nearly broke her ankle when she slipped into a hole where three floorboards had rotted away.

"The inspector was here and saw this," she said, "but that was a month ago and still nothing."

NOT WORST IN DISTRICT

The row of brick houses is in bad condition, but the homes clearly are not the worst slums in Washington. This is little consolation to the row-house tenants. They are paying dearly for these little homes as they fight a frustrating battle to improve not only their homes but their lives.

In one of the houses, an 81-year-old man lives unhappily with two roomers he has been forced to take in to help pay the rent.

Until 2 months ago, the rent there was $75 plus utilities. Then the property changed hands, and the rent for his place, as for all the others in the row, was raised to $100 a month plus utilities.

The same set of miserable conditions remains. The two potbellied stoves on the first floor work only sporadically, throwing off smoke that has blackened the walls and heating only the rooms in which they sit. In the kitchen, water from the toilet above drips directly into the sink.

The old man has been there for 32 years but now the frustration is too much.

TRAPPED BY SHORTAGE

"I'm getting out of here," he said. "I'm not paying $100 for this shack."

If he leaves, the odds are heavily against his finding suitable housing at a reasonable rent in this city. He and thousands like him, mostly Negroes are trapped by the shortage of housing, the wording of the law, the practices and attitudes of slum landlords, the procedures and attitudes of the District government, and, basically, by their own inability to make more money.

The artificial barrier of racial discrimination aggravates this shortage. Suburban resistance to Negro occupancy, though declining, prevents the normal outward expansion of a large portion of the city's population and thus places additional pressure on the low-income market.

If the old man leaves his home, he will join the large corps of families in the Nation's Capital who inhabit slum dwellings until they are evicted for overcrowding their buildings or for nonpayment of exhorbitant rents that usually consume about 40 percent of their incomes.

For these thousands, the situation is bleak. Persons evicted by private action have usually to turn to the overloaded private welfare agencies for help in finding another place to live.

For these displaced by government action such as enforcement of the District's Housing Code or the acquisition of sites for urban renewal, highways or schools, the situation is a little better. The Redevelopment Land Agency provides help through its central relocation office, moving expenses are available for families unable to pay, and they are put at the top of the waiting list for public housing.

The housing situation is part of the syndrome of poverty and cannot be separated from unemployment, lack of skills, low wages, large families, poor education, and the other symptoms of economic distress.

But housing is coming to be regarded as the core of the poverty question. Anita Bellamy, director of the Urban League's Neighborhood Development Center, said that the center's efforts to work with slum families have been met with demands by the people to focus on housing as the primary issue.

She said that most requests they receive for help involve some sort of housing problem.

At the center of the problem is the usually abrasive relationship between the landlord and his tenant. Each regards the other with a suspicion that often grows to complete contempt. The slum dweller views most landlords as the embodiment of evil and greed, while the landlord considers his tenants the epitome of sloth and solvenliness.

PROFIT POTENTIAL HIGH

For the real estate man, the motivation for buying into slum areas is profit. And in the ownership of slum property, the potential for profit is high.

The row houses near North Capitol and P Streets were recently acquired for a little under $8,000 each. With rents of $100 a month, the gross annual return on each property is $1,200. If the owner holds the property for 10 years, he could realize a gross profit of 50 percent on his original investment.

Resale of the land at or near the original cost is almost never a problem. The location of the land in the center of the city and the acquisition of sites for urban renewal or highways means a continuing demand for slum properties.

Slum owners also can use Internal Revenue Service regulations, which were designed to encourage new construction, to their advantage. The rules currently allow any property owner fast depreciation writeoffs for wear and tear on his holdings. At times, this writeoff virtually exempts his rent revenue from tax and occasionally exempts income even from completely unrelated sources.

In addition to the taking of high profits through high rents, there are other ways reported by which an unscrupulous landlord can take advantage of low-income families.

One technique is the leasing of a multiunit dwelling at a price above the already high market rate. This is one with the tacit understanding that the property will be sublet—often to the point of overcrowding—so that the person leasing the property and the landlord both will profit.

Another device is sale of a property to a tenant. This usually involves a monthly mortgage payment slightly higher than the rent but with the prospect for the tenant of eventual ownership. The tenant now is responsible for all repairs and maintenance and the landlord is receiving a larger return. After the poverty-stricken tenant defaults, the landlord repossesses the property and starts over again.

There are, of course, costs that reduce the take of the landlord. One property manager who handles nearly 3,000 slum dwelling units in 150 buildings estimated that 10 percent of the gross rental is lost each year through nonpayment and defaults by tenants. The property manager's salary—between 5 and 10 percent of gross rents—also cuts into the profit.

Maintenance is a highly variable cost factor. There is no slum dwelling that doesn't need heavy repairs, but there are few that get the attention they need.

SOME DAMAGE DELIBERATE

Many of the units are overcrowded by families with large numbers of children, and as the density of occupancy increases, so do wear and tear and maintenance costs.

Some tenant damage is deliberate. Social workers who serve slum families report many cases of what they call "retaliatory damage," in which a tenant who resents a high rent vents his resentment by destroying property. Other damage results from carelessness by people who have no personal stake in property they don't own and would like to leave.

When repairs are made, landlords often use inexpensive and inadequate materials.

"I buy the cheapest stuff I can find," one owner admitted. "It doesn't make sense to put good materials in there, they'll just wreck it."

Evictions and rent increases often are used in retaliation against tenants who complain about conditions.

A homeowner who recently organized a block club in one of the city's worst slums said that one club member complained to her landlord that her home needed paint.

"He sent her a can of cheap paint, told her to paint it herself and raised her rent $18 a month," the homeowner said.

COOPERATION POSSIBLE

But landlord-tenant cooperation is possible. A young Negro, who bought his first property when he was 21, said he has been renting apartments to low-income families at $10 to $15 below the market rate.

"I explain this to them," he said, "and ask for their help in keeping the places up. I help them, they help me and we both benefit."

[From the Washington Star, July 19, 1965]

WAITING LIST TELLS SAD TALE

(By John Stacks and Benjamin Forgey)

Walter Washington, director of the National Capital Housing Authority, sat in his office in an old, dirty-red brick building on New York Avenue looking over the list of applications for public housing.

"Whenever I get to feeling a little heady about our progress, I go through some of these applications—it puts you back on your feet in about 120 seconds," he said.

Public housing is one of the most important forms of relief for the slum dweller seeking a place to live he can afford. But the size of the waiting list for this type of housing tells a grim story of unmet human needs.

Some large families with no priority rights have hopefully renewed their applications every 6 months for 5 years. But they remain trapped in the slums.

At the end of May the waiting list contained 5,440 names. Of these, some 1,337 needed 3 bedrooms, 1,508 needed 4 bedrooms, and 583, 5 or 6 bedrooms.

To this large list must be added the needs for additional space of families who have outgrown their apartments in any of the authority's 29 projects. Current policy is to admit one outside family for every present occupant moved to larger quarters.

While there is no complete, up-to-date inventory of the private housing market, spot checks by the Washington Planning and Housing Association under a United Planning Organization grant indicate a pattern of demand in the private market similar to that shown on the NCHA waiting list.

These surveys confirm what social workers and slum tenants know from bitter experience: finding a five-bedroom unit in a decent, safe, and sanitary building for a family which cannot afford to pay more than $100 a month rent is impossible.

In projects planned or under construction, the NCHA has tried to provide more large units. Of the 2,248 units now being developed, 38 percent are three-bedroom apartments and 15 percent are four-bedroom units. In existing projects, 25 percent have three bedrooms and only 8 percent have four.

Both the NCHA and private builders are restricted in building large units. The private developer faces a high cost per unit that reduces profits while the NCHA cannot exceed an administrative cost-per-unit ceiling now set at about $20,000 in the District.

But Walter Washington believes there is a much more important crisis in the offing. He figures that by the middle of 1968, the NCHA will not be building units fast enough to keep pace with displacement.

The push in constructing new public housing units began in 1962. At the beginning of that year, the waiting list was 7,978, an all-time high.

For the last 3 years, the NCHA has opened about 1,000 new units each year. The waiting list is now smaller, but Washington points out that the crucial time for acquiring new sites has arrived: the development of an average project takes about 4 years.

And even at the present rate of construction, the NCHA can only stay even with demand or perhaps catch up slightly. Latest figures from the District Office of Urban Renewal indicate that about 1,700 families a year will be displaced by governmental action in both fiscal 1966 and 1967.

Statistics on relocation for the past 5 years indicate that between 500 and 600 of these displaced families will be admitted to public housing. Thus the NCHA could make a dent in its waiting list.

COUNTERACTING PRESSURES

But counteracting pressures such as the growing Negro population in the District, which has increased almost 80,000 since 1960, and the increasing number of families being displaced by nongovernmental action assure that if any reduction in the list occurs, it will be small.

And while population in the slums increases, the housing shortage is aggravated by the "back to the city" movement of white persons who move into the luxury homes and apartments in the Southwest and restored areas like Capitol Hill, displacing slum dwellers.

One solution to the shortage of public housing is the changing of zoning regulations to permit high-rise, high-density projects. The NCHA Director reluctantly admits that some easing of restrictions may be necessary, but he is adamantly opposed to high-rise projects. Experience in other cities shows that more often than not, these projects are difficult to manage and maintain and often turn into slums worse than those they were built to replace.

In addition to the continuous search for project sites, Washington and his staff have experimented with several new approaches specifically designed to meet the need for more and larger units.

VALLEY GREEN PROJECT

One experiment was the purchase last year of the Valley Green apartment complex in Southeast from its private owners. In the process of converting it to public housing, the NCHA is reducing from 500 to 350 the number of apartments but adding to the supply of three-, four-, and five-bedroom units.

Another promising NCHA effort has been the "scattered site" program in which the agency leased 50 rehabilitated homes from private owners, turned them over to large families and absorbed the difference between what the tenant could afford and the fair market rate.

In a similar experiment the authority purchased 10 houses in the Cardozo and Northeast areas, rehabilitated them, and rented them to large families.

When first proposed, these plans aroused the familiar fears among many District residents. This hostility was partly racial, but also reflected concern that large numbers of public housing families will strain a community's schools and recreational facilities.

Washington reported, however, that the occupants have become "just another large family living in a neighborhood."

FASTER AND CHEAPER

The rehabilitation program also has proven to be faster and cheaper than building new projects. NCHA staffers said that in the experimental projects, time was cut by about two-thirds and cost was reduced by 25 percent per unit.

But even under ideal conditions, public housing cannot meet all the District's housing needs.

There is a considerable number of families who earn too much money to qualify for public housing, but, because of market conditions, cannot afford adequate housing. Providing homes for this group would inevitably ease the situation for the lowest income families.

In 1961, under a new provision inserted in the Federal Housing Act, the Federal Housing Administration was empowered under section 221(d)(3) to move into this unstable, low-moderate housing market. The FHA was given authority to insure mortgages at below-market interest rates for nonprofit groups and limited dividend corporations.

MORE "D–3" CONSTRUCTION

The groups receiving such mortgages can then construct new units or rehabilitate existing ones for persons who meet income limits established by the FHA. In Washington, as in most places across the country, there has been more new "D–3" construction than rehabilitation.

Some 420 apartment units have been built in the Washington area since the program began, more than 1,400 are under construction and more than 800 are in the planning stages. According to the FHA about half of the 800 will be built in Virginia.

Rents for the new units, however, are fairly high. The median rent charged here for two-bedroom units is $107, the very top of the low-moderate rent scale used by the Washington Planning & Housing Association. Indications are that, once completed, the rehabilitated units will rent for less than the new ones.

Mrs. Sybil Phillips, an FHA specialist, said that several loans to local nonprofit groups for rehabilitation will be certified shortly. She expects the volume of loans to increase rapidly after these first applications are approved.

CARDOZO AREA LOANS

The FHA is now prepared to guarantee over $2 million in loans for the Cardozo area and will increase this amount when it becomes necessary, Mrs. Philips said. The Cardozo area was chosen, she said, because of the availability of social services to tenants, but the FHA also will consider other areas in the city.

The first nonprofit organization in Washington to move into the field was Better Homes, Inc., which has purchased nine homes and has repaired some of them with funds from private investors and loans at market rates. The organization, which has had several tiffs with the District housing division over code violations, is still awaiting approval of its application for FHA-insured loans for rehabilitation.

The new program reverses the usual pattern of rehabilitation in which rents after renovation are so high that even middle-income families find it hard to pay. But another strength—the dedication and enthusiasm of amateurs in the field—is also a weakness.

Housing is an intricate business in which experience has no substitute. Skill in draftmanship, renovation, and finance is often lacking.

ANTI-POVERTY FINANCING

Citizens for Better Housing, set up by the WPHA in 1963 and operating under two antipoverty grants, was formed specifically to meet these needs. This group has processed several applications for below-market-rate loans and has received inquiries from more than 50 interested groups.

One staff member said the hope of persons involved in the program is to form a small nucleus of nonprofit organizations to supervise the actual rehabilitations process and to recruit large numbers of churches, private welfare agencies, and antipoverty workers to provide the supporting social services to tenants.

Yet even the most enthusiastic supporters of these efforts do not contend that these programs will end the housing shortage here for low-rent families.

They are encouraging as gestures of faith and helpful in expanding the supply of good housing, but too small, standing alone, to make any great change in the overwhelmingly large housing problem.

[From the Washington Star, July 20, 1965]

ENFORCEMENT OF DISTRICT CODE RAISES DIFFERING VIEWS

(By John Stacks and Benjamin Forgey)

In the office of Frederick Mallon, superintendent of the housing division of the District Department of Licenses and Inspections, hangs a small sign that reads:

"Sanitation is a way of life. Being a way of life it must come from within the people; it is nourished by knowledge and grows as an obligation and an ideal in human relations."

It is in this office that the most direct governmental attempt to regulate the conditions of housing in the District begins. And, in a way, it is this sign that expresses both the aims and the limitations of the division and its men.

The District's housing code focuses on "environmental health" in residential buildings. It deals with conditions ranging from rats and refuse to screen doors and central heating. Along with the building code and fire regulations, the housing code sets detailed standards for Washington dwellings.

Some persons contend that if enforced literally the code would place the District Building, Junior Village and even the White House in violation. Others say that despite its detailed provisions, the code, as it is now enforced, is totally inadequate to improve slum conditions.

But at present the code and the penalties provided for violations are potentially the most powerful tools immediately available for this job.

The housing division now employs 53 inspectors who report violations discovered after direct complaints or after periodic inspections of tenements, rooming houses or apartments that need licenses to operate.

Thirty-four other inspectors also conduct a "code conservation" program that seeks to improve entire areas of the city at one time by combining extensive code enforcement with the services of other city agencies.

During the past fiscal year, 55,724 buildings that were cited for violating the housing code were brought into conformity, Mallon said. But in code conservation areas as well as in other buildings cited by the inspectors, the constant problem is deterioration and new damage that occurs after inspection and repair.

As the sign in Mallon's office implies, voluntary maintenance, repair and sanitation on the part of both landlord and tenant are necessary; the housing division simply has too few men to police the entire city.

Mallon said that of all code violations discovered last year, 85.6 percent were corrected within 90 days. But some 8,931 cases were taken to the department's enforcement division, for legal action.

Naturally, with heavy case loads in the corporation counsel's office, in the courts and in the enforcement division, delays in action occur. But in addition to this gap between discovery and forced compliance, there are extensions granted to property which permit additional time to make repairs.

Mallon said his office often grants extensions of a week or a month, except in cases where the violation presents a direct health hazard. "The regulations have to be reasonable," he said, "and we have to be reasonable in enforcing them. Everyone is entitled to the due process of law."

Extensions also come from the corporation counsel's office or from Enforcement Division Officer Robert Perkins in the court of general sessions.

Clark King, assistant corporation counsel, said that when "circumstances beyond the control of the owner" prevent repairs from being made on time, he usually grants an extension. He said he is tougher with investment property owners than with owners who occupy their buildings.

And when it comes to enforcing housing division orders to vacate because of overcrowding, King said: "I guess I'm just softhearted."

One real estate manager who deals regularly with the corporation counsel's office said extensions are granted to him freely when he tells counsel that "I just haven't been able to get to it."

While there is the avowed difference in handling private owners and investment owners, there has been no apparent differentiation between rent gouging slumlords and nonprofit corporations seeking to rehabilitate slum homes. The case of Better Homes, Inc., is a case in point.

In April 1963 one of the buildings Better Homes had recently purchased was inspected by the housing division and a list of 19 violations was compiled. Bruce J. Terris, vice president of the organization, was granted an extension by the housing division on the grounds that his group was awaiting an FHA loan to rehabilitate the building completely and that immediate repairs would only be wasted.

The case dragged on, as many do, until June of this year when Terris was fined $100 for the uncorrected violations. But Terris was still awaiting the loan and the repairs were not made.

Following their usual procedures in cases where repairs haven't been made, the enforcement division and the corporation counsel issued a second warrant on the violations and Terris was arrested July 2 and held 4 hours until he posted $300 bond, an amount considerably higher than the usual figure in these cases.

Terris argues that, while the violations do exist, they are not serious enough to warrant the attention being given them. He also contends that since he is awaiting Federal money for a project that will improve slum conditions, he should be granted further extensions.

Terris' case has been handled in about the same way that most code violations cases are and thus illustrates two things about code enforcement:

1. Correction of code deficiencies can be delayed for unreasonable lengths of time by property owners.

2. Inspectors, enforcement officers, and the corporation counsel, while relaxing their rules for owner-occupants, are not using the discretion that is theirs to promote efforts toward better low-income housing.

Both landlord and tenant complain about the lack of a clear standard for enforcement. The landlord says different inspectors use different criteria for spotting violations, and the tenants complain that the lack of quality control permits landlords to use cheap materials in repairs. The code specified only that a "workmanlike" job be done.

Neighborhood workers attempting to help slum dwellers with their housing problems have been annoyed by the housing division's policy of allowing only landlords and tenants to see violations records. Mallon said he was making an exception to this rule when reporters, after filling out detailed forms requiring both Mallon's and the corporation counsel's signatures, were permitted to see the records.

All the division's records are filed by street address. There is no central file listing violators by name. The inspectors become familiar with habitual offenders, but there is no easy way to determine any owner's entire history of code violations.

But mostly it is the long delays and the constant threat or retaliating evictions that frustrate slum dwellers seeking to get repairs in their homes. And perhaps it is the delays that have led to the suspicion by the tenants that inspectors can be bought off by landlords.

One real estate man said that years ago, owners and agents always provided the inspectors with generous Christmas gifts.

"We all used to do it," he said, "but then one time an inspector came by to get his gift, and I saw his car was packed full of whisky so I cut it out."

The agent said he now occasionally will ask an inspector to come by one of his properties to advise him about repairs that will be necessary to meet the code. "I usually give them $5 or $10 for the favor," he said, "but I've only done this a couple of dozen times in the past 25 years."

S. Tudor Strang, deputy superintendent of the housing division, said: "If we knew about any of that, we'd fire the inspector immediately."

There has been an increasingly active local debate in Washington about the desirability of tightening up code enforcement.

Poverty program workers feel that strict enforcement will cause profits to decline to the point where slum landlords will leave the market and be replaced by people not interested in exploiting tenants. But stepped-up enforcement as Mallon points out, would require considerably more inspectors.

Several weeks ago, District Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner suggested what he calls a "reformulation" of the code. He agrees with many slum landlords that the minor aspects of the code should not be emphasized.

Tobriner fears that with strict enforcement and lower profits "the landlord either evicts the tenants, rehabilitates the property and rents to high income groups, or evicts the tenants, razes the building and converts the land to some other use."

"There is a dilemma," Tobriner said. Tough enforcement could have the unintended effect of reducing the housing supply rather than improving housing conditions.

Still other complaints about slum housing center on the landlord and tenant court. Cases handled there last year amounted to more than 96,000 and Chief Judge John Lewis Smith, Jr., estimates the figure will exceed 100,000 this year.

The proceedings in the court are summary, usually without extensive argument. More than 95 percent of the cases in the court deal with nonpayment of rent, while most of the others involve housing code violations.

In the nonpayment cases, Smith said, if the tenant admits having not paid the rent, the only judgment possible will be in favor of the landlord. The law does not give the tenant the right to withhold his rent because his landlord has failed to make repairs or improvements, Smith said.

The wording of the law and the role of the judges in enforcing the law have led slum dwellers to complain that the court is merely a collection agency for landlords.

Civil rights organizations and antipoverty officials in Washington are now seeking changes in the law, but Smith said that whatever reforms are made must come through legislation or appellate court decisions, not from the landlord and tenant court.

[From the Washington Star, July 21, 1965]

Attack on Many Fronts Held Necessary To Solve Problems

(By John Stacks and Benjamin Forgey)

"I just wish that someday, somewhere, we could be told that something will be done about our problems," said Mrs. Ruth Melby, who lives with her family in a decaying six-room house on Potomac Avenue SE.

Her problems, and those of her neighbors in the row of rundown dwellings which form a triangle at Potomac and Pennsylvania Avenues, are common in Washington.

Not only have the families had to live in these dilapidated houses, but their misery will be compounded when they are evicted late this summer. The homes are to be replaced by a supermarket and shopping center, and the occupants will have to find places to live in the face of the city's critical shortage of low-income housing.

Her comment sums up the increasing despair and growing frustration of thousands of tenants who live in Washington's slums.

And throughout Washington the feeling is growing that "something" must be done to meet the crisis in low-income housing in the District.

The difficulty arises, however, when the discussion gets down to just what that "something" will be.

As the situation remains basically unchanged, pressure for improvements is increasing. The District of Columbia Coalition of Conscience conducted a successful battle with the District for permission to house an evicted family in a tent for 3 days.

A new group, the ad hoc Committee on the Housing Crisis, was formed last week, and civil rights leaders here and across the country are beginning to map their own plans for dramatizing the housing issue.

One of the principal efforts now underway is the formation of block groups through which tenants can work together to improve their neighborhoods and their homes.

The neighborhood centers in the antipoverty program are leading this effort.

But even though organized, tenants find their landlords are often unwilling to cooperate. Housing groups are now seeking legal devices to force landlords into repairing their properties.

Julian R. Dugas, director of UPO's Neighborhood Legal Services project, has drafted a bill giving the District the right to repair uninhabitable dwellings and then tax the owner for the cost. Another key section of the Dugas proposal, based on the old District of Columbia rent control law, would prohibit landlords from using evictions or higher rents in retaliation for complaints about housing conditions.

Other cities faced with severe problems in housing the poor have been experimenting with legal measures to insure that owners maintain their properties at code standards.

In Illinois, cities have been using a receivership device in which the courts appoint a temporary legal proprietor, with the authority to use all rents to repair the building. If the rent is not sufficient for this purpose, the receiver can borrow the necessary funds and secure the debt with a lien on the property.

Another proposal advanced here would enable tenants to initiate a suit if the landlord failed to repair deficiencies listed by housing division inspectors. If the court finds the claims valid, it could hold all rents on the property in escrow and direct the use of these funds for repairs.

One suggestion aimed at procedures in the landlord and tenant court, often regarded by slumdwellers as a "collection agency for landlords," would require a landlord seeking to evict a tenant for nonpayment of rent to produce a certificate showing that there are no unsatisfied code violation notices on the property.

The difficulty with these proposals is that they will take considerable time to implement. Although one lawyer studying the problem commented that the political climate is now "extremely favorable to judicial reform in this area," getting any of these reforms through Congress is a tough, time-consuming political task.

The legal proposals are long range, but an immediate concern is the enforcement of the housing code. The debate between housing reformers and District officials in this area is becoming increasingly vehement.

While there seems to be little doubt that slum landlords, even under the pressure of stricter code enforcement, could operate at a profit, it is true also that stepped-up enforcement would lead to some evictions and displacement.

Although strict enforcement of the code is an immediate necessity, the potential danger to slum tenants must be removed by the provision of adequate emergency housing and by expansion of the total housing market.

Under pressure from civil rights groups, the District Commissioners voted in May to provide temporary emergency housing and other assistance for evicted families. But the program has been held up while the District searches for a home to accommodate five or six families.

This facility will help, but more permanent low-income housing is needed. As Walter Washington, Director of the National Capital Housing Authority, pointed out yesterday at a public hearing, local officials are tying their attempts to provide more low-cost units to the new Federal housing bill, now in conference between the Senate and House.

One of the most important new provisions, somewhat obscured by the vociferous debate on rent supplements, is the enlargement of the nationwide authorization for public housing units from 35,000 to 60,000 units per year.

And a new flexibility has been added to the public housing program. Local authorities can use funds provided in the bill to purchase or lease existing buildings as well as to construct new units. The success of the "scattered site" experiments here, in which the NCHA placed 60 families in rehabilitated houses scattered throughout the District, indicates that, if aggressively promoted, this could be a highly effective way to meet the needs for three-, four-, and five-bedroom units.

The bill also would assist local nonprofit groups in providing private housing for families with incomes slightly higher than public housing levels, by dropping the minimum interest rate to 3 percent for the FHA below-market interest rate loan program.

After long debate, both the House and Senate finally decided rent supplements will be available only to those families which qualify for public housing, though many authorities in the District contend that both public housing and low-moderate income groups need the supplements.

Supplements will not be available, however, to needy families who are housed on the private market, but only to families who rent in multifamily buildings constructed under an FHA regular-market interest rate program.

THE SITE PROBLEM

Thus the new Federal programs promise an increase in construction of both public and private housing for low-income families. But it still is up to local officials to find additional sites for low-rent housing.

The difficulty of this task is nowhere better illustrated than in the intense competition for the large, publicly owned Anacostia-Bolling and National Training School sites. In addition to housing, other uses suggested for the sites include construction of a new Government Printing Office, construction of the proposed 4-year college for the District, and, in the case of Anacostia-Bolling, an airstrip for private planes.

Together, these locations could provide housing for between 15,000 and 20,000 families. And since development of the sites would not involve destruction of existing neighborhoods, their use would give planners an ideal opportunity to build "model" communities with mixtures of types of housing, social classes and races.

JOINT AREA PROBLEM

It is evident, however, that housing, like transportation, water resources, and air pollution, is not simply a District problem.

NCHA Director Washington has suggested an informal exchange of information and opinions on housing problems between suburban jurisdictions and the District. This is a necessary first step to any genuine regional cooperation on housing.

Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner has suggested that the NCHA be given authority to bid with private developers on suburban land. This, however, would require congressional action.

The housing problems of Washington and its suburbs are by no means unique. Cities across the country which have grown without planning, almost without forethought, face the same problem.

President Johnson, calling attention to the waste and ugliness of urban sprawl in a special message to Congress earlier this year, proposed federally supported development of "new cities" and "new towns" in the undeveloped outskirts of metropolitan areas. Such balanced, planned residential communities, the President said, could help to relieve the pressures of inner-city ghettoes. This proposal in the housing bill was killed, however, in both the Senate and the House.

Extensive interviews with persons working to assist Washington's slums dwellers showed this consensus:

If any significant attack is to be made on the housing problem in this city, the barriers between the District and the suburbs must be removed and local efforts must be heavily supplemented by the Federal Government.

[From the Washington Post, July 14, 1965]

City's Housing Shortage the Target, Frustration the Theme at Discussion

(By George Lardner, Jr.)

Frustration was the theme.

The city's shortage of low-cost housing was the target. The audience sounded aroused.

But the members of more than 25 housing organizations, civil rights groups and public agencies who gathered to try to "do something" about the housing crisis seemed to realize they were punching futilely at the same old paper bag—full of exorbitant rents, dilapidated homes, slumlords, and the bureaucratic delays facing almost any attempt at improvement.

"We seem to be moving backwards," said Stephen J. Pollak, president-elect of the Washington Planning and Housing Association which called the meeting.

"A tent on the Mall would be an enormous improvement for more people than I care to think of," said Harris Weinstein, the association's housing committee chairman.

The D.C. Coalition of Conscience has been trying to put up a tent for a family of 13—with two working mothers—who were evicted last month, but can't find new quarters. The emergency housing program the city loudly promised in May for predicaments like this may take another 3 months to get started, according to city officials who are not accustomed to rushing.

Forty-five real estate agents and nine public and private agencies had been called, said Coalition Cochairman Walter E. Fauntroy, but none could come up with a single unit that the family could afford.

The tent, of course, is a gimmick—but an appropriate one. As Mr. Fauntroy said, "we have to create pressure to effect the cures."

One WPHA worker who helps families in the Cardozo area told of an eight-room house worth $17,000 that produces gross rentals of $600 a month for its owner.

The worker, Tom Firor, also told of another landlord who "for the 40th time in the last 6 months has evicted or threatened to evict families because they called the city's housing division" to get needed repairs ordered.

Another WPHA worker, Belvie Rooks, broke into tears when she described how her organization had to pay $300 a month in back rent to "one of the worst slumlords in the city" to save a mother of seven from eviction from a house with broken-down plumbing and inadequate heating. The family, Miss Rooks said, had been living there for 3 years when the old owner died. Suddenly, she said, the rent went up from $50 a month with utilities to $100 a month—without utilities.

The audience had plenty of suggestions—ranging from rent controls, to tougher enforcement of the housing code, to easing the housing code's restrictions against overcrowding.

Mr. Fauntroy suggested that citizens' organizations start scouring the suburbs for sites—a suggestion that should be well worth pursuing under the administration's rent subsidy program before Congress. He proposed that "we move into the surrounding area and, if necessary, purchase land to relieve the (city's housing) need."

But no one followed through with the thought. Despite the suggestions, the meeting reflected, primarily, a feeling of exasperation at all the years gone by without any substantial progress.

"What we called victories really just switched people around the slums," said Lillian Secundy of the Washington Urban League.

The WPHA had drafted a statement calling for more low-income housing in the city and action on several long-stalled projects, but the audience didn't bother to endorse it.

"Pious paragraphs," said one speaker. "Too wishy-washy," said another.

Pollak agreed, but added: "I'm wondering what we can do." He suggested development of a "plan of action" backed by a federation of all interested organizations. But no one could do anything right away. They've got their boards of directors to check with.

Everyone, it seems, is saddled with his own bureaucracy—which brings us back to the District Building.

District Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner has suggested "an emergency in low cost housing" might be declared—so the Commissioners could temporarily lift relatively minor housing code requirements in rundown neighborhoods.

The suggestion was sincerely made, but it hardly seems an adequate response to an emergency. If it had any noticeable effect, it would probably benefit the landlords more than the tenants, and promote slums rather than decent housing.

If the Commissioners can agree there's an "emergency"—and there is—perhaps they might try promoting some one- or two-block urban renewal projects—for public housing. It might not work, but it seems worth the attempt. It'll take a while to get to the suburbs.

WABASH RIVER NATIONAL PARKWAY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today I introduce a bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Wabash River National Parkway in the State of Indiana.

The Wabash River is both scenic and historic. The National Parkway provided for in this bill would afford opportunity for many persons, in this time of increasing travel and vacation recreation, to enjoy far more than is presently possible the beauty of this winding river, along which were established some of our earliest settlements and forts in the exploration period of our early days.

After I announced my intention to introduce such a bill, an editorial by the channel 7 station of Evansville, Ind., WTVW, gave approval to the project. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial statement may appear in the Congressional Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the editorial will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2332) to provide for the establishment and administration of the Wabash River National Parkway in the State of Indiana, introduced by Mr. Hartke, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The editorial presented by Mr. Hartke is as follows:

[An editorial of WTVW, Evansville, Ind., May 25, 1965]

It's been a hundred years or so since Robert Browning wrote that "a man's reach should exceed his grasp * * *." But down through the years, many have shown by their visionary efforts that they agree with the poet. For instance, Senator Vance Hartke of Indiana, seems to be driving for more than can possibly ever be accomplished in the Wabash River Valley. But if his dreams do fall short, the scenic valley of song and legend will be far better off than it is now. The Indiana Senator concedes his eight-point plan to beautify and revitalize the historic valley is a dream. But he says the dream can become at least partly real if Federal, State, and local governments and private enterprise cooperate. The dream is worth working toward because, as Senator Hartke says, "the scenic Wabash * * * has become in certain areas nothing more than an open sewer. But much beauty remains," he concludes, "and we must act now to preserve this heritage for future generations." For those dreamers interested solely in beautifying the Wabash Valley, the Senator's plan would create a rolling, winding national parkway along the river's 280 miles between Fort Wayne and New Harmony. Rest areas and parks would dot the route. And he calls for restoring parts of the historic Wabash and Erie Canal and developing Indian sites and villages. For those with eyes mostly for business and commerce, Senator Hartke's dream would mean dredging a navigable channel from the Ohio River up the Wabash to Terre Haute. It would result in construction of reservoirs and added flood protection, a speed-up in efforts to control stream pollution and establishment of more fisheries to provide game fish for the Wabash and nearby reservoirs. Senator Hartke should be supported in his efforts to stop slow deterioriation of the Wabash River. As he says, his eight-point plan to beautify and revitalize the Wabash River Valley may "take years and the job may never be completed. But if we work together and hard, we will have the satisfaction of knowing that we have done our best to preserve for our children the scenic and historic values they might otherwise never know."

ESTATES OF CERTAIN FORMER MEMBERS OF U.S. NAVY BAND—AMENDMENT

(AMENDMENT NO. 368)

Mr. BREWSTER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1503) for the relief of the estates of certain former members of the U.S. Navy Band, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

EXPANSION OF WAR ON POVERTY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am convinced that, if the poverty program is to succeed and if the needy are to receive the promised benefits, the program must remain free from politics. I am certain that the Congress intended the program to be free from politics when it enacted this program last year. Yet evidence continues to mount that such is not the case:

> In far too many communities giant fiestas of political patronage have been encouraged. (Congressman Adam Clayton Powell.)
>
> * * * is emerging as a huge political pork barrel. (Mayor Yorty of Los Angeles.)
>
> Community umbrella organizations "are stacked at least two to one with payrollers of the party faithful."
>
> This poverty program payroll "sounds like the fundraising committee for the Democratic city organization in Chicago." (Rev. Stevenson of Chicago.)
>
> The battle over political control reveals more interest "in the political power of the poverty program than * * * in providing legitimate long-term answers to the needs of segments of our society." (Congressman Edward Derwinski.)

These warning flags have been hoisted and, before irreparable damage has been done, I believe it is imperative that these warnings be heeded and the dangers be eliminated.

Feeling that "where there is smoke, there is fire," I am introducing, Mr. President, an amendment which would stamp out these partisan political fires and prevent the ultimate destruction of the program. Basically, my amendment attempts to prevent politics from taking over the poverty program. I have not adopted a shotgun approach, but I have carefully limited my amendment to that area of the poverty program where indicting testimony and reports have disclosed abuse and where the potential for abuses is limited only by the imagination of the political parties. The conflicts and controversy throughout our country indicate that political opportunists are aware of the potential of controlling the disposition of high-salaried jobs.

Under existing law, employees of State or local agencies whose principal employment is in connection with an activity that is financed in whole or in part by Federal funds are barred from "pernicious political activity" by section 12 of the Hatch Act. On the other hand, employees of private nonprofit organizations conducting community action programs under the poverty program are not subject to the restrictions of the Hatch Act.

VISTA volunteers assigned under section 603(a)(2) of the Economic Opportunity Act are subject to the Hatch Act restrictions, but volunteers assigned to State or local agencies or private nonprofit organizations are not subject to restrictions on political activities.

My amendment would bring the remaining VISTA volunteers and all persons employed on community action projects for private nonprofit organizations under the Hatch Act's prohibition on improper political activities.

Last year the Senate properly added an amendment which prohibits political activity by enrollees and employees of the Job Corps. Our experience with the program since that time has disclosed the necessity of extending the Hatch Act further if the needy citizens of this Nation are truly to benefit from the poverty program.

Our Nation dating back to the time of President Chester A. Arthur has had a policy that those who are paid from public moneys must devote themselves to the interest of the public and not to the interest of a partisan political group.

My amendment, Mr. President, is consistent with this philosophy and it will go a long way in assuring the American people that we are sincere in eradicating poverty from our midst.

Make no mistake about it, the stakes are high—too high for us indifferently to shrug off the warnings and hope that the matter will work itself out. Commonsense and all experience tell us otherwise. Therefore, we must at this early stage take remedial action, for, if we do not, the people's confidence in the program will be undermined. Even more important, the success or failure of the program is at stake. It would indeed be a crucial blow to the Nation's needy if, after hearing of the widespread promises of the program, if after having the Nation's attention focused upon them, and if after having their hopes lifted, they find that the only important result of the program is the enhancing of the political fortunes of a particular politician or a political party.

Since the founding of our country, our people have always been ready and willing to assist their neighbors in need. Helping others is part of the American way of life. Its roots are deeply embedded in the religious heritage of our people. This benevolent spirit has not only built a great nation, but it has also assisted nearly every needy nation on the face of the globe. The generosity of the American people unquestionably has made this Nation the most charitable nation in the history of mankind.

Americans quite naturally are proud of their efforts. Their efforts continue today, for every minute of every day across the country private individuals and private organizations are at work with the needy—counseling, ministering, encouraging, and assisting. And quite naturally, Americans are also proud of the fact that this work has remained bigger than narrow partisan politics. I believe it would be a sad day, indeed a disservice to the American people, if we now turn our backs on the proven traditional nonpartisan approach and permit politics to become entrenched in these programs.

I personally believe, Mr. President, that the American people will not stand idly by and see politics overrun the poverty program. For if it does, the program is destined for failure and the poor will no longer be the primary purpose of the program, but rather will become a mere pawn in the advancement of the political plans of ambitious politicians. Steps must be taken to assure that the poverty program will not be accompanied by political strings.

Being a member of the Senate Select Committee on Poverty, I had the privilege of attending the hearings on the administration's proposal to extend the poverty program. Mr. Shriver failed to convince me that all is well with the program. His is a lone voice against the crescendo of complaints that have been raised throughout the country. As a member of the committee, I for one intend to do everything in my power to see that the needy actually receive the benefits of the program.

The question that Congress will have to decide is whether the traditional nonpartisan approach of assisting the needy will be continued or whether we will permit the program to stumble and stagnate in the quagmire of political controversy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 369) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of two more Senators may be added as cosponsors to my bill, S. 2228, a bill dealing with the pay of teachers in the overseas school system operated by the Department of Defense. They are Senator Brewster and Senator Williams of New Jersey.

Mr. President, at the time the bill was introduced it was intended that it should be held at the desk for cosponsors, but this was not done. Since that time, the names of 15 other Senators were added as cosponsors by unanimous consent, making a total of 17. In order that their names may more adequately appear as supporters of this bill, which I hope will receive a hearing shortly, I request unanimous consent that at a new printing of the bill it be made with the complete list of cosponsors appearing in the new print.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT NO. 339

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], may be added as cosponsors to amendment No. 339 to S. 1702.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponors for the following bills:

Authority of July 13, 1965:

S. 2282. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program of research, study and surveys, documentation, and description of the natural environmental systems of the United States for the purpose of understanding and evaluating the condition of these systems and to provide information to those concerned with natural resources management, and for other purposes: Mr. Clark, Mr. Hart, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Morse, Mr. Moss, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pell, Mr. Ribicoff, and Mr. Yarborough.

Authority of July 19, 1965:

S. 2302. A bill to provide fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel, to improve the quality of teacher training programs, and to establish a National Teacher Corps: Mr. Hartke, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Ribicoff, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 2228 AND H.R. 242

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I announce that hearings will be held to take testimony on S. 2228 and H.R. 242, in room 6202 of the New Senate Office Building, Monday, August 2, 1965, at 10 a.m.

S. 2228 would establish new salary rates for teachers in the Department of Defense overseas education program. H.R. 242 would extend the apportionment requirement of the Civil Service Act to summer employment positions within the District of Columbia. Persons wishing to testify may arrange to do so by calling 225-5451.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LUTHER B. EUBANKS, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, August 3, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Luther B. Eubanks, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. District Judge, Western District of Oklahoma, to fill an additional position created pursuant to provisions of title 28, section 372(b) United States Code.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF THURGOOD MARSHALL, OF NEW YORK, TO BE SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, July 29, 1965, at 10 a.m., in room 2228 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Thurgood Marshall, of New York, to be Solicitor General of the United States, vice Archibald Cox.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], chairman, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

OBSERVATIONS UPON RECENT DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Honorable Charles J. Bloch, of the Georgia bar, has rendered invaluable service to the bench and bar of Georgia and America as president of the Georgia Bar Association, editor of the Georgia Bar Journal, chairman of the Judicial Council of Georgia, chairman of the Rules Committee of the Supreme Court of Georgia, and author of the authoritative treatise, "State's Rights—The Law of the Land."

He is well known to the profession as one of the greatest experts in the Nation in the field of constitutional law.

Mr. Bloch has made some interesting observations concerning some recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. In order that these observations may be made available to as many American lawyers as possible, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBSERVATIONS OF CHARLES J. BLOCH OF THE MACON, GA., BAR

On June 7, 1965, the October term, 1964, of the Supreme Court of the United States came to an end. Now, in the course of time, will come published reviews of its work during the last 9 months. Most of these will emanate from the pens and thoughts of law school deans and professors. I hope that time and circumstances will permit me to write such a review from the standpoint of a practical, practicing attorney, to whom the law is a living actuality, not merely a theory. Though groggy and punch drunk from many blows, even the 5 to 4 ones, I still have hopes for the survival of a rule of law in our land, so I'll call my proposed article: "Darkest Hour—Just Before Dawn(?)."

In the meantime, maybe some of you readers who perhaps do not have the time to read these opinions as they are published would like to know something of three or four of that last batch of June 7, 1965.

No. 256, *Estes* v. *Texas*, is succinctly digested as holding: "Present-day televising of 'notorious' State criminal trial, over defendant's objection, violates 14th amendment's due process clause."

Mr. Justice Clark "delivered the opinion of the Court" in the preface, but examination reveals that the Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Douglas and Mr. Justice Goldberg concurred in a separate opinion; Justice Harlan in another separate one, and Mr. Justice Stewart, joined by Mr. Justice Black, Mr. Justice Brennan, and Mr. Justice White, dissented. Justice Brennan wrote a separate dissent, too.

The various and varying opinions with accompanying photographs comprise pages 4543–4576 of U.S. Law Week.

As I read the succinct digest quoted above, I wondered why the adjective "notorious" was inserted. Apparently its springs from portions of Mr. Justice Harlan's concurring opinion. His concurrence was necessary to establish a majority. One sentence in his opinion is: "On the other hand, the issue is no broader, for we are concerned here only with a criminal trial of great notoriety, and not with criminal proceeding of a more or less routine nature." (33 L.W. 4567.)

Another (33 L.W. 4569) is: "At the present juncture I can only conclude that televised trials, at least in cases like this one, possess such capabilities for interfering with the even course of the judicial process that they are constitutionally banning. On these premises I concur in the opinion of the Court."

I wonder what criteria will be applied in the future to determine whether a criminal trial is one of "great notoriety" or one of a "more or less routine nature." I apprehend that when any accused is on trial, and may as a result be deprived of life, liberty or property, his trial is not "more or less routine" to him. What has become of "equal justice under law"?

The additional separate dissent of Mr. Justice Brennan (p. 4576) emphasizes that "The Estes trial was a heavily publicized and highly sensational affair." That sentence is quoted from Justice Harlan's special concurrence. From it all, Justice Brennan concludes: "Thus today's decision is not a blanket constitutional prohibition against the televising of State criminal trials," (p. 4576).

I cannot help but wonder what the rule will be if the trial of one like that of Sam Thompson, reviewed in *Thompson* v. *City of Louisville*, 362 U.S. 199, is televised.

Then, too, there is a separate dissent of Mr. Justice White (p. 4576) which contains this language: "In my view, the currently available materials assessing the effect of cameras in the courtroom are too sparse and fragmentary to constitute the basis for a constitutional judgment permanently barring any and all forms of television coverage. It may well be, however, that as further experience and informed judgment do become available, the use of cameras in the courtroom, as in this trial, will prove to pose such a serious hazard to a defendant's rights that a violation of the 14th amendment will be found without a showing on the record of specific demonstrable prejudice to the defendant."

So it may be, therefore, that defendants in less notorious trials may in the future be decreed to have the very few same constitutional rights as those adjudicated in the Estes case.

No. 496, *Griswold* v. *Connecticut*, 33 L.W. 4587, is said to hold: "Connecticut's ban on use of contraceptives and on giving of medical advice as to their use violates right of marital privacy that 14th amendment protects against invasion by State, accessories to violation of Connecticut ban on use of contraceptives have standing to challenge ban's constitutionality" (p. 4519).

So, another "constitutional right" is born—that of "privacy of the boudoir."

I looked, in vain, for any attempt to distinguish cases such as *Jacobson* v. *Massachusetts*, 197 U.S. 11, which to me seems pertinent.

But my search was not fruitless. For on page 4600, I found that Mr. Justice Black is now preaching the doctrine of States rights. Eight years or so ago, I wrote a book. I named it "States Rights, the Law of the Land." I dedicated it "to my grandsons, for them and those of their age, my hope is that constitutional government may survive."

On its flyleaf, I quoted from the first opinion written by Oliver Wendell Holmes, as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, January 5, 1903—187 United States at page 608: "While the courts must exercise a judgment of their own, it by no means is true that every law is void which may seem to the judges who pass upon it excessive, unsuited to the ostensible end, or based upon conceptions of morality with which they disagree."

Also, on that flyleaf, I quoted from one of the last dissenting opinions written by the same Justice, May 26, 1930—281 United States at page 595, as follows:

"I have not yet adequately expressed the more than anxiety that I feel at the ever-increasing scope given to the 14th amendment in cutting down what I believe to be the constitutional rights of the States. As the decisions now stand I see hardly any limit but the sky as to the invalidating of those rights if they happen to strike a majority of this Court as for any reason undesirable. I cannot believe that the amendment was intended to give us carte blanche to embody our economic or moral beliefs in its prohibitions."

And, now, lo and behold, is Mr. Justice Black in his dissenting opinion (at p. 4600) quoting that same language from Mr. Justice Holmes in support of his own language: "My point is that there is no provision of the Constitution which either expressly or impliedly vests power in this Court to sit as a supervisory agency over acts of a duly constituted legislative body and set aside their laws because of the Court's belief that the legislative policies adopted are unreasonable, unwise, arbitrary, capricious or irrational * * * subjecting Federal and State laws to such an unrestrained and unrestrainable judicial control as to the wisdom of legislative enactments would, I fear, jeopardize the separation of governmental powers that the framers set up and at the same time threaten to take away much of the power of the States to govern themselves which the Constitution plainly intended them to have."

Is Mr. Justice Black seeing the light? Is he now thinking, "What has the Court wrought in its application of views to the contrary of those which I now state?"

We can only hope that Mr. Justice Black will remain on the Court to preach that doctrine when the marriage laws of some of the States are next brought into question before the Court.

From many other standpoints, *Griswold* v. *Connecticut* is interesting. Among those is the debate between Mr. Justice Black and Mr. Justice Goldberg over the ninth amendment.

For those of you who may have forgotten, the ninth amendment reads:

"The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be constructed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

Mr. Justice Black in his dissent wrote:

"The Court also quotes the ninth amendment, and my brother Goldberg's concurring opinion relies heavily upon it. But to say that the ninth amendment has anything to do with this case is to turn somersaults with history. The ninth amendment, like its companion the 10th, which this Court held 'states but a truism that all is retained which has not been surrendered,' *United States* v. *Darby*, 312 U.S. 100, 124, was framed by James Madison and adopted by the States simply to make clear that the adoption of the Bill of Rights did not alter the plan that the Federal Government was to be a government of express and limited powers, and that all rights and powers not delegated to it were retained by the people and the individual States. Until today no member of this Court has ever suggested that the ninth amendment meant anything else, and the idea that a Federal Court could ever use the ninth amendment to annul a law passed by the elected representatives of the people of the State of Connecticut would have caused James Madison no little wonder." (33 L. W. 4603.)

In his opinion, Justice Goldberg retorted:

"Nor am I turning somersaults with history in arguing that the ninth amendment is relevant in a case dealing with a State's infringement of a fundamental right. While the ninth amendment—and indeed the entire Bill of Rights—originally concerned restrictions upon Federal power, the subsequently enacted 14th amendment prohibits the States as well from abridging fundamental personal liberties. And, the ninth amendment, in indicating that not all such liberties are specifically mentioned in the first eight amendments, is surely relevant in showing the existence of other fundamental personal rights, now protected from State, as well as Federal infringement. In sum, the 9th amendment simply lends strong support to the view that the 'liberty' protected by the 5th and 14th amendments from infringement from the Federal Government or the States is not restricted to rights specifically mentioned in the first 8 amendments." (33 L. W. 4592.)

Had Mr. Justice Black had the opportunity for a surrebuttal he doubtless would have called the attention of Mr. Justice Goldberg to the fact that in American history and American jurisprudence, the first 8 amendments, not the first 10 amendments, more exactly comprise the Bill of Rights.

He could have cited to his colleague "The Bill of Rights" by Judge Learned Hand which in its first paragraph says: "I shall confine myself to the function of U.S. courts, particularly the Supreme Court, of declaring invalid statutes of the Congress, or of the States, or acts of the President, because they are in conflict with what we have come to call our 'Bill of Rights,' by which I mean the first 8 and the 14th amendments of the Constitution of the United States." (See also p. 31.)

He could have cited to his colleague the words of another colleague, Mr. Justice Douglas, appearing at page 25 of his "We The Judges": "The United States has its Bill of Rights, the name usually given to our first eight amendments." (See also, Ibid., p. 299.)

He could have called to his colleagues attention the words of still another colleague, Mr. Justice Brennan, who in *Roth* v. *United States*, 354 U.S. 476, recognized that the purposes of both the 9th and 10th amendments were to emphasize the reservation of powers by the States. (354 U.S. 492–3.)

He could have called to his attention languages in the very Mitchell case which he cited demonstrating that the 9th and 10th amendments have always been coupled as reservations to the people, and not as creating rights other than those enumerated in the first eight amendments. (See 330 U.S. at page 94, where Mr. Justice Reed, for the Court, wrote: "We accept appellant's contention that the nature of political rights reserved to the people by the 9th and 10th amendment are involved.")

American history teaches that the ninth amendment is the embodiment of one of the proposals made by North Carolina as a condition precedent to her ratification of the Constitution. North Carolina had proposed that "those clauses which declare that Congress shall not exercise certain powers, be not interpreted in any manner to extend the power of Congress; but that they be construed either as making exceptions to the specified powers where this shall be the case, or otherwise, as inserted merely for greater caution."

For example, article I, section 9 paragraph 8 of the Constitution provides: "No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States." Why was that inserted in the Constitution? There was no delegation of power which the framers intended to authorize the grant of a title of nobility. Why was anything said on that subject? Simply as an expression of determined ideas and to negative any thought of implied powers of Congress. Of course we know now that in the absence of such an express restriction on the powers of Congress, the Congress might now grant a title of nobility as it creates offices in the Army, Navy or Air Force.

It is interesting that in that same section of the Constitution (Art. I, § 9, par. 3) is this paragraph: "No Bill of Attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed."

That paragraph, too, was considered by the Court on June 7 in No. 399, *United States* v. *Archie Brown*. Applying it, the Court by a vote of 5 to 4 held that section 504 of the Landrum-Griffin Act (29 U.S.C. § 504) under which members of the Communist Party are barred from holding union office is invalid. It, the majority holds constitutes a bill of attainder. Justices White, Clark, Harlan, and Stewart dissented. So the majority consisted of the Chief Justice, and Associate Justices Black, Douglas, Brennan and Goldberg.

That decision is of particular interest to some of us who studied the so-called Voting Rights Act of 1965 as it was being discussed and debated in Congress. All of the Justices seemed to agree in the Brown case that when "an enactment is challenged as an attainder, the central inquiry must be whether the disability imposed by the act is 'punishment' (i.e. is directed at an individual or a group of individuals) or is 'regulation' (i.e. directed at controlling future conduct)" (Compare 33 L.W. 4611).

Measuring the principal provisions of the so-called Voting Rights Act of 1965 by this central inquiry it is quite clear that some of us were correct when we argued in the Spring that the disability imposed by that act is punishment directed at a group of individuals, to wit, all of those of six States of the South, and parts of others.

Toward the conclusion of the majority opinion in the Archie Brown case is this cogent language: "We do not hold today that Congress cannot weed dangerous persons out of the labor movement, any more than the Court held in Lovett (328 U.S. 303) that subversives must be permitted to hold sensitive Government positions. Rather, we make again the point made in Lovett: that Congress must accomplish such results by rules of general applicability. It cannot specify the people upon whom the sanction is prescribes is to be levied. Under our Constitution, Congress possesses full legislative authority, but the task of adjudication must be left to other tribunals."

One of the things which makes life interesting is to be able to look forward to the day when the Court will be asked to apply to the people of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia and parts of North Carolina the same rule of law which on June 7, 1965, it applied to alleged subversives in "the labor movement."

The other case which is of special interest is No. 857 Misc., *Cameron* v. *Johnson*. The order promulgated by the majority (Chief Justice Warren, Justices Douglas, Brennan, Clark, White, and Goldberg), recites that the appellants brought the action, inter alia, under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 to enjoin the enforcement of a Mississippi antipicketing statute (enacted in 1964) on the grounds that it was an unconstitutionally broad regulation of speech, and that it was being applied for the purpose of discouraging appellants' civil rights activities. Probable jurisdiction was not only noted but summarily exercised. The judgment of the district court majority dismissing the complaint was vacated and the cause remanded for reconsideration in light of *Dombrowski* v. *Pfister*, 380 U.S. 479. (That case was an action under the Civil Rights Act for declaratory relief and injunction restraining the defendants from prosecuting or threatening to prosecute plaintiffs for alleged violations of Louisiana Subversive Activities and Communist Control Law and Communist Propaganda Control Law. The U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana, District Judges Frank B. Ellis and E. Gordon West concurring, Circuit Judge Wisdom dissenting, 227 F. Supp. 557, dismissed the complaint. Plaintiffs appealed. The Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Brennan writing, Justices Black and Stewart taking no part in the decision of the case, Justices Harlan and Clark dissenting, on April 26, 1965, held that the provision of the Louisiana Subversive Activities and Communist Control Law defining subversive organization violates due process in that the language thereof is unduly vague and uncertain and broad.) The district court was ordered, on remand, to consider first whether 28 U.S.C. § 2283 bars a Federal injunction in this case, and if it is not a bar, then to determine whether relief is proper in the light of the criteria it had set forth in the Drombrowski case.

Mr. Justice Black, with whom Mr. Justice Harlan and Mr. Justice Stewart joined, dissented. Mr. Justice White also dissented. It should be borne in mind that Justice Black, along with Justices Harlan and White, had a year ago (June 22, 1964) dissented in *Bell* v. *Maryland*, 378 U.S. 226, and later in *Hamm* v. *City of Rock Hill*, 379 U.S. 306, 318 (Dec. 14, 1964), Justices Black, Harlan, Stewart, and White had dissented. The majority held in the latter case that activities punishable occurring prior to the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 were insulated from punishment by the subsequent passage of that act. There Justice Black had concluded his dissent by writing that no Member of Congress in the discussion of that act had "intimate(d) a hope or express(ed) a fear that the act was intended to have the effect which the Court gives it today." (85 S. Ct. at p. 394.)

On June 7, Mr. Justice Black for himself and Justices Harlan and Stewart wrote:

"I dissent from the reversal of this judgment and from the manner in which it was done. A cryptic, uninformative per curiam order is no way, I think for this Court to decide a case involving as this one does a State's power to make it an offense for people to obstruct public streets and highways and to block ingress and egress to and from its public buildings and properties. The case also involves the question whether, having passed such a law, valid on its face, the State can prosecute offenders in its own courts or whether U.S. courts have power to enjoin all State prosecutions merely because of a charge that the law is unconstitutional on its face, without first determining the constitutionality of the statute. Every person who has the slightest information about what is going on in this country can understand the importance of these issues. The summary disposition the Court makes of this case fails properly to enlighten State or Federal courts or the people who deserve to know what are the rights of the people, the rights of affected groups, the rights of the Federal Government, and the rights of the States in this field of activities which encompasses some of the most burning, pressing and important issues of our time. There are many earnest, honest, good people in this Nation who are entitled to know exactly how far they have a constitutional right to go in using the public streets to advocate causes they consider just. State officials are also entitled to the same information. The Court has already waited entirely too long, in my judgment, to perform its duty of clarifying these constitutional issues. These issues are of such great importance that I am of the opinion that before this Court relegates the States to the position of mere onlookers in struggles over their streets and the accesses to their public buildings, this Court should at least write an opinion making clear to the States and interested people the boundaries between what they can do in this field and what they cannot. Today's esoteric and more or less mysterious per curiam order gives no such information." (33 L. W. 3395.)

In a footnote on the same page, Justice Black pursues the subject: "Today's decision appears to add more devices to the collection of delaying tactics by which State criminal defendants may use collateral litigation in the Federal courts to prevent their prosecutions in State courts from coming to trial for many years, if ever."

And further he wrote:

"If, as I believe, the Mississippi statute is not unconstitutional on its face, then the district court in dismissing the complaint and leaving the trials to the State courts acted in accordance with an unbroken line of this Court's cases going back to the early days of this country. See, e.g., *Douglas* v. *City of Jeannette*, 319 U.S. 157; *Watson* v. *Buck*, 313 U.S. 387; *Beal* v. *Missouri Pac. R. Co.*, 312 U.S. 45; *Spielman Motor Sales Co.* v. *Dodge*, 295 U.S. 89; *Fenner* v. *Boykin*, 271 U.S. 240."

The report of this case as it appears in the U.S. Law Week of June 8, 1965, does not reveal where the decision of the district court is reported. Nor does it show when the appeal was filed.

We can only wonder why the majority of the Court did not deem it advisable to have full briefs submitted and to have full argument over the important questions presented to it in this case.

POLICY IN RELATION TO FRIENDSHIP AIRPORT AND DULLES AIRPORT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on Thursday night of last week the former Administrator of the FAA, Mr. Halaby, recommended that the full weight of the Federal Government be brought to bear against any airport that competed with Dulles International Airport, and that all traffic over which the Federal Government had control be directed to Dulles International Airport.

Last Friday, in defense of fairness, I suggested that the position of the Federal Government, through the CAB and the FAA, should be impartial, and that the traveling public and those who wish to ship freight should be allowed to ship such freight or travel over the airline and through the airport that best serves their needs.

On Saturday, the Evening Sun of Baltimore published an editorial entitled "He Won't Give Up." The editorial asks that no artificial pressures to favor one airport over the other be exercised by the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Evening Sun of last Saturday be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HE WON'T GIVE UP

Najeeb Halaby is at it again. The former head of the Federal Aviation Agency, during whose tenure Dulles International Airport was built, simply won't give up the notion that his ill-advised white elephant can somehow be made into a useful behemoth of all work if only it is treated right. The trouble is that treating Dulles "right" will seem to most people like treating Friendship Airport wrong. What is worse, it involves treating the passengers who might logically want to use Friendship, and the airlines which are perfectly willing to accommodate them, quite definitely wrong.

First, Mr. Halaby would change the name of Friendship International Airport to Baltimore Airport. As a sort of reverse public relations trick, this would presumably have the effect of scaring off any number of Washington-bound passengers who would plead in panic not to be sent to this remote way station and would gratefully accept booking into Dulles.

Second, he would insist that all Federal agencies channel air travel of their people through Dulles unless it were absolutely necessary to use the "Baltimore Airport." Finally, looking to the future, he would administer the coup de grace to Friendship by denying it all supersonic planes, which would of course go to Dulles. As a sort of desperate postscript, Mr. Halaby also suggests an "international air show" at Dulles, apparently on the assumption that if people were reminded the airport is there, they might actually use it.

Mr. Halaby notes that he is able to speak out so vigorously only because he is no longer in a position of authority. All we can say is, "Thank goodness." For—except for the rather pathetic air show proposal—his suggestions involve an intolerable degree of favoritism. All Friendship wants, and needs, is a chance to compete fairly for its legitimate share of the Baltimore-Washington traffic. It has shown over the past few years that on this basis it can more than hold its own. There will come a day, to be sure, when all three airports—National, Friendship, and Dulles—will be needed, each taking the portion of the traffic it can most logically attract. But until then, and even then, let there be no artificial pressures to favor one over the others.

DIRKSEN 1-MAN, 10-VOTES AMENDMENT REVERSES GREAT CONSTITUTIONAL TREND TOWARD EQUALIZING VOTE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the first letter appearing in the Sunday New York Times yesterday brilliantly summarizes the historical arguments against the Dirksen amendment.

One of the most exciting and rewarding elements of this democracy of America is that it is constantly striving for improvement, striving to permit more and more people to vote and to count their vote with full and equal value.

As Robert Cammer, of Philadelphia, who wrote the letter said, 9 of the 14 amendments to the Constitution following the Bill of Rights deal with making the franchise more democratic. The Dirksen amendment would be the first one designed to reverse that trend and—as Roscoe Drummond put it so brilliantly the other day—in effect give 1 man 10 votes and another man a one-tenth vote.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEES RIGHTS ABROGATED BY DIRKSEN AMENDMENT

To the EDITOR:

The argument of Joseph W. Reilly, S.J. [letter July 18] that the Dirksen amendment should be passed is questionable.

It is historically insupportable to say State legislative apportionment "based, at least to some extent, on geographic factors, has been the traditional American way of seeking justice. * * *" In fact, the "tradition" is new. It arose only with the failure of most States to reapportion, usually in violation of their own constitutions, to meet the shift in population from rural to urban toward the turn of this century.

Our history has been one of a continually expanding franchise. "Equal representation," wrote Thomas Jefferson in 1819, "is so fundamental a principle in a true republic that no prejudice can justify its violation because the prejudices themselves cannot be justified."

It was no accident, therefore, that following the Bill of Rights, 9 of the next 14 amendments were concerned with making the electoral process more democratic. Yet if the Dirksen amendment were passed, it would be the first to reduce these liberties.

It would make constitutional malapportioned State legislatures controlled by minorities in direct opposition to the American democratic spirit so wisely described by James Madison when he said: "It is essential to [a republic] that it be derived from the great body of society, not from an inconsiderable proportion or a favored class of it."

MINORITY CONTROL

It is clear, as Senator TYDINGS and others have stated, that the Dirksen amendment is designed as an implied repeal of the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment where voting is concerned. Its vague standards would arguably make constitutional apportionment schemes disenfranchising members of labor unions, Negroes or, were they in the minority, even farmers or Republicans.

Nor is it a safeguard for the amendment to say a majority of the voters must first approve a particular scheme.

The Federal analogy is also inapplicable, the nonrepresentative nature of the Senate was due to a great compromise, a concession to the smaller States, which did not even reflect majority sentiment when adopted. It may at least be justified by the fact that the States represent organized political entities within the United States, whereas in their internal organization States are subdivided merely for administrative ease or political expediency.

Finally, not to overlook the obvious, the Senate functions while the State legislatures, because of malapportionment, do not.

TURN TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The amendment would further undermine our already decaying Federal system by forcing cities to continue to bypass State governments, where they would still have little voice, to establish further direct ties with the Federal Government in the attempt to solve the major problems of schools, housing, transportation, etc., with which we are faced.

Defeat of the Dirksen amendment on the other hand, along with reapportionment as suggested by the Supreme Court, could restore a balance of favor of the federalism so essential to our democratic system.

One may debate whether simple arithmetic equality is the only proper basis for apportionment. At least numbers have the virtue of neutrality—an important virtue in our society of shifting alliances where a person may be in the minority as a Negro but in the majority as desiring better housing, or in the minority as a farmer but in the majority as desiring better public transportation.

But the Dirksen amendment goes far beyond such rational discussion and instead would abrogate a right most basic to a democracy. Your editorial view that it should be defeated is therefore commendable.

ROBERT I. CAMMER.

PHILADELPHIA, *July 21, 1965.*

OLD ORDER AGAINST THE NEW

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a column entitled "Old Order Against the New," written by Kenneth Crawford, and published in the August 2 issue—which is the current issue—of Newsweek.

Mr. Crawford's excellent column states that there is no more vital issue than the issue of apportionment that has been raised at this session of Congress. Those measures have included bills to provide an equal opportunity for Negroes in the South to vote, and to provide medicare.

He also argues that this is not merely a fight between urban, suburban, and rural elements, but it is, rather, as Mr. Crawford puts it very well, of the old order in America against the new.

I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLD ORDER AGAINST THE NEW

(By Kenneth Crawford)

A bill to designate August 31 through September 6 as National American Legion Baseball Week would not in the usual course of events excite the U.S. Senate. But events were not running their usual course last week when this measure was taken up. For Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN immediately moved to attach to it his constitutional amendment to nullify half of the Supreme Court's ruling that all State legislators must be elected from districts roughly equal in population.

This did excite the Senate because the Dirksen proposal, if approved by two-thirds of the Senate and House, and three-quarters of the States, would tend to perpetuate a rotten-borough system that has weakened State government and had the effect of concentrating power in Federal Washington. DIRKSEN's amendment would exempt one branch of State legislatures from the Court's mandate, permitting their membership to be apportioned on factors other than population. Thus this branch would be in a position to veto the projects of the popularly elected branch.

No more vital issue has been raised at this session of Congress, notable as it has been for its handling of such complex problems as those posed by discrimination against potential Negro voters and the prohibitive cost of medical care for the unaffluent aged. The resolution DIRKSEN brought to the floor by his parliamentary maneuver was identical with the one he had been trying to pry out of the Senate Judiciary Committee with a favorable report. A few months ago it appeared that the task of persuading the committee would offer no challenge to the talents of the Republican leader. A majority of the 16-member committee was predisposed to give present State legislators some measure of protection in their jobs and, at the same time, to rebuke the Court for meddling.

COSTLY SHORTCUT?

But by the time the committee got around to voting DIRKSEN's majority had evaporated. Members were equally divided, eight to eight. So informed by the nose counters, DIRKSEN talked through the committee's session to prevent a showdown in which his motion to report the resolution would have failed. He threatened further attempts to "educate" the committee but decided instead to shortcut the committee process, a decision that may prove costly to him. It would be most unusual for Congress to sanction a constitutional amendment not previously cleared by a standing Senate committee.

The immediate cause of DIRKSEN's failure in committee was the defection of Senator JACOB JAVITS of New York. As a Republican, JAVITS had been under pressure from Albany to string along with DIRKSEN. Republicans in the legislature owe their strength to malapportionment favoring sparsely populated upstate counties. But JAVITS' own stronghold is New York City. When labor unions and civil-rights groups awakened to the damage the Dirksen amendment could do their interests, JAVITS felt the heat from their direction. He decided to abandon the Dirksen cause and to sponsor a compromise amendment of his own.

THE REAL CONTEST

Nevertheless, it is assumed that majorities both in the Senate and House remain more influenced by entrenched State politicians than by reformist constituents. The question is whether the majorities are two-thirds. Until debate has progressed to the point where this can be discovered, leaders of the opposition to DIRKSEN's resolution propose to keep the talk going in the Senate. Unless assured of the 34 votes necessary to beat it, they will try to filibuster it to death under the leadership of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, DIRKSEN's Democratic colleague from Illinois.

They will argue on the floor, as they have in committee, that the fight is not simply between urban and rural areas but rather between the new and old America. It is the now mushrooming suburban areas, not the cities themselves, that are worst victimized by old voting districts. It is the statehouse wanglers, not the city bosses, who stand to lose most if the Court's one-man, one-vote decisions are permitted to operate in the election of all State legislators to both branches. The contest is not really between Republicans and Democrats. Rather it is between standpatters and progressives of both parties.

DICTATOR NGUYEN CAO KY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, some American military advisers in Saigon are distressed by the actions of Nguyen Cao Ky, presently Prime Minister or dictator of South Vietnam and formerly Air Vice Marshal of South Vietnam. It seems that the South Vietnamese have a proliferation of generals, air marshals, marshals, and so forth, and very few privates to do the fighting. This dictator has been executing some Vietcong infiltrators as spies without trial—this in retaliation for Vietcong brutality to prisoners. Now he is threatening the execution of war profiteers in that unhappy jungle country. Drumhead trials and executions of prisoners of war should not be tolerated.

American officials in Washington and Saigon are even more distressed over a statement made by Ky shortly before he took over forcibly as Prime Minister. In an interview he was asked, "Who are your heroes, Marshal Ky?" Did he say George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, Gen. Robert E. Lee, General Patton, or Rommel? He did not. His answer was:

> I have only one—Hitler. I admire Hitler because he pulled his country together when it was in a terrible state in the early thirties. The situation here in South Vietnam is so desperate that one man would not be enough. We need four or five Hitlers in Vietnam.

This is the leader in South Vietnam that our military is now supporting and keeping in power.

HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CARE FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I am strongly of the opinion that an obligation rests upon Federal, State, and local governments to adopt measures which will secure needed hospital and medical service for our elderly citizens who are financially incapable of providing such service for themselves. As a consequence, I have supported the Kerr-Mills Act which, if properly implemented, would provide all needed hospital and medical service without limitation to all persons 65 years of age and upward who are unable to provide such care for themselves.

I was constrained, however, to vote against H.R. 6675, which is popularly known as the medicare bill. My reasons for so doing are set forth in the following statement which analyzes some of the salient provisions of the bill in the form in which it was approved by the Senate.

I

While the advocates of the bill profess the purpose of merely providing hospital and medical service for persons 65 years and upward in age who are unable to provide such service for themselves, the bill undertakes to provide certain hospital and medical service for all persons of such ages, including well-to-do elderly persons able financially to provide such service for themselves.

The truth is that a substantial part of the 19 million Americans 65 and over are far better able to provide hospital and medical service for themselves than the overwhelming majority of the taxpayers who are to be taxed under the bill to provide such service for them.

A survey conducted during recent years shows these facts concerning the medical expenses of Americans aged 65 years and over: 47.6 percent of them paid for such service through Blue Cross insurance; 29.3 percent of them paid for such service through other private insurance or in cash possessed by them; 20.5 percent of them paid for such service under the provisions of the Kerr-Mills Act; and only 2.6 percent of them were unable to pay for such service in one of these ways. Accordingly, this survey indicates that only 23.1 percent of Americans of 65 years and upward need Government assistance in paying their hospital and medical expenses.

Despite this fact, this bill places upon the Federal Government responsibility for financing hospital and medical service for all the other 76.9 percent of Americans of 65 and upwards.

For this reason, one is justified in inferring that much of the support for this bill comes from those who are not primarily concerned with providing hospital and medical service for those elderly persons unable to provide such service for themselves; but, on the contrary, are primarily desirous of having the Federal Government assume bureaucratic control over the lives of the American people.

In my judgment, the proper approach to the problem of hospital and medical service to the elderly is that of the Kerr-Mills Act, which contains provisions sufficient to give unlimited service of this nature to those unable to provide such service for themselves while leaving to the well-to-do the responsibility for providing such service for themselves out of their own resources.

There is no solid basis for the proposition that the Federal Government must provide for the health needs of the well-to-do in order to avoid a so-called degrading means test for others. That is true because the law could simply provide that persons having an income below a certain amount or possessing property below a certain value would automatically be eligible for benefits under the Kerr-Mills Act.

2

The bill seriously impairs the entire social security system because of the social security taxes it requires to be levied upon the employed and self-employed throughout their entire working lives.

Existing social security taxes are imposed at the rate of 7.25 percent upon the first $4,800 of the earnings of each employee and are payable one-half by the employer and one-half by the employee. This being true, the maximum social security tax payable under existing law amounts to $348 annually.

Under the new medicare bill and existing laws, the social security tax will ultimately rise to a total of 11.5 percent of the first $6,600 of earnings of each American worker, if in some miraculous way there should be no further inflation and no increase in the cost of hospital and medical service, and no expansion of the benefits of the social security system. This means in plain English that each job in America paying gross earnings of $6,600 a year will contribute to the Federal Government in social security taxes alone $759 annually, half of such sum, or $379.50, being paid by the employer, and the other half, or $379.50 being paid by the employee.

The plight of the self-employed person who has no employer to assist him in paying social security taxes upon his earnings will be even worse. Under this bill and existing laws, the social security tax of the self-employed person earning the maximum taxable amount; that is, $6,600, will eventually rise to $518.10 annually.

The burden which these social security taxes will impose upon employees and self-employed persons can be appreciated more readily if one bears in mind that they are in essence income taxes upon gross earnings without the advantage of any exemptions or deductions.

When one meditates upon the burdens which Congress is placing upon earnings, he inevitably calls to mind Aesop's fable about the goose which laid the golden egg, and wonders whether its moral will ultimately apply to the entire social security system.

To all practical intents and purposes, the United States now has three separate Federal taxes upon the funds arising out of employment relationships. The first of these is the Federal income tax, which imposes a heavy burden upon the earnings of all employers, employees, and self-employed persons. The second is the unemployment compensation tax which is imposed upon payrolls, and is paid by employers. This third is the social security tax, which is imposed upon payrolls and is paid half by the employer and half by the employee.

Despite the heavy increases to be made in the social security taxes, the advocates of the medicare bill now admit what I have long contended and they have long denied; that is, that no adequate health program can be tied solely to the social security system. I say this because the bill provides that during the first full year of its operation more than $1.2 billion must be taken from general taxes to make the bill workable. What sums will be taken from general taxes in the future for this purpose no one can now foretell. A prophet would not jeopardize his reputation in the least, however, if he should predict that withdrawals from general taxes for these purposes will amount to many billions of dollars annually in subsequent years.

The medicare bill illustrates the all too often repeated truth that advocates of new Federal programs minimize their costs and their impact upon the economy of the Nation.

The impact of the additional social security taxes imposed for carrying out the medicare program alone upon employment relationships is illustrated by the fact that such taxes will ultimately rise under the terms of this bill from $2.4 billion annually to $9.4 billion annually, even if the miraculous should happen and there should be no inflation and no increase in the cost of hospital and medical service and no expansion of the benefits of the social security system.

There is something essentially unfair in relying upon social security taxes to provide hospital and medical service for elderly persons financially incapable of providing such services for themselves. This is so for at least two reasons.

Social security taxes are imposed solely upon earnings in employment and not upon income derived from investments, property, or other sources. Consequently, an obligation, which in good conscience ought to rest upon all taxpayers, is imposed solely upon one group of taxpayers to the exclusion of all others.

Besides, the provisions of the bill tying the support of a medicare program for elderly persons financially incapable of defraying the cost of their own health needs to social security taxes is utterly repugnant to the principle that taxes should be imposed upon persons in accordance with their ability to pay. Under the bill, a self-employed person earning $6,600 a year pays exactly the same social security tax as a self-employed person earning $66,000, or $660,000 or $6,600,000 a year.

The medicare bill poses other serious problems which give me considerable pause.

It is difficult to believe that young people will be willing to continue in employment or self-employment for as much as 40 years and pay out of their earnings as much as $379.50 each year, if they are employed by others, or as much as $518.10 each year, if they are self-employed, for the support of a social security system and a medicare program when they are not to receive any benefits from either of them until they have spent their youth and their middle age and become elderly persons. As a consequence, it is altogether probable that the imposition of the heavy social security taxes will either lead to the destruction of the social security system in its entirety, or will result in pressures to broaden the social security system and medicare program into programs under which the United States will be converted into a virtual welfare state, and will undertake to manage the affairs of the people from the womb to the tomb.

What the establishment of such a welfare state will ultimately cost in dollars, in the character of our people, and in the nature of the United States as a country nobody knows.

We do recognize, however, as one of the fundamental laws of life that when government undertakes to do for people what people can do for themselves, the people not only lose their liberty, but they lose their incentive to strive to better their lot—the incentive which makes the free enterprise system work and life satisfying. Moreover, we can look with misgivings to Britain which was once a great empire upon whose flag the sun never set. Her politicians promised her people that the Government would relieve them of the responsibility for their own lives, and manage their affairs from the cradle to the grave. Her people relied upon these promises, and Britain became a second-rate nation scarcely able to defray the cost of her welfare programs.

The Kerr-Mills Act is vastly superior to the medicare bill in respect to procedures for administration. This is true because the Kerr-Mills Act is based upon the theory that it is highly desirable to keep as much government as near home as possible. It places the administration of the medical program authorized by it in State and local governments, and restricts the Federal Government to the task of supplying most of the funds needed for its maintenance.

The medicare bill provides, however, that the medicare program established by it is to be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—a Federal Department notoriously given to the practice of taking a mile for every inch of authority extended to it by Congress. This propensity on its part is well illustrated by its current demands upon school districts throughout the country in general and throughout the South in particular—demands which go far beyond title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and far beyond the Constitution as interpreted by the Federal courts.

We can readily surmise that in its administration of the provisions of the medicare program, the hand of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will reach further and further into the field of medical practice.

I wish to indulge one more observation. As the inevitable consequence of including within the medicare program the millions of elderly persons financially capable of providing for their own health needs, the medicare program is grossly inadequate in its provisions for the hospitalization of persons suffering from chronic and protracted diseases. As it was reported to the Senate by the Senate Finance Committee, it made provision for such persons to remain in hospitals for only 60 days, and required as a condition precedent for their so doing that they should pay $40 of the cost of their hospitalization. As amended in the Senate, the medicare bill provides that persons suffering from chronic and protracted illnesses may be hospitalized subsequent to the expiration of the 60-day period only in case they are able to pay and do pay $10 per day for such hospitalization. The result of the effort to establish a medicare program covering all the elderly people, regardless of their financial ability, is that the elderly people who ought to have Government assistance are denied such assistance in the hour of their greatest need.

Congress would have been wiser and more just if it had adhered to the approach of the Kerr-Mills Act, and provided governmental assistance to elderly people financially incapable of obtaining such assistance for themselves, and left all other elderly Americans with the responsibility of using their own resources for their own health needs. Such action could have been taken by Congress for a relatively small cost, and would not have imperiled the social security system itself, or constituted a long step toward the establishment of the welfare state.

DROUGHT AND WATER SITUATION IN NORTHEASTERN UNITED STATES

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on July 20, 1965, the White House released a report to the President from the Secretary of Agriculture relative to the drought and water situation in Northeastern United States.

The last paragraph of this report reads as follows:

> 7. Meanwhile, S. 1766 and H.R. 5075, bills that would expand the insured loan program of the Farmers Home Administration, are still in the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. These bills are needed to expand the rural community water system and other programs. The bills, especially S. 1766, would enable Farmers Home Administration to be of more assistance to rural communities in drought areas that need to develop adequate water supplies.

The date of this release is July 20, 1965. The bill has now been passed by the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the White House release dated July 20, 1965, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT FROM THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

In response to your request, the following is a résumé of steps being taken currently by this Department to provide aid to drought-stricken areas:

1. Farmers in 135 drought-hit counties of 9 Eastern States have received $4 million in emergency loans from the Department to finance current crop operations. The nine States are New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maine, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. These loans are made by the Farmers Home Administration.

2. Other types of Farmers Home loans being made in rural areas of the drought-stricken East are: (a) Credit for drilling wells, buying pumps, and pipe to supply water for rural households as well as livestock and irrigation, and (b) credit to small villages and groups of rural people to develop rural community water systems.

3. Grazing and hay harvesting has been authorized on lands diverted from crop production in a total of 106 drought counties in New York (45 counties), Pennsylvania (33), Maine (15), Vermont (9), and New Jersey (4). Designation of more counties in these States is pending. This assistance is handled through the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS).

4. The Deputy Administrator of the Consumer and Marketing Service had a series of meetings last Friday (July 16) with drought-hit Vermont dairymen. He outlined what help is available through the Federal milk order program, which is administered by his agency (C. & M.S.).

5. In the drought situation nationally, 18,000 farmers in 900 drought counties of 31 States and Puerto Rico have been advanced $70 million in emergency loans by the Farmers Home Administration. Haying and grazing have been authorized—through the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service—on lands diverted from crop production in a total of 82 drought counties in Kansas (24 counties), Ohio (23), Nebraska (20), and Colorado (15).

6. Drought in 1964 and so far this year is responsible for widespread use of emergency conservation measures under the agricultural conservation program, which is administered by ASCS. Allocations under the 1965 agricultural conservation program in a total of 168 drought counties in 11 States amount to $1,240,000 for cost-sharing conservation work needed to restore pastures and ranges heavily damaged by drought. (These States are New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Arizona, Missouri, New Hampshire, and Oklahoma.) For restoration work being done under the 1964 agricultural conservation program because of drought alone, the allocation is nearly $4 million for 334 counties in 13 States. (The States are Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Kentucky, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.)

7. Meanwhile, S. 1766 and H.R. 5075, bills that would expand the insured loan program of the Farmers Home Administration, are still in the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. These bills are needed to expand the rural community water system and other programs. The bills, especially S. 1766, would enable Farmers Home Administration to be of more assistance to rural communities in drought areas that need to develop adequate water supplies.

SHORTCOMINGS OF SURPLUS FOOD PROGRAM

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the welfare director of the city of Portland, Maine—the largest metropolitan area of Maine—has written me giving in detail his observations about the shortcomings of the administration of the surplus food program. He speaks from personal experience of dealing with the problem and with the practical aspects of the administration of the program. Because he does, I ask unanimous consent that his letter be placed in the Record at this point so that all Members of this body may have access to his observations.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CITY OF PORTLAND,
WELFARE DEPARTMENT,
Portland, Maine, July 22, 1965.
Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR SMITH: I am pleased that you have taken an interest in the surplus food program as it presently exists in our State.

You will note from the Portland Evening Express of Saturday, July 17, 1965, that the conference with Federal and State officials by representatives from the town of Freeport came to naught.

I am the welfare director of the city of Portland. Portland as a city has participated in the surplus food program, later the food stamp plan, and again the surplus food program, since 1936.

We know that the surplus food program can be one of the most beneficial, nutritional and dignified programs emanating from our system of government only if commonsense is applied, and the redtape that assumes everyone is a potential liar and conniver is removed.

Our President has stated that a family of four with an income of $3,000 or less falls into the antipoverty group, yet in Maine a family of five with weekly income of only $55.01, or $2,900 a year, is ineligible for the surplus foods which we are sending (no questions asked) all over the world. The tragedy of this is that too often these foreign countries substitute our surplus for their own foods which they sell and thus convert into instruments of war.

At present in the State of Maine over $21 million is annually being given to welfare recipients in cash for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the disabled.

These recipient households of over $21 million (in cash) are certified for this $21 million only once a year and some of them not even as often as that, yet the same State Department of Health and Welfare that certifies only once a year for $21 million of grants in cash demands that local city and town officials certify these selfsame individuals and households four times a year for surplus foods, foods we know must be consumed as food, unlike the $21 million which can be spent no questions asked at the green front or to purchase the affections of a "star" boarder.

We at the local level are forced, if we desire, to participate in this program to subject our old people, our blind, our disabled and individuals of low income to a questioning that resembles the Spanish Inquisition—all for what—for surplus foods that the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the State of Maine would rather see rot than be distributed in a commonsense way to needy nutritional people struggling to make both ends meet, either on inadequate public assistance grants or on inadequate income and wages.

Who put the every-3-month certification into effect? If you can ascertain this, Senator, then you will get an answer that no city or town has been able to secure as to "who did it."

The U.S. Department of Agriculture says that the State of Maine made this ruling and the State of Maine says that it was the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

I quote from a letter from the State dated June 9, 1965, as follows: "Public assistance recipients were not being recertified as requested by the U.S. Department of Agriculture."

Whoever conceived the recertification idea along with the card system for posting should take a refresher course first in logic and then in commonsense, and if they cannot learn from these then I suggest a "head shrinker."

Senator, you have to see this program in operation at the local level to realize how ludicrous it has become because of idiotic rules and regulations and a bureaucratic modus operandi.

I invite you to visit with me at our surplus food distribution center and see for yourself how people in real need are being deprived of these surpluses which rightfully by all the laws of commonsense and decency are theirs.

I urge you, therefore, to use all the force and strength of your office to alert the President as to what is happening at grass roots in depriving our people of these surpluses, for I know that with his interest in the deprived person the foolishness of this program would be evaporated.

He needs to hear us at the local level and bypass the echelon at the National and State levels who are personified in the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the State department of welfare.

We had an excellent program until we got snowed under by someone at Federal or State level who spent their time saying, "How can we put in rules and regulations that will make it tough for our people to get surplus foods?" instead of saying, "How can we eliminate restrictions so that those in need of or near need can benefit from these surpluses?"

I am attaching copy of forms we used most sucessfully for years but this was too simple apparently for State and Federal so now we have a forced system that annoys, irritates and degrades our people so that in June 1965 we had over 1,200 less participants than in June 1964.

People eligible for the antipoverty program are ineligible for surplus foods.

The attached news item from the town of Wiscasset tells the story.

I recommend to you the following for your constituents in Maine and hopefully for an intelligent program in the other States:

1. Households receiving public assistance (OAA–ADC–Ad) are eligible for surplus foods when they present a letter from the public assistance office stating they are recipients of OAA–ADC–AB–Ad.

2. Said households are eligible as long as they receive such PA grants.

3. Households receiving local general assistance to be certified once a year.

4. The income and assets formula for households not receiving PA or GA can be made realistic and these households be certified once a year.

5. It is to be at the discretion of the local office if reviews appear necessary oftener than once a year for those not receiving PA or GA.

6. A return to the old and successful method using the attached forms brought up-to-date.

In conclusion, if your duties and schedule permit, it would be helpful and constructive if you could meet with city and town officials. I would be willing to set this meeting up here in Portland limited to city and town officials.

It has been stated that we as city and town officials have gripes—we have no gripes—we do have the best thinking in the State of Maine that logically can point out how ludicrous and unrealistic this worthwhile program has become to the detriment of the needy.

Sincerely yours,

MATTHEW I. BARRON,
Welfare Director.

THE BIG THICKET REGION OF EAST TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Big Thicket region of east Texas is an area of our Nation and of my State whose potential as a national wildlife preservation area has long been neglected. It is an ecological, not a geographical area. The famous Big Thicket area of east Texas is rich in history and Texas folklore but more famous among students of natural history. Its 3 million acres, much of it swampy or palmetto, embraces a wider range of soil condition and a greater variety of plant, animal, bird, and marine life that can be found in any area of comparable size in the Southwestern United States.

This enchanting area is in the general area of my birth and early life, and I agree with the report of the Big Thicket Park Study Commission that a representative area of the thicket should be set aside and administered by the National Park Service under complete preservation as a wilderness area.

The Alabama-Coushatta Indian Reservation, the only Indian reservation in Texas, is within the thicket and would also provide considerable visitor interest.

Certainly a portion of this area should be preserved for the enjoyment and enrichment of all the people not only of the State of Texas but of our Nation, both present and future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that four of Mr. Louis Hofferbert's articles which appeared in the Houston Chronicle's Texas magazine of June 27, 1965, on pages 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, and 16 under the titles "They Call Him Mr. Big Thicket," "Tree Thicket Is Unique," "Bird Land," "Bears, Panthers, Prowl," "Beauty Unfolds in Deep of Thicket," and other titles, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY CALL HIM "MR. BIG THICKET"

(By Louis Hofferbert)

The Big Thicket has been studied and its many facets described by college professors, naturalists, scientists, writers, and artists whose names appear on books, special reports, and well-known paintings.

But the man recognized as the most competent authority on the Thicket and all of its wildlife today is a mild-mannered, 62-year-old, self-taught naturalist who never wrote a book or painted a picture.

Lance Rosier, of Saratoga, is "Mr. Big Thicket."

The unofficial title is so widely known that he receives dozens of letters each year, from all parts of the world, addressed only to "Mr. Big Thicket, in Texas."

Lance Rosier is the friend, and usually the companion, of every person who wants to study the wildlife of the wilderness that surrounds his hometown. He has guided countless hundreds of botanists, geologists, ornithologists, and entomologists on extensive explorations of the woods and swamps. He gives his time willingly to escort groups of students, garden clubs and nature clubs through the hidden world that has fascinated him since boyhood.

Rosier was born in and has spent his life in Saratoga, once a boom town but now only a semighost of its former size. He lives in a weatherbeaten old home where he was "taken to raise" by an aunt when his family moved away more than 50 years ago.

Rosier's formal education ended with high school, but his "higher" education began far earlier.

"I was a black sheep," he says now with a smile. "When other boys played baseball, I hunted flowers. When older boys hunted jobs, I hunted shrubs and plants. Everybody looked down on me, even my own folks."

Rosier's apparently inexhaustible knowledge of the Big Thicket results from a lifetime of study. He borrowed books from school and public libraries.

"I would leave home with a notebook in one pocket and a cold sweet potato in the other," he says. "I would go into the woods, maybe for all day, maybe for a week at a time. When I needed to go a long way I caught rides on the buses. The drivers all knew I was crazy, so they picked me up and let me out any place."

Rosier's memory is uncanny. He can recall instantly the names of scientists and details of trips they made dozens of years ago. He knows every living thing in the Thicket, by common and scientific name, and can go with unerring accuracy through miles of thicket and swamp to find any species of rare plant that grows in the wilderness.

Although he has never written a book, Rosier is now writing one. He is dictating it, slowly and with painstaking care, into a tape recorder.

He doesn't know how long it will take to complete. He really doesn't care.

THICKET TREE IS UNIQUE

(By Louis Hofferbert)

Growing in the Big Thicket are a holly tree recognized as the largest in the world, a magnolia believed to be more than 1,000 years old, and a pine older than the United States. The 80-foot-high holly stands in the Trinity River bottomlands near Hardin on land owned by Wallace O. Rives.

The pine, a loblolly, is on the Alabama-Coushatta Indian reservation and one of its tourist attractions. It stood with two others of equal size, and it became necessary to cut one. A cross-section now on display in the Indian museum shows "good" and "dry" years dating back to about 1772.

The magnolia is notable both by size and location. When Polk County was separated from Liberty County in 1836 the tree, already a giant, stood on the line. And when Hardin County was created in 1858—107 years ago—the magnolia was so outstanding it was used as the starting point for a new survey.

So it stands today at the exact common corner of the three counties—a three-trunked giant with each of its sections pointing to a different county.

Imposing though it is, this magnolia is not the largest in the Thicket. Some 2 miles from Saratoga, and not far apart, are a magnolia and a hickory recorded as the largest of their kind in Texas.

The fame of other Big Thicket trees is more legend than official record. Such as the hanging tree, an oak near the three-county magnolia, where reportedly a thief was dispatched by his neighbors long before the days of organized government. And the Reverend Willie Daniel Holmes, of Honey Island, tells of a tremendous poplar believed to be the largest ever known.

In Tyler County not far from Woodville is a unique loblolly pine that changes color twice a year, from green to gold in the fall and back again in the spring.

The Big Thicket embraces most of the hardwoods of the central United States, but its major timber tree is pine. Dogwood, fringe-tree, most other flowering trees and shrubs are abundant.

The wide range of Thicket plantlife is due to differing soil conditions and an unusual climatic situation. It is a place where north and south, east and west, all come together and overlap.

Two biological surveys have been made there, both more than 25 years ago. Scores of botanists have made individual studies, and additional species or subspecies are being discovered constantly.

Almost no work has been done on fungi and algae in the Thicket. Lance Rosier of Saratoga, who has spent a lifetime studying wildlife there, estimated at least 1,000 species of each remain unclassified.

Three plant forms seem to hold most interest for casual visitors and serious students alike. They are the ferns, orchids and meat-eating or insect-catching plants.

There are about 25 ferns, 20 orchids and 4 of the meat-eaters.

Best known of the latter is the pitcher plant. Thousands of them, some of remarkable size, grow near Village Mills.

Herbs of real or fancied medicinal value and fruits range from the comparatively rare ginseng to commonplace wax myrtle, from which early settlers made candles.

No meaningful list of flowering plants and shrubs is possible. A good rule of thumb: If it grows between the Mississippi River and Edwards Plateau it probably is in the Thicket.

BEARS, PANTHERS PROWL

The Big Thicket is the haven of the last known ivory-billed woodpeckers.

These strikingly marked birds, largest of the woodpeckers, are even more rare than whooping cranes. Many ornithologists believe the giant woodpeckers are already extinct, but they have been observed in the Thicket by recognized naturalists, and there is even more positive proof.

Some years ago the editor of a weekly newspaper in Kountze printed a picture of the big woodpecker and a report that it probably was extinct. Later a hunter from the depths of the Thicket walked into the office of editor Archer Fullingim and laid a dead bird on the desk.

"I knew you wouldn't believe me unless I brought one in," he said.

It was an ivory-billed woodpecker without doubt. And the hunter added: "You needn't feel bad about it. There are plenty more in the tight-eye thicket if you know where to find them."

In all, some 300 bird species can be found in the Big Thicket. It lies on the dividing line between the great flyway of the Mississippi Valley and the migration route along the curve of the gulf through Mexico. As a result, most bird species of the United States can be seen there during migration seasons.

This crossroads of bird life sometimes offers rare combinations. The ruby-throated hummingbird of the Eastern States is often seen with western hummingbirds, resident and migrant warblers are constantly confusing.

The roadrunner, the pisano or chaparral cock of the south Texas brush country, is not uncommon. The scissor-tailed flycatcher, more adapted to open prairie than wooded swamps, is equally common.

Most species of shore and water birds of the Southern United States live within the Thicket. Great rookeries of herons, egrets, and roseate spoonbills can be found in the Trinity River bottoms and in some of the swamps.

Some authorities believe the Big Thicket once knew such animals as buffalo, javelina and even moose. Others believe that most, if not all, the animals that ever lived there can still be found.

The largest animals now known in the Thicket are bears, panthers, both rare, and plentiful deer.

Sometimes dangerous are the "wood rooters" or hardy, long-snouted hogs that escaped civilization generations ago and roam the Thicket at will.

Many authorities consider the Big Thicket the best deer range in Texas. It is a hunter's paradise.

Panthers are seen occasionally by hunters, and often reported "heard" by others. Mrs. Ethel Hill has referred to one near her home as a pet because she sees it often. Some woodsmen reported seeing black planthers, apparently a darker version of the once common "big yellow cat."

There is ample evidence of bears, sometimes uncomfortably close to homes and highways.

State Representative Emmett Lack of Kountze, reported that his car struck a bear on the paved highway west of Honey Island before dawn one morning.

Smaller animals from rabbits to beaver abound in the Big Thicket. The list includes fox, mink, otter, raccoon, 'possum, skunk, muskrats, squirrel and many others, plus, of course, the ever-present armadillo.

Few people penetrate the wilderness deep enough to find them, but there are beaver colonies and dams on Menard Creek and probably other streams within the Thicket. They also can be found in isolated areas along the Trinity River.

The reptile life is also abundant, with rattlesnakes and moccasins a constant danger to the unwary. Alligators up to 8 and 10 feet in length can be found along the streams and in many swamp areas.

BEAUTY UNFOLDS IN THE THICKET

Only a hint of the brilliance and variety of wildlife in the Big Thicket is conveyed by these random pictures, though they represent a cross-section of the beauty that unfolds each year through a half million acres of wooded hills and fern-banked swamps.

The scarlet buckeye brightens the deep woods, the phlox carpets the roadsides. The native azalea, commonly called bush honeysuckle, lines the hundreds of ravines and masses in the swampy clearings. Warmer days see pitcher plants by thousands trapping unwary insects for food and egrets nesting in hidden rookeries.

There is no day of the year when the Big Thicket is lacking in color or action for those who want to see.

Ghosts of the Thicket

(By Louis Hofferbert)

The Big Thicket has many modern communities, large and small. It also is spotted with ghost towns and semi-ghost towns. Some are gone with hardly a trace, some remain as shadows of their former activity, some live by names transferred to new locations.

Some of these almost forgotten towns go back to the days of Spanish missions, but most are relics of the lumber boom that started at the turn of the century. By necessity, these ghost towns lie near the present or former railroad lines.

There are many names, actually more names than towns.

This peculiarity has a simple explanation. The towns were either logging camps or sawmill settlements, or both. Frequently they carried the name of the mill or landowner, and as mills changed hands the towns changed names.

Sometimes a town would have the same name more than once, with others in between. Thus Nona, south of Kountze, has been Hooksville, Nona, Hook's Switch, Ariola and several others—seven or eight names in all.

Switching of names was common as the lumber boom faded and the "peckerwood" sawmills gave way to larger mills in the cities. For example, the once large mill town named Thicket was on the railroad west of Honey Island. Two miles away was a smaller community named, Whiteoak. Thicket had a postoffice, Whiteoak did not. When the sawmill left and the original Thicket faded away the name was moved to Whiteoak so it could have the postoffice.

As a result, visitors today sometimes hear of Whiteoak but cannot find it, and are told that Thicket is a ghost town. And when they visit the present Thicket they are not even near the ghost town.

The same is true of the present modern community of Village Mills. The original Village Mills lies a mile or more up the railroad, and those who think the present location is a ghost town could not be more mistaken.

Honey Island possibly is the best example of a semi-ghost town.

It was once a large sawmill town, with a population of several thousand, many stores, churches and the largest school in Hardin County.

Today Honey Island is a crossroads community of some 50 to 100 residents. Standing at its original site, it has a general store, service station, church and scattered homes, all modern, but still is only a shadow of its former self.

SIGNIFICANT STEP FOR FREEDOM ACADEMY BILL

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, House Un-American Activities Committee approval of the Freedom Academy bill by a unanimous vote marks a significant step forward in the long effort which has been made to enact a comprehensive nonmilitary program for the United States and the free world in the global struggle against communism.

In approval of the bill, the House Un-American Activities Committee has produced in its report an illuminating record of the history of the proposal since its inception in 1959 and reiterated most positively the need for such an institution as the Freedom Academy "to assist in the development of methods and means employable in both the governmental and private sectors to counter all forms of Communist political warfare, subversion, and insurgency, while seeking to preserve and build free and viable societies."

The committee's favorable action marks the most important advance the bill has made in the House since originally introduced 6 years ago.

I am hopeful that the affirmative action by the House committee will lead to consideration by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the near future on this bill which, in the Senate, I have introduced with the cosponsorship of 11 other Senators. In the Senate it is identified as S. 1232.

Mr. President, the findings of the House committee sound anew the warning that we cannot depend only upon military defenses in the cold war effort to preserve freedom.

I think particularly impressive in the conclusions of the committee is this statement:

> In total war, military defense is only partial defense. Today, the major gap in world resistance to communism, the largely undefended front, is the front of nonmilitary or political warfare. The United States has led the organization and development of the free world's military defense in the global struggle. It is imperative that it now take the lead in developing its total defense by closing the serious gap that exists on the front which, in the long run, could be as decisive as the military front.

The committee outlined six major points in its contention that "if this country and other non-Communist nations are to realize their full capacity to engage in the type of global struggle which has been forced upon them, it is essential that a thoroughgoing program of research, education, and training in the area of Communist political warfare be established."

The committee stated the requirements of such a program as follows:

> 1. Policymakers and Government personnel at many levels must understand communism in depth, with special emphasis on Communist conflict techniques.
>
> 2. At the upper levels of Government we must have, in addition, officials who understand the full range of methods and means by which this Nation and its allies can meet the Communist attack and work toward our global objectives systematically. This means that they will have to master a broad range of nonmilitary measures which have yet to be developed and systematized.
>
> 3. Below this level, agency personnel must be trained to understand and implement this integrated strategy in all of its dimensions.
>
> 4. The public must have greater understanding of communism, its objectives, tactics, and methods, especially Communist conflict techniques and the nature of the global struggle, to insure public support of the Nation's efforts to counter Communist aggression. More thorough public knowledge of communism will help prevent the extremism which, frequently arising from misunderstanding or lack of information, creates national dissension and impairs the country's efforts in the global struggle.
>
> 5. The private sector must also be helped in understanding how it can participate in the global struggle in a sustained and systematic manner.
>
> 6. It is necessary to assist, and to enlist the support of, other non-Communist countries by training selected foreign nationals. Equal support and understanding among other peoples and our allies are essential if we are to continue moving forward in a concentrated effort.

Another portion of the House committee report which I would like to bring to the Senate's attention states as follows:

> The Nation does not even possess, as Dr. Possony[1] testified, a library adequate to meet the needs of research and training in the area of political warfare. Materials and documentation indispensable to full study and understanding of the Communist threat in all parts of the world have not been collected in any single, convenient depository and, in fact, much is not available anywhere in the country. While there are a few private institutions, such as the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, which maintain noteworthy collections, it is unlikely that any private institution or university could adequately finance or house a library of the scope and size required. Such a library could, however, be developed by the Freedom Commission and Academy.
>
> The various research centers established at a limited number of universities in recent years are of an academic type, devoted principally to area studies and exposition of the internal organization and affairs of Soviet and Chinese bloc countries. They do not specialize in Communist external political warfare. Moreover, it is not practical to expect private institutions to perform this function in a manner and on a scale adequate to meet the requirements of a global situation. In addition to the problem of funds, they are isolated from the operational agencies of Government and it is not practical to give them access to the classified information so necessary to form a basis for research and study.
>
> Within Government, too, there are no programs or facilities adequate for systematized study, and research in depth, on the many facets of political warfare. Despite excellence in their specialized fields, the war colleges are not equipped to develop experts in political warfare. They are designed as graduate schools for military officers and offer instruction primarily on matters related to conventional warfare, rather than those forms of struggle which extend far beyond the direct responsibility of the military. The Foreign Service Institute, operated by the Department of State primarily for the training of its own personnel, concentrates, as might be expected, on diplomacy, administration, and foreign languages. The instruction it provides on communism and political warfare is extremely limited and far from adequate for the times. The U.S. Information Agency's own training program only touches on the subject of communism, and the Agency makes use of the 2-week Foreign Service Institute seminar for its professional personnel. In short, no research and educational institution has been established, in or out of Government, having as an objective and purpose study in depth of the continuing problems raised by Communist conflict techniques.
>
> Implicit in the language and purpose of the bill is the fact that the Freedom Academy is an educational and research institution established for this specific purpose. It is not a policymaking or operational agency. It will be dedicated to teaching an understanding of nonmilitary warfare as waged by the Communists and of devising new methods of combating such warfare.
>
> The claim of the Department of State and other executive agencies that this research and educational program can be handled by existing agencies with less overlapping and confusion, or by an enlarged or improved Foreign Service Institute (the proposed National Academy of Foreign Affairs) is not supported by the record. These existing agencies have specialized functions and already heavy responsibilities—the conduct of diplomacy, administration of foreign aid, propaganda activities, and so on. They are not equipped, and should not be expected, to take on the additional, difficult task of operating a major educational, research, and training institution that will deal with such complicated subjects as Communist ideology, doctrine, strategy, tactics, nonmilitary warfare, and the devising of ways and means to combat them. Moreover, it is not desirable, for obvious reasons, that a purely research and educational institution be managed by, or subservient to, an operational agency of the U.S. Government. The fact that, to date, no executive agency has attempted to establish an educational and training program for total political warfare indicates that it is highly unlikely this vital task will be undertaken unless an independent agency is established with clear direction and authority to do so, divorced from all other responsibilities. It is considered that the Advisory Committee will be a sufficient instrument for coordinating the activities of the Freedom Commission and Academy with the activities of operating agencies of Government, with benefit to both and so as to avoid any overlapping or confusion of function.
>
> The evidence amply sustains the conclusion that there is a serious gap in the defenses of the United States, and the non-Communist world generally, on the political warfare fronts; that there is a vital and pressing need for an extensive and thoroughgoing program of education, research, and training in this area to close the gap; that the required program is of such size and scope that it can be adequately organized and financed only by the Federal Government; and that a completely independent agency established for this special purpose, functioning in close contact with appropriate operational agencies, would be best suited to accomplish this objective.[1]

Mr. President, as the coauthor of this proposed legislation which can, in my opinion, move our Nation along more fruitful paths of action and lead us from the impasse which now engulfs the world, I want to pay tribute to the members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for their most constructive action in approving this bill. They have set the wheels in motion by which the objectives set forth in this long-considered program can be attained. The opportunity is now ours to keep those wheels rolling through action. The time for deliberation has passed. The need, now, is for enactment of this bill to produce results.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR ERNEST S. BROWN OF NEVADA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, this past weekend brought unhappy news from my State. I was informed that death claimed former U.S. Senator Ernest S. Brown on Friday, July 23.

Many of my Senate colleagues will remember Senator Brown, although he served only a brief 2 months in this body in 1954. He was appointed in October of 1954 to fill the vacancy left by the death of Senator Patrick McCarran. Following my election to that post the next month, Senator Brown retired from public service, but he remained a leading Nevadan and an active Republican leader as he resumed his private law practice in Reno.

Although we were on opposite sides of the political fence, and although our views often differed, I always held Ernest S. Brown in high regard, not only as a gallant and able political opponent but as a close and respected friend.

Senator Brown lived a constructive and valuable life. Born in neighboring Alturas, Calif., in 1903, he moved with his family to Reno 3 years later. He graduated from the University of Nevada in 1926 and subsequently entered law practice in Nevada.

He served briefly in the Nevada Legislature as an assemblyman from Reno in 1933. Two years later he was elected district attorney of Washoe County, a post he held until he resigned in 1941 to join the armed services.

---

[1] Dr. Stefan T. Possony, director, international political studies program, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace.

Senator Brown served with distinction in the U.S. Army during World War II, entering as a second lieutenant and leaving in 1945, as a colonel.

It was a privilege to know this remarkable man and I know he will be missed in his home State. I know all his former Senate colleagues join me in extending deepest sympathies to his family.

PROPOSED AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION WITH BRAZIL AND AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT WITH UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to inform the Senate that pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a proposed Agreement for Cooperation with the Government of the United States of Brazil concerning civil uses of atomic energy. The proposed agreement was received by the Joint Committee on July 1. Section 123c of the act requires that the proposed agreement lie before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for a period of 30 days while Congress is in session before becoming effective.

I would also like to inform the Senate that a proposed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation between the United States and the United Kingdom concerning the civil uses of atomic energy was submitted to the Joint Committee very recently and that a Joint Committee hearing on this amendment was held in executive session on July 19, 1965. The amendment merely extends the effective period of the existing agreement for a 1-year period, to July 20, 1966.

The basic agreement between these two countries was due to expire on July 20, 1965. The proposed amendment was received by the Joint Committee on July 15. Under the terms of section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the amendment in normal course would not have become effective until the expiration of the 30-day period during which the proposal must lie before the committee. Therefore, in order to avoid a hiatus between the expiration of the existing bilateral agreement and the effective date of the extension, the Joint Committee held its hearing on the proposal as soon as possible after its submission and, pursuant to authority conferred by section 123c, by resolution in writing waived the remainder of the 30-day waiting period. The hearing was held in executive session to permit Committee members to explore areas of cooperation between the United States and the United Kingdom not only in the peaceful uses of atomic energy but also under our existing agreement for mutual defense purposes.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the proposed agreement for cooperation with Brazil, the text of the amendment to the agreement for cooperation with the United Kingdom and the resolution of the Joint Committee waiving the remainder of the 30-day waiting period, together with supporting correspondence.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., July 1, 1965.

The Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. HOLIFIELD: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there are submitted with this letter: (a) An executed "Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United States of Brazil Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy"; (b) a copy of a letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the agreement; and (c) a copy of a letter from the President to the Commission concerning his determination that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and approving the agreement and authorizing its execution.

The proposed agreement, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would take the place of the Agreement for Cooperation with the United States of Brazil which was signed on August 3, 1955, as amended by agreements signed on July 9, 1958, June 11, 1960, May 28, 1962, and September 1, 1964. The proposed agreement maintains all of the provisions of the present agreement and adds several standard modifications as indicated below which are designed to recognize conditions that have developed since the present agreement was last modified substantively.

Article II of the present agreement provides that the Commission will lease uranium enriched up to 20 percent in the isotope U^{235} to Brazil for fueling defined research reactors. In article II of the proposed agreement, the word "transfer" is used in lieu of the word "lease" so as to permit the Commission flexibility to lease or sell fuel should a change in the Commission's policy of leasing fuel for such reactors be required during the 10-year term of the agreement.

Additionally, provision has been made in article II of the proposed agreement for the Commission, upon request and in its discretion, to make all or a portion of the enriched uranium supplied under the agreement available as material enriched to more than 20 percent in the isotope U^{235}. This modification is being made in order to accommodate a request by the Government of Brazil for new fuel elements for their 5 MW research reactor at Sao Paulo to be fabricated from material enriched to 93 percent in the isotope U^{235}. A similar provision has been incorporated in our agreements with several other countries.

As a result of the two modifications mentioned above, standard provisions with respect to rights in special nuclear material produced as a result of the irradiation processes and with respect to the reprocessing of source or special nuclear material received from the United States have been added in article II of the proposed agreement.

Article VI of the proposed agreement provides for the extension of comprehensive safeguards to materials and facilities made available to Brazil under the agreement in lieu of the minimal safeguards provided in article VI of the present agreement. The change in safeguards is required because of the increase in the enrichment of the uranium which may be supplied to Brazil under the agreement.

Article VII(A) of the proposed agreement provides that the International Atomic Energy Agency will be requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the agreement. As the committee is aware, the 1-year extension of the present agreement to August 2, 1965, was based on the understanding that Brazil would, by that date, complete trilateral arrangements for the transfer of safeguards to the Agency. However, as a consequence of the recent review of the Agency's safeguards system by the Agency Board of Governors, a new trilateral arrangement reflecting the agreed upon simplifications and improvements in the Agency system is being drafted by the United States and the Agency. While every effort is being made to complete the trilateral agreement on a timely basis, it is felt that Brazil should be relieved of the August 2, 1965, date for transfer of safeguards should it not be possible to complete the development of the new trilateral agreement by that date, since Brazil was one of the countries which ascribed the greatest importance to having the Agency's system simplified and improved. Accordingly, article VII(A) of the proposed agreement reflects that the transfer of safeguards will be made by August 2, 1965, or as soon thereafter as the trilateral arrangements reflecting the newly revised Agency system can be completed.

The agreement will enter into force when the two Governments have exchanged written notification that their respective statutory and constitutional requirements have been fulfilled.

Cordially,

——— ———,
Chairman.

(Enclosures: (1) Proposed Agreement for Cooperation with the Government of Brazil; (2) letter from the Commission to the President; (3) letter from the President to the Commission.)

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF BRAZIL CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Whereas the peaceful uses of atomic energy hold great promise for all mankind; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United States of Brazil desire to cooperate with each other in the development of such peaceful uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas there is well advanced the design and development of several types of research reactors (as defined in article IX of this agreement); and

Whereas research reactors are useful in the production of research quantities of radioisotopes, in medical therapy and in numerous other research activities and at the same time are a means of affording valuable training and experience in nuclear science and engineering useful in the development of other peaceful uses of atomic energy including civilian nuclear power; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of Brazil desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States of America and U.S. industry with respect to this program; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America, represented by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), desires to assist the Government of the United States of Brazil in such a program;

The parties therefore agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

A. Subject to the limitations of article V the parties hereto will exchange information in the following fields:

1. Design, construction and operation of research reactors and their use as research,

development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy.

2. Health and safety problems related to the operation and use of research reactors.

3. The use of radioactive isotopes in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry.

B. The application or use of any information or data of any kind whatsoever, including design drawings and specifications, exchanged under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party which receives and uses such information or data, and it is understood that the other cooperating party does not warrant the accuracy, completeness, or suitability of such information or data for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE II

A. The Commission will transfer to the Government of the United States of Brazil uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235}, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of research reactors which the Government of the United States of Brazil, in consultation with the Commission, decides to construct and as required in agreed experiments related thereto. Also, the Commission will transfer to the Government of the United States of Brazil uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235}, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of such research reactors as the Government of the United States of Brazil may, in consultation with the Commission, decide to authorize private individuals or private organizations under its jurisdiction to construct and operate, provided the Government of the United States of Brazil shall at all times maintain sufficient control of the material and the operation of the reactor to enable the Government of the United States of Brazil to comply with the provisions of this agreement and the applicable provisions of the transfer arrangement.

B. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} transferred by the Commission under this article and in the custody of the Government of the United States of Brazil shall not at any time be in excess of 15 kilograms of contained U^{235} in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U^{235}, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Brazil or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the 15 kilograms of said material.

C. The Commission may, upon request and in its discretion, make available all or a portion of the enriched uranium supplied hereunder as material enriched to more than 20 percent in the isotope U^{235} for use in research reactors capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 8 kilograms of the isotope U^{235} contained in such uranium.

D. The transfer of uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} under this article shall be at such charges and on such terms and conditions with respect to shipment and delivery as may be mutually agreed and under the conditions stated in articles VI and VII.

E. It is agreed that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States of America requires reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the Commission in either Commission facilities or facilities acceptable to the Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may be otherwise agreed, that the form and content of any irradiated fuel shall not be altered after its removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission or the facilities acceptable to the Commission for reprocessing.

F. Special nuclear material produced in any part of fuel leased hereunder as a result of irradiation processes shall be for the account of the Government of the United States of Brazil and, after reprocessing as provided in paragraph E of this article, shall be returned to the Government of the United States of Brazil, at which time title to such material shall be transferred to that Government, unless the Government of the United States of America shall exercise the option, which is hereby granted, to retain, with appropriate credit to the Government of the United States of Brazil, any such special nuclear material which is in excess of the needs of Brazil for such material in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

G. With respect to any special nuclear material not subject to the option referred to in paragraph F of this article and produced in reactors fueled with materials obtained from the United States of America which is in excess of the needs of Brazil for such material in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the Government of the United States of America shall have and is hereby granted: (a) a first option to purchase such material at prices then prevailing in the United States of America for special nuclear material produced in reactors which are fueled pursuant to the terms of an Agreement for Cooperation with the Government of the United States of America, and (b) the right to approve the transfer of such material to any other nation or group of nations in the event the option to purchase is not exercised.

H. Some atomic energy materials which the Commission may provide in accordance with this agreement are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials to the Government of the United States of Brazil, the Government of the United States of Brazil shall bear all responsibility, insofar as the Government of the United States of America is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any source or special nuclear material or other reactor materials which the Commission may, pursuant to this Agreement, lease to the Government of the United States of Brazil or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction, the Government of the United States of Brazil shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States of America against any and all liability (including third party liability) for any cause whatsoever arising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and the possession and use of such source or special nuclear material or other reactor materials after delivery by the Commission to the Government of the United States of Brazil or to any authorized private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction.

ARTICLE III

Subject to the availability of supply and as may be mutually agreed, the Commission will sell or lease through such means as it deems appropriate, to the Government of the United States of Brazil or authorized persons under its jurisdiction such reactor materials, other than special nuclear materials, as are not obtainable on the commercial market and which are required in the construction and operation of research reactors in Brazil. The sale or lease of these materials shall be on such terms as may be agreed.

ARTICLE III(A)

Materials of interest in connection with defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy undertaken by the Government of the United States of Brazil, or persons under its jurisdiction, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes, will be sold or otherwise transferred to the Government of the United States of Brazil by the Commission for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no case, however, shall the quantity of special nuclear materials under the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States of Brazil, by reason of transfer under this article, be, at any one time, in excess of 100 grams of contained U^{235}, 10 grams of U^{233}, 250 grams of plutonium in the form of fabricated foils and sources, and 10 grams of plutonium in other forms.

ARTICLE IV

It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or Brazil may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, with respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article I, the Government of the United States of America will permit persons under its jurisdiction to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to, and perform services for, the Government of the United States of Brazil and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the Government of the United States of Brazil to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, subject to: (a) Limitations in article V, (b) applicable laws, regulations and license requirements of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United States of Brazil.

ARTICLE V

Restricted data shall not be communicated under this agreement, and no materials or equipment and devices shall be transferred and no services shall be furnished under this agreement to the Government of the United States of Brazil or authorized persons under its jurisdiction if the transfer of any such materials or equipment and devices or the furnishing of any such services involves the communication of restricted data.

ARTICLE VI

A. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United States of Brazil emphasize their common interest in ensuring that any material, equipment, or device made available to the Government of the United States of Brazil pursuant to this agreement shall be used solely for civil purposes.

B. Except to the extent that the safeguards provided for in this agreement are supplanted, as provided in article VII(A), by safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Government of the United States of America, notwithstanding any other provisions of this agreement, shall have the following rights:

(1) With the objective of ensuring design and operation for civil purposes and permitting effective application of safeguards, to review the design of any (a) reactor and (b) other equipment and devices the design of which the Commission determines to be relevant to the effective application of safeguards, which are to be made available to the Government of the United States of Brazil or persons under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction, or which are to use, fabricate, or process any of the following materials so made available: source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the Commission.

(2) With respect to any source or special nuclear material made available to the Government of the United States of Brazil or any person under its jurisdiction and any source or special nuclear material utilized in, recovered from, or produced as a result of the use of any of the following materials, equipment, or devices so made available, (a)

source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the Commission, (b) reactors, (c) any other equipment or device designated by the Commission as an item to be made available on the condition that the provision of this subparagraph B(2) will apply, (i) to require the maintenance and production of operating records and to request and receive reports for the purpose of assisting in ensuring accountability for such material; and (ii) to require that any such material in the custody of the Government of the United States of Brazil or any person under its jurisdiction be subject to all of the safeguards provided for in this article and the guaranties set forth in article VII.

(3) To require the deposit in storage facilities designated by the Commission of any of the special nuclear material referred to in subparagraph B(2) of this article which is not currently utilized for civil purposes in Brazil and which is not purchased or retained by the Government of the United States of America pursuant to article II, paragraph F and paragraph G(a) of this agreement, transferred pursuant to article II, paragraph G(b) of this agreement, or otherwise disposed of pursuant to an arrangement mutually acceptable to the parties.

(4) To designate, after consultation with the Government of the United States of Brazil, personnel who accompanied, if either party so requests, by personnel designated by the Government of the United States of Brazil, shall have access in Brazil to all places and data necessary to account for the source and special nuclear materials which are subject to subparagraph B(2) of this article to determine whether there is compliance with this agreement and to make such independent measurements as may be deemed necessary.

(5) In the event of noncompliance with the provisions of this article, or the guarantees set forth in article VII, and the failure of the Government of the United States of Brazil to carry out the provisions of this article within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate this agreement and require the return of any materials, equipment, and devices referred to in subparagraph B(2) of this article.

(6) To consult with the Government of the United States of Brazil in the matter of health and safety.

C. The Government of the United States of Brazil undertakes to facilitate the application of the safeguards provided for in this article.

ARTICLE VII

Guarantees prescribed by the U.S. Atomic Energy Act of 1954

The Government of the United States of Brazil guarantees that—

A. Safeguards provided in article VI shall be maintained.

B. No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of the United States of Brazil or authorized persons under its jurisdiction, pursuant to this agreement, by lease, sale, or otherwise will be used for atomic weapons or for research on or development of atomic weapons or for any other military purposes, and that no such material, including equipment and devices, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States of Brazil except as the Commission may agree to such transfer to another nation and then only if in the opinion of the Commission such transfer falls within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the United States of America and the other nation.

ARTICLE VII(A)

A. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United States of Brazil, recognizing the desirability of making use of the facilities and services of the International Atomic Energy Agency, agree that the Agency will be requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under this agreement for cooperation. It is agreed that the necessary arrangements will be effected without modification of this agreement, through an agreement to be concluded between the parties and the Agency by August 2, 1965, or as soon thereafter as the parties and the Agency are in a position to enter into an agreement reflecting the revised Agency safeguards system provisionally approved by the Agency Board of Governors on February 24, 1965. The agreement may include provisions for suspension of the safeguard rights accorded the Commission by article VI, paragraph B, of this agreement during the time and to the extent that the Agency's safeguards apply to such materials and facilities.

B. In the event the parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement on the terms of the trilateral arrangement envisaged in paragraph A of this article, either party may by notification terminate this agreement. In the event of termination by either party, the Government of the United States of Brazil shall, at the request of the Government of the United States of America, return to the Government of the United States of America all special nuclear material received pursuant to this agreement and in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction. The Government of the United States of America will compensate the Government of the United States of Brazil for such returned material at the current U.S. Commission's schedule of prices then in effect domestically.

ARTICLE VIII

This agreement shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force until August 2, 1975, and shall be subject to renewal as may be mutually agreed.

At the expiration of this agreement or an extension thereof the Government of the United States of Brazil shall deliver to the United States of America all fuel elements containing reactor fuels leased by the Commission and any other fuel material leased by the Commission. Such fuel elements and such fuel materials shall be delivered to the Commission at a site in the United States of America designated by the Commission at the expense of the Government of the United States of Brazil, and such delivery shall be made under appropriate safeguards against radiation hazards while in transit.

ARTICLE IX

For the purposes of this agreement:

A. "Commission" means the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission or its duly authorized representatives.

B. "Equipment and devices" means any instrument or apparatus, and includes research reactors, as defined herein, and their component parts.

C. "Research reactor" means a reactor which is designed for the production of neutrons and other radiations for general research and development purposes, medical therapy, or training in nuclear science and engineering. The term does not cover power reactors, power demonstration reactors, or reactors designed primarily for the production of special nuclear materials.

D. The terms "restricted data," "atomic weapons," and "special nuclear material" are used in this agreement as defined in the U.S. Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this agreement.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this —— day of 1965.

For the Government of the United States of America:

CHARLES W. THOMAS,
Department of State.
JUNE 2, 1965.
JOHN G. PALFREY,
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.
MAY 19, 1965.

For the Government of the United States of Brazil:

ANTONIO BORGES LEAL CASTELLO BRANCO FILHO.
MAY 19, 1965.
LUIZ CINTRA DO PRADO.
MAY 19, 1965.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 3, 1965.
THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed "Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United States of Brazil Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The proposed agreement which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would take the place of the agreement between the United States of America and Brazil which was signed on August 3, 1955, as amended by agreements signed on July 9, 1958, June 11, 1960, May 28, 1962, and September 1, 1964. The proposed agreement maintains all of the provisions of the present agreement and adds several standard modifications which are discussed below. These modifications are designed to recognize conditions which have developed since the present agreement was last modified substantively.

The present agreement with Brazil provides that the Commission will lease uranium enriched up to 20 percent in the isotope U^{235} to Brazil for fueling defined research reactors. In the proposed agreement, the word "transfer" is substituted for the word "lease" so as to permit the Commission flexibility to either lease or sell fuel should a change in the Commission's policy of leasing fuel for research reactors be required during the 10-year term of the agreement. There is no intent at present, however, to change the Commission's policy of leasing fuel for research reactors.

The Government of Brazil is arranging for the return of the fuel elements from the 5 MW research reactor to the United States for reprocessing and has requested that the replacement elements contain material enriched to 93 percent in the isotope U^{235}. In order to accommodate this request, the proposed agreement provides that the Commission, upon request and at its discretion, may make material enriched to more than 20 percent in the isotope U^{235} available. A similar provision has been incorporated in our agreements with several other countries.

As a result of the two modifications mentioned above, a standard provision with respect to rights in special nuclear material produced as a result of the irradiation process has been added to the proposed agreement. The minimal safeguards provisions of the present agreement have been replaced by comprehensive safeguards provisions.

The 1-year extension of the present agreement which was granted in 1964 was based on the understanding that Brazil would, by August 2, 1965, complete trilateral arrangements for the transfer of safeguards to the International Atomic Energy Agency. However, as a consequence of the recent revision of the Agency safeguards system by the Agency Board of Governors, a new trilateral agreement reflecting agreed upon simplifications and improvements in the Agency system is being drafted by the United States and the Agency. While every effort is being made to complete the trilateral agreement on a timely basis, it is felt that Brazil should be relieved of the August 2, 1965, date for transfer of safeguards should it not be possible to complete the development of the new trilateral agreement by that date. Accordingly, the proposed agreement reflects that the transfer of safeguards will be made by August 2, 1965, or as soon thereafter as the trilateral arrangements reflecting the revised Agency system can be completed.

Following your determination, approval, and authorization, the proposed agreement will be formally executed by appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United States of Brazil. In compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the proposed amendment will then be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,

——— ———,

Chairman.

(Enclosure: proposed "Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United States of Brazil.")

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C. June 29, 1965.

Hon. GLENN T. SEABORG,
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: In accordance with section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to me by letter of June 3, 1965, a proposed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United States of Brazil Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," which proposed agreement would take the place of the present agreement originally signed on August 3, 1955, and most recently amended on September 1, 1964. The Atomic Energy Commission has recommended that I approve this proposed agreement in accordance with the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

Therefore, pursuant to the provisions of 123b of the above act, I hereby (a) approve the proposed agreement, and determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States of America; (b) authorize the execution of the proposed agreement on behalf of the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., July 15, 1965.

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. HOLIFIELD: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there are submitted with this letter (a) an executed "Amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland"; (b) a copy of the letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment; and (c) a copy of the letter from the President to the Commission containing his determination that performance of the amendment will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and approving the amendment and authorizing its execution.

The amendment, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would extend for a period of 1 year the agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland which was signed at Washington on June 15, 1955, as amended.

It had been our intent to conclude a comprehensive agreement for cooperation with the United Kingdom which would replace and supersede the current agreement, which will expire on July 20, 1965. However, due to the complexity of some of the considerations involved, it was concluded in discussions with representatives of the United Kingdom that it would not be possible to complete the negotiations on a new superseding agreement for cooperation prior to the expiration of the present agreement. Accordingly, it was agreed that a simple extension of the existing agreement for a 1-year period should be processed at this time which would provide an interim mechanism for us to retain our cooperation with the United Kingdom, and which also would provide the parties additional time to reach a satisfactory conclusion of our negiotiations on the proposed new agreement.

The amendment will enter into force on the day on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of this amendment.

Cordially,

JOHN G. PALFREY,
Acting Chairman.

Enclosures: (1) Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation with the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; (2) letter from the Commission to the President; (3) letter from the President to the Commission.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION ON THE CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

The Government of the United States of America (including the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission) and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, on its own behalf and on behalf of the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority,

Desiring to extend the term of the Agreement for Cooperation on the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (hereinafter referred to as the "agreement for cooperation"), signed between them at Washington on June 15, 1965, as amended by the notes signed October 20, 1955, and November 3, 1965, the agreement signed at Washington on June 13, 1956, as modified by the agreement signed at Washington on July 3, 1958, as amended by the agreement signed at Washington on June 5, 1963, and as amended by the agreement signed at Washington on June 29, 1964;

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article XI of the agreement for cooperation, as amended, is modified by changing the word "ten" which appears before the word "years" at the end thereof to read "eleven".

ARTICLE II

This amendment, which shall be regarded as an integral part of the agreement for cooperation, shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of this amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the agreement for cooperation, as hereby amended.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., July 7, 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The proposed amendment which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would extend for a period of 1 year the agreement between the United States of America and the United Kingdom which was signed on June 15, 1955, as amended.

It has been the intent of the United States and the United Kingdom to negotiate a comprehensive Agreement for Cooperation which would replace and supersede the current agreement. However, due to the complexity of some of the considerations involved, it has not been possible to complete the negotiations prior to the expiration date of the current agreement. Accordingly, as an interim measure, and in order to furnish the parties with the mechanism for continuing the cooperation, the United States and the United Kingdom have agreed to the simple 1-year extension of the present agreement. The discussions with the United Kingdom are continuing on the text of the new superseding and longer-term agreement for cooperation with the hope of reaching a mutually satisfactory resolution of all points by the time the proposed 1-year extension expires.

Following your determination, approval, and authorization, the proposed agreement will be formally executed by appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. In compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the agreement together with your approval and determination will then be submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

(Enclosures: Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation in the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.)

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 13, 1965.

Hon. GLENN T. SEABORG,
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: In accordance with section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to me a proposed "amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" and has recommended that I approve the proposed amendment, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution.

Pursuant to the provisions of 123b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby (a) approve the proposed amendment, and determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States of America; (b) authorize the execution of the proposed amendment on behalf of the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Atomic Energy Commission on July 15, 1965, submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a proposed amendment to the agreement for cooperation concerning the civil uses of atomic energy between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; and

Whereas the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held a hearing on July 19, 1965, to consider such proposed amendment; and

Whereas subsection 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, provides that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, after having received an agreement for cooperation, may by resolution in writing waive the conditions of all or any portion of the 30-day waiting period required by subsection 123c: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, pursuant to subsection 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the remainder of the 30-day waiting period for the proposed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation concerning the civil uses of atomic energy between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, is hereby waived.

(Approved by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on July 19, 1965.)

SLEUTH OF THE SENATE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, in the July 13, 1965, Family Weekly, I found an article entitled "Sleuth of the Senate," written by Bill Surface. Of course, the article could be about none other than the outstanding and distinguished man of impeccable character, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware.

Senator WILLIAMS, with whom I am proud to be serving, has built an outstanding record in his efforts to bring decency and honesty to the Federal Government. He is called folksy but foxy. This man, whose character is unquestionable, continues in his efforts to expose corruption, but he does it without fanfare and without any attempts to seek personal publicity. This is an admirable quality and one which is seldom found in the political environment in which he has served with distinction for so many years.

This article, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks, pays high tribute to Senator JOHN WILLIAMS and it points out the many outstanding exposés that he has made. Only last Friday, July 23, my friend from Delaware told of the glaring waste under our AID programs. The amazing thing is that Senator WILLIAMS apparently uses public documents which are accessible to the Department of Justice and all other agencies of the Government in finding the waste, the corruption, and the obvious mistakes of various Government officials.

Senator WILLIAMS told the Senate of the 7 million bushels of corn which were given to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of Public Law 480. The pretense was that this corn was needed to meet a severe crop failure in that country. When the Comptroller General's Office looked into the matter, it found that there had been no crop failure and that more than $9 million worth of the corn had been sold rather than distributed for relief, as intended. We do not know for certain what the United Arab Republic did with the money. However, at the same time we were giving them the corn that they were selling on the open market, they were supplying and arming the Congolese rebels, who were creating a great deal of trouble for our Government and our allies in the Congo.

On several occasions I have stood on the Senate floor to pay tribute to Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, and I am proud again to call this Nation's attention to this great patriot. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article printed in the Family Weekly on July 18, 1965.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SLEUTH OF THE SENATE

(NOTE.—Folksy but foxy Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS—the man who exploded the Bobby Baker case—exposes corruption wherever he finds it.)

(By Bill Surface)

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, laid a legal-size manila folder on the desk of Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD and asked for authority to question Robert G. (Bobby) Baker, majority secretary.

Baker had been sued for allegedly accepting, then reneging on, a conflict-of-interest payoff. But he virtually ignored the charge.

WILLIAMS, however, had made his own investigation. Now, would Baker face him? Instead, Baker quit.

The Senator introduced a resolution asking for a full investigation, exploding the Bobby Baker case that October day in 1963. Contending the probe was "whitewashed," WILLIAMS disclosed new information that became a presidential campaign issue. Evidence he presented later reopened the inquiry.

As exemplified by the Baker case, WILLIAMS is perhaps the most amazing man in Congress. He never has been associated with a Senate investigating committee, never has been given one dollar, one professional investigator, or even a special room to interview informants. He has no subpena powers. But the Senator has exposed more corruption than any other legislator now on Capitol Hill.

WILLIAMS stages no show: "Here's the proof," he says to the appropriate authorities. "Now it's your duty to correct the situation."

WILLIAMS, 61, is a 6-foot, ruddy-complexioned man who physically resembles Calvin Coolidge. He speaks amiably and so softly that he is called "Whispering Willie." He is folksy but foxy, relentlessly fighting any semblance of political malpractice. "We can't allow stories to circulate about any Government official taking boxes full of $100 bills without investigating," WILLIAMS told me. "If a case stinks, let it stink. But clean it up fast."

The Senator himself works fast. Moments after presenting his initial Baker testimony, he disclosed the resignation of a deputy secretary of state:

"He didn't file income tax returns for 8 years, and when this was discovered, he was allowed to file retroactively and submit * * * an honorable resignation. What would have happened had this been an ordinary laborer or farmer without proper political connections?"

WILLIAMS watches Government agencies just as closely. He has long fought the "secret" classification for all our national stockpile (storage of strategic goods). No wonder. A later investigation showed that the Government now owns materials valued at $8.8 billion, more than half of which are items we cannot use. In some cases, participants made profits up to 1,000 percent.

In 1963 WILLIAMS simultaneously revealed that 24 million bushels of surplus grain given as foreign aid to Austria had been illegally diverted and sold; and that the Government's Commodity Credit Corporation had bought 500 million pounds of soybean oil to uphold the market although prices were above the support price. The oil was unfit and had been purchased from corporations barred from CCC programs.

A deeper inquiry disclosed that millions of dollars had been paid for salad oil—but the oil tanks were empty.

WILLIAMS even finds chicanery in routine Government booklets. "We spend millions on reports hardly anybody reads," WILLIAMS said.

Once, after examining a report, he told the Senate: "If the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation were examined, we would find millions of dollars are unaccounted for." An investigation produced evidence of "embezzlement or criminal conversion" by 131 warehousemen totaling almost $10 million.

WILLIAMS doesn't pick targets: "I neither gun for nor exclude anybody. You do that, and a bigger rascal sneaks by."

This impartiality was best illustrated during the Truman administration. WILLIAMS' probe led to the resignation of Bill Boyle, Democratic National Committee chairman, for allegedly helping a private client obtain a Government loan previously rejected three times. Then the Senator revealed comparable charges against Guy Gabrielson, Republican chairman, and Gabrielson quit.

WILLIAMS' inquiry also helped convict T. Lamar Caudle, a key income-tax official, and Matthew J. Connelly, President Truman's appointment secretary, for tax conspiracy. Later he began the investigation which disclosed that Sherman Adams, No. 1 assistant to President Eisenhower, had accepted expensive gifts from industrialist Bernard Goldfine.

"Oh, there are just as many scoundrels in both parties," WILLIAMS says. "Men who are inclined to be crooked switch their party or religion to fit the occasion."

Despite voluminous detective work, WILLIAMS is an effective legislator. Many Senators and Congressmen miss up to 45 percent of their roll calls to maintain outside employment. WILLIAMS answered 96 percent of the roll calls in 1963. "Congress should be a full-time job," he argues.

WILLIAMS didn't seriously consider the Senate until he was 42. He was born the 9th of 11 children on a farm near Frankford, Del. (population 610). When he was 20, he married Elsie Steele, a telephone operator, moved into a modest white-frame house, where they still live, and opened a feed store in nearby Millsboro (population 450).

Until he entered the 1946 U.S. Senate race against a Democratic incumbent deemed unbeatable, Williams' only public office had been as town councilman.

Senator Williams immediately discovered a major scandal: a tax collector in Delaware had embezzled Williams' income-tax check. Subsequently he learned of similar frauds, which he quietly but meticulously investigated for 3 years. "The Internal Revenue Service seemed indifferent about straightening things out," Williams recalls, "but I knew a serious crime had been committed and that I'd be part of the crime if I didn't expose it."

In 1951 Williams disclosed the largest tax-fixing ring in U.S. history. "It's set up so crooks get more in bribes than the Government receives," the Senator said. He cited numerous cases like that of an Indianapolis brewery which had settled a $636,000 tax bill for $4,500, then received a $35,000 refund from the Government. Altogether, Williams' investigation resulted in 125 convictions—including five high-ranking tax officers—and 681 dismissals or resignations.

Moreover, Williams remedied the tax problem at its origin. In case of discrepancies, the IRS investigated itself. The Senator forced a change to allow the Justice Department to inspect the tax bureau.

Williams doesn't accept political whitewashes. He revealed that a politician in St. Louis received $1,000 monthly for helping a company get a $565,000 Government loan previously refused. A grand jury cleared the man.

"Now wait a minute," Williams insisted. There was a new hearing, new evidence was produced that had been withheld, and the man was proven guilty.

Afterwards, Williams disclosed that 365-pound "Big Bill" Lias, whom the FBI called a top mobster and ex-bootlegger, owed $2,230,744 in back income taxes and wouldn't pay even $500 although he had $700,000 in a bank account.

When the Senator was told the case had been "solved," he opposed permitting Lias to pay only 25 percent of his original debt and escape penalties for 30 years of fraud. When Williams finished investigating Lias, the Treasury Department had the $2.4 million Lias owed.

Williams also shows a strong distaste for Congressmen's loose spending. On February 6, 1963, he delivered the only derogatory speech against a Congressman in the history of the Senate:

"The administration has been shoveling the taxpayers' money out to Congressman Adam Clayton Powell * * * and to authorize placing $250,000 from the Federal Treasury at Powell's disposal, under the guise that it would help combat the juvenile-delinquency problem, is an insult. Powell could well be recognized as an authority on adult delinquency."

Why does Williams continue his one-man war so vigorously? "We're a legislative body," he says, "but we're not a class above the law."

Some rivals seem to appreciate Williams' integrity. When his opponent in the 1958 campaign heard that the Senator would address a Shrine Club, he drove Williams to the dinner and introduced him to the audience.

Last November, despite a Democratic landslide, Senator Williams defeated the same opponent, Elbert Carvel. The campaign was so clean, however, that they have remained good friends.

THE CONGRESS OF MICRONESIA

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the first legislature in the history of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is now in session in Saipan, Mariana Islands.

Members-elect of the Congress of Micronesia had no previous experience in the establishment of a legislature, and they were aided by a team of experts sent from Hawaii by the Institute of Technical Interchange at the East-West Center. One of the members of this team was former Congressman Thomas P. Gill, of Hawaii.

Dwight Heine, 44, a 1959 graduate of the University of Hawaii, was chosen as the first speaker of the general assembly.

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin recently published an article about Mr. Heine. Knowing that my colleagues are interested in the kind of leadership that is being developed in the Trust Territory of the Pacific, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New Leadership in Trust Territory

Saipan, Mariana Islands.—If any one man offers a good example of the type of leadership now developing in the trust territory of the Pacific Islands it is Dwight Heine.

Heine, 44, was chosen this week as the first speaker of the general assembly in the Congress of Micronesia—in other words leader of the lower house which has 21 members.

Like many of the other members, he is a college graduate (University of Hawaii, 1959), a moderate, and has taken part in top level conferences related to the United Nations.

Heine became a political leader in the Marshall Islands when he helped fight the case of the Rongelap residents after they were hit by fallout from a nuclear bomb test.

He and Amata Kabua (now a Marshallese member of the upper house of the new congress) paid their own way to the mainland.

MADE LECTURE TOUR

There, Heine went on a lecture tour to let people know that the Rongelapese wanted compensation for their suffering.

Heine also participated in the decision of the Marshalls District Legislature several years ago to purchase polio vaccine for the people of the district without authorization. District doctors had diagnosed the disease as polio, but tests had not been completed, and the trust territory administration refused to give the Marshallese a go-ahead until they had an expert opinion from Hawaii.

The subsequent epidemic brought 103 Marshallese down, and their rehabilitation is a major problem for the district now. But Heine and his colleagues are credited with having nipped the epidemic early and having saved numerous lives.

Heine says this is the sort of action which allows a person to become a successful politician in the Marshalls. It is thought unseemly to campaign for yourself there, according to Heine, but those who have exhibited their ability will be supported by friends who want them elected.

This is how Heine was able to win his seat in the new Congress by a healthy majority, even though he was in Saipan at an educational conference throughout the campaign.

Heine, who describes himself as a middle-of-the-roader, says the Congress contains three distinct groups. Hereditary island royalty wants to retain the status quo to prevent further erosion of their power, while the youngest of the new Congressmen cherish grudges against the administration and are anxious to try to force rapid development and an end to the old ways.

"I stand for an evolutionary change into the modern age," Heine says, noting that the other members of his own delegation, all in the royal line, do not agree with him. But he says the Marshallese definitely do stand unanimously for the unity of Micronesia.

Heine is pleased with the new Congress and says it is most important that the Congressmen organize and establish the machinery for governing the trust territory.

"Get it started, let it go * * *," Heine says, "when you are too ambitious, you stifle growth."

UNABLE TO PREDICT

As to the eventual political disposition of the trust territory, Heine said, "I cannot predict the future—only 10 years ago I did not dream that there would be a Congress of Micronesia."

But Heine thinks that whatever happens, it will be under the American flag. He noted the suggestion of Gov. John A. Burns, of Hawaii, that Micronesia might become a part of Hawaii. He said that this is a possibility. "Maybe it will be some new arrangement under the American flag," he said.

"We have American ideas," he said. "All our education is American; the tools of government with which we work are American."

Heine is the son of a Marshallese mother and a half-Polynesian father. His grandfather on his father's side came to the Marshalls from Sydney as a copra trader and later turned to the Congregationalist ministry.

From his parents and grandfather, young Heine received an excellent if informal education on the island of Jaluit, then under Japanese occupation.

At a mission school taught by Americans he learned Marshallese, Japanese, and English, in addition to other subjects. He also "studied American" via periodicals from Honolulu and Sydney.

After 4 years of schooling, his grandfather made him a teacher but the Japanese in 1938 recruited Heine and his pupils to go to work loading coal and building fortifications.

When war broke, Heine's parents and grandfather were interned but he remained free under surveillance, and was made an air raid warden.

The elder Heines were beheaded by the Japanese when the American invasion of the Marshalls started. Dwight made contact with the U.S. marines and served out the war as interpreter for the military governor of the Marshalls.

He also trained a corps of 30 young men as Marshallese-English interpreters and these people later become key figures on the staff of the trust territory.

After the war he became superintendent of schools for the Marshalls, even though his own education was far from rounded.

In 1948, he enrolled at the University of Hawaii, but under a trust territory policy had to return to the Marshalls after 2 years. In 1957 he returned to complete his studies and got his degree in 1959, then returned to the Marshalls as district director of education.

RURAL WATER SYSTEM GRANTS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the rural water system bill which passed the Senate last Friday will place administration of the program under the Farmers Home Administration, a bureau well acquainted with the needs and desires of rural Americans and accustomed to cooperating with them on joint projects.

The FHA will be authorized by the passage of this bill to approve proposed rural water system projects and to make loans and grants in support of such projects. The bill authorizes for each year

$25 million worth of loans and $5 million worth of direct grants.

In order to qualify for the water system grants and loans, a community will have to show that the project would:

First. Serve a rural area not likely to decline in population below that for which the system is being designed.

Second. Be designed and constructed so that adequate capacity will be available to serve the present population and any foreseeable population growth.

Third. Be necessary for orderly community development and consistent with a comprehensive community plan and not inconsistent with any other State, county, or municipal water projects planned in the same area.

Probably the greatest handicap to rural development today lies in the fact that thousands of communities across our State and over the Nation—communities with an incalculable potential for growth and prosperity—can make no progress because they have no dependable water supply.

Without water, a community with good land, good industrial sites, good public facilities and good neighbors may stay practically dormant or may even become a dying community.

This glaring deficiency of rural America is holding down our national progress, and I have joined with 92 other U.S. Senators in sponsoring a bill that presents a new, yet proven, attack on water shortages.

This proposal is Senate bill No. 1766. It will amend the Rural Electrification Act to provide for the financing and building up of rural water systems. The program will be a joint Federal-State-local system of focusing attention upon this need for rural water systems and of obtaining relief for a situation that otherwise can do nothing but get worse and worse.

I am most pleased this legislation will now be passed by the Senate. Rural development will be vastly improved when this bill becomes law.

APPOINTMENT OF JUSTICE ARTHUR GOLDBERG AS THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, President Johnson's recent appointment of Arthur Goldberg as Ambassador to the United Nations deserves credit for at least two important reasons.

First. It is continuing evidence that the President will settle for no less than the best men to serve this Nation.

Second. It again demonstrates the highest esteem and importance President Johnson holds for the work of the United Nations.

Surely peace in the world must rank paramount with all Americans. Justice Goldberg has demonstrated his ability at diplomacy as a labor lawyer who befriended both labor and management, as a capable Secretary of Labor, and as an erudite Justice of the Supreme Court. All of these skills point out the wisdom of Mr. Johnson's choice to replace Adlai Stevenson.

Several editorials in the Nation's press have mirrored the confidence President Johnson had for Arthur Goldberg to tackle this difficult assignment, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean, July 21, 1965]

PRESIDENT'S U.N. CHOICE WAS A WISE SELECTION

President Johnson's choice of Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg to be the Nation's new ambassador to the United Nations came as a surprise, but it nevertheless was a well-thought-out appointment.

In picking a justice from the Nation's highest tribunal, the Chief Executive reaffirmed his full support for the world organization and its work. The U.N. leadership will not miss the subtle nuance of picking a man from one important position to fill another.

There had been some speculation that the President might reshuffle his Cabinet and send Secretary of State Rusk to the U.N. However, there have been rumors—emphatically denied by Mr. Johnson—that he wanted Mr. Rusk out of the State Department. It would have been something of a demotion for Mr. Rusk, and both the U.N. and the world would have concluded that such a move was simply a convenient way to derail Mr. Rusk. If the President even considered it, which is doubtful, he was wise enough not to make the move.

In Mr. Goldberg, the U.N. has a man of impeccable personal credentials. He is a brilliant attorney, a former counsel for the AFL–CIO, former Secretary of Labor in the Kennedy Cabinet and a member of the Supreme Court.

He is noted for his power of persuasion, for patience, tenacity and directness. As he often demonstrated during his tenure as Labor Secretary, he is a tireless negotiator and one who is adept at dealing with opposing points of view. These are characteristics that he will need in the U.N. post.

Mr. Goldberg's command of language may not be as compelling as that of Mr. Stevenson—there was only one Adlai Stevenson. But Mr. Goldberg is nevertheless clear and forceful and he cuts to the heart of the issue. Most important, perhaps, he is like Mr. Stevenson in that he is intellectually honest, and the man who articulates American policy and beliefs in the U.N. window of the world must be that.

Justice Goldberg is best noted for his competence and knowledge in the field of labor-management relations, but his horizons are much broader. He has long been interested in world peace, in world law and in humanitarian problems. He has served on boards and committees representing peace efforts and a new unity for Europe.

It speaks something of his interest and sense of challenge that has given up a life-time job and taken a considerable salary cut to become U.N. Ambassador.

He succeeds Mr. Stevenson, and he said himself that it is doubtful if anyone can replace him. Nevertheless, Mr. Goldberg will in his own way, provide the Nation with an able, intelligent spokesman. The President has made a wise and thoughtful choice.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 21, 1965]

FRIENDS CLAIM HE HAS FELT "WALLED UP"

(By Bruce Biossat)

Justice Arthur Goldberg's publicly voiced reluctance at leaving the Supreme Court for the U.N. ambassadorship cannot hide the abundant evidence that he felt "walled up" in the High Court's marble isolation.

Ebulient in spirit, a tireless talker, a prime mover throughout his life, Justice Goldberg never really adjusted to the hushed tones and red velvet that went with the honored post he accepted from President Kennedy in 1962.

Says a labor lawyer who has observed his Court tenure closely: "He's done a good, competent job. But he really belongs out with the boys."

Justice Goldberg is an inveterate problem solver. When he has finished solving his own, he likes to plunge—sometimes uninvited—into the handling of other people's difficulties.

If his appointment to the U.N. was a genuine surprise, his leaving the Court was not at all stunning to many in labor and law who knew him. Says one such source: "We felt he could not last in the detached atmosphere of the Bench."

Justice Goldberg himself dropped many cues on this score. He heartily disliked the Court's long vacations. At the American Bar Association convention in Chicago in 1963, he told assembled lawyers: "A (Labor) Secretary's and a labor lawyer's phone never stops ringing. The Justice's never does ring. Even his best friends won't call him."

He said he felt his detachment most keenly the week or more of the Cuban crisis in October 1962. He kept thinking President Kennedy would summon him for help. To the lawyers at Chicago he added:

"But our phone was silent. And we went about our business of calling the calendar, and judging * * *.

"Right in the midst of it, a messenger arrived with a White House envelope and I thought: 'Well, I'm not entirely out of it. I am sure the President is going to ask my advice now on how we settle the Cuban conflict.'

"I opened the envelope * * * and it was a notice from the Office of Emergency Management, giving me my directions as to how I could be evacuated from Washington."

Observers of Justice Goldberg believe President Johnson was fully aware of the Justice discomfiture, and may also have known of his hankering to cavort a little on the international stage.

White House sources say the President thought of Justice Goldberg almost immediately as a possible replacement for the late Adlai Stevenson. Mr. Johnson's first talk with the Justice came a day or so after Mr. Stevenson's death.

Other announced timetables notwithstanding, it is said the President had largely made up his mind the day before he took Justice Goldberg with him to the Stevenson funeral in Illinois.

The President's contacts with Justice Goldberg over the months have been fairly frequent. Justice Goldberg was on the scene, offering a bit of advice, when Mr. Johnson was preparing his convention acceptance speech last August.

As the new U.N. Ambassador, Justice Goldberg will have one handicap—a rather heavyhanded speaking style. But most who know think he will nevertheless perform superbly at the United Nations because of his dazzling talents as a negotiator.

He is described as a "tinkerer" who gets at the problem of the moment and builds a bridge which often prevents a long-range crisis from ever materializing.

One lawyer said: "I almost feel sorry for the Communists. He'll detrouser them, and they'll stand there smiling, liking him.

This same man thinks Justice Goldberg will have the "brass" to insinuate himself into decisionmaking more than Mr. Stevenson did, and won't be hobbled by the 225-mile gap between Washington and New York. He adds:

"He'll be the (airline) shuttle's most noted passenger."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Post, July 21, 1965]

THE NEW U.N. AMBASSADOR

As befitted the solemn occasion, the statements of the two men in the White House rose garden yesterday were brief, but stirring.

The President, announcing the appointment of Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg as Ambassador to the U.N., said: "Always, we strive for a world where all men live in peace under a rule of justice under law. It is fitting that we should ask a member of the highest court to relinquish that position and speak for the United States before the United Nations."

Justice Goldberg's response was: "It now comes that the President has asked me to join in the greatest adventure of man's history—the effort to bring the rule of law to govern the relations between sovereign states. I have accepted as one simply must."

We believe Adlai Stevenson would have welcomed the appointment and we make bold to suggest why.

First, there is the demonstration in this appointment of the President's wish to continue the Stevenson tradition. It was, perhaps, a complex idealism based on the theory that what is best in us as a people is our best guide in managing our international relations. Arthur Goldberg and Adlai Stevenson arrived at public prominence on different paths. But in their many public expressions—Stevenson as a politician, statesman, and diplomat, Goldberg as a lawyer, labor advocate and judge—they voiced the same aspirations for human dignity and decency.

Second, there is the meaning of law. What is the U.N. if not an expression of self-government under law? We believe Stevenson, a man of law himself, would have relished Goldberg's professional thought on "the greatest adventure of man's history."

There are many other felicities in the character and talents of Goldberg himself. The largest part of his career has been devoted to the conciliation and reconciliation of many baffling social conflicts and he succeeded brilliantly in many efforts.

To take one signal example, he was the force principally responsible for the merger of the AFL and CIO 10 years ago after a cold war of 20 years' duration. We do not suggest that he is about to bring overnight peace in the larger cold war. What does seem plain is that his skill as a conciliator and maker of industrial peace augurs well for his future as a diplomat.

It remains to be frankly recognized that the Arab nations will grumble over the appointing of a Jew as our Ambassador. We need have little concern. Goldberg's very appointment exemplifies, in pointed terms, our highest traditions. It is, in itself, a rebuke to bigotry. We therefore welcome Ambassador Goldberg to his high post—"our Nation's advocate of peace in the council of nations," in his own words—and salute the President on the wisdom and courage of his choice.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Post, July 21, 1965]

RETURN TO ACTION

(By James A. Wechsler)

Some men are born to be umpires and others to be players; the game requires both. On occasion a player retires to the role of umpire, but I can think of no occasion in baseball when the reverse change of role occurred on any major league scale.

With rare exception, that rule has prevailed in public affairs, and perhaps that is partly why Arthur Goldberg's acceptance of the role of Ambassador to the United Nations has confounded so many. The shift is even more startling because a Supreme Court Justice (unlike an umpire) has permanent tenure and is usually spared the hostile roar of the crowd. Now Goldberg has abandoned that sanctuary to return to the field of combat, and at a moment when the team of which he has been named captain faces a surfeit of trouble.

Yet those who know him well manifested little shock over the transition. Certainly he prized the distinction John F. Kennedy bestowed when he designated him to the Supreme Court; he served conscientiously and well. But he never became wholly wedded to the judicial life, even as a member of the highest tribunal in the land.

His mind and spirit remained restless, his interests diverse. As one old friend remarked yesterday, he continued to "crave the action." And so, when the summons came to step into the explosive U.N. role suddenly and tragically rendered vacant, one doubts that he pleaded even momentarily for exemption.

There were inquisitive murmurs at the U.N. yesterday as to whether Goldberg possessed any special credentials for so strategic a position in international affairs. The questions were plausible because his public life has been so largely identified with labor and law. But in fact he has long been a man of ubiquitous activity, wide concerns, and lively intelligence—often a brilliant busybody.

During the Kennedy era he never viewed the post of Secretary of Labor as one which rendered his views incompetent or irrelevant on other matters, domestic and worldwide; he was one of those with whom Mr. Kennedy invited the exchange of ideas in many realms. He has never regarded reticence as a basic virtue when he felt he had something of consequence to say.

His relations with President Johnson have been close and continuous; to a certain degree, as a member of the Court, Goldberg has quietly participated in some affairs of Government in the fashion of Felix Frankfurter during the Roosevelt era.

Apart from his obvious talents, there were other elements in his history to commend him to Mr. Johnson. During the tense moments of the 1960 convention, after Mr. Kennedy had offered the Vice-Presidency to Johnson, there were rumblings of a labor revolt; it was Goldberg, in long-distance communication with George Meany, David Dubinsky, and others, who helped to avert the storm. (Dubinsky astonished him by quickly agreeing.)

In an early phase of the Johnson Presidency, Goldberg arranged a private dinner for Johnson with a large number of laborites. By that time the new President had altered many stereotypes; the dinner was in the nature of an acknowledgment that labor's hostility had been a parochial misjudgment.

Such acts of Washington diplomacy can hardly be cited as guarantees that Goldberg will harmonize all the feuding forces of this strife-ridden planet. Nor is it suggested that Goldberg's appointment is a reward for such services.

What is most revealing about the new Ambassador is the capacity he has exhibited for evoking the trust and respect of such disparate figures as Meany, Philip Murray, John F. Kennedy, and Lyndon Johnson.

Goldberg has forfeited the total security and comparative serenity of the High Court for a post in which there is no contract and the prospect of much travail.

The pitfalls are obvious. But there may be an ironic footnote in the Washington reports that another man most seriously considered for the post was Justice William O. Douglas.

In the year 1948, Harry Truman asked Douglas to be his running mate. Douglas, after much meditation, confided to a friend that he saw no sense in leaving the bench to serve in a lost cause.

At the time Douglas was generally described as restive in his judicial post; like Goldberg, he had a zest for the public world. Whether he has ultimately regretted his rejection of the bid, none of us can say; but surely much of his life—and U.S. history—would have been different. The story is told only to underline the drama of Goldberg's decision, and perhaps to intimate that judges with an impulse for public activity should not resist the challenge of hazardous adventure even at the sacrifice of job security.

The President's choice will evoke wide, even controversial, speculation. One informed citizen remarked yesterday that it affirmed his quest for negotiation in the dangerous deadlocks confronting mankind; Goldberg is above all a negotiator of eminence. His voice will not echo the lyricism of Adlai Stevenson, as he would be the first to concede. But in the private dialogs on which so much may hinge, his skills may achieve their finest fruit. This is his calculated risk, compounded by all the venality of the anti-Semites he will encounter. But perhaps history, which plays cosmic jokes, will enable him to emerge as an architect of a peace in which all men can breathe, in the Middle East as well as other places.

[From the New York (N.Y.) World-Telegram, July 21, 1965]

JUSTICE IN THE WORLD

Arthur Goldberg will bring to the United Nations a fresh and keen intelligence at a time when the organization desperately needs new ideas.

He is a skilled behind-the-scenes negotiator.

That he has not had experience on the diplomatic scene should prove an asset. He will be able to approach U.N. problems with a more flexible viewpoint than if his attitudes had been hardened by years of dealing with them.

In addition, he should prove a superb spokesman for the cause of American liberty before the world.

As a son of Jewish immigrants and one who rose from poverty to high position, he exemplifies the way of life this Nation hopes to make possible for all mankind.

As the President said in announcing the appointment, the United States seeks above all else a world of law and justice.

So he has assigned to the task of helping to achieve it a distinguished jurist of wide experience and exceptional capability.

[From the Capital Times, Madison (Wis.), July 21, 1965]

AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG DESERVES SUPPORT OF ALL PEACE LOVERS

Arthur Goldberg is not known for his grasp of foreign affairs. He is a superb lawyer, first coming to the attention of the Nation in the field of labor law which brought him to the position of general counsel for the AFL–CIO.

But he has demonstrated beyond doubt in public life that he possesses a brilliant mind, a dedication and devotion to the job at hand unexcelled in public life today, and an instinct for diplomacy.

One will wonder, of course, why he would choose to leave the serenity and security of the U.S. Supreme Court for the turbulence and insecurity of the United Nations Ambassadorship.

Surely, Ambassador Goldberg must realize that he will be under the handicap of being compared constantly with the peerless diplomacy of Adlai Stevenson who will continue to grow in stature.

But Arthur Goldberg is the kind of American who answers the call of his Government, whatever the sacrifices. He tackled some of the toughest labor problems as Secretary of Labor at the call of the late President Kennedy. And his sure hand brought success.

This is undoubtedly what moved President Johnson to call him to step into the chair vacated by the tragic death of Stevenson.

The United Nations is in deep trouble. It is being subverted by nations which will not accept their financial responsibilities to maintain it.

It is being ignored by our own Government in far to many critical situations.

And it is under constantly increasing attack from extremist elements in this country.

Arthur Goldberg faces a stern challenge in his new job. He deserves the support and best wishes of all who seek the rule of reason to find peace for mankind.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Times, July 21, 1965]

GOLDBERG'S RECORD SPEAKS WELL

Two factors lent surprise to President Johnson's appointment of Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg to be U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

Justices of the Supreme Court seldom resign to accept a new appointment. Justice James F. Byrnes resigned from the court October 3, 1942, when President Franklin Roosevelt appointed him Director of Economic Stabilization. President John Adams appointed Chief Justice Oliver Ellsworth one of three envoys and ministers to France in 1799, but the Chief Justice did not resign from the Court until the following year.

Furthermore, Justice Goldberg's experience has been notably in domestic rather than international affairs. He was not among the group of men who have been serving recent Presidents of both parties in difficult and often unrewarding diplomatic assignments.

Justice Goldberg, however, possesses some personal characteristics that may make him extraordinarily effective as (to borrow his own words) "our Nation's advocate of peace in the council of nations."

The son of immigrant parents, he worked for his own education and was graduated summa cum laude from Northwestern Law School in 1929. A long period as lawyer for causes of organized labor established him as a tough-minded, able negotiator, singularly free from dogma and cliches. Philip Murray, former president of the CIO, selected him as lawyer for the CIO and Steelworkers Union. Yet the conservative former Senator Barry Goldwater once said Goldberg was the only union spokesman he could talk to without getting angry.

Thus it was that when President Kennedy appointed Goldberg Secretary of Labor, he had the respect of management, labor and many Members of Congress. Goldberg once expressed his own view of labor disputes by observing: "No one would think of dissolving a marriage because of a few disagreements; the solution is for both sides to be flexible and find some way of living together in harmony."

It is not a bad idea if applied to the United Nations.

However, if this suggests that Goldberg is willing to salve over basic issues for the sake of harmony, the impression is altogether wrong. In his labor-lawyer years he was active in union reform no less than in improving wages and jobless benefits. As Justice of the Supreme Court he has stood firmly for individual and civil rights. His public life demonstrates concern for the worker, the underprivileged and the disadvantaged.

There is little similarity between his background and that of his predecessor at the United Nations. Adlai Stevenson was born to affluence in a family whose record of public service in this country was old. Each of these men typifies a different shining facet of America.

The United Nations is numerically dominated by eager, sensitive and sometimes overreaching new nations striving for what they have not yet attained. Justice Goldberg's accomplishments speak to them. His powers of advocacy and of conciliation stand the United States in good stead among its greater adversaries.

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, July 21, 1965]

AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG

President Johnson doubtless is enormously pleased at having chosen as Adlai Stevenson's successor to head the U.S. delegation at the United Nations a name which had not at all figured in advance speculation.

And the Nation can be equally pleased at the selection of one of such great talents as Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg.

Both at home and abroad—barring only the fanatically anti-Jewish Arabs—praise for the choice of Mr. Goldberg has been virtually unanimous.

Naturally, the question arises as to why Justice Goldberg should give up a lifetime post on the Nation's highest judicial body for the tempestuous U.N. appointment, which is almost certain to terminate when President Johnson leaves office.

Even for one as noted for his powers of persuasion as the President, there must have been additional factors involved.

One, without doubt, is Mr. Goldberg's high sense of patriotic duty. He knows, of course, the extremely high responsibility resting upon our chief representative at U.N.

Also, it is quite possible, as has happened in the case of other distinguished trial lawyers, Mr. Goldberg has found that the dispassionate impartiality demanded of a Supreme Court justice is a difficult and tedious discipline.

In the halls of the United Nations, the whole of Ambassador Goldberg's great skills as an advocate and debater will be called into play.

We do not worry that Mr. Goldberg has no background in diplomacy and foreign relations. He is a born diplomat; even as chief counsel for the United Steelworkers he proved that. And in his years as Secretary of Labor and on the Supreme Court, his restless, acquisitive, keen mind has undoubtedly become thoroughly immersed in the principles of the Nation's foreign policy.

Now, of course, the guessing game as to who will succeed to Mr. Goldberg's Supreme Court seat is underway.

If he is not a victim of the famous "hex" attached to predictions as to Johnson's appointments, one superbly logical choice has already appeared in speculation: Abe Fortas of the outstanding law firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter.

One of these days President Johnson is going to cross up everyone by picking the man all the prognosticators have named. This could be the time.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, July 21, 1965]

JOHNSON PULLS IT: A REAL SURPRISE

(By Philip Potter)

WASHINGTON, July 20.—President Johnson today achieved maximum surprise when he induced Arthur J. Goldberg to step down as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court to succeed the late Adlai E. Stevenson as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

The name of the former Labor Secretary in the Kennedy administration and onetime general counsel for the United Steelworkers Union and special counsel for the AFL–CIO had not figured in the speculation.

That, presidential staff members aver, is the way Mr. Johnson wants it.

STAFF HAS ORDERS

No President in recent memory has so cherished the element of surprise in all his undertakings, and particularly in the selection of appointees to top Government posts.

He is frankly chagrined when his plans leak in advance. His staff and others necessarily consulted on appointments are under the strictest injunction to give no help to newsmen and columnists who, to score a scoop, are eagerly trying to tip the President's hand on appointees.

No President has ever liked to disclose his hand on nominations until everything is nailed down. And out of consideration for those considered and rejected, no Chief Executive has liked to have it known who was in that category.

But Mr. Johnson so zealously guards the selection process that the selectee himself often is one of the last to know it.

ROWAN CASE RECALLED

When Carl T. Rowan, then Ambassador to Finland, was ordered home in February 1964, the State Department was specifically directed not to tell him that he was to be the new Director of the U.S. Information Agency, a post he recently resigned to reenter the newspaper business.

"I didn't have the remotest idea why I was coming home," Rowan said today. "He did not want any leaks from my end until he was ready to announce my appointment."

Bill D. Moyers, White House press secretary and longtime close associate of Mr. Johnson both before and after the latter became President, pragmatically explained his boss' penchant for keeping newsmen and the public in the dark until he is ready to turn on the light.

"Premature disclosure reduces his options," Moyers said. "Fundamental to his operations and way of life is surprise that keeps his foes off balance. He wants to retain the advantage of calling his own signals and deciding on his own timing.

"He doesn't like prenomination talk because it dispels some element of surprise and makes the announcement, when it comes, less startling and dramatic. The President prefers three columns of newspaper space to one. If the appointment has been speculated on long in advance, one column is more likely."

Despite Mr. Johnson's chagrin when a newspaperman does strike close to the mark or on it before a nomination is announced, aides dismiss as idle gossip claims that he has shelved some planned appointments because of premature disclosure.

The Washington Star, for instance, carried an article that Roswell L. Gilpatric, former Deputy Secretary of Defense, was to succeed John A. McCone as Director of Central Intelligence, a job that went instead to Adm. William Raborn.

A columnist later wrote that the Star story caused Mr. Johnson to dismiss Gilpatric from consideration.

DENIED BY REEDY

George Reedy, former White House Press Secretary, flatly denied this, asserting that Gilpatric never was considered for the post and the Star article was "a case of mistaken identity."

Confirming that Gilpatric's name was not among those considered was John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the Civil Service Commission who serves also as the President's chief talent scout and screener for all appointees to top Government posts.

"Frequently I read stories that so-and-so is under consideration and wonder where the heck they came from, because often they are wholly wrong," Macy said.

For instance, the wire services yesterday put out a story that Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, would welcome appointment to succeed Stevenson, and stated that Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, was interested in the State Department post.

PUZZLED RUSK AIDES

Puzzled Rusk aides said they had learned Senator DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, minority leader, was the source.

It may have speeded up Mr. Johnson's announcement of Goldberg's nomination.

Premature disclosure of a personnel change can alter the President's timing.

Rowan, one of the two highest Negro officials in the administration, attracted by a high salary offer to write a newspaper column, on July 8 tendered his resignation as USIA head to Mr. Johnson in a letter, and a day later talked it over with the Chief Executive.

"My letter said I would like it to be effective at the earliest reasonable time, so he would have full opportunity to consider a replacement," Rowan said.

ARTICLE CARRIED

On July 10, however, the Los Angeles Times carried an article that Rowan soon would leave the Government.

He telephoned Mr. Johnson, then at his ranch near Austin, suggesting that it might be better to announce his resignation at once.

Mr. Johnson did so and then over the weekend gave quick thought to a successor. On July 13 he announced nomination of Leonard H. Marks, an old friend whose Washington law firm has represented the Johnson family television interests before the Federal Communications Commission.

The President strongly believes, as he has put it, "that, in the end, the evaluation of me will depend on the kind of appointments I make."

"ABOVE POLITICS"

He picked Macy as his chief recruiter of top appointive talent, according to Moyers, to "symbolize" that appointments would be on merit, since the CIA chief's reputation was that of a man "above politics."

Macy, himself a Phi Beta Kappa, said he was told by the President that he had a preference for men of high education and intelligence, who had been Phi Beta Kappas or in the upper 10 percent of their college classes, and who since college excelled in their professions.

Prior Government service, in the President's judgment, also is a good qualification for high officials. Unlike neophytes drafted from business, labor, and civilian law offices, careerists know their way around in Government and how to do business with the rest of the hierarchy and with Congress.

With no nostalgic memories of the non-Government world haunting them, they are more likely to stay long enough to master their subject matter.

PERCENTAGES GIVEN

As of last April 27, Macy's records showed that 105, or 48 percent, of all Mr. Johnson's nonjudiciary appointments went to men and women drawn from ranks of Government—Federal, State, and local.

There has been nothing comparable in presidential history, Macy said.

He noted that 73 percent of Mr. Johnson's ambassadorial appointments at that time had gone to State Department careerists, "an alltime high."

The Nation's law offices have contributed 15 percent of the nonjudiciary appointees, the university 15 percent, and 20 percent have come from business and labor unions.

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette]

GOLDBERG'S LIFE RANKS HIM AS VERY WORTHY SUCCESSOR

If ever there was a country well represented in a court of world opinion it was the United States in the United Nations by Adlai Stevenson.

For the United States, and particularly for the President of the United States, appointment of his successor seemed to be an insurmountable problem. Adlai Stevenson had made such a record in the United Nations that he had grown to the position of the indispensable man.

Yet, somehow, we are confident this man has been found.

Arthur J. Goldberg survived the city streets to rise to the highest judicial position of the land. Typically, after his appointment, Goldberg said he could not replace Stevenson, he could only succeed him. The humility in the man is one of his finest qualifications for dealing with the world's ills.

His promise was to attempt to bring "the rule of law to relations between the various nations," and if ever there was a time for the rule of law to replace emotion it is in this frustrating era.

Arthur Goldberg, to borrow a little phrase, pulled himself up by his own bootstraps. By his own effort he gained a law degree, became a labor lawyer, and then proved, as President Kennedy's Secretary of Labor, that he could place justice where it belonged and negotiate settlements in the most difficult disputes. As a Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court he demonstrated a humanitarian feeling for people. In all undertakings he has proved that he understood human nature, that he understood the world, that he understood the only course of survival was peace among men of good will.

In accepting the arduous and often thankless task of U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Arthur Goldberg measured up as few men before him to the immortal words of John F. Kennedy, when he put forth the challenge: "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

In such circumstances, we cannot help but have confidence that our new Ambassador to the United Nations—despite the greatness of the man he succeeds—will serve America and the world well.

His background and his rise to prominence, and above all, his humility mark Goldberg as a man dedicated to peace and, we are convinced, a worthy successor to Adlai Stevenson. He is acknowledgeable and he is articulate—and in these respects he carries the noteworthy attributes of his predecessor.

But there is an even more important aspect to highlight Goldberg's selection. This is his dedication to country and world in time of need.

Goldberg had it made for life as a Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. He had stature, security, financial comfort beyond the reach of most men, and a lifetime position no man could take from him. Yet, he was willing to give up much of this to be of service not only to his own country but to the people of a peace-seeking world.

[From the Benton Harbor (Mich.) News-Palladium, July 21, 1965]

A GOOD APPOINTMENT

President Johnson should be credited with good judgment in appointing Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg ambassador to the United Nations, replacing the late Adlai Stevenson.

Why Goldberg was willing to step down from his lifetime job on the High Court bench into a chair on the debating society merry-go-round is another question. But it is fortunate that the United States has on hand a man of his apparent qualifications for this vital job.

Mostly, the U.N. seems to drone along. But in times of world crisis, it fires up to white heat. And the man who is U.S. Ambassador very well might someday hold the fate of this Nation, even the world, in his hands.

Goldberg is an intellectual who demonstrated his ability as a famed labor lawyer to compete most successfully in the hurly-burly of the business world. He is a liberal and a humanitarian, who should appeal to the representatives of the emerging nations.

Goldberg's notoriously quick mind ought to cut short the period of time needed to acquaint him with U.N. politics and diplomatic affairs. The Nation can only hope that when he gets into action, he lives up to the promise of his so-far brilliant career.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, July 21, 1965]

JUSTICE GOLDBERG WILL MEET THE TEST AS AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED NATIONS

President Johnson's surprise appointment of Justice Arthur J. Goldberg to succeed Adlai Stevenson as Ambassador to the United Nations will be met with general approval by the country. The enthusiastic reaction by Members of Congress is proof enough that Justice Goldberg has earned the approval and admiration of that body

His acceptance of the post represents a considerable personal sacrifice on the justice's part. Among other things, it represents a sizable salary cut. His appointment to the Court, of course, was for a lifetime and was the climax of a distinguished career in public and private life. His willingness to give it up testifies to his character and devotion to his country.

As general counsel of the AFL–CIO, Justice Goldberg earned the respect of industry as well as of labor. It brought him the appointment by President Kennedy as Secretary of Labor. Here he did an outstanding job, rebuilding a weak and comparatively ineffective department into one of the strongest in the Cabinet. He must be credited as one of the architects of the Kennedy administration's policy of maintaining economic stability through wage-price guidelines geared to productivity, a policy which has proved successful.

Like Adlai Stevenson, Goldberg is a native of Illinois, growing up in Chicago. Unlike Stevenson, he was born in humble circumstances. A son of Jewish parents who had migrated from Russia, he rose, as President Johnson said, "from city streets to Cabinet office and then to the highest Court of our land. His life embodies the story of our open and free society as a fulfillment of the opportunity we want all mankind to share." His brilliance first came to notice when he was graduated from Northwestern University Law School at the top of his class.

A shrewd bargainer, Justice Goldberg is articulate and persuasive, qualities most needed in the U.N. post. He is a negotiator. He talks well, but acts aggressively. He hammers vague generalities into hard agreements. A Johnson-type, he gets things done.

Carrying on the work of Adlai Stevenson will be a difficult task. Recognizing this, Justice Goldberg has accepted the challenge. We think he will be equal to it.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, July 21, 1965]

GOLDBERG TO THE U.N.

President Johnson sprang another surprise with his appointment of Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg to the post at the United Nations left vacant by the death of Adlai Stevenson. The speculation on Stevenson's successor had centered on men with long experience in foreign affairs, perhaps even Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

Goldberg's experience has run in quite different channels. He was a labor lawyer, then Secretary of Labor in President Kennedy's Cabinet, before his appointment to the Supreme Court. Except for brief wartime experience, his career has not involved him to any extent in the intricacies of foreign policy.

There are, however, qualifications of a general nature which suggests that the choice of Goldberg may be sound. Throughout his career, Goldberg has won esteem for superior intelligence, great industry and unquestioned integrity. He is a philosophical liberal, devoted to the universal rule of law, and he was a close friend and confidant of Stevenson's.

Above all, he is a skilled negotiator. His feats of bringing both sides to the conference table and winning agreements in labor disputes while he was Secretary of Labor have become almost legendary.

All of these attributes will serve him well in the post of U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, where tireless devotion to the rule of law and great skill in debate and negotiation are essential.

Goldberg takes the new assignment at some personal sacrifice, stepping from a lifetime appointment into one of uncertain tenure, and abandoning the relative calm of the Supreme Court for the active battlefield of the U.N. Yet he accepted with humility, saying that while he succeeded Adlai Stevenson, he could not "replace him."

President Johnson was wise to fill the U.N. post at the earliest opportunity, and put an end to the speculation. And it should be a source of pride in Chicago that he picked another son of Illinois to succeed the eloquent Illinoisan whose loss is so keenly felt.

We wish Ambassador Goldberg well in the challenging task of representing his country at the U.N. As President Johnson put it, he will "speak for America before the nations of the world."

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, July 22, 1965]

ARABS NEEDN'T FEAR GOLDBERG

It was probably inevitable that some people in the United Nations would ask whether the new U.S. Ambassador, Arthur Goldberg, could be impartial in disputes between the Arab States and Israel.

The best answer is contained in a remark attributed by a friend to Goldberg: "We cannot be impartial; only intellectually honest. Impartiality is a dream, honesty a duty."

Goldberg is a Jew, a son of Russian-Jewish immigrants, and has been closely identified with Jewish affairs in the United States.

He has also described himself as a Zionist "in the sense that Winston Churchill was a Zionist." He explained that he believes in a national home for the Jews in Israel. He belongs to no Zionist organizations.

Arab nationalists who resent the very notion of an Israeli State may proclaim cause for apprehension in all this. We are confident that such fear would be groundless.

For Justice Goldberg is an American, deeply dedicated to the American principle of the rule of law. Speaking of the Supreme Court this week, Mrs. Goldberg said: "The Court in our family is holy; the law is. It's a quiet place, a sanctuary." That says something as well, for the man whose thoughts and ideals she shares.

Justice Goldberg had this to say of the possibility of difficulty with Arab delegations:

"I believe in the charter of the United Nations which says that all nations are entitled to equal rights, just as all individuals are entitled to equal rights."

Those with an equivalent faith in that principle will have no difficulty, we think, with Ambassador Goldberg.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, July 21, 1965]

SURPRISING BUT GOOD CHOICE

The appointment of our fellow Chicagoan, Arthur J. Goldberg, as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations surprised even his closest associates but the longer one considers the choice the more logical and fitting it appears.

Mr. Johnson is sending a man who has a record as one of the most skillful, forceful negotiators at the labor bargaining table to be America's voice at the most important bargaining table in the world.

Justice Goldberg's direct experience in foreign affairs is not great but his ability to handle men and issues is. As we noted when he was appointed Labor Secretary and later to the Supreme Court by President Kennedy, he has a fine, steeltrap legal mind and a high sense of public duty.

It had been expected that Mr. Johnson would fill Adlai Stevenson's U.N. post with a man of experience in diplomacy or foreign affairs. The three preceding U.N. Ambassadors had been identified with foreign affairs. Goldberg has traveled widely and was a member of a mission to Japan while in the Kennedy Cabinet. During World War II he organized a gigantic espionage network of anti-Nazi transportation workers behind the German lines and later served as an Army officer in Europe.

Still, he has been regarded more as a specialist in labor-management relations than as an expert in foreign matters. Even while on the Court he has been called upon to exert his diplomacy in industrial affairs. Now he will have an opportunity to try his skill in the foreign field.

One of the most brilliant men ever to graduate from Northwestern University Law School (class of 1929), Goldberg turned his talents to the growing field of labor law. Born of penniless Jewish immigrants from Russia, Goldberg had no use for union leaders who took the Russian Communist line. He was instrumental in purging the CIO of Communists after he became general counsel.

In labor negotiations he developed into an impressive debater but he won the respect of his opponents on the business side of the table because his positions were pragmatic and never bitter or extreme. He knew the value not only of winning his points but of getting public acceptance of them, too.

In the field of politics he was one of Stevenson's earliest supporters for the Governorship of Illinois. Still his support of Stevenson did not alienate him from Mr. Kennedy nor did the regard with which Mr. Kennedy held him alienate him from Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Johnson, in fact, called upon Justice Goldberg for advice during the transition period shortly after Mr. Kennedy's assassination and Goldberg has remained a trusted Johnson friend.

Now, this man who came up from the streets of Chicago will match his skill with the leaders of nations. It may be not without significance that a child of Russian parents, strongly anti-Communist and a firm believer in the rule of law, should represent this Nation at the United Nations. For the sake of world peace as well as this Nation's own concerns we hope he does as well in this new assignment as he has done in those that went before. He has never failed in a public job.

[From the Plain Dealer July 21, 1965]

JUSTICE GOLDBERG TO THE U.N.

As the new U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Justice Arthur J. Goldberg will lack only experience in diplomatic legerdemain.

It won't take him long to master it.

Goldberg possesses the aggressiveness of Henry Cabot Lodge and the intellectual energy of Adlai Stevenson, his immediate predecessors in the U.N. post. Both were eminently successful.

In addition, Goldberg has a gift for sharp analysis, an insatiable curiosity, a flair for tackling big problems head on and, it has been said, an abiding love for a good fight.

He can use all possessions to good advantage as the voice of the United States in the General Assembly and the Security Council.

In the sensitive job of Secretary of Labor, Goldberg quickly commanded the respect of both labor and management with his addiction to fairness and thoroughness in investigation of problems that confronted him.

He opposed wage increases not within the limits of productivity and was against a reduction in the 40-hour week. Some labor leaders resented his views but none dared accuse him of being antilabor.

He enjoyed spectacular success in settling major strikes.

Goldberg has the toughness, the articulation and a lawyer's quick awareness of an opponent's weaknesses that should serve him well as the U.S. representative in the world forum of the U.N., where he will not lack problems or the battles he loves.

In stepping down from the lifetime post of a Supreme Court Justice to take the U.N. post, in which he will serve at the pleasure of the President, Goldberg again demonstrated the depth of patriotism for which he is noted.

Goldberg's appointment came as a surprise. It should turn out to be a pleasant one for the country and for the cause of understanding among nations.

DES MOINES REGISTER COMMENDS SENATE PASSAGE OF THE COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Monday of last week the Senate passed the cold war GI bill (S. 9) by a vote of more than 4 to 1.

On Thursday, July 22, 1965, the Des Moines, Iowa, Register often called one of the 10 best newspapers in America, in an able editorial supported the action of the U.S. Senate as being a matter of simple justice.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in full at this point in the Record, because it illustrates many of the arguments for the cold war GI bill and is illustrative of the reaction of the press to the action taken by this body.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, July 22, 1965]

GI BILL OF RIGHTS

The U.S. Senate did well, in our opinion, to pass Texas Senator Ralph Yarborough's cold war GI bill of rights. The vote was a resounding 69 to 17 after 3 restrictive amendments were defeated by smaller but still substantial margins.

Republican Senators had sought to make the bill less costly by the amendments. The Saltonstall amendment would have limited it to veterans of combat areas; the Dominick amendment to veterans of the southeast Asian theater; the Cooper amendment by offering loans instead of grants for education and vocational training. All were beaten.

On the final bill, Senator Bourke Hickenlooper, of Iowa, voted "no"; Senator Jack Miller, of Iowa, was paired against it.

The Senate has passed such a bill before only to have it fail in the House. Today, with the fighting in Vietnam mounting in scale and severity, the simple justice of the bill is more evident.

As passed by the Senate, it is more restrictive than the similar measures passed for Korean conflict and World War II veterans. It takes 180 days' service instead of 90 (as in the Korean bill) to qualify for grants for education and training or for loans for home or farm. No business loans are included this time, and the educational subsistence allowances, while the same in dollars as for Korean war veterans, will buy less.

This can be defended on the ground that (so far) the cold war puts fewer men into combat than the Korean war—though it keeps them in service longer, on average.

Simple justice is one argument for the bill. Those who are drafted to serve their country at peril of their lives ought to be treated more or less like their predecessors in the last two wars.

An even more important argument though, is the value to the whole country of a sizable national investment in the education and vocational training of these men.

As Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, Democrat, of New York, pointed out in a speech Friday supporting the bill, only about half the Nation's young men ever get drafted. These are more vigorous physically, mentally, and emotionally than those who are rejected for service. They have fewer of the advantages of money than those who are deferred for educational reasons year after year. Giving them a good start in civilian life after their service is not only a national duty, it is a national investment.

Many observers have regretted that the educational provisions of the original GI bill of rights were not prolonged and made universal after the 1940's. Countries far poorer than the United States find it to their advantage to try to assure all their young people the most education they can profit by, through paying selected young people to go to college instead of charging them. Thomas Jefferson advocated something of the sort in the earliest days of the Republic.

From early times, the United States has done that to get officers for its armed services. After two wars it did so for its veterans. It has done it on occasion for scarce skills—doctors and nurses in World War II, nuclear scientists in the atomic age. It is beginning to think of its obligation to the youngsters of the poor—and of the social loss in not doing so. A comprehensive system would be even better. Meanwhile, veterans are the largest subdivision of the Nation's young men.

The Yarborough bill ran into opposition from the administration, which feared it might discourage reenlistments (though Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD supported it). The $15 million voted by the House for selective reenlistment bonuses to keep men with certain critical skills in the armed services should take care of that objection, if the military pay raise bill containing it becomes law.

A nation's most precious resource is its people. They are worth investing in.

CHANGING HORIZONS IN TECHNOLOGY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, Mr. Arthur B. Bronwell, dean of engineering at the University of Connecticut, recently addressed a luncheon at the University's Conference on Scientific and Technological Briefing for Management. Dean Bronwell's remarks were directed toward a problem which is of deep concern to me and many of my colleagues. His address points out the necessity of transferring the technology we have developed in our Nation to industries less fortunate in their technological advance—and also the need for directing our technology toward some of the basic problems, like mass transportation and air and water pollution, which confront the United States today. Dean Bronwell's remarks will be of interest to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

CHANGING HORIZONS IN TECHNOLOGY

(By Arthur B. Bronwell, dean of engineering, University of Connecticut)

In the course of a nation's development there are turning points when new outlooks, new perspectives, and new goals are needed. I believe that today we are at one of those turning points, and that the future course of technology, as well as of industry and of our Nation's economic development, will be profoundly affected thereby.

We in Connecticut live in a prosperous State which has a thriving technologically oriented industry. Connecticut, perhaps as much as almost any State in the Union, has profited by the bounties of modern technology. A quick rundown on some of the products—electronics, chemicals, atomic-powered submarines, jet engines, helicopters, metals, nuclear power, plastics, infrared, space exploration, and fuel cells—provides convincing evidence of this fact. A strongly science-oriented company doesn't necessarily have to be a large company, for some very successful and aggressive ones are small companies. But it must have certain ingredients, among these being a management that understands modern technology and gives it full support; a research-oriented program staffed with alert, competent, and creative engineers and scientists; and an organization throughout that can successfully implement technological goals.

It is becoming increasingly clear that large segments of our Nation's industries are technologically impoverished, and that this is a matter of grave national consequence. The major impact of technology has been in those industries that are either military or space oriented. In industries such as electronics, chemicals, aeronautics, and the space sciences, the billions of dollars of Federal support have produced miraculous transformations. These industries boast of the finest research laboratories in the world, staffed by the ablest scientific and engineering brains that money can buy.

Nothing succeeds like success is the age-old maxim. And success can compound itself rapidly when it is backed by the multibillion dollar military preparedness program and the equally beneficient space exploration program.

But the lost voice is that of the civilian industries that have been bypassed by the onrush of science and technology. These industries constitute a large segment of the total of our Nation's economy. Some of them have stood on the sidelines and watched the technological procession go by. Today they are vulnerable to the ravages of foreign competition or of competition from those companies which have shared generously in the Federal bounty.

Survival of the fittest is the law of nature, and likewise it is the axiom of economic survival. Why worry about industries that fall behind? But the problem isn't that simple. The issue bites deeply. Our Nation's technological growth has been tipped on end and severely warped by the decisions of Government, primarily the decisions to build an invincible military power and to be first in the race to the moon. It is difficult to dispute these goals. Survival is our Nation's No. 1 goal, for without this all else dissolves into meaninglessness.

At a time when approximately 70 percent of the Nation's total research and development costs are supported by the Federal Government, one might well ask what happens to those companies that are not on the receiving end of this pipeline? Most of these companies have not built up research capabilities that will enable them to use modern technologies—indeed they know very little about modern technology. Yet they form a large part of the backbone of our Nation's industry and its economy.

In Connecticut, we have seen enough of the bitter sting that accompanies the flight of American industry to foreign lands to know something of its consequences. The closing up of the watch manufacturing industry as it took flight to Switzerland; the extinction of much of the typewriter industry, which has now gone off to Sweden and Italy; the flight of the textiles to Japan and England have all taught us a bitter lesson of the consequences of lagging technologies—and there are others that are now in just as precarious circumstances. This is a compelling national problem. It is in critical need of national policy. It is all well and good for those in the industries which have built up enormous technological power through Government financed military and space contracts to boast about the invincibility of American industry in competition with foreign industries. But perhaps this is like that poetic quip: "The rain falls upon the just and the unjust. But the just get wet because the unjust have borrowed their umbrellas."

At present, we have no national policy respecting this vital sector of American industry. The "haves" and the "have nots" are pulling farther and farther apart, and the situation is growing increasingly precarious for the "have nots." Furthermore, it is not an easy matter for a company or an industry that has had no tradition in technology to suddenly launch out into research. They wouldn't know where to start, and it is unlikely that anything of consequence would be produced. Many companies are too small to support research. They acquire its benefits as a fallout from association with larger research-oriented companies.

It seems timely that we recognize that some segments of American industry are seriously lagging in technological development, and that this is an unhealthy situation for our national economy, as well as a threat to the continued survival and prosperity of these industries. Just as an example, how would one go about automating a textile company, using the latest automation and computer methods, such as those that might be employed in an automobile manufacturing plant? This would require a whole new approach, probably entirely new designs of the machinery of production, the methods of material handling, the use of computers in scheduling and controlling machines, and a vast of array of other innovations.

Indeed, automation itself is going through rapid obsolescence, as is becoming quite evident to many machine tool manufacturing companies. Computers are now used to direct, schedule, and control intricate sequential operations that in earlier days of automation were handled by relatively simple and unsophisticated methods. Automation today requires a much higher order of technological knowledge than that of even a decade ago. This is the inevitable price of progress.

We are at a turning point in industrial growth. It is the problem of inculcating research and technology in companies and whole industries that know very little about the modern technologies. To a person skilled in the advanced technologies, the difference between a science-oriented company and one which has had no research tradition is as the difference between night and day. But it is very difficult to bring on the dawn in companies that may not even be able to see the importance of technology in their own future.

I have intimated that this will become a matter of national policy. Immediately the free enterpriser recoils—Government interfere with private enterprise? We'll have none of it. So let me be more explicit.

1. We must clearly recognize that there are industries in which there exists a high degree of technological vacuum and that these industries must either mount vigorous technological offensives or face economic strangulation.

2. There is no easy road in acquiring technology. It is a long, difficult climb. But its ingredients will certainly require at least the following:

(a) Technological knowledge. Management itself must become broadly knowledgeable about modern technology. Engineering staffs must crawl out of their shells of empiricisms and enlarge their outlooks with respect to the modern technologies. Frankly, we haven't done a very good job of communicating information about technology and its promising new developments. Entirely new approaches are needed.

(b) Educational programs, conferences, and workshops will be needed for management and engineering staffs. Effective means must be found to bring the vast storehouse of knowledge of the new technologies, acquired in federally sponsored research programs, into better focus.

(c) The companies themselves must clearly understand the imperative need of employing highly creative engineers and scientists to undertake research, and then avoid the temptation of circumscribing their activities too closely. Research must be given a dignified, top-level position in the company—not merely tacked on somewhere as an appendage.

(d) Industrywide research may be necessary in order to gain rapid momentum. Research is big business. Seldom does a small company have the resources to mount a vigorous research program. The exception, of course, is the company that deals in a specialized scientific product where the president has a Ph. D. degree and is far ahead of the game. And don't be afraid that the other fellow will steal your secrets. This is a defeatist policy, as the science-oriented industries found out rather early. A company has far more to gain than to lose by throwing open wide the doors and windows to knowledge.

(e) Bring in consultants—people who are intimately acquainted with the newer technologies and who can translate this knowledge into the particular industry's problems. They will think differently. Listen to them.

(f) As much as possible of this effort should be through the initiative of private enterprise. Tax incentives—generous, encouraging, and stimulating tax incentives—will be needed. No company ever acquired technology on a shoestring, and this problem will not be licked on an austerity budget. But we must remember that some of the companies are now hanging over the cliff financially. Tax incentives are meaningless to a company that doesn't have enough earnings to pay taxes.

(g) Let us make no mistake about the order of magnitude of this undertaking. This is a big program; it will be a long-range program; and the costs will be high. Government will have a role to play, and so will the universities. Government has played quite a role in the science and technology buildup of those companies that have participated in the military and space programs. This year alone, over $5 billion will be poured into these companies for research and development. Let's face it—Government financing is today a prime mover in our Nation's scientific and technological progress. Just contemplate for a moment what would happen to the research staffs of any one of the 20 largest companies of the Nation or what would happen to our universities if Government were to suddenly withdraw all of its research and development support. Many company executives and university officials have had nightmares over this problem. The initiative and the performance, however, must largely rest with private enterprise—and the universities.

(h) It would be a tragic mistake for Government to establish research laboratories to solve industry's problems.

(i) The universities will have an important role to play. Their engineering and science faculties are working at the very frontiers of knowledge. Through their research programs, they are contributing significantly to the development of new technologies. But above all, they are educating the people upon whom industry must depend for its technological leadership. Evening graduate study programs, such as those of the University of Connecticut—which today enrolls over 700 graduate students from industry, all of whom have completed bachelor's degree and are working toward their master's degrees in graduate centers in Hartford, New London, Stamford, Waterbury and on the Storrs campus—provide a powerful leverage for technological advance. Research and doctoral degree programs on the university campus are contributing greatly to the discovery of new knowledge and the education of people who can provide our Nation's technological leadership. The unisities will provide the focal center of much of the educational work that will be needed. But much of this will be a whole new order of magnitude of responsibility for the universities and it will require organization, manpower, and money.

Let us take a few moments to examine some of the other technological deficits that our Nation faces.

Certainly one of these which stares us in the face is the technological depravity of virtually all of our Nation's large cities. With our ICBM missiles, we can hit a gnat's eyebrow at a range of 5,000 miles. But the population living in the suburbs of anyone of our major cities everyday of the week is fighting a battle of hopeless confusion, congestion, and frustration in going to and from work in public transportation, much of which was technologically obsolete a quarter of a century ago. High speed, nonintersecting, luxurious public transportation that would whisk the people from their suburban homes into the center of large cities at speeds upwards of 150 miles per hour is technologically feasible today. In fact, in Japan and Europe such public transportation systems are operating. When one stops to consider the problem of instituting such systems in all of our Nation's major cities—New York, Boston, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and so forth, the order of magnitude of the technological effort becomes self-evident; indeed, this item alone could easily consume a good fraction of our Nation's total technological manpower.

Coupled with this transportation problem is another of grave consequences. Most of our large cities are plagued with densely populated slums, of which the holocaust of Harlem is a prime example. Here millions of people live in culturally deprived, poverty and disease-ridden communities, where they and their children so often cultivate diseased minds. We can airlift a whole army halfway around the world, if necessary, to win a war, but we are powerless to lift the million or so people out of the inferno of Harlem and give them the kind of community life in which there can develop hope and visions, and which will give them the chance to contribute their talents to the betterment of mankind. Our Nation sorely needs bold new technological innovations on a large scale to develop the low cost housing that will make the decentralization of populations economically feasible. Only in this way can we hope to reduce the cancerous blight that is eating away at the heart of all of our great cities. Although this problem may seem to be primarily political, sociological and economic, don't overlook the contribution which modern technology can make in enormously reducing housing costs, and in providing commuter transportation for decentralization of the populations.

Every nation in the world is plagued with this large city slum problem. No nation has yet successfully combated it. But the promises of low cost housing, combined with high speed urban transportation, made possible by bold new technological ventures, can provide the greatest hope that mankind has ever had for decentralizing its populations and lifting the masses out of the smoldering ashes of desecrated cities.

The medical care of our people is a problem in which there is a dire need for extensions of technological knowledge. Hospital and medical costs have skyrocketed, and only technology can restore them to reasonableness. Vastly improved diagnostic methods and computer interpretations will provide far more detailed and precise information as to the nature of physical ailments. Indeed, one can imagine a completely computerized and automated diagnostic clinic that would make all of the diagnostic tests, interpret the information, and yield the prognoses for final scrutiny and intrepetation by the doctor. Today the electroencephalograph and electrocardiograph are being computerized in many medical centers to yield such interpretive information, and the information they yield often goes far beyond the physician's interpretative ability.

Just as one example, the problem of picking out defective hearts in a grade school or high school of 10,000 children can consume the time of several doctors and nurses for weeks, and even then the human fallibility in such routine diagnostic work is high. A recent invention of a former student has yielded a small instrument that makes this process completely automatic. A lamp lights up whenever a defective heart is encountered, and the testing can easily be administered by the physical education staff with accuracy far better than that possible with nurses and doctors. This would eliminate the need for most of the doctors and nurses in this part of the examination.

Artificial organs and implants, such as artificial hearts, lungs, kidneys, ears, larynxes, feet, legs, hands, arms, etc., are all possible today only because technology has been applied to the medical problem. It is not at all farfetched to imagine a factory that would build replacement parts for humans about like we now produce replacement parts for automobiles, although one would hope that they would be installed by someone other than a grease monkey.

But I spoke earlier of a turning point. Let me now define this more clearly. This turning point has been clearly recognized by the Engineers' Joint Council in a far-reaching study of the trends in technology, as well as by legislation which has recently been introduced into Congress at the suggestion of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

The time has come when our Nation must redirect its visions, its efforts, and its technological goals. The deficits in technology in many of our civilian industries, in public transportation and urban development, and in numerous other segments of peaceful purposes are becoming so urgent and so imperative that we can no longer ignore these needs. A massive new offensive is needed in directions which are quite distinct from the military and space programs that have up to this time preempted so much of our human engineering and scientific resources. Perhaps this is less glamorous than the conquest of space and it certainly has less scare appeal than the military. But it is a compelling national problem that is in critical need of national policy.

Yes, we are at a turning point in technology. It is the problem of getting on with the business of accelerating the technological growth of industry and our public needs to better serve mankind. I have mentioned only a few of the aspects of this many faceted problem. One could go on and on, into all of the ramifications of technology—of accelerating fundamental and applied research so as to translate ideas into new technologies, of developing new resources, of developing the extractive technologies for recovering oil, metals, and other substances from the oceans, of accelerating atomic power and the uses of atomic sciences.

I have said nothing of the technological needs of underdeveloped nations which in themselves are imperatives so gigantic that it could easily preempt all of the scientific and engineering manpower of the world, working through the most powerful instruments of industry and yet, after one generation, still leave most of the job undone. The fateful specter of population growing so fast that they eat up all the gains, is not a comforting thought. If one seriously explores the technological needs in all of its dimensions, as has been done by the Engineers' Joint Council, one soon gains the quite definite impression that the tasks ahead are of enormous dimensions.

Our patterns of technological growth are twisted and distorted, with great momentum and acceleration in certain areas, but with lethargy and intransigence in others that vitally affect our well-being and our national economy. We must seek to understand this distorted unbalance and find ways of achieving a more rational balance so that all sectors of technology will go forward with reasonable speed and in concert with the needs of our Nation and of humanity.

WASHINGTON'S FUTURE—PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT TRENDS IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, one of Maryland's more distinguished citizens, Prof. Royce Hanson, is an outstanding student of the government of metropolitan areas, particularly the District of Columbia.

He has recently commented, in a most humorous vein, on planning and development trends in our Nation's Capital. I ask unanimous consent that his speech, delivered last May 13, before the Washington Planning and Housing Association be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON'S FUTURE—LOOKING BACKWARD?

(By Royce Hanson)

I awoke a few nights ago from a marvelous dream. I had been somehow transported to the threshold of the 21st century. Since I was in my 70th year, I was treated with utmost respect and veneration in a task I had been called to perform from retirement at my suburban home in Harpers Ferry. I had been asked to advise the District government on its latest review of whether to propose an urban renewal project in the Adams-Morgan area. I had also been asked to review the latest proposals for a Potomac River Bridge (or a tunnel) to be located somewhere between Roosevelt Island and the mouth of the Monocacy.

My dream was not too clear about all that had happened in the intervening 35 years, but it appeared that there had been no war, because most of the scars on the Washington landscape were familiar, having been caused by architecture and engineering rather than by high explosives. Train service to Harpers Ferry had been discontinued with the approval of the Greater and Greater Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, but express bus service was available, by way of the extra-outer beltway on a regular twice-a-week schedule. Since the $25 fare (5 tokens for $1) seemed exorbitant (and the Richmond suburbs always depressed me when seen from a bus window), I, like most other commuters, decided to drive into town on the convenient truck-free Potomac Parkway, 12 beautifully sculptured concrete lanes, overhanging the river from the New Town at Paw Paw to a 7-level interchange at Poolesville, where it swept inland to join River Road extended.

The drive was refreshing, except for the 2 hours from the District line to the center of the city. As I had known in advance that there would be no space to park, I abandoned my Plymouth on the Mall after removing the tags. (All the spaces in the National Square were filled by an enterprising private car storage firm with friends in Congress.) I considered the abandonment a most humane gesture, and I had walked no more than a block before the Housing Authority had seized my car on the spot, as it had others parked nearby, and was busy screening public housing applicants from a line which formed whilst I removed the plates. Within an hour, the car had been occupied by a grateful family of 10 who had previously been living in a privately owned Volkswagen with another family. And soon I knew that the city beautification commission would be there to plant a lovely screen of hollyhocks to block the car from the eyes of visitors to the Washington Monument.

As I tottered into the District Building, I wondered if, in the intervening 35 years, a home rule bill had ever been reported to the House of Representatives. Seeing "Engineer Commissioner" still on the building directory, I sensed that there had been no such revolution. As always before, an air of stability hung heavily over the District Building.

The meeting had already begun when I arrived, but I gathered from the discussion that sometime in the late 1960's the National Capital Planning Commission had reversed its earlier veto of the Adams-Morgan renewal project, and the District Commissioner had once again been confronted with the problem of decision on this controversial program. The present meeting had been called because the Commissioners had just received an opinion from the Office of the Corporation Counsel on the question they submitted in 1968 inquiring if they had authority to decide to postpone action on a decision to ask for a new study of the area. I found, also, the reason for my invitation. I was the only person still living who could remember why the Adams-Morgan project had been proposed initially.

The meeting lasted for most of the morning but was inconclusive, having apparently run into a snag on the question of whether to build public housing or private parking garages on cleared land. This dispute was referred to a subcommittee composed of three people who normally did not speak to each other.

After the meeting adjourned, I pushed my way through the small band of aging pickets in front of the District Building protesting the man-in-the-house rule and found a place to eat lunch before the next meeting on the bridge. That meeting was composed of exactly the same people, except the public housing man had been replaced by the public roads man.

Here there was a rather extended argument about the comparative advantages of subways versus freeways for the movement of downtown traffic. A man from Downtown Progress made a rather impassioned plea for authority for local authority to undertake commercial renewal before the person next to him slipped him a note that this was the bridge meeting instead of the downtown renewal meeting. Everyone thought he had done a nice job of breaking the tension, however, and one of the several people who seemed to think he was chairman assured him that the bridge committee shared his views completely.

Following this, which proved to be the best speech of the day, the representative from the Virginia Roads Commission complained rather bitterly that the Commonwealth had now paved most of Arlington in futile attempts to anticipate where the approaches to the Potomac Bridge might finally be located. This brought a sharp rejoinder from the Interior Department spokesman who deplored the whole idea of access to the city. The bridge committee finally decided that a consensus had been reached that, if a new structure was to join the District and northern Virginia, it should be either an elevated tunnel or a subterranean bridge with center space for mass transit and flower boxes on all pediments which did not support heroic statues of members of the Public Works Committee. It was also decided to name the bridge for some dead President from the party out of power in the hope that he might be blamed for it. A proposal was vetoed to allow one ramp of the bridge to end in the parking garage of the Rayburn Office Building, which was now being used as an annex of the Library of Congress to house architectural criticisms of the Rayburn Office Building. The question of the bridge's location, however, was deferred, and a committee, chaired by the President and including the Governor of Virginia, was appointed to reach a final resolution of this somewhat vexing problem. Everyone understood that neither the President nor the Governor could find time to attend a meeting, but staff members without the authority to commit either would be assigned the task.

I never really discovered why I had been invited to the second meeting. I ultimately assumed it was because I had once been to such a meeting and the secretary had come across my name in that connection. Flushed with two successful meetings—success being measured by the fact that both made progress—I began to have doubts, as I reflected on the day's events, about my impetuous and impatient statements about Washington politics in my younger years. I had formulated in those days a law of decisionmaking, known as the Law of Vanishing Decisions. This law had made me famous throughout the profession, for it expressed the condition that, in Washington a proposal, in moving from decision point to decision point, gradually diminished in scope and content until it disappeared entirely. Yet, here were these same decisions. Had they never disappeared at all, or was I only a witness to the corollary of the law—the corollary of the reappearing idea? As I mused on this riddle, my reveries were interrupted by another old gentleman who approached, asking if I were not Royce Hanson, whom he apparently presumed dead after his fifth consecutive defeat for a seat in Congress. After confessing my identity, he revealed to me that he was Dwight D. Pangloss, one of the graduate students whom I urged to study the politics of Metropolitan Washington, but who had instead gone to work for the board of trade.

What had happened to the city, I demanded to know. "Nothing at all. It's just grown larger," he responded cheerily.

"But what about the subways?"

"Oh, we have all 24 miles of it, but it hardly made a dent. The automobile is here to stay. Of course, parking is a problem, but with more industry and government in the suburbs we manage."

"Didn't the 1985 plan solve some of the problems we used to worry about?"

"It could have, I guess, but people just couldn't seem to get together on it, and then it was controversial. But have you seen the year 2000 plan?"

"Yes, I think I have," I muttered, and changed the subject. "Well, I guess poverty has pretty well been eliminated in Washington."

"Oh, yes—except for those poor devils on the Mall who can't seem to make it to the suburbs. You see, we just exported most of our poverty. As the suburbs began to decay and apartments and offices were built here, the poor just followed the market. Supply and demand, you know. And it sure helped the fiscal situation downtown."

"Surely there have been improvements in regional planning since the 1960's and early 1970's—I mean, aren't problems like housing now being approached on a metropolitan scale?"

"Well," he said, "I guess you could say we've made progress. Nothing spectacular, you understand, but of course you have to walk before you can run. I think the areas are cooperating very well on common problems. We don't interfere with their housing problems, and they don't interfere in our tax problems. Then we've made real advances in other areas. We've got a real efficient subway system as far as it goes. It's completely out of politics in an interstate compact authority, and the same sort of thing controls the metropolitan water supply. Highways are also coordinated by an interstate group, and the Council of Governments hopes to get a charter this year."

"I know all about that," I said. "What really interests me is the way the city is run. I see nothing now to make me change opinions I held long ago about the moribund, inefficient, unresponsive, and undemocratic character of the government. And the Federal Government seems no better organized to deal with District and metropolitan affairs. Why, pickets I knew in the old days are still protesting at the District Building. How can a government—how can a Federal organization—how can a metropolitan planning process so cumbersome, so ineffective, so unled, so plain incredible, have lasted so long? I thought it was on the verge of collapse almost 40 years ago."

My old student thought for a long while. "I agree with all your criticisms," he said, "but one thing you've got to say for it, it's fairly honest. We don't have a big city machine here or in the suburbs. Why, right now, with 5 million people, we are almost where New York was in 1950. Now that's progress."

It was at this point I awoke. As I shaved, the cars on the beltway a half mile away droned toward the interchange. "It was only a dream," I kept reminding myself. It was only a dream, or was it?

This city, this metropolis of all those in America, yearns for a greatness in spirit, in politics, in architecture, in culture, in social health. This metropolis, alone of the great cities of America, could still so control its development in its core and at its edges to achieve that greatness. Instead it is mired in a mediocrity of government and a pettiness of spirit which stifles action and loses thought. The next few years can and will determine the course for this metropolis for at least the next 50 years, if not more. The great decisions are upon us, and even by trying to avoid them, we make them by default.

As the Capital of the greatest of modern democracies, Washington should embody the dream of a great democracy and a great civilization. I fervently hope you shall not permit an American dream to become a professor's nightmare.

FEDERAL ROLE IN TRAFFIC SAFETY

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, in the past few weeks the attention of the major automobile manufacturers has been directed increasingly toward Washington, where the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] has been holding hearings on the Federal role in traffic safety. It is increasingly apparent that the automobile industry is taking a serious interest in this problem and that they are concerned with the continually increasing toll of traffic deaths on our highways.

Last Wednesday, July 21, representatives of the major automobile manufacturers met to discuss measures that could be taken in the near future to improve the safety of our cars. It is my hope that when the industry reports back to the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization on their plans for the future, we will witness a positive program for increasing safety in the cars of the future. We must recognize—as a matter of fact—that some accidents will inevitably occur. Our attempt, and the attempt on the part of the automobile industry, should be to prevent injury and fatality to the occupants of motor vehicles when accidents do occur.

May I also take this opportunity to commend the able and distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] for the courageous and determined fight he has conducted in behalf of traffic safety. It has been a battle of long duration. As Governor of Connecticut, Senator RIBICOFF established a model traffic safety program for his State and brought Connecticut's traffic death toll to the lowest in the Nation. That program has long been the envy of States interested in a safe and sane traffic-safety program. As Secretary of HEW he worked with conviction and distinction in this vital field. And as a Senator he has brought our national traffic safety problem into focus.

Under his able chairmanship, the recent hearings of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization have served to focus public attention on the magnitude of the slaughter on our highways. In no small part, the success of the hearings and Detroit's response have been due to Senator RIBICOFF's conviction, experience, and ability. A national attack upon this problem is long overdue; we and all other Americans owe him a genuine debt of gratitude.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that some recent articles and editorials on this subject be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 25, 1965]

SAFER CARS, SAFER TIRES

"If you people would take the lead in these matters; if you took the initiative in trying to make automobiles safer for the millions of people who buy and drive them, there would be no need for hearings like this."

The Automobile Manufacturers Association has responded to this challenge from Senator ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, by appointing a committee on safety made up of the presidents of the four major automobile companies. This display of top-level concern by the auto manufacturers is proof of the usefulness of the recent Senate hearings at which Senators RIBICOFF and ROBERT F. KENNEDY articulated the public uneasiness that cars are not as safe as they could—and should—be.

Marketing experience tends to show that improved safety features do not help sell cars. Younger drivers put auto safety in the same category as admonitions to wear rubbers on cloudy days. Yet accident statistics shows that more young American men will die at the wheels of their cars this month than will be killed fighting in Vietnam. Auto manufacturers, like other businessmen, have a responsibility to turn out safe products, regardless of the whims of their customers. An industry-wide approach makes sense because it eliminates fears of competitive advantage that would arise if one company incorporated costly safety features and its rivals did not.

Another Senate committee has meanwhile held hearings on automobile tires. The consumer cannot make a meaningful choice among tires because apparently the grading of tires has only haphazard relevance to quality and dependability.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin, has introduced a bill authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe minimum safety and performance standards and to establish a grading and labeling system for tires. The passage of this legislation might save the lives of many drivers.

[From Life magazine, July 23, 1965]

CARS, ROADS, DRIVERS, AND SAFETY

There are now some 90 million internal combustion machines on U.S. roads, and there will soon be one for every two Americans. The automobile has built one of our most dynamic industries and been the object of a long love affair with the American people. But social critics now ask questions like who's in charge here, man or motor? And Congress is considering more legislation to control the automobile than ever in its past.

Proliferation has made the automobile a factor in many urgent social problems, such as urban sprawl, city congestion, and the pollution of the air. But the most urgent is the rate of highway deaths. After dropping steadily from 16 per 100 million vehicle-miles in 1935 to 5.2 in 1961, it has since been creeping steadily up again and is now at least 5.7. There will probably be a record 50,000 highway deaths this year—yes, 50,000 violent deaths, an appalling number in peace or war.

The uphill campaign for highway safety has now reached the Capitol, where Senator RIBICOFF's subcommittee is holding hearings on car design. RIBICOFF has made safety his personal issue. His problem is whether, and to what extent, to cast Detroit in the role of victim or ally. This is partly up to Detroit.

Detroit conducts a lot of safety research and has introduced scores of safety devices on all its cars. But the history of many of these devices is that they become standard equipment only under political pressure, since Detroit's customers aren't much interested in them. Seat belts, for example, long after their utility had been proven, got built-in attachment points in all 1962 cars mainly as the result of political agitation started by Senator Speno of the New York Legislature, one of whose colleagues had been killed for lack of a belt. Last month the General Services Administration announced it would require 16 new safety devices on all the vehicles (at least 36,000) it will buy for the Federal Government in 1967. They include padded dashboards and visors, safety door latches and hinges, back-seat belts, et cetera. A week later General Motors announced that five of these features would be standard on all its 1966 models. Senators

RIBICOFF and NELSON were only partly assuaged: "A step in the right direction, but we already know about more safety features." At the hearings, GM executives upped the 5 to 13.

If all presently known safety devices were on all cars, passengers would wear helmets and shoulder straps as well as seat belts, while in a crash, windshields would fly out whole and steering columns collapse like candy canes. All this would of course add to the cost of cars and scarcely enhance their glamor. Even if they were adopted, there would still be a question whether speed and power should not somehow be restrained. Secretary of Commerce Connor, a former GM director, has promised to talk to the industry about this ticklish point.

Only so much safety can be built into the car itself. The other sides of what RIBICOFF calls the "accident triangle" are the highways and the drivers. The Federal highway program has made roads much safer, but little has been done to make drivers more responsible.

RIBICOFF, as Governor, made Connecticut one of the safest States by getting tough with the driver, not the manufacturer. In the current Atlantic he describes some of the latitudes allowed car owners in other States. In Kansas, until a couple of years ago, 10 percent of those who got State aid to the blind were licensed drivers. Few States require drivers to take periodic physicals and only 20 require regular examination of the car. More uniform traffic and licensing laws could prevent accidents instead of mitigating them, and their crazy variety is a more serious menace to life than nonpadded visors.

The most serious menace of all—about half the drivers in fatal accidents are drunk. Men, not cars, are responsible for that.

[From the Atlantic Monthly, July 1965]

HARMONY ON THE HIGHWAYS

(BY ABRAHAM RIBICOFF)

As Governor of Connecticut I did what I could to improve highway safety in my own State. People still speak to me about the comparatively civilized climate of Connecticut motoring. Most important, by taking aggressive action we succeeded in reducing the traffic-fatality rate to one of the lowest in the Nation.

Now, looking at highway safety from a national viewpoint, I find a senseless and tragic situation developing: The separate efforts of individual States to promote highway safety have created a conflicting and confusing pattern of traffic regulations across the country. Some States have good rules, some have few rules, and too many have different rules. Usually this inconsistency irritates the motorist. Sometimes it kills him. The adoption by all the States of just one uniform regulation, periodic motor vehicle inspection, could save many thousands of lives a year.

About 94 million Americans are expected to take extended driving trips in the course of this year. As you drive from one State to another, the highway markings are different—traffic signs and signals have different meanings—and the basic rules of the road, or who has the right-of-way, are different. The cars coming at you meet different standards, and sometimes no standards, of safety. And the people driving these cars have measured up to different licensing standards. It's as though you were one of Pavlov's dogs put to a series of confusing tests. The concrete may look the same, but the rules change drastically without your knowing it, destroying your ability to predict how the other fellow, and his car, will behave. Let me cite some examples.

You learned to drive in a State where, for example, a car making a left turn must yield the right-of-way until all cars coming in the opposite direction have passed. Now you take a trip in North Carolina, where (as in quite a few other States) a driver turning left who is in the intersection first, even though he has not begun his turn, has the right-of-way; he need not stop to let oncoming cars go by. As you approach an intersection, you are amazed to see a car make a left turn directly across the path of your car. You are lucky to avoid an accident this time.

You are a salesman on a business trip, a careful driver who never passes another car when you are not supposed to. In Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Indiana you are forbidden to pass when there is a solid yellow line to the right of the center strip. In Massachusetts and Virginia the solid line is white. In Pennsylvania no lines are used; a no-passing zone is marked by signs. So far you've kept your wits about you. But when you get down South, into Georgia, the line—yellow this time—is placed along the right edge of the roadway. You fail to see it, and pass a slow car illegally. You narrowly escape a huge truck coming toward you around a curve. Or you crash into it, losing your life instead of your temper.

You are driving your family east to the World's Fair. Your car is in tiptop shape; in fact, it has just passed a stiff motor vehicle inspection demanded each year by law in your own State (the inspector made you come back twice—first your brakes weren't tight enough, and the next time one of your headlights was faulty). As you motor along the superhighway toward dusk, two States away from home, an inexperienced 15-year-old driver approaches you in the opposite lane—his car hasn't been inspected for 3 years, and his tires are worn down. He tries to jam on his brakes instead of stopping slowly. His car careens over the narrow center concrete strip and smashes into yours.

If baseball rules changed each time a team entered a different stadium—if the bases were farther apart, or homeplate were closer to the pitcher's mound—the players would be unable to function properly. Drivers are no different. But the rules they must follow as they move about the country change from one State to another.

Accepted driver signals in most States, for instance, are the hand and arm extended horizontally for a left turn; the hand and arm extended upward for a right turn; and the hand and arm extended downward to signal a stop or slowdown. Yet the legal signals in several States differ drastically from these recognized directions, and in Pennsylvania a signal can be given only by the electric turn signal, a device now built into all cars. Motorists in all States must stop behind a halted schoolbus as it discharges young passengers. But drivers in Hawaii, Texas, and Oklahoma are permitted to proceed before the children are across the highway. A driver from these States might pass a bus when it stopped and smash into a group of children with disastrous consequences.

In some States, U-turns are permitted; in others they are not. In some States, drivers are encouraged to keep to the right after passing; in others they are encouraged to stay in line. The laws of 48 States authorize overtaking and passing on the right. Massachusetts and Vermont do not. In a large number of States—26 to be exact—a pedestrian can cross the street against a red light (or when the traffic he is intersecting has a green light) if it can be done "with safety and if he does not interfere with vehicular traffic." Fourteen States prohibit this. In most States, a yellow sequence in a stop-and-go traffic signal means a period of caution before a shift in the flow of traffic through an intersection. But, in New York, caution may also be signaled by a brief dark period between the stop and go signals, or by a period when both the red and green panes are lighted at the same time. An added complication: in most States, flashing yellow signals are used to caution motorists to proceed slowly and with utmost care. In half a dozen States, you can turn right on a full red light; in all others this is not permitted.

The National Safety Council reports that 47,800 persons were killed on our highways in 1964, an increase of 10 percent over 1963. More than 3 million persons were injured. There are now 95 million drivers in this country. By 1975, there will be some 30 million more. At the current rate of increase, traffic deaths will rise to 100,000 a year by that time, and the cost of accidents will climb from $8.2 to $15 billion.

How much of this terrible waste, both human and material, is due to the lack of uniformity in traffic laws and traffic control devices? It's hard to say exactly. But this much is clear: We are all creatures of habit, and we react instinctively in the same way to identical situations. We grow accustomed to following the rules in which we have been schooled both on and off the highway. If you travel abroad you expect to do many things, including motoring, differently. In England, for instance, you'll be driving on the left-hand side of the road; on the Continent, an intriguing but uniform set of signs will keep you minding your motoring p's and q's. But on trips within your own country, you want and expect signs and signals just like the ones back home.

Often you fail to get them. Instead a vast array of perplexing changing traffic laws and control systems confronts you as you drive from State to State. Such variances can cause confusion and delays. In high-speed modern traffic there's no room for confusion and delay. It's no wonder then, that 12 percent of all fatal accidents involve out-of-State drivers. It's no wonder, either, that experts have estimated that if all traffic laws were uniform, 2,000 fewer persons would die each year on U.S. highways. When the rules of the road vary by as much as a word, we risk costly confusion. The experts have come to regard right-of-way priorities as the single most important cause of traffic accidents.

There are other less obvious risks we take when we fail to insist on uniformity on the highways. There is, for one thing, a frightening lack of uniformity in driver licensing. Who is physically able to drive that complicated machine, the modern automobile? It all depends. In Kansas, an official was shocked to find that 10 percent of the people who receive State aid-to-the-blind payments still were licensed to drive. In Louisiana, Wyoming, Maine, Massachusetts, and New York there are no laws prohibiting the issuing of licenses to drug addicts or people suffering from mental illness.

Many States do not ask a driver to pass a physical examination before his license is renewed. In fact, in very few States is there any provision for periodic reexamination. Only a few States—Maine, for example—determine the physical condition of older drivers through examination. Certain hazards from aged drivers are just as bad as those from the too young.

In Montana, a youngster can obtain a driver's license when he is 15 years old. Under certain special circumstances, he can get restricted driving privileges at 13. Many States grant licenses, albeit restricted, to boys and girls who are only 14. In such States parents have a responsibility to them, and to themselves, to make certain they can deal properly with highway conditions. We can discharge this responsibility through licensing.

The uniform vehicle code is widely accepted as the most current composite of desired traffic laws. Drawn up by experts between 1923 and 1926, it has been updated 10 times to keep pace with changing traffic patterns. In it are only the provisions which have been tried out in more than one State and have been put into law in at least one State. This code contains a provision setting down the elements of driver identification that should be on an individual's license. Nine items are specified, ranging from full name to date of birth to physical characteristics. Yet, none of the 50 States lists all 9 items on the licenses it issues.

Perhaps some minimum licensing standards should vary from State to State. Perhaps some criteria are best determined by each State. Yet the disparity between present State laws contains an element of danger. A person licensed to drive in one State is, in fact, licensed to drive in all States. State lines do not inhibit wanderlust. Each State has a distinct obligation to make certain, insofar as is possible, that its drivers will not cause accidents elsewhere. All drivers should meet a basic standard of physical and mental ability.

This lack of uniformity hampers a Federal reporting program intended to make highways safer for all Americans, no matter where they live. Revocations or suspensions of drivers' licenses for conviction of serious traffic offenses (drunken driving and fatality involvement) are recorded on an electronic computer operated by the National Driver Register Service at the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads in Washington. All the States are providing daily information on persons who have had their licenses revoked or suspended. By checking with the National Driver Register Service, State licensing officials can quickly learn an applicant's road record in other States. If revocations or suspensions are uncovered—revocation or suspensions that the applicant may have failed to list—the information can make a difference in the decision of licensing authorities.

To date, this service has helped the States prevent more than 43,000 people from getting licenses when they have had bad driving records in other States. These people might have gone undetected had it not been for this Federal service. The system would be even more effective if all States identified licenses in uniform fashion, so that uncertainty in matching application material with bad driving records would be reduced. In some States the names of drivers whose licenses have been suspended or revoked are released to the press.

If the people who drive cars should meet certain uniform standards, how about the cars they drive? Traffic experts generally agree that periodic inspection of all motor vehicles contributes to highway safety. The Uniform Vehicle Code recommends that there should be inspections at least once a year, to rid the highways of unsafe cars and trucks. But only 20 States and the District of Columbia have laws requiring periodic inspection.

Another subject for greater attention is the installation and use of seat belts, which are installed now in all new cars but not always used.

And how about the speeds to which the driver can push his car? All authorities agree that speeding is a major problem. But open-highway speed limits differ from State to State. The excuse given for this is usually varying geography and terrain. It is the extent of variance that troubles me. In South Dakota, the daytime speed limit is 75 miles per hour. In Massachusetts, even on some open highways, it may be 40 miles per hour. Do conditions vary that much between the States?

Slow drivers can be as much of a menace as fast drivers. The U.S. Bureau of Public Roads has found that speeds below 40 miles per hour, especially on open highways, can bring high accident rates. Despite this, eight States have no law prohibiting driving which impedes the normal and reasonable movement of traffic. Even if some degree of uniformity in speed limits might be encouraged along the Interstate Highway System, this system, when completed in 1972, will constitute only 2 percent of the Nation's total highway mileage.

But the situation is not hopeless. Many people and many organizations have become concerned with the problem of achieving greater uniformity on the roads of our Nation. The trouble is that three things must be spent if their goals are to be achieved: money, time, and effort. In this field, as in all others, these are hard to come by.

The cost of even small things becomes enormous when multiplied by the numbers involved in our network of roads. Tennessee, for example, has 418,446 official traffic signs on its highways. A recent survey showed that if the State is to measure up to national standards, these changes in the signs will be required; 13,149 to be removed as unnecessary, 32,808 to be replaced by standard signs, 131,016 to be repositioned, 197,122 to be both replaced and repositioned, and 7,973 added. And of 1,419 traffic signals in the State, only 430 meet national criteria. Nonetheless, Tennessee, much to its credit, is moving toward greater uniformity. Other States are studying just how much money and time would be required to follow suit.

The cost of replacing nonconforming traffic-control devices is high. Iowa officials found that a $4.9 million investment would be needed to bring their signs, signals, and highway markings into line with national standards. In Tennessee, the potential cost was pegged at $2.5 million. In Minnesota, it was set at $1.3 million.

Still, money and time spent here are worth the effort in lives. Experience in Kansas shows why. The year before new standards governing traffic signs were established in that State, 49 persons died on curves in the highway. The year after new standards were implemented, the curve death toll dropped to 28.

There are many indications of deepening concern. The National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances is pushing for adoption of the Uniform Vehicle Code by all States. The committee has started to publish periodic surveys on disparities in certain State traffic laws and also now publishes an annual digest of traffic law changes enacted by State legislatures.

The National Joint Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices has compiled a manual of sign and signal standards, and the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads urges adoption and use of this manual by the States. What is more, the bureau has set December 31, 1968, as the deadline for compliance with the manual's provisions on all federally aided highways. Federal financial aid has been made available to encourage replacement of nonconforming devices.

Still, two-thirds of our total highway mileage falls outside the scope of any Federal aid. Construction and maintenance of these secondary roads are the direct responsibility of local communities. It is here that we find the biggest challenge. But if the taxpayers are insistent and demonstrate a willingness to pay the necessary costs, State officials will act. The real tragedy is that until now the public has been apathetic about this whole problem. Such apathy can be overcome through voluntary cooperative action among the States, genuine teamwork. In 1963, the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce began a spirited drive in support of uniformity. If other civic organizations follow this lead, we could move forward.

Thirteen States have joined in a driver's license compact. Under this agreement, member States exchange data on convictions within their jurisdiction on major offenses—manslaughter or negligent homicide, driving under the influence of drugs or liquor, a felony in which an automobile is used, leaving the scene of an injurious accident. Each State treats a conviction in another member State as if it had occurred in the home State. The same penalty is exacted. And each State refuses to license a driver under suspension or revocation in another member State. I fully expect the trend toward interstate compacts to help the campaign for greater uniformity in the statutes.

In the long run, this traffic safety problem will be eased only if the States exercise more initiative. Last year, 13 States adopted provisions of the Uniform Vehicle Code. Eight State legislatures authorized special studies of uniform laws. These were major steps, and must be extended. The tools are available. The Uniform Vehicle Code and the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices represent the best thinking of experts in these fields. The painstaking work of formulating feasible and effective standards is done. They just need to be used.

There is an important role for the Federal Government too. It can and should help the States attack this problem with technical advice and financial assistance. Action must be taken by the States, but Washington can help with research, new techniques, and guidance where it is requested. Some financial help may also be needed. The hearings before my subcommittee investigating the Federal role in traffic safety will help us find the answers to how the Federal Government can contribute best to the overall national effort to reduce the highway toll. We will make sure that the Federal Government gives the States all necessary help in their individual efforts to promote traffic safety on all our Nation's highways.

We spend tens of millions of dollars to teach our children a common language. But our traffic laws and traffic control devices remain a confused babel. It is high time we demanded harmony on our highways.

[From Newsweek, July 26, 1965]

AUTO SAFETY: WHO WILL TAKE LEAD?

One mid-September day in 1899, Henry H. Bliss, a New York City real estate dealer, stepped off a trolley car near Central Park right into the path of an oncoming horseless carriage. Bliss thus went down in history as the first known victim of a U.S. automobile traffic accident. But he has since been joined by 1.5 million other Americans—a tragic toll that exceeds the Nation's combined casualties in both World Wars. Last year alone, auto traffic fatalities amounted to a record 47,700 and, at the rate automobiles are multiplying and colliding, experts fear the total may double within the next two decades.

The automobile not only kills more Americans than any other form of mass transportation, it is the only form that is not regulated to some degree by Federal safety controls (though there are State and local regulations). With alarm about traffic deaths mounting, however, Government controls may soon be on the way. Democratic Senator ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, last week convened the Senate Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization with the avowed intent of finding out what role Washington might play in helping to reduce the increasing auto carnage. And he started out by importing some of Detroit's highest powered auto executives as witnesses and subjecting them to a tactful, but skeptical, grilling about how devoted they are to promoting safety and how safe their cars are.

DRIVER FAILURE

All the auto men, ticking off the safety provisions that their companies build into their models, voiced their continuing concern over the rising total of traffic fatalities. "No consideration," General Motors Corp. Chairman Frederic G. Donner declared, "is more important to us than safety." The executives also attributed most accidents to driver failure. "More than 85 percent of auto accidents involve the attitude, behavior, and judgment of the human being behind the wheel," American Motors Corp. President Roy Abernethy asserted.

RIBICOFF, while admitting that this was so, nevertheless sharply scolded the automakers for failing to introduce more new safety features on their own initiative. Most of those that will appear on 1966 models (including rear seat belts, padded instrument panels and recessed door latches) have already been made required equipment for the cars that the Federal Government will buy from the industry starting with the 1967 model year. "Should the automobile industry always be lagging behind," RIBICOFF chided, "waiting for somebody to tell them something has to be done? It would seem to me that if the automobile industry took the initiative and took the lead, you wouldn't have to have hearings like this."

For years, the industry has fended off this charge by contending that the public is reluctant to accept new safety devices. Donner, noting that both directional signals and safety belts were slow to catch on after they were introduced, argued that "if we were to force on people things they are not prepared to buy, we would face a consumer revolt."

Donner insisted that GM was, nonetheless, still pushing hard on promoting safety. He announced that the company is donating $1 million to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to help finance a research program on auto safety. But, along with Chrysler Corp. Vice President Harry E. Chesebrough, Donner was unable to cite many specifics about company safety programs and costs under bristling interrogation by Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, who often attacked like a prosecuting attorney.

CRITICISM

When Donner and GM President James M. Roche reported they were unfamiliar with a Cornell University study that showed the doors of GM cars tore off more easily in accidents than those of competitive makes, KENNEDY snapped: "I'm shocked. This important study has been made. It's important to your company and the safety of drivers. Yet the top executives of the company don't know of the findings." One particularly acid exchange with Donner and Roche followed after KENNEDY asked how much it was costing GM to contribute to outside safety programs:

"DONNER. This, sir, isn't a matter of cost.

"KENNEDY. I know the cost may not be of concern to you. But it is to me.

"ROCHE. GM spent about $1,250,000 on aspects of safety.

"KENNEDY. What was the profit of General Motors last year?

"ROCHE. $1.7 billion.

"KENNEDY. With your profits of $1.7 billion, I can't believe that General Motors couldn't afford to have a detailed study of accident and safety features. If you took the initiative and invested some of your money, we'd do very well."

For GM, auto safety also was at issue last week in a San Jose, Calif., county court, where the giant automaker was defending itself against one of an estimated 50 legal claims that have been filed by owners of its Corvair automobile. The claimants are all seeking damages for accidents stemming from the allegedly unstable design of the rear-engine Corvair, mainly the 1960–63 models.

STIFF QUESTIONING

At the San Jose trial of a $400,000 damage suit brought by a 39-year-old divorcee whose fiance and daughter were killed in a crackup of a 1960 Corvair, GM produced a witness every bit as impressive as the corporate brass who paraded before the Ribicoff subcommittee. Retired British racing star, Stirling Moss, appeared in the witness box (standing, in accordance with British legal tradition) to defend the Corvair's driving characteristics. The car, Moss maintained, was not inherently unstable "unless a driver got into a turning position requiring that he be very professional or very, very foolish." Moss added that design alterations made in the 1964 and 1965 Corvairs were not corrections of the alleged instability but simply the fruit of engineering progress.

Chrysler, too, encountered stiff questioning about the mechanical soundness of some if its cars at the Ribicoff hearings. Vice President Chesebrough admitted that certain 1965 Chryslers, Dodges and Plymouth Furys had been sold with steering mechanisms that might break away from their moorings under stress unless they were rewelded. He testified that dealers were notified—but that the car owners weren't:

"KENNEDY. Why weren't the owners notified?

"CHESEBROUGH. The probability [of steering failure] was so remote that we didn't think it was important.

"KENNEDY. I'm shocked. How many of these people had accidents?

"CHESEBROUGH. None.

"KENNEDY. Did you write to them?

"CHESEBROUGH. No.

"KENNEDY. Then how did you know they didn't have accidents?

"CHESEBROUGH. We didn't.

"KENNEDY. Again I'm shocked."

There were implications for the auto industry in the actions of State governments last week. In California, Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown signed a new smog-control law making it mandatory for all cars in the State to be equipped with exhaust control devices. And in New York, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller gave his approval to an appropriation of $100,000 for a study on whether it is feasible to develop a car with maximum safety features.

As the Senate hearings recessed with only Ford Motor Co. President Arjay Miller to be heard this week, RIBICOFF seemed to have achieved one major breakthrough. Whereas the automakers have gone their separate ways on safety in the past, they now appeared agreeable to a concerted attack on the problem. Chrysler suggested setting up a federally financed automobile safety center to study such neglected subjects as accident causes and stricter driver licensing. All the executives, moreover, agreed to begin looking into a coordinated, industrywide program to engineer more safety features into new cars. "I can assure you," GM's Donner told RIBICOFF, "that we'll sit down and talk this over." True to their word, autodom's top leaders—including Donner, Chrysler Chairman Lynn Townsend, and Ford Chairman Henry Ford II—arranged an industry summit meeting for this week to compose a new safety policy.

[From the New York Herald-Tribune, July 25, 1965]

SAFETY IN AUTOS: NUDGE FROM UNITED STATES

(By Terry Robards)

(Safety on the highways involves three factors—the road, the driver, and the car. Roads are constantly being improved. Laws are getting tougher on drivers. The automobile industry has developed a wide range of safety features for cars. But it has taken Government prodding to get many of them installed as standard equipment. A new industry philosophy about auto safety is evolving, however, and it looks like the consumer will benefit—beginning with the 1966 models.)

Without fanfare, the reigning executives of the Nation's automobile industry sat down together last Wednesday at the Detroit headquarters of the Automobile Manufacturers Association and established a blue-ribbon committee to draw up plans for a new policy on safety.

On the same day, Arjay Miller, president of Ford Motor Co., appeared before a Senate subcommittee hearing in Washington and announced that his company will install as standard equipment on its 1967 models all the safety items which the General Services Administration has demanded for cars it buys for Government use.

Mr. Miller's announcement followed similar indications from General Motors Corp., Chrysler Corp., and American Motors Corp. The industry has made a decision which ultimately will increase the safety built into the new cars to be driven by Americans beginning with the fall of 1966. And many of the new features will be in the 1966 models which debut this fall.

The Detroit meeting, coupled with the industry's decision to meet the GSA standards, marked a major turning point in Government-auto industry relations.

SAFETY FIRST

At loggerheads for years over where the responsibility for the death toll on the Nation's highways lies, the industry apparently has decided that the question of responsibility for auto accidents is secondary.

While still emphasizing that it is driver error—not vehicle error—which is to blame for the vast majority of accidents, the car manufacturers obviously have decided that it is in their best interests to start building more safety into their cars, regardless of where the responsibility for accidents may rest.

If their decision provides an indication of future policy in auto safety, it is tantamount to surrender in the long battle with State and Federal Government over safety standards.

"The Federal Government has the basic responsibility for recommending national transportation policies," conceded Mr. Miller in his testimony. "Further, the Federal Government is in the best position to assemble and analyze the great mass of research information now collected by Federal, State, and local agencies.

PROTECTION

"It would not be appropriate for the auto industry to have the primary responsibility to direct this general research and analysis program, serving, as it will, as a basis for important public policies."

Not only was the president of the Nation's second largest auto company agreeing to install the GSA-required safety items on all the cars it builds, he was also tossing the responsibility for collecting and analyzing all safety data right into the Government's lap.

In calling for establishment of "multiobjective analysis" of the safety problem, Mr. Miller said this approach would operate "within a framework recognizing the Government's role in recommending national transportation policies."

That the industry is not making a great sacrifice under the present circumstances is no secret. Most of the new safety equipment to be installed in the 1966 and 1967 cars already is available on an extra-cost-optional basis.

What's more, no one—not even the Federal Government—expects the auto companies to install extra safety features without raising car prices to match the added costs which, as a side effect, will partially offset the reduction in auto excise taxes.

Over the years, the battle has been typical of business-Government disputes, with the auto manufacturers charging that the Government was overstepping its bounds in trying to tell them how to run an aspect of their business.

The manufacturers have maintained that free market factors should decide what goes into the cars they build, that the public should be given exactly what it demands.

Government officials have argued, on the other hand, that the public should be given a maximum of protection in the cars it buys and that it is the industry's responsibility to provide such protection, even without public demand.

Frederic G. Donner, chairman of GM, appeared before the Senate subcommittee prior to Mr. Miller's appearance and remarked: "If we were to force on people things they are not prepared to buy, we would face a consumer revolt."

Regardless of whether the public is prepared to buy, GM revealed that 13 of the 17 GSA-required safety features will become standard equipment on all its 1966-model cars.

The Nation's largest automaker thus will be force-feeding the public with the new safety features. Force-feeding is exactly what GM and the other automakers have been reluctant to do, but Ford President Miller readily used the term in describing Ford's own plans for safety.

As far back as last March, one industry leader was suggesting that perhaps the public wasn't capable of judging what's best for it in the safety area.

SALES JOB

Roy Abernethy, president of American Motors Corp., told the Northern California Motor Car Dealers Association in San Francisco that the automakers might be wise to force-feed new safety design approaches to the public.

"The industry has been expert in selling almost everything," Mr. Abernethy declared, "but it has acquired no experience in selling safety features."

This is precisely what the Federal Government, through Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut, has been saying. Senator RIBICOFF has made car safety a "cause celebre" in the Halls of Congress and is responsible in no small way for prodding the auto industry into adopting stiffer standards.

Regardless of whether they are being force-fed, here are the added safety features which new-car buyers are going to have to pay for:

Heavy-duty seat belt anchor points for all seats.

Padded dashboards and sun visors.

Recessed instrument panel knobs and levers.

Safety door locks and door hinges.

More strongly anchored seats.

Safety glass in all windows, preventing splintering upon impact.

Four-way flasher systems which enable lights at both front and rear of an automobile to flash simultaneously in case of emergency.

Dual braking systems whereby failure of one master brake cylinder would not result in total loss of brakes.

Standardized bumper heights.

Standardized automatic gear shifts, so that a driver accustomed to "reverse" being in one position on his own car won't accidentally shift into "low" when trying for "reverse" on a strange car.

Two-speed windshield washers and wipers.

Glare-resistant dashboards.

Safety tires and wheel rims.

Backup lights.

Outside rear-view mirrors.

Exhaust-control devices which would cut back on the amount of air pollutants emitted from a car's exhaust system.

Impact-resistant steering column which would not move back into the passenger compartment more than 5 inches in a head-on collision at 20 miles an hour.

The last two items have caused the most controversy. The industry feels better exhaust-control devices can be developed if more time is allowed and, moreover, points out that a need for such devices has not been demonstrated in all parts of the country.

As for special steering columns, the GSA originally had asked that they be capable of moving back no more than 2 inches at an impact of 30 miles an hour. The newer, less stringent requirement already has been met by automakers, but they have promised to try for further improvement.

The added cost to the consumer of the new features has been estimated at around $65, not counting the exhaust-control devices. In California, which has enacted legislation to make them mandatory, the extra cost of antismog devices has been pegged at around $50.

CUT COSTS

Officials of the auto companies point out, however, that mass producing the items and installing them directly on the production line would reduce costs.

The 17 GSA-required features by no means reflect the only steps to be taken in auto safety.

Mr. Abernethy, who also is president of the Auto Manufacturers Association, said the top-level committee set up last week would make "plans for a cooperative program to expand the industry's efforts in the field of automotive safety, particularly in the areas of accident prevention, safety research and the problems of the second collision."

OTHER STEPS

The so-called second collision occurs when the driver or passenger of a car hits the interior of the car as a result of the initial impact between the car and an exterior object.

The specific steps to be taken by the committee, whose membership consists of the presidents of the four major domestic auto producers, have not been revealed.

But whatever they are, it's a good bet that safer cars will result and the highway death toll may be slashed.

Behind the current safety drive lie the efforts of the Federal Government. Could it be that the automobile industry is conceding that what's good for the Government is good for itself?

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times, July 19, 1965]

SENATOR RIBICOFF ASKS QUESTIONS

In the course of congressional inquiry into means of improving highway safety, Senator RIBICOFF seems to be making a point that the automobile industry is not so concerned as it should be with improving automobile safety equipment.

To the degree that such equipment might be improved, but is not, the Nation's car owners pay a toll in additional insurance, accident rates, and risk. Thus, the matter merits serious attention.

Certainly the automobile industry does not stand discredited on its safety score. Over the years, as its spokesmen noted, it has continuously built in aids and guards to safe driving.

But it would be good to know that, under today's road conditions, manufacturers were actually more eager to take the initiative and pioneer further faster. Far more highways, far more cars, far more drivers, and far higher speeds all create a need for it.

So far as one can learn from the testimony, the industry has no consistent policy to provide the safest cars it can. It is not amiss for the manufacturers to be jogged in this regard, for today's traffic demands the utmost in safety equipment. And a time of high sales and high profits would appear to be the right time for the industry to tackle safety features with ingenuity.

The industry spokesmen are correct in observing that two large factors in safety are the proper maintenance of equipment and a highly developed sense of driver responsibility.

It would be most unfair to place the entire burden for highway safety on the makers of automobiles. Besides the quality of the operator, highway engineering and law enforcement, among other things, have important bearing.

As Senator RIBICOFF seeks to show, in order to hope to control dangers on the highways, a general improvement in all who contribute to highway activity is desirable. His efforts while he was Governor did much to center awareness of the problem in this State. Nationwide the field of highway safety deserves the attention he is devoting to it.

BIG BROTHER IN INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, my Big Brother item for today is a particularly good editorial from the Chicago Daily News, entitled "Big Brother in the IRS." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG BROTHER IN THE IRS

President Johnson is insisting on a halt to wiretapping activities by the Internal Revenue Service, and judging by testimony before a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee, it is high time.

It has now become quite clear that there can be no such thing as "sparing" or "moderate" or "discreet" employment of electronic snooping by a Government agency. If the IRS' bosses thought this was what they were getting by winking at the practice, they must now be feeling silly indeed.

For last week it developed that in the Pittsburgh IRS district, for example, electronic taps were being used systematically in spite of Washington's supposedly vigorous efforts to curb the practice.

And this week it turns out, according to testimony by agents, that a regular school of eavesdropping has been operated by the IRS in Washington, where young Federal men became expert at bugging, tapping, and lock picking, and then went out into the field to practice these arts. The image of Big Brother surely hovered over the hearing room as an agent told of breaking into the home of a taxpayer under suspicion (though never convicted on any tax charge) and using a long-range "snooperscope" to watch a taxpayer's wife sunbathing.

The plain fact—long apparent but made more obvious by current disclosures—is that eavesdropping trends inexorably toward harassment. An IRS Commissioner may direct highmindedly that it be employed only where solid evidence indicates evildoing, but the eager beavers in the field will presently be engaging in "fishing expeditions" prompted by back-fence gossip.

We do not doubt that wiretapping is of value in trapping bigtime racketeers and gangsters. But it is also a typical and favorite police state device utterly foreign to the American concept of right to privacy.

President Johnson, who spoke out against Federal wiretapping shortly after he took office, has issued a more vigorous ban, outlawing the practice in all but cases directly involving the national security. We hope he makes it stick.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY ON THE ECONOMIC SITUATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the present economic expansion is, in the words of Vice President HUMPHREY in a recent address, "almost too good to be true." Yet, all indications are that we are continuing to move forward in the economy without any obvious threat of an imminent downturn. Indeed, the state of the Nation's economic well-being is remarkably good.

Nowhere have I seen a statment of the current economic situation presented in a clearer fashion than that of the Vice President as he spoke to the American Society of Corporate Secretaries in White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., on June 28. Not only are we 30 percent ahead of the low point of 4 years ago in gross national product, but we are ahead by 39 percent in investment; by 38 percent in manufacturing production; by 27 percent in consumption and personal income; and by 88 percent in corporate profits after taxes.

The clear summary of these and related economic factors, and the prospects for the future, which Vice President HUMPHREY presented in that speech deserves wide note. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this address may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CORPORATE SECRETARIES, WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, W. VA., MONDAY, JUNE 28, 1965

Today our economy is healthy. We are prosperous. In a few days' time, we will enter our 53d consecutive month of economic expansion.

To our generation—a generation which has known depression and recession—this present expansion seems almost too good to be true. And today questions are asked: How long can it last? How can we make it last?

Today I will try to provide at least partial answers to those questions.

Since the Employment Act of 1946—and I regard this as a historic turning point—this Nation has seen increasing agreement—yes, growing consensus—on economic objectives. These have been full employment; economic growth; price stability; and, today, equilibrium in our balance of payments.

The private sector, through its own initiative, has done remarkably well during this period of expansion in helping our economy move toward these objectives.

The Federal Government, too, has played a positive role. Budget, tax, and monetary policy have been used effectively and flexibly to keep the expansion going—and always with an eye for balance and stability.

Today, then, entering our 53d consecutive month of expansion, we find public and private agreement that the size of our productive capacity, the potential output of our manpower, and plant capacity must continually be measured and evaluated; total economic demand should be adjusted to make full use of this productive capacity; and investment must be encouraged to improve our productivity.

Only by moving in a balanced way in all these areas can we prevent waste of this Nation's economic potential.

And let me assure you, we cannot afford that waste.

We need national prosperity and economic expansion, not only for their own sake, but to provide for the needs of a growing Nation; to make the millions of young men and women in the coming generation assets, not liabilities; taxpayers, not taxeaters; to meet technological change; to extend opportunity for productivity to those people and places in our country who do not now have that opportunity; to maintain our role of leadership in the world.

Anything less than economic expansion and broadened prosperity will not do these things.

Standing still means falling behind.

The best example is right here at home.

As President Johnson pointed out in his recent speech at Howard University, the Negro American—a man we seek to bring to full participation in our society—has actually fallen behind the rest of the country economically during the past 20 years. The unemployment rate, median income, and mortality rate of the Negro American have all worsened in comparison to those of the white American during these years.

Today we seek to reverse this cycle. But to do so we need programs of education, of medical care, of retraining. These programs can only be undertaken in an expanding economy.

So, too, do we need programs to eradicate poverty, to make our cities better places in which to live and work, to preserve our natural resources, and, not least, to maintain a strong national defense and to assist other free nations to defend themselves and find a better life.

These programs are basic investments in our national and international well-being.

We need an expanding economy, too, to provide maximum opportunity for private enterprise—so that the full productive force of private energy, private initiative, and private investment can be felt.

Today this administration is committed to a positive partnership for prosperity with the private sector.

We have acted on that commitment:

We adopted the 7-percent investment credit and revised the depreciation guidelines. The latest reports indicate businessmen will spend 12 percent more next year on plant and equipment than last year's total.

We cut $14 billion from personal and corporate taxes. Total demand has pushed our gross national product surely above $650 billion in this quarter.

So far the benefits from almost 53 months of expansion have been nothing short of phenomenal:

Gross national product is running almost 30 percent above 4 years ago. And we expect it to reach the $660 billion predicted for this year—almost 6 percent above last year.

Consumption is up 27 percent.

Investment is up 39 percent.

Manufacturing production is up 38 percent.

Corporate profits after taxes are up 88 percent.

Personal income reached $517 billion in May and is running over 27 percent higher than in January 1961.

In addition to this, we are reducing the unemployment rate. According to our latest figures, it is 4.6 percent—down from a national average of 7.1 percent in May 1961.

All this has been done with price stability—the greatest price stability in the industrialized world.

American consumers have over $2 worth of financial assets—such as savings accounts and insurance policies—for every dollar of their debt. And I would remind you that the Federal debt, in relative terms, is shrinking. In 1950, our Federal debt was more than our gross national product—by $3 billion. Today our Federal debt is only one-half as large as our gross national product.

And then we come to the questions: Can prosperity last? How can we make it last?

Some people fear that our policies cannot stimulate enough demand to keep us moving ahead. Others fear that demand has been stimulated too much and that we must put on the brakes to stop inflation.

We accept neither of these views.

In the first instance, this administration is committed to the principle of maintaining sound economic expansion in balance with our economic goals.

I will point to the signing of the excise tax bill by the President last week. This will result in a cut in taxes of more than $4½ billion. One and three-quarter billion dollars of the cut is effective now, an equal amount will be effective on January 1 of next year, and further cuts will come later on.

If our tax cuts are passed along to consumers in the form of lower prices—as many companies are already doing—we will certainly help keep the expansion going.

Now let me say a word about those who show some concern in the other direction.

Inflation as you know can arise in two different ways:

It may come from too many dollars chasing too few goods.

This is the classic type of inflation.

We don't have it now: The manufacturing industries are operating on the average about 4 percent below businessmen's preferred rate of use of their capacity.

We still have an unemployment rate above what most economists would call a realistic interim goal of 4 percent.

Labor cost per unit of output has actually declined in manufacturing. It is now lower than a year ago or 4 years ago.

Furthermore, we have none of the usual imbalances which frequently accompany inflation:

There has been no unreasonable scramble to buildup inventories. Total inventories in relation to sales are lower than when the expansion began.

There are no excessive backlogs of unfilled orders.

There are no serious bottlenecks of labor or of industrial capacity.

American householders today have more than four times as much money in savings as they do in debt. In the first quarter of this year, consumer debt increased by $9½ billion, compared with an increase in personal savings of $30 billion. And delinquencies in bank loans have decreased in the past several months.

These facts demonstrates a sound balance in our economy. But this administration is not complacent.

Signs of balance—or imbalance—are watched for.

This Government has, in effect, an economic early warning system. Data and information concerning the economy is collected and refined by various Government agencies—and brought directly to the attention of the President—so that economic policy instruments can be used, if necessary, to head off trouble ahead.

No indications now point to an unstable boom or classical inflation.

The other danger of inflation comes from unreasonable use of market power—when wages or profits rise too quickly.

Most businesses and unions, in this expansion, have not indulged in such excesses.

As a result, we have had a remarkable record of price stability.

This price stability has protected the purchasing power of interest earnings, retirement benefits and insurance payments.

If this stability of prices is to continue, business and labor leaders alike must, as they have, keep the public interest in mind. I am confident they will.

To help them in this, the wage-price guideposts have been carefully worked out by the Council of Economic Advisers.

Short-term advantages by either labor or business become meaningless if they bring about a wage-price spiral and its consequences.

This can be avoided by keeping increases in wages and fringe benefits within the average gain in labor productivity. This keeps average labor costs steady.

And this wage-price spiral can be avoided by keeping prices down—raising them only in special circumstances where costs rise, and lowering them where rapid gains in productivity reduce costs.

We must have relatively stable prices—for domestic economic health and for our balance-of-payments position.

Think of what our balance-of-payments deficit would be if we were not running a healthy surplus in our exports over imports. Last year we had a favorable trade balance of $6.7 billion. Our exports in March and April were running at an even better rate—one which would give us a favorable trade balance of $8½ billion if continued throughout the year.

I am happy to announce today that in May, in large part because of this trade surplus, we showed a slight payments surplus. But this is a long-term task which will call for continued work. It is a task which calls for aggressive, positive export promotion. It is a task which calls, above all, for an American economy competitive in world markets.

The price stability we have achieved over the last 4 years has allowed us to pursue expansionary policies.

Consider the losses we would have sustained if we had not pursued these policies—if our economy had slipped a year ago into a recession such as it has done four times since the end of World War II.

If the economy had followed the average pattern of the postwar recessions, our economic performance for the first quarter of this year would have fallen below what we actually achieved by the following amounts:

Our rate of total national output would have been $39 billion less.

Our rate of corporate profits before taxes would have been $18 billion less.

Our rate of wages and salaries would have been $20 billion less.

Our Federal budget on a national accounts basis would be running at a deficit of more than $15 billion instead of approaching balance.

And again, most important of all, well over a million people working today would be out of a job.

But our task is not merely to avoid recession.

We have set our sights much higher than that.

Our task is to continue the present expansion.

This expansion can continue—even though it is already longer than any other peacetime expansion in our history.

Economic policy has developed to the point where we realize that large swings in the business cycle are not a fact of nature.

To achieve a continuing expansion, however, the evolving private-public partnership must work.

The key to this is confidence, and mutual respect and understanding: confidence on the part of consumers in the underlying strength of any economy; confidence by Government in business, as demonstrated by programs to stimulate investment and by tax cuts; confidence by business in Government, and above all in other businessmen; mutual respect and understanding among all Americans for each other. Yes, confidence, mutual respect, and understanding are what we will need to maintain our expansion and to build upon it. For we are past the time in this Nation when we talked of "economic royalists" and "labor bosses," of social classes and special interest groups. Today, in this Nation, we have built a peacetime unity never before achieved. As Americans, we are working together.

Together, in a free society, we can achieve what man has always sought: A better life, a greater opportunity, a security from fear. Our productivity and energy can prove in history that freemen can accomplish what totalitarians can never do.

Yes, our expanding economy can continue to expand and to provide growth and security.

Working together, we will succeed.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—A WEEK OF SORROW

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, last week—Captive Nations Week—we marked with sadness the oppression that hangs over Eastern Europe.

Again we were reminded that a hundred million people are denied the right to choose their own form of government.

Again we were reminded that a hundred million people are denied the basic freedoms that we in the Western World cherish as man's due.

Our Nation is dedicated to the principles of justice and freedom. We long for the day when these principles will govern the lives of people throughout the world. Then, Captive Nations Week—a week of sorrow—would be an observance of the past. And independence celebrations—a time of joy—would be a welcome replacement.

THE IMPORTATION OF BRAIDED RUGS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, I have introduced for appropriate reference a bill which is designated to correct a serious injustice in the interpretations of our tariff laws relating to the importation of braided rugs.

Even those of us who are the stanchest advocates of expanded trade opportunities are made painfully aware from time to time of the great hardships which can be visited on a particular segment of our economy because of the difficulty in winning fair and equitable interpretation of our highly complicated tariff regulations.

Such is the plight, Mr. President, of our domestic braided rug industry, which is highly concentrated in my home State of Rhode Island. The Braided Rug Manufacturers Association of the United States, which has its headquarters in Rhode Island, lists 8 of its 16 member companies from our State. The rest are located in California, Georgia, Tennessee, Massachusetts, Illinois, and Pennsylvania. Approximately 500 Rhode Islanders depend on this industry for their livelihood.

This small but concentrated industry argues persuasively that its market opportunities have been sharply curtailed in recent years by massive influxes of imports allowed into this country because of adverse interpretations of our customs laws.

Industry figures show that braided rug imports increased over 100 percent in 1964, rising to 114 million square feet as opposed to 54 million square feet in 1963. Domestic production has remained almost level at 38 million square feet for the last 3 years.

The industry maintains that 95 percent of all of these imports are being incorrectly classified for tariff purposes and thus are permitted to enter at a much lower rate of duty than is really intended.

The root of the problem was a 1944 Customs Court decision in a dispute over the classification of novelty braid used for trimming shoes and ladies' handbags. The question at issue was whether a tubular braided sheath around a filler core was truly a braid. The court ruled in effect that it was not, thus placing such tubular braided constructions in a lower tariff classification.

Although this ruling related in particular to braid used in trimming shoes and handbags, it has been seized upon by foreign manufacturers of braided rugs made of tubular type braids, and it is through this tariff loophole that these rugs are being imported as tubular mats at a much lower rate of duty than would apply if they were brought in under the proper classification.

The bill which we are introducing today would simply provide that any and all braided material—whether or not it surrounds a core or filler—is in fact a true braid as far as customs law is concerned and therefore uniformly dutiable at the rate of 42.5 percent.

This reform would provide fair and long overdue relief to our industry. Without it, our plants must labor under the disadvantage of unclear law and precedent which is being interpreted to our disadvantage.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I wish to give my wholehearted support to S. 2319, a bill introduced last Thursday by my colleague, Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, to amend the tariff schedules with respect to the tariff classification of braided rugs composed of tubular braids with a core.

In 1962 I voted for the Trade Expansion Act. I supported this legislation because I believed then as I do now that we must develop trade without discrimination throughout the free world. The challenge of communism has created this need for cooperation in trade among the free nations.

Yet, I cannot condone foolish trade in the name of free trade. Our economy—our very security—depends entirely upon the security of our people in their jobs. This is why I support Senator PELL's proposal to amend the tariff schedules to plug the loopholes through which foreign manufacturers have been flooding our domestic market with braided rugs.

Domestic production of these rugs is centered in my State of Rhode Island. No wonder then that I am disturbed by the fact that last year the imports of braided rugs increased by over 100 percent; 114 million square feet of rugs were imported compared to the 38 million square feet we produced here at home.

This free flow of foreign made rugs into the United States was made easy, as I understand it, by a decision of the U.S. Court of Customs in 1944. The dispute then centered about the classification of novelty braid which is used in trimming shoes and handbags.

The court was called upon to decide whether a tubular braid around a core constituted a braid within the definition of the law. The court said "No." Thereafter tubular braids got the benefit of the less costly tariff classification.

Of course, this judicial decision did not relate to braided rugs, but it was not long before foreign businessmen were flooding this country with tubular type braided rugs at the lower rate of duty.

Senator PELL's bill, S. 2319, which I am pleased to cosponsor, will plug the loophole by providing that all braided material—whether or not it surrounds a core—is a braid as far as the tariff schedules are concerned and dutiable at the rate of 42.5 percent.

We never meant when we adopted the tariff schedules and when we enacted the Trade Expansion Act—to sacrifice American jobs to facilitate world trade. There is a crisis confronting the braided rug industry in Rhode Island, in California, in Georgia, Tennessee, and in Masachusetts. Unless we enact this legislation, American workers will be idled by these imports. I urge the Senate Finance Committee, to which this bill was referred, to give it speedy approval.

HIGHWAYS CAN BE SAFE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, as we near the halfway point in the completion of the Interstate Highway System, it behooves us to reflect upon the progress we have made to date and to look at plans for the future.

Of all standards by which the Interstate Highway System is judged, none is more outstanding—none is more important—than the saving of lives. Since its beginnings in 1956, thousands of American lives have been saved. When it is completed, probably in 1973, an estimated 8,000 lives per year will be saved.

Recent figures point out vividly the value of the Interstate System. Over the recent Fourth of July weekend, 555 Americans died in traffic accidents, yet only 39 of the fatalities occurred on interstate highways. This is in spite of the fact that our people accounted for more than 1,054 million vehicle-miles of travel on interstate highways during this 4-day period.

Thirty-seven States enjoyed a death-free holiday on the Interstate System within their boundaries. In my own State of Indiana, for instance, some 22 persons were killed. Not one, however, died on an interstate highway.

I ask unanimous consent that a table compiled by the Bureau of Public Roads listing by States the deaths on interstate highways and other highways over the Fourth of July weekend be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total U.S. highway system motor vehicle fatalities 6 p.m. July 2 to 12 p.m. July 5, 1965

State	Interstate system [1]	All others	Total
Alabama	0	15	15
Alaska	0	0	0
Arizona	1	6	7
Arkansas	0	2	2
California	2	51	53
Colorado	7	9	16
Connecticut	1	2	3
Delaware	0	0	0
Florida	0	9	9
Georgia	2	10	12
Hawaii	0	1	1
Idaho	0	12	12
Illinois	0	22	22
Indiana	0	22	22
Iowa	0	8	8
Kansas	0	3	3
Kentucky	0	13	13
Louisiana	1	13	14
Maine	0	1	1
Maryland	0	5	5
Massachusetts	0	8	8
Michigan	0	21	21
Minnesota	0	15	15
Mississippi	0	8	8
Missouri	0	31	31
Montana	0	1	1
Nebraska	0	9	9
Nevada	0	1	1
New Hampshire	0	1	1
New Jersey	0	10	10
New Mexico	0	4	4
New York	7	26	33
North Carolina	2	20	22
North Dakota	0	3	3
Ohio	8	28	36
Oklahoma	0	11	11
Oregon	0	4	4
Pennsylvania	2	17	19
Rhode Island	0	1	1
South Carolina	1	17	18
South Dakota	0	3	3
Tennessee	0	9	9
Texas	4	22	26
Utah	1	1	2
Vermont	0	1	1
Virginia	0	12	12
Washington	0	6	6
West Virginia	0	5	5
Wisconsin	0	12	12
Wyoming	0	5	5
District of Columbia	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	----	----	----
Total	39	516	555

[1] "Those portions of the Interstate Highway System completed or improved to full or acceptable standards and open to traffic including toll roads incorporated into the Interstate System."

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the traffic death rate over this same weekend proved that interstate highways were twice as safe as conventional roads. This finding has been substantiated time and time again in long-time studies sponsored by the Bureau of Public Roads and other organizations.

A second standard in judging the Interstate System is the savings which it brings to the traveling public. Those who use the 20,000 miles now completed are expected to reap a whopping $3.7 billion in savings this year alone. When the 41,000-mile system is completed, the public will save an estimated $11 billion a year.

It is interesting to note that while the Interstate System is expected to cost $46.8 billion, the users of this system will have accrued a savings of $60 billion by the time construction is completed.

These savings come from reductions in vehicle operating costs, lower accident property damages, lower insurance rates, less hospitalization, and savings in time.

The increased communication between our people and the added comfort and convenience of drivers provided by the Interstate System are not easily measurable quantities. But they are values which must be weighed heavily in judging the progress of this program.

When we look to the future of highway transportation in this country, the need for the Interstate System—even larger than that proposed now—is apparent. In 1934 there were 25.3 million vehicles in this country. This year the figure is 86.2 million. But in 1975—just 10 years away—117 million cars and trucks will be vying for breathing room on the Nation's highways.

Every month for the next 10 years, 230,000 new drivers will be added to the flow of traffic on already overburdened roads. By 1975 they will be driving at the rate of 1.25 trillion vehicle miles a year.

The need for better, safer highways is clear. In the years ahead this need will become critical. The lives of loved ones are at stake.

My interest in the Interstate System is older thar the system itself. In the years since its birth, I have watched it grow with the pride of all Americans who appreciate the cooperation and hard work which have helped to make this one of man's most spectacular programs of progress.

The program, of course, can be improved. I believe, for instance, that we must expand its concept beyond the projected 41,000-mile length to at least 60,000 miles. I have introduced legislation (S. 1272) to implement this proposal.

I believe, too, that we must accelerate the construction of the Interstate System. Added effort in this direction is vital if for no reason other than the saving of human lives. For 1 mile of interstate opened to the public, five lives a year are spared. The saving of just five lives is enough cause to speed the entire national program to completion.

During the course of the debate on the excise tax measure this year, I offered as an amendment a proposal to insure the acceleration of interstate highway construction. This plan, which I will introduce soon in the form of a bill, provides that all highway trust fund revenue be designated for Interstate System construction. By this method, $1 billion a year more would be made available, bringing a total of $3.8 billion annually to bear on the problem of providing safer, more modern highways and lessening the tragedy of loss of life.

CITIZENS, COURTS, AND THE EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an excellent article by Justice Tom C. Clark, of the Supreme Court of the United States, appearing in the June issue of the Journal of the American Judicature Society on the subject of "Citizens, Courts, and the Effective Administration of Justice."

This article I recommend to every person interested in the improvement of our administration of justice.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZENS, COURTS, AND THE EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

(By Tom C. Clark)

The American Assembly has made another "first." A distinguished American institution, neither governed nor staffed by lawyers or judges, has sponsored this significant meeting of citizens concerned with the present dissatisfaction with the administration of justice. I congratulate the Assembly and its learned president, Clifford Nelson, on this accomplishment.

Let us get on with the business of the evening. You have come here to consider "ways and means" for improving the administration of justice. You have read the enlightening materials that have been circulated. They illustrate the "law explosion" which faces us today. A widening of our horizons in science, medicine, transportation and communication—coupled with a modern interpretation of old rights—has brought on a rash of new disputes among and between men as well as with and between governments. These collisions would have been beyond credulity a century ago but today are commonplace in an increasingly complex and interdependent society.

This explosion has bombarded the courts with an unprecedented increase in litigation. For example, the caseload of the Supreme Court of the United States has increased over threefold since I took my seat there 15 years ago. I daresay that the trial courts of the country have experienced an even greater percentage of increase. As a result, the dockets of our metropolitan courts are now congested to the saturation point. Murmurings of dissatisfaction sometime break into the open resulting in spasmodic demands for modernization. There are those who cry out that archaic methods, such as trial by jury, are the procuring cause; others echo the century-old platitude that if we killed off all the lawyers it might solve the problem; and increasingly, the accusing finger is pointed at the court itself and the judge who presides over it. In the criminal field we witness a mounting incidence of serious crime—largely among juveniles. Many thinking people are convinced that this increase is caused by technical court procedures, leniency in sentencing, the enlargement of defenses for the accused, and a breakdown in law enforcement at the detection level.

Still, all of us know that the rule of law is the best method yet devised to resolve the ever-increasing conflicts between men. The judiciary remains the greatest bulwark of the rule of law so vital to democratic living. The great danger today is that the courts will be so caught up in this deluge of litigation that they will be discredited. We see evidences of this now in the disrespect for courts that is raising its ugly head not only higher but more often.

It is my view that this situation can only be remedied by interested public-spirited individuals. It is, therefore, most heartening to see you, distinguished leaders of American thought and opinion, taking these problems of the judiciary to mind and to heart. Again and again we have witnessed failure in effecting a modern businesslike judiciary simply because the individual citizen took a walk rather than an interest. Only an aroused citizenry can solve the problems that face the effective administration of justice today.

And when, you ask, is justice effective? The short answer is when it is fairly administered, without delay, by competent judges operating in a modern courtroom under simple and efficient rules of procedure. I know that you will understand that I mean no disrespect when I ask. "How about your judiciary back home?" Ask yourself, do you really know much about it? Did you know that only half a dozen States—aside from Alaska and Hawaii—have a modern judicial article in their constitutions? Count the fingers of one of your hands; less than that number of States have a unified court system. Is yours one of those? Did you know that 35 States require a judge to run for his office in a political election every few years. Is yours one of those? To you leaders in business I ask, "How efficiently could you run a business on such a basis? Assume your president or board of directors had no final authority: that your employees had overlapping duties and functions without any authoritative supervisor and, furthermore, were selected on a political basis. How efficiently could your company work?"

Now I am sure that we can all agree that something should be done. But we have been hearing that tune for decades. The burning question is, how to go about it and when? I must confess that no definitive answer as to the "how" part of the question has yet come to me. But as to when, it is now. As Professor Jones has explained in his paper, I sit on the most remote court in the United States and some say the most uninformed.

However, during the past 4 years I have supervised the organization of over 50 seminars for the State trial judges of general jurisdiction and attended over half of them. I have personally attended meetings of lawyers and laymen on court modernization in over a third of the States in a shorter period. In addition, the National College of State Trial Judges at Boulder, Colo., which was organized in 1963 and whose board I chair, is now in its second year with a $2½ million grant to run it for 10 more years. My association with some 3,000 State judges who have been carrying on these enterprises has afforded me an opportunity to hear about their problems. Perhaps I can best confine my remarks to some of the things that I have learned from them. In this way I can escape repetition of remarks you have already heard and ideas that you have previously considered.

First, the mass of litigation of which we speak faces the most specialized of our courts—the traffic and magistrate courts. While the judge in a Federal court measures his workload in terms of hundreds of cases per year and the average State circuit and district court judge talks of a thousand or fifteen hundred cases annually, the traffic and magistrate courts measure their workload in terms of thousands of cases each year. The alcoholic commonly appears before these judges, in many instances for the 5th, 6th, or maybe 15th time. The housewife answering a speeding charge appears 1 minute followed by a taxi driver and a teenager in that order of succession. Decisions are made on the spur of the moment and after a short period of time the judge, if he is not careful, begins to lose track of the individual nature of each case. The awful job of administering justice in 200 to 300 cases or more each day requires the greatest effort in our entire system of courts and in many respects requires the ablest human beings that can be enlisted into this service.

Needless to say the ablest lawyers are not always attracted to this type of work. Generally speaking, salaries begin well below those of the courts of general jurisdiction which, I might add, are none too high. The courtrooms in which they sit are often inadequate. The offices provided for their work off the bench are seldom satisfactory. The justice they dispense touches almost every citizen and the public image of justice is often formed by what happens there. Still the judges on those benches are treated as second-class judges in all respects. The wonder is that many men of ability are willing to and do serve on these courts. We must upgrade these courts and improve the image of their judges. The first order of our business in my opinion is to give attention to these courts to the end that they will be recognized as courts of dignity and worth.

At present there are only two organizations actively working in this fertile field, the National Association of Municipal Judges and the American Bar Association Committee on Traffic Courts. Though they are working hard, they can do little more than scratch the surface of the need for improvement. If nothing more came of the concern expressed by your presence here than to focus on the problems of justice in these courts of limited jurisdiction, the meeting would be a success.

Of equal significance are the courts involved in juvenile matters. In many instances these judges are county magistrates who engage in other business and are paid $6,000 a year or less to hear probate and mental health matters in addition to juvenile cases. They seldom have any staff or trained juvenile workers, and yet they are expected to protect the community as well as rehabilitate offenders. In the larger cities, specialized juvenile courts have developed, often with strong local community support, but in cities of 200,000 population and less there is little hope that the courts will be specialized or have the necessary social services. If, as many believe, the development of crime is in the juvenile mind and the cure is the proper treatment of juvenile offenders these probate and county courts, to be effective, must receive the informed support of the community.

The National Council of Juvenile Court Judges has labored long and hard to train judges for juvenile court work. They have held institutes throughout the country with juvenile judges. In addition, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency through its council of judges has promulgated guidelines for juvenile and family courts and has set high standards for correction work. But, as with the magistrate courts, these efforts are only a beginning in the task which must be initiated to bring to each community the best thinking on the handling of juveniles.

PERSONAL INJURY CASES CROWD COURTS OF GENERAL JURISDICTION

The greatest concern in recent years has been expressed over the work of the courts of general jurisdiction. In New York State it is called the supreme court, in your State it may be called the superior court, the circuit court, or the district court. It is a court which handles everything from breach of contract to automobile accidents to murder. In our system of courts, the court of general jurisdiction has the widest variety of work and, to some, is the most interesting in its scope. But this court which has long served as the backbone of the American judicial system has in recent years been bogged down by an ever-increasing concentration of work growing out of physical injuries to persons. In some courts the personal injury litigation consumes 80 percent of the judge's available time even though the number of cases in this category may be less than a third of those filed. The increase of automobiles and traffic has contributed much to the "law explosion" and especially to its effect on the work of the courts. Many concerned individuals have worried over this problem, but no one has yet reached a satisfactory solution. Only a fortnight ago I invited the leaders of the bar in the personal injury field to meet with me in Washington. Insurance researchers, plaintiffs' lawyers and defense counsel sat around the table all day talking over the problems of personal injury litigation. We think we have come up with some helpful answers in this specialized field and a subcommittee is now working on their implementation. Some say that more judges are needed. It may well be that in some areas this is necessary. Indeed, some States relate the number of their judgeships to population, such as Florida where there is a judge of general jurisdiction for each 50,000 of population.

Generally, however, we do not need more judges. We have discovered that in the Federal system. We do need to improve the procedures of the courts. This can be done by the adaptation of the most improved business practices to court operation. We shall discuss that proposal and others later. Let me now, however, scotch some suggestions that have been made. One of these is that judges maintain longer hours. I do not share this view. Most judges work over 12 hours a day now. A judge cannot hear cases over 6 hours a day. We on the Supreme Court only sit for 4 hours of argument. I find it quite exhausting. Trial courts have a much more tedious and burdensome role than do we.

Besides, judges have many hours of work to perform off the bench. I take work home every night. The public does not see all this work, and they cannot recognize the necessity for it. As one who has been on the Supreme Court of the United States for over 15 years I say this is the most important work of the judge. It is during those hours off the bench that he can study the pleadings, research the law, prepare charges, etc., all of which are vital in the adjudication process.

Some say summer sessions would help. Perhaps this might be tried. However, the courtrooms must be prepared for air conditioning before it could be effectively pursued. In view of the unavailability of jurors in the summer in most jurisdictions, I doubt if this proposal would be of much assistance.

A proposal that we abolish the right of trial by jury in civil cases is also being urged. I am opposed to this suggestion. The right of a citizen to a trial before a jury of his peers has for centuries been considered the sine qua non of an enlightened system of jurisprudence. It is the bulwark of our Bill of Rights. It should not be tampered with.

Another suggestion is that personal injury litigation be relegated to administrative boards. Some say that the principles of workman's compensation, i.e., liability without fault, be extended to this type of case. I am opposed to this also. I believe that the unfortunate parties to such a claim are entitled to judicial, not administrative, process. Our bureaucracy is already under enough stress and strain. Moreover, you would find the personal injury case not adaptable to administrative procedures. In addition, it would be much more costly to administer and more expensive to insurance carriers—and hence to the public itself. Some investigation of the possibility of such handling would be in order but such a major change should come slowly, if at all.

I note also the proposal for the creation of a specialized court to handle personal injury cases. This would be of no benefit whatever and would only transfer our problem to another pocket and entail enormous expense. In addition, the new courts would soon be "bogged down." I am opposed to the plan.

It is my suggestion that we can solve this problem within our existing system. Many groups have been working on it and with some success. They have found that in the area of court administration the judicial system is not operating on a 20th century basis. And further, that the apathy of the public has largely been to blame for the failure to modernize our court procedures. For example, it was proposed over 50 years ago that a unified judiciary article be adopted in each State. The reason given was that urbanization was coming and that when it arrived our judicial processes would not be able to meet the stress of the case load.

The preamble of the proposed article said that something should be done about it. Well, nothing was. Since that time, as we now know, urbanization has taken over. Still we have done little about modernizing our courts to meet its demands. Efficient organizational structure is still virtually unknown. Indeed, our courts in this respect are like the old general store—loaded with items but with no systematic arrangement for their handling. Hence, the customer-litigant wastes all of his time trying to get waited on while some of the management look up lost items—others, as in the general store, sit by the pot-bellied store and whittle. Half of the court systems today have no inventory of cases—as a result judges in rural areas are idle while metropolitan courts are plagued with backlogs.

The American Bar Association was the first to come to grips with this problem. Some 30 years ago it began to work on it through its section of judicial administration. Within the section is the National Conference of State Trial Judges. It carries on a series of programs and seminars in the various States having to do with trial administration. A metropolitan court committee, composed of judges from cities of 750,000 population and over, works on congestion in those courts. A national college of State trail judges was organized last year and conducts sessions each year of 1-month duration at Boulder, Colo. One hundred judges who have been on the bench for less than 2 years attend this college with their expenses paid by a grant from the Kellogg Foundation. The American bar also has a distinguished committee chaired by Chief Judge Lumbard, of the Second Circuit, that is making a survey of the criminal justice field. The American Bar Foundation is conducting research projects on several specific problems of the trial courts, such as counsel for indigents and marriage conciliation services.

The American Judicature Society, through its distinguished journal, devotes all of its effort to the improvement of judicial administration, especially with reference to the selection, tenure, and compensation of judges. They have, in cooperation with the college, staged a score of seminars in as many States on this subject.

The Institute of Judicial Administration conducts a 2-week seminar for appellate judges each year at New York University. It also conducts special surveys of a State or city court system upon request. Its library on judicial administration is the most complete in the country.

The National Council on Crime and Delinquency has a membership of over 30,000 laymen, lawyers, and judges, and provides services to promote the rehabilitation of juvenile and adult offenders. Its mission is the improvement of probation, parole, and institutional services and facilities as well as the prevention, treatment, and control of delinquency and crime.

Finally, in 1964 a coordinating committee for effective justice was formed by each of the above groups plus the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges. Its function is to coordinate the work of these organizations and to be the successor to the joint committee for the effective administration of justice which performed this task prior thereto. As you have been advised, the joint committee was organized in 1961 and expired in 1964. It conducted seminars for trial judges in all of the States; organized the college heretofore mentioned and contributed invaluable service to the modernization of the State court system.

So far I have talked only of problems and those who are trying to solve them. Perhaps it is time to add in a lawyer's brief some direction that might be followed in attaining a reorganization and effective staffing of the Nation's courts. Though each plan must be tailored to the needs of the community, we are not without some standards in the pursuit of a practical solution.

ILLINOIS JUDICIAL AMENDMENT

Taking the lead from Illinois, a more effective use must be made of judicial manpower. It did so by unifying the courts of the State. Under the Illinois judicial amendment an administrative head supervises all of the judicial functions in the trial circuit from parking fines to murder and on the civil side from bill collecting to million-dollar construction disputes. Judges are assigned according to their special abilities and magistrates are chosen by the circuit judges and are responsible to the presiding judge.

Take Chicago—on January 1, 1964, there were 30 courts of record, 75 justice of the peace courts, and 103 police magistrates. All of these were consolidated into the new circuit court of Cook County. At that time the courts were behind 6½ years in the disposition of cases. A court administrator was installed and the use of modern business methods was encouraged. In 1964, 1,617,822 cases were filed, the largest number in history. But the consolidated court disposed of 2,173,265, reducing the docket by 500,000 cases and the time lag to 5 years. Thus, in the short period of a year the time lag was reduced a year and one-half and the docket by half a million cases. With one full sweep Illinois achieved unification of its courts and through it began the elimination of its backlog. In a short period it should be completely wiped out.

I can see the businessmen smiling. How else would you run a business? Well, as I have indicated, the majority, the overwhelming majority of States follow no such practice. What about yours? Justices of the peace who are responsible to no one for their conduct are supported in many States on the fees they collect; they are not trained in law but depend on political preferment. Strangely they have complete autonomy—exacting their tribute without any supervision. Justice varies according to the JP that you are before. A unified system would prevent this.

Moreover, a unified system would do away with much of the disparate sentencing now present in the multijudge court. It would also permit the efficient handling of counsel problems in indigent cases. The administrative judge could handle this for all of the judges in the metropolitan areas. And in the rural areas the statewide court administrator could develop a plan that would best serve this purpose. In addition, marriage conciliation services could be developed and used as they presently are in Los Angeles and in Montana.

Furthermore, the bail bond "racket," as it is called, could be controlled through procedures permitting release on recognizance in appropriate cases and bail commensurate with means, as well as the nature of the offense, in others. Illinois is now studying a State bail bond administration that might be helpful. All this is possible in Illinois because of the unified court system adopted there.

However, we must have more than just a unified court. We must have competent manpower—both judges and staffs. It is a mistake to say that the staff is not important. Sometimes it makes the difference. And, in many jurisdictions it is selected by the judge. That is an additional reason why the joint committee for the effective administration of justice declared that judges should be selected through nonpolitical methods based on merit. Otherwise not only the judge becomes political but also his staff.

As I have stated most of the States select their judges at the polls. This is a mistake. Judges should be selected on a nonpartisan merit basis. To change the present system is not only difficult but will take time. In the interim, the plan that has been used in Pennsylvania and in some of our metropolitan cities might be extended. The chief executive in these places appoints a board that makes recommendations to him from which he selects the appointee when a vacancy occurs. The appointee must stand election—in most States—at the next general election.

But this gets a good man in at the start, and in most instances he is elected at the polls once he is a sitting judge.

As to the administrators, it is best to have a State-wide one selected by the chief justice of the State or by the supreme court. The administrator should select his subordinates and also appoint the local administrator of a judicial district when one is needed. This would give you a Statewide administration. These administrators must use the most modern business methods, including computers such as those now in use in Pittsburgh, Pa.

It has been suggested that career training for judges be created here along the line of that in England. I believe that the public as well as the bar would be skeptical of this. We have so many more important and urgent problems before us that it would only be a distraction to propose such a plan at this time. In this connection there have been proposals in the Congress that would require appellate judges to be selected from the trial bench. This is, one might say, an alternative to the English system of career training for judges. It is, of course, necessary for the appellate bench to have some judges of nisi prius experience. However, to require all to be taken from trial courts is too much. The appellate courts—especially the Supreme Court—need more than trial judges. Otherwise, why have an appeal? Only to secure the right to a fair trial. This can best be done by an appellate court made up of judges of varied experiences.

There are some who say that judges need disciplining. And in my days at the bar I have thought that perhaps some did need correction, other than in their decisions. California has a commission plan on this which has proven very successful. In fact, so much so that the Nebraska Legislature adopted a similar plan only this week (April 28, 1965) and Texas is considering it now. Procedures for discipline and removal are necessary. Impeachment is antiquated and cumbersome.

Judges must also be adequately compensated, with fair retirement benefits, widow's pension rights and security of tenure. Only in this way will the most competent lawyers be attracted to the Bench. The judiciary needs the best legal talent obtainable and along with it the most efficient supporting staff.

Nor can justice be equal when it is administered with delay. The quest for truth is successful only to the extent that the memory of witnesses is accurate. Delay dims the memory and obscures the truth. In addition, like Caesar's wife, justice must be above suspicion. Appearances are often as important as events. Nothing dims the image of courts more than "interminable delays" in adjudication. It corrodes, as Chief Justice Warren said, the very foundation of justice.

IMAGE OF JUSTICE DEPENDS ON LAWYERS, TOO

Moreover, the image of justice depends greatly upon the lawyers. I am sure that you businessmen who unfortunately may have been litigants understand. So many lawyers lay the loss of a case at the feet of the judge or the court. This is natural but is nothing short of a self-confession of error and a hopeful avoidance of responsibility. There are always two sides to a case. If clients corrected lawyers in such instances instead of joining in with the castigation of the courts it would be helpful. But I suppose that is asking too much.

Now what is the relevance of all this to a layman? What can he do to correct these long-existing deficiencies in our judicial system? The short answer is that nothing can be done without you. Experience in California, Colorado, Iowa, Illinois, Florida, North Carolina, and New York proves that much can be done with you. Without the support of an informed citizenry judicial reform cannot be attained. The lone plea of the lawyers and the judges for an adequate judicial system has always fallen on deaf political ears. Nothing talks as well as the voter. The operation of the courts is a local matter. If we are to have an efficient court system we must begin at the grass roots. Your active assistance is needed.

When you go back home check up on your judicial system. Ask your judge, your lawyer, your legislator, your newspaper editor. Find out where it can be improved. Then go to your local judge and propose to him that he organize a "law-laymen" committee to secure the needed improvement. On this committee have the leading citizens of your town and get your neighbor in the next town to do the same thing. Soon you will have an organization that can get the job done. Judge Bolitha Laws did just that in Washington, D.C., a decade or so ago. Now we have a beautiful courthouse, an efficient court system, and a modernized administration of justice.

Moreover, while you are here at this meeting why not appoint a national committee to coordinate your efforts with the organized professional associations that I have mentioned? The time is ripe for a stupendous national effort to improve the administration of justice.

As I close let me say again that this is an historic occasion. It is the first national call for laymen to work for more effective justice. No more important task could be undertaken. "Justice," said Webster, "is the greatest interest of man on earth." Let me add that they who work to strengthen its foundations shall forever be called blessed for only through the rule of law shall every man inherit the earth.

REPORT TO THE SENATE ON THE LATIN AMERICAN PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE HELD IN LIMA, PERU, JULY 14–18, 1965

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I spent an informative and rewarding 5 days in Lima, Peru, recently as the U.S. Senate's official observer at the second Latin American Parliamentary Conference.

I do not mind telling you that I approached this Conference with some trepidation, because I had been led to believe by press reports that there was widespread criticism in the Latin American countries of our very necessary decision to intervene in the Dominican Republic crisis 3 months ago.

You will be happy to know, Mr. President, that there was actually very little criticism of the United States at this Conference.

The nations which were official members of the Conference were Argentina, Brazil, Costa Rica, Chile, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Colombia. In addition, Trinidad and Jamaica were represented by observers, as we were.

There was some criticism expressed, but we were able to prevent the adoption of any resolutions inimical to the United States.

The day the conference opened, a delegate from Venezuela took the floor to denounce this country. But I knew many of the Venezuelan delegates, Mr. President, and it did not sound to me like this one individual was reflecting the views of the others.

That evening I called on every one of the other Venezuelan delegates and found that my suspicions were fully justified. None of that man's colleagues supported his position, and at my urging, each of them took the floor the next day to disavow what he had said.

If left to stand, his statement would have been a serious blow to U.S. prestige and would have been the door opener for further criticism against the United States.

Later on, a delegate from Uruguay introduced a resolution attacking the United States, but we were able to prevail on the Conference to turn it down.

As a result, Mr. President, the United States emerged from this meeting with more support and understanding of her role in the Dominican situation than she had before.

I want to give credit to our esteemed Ambassador, J. Wesley Jones, who assigned an able staff to work out a proper representation of our country at the Conference. Mr. James Haahr, first secretary at the U.S. Embassy in Lima, headed this team with great ability and dedication.

Although formal membership in the Parliamentary Conference is limited to Latin American countries, it should be emphasized that it is in no sense an anti-U.S. group.

It is simply an expression of a widespread belief among the democratic Latin countries that they need their own organization to give a solidarity of effort and unanimity of approach to the problems of economic development, the fostering of democratic government, and social reform.

Because of my interest in Latin America, I have done all I can to foster new lines of communication wherever possible.

For example, the series of interparliamentary meetings which we have held with Mexico, our closest Latin neighbor, have proven of inestimable value to this country.

Before closing, Mr. President, I should like to say a few words about our host country for the Parliamentary Conference, Peru.

Peru will be one of the showcases of Latin American democracy in just a few short years. Under the leadership of President Fernando Belaunde, democratic government has been firmly established, and the country has made remarkable economic strides recently.

His government is aggressively attacking the Communists wherever they rear their heads. He has ordered the army and the police to round up those Communists who are trying to implant Castroism in the mountain areas. The liberal press has joined in this fight. The people are being alerted.

This is a good sign.

Unfortunately, President Belaunde's efforts at reform have been meeting violent resistance from Castro-trained Communists. Shortly before our conference began, guerrillas in the Peruvian mountains killed seven policemen in an ambush, and not long thereafter, two dynamite bombs were set off in downtown Lima. No one was killed, but there were serious injuries.

President Belaunde showed that he is determined to deal effectively with such subverison.

He has caused the arrest of a number of Castroist and other Communist leaders suspected of responsibility for this terrorism, and is making a determined effort to control the guerrilla menace.

I think, Mr. President, that the record in Peru is an indicator of the changes for the better which are occurring throughout Latin America.

It is a hopeful record, and one to which we, through conferences such as I have just described and through other programs, have made a substantial contribution.

MENTAL RETARDATION FACILITIES AND COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS CONSTRUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2985) to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 27, 1965, pp. 18428, Congressional Record.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, H.R. 2985 as passed by the Senate and the House authorized the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to pay part of the initial professional and technical staffing costs of community mental health centers. The Federal share could not exceed 75 percent during the first 15 months, 60 percent during the next 12 months, 45 percent during the next 12 months, and 30 percent during the next 12 months. A total of 51 months of staffing assistance is authorized.

The Senate and the House approved appropriation authorizations of $19,500,000 for fiscal year 1966, $24 million for fiscal year 1967, and $30 million for fiscal year 1968 to enable the Secretary to make initial grants to community mental health centers.

In the case of continuation grants the legislation authorizes such appropriations as may be necessary to complete the financing initiated in the fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968.

As passed by the House, however, H.R. 2985 did not provide for appropriations for continuation grants beyond fiscal year 1969. The Senate amendment authorized appropriations for continuation grants through fiscal year 1972 so that funds could be appropriated to finance the full 51 months of staffing assistance for all community mental health centers receiving initial grants in fiscal years 1966, 1967, 1968. The conferees accepted the Senate amendment.

The total 7-year cost for the new program is estimated at $224,175,000.

In addition, the conferees agreed to extend for an additional 3 years the Public Law 88-164 programs for training teachers of handicapped children and for research and demonstrations in educating handicapped children.

The conferees approved appropriation authorizations totaling $101 million for training teachers of handicapped children for the three fiscal years 1967–69.

The conferees also approved appropriation authorizations totaling $35 million for research and demonstrations in educating handicapped children for the three fiscal years 1967–69 and an increase of $4 million in the appropriation authorization for fiscal year 1966 to a total of $6 million for that year. The conference agreement authorizes the construction and operation of a facility for research in the field of special education.

In closing, let me say that the approval of the conference agreement on H.R. 2985 will permit great progress in the care and treatment of the mentally ill and in the education of handicapped children.

The Members will recall that in 1963 we approved the legislation authorizing assistance in the construction of community mental health centers. That legislation in conjunction with the initial staffing assistance that H.R. 2985 would authorize will bring new hope to the mentally ill and to their families and friends. As community mental health centers are established across the country we will reduce the toll of mental illness and minimize the periods of institutional care.

H.R. 2985 would also strengthen our resources for educating children who are handicapped by mental retardation, deafness, blindness and other disabilities. We now need 300,000 teachers trained in special education, but we have only 60,000. If we are to offer handicapped children the opportunity for an adequate education we need to increase our efforts in training teachers and in pursuing research and demonstrations that will improve educational methods.

The conference report is signed by all of the conferees on the part of the Senate and by all of the conferees on the part of the House.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

HEALTH RESEARCH FACILITIES AMENDMENTS OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2984) to amend the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities by extending the expiration date thereof and providing increased support for the program, to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 27, 1965, p. 18427, Congressional Record.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as passed by the Senate and House, H.R. 2984 authorizes a 3-year extension and appropriations aggregating $280 million for the matching grant program of the Public Health Service for the construction of health research facilities.

A Senate amendment to H.R. 2984 authorized appropriations of $35 million for grants to be awarded by the Public Health Service to pay for the costs of establishing health research facilities of national or regional importance. The conferees agreed to defer action on this new authority so that it could be considered by the House in connection with the legislation that would establish regional medical complexes to combat heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

As passed by the House, H.R. 2984 authorized the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to enter into contracts, including contracts for research subject to certain provisions of law applicable to the military departments and subject to an overall ceiling of $43 million on annual appropriations for the fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968. The conferees agreed to delete the $43 million limitation on appropriations. This action of the conferees recognizes that many research activities can be pursued most effectively through contracts and through utilizing industrial capabilities. It is clearly in the best public interest to allow the Public Health Service access to nongovernment capabilities through contracts as an alternative to duplicating existing resources and developing them as Federal activities.

Both the Senate and House approved the creation of three additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The conference report is signed by all the conferees on the part of the Senate and by all of the conferees on the part of the House.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES EXTENSION AMENDMENTS OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill—S. 510—to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 27, 1965, p. 18425, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the conferees agreed to the House amendment that authorized $33 million over the 3 fiscal years 1966–68 to assist in financing immunization programs against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, and measles, in lieu of the 5-year program approved by the Senate. The Senate amendment relating to simplified recordkeeping was accepted in a modified form.

There was agreement to authorize $24 million in appropriations over the 3 fiscal years 1966–68 for health services for domestic agricultural farmworkers and their families. The Senate had approved $44 million for the 5 fiscal years 1966–70 and the House of Representatives had approved $9 million for the 3 fiscal years 1966–68. The House amendment deleting authorization for financing necessary hospital care was rejected.

There was also agreement to reject the House amendment that deleted the Senate-approved increase in the subceiling on appropriations from $2,500,000 to $5 million for formula grants for schools of public health for each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

The provisions of the legislation authorizing $50 million for formula grants for fiscal year 1967 for general health services, mental health services, dental health services, health services for the chronically ill and aged, radiological health services, and schools of public health as well as $10 million for project grants for community health services for fiscal year 1967 were identical as approved by the Senate and House of Representatives and were not in conference.

These programs of the Public Health Service are outstanding examples of Federal-State cooperation in advancing health in this country.

The conference report is signed by all of the conferees on the part of the Senate and by all the conferees on the part of the House.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

NATIONAL AMERICAN LEGION BASEBALL WEEK—LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6, 1965, as National American Legion Baseball Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6, 1965, as National American Legion Baseball Week.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the substitute measure offered by the minority leader, in my opinion, is just as inappropriate and retrogressive as was his original proposal last year.

The question of legislative reapportionment, of course, should be—and has been—carefully considered by the Judiciary Committee. The minority leader's proposal is apparently not favored by a majority of this committee. In any event, it should not be brought up as a hasty substitute for a completely unrelated resolution.

If agreed to, this constitutional amendment would be of critical importance in shaping the future path of our State governments. It would mark a long step away from truly representative government, for reasons which I would like to describe to my colleagues.

In order to arrive at my own position on this complex issue I found it necessary to go back and examine my own basic views of our American governmental way of life. I began with the Constitution and the fundamental democratic philosophy which guided the Founding Fathers. I found myself asking questions that seemed simple, but proved otherwise. But by posing and answering those questions, I arrived at what I believe to be the most reasonable position on the tangled and controversial subject of apportionment of State legislatures.

The first question I asked was: Is there a clear and compelling need to alter the Constitution of the United States as the proponents of this amendment declared? I believe that our Federal Constitution is the greatest instrument of government ever devised by mankind. It has functioned so well as the charter of our democratic system that my instinct is to question any change in it unless the need for such a change can be clearly shown.

I certainly do not feel that the proponents of this amendment have in any way demonstrated the necessity of taking such a far-reaching and momentous step. Until they can produce substantial proof that the Constitution which has served so well thus far ought to be changed, I do not believe that this amendment should be adopted.

Second, I asked myself, Is this proposed amendment needed in order to achieve or preserve some fundamental right for the citizens of our Nation?

The answer, it seems to me, is "No." The right which is at issue here is the right of each citizen to have his vote count fully. The general principle enunciated by the Supreme Court in the case of Reynolds against Sims is that the vote of every citizen within a State—regardless of what color his skin is or where he lives within that State—should be given approximately the same weight as every other vote.

Such has not been the case in the past, of course. Apportionment of State legislatures has consistently given overrepresentation to the rural areas. Frequently a relatively small proportion of the population of a State has been in a position to elect a majority of the representatives in the legislature. What this means in effect is that a minority of the people rules—which is in flagrant contradiction to the basic democratic principle of majority rule.

In January 1964, voting statistics showed that, in 30 out of the 50 States, representation was so inequitable that a mere 40 percent or less of the people could elect a majority of the State senate. In the California Senate, 10 percent of the population could elect a majority. In Nevada, 8 percent of the voters could control the State senate in this manner. Some legislative districts were a hundred or more times larger than other districts in the same State—yet each district had one representative. This meant, in effect, that a rural vote might literally be worth a hundred city votes—a situation which is hardly consistent with our avowed democratic principles.

Following the Baker against Carr and other decisions, however, the situation began to improve. The apportionment systems in 32 States were ruled unconstitutional last year. Ten of the legislatures voluntarily reapportioned themselves. The courts did it for them in three other States. Twenty-four States are currently under order to reapportion before the next election. Thus it appears that enforcement of the Constitution is beginning to guarantee to every man the right to his vote—a full vote, not a half, or even one-hundredth of a vote.

The amendment under consideration would alter the Constitution, to provide that in the elections for one house of a State legislature, some citizens' votes could be given greater weight than others. This amendment would at least partially undo the good work which has been done during the past year. Instead of preserving the rights of citizens, this would help create anew the situation in which those citizens residing in urban areas would be deprived of one of their fundamental rights.

Let me illustrate this by examining the effect this amendment might have on my own State of Maryland: 76 percent of the population of Maryland resides in the city of Baltimore and the four most populous counties in the State; namely, the suburbs of Baltimore and Washington. If equitable representation were required—as it will be unless such an amendment as the Dirksen amendment is enacted—this large majority of the population would elect the large majority of the Maryland Senate. Yet at present, this 76 percent of the population elects only 34 percent of the Maryland Senate—less than half of that to which it is entitled. Residents of these areas are in effect, given only half a vote. And the proposed amendment would continue this inequity. I fail to see what rights as citizens are thereby safeguarded; I see clearly that the right of urban and suburban residents to a free and full vote is seriously impaired.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. NELSON. Does the constitution of the State of Maryland provide for apportionment of the legislature, the senate on one basis and the lower body on another basis, or is it merely by an accident of history that disproportionate representation has developed?

Mr. BREWSTER. By custom and by law we have malapportionment in Maryland. This can be changed by an act of the legislature.

Mr. NELSON. It is not a constitutional question?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is my understanding.

Mr. NELSON. If the so-called Dirksen amendment were passed, would it be possible for the Senator's State to legally remain, along with other States, malapportioned as between the two houses?

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator is entirely correct. We start with a situation in which one house of the legislature is entirely out of proportion with regard to representation. There is complete small county and rural domination. Adoption of the Dirksen amendment would allow some legislatures that are not representative to continue malapportionment and to have an unrepresentative type of government.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, another question which occurred to me was: Would the proposed amendment be justified by a sweeping change that has recently taken place? A constitution should be adaptable to the needs of changing times, and a great shift in the composition of American society has indeed taken place. From a onetime largely rural nation we have become an increasingly urbanized and suburbanized nation. Within our own generation that change has become evident to all. In my own State, over three-fourths of the people now live in Baltimore City and four suburban counties. But the amendment proposed would not help to adjust Maryland's government or the other State governments to that sweeping tide in American society. It would, in fact, move in the opposite direction. It would perpetuate the long-outdated dominance of rural minorities over the growing urban majorities. It would extend injustice and tend to impede progress.

A related question is: Would the amendment proposed improve the capacity of State governments to deal with the pressing problems that these new populations bring?

Let me stress at this point that I am a stanch believer in strong and effective State governments as a key element in our governmental system. I am forced to conclude that the amendment here proposed would not make State governments more responsible to the needs and desires of their people today or in decades to come. The opposite effect is more likely. In my own State, again, the amendment would make it possible for 15 senators who represent one-seventh of our people to maintain a veto over every piece of legislation needed by the State. That is more likely to be a recipe for frustration and stalemate than for responsible and effective State government.

I remember well, in my personal experience of 8 years' service in the General Assembly of Maryland representing Maryland's largest county, Baltimore County, a county of half a million population, that time and again what we considered progressive and imaginative measures were blocked completely by representatives who had little or no compatibility of interest with the points of view which the representatives from Baltimore County expressed.

Time and again, Congress has entered areas and passed statutes that are now the law of the land, where in my opinion, the State governments should have taken over. In the Senate, and prior to that time in the House of Representatives, I have consistently supported civil rights legislation, because I believe in equal rights for all citizens. I wish it had been unnecessary for me to do this. I would much rather have seen the State of Maryland and all the other States in the Union take those actions on their own, but when the States fail to act in areas concerning the entire Nation, Congress must step in.

Through the years, one of the reasons why the States have failed to act is that their legislative bodies have become ineffective due to malapportionment. Thus, far from taking away the rights of States, the proposition of one vote for one voter gives to the States the ability to enjoy true State's rights.

Now let me propound the fifth question. Will the constitutional amendment under consideration be necessary to protect the interests of rural minorities within States? I believe that question is the main concern of many fine and thoughtful people who sincerely believe this amendment is necessary. I feel that the answer is a twofold one. One answer is that none of us considers it necessary or appropriate to grant other minorities, such as racial or religious groups, the right to have their ballots count 5, 10, or 100 times as much as those of other citizens, so that they can protect their minority interests. So why should one particular kind of minority have such a privilege?

The second answer is that those who claim they need protection from the tyranny of urban and suburban areas have a misconception of those areas. Urban voters do not form a monolithic group having identical interests and always voting as a bloc. Rather, they are as diverse as the rural voters themselves, and usually far more diverse. Using the example of my own State again, citizens in Montgomery County, on the outskirts of the District of Columbia, exhibit quite different ideas and interests from those in Baltimore City, or in Anne Arundel, Howard, or Baltimore Counties. Even in the city of Baltimore, there are wide differences in the concerns and outlooks of the voters in the different parts of the city. In reality, there is no single, overwhelming urban majority. The voters there live closer together than the voters in rural counties, but they are just as diverse and just as likely to have their separate views on questions of public policy as those in less populated areas. Thus, there is no tyranny of urban voters to be feared. What is at stake, rather, is the right of diverse urban interests to have a vote equal to that of rural interests, one vote for one citizen.

Another question is: If a majority of the people of a State wish to apportion one house of their legislature on a nonpopulation basis, why should they not be allowed to do so?

This is indeed a difficult question in a government which functions by majority rule. But under the Constitution as it stands, the right to an equally counted vote is, today, a basic constitutional right, as is the right to equal treatment regardless of religion or race—as are all the rights guaranteed by the first 10 amendments, the Bill of Rights, to the Federal Constitution.

Our democracy is based on the dual conception of majority rule—and the preservation of individual or minority rights. The people of a State cannot decide, even if a majority so desires, to impair the free and full vote of individuals in that State, any more than a majority can decide to suspend the Bill of Rights or the Constitution.

Accordingly, I feel that this question should, rather, be phrased: If the majority of the people in a State wish to deprive some of their citizens of the full right to vote, should they be allowed to do so? I believe that the answer is very clear; it is "No."

A final question which puzzles many people is: Does the fact that one House of the U.S. Congress represents governmental units instead of population mean that State legislatures should be structured in the same way? A study of the history of our Constitution and of our Nation shows that there is no constitutional or historical case for such a parallel.

The original American Union was composed of 13 separate and jealous sovereign States, among whom, I am proud to say, was my own State of Maryland. These States joined together to form a

Federal union, but each State was anxious to retain a certain degree of sovereignty. Out of the genius of the Founding Fathers evolved the Connecticut Compromise. The representation of one House emphasized the union of the States: Members of the House of Representatives were to be elected to represent the people in each district. The representation of the Senate, on the other hand, emphasized the separate sovereignty of the States, as two Senators were chosen to represent each State. This brilliant compromise was necessary, in order to induce the 13 independent States to unite in one Federal Government.

Such is not the situation in the States. It has never been a question in my own State of Maryland, for instance, of inducing 23 sovereign counties and Baltimore City to unite in one State. There has never been any basis for representation by counties, rather than by population.

Those counties are themselves only the creation of the State, and are created by the State and the State legislature to carry out various governmental duties in an orderly manner within that State.

Those who argue that analogy to the Federal Government ignore the unique historical circumstances of 1789—circumstances which have no parallel in the States today.

The situation within the States today has been succinctly stated by the Supreme Court, in the Gray against Sanders case: "Within a given constituency, there can be room for but a single constitutional rule—one voter, one vote." And I can see no justification for altering our Constitution to provide otherwise.

The Supreme Court's decision does in fact allow States to deviate from a population basis to give a certain recognition to such subordinate units. That desirable flexibility is a far cry, however, from giving equal representation to counties in one house instead of to people.

So, Mr. President, if there is no constitutional or legal requirement for an amendment, the question is simply whether the change would improve the fairness of representation, and effectiveness of State legislatures in the world of today and tomorrow. Those aspects I have dealt with before. I recognize, Mr. President, that many able and dedicated Americans in my own State and elsewhere come to a different conclusion than mine. I respect their views, which I know are held with deep conviction. But on the basis of all the evidence I can find, and with careful concern for the interests of all the citizens of this great country today and in generations to come, I see no justification for amending the Constitution of the United States as has been proposed. I hope that this great body, in its wisdom, will reject this extraneous amendment.

Mr. President, this is not a political question in the sense that there is a difference between the parties. This is a basic philosophical and ideological difference of opinion.

To stress that my point of view is not a point of view espoused only by my party, the Democratic Party, I should like to quote from one of the leading Republicans of our land, a former Governor of Maryland, and at present the mayor of one of our great cities, Baltimore. That distinguished administrator is Mayor Theodore R. McKeldin. He testified before a committee of the Senate on this question. I remind the Senate that these are the words of a recognized Republican leader in our land. Mayor McKeldin stated:

> I know that these resolutions were introduced by men of high honor and ability, and I have no doubt that they were introduced with the best of intentions. It is my belief, however, that they would perpetuate obsolescence and inequity, and that they would do injustice to my city and to all highly urbanized areas in the United States, and I am unalterably opposed to their passage by the U.S. Senate.
>
> Since the days of ancient Greece, western statesmen have striven constantly to discover and evolve a perfect system under which man might govern himself and his fellows. While democratic government may not be ideal and perfect, it is, all of us in this land believe, the nearest system to perfection which has as yet been developed.
>
> In the early days of our national history, men whose names are familiar to every American student—Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and Maryland's Charles Carroll—struggled earnestly and even fought to perfect their dream of democracy and to bring it even nearer to the principle of representative government. Recognizing their own fallibility and the probability that changing times would require changes in the form of government, they also made provision for future generations to alter that form.
>
> But it was certainly the intention of the Founding Fathers that all such alterations would continue to move nearer the ideal of representative government. Despite this inheritance, we are now confronted with a movement which would amend our Constitution to say, in effect, that one person's vote would mean more than another person's.
>
> This is hardly a new concept, for it is an unhappy fact that in many areas of our country one vote has, for a long time indeed, had more meaning and more weight than another. It is this inequity and its deplorable results which the Supreme Court has struck down. Justice Douglas, in the case of *Baker* v. *Carr*, found that, and I quote:
>
> "We are told that a single vote in Moore County is worth 19 votes in Hamilton County, that 1 vote in Stewart or in Chester County is worth nearly 8 times a single vote in Shelby or Knox County."
>
> Earlier in his opinion, Justice Douglas asks this question of the entire Nation:
>
> "And so one question is, May a State weigh the vote of one county or one district more heavily than it weighs the vote in another?"
>
> I ask you, gentlemen, how can anyone justify, either morally or constitutionally, giving more weight to one man's vote than to another man's vote?
>
> The Supreme Court has interposed our Constitution for the past 189 years. Many of its decisions, of course, were controversial when made, but the majority have since proved to be remarkably farsighted. It is my firm conviction that the Court's ruling in favor of the one-man, one-vote principle will be found similarly wise and just.
>
> I noted previously my belief that good intentions were behind the introduction of the several proposed constitutional amendments which would, in effect, circumvent the Supreme Court's historic move to strike down malapportionment. One intent certainly was to retain unto the States the power to determine the composition of State legislatures. Our Founding Fathers shared this fear of the encroachment of a strong Federal Government upon the prerogatives of the other levels of government and, indeed, upon the abridgment of individual freedom itself. Please let there be no doubt about it. However, they did not intend the preservation of States rights at the expense of individual rights, and they wisely provided instruments and mechanisms by which the Federal Government might restore individual rights whenever these latter were threatened at any other level of government.
>
> I have quoted Justice Douglas in the Carr case, in which he points to shocking inequities in the representation of a State legislature. The case is extreme, but not so extreme as the one I am about to cite from the State of Maryland. The Maryland General Assembly is a bicameral legislature and, while there is malapportionment within the house of delegates, there is a far greater malapportionment in the Maryland Senate.
>
> For example, Baltimore City and the four most populous counties in this State—Baltimore, Anne Arundel, Montgomery, and Prince Georges Counties—had a 1960 population of 2,335,000 or about 75 percent of the State total of 3,100,000. This 75 percent of the population of Maryland, however, was represented in the Maryland General Assembly by only 57 percent of the members of the house of delegates and by less than 35 percent in the Maryland Senate. In other words, gentlemen, three-fourths of the population of the State of Maryland had a representation in the State senate of only slightly more than one-third of its members, but this is not the worst comparison that might be made. Leaving aside my own city of Baltimore for the moment, I note that the four most populous counties of the State had a combined population of nearly 1,400,000 in 1960. I note further that the four least populous counties in the State—Calvert, Caroline, Kent, and Queen Anne's Counties are represented by a single senator in the Maryland Senate. This means that the individual voter in the four least populated counties in our State has a vote in the Maryland Senate which has 28 times the weight of a voter in the four most populous counties. These ratios, of course, are based on computations which average the populations of the two groups of four counties each. By taking the most extreme examples available and comparing Kent County, with its population of 15,841 in 1960, with Baltimore County, with its population of 492,428, I can say, casting the statement in Justice Douglas' terms that: "a single vote in Kent County is worth more than 31 votes in Baltimore County in the Maryland Senate at this time."
>
> I would also note that in terms of absolute growth, the larger counties cited are experiencing the greatest population growth. If the U.S. Senate were to change the Constitution in a way which would permit the perpetuation of the existing malapportionment, or some other, shall we say, "reasonable," malapportionment, we undoubtedly could achieve even more dazzling ratios and inequities by using estimated 1965 population figures or by waiting until the end of this decade to make our computations.
>
> The city of Baltimore and the other more urbanized areas of the State of Maryland suffer from a lack of equitable representation in the Maryland General Assembly principally in the area of finances. Specifically, this has meant that we have been the beneficiaries of State financial aid to an extent below the size of our populations relative to other areas of the State. This fact has several additional ironies, in that because of our size, our people have been contributing a disproportionately large share to State revenues and, in addition, we are the areas which are experiencing the most serious social and fiscal problems for reasons not directly related to apportionment or malapportionment in the State legislature. Thus it is that the areas

which are required to give the most and which have the greatest need receive, in their turn, the least back, relatively speaking.

I would like to point out an additional problem inherent in the resolutions under consideration here today. First, they would permit apportionment on some basis other than on population. What basis, may I ask? I submit that this provision is disastrously vague. In the hands of the U.S. Senate, this provision might be implemented to the benefit of all. But in other hands, the result might be ludicrous and even tragic.

Secondly, any system of apportionment devised as a consequence of the resolutions under consideration here today would be subject to a referendum of the voters in each State. This, of course, is as it should be, but in the State of Maryland, all issues must first be approved by the general assembly before they can be referred to the people for a vote. In effect, then, a malapportioned general assembly could be expected in existing malapportionment under a procedure such as this. And I want to be clear on one point, gentlemen, I cannot find it in my heart to castigate the members of the State legislature who vote, in effect, to maintain their own advantage and that of their own constituents. I may not like the way they vote, and I may not like the consequences, but I recognize their vote, in terms of political reality, as inevitable and natural.

Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate an editorial published in the Baltimore Sun on June 25 of this year supporting those of us who oppose the Dirksen amendment. In particular, I should like to compliment my colleague from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] for his vigorous and effective opposition to the substitute now pending before the Senate and for his continuing effort in the Judiciary Committee to prevent the passage of this retrogressive amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial of June 25 be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

States' Rights

Senator Tydings makes a good point when he says that citizens who advocate strong State governments, and who oppose Federal encroachments on the States, should support the efforts to reapportion the State legislatures. If the State legislatures are able to act in response to the needs and problems of the States and communities there is less need to seek action from the Federal Government. Efforts to freeze the legislatures in outmoded patterns, and especially to allow State senates to remain under the control of a minority of the voting population, thus do not really strengthen State governments or advance the principle of States' rights; they encourage the cities and the suburbs, in particular, to bypass the legislatures and go to Washington with their problems.

Viewed in that light, the adoption of the constitutional amendment sponsored by Senator Dirksen, and approved this week by a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee, would be at best a hollow victory for States' rights. It would be a victory for those who are able to persuade themselves that a rural minority should continue to have a controlling influence in States in which urban and suburban voters are in the majority.

The Dirksen amendment endorses the principle that factors other than population may figure in the apportionment of State senates, and it provides for referendums on apportionment proposals. It tends to encourage those who want to maintain the status quo in State senates and who are trying in various ways to block the efforts to bring State legislatures into the urbanized world of today. It may be well to consider factors other than population at some later point, but this could be done more equitably by legislatures in which a State's voters are fairly represented.

Washington dispatches indicate that the entire Senate Judiciary Committee will approve the Dirksen amendment, and that a long legislative battle is in prospect before its fate is decided. This is a major public issue which all citizens should understand clearly before such an amendment is added to the Federal Constitution.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial from this morning's Baltimore Sun. The editorial is highly critical of the manner in which the present substitute is being taken up, and opposes the Dirksen amendment.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, July 26, 1965]

Two Wrongs

It is easy to get so involved in legislative procedure as to lose sight of the aims of the legislation. In most cases procedure isn't very important but this week Congress, in both the House and the Senate, is using questionable procedures to consider major issues.

In the House of Representatives President Johnson and the Democratic leaders are getting ready to make good their promise, in the 1964 Democratic platform, to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley labor law, which permits States to enact laws barring the union shop. This is a controversial issue, of course, of prime importance to the labor union leaders who customarily support Democratic political candidates. Most of the States with large urban populations, in which labor is well organized, are not directly involved in the matter, since they have not enacted laws against the union shop, and most of the votes for the repeal amendment will come from these States. Some Congressmen from industrial States argue that the repeal of 14(b) should be accompanied by other amendments intended to make improvements in labor union practices, but the House Democratic leaders indicate that they will try to rule out such proposals. The procedure which the Democratic leadership would adopt, in other words, would limit the House to a single point.

On technical matters such as tax rates a good argument can be made against amending a bill from the House floor, but on a political-economic matter such as a labor law this argument has little validity. Open debate and open consideration of amendments would be preferable.

In the Senate the Republican leader, Senator Dirksen, is pushing ahead with his proposal to amend the Federal Constitution by means of a proposal called up on the floor as a substitute for an unrelated piece of legislation. Mr. Dirksen adopted this expedient because his proposal was stalled in a Senate committee. We saw, in the case of the proposed constitutional amendment dealing with Presidential disability and the Vice-Presidency, how careful committee consideration and debate can produce a sound proposition. We see, in the case of Mr. Dirksen's amendment to limit the authority of the Federal courts over the reapportionment of State senates, the disadvantage of hasty action. An argument can be made for considering factors other than a strict population rule in apportioning State senate districts, but Mr. Dirksen's impatience in this instance prevents the reasoned consideration the subject demands. The Senate would do well to reject the Dirksen amendment and follow its regular procedure on a question of this importance.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Evening Sun of Baltimore, dated July 19, very critical of certain supporters of the Dirksen amendment, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Evening Sun, July 19, 1965]

No Help From the Bar

If Maryland legislators have looked to the legal profession for help in redistricting the seats in the general assembly to conform to the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote principle, they now know that they are not to have it. The action of the Maryland State Bar Association in voting its approval of the Dirksen constitutional amendment confuses and beclouds the redistricting job which Maryland legislators must do here and now, without waiting to see if somehow the Supreme Court principle can be undone through the slow process of amending the U.S. Constitution.

In supporting the Dirksen position that States should be allowed to have the seats in one house of a bicameral legislature distributed on a basis other than population, the State bar group presumably means distribution in some other fair way. At least, the public may hope that is what the State legal profession means. But what other fair basis is there? And what would its advantage be? The answers to these two questions are always vague when groups attack the Supreme Court for saying that voters should have equal representation in both chambers of a legislative body.

Clarence W. Miles, who made the chief pitch before the State Bar Association for the Dirksen delaying action, makes it evident that he believes that having a State senate apportioned on a different basis than the house is vital to the legislative process. "You might argue," he told fellow lawyers, "why have two houses if members of both are elected by the same pattern." But all this has been argued before, and the Supreme Court is well ahead of Mr. Miles. The Supreme Court already has pointed to the advantages of bicameralism and said that simply because both houses are based on population "does not mean that there will be no differences in the composition and complexion of the two bodies." The Supreme Court also has suggested how the differences can be maintained:

"One body could be composed of single-member districts while the other could have at least some multimember districts. The length of terms of the legislators in the separate bodies could differ. The numerical size of the two bodies could be made to differ, even significantly, and the geographical size of districts from which legislators are elected could also be made to differ."

The task confronting Maryland legislators is to work out their own pattern of reapportionment, based on population but taking into consideration the desirability of having a State senate which is not simply a duplicate house. It is a job not made any easier by the withholding of support by the Maryland legal profession, but it remains a job that the legislators must do and can do, if they are to keep faith with all Maryland voters.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have in my hand a fourth editorial printed in the Baltimore Sun on June 1. The editorial praises the junior Senator from Indiana

[Mr. BAYH] for his most effective efforts in this area. I should like now to read from that editorial. I see the Senator from Indiana on the floor of the Senate, where he has been for the past hour.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. I thank the Senator for the compliment as well as his reference to the editorial which he has in his hand. I have garnered a great deal from listening to the learned discussion of the Senator. He has made a considerable contribution to the issue. I hope that all Senators will take advantage of the opportunity which is available to all Senators to read in the RECORD, in particular, the discussion which the Senator from Maryland has delivered. He has pointed out very vividly that the issue is not one which should be taken lightly. A subject such as the one the Senator has been discussing should not be foisted upon the Senate before it has been fully considered in the committee.

After I have had an opportunity to hear the Senator's concluding remarks, I should like to dwell on that particular point.

Since the Senator from Maryland has been kind enough to yield to me, and since he has had such an illustrious career in the Legislature of the United States, having had an opportunity to serve in the House of Representatives as well as in the Senate, I should like to ask him a question that particularly concerns me about the issue which we are considering and the way in which we are considering it. It seems to me that the proposal would strike at and damage one of the basic concepts of our representative form of government, namely, the committee system. In a body of 100 Senators, or in a body such as the House of Representatives, which has 435 Members, as the Senator, who has had the privilege to serve in that body, knows, it seems to me we would have nothing but anarchy if we did not maintain a strong committee structure. Yet, by considering the question today, and day after day, we are circumventing the Judiciary Committee of this body. The Judiciary Committee has been ready to take action on the measure. I thought because of his experience, the Senator from Maryland might wish to share his thoughts on that particular aspect of the question.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Indiana is entirely correct. The Committee on the Judiciary, of which the Senator from Indiana is a distinguished member, has considered this subject in great detail and has spent many hours hearing testimony on it. To date, the committee has not seen fit to make a recommendation to the Senate. Notwithstanding that, another Member of this body has chosen to circumvent and push aside the committee's efforts by bringing up this matter as a substitute for another very reasonable but entirely irrelevant proposal, by going outside the committee system.

I serve on the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Commerce, and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I would resent a matter on which a committee had spent days and weeks of consideration suddenly being brought up on the floor of the Senate by means other than through the committee structure.

Mr. BAYH. I appreciate the Senator's remarks. There is irony in this particular situation, and I hope to discuss it in some detail. Some Senators, in all sincerity of purpose, have referred to past actions that have been taken by this body, in which the same method has been followed. The distinguished junior Senator from Illinois—and perhaps the RECORD should show that although he is the junior Senator from Illinois, he is, indeed, not our junior altogether; he is very much senior to us—has said that a precedent has been established to permit what he has done. But the irony of the situation is that the very Senator who now seeks to circumvent committee action and to substitute his proposal for the proposal which would provide for the observance of American Legion Baseball Week is the same individual who, through his lengthy discussion of the subject in committee, has prevented the committee from voting on it. The committee is ready to vote on it, but he will not let us bring the matter to a vote.

I say this with great respect for the Senator from Illinois, who is well within his parliamentary rights in doing exactly what he is doing. But, again, we are striking at the committee system by not letting the Committee on the Judiciary vote on this proposal.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to read the editorial entitled "State Senates," published in the Baltimore Sun of June 1, 1965:

> ### STATE SENATES
>
> Senator BAYH is moving into the argument over the apportionment of State senates with a proposal that deserves attention. The young Democrat from Indiana has earned his credentials in the constitutional field by his work, as chairman of a Senate judiciary subcommittee, in the drafting of the proposed constitutional amendment on presidential disability and appointment of a Vice President when a vacancy occurs in that office.
>
> Mr. BAYH, who helped to establish a common ground on the intricate disability problem, is trying to establish a compromise on the question of whether factors other than population—geography, for example—should be taken into account in the makeup of State senates. The Supreme Court laid down a general rule that State senates, as well as houses of representatives, should be apportioned solely on a population basis. In the case of Maryland, for example, this would require either that some of the smaller counties (each of which now has a senator) be grouped into multicounty senatorial districts or that the senate be enlarged so that, in effect, it would be another house.
>
> A strong movement is underway to retain present senate lines in Maryland and other States. It is represented in a constitutional amendment backed by Senator DIRKSEN, the Republican leader, and it is represented in an effort—endorsed by the Maryland Assembly—to initiate a constitutional convention to advance such an amendment.
>
> Senator BAYH, as reported by Adam Clymer in the Sun, is "willing to give the States some latitude" in deciding whether factors other than population should be considered in apportioning one house of their legislatures. But he proposes, first, that the legislatures be reapportioned on a population basis, so that the public would be equitably represented in the creation of a plan including other factors. He also proposes that plans of this kind be submitted to a referendum of the State's voters after each census, and that reapportionment measures remain subject to review by the courts.
>
> The Indiana Senator should be encouraged in his effort. Commonsense is sorely needed in this subject. A minority of the population should not expect to continue indefinitely to exert a controlling influence in State senates. But a majority of the population should be willing to see that the rights and interests of thinly populated areas are safeguarded.

Mr. President, in concluding my speech, I wish to express my vigorous and unequivocal opposition to the substitute offered by the Senator from Illinois. I associate myself with the efforts of my colleague from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] to block this proposal, which circumvents the committee system, which would change the Constitution, and which would deprive the people of our great cities and suburban areas of their equal vote in all public affairs.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. I again thank the Senator from Maryland for the compliment he has paid me and for reading the editorial published in an outstanding newspaper of his State, the Baltimore Sun. I hope that in some way I may live up to the fine things which he and the Baltimore Sun have said about me.

I doubt whether there is a State in the Union that has or has had two Senators who have taken more interest in this subject, a subject which exceeds in importance almost everything else we discuss, because it goes to the bedrock of the representation of the people of this great land at the State level.

Some of us have been much alarmed by the efforts made during the past several years to move the power of the States to Washington. There is much merit to the belief that if the States were better apportioned and the people received better representation, the problems of the States could be solved better at the State level, making it unnecessary to take their problems to Washington.

Speaking as a former member of the Indiana Legislature for 8 years, I hope that the reapportionment of State legislatures will be successful, so that many of the problems of the States can be solved closer to home. But until the State legislatures provide better representation, as the Senator from Maryland has pointed out, that is not likely to be done.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland for the clear and precise way in which he has outlined his position. Since the beginning of this fight, he has been a forthright defender of the right of the American people to have equal representation in the State legislatures.

He has been an inspiration to those of us who have perhaps been somewhat reluctant to tangle with the distinguished minority leader of the Senate.

The reapportionment of State legislatures is, in my judgment, the most important constitutional issue facing the Nation today. As the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] has said, it could well be the most important proposal to amend the Constitution that has been offered for many years. Certainly it is the most important question of domestic policy that is before this session of Congress. To have the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland at the forefront of this fight is a great solace to all citizens of our country who believe, as did James Madison and Thomas Jefferson, that equal representation in the legislatures of a democratic, free nation is absolutely essential.

I again compliment the distinguished Senator from Maryland for his excellent address.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank my colleague from Maryland and commend him again for his strong efforts in this field.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BAYH obtained the floor.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. BAYH. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. I wish to add to the comments of the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] my observation that the speech just delivered by the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] was a well-reasoned, intelligent presentation of one of the most important issues that confronts the Nation today.

Unless we have apportionment representation based upon one vote to each individual, I believe that we shall effectively erode away the very basis of democratic society that we revere so much.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, over the past several months it has been my good fortune—indeed, I consider it a privilege—to have an opportunity to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary.

During this time, there have been rather extensive discussions of the subject referred to by the two Senators from Maryland and the Senator from Wisconsin. I have heard nearly all the testimony which has been offered.

The junior Senator from Maryland has been a member of that committee. The distinguished minority leader, who now offers his proposal, has also been a member of that committee.

The hearings, as they have unfolded, have afforded us an extra opportunity to view this subject from all sides and to review all its rather complicated aspects. Therefore, I beg the indulgence of the Senate for a few moments in order that I may give a brief recounting of the efforts of the subcommittee relative to the proposed constitutional amendment on the apportionment of State legislatures.

Lest anyone be led to say that the subcommittee did not take a careful and earnest look into this complex and intricate subject, I shall point out exactly the extent to which the committee went in an effort to try to make an adequate record. The committee tried to listen to all who were interested in being heard.

The hearings on legislative apportionment are contained in a volume of 1,228 pages. The subcommittee conducted hearings on 17 different days. Some of those days were lengthy, all-day hearings which continued past the time of Senate adjournment for that day. The hearings, which began on March 3 and continued to the last part of May, encompassed a period of almost 3 months.

Every effort was made to take testimony from those representing every shade of opinion on this subject. I was amazed that, except in rare instances, the testimony was not repetitive.

It did not take me long to realize that this question had as many facets as, I suppose, one would say there were on a diamond, and that a reasonable solution would take long and serious thought, consultation with scholars, and adjustment in the thinking of many of us.

For that reason, we conducted rather extensive hearings. On several occasions, after we thought a determination had been reached as a result of our hearings, we received, at the request of certain Senators, new evidence from witnesses who made a considerable contribution to the consideration of the subject.

In listening to the testimony, it was brought home to me that Congress, when considering amendments to the Constitution, has a great responsibility. We must scrutinize the issue with care and study it more closely than is normally required when considering a change in statute law of the land, which can be altered almost at will.

I remind the Senate that the proposed 25th amendment to the Constitution—which was approved overwhelmingly by Congress and now rests in the hands of several States—was studied carefully for 18 months in an effort to find the best possible solution to the problem of Presidential inability and the filling of a vacancy in the office of Vice President.

When we started to consider this problem, there were almost as many different ideas on how to solve the complicated problem as there were Senators. We spent an entire year developing the consensus. Then we spent half a year refining the language and honing it to such a fine edge that when the issue came to a vote, only 5 Senators and 29 Representatives opposed that proposal, despite its far-reaching significance in our fundamental law.

I mention this only to remind myself, and any other Senator who might need reminding, that the Constitution of the United States is not a document to be tampered with lightly. It is not something that we change, or even seek to change, without most careful consideration, particularly when the question at issue is so obviously charged with political and emotional overtones.

Some Senators were disturbed, I might say even angered, by a ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court that apportionment of State legislatures in order to conform with the Constitution had to be based on substantial equality of population as the controlling factor in both houses.

In their anger, they wanted to change the Constitution so that the States could, if they desired, digress from the population formula in one house of the legislature. This action reminds me of the old but wise saying that "the one thet fust gits mad the most, hollers wrong."

We cannot let emotions or partisan considerations enter into the fundamental law of the land. The best way to prevent this is by taking our time and carefully considering all alternatives, getting outside advice, and then revising, adjusting, and refining it. We debated this subject in committee and then on the floor of the Senate and in the House of Representatives.

As chairman of the subcommittee that studied this subject, I, too, gave it careful thought. When hearings began on March 3, I announced that I counted myself among those who had expressed sympathy with the idea that the States should be permitted to retain reasonable autonomy in the area of apportionment.

I must admit that this decision was based on my deep and enduring belief in the concept of States rights. However, at the same time, I said that, with States rights, must go State responsibilties.

Before becoming a Member of the U.S. Senate, I served for 8 years in the house of representatives of my State legislature. Eight of those years I served as leader of the minority and for two years as speaker of the house.

During most, if not all of those sessions of the legislature, the Indiana Legislature at one time or another considered the matter of apportionment. Therefore, I believe that I view this problem from a State as well as from a National legislative level.

When I speak of the State legislatures, I speak with a sense of closeness, quite frankly, to the men and women who serve long and tireless hours in the 50 State legislatures. Having said this, Mr. President, I submit that in the area of apportionment, many State legislatures long ago abandoned any sense of responsibility. It is my firm belief that the consistent refusal of State legislatures to recognize, even partially, the principle of majority rule brought about the Supreme Court decision that we are now seeking to modify.

I recall standing on the floor of the Indiana House of Representatives and beseeching my colleagues to pass an apportionment measure so we would be able to keep our own ship in shape, and not be faced with a Federal edict to do the same.

The primary case that injected the Supreme Court into the matter of apportionment concerned the State of Tennessee. The State Legislature of Tennessee, with all due respect, had gone 70 years without apportioning its legislative body so that the people of that State could get equitable representation.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] and I engaged in some friendly colloquy the other day, in which I admitted, quite frankly, as I do again at this time for the Record, that I did not view with great anticipation the entry of the Supreme Court of the United States into the field of legislative apportionment. I felt that it was primarily a State responsibility. But the question I asked my friend from Illinois was what should be done when for 70 years, a State legislature—or for 40 years as, I must admit, was the case in Indiana, where we had been violating the Indiana constitution as well as the 14th amendment to the Constitution—a legislative body elected to represent the best interests of the people, refuses, for one reason or another, to guarantee equitable representation to the people. The people certainly cannot appeal to the majority of the legislature, which is controlled by a minority of the people. So it seems that with some reluctance we must admit that the only body which has adequately protected this right is the Supreme Court of the United States. When the State legislative bodies were taking sole jurisdiction in the matter, as a matter of last resort, as a court of last appeal, the Supreme Court entered, I think reluctantly, into the field which had formerly been confined to the jurisdiction of our many State legislative bodies.

Even so, quite frankly, I believed it was wrong to seek to abrogate States rights in this area out of a sense of vengeance. Surely, I told myself some months ago as we opened our committee hearings, there must be some way in which we could permit States to retain a reasonable amount of autonomy in this area without doing injustice to the principle of majority rule; a principle, I might add, that has served this Nation well for nearly two centuries and which, if forced to choose, I greatly prefer to the gross and ill-considered malapportionment that has characterized our State legislatures for the past 40 years.

As we started those hearings, it seemed to me that there were two diametrically opposed philosophies. On the one hand we had the philosophy that a majority should decide each issue. On the other hand we had the equally important philosophy that, even if a majority does decide, there are certain basic rights that belong to a minority which should also be protected. But as I have said to those who have been shocked over the Supreme Court rule, I must admit that I have been equally shocked by the course of action they have taken. Many are sincere and dedicated individuals. All our colleagues in this body who discussed this matter have sought, out of their consciences and hearts and desire, to do good in this area. But I have seen, outside this Chamber, efforts made which are completely illogical. For example, I read an article in which it was suggested that the Chief Justice should be impeached, and others which indicated that it was wrong for the Supreme Court to become involved in controversy. Indeed, history will show that the Supreme Court, ever since its inception, has been involved in controversy. It is because of its willingness to involve itself in controversy that our country has moved ahead much better than it would have otherwise.

The article to which I referred went further to state that readers should write to Members of the House and the Senate—and I shall try to quote as nearly as I can recall—to ask us to do all in our power to vote against this insidious effort to make majority rule the law of the land—as if majority rule was something anti-American.

Majority rule is one of the basic principles of our American way of life. But, as I pointed out in the hearings, I hoped there would be some way to reconcile these two diametrically opposed philosophies. With 99 of my colleagues possessing the wisdom they do, we should all join efforts to reconcile these differences.

On May 18, which was after the bulk of the hearings had been completed and 3 days before the subcommittee completed its hearing, I tried my best to compile the thoughts and facts that had been injected into the hearings. From this effort I attempted to enunciate a formula which I believed then—and which I continue to believe now—would achieve the stipulated goal of reconciling States rights with adequate protection of the majority.

Quite frankly, I am not wedded to the specifics of my original proposal. I do not take any pride in its authorship, because my suggestions were the result of many suggestions that others had made before our committee. But I tried to set certain basic requirements which I thought, as a minimum, should be considered before any attempt was made to provide a variance from the Supreme Court's announced rule.

The distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is a patient, just, and wise man. He made several fundamental changes in his original proposals in an effort to coincide with the thinking of many Members of the Senate concerning safeguards. It is important to note that the changes which he has made have removed many of my objections to his original proposition. The RECORD should show that the junior Senator from Illinois continued to make changes even after the subcommittee had favorably reported his proposals by a vote of 6 to 3. I voted against the proposal because it did not contain one safeguard which I consider most vital to a reconciliation of the principles of States rights and majority rule.

The changes which the Senator from Illinois made, after the measure was passed by the subcommittee, were in no way designed to circumvent the actions of the subcommittee but, rather, I believe, represented his sincere desire to strengthen the measure and to make it a better piece of legislation.

The one item which the Senator from Illinois has not accepted, but which I believe is extremely important and basic, is this: that before a legislature could submit to the people a plan to apportion one house on factors other than substantial equality of population—and the Senator from Illinois, I believe rightly, has tied this down to factors of population, geography and political subdivision—before it could ever seek to put this issue to a referendum of the people, the legislature must itself first be apportioned on the basis of population in both houses.

At one time or another we have all heard the joke, "Have you stopped beating your wife?" This is the kind of question that loses either way it is answered. If we admit we are still beating our wife, we are in trouble, and if we admit we have stopped beating her, we admit that at one time or another we did beat her.

I mention this tired joke because it helps emphasize the point which I should like to make concerning the need to have a legislative body first apportioned completely on the one-man, one-vote basis before it is given the responsibility of submitting a referendum. A legislative body which frames a proposal to be submitted to the people for approval can ofttimes, by the wording in the referendum document itself, determine what the outcome of that referendum will be.

I believe it is only natural to suggest that a legislative body which is malapportioned will be subjected to the most severe temptation to so word the referendum which will be presented to the people, that wise citizens of a State would be inclined to keep in office the malapportioned legislative body.

It seems to me that requiring a legislative body to be first apportioned before it was given the right to digress from the population basis is a reasonable and wise suggestion. First, it recognizes the fundamental principle that people, not trees, or grass, or cows are the most important and overriding factor to be considered in the apportionment of any legislative body.

Although some arguments to the contrary concerning the Supreme Court decisions have been heard, it is still difficult for me—in fact it is impossible—to accept any argument which asserts that people are not the most important factor to be considered in any legislative apportionment scheme.

Second, the proposal I have made recognizes that there may be situations in which a unique problem of geography, communications, accessibility, or others, may dictate that people of a State may be best represented in one house by varying from the principle of substantial equality of population.

The important point to consider is equality of representation of the individual, how each citizen of a State is represented. In one or two States—perhaps more—there was compelling evidence presented that citizens spread out over a mountain range, or citizens in one State living on the far side of the Great Divide who could not be reached by television within the State in which they resided, could not get the same kind of representation which was given to people who live, say in a downtown metropolitan area, who are easily accessible to the legislator, and who have access to communication media within the State.

That is why I thought that perhaps a small bit of leeway should be granted to take this factor into consideration. I am well aware that the substantial equality formula which was laid down by the Supreme Court does not say, in so many words, that the final determination of the issue will be on a strictly one-man, one-vote basis. There are certain dicta in some of the Court decisions to indicate that the Court itself might take into consideration matters of geography, accessibility to communications, and other things to which I have just referred; but these pronouncements by the Court have not been in the findings and are largely dicta, so that the final decision of the Supreme Court has been based on the one-man, one-vote rule.

Third, the suggestion I have made provides that questions of apportionment—within the limits of geography and political subdivisions—would not have to be adjudicated. Each State would have a self-implementing method of apportioning one of its houses on a basis other than population if the legislature and the people of that State so desired.

Finally, the proposal recognizes the reality of the recent Supreme Court decision as the law of the land, which must be obeyed until the 38th State has ratified a contrary proposal which Congress might choose to submit.

Most important of all reasons is this: The Supreme Court has decided. There is no question about the law of the land now being that legislatures should be apportioned on the basis of substantial equality of population, not on the basis of cows, rocks or trees. This is the law of the land. As a lawabiding people, I believe that it is incumbent upon all of us to do everything within our power to see that this law is enforced, and that each State is apportioned in the only manner—which is constitutional—and that is on the basis of substantial equality of population.

Quite frankly, I am somewhat concerned about those who continually seek to thwart, avoid, or delay compliance with the law of the land. I recognize that a judicial decision of the kind handed down by Reynolds against Sims poses real difficulties for many States, and that it is not an easy matter to overturn the practice—however ill-considered—of decades. Nonetheless, it seems somewhat ironic to me that in several States—whose leaders never hesitated to decry and denounce lawlessness and the growing disrespect for law and order in our Nation, we find the same leaders using every trick in the book to avoid obeying the law.

To quote a distinguished Member of our own body, I suppose that consistency is difficult to find and, as he said, it all depends on whose ox is being gored, as to which side of the issue we are going to be on.

Under the plan which I propose, and to which I remain committed, those States which have unique problems would utilize the machinery of the proposed amendment and would apportion one house on the basis of geography and political subdivision as well as on the basis of population.

I submit further that to leave the framing of questions which will appear on a referendum ballot to malapportioned legislatures would virtually assure questions designed to prejudice the outcome. Anyone who has ever served on a State legislature which has framed a referendum question knows what I am talking about. The consideration would not be what is in the best interests of the people of the State, I am afraid, but, rather, it would, in all probability, be merely, "How can I put this question so that I will keep my seat in the legislature?"

Mr. President, let me summarize what I have tried to say.

First, that the legislatures should be apportioned on the basis of one man, one vote; that people are the most important factor to be considered in the apportionment of a State legislature; that people, on the population basis, should be in most cases the sole factor to be considered; but that in some instances other factors and their relationship to people might be considered, if they have a direct bearing on equal representation of the people within a State.

Let me state my personal thoughts on this subject. My position has not been a pleasant one. I have found that some of my very good friends in the Senate, who are diametrically opposed to any leeway whatever, do not share my view that there might well be geographic conditions or communication conditions, or other conditions, which could present a need for a change. On the other hand, other good friends of mine have thought that my proposal goes too far, that it does not provide sufficient leeway.

Mine is a middle-of-the-road course, which, I suppose, is a dangerous one. It reminds me of the story of the man who drove down the middle of the road. As a result, he had all four of his fenders bumped, because those on both sides were against his particular position.

Nevertheless, it seems to me that this is the best position to take, if we are to reconcile the differences which exist in this body and which threaten not only to involve us in precipitate and long debate, but also to tie up very much needed legislation on subjects which are of great importance to our entire Nation.

The distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has alluded to what he terms extraneous pressures which have apparently influenced his inability to acquire the necessary votes in the full Committee on the Judiciary to properly report his proposal to the Senate. No doubt there are certain pressures. This is an issue in which many people are involved. So far as I am personally concerned, I have been visited by a number of groups, some of which have urged me to support this or that proposal, and by other groups, which have urged me to oppose this or that proposal.

To all of these I have told my view. None of them has been completely satisfied. Those who favor the proposal of my friend from Illinois have said that my proposal is too harsh. Those on the other side have said it is too lenient. But no one has threatened me or tried to coerce me.

I oppose the proposal of the minority leader as it now stands because I believe it shows fundamental flaws—flaws which I still hope we shall be able to correct.

That is why I most urgently plead that this proposal be not subjected any further to the ill-considered and hodgepodge approach of premature debate on the floor of the Senate.

Can anyone say that this is not an extremely complex proposal? I do not believe anyone who has read the Supreme Court's decision can say that. Can anyone say that this is not a proposal which requires intricate care in its formulation? Can anyone say that this is a subject which is no less important than any other which we have discussed on the floor of the Senate during the present session? I believe that most of my colleagues agree with my evaluation of the significance of this issue.

Mr. President, it is my opinion that this problem needs further study. Unless our rules and procedures are entirely outmoded, the place for such study is not the floor of the Senate, but in committee. I do not mean to suggest that this further study should be overly long, or that it should be dilatory. I appreciate very much the kind statement that my friend the junior Senator from Illinois has made concerning our desire to explore all facets of the subject. I do not believe that the charge can be made and supported that to date dilatory procedures have been had in the discussion of this very important subject.

However, I am concerned—and I cannot hide my concern—over the effort to circumvent the committee system. I know that I speak as a neophyte on the workings of this great body. I believe the RECORD will show—or perhaps the lack of RECORD will show—that I have not spoken on many occasions on the floor of the Senate in the almost 3 years of my tenure here. I have spoken only when I have felt strongly impelled to do so.

As I said in my colloquy with my distinguished friend from Maryland, anyone who has had occasion to serve in a legislative body, whether in the U.S. Senate, in the House of Representatives, or in one of our State legislatures, learns very quickly that, because of the thousands of subjects which come before a legislative body, it is absolutely impossible for a legislature to proceed to a constructive determination of a substantial issue unless it adheres closely to the committee system.

In this manner we all know that the wheat is separated from the chaff, inconsequential matters are relegated to positions of obscurity, and important questions are studied, closely scrutinized and examined, so that when the committee has acted many hours have been saved. As a result, these subjects need not be discussed as fully on the floor of the legislative body itself as would otherwise be the case. It it were not for a strong committee system, I am sure all of us know that this body could not function at all. Indeed, it is for this reason that some of our colleagues who have seniority and who know so much more about the workings of the Senate than does the junior Senator from Indiana have been the strongest defenders of the committee system and the strongest opponents of past efforts to circumvent it.

I believe it is fair to say that if we did not have a strong committee system, instead of an effective two-body legislative branch, we would have in Congress nothing but chaos and even anarchy.

Quite frankly I believe that the committee system has proved its worth in the way it has handled Senate Joint Resolution 2, which is now sought to be substituted for the American Legion Baseball Week resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 66.

There have been many changes in the Senate joint resolution because of committee deliberations. In the beginning, many Senators who cosponsored the measure, testified in its behalf and, I believe, strongly supported the proposed changes, were somewhat shocked to find that the actual wording of the original resolution would have done things which they would not have supported.

For example, as originally introduced, the measure, in its first sentence, would preclude all Supreme Court review. It would not only remove the power of judicial determination by the Supreme Court in respect to considerations based upon other factors, but it would remove the ability of the Supreme Court to determine apportionment of that body which was supposed to be based on population alone.

Second, reference was made to factors which should be considered in the apportionment of one house of a legislative body. In essence, it said that all or any factors could have been included. There was nothing in that document that would preclude factors such as race, religion and national background, from being used. Quite to the contrary, there would have been some inclination to say that use could be made of the factors of race, religion, and national background in the apportionment of one house of a bicameral legislature.

I am certain the authors, who were at the hearings and testified, would not have included those factors in the apportionment of any legislative body.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] has been in the forefront of the effort to do away with second-class citizenship and discrimination. And yet inadvertently the wording of the proposed amendment would have permitted the inclusion of such factors.

Third, no periodic review was provided in the original plan. In other words, a plan could be adopted, and subsequently, because of population shifts, which are continually going on, the new plan could be completely different than the people had intended it to be 5 or 10 years from now. There were no means to review and let the people have another look at it.

All three of these original shortcomings have been deleted by the diligence of the Senator from Illinois and because of the close scrutiny this subject received in our committee. Supreme Court review now is maintained.

My personal opinion has been that when the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] limited the factors to population, geography, and political subdivisions, he made it abundantly clear that the factors of race, religion, and national origin could not be employed for apportionment purposes.

I believe the present wording would take into consideration the language of the 14th and 15th amendments, which deals specifically with those questions.

In his wisdom, the Senator accepted—indeed he himself proposed—that there be periodic review, so that now any plan which would be suggested and ratified by State referendum must be subject to a periodic review every 10 years, and the people of the State would not be saddled with a plan they could not get rid of, if they so desired.

I compliment the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] for the modifications he has made in his proposed amendment. The amendment is much better now than it was earlier. This is largely the result of the long, close study given this question in the committee system.

Yet, an attempt is now made to circumvent the wishes of the committee which has studied this subject.

Let us make it clear that this is not an issue in which the Committee on the Judiciary has refused the principal architect of this proposal an audience. This is not a proposal which the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments has refused to consider and to mold.

On the contrary, the reason the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois, has resorted to his parliamentary magic to bring the joint resolution to the floor was that he did not wish an audience in the Committee on the Judiciary and he did not have the votes to get his proposal through in the committee. He now seeks to appeal the decision of the committee and bring the question directly to the floor.

I submit that if we are to favor circumventing the committee system, we shall create that first chink—that first weakness—in the committee system.

If we follow the distinguished minority leader's logic, we come to the inevitable conclusion that committees are serviceable only when they approve amendments in the form he proposes them to be considered.

The distinguished senior Senator from Florida brought a similar amendment to the floor of the Senate by a similar tactic. But I submit that that situation was different from the present proposal.

I say to my friend the Senator from Illinois that since he is in the Chamber, I know full well that he is completely within his parliamentary rights.

He is not trying to stress the letter of the law, but rather he is trying to utilize the law to circumvent the committee system, which I think is traditionally as important as the letter of the law.

I point out for the Record very quickly what I believe to be the characteristics which distinguish the present effort from those which have been made before.

First, I shall reiterate what was said earlier to show the present circumstances which prevail and surround the particular instance to do an injustice to the committee system with respect to a question now before the Committee on the Judiciary.

The proposed amendment has been considered and voted out of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments. On two separate occasions it was discussed briefly in the Judiciary Committee for a period not to exceed 2 hours—about an hour on each occasion.

In the last committee meeting, the Senator from Indiana and other members of that committee who share my feeling about the present form of the so-called Dirksen amendment attempted to have the question brought to a vote. We attempted to get a vote on the issue. There was no question that the committee was considering it, and many of us wanted to have it brought to a vote so we could decide the question one way or the other. However, the distinguished author of the measure declined to give us the opportunity to vote on it. I wish to make it crystal clear that we desired to vote on the question. We wanted discussion.

The distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], brought the proposed amendment before the committee. It was there to be discussed.

The other two instances in which the so-called end run of the committee system has been attempted were far different. They dealt with the long-time effort which the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] had made to amend the Constitution to provide once and for all that it would be against the basic law of the land to assess poll taxes in a Federal election.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] was so tenacious in his effort that ultimately he became the father of the 24th amendment to the Constitution, which upon ratification now prohibits poll taxes to be assessed as a qualification for casting a vote in a Federal election.

In the instances which describe or surround the effort of the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] to have the resolution reported by the committee, we find some circumstances much different from those which now exist. I should like to read several paragraphs from the Congressional Record in 1960. At that particular time, the distinguished senior Senator from Florida sought to have his joint resolution (S.J. Res. 126) attached to a measure of Senator Kefauver's which was Senate Joint Resolution 39 and which dealt with the replacement of Members of Congress at a time of national disaster. In making this effort, the Senator from Florida set forth the consideration that had given rise to this particular measure.

I should like to read his own words:

> The Senator from Florida has been offering the amendment to the Constitution relating to poll taxes, which I shall call his amendment, continuously since 1949, or for 11 years. We have had hearings on the matter four times by subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary. The printed records speak eloquently of those hearings on each occasion. Four different printed records are available.
>
> The subcommittees have reported the measures favorably to the full committee. I

> will not say the subcommittees did so in every instance, because my recollection does not go back that far, but I believe they did in every instance, and I am sure they did in this Congress. I believe that has been the case in each Congress.
>
> The time has come when somehow, in some way, this matter should be debated by the Senate as a whole—

I emphasize the next part of the sentence—

> because the Judiciary Committee as a whole has neither approved nor disapproved the proposed amendment to the Constitution. The committee has simply tucked away in the archives the hearings records and the favovable reports of the subcommittees, so that absolutely no action could be taken.

The RECORD will show that the members of the Committee on the Judiciary did not discuss or act on this matter before the committee. It was never brought before the committee.

In 1962, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] sought to have his measure substituted for the Hamilton Memorial resolution, and was successful in doing so. But in that situation, as in other similar situations, the matter had never been discussed or acted upon in committee. His procedure was the only alternative to getting legislative determination.

That is not true in the present case. The Committee on the Judiciary remains ready to vote. To take other means, to prohibit the committee from exercising its power of determination, is, in my estimation, extremely detrimental to the committee system. It is my belief that this particular situation furnishes us with an unusual precedent, because the committee is ready, willing, and able to consider the issue, but the proponent of the measure refuses to permit such consideration.

There have been few more eloquent spokesmen for this point of view than the distinguished minority leader himself. I have already spoken at greater length than is my custom and than was my original intention, but if the Senate will indulge me, I should like to close by quoting the words of the distinguished minority leader, which give more forceful documentation of the need for keeping the committee system strong than can the words of the junior Senator from Indiana.

In a proposal which was before the Senate for consideration on June 2, 1965, an amendment was proposed to the NASA authorization bill by the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, the so-called Long amendment. Before I came to the Chamber, I had about made up my mind to vote for the amendment. One of the telling arguments which changed my mind was the one presented by the distinguished minority leader. I shall close by reading his stirring appeal urging the Senate not to circumvent the committee system:

> The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has advanced the best reason for tabling the amendment. He is chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary which is considering this question * * *. He stated on the floor this afternoon that this subject is under consideration by his subcommittee * * *. In view of the complexities and implications that are involved, either we should tell the McClellan subcommittee that it is useless and worthless and that we do not need it any longer, or we should let it function as it should function, because the Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction of this subject under the rules of the Senate and that responsibility has been delegated to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. He is entitled to an opportunity to examine every implication that is involved before the Senate takes precipitate action in this field * * *. Mr. President, I would be the last to * * * (put) something on the statute books which may be sumptuary and done in haste. The pending amendment has not been considered by Senator McCLELLAN's committee. Are we going to be so foolish this afternoon, in the face of an emotional argument, as to * * * adopt that amendment. That is the reason I hope the motion to table will be sustained—and it should be sustained. The world will not fall, the United States will not quake, the Treasury will not be despoiled, the country will not be robbed blind, until JOHN McCLELLAN can come back to the Senate with a bill which has had careful and reasoned consideration in his committee—a committee which has been assigned to the responsibility.

So my friend, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, a man for whom I have the utmost respect, has, in my estimation, given the most forceful argument in opposition to the position which he takes today. I hope that during the debate he will reconsider the effort to circumvent the Committee on the Judiciary, so that the committee may continue with its deliberations.

In the final analysis, I hope the Senator from Illinois will consider agreeing to one additional change in his amendment, which I feel is highly important and which would offer the Senate the opportunity to provide some leeway with respect to the Supreme Court decision and yet do something to correct the terrible malapportionment of most of the State legislative bodies.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAYH. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, as the Senator from Indiana well knows, this discussion came about as a result of a motion to substitute another measure for Senate Joint Resolution 66. The purpose of the joint resolution that is really the business before the Senate is to authorize and request the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the period from August 31 through September 6, 1965, as National American Legion Baseball Week.

I know of the great personal interest of the Senator from Indiana in sports and baseball. I well remember, a year or perhaps 2 years ago, when the Senator from Indiana led the Senate baseball team against the House baseball team at the baseball stadium here. I remember that the Senator from Indiana had a batting average of 1.000, including three home runs and a double or a triple.

In view of the great interest of the Senator from Indiana in baseball, if the Senator from Illinois would withdraw his motion to substitute, would the Senator from Indiana not be very happy to proceed with the business at hand and support the resolution to have the President proclaim and designate a National American Legion Baseball Week?

Mr. BAYH. The Senator from Maryland is, of course, completely accurate and correct in assessing my feelings concerning a National American Legion Baseball Week.

I say, in deference to the Senator, that I believe he is a bit more correct in assessing my feelings about a National American Legion Baseball Week than he is in reciting my prowess on the baseball diamond. Nevertheless, I am grateful for the complimentary manner in which the Senator described my ability.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, after the Senate acted favorably on Senate Joint Resolution 66, as I am sure it would, would the Committee on the Judiciary proceed to give the Senator from Illinois all the time he wanted in which to present his case to the committee, and then act upon the resolution if he wanted it acted upon?

Mr. BAYH. The Senator is correct. We must be very careful, as the Senator from Illinois said—and I do not quote him verbatim—that we do not cloak ourselves in the literal letter of the law and the rules and overlook the practicalities. The subject has been discussed for less than 2 hours. We have hardly had time in which to make a final determination that this committee will not eventually perhaps yield to the wishes of the Senator from Illinois.

It is a dangerous precedent that is being proposed, and I believe some of our wiser and more learned and experienced colleagues must believe this more strongly than do I. Every time a committee did not report a measure that is desired by a Senator, that Senator, whoever he might be, would be permitted to bring that subject to the floor of the Senate and appeal to the Senate in an effort to reverse the decision of the committee. We would be bogged down in disputes like this that would seriously jeopardize and hamper the normal legislative process.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, has there been any attempt in the Committee on the Judiciary to prevent the Senator from Illinois from presenting his case adequately?

Mr. BAYH. Quite to the contrary. The Senator from Illinois is the only one who has discussed the subject in any way.

The Senator from Illinois had the floor from the time the subject was first brought up. He did not yield the floor—particularly he did not yield the floor to let the committee vote on the matter.

There have been no dilatory tactics. The Senator from Illinois has been very fair and very frank in his usual candid manner. He has admitted that there have been no dilatory tactics, that it is merely a matter of who has the votes. At present, neither side has the votes.

I believe that a head count by the Senator from Illinois shows that, if all Members were present—as we speculate, never knowing for certain—the vote would be 8 to 8.

I note that the distinguished senior Senator from New York, who has been a member of the committee, is present in the Chamber. He was present when the last committee meeting was held. The senior Senator from New York could speak, as could the junior Senator from Maryland, on the committee attendance.

The Senator from Illinois, in our colloquy last week, referred to the fact that two or three members of the committee were absent and that, for that reason, he would have been defeated if he had brought the matter to a vote before the committee.

As I tried to tell the Senator then, I do not believe that it is the responsibility of the distinguished minority leader to guarantee the attendance at every session of the committee of the proponents of a given piece of legislation. Indeed, it is the responsibiltiy of the committee members to be there when the subject is discussed. Their absence would be no reason for taking the measure from the committee and bringing it to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I commend my distinguished friend from Indiana for his careful, studious, and well-prepared presentation of his argument, both on the structure of the Senate and the use of our committee system, and also on the merits and demerits of the issue before the Senate.

The words of the Senator were clear and convincing. I am highly pleased that he had an opportunity today to present his opinion on this issue which is of great importance to the Senate and to the people of the Nation.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for his learned presentation earlier, and also for his kind remarks concerning the junior Senator from Indiana.

I approach this particular position in which I find myself with a great deal of hesitation, because, as a relatively young Member, from the standpoint of seniority, I feel reluctant to talk about the traditions of the Senate and the committee system.

It seems to me that many other Senators are eminently better qualified than I. I do not relish the position of opposing such a distinguished legislator and such a learned colleague as my friend the Senator from Illinois.

I feel that this particular course leaves me no other alternative. It is up to those of us who feel strongly about such an important matter to present the logic of the situation in as nonpassionate, unemotional, and logical a way as possible.

I have tried in my feeble fashion to do that. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Maryland and his contribution earlier.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAYH. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to state that, during the entire period of the hearings on this important and controversial constitutional amendment, that the distinguished Senator from Indiana was not only fair, but also highly objective.

He would frequently act as a kind of devil's advocate with every witness. He would try to draw out the strong points. He would try to learn what the weaknesses were. He would try to learn what the advantages were. He would try to develop the record. The transcript of the hearings conducted by the distinguished Senator from Indiana show to any fair and objective individual that the hearing itself was a very fine one. The distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments and Bylaws went to a great deal of trouble to bring witnesses to the hearings from distant States, as far away as Idaho and Utah.

I recall that in one case a young professor could not afford the plane fare. The distinguished Senator from Indiana managed to get the young professor here so that he could present his point of view.

I believe that the Senator should be commended. His actions were in the highest and best traditions of the manner in which Congress deliberates.

Today we have the most important and most serious constitutional amendment to be considered by this body at least since the period immediately after the Civil War. To attempt to tack it onto a resolution involving American Legion baseball is almost a mockery of our committee system and the way this great body deliberates, particularly so because of the way that the Senator from Indiana handled the hearings.

He and I differed in many areas, frequently on amendments and positions, but I respect the objectivity and fairness with which the Senator handled the hearings. The results speak for themselves.

I commend him for the record and to let the country know what an outstanding job he did as chairman of the subcommittee in considering this vital question.

Mr. BAYH. I thank the Senator. During the course of the hearings, there was no one who was a more regular attender and no one who did a better job on his homework or no one who displayed within those hearings day after day a more vivid interest in the whole subject than the Senator from Maryland. He was there to discuss and debate the matter at all times. I appreciate his help in the conducting of the hearings. I reiterate that the people of Maryland can be particularly proud of their two Senators. They can sleep easier knowing that they have at the gates such sentinels watching the legislation as it comes up for consideration.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE RESPONSIBILITY IN THE CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, one of the blessings of our free society is the availability to the President and to the Department of State of a great deal of free and unsolicited advice on foreign policy. This counsel comes in abundance from Congress, from the press, from private individuals and organizations, and from foreign nations. One gets the impression at times that high officials in the executive branch feel that they are getting more guidance than they want or need, but there is nothing very disturbing about that—it may in fact be all to the good.

It is disturbing, however—very disturbing indeed and very mischievous—when private groups or businesses or individuals take it on themselves, by act or omission, to alter or dictate or defeat official policies of the U.S. Government directly and not through our duly constituted governmental agencies such as the Congress. This amateur policymaking—or policy-breaking—can be accomplished by almost any group or organization endowed with the conviction that it knows more about some aspect of foreign policy than anybody else and with the will to intimidate officials or other organizations that are not very hard to intimidate. It has been done by business interests seeking a competitive advantage, by organized labor, and by those sterling patriots whose self-designated task it is to keep the rest of us in line, loyal and true to the red, white, and blue.

Power, as we know, hastens to fill a vacuum. When official Government policies are defeated by private pressure groups, it is hard to avoid the suspicion of a lack of energy and conviction on the part of Government officials. In some instances one even suspects tacit cooperation in the task of policy-breaking between private interests and officials who are not in sympathy with the President's policies.

In a free society the actions of private citizens and organizations have important effects on the country's foreign policy and on the national interest. Business and trade, for example, are of the greatest importance for the Nation's political objectives abroad. A large company engaged in international business has a national responsibility; its transactions, though legally private, may have major consequences for public policy. The Government, in turn, has the responsibility to assist and encourage foreign business activities which are considered to be in the national interest and to support private parties engaged in such activities when they encounter difficulties at home or abroad; it is dishonest, disingenuous, and irresponsible for Government officials to disavow previously encouraged private activities that run into difficulties on the ground that they are, after all, private matters.

If our Government has not always honored its responsibilities in connection with the foreign business activities of private organizations, it has at least acknowledged them. In a statement to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on March 13, 1964, Secretary of State Rusk said:

> The use of trade with Communist countries for national purposes is a matter for national decisions. The volunteer efforts of individuals or organizations to impose their private notions on our overall trade policy can only frustrate the effective use of this essential national instrument.

A recent striking example of this sort of thing was the fiasco involving the termination of negotiations between the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. and the Government of Rumania for the design and engineering of two synthetic rubber plants in that country.

The background of the situation and the sequence of events connected with it are as follows:

For several years the Rumanian Government has been seeking improved relations with the United States and other Western countres while at the same time lessening its economic and political dependence on the Soviet Union. The Rumanians have openly defied the Russians in refusing to subordinate their economy to the requirements of a Soviet-sponsored program for joint economic development of the Soviet bloc countries. In pursuit of its independent national plans Rumania has sought, at considerable risk, to increase its economic ties with the West.

Rumanian independence has been expressed in political and cultural as well as economic policy. The Rumanian Government, for example, has granted amnesty to many political prisoners, has ceased jamming radio broadcasts by the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe, and has adopted procedures designed to encourage Western tourist travel in Rumania. Rumania has demonstrated its interest in improving relations with the United States by participating since 1961 in an expanding program of exchange of persons. In addition, the Rumanian Government has settled more than 200 consular cases involving U.S. interests by allowing residents of Rumanian to emigrate to the United States.

It is the established policy of the United States Government, adopted with care and caution and deliberation, to pursue a policy of building bridges to the East. The essence of that policy is the improvement of relations, on a highly discriminating basis, with those Communist countries which demonstrate relative degrees of national independence, which abstain from hostile activities against non-Communist countries, and which show a willingness to enter into cordial, businesslike, and responsible relations with non-Communist countries.

This policy is a proven success. Over recent years a number of Eastern European countries have become steadily more independent of the Soviet Union and have entered into increasingly friendly relations with the United States. Indeed, it may be said that Eastern Europe is one of the few areas of the world, perhaps the only one, where American prestige is rising rather than declining.

As part of this policy of building bridges the United States agreed last year to a Rumanian proposal for talks between the two countries on trade and other matters. Discussions were held with a Rumanian delegation in Washington from May 18 to June 1, 1964. At the end of the talks a joint communique was issued setting forth certain specific agreements between the two countries. The United States agreed to establish a general export licensing procedure under which most commodities may be exported to Rumania without the necessity for individual export licenses. This means in effect that various kinds of industrial equipment which are considered to be nonstrategic may be exported to Rumania by American businessmen without first being licensed individually by the Department of Commerce.

In addition, the United States agreed to grant export licenses for a number of particular industrial facilities in the fields of chemicals, petrochemicals, electric power, the production and processing of petroleum, and glass manufacturing. Included in the petrochemical sector were two synthetic rubber plants. The joint communique further expressed the desire of the two countries to expand mutual trade promotion activities and to expand existing educational and cultural exchanges. In addition, it was agreed that the diplomatic missions in Washington and Bucharest would be elevated from Legations to Embassies.

The United States was not prepared to extend long-term credits to Rumania. President Johnson, however, in compliance with title III of the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1964, advised the Congress on June 16, 1964, that he judged it to be in the national interest for the Export-Import Bank to issue guarantees of private credits extended in connection with the sale of American goods and services to Rumania. These guarantees are limited to sales on short- and medium-term credits.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the joint communique of June 1, 1964, on the United States-Rumanian talks printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint communique was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT COMMUNIQUE ON UNITED STATES-RUMANIAN TALKS, MAY 18–JUNE 1, 1964

Representatives of the Governments of the United States of America and of the Rumanian People's Republic met in Washington from May 18 to June 1, 1964, to discuss matters of common interest, particularly economic and trade matters. The Rumanian delegation was headed by Gheorghe Gaston-Marin, Vice Chairman of the Council of Ministers and Chairman of the State Planning Committee. The U.S. delegation was headed by W. Averell Harriman, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

In the course of the negotiations, the two delegations noted the improvement in the relations between the two countries following the agreement of March 30, 1960, which provided for the reciprocal settlement of claims and other financial questions. They noted in particular the mutually beneficial results of the increased cultural, educational, scientific, and other exchanges between the two countries in the past several years.

The representatives of the two Governments agreed that further steps should be taken to carry forward the improvement in mutual relations. To this end they reached the following understandings:

1. The U.S. Government agreed to establish a general license procedure under which most commodities may be exported to Rumania without the necessity for individual export license. In addition the U.S. Government agreed to grant licenses for a number of particular industrial facilities in which the Rumanian delegation expressed special interest.

The Government of the Rumanian People's Republic agreed to authorize enterprises and institutes in Rumania to sell or license Rumanian technology to U.S. firms.

The two Governments agreed that products, designs, and technology exported to Rumania from the United States would not be transshipped or re-exported without the prior consent of the U.S. Government. They agreed further that contracts between U.S. firms and Rumanian state enterprises for imports from Rumania could provide for limitations or re-export or transshipments without prior consent of the Rumanian supplier. The two Governments will mutually facilitate the exchange of information on the use and disposition of products, designs, and technology exported from one country to the other.

2. The two Governments also agreed on arrangements for the mutual protection of industrial property rights and processes. It was agreed that commercial contracts between U.S. firms and Rumanian state enterprises could provide for the settlement of commercial differences and disputes by arbitration in third countries or by appropriate international tribunals, as agreed by the parties to the contracts.

3. The two Governments further agreed to consult, at the request of either party, about any other problems that might arise as the trade between the two countries grows.

4. In order to promote trade between Rumania and the United States, the representatives of the Rumanian Government expressed their desire to expand the activity of the New York Trade Office of the Rumanian Mission in the United States. The U.S. delegation discussed plans for setting up in Bucharest a trade promotion office of the U.S. mission in Rumania. It was also understood that tourist promotion offices could be established in the two countries.

5. Both governments agreed to facilitate the entry, travel, and work of the representatives of firms and enterprises, and of trade missions. They also agreed to facilitate the exchange of trade exhibits and the publication of trade promotion materials.

6. Both delegations recognized that the development of significant and durable trade relations between the two countries requires the promotion of trade in both directions.

The Rumanian delegation emphasized that Rumanian products cannot compete on an equal basis in the U.S. market under the tariff treatment accorded such products. It stated that this factor could limit the expansion of trade between the two countries. The U.S. delegation took note of this concern, and explained the applicable provisions of U.S. law. The two delegations agreed to give continuing consideration to means of increasing trade between the United States and Rumania.

7. The two delegations noted the forward steps that had been taken in consular matters, and on behalf of their Governments agreed that further measures would be taken to facilitate the mutual settlement of consular problems. In the interest of further improvement of consular relations, they agreed that representatives of the two Governments would meet in Washington in September 1964 to negotiate a new consular convention between the two countries.

8. The delegations stated the intention of the two Governments to expand the existing program of cultural, educational, scientific, and other exchanges between the United States and Rumania.

9. The Governments of the United States of America and of the Rumanian People's Republic today raised the level of their diplomatic missions in Washington and Bucharest from Legations to Embassies. Ambassadors will be exchanged at an early date.

At the conclusion of the meetings, Under Secretary Harriman and Vice Chairman Gaston-Marin expressed the hope on behalf of their Governments that progress in carrying out the understandings reached would furnish the basis for a further broadening and improvement in the relations between the United States and Rumania.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Rumanian Government attached particular importance to the willingness of the United States to issue export licenses for the construction of two synthetic rubber plants in Rumania. The Rumanians are undertaking to strengthen their economic independence of the Soviet bloc by broadening their industrial base with advanced industrial equipment. The major foundation of Rumanian industry is petroleum and the two projected rubber plants were to have an important part in expanding the country's petrochemical industry. Rumanian officials stressed the importance of the two plants to their economic development—and, therefore, to their growing independence of the Soviet bloc. It is clear that the agreement to allow the sale of two synthetic rubber plants was not a marginal or incidental arrangement in relations between the United States and Rumania. According to the Department of State, the ability of Rumania to purchase the two plants from the United States became a fundamental element in our new policy toward that country.

With the encouragement of the U.S. Government, a number of American firms discussed the possible sale of rubber plants with the Rumanians. After extensive negotiations, a preliminary contract was initialed between the Rumanian Government and the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.

In the months that followed Firestone found itself subjected to unusual competitive pressures and to a nuisance boycott campaign conducted by an extremist political organization. In April 1965 Firestone issued the following cryptic statement:

> The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. has terminated negotiations for a contract to design and equip a synthetic rubber plant in Rumania.

Prior to issuing this public statement, Firestone executives conferred with Department of State officials on April 16 in order to advise the Department of the company's intention to terminate the Rumanian negotiations because of the unexpected extent and intensity of competitive pressures and because of the rightwing agitation against Firestone's proposed transaction with Rumania. The events leading up to the abrupt termination of the negotiations are a case study in the defeat of an important and carefully considered policy of the U.S. Government by irresponsible private interests, aided and abetted by the failure of Government officials actively to support the President's established policy.

It is not necessary to review in detail the events leading to the rupture of negotiations. The irresponsible role of rightwing extremists was discussed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] in an admirable address to the Senate on May 17. Further information and details were set forth in an article which was published in the Washington Evening Star on May 8, entitled "Firm Facing Boycott Drops Rumania Deal." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article, written by Bernard Gwertzman, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES EMBARRASSED: FIRM, FACING BOYCOTT, DROPS RUMANIA DEAL

(By Bernard Gwertzman)

Faced with the threat of a boycott campaign by a conservative organization, the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. recently halted negotiations to sell Communist Rumania a $50 million synthetic rubber plant even though the deal had the official approval of the U.S. Government and the personal blessing of President Johnson.

Because Firestone ended the talks only a few weeks before the final contract was to be signed, it was a blow to Rumania's planned economy, and a severe embarrassment to the State Department.

The aborted deal and the boycott threat have received little public attention because none of the interested parties—Firestone, Rumania, or the State Department—has wanted to say much about it.

However, from information on the public record and from confidential disclosures by diplomatic and rubber industry sources, it was learned that the conservative Young Americans for Freedom, almost singlehandedly caused giant Firestone, the Nation's second largest rubber manufacturer, to drop the deal.

The incident demonstrates anew that trade with Communist countries is a major political problem for many U.S. firms, even when such deals have the encouragement and approval of the U.S. Government.

It also points up why President Johnson's special committee on East-West trade said yesterday in urging more such trade, that the U.S. Government "should act to remove any stigma from trade with Communist countries where such trade is determined to be in the national interest."

The Firestone story began on June 1 last year when the United States and Rumania signed a joint communique to improve relations between the two countries. The talks were initiated because the administration's experts believed that Rumania, although an ally of Russia, was charting a more independent course in foreign affairs, part of which was an increased trade with the West.

COMMUNIQUE PAVED WAY

The communique paved the way for Rumania to purchase a synthetic rubber plant from any American company that would sell to it.

For years, Rumania had sought to buy such an industrial plant. A major oil producer, Rumania knew that synthetic rubber is a convenient and profitable byproduct of petroleum. Rumania officials, as long ago as 1960, had offered to spend more than $100 million to buy such plants in this country.

For a long time, the Defense Department argued against selling the Rumanians such an advanced technology, but finally, because such technologies are now widely available in Europe, and because Rumania was no longer a close ally of Russia, the Pentagon agreed with the State and Commerce Departments that such a sale would be in the national interest.

It was argued that the sale would encourage Rumania to go further in its independent course.

RUMANIAN EXPERTS VISIT

Soon afterward, top Rumanian experts toured many American firms, including Goodyear, the Nation's biggest rubber manufacturer, and Firestone.

In late November, Rumania and Firestone entered into final negotiations for a $50 million plant.

Both Rumania and Firestone claim experts from Bucharest chose the Firestone process, and that Goodyear, in addition, had certain legal problems involving its process that made it almost impossible to sell to the Rumanians.

Goodyear, however, said it was offered the Rumanian contract, but rejected it as not in the U.S. national interest.

On December 3, in fact, the "Wingfoot Clan," Goodyear's house organ, published an editorial saying that "even to a dedicated profitmaking organization, some things are more important than dollars. Take the best interests of the United States and the free world, for example. You can't put a price tag on freedom."

LISTED SEVERAL REASONS

The editorial went on to list several reasons why Goodyear turned down the Rumanian contract. It said that Goodyear "stood firmly on the side of freedom, as a foe of aggression * * * even though the company stood to lose financially."

Some conservative organs began contrasting Goodyear's "patriotic" refusal to sell, with Firestone's obvious willingness. They did not mention that last summer President Johnson determined it was in the national interest of the United States to sell the plant, and authorized the Export-Import Bank to grant normal 5-year credit guarantees for industrial sales to Rumania.

The conservative criticisms began to pick up in February, after the escalation of the Vietnam war. It was the Young Americans for Freedom, a college-age conservative organization which claims 25,000 members, that led the anti-Firestone campaign.

OUTLETS PICKETED

David R. Jones, the national director of the YAF, which has its headquarters at 514 C Street NE., said his group became involved when local chapters in Philadelphia, Brooklyn, and Providence began picketing Firestone outlets.

The YAF people handed out flyers which said:

"In South Vietnam, Americans are being killed daily by Communist bullets. It would be disastrous for American companies to supply the atheistic Communist governments with valuable materials, especially rubber, which the Reds must have to wage their war on free nations.

"In the past month, Communist Rumania shipped 500 heavy-duty trucks of military value to Red China, the principal supplier of the North Vietnam Communists.

"The synthetic rubber plant which Firestone plans to build in Communist Rumania parallels the steel which the United States sold to Japan prior to World War II. America got that steel back—at Pearl Harbor. No nation can wage war without large quantities of synthetic rubber."

QUOTES GOODYEAR ORGAN

After quoting Goodyear's house organ, the flyer said "Firestone's plans to build a synthetic rubber plant in Communist Rumania can only strengthen the Communists and throw away American jobs."

It urged people to protest to Firestone in Akron, Ohio.

The chairman of the Bay Ridge, Brooklyn, chapter of YAF, Thomas F. Harrison, was quoted in the organization organ as saying that a petition drive to get signatures to stop the Firestone deal "is an opportunity for everyone to do something positive in support of an anti-Communist policy; Goodyear deserves the praise and encouragement of all freedom-loving Americans."

The campaign apparently caught Firestone officials off guard. Many franchised dealers whose concern is strictly with selling tires asked Firestone to get the conservatives off their back, since they were losing business to Goodyear.

Firestone sent its Eastern region public relations man, Bernard Frazier, to speak to YAF leaders in different cities. Frazier was described by those who listened to him as a sincere individual who believed Firestone was acting in the national interest by "building bridges" to Eastern Europe, as President Johnson has urged.

Firestone also spread the word that some Rumanian trucks and tractors, photographed in Red China had Goodyear tires on them, and that Goodyear, with Commerce Department approval, had been selling synthetic rubber (but not plants) to Rumania.

Goodyear had denied it knowingly sold such tires to Red China, and says Peiping might have purchased them somewhere on the black market.

The Firestone publicity campaign, deliberately handled in a low key, failed to sway YAF. Even appeals by Firestone to certain conservative Senators and Representatives failed to halt the YAF activity.

Jones says it is very possible Firestone decided to call off the deal with the Rumanians when it learned of the YAF's plans to set up a "Committee Against Slave Labor" office in Indianapolis the week before the Memorial Day, Indianapolis 500 auto race.

YAF planned to mount a massive publicity campaign urging a boycott of Firestone tires which it was hoped would ruin Firestone's normal promotional activities at that time.

Jones says plans were made to hire airplanes to fly over the track with streamers against Firestone.

"A top Firestone executive heard about this on April 18," Jones said. "Two days later the deal was off."

All Firestone said publicly was the following:

"The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. has terminated negotiations for a contract to design and equip a synthetic rubber plant in Rumania."

UNITED STATES INFORMED EARLIER

The State Department was told about the collapse of the negotiations about 2 days before it was publicly announced. This was about the same time Rumania heard about it.

On April 19, Under Secretary of State George W. Ball called in Rumanian Ambassador Petre Balaceanu to repeat that the U.S. Government still approved sale of the synthetic rubber plant, and had nothing to do with Firestone's decision.

Because of great State Department sensitivity over the issue, Ball's meeting with Balaceanu was not announced to the press. The State Department did not want to appear as having a direct interest in the Firestone-Rumania deal, since it already had been attacked by conservative groups for "ordering" Firestone to sell to the Communists.

Originally organized 4 years ago, YAF worked on behalf of defeated Republican presidential candidate Barry Goldwater.

Recently, YAF members picketed the White House in support of Johnson's Vietnam policies—one of the few student groups in favor of the escalation of the war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there would seem to be three main reasons why Firestone felt constrained to terminate the negotiations with Rumania: first, the nuisance activities of a minor vigilante group; second, and undoubtedly more important, the pressure of a major Firestone competitor; third, the curious reluctance of the U.S. Government to give the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. strong support against these pressures.

The contribution of the organization which calls itself Young Americans for Freedom is clearly illustrated by the handbills and other little statements issued by these youngsters. For the most part, these statements contain the familiar fulminations of the radical right along with dark hints of immorality and worse on the part of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. Perhaps the most interesting part of these little handbills is the fulsome praise heaped upon Firestone's competitor, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that four examples of the propaganda issued by the group which calls itself Young Americans for Freedom be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRESTONE TO BUILD SYNTHETIC RUBBER PLANT IN COMMUNIST RUMANIA

(Handbill given to passing cars and pedestrians)

We are at war with the Communists. In South Vietnam, Americans are being killed daily by Communist bullets. It would be disastrous for American companies to supply the atheistic Communist governments with valuable materials, especially rubber, which the Reds must have to wage their war on free nations.

In the past month, Communist Rumania shipped 500 heavy-duty trucks of military value to Red China, the principal supplier of the North Viet Communists.

The Reds must have rubber to wage war. The synthetic rubber plant which Firestone plans to build in Communist Rumania parallels the steel which the United States sold to Japan prior to World War II. America got the steel back—at Pearl Harbor. No nation can wage war without large quantities of synthetic rubber.

Goodyear refuses to trade with the Communists. Among the companies which refuse to trade with Communist governments are Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Standard Oil of New Jersey, and the Du Pont Co. of Delaware.

A Goodyear statement tells us: "Even to a dedicated profitmaking organization, some things are more important than dollars. Take the best interests of the United States and the free world for example. You cannot put a price tag on freedom."

What you can do. Firestone's plans to build a synthetic rubber plant in Communist Rumania can only strengthen the Communists and throw away American jobs. Express your opinion by writing Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., 1245 Firestone Parkway, Akron, Ohio.

Time is short. Write today before you lose the address.

Distributed by the Philadelphia County Chapter of the Young Americans for Freedom. For information on YAF, a nationwide conservative organization, write Young Americans for Freedom, 3511 Baring Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

SAMPLE PRESS RELEASE

The Philadelphia County chapter of Young Americans for Freedom will stage, for the second week in succession, a protest demonstration on Saturday, March 27, from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m., before the offices of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. at 32d and Market Streets and from 1:30 p.m. to 3 p.m. before the offices at Wayne and Chelten Avenues.

The purpose of the protest is to alert the American public to negotiations for construction of a Firestone synthetic rubber plant in Communist Rumania. The demonstration will mark the start of a series of statewide and nationwide protest actions against Firestone.

Young Americans for Freedom, a nationwide conservative political action organization, contends that the Firestone-Communist Rumania agreement threatens the national security of the United States. YAF maintains this position for these reasons: (1) No nation can wage a protracted war without access to large quantities of synthetic rubber; (2) the agreement between Firestone and Communist Rumania will give the Communists this access; (3) American fighting men are being killed in Vietnam by weapons provided by Red China; (4) last month, Communist Rumania shipped 500 heavy-duty trucks of obvious military value to Red China.

Philadelphia County chapter of Young Americans for Freedom urges Americans to send letters of protest to Firestone, the address being: Office of the President, Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., 1245 Firestone Parkway, Akron, Ohio.

PHILADELPHIA COUNTY
YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 5, 1965.

FELLOW CHAIRMAN: On behalf of my group I am asking all the chapters across the country to join us in a national protest. The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. is planning to build a synthetic rubber plant in Communist Rumania.

To date Philadelphia County YAF has held consecutive demonstrations on March 20 and 27. We will continue until we have alerted the American consumer of these proposed dangers to the American defense and economy.

Our first demonstration received immediate response from the Firestone Co. To date they still intend to go through with their plans.

It is up to YAF members from coast to coast to organize these protests and voice our dissent. Please join with us. Arrange for your chapter to picket local Firestone stores. Distribute handbills urging the public to write the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. and local newspapers expressing their disapproval of this action.

The actuation and continuation of these demonstrations by you is vital in this nationwide effort.

Conservatively,
JOHN D. LAMOTHE,
Chairman.

YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM,
HERBERT C. HOOVER CHAPTER,
Providence, R.I.

Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. is planning to build a synthetic rubber plant in Rumania.

Synthetic rubber is an essential to wage war. Rumania is supplying Red China, principal supplier of the North Vietnamese, with heavy-duty trucks. Heavy-duty trucks, capable of locomotion (need: synthetic rubber), are used for transporting manpower and supplies to key areas in Vietnam, thwarting the American effort. Result: American casualties and key areas heavily damaged or lost to the Vietcong.

Goodyear refused the above agreement, and issued the following statement: "Even to a dedicated profitmaking organization, some things are more important than dollars. Take the best interest of the United States and the free world for example. You cannot put a price tag on freedom."

Our chapter protests the agreement (Firestone-Rumania) and urge the people of Rhode Island to express their opinion by writing to: Office of the President, Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., 1245 Firestone Parkway, Akron, Ohio.

Firestone's agreement threatens the security of the United States. The time is short. Write today.

JOSEPH WASSERMAN,
Chairman.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Goodyear Company at first, showed an apparent interest of its own in the possibility of doing business with Rumania; I am informed by a reliable source outside the Government that Goodyear obtained an export license to export synthetic rubber to Rumania some time after the authorization of such licenses by the Government in June 1964. Then, for reasons which are not entirely clear, Goodyear suddenly "got religion" and grandly refused to traffic with the Red heathen.

Having defeated temptation, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., for reasons no doubt of pure idealism, decided to publicize its profit-sacrificing patriotism. The Goodyear house organ, the Wingfoot Clan, on December 3, 1964, expressed the cloying sentiment that—

> Even to a dedicated profit-making organization, some things are more important than dollars. Take the best interests of the United States and the free world, for example. You can't put a price tag on freedom.

Who can argue with this? But so profound is Goodyear's patriotism that it was not satisfied with mere patriotic generalizations. No indeed, Goodyear was willing to make financial sacrifices in the fight against aggression. Standing resolute against Firestone's greed and the shocking lack of patriotism of the President and the Department of State, Goodyear acted on its own superior knowledge of foreign policy by proclaiming its refusal to do business with Communist Rumania and further proclaiming that Goodyear had "elected not to seek the business." The article in the Wingfoot Clan does not mention that Goodyear had obtained an export license for the shipment of synthetic rubber to Rumania and was therefore obviously interested in seeking some kind of business with that country.

Happily, as the article in the Wingfoot Clan points out, virtue does not go unrewarded. The Goodyear position was warmly applauded by one of the Nation's great newspapers, the New York Daily News, in an editorial eloquently entitled "10 Cents From Russia, Maybe," and, as already mentioned, Goodyear also received high praise from the Young Americans for Freedom.

Even this was not the end of heaven's bounty to Goodyear for refusing to traffic with the enemy. Says the article in the Wingfoot Clan:

> As a matter of fact, there is every indication that in addition to the warmth that this decision brings, Goodyear may benefit from a sales standpoint—a benefit that couldn't have been further from the company's mind when the decision was made not to sell to Rumania.

Perish the thought.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article from the Wingfoot Clan, dated December 3, 1964, entitled "An Order Goodyear Didn't Take."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ORDER GOODYEAR DIDN'T TAKE

Even to a dedicated profitmaking organization, some things are more important than dollars. Take the best interests of the United States and the free world, for example. You can't put a price tag on freedom.

And when you believe in something you may be called upon to back up your belief with action. That goes for a company such as Goodyear, just as it does an individual.

Recently, Goodyear did just that—it stood firmly on the side of freedom, as a foe of aggression. Goodyear did this even though the company stood to lose financially.

The company's refusal to sell a modern synthetic rubber plant to Communist Rumania has made news throughout the Nation.

The Associated Press and United Press International duly reported Goodyear's decision and their stories appeared in hundreds of newspapers from coast to coast. The widely based Scripps-Howard Newspapers carried the story at length.

Goodyear elected not to seek the business—which could amount to some $50 million—even though the State Department had sanctioned such traffic with Rumania. This in itself was something of a paradox, as one newspaper writer observed:

"In this case of East-West trade, the position of the Government and a big corporation are the reverse of a traditional pattern. Usually, business is pictured as favoring such sales to bolster profits and the Government as opposed on grounds of not bolstering a Communist economy."

At this point we'd like to take a moment to express the State Department's point of view. The Government is said to believe that the creation of greater economic ties between the United States and Rumania will encourage the Rumanians to be still more independent of the Soviet Union. This certainly is a consideration and one that is based on a sincere belief.

However, Goodyear feels that the dangers far outweigh the possible benefits in the proposed deal. For that reason Goodyear has no intention of being a party to it.

Why is Goodyear so opposed to the transaction?

Because we foresee the knowledge that Rumania seeks to purchase from the United States in the potential role of an international agitator, we don't believe that the United States should allow any Communist nation to acquire the know-how to produce a synthetic rubber which competes head-on with natural rubber.

And that's what Natsyn—Goodyear's polyisoprene—does. As you know, Natsyn is an exact duplication of natural rubber, offering natural's many desirable qualities that have eluded duplication in all other manmade rubbers.

While synthetic and natural rubber are now competitively priced, Goodyear believes the Communists could—if they wished—disrupt natural rubber markets in Malaysia, Liberia and other so-called underdeveloped countries. The Communists are not governed by marketing conditions in setting their prices and in the past have, in fact, used cut-rate prices as an economic club.

The State Department, in commenting on the situation, has said that the Rumanians have assured the United States that they won't divulge the polyisoprene secrets they purchase from us to other Communist nations. With due respect for the State Departments belief in the Rumanians' promise, Goodyear would prefer not to entrust its production secrets to the Communists.

What's to keep the Rumanians from passing techniques developed in the Goodyear Research Laboratory on Goodyear Boulevard to Communist production geniuses in Moscow or Peiping? The why's and wherefore of Natsyn might make an interesting "I'll trade you" tool for the Rumanians.

It has been heart warming to see the response from private and public citizens with regard to Goodyear's stand. One of the strongest voices raised in behalf of the company's decision was that of Walter H. Judd, the well-known and respected former Congressman from Minnesota. Judd declared flatly in his "Washington Report of the Air" radio program that the proposed sale would not be in the best interest of the United States.

In the program, broadcast over 700 radio stations, Judd expressed the hope that other American companies would follow Goodyear's example in the economic war with communism.

Perhaps the most volatile support for Goodyear's action came from a source that speaks on behalf of 2.4 million persons who purchase its newspapers each day—the New York Daily News, largest newspaper in the United States.

The Daily News ran an editorial entitled "Ten Cents From Russia, Maybe," in which it castigated U.S. businessmen for believing Soviet Premier Kosygin's hint that Russia might repay its World War II debts to the United States if U.S. firms would sell Russia anything it wanted to buy, on long-term credits.

The editorial also stated:

"Meanwhile, there is one honorable exception—and there may well be many more that we haven't heard of—to the list of U.S. firms now yearning to do business with the Communists.

"The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. recently refused pointblank to sell a synthetic rubber plant to Red Rumania, despite a Commerce Department OK on such sales and the administration's desire to cozy up to Rumania.

"Goodyear considers such deals unpatriotic and injurious to our side, and how about fixing the patriotism of this company in your memory?"

With voices such as that of Walter Judd and the New York Daily News being raised in our behalf, it's unlikely that Goodyear's dedicated stand will end up costing the company in lost revenue.

As a matter of fact, there is every indication that in addition to the warmth that this decision brings, Goodyear may benefit from a sales standpoint—a benefit that could not have been further from the company's mind when the decision was made not to sell to Rumania.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Somewhere along the line the idea of profiting from all the demagoguery against Firestone did creep into the minds of Goodyear's managers. Having loudly proclaimed that patriotic virtue was the only reward they sought, these estimable gentlemen seem also to have remembered the old adage about the Lord helping those who help themselves. On June 11 of this year, almost 2 months after Firestone had terminated its negotiations with Rumania, Mr. C. F. Stroud, marketing manager of Goodyear's tire division, issued "Sales Department Instructions" to Goodyear salesmen suggesting that they distribute two rightwing publications, Human Events, and something called the New Guard, containing vitriolic attacks on Firestone for its abortive Rumanian transaction. In his "sales instructions" Mr. Stroud expressed confidence that Goodyear employees would "enjoy" the attack on Firestone in Human Events and suggested that Goodyear salesmen "proudly show this article to commercial accounts, competitive dealers—especially Firestone, and Goodyear dealers." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point Mr. C. F. Stroud's "sales instructions" to Goodyear salesmen of June 11 along with the article from Human Events of May 8 and the article from the New Guard of May 1965 which were distributed to Goodyear salesmen.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALES DEPARTMENT INSTRUCTIONS

AKRON, OHIO,
June 11, 1965.

From District Manager, No. 65–289:

I am sure that every Goodyear employee will enjoy reading the attached reprint of page 4 from the Human Events magazine of May 8, 1965.

Surely every Goodyear salesman will proudly show this article to commercial accounts, competitive dealers—especially Firestone and Goodyear dealers.

We are sending a small supply to your district office and I am sure if you would like additional copies to mail to some of your friends—especially those in the tire business—that you will be able to get the number you need from your district manager.

I am also attaching a photostat of page 21 from the May 1965 issue of the New Guard magazine. There will not be an extra supply of these sent to your district because we have only a limited number.

C. F. STROUD,
Marketing Manager, Tire Division.

[From Human Events, May 8, 1965]

BIG CONSERVATIVE WIN

Lyndon Johnson is in the White House, the Americans for Democratic Action have a vice president and liberals outnumber conservatives in Congress by a good majority. But conservatives throughout the country have just scored a stunning upset victory over the liberal elements who have been pushing America into selling its technical know-how to Communist countries.

The victory came unexpectedly when Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., of Akron, Ohio, curtly announced on April 20 that it had "terminated negotiations for a contract to design and equip a synthetic rubber plant in Rumania." The action was startling, considering Rumania's strong desire to trade with Firestone and considering the State Department's active encouragement of the $40-million deal.

Firestone refused to amplify its short announcement in any way, but businessmen in the tire industry say they know one reason the company ended the Rumanian affair; an avalanche of adverse public criticism.

Firestone offices in Akron remain stonily silent on the subject, but insiders report the company began to back away from the deal after receiving thousands of irate letters. Businessmen estimate the rubber firm lost millions of dollars because angry consumers and dealers started a boycott.

How the public pressure mounted against Firestone and how the company tried to combat it makes fascinating reading. What stirred up the initial storm was an article in January by Robert Dietsch, a Scripps-Howard reporter, detailing the story of the Firestone negotiations with Rumania. When this was elaborated upon by other newspapers, the attacks against the firm began to step up in furious fashion.

Letters sent to Firestone showed the American people boiling mad over this plan to increase trade with a Communist country while American soldiers were dying in Vietnam. In addition, the public realized the synthetic rubber was of obvious military value.

Moreover, Firestone began to be hurt financially as its chief competitor, Goodyear, started to pick up some of Firestone's longstanding customers. The American public, in fact, had begun to buy from Goodyear when that company had earlier publicly refused to trade with Rumania, remarking in its house organ, the Wingfoot Clan, "Even to a dedicated profitmaking organization, some things are more important than dollars."

Finally, Firestone ran into a buzz saw: the nationwide conservative youth group, Young Americans for Freedom. The Philadelphia chapter of YAF, headed by John LaMothe, began to create all sorts of trouble for the Firestone Co.

"After reading in Human Events about the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.'s plan to build a synthetic rubber plant in Communist Rumania," writes Philadelphia YAF treasurer David K. Walter, "the Philadelphia County Chapter of Young Americans for Freedom launched a drive to force Firestone to reconsider and withdraw these plans.

"Letters sent to the office of the president produced unsatisfactory replies. Philadelphia YAF then organized picketing of Firestone stores in the Philadelphia area." Picket signs appeared paraphrasing Firestone's slogan: "When Red wheels are rolling, the name is known as Firestone?"

The Philadelphia campaign soon became national, with YAF demonstrations in Los Angeles, Cleveland and cities on the east coast.

Firestone began to feel the heat. To quell the rising public passions against its Red-trade deal, the company attempted to counterattack:

The firm sent Bernard W. Frazier, its Eastern public relations manager, down from New York to call off the YAF pickets in Philadelphia. Frazier made similar trips to other YAF chapters along the east coast. While Frazier attempted to "smooth things over," his remarks only infuriated YAF. At a meeting of Pennsylvania YAF at Harrisburg on March 27, Frazier argued that Firestone was only trying to build "bridges to the east." At one time he coyly avoided saying who would own the rubber plant, but finally admitted it would be completely owned by Rumania. Furthermore, he did not deny that Rumanian slave labor would be used in constructing and manning the plant.

Firestone representatives also tried to discredit Goodyear by repeating a statement picked up on the television program "CBS Reports" that Goodyear tires had been found on Chinese Communist vehicles. Goodyear, however, showed YAF that in its trade deals overseas it requires the purchasing companies to sign a statement saying that Goodyear goods will not be transshipped to Communist countries. If the Communists wind up with Goodyear tires, it is through no intent of Goodyear.

Firestone motivated into action BILL AYRES, a moderate Republican Congressman from Akron. where Firestone is located. Representative AYRES defended Firestone's trade deal with Red Rumania and reportedly put pressure on certain groups to stop their anti-Firestone activities.

Firestone, who's executives normally put up money for Republican candidates, also tried to pressure House Republicans into calling off "the conservative" picketing of the company. When YAF Executive Director Dave Jones received word about this pressure through a prominent Senator, he said: "You tell them a $10 million check to YAF couldn't get us to call it off."

In the end, however, it was Firestone that caved in. What many feel was the coup de grace was YAF's planned demonstration at the famous Indianapolis 500 auto race on May 31. Thousands of people from all over the country usually attend this sports classic and the publicity impact would have been enormous. YAF had planned to set up an Indianapolis office called the Committee Against Slave Labor to focus attention on the fact that forced labor would help build the Firestone plant. YAF was in the process of hiring a plane to haul a banner over the Indianapolis speedway stadium denouncing the deal and had planned to saturate the stadium with a half-million pamphlets sharply criticizing Firestone.

Firestone officials, however, got wind of the plan shortly after it was drawn up. Within days, the company threw in the towel, announcing its negotiations with the Rumanians had ended.

On April 22, YAF received a post-victory note: a letter to Dave Jones from Firestone's Bernard Frazier. The note announced the termination of the Firestone deal and asked YAF to bring public attention to it.

The Firestone story is bound to have national impact. It shows what can be accomplished by conservatives in the face of strong counter-pressure. And it most certainly will have an effect on American businesses that desire to do business-as-usual behind the Iron Curtain. There are reportedly some 40 American firms dickering with Communist countries at the present time over deals similar to the Firestone-Rumanian one. But they had better be on their guard. YAF is planning to call attention to every one of them.

[From the New Guard magazine]

YAF CHAPTERS SUPPORT GOODYEAR, PICKET FIRESTONE

The Firestone corporation is coming under increased attack by YAF chapters for its decision to build a synthetic rubber plant in Communist Rumania.

One of these chapters is Bay Ridge YAF of Brooklyn. Under the leadership of chapter chairman Thomas Harrison, it is circulating a petition praising Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. for its "steadfast refusal" to build a synthetic rubber plant in the Communist satellite.

Their project resulted in the Brooklyn chapter's receiving an "outstanding community chapter" award from national YAF. The award carries with it a $25 contribution to the chapter's treasury.

Subsequently, Philadelphia County YAF—headed by John D. LaMothe—has initiated a nationwide protest against the proposed synthetic rubber plant. Already the Philadelphia group has held two demonstrations in front of Firestone offices in downtown Philadelphia. A handbill distributed by the YAF pickets urged Firestone to reconsider its decision, and notes that in the past month Communist Rumania has shipped 500 heavy-duty trucks to Red China. Red China, in turn, is the major supplier of heavy military equipment to North Vietnam.

LaMothe urges all YAF members to show their disapproval of the Firestone proposal either by organizing a protest demonstration, or by writing the president of the company. The address is Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., 1245 Firestone Parkway, Arkon, Ohio.

BULLETIN

As the New Guard goes to press, newspaper reports indicate that the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., has backed out of its plans to build a synthetic rubber plant in Communist

> Rumania. Firestone officials gave no reasons for this reversal of policy, but it is known that they were disturbed over YAF picketing of Firestone stores around the Nation, and even tried to get Congressmen to pressure YAF into halting the pickets. News of their decision came too late for us to note in the story on page 21 of this issue.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the role of the Department of State in this memorable affair is, to say the least, equivocal. Having determined that the building of bridges to the East was important for the advancement of American national interests, and having thereafter concluded the agreement with Rumania which made possible the negotiations between Firestone and the Rumanian Government, the State Department now seems to be taking the disingenuous position that all this, after all, was a private affair involving an American private company and a foreign government. In a press and radio briefing on April 21, 1965, for example, Mr. McCloskey replied as follows to a question on how the negotiations began and who broke them off:

> On the first part of it, the issuance of the export licenses to go ahead on the negotiations was a result of the interest of the Rumanian Government in that type of plant. As to circumstances surrounding the breakoff, I would address you either to the Rumanian Government or the Firestone company. It's a matter between the two.

The Department of State has expressed its regret at the rupture of the negotiations between Firestone and the Rumanian Government. The executive branch, however, took no action to salvage the negotiations by giving the company vigorous backing and encouragement in the face of irresponsible pressures. The sale of the two rubber plants was not a trivial or marginal element of American policy toward Rumania; it was part of a carefully conceived long-term policy of encouraging the independence of Communist countries in Eastern Europe. The Firestone transaction was the first real test of the new American policy toward Rumania and the United States failed the test.

When important policies of the Government are threatened by irresponsible, selfish interests, it is not adequate for the executive branch to accept the defeat of these policies with nothing more than expressions of regret. Had the State Department officials with whom Firestone executives conferred on April 16 indicated that a strong public statement of support for the Rumanian transaction might be provided by the Secretary of State or by the White House, it is possible that Firestone could have been persuaded to carry out the sale of the two synthetic rubber plants. As it turned out, Firestone was told in effect that it was on its own. According to one account of this meeting, Firestone officials were told that the administration has to face a congressional election next year and therefore could not be expected to go out on a limb in support of their transaction with Rumania. Whether this is accurate or not, it is clear that the executive branch gave Firestone no encouragement and at that point the company pulled out.

The effect of the rupture in the Rumanian-Firestone negotiations almost certainly will not be the denial to Rumania of the synthetic rubber plants that it seeks. Synthetic rubber technology and equipment are available to Rumania quite readily from Western European sources, or, for that matter, from the Soviet Union, and the probable outcome of the whole affair will be that Rumania will get her synthetic rubber plants but not from the United States. Instead of a healthy profit of Firestone, a solid gain for our balance of payments, and a positive step forward in the building of bridges to the East, the United States will have earned a harvest of ill will and a reputation for being quite incapable of executing policies decided upon by the President and the Department of State.

The rupture of the negotiations between Firestone and the Rumanian Government is by no means the first occasion on which American foreign policy has been defeated by private individuals and pressure groups. In the spring of 1960, for example, two American maritime unions picketed and thus prevented the unloading of the Egyptian passenger and cargo ship, the *Cleopatra*. The unions, ostensibly, were protesting the action of the United Arab Republic in closing the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping.

I commented on this matter in the Senate on April 25, 1960, as follows:

> I hold no brief for United Arab Republic interference with international traffic passing through the Suez Canal. The point is, however, that the U.S. Government is proceeding through diplomatic channels to promote free passage through the canal. The Israeli Government, which complains that the United Arab Republic stops its ships, has available to it the procedures of the United Nations as well as other diplomatic devices for urging its views on the Government of the United Arab Republic. Yet, despite the official actions of the United States, we find private groups proceeding by coercive devices of their own to interfere with the official activities of our Government in the field of foreign policy.
>
> These maritime unions do not seek an economic result related to wages or working conditions. Rather, they seek to force political action in an area of most delicate international negotiation.
>
> It is my position that the President is the constitutional vehicle through which the American people engage in the day-to-day conduct of their foreign policy. There are constitutional channels through which citizens can legitimately and effectively petition their government and thus bring about changes in the conduct of foreign policy. Actions on the part of individuals or organizations which interfere directly or indirectly with the constitutional exercise of governmental authority or activity in the conduct of foreign policy, however, should be avoided as inimical to the total national interest. And finally, our constitutional system is designed to give free expression to the will of citizens of the United States. It must not be corrupted by calculated influence and pressure from any other source.

There have been other instances of irresponsible shipping boycotts. From February 16 to February 26, 1964, east coast and gulf port longshoremen, supported by the maritime trade unions, boycotted the shipment of wheat to the Soviet Union in defiance of policy decisions made by President Kennedy and President Johnson and supported by the Congress.

During March 1965 longshoremen at several east coast ports refused to unload codfish caught and processed by Soviet fishing vessels and consigned from Hamburg aboard a U.S. vessel to an American company for further processing. There are, I am told, other instances of this sort of thing, but State Department officials are squeamish about discussing them, for fear, presumably, of incurring the wrath of certain unions.

Another example of the tyranny of special interests was the campaign mounted in 1962 by certain rightwing groups to force food retailers to remove from their shelves merchandise coming from Poland and other Eastern European countries. At that time a person called Dr. Jerome D. Harold, a Miami, Fla., chiropractor, founded an organization called Committee To Warn of the Arrival of Communist Merchandise on the Local Business Scene. Thus inspired, vigilantes in various parts of the country sought to identify Communist products on the shelves of retail stores and then would telephone or write to the manager demanding removal of the ideologically tainted merchandise. If the manager resisted these pressures, the group would hold a "card party," surreptitiously placing small cards on the shelves of the store stating "Always buy your Communist merchandise at," then naming the store. The boycott campaign was extended in late 1962 from Polish hams to include cut glass, Christmas ornaments, bicycles, fabrics, frozen foods, and other such contraband. By the end of 1962 the boycott tactics had successfully intimated many small stores throughout the country and some of the larger chains, including Sears, Roebuck, Woolworth, Kresge, and most of the major food chains.

In December 1962, moreover, a number of local governments joined with the superpatriots in their campaign to set up little foreign policies of their own independent of that of the U.S. Government. The communities did so by enacting ordinances requiring stores which handled goods originating in Communist countries to pay a license fee of from $1,000 to $5,000 and to post the license in a prominent place or otherwise clearly label the goods as being "Communist."

Polish hams are still not easy to come by—which is regrettable, because they are extremely good. But even beyond their success in regulating the diets of individual Americans, the boycott groups quite successfully defeated an official policy of the U.S. Government without having even to communicate with the Government, much less seek a change of policy through established constitutional procedures.

The tendency for private groups to allow their own interest to cause them to interfere with our national policies is illustrated by another more recent example. While this is not as serious as the Firestone affair, it does illustrate an unfortunate practice.

I should add that, upon a last minute review of my remarks last Friday, I concluded that this example was marginal because the participants' concern was not with broad policy. I decided, therefore, that it should be omitted. My staff was instructed to delete it but unfortunately they failed to do so in every case and some papers carried it. In order to keep the record straight I shall therefore include it today even though it is not completely relevant to the principal point of my remarks.

In a statement on May 29, 1965, Mr. H. A. True, Jr., president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, pressed the case for a larger share of the market for domestic oil producers and for reduced imports of Venezuelan oil by asserting that the Department of State has given Venezuelan oil a "sacrosanct" position, and that Venezuela has responded "with a kick in the face in the Dominican Republic crisis." Venezuelan oil, said Mr. True, had a "privileged position" in the United States. "But when our Government took responsible action to prevent establishment of another Communist outpost in the Caribbean," he charged, "the State Department failed to muster the support of the country for which its 'oil diplomats' have been so solicitous and the country which stands to lose the most to Communist infiltration—Venezuela."

Later in his statement, Mr. True presses the case for the domestic oil interests by referring to "a foreign government that now turns its back on us in time of another crisis" and by denouncing what he calls "a phantom policy favoring those who refuse to stand with us in time of need."

Mr. True's statement suggests that the Independent Petroleum Association of America may genuinely believe that it would be good statesmanship to try to blackmail Latin American countries into supporting the U.S. position on the Dominican Republic by threatening them with economic reprisals. I am more inclined to the view that the Independent Petroleum Association of America is far less interested in the Dominican crisis than it is in the domestic oil market and that it is trying to use the fact that Venezuela exercised her sovereign rights as a member of the Organization of American States—as she had every right to do—as a weapon to bludgeon the U.S. Government in yielding to the demands of domestic oil producers.

I can think of nothing more certain to undermine the inter-American system than the use of North American economic power to blackmail Latin American countries into supporting U.S. policies. It is sometimes suggested that exactly this has been done in the past and is being done now; I hope it is not true, and, if it is true, I hope that the practice will be suspended.

There is no evidence to suggest that the State Department is inclined to yield to the irresponsible demand of the president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America. I am confident that it will not, and it occurs to me that if it has not done so already the Department would be well advised to reassure Venezuela that the United States has no intention of trying to punish Venezuela for taking an independent position on the Dominican crisis or to coerce Venezuela into supporting our policies in the future. Many Latin Americans already believe that the United States has used economic pressures to gain support in the OAS for its Dominican policy. Any connection in U.S. policy between the Dominican crisis and the advancement of private economic interests, as suggested by Mr. True, would discredit the OAS and dishonor the United States. It is not enough for the U.S. Government to be silent in the case of such pressures. It should actively repudiate them.

I have cited the instances involving Egypt, Poland, and the Soviet wheat sale to emphasize the point that the matter involving the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. and the Rumanian Government is not an isolated incident but only a recent example of the ability of special interests to disrupt the foreign policy of the United States.

To a certain extent, this sort of thing is probably inevitable in a free society. It can, however, and should be kept to a minimum by a strong sense of public responsibility of the part of private individuals and organizations which become involved in foreign policy, combined with forthright and courageous leadership on the part of the foreign policy-making agencies of the U.S. Government.

These elements were not notably present in the Firestone affair. The Department of State failed to support the company as it certainly should have. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. resisted the temptation to earn tainted money from a Communist government—although it did obtain an export license to sell synthetic rubber to Rumania—but Goodyear was not so virtuous in its domestic competition with Firestone. The Young Americans for Freedom may well have been the innocent instruments of individuals more sophisticated than themselves and, in any case, are quite young and should not be taken too severely to task for their little caper.

As to the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., it entered the negotiations with Rumania in full awareness that complications could arise and that it had responsibilities larger than its own profits; the company was victimized by demagoguery, but it must also be said that it is more admirable to resist demagoguery than to yield to it.

The Firestone episode, along with the other instances cited, is an example of how the constitutional processes by which American foreign policy is made can be defeated and disrupted. No act of Congress or constitutional amendment can cure this difficulty, which is inherent in a free society. It can, however, be cured by the combination of Government leadership and private responsibility, both of which, in the Firestone case, were sadly lacking.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I congratulate the Senator from Arkansas for a very courageous speech. I associate myself with him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I join the distinguished Senator from Oregon in what he has said. It appears to me that if we ever wish to break away some of the so-called satellites from the Soviet Union, one of the ways to do it is through business exchanges.

I did watch with interest the story of Firestone and Rumania over a period of weeks. I was surprised and disheartened when the negotiations fell through, because certainly Rumania, for whom I have no special interest or sympathy, was desirous of breaking away from the Soviet Union and establishing an independent, or at least a semi-independent, status. That was one way we could have gotten in, one way we could have drawn them toward us, one way in which we fell down. I am sorry for that action.

The reason for it was certain domestic pressures within.

Also I believe that the maritime unions of our country have taken too much into their own hands in the formulation of American foreign policy. It would do them good to look after their own affairs—and they are in a state of disarray—rather than to try to formulate and to carry out the foreign policy of the United States according to their particular whims.

I congratulate and commend the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, for his speech. I hope that this is only one of a good many which will follow.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator. I believe that these people have confused the constitutional right of petitioning the Congress with a constitutional right to carry on their own foreign policy. It is quite all right for them to come to Congress and present their views to Senators and Representatives. But it is utterly inexcusable to go about it in the way in which they have. They would do well to read the Constitution of the United States.

Very likely the Germans, the British, and the French would be glad to take up those contracts. It is not only denying the Firestone Co. business——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Also American workers' jobs.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. American workers' jobs. It is a very bad thing. In addition to contributing to a rebuilding of relations or a relief of the tensions with the whole Communist world—and who knows where we are going, because the incident is so overshadowed by affairs in Vietnam—this is a part of the overall struggle for peace. It is therefore a very bad thing to have such things as the breakdown of the Rumanian-Firestone negotiations occur.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would be well for them to read the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. I think this case was a particularly regrettable one, because this new policy of our Government, as evidenced by the communique on Rumania which I inserted in the Record, is a most hopeful one, and one that the administration and the previous administration developed to try to bring about a relaxation of the tensions that have grown up between us and Eastern Europe. For a company like Goodyear to come in, with the help of the Young Americans for Freedom, to defeat the considered policy of our Government seems inexcusable. I do not know what other countries would think of the United States when we make these agreements and then have them thwarted in this fashion. Why would they place any reliance on agreements with us? It would make us appear ridiculous and irresponsible in the eyes of other countries.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I daresay the contract which Firestone had tried to formulate has now been taken up by some of our allies in Western Europe.

NOMINATION OF JAMES P. COLEMAN

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have the 7 minutes preceding 4 o'clock to speak in behalf of the nomination of James Coleman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object to the majority leader's request—there is a time limitation. I expected to speak for 20 minutes. The Senator from Oregon will speak. The Senator from Michigan desires to speak. I wonder if the majority leader might expand his request. May we not allocate the time and let the majority leader control it?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] may be permitted to speak for 20 minutes; the Senator from Oregon 20 minutes; the Senator from Michigan 2 minutes; and the Senator from Montana 7 minutes——

Mr. MORSE. I shall not need 20 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And 5 minutes to be distributed otherwise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last Thursday, I respectfully asked the Senate to withhold the vote on the Coleman nomination to the Federal bench until today. My request was cooperatively and graciously granted. I made the request because I wanted time in which to read the hearing record. I have read the record.

I said last Thursday—and the Record will so show—that I hoped that Senators who had voted for the nomination in committee could find a basis for so doing. It is on that record that I announce that I found no basis to justify my voting to confirm the nomination; but I found, to my satisfaction, overpowering evidence that, as a matter of conscience, as a matter of what I consider to be the law, under the advise and consent clause of the Constitution I should vote against the nomination; and I shall do so at 4 o'clock.

Mr. President, Coleman's nomination can be challenged on grounds either of character or of what might be called an emotional conflict of interest, depending on whether he believed all the things he said about Negro Americans, or said them merely because it was the politically expedient thing to do in Mississippi. This relates to his competency so far as possessing a judicial temperament is concerned.

As the Record will show, starting with the vote to confirm the Wallace nomination in 1945, I have followed four major historic criteria that I believe are binding upon me under the advise and consent clause; and in this instance, I believe the Coleman nomination falls short on the grounds both of competency and of character.

If Coleman's record of opposition to Negro rights was pure expedience, his character does not measure up to the high standards needed in a Federal judgeship. If he believes that Negroes should not vote, that segregation should be maintained, and that his legal talents should be put to work to perpetuate segregation, as he often implied in his campaign oratory, he harbors a hostility to a basic right of large numbers of our people that will make it impossible for him to exercise sound judgment in cases affecting Negroes.

When Coleman ran for Governor again in 1963—and lost in the primary—he based much of his campaign on the contention that he had been "successful" in staving off integration in Mississippi and could do better than his opponent because he was not a "hothead," as he put it. He advertised himself as giving Mississippi a better chance of avoiding integration because he was a smart lawyer and could fight it with better legal tactics.

If all this was offered to the voters of Mississippi merely because one had to talk segregation in order to have a chance to win, the man lacks character. It may be true that only a segregationist could be elected Governor of Mississippi, but that man did not have to be James Coleman. In my many years as a Member of the Senate, I have heard the argument of expediency used in connection with Southern politicians being elected to Congress and to other offices on the ground: "If we did not follow that course of action, we could not be elected to Congress." My answer is, "So what?" Better that they not be elected to Congress than to be elected on the basis of such an argument of expediency. So far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, it is not important that anyone be elected to Congress or re-elected to Congress. It is important that so long as we sit here, we never bend our knee at such an altar of political expediency. In my judgment, we cannot read the record of this man without recognizing time and again he has paid tribute at the altar of political expediency.

If expediency was his excuse then, how can we know that expediency will not control his decisions as a judge, too? An individual does not change his morals or his standards when he switches from one job to another. He takes them along with him, and we cannot escape the conclusion that an expedient politician will be an expedient judge.

If Mr. Coleman is a sincere believer in separation of the races, if he believes that the Negro is not fit to vote, as he declared in 1957, can he be entrusted to enforce, against his conscience and convictions, basic rights of American citizens? I believe that such a conviction held by a judge is an emotional conflict of interest that goes far beyond the ordinary situation of law in which a judge may merely disagree with a holding of the high court which he must apply.

In the words of Representative Ryan, who testified against the confirmation of the nomination:

> The fact remains, however, that Coleman is reputed as a moderate only because he counseled nonviolent devices to achieve the same total disenfranchisement of the Negro which others sought by terror and brutality.

Such convictions on the part of a judge deprive citizens of their rights as surely as do violence and brutality and terror. By his own testimony, Coleman has deep roots in the State and has long been active in its law and politics. Race has for decades been the major public issue in Mississippi. If he believes everything he has preached there on the race issue, it will be impossible for him to render impartial decisions based on the law alone.

I believe that if Mr. Coleman is sincere in his expressed views and his actions as Governor, his judgment on civil rights issues is so completely impaired as to render him unfit to hold this judicial office.

One cannot read the record of this man's demagoguery, as set forth in his public statements, without finding that he has attacked the Supreme Court of the United States, has attacked the Department of Justice, has attacked the Attorney General, has attacked the President. His blanket-type attacks on Negro rights disqualify him ever to sit in judicial judgment. His attacks show the temperament of a biased advocate, which is so foreign to judicial impartiality.

Mr. President, it is argued, "Where would you go in Mississippi to get someone better?" I would not accept the innuendo or the implication of that argument. But if it is true that the President could not find anyone in the legal profession in all of Mississippi who is free of the shocking demagoguery of this nominee, the answer is, "Do not appoint someone from Mississippi. There is nothing in the law that requires that this particular judicial position must be filled with someone from Mississippi."

But I deny that implication. On the record of this man's demagoguery, I do not consider him, either from the standpoint of competency or of character, fit to assume the robes he will have to put on if his nomination is confirmed, for I think his body and his mind will desecrate those robes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a compilation of reported statements by Mr. Coleman on the race issue.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORTED STATEMENTS OF J. P. COLEMAN ON RACIAL QUESTION

August 7, 1955 (p. 12, re school desegregation): "In my opinion," he said, "this issue which has been forced upon us will be settled one way or the other in 16 months or 2 years * * * and based on the studies I have made and the experience I have had fighting integration attempts I can say without hesitation that if I am elected Governor the schools of Mississippi will never be integrated nor will they be closed."

January 3, 1956 (excerpts from Coleman's inaugural address as Governor, p. 6):

"I come now to a discussion of * * * the continued separation of the white and Negro races in accordance with those customs which the experience of 90 years has taught us all, white and colored alike, to be for the welfare of all concerned.

"My own personal and official attitude toward this question is well known to all Mississippians. In the gubernatorial campaign of 1955 I said in my official platform: 'There will be no mixing of the races in any of the State-operated educational institutions. I already have a record on this subject. This is no task for the amateur or the hothead.'"

"I further told the people that if elected Governor, with the cooperation of a good legislature, we would maintain the separation of the races without at the same time keeping our State, its economy, its customs, and its practices, in a daily uproar of confusion and uncertainty. I say to this audience and to those who are listening by radio and television that I have not the slightest fear than 4 years hence when my successor stands on this same spot to assume his official oath, the separation of the races will be left intact and will still be in full force and effect in exacty (sic) the same manner and form as we know it today."

October 26, 1956 (p. 29): "Coleman said recently. 'I do not now favor the Negro voting in Mississippi. He is wholly unprepared to assume this responsibility.'"

June 21, 1957 (p. 1): "Coleman said further that he does not favor Negroes voting in this State and that he hopes that there will never be a strong Republican Party in Mississippi. 'The reasons that the Negro should not vote in that State are obvious,' he said. 'If they vote in numbers, they will vote as a block, and you will see politicians playing up to them as in the Northern States now.'"

November 19, 1957 (p. 1): "Governor Coleman also warned of the expanding Negro vote in the State and suggested constitutional revision to cope with this threat.

"He declared circuit clerks who now act as registrars, not being lawyers, could be intimidated into allowing 'wholesale voting of unqualified voters'—obviously Negroes—under the Civil Rights Act. He proposed three-man registrar boards, with one member a lawyer, but did not say how they would operate."

November 21, 1958 (p. 1): "Gov. J. P. Coleman promised Thursday that Mississippi would maintain segregation despite the efforts of his political enemies who agitate 'to improve their political chances.'

"We are going to keep the schools in Mississippi open, and we are going to operate them on a segregated basis."

June 30, 1959 (p. 7; Note: The following is taken from a television speech by Coleman):

"I am well aware that a little handful of my political adversaries have tried to destroy my place in the affections of my fellow Mississippians by claiming that I am a 'moderate.' Apparently, these people cannot tell a moderate from a successful segregationist. They have made a great sham of this, and every time they can get a chance they try to stir it up. I ask you to ignore what they say and look at what the record says * * * I stand on a record of performance and I have delivered the goods. I am not entitled to be called a moderate, and I notice that none of my friends have called me that."

March 17, 1963 (p. 1):

"Former Gov. J. P. Coleman Thursday night promised there will be no racial integration of public schools in Mississippi during the next 4 years if he gets a second term in the Governor's office.

"'There will be no necessity to abolish the public schools,' he promised again Thursday. 'Nor will there be any mixing of the races in any of the State-operated educational institutions. This is no task for the amateur or the hothead.'"

July 10, 1963 (p. 1): "Former Gov. J. P. Coleman said Tuesday his opponents have taken a defeatist attitude on the race issue. Speaking at Monticello, Morgantown, and McComb, Coleman said he is the only candidate 'with hope of stemming widespread integration and the ability and experience to do it. My opponents say that I cannot stop it,' he declared, 'because they have apparently lost hope and have offered no plan or suggestion for maintaining separation of the races.'"

June 2, 1954 (pp. 1, 16):

"Attorney General J. P. Coleman told a television audience here Tuesday night that the Congress of the United States never intended that the 14th amendment to the Constitution be used as applicable to public schools. He declared further that Mississippi will maintain segregation in the schools, regardless of the U.S. Supreme Court.

"Coleman said that there is plenty that the sovereign States can do to counteract the Supreme Court decision. 'Separate education for the races can be maintained in Mississippi,' he declared solemnly."

June 3, 1954: Note—This story reports Governor White's calling a meeting of his legal advisory committee on education. J. P. Coleman, according to the Clarion-Ledger, besides being a regular member of this committee, also served on two subcommittees, the planning and statutory committee and the resolutions committee. The following policy statement was issued by the committee (p. 1): "The committee conceives its duty to be to devise the means and methods by which separate schools for the races shall be maintained in that State and to submit such plan to the legislature for its action thereon.

(Note: The following statement concerns the committee's view on school desegregation, (p. 14): "The committee was unanimous in its opinion that Mississippi should not attempt to work with the Supreme Court, as the States have been invited to do, to solve the integration problem."

May 11, 1955 (Note: the Clarion-Ledger reported the following story concerning the opening of Coleman's campaign for Governor. The speech quoted was made at Ackerman, Miss., Coleman's hometown, (p. 3): "Coleman set forth that he is the only candidate officially facing up to the Court and called to attention his move enlisting all attorneys to provide legal aid against desegregation.

"'When you go to the polls on August 2, your ballot most certainly will determine the education of your children and the maintenance of segregation for the next 4 years, possibly for the next 50 years,' he said.

"'I have said that those who propose to mix the races in our public schools had might as well try to dip the Atlantic dry with a teaspoon.'

"'I here and now give the people of Mississippi my solemn pledge that if I am elected Governor there will be no necessity to abolish the public schools, nor will there be any mixing of the races in those schools,' Coleman declared."

June 10, 1965 (Note: The following has been extracted from a Clarion-Ledger account of a meeting of five gubernatorial candidates at Canton, Miss., (p. 1, p. 12): "J. P. Coleman, the third candidate to speak, cited his experience in defending the segregation laws of Mississippi, and declared that so long as he is Governor, 'no Negro will ever enter the white schools of this State.'

"Attorney General Coleman said that 'in this segregation issue, we are put on notice that the Supreme Court proposes to change the South's social face rather than its legal face'.

"Coleman said that the issue has been brought on us by the courts 'and we must resist in the courts.'"

June 29, 1955 (Note: On June 28, 1955, Coleman spoke at Laurel, Miss. Part of his speech concerned the school integration issue (p. 7)): "We have already planned our strategy. First, we will stand on the provisions of our State constitution. When the U.S. Supreme Court strikes that down, then we will start assignments under the Gore Act, which is perfectly constitutional law. Should that fail, we can adopt a school on the local option plan, get it out of the clutches of the Federal courts, and immediately reestablish it with a new set of trustees."

July 27, 1955 (p. 11, subject: School segregation): "Earlier today at Bruce, Coleman said that he believes that the assignment bill adopted by the Mississippi Legislature, known as the Gore bill, will take care of the segregation problem for 25 years to come.

"Candidate Coleman charged that no other candidate in the race for Governor has the experience to combat the integration attempts which will be forthcoming in this State."

August 7, 1955 (p. 12, subject: School desegregation): "In my opinion this issue which has been forced upon us will be settled one way or the other in 16 months or 2 years * * * and based on the studies I have made and the experience I have had fighting integration attempts I can say without hesitation that if I am elected Governor the schools of Mississippi will never be integrated nor will they be closed."

August 13, 1955, Coleman also spent considerable time reviewing his record as an opponent of racial segregation:

"'Where was my distinguished opponent in 1951?' Coleman asked rhetorically, 'when I stood alone before a hostile U.S. Supreme Court and showed those Communist lawyers they could not fool * * * with the great State of Mississippi.' He repeated his account of how he interrupted his campaign during the first primary to drive all night to Vicksburg and dispose of a petition by Negroes there to integrate the schools.

"'I handled that situation in less than 12 hours,' he declared. 'It was the shortest integration attempt in the history of the South.'"

September 22, 1955 (Note: The committee referred to in the story is the Governor's Legal Advisory Committee on Education, (p. 1)):

"The committee, upon the recommendation of Coleman, voted to ask the legislators to:

"1. Abolish common-law marriages by statute.

"2. Enact laws penalizing champerty and the stirring up of litigation against the State and any of its subdivisions and against unauthorized practices of law in this State by any attorneys from outside.

"3. Enact statutes penalizing persons who use abusive language over the telephone.

"4. Effect laws giving the State authority to arrest the officers of the Federal Bureau of Identification (sic) for interfering with the rights of individuals in this State.

"5. Authorize creation of a council for the maintenance of segregation.

"6. Authorize the secretary to the Legal Education Advisory Committee to form liaison (sic) between Southern States as an interstate commission to fight integration.

"7. Repeal the compulsory school attendance act."

September 2, 1955 (p. 1, Note: The statement referred to below was by U.S. Attorney General Brownell who called for investigation of Negro voting in the recent Mississippi primary):

" 'I think Mississippi is perfectly capable of conducting its own elections without any assistance from the NAACP or its sympathizers.'

"Coleman said he hadn't read the statement but that he knew of 'no violation of anybody's civil rights in connection with Mississippi's primary.' "

October 22, 1955 (p. 9): "Attorney General J. P. Coleman, as the next Governor of Mississippi, will recommend to the 1956 legislature that the common-law marriage in the State be outlawed. The action would be directed toward continuing of segregation in the schools of the State and would be a part of several facets of the overall State plan to defeat efforts of the NAACP and the Supreme Court of the United States to break down racial discrimination."

December 19, 1955 (p. 1): ("Governor-elect J. P. Coleman declared that he agrees with former Governor Fielding Wright's suggestion that Mississippi join with Virginia in seeking a constitutional amendment on the preservation of States rights and segregation.

" 'Let there be no misunderstanding. I am for segregation. Mississippi will never integrate. I told the people last summer that we would preserve segregation and that it would be done by lawful means. The people in Mississippi approved my position by a resounding majority.' "

January 3, 1956 (Source: Coleman's inaugural address as Governor p. 6):

"I come now to a discussion of that governmental question which continuously for months has been uppermost in the minds of the people of Mississippi and which no doubt is destined to vex and harass us in the years immediately ahead. I refer to maintaining the continued separation of the white and Negro races in accordance with those customs which the experience of 90 years has taught us all, white and colored alike, to be for the welfare of all concerned.

"My own personal and official attitude toward this question is well known to all Mississippians. In the gubernatorial campaign of 1955 I said in my official platform: "There will be no necessity to abolish public schools, nor will there be any mixing of the races in any of the State-operated educational institutions. I already have a record on this subject. This is no task for the amateur or the hothead.

"This position was given overwhelming support of the people of Mississippi at the ballot boxes last August.

"I further told the people that if elected Governor, with the cooperation of a good legislature, we would maintain the separation of the races without at the same time keeping our State, its economy, its customs, and its practices in a daily uproar of confusion and uncertainty. I say to this audience and to those who are listening by radio and television that I have not the slightest fear that 4 years hence when my successor stands on this same spot to assume his official oath, the separation of the races will be left intact and will still be in full force and effect in exacty [sic] the same manner and form as we know it today."

January 21, 1956 (p. 1):

"Governors of four Southern States, including Mississippi's James Plemon Coleman, will set down for a round-table discussion of educational and segregation problems at Richmond, Va., Tuesday.

"He said that the whole purpose of the meeting of Governors, whose State legislatures are now all in session, is to unify and to correlate their efforts toward maintaining segregation in the schools of the South."

January 25, 1956 (p. 1):

"RICHMOND, VA., January 24.—Four Southern Governors tonight agreed to seek joint action by their States to protest and appeal the Supreme Court decision throwing out school segregation.

"They also agreed to take whatever individual State action by legislative means they deemed necessary to prevent mixing the races in their public schools.

"The decision was announced at the end of a 6-hour conference among Governors Thomas B. Stanley, Virginia; George Bell Timmerman, Jr., South Carolina; J. P. Coleman, Mississippi, and Marvin Griffin, Georgia."

(P. 3): Timmerman read this statement at the close of the session:

"This conference, composed of the Governors of the four Southern States whose legislatures are in regular session does declare:

"That the States have not delegated to the Federal Government or any agency thereof the power to prohibit the segregation of the races in the public schools and we, therefore, shall recommend to the legislatures of our respective States that the following action be taken:

"1. That there be adopted a resolution of interposition of protest in appropriate language against the encoachment of the Central Government upon the sovereignty of the several States and their people.

"2. That a call be made upon the Congress of the United States to take such action within the limits of its constitutional authority as to protect the States and her people against present and future encroachment by the Central Government.

"3. That each State exercise its right to enact and utilize such other appropriate legal measures as it may deem advisable to protect its sovereignty and the rights of its people."

January 27, 1956 (p. 1):

"Gov. J. P. Coleman just returned from a conference of Southern Governors, said here Thursday that he will support any move toward the exercise of interposition to maintain segregation in the South and in this State.

"He said that while there are no such legal terms as interposition or nullification, that he has never objected to the use of the term interposition, and that we will support it in the terms he understands are implied.

"Interposition, he explained, is a stand interposing rights of the people of the use of every legal means by the State to protest the rights of the State against an unconstitutional edict of the U.S. Supreme Court.

"Coleman said the Governors of Virginia, Georgia, and South Carolina agreed with him that they should let the Nation know 'In no uncertain terms that the Supreme Court ban on segregation is unconstitutional and that we will oppose it with every legal means available.' "

February 15, 1956 (p. 1):

"Professors in State-owned and operated institutions of higher learning who wish to act as a sounding board for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People are not wanted, Gov. J. P. Coleman told newsmen here Tuesday.

"The State's chief executive thus backed up the Mississippi Legislature in its resolutions of 'good riddance' of two college officials, Morton King, of the University of Mississippi and William Buchanan, of Mississippi State College, both of whom have resigned in protest against screening of speakers in the two institutions.

" 'They just staged a sympathy strike on behalf of the Reverend Elvin Kershaw, whom Ole Miss barred after he announced he belonged to the NAACP,' Coleman declared.

"Coleman told newsmen that 'I worked hard to get Kershaw here, and then he wrote the silliest letter I ever read, announcing his NAACP stand.'

" 'I really don't believe Kershaw wrote the letter he sent us,' Coleman said. 'It reads like it was NAACP-inspired.'

"Governor Coleman reminded his audience that the University of Mississippi and Mississippi State College are State owned.

" 'They belong to the people, and the people of Mississippi have the right to demand that teachers expounding against our way of life be ousted,' he said."

February 22, 1956 (p. 1):

"Gov. J. P. Coleman declared Tuesday that if a Negro succeeds in entering any institution of higher learning or any common school in Mississippi, the seat of learning would be immediately abolished.

" 'Not only would the legislature refuse to appropriate funds to operate an interracial institution,' he cited, 'but lawmakers would insist on the immediate cessation of teaching activities there.'

February 25, 1956 (p. 1):

"Gov. J. P. Coleman signed a bill repealing the compulsory school attendance laws—a move to protect the State integration cases.

"The bill was proposed by the Legal Education Advisory Committee, set up to find ways to evade the U.S. Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in schools. Members argued last year that the State would have firmer legal standing in integration cases if it did not require children—Negro and white—to attend school."

April 27, 1956 (p. 1):

"Gov. J. P. Coleman revealed here late Thursday that he has turned down speaking engagements on the segregation issue in at least six States, including Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and New York.

"He gave as his reason the fact that he does not believe the Governor of Mississippi should be attempting to influence the people of another State on any issue.

" 'That is just what we are objecting to in Mississippi,' he said. 'We don't want outsiders coming in and telling us what to do. By the same token, I don't propose to be going to other States for such a purpose. Anyway, why discuss a proposition on which we permit no argument.' "

May 3, 1956 (p. 1, note: Story by the Associated Press):

"The 12-member Mississippi State Sovereignty Commission, created to protect States' rights from Federal 'encroachment,' organized behind closed doors Wednesday and prepared to hire a full-time staff.

"Gov. J. P. Coleman, who advocated open meetings of all State organizations during his campaign last summer, barred the press from the meeting, saying he would issue a statement later.

"He was automatically named chairman of the group and chairman of a subcommittee to select an 'outstanding attorney with wide Federal court experience' to work with the attorney general in fighting court cases attacking the sovereignty of Mississippi.

"The SCC, empowered to resist any Federal laws of court decisions contrary to Mississippi law and tradition, was created to replace the disbanded Legal Education Advisory Committee, itself set up to seek means of evading the U.S. Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation."

May 28. 1956:

"The Governor of Mississippi Sunday called the defeat of the two North Carolina Congressmen, a warning to the Democratic Party not to 'insult the South's convictions.'

"Gov. J. P. Coleman issued a statement about the defeat of U.S. Representatives Thurmond D. Chatham and Charles B. Deane, both North Carolina Democrats who refused to sign the southern manifesto which pledged 101 southern lawmakers to resist the school segregation decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. The Congressmen were defeated for renomination in North Carolina's Democratic primary voting yesterday. Coleman, a lifelong Democrat who helped keep Mississippi in the party in 1952, said: 'The action of the voters in a moderate State like North Carolina in defeating two Members of Congress because of their refusal to sign the southern manifesto should be notice to certain figures in the Democratic Party that the South has no intention of submitting to an unconstitutional Supreme Court decision' (on segregation.)"

July 17, 1956 (p. 1):

"In concerted efforts to present a united front at the national convention, Mississippi Democrats in convention here Monday divided posts of honor among rival factions and effected compromises on several nonvital issues.

"On the really important points, they stood together, including strong resolutions on segregation and States rights, an uninstructed, unit-rule delegation, a recessed convention subject to recall after the national conventions, and freedom of States righters to express their views and yet remain in the party fold.

"As expected, Governor Coleman held a majority in the convention."

September 12, 1956 (p. 1):

"Gov. J. P. Coleman said here late today that he does not anticipate any attempts to integrate the common schools of this State 'now or at any time in the foreseeable future.'

"'Our firm policy of State government which has the backing of all of our people will forestall that,' he said.

"Coleman also reminded his audience that the school abolition act of 1954 which would allow the States to transfer the school to private status is also a deterrent to any attempts at integration.

"'Our Negro leaders know that to attempt to integrate would only cause their children to lose on schooling altogether,' the chief executive of Mississippi said.

"'We will have segregation in Mississippi so long as our people want it,' Coleman declared. He said that Mississippi has many ways of defending itself against any attempts at integration, but that he would not reveal them until such time as needed to be put into effect."

October 8, 1956 (p. 1):

"Gov. J. P. Coleman Sunday told 20 visiting New England editors and publishers that Mississippi will keep racial segregation 'for at least the next 50 years.'

"Coleman said, 'That doesn't mean I think it will end then; I just don't think I can speak for the period beyond that.'

"'As far as I am concerned, there will (be) no integration in Mississippi. I don't say that boastfully, but because it is for the best interest of the State.'

"The journalists are guests of the State sovereignty commission which was created by the 1956 legislature to preserve Mississippi's States rights—primarily segregation.

"Coleman, a 6-foot, 2-inch one time Mississippi plowboy, wrote most of Mississippi's new segregation laws during his term of attorney general."

October 14, 1956 (p. 1):

"He (Coleman) told them of new laws—most of which he wrote as attorney general and then signed when his people promoted him to Governor—to keep Negroes out of white schools. They include authority for the legislature to abolish public schools."

October 25, 1956 (p. 1):

"Holding that Mississippi is the only Southern State that still retains 100 percent segregation, Coleman also attacked States righters for attempting to make integration a campaign issue.

"'They are picking flaws in perfection,' the Governor declared. 'We haven't had one school integrated; yet, they cry integration Democrats in Mississippi have enacted integration laws as regards our schools that no States righter has been able to improve upon or even suggest an improvement (sic),' Coleman declared. 'What can the States righters find wrong with the 100 percent segregation now in effect in this State,' Coleman asked."

October 26, 1956 (p. 29):

"Coleman said recently, 'I do not now favor the Negro voting in Mississippi. He is wholly unprepared to assume this responsibility.'"

November 20, 1956 (p. 1):

"Attorney General Herbert Brownell has summoned U.S. attorneys of 14 Southern States to appear in Washington on December 10 to map plans of action for enforcing desegregation on buses and other public carriers.

"Late Monday afternoon, no action had been taken by the State sovereignty commission toward an early meeting to cope with the new problems. Hal De Cell, publicity director, said that his office had received no notice of the Brownell action. The sovereignty commission, created to keep Mississippi segregated, has not held a meeting in several weeks. Gov. J. P. Coleman, nominal head of the commission, was not immediately available for comment."

December 30, 1956 (p. 27—Note: the following quotations were taken from an article about Governor Coleman by Phil Strouse of the Jackson Daily News):

"The Governor (Coleman) interpreted the 'reason we haven't had integration in Mississippi.'

"(1) Because integrationists realize the resistance that would be given by Mississippians. (2) Our colored citizens are well pleased and decline to become plaintiffs or guinea pigs of outside agitators. Although the U.S. Supreme Court decision was handed down on May 17, 1954, Mississippi still stands 100-percent segregated. The Governor said he 'honestly believes segregation will stick in Mississippi.'"

June 21, 1957 (p. 1):

"Mississippi can and will legally sidestep integration of her schools, even as this State has done at the ballot box, Gov. J. P. Coleman said here late Thursday. Governor Coleman declared that any State in the Union may avoid integration by taking full advantage of the legal opportunities available to it. He said that the State of Mississippi has a perfect example in the voter laws which have remained partically (sic) impregnable to the would-be Negro balloteer since 1890. He said that there has been no appreciable increase in the Negro vote in this State despite an all-out effort by the NAACP, because the State constitution makes no provision on voting or elections that refers in any way to race.

"Coleman said further that he does not favor Negroes voting in this State and he hopes that there will never be a strong Republican Party in Mississippi. 'The reasons that the Negro should not vote in this State are obvious,' he said. 'If they vote in numbers they will vote as a block and you will see politicans (sic) laying up to them as in the Northern States now.'

"He said that despite all efforts, Mississippi is legally conducting elections in which the Negro is unable to dominate the picture. He declared that by the same token, the schools can be kept from being integrated. 'It would be utterly impossible to integrate the schools of any State or this State now, if the State will take the right legal approach.' Coleman said."

(Note: Coleman was asked if a special session of the legislature might be called in case the civil rights law is enacted. Excerpts from his answer follow:)

"If I deemed it necessary for the protection of segregation in this State, I would certainly not (p. 11) hesitate to call a special session of the legislature," he said.

June 24, 1957 (p. 1, comments on Coleman's appearance on Meet the Press, June 23):

"He (Coleman) said he considered most Mississippi Negroes unqualified to vote. He declared schools in this State will not be integrated in the lifetime of any person now living."

August 2, 1957 (p. 1, at the midway mark of his administration, Coleman comments):

"He points with particular pride to the fact that Mississippi has continued to enjoy segregation of the races without incident. 'We have not been to the Federal courthouse the first time,' he says. He thinks that the State Sovereignty Commission, which at times has been beset by controversy, has been serving its purpose as a sort of watchdog over segregation. And, further, he thinks that it must be continued in that role. 'We cannot afford to abandon our watch and be caught unprepared,' he says."

September 27, 1957:

"Members of panel of Mississippians were told Thursday night that:

"1. Our unanimity is creating a climate calculated to prevent or minimize racial disturbances.

"2. Governor Coleman will immediately invoke the constitutional authority to close any school at which integration appears imminent, leaving empty classrooms into which troops could march Negro children.

"3. Specific plans for handling school integration problems are laid, but will not be 'telegraphed to our enemies' by publicity.

"4. President Eisenhower went beyond his constitutional authority and congressional intent in sending troops to Arkansas, but there seems no effective remedy at hand.

"These points and many others favorable to the maintenance in Mississippi of segregation in public schools were made by a panel of public leaders, questioned by a quartet of citizens of the State on a statewide TV hookup, broadcast without commercial sponsorship as a public service. The program had Governor Coleman, flanked by Senator James O. Eastland and Congressman John Bell Williams on the official panel. It was Coleman who emphasized the fact that Mississippi will never have integrated schools because citizens voted a constitutional amendment to close the schools first. 'I doubt,' he said, 'that the President would get any satisfaction out of guarding any empty school.' Governor Coleman said Mississippi has taken the lead in segregation legislation and he praised members of the legislature for their work. He said the big question is whether or not we can preserve our schools if we have to close them for integration threats."

(The following excerpts are taken from an Associated Press story concerning Coleman's statement on the Little Rock integration crisis, p. 6):

"Governor Coleman Thursday warned that race-mixers 'no doubt are trying to goad Mississippi into furnishing an excuse for sending Federal troops to integrate the State's schools.'

"The unfortunate turn of events in Little Rock has not changed the firm resolution of the State of Mississippi to control its internal affairs in public schools and otherwise. The people of Mississippi may be assured that the Governor and the legislature have no intention of surrendering at any time or any place to any unjustified, illegal, unconstitutional interference with the rights of this State and of its people. The Governor and the legislature are in constant conference to this end. Success will not be attained by loud talk and muddy thinking but by well planned action."

August 29, 1957 (p. 1): "Gov. J. P. Coleman plans to name committees in every county and call mass meetings throughout the State to prepare Mississippi's defenses against the new civil rights bill."

(Discussing proposed changes in Mississippi constitution): "Coleman also has said the constitutional provision for separate Negro and white schools should be removed because similar provisions in other Southern States have been the basis for overthrow of segregation laws. If the Negro can command the vote under this civil rights bill, then he can, as a matter of course, get everything else."

August 30, 1957 (p. 1): "Gov. J. P. Coleman hinted today he may seek a change in the way Mississippians are registered to vote as a part of the State's defense against civil rights legislation. The Governor told the Calhoun City Rotary Club he may ask that the registration function be taken from circuit clerks under the new constitution he hopes to have written. Instead, a three-man commission or board would meet at a regular time once a month to accept registrations."

August 31, 1957 (p. 1): "Gov. J. P. Coleman said Friday he will call Mississippi's State Sovereignty Commission into session at the earliest possible time to consider the situation growing out of civil rights legislation. He also outlined plans for a statewide committee of lawyers, one from each of Mississippi's 82 counties, to study this civil rights bill in all its implications and what we've got to do to protect ourselves against it.

"Asked today if he thought the civil rights legislation would result in any increase in Negro voting in Mississippi, the Governor said: 'That all depends on a lot of things. It does not necessarily follow that more would vote, although it could follow through a lack of management and preparation. This civil rights bill represents an effort by the Federal Government to vote a man whether he meets State quilifications [sic] or not—and therein lies the great danger,' he said. He said that with the defenses he outlined and 'certain very necessary changes in the constitution the people of Mississippi will escape any substantial injury from this Federal legislation.'"

"If a legislator is sincerely interested in maintenance of segregation—and I think they all are—then he will have no choice but to vote for a constitutional convention. If he votes against a constitutional convention then he will have to assume the responsibility for the disaster which may follow." (P. 18.)

October 1, 1957 (p. 1): "Gov. J. P. Coleman agreed here Monday with a Jackson member of the legislature that Mississippi should take immediate legislative action to forestall integration of the State's public schools. In answer to a letter from T. Eugene Caldwell, representative from Hinds County, the Governor said: 'You are correct in that the legislature could now go ahead with the implementation of 213–B of the constitution, and I think it ought to be done if it has any chance of standing up in the Federal courts.' Section 213–B is the amendment to our State constitution which will allow the abolition of public schools in favor of a private school system."

October 2, 1957 (p. 1): "Rutherford (George W., Jr., Prentiss County sheriff) was here (in Jackson) for the Mississippi Sheriffs' Association convention. A citizens' group in Booneville has accused him of allowing bootleggers and gamblers to flourish.

"His attorneys charge that Coleman knowingly approved recall election petitions which were insufficient under the 1956 recall law, and conspired with the citizens' group. Coleman himself has ignored subpenas to appear at the hearing and to present pertinent records, saying the Governor is immune to subpena."

November 19, 1957 (p. 1): "Gov. J. P. Coleman made a dramatic appeal to a joint session of the Mississippi legislature here Monday afternoon for adoption of his plans for a revision of the constitution of 1890, basing his plea on segregation.

"He told the law-making body that failure to accede to his request would take responsibility for any future integration of schools off his shoulders and onto the backs of themselves. The chief executive painted a dark picture of the possibility that the U.S. Supreme Court may strike down all the laws already made in this State to circumvent integration, citing similar decisions in other States. 'If our constitutional provisions will not stand the test, then all statutory provisions enacted pursuant to those provisions would likewise fall the first time they are attacked,' Coleman said. 'The inevitable result then is to leave Mississippi without any public school laws which will stand up in the Federal courts,' he said. 'We will be left legally naked and defenseless.'

"Governor Coleman also warned of the expanding Negro vote in the State and suggested constitutional revision to cope with this threat. He said he was convinced this problem could be handled only by a constitutional convention. Governor Coleman said the U.S. Supreme Court decision in the Virginia case means Mississippi is shorn of enforceable school segregation laws. He said the State's obligation to educate children should be removed from the constitution so that the schools themselves could make a district-(p. 14) by-district defense against integration, sacrificing some schools if necessary but saving the rest.

"He declared circuit clerks who now act as registrars, not being lawyers, could be intimidated into allowing 'wholesale voting of unqualified voters'—obviously Negroes—under the Civil Rights Act. He proposed three-man registrar boards, with one member a lawyer, but did not say how they would operate. A 'host of court decisions,' he said, make clear the State cannot have 'a segregated private school system supported directly or indirectly with public funds.'

"Coleman said further bond sales to support the State's $120 million Negro-white equalization program will not be justified if the constitutional safeguards he asked are not adopted. This appeared to be a threat to withhold funds now sought by school districts throughout the State.

"By 'wiping the State clean'—removing present constitutional authority to abolish schools and requiring separate schools, he said, and adopting a legislative program similar to North Carolina's the State could become 'absolutely immune in the Federal courts.' The North Carolina school program has been upheld in Federal court.

"He said Mississippi's constitutional authority to abolish schools should be removed because legislative journals show 'the clear purpose of that amendment was to preserve segregation to the last ditch and then abolish the schools as a last resort.'"

Referring to the North Carolina program: "The Federal courts have ruled that pupils 'would have to apply for admission on an individual basis if they claimed the law had been administered in their case solely on account of race and color,' Coleman said.

"This method 'would be most effective in Mississippi' and in the event one such suit were won 'the closing of one school would not affect any other school still operating on an acceptable basis,' the Governor said. If the legislature does not act, Coleman said, 'then we will soon be compelled—it could happen any day now—to watch our attorney general appear at the Federal courthouse and suffer the humiliating experience of losing the public school system of this State.'"

February 4, 1958 (p. 1): Voter registration would be taken out of the hands of circuit clerks and given to county election commissioners and examiners under a measure introduced in the legislature Monday. Gov. J. P. Coleman has suggested such a step to prevent voting onslaughts—obviously by Negroes—under the Civil Rights Act. The House measure was introduced by Representatives David Glass and John Guyton of Attala County. Their resolution bore the notation by request, which means they acted at the request of someone else.

(In reference to the registration clerks presently in charge): "If he is pressured into registering all those who ask for registration in order to stay out of trouble, we will soon be engulfed by wholesale voting of unqualified persons in Mississippi."

March 19, 1958 (p. 1): Gov. J. P. Coleman told a joint assembly of the Mississippi Legislature here Tuesday morning that the only way to successfully handle onslaughts of integrationists is through a constitutional convention. Thus, he renewed his claim that only a completely new basic formula of law will maintain segregation in this State.

March 23, 1958 (p. 8): The Governor used a Negro's challenge of Mississippi's voter registration laws to issue another convention request. (See March 19; the Negro minister's name is H. D. Darby.)

(Reference is to the U.S. Justice Department's announcement of plans to send investigators into the South after the 1956 election, p. 10): "Gov. J. P. Coleman called the 1956 Justice Department announcement 'a cheap political bluff' and 'mass slander'.")

May 9, 1958 (p. 2): "Gov. J. P. Coleman signed into law Thursday one bill to help strengthen segregation. The approved bill authorized the attorney general and the general legislative investigating committee to investigate organizations whose directors have been cited as subversive or as having belonged to subversive groups. It also required those organizations to file with the secretary of state a yearly list of members under penalty of fine and imprisonment. Sponsors of the bill told the legislature it was aimed at the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People because they understood some of the directors have been cited."

June 6, 1958 regarding the barring of a Negro, Prof. Clennon King from registering at the University of Mississippi, p. 1): "Scarbrough (public safety commissioner) said he and his patrolmen, some of them in plain clothes, were assigned to the 'Ole Miss' campus by Gov. J. P. Coleman to preserve the peace.

"Coleman, asked Thursday night about reports that an attempt would be made to commit King to an institution (note: a lunacy warrant had been issued against King at the request of Lafayette County Sheriff Boyce Bratton), said 'all of his legal rights will be fully preserved.' It was evident the Governor was in close touch with the situation.

"King said he was taken from a line of students waiting to register for summer school and was invited into the administration building for a conference with Registrar Robert Ellis. He was told it would be some time before his application could be processed—probably until after the last day of registration. Told he had to leave, he was not allowed to leave alone. King said, 'When I sought to leave the room alone they forced me out another entrance.' (Students registering when King was taken from line said that King was carried bodily to the waiting, green station wagon which sped away before newsmen could talk to King on the campus.)"

June 7, 1958 (p. 1): "King was committed on June 6 to Whitfield State Mental Hospital for a period of observation to last a minimum of 30 days."

"Examination by the two Hinds County doctors was ordered by Chancery Clerk Frank Scott following a statement by Gov. J. P. Coleman who declared King "went berserk" during his attempt at entry to the University Thursday. Coleman said that if the mental examination shows King is sane, he will be tried on charges of disturbing the peace and resisting arrest on the Ole Miss campus at Oxford. (P. 1.)

"Coleman said plainclothes officers followed King's cross-country bus from Gulfport to Oxford. In addition, a plainclothesman was aboard the bus with the professor. 'We knew what he was going to do,' Coleman said. 'He had told it all over the State.' (P. 6.)

"Coleman said the former Alcorn A. & M. (Negro) College history professor was arrested Thursday morning when he refused to leave the university administration building without registering. He had been told he could not register until his application had been approved—standard college procedure. Coleman told a news conference Friday King's refusal to follow procedure proved 'his complete unfitness to become a student in any of the educational institutions supported by the State.' The Governor said the Georgia-born professor went berserk when Old Miss authorities and State officers sought to persuade him to leave the campus and await a decision on his hopes to enroll as a graduate student. Coleman said he was brought to State patrol headquarters because he threatened, if released, to return immediately to the campus.

"The professor was held incommunicado in a cell and Coleman and other officers refused to disclose his whereabouts.

"But Daily News Photographer Norm Bergoma and the Associated Press succeeded in tape recording an interview with King through the cell door, the news of which resulted in Coleman ordering guards posted around the building. During his news conference, Coleman said King's whereabouts were kept secret to prevent crowds collecting and possible disorder.

"In the interview, King said he wanted only 'to get out of here. I don't know what they're going to do. I would like to get out. I wouldn't bother it any more. I would leave it alone.' He referred to his attempt at registering."

June 14, 1958 (p. 1): "Gov. J. P. Coleman said Friday night he will not respond to the subpena (sic) issued in circuit court seeking to have him testify in the habeas corpus hearing for Prof. Clennon King. His stand is the same he took in the Prentiss County sheriff-recall case, when he stood on his constitutional immunity as the chief executive."

September 14, 1958 (p. 1): "Gov. J. P. Coleman Saturday repeated his vow that Mississippi schools will remain segregated despite problems which have stricken other Southern States.

"In reporting Governor Coleman's speech the United Press International drew the following conclusion: 'Coleman said in effect that after the Supreme Court's Little Rock decision Friday the only way Mississippi can maintain an adequate public education system is through voluntary segregation.

" 'The Governor of Mississippi has promised to operate the schools of this State for the best interest of all children. This means that each race will have its own teachers; and each race will march forward with pride in its own accomplishments. There is really nothing "inferior" about this kind of a program. In the spirit of calmness and confidence, let us keep our poise and dignity. As for myself, I shall keep my promises to the people of Mississippi.' " (p. 14.)

October 5, 1958 (p. 11): "Even before the latest decision Gov. J. P. Coleman warned that 'all could be lost' in the Federal courts. Coleman's statement indicated he believes Mississippi would have no public school system before she accepted integration. No suits have been filed in Mississippi for integration. Coleman said whether the State has public schools in the future may depend on whether the voluntary system of segregation continues."

October 6, 1958 (report on Coleman's appearance on "Meet the Press" on October 5, p. 4): "Coleman stressed that Mississippi is not afraid of the issue but is deeply concerned about where the powers of the Supreme Court stop and those of Congress begin. He said that separate schools are in the best interest of both races. Asked whether Mississippi would ever accept integration of schools Coleman repeated his statement of a year ago that 'never is a long time,' and he would not predict the ultimate outcome."

October 17, 1958 (p. 1): Gov. J. P. Coleman predicted Thursday Mississippi would continue to operate public schools on a segregated basis. "I don't anticipate any trouble at all. I want our people to proceed on that same basis. I don't believe either race wants to destroy the public schools. Our people will only support a segregated system."

November 21, 1958 (p. 1): Gov. J. P. Coleman promised Thursday that Mississippi would maintain segregation despite the efforts of his political enemies who agitate "to improve their political chances."

"We are going to keep the schools in Mississippi open, and we are going to operate them on a segregated basis."

"Coleman also announced the State textbook commission has completed work on the list of books approved for high school use during the next 4 years.

"Coleman a member of the five-man group, said, 'We have done our best to select the very best books available and have carefully checked on them all as to content.'

"Before the group of books went before the group, every one was examined by a committee of teachers, who screened out material that might be construed as for integration."

June 30, 1959 (the following is taken from a television speech made by Coleman, p. 7): "In 1955, I said in my official platform (and I am reading the exact language): 'There will be no necessity to abolish public school, nor will there be any mixing of the races in any of the State-operated educational institutions. This is no task for the amateur or the hothead.'

"I said this again in my inaugural address when I took the oath of office on January 17, 1956.

"Tonight, the people of Mississippi know that I have kept this pledge inviolate. They know that we have had absolutely no mixing of the races in our public schools. And they further know that the schools have been in no danger of closing. We have done this with what amounted to almost complete quietness and we have done it without keeping up a daily atmosphere of fighting and tension. If there be those who would have enjoyed an uproar they must remember that 4 years ago I promised the people that the job would be done in quietness and dignity, and the people elected me on that promise. By their vote in 1955, the people indicated that they did not want to be forever in a stew about the safety of racial separation and the existence of their public schools.

"There have been a few individuals running around over Mississippi saying that no one man is entitled to the credit for this happy state of affairs. I do not know of any one man who wishes to claim all the credit. I do know that if the cause had been lost and if Mississippi had been integrated, or if we had lost our public school system, these same individuals would be yelling at the top of their well-exercised lungs that the Governor was wholly and solely to blame for the entire catastrophe. They would be dancing on my grave with savage glee. The cold truth is that they have been disappointed with my success and they have done a mighty poor job of hiding their disappointment.

"When I was sworn in as Governor, many people fearfully but frankly told me in private that they thought I had overspoken myself in promising that there would be no race mixing and that there would be no school closing. They said I had made a promise that I could not keep. You see, however, that I have kept that promise to the last letter, and I know that I shall go out of office on the 19th day of next January with racial separation still intact in Mississippi. I ask you, the people of Mississippi, could those who attack me in the newspapers have done a better job than your Governor has done? Your answer would be that they could not, because the situation has been perfect insofar as we are concerned. And Mississippi is the only State which enjoys such conditions.

"I am sure everybody within the sound of my voice remembers when Clennon King tried to integrate the University of Mississippi. I am sure they remember that when I came face to face with this dire threat I did not sit scared to death in the Governor's office at the State Capitol, nor did I go into a panic, issuing newspaper statements every hour on the hour. I went in person to Oxford, Miss., and everybody knows what happened to Clennon King. Where were my critics then? Where were the Monday morning quarterbacks?

"They offered no suggestions, they provided no remedies, and they rendered no assistance. When the university had been saved from integration, when Clennon King had left the State, and when our educational institution sailed ahead as if nothing had ever happened. the habitual critics did not have the courtesy to offer one word of congratulations or to say one word of approval.

"What Mississippi needs is leadership possessed of the experience, the courage, the wisdom, the ability, and the resourcefulness to preserve racial separation and at the same time preserve and improve our public schools. Therein lies the only hope for the future of our children.

"I am well aware that a little handful of my political adversaries have tried to destroy my place in the affections of my fellow Mississippians by claiming that I am a moderate. Apparently, these people cannot tell a moderate from a successful segregationist. They have made a great sham of this, and every time they can get a chance they try to stir it up. I ask you to ignore what they say and look at what the record says. I stand on a record of performance and I have delivered the goods. I am not entitled to be called a moderate, and I notice that none of my friends have called me that."

(Coleman answers attack for not following the Governor of Arkansas): "Let us examine the record. Nobody can argue with the record.

"When the schools were integrated at Hoxie, at Van Buren, at Fort Smith, and other places in Arkansas, Governor Faubus made no effort to stop that integration. When trouble flared up in Arkansas, Governor Faubus made no effort to stop that integration. When race mixing finally got to the State capital at Little Rock, he did try to stop it. Do you believe it would be right for me to refuse to fight until it got within the shadow of the State capitol at Jackson? Do you believe it would be right for me to let the NAACP integrate Lexington, or Greenwood, or Macon without raising my hand to stop it? In my view of things, if I were to follow this policy, I would not be the Governor of Mississippi, I would simply be the Governor of Jackson. I have adopted the rule of stopping integration anywhere it raises its head, regardless of the town, and I have enforced that rule.

"Governor Faubus had done nothing about race mixing at the University of Arkansas. I could not follow him in this. When they attempted to mix the races at the University of Mississippi, I stopped it cold.

"Many of you have heard Governor Faubus say on nationwide television that his son attended an integrated college. I cannot follow the Governor in sending his son to an integrated college. I have sent my son to the University of Mississippi, where the races are apart. People ordinarily do not send their children to schools that they do not approve of, and I feel that if I were to send my son to a mixed school I would be publicly approving of race mixing, and I would be setting an example for the entire populace to follow.

"Governor Faubus appointed a Negro to a high party office in Arkansas. If I had followed him on this, Mr. Bidwell Adam, who got beat for reelection as Lieutenant Governor by 44,000 votes 27 years ago, and who introduced Mr. Faubus at Biloxi, would no doubt have had a stroke. However, since Governor Faubus appointed a Negro, it was, of course, perfectly all right with Bidwell.

"In a speech which he delivered on June 13 at Biloxi, at the Mississippi Bar Association, Governor Faubus said the people ought to be allowed to mix the races in the public schools if they wanted to, or that they should be allowed to keep the races separate if they wanted to. That might please both sides, but that is not the public policy of the State of Mississippi. We believe that it is to the best interest of both races that they have their own schools throughout the State and that everybody operate under the same rule. Therefore, I could not follow Governor Faubus in supporting local option on segregation."

February 5, 1959 (discussion of the South's power in the coming election p. 12): "A new Governor will be in office succeeding Coleman, of Mississippi, who had a large part in toning down the 1956 civil rights plank."

February 8, 1959 (p. 1): "Lieutenant Governor Gartin has the backing of Gov. J. P. Coleman in the gubernatorial race."

February 25, 1959 (p. 1, Gartin): "I am committed to a total battle for total segregation now and at all times and I do not want our people to weaken or to yield on this matter, now or in the future." Gartin in a recent speech declared that if some attempts were made to integrate the schools of Mississippi, he would not hesitate to close them in favor of a private school system as provided by the legislature.

March 20, 1959 (p. 1): "Governor Coleman said that integrated schools will not and cannot come to the State."

March 17, 1963 (p. 1): "Former Gov. J. P. Coleman, Thursday night, promised there will be no racial integration of public schools in Mississippi during the next 4 years if he gets a second term in the Governor's office. 'There will be no necessity to abolish the public schools,' he promised again Thursday. 'Nor will there be any mixing of the races in none [sic] of the State-operated educational institutions. This is no task for the amateur or the hothead.

" 'The people will remember Clennon King and where he landed,' he said. 'If you want your schools and colleges to remain open and to remain separate, then give me your vote and I shall not betray your trust,' he vowed.

"He said that he planned to be a leader among the Southern States, and recalled that he was unanimously elected the Southern leader at the annual meeting of Governors in Chicago, 1956.

" 'You will remember,' he said, 'that after a 2-week battle that convention refused to endorse the Supreme Court school integration decision of 1954,' he declared."

May 19, 1963: (Reply to the attack of other candidates, p. 8): "Coleman arose to declare that 'when I was Governor, segregation was maintained.' He said that he voted for Kennedy and Johnson but that one vote does not make a man's career, and you cannot condemn him forever. Coleman then reminded his audience that as attorney general in Mississippi for 5 years he would not let mixed prize fights or baseball come to Mississippi, though pressure was brought."

June 12, 1963: "Coleman called Kennedy's Tuesday night speech after the Alabama integration 'the greatest challenge to the South in 100 years.'

"He said the South has two weapons to battle the Kennedy plan. One of these is the filibuster in the Senate, and the other is the chairmanship of the powerful Senate Judiciary Committee, in the hands of Senator J. O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi.

"Coleman said rumored attempts to purge EASTLAND because Mississippi bolted the Democratic Party in the 1960 election was the main reason he supported the party ticket in that election.

"Coleman said he will fight 'any man who is an enemy of Mississippi,' whether his name is 'Kennedy or Rockefeller or any other you might name.'

"He said a Coleman defeat in the August 6 primary would 'please Bobby Kennedy beyond expression. I can mix it up with them.'

"He said he would let the NAACP, CORE, and similar professional rabble rousers 'know what I propose to do and how it is to be done when the time is ripe, and not a minute before.'

" 'I propose,' he said, 'to seek a southwide convention to take stock of our troubles and to come up with a remedy which at least a half dozen Southern States will support. No national politician can laugh at the solid effect of as many as six States.'

" 'You have no intention of tolerating the destruction of these institutions (schools and universities of Mississippi) by the process of integration.'

"He said that Mississippi's relationship with the Federal Government is the State's paramount problem at present. 'Not only in the field of race relations, but in every other area of activity of the Federal Government.'

"He said he thinks Mississippi can defeat Federal encroachment on State's rights through 'quiet, effective work, backed by all the power and dignity of the Governor's office in a statesmanlike manner.' "

July 10, 1963 (p. 1): "Former Governor J. P. Coleman said Tuesday his opponents have taken a defeatist attitude on the race issue. Speaking at Monticello, Morgantown, and McComb, Coleman said he is the only candidate 'with hope of stemming widespread integration and the ability and experience to do it. My opponents say that I cannot stop it,' he declared, 'because they have apparently lost hope and have offered no plan or suggestion for maintaining separation of the races.'

"Senator EASTLAND's judiciary committee chairmanship, and we're glad of that. That chairmanship is the major bulwark between us and Kennedy's civil rights bill.' "

July 12, 1963 (p. 16): "Coleman said separation of the races can be maintained with calm and dignity, with no disturbing headlines circulating the country. This is how it was accomplished during my first term as Governor, and it can be done again.' "

July 16, 1963 (p. 10): " 'The only racial trouble in this State from 1956–1960 was when Negro Clennon King decided he wanted to go to Ole' Miss. He went in the front door and out the back door to another State institution (a State mental hospital). He decided then he wanted to leave the State, and he hasn't been back since.' "

July 23, 1963 (p. 12): "At Ripley, Miss., former Gov. J. P. Coleman said * * * he was 'better qualified to fight the Kennedys' than his opponents for the State gubernatorial nomination."

July 24, 1963 (p. 16): " 'I'd shut up every schoolhouse before we see education by Federal bayonet,' Coleman said."

July 26, 1963 (p. 12): " 'When I was your Governor, Clennon King was escorted by officials as he attempted to enroll in school,' Mr. Coleman said, 'but it was red-blooded Mississippi highway patrolmen and not a Federal marshal.' "

August 1, 1963 (p. 16): "Claiming that both Johnson and Sullivan 'feel that an uproar and turmoil are inevitable in the fight for States rights,' Coleman said that sovereignty can be maintained peacefully.

" 'But not by knocking over the paramount rules of the United States. You just have to learn how to plow around them,' he added.

" 'But if Coleman goes down in defeat, you can look forward to half a dozen political opportunists running against Senator JOHN STENNIS next year with the same argument. And the same thing goes for Senator JAMES EASTLAND the following year.

" 'Because they voted the Democratic ticket in 1960, also. We did it to save Senator EASTLAND's chairmanship of the vital Senate Judiciary Committee—one of our main weapons against the civil rights bill.' "

August 2, 1963 (p. 12): "Coleman cited his handling of Negro Clennon King, 'who wanted to go to Ole Miss, but who wound up in another of our fine institutions called Whitfield.'

"He said King 'learned more at Whitfield than he would have at Ole Miss in 3 years. We gave him his diploma, he went to Hawaii, and that's about as close to Mississippi as he ever wants to be.'

"He (Coleman) told the crowd, 'If you really want to help the Kennedys, then vote for the candidate who is not prepared by experience and training to do battle with them and who will be duck soup and the easiest for them to run over, and I can assure you that that man is not J. P. Coleman.' "

August 3, 1963 (p. 2): "Coleman repeated the story about Negro Clennon King, who attempted to register at Ole Miss during Coleman's tenure as Governor but who was committed to Whitfield after 2 weeks after being held incommunicado for some time by highway patrolmen.

" 'The point of this story,' he said, 'is not the fact that one man was kept out of Ole Miss. Rather, it shows that we know how to protect your rights in such a way that the Federal Government could find no excuse for putting hands on the State of Mississippi.' "

August 16, 1963 (p. 3): " 'My opponent and his friends try to belittle my record as a public official,' Coleman said, 'but as attorney general and later as Governor, our institutions including segregation remained intact while I held office.'

"The former Governor said he 'fought the battles for the people of Mississippi for 30 years and now my opponent who has served as Lieutenant Governor for only 3½ years thinks he is best qualified.'

"Former Gov. J. P. Coleman, branded by foes as the Kennedy man, in Mississippi's bitter gubernatorial race, said Thursday night he might support Arizona Senator Barry Goldwater in the 1964 presidential race.

" 'I will actively support that man who gives the State of Mississippi the best chance of surviving the 4 years ahead,' the longtime Democratic leader said. 'It's possible that man might be Goldwater.' "

August 17, 1963 (p. 3): " 'But I (Coleman said) have served the people of Mississippi for more than 30 years and have never lost a battle with the Federal Government.' "

August 18, 1963 (p. 14): "(Full-page ad): 'J. P. Coleman's Platform, 1964–68,' submitted to and approved by A. F. Summer, State campaign manager. For segregation, peace, prosperity. J. P. Coleman for Governor.' "

August 23, 1963 (p. 12): "Citing his success in halting the attempted enrollments of Negroes Medgar Evans Evers and Clennon King, the former Governor said, 'The people will now have to decide whether they want to be led by a man who stood up for 3 minutes and failed or one who stood up successfully for 10 years.' "

August 24, 1963 (p. 3): "Coleman scored his opponent for claiming to be a 'political descendant of Bilbo.' 'It tickles me that he is going around and making that claim because Paul Johnson, Sr., fought Bilbo as long as he could breath. My opponent is no more kin to Bilbo than someone from Massachusetts.'

"The former Governor said Johnson had accused him of 'being associated with a long list of people, including Martin Luther King, Jr.' 'If he would resort to such tactics as going on television and comparing another white man to a Negro what do you think he might do as Governor?' 'If the people will buy that sort of thing, then God save Mississippi, because it is in need of salvation.' "

August 26, 1963 (p. 11, taken from a full-page advertisement): "For segregation, peace, prosperity, elect J. P. Coleman Governor of Mississippi. Submitted to and approved by J. P. Coleman."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair recognizes the Senator from Michigan for 2 minutes.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I am one of two Senators who voted against the favorable reporting of the nomination from the Committee on the Judiciary. In fairness, I think that a summary explanation should be offered.

The political power system or structure, or call it what you will, which Governor Coleman represented—indeed, which he led for 4 years as Governor—does not fit in with my idea of the training ground from which I should advise the selection be made of a man for the Federal bench. Governor Coleman was impressive in his testimony before our committee. If his nomination is confirmed, he may become an outstanding judge. I suppose that a reformed segregationist, performing effectively, would be the very best medicine possible to be applied to a sore wound.

I hope that he will be that kind of judge. However, because of the principles with which he has been identified in public life for some 20 years, I could not in good conscience consent to this nomination.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania from my time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the senior Senator from New York. The statement made by the Senator from Michigan has had a considerable impact on me. Frankly, I have not made up my mind as to how I shall vote on the matter.

Did the impression made on the Senator from Michigan by Governor Coleman cause the Senator to have any belief that the former Governor of Mississippi, the nominee, was not a man of integrity and would not comply with the Constitution and the oath of office that he would take if advice and consent were given?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, my impression was that Governor Coleman is a man of great integrity. He told us that he would, indeed, apply the Constitution and the decisions interpreting it forthrightly.

I hope that, if confirmed, this will be true. If it is true, I shall gladly be the first to acknowledge that my vote was in error. If the statement proves to be incorrect, I shall not appear here to say, "I told you so."

It is really my judgment of the man—and in making this statement, I may be very unfair—that he is an extraordinarily able lawyer who wants to do what every Senator would want him to do, and that is to apply the law in the manner in which it should be applied.

I shall cast my vote as I did in committee, in protest really of the fact that over the years when he was a successful political leader—and I know that there are faults in our own northern society, too—Governor Coleman was part of a power structure which abusively and consistently denied rights to Negroes.

I cast my vote in protest of the fact that one who has led in such an effort should be made judge.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The senior Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, when I spoke on last Thursday, I mentioned four States which have no representatives on any of the circuit courts of appeals. I did this to demonstrate that we do not necessarily have to reach out in order to find someone in Mississippi who could be appointed to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Oregon, South Dakota, Alaska, and Hawaii are States which, even if this nomination were to be confirmed, would still not be represented on the circuit court of appeals which covered their particular area.

It seems to me that the Senator from Pennsylvania in his colloquy with the Senator from Michigan has pretty much set the key to what I had in mind in opposing this nomination.

If I were considered as leading the opposition, in the sense of having taken the matter up and studied it very carefully, I could not challenge Governor Coleman as a lawyer. I would not in any way attribute bad faith to Governor Coleman when he states that he can decide civil rights cases in good faith, as far as he is conscious of his own feelings in the matter.

I do say that these segregationist views are ingrained in him, as can be seen from examining the entire career of Governor Coleman from the 1950's down to the very time when he testified before our committee in relation to this nomination.

We had not seen any evidence of a contrary viewpoint until his appearance before our subcommittee this month. That makes me feel that the weight or preponderance of the evidence is not on the side of finding that he will judge civil rights cases objectively and free from segregationist viewpoints.

We are not talking about a man being extreme on the side of segregation, desegregation, or integration. We are not talking about extremes. We are merely talking about the law of the land, which provides that the segregation of the races and the denial of the right to vote because a man is a Negro are wrong.

It is wrong to bar a man from any place of public accommodation, such as a store, or from municipal facilities. Such action violates both the Constitution and specific law passed by Congress. The burden of the evidence of proving objectivity in such a case must be borne by the nominee or those who would speak for him.

It is in that respect that I think the most significant and revealing testimony appears on pages 139 to 140, inclusive, of the hearing record. I beg Senators to listen to this because it traces a man's history and his reasons for acting as he did. It establishes how he accounts for his statements and actions.

It shows that in his entire record and career, up to the time of his testimony before our subcommittee, he did not give any evidence of a departure from those views.

I read from page 139 of the transcript of hearings dealing with the nomination of James P. Coleman as follows:

> Senator FONG. You have been in elective office for approximately 24 years?
>
> Mr. COLEMAN. Yes, sir; I was up to January 1964.
>
> Senator FONG. The practicality of Mississippi in politics forced you to be a segregationist during those years; is that right?
>
> Mr. COLEMAN. I wouldn't use the word "force," Senator. I think it was with a common understanding and belief of the people in the State of Mississippi up until May 17, 1954, at which time I was then attorney general of the State and it had been accepted up until that time as legal and permissible by prior proceedings of the Supreme Court. There wasn't any controversy about it. It didn't become controversial or even a subject of controversy until May 1954.

May 17, 1954, was the date of the decision in the case of Brown against Board of Education. Let us toll the statute as far as Governor Coleman is concerned, to May 18, 1954, and look at his record from then on.

I continue to read from the testimony given by Governor Coleman before our committee:

> Senator FONG. Whether or not you were an ardent segregationist, you followed the segregationist line in 1954?
>
> Mr. COLEMAN. Yes, sir, I did.
>
> Senator FONG. Are you now a segregationist?
>
> Mr. COLEMAN. Well, I go back to what I said a while ago, Senator, that as a judge, I do not want to be called a liberal or a conservative or a segregationist or an integrationist or anything else. I will say that I am going to be a judge of that court and follow the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and the acts of Congress faithfully and without any reluctance or without any evasion or equivocation whatsoever. That will be my policy. I never have liked the labels, as I said a while ago. I have been called everything, I am sorry to say, and sometimes by people that I really didn't expect it from. But that's also a part of political life.

Where in that statement is there any evidence of change of conviction? There is no evidence there of any change of conviction. Even when Governor Coleman testified before the congressional committee, he merely stated that he believed he could be a fair judge. He does not say that he is not a segregationist. The best that we could say on his behalf would be that he is at least an honest man. He could have said, "I am not a segregationist." He could have said, "I am no longer a segregationist." But from the answer which he gave, I do not know what is in the man's mind. Perhaps Governor Coleman wants to run for Governor of Mississippi again and does not want to be disqualified by his testimony given here.

Up to now, we have received no evidence of any basic change of conviction by Governor Coleman, who has been a highly successful public official.

Governor Coleman states that he can be a fair judge. I believe that it is fair to say that perhaps he is the best man we could find if we had to have a distinguished Mississippi lawyer for this post. However, that does not mean that we should confirm him.

I believe decidedly that we should not confirm his nomination. If he is the best that we can obtain there, we are better off leaving him as a distinguished lawyer and possible future candidate for public office in the State of Mississippi, but not as judge for the fifth circuit court of appeals which is probably the main circuit court dealing with such cases. To say that the Supreme Court of the United States can reverse the circuit court of appeals is to beg the question. There is no reason in the world that we should place that burden in the Supreme Court of the United States.

On the contrary, in order to handle civil rights cases expeditiously and with facility to enable Federal judges to carry our Supreme Court mandates, we should have on the circuit courts of appeals judges who will implement the decisions of the Supreme Court. We have all heard of situations in which cases have had to go back to the Supreme Court because of the desire to have opinions construed case by case. That is defeating justice by making it expensive and greatly slowing the process. Instances of term after term passing by, with a disposition of a case having been made, with hassling among the courts, is illustrative of why we need courts on which there will be judges who will, by conviction, carry out the law in accordance with the policy and laws of the United States.

It has been said that he will be only one of at least three judges on the court. Governor Coleman is an able man. He himself said that he was a successful segregationist as late as 1963. He was wholeheartedly in favor of what he had stated. It shows what he can do. I am not saying he will do it. I am not challenging his good faith. I say we cannot take the risk of having on that bench a man who said in 1963 that State sovereignty can be maintained not by knocking over the rulings of the U.S. Supreme Court, but by merely plowing around them. That was said in 1963. That was not in the 1950's, when he was a working politician, running for office, but it was said 9 years after the decision in Brown against Board of Education—not 6 months, but 9 years. After 9 years he said "You do not have to knock over the paramount rules of the United States. You just have to learn how to plow around them."

I shall not vote to place on the circuit court of appeals a man who wants to plow around the decisions of the Supreme Court, when what needs to be done on the bench is to follow the policy and laws of the United States.

I refer again to the case of Clennon King, a professor, a Negro, a man who, from what Governor Coleman indicated, was not the most stable individual. The Governor showed that he had received a letter from Clennon King, the man who attempted to enter the University of Mississippi, and was placed in an institution, and left the State. In a letter which he wrote to the Governor later, he showed great contrition over the trouble he had caused. I am not making any judgment on that fact. The point to which I object is that Governor Coleman crowed about this incident of Professor King's trying to get into the University of Mississippi. He crowed about the Meredith incident, too. It was stated in Governor Coleman's campaign literature "When the fist came down, the hand went out, and Meredith went in," implying that weakness was shown in admitting Meredith.

I shall not vote to confirm the nomination of a man to be named a judge who has made those statements. As late as 1963, he was still crowing about how he would have kept Meredith out of Mississippi University and the fact that he would have had more leeway in keeping Meredith out.

Even though it is said that he will be but one man on the bench, we should have on the bench as representatives of that court men who have convictions to carry out the laws and policies of the United States, not only as expressed by the nine men of the Supreme Court on Capitol Hill, but as expressed by Congress after a stirring struggle in which the Senate passed a civil rights bill by an overwhelming vote, after breaking a civil rights filibuster for the first time in history.

Again I speak with no disrespect to Governor Coleman, but, in my opinion, we should do what is in accord with the will of the people and in accord with the processes of the Congress of the United States and our Federal establishment.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I happen to have been chairman of the subcommittee which heard those opposing as well as those supporting the nomination of Gov. James P. Coleman, of Mississippi, to be a judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Virtually without exception, the witnesses who appeared before that subcommittee in opposition to this nomination admitted that they had never seen Governor Coleman, that they knew nothing about Governor Coleman's ability as a lawyer, and that they knew nothing about his capacity to serve on the bench of the fifth circuit.

I have had the privilege of knowing Governor Coleman for 9 years. I have had the privilege of knowing something about his record for an even longer time. He is an able lawyer. He served with distinction as a district attorney in Mississippi. He served with distinction as superior court judge in Mississippi. He served with distinction as a commissioner of the Supreme Court of Mississippi. He served with distinction as Governor of Mississippi.

Seven members of the Senate Judiciary Committee who are not members of the subcommittee appeared at the hearings for the purpose of propounding questions to Governor Coleman. After they heard the answers of Governor Coleman, five of those seven members of the Judiciary joined other members of the Judiciary Committee in recommending that the Senate take favorable action on his nomination.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield momentarily at that point, so that I may express my appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ERVIN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for the great courtesy which was shown to us in allowing us to question the witness and in producing a record which otherwise would not have been made. I wish the Senator to know how much I appreciate the views expressed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I repeat there were five members of the Judiciary Committee who were not members of the subcommittee, who participated by questioning or otherwise in the hearing, who resided in areas outside the South, and who reached the conclusion that Governor Coleman ought to be confirmed. The man who did the most in investigating the capacity and character of Governor Coleman was the Attorney General of the United States, who likewise resides outside the South.

I invite the attention of Senators to what the Attorney General said in the first paragraph on page 7 of the hearings:

> It is customary to consult members of the judiciary, on a confidential basis, with respect to the appointment of Federal judges. Ten members of the Federal judiciary were consulted prior to Governor Coleman's appointment. Without exception these men stated that they considered him to be well qualified by experience, character, and dedication to legal principle to be a member of the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. One of these judges whose record of support for the U.S. Constitution and Federal law is unsurpassed stated that he was aware of James P. Coleman's governorship of Mississippi, that he had never heard any of his associates criticize his intelligence, character, integrity, reputation, or associations; that he considers Governor Coleman to be an extremely capable attorney who possesses the necessary background and abilities to handle the duties and responsibilities of a judge of

> the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, and that he had personally recommended consideration of James P. Coleman in previous conversations with Justice Department officials.

That is the statement of the Attorney General. He asserts, in effect, that he consulted 10 members of the Federal judiciary on a confidential basis as to the capacity of Governor Coleman to be a judge of the fifth circuit, and that all of them endorsed him without qualification.

There is a great deal of difference between being a candidate for an elective public office and a judge. The history of the United States shows time and again that men have ascended the bench and laid aside their personal feelings concerning what the law ought to be, and have followed the law as it has been declared to be by the courts having the authority to interpret the law, and as it has been enacted by legislative bodies having the power to enact the law.

I had the privilege of serving as a member of an appellate court in my State for 6 years, and on some occasions I wrote opinions upholding laws which I, as an individual, did not believe to be either wise or just. I have no doubt that Governor Coleman will do the same. From my knowledge of him for 9 years, and my knowledge of his record for an even longer period, I am satisfied that he possesses to a preeminent degree that quality which we call "judicial restraint."

Judicial restraint is the capacity to lay aside one's personal views as to what one believes the law should be, and in making decisions, to be guided by what the law has been declared to be by those having authority to interpret it, and by those having authority to enact it.

I have no doubt that Governor Coleman will become one of the outstanding circuit judges of the United States, after he has ascended the bench and gained some experience in the field.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am convinced that I shall be doing a great service, not only to Governor Coleman and the fifth circuit but also to all the areas of my country—in voting to confirm the nomination of a man who I am satisfied will adorn the Fifth Circuit Court bench.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. **KENNEDY** of New York. Mr. President——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. **KENNEDY** of New York. Mr. President, I shall vote to confirm the nomination of Governor Coleman. Inasmuch as this matter has been embroiled in controversy, I wish to make clear the reasons why I shall do so.

I have had considerable personal experience with Governor Coleman over the past 7 or 8 years, and particularly over the period of the past 4 years. We have often not agreed, but Governor Coleman is a man of his word and, in my judgment, a man of high character.

He has gone before the Senate Judiciary Committee and has said that, to the best of his ability, he will uphold his oath of office and in good faith will apply the law as laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States and Congress.

Mr. President, I believe that Governor Coleman will keep that pledge.

Attorney General Katzenbach went into the record at some length in his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee and on the basis of this record and my own personal knowledge, I intend to support President Johnson's nomination of Governor Coleman as a judge of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

My best judgment is that Governor Coleman will uphold his oath of office.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall not withhold my advice and consent to his nomination, but I shall vote for the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. **TYDINGS**. Mr. President, I intend to vote today for confirmation of the nomination of James P. Coleman to fill a vacancy which has existed for many months on the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. Since some concern has been voiced with respect to his appointment, I wish to say a word as to my decision.

As were a number of other Senators, I was troubled by many of the statements which Governor Coleman had made in the past. I was disturbed as well by some of his actions as Governor of Mississippi.

On the other hand, I am aware of the confidence which President Johnson has placed in his ability and his integrity and of the fact that many responsible civil rights leaders recognize, at least in private, that he has a moderate civil rights record. I was impressed too, by the unqualified endorsement which Governor Coleman was given by Attorney General Katzenbach in his testimony before the Judiciary Subcommittee which considered the nomination.

I agree with the Attorney General that "the test of a man's views is not oratory which is politically safe, but action which runs contrary to strong popular sentiment." In his testimony before the subcommittee, the Attorney General pointed out:

> To support segregation in Mississippi during James P. Coleman's political career was merely a commonplace political platitude; to support moderation, to exalt law and order, and to counsel obedience to court decisions—these must be regarded as deliberate acts of conscience and devotion to principle.

During Governor Coleman's testimony before that subcommittee, a number of penetrating questions were put to him. His answers indicate that the confidence of the President and the Attorney General has not been misplaced.

Because he forcefully declared his willingness to enforce the Constitution of the United States and to uphold the decisions of the Supreme Court as the law of the land, I intend to vote for the confirmation of his nomination.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of James P. Coleman, of Mississippi, to be a U.S. circuit judge for the fifth circuit.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, let him who is without prejudice cast the first stone.

I shall support this nomination. I hope the Senate will support this nomination. These are the circumstances which indicate that course to me.

There is the fact that the President of the United States has sent this nomination for confirmation to the Senate. The President had the record of James P. Coleman before him before he made that judgment. He did not act in haste. He did not act without the best advice available to him. He considered this nomination carefully, fully aware of the possibilities of adverse comment because of the civil rights question. Nevertheless, he found this man eminently qualified as a whole man to be a whole judge and so he sent his name to the Senate.

There is the fact that, in the Committee on the Judiciary, the nomination was not acted on in haste. It was considered thoroughly. The hearings produced a great deal in the way of information but, in all candor, they did not add any new considerations to the public record which might have been considered as grounds for a rejection. In the end, the Judiciary Committee confirmed the President's initial judgment and reported out the Coleman nomination by a 13 to 2 vote.

That combination of considerations—a thoughtful Presidential consideration and a thorough committee consideration—ought to be sufficient to resolve any legitimate doubts which may still exist as to the question of confirming this nomination.

Yet, the President's judgment, confirmed by the committee, need not be persuasive on any Senator. Each of us has his individual responsibility to be discharged in consonance with his individual conscience. Therefore, I neither argue with nor reflect upon any Senator on either side of the aisle who may decide one way or the other on this nomination.

But I will say that vengeance or retribution for past positions is not a sound basis for judgment in a situation of this kind. Nor is a demand for present perfection which is defined on the basis of hindsight a sound basis for judgment.

Yes, Mr. Coleman is a southerner. Is that to be held against him? Yes, Mr. Coleman is a former Governor of a State deeply tortured by the struggle in our times to bring the full meaning of the Constitution to all Americans, whomever, whatever and wherever they may be. Yes, Mr. Coleman made statements as Governor which are disconcerting, to say the least. But note, too, the time and place which they were made. Note, too, the other side of the coin. Note, too, that this nominee has made clear, as every Senator who initially opposed the 1964 Civil Rights Act has made clear, that, with its adoption, it became the law of the United States and the law of the United States will be upheld.

I would remind the Senate, that we are, all of us, products of time and place. And, who of us is without a heritage of the prejudices of our own particular time and place? Do any of us claim that unbroken perfection of insight, of judgment, of temperament which might entitle us to throw the first stone? Are we, indeed, any of us, Caesar's wives?

As one Senator, I want to say that I do not believe this system of government can continue to function on the basis of an insistence upon that kind of perfection in its servants on any issue, whether it be civil rights or whatever which is underwritten with a long history of fear, conflict, prejudice, and ignorance. Would a Senate, so disposed, have voted to confirm a Lincoln of the 1850's for a judgeship today? Do we wish our public servants to come prepackaged in a vacuum jar from the moment of birth to the moment of appointment? Do we want them born and bred and preserved through their growth, impervious to the social storms and torments which inevitably beset a living nation?

Or may an active participation in these storms and torments—replete with errors to be sure—at least as errors are seen with the benefit of hindsight and in the light of change—predispose to an essential humility, and a deeper human understanding? And are these not qualities, along with legal skill which may render a public servant, and especially a judge, of immense value to the Nation?

Mr. President, I do not know what kind of a judge James P. Coleman will be if the Senate in its wisdom decides to confirm him. The answer to that question, only the future can reveal in this case as in any other.

I am persuaded, however, that there is no reason to assume from the record that he will not make an excellent judge and that he will do anything other than to uphold the laws of the land—all the laws of the land.

What is important, it seems to me, in deciding upon this or any other Presidential appointment is not so much what the nominee has done in the context of another time and another place. It is what he will do in the context of this place and this time and of the place and time which will continue to evolve in the years ahead. That is a judgment which each of us must make for himself. And in making it, the record of the past, as every Senator knows, is but an imperfect and inadequate guide. It can in no way relieve us of our personal responsibility to decide anew even as the circumstances are new.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suppose understanding comes only if one can project himself into the shoes of the man who is at the bar of judgment, in trying to determine as best he can what he would do under those circumstances.

If I had been in Governor Coleman's shoes, and lived in Mississippi, and I had an ardent desire to render public service, and if I had the desire and hope that I would win an opportunity to render public service, I am sure that I would appraise the temper of the people in Mississippi and then see what I might have to do in order to attain public office.

Had I been a candidate for the U.S. Senate in my State on the Prohibition ticket, frankly, I would not be in the Senate today.

It is that simple.

Therefore one must draw a line between the elective political and judicial verities. Governor Coleman was confronted with a situation in his State. He accepted what was there.

That, however, does not prevent him from being regenerate at the same time. That does not prevent him in the course of life and events from hitting the sawdust trail and sitting in the seat of the repentant, as a sinner should. I have often done that.

How many times have I made mistakes? Once I sat in our committee—and the chairman will bear this out, I am sure—and I shall mention no names—when a candidate for a high judicial position sat before the committee. One Senator came to quiz him. In so doing he read from speeches made by the candidate for the bench several years ago.

I almost fell out of my seat when the candidate for the court, in response to the question, "Did you make that statement?" said, "I did."

I was constrained then and there to vote against him. However, my President, a Republican President, had selected him. He had consulted with members high in the judicial field, and they gave him a good account of that candidate.

On another occasion, when the late Senator Langer was a member of that committee, there was a quick meeting on a judicial candidate. The Senator from North Dakota asked a question. Regardless of what the answer was, the question itself was so shocking that I did not know what to make of it.

The candidate looked him right in the eye.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 4 o'clock having arrived——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? None is heard, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We asked him about a course of conduct and he said, "I did," and then he proceeded to narrate the circumstances. We confirmed the nomination by a unanimous vote in the committee.

So who will say that the former Governor of Mississippi may not become one of the great jurists of our country? He is young and capable enough to do so. I am confident that he can put aside his prejudices and interpret the law and the Constitution, as will be his responsibility when he holds up his right hand to take the oath. Under all the circumstances, I propose to vote to confirm him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James P. Coleman, of Mississippi, to be a circuit judge for the fifth circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 4 o'clock having arrived, under the agreement previously entered into the Senate will proceed to vote. The question is, "Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of James P. Coleman, of Mississippi, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit?" On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of James P. Coleman, of Mississippi, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARTKE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MONDALE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mrs. NEUBERGER (when her name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "yea" and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 8, as follows:

[No. 200 Leg.]

YEAS—76

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Gore
Harris
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C
Russell, Ga.
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—8

Case
Cooper
Douglas
Hart
Javits
Morse
Nelson
Proxmire

NOT VOTING—16

Allott
Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Fong
Gruening
Hartke
Jordan, N.C.
Lausche
Long, La.
McCarthy
Mondale
Muskie
Neuberger
Prouty
Saltonstall
Smathers

So the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, my vote on the James Coleman nomination was cast only after long and thorough consideration.

During the 10½ years I have been in the Senate, I do not believe there is any Senator who has voted more consistently in behalf of civil rights and in behalf of first-class citizenship for all Americans.

I do not view my vote on the Coleman nomination as inconsistent with my deep-seated philosophy regarding equal rights and the important role of the courts in protecting these rights.

I am familiar with the statements on racial segregation attributed to Mr. Coleman while he was Governor of Mississippi. I cannot say too strongly how much I disagree with those statements.

Yet, I am persuaded by a number of factors to believe that Mr. Coleman will devote himself to the cause of fairness, impartiality, and judicial honesty as a Federal judge.

First. The President of the United States, in nominating Mr. Coleman, has placed his personal prestige and the great integrity of his office behind this nomination. I cannot believe that the President would take such action without being firmly convinced that the appointment would be in the best interests of the judiciary and the United States and, in the long run, the cause of civil rights.

Second. The Attorney General, whose reputation as a defender of the civil rights of all Americans is without challenge, personally appeared before the Judiciary Committee to urge in the strongest possible terms that Mr. Coleman be confirmed.

The Attorney General stated:

> I would not recommend to the President * * * a man whom I did not believe would faithfully apply and administer impartial justice irrespective of the parties, of their race and on any issue that he would support to the best of his ability the Constitution of the United States, and that he would fairly interpret it, and that he would follow the decisions of the Supreme Court in both spirit and letter.

Third. The testimony of Mr. Coleman, while candid about his past attitudes, was equally frank about his view of his court responsibilities.

He stated:

> I want to say to the * * * U.S. Senate and to the world, that I have no bias or prejudice or feeling that will keep me from fully obeying the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States and the acts of Congress in this field if I should be confirmed as a judge.

Finally, I would point to a comment of the President of the United States which he made at a news conference on July 13 when he was questioned about his own civil rights views of the past. He said:

> I am going to try to provide all the leadership that I can, notwithstanding the fact that someone may point to a mistake or 100 mistakes that I made in my past.

We cannot demand total purity or conformity of views among those whom we place in high office, principally because not everyone will agree on definitions.

However, I believe the exposure and debate given this nomination will be beneficial in showing Mr. Coleman how serious we hold the question of civil rights to be.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3, AFFECTING BUREAU OF LOCOMOTIVE INSPECTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the President has sent to Congress a reorganization plan specifically affecting the Bureau of Locomotive Inspection. If not disapproved by Congress, the plan will go into effect tomorrow, July 27.

Because some railroad unions—specifically, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen—expressed concern about the wisdom of the plan, hearings were held last week by the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations, of which I am a member.

The objections voiced by the Brotherhood arose from the fear that the reorganization would result in lowering safety standards on the Nation's railroads and impairing the work of locomotive inspectors. Administration witnesses—representing the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Bureau of the Budget—assured the members of the subcommittee that this was not the case, and that the reorganization was proposed simply to clarify administrative responsibilities under the act.

Because these assurances have virtually eliminated opposition to the plan, it is my understanding that a resolution of disapproval will not be introduced. It is extremely important, therefore, that the Senate understand fully the terms of the agreement and go on record as approving the reorganization only with these understandings:

First. The qualifications for Director and Assistant Director of Locomotive Inspection will remain the same as they are today; that is, as found in Civil Service Commission Announcement No. 260 B issued July 5, 1961.

Second. These positions will henceforth be filled by the Civil Service Commission, and not by Presidential appointment, as is now the case; and only those who are highly competent and experienced will be named to the posts.

Third. A separate section of Locomotive Inspection will continue to be maintained within the Bureau of Railroad Safety and Service, and the existing qualifications will continue to be required of district supervisors and inspectors of locomotives.

Fourth. Other employees of the Bureau of Railroad Safety and Service may be given assignments to perform locomotive inspection work, but these assignments will be given only to employees who meet the civil service requirements for locomotive inspectors.

Mr. President, it was with these agreements before us that the members of the subcommittee agreed not to offer a resolution of disapproval. We, too, share the Brotherhood's concern for safety and the protection of railway employees and passengers. But we are satisfied that the high standards now in force will be preserved and that the reorganization can proceed without affecting them.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, having served as cochairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations, which held hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 3, I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New

York, which largely incorporate the understanding which was had between the subcommittee and the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Brotherhood of Railroad Enginemen & Firemen. These were largely incorporated in three documents.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a joint detailed plan filed by the committee with the Interstate Commerce Commission and Bureau of the Budget; a letter from the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen under date of July 22, 1965, together with a memorandum thereafter filed by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; and a letter from the Interstate Commerce Commission under date of July 23, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE FIREMEN & ENGINEMEN,
Washington, D.C., July 22, 1965.

Hon. FRED R. HARRIS,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Government Operations, 1251 New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: During the hearings held before the Executive Reorganization Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations held July 20, 1965, over which your presided, a request was made of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Bureau of the Budget to furnish your committee a statement regarding the Interstate Commerce Commission's plan to operate the Bureau of Locomotive Inspection in the event Reorganization Plan No. 3 becomes effective.

I have read the aforementioned statement of the Bureau of the Budget and the Interstate Commerce Commission and I am submitting memorandum of understanding that our organization has of what transpired at the hearings and we wish to have this memorandum of understanding made a part of the record.

Respectfully yours,
A. M. LAMPLEY.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3, 1965

During the hearings before the Executive Reorganization Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations held on July 20, 1965, room 318 New Senate Office Building at 10 a.m., the following understandings were reached:

1. The qualifications for the selections of Director (Chief) of Locomotive Inspection, the Assistant Director (Chief) of Locomotive Inspection and the locomotive inspectors will remain the same as it is today as found in sections 3 and 4 of the Locomotive Inspection Act of 1911, and U.S. Civil Service Commission July 5, 1961, announcement bulletin No. 260(b).

Sections 3 and 4 of the present Locomotive Inspection Act shall be maintained. (Refer to pp. 16, 17, 18, and 48 in the transcript of the hearings.)

2. Only qualified personnel shall be used to inspect locomotives. (Refer to pp. 19, 20, and 49 of the transcript of hearings.)

3. That the present Locomotive Inspection Act shall not be changed except the 50 districts shall be abolished. (Refer to p. 27 of the transcript of the hearings.)

4. That a letter shall be prepared jointly by the Bureau of the Budget and the Interstate Commerce Commission which shall be furnished the committee outlining the detailed plan of operation which will carry out the statutory policy of the present act (which Congress has previously refused to change), and that such plan will become part of any understanding that the committee will reach whether the plan is approved or disapproved (refer to pp. 25 and 26 of the transcript of the hearings) and further that such plan will be placed in the hands of the Executive Reorganization Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations by Wednesday, July 21, 1965, or Thursday, July 22, 1965. (Refer to p. 51 of the transcript of the hearings.)

5. That there shall be a position of Director (Chief) of Locomotive Inspection and Assistant Director (Assistant Chief) of Locomotive Inspection who shall be appointed by the Interstate Commerce Commission instead of the President of the United States. Also that the most highly competent and experienced personnel available would be chosen to fill the above positions, using the rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission whose present requirements or standards shall be maintained. (Refer to pages 49 and 50 of the transcript of the hearings.)

We feel that the above positions should be filled from the ranks of the locomotive inspectors who are the most experienced, qualified, and competent individuals available.

6. It was further agreed that the minimum number of locomotive inspectors will be maintained at the present 50 or more. (Refer to page 22 of the transcript of the hearings.)

In the event the Interstate Commerce Commission fails to conform with these joint understandings, we would have recourse to the Senate Committee on Government Operations who would then require the Interstate Commerce Commission to appear for questioning to show cause why they failed to follow the intent of Congress, and if question still remained thereafter, the law would have to be amended.

This understanding was made clear to all parties participating in the July 20, 1965, hearings. (Refer to page 101 of the transcript of the hearings.)

In conclusion, the major concern of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen is the protection and safety of the employees we represent.

While we are not completely satisfied with Reorganization Plan No. 3, these understandings do meet and correct some of the major objections we have.

JOINT ICC-BUREAU OF THE BUDGET STATEMENT WITH REGARD TO IMPLEMENTATION OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1965

If Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1965 is permitted to become effective it will be implemented and operate as follows:

1. All of the substantive duties and functions now assigned to the Commission and the Director of Locomotive Inspection under the Locomotive Inspection Act, 45 U.S.C. 22–34, as amended, will continue to be performed after the reorganization becomes effective. Final responsibility therefor will be vested in the Commission. In this connection, it will be unnecessary and neither does the Commission intend to change the basic assignment of locomotive inspection work and functions as reflected in its present organization minutes, table of organization and description of central and field organization as published in the Federal Register. The statutory provisions will be administered by the Commission with the same force and effect as heretofore. Through elimination of certain cumbersome restrictions, as provided in the reorganization plan, and better utilization of resources, it is the Commission's intention that more substantive locomotive inspection work will be accomplished.

2. There will continue to be maintained within the Bureau of Railroad Safety and Service, a separate Section of Locomotive Inspection which will provide technical guidance to the locomotive inspection program. The section will be headed by a chief and an assistant chief. These officers will be delegated the basic locomotive inspection duties and responsibilities comparable to those now assigned by statute to the Director and Assistant Director of Locomotive Inspection.

The existing qualification requirements for the Director and Assistant Directors of Locomotive Inspection will be continued for the chief and assistant chief of the section, respectively.

The Section of Locomotive Inspection and its chief will function under the general direction of the Director of the Bureau of Railroad Safety and Service; and will adhere to the same organizational and administrative channels and procedures established for other organizational components of the Bureau including those engaged in railroad safety, signal inspections, car service, etc.

3. With respect to the field organization the following changes will be made:

DISTRICT SUPERVISORS

The present eight district supervisors of locomotive inspection will be reduced to seven. One supervisor will be assigned to each of the Commission's seven regional offices. With the resultant savings one additional position will be provided for field locomotive inspection activities. We will require the supervisors to conduct locomotive inspections in addition to the work of supervising other locomotive inspectors. Since the district supervisors are generally the more highly skilled locomotive inspectors, they also will be assigned to handle some of the more difficult accident investigations. District supervisors will work under the general direction of the Regional Director of Railroads, however, technical guidance will continue to be provided to them by the Section of Locomotive Inspection. The existing qualification requirements will be continued for district supervisors of locomotive inspection. Our present promotion program will be amended to include the district supervisor positions among those eligible for promotion to the position of Regional Director of Railroads and other positions within the Bureau for which they qualify. District supervisors and inspectors of locomotives have heretofore been deemed ineligible for promotion to such positions due to the rigid provisions of the act.

INSPECTORS OF LOCOMOTIVES

Inspectors of locomotives will continue to perform all of the duties now assigned to them under the Locomotive Inspection Act. They will place primary emphasis on such duties. The existing qualification requirements for inspectors of locomotives will be continued. Selection for these positions will be made in accordance with civil service standards, and only persons qualified by experience and training will be used in these capacities.

After appropriate training we will assign certain additional duties to qualified locomotive inspectors which will in no way interfere with the existing statutory duties. These will include:

(a) Inspecting the records of signal equipment tests on locomotives. These records are normally maintained at the same location as the locomotive inspection records. Also, the inspection of the locomotive signal equipment, now conducted by signal and train control inspectors, will be made by locomotive inspectors after they are trained. This work is closely related to the locomotive inspectors' tests of locomotive brake equipment. Only a little additional time would be required for the locomotive inspector to complete the entire signal inspection. This will relieve the signal and train control inspectors from much of this particular inspection activity and permit them to do other important work.

(b) In the course of their regular duties, it is sometimes necessary for locomotive inspectors to visit remote and isolated points at which locomotives are housed. These locations include logging camps, sand and gravel pits, and mines. In all these operations, equipment is subjected to rough handling and more safety appliance inspections at these points would be beneficial. Locomotive inspectors will be authorized to make safety appliance inspections at these locations and our safety appliance program improved. It should not be necessary to send safety appliance inspectors and locomotive inspectors to these remote points at approximately the same time.

(c) We frequently receive complaints involving more than one of our railway safety functions. Usually these complaints involve the determination of facts which could be developed by one qualified investigator. In many instances, we could make the required investigation with a single qualified employee, where we now must use two. When appropriate, certain of these complaints will be assigned to qualified locomotive inspectors. In addition to the foregoing, the Commission will, over a reasonable period, review the present 50 geographical districts and make such adjustments as may be necessary to achieve a balanced and equitable workload for each inspector, assure maximum efficiency and economy in the field operations, and integrate the district pattern with the rest of the Commission's field organization.

OTHER RAILROAD SAFETY PERSONNEL

To the extent that other members of the Bureau's field staff are qualified by experience and training they will be given assignments to perform locomotive inspection work when it will further the Commission's safety programs. Cross-use of staff in this manner will make additional qualified manpower available for locomotive inspection work and eliminate the necessity for dual inspections or investigation of complaints at some points. Under no circumstances, will we permit an unqualified employee to inspect a locomotive. The current qualification requirements are set forth in Civil Service Commission examination announcement No. 260B, "Inspector of Locomotives." Only those staff members meeting these requirements will be given locomotive inspection assignments.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1965.

Hon. FRED R. HARRIS,
Acting Chairman, Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: This refers to the Memorandum of Understanding of Reorganization Plan No. 3, 1965, submitted to the subcommittee by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, a copy of which was given to us by Mr. Nobleman for review.

We agree that the memorandum represents our understanding of how the reorganization plan would be implemented with the following clarification with respect to the specific items contained in brotherhood's memorandum:

Item (1): We interpret the statement reading "sections 3 and 4 of the present Locomotive Inspection Act shall be maintained" to relate to qualifications of the Director (Chief) of Locomotive Inspection, the Assistant Director (Chief) of Locomotive Inspection, and the locomotive inspectors, only. If the plan becomes effective it obviously would abolish those provisions of these sections relating to method of appointment of the Director (Chief) and Assistant Director (Chief) and dividing the territory comprising the several States and the District of Columbia into 50 locomotive boiler-inspection districts.

Item (3): This item apparently refers to Mr. Schnoor's testimony on page 27 of the transcript in which he said, "the reorganization plan itself does not abolish any of the functions of the present locomotive inspection program except for the function of setting up these 50 districts." We agree that all of the basic statutory functions of the locomotive inspection program would remain unchanged. However, in addition to abolishing the function of dividing the several States and the District of Columbia into 50 districts, the reorganization plan would transfer responsibility for the performance of all locomotive inspection functions to the Commission; and give the Commission authority to appoint the Director (Chief) and Assistant Director (Chief) of Locomotive Inspection.

Item (4): The Commission submitted to the subcommittee on July 21, 1965, a statement entitled "Joint ICC-Bureau of the Budget Statement with Regard to Implementation of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1965." It is our intention that this will constitute the detailed plan of operation referred to in this item.

Item (6): It is the Commission's intention to maintain a minimum of 50 locomotive inspectors as long as the Congress authorizes appropriations therefor.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the brotherhood's memorandum relating to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. WEBB,
Chairman.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I commend the acting chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma, for the very able manner in which he handled the entire matter.

As a result of the hearings, the committee, in effect, entered into a compact with the Interstate Commerce Commission to the effect that the provisions of the 1911 Act would remain in force and effect insofar as the integrity of the inspection systems are concerned.

The only real change in the 1911 Act stemming from the reorganization plan would be in connection with the organization of the inspection service. The integrity of the systems under which the men work on the trains would be preserved and protected.

The distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma deserves great credit for working out the plan which resulted in general agreement between the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I also commend the junior Senator from Oklahoma for working out the agreement which I am convinced will satisfy the concern that was expressed about the proposed plan of reorganization.

I understand that the agreement will satisfy the safety requirements that this agency has long been striving for. I do not believe, therefore, that any resolution of disapproval is required.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, both Senators from Washington added materially to the effectiveness of the committee meetings.

Mr. COOPER subsequently said: Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the statements of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] regarding the President's reorganization plan affecting the Bureau of Locomotive Inspection.

Although I am not a member of the Senate Committee on Commerce which has jurisdiction of the reorganization plan, I was concerned with the proposal, and like my colleagues wished to be sure that under its provision the highest safety standards would be maintained and improved.

The Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Engineers and all railway brotherhoods are concerned with safety as is the public.

The Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Engineers are very much concerned, inasmuch as firemen no longer work with them on a large proportion of engines in use—moving tremendous trains of great lengths and tonnage. I am very glad that the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], and with the active cooperation and interest of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and its members, has written into the record the assurance that high standards of safety will be maintained and improved.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill, H.R. 7984, to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 27, 1965, pp. 18394–18412, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement on the conference report on the housing bill. I do not believe it necessary that my remarks be in great detail because there is a printed report on the desk of each Senator giving full text of the agreed-upon legislation and a statement of managers on the part of the House, explaining the differences between the House bill and the legislation agreed to in conference.

Before I comment on the details, I want to say how pleased I am with the fine job done by the members of the conference committee from both Houses of Congress.

We had before us the most difficult task of resolving significant differences on a total of 82 items, some of which had 4 and 5 subtopics. As you may know, housing is one of the most complex pieces of legislation that the Congress deals with because it involves so many different programs. Practically all of these programs were involved, in one way or another, in the decisions to be made by the conference committee.

The committee worked together with speed and in a spirit of good will and cooperation and completed its work in three sessions held on July 20, 21, and 22. As conferences usually do, there were compromises between the two sides. On the part of the Senate, we remained adamant on several items on which we believed there could be no compromise but naturally gave in on others.

The final agreements result in a good bill of which both the Senate and the House can be proud. I am not wholly in accord with the results on several items and there were several that I voted against but which were finally approved based on the majority vote. However, I believe we have the best compromise that we could get.

Many important items, of course, were not in conference, having already been agreed to by each House.

All in all, this is one of the most comprehensive housing bills ever written by the Congress. It is a 4-year bill, involving extensions of programs, many of which have been in existence for 30 years.

The bill provided a 4-year extension for FHA, urban renewal, college housing, housing for the elderly, public housing, urban planning and rural housing. In addition to extending these programs, amendments were written to improve their workability and to make them more effective in doing the housing job that Congress intended.

The final bill also provided new programs to supplement the existing ones.

The new programs may be considered in three different categories. First, and most important, is a program of financial assistance for the construction and rehabilitation of housing for elderly and for families of low income who are living in slums and blighted neighborhoods. The principal provision here is the new rent supplement program under private auspices.

Another category is a program of Federal assistance to the cities and communities of our Nation to help pay the cost of essential public works. Under this the conference committee agreed to a 4 -year program of $800 million of matching grants for water and sewer facilities.

The third category involves a relatively new approach to improve the environment of our communities through acquisition of open spaces, the development of parks, the construction of neighborhood facilities for recreational and cultural purposes, and the provision for beautification of urban areas. Not much attention has been paid to this aspect of the bill, but in the years to come this may well turn out to be one of the most important contributions of the 1965 act.

Mr. President, I should like to make some remarks about a few of the items in which the Senate had a particular interest.

On rent supplements, both Houses made provision in almost identical terms to authorize this program for a 4-year period. Each House recognized the merits of an alternative program of assistance for families at the public housing level through a new program of housing to be sponsored, built and managed by private enterprise. Although each House of Congress would have limited eligibility for rent supplements to families qualified for public housing, the House bill would have changed the basic public housing law relative to rental gap, the effect of which would be to increase slightly the income ceiling for eligibility for both public housing and for rent supplements. The Senate had no such provision and the conferees agreed with the Senate version.

Also the Senate had a provision for an experimental program for a limited amount up to 10 percent of the rent supplement funds for FHA section 231 program of mortgage insurance for the elderly, section 202 direct Federal loans for the elderly, and FHA section 221(d)(3) below-market rate program. The conference committee agreed to accept the Senate provision with an amendment that no more than 20 percent of units in an existing project could benefit from rent supplements, and that no more than 50 percent of the exeprimental funds authorized could be used for newly constructed FHA section 221(d)(3) below-market interest rate projects. This was to assure the equitable allocation of funds between these projects and those exclusively for housing for the elderly.

Agreements were reached on the downpayment provisions relative to FHA programs for veterans, servicemen, and for regular sales housing. The conference committee finally agreed to an amendment offered by the House conferees which is quite satisfactory to all and which I believe will act as one of the most important incentives for home ownership in recent years.

Compromise language was written into the report relative to the approval by the FHA Commissioner of technically suitable materials. This issue has been one of the most difficult ones to resolve since it was first discussed by the Housing Subcommittee several months ago. The statement in the House managers' report explains the substitute language by which the conferees intended to clarify the FHA Commissioner's responsibility without changing the intent of the Senate provision. I believe this was an excellent resolution of a most difficult problem and I suggest that the Members read that statement.

On urban renewal, the conferees had a number of differences, the most important of which involved the extent to which urban renewal funds should be used for commercial and other nonresidential uses. The Senate version would have permitted 40 percent of new funds to be used for nonresidential purposes. House conferees disagreed but finally compromised on a 35-percent figure.

The only other items under urban renewal which the House conferees would not agree to were more or less technical matters involving a definition of substandard structures, and limiting acquisition to such structure, a new definition of gross project cost when State law authorizes additional relocation assistance and where certain tax losses are not now included. The House conferees were adamant on these items, believing that more information was needed and in view of the fact that no hearings were held and no committee consideration was given to them, the Senate receded.

Mr. President, at this point, I should like to repeat what I have said several times on the Senate floor relative to items being brought up on the Senate floor for inclusion in the bill. I would never want to foreclose Members from bringing up matters and having them considered without benefit of hearings or committee consideration, but I believe that Senate floor approval of such matters should be given only on extremely rare occasions.

It is not only unfair to the Senate, but such action often prejudices the chance of success of an item in conference because it is so easy to have the other body refuse to accept an item which has not been given full consideration by the committee.

One item which the conference committee agreed to only after considerable discussion involved a House provision on compensation of condemnees. No such provision was included in the Senate version primarily because the entire subject of land acquisition procedures and equitable payment to property owners for land acquired under eminent domain rights is being considered by the Senate Government Operations Committee. I have a bill, S. 1201 and Senator MUSKIE has a bill, S. 1681, which would establish uniform procedures for all Government taking of private property. Nevertheless, the House insisted on some action at this time and the conferees agreed on tentative first steps toward the larger goal, namely that property owners be paid at least 75 percent of the value of the property acquired under rights of eminent domain and, furthermore, that owners not be thrown off their property within less than 90 days after written notice. Senator MUSKIE was active in working out this compromise and everyone seemed quite pleased with the results.

Another good compromise was reached relative to rural housing. The House had proposed language redefining a rural area to include a city or town up to 5,500 population which is not associated with an urban area. The conferees agreed to new language making it clear that rural areas for purposes of the rural housing program could include places over 2,500 population but less than 5,500 population only if such places were rural in character.

Relative to savings and loan legislation, the House conferees receded to the Senate on a provision authorizing new investment powers for non-Federal savings and loan associations in Washington, D.C., and the Senate receded to the House on the term of a leasehold securing a mortgage loan made by a Federal savings and loan association. On the latter case, the conferees agreed to a period of at least 10 years as the proper time beyond which the leasehold should run after expiration of the loan.

The House also receded to the Senate on a provision requiring insured members of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to pay up to 1 percent of deposits upon call of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. When this item was placed in the Senate bill, it was clearly understood that such a call would be made only to the extent needed to provide liquidity to the Corporation and that reasonable notice would be given to the members of the Board's intentions and that ordinarily a call for deposits would not be made in increments of greater than one-fourth of 1 percent in any 90-day period.

The House also receded to the Senate relative to a provision authorizing Federal savings and loan associations to invest up to 1 percent of their assets in loans guaranteed by the Agency for International Development for Latin American housing. The only objection to this came because of the possibility of an adverse effect on the passage of a pending bill to establish an International Home Loan Bank in which savings and loan associations could invest up to 1 percent of assets to be used to help finance housing in underdeveloped countries abroad. It was my opinion that in no way would the action proposed in the bill be in lieu of the proposal relative to the establishment of the International Bank and, with this in mind, the conferees agreed to approve the Senate provision.

The Senate bill contained two clarifying provisions relating to national banks. One would have made it clear that a national bank may purchase a participation in an existing real estate loan. The other would have increased the maximum maturity of industrial, commercial, and residential loans from 18 to 30 months.

At the present time paragraph 2120 of the regulations of the Comptroller of the Currency states that national banks may purchase or sell participations in existing real estate loans, when the interests of the participating banks are adequately protected by the terms of the participation agreement. And under the provisions of law which authorizes banks to make loans to manufacturing and industrial businesses—when they rely primarily on the borrowers' general credit standing and forecast of operations—without regard to the requirements for real estate loans, national banks may when appropriate make construction loans beyond the statutory limits.

The House conferees did not accept the Senate amendment with respect to the purchase of participations in real estate loans. The report states:

> It was felt that further study of the authorization for the purchase of participations is needed, and this authority is not included in the conference substitute.

The conference did, however, increase the maximum maturity of construction loans from 18 to 24 months.

The fact that under current regulations national banks are permitted to carry on these activitities was brought to the attention of the conferees, and it is expected that the current regulations will continue in force.

Mr. President, I have taken more time than I intended in explaining the conference report.

It is an involved bill and I have tried to explain only the more important relevant items. There are many other items which I did not cover which I should be glad to explain if Members have any questions.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. First, I wish to take the opportunity to congratulate the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing and to concur in his statement that this is one of the biggest and most complicated housing bills we have ever had. As a matter of fact, when the bill came from the administration I recommended to the chairman of the subcommittee that it be made into four separate bills. While he did not do that, we took out one proposal to create a new department on housing, but he kept all the other proposals together. I commend him and his subcommittee. The conference report contains 62 pages. If we add the comment by the House managers, it amounts to 78 pages. I have never seen one that big before on a housing bill.

In the debate on the bill, one Senator said it would cost $15 billion. Another said that there was no way to tell how much it would cost. It will cost far less than it would have cost because of the efforts of the Senator from Alabama. He took out the open-end provision, providing a period of 4 years of authorization, and took out the visionary scheme that would build new houses with Federal funds and then invite citizens and industries to come in. I am grateful for the fine work he did in eliminating some of the provisions of the bill. I am also grateful to him and to the Senate conferees in respect to the provision with relation to the city of Norfolk.

It was on a par with the other provisions for cultural and convention centers which, in their benefits, went a little beyond the renewal areas in which they would be located. It was extended to the whole city, so that we had to authorize.

For the benefit of some of the younger Senators, let me make a personal reference. The junior Senator from Virginia and the junior Senator from Alabama qualified for the Senate in November of 1946. In January of 1947, we were both assigned to the Committee on Banking and Currency. We had equal seniority in the Senate, but the rules of the Senate do not recognize equal seniority in a committee. So the Senator from Alabama said to me:

> Let us toss a coin to see who will be chairman and who will be the ranking Democrat on the committee.

The junior Senator from Virginia won. However, I wish to say that the ranking Democrat, the Senator from Alabama, has been my right arm on that committee through the years, and I sincerely hope that the great and sovereign State of Alabama will keep him in the Senate for as long as he cares to serve.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, let me express my appreciation to the chairman of the committee. Let me say on behalf of the entire Housing Subcommittee that we could not have had better or finer cooperation than that which we received from the chairman of the full committee. He was frank about the provisions to which he objected, as he always is, but any time we wished the committee assembled for a hearing, he saw to it that it was done.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am grateful to the Senator from Virginia for his very fine cooperation and the flattering remarks he has made about me.

I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The housing bill which the Senate will finally approve today is, in my judgment, the most significant piece of housing legislation I have seen in my 17 years in the Senate. It is not only a comprehensive bill, but it sets up certain new principles whereby we will seek to aid directly those citizens of our country who otherwise could not afford decent housing. We shall aid them to live in homes which otherwise they could not afford without Government help.

The Senator from Alabama should be saluted for his leadership in the housing field. There are many items in the bill which are major improvements and extensions of benefits that we had before to help us improve the Nation, particularly the cities and smaller communities, to provide facilities which they otherwise could not obtain. I pay tribute to the Senator for his great leadership in this field.

It was my privilege, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency a number of years ago—to serve under the leadership of the great Senator from Alabama, who was then and is now chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I tried to contribute, insofar as I could, to the legislation which was being enacted at that time, and I believe that I made some contribution in the field of community facilities; but there was always our chairman, the Senator from Alabama, who stood as a great stalwart fighting for practically everything that would make it possible for Americans to live better in this great land of ours.

To a considerable extent, the pending bill is undoubtedly the culmination not merely of 2 years work but of 18 to 20 years of hard work which the Senator from Alabama has performed in the housing field.

I salute his magnificient contribution to the housing field, and also pay tribute to the Johnson administration for the part it played in recommending the proposed legislation provided for in the bill, and in helping us by urging its immediate passage.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his kind remarks.

Even though this is one of the most important measures, perhaps the biggest we have ever passed, I still adhere to the belief that the Housing Act of 1949 was perhaps the most important of any, because all the programs were new then. A major part of the pending bill will continue and improve upon existing programs, many of which the Senator from Louisiana helped to write when he was a member of the committee. There are many provisions in the law today which have resulted from amendments which were offered by the Senator from Louisiana. I shall always remember his valuable service to the cause of good housing.

In the pending bill, there are only one or two really new programs included. The Senator touched upon one of them, the rent supplement proposal. By the way, that is not a new program. I remember the first year I was on the Housing Subcommittee, when former Senator Taft, and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and former Senator Wagner were sponsors of the general housing bill.

At that time, I remember that the real estate boards came before us, urging strongly that instead of public housing we should provide for direct payments of aid to low-income families. The pending bill does this for the first time, although the real estate boards were recommending it 20 years ago.

In the pending bill, there has been considerable criticism of the rent supplemental. The idea was supported this year by such organizations as the American Bankers Association, the Mutual Savings Banks Association, the Catholic Charities of America, the savings and loan associations, the National Association of Home Builders, the Mortgage Bankers Association—I could go on and name organization after organization who approve of this measure, trying to improve on public housing and perhaps to replace public housing with this private enterprise undertaking which the pending bill would provide.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield briefly?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No one can appreciate more than the Senator from Washington, without being on the Senator's committee, how complicated and comprehensive a housing bill can be when one is chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations. But I was going to ask the Senator if the bill made any substantial change in the need for appropriations, other than exist in the present independent offices bill, which is about ready to go to conference.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, so far as existing programs are concerned, the Senator from Washington might be interested in this statement: On existing programs which were to be continued, the request had gone from the administration for open-end authorizations. We declined to do that. We have always declined to make open-end authorizations, but instead we decided to extend the program for 4 years until October 1, 1969, and to authorize appropriations at the going level for that period of time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I, as well as many others in the lumber-producing areas of the United States, including that of the Senator from Alabama, was quite interested in section 211 of the pending bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I made a few remarks on that subject earlier.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I understand, we kept in the conference substitute which contained a further provision, making it clear as to the decision that the material or product which is technically suitable must still be subject to the financial decision of the Commissioner, that is, within the scope of the requirement of mortgage insurance, and that he must provide that use of the material or product is consistent with economic soundness or an acceptable risk, as the case may be.

Can the Senator enlarge on what the conference meant by "further provision"?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The objection had been raised that the Senate language would place a severe burden on the Federal Housing Commissioner for beyond what it was felt he should have. The language was included to clarify the Commissioner's responsibility in approving new material for FHA housing. In other words, what we wish is this: The Senator realizes that if we are to make progress, we must have new materials.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And they should be given a fair chance. We wished to stress to him that new materials should be utilized, when he is satisfied and makes a finding that they are suitable and meet the underwriting standards laid down by the FHA.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But not if the material is inconsistent with economic soundness—for example, lumber which might not hold up over a period of time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then he would still have the authority to agree to the acceptable standards——

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As to the type of lumber that would be consistent with economic soundness.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In other words, there would be no compulsion on him to accept materials that would not be economically sound.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I notice one other thing that I hope the Commissioner would take under consideration. The Senator suggests that he should bend every effort to minimize the long delays which have often been experienced by buyers or manufacturers of products that go into houses, when it is not known whether they are acceptable or not acceptable. In some cases no decisions have been made.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct. Many of us have encountered experiences in connection with materials which were perfectly sound and which had met all the tests, but which had to wait for many years before they could be used. I wonder if I might relate a little experience that I had at one time.

A manufacturer in my State made doorlocks. They had been tested, and the Public Housing Administration had found them acceptable. They were perfectly willing to use them. However, the locks had not been approved by the appropriate industry committee. When I checked into the matter, I found that they could not meet the lock specifications of the standards committee within the industry, because the specifications had been written in 1893. Those specifications required a solid block of copper, I believe, to back up a part in the lock.

The company that manufactured the lock had used a light metal, probably magnesium, or something of that kind. It had worked perfectly well, and had replaced a scarce material. It served as a good substitute. However, the company could obtain no action from the industry committee in modernizing the requirement that had been written in 1893.

I kept pushing, until that specification was changed. The manufacturer had come to me, and I was willing to go to work on it. Most people in those circumstances would never think of doing that.

We hope that under this language the Administrator will use his discretion, and that new material can come into use, and perhaps expedite action by industry committees, which serve a useful purpose, if they act promptly.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I rise to express my appreciation to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], first because I had two questions that I raised when the bill was under debate on the floor of the Senate, to answer which I offered amendments on the floor. The Senator from Alabama was understanding in his handling of these questions, despite the fact that these questions had not been brought to my attention before that time, and I had not been able to offer in committee the appropriate amendments. The amendments were adopted on the floor of the Senate because the Senator from Alabama and the distinguished members of his committee did not object to them.

I appreciate the fact that the amendments were kept in the bill, as reported by the conference at page 25 and at page 41 of the conference report, respectively.

Second, and more broadly, I join Senators who have commended the distinguished Senator from Alabama for his courteous, energetic, skillful, wise, and knowledgeable handling of what is magnificent landmark legislation.

On the last note that I may express the Senator from Alabama may wish to strike my remarks, because he may feel that I am not a competent judge, because of my being so lately initiated into this body. However, even though it may be presumptuous on my part, he has evidenced once again all of those great qualities which constitute an outstanding Member of the Senate. I praise him for the remarkable way in which he has handled this proposed legislation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the Senator's statement. The Senator from

Alabama would be the last one in the world to try to expunge those remarks from the Record.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I have several questions that I wish to discuss with the Senator from Alabama. I shall also, in due course, pay my tribute to him, and it will be a glowing one.

While the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] is on the floor, I should like to invite the attention of Senators who are interested in urban renewal to page 26 of the conference report. By way of explanation, the very able senior Senator from Washington is now the chairman of the Senate conferees who are dealing with the independent offices appropration bill. With that background, I ask the Senator from Alabama, with respect to section 304(a), which sets forth the authorization for urban renewal capital grants for the next 4 years, whether this method of financing urban renewal has not been in effect since the first Urban Renewal Act of 1949, and was to a very large extent the brainchild of the late Senator Robert A. Taft. I refer to contract authorizations, as opposed to annual appropriations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. This refers to contract authority. It has been in the act since 1949.

Mr. CLARK. People who do not like it sometimes refer to it as backdoor financing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I have always felt that that was not a very good description.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with the Senator. As the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] knows—and he is chairman of the Senate conferees on the Independent Offices appropriations bill—the House wrote a proviso into that bill which would forbid the expenditure of any money for administrative expenses or technical services in connection with a contract authorization for a capital grant. The effect of the proviso would be to make it impossible for the Urban Renewal Agency to implement its new contract authority.

The Senate struck out that proviso. The conferees are now meeting. The House, I am told by my friend, the Senator from Washington, feels very strongly about this question.

My question to the Senator is this: Would not such a proviso, if the House remained adamant, and the proviso stayed in the conference report, inevitably result in the whole system of urban renewal grants being set aside and a system of annual appropriations, under which normal and judicious planning is practically impossible, being put in its place?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; of course, that would be the result of the adoption of that proviso.

I said a moment ago that I did not believe backdoor financing was properly descriptive of this situation. For this type of program I believe this method of financing is the businesslike way of proceeding.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As the Senator says, it permits planning. Furthermore, it makes it unnecessary to have an appropriation made ahead of time, and to wait until a program is ready before moving forward.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I must leave in a moment. I leave this thought with Senators: The fact that this type of financing has again been put in the bill——

Mr. CLARK. With the concurrence of the House.

Mr. MAGNUSON. With the concurrence of the House—reiterates what we have been doing, and establishes the fact that no urban renewal can be accomplished without some planning; and that, it seems to me, should be very persuasive in conference. Of course, the Senate conferees will do their best to continue the amounts. Secondly, there is another item which has also been agreed to, and that relates to the trainees for urban renewal.

Mr. CLARK. I was coming to that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A small amount was put in for that purpose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There was no question in the conference between the two legislative committees on this method of urban renewal.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was not even mentioned. There was no controversy on it at all.

Mr. CLARK. There was no suggestion on the part of the House conferees that this time-honored method should be set aside or changed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In past years our own committee has changed this procedure in connection with some programs; and we have changed from Treasury borrowing to annual appropriations.

But in a program of this type we have felt that the businesslike way of doing it is as provided.

Mr. CLARK. I am sure that the Senator from Alabama will join me and the members of his subcommittee, and indeed the full committee, in giving complete support to the Senate conferees. What the House desires to do is to eliminate the traditional type of financing by what might be called a backdoor proviso, that is, by denying the money necessary for administration and technical services in connection with contracting for grants. In effect, they would be killing an important, multibillion-dollar program, if their will were to prevail.

The Senator may wish to complete his formal statement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have completed it.

Mr. CLARK. I ask the Senator to turn to page 11 of the conference report, at which point reference is made to section 108(a) entitled "Acquisition of Certain Properties Situated at or Near Military Bases Which Have Been Ordered To Be Closed." The genesis of that particular provision was in the House of Representatives, with Representative John Kunkel of the Harrisburg area.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to stop the Senator at that point. The genesis was a bill which I introduced in the Senate, which was inserted by our subcommittee in the housing bill we are now discussing before it ever came up in the House.

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to have the Senator make that statement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. After we had written the provision into the bill, it was picked up in the House and added to the House bill.

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to have that statement from the Senator from Alabama. I do not wish to take undue credit on my part for that feature of the bill. But it was the closing of the Olmsted Air Force Base in Pennsylvania which resulted in this particular suggestion coming to fruition and getting into both the bills.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was the closing of Brookley Field at Mobile, Ala., which suggested it to me, and I introduced a separate bill on that subject early in the session.

Mr. CLARK. I do not wish to take undue credit for that.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator from Texas joined the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. He certainly did.

Mr. TOWER. We have had a problem at Waco, Tex., and Amarillo, Tex., that might have been some inspiration.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy, indeed, to learn that Senators on both sides of the aisle are as deeply interested in section 108(a) as I am. But I point out to the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Alabama that that provision will be no good unless it is funded. In order to fund it, we must obtain an appropriation. The way the section is worded—and I ask my friends if they do not agree with me—the funding ought to come in the military construction appropriations bill, since the Secretary of Defense would be given the authority, and indeed the duty, to carry the proposal into effect.

My information is that the Department of Defense has not the slightest intention of funding that section. At the moment, they are opposed to it. I do not know that any member of the Military Construction Appropriations Committee of the Senate has any particular enthusiasm for the program. It is badly needed in Alabama and Texas. I assure Senators that it is vital to the economy of the Harrisburg, Pa., area. I hope that the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Alabama will do all they possibly can to see that the program is funded, because if it is not funded, it will not do anyone any good.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct; and I plan to do anything that I can to that end.

Mr. CLARK. I suggest that the Senator's senior colleague [Mr. HILL] might be able to help him in that endeavor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure that he can, because he is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and I know he is vitally interested in the subject.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will bear with me, there is one more question I should like to call to his attention.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. It seems to me that, in the final analysis, the proposal would really not cost very much. There should not be too much difficulty in obtaining the funding. Once acquired, the property will be ultimately disposed of.

The authorization is available. The Appropriations Committee will probably be amendable. I seriously doubt if the Armed Services Committee would do anything on the question one way or the other.

Mr. CLARK. I do not believe that the problem is one to be considered by the Armed Services Committee. I believe that it is a question for the military construction appropriations subcommittee.

Mr. TOWER. The subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CLARK. And the Pentagon has no interest in the question at all. We have explored that today. They do not want it funded.

I am undertaking to do all possible to persuade the powers that be to press for its funding.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad that the Senator has taken that stand. I promise to do all I can.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator turn to page 55 of the conference report, where reference is made to section 1103(a)? In effect, the conferees increased the authorization for a program of Federal-State training from $10 million to $30 million, all of which appears more clearly if the Senator will turn to page 76 of the conference report, where, under the heading "Federal-State Training Programs," the following statement appears:

> FEDERAL-STATE TRAINING PROGRAMS
>
> The House bill contained a provision eliminating the ceiling on the authorization for appropriations for the Federal-State training program and terminating that program on October 1, 1969. The Senate amendment simply increased the authorization from the existing $10 million limit to 30 million.
>
> The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

I ask the Senator whether the House and the Senate were not in accord that the program was a good program, that it should go forward, and that it should be substantially increased.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. The only difference between us was that the House was willing to have an open-end authorization. The Senate, of course, had the policy of no open-end authorization.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator will remember that he took the lead, and I gave him some support during the 8 years I served under him when he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, in getting this Federal-State training program underway. It took us a long time to do it. Finally, we got it into the Housing Act of 1964. We obtained a 3-year authorization for fellowships in city planning.

When the independent offices appropriation bill came to the Senate, the House had deleted the funding for both of those programs. The Senator from Alabama was not present at that time, but I had spoken to him about it and I undertook to use his name as indicating his keen interest in both those programs. The other day, when the independent offices appropriation bill came to the floor of the Senate, the Senator was not present. The Senate Appropriations Committee reported a bill in which it categorically refused to fund either of those programs.

Thanks to the good offices of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and because of the kind heart of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who was the acting minority leader when the bill came to the Senate, I was able to persuade them to fund the Federal-State training program to the tune of $4 million. That was when the authorization was $10 million. Now the authorization has gone up to $30 million, but I am told by my friend, the Senator from Washington, that it would be very difficult indeed to hold as much as 1 cent in conference. Even the Senate Appropriations Committee refused to recommend as much as 1 cent for the fellowship program, which was only $500,000 annually for 3 years.

I raise this question because again I hope that I can have the support of the junior Senator from Alabama in urging the Senate conferees to stand firmly behind at least this modest $4 million authorization and to do what they can next year to have the fellowship program funded. It is my view—and I do not ask the Senator from Alabama necessarily to agree with it—that when the Congress of the United States passes an authorization program, when the President of the United States signs the bill, and when in another year the President recommends a continuation of the program, I believe it is a rather serious matter for the Appropriations Committee of either body to say, "We do not like what the House did. We do not like what the Senate did. We do not like what the President did. We are not going to fund the program."

Those may be unduly belligerent words. I do not mean them as such. In any event, I hope that we might have the active support of the Senator from Alabama in getting these programs funded as rapidly as we can.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly do. The Senator knows that throughout the years, primarily because of the need of the smaller cities and towns that could not afford planning offices of their own to meet the need, I felt that a program of the type proposed was needed.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. In my own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania we are having the greatest difficulty in obtaining adequately trained officers for planning boards in a score of cities, on the State level, and in a great many counties. Those people are in short supply. Unless the Federal Government will make a modest amount available to provide both fellowships and in-service training for those people, we shall not get the caliber of county, municipal, metropolitan area, and State planning which is badly needed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I compliment a country boy upon doing so much for the city. I have rarely seen a bill——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I hasten to add that there is a good bit in the bill for the country boys, too.

Mr. JAVITS. That is very true. But really, the Senator from Alabama, with his great devotion to housing, has in this bill been able to provide leadership for a great many programs which the cities urgently need. Many problems remain unsolved, but the bill contains a number of items which are especially helpful and important to the cities. They should be noted, because they indicate the kind of concern over where the housing shoe pinches the most in human misery and deprivation.

I invite attention to some of these provisions such as the allowability of an increase in the per room cost limitations on public housing; to the opportunity to reallocate public housing units not under construction within 5 years from the date reserved without regard to the 15-percent State limit. When one realizes how hard it was to get that, one is appalled at how difficult it is to get things done that seem meritorious.

I invite attention also to the needed increase in compensation to small businesses displaced by urban renewal. I also feel that the remarkable efforts of the committee, under the leadership of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], in respect to code enforcement are important aspects of the bill, as is the new breakthrough in rent supplements, which I supported. The efforts to bring the focus of rent supplements upon lower income families with the greatest needs was a most constructive one. The efforts to improve the 221(d)(3) below market interest rate program were also most valuable.

I am pleased to see that the Senate was able to retain the increase from $50 to $100 million in the authorization for rehabilitation loans, which I proposed for urban renewal areas. The bill makes contributions to the major and vital needs of low- and middle-income housing.

Finally, I cannot tell the Senator how happy I am and how happy it must be for many other Representatives and Senators who come from highly metropolitan areas with respect to the action taken on airport problems. This is the time to really obtain the research and organizational help of Federal housing officials in the noise abatement field and know that something tangible will be done in terms of examining into what can be done to improve housing near airports and to alleviate many of the existing problems concerning valuation.

Citizens living near airports do not seem to be asking for the millennium; they know that airports cannot be eliminated; they know that airports have to be near fairly sizable space. But, at least, they want the resulting problems examined and efforts made.

On this ground and many others, I express appreciation for the fine leadership of the Senator from Alabama. I appreciate the sympathetic consideration which he gave to these proposals and many others.

I am proud of the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. He may have agreed or disagreed with particular aspects of the bill; but once the Senate spoke, he was a powerful advocate for doing what the Senate wanted done, and he acted in a most dedicated way.

We owe much, with respect to what has been done in the bill, to the fine collaboration which now exists between the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing and the ranking minority member.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I would be derelict both in my duty and in common good manners if I did not close my part of the colloquy with an expression of my deep appreciation and real admiration for the work the Senator from Alabama has done in the entire field of housing throughout the years in which he has been chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

It was my privilege to serve under him for 8 years in bringing forward various housing bills. His ingenuity, his complete understanding of the complex, difficult problems, his imagination in being willing to move into new areas are really beyond the bounds of praise.

He said a moment ago that he thought the late Senator Taft was really the man who started housing on its way. Of course, the first Housing Act was passed in the 1930's; but I am perfectly confident that when the history of housing is written, the junior Senator from Alabama will get the principal share of the credit for a program which I think has done more for urban America than anything else in my time as a Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, as a member of both the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on the District of Columbia, I should like to be among the first to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] for his role in helping our Nation's Capital to become the beautiful city which it should be. I refer to his success in retaining in conference section 307 of the Senate housing bill, now section 317 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, which will allow the District of Columbia to exercise the same urban renewal powers in commercial areas which are possessed by every city in the United States.

For 15 years the District of Columbia has tried to obtain this authority, but it was not until today that his long-awaited reform came into view.

I first became aware of this problem when, as a freshman Senator, I was named chairman of the Business and Commerce Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia. In that capacity, I presided over the hearings and managed on the floor S. 628 of the 88th Congress which was essentially similar to the proposal that is before us today. That bill, which passed the Senate, did not become law, but I was so much impressed by the quality and persuasiveness of the testimony before my subcommittee that I offered an amendment to the Housing Act of 1964 to accomplish the same purpose. Although the Senate accepted that amendment, it did not become law either. This year section 317 of the bill came to the Congress as a presidential proposal, and this year we have succeeded—the District of Columbia urban renewal program will now be able to obtain those powers which every other major city in the United States shares and can make available to small business the benefits of this program which are presently denied under the laws of the District of Columbia.

I commend publicly the efforts of a number of people who have contributed to this triumph. An organization of businessmen and citizens concerned with Washington, Downtown Progress, has consistently been of great assistance over the years in making this day possible. My colleagues on the Senate District Committee have given their full and very essential support. The Senate Subcommittee on Housing, under Senator SPARKMAN, and with active assistance from Senator DOUGLAS, and last year from Senator CLARK, carried the ball on the floor and in conference. I also understand that certain Members of the House played significant roles in making this action of the conference committee possible. Above all, President Johnson's decision to incorporate this section in his bill should be recognized by the people of the District of Columbia as evidence of his constructive concern.

All in all, Mr. President, today represents a great victory for the people of the District of Columbia. Perhaps it is indicative of what may lie in store for the mass transit and home rule bills for the District in this session of Congress.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as a member of the Subcommittee on Housing, I wish to join in the general commendation of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. SPARKMAN]. The Senator from Alabama is not only "Mr. Small Business" in the Senate; he is also "Mr. Housing." He did a magnificent job. As a member of the committee, I can testify that it was the skill of a professional that was at work.

The bill was highly complicated. It contained scores of differences between the House and the Senate, many of which could have resulted in a deadlock or could have resulted in extended debate, debate lasting many days. I am sure the Senator from Alabama would join me in saying that the successful result is due also to the cooperation of the minority members of the conference, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], who were most intelligent, discriminating, and cooperative at every turn; also to the Members of the House, including Representative PATMAN, who attended throughout the conference; Representative BARRETT, of Philadelphia, an able man; and, Representative WIDNALL, of New Jersey, a Republican Representative and a real expert in the housing area. All were most cooperative and helpful. Nevertheless, because it was a new bill, because it contained a completely new concept, at least so far as action on rent supplements was concerned, and because it was a comprehensive bill, since, over 4 years, it provides a large sum of money, it was a bill that could have foundered along the way.

I wish to join particularly in the sentiment expressed by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency [Mr. ROBERTSON] by saying that the firm, solid position of the Senator from Alabama in insisting on limited authorizations, in insisting on 4 years, and in insisting that the bill be responsible fiscally, without being economical, was a great service not only to the housing industry, not only to the people who so urgently needed housing and who will be helped so greatly by the bill, but to the general taxpayer.

As a member of the subcommitte, I am delighted to join in congratulating the Senator from Alabama for his excellent work.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. I express appreciation to every member of the subcommittee for their fine cooperation. It was a delight to work with the subcommittee.

I have completed my discussion of the bill.

I say again that our being able to write the bill and have it passed was due in large part to the very fine cooperation we received from the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] throughout the consideration of the measure in the subcommittee, in the full committee, and in the conference committee.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for his kind remarks. I thank my friend the Senator from New York, for making his very generous remarks and expressing the hope that one day we will not think in terms of there being a conflict of interest between the urban and rural citizens in the country, but that rather the mutuality of interest which exists between us all will demonstrate that our differences are not so large that they cannot be reconciled. I trust that, in the good American fashion, they will be reconciled in the future.

I thank my friend the Senator from Wisconsin, for his kind remarks.

Mr. President, the conference report of the omnibus housing bill, in my opinion, represents the best consensus possible under the circumstances.

Certainly I remain adamantly opposed to the concept of the Federal rent supplement program, despite the fact the Congress wisely rejected the administration's proposed subsidies for those of moderate income. The reporting safeguards incorporated into the bill, whereby the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency must advise the Congress of the operation of the rent supplement program, should help insure its limited scope. The Congress will have the opportunity to alter the course of the program should the desired ends not be achieved.

I do not wish my opposition to rent supplement to overshadow my support in general of various meritorious programs under the Housing and Home Finance Agency's jurisdiction. I did, of course, support the continuance of the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, housing for the elderly and handicapped, college housing, the low-income housing demonstration program, and the rural housing program.

I am happy that the House conferees receded on their proposals for open-end authorizations.

As I have stated, this conference report represents what I believe to be a true consensus of the minority and majority. I wish to again thank my colleague, the very able chairman of the Housing Subcommittee, for his consideration to the minority during the several months we have been working on this bill.

John Sparkman is one of the most forthright men I know. We have had our day in court. We have been allowed to express our support and dissent to various provisions of the bill. We have, I believe, influenced—perhaps to a relatively small degree, but to some degree—the legislative course of this particular legislation. That was possible because the chairman has been very fair in recognizing that the minority view should and must be heard if we are to have a true reflection of opinion in a democratic society.

I believe that perhaps the greatest talent of the Senator from Alabama is his ability to synchronize ideas of two divergent points of view which seem to be diametrically opposed, reflect on them for awhile, and come up with a proposal that seems to satisfy everyone and causes everyone to think he was the author of the idea.

I believe that the Senator from Alabama has demonstrated that legislation does embody the art of compromise and draws together divergent viewpoints. The Senator has produced a measure that I believe does represent the consensus and takes various approaches into consideration.

It has been a great pleasure and an education for me to work with the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], who served with me as a minority member of the conference committee.

He is necessarily absent from the Senate today.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT

I signed the conference report on the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, because I feel that it is a good resolution of the differences in the two bills. I believe that I can say on balance that the conference report is better from my point of view than was either of the House or Senate passed bills. Thus, the conference committee within the limits set by the House and Senate performed a valuable service for the Congress and for the Nation.

Although the final proposals included in this act are a great improvement over the original bill introduced, and many desirable provisions are included in the act, there are also many important new programs which are included that I cannot support, because I feel that they are not in line with the principles of individual initiative and private homeownership that have been so important to the development of housing in this country.

My signature on the conference report therefore does not reflect a reversal of my vote against the original Senate bill.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am opposed to this legislation and shall vote "No" on the conference report.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I voted against S. 2213 when it was before the Senate.

I shall also vote against the conference report, which has agreed to include the new program of rent supplements, which I opposed. I do so with regret, because the bill extends other valuable programs which I have supported during my service in the Senate.

In past years, as the Senate and Congress have written legislation for housing programs, I have supported authorizations and appropriations for low-rent public housing, loans for construction of college housing, urban renewal, and urban improvement programs, mortgage insurance and property improvement programs under the Federal Housing Administration, special programs available for the elderly and handicapped, and other programs for rural housing.

I am glad that extensions of these programs are included in the bill, and I know that they will continue to be useful in Kentucky and in other States. I also wish to note that provision is made to continue the community facilities program which has been much used by cities and towns of my own State, and that special attention will be given to the growing needs for facilities in urban areas.

I voted against the bill because of the new program authorized by section 101, which provides for payment of rent supplements by the Federal Government. Although the bill as amended by the Senate does place some limits upon the rent supplement program recommended by the President, the approval of this section by the conference report would, by 1968, raise the annual authorization to $150 million. Additionally, it is argued that rent supplements would simply provide an auxiliary program for public housing, but the estimated initial cost of the rent supplement program alone would come to some $6 billion and I believe it will cost billions more.

In the committees on which I serve, and in the Senate, I have worked and voted for programs to provide needed facilities for cities and communities of all sizes. I have cosponsored, supported, and voted for many programs designed to to give aid to the unemployed, to the elderly, and the disabled, and to provide equality of opportunity; but the rent supplement program goes beyond the objectives of such legislation.

Inasmuch as under existing law programs are now available to provide loans for housing at a low interest rate not to exceed 3½ percent for the elderly and the handicapped, with an authorization of $500 million—there is an added reason for not approving the rent supplement program.

I believe that whatever the conception is of the new rent supplement program, it will be impossible to hold it to any reasonable limit. I also believe that it could well bring great difficulties in its administration, with possibilities of unfairness, discouragement of incentive for home owning, as well as great political pressures.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the conference report was signed by all conferees of both Houses.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1321) to amend section 501(e) of title 16 of the District of Columbia Code relating to bond requirements in connection with attachment before judgment.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 70. An act to provide for the conveyance of approximately 80 acres of land to the heirs of Adam Jones, Creek Indian not enrolled;

H.R. 237. An act to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project by the Secretary of the Interior;

H.R. 903. An act to add certain lands to the Kings Canyon National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1987. An act for the relief of Nabhane M. Nickley (Nabhane M. Karam);

H.R. 1989. An act for the relief of Krystyna Stella Hancock;

H.R. 2012. An act for the relief of Dr. Ignace D. Liu;

H.R. 2351. An act for the relief of Teresita Centeno Valdez;

H.R. 2360. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio R. Perez;

H.R. 2499. An act for the relief of Remedios Ocampo;

H.R. 2913. An act for the relief of Lt. Thomas A. Farrell, U.S. Navy, and others;

H.R. 4131. An act for the relief of Mrs. Phoebe Thompson Neesham;

H.R. 5508. An act to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5860. An act to amend the law relating to the final disposition of the property of the Choctaw Tribe;

H.R. 8620. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to take into consideration floods and other natural disasters in reference to the feed grains, cotton, and wheat programs for 1965;

H.R. 8862. An act to amend the Act of August 7, 1935, to increase the authorized annual share of the United States as an adhering member of the International Council of Scientific Unions and Associated Unions; and

H.R. 9041. An act to restore to the heirs of the Indian grantor certain tribal land of the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New York.

POSTAL SERVICE IN PHILADELPHIA, MISS.—A CASE HISTORY OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have recently intervened in a case which dramatically demonstrates how important is, and must be, the continuing role of the Federal Government in assuring equal rights for all our citizens regardless of race, creed, or color. The case involved the provision of mail service to the section of a town heavily populated by Negroes—an issue which would hardly seem to be a civil rights problem at first glance. But in Philadelphia, Miss.—the site of the murder of three young civil rights workers last summer—it was very definitely a civil rights problem and one to remedy which required firm Federal action.

To obtain that Federal action required a series of letters from civil rights groups and from me, first to the Post Office Department and, finally, to the President. In any event, the necessary action is now being taken, and the regular U.S. mail delivery will be extended on July 31 to the Negroes of Philadelphia, Miss., just as it has been all along to all the other citizens of that town.

I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence on this subject be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 25, 1964.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Our letter of November 17 promised you a further reply concerning extension of city mail delivery at Philadelphia, Miss.

In determining areas where city delivery service may be operated effectively, it has been necessary to fix some minimum standards with relation to civic improvements. These include paved or improved streets to permit travel of vehicles at all times without damage or delay, street signs at intersections, and proper house numbers.

To qualify for delivery to the door, 50 percent of the building sites in the areas proposed for service must be occupied by dwellings or business places and passable walkways provided from the street or sidewalk to the delivery point. Sidewalks are also required where traffic hazards or weather conditions preclude use of the streets by carriers. Patrons are required to furnish suitable receptacles for delivery of their mail in all instances.

At present, those minimum requirements are not met in several sections of Philadelphia. However, considerable progress has been made in recent months. Some of the streets which were in poor condition have been graded and graveled and bridges have been repaired. There are indications that house numbers and street signs will be provided within a reasonable time.

We appreciate your interest, and assure you delivery will be extended to those areas as soon as the minimum requirements are met. Your correspondence is returned.

Sincerely yours,

A. C. HAHN,
Deputy Assistant Postmaster General.

DECEMBER 2, 1964.

Hon. A. C. HAHN,
Deputy Assistant Postmaster General, Bureau of Operations, Post Office Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HAHN: Thank you for your letter of November 25 concerning extension of city mail delivery at Philadelphia, Miss.

I appreciate the merit, in the ordinary case, of the Department's minimum requirements in regard to civic improvements for mail delivery. However, I am sure the Department must also recognize that such requirements should not be inflexibly applied to a case such as this, in which the Negro community very likely can be shown to have been discriminatorily denied those civic improvements by the city and State authorities.

Your letter states that the minimum requirements will be met within a "reasonable time." I would very much appreciate your estimate of what length of time this may involve, as well as the Department's position on waiving or amending the minimum standards in this case.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senator.

DECEMBER 9, 1964.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This refers to your letter of December 2 expressing further your interest in the extension of city mail delivery at Philadelphia, Miss.

The present requirements for mail delivery by city carrier are considered to be minimal. Passable streets, the display of house numbers, and provision of street signs constitute a basis for a dependable service. Waiving these fundamental requisites could result in confusion and delay in delivery of mail.

Our letter of November 25 advised there were indications that house numbers and street signs would be provided within a reasonable time. We have no definite information as to when these improvements may be completed. The Department has no jurisdiction over maintenance of streets, assignment of house numbers, or erection of street signs. These have always been the responsibility of local governmental authority.

Your continued interest is appreciated, and we will advise you promptly of any further developments in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

A. C. HAHN,
Deputy Assistant Postmaster General.

JANUARY 5, 1965.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It has been brought to my attention that there is no home delivery of mail to the Negro section of Philadelphia, Miss., because the civic improvements in that section do not meet the minimum requirements as to paved streets, street signs, and proper house numbers, which are imposed by Post Office Department regulations.

I have looked into the matter with the Department, emphasizing that, while their minimum requirements are reasonable in the ordinary case, they should not be inflexibly applied to a case such as this, in which the Negro community very likely can be shown to have been discriminatorily denied those civic improvements by the city and State authorities. I have requested that the Department waive or amend the minimum standards in this case.

The Department's response is that there are indications that the minimum standards will be met "within a reasonable time," but that they have "no definite information as to when these improvements may be completed." Yet the Department refuses to waive the requirements.

I believe the Department's position in this instance, while perhaps it can be justified under existing regulations, is inconsistent with the policy of your administration and the policy which the Congress has enunciated in regard to the nondiscriminatory use of Federal funds, and I respectfully request your review of the matter.

With warm regard.

Sincerely yours,

JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senator.

JUNE 18, 1965.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This has reference to our letter of December 9 concerning your interest in extension of mail delivery at Philadelphia, Miss.

Further attention has disclosed the city government has requisitioned street signs and expects to complete installation by July 15. We also have been informed the city plans to supply house numbers without cost to the residents.

Since the streets have been placed in suitable condition, delivery service will be extended to these areas as soon as the improvements mentioned above are completed.

Sincerely yours,

A. C. HAHN,
Deputy Assistant Postmaster General.

JULY 21, 1965.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This has reference to our letter of June 18 concerning your interest in extension of mail delivery at Philadelphia, Miss.

We have been informed by our regional office in Memphis, Tenn., which has jurisdiction over post offices in the State of Mississippi, that the city officials at Philadelphia plan to have street signs installed and provide house numbers by Saturday, July 31, at which time the region will institute appriate delivery service.

Your interest in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

A. C. HAHN,
Deputy Assistant Postmaster General.

COMMENDATION OF ACTIONS OF YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, earlier today the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] delivered a most disturbing speech on this floor. I say "disturbing" because of the central theme of his remarks and because of the language he used while describing an outstanding and patriotic organization which is dedicated to the best interests of this Nation and the free world. The Senator from Arkansas described Young Americans for Freedom, this country's largest and most responsible conservative youth group, as "extremist," and a "vigilante group."

Mr. President, if anyone who is connected with Young Americans for Freedom is an extremist, then there are 39 Members of this Congress who should be so classified because we serve as members of the National Advisory Board of Young American for Freedom.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have this list inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have the statement of principles of this fine organization, called the Sharon statement, inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask every Member of this body to read this statement, and then ask himself if this is extremism. I can answer here and now, Mr. President, that the Sharon statement and indeed all the public utterances of Young Americans for Freedom are based upon the enduring documents of this Nation: the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.

Furthermore, Young Americans for Freedom is no secret vigilante group skulking about in the night. They have been in business since September of 1960 and have been the object of editorial comment and commendation in countless publications across America, including Life magazine, which has described Young Americans for Freedom as responsible. None of these publications has seen fit to describe or characterize Young Americans for Freedom as extremist. They could not because Young Americans for Freedom is not.

In addition, Young Americans for Freedom has received the George Washington Honor Medal from the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, "For outstanding achievement in helping to bring about a better understanding of the American way of life." Young Americans for Freedom has also received a national award from the All-American Conference to Combat Communism, which is composed of such groups as the American Legion, the Catholic War Veterans, the Jewish War Veterans, the Elks, and Lions International.

Typical of the many words of encouragement Young Americans for Freedom has received were those of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1963, on the occasion of a Young Americans for Freedom testimonial dinner for Congressman WILLIAM CRAMER of Florida. Said President Eisenhower:

> I join wholeheartedly in the salute that Young Americans for Freedom are rendering.

Or consider the words of former Vice President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon, commenting on the New Guard magazine, which is the official publication of Young Americans for Freedom. Said Dick Nixon:

> You have my best wishes for success in this new enterprise. I hope you reach a wide audience.

Perhaps one of the most encouraging endorsements of Young Americans for Freedom came from the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD]. In a letter to the Montana Young Americans for Freedom State chairman, the majority leader commented about extremists and fright peddlers:

> Young Americans for Freedom does not fall into this category. I have heard nothing about the Young Americans for Freedom which would indicate that they are anything but patriotic young people with a genuine interest in the well-being of their Nation. I have every reason to believe that they will continue to do so.

Or, consider the words of such a great American as the late Herbert Hoover, who called Young Americans for Freedom "American youth dedicated and devoted to the preservation of American freedoms."

Now as to the incident described in such detail by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], regarding the Firestone Co., Goodyear Co., and Young Americans for Freedom. I have been informed by the national chairman of Young Americans for Freedom, Mr. Robert Bauman, that there was no collusion or conspiracy whatsoever between Goodyear and Young Americans for Freedom. The actions against Firestone were the inspiration of a local chapter of Young Americans for Freedom in Philadelphia, which did not want to see strategic materials—and synthetic rubber is such a material—manufactured in a Communist country with American help. It is obvious that many other Americans felt the same way or Firestone would not have canceled their plans to build a rubber plant in Rumania.

It is worthwhile adding, Mr. President, that Young Americans for Freedom is supporting this Nation in a most important way these days by backing the President in his strong stand to date against Communist aggression in Vietnam.

I wonder if the Senator from Arkansas would call Young Americans for Freedom's support of the President in Vietnam extreme?

Young Americans for Freedom is most emphatically not a group of leftwing, irresponsible beatniks like the thousands of dirty, hairy youths who crowded the Capital City this past April. Mr. President, who are the real extremists, the real vigilantes, the real irresponsibiles? My answer is, not Young Americans for Freedom, but those who would surrender, who would accommodate, who would compromise with communism at this critical juncture in the free world's fight for freedom.

Mr. President, I am particularly struck by the curious timing of the Senator's remarks. Today, he castigates the failure of a deal to provide Rumania with a synthetic rubber plant. Yesterday, in Bucharest, the Rumanian Communist Congress, meeting with representatives of Red China and Soviet Russia, passed a resolution condemning the United States "acts of open war" in Vietnam.

Furthermore the new general secretary of Rumania stated that the only legitimate representative of the people of South Vietnam is the national liberation front—that is, the Vietcong, who constitute the Communist invaders from the North.

I ask my colleagues, is this the kind of nation to which we should be sending strategic materials for whom we should be making special allowances, in which we should be building a synthetic rubber plant? Indeed, it is not, and I am delighted that the voice of America was heard and that the Firestone company decided to cancel the project.

I am even more disturbed, however, about the central theme of the Senator's speech. In it, he severely condemned private political organizations such as Young Americans for Freedom, corporations like Goodyear, labor unions, industrial associations, private individuals, for what? For speaking out, for expressing their opinions, for attempting to let this Government know how they feel about our foreign policy. The Senator from Arkansas is most upset about this trend. He suggests that it is not democratic, that it is not constitutional. He states, and I quote:

> This sort of thing is probably inevitable in a free society. It can, however, and should be kept to a minimum.

Mr. President, several years ago, an attempt was made by the administration to muzzle our military leaders in their statements about our Communist enemy at the suggestion of the junior Senator from Arkansas. It was all too successful. I now wonder, is an attempt now to be made to muzzle America? I hope and pray not, and I shall personally do all within my power to prevent any such muzzling of America and to allow free speech and public opinion to function without hindrance and in so doing to preserve this Nation with freedom under God.

Mr. President, I notified the office of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] earlier this afternoon of my intention to make these remarks.

EXHIBIT 1

The Members of Congress who are on the National Advisory Board of Young Americans for Freedom are as follows: Representative E. ROSS ADAIR of Indiana; Representative JOHN B. ANDERSON of Illinois; Representative

Glenn Andrews of Alabama; Representative John M. Ashbrook of Ohio; Representative James F. Battin of Montana; Representative E. Y. Berry of South Dakota; Representative William E. Brock of Tennessee; Representative Clarence J. Brown of Ohio; Representative Joel T. Broyhill of Virginia; Representative Howard H. Callaway of Georgia; Representative Elford A. Cederberg of Michigan; Representative Donald D. Clancy of Ohio; Representative Harold R. Collier of Illinois; Representative William M. Colmer of Mississippi; Representative William C. Cramer of Florida; Representative Glenn Cunningham of Nebraska; Representative William J. B. Dorn of South Carolina; Representative James A. Haley of Florida; Represenative Durward G. Hall of Missouri; Representative Ralph Harvey of Indiana; Senator Spessard L. Holland of Florida; Representative Charles Raper Jonas of North Carolina; Representative Carleton J. King of New York; Representative Delbert L. Latta of Ohio; Representative Glenard P. Lipscomb of California; Representative Jim Martin of Alabama; Representative Robert H. Michel of Illinois; Senator George Murphy of California; Representative Thomas M. Pelly of Washington; Representative Alexander Pirnie of New York; Representative Charlotte T. Reid of Illinois; Representative John J. Rhodes of Arizona; Representative Richard L. Roudebush of Indiana; Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina; Senator John G. Tower of Texas; Representative James B. Utt of California; Representative Albert W. Watson of South Carolina; John Bell Williams of Mississippi.

Exhibit 2

The Sharon Statement

"Adopted in conference at Sharon, Conn., September 9–11, 1960."

In this time of moral and political crisis, it is the responsibility of the youth of America to affirm certain eternal truths.

We as young conservatives, believe:

That foremost among the transcendent values is the individual's use of his God-given free will, whence derives his right to be free from the restrictions of arbitrary force;

That liberty is indivisible, and that political freedom cannot long exist without economic freedom;

That the purposes of government are to protect these freedoms through the preservation of internal order, the provision of national defense, and the administration of justice;

That when government ventures beyond these rightful functions, it accumulates power which tends to diminish order and liberty;

That the Constitution of the United States is the best arrangement yet devised for empowering government to fulfill its proper role, while restraining it from the concentration and abuse of power;

That the genius of the Constitution—the division of powers—is summed up in the clause which reserves primacy to the several States, or to the people, in those spheres not specifically delegated to the Federal Government;

That the market economy, allocating resources by the free play of supply and demand, is the single economic system compatible with the requirements of personal freedom and constitutional government, and that it is at the same time the most productive supplier of human needs;

That when Government interferes with the work of the market economy, it tends to reduce the moral and physical strength of the Nation; that when it takes from one man to bestow on another, it diminishes the incentive of the first, the integrity of the second, and the moral autonomy of both;

That we will be free only so long as the national sovereignty of the United States is secure; that history shows periods of freedom are rare, and can exist only when free citizens concertedly defend their rights against all enemies;

That the forces of international communism are, at present, the greatest single threat to these liberties;

That the United States should stress victory over, rather than coexistence with, this menace; and

That American foreign policy must be judged by this criterion: Does it serve the just interests of the United States?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE EFFECT OF INCREASED PAYROLL TAXES ON THE TAX BURDEN OF LOWER-INCOME WAGE EARNERS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, during the recent debate on the medicare-social security bill, some of us raised questions that those in the lower-income brackets would be most adversely affected.

Our arguments were either dismissed or ignored. There was no reaction from the administration as to those who would bear the brunt of the increases in payroll taxes.

Additionally, the administration has shrugged off any concern over inflation and what it has been doing to the purchasing power of the dollar, including that of the people who must depend on small pensions to live.

I am happy to see that at least one administration spokesman, however belatedly, is coming around to our point of view.

In testimony before a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee on Tuesday, as reported by the Wall Street Journal, Gardner Ackley, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, declared:

> The real value of the ($600) personal income tax exemption has been substantially eroded since its present level was established in 1948, both by inflation and the general growth of real income. This has substantially raised the burden of low-income taxpayers, particularly with several children. The projected increases in (social security) payroll taxes will raise further, and in a disproportionate way, the tax burden on lower-income wage earners.

Mr. President, Mr. Ackley, in this area, expresses my thoughts exactly.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Ackley Ties Outlook for New Tax Cut in 1966 to Future Outlays for Vietnam Commitment," from the Wall Street Journal of July 21, 1965, be placed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fiscal 1965 U.S. Budget Tally Revised; Deficit Unchanged

Washington.—The White House announced slightly revised figures for Government spending and receipts in the fiscal year just ended, but the budget deficit remains at $3.5 billion.

Preliminary figures released by Treasury Secretary Fowler on June 30—the last day of fiscal 1965—put spending at $96.4 billion and receipts at $92.9 billion, for a deficit of $3.5 billion. Final figures released yesterday raised spending and receipts totals by $100 million each.

The deficit, since President Johnson estimated it at $6.3 billion last January, has been revised downward a number of times. As recently as June 17, the President said he expected it to be $3.8 billion.

Ackley Ties Outlook for New Tax Cut in 1966 to Future Outlays for Vietnam Commitment

Washington.—President Johnson's chief economist said the cost of the Vietnam war will greatly influence prospects for another income tax cut next year.

If a cut is possible, he hinted, the administration might like to see it achieved through an increase in the $600 personal exemption allowed for each taxpayer and his dependents. For every $100 increase in the exemption, he estimated, revenue loss to the Treasury would be roughly $2.5 billion a year.

The ruminations on the administration's future economic policy came from Gardner Ackley, chairman of the President's Council of Economics Advisers. He testified before a subcommittee of the Joint House-Senate Economic Committee, which is studying the long-range influence of Government taxing and spending on the general economy.

Treasury Secretary Fowler is scheduled to appear before the panel today, and Budget Director Charles Schultze is on tap for tomorrow. The appearance of these top financial advisers to the President comes at a critical time in the administration's economic planning for next year. These officials and President Johnson himself earlier in the year were holding out the prospect of another income tax cut next year, concentrated in the lower-income brackets, to spur consumer spending and prolong the current economic expansion. The tentative objective had been to provide the major stimulus through tax reduction instead of a heavy increase in Government spending.

GREAT SOCIETY OUTLAYS

At present, however, the economic strategists are faced with the prospect of a renewed rise in military outlays to finance the growing U.S. commitment in South Vietnam. The heavier defense spending will follow new increases in outlays for the Great Society's education, antipoverty, and health programs. Thus, a substantial increase in defense spending could push total budget outlays much higher in fiscal 1967, starting next July, theoretically providing an economic stimulus that would make a further tax reduction unnecessary.

The fiscal 1967 budget, which will set forth the administration's economic blueprint, is in the early stages of preparation for submission to Congress next January. Mr. Ackley told the House-Senate panel that the budget "will reflect a careful review of our economic prospects, and will be designed to sustain a steady and balanced advance of private demand next year."

But Mr. Ackley said later, "The big question mark which confronts us today is the size of the defense budget." Until the level of military outlays can be predicted, he said, it will be hard to make a judgment about the possibility of either tax reductions or tax increases. He added quickly that he is "certainly very hopeful" the administration won't need to consider any proposals for income tax increases next year.

The White House economic adviser repeated the standard administration assessment that "we're not expecting a recession in 1965 or early 1966." Asked what the Council of Economic Advisers would recommend if a recession did threaten, Mr. Ackley said it would propose an emergency tax cut.

DISTINCTION DRAWN

However, fiscal policy planners have been drawing a distinction between an emergency antirecession tax cut and a less urgent reduction intended to insure continued economic growth. Mr. Ackley, concurring with other officials, said the second kind of tax reduction should be concentrated among low-income families, and he indicated one way this could be done.

"The real value of the ($600) personal exemption has been substantially eroded since its present level was established in 1948, both by inflation and the general growth of real income. This has substantially raised the burden of low-income taxation, particularly for families with several children. The projected increases in (social security) payroll taxes will raise further, and in a disproportionate way, the tax burden on lower-income wage earners."

Mr. Ackley didn't voice any more definite endorsement of an increase in the personal exemption; however, the administration vigorously opposed such an increase last year when several Senators tried to incorporate one in the big income tax reduction act of 1964. That law cut taxes by reducing the percentage rates of tax levied on net income after exemptions and deductions; officials felt at that time that reduction of tax rates should be given top priority. Mr. Ackley's reference to the personal exemption yesterday may indicate this technique may win more administration enthusiasm in the future.

AN INTERESTING IDEA

Representative GRIFFITHS, Democrat, of Michigan, suggested that the administration also consider cuts in social security payroll taxes as a device for stimulating the economy, or suspending them temporarily to fight a recession. Mr. Ackley replied that it's "an interesting idea that ought to be studied."

In his far-ranging testimony, Mr. Ackley also made these other points:

The Council of Economic Advisers projects the economy's growth rate at 4 percent annually over the period to 1970, which would bring gross national product to about $895 billion in 1970. Gross national product, the total output of all goods and services, is estimated at $660 billion for this year.

To achieve a GNP of that amount by 1970, the Government probably would have to pursue taxing and spending policies that would produce a net Federal budget deficit during the 1966–70 period. Thus, he said, it would be "quite unlikely" that there could be a reduction in the national debt during this period.

Recent increases in the Government's wholesale price index were described by Mr. Ackley as "very disturbing," and he blamed them mainly on higher livestock prices. He warned that the increase in wholesale food prices may outweight in the next several months any retail price reductions resulting from Federal excise tax cuts.

He voiced confidence that businessmen will pass on most of the excise tax cuts to consumers in the form of lower prices, a point on which some doubt has been expressed in Congress. Mr. Ackley added that the Council of Economic Advisers is joining with other Government agencies in a special before-and-after comparison of price levels to check whether the excise tax reductions, which took effect in late June, are resulting in lower prices.

BIG GOVERNMENT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Independence, Iowa, Bulletin-Journal recently reviewed in a very astute editorial what it termed "Our Relentless March Toward Big Government."

The editorialist made some sage observations and left the reader with two questions:

First:

> What will future appraisers of this era have to say about the storm cellar decision to abandon the dream and the blueprint bequeathed to us by the architects of our Constitution?

Second:

> What would the Founding Fathers themselves say?

In the current dialog now engulfing this Nation, these are indeed two questions which each of us should endeavor to answer.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the July 16, 1965, issue of the Independence, Iowa, Bulletin-Journal be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR RELENTLESS MARCH TOWARD BIG GOVERNMENT

The march toward big Government in a Nation which for a century and a half prided itself on its devotion to private incentive and free enterprise has been relentless the past three decades.

It all started with a glib assumption, in the face of a worldwide depression, that there was nothing to do but let the Government take over the lives and fortunes of all our people.

Where once there had been the premise that Government, like individuals, should live within its income, a new thesis was instituted. The floodgates of spending were opened wide.

An economist over in England at about this time wrote a book with a beguiling central idea. A public debt, he contended, isn't a debt at all because the people owe the money to themselves.

Wishful thinking made our leaders susceptible to this strange new doctrine. A few years previously a national debt of $28 billion piled up in World War I worried us—but no longer.

With more spending there came a proliferation of bureaus, and bureaucrats. These hordes of public servants liked their new life. They had never had it so good.

At the same time millions not on the Government payroll became beneficiaries of the newly tapped largess out of Washington. They had never had it so good either—and, likewise, they had votes.

A limited few in the burgeoning days of this new order were hit on their pocketbook nerve by a rising income tax. But most of the cost was reflected in a skyrocketing national debt and a companion culprit called inflation.

For good or for ill, America has crossed the Rubicon. Nobody seriously believes any longer that we'll ever turn back to the system under which 13 little colonies became the world's most prosperous Nation.

The die has been cast. Those beholden to Big Government (some label it socialism)—as jobholders or as recipients of special benefits—are not merely the balance of power in our Republic, they are the power.

It's a far piece from the Republic envisioned by our Founding Fathers to the Government of paternalism which has supplanted free enterprise. The assumption that what has been had to be is indeed debatable.

What will future appraisers of the era have to say about the "storm cellar decision" to abandon the dream and the blueprint bequeathed to us by the architects of our Constitution?

What would the Founding Fathers themselves say?

We leave you with these two interesting questions.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S SECURITY CLEARANCE OF WILLIAM A. WIELAND

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the case of William Wieland, State Department official accused of misrepresenting contacts with Cuban Premier Castro, is becoming more mysterious each day.

In wake of the State Department's giving Wieland a clean bill of health and posting him off to Australia in a top diplomatic position, these developments have occurred:

First. The attorney for Otto Otepka has declared that Otepka played no part in giving a security clearance to Wieland, despite such statements by the State Department. This denial was reported in the Washington Post of July 21.

Second. Deputy Assistant Under Secretary of State for Administration William J. Crockett has rebuked Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs James L. Greenfield for changing a press release relating to the security clearing of Wieland. The press release implied that the FBI had cleared Wieland, although this was far from fact.

This report was published in the Washington Evening Star of July 21.

Third. Brig. Gen. M. F. Summerfelt, one of three members of the special committee looking into the matter of Wieland's clearance, was reported by the able reporter, Clark Mollenhoff, that he did not consider misstatements by Wieland to be of a material nature.

The report, in the July 20 editions of the Des Moines Register, went on to say:

> He [Summerfelt] said that Wieland had not included some information derogatory to Castro in his reports, but that "this might have been an effort to please his superior officers."

Mr. President, I am mystified over these developments, especially over the last.

Just who were these "superiors" that Wieland sought so hard to please that he declined to include information derogatory to Castro in his report?

And is this the way the State Department usually acts on reports—ignore material derogatory of a person because a superior may not like it?

Or was Wieland ordered by someone not to include any detrimental data when it involved Castro?

I think the Congress should intensify its efforts to determine this. I, for one, feel that there is more to this case than has been aired in the public to date.

I ask unanimous consent that the following articles be placed in the RECORD:

First. "Senate Transcript Revives Controversy Over Otepka," Des Moines Register, July 19, 1965.

Second. "Security Clearance of U.S. Aid Is Termed Shocking," Des Moines Register, July 20, 1965.

Third. "Otepka Role in Wieland Case Denied," Washington Post, July 21, 1965.

Fourth. "Press Release on Wieland Stirs Dispute," Washington Evening Star, July 21, 1965.

There being no objection, the material was orderd to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, July 19, 1965]

SENATE TRANSCRIPT REVIVES CONTROVERSY OVER OTEPKA

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—State Department security evaluator Otto F. Otepka has testified that William Wieland, a Latin American expert, lied to security officers about his association with Fidel Castro.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee Sunday released a transcript of testimony in which Otepka said Wieland had said he met with Castro only once when the Cuban Premier was in Washington in April, 1959.

DIFFERENT REPORT

Otepka told the subcommittee that he obtained information that Wieland saw Castro "at least six" times during that visit.

Otepka testified that he and Harry A. Hite, a security evaluator in Otepka's division, told superiors that Wieland "lied" about this and other material matters when questioned in 1961.

The chief security evaluator testified that the extent of Wieland's association with Castro was important because Wieland had "testified he saw him only once."

Otepka concluded that Wieland lacked "integrity and judgment."

Later, after more information was developed, Hite testified that he wrote a stronger report in which he recommended that Wieland be regarded as a security risk.

OVERRULED

However, in both instances, Secretary of State Dean Rusk overruled the security division and permitted Wieland to remain on the State Department payroll.

William Crockett, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, told the subcommittee that final decision to close the case against Wieland was made in concurrence with the Justice Department, the FBI, a special personnel advisory board, and then Attorney General ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

Wieland is still on the State Department payroll as a Foreign Service officer, class 1, at a salary of $24,500 a year. Assigned to Crockett's office, he is to be sent to Canberra, Australia, as supervisory consul general.

The Wieland decision resulted in sharp controversy developing between Otepka and his immediate superior, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State John F. Reilly and Crockett.

As a result, the State Department is trying to fire Otepka for delivering to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee documents that supported his story of what he considered to be laxity in the State Department security program.

The Wieland case was one of several which the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has stated indicates laxity or poor administration of security matters in the State Department.

The testimony released by the Senate subcommittee includes pertinent parts of the questioning of Otepka, Hite, Reilly, Crockett, Wieland, and a half dozen other officials.

It gives the clearest picture to date of the controversy over the Wieland case, and the events that led up to State Department efforts to oust Otepka.

FILES APPEAL

Otepka, dismissed November 5, 1963, has appealed through Department channels. He could have appealed outside the State Department to the Civil Service Commission, but in that case he would have ceased drawing his pay.

His counsel, Washington Attorney Roger Robb, has asked on five occasions for a postponement of the Department hearing, saying he wanted to study the transcript of the subcommittee hearings, the first of which is the volume on Wieland.

The State Department granted a postponement each time Robb asked for it. The hearing now is set for September 18.

The security investigation of Wieland was started in November 1960, a short time after FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover met with the then Secretary of State Christian Herter to explain that derogatory reports on Fidel Castro's Communist connections had been transmitted to the State Department from the FBI.

These reports as well as reports from the Central Intelligence Agency went to the State Department Security Division then to the Caribbean desk that was headed by Wieland.

The conference between Hoover and Herter was a result of the concern of President Eisenhower over comments at a White House stag dinner about Castro's Communist connections. The reports reaching the White House and Herter did not include the facts the White House guest conveyed to President Eisenhower, and he wanted Herter to check on it immediately.

WIELAND'S DESK

An investigation by Otepka's division resulted in a report that much of the derogatory information about Castro was stopping at Wieland's desk. Against that background, Otepka opened the Wieland investigation.

Otepka told the Senate subcommittee that he examined documents written by Wieland for the purpose, among other things, of testing Wieland's veracity on matters relating to Castro and Cuba.

"They had a bearing on Mr. Wieland's credibility in connection with a statement that he made to me," Otepka testified.

Otepka said that a study of these documents "raised questions of both his judgment and his integrity." Hite also stated that "in his opinion the evidence indicated that Wieland had slanted reports concerning Fidel Castro."

Otepka and Hite also made allegations that Wieland was a Communist. Although they stated they were unable to find evidence that he was a Communist, they did develop what the Senate subcommittee characterized as evidence that Wieland "falsified his job application by ommission."

CITE MISSTATEMENT

"When he (Wieland) later filled out an expanded personal history form, he falsified that by direct misstatement," the Senate subcommittee found.

This involved a statement that he had never used any other name than his own, when, in fact, he had been known as William Arthur Montenegro for an extended period of time. He had also failed to reveal that he was fired from a job with a newspaper in Havana prior to becoming a State Department employee.

In 1961, Otepka made a finding that was not adverse to Wieland on security grounds, but it did recommend that Wieland be dropped on "suitability" grounds because of the lack of integrity and lack of judgment displayed in misrepresentation of material matters.

At that time, Otepka testified he was unaware that Wieland had lied to him and Hite relative to the number of times he had contacted Fidel Castro.

Higher officials in the State Department overruled Otepka. Not only was Wieland's employment continued but he was scheduled in 1961 for assignment to a highly sensitive post in Germany.

At that time, Federal Bureau of Investigation Director Hoover went to Attorney General Kennedy and reviewed his impressions of the Wieland case. As a result, Kennedy went to the State Department and directed Wieland be given what was later called a paper-shuffling job.

NEW EVIDENCE

In late January 1962, or early February 1962, Otepka said, he came across the evidence indicating that Wieland had seen Castro on more than the one occasion he stated he had seen Castro. He said he was in the process of opening another security investigation, but was barred by a superior from obtaining access to the Wieland file.

However, early in 1963 the new investigation was formally reopened and it was assigned to Hite.

The State Department issued a press release in which it stated that the Senate Internal Security subcommittee report contains "no information that would lead the Department to withdraw Mr. Wieland's clearance or to reopen the case."

THREE-MAN BOARD

The Department stated that a special three-man board including two persons outside the State Department, has reviewed the entire Wieland file and recommended that he be restored "to full status as an active senior foreign service officer."

"The Board believes that a grave injustice would be done to the subject were its recommendations to be otherwise.

"In arriving at its recommendations, the Board is of the opinion that the subject has honestly exercised his judgment over the years, including the period of the difficult and highly complex Cuban situation."

The State Department release makes no reference to the specific charges by the Senate Internal Security subcommittee that Wieland had engaged in "falsification" on his personnel record.

There was no comment on the specific charge that Wieland had lied about his contacts with Castro.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, July 20, 1965]

SECURITY CLEARANCE OF U.S. AID IS TERMED "SHOCKING"

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The State Department security clearance of William A. Wieland was termed "shocking" Monday in the light of statements Wieland made to security investigators.

Representative H. R. GROSS, Republican, of Iowa, told the House that Senate Internal Security Subcommittee hearings include testimony that Wieland, a Latin American expert, "lied about his contacts with Fidel Castro."

Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Republican, of Iowa, said, "I am surprised indeed at this clearance in the light of the record of the hearings before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. I and others will attempt to look into this whole matter."

The questions raised by Senator HICKENLOOPER and Representative GROSS are based on hearings and reports in which the Senate subcommittee charged that Wieland had "falsified his job application by omission" on what the subcommittee felt was a material matter.

"When he later filled out an expanded personal history form, he falsified that by direct misstatement," the subcommittee had reported.

In addition, testimony released only Monday showed that Chief Security Evaluator Otto F. Otepka had testified that Wieland told him he had only associated with Fidel

Castro on one occasion when the Cuban Premier visited the United States in 1959.

SAW HIM SIX TIMES

Opteka testified that he and Evaluator Harry Hite had obtained information that Wieland actually had seen Castro at least six times. This was a misstatement on a material matter as far as Otepka and Hite were concerned, and the evaluation division made an adverse security recommendation on Wieland.

It was this adverse recommendation that was overturned when a special personnel committee of the State Department concluded that Wieland should be restored to full status as a Foreign Service officer with complete security clearance.

Both Otepka and Hite examined all of the reports filed by Wieland in connection with his duties as a Caribbean desk officer at the time Castro took over Cuba. They concluded that Wieland had "slanted" his reports and had not passed on to his superiors derogatory material about the Communist connections of Castro and his associates.

"CONSCIENTIOUS EMPLOYEE"

The special three-man personnel committee ruled, however, that it would be unjust to make a finding that Wieland was unsuitable as a security risk.

Brig. Gen. M. F. Summerfelt, a retired Air Force officer and one of the three committee members, told the Register he and his associates spent 2 weeks examining the Wieland case and concluded that he was "a conscientious career employee" of the State Department.

General Summerfelt said he did not consider the misstatements by Wieland to be of a material nature. He said that Wieland had not included some information derogatory to Castro in his reports, but that "this might have been an effort to please his superior officers."

Gross told the House Monday: "It is incredible, in view of the report made * * * by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, that the State Department now employs Wieland in the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration at a salary of more than $24,000."

Gross said it is equally astounding that the State Department has announced it will send Wieland to Canberra, Australia, where he will be supervisory consul general and the highest consular officer in Australia.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 21, 1965]

Otepka Role in Wieland Case Denied

An attorney for Otto F. Otepka says his client played no part in giving a security clearance to fellow State Department official William A. Wieland.

A Senate Internal Security Subcommittee report disclosed Sunday that Wieland had been cleared twice following charges that he helped form U.S. good will toward Cuba's Premier Fidel Castro.

Wieland, now 57, headed the Department's Office of Caribbean Affairs when Castro took over. Otepka was then the Department's chief security evaluator. He was dismissed in November, 1963, accused of turning over classified documents to the subcommittee. His appeal is pending.

The subcommittee report quoted William J. Crockett, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, as saying on May 4 that Wieland had been cleared first in January of 1962. This favorable determination was signed by Otepka, he said. The second clearance, he said, was by a three-man board.

Otepka's attorney, Roger Robb, said in a letter Monday that Otepka did not clear Wieland, but only signed the formal notification to the Civil Service Commission of action taken by Otepka's superiors. Robb said this did not represent Otepka's views.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, July 21, 1965]

Press Release on Wieland Stirs Dispute

One high-ranking State Department official has criticized another for changes made in a press release issued last weekend about the security clearing of career diplomat William A. Wieland.

The officials involved are Deputy Assistant Under Secretary of State for Administration William J. Crockett and Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs James L. Greenfield.

Crockett, it was learned on reliable authority, sent a memo to Greenfield stating that he is "most unhappy" with changes made in the agreed-upon press release by the State Department on the Wieland case. The release disclosed that a personnel advisory board had recommended that Wieland be restored to full status as a Foreign Service Officer.

Wieland, 57, had been under investigation since 1961 by the Senate Internal Security subcommittee for his role as head of the State Department's Caribbean desk during the years Fidel Castro was climbing from guerrilla outlaw to control of the Cuban Government.

The paragraph in controversy in the press release, in its original form read, "The Department of State has investigated and reviewed the allegations made against Mr. Wieland, utilizing its own resources as well as other agencies."

As given to the press last Saturday, the sentence was amplified to add at the end, "* * * including the FBI."

Crockett reportedly wrote Greenfield that the added words implied that the FBI cleared Wieland. He is said to have pointed out that the FBI only investigates and does not render an evaluation or state whether a person is cleared.

An FBI spokesman declined comment except to also point out that the FBI does not evaluate or clear individuals in investigations. It leaves evaluations to others, the spokesman said.

Greenfield is out of the country and could not be reached for comment.

Wieland, now assigned to a State Department post in Canberra, Australia, was subject of a variety of charges when the Senate subcommittee took up his case more than 3 years ago. The focal point was the charge that he had been an "apologist" for Castro when he was the State Department Desk Officer in Charge of Cuban Affairs both before and after Castro took over in Havana in 1959.

DOLLAR SALES OF TALLOW DISPLACED BY SALES OF SURPLUS TALLOW

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, Public Law 480—the food for peace program—clearly sets out that it is the policy of the Congress to "stimulate and facilitate the expansion of foreign trade in agricultural commodities produced in the United States by providing a means whereby surplus agricultural commodities in excess of the usual marketings of such commodities may be sold through private trade channels, and foreign currencies accepted in payment therefor."

In other words, any shipment or sales under Public Law 480 should not displace normal commercial sales.

In a report issued last week, the Comptroller General of the United States declares that various governmental agencies apparently have been circumventing this law, to the detriment not only of our commercial shippers but to the balance-of-payment situation as well.

And it does not surprise me in the least to find that the beneficiary of this look-the-other-way policy is the United Arab Republic. This administration has had a long record of being helpful to Nasser, regardless of his attitude toward the American people.

I quote from pertinent sections of that report:

> Our review of surplus agricultural sales activities in the United Arab Republic disclosed that U.S. commercial dollar sales of tallow to the United Arab Republic have been displaced by sales of surplus tallow for foreign currency under title I, Public Law 480, programs.
>
> We estimate that commercial sales totaling about $5.5 million were displaced between 1962 and 1964 and that under existing agreements additional sales are likely to be displaced in 1965. This situation resulted because U.S. agencies made increasing amounts of title I surplus tallow available without establishing realistic commercial import requirements for the United Arab Republic. Commercial import requirements are specified in each Public Law 480 sales agreement as a means of insuring that title I, Public Law 480, sales do not displace normal commercial sales.
>
> In 1958 the United Arab Republic's imports of tallow amounted to about 32,000 metric tons, which were obtained from U.S. exporters for dollars. In 1964 the United Arab Republic's imports increased to about 56,000 metric tons, but U.S. commercial dollar sales decreased to 21,600 metric tons.
>
> We believe that the real reason for the unrealistic assessment by the U.S. agencies involved in this matter, and the consequent failure to protect U.S. commercial exports, is the overriding consideration by the Department of State of the foreign policy aspects and implications of Public Law 480 programs, and the administration of these programs in a manner which focuses primarily on this consideration rather than on the safeguarding of U.S. commercial exports.

I think it is about time that we pay attention to our commercial exporters, especially when it relates to the United Arab Republic.

SPEECH BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART UDALL ON RECREATION AND CONSERVATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on July 23, the Secretary of Interior made a speech in my State of Iowa at a conference on recreation and tourism. The first I knew of the conference was when I received a copy of the Secretary's speech on that day.

We are always pleased to have a Cabinet official come into our State, and the hospitality of the Iowa people to its visitors is, I am sure, well known.

However, most Iowans expect their hospitality to be matched by a sense of good taste and fair play on the part of the visitor.

I regret that the Secretary, in his overzealousness as a member of the Democratic Party, could not resist the temptation to single out the Democratic Congressman and the Democratic Governor for high praise in the field of recreation and conservation and to do so in such a manner that the listener would get the idea that a Republican Senator from Iowa had done nothing in this vital area.

The Secretary, of course, knows better. He knows that I served on the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission and strongly supported the key legislative proposal of the Commission which became law last year—the land and water conservation fund bill, which he singled out in his speech. He also knows that I was a sponsor of the bill to establish the Lewis and Clark Trail for Interior Department recognition—which he also singled out in his speech.

Fortunately there were many Iowans present to hear the Secretary who know of my activities in behalf of recreation and conservation. They were not misled by the Secretary's "oversight."

I still retain the deep sense of hospitality of the Iowa people. That being the case, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary's speech may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall at the Conference on Recreation and Tourism, Backbone State Park, Strawberry Point, Iowa, July 23, 1965

I would like to open this conference on a congratulatory note. It is with real pleasure that a Cabinet officer charged with the responsibility for promoting outdoor recreation and preserving natural beauty finds himself in a setting such as this, surrounded by people eager and determined to further these aims. You are lucky to have inherited this natural jewel—which I am told is a term applicable not just to this lovely park, but to the entire northeastern section of the State.

You were not merely lucky, but perceptive, to have enhanced this natural asset by electing to Congress last November a Representative who appreciates the development potential of your beautiful outdoors and who is willing and able to initiate a conference such as this.

John Culver and Governor Hughes are setting an excellent example for the entire Nation by bringing together here leaders from all levels of government and from many areas of citizen action. It is out of this kind of meeting that your State's comprehensive plan for recreation will acquire shape, direction, and polish. The hard-won land and water conservation fund is at last a reality. The battle to establish it is over. But the effort necessary to turn this legislation into parks and camping sites and marinas must still be forthcoming, and it is the States who must carry this particular ball.

Congressman Culver has read the signposts to the future, most accurately. He has recognized the immense potential for economic growth offered by tourism and recreation. Iowa has long been on the agricultural and industrial bandwagon. The vision to add a third dimension to this economic picture-in-depth is what is personified here today. For recreation, to an increasingly leisure-oriented and mobile population, is the growing market. And so far as I am concerned, it is not merely a matter of monetary output. For where outdoor recreation is concerned, there is a compensatory "input" which enriches the inner life—the psyche—the "starch," if you will, which puts your spine in a firmly upright position throughout the days of work and sweat and fears.

Several years ago, when the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission first reported, recreation was a $20-billion-a-year industry in this country—the fourth largest and fastest growing of all our economic underpinnings. Today that industry shows the greatest signs of expansion. The demands are spectacular, and your Congressman and Governor are well ahead of the pack. It is good to have leaders when leading is in order.

Today we face not just a single problem. It is not just vanishing open space opportunities which confront our Nation. It is the problem of what to do with an increasingly expanding population seeking to find surcease from its increasingly limited elbowroom. The market for elbowroom—scenic and recreative elbowroom—is practically unlimited, provided you move to preserve it while it still exists.

The counties of Iowa, among all the States in the Nation, have done the best—unequivocally—in promoting the establishment of parks and outdoor recreation facilities. Your Governor Hughes acted long before the passage of the land and water conservation fund bill. He proved his faith in the trend in 1963, by appointing a Governor's Committee on Conservation of Outdoor Resources and charging it with developing a long-range plan. This blue-ribbon committee of distinguished Iowa citizens put Iowa a jump ahead of the other States in qualifying for Federal money.

As far back as 1955, a State act passed by your legislature authorized counties to establish conservation boards with the authority to acquire lands, provide access to water areas, and develop facilities for conservation and outdoor recreation use. By 1964, 72 Iowa counties had conservation boards, and each of these had been approved by the voters of these counties—demonstrating the grassroots awareness of the urgency implicit in the tourist and recreation potential.

A year earlier, in 1963, the counties with conservation boards had acquired 329 areas, comprising 17,000 acres, including 112 parks, 91 river access roads, 29 wildlife areas, 28 roadside parks, 10 historic areas, 8 forest areas, 5 outdoor playgrounds, 5 outdoor classrooms, 3 fishing areas, 2 botanical preserves, and 29 miscellaneous outdoor recreation and conservation areas.

Since 1964, I believe the number of counties which have established conservation boards has risen to almost 90 out of a total of 99. This record has caused Iowa to be acknowledged by its peers as the model for county action in the outdoor recreation planning field.

It was out of Iowa that the concept for the proposed and virtually assured Lewis and Clark Trail came. The trail, which eventually will traverse 10 States, from St. Joseph, Mo., to Astoria, Oreg., was conceived by J. N. (Ding) Darling, former director the the U.S. Biological Survey, founder of the National Wildlife Federation and a Pulitzer Prize winning cartoonist from Des Moines. The idea was kept alive by the Darling Foundation, in his name, by two distinguished Iowans—Sherry Fisher and Ries Tuttle. These men gave it the breath of life. In 1962 they visited the Department of Interior, laid out their idea to me, and I bought it on the spot. Today, the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission has the cooperation of all Federal agencies involved, and its establishment is only a matter of time.

The great tourism and recreation potential of this particular section of Iowa rests on three steady legs. First, there is the matter of the region's tremendous potential for development. With all this beauty and all those people, there's nowhere for you to go but up. Second, there is the matter of the new Federal interstate highway, destined to make your area readily accessible to the millions in Chicago and Milwaukee as the newest unspoiled vacationland within easy driving distance. Third, there is the possibility of a great river road along the Mississippi, from the northern reaches of the river into Louisiana. This potential scenic roadway could be every bit as great a natural and economic asset to Iowa as it is destined to be for your neighboring State across the river, where State funds already are securing scenic easements.

Another possible plus is your lovely Wapsipinicon River. This waterway was given initial consideration for inclusion in our proposed Wild Rivers system. Although not included in the current proposed legislation, it still could become part of a national system. Meanwhile, State action could designate it as a State wild river, and thus preserve its beauty and recreational value, to the future benefit of the State's purse and the Nation's people.

The lure of your area is apparent. The combination of Mississippi waterfront, with its opportunities for boating, fishing, and hunting, and its enviable position on the Mississippi flyway, has been little capitalized on as yet. The lack of ground water hurts and may need remedial attention, but the plethora of pluses outweigh the minuses in your region by a ratio of hundreds to one. From smallmouth bass on the water, to deer and small game inland, to waterfowl in the flyways, you offer the hunter and angler a veritable paradise. For those who want merely to picnic, to swim, to boat, to camp, to snap nature pictures, the development possibilities are virtually unlimited—but they are up to you.

Make no mistake—an economy is based on need. You have lived and prospered off agriculture and industry because people must eat when they are hungry and they must have tools and machines to supply their creature comforts. Industry came second, because people didn't demand machines until they were introduced to creature comforts. Likewise it is with recreation and tourism. Until people acquired the leisure and mobility to indulge in these pursuits there was no market. Until they were made aware of the various ways of indulging these pursuits, there was no demand. Today, their appetite is sharp and their response lucrative. You have here, in this picturesque corner of a long-neglected State, the ability to slake their thirst for change and relaxation. In doing so, you have the potential for tremendous economic growth. The clue to your next forward step lies in cooperation with each other and in liaison between your State officials and agencies of the Federal Government. We have recognized the potential of the several States. You have elected men who understand what must be done. The rest is up to you.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES UNDER THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, when the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was before the Senate, I was designated as the Senator in charge of title VII of the bill, which related to fair employment practices, largely because a bill somewhat different from the one which was passed had been the subject of rather extensive hearings before the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which subcommittee I chaired.

For the edification of readers of the Congressional Record, and with the purpose of supplying a little guidance to the regulation of writers in the newly created Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, I should like to comment with respect to some apparently ex post facto legislative history placed in the Congressional Record on June 11, 1965.

The colloquy in question took place between the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. It appears at pages 13359 and 13360 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 11, 1965. I ask unanimous consent that that colloquy may be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the colloquy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO RULE XXII—CLOTURE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is a matter of clarification under the Civil Rights Act——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be on the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is a matter of clarification under the Civil Rights Act, which should be settled, because of certain confusion at the other end of the avenue. To that end, I yield 10 minutes under the bill to the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, we have just finished our work on the voting bill which again involved a decision by the Senate to invoke cloture. Fortunately, there were comparatively few amendments to be voted on, after cloture, and they could be handled in an orderly manner. The fact that they were, reminded me of the completely different situation that prevailed when the Senate a year ago was voting, after cloture, on amendments to the civil rights bill.

On 2 days, June 16 and 17, 1964, there were 56 rollcall votes on amendments which were properly before the Senate. Those 56 votes proceeded in an atmosphere of complete chaos because most of the Senators offering amendments had already used up so much of their allotted hour of debate that there was barely time available to call up many of the amendments and no time to discuss them. This resulted in action by the Senate without the creation of any legislative history. Thus, the Senate failed in its responsibility to give sufficient guidance to those in the executive branch and elsewhere to those who must interpret and apply the amendments adopted.

As an example of what has occurred because of the confusion and near chaos that prevailed on those days, I find myself today under the necessity of trying to create legislative history that should have been created then.

I offered an amendment to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 before cloture was invoked, but when I called up my amendment after cloture the Senate was driving toward final passage of the bill. Though my amendment was acceptable both to the Senator in charge of the bill, the then Senator from Minnesota, and to the minority leader, I was urged by these gentlemen not to take any time to explain the amendment. I followed their recommendations, the amendment was adopted, and now my purpose is being questioned.

That part of the bill represented by my amendment was the subject of a law review article which questioned the intent of the amendment. That article contains this statement:

"Neither title VII nor its legislative history sheds any light on this problem."

Now I find myself, nearly a year later, with the responsibility of clearing up the confusion thus inadvertently created.

In order to do that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD both the appropriate excerpt from the law review article, which raises the question, and a brief prepared by my staff which contains an explanation that should have been made last June.

There being no objection, the excerpt and brief were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"EXCERPT FROM 'EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY UNDER THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964,' 31 BROOKLYN LAW REVIEW 62

("By Richard K. Berg, Esq.)

"The final provision of section 703(h) does appear to effect a substantive change in the title. It provides: 'It shall not be an unlawful employment practice under this title for any employer to differentiate upon the basis of sex in determining the amount of the wages or compensation paid or to be paid to employees of such employer if such differentiation is authorized by the provisions of section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 206 (d)).'

"Section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act was added to that act by the Equal Pay Act of 1963, 77 Stat. 56, prohibiting discrimination in wages on account of sex. The quoted provision of section 703(h) was added by amendment on the Senate floor for the purpose of providing 'that in the event of conflicts, the provisions of the Equal Pay Act shall not be nullified.' This purpose seems reasonable enough. However, it is not clear exactly what conflicts Senator BENNETT, the sponsor of the amendment, intended to resolve. The Equal Pay Act does not affirmatively authorize any differentiation in compensation on the basis of sex. It does contain exceptions for differences in compensation based on a seniority system, a merit system, a system measuring earnings by quantity or quality of production, or any other factor other than sex. This is merely clarifying language similar to that which was already in section 703(h). If the Bennett amendment was simply intended to incorporate by reference these exceptions into subsection (h), the amendment would have no substantive effect.

"Another interpretation of the Bennett amendment seems more plausible. The Equal Pay Act was an amendment to section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act, and its coverage is dependent on that of section 6. The provisions of section 6 are applicable to employees 'engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce' and to employees of certain enterprises which are 'engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.' These are narrower concepts than an 'industry affecting commerce,' the standard for title VII, *Kirschbaum Co.* v. *Walling,* 316 U.S. 517, 520–23 (1942). In addition, section 13 of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. 213, contains numerous specific exemptions from the coverage of section 6, some involving significant numbers of employees. Consequently, there are numerous employers covered by title VII who are wholly or partially exempt from the coverage of the Equal Pay Act. This is the only significant conflict which appears to exist between the two, and if the Bennett amendment is to be given any effect, it must be interpreted to mean that discrimination in compensation on account of sex does not violate title VII unless it also violates the Equal Pay Act.

"This creates an anomalous situation with respect to employers affected by the Bennett amendment. They may not refuse to hire a person because of his (or her) sex, but they may discriminate with respect to compensation. Suppose the difference in compensation is so great as to make the job undesirable to members of the sex discriminated against. Arguably, this could be considered a constructive refusal to hire and not covered by the Bennett amendment. Neither title VII nor its legislative history sheds any light on this problem."

"RELATION TO TITLE VII TO THE EQUAL PAY ACT: AN EXPLANATION OF THE BENNETT AMENDMENT

"Section 703(h) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: 'It shall not be an unlawful employment practice under this title for any employer to differentiate upon the basis of sex in determining the amount of the wages or compensation paid or to be paid to employees of such employer if such differentiation is authorized by the provisions of section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 206(d)).'

"The amendment speaks in terms of a 'differentiation * * * authorized by the provisions of section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act.'

"Section 6(d) authorizes two things:

"1. Wage differentials as between exempt male and female employees doing the same work; and

"2. Wage differentials on equal jobs made pursuant to (i) a seniority system; (ii) a merit system; (iii) a system which measures earnings by quantity or quality of production; or (iv) a differential based on any other factor other than sex.

"The amendment therefore means that it is not an unlawful employment practice; (a) to differentiate on the basis of sex in determining the compensation of white-collar and other employees who are exempt under the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act; or (b) to have different standards of compensation for nonexempt employees, where such differentiation is not prohibited by the equal pay amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

"Simply stated, the amendment means that discrimination in compensation on account of sex does not violate title VII unless it also violates the Equal Pay Act."

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, to prevent this kind of situation occurring in the future, I send to the desk a resolution proposing an amendment to Senate rule XXII. It provides that each Senator who calls up an amendment after cloture and in addition to the 1 hour overall that he now has under rule XXII, the author of the amendment shall have up to an additional 5 minutes to explain that amendment. In addition, the majority leader or another Senator designated by him shall also have an additional 5 minutes to speak in opposition to each amendment called up.

This proposed change in rule XXII will not change the requirement that any amendments may be introduced after the cloture vote is taken and to prevent the use of this additional time for dilatory purposes my proposed amendment includes this language:

"No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order."

Admittedly, this language is not a complete answer to possible delays, but I believe that it is better to err on the side of sound legislative procedure than to operate under a rule which permits and, under some circumstances, even recognizes amendments to be voted on by the Senate with no possibility of any discussion on the proposals of the amendment or its merit or lack of it.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate Rules Committee will take early and favorable action on this proposed amendment to rule XXII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 114) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

"S. RES. 114

"*Resolved,* That the last paragraph of clause 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

" 'Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than one hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, except that each Senator who offers any amendment to the same which has been presented and read before the vote to bring the debate to a close shall have five additional minutes to explain that amendment and the Majority Leader or another Senator designated by him shall have five additional minutes in which to speak in opposition to that amendment. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.' "

Mr. Dirksen. Mr. President, if there is any time left, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. Bennett. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

The Presiding Officer. Six minutes remain to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. Dirksen. Mr. President, without commenting on the proposal to modify rule XXII, I am somewhat surprised that the question arose with respect to the amendment.

First, it was carefully examined by me, and also by my staff, whom I deem to be competent and quite schooled in the entire 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Second, it was submitted and carefully examined by the then Senator from Minnesota and now the Vice President of the United States. We accepted it as indicated, on the basis of the intent which was in the mind of the Senator from Utah when he submitted the amendment.

I trust that that will suffice to clear up in the minds of anyone, whether in the Department of Justice or elsewhere, what the Senate intended when that amendment was accepted.

Of course, we were under great pressure at the time to try to complete action on the bill and to get it over to the other body.

I hope that the Senator from Utah will understand why we showed what might be regarded as unseemly haste, but at the time I thought it had to be done.

However, let me emphasize and pinpoint the fact that we had in mind precisely the point made by the Senator from Utah when the amendment was submitted, and I believe that the language speaks for itself.

Mr. Bennett. Mr. President, my intention is represented by the statement I have inserted again in the Record today.

I thank the minority leader for giving me this opportunity to try to straighten out the situation, even if it is 1 year late.

Mr. Dirksen. Of course it is not strange that questions with respect to the intent of Congress arise from time to time. I examined a court decision, not too long ago, from one of the circuit court of appeals, which started out, I believe, with the statement, "The intent of Congress is a fiction."

Congress intends "what the court says it intends," and unless we make it abundantly clear on the floor of the Senate, and do provide legislative history from time to time, I can readily understand how the judicial branch will get so wide of the mark that we should be a little more careful. Not even speed, under the circumstances recited with respect to the 1964 Civil Rights Act, will quite condone our haste and the oversight in making legislative history.

Mr. Bennett. I thank the Senator from Illinois for assisting me in making the record clear today.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. The disturbingly far reach of this interesting and novel interpretation of the language of section 703 (h) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has quite properly been brought to the attention of the Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Committee, Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., by Anne Draper, chairman of the National Committee for Equal Pay. I ask unanimous consent that her letter be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

National Committee for Equal Pay,
Washington, D.C., June 30, 1965.

Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.,
Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunities Committee, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Roosevelt: As chairman of the National Committee for Equal Pay, I am writing to you about the status of equal pay protection for women under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The National Committee for Equal Pay (a list of member organizations is attached) is a clearinghouse committee which specifically concerns itself with equal pay legislation for women. Member organizations were active, for example, in seeking enactment of the Federal Equal Pay Act of 1963.

Many of the committee members have become concerned over the possibility that the equal pay protection for women postulated by the Civil Rights Act might be curtailed by certain ambiguous language contained at the end of section 703(h). This language reads as follows:

"It shall not be an unlawful employment practice under this title for any employer to differentiate upon the basis of sex in determining the amount of wages or compensation paid or to be paid to employees of such employer if such differentiation is authorized by the provisions of section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 206(d))."

Section 6(d) is the Equal Pay Act of 1963, which was enacted as an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The quoted language was included in the Civil Rights Act through an amendment introduced by Senator Bennett, of Utah, on June 12, 1964 (Congressional Record, vol, 110, pt. 10, p. 13647). Mr. Bennett explained at the time that the amendment was a technical correction and that its purpose was "to provide that in the event of conflicts, the provisions of the Equal Pay Act shall not be nullified."

Our best understanding of the implications of the amendment at the time it was adopted was that its intent and effect was to make sure that equal pay would be applied and interpreted under the Civil Rights Act in the same way as under the earlier statute, the Equal Pay Act. That is, the Equal Pay Act standards requiring equal work on jobs requiring equal skill, effort, and responsibility under similar working conditions, would also be applied under the Civil Rights Act. In this way, conflicting interpretations would be avoided in cases covered by both the Civil Rights Act and the Equal Pay Act. Also, since the employment coverage provisions of the two statutes differ in many important details, consistent standards of interpretation would be administered in cases where only one law or the other applied. All of us who have had experience with equal pay legislation are well aware of the conflicting variety of interpretations possible under different laws as to what constitutes equal work requiring equal pay.

Almost exactly a year later, on June 11, 1965, Senator Bennett undertook to place on record a retroactive and totally different explanation of the intent of his original amendment (Congressional Record, p. 13359), as follows:

"Simply stated, the amendment means that discrimination in compensation on account of sex does not violate title VII unless it also violates the Equal Pay Act."

If Senator Bennett's postenactment legislative history is followed, it means that equal pay protection under the Civil Rights Act applies only for persons subject to the Equal Pay Act and does not extend to employees whose only coverage is under the Civil Rights Act (such as professional, administrative, and executive workers). In fact, the effect is to nullify the Civil Rights Act completely as far as equal pay protection for women is concerned, and to leave the Equal Pay Act as the only applicable Federal statute in the field.

This is a drastic reinterpretation of an amendment offered as a technical correction for the purposes of avoiding conflicts. It is hard to believe that Congress actually intended to nullify the Civil Rights Act in a substantive matter of employment coverage as a means of bringing about harmony with the Equal Pay Act. Such an interpretation has the further effect of creating an anomalous differential coverage for women as to the various antidiscrimination provisions applicable to them under the Civil Rights Act itself. That is, many individuals who will be protected under the Civil Rights Act against discrimination on the basis of sex in hiring, firing, promotion and other terms of employment will not be covered for "equal pay": "equal pay" protection under the Civil Rights Act would obtain only for those who happen also to be subject to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

It is a fair question as to whether Congress would have passed Mr. Bennett's amendment had he stated on June 12, 1964, what he chose to state nearly a year later on June 11, 1965. It is also a matter for some conjecture as to whether Mr. Bennett would even have arrived at his second explanation had he not in the meantime had such an explanation suggested to him by an article in the Brooklyn Law Review, the pertinent parts of which are reproduced in connection with his June 11, 1965, statement.

Assuredly the Commission will reach a reasonable judgment based on the general remedial intent of the Civil Rights Act and its actual legislative history, without regard to postenactment efforts to rewrite the record.

Sincerely yours,
Anne Draper,
Chairman, National Committee for Equal Pay.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as all Senators know, legislative history cannot be written after the fact. I commend to the Equal Opportunity Commission the reasoning set forth in the Draper letter, with complete confidence that the Commissioners and their staff will be influenced by solemn senatorial colloquy, but will be guided by the fundamental legal proposition, that the intent of Congress in enacting particular legislation must be discovered from the words of the enactment themselves, and through explanatory colloquy prior to enactment if such is available, but never through explanations made on the Senate floor long after enactment.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the

Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 27, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 26, 1965:

The Judiciary

Oren Harris, of Arkansas, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern and western districts of Arkansas; to fill a position created by Public Law 87-36 approved May 19, 1961.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 26, 1965:

Department of Justice

James P. Coleman, of Mississippi, to be U.S. circuit judge for the 5th circuit.

Bureau of the Census

A. Ross Eckler, of New York, to be Director of the Census.

Postmasters

ALABAMA

Charles T. Farrow, Eclectic.

ALASKA

Ramona D. Kookesh, Angoon.

ARIZONA

Luis O. Acosta, Superior.

ARKANSAS

Ruth A. Parker, Lincoln.

CALIFORNIA

Warren F. Leedom, Albion.
Gordon W. Clancy, Barstow.
Dale F. Smith, Beverly Hills.
Noel W. Bassett, Fall River Mills.
Donald D. Lawton, Ferndale.
Maurice E. Ball, Fillmore.
Arpad J. Sutch, Hermosa Beach.
Robert S. Gleason, Oceanside.
Carroll E. Nix, Pittsburg.
William C. Miller, Santa Clara.
Nellie F. Chandler, Shingletown.
Mary L. Charlesworth, Sunland.
William D. Wilson, Sun Valley.
Louise A. McCallen, Truckee.
Cleo B. McKnight, Tupman.
Eunice V. Isaman, Valyermo.

COLORADO

Edward G. Ruhter, Empire.
W. Calvin Berk, Idledale.
Kenneth W. Simon, Naturita.

CONNECTICUT

Daniel A. Shembreskis, Oakville.
Albert F. Gereg, Jr., South Kent.
Doris P. Boivin, South Woodstock.
Ursula H. McCafferty, West Cornwall.

DELAWARE

Maynard T. Boulden, Claymont.
Herbert L. Semans, Magnolia.

FLORIDA

Joseph W. Brenner, DeBary.
Clifford E. Baxter, Delray Beach.
Gerald E. Ward, Mandarin.
Wilton P. Banks, Pompano Beach.
James P. Seckinger, Wildwood.

GEORGIA

H. Bryson Turk, Flowery Branch.
Jefferson S. McRae, Mount Vernon.
Robert K. Carpenter, Richmond Hill.
Harley R. Drew, Waynesboro.

IDAHO

Clare G. Zimmerman, Emmett.
Glen H. Sherman, Greenleaf.
Ardinelle L. White, Pierce.
John R. Welz, St. Maries.

ILLINOIS

William T. Wasilewski, Athens.
Lorman P. Wehling, Cottage Hills.
Robert C. Wright, Marseilles.
R. Dean Rogers, Mulkeytown.
Allen D. Welker, Olney.
Evelyn W. Kramer, Orland Park.
Lela Green, Wheeler.

INDIANA

Herbert D. Barnes, Burnettsville.
Garland F. Stickler, Columbia City.
Helen R. Yates, Decker.
Leo J. Rouhier, Goodland.
Eugene R. Ruley, Lowell.
Willis E. Fouts, Macy.
Clifford H. Shanahan, North Manchester.
Hazel R. Tudor, Stilesville.

IOWA

Leslie N. Blitgen, Bellevue.
Ronald D. Stewart, Braddyville.
Cady J. Reece, Bradford.
Harlan Morgan, Castana.
Ralph L. Zearley, Edgewood.
F. Francis Fickess, Gravity.
Sam K. Merrill, Kellerton.
Eldon J. Stein, Manson.
Ellis O. Bailey, Middletown.
Stanley R. Johnson, Nodaway.
William G. Gantz, Onawa.
Arnold F. Brehmer, Peterson.
Sara L. Holt, Randall.
Sidney J. Ness, Underwood.
Richard D. Hulse, Van Meter.
Donald E. Havenhill, Wapello.

KANSAS

Joseph F. Pendergast, Frankfort.
Emily E. McCoy, Hamlin.

KENTUCKY

Richard B. Young, Jr., Allensville.
Joesph N. Orem, Campbellsburg.
William H. Miller, Campton.
Mildred K. Skaggs, Crockett.
Morris Uzzle, Graham.
Jack L. Hopgood, Morganfield.

LOUISIANA

Fabius J. Normand, Cottonport.
John E. Davis, Jr., Rosepine.
Marion D. Morris, St. Francisville.

MAINE

William C. Abelli, East Winthrop.

MARYLAND

Charles F. Carlin, Adamstown.
Audrey M. MacWilliams, Churchton.

MASSACHUSETTS

Raymond J. Decker, Chesterfield.
Martin H. Walsh, Gardner.
John C. Nowick, Maynard.
Jane M. Kane, Rochdale.
Norman D. Potter, South Lee.
Henry K. Johnson, Townsend.
Chester J. Martin, Turners Falls.
Stanley V. Skamarycz, Westminster.

MICHIGAN

Dan W. Geneit, Charlevoix.
Jack E. Blacklock, Elberta.
Earl Engle, Jr., Woodland.

MINNESOTA

Gerald E. Struss, Akeley.
Donald C. Stroman, Alberta.
Vernon D. Desing, Barnesville.
J. Sherman Kerr, Bemidji.
James R. Maalis, Crosby.
Lenard M. Olsen, Elgin.
Gerald D. O'Reilly, Goodhue.
Sheldon H. Peterson, Grygla.
Erwin M. Johnson, Hawley.
Squire H. Holmes, Middle River.
H. Earl Berg, Milaca.
Francis W. Wuetherich, Norwood.
Catherine C. Bloom, Okabena.
Daniel J. O'Connell, Orr.

MISSISSIPPI

Homer F. Hunter, Decatur.

MISSOURI

Nolan L. Rowe, Granby.
Theon L. Schlosser, Illmo.
Kathleen F. Dwiggins, Westalton.
Frank D. Hicks, Willow Springs.

MONTANA

Alfred G. Walker, Arlee.
Marjorie D. Badgley, Rexford.
Elmer W. Page, Sidney.

NEBRASKA

Arthur E. Pavey, Giltner.
Arthur W. Bestol, Hyannis.
William Witt, Jr., Kenesaw.
Kenneth D. Timme, Pleasant Dale.
E. Jerome Christensen, Ruskin.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Robert W. Gingras, Georges Mills.
John M. Gendron, Marlow.
Raymond A. Saulnier, Whitefield.

NEW JERSEY

Helen B. Milne, Elwood.
Allan George, Hazlet.
George J. Lahey, Highlands.
Philip Serpico, Keyport.
Rudolph J. Kuchta, Linden.
Rocco N. Bonforte, Long Branch.
Joseph J. Benucci, Newark.
John Kane, Jr., South Plainfield.

NEW MEXICO

Dixie B. Sparks, Fort Stanton.
Mary Mascarenas, Hanover.
Carmelita R. Shoemake, Lake Arthur.
Clark T. White, San Jon.

NEW YORK

Nicholas P. Bier, Jr., Acra.
Robert V. Gorman, Apulia Station.
Joseph P. Komarowski, Barker.
Harry J. Tabler, Brocton.
John R. Sutter, Jr., Cairo.
Donald A. Wiley, Cape Vincent.
Virginia S. Gimmillaro, Chadwicks.
Oreina L. Lavoie, Champlain.
William J. Marsh, Cleveland.
Leonard Seidel, Delanson.
Luke Bottiglieri, Dobbs Ferry.
Donald R. McMahon, Dresden.
Thomas J. Powers, Elnora.
Robert K. Norton, Fayetteville.
Richard C. Smolk, Findley Lake.
John L. Kress, Jr., Galway.
Joseph D. Zint, Highland Falls.
Joseph F. Clark, Hughsonville.
Lenora M. Turner, Indian Lake.
Helen M. Ohanesian, Jefferson Valley.
Theodore V. Auguston, Lake Grove.
Dominic F. Mazza, Liverpool.
Joseph W. Mannion, Memphis.
Stephen J. Kennedy, Niagara University.
Ellen M. Poley, North Branch.
Leonard V. Behr, Orangeburg.
Lachlan Thomson, Pawling.
Waynes C. Jones, Petersburg.
Earl E. Gordon, Pomona.
John F. Boyle, Ransomville.
Maurice E. Karker, Richmondville.
R. Felix Hendrix, Jr., Roscoe.
Willard H. Aubrey, Rouses Point.
Donald E. Felter, Sparrow Bush.
Edwin E. Wallace, Spring Valley.
Thomas B. O'Driscoll, Theresa.
Claude S. Mount, Three Mile Bay.
Edwin B. Hinzmann, Wappingers Falls.
Lester R. Marshall, Waverly.
Daniel B. Stone, Watkins Glen.
Orville B. Clark, Westons Mills.
Frances I. Straley, West Park.

NORTH CAROLINA

Ralph E. Sorrell, Cary.
Allen W. Lanier, Chinquapin.
Sallie W. Elmore, Dover.
Levin B. Culpepper, Elizabeth City.
Howard C. Steele, Hickory.

Walter T. Upchurch, Norwood.
Lawrence W. Bryant, Patterson.
Hazel J. Thompson, Plumtree.
Leon E. Peedin, Princeton.
Wesley B. Draper, Weldon.

NORTH DAKOTA

Marilyn B. Peters, Hampden.
Lyle W. Bethke, Kulm.
Robert B. Bjerke, Starkweather.

OHIO

Woodrow W. Little, Bluffton.
R. Reed Stoner, Fayette.
Harold R. Ferrell, Fletcher.
Otis A. Redmond, Harbor View.
Wayne E. Hastings, Homerville.
Theodore R. Boring, McArthur.
Richard J. Marlowe, Mineral Ridge.
Francis E. Bisson, Ravenna.
William W. Clow, Jr., Sherrodsville.
Martha J. Cox, Windsor.

OKLAHOMA

Ben R. Karnes, Caddo.
Raymond L. Reiswig, Kingfisher.
Cecil L. Brandly, Oakwood.
M. Jack Phelps, Selman.
Gordon L. Eisener, Tipton.
Eugene T. Moseley, Watonga.

OREGON

Fred M. Reeves, Hermiston.
Alva N. Bradford, Medford.
Thomas L. Holland, Toledo.
Harold M. Engberg, Wasco.

PENNSYLVANIA

Robert B. Good, Bird in Hand.
Rudolph V. Benigni, Brookville.
Stewart E. Marsh, East Stroudsburg.
Warren S. Whipple, Hughesville.
Donald E. Sherwin, Karns City.
Gerald A. Volk, Loretto.
Phaon R. Herb, Orwigsburg.
Donald L. Morris, Point Pleasant.
Joseph F. Sama, Westfield.
Kenneth J. Bryan, West Sunbury.
Vernon E. Oberdorff, Sr., Windsor.

PUERTO RICO

Jesus Perez, Arecibo.
Jose R. Sotomayor, Barceloneta.
Nestor Velez Rivera, Corozal.
Felipe B. Cruz, Jr., Vieques.

RHODE ISLAND

Maurice N. Valois, Manville.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Jennie M. Swartz, Baltic.

TENNESSEE

Herman W. Powers, Tellico Plains.

TEXAS

James C. Wood, Coppell.
Otis S. Bowers, Corpus Christi.
O. Lavelle Taliaferro, Eden.
Grace Cullender, Hartley.
Ernest J. Ohnemus, Lubbock.
Milton Farmer, Pearland.
Percy W. Adams, Ravenna.
Frank D. Sutton, Stratford.
Holley H. Arnold, Trinity.

UTAH

L. Clark Roberts, Myton.
Richard E. Allgood, Tooele.

VERMONT

Mary A. Bagley, West Topsham.

VIRGINIA

George M. Crumpler, Abingdon.
Elton T. Matthews, Atlantic.
Jack L. Russell, Berryville.
Dorothy D. Crowgey, Emory.
Gertrude B. Hurst, Port Haywood.

WEST VIRGINIA

Richard W. Goodwin, Beaver.
Lowell E. Canaday, Crab Orchard.
Cecil Ward, Gilbert.
Ruth B. Netotea, Raysal.
Harley F. Wright, Reader.

WISCONSIN

Raymond E. Mattison, Amberg.
Dell V. Anderson, Cable.
Leland James Meylink, Cedar Grove.
Anthony F. Pickart, Mount Calvary.
Malcolm J. Goodrich, Pickett.

TAX COURT

Theodore Tannenwald, Jr., of New York, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States for the term of 12 years from June 2, 1962.

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

Mrs. Penelope Hartland Thunberg, of Maryland, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1970.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Ethiopia's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, an ancient and colorful kingdom celebrated its Independence Day last Friday. The kingdom of Ethiopia, described by Herodotus in the 25th century B.C., has existed for centuries in the east African highlands. A long tradition of independence has made Ethiopia an important member of the world's nations. One of the original signatories of the U.N. Charter, Ethiopia has been active in its support of that organization. In 1951, she sent combat troops to help the U.N. cause in Korea. And in 1960, Ethiopia provided troops for U.N. service in the Congo.

Emperor Haile Selassie I, has provided leadership in the movement for African unity, and the Capital of Ethiopia, Addis Ababa, is the seat of the Permanent Secretariat of the Organization of African Unity.

The Government of Ethiopia is a constitutional hereditary monarchy. Sovereignty is vested in the person of the Emperor, who appoints the various ministers and the Members of the Senate. Since 1957, however, the Members of the Chamber of Deputies have been chosen by popular election. Though more than 40 tribes and people are represented among Ethiopia's 20 million inhabitants, all Ethiopians by birth, regardless of sex, who are 21 years of age are entitled to vote for Deputies from the electoral district where they reside.

Almost 90 percent of the population of Ethiopia is engaged in farming or the raising of livestock. Coffee constitutes more than 50 percent of its value of exports. In addition, however, Ethiopia has been carrying out developmental programs with the help of foreign aid and loans. The Government's Ethiopian Air Lines, operated under contract by Trans World Airlines, has been a major factor in this development.

I want to extend my congratulations and best wishes to the people of Ethiopia and to their Emperor, Haile Selassie I, on this occasion.

Ethiopia's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 23, Ethiopia celebrated its day of independence, and I think it appropriate that on this day we salute the long struggle for progress and the achievements of this nation. We all know of the terrible aggression suffered by Ethiopia in 1935, and are aware of the fierce and proud struggle made by the Ethiopian people to prevent domination by Italy.

Less, Mr. Speaker, is known of Ethiopia's strong efforts of progress and peace since World War II. Emperor Haile Selassie and his nation have shown great interest in the Pan African movement through the sponsorship of the Conference of African Chiefs of State in Addis Ababa in May 1963. Addis Ababa is now the seat of the Permanent Secretary of the Organization for African Unity. This step, I think, signifies the growing importance in responsible development of the national cooperation and democratic progress which has so characterized Ethiopia for many years.

New England T. & T. Co. Given Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I have learned about a major award being presented to the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.

The company was recently presented a Silver Anvil Award for its outstanding work with the news media in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont.

It won the award in national competition in the business-industry category.

The annual contest is sponsored by the Public Relations Society of America.

Judges are leaders from many walks of life in our Nation.

This is the second major award for New England Telephone this year. Several months ago, the New England Press Association honored the utility for its outstanding press work.

Knowing the interest of President Allen G. Barry and Vice President-Public Relations Thomas M. Hennessey in civic affairs and service to customers and communities, these awards are in keeping with the company's reputation.

Others who have worked to build a solid reputation among New England newspapers, radio and television stations are hundreds of employees throughout the region; Timothy P. Mannix, assistant vice president; Paul H. Spiers, Jr., general news manager; and Richard B. Flynn, public information supervisor.

Increased Military Pay a Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, prior to the debate on the military pay raise, legislation in the House of Representatives, my colleague, the gentleman from the Fourth District of Kansas, the Honorable GARNER SHRIVER, made a strong case for the increase for military personnel in his weekly newsletter to his constituents.

The logic of his arguments for the pay increase provided the basis for an editorial in the Junction City, Kans., Daily Union on Wednesday, July 21.

Inasmuch as I also supported the military pay increase, and since this editorial appeared in the district I represent, I feel that it should be brought to the attention of my colleagues.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, the editorial follows:

INCREASED MILITARY PAY A MUST

It is strange, indeed, remarks Congressman GARNER SHRIVER, that under pay scales now in effect a private in the Army who may be called upon to risk his life for his country receives substantially less pay than a Job Corps enrollee in the antipoverty program.

Representative SHRIVER, who represents the Kansas Fourth District in Washington, pointed out that legislation providing an average 10 percent pay increase for members of the Armed Services had been approved 34 to 1 by the House Armed Services Committee. He added:

"Each of the military services has reported difficulty in attracting and retaining adequate numbers of highly qualified career personnel. Department statistics reveal a large percentage of military personnel are forced to obtain a second job to provide their families with an adequate standard of living.

"There is no question that the men and women serving in the military services are entitled to, and require adequate compensation. They are making substantial personal sacrifices to help insure the security and strength of America and the free world.

"Neither is there any question that an increase in military pay is needed in order to make such service more attractive to prospective servicemen and to those already serving.

"It is strange, indeed, that under pay scales now in effect a private who may be called upon to risk his life for his country receives substantially less pay than a Job Corps enrollee in the antipoverty program here at home.

"This is hardly an incentive designed to attract men to serve, or reenlist, in the U.S. Armed Forces.

"The present system of promotions in the military services also fails to make service in the Armed Forces attractive to young men. Congress should give immediate consideration to the improvement of the present structure of promotion.

"There also are inconsistencies which need to be corrected in the way the Department of Defense has applied combat pay provisions of present law. I have introduced legislation to provide special hostile fire duty pay for all military personnel serving in Vietnam.

"Shortly after I introduced the combat pay bill, the Department of Defense made 75 percent of our forces in Vietnam eligible for such benefits at the discretion of the Secretary. In view of the growing buildup of troops in Vietnam, the combat pay provision should be applied across the board in that theater of activity.

"These are some of the steps which should be taken to help correct present inequities. Every American owes a debt of gratitude to the men and women who are loyally and sacrificially serving and defending the freedom and liberty we enjoy."

Congress Giving Up Control of Purse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body knows that one of the principal powers of the legislative branch under our form of Government is control of the purse strings. Every Member also knows that this power has been steadily eroding away in recent years.

In an illuminating article which should interest every Member of this body, one aspect of this steady loss of power was discussed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Under unanimous consent, the article by the gentleman from Wisconsin, entitled "Congress Giving Up Control of Purse," which appeared in the July 24 issue of the Milwaukee Sentinel, follows:

CONGRESS GIVING UP CONTROL OF PURSE

(By GLENN R. DAVIS, U.S. Representative, Ninth District, Wisconsin)

Acting in the light of their British colonial experiences, our Founding Fathers sought to make certain that their elected legislative representatives—their Congressmen—controlled the Federal purse strings.

Hence, section 9 of our Federal Constitution provided: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

Sadly, and ominously, Congress has slipped into the slovenly habit of appropriating large sums of money, mostly in accordance with the patterns and amounts set in the executive budget, without proper concern for when the money will be spent, and without adequate post appropriation surveillance of the expenditure of the money.

In short, Congress is turning over too many signed checks to the President and his appointees.

In the fiscal year just begun, July 1, the President has said he will spend, that is, withdraw from the Treasury, $99.7 billion during this and the succeeding 11 months. As you will note from the upper chart, he has asked Congress to authorize the spending of $106.4 billion in this and subsequent fiscal years. Thus nearly one-third ($34.4 billion) of this year's appropriated funds would be spent at the discretion of the President in future years.

At the same time, the President will drain off $27.6 billion of prior years' appropriations.

At the end of this fiscal year—June 30, 1966—there will be $101.5 billion available for expenditure by the executive departments of the Government. What a bundle of blank checks. And the signer of the checks, the Congress, has relinquished possession and control of them.

And this is only part of the true spending picture. Through Government trust funds, another $28 billion will be taken out of the Treasury in this 12-month period. Such trust funds include social security, medicare (when authorized), and the interstate highway fund, to name a few.

As an instrument of further executive control of spending, the President has recommended several new user taxes, the proceeds of which would likewise go into trust funds to be disbursed by executive appointees without congressional appropriations.

Examples of such new sources of revenue, spendable without appropriation by Congress, are the proposed doubling of the aviation gasoline tax, the establishment of a new soil conservation revolving fund, and the enhancement of transportation taxes payable into the interstate highway trust fund.

It is obvious that a supine Congress—and the 89th Congress seems to be even more supine than its predecessors—is rapidly relinquishing control of the public purse.

Unless that control is reasserted, and soon, the Members of Congress will be reduced, along with their constituents, to begging for political and economic crumbs at the back door of the White House.

Mormon Pioneer Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Saturday last—July 24, 1965—I was accorded the high honor of acting as grand marshal in the Pioneer Day parade in Idaho Falls, Idaho. In addition, I was fortunate in being able to participate in a Pioneer Day celebration in Pocatello.

Pioneer Day, 1965, Mr. Speaker, marked the 118th anniversary of the yesterday when President Brigham Young of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, from a canyon ridge overlooking Salt Lake Valley, gazed thoughtfully into the valley for a number of minutes and then, with satisfaction in his voice said: "This is the place, drive on."

This, then, was the end of months of rugged, dangerous travel across desolate and unfriendly country, a feat strikingly similar to the great Oronca of Moses and the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt to the promised land. The pioneers accompanying Brigham Young had found their promised land—a place where they could fulfil the predictions of the Prophet Joseph Smith, and become a mighty people in the midst of the Rocky Mountains.

But, having settled and laid the foundation for a great city on the shore of the Great Salt Lake, these pioneers were not content to rest. For them, the end of the long, arduous journey was just the beginning of their work. It was the start of the colonization of an entire area—an area which had been described by a U.S. Senator as not worth a "pinch of snuff". It is true that the land was forbidding looking. There was little vegetation save for sage, greasewood, and saltgrass. And there was little water.

But for dedicated men and women it was a challenge which they were more than willing to meet. What water there was, was captured and used—used to bring forth crops where there had been nothing but desert. With the crops, other cities, communities, and developments came into being. And, to supply the needs of this expansion, more crops were produced.

The growth of the area, Mr. Speaker, was not explosive. But it was steady. And, with the same pioneering spirit, the contemporary inhabitants of the area are continuing that growth.

This story illustrates in a most unusual and dynamic way the spirit of the American heritage—that the settlement of Idaho, the West, and even our original colonies was largely accomplished through the spirit of religious freedom and devotion. It is my most sincere hope and wish, Mr. Speaker, that the spirit of our pioneers may never die nor languish—and that many times 118 years from now, Pioneer Day will still recall the words—"This is the place, drive on."

A Salute to Wright Patman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a salute to WRIGHT PATMAN.

At the recent meeting of the Small Business Administration's National Advisory Council, Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY paid a glowing tribute to our esteemed colleague from Texas, WRIGHT PATMAN.

The Vice President praised Mr. PATMAN as the champion of a competitive economy and the preserver of a strong business community, so important to our economic well-being. Mr. HUMPHREY went on to state the importance of small business in the recent successful orbits of Gemini III; over 3,000 small defense contractors were part of the Gemini program.

Mr. Speaker, I have served many long and happy years in the House and on the Subcommittee on Small Business of the House Banking and Currency Committee with WRIGHT PATMAN and like Vice President HUMPHREY know him to be a true friend of the small business community and a truly great public servant.

I hope that the Members will take the opportunity to read the Vice President's excellent speech:

ADDRESS BY HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, VICE PRESIDENT, TO THE JOINT SESSION OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AND TOP DEFENSE PRIME CONTRACTORS, WASHINGTON HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Thank you very much. Thank you very much my friend, Cortland Silver; Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, the friend of independent and small business and one of the the great representatives of our Government; Mr. Foley, my esteemed friend and the Administrator of our Small Business Administration; and a special word of congratulations to the couple that I have been privileged to be seated alongside, Mr. and Mrs. Dominic Donatello.

Now, I come to you to speak about the program in which you are so deeply involved, and to thank you once again as I have on other occasions for the splendid service that you give to your country through the Small Business Advisory Council. I know how much this council means to the Small Business Administration and I have some appreciation of what it means to the entire economic structure of this Nation. I served for 16 years, or about that period of time, on a committee in the Congress related to the activities of small business: first, the Small Defense Plants Committee and then, later on, the Small Business Committee of the Senate. I felt a kinship and a closeness to this organization of yours, the council, and to Small Business Administration, and I'm happy to say that a Minnesotan, Mr. Silver, has done a good job as your chairman, and a Minnesotan, the Administrator of this Agency, has done a very good job as your Administrator.

I'm so pleased that the President also feels so strongly about your work. This gives you encouragement and, I think, demonstrates to you how important your service is. Let me underscore that. We need your help.

Now I know that we are meeting today not only with the Council but also with some of the representatives of the largest defense contractors. And this is as it should be it. I think few people in this country realize the extent to which you work together and depend on each other. You are doing a job, a real job, that neither of you could do alone.

I serve as Chairman of the Space Council and I'm familiar with the projects of NASA and the Defense Department. I think the Gemini project is a good example of cooperation between small business and larger defense contractors. More than 3,000 subcontractors—large and small—worked on the Gemini spacecraft production—and what teamwork. In fact, one of the most thrilling experiences I've had was to be present when Gemini 3 was put into orbit. I saw the project functioning—the launching of the rocket—the projection of the capsule. It was thrilling to be a part of it, at least as an observer, and as an interested public official. The success of that mission was based on real cooperation on the part of Government, and business and labor, on the part of the scientists in and out of Government, in our universities, and in our private sector. Now Gemini will be followed by other projects which will require the same kind of cooperation, even a little more so. I mention this interdependence theme between big and small business. Of the $27 billion the Department of Defense spent on defense and space procurement last year, my research tells me that some $4 billion was subcontracted to small firms. Now, big and small business are engaged today in a partnership which on its face and in depth benefits both—just as we see in the Nation as a whole—a constructive partnership for prosperity between private initiative and sound Government economic policy. Our Government economic policy is directed toward creating conditions which will lead to long-term economic health.

Now a good part of this economic well-being that I speak of depends upon a competitive economy and the preservation of a strong small business community. And that's why we have an SBA. That's why we have a WRIGHT PATMAN. That's why we have a Justice Department. That's why we have a Federal Trade Commission. That's why we place emphasis in this Government upon fair competition. And that's why we give encouragement to the maintenance of a strong, healthy, small business community. We need small business if we are to maintain this broad base of economic support. We need the independent man in our economy. He is important to our national character. We need enterprising, imaginative, small firms and leaders in small firms to give us new ideas and new competition. Some of the best ideas of merchandising, of manufacturing, or improvement of efficiency come from small firms. Maybe it's because of the necessity of making savings and improving productive efficiency. Many of the great corporations that are represented here today started as small, independent firms. They were aggressive, they offered something, and today they are great national assets. Now we must make certain that the door remains open for others to follow. Thus, we have undertaken and we will continue to undertake programs which help small business maintain a strong place in our economy.

Now, in the first 8 months of this fiscal year, for instance, over $100 million in Defense Department contracts went to small business as the result of an SBA program to locate new suppliers for prime contractors represented here today. Under the new procurement set-aside policy, we believe that small business will have added opportunity for help. Under this new policy, and it was strongly advocated by Mr. Foley and the council here, a small business spokesman will sit at the table when broad procurement policies are set for Federal agencies, such as the General Services Administration and the Defense Department. The time to be present is when the policies are being written, before they are promulgated. Today both big business and small business benefit from the atmosphere of mutual trust that exists between the private sector and Government.

We are now in the 51st consecutive month of economic expansion. I know you've heard it but let it sink in because if somebody were to tell you that a new continent was discovered today and it was headlines, it could be no more sensational news than 51 months of consecutive economic growth and expansion. It has never happened before. It is the first. You've lived through it. No other generation in recorded history can say that they were part of such development.

The average length of expansion over our history has been between 26 and 28 months. This is the longest peacetime prosperity period that we have ever had and it is the strongest. Unemployment is at its lowest point in 7½ years. Industrial production and retail sales and dividends and profits and wages are all moving up; investment in new plant and equipment is running at the rate of over $50 billion in 1965. That's 12 percent higher than last year and 45 percent higher than 4 years ago. And every forecast indicates that it will continue.

During the past quarter, our national economy has advanced as much as it has in any comparable time since the expansion began and I hear people say, "But it just can't continue. It never was before." Well, there are a lot of things that never were before. What this Nation needs is a spirit that we can do whatever we will to do. Do the impossible—and we will. We can do things with our economics and we are. We've learned a great deal. We are learning that we can do things and that we can maintain prosperity. Now I would like to remind you that this economic growth that we have has been accomplished within a framework of price stability unequalled in any country. In fact, the per-unit cost has gone down in manufacturing.

I just want to note for you something that came to my attention at the Cabinet meeting the other day, and I'm sure many of you have seen it, but it tells a story that you might want to think about a little bit. It's premature, of course, to say that we can avoid all ups and downs in our economy—but we can cushion them. The benefits of a sustained economy and a sustained expansion, I think, are pretty clear. Here's the report of the Council of Economic Advisers: The GNP—gross national product—in the first quarter of 1965—had it followed the old patterns that everybody was taught to believe in—would have been about $610 billion instead of $649 billion. Federal revenues on a national accounts basis would have been $104 billion, instead of approaching $120 billion. And the Federal budget would have been running at a deficit rate of $15 billion, instead of moving toward a balance. These are some figures that need to be understood. Now, this can't all be an accident because you've had 51 months of this policy. Now this achievement has replaced this postwar pattern which we lived with and which we readily accepted—if not readily, at least we accepted—of no less than four economic recessions and three of them in the 8 years before 1961.

Now, I believe that business has confidence in the Government and in the Johnson administration, but I know one thing for sure—this administration has confidence in the vitality and the know-how and the ingenuity of American business. You know what has been done already in this administration. The 7-percent tax credit for new business and investment. The sweeping reform of tax treatment of depreciation and liberalized gain this year, the tax cut which President Johnson signed into law a little more than a year ago, the biggest corporate and individual tax cut in our history. Now, these measures cut corporate taxes this year by some $5 billion. These measures raised the profitability of business investment, these measures have helped this administration prove its faith in the free enterprise system. These measures have increased Government revenues far beyond our fondest expectations. Well beyond it, actually about a billion and a half dollars more than anybody dreamed in the most optimistic estimates. Now, we demonstrated the faith in these economic policies again this month with our proposal to cut excise taxes which can help both the producer and the consumer. If you are a retailer, I can tell you that it will be a blessing, because I can remember I used to complain like fury, and my father before me, for having to make every retailer a tax collector for the Government and then have the Internal Revenue Service in on you about every other 6 months to make sure that you had been collecting the taxes. So when those excise taxes are removed, there will be a good deal of the hallelujah chorus in this country.

This administration has been working hard to unleash the full productive force of our private economy. But, we've also been working hard to economize in Government and if you haven't received this pamphlet or seen it I want you to get a copy of it. It is called "War on Waste." We have in the White House a man who symbolizes his frugality, as some people say, by turning off those lights; he may be turning out a light bulb in the White House, but he is turning on a lot of lights throughout the Nation I can tell you, in terms of new jobs and new business opportunity. My daddy and mother brought me up doing this business of turning out the lights. I can still hear my mother saying, "Boys, turn out the lights." You'd think that was going to bankrupt the family if that light bulb, that 40-watt or 60-watt, was left on. But it was one way that Mom had of reminding us that money didn't grow on trees and that it ought not be looked upon as if it was going out of style and you just had to get rid of it.

We wage today a war on waste in this Government and the President of the United States, this President, in the last two budgets, has demonstrated that he knows how to do it. The average increase in the Federal budget for the preceding 10 years was $3 billion a year. This man came into the White House and he said, "Look, we're going to do something about it," and the budget has been increased only a billion dollars a year in the last 2 years and we haven't had recessions. Well, in all truth, we have waged war on waste. And the President has let it be known to Mr. Foley and to others that each Government program must be justified in itself and he will not tolerate fat or waste in our Federal Government and he is at it at every Cabinet meeting—every meeting—and there is a report from a Cabinet officer every meeting as to what has been done to reduce cost—to eliminate obsolete programs—to eliminate duplication.

Your Government today has 25,000 fewer Federal employees than it had a year ago, 23,000 fewer than it had 2 years ago. And, yet there is a bigger country and a bigger economy. Now, as a result of this, these things and other things that have happened, you see a sound Federal budget which allows us to save where we can in order to spend where we must. And I'm proud of the fact that this administration has been able to keep Government expenditures in check without denying essential defense needs and human needs.

Your defense today is stronger than it has ever been. I don't have the time here but I hope before you leave here you will all get that little pamphlet that the Defense Department puts out that shows where your defense dollar has gone and what comes out of it. Mr. McNamara and company have eliminated over $3 billion of obsolescence in the Defense Department and it hasn't hurt your strength one bit. In fact, it has improved it. We are making it a much more productive and efficient establishment. Well, we have been able to reduce certain budget costs and, as I said, at the same time we've left room for things that we must do to keep this country strong and productive. And let me just run them over quickly. The maintenance of the strong Defense Establishment, second to none in the world—and I would like to drive that home in this period of uncertainty and trouble. The investment of more than $1½ billion in education—additional investment this year and this is a basic investment. We are going to have a doubling of our poverty program, provision of proper medical care for the aging generation, comprehensive attacks on heart disease, cancer and stroke.

We are trying to make our cities better places in which to live and to work and we are advocating a broad program of urban rehabilitation. We have programs to preserve this country's natural resources and natural beauty. Why a poverty program? Why a greater investment in education? Why a fight for voting rights? Well, let me give you one other little figure that was brought to our attention by the Council of Economic Advisers the other day. The cost of discrimination in employment—taking out the educational attainment of a colored person and a white person, side by side—the cost of discrimination is estimated to have cost the American economy $20 billion. Now, that is a rough estimate. Maybe it's only $15 billion, maybe it's 25, maybe it's only 5, maybe it's 30, but it's too much.

This country needs all the strength it has. It has the whole burden of humanity on its shoulders. We're leaders and when you are a leader, you don't have an opportunity for pleasure. A leader has burden and duty and responsibility.

Fifty percent of the world's gross national product is in the United States of America. Did you know that? We—194 million people—have 50 percent of the total production of the world. Four years ago, we had only 45 percent of it. That's how we've been improving. The rest of the world gets along on the other 50 percent—and we have ours. Is it any wonder that some people expect a great deal from us? And, is it any wonder that we are able to do great things? Is it any wonder that we can really talk about the Great Society and know that it's within our limits—it's within our power? And a Great Society isn't the quantity of goods—it's the quality of our lives and we are going to do something about that and we are—each of us individually—and in terms of community.

Well, we have this war on poverty and this effort for education. We do these things for one purpose: So that every man and woman in this society can have the opportunity to contribute to this society—to help. There will be a return tomorrow on our investments today. I believe that we reap what we sow. The investment we make determines the product that we get.

How many of us have thought of these figures? The average expenditure for education in the United States for your youngsters is $500 a year—elementary and secondary schools. The average school dropout costs you $1,800 a year; costs you four times as much to have them drop out of school as it does to keep them in. The inmate in the State penitentiary costs the American taxpayer $3,500 a year—$3,500 if you lock them up and $500 or less, $450 if they go to school. I sometimes wonder if we don't have our values upside down. We ought to be spending a little bit more on the schools so that we wouldn't have to spend so much in aggregate or individually in the institutions.

Now, to conclude, let me just point out that this administration has pledged not only for a richer society economically but a society of opportunity for everyone. We don't want a welfare state in America where the Government says it owes everybody a good living. But what we want above all and what we ought to have is a state of opportunity where the Government says that it's going to do everything it can, in cooperation with the private sector, to see to it that every person has an opportunity to make a good living.

Now some people may squander that opportunity. Sometimes in our own families, our own children squander opportunity—sometimes we do. But that doesn't violate the principle—the principle is that every person in America regardless of race, color, or creed, national origin, religion, or whatever his background—should have an opportunity to make something out of his life, to enrich that life to be a participating member of this society. That is what the war on poverty is all about. That is why we're reaching out to the youngsters. We know that certain families have had relief patterns for three generations. We are trying to get at the cause of that. At least, we can see that the children that come from those families do not fall into that vicious cycle and circle of dependency. Operation Head Start, Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, the VISTA program.

I was at my own University of Minnesota yesterday recruiting people to give a year of their lives—the students—1 year of their lives—to their country. You get paid only $50 a month and only board and room, but, as I told them, every one of you have been subsidized. You all have been at a State university. None of you paid for your education. Somebody told you you did, but you didn't. How can you pay for the works of art, the books in the library, the accumulated culture of 10,000 years? How can you pay for the inspiration of a teacher? How can you pay for an education? It's impossible. And those of us that have had the privilege of higher education, we'll never be able to pay back our debt to society. But, I said you ought to get a start on it, at least make a downpayment or two on the interest.

And we're going to try to inspire people to lift their country. We're going to try to help people help themselves. We're going to get people away from this idea of dependency. We're going to help them feel independent. That is one of the things we try to do in our economic policy for our economic structure and it sure is one of the things that we seek to do on our social policy for our social structure.

The investments we make to create opportunity will be mighty small in the long run compared to the prices that we pay for poverty, for ignorance, for disease—and for discrimination and for crime. And I call upon this wonderful group of business people to enlist in this battle. Here's a war that you can afford to accelerate. As I told those students yesterday, if you want to demonstrate and parade, parade against poverty, demonstrate against inequity, seek to lift the standard of American democracy a little higher. Help the fellow down the street, get to know him, get to know your America. It's a priceless and wonderful place but we can even make it better. A better America, better education, better health, better sense of social service and justice, better opportunities, better people. These are goals that I think are worthy of us and I ask you to join in the fulfillment and the attainment of them. Thank you.

Independence Day in Liberia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORRIS K. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to honor the 118th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Liberia which lies on the West Coast of Africa. With so much attention currently being paid to the so-called emerging nations and those just gaining their freedom from colonialism in Africa, it is amazing to realize that this country, which was never actually a colony of a great power, has enjoyed independence for only 71 years less than our own country.

The Republic of Liberia had its origin in 1816 when the American Colonialization Society was given a charter by the Congress to send freed slaves to settle on the West Coast of Africa. The country was first settled in 1822 with the financial assistance and encouragement of President James Monroe. Its capital, Monrovia, bears his name. The first arrivals settled along the coast, gradually securing additional territory from the tribal chieftains. In 1847 a free and independent republic was established. Although surrounded by vast territories belonging to the French and British Empires, Liberia struggled to maintain its borders and remain free of encroachment by these great European powers during the first 100 years known as the "century of survival." Today, Liberia is about the size of the State of Ohio with a population of somewhat over a million.

Liberia has always shared a common heritage with the United States, not only because of our assistance in its founding, but also because its constitution and system of government are modeled after ours. English is the official language and American currency is used. Our two nations have constantly maintained close economic and cultural contacts. Evidence to this closeness is the fact that the descendants of the original founders are known as Americo-Liberians.

Despite its Western heritage Liberia exhibits an identity that is completely African. As a small but effective leader among free nations it is strongly anti-Communist, a faithful ally of the United States and the free world, and an active member of the United Nations.

A country rich in natural resources of rubber, iron ore, timber, and other raw materials, Liberia today faces the task of reconciling the old tribal society and mores with a new expanding economy which is seeking to modernize and raise standards of living, education, and public welfare. Increasing nationalism has caused the Americo-Liberians to begin identifying with their African rather than Western heritage, and to push for greater integration of all levels of culture and society in the country. On its own initiative, with financial and technical assistance from the United States and United Nations, Liberia is making a major effort to upgrade its economy and provide materially for a better life for its people. Under the very able leadership of President William V. S. Tubman the country has been making great strides forward, especially during the past 20 years, to create a viable modern society with the materials at hand.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend this Nation for its contribution to an expanding, modern world. Without any strife or violence, backed by 118 years of independence, Liberia, too, is an emerging nation. It is emerging as an advocate of freedom for all people, international cooperation and world peace, a leader in the use of self-help to combat the age-old enemies of ignorance, superstition and economic dependence that has long plagued Africa, and a prime example of a combination of the best of old and new operating effectively in our time.

Beautification—St. John, Mo.: An Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, following are my remarks on the occasion of St. Johns, Mo., receiving the national award of the Men's Garden Clubs of America for community beautification, Sunday, July 25, 1965, Endicott Park:

Fellow citizens, fellow estheticians, fellow horticulturists, fellow floriculturists and, I presume, a few fellow olericulturists, because it is primarily in the field of cultivating vegetables and that limited to the easiest of all to tend—the tomato—that I qualify in the fellowship here assembled.

I want to assure you that it is a great pleasure to me to participate in these ceremonies, first to honor a community which has honorably lived up to what we all would wish our communities would live up to—so I call attention to the broad fellowship of citizenship here assembled; second, to honor a noble human aspiration, the desire for beauty, to honor the esthetic values of life. Third, to honor a specific area of esthetics, that of working with rather than against the splendors of nature. It is the belief of horticulturists, and certainly the floriculturist, that man can pursue his economic endeavors, not only in harmony with nature and its beauties, but in a complementary fashion that enhances both economic values and esthetic values. Fourth and last, but possibly most important, to honor the voluntary, rather than the compulsory, cooperative efforts of men and women. You volunteers of St. John, you members of the Ritenour Men's Garden Club, you members of the Men's Garden Clubs of America have the understanding that it is by persuasion and example that lasting human values move forward.

Our constitutional forefathers grasped that basic truth when they referred to the pursuit of happiness, not happiness itself, as a proper objective of the governmental mechanism within a society—the compulsory mechanism within a society.

After all, when all is said and done, is not the essence of government the right of the majority to bind, in a compulsory fashion, the minority? A necessary element in man's efforts to work together for a common goal and yet an element which, as much as possible, should be minimized to allow for the working together voluntarily whenever and wherever this can come about. And this does come about through specialized knowledge becoming what we call, but fail so often to ponder its true meaning, commonsense (and I am accenting the adjective common to mean within the grasp of almost all).

I will dwell on this point a bit more because it needs to be more widely understood itself, so it too will become commonsense. Before Galileo, commonsense was that the earth was the center of the universe around which the sun, the moon, the planets and all the stars orbited. Indeed, is this not so? Common observation confirms it. Yet specialized knowledge, not yet commonsense, based upon special observation, not common observation, told men differently. It was only when enough men led by those, persuaded by those who had made the special observations, made these special observations themselves that it became common knowledge that the earth went around the sun. So we are constantly in the process, through education, of rendering specialized knowledge into common knowledge.

I might state that, as far as I am concerned, how a television set operates among so many common things in our life today is still specialized knowledge, not common knowledge. But it works and there are enough people who are gainfully employed because it works to make its working, if not the details, common knowledge.

So it is with beauty. There is much specialized knowledge in the broad field of esthetics, but there is also much common knowledge about beauty, and the amount of this knowledge is constantly increasing in our society. However, it moves and must move voluntarily, not compulsorily. If this movement seems slow, we must exercise patience. Government can help, just as the wise city fathers of St. John have helped the volunteer efforts of its citizens. So, rightfully, they—in behalf of all the citizens of St. John—are receiving a national award from a volunteer group with specialized knowledge in an important field of esthetics. But what has the city of St. John really done? What it really has done is to assist in efforts already being made. It has removed impediments to the pursuit of beauty; it has smoothed the path. It has created the climate so the voluntary efforts could root, could grow and be productive.

I think many of you are beginning to grasp the fundamental point I am trying to make. Here I am, an official of the Federal Government in Washington, D.C., participating in the ceremonies honoring voluntary activities and local governmental activities. I am happy to participate, but the main function I can serve is to call attention to what has been done and is being done without the use of the powerful mechanism we call the Federal political government. The yet unanswered question I raise and leave for study is, Where can the Federal Government help in these efforts and, conversely, where can it hurt in these important voluntary and local efforts?

There are too many people today, either through laziness, lack of concern or because they think they know the answers with sufficient certainty, to compel others to pursue the course they lay out, who think we can attain beauty or happiness through the majority imposing its will on the minority. Is compulsion the real way to make specialized knowledge common knowledge? I doubt it deeply.

I would observe, as Justice Brandeis observed, about knowledge in the field of political science: we have 48 State laboratories to test out ideas about how to run government—48 laboratories in which to experiment. The 48 have now become 50, but good people of St. John, I would observe that there really are 100,000 laboratories in the United States today to test out theories in the field of political science. There are 100,000 taxing authorities in the United States run by boards of aldermen, trustees, and councilors elected by the people who make up the school districts, the fire districts, the sewer districts, the counties, the municipalities and the States, all experimenting in the field of government—the field of how men and women work together.

And here, I am so proud to say, is one of the 100,000 laboratories, here in my congressional district, where the workers, the scientists, if I may say so, have brought forth results which point the way for others to emulate in the important field of esthetics.

This is not St. John's first national award in this field. It is its second. We, your neighbors, are all mighty proud of your achievement. But my pride comes mainly, as I have sought to stress, from the example it sets of how our society really moves forward, through the voluntary efforts of 190 million people, through efforts based upon common understanding. It is commonsense in St. John that beauty is important.

Conservation Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this spring dedicated men and women from all sections of the country came to Washington to participate in the White House conference designed to gain public recognition of the need for conserving and beautifying our country. They left here in a highly enthusiastic and determined mood, and I am convinced that America will profit by this commendable spirit.

A lady from a small country town told me at the close of the meeting:

> Since our children married and left home I am afraid that my contribution to society has amounted to little or nothing. Now I think that I can do something worthwhile in the few years that I have left on earth. I almost feel important, and I know that what I will be doing from now on in getting my friends and neighbors interested in this program will be very important.

A laudatory objective, Mr. Speaker, and my observation was that this attitude was general among those who took part in the conference. Yet you and I know that the success of the program to conserve and to beautify our country will depend largely upon the interest that is generated by the press and other communications media. For this reason I am especially pleased that the National Wildlife Federation and the Sears, Roebuck Foundation have joined in formulating a program of National and State awards to recognize and encourage outstanding contributions in conservation and the preservation of natural beauty.

The program has been explained by Louis D. McGregor, of Flint, Mich., president of the federation, and James T. Griffin, of Chicago, president of Sears Foundation:

> We believe this new awards program will stimulate efforts at the local, State, and national level to more wisely use all our natural resources, as well as preserve or restore the natural beauty of our countryside.
>
> Financed by grants from the Sears-Roebuck Foundation, the awards program will encourage renewed dedication and action among professional and citizen conservationists throughout our land. We trust this recognition of conservation leaders will likewise stir a new awareness among all Americans of the need to conserve and wisely manage our soils, waters, forests, rangelands, plant life, and wildlife upon which the Nation's economic and social well-being are based.
>
> This new program will also recognize outstanding contributions to conservation being made by public communications media, for without public interest and understanding conservation efforts cannot succeed. Awards will be made to newspapers, radio and television stations, magazines, broadcasters, outdoor writers, and other communicators who help spread the conservation message throughout America.
>
> Although this cooperative program has been in the planning state for many months, it has been initiated in immediate response to the President's White House Conference calling for public recognition of the need to conserve and beautify our country.

The awards program will be conducted on both State and National levels. Each cooperating State affiliate of the National Wildlife Federtion will establish its own awards program, with recognition of individuals, groups and organizations for outstanding effort in 10 categories:

First. State Conservationist of the Year.

Second. Wildlife Conservationist of the Year.

Third. Soil Conservationist of the Year.

Fourth. Water Conservationist of the Year.

Fifth. Forest Conservationist of the Year.

Sixth. Youth Conservationist of the Year.

Seventh. Conservation Educator of the Year.

Eighth. Legislative Conservationist of the Year.

Ninth. Conservation Communications Award of the Year.

Tenth. Conservation Organization of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, the details of this meritorious program should be circulated as widely as possible. It is my intention to send that portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD covering this message to every newspaper and radio and television station in my congressional district, and I invite you to do likewise. I shall also send copies to the White House and to the Secretary of the Interior in hopes that they will help in making the news available to all interested parties.

I congratulate the National Wildlife Federation and the Sears, Roebuck Foundation for undertaking this important and exciting awards program.

Connecticut Wants To Save Its Poultry and Egg Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Dairy and Poultry started hearings this morning on several bills aiming to establish a nationwide marketing order for table eggs, among them my bill H.R. 7008 and the bill by our colleague from New York, the Honorable JOSEPH Y. RESNICK, H.R. 7481.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the statement I presented to the subcommittee this morning. In addition, I wish to insert the brief statements presented by Mr. Emanuel Hirth, representing the members of the Central Connecticut Cooperative Farmers Association, and Mr. Max Girshick, of the Connecticut Poultry Association. Poultry and eggs are a vital segment of the Connecticut farm economy and we are extremely anxious to help this industry in its struggle for survival under the present trying circumstances.

The three statements presented to the subcommittee are as follows:

Statement by Congressman William L. St. Onge, Subcommittee on Dairy and Poultry, House Committee on Agriculture, July 26, 1965

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the legislation on which your committee is holding hearings this morning includes also my bill, H.R. 7008, which provides for a nationwide marketing order for table eggs. These bills would provide nothing more than access to means of self-expression and self-determination for egg producers. On this question I wish to stand up, not only to be counted, but also to explain how I reached my position. After explaining the basis for reaching my position, I shall point to an assumption—a mistaken assumption—which I think forms the basis of the thinking of some of the people that come to a view opposite from mine.

I want to thank you gentlemen of the committee for your consideration in giving me time to present the facts that relate to this situation, particularly as it affects the egg-producing poultryman in Connecticut. You gentlemen have had continuous presentations made to you, I am sure, telling that eggs are one of the few food items for which both wholesale and retail prices are lower now than a decade ago. For that reason, I will only hastily summarize that, despite the declining breakfast and the cholesterol scare, the egg remains a basic item in the American diet, and, in fact, it is not overproduced: Production in 1965 will support an average consumption of 307 eggs per person for the year. This is considerably less than the proverbial egg-a-day and it includes eggs partaken invisibly—in commercial baked goods, in noodles, in prepared mixes.

Not only is this per capita consumption figure less than an egg a day, it is smaller than at any time during the 1950's. Total annual production of eggs is about steady at the level of the past 10 years. This suggests that the problems of the industry do not stem from any sudden net moves toward overproduction on a national basis.

At the same time, I get the impression that this industry is efficient. Producers in my district tell me that where a family 20 years ago had 3,000 hens, they now have 10,000, and that now they get 25 or 30 eggs more per year from each hen than 20 years ago—but they earn less from the enterprise now than they did then.

In New Jersey, where the organization of egg production is somewhat similar to Connecticut, the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that a representative producer in 1964 had a net cash farm income of $1,296 from 4,700 layers.

From these foregoing observations, we can arrive at only one conclusion: here is an industry that produces a socially desired good, the egg: it produces it efficiently; and yet the proprietors in the industry have incomes that, if not supplemented by off-farm work or by living off the depreciation of their buildings and equipment, would put them among the economically disadvantaged.

This is my idea of a paradox: an efficient industry, producing a good the public wants, yielding a substandard return. It seems to me that a nation that can orbit a man in space could also figure out a solution to this dilemma.

It also seems to me that a government that can orbit a man in space could give egg-producing poultrymen the opportunity to act together to find a resolution to this dilemma. As I understand the Resnick bill, this is exactly what it provides. It is enabling legislation that permits (not directs) egg producers to operate under a program, if certain conditions are first satisfied: those conditions include—

(a) The holding of appropriate hearings upon a proposed order;

(b) The approval of an order by two-thirds of the producers casting ballots; and

(c) The approval of the provisions of the order by the Secretary of Agriculture.

With these safeguards, an order does not stir within me any fears regarding regimentation, limitation of initiative, or stifiing of growth. I think that efficient operators whose enterpises—despite their efficiency—yield them as little as $1,300 per year are entitled to the benefits of programs to improve their position, even if the improvement may involve some minor burdens. I would hope that a program can be devised to remedy the situation I describe. I have confidence that sufficient expertise exists in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, in the State colleges, and in the farm organizations, to devise a more equitable and satisfactory system than the one now prevailing.

Opponents of this bill fall into three classes:

1. Those that would deny egg-producers the opportunity to devise an economic program and submit it to referendum;
2. Those who do not realize what the bill provides; and
3. Those who claim a program wouldn't work.

I have a critical word for opponents of the first category, and guiding words for opponents in the second and third categories. These guiding words, indeed, may convince some of these folks to join me in my support of the bill.

With opponents in the first category I can find no common ground. If a program is devised and found wanting, I would say it should be every man's privilege to vote against it. But a negative attitude now, at the present stage of the game, is tantamount to saying: "I don't want you to devise a proposal, nor to submit it to a referendum of interested parties." This amounts to a suppression of expression which I could never endorse. The second category of opponent is one who has been misled on what the Resnick bill provides. A person in this position could have read, for example, in the July 19 Poultryman (a trade newspaper) that, "Stripped of its superfluity of legislative jargon, Representative Joseph Y. Resnick's H.R. 7481 boils down to setting an egg quota and a quota of hens to fill it." Reading further in the same issue, and still on page 1, "Allotments of hen and egg quotas would be made to producers, and handlers would be told how many eggs they could handle."

This casts the proposition as if the passage of H.R. 7481 is tantamount to the imposition of quotas. Not so. The Poultryman recognizes not so, but only on page 12. Too many poultrymen get their information from page 1, where no footnotes appear to indicate that the paragraphs I read you are subject to any qualifications. As a matter of fact, actions such as those paragraphs describe could be part of a proposed order under an amendment such as the Resnick bill permits, but so could a lot of other features likewise be proposed, and many of the other features are less drastic than the possibilities the press chose to dramatize.

So, to those who are startled by what they think is in the bill, I urge you to read the bill, rather than read what somebody else wrote was in the bill. You will find it to be enabling legislation, not directive legislation; it enables poultrymen to do any or all of certain things, listed in the legislation, if they conform to certain provisions. These provisions have already been listed: they include approval at a referendum, and concurrence by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Now I will demolish the third possible basis for opposition to the measure. It is a concern, that can be well-intentioned, about the practicality of stabilization measures for eggs. At the proper time, this would be a valid question. But the proper time is when there is a proposed program on the table. The Resnick bill is not a proposed program: it is authorization toward submitting a program to referendum, but that proposed program is yet to be drawn up.

When a program is drawn up, calling upon the vast talent in USDA, it then becomes the right time to judge it. But that time is not yet. People calling "no" at this point are declaiming against something they haven't seen, and which in fact doesn't yet exist.

The poultryman may again be a factor in this sort of opposition to the Resnick bill. The July 9 issue of that weekly paper reported a NEPPCO banquet addressed by an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and he was quoted as having allegedly said—I stress the word allegedly—"a nationwide order for eggs is simply not practical because," and there follow, still within direct quotes, items related to the word "because."

People have confidence in the analytical abilities of the Department of Agriculture and of the Department's assistant secretaries. They also have confidence in The Poultryman, which is the foremost weekly circulating among egg producers. So when they read on such high authority that a program is not practical, egg producers are likely to be guided accordingly. But is this faith in the printed word placed on a sound basis? I fear not. Assistant Secretary Mehren met on July 15 with a group of poultry leaders, and he encouraged them to develop a stabilization program for their industry, even offering the Department's help toward that end. That does not sound like the advice of a man who is quoted as judging orders to be impractical. Indeed, the reports I have had of this meeting led me to expect that a denial of the remarks attributed in print to the Assistant Secretary might even be expected, and perhaps the Department witness might help to clarify this situation.

We could run on for quite a while discussing some of the principles that are relevant to the situation for which the Resnick bill would permit some help. But if we spend much more time discussing principles, not too many Connecticut poultrymen will be around to appreciate the conclusions. In 1960, the Connecticut Extension Service counted 981 egg-producing flocks in the State with 1,000 or more birds. In 1963 this number had dwindled to 527. Attrition since then has reduced it further.

As further evidence of the squeeze among Connecticut egg producers, the Department of Agriculture estimated that Connecticut poultrymen raised 4 million chickens in 1963 for laying flock replacement. In 1964 this dropped 10 percent, to 3.6 million. The 1965 estimate is less than 3½ million. Gentlemen, at the rate this decline proceeds, it suggests that people who would delay a self-help program for egg producers are presiding over the extinction of a large part of the egg industry not only in Connecticut, but in other States where egg production is organized on an independent family-farm basis.

Statement by Emanuel Hirth, Representing the Members of the Central Connecticut Cooperative Farmers Association, Inc., of Manchester, Conn.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, my name is Emanuel Hirth, general manager of the Central Connecticut Cooperative Farmers Association, Inc., of Manchester, Conn. Our membership represents the majority of the table egg producers in the State of Connecticut. We also operate an egg processing plant in the city of Willimantic, Conn.

From year to year the economics of egg production become more chaotic and the independent farmer finds himself in a tighter squeeze. And, thus, each year, or each time a census is taken, we find that the number has shrunk. Not the number of hens but the number of families who find their freedom to exist under a chosen way of life, being denied them.

In a census taken, county by county, by the Connecticut Extension Service in 1960 there were 981 egg producers. Three years later, in 1963, a similar census was taken by the same agency and it disclosed that 46 percent of these egg producers went out of business; only 527 were left.

But the number of hens on farms had increased from 3,500,000 to 3,800,000.

The price of eggs the last 10 or 12 years has declined sharply. During the 5-year period, 1952–56 the price of eggs averaged about 42 cents per dozen. The next 5 years the average price of eggs was about 36 cents per dozen, and the year 1964 saw the decline continue with an average price of 33.4 cents per dozen.

The independent egg producer finds himself running hard in order to stay in one place. Those who had the capital or credit have kept increasing their volume of production in order to compensate for declining prices.

This process is continuing and being aggravated by the advent of huge integrated operations supported and financed by the giant national feed, hatchery and equipment companies. In many cases with unwarranted credit practices. To the point that the independent producers are running out of capital and find it difficult to get the credit to continue as independent businessmen.

It is obvious that the poultry industry cannot find within itself the means to "put its house in order" and that those who will be the victims of disorder will be the independent family units who have been the mainstay of agricultural free enterprise.

History has shown that the producers of other agricultural commodities, when provided by legislation with the tools of self-help have been able to discipline their industries and provide an economic and production atmosphere wherein their independence prospered and their industry was stabilized.

We, in the poultry industry are entitled to have made available to us the same tools that have already been provided to other segments of agriculture. We ask the right to develop a program for self-help; the right to have regional hearings under the auspices of the Department of Agriculture; and, above all, the right to vote for an independent family oriented stable poultry industry. And, this last I want to repeat and emphasize; the right to vote, to decide for ourselves while many of us still have our independence.

In order to make it possible for us to have these rights we urge the adoption of the Resnick bill, H.R. 7481, or the St. Onge bill, H.R. 7008, at this session of Congress, while there is still time to save those who have not succumbed to integration.

Thank you for your permission to present this testimony and for your courtesy in listening to my presentation.

Statement of Connecticut Poultry Association, Inc.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Max Girshick. I am a member of the board of directors of the Connecticut Poultry Association and have been authorized by its president, Harold Liebman and the board of directors to make the following statement.

On behalf of the poultrymen in Connecticut, the Connecticut Poultry Association goes on record as favoring H.R. 7008 introduced by Congressman William St. Onge; and, also, H.R. 7481 introduced by Congressman Resnick.

This legislation simply amends the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937 to include poultry and eggs in its provisions. It does not establish marketing orders, production controls or any other program within the industry as its critics suggest.

Inclusion of poultry and eggs into the provisions of this act would permit the producers of these products to formulate a program, or programs, designed to stabilize the chaotic economic conditions that have plagued our industry for years. Once formulated, this act would not go into effect until producers, falling under the provisions of this projected program, voted in the affirmative for it.

It is hard for us, here in Connecticut, to understand why we cannot be extended the same privileges in determining the future course of our industry as are extended to other areas of agriculture.

We have fought for this legislation for many years and have appeared before this committee to this end on many previous occasions.

The problems of the producers have worsened during this time.

The control of production facilities have moved steadily into fewer and bigger hands and the pattern of contract serfdom established in the broiler industry is rapidly being duplicated in the egg industry.

Give us the opportunity to formulate our own destiny.

Thank you for your courtesy of listening to my statement.

Memorial Ceremony for Adlai Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the late Adlai Stevenson was actively involved in the establishment of the United Nations in 1945. From that time on, the United Nations formed one of the most prominent strains in his life. He was there, in sentiment and in spirit, if not always in person, from its beginning to the time of his death.

It is fitting and proper that of the most eloquent eulogies to him, four should have been delivered before the United Nations on the day of his funeral in Illinois—there spoken by Secretary General U Thant; Carlos Sosa Rodriguez, former President of the General Assembly; Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and Archibald MacLeish, all of whom believed in Stevenson and in the United Nations. The addresses follow:

Statement by Secretary General at Memorial Ceremony for Adlai Stevenson, July 19

When I first was told last Wednesday, a little before 1 p.m., that Ambassador Stevenson had died in London, I could not believe my ears. I had seen him only recently, in Geneva, less than a week before and he was so alive, and looked so well. When the news was confirmed, it took me some time to accept the fact that Adlai Stevenson had really passed away.

My first thought was to send a message of condolences to President Johnson. In my message I referred to the respect, admiration, and affection of all of his colleagues at the United Nations which Ambassador Stevenson had earned over the last 4½ years by reason of his extraordinary human qualities.

The same afternoon I referred, in a public statement, to my sense of grief and shock because, suddenly and without warning, death had struck and we had lost a good friend and a highly esteemed colleague. As I stated in that tribute, in his years at the United Nations, Ambassador Stevenson had demonstrated with rare distinction how it was possible to combine the highest form of patriotism with loyalty to the idea of international peace and cooperation.

When on December 8, 1960, it was announced that Mr. Stevenson was to be permanent representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, it seemed to everybody to be such a natural and right appointment. He was, in truth, one of the founding fathers of the United Nations, having been present at the signing of the charter in San Francisco in June 1945, and also having been closely associated with the negotiations leading up to that historic event.

Thereafter, he was the head of the U.S. delegation to the Preparatory Commission and Executive Committee of the United Nations in London, and I believe his offices were located in Grosvenor Square, close to the very spot where he collapsed last Wednesday.

Subsequently, of course, he had entered domestic politics and his direct association with the United Nations was only intermittent. But I have no doubt in my own mind that his presence at the birth of the United Nations was an important factor in the evolution of his own political thinking and in his own dedication to the noble principles and purposes of the charter.

I remember how many tributes were paid to him when he took over his duties at the United Nations. There were so many encomiums, both within and outside these walls, that they could have turned the head of a lesser man. Not so with Ambassador Stevenson. On one occasion he observed: "Flattery is like smoking—it is not dangerous so long as you do not inhale."

During the 4½ years that he served at the United Nations, he stood as the embodiment of dedication to the principles of the United Nations. His many speeches, which expressed so well his whole mental and intellectual approach, in the championship of fundamental rights, in defense of the dignity and worth of the human person, in support of the equal rights of nations large and small, were cheered and applauded by all sides of the house. He not only spoke with a rare gift of phrase, but with such an obvious sincerity that his words carried conviction.

My first contact with Ambassador Stevenson came about in 1952 when I was one of the members of the Burmese delegation to the Seventh General Assembly. This was at the time when he was the Democratic candidate for the presidential election. His speeches were naturally fully reported in the newspapers, and I followed his campaign closely. His speeches were not only masterpieces of oratory, they were also the incisive reflections of a great man and of a great mind, in line with the best traditions of American liberal thought.

There were some during his lifetime, of course, who rated him as too liberal and too far ahead of the times. Others sought to discount his effectiveness on the score that he was too much the idealist and therefore not practical enough. This does him injustice.

The line of distinction between idealism and vision is obscure at best. Vision, certainly, is an essential attribute of statesmanship, and he was a fine statesman. In any case, what a dismal world it would be, and how unpromising its future, without spiritual lift given to mankind by the idealists who, in the courage of their conviction, chart the course and mark the goals of man's progress.

At that time I did not have any personal acquaintance with Mr. Stevenson. For me the chance came a year later when he visited Burma in 1953. On that occasion I had the opportunity to talk to him and to discuss with him many issues of current interest. Again I was greatly impressed, not only by the depth of his intellect, but equally by his breadth of vision.

From the time that Mr. Stevenson became the permanent representative of his country at the United Nations and while I was still the permanent representative of Burma, we developed very close ties of friendship. These ties became even closer toward the end of the year when I assumed my present responsibilities, and continued to be so during the last 3½ years. I found it easy to discuss with him any current issue of importance with complete freedom, and in full frankness and friendliness.

No one can serve his country in the United Nations for long without having his moments of frustration. Ambassador Stevenson had his share of such moments, and on such occasions he confided to me his innermost thoughts, and I was struck by his completely human approach to our common problems. He seemed not only to think about them, but also to feel about them as a human being. In all such discussions I was repeatedly impressed by his dedication to the basic concepts of peace, justice, and freedom.

So many tributes have been paid to Mr. Stevenson since his sudden and tragic passing away. So many of his friends and admirers have eulogized his fine intellect, his modesty, and humility. Many have praised his felicitous style and his ready wit. Tributes have been paid to his great learning, which he carried so lightly because he was truly an educated man, a cultured man, a civilized man.

Speaking in San Francisco on June 26, 1965, on the 20th anniversary of the United Nations, Ambassador Stevenson said:

"Some of us here today who were midwives at the birth of the United Nations can never forget those days here in San Francisco in the twilight of the war, when an old world was dying and a new world was coming to birth.

"We shared an audacious dream—and launched a brave enterprise.

"It seemed so easy then—when all was hope and expectation. I remember my own sense of pride, of history, of exultation." He went on to reflect:

"In the bright glow of 1945, too many looked to the United Nations for the full and final answer to world peace. And in retrospect, that day may seem to have opened with the hint of a false dawn.

"Certainly we have learned the hard way how elusive is peace—how durable is man's destructive drive.

"We have learned, too, how distant is the dream of those better standards of life in larger freedom—how qualified our capacity to practice tolerance—how conditional our claims to the dignity and worth of the human person—how reserved our respect for the obligations of law."

He then proceeded to restate, on behalf of himself, his Government and the vast bulk of his countrymen, his faith in the United Nations in the following words:

"We believe in the United Nations; we support the United Nations; and we shall work in the future—as we have worked in the past—to add strength, and influence, and permanence to all that the organization stands for in this, our tempestuous, tormented, talented world of diversity in which all men are brothers and all brothers are somehow, wondrously, different—save in their need for peace."

And he concluded by saying:

"We have the United Nations. We have set it bravely up. And we will carry it bravely forward."

Unfortunately, Adlai Stevenson is no longer with us to keep step with us in the march forward to the goals he had stated so well.

On this occasion when we are paying homage to the memory of one who has left us so large a legacy, it is fitting, I believe, to give some thought to the momentous questions of war and peace which were so close to his heart.

In my view, many governments, while unwilling to wage war, and at the same time unable to make peace, seem to have resigned themselves to the prospect of an interminable cold war. While admittedly the cold war cannot bring down the physical holocaust on our heads, it has nevertheless already inflicted on us a tremendous moral and psychological injury which is intangible but equally destructive. The long, uneasy cold war has destroyed and mutilated not our bodies, but our minds. Its weapons are the myths and the legends of propaganda.

It has often been said that in war, the first casualty is truth. The cold war is also capable of inflicting the same casualty. The weapons designed and utilized to crush and mutilate the human mind are as potent as any of the weapons designed for physical destruction. The weapons of the cold war contaminate our moral fiber, warp our thinking processes and afflict us with pathological obsessions. These are the invisible but, nevertheless, the most devastating effects of the cold war on humanity. I believe Adlai Stevenson, in his innermost thoughts, realized these truths.

There is no doubt that Adlai Stevenson has earned a place in history—not only a place in the history of his own country, but a place in the history of this world Organization. He brought to international diplomacy, in his dignity, his gentility, and his style, a special dimension. Even more, he has earned the admiration and affection of millions of people to whom he was but a name and a legend.

This was so, I think, because so often his voice rang true as the voice of the people, his eloquence expressed the hopes and aspirations of the common man the world over. He was, in our times, in a quite unique way, the people's friend. Equally, he has earned a permanent place in the hearts of all those who knew him, and today I mourn his passing, not just as a great historical figure, a famous man, but as a true and trusted friend. As the poet says:

> "Friendship is a nobler thing;
> Of friendship it is good to sing."

STATEMENT BY CARLOS SOSA RODRIGUEZ (VENEZUELA), PRESIDENT OF THE 18TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, AT THE MEMORIAL CEREMONY FOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON

Mr. Secretary General, Mr. Secretary of State, fellow delegates, ladies, and gentlemen, it is sometimes difficult to put into words the true magnitude of a feeling, the sorrow that takes hold of the spirit in the face of the irreparable, the sadness that invades the soul in the face of hard reality. And yet, we must find words to reflect the pain that grips us at the loss of a friend who knew how to win our hearts, of a colleague who know how to conquer our admiration, for such was for us Adlai Stevenson, the Governor, as we, his friends, used affectionately to call him.

The impact of the unexpected news, while I was on holiday in Madrid, was a hard blow for me: "Adlai Stevenson died suddenly in London." Only 3 weeks earlier we had been together in San Francisco at the commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the United Nations, and he appeared so jovial, as ever, so full of life.

Why is it that it is the good men, the men necessary to mankind, that we lose so suddenly? We must bow, however, before the inscrutable dictates of providence and resign ourselves to the will of God. Yet the vacuum left by the death of a friend we cannot but feel profoundly. We, his colleagues in the United Nations, have lost a dear and admired friend. But America has lost one of its most enlightened sons, and the United Nations one of its most faithful champions.

In this time of mourning, in which gathered here in the General Assembly, witness to so many of his brilliant interventions, we pay tribute to his memory, it seems to us that we still hear the echo of his eloquent and tempered words, the expression of a noble spirit and a high culture placed at the service of his country, but placed also at the service of the ideals of peace and justice, advocated in the United Nations Charter.

Of the many qualities that adorned the shining personality of Adlai Stevenson, perhaps the most outstanding were his moderation and his profound human feeling. Perhaps this is the reason why he never inspired hatred but only affection, and always respect. Adlai Stevenson, like all public men, has been known to have devoted admirers and formidable adversaries, but he has never been known to have enemies. And it is because the goodness and sincerity that flowed from his personality could not allow for feelings of enmity to be forged against him.

In his distinguished public life, and especially in the United Nations where we better knew him, Stevenson always highlighted the great sense of equanimity and his constant preoccupation with the search for truth and justice. Perhaps these qualities, combined with so vast a culture which perforce opened for him horizons of doubt, at times deprived him of the necessary impetus for political triumph, but gave him instead the universal and broad understanding of the problems of our time and an acute and penetrating vision of the future, clouded neither by prejudice nor by preconceived notions.

Adlai Stevenson was a great patriot. He placed at the service of his country, unstintingly and unsparingly, the full fountain of his extraordinary intelligence, of his profound culture, and of his personal charm. And while in the service of his country he was struck down by death.

Adlai Stevenson lived and died for his country. Perhaps better than any other public figure, Adlai Stevenson gave the world an image of a modern and liberal North America conscious of the outstanding role it is called upon to play in history and conscious of the enormous responsibility derived for her from her great military and economic power. It would be difficult to classify Adlai Stevenson, from the political standpoint, as a man of the right or a man of the left. Stevenson was a liberal in the true sense of the word. He was a man free of extremism, ever respectful of the opinions and viewpoints of others, but always convinced of the force of reason, not of the reason of force. His liberal spirit was reflected in all his acts as a public figure and especially in his performance as a diplomat.

For him, negotiation and conciliation were the methods par excellence for the attainment of his aspirations, and he never lacked moderation, patience, and understanding in the fulfillment of the delicate functions entrusted to him. As an orator he was brilliant, eloquent, witty. When it was necessary to enter into polemics he could be sharp and even ironical, but at all times courteous and considerate. Socially, he was a man of the world, of great personal charm, with the simplicity and the natural manner of great men.

Adlai Stevenson leaves of his passage through life a profound imprint. He leaves in his country that owes him so much a profound mark. He leaves a mark in the United Nations which he so vigorously defended. He leaves a mark in the world which he understood so well. He leaves his imprint in the hearts of his friends who will never forget him. The death of Adlai Stevenson opens a great vacuum in the intellectual world, in the world of letters, in the world of politics, in the world of diplomacy. It leaves a vacuum in his country and it leaves a vacuum in the world.

His understanding of the true causes of present-day problems, his great concern with social affairs, his untiring defense of peace and concord among nations, his knowledge of man and his stanch defense of the ideals in which he believed—all of this manifested in his public acts, in his words, his writing and his actions—had made of him the prototype of the intellectual who uses his culture for the benefit of mankind.

Stevenson was not happy with the egotistical pleasure of having a vast culture for himself. His constant preoccupation with the well-being of the less favored in the world and with the true grandeur of his country made him at all times place that culture at the service of others. That is why he will always be remembered with admiration and respect, both by his partisans and his adversaries.

The death of Adlai Stevenson will be felt most especially in the United Nations, where we had become used to having him as head of his country's delegation. There were those who agreed with the views he upheld and those who did not, but no one can deny that Stevenson, because of his great love for peace, his profound human feeling and his faith in negotiation, was at all times a guarantee in the most difficult situations. It will not be easy to fill the void that he leaves with his death.

To the great American people, to President Johnson, to Mr. Stevenson's family, I convey my words of condolence. May the good and generous man, the true and sincere statesman, the refined diplomat, the perfect gentleman, who was Adlai Stevenson, rest in peace.

May these words of mine be accepted as the modest tribute of a sincere friend to the great man whose memory will continue to guide future generations in the search for peace and justice in our world.

Address by Archibald MacLeish at a Memorial Ceremony for Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, in the General Assembly Hall, United Nations, Monday, July 19, 1965

I am deeply conscious of the privilege of speaking of Adlai Stevenson in this company and in this place, this room which has heard his remembered voice so often.

I am conscious too of the responsibility and burdened by it, for it is here, and perhaps only here, that something might be said of him which would touch, or almost touch, the indefinable, rare thing he was. When Adlai Stevenson spoke at the memorial service for Eleanor Roosevelt who had come home, he said, to the Rose Garden at Hyde Park for the last time, he told her friends that it was not her life they had lost—she had lived that out to the full: it was the thing she was "* * * And who can name it?"

Who can name what he was? Not I certainly. But if there is a room anywhere in which it can be spoken of, it is this one. Not because—not only because—the United Nations was, for so many years, the center of his life and of his concern, but for a different reason: because the Organization itself, the nature of the Organization, creates a perspective in which a life like Adlai Stevenson's might perhaps be seen—in which it might assume the nobility, the significance, which are its inward form.

In the ordinary context, the context to which our age is increasingly accustomed, a life like his becomes a puzzle, a contradiction, which even those who love him—and this room is full of those who love him—cannot readily resolve. Our generation, and not in the United States alone, not only in the United States—is obsessed by a view of human life which leaves no room for any human greatness or magnificance but one. Power fascinates us, and the exercise of power, and we judge our public figures by the power they dispose of, by the offices they hold which give them access to the thrust of power. Adlai Stevenson cannot be measured by these measures: cannot be known or recognized by them or even named.

He had no taste for power, no desire for it. The unforgettable speech in which he accepted the inevitability of his nomination for the Presidency was a portrait of himself as ill-advised politically as it was personally honorable. And the two disastrous and superb campaigns which he conducted were proof that his reluctance at the start was not the reluctance of political calculation but of passionate belief. When he said, years afterward, that he would like to be remembered for those unsuccessful ventures, for those two defeats, he meant that there are some things in the life of a democracy more important than to come to power—more important ultimately than the possession of the power.

And yet, as the last few days have demonstrated, it is in terms of power or of the failure to come to power that his life is still most commonly conceived. In the shock and sorrow of his sudden death, the minds of those who wrote and spoke of him went back again and again, over and over, with admiration and regret and more sometimes than admiration or regret, to what were called the contradictions and the paradoxes of his history. He was, we were reminded, a great political figure who had never held a great political office; a master of the art of government who had governed only in his own State; a public man unsuccessful somehow in public life—too fine for it, perhaps; a Hamlet who thought too long too deeply, who doubted too scrupulously, who could never permit himself to be as sure as an American politician in the fifties were supposed to be sure, that that voice beneath the battlements urging to violence and revenge was the king his father's voice.

Well, it was true in part of course—true that he thought long and deeply—true that he had the courage of his doubts—true, too, that he was skeptical of hatred and its prophets in a day when the great majority of his fellow citizens were listening to those prophets and believing them. But the conclusions most often drawn from these observations are not true. Hamlet dies to those heartbreaking words in which the pity overwhelms the grief: **Good night, sweet Prince.** In Adlai Stevenson's death there is no room for pity. Those of us who mourn him and will always mourn him think of him not as a man defeated in his purpose but as a man victorious in it; not as a man whose life was a contradiction and a paradox but as a man whose life had a particular singleness, an unusual wholeness, its own law.

And it is here in this room, I think, that that wholeness best appears. For the United Nations, though it knows and suffers from our contemporary trust in power, is dedicated to another end: the subordination of power to the hope for peace—which is to say the hope for humanity. Those qualities in Adlai Stevenson which seemed, in other surroundings, to be traits of character, attributes of personality—his warmth, his charm, his considerateness, his intelligence, his humor, his devotion, his incisiveness, his eloquence—were fused here, in their employment in the noblest of all causes, to compose a complete man, a man so balanced, so harmonious as a human being, that his greatness passed almost unnoticed while he lived.

His effectiveness here, his services to this organization and to the country to which his life was given, others have spoken of and will speak. They were great services, greatly rendered. But the most important thing about them, or so it seems to me, was their humanity. It is not, in the long history of civilization, the accomplishment which counts but the manner of the accomplishment. Works of will are notoriously short-lived and even works of intellect can fail when the intelligence is cynical or dry. It is only when the end is reached through the human heart as well as through the human mind that the accomplishment is certain to endure. And it is for that reason that Adlai Stevenson seems certain of remembrance.

His great achievement was not political triumph or, indeed, triumph of any kind. His great achievement was the enrichment of his time by the nature of his relationships with his time. If his intelligence was remarkable it was remarkable, even more than for its clarity, by its modesty, its humor, its total lack of vanity or arrogance. If he was one of the great articulators of his time, one of the few, true voices, it was because the words he spoke were the words of his own thought, of his deepest and most personal conviction. It was himself he gave in word and thought and action, not to his friends alone but to his country, to his world. And the gift had consequences. It changed the tone and temper of political life in the United States for a generation. It humanized the quality of international exchanges throughout a great part of the world. It enlightened a dark time.

Which means, I suppose, that Adlai Stevenson's great achievement was himself. What we have lost as he said of his friend, Mrs. Roosevelt, is not his life. He lived that, if not to the full, at least more fully than almost any other man. What we have lost is himself. And who can name the warmth and richness of it?

Address by Secretary of State Dean Rusk at a Memorial Ceremony for Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson in the General Assembly Hall, United Nations, Monday, July 19, 1965

Colleagues and friends, his family and his fellow countrymen are grateful that so many from so many lands are gathered in this great hall to pay respect to Adlai Stevenson. Today he returns to the soil which gave him birth—as we gather here at the United Nations which had become the very fiber of his life.

We have been deeply moved by what has been said here today—and by the messages which have come from all over the earth. For these are messages which leap over the frontiers of nation, cultural tradition, or ideology, messages which brush aside the passing differences of present controversy and recall that Adlai Stevenson's hopes, dedication, and passionate concern encompassed all mankind.

You and we who have worked alongside him day by day have lost a talented colleague in our most stimulating profession—a profession corporately bound together in the unrelenting search for peace. And what an inspiring colleague he was.

His restless conviction that things were never good enough sustained his zest and joy in public service. But his exultation in a further step toward peace was short lived, for there was always the unfinished business still to be done—the next step which consumed his energy and imagination.

Adlai Stevenson deeply respected the colleagues with whom he labored in this United Nations and treasured the friendships nourished in this place. It is true that he had the capacity for forceful advocacy—when advocacy was needed. But he also had the perception to see that all issues worthy of debate are complex and are seen differently—and honestly—from other points of view. Thus, if his talents blazed bright from the public platform, his skills were no less luminous in the professional arts of quiet diplomacy. For he had the wisdom to seek always to see problems as they are seen by others, even though he might himself not be able to share their view.

He had the discrimination to separate the important from the unimportant. And he had the endless patience—the tolerance and restraining moderation—to sustain him through the sometimes exhausting work of mediation and accommodation.

He knew, as do all who are schooled in the great traditions of diplomacy, that it is never too early to anticipate difficulty in order to prevent it and never too late to lay the hand of reason upon a crisis in order to solve it.

His colleagues were never bored; perhaps it was with Adlai Stevenson in mind that one editor defined a liberal as "independent and surprising." In private this public man was a warm and entertaining friend, perceptive of the ironies of politics and statecraft, given to illuminating shafts of sardonic wit, obviously worried about the behavior of nations but deeply confident about the nature of man. Because he believed so thoroughly in what he was doing and enjoyed so immensely the doing of it, he poured out his energies to the full—and to the very end.

In these past few days it has been said, over and over again, that Adlai Stevenson was a universal man. And so he was. But not merely because he was informed, well traveled, urbane, sophisticated, eloquent, and gifted; he was all of these. But his universality did not rest upon his being a prince among plain men, but upon his being a plain man even among princes. His was the simplicity of fundamental human values—with what is common in the midst of diversity—with what is permanent in the midst of change: the love of peace; the instinct of tolerance; the feeling of compassion; the devotion to human rights; the urge to act for human welfare.

This philosophy which animated Adlai Stevenson lay deep in him—permanent and indestructible. Perhaps this is what attracted him so powerfully—almost irresistibly—to the United Nations and its noble tasks. For he was committed to the principles of the charter before it was written. The preamble and the first two articles of the charter put into words what had already guided his life. And so it seems most natural that he should have spent so much of his energies in the cause of the United Nations.

He began in 1945 as an assistant to the Secretary of State and adviser to the U.S. delegation at the Charter Conference in San Francisco. He was the chief of our delegation at the Preparatory Commission in London, then a delegate to the first and second sessions of the General Assembly. It was altogether fitting that his lifework was crowned in these halls—that his last mission was to the United Nations Economic and Social Council.

The words of the charter—and his own ringing phrases which will live in literature—were more than symbols to him. They were calls to action. He used language as few men have—but used it to summon himself and others to work.

The work to which he summoned our reason and our feelings remains still to be done. The charter he kept on his desk contains only 5 pages of philosophy, followed by 50 pages of procedure.

He knew that the philosophy could lift men's vision and sustain their energies. But he also sensed that its meaning was contained not in eloquent words but in agreed procedures, in workable machinery, in arrangements that enabled the nations to work together on particular tasks—while continuing to argue about why they are working together and why they sometimes disagreed.

He had early learned the dictum of Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes that general propositions do not decide concrete cases, and he worked hard and long to build that executive machinery for peace which is the real alternative to the system of war by which men and nations have always lived—by which they no longer dare to live.

And so we pay tribute to a working colleague—to a professional diplomat—to a practitioner, a craftsman, an indefatigable worker for peaceful change. And in honoring him we are affirming our determination that the peace of the world will be secured.

You and I, who worked with him, will remember Adlai Stevenson not only as an inspired voice of the conscience of man; we shall remember him and miss him and honor him, as well, as a valued professional colleague—as a brilliant public servant in the broadest and noblest sense of that term.

There is no institution which deserves such talents more than the United Nations; it calls out for the best that can be produced by the societies of man. Three Presidents of the United States sent Adlai Stevenson to the United Nations. They sent you our best.

Now that he is gone I think of the line from "Pilgrim's Progress": "So he passed over and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side." Yet something of him remains with us in this great Assembly hall.

Congressman Bennett Praises President's Crime Commission Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate President Johnson on the appointment of a 19-member National Crime Commission to study all aspects of crime and juvenile delinquency and the administration of justice.

On February 16, 1965 I introduced legislation in the House of Representatives to establish a National Advisory Commission on Interstate Crime. At that time, President Johnson wrote to me and commended me for this, and on the introduction of two other bills in the anticrime field: Legislation calling for a White House Conference on Crime Prevention and Juvenile Delinquency and making grants available for college-level instruction in modern methods of crime detection and studies in the cause and cure for various types of criminal behavior.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice will fill a gap in our national planning to cut into the rising crime rate, up 13 percent in 1964 over 1963. Under the strong and able leadership of the Attorney General, I believe this Commission will make concrete recommendations to the President for action to help stem crime and juvenile delinquency in America, which costs the country $27 billion annually.

The prime responsibility in the prevention of crime rests with the local and State governments. But, it is a national responsibility, too, and I believe positive legislation in this field and the President's action yesterday will provide for a safe society.

The voting rights legislation is a fact, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is in operation in all sections of the country, North and South, and now is the time for the Negro leaders to stop their marching in the streets.

It is time for these leaders and groups, who accomplish little but achieve great publicity, to start working on positive measures to educate and to train the less fortunate to be decent, hard-working Americans.

It is time for these leaders to put their energy into improving teaching and schools, working in the antipoverty programs in their local communities and helping to stop the rising juvenile delinquency and crime rates.

It is time that they realize the Congress and the people will not tolerate continued purposeless coercion and intimidation that is now being practiced in such diverse locales as Chicago, Ill., and Americus, Ga.

The voting rights legislation was passed because it was right for the country, and not that these Negro leaders were right in exercising their mob protests. Before the horrible events in Selma, Ala., I said a voting bill was needed, and I feel that any other really needed legislation can be enacted without mob support.

So, I say to these leaders of mob action, let us have a moratorium on your marches and demonstrations and let us do something to raise the level of education and job training among Negroes.

A Statement of Peter W. Rodino, Jr., in Commemoration of the 13th Anniversary of the Puerto Rican Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we commemorated the 13th anniversary of the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. In doing so, we recognize the quality of a people who have proved themselves capable of governing themselves through representative institutions.

Any people who have undertaken and advanced the industrial development of their land by their own initiative as have the people of Puerto Rico must be qualified likewise to take responsibility for their own political affairs.

In a few decades the Puerto Rican people have increased the industrial productivity of their land many times over. They have done so not by means of totalitarian control over the minds and bodies of persons, but by the exercise of personal freedom and initiative.

And their industrial accomplishment, which renders their initiative and intelligence apparent for all to see, has enhanced in the people of Puerto Rico that self-confidence which is the indispensable foundation of democratic self-government.

In 1940, Puerto Ricans lacked three factors essential to production. They lacked capital; they lacked raw materials; and they lacked technical know-how.

The Economic Development Administration, popularly called Fomento, is a public agency established in 1942 which has invited, encouraged, and fostered private enterprise on the island. It does so by helping manufacturers find investment funds. It rents factory buildings at low rentals with a view to eventual purchase by producers. It makes studies to determine advantageous possibilities of production. It gives workers the opportunity to acquire skills needed by industry.

In 1949, there were 52 factories in Puerto Rico. At the present time, there are more than a thousand.

Industrialization is making up more and more for the island's lack of materials for manufacture. It is doing so in two ways: first, by increasing exports so that more materials for industry can be imported; second, by producing such materials as chemicals and textiles.

As far as scientific and technological know-how is concerned, Puerto Ricans have displayed a remarkable determination to acquire vocational training and higher education. Many hundreds of Puerto Ricans are taking vocational training courses today, and enrollment at the University of Puerto Rico has increased more than four times over since 1940.

The sense of responsibility with which Puerto Ricans face public issues, and the praiseworthy degree of voter participation, render meaningful their step-by-step advance toward political autonomy.

By the Foraker Act of 1900, Puerto Ricans had the right only to elect their representatives in the lower house of the legislature. The President of the United States appointed the members of the upper house, as well as the Governor and his cabinet.

The Jones Act of 1917 granted U.S. citizenship to Puerto Ricans and the right to elect the members of the senate as well as the house of delegates.

An amendment to the Jones Act in 1947 provided for popular election of the Governor. The people elected as their first Governor the man who had shown the way toward economic development, social justice, and political liberty—Luis Muñoz Marín, leader of the Popular Democratic Party.

The constitution which the Puerto Rican people adopted and which went into effect on July 25, 1952, provides for popular self-government with respect to insular affairs and provides at the same time the advantages of Federal union. The political status of Puerto Rico is unique. It is that of an associated free state—Estado Libre Asociado.

I am sure that I speak for all members in congratulating Governor Roberto Sánchez-Vilella; the distinguished Resident Commissioner, SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU, and the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico on this anniversary commemoration of their constitution.

Majority Rule Is the Basic Issue Involved in Proposal To Repeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Congress is now studying a proposal to repeal section 14(b) of the Labor-Management Relations Act. This section permits individual States to enact their own State laws dealing with membership in unions.

The national law provides that where a majority of workers in any establishment have voted—in a secret election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board—in favor of a union as their collective bargaining agent, within 30 days after certification, all workers in that plant must join the union.

Conversely, the Federal law also provides that where a majority of the workers in an establishment vote against a union, then none of the workers shall belong to the union because no union shall be certified in that particular establishment.

Thirty-one States now follow the Federal standards, including Illinois. Repeal of section 14(b) would have no effect on labor-management relations in the State of Illinois because Illinois has not enacted its own membership standards under section 14(b). In Illinois, when a majority of workers vote for or against a union as their collective bargaining agent, the majority rule prevails. All the members of a particular establishment must join a union if the majority of the workers have voted in favor of such a union. Likewise, no union is recognized if the majority votes against a union and none of the workers is compelled to join a union.

Nineteen States have chosen to take advantage of section 14(b) and have adopted their own State laws regarding membership in unions. In these States, the law provides that only those workers who want to may join a union, even though a majority of the workers have voted for a union.

The President has proposed repeal of section 14(b) in order to establish a uniform national policy regarding membership in unions which would apply to all 50 States.

Repeal of 14(b) will in no way alter the basic provision that membership in a union shall be compulsory only when a majority of the workers in a given establishment have voted in favor of a union. Nor will the repeal of section 14(b) in any way alter the provision that when a majority of the workers vote against a union, none of the workers of the establishment will have to join a union.

Arguments against repeal of 14(b) include a claim that compulsory unionism violates a worker's right to hold a job even though he does not want to join a union. This is why supporters of section 14(b) have called this provision a right-to-work law because it permits a worker to continue working even though he chooses not to join a union.

Opponents of 14(b) argue that the title "right-to-work law" is a misnomer because section 14(b) does not guarantee any worker the right to a job if an employer has no need for his employment.

Opponents argue further that permitting members not to join a union, even though a majority of their fellow workers in a given shop have voted for a union, creates what the labor movement describes as free riders. That is, nonmembers share the same benefits won by a union at the collective bargaining table even though they do not contribute toward the financial support of the union activities which have made it possible for the union to negotiate such benefits.

The administration claims that by having a single national policy under which all 50 States will be governed by a uniform law dealing with membership in unions, we will reduce considerably the competition which now exists between the States for attracting American industry.

There is no doubt that in the 19 States which have created their own labor standards under section 14(b), the unions have had less success in organizing. This is because, even though a union succeeds in persuading a majority of the workers to vote for a union, many workers in the same plant continue to enjoy the benefits carved out by the union without actually belonging to the union or paying dues.

It is not long before the entire membership of the union falls apart under these conditions. As a result, union organizing drives, particularly in the 10 Southern States which have so-called right-to-work laws, have been ineffective. Opponents of 14(b) claim this is why these Southern States have been able to attract considerable industry from the North by advertising—"Build your plant in such-and-such State, where the labor climate is favorable." By a "favorable labor climate" they mean, of course, no unions.

Recent studies have shown that weekly earnings of industrial workers in so-called right-to-work law States are substantially lower than the national average. In the 10 Southern States which have discouraged unionization through 14(b), the weekly average salary per industrial worker is $77 as compared to a weekly average of $103 in the remaining 40 States.

Those who oppose repeal of section 14(b) argue that the Southern States have been traditionally behind the Northern States in industrial development and that the average weekly wage gap is being closed.

Those who urge repeal of 14(b) argue that by prohibiting effective unionism, the right-to-work law States keep salaries depressed and the rest of the Nation must make an abnormally high contribution to these States in the form of various social welfare programs.

A recent study showed that the 10 Southern States which have their own right-to-work laws receive 33 percent of all Federal grants for relief, education, and so forth. The remaining 40 States—most of which are highly unionized—divide the remaining 67 percent of Federal grants among themselves.

It is argued that the disproportionate distribution of Federal aid is not fair to the taxpayers of northern industrial States.

It is interesting to note that Louisiana recently repealed its own right-to-work law permitted under section 14(b) when they discovered that, by barring unions, the State was unable to attract skilled workers. As a result its industrial growth was seriously impeded. It is generally agreed that highly skilled industrial workers tend to prefer areas where they can get union protection for their jobs and seniority.

The entire debate on repeal of section 14(b) is now under careful scrutiny by Congress. It can be seen from the remarks above that this is a very complicated subject. Both sides feel strongly in support of their respective views. The issue is further complicated by a sincere belief among some people that repeal of 14(b) affects their basic right to employment and, as a result, this has become an extremely emotional issue, as well.

Congress is now trying to resolve this issue in a manner which will serve the best interest of the United States. In the search for appropriate action, Congress is further mindful that some people do not want to be compelled to join unions because of religious beliefs. This aspect also is receiving careful consideration. There is no question that this entire subject will be fully debated in Congress.

I believe it is only fair to point out that when all of the arguments are reduced to the lowest common denominator, the one question remaining to be answered by the Congress is whether or not the United States will have a uniform labor policy dealing with membership in unions based on the concept of majority rule.

The President of the United States serves in office on a basis of majority rule; the Supreme Court of the United States frequently hands down split decisions by a vote of 5 to 4 and because of a majority of one, this decision guides the destiny of our entire nation; a Congressman represents an entire district simply because a majority of people have elected him.

The whole basic structure of American government is based on a concept of majority rule.

The Congress—a majority of the Congress—will have to decide whether the same principles shall apply to membership in unions. Thus, the decision here is whether or not all 50 States shall be guided by Federal law, which provides that if a majority of workers in a given plant want a union, the remaining members of that plant must join. Conversely, if the majority decides it does not want a union, there can be no union.

I believe that after all the debate is concluded, Congress will respond to the best interest of the United States.

Vietnam: Four Steps to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address delivered by the distinguished Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk, before the American Foreign Service Association at Washington, D.C., on June 23, 1965.

Secretary Rusk's address reaffirms the threefold objectives of U.S. policy in Vietnam as set forth by President Johnson, to wit: "determination against aggression, discussion for peace, and development for the human hopes of all."

The address follows:

VIETNAM: FOUR STEPS TO PEACE

(Text of an address made by Secretary of State Dean Rusk before the American Foreign Service Association at Washington, D.C., on June 23, 1965)

It is a very great pleasure for me to be here. It is a privilege for me to salute my colleagues, present and retired, of the Foreign Service and to express to you the gratitude of President Johnson and of the American people for a service which is marked by so much competence, dedication, and personal commitment.

Two and a half months ago President Johnson spoke to the world about Vietnam at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. Today I wish to talk to you on the same subject—to you who know that such problems have deep roots, to you who have lived through and worked upon such problems before, and to you who know that such matters can gravely affect the future of our Nation and the prospects for general peace.

The struggle in Vietnam has continued since April and indeed has grown the more severe. The harsh resistance of the Communists to any form of discussions or negotiation continues. The effort to destroy the freedom of Vietnam has been expanded. The trial by fire of the people of Vietnam goes on. Their own resistance has been courageous, but the need for American resolution and for American action has increased.

AGGRESSION FROM THE NORTH

The root of the trouble in Vietnam is today just what it was in April and has been at least since 1960—a cruel and sustained attack by North Vietnam upon the people of South Vietnam. Now as then, it is a brutal war—marked by terror and sneak attack, and by the killing of women and children in the night. This campaign of terror has continued throughout the spring.

Those of us who have not served in Vietnam may find it hard to understand just how ugly this war of aggression has been. From 1961 to the present date the South Vietnamese Armed Forces have lost some 25,000 dead and 51,000 wounded. In proportion to population, these South Vietnamese losses are 10 times as great as those suffered by Americans in the Korean war, and larger than our losses in World War II.

Even more terrible than these military losses are the cruelties of assassination and kidnaping among civilian officials and ordinary citizens. In the last 18 months, for example, more than 2,000 local officials and civilians have been murdered. When an official is not found at home, often his wife and children are slain in his place. It is as if in our own country some 35,000 civic leaders or their families were to be killed at night by stealth and terror.

These are the methods of the Vietcong This is the test to which the people of Vietnam have gallantly responded.

Meanwhile, from the North, heavy infiltration has continued. Intelligence now shows that some 40,000 had come down before the end of 1964. Toward the end of that year—well before the beginning of our own air operations against North Vietnam—the infiltration of regular North Vietnamese army units was begun, and important elements of that army are now known to be in place in South Vietnam and Laos, where they have no right to be.

And so we face a deliberate and long-matured decision by a persistent aggressor to raise the stakes of war. Apparently this was their answer to our own repeated affirmation that we ourselves did not wish a larger war. Apparently a totalitarian regime has once again misunderstood the desire of democratic peoples for peace and has made the mistake of thinking that they can have a larger war without risks to themselves. And hence the airstrikes against military targets in North Vietnam.

These actions have made infiltration harder. They have increased the cost of aggression. Without them South Vietnam today would face still stronger forces from the North.

These measured air operations have done what we expected them to do—neither more nor less. For air attack alone cannot bring peace. I cannot agree with those who think it wrong to hit the logistics of aggression. It is the aggression itself that is the wrong. Those who worry about bridges and barracks and ammunition dumps would do well to give their sympathy instead to the daily victims of terror in South Vietnam.

EFFORTS TO NEGOTIATE

The other side is obviously not yet ready for peace. In these last months, the friends of peace in many lands have sought to move this dangerous matter to the conference table. But one proposal after another has been contemptuously rejected.

We and others, for example, have sought to clear a way for a conference on Laos, and a conference on Cambodia—two neighboring countries where progress toward peace might be reflected in Vietnam itself. But these efforts have been blocked by North Vietnam and by Communist China.

Twice there has been an effort at discussions through the United Nations—first in the Security Council after the August attacks in the Tonkin Gulf, and later this April, when Secretary General U Thant considered visits to Hanoi and Peiping to explore the possibilities of peace. But in August there was a refusal by Hanoi to come to the Security Council. And in April both Hanoi and Peiping made it clear that they would not receive U Thant, and both regimes made plain their view that the United Nations is not competent to deal with that matter.

Repeatedly our friends in Britain, as a cochairman of the Geneva Conference, have sought a path to settlement—first by working toward a new conference in Geneva and then by a visit of a senior British statesman. But the effort for a conference in Geneva was blocked, and the distinguished

British traveler was told that he should stay away from Peiping and Hanoi.

Twice in April we made additional efforts of our own. In Baltimore the President offered unconditional discussions with the governments concerned. Hanoi and Peiping called this offer a "hoax." At that time the 17 nonalined nations had appealed for a peaceful solution, by negotiations without preconditions. This proposal was accepted on our side. It was rejected by Hanoi and by Peiping. And some of its authors were labeled "monsters and freaks."

The President of India made constructive proposals—for an end of hostilities and an Afro-Asian patrol force. To us this proposal was full of interest and hope. But by Hanoi and Red China it was rejected as a betrayal.

Our own Government and the Government of South Vietnam, in May, suspended air attacks on North Vietnam. This action was made known to the other side to see if there would be a response in kind. This special effort for peace was denounced in Hanoi as a "wornout trick" and denounced in Peiping as a "swindle." To those who complain that that so-called "pause" was not long enough, I would simply report that the harsh reaction of the other side was fully known before the attacks were resumed. And I would also recall that we held our hands for more than 4 years while tens of thousands of armed men invaded the south and every attempt at peaceful settlement failed.

HANOI'S RESPONSE

Reports in the first half of June have confirmed that all these violent rejections are in fact what they appear to be—clear proof that what is wanted today in Hanoi is a military victory, not peace, and that Hanoi is not even prepared for discussions unless it is accepted in advance that there will be a Communist-dominated government in Saigon, and unless too—so far as we can determine—American forces are withdrawn in advance.

So this record is clear. And there is substance in Senator FULBRIGHT's conclusion that "It seems clear that the Communist powers still hope to achieve a complete victory in South Vietnam and for this reason are at present uninterested in negotiations for a peaceful settlement." For the simple truth is that there is no lack of diplomatic procedures, machinery or process by which a desire for peace can be registered—that there is no procedural miracle through which peace can be obtained if one side is determined to continue the war.

As I have said, Hanoi is presently adamant against negotiation or any avenue to peace. Peiping is even more so, and one can plainly read the declared doctrine and purpose of the Chinese Communists. They are looking beyond the current conflict to the hope of domination in all of southeast Asia—and indeed beyond. But one finds it harder to understand Hanoi's aversion to discussion. More immediately than the Chinese, the North Vietnamese face the costs and dangers of conflict. They, too, must fear the ambitions of Communist China in southeast Asia. Yet they are still on the path of violence, insisting upon the forceful communization of South Vietnam and refusing to let their brothers in the south work out their own destiny in peace.

In recent weeks, after 2 months of reduced activity, the enemy has sharply quickened the tempo of his military action in the south. Since early May, major Vietcong units have returned to the battlefield, and already a series of sharp engagements has shown us that the fighting through the summer may be hard. Setbacks have occurred and serious defeats have been avoided only by the combination of continuing Vietnamese bravery and effective air and other types of support.

Losses on both sides have been heavy. From April 1 to date, we have had confirmed reports of almost 5,000 Vietcong dead, almost 3,000 South Vietnamese, and almost 100 Americans. We must expect these losses to continue—and our own losses may increase.

ROLE OF U.S. FORCES

Since March we have deployed nine battalions of fighting men to South Vietnam. Six more are on their way. For as the President said in April, "we will not be defeated. We will not grow tired * * *. We will do everything necessary * * * and we will do only what is * * * necessary."

Our own battalions in South Vietnam have three related tasks. Their first assignment was and is to guard such major installations as the airfield at Da Nang. A second and closely related task is that of active patrol in nearby areas. And the third is to join in combat support of Vietnamese forces—when such help is requested and when our commander, General Westmoreland, believes it should be given.

American forces so committed will carry with them the determined support of our people. These men know, as all our people know, that what they do is done for freedom and peace, in Vietnam, in other continents, and here at home.

SUPPORT FOR U.S. ACTION

In authorizing combat missions for our ground forces in Vietnam, the President acted to meet his constitutional responsibilities as Commander in Chief. He has recognized the obligations of this nation under the Southeast Asia Treaty, which the Senate approved by a vote of 82 to 1. He has acted under the joint resolution of August 1964, which passed the Senate by a vote of 88 to 2—and passed the House with no opposing vote. This resolution expresses our national readiness—as the President determines—"to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States" and "all necessary steps, including the use of armed force" to help Vietnam and southeast Asian members of the SEATO who ask for help to preserve their freedom.

The President has acted on the unanimous advice of the American leaders in Saigon and his senior civil and military advisers in Washington.

He has acted in full consultation with the Government of South Vietnam.

And he has acted on his own considered judgment of what is necessary at this time to stop aggression.

This decision—like all of our decisions in Vietnam—is open to review by Members of the Congress and open to reversal if it does not have their support. But the leaders of the Congress have been kept in close touch with the situation, and no such prospect should stimulate the hopes of enemies or the fears of friends. For America is not divided in her determination nor weak in her will.

In Vietnam today we face one more challenge in the long line of dangers we have, unhappily, had to meet and master for a generation. We have had to show both strength and restraint—courage and coolness—for Iran and for Greece, for Berlin and for Korea, in the Formosa Strait, and in the Cuban missile crisis. We mean to show the same determination and coolness now.

In 1954 President Eisenhower pledged our support to the Government of Vietnam, to assist that Government, as he put it, "in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." And this determination was reaffirmed again and again by President Kennedy. "We are going to stay here," he said. "We are not going to withdraw from that effort." And that is our position still.

FIRMNESS AND RESTRAINT

Now, as in April, as the President put it, "We will use our power with restraint and with all the wisdom that we can command." For it is others, and not we, who have increased the scale of fighting. It is others, and not we, who have made threats of gravely widened conflict. The firmness with which we resist aggression is matched by the firmness with which we will refrain from ill-advised adventure.

A few—a very few—may believe that unlimited war can take the place of the sustained and steady efforts in which we are engaged, just as there may be a few—a very few—who think we should pull out and leave a friendly people to their fate. But the American people want neither rashness nor surrender. They want firmness and restraint. They expect courage and care. They threaten no one. And they are not moved by the threats by others.

ROLE OF SOUTH VIETNAM

This contest centers in the defense of freedom for the people who live in South Vietnam. The sustained and increasing infiltration from North Vietnam has required the measured use of air attack on military targets in the north. We alone cannot determine the future—could we do so there would be a prompt peace. The other side, too, must decide about the future. And we must hope they know—as we do—that increased aggression would be costly far beyond the worth to the aggressor.

The political turmoil in South Vietnam has continued. It is easy to be impatient with our friends in Saigon as they struggle to establish and sustain a stable government under the stress of war. We see there the ferment of a society still learning to be free, even while under attack from beyond their borders.

We must remember that this ancient people is young in its independence, restless in its hopes, divided in its religions, and varied in its regions. The turmoil of Vietnam needs the steadfastness of America. Our friends in Vietnam know, and we know, that our people and our troops must work and fight together. Neither of us can do the work of the other. And the main responsibility must always be with, and is fully accepted by, the South Vietnamese. Yet neither of us can "go it alone." We would not be there without the urgent request for assistance from those whose land this happens to be. We have a tested faith in the enduring bravery of the people of Vietnam, and they, in turn, can count on us with equal certainty.

FORMULA FOR PEACE

The people of Vietnam long for peace. And the way to peace is clear. Yesterday the foreign minister of South Vietnam set forth the fundamental principles that can provide a "just and enduring place." Those principles, in summary, are:

An end to aggression and subversion.

Freedom for South Vietnam to choose and shape for itself its own destiny "in conformity with democratic principles and without any foreign interference from whatever sources."

As soon as aggression has ceased, the ending of the military measures now necessary by the Government of South Vietnam and the nations that have come to its aid to defend South Vietnam; and the removal of foreign military forces from South Vietnam.

And effective guarantees for the independence and freedom of the people of South Vietnam.

Now these are the fundamental steps. This is what the arguing and the fighting is all about. When they are carried out, we can look forward, as we have stated previously many times, to the day when relations between North Vietnam and South Vietnam can be worked out by peaceful means. And this would include the question of a free decision by the peoples of North and South Vietnam on the matter of reunification.

This forthright and simple program meets the hopes of all and attacks the interests of none. It would replace the threat of conquest by the hope of free and peaceful choice.

A LOOK TO THE FUTURE

And even while these hopes of peace are blocked for now by aggression, we on our side and other nations have reaffirmd our deep commitment to the peaceful progress of Vietnam and southeast Asia as a whole. In April the President proposed to the nations of Asia and to the United Nations that there be constructed a new program of support for Asian efforts and called upon Mr. Eugene Black to assist them. Now in June this work is underway. The Mekong River project has been given new life. A new dam is ready to rise in Laos. A billion-dollar bank is in the making for the development of southeast Asia. And in Vietnam itself new impetus has been given to programs of development and education and health.

So let us call again on other nations—including the Soviet Union—to join in turning this great region of the world away from the waste and violence of a brutal war. For the hope of Asia is not in relentless pressure for conquest. It is in unremitting hope for progress—a progress in which rice production could be multiplied manyfold, where the expectation of life could be doubled, the education of the young could be tenfold what it is today, and there could be an end of cholera and tuberculosis and intestinal parasites and other human afflictions.

In April the President offered determination against aggression, discussion for peace, and development for the human hopes of all. And in June we reaffirm that threefold policy.

Aggression has increased, so that determination must be greater than ever.

Discussion is rejected, but our efforts to find a path to peace will not be stopped. We have welcomed the new initiative of Prime Minister Wilson and the Commonwealth conference and regret that it has received so little reception on the other side.

Beyond the terror of the aggressor and the firmness of our defense, we must, nevertheless, look to the day in which many new dams will be built, and many new schools opened, and fresh opportunities opened to the peoples of southeast Asia. For we must look beyond the battle to peace, past fear to hope, and over the hard path of resistance to the broad plain of progress which must lie ahead for the peoples of southeast Asia.

I'm Just Not the Type

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, last night after the House adjourned, I sat down to write in detail my position on the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. I would like to submit my statement for the Congressional Record so that my constituents and other interested parties will know my feelings on this highly controversial matter.

I have often heard the expression that an airline pilot really earns his pay about 3 minutes a month. As I sit here in my office alone tonight, I realize that tomorrow when I cast my vote on section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act I will feel very much like that airline pilot.

I find that my problem tonight is not one of indecision on how to vote, but the fact that my conscience dictates to me that I must cast a vote that is contrary to the strong convictions of many of my personal friends, the majority of the members of my political party, and even against the opinion of some members of my own staff. There is also no doubt in my mind that whatever I say in explanation of my vote will not be acceptable to a great many of these wonderful people.

For a reason that has eluded me for 6 years the subject of right to work has evoked passionate support and equally intense opposition. As a result, the facts will be lost in this strong field of emotion, and many good intentioned people will have serious doubts about the person they sent to Congress.

Despite this, however, those who agree or disagree are entitled to an explanation and I can say in all modesty that anyone who knows me well, will know that I always have a good reason for voting one way or another. For that reason, let me try to explain why I shall vote for repeal of section 14(b).

In 1958 the subject of right-to-work laws in my State of Ohio was the No. 1 issue facing the voters. At that time, although I was not up for election for any office, I thoroughly studied the pros and cons of this issue, devoid of all emotional aspects. I came to the conclusion that a union cannot bargain for just its own members alone. It must give equal benefits and equal protection to all. If this were true, then it must logically follow that it is unfair to deny a union the right to seek a contract which requires all of those whom it protects to carry their fair share of the cost. Having reached this decision I informed representatives of local district 50 of the United Mine Workers and the local labor secretary in my home county of my feelings. This was many months before the issue came to a vote in Ohio and is today, I presume, still a matter of public record.

I never regretted this decision. I have often felt, however, that the final vote on this issue in Ohio would not have been so overwhelming against right to work if the people had been less passionate in their outlook. Against the pleading of Ray Bliss, a group of people, some of whom secretly desired to ruin the labor movement, fully committed the Republican Party to a subject that right fully belonged between employee and employer. The unions, on the other hand, fought back with all their might and I am sure that many a laboring man became wrongly convinced that the establishment of a right-to-work law meant the absolute end of union seniority. Both sides went too far.

When it became apparent that the repeal of a State's right to enact a so-called right-to-work law was to come before this Congress, I felt it was necessary to look at this issue from an entirely different approach. While Ohio has settled this issue once and for all, one must ask oneself the fundamental question, Did not Ohio have the right to decide? Should not other States? Is not States rights a major issue involved in this vote? For one who strongly believes in a political philosophy of States rights this became the predominate subject in my decision and I know I would vote for or against repeal mainly on this issue.

In arriving at my decision I can honestly say that I feel I have read as much testimony of the hearings, examined the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act as closely, and received the vast amount of literature available on this subject, as any other Member of the 89th Congress. Here was my conclusion.

The fundamental purpose of the Taft-Hartley Act was to establish a uniform, national policy in the area of labor-management relations. The law itself provides safeguards for employers against certain types of union activities, such as secondary boycotts, jurisdictional strikes, and certain types of picketing. It outlaws the closed shop.

Along with this national law, the Landrum-Griffin Act applies national standards to outlaw hot cargo contracts, protects union funds against misuse, erects safeguards to insure fair elections, and provides a procedure for the removal of union officers by the union membership.

Every single section of both laws is applicable to every State in the Union with one exception—14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. This section should apply equally, in my opinion, to all States. In fact, this inequality definitely gives an unfair competitive advantage to those States, which seek to improve their economic fortunes at the expense of labor, over those States which seek to achieve the highest labor standards consistent with sound industrial development. A person cannot argue one minute that a voting rights bill was unfair because it did not apply equally throughout our country and, at the next minute, say that our national labor laws should not apply to all 50 States.

Many people have written that a vote against repeal of 14(b) would be a vote against the freedom of an individual. If I thought this was true I would not vote for repeal. Nothing is more sacred to me than my responsibility to protect the rights of an individual. The growth of welfarism and socialism is my biggest fear. To stop the growth of centralized government with its accompanying power over the individual freedom of man, and his right to lead his life as he sees fit I consider one of my main objectives in life.

I am a firm supporter of both the Taft-Hartley and the Landrum-Griffin Acts. The repeal of section 14(b) would result in no fundamental or significant modification in the structure and safeguards which these acts have made available to rank and file union members, employees, and employers.

I will, in the future, support labor legislation which would provide the proper climate for fair collective bargaining. Possession of excessive power by either labor or management can lead to nothing but disaster for both. Recent national labor elections, especially the recent steel election, points out that certain loopholes exist that might deny a union member to participate in fair and honest elections. Legislation should be considered to close these loopholes.

I wish to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that I was personally disappointed that certain amendments that were to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] and the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] were blocked by legislative procedures from receiving the full attention, discussion, and debate of this body. I feel Mrs. GREEN's amendment that protects people who cannot join a union due to religious belief has much justification. The Amish and Seventh-Day Adventists in my district would have been helped by such an amendment. Mr. GRIFFIN's amendments, as they involve civil rights and the use of employee's dues for other than union activity as defined by law, wages, working conditions, and so forth, merit consideration by Congress. If given a chance to vote to send back the bill to committee so that these amendments can be considered I will do so.

In conclusion I would like to repeat how sorry I am that there are so many of my friends who disagree with me on this subject. I can honestly say, in all fairness, that I know none of them have given this subject as much thought or did as much research on labor laws as I have. The easiest and most politically expedient vote would be to vote against repeal. The same people who worked so passionately against the right-to-work issue in 1958 have put tremendous pressure on me. Some letters have been quite abusive and threatening. On the other hand, except for a few letters, I have had very little pressure from labor leaders back home. District 50 of the United Mine Workers has not expressed an opinion one way or another, nor has the vast majority of unions.

Only one reason keeps me from voting "no." Tonight I have to go home and sleep with my own conscience. If I vote not to repeal section 14(b), it would be only due to political pressure and not what I honestly think is the thing to do. Life is too short for that. I am just not the type.

Address by the Honorable Edith Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I recently learned that our colleague, Representative EDITH GREEN addressed the 12th annual National Institute on Crime and Delinquency on June 14, in Detroit. Her remarks as a Member of this body, and as a fellow member of the Education and Labor Committee, bring home the fact that there is a pressing need for recognition of the shortage of personnel to work in the field of rehabilitation of those persons institutionalized for offenses against society.

Among the more than 1,500 attending the institute was Paul C. Wolman, chairman of the Department of Parole and Probation for the State of Maryland. Mr. Wolman told me of the excellent reception by the entire group to the remarks of Representative GREEN. Because of the timeliness of these remarks and recommendations in conjunction with the President's keen interest in the entire subject of crime, its prevention, and more thorough examination, I include, in the RECORD, the speech delivered by Congresswoman GREEN. I am happy to make this request in light of the many favorable comments I have received from my constituents and others attending the institute.

I would like to take this opportunity to lend my support to Representative GREEN in the drive for seeking programs which will give greater weight and recognition to solving the problems of rehabilitation of offenders, programs such as the nongovernmental Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training. In line with this idea, and in Representative GREEN's demonstration of how we in the Congress can be a force for action and progress, I am sure all of us commend the efforts being made to solve this most difficult problem within our society.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE EDITH GREEN AT THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY, DETROIT, MICH., JUNE 14, 1965

It is a great pleasure to be here tonight to discuss with you the development of an action program in correctional manpower and its implications across the Nation. So much of legislative life deals with the problems before the congressional committees that I always welcome the opportunity to participate in this type of conference and to have the opportunity to discuss freely and informally problems relating to social and human service.

I suppose there are times when we legislators complicate life for you as we enact new and evermore complex programs or as we fail to enact programs which you need. But at times some of your leaders can complicate our lives as well. I am sure that my colleagues in the House and Senate, and their staffs, will agree that seldom has there been a more persistent and more energetic advocate of the need for legislation in the correctional field than your Dr. Charles Prigmore. Perhaps some of my unconvinced colleagues may even vote to enact the pending bills in this area just to have time and opportunity to pursue other activities.

Everyone here tonight, I believe, will agree that we truly live in a great year, an exciting year. Two weeks ago all of us eagerly awaited each new report on the two American astronauts. In the last two decades we have witnessed tremendous advances in the scientific and technological areas. But we also live in a year when more and more voices are crying out in righteous indignation, and countless others in silent demonstration, about the lack of progress on this planet in human relations. We have made it possible, literally, for man to walk in outer space—but there are still so many who cannot yet walk with dignity on this planet—and surely a lack of dignity and self-respect must be a contributing factor to delinquency.

While it's an exciting decade, this is also a decade in which crime, delinquency, and social disorder have risen to new and alarming heights.

Father Hesburgh, the president of Notre Dame, has said:

"Personally, I don't care if the United States gets the first man on the moon on a 'crash' basis if, while this is happening, we dawdle along here on our corner of the planet nursing our prejudices, flaunting our magnificent Constitution, ignoring the central moral problem of our time and appearing hypocrites to the world."

Personally, I reject the philosophy that says we can afford $20 billion to $40 billion on a race to the moon on this crash basis—but we can't afford to provide adequate educational opportunities on this planet in order to have the scientists, the doctors, the teachers, the social workers, the philosophers, the preachers, to make life here enriched and meaningful to our own people.

I reject the philosophy which says we can spend billions of Federal funds on highways to serve as interconnecting links between each and every one of our 50 States—but we can't afford services and manpower to try to prevent and control crime, delinquency, mental illness, poverty, disease, ignorance, alcoholism, and our other serious social problems.

It would be intellectually dishonest if I did not recognize recent advances we have made in human relations and in the development of human resources. We can all applaud the steps taken in civil rights, in assisting the poor of this Nation, and in making quality educational opportunities available to more and more individuals.

But I don't want to talk to you tonight about the past. I want to talk to you about the future, about the vast and shocking needs that still exist in human relations and the development of human resources. The record to date is marred by the dismal and costly increases in the number of persons involved in crime and delinquency. What are we doing, and what can we do about this serious and growing problem, the cost of which in the United States is variously estimated in the billions of dollars annually. The direct cost, annually, of crime to taxpayers of this Nation is $6 billion. This is the cost of administration of criminal justice at Federal, State, and local levels for police, courts, and correction. And the total cost of crime, direct and indirect, is estimated to be $27 billion a year. While these figures show the staggering needs which the Nation must meet in the field of corrections, a survey of our resources shows a terrifying gap in meeting these needs. We see a society characterized by the sharp increase in population, growing concentrations of people in cities and towns, industrialization, automation, assimilation of minority and immigrant groups in the American middle class, and changes in cultural values. All these developments have wide implications for the incidence and nature of crime and delinquency.

If I may digress for a moment—this noon at Yale University, I listened to a quiet but a very stirring message by the Secretary General of the United Nations. In his address Mr. U Thant stressed the need for moral and spiritual values in an age of technocracy. He also said that, although he was a Buddhist by conviction because he felt certain that Buddhism offered to him more than the other religions, that he did not feel this gave him the right to determine for others what philosophy they should embrace. There is a point here to be realized by those of us who, convinced of the validity and truth of democracy, demand that people who have no idea of what the terms "democracy" or "communism" mean—who are more interested in four sandwiches than in the four freedoms—how can we demand that these people choose our way. Are we justified in demanding that they make a choice—or in some cases impose it with force.

And perhaps a generation that has grown up under the atomic mushroom cloud—and has known no cessation of the hates and fears engendered by these 20 years of cold war—or hot war—perhaps this, too, has its implications for crime and delinquency. We can send man to the Moon and Mars, and the stars—but we can't build the bridges of understanding on this Earth. And we can build buildings and talk about programs but the ultimate success of any endeavor will depend upon the individuals involved and the climate of opinion in which we must operate. And as we look at all our problems—poverty, crime, delinquency, wars, and rumors of wars—I get a bit impatient with those who shrug their shoulders and say: "I'm just an innocent bystander." I say that if someone is just a bystander, then he is not innocent.

And when I read, as I did several months ago, of a woman attacked and murdered, I wondered how 38 people could possibly pretend they were innocent bystanders. And within the last 2 weeks I read of a woman robbed and beaten on a city bus—with 40 standing or sitting nearby. I wonder where society has failed.

I suggest that our approaches to crime and delinquency control have been somewhat primitive in comparison to our approach to other social problems. We would never for a moment imagine that good public health laws or sanitation laws alone would insure good public health.

Our attention is directed immediately to preventative measures, to establish enough facilities and resources to turn out an adequate number of qualified personnel such as doctors and nurses. We think also of ways to induce these qualified people to enter public health careers and to remain there. Yet we have naively assumed in our halting and uncertain attempts to prevent and control crime that more new laws and a great many more institutions and jails alone should do the job.

Daniel Blain, president of the American Psychiatric Association, has described the situation in the following terms: "By and large, our Nation's traditional approach to crime and delinquency has been analogous to putting out fires. The prevention and correction of conditions that lead to fires has attracted a relatively small measure of our resources and energies. Now, our people, as a whole are horrified at the extent of crime and violence in their midst."

First, let us examine briefly the status of correctional manpower and training. Recently I received statements from half the Governors in the Nation testifying that the shortage of skilled personnel was the primary drawback to the successful operation of the State correctional programs.

Again, if I may disgress for a moment, those of you who know political situation may share my interest and pleasure that Governor Wallace endorsed a bill I authored and the Governor of my own State wrote urging me to support my own bill.

Governor Brown, of California, stressed the fact that "local probation services for offenders not institutionalized are scandalously undermanned." Other witnesses who have recently appeared before our subcommittee have pointed out that there is a ratio of 1 psychiatrist to every 4,400 offenders in our adult institutions, 1 psychologist to every 2,000 offenders, and 1 academic teacher for every 400 offenders. It is abundantly clear from the statements of leaders across the Nation that correctional facilities are both undermanned, and, most importantly, inadequately served by qualified and skilled individuals. It is clear that the field of corrections and, in fact, the Nation, has suffered because of lack of attention given to corrections.

The 2 million offenders incarcerated each year in our adult and juvenile institutions do not receive care, treatment, and rehabilitative services on a par with our public health patients, our mentally ill, our mentally retarded, or our vocationally handicapped. This 1 percent of our annual population is a forgotten segment along with another one-half of 1 percent on probation and parole. Yet, a poor public policy is manifested in this neglect. Last year serious crime in the United States rose 13 percent, an increase the Nation cannot afford in terms of dollars spent or human lives wasted.

We will never capitalize on our research findings in crime and delinquency until we have enough skilled rehabilitation and prevention personnel. For example, our committee was told that over 90 percent of our offenders shift back and forth from legitimate to illicit careers at one time or another and are not genuinely career criminals. This 90 percent or so might, therefore, be potentially directed into permanently legitimate careers.

Perhaps the most vivid and convincing signpost in the maturation of a field of human service is its degree of attention to the issues of recruitment, education, training, utilization and retention of personnel. This is as true for the field of corrections as it is for the fields of public health, mental health, child welfare and vocational rehabilitation.

The most telling characteristic of a dynamic society is its ability to utilize the potential and capacity of all its citizens. It is a truism in America of the 1960's that much of our human capability is not developed or used.

These two salient facts are the cornerstones upon which a massive national action program to create a modern correctional system in the United States should be based.

I believe we are witnessing in the 89th Congress and in the United States of 1965, a quiet revolution which is not as headline-producing as our civil rights revolution or our antipoverty revolution. But it may have equally important long-range implications.

The seeds of this revolution were planted at Arden House just a year ago. As you who were there well know, it was perhaps the first time that so many leaders and organizations in the field of corrections met and worked together to block out a consensus as to priority needs and plans for solution. One result is that legislation has been introduced in the U.S. Congress to provide public support for this 3-year study of correctional manpower and training by the joint commission.

The seeds planted at Arden House have been nourished by the deep and continued interest of persons in the correctional field.

These seeds are now bearing fruit. I'm sure you know, too, that H.R. 2263 received unanimous approval of my Special Subcommittee on Education and by the full Committee on Education and Labor. Final House action is expected soon. I predict a good chance of it next Monday. I'm optimistic. However, some of you or most of you may wish to express your interest to your congressional delegation in order to insure passage.

In the Senate similar action is also expected in the near future.

Parenthetically, I should add that the entire field of corrections owes much with respect to the legislative process of the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act, to Dr. Charles Prigmore and Milton Rector who have worked untiringly on this matter.

These fruits are a concrete testimony to the worth of the conference you held in June of 1964. It is my earnest belief that a carefully planned, multidisciplinary effort such as this, involving all the national groups and bodies, is a far more promising path to leadership in crime prevention and control than any narrowly based effort involving a single approach, a single philosophy, or a single profession.

And, of course, the real advantage in a national correctional manpower policy will be in the impact on the lives of our offenders. Are our adult and juvenile offenders receiving the kind of medical, dental, psychiatric, psychological, recreational, educational, and other services they need? Or is it a frequent occurrence for men, women, and youngsters to leave correctional institutions not only unrehabilitated but more bitter, cynical, and antisocial than when they entered? Is it still the rule rather than the exception to find inadequate rehabilitation programs and even no programs at all in courts, institutions, jails, detention homes and other facilities? You, the experts in this field, have convinced the Congress that offenders are not being rehabilitated and will not be as long as existing limitations in both the quality and quantity of personnel prevail.

If steps can be taken, under your leadership and with the sanction of the Congress, to bring genuinely effective help to our individual offenders, the savings in human lives will be an enormous contribution indeed.

Men, women, and children, less often, will leave correctional institutions bitter, cynical, and more antisocial than when they entered. For many, hope may replace despair; the plans for a job may remove some of the pain of previous failures.

I seldom make any speech without making at least a passing reference to my State of Oregon. But I am not sure it is appropriate for me to do so with this audience, since too many of you associate the word "Oregon" with the term "Oregon boot" which fills a long and unsavory chapter in the history of corrections.

Let us hope that the Oregon boot and similar repressive controls will not be needed in the correctional programs of the future as the Nation accepts its responsibility for the treatment of offenders and develops a large and well qualified team of dedicated men and women to provide the kind of help and services our offenders need.

Working together we may be on the threshold of new discoveries, new programs and new cooperation among ourselves. I look forward, with you, to the completion of the work of the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training and to a White House Conference which I intend to propose, a conference which will launch the national action program in the field of corrections.

I don't know how many of you read Pogo, but it is one of my favorite comic strips. Some time ago, Walt Kelly had Pogo say this: "During this geophysical year, we have plumbed the depths and shot moons into the stars. Now, if we could just have a year dedicated to man—for how can we know the stranger from without if we do not know the man under our own skin."

The work which you have begun, and which now must be continued, is a real dedication to man and will produce results as rewarding to you and as meaningful to society as any other endeavor I can imagine.

SENATE

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Ralph J. Harmon, bishop of the seventh ward of the Las Vegas North Stake, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, offered the following prayer:

Our Father which art in Heaven, we humbly thank Thee for this day. We thank Thee for this great land of America; for the freedoms we enjoy; for the great privilege we have of living in this time in this great Nation, the United States of America. We thank Thee for the prosperity of this country; for the individual freedoms we enjoy guaranteed under the Constitution of these United States, set forth by the Founders of this Nation who were divinely inspired. We are humbly thankful for the responsibilities we have this day in this U.S. Senate.

We do humbly ask Thy choicest blessings to be with each Member of this Senate and every other leader of this Nation. Pour out upon each of these great men the blessing of health of mind and body. Let Thy spirit rest with each, that they might have the wisdom to perform their duty for the best good and benefit of all men; the love and understanding that is needed to deal with the problems confronting our Nation this day; the desire to serve to seek Thee daily in individual prayer. Bless and inspire these men to protect the freedoms won on many battlefields and in these sacred Halls throughout these many years, the individual freedoms of each citizen living in this Nation; bless these leaders in dealing with world problems that our sons and their posterity might live to enjoy the same freedoms we have been blessed with. Bless each Senator that he might do Thy will, serve Thee, and keep Thy commandments, we do humbly pray in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 26, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-81, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Edmondson, Mr. Giaimo, Mr. Conte, and Mr. Battin members of the Joint Commission on the Coinage on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1317) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe penalties for the handling and collection of dishonored checks or money orders, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7067) to prescribe administrative procedures for the District of Columbia government, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7067) to prescribe administrative procedures for the District of Columbia government, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request by Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were limited to 3 minutes.

CAPE LOOKOUT NATIONAL SEASHORE, N.C.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 492, S. 251.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 251) to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 3, line 1, after the word "Banks", to strike out "and he may acquire by exchange or by purchase with appropriated or donated funds the property held by the Core Banks Gun Club on July 1, 1963, which lies westerly of a line located one thousand feet inland from the mean high waterline of the Atlantic Ocean if there is a change of ownership of such property or if it ceases to be used for the purposes of hunting and fishing" and insert "Land donated by the State of North Carolina pursuant to this subsection shall constitute consideration for the transfer by the United States of 1.5 acres of land that is to be used as a site for a public health facility in the village of Hatteras, Dare County, North Carolina, and such a transfer is hereby authorized."; at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "not required for other Federal purposes"; on page 5, line 17, after the word "a", to strike out "refund" and insert "refined"; and on page 7, at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act" and insert "not to exceed $3,200,000 for the acquisition and development of the seashore in accordance with the purposes of this Act"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve for public use and enjoyment an area in the State of North Carolina possessing outstanding natural and recreational values, there is hereby authorized to be established the Cape Lookout National Seashore (hereinafter referred to as "seashore"), which shall comprise the lands and adjoining marshlands and waters on the outer banks of Carteret County, North Carolina, between Ocracoke Inlet and Beaufort Inlet, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Proposed Boundaries—Proposed Case Lookout National Seashore", dated April 1964, and numbered NS–CL–7101–B, which is on file in the Office of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior: *Provided, however,* That such seashore shall not include those lands and interests in lands which are bounded on the north by the Cape Lookout lighthouse property, on the east by a line located seven hundred and fifty feet inland from the mean high waterline of the Atlantic Ocean, on the south by property owned or leased by the United States Coast Guard and other Federal agencies, and on the west by the easterly boundary of property of the Thomas Gold heirs and the waters of Lookout Bight.

Sec. 2. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Federal property located within the boundaries of the Cape Lookout National Seashore may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for the purposes of the seashore. Non-Federal lands, marshlands, waters, or interests therein located within the authorized seashore may be acquired by the Secretary of the Interior only through donation, except that he may purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or may acquire by exchange, the lands, marshlands, and waters or interests therein comprising the Shackleford Banks. Land donated by the State of North Carolina pursuant to this subsection shall constitute consideration for the transfer by the United States of 1.5 acres of land that is to be used as a site for a public health facility in the village of Hatteras, Dare County, North Carolina, and such a transfer is hereby authorized.

(b) When acquiring lands by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within the boundaries of the seashore and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under his jurisdiction which he classifies as proper for exchange or other disposition. Property so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value, but the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

(c) Owners of property which on July 1, 1963, was developed and used for noncommercial residential purposes may reserve for themselves and their assigns, as a condition to the purchase or acquisition by exchange of such property by the Secretary, a right of use and occupancy of the residence and not in excess of three acres of land on which the residence is situated, for noncommercial residential purposes for a term ending at the death of the owner, or the death of his spouse, or the death of either of them, or, in lieu thereof, for a definite term not to exceed twenty-five years: *Provided,* That the Secretary may exclude from such reserved property any marsh, beach, or waters, together with so much of the land adjoining such marsh, beach, or waters as he deems necessary for public access thereto. The owner shall elect the term of the right to be reserved. The Secretary is authorized to accept donations of property for purposes of the seashore in which a right of use and occupancy for noncommercial residential purposes is reserved for the period stated in this subsection if the land on which the residence is situated and to which the right attaches is not in excess of three acres and there is excluded from the reserved property such marsh, beach, or waters and adjoining land as the Secretary deems necessary for public use and access thereto.

(d) A right of use and occupancy reserved in lands that are donated or otherwise acquired pursuant to this section shall be subject to termination by the Secretary upon his determination that such use and occupancy is being exercised in a manner not consistent with the purposes of this Act and upon tender to the holder of the right of an amount equal to the fair market value of that portion of the right which remains unexpired on the date of termination.

(e) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or acquire by exchange, not to exceed one hundred acres of lands or interests in lands at or near Beaufort, North Carolina, as an administrative site, and for a landing dock and related facilities that may be used to provide a suitable approach or access to the seashore.

SEC. 3. When title to the lands and interests in lands which under section 2(a) of this Act may be acquired for the purposes of the seashore by donation only is vested in the United States, the Secretary shall declare the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register. Such notice shall contain a refined description or map of the boundaries of the seashore as the Secretary may find desirable and such exterior boundaries shall encompass, as nearly as possible, the area generally described in section 1 of this Act. Following such establishment, and subject to the limitations and conditions prescribed in this Act, the Secretary may, subject to the provisions of section 2 hereof, acquire the remainder of the lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of the seashore.

SEC. 4. The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing, including shellfishing, on lands under his jurisdiction within the Cape Lookout National Seashore in accordance with the appropriate laws of the State of North Carolina, to the extent applicable, except that the Secretary may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting or fishing shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, fish or wildlife management, or public use and enjoyment. Except in emergencies, any rules and regulations of the Secretary pursuant to this section shall be put into effect only after consultation with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission and the North Carolina Department of Conservation and Development.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall administer the Cape Lookout National Seashore for the general purposes of public outdoor recreation, including conservation of natural features contributing to public enjoyment. In the administration of the seashore and the administrative site, the Secretary may utilize such statutory authorities relating to areas administered and supervised by the Secretary through the National Park Service and such statutory authorities otherwise available to him for the conservation and management of natural resources as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 6. The authority of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, to undertake or contribute to shore erosion control or beach protection measures on lands within the Cape Lookout National Seashore shall be exercised in accordance with a plan that is mutually acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army, and that is consistent with the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $3,200,000 for the acquisition and development of the seashore in accordance with the purposes of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 509), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA

The proposed national seashore area is comprised of that portion of the Outer Banks of North Carolina between Ocracoke Inlet on the north and Beaufort Inlet on the south. This portion of the Outer Banks has a history closely connected to the sea, to the whaling industry, and to piracy and war. These barrier reefs are also considered by many to have provided a large degree of protection to the mainland from tidal forces engendered by hurricanes and severe storms.

Originally, the lower portions of the banks were heavily forested. The cutting of juniper and oak trees and heavy grazing left the area vulnerable to the action of wind and waves from heavy storms. The considerable damage incurred in the hurricanes of 1944, 1954, 1955, and 1958 brought about the realization that prompt protective measures were needed.

In 1959, the general assembly in North Carolina appropriated funds for surveys and land acquisition. The Army Corps of Engineers began a cooperative study culminating in recommendations for protective works to cost $5,800,000. The State department of conservation and development did not wait for the final study recommendations before undertaking stabilization projects.

The State of North Carolina, continuing its fine tradition of cooperation in establishing national parks and recreation areas, plans to donate all except 2,700 acres of the 20,000 acres of land and marsh within the seashore. The 58 miles of ocean beach would augment the recreational development of the Outer Banks. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore, immediately to the north, served over 1 million visitors during 1964.

The Cape Lookout National Seashore would greatly increase the opportunities for water-based activities, such as swimming, fishing, boating, and waterfowl hunting, as well as land-based pursuits such as picnicking, camping, nature study, beachcombing, photography, and painting.

President Johnson, in his message to Congress on February 8, 1965, concerning the natural beauty of our country, stated, "It is true that we have often been careless with our natural bounty. At times we have paid a heavy price for this neglect. But once our people were aroused to the danger, we have acted to preserve our resources for the enrichment of our country and the enjoyment of future generations." He included, among the areas he proposed for acquisition, the Cape Lookout National Seashore in North Carolina.

Any owner of property which was developed and used for noncommercial residential purposes may reserve a right of use and occupancy of the residence for noncommercial residential purposes for his lifetime, his spouse's lifetime, or in lieu thereof, for a definite period not to exceed 25 years, as the owner elects.

FACT SHEET

Location: The Outer Banks of North Carolina between Ocracoke Inlet and Beaufort Inlet.

Area: 30,000 acres, of which approximately 20,000 acres are land and marsh, with the remaining 10,000 acres being water surface; has 58 miles of ocean beach.

Potential use: Located within 250 miles of a population exceeding 5 million. Cape Hatteras, immediately to the north, served over 1 million visitors in 1964. Major natural features: 58 miles of beach. Estimated acquisition cost: $265,000.

Estimated 5-year development costs: $2,910,000.

Estimated shore protection costs (Army Corps of Engineers): $5,800,000.

Annual operation costs: From $90,000 the first year to $370,000 the fifth year.

Conveyance of 1.5 acres in the village of Hatteras, Dare County: 1.5 acres of land, under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Interior, in the village of Hatteras, Dare County, not being needed for recreation or for administrative improvements, is to be conveyed for use as a site for a public health facility. The lands donated by the State of North Carolina for the Cape Lookout National Seashore, are deemed just consideration for this parcel.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 251) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Vietnam.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Arthur J. Goldberg, of Illinois, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 19th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND ORGANIZATION FOR OUTER SPACE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], I report an original resolution, the purpose of which is to allow to be published as a Senate document a staff report prepared for the committee by Mrs. Eilene Galloway, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, and entitled, "International Cooperation and Organization for Outer Space." The purpose of this study is to report on space programs of nations and organizations and the patterns of worldwide cooperation which they have been developing since the beginning of the space age. The report describes the history and development of international space activities, particularly those negotiations which have resulted in bilateral and multilateral agreements for cooperation. The main approaches to international space cooperation developed by the United Nations and its specialized agencies are examined. One part deals with the organization and practices of the international scientific community as developed for space research by the International Council of Scientific Unions. Professional organizations and industrial entities established by the business communities of various nations are also surveyed with regard to their space programs and administrative procedures. The report sets forth the record made by the United States in international space activities in accordance with policies established by the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 132), under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That there be printed as a Senate document a study entitled "International Cooperation and Organization for Outer Space", prepared for the use of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences; and that there be printed two thousand additional copies of such document for the use of that committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 2333. A bill to amend title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to authorize forgiveness of loans for service as a full-time employee of a local educational agency; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. METCALF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CANNON (for himself and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 2334. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the occupational tax on coin-operated gaming devices for similar taxes imposed by a State where the operation of such devices is legal; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CANNON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 2335. A bill to amend section 216 of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide that shippers may designate the routing of property transported by motor carriers in cases where two or more through routes have been established, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2336. A bill for the relief of Lam Hai Cheung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2337. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of State science academies and the promotion of the study of science; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

TO PRINT AS SENATE DOCUMENT A STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND ORGANIZATION FOR OUTER SPACE

Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mrs. SMITH), from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 132) to print as a Senate document a study of international cooperation and organization for outer space; which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. ANDERSON, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

FORGIVENESS OF LOANS UNDER NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to extend forgiveness of loans under the National Defense Education Act to all full-time school employees.

Presently, the forgiveness of loans is granted to those engaged in full-time teaching activities. The purpose of the provision in the 1958 act was to provide incentive to college graduates to enter the teaching profession in order to improve the quality and quantity of teachers in our growing schools.

But we also have shortages of qualified personnel in the vital administrative and other supporting service positions in our elementary and secondary schools. The best teachers available can be handicapped in their duties by weaknesses and shortages in their school system's administrative structure. These shortages result in a variety of handicaps resulting in teachers typing their own classroom material or spending part of their time filling in administrative tasks created by vacancies.

I propose incentive for qualified graduates to seek employment in local school systems not only as teachers but also as psychologists, counselors, stenographers, assistant principals, principals, auditors, nurses, recreation directors, and other positions which involve or support teaching of elementary and secondary pupils.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2333) to amend title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to authorize forgiveness of loans for service as a full-time employee of a local educational agency, introduced by Mr. METCALF, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 205(b)(3) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended (1) by inserting after "United States," the following: "or for service (other than primarily as a teacher) as a full-time employee of a local educational agency", and (2) by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "or for each full year of such service in the case of such an employee of a local educational agency".
>
> SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall be applicable with respect to service performed on and after the date of enactment of this Act whether the loan was made before or after such date.

TAX CREDIT FOR TAXES IMPOSED ON DEVICES

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, on behalf of my senior colleague from the State of Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and myself, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill requested by the Nevada State Legislature. It would provide a tax credit to be applied against the Federal tax on coin-operated gaming devices through a similar State tax assessed in Nevada where such devices are legal. The measure would permit the State of Nevada to impose additional gaming taxes to meet growing demands for public services while continuing the regulatory aspect of the Federal tax. It would not reduce total taxes now paid on each device.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2334) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the occupational tax on coin-operated gaming devices for similar taxes imposed by a State where the operation of such devices is legal, introduced by Mr. Cannon (for himself and Mr. Bible), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

SPECIAL POSTAGE STAMP IN COMMEMORATION OF 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF STATE SCIENCE ACADEMIES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Academy of Science will celebrate its centennial in 1968. It is the fifth oldest academy of science and probably the first State academy of science in the United States. I believe the first four academies were city academies and not State academies.

The Kansas Academy of Science came into being through the vision and perseverance of early day Kansas educators who, realizing the great need in the West to encourage science, believed that through organization, individual efforts could be given a greater oportunity.

The Kansas Academy of Science was founded in 1868 in Topeka, Kans., at Lincoln College, a precedecessor of Washburn University. After a few years of struggle for survival the academy was reorganized and expanded. It has grown and flourished since then. It has played an important role as a leader in encouragement of science and in providing an example for other States to follow.

Mr. President, I believe it would be fitting and proper for the Post Office Department to issue a commemorative stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the founding of State science academies and in honor to all science schools in the great work they are doing in the field of science.

I, therefore, today am introducing a bill calling for a commemorative stamp in honor of State science academies and request that the bill be appropriately referred.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2337) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of State science academies and the promotion of the study of science, introduced by Mr. Carlson, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 370

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, with the support of an informed public we can hope that Congress will soon act to curb the worst excesses in the national traffic in firearms. However, in this effort to control an existing threat to community and public safety, we must take care not to punish or discriminate against legitimate small business dealers.

I refer specifically to that provision of S. 1592 which would place a $100 annual license fee on firearm's dealers operating under Federal law. In this regard, I am in agreement with the National Retail Hardware Dealers Association that this amount would represent a discriminatory burden on small business. Representatives of the association reiterated their position on this subject in testimony given to the House Ways and Means Committee.

That the existing $1 annual fee should be increased is beyond argument. But the evidence gathered through years of study in this area indicates that an increase to $10 a year would serve the purpose of the pending control legislation.

That purpose, of course, is to impose reasonable and proper limits in the commercial interstate flow of firearms. We intend to rid the country and the firearms industry of those elements which seek profits in disregard of public safety.

The current $1 license fee is a mockery of the public interest in that it is an open invitation to illicit and nonbona fide traffickers in firearms to enter the commercial trade under the cloak of legal sanction. What we seek then is an increase in the annual fee which will discourage such hip-pocket firearms operators and thus limit commercial firearms sources.

But we mean to curb the proliferation of so-called firearms dealers who are not in fact legitimate firearms dealers. Our purpose is not to drive out the legitimate dealer or to weigh down the small businessman with a discriminatory tax burden.

The proposed $100 dealers license fee will certainly shake out the hip-pocket operator, but I am afraid it will also have the effect of shaking out the legitimate small business dealer in firearms.

Consider the case of the small retailer who handles firearms equipment as a limited part of his overall operation, only as a service to his customers. He is not making any large profit out of his sales of firearms, and in fact he may even be taking a loss in this area of operation. Yet it is important to his business that he maintain this service in order to keep his regular customers.

That situation exists in thousands of cases of small hardware dealers and retailers in outlying rural areas. In such instances, a $100 annual license fee would be a prohibitive tax burden on the small operator. It is almost certain that such a fee would discourage and drive out many such operators. The large-scale operator—not only legitimate large dealers but the large-scale illicit trafficker as well—would shrug off a $100 license fee and continue in business, however.

Thus, this provision of the proposed bill discriminates against the legitimate small businessman. It is anticompetitive—and it is not necessary to accomplish the purpose of the legislation at hand.

We need only consider prior recommendations in this area. An increase from $1 to $10 in annual license fee was proposed by the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency in its report of August 7, 1964. This report was not hastily assembled but was the result of over 4 years of careful study of this matter. Indeed, Senator Thomas Dodd, chairman of the subcommittee, deserves great credit for the thorough study he has made of this entire subject. A $10 dealer's fee, said the subcommittee report, would be effective in eliminating "fringe elements and non bona fide firearms dealers" from the gun trade.

I think it also significant that the $10 fee level was included in prior legislation introduced in this area, notably S. 1975 and S. 14. The former bill was introduced in August 1963, and the latter in January of this year.

As a cosponsor of both these proposals, I can vouch for the careful study that went into the level of increase in dealers' fees. It was concluded in both instances that $10 in annual license fee was sufficient to protect the public interest and to meet the administrative needs of the affected Government regulatory agencies.

In this regard, the record clearly shows that the General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury, as well as officials of the Internal Revenue Service, have, in the past, endorsed the adequacy of the $10 fee scale.

Thus, it would seem that a $10 license fee for dealers is both reasonable and conducive to achieving the desired ends of the proposed firearms control bill. Increasing the fee above that level, to $25 or $50 or $100, would place an unreasonable and unnecessary burden on legitimate small businessmen. If additional controls on licensing are required, the best method to accomplish this would be to provide that prospective licensees must be shown to operate established places of business which meet certain standards. Such a provision would weed out the irresponsible, unwanted element without penalizing the small businessman.

The American people owe a great debt to Senator Dodd for his dedication and perseverance to the cause of firearms safety. I have always supported these efforts, and I will continue to support them until we have written into the lawbooks of this country an adequate system of regulating the traffic of lethal weapons. My concern here is that we assure that such a law is effective in remedying existing evils, without unnecessarily injuring those persons legitimately engaged in the manufacture and distribution of firearms. I am therefore introducing an amendment to S. 1592 which will increase the fee for firearms dealers from $1 to $10 annually.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 370) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add the names of the senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] as additional cosponsors of S. 2278, an amendment of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, to provide a $75,000 minimum payment for certain State administrative expenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill I introduced to promote the safety of railroad employees, S. 2180, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BIRTH CONTROL HEARINGS CONTINUE WEDNESDAY, JULY 28; WITNESSES ARE AMBASSADOR CHESTER BOWLES; JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER III; DR. FRANK NOTESTEIN; AND DR. JOSEPH L. FISHER

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce that the Government Operations Committee's Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures will resume public hearings on S. 1676 tomorrow at 10 a.m. in room 4200, New Senate Office Building.

Witnesses scheduled to appear before the subcommittee are the Honorable Chester Bowles, U.S. Ambassador to India; John D. Rockefeller III, New York City, chairman of the board of the Population Council, Inc.; Dr. Frank Notestein, Princeton, N.J., demographer and author; and Dr. Joseph L. Fisher, Washington, D.C., president, Resources for the Future, Inc.

I expect Wednesday's session to be informative and helpful, as have been previous subcommittee hearings on S. 1676. Senate cosponsors of S. 1676 are the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS OF ELMO B. HUNTER TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI, AND WILLIAM R. COLLINSON TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN AND WESTERN DISTRICTS OF MISSOURI

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee of the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Tuesday, August 3, 1965, at 10 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

Elmo B. Hunter, of Missouri, to be U.S. district judge, western district of Missouri, vice Floyd R. Gibson, elevated.

William R. Collinson, of Missouri, to be U.S. district judge, eastern and western districts of Missouri, vice Richard M. Duncan, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself as chairman.

THE PROBLEM OF PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the overriding issue of our times—and probably the least discussed—is the problem of finding a way to end the proliferation or distribution of nuclear weapons to additional nations. I am hopeful that the Geneva Disarmament Conference will make some headway in stopping the growth of atomic arsenals among nations. There is no greater danger to world peace, indeed to the very existence of mankind than such growth. Although the likelihood of war between the United States and the Soviet Union is rapidly receding and such a war but a remote possibility, the danger now and for years to come is not only that Red China will acquire an atomic arsenal, but that many smaller nations will commence to do likewise.

The Chinese Communists have exploded two crude nuclear bombs. At least eight nations, and perhaps more, could build and explode nuclear weapons within a decade if they tried. Today, any industrial society can develop a 20-kiloton bomb, the size of the one dropped on Hiroshima, within 5 to 7 years at a cost of only $100 million. With each passing year more nations will be able to do so unless an ironclad treaty is signed soon to ban the further spread of nuclear weapons.

Recently, Red Chinese leaders again repeated their proposal for a summit conference of all countries to discuss the complete destruction of nuclear weapons. Last May, Red Chinese leaders proclaimed that "China will never be the first to use nuclear weapons." No other government, not even our own, has made such a pledge. Granted that the word of the Chinese Communist leaders cannot be relied on, it would be to our advantage and to the furtherance of world peace to take them up on their offer to negotiate a workable nuclear arms control agreement, with adequate safeguards that would in no way impair our national security.

It is important that this Nation, the Soviet Union, France, and Red China seek with other nations to bring to an end the production and proliferation of nuclear missiles. As a first step, it would be advisable that the negotiators designate nuclear free zones. It would be easy to start with all Latin American republics and the continent of Africa.

Also, it may at this time be feasible to extend the limited nuclear test ban treaty to bar underground tests of nuclear bombs if scientific progress in detection makes it possible to ban all underground nuclear tests without endangering our Nation's security.

Unless some steps similar to these are taken, there will certainly be 10 or more nations with nuclear bombs by 1970 and missiles with nuclear warheads within that time. Presently, the nuclear powers are England, France, China, and the United States. By spending about $200 million, any mature industrial country can readily produce one or two atomic bombs. India, Italy, Israel, Japan, Egypt, Indonesia, Australia, Canada, Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, Sweden, Switzerland, Belgium, the Netherlands, South Africa, and West Germany all have the potential know-how, resources and wealth, or soon will have that capacity, with which to produce nuclear weapons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] may have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, if West Germany is permitted to become a nuclear power and Red China becomes a rival to the Soviet Union and the United States in nuclear capacity, a third world war far more destructive than all wars in history will become an ever-present threat.

The tremendous danger inherent in the possession of nuclear weapons by the Red Chinese is apparent. Likewise, if West Germany should become a nuclear power, brother, pin down your ears. Germans over thousands of years have waged wars of aggression. Recently, top-ranking West German officials have indicated that if not given nuclear weapons West Germany will produce them itself in the near future. Thoughtful people may wonder if Germans will again seek to march to power over the dead bodies of millions of victims, as they have done twice within the past 50 years.

Recently, Gen. Thomas D. White, former Chief of Staff of the Air Force, testified before the Senate Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations. General White is one of the more highly respected officers of our Armed Forces. He is now on the Advisory Committee of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. In his testimony General White stated:

> I am convinced that the United States must continue its efforts in the direction of arms control. I can simplify and rationalize this by suggesting that two men, each with a fatally loaded pistol pointed at the other, probably would be wise to talk and keep on talking.

We must keep on talking. To speak disarmament is easier than to achieve it. We must be prepared for long, tedious, often discouraging negotiations. The alternative to coexistence is coannihilation.

Mr. President, on July 26, 1965, an excellent editorial, entitled "The Problem of Proliferation," appeared in the New York Herald Tribune. I commend this to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROBLEM OF PROLIFERATION

When the Geneva Disarmament Conference reconvenes tomorrow, the nuclear mushroom cloud will hang darkly over it. This, of course, has been true of every disarmament discussion since Hiroshima. But the shape of the problem, if not of the cloud, has changed. The urgent danger does not lie in the competition between two massive nuclear powers—the Soviet Union and the United States, which, with Britain, form the original "nuclear club"—but in the spread of nuclear weapons to many other states.

Already France and Red China have their own atomic arsenals. At least another dozen countries could readily produce atomic bombs.

The late Bernard Baruch, who warned against this proliferation of nuclear arms many years ago, referred to them as "equalizers," the term used to describe the old Colt revolver on the frontier, because it made the little man equal to the big man. This may not be literally true in the case of nuclear weapons, since stockpiles of bombs and large "families" of delivery systems will doubtless long give the Soviet Union and the United States powerful advantages over newcomers in the field.

Nevertheless, the release of even a single bomb could wreak enough havoc to cause a major human disaster. More, it might set off its own chain reaction among friends and allies of the nations involved. Finally, while both the United States and the U.S.S.R. have publicly acknowledged the folly of nuclear war and have set up elaborate and costly systems to guard against nuclear exchanges by error or irresponsibility, these safeguards may well be ignored if smaller, or less stable, governments attain nuclear capability.

Britain's Minister for Disarmament, Lord Chalfont, has warned against these perils. He is also taking to Geneva a draft treaty under which the five present nuclear powers would seek to check the spread of the peril. He is backed by the United States, Canada, and Italy—but even if Russian assent were secured, it would be difficult to convince France and Red China, not even represented at Geneva, to go along with the plan. And there would be the additional difficulty of persuading nations which even now may be spending large sums to obtain atomic bombs that they should drop their labors, unfinished. The prospect for such a consummation is hardly bright—but it must at least be sought with all the vigor that the Geneva Conference can command.

THE FEUD BETWEEN THE AMATEUR ATHLETIC UNION AND THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, this weekend American athletes will travel to Kiev in the Soviet Union to participate in a meet with the Soviet athletes.

Many of our finest competitors will be there, some despite the continued feuding between the AAU and the NCAA. Others will undoubtedly not participate, as a result of that feuding.

Several recent developments encourage me to believe that this long-standing dispute may be resolved. I have received reports which indicate that perhaps the U.S. Olympic Committee may be able to aid greatly in a settlement.

The Senate Commerce Committee, under the outstanding chairmanship of the able Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], will hold hearings on this subject in the near future. The prospects are good that, by airing the issues involved, the two parties may be induced to arrive at an agreement.

I have been in communication several times with the directors of both of the great athletic organizations involved. I have received replies indicating that each is ready and anxious to present its case to the committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letters from Mr. Walter Byers, executive director of the NCAA, and Col. Donald F. Hull, executive director of the AAU, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMATEUR ATHLETIC UNION
OF THE UNITED STATES,
New York, N.Y., July 20, 1965.

Hon. DANIEL B. BREWSTER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: I regret that my busy travels for the development of physical fitness and amateur athletics has prevented me from providing you with the materials requested in your letter of July 15. I did return to New York on July 6, but was off again before I got down to your letter. I have just gotten back again today and am compiling some material for you.

Your statement before the Senate on June 25, 1965, indicates an understanding of the importance of international sports and the values of amateur athletics for the youth of our Nation. As a service organization of volunteer workers for amateur athletics, we appreciate your interest and understanding.

We believe we are discharging our responsibilities in accordance with established national and international rules. It is also our firm conviction that the discharge of those responsibilities is done in a reasonable manner that is in the best interests of the deserving amateur athletes and amateur athletic organizations of this Nation. Our rules permit all amateur athletic organizations, including the NCAA, to have an opportunity for equitable representation on all committees. Also under our rules, NCAA athletes, along with athletes from every other amateur athletic organization in the United States, have a fair opportunity to earn positions on international teams.

I have enclosed some reprints of articles written to explain the amateur sports structure. Also enclosed is a cross-section of articles from the Nation's press which our president compiled for the AAU Board of Governors. I have tried to pick out the key facts and marked them in red for your easy perusal.

Also enclosed is a brochure "You and the AAU" and "The Story of the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States." I hope these will be of assistance to you.

Please let me know if you desire more prints of any of the above, or if I can be of further help to you in your efforts to determine the facts behind this dispute.

Sincerely,

DONALD F. HULL,
Executive Director.

THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE
ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION,
Kansas City, Mo., July 21, 1965.

Senator DANIEL B. BREWSTER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: As I wired you yesterday, it was necessary for me, upon my return to the office July 7, to embark upon another extended trip. This accounts for the delay in my responding to your June 25 letter and I apologize for this.

First, let me state on behalf of this association that we welcome and appreciate your interest in this problem and look forward to an opportunity to present our position and the reasons therefor to the Commerce Committee of the U.S. Senate.

The NCAA, along with the national organizations representing the high schools, junior colleges, and other agencies interested in track and field, formed the U.S. Track and Field Federation (USTFF) for a worthwhile purpose. The administration of track in this country needed reorganization. Those who are the major contributors to the sport and represent more than 90 percent of the track and field resources in this Nation feel they deserve a voice and vote equal to their contribution. There also is a place for the AAU in the federation, but as a partner and not a dictator.

The AAU was given the obligation, by the Department of State, to select the track team to compete against Russia. Should not the AAU, then, abide by the rules of those organizations from which it expects to draw the athletes? In short, if the AAU meet at San Diego was to be the final tryout, and the AAU wanted college athletes to compete, why should it not follow established rules of the colleges and obtain the necessary certification and sanction? The fact that college athletes did not show up in San Diego in any appreciable number, in my judgment, represents an AAU lockout rather than an NCAA boycott. Let me emphasize, it is not a question of the NCAA refusing to grant certification—the point is that the AAU won't seek it or accept it.

The issues which divide the U.S. Track and Field Federation (including the NCAA) and the AAU are real and meaningful and do not reflect petty bickering. There are many basic struggles going on in our world today which are quite worthwhile; in fact, the causes are absolutely necessary even though the reasons for engaging in such struggles get lost in the sometimes tragic, often misunderstood, and many times frustrating products of conflict. Such is the case in the school-college dispute with the AAU.

There are basic educational principles as well as sound athletic standards involved in this disagreement with the AAU. The school-college system of athletics forms the foundation stone for American athletic prowess in most of our sports. We believe we have an important and meaningful story to tell—meaningful not only to athletics in general but to the United States as a whole. We have long sought an impartial hearing board and that is why we have readily embraced the invitation of the Commerce Committee to appear at its hearing. I might observe that President Barnes of this association—prior to the AAU meet in San Diego—proposed binding arbitration to the AAU. The AAU declined to participate.

I look forward to the opportunity of meeting you at the time of the Commerce Committee hearings and, meanwhile, I am taking the liberty of enclosing publications which I hope you will find to be interesting.

Cordially yours,

WALTER BYERS,
Executive Director.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, both parties have thus shown themselves to be cooperative and apparently eager to reach a settlement. It may well be that the Commerce Committee hearings will result in a voluntary settlement.

But if the parties cannot or will not resolve this dispute themselves, then the Federal Government may be forced to step in once again. It is my hope that the NCAA and the AAU will be able to establish an arbitration board of some kind, on their own initiative. But if they do not, Congress may very well decide to do it for them.

I reiterate, Mr. President, that the parties to the dispute appear to be ready and willing to resolve it. I certainly hope that this will be the outcome of our hearings. We can ill afford to permit the continuation of a pitched battle between our leading athletic organizations, one which adversely affects the quality of our international competitors and punishes those innocent young athletes who happen to be caught in the middle. This situation will not be allowed to continue.

DEATH OF ERNEST S. BROWN, FORMER U.S. SENATOR FROM NEVADA

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I know my Senate colleagues share the sadness of Nevada's Senators on the sad passing last Friday of Ernest S. Brown who represented Nevada in the Senate for a brief period in 1954.

Many Senators remember Senator Brown, although he retired from public life after serving 2 months in the Senate during October and November of 1954.

Senator Brown was a valued friend whom I held in the very highest regard. He was a man of deep conviction, a true leader, and a mainstay of the Republican Party in Nevada.

Although I often disagreed with Senator Brown's political views, I always held him in the highest esteem, as did the many Members of the Senate who served with him.

He was virtually a life-long resident of Nevada, having moved there when he was 3 years old. He graduated from the University of Nevada in 1926 and later entered the practice of law in Nevada.

His life was one of achievement. He served in the Nevada Legislature, as district attorney of Washoe County, and as an officer in the U.S. Army during World War II.

Senator Brown's many contributions speak highly of him and he will be sorely missed by those of us who had the privilege of knowing him. I extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

RESOLUTION ON VIETNAM ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF THE MENNONITE CHURCH

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the General Conference of the Mennonite Church at its 37th triennial sessions, July 10 to 16, 1965, adopted a resolution, in which they expressed their views regarding the military situation and our involvement in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON VIETNAM

We, the delegates to the 37th triennial sessions of the General Conference Mennonite Church are deeply grieved over the course of action being pursued in Vietnam. We note the statements made by other church and religious bodies such as the Mennonite Central Committee in its letter of June 2, 1965, to the President of the United States, the Church of the Brethren in their resolution adopted by the 1965 annual conference, June 22–27, and the Fellowship of Reconciliation in its April 14, 1965, advertisement in the New York Times. We are in general agreement with their call for reappraisal of the U.S. Government policy in Vietnam. "We believe that war is altogether contrary to the teaching and spirit of Christ and the Gospel; that, therefore, war is sin."[1]

We recognize that many countries, including the United States, share responsibility for the war in Vietnam, and we abhor the subversion and aggression of the Communists in Vietnam. In the first place we call on the U.S. Government and the other governments involved immediately to halt and disavow the bombing of noncombatants, the torture of prisoners and other such acts of war which are particularly abhorrent even to many in the general public and which seriously damage relationships to the peoples of Asia.

Furthermore, as a conference, we appreciate the efforts of the U.S. Government to negotiate a settlement and urge that it continue to explore every possible means to end the war. Acknowledging the complex nature of the problem and the ambiguities involved we would propose consideration of the following steps:

1. Use the United Nations and agencies of government neutral to the conflict in negotiating and controlling a settlement of the war.

2. Use the reduction of military acts and increased economic aid to demonstrate our good faith and sincere desire to end the conflict. We believe that intensified and increased economic development in the Mekong Delta would contribute to the resolution of the total southeast Asian problem.

3. Initiate negotiations for a united Vietnam arrived at by an internationally supervised system of self-determination, without insisting strictly on our preference of a political, social, and economic order.

We have committed ourselves as a church to expand our aid to Vietnam through the agencies of the national churches there. We are urging the congregations of the General Conference Mennonite Church—

1. To study the situation in Vietnam and discuss the issues involved in their congregations;

2. To communicate our spiritual and moral concern for Vietnam to the public and to stimulate others to study and express their concern over Vietnam;

3. To support faithfully by prayer and through gifts the expanding work of the Mennonite Central Committee in Vietnam;

4. To continue in prayer that the Government leaders involved will be given wisdom and understanding to fulfill their responsibilities and that peace will come to Vietnam; and

5. To pray for the welfare and safety of all Christian workers in Vietnam, including our own, and especially for Daniel Gerber, Dr. Eleanor A. Vietti, and Archie Mitchell, who are being held captive by the Vietcong.

A FLAG FOR HUE, SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from two American servicemen who are among the many Americans currently defending freedom from Communist aggression in Vietnam.

This brief letter from two of my constituents reinforced my firm belief that our cause in Vietnam is right and just and, more than that, the attitude of Americans involved in that conflict is healthy and constructive.

The letter is from Pfc. David L. Dethlifsen, of New Castle, Ind., and Pfc. Roger W. Baser, of North Webster, Ind. I believe, Mr. President, you will agree that this note clearly indicates the respect in which Americans hold their South Vietnamese neighbors and the desire to help these people reach the goal of liberty and self-determination, free from the wanton aggression of the North.

MR. SENATOR: We are writing to you in request for an American flag which can be presented to the city of Hue, South Vietnam, for the strides they have made toward democracy and the stand they have taken against communism.

We wish to show the people of Hue that the American people as a whole, whether they fight on Vietnamese soil or live peacefully on American soil, admire and honor a city with strength, courage, and the desire for a better way of life.

It is particularly hard for these people of Hue, inasmuch as the city is fairly well separated from its center of government, Saigon, and because Hue is very close to the North Vietnam border.

Mr. President, I am pleased to inform the Senate that a flag flown over the Capitol of the United States will be shipped as soon as possible to the city of Hue, South Vietnam. I am equally pleased that two young Hoosiers were the individuals who thought of this way of honoring their friends with whom they are fighting side by side in defense of freedom.

SOVIET AGGRESSION AGAINST THE BALTIC STATES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, this year marks the 25th anniversary of the Soviet aggression against the Baltic States. This year also commemorates the 25th year of the heroic struggle for freedom by the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian peoples.

---

[1] From "A Christian Declaration on Peace, War and Military Service" adopted by General Conference Mennonite Church at Portland, Oreg., August 22, 1953.

This anniversary acquires a special meaning against the background of the recent events in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic as well as in view of the almost total elimination of Western colonial rule in the world, to which the continued Soviet colonial entrenchment in the Baltic States stands in sharp contrast.

I ask unanimous consent that the manifesto, issued by the Baltic States Freedom Council, which sums up the case for Baltic freedom, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the manifesto was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Manifesto by the 25th Anniversary of Soviet Aggression Against the Baltic States, by Free Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians

Twenty-five years ago, in connivance with Hitler's Germany, the Soviet Union attacked the Baltic States. Some 300,000 Red army troops poured into Lithuania on June 15, 1940, and into Latvia and Estonia, on June 17, 1940. With the assistance of the occupation army, the emissaries of the Kremlin—Dekanozov, Vishinsky, Zhdanov—unseated the legitimate governments of the Baltic States. The Baltic countries were robbed of their independence and transformed into colonies of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union's assault against its Baltic neighbors initiated the Soviet westward march against Europe. The beginnings of today's international tension and threat to peace may thus be found in the Soviet aggression against the Baltic States in 1940.

By its aggressive acts against Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, the U.S.S.R. broke the peace and nonaggression treaties it had signed with those states as well as other international agreements.

Expropriation, exploitation, papuerization, slave labor, suppression of human rights and fundamental freedoms, Russification, terror, murder, mass deportations—these are the marks of the Soviet occupation in the Baltic States. In committing and continuing these acts, the Soviets violated the United Nations Declaration, the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Charter, the Convention on the Suppression of Crimes of Genocide, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—all these documents bearing the signature of the U.S.S.R.

The Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian peoples, historically and traditionally Western in orientation and outlook, have consistently placed their hopes in the Western World. Their trust in the West was strengthened by the declaration of the U.S. Department of State of July 23, 1940; the statement of the President of the United States on October 15, 1941; the Atlantic Charter; the Yalta Declaration on Liberated Europe; the repeated statements by the U.S. Government about nonrecognition of the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States, the continued recognition of free Baltic diplomatic representatives by the United States as well as many European and South American governments; and the proclaimed aims and principles of the United Nations.

At the same time the hopes of the Baltic peoples have been strengthened by the global process of decolonization and the universal acceptance of the right of self-determination of nations. The liberation movement of the colonial peoples in Africa and Asia has helped to expose Soviet colonialism as well and has raised the hopes of captive Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians. They are convinced that the tide of emancipation from colonial rule will not stop at the borders of the Baltic countries.

The Baltic peoples have given active expression to their determination to regain freedom, and have resisted their oppressors, thus contributing greatly to the continuing struggle for freedom and justice being waged by all captive peoples enslaved by the Soviet Union. Despite heavy setbacks and trials, our peoples maintain their faith in the restoration of their freedom and independence.

This summer the Soviet enslavers will unveil a macabre spectacle—a festive celebration of the 25th anniversary of the enslavement of the Baltic States during which the captive Baltic peoples will be coerced to appear grateful to their conquerors.

We—free Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians—are conscious of our responsibility toward our nations and to history. At this 25th anniversary of Soviet aggression, we feel dutybound to give voice to the will and the aspirations of our captive peoples:

We accuse the Soviet Union of committing and continuing an international crime against the Baltic States;

We demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its military, police, and administrative personnel from the Baltic countries;

We request that the governments of the free world, especially those of the great powers, use all peaceful ways and means to restore the exercise of the right to self-determination in the Baltic countries and in the rest of East-Central Europe;

We further request that the United Nations' Decolonization Committee immediately fulfill its overdue duty and take up the case of Soviet colonialism in the Baltic States;

We appeal to the conscience of all mankind to perceive the magnitude of the injustice perpetrated upon the Baltic people and to support the efforts toward the restoration of liberty to these countries;

We convey to our people at home our pride in their resolute resistance against the endeavors of the oppressor to destroy their national and personal identity;

We share with our captive compatriots their view that the recent Soviet economic, political and ideological setbacks—inherent in the structure of their totalitarian system—have considerably weakened the Soviet Union and thus raised the hopes of the captives for deliverance;

We pledge to intensify our joined organized activity in the free world to promote the cause of liberty for the Baltic countries;

We finally declare to the free world and the Communist-dominated world, including the U.S.S.R., that, once free again, the Baltic nations will do all in their power to insure the best possible relations with their neighbors on the basis of mutual respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity.

BETTER DAY FOR MIGRANT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, despite contradictory, factual information, some people are still laboring under the false impression that the ending of the importation of foreign farmworkers has caused crops to rot in the fields and the prices of fruits and vegetables to increase.

The New York Times, which has, over the years, taken great interest in farm labor problems, refutes these charges in its July 18 editorial stating:

> A Labor Department survey over the past 9 weeks indicates that most farm products have been selling in the wholesale market at prices below those of 1964. The spread between what the housewife pays and what it costs to pick most fruits and vegetables is so great that even a doubling of farm wages would have only a slight direct impact on market-basket prices.

This editorial, which I believe will be of great interest to all Members of this body, goes on to state:

> The need now is to extend to migratory American farm laborers some of the protections that are basic for virtually all other American workers.

The concluding paragraph of this editorial is especially worthwhile. It declares that:

> A nation dedicated to abolishing poverty cannot continue to neglect the most elementary rights of the most deprived group in its work force.

I believe the Senate should have the benefit of this informative commentary, and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent for this editorial to be printed in the Record.

Better Day for the Migrant

More than a half-year has passed since Congress cut off the mass inflow of foreign labor willing to work at starvation wages to harvest American crops. Despite continued expressions of anguish from many large farm owners, the transition to total reliance on domestic workers has been encouraging. Only 1,500 foreign workers are now engaged in offsetting local labor shortages on American farms, compared with more than 54,000 at the same time last year.

A sterner test may come in September and October, but thus far the evidence is strong that the Nation's food needs can be well met without reopening the floodgates for low-cost labor from Mexico, the West Indies, and other areas. Secretary of Labor Wirtz deserves credit for his refusal, under incessant political pressure, to yield to the warnings of disaster with which California growers bombarded him. He stood courageously on the principle that enough domestic labor would be found if wages and living conditions for field workers were brought up to a level of decency.

The interesting fact is not only that he has been proved right on this score, but also that fruit and vegetable prices have not skyrocketed as a result of the bettered labor standards. A Labor Department survey over the past 9 weeks indicates that most farm products have been selling in the wholesale market at prices below those of 1964. The spread between what the housewife pays and what it costs to pick most fruits and vegetables is so great that even a doubling of farm wages would have only a slight direct impact on market-basket prices.

The need now is to extend to migratory American farm laborers some of the protections that are basic for virtually all other American workers. Mr. Wirtz has told a Senate subcommittee of his strong personal support for the inclusion of farmworkers under both the Federal minimum wage and the statutory guarantees of freedom to bargain collectively. But he emphasized that there was no official administration position in favor of either of these highly salutary objectives. There ought to be.

A nation dedicated to abolishing poverty cannot continue to neglect the most elementary rights of the most deprived group in its work force.

MEXICO'S DEMOCRACY: ITS ACHIEVEMENTS AND PROBLEMS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a very thoughtful summary of Mexico's position in the world was delivered yesterday at the 57th annual Governors' conference in Minneapolis by the Honorable Hugo B. Margain, who has recently come to the United States as Mexico's Ambassador.

With many part of the world in chaos and grave problems confronting nearly all of our Latin American neighbors, it is desirable that the people of the United States understand why Mexico is the most stable of all the Latin American countries. It is due, in my judgment—as one who has studied and been familiar with Mexico for nearly half a century—to the Mexican revolution itself. It is the one outstanding example of a successful political and social revolution in this century in Latin America.

It is a regrettable fact that a number of other Latin American countries need revolutions, but the difficulty is that any such attempted revolution today is almost invariably infiltrated by the Communists, who pervert the social political and economic reforms of a needed revolution into an imposed tyranny with suppression of all liberties and ruthless extermination of dissenters. It was precisely to achieve the results of revolution without these untoward aspects that the Alliance for Progress came into being. It is still very much of a question whether it can be successful in this worthwhile endeavor.

The Mexican revolution antedated the export of communism from Moscow and later from China, and was responsive wholly to indigenous needs. The reforms which the Mexican revolution sought, and has in large measure achieved, were derived from the Mexicans' own experience. As a result, the Constitution of 1917, as Ambassador Margain has pointed out, intensified nationalism, the abolition of vast land holdings, and the consequent peonage which existed on them, no presidential reelection, and wrote a new chapter of freedom for the people of Mexico.

While the violent phase of the revolution lasted nearly a decade and was succeeded for the following 10 years by occasional military coups, all of which fortunately failed, Mexico has now, for 30 years, enjoyed stability and progress. The basic freedoms are all there and fully protected. There is freedom of the press, assembly, speech, and of worship. Mexico, however, still has serious problems, as Ambassador Margain points out in quoting President Diaz Ordaz, that the liberty and equality which Mexicans prize and seek cannot be fully realized in the presence of vast poverty. That poverty still exists and is widespread. Efforts to diminish it are partly nullified by population growth. It demonstrates that the Mexican revolution is not yet finished, although now, for more than a generation, it has passed into an evolutionary stage.

I am happy to say that relations between the United States and Mexico, which, for the first century of Mexican independence, were harassed by deep misunderstandings and occasionally by actions which, in retrospect, may be viewed as regrettable, today have never been better. The long-standing Chamizal issue, the settlement of which the United States avoided for half a century, was settled through the statesmanship of President Kennedy. The salinity problem in the State of Sonora, due to the salinization of water flowing across the border to which Mexico is entitled, is now on its way to settlement. The annual Interparliamentary Unions, several of which I have been fortunate in attending, are increasingly demonstrating the good will and desire for mutual understanding and helpfulness which characterize our present relations.

Thus, the relations between Mexico and the United States, one of our two land neighbors, represent a happy, demonstration of what can be accomplished in international understanding when intelligence and purpose are joined, as they now are.

I ask unanimous consent that the address of Mexico's Ambassador, Hugo B. Margain, delivered before the 57th annual meeting of the Governors' conference in Minneapolis on July 26, 1965, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY H. E. HUGO B. MARGAIN, AMBASSADOR OF MEXICO TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AT THE 57TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., JULY 26, 1965

It is a high distinction for me to attend the State luncheon of this important Governors' conference, at its 57th annual meeting.

I shall speak to you about the Mexican revolution, which is the basis of modern Mexico, and explain why we enjoy political stability, economic progress, and social development, under absolute respect for human liberty. This singular situation prevailing in my country is fully realized when studying events of the past 50 years.

As all social revolutions in our century, the Mexican revolution has been nothing but a vigorous reaction against the crisis brought about by individualism during the 19th century. The principles of the French Revolution—liberty, equality, and fraternity, as applied to political and economic theories—originated great injustices. At the same time that the ideas of liberalism developed in the past century, the industrial revolution appeared and, as a result of it, mass production and the control of international markets. All dealings between workers and employers under the false supposition of equality between both parties and the free expression of their will, permitted the inhuman 16 hours of work per day, hunger wages, and all kinds of abuses to which the workers were subjected, who were treated even worse than during the times of slavery. The social crisis generated by the excesses of individualism, and Government's absence from the economic phenomenon and from the contractual obligations between employer and worker, produced a violent reaction in the field of ideas against the prevailing injustices and against the economic imperialism of the great industrial centers over underdeveloped peoples.

As a natural consequence of the great crisis through which the prevailing individualism found itself, the ideas of social transformation appeared and prevailed. Very likely this era of reaction will be known in the future as the century of social revolutions.

Mexico started its social revolution in 1910, the first in our century. The fundamental political decisions with social contents incorporated in our Constitution of 1917, were inspired by the aspirations of our working classes, and by the rebellious standard-bearers of our traditionally oppressed peasants: "Land and Liberty," "Bread for All," "The Land Belongs to the One Who Works It," "Exploit the Land and Not the Man"—these were the slogans of our agrarian revolution.

As against land monopoly, this historical movement struggled to destroy the latifundia, and to defend ourselves from economic imperialism, it aspired to a nationalistic economic integration. The Mexican revolution was the natural consequence of a 30-year dictatorship and for this reason it endeavored to create an authentic representative democracy and established the principle of "no reelection." To counteract the appearance of monopolies, it established the bases of government intervention in the economic field. To face private exploitation of the subsoil, nationalization of the subsoil was secured. As against limited education for the privileged, it established nationwide, free education. In the face of egotism, leaving the worker abandoned when ill, unemployed, old, and his family to shift for itself when death came, it established social security for everyone working in Mexico.

To fight systems of taxation reminiscent of privileges under which the disinherited and poor were taxed proportionately more and lighter taxation was for those enjoying wealth, tax systems were adopted that permit a better redistribution of income by granting a vital minimum tax exemption for the lower income, and progressive schedules as individual income increases, with a tendency to simultaneously protect reinvestment favorable to economic development.

At the same time, in international affairs and as an instinctive affirmation of survival, the Mexican revolution reiterated the principles of nonintervention and self-determination of peoples, to which we owe the ability to survive the catastrophes of the past century that gave us the net loss of over half our territory, and five international wars.

In the year 1917, and under our Constitution, a modern democratic nation was erected to correct the abuses of individualism, and for this purpose it consecrated individual rights and established a series of social rights for the disinherited.

Faithful to the aspirations of the peasants, the solid foundation of the agrarian reform was built against latifundia, and the land was turned over to the people under the "ejido" under a policy of social progress which, at that time, was subjected to strong criticism and which, at the present time, is considered as one of Mexico's very best discoveries.

The Mexican Constitution of 1917 was the product of the sources of real power in our country, and the thinking of our popular leaders was predominant among the delegates to the constitutional convention. It was not the work of a group intellectuals, even though very distinguished ones were there, knowledgeable in the prevailing social doctrines. It was the spontaneous, authentic product of rough leaders without university background, who heard the clamor of the hour and had the certainty of the path to follow, backed up by commonsense.

True, that it was not the work of men experienced in general theories, and for this reason they did not establish theoretical principles aspiring to create a doctrine. They came straight from the people, and knew of their anguish, for they had suffered their miseries and knew their appalling needs. It was the work of men without university education, with a practical sense and specific aspirations—Carlos Gracidas, for example, was a humble typesetter who demanded the establishment of profit sharing.

The 1917 Constitution was not produced by the intellectuals, it was the offspring of a violent and fruitful struggle among the various groups from the Mexican revolution, gathered for that purpose in the city of Querétaro. The men of culture among the constituents felt the pressure from the direct representatives of the people who secured the distribution of the land for, indeed, they came from suffering all kinds of vexations in landowners' stores, their private jails, and hunger wages. Labor unions were legalized by labor leaders who with heroism fought against individualism that had exploited them. The maximum 8-hour workday was established by those who had labored from sunup to sundown.

The constituents of 1917, facing the imperative of the hour, succeeded in resolving the fundamental problems of Mexico and gave us our charter, the Constitution under which it is now possible to progress without the deviations of individualistic capitalism and to recognize social rights without losing individual liberty, so essential to a democratic nation, in harmony with a solution all our own, born from the very hearts of our people. Such solution, adequate for our country, is confirmed by Mexico and with its affirmation Mexico defends it. Any doctrine, whatever it may be, attempting the negation of the basic principles of the Mexican revolution, will have to be fought and rejected.

This is the hour when we must avoid the ailment of our century. As a result of so many crises, we have a proliferation at the present time of negative doctrines. In fact, all peoples must first affirm and then, by defending their affirmations, reject. It is most important to abandon mere negative doctrines, and to maintain affirmative doctrines. It is quite dangerous to adopt attitudes of combat without having beforehand made affirmations. At the present time, several peoples are giving that negative sensation of rejecting without affirming anything whatsoever or, worse yet, for the sole purpose of defending a status quo of oppression and social injustice. There, I believe, we find the greatest latent danger of our time.

Mexico's present affirmation of its revolutionary principles is evident in a series of basic postulates. It maintains that the essence of the doctrinal framework of our Revolution is to be found in the 1917 Constitution, and in the institutions established under that Constitution, which has been the guide for our present political, economic, social, and cultural development.

As a natural consequence of affirming the basic principles of our Constitution, we reject and deny validity to doctrines attempting to substitute or destroy it.

In Mexico we respect liberty. We cannot, however, understand it in a suicidal sense. It cannot be used by those attempting its destruction, or denying the basic principles of our 1917 Constitution, and of our revolutionary institutions. It would be tantamount to betraying the historical movement that has permitted our survival and growth in the midst of the storm. President Dias Ordaz has expressed it with all clarity when he said: "All liberties exist in Mexico, except one: Freedom to end all liberties."

Ideologists, such as Locke, considered private property as the basis of individual liberty. In practice, individual property, at the time of individualistic liberalism, brought about the enslavement of many people. Social revolutions endeavor to secure freedom for men who are subjugated. The 1917 Constitution has followed the path of applying individual property in such a manner as to protect human liberty and enslave no one.

We need mechanisms for redistribution. Social development is not a doctrine devoid of contents, nor is it a merely verbal political attitude. Social development is achieved with effective mechanisms for the redistribution of national income. The nations that have no such legal instruments for redistribution turn their backs on present-day problems and only aggravate injustices the world faced due to last century's individualism.

Some of the basic principles of the 1917 Constitution in connection with nationalism, governmental intervention in the economy, redistribution of national income, and social rights are, for example, article 123 insuring minimum rights for the workers; article 27 containing nationalization of the subsoil and agrarian reform, social security for workers, peasants, and bureaucrats; fiscal reform with progressive taxation on profits and vital minimum exemptions for effective redistribution; compulsory profit sharing for the workers; ejido and agricultural banks supplying farm credit; Mexican ownership of banking, insurance and bonding institutions and their national supervision by Government commissions; Nacional Financiera promoting industrialization; free public education and free textbooks for the students; vigorous and systematic building of schools, 23.42 percent of the Federal budget being spent on public education plus state budgetary appropriations also being devoted for that purpose; free distribution of breakfast to schoolchildren; Government investments in exclusive economic fields such as electric power, oil, basic petrochemicals, and railways; guaranteed prices for farm products; health and welfare work in shops and rural communities; price controls for basic foodstuffs and their sale at low prices; minimum wage revision every 2 years; rate schedules for public services with social contents; Government control of imports and exports to safeguard the economic integration of the country; irrigation works; feeder roads called in Mexico "neighbourly roads"; electric power for distant communities; and other social institutions no less important.

We know, as Tacitus said, that laws unmindful of customs are ignored, and in the face of deviations of rationalist jus-naturalism, we assert the need of juridical development harmonious with historical ideas, preferring to have the social realities of our people germinate the institutions that must govern. In the face of imitations beyond logic, countries must choose logical development. Since we have resolved Mexican social problems in theory with the 1917 Constitution, since our generation has harvested the first healthful fruits issuing from its application, and since the principles are consecrated in practice by their efficacy, our mission now is to defend and protect our institutions with the energy and determination of those who defend and protect what is their own, vital, the very essence of nationality.

The various groups of diverse opinion in Mexico accept the general framework and cooperate with our specific constitutional institutions. What is legitimate and open to discussion is the question of how much out of national income is to be devoted to reinvestment and new investment, and how much must be destined to works of social benefit.

A nation with a mixed economy, Mexico must have capitalization to progress and, at the same time, carry out works of social benefit according to the Constitution, which result in consolidating economic progress by enhancing the domestic market.

We live under a system of law and consecrated individual liberties. This social progress under no circumstances is to be lost. A regime under law with effective liberties for only a select group and mere formalities for the majority, nowadays is doomed. It is of the utmost urgency to recognize individual liberty with an economic content, based on equality and combating all aspects of misery.

We have already witnessed how internally our people must rapidly establish the indispensable mechanisms for redistribution of national income, having as their goal the raising of living standards of the population. By so doing, besides complying with present-day social demands, a vigorous domestic market will be achieved, as the foundation of a healthful industrial integration. As to the international scope, developing countries such as Mexico have been demanding an indispensable revision of world trade, in order to avoid interchange phenomena harmful to their economies, and thus allow rapid economic development as the basis of their social progress.

Commercial development in our hemisphere, not to speak of other countries belonging to other economic areas, requires constant revision of our commercial relationship.

It already is rather old fashioned to make remarks about the dangerous fundamental deterioration of interchange. We must avoid, consequently, the drop in prices of raw materials, constantly downgrade, while having a tendency to higher prices for capital goods. This handicap impoverishes our peoples and is one of the most important obstacles to their sociopolitical development.

Irrespective of having considered a series of instrumentalities to guarantee remunerative prices for raw materials, the request has been made, as for instance at the Geneva meeting, that developing countries in strategic geographical locations be allowed to furnish their tropical products to international markets. Under this project, subsidies ought to be withdrawn from this type of production in the United States, and instead acquire from our countries tropical raw materials. It has been frequently stated that, rather than loans, Latin America needs fair prices for its exports.

The enhancement of domestic markets in our countries is achieved by securing purchasing power for the majority of our population. The enhancement of foreign markets must be attained by using all possible means. For this purpose, the people of Latin America must sell ever larger quantities of intermediate and finished products, at more stable prices, in order to purchase with that foreign exchange capital goods for their more rapid development. This is bound to result in opening U.S. markets with more largess, and not levying excessive tariff duties on merchandise and products from our area.

Another aspect is that of credits for Latin American economic development, which should be extended preferably for the purchase of machinery and equipment within our own countries, rather than to continue making them conditional to the purchase of those tools for progress in developed countries.

A revision of "convention" cargoes is also required, as they force higher rates on our countries that have no merchant fleet, and have just entered foreign markets. Rate discrimination, on occasion, makes it impossible for our products to compete with those of highly developed countries protecting their products with very low special cargo rates.

It is likewise harmful to our development to subject to import quotas the entry of our products into this huge United States market. Drops in international prices ruin our economies; and as soon as there is a tendency to higher prices, the establishment of import quotas limits our income. It has been recommended that preference in the United States market be given to hemispheric production, particularly now that the world has been divided in areas for the obvious purpose of favoring area production. The European Common Market has hurt Latin American exports, and its preference for consumption of African products has shrunk Latin American exports. To compensate this actual loss, it is advisable to give preference to hemispheric production in what the United States consumes.

May I reiterate that the creation of mechanisms for domestic redistribution to raise living standards of the majority of the people, and a revision of international trade with a view to legitimately protecting developing countries, are measures demanded by the urgency of our times, which permit no delay lest greater social upheavals, political instability, and economic stagnation are to take place.

At the present hour of universal anguish and of legitimate aspirations of impoverished peoples, it is important to radically and effectively combat oppression, ignorance, sickness, and all manifestations of the misery of the people. Those who attempt to forget these urgent pending duties, by attacking or pretending to attack doctrines that are incompatible with our democratic systems, are only provoking an indispensable social revolution among their own peoples. The peace all of us are striving for is not secured at the price of oppression.

We want democracy, and yet, we forget that democracy is based upon liberty and equality. As President Díaz Ordaz clearly stated: "Liberty and equality cannot exist side by side with poverty, if there is poverty, there is neither equality nor liberty" and, consequently, we may conclude that there is no democracy wherever there is poverty. The social problem of subjected peoples must be resolved within the framework of their own and fundamentally democratic ideas. Then, and only then, shall peace be secured.

THE REFUGEE SITUATION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a nationally syndicated article by Mr. Leo Cherne, dealing with the refugee situation in South Vietnam, and the efforts of the International Rescue Committee to help alleviate the lot of the refugees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DODD. Mr. Cherne, who is perhaps best known as executive director of the Research Institute of America, has for almost two decades now played a leading role in the work of the International Rescue Committee, a nonsectarian organization dedicated to the assistance of all those who escape from totalitarian persecution.

Mr. Cherne has always believed that in planning any refugee program there is no substitute for on-the-spot inspection by the responsible heads of an organization.

Thus, in helping to organize the IRC's Hungarian refugee relief program, he became one of the first Americans to enter Budapest after its liberation.

In his recent tour of Vietnam he helicoptered around much of the countryside. Among other things he visited Dong Xoai shortly after the terrible battle which took place there last month.

He describes the city as a smoldering ruin, with streets filled with broken, smashed bodies, many of them women and children.

Mr. Cherne makes a basic point which some of the critics of our Vietnam policy ignore. He points out that the Vietnamese people have given conclusive proof of their hatred of communism in the massive refugee flow from North to South Vietnam, and in the flow from Communist dominated areas to non-Communist dominated areas.

Mr. Cherne also points out that there are 100,000 war-orphaned children in Vietnam and that the International Rescue Committee has decided to make this situation a special project. The IRC is appealing to the American people for a fund of $2.5 million to assist the Vietnamese orphans and to provide medicines for the Vietnamese people.

I believe that all of us in this Chamber are familiar with the truly heroic work carried out by the International Rescue Committee over the decades—first in assisting the victims of Nazi totalitarianism; then, in the postwar period, assisting the scores of thousands of refugees from the Communist dominated countries in Europe; then in assisting the Hungarian refugees after the brutal suppression of the Hungarian Revolution; and more recently, in assisting refugees from Cuba and the refugees from communism in Vietnam.

I am sure that all of you who are familiar with the work of this great organization will wish it every possible success in raising the funds which it has made its target for relief in Vietnam.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Des Moines Register, July 6, 1965]

THE PLIGHT OF REFUGEES IN VIETNAM

(By Leo Cherne)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—Vietnam has become a nation of refugees. Some 380,000 peasants and villagers have crowded into the coastal towns as a result of Vietcong harassment.

Wherever the Vietcong have struck or threaten to strike—and this covers much of the countryside right up to the edge of Saigon—the Vietnamese people are often uprooted, homeless, ill or wounded, hungry. They are in desperate need of the essentials of life—food, clothing, shelter, medical care.

VOTING WITH THEIR FEET

The refugee problem is nothing new for Vietnam. In the summer of 1954, shortly after the defeat of the French and the signing of the Geneva agreement which partitioned the country along the 17th parallel, a massive flow of refugees from the Communist north had already begun.

The International Rescue Committee (IRC) set up an emergency program to aid these people who are voting for freedom in the only way they could, with their feet. Eventually almost 900,000 Vietnamese cast their lot with freedom by making the trip from the north.

The direction of the refugee flow clearly contradicts the claim that the Vietnamese do not understand the nature of the struggle against communism or are indifferent to the rule by the Communist north. Only about 10,000 Vietnamese crossed the 17th parallel heading north and many of those were Vietcong cadre returning home for more training.

THEY MUST FLEE AGAIN

Many who escaped south 10 years ago, now must flee again. They are the peasants and the villagers of Vietnam, the very people the Vietcong are supposed to have won to their side. My observations and conversations with Vietnamese and Americans here, have convinced me that the Vietcong have so savagely terrorized the peasantry that they have made them their mortal enemies.

I helicoptered from Saigon to Dong Xoai shortly after the siege which resulted in 33 American and 650 Vietnamese casualties. The Vietcong had burned out a large portion of the town. For a brief time they had occupied the village. They entered every household and stripped it of every scrap of food and every piastre which could be used to buy food.

When the Vietcong retreated they left Dong Xoai a smoldering ruin and streets filled with broken, smashed bodies (many of them women and children) some dead, others dying, still other condemned to live the rest of their lives horribly maimed.

U.S. RESCUE MISSION

The dust of battle had hardly settled when personnel from the U.S. operations mission (USOM) (our civilian aid program) and the U.S. Army Civil Affairs officers entered the town to take an inventory of needs.

It was arranged to fly in 5,000 kilos of rice. On behalf of the IRC I undertook to obtain 500 kilos of protein-rich fish and 50 pounds of salt, also to be flown in by U.S. Army helicopter.

These supplies, together with some powdered milk which the Vietcong somehow missed, kept the people of Dong Xoai from starving in a country in which starvation is rare.

Emergency medical treatment was begun immediately.

I have read much about our military involvement in Vietnam. But at Dong Xoai I could not help thinking that much of our work in Vietnam is not military in the strict sense, that much of our efforts are constructive, even life sustaining.

The children are a very special part of the tragedy of Vietnam. I have seen more horribly injured, broken, maimed children in a week in Vietnam than in my lifetime. There are perhaps 100,000 war-orphaned children in Vietnam.

EMERGENCY FUND DRIVE

We in the IRC have set an emergency fund goal of $2.5 million—the highest in our 33-year history. The majority of these funds will go to aid the orphans. We also have undertaken a program to provide an initial $500,000 in medicines to aid the Vietnamese. We hope to get a large measure of support from the American people.

The task of raising this kind of fund is herculean, but it is only a small part of what must be done to aid this nation of refugees. If we fail to alleviate the pain and suffering of these people, no matter what the outcome of the war in Vietnam, we will have failed in our purpose as Americans and as human beings.

EASTERN AIRLINES PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH NONSTOP SERVICE BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND HAWAII

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, we of Hawaii had good news yesterday when we heard of Eastern Airlines' announcement that it was proposing to link by direct nonstop service some of the great cities in the eastern half of the United States with our continually developing islands. We, of course, warmly welcome Eastern's proposals not only because they would link us more closely with the industrial centers of the United States, but for their endorsement of our own faith in the future of Hawaii and the Pacific and for the growth that we all know that direct air service would contribute to our State.

I would hope that the Civil Aeronautics Board will move promptly in their proceedings on this important matter. On a more personal basis, I would also hope that after the certification of these routes, it will be even easier for my friends in this Chamber to spend more time with us in the 50th State.

Mr. President, as many Senators will remember, it was only 6 short years ago that the dream of statehood for Hawaii was finally attained. And many of us still hear in our hearts the echoes of the words of those who argued against statehood for Hawaii. "Hawaii is not contiguous with the mainland," they said. And, in fact, when it took the most modern airplane then flying 20 hours, including necessary stopovers on the west coast, to carry passengers from New York or Washington to Hawaii, our opponents' arguments were more difficult to counter. Six years later Hawaii is a State and yesterday we were reminded it is less than 9 hours away.

Mr. President, we of Hawaii welcome these new route proposals and look forward to the early day when the promises therein will be realities.

AN INTERNATIONAL MONETARY CONFERENCE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I was greatly encouraged by Secretary of the Treasury Fowler's recent speech which indicated the willingness of our Government to participate in a conference on our international monetary machinery. Secretary Fowler's speech marked a significant step forward toward a solution of the balance-of-payments problem which continues to plague not only the United States but other nations as well. Secretary Fowler's comments were made in the context of a marked improvement in our balance of payments—an improvement I might add due to the fine efforts of President Johnson, Douglas Dillon, and Robert Roosa. This new willingness on the part of the United States is not motivated by a new crisis in the strength of the dollar, but rather by a farsighted determination to improve our international means of exchange in a calm atmosphere and not during a future payments crisis.

The Evening Star for July 19 contains a fine editorial praising President Johnson for his well timed call for an international conference. As this editorial correctly points out:

> It has been clear for 2 years or more that reform of the free world's monetary system will be needed to prevent a liquidity crisis that could stifle the international economy. But, until now, conditions for negotiations have been wrong.

I am hopeful that an international conference can be speedily arranged. Now is the time to act when the nations of the world are aware of the problem, are seeking solutions, but are not driven by financial panic to protect their own interests at the expense of others. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TOWARD MONETARY REFORM

A shrewd bargainer knows when to negotiate and when to wait. After resisting pressure to move faster, the Johnson administration finally has called for an International Monetary Conference. The call is well timed.

It has been clear for 2 years or more that reform of the free world's monetary system will be needed to prevent a liquidity crisis that could stifle the international economy. But, until now, conditions for negotiations have been wrong.

Chronic deficits in the U.S. balance of payments poured a steady stream of dollars into foreign countries. To a point, the dollars were welcome. But the flow at length became a glut, and in that atmosphere a shortage of exchange was the last thing Europeans felt inclined to worry about. There was widespread skepticism about the ability and will of the United States to stop the flow of dollars. Proposals to expand liquidity sounded like schemes to relieve the United States of the need to balance its accounts.

The picture has changed radically since the President launched an emergency campaign in mid-February to eliminate the payments deficit. Although the danger of backsliding has not vanished, the campaign actually yielded us a surplus in the April–June quarter. It already has started to tighten the supply of dollars abroad. The scarcity still is spotty and mild, but it gives the Europeans a foretaste of the real trouble they could encounter. They now have an equal stake with us in reform which would provide for an orderly growth of liquidity.

In the negotiations that lie ahead, expansion of credit mechanisms could help solve the liquidity problem. Beyond credit, it probably will be necessary to create additional reserves. One way would be to invent a "composite reserve unit," or "CRU." Major countries would deposit currencies in a pool and would receive CRU's representing their shares. The CRU's would be held in reserves and used in settling international accounts.

The detailed U.S. position on the shape of monetary reform has not jelled, but key principles are clear:

1. American negotiators will not consider devaluation of the dollar or a return to the gold standard.

2. The International Monetary Fund must provide the framework for a revised monetary system, and underdeveloped countries must participate.

3. The dollar must be maintained in its special status as a reserve currency.

Negotiations will be slow and difficult. But the growing strength of our dollar means at last that there is reason to hope for a successful outcome.

THE MESS IN VIETNAM—XVIII

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, Walter Lippmann, the internationally known columnist, in his syndicated column printed in this morning's Washington Post entitled "Asian War," is saying precisely what I have been saying for nearly a year and a half, starting with my full-length address to the Senate on March 10, 1964.

I can only wish that President Johnson would follow the course that is clearly implicit in this appraisal of our unfortunate, unnecessary, and unjustified military commitment in southeast Asia, with its steadily mounting toll of American lives and its foreseeable disastrous consequences.

I ask unanimous consent that Walter Lippmann's column appearing in today's Washington Post entitled "Asian War" be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 27, 1965]

TODAY AND TOMORROW: ASIAN WAR

(By Walter Lippmann)

We are about to pit Americans against Asians on the continent of Asia. Except for the diminishing and disintegrating South Vietnamese Army, we have only token or verbal support from any Asian country. No great Asian power, Japan, India, or Pakistan, is alined with us. None of our European allies is contributing anything beyond scattered verbal support. We have no mandate from the United Nations as we had in Korea, none from NATO, none from the nations of this hemisphere.

The situation in which we find ourselves is unprecedented, and the best the administration has been able to achieve by way of approval and support from our own people is a reluctant and depressed acquiescence. For there has been no proof, not even a real attempt to prove, that the security of the United States is vitally threatened in this war as it was, for example, when Hitler was in sight of the conquest of Britain and the capture of the British fleet, or when Japan with a great navy threatened to command the whole Pacific Ocean including Hawaii and the coast of California.

Nations fight well when they are defending themselves, when, that is to say, they have a vital interest. It is the lack of an American vital interest which explains the current mood of depression and anxiety, which explains why our intervention in southeast Asia has for 10 years been so gingerly, so furtive, so inadequate.

There are in truth two main reasons why we are becoming ever more deeply involved in Vietnam. The first, must the more powerful of the two, is a proud refusal to admit a mistake, to admit the failure of an attempt, begun 10 years ago, to make South Vietnam a pro-American and anti-Chinese state. More than anything else we are fighting to avoid admitting a failure—to put it bluntly, we are fighting to save face.

There is a second reason which weighs heavily with many conscientious people. It is a respectable reason. As stated by the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday:

"We're in Vietnam at the express invitation of the Vietnamese Government; we're fighting there for the Vietnamese people. But we're fighting also for the millions of people in the other threatened lands beyond, people who haven't the power to defend themselves from the Chinese colossus, and whose lives, safety, and freedom depend on the strong arm of the policeman—which only we can provide."

My own view is that the conception of ourselves as the solitary policeman of mankind is a dangerous form of self-delusion. The United States is quite unable to police the world, and it is dangerous to profess and pretend that we can be the policeman of the world. How many more Dominican Republics can the United States police in this hemisphere? How many Vietnams can the United States defend in Asia?

The believers in America as the world policeman get around these practical difficulties by making an assumption—that what happens in Vietnam will determine what happens elsewhere in Asia, that what happens in the Dominican Republic will determine what happens all over Latin America. This notion of the decisive test is a fallacy. The Korean war, in which we successfully defended South Korea, did not determine the outcome in Indochina. What we have done in the Dominican Republic will not protect any other Latin American country from the threat of revolution.

Revolutionary wars are indeed dangerous to order and it is baffling to know how to deal with them. But we may be sure that the phenomenon of revolutionary wars, which is latent in all of the underdeveloped regions of the world, cannot be dealt with by American military intervention whenever disorder threatens to overwhelm the constituted authority. On the contrary, it is more likely that in making Vietnam the test of our ability to protect Asia, we shall in fact provide revolutionary China with just the enemy it needs in order to focus popular hatred against us—a white, rich, capitalistic great power. We are allowing ourselves to be cast in the role of the enemy of the miserable and unhappy masses of the emerging nations.

DEATH OF ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, at a time when our country was caught in a tide of complacency, Adlai Stevenson summoned the Democratic Party in 1962:

> Let's talk sense to the American people * * * there are no gains without pains. * * * This is the eve of great decisions, not easy decisions * * * but a long, patient, costly struggle which alone can assure triumph over the great enemies of mankind.

Despite the odds, Adlai Ewing Stevenson never stopped talking sense. To a nation parading its nuclear might, he warned of the dangers of atmospheric testing. To a people already wearied by the complexities of the cold war, he cautioned against the easy panacea.

Yet, two election defeats never daunted his courage, never dampened his devotion to his country. As our Ambassador to the United Nations which he helped construct 20 years earlier, he took upon his shoulders the criticisms directed at all Americans, and by so doing, blunted, and softened the accusations of our critics.

Adlai Stevenson represented the finest in our American heritage. In the forum of world politics, he was at once our spokesman and our ideal. We, and history, will mourn his loss.

AMBASSADOR ARTHUR GOLDBERG

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, yesterday Arthur Goldberg was sworn in as our Ambassador to the United Nations. Very few times in the history of this great land of ours has a man left the security, quiet, and prestige of the Supreme Court for a position as demanding and soul-trying. I join my many fellow Americans in praising the former Mr. Justice and now Ambassador, Arthur Goldberg for taking this courageous step.

All Americans can again feel at ease that our country is being represented before the nations of the world by a man who typifies the best attributes of our people. We all felt this was true while Adlai Stevenson was our representative at the U.N., and I know that I, as I am sure was true with the rest of my fellow Americans, felt greatly reassured when it was announced that then Mr. Justice Goldberg had agreed to assume this awesome burden.

Ambassador Goldberg has a brilliance of mind which made him a great private lawyer, a widely respected Secretary of Labor, and a greatly admired member of the Court. Long before he reached such high position, this brilliance was recognized. My old friend and teacher, the eminent professor of law, Leon Green, of the University of Texas, has often stated with pride that while he was dean of the Northwestern University Law School, his star pupil was Arthur Goldberg. My own acquaintance with the Ambassador runs back more than 10 years.

Ambassador Goldberg throughout his illustrious career has always been one of those who advance the frontiers of thought. As a jurist this has been typified by his concern for the innocent victims of crime. This is a field in which I have long been interested, and was greatly encouraged by Ambassador Goldberg's continued advocacy of a plan to provide compensation for the victims of crime. A man of his caliber, one who becomes increasingly concerned with the victims of crime while it is fashionable jurisprudence to concentrate solely on constitutional rights of the accused, is a man who is excellently qualified to represent our Government and our people before the nations of the world.

H.R. 7984, HOUSING ACT OF 1965

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Congress in passing H.R. 7984, the Housing Act of 1965, has taken another step in solving this Nation's farm labor problems. Section 905 of this bill increases from $10 to $50 million the total appropriation authorized through 1969 for Federal assistance grants for the construction of low-rent housing for American farm labor.

As chairman of the Migratory Labor Subcommittee, I have carefully studied the problems of our Nation's agricultural workers and have found that one of the main reasons Americans are reluctant to work in our Nation's fields is the lack of adequate family housing.

The expiration of Public Law 78 has brought about a massive interstate recruitment program of American farmworkers. Adequate housing facilities for these American farmworkers who travel with their families is at the present time nonexistent. I realize that in the past family type farm housing was not in great demand especially in those areas of our Nation which were heavy users of foreign farmworkers. Foreign farmworkers were either single males or traveled without their families. They were often housed in barrack-type structures dormitory style. These structures were equipped with three decker bunks as sleeping accommodations and lacked family type sanitation and cooking facilities. For example, California, the Nation's largest user of foreign farm labor, in 1964 had 158,222 farm housing units for single males as opposed to 9,875 family housing units. Obviously, this type of accommodation is not suitable for a worker who is accompanied by his family.

The farmer who employs American farm labor has a unique labor problem in that he generally must provide housing for his employees. This housing is an extra item of labor costs; it has no economic value to the farmer beyond enabling him to attract employees and is only occupied for short periods of the year.

I realize that many farmers do not have adequate financial means to build family housing. The $50 million authorized by H.R. 7984 for Federal grants in this area is an insignificant amount indeed when compared with the need for such housing.

A recent study by the State of California showed that there were 250,000 farmworkers in that State who earned less than $2,700 a year. A great majority of these workers lived in dilapidated and deteriorated housing. In the heart of the California farm community an eight-county survey reported that 80 percent of the farmworker housing violated minimum standards of health, safety and sanitation. Sixty-five percent of such housing was deteriorated or dilapidated; 33 percent had inadequate sanitation facilities; 30 percent had no bathing facilities and 25 percent were without running water.

The lack of family housing is most acute in communities which have high seasonal, short-term labor demands. In California's Monterey, Santa Cruz, and Santa Clara Counties in the heart of that State's strawberry-producing area, there are only 183 family housing units.

The State of California estimates that in order to provide adequate housing for these farmworkers the cost would be $4,000 per housing unit. These costs cannot be paid for by the farmworker since his low family income limits his opportunity of obtaining normal financing. The States with their already strained budgets cannot be expected to pay the entire amount.

Federal assistance such as is provided in H.R. 7984 is needed in order to better the lot of our Nation's agricultural workers. I realize, however, that low-rent housing cannot compensate for the effect of public policy which up until now has excluded American agricultural workers from such basic social legislation as minimum wage, collective bargaining and unemployment insurance. Federal grants for the construction of farm housing must only be a part of a broader overall social economic program to better the lot of our agricultural workers.

OUR PACIFIC TRUST TERRITORY—TIME FOR REAPPRAISAL

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, a timely and perceptive editorial on the political alternatives facing Pacific island peoples has been published in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin. I offer the editorial as another useful item to add to the information available for discussion among the growing number of those concerned with the present and future status of non-self-governing people of the Western Pacific.

As the Nation charged with administering the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under a trusteeship agreement with the United Nations Security Council, the United States has an obligation to promote greater self-government among the 87,000 Micronesians who live in the former Japanese mandated islands. We are doing this with some success despite many difficulties.

Nearly 20 years have passed since we began administering the Pacific Trust Territory. It is time to take stock of our national policies and to seek a consensus on the eventual destiny for the peoples of the trust territory.

As the Star-Bulletin editorial cogently noted:

> Of one thing we may be sure. Colonialism under the cloak of United Nations trusteeship is not the final answer.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin editorial of July 22, 1965, titled "Too Poor for Independence."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, July 22, 1965]

Too Poor for Independence

Pacific island leaders, meeting in New Guinea, almost without exception indicated that they do not want to be cut adrift from their more powerful protectors: the United States, France, Britain, New Zealand, Australia.

The one exception is Nauru, rich with phosphate, which is one of the few Pacific islands with resources enough to be economically independent. But even Nauru realizes that it would still have to depend upon Australia, which administers it under United Nations trust, for defense and some services.

None of the scattered island groups under U.S. trusteeship is economically viable in today's world at anything beyond the barest subsistence level. It is unlikely that the people of those islands, having known a higher standard of living than bare subsistence, will want to revert to the primitive economies they never knew.

A colonial status under the United States, or any other power, is an anachronism not sanctioned by today's enlightened political thought—or by the U.N. Charter. And yet these small island groups are too poor to be independent. Their leaders for the most part are well aware of this. While appreciative of the internal self-government that is coming their way, they fear the consequences of being cast adrift on their own.

It is against this background that the proposal to incorporate the Pacific islands in the State of Hawaii emerges as one practical, if complex, way out. Senator Fong has placed the idea before Congress and a study of the possibilities, if nothing else, may be forthcoming.

Of one thing we may be sure, colonialism under the cloak of United Nations trusteeship is not the final answer.

PUERTO RICO CELEBRATES 13TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF ITS COMMONWEALTH

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on Sunday, July 25, Puerto Ricans celebrated the 13th anniversary of the establishment of the island's Commonwealth. It was a day of rejoicing, made notable by addresses of the Governor, the Honorable Roberto Sanchez Vilella, of Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, and others.

Because the establishment of the Commonwealth—an inaccurate translation really of the political status of Puerto Rico, a literal translation of its Spanish nomenclature being "associated free state"—has been so successful and has set such a fine example of what can be accomplished in eliminating colonialism in consonance with the wishes and needs of the people affected, I think it desirable that the two principal addresses—those of Governor Vilella and Secretary of the Interior Udall—be inserted in the Record, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech Delivered by Gov. Roberto Sanchez Vilella on the 13th Anniversary of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, July 25, 1965

Honorable representative of the President of the United States, distinguished guests of honor, honorable visitors, members of the three branches of government, friends, and fellow citizens, today we commemorate once again the greatest act of political creativity which our people have accomplished. Exactly 3 years ago, on a similar occasion, two historic letters were made public. Former Gov. Muñoz Marín wrote to the late President John F. Kennedy that our people should again be consulted on their political relations with the United States of America. The late President was in total agreement with this aspiration. On that same occasion, we were honored to have among us the man who is now President of the Nation. Lyndon B. Johnson said then that the exchange of letters constitutes "a historic reaffirmation of our belief in the self-determination of peoples, when exercised with the acceptance of the responsibilities of freedom."

As a result of that exchange and that belief, a commission was created—composed of American citizens from Puerto Rico and from the continent, and with representation from all sectors of opinion—to study all the aspects of our relations with the United States of America. The commission is making this study because we are proud of our present relationship with the United States, and because we want to improve it. It is also making this study because we want finally to liberate the energies of our people from the narrow dilemma of political status. We will succeed.

I am confident that the work of the commission and the subsequent acts of our people and of Congress will result in the reaffirmation of our will, expressed time and again in the ballots: the will to associate with the United States on the basis of a compact of political equality. But regardless of the deliberations and studies made by the commission, the Commonwealth now is a way of life which is beyond the determination of any Congress or any commission. It is, and it has been for 13 years, our way of life.

LET US TAKE AN INTROSPECTIVE LOOK

We have no doubts about the meaning of commonwealth status for our people. We know what it is; we "live" what it is. It has never been defined better than in the few words pronounced here 2 years ago by its main architect and exponent. Luis Muñoz-Marín said then: "Commonwealth is not a theory that is described and proposed to me; commonwealth is what I am living in my body and in my spirit every day of my life; it is what I am living and feeling in my work, in my hope, in the development of the future of my children; commonwealth is this and nothing less than this."

In the past, we have heard on similar occasions many voices congratulating us on this breakthrough from narrow nationalism and on our contribution to the constitutional life and thought of the hemisphere. But today let us alter the direction from which we have traditionally regarded our creation on days such as this. While our relationship with the United States is being studied, let us, for the first time in 13 years, look introspectively at our Commonwealth.

Let us ask ourselves what use have we made of the powers obtained 13 years ago. Let us reply to ourselves how this constitutional system—an essential part of our creation, a system called beautiful and formidable even by the greatest opponents of association as a solution to our political status—serves our people. Let us see how we are developing democracy in our self-government and how this process will continue in the future.

WHAT LEADERSHIP MEANS

Our Government and party system is a real democracy; it has a solid base: We are responsible to the people, not as an idea or an abstraction, but to 2½ million human beings each one as important as the other. We have chosen this system of parties and elections as the means of expression of popular opinion. But the popular will cannot be unanimous. When voting, the voter does not mean to say that he is in absolute agreement with all of the platform or all of the actions of his party. The mandate is consensus, not unanimity. The parties, the Government itself, is and should be a reflection of that reality. So that this system may produce the greatest benefit for our people, we must maintain a harmonious relation of consensus among the three branches of Government and among all parties, a relation of common direction, of common purpose. We have to fulfill the people's mandate.

The exercise of power is necessary to achieve the common purpose, to fulfill that mandate. It is necessary and healthy that there be strong leadership; leadership that marks the route clearly; leadership that offers alternatives and gives the reasons for the selected course of action; the leadership of reason. It is necessary and healthy that such authority be exercised by the executive. It should be used to the maximum and continuously, without evasion and without encumbrances. But it is the authority of the law, the authority of the institutions, and the authority that our people delegated to their executive in the Constitution. Absolute power does not educate in democracy. Limited power does. We have to account to the people for the exercise of that authority which is in reality and in the last instance, exclusively their own.

Our people will produce excellent leaders from among themselves. But we must seek excellence in normality. We must become accustomed to normality in the nature of men and in the functioning of institutions. We must search for and promote excellence in normality, because the gigantic stature of Luis Muñoz Marín will not be repeated in our history.

The exercise of constitutional authority must be accompanied by the exercise of political power. But to engage in politics does not mean politicking. Political power is an instrument whereas moral principles are goals. If the cost of exercising political power is the surrender of basic principles that one sustains, it is too high a price, and it is a price which people never demand.

LET US GO TO THE PEOPLE

The people of Puerto Rico, our people, understand this far more and far better than has ever been recognized. In our recent history, economic and social progress took precedence over political development; and political development was confused with the question of our status, or relationship with another country. It is one of the tasks of this new era to equate our political development with our economic and social development. It is a task of this new era to continue purifying our democracy.

The collective wisdom of the people is always greater than that of the leaders that represent them, or that of political organizations. People have prevailed over hundreds of political machines, men, and structures through the centuries, and they always reject those that depend on mere politicking. The intraparty dialog or the search for a consensus in our country cannot be founded on the basis of norms imposed by certain structures or groups. The enormous majority of our people reject the assumption that he who differs is an enemy. They already know that there is always more than one alternative, and that they are really the only final judge.

We must go directly to the people. The ballot will always prove their wisdom. The people entrust their government with the solution, not the evasion of their difficult problems. And all of us in Government are required to assume the responsibility of solving them. In recent years, some did not assume their responsibility to do their jobs, because the colossal figure of a great leader could respond for them before the electorate. Times have changed. We are widening the base of our Government and each one must assume his corresponding task. Our people are going to ask to each one of us, every 4 years: How many difficult problems did you aid me to solve? What did you do to help me?

IDEAL FUNCTIONING OF OUR THREE BRANCHES

So that we can answer to their satisfaction, I want to leave with you today some thoughts on the ideal functioning of our system of self-government.

The executive branch must determine priorities among the collective needs, and it must remain continuously sensitive to the human relations of which they are evidence. It must remain always alert to the new and old problems of the country in order to propose solutions. It must prevent at all costs complacency, bureaucratization and self-deception. We must devote to this task the highest degree of imagination and initiative. The people are going to judge the extent to which the executive initiates and directs, with dedication and capability, the solution of their collective problems.

The legislative branch must in turn vigorously represent its respective constituents in establishing a clear consensus; and it must firmly demonstrate its self-respect. It must give the most profound and careful study to the problems of the country, with a clear vision of our common purpose. It must at all costs avoid superficiality, politicking and the pettiness of conflicts of interest. We must provide it with the means to devote the greatest possible time to its work and to attract to its ranks the best of human quality. The people are going to judge the extent to which it collaborates, with vision and depth, in the successful solution of their collective problems.

The judicial branch must firmly express its independent criteria, and assume the responsibility for its effective operation as well as the efficient administration of its functions. It must foster mutual respect among its components and a harmonious relation with those that represent the people's will. It must at all costs avoid idleness, politicization and disorder. It must be provided with all that is necessary to inspire maximum respect and dignity. And will itself be judged on the extent to which it can guarantee, day by day, to our citizens the sacred rights of the law.

In the relationship among the branches, in spite of the functional separation which constitutional order obliges us to maintain, there must exist a close and harmonious collaboration of spirit. There must be all the agreement permitted us within the limits set by the people in their Constitution. There must exist communication without intervention.

THE FUNCTION OF POLITICAL PARTIES

The picture of our self-government would not be complete were we to omit mention of the function of political parties. On this subject, it is sufficient to repeat the prophetic and illuminating words of Luis Muñoz Marín. Long before becoming Governor, he gave us the rule to follow when he said:

"The best public administration can only be achieved if it acts on the basis of a clear idea of the relations in a democracy between politics and public administration.

"We all know what the ideal function of minority parties is: a mission to criticize all that they honestly feel should be criticized and corrected; and to cooperate in all that they honestly feel deserves promotion and support.

"The Government and the majority party, both being expressions of the people, must have a common purpose: the establishment and development of the program of public action approved by the people in the elections. But the political party and the Government have different things to do, as a result of their common origin in the people, and as instruments of their common objectives for the people.

"The political party is created to propose and discuss solutions before the people and to facilitate the exercise of voting rights. Beyond that, the political party cannot intervene determinatively without risking, in the long or the short run, good public administration.

"This is due to the fact that behind the political party is the people; that the interest of the people must always be dominant over the interest of the political party as such, and that in the interest of the people is the best possible public administration."

THIS IS OUR GOVERNMENT

That is the illuminating word. Here is our reality: We have begun since last January 2, the healthy process of differentiation in action. The function of the three branches, of the Government and the parties, is seen now without the presence of a charismatic leader. We see in action the total dimension of our constitutional system. It is our system of self-government, and it deserves to be so under any political status. It is a democratic government. It means that there is a popular mandate, and that we are responsible only to the people. I have described the role which I think corresponds to each of us who works in Government. Our respective oaths give us that responsibility, and we assume the duty to fulfill it. Our people, on the other hand, will assume their own duty.

I am determined to serve honorably to fulfill my duty. I shall never do my own will, but that of my fellow citizens. Our democratic system provides that the people shall judge every 4 years. And judge they will. The people of Puerto Rico will respond to the confidence that I have deposited in them, and they will give me their confidence for as long as necessary, until we fulfill our final purpose: greatness for Puerto Rico.

The institution, the system that will serve us as the means to this goal, is the one we are honoring today. It is the commonwealth, it is our constitution. Let this day serve to repeat with love, the phrase that is the essence of self-determination and freedom. Let this day serve to reiterate with dedication the phrase that expresses the obligation of each one of us, of every Puerto Rican. Let us say, with pride: "This is our government."

Thank you.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL AT COMMONWEALTH DAY OBSERVANCE, SAN JUAN, P.R., JULY 25, 1965

I am delighted to be here in Puerto Rico to join in the observance of Commonwealth Day. This is a great day in the history of United States and Puerto Rico and the hemisphere, an occasion for true celebration.

I am here to bring to you the warm personal greetings of the President of the United States. As you know, he has been long associated with Puerto Rico and he is glad of his participation in the historical events which led up to the establishment of the Commonwealth. He is proud of the splendid economic and social evolution which has been taking place within Puerto Rico, and he is excited at the prospect of the really magnificent achievements and contributions which the people of Puerto Rico now have the opportunity to make in the world.

It seems to me appropriate in a sort of reverse sense that the President happened to choose me as his Commonwealth Day proxy. The Secretary of the Interior can be called a symbol of the growth and development of the United States-Puerto Rican relationship. Puerto Rican matters are no longer referred to the Interior Department. This is one time I am enthusiastic over seeing my empire shrink.

It was in keeping with history that President Kennedy made this change in 1961, ordering that matters involving Puerto Rican status be referred to the Office of the White House. On that occasion he stressed the "unique position of the Commonwealth." It is this uniqueness which I think most fascinates us all, and sums up our joint delight in the Puerto Rican story.

The uniqueness covers many fronts. To start with, Puerto Rico is, of course, dramatically different in many elementary ways from the United States—site, climate, resources. Add to that the cultural and historical differences in such areas as political experience, language, wealth, population. To the enormous credit of the United States, it has historically responded to those differences by differences in treatment—uniqueness of relationship. Even from the beginning of our political association, it has been characterized by a combination of elements, some resembling integration, some completely different. I do not here have the time or need to specify the aspects of the long relationship. The heart of it, the cause of our mutual pride, the practical genius of it, is this: the Americans and the Puerto Ricans have been able to work out arrangements between them which are appropriate to the peculiar circumstances of Puerto Rico and which are at the same time a benefit to the United States.

Uniqueness is usually intriguing, just because it is unique. But the charm in the Puerto Rican story goes much deeper, into real meaning for many areas of our troubled lives. I mentioned earlier that the United States reacted gracefully and generously to the differences it confronted in 1898 in Puerto Rico, differences it had had no experience with before in all its wide territories. But just as decisive was the Puerto Rican reaction to the reaction. With a slow start and a tremendous rate of speed in recent years, Puerto Rico has achieved remarkable gains economically, in diversification and industrialization and sound growth in prosperity. This is in the face of devastating natural odds, and with current direct American financial help less per capita than that going to some independent foreign countries.

In other areas the success of the Puerto Rican talent for self-help is less tangible but even more heartening. The development of political responsibility is a dramatic story, both on the part of the Government and of the people. The island's bold attacks on problems of deplorable housing, illiteracy, scanty land area, poverty (Shriver didn't invent the poverty program) have all made tremendously impressive gains, and there are many others of this kind. The Puerto Rican achievements in the last generation or so are a sort of evolving success story in an area where most stories are gloomy and disheartening. The less developed areas are now generally doing worse, economically at least, than a few short years ago. The world, and all of us, need encouragement, and it is good indeed to see the wonderful progress that Puerto Rico is continuing to make in the different areas of life.

The first Commonwealth Day, 13 years ago, is a proud day for us for many reasons. One of the most important is its recognition of a close relationship in equal association, a compactual relationship, tailored to the particular individualisms of the United States and Puerto Rico in relation to each other. Both the Americans and the Puerto Ricans showed themselves possessed of a political creativity and vision. The Commonwealth established at that point in time was thoroughly unique. It certainly differed sharply from the traditional varieties of American status: statehood, colony, incorporated territory. It didn't resemble very closely any other entity in the world—the nearest relative was probably some stage in British dominion development, but the differences there were still acute.

The Americans, then, and the Puerto Ricans both had the bravery to venture beyond the textbook relationships to work out something more appropriate to their own personalities and abilities. This in itself is to us one of the great significances of Commonwealth Day. For some dire reason, creativity in political affairs of the world has been moving much more slowly than our desperate need occasions, and the Commonwealth is a brilliant exception.

Commonwealth, the free association between the United States and Puerto Rico, has as we all know grown and proved itself in many ways and to many persons since July 25, 1952. That illustrates the underlying nature of Commonwealth: it is a growing, evolving, dynamic creature. The nature of life is change, but Commonwealth has the grace to be able to adapt to it without losing its hold on the stable lasting values.

The most stirring aspect of this festive occasion is to me the possibilities now open to the Puerto Ricans for many important different kinds of achievements. The fact of Puerto Rican success can be in itself a meaningful incentive to other peoples, particularly the underdeveloped, to help themselves to economic improvement and political stability. The world badly needs this kind of example, and it can respond to this kind of success story. In this connection, the Commonwealth status can point the way to weaker areas for dignified and beneficial association with other areas. Once the less developed nations lose their fears and oversensitiveness, we can hope that they will evaluate the many kinds of beneficial relationships open to them.

It is also most interesting to see the energy with which Puerto Rico is tackling its problems and extending its lines. Some of these areas are of special importance to the United States. Puerto Rico is aptly suited for certain kinds of activities, including particular assistance programs and regional development activities to help build up Caribbean economic and political health. The possibilities in areas like this are exciting indeed.

It all sounds like quite a love affair, this relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico, and I think that is true. It happily combines tremendous affection with a real feeling for the separatenesses and differences of two entities.

I have no doubt that this close and intimate relationship—this brotherhood—between the United States and Puerto Rico will continue as far as one can see into the future. It is a sign of the dynamic nature of the Puerto Rican people and of the vision of the United States that the political status of Puerto Rico is now being reexamined by a distinguished joint committee. I do not, of course, know what the specific results will be—but I am confident of one fundamental fact: I am sure that whatever the status commission recommends—whatever the future holds in terms of adaptations and changes in the form of the relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico, they will always be close collaborators and intimate partners in the great human adventure—the search for peace and the spiritual and physical well-being of people.

HARTFORD'S REVITALIZATION CORPS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the Revitalization Corps of Hartford, Conn., is a private agency which is seeking to answer the challenge of our times on a personal basis. Founded in 1964 by Edward T. Coll, the Revitalization Corps offers a citizen peace corps, through which individuals may serve their community without interrupting their careers or their studies.

The corps operates a four-pronged program of educational, recreational, humanitarian and civic activities, working to enrich the lives of culturally deprived seventh and eighth graders in the Hartford area. The volunteer staff, comprised of members of all races, religions and age groups, includes New York Knickerbocker Basketball Star Johnny Egan. Under the direction of its president, Mr. Coll, the organization offers programs including lectures and seminars on civic affairs, remedial tutoring, athletic tournaments, volunteer service at hospitals and charitable institutions and youth guidance and counseling to the over 500 participating youngsters.

The Revitalization Corps is carrying out its program in the American tradition of cooperative private efforts devoted to the public welfare.

I ask unanimous consent that an article concerning the Revitalization Corps from the New York Times and an editorial from the Hartford Times be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 11, 1965]

Kennedy's Ideals Inspire Program—Group in Hartford Is Helping Children Meet Challenges

(By John C. Devlin)

Hartford, July 10.—When President Kennedy was assassinated late in 1963, one of the thousands of mourners at his funeral was a 24-year-old public relations man for an insurance company here.

The young man, Edward T. Coll, a graduate of Fairfield University, of Fairfield, Conn., was particularly distressed because he felt that some of the "youthful vibrance and sense of purpose that the late President had given to the Nation had been cut short." Mr. Coll made up his mind to do something about it.

He felt that President Kennedy had been trying to encourage men both to become more humane and to seek to improve themselves—mentally and physically—with zest.

Mr. Coll quit his job and established a group here he called the Revitalization Corps to work with culturally deprived seventh and eighth grade pupils. His goal was to encourage them to adopt the ideals of courage and dignity, which he believed President Kennedy exemplified.

Today, a year after it began, the program has proved so successful that there is a waiting list of youngsters wanting to be tutored, to participate in physical-fitness programs, and to study civics.

There are about 500 youngsters in the program this summer and 80 volunteer tutors and guides.

OPERATION HANK

The program has been operating on a budget of only $3,000, provided through small donations. Described by Mr. Coll as "a sort of domestic peace corps," it is known as Operation Hank after a young policeman, Henry Jenkins, who was slain by a thug a little over a year ago.

Mr. Coll said the policeman represented the type of courage and integrity that has made the Nation brave and strong.

"We want to get the kids off the streets and the street corners," said Mr. Coll, who now supports himself as a part-time substitute teacher. "We want to tutor them, to get them out participating in sports in the parks, and to develop a civic interest."

The corps has both day and night shifts, based on the time when volunteers are available. Sometimes the tutors go to the homes of the students and sometimes it is the other way around. There are also classes held in a high school, but the corps tries to maintain a policy of one tutor for one student, or at least two students.

Recreation is sponsored in city parks. An instructor with a nominal salary is Johnny Egan, New York Knickerbocker basketball star, who is one of the original trustees of the corps. The male students regard him as an ideal and they want to try to match his career.

The civics program calls for trips to businesses and industries in the city, and even to supermarkets—all job potential areas. The students travel in buses paid for by local businessmen, who have learned about the revitalizations project through local newspaper publicity and through a brochure paid for by the Travelers Insurance Co.

The volunteer instructors are of all ages and from all walks of life. One is a man who was tutored last year in prison, where he had been serving a burglarly sentence.

"What we're all trying to do in the best way we can," Mr. Coll said, "is to face the challenge that President Kennedy raised when he asked: 'What can you do for your country?' "

The volunteer tutors, guidance counselors, physical education specialists, and others were rounded up through local newspaper advertisements that read:

"Wanted—college or high school students interested in helping others in challenging and diversified ways, and on a voluntary basis."

The little office headquarters at 485 Wethersfield Avenue, enlisted not only young college and high school graduates but older people, some retired, in what Mr. Coll calls the "fight against poverty and apathy."

"When President Kennedy died," Mr. Coll said, "I vowed to do something and I guess these other people feel the same way."

He said that the project was strictly humanitarian, nonreligious and nonpolitical and that he would like to call the workers "The Kennedy corps." He said he had asked permission for this of the family of the late President, adding that the matter was under advisement.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times, May 19, 1965]

Youngsters, Meet Your City

An imaginative and valuable project is being undertaken by the Hartford Revitalization Corps for the summer vacation months. About 100 volunteers, chiefly college students, will undertake to introduce culturally deprived children to the city in which they live.

Each volunteer will be in charge of about five children from the seventh and eighth grades. He will take them to visit factories, stores, banks, museums, small business establishments and colleges. The children will also be given an idea of the challenges and opportunities that will be available to them in high school. That will bridge what is sometimes an uncomfortable gap for children who are unprepared for the unaccustomed freedom and variety of secondary school.

In charge of the summer program will be Johnny Egan, the sparkplug of the New York Knicks professional basketball team. Once a Weaver High School star, he is a hero to youngsters who follow basketball. He likes children and they idolize him.

Edward Coll, founder and director of the Hartford Revitalization Corps, says he would welcome invitations from industry and business for visits by groups of the children. Mr. Coll gave up bright prospects for a career to work without financial return for the benefit of people in need of help. He deserves some help in return. Anyone who can offer assistance—as a teacher, a patron or a host—can reach him at the corps office at 485 Wethersfield Avenue, telephone 249-7523.

JOHN GARDNER

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, some years ago, John Gardner pointed the way for us to a new definition of excellence. He defined this much abused word for us in new ways, ways more fitting to a modern industrial society whose goals are those of equality and democracy. Now he has a new, and especially appropriate way of bringing new standards of excellence to the American people: as President Johnson's Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Scholar, teacher, administrator, and fine human being, Dr. Gardner has excelled at everything he has done. When he was at Stanford, as an undergraduate, he set several swimming records and won a number of Pacific coast championships—while devoting enough time to his studies to graduate with distinction. He taught at Connecticut College and Mount Holyoke and rendered great service to the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, the Marine Corps, and the OSS during World War II. He has been an able and conscientious president of the Carnegie Corp., and has come to know our country and its people intimately and to deal with its problems imaginatively.

I congratulate President Johnson for an outstanding appointment. I know that John Gardner will be an excellent Secretary who will bring his experience and ability to a great and important post.

POOR MAN'S HEAVEN

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, out in South Dakota we have an outstanding weekly newspaper edited by an accomplished little lady—Mrs. Charles Burges. Under her editorial guidance, the Milbank Herald Advance conducts a weekly program of editorial comment and counsel which is always both interesting and informative.

In last week's issue of the Herald Advance, there appears an editorial entitled "Poor Man's Heaven". In its sprightly, informal manner, this editorial uses humor and sarcasm to sound an alarm against the rapid drive we are making in this country toward the all-powerful, all-embracing, paternalistic State. I commend its reading to the Congress and to the country.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Poor Man's Heaven

Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz has recently said that he thinks everyone should have a 1-year sabbatical—365 days of vacation with full pay. We think this is a wonderful idea. It could be called the "war on work" program. And added to the on-going wars against poverty, illiteracy, disease, and even against war itself, the Labor Secretary's idea could take us beyond the Great Society and right into "Poor Man's Heaven"—a carefree realm which was the subject of a song by that name, back in those bad old days of the thirties. The song's refrain defined it thusly:

"In poor man's heaven we won't have to work.
There ain't nothin' there but good luck.
There's strawberry pie that's 20 feet high,
And whipped cream they bring in a truck."

Unfortunately, Mr. Wirtz isn't really pushing this antiwork war right now. He says there are some "bugs" in the idea which might make it a bit difficult to carry out. One of the problems, no doubt, is how to give a sabbatical to someone who's been on the relief rolls for months on end. A year of work, perhaps?

That's a tough problem, we admit. Still we see no reason why the Labor Secretary should be discouraged just because there are a few bugs in his idea. It's no buggier than most of the President's Great Society projects, and they're going ahead full blast.

Certainly financing a year's sabbatical for everyone should pose no problem to the engineers of the Great Society. For we're quite sure that some of them at least would go along with the way that matter was handled in the lyrical version of "Poor Man's Heaven":

"We won't have to yearn for money to burn,
'Cause we'll have our own money press;
We'll run her full speed, and make all we need;
And we'll light our cigars with the rest."

—Washington Exclusive.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM—EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we have heard much debate in this Chamber over our present policy in Vietnam. We have also heard many proposals aimed at a final solution to that problem. The suggestions have ranged from total unconditional withdrawal to all out war employing every weapon at our command. There is one thing that these debates and suggestions have in common, they are aimed at isolated problems in that troubled area. There have been very few constructive suggestions dealing with the entire southeast Asian situation. Moreover, the debate has not adequately covered the effect that our policy will have on all other parts of the world.

There is one man who must take all these aspects into consideration, the President. He alone has all the necessary information to deal with the problems that come across his desk. He is responsible for all policy decisions made by this country. I think we should examine the Vietnam situation with an eye toward its overall effect both on this country and on all phases of our foreign policy.

To be sure, I am not advocating cessation of debate in this Chamber.

But I do think that when we address ourselves to this problem we must remain constantly aware that there are those who quote us out of context, there are those who only accept our side of the story, and finally, there are those who wish to confuse the populace by showing the discord that surrounds our present policy.

An editorial recently appeared in the Trentonian which touches on some of these points. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Narrow Views of the War in Vietnam

(By J. Willard Hoffman)

President Johnson's dilemma in Vietnam is how to win the war there without having it grow into a major conflict. Thus when Gerald Ford, House Republican leader, recommends that sites in North Vietnam containing Russian antiaircraft missiles be bombed out of existence immediately, it may be fairly said that Mr. Ford has his eye on a very little piece of a very big ball, while President Johnson has to keep the whole thing in prospect.

It may well be that a military decision to bomb those sites out of existence will be taken—perhaps it will have been taken before this gets into print. But if such a decision were to be made, there is every reason to believe that it would not be made out of the context of the whole military effort.

Accordingly, the White House statement in reaction to Mr. Ford's recommendation was much to the point. It said:

"Mr. Ford was speaking as a Member of Congress, a coordinate branch of government, and the administration has the responsibility for conducting operations and will continue to conduct them according to plans."

No doubt the White House reaction was the same when Mr. Ford originally suggested "unleashing devastating air and seapower against all significant military targets in North Vietnam."

Mr. Ford's difficulty—and it is one shared by many others, notably some of his Republican colleagues—is a fixation that the Vietnamese war can be won through the use of sheer aerial power.

This is akin to the fixation of some Democrats that the whole thing can be solved if the United States will only sit down at the conference table and negotiate a peaceful settlement. This attitude conveniently ignores the fact that the Reds don't want any part of the peace pipe, and if the United States were to sit down at the conference table, its representatives would be mighty lonely.

The probable fact of the matter is that we are in for a long war in Vietnam. The Communists have already spent 20 years at it. There is no indication whatsoever that they are not perfectly willing to spend another 20 years—or even another 200 years—plodding toward eventual victory.

They appear to be resigned to the fact that we can bomb the bejabbers out of North Vietnam, as Mr. FORD suggests we do. But that is not going to stop them. They have withstood the impact of our aerial might to date, and anyone who reads a daily newspaper knows that their force in South Vietnam has grown, rather than shrunk. It is worthy of note that there is no public knowledge that the North has yet committed any sizable portion of its armed forces to the fighting in the South. Thus far most of the fighting has been done by guerrillas.

It is extremely difficult to see that the North Vietnamese—and/or Red China—have the slightest inclination to give up their aims by negotiating a settlement. It is true, of course, that the Reds did so in Korea, but that was something else again.

It is too bad that some people in responsible positions cannot clearly see that there is no way out, short of abject surrender of some sort on the part of the United States.

They have the right and the duty to speak out on the matter, but in virtually demanding that the United States unilaterally attempt to negotiate a settlement, they serve two regrettable purposes:

(1) They encourage the Reds to believe that the United States will not continue to prosecute the war to the fullest extent necessary, and (2) they hold out a false hope to the American people, who wish we had never gotten involved in the first place.

At this time, Mr. Johnson's conduct of the war cannot be faulted. All that we can hope for is that the Reds will soon see that they had better settle for a stalemate.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KUCHEL BEFORE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, yesterday I was honored to appear before the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, holding their annual convention at the Sheraton Park Hotel, in our Capital City.

I ask unanimous consent that a partial text of my remarks on that occasion be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"YOU CAN MAKE THE DIFFERENCE"

Senator KUCHEL. President Ford, delegates and friends; our country, indeed, the world, haltingly wends its way through one of the most crucial, dangerous paths in all the long journey of mankind. You know it. I know it. The question is: what are we going to do about it?

One does not have to be simply a reader of statistics to know the power of women in American life, or to be aware that they control a majority of the material wealth of our Nation. But women also control, for good or for evil, a majority of the nonmaterial wealth of this Nation: Their own selves. One does not have to be a politician, though certainly a politician more keenly appreciates it, to realize that the success or loss in a political campaign is usually directly related to the number of women who have dedicated themselves to the task of electing or defeating a particular candidate for public office.

Since the organization of your Federation in 1919, you have strenuously and successfully fought for the rights of women, and for equal recognition of their abilities and their capabilities. You have fought for the right to vote, the right to equal opportunities, and the right to equal pay for equal work. Many of us in the Congress, in both parties, have been proud to aid you in these causes, but, I suggest, with women in America, as with States in America, that it is not enough simply to talk about rights. We need also to talk about responsibilities.

Your national organization, and your local district units of the Business and Professional Women, have made great progress in taking on new responsibilities which, when successfully discharged, will change the face of this land and the substance of American life. In "Youth Power U.S.A.," you have taken the lead in working with young people so that they can learn more about America's economic system and the opportunities which are available under it. When one realizes that by 1968, half of the people in America will be under 25 years of age, then one understands that we are, indeed, a young country. When one realizes that next year 1 million more young Americans will reach age 18 than have this year, and that the average yearly increase in America's teenage labor force in the 1960's will be almost six times the average yearly increase in the 1950's, then one understands that we are not only a young nation, but that we are also a young nation with manifold problems and innumerable challenges.

By working through your organization, and the many other groups of which you are also members, and by encouraging American women who have the necessary education and experience to dedicate their efforts and their talents, full time or part time, to helping the youth of this land, you will have truly contributed to the building of a better America. For we need now, as never before in this city and in the teeming cities across our land, people with dedication and with thought—people who will consecrate themselves to the public interest and to public affairs. The question is who can provide this leadership? Who can fill the vacuum which now exists in the cities of this country? The answer is: You and the women of America, as aroused citizens, can fill this vacuum and provide essential leadership.

As our Nation, in bygone days, faced up to the challenges of pioneering and of conquering a westward wilderness, of building great educational institutions, of spanning a continent with iron rails and, then, with high-speed interstate highways, of conserving and developing our natural resources for the benefit of the people, so, too, our Nation must now accept the enormous and growing challenge of conserving the human resources of an urban America.

The sad fact of many of our States and many of our cities, where huge conglomerations of people have come to live, to seek their livelihood, and to search for opportunities to improve their standard of living and their future, is that our urban areas lack leadership of people who care very much about what happens.

As you go back to the communities from which you come, you have a historic chance to prove that we can offer hope where despair abounds, and to provide action where unconcern and delay have for so long been the prevailing theme. All too many of our cities, and some of our more populous States, have not displayed the drive and dedication to help lift the people of urban America from the chronic despair which too often surrounds them. Look at our smog-filled cities, our cramped and clogged streets, our poor transportation, our unsafe sidewalks, our rundown housing and schools. Look at the lack of job opportunities, crowded court dockets, and inadequate parks and recreation facilities.

Look at the overcrowded schools and substandard teaching; inadequate vocational schools and outdated concepts of vocational education; narcotic addiction of young and old, increasing at alarming rates; a ghetto life where a fifth of those who live in our urban areas live under poverty conditions; cramped, barely heated, unsanitary living quarters; a middle class escaping to the suburbs, while largely unskilled and semiskilled fellow Americans flock to the central city to seek something better than that from which has been their lot; crowded hospitals and surging costs of health care; ever-increasing welfare rolls; public housing which is 10 years behind in meeting demand and which, after 10 years tends once again to become a slum.

Is this the America you want your children and their generation to inherit? It is not. These problems are not insoluble. We do not have to tolerate them. An apathetic electorate is the only reason why they are tolerated.

With the splendid luxury of citizenship which all Americans enjoy goes a concomitant duty which, too often, is not being fulfilled by our people. When good people stay home on election day through disinterest, be assured that those with a mission and a political passion are being goosestepped to the polls in droves. Make no mistake. Those who accept the luxury of being American but who decline to assume the burden, create a vortex on election day and every day, speedily filled by frantic and frenetic political minorities intent on bending government to the far left or the far right.

But the luxury of citizenship is not paid for by casting a ballot at the polls. The price of maintaining our free Republic requires suitable exertions every day of the year and in a variety of ways. The whole vast panorama of issues and questions which confront our American society, at every level of government, and in every part of the Union, cries out for attention, not by the few, but by the many.

It is not enough to work for bond issues for our schools to provide the bricks and the mortar. We must work in our schools and outside our schools to inculcate the values of a free society and a sense of civic responsibility. We must lend a hand and set a better example, not of the "better off" to the "poorer off," but on one human being to another human being. Bricks and mortar are not enough to assure education of the young or the old. Let us remember that we must be concerned with the quality of teaching which goes on within each school or college. Let us remember that the dedication of our teachers alone will not pay for their food bills, and that if you want to keep and encourage able and experienced teachers, or to keep and encourage experienced welfare workers, indeed, to keep and encourage all members of society who are working with the people in our cities, then we must be willing to compensate them adequately for their efforts.

It was the first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, who in a speech in Springfield, Ill., 6 years prior to his election in 1860, provided this Nation and both political parties with a criteria and a goal as applicable today as then, and we seek to determine what public programs are appropriate and inappropriate for the Federal Government to undertake. Said Abraham Lincoln: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or so well do for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

It was for succeeding generations to determine the community to be served, and the level of government most appropriate to meet those needs. It was for succeeding generations to determine whether particular needs of society might most appropriately be met by the public or the private sectors of our economy or by a combination of the two. Thus have ensued the struggle, the challenge, and the balance of federalism in America and of a free economy regulated in the public interest. You—the women power of America—can shape the outcome of this struggle, this challenge, and this balance by the action you have taken and will take in your own communities.

Today America stands at one more threshold. At home, it is the threshold of a new era—an era of youth and urbanism, of greater educational and skilled job opportunities, and of cultural and racial enlightenment. Abroad, it is the threshold of bringing into the world new and smaller nations in freedom and in progress, of learning how to feed and meet the needs of hungry people. In every hemisphere, totalitarian communism continues its struggle to engulf mankind and to establish its imperialism over every race and state.

Across the seas, deadly serious problems confront our Nation in the jungles of South Vietnam, in the weakened NATO Alliance, and in the growing probability of proliferating nuclear nations. Millions of fellow human beings suffer from malnutrition. Disease and ignorance still stalk this globe. The lust for power and domination is ever present. From our own home communities to the farthest corner of the globe the eternal conflict between good and evil continues. There is a place in the struggle for every one of you, women from business and from professions, from the ranks of the governing and from the governed; no, there is more than simply a place, there is a duty station.

I believe that freedom has been best preserved and human well-being best advanced in the American society by utilizing the resources of our people to the fullest. If our Nation and the free world are to survive, then high morals, good ideas, and hard work are the basic prescription. This country urgently needs your constant help. It needs your active participation, simply as informed and devoted citizens, doing their duty in Government and community affairs.

A great Governor of California, the late Hiram Johnson, once said: "We are going to forget for a moment how to make men richer, and we are going to think how to make men better." Hiram Johnson's remarks were not limited to men, but comprehended mankind. By your efforts you can make the difference and determine whether we do have a better America and a better world.

A LAND WAR IN ASIA

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Appleton Post-Crescent is a forthright, independent newspaper with a fine tradition of vigorous, intelligent commentary on the State and National scene.

The Sunday, July 25, 1965, Post-Crescent carried a particularly thoughtful and important editorial entitled "A Land War in Asia." The editorial seriously questions "whether sending more and more American troops to Vietnam is really the answer to the Communist aggression in that area."

I believe that other Members of Congress will benefit from this thoughtful editorial. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Appleton Post-Crescent, July 25, 1965]

A LAND WAR IN ASIA

Secretary McNamara's recommendation that a great many more American troops—perhaps 100,000 combat forces—will be needed in Vietnam to halt the deterioration is just what so many Americans have feared and warned about. Now it appears that we are committed to fighting a ground war in Asia on terrain that works for the guerrilla forces rather than our more advanced weapons and techniques.

McNamara estimated the Vietcong forces at about 165,000, many of them now supposedly North Vietnamese. The South Vietnamese forces are about 500,000 and there are some 75,000 Americans in Vietnam, about half of which are combat troops. In antiguerrilla campaigns, the ratio should be at least 5 to 1 and preferably as high as 15 to 1 since the advantage of the hit-and-run jungle attack is with the guerrillas.

But we seriously question whether sending more and more American troops to Vietnam is really the answer to the Communist aggression in that area.

The North Vietnamese Army has several hundred thousand men under arms. In China there are millions available for service. Is there any reason to believe that both forces will not eventually be thrown into the fighting as far south as Saigon?

"The size of the Vietcong has increased," McNamara reported. "The rate of operations has increased and the size of attacks have expanded. The disruption of lines of communications by rail, sea, and road has become more intense. Terroristic attacks have increased." And all of this since the last shipment of American ground forces, the marines and the 1st Division.

The American strategy presumably is simply to make it so tough for the Vietcong and the infiltrating North Vietnamese that they will seek out negotiations. This is not only reasonable; it is about all we can do unless we withdraw. But what are the possibilities for the future?

Ho Chi Minh is supposed not to want to ask for any more Red Chinese help than arms and ammunition. If the Chinese send troops, it is said that Ho fears they won't ever go home and he is probably quite right. But if the Vietcong and North Vietnamese are on the verge of defeat in South Vietnam and especially if there is the threat of South Vietnamese invasion of the north—something now remote but which could happen if the Vietcong are soundly beaten—it certainly is likely that Ho might turn to the Red Chinese for aid. It is also quite possible that the Chinese might not wait to be asked. Are we going to continue to try to match ground troops?

This is a war which we should not have become involved in particularly in the way we have. In retrospect it even appears that our policy for Laos was wiser than the one for Vietnam. At least the Laotians on their own now have brought about a somewhat stable government out of chaos while exactly the opposite has happened in Saigon despite or perhaps because of the presence of American military "advisers."

It may well be, as infantrymen have always argued, that in the long run wars must be won on the ground. Our bombings of North Vietnam have not as yet brought them even to consider terms. We are handicapped by a moral restriction against bombing open cities—at least at this stage of the conflict. We don't dare bomb Russian missile bases as we prefer to try to tone down the Russian involvement rather than to force them further into opposition.

Some time ago Harrison Salisbury, military writer for the New York Times, warned that this would be a most serious and discouraging war and that we had to face up to the participation of a great many American ground troops but that we had no alternative except capitulation. Another Times writer insisted we must withdraw and recognize the future of Chinese domination of Asia. And yet would not exactly the opposite be true? We cannot turn backward but if we were not so militarily involved, it is more likely that there would be more homegrown opposition to the spread of Chinese influence among Asians, even in Hanoi, and more interest in vigorously opposing Communist aggression by such Asian countries as the Philippines, Japan, Thailand, and even Australia.

Ambassador Maxwell Taylor has reportedly strenuously and consistently opposed the commitment of massive numbers of American ground troops in Vietnam. This may be a major reason why he resigned as Ambassador and is being replaced by Henry Cabot Lodge. Whatever the chances of our present firm attitude persuading North Vietnam to come to the conference table, Americans must recognize the risks we are taking. Do we want to become involved in a major ground war in Asia with the obvious heavy casualties? Is the danger of Communist control of Vietnam that important?

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the August edition of Fortune magazine, there is an article entitled "Traveler to Pacific Wars," written by Mr. Charles J. V. Murphy. The author has just returned from an extensive trip to the Far East and Vietnam. His sober presentation contributes to much needed perspective on the war in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Traveler to Pacific Wars" be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRAVELER TO THE PACIFIC WARS

(By Charles J. V. Murphy)

(NOTE.—Viewed in the perspective of U.S. strategy in the Pacific, the present war in Vietnam is only part, though a crucial part, of a much larger whole. The involvement of the United States and its allies stretches all the way from the Antipodes to Japan and Korea, and in fact four wars are presently going on in the Pacific area. The biggest, in South Vietnam, engages on our side some 580,000 South Vietnamese fighting men, at least 75,000 U.S. troops, very substantial fractions of U.S. tactical air and carrier task forces, and Australian, New Zealand, and Korean contingents. The other big war is the one launched by Indonesia against its neighbor Malaysia—the so-called confrontation war. This strange term was invented by President Sukarno for his, so far, unavailing effort to pitch the British out of Malaysia and most particularly off their commanding airfields and magnificent naval base at Singapore. This has drawn in some 50,000 British (including 14,000 Gurkhas), about 50,000 Malaysians (including internal security forces), and small Australian and New Zealand forces. A war collaterally related to the Vietnamese one is being fought in Laos against the Hanoi-directed Pathet Lao. Here the hitherto desultory "neutralist" Laotian forces, with assistance from the Thais, are attempting to block the Ho Chi Minh trails into South Vietnam. The fourth war, between Taiwan and Red China, is in suspense except for occasional air and naval brushes.

(Until recently the anti-Communist powers in the Pacific have tried to maintain the fiction that their wars were separate. Now, in a very real sense, the wars are beginning to flow together. It is plain that the United States, its partners, and friends must rethink their Pacific strategy and alliances for the immense test in the making with Red China's power.

(Fortune Editor Charles Murphy has been making an extended tour of the South Pacific. His report on New Zealand "Traveler in a Small Utopia" and Australia "Traveler on the Rim of Asia" appeared in the May and June issues. From Australia he flew on to Singapore and Bangkok. A report on that area will be detailed in an early issue. This letter begins with his reflections as he approaches Saigon and the larger war in Vietnam.)

There was not much to see from 30,000 feet. In these near equatorial latitudes, the rainy season had begun rather earlier than usual, and much of the time the plane was either in or over soggy, heavy cloud layers. Soon after takeoff from Bangkok, however, I noticed that the pilot angled southward over the Gulf of Siam, so as to skirt the Cambodian delta. Some few days before, the left-leaning, somewhat frivolous Prince Sihanouk had noisily broken off such diplomatic business as until then went on between Cambodia and the United States. His displeasure embraced Thailand as well, as America's good and helpful ally, and it was therefore only commonsense for the Thai commercial pilots to shy clear of the itchy-fingered gunners, friends and foes alike, who man the Cambodian-Vietnamese borders.

At this stage of my travels I was well up what I had come to think of as the Pacific ladder of trouble, which stretches from the Antipodes through Malaysia and Thailand into Taiwan and beyond to Panmunjom, across some 10,000 miles of land and ocean in all. In Borneo I had been shown what might in modesty be described as a VIP view of that other major Asian war—the so-called confrontation war between the new British-protected state of Malaysia and Indonesia. It's a bona fide war all right, although for cost and killing it doesn't begin to compare with the one that we Americans are in for in Vietnam, some 400 miles away, on the far shore of the South China Sea. Still, there were small but sharp running sea fights at night in Singapore Harbor while I was there, and shooting was going on in the rubber plantations of Johore and in the pepper groves of Sarawak and Sabah.

From Singapore, in due course, I had gone on to Bangkok. Alone among the SEATO partners and the American allies in the Pacific, Thailand occupies a physical bridge, or link, between the British war to save for the West the sea gate between the Pacific and Indian Oceans and the American war to save for the West a political and military lodgment on the Asian Continent. Though Bangkok itself is the capital of the SEATO alliance, Thailand is not yet formally a belligerent in the Far East. Nevertheless, it has become in a studied way a de facto power in both situations. It has bravely lent its geography to the Laotians and ourselves in manners it does not wish specified for military pressures against the North Vietnamese deployments that are a potential hazard to Thailand. It has also begun to give serious attention, for the first time, to the feasibility of a joint operation with the British and Malaysian forces for the purpose of cornering in the wild mountains of southern Thailand a band of Peiping-oriented guerrillas who are the last surviving cadres of the Communist movement that sought to take over postwar Malaya.

Nations and people of like minds in the western and southern Pacific, it seemed to me, were finally beginning to come together out of a realization of a growing common danger. A year ago the United States, Britain, New Zealand, Australia, and Malaysia were pursuing their separate interests in the Pacific with sidelong glances at each other to see how the other was faring. Then, in a matter of months, the Australians and New Zealanders became engaged. Australians are now fighting in Malaysia; both Australia and New Zealand have taken the hard decision to send combat troops into South Vietnam. And so the alliances are converging.

There was no mystery about the circumstances that had finally begun to pull the Pacific alliances together. It was, first, the sudden appalling realization that the fragile structure of South Vietnam was on the verge of falling apart and, next, the spectacle of the United States striking with its too long withheld airpower at North Vietnam and moving tens of thousands of combat troops across the Pacific into South Vietnam. But it was not simply the agony of Vietnam, heartrending as that is, that finally galvanized the non-Communist powers into action. What happened was that tardily but unblinkingly the politicians in power in these Pacific nations finally recognized and faced up to a still distant but ultimate danger.

"THE TIME TO STOP MAO"

Most certainly the danger does not rest simply with a fear that if South Vietnam should go down, then that wily septuagenarian Ho Chi Minh will fasten communism on a primitive community that does not really want communism. The central danger is that if the Vietnamese social structure should finally dissolve, in the face of the now quite desperate American efforts to hold it together, then the Red Chinese will have stunningly proved the case for the so-called wars of national liberation, wars waged in the guise (to borrow the jargon of the original Soviet handbook) of anti-imperialist national-liberation movements.

It may come as a surprise to some, but the fact is that few understand this rising danger more acutely than do the politicians and intellectuals of the non-Communist socialist left. In Auckland and Wellington, in Canberra and Melbourne and Sydney, in Singapore and Kuala Lumpur, one man after another said as much to me. Their shared reasoning went something like this: "You Americans must never give up in Vietnam. Red China is the enemy. Now is the time to stop Mao. Only you Americans have the military power to do the job." Then, after a pause, this sotto voce apology: "Of course you will appreciate why we can't say this publicly. Politics, you know." All the politicians in the Pacific knew that even Prime Minister Shastri of India, while publicly deploring the American air bombing of North Vietnam, had privately spoken admiringly of the American resolution. And the diplomatic grapevine vibrated with the news that even Prince Hihanouk and the somewhat anti-American Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yu of Singapore were agreed in their private conversations in May at Pnompenh that American military power had entered the battle none too soon.

What the Pacific leaders are finally braced for, while still flinching from openly acknowledging its inevitability, is a decisive contest between the United States and Red China. There can be no real peace in their world of non-Communist Asians—a community of 1 billion people—until the power question has been settled one way or another. I pondered what this judgment involves for us: can the United States even hold on in Vietnam without pressing the war home directly against North Vietnam and the power center in Hanoi itself? Judgment on this was to be made soon enough on my arrival in Saigon. What I was sure of, already, was that a whole new experience, a test, a struggle, possibly even some fantastic ordeal, is unmistakably in the making for the United States in the Pacific, and a new and formidable chapter has opened in U.S. history. There is no mistaking the character and meaning of one fundamental happening. It is that the U.S. strategic center of gravity has moved west of the 180th meridian, into the Asian Pacific. It is almost certain to stay there for years to come.

The pity, the folly, is that the famous men who have been manipulating the American tactics and strategy in the struggle for South Vietnam let the rot and collapse there go on so long. Indeed, I was hardly back in Saigon before I began to wonder whether all of Lyndon Johnson's men have grasped the full seriousness of the new situation. After getting settled in the Caravelle Hotel in the center of the city, and sharing a meal with several colleagues in a tiny bistro run by an expatriate Frenchman with a perhaps exaggerated reputation for occasional murder, I took a walk in the direction of the Saigon River. My path led me past the American Embassy, which had been all but demolished in March by terrorists' bombs. With the reconstruction not yet finished, it put me in mind of the bridge structure of a battleship. The outer walls had been heavily reinforced; the once tall windows had been contracted to narrow turret-like slits; shatterproof plastic was being substituted for glass, to reduce the danger from lethal flying splinters in the event of another bombing; and the street approaches to the building itself had been closed off with upended sections of sewer pipe weighted with concrete to form a barricade.

These defensive dispositions I noted with approval. Then I was taken aback to hear my companion, an officer of fairly senior rank, say that on orders from Washington construction of a new Embassy, to cost about $1 million, was to be started immediately in a residential area. The design had been chosen some years ago, during the false lull that followed the French defeat and withdrawal; it calls for a handsome three-story office building with spacious windows and wide entrances appropriate for a tranquil garden setting. The site was further attractive at the time of its acquisition because of its close proximity to the Premier's office. In the current mood of Saigon, however, this handiness no longer is an advantage. There have been 10 changes of government since November 1963—or were there only 9?—and the mobs have got into the habit of demonstrating in front of their Premier's windows every few months, usually in protest over his supposed subserviency to the American Ambassador. To put up the new Embassy more or less on the direct line of the mobs' accustomed march struck me as a heedless action. Indeed, the whole scheme seemed most untimely; our diplomacy, my friend and I were agreed, might be most prudently conducted for the time being in the present bunker and the million dollars invested in ammunition.

OUR LONGEST LOSING WAR

If I appear cynical about the conduct of American business in South Vietnam, it is because in the course of my visit here I find it hard to be anything but distressed and shocked by the American management of what has become a large and costly war. With the end nowhere in sight, it is already the longest losing war that Americans have been engaged in since the French-Indian wars in the middle 18th century.

In President Eisenhower's last year, U.S. military aid to Vietnam came to only $65 million, and our military mission there totaled 773 officers and men. Within a year our military aid to that country was more than doubled, rising as it did in fiscal 1962 to about $144 million, and the military mission was increased some twentyfold, the strength rising to nearly 17,000 men. As this article went to press, early in July, something like 75,000 U.S. troops were already deployed, in one role or another, in South Vietnam. This figure does not take into account some 27,000 fliers and sailors who man Carrier Task Force 77 of the 7th Fleet, and who are wholly in the fight. Nor does it include the general support being provided the forward forces by the large permanent Air Force and Navy establishments in the Philippines, Japan, and on Okinawa. Very substantial fractions of the Tactical Air Command and the Navy's fast carrier task forces have been concentrated in the Pacific and the westward, or Pacific, tilt of our military resources is generally much more pronounced than most Americans realize.

The capital input has also soared, although its true magnitude has been to some degree concealed. As the battle went against "McNamara's war" (as he himself described it), he was able to absorb the rising costs without a stiff boost in the defense budget by drawing upon the emergency-reserve stocks of the U.S. forces and by reducing or deferring their less urgent normal operations. As a former controller, the Secretary appreciates, of course, the eventual perils of such a practice for a defense strategy that stressed a high degree of readiness for both general war and simultaneous limited wars oceans apart. The running costs of the Vietnamese operation appear to have risen to about $2.2 billion annually. These costs break down roughly as follows:

Continuing economic aid to keep the Saigon Government afloat and to pay the bureaucracy: about $300 million annually.

Other economic support to the Vietnamese infrastructure: about $70 million.

Military assistance programs (weapons, pay for the Vietnamese forces, overhead cost of the U.S. military advisory establishment): about $330 million annually.

Indirect costs represented by other forms of U.S. participation—including the combat forces, day-to-day military operating costs—that are absorbed by the U.S. defense budget: an estimated $800 million annually.

Extraordinary additional U.S. military costs, chiefly for port and airfield construction, and for replacing reserve stocks of ammunition, fuel, and so forth: $700 million, to be financed by the supplementary appropriation that President Johnson asked for in May.

And we are in for an eventual bill for the war that will be much stiffer than the Pentagon cares to divulge just now.

THE MONSOON OFFENSIVE

Although McNamara has demonstrated his ability as an administrator of a vast bureaucracy, the primary job of the Pentagon is to conduct war—and the only war McNamara has so far been called upon to conduct has gone very badly from the outset. When President Johnson finally decided in February to put North Vietnam below the 20th parallel under the U.S. air counterattack, and to bring U.S. jets to bear for the first time in the battle for villages and roads inside South Vietnam, it was an act of desperation. The South Vietnamese Army was actually distintegrating. To the extent that a government remained in Saigon, it was the thinnest kind of film over the American presence.

The U.S. air counterattack achieved all that was expected of it, up to a point: it did check the Communist offensive. It had the effect of driving home barely in time a bolt to hold a door that was swinging wildly on its hinges. But by reason of the very limitations that the political direction of the war in Washington imposed upon the air counterattack, the blows have only impaired, without paralyzing, the Vietcong's capacity for further heavy fighting. There is excellent reason to believe that the North Vietnamese buildup was well advanced before the February air attacks on the principal supply lines to the Vietcong forces in the battle zone. Enough trained troops were by then already deployed inside South Vietnam, and enough battle stocks had been laid by or were within its reach, for the enemy to decide that it could still continue to sustain a powerful offensive by its standards through the monsoon season—i.e., into our autumn. Certainly, it is acting as if it had such means.

The Communist guerrilla forces are the lightest kind of infantry. Once armed and equipped, they don't need much replenishment other than ammunition. They live off the country. U.S. Army intelligence measures the Communist military strength at present inside South Vietnam, in terms of organized forces, at more than 100 battalions. It further hypothesizes that this force, with a daily average aggregate consumption of from 100 to 150 tons of supplies, could fight from 20 to 30 sharp two-battalion-size actions every month. Ho's flitting battalions don't need much in their supply wagons, because they are not required to hold ground. The marines and the U.S. Army in their redoubts and strongpoints are not the targets. The target is the exposed hamlet or district or provincial capital, or the column vulnerable to ambush.

So, the U.S. air counterattack notwithstanding, the critical phase of the 1965 monsoon offensive remains to be fought. No knowledgeable officer that I talked to in South Vietnam was sanguine about the outcome of the summer's fighting. It is not a question of our marines, or our airborne troops getting overpowered. Ho Chi Minh is too smart to send his light infantry forward to be mowed down by American firepower. The U.S. military problem at this late hour consists in finding some way to lift the pressure from the exhausted Vietnamese village and district garrisons. And if the struggle continues to go as badly against the South Vietnamese in the rest of the monsoon season as was the case in May and June, a force of from 200,000 to 300,000 American troops will be none too many simply to shore up a sagging Vietnam Army for the elementary tasks of holding Saigon, the major ports and airfields, the strategic provincial capitals, and the main highways.

AN OLD SOLDIER'S ADVICE

This is an outcome that was never meant to be. U.S. ground forces fighting Asians in Asia? Until the other day, the idea was all but unthinkable. At the White House, for example, whenever the question arose of how U.S. military power might best be used in Asia, President Johnson used to tell about his last talk with Gen. Douglas MacArthur at Walter Reed Hospital. "Son," the President quotes the dying soldier as saying to him, "don't ever get yourself bogged down in a land war in Asia."

MacArthur's view has been an article of faith with U.S. military men and notably of the Army Chiefs of Staff ever since the bloody island campaigns against the Japanese. It was a view shared by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor before he was sent to Saigon as special U.S. Ambassador. Once there, and with Vietnam falling apart around him, Taylor reversed his position. He was not happy about it. He was confronted with the testing of a military policy by which he himself, as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and McNamara had reshaped the Armed Forces over a period of 3½ years: making a great point of preparing U.S. troops for limited and counterinsurgency wars. The truth is the Army's investment in these particular skills was nothing like what it was cracked up to be. Nevertheless, in the absence of decision in Washington to aim the U.S. air attack primarily at North Veitnam, Taylor had no choice but to ask the President for combat troops to be directly committed in the South.

THE MORNING THE B-57 BLEW UP

As I looked around, I could not help feeling that the condition of our forces left much to be desired in the most elementary respects. One of the major military air bases in Vietnam is at a place called Bien Hoa, 18 miles northeast of Saigon. At the time of my visit there, in May, jet operations were possible only from three runways in the entire country, and Bien Hoa had one of them. The original airstrip was built by the French Air Force, on a rubber plantation that occupied the north bank of the Dongnai River.

One can drive to Bien Hoa from downtown Saigon in half an hour over a new three-lane asphalt highway. Light-engineering plants have sprung up on both sides of the roads, and racing along with the crowded buses and the careening trucks and the honking and hooting motorbikes, one has the sense of passing through a thriving, prospering, mushrooming suburb. This impression is valid enough, as regards the construction indexes. But the area is also a genuine no man's land. Open to traffic and commerce with Saigon by day, it reverts to Vietcong control at night. The notorious war zone D —a densely forested stronghold that the B–52's have been methodically bombing—begins just to the north of the airfield and, every few days or so, black-suited Vietcong in their outposts take potshots at planes on the final approach.

When I came this way a year ago, the Air Force contingent at Bien Hoa numbered only 400 men and they operated 40 light planes. When I returned this year, one blindingly hot Saturday morning, it was to find the Air Force unit swollen to about 2,300 men and they were operating 100 planes, including a number of light jet B–57 bombers. And that was not all. On the same field were jammed another 100 U.S. Army planes, mostly helicopters, plus another 100 planes belonging to the Vietnamese Air Force, mostly light, close-support, propeller-driven craft. This made a total of about 300 aircraft collected around a single strip. It was the dirtiest, most slovenly, ramshackle air operation I have ever visited. One can excuse a lot in war, but the confusion, disorder, and disarray here were beyond excuse.

For one thing, more than 6 months earlier, in the early morning hours of November 1, 1964, a handful of Vietcong mortar men who had penetrated the base's outer defense system laid down a fast and accurate barrage that destroyed, in a matter of minutes, five costly B–57 bombers on their hardstands. The chances of a return visit by the Vietcong were high and, indeed, shortly before my call, a brigade of the U.S. 173d Airborne Division was hastily taking up positions around the base to guard it from an expected attack in force. Yet even then, the costly planes, tens of millions of dollars' worth of them, stood wingtip to wingtip for want of dispersal room; and, incredibly, a dozen or so simple concrete and earth revetments to protect the planes had not been finished. Funds for new construction, I presently learned, were difficult to come by in Washington. So under the very eyes of the two-star Air Force theater commander, the four-star Army general in command of the entire war, and even the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs who sat in Saigon, the squalid, inefficient, and dangerous operation at Bien Hoa was tolerated and left to an overworked Air Force colonel to manage as best he could.

The poor chap didn't manage very well. Less than 24 hours later, from an angled distance of maybe 2,000 yards and a height of 4,000 feet, I was a chance eyewitness of Bien Hoa's second and far larger disaster. I was abroad a Navy plane, en route to Task Force 77 on station in the South China Sea. Our course took us past the base and, as it happened, while he was only 2 minutes or so away, our pilot saw a puff of smoke, then a swelling fireball, and he sent word aft that Bein Hoa seemed to be "blowing up." When the field came abeam, I saw that the entire block of B–57's was fiercely ablaze, and the conflagration had spread to long files of light piston-powered bombers, the A–1's. My first thought was that the Vietcong mortar specialists had done it again; then I realized that the recurring explosions were caused by bombs exploding in the racks of the burning planes. A careful inquiry by the Air Force failed to identify the root cause of the disaster. Most likely, a defective fuse or the faulty stowing of an old 750-pound bomb abroad one of the B–57's—the bombers there still were being armed with 1944 vintage "iron" bombs—started the chain reaction. Twenty-two planes blew up, more were damaged; a loss of that magnitude in an air battle would have been cause for national anxiety. The pennypinching that contributed to this episode and the timidity that impelled experienced officers to endure a scandalous situation did credit to no one.

REFLECTIONS IN A HELICOPTER

The American officer corps is, needless to say, a good deal more competent than this incident may suggest. In Vietnam, though, the Army is up against a slippery, slithering kind of battle that it can't seem to get a hard grip on. Doubts about the Army's preparedness for such campaigning were amply confirmed—despite all the high-flown theorizing about counterinsurgency tactics. A morning's helicopter tour of a crucial war zone in the company of an intelligent, youthful operations-planning officer, Brig. Gen. William E. DePuy, was highly informative in this respect.

A helicopter can't be beaten for enabling a general of infantry to get around and to see what is going on beyond his headquarters. On this particular morning, General DePuy, at the cost of being only 5 hours away from his busy desk in Saigon as the senior U.S. military planner, made a swing in his clattering helicopter that took him into three provinces, afforded him a grandstand view of a helicopter attack in company strength, brought him into a quick conference with the staff of a Vietnamese division engaged in a "search and destroy" sweep on the edges of a Vietcong staging area, and finally put him down at the heavily barricaded headquarters of a great French-operated rubber plantation for a canvass of the tactical situation with the U.S. advisers to a Vietnamese battalion that was braced, behind its sandbags and slitted brick walls and barbed wire, for a night descent by the Vietcong.

Helicopter etiquette orders the seating of the noncombatant guest inside, between the escort officer and the port and starboard riflemen; their bodies are interposed between him and the open doors through which a sniper could sensibly aim. The guest must take his chances even Stephen, of course, with whatever ill-aimed shot might come up through the floor. DePuy sat alongside me, and as we flew west by north, he kept up a running commentary on places and events in the changing neighborhood in view. I was familiar with the region, having traveled over the same area the year before. But I marveled again at how close the swirl of battle remains to Saigon, and how vague and impalpable the enemy remains. From our altitude one could see 40 miles or so, and in this watery domain, north and west of Saigon, given over to rice paddies, rubber and tea growing, at least 1,000 sharp battles of one kind or another—ambushes, night rushes on sleeping hamlets, skirmishes—have been fought during the past 3 years. To the west, I had a fine view through broken clouds of Cambodia and the forested waterways over which the Vietcong come and go in sampans. We flew at 5,000 feet. But I never did see a Vietcong.

THE TROUBLESOME REDOUBT

The educational aspects of the flight included a skirting of the zone D area north of Bien Hoa. As described earlier, this is reputedly the major Vietcong base for their operations against Saigon itself. From the air, it put me in mind of the Louisiana river country, except that the forest here is much more dense, with the tree canopy reaching in places to heights of 200 feet. The forest redoubt covers about 150 square miles, and from the accounts of defectors and prisoners it is both a maze and trap made up of secret trails, hidden strongpoints, and supply dumps, and bunkers connected with deep tunnels impregnable to air bombing.

None of this can be seen from the air. I was shown a short, narrow gray swath in the forest left by the Air Force in its forlorn experiment some months ago to defoliate the region by saturating the tree tops with a mixture of napalm and chemicals. The chemicals were expected to dry out the trees and the napalm to set the forest ablaze. But, for various reasons, the hoped-for conflagration never got going, and the experiment was abandoned as being too costly and tricky. Now, the Air Force is trying to reduce the forest to matchwood with B–52's.

I doubt even the B–52's will make much of an impression with TNT, unless McNamara wants to make treefelling a new career for SAC, or unless SAC has the extraordinary good luck to pinpoint and smash the headquarters area. But it was equally obvious that the job of prying the enemy out of the forest tangle was hopelessly beyond the competence and means of the troops we had committed. In recent major engagements the air attack has again and again finally turned the tide of the battle. But it must also be said that, for the Vietnamese garrisons, the turn has usually come too late. Since the Vietcong time their assaults at night, and in the monsoon season at intervals when they can count on cover from rain and clouds, the Air Force's ability to react quickly has been sorely limited on occasion, and in consequence battalion after battalion of Vietnamese regional troops were cut to ribbons before help came. One doesn't have to look very far to observe that, except for the introduction of the helicopter, there has been little new invention to prepare the ground forces for the kind of war they are now being asked to fight. Indeed, the United States doesn't even yet have a satisfactory airplane to support this kind of action. We are therefore obliged to use planes that are either obsolete (A–1's and B–57's) or too valuable (F–105's and F–4's).

THE CASE FOR GOING NORTH

It is time that the E-ring in the Pentagon stopped kidding the troops, and that the rest of us stopped kidding ourselves. It makes no sense to send American foot soldiers, rifles and grenades at the ready, into the rain forests and the rice paddies and the dim mountain trails to grapple with a foe whom they cannot distinguish by face or tongue from the same racial stock whom they seek to defend. On every count—disease, tropical heat and rain, the language curtain—the odds are much too high against their making much of an impression. When the question arose last year of sending U.S. combat forces into South Vietnam as stiffeners, serious consideration was given to the proposition of forming them into a line, a sort of cordon sanitaire, across the jungle and mountain approaches through Laos and Cambodia, with the object of thereby sealing off the Communist supply routes. This impractical scheme was discarded in view of the all but impossible cost of supplying the Army at anything like its desired standards, and the further consideration that nine-tenths of the force's energies and means would be consumed merely in looking after itself. The solution that was adopted and is being followed now is to settle the troops in garrison-like strongpoints along the coast. It has been romantically suggested that these places will in due course become sally ports from which our troops will issue forth into the hinterland, spreading in ink-spot fashion stability and hope among the hamlets. But such a process could take a decade or two short of forever. It also means military occupation, the last thing Kennedy, McNamara, Taylor & Co. had in their minds when they resolved in 1961 to risk a stand in South Vietnam. Taylor understood this perfectly, and the dreary outlook no doubt made it easier for him to leave Saigon.

THE U.S. ADVANTAGE

Is there an alternative strategy? There certainly is. It is one, however, that revolves around a different set of premises than the McNamara-Taylor strategy has so far favored. Most particularly, it means shifting the main weight of the American counterattack from a ground war below the 17th parallel to an air offensive in North Vietnam itself, accompanied by a blockade of the North Vietnamese coast. Does this mean leveling Hanoi? No. It means, if necessary, the deliberate, progressive destruction of the North Vietnamese infrastructure—the plants, the railroads, and electric-power systems, the ports—to a point where Ho Chi Minh can no longer support his aggression in the South. Will this cause Ho to capitulate? Not necessarily. Ho is an elderly Asian revolutionary whose education in communism began in Europe after the Bolshevik revolution. More of his adult life has been spent outside Vietnam than inside. His government will probably be wherever he chooses to hang his hat.

But if his capacity for mischief is reduced, then our object is served. That object, it seems to me, is to lift from South Vietnam, at all possible speed, the terrible pressure on its hamlets. Because that task is manifestly beyond the competence of the Army and Marine Corps, except in a prolonged and costly test of endurance, then we must pick up our weapons of technological advantage—the air arms, both sea and ground based. What has made the American fighting man better than his enemies is higher technological proficiency. It seems folly for us to fight in Asia without drawing on this technological advantage. It might be highly desirable, for instance, to use our seapower and ground troops to a limited extent to establish a beachhead near Haiphong, thus threatening the enemy's main supply lines and forcing it to pull its troops out of southern Vietnam. Such tactics were immensely successful in Leyete Gulf and later at Inchon and had a salutory effect on equally stubborn enemies.

Would a truly stern attack on the North bring China into the war? Expert opinion splits sharply over the answer. High value would certainly have to be given to that possibility in any plan for enlarging the theater of action. We are already in an undeclared contest of power with Red China, and the question that the President has to face up to is whether in the months immediately ahead, he settles for a partial defeat or failure in a war, one fully removed from the major enemy, or risks a clash with Red China in order to bring the secondary war under control. My own view is that Mao, should he elect to engage, will do so reluctantly and within cautious limits. He is certainly not likely to force an engagement on terms that will compel the United States to employ its technological advantages á outrance (to use an old-fashioned term). And I find it hard to believe he would dare to send his infantry masses over wretched roads to do battle in southeast Asia, while Chiang Kai-shek waits and watches hopefully close by on the sea flank, with a spirited army of 400,000 men and the sharpest, most experienced, small air force in the world.

THE BIG BLUE-WATER CHIPS

It is, I suggest, the looming struggle with Red China that we Americans must keep in the forefront of our minds as we grope for the right mixture of political and military strategy for ending the mischief in Vietnam. This is why the map shown at the start of this report now grows luminous with meaning. Now, while hoping for a satisfactory outcome in the going war, we should be sensibly preparing the dispositions we shall need if it turns out badly.

The huge naval base at Subic Bay with its fine runways and the Air Force's runways, repair shops, and storage facilities at Clark Field in the Philippines are indispensable for any forward strategy in the Pacific. It stands to reason that the British air establishment and truly superb naval base at Singapore, all greatly refurbished in the past decade, are also crucial for the control of the Pacific sea routes and the approaches to Australia and New Zealand. Hundreds of millions of U.S. dollars have been invested in air and sea facilities in Okinawa and Japan. And Japan must itself be persuaded to become the north hinge of any grand strategy scheme in the Pacific.

Then, too, there is Thailand, which has generously opened its geography for new jet airfields. This to me is the most stunning recent development of all. It could have the effect of transforming Thailand from being a weak ground flank on the U.S. position in South Vietnam into becoming the main air-strike position, of which South Vietnam becomes the weak ground flank. And, finally, there are South Korea and Taiwan, the only other friendly countries in the area with large, ready, experienced forces. It seems to me our diplomacy should be cultivating this vast garden with more assiduity than it has shown.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

NATIONAL AMERICAN LEGION BASEBALL WEEK—LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6, 1965, as "National American Legion Baseball Week."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of the joint resolution.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, for the next few minutes, I shall address myself to a question of deep concern to many of us. It relates to the crisis in Vietnam and to academic freedom. As far apart as those two subjects might seem to be at first glance, they have indeed become joined.

Since February of this year, the Nation has been engaged in what may truly be described as a great debate. The subject of this great debate is our future course of action in southeast Asia and the Far East, in general. Indeed, the basic question is not really the propriety of our action in Vietnam, but what course will serve the United States in the Near East in the next decade. The outcome of the debate will undoubtedly shape the future of the entire world for years to come.

As in any great debate, there is an unfortunate tendency for arguments to polarize, for rhetoric and bombast sometimes to replace logic and reason, and for the development of feelings of distrust and alienation for those who disagree with the viewpoint you happen to hold. This is probably a natural development given the nature of human behavior, but it can have some very unfortunate repercussions. In this context I would like to examine today what I believe are the beginnings of a protest movement that may have serious consequences for our American traditions and for free inquiry in our society. This has to do with academic freedom.

In the past few years, much to my personal gratification, the university and college students of the Nation have begun to take an increased interest in the state of the Nation around them. For the years following the Korean war, 15 years ago, it had been difficult to interest students in the affairs of the Nation. They were interested in their personal surroundings and in the search for a job with status and security. But in recent years—sparked in large part, in the beginning at least, by the magnetic personality and shining example of the late President John Kennedy, and continued by the leadership of President Johnson, the younger generation of students of America have become interested in the world around them. They have worked long and hard in the civil rights movement, in helping to teach and train the dropouts and the children of the poor and neglected minorities, and in projects too numerous to mention which aim at the improvement of society. It is from the ranks of our college students that we have drawn the majority of the recruits for the Peace Corps. And in that endeavor they have justly earned and received the acclaim not only of a great portion of our people at home, but, indeed, of the world.

And now, in the great debate on Vietnam, the students have entered these lists with the enthusiasm typical of all their endeavors. And on this issue, they have been joined, again as seldom before in recent history, by the members of our college faculties. All across the Nation we see the results of this interest, this concern for the shape of tomorrow. A new word—"teach-in"—signifies a tactic to generate interest and enthusiasm and, I hope, instill knowledge. To this ferment I add my wholeheateded and complete support, even though in many of the teach-ins, I hasten to add, I have been the object of much criticism because of my position that the United States should stand firm and strong in Vietnam. Yet in endorsing this new flurry of activity on the campus, I am well aware that this movement and its manifestations across the country represent no Arcadian discourse with student and teacher contemplating the problems of state in the calm surroundings of the Halls of Ivy. I know full well that this debate has taken on many of the aspects of a protest movement on the campus, that in this movement there are professional revolutionaries and malcontents as well as bona fide academics and students. I realize that perhaps there are even a few persons who might think they take orders from Moscow or Peiping and are working to turn this activity to their advantage. And, too, there may be found in this movement on the campus a few individuals whose mode of dress and whose lack of enthusiasm for bathing cause concern among more traditional members of society. These are all facts which I acknowledge.

But emerging from the emotional extremes of the controversy on Vietnam have been harsh charges and even more dangerous assumptions from fringe groups on both sides. There have been certain groups on a few campuses, for example, who sought to shut out debate and controversy and to conduct a monolog their way. As these critics have attacked our Nation's policies in Vietnam, they have described the policymakers as "new imperialists," "power-mad militarists," and "warmongers" out to conquer the world.

In the Senate earlier this year, I suggested that the campus debates would be better received and would better serve the traditional concepts of the academic world if dissent on this issue among the academics was not only tolerated but even encouraged and promoted. Whatever else, in the realm of human knowledge, there has surely emerged full appreciation for the right to be wrong and the right to think "otherwise."

Likewise, I expressed the fear that, if the campuses did not make a conscious effort to maintain a dialog rather than a monolog, the consequence would be a distortion of the true face of the modern American college campus today. In all fairness, the voices from the campus have not been nearly as one sided as the headlines in the newscasts would suggest. We all know that protest often gathers more attention than support. Willfully or otherwise, there has been a distortion of the state of mind in the Halls of Ivy. The fact remains that the vociferousness of the protests from both students and faculty have succeeded in exciting those who peddle patriotism professionally as well as those who may be wrongfully disturbed by the origins of the dissent.

What concerns me is that this normal, if sometimes wrongheaded, ferment on the campus is already being seized upon as an excuse to launch new witch hunts, new predatory forays into the realm of academic freedom—all in the name of Americanism, of course, but with the purpose of stifling the differing points of view. It threatens, in fact, to shut the doors on free inquiry and free expression.

Given then the reemergence of extremist groups in our country during the past few years, it should not be especially surprising that the anxieties engendered by Vietnam, when added to the already existing atmosphere of hate, smear, and fear should increase the tempo of fringe groups both to the left and the right. The classroom in particular has always been an area of suspicion in their lexicon of conspiracy, and thus it is not unusual—and certainly not unexpected—that it becomes a prime target now. The cases of new attacks being launched against the campus are becoming numerous enough, however, to cause us all to become concerned lest it get out of hand.

It is more than a little disturbing that a teach-in on the campus of the University of Miami in Florida not long ago should evoke the use of one of the newer weapons of the extreme rightwing. This is the recorded telephone message. Reportedly begun by a medical doctor, Dr. W. C. Douglas, of Sarasota, Fla., this device plays back messages from a program entitled "Let Freedom Ring" and can be connected to any telephone exchange around the country—and, in fact, is so connected. It has become a tool of extremists coast to coast with the advantage that, until now at least, it has not been the subject of regulation by the Federal Communications Commission. In the University of Miami case, people throughout the community were called by unnamed voices the night after the teach-in and asked if they knew what was going on on the campus and that if they did not know, to dial 221-6767. Upon dialing that number, a woman's recorded voice said, in part, as follows:

> This is "Let Freedom Ring." Last Tuesday night, at Miami's own little red schoolhouse, there was a strange assortment of pinks, punks, beatniks, and leftwing educators assembled for the unashamed purpose of pleading for a soft line against the Communists.

An extended diatribe then proceeded to link anyone who had participated in the affair with specifically named individuals who were accused of being Socialists, Communists, pacifists, and oddballs. A U.S. Senator who participated was likewise singled out for attack and described as being "shoulder to shoulder with a Marxist who advocates selective assassination."

Finally, the feminine voice concluded the canned message with, "Thank you for calling. Call us Monday for a new weekly message. 'Let Freedom Ring.'"

Needless to say, this sort of irresponsible and reckless mish-mash of character assassination and name-calling readily excites the fears of otherwise well-meaning citizens and sometimes triggers additional actions which threaten to impinge upon fundamental freedoms.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, as the Senator knows, these techniques are not limited to this particular kind of situation. Rightwing organizations have been using this technique for some time.

It seems to this Senator that we should take a look at this matter and require people who would use the telephone to transmit recorded messages in this irresponsible manner to identify themselves and make themselves available to be sued for libel and slander, or we should require that the company should assume responsibility for permitting that kind of message to be transmitted over their wire.

Mr. McGEE. I agree. As the Senator well knows, this is a practice which has been followed rather widely. The technique was originated by Dr. Douglas, of Sarasota. The use of this technique in a case such as I have mentioned is less known and understood than is its general use. In general usage a telephone number is given, whether on the radio, TV, or in the newspaper. When one dials that number, he is furnished with weather, or other information.

When I addressed a group on this subject at a college in California a couple of weeks ago, I recommended that the Senate ought to have a voice in the control of this relatively new development in the peddling of hate and fear without a public consciousness or awareness that it was going on.

I believe that perhaps the appropriate committees of the Senate should take a hard and close look at this procedure.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in my own case, I recall that sometime ago I had urged that this Nation might recommend certain changes in the structure of the United Nations.

Someone put such a recorded message over the New Orleans telephone, advertised in the newspaper to dial a certain number, to "find out about your Senator," or some such thing. The advertisers turned it into propaganda, as though I were trying to turn the United Nations into a part of the Communist conspiracy. In this particular case the people did not identify themselves at all. There were many smears and misrepresentations that came over the telephone wire by means of a recorded message when a person dialed the certain number.

Mr. McGEE. Yes; and I understand that the use of such a recorded message in that way can be obtained for as little as $40 or $50 a week.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It seems to me the telephone company should be required to be responsible in that matter. I have had familiarity with a situation in which the telephone company had tapped its own wires to catch someone who might be using the company's wires to engage in gambling activities, and matters of that sort. If the telephone company can do it in such a case, which is invading the right of privacy to some extent, whenever it leased a wire for use of recorded messages it seems to me it could be held responsible in that regard.

Mr. McGEE. That might be one approach to the problem, without regard to the question of whether that step should properly be taken by the Federal Communications Commission, which has jurisdiction over these matters. Otherwise, I think Congress could enter into the problem by clarifying the situation. What the Senator has suggested might be an approach.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It appears to this Senator that the telephone company first has the responsibility for looking into these matters and seeing whether it should permit the use of its telephone wires for repeated calumnies by means of a recorded message.

Mr. McGEE. My first reaction to that suggestion is that I doubt whether the telephone company could turn down such a request on the ground of content, lest it be the judge of such content. We would then be faced with the problem of someone in the telephone company judging that something which was requested to be sent over its wires was defamatory or was not good in the national interest. So I believe some other judgment should be made, but it would be well to look at all the suggestions as a possible basis to get at the problem.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. With regard to the use of broadcasting facilities, this Senator has had occasion to challenge the right of broadcasting companies to refuse to broadcast election material.

The argument was made that someone might play a scurrilous, last minute trick during the election contest. That has been known to happen. What I said was that while the broadcasting company could, in good conscience, decline to accept such live messages because it did not know what the messages might be, nevertheless when some organization hands the company recorded material, the company could say that it made a proper appeal to persons who felt the same way about supporting a candidate; that it was completely logical to accept such material; and that those who felt the same way about the candidate should have an opportunity to go to the polls and vote for the man they supported. In that particular case I prevailed. It was felt that people could listen to that material and that those who shared that opinion could agree with it.

Mr. McGEE. In other words, they had a choice, and not an echo.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McGEE. A former Member of this body, Senator Harry P. Cain, who now lives in Florida, took occasion to say about this incident: "The attack on the University of Miami and its encouragement for debate and free inquiry among its students and faculty was cowardly, scurrilous, distorted, misleading, and inaccurate." I would add that those shortcomings, however, never deter, or slow down the extremist groups. In fact, they become more often than not their stock in trade, rather than unusual.

But not all of the outbursts of late have come from little-known spokesmen for secret societies. The temptation to find conspirators and ploters in the midst of our complex problems has spilled over into the Halls of Congress. Just recently a Member of the other body questioned whether a professor who had engaged in a teach-in and was critical of the administration's Vietnam policy should be allowed to conduct research supported in part by the Federal Government. To that Congressman, for a professor to continue to receive Federal aid under those circumstances was a "shocking inconsistency." Mr. President, the only thing about this that is "shocking" to me is that the Congressman should question the grant in the first place—and on such grounds. It has always been part of any Federal involvement in education that such participation did not, should not, and must not involve any attempt to influence the thought or direction of the inquiry. To demand political conformity before hiring whatever talent and training a man may possess to me would establish a precedent which contains the potential for the destruction of our system of higher education and of the academic freedom central to it.

Even more recently another Member of the Congress took up "Let Freedom Ring's" old cliche about "the little red schoolhouse is redder than you think." He deplored the situation on our college campuses where, he contends, communistic beatniks and "foreign-born, fuzzy professors" are destroying the pillars of true Americanism. While I carry no personal brief for the beatniks, I would remind this man that among the great rights dear to our traditions is the right to err, the right to be different, or even the right to be a crackpot. And surely this same Member of the Congress ought to recall the many instances in which our Nation has profited immensely from the arrival of foreign-born professors—either fuzzy ones or otherwise.

Our history is replete with instances of rich returns from newly arrived immigrant scholars like Louis Agassiz, Charles Steinmetz, Carl Schurz, James Audubon, and later Enrico Fermi, Justice Felix Frankfurter, Werner von Braun, and Edward Teller. Another who comes to mind at once, of course, was the absentminded professor who spent a lot of time doodling formulas on the blackboard and came up with one which read, $E=MC^2$. I refer, of course, to Albert Einstein.

To those who are concerned that—as one editorial writer put it—"the cockeyed professors and pacifists and anarchists" are destroying the Nation and the culture that has given them sustenance, I would suggest that while we should not glory in the fact that some dissent on the campus is erratic and irresponsible, to seek to enforce conformity—"thought control" is a better term—upon our institutions of higher learning would do far more damage to our civilization and our Nation than can the fulminations of the most radical of students and professors.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I have had an opportunity to read the excellent speech the Senator from Wyoming is delivering. I commend him for a most thoughtful and timely discussion of this problem. The Senator from Wyoming is a former college professor, and a highly respected member of the profession. He holds a doctoral degree from one of the world's great universities. He discusses one of the most precious rights we have in this country, and one of the most valuable institutions. That is the tradition of academic freedom. Some of the great ideas in the field of science that relate directly to the security of our country and the success of our arms in earlier conflicts have grown out of the interplay of ideas, on the university campuses of our country.

Our entire society has been enriched and blessed by our free university communities. Therefore, we can take heart from the vigorous defense and definition of the academic community that the Senator from Wyoming makes this afternoon.

I especially commend the Senator for his defense of the teach-ins and the discussions on university campuses of the issue of Vietnam, because I believe that the Senator from Wyoming in one or two instances has been unfairly attacked by some of those whom he is now gracious enough to defend.

Although the Senator from Wyoming and I have not agreed in all instances on the issue of our involvement in Vietnam, I have never for one moment doubted his sincerity and his good faith. Yet in a few instances colleagues in the academic profession have not treated the Senator from Wyoming with proper respect, and have not given him credit for the sincerity and good faith that I know he has on this issue.

Thus, I wish especially to commend him for the graciousness and the breadth of spirit which he displays in the Senate today.

In various periods in our past, we have all deplored the failure of our young college people to speak out on public issues. It was not so many years ago that we were talking about the "lost generation," because of its cynicism, indifference, and lack of conscience about public issues. Some years later, the current generation was referred to as the "silent generation," because it seemed to be so timid, having been somehow intimidated about public issues to the point that it lapsed into silence.

In more recent years, we have heard about the "beat generation," which, supposedly, has no concern with public issues.

I therefore believe that what the Senator is saying on the floor of the Senate this afternoon is cause for hope in that he invites attention to the genuine concern of the young people on our college campuses today over national and international issues. Of course, there will be times when their judgment will be ill-advised, but the important thing is that they are speaking out of their consciences, from their minds, and from their hearts on issues which affect their lives, perhaps more than any of the rest of us. I personally believe that the current college generation is the best informed, most intelligent, and most concerned generation in our history. I commend the Senator from Wyoming once again for his articulate and effective defense of academic freedom.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator from South Dakota knows whereof he speaks. He has earned a Ph. D. in history from one of the great institutions of higher learning in this country. He is also a professor of history.

Academic freedom is a phrase that takes on deep meaning to him as being fundamental to the cause of all freedom and free inquiry. He has long remained a stalwart on the floor of the Senate in defense of the kind of basic, deep-running sort of inquiry which academic freedom demands at all times.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it is no comfort to believe that the current attacks against the campuses are mere nitpicking assaults that will soon fade away. As our past history long since should have taught us, such small beginnings readily explode into dangerous and distorted assaults on everyone's freedom. Already the campus is being selected not only for those targets of anti-Vietnam advocates, but also for all other suspicious persons and groups convenient to the needs of professional patrioteers. From Vietnam it is a short hop, skip, and jump into looking for all kinds of conspirators, spies, and traitors.

On one State university campus in the West a professor—identified at one time with SNICK and who has remained an outspoken critic of our Vietnam policy—is under attack from certain self-appointed patriots. Some of them are even demanding that he be fired. On another campus, a 2-year-old law against leftist speakers is currently the source of much antagonism. This statute, enacted by the North Carolina Legislature in 1963, did prohibit Communists and pleaders of the fifth amendment from speaking at any State educational institution. Its substance brings squarely into focus the right of an esteemed faculty and student representatives to invite and to hear speakers at open forums for assessing all points of view, including the extremes of the right, the left, and the middle; conservative, liberal, and moderate, all subject to the tests of truth and the scrutiny of cross-examination. Such public forums in themselves are an integral part of the educational process for preparing students to understand their own democracy and the meaning of our national and personal freedoms.

As a distinguished former member of this body, Dr. Frank Graham, had occasion to say recently when speaking about the Carolina law:

> The free market of ideas in the historic American view is a basic part of the American tradition of free enterprise. "Gag laws" repressing the freedom of assembly and speech are expressions of the totalitarian way and are contrary to the American way.

Then, former Senator Graham continues,

> The "gag law" is a reflection on the intelligence of youth and the responsible freedom of students in the States' colleges and an expression of a lack of faith in the robustness of democracy.

The North Carolina case is by no means the end of the line. Only last week just across the border in neighboring Virginia, the Virginia department of one of our largest veterans' organizations adopted a resolution urging the State assembly to ban Communist speakers on the campuses. If I may predict, this tendency will intensify rather than abate in the months ahead.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. McGEE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I join in commendation of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for his excellent speech, and especially for its timing. That is the reason I asked him to yield at the point where he said, "If I may predict, this tendency will intensify rather than abate in the months ahead."

Only just the other day, the majority leader said that in his judgment there was a possibility that we might be involved in war in southeast Asia for 5 years, 10 years, or even longer.

It is clear, on the basis of the conferences now being held at the White House, that developments in Vietnam are going to become more serious, that the casualty lists will grow, that the draft may well be intensified, and that Reserve callups are quite possible. There is every possibility that it will have an effect on the economy. Witnesses before the Joint Economic Committee recently indicated that the prospect of a tax cut next year has been greatly reduced. Of course, that is not much of a sacrifice compared to the sacrifices being made in South Vietnam, but we can expect sacrifices in America to grow.

The war in Vietnam will not become more popular but will become less popular. Perhaps, also, there will be an exacerbation of tempers and temperaments, and of attitudes—and, I am afraid, of a tendency on the part of our people to become less tolerant of those who disagree.

Therefore, I believe that the speech being made by the Senator from Wyoming is vitally important. There is nothing more important in democracy than freedom of speech and freedom of expression.

The Senator from Wyoming is ideally suited to make such a speech. He has been a strong supporter of the administration, but at the same time has spoken up—not just now, but many times in the past—urging a national debate on the matter, and defending those who wish to speak their minds.

I believe that his contribution today is very useful. It is especially important that, unless those like the Senator from Wyoming and others are willing to speak out frequently in defense of those who disagree with the administration, and who speak critically of it, that the situation will become much worse.

The President of the United States has taken the same position that the Senator from Wyoming takes today, by saying that he welcomes criticism; that while he is as human as any other individual, and does not enjoy being criticized himself, nevertheless he recognizes, in this free democracy of ours, that the critic plays an enormously important role.

I commend the Senator on his excellent speech, one that is most important, especially at this time.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his thoughtful remarks. I would only add to them the sobering reminder—and this is so obvious that it need hardly be said at all—that all of us should be reminded that the Lord never vested in one person or group of persons or party or race or creed all the wisdom or all the right; that the only truism that has emerged in our own national history is that the nearest approach to truth and the closest approach to right is the freedom to disagree, and to hammer out the best possible solutions to the complex problems of our time on the anvil of reason. This is where we test ideas and make sure of the ground that we seek to occupy.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his own contributions and measures. They have been invaluable as we have sought the path of unlimited freedom.

As Americans, we are required once again to take fresh stock of our heritage of freedom and all that it means. To destroy freedom in the name of protecting it does not preserve our national traditions. It betrays them. Yet, there have always been those who would—in the name of liberty—seek to deny it to their opponents. License is no substitute for liberty. We dare not forget that ideas, no matter how unpopular or unwanted, cannot be legislated out of existence. They cannot be silenced by resolutions of a veterans' convention. The only way to defeat an idea is with a better idea. Moreover, neither patriotism nor loyalty can be revoked by legislative edict, nor decreed by administrative order, nor achieved by oath. If they are to endure, they must be inspired, rather than commanded. In sum, it is imperative that we not convert the campus into another tinderbox of vengeful hatreds bent upon destroying the freedom of dissent. The halls of ivy must ever remain the repository for free and unfettered inquiry. The professors call this academic freedom. For all of us it remains the heartbeat of all human freedoms.

Mr. President, although its longevity might deny it, academic freedom has never enjoyed sound health. Throughout Western history it has been subject to frequent attack and has all but succumbed on many occasions either from assault from without or from weakness within. Most of us with campus backgrounds remember only too well the nightmare of the Joseph McCarthy era, when self-appointed thought police swarmed across the Nation labeling anyone who disagreed with their outlook on life as a Communist. Many innocent persons were subject to merciless and un-American persecution for having the effrontery to have ideas of their own for making judgments independent of those of the grand inquisitors. Mr. President, I hope that it will be a long time before we have to live through another such era of suspicion and distrust, of smear and character assassination, and of human rights and constitutional rights being ignored or even ground under foot.

Colleges and universities have always had to contend with those who wish to proscribe teaching and research with limits reflecting the political and cultural convictions of the time. But I agree with the Supreme Court of this Nation in the thought that "if there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can order what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein."

While I realize that, in some circles to quote from the Supreme Court is ipso facto an admission of an un-American thought in itself, I would further quote from two members of the Court to buttress my argument that there is no freedom more essential to our way of life than academic freedom. Mr. Justice Frankfurter, who had academic experience at Harvard, noted in a famous decision that "it is the business of a university to provide that atmosphere which is most conducive to speculation, experiment, and creation. It is an atmosphere in which there prevail 'the four essential freedoms' of a university—to determine for itself on academic grounds who may teach, what may be taught, how it shall be taught, and who may be admitted to study."

To this analysis should be added a statement by Chief Justice Earl Warren. Justice Warren, as I do, believes that "to impose any straitjacket upon the intellectual leaders in our colleges and universities would imperil the future of our Nation * * * Scholarship cannot flourish in an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust. Teachers and students must always remain free to inquire, to study and to evaluate, to gain new maturity and understanding; otherwise our civilization will stagnate and die."

But even as it is essential for us to guard against any restrictions on academic freedom, the academic community itself must remember that this is a two-way street. Academic freedom must be balanced with academic responsibility. How best to strike that wise balance must ever remain within the province of good judgment, but surely it will continue to provoke continuing disagreement and contention—as well it should.

Nowhere is this put better than in the 1940 Statement of Principles of the American Association of University Professors, a portion of which reads as follows:

> The college or university teacher is a citizen, a member of a learned profession, and an officer of an educational institution. When he speaks or writes as a citizen, he should be free from institutional censorship or discipline but his special position in the community imposes special obligations. As a man of learning and an educational officer, he should remember that the public may judge his profession and his institution by his utterances. Hence, he should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that he is not an institutional spokesman.

As a longtime member of the AAUP, I subscribe completely to that declaration.

Even as that principle may be accepted, surely we are realistic enough to know that all freedoms are sometimes abused and that men of every station and occupation tend in moments of excitement and crisis to say things with greater recklessness and impetuosity than with impartiality and dispassion. But this is no reason to suspend liberty. Clichés about "anticommunism" must never be permitted as a substitute for thinking. Intolerance, be it of the left or the right, is still intolerable.

Even as discipline and restraint are the hallmarks of the effective advocate, and indeed of civilized man, so deviation from those hallmarks reflect human frailities. Thus, as there have been abuses until now, there will inevitably be more; and with the resumption of the new school year scarcely a month from now, these abuses will multiply. But these divergencies and excesses will survive as long as the constant pursuit of truth remains the high standard to which we repair, without regard for risks, without concern for costs.

As we pick our way along the tortuous and troubled pathways into the future, let us hark back to a bit of the eternal wisdom which flowed so generously from the pen of Thomas Jefferson when he wrote in his first inaugural address:

> Error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOW TO SAVE LIVES AND POLITICAL FACE IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, it now appears that the United States is faced with the distinct possibility of a major land war in Asia. Seventy-five thousand U.S. troops are already there, and it is reported that this number may reach 200,000 by the end of the year and perhaps many more than that by next spring. That would be a force on the scale of the Korean war with the added dimension of a much more elusive enemy. We do not know whether or not such a major American campaign would draw in the main body of the North Vietnam Army—a well-equipped, disciplined force of 350,000 men. If that army were to become involved in the war in the south, a much larger commitment of American forces—perhaps a million men—would be required if our side were to prevail. Also unpredictable is the reaction of China and Russia. Neither do we know what kind of political system would emerge even if we were somehow able to wear down the guerrillas and their allies.

We are talking here, however, of a major war involving thousands of American casualties, the expenditure of billions of dollars, vast bloodshed and destruction for the Vietnamese people, and an uncertain outcome. There are other possible side results of such a war that may be even more serious in the long run than the war itself, including:

First. The worsening of relations between the world's two major nuclear powers, the Soviet Union and the United States.

Second. The strengthening of the most belligerent leadership elements in the Communist world and the weakening of the moderate forces.

Third. The growing conviction in Asia whether justified or not that the United States is a militaristic power with a low regard for the lives of Asiatics and an excessive concern over other people's ideologies and political struggles.

Fourth. The derailment of efforts toward world peace and the improvement of life in the developing countries, to say nothing of its impact on our own hopes for a better society.

The proponents of a large U.S. military effort in Vietnam base their case on the domino theory and their fear of the paper tiger charge. This theory, first propounded by the late John Foster Dulles more than a decade ago, has been the guiding light of the foreign policy establishment ever since.

According to the domino theory, if South Vietnam goes Communist, this will topple Thailand or Cambodia which will then topple Burma, Malaysia, and so on through the list of Asiastic powers including the Philippines, India, Pakistan, Australia, New Zealand, and Japan.

It is not always made clear whether the dominoes are expected to fall because of Chinese aggression or because each country in turn infects its neighbor with the virus of communism. Be that as it may, as the theory goes, the United States must stand firm in South Vietnam to prevent the dominoes from falling no matter what the cost.

The related paper tiger theory holds that unless the United States stands firm, we will lose face in the eyes of Asiatics and American power in the Pacific will collapse.

This was the rationale that led Mr. Dulles and President Eisenhower to take up the French mantle after France was expelled from French Indochina by Ho Chi Minh in 1954 and other U.S. aid to President Diem to build an anti-Communist barrier in South Vietnam.

Despite the fact that numerous governments have come and gone in Saigon since the fall of Diem in 1963, we have been holding on to that bastion at a steadily mounting cost ever since until we now stand on the brink of a major land war in Asia.

The questions now before us are:

First. Do we continue to accelerate the struggle toward a major war?

Second. Do we call it off and withdraw our forces? or,

Third. Do we consolidate our present position, keep our casualties at a minimum and hold out indefinitely for a negotiated settlement?

A POLICY OF MODERATION—HOLDING THE LINE

I strongly recommend the third course. I urge that we stop the bombing attacks in both North and South Vietnam. Bombing is largely ineffective in a guerrilla war and more often than not kills the wrong people. We should also stop the jungle land skirmishes which subject our soldiers to ambush. Instead, let us consolidate our troops in a holding action in the cities and well-defended enclaves along the coast. We can hold the cities and the coastal enclaves with few casualties and with little likelihood that the Vietcong will attack frontally. Such a plan would provide a haven for anti-Communist progovernment citizens including the religious groups. It would demonstrate that we are not going to be pushed out, thus giving consolation to those who hold the domino theory and fear the paper tiger label. We would by this policy respect our commitment to the various governments in Saigon that have held power since 1954. It is the best strategy for saving both lives and political face—the two most sensitive factors to be considered now.

Furthermore, it is based on the realities of the present political and military map of Vietnam. While we are in control of the cities and the coast, the guerrillas control most of the rural and village areas. To dislodge them would be to destroy in the process thousands of the innocent civilians we are trying to save.

A recent news report described the despair of American officers who arrived in the village of Bagia which our forces recaptured from the Vietcong after 3 days of U.S. bombing, machinegun, and rocket attacks. What the officers found were weeping women holding their dead children or nursing their wounds and burns. The village church and the school had been destroyed; the people who had been considered progovernment were filled with bitterness toward their rescuers. Meanwhile, the handful of Vietcong guerrillas in the village, who were responsible for our attack in the first place, had melted into the jungle and were never found. Surveying the human tragedy in this village an American officer said:

> This is why we're going to lose this stupid damn war. It's senseless, just senseless.

A policy of restricting our military efforts in Vietnam to a holding action in the cities and the coastal enclaves will avoid this kind of self-defeating jungle warfare, which we are ill-equipped to fight, but which the other side is best equipped to fight. We can supply, feed and defend the urban and coastal areas with a modest effort and minimum loss of life. This is a strategy that calls primarily for restraint and patience until such time as the Vietcong get it through their heads that we will not be pushed out. I have been critical of our unilateral involvement in Vietnam. I think the original commitment and its acceleration was a mistake. But we made the commitment, and I would be prepared to support the kind of holding action outlined above for as many years as is necessary to reach an acceptable settlement of the struggle.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Is the distinguished Senator from South Dakota familiar with the original commitment, with exactly what was promised and not promised, by President Eisenhower in his letter of October 23, 1954?

Mr. McGOVERN. My understanding is that in President Eisenhower's letter he stated, in effect, that the United States was prepared to give to the Diem government in Saigon aid consisting of military advice and presumably some economic and technical assistance, but that the commitment was conditioned on the carrying out of reforms on the part of the government in Saigon.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator is quite correct. It was conditioned upon reforms. Those reforms never took place. Instead of reforms, brutal tyranny resulted—the imprisonment of many persons without trial, the execution of others, and widespread suppression—which alienated the possible support which a friendly, progressive, enlightened government, carrying out the reforms which President Eisenhower had in mind, would have secured.

It might be helpful if the Senator would include in his remarks the text of that letter. I shall be glad to furnish him a copy of it. It shows that the offer was tentative in nature. In it President Eisenhower stated that he would send our Ambassador to explore with President Diem, who was then President of the Council of Ministers, how aid could be rendered to make the Government viable so as to resist aggression. There was no firm commitment whatsoever to send our troops there.

This historic fact is important to bear in mind, because this administration has escalated the commitment. I do not share the view of President Johnson that our honor is at stake. "Honor" is a highly emotional word. It is a challenge to all Americans who naturally do not want our national honor violated. There is nothing in the history of the original commitment, which is what President Johnson referred to when he said that three Presidents have promised this aid, to indicate that the commitment was other than a tentative offer of exploration of aid, depending, as the Senator from South Dakota has said, on "standards of performance" by the South Vietnam Government and on reforms. Those reforms have not taken place. Therefore, it would have been perfectly reasonable, when the Diem regime failed to carry out any of those reforms, and when, in addition, it was overthrown—I will not say overthrown with our assistance, but we were not unwilling to see the Diem government overthrown—and since that time, has been followed by one administration after another, none of which had popular support, to assume that whatever commitments had been made could have been considered voided. It is a source of regret to me that that has not been done. It is one of the weaknesses in the administration's positions, and its reiterated assertions about our solemn commitments are not borne out by the facts.

Mr. McGOVERN. I agree with the Senator from Alaska that the nature of our commitment today is drastically different from what it was 10 or 11 years ago, or even 1 or 2 years ago. But having made those commitments as recently as a few weeks ago, it is difficult at this point to see how we can easily back away from them.

What I propose today is that we try to respect those commitments with a minimum loss of life and with limitations designed not only to hold the casualties of our troops at a minimum, but to hold the losses among the people of Vietnam to a minimum.

In a few moments I shall elaborate on the point that we ought not to contend that the fate of the world hangs on the outcome of events in Vietnam.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator is correct. I take it that he has read Walter Lippmann's column in this morning's Washington Post?

Mr. McGOVERN. I have and I greatly appreciated the point of view which he expressed so well.

Mr. GRUENING. In effect, Mr. Lippmann expresses what I have been saying on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere for the last year and a half. He disputes the basic assumption on which our present policy is predicated; in other words, he asserts that our security is not in jeopardy by what happens in Vietnam; that we are, in effect, going it all alone; that nothing that happens in Vietnam imperils the safety of the United States; that the freedom we are allegedly protecting fails to exist.

I would add that it seems to me we could comply with such commitments as we made, assuming we made them, without a military force. If a peacekeeping arrangement could be made in Vietnam, the killing on both sides could be stopped. Then plans could be worked out to hold an election, which was promised by the Geneva accords but has never been carried out. We could keep alive the hope of a united South Vietnam and North Vietnam without killing countless people.

We cannot succeed in persuading the people of Vietnam that we are their friends after we have bombed them with napalm to the extent that we have. It will now be next to impossible to create the feeling that we are their friends or that our intentions are what we said they were in the beginning.

Mr. McGOVERN. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Alaska. He will observe, as I outline my ideas, that they are very much in line with what he has just suggested.

THE POLITICAL HAZARDS

The strategy I have suggested—the tightening of our defenses in South Vietnam and the holding of the cities and the enclaves in the coastal area—is a policy that involves primarily political patience and military restraint. It requires that we put the issue of Vietnam in a more reasonable perspective. We must stop talking about it as though the honor of America and our stature in the world depend upon South Vietnam. Our top officials ought to quit preaching that the fate of the human race and the cause of all mankind centers in Saigon. In the first place, it is not true. American military power in the Pacific is largely in the firepower and maneuverability of our 7th Fleet plus our island air bases. That enormous firepower, the mightiest military force in the Pacific, will remain no matter what goes on in Vietnam.

Second, exaggerated talk, front page news reports of almost daily bombing missions, B-52 raids, and daily jungle forays focus excessive attention on the Vietnamese issue both at home and abroad. This has the effect of diverting attention from much more important issues related to our national interest such as the strengthening of the Atlantic Community, the Alliance for Progress in Latin America, Soviet-American relations, the control of nuclear weapons, and other steps toward peace that promise a better life for the people of the earth. It also wastes energy and talent and planning that we need to concentrate on such crucial countries in Asia as India and Japan.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I want the Senator from South Dakota to know, first of all, that I have read his prepared speech. I interrupt him at this time only because I have a luncheon engagement with constituents which requires me to leave the Chamber soon.

The Senator has my deep admiration. He was one of the first to register his disagreement with the general thrust of American policy in southeast Asia. The Senator has had very little company these past months, during which there has been so much hesitation to speak out, even among those who privately question the wisdom of our course.

The Senator from South Dakota realistically points out that we are deeply involved in southeast Asia, that commitments have been made—whether wisely or unwisely—and that the question before us at this time is, Where do we go from here?

It is with that question that the Senator concerns himself in the remarkable address which he is making on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

His address is in line with the general purpose he has sought to serve. His objective has been to avoid an American involvement in a full-scale land war against Asians on the mainland of Asia. Perhaps it is still possible to avoid such a war. I believe that the President wants very much to avoid it.

The course of action which the Senator from South Dakota has suggested today commends itself strongly to me as a way in which we might still avoid a tragic American involvement in a full-fledged war in southeast Asia, the cost, extent, and consequences of which defy assessment.

I know that the position of the Senator has often been a lonely one. I am happy that newspapers in his own State have, to some extent, realized this and have paid him proper credit for his courage.

The people of South Dakota have reason to be very proud of Senator McGovern. With his consent, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record, following the remarks of the Senator, an editorial entitled "Sincere Dissenter," published in the Watertown Public Opinion of April 19, 1965; an editorial entitled "Stand for Peace," published in the Daily Republic of March 5, 1965; and an editorial entitled "Time To Review Our Vietnam Policy," published in the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader of April 25, 1965.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from South Dakota for the position he has taken. I hope that his speech will be widely read and soberly reflected upon by those in the States Department and White House who direct our foreign policy.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President I thank the Senator from Idaho for his encouraging and thoughtful remarks, not only because he is a distinguished and highly regarded member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and a recognized voice in the field of foreign policy, but also because the Senator, perhaps better than any other Senator, has consistently enunciated a policy of commonsense with reference to our responsibility in southeast Asia.

The statement made by the distinguished Senator from Idaho—first for the New York Times magazine and then on the Senate floor—in which the Senator warned against the dangers of an overextension of American power in Asia is one of the finest statements made on the larger issues of American foreign policy.

I appreciate the comments of the Senator this afternoon.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his kindness.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I agree with the remark just made by the distinguished Senator from Idaho that the President is searching for a way to peace in Vietnam. He has always been a man of peace and he wants with all his heart to find an honorable settlement to the war in Vietnam. However, the overemphasis on the need for our growing military presence in southeast Asia by those who insist that the honor of our Nation rests on the future of Vietnam places a very hazardous political foundation under the administration effort. It invites the American people and the world to watch most closely the very area where the chances of a happy outcome are most questionable. This not only distorts an issue of secondary importance beyond its real significance, but it is poor diplomacy and even poorer politics. If we keep insisting that the image of America in the world depends on the politicians and generals of Saigon, we are going to be in bad shape.

President Johnson has a legislative and administrative record that is virtually unprecedented in American history. It ought to be the pride of our country and the envy of the world. But unless members of the foreign policy establishment who do not have to face the electorate quit making Vietnam appear as the top concern of the administration, they will create grave political hazards for a great President and his supporters in the Congress—to say nothing of weakening our country in the eyes of the world.

The Korean war, rightfully or not, destroyed the confidence of millions of Americans in the peacekeeping capacity of the Truman administration. General Eisenhower capitalized on that anxiety and wrecked the presidential bid of Governor Stevenson by pledging to go to Korea and negotiate an end to the fighting. Those opposition politicians such as the minority leader of the House who are now urging the President to step up the bombing attacks may be speaking with sincere motives. But it is not without passing interest that President Johnson rolled up a landslide victory over Senator Goldwater last fall in considerable part because the overwhelming majority of Americans favored the policy of restraint advocated by the President. The voters rejected Senator Goldwater's prescription for bombing raids and a stepped-up war in Vietnam. It is hardly a political favor to the President at this point to urge him to appease the minority and disappoint the majority by a still larger and larger war effort. Yet, recent public opinion polls indicate that the minority, who supported Senator Goldwater last fall, are more pleased with our accelerating war effort in Vietnam than is the majority who voted so enthusiastically for the President.

Stopping the bombing raids and the daily battles in the jungles, quietly consolidating and holding the enclaves along the coast and in the cities, and reducing the number of exaggerated statements about the importance of Vietnam—these steps will help to quiet much of the clamor and publicity associated with the issue and will help to put it in a more reasonable perspective.

RESULTS OF THE RECOMMENDED HOLDING ACTION

The beneficial results of such a policy of moderation and restraint as I have urged this afternoon are these:

First. It will demonstrate to friend and foe alike that we have the staying power to keep our commitments without needless fanfare and unnecessary bloodshed.

Second. It will enable us to conduct our commitment according to the guidelines that are most practical for us, rather than playing the game according to guerrilla rules, which include the jungle ambush, at which they are the admitted masters.

Third. It will take the Russians out of a dilemma that is pressing them back into a more belligerent alliance with the Chinese.

Fourth. It will ease the pressures on such friendly allies as the Wilson government in Britain.

Fifth. It will remove much of the diplomatic and political hazard for the administration both at home and abroad.

Sixth. It will reduce the necessity of calling up our Reserves and stepping up the draft while saving countless millions of dollars that can be used to improve our society and our economy here at home.

Seventh. It will reduce the danger of world war III and improve the chances for further steps toward peace.

Eighth. Finally, and most significant of all, it is the practical way of saving political face while at the same time holding to a minimum the loss of human life—the lives of our soldiers and the Vietnamese people.

Mr. President, in accordance with the suggestion of Senator Gruening, I ask unanimous consent that the text of President Eisenhower's letter to the president of South Vietnam pledging U.S. aid on October 23, 1954, be printed in the Record following the editorials inserted at the request of Senator Church.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Exhibit 1

[From the Watertown (S. Dak.) Public Opinion, Apr. 19, 1965]

Sincere Dissenter

There are many degrees of political courage, but South Dakota Senator George McGovern is exhibiting one of the greatest—espousal of the unpopular side of a great national issue, even as his political peers try to shut him up.

The issue: Should the United States become increasingly involved in South Vietnam as the dangers of an escalated war loom greater?

McGovern's stand: No.

He stands fast on this line and hasn't been chary about saying so, even when such personal friends and influential big names as Hubert Humphrey and McGeorge Bundy have urged him to keep silent on behalf of national unity. McGovern keeps right on opposing the U.S. role in Vietnam and doing so out where lots of people see and hear him.

Chicken? Appeaser malcontent? By no means. McGovern points out that he is neither a pacifist nor an isolationist but simply, "I don't believe military aid can be used effectively in southeast Asia. The problems there are ones of internal political revolution."

In other words, in the McGovern book, America is charging along a jungle path in Vietnam that is not only militarily futile but very costly and extremely dangerous. He recently told Bucknell University students, "It seems clear that we are now on a spiral of blows and counterblows which could lead to a major war under the worst possible conditions for the United States."

He has recalled his food for peace days and reflected, "The extensive traveling that I did in Asia and Latin America convinced me that the basic problems in these areas are ones of hunger, illiteracy, and bad government. These are the problems we should attack. In South Vietnam we inherited the hostility and mess that came from 50 years of French misrule and exploitation."

McGovern obviously is under no illusions as to the political hazard of his own position. For the junior Senator from a prairie State to so adamantly oppose a major policy and commitment of his own party and administration, and to do it repeatedly, while spurning big brother attempts to shush him, takes a brand of nerve one doesn't see very often these days, particularly not in politics. And to compound it, McGovern displayed something of the same independent attitude when he openly expressed his disappointment over some facets of the administration's new farm program and vowed to work to correct them.

McGovern's views have not prevailed, and it is unlikely that they will. But whether they do or not, the man who endorses them and does so most effectively, has increased his stature among many people for his sincerity, his steadfastness, and his willingness to go for broke in behalf of an ideal he honestly believes is right.

[From the Daily Republic, Mar. 5, 1965]

Stand for Peace

Senator George McGovern, Democrat of South Dakota, and a small handful of colleagues have taken a courageous stand for a negotiated settlement of the war in South Vietnam. They are bucking the Johnson administration policy, which has been given strong support by leading Republican Congressmen. The prevailing view is that the United States cannot and will not pull out of the turmoil in southeast Asia, that if a stable South Vietnam government can be established, the military operations against the Communist Vietcong will succeed.

Senator McGovern early this week outlined what he called his "minimum terms" for a settlement in a talk at the University of South Dakota. He called for: Closer confederation between North and South Vietnam, with local autonomy; economic ties and railroad links between the two nations; U.S. financial aid in developing the Mekong River Basin; neutralization of both countries, withdrawal on both sides of outside troops and advisers, and no effort made to dictate political ideology; establishment of a U.N. Commission to guarantee national borders, provide police protection, and guarantee fair treatment for tribal groups.

The U.S. effort in South Vietnam has been discouraging ever since President Eisenhower permitted Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, the late, great advocate of brinkmanship, and the CIA, under his brother, Alan, to intervene through the back door. As the St. Louis Post-Dispatch observed recently, it will be Eisenhower "who will be charged by history with the initial responsibility for our Vietnam military adventure, wherever it may lead."

President Johnson has made the decision that we must remain involved in the conflict, indeed, we must pursue the enemy with more vigor, and carry out reprisals for attacks allegedly engineered by North Vietnam. He could hardly do otherwise in view of the steps initiated in the Eisenhower administration and continued under President Kennedy. Any sudden reverse—a quick withdrawal—could not but lose face for the United States. Those concerned about the possibility of an escalation into a large-scale war, however, are rightfully wondering what the final goal of our southeast Asia policy is. We cannot maintain the status quo indefintely; we cannot risk World War III by going all out for a military victory, even though we have the strength to do so.

The only sane solution, it seems, is a gradual disengagement from the military operations. That is what Senator McGOVERN and his small group are proposing—encouraging negotiations or mediation looking toward military neutralization. It can be accomplished over a period of time and bring honor, not dishonor, to the United States. President Eisenhower negotiated a settlement in Korea after he took office. It was neither a victory nor a defeat for us. Korea remains split as Vietnam is now, and a U.N. Commission patrols the buffer zone between North and South. The same course of action today is as valid today as it was in 1953, and McGOVERN's group rates public encouragement for their pursuit of a peaceful and honorable settlement.

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader, Apr. 25, 1965]

TIME TO REVIEW OUR VIETNAM POLICY

The expanding military activity in Vietnam is disconcerting and more and more people are beginning to wonder just how and where it will end.

About the developments in Vietnam today is a scene of frustration and uncertainty comparable to that which prevailed while the Korean struggle was underway several years ago.

In respect to Korea, there was confusion about our objectives and our methods. The same attitude exists now.

The conflict in Korea was terminated, happily, before it broadened into a major war. Many like to believe that the Vietnam episode will end similarly. But there's doubt, plus bewilderment, accentuated by the realization the problem seems to become more perplexing week after week.

KEEN PUBLIC INTEREST

This deep concern about Vietnam was very likely the reason why an overflow crowd assembled at luncheon in Nettleton Manor Thursday to hear Senator GEORGE McGOVERN, of South Dakota, discuss the matter. The luncheon was first scheduled to be a small one with members of the public affairs committee and the directors of the chamber of commerce. But so many were eager to be present that the public generally was invited.

Perhaps the interest was intensified by the fact that McGOVERN previously had indicated a difference with the administration on Vietnam policy, suggesting that we should explore the possibilities of negotiating a settlement.

In his Thursday speech here, he explained why he considered negotiation both desirable and feasible. And, judging from the reception he received and the close attention paid to his remarks, there were many in the audience who shared his opinion.

THE ALTERNATIVES

The question about alternatives naturally arises. If we don't negotiate, what do we do?

One answer is to say we should either go into Vietnam with great enough strength to smash the opposition. Another is that we should withdraw.

Flaws can be found, however, with both of these suggestions.

If we go into the conflict with a full determination to smash the opposition, we invite sharp retaliation from both Red China and Russia. And that means moving right to the brink of major war and perhaps over it. We faced the same problem in Korea and our leaders wisely refrained from taking that gamble.

The other prospect—that of withdrawal—is also inadequate. If we do so, it may be maintained through the Asiatic southeast that we are, as the Red Chinese insist, just "a paper tiger." Withdrawal would be heralded widely as an American defeat and a Red Chinese triumph and it could be charged that we had deserted those who had depended on us.

WE DO HAVE STRENGTH

Between the two alternatives—an all-out smash or withdrawal—is the possibility of negotiation.

There are those who say that this isn't the time for a discussion of that and we should wait until we are ready to negotiate from strength. This means, of course, after we have beaten North Vietnam into a state of at least partial submission.

One may be sure, though, that the Red Chinese also may be reluctant to allow us to acquire this so-called position of strength. There will be growing resistance.

But what seems to be overlooked by many is that we are right now, as Senator McGOVERN pointed out Thursday, in a position to negotiate from strength.

We have the power in the Pacific and Asiatic waters to smash Red China to bits. The Red Chinese know this. And when you have that kind of strength behind you, you aren't negotiating from a position of weakness. We could approach the conference table with some mighty powerful cards on our side and those negotiating with us would be well aware of this.

WHAT WE DID IN KOREA

Every major step taken in this extraordinary day and age involves, of course, a calculated risk.

That was the case when President Eisenhower aided in the negotiation of the settlement in Korea. But the fighting was stopped and our prestige was unharmed.

It is entirely possible that the same step can be taken in respect to Vietnam. With proper negotiation, very likely something can be done to maintain a degree of prestige on both sides.

Just what can be done in respect to the self-government of Vietnam is, I grant, a disturbing problem. The Government has changed freely there even under our supervision and may shift just as readily in the future.

OPEN MINDS NEEDED

What may be said in general is that the whole situation is so confusing that it is well that our minds be kept open. Negotiation may or may not be the answer but surely we should explore its possibilities in complete detail.

We are heading directly, as someone said the other day, along a collision course with Red China. Let's utilize the power of our strength to try to make a change before it is too late.

F. C. CHRISTOPHERSON.

EXHIBIT 2

AID TO THE STATE OF VIETNAM

(Message from the President of the United States to the President of the Council of Ministers of Vietnam, Oct. 23, 1954)[1]

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have been following with great interest the course of developments in Vietnam, particularly since the conclusion of the conference at Geneva. The implications of the agreement concerning Vietnam have caused grave concern regarding the future of a country temporarily divided by an artificial military grouping, weakened by a long and exhausting war, and faced with enemies without and by their subversive collaborators within.

Your recent requests for aid to assist in the formidable project of the movement of several hundred thousand loyal Vietnamese citizens away from areas which are passing under a de facto rule and political ideology which they abhor, are being fulfilled. I am glad that the United States is able to assist in this humanitarian effort.

We have been exploring ways and means to permit our aid to Vietnam to be more effective and to make a greater contribution to the welfare and stability of the Government of Vietnam. I am, accordingly, instructing the American Ambassador to Vietnam, to examine with you in your capacity as Chief of government how an intelligent program of American aid given directly to your Government can serve to assist Vietnam in its present hour of trial, provided that your Government is prepared to give assurances as to the standards of performance it would be able to maintain in the event such aid were supplied.

The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. The Government of the United States expects that this aid will be met by performance on the part of the Government of Vietnam in undertaking needed reforms. It hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts, will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam endowed with a strong government. Such a government would, I hope, be so responsive to the nationalist aspirations of its people, so enlightened in purpose and effective in performance, that it will be respected both at home and abroad and discourage any who might wish to impose a foreign ideology on your free people.

Mr. CLARK subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] made what in my opinion was an extremely well considered and carefully thought out speech on the subject of how to save lives and political face in Vietnam.

He gave me the opportunity to read the speech before he delivered it. I regret that I was not on the floor at the time he delivered it. I hope every Member of the Senate and also the leaders of the Johnson administration, including the President himself, will take the few minutes necessary to read this analysis of our situation in Vietnam as presented by the Senator from South Dakota.

To me, his arguments are unanswerable. We all know that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], whom I see on the floor, has advocated a point of view which a few favor. There have been many traditionalists on the floor who have supported the position of the President of the United States. I find myself somewhere in between those two positions, although the Senator from Oregon may correct me if I do not properly present his point of view.

---

[1] Department of State Bulletin, Nov. 15, 1954, pp. 735–736.

I go 100 percent with Senator McGovern in his recommendation that we should consolidate our present position in Vietnam, keep our casualties at a minimum, hold out indefinitely in certain strong points, backed, I imagine, as a matter of precaution, by the sea, and well fortified, from which we could not be dislodged. I believe this course of conduct is the wisest one to pursue, as opposed to what certain people have represented as the scuttle-and-run-program, on the one hand, or, on the other, to accelerate the struggle toward a major world war, or even, for that matter, to accelerate the struggle so that coffins will begin to come back to us with American boys in them, by the hundreds and perhaps thousands, as we make what seems to me to be a very unwise effort to recapture a certain amount of real estate which has very little actual value to the United States, and also very little practical or even symbolic value.

Mr. President, I commend the Senator from South Dakota for what he has said. I particularly invite the attention of Senators to his comment with respect to our national honor. He says:

> The overemphasis of the need for our presence in southeast Asia by some people who insist that the honor of our Nation rests on the future of Vietnam, places a very tenuous and hazardous political foundation under the administration effort.

It has been said many times that we are merely following a policy laid down by three Presidents—Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson—in defending our national honor.

Mr. President, on Thursday of last week I undertook to mention this subject. My comments appear at page 17849 of the Congressional Record.

I asked a series of questions which I indicated I hoped the President of the United States would answer when he completes his review of the situation in South Vietnam and comes down to tell Congress and the American people what he thinks should be done.

The first question I asked was: "Is it really true that our national honor is at stake in South Vietnam, and if so, why"?

I do not want to close my mind on this subject, but from what I have heard so far and from whatever analysis I have been able to make in connection with my own ethical sense, I do not see any basis whatever on which we are presently committed to fight a major land war on the land mass of Asia in defense of our national honor.

We never undertook during the days when President Eisenhower was in the White House to do any such thing; and we never undertook during the days when President Kennedy was in the White House to do so. All we said was that we would help the South Vietnamese with financial aid and military advice. That we have done. That we can continue to do.

I cannot see that any of the commitments made by the Johnson administration would lead to the conclusion that, as one government succeeds another in Saigon, as we find more and more irresponsible individuals coming to the head of that government—and I may say, more and more dictator-like types coming to the head of that government—we must commit more and more American boys to combat.

As I indicated a moment ago in colloquy with the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], I cannot see how our national honor is involved.

Perhaps I am obtuse. If so, maybe the supporters of an accelerated war in the Senate will explain how our national honor is involved.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], with great stress, spoke about the impact on the South Vietnamese people of the combined air attacks, mortar fire, and machinegun attacks we are making to recapture certain villages.

What is this real estate we deem so important to take?

The Senator from South Dakota refers to the news report referring to the area around the village of Bagia, which our forces recently captured from the Vietcong after 3 days of bitter fighting.

Mr. President, it has often been said that this is a dirty war; and indeed it is. What we are interested in, it seems to me, is an effort to maintain a situation in which the people of South Vietnam can determine their own fate. For that reason I agree we should not scuttle and run. I do not think we can pull out.

But on the other hand I do not think we are doing ourselves or the people of South Vietnam any good—and I do not believe we are doing the cause of freedom any good—by a military effort which results in killing women and children to recapture a certain amount of useless real estate.

Mr. President, the newspapers this morning carry a series of shocking pictures showing the torturing of Vietcong prisoners by members of the South Vietnam Army.

I have long regretted that we are unable to get in the Congressional Record pictorial material which is so important for understanding. There are also magnificent cartoons which in a few short lines, in a few short words, can describe a particular situation so much better than we in the Senate can in speaking 1, 2, or 3 hours.

The Philadelphia Inquirer this morning has a picture on its front page and in the caption it is stated:

> Vietnamese soldier beats a captured Vietcong guerrilla during interrogation after a major assault on Tetam Loc village in South Vietnam.

The Washington Post this morning has 3 pictures on page A-10 and the captions are "Grilling of Vietcong suspects can involve torture. At left, a U.S. marine rounds up suspects after capture near Tamloc, 40 miles southeast of Danang. A suspect, who later revealed an arms cache, gasps for breath above, as South Vietnamese soldier pours water on cloth held over nose and mouth. Militia beat other captured suspects."

In the New York Times this morning, page 7, there are three pictures under the caption, "South Vietnamese Use Sticks and Water in Interrogating Suspects." The first caption is:

> One of 13 men captured by South Vietnamese soldiers in Tamloc area, southeast of Danang, is beaten by questioner.

The second caption is:

> After placing a cloth over this man's face, the soldiers pour water on him, as a further inducement for him to talk. He finally told where two shotguns were hidden.

The third has a caption:

> Another of the 13 is beaten as the interrogators seek to obtain information about locations of guerrillas and arms.

Mr. President, I know that if we had a complete pictorial display, there would probably be 10 pictures of torturing by the Vietcong of South Vietnamese and Americans also for everyone punished or tortured by the South Vietnamese, or the Vietcong guerrillas.

But, after all, what are we fighting for? We are fighting for the freedom of people to determine their own way of life, and we are fighting, to some extent—and I make the statement in all seriousness—we are fighting to keep America in the eyes of the rest of the world, a nation which has a decent respect for the opinions of mankind.

The type of warfare we are fighting in South Vietnam today I feel very much is destroying in the eyes of the world the view that America has a decent respect for the opinions of mankind, which was the major, or one of the major, bases of the Declaration of Independence.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I commend my friend from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] not only for what he said, but his courage in saying it.

I hope before the President comes to Congress and the country with his recommendation for further action, he will give prayerful thought to the viewpoint of the Senator from South Dakota, who, I say, does not stand alone on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NEED FOR EXPANDED AND ACCELERATED SALINE WATER RESEARCH

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, whether or not, as Henry Thoreau once said, "Water is the only drink for a wise man," it is certainly the necessary drink for all men, all life. Yet, today, demand for this vital resource is beginning to outstrip supply in many areas. Around the corner is a future of crippling thirst, if prompt steps are not taken to tap new reservoirs of potable water.

Even as we meet in this Chamber, water is being rationed in New York City, portions of New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, and elsewhere in the heavily populated Northeast. In New York City, for example, washing of cars, filling of private swimming pools, and watering of lawns is prohibited. Citizens are being urged to take brief showers instead of baths, and restaurants are subject to fine should a waiter fill a water glass before being requested to do so by a patron.

Recently there have been front page articles in the Washington newspapers pointing out that salt intrusion in the depleted Delaware River is approaching perilously close to the water intake pipes at Philadelphia. The Delaware River Water Commission has directed New York to release badly needed water into the river to avert a disaster to her neighbor city many miles downstream.

But, these are only local indications of a pressing national and international problem.

Throughout the United States it is estimated that daily water consumption this year will average 359 billion gallons. Water use in this Nation is growing at the alarming rate of 25,000 gallons per minute.

By 1970, we will be using 400 billion gallons of water every day. By 1975, the figure will exceed 453 billion gallons daily—a demanding deadline.

Think, if you will, of the typical water requirements of the United States for domestic use alone. Each time a toilet is flushed, seven gallons of water are used. The average person taking a 5-minute shower will drench himself in 25 gallons of water. Springling a lawn for 1 hour takes 300 gallons.

Agriculturally, water requirements are higher. Production of 1 pound of beef necessitates the use of 3,750 gallons of water—200,000 gallons are needed to produce 1 ton of alfalfa. A single slice of bread takes 37 gallons.

In the field of industry, the production of 1 ton of acetate requires 240,000 gallons of water. It takes 650,000 gallons to make a ton of synthetic rubber. To produce 100 barrels of synthetic fuel from coal requires the staggering total of 1,115,000 gallons of water.

Elsewhere in the world, the situation is no better even though many nations use substantially less water per capita than does the United States. The United Nations last year completed a survey of the water use and future water needs of more than 40 countries. The report, entitled "Water Desalination in Developing Countries", stated in part:

> From the official and unofficial estimates of future fresh water requirements in the countries and areas surveyed, it becomes apparent that substantial increases may be expected in water demand over the course of the next decade.

This report points out, for example, that potable water requirements in Mauritania are expected to jump 533 percent by 1975. Those in India will increase by 584 percent by 1970. Jordan's requirement will increase 505 percent by 1972, and on the Island of Margarita in Venezuela, requirements will increase 294 percent by 1986.

In Israel, effective utilization of the last drop of available water already approaches 100 percent. Yet, by 1970, that nation will be needing 20 percent more of this precious liquid than she is now using.

Mr. President, the specter of thirsty cities and parched fields should—by itself—be enough to spur prompt remedial action; and, this is but one aspect of a critical water supply situation.

In the United States, in addition to the areas suffering from actual water shortages, there are others where, although the quantity of water available is sufficient, it is substandard in quality.

Standards set up by the U.S. Public Health Service state that good water should contain no more than 500 parts of dissolved salts per million parts of water. Furthermore, water with more than 1,000 parts per million should not be used for human consumption. Yet, there are hundreds of U.S. communities where the regular municipal water supply contains far more than 500 parts of dissolved salts, and in some cases, the figure runs as high as 3,000 parts or more.

In my own State of Florida, for example, there are 26 municipal water supplies which provide water containing between 1,000 and 3,000 parts of dissolved salts per million parts of water.

Another 28 such supplies serve subdivisions and trailer parks.

In the State of South Dakota, there are 152 sources of water—three-fifths of those in the State—that have salt content between 1,000 and 3,000 parts, and three others range from 3,000 to 10,000 parts per million.

Iowa has 143 supplies between 1,000 and 3,000 and 8 from 3,000 to 10,000.

Arizona, Minnesota, North Dakota, and Texas also are among the States that suffer in this regard.

This problem, and its companion one of inadequate supply, have not gone unnoticed in Washington. Through the years, Congress has generally shown that it stood ready to take whatever steps were necessary to assure that the growth and well-being of America should never be jeopardized by a lack of sparkling, pure water.

By 1952, a bill introduced by the late Clair Engle, of California, then a Member of the House of Representatives, was enacted which authorized $2 million for a 5-year period to develop a practicable, low-cost means of producing fresh water from sea water and other saline waters. The program initiated by the Engle bill was intended to explore the feasibility of entering into such production on a large-scale basis.

Under the provisions of this act, the Secretary of the Interior established the Office of Saline Water to develop new or improved conversion processes by means of research grants and contracts; to conduct research and technical development work; to make careful engineering studies to ascertain the lowest investment and operating costs; and to determine the best plant designs and conditions of operations.

During its first year of existence, the Office of Saline Water worked with an appropriation of just $175,000. It did not take long, however, to realize that $2 million and 5 years were not going to be sufficient to come anywhere close to doing the job, and so the Congress moved again, amending the original act in 1955, and in 1958, authorizing a demonstration plant program.

Shortly after his inauguration in 1961, President Kennedy came to Capitol Hill requesting still more sweeping saline water legislation. In a special message to Congress on natural resources, he stated:

> No water resources program is of greater long-range importance * * * than our efforts to find an effective and economical way to convert from the world's greatest, cheapest natural resources—our oceans—water fit for consumption in the home and by industry.

Heeding the President's words, the House and Senate passed that same year the Anderson-Aspinall Act which authorized $75 million for an expanded and accelerated program of basic and applied research.

President Johnson has shown no less enthusiasm than his predecessor for the saline water conversion program. While serving as majority leader of the Senate, the President introduced in 1960 a bill which later became the basis for the Anderson-Aspinall Act of the following year.

Last summer, President Johnson gave further evidence of his strong backing of this program by directing Secretary of the Interior Udall to formulate an imaginative and aggressive program to hasten the day when desalting of water will help to solve impending and actual shortages. The report of Secretary Udall was sent to the White House in September.

In his letter transmitting the report, the Secretary stated that it presented "a broad-gage program designed to improve technology and lower the cost of desalted water. It provides an accelerated effort designed to develop large-scale dual-purpose distillation plants in a reasonable period of time." Secretary Udall noted further that in addition to the large-scale plants that will be needed, steps will have to be taken to develop economical processes that will meet the growing requirements of small communities.

He also said that the proposed program is directed toward meeting anticipated needs for desalting both here and abroad. It should enable the United States to fulfill the promise to share the results of this vital work with other nations for the benefit of mankind.

Included in the recommendations made to the President by Secretary Udall are the following:

That the Anderson-Aspinall act be extended through fiscal 1972 with authorized expenditures increased by $200 million along with clarification of authority to build experimental facilities.

That congressional authority be requested at the proper time to provide assistance for the construction of model and prototype plants that must be built in order to test the economic and operational capabilities of different processes and techniques.

That development of large evaporators be accelerated by a program of conceptual design studies, and that a west coast center be started for the testing of full-size modules and components.

That plans be made to have construction started in 1967 of at least one dual-purpose distillation plant in the intermediate range—approximately 50 million gallons per day. I might note here that I am informed that the Interior Department already has issued several contracts for conceptual design studies for a large-scale plant, and that additional design contracts will be awarded soon.

That a substantial increase be made in the research effort to create entirely new desalting techniques, improve tested distillation processes, and to explore the promising reverse osmosis process.

Mr. President, the Senate lost no time in responding to these requests. Exhaustive hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and prompt floor approval was given to S. 24, which calls for a 5-year extension of the saline water conversion program and an increase in funds of $200 million.

On the other side of the Capitol, however, the House passed a bill that would give the Office of Saline Water an additional authorization of only $10 million for fiscal 1967 and would not—at this time, at least—extend the life of the program beyond next year.

The Office of Saline Water is now geared to a 5-year program, and the path this program would take has been charted in broad form in testimony before various legislative committees. The steps on this path from basic research through the laboratories, bench-scale stages, and pilot plants are arduous ones to travel requiring a minimum of 30 months and, in some cases, as much as 3 to 4 years. It would be difficult, therefore, to plan efficiently for the future without the solid knowledge that the desalting program will continue its forward motion at the stepped-up pace authorized by S. 24.

The interest and participation of private industry and research organizations, so vital to the accomplishment of our goals, might well be discouraged should Congress suddenly demonstrate an indifferent or negative attitude.

Mr. President, there is an old saying that "you never miss the water till the well runs dry." Since its inception, the activities of the Office of Saline Water has been directed toward assuring that the well will always give in abundance.

Even at this stage, their research has proven fruitful.

In my own State of Florida, a small experimental desalting plant operated for a time in St. Petersburg. More recently, studies have been underway to determine whether a dual-purpose facility—providing both electricity and converted water—would be feasible for the water-short Florida Keys, now served by an overburdened pipeline that has to bring fresh water 140 miles from wells near Florida City.

Only this week, the Community Facilities Administration announced approval of a $4,446,000 loan to the Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission for construction of a plant capable of desalting over 2 million gallons of ocean water a day. By next year, this plant should be in production.

Last year we saw a far more dramatic example of our saline water conversion program when the Cuban despot Fidel Castro decided to cut off water he was selling to our strategic Naval installation at Guantanamo Bay. Although Castro later offered to restore the water, his offer was rejected, and to make the rejection even more emphatic, the line was cut by Navy personnel. Arrangements were made to start bringing water to the base by ship.

Today, our Naval station is getting two and one quarter million gallons of fresh water a day—but not by tanker. This water is coming from the surrounding sea.

Within a few short weeks after the water line to Guantanamo was cut, the Navy had made arrangements to purchase from the Interior Department a demonstration desalination plant being operated in Point Loma near San Diego, Calif. This plant was shut down in March, dismantled, loaded on board a ship, and by July 26, was again in operation producing 750,000 gallons of fresh water daily at Guantanamo. Since that time, the Navy has purchased and installed at the base two more plants similar to the first, and the base is now self-sufficient from a fresh water standpoint.

This is but one aspect of the impact that the fruits of saline water research have had on our international relations.

Earlier this year, President Johnson said:

> Water should never be a cause of war—it should always be a force for peace.

In the spirit of this statement, an agreement was signed last November in Moscow calling for cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union in the field of desalting. This agreement provides for an exchange of information, symposia, scientific meetings, and reciprocal visits to installations in both Nations. A team of Soviet scientists traveled here last summer, and a group of our own scientists went to Russia last November.

Secretary Udall later reported that the technical exchange was open and free, and his science adviser, Dr. John C. Calhoun, Jr., said that while the Russians have much to learn from the United States in the field of desalting, our Nation can also learn from them.

A joint United States-Israel team has been studying the water problems of that nation and has indicated that a nuclear fueled electric power and desalting plant would offer an attractive solution to Israel's short-term water problems and at the same time make a significant contribution to the development of the art of desalting. The two Governments will soon announce the selection of an engineering firm to make a detailed technical and economic feasibility study.

Mr. President, in an age when the evidences of present and impending water shortages are everywhere about us, Congress must not fail in its duty to assure a future in which men may freely quench their thirst without fear of drinking the well dry. We must act now, while there is time, so that generations yet unborn will not cry out, as did Coleridge's Ancient Mariner:

> Water, water, everywhere * * * nor any drop to drink.

Shortly, House and Senate conferees will meet to work out the differences between their respective saline water bills. I urge wholeheartedly conference adoption of S. 24 as it originally passed the Senate.

RADIO INTERVIEW WITH GEN. NGUYEN CAO KY, PREMIER OF SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on July 18, an interview of Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, Premier of South Vietnam, which was conducted by Walter Cronkite, was telecast over the CBS network. This was a news event of first importance because this Nation is linked by circumstances and developments with the Cao Ky government which is the latest in a long line of self-ordained governments in Saigon.

I think that due allowance should be made for Gen. Cao Ky's difficulties with the English language. It is not easy to speak, let alone to think extemporaneously in another tongue recently learned. Nevertheless, enough of the General's thought comes through the language barrier to make clear that he has a good deal of personal idealism about Vietnam. He does not confine his idealism, moreover, to South Vietnam as some of our own officials do—as though it were a world apart from North Vietnam. Rather he speaks idealistically of all Vietnam. That is understandable, inasmuch as he is a northern Vietnamese from Hanoi and could hardly be idealistic about the southern portion of Vietnam alone. It is also apparent that the General is hopeful and expectant that the United States will carry a major portion of his idealism by fighting on the perimeter, so to speak, in order that his government will have an opportunity to reorganize the Vietnamese people in the rear, with social justice.

I think it is of great importance that the American people have as much information as is available with regard to those on whose side we stand as well as those to whom we are opposed in this critical situation. From this interview an insight can be obtained into the maturity and wisdom of the present head of the Saigon Government, Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky. I think the interview might also be of particular value to the many officials, military and civilian of this Government, who are concerned with Vietnamese affairs. It should help them to appreciate more fully, too, that it is not only the infiltrators and planes in recent years which cross the 17th parallel in Vietnam. It has also been crossed, for many centuries, by cultural and other patterns.

I ask unanimous consent that the interview previously referred to be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Face the Nation

(Special edition as broadcast over the CBS Television Network and the CBS Radio Network, July 18, 1965, 12:30 to 1 p.m.)

Guest: Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, Premier of South Vietnam.

CBS news correspondent: Walter Cronkite.

Producers: Ellen Wadley and Robert Quinn.

Director: Robert Vitarelli.

Announcer. This special edition of "Face the Nation" from Saigon, where top-level talks this weekend may lead to important and far-reaching decisions for the U.S. commitment in South Vietnam.

On the eve of these talks, CBS news correspondent Walter Cronkite recorded this special interview with the man who could hold the key to success or failure.

He is South Vietnam's youthful new Premier, Air Force Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, 36 years old, who took over as head of the South Vietnam Government in June, just a few weeks ago, pledging a new, firm rule aimed at winning the war against the Vietcong and establishing social justice for the people of South Vietnam.

He has banned all demonstrations and strikes, promised death by firing squad to traitors and corrupt officials, closed down several newspapers which he feels were harming morale and, the most popular measure so far, doubled the pay of South Vietnam's soldiers at the front and cut the pay of government officials by half, including his own.

This week, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, one of the chief architects of American policy in Vietnam, met with General Ky and was reported impressed by the Premier's aims to win the support of the people through social and economic reforms. General Ky also urged a major and rapid buildup of American combat troops in South Vietnam. We shall begin the interview with General Ky in just a moment.

Here is CBS news correspondent Walter Cronkite.

Mr. Cronkite. General Ky, how's the war going?

Premier Ky. Well, concerning military operations, I think the situation is better now.

Mr. Cronkite. Is the monsoon offensive proving to be as heavy as you feared?

Premier Ky. No, no. That's why I said this seems better now because every, every people, I think, and even the Vietcong, Communists, you know, speak about offensive, rainy season. So. But until now we break all their offensives.

Mr. Cronkite. Why do you think they have failed so far in this season?

Premier Ky. Because airpower.

Mr. Cronkite. Airpower?

Premier Ky. Really. I think they—they were a little surprised by air support. I think their first test was Quong-hai battle, and they failed because really we had air support day and night, 24 hours. And with the zone D and down south, all these patterns, they were a little surprised by airpower.

Mr. Cronkite. Could we win this war with airpower primarily?

Premier Ky. Well, of course, not only with airpower, but airpower is the most important element.

Mr. Cronkite. Do you think it's going to take large numbers of American ground troops to win?

Premier Ky. Not really for winning the war, but I think we need more American troops or allied troops, so thus to allow the Vietnamese troops and the Government of Vietnam to reorganize the rear. In other words, using more Vietnamese troops for this pacification policy.

Mr. Cronkite. For the allied troops to go out and hold the perimeter defenses while the Vietnamese can rebuild behind them.

Premier Ky. Yes. Right, right.

Mr. Cronkite. Do you have any idea, General, how many troops might be needed?

Premier Ky. We discuss, we study it right now with General Westmoreland, General Co.

Mr. Cronkite. General, do you have any concern that Americans might take over control of this war?

Premier Ky. No; never.

Mr. Cronkite. What about the problem of the conflict in command? We hear this discussed frequently. Do you think there will have to become a unified command, or can the present divided authority continue?

Premier Ky. I think at this moment it is not necessary to officialize this coordination that we have already by establishing a joint or unified command because if we do this and then it is good for Communist propaganda. I'm sure that they will say here now—the American war. But now, in the future, if in some cases, we have a big American units involved in operations with the Vietnamese unit but in small number, I think in this—that case we must establish a sort of task force. In other words, a temporary command for a special operations, in a particularly torn area. So, as you know, once you have this task force, if the element involved are American more than Vietnamese and then the commander of this task force must be American.

Mr. Cronkite. By the same token, then, if the larger force is Vietnamese and there are smaller American units, a Vietnamese commander.

Premier Ky. Mmmmmm.

Mr. Cronkite. How long do you think it will take to win the battle in South Vietnam?

Premier Ky. It depends. If really a U.S. Government want to help us or give us everything we need and if really in the next few month or in the future we have a good frank coordination between the two Governments, United States and Vietnam, and without intervention of Red China or North Vietnam, I think within 1 year, the situation will be better.

Mr. Cronkite. What was that, sir, 1 year?

Premier Ky. 1 year. But really to clean all the Vietcong it's a long, long way yet to go, 3, 4 years.

Mr. Cronkite. What do you mean when you say give you everything you need. Can you put any kind of a figure on that in manpower or material?

Premier Ky. Yes.

Mr. Cronkite. How much, do you have any idea?

Premier Ky. I don't have any idea yet, but right now we are in short many things.

Mr. Cronkite. What about manpower. How short are you in manpower. You must—you've been fighting this war so long, you've—the number of young men available must be getting very short.

Premier Ky. Well, we—we are not in short of manpower, but the problem for the Government to solve is how to get the participation of the population in the war effort. In other words, how to bring back this confidence in the people. That is the problem of my Government today.

Mr. Cronkite. And how do you intend to tackle that?

Premier Ky. Justice and really freedom.

Mr. Cronkite. How, as a practical matter do you do that? I mean, what—what is your program?

Premier Ky. Clean out administration, armed forces, rank, and everything. In other words, banish corruptions, injustice.

Mr. Cronkite. Well, General, how do you expect to accomplish this when the revolutionary governments of the past couple of years haven't been able to?

Premier Ky. I think I mentioned to you, I said the so-called revolutionary governments. That's a big difference because I am not politicians, but I am patriot and revolutionary man.

Mr. Cronkite. You're going to need some politicians to do that job. Are they going to remain loyal to you while the job gets done? Do they have the same devotion you have?

Premier Ky. Well, sir, I don't need people loyal to me, but I want the people loyal to the country, to my policy, which is very simple. First to give justice and freedom to the people, and then fight the Communists. So, regardless his groups, religions, if they agree with me about this policy, if they are loyal to Vietnam, I always happy to have them helping me. I don't need people loyal to me.

Mr. Cronkite. General, when do you feel that your program will have been advanced far enough that you can return the country to a constitutional government?

Premier Ky. Well, it depends on the situation military and politics, but with what I can see after 3 weeks now as Premier, I hope that we need 2 or 3 more months to see clearly and then we will decide.

Mr. Cronkite. Should the American people be concerned about the frequent changes of government in Vietnam?

Premier Ky. Not only the American, but even the Vietnamese people. We are worried, and I can say we are tired of the, you know, so often changes. This fact explains also why at the present time most, or many Vietnamese people, are so indifferent, and I think this fact is very also important and dangerous for us, because when they are indifferent people, it means they will not participate to the war effort. And as I mentioned before, they are indifferent because they are tired of so often changes of government. They cannot believe as, you know, I am sure that you heard about rumors that this Government cannot stay longer than 15 days, and now this deadline is, you know, over 15 days. Now, they said, well, no, no good in 2 months.

Mr. Cronkite. Do you feel pretty confident now that you are going to be able to hold on?

Premier Ky. Personally, yes; why not?

Mr. Cronkite. General, is there any possibility of negotiation with the Vietcong?

Premier Ky. Well, at the present time I don't see any.

Mr. Cronkite. Could you—is there any possibility of this policy of yours creating an atmosphere in which you could invite the Vietcong to join you in this effort in your country?

Premier Ky. Yes, I think, yes, because according to the information or intelligence, I think the morale of people, North Vietnam, is affected very much by these air attacks, air raids over North Vietnam. And in some areas, people of North Vietnam are taught that each time we launch an air raid, North Vietnam because somewhere in the South the Vietcong you know, make sabotage, or something like that. So, the people in North Vietnam, in some areas, ask the Communist authorities to stop all this sabotage, South Vietnam, yes. But we know we are quite sure that these air raids and bombs affect very, very much morale of the people, even the morale of the Communist troops. So if we continue or increase these air raids, and if at the same time we can drop or deliver some of our volunteer or some of the members of the friendly liberation of the North, I am quite sure they will do a good job in enrolling and getting people with them.

Mr. CRONKITE. Was it possible that the Vietcong might just quit and go underground?

Premier KY. I always said that if Ho Chi-Minh and Communist leaders are smart enough, they will accept this solution, stop fighting and continue in an underground fight. More, more dangerous because at this moment they will give to the free world, to other allied countries the impression that now they are no more aggressors and now South Vietnam is living, you know, in peace and free. This whole impression is more dangerous. That's why we never accept a cease-fire, a so-called, you know, a peace or this temporary peace. We, as General Taylor many times mentioned that we always accept a stop-fight the day that all the Communist soldiers and Asians are out of South Vietnam.

Mr. CRONKITE. Are you concerned that America might negotiate a separate agreement with North Vietnam?

Premier KY. Never do it.

Mr. CRONKITE. You don't worry about that as a possibility.

Premier KY. No. There is—no, the ally must not take this decision without the approvement of the Government of Vietnam. Because you know, why we fight Communists for 20 years now, why myself and 3 millions of North Vietnam refugees just left all our land, our houses, North Vietnam to come down here? Because we don't want Red China coming here. Why we in the past, we fought against French? Because we don't want domination, because we want independence.

ANNOUNCER. This special edition of "Face the Nation" will continue in a moment.

General Ky, though Premier of South Vietnam, is a native of Hanoi, capital of North Vietnam, and he recently proposed a new plan to hasten the defeat of the Communists there by organizing resistance, a free Vietnamese underground in North Vietnam.

He discussed this plan with Walter Cronkite.

Mr. CRONKITE. I'm very interested in this plan of yours to infiltrate North Vietnam the same way that the Communists have infiltrated South Vietnam. Why hasn't this been done before?

Premier KY. As I told you, I am not a politician. That's why sometimes my reasoning is very logical. When once you are a politician, you think as politicians—international politics, domestic—sometimes it's very difficult to be logical.

Mr. CRONKITE. Do you expect this plan of yours to be put into effect soon?

Premier KY. I hope so. I hope so. I hope so.

Mr. CRONKITE. Do your American counterparts think this is a good idea?

Premier KY. Well, before I had many occasions to discuss this problem with many of my American friends, military Americans. So as you know, as they are military they all agree, even some think that it is necessary to win this war.

Mr. CRONKITE. Going into North Vietnam with a——

Premier KY. Yes.

Mr. CRONKITE. Democratic liberation front of our own. But do American politicians take a dimmer view of that?

Premier KY. Well, until now I never had the chance to speak with American politicians, as I hope that in a few days, in the very near future, I will have the chance to discuss this problem.

Mr. CRONKITE. Because you are a military man, because General Taylor, of course, is a military man, you've had an easy dialog with him?

Premier KY. Yes.

Mr. CRONKITE. Do you expect it to be as easy with a political man, Ambassador Lodge?

Premier KY. Yes, why not?

Mr. CRONKITE. General Ky, thank you very much, sir. I appreciate your taking the time to meet with us today and to explain your policy.

Premier KY. Gentlemen, if my voice some day heard by American people, I would like to say something, let them know, I mean the average American, not the Government, not politicians, that we are not a puppet government, that if we fight today not because we just want to fight; not because I am military so my job is fight, fight, no. If someone in this country is tired, tired of war; if the people who really suffer in this country about war, it's military, military, not Saigonese, not the rich man, not the politicians here. We fought for 10 years. We die every day. We suffer from the war. So I can say that more than other people we like—we love peace, but peace in free—freedom—and liberty, not peace under the Communists. So, we are going to fight the Communists until the day we become a freeman or a dead man. So please understand this and help us. If the so-called free people of free countries don't understand or help us, how we can defeat the Communists? That the only thing I want the people to know, and personally, if I accept this job, it is not for, you know, having the title as a Prime Minister or just with the intention to stay here 2, 3 months getting millions of dollars and then some day fly overseas somewhere and living in peace in Washington or Los Angeles or Paris. No, I was born in this country. I'm going to die here for this country, and I'm sure that millions of other Vietnamese are ready to stay and die here for this country. So help us. That's all what I say.

Mr. CRONKITE. Well, let's all hope, General, that the dying will stop very shortly, and so will the Communist aggression. Thank you, sir.

Premier KY. OK.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am interested that the majority leader, for whose views I have the highest respect, should undertake to insert in the RECORD an interview and to comment generally favorably about the new Chief of State in South Vietnam, General Ky.

I wonder if the Senator has given any consideration to the attitude that General Ky appears to have taken with respect to two subjects which give me grave concern about the validity of his leadership.

The first is his position on civil liberties. I understand that he has set up sandbag barriers in the center of Saigon and that he has had one criminal executed—and no doubt the man deserved to die—and has indicated that in order to bring the price of rice down, he intends to execute speculators without further trial until the price of rice is brought down.

The newspapers this morning carried a gruesome picture of the torturing of Vietcong prisoners by representatives of the South Vietnamese Army. I am as aware as anyone else, of the horrible cruelties which are perpetrated on the South Vietnamese and, whenever they can, on Americans, by the Vietcong. From what I know of General Ky, he is not much better than Ho Chi-Minh with respect to his attitude toward freedom and decency of treatment. Does the Senator care to comment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall comment, but not in answer to the specific question of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The purpose of putting the interview in the RECORD was to bring home to the Senate the policies which General Ky is advocating, namely, that American troops should be on the perimeter and that the Vietnamese troops should be in the rear pacifying the villagers.

As much as we can find out about the head of a government, with which we are in a certain sense allied, ought to be put in the RECORD for the edification and education of all Americans.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank my friend.

FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 448, Senate bill 2300.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, statements on Tuesday by President Johnson in his news conference show that the United States and the world are sliding further into the morass of war.

It is interesting to note that our new escalation is being fortified on the basis of alleged increases in participation in the war by North Vietnam; yet the reaction of much of our own Government suggests infiltration from the North was stepped up in 1964 after American raids on North Vietnam naval bases subsequent to the Tonkin Bay incident.

The latest off of the wire came in just a few moments ago. It reads as follows:

> Three F-105 fighter bombers were shot down, the Pentagon reported, by what was described as "intense conventional ground fire" during the low-level attack on two previously undiscovered surface-to-air missile sites about 40 miles northwest of Hanoi.
>
> The two sites, using semimobile equipment which could be put in place in as little as 24 hours, are in addition to five sites previously identified as under construction around Hanoi, the North Vietnamese capital.
>
> The U.S. attack was launched 3 days after a U.S. plane was shot down by fire from one of the missile sites.
>
> Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester told a news conference that U.S. pilots reported destruction of one of the new sites and damage to the other.

I think there is no doubt that we are galloping toward a major, massive war in Asia. Every action we have taken, we have called retaliation. Every action the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese have taken, they have called retaliation.

Today's raid on the missile sites is but another step in the process by which all wars begin.

In today's Washington Post, Walter Lippmann once again sets forth the unhappy, unpromising, and potentially disastrous position of the United States in Vietnam. As I have pointed out ever since our military involvement in Vietnam began, the United States is there alone. This stark fact is not covered up by the recital of token forces, largely noncombatant, that have been contributed by such dependencies of the United States as Taiwan and South Korea.

As Mr. Lippmann once again points out, the real powers of Asia—the large, rich, and populous nations upon whom the long-range stability of Asia depends—are at best unhappy bystanders. Some of them, including Indonesia, Pakistan, and India, are in varying degrees of opposition to our war policy and the most we have obtained from Japan is a lipservice which may not be forthcoming much longer.

It is this failure of the large nations of Asia to support or join our war activity in Vietnam that totally destroys the argument quoted by Mr. Lippmann from the New York Herald Tribune, which depicts the United States as saving the masses of Asia from communism. So far the only "masses" to urge us on have been the ruling factions in Thailand, Malaysia, Taiwan, the Philippines, and the white nations of Australia and New Zealand. Even these have offered little or nothing in tangible support.

What is worse, the more this becomes an American war, the less tangible support we are going to have from them. We have already seen this happen in South Vietnam itself. The efforts of the Secretary of Defense and Ambassador Taylor to increase the ratio of government troops to guerrillas have totally failed. Time after time they announced a stepping up of American military and financial aid to increase the size of the South Vietnam Army. And today, most of the same people who have persistently recommended year after year that with a little more U.S. help, South Vietnam could do the job, are now gathered in Washington to plan the replacement of the South Vietnamese war effort with a total American war effort.

It is clear that the more the South Vietnamese Army is supplied, the larger the number of desertions and the more equipment gets into the hands of the Vietcong. The briefings we receive make it impossible for one to escape the conclusion that the South Vietnamese Army is collapsing at a rapid pace. The war will be increasingly fought with American boys. That is what has been discussed at Camp David and in the precincts of the White House in recent days. That is obvious. It has not been a discussion of the political implications of war in southeast Asia, or of how to gather international support for our policy, or how to make it legal under the United Nations Charter or the U.S. Constitution. The Government continues to stand in defiance of the Constitution, article I, section 8, which places in Congress the responsibility to declare war. Not a word of the Constitution gives the President the power to make war in the absence of a declaration of war, save and except for the short period of time necessary to meet an immediate emergency that threatens the defense of this country and justifies a temporary action by way of self-defense.

The discussions taking place involve the number of American troops that must be landed, where and how, and who shall be called to the colors to prosecute the war that South Vietnam can no longer prosecute.

When the President takes to the air to tell the decisions to the American people, he will not be able to set forth the role of the United States as leader of an allied effort; he will not be able to call upon the American people to join in an allied effort in Vietnam; he will not be able to say that American boys are about to be asked to participate in an operation that the great nations of Asia or the world regard as vital to their security.

All he is going to be able to do is announce the calling up of American military forces to fight for American face and prestige in Asia. He will not even be able to say that they are going there with the blessing of people of Pakistan, India, Japan, or Indonesia, and if he is completely honest with the American people, he will tell them that three of these countries believe we should be waging a political war, not a military war, in Vietnam, and the fourth is going along with the war effort only on the surface of official policy but not at the deep grassroots of its people.

If he is completely honest, he will tell the American people that there is no major support in Asia for what we are about to do, and he will also explain that the more the war becomes an American war, the less popular and effective the United States will be everywhere in Asia. Should the war prove long drawn out, or should North Vietnam or China enter it directly, he should make it perfectly clear that the United States can expect no help whatever from any quarter in Asia, and we will be lucky if many of these countries do not actually turn on us.

We are drawing heavily upon our political capital built up in Asia over a 20-year period and the Americanization of the war will step up the process. Those are the realities of the further American takeover of the war. I hope the President will bring them out. I hope he will offer the people some explanation of why everything we have financed in South Vietnam in the last 3 years has dissolved, why the South Vietnam Army is less interested and less capable now than it was 3 years ago of resisting the Vietcong, and the extent to which we must expect the same process to take place among the other nations of the area.

Let the President also make it clear that no Asians are going to die in Asia for the face, prestige, or security of the United States. If anything, they will more likely die just to get us out, just as they died to get the Dutch, the British and the French out.

CONGRESS MUST REMAIN IN SESSION

One great contribution the President can make to the war effort would be to ask Congress to remain in session at the same time he calls up additional military forces. Certainly it will not set well with the American people to see Congress go home for a vacation at the same time thousands of reservists and guardsmen and draftees are being called to leave civilian life to meet what is described as a crisis situation.

It will not set well with them because that is not the way our Government is supposed to operate. Congress, under our Constitution, is supposed to be a check upon the Executive; for it to dissolve itself just as the Executive leads the country into an "Executive" war would be a repudiation of our constitutional system.

The President should tell the country that he does not expect any sine die adjournment September 1 because the Nation will be in the midst of a growing war crisis this summer and fall and Congress must be on hand to exercise its constitutional function to authorize the raising of an Army and a Navy, to appropriate the money for their maintenance, and to declare war.

That is what the Constitution calls for. Let the RECORD be perfectly clear that at the Democratic conference held by Democratic Senators some days ago, I took exactly the position in that conference that I am expressing on the floor of the Senate today.

I said then, and I say now, that, in my judgment, Congress could not possibly justify adjourning sine die and going home while American boys are dying in an executive war in Asia.

Congress has the clear constitutional responsibility to stay here and maintain a constant check upon the Chief Executive, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense. We cannot turn this war over to the President of the United States to fight.

The American people have the right to call upon every Member of Congress to stay on the job so long as American boys are dying in Asia. I say most respectfully that we are well paid and have a duty to stay here and earn our money, if we do no more than function in our checking capacity. However, much more needs to be done. We cannot begin to carry out the legislative trust that we owe to the American people by September 1, October 1, November 1, or December 1.

Mr. President, here is one Senator who will not vote under any circumstances for a sine die adjournment resolution this fall. We should stay here and exercise our constitutional responsibility to maintain a constant check upon the operation and the execution of this war. Furthermore, I say most respectfully on the floor of the Senate today, to my colleagues in the Senate and in the House, that, in my judgment, American public opinion will be quite different 60 days from now than it is today. We should at least be in session to respond to that public opinion, for I am satisfied that it will shift, and shift rapidly.

If Congress did not remain in session, it would be running away from its constitutional duty and moral obligations to the American people. When the President sends American boys to face the fire in Vietnam, he should also keep the feet of Congress in the fire here at home, because that is where they belong.

Certainly all those in Congress who have gone along with one endorsement after another of Presidential action in Asia on the expectation that they would be consulted in the future should be on hand in the event the President does decide to consult Congress on the course and extent of the war. How can Congress be consulted, if it is not even in formal session?

What we are headed for in Asia could be disaster. It could well be war with North Vietnam, and it could well be war with China, because war with China is in the minds of a large group of the President's military advisers. Congress can no longer hide behind its pleas that the whole policy in Asia was instigated by Presidents and should be carried out by Presidents, without any sharing by Congress of the responsibility for the policy and its results.

Congress must stop being a rubber-stamp parliament. The war in Asia has gone far beyond the action of a Commander in Chief. It is about to be transformed into a de facto state of war, as the calling up of additional forces will make very clear to the American people. Congress must remain in Washington, in session, if it is to fulfill its constitutional duty.

Although the Pentagon and the State Department do not seem to think there is any serious danger that Russia will enter the war, the senior Senator from Oregon does not share that sense of safety and security. In my judgment, any substantial bombing in Hanoi would kill Russians. There are many Russians in Hanoi. If we started to kill Russians with our bombs, I cannot imagine that Russia would send us greetings and thanks.

Moreover, I cannot listen to the reports from the State Department and particularly from the Pentagon without being satisfied in my own mind that there is a group of preventative war people in the Pentagon who share the views of Hanson Baldwin, who is usually their trial balloonist, that we ought to send a large body of troops into Asia to fight a preventative war against China.

Mr. President, if we should make that great mistake, I do not believe that there is any possibility that Russia could stay out of that war and have any hope at all of maintaining any influence in the Communist segment of the world.

Mr. President, I should like to have my colleagues read very carefully the remarks of Walter Lippmann in his column published in this morning's Washington Post.

Some individuals will consider my statement to be a bit boastful, but the record will speak for itself. There is no premise in the Walter Lippmann article of this morning that the senior Senator from Oregon has not been setting forth in detail in the Senate in speech after speech for 2 years.

I am glad that Mr. Lippmann has emphasized the point of view set forth in the premises of the long series of speeches that I have made in opposition to what I at first called McNamara's war, because McNamara, Taylor, and Lodge were the original blueprinters of that war in Asia. Then, finally, reluctantly, and with dragging feet, the Secretary of State joined them. That made it the McNamara-Rusk war. Then, to his everlasting sorrow, I believe, so far as the future pages of history will show, they brought the President into the war. That made it the McNamara-Rusk-Johnson war, which it is today.

Mr. President, in my judgment the observations made by Walter Lippmann in his column of this morning are sound. He has been warning the American people for some time about the great dangers that are likely to develop from the escalation of this war into a massive war in Asia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Asian War," written by Walter Lippmann, and published in this morning's Washington Post be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Kennedy of New York in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

Today and Tomorrow: Asian War

(By Walter Lippmann)

We are about to pit Americans against Asians on the continent of Asia. Except for the diminishing and disintegrating South Vietnamese army, we have only token or verbal support from any Asian country. No great Asian power, Japan, India, or Pakistan, is alined with us. None of our European allies is contributing anything beyond scattered verbal support. We have no mandate from the United Nations as we had in Korea, none from NATO, none from the nations of this hemisphere.

The situation in which we find ourselves is unprecedented, and the best the administration has been able to achieve by way of approval and support from our own people is a reluctant and depressed acquiescence. For there has been no proof, not even a real attempt to prove, that the security of the United States is vitally threatened in this war as it was, for example, when Hitler was in sight of the conquest of Britain and the capture of the British Fleet, or when Japan with a great navy threatened to command the whole Pacific Ocean including Hawaii and the coast of California.

Nations fight well when they are defending themselves, when, that is to say, they have a vital interest. It is the lack of an American vital interest which explains the current mood of depression and anxiety, which explains why our intervention in southeast Asia has for 10 years been so gingerly, so furtive, so inadequate.

There are in truth two main reasons why we are becoming ever more deeply involved in Vietnam. The first, much the more powerful of the two, is a proud refusal to admit a mistake, to admit the failure of an attempt, begun 10 years ago, to make South Vietnam a pro-American and anti-Chinese state. More than anything else we are fighting to avoid admitting a failure—to put it bluntly, we are fighting to save face.

There is a second reason which weighs heavily with many conscientious people. It is a respectable reason. As stated by the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday:

"We are in Vietnam at the express invitation of the Vietnamese Government; we are fighting there for the Vietnamese people. But we are fighting also for the millions of people in the other threatened lands beyond, people who have not the power to defend themselves from the Chinese colossus, and whose lives, safety and freedom depend on the strong arm of the policeman—which only we can provide."

My own view is that the conception of ourselves as the solitary policeman of mankind is a dangerous form of self-delusion. The United States is quite unable to police the world, and it is dangerous to profess and pretend that we can be the policeman of the world. How many more Dominican Republics can the United States police in this hemisphere? How many Vietnams can the United States defend in Asia?

The believers in America as the world policeman get around these practical difficulties by making an assumption—that what happens in Vietnam will determine what happens elsewhere in Asia, that what happens in the Dominican Republie will determine what happens all over Latin America. This notion of the decisive test in a fallacy. The Korean war, in which we successfully defended South Korea, did not determine the outcome in Indo-China. What we have done in the Dominican Republic will not protect any other Latin American country from the threat of revolution.

Revolutionary wars are indeed dangerous to order and it is baffling to know how to deal with them. But we may be sure that the phenomenon of revolutionary wars, which is latent in all of the underdeveloped regions of the world, cannot be dealt with by American military intervention whenever disorder threatens to overwhelm the constituted authority. On the contrary, it is more likely that in making Vietnam the test of our ability to protect Asia, we shall in fact provide revolutionary China with just the enemy it needs in order to focus popular hatred against us—a white, rich, capitalistic great power. We are allowing ourselves to be cast in the role of the enemy of the miserable and unhappy masses of the emerging nations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "War With China Favored, Opposed," written by Drew Pearson, and published in this morning's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

War With China Favored, Opposed

(By Drew Pearson)

The most important question in the background of the White House huddles over Vietnam is whether we will—or should—get into war with Red China. One group definitely favors war.

Some time ago, certain top Air Force commanders presented the White House with the view that there must be an eventual showdown with Red China, and it would be strategically easier for such a showdown to come now rather than later.

They proposed wiping out Chinese nuclear bases and laboratories this year, before China can become a major nuclear power.

There was some reason to believe that when Khrushchev was in power he would not have objected. Today the situation has changed. The Kremlin has warned us that an attack on China would bring instant Russian retaliation.

Despite this, many Pentagon strategists still argue that the time for a showdown with Red China is now.

The President so far is taking the opposite view. He has made it clear that he is against the use of nuclear weapons, that he is flatly opposed to escalating the war.

In one session, he pointed out that if we followed the recommendation of Representative GERALD R. FORD, Republican, of Michigan, and bombed Hanoi, the Chinese would retaliate either by sending in massed troops or bombing Saigon. We would then be called upon to retaliate against Peiping and world war would follow.

The President devoutly desires to avoid world war. He is proceeding with extreme caution. He does want to stop the march of communism in southeast Asia, but believes this can be done with a limited war.

ALLIES WORRY

There is always the risk, however, that this limited war will slide into a major conflict, and that is why our allies have been so worried.

Japanese leaders have been among the most persistent in urging the United States to change its policy in South Vietnam.

Many Democrats on Capitol Hill do not agree with our massive commitment in southeast Asia, but they are loyal to the President. A hint of this came out in the recent statement by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, urging that the Russians or the British or any member of the Geneva Treaty Conference (which split up North and South Vietnam in the first place) take the initiative in asking for peace talks.

BAD NEWS FROM SAIGON

Here is some of the distressing news from Saigon that has caused the series of White House huddles over future policy:

The South Vietnamese army is suffering from such wholesale desertions that it is risky to arm it. The arms go over to the Vietcong.

The Saigon Government, always corrupt, always ineffective, might just as well be scrapped.

American popularity once reasonably high, has nosedived. It is now on a par with the anti-French feeling during the long civil war in French Indochina.

Sixty percent of South Vietnam is now in the hands of the Vietcong, with many villages still supposedly loyal to the government probably actually disloyal.

The policy of bombing North Vietnam has been a complete failure. Military supplies have continued to come down from the north.

The above facts show the contrast between war in Vietnam and war in Korea. In the Korean war, the United States was supported by a strong patriotic civilian population that gave full cooperation. We also had the advantage of a Korean army, much of it well trained and willing to fight. There was no problem of an enemy constantly disappearing into the jungle.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this article by Drew Pearson sets forth the conflict that has been going on in the high council of our Government at the executive end of the avenue. However, it is also well that the American people be forewarned, as Pearson has forewarned them in his column of this morning, about the danger of a war with China.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Must Halt This Fiasco," published in the Wheeling News Register of Sunday morning, July 25, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST HALT THIS FIASCO

From every indication, the United States is about to embark upon a policy in Vietnam which at best will cost the lives of thousands of America's young men and at worst could escalate into a nuclear holocaust which would destroy most of the cities and peoples of the world.

The whole situation has been thoroughly confused by alluding to clever phrases to be substituted for simple truth. For example, much has been made over the idea that our involvement in Vietnam has something to do with a "test of national honor" or "our word" being at stake. This is nonsense and it is time that we set the record straight, at least in the minds of our own citizens.

What looms now as massive American commitment did not begin as any such test. It started as a conditional program of aid and support during the Eisenhower administration, with just over 300 American military advisers on the scene. Now we are on the verge of a military buildup there which may exceed the 327,000 Americans who fought in Korea with 142,000 casualties, 1 million reservists and national guardsmen called up and draft calls reaching some 80,000 monthly.

Our phrasemakers have harped so long on the idea that we will meet all requests of the South Vietnamese government for support, that we fail to view that government itself. At the moment that government supposedly is represented by a flamboyant little dictator named Nguyen Cao Ky. He seized power in a military coup while American soldiers fought to stave off the Communists.

Ky has become the 10th Premier of South Vietnam in 20 months and no one can predict how long he will survive. The very thought of supporting Ky is distasteful. Only recently in an interview he said that he had only one hero, Adolph Hitler.

He sports pearl-handled revolvers and purple chokers. His office reflects his character. It is splashed with bright blue flags and curtains. Orange and silver flying helmets cover the walls. He sits and listens to the Beetles from a hi-fi set in the corner while Americans fight through the mud and rain of the monsoons.

Meanwhile the war itself has gone badly. Hamlets and villages by the score are being overrun; strategic district towns are beginning to topple; the pressure is mounting on key provincial capitals. Driving hundreds of refugees before them, the Reds are clogging coastal areas with displaced villagers, adding to already serious economic strains.

All the while our allies are continuing to do business with our enemy. As was reported the other day, the freighters of 6 allied nations sent 74 shiploads of supplies to Communist North Vietnam during the first half of the year. And we talk about "national honor" being at stake.

Up to now this newspaper has supported the policy of President Johnson as expressed last August in New York as follows:

"Some others are eager to enlarge the conflict. They call upon us to supply American boys to do the job Asian boys should do. They ask us to take reckless action which might risk the lives of millions and engulf much of Asia and certainly threaten the peace of the entire world. Moreover, such action would offer no solution at all to the real problems of Vietnam."

We cannot go further. We cannot support war or the risk of atomic war without more information than the Government so far has seen fit to disclose. Why has Presidential policy completely changed? What developments have there been since last August which justify the commitment of thousands of American boys to fight and die in the swamps and rice paddies of this remote corner of southeast Asia? What changes in the world situation now justify the risk of an atomic war throughout the world?

The people of America are entitled to complete information, expressed not in clever phrases or the outright lies, justified by the Defense Department, but in simple straightforward language we all can understand.

It is time our Senators and Congressmen moved to protect their constituents rather than blindly following White House policy. It is time all of us let our views be known through letters and telegrams to our representatives and our President. It very well may be that the future of the world depends upon us.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this constitutes a very interesting shift in editorial policy. We are seeing increasing evidence of this. At long last, American editors are beginning to do their book work. At long last there is increasing evidence that American editors are reading something besides their own newspapers. At long last, there is increasing evidence that American editors are beginning to recognize the increasing danger that the McNamara-Rusk-Johnson war is creating in Asia to the security of our country and the peace of the world.

Oh, there have been some editors, from the very beginning, who had the courage to warn the American people of the danger. I refer again to the editors of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. These editors have been the most farsighted and courageous of any, with regard to American foreign policy, but they have had some good colleagues for a long time. The editors of the New York Times warned us of the danger of massive war in Asia. There seems to have been at least some silence on their part in the most recent past, but I am satisfied that we cannot escape the conclusions they were setting forth in their editorials for months in regard to the danger of war in southeast Asia.

Special tribute should be paid to Mr. Higgins, the editor of that little fighting newspaper in York, Pa., called the York Gazette. Obviously a keen student, this editor, and a very courageous writer who has been, in editorial after editorial, warning the American people for months of what is going to happen. His predictions have always happened. We cannot start the type of escalation that has been going on in Asia and not escape the fact that we are going to find ourselves in a massive conflict.

I also pay my high respect to the chain of Knight papers, which for many months have been trying to warn the American people that this executive war will threaten and endanger the peace of the world, as well as the ultimate security of the United States.

It is interesting to read what the editor of the Wheeling News-Register said in the editorial which I previously asked to have printed in the RECORD. He said:

> Up to now this newspaper has supported the policy of President Johnson as expressed last August in New York as follows:
>
> "Some others are eager to enlarge the conflict. They call upon us to supply American boys to do the job Asian boys should do. They ask us to take reckless action which

> might risk the lives of millions and engulf much of Asia and certainly threaten the peace of the entire world. Moreover, such action would offer no solution at all to the real problems of Vietnam."

The senior Senator from Oregon has quoted that statement by the President of the United States, plus the statement he made in Texas, plus the statement he made in New Hampshire during the campaign, all to the effect that he was against sending American boys to do what Asians should do. He has changed his mind. He has a right to change his mind, but the President has never advanced a sound argument in support of changing his mind.

The editorial continues:

> We cannot go further. We cannot support war or the risk of atomic war without more information than the Government so far has seen fit to disclose. Why has Presidential policy completely changed? What developments have there been since last August which justify the commitment of thousands of American boys to fight and die in the swamps and rice paddies of this remote corner of southeast Asia? What changes in the world situation now justify the risk of an atomic war throughout the world?
>
> The people of America are entitled to complete information, expressed not in clever phrases or the outright lies, justified by the Defense Department, but in simple straightforward language we all can understand.
>
> It is time our Senators and Congressmen moved to protect their constituents rather than blindly following White House policy. It is time all of us let our views be known through letters and telegrams to our representatives and our President. It very well may be that the future of the world depends upon us.

It is my belief that editorials of that type are going to increase in number in newspaper after newspaper in this country as the American people really come to grips with the awful and ugly reality that is ahead of us unless the warmaking policy of the United States in Asia is changed, unless the United States starts living up to its treaty commitments, unless the United States calls for an extraordinary session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and announces to the world that we are laying the whole threat of peace to the world before the United Nations for its jurisdiction, and that we will support the United Nations in the course of action that is taken in trying to reach a honorable, negotiated, peace settlement of this threat to the future of all mankind.

I close by saying that yesterday at the Governors' conference in Minneapolis, the Governor of Oregon, Mark O. Hatfield, made a statement which, in my opinion, is deserving of high commendation on the part of the senior Senator from Oregon. I commended the Governor once before for the efficient and effective work he did many months ago in connection with the flood disaster that struck my State of Oregon, back in January and December. Under his responsibility, it was his duty to report immediately to the Federal Government and to the President with regard to what the facts showed. He did. He worked closely with the office of the senior Senator from Oregon. He is worthy of the commendation I gave him. But we have in both parties some very blind partisans who seem to think one commits a great offense in partisan politics if he recognizes a commendable piece of work that is done by a member of the other party. I have never held to that principle.

Last night, sitting in my living room, watching television, I listened to the statement made over television by Governor Hatfield. I read an account of his statement in the press today. I sent the following telegram to Governor Hatfield:

> I listened to you last night on television and also read the newspaper accounts this morning of your statement on American foreign policy in Asia. Congratulations.
>
> You must expect to be criticized for advocating the negotiation of an honorable peace through existing procedures of international law, but the American people should face up to the fact that not even the powerful use of American military might in Asia makes right.
>
> For a long time I have pointed out in the Senate that our Government cannot justify the killing of American soldiers in southeast Asia in an undeclared war. I am proud to stand on that record.
>
> Although some will criticize you for it, I am proud of the statement you made yesterday at the Governors' conference. Regards.

I repeat that, in my opinion, there is a shifting in America, so far as American public opinion is concerned, in attitude in respect to the McNamara-Rusk-Johnson war in Asia. It is my opinion that the time has come—it is long overdue—for a reappraisal by the Congress of the war in Asia. I hope the Congress will stay on the job as long as American boys die in southeast Asia in this undeclared war, and that Congress will proceed to exercise its constitutional responsibility of checking the President in regard to the execution of that war.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes.

FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, S. 2300, now before the Senate, is the first general river and harbor and flood control bill to come before Congress since 1962.

The Public Works Committee has devoted much time to this proposed legislation. Public hearings covered a period of 4 months, extending from March through June.

Details concerning the recommended improvements have been furnished by the Corps of Engineers.

The committee believes that each project is economically justified, having passed the formula for authorization imposed by the corps.

We believe that the projects are well conceived. Their inception stems from the knowledge possessed by one of the greatest engineering organizations in the country.

Other Federal agencies, equally well qualified, and including the Bureau of the Budget, have reviewed these projects and concurred in their construction.

The inclusion of these projects in the construction program of the Corps of Engineers will be a valuable addition to the works that are now under construction, or are on the drawing boards, for protection from floods and the betterment of navigation.

The projects to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers as a result of this authorization would consist of single- and multiple-purpose dams and reservoirs—levees, flood walls, breakwaters, and channel improvements.

All are in the interest of navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, beach erosion control, and other multiple-purpose water uses.

They will provide needed flood protection to our cities and towns, as well as agricultural areas of the country.

They will enhance the use of the navigable waterways of our Nation which, as we all know, has one of the best harbor and inland waterway systems in the world.

They will provide additional water for domestic as well as industrial uses, augmenting the supply which in many sections of the country is becoming critical.

Hydroelectric power will also be generated at some of the projects recommended in the proposed legislation.

Recreational activities will be enhanced by the adoption of these projects.

All in all, the projects contained in this bill will go far in promoting and developing the Nation's water and land resources.

The projects recommended are the result, in many instances, of requests made by the Members of this body for studies of water resource problems in their States.

The committee asked the Corps of Engineers to look into these problems, and to advise the committee on the best course of action for remedying the situation.

The projects contained in this bill are the answers to these problems.

Highlights of the bill will be of interest to the Senate.

It is, as I mentioned, the first general omnibus bill since 1962.

It would authorize a total of 109 flood control, navigation, beach erosion control, and mutliple-purpose improvements, having a total estimated cost of $1.9 billion.

A portion of this cost will be returned to the Federal Treasury in payments for water supply and recreation by local interests.

The storage space in Federal reservoirs allocated to water supply and recreation—would be paid for by local interests over a period of not to exceed 50 years.

On this basis—the net cost to the United States for construction of these projects would be $1.8 billion.

While the direct dollar return of the total cost of the projects in the bill would not be great—the overall benefits that will accrue to the Nation will more than offset the costs.

This, of course, does not take into account the human lives that will be saved due to flood protection measures, upon which we cannot place a dollar value.

Certain other functions of the projects, such as flood control and navigation, the cost of which is not reimbursable in cash to the Federal Government, nevertheless, will contribute to the economic growth of the country.

The funds thus expended would be eventually returned with interest to the general public in the form of increased purchasing power.

The $1.9 billion authorized in the bill does not represent spending for 1 year.

This amount will be budgeted over a period of years on a sound fiscal basis compatible with other needs of the country.

The bill contains works of improvement for construction in 38 States of the Union.

Surveys leading to future projects will be made in a number of other States, in accordance with language that the committee has seen fit to include in the bill.

Section 104 of the bill grants the consent of Congress to construction of a dam by the State of Pennsylvania on the Susquehanna River. This will result in no cost to the Federal Government.

Section 204 would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make loans to those local interests—located in designated depressed areas—who are unable to meet the required local contributions toward the cost of construction of water resource projects.

This will be a valuable provision to assist those communities located in economically depressed areas of the country.

Section 206 as well as 207—would provide for needed comprehensive water resource surveys throughout the Nation.

In closing—I especially wish to thank the members of the Public Works Committee who devoted long hours to the consideration and formulation of this bill.

Also, my appreciation is extended to Gen. Jackson Graham, the Director of Civil Works of the Corps of Engineers, and to his able staff for furnishing the committee with details on the various projects and matters.

I consider the pending bill to be a well conceived and carefully analyzed piece of water resource legislation, and highly recommend its passage.

Mr. President, I offer several amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The first two are in the form of technical amendments merely indicating document numbers for reports which have become available since the bill was reported by the committee.

The other amendment provides for authorization of the navigation project at Cedar River Harbor, Mich.

The amendment offered on this project meets the criteria the committee has set for other projects cleared since the committee met.

The project has the favorable recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and has been cleared by all Federal and State agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget.

The project is necessary in the interest of commercial and recreational fishing, and will also serve as a harbor of refuge. It has an exceedingly high benefit-cost ratio of 1.7 and is well justified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Page 25, line 8, insert the figure "244".

Page 25, line 16, insert the figure "246".

Page 4, following line 23, insert the following:

> Cedar River Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered —, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $664,000;"

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are considered en bloc and, without objection, they are agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I join the distinguished Senator from Michigan, Senator McNAMARA, the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, in asking that S. 2300 be passed by the Senate.

As the Senator from Michigan has said, the bill has been the subject of long and thorough consideration over a period of 4 months. The Committee on Public Works gave the bill close scrutiny in comprehensive hearings.

This year the chairman of the committee initiated a new system of hearings, which I believe was helpful and enabled the committee to give fuller consideration than was possible for each project in past years. The chairman established four subcommittees dealing with specific projects in the Atlantic regions, the central regions, the Mississippi-Plains regions, and the Pacific regions.

After the hearings in these special subcommittees had been completed, the full committee went over the bill, item by item, and it was reported unanimously by the Public Works Committee.

As the chairman has noted, the omnibus authorization bill is usually brought before the Senate biennially, but it has been 3 years since a regular omnibus Public Works bill has been before the Senate. This, to a large extent, accounts for the authorization of $1,968,485,500 as reported in the bill developed by the committee.

There is always some criticism of this bill, chiefly from those who are not familiar with the careful processes fixed by law and Corps of Engineers regulations which must be followed before any project can be authorized by the Congress, or before appropriations can be provided for construction.

This is one of the cleanest omnibus bills that has been reported by a Public Works Committee. I do not know of any project included in the bill which has not met the requirements of the Corps of Engineers, the regulations of the Executive Department, or which is not in accord with law.

As those of us who serve on the committee know that every step provided by law and specific regulations must be met before the bill can be brought before the Senate. If a member considers a project to have merit, its survey by the Corps of Engineers must be ordered by a resolution of the Senate or House Public Works Committee. Then an appropriation for the survey must be provided to the Corps of Engineers by the Appropriations Committees and the Congress. When the survey has been completed by the district engineers, it must be approved at every level of the Corps of Engineers—the district engineer, the division engineer, the Board of Engineers of Rivers and Harbors, the Chief of Engineers, and then by the Secretary of the Army—before it can be recommended to the Congress.

It must meet the cost-benefit ratio. The cost-benefit ratio prescribes that the benefits to be derived from a project must equal in value cost of the project, amortized either over a period of 50 years, or in some cases, 100 years. Every project in this bill meets the cost-benefit ratio.

Even after approval is granted at all levels of the Corps of Engineers, the project must have the approval of all interested departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and of the State governments concerned and, finally, the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, which actually is approval by the President of the United States, as the Bureau of the Budget is an office of the President of the United States.

This process takes a long time—sometimes years—before a particular project can be considered by the Congress for authorization and then appropriated. In that time, hearings have been held in the local areas, and hearings have been conducted by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and by the Committee on Public Works of the House. No project is eligible for appropriations until all these steps have been satisfied.

I make this statement to describe the long process of approval and to answer the statement made by some, that the approval of river development projects of harbor improvements is a logrolling project or a porkbarrel bill.

This bill provides authorization for rivers and harbors projects, beach erosion projects, vital flood protection dam and reservoir projects, local flood protection projects, and navigation projects. In many cases, particularly with respect to local flood protection projects, a part of the cost of the project is borne by the community deriving the benefit from the specific project.

There is always some controversy about power projects. Some power projects are included in the bill, but they are few in number. They, too, have been justified in the same way that I have described in my remarks. Usually these hydroelectric projects are a part of multipurpose projects, providing flood protection and navigation benefits and are usually used for what is known as peaking power.

The witnesses who have testified before us—both on behalf of the Corps of Engineers and also private utility companies—stated that hydroelectric projects are the most useful and economical in the supply of peaking power.

In addition, the projects in this bill, in connection with those now under construction, will conserve precious water for human and industrial use, improve water quality, and furnish recreational benefits and conserve wildlife.

I do not need to remind Senators of the great floods which ravage this country every year. In recent months we were saddened by the terrible floods in the West—in Washington, Oregon, California, and Idaho. They are repeated every year in my State, and all over the country, resulting in the loss of millions of dollars in property and, year after year, in the loss of human life.

I have had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Public Works since 1957, and in these years I have been fortunate to see great progress made in the water resources programs affecting my own State of Kentucky, and I know the importance these programs have all across the Nation. I have been pleased to introduce in the Senate resolutions that ordered and initiated surveys of needed flood control projects in the river valleys of Kentucky. These resolutions have resulted in authorization and in construction of floodwalls, dams, and reservoirs to protect the people and the communities in the river valleys of Kentucky.

Some of these resolutions initiated projects included in this bill before the Senate today. Other surveys are being made, and when completed will be recommended to the Congress. The development of the water resources of Kentucky has meant much to the saving of lives, the preservation of property, and to economic growth of Kentucky.

It has been a privilege to work with my colleagues on the Senate Public Works Committee, and my colleague in the Senate, Senator Morton, and the members of the Kentucky congressional delegation in the House of Representatives.

The improvement and development of our rivers brings protection to communities and cities against floods. Having served on the Committee on Public Works for several years, I know that this program along with the navigation program, is one of the great factors in the economic development and growth of our country. It is of immense value to private industry, which bears the chief burden for the economic development and growth of our country.

So, today, I again wish to congratulate the chairman, the members, and the staff of the committee for their very careful consideration of the bill. The majority and the minority worked hard together, and I know that Senators Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy join me in appreciation for the attention and consideration given by the committee to this bill.

I believe the bill is one which stands uniquely, the test of the criteria imposed by the Corps of Engineers, the agencies in the executive branch of the Government, the Committee on Public Works, and the Congress itself. I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee for his timely remarks. His remarks indicate the spirit of the Committee on Public Works. His cooperation has been greatly appreciated by all of us on the committee.

Mr. President, I had a commitment to yield to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] at this time. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the Senator without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

BIG SANDY RIVER AND ITS TRIBUTARIES; PANTHER CREEK RESERVOIR IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I share the interest expressed by the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] in the projects brought into the bill as a consequence of the Corps of Engineers' report on the Big Sandy River and its tributaries.

I especially commend the effective work done by Representative James Kee, in whose district one of these projects would be located. Representative Kee has worked very diligently to advance flood control for the Big Sandy River and its tributaries.

It is pertinent that I point out, however, that although the need for flood protection and other water resource measures is of high priority in the Tug Fork watershed of the Big Sandy basin in Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia, the major emphasis in this bill is on the Levisa Fork in Kentucky.

We are grateful, nevertheless, for the inclusion of the Panther Creek Reservoir proposal at an estimated cost of $11.3 million. This impoundment in McDowell County, W. Va., would provide important flood protection in the local area and would have a beneficial effect on flooding in the main stream of the Tug Fork River. Moreover, it would offer substantial recreational benefits to a recreation-starved section of Appalachia in a three-States corridor which includes portions of Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia.

But, Mr. President, the Tug Valley obtains very little of the considerable flood protection, water quality control, and low flow augmentation that it needs, especially along the main stem of the Tug Fork River.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, in taking action on the Big Sandy Basin report and recommending the Yatesville, Paintsville, and Panther Creek Reservoirs, as well as a Martin, Ky., local protection project, also recommended as follows:

> That the Knox Creek Reservoir (at either the upper or alternate lower sites), and the Pond Creek and Matewan local protection projects, which approach marginal economic justification but are not presently eligible for recommendation, be included in the basin plan, and that these projects be studied in connection with programs pertaining to Appalachia or other enacted legislation which may evolve.

I sincerely hope that the studies recommended by the Board, and such other actions as may be necessary, will be taken to bring forth a favorable report which will result in the provision of flood protection for the main Tug Valley from Knox Creek to confluence with the Levisa Fork in a not-too-distant year.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Record in connection with these remarks certain quotations from testimony given by Mr. Everett Thompson, a resident and former delegate to the West Virginia Legislature from Mingo County, W. Va., concerning flood problems and flood control needs in the Tug Valley.

There being no objection, the quotations were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> The Tug Valley had a major flood in 1957 and in 1963, and we were saved from another one last year on March 26 by a lull of 7 hours in the rainfall as this gave time for the water to run off, and this prevented the flood. The Corps of Engineers has recommended the Panther Creek Reservoir which would lower our flood crest by a half to 2 feet.
>
> We feel that, with the construction of a spur line up Peter Creek by the N. & W. Railroad connecting into their area in Buchanan County, Va., that the cost-benefit ratio for Lower Knox Creek would be favorable and, with this in mind, we have asked for a meeting with railroad officials hoping that something can be worked out where this can be accomplished.
>
> The cost of constructing a railroad Y at the mouth of Knox Creek would tend to be a major part of the cost involved in the relocation of the Knox Creek railway line. This Y would span Tug River at an elevation of 150 feet above the stream and would permit coal to be hauled in either direction, east or west. If the Peter Creek line of the N. & W. Railway Co. could be used in conjunction with a connecting link into Buchanan County, Va., this would be above the maximum pool level of the proposed Lower Knox Creek Reservoir. We feel a comparable Y could be constructed at the mouth of Peter Creek to substitute for the Y at the mouth of Knox Creek. The Y at the mouth of Peter Creek would be at a lower elevation over the river, thus at a great reduction in construction cost.
>
> The amount and grade of coal which would be affected has been stressed to some extent by the opponents of the proposed Lower Knox Creek Reservoir; however, the amount and grade of the coal which is recoverable are subjects which require exhaustive professional determination, and, at this point in the matter, any statements made are merely self-serving declarations.

It cannot be too strongly stressed that the lower Knox Creek Dam, if constructed, will be a benefit to the entire Tug Valley extending from the site of the dam to Fort Gay, W. Va., and the Big Sandy Valley from Fort Gay to Kenova, W. Va. All of the remarks made by the opposition seemed to be limited to Williamson and Matewan whereas it must be borne in mind that we are not dealing merely with the small town of Matewan and the not too much larger town of Williamson, both in West Virginia. There has also been mention made of the Williamson floodwall.

In spite of the existence of the Williamson floodwall, when there is high water, the city of Williamson is forced to expend large sums of money to replace and renew waterlines which extend from the West Virginia side and the city of Williamson's water system to the residents of a vast area of Pike County, Ky., including, but not limited to, the Appalachian Regional Hospital located in South Williamson and in which the Federal Government, through various agencies thereof, has invested many millions of dollars. Since the construction of the Williamson floodwall, Williamson has installed and put into operation a sewage disposal and treatment system with the aid and assistance of more than $600,000 in Federal funds, and this system includes sewage service furnished to the Appalachian Regional Hospital Association, requiring the extension of sewerlines to serve South Williamson and adjacent housing and pumping stations across Tug River from West Virginia into Kentucky. These lines will be washed out unless some additional measure of flood protection, over and above the Panther Creek Dam, is provided. The loss to Williamson alone by almost any amount of high water will bring untold financial hardships on the municipality. It must be borne in mind, and cannot be overstressed, that the Williamson municipal corporation has invested in its water and sewage system more than $2 million.

A comment on the Williamson floodwall, which has more than $850,000 in Federal money tied up in steel and concrete along the bank of Tug River for a short distance of the borderline of the municipal corporation, and also has $185,000 in municipal funds tied up in land and right-of-way, making a total of more than $1 million in Federal and municipal funds in a floodwall which in the 1963 flood did not provide flood protection for the small section of Williamson which it was supposed to serve. The floodwall is of a cantilever type of construction and if the floodwaters are ever permitted to get behind the wall, as they threatened to do in 1963, and did do to some extent, then the Williamson floodwall is completely lost and all of the funds invested are lost, as well as all of the property it is intended to serve. The construction of the lower Knox Creek Dam will eliminate all of these possibilities. During the 1963 flood, the Army Engineers hurried to Williamson and were constantly on hand during the main flooding threat, observing the floodwall in every detail, and wringing their hands. The municipality was informed afterward by the Engineers that the floodwall could not be raised, and this is a matter of record.

In view of the above remarks, it appears clear to the people of the Tug Valley that unless the Knox Creek Dam is constructed, there will be no flood protection whatever in the Tug Valley which is adequate.

During two major floodings, in a period of 6 years, traffic using the Norfolk & Western facilities from east to west and west to east was entirely halted for several days because of major flooding in the N. & W. facilities, including the yards and the tunnel which is located in the west end of the community. Since that time, the N. & W. has expanded even greater and their traffic from east to west and west to east, using these same facilities, has increased manifold, and today the N. & W. is breaking all records in coal loadings for shipments for all figures used prior to this date are now obsolete.

I would like to say that the money which is used in construction of the proposed lower Knox Creek Reservoir will return to the Government many times because of the additional industry that will be furnishing jobs for those who are now drawing welfare, unemployment, and so forth.

The question of water supply came up this morning. I would just like for the record to note that the city of Williamson last year had to build several small dams at different locations in Tug River before there was ample water for the citizens of Williamson, and I have had several businessmen who are in the well-drilling business tell me that they have had to go 10 to 15 feet deeper in the past few years to find water. There are wells that never went dry before that will no longer furnish water in the dry months of the summer and autumn seasons.

AMENDMENT NO. 364

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I offer my amendment No. 364, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from West Virginia will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 25, following line 4, change the period to a comma and add the following:

Provided, That the power features of this project shall not be undertaken until such time as the Federal Power Commission has completed action on any applications that may be pending before that agency for private development of the pumped-storage facility of the project: *Provided further*, That should the Federal Power Commission act in the affirmative on any pending applications, the authority for such project shall not include Federal power features and the estimated cost of such project shall be $88,402,000: *And provided further*, That in the event the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending applications, Federal construction of such pumped-storage power facilities is hereby authorized and approved.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, before addressing myself very briefly to the amendment, I wish, as a member of the Committee on Public Works, to commend the most capable chairman, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] for his consideration of the many projects incorporated in the authorization bill for rivers and harbors, flood control, and multiple-purpose uses.

I wish also to commend the ranking Republican member of the committee, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and all other members of the committee, who have worked diligently during the hearings, and who listened for hours to explanations of projects and considered the pending projects in close detail. In the words of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], they have presented to the Senate a clean bill. I understand exactly what the Senator means when he so designates the proposed legislation.

The bill has been gone over very carefully. That is the background of the amendment which I now have offered to the Senate.

In West Virginia we have had a project known as the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, which in one way or another has been pending for 30 years. I knew the project when I was in the House of Representatives. It is a project to which there have been from time to time various types of vigorous opposition.

The Rowlesburg Reservoir proposal in S. 2300 is the culmination of studies of the Cheat River and tributaries in West Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania dating back more than three decades. It is a project which has been locally controversial, but nationally necessary. I speak of it as being nationally necessary because it is one of the vital impoundments proposed in the Appalachian highlands to hold back floodwaters and lessen the dangers in the industrially important Monogahela and Ohio River valleys. And it is needed equally as much to provide low flow augmentation when summer and autumn droughts so seriously affect both the Monongahela and the Ohio. Also of vital importance in the Rowlesburg Reservoir proposal are the water quality control and recreation benefits, and the pumped-storage capacity to enhance the power potential.

There has been opposition over the years in the impoundment area, as we must naturally expect in projects of this nature. There has been some opposition from conservation forces usually heard against high dams. And there has been opposition to development of the hydroelectric potential. But these classes of opposition have largely disappeared, with the contesting forces being almost exclusively those of the impoundment area.

Wildlife and conservation objection largely gave way to the concept that the reservoir is vitally needed as a part of the national system of water resource facilities.

The former antihydroelectric opposition has disappeared as the technology of power generation and the markets for power have changed in the region. As a matter of fact, investor-owned utilities and coal interests now look with favor on a Rowlesburg Reservoir. The electric company serving the area has made application to the Federal Power Commission for a license to construct and operate the pumped-storage power facilities of the project.

We overlooked this factor in committee when we recommended that the Rowlesburg Reservoir be authorized at the full estimated cost of $133 million plus, including Government power development.

Inasmuch as the Monongahela Power application is pending before the FPC, the administration has expressed a view that I share—and which I believe the chairman of our committee and other colleagues of the committee likewise share—that in authorizing the Rowlesburg project at this time we should restrict the construction of the power features until such time as action is taken by the Federal Power Commission.

This is the purpose of the amendment, but we have made it broad enough to—

First. Provide that the power features of the project shall not be undertaken until such time as the Federal Power Commission has completed action on any applications that may be pending before that agency for private development of the pumped-storage facility of the project.

Second. Provide further that, should the Federal Power Commission act in the affirmative on any pending applications, the authority for such project shall not include Federal power features and the estimated cost of the project shall be reduced to $88,402,000 from the $133 million figure in the bill.

Third. Provide further, however, that in the event the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending application, Federal construction of such pumped-storage power facilities would be authorized and approved.

We should not prohibit in this bill the processing of any application for a license pending before the Federal Power Commission. I will state candidly to my colleagues that the Bureau of the Budget expedited the clearance of this project to the Congress with the understanding and the strong recommendation that there be the restrictions on construction of the power features as proposed in my amendment. I also want the RECORD to reflect the constant support and effective assistance which my colleagues, Senator ROBERT BYRD and Representative HARLEY STAGGERS, have given in bringing this project to its present stage of authorization.

I feel that all rights and interests, including that of the Government, are properly and adequately protected by the amendment numbered 364 as printed and called up by me. For the reasons given, I hope my amendment will prevail.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the committee has no objection to the inclusion of this amendment in the bill permitting the Federal Power Commission to consider applications for private development of the pump-storage power at the Rowlesburg Dam since an application for a license is now pending before that agency. However, it should be clearly understood that the Federal Power Commission would be expected to carefully analyze the situation as to whether it is in the best interests of the country to allow private interests to develop this site or whether it should be a Federal development.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am in full accord with the observation of our chairman.

Mr. McNAMARA. With that understanding, unless there is some objection on the part of the minority, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I should like to have the Senator from West Virginia assure the Senate that the amendment would not give any direction to the Federal Power Commission as to whether or not there should be public or private power in that area.

Mr. RANDOLPH. There is no such direction in the amendment, and there was no such intended direction or implication by the Senator from West Virginia. I assure the distinguished Senator from Montana, as I have assured the distinguished chairman of the committee, that there is in nowise an attempt to direct or coerce a decision in that respect.

Mr. METCALF. The proposal is merely an attempt to maintain the status quo in order that the Federal Power Commission can be fully free to arrive at a decision at its own discretion.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is entirely correct.

Mr. METCALF. I have no further objection.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Montana. I move the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 362

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 362 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

In the proper place immediately preceding the section entitled "Rahway River Basin, New Jersey," add the following:

"ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, NEW JERSEY

"The project for hurricane-flood protection on the Elizabeth River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized susbtantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered —, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,769,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Corps of Engineers had not submitted a full report on the Elizabeth River flood control project at the time of the hearings. Also, not all the other departments concerned had reported on the project at the time of the executive session of the Committee on Public Works. Since then, all the affected departments have reported on this flood control project, so desperately needed on the Elizabeth River, and their reports are favorable.

The project has been cleared by the Chief of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, the Public Health Service of New Jersey, and the New Jersey Department of Conservation and Economic Development.

The distinguished chairman of the committee, who has done magnificent work on this highly complex bill, is familiar with the project and, I believe understands the need as expressed by the various departments and as I know it intimately, of course, because the project is in my State.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the committee has no objection to the inclusion of this project in the bill. It has been favorably recommended by the Chief of Engineers; and all the Federal agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget, have recommended it. The project is necessary to prevent hurricane flooding in the highly developed Elizabeth River basin and has a favorable benefit-cost ratio of 1.3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS.]

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I join other members of the Committee on Public Works in complimenting the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and the ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. I have the pleasure of serving on this committee. I know of the time that these two distinguished Senators have devoted to the public works bill. What I say of them is true also of the other members of the committee.

I also compliment the entire staff of the committee, because they have done a vast amount of work in preparing the bill for the Senate. Many hours of work have gone into its completion. As the Senator from Kentucky has said, 4 months of work have gone into the preparation of the bill, and it is a good, clean bill.

Mr. President, I offer an amendment to authorize a project that has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget since the Committee on Public Works acted on the omnibus bill.

The project involves the deepening of the Cape Fear River Channel above Wilmington, N.C., between Wilmington and Acme, N.C. The total cost of the project to the United States for construction dredging is $1,510,000. The project has an estimated benefit-cost ratio of 1.7 to 1.

The Corps of Engineers has been reviewing this project for the past 4 years. It is one which all interested agencies of the Federal Government and State and local governments have approved. I sincerely hope the Senate will approve the project as an amendment to the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 3, following line 10, insert the following:

"Cape Fear River, North Carolina: House Document Numbered —, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,510,000;".

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the amendment is agreeable to the committee. It has a favorable benefit-cost ratio of 1.7 and has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers and approved by all interested Federal and State agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget. The project will improve navigation conditions on the Cape Fear River.

There being no objection to the amendment by any member of the committee, I move the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 6, following line 7, insert the following:

"Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 43, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,000,000;".

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I make a brief statement on the amendment, I wish to make a few personal comments. I know that the Senator from Michigan never likes to hear compliments. I sometimes think that were one to compliment the Senator from Michigan, he might be a little suspicious. Nevertheless, the people of Michigan, who sent him here, are deserving of the respect that I pay to them through my comments on the Senator from Michigan. I have worked closely with the Senator from Michigan on other committees and have found him to be a delightful colleague.

I thank him for his fairness, his thoroughness, and his keen foresight in regard to the facts that involve problems such as the one raised by my amendment.

I thank him sincerely for the leadership he has given in bringing to the Senate what the ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] referred to as a clean public works bill. The Senator from Kentucky and I have worked together in the Senate for more years than we sometimes like to admit—and on both sides of the aisle. I served with the Senator from Kentucky for many years on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; in fact, we served together as members of the Subcommittee on Education and also on the Subcommittee on Railroad Retirement. So I know whereof I speak when I say that the Senator from Kentucky, as is also true of the Senator from Michigan, asks only one question, "What are the facts, and what can you say in support of the facts?"

On the basis of that premise, I urge the acceptance of my amendment. I spoke with the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Kentucky about the amendment prior to the reporting of the bill to the Senate. We had been waiting for some time to receive a report and the final papers from the Corps of Engineers. They were received after the bill had been reported to the Senate.

The amendment is in proper form. It relates to a jetty at Tillamook, Oreg. The report of the Army Engineers shows how essential it is to eliminate the great annual waste and loss suffered by property owners in that area each year.

I offer the amendment on its merits. The chairman and ranking minority member of the committee are familiar with the merits.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon on this project is agreeable to the committee. The project has a favorable benefit-cost ratio of 1.3. It has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers and approved by all interested Federal and State agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget. The project will improve navigation conditions at Tillamook Bay. Therefore, I move the adoption of the amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be started.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 23, line 9, strike the period at the end thereof and insert in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That such portion of the project as relates to the area above the city limits of Sioux City, Iowa, be compatible with a fish and wildlife mitigation plan and also a flood control plan for the upper basin of the Big Sioux River, both to be approved by the States of Iowa and South Dakota."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to solve a problem that exists in my State of Iowa, and more particularly in the State conservation commission of Iowa, with regard to the project in the Big Sioux River. The difficulty is outlined in the committee report.

I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the committee report on page 147 be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Comments of the States and Federal agencies:

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

State of South Dakota: Favorable.

State of Iowa: Does not concur in fish and wildlife mitigation plan. Have expressed the view that the report should be delayed pending results of authorized study of upstream reservoirs. It is the view of the Chief of Engineers that the proposed project will be compatible with, and enhanced by, any future flood control plan that might be developed for the upper basin, and will not become redundant as a result of any upstream reservoirs that may later be authorized and built. It is his further view that this proposed project will not bar consideration of other projects which may be developed in the basin in the future. He, therefore, recommends authorization of the project without further delay. If the project is authorized, the corps will continue coordination with concerned interests during advanced planning with a view to developing a mutually agreeable fish and wildlife mitigation plan.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget: No objection.

Remarks: The committee notes that the State of South Dakota favors the project. Also, that a preponderance of affected local interests in the area to be protected favor the project, but the State of Iowa does not concur completely in the plan. The committee believes the project is a worthy undertaking, but that in its planning and design phases continued effort should be made to develop a project mutually agreeable, insofar as possible, to all concerned.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have a letter from the Governor of Iowa, the Hon. Harold E. Hughes, to the Senator from Michigan. This letter indicates that he is not objecting to a portion of the project, but is objecting to another portion of the project.

My amendment would permit the first portion of the project to proceed as planned, and would make the start on the second portion of the project contingent upon the States of Iowa and South Dakota agreeing to the fish and wildlife conservation plan and the upper flood control basin plan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to the Senator from Michigan from the Governor of Iowa under date of April 13, 1965, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

April 13, 1965.

Hon. Pat McNamara,
U.S. Senator Chairman, Public Works Committee, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator McNamara: In view of the great national concern for the conservation of our natural resources, promotion and development of outdoor recreation and the mounting emphasis toward sound integrated resource planning, I, as Governor of Iowa, wish to be officially on record as opposing the straightening of the Big Sioux River from Akron to Sioux City, as proposed by the Corps of Engineers.

As an alternative, I urge that this subcommittee consider favorably a program which is more consistent with modern concepts of conservation. This would involve complete watershed development for the Big Sioux River Basin, including main stream impoundments, subimpoundments, and reclamation of drained marshes, plus other sound practices involved in water and soil conservation. By such a program, a broad cross-section of our taxpayers would benefit from the expenditure of public funds.

I support the proposed channel improvement within the city limits of Sioux City, but I strongly urge that the channel straightening project as proposed by the Corps of Engineers for the Akron to Sioux City reach of the Big Sioux be rejected.

Your consideration of this letter will be deeply appreciated.

Very truly yours,
Harold E. Hughes,
Governor.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the State conservation commissioner of Iowa has indicated in a letter under date of April 9, 1965, that he is opposed to the particular portion of the project to which I have referred.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that letter be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

April 9, 1965.

Iowa Conservation Commission's Objections To Straightening the Big Sioux River

Senator Pat McNamara,
Chairman, Public Works Committee, New Senate office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The State Conservation Commission of Iowa hereby objects to the straightening of the Big Sioux River between the town of Akron and Sioux City, as proposed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This objection is based upon detrimental effects that would accrue to the fisheries, wildlife and associated recreational values of this river.

The State law that provided for a conservation commission sets out the following general duty, "It shall be the duty of the commission to protect, increase, preserve the fish, game, fur-bearing animals and protect birds of the State." Also, "Matters relating to State waters, State parks, forest and forestry, and lakes and streams, including matters related to scenic, scientific, historical, archeological, and recreational matters."

All wild game and fish are the property of the State and every citizen has his share of ownership. The above law is a mandate to the conservation commission to protect and preserve fish and game and to insure that all streams are considered in their scenic and recreational uses for all the people of Iowa.

Numerous examples of the catastrophic biological effects of stream straightening on fish and game may be cited. Portions of the Little Sioux, Skunk, Upper Iowa, Des Moines, Nishnabotna, Nodaway, and many other rivers have been virtually ruined from the standpoint of fishing and hunting and other outdoor recreation by virtue of straightening. The elimination of river bends or oxbows from the flowage eliminates environmental conditions conducive to welfare of fishes and game that are endemic to the stream basin. Esthetic values associated with a meandering-type stream are lost by straightening and channelization.

It is most difficult to ascribe economic values to wildlife, fisheries, and recreation. Intangibles are involved which transcend cash money evaluations, but are recognized as true values nevertheless. Minimal figures have, therefore, been ascribed to the annual fish, game, and water losses involved in this project, if completed. Calculated as follows:

Deer	$612.00
Raccoon	109.76
Beaver	547.25
Squirrel	661.50
Cottontails	423.00
Pheasants	150.00
Mink	93.42
Muskrats	894.87
Canada geese	250.00
Blue and snow geese	500.00
Ducks	3,000.00
Fish	23,000.00
Water surface area	24,000.00
Annual loss	54,241.00

The 50-year amortization figure used by the Corps of Engineers—appendix II, page 6—in "The Review Report on Flood Control for Big Sioux River and Tributaries Iowa and South Dakota, Reports and Appendixes, U.S. Army Engineer District, Omaha, Nebr., October 1960," may be used to indicate the magnitude of recreational loss in the same period. Multiplying the annual loss of $54,241.00 by 50, we have $2,612,090. The loss of wildlife habitat caused by the probable clearing of timber, shrubs, and forbs, calculated at $100 per acre for the 5,647 acres involved in this stretch of river means an additional loss of $564,700. This amount added to the accrued deficits gives a total of $3,176,790 as the total of these values alone for a 50-year period. It does not include esthetic recreational intangibles such as picnicking, nature hikes, bird watching, and other values inherent in a natural meandering stream as compared to the practically negligible values of a straight ditch.

It is the contention of the Iowa Conservation Commission; South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks Department; National, State, and local chapters of the Izaak Walton League of America; National Wildlife Federation and its local affiliates; plus the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners that the straightening of streams as a means of flood control is not compatible with modern concepts of good resource management. All agree that watershed controls including impoundments and subimpoundments on the main stem and tributaries in the watershed, plus other recognized water and soil conservation practices constitutes more effective control of floods. It also retains and enhances the fisheries, wildlife, and recreational features endemic to the river basin. Iowa has many hundreds of miles of straightened rivers which provide practically no outdoor recreation. The elimination of fish and game habitat automatically degrades the environment for these animals and at the same time abolishes the scenic attraction for those in search of outdoor recreation.

The State Conservation Commission of Iowa recognizes that flood control is needed by the farmers in the lower flood plain of the Big Sioux; however, it is the contention of this body that the mitigation of floods by channel straightening is inimicable to modern concepts of conservation of natural resources. The long-range planning for the Nation's needs of soil, water, and recreation must include the saving of water, soil, and recreational areas. Our Nation's leading ecologists have warned repeatedly of the dangers to our civilization, if we continue the abuses of natural resources. The plundering of soils, waters, and recreational areas by river straightening to benefit a few individuals at public expense is inconsistent with and in diametric opposition to these postulates.

In conclusion we respectfully call your attention to several other factors which seem germane to any decision concerning this project:

1. The Big Sioux River is a meandered stream and, therefore, the property of the State of Iowa from midchannel to the left bank (Iowa side).

2. The Big Sioux River constitutes the boundary between Iowa and South Dakota (act of Congress, August 4, 1846, and constitution of Iowa).

3. The proposed channel change would place 1,610 acres of Iowa land in South Dakota and 760 acres of South Dakota land in Iowa. This represents a 850-acre loss of Iowa land to the State of South Dakota unless our Constitution is amended. The boundary of Iowa can be enlarged by an act of Congress and the general assembly. There is no provision for reducing it. The corps proposes to do the work first and obtain approval by these bodies afterward (p. 32, 1960 report).

4. Using the corps figures (Appendix III—23, 1960 report) the costs exceed the value of the benefited lands (34,000 acres at $200=$6,800,000).

5. In calculating the cost-benefit ratio the Corps of Engineers did not include any mitigation for losses to fisheries, wildlife, or recreation. If these annual losses cited previously in this report were included, the cost-benefit ratio would be less than 1:1 or 1:0.93 (corps calculations, p. 28, 1960 report). This does not include the cost of the loss of wildlife habitat worth over a half million dollars. Thus, the costs far exceed the benefits.

Finally, the State Conservation Commission urges this subcommittee of the Congress to look with favor upon the plan very recently drafted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, for a comprehensive Big Sioux River Basin study in South Dakota, Minnesota, and Iowa. This proposed study is designed to develop a water resources management plan for the Big Sioux River Basin. It involves coordinating arrangements with the Department of the Army (Corps of Engineers), Department of Agriculture, Department of Interior, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of Commerce, Department of Labor, plus 21 State agencies from South Dakota, Minnesota, and Iowa. These agencies would serve in a sponsoring position and assume the leadership for coordination, development, and activation of an integrated program to appraise, conserve, and efficiently utilize the Big Sioux Basin's water and related land resources to meet all long-term needs. With such a program, a broad spectrum of our taxpayers would benefit from the expenditure of public funds.

For the Director:

E. T. Rose,
Chief, Fish and Game Division,
Iowa Conservation Commission.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have a letter from the Department of the Army under date of July 26, 1965, indicating that extensive discussions and inquiries among several members of his staff have failed to disclose any instance of congressional authorization of any civil works project in the face of disapproval by the Governor of an affected State.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Department of the Army,
Office of the Chief of Engineers,
Washington, D.C., July 26, 1965.

Hon. Jack Miller,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Miller: I have your recent inquiry as to whether or not the Congress has authorized a flood control project which has been disapproved by the Governor of an affected State.

As discussed in a telephone conversation between representatives of our respective offices, a conclusive negative would require research over a considerable period of time. However, extensive discussions and inquiries among several members of my staff have failed to disclose any instance of congressional authorization of any civil works project in the face of disapproval by the Governor of an affected State.

Sincerely yours,

Jackson Graham,
Major General, U.S. Army,
Director of Civil Works.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, my amendment would be to let the program go forward.

I am satisfied that, if the bill is passed with my amendment contained therein, the States of Iowa and South Dakota will devise a plan that will be mutually acceptable to them with respect to the present disputed portions.

I hope that the chairman of the committee will see fit to accept my amendment.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, unless there is objection to the amendment, the chairman has no objection. If the author of the amendment wishes to move that the amendment be agreed to, I shall not object.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask unanimous consent that the amendment be not read but printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> On page 35, between lines 12 and 13, insert a new section as follows:
>
> "SEC. 208. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this Act any authorization of any project pursuant to such provisions shall not be effective if the benefit-cost ratio of such project contained in the report on such project by the Chief of Engineers is less than 1.51."
>
> On page 35, line 13, strike out "SEC. 208" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 209".

WASTE IN FEDERAL PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to remove from the public works bill now under consideration projects which are not economically justified. The amendment would cut $845 million out of the bill. Although many projects in the bill are worthwhile ones which would pay back the public investment put into them, there are other projects in the bill which are not worthwhile. These wasteful projects should be eliminated.

This is not the first time I have spoken in this Chamber on the subject of the benefits and costs involved in public works projects. On August 9, 1962, I urged implementation of realistic congressional standards for evaluating proposed Federal projects. On December 24, 1963, I discussed the work of Prof. Robert Haveman, the highly respected economist who had just completed a lengthy study of economic efficiency in postwar programs carried out by the Corps of Engineers. I had printed, for the consideration of other Senators, an article by Professor Haveman analyzing deficiencies in the current methods of determining benefit-cost ratios. On June 19, 1963, I introduced a resolution which would have been a first step toward realistic standards and which would have made the executive branch aware of the Senate's insistence that realistic standards be applied so that the taxpayer would know just what he is being asked to pay for.

At the heart of all discussion on the worth of Federal projects is the benefit-cost ratio. It is, at first glance, a very simple thing. It is obtained by adding up the monetary value of all benefits and of all costs which will be connected with a given project. Annual benefits and annual costs are obtained by dividing by the number of years the project will contribute to the economy. The actual benefit-cost ratio is then obtained by dividing annual costs or charges into annual benefits. If costs and benefits are equal, the ratio is one, or unity If benefits exceed costs, the ratio is greater than unity. If benefits are less than costs, the ratio is less than unity.

The important thing, however, is that every cost and every benefit used in arriving at the ratio be accurate and justifiable. It is a regrettable fact that at the present time a number of spurious benefits are often used in arriving at the benefit-cost ratio. It is also a fact that costs are often computed at an unrealistically low level.

Two major elements in determining costs of long-term investment, as any homeowner knows, are interest rates and the length of time allowed for repayment. Previously I have pointed out that it would be utopian for a private citizen to expect to pay for his house at an interest rate of 2½ or 3 percent and to have as long as 100 years to pay. Yet, these are the assumptions which form the basis for estimating costs of investment in many Federal projects. All this amounts to gross deception. Costs of Federal projects appear far lower than they really are. If anyone wonders who loses, it is that forgotten person, the American taxpayer.

To give credit where credit is due, current executive branch policy is to use as the interest rate for Federal projects the average rate of interest payable on interest-bearing marketable securities of the United States having terms of maturity of at least 15 years. Right now this rate is 3⅛ percent. This policy, however, has not yet trickled down to affect cost computations of projects now coming to Congress for approval. Interest rates for most projects in the present bill are set at 3 percent—although some projects have rates as low as 2½ percent. And in view of the fact that the Federal Government is now borrowing at more than 4 percent, why should not at least 4 percent be the discount rate? The answer, Mr. President, is that at 4 percent many of these projects would be lost. It would be proved that the costs would be greater than the benefits.

The effect of this unreasonably low interest rate is to make many unreasonable projects appear reasonable. My amendment would eliminate most, if not all, of such projects.

Turning to the benefit side of the benefit-cost ratio, it becomes apparent that several categories of benefits now included are spurious. Congressional policy on this score has become more lax in the last decade. In 1951, a House Appropriations subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Army Civil Functions, reported to the House Appropriations Committee about a proposed Corps of Engineers project as follows:

> It was evident to Congress from this report that the project could not be justified by the statutory criterion, a favorable benefit-cost ratio, unless intangible and arbitrary values such as national defense ($600,000), enhancement of local land values ($275,000), and recreation ($100,000), were included in the ratio. In congressional hearings and debates, Senators and Congressmen objected to these intangibles, and they have been dropped in subsequent consideration of the project.

The proposed project happened to be the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, a project which has by no means been laid to rest even now. In 1947, the Corps of Engineers had reported a benefit-cost ratio of 1.13, in other words, annual benefits were said to be 1.13 times greater than annual costs. The House subcommittee found, once the items mentioned in the paragraph had been eliminated, that the actual ratio was only 0.27. In other words, benefits were actually only 27 percent or less than one-third of costs. Phony benefit items made the difference between fiction and reality.

Mr. President, fiction is still with us today. Land enhancement benefits and recreation benefits, neither of which provide monetary returns to the economy, appear in profusion in the report accompanying the present bill. The land enhancement benefit item is especially vulnerable. Those economists, such as Professor Haveman, who have studied the matter are unanimous in stating that increased appraised values are "paid for" by project construction costs—they do not enter the economy as a separate benefit. Furthermore, in cases where land enhancement benefits are claimed to result from transportation improvements, there are corresponding reductions in land values in the places from which the traffic is diverted. In such cases, reduction in one place cancels out benefits in another.

No less than 16 projects in the present bill have land enhancement benefits claimed as part of their justification. In most cases, the benefit claimed is small, for example 1 percent of benefits claimed for Edmonds Harbor, Washington; 2 percent of benefits claimed for Kawaihae Harbor in Hawaii; and 2 percent of benefits claimed for the Maumee River Basin project in Ohio.

In a few cases, however, the land enhancement benefit claimed is extremely large. Two flood control projects in California, the Eel River project and the Napa River Basin project, are justified largely on the basis of land enhancement benefits, which, as I have said, are condemned by economists as a fake benefit. For the Eel River project, 44 percent of annual benefits are said to be in land enhancement. For the Napa River Basin project the figure is 39 percent. With the spurious land enhancement benefit included, the benefit-cost ratio for Eel River is 1.1 and for the Napa River Basin it is 1.5.

Mr. President, when the phony benefit item is eliminated, the benefit-cost ratio for both projects falls to less than unity. For Eel River the ratio becomes 0.62, and for the Napa River Basin it becomes 0.90. These are the real benefit-cost ratios which should be put before this Chamber and before the American taxpayer. My amendment would remove both projects from the present bill.

Another unjustifiable project, Mr. President, is the proposed project for the Grand River and tributaries in Missouri and Iowa. As part of this project, seven tremendously costly reservoirs are proposed. For the seven reservoirs the Federal taxpayer is being asked for $252,020,000—more than $1 from every man, woman, and child in this Nation. With such huge sums involved one would expect substantial benefit-cost ratios for the reservoirs, with every benefit item thoroughly examined and 100 percent justifiable.

But what are the actual ratios?—see page 150 of report. For Mercer Reservoir the ratio claimed is 1.5. For Pattonsburg, Trenton, and Brookfield Reservoirs the ratio claimed is 1.3. For St. Catherine and Braymer Reservoirs the ratio claimed is 1.1. And I am almost embarrassed to tell you, Mr. President, that for the remaining reservoir, the Linneus Reservoir, the ratio claimed is exactly 1.

What about the benefit items used in arriving at the claimed ratios for these seven reservoirs? Is every one of them guaranteed to provide tangible benefits to the national economy? Not by a long shot. Thirty-two percent of the annual benefits claimed are intangible. The dollar figure is $3,600,000 annually for "recreation and fish and wildlife." I have nothing against recreation, Mr. President. Recreation areas are vitally needed. But let us be honest with ourselves. As the House subcommittee reported in 1951, recreation benefits, however valuable in the abstract, are intangible in terms of dollars and cents. We are being deluded if we let ourselves believe that a tangible monetary return will be provided from recreation which can properly be used to pay back taxpayers' dollars poured into these reservoirs in the Midwest and into the numerous other projects in the bill which are justified on the same ground. I need hardly add, Mr. President, that with these intangible benefits eliminated, the seven reservoirs have a benefit-cost ratio of less than unity.

The Department of Agriculture has expressed reservations about the adverse effects which some of these reservoirs would have on flood prevention and watershed protection.

GROSSLY INADEQUATE INFORMATION

Mr. President, something should be said about the information available to Senators about the bill we are now considering. Normally the bill itself and the report accompanying it give us most of the information we need to make an intelligent decision before casting our vote. In some cases further information, often in the form of House or Senate documents, is necessary to provide detailed information not presented in the report. Such is the case for the public works bill. For each project in the bill, a separate House or Senate document exists. These documents, most of which take the form of a "letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers," explain, or should explain, in detail the purposes and costs and benefits of the projects.

There are two points which should be made. The first is that a number of these documents are not yet printed. At least 13 House documents relating to specific projects in the bill now before us are not available. Before introducing my amendment to eliminate all the projects having a benefit-cost ratio of less than 1.51, I naturally tried to learn everything I could about such projects and the others in the bill.

I was dismayed to learn that detailed information about a number of projects is simply unavailable. As an example, one of the projects which we are being asked to approve is the seven reservoir project for the Grand River and its tributaries in Iowa and Missouri. We are being asked to approve no less than $252 million for these projects. It is one of the most expensive in the bill. Detailed information, we are told in the report accompanying the bill, is contained in House Document No. 241, 89th Congress. I have tried to obtain this document. It is not yet printed, or at least it was not yesterday afternoon. How can the Senate pass proper judgment on such a tremendous project without the primary documents relating to it? As I have said, other House documents which we should have before us are not yet printed either.

The other point which should be made concerns the actual documents themselves. The essential information which we seek in them concerns the justification for the various projects. We want to know exactly what benefits and costs will result, and we want to see how those benefits and costs have been obtained. In almost every case, this essential information is sketchy and incomplete. In these documents, which run from 20 to 100 pages, the benefit-cost information is given on one, two, or three pages. Often, as one seeks greater detail about the benefit-cost ratio, he is referred to the appendixes of the document. Time after time I have been frustrated to find that the appendix concerning the benefit-cost ratio is not included in the document. Even though it is listed in the table of contents, it is not printed as part of the document. For example, in Senate Document No. 94 of the 88th Congress, relating to the Perdido Pass Channel project in Alabama, the appendix entitled "Computation of Benefits" is not included in the document. The document contains fancy photographs and all sorts of charts, but the basic information about the benefit-cost ratio is not deemed worthy of inclusion.

Another example is provided by House Document No. 159 of this Congress relating to the Evanston, Ill., beach erosion control study. In this document the appendix concerning costs and benefits is the only appendix not printed in the document.

I could go on with all the other examples. I will provide the complete list to anyone who wishes to see it. It is a shocking situation, Mr. President, that all the essential information I have referred to should be unavailable as we consider this tremendously important bill.

Mr. President, I could go on at length about the unjustifiable benefit-cost ratios which we are asked to accept in this bill. My calculations have convinced me that for a project to be acceptable under present procedures, its benefit-cost ratio must be close to 2. In other words, benefits must appear to be almost twice as much as costs. And I have not mentioned the inevitable increases in costs which take place between the start and finish of Government projects.

My amendment would remove from the present bill all projects having a claimed benefit-cost ratio of less than 1.51. My amendment would not prevent restudies of the projects affected. My amendment would compel all questionable projects to be reexamined or abandoned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of projects provided for in the present bill which have a benefit-cost ratio of less than 1.51. The list shows the pertinent data for each project.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Projects having low benefit-cost ratios (S. 2300 public works authorizations fiscal year 1966 information from S. Rept. 464)

Page of S. Rept. 464	Project	Benefit-cost ratio	Annual Federal charges	Total Federal cost
	Navigation improvements:			
16	Alpena Harbor, Mich	1.4	$27,900	$695,000
17	Bayou La Batre channel, Alabama	1.1	36,000	262,000
25	Newport News-Norfolk channel	1.1	530,600	7,095,000
32	Frankfort Harbor, Mich	1.5	14,200	237,000
34	Hanalei Bay Harbor, Hawaii	1.3	36,500	347,000
34	Waianae Harbor, Hawaii	1.1	85,000	933,000
34	Kailua Harbor, Hawaii	1.5	34,600	244,000
34	Lahaina Harbor, Hawaii	1.4	32,900	364,000
34	Hana Harbor, Hawaii	1.2	88,200	1,679,000
43	Columbia River lock and dam, Washington and Oregon (John Day)	1.35	108,323	1,356,000
45	Lexington Harbor, Mich	1.2	30,500	563,000
52	New York Harbor	1.5	1,848,800	44,852,000
55	Perdido Pass channel, Alabama	1.4	94,000	625,000
57	Ponce de Leon Inlet channels, Fla	1.3	169,000	1,104,000
67	Savannah Harbor, Ga	1.3	401,000	7,112,000
	Beach erosion control projects:			
73	Newport, R.I	1.3	13,200	340,000
76	Evanston, Ill	1.5	15,300	392,000
77	Fort Pierce, Fla	1.3	45,800	220,000
80	Perth Amboy, N.J	1.2	4,200	82,000
	Flood control, hurricane protection, and multiple-purpose works:			
89	Danbury, Conn	1.2	75,000	2,300,000
93	Rockaway Inlet, N.Y	1.4	1,474,700	32,620,000
97	Rahway River, N.J	1.4	57,400	1,514,000
100	New Bern, N.C	1.1	423,900	10,400,000
101	Ocracoke Island, N.C	1.3	257,300	1,636,000

Projects having low benefit-cost ratios (S. 2300 public works authorizations fiscal year 1966 information from S. Rept. 464)—Continued

Page of S. Rept. 464	Project	Benefit-cost ratio	Annual Federal charges	Total Federal cost
	Flood control, hurricane protection, and multiple-purpose works—Continued			
103	Flint River, Ga.:			
	Lazer Creek	1.2	$2,158,000	$40,378,000
	Lower Auchumpkee	1.3	2,397,000	48,275,000
109	Phillippi Creek Basin, Fla	1.3	195,500	4,592,000
118	Grand Isle and vicinity, Louisiana	1.3	182,400	5,500,000
129	White Oak Bayou, Tex	1.2	57,000	1,800,000
134	El Paso County, Tex.:			
	Central	1.1	231,300	[1] 7,310,000
	Southeast	1.2	58,200	[1] 1,839,000
138	John Redmond Reservoir, Kans	1.5	111,400	1,315,000
141	Walnut River, Kans.:			
	El Dorado Reservoir	1.2	[2] 2,321,900	23,300,000
	Towanda Reservoir	1.2		23,000,000
	Douglas Reservoir	1.2		18,200,000
143	Shidler Reservoir, Okla	1.2	258,000	6,150,000
148	Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers, Iowa and Missouri:			
	Reservoirs	1.2	203,600	5,280,000
	Channel improvements:			
	Mussel Fork	1.5	56,600	1,267,000
	Little Chariton	1.5	109,600	2,581,000
149	Grand River and tributaries, reservoirs, Missouri and Iowa:			
	Pattonsburg	1.3	9,195,000	[3] 252,020,000
	Trenton	1.3		
	Mercer	1.5		
	Linneus	1.0		
	Brookfield	1.3		
	St. Catherine	1.1		
	Braymer	1.1		
155	Sandy Lick Creek, Pa	[4] .9	66,100	1,654,000
160	Big South Fork, Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn	[5] 1.2	10,074,000	151,000,000
166	Big Sandy River and tributaries, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia:			
	Paintsville Reservoir	1.4	600,200	16,974,000
	Panther Creek Reservoir	1.1	417,200	11,094,000
172	Kaskaskia River levees, Illinois	1.4	344,000	8,940,000
173	Iowa and Cedar Rivers, Iowa and Minn.:			
	Marshalltown	1.5	87,000	2,670,000
	Waterloo	1.2	492,800	14,900,000
175	Zumbro River, Minn	1.3	37,100	975,000
177	Big Stone Lake and Whetstone River, Minn. and S. Dak	1.1	159,500	3,885,000
179	Maumee River Basin, Ohio	1.2	345,600	9,317,000
183	Grand River, Mich	1.2	49,600	1,373,000
184	Winslow, Ariz	1.4	104,000	2,775,000
189	Eel River, Calif	1.1	534,000	13,732,000
192	Sonoma Creek, Calif	1.1	374,000	9,400,000
193	Napa River Basin, Calif	1.5	473,500	14,950,000
195	Tahquitz Creek, Calif	1.3	96,000	3,030,000
196	San Diego River, Calif	1.2	462,000	14,600,000
197	Willow Creek, Oreg	1.2	233,100	[6] 4,345,000
	Amount cut by Proxmire amendment			845,393,000
	Bill total			1,968,485,500

[1] 1st costs.
[2] Total annual Federal charges.
[3] Total for 7 reservoirs.
[4] With area redevelopment benefits, 1.1.
[5] Original estimate by Chief of Engineers in his report.
[6] Net cost.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President——

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I should like to respond first to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I withdraw my request.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, together with his statement, has some merit. I admit this at the outset. Everything the Senator said should be considered was considered by the agencies, especially by the Army Corps of Engineers. It is true, as the Senator from Wisconsin has stated, that some of these projects get down practically to parity—in other words, a 1-to-1 ratio.

The Senator made quite a point of the unavailability of certain documents. I assure him that in the files of the Public Works Committee we have every one of these reports from the agencies, and they will be made available to his staff any time they want to see them. I suggest that he consult the committee clerk. We have all the documents to which the Senator referred in our files.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I appreciate the Senator's statement. My staff tried to obtain the documents. The point I made is that they were not printed and were not generally available.

Mr. McNAMARA. The material and letters are available in our files.

Mr. PROXMIRE. My staff had some difficulty obtaining certain of these documents. I appreciate what the Senator from Michigan is saying.

Mr. McNAMARA. The idea of a benefit-cost ratio is very simple. If the benefits exceed the costs, the project is acceptable. To arbitrarily set a benefit-cost ratio higher than parity would be unfair and inconsistent with sound public policy. If there is something bad about the benefit-cost ratio as it is now used, let us replace it with something better. But let us not say that some projects are favorable when the benefits are more than the costs, but others are not. I am against that kind of principle.

Therefore, I am opposed to the amendment, and I hope that it will be defeated.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I join my good friend from Michigan in opposing the pending amendment.

For the past 14 years, I have been chairman of the Subcommittee on Public works of the Committee on Appropriations. What we are considering now is merely an authorization. Before the money can be obtained, in order to proceed with the planning and construction of any of these projects, the Senate through the Appropriations Committee, will have ample opportunity to annually look into and study all the projects.

Oftentimes, some of the projects presented to the Public Works Committee had a low benefit-cost ratio, say something on the order of 1.4 or 1.1 to 1.0, but I assure the Senator from Wisconsin that there are very few projects that have been undertaken unless it could be shown that the benefits would exceed the costs.

For instance, of the many navigation projects that have been constructed, I can point to some in which the tonnage actually moved on the waterway was 13 times more than the estimates given when the project was first authorized. That situation applies to many projects.

Let me assure the Senator from Wisconsin that I shall in the future, as I have in the past, carefully review these projects before recommending any appropriations. As he knows, many projects, although authorized as long as 25 years ago, have not been provided with money, because the committee felt that the projects, although authorized, were not under present conditions economically justified, and so they were turned down.

Let me point out that Congress enacted Public Law 88–578, wherein authority was given to agencies of the Government to charge fees to visit recreational centers. The Public Works Committee in this bill has recommended projects in which certain amounts of money are required for recreation, let us say. Only a few months ago, Congress enacted a bill which established the policy that committees should take into consideration the benefits that would be derived from recreation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, at the end of my remarks, to have printed in the Record section 2 of Public Law 8972, which was signed by the President on July 9, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if it is necessary in order for a project to obtain the proper benefit-cost ratio to include recreational benefits, the local authorities must bind themselves to pay at least half of the separable cost of the recreational facilities. That is something new which has been added in the law passed this session. Before that time, recreation could be considered in a Corps of Engineers project and the Federal Government would put up the entire cost. Now, if it is necessary to have recreation, in order to make the benefit-cost ratio at least 1 to 1, under the law which was enacted a few weeks ago, it would be incumbent on the local people to put up at least half the cost for such items as acquiring the additional land, buildings, access roads, and other facilities required solely for recreation. The local people would be compelled to contribute at least half of that cost, which is an innovation compared to what it was in the past.

It is my belief that with the new law, and the authority given under Public Law 88–578 giving the agencies of Government the authority to charge fees for visiting recreation centers, it will go far toward paying a good deal of the cost of the recreational features of these projects.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will be defeated. As I said, this is merely an authorization of the projects. Congress will have another opportunity to look more closely into the details, if and when the projects come up before the Appropriations Committee to provide the money.

Although the projects are authorized, we must provide funds for engineering and design before construction can start, at which time the Engineers will have another opportunity to study the project in detail, to be certain that the benefit-cost ratio is good, and one which will return benefits in excess of its costs.

It is my belief that with these two laws which I have cited, which have been recently adopted, and the fact that recreation centers are very popular today throughout the Nation, and are much needed, we need not fear that the Government will not get a proper return on its investment.

EXHIBIT 1

PUBLIC LAW 89–72

SEC. 2. (a) If, before authorization of a project, non-Federal public bodies indicate their intent in writing to agree to administer project land and water areas for recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement or for both of these purposes pursuant to the plan for the development of the project approved by the head of the agency having administrative jurisdiction over it and to bear not less than one-half the separable costs of the project allocated to either or both of said purposes, as the case may be, and all the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement incurred therefor—

(1) the benefits of the project to said purpose or purposes shall be taken into account in determining the economic benefits of the project;

(2) costs shall be allocated to said purpose or purposes and to other purposes in a manner which will insure that all project purposes share equitably in the advantages of multiple-purpose construction: *Provided,* That the costs allocated to recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement shall not exceed the lesser of the benefits from those functions or the costs of providing recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement benefits of reasonably equivalent use and location by the least costly alternative means; and

(3) not more than one-half the separable costs and all the joint costs of the project allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement shall be borne by the United States and be nonreimbursable.

Projects authorized during the calendar year 1965 may include recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement on the foregoing basis without the required indication of intent. Execution of an agreement as aforesaid shall be a prerequisite to commencement of construction of any project to which this subsection is applicable.

(b) The non-Federal share of the separable costs of the project allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement shall be borne by non-Federal interests, under either or both of the following methods as may be determined appropriate by the head of the Federal agency having jurisdiction over the project: (1) payment, or provision of lands, interests therein, or facilities for the project; or (2) repayment, with interest at a rate comparable to that for other interest-bearing functions of Federal water resource projects, within fifty years of first use of project recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement facilities: *Provided,* That the source of repayment may be limited to entrance and user fees or charges collected at the project by non-Federal interests if the fee schedule and the portion of fees dedicated to repayment are established on a basis calculated to achieve repayment as aforesaid and are made subject to review and renegotiation at intervals of not more than five years.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a copy of a letter dated February 19, 1965, to the Secretary of the Army from the Director of the Budget, which indicates the basis for the law which was referred to by the Senator from Louisiana.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1965.

HON. STEPHEN AILES,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Enclosed herewith is a copy of our response to a request by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for views on H.R. 52, a bill "To provide uniform policies with respect to recreation and fish and wildlife benefits and costs of Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects, and to provide the Secretary of the Interior with authority for recreation development of projects under his control." That response, including the recommended substitute bill drafted in cooperation with members of your Department, sets forth the administration's position on uniform policies regarding recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement at water resources projects.

Following the introduction of H.R. 9032, Federal agencies involved in the planning, development and construction of Federal water resources projects have applied the policies and procedures established therein. Those agencies, as of this date, should implement the policies and procedures as contained in the substitute bill.

It is our understanding that a large number of project reports have been held by the Corps of Engineers pending development of the policies contained in the substitute bill. In view of the possibility of an omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control bill this year, we would expect that appropriate revisions will be made in the project reports as expeditiously as possible. If problems are encountered in such revisions, Bureau of the Budget staff will be available to discuss the matter with your staff.

The success of the administration's policies and procedures on this subject will require a high degree of cooperation and coordination among the Departments of the Interior and Army and the Bureau of the Budget, and a sincere effort by the water resources agencies to obtain cost sharing. In this connection, I believe you may wish to have brought to your attention as early as possible in the planning process any projects at which it is anticipated that non-Federal interests will not execute the required cost sharing agreement and where an allocation of project costs to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement is planned. Included in this category would be any project proposed for authorization pursuant to section 3 of the enclosed draft bill.

Sincerely,

ELMER B. STAATS,
Deputy Director.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand it—and I desire to clarify one point—the local contributions for flood control, navigation, and water supply have not been changed in any manner except——

Mr. McNAMARA. By the new law.

Mr. ELLENDER. By the new law.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The contributions to be made by the local people, let us say on flood control, have not been changed. The only thing affected by the new law would be the local cooperation with respect to recreation.

Mr. McNAMARA. That is my understanding.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President——

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I know that the Senator from Michigan has the floor, and I asked him to yield so that I could reply to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. McNAMARA. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin for that purpose.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I appreciate what the Senator from Louisiana has said. He and the Senator from Michigan are outstanding authorities in the Senate on these projects.

My reply is that although it is true the local people will have to pay for half the recreation benefits—which will be a help—the fact is that the benefits will still be intangible and it will be hard to assess the value of the remaining half.

Of course, the fees to be charged will help to some extent, but far more important is the fact that the discount figure for interest is unrealistic. After all, if a person could purchase a home on the basis of paying 2½-percent interest over a 100-year period, that would mean that he could buy a $20,000 home for less than $60 a month with no down payment. Who would not jump at that opportunity? But a banker would have to have an insane hatred of money to permit it.

The Federal Government is paying far more for its money than this 2½ percent. It must pay more than 4 percent, and close to 4¼ percent. And yet the rules of this game of self-deception and taxpayer deception pretends the taxpayer pays 2½ or 3 percent for the money; this constitutes a hidden subsidy.

The rules of this game under which the Public Works Committee operates assumes that borrowers will accrue for a fictitious length of time.

A hundred years for the life of these projects is ridiculous. If they are dams, they silt in. Most projects are obsolete, utterly useless in far less than a hundred years. In some cases even 50 years is too much. It is true, as the senior Senator from Louisiana has said, that there is an additional opportunity to appraise these projects when they come before the Appropriations Subcommittee so ably headed by the Senator from Louisiana. However, the rules there are the same. The subsidized discount rate will be the same. The dishonest, 100 year benefit life will be the same. When those rules are followed, these uneconomical projects will be approved.

I conclude by saying that this is not only the position taken by the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the position taken by Senator DOUGLAS during past years, but this is also the position taken by the overwhelming preponderance of competent economists in the field. Dr. Otto Eckstein, who is one of the top economic advisers to the President, wrote an excellent book on this subject. Dr. Robert Haveman, who is also highly regarded, has written on this subject. The expert consensus is that we are tragically wasting public money in this area.

I know the amendment may not be adopted. However, I have offered it, not out of any desire to embarrass or criticize the committee in connection with what it has done. It has been very expertly and competently handled by the Senator from Michigan. Rather, I do this in an attempt to dramatize the situation, in the hope that perhaps this year or next year, or at some time in the future, we can set up adequate, fair, and realistic standards with respect to interest and discount and benefit life, as well as with respect to evaluating the intangibles. And I intend to pursue this goal as long as I am in the Senate.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. I do so also with the knowledge that any one of us who serves on the Public Works Committee, and is concerned with the Corps of Engineers projects, has questioned, at times, the formulas which are used for the approval of these projects.

It is correct to say that in recent years weight has been given to recreation and wildlife enhancement and other features, which, while of great value, are not as important as flood control and navigation and water conservation.

Nevertheless, I must join in what the Senator from Louisiana, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, has said. I served on it in an ex officio capacity by reason of the fact that I am the ranking minority member of the Public Works Committee, as does the Senator from Michigan, chairman of our committee.

I believe that all of us know that no Member of the Senate is able to secure from the Senator from Louisiana and from the Appropriations Committee approval of a project that does not meet the strictest criteria which have been prescribed. We honor him for his care, for he is the strongest advocate of river development in the Senate.

This leads us back to the original question raised by the Senator; namely, criteria. The proposal the Senator from Wisconsin has made about criteria is an arbitrary proposal.

I do not know anything more important in this bill than flood protection. In the valleys in Kentucky many of our flood control projects have great trouble meeting even the 1:1 ratio. Costs are high, due to the narrow valleys, and the encroachment on the river channels, because of the necessary location of industries in the narrow valleys increase the cost of projects year after year. It becomes more and more difficult to meet the cost-benefit ratio every year, even on a 1:1 basis. Yet the rains come down and wash these cities and towns away year after year. The formula the Senator from Wisconsin proposes could mean that needed flood protection could never be provided, and that those communities would continue to be washed away year after year.

The Senator has provoked a good question about criteria, and it is continually reviewed.

But I wish to emphasize the necessity of securing flood protection, and I believe the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin would stand in the way. It should be defeated.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment of my distinguished friend from Wisconsin. He has stimulated our thought. As I look at the fine projects in my own State, I remind him that although these House documents are new, the projects have been coming to me year after year. One of the projects, the Buffalo Bayou, is near Houston. One is near Texas City, and another is at Port Arthur and Beaumont. That is where so much damage was done by Hurricane Carla.

These are growing areas, where the flood damage increases each year. The cost ratio presupposes present values. However, it must be remembered that the values are going up fast.

We have worked for many years trying to have these projects approved.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Michigan for the great care he has taken in connection with these projects. Some of my constituents have been disappointed, but no projects have been speedily approved. It has taken many years for the Army Engineers to get to this point. Delegations have come here year after year.

I refer particularly to Caddo Lake, where a dam is located. That particular project has been needed since before I came to the Senate, 8 years ago.

The lake itself is located in Louisiana. However, half of the lake backs up into my State.

I commend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for his long work on these projects, for giving his attention to each appropriation after it is authorized.

Caddo Lake was formed by a great earthquake in that valley, about 1811, the year that is called the Year of the Shakes in the Mississippi Valley. This earthquake is also thought to have been responsible for the formation of Reelfoot Lake. It was the gateway to Texas until the railroads were built, up the Mississippi and Red Rivers.

It is mainly due to the work of the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana that this project is going ahead.

Another project involves a population of 300,000. Without flood protection, when the rains come, some areas are washed out. The work of guarding against such a catastrophe must go on year after year. First there is an authorization, then the survey, and then the construction moneys.

I commend the committee for the great diligence it has shown. I know from personal knowledge that there is nothing new here, that there is nothing in this authorization for my State that has not been thoroughly considered and studied. We have seen these projects year after year. Two of the areas were badly damaged by Hurricane Carla, some 4 years ago. Other projects have long been in existence. Caddo Lake has been in existence for many years. A very fine and thoughtful piece of work was done by the Public Works Committee. I commend them for their care and diligence. This program involves taxpayer money, and they are going very deliberately on these projects.

Also, although he is not on the committee, but is on the Appropriations Committee, I desire to pay tribute to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for his great knowledge in this field, his care, and his support of these projects. I commend the senior

Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] also for their care in respect to these projects. We have had the benefit of their counsel and work as well as their leadership in the committee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator. The distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], who is a very able member of the committee, has asked me to yield to him. I shall yield to him first, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am grateful to the chairman of the committee for yielding to me. I, too, wish to pay tribute to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] for bringing to the Senate a bill providing for an investment in the resources of America and for the development of our water resources, our river resources, the saving of lives and the perpetuation of some of our cities and towns.

Because the Senator from Louisiana mentioned Public Law 872, I wish to make a comment about it.

I am a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. That bill came out of the committee. Sometimes I think that bill will come back to haunt us. I emphasize the fact that recreation, fish and wildlife benefits of Federal dams, including Department of the Interior dams and Corps of Engineers dams, have been greater than we have anticipated, and, as recreational developments are needed in the years ahead, they will again be greater than we anticipated.

We should be very careful, as the report admonishes, not to prevent necessary flood control projects from developing because there is a failure of the local people to provide self-participation. If at the inception of the project there is a failure of local participation, later, as recreational developments come about, we shall find that the States or private organizations will wish to participate. People want to use these projects for water-based recreation, including swimming, boating, and so forth. So we should be careful to see that we do not prevent necessary flood control development merely because we cannot find initially the local participation that is required by Public Law 872. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, first I would join other Senators in congratulating the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] for his splendid accomplishments with the members of his committee in recognition of the vital importance of the control of water in our country today.

Many years ago, as chairman of the National Security Resources Board, now called OEP, a report was made by a committee chaired by William Paley, of New York. The basis of the report was what we would be shortest of in 25 years. That would be 10 years from now.

To my surprise, this report stated that, in all probability, the commodity of which we would be shortest would be fresh water.

I have had the privilege recently of reading many brochures and pamphlets that have to do with the achievements of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] in the field of development of desalinization of salt water into fresh water. Those pamphlets will stand as a monument to his wisdom and foresight as expresed in that field.

Today the U.S. Government is spending a great many millions of dollars in order to get methods to obtain clean, fresh water from salt water.

We, in the Middle West, especially in Missouri, have a great deal of fresh water, but we have not taken advantage of controlling it as have so many other States. In 1951, for example, when in the executive branch, I had the dubious privilege of directing the rehabilitation resulting from those terrible floods that came to the Kansas City area. It was interesting to note that, whereas the total cost of flood control would have been about $220 million, people in the Kansas City area lost over $1 billion from that one flood.

I mention this to present with great respect to my able colleague, the Senator from Wisconsin, who has some criticism of proposed developments in northwest Missouri, and am glad to see my own colleague on the floor, because only in the last few days floods in this very part of Missouri—the Grand Platte, and the Fishing Rivers floods—have already caused over $50 million estimated damage, in addition to the loss of many lives as a result of the sudden flash floods, this proposed bill would correct.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. First, I should like to join my colleague in extending my compliments to the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] for the great work that he has done on this particular piece of proposed legislation.

My colleague, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], has mentioned the flooding conditions in Missouri. Last Friday and Saturday I drove, flew, and walked over that area of my State. Anyone who sees the suffering of the people in that area and sees the damage that has been done will realize that the proposal is not particularly a dollars-and-cents proposal. They will see that homes by the dozens in little towns have been completely floated off their foundations and crushed against large trees. A merchant to whom I was talking had a store in which $150,000 of furniture was damaged. The back end and the front end of the store had been washed out. He told me that he sold what he had left for $300. He did not owe a dime to start with. He said he did not have enough money to buy his wife a dinner that night.

Well-dressed men are seen digging in the debris and trying to recover some of their belongings. Furniture and boxes of clothes are piled in the streets and on the sidewalks.

On my desk now there is a memo from the State ASC committee telling us that 3 to 4 million dollars' worth of farm damage has been done in the area of Fishing River.

The President has allocated $500,000 to help repair the villages in that one little area of that particular river, Fishing River.

Over at Excelsior Springs, in the same area, great damage has been done to streets, sewers, waterlines, and homes. Many have been completely damaged. So actually the proposal would be a good investment from a dollars-and-cents standpoint, and curbing floods would save our people the great misery and suffering which they have endured.

My colleague has mentioned flooding on the Grand and Platte Rivers. I think that is particularly what our friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, has referred to. A number of years ago, when I was Acting Governor of Missouri, while our Governor was out of the State, we had a similar type of flood. I flew and drove through the area affected. I saw the millions upon millions of dollars of damage that was done.

The project is one that has been worked on for a long time. It relates not only to the shortage of water and the conservation of water, which is so essential in that part of Missouri and that entire area, but to the industrialist, and from an agricultural standpoint, an investment in dams to control the flooding and to conserve the water certainly seems to me to be a good business investment for our Government and our people to make in considering the welfare of the people in that part of our State.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I would join my colleague in the remarks he just made, remarks made after he personally just visited out there, and seeing this tragedy first hand, the loss in lives, the loss of millions upon millions of dollars worth of property.

Again I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan for his consideration in this bill. I know my colleague from Missouri would join me also in expressing our deep gratitude to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] for his understanding as to the importance of developing the water resources of the State of Missouri.

MISSOURI FLOOD DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. SYMINGTON subsequently said: Mr. President, the announcement this morning that the President had designated 20 counties in northwest and west central Missouri as emergency disaster area and had allocated an initial grant of $500,000 to help repair and replace publicly owned facilities damaged or destroyed in last week's flood was good news.

But this emergency assistance, helpful as it is, can never replace the lives lost, nor can it compensate for the many millions of dollars in private property loss.

In an editorial last week, the Kansas City Star stated that the peculiar poignancy of the latest area floods is that they struck hardest in two basins, the Platte and Fishing, just north of Kansas City, where flood control plans are now awaiting final executive approval and congressional authorization.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Kansas City Star be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Floods Dramatize Need for Pending Dams

The peculiar poignancy of the latest area floods is that they struck hardest on two streams where flood control plans now are being pushed avidly after years of inaction. The two Clay County communities of Smithville, on the Little Platte River, and Mosby, on the Fishing River, took the worst beating in this week's floods.

Several years ago the Army Engineers made preliminary flood need studies on the Platte, but funds ran out. Recently local backers revived the project and, with the help of their Congressman, Representative WILLIAM R. HULL, JR., obtained additional survey funds. The result was a $27 million program consisting of a $21 million reservoir just north of Smithville and channel improvements on both the Platte and Little Platte. Pushed vigorously by local interests, HULL and Missouri's two Senators, the plan has moved swiftly ahead through channels until now it is virtually ready to be inserted in a river projects authorization bill before Congress.

The Fishing River, a small but very "flashy" (i.e., fast rising) stream, long has harassed Excelsior Springs. At one time, several years ago, the engineers could not justify any project there on a benefit-to-cost ratio. But subsequent floods, indicating a higher probable frequency, and recognition of the dollar value of other benefits from impounded streams, have changed the picture. A plan for two small reservoirs just upstream from Excelsior is in the works, has been approved by Missouri and should clear the Army Engineers in time to make this year's biennial authorization bill.

But the tragic, obvious fact is that dams and levees not yet built cannot stem today's floods, however rapidly they now are being pushed toward construction. The Platte and Fishing River flood projects are at best, 3 or 4 years away. Planning and construction take time, however eager the supporters of the work may be to see them finished.

Not everywhere has help come too late. As the current pattern of soaking rains continues almost every night in July, area residents are reminded of 1951 and the catastrophic flood that finally moved down the Kaw and other rivers that year.

This summer such Kansas dams as Tuttle Creek, Pomona, and John Redmond—completed since 1951—have broken the back of developing major floods. But in northwest Missouri, moving fast but late into the flood protection field, the works on the drawing board are not in time to handle this summer's floods. It is a bitter dose for the families, farmers and businessmen who once more have had to flee in boats, leaving behind heavy losses. Their spirit, however, may have been best expressed by a Smithville merchant who was asked this week if the frequent sandbagging of his store front and cleaning up the muck and mess afterward didn't grow wearisome. "We can take it if we know help is on the way," he said.

With the flood plans now before Congress, help is on the way. Somewhat late, perhaps, but some year soon this scourge of flood will be laid to rest on the Platte and Fishing Rivers.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, plans for the Platte and Fishing Rivers have not yet reached the Congress, but we hope that they will be coming from the Army in time so that they can be included in this year's omnibus authorization bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, since I made a few remarks, I had the clerk of the Subcommittee on Appropriations dealing with public works obtain some data for me. I would like to call to the attention of my good friend the Senator from Wisconsin the fact that there have been 4,189 projects authorized prior to this bill.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin to these figures. In the past, 4,189 projects have been authorized. Of that number, 3,005 have been completed; 552 of the 4,189 were deferred or are carried as inactive because the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committees on Appropriations, after examining into many of the projects, asked the corps to review their backlog of authorized projects and reclassify those projects where the benefit-cost ratio was not up to standard. Projects that did not meet those standards were then deferred. That has been going on for as long as public works have been constructed.

Of all the projects named in the bill, as many as 10 percent may not be built because, when the final studies are made and the engineering features refined, it may be found that the benefit-cost ratio is no longer favorable.

As I have said, of 4,189 projects authorized, only 3,637 have been completed or are now in the process of being constructed; 552 projects having an estimated cost of $2.5 billion have been inactivated because the benefit-cost ratio was not what it should have been or the requirements of local cooperation have not been met.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I do not question that the distinguished Senator from Lousiana is a discriminating, fair, competent chairman of his subcommittee, just as the Senator from Michigan is of his committee. I am sure they apply the rules fairly and refuse to approve projects which do not have a favorable benefit-cost ratio.

I am speaking about the rule that determines what is a fair benefit-cost ratio. I still maintain that my position has not been challenged, namely, that the rule is not realistic; it does not tell the taxpayer or Congress what the benefits really are and what the costs really are.

The Senator from Louisiana has been extremely fair and competent within the rules; but I question the rules.

I am sympathetic toward the views of the distinguished Senators from Missouri concerning the conditions that confront their State. Wisconsin, too, earlier this year suffered terrible flood and tornado damage and loss of life. I deplore the loss of human life. How can one evaluate the loss of life? He cannot. The value of a life that is lost is infinite.

I heartily approve of flood control projects; but if we are to operate in an economic, sensible way, we ought to apply sensible, economic criteria, and stick to them, so that we will know what we are going to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order for the quorum call is rescinded.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order for the quorum call has already been rescinded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon, the Army Corps of Engineers telephoned my office with respect to the Tahquitz project, included by the courtesy of the Committee on Public Works. I am the author of the Tahquitz legislation, which passed Congress several years ago. It is located in an arid part of the county of Riverside in my State. There will be a local contribution geared to the percentage of real property in the area over which the Tahquitz project would operate.

The Corps of Engineers finds that the property is not so large as it once was; therefore, it will be required to contribute the charge to the local area when the Tahquitz project is under consideration.

It is the Corps of Engineers that recommends this language, not the Senator from California. The language I propose to offer as an amendment reads:

At the appropriate place in the bill—

Which is on page 30—

at the conclusion of line 11, insert the following language: "*Provided*, That the amount of local contribution required due to enhancement of land shall be reduced by the amount of contribution determined on lands under Indian ownership at the time of project authorization and not subject to taxation due to Federal statutory restrictions. The amount of contribution on this basis is presently estimated at $508,000."

I repeat to Senators, and particularly to the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. MCNAMARA], that this project is recommended by the Corps of Army Engineers. On that basis, I ask the chairman to consider accepting the amendment.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the request comes very late.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is true.

Mr. McNAMARA. This amendment was not presented at the hearings before the committee.

I do not for a moment question the statement that the Corps of Engineers has approved it. But we have had clearance from the Bureau of the Budget on every project in the bill before us, and to accept the proposal of the Senator from California would be out of character considering the criteria that we have been using today.

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not believe it would be. I merely ask that the chairman consider taking the amendment. I apologize for bringing this up at this late moment.

Mr. McNAMARA. The House has not acted on a bill. The House has started hearings on these projects. I would think that the amendment could be offered during House consideration of this measure and by the time the bill is put before the House, it could be amended.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I do not know how a representative of any area in the country would legislate if the the circumstances and the exigencies surrounding the situation were to result in a last moment recommendation by the agency charged with the responsibility of making this construction.

I am doing what the Senator would do if he were in my situation.

Mr. McNAMARA. The responsible downtown agency in the Corps of Engineers would make the recommendation. I would try to have the amendment agreed to in the House, if I were in the position of the Senator.

It would be a month before the measure would get through the House. It is almost certain of passage in the House.

I should think that the Army Engineers would have taken the matter up with our committee with the House.

The provision can easily and properly be included in the bill there.

We have had no opportunity to study this amendment or to hear any testimony on it. We would like to have an opportunity to hear testimony concerning the proposal in the committee before arguing to it. I believe the Senator understands how we feel.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, during the calling of the quorum I had a further discussion with the Senator from Michigan.

I came to the Chamber a few moments ago, after my staff had received this recommendation from the Army Corps of Engineers, based on its own up-to-the-moment survey of the data surrounding the Tahquitz project.

The distinguished and able Senator from Michigan has made the point that since no hearings were held by a Senate committee, he would hope that the amendment might be considered before the House committee.

I believe that, in bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate, I have tried to discharge my responsibility as a Senator to my State and, in particular, to this area of my State. This project was authorized because of legislation which I introduced several years ago.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I am most sympathetic toward the position of the Senator. I know of his great interest in the project. I know of his activities in past years in connection with this matter. However, we are advised that the House is to start hearings on the bill immediately.

There will be every opportunity for the Senator to have his amendment considered and included in the bill.

There will be no problem. I ask the Senator to give us an opportunity to permit the departments and agencies to make recommendations.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I appreciate the comment of the Senator.

I read my amendment. I did not offer it. Rather than raise a needless controversy, particularly in view of the comments which the able Senator from Michigan has made, I do not intend to offer the amendment.

I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield so that we may have a third reading of the bill before discussing another matter?

NAVIGATION ON THE MISSOURI BETWEEN YANKTON AND SIOUX CITY AND OTHER SOUTH DAKOTA PROJECTS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I had intended to offer an amendment to the Omnibus Public Works Act of 1965. The amendment would, in addition to the projects already included in the bill by the committee, authorize the construction of a Corps of Engineers navigation and bank stabilization program on the Missouri River from Sioux City, Iowa, to Yankton, S. Dak. After discussing the amendment with the distinguished chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, Senator McNAMARA, I will not offer the amendment now. He tells me that the committee cannot accept the proposal until the Corps of Engineers Board of Review and other Government agencies complete their review.

By way of explanation, let me say that under the original Missouri Basin plan, the corps had envisioned navigation on the Missouri from the point where it enters the Mississippi near St. Louis as far north as Yankton, S. Dak. Just north of Yankton the first of the Missouri great mainstem dams, the Gavins Point Dam, is located. Beyond this dam lies the Gavins Point Reservoir and beyond it, lies the other great reservoirs in South Dakota and North Dakota.

To date, authorized navigation and bank stabilization projects reach as far north as Sioux City, Iowa. The Missouri is largely operative for navigation as far north as Omaha and the river reach between Omaha and Sioux City is presently under construction and is partially operative.

The corps has completed its studies and investigations on this project and has found it to be feasible. The project has been reported favorably to the Chief of Engineers here in Washington, bearing a benefit-cost ratio of 1.06 to 1, with an estimated potential cost of $57,782,000 of which $333,000 is non-Federal.

The river distance between Sioux City and Yankton is 77 miles and the project is twofold, involving the stabilization of the riverbank and the construction of a 300-foot channel, 9 feet deep. It essentially would be based on proven works of the type constructed below Sioux City. Presently, a bank stabilization project ends at Kenslers Bend above Sioux City and for 64 miles the river width varies from 1,200 to 5,000 feet, averaging 2,600 feet. Each year many acres of rich South Dakota farmland is contributed to the river through bank erosion. This project would stabilize the bank by dikes and revetments and would contract the river to 600 feet. The corps has found the production capability of agricultural lands in the meander belt to be substantially in excess of current production levels. The project would not only release many valuable acres for agriculture, but it would remove flood and meander threats, thus stabilizing existing land values and allow realistic bank and insurance company financing all along this stretch of the river.

The corps conservatively estimates that if the project proceeds on schedule, by 1975 over 68,000 tons of farm commodities would probably move in and out of the port of Yankton and a further projection for 50 years indicates a probable movement of 1.5 million tons annually. Adequate plans for the mitigation of fish and wildlife losses have been included by the corps and it is my understanding from corps officials that minor revisions can be adequately dealt with in cooperation with appropriate State and Federal agencies.

Mr. President, over the years the Upper Great Plains has contributed its land for reservoir uses and flood control protection. The commercial development of the river has now been authorized and constructed as far north as Sioux City, Iowa. South Dakota needs and deserves fair and equal treatment—it needs every stimulus to expand its economic resources. At the present time we depend on a one-industry economy for survival—agriculture. In large terms we neither process our agricultural products nor do we distribute them. This project can encourage industrial growth in South Dakota. By making inexpensive water transportation available, we can not only export raw agricultural products but encourage processors of these products to locate in South Dakota and have direct transportation outlets available all along the Missouri-Mississippi complex as far south as New Orleans.

Mr. President, South Dakota wants and needs this project authorized now. Already the ports to the south are planning and locating their industrial complexes near and around the river ports. Sioux City and Omaha Chambers of Commerce are laboring night and day to attract grain processors to their communities. Yankton and the adjacent areas in South Dakota and Nebraska should have this same opportunity. We know that the corps wants to complete its plan for navigation and stabilization to its northernmost point. To wait another 2, 3, or 4 years for another omnibus bill could prove to disadvantage South Dakota interests seriously. Industry needs to know what the Government intends to do in the field of public works to implement its long-term expansion programs and South Dakota needs this project authorized by the Congress in order to fulfill the hopes and dreams of its people. During the period 1950–60, when average personal income increased on a national scale by 120 percent, South Dakota's average was only 60 percent. We desperately need public works projects such as the one which forms the subject of this amendment if we are to move forward with the rest of the Nation.

Mr. President, I wish the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] could accept my amendment, but I realize that the committee is awaiting proper reports from the Federal agencies. I am pleased that the Senator from Michigan has assured me that he will work with me in securing prompt handling of the legislation when the reports, which have not arrived as early as I had anticipated, are available.

Mr. President, in addition to my remarks regarding the Missouri River navigation project, allow me to express my deep gratitude for two programs included in the bill which affect South Dakota.

The Big Sioux River flood control project, which is a part of the bill as reported, is urgently needed in my State. The amendment which the Senate accepted to this project, I am sure, can be worked out to the satisfaction of the corps and the sovereign States of Iowa and South Dakota.

Let me also applaud the Big Stone Lake-Whetstone River project in South Dakota and Minnesota. Big Stone Lake is a major recreation spot in South Dakota and is in dire need of assistance to maintain the lake level and improve the wildlife habitat for fish and wildfowl. I am confident that authorization of the project will receive the enthusiastic approval of conservation interests throughout the area.

Mr. President, I shall not call up my amendment in view of the discussion I have had with the chairman, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara]. However, I should like to have assurance that the Senator will do what he can and work with me when the reports are in so that we can move the project along.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion on the amendment concerning which the Senator has spoken. We are sympathetic toward the position of the Senator. We believe that his project is a good project. However, the project has not had the approval of the agencies and the Bureau of the Budget, as have the other projects contained in the bill.

The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota presents a situation similar to that which we have just discussed with the distinguished Senator from California.

I would hope on the basis of our colloquy we have established that, after appropriate consideration, this project will be brought before the Senate.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in view of the assurances that the Senator from Michigan has given me, I shall not call up my amendment. However, I shall call on the Senator for help to expedite the project when the reports are completed.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to cooperate with the Senator. I appreciate his cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, before final action is taken on the bill, I express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the committee and to the members of the committee for the work which they have done on this bill and on previous bills.

I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] who has been so helpful in dealing with projects in our State and in the Nation.

We have just experienced a very disastrous flood in certain streams in Kansas. The heavy flooding which has occurred in some parts of Kansas in June and to a lesser degree in July as rains continued here and there, can be likened to a depositor's statement we periodically receive from our banks. In other words, nature has furnished us an accounting of where we stand in Kansas in the matter of flood control and protection. Perhaps next year, possibly within the summer at hand, an extreme drought condition will furnish us a checkup on what headway we are making in the direction of water reserve to meet such conditions.

Last June was the wettest since the disastrous floods of 1951. Quite naturally many of our citizens commented on the similarity of conditions between this year and 1951. There was a similarity in the timing of the rainfall although not the intensity and volume of flood impact. But there was a great dissimilarity that has nothing to do with the weather, and that is in the reservoirs and other structures which have been built by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of Agriculture watershed program.

At the time of the 1951 flood, only Kanopolis and Fall River and a few other structures were in place. As of this time, 14 multiple-purpose reservoirs with substantial flood control allocations are in place and these are supplemented by local protection at certain critical areas and by watershed projects. It would seem apparent that the structures built since 1951 would make the likelihood of another 1951 flood much less likely, and that is true. While the dams have proved their worth within the limits of their respective areas of influence, there is, however, on the red side of the ledger a total of some millions of dollars of damage in areas where reservoir and other works needs to be accomplished.

Heaviest damage within the State, as most of us know, was recorded along the Arkansas River in the jurisdiction of the Albuquerque district of the corps extending eastward to Great Bend. Although the John Martin Reservoir on the Arkansas 60 miles into Colorado effectively reduced flood crests for some distance downriver, there was nothing in place in the way of reservoirs in the Arkansas Valley in Kansas to team up with John Martin, and with local protection and flood fighting at various communities along the way. Local protection works at Hutchinson and Wichita, in the Tulsa district of the corps, however, stood the test of floodwaters. A House subcommittee group recently completed a study of the flooded area along the Arkansas, and particularly at Augusta and along Walnut Creek, and has urged more funds for a corps study. The Tulsa district engineer has reported that damage east of Great Bend would have been held to considerably less had projects now proposed been in place.

There was flooding elsewhere in Kansas, but the big news may have been the floods that did not happen. At the finished reservoirs, Tuttle Creek, Pomona, Kanopolis, Fall River, John Redmond, Council Grove, and some Bureau reservoirs, lake levels jumped up as the high waters poured into the manmade traps. Tuttle Creek, for example, once again proved its effectiveness in keeping Big Blue floodwaters out of the Kaw. John Redmond, which was the scene of a dedication program at the time the floodwater impoundment was at its peak, is credited with preventing more than a million dollars in possible damages at Burlington and elsewhere downstream.

Although the dams, and the local protection works at Manhattan, Topeka, and Salina, proved their worth, there was, however, the matter of an estimated $6.5 million of flood damage mainly in areas where reservoir work needs to be accomplished. While Kansas is being benefited by the reservoirs now in place, and others about to come into the picture such as Milford and Wilson in the corps complex, and the Bureau's Glen Elder, it is apparent there is urgent work yet to be done.

Some of the worst floods this year have resulted from spotty downpours, local in extent and outside the range of the reservoirs. These areas pointed up particularly the need for local protection, either supplemental to reservoir control or working on its own.

At Ottawa on the Marais des Cygnes we had dramatic evidence of what flood protection really means. This was an example of the coordinated efforts of local works and a reservoir, in this case, Pomona. Without this protection, Ottawa, which suffered so severely in 1951 and other floods, would be in the cleanup stages from at least two overflows.

In fiscal year 1965, the Federal Government is spending about $63 million on water resources development in Kansas, some $55 million more than a decade ago in 1955. The total Federal investment in Kansas water now totals more than $470 million. Fiscal year 1966, as based on the President's budget and congressional action to date, is expected to reflect similar continued acceleration of water resources development in the State. The bulk of the funds expected for fiscal year 1966 will go into actual construction, although a substantial amount will be for initiation or continuation of studies. Some of this money will be spent in areas which have shown up as trouble spots in the recent flooding. As population and development continues, more works now in the proposed or visionary stages, will be added to take care of the added demands of flood control, water supply, and recreation. Some say that by 1975 Kansas and its visitors can use upward of 23 completed Federal reservoirs for recreation.

While flood control is a primary consideration in the advent and strengthening of the Federal reservoir system in the various basins in Kansas, the size of these reservoirs and the conservation lakes they provide adds a new element to recreation in the State. Kanopolis, the first of the Federal reservoirs completed by the corps in 1948, included a lake of 3,500 acres, nearly 10 times as big as the previous largest nearby body of water. Today, the 14 completed reservoirs offer over 80,000 acres of lake area which are being used by several million visitors annually. The Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation provide certain facilities and cooperate with the Kansas Forestry, Fish, and Game Commission and the Kansas Park and Resources Authority in maintenance and development. The authority has undertaken intensive development as State park areas at some of the reservoirs.

In addition it is estimated there are about 70,000 farm ponds on private farm lands in Kansas. These provide about 90,000 acres of water surface which in many instances are used for recreation. Also, lakes in place or planned in organized watershed districts will add upward of 10,000 more acres of water. One of the outstanding watershed developments is the White Clay, Brewery Creek Watershed District which rings Atchison with 25 small lakes. The watershed improvement was developed as a product of joint study and cooperation with the corps which has the responsibility for local flood protection works at Atchison.

Those who have visited the big reservoirs in Kansas or perhaps live nearby or have business interests in the area must agree that the recreation and tourist trade in the State has become a tremendous industry. At the same time, some of the reservoirs will provide for future water supply as it may be needed by the State for municipal and industrial uses. While we are fortunate in having these reservoirs for impoundment of flood waters at this time, we are doubly blessed in being able to capture some of the water for the dry periods which inevitably come around in nature's cycle of events.

We have a splendid water resources program well underway in Kansas. We realize too that the future growth and development of this area of the country is going to be determined by the amount of water we can control, and subsequently put to beneficial use. I am privileged to be part of the team which has put a sound and progressive water development program on the road. The State itself has been fortunate in having had good leadership able to see the long-range picture. The Kansas Governors, the legislature, the water resources board and the congressional delegations, have, in cooperation with local governments and representatives of such groups as Mo-Ark and local chambers of commerce, directed efforts toward molding of a comprehensive plan for the State. This procedure has provided excellent working relationship with the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of Agriculture, and all State and Federal agencies concerned.

While we are passing out credits for those instrumental in advancing our water resources program, we must not overlook a prime contributor to this effort, and that is the farm owner, or perhaps the small home owner, who relocates in order to make room for reservoirs and other improvements. While he is paid for this dislocation, and in many cases finds himself better off as to finances and living conditions if he is able to locate in the general area of a reservoir, he is, in my book, an unsung hero in this age of advancement.

Mr. President, there is ample proof that we can save many millions of dollars as a result of the reservoirs that have been constructed. I am very hopeful that further projects of this kind can be constructed and carried out in order that we may further protect the damaged communities and our rural areas.

I appreciate very much the progress that we have made and look forward to further progress.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I call attention to a recommendation made by the committee with respect to the cost sharing guidelines presented in S. 1229 with reference to multiple-purpose projects.

This question was alluded to a few minutes ago during the debate on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin. The Senator from Louisiana commented on the guidelines, as did the Senator from Michigan. I would like to comment on this subject for the purposes of interpretation, particularly with respect to future action of the agencies of the Federal Government when questions of authorizations and appropriations of Corps of Engineers projects may arise.

I see in the Chamber the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], who expressed great interest in this matter in the committee and helped write the committee recommendations. I would like to read into the RECORD from page 14 of the report; its recommendations:

> Application of cost-sharing guidelines to non-Federal public bodies in connection with flood control projects: The committee notes its strong desire that the guidelines proposed for Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects in S. 1229 be applied by departments and agencies of the executive branch with flexibility in regard to flood protection programs developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. In particular, the committee calls attention to the burden that would be imposed on many non-Federal public bodies by requiring them to share the separable costs attributable to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement. The inability of such non-Federal public bodies to share in these costs would result in the denial of needed flood control facilities required to protect lives and property and communities.
>
> In this regard, the committee also notes the intent of the Senate, as developed in the debate at the time of adoption of the conference report on S. 1229 on June 25, 1965, that flood projection projects under the Corps of Engineers, and involving recommendations about agreements with non-Federal public bodies, be submitted by the executive agencies and the Bureau of the Budget to this committee for decisions on authorization and for recommendation to the Senate. This intent most certainly represents the feelings of the members of this committee.
>
> Further, the committee recognizes the benefits which come from recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, and it encourages such development. It does feel, however, that it would be wrong to deny flood protection facilities to communities and river basins because of guidelines established and administered by the executive agencies of the Federal Government. The consideration and authorization of these facilities is the responsibility of the Congress, and the committee does not want these guidelines used to make impossible the congressional consideration of projects and the appropriation of funds for such projects. Inability of non-Federal public bodies to share in the allocation of costs made in plans developed by executive agencies should not result in the denial of flood protection afforded by projects which affect the areas involved.

Mr. President, for the purpose of providing the background for this recommendation, I call attention to the fact that S. 1229, a bill requested by the President and reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has been approved by the Congress. This bill would apply to multiple-purpose projects, those developed by the Corps of Engineers as well as the Bureau of Reclamation. The bill called for one-half of the separable costs attributable to recreation benefits and fish and wildlife enhancement to be borne by what are called non-Federal public bodies.

In a colloquy between the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and myself, on June 25, 1965, we attempted to outline his interpretation of the guidelines.

It was his interpretation that "non-Federal public bodies" did not mean solely the community or communities nearest the project which might enjoy recreational benefits and fish and wildlife enhancement benefits. The Senator stated that the term "non-Federal public bodies" could include the State itself, and such other public bodies as might be organized by the State as well as near local communities. He said, further, that there would be a period—as I remember, about 10 years—after the authorization of a project during which the details of an arrangement for payment of one-half of the separable costs could be worked out by the Federal Government and the appropriate non-Federal public body, which might be the State itself.

It was his further understanding, that in the event that one-half of the separable cost was imposed upon a non-Federal public body, the cost could be amortized over a period of 50 years, as could the project itself, and if the non-Federal public body desired, it could recover its portion of the separable costs—one-half—by the imposition of fees.

In the colloquy I called attention to the fact that the strict imposition of these guidelines might deny the provision and construction of necessary flood control projects. The Senator from Washington said that he did not believe that it was intended to be so inflexibly applied that it would deny the construction of needed flood protection facilities.

In our Public Works Committee, in discussing this problem, it was the agreement of the committee that the Federal agencies would be expected to apply the guidelines with reasonable flexibility so as not to deny communities the opportunity to go ahead with construction of necessary flood protection. We agreed that flood protection is imperative.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf] made a very strong statement on the subject, and the recommendation arrived at between the Senator from Montana and myself was approved by the committee.

I bring this matter to the attention of the Senate. I wanted it to appear in the Record so that the interpretation and intention of the Senate Committee on Public Works would be understood by the executive department, by the Corps of Engineers, by the Bureau of the Budget, and by other agencies which must give their approval to the authorization and appropriations of Corps of Engineers projects.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. There are a number of members of the Interior Committee and members of the Interior Committee staff who would not agree with the language of the report. S. 1229 was clearly a bill dealing with recreation and fish and wildlife. It did not deal with flood control. Therefore, I do not quite understand how it could deal with flood control projects.

Mr. COOPER. Let us assume the chief purpose of a project is flood protection. Let us consider a dam necessary to be constructed above a city or small community to give flood protection to the city and downstream communities. The Corps of Engineers might find, considering only flood protection, that the cost-benefit ratio was 1 to 0.9; and therefore it could not recommend the facility for authorization.

But by giving some benefit for recreation and the fish and wildlife enhancement, it might reach 1 to 1.2, and it could be approved for flood protection. The point I make is that if the guideline of S. 1229 is inflexibly applied, in demand for payment of one-half of costs, they could not include the needed recreational benefits and fish and wildlife enhancement necessary to secure a favorable cost-benefit ratio. Thus the construction of needed flood protection could be denied.

Mr. ANDERSON. That was considered. The members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs felt that if a project could not stand on its own feet, we should not pad it with fish and wildlife in order to make it look good.

Mr. COOPER. I understand that.

Mr. ANDERSON. That was the whole purpose of it.

Mr. COOPER. That has been the position of the agency, but we will let the interpretation, as we see it, speak for itself. The Public Works Committee does not want to see consideration or construction of greatly needed flood protection facilities under the Corps of Engineers slowed or stopped or denied, and that is our purpose.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to praise the diligence of the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works [Mr. McNamara] in shaping and molding the omnibus rivers and harbors bill of 1965.

The authorization for rivers and harbors and flood control projects, which I am confident the Senate will approve, represents an investment—an investment, Mr. President, in human life and property.

Every project authorized in this bill will bring returns which will significantly exceed the funds that will be invested by the Federal Government and by the several States.

As for Indiana, Mr. President, this is the greatest authorization in history. Some years ago, some short-sighted leaders in my State tried to convince the people that they should not accept Federal assistance for these projects. Needless to say, the State was not able to shoulder alone the terrible financial burden of constructing flood control facilities and reservoirs. As a result, Hoosiers fell behind the Nation in its efforts at conservation and failed to protect itself against the ravages of floods.

Today, Mr. President, I am pleased to say that this has all changed. We in Indiana today understand the need for conservation, for flood control projects, for reservoirs, for the recreational benefits that accrue to us from these projects.

Through coordinated and cooperative efforts on the part of our State government, private conservation groups in Indiana, and our delegation in Congress, Indiana today can say that of all 50 States, we rank sixth in the dollars authorized for flood control and rivers and harbors in this 1965 bill.

We can say today that of the more than $98 million in Federal funds authorized for Indiana in this bill, we have four major dam and reservoir projects and a major deepwater port project.

As you know, Mr. President, these things just do not happen by themselves. They result from hard and diligent study and unceasing work on the part of the Senate Public Works Committee and the many people in this Nation who care enough about our natural resources to attempt to preserve them today for the generations of tomorrow.

Again, Mr. President, I would like to thank my distinguished chairman, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] for his untiring efforts in this field. I am proud to be a member of his committee and to have been able to contribute in my own limited way to this great and comprehensive contribution to the future of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. It there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2300) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2300

An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

Sec. 101. That the following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated: *Provided,* That the provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full:

Navigation

Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 247, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,500,000;

Providence River and Harbor, Rhode Island: Senate Document Numbered 93, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,900,000;

New York and New Jersey Channels-Entrance to Kill Van Kull from Upper New York Bay: House Document Numbered 108, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,581,000;

New York Harbor, New York (Anchorage Areas): Senate Document Numbered 17, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,852,000;

Tred Avon River, Talbot County, Maryland: House Document Numbered 225, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $323,000;

Channel to Newport News and Norfolk Harbor, Hampton Roads, Virginia: House Document Numbered 143, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,095,000;

Channel to Newport News, Norfolk Harbor; and Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia: House Document Numbered 187, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,600,000;

Hampton Creek, Virginia: House Document Numbered 201, Eighty-ninth Congress, modification of items of local cooperation;

Cape Fear River, North Carolina: House Document Numbered —, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,510,000;

Savannah Harbor, Georgia: House Document Numbered 226, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,112,000;

Jacksonville Harbor, Florida: House Document Numbered 214, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,484,000;

Ponce de Leon Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 74, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,104,000;

Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 91, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,093,000;

East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered 194, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,151,000;

Perdido Pass Channel, Alabama: Senate Document Numbered 94, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $625,000;

Bayou La Batre, Alabama: House Document Numbered 327, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $262,000;

Mermentau River, Louisiana: House Document Numbered 239, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,690,000;

Alpena Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 151, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $806,000: *Provided,* That in order to compensate for existing low water levels in Lake Huron, an additional increment of one foot in channel depth is hereby authorized;

Frankfort Harbor, Michigan: Senate Document Numbered 16, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimate cost of $237,000;

Lexington Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 301, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $563,000;

Saginaw River, Michigan: House Document Numbered 240, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $437,000;

Cedar River Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered —, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $664,000;

Rocky River Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 352, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $235,000;

West Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 245, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $544,000;

Indiana Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 227, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $96,000;

Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,000,000: *Provided,* That any funds appropriated for the construction of this project shall not be utilized until such time as the Indiana dunes have been preserved and protected as a national lakeshore by Act of Congress.

Chocolate Bayou, Texas: House Document Numbered 217, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,254,000;

San Francisco Bay to Stockton, California: House Document Numbered 208, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $46,853,000;

Bodega Bay, California: House Document Numbered 106, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $853,000;

Port San Luis, San Luis Obispo Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 148, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,360,000;

Oceanside Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 76, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance;

Port Orford, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 62, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $696,000;

Chetco River, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 21, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,308,000;

Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered —, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,000,000;

John Day Lock and Dam, Oregon and Washington: Senate Document Numbered 28, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $676,000;

Edmonds Harbor, Washington: House Document Numbered 147, Eighty-eighth Congress, maintenance;

Coasts of the Hawaiian Islands, harbors for light-draft vessels, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 353, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,737,000;

Honokahau Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 68, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $680,000;

Honolulu Harbor and Barbers Point Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 93, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,928,000;

Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 75, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,291,000;

Beach erosion

Cliff Walk, Newport, Rhode Island: House Document Numbered 228, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $340,000;

Perth Amboy, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 186, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $82,000;

Atlantic City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-eighth Congress, periodic nourishment;

Hunting Island Beach, South Carolina: House Document Numbered 323, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $319,000;

Fort Pierce, Florida: House Document Numbered 84, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $220,000;

Evanston, Illinois: House Document Numbered 159, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $392,000;

Haleiwa Beach, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 107, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $572,400;

Waikiki Beach, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 104, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,490,000.

SEC. 102. That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local interests for such work done by them on the beach erosion projects authorized in section 101, or in other sections of this Act, subsequent to the initiation of the studies which form the basis for the projects: *Provided,* That the provisions of section 103 of the River and Harbor Act of October 23, 1962 (Public Law 874, Eighty-seventh Congress), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act: *Provided further,* That the work which may have been done on these projects is approved by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the projects herein adopted: *And provided further,* That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto or funds available therefor, and shall not take precedence over other projects of higher priority for improvements.

SEC. 103. That section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297, 300) as amended by section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173, 1180), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 104. (a) That there is hereby authorized a comprehensive program to provide for control and progressive eradication of water-hyacinth, alligatorweed, Eurasian water milfoil, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths, from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters of the United States, in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies: *Provided,* That local interests agree to hold and save the United States free from claims that may occur from control operations and participate to the extent of 30 per centum of the cost of such operations: *Provided further,* That costs for research and planning undertaken pursuant to the authorities of this section may be borne fully by the Federal Government.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts, not in excess of $5,000,000 annually, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section: *Provided,* That any such funds employed for control operations shall be allocated by the Chief of Engineers on a priority basis, based upon the urgency and need of each area, and the availability of local funds."

SEC. 104. That the consent of Congress is hereby granted for the purposes of section 9 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401), to the State of Pennsylvania, to construct a dam on the Susquehanna River, downstream from the Bainbridge Street Bridge at Sunbury, Pennsylvania.

SEC. 105. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made at the following locations and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

Jonesport Harbor, Maine.

Blue Hill Harbor, Maine

Great and Little Bays and their tributaries, New Hampshire, and adjoining tributaries of the Piscataqua River, New Hampshire and Maine, with a view to determining the advisability of providing improvements in the interest of navigation and allied purposes.

Niagara River, New York, with respect to nature and extent of measures necessary to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the American Falls.

Great Lakes and Saint Lawrence Seaway: Investigation and study of means of extending the navigation season on the waterways at an estimated cost not to exceed $75,000. Report to include a full and complete investigation and study of waterway deicing systems, including a review of any previous pertinent reports by the Department of the Army, any available information from any of the other Departments of the Government, and waterway deicing methods in use by private concerns and foreign governments, for the purpose of determining the practicability, means, and economic justification for extending the navigation season on the Great Lakes (including connecting channels and harbors) and the Saint Lawrence Seaway by eliminating ice conditions to the extent possible. The Chief of Engineers may submit such interim reports as may be deemed advisable, and shall submit his final reports, together with his recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as he may deem advisable, not later than two years after funds are made available for the study.

SEC. 106. Title I of this Act may be cited as the "River and Harbor Act of 1965".

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

SEC. 201. Section 3 of the Act approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938 (Public Law Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided,* That the authorization for any flood control project herein adopted requiring local cooperation shall expire five years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

Sec. 202. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

Sec. 203. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided,* That the necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided further,* That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements: *And provided further,* That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

Saint John River Basin

The Dickey-Lincoln School project, Saint John River, Maine, is hereby authorized as approved by the President on July 12, 1965, and substantially in accordance with the plans included in the report of the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers dated August 1964, which is a supplement to the July 1963 report of the International Passamaquoddy tidal power project and upper Saint John River hydroelectric power development, at an estimated cost of $227,000,000.

Housatonic River Basin

The project for flood protection on the Still River at Danbury, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document numbered 324, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,300,000.

The project for flood protection on the Housatonic and Naugatuck Rivers at Derby, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 324, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,800,000.

New England-Atlantic Coastal Area

The project for hurricane-flood control protection at Westerly, Rhode Island, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 85, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,287,000.

Long Island Sound Area

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Stratford, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 292, Eighty-eight Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,340,000.

New York-Atlantic Coastal Area

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 215, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $32,620,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Staten Island, Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 181, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,230,000.

Elizabeth River Basin, New Jersey

The project for hurricane-flood protection on the Elizabeth River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered —, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,769,000.

Rahway River Basin, New Jersey

The project for flood protection on the Rahway River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 67, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,514,000.

Neuse River Basin

The project for the Falls Dam and Reservoir, Neuse River, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $18,600,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bern and vicinity, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 183, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $10,400,000.

Middle Atlantic coastal area

The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Ocracoke Island, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 109, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,636,000.

Flint River Basin

The project for the Lazer Creek Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $40,378,000.

The project for the Lower Auchumpkee Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $48,275,000.

Central and southern Florida basin

Comprehensive Plan

The comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida approved in the Act of June 30, 1948, and subsequent Acts of Congress, is hereby modified to include the following items: *Provided,* That said projects shall be prosecuted within the monetary authorization made available for the comprehensive plan.

The project for flood protection in Hendry County, west of levees 1, 2, and 3, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 102, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,986,000.

The project for flood protection in southwest Dade County, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 20, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,903,000.

South Atlantic coastal area

The project for hurricane-flood protection on Biscayne Bay, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 213, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,954,000.

Phillippi Creek Basin, Florida

The project for flood control in Phillippi Creek, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 156, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,592,000.

Lower Mississippi River Basin

Comprehensive Plan

The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534), as amended and modified, is hereby further modified and expanded to include the projects and plans substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress, at a cost not to exceed $181,109,100, and the authorization for the lower Mississippi River project is hereby increased accordingly: *Provided,* That this authorization shall not be made available for the prosecution of any projects except those set forth in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress: *Provided further,* That any modified easements required in the improvement of the Birds Point-New Madrid, Missouri, floodway shall be acquired as provided by section 4 of the Act of May 15, 1928: *And provided further,* That the pumping plant in the Red River backwater area shall be operated and maintained by the Corps of Engineers.

General Projects

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Grand Isle and vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 184, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,500,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at Morgan City and vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 167, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,049,000.

The project for hurricane-flood protection on Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 231, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $56,922,000.

Ouachita River Basin

The project for flood protection on the Ouachita River at Monroe, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 328, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $520,000.

Red River Basin

The project for flood protection on Bayou Bodcau and tributaries, Arkansas and Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the

Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 203, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

The project for Caddo Dam and Reservoir, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 39, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,934,000.

Gulf of Mexico

The project for flood protection on the Buffalo Bayou and Tributaries, White Oak Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 169, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,800,000.

The project for flood protection on Highland Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 168, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,500,000.

The project for flood protection on Taylors Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 206, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,290,000.

Rio Grande Basin

The project for flood protection on the Rio Grande at El Paso, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 207, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,493,000.

Arkansas River Basin

Comprehensive Plan

The multiple-purpose plan for improvement of Arkansas River and tributaries, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, as amended, is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers, to provide replacement outfall facilities for the Kansas Street outfall sewer in the city of Pine Bluff, Arkansas, including such new pumping facilities as may be necessary, at the most economical Federal expense, but including in the Federal expense the reasonable capitalized cost of operation and maintenance of the pumping facilities over the cost of pumping now required in the existing system.

General Projects

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Las Animas, Colorado, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 165, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,541,000.

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Great Bend, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 182, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,030,000.

The project for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Grand (Neosho) River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 27, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $730,000.

The project for flood protection on the Walnut River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $66,036,000.

The project for the Shidler Dam and Reservoir, Salt Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 242, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,150,000.

Missouri River Basin

The project for flood protection on Big Creek at Hayes, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 22, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,702,000.

The project for flood protection on the Little Nemaha River and tributaries, Nebraska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

The project for flood protection on the Big Sioux River and tributaries, Iowa and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantiall as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 199, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,400,000: *Provided,* That such portion of the project as relates to the area above the city limits of Sioux City, Iowa, be compatible with a fish and wildlife mitigation plan and also a flood control plan for the upper basin of the Big Sioux River, both to be approved by the States of Iowa and South Dakota.

The project for flood protection on the Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers and tributaries, Iowa and Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army in House Document Numbered 238, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,167,000.

The project for flood protection on the Grand River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 241, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $278,635,000.

Ohio River Basin

The project for flood protection on Chartiers Creek, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 302, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,207,000.

The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek at Du Bois, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 185, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,654,000.

The project for the Lincoln, Clifty Creek, and Patoka Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana and Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 202, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $72,900,000.

The project for the Lafayette and Big Pine Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 29, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,800,000.

The project for the Devils Jumps Reservoir, Big South Fork of the Cumberland River, Kentucky and Tennessee, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $151,000,000.

The project for the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, Cheat River, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 243, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $133,548,000: *Provided,* That the power features of this project shall not be undertaken until such time as the Federal Power Commission has completed action on any applications that may be pending before that agency for private development of the pumped-storage facility of the project: *Provided further,* That should the Federal Power Commission act in the affirmative on any pending applications, the authority for such project shall not include Federal power features and the estimated cost of such project shall be $88,402,000: *And provided further,* That in the event the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending applications, Federal construction of such pumped-storage power facilities is hereby authorized and approved.

The project for the Martins Fork Reservoir, Upper Cumberland River Basin, Kentucky, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 244, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,860,000.

The Yatesville, Paintsville, and Panther Creek Reservoir projects and the Martin, Kentucky, local protection project on the Big Sandy River, and Tug and Levisa Forks of Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $51,491,000: *Provided,* That prior to initiation of construction the Department of the Army will prepare an analysis of benefits and costs of the proposed projects, including such reformulation as may be necessary to comply with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

Upper Mississippi River Basin

The project for flood protection at East St. Louis and vicinity, Illinois (East Side levee and sanitary district), is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 329, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,180,000.

The project for the Kaskaskia River, Illinois, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 500, Eighty-fifth Congress), in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-fifth Congress, is hereby modified substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 351, Eighty-eighth Congress, to provide for the deletion from the items of local cooperation the requirement of a cash contribution due to changed land use, at an estimated increased Federal cost of $3,498,000: *Provided,* That local interests make a cash contribution of an amount equal to the full cost of acquisition of flowage easements in those lands which are no longer needed for construction, operation, and maintenance of Carlyle Reservoir.

The project for the Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Madison County, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 150, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $179,000.

The project for flood protection on the Iowa River at Marshalltown, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 166, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,670,000.

The project for flood protection on the Cedar River at Waterloo, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 166, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,900,000.

The project for the Zumbro River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $975,000.

The project for the Big Stone Lake and Whetstone River, Minnesota and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 579, Eighty-seventh Congress, and House Document Numbered 193, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,885,000.

Great Lake Basin

The project for flood protection on the Maumee River at and in the vicinity of Findlay, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 158, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,317,000.

The project for flood control and navigation on the Chagrin River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 35, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,200,000.

The project for flood protection on the Grand River at and in the vicinity of Grandville, Michigan, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 157, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,373,000.

Little Colorado River Basin

The project for flood protection on the Little Colorado River at and in the vicinity of Winslow, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 63, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,775,000.

Gila River Basin

The project for flood protection on Indian Bend Wash, Maricopa County, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 303, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,250,000.

The project for flood protection on the Santa Rosa Wash, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 189, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,430,000.

The project for flood protection at Phoenix, Arizona, and vicinity, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 216, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $58,310,000.

Eel River Basin

The project for flood protection on the Eel River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 234, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,732,000.

Sacramento River Basin

The project for the New Bullards Bar Dam and Reservoir, Yuba River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 180, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,979,000.

San Francisco Bay Area

The project for flood protection on Sonoma Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 224, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,400,000.

The project for the Napa River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 222, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,950,000.

Whitewater River Basin

The project for flood protection on Tahquitz Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 223, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,030,000.

San Diego River Basin

The project for flood protection on San Diego River (Mission Valley), California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers in House Document Numbered 212, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,600,000.

Columbia River Basin

The project for flood protection on Willow Creek, Oregon, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 233, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,680,000.

SEC. 204. (a) In the prosecution of improvements of rivers and harbors and other waterways for the benefit of navigation, the control of destructive flood waters, hurricane protection, beach erosion control, and for other purposes, authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with plans adopted and authorized by the Congress, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress, that whenever such improvements are located wholly or partially within an area which is eligible for financial assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act or any subsequent similar Act requiring the designation of an area by the Secretary of Commerce as a condition of such assistance, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans for a period not exceeding fifty years to enable responsible local interests to meet the requirements of local cooperation pertaining to contributions toward the cost of construction of water resource projects within such areas.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 205. That the flood control project for the Scioto River, Ohio, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962, is hereby modified to authorize the construction of the local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, at such time as the reservoirs on Alum, Mill, Big Darby, and Deer Creeks are under construction: *Provided*, That in the event the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs are constructed by an agency other than the Federal Government, said agency shall furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that it will provide flood control storage in those reservoirs equivalent to that proposed for the Federal reservoir projects, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, in accordance with the plan set forth in House Document 587, Eighty-seventh Congress, and: *Provided further*, That the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs shall be operated for flood control in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

SEC. 206. (a) That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to prepare under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, a comprehensive plan for the development and efficient utilization of the water and related resources of the region drained by streams which discharge, within the State of Michigan, into the Saint Clair River, Lake Saint Clair, the Detroit River and Lake Erie: *Provided*, That such plan may provide for importation of water from points not located within the region as defined above.

(b) Said comprehensive plan shall be designed to meet the long-range needs of the region for protection against floods, wise use of flood plain lands, improvement of navigation facilities, water supplies for industrial and municipal purposes, outdoor recreational facilities, the enhancement and control of water quality, and related purposes; all with a view to encouraging and supporting the optimum long-range economic development of the region and enhancing the welfare of its people.

SEC. 207. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its territorial possessions, which include the following named localities: *Provided*, That after the regular or formal reports made on any survey are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress, if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions: *Provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this title until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law:

Watersheds of streams in the North Atlantic region draining northward in New York toward the Saint Lawrence River below the international boundary and draining directly into the Atlantic Ocean above the Virginia-North Carolina State line with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

All streams flowing into the sounds of North Carolina between Cape Lookout and the Virginia line except those portions of the Neuse, Pamlico, and Roanoke Rivers above the estuarine reaches.

Watersheds of streams in the South Atlantic region draining directly to the Atlantic Ocean below the Virginia-North Carolina State line and draining directly into the Gulf of Mexico east of Lake Pontchartrain with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

The Rio Grande River and its tributaries with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams, washes, lakes and their tributaries, which drain areas of the great basin region of Oregon, California, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries above Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries below Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams in the Pacific Northwest region which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean along the coast lines of Washington and Oregon with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Watersheds of streams in California which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean and of streams, washes, lakes and their tributaries, which drain areas in the eastern portion of the California region with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Kaneohe-Kailua area, Oahu, Hawaii.

SEC. 208. Title II of this Act may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1965".

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR FOR NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT STUDIES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, a considerable amount of concern has been expressed as to the implications for water resource development inherent in the November 20, 1964, directive of the Chief of Engineers regarding criteria to be employed in evaluating new improvements.

Several river valley associations have joined together in expressing views on this subject to the Chief of Engineers. He has responded in detail.

A representative of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Mr. William J. Hull, also represented the Arkansas Basin Development Association, the Inland Empire Waterways Association, Interconnecting Waterways, Inc., the Mississippi Valley Association, and the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Development Authority, in testifying June 10, 1965, before an ad hoc group of the Public Works Committee over which I presided.

In essence, the joint position of the organizations was one of commending the intent of the Chief of Engineers in seeking sound and conservative standards of project evaluation. But the belief was expressed that generally the Corps of Engineers' traffic estimates in project evaluation under previous standards have been fully justified by experience and that there is basis for concern first, lest the newly promulgated standards for traffic estimates result in serious understatement of project potentials; and second, lest these standards introduce an element of subjective conjecture into project evaluation which would obstruct meaningful review of Corps of Engineers reports by the cognizant committees of Congress.

Mr. President, I feel that there is considerable support for the request further stated by the several associations and authorities represented that the Chief of Engineers review the criteria for traffic estimates under the instructions of November 20, 1964, in the light of the conditions cited above and in the light of the emphasis on economic growth and development called for by the "Report on Policies, Standards, and Procedures for Formulating and Evaluating Water Resource Projects," approved by the President in May 1962 and published as Senate Document 97, 87th Congress, 2d session.

COMMUNIST ESPIONAGE AND SUBVERSION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the best and most informative weekly radio broadcasts in this country is the "Manion Forum," which is produced by Dean Clarence Manion, of South Bend, Ind. Dean Manion was formerly dean of the Law School at Notre Dame University.

In the "Manion Forum" broadcast of April 25, 1965, Miss Marilyn Manion, Dean Manion's very able and dedicated daughter, interviewed Mr. J. G. Sourwine, the distinguished chief counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. The interview was on the subject of Communist espionage and subversion.

Mr. President, I have been very much impressed with this interview and feel that it should be studied by every Member of Congress. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have this radio broadcast printed in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following the text of this broadcast, an important excerpt from Whittaker Chambers' monumental literary work, "Witness." This excerpt was printed with the "Manion Forum" broadcast, and I feel that this excerpt entitled "Why Does Communism Continue To Exist—Even in America?" should likewise be studied by all Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the interview and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNIST ESPIONAGE AND SUBVERSION—EXPERT TESTIMONY REVEALS ITS BREADTH AND DEPTH IN THE U.S.A.

(Interview with J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel, Senate Internal Security Subcommittee)

Dean MANION. For many years the Committee on the Judiciary of the U.S. Senate has had a subcommittee for the investigation of the administration of the internal security of the United States—communism, among other things. This subcommittee is composed of nine U.S. Senators, and for many years, as its chief counsel, it has had Mr. J. G. Sourwine. Throughout the years of his service, Mr. Sourwine has acquired a great fund of experience about subversion and subversive activities in the United States.

I take you now to Washington, D.C., where my daughter, Marilyn, is interviewing Mr. J. G. Sourwine, counsel of the Senate subcommittee to investigate the administration of internal security in this country.

MARILYN MANION. Mr. Sourwine, to begin our discussion, I'd like to ask you a very basic question. Since we shall be discussing the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, what is the purpose of the subcommittee? Why does it exist?

Mr. SOURWINE. The Internal Security Subcommittee was created because at the time of passage of the Internal Security Act, Senator McCarran, who was the father of that act, and other Senators thought there should be in the Senate a committee charged with the dual responsibility of legislative oversight of that act and other internal security laws, and charged also with investigating the activities of the Communist Party and other subversive organizations of a totalitarian nature in the United States.

The committee was authorized initially by a resolution of the Senate passed at the end of 1950, and activated in early 1951. The committee has a very specific charter which gives it several responsibilities: those I have mentioned, and the further responsibility of a continuing investigation with respect to propaganda by the Communist Party or any other subservise organization which threatens the internal security of the country. To use the words of our basic resolution, "including but not limited to espionage and subversion."

MARILYN MANION. Is there really a subversive threat to America today; and specifically, is there a strong Communist threat? And is there Communist espionage going on in the United States at the present time?

Mr. SOURWINE. Those are three questions. They are interlocked. The answers are "Yes" in every instance. There is a threat to the internal security of the country just as there is a threat to the internal security of every free country in the world as long as the world Communist conspiracy exists and has as its objective the communization of the world.

The Communist Party is a definite danger to the security because the Communist Party USA is an arm of the world Communist conspiracy, responsible to Moscow, whose tactics and strategy in many instances are directly dictated by Moscow. And because this is a group of hard-core Communists, which means dedicated, disciplined and able.

Now with respect to espionage, we must accept as a fact that there is espionage in the United States, unless we wish to take the position that the Communists are treating the United States, their main enemy, differently from the way they are treating every other country on earth. We have additional evidence with respect to espionage in testimony which has been given back through the years by persons who had been members of the party—parties to the conspiracy, and who have told us what the Communist plan and program is and how they operate.

For instance, several espionage networks have been disclosed. The network which was headed at various times by John Abt and Harold Ware and Nat Witt was one which was exposed. We know that there was another at that time which was not exposed then and has not been exposed since, because we have the sworn testimony that an effort was made to recruit Alger Hiss into the Abt-Ware-Witt group of the party but that the word came through from topside to leave him alone, that he was working with another group.

Now we know that the Communists usually set up their networks in a dual manner. That is, two networks side by side, independent of each other but with the same objectives. When you disclose one and don't find its opposite number, you know that there is one that is still to be uncovered. Also, the Soviet Union has espionage networks operating under three different branches of its government—military, naval and secret police. We have uncovered in this country more than one secret police network. We have uncovered at least one Soviet military espionage network, the Abel network. We have never uncovered a Soviet naval espionage network.

Even in the case of our top level intelligence agencies, there is always a danger of infiltration. The head of the CIA told us some years ago that while he did not know of Communist infiltration in his agency—of course, if he did know about it, he would eliminate it—he operated on the assumption that the agency had been infiltrated. And a more recent instance was that of a defector from a high level position in a Communist country who had himself headed espionage activity who told us that he knew that every agency of our Government had been infiltrated with the exception of the FBI. He didn't know that it had not been infiltrated, but he didn't know that it had been. Is that a sufficient answer?

INFILTRATION BY FEW INFLUENCES MANY

MARILYN MANION. Yes, it is, Mr. Sourwine. You have told us how active the Communists are in the areas of infiltration and espionage. What specifically have they accomplished by this? What goals have they reached?

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, the Communist Party's goals in this country have been many. Many of their goals involve conditioning the people of the country to accept some Communist theory or to act in some way that the Communists want them to act. Perhaps the best way to answer your question would be to give you a single illustration of one Communist operation which has been fully documented by our committee. Would that do?

Marilyn Manion. That certainly would.

Mr. Sourwine. All right, then, take the case of the Institute of Pacific Relations. This was a non-Communist organization formed in Hawaii, infiltrated and taken over by the Communists while it was still small. They gained control in the 1920's. They built the organization. And they made it eventually the top authoritative organization for scholars and historians in the area of Far Eastern affairs. They published the most authoritative magazine in this area, which was edited by Owen Lattimore, a magazine called Pacific Affairs.

And as a result of this control over a period of 20 years and more, they succeeded in conditioning the thinking of the American people, not only the mass of the people, but the scholars in the field, until nearly everyone in this country was ready and willing to accept a number of false theories about the Far East, incuding the theory (which thank goodness has now been exploded) that the Chinese Communist movement was just a bunch of agrarian reformers. They did this—the Communists did this—with at no time more than 500 persons involved, of whom at no time were more than 200 party members.

Marilyn Manion. I see that the subcommittee has recently issued a report which describes extensive Communist activities in Latin America, including Communist infiltration among students there. But what about Communist influences on students right here in the United States?

Mr. Sourwine. The Communists are actively working in that area. A new drive on youth was begun a little over 3 years ago, and between 2 and 3 years ago there was increased emphasis by the party on the campuses as targets.

Marilyn Manion. We hear a lot about academic freedom whenever the American student community is being discussed. And the usual question is: Why shouldn't a Communist be allowed to teach in a school?

Mr. Sourwine. The reason for this is best explained, I think, by a simile. When a man builds a granary, he builds into the granary every protection he can think of against rats because he knows if the grain is there the rats will try to get in; and if they get in, they'll spoil the grain. He knows this because of the nature of rats with grain. He doesn't have to find a particular rat spoiling a particular grain of wheat in order to need protection for his granary or know that he needs it.

Now every member of the Communist Party has been indoctrinated, has been put under discipline, has been accepted by the party as loyal and reliable, and has accepted as one of his personal obligations to the party the responsibility of using any position he gets for the furtherance of the party's purposes and objectives, on his own initiative where he is not given instructions and in strict accordance with party instructions when he is instructed. A Communist teacher is by definition incapable of exercising academic freedom because he is not permitted by his obligation to the party to teach anything contrary to the party line or to take any action which would help to induce an independent state of mind or a freedom of choice or a capacity for clear thinking in his students. His whole job is to do those things and to teach those things which will help the party obtain its objective of gaining the minds of the students, gaining control over them where possible, advancing its propaganda and making new recruits for the party.

Marilyn Manion. What about Communist speakers being allowed to appear on college campuses?

Mr. Sourwine. A Communist has the same right of free speech in this country that you or I have. But that right of free speech does not embrace an obligation to make public funds available to the Communists, nor public facilities available to a Communist for the purpose of spreading his message among youth. On the contrary, the fathers and mothers who pay taxes for the education of their children have a right to be assured that their tax money will not be used for the purpose of teaching those children things which are wrong.

COMMUNISTS EXPLOIT NAIVETE OF YOUTH

Marilyn Manion. Approximately how many tax supported schools and colleges have been used in the last few years as platforms for Communist speakers?

Mr. Sourwine. I can't give you a precise number but I think it's safe to say not less than 200 and probably not more than 400, although I think the total number of appearances by Communists on college campuses may have exceeded 400 substantially.

Marilyn Manion. Why is it that this Communist propaganda among our young people is so effective? Is there any possibility that these students are being conditioned beforehand—made vulnerable for Communist recruitment?

Mr. Sourwine. I think a categorical answer would be "no," but it would be a misleading answer. A great deal of the Communist purpose in its activity on the campus is to condition the students. And in a sense, students are preconditioned by their youth, by their natural youthful aggressiveness, by their natural youthful idealism, and by their youthful naivete, their lack of sophistication.

The finest mechanical or electronic computer that the mind of man can conceive of will give the wrong answers or break down if false data is fed into it, at least until the computer has been given a sufficient amount of true data to develop within the computer an ability to reject that which is false. The human mind is the finest computer that was ever made. The same thing is true of the human mind, however. If false basic premises are fed into it, and it works properly, false answers will come out.

If false premises are fed into it in contradiction to truth which is already there, at a time when the mind as a computer has not had enough data to achieve enough sophistication to make the choice and reject the false, the result is confusion or even mental breakdown—just as a computer would break down. And it's by reaching for the youth at a time when they are particularly vulnerable that the Communist Party hopes to make major gains through its campaign addressed to college campuses.

Marilyn Manion. Thank you, Mr. Sourwine. As chief counsel for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, you know of what you speak. And I know that you've enlightened the members of our radio audience in this interview. Ladies and gentlemen, I return you to my father, Dean Manion, in South Bend, Ind.

Dean Manion. Thank you, Marilyn, and thank you, Mr. Sourwine, for this informative and helpful interview about communism and other things.

FREE POSTAGE FOR OUR AMERICAN TROOPS IN VIETNAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there are several thousand young American boys serving their country in Vietnam. The war seems to be escalating rapidly.

I have visited with some of the returning troops—and have also received mail—which indicates that one thing that would really give them a great deal of encouragement would be for Congress to vote them free postage while in Vietnam.

We can well imagine what happens to these boys when they come out of the jungle mountains, dripping with perspiration, and run down to the canteen to buy a few stamps, which they put in their pockets, which are damp, so that they will have enough stamps to write letters to their loved ones.

It seems to me that this is one thing we should be taking prompt action on. It is not an unusual procedure. It was followed in World War II and in the Korean conflict—and we should do the same thing now.

I have been told that our boys in Vietnam are more concerned about getting free postage than they are in receiving additional financial help. It is little things like this which can give a great boost to their morale. It seems to me that in view of that fact, and because everyone wishes to be helpful, we should do so at once.

A bill is pending before the Subcommittee on Post Office and Civil Service, introduced by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], S. 2315, which would provide this free postage.

The distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], is in the Chamber at the present moment, and I would urge that in the very near future we have a committee meeting and report the bill along this line.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I join the Senator from Kansas in urging prompt consideration of this measure. As he has pointed out, we did the same thing for World War II veterans and also for veterans of the Korean conflict. Therefore, if not from the standpoint of finances, from the standpoint of convenience this is certainly something that we can do to help our boys in an area where we know they cannot always have access to postage and find an opportunity to write their friends and loved ones.

I join the Senator from Kansas in expressing the hope that the committee will promptly report the bill, and that the Senate will give it immediate consideration.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. I, too, wish to join the distinguished Senator from Kansas and the distinguished Senator from Delaware with respect to the bill introduced by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton].

This is a timely piece of legislation, one which would be a great morale booster for our troops in Vietnam.

Let me add that it would also be an additional boost to their morale if my bill, Senate 2230, could be voted on, which provides for an increased pay rate for the Armed Forces. It is a duplicate of the Rivers bill in the House of Representatives which is being considered at the present time.

I compliment the Senator from Kansas for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. I assure him that I shall work toward its passage, and I am sure that it will be given prompt consideration by the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Let me say to the Senator from Kansas that the bill of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] providing for free postage to veterans in Vietnam was referred yesterday to the Subcommittee on Post Office and Civil Service and will be expedited and brought to the floor of the Senate at the earliest possible moment.

I thank the distinguished ranking Republican Member for his statement in support of the bill.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the comments of the distinguished chairman of the committee. I am confident that, with his support, and that of the other members of the committee, there will be no difficulty in getting action on this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I congratulate the Senator on this very important legislation, and also congratulate the chairman of the committee for bringing it to the attention of the Senate.

It is my hope that the bill will be promptly enacted. I am pleased that both sides of the aisle are in complete agreement on it.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the distinguished acting majority leader will yield, there has been colloquy about what his intentions are with respect to action on the conference report tonight.

There are some complications; and I uttered the hope that he would announce to the Senate that any statement any Senator wished to make on the conference report tonight could be made, with the clear and explicit understanding that there would be no vote tonight, and that when the Senate reconvene tomorrow there will be a request for a limitation of time. I shall be glad to join with the acting majority leader in securing a limitation on time insofar as it lies within my power to do so.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I discussed this matter with the distinguished minority leader. I will not seek to press this matter to a vote tonight, in view of certain problems which exist with respect to Senators who wish to be heard on the conference report at the time of the vote.

I would hope very much that Senators who are available to discuss this matter would make their speeches before the Senate recesses or adjourns tonight, as the case may be, in view of the fact that there is urgency to this piece of legislation.

In my judgment, the bill should be signed before the end of this month because of effective dates relating to money which many people will need.

The bill contains effective dates for the second month after it is signed. If it is signed this month, it means that some of the benefits will commence in September; if it is signed in August, the benefits will not commence until October.

In my judgment these effective dates should be September, instead of October. I very much hope that we can act on the bill and have it available for the President to sign before the month is over, which means by July 31.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am not unaware of the problems of enrolling a bill of this size. Of course it can be done, and extra talent can be employed. However, there is ample oppportunity to have it properly enrolled and ready for the President's signature. I shall put no stone in the way of my distinguished friend from Louisiana in attaining his objective. I would be more than glad to cooperate with him in obtaining a time limitation tomorrow.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator. He always makes his position very clear. He always does a fine job in speaking for all of those on the other side of the aisle, and sometimes even for some of us on this side of the aisle.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I salute him for the fine work he does. I shall work with the Senator to conclude action on the bill as soon as possible. I shall not insist that the Senate vote on the conference report until tomorrow.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. I wonder if the Senator would ask for a yea-and-nay vote?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator wishes to insist upon a yea-and-nay vote on the conference report, I shall seek to accommodate him when the vote occurs tomorrow. Some Senators have indicated that they did not care to have the yeas and nays ordered. Others have indicated that they wished a yea-and-nay vote. My position is very clear for the RECORD.

Mr. THURMOND. Several Senators would like to have a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There would be no trouble about obtaining a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator from South Carolina cares to have the yeas and nays ordered on the adoption of the conference report, I shall be glad to cooperate with him to have that vote. However, I have told some Senators, who have now left the floor, that I knew of no request for the yeas and nays. That being the case, I would prefer to have him make his request tomorrow. At that time I shall be glad to second his motion.

Mr. THURMOND. That is satisfactory. I wonder if a quorum call could be had, and in that way have me notified to be on the floor. If it is determined at that time that a yea-and-nay vote is desired, I am sure the Senator will cooperate in obtaining such a vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. President, after a full week of consideration your conferees are ready to report that we have reached agreement with the House conferees on the most significant social security and public welfare legislation ever passed by the Congress. Realizing full well the awesome responsibility which was ours we went through the 409-page bill line upon line and section by section to reach agreement on some 513 Senate amendments, including some minor and technical amendments.

The conference bill now before the Senate marks a new era in our effort to promote the general welfare. It recognizes the fact that a dynamic democracy changes as the country grows. It recognizes that we are a great—and questioning—country. It is a reaffirmation, in a time of prosperity, of our concern for our aged and our children which, almost exactly 30 years ago, in a time of deep depression, led to the adoption of our country's first social security system. Building on a great "cornerstone"—as President Franklin D. Roosevelt described the 1935 act—we are proving again today that the American answer to disease and despair is to respond with dedication and with deeds. Much has been demanded of our country in these three decades since 1935, from many parts of the world and from the reaches of outer space. Now, at their close, we have recognized that there comes a time—and the time is now with us—when a man must look to his own household and it is in this spirit that the Congress has acted.

We can get some idea of the scope of the 1965 act by comparing it with the historic Social Security Act of 1935. At that time it was estimated that, by 1980, a full 45 years later, social security payments would total $3½ billion.

If my recollection serves me right, during the first 5 years of the Social Security Act of 1935, no benefits were paid. Under the bill now before us the additional payments alone will greatly exceed this amount in the first full year. And by 1972—8 years earlier than 1980, it is estimated that social insurance payments—including the health and disability features—will be running about $31 billion a year. I emphasize the fact that these expenditures refer only to trust fund payments for hospital and medical care insurance, and for cash payments to the some 20 million people now entitled to social security benefits and the millions more who will qualify in the future. In addition to these expenditures, the bill includes $1.3 billion in money from the General Treasury for the first full year. Thus, as finally approved by the conference, the social security bill of 1965 contains almost $6½ billion in additional benefits which extend to every part of our population.

To put these amounts into focus, it is well, perhaps, to measure these payments to people against the march of our expanding economy. In the year 1950, when social security payments amounted to $960 million they represented less than one-half of 1 percent of a total personal income for that year which totaled $228.5 billion. With the improvements in the social security system made by amendments in the 1950's total social security payments had, by 1957 moved up to $7.4 billion—or about 2 percent of the total personal income for that year of $351.4 billion. Last year, with total personal income climbing to the unprecedented heights of $491 billion, total social security payments of $16.2 billion represented just about 3 percent of our people's total personal income for 1964. Moreover, assuming an increase in personal income in the next 7 years, paralleling that of the last 7 years, these payments in 1972 will equal 5 percent of total personal income. It is then still a relatively small but climbing segment of income. Yet, as we have found through the years the social security segment not only constitutes a growing guarantee that most of us will find a measure of self-sufficiency and dignity in our older years, but these payments—which go directly to purchase the necessities of life—are also an important means of helping to stabilize the economy since they are paid regularly and in fixed amounts.

When I spoke of this bill some days ago as the most significant social security and public welfare legislation ever passed by Congress in the history of our country, I noted an editorial which appeared in the great Washington newspaper, the Washington Post, referring to what I said in this regard as a "modest exaggeration."

I admired the editorial, and I thought it was well taken and well done. However, I would take issue with that great newspaper when it describes my statement as a "modest exaggeration."

What bill ever passed by Congress brought more cash dividends or did more good to more people immediately and even more so within 1 year than this bill? It cannot be said of the Social Security Act of 1935. That act planted good hopes. But then so do the Social Security Amendments of 1965. Not only does this bill plant good hopes, but it nurtures to a flowering maturity the hopes of 1935 and succeeding years. We expand existing benefits and inaugurate great, new benefits.

The new benefits for the first full year of operation under this bill would be $6.5 billion.

While no one likes to vote for taxes, Congress also has the responsibility to vote the taxes to pay for the benefits provided in the bill. In doing so, we have brought to the Senate in the conference report one of the largest tax bills ever passed to provide medical services for people in this country.

Both as a revenue bill and as a bill providing services, this is a great and significant bill.

It is not "modest exaggeration," it is a fact that this bill does more to meet more human problems than any other measure ever passed.

The Social Security Amendments of 1965 which the conferees present to you today are, then, a reaffirmation in the midsixties of the 20th century of a long heritage of concern, in this country, that our youth and our aged shall have their fair share of the abundance in our land, and shall be protected against the loss of the necessities of life. First, let me discuss a few of the many differences in the bills which were reconciled in conference.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE

The provisions which emerged from the conference committee relating to the basic hospital program represent a reasonable compromise between the House and Senate versions of the bill. As to the number of inpatient hospital days, the Senate had provided an unlimited duration to take care of the catastrophic case. As you know, I felt as strongly as any Member of this body as to the desirability of this provision. Needless to say, the House conferees had equally strong convictions as to the wisdom of their legislation, which provided only 60 days of care. The conference agreement provides an additional 30 days of care using the coinsurance provision which was included in the Senate bill. This legislation will take care of about 98 percent of the cases. I think I am safe in saying that we have not heard the last about the unfortunate 2 percent. A complete solution of this problem, however, will have to wait until a future year.

As to the coverage of the physician-specialists under the basic program, the House conferees were insistent that physicians services should be placed in the voluntary supplementary program where the private sector will play a greater role as a buffer between the doctor and the Government.

The Senate prevailed as to the 100 days of extended care—skilled nursing home—but the House version of the home health benefit was taken both as to the requirement of hospitalization and the duration of 100 visits. Some question was raised as to whether there were sufficient facilities to warrant the 175 visits a year and the House believed the home health visits in the voluntary supplementary program afforded sufficient backup protection.

SUPPLEMENTARY PLAN

One of the more significant decisions was the adoption of the House effective date of July 1, 1966, for the supplementary plan. The conferees believed it was important that both the basic program and the supplementary start together and this consideration overrode the administrative convenience of a starting date of January 1, 1967. The Senate inclusion of the services of dentists performing dental surgeon functions was adopted, but the House prevailed in the exclusion of chiropractors and podiatrists.

INCOME TAX PROVISIONS

The conference accepted the Senate amendment eliminating all maximum limitations on the medical expense deduction for all taxpayers.

The House insisted that there be some mechanism for recovering the $3 monthly premiums for the supplementary plan which are paid from the general funds of the Treasury, from those individuals who have substantial amounts of taxable income. Thus, the conference adopted the House provision that the 3-percent floor on medical expense deductions, as well as the 1-percent limitation on medicines and drugs, is to apply to those people age 65 or over in the same manner as it presently applies to those under age 65. The conference also adopted the House provision allowing a special deduction for one-half of premiums paid for insurance of medical care expenses up to $150. This deduction is to be outside the regular medical expense limitations and is to apply with respect to taxpayers who itemize their deductions. Thus, if the premium is $350, $150 of this may be deducted outright and the remaining $200 will be treated as a medical expense subject to the limitations.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE

There were relatively few differences between the House and Senate versions of the new title XIX which provides a more effective Kerr-Mills program and extends its provisions to individuals who are needy and medically needy in the aged, blind, disabled, and dependent children programs.

One difference was in the administering agency. The House had required that the single State agency administering the new program must be the agency administering title I or XVI—the welfare agency. The Senate believed that a State should be allowed to choose any single State agency to administer the program providing the welfare agency be used to determined eligibility. The conference wisely adopted the Senate version.

Another difference concerned the future termination of existing medical vendor program. The House required that all existing medical programs in the five titles of the Social Security Act would be terminated on June 30, 1967. The Senate gave the States the option of continuing under existing law or under the new program. A compromise was reached under which the existing programs will not be terminated until December 31, 1969.

Still another difference dealt with the coverage of children under the broadened Kerr-Mills program. The House provided that dependent children under the age of 21 and specified relatives caring for them could be included even though they did not meet requirements for need and age under the State plans for aid to families with dependent children, but were otherwise qualified. The Senate included all children under 21 and adults caring for them. The Conference reached agreement by adopting the Senate provision as to the coverage of children under 21 but accepted the House provision as to coverage of the adult caretakers.

OTHER AMENDMENTS ON HEALTH CARE AND WELFARE

One of the hardest provisions to lose in this conference was that which would have authorized special project grants for services for children who are emotionally disturbed. The House conferees argued that the study of this problem, which was authorized by the Senate bill and agreed to by the conference should precede the authorization of grants. I surely hope that the grants program for this worthy cause will not be too long delayed.

OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE

Earnings base: The Senate prevailed as to its provisions which established a $6,600 earnings base in 1966. Under the House bill a $5,600 base was provided through 1970 and then it went up to $6,600. The tax rates adopted follow more closely the Senate bill, particularly in the early years. Incidentally, all the trust fund programs are adequately financed on the basis of conservative actuarial assumptions.

Disability: As to the definition of "disability," the waiting period, the offset against workmen's compensation, and the payment of certain rehabilitation services, the conference follows the Senate bill.

With respect to the Hartke amendment in the Senate which would have provided benefits to blind persons under a very liberal definition with as few as six quarters of coverage, the conference has provided a substitute which will be of assistance to two classes of blind people, who are presented with real problems under existing law, as follows:

First. Young disabled workers: An alternative insured status requirement is established for workers disabled by blindness before age 31 of one-half of the quarters elapsing after age 21 up to the point of disability, with a minimum of six quarters. To qualify for this alternative the worker would have to meet the statutory definition of blindness for the disability "freeze." The worker will, however, have to meet the other regular requirements for entitlement to disability benefits, including inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity.

Second. Older disabled workers: Those individuals aged 55 or over who meet the statutory definition of blindness in the disability freeze could qualify for cash benefits on the basis of their inability to engage in their past occupation or occupations. Their benefits would not be paid, however, if they were actually engaging in any substantial gainful activity.

Earnings test: The provision worked out in conference provides substantial relief to those who have to work to supplement their social security benefits. The House bill had only provided for an increase in the $1 for $2 band from $1,700 to $2,400 while retaining the annual earnings limitation of $1,200. The Senate had increased the exempt amount from $1,200 to $1,800 a year and ran the $1 for $2 band up to $3,000 a year. Under the conference agreement, the first $1,500 a year would be fully exempt and there would be a $1 reduction in benefits for each $2 of earnings between $1,500 and $2,700 and for each $1 of earnings thereafter. In addition, the amount of earnings a beneficiary may have in a month and get full benefits for that month, regardless of his annual earnings, would be raised from $100 to $125.

Cash tips: Probably one of the most difficult problems to resolve in conference was that of cash tips. The House bill, as Senators may remember, made the employer liable for money he had never paid or had knowledge about. He was to be taxed on "wages" he had never seen and whose amount for tax purposes would be determined solely by his employee. On the other hand, we realized when we covered tips as self-employment income in the Senate that the social security protection of many tipped workers was inadequate. The compromise worked out does hold out the hope of providing social security coverage of a higher proportion of tip income, but not at the expense of imposing an arbitrary tax on thousands of employers. It uses the House bill mechanism for social security reporting and income tax withholding purposes but imposes no tax liability on the employer who was not the source of the tip in the first place. The more detailed explanation of the bill resulting from the decisions reached in conference, which I shall include at the end of these remarks, explains in more detail how the conference provision will work as to cash tips.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

REDUCTION OF RETIREMENT AGE TO 60 WITH AN ACTUARIAL REDUCTION

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, we found that the House was adamant with respect to the amendment of the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] that would have reduced the retirement age to 60 with an actuarial reduction. The House was particularly concerned with the large initial expenditure of money particularly in a year when the medical and hospital insurance provisions were going into effect. This was so even though this amendment has no long-term cost effect because of the actuarial reduction.

It should be stated that the savings for the fund would not begin to take effect until almost 20 years after the amendment went into effect.

I have great sympathy with this amendment, and I feel sure that before too long the Senator from West Virginia will once again have sponsored a change in the law to this effect. I think the Senator is entirely correct in recognizing that automation and other modern developments are irrevocably forcing older workers out of their jobs, and that we must recognize this fact of life in our social security law. I congratulate him for being a leader in this field.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

The Senate was able to prevail on a number of significant earning exemptions under the public assistance programs. I might say that this body has been the leader in developing a more enlightened welfare policy in this regard. Too often the practice under present law has led to pinch-penny reductions in the amount of monthly payments because an older person has sold some eggs, or because an enterprising youngster got a weekend job stocking groceries in a store or worked a newspaper route. The following Senate amendments were adopted by the conference, together with the old-age assistance earnings exemption which originated in the Senate last year with an amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and which has been adopted by both Houses this year:

First. Under the Ribicoff amendment a State at its option, may disregard up to $150 per family per month of earned income of any dependent children under the age of 18 in the same home, but no child may have earnings of more than $50 per month and have those earnings exempted.

Second. Under my amendment, a State, at its option, may disregard the first $20 per month of earnings of aid to the permanently and totally disabled recipients and one-half of the next $60—this is the same as the exemption provided for old-age assistance recipients. Also, any additional income and resources could be exempted as part of an approved plan to achieve self-support during the time the recipient was undergoing vocational rehabilitation.

Third. Under another Long amendment, a State, at its option, may disregard not more than $5 per month per recipient of any income under all five public assistance programs. The conference arrived at this figure by reducing the Senate figure, which had been $7 a month.

Fourth. A provision is also made so that any amount of income which is disregarded in determining eligibility for a person under one of the public assistance programs shall not be considered in determining eligibility of another individual under any other public assistance program.

I deeply regret that our most strenuous efforts could not budge the House conferees in providing an earlier effective date than January 1, 1966, as suggested by the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], for the formula increases in public assistance. These increases, which were amendments I submitted last year and were included in the bill which died in conference last fall, are badly needed by the needy aged, blind, and dependent children.

MAJOR PROVISIONS NOT IN CONFERENCE

On many of the equally important measures of this legislation which so directly affects so many millions of Americans the House and the Senate were in agreement. These provisions included:

OLD AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE

First. The 7-percent increase in benefits across the board which will immediately affect some 20 million beneficiaries, also providing them with a September bonus since the increase is effective retroactively to January 1, 1965.

Second. The increase from age 18 to 22 for some 295,000 surviving or dependent children who continue in school is also retroactive and the September bonus for these young people will, it is hoped, make it possible for them to return to school this fall with a new dress or a new pair of shoes, or to purchase other necessities which may mean the difference as to whether they can continue in school.

Third. Some 185,000 widows, it is estimated, will take advantage of the change which provides actuarially reduced benefits for them at age 60, rather than waiting 2 years, until they reach the age 62 requirement in existing law.

Fourth. Another 355,000 of our oldest Americans who are in their seventies and are not now eligible for benefits at all would qualify through a liberalization of the eligibility requirements to provide a basic benefit of $35 at age 72 or over if they have from 3 to 5 quarters—depending on age—acquired at any time since the beginning of the program in 1937. Present law, as you know, requires a minimum of 6 quarters. By this transitional adjustment many of these people who do not have coverage because they spent most of their work life at an occupation—such as farming—which was actually excluded from coverage until 1955 or because of other of the various exclusions which characterized the more limited coverage of the early years of the system, will be brought under social security's umbrella. With today's much broadened coverage reaching at least 9 out of 10 of our working population, this transitional provision will no longer be required after a few years and it will wash out because people coming on the rolls in the future will almost universally be able to qualify on the basis of their covered earnings, or as dependents and survivors of a breadwinner with sufficient covered earnings.

Fifth. Certain coverage changes strengthen the law by (a) including self-employed physicians; (b) liberalizing the income treatment for self-employed farmers; and (c) improving certain State and local coverage provisions. In addition certain religious groups opposed to insurance are exempted.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

First. An estimated 7,200,000 of our most needy aged, blind, disabled, and dependent children will find themselves better able to cope with today's living costs through an increase in the Federal share of our public assistance programs for cash payment purposes. This purpose will be accomplished by a new matching formula which will provide increases, on the average, of $2.50 a month for adults and $1.25 for children.

Second. When another 100,000 to 150,000 of our aged, who are patients in institutions for tuberculosis or mental diseases receive their first public assistance payments on January 1, 1966, I will have realized a hope that has long been close to my heart. For I have always deplored the fact that a vestigual practice, developed over the years, has disinherited these people from any Federal assistance. In order to make sure that the unfortunate victims of these afflictions directly benefit from this new provision, the bill provides that States will receive additional Federal funds only to the extent they increase their own expenditures for mental health purposes under their public health and public welfare programs.

CHILD HEALTH AND WELFARE

The concern of the Congress that America's children have a right to good health care—particularly the vital preventive case so important in the early days of life—is reflected in a number of changes, which substantially increases the amounts authorized for maternal and child health, crippled children, and child welfare services for the present and in the year immediately ahead of us. Moreover, a new 5-year grant program is authorized for special project grants to provide comprehensive health care and service for preschool or school age children, particularly in areas with concentrations of low-income children. Grants are also authorized for the next 2 fiscal years for the purpose of assisting States to implement and followup on plans to combat mental retardation under the legislation which was passed in 1963.

Finally, it is, perhaps, peculiarly fitting and proper that 1965 should be the year of enactment of this great package of social legislation. The men and women who were born at the turn of the century, in 1900, are this year reaching a 65th birthday which will entitle them to the kind of health care to which they deserve, as well as to more adequate cash benefits.

Let me emphasize again that this is not hastily conceived legislation. It has received the kind of painstaking consideration over the years—and particularly over the last months—that such a monumental bill deserves and demands. It reflects the mandate of the American people in the election of last fall. Introduced on the opening day of this Congress, with the distinguishing bill numbers of H.R. 1 and S. 1, the administration's original proposal has, through the most careful consideration and consultation as to each of its many details, been tested—and tried. During these deliberations seemingly staggering stalemates were met and resolved with the result that the original bill has been greatly improved and expanded. In late January, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives began weeks of study before they were ready to report the bill to the House in early April. When the bill reached the Senate, after House passage, it received equally serious and painstaking, but rewarding, consideration. Prior to opening the hearings on April 29, the Committee on Finance had a 3-day briefing session on all of its many parts. This was followed by 2½ weeks of hearings, in late April and well into May, during which witnesses representing various points of view were heard, and their suggestions and positions recorded. Then the committee, in executive session, began its deliberations which, during the month of June weighed issue after issue to come forth with the bill reported to the Senate on June 30. The first week of July brought 3 days of discussion and debate on the Senate floor. For a full week, the conferees of the House and Senate met regularly, both in the morning and in the afternoon, to resolve the many points of difference, while the legislative technicians worked far into the night to bring into final form the bill which is before us today. In all, the Finance Committee spent 27 hours in executive session, 36 hours in hearings, and then another 27 hours in conference with our colleagues, the House conferees.

In my opening remarks, I described this bill as legislation for the present and the future—legislation to meet changing conditions. But in closing I also wish to point out that the spirit in which this law is written draws deeply upon the ancient dreams of all mankind. In Leviticus it is written:

> Thou shall rise up before the hoary head, and honor the face of an old man.

We are writing history today.

I hope we may soon see the bill signed into law.

EXHIBIT 1

PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF H.R. 6675, AS AGREED TO BY HOUSE-SENATE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

A. HEALTH INSURANCE AND MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

The bill would add a new title XVIII to the Social Security Act providing two related health insurance programs for persons 65 or over:

(1) A basic plan in part A providing protection against the costs of hospital and related care; and

(2) A voluntary supplementary plan in part B providing protection against the costs of physicians' services and other medical and health services to cover certain areas not covered by the basic plan.

The basic plan would be financed through a separate payroll tax and separate trust fund. The plan would be actuarially sound under conservative cost assumptions. Benefits for persons currently over 65 who are not insured under the social security and railroad retirement systems would be financed out of Federal general revenues.

Enrollment in the supplementary plan would be voluntary and would be financed by a small monthly premium ($3 per month initially) paid by enrollees and an equal amount supplied by the Federal Government out of general revenues. The premiums for social security, railroad retirement, and civil service retirement beneficiaries who voluntarily enroll would be deducted from their monthly insurance benefits. Uninsured persons desiring the supplemental plan would make the periodic premium payments to the Government.

Both the basic plan and the supplementary plan would become effective July 1, 1966.

The bill would also add a new title XIX to the Security Security Act which would provide a more effective Kerr-Mills program for the aged and extend its provisions to additional needy persons. It would allow the States to combine within a single uniform category the differing medical provisions for the needy which currently are found in five titles of the Social Security Act. Medical vendor provisions in existing law would expire, however, on December 31, 1969.

A description of these three programs follows:

1. Basic plan—hospital insurance

General description: Basic protection, financed through a separate payroll tax, would be provided by H.R. 6675 against the costs of inpatient hospital services, posthospital extended care services, posthospital home health services, and outpatient hospital diagnostic services for social security and railroad retirement beneficiaries when they attain age 65. Benefits for railroad retirement eligibles would be financed by the railroad retirement tax if certain conditions are met. The same protection, financed from general revenues, would be provided under a special transitional provision for essentially all people who are now aged 65, or who will reach 65 in the near future, but who are not eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits.

Effective date: Benefits would first be defective on July 1, 1966, except for services in extended care facilities which would be effective on January 1, 1967.

Eligibility for protection under the basic plan

The proposed basic hospital insurance would be provided (on the basis of a new section in title II of the act) for people aged 65 and over who are entitled to monthly social security benefits or to annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act. In addition, people who are now aged 65 or will reach 65 within the next few years and who are not insured under the social security or railroad programs would nevertheless be covered under the basic plan. In July 1966, when the program would become effective, about 17 million people aged 65 and over who are eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits, and about 2 million aged who would be covered under a special transitional provision, would have the proposed basic hospital insurance.

Included under the special provision would be all uninsured people who have reached 65 before 1968. As to persons reaching 65 after 1967, they would have to have the quarters of coverage that are indicated in the following table:

Quarters of coverage required for OASI cash benefits as compared to hospital insurance

Year attains age 65	Men		Women	
	OASI	Hospital insurance	OASI	Hospital insurance
1967 or before	6–16	0	6–13	0
1968	17	6	14	6
1969	18	9	15	9
1970	19	12	16	12
1971	20	15	17	15
1972	21	18	18	(1)
1973	22	21		
1974	23	(1)		

[1] Same as OASI.

As indicated in the table, by 1974 the quarter coverage required for cash benefits and hospitalization insurance benefits will be the same and the transitional provision will phase out.

Together, these two groups comprise virtually the entire aged population. The major group excluded will be individuals afforded protection under the provisions of the Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act. Federal employees who retired before February 16, 1965, and who did not have coverage under the Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act on that date would be covered under the transitional provision for the uninsured. Others excluded would be aliens (unless they have been admitted for permanent residence and have been residents of the United States for 5 years) and certain people convicted of subversive crimes.

Currently, 93 percent of the people reaching age 65 are eligible for benefits under social security or railroad retirement and this percentage will rise to close to 100 percent as the program matures.

Benefits: The services for which payment would be made under the basic plan include:

1. Inpatient hospital services for up to 90 days in each spell of illness. The patient pays a deductible amount of $40 for the first 60 days plus $10 a day for 30 days in excess of 60 for each spell of illness; hospital services would include all those ordinarily furnished by a hospital to its inpatients; however, payment would not be made for private duty nursing or for the hospital services of physicians except services provided by medical or dental interns or residents in training under approved teaching programs. Inpatient psychiatric hospital service would also be included, but a lifetime limitation of 190 days would be imposed.

2. Posthospital extended care (in a facility having an arrangement with a hospital for the timely transfer of patients and for furnishing medical information about patients) after the patient is transferred from a hospital (after at least a 3-day stay) for up to 100 days in each spell of illness, but after the first 20 days of care patients will pay $5 a day for the remaining days of extended care in a spell of illness.

3. Outpatient hospital diagnostic services, with the patient paying a $20 deductible amount and a 20-percent coinsurance for each diagnostic study (that is, for diagnostic services furnished to him by the same hospital during a 20-day period); and

4. Posthospital home health services for up to 100 visits, after discharge from a hospital (after at least a 3-day stay) or extended care facility and before the beginning of a new spell of illness. Such a person must be in the care of a physician and under a plan established by a physician within 14 days of discharge calling for such services. These services would include intermittent nursing care, therapy, and the part-time services of a home health aid. The patient must be homebound, except that when certain equipment is used, the individual could be taken to a hospital or extended care facility or rehabilitation center to receive some of these covered home health services in order to get advantage of the necessary equipment.

Christian Scientists are treated separately so that they will have sanatorium services of up to 60 days with $40 deductible plus 30 additional days at $10 coinsurance per day, as hospital service; plus an additional 30 days in a Christian Science sanatorium as extended care facility services with the $5 per day coinsurance feature.

No service would be covered as posthospital extended care or as outpatient diagnostic or posthospital home health services if it is of a kind that could not be covered if it were furnished to a patient in a hospital.

A spell of illness would be considered to begin when the individual enters a hospital or extended care facility and to end when he has not been an inpatient of a hospital or extended care facility for 60 consecutive days.

The deductible amounts for inpatient hospital and outpatient hospital diagnostic services would be increased if necessary to keep pace with increases in hospital costs, but no such increase would be made before 1969. The coinsurance amounts for long-stay hospital and extended care facility benefits would be correspondingly adjusted. Increases in the hospital deductible will be made only when a $4 charge is called for and the outpatient deductible will change in $2 steps.

Basis of reimbursement: Payment of bills under the basic plan would be made to the providers of service on the basis of the "reasonable cost" incurred in providing care for beneficiaries.

Administration: Basic responsibility for administration would rest with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; however, some administration for individuals under the railroad retirement system is vested in the Railroad Retirement Board if certain financing conditions are met, as explained under the next heading. The Secretary would use appropriate State agencies and private organizations (nominated by providers of services) to assist in the administration of the program. Provision is made for the establishment of an Advisory Council which would advise the Secretary on policy matters in connection with administration.

Financing: Separate payroll taxes to finance the basic plan, paid by employers, employees, and self-employed persons, would be earmarked in a separate hospital insurance trust fund established in the Treasury. The amount of earnings (earnings base) subject to the new payroll taxes would be the same as for purposes of financing social security cash benefits. The same contribution rate would apply equally to employers, employees, and self-employed persons and would be as follows:

	Percent
1966	0.35
1967–70	.50
1971–72	.50
1973–75	.55
1976–79	.60
1980–86	.70
1987 and after	.80

The taxable earnings base for the health insurance tax would be $6,600 a year beginning in 1966.

The schedule of contribution rates is based on estimates of cost which assume that the earnings base will not be increased above $6,600.

The benefits for railroad retirement eligibles will be financed by the railroad retirement tax, which is automatically increased by the operation of this bill, but the tax will be paid into the hospital insurance trust fund. During any period that the railroad retirement wage base is not equivalent to the hospital insurance earnings base, railroad workers and employers will be taxed as other workers and employers, and the benefits for railroad retirement eligibles will be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The cost of providing basic hospital and related benefits to people who are not social security or railroad retirement beneficiaries would be paid from general funds of the Treasury.

2. Voluntary supplemental medical insurance plan

General description: A package of benefits supplementing those provided under the basic plan would be offered to all persons 65 and over on a voluntary basis. Individuals who enroll initially would pay premiums of $3 a month (deducted, where possible, from social security or railroad retirement benefits). The Government would match this premium with $3 paid from general funds. Since the minimum increase in cash social security benefits under the bill for workers retiring or who retired at aged 65 or older would be $4 a month ($6 a month for man and wife receiving benefits based on the same earnings record), the benefit increases would fully cover the amount of monthly premiums.

Eligibility: The proposed supplementary insurance would be available to all people age 65 and over (whether or not they are social security or railroad retirement beneficiaries) who are residents of the United States and either are citizens or aliens admitted for permanent residence who have had 5 years of continuous residence. Any person entitled to the basic hospital insurance benefit would be eligible regardless of the preceding requirements.

Enrollment: Persons who have reached age 65 before January 1, 1966, will have an opportunity to enroll in an enrollment period which begins on the first day of the second month after the month of enactment and ends March 31, 1966.

Persons attaining age 65 subsequent to December 31, 1965, will have enrollment periods of 7 months beginning 3 months before the month of attainment of age 65.

In the future, general enrollment periods will be from October to December 31 in each odd-numbered year. The first such period will be October 1 to December 31, 1967.

No person may enroll more than 3 years after the close of the first enrollment period in which he could have enrolled.

There will be only one chance to reenroll for persons who are in the plan but drop out, and the reenrollment must occur within 3 years of termination of the previous enrollment.

Coverage may be terminated (1) by the individual filing notice during an enrollment period, or (2) by the Government for nonpayment of premiums.

A State would be able to provide the supplementary insurance benefits for its public assistance recipients who are receiving cash assistance if it chooses to do so.

Effective date: Benefits will be effective beginning July 1, 1966.

Benefits: The voluntary supplementary insurance plan would cover physicians' services, home health services, and numerous other medical and health services in and out of medical institutions.

There would be an annual deductible of $50. Then the plan would cover 80 percent of the patient's bill (above the deductible) for the following services:

1. Physicians' and surgeons' services, whether furnished in a hospital, clinic, office, in the home, or elsewhere.

2. Home health service (with no requirement of prior hospitalization) for up to 100 visits during each calendar year.

3. Diagnostic X-ray, diagnostic laboratory tests, and other diagnostic tests.

4. X-ray, radium, and radioactive isotope therapy.

5. Ambulance services.

6. Surgical dressings and splints, casts, and other devices for reduction of fractures and dislocation; rental or durable medical equipment such as iron lungs, oxygen tents, hospital beds, and wheelchairs used in the patient's home, prosthetic devices (other than dental) which replace all or part of an internal body organ; braces and artificial legs, arms, eyes, etc.

There would be a special limitation on outside-the-hospital treatment of mental, psychoneurotic, and personality disorders. Payment for such treatment during any calendar year would be limited, in effect, to $250 or 50 percent of the expenses, whichever is smaller.

Administration by carriers—Basis for reimbursement: The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be required, to the extent possible, to contract with carriers to carry out the major administrative functions relating to the medical aspects of the voluntary supplementary plan such as determining rates of payments under the program and holding and disbursing funds for benefit payments. No contract is entered into by the Secretary unless he finds that the carrier will perform its obligations under the contract efficiently and effectively and will meet such requirements as to financial responsibility, legal authority, and other matters as he finds pertinent. The contract must provide that the carrier take necessary action to see that where payments are on a cost basis (to institutional providers of service), the cost is a reasonable cost. Correspondingly, where payments are on a charge basis (to physicians or others furnishing noninstitutional services), the carrier must see that such charge will be reasonable and not higher than the charge applicable, for a comparable service and under comparable circumstances, to the other policyholders and subscribers of the carrier. Payment by the carrier for physicians' services will be made on the basis of a receipted bill, or on the basis of an assignment under the terms of which the reasonable charge will be the full charge for the service. In determining reasonable charges, the carriers would consider the customary charges for similar services generally made by the physician or other person or organization furnishing the covered services, and also the prevailing charges in the locality for similar services.

Financing: Aged persons who elect to enroll in the supplemental plan would pay monthly premiums of $3. Where the individual is currently receiving monthly social security, railroad retirement, or civil service retirement benefits, the premiums would be deducted from his benefits.

The Government would help finance the supplementary plan through a payment from general revenues in an equal amount of $3 a month per enrollee. To provide an operating fund, if necessary, at the beginning of the supplementary plan, and to establish a contingency reserve, a Government appropriation would be available (on a repayable basis) equal to $18 per aged person estimated to be eligible when the supplementary plan goes into effect.

The individual and Government contributions would be placed in a separate trust fund for the supplementary plan. All benefit and administrative expenses under the supplementary plan would be paid from this fund.

Premium rates for enrolled persons (and the matching Government contribution) would be increased from time to time if program costs rise, but not more often than once every 2 years. The premium rate for a person who enrolls after the first period when enrollment is open to him or who reenrolls after terminating his coverage would be increased by 10 percent for each full 12 months he stayed out of the program.

Income tax provisions: The bill provides that the 3-percent floor on medical expense deductions, as well as the 1-percent limitation on medicines and drugs, is to apply to those age 65 or over in the same manner as it presently applies to those under age 65. This will have the effect of partially recovering the $3 monthly premium paid from general funds of the Treasury from those aged persons who have taxable income, depending on the amount of their taxable income.

The bill also provides a special deduction, available to those who itemize their deductions, for one-half of any premiums paid for insurance of medical care expenses whether or not they have medical expenses in excess of the 3-percent floor, but this deduction may not exceed $150 per year.

Another change limits the insurance premiums which may be taken into account to those which arise from coverage of medical care expenses and this must be indicated either on the insurance contract or on a separate statement supplied by the insurance company. Still a further change treats as current, qualifying medical care expenses (subject to limitations) the prepayment before age 65 of insurance for medical care after age 65. Also all maximum limitations on the medical expense deduction for all taxpayers are eliminated.

3. Improvement and extension of Kerr-Mills medical assistance program

Purpose and scope: In order to provide a more effective Kerr-Mills medical assistance program for the aged and to extend its provisions to additional needy persons, the bill would establish a single and separate medical care program to consolidate and expand the differing provisions for the needy which currently are found in five titles of the Social Security Act.

The new title (XIX) would extend the advantages of an expanded medical assistance program not only to the aged who are indigent but also to needy individuals in the dependent children, blind, and permanently and totally disabled programs and to persons who would qualify under those programs if in sufficient financial need. Other medically needy children may also be included.

Medical assistance under title XIX must be made available to all individuals receiving money payments under these programs and the medical care or services available to all such individuals must be equal in amount, duration, and scope. Effective July 1, 1967, all children under age 21 must be included who would, except for age, be dependent children under title IV.

Inclusion of the medically indigent aged not on the cash assistance rolls would be optional with the States but if they are included, comparable groups of blind, disabled, and parents and children must also be included if they need help in meeting necessary medical costs. Moreover, the amount and scope of benefits for the medically indigent could not be greater than that of recipients of cash assistance.

Under the bill, the current provisions of law in the various public assistance titles of the act providing vendor medical assistance would terminate upon the adoption of the new program by a State, but in no case later than December 31, 1969.

Scope of medical assistance: Under existing law, the State must provide "some institutional and noninstitutional care" under the medical assistance for the aged program. There are no minimum benefit requirements at all under the other public assistance vendor medical programs.

The bill would require that by July 1, 1967, under the new program a State must provide inpatient hospital services, outpatient hospital services, other laboratory and X-ray services, skilled nursing home services for individuals 21 years of age or older, and physician's services (whether furnished in the office, the patient's home, a hospital, a skilled nursing home or elsewhere), in order to receive Federal participation. Coverage of other items of medical service would be optional with the States.

Eligibility: The program for the needy elderly would be revised to require that the States must provide a flexible income test which takes into account medical expenses and does not provide rigid income standards which arbitrarily deny assistance to people with large medical bills. In the same spirit the bill provides that no deductible, cost sharing, or similar charge may be imposed by the State as to hospitalization under its program and that any such charge on other medical services must be reasonably related to the recipient's income or resources. Also important is the requirement that elderly needy people on the State programs be provided assistance to meet the deductibles that are imposed by the new basic program of hospital insurance. Also where a portion of any deductible or cost sharing required by the voluntary supplementary program is met by a State program, the portion covered must be reasonably related to the individual's income and resources. No income can be imputed to an individual unless actually available; and the financial responsibility of an individual for an applicant may be taken into account only if the applicant is the individual's spouse or child who is under age 21 or blind or disabled.

Increased Federal matching: The Federal share of medical assistance expenditures under the new program would be determined upon a uniform formula with no maximum on the amount of expenditures which would be subject to participation. There is no maximum under present law on similar amounts for the medical assistance for the aged program. The Federal share, which varies in relation to a State's per capita income, would be increased over current medical assistance for the aged matching so that States at the national average would receive 55 percent rather than 50 percent, and States at the lowest level could receive as much as 83 percent as contrasted with 80 percent under existing law.

In order to receive any additional Federal funds as a result of expenditures under the new program, the States would need to continue their own expenditures at their present rate. For a specified period, any State that did not reduce its own expenditures would be assured of at least a 5-percent increase in Federal participation in medical care expenditures. As to compensation and training of professional medical personnel used in the administration of the program, the bill would provide a 75-percent Federal share as compared with the 50–50 Federal-State sharing for other administrative expenses.

Administration: The bill provides that any State agency may be designated to administer the program, as long as the determination of eligibility is accomplished by the agency administering the old-age assistance program.

Effective date: January 1, 1966.

B. CHILD HEALTH AND WELFARE AMENDMENTS

Maternal and child health, crippled children, and child welfare: The bill would increase the amount authorized for maternal and child health services and crippled children's services over current authorizations by $5 million for fiscal year 1966 and by $10 million in each succeeding fiscal year, as follows:

Fiscal year	Existing law	Under bill
1966	$40, 000, 000	$45, 000, 000
1967	40, 000, 000	50, 000, 000
1968	45, 000, 000	55, 000, 000
1969	45, 000, 000	55, 000, 000
1970 and after	50, 000, 000	60, 000, 000

The bill has made a similar increase in the authorization for the child welfare program.

The increases would assist the States, in these programs, in moving toward the goal of extending services with a view of making them available to children in all parts of the State by July 1, 1975.

Crippled children training personnel: The bill would also authorize $5 million for the fiscal year 1967, $10 million for fiscal 1968, and $17.5 million for each succeeding fiscal year to be for grants to institutions of higher learning for training professional personnel for health and related care of crippled children, particularly mentally retarded children and children with multiple handicaps.

Health care for needy children: A new provision is added authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry out a 5-year program of special project grants to provide comprehensive health care and services for children of school age, or for preschool children, particularly in areas with concentrations of low-income families. The grants would be to State health agencies, to the State agencies administering the crippled children's program, to any school of medicine (with appropriate participation by a school of dentistry), and any teaching hospital affiliated with such school, to pay not to exceed 75 percent of the cost of the project. Projects would have to provide screening, diagnosis, preventive services, treatment, correction of defects, and aftercare, including dental services, with treatment, correction of defects, and aftercare limited to children in low-income families.

An appropriation of $15 million would be authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; $35 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; $40 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; $45 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; and $50 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

The bill would further authorize an appropriation of $500,000 each for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967, for grants for studies of resources, methods and practices for prevention and diagnosis of emotional illness in children and for treatment and rehabilitation of emotionally ill children.

Mental retardation planning: Title XVII of the act would be amended to authorize grants totaling $2,750,000 for each of 2 fiscal years—the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. The funds would be available during the 3-year period July 1, 1965, to June 30, 1968. The grants would be for the purpose of assisting States to implement and followup on plans and other steps to combat mental retardation authorized under this title of the Social Security Act.

C. OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE PROVISIONS

1. Benefit changes

(a) 7-Percent Across-the-Board Increase in Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Benefits

The bill provides a 7-percent across-the-board benefit increase, effective retroactively beginning with benefits for January 1965, for the 20 million social security beneficiaries on the rolls (with a guaranteed $4 a month minimum increase for retired workers who are age 65 or over in the first month for which they are paid the increased benefit).

Monthly benefits for workers who retire at or after 65 would be increased to a new minimum of $44 (now $40) and to a new maximum of $135.90 (now $127). In the future, creditable earnings under the increase in the contribution and benefit base to $6,600 a year (now $4,800) would make possible a maximum benefit of $168.

The maximum amount of benefits payable to a family on the basis of a single earnings record would be related to the worker's average monthly earnings at all earnings levels. Under present law, there is a $254 limit on family benefits which operates over a wide range of average monthly earnings. Under the bill the highest family maximum eventually would be $368.

(b) Payment of Child's Insurance Benefits to Children Attending School or College After Attainment of Age 18 and up to Age 22

H.R. 6675 includes the provision adopted by both House and Senate last year which would continue to pay a child's insurance benefit until the child reaches age 22, provided the child is attending a public or an accredited school, including a vocational school or a college, as a full-time student after he reaches age 18. Children of deceased, retired, or disabled workers would be included. No mother's or wife's benefits would be payable if the only child in the mother's care is one who has attained age 18 but is in school.

This provision will be effective January 1, 1965. It is estimated that 295,000 children will be eligible for benefits for September 1965, when the school year begins.

(c) Benefits for Widows at Age 60

The bill would provide the option to widows of receiving benefits beginning at age 60, with the benefits payable to those who claim them before age 62 being actuarially reduced to take account of the longer period over which they will be paid. Under present law, full widow's benefits and actuarially reduced worker's and wife's benefits are payable at age 62.

This provision, adopted by both Houses of Congress last year would be effective for the second month after the month of enactment. It is estimated that 185,000 widows will claim benefits during the first year of operation under this provision.

(d) Amendment of Disability Program

(i) Definition of disability: The bill would eliminate the present requirement that a worker's disability must be expected to be of long continued and indefinite duration, and instead provide that an insured worker would be eligible for disability benefits if he has been under a disability which can be expected to result in death or which has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 calendar months. Benefits payable by reason of this change would be paid for the second month following the month of enactment. An estimated 60,000 people—disabled workers and their dependents—will become immediately eligible for benefits as a result of this change.

(ii) Disability benefits offset provision: The bill provides that the social security disability benefit for any month for which a worker is receiving a workmen's compensation benefit will be reduced to the extent that the total benefits payable to him and his dependents under both programs exceed 80 percent of his average monthly earnings under social security prior to the onset of disability, but with the reduction periodically adjusted to take account of changes in national average earnings levels. The offset provision will be applicable with respect to benefits payable for months after December 1965 on the basis of disabilities commencing after June 1, 1965.

(iii) Blindness as a disabling factor:

(a) Young workers who are blind and disabled: Establishes alternative insured status requirement for workers disabled before age 31 of one-half of the quarters elapsing after age 21 up to the point of disability with a minimum of six quarters. [For insured status under existing law, an individual (1) must have at least 20 quarters of coverage in the 40 quarters ending with the quarter in which the disability begins and (2) must be fully insured.] To qualify for this alternative the worker would have to meet the statutory definition of blindness for the disability "freeze." (Central visual acuity of 5/200 or less in the better eye with use of correcting lens. An eye in which the visual field is reduced to 5° or less concentric contraction shall be considered as having a visual acuity of 5/200 or less.) Worker will, however, have to meet the other regular requirements for entitlement to disability benefits, including inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity.

(b) Older workers who are blind and disabled: Provides that those individuals aged 55 or over who meet the statutory definition of blindness in the disability "freeze" could qualify for cash benefits on the basis of their inability to engage in their past occupation or occupations. Their benefits would not be paid, however, if they were actually engaging in any substantial gainful activity.

(iv) Rehabilitation services: Reimbursement from the social security trust funds to State vocational rehabilitation agencies would be provided for the cost of rehabilitation services furnished to individuals who are entitled to disability insurance benefits or to disabled child's benefits. The total amount of the funds that could be made available from the trust funds for purposes of reimbursing State agencies for such services could not, in any year, exceed 1 percent of the social security disability benefits paid in the previous years.

(v) Entitlement to disability benefits after entitlement to benefits payable on account of age: Under the bill, a person who becomes entitled before age 65 to a benefit payable on account of old age could later, before he reaches age 65, become entitled to disability insurance benefits.

(vi) Allocation of contribution income between old-age, survivors insurance and disability insurance trust funds: Under the bill, an additional 0.2 percent of taxable wages and 0.15 percent of taxable self-employment income would be allocated to the disability insurance trust fund, bringing the total allocation to 0.70 percent and 0.525 percent, respectively, beginning in 1966.

(e) Benefits to Certain Persons at Age 72 or Over

A provision approved by the House and Senate last year, which would liberalize the eligibility requirements by providing a basic benefit of $35 to certain elderly persons with a minimum of three quarters of coverage acquired at any time since the beginning of the program in 1937 was adopted. To accomplish this, a new concept of "transitional insured status" is provided. Present law requires a minimum of six quarters of coverage in employment or self-employment.

(i) Men and women workers: Under the "transitional insured status" provision a worker could qualify for benefits at age 72 if he had one quarter of coverage for each year that elapsed after 1950 and up to the year in which he reached age 65 (62 for women), with a minimum of three quarters. Those quarters could have been acquired at any time since the inception of the program in 1937. Wives of workers who qualify under this provision would be eligible for benefits if they reached age 72 before 1969. For workers who reached age 65 (62 for women) after 1956, the quarters of coverage requirement merges with the present minimum requirement of six quarters.

The following table illustrates the operation of the "transitional insured status" provision for workers.

Transitional insured status requirements with respect to workers benefits

Men		Women	
Age (in 1965)	Quarters of coverage required	Age (in 1965)	Quarters of coverage required
76 or over	3.	73 or over	3.
75	4.	72	4.
74	5.	71[1]	5.
73 or younger	6 or more.	70 or younger.	6 or more.

[1] Benefits will not be payable, however, until age 72

(ii) Widows: Any widow who attains age 71 in or before 1965, if her husband died or reached age 65 in 1954 or earlier, could get a widow's benefit when she is aged 72 or over if her husband had at least three quarters of coverage. Present law requires six quarters. If the husband of such a widow died or reached 65 in 1955, the requirement would be four quarters. If he died or reached 65 in 1956, the requirement would be five quarters. If he died or reached 65 in 1957 or later, the minimum requirement would be six quarters or more, the same as present law.

For widows reaching age 72 in 1967 and 1968, there is a "grading in" of the quarters of coverage requirement; which would be four or five quarters of coverage, respectively. Widows reaching age 72 in 1969 or after would be subject to the requirements of existing law of six or more quarters of coverage.

The table below sets forth the requirements as to widows:

Transitional insured status requirements with respect to widow's benefits

Year of husband's death (or attainment of age 65, if earlier)	Present quarters required	Proposed quarters required for widow attaining age 72 in—		
		1966 or before	1967	1968
1954 or before	6	3	4	5.
1955	6	4	4	5.
1956	6	5	5	5.
1957 or after	6 or more.	6 or more.	6 or more.	6 or more.

(iii) Basic benefits: Men and women workers who would be eligible under the above-described provisions for workers would receive a basic benefit of $35 a month. A wife who is aged 72 or over (and who attains that age before 1969) would receive one-half of this amount, $17.50. No other dependents' basic benefits would be provided under these provisions.

Widows would receive $35 a month under the above-described provision.

These provisions would become effective for the second month after the month of enactment, at which time an estimated 355,000 people would be able to start receiving benefits.

(f) Retirement Test

The bill would liberalize the retirement test provision in present law under which benefits are decreased in relation to a beneficiary's earnings over $1,200 in a year. Under existing law, the first $1,200 a year is fully exempted, and there is a $1 reduction in benefits for each $2 of annual earnings between $1,200 and $1,700 and for each $1 of earnings thereafter. Under the bill, the first $1,500 a year would be fully exempted and there would be a $1 reduction in benefits for each $2 of earnings between $1,500 and $2,700 and for each $1 of earnings thereafter. In addition, the amount of earnings a beneficiary may have in a month and get full benefits for that month regardless of his annual earnings would be raised from $100 to $125. These changes are effective for taxable years ending after 1965.

Also exempted are certain royalties received in or after the year in which a person reaches age 65, from copyrights and patents obtained before age 65, from being counted as earnings for purposes of the retirement test, effective for taxable years beginning after 1964.

For 1966, an estimated 750,000 persons—workers and dependents—either will receive more benefits under these provisions than they would receive under present law, or will receive some benefits where they would receive no benefits under present law.

(g) Wife's and Widow's Benefits for Divorced Women

The bill would authorize payments of wife's widow's benefits to the divorced wife of a retired, deceased, or disabled worker if she had been married to the worker for at least 20 years before the date of the divorce and if her divorced husband was making (or was obligated by a court to make) a substantial contribution to her support when he became entitled to benefits, became disabled, or died. H.R. 6675 would also provide that a wife's benefits would not terminate when the woman and her husband are divorced if the marriage has been in effect for 20 years. Provision is also made for the reestablishment of benefit rights for a divorced wife, a widow, or a surviving divorced wife who remarries and the subsequent marriage ends in divorce, annulment, or in the death of the husband. These changes are effective for the second month following the month of enactment.

(h) Continuation of Widow's and Widower's Insurance Benefits After Remarriage

Under present law, a widow's and widower's benefits based on a deceased worker's social security earnings record generally stop when the survivor remarries. The bill provides that benefits would be payable to widows age 60 or over and to widowers age 62 or over who remarry. The amount of the remarried widow's or widower's benefit would be equal to 50 percent of the primary insurance amount of the deceased spouse (if that amount is higher than her wife's benefits as a result of the remarriage) rather than 82½ percent of that amount, which is payable to widows and widowers who are not remarried.

(i) Adoption of Child by Retired Worker

The provisions relating to the payment of benefits to children who are adopted by old-age insurance beneficiaries would be changed to require that, where the child is adopted after the worker becomes entitled to an old-age benefit, (1) the child must be living with the worker (or adoption proceedings have begun) in or before the month when application for old-age benefits is filed; (2) the child must be receiving one-half of his support for the entire year before the worker's entitlement; and (3) the adoption must be completed within 2 years after the worker's entitlement.

(j) Definition of Child

(i) A child would be paid benefits based on his father's earnings without regard to whether he has the status of a child under State inheritance laws if the father was supporting the child or had a legal obligation to do so. Under present law, whether a child meets the definition for the purpose of getting child's insurance benefits based on his father's earnings depends on the laws applied in determining the devolution of interstate personal property in the State in which the worker is domiciled. This provision would be effective for the second month after the month of enactment. It is estimated that 20,000 individuals (children and their mothers) will become immediately eligible for benefits under this provision.

(ii) Also an exception is provided so that child's benefits would not terminate if child is adopted by his brother or sister after death of worker. Under present law benefits terminate unless he is adopted by his stepparent, grandparent, uncle, or aunt after death of worker on whose earnings record he is getting benefits.

2. Coverage changes

The following coverage provisions were included:

(a) Physicians and Interns

Self-employed physicians would be covered for taxable years ending on or after December 31, 1965. Interns would be covered beginning on January 1, 1966.

(b) Farmers

Provisions of existing law with respect to the coverage of farmers would be amended to provide that farm operators whose annual gross earnings are $2,400 or less (instead of $1,800 or less as in existing law) can report either their actual net earnings or 66⅔ percent (as in present law) of their gross earnings. Farmers whose annual gross earnings are over $2,400 would report their actual net earnings if over $1,600, but if actual net earnings are less than $1,600, they may instead report $1,600. (Present law provides that farmers whose annual gross earnings are over $1,800 report their actual net earnings if over $1,200, but if actual net earnings are less than $1,200, they may report $1,200.)

(c) Cash Tips

Cash tips received after 1965 by an employee in the course of his employment will be covered as wages for social security and income-tax withholding purposes, except that employers will not be required to pay the social security employer tax on the tips. However, for tips to be subject to withholding for either income tax or social security tax purposes, the tips must be paid in cash and must amount to more than $20 a month. The tips still represent compensation even though less than $20 a month or even though paid in other than cash, but would not, under either of these conditions, be subject to withholding for income tax or social security tax purposes.

The employee will be required to give his employer a written report of his tips within 10 days after the end of the month in which the tips are received (or at such other times as is provided by regulations); to the extent that unpaid wages due an employee and in the possession of the employer are insufficient to pay the employee social security tax due on the tips, the employee will be permitted (but not required) to make available to the employer sufficient funds to pay the employee social security tax. To the extent that the employer does not have sufficient wage payments to offset the required withholding, he notifies the employee and the employee reports this amount to the Government directly.

The employer will be required to withhold the employee social security tax only on tips reported to him within the specified time and for which he has sufficient funds of the employee out of which to pay the tax. He will be liable for withholding income tax on only those tips that are reported to him within 10 days after the end of the month in which the tips were received, and then only to the extent that he can collect the tax (at or after the time the tips are reported to him and before the close of the calendar year in which the tips were received) from unpaid wages (not including tips), or from funds turned over to him for that purpose remaining after an amount equal to the amount due for the social security tax has been subtracted.

As indicated, these amendments apply with respect to tips received by employees in 1966 and subsequent years.

(d) State and Local Government Employees

Several changes would facilitate coverage in this area:

(i) Added Alaska as a State which can provide coverage for State and local employees under the split-system provision; also validated the past coverage of certain school districts in Alaska.

(ii) Reopened until July 1, 1967, a provision of law permitting the State of Maine to treat teaching and nonteaching employees actually in the same retirement system as though they were in separate retirement systems for social security coverage purposes.

(iii) Authorized the State of Iowa and the State of North Dakota to modify their coverage agreements to exclude from social security coverage certain service performed in any calendar quarter in the employ of a school, college, or university by a student if the remuneration for such service is less than $50.

(iv) Authorized another opportunity, through 1966, for the election of coverage by State and local government retirement system members who originally did not choose coverage under the divided retirement system provision, under which current employees have a choice of coverage.

(v) Authorized California to modify its coverage agreement to extend coverage to certain hospital employees whose positions were removed from a State or local government retirement system. The State will have until the end of the sixth month after the month of enactment to take action under this provision.

(e) Exemption of Certain Religious Sects

Members of certain religious sects who have conscientious objections to insurance (including social security) by reason of their adherence to the established tenets or teachings of such sects could be exempt from the social security tax on self-employment income upon application accompanied by a waiver of benefits.

(f) Nonprofit Organizations

Nonprofit organizations, and their employees who concur, could elect social security coverage effectively retroactively for a period up to 5 years (rather than 1 year, as under present law). Also, wage credit could be given for the earnings of certain employees of nonprofit organizations who were erroneously reported for social security purposes.

(g) District of Columbia Employees

The bill provides for social security coverage of certain employes of the District of Columbia (primarily subtitute school teachers).

(h) Ministers

Social security credit could be obtained for the earnings of certain ministers which were reported but which cannot be credited under present law. Also the bill reopened until April 15, 1966, the period (which expired on April 15, 1965) during which ministers who have been in the ministry for at least 2 years may file waiver certificates electing social security coverage.

3. Miscellaneous

(a) Filing of Proof

The period of filing of proof of support for dependent husband's, widower's, and parent's benefits, and for filing application for lump-sum death payments where good cause exists for failure to file within the initial 2-year period, is extended indefinitely.

(b) Automatic Recomputation of Benefits

Benefits of people on the rolls would be recomputed automatically each year to take account of any covered earnings that the worker might have had in the previous year and that would increase his benefit amount. Under existing law there are various requirements that must be met in order to have benefits recomputed, including filing of an application and earnings of over $1,200 a year after entitlement.

(c) Military Wage Credits

The present provision authorizing reimbursement of the trust funds out of general revenue for gratuitous social security wage credits for servicemen is revised so that such payments will be spread uniformly over the next 50 years.

(d) Extension of Life of Applications

The bill liberalizes the requirement in existing law that an application for monthly insurance benefits be valid for only 3 months after the date of filing, and for disability benefits 3 months before the beginning of the waiting period. The bill would allow an application to remain valid up until the time the Secretary makes a final decision on the application.

(e) Authorization for One Spouse To Cash a Joint Check

The Secretary would be authorized to make a temporary overpayment so as to permit a surviving spouse to cash a benefit check issued jointly to a husband and wife if one of them dies before the check is negotiated; any overpayment resulting from the cashing of the joint check would be recovered.

(f) Attorney's Fees

A provision is incorporated which would permit a court that renders a judgment favorable to a claimant in an action arising under the social security program to set a reasonable fee (not in excess of 25 percent of past due benefits which become payable by reason of the judgment) for an attorney who successfully represented the claimant. The Secretary would be permitted to certify payment of the fee to the attorney out of such past due benefits.

(g) Waiver of 1-Year Marriage Requirement

The bill provides an exception to the 1-year duration requirement as to social security benefits for any widow, wife, husband, or widower who was, in the month before marriage, actually or potentially entitled to railroad retirement benefits as a widow, widower, parent, or disabled adult child.

(h) Social Security Records

The Social Security Administration is required to furnish the address to help locate a deserting parent or husband to a welfare agency or court on condition that information be transmitted through a welfare agency, that an actual public assistance case be involved and a court order for support have been issued, and that all nondisclosure provisions be complied with.

4. Financing of social security programs

Earnings base: The bill provides an earnings base of $6,600 effective in 1966. The earnings base in existing law is $4,800.

The following are the tax rates for the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system:

OASDI tax rates

[In percent]

Years	Employer-employee rate (combined)	Self-employed rate
1966	7.7	5.8
1967–68	7.8	5.9
1969–72	8.8	6.6
1973 and after	9.7	7.0

The allocation to the disability insurance trust fund is set at 0.70 percent of taxable wages and 0.525 of self-employment income. The figures under existing law are 0.50 and 0.375 percent, respectively.

5. Number of people immediately affected by OASDI changes in first full year, 1966

Provision:	
7-percent benefit increase ($4 minimum in primary benefits)	20,000,000
Reduced benefits for widows at age 60	185,000
Benefits for people aged 72 and over with limited periods in covered work	355,000
Improvements in benefits for children:	
Benefits for children to age 22 if in school	295,000
Broadened definition of "child"	20,000
Modifications in disability provisions:	
Change in definition	60,000
Liberalized requirements for benefits for the blind	7,000
Modification of earnings test	[1] 750,000

[1] Number affected in 1966; modification does not become effective until then.

D. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS

1. Increased assistance payments

The Federal share of payments under all State public assistance programs is increased a little more than an average of $2.50 a month for the needy aged, blind, and disabled, and an average of about $1.25 for needy children, effective January 1, 1966. This is brought about by revising the matching formula for the needy aged, blind, and disabled (and for the adult categories in title XVI), to provide a Federal share of $31 out of the first $37 (now twenty-nine thirty-fifths (29/35) of the first $35) up to a maximum of $75 (now $70) per month per individual on an average basis. The matching formula is revised for aid to families with dependent children so as to provide a Federal share of five-sixths (5/6) of the first $18 (now fourteen-seventeenths (14/17) of the first $17) up to a maximum of $32 (now $30). A provision is included so that States will not receive additional Federal funds except to the extent they pass them on to individual recipients.

Effective January 1, 1966. Cost: About $150 million a year.

2. *Tubercular and mental patients*

The exclusion was removed from Federal matching in old-age assistance and medical assistance for the aged programs (and for combined program, title XVI) as to aged individuals who are patients in institutions for tuberculosis or mental diseases or who have been diagnosed as having tuberculosis or psychosis and, as a result, are patients in a medical institution. Requires as condition of Federal participation in such payments to, or for, mental patients certain agreements and arrangements to assure that better care results from the additional Federal money. Provides that States will receive not more in Federal funds under this provision than they increase their expenditures for mental health purposes under public health and public welfare programs. Also removes restrictions as to Federal matching for needy blind and disabled who are tubercular or psychotic and are in general medical institutions. Effective January 1, 1966. Cost about $75 million a year.

3. *Aid to families with dependent children in school*

A provision, optional with the States, allows them to continue making payments to dependent children who have attained age 18 but continue in school up to age 21. Present law calls for regular attendance at a high school or vocational school. The bill would extend this to attendance at a school, college, or university.

4. *Protective payments to third persons*

The bill includes a provision for protective payments to third persons on behalf of recipients of old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and those on combined adult program (title XVI), unable to manage their money because of physical or mental incapacity. Effective January 1, 1966.

5. *Income exemptions under public assistance*

(a) Old-Age Assistance

The earnings exemption under the old-age assistance program (and aged in combined program) is increased so that a State may, at its option, exempt the first $20 (now $10) and one-half of the next $60 (now $40) of a recipient's monthly earnings. Effective October 1, 1965. Cost: About $1 million first year.

(b) Aid to Families With Dependent Children

The bill allows the State, at its option, to disregard up to $150 per family per month of earned income of any dependent children under the age of 18 in the same home, but no child could have earnings of more than $50 per month exempted. Effective July 1, 1965.

(c) Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled

An exemption of earnings is added so that, at the option of the State, the first $20 per month of earnings of recipients and one-half of the next $60 could be exempted. In addition, any additional income and resources could be exempted as part of an approved plan to achieve self-support during the time the recipient was undergoing vocational rehabilitation. Effective October 1, 1965.

(d) Income Exemption for all Public Assistance Programs

Allowed States, at their option, to disregard not more than $5 per month per recipient of any income in all five public assistance programs. Effective October 1, 1965.

(e) Aid-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance (Retroactive Increase)

States would be allowed to disregard so much of the OASDI benefit incerase (including the children in school after 18 modification) as is attributable to its retroactive effective date.

(f) Economic Opportunity Act Earning Exemption

H.R. 6675 also provides a grace period for action by States that have not had regular legislative sessions, whose public assistance statutes now prevent them from disregarding earnings of recipients received under titles I and II of the Economic Opportunity Act.

(g) Income Exempt Under Another Assistance Program

A provision is added so that any amount of income which is disregarded in determining eligibility for a person under one of the public assistance programs shall not be considered in determining the eligibility of another individual under any other public assistance program.

6. *Uniform matching*

The bill permits a State that has a medical assistance program under title XIX to claim Federal sharing in total expenditures for money payments under other titles, under the same formula used for determining the Federal share for medical assistance under title XIX.

7. *Definition of medical assistance for aged*

The definition of medical assistance for the aged is modified so as to allow Federal sharing as to old-age assistance recipients for the month they are admitted to or discharged from a medical institution.

8. *Judicial review of State plan denials*

The bill provides for judicial review of the denial of approval by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of State public assistance plans and of his action under such programs for noncompliance with State plan conditions in the Federal law.

E. ACTUARIAL DATA RELATING TO BILL

TABLE 1.—*Summary of 1st-year costs under H.R. 6675*

[In millions of dollars]

	Trust funds		
	House	Senate	Conference
Health care programs:			
Basic hospital insurance	2,190	2,403	2,210
Voluntary supplementary medical	[1] 600	[1] 600	600
MAA liberalization			
Total	2,790	3,003	2,810
OASDI:			
7 percent benefit increase	1,430	1,470	1,470
Child school benefits	195	195	195
Broader definition of child		10	10
Child disabled at 18 to 21		10	
Blind disability		120	5
Reduced benefits at 60	165	590	165
Transitional benefits at 72	140	140	140
Disability definition	105	40	40
Retirement test	65	590	295
Total	2,100	3,165	2,320
Public assistance and child health:			
Increase in formula			
TB and mental exclusion			
Coverage of MA			
Maternal and child health			
Miscellaneous			
Total			
Income tax changes			
Total, all programs	4,890	6,169	5,130

	General Treasury		
	House	Senate	Conference
Health care programs:			
Basic hospital insurance	275	295	290
Voluntary supplementary medical	600	600	600
MAA liberalization	200	200	200
Total	1,075	1,095	1,090
OASDI:			
7 percent benefit increase			
Child school benefit			
Broader definition of child			
Child disabled at 18 to 21			
Blind disability			
Reduced benefits at 60			
Transitional benefits at 72			
Disability definition			
Retirement test			
Total			
Public assistance and child health:			
Increase in formula	150	150	150
TB and mental exclusion	75	75	75
Coverage of MA		50	40
Maternal and child health	60	61	61
Miscellaneous	6	13	13
Total	291	349	339
Income tax changes	−82		−97
Total, all programs	1,284	1,444	1,332
Grand total, House		6,174	
Grand total, Senate		7,612	
Grand total, conference		6,462	

[1] Contributions of participants.

TABLE 2

OASDI TAX RATES

[In percent]

Years	Employer-employee rate			Self-employed rate, conference
	House	Senate	Conference	
1966	8.0	7.7	7.7	5.8
1967-68	8.0	7.7	7.8	5.9
1969-72	8.8	9.0	8.8	6.6
1973 and after	9.6	9.9	9.7	7.0

TABLE 2—Continued

HI TAX RATES

[In percent]

Years	Employer-employee rate			Self-employed rate, conference
	House	Senate	Conference	
1966	0.7	0.65	0.7	0.35
1967-70	1.0	1.0	1.0	.50
1971-72	1.0	1.1	1.0	.50
1973-75	1.1	1.3	1.1	.55
1976-79	1.2	1.4	1.2	.60
1980-86	1.4	1.6	1.4	.70
1987 and after	1.6	1.7	1.6	.80

COMBINED OASDI AND HI TAX RATES AND TAXES UNDER CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

Years	Employer-employee		Self-employed	
	Rate	Maximum amount	Rate	Maximum amount
1966	8.4	$554.40	6.15	$405.90
1967-68	8.8	580.80	6.40	422.40
1969-72	9.8	646.80	7.10	468.60
1973-75	10.8	712.80	7.55	498.30
1976-79	10.9	719.40	7.60	501.60
1980-86	11.1	732.60	7.70	508.20
1987 and after	11.3	745.80	7.80	514.80

TABLE 3.—*Changes in actuarial balance of OASDI system, expressed in terms of estimated level-cost as percentage of taxable payroll*

Item	OASI	DI	Total
Actuarial balance of previous system	+.014	−0.13	+0.01
Earnings base increase to $6,600	+.51	+.04	+.55
Revised contribution schedule	+.09	+.20	+.29
Extensions of coverage	+.01		+.01
7 percent benefit increase	−.59	−.05	−.64
Earnings test liberalization	−.14		−.14
Child's benefits to age 22 if in school	−.10	−.02	−.12
Reduced widow's benefits at age 60			
Disability definition revision		−.01	−.01
Transitional insured status at age 72	−.01		−.01
Broader definition of "child"	−.01		−.01
Total effect of changes	−.24	+.16	−.08
Actuarial balance of bill	−.10	+.03	−.07

TABLE 4.—*Actuarial balance of HI system, expressed in terms of estimated level-cost as percentage of taxable payroll*

[Level-cost in percent]

Hospital and extended care facility benefits	1.19
Outpatient diagnostic benefits	.01
Home health service benefits	.03
Total benefits	1.23
Contributions	1.23
Actuarial balance	0.00

Prepared by Robert J. Myers, Chief Actuary, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, July 21, 1965.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am pleased to see that the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is present in the Chamber on this occasion. I salute him for the great contribution he has made to this legislation.

Some of the most significant and controversial provisions of this measure are matters for which he labored long and hard. He has known both victory and defeat in fighting these battles. I know that the enactment of this bill is a great victory for the Senator.

As one who worked with him in studying, voting, and helping to enact this legislation, I express to the Senator my great appreciation for his diligent work on this measure.

I have mentioned this matter before, but I particularly thank him on this occasion for the excellent work he did as a Senate conferee.

I believe the Senator from New Mexico was present during almost every moment of the conference during the full week of morning and afternoon sessions. He was one of the most effective Senators in the committee, on the floor, and in conference.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Louisiana. I hope that the Senator from Louisiana and other Senators realize the great contribution which was made by the Senator from Louisiana. The Senator from Louisiana is a vigorous campaigner inside the conference room as well as on the floor.

I believe that the Senator from Louisiana performed a distinguished service on this measure. I thank the Senator for myself, and on behalf of the Senate.

I believe that we should take note of the vote by which this measure was passed in the House. While 237 Democrats and 70 Republicans voted for the measure, 48 Democrats and 68 Republicans voted against the measure. There was a ratio of 5 to 1 on the Democratic side voting for the measure. I believe this is a remarkable achievement. It demonstrates the character of the legislation.

A great debt of thanks is owed to other Senators for the work that has been done on behalf of this measure.

Those of us who have been through two or three fights on this matter know how hard vote getting is. The passage of this measure is a great achievement for us all.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from New Mexico worked very long and hard for the medicare sections of this measure. I recall some years ago when the Senator had fought so diligently for that most controversial feature of the bill and lost, that I saw a picture in the newspaper of the Senator congratulating the victor on that occasion, the late Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Kerr.

The Senator has proved to us throughout the years that he can be both a good winner and a good loser. Many people find it difficult to be both a good winner and a good loser. The Senator has worth in this regard. I again salute him.

While the ranking Republican member on our committee, the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] did not feel that he could in conscience support the measure, he acted in the best traditions of the Senate. He did not delay the bill. He expedited its consideration. He made clear his feelings that he did not wish to vote for the measure, but that he also did not wish to impede the Senate in its work in the committee, on the floor, or in conference. The Senator from Delaware urged that the Senate proceed with its business and decide these important matters, rather than save them until later, because he felt that they are important matters to the Nation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Senator said that I was present at the conference at all times. I was. I am glad that I did not miss a moment of the conference.

I believe it should also be noted that, along with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] did a marvelous job during the consideration of this measure. Neither the Senator from Delaware nor the Senator from Kansas delayed the matter unnecessarily.

They presented their point of view rather vigorously, almost too vigorously at times, but always honestly.

I believe that the Senate can, and should, be proud of these Senators for the work they did. I want the record to show that the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Kansas were fine conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They both worked very hard to improve the bill. Even though I suspect that my friend the Senator from Delaware, may not vote for the conference report when it comes to a final vote, he nevertheless worked to make it the best bill possible. He signed the conference report, as did the Senator from Kansas, even though, in a number of instances, he was working as a Senate conferee to improve a bill which he opposed as a Member of the Senate.

I feel that the action of Senators has been in the best tradition of statesmanship, in that, while they opposed certain features of the measure, they sought to support the will of the Senate in the conference in order to make the measure the best bill that could be hammered out by Congress and by the conferees.

I also wish to make reference to the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], who was an extremely helpful conferee and who worked diligently to sustain the Senate position on the Senate amendments.

We were not always able to obtain everything that we wanted. On some amendments we very reluctantly had to yield. We fought vigorously, on some occasions for several hours on end, to try to see that the position of the Senate was respected by the House. We tried to make the will of the Senate prevail. I believe that from the point of view of the Senate, this has been a successful conference, even though we would have liked to prevail to an even greater extent.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I believe that a word or two must be said concerning the able chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. Although the Senator from Virginia was opposed to the bill, at all times he expedited the work of the committee. He evidenced a very fine attitude throughout the conference, from which he emerged with more respect and friendship than he had before the conference.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico. I certainly share his viewpoint.

As I said in my speech on the bill when it passed the Senate, the distinguished chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], even though he was adamantly opposed to the bill, voted consistently to improve the bill in every respect.

The Senator from Virginia did nothing whatever to impede the action on the measure. In fact, he cooperated so that in the end the measure represents the prevailing view of the Senate, even though there were many items to which he could not in conscience subscribe.

I join the Senator from New Mexico in all of his statements with regard to the Senators mentioned and with regard to all committee members. I am sure it would apply to the Senate as a whole.

I pay tribute to our distinguished chairman for his statesmanship and devotion to duty and to the best traditions of the U.S. Senate.

GRACE PERIOD FOR STATES TO COME INTO CONFORMITY WITH TITLE XIX OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I deeply regret that the House-Senate conferees did not see fit to accept all of the amendment which I successfully offered in the Senate pertaining to the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act.

Amendment 513 added two provisions—a new section 1118 of the Social Security Act—relating to the Federal share of expenditures for public assistance. First, it would permit any State which has in effect a plan approved under the new title XIX, which is the consolidated and expanded Kerr-Mills program, to claim equal Federal participation in its expenditures under all of its Federal-States public assistance programs by application of the new formula contained in title XIX instead of using the varying formulas in the existing titles.

Second, it would permit any State, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1966, which could meet substantially all of the objectives and requirements of the new title XIX under its assistance programs approved under the other titles of the Social Security Act to receive Federal participation in its medical assistance expenditures by application of the formula provided in title XIX and, at its option, to have this formula applied in determining the Federal share for its money payments.

No similar provisions were in the House bill. The House-Senate conferees agreed to the general Federal-State matching provisions of my amendment, but, regretfully, rejected the grace period provision.

This latter provision was an optional provision. It did not require the States to choose that route. They could seek implementing legislation from their State legislatures immediately, rather than choose the route of the grace period through June 30, 1966. The fundamental reason for providing this alternative was that in several States, State senates are under court orders to reapportion. In four instances—Connecticut, Hawaii, Vermont, and Washington—the Federal courts originally held that the legislature or the State senate could not meet except for the purpose of redistricting itself. While these orders were subsequently modified, it is possible in the foreseeable future that as a result of a court order there will be a hiatus or vacuum in political power in several of our States until the reapportionment question is resolved. The result would be that the legislature or part of it could not meet to pass implementing legislation and take advantage of the new and improved Kerr-Mills program which will go into effect on January 1, 1966. The California State Legislature is now under Federal court order to reapportion. Final court decree has not yet been handed down. I do not know what the nature of it may be. That is the reason for providing a grace period which could be utilized by my State or any other State which finds itself in a similar situation.

I regret to say that the California State administration bitterly opposed this provision and were largely responsible for its being deleted. They argued, and I quote from a letter dated July 14, 1965, by Paul D. Ward, administrator of the health and welfare agency, written on behalf of Governor Brown:

> This amendment would not avoid the necessity of action by the State legislature nor would we deem this to be the proper course even if it were possible. For example, the legislature would have to be reconvened to modify present statutory limitation on PAMC.

Mr. Ward goes on to make what essentially are administrative arguments that it would be better to secure the necessary enabling legislation. No one can deny that. But that is not the question. The question is: If you cannot secure a meeting of the legislature because one house or both houses may be under a court order not to meet on substantive matters until they have redistricted, then what do you do? In brief, the State administration, rather than support an alternative procedure, which it could exercise at its sole option, should the court not rule as they think it will, would restrict itself to no alternative but to deprive needy citizens in California of the necessary Federal matching funds, should the court initially rule as they did in these other States. This is a gamble which ought not to be undertaken. Maybe the State administration will be right on its gamble. For the sake of my fellow Californians, I hope so. But I think it is an unnecessary risk to take when people's livelihoods and health needs are at stake.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 83) to authorize the President to issue a proclamation commemorating the 175th anniversary, on August 4, 1965, of the founding of the U.S. Coast Guard at Newburyport, Mass.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 510) to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2984) to amend the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities by extending the expiration date thereof and providing increased support for the program, to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2985) to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7984) to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1321) to amend section 501(e) of title 16 of the District of Columbia Code relating to bond requirements in connection with attachment before judgment.

NATIONAL AMERICAN LEGION BASEBALL WEEK — LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6, 1965, as "National American Legion Baseball Week."

LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATION: A FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I rise today to address the Senate on a matter crucial to the future health and vitality of this Nation. The very strength of our federal system lies in the constitutional sharing of power by the Federal Government and by the States, under a Federal Constitution which has endured and developed for over 180 years. The rapid urbanization of this Nation has created severe population imbalances within each State, and the drive for a return to equality of legislative representation first began in the courts. Because of their successful resolution of the problem—because the Supreme Court rightly insisted that the Constitution requires equality in representation—we are today involved in this serious discussion.

The first cases, brought in State courts on the basis of violation of State constitutional provisions, stopped far short of solving the problems presented. State courts felt limited in the relief they felt able to grant. Judges declared themselves unable to order legislatures to take legislative action, unable to order at-large elections, and unable to draw up apportionment plans on their own initiative.

Of course, the Federal courts at first refused to act on the issue at all. In the famous case of *Colegrove* v. *Green*, 328 U.S. 549 (1946), involving Illinois congressional districts, the Supreme Court of the United States refused by a vote of four to three to consider the merits of the case. Three of the four Justices thought that the question was one of those which courts are unable to decide because it involved essentially political rather than judicial issues. On the basis of the Colegrove case, the courts generally refrained from adjudicating apportionment cases until 1962.

But in 1962, the court was faced with a Tennessee legislature which had last apportioned in 1901. In the 60 years following, population growth in the counties in the State had been uneven, causing large discrepancies among legislative district populations. A group of urban voters filed suit in 1959 in the Federal district court charging that the failure of the legislature to reapportion had deprived them of their constitutional rights. They charged that they were denied in particular the right of equal protection of the laws guaranteed against State interference by the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The lower Federal court dismissed the action on the basis of Colegrove against Green, but the Supreme Court, voting 6 to 2, held that the action was a proper one for judicial consideration and that the plaintiffs could properly bring the action. *Baker* v. *Carr*, 369 U.S. 186 (1962).

During the first year following Baker against Carr, cases challenging legislative apportionments were filed in 36 States, Twenty-five decisions were handed down—19 of which struck down existing apportionment schemes in one or both houses. Some 15 legislatures revised their apportionments to some extent.

Subsequent to its decision in Baker against Carr, the Supreme Court in *Gray* v. *Sanders*, 372 U.S. 368 (1963), invalidated the county unit system employed in Georgia, which counted votes cast for State officers in statewide elections, and, in *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1 (1964), held that congressional districts must be composed of substantially equal numbers of people. After these decisions, there still remained some uncertainty as to whether the Supreme Court would require that population be the principle of apportionment in both house of State legislatures.

On June 15, 1964, the Supreme Court resolved that question, if not the controversy which later arose, by holding that in both Houses of a bicameral legislature, districts must be "as nearly of equal population as is practicable." *Reynolds* v. *Sims*, 377 U.S. 533, 579 (1964). In all, there were six decisions affecting as many States. The Reynolds case arose out of Alabama, and similar cases were decided in New York, Maryland, Virginia, Delaware, and Colorado cases. One week later, nine other cases pending before the Supreme Court were remanded, per curiam, for further proceedings in the light of Reynolds and its companions. These cases involved Florida, Washington, Idaho, Ohio, Oklahoma, Illinois, Michigan, Connecticut, and Iowa.

The reaction to the June 15 decisions was much more critical than had been the reaction to Baker against Carr. Immediate steps to obtain a constitutional amendment were begun in and out of Congress. Congress found itself engaged at the end of the 2d session of the 88th Congress in extended consideration of measures which would have directed the Federal courts to delay apportionment decisions for periods up to 4 years, thus allowing time for a constitutional amendment to be proposed and ratified. But nothing was enacted.

What involved the Congress also involved the States. As of March 1965, all States but Oregon and South Carolina have been involved in reapportionment struggles or lawsuits. Four States have acted to some extent without being forced by court order. The other 44 States have been directly involved in Federal and State court suits. Four of these latter States were reapportioned by the courts, while 22 others are under order to reapportion one or both Houses of their legislatures. In seven others, suits are presently pending. Fourteen States have reapportioned since initiation of cases or decisions involving them and at this time have no new litigation pending.

Senate Joint Resolution No. 2, the sire of many offspring, provides clearly that a State could apportion one house of a bicameral legislature "upon the basis of factors other than population," and allows legislatures to give "reasonable weight to factors other than population in apportioning a unicameral legislature." This proposal has been vigorously attacked in extended hearings before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, in March, April, and May of this year. Since then, the progeny of this amendment have been presented to the members of the committee and the Senate for their consideration. The version we consider today was first introduced on the floor last Thursday. It provides that:

> The people of a State may apportion one house of a bicameral legislature using population, geography, or political subdivisions as factors, giving each factor such weight as they deem appropriate, or giving similar weight to the same factors in apportioning a unicameral legislature.

In my judgment and in the judgment of many of my colleagues, this language is no more acceptable than the original proposal.

The rule under the Supreme Court cases is clear. The Federal constitutional picture has been brought into focus and greatly clarified. These cases established that the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment requires substantially equal legislative representation for all citizens of the State. This is the basic concept and the basic rule against which our arguments must be measured. Those cases required that States make an honest and good faith effort to construct districts in both houses of its legislature as nearly of equal population as is practicable.

The Court declared its holding concisely and clearly in Reynolds against Sims:

> We hold that, as a basic constitutional standard, the equal protection clause requires that the seats in both houses of a bicameral State legislature must be apportioned on a population basis. Simply stated, an individual's right to vote for State legislators is unconstitutionally impaired when its weight is in a substantial fashion diluted when compared with votes of citizens living in other parts of the State. (Id., 568.)
>
> (W)e mean that the equal protection clause requires that a State make an honest and good faith effort to construct districts, in both houses of its legislature, as nearly or equal population as is practicable. We realize that it is a practical impossibility to arrange legislative districts so that each one has an identical number of residents, or citizens, or voters. Mathematical exactness or precision is hardly a workable constitutional requirement. (Id., 577.)

The amendment under discussion would clearly strike back at the effect and force of those Supreme Court decisions. It seeks to limit the elective franchise, contrary to the trend and development of legislative and judicial constitutional law. The principle of equal representation is deeply ingrained in the political history and background of this Nation. The entire course of our national constitutional development from the Declaration of Independence to the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is a history of opening up and broadening the scope of elective franchise. A whole series of struggles was fought over removing suffrage qualifications based on ancestry, property, religion, race, sex, and status.

We have adopted five amendments to our Constitution which expand, rather than limit the franchise. The 15th amendment guarantees all citizens of the United States the right to vote, regardless of race or color. The 17th amendment provides for the direct election of U.S. Senators. The 19th amendment extends the franchise to women. The 23d amendment allows the residents of the District of Columbia to vote for President and Vice President of the United States. The 24th amendment outlaws the poll tax in Federal elections.

And, indeed, in this session of the Congress, we have taken another step in the implementation of the guarantees of the 14th and 15th amendments to insure that Negroes in every part of the Union can exercise the right of suffrage. How ironical it would be for the same Congress which passed the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to approve and submit to the States a constitutional amendment which would make possible the deprivation of Negro and white citizens' right to equal representation in our State legislatures.

I submit that we must stand opposed to measures which would restrict or reduce the rights guaranteed by the Constitution, and the denial or reduction is no less objectionable whether accomplished by the dictation of a single tyrant or a majority.

Regardless of the particular form the proposed amendments take, they all share two fundamental defects. First, they would, at best, permit a bare majority of the voters participating in an initiative or referendum to deny to individual citizens, to others and to themselves, the right to equal representation and to the equal protection of the laws. It is my contention that no majority of whatever size has the right to deprive citizens of the several States of their right to equal protection of the laws any more than can be denied the basic constitutional rights of speech or of religion. If such basic rights, as are enumerated in the first amendment to the Constitution, would be repealed by constitutional amending procedures, the American democracy as we know it now would cease to exist. The same result would follow if we allow the present proposal to be attached to our Constitution. Second, these amendments would continue or make possible in practice minority rule over State governments by giving control of one house of the legislature to an over-represented area, interest group, or class of people. In short, the amendment proposed today is tantamount to legalized ballot-box stuffing. Dilution of the right to have one's vote count is wrong whether done by election fraud, or by legalizing a discount rate on a man's vote. I see little difference between stuffing extra votes into the ballot box and stuffing extra weight into the votes of certain citizens. The result is the same—to pervert our system of representative government.

I do not see how section I of the 14th amendment could be any more clear. It provides:

> No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

It seems plain to me that allowing one citizen's vote to be 500 times as effective as another citizen's vote is to deny the latter the equal protection of the laws. And this is a result that we cannot and should not tolerate.

In the past history of our Nation, there has been agitation and widespread support for amendments providing that States might limit the freedom of speech of groups advocating violent change in our Government; limit the freedom to assemble of persons who advocate or practice civil disobedience; or provide any system of public education of the respective races which the people may desire. In each of these cases, whatever the majority may have willed, it was determined that these rights should not be sacrificed.

We are dealing with a matter here so fundamental that to state the proposition is to make the most convincing case and argument for it. Senate Joint Resolution 2 and the resolution presently before the Senate abridges one of the most fundamental of political rights, the right of the individual to be equally represented in the legislature which controls public affairs in his State and appropriates his taxes.

John Locke maintained over 300 years ago that a majority must not infringe fundamental rights, even though his doctrine of legislative supremacy held that the legitimacy of governmental actions depended upon the consent of the governed expressed in majority rule. Thomas Jefferson in 1819 wrote:

> Equal representation is so fundamental a principle in a true republic that no prejudices can justify its violation, because the prejudices themselves cannot be justified.

The whole point is that the majority does not have the power, and we must not allow it the power, under our constitutional system, to deprive the minority or any person of rights so basic and so fundamental to our Republic. The political equality of all citizens was eloquently expressed by Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It is not the prerogative of any majority to reduce this right, nor is it the right of any citizen to give up this right for another person. It is as well true that no citizen of the United States may sell himself or his brother to bondage or slavery. In like manner, that person is without power to give up his equal representation in the legislature of his State.

If there is any belief fundamental and absolutely necessary to our Constitution, it is the belief that there are and do exist certain unalienable rights which man cannot contract nor give away, and which a bare majority of citizens cannot deny them. This question is not a proper one for a referendum. It is not subject to an election.

On the other hand, the proponents of the amendment argue that States should be allowed to take into account economic or social interests of minority groups. Although it is true that legislatures represent all economic, social, and political interests within their States, no one of those groups is entitled to special representation. After all, it is the people who have the interests, and what the proponents are doing is certifying certain interests to be the recipients of special representation. Or rather, they seek to allow malapportioned legislatures to do this. They incorrectly assume that interests are identifiable and that everyone having an interest is affected the same way. Each person, however, belongs to a number of interest groups, and people in urban and rural areas share many, many interests today.

It is only when the majority seeks to deprive the minority of fundamental, unalienable, and constitutional rights that we must check the power of the majority. The rights of minorities are to be protected by constitutional guarantees, enforced by the courts, through rules of legislative procedure, through political party operations, and in other ways, but not through unusual representation in the legislature. Unequal representation does not safeguard minority rights, but gives the minority the power to make policy—which cannot be said to be a minority right.

The idea of representation of interest groups was long ago rejected in England with the demise of the "Rotten Boroughs," which were based on just that justification. Prof. Carl Auerbach, of the University of Minnesota Law School, has observed:

> Nothing is more fundamental to representative government—and therefore more constitutional, than the rules governing the electoral process itself. No reason consistent with the democratic ideals of equality and majority—or minorities—rule has been advanced for not effectuating the equal population principle. (See Auerbach, "The Reapportionment Cases," 1964 Supreme Court Rev. 1, 67.)

Can we really believe that the rights of citizens of the several States and of the United States depend upon the vote of the electorate? We do not submit the right of free exercise of religion to the electorate. We do not submit the rights of speech, press, or assembly to the electorate. We do not let the majority decide whether we shall have trial by jury, the right of counsel, or due process of law.

I think that those proponents would not admit that a majority of the people of a State in a referendum could prevent Negroes from voting, even though the majority so voted. For they believe, and sincerely believe, that the right to vote of all citizens is unalienable. They believe that to prevent a minority, whether it be Jewish, Negro, or other, from exercising the right to vote is not within the ability of the majority to prohibit. In like fashion, I believe, and I think the Senate should follow the rule, that the right to be equally represented is also as fundamental, and may not be abridged by a majority, whether in a referendum or by action of a malapportioned State legislature.

In testimony before the subcommittee, Prof. Royce Hanson, American University professor, said:

> Here is the nub of the issue. Of all the decisions about fundamental rights a majority should not make, the question of how the majority can be formed is among the least appropriate of all. Perhaps I could look with sympathy on an amendment abolishing legislatures and permitting the people by referendum to decide directly every issue of public importance. At least, every man would have an equal right to participate and his vote would be equal to that of every other voter. But I must emphatically oppose any system that permits a majority found on a single day to prejudice by a single vote the power arrangement within which all subsequent

decisions must be made, and by which every individual citizen must then abide.

Any representative system which purports to exclude or dilute population from its makeup is a system which inevitably discriminates against some people and in favor of others. It is simply impossible to represent factors other than population without discrimination against people. Only people can be represented. Other factors, such as geography, or political subdivisions, are simply means of manipulating political power to reduce the political equality of some people and to perpetuate incumbents in office.

People elect and authorize representatives to represent them, because they have needs and interests at stake. Cows, trees, and rocks cannot authorize someone to represent them.

In the absence of legislative representation based on population, the drawing of lines for legislative representation will be done by those in power, and such distributing of legislative representation will be the product of political chicanery, fraud, and self-interest. The word "gerrymander" has a long and shameful connotation in American political history, and not without justification. That word is a tribute to those who will use power in a cynical and selfish way to perpetuate their own interests or the interests of a special group, in complete and total disregard of the rights of the majority and minority. And this is not speculation, for the whole history of legislative apportionment reflects the urge of incumbents to perpetuate themselves. We know that it is too much to expect of a politician to vote himself out of office. The very fact that the Tennessee legislature, before Baker against Carr, did not apportion itself for over 60 years is a reflection of this natural human tendency. The real result of allowing State legislatures to draw lines on the basis of factors other than population will not be to give special weight to the interests of rural citizens or farmers, but to allow a privileged few to give greater representation to their friends and to the interests which are most accommodating to them.

It is said that the express purpose of this amendment is to preserve the rights of rural minorities. It is said that they should have a voice in State policies greater than their numbers if they are to survive attempt by nonsympathetic urban dwellers to disregard farm problems and concentrate solely on urban problems. But, I could not be more concerned about the serious plight of the family farmer in the United States today. And I challenge those who favor this amendment to point to any malapportioned State legislature which has done anything significant or of importance to help the farmer.

But today the farmer is low man on our economic totem pole. To drag in the red herring of reapportionment serves no good purpose. It merely distracts our attention from the extremely serious and meaningful task of taking positive steps to improve farm income. And I know what a tremendous task this is, because I sit on the Senate Agriculture Committee, which is now engaged in the very difficult and arduous task of drafting farm legislation.

In my judgment, the arguments of those who seek to justify malapportioned legislatures on this ground are malicious attempts to set farmers against city dwellers, and to encourage suspicion and hostility between them.

In addition, the rural people in Minnesota are not just farmers, they are smalltown dwellers, they are merchants, they are businessmen, bankers, and people from all walks of life with diverse and wide-ranging interests. I would not want an urban majority to have the power to draw population lines or geographic lines or political subdivision lines which would give the urban majority unequal and superior representation in their State legislatures. And, this could happen under the proposed amendment, if an urban majority came into power—and they are and will.

I do not want to see the day when big cities can draw up a legislative scheme which will deprive our farmers of their right to equal representation. That day will come, for the trend is unmistakably toward urban majorities. Within the next 50 years, the number of those in large urban areas will increase from 70 to 80 percent of our population. During the next 15 years 30 million people will be added to our cities. We have to look forward to the future. The amendment proposed today is extremely dangerous to the political health of rural America. The friend of the farmer—those vitally concerned as I am with the health of rural America—should applaud the Supreme Court's insistence on full weight, equal representation for those in the farm areas. Their numbers in proportion to the rest of the population shrink every day.

In addition, it is being suggested that a possible compromise solution to the reapportionment question would be to permit apportionment on the basis of other factors with population if the legislature which draws up the apportionment plan is fairly and equally apportioned on the basis of population. This would be no more satisfactory than the present proposal. It would still permit discrimination against some citizens. The only difference would be that the citizens in danger of being discriminated against would be rural rather than urban or suburban. In short, Mr. President, I am against giving any type of legislative majority—urban or rural—the right to discriminate against the minority. I want to guarantee every citizen—whether he lives in the city, on a farm or in a suburb—his right to fair representation.

My position, and the position of my colleagues in this discussion, is that equal representation must be our most fundamental political commitment. And, we must resist any attempts at discrimination between different voters in our society.

I speak from strength in adopting a position opposed to these reapportionment amendments. For my own State, Minnesota, has always had in its constitution a requirement that both houses of our legislature be apportioned on the basis of population. In article IV, section 2, of our Minnesota constitution, it states:

> The representation in both houses shall be apportioned equally throughout the different sections of the State, in proportion to the population thereof.

This provision has remained unchanged since the adoption of the constitution on August 29, 1857. On that date, two constitutional conventions in St. Paul adopted constitutions substantially similar in which have remained to this day the requirement that both Houses be so apportioned. Henry H. Sibley, president of one convention and a delegate from Dakota County in St. Paul, signed a constitution exactly alike in article IV, section 2 as the other convention signed by Mr. A. D. Balcombe on the same date in St. Paul, Minn.

Our State has always adhered to the requirement laid upon it by the Northwest Ordinance, adopted July 13, 1787, by the Continental Congress of the United States. In section XIV, article 2 of that ordinance, the Congress stated that—

> The inhabitants of the said territory shall always be entitled to the benefits of the writ of habeas corpus, and of the trial by jury; of a proportionate representation of the people in the legislature; and of judicial proceedings according to the course of the common law.

Robert L. Tienken, legislative attorney of the Library of Congress, concluded in a study of the apportionment of territorial legislatures in the Northwest Territory that the Congress developed a policy of general and substantial equality of population and equality of representation.

> Rational policies based generally on population or voter standards were, however, practiced, no matter how roughly. And these, rather than area or other conditions were essentially at the base of apportionments in the Northwest Territory. Perfect apportionment there was not, but apportionment on the basis of persons there was. It may not have been exactly one man, one vote, but it was certainly not premised on arbitrary policies or discrimination.

But despite Minnesota's constitutional provision, my State became malapportioned as had many other States in the Union, through the general shift of persons from rural areas and cities to the suburban areas.

In the century which elapsed between the 1857 Minnesota Constitutional Conventions and the 1959 act, the State's legislative districts were reapportioned generally seven times in 1860, 1866, 1871, 1881, 1889, 1897, and 1913. The 1959 act was, therefore, the eighth reapportionment, but the first in 46 years. It was accomplished in 1959, on the basis of the 1950 census, and, therefore, no redistricting based upon the 1960 census has ever yet been effected. On June 4, 1964, in U.S. District Court, District of Minnesota, the case of Honsey against Donovan was brought. That suit was brought to challenge the validity of the then present apportionment of both houses of the bicameral Minnesota Legislature.

That lawsuit was brought because the population of Minnesota increased 14.5 percent between the 1950 census and the

1960 census. This increase was not uniform throughout the State's 87 counties. The increases varied from 18.9 percent in Ramsey County to 141.5 percent in Anoka County, one of our surburban areas. Our 1960 population, according to the Federal census, was 3,413,800. Based on that number each Senate district in the State should have produced an ideal figure of 50,950, and each House district a figure of 25,280. The population of Senate districts ranges from over 100,000 to under 25,000 and, therefore, the largest district in population had almost twice the average figure and the smallest less than half the average figure.

The malapportionment of the House districts was equally as great. The ratio of the largest House district to the smallest was nearly 7 to 1. The ratio of the five largest to the three smallest was over 5 to 1.

If one used the 1960 census figures, then in 1962 a majority of the State's population was represented by only 26 Senators, or 38.8 percent of the 67 seats, and by only 48 Representatives or 35.5 percent of the 135 seats. In reverse, this means the 34 smallest senatorial districts were represented by a majority of the Senate but contained only 39.1 percent of the population. Again, the 68 smallest House districts were represented by a majority of the House but contained only 35 percent of the population.

The Federal district court declared our 1959 State plan of reapportionment unconstitutional on December 4, 1964. Because of the lateness of the case, the court decided not to require redistricting before the convening of the legislature on January 5, 1965. It warned, however, that if the legislature failed to reapportion both houses in 1965, the court might do so or order elections at large. The suit was filed in June of 1964, following which a citizens' bipartisan reapportionment commission was established by our distinguished Gov. Karl F. Rolvaag by Executive order on July 30, 1964.

The Commission proposed tentative reapportionment plans on December 11, 1964, and included a proposed constitutional amendment to insure periodic reapportionment either by the legislature or by a special commission. The legislature did not accept the plan of the citizens' bipartisan reapportionment commission, but worked out another proposal which was vetoed by our Governor in May of 1965. A court test is now underway to determine the validity of Governor Rolvaag's veto.

Before I begin to discuss some of the practical ramifications of adoption of the proposed amendment, I would like to express my views on what seems to be the last dying gasp of the proponents of the amendment, in their advocacy of the Federal analogy argument.

It is true that the Senate of the United States is apportioned by States without regard to population. This results in 26 States with 52 Senators having a majority of the Senate but representing only 16 percent of the population and, as a matter of fact, 17 States with 34 Senators representing only 7 percent of the population, and under the present rule 22 this group can, by filibustering, prevent a vote.

But, any argument based on this situation ignores the fact that a constitutional compromise was necessary to produce the federal union under which we operate today. The issue of the Federal compromise was clear. Certain smaller States threatened to refrain from joining in union, and to make treaty with foreign powers. At the price of this threat, the larger States were willing to enter into an agreement to form two houses as we have them now.

The large States were given the full weight of their size in the House of Representatives, and the small States retained their sovereignty in the Senate. For the small States and all of the original States were independent political units, and the smaller ones extracted equal representation as the price of union. And I think it was worth it.

But none of this procedure of concession and compromise may be found in the establishment of towns, counties, and other political subdivisions in the several States. For each State and all the States together created the United States. In doing so, they reserved to themselves much authority and power. This principle of federalism is a vital ingredient of our liberty.

But, it would be ridiculous to apply it to counties or towns. I know of no one who pretends that counties or cities or political subdivisions within a State can concede or grant to a State such a residual of power. They are creatures of the State—administrative units that can be abolished or created by the State legislature. They exist to provide an orderly framework for the administration of laws and the provision of services.

If and when they prove too cumbersome or ineffective, they can be, and should be, and often are, replaced by units of government more realistically attuned to the needs of the people. In short, the Nation is a union of States which surrendered a portion of their sovereignty to achieve union. The States on the other hand are not unions of county governments or city governments.

I think we should recognize the fact that between 1790, when Vermont was admitted, and 1889, when Montana was admitted, almost 100 years later, every State admitted to the Union entered with a constitution providing for representation based principally on population in both houses of the legislature. In fact, the original constitutions in 36 of the 50 States provided for representation largely in accordance with population in both houses of the legislature. It was not until late in the 19th century that the States began the movement away from representation in accordance with population, sometimes by a change in formula and sometimes simply by failing to live up to their own constitutional requirements.

By the time Baker against Carr was decided in 1962, the movement was virtually complete. Malapportionment was king nearly everywhere. But even by that date no more than 10 States had formulas even roughly comparable to the alleged congressional model, and even those differed somewhat from Congress and from each other. In short, as the Court noted in rejecting the so-called Federal analogy, reliance on it was an "after the fact rationalization offered in defense of maladjusted State apportionment arrangements." Reynolds against Sims at page 573.

I would also note that 27 out of the 36 States providing for population as the primary basis for representation provided that it should be the sole basis. This has been an extremely difficult bone to swallow for those who contend that the very foundations of the Republic were swept away by the Supreme Court decisions of 1964. Senator PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, argued this point brilliantly in the hearings before the Judiciary Subcommittee on March 4, 1965, and his statement is reproduced in the hearings. I recommend it to those Senators who are attracted by the Federal analogy argument.

Now I would like to proceed to what we might expect as the result of the adoption of the proposed amendment. First of all, its adoption would weaken our American system, based on grants of power to the Federal Government by the sovereign States, and reservation of certain powers in those States. Our Constitution provides the United States Constitution, in the 10th amendment, adopted in 1791, states:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

The practical effect of allowing malapportioned and ineffective and stalemated State legislatures to continue will be to increasingly centralize power and control over all phases of social concern in the Federal Government, and allowing the proper role and responsibilities of the several States to slip away and decay.

The plain fact of the matter is that malapportionment of only one house of the legislature, no matter how equally apportioned be the other house, effectively destroys a citizen's equal representation in the legislature. There are two steps in the progress of legislation and appropriation measures through a bicameral legislature. Each of the two houses must pass on them. Therefore, the malapportionment of only one house is sufficient to give a veto of wholly disproportionate influence to those who would delay or dilute progressive legislation and progressive administration.

Those most interested in State's rights in relationship to Federal activities should oppose a constitutional amendment of the type being considered with all their might. Over the past decades, the Federal Government has been forced to assume an ever increasing burden of problems which unfairly apportioned State legislatures have refused or been unable to deal with. Too often the majority of the State citizens must go to Washington and the Federal Government rather than to the State capitals, to lobby for urban redevelopment, air pollution control, water pollution control, mass transit, public housing, educational assistance, and the like. I think it is interesting to note that many of those who complain about a paternalistic and socialistic Federal Government, expanding beyond all reason, are the very same people who are now trying to perpetuate unequal representation in State legislatures leading to delay, frustration, and inaction.

If they are really serious about State's rights, and about the ability of States to help themselves and not come to the Federal Government for assistance, then they must do everything in their power to insure equal representation of all State interests and citizens before both houses of their State legislatures. Continuing and perpetuating malapportioned representation will destroy rather than enhance State sovereignty.

We have heard many times of the celebrated case of Missouri House bill 106, which provided for a minimum wage of $1 per hour within the State of Missouri. The vote was 68 for and 83 against the bill. The 68 votes came from districts representing 2.6 million while the 83 no-votes came from areas that represented a population of only half or 1.3 million. The supporters of this legislation numbered 15 less than the opponents, but yet represented twice as many people. It is certainly no wonder, then, that the majority which was frustrated in Missouri will come to the Federal Government for assistance.

We already know that the cities and urban areas in the Nation have bypassed the States and made direct cooperative arrangements with the Federal Government in such fields as housing, urban development, airports, and defense community facilities. We could also list public works, health needs, highways, crime prevention, educational assistance, poverty prevention, and the list grows longer and longer every day. I personally would not want to see the day when our States become no more than administrative provinces of the Federal Government, only carrying out Federal aid programs and distributing Federal assistance under strict Federal standards.

I believe strongly in the Federal system. I believe that the role of the States must be strengthened and expanded. But State power will depend, not upon what we say about it, but on what State government can do to meet the legitimate needs of its people. State legislatures must be representative if they are to respond to these needs. As one who served in State government, as former attorney general in Minnesota, I know this to be true, and would much rather see the trend reversed.

Many State legislatures, of course, will need other reforms than mere equality of representation. Some of our antiquated State legislatures are the most out-of-date governmental machinery in our Nation.

The issue of civil rights has dominated this Congress, as it has previous Congresses for many years. The issue of civil rights has been a major issue in American society almost since the beginning of our Nation. I am enormously proud of the progress our Nation has made. We will add to the already impressive list of fundamental court decisions and substantial congressional enactments the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which seeks to assure that every person will have the right to vote regardless of his color. The drive for voting rights followed the Reynolds decision—that each man was entitled to a vote of equal strength with all others.

If it had not been for this decision of our Court, the adoption of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 would be folly. To pass the Voting Rights Act, protecting and assuring the right to vote, and then to follow it with a constitutional amendment undercutting the need for the act is to grant the vote with one hand and to take it away with the other. The issue of the Dirksen amendment, therefore, is not limited solely to the fairness of vote apportionment in the abstract, as important as that is, but is fundamental to the objectives of an America in which all Americans are fully and freely admitted to the American political process.

More than that, I am firmly persuaded that more justice, more fair treatment, and more meaningful progress will stem from the admission of the American Negro to full participation in political life than has followed all previous court decisions and all previous enactments in our States and Congress. I say this because I believe that the American Negro, if given his full political power, will be his own best representative in the political field. For this reason I believe the Dirksen amendment would be a disastrous blow to the cause of human rights, even though I know it is not the intention of some of the proponents of this amendment.

Malapportionment has always struck hard at the political rights of the American Negroes. On May 14, 1965, former Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall testified before the subcommittee holding hearings on the proposed amendments. He said:

> Apportionment on any but a population basis, for example, has always discriminated against city dwellers, and this fact proportionally deprives Negroes of a political voice more than any other identifiable group. In 1960, over 72 percent of Negro-Americans lived in urban areas. There is every indication that this percentage is increasing, and increasing rapidly. In Alabama, for example, the percentage of non-whites living in urban areas went up to 23 percent between 1950 and 1960, while those living in rural areas went down almost 20 percent. In Mississippi, the comparable figures were 27.6-percent increase against 2.5-percent increase; in Louisiana, over 20 percent as against 8.6 percent. Of all the Southern States, only Florida showed any increase in the nonwhite population of rural areas, and that increase was slightly over 1 percent as against 71.3 percent in urban areas.

Regardless of the undoubted and unchallenged good faith of those who support the proposed amendment, its passage would be a cynical mockery of those who died in Selma, Birmingham, and elsewhere in their battle for equal voting rights. The right to equal representation is just as basic and fundamental as the right to vote. Representation—equal or otherwise—cannot exist without the vote—and the vote is meaningless without equal representation.

I might conclude my statement by observing that we have not let the courts have sufficient time to implement their decision, and to observe the practical effect of fair reapportionment. The court decisions have resulted in substantial progress and I think it would be premature to amend the Constitution in a hasty manner, without seeing the practical effects of the opposite course, which is to allow the courts more time and to let us have more experience under thoroughly and equally apportioned legislatures.

Since the decision in Baker against Carr, March 26, 1962, court cases have been filed in 44 States, seeking declaration of invalidity of the apportionment of one or both houses of those State legislatures. In the June 15, 1964 reapportionment cases, U.S. Supreme Court invalidated apportionments in six States, and 1 week later on June 22, 1964 invalidated the apportionment schemes of eight additional States.

Twenty-four States began in 1965 under Court orders to reapportion. And since that time four more States have joined the list.

A number of States have reapportioned in 1965 to date. Those presently known are Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, and Washington.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I would like to say that I feel it a distinct honor to participate in this discussion of an issue of high importance to the future course of American democracy. The controversy here is not between rural virtue and urban iniquity—between Republicans and Democrats—between farmers and white-collar workers, but between those who believe that men are entitled to equal representation regardless of their position, and those who feel that certain citizens should be given a greater influence in government than others.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NO MORNING HOUR TOMORROW

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is planned that tomorrow there will be no morning hour, and that immediately after the prayer the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report before the Senate, in the hope of reaching a vote at an early hour.

RECESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 28, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian).

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 27, 1965:

THE JUDICIARY

Anthony J. Celebrezze, of Ohio, to be U.S. circuit judge, sixth circuit, vice Lester L. Cecil, retired.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

John W. Gardner, of New York, to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, vice Anthony J. Celebrezze.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 27, 1965:

UNITED NATIONS

Arthur J. Goldberg, of Illinois, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 19th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 27, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture: Malachi 3: 16: *Then they that feared the Lord spake often one to another.*

Almighty God, unite us now more closely with all who are searching for truth and goodness and give us courage and faithfulness to follow the ways of Thy spirit.

Help us to believe and see that in our day the invading spirit of God and the uprising passion of humanity are desperately and patiently working together to break down all those barriers that have sought to imprison the free spirit with which mankind has been created and endowed.

We know that darkness will descend upon us unless we strive together in the spirit of unity, of fellowship and adventure and relate ourselves to the issues of our time. In praying and laboring for the Kingdom of God may we have faith in the unity of them which differ, however troubled and tangled, and not too great for the purity and power of God to overcome in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 202]

Blatnik
Bonner
Bow
Cahill
Colmer
Derwinski
Diggs
Griffin
Keogh
McVicker
Powell
Pucinski
Rivers, Alaska
Scott
Shipley
Toll
Watson

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 414 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The Clerk proceeded to read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 682)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 4, 6, 9, 12, 16, 19, 22, 41, 42, 49a, 49a, 56, 57, 58, 59, 73a, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 127a, 133, 139, 141, 144, 146, 158, 160, 161, 161a, 162, 162a, 162b, 162c, 164a, 176a, 177, 181, 182a, 182b, 185a, 185b, 186, 195, 196a, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 218, 228, 229 235, 240, 243, 246, 247, 249, 252, 253, 254, 255, 267, 272, 277, 285, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 331, 334, 335, 336, 341, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 421, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 436, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 465, 470, 471, 474, 478, and 510.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 5, 8, 13, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 102, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 134, 135, 136, 137, 140, 142, 143, 145, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 163, 164, 165, 167, 168, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 183, 184, 185, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 194, 196, 197, 200, 201, 202, 204, 207, 208, 214, 215, 217, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 230, 231, 232, 233, 236, 237, 238, 239, 241, 242, 244, 245, 250, 251, 256, 257, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 268, 269, 270, 271, 273, 275, 278, 280, 283, 284, 297, 298, 299, 300, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 313, 314, 315, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 325, 326, 327, 328, 337, 338, 339, 340, 342, 343, 344, 345, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 363, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 459, 463, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, and 509, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TABLE OF CONTENTS

"Title I—Health insurance for the aged and medical assistance

"Sec. 100. Short title.

"Part I—Health Insurance Benefits for the Aged

"Sec. 101. Entitlement to hospital insurance benefits.
"Sec. 102. Hospital insurance benefits and supplementary medical insurance benefits.

"Title XVIII—Health insurance for the aged

"Sec. 1801. Prohibition against any Federal interference.
"Sec. 1802. Free choice by patient guaranteed.
"Sec. 1803. Option to individuals to obtain other health insurance protection.

"Part A—Hospital Insurance Benefits for the Aged

"Sec. 1811. Description of program.
"Sec. 1812. Scope of benefits.
"Sec. 1813. Deductibles and coinsurance.
"Sec. 1814. Conditions of and limitations on payment for services.
  "(a) Requirement of requests and certifications.
  "(b) Reasonable cost of services.
  "(c) No payments to Federal providers of services.
  "(d) Payments for emergency hospital services.
  "(e) Payments for inpatient hospital services prior to notification of noneligibility.
  "(f) Payment for certain emergency hospital services furnished outside the United States.
"Sec. 1815. Payment to providers of services.
"Sec. 1816. Use of public agencies or private organizations to facilitate payment to providers of services.
"Sec. 1817. Federal hospital insurance trust fund.

"Part B—Supplementary Medical Insurance Benefits for the Aged

"Sec. 1831. Establishment of supplementary medical insurance program for the aged.
"Sec. 1832. Scope of benefits.
"Sec. 1833. Payment of benefits.
"Sec. 1834. Limitation on home health services.
"Sec. 1835. Procedure for payment of claims of providers of services.
"Sec. 1836. Eligible individuals.
"Sec. 1837. Enrollment periods.
"Sec. 1838. Coverage period.
"Sec. 1839. Amounts of premiums.
"Sec. 1840. Payment of premiums.
"Sec. 1841. Federal supplementary medical insurance trust fund.
"Sec. 1842. Use of carriers for administration of benefits.
"Sec. 1843. State agreements for coverage of eligible individuals who are receiving money payments under public assistance programs.
"Sec. 1844. Appropriations to cover Government contributions and contingency reserve.

"Part C—Miscellaneous Provisions

"Sec. 1861. Definitions of services, institutions, etc.
"(a) Spell of illness
"(b) Inpatient hospital services.
"(c) Inpatient psychiatric hospital services.
"(d) Inpatient tuberculosis hospital services.
"(e) Hospital.
"(f) Psychiatric hospital.
"(g) Tuberculosis hospital.
"(h) Extended care services.
"(i) Post-hospital extended care services.
"(j) Extended care facility.
"(k) Utilization review.
"(l) Agreements for transfer between extended care facilities and hospitals.
"(m) Home health services.
"(n) Post-hospital home health services.
"(o) Home health agency.
"(p) Outpatient hospital diagnostic services.
"(q) Physicians' services.
"(r) Physician.
"(s) Medical and other health services.
"(t) Drugs and biologicals.
"(u) Provider of services.
"(v) Reasonable cost.
"(w) Arrangements for certain services.
"(x) State and United States.
"(y) Post-hospital extended care in Christian Science extended care facilities.
"Sec. 1862. Exclusions from coverage.
"Sec. 1863. Consultation with State agencies and other organizations to develop conditions of participation for providers of services.
"Sec. 1864. Use of State agencies to determine compliance by providers of services with conditions of participation.
"Sec. 1865. Effect of accreditation.
"Sec. 1866. Agreements with providers of services.
"Sec. 1867. Health insurance benefits advisory council.
"Sec. 1868. National medical review committee.
"Sec. 1869. Determinations; appeals.
"Sec. 1870. Overpayments on behalf of individuals.
"Sec. 1871. Regulations.
"Sec. 1872. Application of certain provisions of title II.
"Sec. 1873. Designation of organization or publication by name.
"Sec. 1874. Administration.
"Sec. 1875. Studies and recommendations.
"Sec. 103. Transitional provision on eligibility of presently uninsured individuals for hospital insurance benefits.
"Sec. 104. Suspension in case of aliens; persons convicted of subversive activities.
"Sec. 105. Railroad retirement amendments.
"Sec. 106. Medical expense deduction.
"Sec. 107. Receipts for employees must show taxes separately.
"Sec. 108. Technical and administrative amendments relating to trust funds.
"Sec. 109. Advisory council on social security.
"Sec. 110. Meaning of term 'Secretary'.
"Sec. 111. Role of the Railroad Retirement Board in the administration of hospital insurance for the aged.

"Part 2—Grants to States for Medical Assistance Programs

"Sec. 121. Establishment of programs.

"Title XIX—Grants to States for medical assistance programs

"Sec. 1901. Appropriation.
"Sec. 1902. State plans for medical assistance.
"Sec. 1903. Payment to States.
"Sec. 1904. Operation of State plans.
"Sec. 1905. Definitions.
"Sec. 122. Payment by States of premiums for supplementary medical insurance.

"Title II—Other amendments relating to health care

"Part 1—Maternal and Child Health and Crippled Children's Services

"Sec. 201. Increase in maternal and child health services.
"Sec. 202. Increase in crippled children's services.
"Sec. 203. Training of professional personnel for the care of crippled children.
"Sec. 204. Payment for inpatient hospital services.
"Sec. 205. Special project grants for health of school and preschool children.
"Sec. 206. Evaluation and report.
"Sec. 207. Increase in child welfare services.
"Sec. 208. Day care services.

"Part 2—Implementation of mental retardation planning

"Sec. 211. Authorization of appropriations.

"Part 3—Public assistance amendments relating to health care

"Sec. 221. Removal of limitations on Federal participation in assistance to individuals with tuberculosis or mental disease.
"Sec. 222. Amendment to definition of medical assistance for the aged.

"Part 4—Miscellaneous amendments relating to health care

"Sec. 231. Health study of resources relating to children's emotional illness.

"Title III—Social security amendments

"Sec. 300. Short title.
"Sec. 301. Increase in old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits.
"Sec. 302. Computation and recomputation of benefits.
"Sec. 303. Disability insurance benefits.
"Sec. 304. Payment of disability insurance benefits after entitlement to other monthly insurance benefits.
"Sec. 305. Disability insurance trust fund.
"Sec. 306. Payment of child's insurance benefits after attainment of age 18 in case of child attending school.
"Sec. 307. Reduced benefits for widows at age 60.
"Sec. 308. Wife's and widow's benefits for divorced women.
"Sec. 309. Transitional insured status.
"Sec. 310. Increase in amount an individual is permitted to earn without suffering full deductions from benefits.
"Sec. 311. Coverage for doctors of medicine.
"Sec. 312. Gross income of farmers.
"Sec. 313. Coverage of tips.
"Sec. 314. Inclusion of Alaska among States permitted to divide their retirement systems.
"Sec. 315. Additional period for electing coverage under divided retirement system.
"Sec. 316. Employees of nonprofit organizations.
"Sec. 317. Coverage of temporary employees of the District of Columbia.
"Sec. 318. Coverage for certain additional hospital employees in California.
"Sec. 319. Tax exemption for religious groups opposed to insurance.
"Sec. 320. Increase of earnings counted for benefit and tax purposes.
"Sec. 321. Changes in tax schedules.
"Sec. 322. Reimbursement of trust funds for cost of noncontributory military service credits.
"Sec. 323. Adoption of child by retired worker.
"Sec. 324. Extension of period for filing proof of support and applications for lump-sum death payment.
"Sec. 325. Treatment of certain royalties for retirement test purposes.
"Sec. 326. Amendments preserving relationship between railroad retirement and old-age, survivors, and disability insurance systems.
"Sec. 327. Technical amendment relating to meetings of board of trustees of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance trust funds.
"Sec. 328. Applications for benefits.
"Sec. 329. Underpayments.
"Sec. 330. Payments to two or more individuals of the same family.
"Sec. 331. Validating certificates filed by ministers.
"Sec. 332. Determination of attorneys' fee in court proceedings under title II.
"Sec. 333. Continuation of widow's and widower's insurance benefits after remarriage.
"Sec. 334. Changes in definitions of wife, widow, husband, and widower.
"Sec. 335. Reduction of benefits on receipt of workmen's compensation.
"Sec. 336. Payment of costs of rehabilitation services from the trust funds.
"Sec. 337. Teachers in the State of Maine.
"Sec. 338. Modification of agreement with North Dakota and Iowa with respect to certain students.
"Sec. 339. Qualification of children not qualified under State law.
"Sec. 340. Disclosure, under certain circumstances, to courts and interested welfare agencies of whereabouts of individuals.
"Sec. 341. Additional period of filing of ministers certificates.
"Sec. 342. Rectifying error in interpreting law with respect to certain school employees in Alaska.
"Sec. 343. Continuation of child's insurance benefits after adoption by brother or sister.

"Sec. 344. Disability insurance benefits for the blind; special provisions.

"*Title IV—Public assistance amendments*

"Sec. 401. Increased Federal payments under public assistance titles of the Social Security Act.
"Sec. 402. Protective payments.
"Sec. 403. Disregarding certain earnings in determining need under assistance programs for the aged, blind, and disabled.
"Sec. 404. Administrative and judicial review of public assistance determinations.
"Sec. 405. Maintenance of State public assistance expenditures.
"Sec. 406. Disregarding OASDI benefit increase, and child's insurance benefit payments beyond age 18, to the extent attributable to retroactive effective date.
"Sec. 407. Extension of grace period for disregarding certain income for States where legislature has not met in regular session.
"Sec. 408. Technical amendments relating to public assistance programs.
"Sec. 409. Eligibility of children over age 18 attending school.
"Sec. 410. Disregarding certain earnings in determining need of certain dependent children.
"Sec. 411. Federal share of public assistance expenditures."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and on page 10, line 17, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "60" and insert the following: "90"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and on page 11, line 4, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "subsections (c) and (d)" and insert the following: "subsection (c)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and on page 11, line 7, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "60 days during such spell; or" and insert the following: "90 days during such spell";.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "spell; or"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 8, line 3, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(2)" and insert the following: "(3)".

On page 8, line 5, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "210 days during his lifetime; or" and insert the following: "190 days during his lifetime".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and on page 11 of the House engrossed bill, after line 10, insert the following:

"(c) If an individual is an inpatient of a psychiatric hospital or a tuberculosis hospital on the first day of the first month for which he is entitled to benefits under this part, the days on which he was an inpatient of such a hospital in the 90-day period immediately before such first day shall be included in determining the 90-day limit under subsection (b)(1) (but not in determining the 190-day limit under subsection (b)(3))."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "(d)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "(e)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "subsections (b), (c), and (d), inpatient hospital services, inpatient psychiatric"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "(f)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 13, line 1, of the House engrossed bill, after "DEDUCTIBLES" insert the following: "AND COINSURANCE".

On page 9, line 21, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "deduction" and insert the following: "coinsurance amount".

On page 10, line 1, of the Senate engrossed amendments, after "for each day" insert the following: "(before the 91st day)".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 10, line 16, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "deduction" and insert the following: "coinsurance amount"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "and (B)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "(other than physicians' services unless furnished by a resident or intern of a hospital)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "year; and (2) the amount of any deduction imposed under section 1813(a)(2)(A) with respect to outpatient hospital diagnostic services furnished in any calendar year shall be regarded as an incurred expense under this part for such year".

On page 35, line 7, of the House engrossed bill, after "except that" insert the following: "(1)".

On page 35, line 10, of the House engrossed bill, after "year" insert the following: "(or regarded under clause (2) as incurred in such preceding year with respect to services furnished in such last three months)".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 36, line 16, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "DURATION OF" and insert the following: "LIMITATION ON HOME HEALTH".

On page 37, of the House engrossed bill, strike out the sentence beginning in line 6 and insert the following: "Payment under this part may be made for home health services furnished an individual during any calendar year only for 100 visits during such year.".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "either (i)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "(ii)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "who has resided in the United States continuously during the 5 years immediately preceding the month in which he applies for enrollment under this part, or (B) is entitled to hospital insurance benefits under part A".

On page 42, line 4, of the House engrossed bill, after "(2)" insert the following: (A).

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 43, line 4, of the House engrossed bill, after the period insert the following: "For purposes of this subsection and subsection (d), an individual who satisfies paragraph (2) of section 1836 solely by reason of subparagraph (B) thereof shall be treated as satisfying such paragraph (2) on the first day on which he is (or on filing application would be) entitled to hospital insurance benefits under part A.".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "none of the preceding provisions of this section applies, or with respect to whom subsection (d)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 138: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 138, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "the calendar year 1967"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 156: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 71, line 22, of the House engrossed bill, strike out ", and such individual" and insert the following: "; and an individual".

On page 71, line 23, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "from the" and insert the following: "from an".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 157: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 157, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "necessary (subject to the second sentence of section 1863);".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 159: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 159, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following: "The term 'extended care facility' also includes an institution described in paragraph (1) of subsection (y), to the extent and subject to the limitations provided in such subsection.".

On page 87 of the House engrossed bill, after line 12, insert the following:

"POST-HOSPITAL EXTENDED CARE IN CHRISTIAN SCIENCE EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

"(y)(1) The term 'extended care facility' also includes a Christian Science sanatorium operated, or listed and certified, by the First Church of Christ, Scientist, Boston, Massachusetts, but only (except for purposes of subsection (a)(2)) with respect to items and services ordinarily furnished by such an institution to inpatients, and payment may be made with respect to services provided by or in such an institution only to such extent and under such conditions, limitations, and requirements (in addition to or in lieu of the conditions, limitations, and requirements otherwise applicable) as may be provided in regulations.

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, payment under part A may not be made for services furnished an individual in an extended care facility to which paragraph (1) applies unless such individual elects, in accordance with regulations, for a spell of illness to have such services treated as post-hospital extended care services for purposes of such part; and payment under part A may not be made for post-hospital extended care services—

"(A) furnished an individual during such spell of illness in an extended care facility to which paragraph (1) applies after—

"(i) such services have been furnished to him in such a facility for 30 days during such spell, or

"(ii) such services have been furnished to him during such spell in an extended care facility to which such paragraph does not apply; or

"(B) furnished an individual during such spell of illness in an extended care facility to which paragraph (1) does not apply after such services have been furnished to him during such spell in an extended care facility to which such paragraph applies.

"(3) The amount payable under part A for post-hospital extended care services furnished an individual during any spell of illness in an extended care facility to which paragraph (1) applies shall be reduced by a coinsurance amount equal to one-eighth of the inpatient hospital deductible for each day before the 31st day on which he is furnished such services in such a facility during such spell (and the reduction under this paragraph shall be in lieu of any reduction under section 1813(a)(4)).

"(4) For purposes of subsection (i), the determination of whether services furnished by or in an institution described in paragraph (1) constitute post-hospital extended care services shall be made in accordance with and subject to such conditions, limitations, and requirements as may be provided in regulations."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 166: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 166, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "(1) physicians' services;".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 169: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 169, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and on page 82 of the House engrossed bill, strike out lines 15, 16, and 17, and insert the following:

"(1) diagnostic X-ray tests, diagnostic laboratory tests, and other diagnostic tests.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 182: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 182, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "for use in such hospital"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 193: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 193, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "; except that, in the case of any State or political subdivision of a State which imposes higher requirements on institutions as a condition to the purchase of services (or of certain specified services) in such institutions under a State plan approved under title I, XVI, or XIX, the Secretary shall impose like requirements as a condition to the payment for services (or for the services specified by the State or subdivision) in such institutions in such State or subdivision".

On page 66, line 15, of the House engrossed bill, before the period insert the following: "(subject to the second sentence of section 1863)".

On page 91, line 22, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "An" and insert the following: "Except as provided in the second sentence of section 1863, an".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 198: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 198, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 93, of the House engrossed bill, strike out line 9 and "section 1833(b)" in line 10 and insert the following: "or coinsurance amount imposed pursuant to section 1813(a)(1), (a)(2), or (a)(4), section 1833(b), or section 1861(y)(3)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 199: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 199, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 35, line 16, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(or may be)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 203: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 203, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 101, line 18, of the House engrossed bill, after "and" insert the following:, in the case of a determination as to entitlement or as to amount of benefits where the amount in controversy is $1,000 or more,".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 205: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 205, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, on page 102, line 18, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "or 1835(c)", and on page 103, line 13, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "1834(f)" and insert the following: "1841(f)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 206: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 206, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 103, line 21, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "sections 1814(e) and 1835(c))" and insert the following: "section 1814(e))"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 216: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 216, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following "5 years"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 219: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 219, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 109 of the House engrossed bill, strike out line 14 and all that follows through line 21, and insert the following:

"(3)(A) at the beginning of such first month is covered by an enrollment in a health benefits plan under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959,

"(B) was so covered on February 16, 1965, or

"(C) could have been so covered for such first month if he or some other person had availed himself of opportunities to enroll in a health benefits plan under such Act and to continue such enrollment (but this subparagraph shall not apply unless he or such other person was a Federal employee at any time after February 15, 1965).

Paragraph (3) shall not apply in the case of any individual for the month (or any month thereafter) in which coverage under such a health benefits plan ceases (or would have ceased if he had had such coverage) by reason of his or some other person's separation from Federal service, if he or such other person was not (or would not have been) eligible to continue such coverage after such separation."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 227: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 227, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and on page 115, line 9, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "$250" and insert the following: "$150"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 234: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 234, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(d) (1) Section 213 of such Code (relating to medical, dental, etc., expenses) is amended by striking out subsections (c) and (g) of such section.

"(2) (A) Section 72(m) (5) (A) (i) of such Code (relating to special rules applicable to employment annuities and distributions under employee plans) is amended by striking out 'section 213(g) (3)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'paragraph (7) of this subsection'.

"(B) Section 72(m) of such Code is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(7) MEANING OF DISABLED.—For purposes of this section, an individual shall be considered to be disabled if he is unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or to be of long-continued and indefinite duration. An individual shall not be considered to be disabled unless he furnishes proof of the existence thereof in such form and manner as the Secretary or his delegate may require.'

"(C) Subparagraphs (A) (iii) and (B) (iii) of section 72(n) (1) of such Code (relating to treatment of certain distributions with respect to contributions by self-employed individuals) are each amended by striking out 'section 213(g) (3)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'subsection (m) (7)'.

"(3) Section 79(b) (1) of such Code (relating to group-term life insurance purchased for employees) is amended by striking out 'paragraph (3) of section 213(g), determined without regard to paragraph (4) thereof' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 72(m) (7)'.

"(4) Section 401(d) (4) (B) of such Code (relating to additional requirements for qualifications of trusts and plans benefiting owner-employees) is amended by striking out 'section 213(g) (3)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 72(m) (7)'.

"(5) Section 405(b) (1) (D) (ii) of such Code (relating to qualified bond purchase plans) is amended by striking out 'section 213(g) (3)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 72(m) (7)'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 248: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 248, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"ROLE OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

"SEC. 111. (a) The first sentence of section 1874(a) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows: 'Except as otherwise provided in this title and in the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the insurance programs established by this title shall be administered by the Secretary.'

"(b) (1) Section 21 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 (as added by section 105 of this Act) is amended to read as follows:

"'HOSPITAL INSURANCE BENEFITS FOR THE AGED

"'SEC. 21. (a) For the purposes of this section, the Board shall have the same authority to determine the rights of individuals described in subsection (b) of this section to have payments made on their behalf for hospital insurance benefits consisting of inpatient hospital services, post-hospital extended care services, post-hospital home health services, and outpatient hospital diagnostic services (all hereinafter referred to as "services") under section 226, and parts A and C of title XVIII, of the Social Security Act as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has under such section and such parts with respect to individuals to whom such section and such parts apply. For purposes of section 11, a determination with respect to the rights of an individual under this section shall, except in the case of a provider of services, be considered to be a decision with respect to an annuity.

"'(b) Except as otherwise provided in this section, every individual who—

"'(1) has attained age 65, and

"'(2) (A) is entitled to an annuity under this Act, or (B) would be entitled to such an annuity had he ceased compensated service and, in the case of a spouse, had such spouse's husband or wife ceased compensated service, or (C) had been awarded a pension under section 6, or (D) bears a relationship to an employee which, by reason of section 3(e), has been, or would be, taken into account in calculating the amount of an annuity of such employee or his survivors,

shall be certified to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as a qualified railroad retirement beneficiary under section 226 of the Social Security Act.

"'(c) The Board and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall furnish each other with such information, records, and documents as may be considered necessary to the administration of this section or section 226, and part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act.

"'(d) For purposes of this section (and sections 1840, 1843, and 1870 of the Social Security Act), entitlement to an annuity or pension under this Act shall be deemed to include entitlement under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935.

"'(e) The rights of individuals described in subsection (b) of this section to have payment made on their behalf for the services referred to in subsection (a) of this section but provided in Canada shall be the same as those of individuals to whom section 226 and part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act apply, and this subsection shall be administered by the Board as if the provisions of section 226 and part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act were applicable, as if references to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare were to the Board, as if references to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund were to the Railroad Retirement Account, as if references to the United States or a State included Canada or a subdivision thereof, and as if the provisions of sections 1862(a) (4), 1863, 1864, 1867, 1868, 1869, 1874(b), and 1875 of such title XVIII were not included in such title. The payments for services herein provided for in Canada shall be made from the Railroad Retirement Account (in accordance with, and subject to, the conditions applicable under section 10(b) in making payment of other benefits) to the hospital, extended care facility, or home health agency providing such services in Canada to individuals to whom subsection (b) of this section applies, but only to the extent that the amount of payments for services otherwise hereunder provided for an individual exceeds the amount payable for like services provided pursuant to the law in effect in the place in Canada where such services are furnished. For the purposes of section 9 of this Act, any overpayment under this subsection shall be treated as if it were an overpayment of an annuity.'

"(2) Section 5(k) (2) of such Act is amended—

"(A) by striking out subparagraphs (A) and (B) and redesignating subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively;

"(B) by striking out the second sentence and the last sentence of subdivision (i) of the subparagraph redesignated as subparagraph (A) by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph; and by striking out from such subdivision (i) 'the Retirement Account' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Railroad Retirement Account (hereinafter termed "Retirement Account")';

"(C) by adding at the end of the subparagraph redesignated as subparagraph (A) by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph the following new subdivision:

"'(iii) At the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Board and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall determine the amount, if any, which, if added to or subtracted from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, would place such fund in the same position in which it would have been if service as an employee after December 31, 1936, had been included in the term "employment" as defined in the Social Security Act and in the Federal Insurance Contributions Act. Such determination shall be made no later than June 15 following the close of the fiscal year. If such amount is to be added to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, the Board shall, within ten days after the determination, certify such amount to the Secretary of the Treasury for transfer from the Retirement Account to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund; and if such amount is to be subtracted from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, within ten days after the determination, certify such amount to the Secretary of the Treasury for transfer from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund to the Retirement Account. The amount so certified shall further include interest (at the rate determined under subparagraph (B) for the fiscal year under consideration) payable from the close of such fiscal year until the date of certification';

"(D) by striking out 'subparagraph (D)' where it appears in the subparagraph redesignated as subparagraph (A) by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, and inserting the date of certification.';

"(E) by striking out 'subparagraphs (B) and (C)' where it appears in the subparagraph redesignated as subparagraph (B) by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof 'subparagraph (A)'; and

"(F) by amending the subparagraph redesignated as subparagraph (C) by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph to read as follows:

"'(C) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transfer to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, or the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund from the Retirement Account or to the Retirement Account from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, or the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, as the case may be, such amounts as, from time to time, may be determined by the Board and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare pursuant to the provisions of subparagraph (A), and certified by the Board or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for transfer from the Retirement Account or from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, or the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.'

"(c)(1) Section 3201 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of tax on employees under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act) is amended by striking out 'section 3101(a)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 3101(a) plus the rate imposed by section 3101(b)'.

"(2) Section 3211 of such Code (relating to the rate of tax on employee representatives under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act) is amended by striking out 'section 3101(a)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 3101(a) plus the rate imposed by section 3101(b)'.

"(3) Section 3221(b) of such Code (relating to the rate of tax on employers under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act) is amended by striking out 'section 3111(a)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 3111(a) plus the rate imposed by section 3111(b)'.

"(4) Section 1401(b) (as amended by section 321 of this Act) of such Code (relating to the rate of tax under the Self-Employment Contributions Act) is amended by striking out the last sentence.

"(5) Section 3101(b) of such Code (relating to the rate of tax on employees under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act) is amended by striking out ', but without regard to the provisions of paragraph (9) thereof insofar as it relates to employees'.

"(6) Section 3111(b) of such Code (relating to the rate of tax on employers under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act) is amended by striking out ', but without regard to the provisions of paragraph (9) thereof insofar as it relates to employees'.

"(d) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund (established by section 1817 of the Social Security Act) from time to time such sums as the Secretary deems necessary for any fiscal year, on account of—

"(1) payments made or to be made during such fiscal year from such Trust Fund under part A of title XVIII of such Act with respect to individuals who are qualified railroad retirement beneficiaries (as defined in section 226(c) of such Act) and who are not, and upon filing application for monthly insurance benefits under section 202 of such Act would not be entitled to such benefits if service as an employee (as defined in the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937) after December 31, 1936, had been included in the term 'employment' as defined in the Social Security Act,

"(2) the additional administrative expenses resulting or expected to result therefrom, and

"(3) any loss of interest to such Trust Fund resulting from the payment of such amounts,

in order to place such Trust Fund in the same position at the end of such fiscal year in which it would have been if the individuals described in paragraph (1) had not been entitled to benefits under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act.

"(e)(1) The amendments made by the preceding provisions of this section shall apply to the calendar year 1966 or to any subsequent calendar year, but only if the requirement in paragraph (2) has been met with respect to such calendar year.

"(2) The requirement referred to in paragraph (1) shall be deemed to have been met with respect to any calendar year if, as of the October 1 immediately preceding such calendar year, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act provides that the maximum amount of monthly compensation taxable under such Act during all months of such calendar year will be an amount equal to one-twelfth of the maximum wages which the Federal Insurance Contributions Act provides may be counted for such calendar year."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 258: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 258, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 128 of the House engrossed bill, after line 18, insert the following: "except that the making available of the services described in paragraph (4) or (14) of section 1905(a) to individuals meeting the age requirement prescribed therein shall not, by reason of this paragraph (10), require the making available of any such services, or the making available of such services of the same amount, duration, and scope, to individuals of any other ages;"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 265: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 265, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "diseases; and;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 266: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 266, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 61, line 3, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "; and" and insert a period; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 274: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 274; and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 142 of the House engrossed bill strike out "who" in line 13 and all that follows down through line 18 and insert the following:

"who are—

"'(i) under the age of 21,

"'(ii) relatives specified in section 406(b)(1) with whom a child is living if such child, except for section 406(a)(2), is (or would, if needy, be) a dependent child under title IV,

"'(iii) 65 years of age or older,

"'(iv) blind, or

"'(v) 18 years of age or older and permanently and totally disabled,

"but whose

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 276: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 276, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: ("other than services in an institution for tuberculosis or mental diseases) for individuals 21 years of age or older;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 279: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 279, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"'(14) inpatient hospital services, and skilled nursing home services for individuals 65 years of age or over in an institution for tuberculosis or mental diseases; and

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 281: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 281, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "after December 31, 1969;"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 282: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 282, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: On page 63 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out line 2 and insert the following:

"(2) Section 1109 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'AMOUNTS DISREGARDED NOT TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN DETERMINING ELIGIBILITY OF OTHER INDIVIDUALS

"'SEC. 1109. Any

"On page 63, line 4, of the Senate engrossed amendments, before 'eligibility' insert the following: 'the'

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 286: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 286, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 146, line 19, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "succeeding fiscal years" and insert the following: "each fiscal year thereafter"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 287: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 287, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 147, line 14, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "succeeding fiscal years" and insert the following: "each fiscal year thereafter";

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 295: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 295, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: On page 68, line 10, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "each year." On page 68, line 11, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "succeeding fiscal year" and insert the following: "each fiscal year thereafter";

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 296: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 296, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

"On page 68 of the Senate engrossed amendments, after line 21, insert the following:

"'ALLOTMENTS TO STATES'

"On page 69 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out line 12 and all that follows through line 17 and insert the following:

"'(v) that day care provided under the plan will be provided only in facilities (including private homes) which are licensed by the State, or approved (as meeting the standards established for such licensing) by the State agency responsible for licensing facilities of this type, and'.

On page 69 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out line 18 and all that follows through line 22 and insert the following:

"(d) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 1966."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 301: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 301, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "(as amended by section 403(e) of this Act)";

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 312: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 312, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 303. (a)(1) Clause (A) of the first sentence of section 216(i)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out 'or to be of long-continued and indefinite duration' and inserting in lieu thereof 'or has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months'.

"(2) So much of section 223(c)(2) of such Act as precedes the second sentence thereof is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) The term "disability" means—

"'(A) inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or which has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months; or'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 316: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 316, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(3) Subparagraph (D) of section 223 (a)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out 'at the time such application is filed,'. So much of such section 223(a)(1) as follows subparagraph (D) is amended by striking out 'the first month for which he is entitled to old-age insurance benefits,'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 324: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 324, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(2) The amendment made by subsection (e) shall apply in the case of the primary insurance amounts of individuals who attain age 65 after the date of enactment of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 329: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 329, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "0.70;"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 330: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 330, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "0.525;"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 332: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 332, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "18;"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 333: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 333, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"'(E) the month in which such child attains the age of 18, but only if he (i) is not under a disability (as so defined) at the time he attains such age, and (ii) is not a full-time student during any part of such month,

"'(F) if such child was not under a disability (as so defined) at the time he attained the age of 18, the earlier of—

"'(i) the first month during no part of which he is a full-time student, or

"'(ii) the month in which he attains the age of 22, or

"'(G) if such child was under a disability (as so defined) at the time he attained the age of 18, the third month following the month in which he ceases to be under such disability or (if later) the earlier of—

"'(i) the first month during no part of which he is a full-time student, or

"'(ii) the month in which he attains the age of 22.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 346: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 346, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "18"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 362: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 362, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: On page 82, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "$150" and insert the following: "$125". On page 82, line 14, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "$150" and insert the following: "$125".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 364: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 364, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment.

On page 222, line 17, 18, and 19, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "Such tips shall be deemed to be paid to the employee by the employer and shall be deemed to be so paid" and insert the following: "Such remuneration shall be deemed to be paid"

On page 223 of the House engrossed bill, strike out line 10 and all that follows through line 23 on page 224 and insert the following:

"'(c) Special Rule for Tips.—

"'(1) In the case of tips which constitute wages, subsection (a) shall be applicable only to such tips as are included in a written statement furnished to the employer pursuant to section 6053(a), and only to the extent that collection can be made by the employer, at or after the time such statement is so furnished and before the close of the 10th day following the calendar month (or, if paragraph (3) applies, the 30th day following the quarter) in which the tips were deemed paid, by deducting the amount of the tax from such wages of the employee (excluding tips, but including funds turned over by the employee to the employer pursuant to paragraph (2)) as are under control of the employer.

"'(2) If the tax imposed by section 3101, with respect to tips which are included in written statements furnished in any month to the employer pursuant to section 6053(a), exceeds the wages of the employee (excluding tips) from which the employer is required to collect the tax under paragraph (1), the employee may furnish to the employer on or before the 10th day of the following month (or, if paragraph (3) applies, on or before the 30th day of the following quarter) an amount of money equal to the amount of the excess.

"'(3) The Secretary or his delegate may, under regulations prescribed by him, authorize employers—

"'(A) to estimate the amount of tips that will be reported by the employee pursuant to section 6053(a) in any quarter of the calendar year,

"'(B) to determine the amount to be deducted upon each payment of wages (exclusive of tips) during such quarter as if the tips so estimated constituted the actual tips so reported, and

"'(C) to deduct upon any payment of wages (other than tips, but including funds turned over by the employee to the employer pursuant to paragraph (2)) to such employee during such quarter (and within 30 days thereafter) such amount as may be necessary to adjust the amount actually deducted upon such wages of the employee during the quarter to the amount required to be deducted in respect of tips included in written statements furnished to the employer during the quarter.

"(4) If the tax imposed by section 3101 with respect to tips which constitute wages exceeds the portion of such tax which can be collected by the employer from the wages of the employee pursuant to paragraph (1) or paragraph (3), such excess shall be paid by the employee."

On page 226 of the House engrossed bill, strike out lines 3 through 7 and insert the following:

"(q) Tips Included for Employee Taxes.—For purposes of this chapter other than for purposes of the taxes imposed by section 3111, tips received by an employee in the course of his employment shall be considered remuneration for employment. Such remuneration shall be deemed to be paid at the time as written".

On page 226, lines 17, 18, and 19, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "Such tips shall be deemed to be paid to the employee by the employer, and shall be deemed to be so paid" and insert the following: "Such wages shall be deemed to be paid".

On page 227, after line 14, of the House engrossed bill, insert the following:

"(4) Section 3402(h)(3) of such Code (relating to income tax withholding on basis of average wages) is amended by inserting after 'quarter' the first place it appears the following: '(and, in the case of tips referred to in subsection (k), within 30 days thereafter)'.

On page 227, line 15, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "(4)" and insert the following: "(5)".

On page 227, lines 23 and 24, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "the employee receives the tips which are included in such statement," and insert the following: "such statement is furnished,".

On page 228 of the House engrossed bill, strike out lines 15 through 26 and insert the following: "the aggregate of such wages and funds (including funds turned over under section 3102(c)(2)) minus any tax required by section 3102(a) to be collected from such wages and funds."

(e)(1) Section 6051(a) of such Code (relating to receipts for employees) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the case of tips received by an employee in the course of his employment, the amounts required to be shown by paragraphs (3) and (5) shall include only such tips as are included in statements furnished to the employer pursuant to section 6053(a)."

On page 229, line 6, of the House engrossed bill, after "(a)" insert the following: Reports by Employeees.—

On page 229 of the House engrossed bill, strike out lines 15 through 22 and insert the following:

"(b) Statement Furnished by Employers.—If the tax imposed by section 3101 with respect to tips reported by an employee pursuant to subsection (a) exceeds the tax which can be collected by the employer pursuant to section 3102, the employer shall furnish to the employee a written statement showing the amount of such excess. The statement required to be furnished pursuant to this subsection shall be furnished at such time, shall contain such other information, and shall be in such form as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulation prescribe.

When required by such regulations, a duplicate of any such statement shall be filed with the Secretary or his delegate."

(B) Section 6652(b) of such Code (relating to failure to file information returns) is amended by inserting after "income tax withheld)," the following: "and in the case of each failure to furnish a statement required by section 6053(b) (relating to statements furnished by employers with respect to tips),".

(C) Section 6674 of such code (relating to fraudulent statement or failure to furnish statement to employee) is amended by striking out "6051" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "6051 or 6053(b)".

On page 229, line 23, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "(B)" and insert the following: (D)

On page 230 of the House engrossed bill, strike out lines 5 through 20 and insert the following:

"(c) Failure To Report Tips.—In the case of failure by an employee to report to his employer on the date and in the manner prescribed therefore any amount of tips required to be so reported by section 6053(a) which are wages (as defined in section 3121(a)), unless it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect, there shall be paid by the employee, in addition to the tax imposed by section 3101 with respect to the amount of tips which he so failed to report, an amount equal to 50 percent of such tax."

On page 230, line 21, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "(g)" and insert the following: "(f)".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 385: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 385, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: 1966, and; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 407: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 407, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment.

Insert the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment.

On page 253, line 9, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "1969," and insert the following: "1967,".

On page 253, after line 11, of the House engrossed bill, insert the following:

"(2) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1966, and before January 1, 1969, the tax shall be equal to 5.9 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year;".

On page 253, line 12, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "(2)" and insert the following: "(3)".

On page 253, line 17, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "(3)" and insert the following: "(4)".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 420: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 420, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment. Insert the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment.

On page 255, line 12, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "years 1966, 1967, and 1968," and insert the following: "year 1966,".

On page 255, after line 13, of the House engrossed bill, insert the following:

"(2) with respect to wages received during the calendar years 1967 and 1968, the rate shall be 3.9 percent;".

On page 255, line 14, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "(2)" and insert the following: "(3)".

On page 255, line 17, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "(3)" and insert the following: "(4)".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 422: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 422, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "4.85".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 435: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 425, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment. Insert the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment.

On page 257, line 4, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "years 1966, 1967, and 1968," and insert the following: "year 1966,".

On page 257, after line 5, of the House engrossed bill, insert the following:

"(2) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1967 and 1968, the rate shall be 3.9 percent;".

On page 257, line 6, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "(2)" and insert the following: "(3)".

On page 257, line 9, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "(3)" and insert the following: "(4)".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 437: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 437, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "4.85".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 458: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 458, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"UNDEFPAYMENTS

"Sec. 329. Section 204 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), if an individual dies before any payment due him under this title is completed, and the total amount due at the time of his death does not exceed the amount of the monthly insurance benefit to which he was entitled for the month preceding the month in which he died, payment of the amount due shall be made—

"'(1) to the person, if any, determined by the Secretary to be the surviving spouse of the deceased individual and to have been living in the same household with the deceased at the time of his death, or

"'(2) if there is no such person, or if such person dies before receiving payment to the legal representative of the estate of such deceased individual.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 460: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 460, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 99, line 6, of the Senate engrossed amendments, after "tax" insert the following: "exemptions".

On page 100, line 9, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "this paragraph" and insert the following: "the Social Security Amendments of 1965".

On page 100, line 12, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "this paragraph" and insert the following: "the Social Security Amendments of 1965".

On page 101, line 1, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(B)," and insert the following: "(B) ending before January 1, 1966,".

On page 101, line 12, of the Senate engrossed amendments, after "Code" insert the following: "of 1954, as amended by subsection (a)".

On page 101, line 15, of the Senate engrossed amendments, after "year" insert the following: "ending before January 1, 1966,".

On page 102, line 3, of the Senate engrossed amendments, after "year" insert the following: "ending before January 1, 1966,".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 461: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 461, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 103, line 16, of the Senate engrossed amendments, after "claimant" insert the following: "under this title".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 462: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 462, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 105, line 15, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(3)," and insert the following: "(3) and subsection (q),".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 464: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 464, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: On page 110 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out lines 10 through 14 and insert the following:

"Sec. 335. Effective with respect to benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after December 1965 based on the wages and self-employment income of an individual who is entitled to benefits under section 223 of such Act and whose period of disability (as defined in such title) began after June 1, 1965, title II of such Act is amended by inserting after section 223 the following new section:".

On page 111, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "month and" and insert the following: "month, and".

On page 111, line 21, of the Senate engrossed amendments, after "month" insert the following: "(in a continuous period of months)".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 466: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 466, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: On page 117 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out lines 6 through 9 and insert the following:

"Sec. 336. Section 222 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:".

On page 117, line 11, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(b) (1)" and insert the following: "(d) (1)".

On page 118, line 5, of the Senate engrossed amendments, before "benefits" insert the following: "total of the".

On page 118, line 7, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "or" and insert the following: ", and the benefits".

On page 119, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendments, before "followed" insert the following: "which would otherwise be".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 467: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 467, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TEACHERS IN THE STATE OF MAINE

"SEC. 337. (a) Section 316 of the Social Security Amendments of 1958 is amended by striking out 'July 1, 1965' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1967'.

"(b) The amendment made by this section shall be effective as of July 1, 1965."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 468: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 468, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 121, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "339" and insert the following: "338".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 469: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 469, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 122, line 4, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "340" and insert the following: "339".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 472: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 472, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"DISCLOSURE, UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES, TO COURTS AND INTERESTED WELFARE AGENCIES OF WHEREABOUTS OF INDIVIDUALS

"SEC. 340. Section 1106 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c)(1) Upon request (filed in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection) of any State or local agency participating in administration of the State plan approved under titles I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, or XIX, or participating in the administration of any other State or local public assistance program, for the most recent address of any individual included in the files of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare maintained pursuant to section 205, the Secretary shall furnish such address, or the address of the most recent employer, or both, if such agency certifies that—

"'(A) an order has been issued by a court of competent jurisdiction against such individual for the support and maintenance of his child or children who are under the age of 16 in destitute or necessitous circumstances,

"'(B) such child or children are applicants for or recipients of assistance available under such a plan or program,

"'(C) such agency has attempted without success to secure such information from all other sources reasonably available to it, and

"'(D) such information is requested (for its own use, or on the request and for the use of the court which issued the order) for the purpose of obtaining such support and maintenance.

"'(2) A request under paragraph (1) shall be filed in such manner and form as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall be accompanied by a certified copy of the order referred to in paragraph (1)(A).

"'(3) The penalties provided in the second sentence of subsection (a) shall apply with respect to use of information provided under paragraph (1) of this subsection except for the purpose authorized by subparagraph (D) thereof.

"'(4) The Secretary, in such cases and to such extent as he may prescribe in accordance with regulations, may require payment for the cost of information provided under paragraph (1); and the provisions of the second sentence of subsection (b) shall apply also with respect to payment under this paragraph.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 473: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 473, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 132, line 9, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "344" and insert the following: "341"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 475: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 475, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 134, line 18, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "346" and insert the following: "342"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 476: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 476, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 135, line 15, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "347" and insert the following: "343"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 477: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 477, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFITS FOR THE BLIND; SPECIAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 344. (a) Section 216(i)(3) of the Social Security Act (as amended by section 303 of this Act) is further amended by striking out subparagraph (B) and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(B)(i) he had not less than 20 quarters of coverage during the 40-quarter period which ends with such quarter, or

"'(ii) if such quarter ends before he attains (or would attain) age 31 and he is under a disability by reason of blindness (as defined in paragraph (1)), not less than one-half (and not less than 6) of the quarters during the period ending with such quarter and beginning after he attained the age of 21 were quarters of coverage, or (if the number of quarters in such period is less than 12) not less than 6 of the quarters in the 12-quarter period ending with such quarter were quarters of coverage;

except that the provisions of subparagraph (A) of this paragraph shall not apply in the case of an individual with respect to whom a period of disability would, but for such subparagraph, begin before 1951. For purposes of subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, when the number of quarters in any period is an odd number, such number shall be reduced by one, and a quarter shall not be counted as part of any period if any part of such quarter was included in a prior period of disability unless such quarter was a quarter of coverage.'

"(b) Section 223(c)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(B)(i) he had not less than 20 quarters of coverage during the 40-quarter period which ends with the quarter in which such month occurred, or

"'(ii) if such month ends before he attains (or would attain) age 31 and he is under a disability by reason of blindness (as defined in section 216(i)(1)), not less than one-half (and not less than 6) of the quarters during the period ending with the quarter in which such month occurred and beginning after he attained the age of 21 were quarters of coverage, or (if the number of quarters in such period is less than 12) not less than 6 of the quarters in the 12-quarter period ending with such quarter were quarters of coverage.

For purposes of subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, when the number of quarters in any period is an odd number, such number shall be reduced by one, and a quarter shall not be counted as part of any period if any part of such quarter was included in a period of disability unless such quarter was a quarter of coverage.'

"(c) Section 223(a)(1) of such Act (as amended by section 303 of this Act) is further amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: 'No payment under this paragraph may be made to an individual who would not meet the definition of disability in subsection (c)(2) except for subparagraph (B) thereof for any month in which he engages in substantial gainful activity, and no payment may be made for such month under subsection (b), (c), or (d) of section 202 to any person on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of such individual.'

"(d) The first sentence of section 223(c)(2) of such Act (as amended by section 303 of this Act) is further amended by adding after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

"'(B) in the case of an individual who has attained the age of 55 and is blind (within the meaning of "blindness' as defined in section 216(i)(1)), inability by reason of such blindness to engage in substantial gainful activity requiring skills or abilities comparable to those of any gainful activity in which he has previously engaged with some regularity and over a substantial period of time.'

"(e) The amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after the first month following the month in which this Act is enacted, on the basis of applications for such benefits filed in or after the month in which this Act is enacted."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 485: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 485, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 142, line 18, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "$7" and insert the following: "$5"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 486: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 486, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: On page 143, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "411" and insert the following "410".

On page 143, line 6 and 11, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "$7" and insert the following: "$5".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 487: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 487, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 143, line 18, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "$7" and insert the following: "$5"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 488: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 488, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 146, line 1, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "$7" and insert the following: "$5"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 499: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 499, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, insert the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 294, line 26, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "such Act" and insert the following: "the Social Security Act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 511: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 511, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"ELIGIBILITY OF CHILDREN OVER AGE 18 ATTENDING SCHOOL

"SEC. 409. Clause (2)(B) of section 406 (a) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out '(as determined in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary) a student regularly attending a high school in pursuance of a course of study leading to a high school diploma or its equivalent,' and inserting in lieu thereof '(as determined by the State in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary) a student regularly attending a school, college, or university,'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 512: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 512, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"DISREGARDING CERTAIN EARNINGS IN DETERMINING NEED OF CERTAIN DEPENDENT CHILDREN

"SEC. 410. Effective July 1, 1965, so much of clause (7) of section 402(a) of the Social Security Act as follows the first semicolon is amended by inserting after 'except that, in making such determination,' the following: '(A) the State agency may disregard not more than $50 per month of earned income of each dependent child under the age of 18 but not in excess of $150 per month of earned income of such dependent children in the same home, (B)'.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 513: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 513, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 149, line 13, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "SEC. 412." and insert the following: "SEC. 411.".

On page 149, line 18, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(a)".

On page 150, line 13, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "sections." and insert the following: "sections".

On page 150 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out line 14 and all that follows through line 5 on page 152.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendments to title: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
THOS. B. CURTIS,
JAMES B. UTT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RUSSELL B. LONG,
GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The following Senate amendments made technical, clerical, clarifying, or conforming changes: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 49a, 49b, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73a, 75, 76, 77, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127a, 133, 135, 136, 139, 140, 142, 144, 145, 146. 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 157, 161a, 162a, 162b, 162c, 164a, 165, 168, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176a, 177, 179, 182a, 182b, 183, 184, 185, 185a, 185b, 187, 188, 189, 190, 194, 196, 196a, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 204, 206, 207, 208, 209, 211, 212, 213, 214, 218, 224, 225, 226, 228, 229, 230, 231, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 252, 253, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 264, 265, 268, 269, 275, 278, 279, 280, 283, 284, 286, 287, 291, 292, 294, 297, 301, 307, 308, 310, 311, 314, 315, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 326, 327, 328, 331, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 354, 356, 359, 365, 369, 370, 371, 372, 375, 377, 379, 388, 390, 392, 395, 398, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 481, 482, 483, 489, 490, 493, 494, 495, 496, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, and 509.

With respect to these amendments (1) the House either recedes or recedes with amendments which are technical, clerical, clarifying, or conforming in nature; or (2) the Senate recedes in order to conform to other action agreed upon by the committee of conference.

REQUIREMENT OF PRIOR HOSPITALIZATION FOR COVERAGE OF HOME HEALTH SERVICES UNDER PART A—DURATION OF SUCH SERVICES

Amendments Nos. 2, 9, 19, 42, and 161: The House bill limited payment for home health services under part A of the new title XVIII of the Social Security Act to services furnished an individual within 1 year following his most recent discharge from a hospital in which he stayed at least 3 days or, if later, 1 year following his most recent discharge from an extended care facility in which he received covered posthospital extended care services. Under the House bill, payment would be made for up to 100 visits during such 1-year period after the beginning of one spell of illness and before the beginning of the next such spell, and the services would be covered only if the physician certified that the individual required home health services for any of the conditions for which he was receiving inpatient hospital services or posthospital extended care services.

The Senate amendments (1) deleted the requirement of prior hospitalization; (2) removed the requirement of certification described above; and (3) provided for payment for up to 175 home health visits per calendar year.

The Senate recedes.

DURATIONAL LIMITATION ON INPATIENT HOSPITAL BENEFITS

Amendments Nos. 7 and 25: Under the House bill, section 1812 of the new title XVIII of the Social Security Act provided for a durational limitation on payments for inpatient hospital services of 60 days per spell of illness.

The Senate amendments modified the House provision by changing sections 1812 and 1813 of the new title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the durational limitation on payments for inpatient hospital services, and to provide for reducing the payment for each day after the 60th day of hospital care in each spell of illness by a deduction equal to one-fourth of the inpatient deductible (a $10 reduction initially).

The conference agreement provides for a durational limitation on inpatient hospital benefits of 90 days per spell of illness, with payment by the program for each day after the 60th day and before the 91st day of hospital care reduced by a coinsurance amount equal to one-fourth of the inpatient hospital deductible. (This change, and other changes, in terminology from "deduction" to "coinsurance amount" help make it clear that the amounts in question are not "deductibles" for purposes of the new title XIX of the Social Security Act, relating to Federal-State medical assistance programs.)

DURATIONAL LIMITATION ON EXTENDED CARE SERVICES; INPATIENT PSYCHIATRIC AND TUBERCULOSIS HOSPITAL SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUAL HOSPITALIZED ON ENTITLEMENT

Amendments Nos. 8, 17, and 31: Under the House bill, sections 1812(a), 1812(c), and 1813 of the new title XVIII of the Social Security Act provided that payment would be made for posthospital extended care services for up to 20 days in a spell of illness, plus 2 additional days (up to a maximum of 80 additional days) for each day that the person's hospital stay was less than 60 days. Section 1812(d) provided that if an individual were in a tuberculosis hospital on the first day of the first month for which he was entitled to benefits under the hospital insurance program, the days on which he was an inpatient of a tuberculosis hospital in the 60-day period preceding that first day would be counted toward the 60-day maximum limit on benefit payments for inpatient hospital services in a spell of illness.

The Senate amendments provided that payment would be made for up to 100 days of posthospital extended care services in a spell of illness, with payment by the program for each day after the 20th day of such services reduced by a coinsurance amount equal to one-eighth of the inpatient hospital deductible (a $5 reduction initially). The Senate amendments deleted (1) the provision that payment could be made for additional days of posthospital extended care services; and (2) section 1812(d).

The House recedes with a technical amendment and an amendment providing that days in a psychiatric or tuberculosis hospital in the 90-day period immediately preceding an individual's entitlement to hospital insurance benefits will be counted toward the 90-day limitation on payments for inpatient hospital care in a spell of illness, but not toward the 190-day lifetime limitation discussed below.

INPATIENT PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL SERVICES

Amendments Nos. 15, 67, and 79: Under the House bill, section 1832(a)(2)(A) in part B of the new title XVIII of the Social Security Act provided for coverage of inpatient psychiatric hospital services with a lifetime limit of 180 days on coverage of such services. The Senate amendments transferred coverage of inpatient psychiatric hospital services from part B to part A of title XVIII and provided for a lifetime limit of 210, rather than 180, days on coverage of inpatient psychiatric hospital services.

Under the conference agreement, inpatient psychiatric hospital services are covered under part A of the new title XVIII, and there is a lifetime limit for each individual for such coverage of 190 days.

POSTHOSPITAL EXTENDED CARE FOR MENTAL DISEASE

Amendments Nos. 16 and 158: Section 1861(j) of the new title XVIII, added to the Social Security Act by the House bill, excluded from the definition of an extended care facility an institution which is primarily for the care and treatment of mental diseases or tuberculosis.

The Senate amendment deleted this exclusion and added a new provision including within the lifetime limit imposed on inpatient psychiatric hospital services any days of posthospital extended care services for the care or treatment of any mental disease (whether or not such services are furnished in a facility that is primarily for the care and treatment of mental diseases).

The Senate recedes. Under the conference agreement an institution which is primarily for the care and treatment of mental diseases or tuberculosis is excluded from the definition of an extended care facility.

OUTPATIENT HOSPITAL DIAGNOSTIC SERVICES AND INPATIENT DEDUCTIBLE

Amendments Nos. 25, 28, and 74: Under the House bill, section 1813(a)(1) of the new title XVIII of the Social Security Act provided for crediting against the inpatient hospital deductible the amount of the outpatient hospital diagnostic deductible in certain instances where the individual was hospitalized in the same hospital after receiving outpatient diagnostic services.

Senate amendment No. 25 deleted this provision. Senate amendment No. 74 added a provision to section 1833(b) of the new title XVIII under which an outpatient diagnostic deductible imposed under part A of title XVIII would be counted as an incurred expense for purposes of the $50 deductible under part B. Senate amendment No. 28 added a provision to section 1813(a)(2) of the new title XVIII, under which payment by the program for outpatient hospital diagnostic services would be reduced by 20 percent of the remainder of the reasonable cost of the services after deduction of the deductible amount.

The House recedes with technical amendments and with an amendment providing that an outpatient diagnostic deductible incurred in the last 3 months of any calendar year will apply against the $50 deductible amount under part B in the following year if it was applied against the $50 deductible for the calendar year in which the diagnostic services were furnished.

ROUNDING OF INCREASES IN INPATIENT HOSPITAL DEDUCTIBLE

Amendments Nos. 32, 33, 34, and 35: The House bill provided, in section 1813(b)(2) of the new title XVIII, that in determining the amount of the inpatient hospital deductible in the future, any amount which is not a multiple of $5 would be rounded to the nearest multiple of $5.

The Senate amendment provided for rounding to the nearest multiple of $4.

The House recedes.

EMERGENCY HOSPITAL SERVICES FURNISHED OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Amendment No. 50: The Senate amendment added to the House bill a new section 1814(f) of the new title XVII. The amendment provided for payment for certain emergency inpatient hospital services furnished outside the United States despite the general exclusion, in both the House and Senate bills, of services furnished outside the United States. Such emergency services would be covered only if the patient was within the United States when the emergency which necessitated the hospitalization occurred and only if the hospital in question was closer or substantially more accessible than comparable facilities within the United States.

The House recedes.

RELIEF FROM LIABILITY OF AGENCY OR ORGANIZATION WHERE CERTIFYING OR DISBURSING OFFICER IS RELIEVED OF LIABILITY

Amendments Nos. 55 and 129: The Senate amendment added to section 1816(g) and section 1842(e) of the new title XVIII provisions which would grant to agencies and organizations authorized to make payments under part A and carriers authorized to make payments under part B the same immunity from liability for incorrect payments as would be provided their certifying and disbursing officers.

The House recedes.

GENERAL REVENUE FINANCING OF HOSPITAL BENEFITS BEYOND THE 60TH DAY

Amendment No. 59: The Senate added an amendment to the new section 1817(a) of the Social Security Act which authorized appropriations from the general fund in the Treasury sufficient to place the Federal hospital insurance trust fund in the same position as if hospital insurance benefits were not payable beyond 60 days during a spell of illness.

The Senate recedes.

NAME OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY PROGRAM

Amendment No. 63: The House bill referred to the program provided under part B of the new title XVIII as "supplementary health insurance". The Senate amendment changed the name to "supplementary medical insurance".

The House receeds.

INCORPORATION OF PHYSICIANS' SERVICES IN DEFINITION OF MEDICAL AND OTHER HEALTH SERVICES AND COVERAGE OF CHIROPRACTORS' AND PODIATRISTS' SERVICES

Amendments Nos. 66, 166, and 186: Under the House bill, section 1832(a)(1) of the new title XVIII of the Social Security Act listed physicians' services and medical and other health services separately, and section 1861(s) (redesignated as 1861(r) by the Senate bill) which defined medical and other health services did not include physicians' services in the definition. Under the House bill, services of chiropractors and podiatrists were not listed as covered services.

The Senate amendments included physicians' services in the definition of medical and other health services in the redesignated section 1861(r) and did not list physicians' services separately in section 1832(a)(1). The Senate amendments also provided for coverage of chiropractors' and podiatrists' services as medical and other health services.

The conference agreement includes physicians' services in the definition of medical and other health services and the effect of the agreement is to exclude chiropractors' and podiatrists' services from coverage as medical and other health services.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES OF CERTAIN MEDICAL SPECIALISTS

Amendments Nos. 70 and 141: Under the House bill, section 1861(b) of the new title XVIII excluded from the definition of inpatient hospital services the medical or surgical services of physicians. Except for the services of certain interns and residents in training, physicians' services would not be covered under part A of title XVIII but would be covered only under part B. Under section 1832(a) of title XVIII, payment could not be made under part B to a provider of services (a hospital, extended care facility, or a home health agency) for the services of a physician; the payment would have to be made to the beneficiary or, under certain circumstances, to the physician.

Senate amendment No. 141 added to section 1861(b) of the new title XVIII a provision under which payment under part A would be made for the services of physicians in the fields of pathology, radiology, physiatry, and anesthesiology when their services are provided by the hospital or under "arrangements" with the hospital. "Arrangements" would be limited to those under which receipt of payment by the hospital discharged the liability of the beneficiary or any other person to pay for the specialist's services. Amendment No. 70 modified section 1832(a) of the new title XVIII to permit payment to be made under part B of the new title to a provider of services for physicians' services in the fields of pathology, radiology, physiatry, or anesthesiology where the physician's services were furnished by the physician under arrangement with the provider of services.

The conference agreement follows the House bill with a technical amendment on Senate amendment No. 70.

OPTION TO RECEIVE PAYMENT ON BASIS OF COST INSTEAD OF CHARGES FOR PREPAYMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Amendment No. 73: Section 1833(a)(1) of the new title XVIII, added by the House bill, required that payment under part B of the new title for physcians' services and for other medical and health services not furnished by a provider of services (a hospital, extended care facility, or home health agency) must be made on the basis of charges rather than cost.

Senate amendment No. 73 modified this provision to provide, for group practice prepayment plans, the option of having the program pay, with respect to the covered services (including physicians' services) they furnish their members, 80 percent of reasonable cost instead of 80 percent of reasonable charges.

The House recedes.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR ALIENS

Amendments Nos. 95, 215, and 216: Section 103(a)(4) of the House bill provided that an alien who otherwise meets the eligibility requirements under the transitional provision providing eligibility for certain uninsured individuals under part A of the new title XVIII must also, to be eligible, have resided continuously in the United States for 10 or more years, immediately preceding the month in which he applied for hospital insurance protection. Section 1836 of the new title XVIII, under the House bill, provided that an alien who otherwise meets the eligibility requirements for enrollment under part B of the new title, must also, to be eligible, have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States.

Senate amendment No. 215 added, to the eligibility requirements of the House bill for an alien under the transitional provision for eligibility under part A, the requirement that the alien have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence; and amendment No. 216 reduced the required period of continuous residence in the United States from 10 years to 6 months. Amendment No. 95 added, to the eligibility requirements of the House bill for an alien under part B of title XVIII, the requirement that the alien must have resided continuously in the United States for 10 or more years immediately preceding the month in which he applied for enrollment under part B.

Under the conference agreement, to be eligible for the transitional provision for purposes of part A, an alien must have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States and must have resided continuously for 5 or more years immediately preceding application for benefits. For enrollment under part B, an alien must either (1) have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States and have resided continuously in the United States for 5 or more years immediately preceding application for enrollment; or (2) be entitled to hospital insurance benefits under part A.

TIME FOR ENROLLMENT IN THE SUPPLEMENTARY INSURANCE PROGRAM

Amendments Nos. 96, 97, 98, 99, and 100: The House bill provided under section 1837 of the new title XVIII that individuals who reach age 65 before 1966 would have an enrollment period beginning with the second month after the month of enactment of the bill and ending on March 31, 1966. The

House bill also provided for there to be general enrollment periods during the last quarter of odd-numbered years beginning with 1967.

The Senate amendments provided for an enrollment period during the second and third quarters of 1966 for persons who reach age 65 before July 1966 and general enrollment periods during the last quarter of even-numbered years beginning in 1968.

The conference agreement follows the House bill, with a technical amendment.

EFFECTIVE DATE FOR BENEFITS UNDER THE SUPPLEMENTARY INSURANCE PROGRAM

Amendment No. 101: This amendment modified section 1838(a) (1) of the new title XVIII by providing that payment would be made under part B for services furnished on or after January 1, 1967, rather than for services furnished on or after July 1, 1966.

The Senate recedes.

BEGINNING DATE OF COVERAGE PERIOD UNDER THE SUPPLEMENTARY INSURANCE PROGRAM

Amendment No. 102: Under the House bill, section 1838(a) of the new title XVIII provided that an individual who enrolled under part B of the new title during the 7-month enrollment period beginning with the third month before the month he reached age 65 would have protection under the supplementary insurance program beginning with the third month following the month in which he enrolled.

Under Senate amendment No. 102, the same 7-month enrollment period is retained but the individual's coverage would take effect as follows: If the individual enrolled before the month in which he attained age 65, the insurance would take effect with the month in which he attained age 65; if he enrolled in the month in which he attained age 65, the insurance would take effect with the following month; if he enrolled in the month following the month in which he attained age 65, it would take effect with the second month following the month of enrollment; if he enrolled more than 1 month following the month in which he attained age 65, the insurance would take effect with the third month following the month in which he enrolled.

The House recedes.

YEARS WHEN PREMIUM AMOUNTS APPLY AND ARE DETERMINED

Amendments Nos. 103, 104, 105, and 106: Under the House bill, section 1839 of the new title XVIII provided that monthly premiums under the supplementary insurance program would be $3 until 1968. For 1968 and subsequent years, the monthly premiums would be subject to change. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would, between July 1 and October 1, 1967, and each odd-numbered year thereafter, determine and promulgate the monthly premium.

The Senate amendment provided for the $3 premium amount to remain in effect through 1968 and for changes in premiums to be determined by the Secretary in 1968 and each even-numbered year thereafter.

The Senate recedes.

DEDUCTION FROM CIVIL SERVICE ANNUITIES OF PREMIUMS UNDER THE SUPPLEMENTARY INSURANCE PROGRAM

Amendment No. 113: This amendment added to section 1840 of the new title XVIII a new subsection (e) authorizing the withholding of premiums of an enrolled individual from the annuity he receives under the civil service retirement system or any other retirement system administered by the Civil Service Commission. If the wife of such an individual was also enrolled, and he agreed, her premium could also be withheld from his monthly annuity.

The House recedes.

ADMINISTRATION OF BENEFITS UNDER THE SUPPLEMENTARY INSURANCE PROGRAM

Amendment No. 127: Under the House bill, section 1842(a) of the new title XVIII required the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to the extent possible, to enter into contracts with carriers which would perform specified functions with respect to administration of all benefits under part B of the new title.

The Senate amendment authorized the Secretary to enter into such contracts with carriers (including carrers which are agencies or organizations with which agreements for administration of part A benefits are in effect), and, with respect to functions which involve payments for physicians' services, the Secretary was required, to the extent possible, to enter into such contracts.

The House recedes.

REASONABLE CHARGES UNDER THE SUPPLEMENTARY INSURANCE PROGRAM

Amendment No. 128: The Senate amendment added to section 1842(b) (3) of the new title XVIII a sentence expressly requiring that, in the determination of reasonable charges for covered services under part B of the new title, consideration be given to the customary charges generally made by the physician or other person for furnishing such services as well as the prevailing charges in the locality for similar services.

The House recedes.

STATE AGREEMENTS FOR ENROLLMENT UNDER SUPPLEMENTARY INSURANCE PROGRAM OF AGED RECIPIENTS OF CASH PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Amendments Nos. 130, 131, 132, and 134: The House bill provided that States could, before July 1, 1967, agree with the Secretary to enroll their aged public assistance recipients (those receiving money payments) in the supplemental medical insurance program under part B of title XVIII. The States would pay the premiums for these recipients.

The Senate amendments extended the period during which such agreements could be made to January 1, 1968.

The House recedes.

TIME OF APPROPRIATION TO SUPPLEMENTARY INSURANCE TRUST FUND FOR CONTINGENCY RESERVE

Amendments Nos. 137 and 138: The Senate amendment modified section 1844(b) of the new title XVIII to remove the requirement that appropriation of funds to the supplementary medical insurance trust fund for the contingency reserve be made during fiscal year 1966 and to provide that an appropriation so made would remain available through calendar year 1968.

Under the conference agreement, the authorization of appropriations is not limited to the fiscal year 1966, and moneys appropriated pursuant to this authorization are to remain available through the calendar year 1967.

DENTAL INTERNS

Amendment No. 143: The Senate amended the definition, in the new section 1861(b) of the Social Security Act, of the inpatient hospital services to be paid for under the hospital insurance program by adding the services of dental interns and residents-in-training who are under a teaching program approved by the Council on Dental Education of the American Dental Association.

The House recedes.

INDIVIDUAL NOT CONSIDERED DISCHARGED FROM EXTENDED CARE FACILITY IF ADMITTED TO SAME OR ANOTHER FACILITY WITHIN 14 DAYS

Amendment No. 156: Under the House bill, section 1861(l) of the new title XVIII provided that, for purposes of determining whether an extended care facility patient meets the requirement of transfer from a hospital, an individual would not be considered to have been discharged from an extended care facility if he is readmitted to the same facility within 14 days.

The Senate amendment modified this provision so as to provide that an individual would not be considered to have been discharged from an extended care facility if within 14 days he is admitted to the same or any other extended care facility.

The House recedes with technical amendments.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE NURSING HOMES

Amendment No. 159: The Senate amendment added to the new section 1861(j) of the Social Security Act a provision which would have included Christian Science nursing homes within the term "extended care facility." Payments to such nursing homes would have been subject to regulations of the Secretary.

The conference agreement deletes this provision and provides instead that Christian Science sanatoriums would be included within the definition of an extended care facility. Payment for posthospital extended care services in such facilities would be subject to special limitations, to be prescribed in regulations; services in such facilities would be covered as posthospital extended care services only if the individual elected to have them so covered; payment for posthospital extended care services would be made with respect to services furnished any individual in either Christian Science sanatoriums or in regular extended care facilities, but not in both, during the same spell of illness; payment would be made for up to 30 days only in each spell of illness (instead of the 100 days applicable with respect to extended care services generally) and payment for each day of such services (instead of each day after the 20th day) would be reduced by a coinsurance amount equal to one-eighth of the inpatient hospital deductible (a $5 reduction initially).

HOSPITAL-EXTENDED CARE FACILITY TRANSFER ARRANGEMENTS

Amendment No. 160: The Home bill provided, in section 1861(l) of the new title XVIII, that an extended care facility may be deemed to have a transfer agreement in effect with a hospital under certain circumstances if the facility has attempted to enter into such an agreement with a hospital near the facility. The Senate amended this provision to make it clear that the facility may be deemed to have a transfer agreement in effect whether or not the hospital with which it has attempted to make the agreement is within the State or otherwise.

The conference agreement omits this clarification since under the House bill there was no requirement that the hospital be in the same State as the extended care facility.

DEFINITION OF HOME HEALTH AGENCY

Amendment No. 162: The House bill excluded organizations primarily for psychiatric care from the definition of "home health agency" in the section of the new title XVIII designated 1861(o) in the House bill and 1861(n) in the Senate bill.

The amendment added by the Senate removed that exclusion and added a provision including a Christian Science visiting nurse service within the meaning of the term "home health agency."

The Senate recedes.

DEFINITION OF PHYSICIAN

Amendments Nos. 163 and 164: The Senate amendments modified the definition of "physician" (in the new section of the Social Security Act designated as sec. 1861(r) in the House bill and 1861(q) in the Senate amendments) to mean (1) a doctor of medicine or osteopathy legally authorized to practice medicine and surgery (including osteopathy); and (2) a doctor of dentistry or of dental or oral surgery who is legally authorized to practice dentistry, but only with respect to surgery related to the jaw or the reduction of any fracture of the jaw or any facial bone.

The House recedes.

COVERAGE OF SERVICES INCIDENTAL TO PHYSICIANS' SERVICES

Amendment No. 167: The Senate amendment added to the definition of covered medical and other health services in section 1861(s) of the new title XVIII (redesignated as sec. 1861(r) by the Senate amendments) certain services and supplies incidental to physicians' services.

The House recedes.

DELETION OF SPECIFICATION OF SOME DIAGNOSTIC TESTS

Amendment No. 169: This amendment deleted reference to some specific diagnostic tests covered under the supplementary medical insurance program since they are included under the more general phrase "other diagnostic tests."

The House recedes with a clarifying amendment.

STANDARDS FOR INDEPENDENT LABORATORIES PERFORMING DIAGNOSTIC TESTS UNDER SUPPLEMENTARY PROGRAM

Amendment No. 176: This amendment added to section 1861(s) of the House bill new paragraphs (10) and (11) providing that diagnostic tests performed in a laboratory which is independent of a physician's office or of a hospital would be covered under the supplementary program only if the laboratory is licensed under applicable State or local law or meets standards for such licensing and only if it meets such other requirements relating to the health and safety of individuals with respect to whom tests are performed as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare finds necessary.

The House recedes.

INCLUSION OF HOMEOPATHIC PHARMACOPOEIA AND DRUGS APPROVED BUT NOT LISTED IN APPROVED FORMULARIES

Amendment Nos. 178 and 180: These amendments modified the definition of drugs and biologicals for which payment would be made under the hospital insurance program by adding the United States Homeopathic Pharmacopoeia to the list of drug formularies to be used and by specifying that drugs approved for listing in the approved formularies, although not actually listed, would be included.

The House recedes.

COMBINATIONS OF DRUGS OR BIOLOGICALS

Amendment No. 181: This amendment added to section 1861(t) of the House bill a new clause expressly providing that combination drugs would be included in the definition of drugs and biologicals for which payment could be made where the principal ingredient, or ingredients, are listed in the formularies specified in the bill.

The Senate recedes.

HOSPITAL-COMMITTEE APPROVED DRUGS

Amendment No. 182: The House bill provided, in section 1861(t) in the new title XVIII (redesignated as sec. 1861(s) by the Senate), that the definition of the drugs and biologicals for which payment could be made under part A of title XVIII would include drugs and biologicals approved by the pharmacy and drug therapeutics committee (or equivalent committee) of the hospital furnishing such drugs and biologicals. The Senate amendment added the requirement that such drugs and biologicals must be approved by such committee for use in such hospital.

The House recedes with a clerical amendment. Under the conference agreement, the hospital committee may approve a drug or biological either for general use in the hospital or for a particular patient or group of patients therein.

ROUTINE DENTAL CARE

Amendment No. 191: The Senate amendment added to section 1862 of the new title XVIII an exclusion from coverage under the hospital insurance and medical insurance programs of expenses for services in connection with the care, treatment, filling, removal, or replacement of teeth or structures directly supporting the teeth.

The House recedes.

HEALTH AND SAFETY REQUIREMENTS

Amendments Nos. 192 and 193: The House bill provided, in section 1863 of the new title XVIII, that conditions for the participation of institutions and agencies relating to health and safety may, at the request of a State, be higher for that State than for other States; in the case of hospitals, the higher requirements could not have been higher than the comparable standards set by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals.

The Senate amendment deleted the reference to this limitation (to standards set by the Joint Commission) from the provisions authorizing use of higher health and safety requirements for institutions at the request of a State and further required the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to impose health and safety requirements for institutions in a State (or political subdivision of a State) higher than those of the Joint Commission if the State (or subdivision) imposed such higher requirements as a condition to the purchase of services in such institutions under a State medical assistance plan.

The House recedes with technical conforming amendments and an amendment requiring the imposition of such higher requirements as a condition to the payment for only certain specified services if the State (or subdivision) imposes them as a condition to the purchase of such specified services under such a State medical assistance plan.

CERTIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONS AND AGENCIES BY STATE AGENCIES

Amendment No. 195: Section 1864(a) of the House bill provided that, where a State (or local) agency with which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare had an agreement for the purpose of determining which institutions and agencies qualify to participate in the programs under title XVIII, the Secretary could accept such agency's certification that an institution or agency is a provider of services.

Under the Senate amendment, the Secretary would be required to accept the certification by a State agency that an institution or agency is a provider of services unless he determined that the institution or agency was so inadequate as to endanger the lief or health of the patients.

The Senate recedes.

MINIMUM APPEALS AMOUNT

Amendment No. 203: Section 1869(b) of the House bill provided that any individual dissatisfied with any determination as to the amount of benefits under part A of the new title XVIII where the matter in controversy is $1,000 or more would be entitled to a hearing thereon by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and to judicial review of the Secretary's final decision.

Under the Senate amendment such an individual would be entitled to a hearing and to judicial review where the amount in controversy is $100 or more.

Under the conference agreement, an individual would be entitled to a hearing by the Secretary when the amount in controversy is $100 or more and would be entitled to judicial review of the Secretary's final decision where the amount in controversy is $1,000 or more. The provisions of section 205 of the Social Security Act and of the Administrative Procedure Act would apply to the administrative and judicial review provided for in the new section 1369(b) to the same extent as they now apply to the appellate procedures for cash benefits under existing law.

OVERPAYMENTS ON BEHALF OF INDIVIDUALS

Amendment No. 205: Section 1870 of the House bill provided that, where an overpayment under part A or B of title XVIII was made and could not be recouped, subsequent cash social security benefits or railroad retirement benefits payable to the individual (or, if such individual dies, benefits payable to others based on his earnings), would be reduced in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Railroad Retirement Board.

Under the Senate amendment, section 1870 provided that, where the Secretary found that an overpayment under part A or B of title XVIII was made and could not be recouped, proper adjustment or recovery would be made under regulations prescribed by the Secretary after consultation with the Railroad Retirement Board. The Secretary would make the proper adjustment or recovery by (*a*) decreasing any payment under title II of the Social Security Act or under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as the case may be, to which such individual is entitled; or (*b*) requiring such individual or his estate to refund the amount in excess of the correct amount; or (*c*) decreasing any payment under title II of the Social Security Act or under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as the case may be, payable to the estate of such individual or to any other person on the basis of the wages and self-employment income (or compensation) which were the basis of the payments to such individual; or (*d*) by applying any combination of the foregoing.

The conference agreement contains the House provision with technical changes.

STUDY OF FEASIBILITY OF DRUG COVERAGE

Amendment No. 210: This amendment added to the new section 1875 of the Social Security Act a provision requiring the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to study the feasibility of covering prescription drugs under part B of the new title XVIII and to report his findings to the Congress on or before June 30, 1966.

The Senate recedes.

ADVANCE FILING UNDER TRANSITIONAL PROVISION

Amendment No. 217: The House bill provided that an application to establish hospital insurance eligibility under section 103 of the bill would not be valid if filed before the first month in which the uninsured individual meets the various eligibility requirements.

The Senate amendment permits filing as early as the third month preceding that month.

The House recedes.

EXCLUSION OF PERSONS COVERED UNDER THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT OF 1959

Amendment No. 219: The House bill excluded from hospital insurance protection under section 103 of the bill those uninsured persons who are or could have been covered under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959.

The Senate amendment modified this exclusion so that it would apply only to individuals who actually are enrolled under that act.

The conference agreement excludes an individual who (1) at the beginning of the first month in which he meets the requirements of section 103(a) of the bill, is covered by an enrollment in a plan under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959; (2) was so covered on February 16, 1965; or (3) could have been so covered for such first month if he or some other person had availed himself of opportunities to enroll or continue enrollment (but this last of the three grounds for exclusion would apply only if the individual or such other person was a Federal employee after February 15, 1965). The above three grounds for exclusion would not apply with respect to any month for which an individual is not covered under such a health benefits plan because he or another person separated from Federal service was not eligible to continue such coverage after separation.

It is hoped that the comprehensive study of retirement provisions for Federal personnel which the executive branch has initiated will include a reexamination of existing health insurance programs for Federal personnel in the light of the hospital insurance and supplementary medical insurance programs established by this bill.

TIME FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND FOR PAYMENTS TO THE UNINSURED

Amendments Nos. 220, 221, 222, and 223: The Senate amendments provided that the amounts to be paid under section 103 of the bill from the general fund to the Federal hospital insurance trust fund for uninsured persons for a fiscal year could be appropriated at the beginning of that year.

The House recedes.

MEDICAL EXPENSE DEDUCTION

Amendment No. 227: Under existing law, taxpayers generally may deduct expenses for medical care only to the extent that they exceed 3 percent of adjusted gross income. Also, in the case of medicine and drugs, taxpayers generally may take into account only the aggregate of the amounts paid in excess of 1 percent of adjusted gross income. However, the 3- and 1-percent limitations are not applicable in the case of expenses paid (1) for the care of the taxpayer and his spouse if either has attained age 65 before the close of the taxable year; or (2) for the care of a dependent mother or father of the taxpayer or his spouse, if such mother or father has attained age 65 before the close of the taxable year. Under the House bill, the 3- and 1-percent limitations apply without regard to age, but an amount (not in excess of $250) equal to one-half of the expenses for insurance which constitutes medical care may be deducted without regard to the 3-percent limitation. Senate amendment No. 227 struck out these provisions of the House bill.

Under the conference agreement, the 3- and 1-percent limitations will apply without regard to age and an amount (not in excess of $150) equal to one-half of the expenses for insurance which constitutes medical care may be deducted without regard to the 3-percent limitation.

Amendments Nos. 232 and 233: The bill, as passed by the House, provides, in effect, in the case of an insurance contract under which amounts are payable for other than medical care, that no amount may be taken into account as a medical expense unless the charge is separately stated in the insurance contract. Under the Senate amendments the charge may alternatively be furnished in a separate statement.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 234: Under existing law, the deduction for medical expenses is limited to $10,000 (or $20,000 in case of joint returns, etc.), except that special maximum limitations apply if the taxpayer or his spouse ($20,000), or both the taxpayer and his spouse ($40,000), are 65 and disabled. Under the House bill the special limitations would apply without regard to age. Under the Senate amendment all maximum limitations are repealed.

The House recedes with technical amendments. The conferees on the part of the House, in accepting this amendment, recognize that the removal of the ceiling on medical expense deductions, while generally desirable, may raise problems in connection with amounts claimed as medical expense deductions for facilities, devices, services, and transportation which are of the types customarily used, or taken, primarily for other than medical purposes. In some cases, for example, taxpayers have been able to sustain claims for medical deductions for part or all of the costs of installing swimming pools in their yards, air-conditioning systems in their homes, and transportation expenses which may be relatively extensive. Removing the ceiling on medical expense deduction may increase the aggregate amount claimed for deductions of these types. Therefore, the conferees, both on the part of the House and on the part of the Senate, in removing the ceiling on medical expense deductions recognize the desirability of considering legislation dealing with the definition of allowable medical expense deductions.

NURSING HOME STUDY

Amendments Nos. 240 and 247: The Senate amendments added a provision to section 109 of the bill requiring the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to appoint an Advisory Council on Social Security to study nursing homes and other extended care facilities. The Council would, within 1 year after enactment of the bill, submit its report with recommendations regarding the action necessary to make maximum use of extended care facilities to provide high quality care under the hospital insurance program.

The Senate recedes.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR RAILROAD BENEFICIARIES

Amendment No. 248: The House bill, through various amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, and the Social Security Act, provided health insurance benefits for railroad beneficiaries under the social security program, with hospital insurance taxes imposed under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act.

Senate amendment No. 248 added to the House bill a new section (sec. 111), which, subject to an effective date proviso, provided for imposing hospital insurance taxes on railroad employment under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, with exchanges of funds with respect to hospital insurance benefits for railroad beneficiaries to be made through financial interchange provisions comparable to those which now apply to old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits. The Senate amendment would authorize the Railroad Retirement Board to make determinations as to the rights of railroad retirement beneficiaries to hospital insurance benefits, and to enter into agreements with Canadian hospitals and with hospitals devoted primarily to railroad employees for the purpose of providing hospital insurance benefits for railroad retirement beneficiaries. The Senate amendment would become effective only after the enactment of amendments to the Railroad Retirement Tax Act increasing the maximum amount of monthly compensation taxable under that act to an amount equal to or in excess of one-twelfth of the maximum annual earnings creditable under the hospital insurance program. The House recedes with an amendment.

The conference agreement would delete the provisions in the Senate amendment giving the Railroad Retirement Board authority to enter into agreements with railroad hospitals, and providing for payments to suppliers of services from the railroad retirement account. Under the conference agreement, the Railroad Retirement Board would, as under the Senate amendment, make determinations as to the right of railroad retirement beneficiaries to hospital insurance benefits, but the administration of the benefits provided would be under the social security program. Under the conference agreement the contributions for hospital insurance for railroad workers would be collected in combination with the railroad retirement contributions on the railroad retirement tax base, and the amount of the contributions on the social security base would be transferred from the railroad retirement account to the hospital insurance trust fund through the financial interchange provisions. The effective date provisions of the Senate amendment would be changed so that the provisions of the bill as passed by the House would be effective for any year during which the railroad retirement taxable wage base (on an annual basis) is different from that of social security.

ADDITIONAL UNDER SECRETARY AND TWO ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Amendment No. 249: The Senate amendment added to the House bill a new section (sec. 112) providing for an additional Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and two additional Assistant Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare. The House bill contained no such provision.

The Senate recedes.

REQUIREMENT OF STATE FUNDS TO MEET NON-FEDERAL SHARE OF MEDICAL ASSISTANCE EXPENDITURES

Amendment No. 250: Under the House bill the new title XIX of the Social Security Act required (effective July 1, 1970) a State plan for medical assistance to provide that all of the non-Federal funds under it shall be from State, rather than from State and local sources.

The Senate amendment provided as an alternative that, if a State, on an equalization or other basis, could assure that lack of adequate funds from local sources would not result in lowering the amount, duration, scope, or quality of care and services available under the plan, local funds could continue to be utilized to meet the non-Federal share of expenditures under the plan.

The House recedes.

NATURE OF STATE AGENCY REQUIRED TO ADMINISTER STATE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Amendment No. 251: Under the House bill, the new title XIX of the Social Security Act provided that an approved program of medical assistance would have to be administered (or its administration supervised) by the State agency responsible for the administration of title I or title XVI (insofar as it relates to the aged) of the Social Security Act.

Senate amendment No. 251 permitted the establishment or designation of any single State agency to administer or supervise the administration of the plan, but required that the determination of eligibility for medical assistance under the plan be made by the State or local agency responsible for administering the State plan approved under such title I or XVI.

The House recedes.

REQUIRED HEALTH AND SAFETY STANDARDS

Amendment No. 254: This amendment added to the House bill a requirement that after June 30, 1967, the requirements and standards established by States under the medical assistance program under the new title XIX must include any requirements contained in standards established by the Secretary relating to protection against fire and other hazards to the health and safety of individuals in public or private institutions.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The Senate recedes.

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO ASSISTANCE FOR RECIPIENTS IN MENTAL OR TUBERCULOSIS INSTITUTIONS

Amendments Nos. 262, 263, 271, 298, 299, 300, 302, 303, and 304: The House bill imposed certain special requirements for State medical assistance and other Federal-State public assistance programs if the State chooses to include persons aged 65 or over who are patients in hospitals for mental disease or tuberculosis.

Under the Senate amendments, these special provisions applied only in the case of patients in hospitals for mental diseases.

The House recedes.

STANDARDS TO ASSURE HIGH QUALITY OF MEDICAL ASSISTANCE

Amendment No. 266: This amendment required that approved State plans for medical assistance describe the various standards, methods, and arrangements the State expects to use to assure that medical or remedial care provided to recipients of medical assistance is of high quality. The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The House recedes.

FREEDOM TO CHOOSE AGENCY OR PERSON PROVIDING MEDICAL SERVICES

Amendment No. 267: This amendment provided that an individual entitled to medical assistance under an approved State plan (under the new title XIX) might obtain such assistance from any institution, agency, or person qualified to perform the service or services required. The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The Senate recedes.

FEDERAL SHARE OF TRAINING EXPENDITURES

Amendment No. 270: The House bill provided 75 percent Federal participation in expenditures, under an approved State plan for medical assistance, which are attributable to compensation of skilled, professional medical personnel, and staff directly supporting such personnel.

Senate amendment No. 270 provided the same Federal share of expenditures for the training of such personnel.

The House recedes.

EXTENSION OF STATE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PLANS

Amendment No. 272: The House bill contained a provision requiring approved State plans for medical assistance to show that they were being expanded with a view toward furnishing, by July 1, 1975, comprehensive care and services to substantially all individuals who meet the plan's eligibility standards with respect to income and resources.

A Senate amendment changed this date to approximately 10 years following the taking effect of the State plan.

The Senate recedes.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR MEDICALLY NEEDY FAMILIES

Amendments Nos. 273 and 274: The House bill included among those eligible for medical assistance under the State plans approved under the new title XIX all children and their relatives responsible for their care who would, if needy, be eligible for aid to families with dependent children (i.e., families in which children are deprived of parental support by reason of the death, absence, incapacity, or unemployment of a parent). Senate amendments Nos. 273 and 274 expanded the definition of eligible persons to include all medically needy children and relatives responsible for their care.

The House recedes with an amendment to include all such children, but limiting the eligibility of relatives to those in families which would, if needy, be eligible for aid to families with dependent children.

NURSING HOME SERVICES AND DENTAL SERVICES

Amendments Nos. 276 and 277: Under the House bill, an approved State plan was required to include skilled nursing home services for all individuals eligible for medical assistance. Dental services could be provided, with Federal financial aid, if the States wished.

The Senate amendments included skilled nursing home services as a required service for individuals aged 21 or over, and dental services as a required service for individuals under age 21. They made skilled nursing home services and dental services for individuals of other ages optional.

Under the conference agreement skilled nursing home services would be required for individuals aged 21 or over, but dental services would be optional with the States for persons of all ages.

TERMINATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR MEDICAL CARE UNDER EXISTING PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Amendment No. 281: The House bill terminated Federal sharing in aid or assistance in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care under titles I, IV, X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act with respect to any period after June 30, 1967.

Senate amendment No. 281 continued authorization under the other public assistance titles indefinitely.

The House recedes with an amendment establishing the termination date of Federal financial participation in such aid or assistance under the other titles as December 31, 1969.

EFFECT UNDER OTHER PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS OF DISREGARD OF INCOME UNDER ANY SUCH PROGRAM

Amendment No. 282: A provision of the House bill required that any income which is disregarded or set aside under any other public assistance title must also be disregarded under title XIX (a comparable provision under existing law applies to title X of the Social Security Act).

The Senate amendment extended this principle to all of the public assistance titles.

The House recedes.

NOTICE CONCERNING BENEFITS PROVIDED UNDER TITLE XVIII OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Amendment No. 285: This amendment added a new section 123 to the bill to require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, before July 1, 1966, to provide personal notice containing specified information relating to benefits under the new title XVIII of the Social Security Act to individuals who the Secretary has reason to believe will be entitled to benefits under part A of the new title XVIII.

The Senate recedes. It is the understanding of the conferees, on the part of both the House and the Senate, that the appropriate officers and employees of the Social Security Administration will take all feasible steps to give full information, by personal notice and by other means, with respect to the hospital insurance program to individuals who will be eligible for the benefits of such program when it goes into effect or who thereafter become eligible for such benefits.

PROJECT GRANTS FOR HEALTH OF SCHOOL AND PRESCHOOL CHILDREN (INCLUDING THE EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED)

Amendments Nos. 288, 289, 290, and 293: The House bill amended title V of the Social Security Act by adding a new section 532 authorizing a 5-year program of project grants to promote the health of children of school age or preschool age.

The Senate amendments increased the appropriation authorizations for fiscal years 1968, 1969, and 1970 by $5 million each and added a specific authorization for project grants for the identification, care, and treatment of emotionally disturbed children.

The Senate recedes.

APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATIONS FOR CHILD WELFARE SERVICES

Amendment No. 295: This amendment increased the authorization for child welfare services to the same levels provided in the House bill for maternal and child health and crippled children's services. No provision was included in the House bill.

The House recedes with technical amendments.

DAY CARE SERVICES IN CHILD WELFARE SERVICES PROGRAM

Amendment No. 296: This amendment repealed the provisions in title V of the Social Security Act which earmark, for day care services, up to $10 million per year of the appropriation for child welfare services.

The House bill did not deal with these existing provisions of the Social Security Act.

The House recedes, but with an amendment postponing the effective date of the repeal to January 1, 1966.

HEALTH STUDY OF RESOURCES RELATING TO CHILDREN'S EMOTIONAL ILLNESS

Amendment No. 305: This amendment authorized $500,000 each for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for grants for a program to study our resources for finding, preventing, and treating children's emotional illness. No comparable provision was contained in the House bill.

The House recedes.

BENEFIT AMOUNTS

Amendments Nos. 306 and 309: Section 301(a) of the House bill amended section 215(a) of the Social Security Act to provide a new benefit table for determining primary insurance amounts and maximum family benefits, based on the $5,600 contribution and benefit base scheduled by the House bill to be effective for the years 1966 through 1970. Section 301(f) of the House bill revised and extended the benefit table, effective with monthly benefits payable for months after 1970, to take account of the $6,600 annual contribution and benefit base that the House bill would make effective for years after 1970.

To take account of the fact that the Senate amendments provide for the $6,600 contribution and benefit base to be effective for years after 1965, Senate amendment No. 306 substituted for the benefit table in section 301(a) of the House bill a new table corresponding to the table in section 301(f) of the House bill. Senate amendment No. 309 deleted section 301(f) of the House bill.

The House recedes.

DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFITS

Amendment No. 312: Under existing law, the term "disability" is defined as inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or to be of long-continued and indefinite duration. The bill as passed by the House struck out the requirement that the individual's impairment be one which can be expected to result in death or to be of long-continued and indefinite duration. The effect, in general, would be to take an impairment into account for disability freeze and disability insurance benefit purposes if the period of disability included 6 consecutive calendar months.

Under Senate amendment No. 312, the impairment must be one which can be expected to result in death or which has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months.

The House recedes with a technical amendment.

Amendment No. 313: Under existing law (sec. 216(i)(2)) a period of disability ends with the second month after the month in which the disability ceases. Under the bill as passed by the House, if the individual was under a disability for a continuous period of less than 18 calendar months the period of disability would end with the first month after the disability ceased.

Senator amendment No. 313 would in effect retain the rule of existing law.

The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 316 and 317: Under existing law, an individual's entitlement to disability insurance benefits (in general) begins with the first month after his 6-month waiting period and ends with the second month following the month in which his disability ceases. Under the bill as passed by the House benefits would (in general) begin with the last month of the waiting period and end as provided by existing law except they would end with the first month following such cessation if the individual was under a disability for a continuous period of less than 18 calendar months.

Under Senate amendments Nos. 316 and 317 the rule of existing law as to the period of entitlement to benefits would be retained. Under both the bill as passed by the House and the Senate amendments the requirement that the application be filed while under a disability is eliminated.

The House recedes on Senate amendment No. 316 with a technical amendment, and recedes on Senate amendment No. 317.

SIMULTANEOUS ENTITLEMENT TO A DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFIT AND AN OLD-AGE INSURANCE BENEFIT

Amendment No. 325: Section 304(a) of the House bill provided that where a worker is simultaneously entitled to an old-age insurance benefit and a disability insurance benefit, only the disability insurance benefit would be payable.

The Senate amendment provides that where a worker is entitled for any month to both a disability insurance benefit and an old-age insurance benefit he is to receive the larger benefit, unless he elects to receive the smaller benefit.

The House recedes.

DISABILITY INSURANCE TRUST FUND

Amendments Nos. 329 and 330: The House bill allocated to the Federal disability insurance trust fund three-fourths of 1 percent (0.75 percent) of taxable wages and nine-sixteenths of 1 percent (0.5625 percent) of taxable self-employment income (0.50 percent of wages and 0.375 percent of self-employment income in existing law) to meet the cost of the disability provisions of existing law and the amendments to these provisions made by the House bill.

The Senate amendment allocated to the disability insurance trust fund 0.76 percent of taxable wages and 0.57 percent of taxable self-employment income to meet the cost of the disability program as amended by the Senate bill.

The conference agreement allocates to the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund 0.70 percent of taxable wages and 0.525 percent of taxable self-employment income to meet the cost of the disability program under the conference agreement.

CHILDHOOD DISABILITY BENEFITS

Amendments Nos. 332, 333, and 346: Section 306 of the House bill, relating to the payment of child's insurance benefits to children age 18 through 21 attending school, made no change (other than changes conforming to the changes in the disability provisions under sec. 303 of the House bill) in the provision for paying child's insurance benefits after age 18 to an individual whose disability began before age 18.

The Senate amendment modified section 306 by removing the changes conforming the section to the disability provisions in the House bill and adding a provision permitting a child disabled before age 22 (rather than before age 18) to be entitled to a child's insurance benefit should his parent retire, die, or become disabled.

Under the conference agreement, the disability must have begun before age 18.

RESTORATION OF BENEFIT RIGHTS AFTER REMARRIAGE

Amendments Nos. 352, 353, 355, 357, 358, 360, and 361: Section 308 of the House bill, relating to the payment of wife's or widow's benefits to divorced women, provided for reinstating widow's and mother's insurance benefits (and, in the case of a divorced wife, wife's insurance benefits) in cases where such benefits had terminated on account of remarriage but the remarriage ended in divorce after less than 20 years. (There are comparable provisions in the present social security law for reinstating benefits after a remarriage that ends in the death of the husband after less than 1 year.)

The Senate amendments provided that widow's and mother's insurance benefits (and, in the case of a divorced wife, wife's insurance benefits) would be payable to women who are not married, regardless of any intervening marriage that has ended.

The House recedes.

LIBERALIZATION IN THE RETIREMENT TEST

Amendment No. 362: Section 310 of the House bill amended section 203(f) of the Social Security Act to provide that if a beneficiary earns more than $1,200 in a year, $1 in benefits would be withheld for each $2 of earnings between $1,200 and $2,400 (rather than between $1,200 and $1,700 as under existing law), and $1 in benefits would be withheld for each $1 of earnings above $2,400. As under existing law, no benefit would be withheld for any month in which the beneficiary earns $100 or less in wages and does not engage in self-employment.

The Senate amendment changed section 310 of the bill so that it amends sections 203(f) and 203(h) of the Social Security Act to provide (1) that the amount of yearly earnings which a beneficiary can have and still get all of his benefits for the year would be increased from $1,200 to $1,800; (2) that $1 in benefits would be withheld for each $2 of earnings between $1,800 and $3,000 and for each $1 of earnings thereafter; and (3) that no benefit would be withheld for any month in which the beneficiary earns $150 or less in wages and does not engage in self-employment.

The House recedes with an amendment which provides (1) that the amount of yearly earnings which a beneficiary can have without having any benefits withheld will be increased to $1,500; (2) that $1 in benefits will be withheld for each $2 of earnings between $1,500 and $2,700 and for each $1 of earnings thereafter; and (3) that no benefit will be withheld for any month in which the beneficiary earns $125 or less in wages and does not engage in self-employment.

COVERAGE FOR DOCTORS OF MEDICINE

Amendment No. 363: Section 311 of the House bill amended section 211(c) of the Social Security Act and section 1402(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to extend coverage under social security to earnings derived by self-employed doctors from the practice of medicine, effective for taxable years ending after December 31, 1965.

Under the Senate amendment, coverage for self-employed doctors of medicine would begin with taxable years ending on or after December 31, 1965.

The House recedes.

COVERAGE OF TIPS

Amendment No. 364: Section 313 of the bill as passed by the House amended both the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend social security coverage with respect to tips received by employees. In addition, the bill as passed by the House required employers to withhold the income tax attributable to tips from wage payments to employees.

In extending social security coverage with respect to tips, the House bill provided a method for the collection of the Federal Insurance Contribution Act taxes imposed by sections 3101 and 3111 of the Internal Revenue Code. Under this method, an employee who received tips would be required to report the amount thereof to his employer periodically and the employer with certain limitations would be made liable for the taxes imposed by sections 3101 and 3111 of the code with respect to tips so reported. One such limitation was a provision limiting the employer's liability for the taxes imposed by section 3101 of the code (the employee taxes) to amounts which could be collected by deducting the taxes from wages (other than tips) of the employee and from funds which the employee would have been required to turn over to his employer for this purpose. The wages other than tips from which an employer would have been required to deduct the taxes were limited to those which were under his control from the date on which he received an employee's report of the tips up to the 10th day of the month following the month in which the report was so received. If, without reasonable cause, the employee failed to report tips to his employer as required, or failed to turn over to the employer funds in an amount sufficient to permit the employer to withhold the taxes imposed by section 3101, the employee, in addition to the tax which the employer could not withhold because of such failure, would become liable for a penalty equal to 100 percent of the amount of such tax.

Under the bill as passed by the House, the income tax attributable to tips would be withheld (in much the same manner as the employee social security taxes) by the employer by deducting the tax from wages (other than tips) paid to the employee on the basis of the periodic statement of tips the employee would be required to furnish his employer.

Senate amendment No. 364 substituted for the provisions of section 313 of the bill as passed by the House provisions treating tips received by employees as self-employment income (taxable under ch. 2 of the Internal Revenue Code).

Under the conference agreement, as in the bill as passed by the House, social security coverage is extended with respect to tips by adding a new paragraph at the end of section 209 of the Social Security Act and a new subsection (q) to section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that tips received by an employee in the course of his employment are to be considered remuneration for employment for social security purposes and are to be deemed paid to the employee at the time reported to his employer pursuant to 6053(a) of the Internal Revenue Code (added by sec. 313(e)(2) of the bill). The new subsection (q) of section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code does not apply for purposes of the taxes imposed on employers by section 3111 of the code. Thus, tips are not considered as remuneration for employment for purposes of the employer taxes imposed by section 3111 of the code. The effect of this limitation is to prevent the imposition of the employer taxes with respect to tips received by employees (and the amounts transferred to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, the Federal disability insurance trust fund, and the Federal hospital insurance trust fund in respect to the taxes imposed by sections 3101 and 3111 of the code will be determined by taking this limitation into account). An additional effect of such limitation is to exclude tips from the computation of the

$6,600 limitation in the definition of the term "wages" contained in section 3121(a)(1) of the code for purposes of section 3111 of the code, although tips are included in computing such $6,600 limitation for purposes of section 3101 of the code. The determination of the existence of an employee-employer relationship with respect to any tip recipient is to be made in accordance with existing law and nothing contained in section 313 of the bill is intended to bear on such determination. Under the conference agreement, the provisions of section 313 of the bill are to apply with respect to all tips received by employees after 1965 including those which under existing law would have been covered for social security tax purposes by reason of being accounted for by the employee to the employer. The provisions of section 313 of the bill, of course, do not apply to amounts which, although denominated tips, constitute wages under present law irrespective of whether accounted for by the employee to his employer.

The bill as passed by the House added a new subsection (c) to section 3102 of the code. Paragraph (2) required an employee to turn over to his employer funds in an amount which, when added to the wages of the employee (other than tips) under the control of the employer would provide an amount from which the employer could deduct the employee taxes imposed by section 3101 of the code in respect of tips. Under the conference agreement the new section 3102(c)(2) is modified to provide that the employee may furnish such funds to his employer but is not required to do so.

The bill as passed by the House also added a new section 3102(c)(3) to the code which contained provisions permitting employers (when authorized to do so by regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate) to deduct the tax imposed by section 3101 of the code in respect of tips from wages paid during a quarter of a calendar year on an estimated basis and to adjust the amount so deducted by making addtional deductions from wages paid to the employee during the same quarter. Under the conference agreement the new section 3102(c)(3) is modified to permit the employer to make the required adjustment by deducting amounts from wages (not including tips) paid to the employee either during such calendar quarter or within 30 days after the end of such calendar quarter. The limitation on the liability of the employer for the taxes imposed by section 3101 contained in the new section 3102(c)(1) also is modified to conform to this 30-day extension of the period during which the employer is to deduct the tax.

Under the conference agreement a new section 3102(c)(4) is added to the code. Under this provision an employee is required to pay directly to the Internal Revenue Service that part of the taxes imposed by section 3101 in respect of tips which exceeds the portion of such tax which can be collected by the employer (from wages, including funds turned over by the employee) pursuant to the new section 3102(c). In such cases, the tax is to be collected from employees pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate under the general provisions of subtitle F of the Internal Revenue Code.

In order for the employee to be able to report and pay to the Internal Revenue Service the portion of the employee taxes which the employer is unable to withhold, the conference agreement (new sec. 6053(b) of the code) requires employers to furnish to their employees written statements showing the amount by which (A) the taxes imposed by section 3101 with respect to tips which were reported by the employees to the employer, exceeds (B) the taxes which the employer could collect from wages of the employee (other than tips) and from funds turned over to him by the employee. The statements are to be furnished at such time, contain such information, and be in such form as the Secretary or his delegate prescribes by regulations. In addition, the employer, when required by regulations so to do, is to furnish a duplicate of the statements to the Internal Revenue Service. Sections 6674 (fraudulent statement or failure to furnish statement to employee) and 6652(b) (failure to file certain information returns) are amended to extend the penalties provided by such sections to the comparable failures in respect of the new statements.

The bill as passed by the House added a new section 6652(c) to the code. The effect of the new section was to provide a penalty for failure (other than for reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect) of an employee to report the receipt of tips to his employer as required by section 6053(a) of the code and to furnish to his employer funds in an amount sufficient to enable the employer to deduct the taxes imposed by section 3101 of the code. The penalty was to be an amount equal to 100 percent of the taxes the employer was unable to collect because of such failures by the employee. Under the conference agreement, the penalty is to be imposed only for failures of employees to report the receipt of tips to their employers as required under section 6053(a), and the amount of the penalty is to be an amount equal to 50 percent of the taxes imposed by section 3101 of the code with respect to the tips the employee has so failed to report.

Under the conference agreement, as in the bill as passed by the House, the income tax attributable to tips is required to be withheld by employers. However, under the conference agreement, section 3402(h)(3) of the code is amended to permit the adjustment, required in the case of an employer who is using the average basis for withholding income tax at source during a calendar quarter, to be made with respect to the amount required to be deducted in respect of tips by making additional deductions during the 30 days following the close of the calendar quarter.

INCLUSION OF ALASKA AMONG STATES PERMITTED TO DIVIDE THEIR RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

Amendment No. 366: Section 314 of the House bill amended section 218(d)(6)(C) of the Social Security Act to add Alaska and Kentucky to the list of States which are permitted to divide a retirement system into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage for only those employees in the system who desire it.

The Senate amendment deleted the provision adding Kentucky to this list of States.

The House recedes.

EMPLOYEES OF NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

Amendment Nos. 367 and 368: Section 316 of the House bill amended section 3121(k) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit a nonprofit organization to file a waiver certificate and make it retroactive for up to 5 years (rather than 1 year under present law) before the quarter in which the certificate is filed. An organization filing a waiver certificate during or before the year of the enactment of the bill could amend the certificate to begin coverage as early as 5 years before the quarter in which the certificate is amended. In addition, the House bill amended section 105 of the Social Security Amendments of 1960 to provide that employees who were reported erroneously and who are no longer employed when the organization files its waiver certificate could validate such erroneous reportings.

Under Senate amendment No. 367, the amendment of a certificate to make it retroactive (or to provide increased retroactivity) would apply only to individuals who concur in the filing of the amendment. Senate amendment No. 368 added to section 316 of the House bill a new subsection (d) which would permit certain employees whose wages were erroneously reported by a nonprofit organization during the period the organization's waiver certificate was in effect to validate such erroneously reported wages.

The House recedes.

CONTRIBUTION AND BENEFIT BASE

Amendments Nos. 373, 374, 376, 378, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 389, 391, 393, 394, 396, 397, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, and 406: Section 320 of the House bill amended the Social Security Act to increase the earnings counted for benefit and tax purposes to $5,600 beginning with 1966 and $6,600 beginning with 1971.

Under the Senate amendments, the earnings counted for benefit and tax purposes would be increased to $6,600 beginning with 1966.

The House recedes.

CHANGES IN TAX SCHEDULES

Amendments Nos. 407 through 449: The following table shows the tax schedule in the House bill and that in the Senate bill:

Contribution rates for employees and employers each

[In percent]

Year	House bill			Senate bill		
	OASDI	HI	Total	OASDI	HI	Total
1966	4.0	0.35	4.35	3.85	0.325	4.175
1967–68	4.0	.50	4.50	3.85	.50	4.35
1969–70	4.4	.50	4.90	4.50	.50	5.00
1971–72	4.4	.50	4.90	4.50	.55	5.05
1973–75	4.8	.55	5.35	4.95	.65	5.60
1976–79	4.8	.60	5.40	4.95	.70	5.65
1980–86	4.8	.70	5.50	4.95	.80	5.75
1987 and after	4.8	.80	5.60	4.95	.85	5.80

Contribution rates for the self-employed

[In percent]

Year	House bill			Senate bill		
	OASDI	HI	Total	OASDI	HI	Total
1966	6.0	0.35	6.35	5.8	0.325	6.125
1967–68	6.0	.50	6.50	5.8	.50	6.30
1969–70	6.6	.50	7.10	6.8	.50	7.30
1971–72	6.6	.50	7.10	6.8	.55	7.35
1973–75	7.0	.55	7.55	7.0	.65	7.65
1976–79	7.0	.60	7.60	7.0	.70	7.70
1980–86	7.0	.70	7.70	7.0	.80	7.80
1987 and after	7.0	.80	7.80	7.0	.85	7.85

The conference agreement provides the following tax schedule:

[In percent]

Year	Employers and employees, each			Self-employed		
	OASDI	HI	Total	OASDI	HI	Total
1966	3.85	0.35	4.20	5.8	0.35	6.15
1967–68	3.90	.50	4.40	5.9	.50	6.40
1969–72	4.40	.50	4.90	6.6	.50	7.10
1973–75	4.85	.55	5.40	7.0	.55	7.55
1976–79	4.85	.60	5.45	7.0	.60	7.60
1980–86	4.85	.70	5.55	7.0	.70	7.70
1987 and after	4.85	.80	5.65	7.0	.80	7.80

APPLICATIONS FOR BENEFITS

Amendment 457: Existing law provides (in general) that applications filed more than 3 months before an individual becomes entitled to benefits are not to be treated as valid applications. The Senate amendments added a new section 328 to the House bill amending sections 202(j)(2), 216(i)(2), and 223(b) of the Social Security Act so as to extend the life of applications for social security benefits to the date of final decision thereon by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The House recedes.

OVERPAYMENTS AND UNDERPAYMENTS

Amendment No. 458: The Senate amendment added to the House bill a new section 329, amending section 204 of the Social Security Act to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to recover overpayments made to a beneficiary by decreasing, during the overpaid beneficiary's lifetime, the benefits of another beneficiary entitled on the basis of the same earnings record; to permit the Secretary to waive recovery or adjustment of an overpayment from any person who is without fault in the overpayment, even if he is not the overpaid person and the overpaid person is at fault; and to authorize the Secretary to establish an order of priority for disposing of amounts due a deceased beneficiary.

Under the conference agreement, the change in existing law is limited to cases of underpayments in which an individual dies before completion of payment of amounts due him under title II of the Social Security Act and the total amount due him at the time of his death, does not exceed an amount equal to 1 month's benefit. In such a case, payment is to be made to his surviving spouse who was living in the same household, or, if there is no such spouse, to the legal representative of his estate.

PAYMENTS TO TWO OR MORE INDIVIDUALS OF THE SAME FAMILY

Amendment No. 459: The Senate amendment added to the House bill a new section 330, which amended section 205(n) of the Social Security Act to provide that payment to the surviving payee or payees of a joint benefit check which was not negotiated before one of the payees dies may be authorized in accordance with regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury, and to provide for recovery of any overpayment resulting from the cashing of the joint check.

The House recedes.

VALIDATING CERTIFICATES FILED BY MINISTERS

Amendment No. 460: The Senate amendment added to the House bill a new section (sec. 331) amending sections 1402(e) (5) and (6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The amendment would under certain conditions permit social security credit to be obtained for the earnings of certain ministers who die or file waiver certificates before April 16, 1966, where such earnings were reported for social security purposes but cannot be credited under existing law.

The House recedes with technical amendments.

DETERMINATION OF ATTORNEYS' FEES IN COURT PROCEEDINGS UNDER TITLE II

Amendment No. 461: The Senate amendment added to the House bill a new section 332, which amends section 206 of the Social Security Act to permit a court which renders a decision favorable to a claimant for benefits to set a reasonable fee, not in excess of 25 percent of the past due benefits resulting from the decision, for the attorney who represented the claimant before the court. The amendment also permits the Secretary to certify payment of the court-awarded fee to the attorney from the past due benefits of the claimant, and provides that any attorney charging or receiving more than the fee set by the court is subject to a fine of up to $500, imprisonment up to 1 year, or both.

The House recedes with a technical amendment.

CONTINUATION OF WIDOW'S AND WIDOWER'S INSURANCE BENEFITS AFTER REMARRIAGE

Amendment No. 462: The Senate amendment added a new section (sec. 333) to the House bill providing for the payment of benefits based on a prior spouse's earnings record to widows age 60 or over and to widowers age 62 or over who remarry. The amount of the remarried widow's or widower's benefit would be 50 percent of the primary insurance amount of the deceased spouse rather than 82½ percent as in the case of unremarried widows and widowers. If a larger benefit would be payable based on the new spouse's earnings record, the excess of that benefit over the benefit based on the prior spouse's earnings would be paid to the remarried widow or widower.

The House recedes with a technical amendment.

CHANGES IN DEFINITIONS OF WIFE, WIDOW, AND WIDOWER

Amendment No. 463: The Senate amendment added to the House bill a new section (sec. 334) that would provide an exception to the 1-year duration-of-marriage requirement for spouse's benefits for any wife, widow, husband, or widower who was, in the month before marriage, actually or potentially entitled to railroad retirement benefits as a widow, widower, parent, or disabled adult child. Similar rules apply under existing law where the wife, widow, husband, or widower was actually or potentially entitled to similar benefits under title II of the Social Security Act.

The House recedes.

REDUCTION OF BENEFITS ON RECEIPT OF WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Amendment No. 464: The Senate amendment added a new section 335 to the House bill which provides that social security disability benefits for any month for which a worker is receiving a workmen's compensation benefit will be reduced to the extent that the total benefits paid to him and his dependents under both programs exceed the higher of (1) 80 percent of his average current earnings, or (2) the total of his disability insurance benefit for such month and of any monthly insurance benefits under section 202 for such month based on his wages and self-employment income. For this purpose, an individual's average current earnings is the larger of (A) the average monthly wage used in computing the disability insurance benefit, or (B) one-sixtieth of the total of his wages and self-employment income for the 5 consecutive calendar years after 1950 for which such wages and self-employment income were highest. The reduction is to be periodically adjusted to take account of changes in national average earnings. The new section will be applicable with respect to benefits payable for months after December 1965 on the basis of disabilities commencing after June 1, 1965.

The House recedes with technical amendments.

METHOD OF MAKING CERTAIN DISABILITY DETERMINATIONS

Amendment No. 465: This amendment added a section 336 to the bill to include among the individuals with respect to whom the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would make the disability determinations referred to in section 221(a) of the Social Security Act (that is, determinations of whether an individual is under a disability and of the day such disability began, and the determination of the day on which such disability ceases) those individuals with respect to whom the Secretary, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, finds that a determination of disability or cessation of disability can be made on evidence specified in the amendment.

The Senate recedes.

PAYMENT FOR COSTS OF REHABILITATION FROM TRUST FUNDS

Amendment 466: The Senate amendment added a new section 337 to the House bill amending section 222 of the Social Security Act. For the purpose of making vocational rehabilitation services more readily available to disabled individuals who are entitled to disability benefits (or entitled to child's insurance benefits after age 18 where the child is disabled) and to the end that savings will result to the Federal Disability Trust Fund and the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, the new section authorized transfers from the trust funds of such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to pay the costs of vocational rehabilitation services for such disabled individuals. The total amount made available during any fiscal year may not exceed 1 percent of the total amount certified for payment in the preceding year as (1) benefits for children over 18 and under a disability, and (2) disability insurance benefits.

The House recedes with technical amendments. The conference agreement relates to payment for the costs of rehabilitation services, and it is expected that this will be accomplished through use of rehabilitation and training facilities and services which are otherwise available.

TEACHERS IN THE STATE OF MAINE

Amendment No. 467: The Senate amendment added to the House bill a new section (sec. 338) which would extend from July 1, 1965, to July 1, 1970, the period during which the State of Maine is permitted (under sec. 316 of the Social Security Amendments of 1958) to treat teaching and nonteaching employees who are actually in the same retirement system as though they were under separate retirement systems for social security coverage purposes.

The House recedes with an amendment the effect of which is to change "July 1, 1970" to "July 1, 1967."

EXCLUSION FROM COVERAGE OF CERTAIN STUDENTS IN IOWA AND NORTH DAKOTA

Amendment No. 468: The Senate amendment added to the House bill a new section (sec. 339) which would permit the State of Iowa and the State of North Dakota to modify their coverage agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under section 218 of the Social Security Act so as to exclude from social security coverage service performed in any calendar quarter in the employ of a school, college, or university by a student if the remuneration for such service is less than $50.

The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

QUALIFICATION OF CHILDREN NOT QUALIFIED UNDER STATE LAW

Amendment No. 469: The Senate amendment added to the House bill a new section (sec. 340) which would provide for the payment of benefits to a child regardless of whether he has the status of a child under applicable State law, if the father had acknowledged the child in writing, had been ordered by a court to contribute to the child's support, or had been judicially decreed to be the child's father, or he had been shown by other satisfactory evidence to be the child's father and was living with or contributing to the support of the child.

The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

EMPLOYEES OF MEMBERS OF AFFILIATED GROUP OF CORPORATIONS

Amendment No. 470: The Senate amendment added to the House bill a new section (sec. 341) to provide that in cases where a person works for more than one corporation in an affiliated group of corporations during the calendar year, the affiliated group (rather than each corporation, as under present law) would be considered to be a single employer for purposes of determining the maximum amount of wages subject to employer and employee taxes.

The Senate recedes.

ACTUARIALLY REDUCED BENEFITS AT AGE 60

Amendment No. 471: The Senate amendment added to the House bill a new section (sec. 342) amending section 202 of the Social Security Act to provide that workers, wives, husbands, widowers, and parents would be eligible for benefits at age 60 rather than at age 62 as under existing law. The amendment also amended subsections (q) and (r) of section 202 of the act to provide that where an individual elects to receive his benefits before age 65 in the case of workers, wives, or husbands, or before age 62 in the case of widowers or parents, the benefits would be actuarially reduced. (A provision to make widow's benefits available at age 60, with the benefits actuarially reduced, is included in section 307 of the bill as agreed to in conference.)

The Senate recedes.

DISCLOSURE UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES TO WELFARE AGENCIES OF WHEREABOUTS OF INDIVIDUALS

Amendment No. 472: The Senate amendment added to the House bill a new section 343, amending section 1106 of the Social Security Act, to require the Secretary to furnish promptly, at the request of a welfare agency or a court, the most recent address in the social security records for a person who has failed without lawful excuse to provide support for his or her destitute child or children under age 16, or his destitute wife.

The House recedes with an amendment requiring the Secretary to furnish, at the request of a State or local agency participating in any State or local public assistance program, the most recent address in the social security records for a parent (or his most recent employer, or both) who has failed to provide support for his or her destitute child or children under age 16 who are recipients of or applicants for assistance under such public assistance program, where there is a court order for the support of the children and the information requested is to be used by the welfare agency or the court on behalf of the children.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MINISTERS TO ELECT COVERAGE

Amendment No. 473: The Senate amendment added to the House bill a new section (sec. 344) amending sections 1402(a) (2) and (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The amendment extends the period during which ministers may file waiver certificates electing social security coverage. If a certificate is filed after the date of enactment of the bill and on or before the due date of the return (including any extension thereof) for the second taxable year ending after 1963, the certificate is to be effective for the taxpayer's first taxable year ending after 1962 and all succeeding years. In the case of a calendar-year taxpayer the due date of the return for such second taxable year is April 15, 1966, and the certificate would apply to 1963 and succeeding taxable years.

The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

INTERRELATIONSHIP BETWEEN VETERANS' BENEFITS AND INCREASED SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Amendment No. 474: The Senate amendment added to the House bill a new section (sec. 345) amending section 503 of title 38, United States Code, for the purpose of excluding the benefit increase provided in the bill from countable income in determining eligibility for and amount of a veteran's pension.

The Senate recedes.

CERTAIN SCHOOL EMPLOYEES IN ALASKA

Amendment No. 475: The Senate amendment added to the House bill a new section (sec. 346) validating, for periods through the year of the enactment of the bill, social security coverage of employees of certain school districts in Alaska which have been included in error as employees of separate political subdivisions under the coverage agreement between the State of Alaska and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare entered into pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act.

The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

CONTINUATION OF CHILD'S INSURANCE BENEFITS AFTER ADOPTION BY BROTHER OR SISTER

Amendment No. 476: The Senate amendment added to the House bill a new section (sec. 347) under which a child's brother or sister would be included in the list of relatives (under existing law, the stepparent, grandparent, aunt, or uncle) who may adopt a child after the death of the worker on whose earnings the child is entitled to benefits without causing termination of the child's insurance benefits.

The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFITS FOR THE BLIND; SPECIAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 477: This amendment added a new section to the bill (1) to provide, for purposes of both disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze, that the term "disability" includes blindness (as defined by the amendment), and (2) to provide that an individual whose disability is blindness (as so defined) be insured for disability insurance benefits for any month if he had not less than 6 quarters of coverage before the quarter in which such month occurs. (Existing law requires an individual to be fully insured and to have 20 quarters of coverage in the 40 quarters ending with the quarter in which the disability begins.) The term "blindness" was defined to mean central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye, or visual acuity greater than 20/200 if accompanied by a limitation in the fields of vision such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle no greater than 20°. The amendment also provided for payment of disability benefits after age 65 in such cases.

Under the conference agreement, an individual who becomes disabled before age 31, and whose disability is blindness (as defined for disability freeze purposes under existing law), is insured for disability insurance benefits for any month if not less than one-half (and not less than 6) of the quarters during the period ending with the quarter in which such month occurs and beginning after he attained the age of 21 were quarters of coverage, or (if the number of quarters in such period is less than 12) not less than 6 quarters in the 12-quarter period ending with such quarter were quarters of coverage. Similar rules are provided for purposes of the disability freeze.

The conference agreement also provides disability insurance benefits for disabled individuals who are blind (within the meaning of existing law) and have attained 55. For such purposes, the term "disability" is defined to mean inability by reason of blindness to engage in substantial gainful activity requiring skills or abilities comparable to those of any gainful activity in which the individual had previously engaged with some regularity and over a substantial period of time. If the individual engages in substantial gainful activity in a month, no payment of a disability insurance benefit is to be made to him for such month, and no payment of a wife's, husband's, or child's insurance benefit is to be made for such month on the basis of his wages and self-employment income.

INCREASE IN FEDERAL SHARE OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE EXPENDITURES

Amendment No. 478: The House bill increased the Federal share of the expenditures for cash assistance and medical care under State plans approved under title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act. This change was to be effective for expenditures after December 31, 1965.

The Senate amendment advanced this date to June 30, 1965.

The Senate recedes.

PROTECTIVE PAYMENTS FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS

Amendments Nos. 479 and 480: The House bill authorized protective payments to interested third parties on behalf of aged public assistance recipients who, because of a physical or mental condition, are so unable to manage money that payment of the assistance directly to them would be contrary to their welfare. These payments would be authorized under conditions designed to protect the interests of the needy person.

The Senate amendments authorized comparable provisions with respect to blind and disabled recipients. (The existing law authorizes such payments under the aid to families with dependent children program.)

The House recedes.

DISREGARDING CERTAIN INCOME ON DETERMINING NEED UNDER PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Amendments Nos. 484, 485, 486, 487, and 488: The House bill authorized the exemption of a larger amount of earnings than under present law for recipients of old-age assistance and for aged recipients under the State plan approved under title XVI of the Social Security Act.

The Senate amendments changed these provisions in several ways: (1) they advanced the effective date from January 1, 1966, to October 1, 1965; (2) they provided a comparable earnings exemption with respect to disabled recipients under titles XIV and XVI; (3) they included a provision under such titles for disregarding other income and resources of disabled recipients who actually are undergoing vocational rehabilitation; (4) they clarified the exemptions under title XVI with respect to individuals who are both aged and blind or aged and disabled to assure that the individual would qualify for the largest exemption to which he might be entitled; and (5) they provided for the exemption, over and above any other exemptions allowed, of up to $7 a month of income from any source, and whether or not earned.

The House recedes with an amendment reducing the monthly exemption of the income referred to in clause (5) above from $7 to $5. The $5 (or lesser amount) of income which may be disregarded for a month may be earned income, income from relatives or any other type of income.

REVIEW OF CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE DETERMINATIONS UNDER PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Amendments Nos. 491 and 492: The House bill provided, in relation to judicial review of the Secretary's decisions regarding public assistance plans, that the findings of the Secretary unless substantially contrary to the weight of evidence would be conclusive.

The Senate amendments change the language "unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence" to "if supported by substantial evidence."

The House recedes.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO ELIMINATE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 497: Under the House bill, after June 30, 1967, payments to the States with respect to aid or assistance in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care could be made only under the new title XIX of the Social Security Act (and not, as at present, under title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI). Section 408 of the House bill eliminated those public assistance provisions which would become obsolete as of July 1, 1967.

Under the conference action explained above with respect to Senate amendment No. 281, payments to States with respect to aid or assistance in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care may not be made under title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI after December 31, 1969.

The House recedes. The provisions of these titles which are in effect in 1969 and which will become obsolete on January 1, 1970, should at some time be removed from the law to simplify it.

OPTOMETRISTS SERVICES

Amendment No. 510: The House bill included a provision in the new medical assistance title (title XIX of the Social Security Act) that, if eyeglasses are provided, the individual must be free to choose whether these are prescribed by a physician skilled in the diseases of the eye or an optometrist. It also carried over from existing law the requirement that the individual be free to choose either a physician or an optometrist to examine his eyes to determine whether he is blind.

Senate amendment No. 510 extended this principle of freedom of choice to all titles of the Social Security Act and to all services which an optometrist is licensed to perform.

The Senate recedes.

ELIGIBILITY OF CHILDREN OVER 18 ATTENDING SCHOOL

Amendment No. 511: This amendment would broaden the type of schools that children over the age of 18 and under the age of 21 may attend and receive aid to families with dependent children payments in which the Federal Government will participate. The extension would be from the requirement that the child be (as determined in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare) a student regularly attending a high school in pursuance of a course of study leading to a high school diploma or its equivalent, to the requirement that he be (as determined by the State in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary) a student regularly attending a school, college, or university. The House bill contained no provision on this subject.

The House recedes.

DISREGARDING CERTAIN EARNINGS OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Amendment No. 512: This amendment would permit States, effective July 1, 1965, in determining need for assistance under aid to families with dependent children programs, to disregard not more than $50 per month of the earned income of a dependent child under the age of 18, but would limit the exemption to not more than three children in the same home. There was no provision on this subject in the House bill.

The House recedes with an amendment making the family limitation $150 per month for children in the same home.

ALTERNATIVE FEDERAL PAYMENTS WITH RESPECT TO PUBLIC ASSISTANCE EXPENDITURES

Amendment No. 513: This amendment added two provisions (in a new sec. 1118 of the Social Security Act) relating to the Federal share of expenditures for public assistance: (1) it would permit any State which has in effect a plan approved under the new title XIX to claim Federal participation in its expenditures under all of its Federal-State public assistance programs by application of the new formula contained in title XIX instead of using the varying formulas in the existing titles, and (2) it would permit any State, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1966, which could meet substantially all of the objectives and requirements of the new title XIX under its assistance programs approved under the other titles of the Social Security Act to receive Federal participation in its medical assistance expenditures by application of the formula provided in title XIX and, at its option, to have this formula applied in determining the Federal share for its money payments. No comparable provisions were in the House bill.

The House recedes with an amendment retaining the first but not the second provision.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
THOS. B. CURTIS,
JAMES B. UTT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the statement of the managers on the part of the House is some 35 pages in length and because the highlights of the conference agreement will be discussed by the managers on the part of the House, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are today reaching the final stages of legislative consideration of one of the most significant and far-reaching measures which has been before this or any recent Congress.

The legislation which this House passed on April 8 by an overwhelming vote and which is brought back to you today after detailed examination in the other body and after having been amended in a number of respects by the other body, is brought back essentially in the same form and basically with the same primary provisions as were contained in the House bill, originally.

However, before proceeding into the highlights of the conference agreement, it might be well for Members to recall the truly significant nature and broad ramifications of what we are doing in this legislation. It has been referred to as historic legislation—and I believe properly so. Over the years since the initiation of the social security program in 1935, there have been several notable landmarks in the form of amendments. I think the addition of survivor benefits in 1939, the extension of coverage to the self-employed in the early 1950's, the addition of disability benefits in 1956, and the improvements which were made in 1960 will rank among these outstanding measures. However, compared to these, the bill upon which you take final action today perhaps stands head and shoulders over all these other measures. It will be only a few short days until the social security system will celebrate its 30th anniversary, in fact, on August 14 next. I think this occasion takes on added significance because of that fact.

The measure on which you will take final action today meets the requirements of actuarial soundness and fiscal responsibility. It meets the requirements of the times in terms of the urgent needs of our elderly citizens. It meets the requirements of this day in terms of extension of programs to the needy, to crippled children, and to the millions of our citizens whose primary source of income is their social security benefits. I can commend this conference report to the House because in it you will be voting to approve over 95 percent of the original House version of this legislation. The additions, although numerous by a count of amendments, are few in terms of major structural changes.

Mr. Speaker, manifestly it will not be possible for me to cover in the brief time alloted to us under the rules all of the detailed provisions of this conference report. I will undertake simply to outline the principal provisions which I believe will be of broadest concern to the most Members.

First, let us consider the hospital and medical provisions.

BASIC HOSPITAL INSURANCE PLAN

Members will recall that the basic hospital insurance plan is referred to as plan A. Under the new title XVIII of the Social Security Act, the House provided coverage of 60 days of hospital care after a deductible of $40 currently. The Senate provided for unlimited duration of benefits but with $10 coinsurance for each day in excess of 60 days.

The conference provides 60 days of hospital benefits with a $40 deductible and with an additional 30 days with the Senate's $10 coinsurance feature—a total of 90 days.

Next we turn to posthospital extended care, that is, care in skilled nursing homes.

The House provided coverage of 20 days of such care with 2 additional days for each unused hospital day but with a maximum of 100 days of extended care covered.

The Senate provided 100 days but imposed $5 a day coinsurance for each day in excess of 20.

The conference report adopted the Senate version.

Posthospital home-health visits: The House authorized 100 visits after hospitalization.

The Senate increased the number of visits to 175 and deleted the requirement of prior hospitalization.

The conference adopted the House version.

Outpatient diagnostic services: The House imposed a $20 deductible with this amount creditable against an inpatient hospital deductible which was imposed at the same hospital within 20 days.

The Senate imposed a 20-percent coinsurance on such services, removed the credit against the inpatient hospital deductible, but allowed a credit for the deductible as an insured expense under the voluntary supplementary program.

The conference adopted the Senate version.

Psychiatric facilities: The House provided for 60 days of psychiatric hospital care with a 180-day lifetime limit in the voluntary supplementary program.

The Senate moved these services over into the basic hospital insurance program and increased the lifetime limit to 210 days.

The conference accepted the Senate version but reduced the lifetime limit to 190 days.

The House excluded any extended care facility primarily for the care and treatment of mental diseases or tuberculosis.

The Senate included such facilities but made both psychiatric extended care days and psychiatric hospital days subject to the lifetime limitation of days of care.

The conference report continues the House exclusion.

Scope of services—specialists: The House excluded physicians; services in the field of pathology, radiology, physiatry, or anesthesiology from basic hospital insurance benefit—but provided for their payment under the supplementary voluntary medical insurance program.

The Senate included these services if billed through a hospital.

The conference adopted the House version.

Federal employees: The House provided for coverage of aged under part A. Federal employees who were not eligible for protection under the Federal Employees Health Act and were not insured under social security. The Senate blanketed in all aged Federal employees. We ended up in a compromise with the Senate by including some additional Federal employees under the transitional provision for the uninsured.

Railroad retirement employees: We had a difference within the conference on railroad retirement employees and how their program would be financed. We ended up in conference in a compromise with the Senate on this provision, the net general effect of which is that the Railroad Retirement Board will determine eligibility but the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would reimburse providers who provide the covered services.

SUPPLEMENTARY VOLUNTARY PLAN

Mr. Speaker, in the supplementary medical insurance plan, plan B, the House proposed to initiate the program as of July 1, 1966, when the basic plan would go into effect. The Senate changed the effective date of the B plan to January 1, 1967. The conference accepted the House version in this respect.

Medical services: The House bill limited the services under the supplementary plan to physicians. The Senate bill extended the program to dentists performing certain dental surgeon functions and to chiropractors and podiatrists.

The conference adopted the dental surgeon's services but did not include those of podiatrists and chiropractors.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE—NEW TITLE XIX

Under the new title XIX the revised Kerr-Mills program, a very significant change was made I think from the House bill. Under the House bill, a single State agency was to administer the medical assistance program. This is the agency administering title I or title XVI; that is, the welfare agency. Under the conference agreement we adopted the provision that the State agency may be chosen by the State to administer the program but that eligibility for the program would be determined by the agency administering title I and title XVI.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, would the distinguished chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means rather finish his statement and then yield for some questions?

Mr. MILLS. If I may.

Mr. HALL. I want to ask a question on that point.

FUTURE TERMINATION OF EXISTING MEDICAL VENDOR PROGRAMS

Mr. MILLS. The House provided that all the medical programs under the titles were to terminate on June 30, 1967, and that the medical programs would have to be made available to the States under title XIX. The Senate gave the States the option of continuing existing law or going under the new title XIX.

The conference agreement would terminate all these existing programs on December 31, 1969, with the result that beginning in 1970 the only program of medical care that the States could have to which we would make contribution would be the title XIX program, the Kerr-Mills program.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on the subject of the new title XIX, I should clear up one point on which there has been some confusion. In the new title XIX, under the State plan, the bill provides that in determining whether an individual is blind, there would have to be an examination by a "physician skilled in diseases of the eye or by an optometrist, whichever the individual may select." Again in the definition of medical assistance, the State program may provide for eyeglasses prescribed by a "physician skilled in diseases of the eye or by an optometrist, whichever the individual may select."

It has come to my attention that there may be some confusion as to what meaning was intended by "physician skilled in diseases of the eye." It is our intention that this phrase shall have the same meaning it has in the existing social security law; that is, that the determination of blindness and the prescribing of glasses can be made by any physician authorized by State law to perform such services. It has never been our intention to limit the authority of physicians who have been licensed under State law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. MILLS. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the time to discuss the other changes that were made with respect to the Kerr-Mills program.

OASDI SYSTEM

However, let me go now to the retirement test under social security itself.

The House provided for an expansion of the $1 deduction for each $2 of earnings, from $1,700 to $2,400. The House retained the provision of no loss of benefit at $1,200. The Senate provided for the $1,200 to increase to $1,800 and extended the two-for-one band to cover earnings between $1,800 and $3,000.

Mr. Speaker, in the conference a compromise was worked out wherein the $1,200 is increased to $1,500. On top of that, we placed another $1,200 band on two-for-one earnings versus benefits, or a total of $2,700 compared to $2,400 in the House bill as the place where $1 in earnings results in a $1 reduction in benefits.

I shall not discuss, Mr. Speaker, the provisions of the disability insurance program included in the conference report, nor shall I discuss the amendment on blindness under the disability program as well as vocational rehabilitation of disability beneficiaries. Nor shall I discuss the offset for workmen's compensation which is included in the bill. All of these provisions are discussed in the material I will put in the Record.

The provision for the coverage of tips which was in the House bill is returned in almost the identical form that it passed the House. The one major exception is that the employer is excluded from paying any employer tax on the amount of tips that are included for social security purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the coverage of doctors under the social security program remains in the bill. However, the date for the inclusion of doctors was moved up 1 year by the Senate so that the effective date was moved to taxable years ending on or after December 31, 1965, instead, of as it was in the House bill with respect to the year 1966.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report included the Senate version in this respect.

FINANCING

Now, Mr. Speaker, I said earlier that this bill is actuarially sound and fiscally responsible. I can assure the Members of the House that it it is. In the process, however, of making it actuarially sound and fiscally responsible, it is necessary that I report to you about the increase in social security tax to be withheld from the worker's pay check and the amount which will be paid by the self-employed individual.

Mr. Speaker, bear in mind that there was a 1 percent increase in the combined rate effective under the provisions of the existing law for January 1, 1966. The rate that is in the bill, the rate on the employer and employee combined for OASDI purposes starts off at 7.7 percent and goes to 9.7 percent in the year 1973 and thereafter.

The self-employed OASDI rate will never go higher than 7 percent under the provisions of the conference report, just as under the House-passed bill.

For the hospital insurance, there is a tax applied also. This is a separate tax, separately stated.

That tax—the HI tax—starts off in the conference report, the combined tax on employee and employer, as seven-tenths of 1 percent, or 0.35 percent each. In 1987 and years after that it is our opinion the rate should go to the stated combined rate in the conference report of 1.6 percent, or 0.8 percent each.

These are the things, Mr. Speaker, that make it possible for a report of actuarial soundness and fiscal responsibility with respect to the bill.

One change was made in the conference that varied from the provisions of the House bill. In the House bill we started in January 1966, with a wage base of $5,600 and provided that on January 1, 1971, the base would go to $6,600. The Senate moved the $6,600 effective date forward to January 1, 1966. The House accepted the Senate amendment in this respect so that this coming January 1, 1966, the wage base will be $6,600, but it will remain that way in future years under the provisions of the conference report. There will be no additional step-up in the base under the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the bill itself involved some 409 pages as we had it, and there were some 513 amendments that were numbered, maybe some that were not numbered, that were adopted by the Senate. The bill is voluminous and complex. Many of these Senate amendments were technical, clerical or editorial, many of them going to matters of substance. In the conference we maintained a rather firm position with respect to the amendments of substance. I think, though, we did increase the number of words in the bill. I can assure you, anyone who voted for the bill as it passed the House can feel perfectly safe in voting for this conference report.

I would commend it to all of you. I would urge that everyone this time express himself as being for the programs involved in the bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means yielding. Certainly, as chairman of the conference, a stentorian duty has been performed in dealing with all of the amendments of both bodies. I am particularly delighted that in amendments 70 and 141 the position of the House prevailed, and that the professional services involving involuntary servitude for certain medical specialists was removed.

May I ask the gentleman about the State requirements? For example, amendment 195 on page 45, page 50, amendment 251, and on page 51, the standards of assuring high quality of medical assistance in the various States, and so forth.

Will the various parts, if not, indeed, the titles of this new soon-to-be act be implemented through the State health department agencies by and large, and, then, is there provision for that to be done with coordination throughout the Nation, or with the Blue Shields and other qualified insuring agencies insofar as those plans are concerned?

Mr. MILLS. The bill very specifically calls upon the State public health departments to assist with respect to standards and also to really set the standards under certain of the programs. Are you referring to the basic program? As you know a number of programs are involved.

Mr. HALL. I am referring both to the basic and supplemental and including the B insurance, Mr. Chairman.

If I may proceed just to elaborate on my question, what particularly worries me is this. A State, for example, under amendment 195, having to do with determining which institutions and agencies qualify and the certification thereof, the Secretary would accept such agencies' certification of institutions as a provider of services. The Senate receded although they had provided that it would be mandatory on the Secretary to establish such. My question simply is—Does this leave this in the hands of the State agency?

Mr. MILLS. It provides that when a State is able and willing to do so, the State will be utilized to determine whether its institutions and agencies qualify for the program and the Secretary may accept the State's certifications.

Mr. HALL. Does the same thing generally apply to this other situation?

Mr. MILLS. What amendment number is the gentleman specifically referring to?

Mr. HALL. Page 50 and 51. On page 50, amendment 251, nature of State agency required to administer State medical assistance program.

This can involve everything from certification of a nursing home right on down to coinsurance.

Mr. MILLS. The State is free to decide what agency will administer the medical assistance programs. The only limitation in the bill is that the welfare department, which has been determining eligibility under public assistance medical care programs for years, determine eligibility.

Mr. HALL. Does the distinguished chairman concur in my statement in the feeling that it would be necessary to have physicians help to implement these plans?

Mr. MILLS. Absolutely.

Mr. HALL. Which statement I think he made once before.

Mr. MILLS. Absolutely, as to both the supplemental plan and the basic plan.

Now as to the plan under title XIX, the services of physicians will be most necessary.

Mr. HALL. In order to avoid the abuse factor in order to serve on the utilization committees at the local, State, and National level?

Mr. MILLS. Yes. They will serve on utilization committees in all hospitals. That is the requirement of the bill, that they be on these utilization committees. But in the administration of the new title XIX, the State now, as I pointed out, can select, if it so desires, the public health department to be primary administrator of the program except that the public health department will not make a determination of eligibility. We accepted that Senate amendment which actually had been previously considered by our committee. It was not written into the bill initially, but the Committee on Ways and Means looked with a great deal of interest upon the idea when we had it in committee. What we are trying to do all the way through here is to indicate that medical programs have to have the advice of physicians and the advice of skilled hospital people and those people who are skilled in the field of medical services. Such a program cannot be properly administered in my opinion without their advice and assistance.

Mr. HALL. Would it then be possible, if the gentleman will yield further, for any given State to say—We want our State health department, including the Public Health Service and officials, to implement this whether they use the Blue Cross or the coinsurors.

Mr. MILLS. That is title XIX we are talking about—it will not be possible for a State agency to administer the basic A plan or the basic B plan. The administration of these programs is lodged in the Social Security Administration with the directive, as you will recall, that they employ the services of fiscal intermediaries and carriers who will deal directly with hospitals and will deal directly with the doctors.

Mr. HALL. The provider of the services could be dealt with at the State level; is that not true?

Mr. MILLS. Not necessarily at the State level, but it could be done on a State or regional basis. But the State health department would not necessarily come into the administration on a broad basis.

Mr. HALL. Would this be determined by social workers in the HEW or the Surgeon General in his Public Health Service?

Mr. MILLS. The provider would enter into an agreement with the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. HALL. I notice that doctors of medicine are covered under the basic social security law on an involuntary basis whether they like it or not. I must say I regret that, but I am glad that physicians have been defined in the conference report.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. As a member of the conference committee who served with the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, I shoud like to commend the gentleman for the outstanding job he has performed as chairman of the conference. I also want to commend him for the job he did in developing this legislation in the Committee on Ways and Means. He, along with other members, worked long and diligently to perfect a well-rounded program.

Mr. Speaker, there were 513 amendments to this bill adopted by the other body, many of which could be and should be classified as major amendments.

In, I believe, six long sessions, covering a week in duration, of very hard work and extremely good staff work, these differences were worked out between the two bodies.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the gentleman and other members of the committee, both on the minority and majority sides, and in both bodies, have come up with what can be described only as a monumental piece of legislation. In my humble judgment, this bill will be one of the great bills not only of this Congress but also of any Congress in the history of our country. It is a landmark. Many people have worked on various facets of it over the years. The people will rise up to say "blessed" for the work which we will complete today.

I again compliment the gentleman for a magnificent job.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana. I observe that there were seven of us representing the House in this conference, along with six Members of the other body. It was a very harmonious conference. We were never at any time in anything other than an even temper.

I thank all the members of the conference on the part of the House for their extreme degree of cooperation in this conference.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the conference committee, a question. I introduced legislation calling for social security amendments earlier in the session providing for a 7-percent increase in retirement benefits and providing for benefits to widows who remarry, allowing them to use the prior earning record of their spouses. This legislation was introduced along with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. I understand the Senate agreed to this. Is it in the conference report?

Mr. MILLS. I appreciate the gentleman's calling that to my attention. I knew of his interest and the interest of my friend from Florida with respect to the benefits for widows who remarry. As soon as we learned what the Senate had done, we immediately decided to accept the amendment, in view of the great interest of these two colleagues of ours, as manifested. That is in the conference report, but the benefit to be provided is on the basis of 50 percent of the primary benefit rather than 82½ percent, which is a widow's benefit. We have provided for continuation of payment as a wife's benefit, rather than a widow's benefit, at 50 percent.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to associate myself with the commendation which, by so many Members of the House, has been heaped upon the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, who has been the creator of and the one who has shepherded this difficult bill to almost the final stage of enactment. What he has done through this measure in the lengthening of the lives, the betterment of the health, and the promotion of the happiness of the senior citizens of this country—I believe our most deserving segment of citizenship—is immeasurable. Not only they but all who love them and honor them will always call his name "blessed" for what he has done.

I should like to ask one question about a technical aspect, if the gentleman will yield further.

I thank the able gentleman for what he said to the distinguished gentleman concerning the recognition of the right of marriage by widows after reaching I believe the age of 62 without the loss of pension the widow formerly derived from a deceased husband. Now, such a lady may take a wife's benefit from her deceased husband or her new husband?

Mr. MILLS. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. I commend the able gentleman on that. One thing I fear we have not adequately covered is providing for the chronic illness of senior citizens of the country. Will the able gentleman tell us what provisions are in the bill to take care of the aged and chronically ill who need both hospital provisions and nursing home provisions provided for under this program? What provisions are in the bill as of this time?

Mr. MILLS. That requires a rather long and involved answer. The gentleman will recall that there are really three programs of medical care in this bill. One is a basic plan of up to 90 days of hospitalization.

Second, up to 100 days of skilled nursing home following hospitalization. Third, up to 100 home visits following hospitalization.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

You have the supplemental plan which provides for professional services of your doctors as well as for 175 home health visits annually and other services. On top of that, or below that, however you want to say it, you have a continuation of the Kerr-Mills program. I must say it is materially improved in this conference report. So that we are matching moneys with the States under the formula for an additional amount of care for anyone who is in need of that care as defined by the States.

Mr. PEPPER. But do I understand correctly, as I thought I was previously advised by the able gentleman, that the Federal funds are available to allow the States to provide any amount that may be reasonable and necessary and proper to provide under the amended Kerr-Mills bill for the care of the aged and chronically ill?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is correct; there is no ceiling on Federal matching funds for the Kerr-Mills program.

Mr. Speaker, I will include at this point a more detailed explanation of the legislation as reflected by the conference agreement:

PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF H.R. 6675, AS AGREED TO BY HOUSE-SENATE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

A. HEALTH INSURANCE AND MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

The bill would add a new title XVIII to the Social Security Act providing two related health insurance programs for persons 65 or over (1) a basic plan in part A providing protection against the costs of hospital and related care; and (2) a voluntary supplementary plan in part B providing protection against the cost of physicians' services and other medical and health services to cover certain areas not covered by the basic plan.

The basic plan would be financed through a separate payroll tax and separate trust fund. The plan would be actuarially sound under conservative cost assumptions. Benefits for persons currently over 65 who are not insured under the social security and railroad retirement systems would be financed out of Federal general revenues.

Enrollment in the supplementary plan would be voluntary and would be financed by a small monthly premium ($3 per month initially) paid by enrollees and an equal amount supplied by the Federal Government out of general revenues. The premiums for social security, railroad retirement, and civil service retirement beneficiaries who voluntarily enroll would be deducted from their monthly insurance benefits. Uninsured persons desiring the supplemental plan would make the periodic premium payments to the Government.

Both the basic plan and the supplementary plan would become effective July 1, 1966.

The bill would also add a new title XIX to the Social Security Act which would provide a more effective Kerr-Mills program for the aged and extend its provisions to additional needy persons. It would allow the States to combine within a single uniform category the differing medical provisions for the needy which currently are found in five titles of the Social Security Act. Medical vendor provisions in existing law would expire, however, on December 31, 1969.

A description of these three programs follows:

1. Basic plan—hospital insurance

General description: Basic protection, financed through a separate payroll tax, would be provided by H.R. 6675 against the costs of inpatient hospital services, posthospital extended care services, posthospital home health services, and outpatient hospital diagnostic services for social security and railroad retirement beneficiaries when they attain age 65. Benefits for railroad retirement eligibles would be financed by the railroad retirement tax if certain conditions are met. The same protection, financed from general revenues, would be provided under a special transitional provision for essentially all people who are now aged 65, or who will reach 65 in the near future, but who are not eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits.

Effective date: Benefits would first be effective on July 1, 1966, except for services in extended care facilities which would be effective on January 1, 1967.

Eligibility for Protection Under the Basic Plan

The proposed basic hospital insurance would be provided (on the basis of a new section in title II of the act) for people aged 65 and over who are entitled to monthly social security benefits or to annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act. In addition, people who are now aged 65 or will reach age 65 within the next few years and who are not insured under the social security or railroad programs would nevertheless be covered under the basic plan. In July 1966, when the program would become effective, about 17 million people aged 65 and over who are eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits, and about 2 million aged who would be covered under a special transitional provision, would have the proposed basic hospital insurance.

Included under the special provision would be all uninsured people who have reached 65 before 1968. As to persons reaching 65 after 1967, they would have to have the quarters of coverage that are indicated in the following table:

Quarters of coverage required for OASI cash benefits as compared to hospital insurance

Year attains age 65	Men		Women	
	OASI	Hospital insurance	OASI	Hospital insurance
1967 or before	6–16	0	6–13	0
1968	17	6	14	6
1969	18	9	15	9
1970	19	12	16	12
1971	20	15	17	15
1972	21	18	18	(1)
1973	22	21	--------	----------
1974	23	(1)	--------	----------

[1] Same as OASI.

As indicated in the table, by 1974 the quarter coverage required for cash benefits and hospitalization insurance benefits will be the same and the "transitional" provision will phase out.

Together, these two groups comprise virtually the entire aged population. The major group excluded will be individuals afforded protection under the provisions of the Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act (FEHBA). Federal employees who retired before February 16, 1965, and who did not have coverage under FEHBA on that date would be covered under the transitional provision for the uninsured. Others excluded would be aliens (unless they have been admitted for permanent residence and have been residents of the United States for 5 years) and certain people convicted of subversive crimes.

Currently, 93 percent of the people reaching age 65 are eligible for benefits under social security or railroad retirement and this percentage will rise to close to 100 percent as the program matures.

Benefits: The services for which payment would be made under the basic plan include—

(1) inpatient hospital services for up to 90 days in each spell of illness. The patient pays a deductible amount of $40 for the first 60 days plus $10 a day for 30 days in excess of 60 for each spell of illness; hospital services would include all those ordinarily furnished by a hospital to its inpatients; however, payment would not be made for private duty nursing or for the hospital services of physicians except services provided by medical or dental interns or residents in training under approved teaching programs. Inpatient psychiatric hospital service would also be included, but a lifetime limitation of 190 days would be imposed.

(2) posthospital extended care (in a facility having an arrangement with a hospital for the timely transfer of patients and for furnishing medical information about patients) after the patient is transferred from a hospital (after at least a 3-day stay) for up to 100 days in each spell of illness, but after the first 20 days of care patients will pay $5 a day for the remaining days of extended care in a spell of illness;

(3) outpatient hospital diagnostic services, with the patient paying a $20 deductible amount and a 20 percent coinsurance for each diagnostic study (that is, for diagnostic services furnished to him by the same hospital during a 20-day period); and

(4) posthospital home health services for up to 100 visits, after discharge from a hospital (after at least a 3-day stay) or extended care facility and before the beginning of a new spell of illness. Such a person must be in the care of a physician and under a plan established by a physician within 14 days of discharge calling for such services. These services would include intermittent nursing care, therapy, and the part-time services of a home health aid. The patient must be homebound, except that when certain equipment is used, the individual could be taken to a hospital or extended care facility or rehabilitation center to receive some of these covered home health services in order to get advantage of the necessary equipment.

Christian Scientists are treated separately so that they will have sanatorium services of up to 60 days with $40 deductible plus 30 additional days at $10 coinsurance per day, as hospital service; plus an additional 30 days in a Christian Science sanatorium as extended care facility services with the $5 per day coinsurance feature.

No service would be covered as posthospital extended care or as outpatient diagnostic or posthospital home health services if it is of a kind that could not be covered if it were furnished to a patient in a hospital.

A spell of illness would be considered to begin when the individual enters a hospital or extended care facility and to end when he has not been an inpatient of a hospital or extended care facility for 60 consecutive days.

The deductible amounts for inpatient hospital and outpatient hospital diagnostic services would be increased, if necessary, to keep pace with increases in hospital costs, but no such increase would be made before 1969. The coinsurance amounts for long-stay hospital and extended care facility benefits would be correspondingly adjusted. Increases in the hospital deductible will be made only when a $4 change is called for and the outpatient deductible will change in $2 steps.

Basis of reimbursement: Payment of bills under the basic plan would be made to the providers of service on the basis of the "reasonable cost" incurred in providing care for beneficiaries.

Administration: Basic responsibility for administration would rest with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; however, some administration for individuals under the railroad retirement system is vested in the Railroad Retirement Board if certain financing conditions are met, as explained under the next heading. The Secretary would use appropriate State agencies and private organizations (nominated by providers of services) to assist in the administration of the program. Provision is made for the establishment of an Advisory Council which would advise the Secretary on policy matters in connection with administration.

Financing: Separate payroll taxes to finance the basic plan, paid by employers, employees, and self-employed persons, would be earmarked in a separate hospital insurance trust fund established in the Treasury. The amount of earnings (earnings base) subject to the new payroll taxes would be the same as for purposes of financing social security cash benefits. The same contribution rate would apply equally to employers, employees, and self-employed persons and would be as follows:

	Percent
1966	0.35
1967–70	.50
1971–72	.50
1973–75	.55
1976–79	.60
1980–86	.70
1987 and after	.80

The taxable earnings base for the health insurance tax would be $6,600 a year beginning in 1966.

The schedule of contribution rates is based on estimates of cost which assume that the earnings base will not be increased above $6,600.

The benefits for railroad retirement eligibles will be financed by the railroad retirement tax, which is automatically increased by the operation of this bill, but the tax will be paid into the hospital insurance trust fund. During any period that the railroad retirement wage base is not equivalent to the hospital insurance earnings base, railroad workers and employers will be taxed as other workers and employers, and the benefits for railroad retirement eligibles will be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The cost of providing basic hospital and related benefits to people who are not social security or railroad retirement beneficiaries would be paid from general funds of the Treasury.

2. *Voluntary supplementary medical insurance plan*

General description: A package of benefits supplementing those provided under the basic plan would be offered to all persons 65 and over on a voluntary basis. Individuals who enroll initially would pay premiums of $3 a month (deducted, where possible, from social security or railroad retirement benefits). The Government would match this premium with $3 paid from general funds. Since the minimum increase in cash social security benefits under the bill for workers retiring or who retired at age 65 or older would be $4 a month ($6 a month for man and wife receiving benefits based on the same earnings record), the benefit increases would fully cover the amount of monthly premiums.

Eligibility: The proposed supplementary insurance would be available to all people age 65 and over (whether or not they are social security or railroad retirement beneficiaries) who are residents of the United States and either are citizens or aliens admitted for permanent residence who have had 5 years of continuous residence. Any person entitled to the basic hospital insurance benefit would be eligible regardless of the preceding requirements.

Enrollment: Persons who have reached age 65 before January 1, 1966, will have an opportunity to enroll in an enrollment period which begins on the first day of the second month after the month of enactment and ends March 31, 1966.

Persons attaining age 65 subsequent to December 31, 1965, will have enrollment periods of 7 months beginning 3 months before the month of attainment of age 65.

In the future, general enrollment periods will be from October to December 31 in each odd-numbered year. The first such period will be October 1 to December 31, 1967.

No person may enroll more than 3 years after the close of the first enrollment period in which he could have enrolled.

There will be only one chance to reenroll for persons who are in the plan but drop out, and the reenrollment must occur within 3 years of termination of the previous enrollment.

Coverage may be terminated (1) by the individual filing notice during an enrollment period, or (2) by the Government for nonpayment of premiums.

A State would be able to provide the supplementary insurance benefits for its public assistance recipients who are receiving cash assistance if it chooses to do so.

Effective date: Benefits will be effective beginning July 1, 1966.

Benefits: The voluntary supplementary insurance plan would cover physicians' services, home health services, and numerous other medical and health services in and out of medical institutions.

There would be an annual deductible of $50. Then the plan would cover 80 percent of the patient's bill (above the deductible) for the following services;

(1) Physicians' and surgeons' services, whether furnished in a hospital, clinic, office, in the home, or elsewhere.

(2) Home health service (with no requirement of prior hospitalization) for up to 100 visits during each calendar year.

(3) Diagnostic X-ray, diagnostic laboratory tests, and other diagnostic tests.

(4) X-ray, radium, and radioactive isotope therapy.

(5) Ambulance services.

(6) Surgical dressings and splints, casts, and other devices for reduction of fractures and dislocations; rental of durable medical equipment such as iron lungs, oxygen tents, hospital beds, and wheelchairs used in the patient's home, prosthetic devices (other than dental) which replace all or part of an internal body organ; braces and artificial legs, arms, eyes, etc.

There would be a special limitation on outside-the-hospital treatment of mental, psychoneurotic, and personality disorders. Payment for such treatment during any calendar year would be limited, in effect, to $250 or 50 percent of the expenses, whichever is smaller.

Administration by carriers: Basis for reimbursement: The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be required, to the extent possible, to contract with carriers to carry out the major administrative functions relating to the medical aspects of the voluntary supplementary plan such as determining rates of payments under the program and holding and disbursing funds for benefit payments. No contract is entered into by the Secretary unless he finds that the carrier will perform its obligations under the contract efficiently and effectively and will meet such requirements as to financial responsibility, legal authority, and other matters as he finds pertinent. The contract must provide that the carrier take necessary action to see that where payments are on a cost basis (to institutional providers of service), the cost is a reasonable cost. Correspondingly, where payments are on a charge basis (to physicians or others furnishing noninstitutional services), the carrier must see that such charge will be reasonable and not higher than the charge applicable, for a comparable service and under comparable circumstances, to the other policyholders and subscribers of the carrier. Payment by the carrier for physicians' services will be made on the basis of a receipted bill, or on the basis of an assignment under the terms of which the reasonable charge will be the full charge for the service. In determining reasonable charges, the carriers would consider the customary charges for similar services generally made by the physician or other person or organization furnishing the covered services, and also the prevailing charges in the locality for similar services.

Financing: Aged persons who elect to enroll in the supplemental plan would pay monthly premiums of $3. Where the individual is currently receiving monthly social security, railroad retirement, or civil service retirement benefits, the premiums would be deducted from his benefits.

The Government would help finance the supplementary plan through a payment from general revenues in an equal amount of $3 a month per enrollee. To provide an operating fund, if necessary, at the beginning of the supplementary plan, and to establish a contingency reserve, a Government appropriation would be available (on a repayable basis) equal to $18 per aged person estimated to be eligible when the supplementary plan goes into effect.

The individual and Government contributions would be placed in a separate trust fund for the supplementary plan. All benefit and administrative expenses under the supplementary plan would be paid from this fund.

Premium rates for enrolled persons (and the matching Government contribution) would be increased from time to time if program costs rise, but not more often than once every 2 years. The premium rate for a person who enrolls after the first period when enrollment is open to him or who reenrolls after terminating his coverage would be increased by 10 percent for each full 12 months he stayed out of the program.

Income tax provisions: The bill provides that the 3-percent floor on medical expense deductions, as well as the 1-percent limitation on medicines and drugs, is to apply to those age 65 or over in the same manner as it presently applies to those under age 65. This will have the effect of partially recovering the $3 monthly premium paid from general funds of the Treasury from those aged persons who have taxable income, depending on the amount of their taxable income.

The bill also provides a special deduction, available to those who itemize their deductions, for one-half of any premiums paid for insurance of medical care expenses whether or not they have medical expenses in excess of the 3-percent floor, but this deduction may not exceed $150 per year.

Another change limits the insurance premiums which may be taken into account to those which arise from coverage of medical care expenses and this must be indicated either on the insurance contract or on a separate statement supplied by the insurance company. Still a further change treats as current, qualifying medical care expenses (subject to limitations) the prepayment before age 65 of insurance of medical care after age 65. Also all maximum limitations on the medical expense deduction for all taxpayers are eliminated.

3. *Improvement and extension of Kerr-Mills medical assistance program*

Purpose and scope: In order to provide a more effective Kerr-Mills medical assistance program for the aged and to extend its provisions to additional needy persons, the bill would establish a single and separate medical care program to consolidate and expand the differing provisions for the needy which currently are found in five titles of the Social Security Act.

The new title (XIX) would extend the advantages of an expanded medical assistance program not only to the aged who are indigent but also to needy individuals in the dependent children, blind, and permanently and totally disabled programs and to persons who would qualify under those programs if in sufficient financial need. Other medically needy children may also be included.

Medical assistance under title XIX must be made available to all individuals receiving money payments under these programs, and the medical care or services available to all such individuals must be equal in amount, duration, and scope. Effective July 1, 1967, all children under age 21 must be included who would, except for age, be dependent children under title IV.

Inclusion of the medically indigent aged not on the cash assistance rolls would be optional with the States, but if they are included, comparable groups of blind, disabled, and parents and children must also be included if they need help in meeting necessary medical costs. Moreover, the amount and scope of benefits for the medically indigent could not be greater than that of recipients of cash assistance.

Under the bill, the current provisions of law in the various public assistance titles of the act providing vendor medical assistance would terminate upon the adoption of the new program by a State, but in no case later than December 31, 1969.

Scope of medical assistance: Under existing law, the State must provide "some institutional and noninstitutional care" under the medical assistance for the aged program. There are no minimum benefit requirements at all under the other public assistance vendor medical programs.

The bill would require that by July 1, 1967, under the new program a State must provide inpatient hospital services, outpatient hospital services, other laboratory and X-ray services, skilled nursing home services for individuals 21 years of age or older, and physician's services (whether furnished in the office, the patient's home, a hospital, a skilled nursing home or elsewhere), in order to receive Federal participation. Coverage of other items of medical service would be optional with the States.

Eligibility: The program for the needy elderly would be revised to require that the States must provide a flexible income test which takes into account medical expenses and does not provide rigid income standards which arbitrarily deny assistance to people with large medical bills. In the same spirit the bill provides that no deductible, cost sharing, or similar charge may be imposed by the State as to hospitalization under its program and that any such charge on other medical services must be reasonably related to the recipient's income or resources. Also important is the requirement that elderly needy people on the State programs be provided assistance to meet the deductibles that are imposed by the new basic program of hospital insurance. Also where a portion of any deductible or cost sharing required by the voluntary supplementary program is met by a State program, the portion covered must be reasonably related to the individual's income and resources. No income can be imputed to an individual unless actually available; and the financial responsibility of an individual for an applicant may be taken into account only if the applicant is the individual's spouse or child who is under age 21 or blind or disabled.

Increased Federal matching: The Federal share of medical assistance expenditures under the new program would be determined upon a uniform formula with no maximum on the amount of expenditures which would be subject to participation. There is no maximum under present law on similar amounts for the medical assistance for the aged program. The Federal share, which varies in relation to a State's per capita income, would be increased over current medical assistance for the aged matching so that States at the national average would receive 55 percent rather than 50 percent, and States at the lowest level could receive as much as 83 percent as contrasted with 80 percent under existing law.

In order to receive any additional Federal funds as a result of expenditures under the new program, the States would need to continue their own expenditures at their present rate. For a specified period, any State that did not reduce its own expenditures would be assured of at least a 5-percent increase in Federal participation in medical care expenditures. As to compensation and training of professional medical personnel used in the administration of the program, the bill would provide a 75-percent Federal share as compared with the 50–50 Federal-State sharing for other administrative expenses.

Administration: The bill provides that any State agency may be designated to administer the program, as long as the determination of eligibility is accomplished by the agency administering the old-age assistance program.

Effective date: January 1, 1966.

B. CHILD HEALTH AND WELFARE AMENDMENTS

Maternal and child health, crippled children, and child welfare: The bill would increase the amount authorized for maternal and child health services and crippled children's services over current authorizations by $5 million for fiscal year 1966 and by $10 million in each succeeding fiscal year, as follows:

Fiscal year	Existing law	Under bill
1966	$40,000,000	$45,000,000
1967	40,000,000	50,000,000
1968	45,000,000	55,000,000
1969	45,000,000	55,000,000
1970 and after	50,000,000	60,000,000

The bill has made a similar increase in the authorization for the child welfare program.

The increases would assist the States, in these programs, in moving toward the goal of extending services with a view of making them available to children in all parts of the State by July 1, 1975.

Crippled children training personnel: The bill would also authorize $5 million for the fiscal year 1967, $10 million for fiscal 1968, and $17.5 million for each succeeding fiscal year to be for grants to institutions of higher learning for training professional personnel for health and related care of crippled children, particularly mentally retarded children and children with multiple handicaps.

Health care for needy children: A new provision is added authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry out a 5-year program of special project grants to provide comprehensive health care and services for children of school age, or for preschool children, particularly in areas with concentrations of low-income families. The grants would be to State health agencies, to the State agencies administering the crippled children's program, to any school of medicine (with appropriate participation by a school of dentistry), and any teaching hospital affiliated with such school, to pay not to exceed 75 percent of the cost of the project. Projects would have to provide screening, diagnosis, preventive services, treatment, correction of defects, and aftercare, including dental services, with treatment, correction of defects, and aftercare limited to children in low-income families.

An appropriation of $15 million would be authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; $35 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; $40 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; $45 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; and $50 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

The bill would further authorize an appropriation of $500,000 each for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967, for grants for studies of resources, methods and practices for prevention and diagnosis of emotional illness in children and for treatment and rehabilitation of emotionally ill children.

Mental retardation planning: Title XVII of the act would be amended to authorize grants totaling $2,750,000 for each of 2 fiscal years—the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. The funds would be available during the 3-year period July 1, 1965, to June 30, 1968. The grants would be for the purpose of assisting States to implement and followup on plans and other steps to combat mental retardation authorized under this title of the Social Security Act.

C. OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE PROVISIONS

1. Benefit changes

(a) 7-percent Across-the-Board Increase in Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Benefits

The bill provides a 7-percent across-the-board benefit increase, effective retroactively beginning with benefits for January 1965, for the 20 million social security beneficiaries on the rolls (with a guaranteed $4 a month minimum increase for retired workers who are age 65 or over in the first month for which they are paid the increased benefit).

Monthly benefits for workers who retire at or after 65 would be increased to a new minimum of $44 (now $40) and to a new maximum of $135.90 (now $127). In the future, creditable earnings under the increase in the contribution and benefit base to $6,600 a year (now $4,800) would make possible a maximum benefit of $168.

The maximum amount of benefits payable to a family on the basis of a single earnings record would be related to the worker's average monthly earnings at all earnings levels. Under present law, there is a $254 limit on family benefits which operates over a wide range of average monthly earnings. Under the bill the highest family maximum eventually would be $368.

(b) Payment of Child's Insurance Benefits to Children Attending School or College After Attainment of Age 18 and Up to Age 22

H.R. 6675 includes the provision adopted by both House and Senate last year which would continue to pay a child's insurance benefit until the child reaches age 22, provided the child is attending a public or an accredited school, including a vocational school or a college, as a full-time student after he reaches age 18. Children of deceased, retired, or disabled workers would be included. No mother's or wife's benefits would be payable if the only child in the mother's care is one who has attained age 18 but is in school.

This provision will be effective January 1, 1965. It is estimated that 295,000 children will be eligible for benefits for September 1965, when the school year begins.

(c) Benefits for Widows at Age 60

The bill would provide the option to widows of receiving benefits beginning at age 60, with the benefits payable to those who claim them before age 62 being actuarially reduced to take account of the longer period over which they will be paid. Under present law, full widow's benefits and actuarially reduced worker's and wife's benefits are payable at age 62.

This provision, adopted by both Houses of Congress last year, would be effective for the second month after the month of enactment. It is estimated that 185,000 widows will claim benefits during the first year of operation under this provision.

(d) Amendment of Disability Program

(i) Definition of disability: The bill would eliminate the present requirement that a worker's disability must be expected to be of long continued and indefinite duration, and instead provide that an insured worker would be eligible for disability benefits if he has been under a disability which can be expected to result in death or which has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 calendar months. Benefits payable by reason of this change would be paid for the second month following the month of enactment. An estimated 60,000 people—disabled workers and their dependents—will become immediately eligible for benefits as a result of this change.

(ii) Disability benefits offset provision: The bill provides that the social security disability benefit for any month for which a worker is receiving a workmen's compensation benefit will be reduced to the extent that the total benefits payable to him and his dependents under both programs exceed 80 percent of his average monthly earnings under social security prior to the onset of disability, but with the reduction periodically adjusted to take account of changes in national average earnings levels. The offset provision will be applicable with respect to benefits payable for months after December 1965 on the basis of disabilities commencing after June 1, 1965.

(iii) Blindness as a disabling factor:

(a) Young workers who are blind and disabled: Establishes alternative insured status requirement for workers disabled before age 31 of one-half of the quarters elapsing after age 21 up to the point of disability with a minimum of six quarters. [For insured status under existing law, an individual (1) must have at least 20 quarters of coverage in the 40 quarters ending with the quarter in which the disability begins and (2) must be fully insured.] To qualify for this alternative the worker would have to meet the statutory definition of blindness for the disability "freeze." (Central visual acuity of 5/200 or less in the better eye with use of correcting lens. An eye in which the visual field is reduced to 5 degrees or less concentric contraction shall be considered as having a visual acuity of 5/200 or less.) Worker will, however, have to meet the other regular requirements for entitlement to disability benefits, including inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity.

(b) Older workers who are blind and disabled: Provides that those individuals aged 55 or over who meet the statutory definition of blindness in the disability "freeze" could qualify for cash benefits on the basis of their inability to engage in their past occupation or occupations. Their benefits would not be paid, however, if they were actually engaging in any substantial gainful activity.

(iv) Rehabilitation services: Reimbursement from the social security trust funds to State vocational rehabilitation agencies would be provided for the cost of rehabilitation services furnished to individuals who are entitled to disability insurance benefits or to disabled child's benefits. The total amount of the funds that could be made available from the trust funds for purposes of reimbursing State agencies for such services could not, in any year, exceed 1 percent of the social security disability benefits paid in the previous year.

(v) Entitlement to disability benefits after entitlement to benefits payable on account of age: Under the bill, a person who becomes entitled before age 65 to a benefit payable on account of old age could later, before he reaches age 65, become entitled to disability insurance benefits.

(vi) Allocation of contribution income between OASI and DI trust funds: Under the bill, an additional 0.2 percent of taxable wages and 0.15 percent of taxable self-employment income would be allocated to the disability insurance trust fund, bringing the total allocation to 0.70 percent and 0.525 percent, respectively, beginning in 1966.

(e) Benefits to Certain Persons at Age 72 or Over

A provision approved by the House and Senate last year, which would liberalize the eligibility requirements by providing a basic benefit of $35 to certain elderly persons with a minimum of three quarters of coverage acquired at any time since the beginning of the program in 1937 was adopted. To accomplish this, a new concept of "transitional insured status" is provided. Present law requires a minimum of six quarters of coverage in employment or self-employment.

(i) Men and women workers: Under the "transitional insured status" provision a worker could qualify for benefits at age 72 if he had one quarter of coverage for each year that elapsed after 1950 and up to the year in which he reached age 65 (62 for women), with a minimum of three quarters. Those quarters could have been acquired at any time since the inception of the program in 1937. Wives of workers who qualify under this provision would be eligible for benefits if they reached age 72 before 1969. For workers who reached age 65 (62 for women) after 1956, the quarters of coverage requirement merges with the present minimum requirement of six quarters.

The following table illustrates the operation of the "transitional insured status" provision for workers.

Transitional insured status requirements with respect to workers' benefits

Men		Women	
Age (in 1965)	Quarters of coverage required	Age (in 1965)	Quarters of coverage required
76 or over	3	73 or over	3.
75	4	72	4.
74	5	71 [1]	5.
73 or younger	6 or more	70 or younger	6 or more.

[1] Benefits will not be payable, however, until age 72

(ii) Widows: Any widow who attains age 71 in or before 1965, if her husband died or reached age 65 in 1954 or earlier, could get a widow's benefit when she is aged 72 or over if her husband had at least three quarters of coverage. Present law requires six quarters. If the husband of such a widow died or reached 65 in 1955, the requirement would be four quarters. If he died or reached 65 in 1956, the requirement would be five quarters. If he died or reached 65 in 1957 or later, the minimum requirement would be six quarters or more, the same as present law.

For widows reaching age 72 in 1967 and 1968, there is a "grading-in" of the quarters of coverage requirement; which would be four or five quarters of coverage, respectively. Widows reaching age 72 in 1969 or after would be subject to the requirements of existing law of six or more quarters of coverage.

The table below sets forth the requirements as to widows:

Transitional insured status requirements with respect to widow's benefits

Year of husband's death (or attainment of age 65, if earlier)	Present quarters required	Proposed quarters required for widow attaining age 72 in—		
		1966 or before	1967	1968
1954 or before	6	3	4	5.
1955	6	4	4	5.
1956	6	5	5	5.
1957 or after	6 or more	6 or more	6 or more	6 or more.

(iii) Basic benefits: Men and women workers who would be eligible under the above-described provisions for workers would receive a basic benefit of $35 a month. A wife who is aged 72 or over (and who attains that age before 1969) would receive one-half of this amount, $17.50. No other dependents' basic benefits would be provided under these provisions.

Widows would receive $35 a month under the above-described provision.

These provisions would become effective for the second month after the month of enactment, at which time an estimated 355,000 people would be able to start receiving benefits.

(f) Retirement Test

The bill would liberalize the retirement test provision in present law under which benefits are decreased in relation to a beneficiary's earnings over $1,200 in a year. Under existing law, the first $1,200 a year is fully exempted, and there is a $1 reduction in benefits for each $2 of annual earnings between $1,200 and $1,700 and for each $1 of earnings thereafter. Under the bill, the first $1,500 a year would be fully exempted and there would be a $1 reduction in benefits for each $2 of earnings between $1,500 and $2,700 and for each $1 of earnings thereafter. In addition, the amount of earnings a beneficiary may have in a month and get full benefits for that month regardless of his annual earnings would be raised from $100 to $125. These changes are effective for taxable years ending after 1965.

Also exempted are certain royalties received in or after the year in which a person reaches age 65, from copyrights and patents obtained before age 65, from being counted as earnings for purposes of the retirement test, effective for taxable years beginning after 1964.

For 1966, an estimated 750,000 persons—workers and dependents—either will receive more benefits under these provisions than they would receive under present law, or will receive some benefits where they would receive no benefits under present law.

(g) Wife's and Widow's Benefits for Divorced Women

The bill would authorize payments of wife's or widow's benefits to the divorced wife of a retired, deceased, or disabled worker if she had been married to the worker for at least 20 years before the date of the divorce and if her divorced husband was making (or was obligated by a court to make) a substantial contribution to her support when he became entitled to benefits, became disabled, or died. H.R. 6675 would also provide that a wife's benefits would not terminate when the woman and her husband are divorced if the marriage has been in effect for 20 years. Provision is also made for the reestablishment of benefit rights for a divorced wife, a widow, or a surviving divorced wife who remarries and the subsequent marriage ends in divorce, annulment, or in the death of the husband. These changes are effective for the second month following the month of enactment.

(h) Continuation of Widow's and Widower's Insurance Benefits After Remarriage

Under present law, a widow's and widower's benefits based on a deceased worker's social security earnings record generally stop when the survivor remarries. The bill provides that benefits would be payable to widows age 60 or over and to widowers age 62 or over who remarry. The amount of the remarried widow's or widower's benefit would be equal to 50 percent of the primary insurance amount of the deceased spouse (if that amount is higher than her wife's benefit as a result of the remarriage) rather than 82½ percent of that amount, which is payable to widows and widowers who are not remarried.

(i) Adoption of Child by Retired Worker

The provisions relating to the payment of benefits to children who are adopted by old-age insurance beneficiaries would be changed to require that, where the child is adopted after the worker becomes entitled to an old-age benefit, (1) the child must be living with the worker (or adoption proceedings have begun) in or before the month when application for old-age benefits is filed; (2) the child must be receiving one-half of his support for the entire year before the worker's entitlement; and (3) the adoption must be completed within 2 years after the worker's entitlement.

(j) Definition of Child

(i) A child would be paid benefits based on his father's earnings without regard to whether he has the status of a child under State inheritance laws if the father was supporting the child or had a legal obligation to do so. Under present law, whether a child meets the definition for the purpose of getting child's insurance benefits based on his father's earnings depends on the laws applied in determining the devolution of interstate personal property in the State in which the worker is domiciled. This provision would be effective for the second month after the month of enactment. It is estimated that 20,000 individuals (children and their mothers) will become immediately eligible for benefits under this provision.

(ii) Also an exception is provided so that child's benefits would not terminate if child is adopted by his brother or sister after death of worker. Under present law benefits terminate unless he is adopted by his stepparent, grandparent, uncle, or aunt after death of worker on whose earnings record he is getting benefits.

2. Coverage changes

The following coverage provisions were included:

(a) Physicians and Interns

Self-employed physicians would be covered for taxable years ending on or after December 31, 1965. Interns would be covered beginning on January 1, 1966.

(b) Farmers

Provisions of existing law with respect to the coverage of farmers would be amended to provide that farm operators whose annual gross earnings are $2,400 or less (instead of $1,800 or less as in existing law) can report either their actual net earnings or 66⅔ percent (as in present law) of their gross earnings. Farmers whose annual gross earnings are over $2,400 would report their actual net earnings if over $1,600, but if actual net earnings are less than $1,600, they may instead report $1,600. (Present law provides that farmers whose annual gross earnings are over $1,800 report their actual net earnings if over $1,200, but if actual net earnings are less than $1,200, they may report $1,200.)

(c) Cash Tips

Cash tips received after 1965 by an employee in the course of his employment will be covered as wages for social security and income-tax withholding purposes, except that employers will not be required to pay the social security employer tax on the tips. However, for tips to be subject to withholding for either income tax or social security tax purposes, the tips must be paid in cash and must amount to more than $20 a month. The tips still represent compensation even though less than $20 a month or even though paid in other than cash, but would not, under either of these conditions, be subject to withholding for income tax or social security tax purposes.

The employee will be required to give his employer a written report of his tips within 10 days after the end of the month in which the tips are received (or at such other times as is provided by regulations); to the extent that unpaid wages due an employee and in the possession of the employer are insufficient to pay the employee social security tax due on the tips, the employee will be permitted (but not required) to make available to the employer sufficient funds to pay the employee social security tax. To the extent that the employer does not have sufficient wage payments to offset the required withholding, he notifies the employee and the employee reports this amount to the Government directly.

The employer will be required to withhold the employee social security tax only on tips reported to him within the specified time and for which he has sufficient funds of the employee out of which to pay the tax. He will be liable for withholding income tax on only those tips that are reported to him within 10 days after the end of the month in which the tips were received, and then only to the extent that he can collect the tax (at or after the time the tips are reported to him and before the close of the calendar year in which the tips were received) from unpaid wages (not including tips), or from funds turned over to him for that purpose remaining after an amount equal to the amount due for the social security tax has been subtracted.

As indicated, these amendments apply with respect to tips received by employees in 1966 and subsequent years.

(d) State and Local Government Employees

Several changes would facilitate coverage in this area:

(i) Added Alaska as a State which can provide coverage for State and local employees under the split-system provision; also validated the past coverage of certain school districts in Alaska.

(ii) Reopened until July 1, 1967, a provision of law permitting the State of Maine to treat teaching and nonteaching employees actually in the same retirement system as though they were in separate retirement systems for social security coverage purposes.

(iii) Authorized the State of Iowa and the State of North Dakota to modify their coverage agreements to exclude from social security coverage certain service performed in any calendar quarter in the employ of a school, college, or university by a student if the remuneration for such service is less than $50

(iv) Authorized another opportunity, through 1966, for the election of coverage by State and local government retirement system members who originally did not choose coverage under the divided retirement system provision, under which current employees have a choice of coverage.

(v) Authorized California to modify its coverage agreement to extend coverage to certain hospital employees whose positions were removed from a State or local government retirement system. The State will have until the end of the sixth month after the month of enactment to take action under this provision.

(e) Exemption of Certain Religious Sects

Members of certain religious sects who have conscientious objections to insurance (including social security) by reason of their adherence to the established tenets or teachings of such sects could be exempt from the social security tax on self-employment income upon application accompanied by a waiver of benefits.

(f) Nonprofit Organizations

Nonprofit organizations, and their employees who concur, could elect social security coverage effective retroactively for a period up to 5 years (rather than 1 year, as under present law). Also, wage credit could be given for the earnings of certain employees of nonprofit organizations who were erroneously reported for social security purposes.

(g) District of Columbia Employees

The bill provides for social security coverage of certain employees of the District of Columbia (primarily substitute schoolteachers).

(h) Ministers

Social security credit could be obtained for the earnings of certain ministers which were reported but which cannot be credited under present law. Also the bill reopened until April 15, 1966, the period (which expired on April 15, 1965) during which ministers who have been in the ministry for at least 2 years may file waiver certificates electing social security coverage.

3. *Miscellaneous*

(a) Filing of Proof

The period of filing of proof of support for dependent husband's, widower's, and parent's benefits, and for filing application for lump-sum death payments where good cause exists for failure to file within the initial 2-year period, is extended indefinitely.

(b) Automatic Recomputation of Benefits

Benefits of people on the rolls would be recomputed automatically each year to take account of any covered earnings that the worker might have had in the previous year and that would increase his benefit amount. Under existing law there are various requirements that must be met in order to have benefits recomputed, including filing of an application and earnings of over $1,200 a year after entitlement.

(c) Military Wage Credits

The present provision authorizing reimbursement of the trust funds out of general revenue for gratuitous social security wage credits for servicemen is revised so that such payments will be spread uniformly over the next 50 years.

(d) Extension of Life of Applications

The bill liberalizes the requirement in existing law that an application for monthly insurance benefits be valid for only 3 months after the date of filing, and for disability benefits 3 months before the beginning of the waiting period. The bill would allow an application to remain valid up until the time the Secretary makes a final decision on the application.

(e) Authorization for One Spouse To Cash a Joint Check

The Secretary would be authorized to make a temporary overpayment so as to permit a surviving spouse to cash a benefit check issued jointly to a husband and wife if one of them dies before the check is negotiated; any overpayment resulting from the cashing of the joint check would be recovered.

(f) Attorney's Fees

A provision is incorporated which would permit a court that renders a judgment favorable to a claimant in an action arising under the social security program to set a reasonable fee (not in excess of 25 percent of past due benefits which become payable by reason of the judgment) for an attorney who successfully represented the claimant. The Secretary would be permitted to certify payment of the fee to the attorney out of such past due benefits.

(g) Waiver of 1-year Marriage Requirement

The bill provides an exception to the 1-year duration requirement as to social security benefits for any widow, wife, husband, or widower who was, in the month before marriage, actually or potentially entitled to railroad retirement benefits as a widow, widower, parent, or disabled adult child.

(h) Social Security Records

The Social Security Administration is required to furnish the address to help locate a deserting parent or husband to a welfare agency or court on condition that information be transmitted through a welfare agency, that an actual public assistance case be involved and a court order for support have been issued, and that all nondisclosure provisions be complied with.

4. *Financing of social security programs*

Earnings base: The bill provides an earnings base of $6,600 effective in 1966. The earnings base in existing law is $4,800.

The following are the tax rates for the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system:

OASDI tax rates

[In percent]

Years	Employer-employee rate (combined)	Self-employed rate
1966	7.7	5.8
1967–68	7.8	5.9
1969–72	8.8	6.6
1973 and after	9.7	7.0

The allocation to the disability insurance trust fund is set at 0.70 percent of taxable wages and 0.525 of self-employment income. The figures under existing law are 0.50 and 0.375 percent, respectively.

5. *Number of people immediately affected by OASDI changes in first full year, 1966*

Provision:	
7-percent benefit increase ($4 minimum in primary benefits)	20,000,000
Reduced benefits for widows at age 60	185,000
Benefits for people aged 72 and over with limited periods in covered work	355,000
Improvements in benefits for children:	
Benefits for children to age 22 if in school	295,000
Broadened definition of "child"	20,000
Modifications in disability provisions:	
Change in definition	60,000
Liberalized requirements for benefits for the blind	7,000
Modification of earnings test	[1] 750,000

[1] Number affected in 1966; modification does not become effective until then.

D. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS

1. *Increased assistance payments*

The Federal share of payments under all State public assistance programs is increased a little more than an average of $2.50 a month for the needy aged, blind, and disabled and an average of about $1.25 for needy children, effective January 1, 1966. This is brought about by revising the matching formula for the needy aged, blind, and disabled (and for the adult categories in title XVI) to provide a Federal share of $31 out of the first $37 (now twenty-nine thirty-fifths (29/35) of the first $35) up to a maximum of $75 (now $70) per month per individual on an average basis. The matching formula is revised for aid to families with dependent children so as to provide a Federal share of five-sixths (5/6) of the first $18 (now fourteen-seventeenths (14/17) of the first $17) up to a maximum of $32 (now $30). A provision is included so that States will not receive additional Federal funds except to the extent they pass them on to individual recipients.

Effective January 1, 1966. Cost: About $150 million a year.

2. *Tubercular and mental patients*

The exclusion was removed from Federal matching in old-age assistance and medical assistance for the aged programs (and for combined program, title XVI) as to aged individuals who are patients in institutions for tuberculosis or mental diseases or who have been diagnosed as having tuberculosis or psychosis and, as a result, are patients in a medical institution. Requires as condition of Federal participation in such payments to, or for, mental patients certain agreements and arrangements to assure that better care results from the additional Federal money. Provides that States will receive not more in Federal funds under this provision than they increase their expenditures for mental health purposes under public health and public welfare programs. Also removes restrictions as to Federal matching for needy blind and disabled who are tubercular or psychotic and are in general medical institutions. Effective January 1, 1966. Cost about $75 million a year.

3. *Aid to families with dependent children in school*

A provision, optional with the States, allows them to continue making payments to dependent children who have attained age 18 but continue in school up to age 21. Present law calls for regular attendance at a high school or vocational school. The bill would extend this to attendance at a school, college, or university.

4. *Protective payments to third persons*

The bill includes a provision for protective payments to third persons on behalf of recipients of old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and those on combined adult program (title XVI), unable to manage their money because of physical or mental incapacity. Effective January 1, 1966.

5. *Income exemptions under public assistance*

(a) Old-Age Assistance

The earnings exemption under the old-age assistance program (and aged in combined program) is increased so that a State may, at its option, exempt the first $20 (now $10) and one-half of the next $60 (now $40) of a recipient's monthly earnings. Effective October 1, 1965. Cost: About $1 million first year.

(b) Aid to Families With Dependent Children

The bill allows the State, at its option, to disregard up to $150 per family per month of earned income of any dependent children under the age of 18 in the same home, but no child could have earnings of more than $50 per month exempted. Effective July 1, 1965.

(c) Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled

An exemption of earnings is added so that, at the option of the State, the first $20 per month of earnings of recipients and one-half of the next $60 could be exempted. In addition, any additional income and resources could be exempted as part of an approved plan to achieve self-support during the time the recipient was undergoing vocational rehabilitation. Effective October 1, 1965.

(d) Income Exemption for All Public Assistance Programs

Allowed States, at their option, to disregard not more than $5 per month per recipient of any income in all five public assistance programs. Effective October 1, 1965.

(e) Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance (Retroactive Increase)

States would be allowed to disregard so much of the OASDI benefit increase (including the children in school after 18 modification) as is attributable to its retroactive effective date.

(f) Economic Opportunity Act Earning Exemption

H.R. 6675 also provides a grace period for action by States that have not had regular legislative sessions, whose public assistance statutes now prevent them from disregarding earnings of recipients received under titles I and II of the Economic Opportunity Act.

(g) Income Exempt Under Another Assistance Program

A provision is added so that any amount of income which is disregarded in determining eligibility for a person under one of the public assistance programs shall not be considered in determining the eligibility of another individual under any other public assistance program.

6. *Uniform matching*

The bill permits a State that has a medical assistance program under title XIX to claim Federal sharing in total expenditures for money payments under other titles, under the same formula used for determining the Federal share for medical assistance under title XIX.

7. *Definition of medical assistance for aged*

The definition of medical assistance for the aged is modified so as to allow Federal sharing as to old-age assistance recipients for the month they are admitted to or discharged from a medical institution.

8. *Judicial review of State plan denials*

The bill provides for judicial review of the denial of approval by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of State public assistance plans and of his action under such programs for noncompliance with State plan conditions in the Federal law.

E. ACTUARIAL DATA RELATING TO BILL

TABLE 1.—*Summary of 1st-year costs under H.R. 6675*

[In millions of dollars]

	Trust funds		
	House	Senate	Conference
Health care programs:			
Basic hospital insurance	2,190	2,403	2,210
Voluntary supplementary medical	[1] 600	[1] 600	900
MAA liberalization	----------	----------	----------
Total	2,790	3,003	2,810
OASDI:			
7-percent benefit increase	1,430	1,470	1,470
Child school benefit	195	195	195
Broader definition of child	----------	10	10
Child disabled at 18 to 21	----------	10	----------
Blind disability	----------	120	5
Reduced benefits at 60	165	590	165
Transitional benefits at 72	140	140	140
Disability definition	105	40	40
Retirement test	65	590	295
Total	2,100	3,165	2,320
Public assistance and child health:			
Increase in formula	----------	----------	----------
TB and mental exclusion	----------	----------	----------
Coverage of MA	----------	----------	----------
Maternal and child health	----------	----------	----------
Miscellaneous	----------	----------	----------
Total	----------	----------	----------
Income tax changes	----------	----------	----------
Total, all programs	4,890	6,168	5,130

	General Treasury		
	House	Senate	Conference
Health care programs:			
Basic hospital insurance	275	295	290
Voluntary supplementary medical	600	600	600
MAA liberalization	200	200	200
Total	1,075	1,095	1,090
OASDI:			
7-percent benefit increase	----------	----------	----------
Child school benefit	----------	----------	----------
Broader definition of child	----------	----------	----------
Child disabled at 18 to 21	----------	----------	----------
Blind disability	----------	----------	----------
Reduced benefits at 60	----------	----------	----------
Transitional benefits at 72	----------	----------	----------
Disability definition	----------	----------	----------
Retirement test	----------	----------	----------
Total	----------	----------	----------
Public assistance and child health:			
Increase in formula	150	150	150
TB and mental exclusion	75	75	75
Coverage of MA	----------	50	40
Maternal and child health	60	61	61
Miscellaneous	6	13	13
Total	291	349	339
Income tax changes	−82	----------	−97
Total, all programs	1,284	1,444	1,332
Grand total:			
House		6,174	
Senate		7,612	
Conference		6,462	

[1] Contributions of participants.

TABLE 2

OASDI TAX RATES

[In percent]

Years	Employer-employee rate			Self-employed rate, conference
	House	Senate	Conference	
1966	8.0	7.7	7.7	5.8
1967–68	8.0	7.7	7.8	5.9
1969–72	8.8	9.0	8.8	6.6
1973 and after	9.6	9.9	9.7	7.0

HI TAX RATES

Years	House	Senate	Conference	Self-employed rate, conference
1966	0.7	0.65	0.7	0.35
1967–70	1.0	1.0	1.0	.50
1971–72	1.0	1.1	1.0	.50
1973–75	1.1	1.3	1.1	.55
1976–79	1.2	1.4	1.2	.60
1980–86	1.4	1.6	1.4	.70
1987 and after	1.6	1.7	1.6	.80

COMBINED OASDI AND HI TAX RATES AND TAXES UNDER CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

Years	Employer-employee		Self-employed	
	Rate	Maximum amount	Rate	Maximum amount
1966	8.4	$554.40	6.15	$405.90
1967–68	8.8	580.80	6.40	422.40
1969–72	9.8	646.80	7.10	468.60
1973–75	10.8	712.80	7.55	498.30
1976–79	10.9	719.40	7.60	501.60
1980–86	11.1	732.60	7.70	508.20
1987 and after	11.3	745.80	7.80	514.80

TABLE 3.—*Changes in actuarial balance of OASDI system, expressed in terms of estimated level-cost as percentage of taxable payroll*

Item	OASI	DI	Total
Actuarial balance of previous system	+0.14	−0.13	+0.01
Earnings base increase to $6,600	+.51	+.04	+.55
Revised contribution schedule	+.09	+.20	+.29
Extensions of coverage	+.01	--------	+.01
7-percent benefit increase	−.59	−.05	−.64
Earnings test liberalization	−.14	--------	−.14
Child's benefits to age 22 if in school	−.10	−.02	−.12
Reduced widow's benefits at age 60	--------	--------	--------
Disability definition revision	--------	−.01	−.01
Transitional insured status at age 72	−.01	--------	−.01
Broader definition of "child"	−.01	--------	−.01
Total effect of changes	−.24	+.16	−.08
Actuarial balance of bill	−.10	+.03	−.07

TABLE 4.—*Actuarial balance of HI system, expressed in terms of estimated level-cost as percentage of taxable payroll*

	Level-cost (percent)
Hospital and extended care facility benefits	1.19
Outpatient diagnostic benefits	.01
Home health service benefits	.03
Total benefits	1.23
Contributions	1.23
Actuarial balance	0.00

Prepared by Robert J. Myers, Chief Actuary, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, July 21, 1965.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chairman of the conference, has outlined the details of the conference agreement. I will not go into those details. I will speak in more general terms.

When one considers what we had before us in the conference, Mr. Speaker—namely, the bill that passed the House last April with over 500 amendments adopted in the Senate—your managers did a magnificent job. We bring back to you what is basically the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. When the bill was before us in April, it was referred to as a monumental bill. I agreed with that description at that time, and I would say that it is still a monumental bill.

Mr. Speaker, as I said many times, no Government program can be static. The old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system is no exception. We must constantly strive to improve the system, to correct inequities, and to make such changes as are deemed wise and appropriate. This bill, as it relates to the basic and current old-age and survivors disability insurance system, represents an improvement of that basic system. I am in agreement with a large part of this bill and particularly as it relates to that phase. As I pointed out when it was before the House last April, a good share of the bill was adopted on a noncontroversial basis. It had agreement of practically all members of the Committee on Ways and Means and, as the vote last April would indicate, it had practically unanimous agreement in this House. As far as my position is concerned, I would like to claim a little credit for a number of the items in the bill because of the fact that I proposed them in the first instance.

The voluntary contributory insurance system for medical services, the so-called part B of the medical program, is taken from the bill that I introduced last February. The program permitting all taxpayers to deduct for income tax purposes one-half of the cost of health insurance without regard to the 3-percent limit on medical expenses, I first proposed in the 87th Congress. The repeal of the curb on the deductibility of medical expenses which I proposed in the 88th Congress is now in this bill. The liberalization of the requirement for eligibility of persons over 72 years of age for the basic benefits is a modification of a proposal I first made in the 87th Congress.

But while I agree with many of the changes made in this bill I must take this occasion to sound a note of caution. There is a limit to the burden of benefits and responsibilities that can be imposed on our social security system.

I do not believe that this is the time to again debate the issues involved in imposing a hospitalization program on the old-age and survivors disability insurance system. This particular matter, as far as a basic proposition is concerned, was not a matter in conference. We did debate it. In fact, we debated it for a number of years. The issue came to a head in this House last April. At that time I proposed an alternative means of providing for the hospitalization and medical needs of our older people. And I pointed out what I thought were the dangers in the course that was being pursued by embodying it in the old-age and survivors insurance system. But, Mr. Speaker, a majority in both this House and in the other body decided to pursue the course of embodying hospitalization benefits in the old-age and survivors insurance system. I still believe the majority is in error and I think the country will come to regret having pursued this course.

But the die has been cast. There is no difference between the House and the Senate on that issue. It is not a matter in conference. It is not a matter in dispute before us today, as far as this particular report is concerned. I think, Mr. Speaker, the job now before us is to try to make the system that is established under this bill work as best it can. There will be no advantage to anyone in trying to sabotage the program. The program contains enough dangers to the basic social security system and to the quality of health in this country without adding additional problems and dangers. I would, therefore, at this point urge all who have anything to do with the administration of the program or with the health needs of our people, if they have any hatchets to bury them, and if they have any disagreements or animosities from the past that they bury them; and that all do their utmost to make the program work as well as possible.

When I warn of the limitations of the social security system, and the burdens we place on it, I am not only thinking now with reference to this new burden that we are placing on it of hospitalization, but I am thinking also of other changes that we have made which increase the burdens on the system and that are made in this legislation. And, I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to my colleagues that I am also speaking of other proposals that are being made constantly to broaden the scope and the burdens of this program. The system itself can be destroyed. It can be destroyed by the tax burden that must be imposed in order to carry the benefits of the program.

Under this bill and under the law as it will be when it is signed by the President, all of our people, and those least able, are going to bear an increased tax burden.

Mr. Speaker, we will shortly have before us a conference report dealing with housing. It was first proposed that we subsidize housing for middle-income levels, or people in the income level of $5,000 or $6,000 or $7,000. Let us look at what this program is going to impose on those people. The person with $6,600 in wages will be paying $277 in social security taxes. That is irrespective of the number of children he has or the burdens of that family. There are no deductions; there are no exemptions. That represents a $103 increase over what he is paying today. He is going to pay $103 more next year in social security taxes. Two and one-half years from now, which is not very long, the tax will be $323, or an increase of 86 percent over his present social security taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the self-employed tax on $6,600 will go up to $405 next year and to $468 two years later, an increase of $209 in social security taxes in less than 2½ years. I say to you we had better stop and be cautious of what we might do to this program by overburdening it, because it does have its limitations, just as our people have a limitation upon what they can pay in payroll taxes.

Let us remember, Mr. Speaker, that the old-age, disability, and survivors insurance program is the system upon which our people rely as a floor of protection in old age, in disabilities, and for the protection of their survivors in case of their decease. Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress have, as trustees of that system, the responsibility of seeing that their trust and their confidence, and their dependence upon this system in the future, is not misplaced and that we will do nothing that will jeopardize the capability of the system to meet the commitments that have been undertaken insofar as the older people and our disabled and their survivors are concerned.

That, Mr. Speaker, can represent an awesome responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, as we move into this monumental change in that system, let us be cautious. And let us remember that we have that responsibility as we move and advocate any change in the future. Let me put the responsibility for the welfare of this system right where it belongs. It rests on the Congress of the United States, because we are the trustees of this system. It will either continue as a good, sound, and reliable program, or it will fail, depending on how we carry out our responsibility.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, first let me concur in the remarks made by our able chairman in reporting to the House what the conferees did, and also in the remarks of my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], the ranking minority member, and echo again a statement he made in which I agree very deeply that now that this is going to become law, indeed, those of us who thought it was not good and felt this is unsound, it is still our responsibility to do everything we can within our power to prove ourselves to be wrong, and to make this work.

I have several points I want to make, and I hope to be able to get through all of them.

First I want to point out I signed the conference report, although I am going to advocate to my colleagues, those who voted against the bill in the House, that I still feel the bill itself is essentially unsound, and therefore shall vote against the conference report if it comes to a vote. It is important to explain the difference between the responsibility that a Member assumes as a conferee, the responsibilities as I see them in working out the differences between the House and Senate versions, and the responsibilities a Member has in his primary capacity of representing the people.

I might say to some of my self-styled liberal friends in relation to what happened yesterday that you do not change your basic position on principle because of the expediency at the time. If you believe in free debate and the opportunity of those who disagree with you to have the opportunity to debate a matter fully and offer amendments, you do not alter your position simply because you gain an important advantage today. So, as a conferee, my responsibility as I saw it was to do the best I could to work out the best version. So I signed the conference report. Because in essence the House version prevailed and what Senate amendments were agreed to, with a few exceptions, improved the bill.

Second, a portion of this bill, which has to do with improvement of the social security system, the OASDI, and the second part of social security, that which has to do with welfare programs, aid to the blind, old-age assistance and aid to dependent children; those are parts of the bill which the House passed last year and were parts of the bill the Senate passed last year but the administration ordered to be killed. There was no disagreement on these measures then or now.

Let the responsibility of this rest where it belongs—their not becoming law in the year 1964 rests on the administration that insisted on tying those beneficial programs on which there was no disagreement of a fundamental nature to this very controversial program of health care for the aged. Because the old people, the dependent children, the blind and others, could have had these benefits last year, so people on OASI could have had these benefits last year. However, the administration felt they could not get through the controversial program on its own merits and insisted upon pushing through the controversial programs, on which there was disagreement about health care. They tied that with something that was collateral and not controversial.

This is the reason for the situation today. We have had to wait for these controversial amendments to be added to the good parts of this bill.

There is the third part that has to do with health care for the aged. There are some features in this which are good. Indeed, the chairman mentioned the third part of this three-layer cake which he did not name, extension of the Kerr-Mills Act. It was eldercare. Yes, it is here, and in my judgment that has been and still remains the intelligent and basically sound method to move forward in taking care of this problem of health care for the aged.

Now the points I want to make are in the controversial area. The action that has been taken by the Congress is against the advice of the overwhelming majority of almost all professional groups in the health field—the medical profession, the hospital and home nursing professions and the health insurance professions. We are moving in this area against the overwhelming advice of those who have so nobly advanced our health care in our society to the point where we actually have created new problems. These are the professions that have created the problems. People are living 10 to 15 years longer—not because of a failure of the health care system in our society. Quite to the contrary. It is because of its successes. This becomes quite important. I agree it might be possible that those responsible for creating the problems that success has created might not be in a position to solve these new problems. But I think we should think a long time before we ride over these groups. We should contemplate in the efforts to ride over them the conduct of a nasty campaign of denigration, which has afflicted our society for years, to try to create the impression that those in the medical profession or those in the health field are unconcerned about health care for the aged and unconcerned about health care for our entire society.

I would point out that—what we have done is to take a system that has proved successful for 85 percent of our people, including our older people, in order to solve the problems of the 15 percent.

I would point out the problems of the 15 percent that we see in health care for the aged are not peculiar to the field of health care. These same problems exist with these people in the field of housing. They exist in matters of nutrition. They exist in all aspects of those needs that we know are necessary to sustain a life of subsistence if not one that is bountiful.

So we are in the process of radically changing this system which has proved so successful in the great majority of our people. What a burden it places on those innovators and on the Congress to have moved to change radically this system which itself is still so full of vitality and capable of progressive improvement.

I want to point out some of the radical changes. One of them is that we have made the system compulsory through the powers of Government. And I would argue that we have done that in an unconstitutional fashion if people would regard the Constitution and the proper interpretation of the Constitution. Here we are in effect saying—a person who contributes $66 a year, using a 1-percent figure on a $6,600 base—gets the identical services and the identical policy that a person who contributes only $30 gets. This we have never done before. This is only to point up one aspect of the unconstitutionality of using a compulsory system in order to move forward to hit at this problem that our 15 percent may have in this area.

Now I would also point out that we have basically altered our welfare system. The chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], for years pointed out that never have we used general revenues for welfare matters without applying a needs test because, first, it was a restriction on what we did in this area—otherwise, there is no restriction, no discipline; second, there is a real question of whether the Federal Government under the Constitution can be used to spread wealth in this fashion. So we have altered our basic welfare system, which I believe is going to create very serious problems for Congresses of the future.

Not only that, but we have altered the basic social security system, OASDI. Under this system, we have given our people cash. This was a great advancement forward over the old-age assistance, under which services were rendered and cash was budgeted. We have moved in this bill to a combination cash-and-service program.

What does it mean when we get the Government into delivering services to the people instead of cash? It means either we must provide the services directly or regulate the services by having Government bureaus set up to do it or by having the bureaus actually do the contracting and supervising of these services, to see that they are delivered as scheduled in the law. Of course we will have to have regulations written in.

The first part of the bill says that this shall not interfere with the personal choice of people for physicians or how hospitals are run, and then the next 80 pages spell out in detail exactly how the political government does interfere, as perforce it must to be certain that the tax dollars are spent efficiently and in accordance with law.

The second major point, which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] pointed out well, is the reliance on the payroll tax. One can overburden any tax. I happen to believe that the payroll tax has served well and could serve well in the future. There have been warnings that if we got it beyond 10 percent of payroll we would create great economic damage, in the field of unemployment and in the field of our international balance of payments. We already have a problem now of an employment, coming as a result of automation.

The payroll tax is a tax on jobs. It is not a tax on machines. It is an added incentive, of course, to further replace manpower with investment capital, through machines.

The payroll tax has an effect on our balance of payments. Of course, the payroll tax is essentially a consumer tax passed on in the price of goods and services the consumer must pay, and therefore it gets involved in our competition in the international marketplace and affects our exports, which in turn affects both jobs and our international balance of payments.

These matters were in a very cursory fashion gone into in the Ways and Means Committee, but not adequately, and we have ignored the warnings, because this tax will go to 11.3 percent on a base, not of $4,800, but of $6,600.

Finally, I would observe that the actuarial soundness to which the chairman alluded is based upon some very questionable premises. It is the premises to which one must look in order to view the overall actuarial soundness.

I quote three figures: $19 billion, $14 billion, and $80 billion.

The figure of $19 billion is the amount of money we have in our trust fund for social security retirement. The figure of $14 billion is the amount we have in our civil service retirement system trust funds. The figure of $80 billion is what there is in the private employer-employee pension plans trust funds.

Notice the difference—$80 billion covers about 15 million people, while $14 billion covers about 5 million, and the $19 billion of OASDI covers around 180 million. That in itself should alert everyone in the House to the fact that these programs are based upon entirely different actuarial assumptions, and I would say that the actuarial assumptions of the OASDI programs are highly questionable.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, and to the other members of the conference on the social security amendments of 1965. The result of these efforts will merit the lasting gratitude of the American people.

I also want to pay special tribute to the conference committee for adopting an amendment which I recommended which requires the Social Security Administration to furnish the address to help locate a deserting parent or husband to a welfare agency or court on condition that information be transmitted through a welfare agency, that an actual public assistance case be involved and a court order for support have been issued, and that all nondisclosure provisions be complied with.

For the past 8 years, I have endeavored to have the Social Security Administration to adopt regulations permitting the disclosure of the last known address of the worker under social security who flees from family responsibility and avoids detection by reason of the confidentiality of social security records.

Today, over $1 billion in Federal funds, plus an additional $750 million in State and local funds are paid to support dependent children. Almost 20 percent, or $350 million, is spent annually in the support of children who have living "runaway" fathers who could and should support these children. Providing for these abandoned children costs the taxpayers $931,000 a day, a 67-percent increase in the daily cost of this program since 1958. The rate of increase in this item of public expense is more phenomenal than any other peacetime Government expense.

In the summer of 1960, at the request of Congressman WIDNALL and myself, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare proceeded with a special survey study in three scattered communities in America, including the Cleveland, Cuyahoga County area. As a result of this special effort in my community of 290 errant fathers, 111 were located. Sixty-three were located with social security records as the chief source of this information. In this special effort, 37 support orders were obtained and 5 entered into voluntary agreements to support their children. The results of this special effort were significant and point the way to saving hundreds of millions of dollars.

In my opinion, social security should not provide shelter through the extension of confidentiality to persons who are proven cases of family abandonment.

I am grateful to the conference committee for including this matter in its report.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], and add my thanks to the conference committee for their action regarding the "deserting parent" problem. By requiring the Social Security Administration to make addresses available to welfare agencies and courts in support cases, the Congress will provide an excellent means to find those who flee family responsibility and depend upon the taxpayer to take care of the dependents he or she has left behind. Congressman VANIK and I have been urging this action for years.

This should do more than cut down on the tremendous cost of public support for the children of runaway parents. That cost is estimated at $350 million per year, or 20 percent of the $1.75 billion spent each year by Federal, State, and local governments to assist dependent children. It can provide an opportunity to encourage the acceptance of responsibility, to promote the realization on the part of parents of what family responsibility means, perhaps even to recement family ties. I have no doubt that the phenomenal increase in cost for dependent children programs has occurred, at least in part, as a result of a paradoxical situation whereby a parent could abandon his children to the care of the State, and yet collect from another governmental agency under social security. By permitting disclosure of addresses, neither the children involved nor the social security recipient will receive anything less, but the financial responsibility in the case of the children will rest where it belongs, on the parent.

That this is feasible is illustrated by the special survey conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1960, at the urging of Congressman VANIK and myself. Over 20 percent of the errant fathers were located by using social security records as the chief source of information. I congratulate the members of the conference committee for their wisdom and efforts in this matter.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I support this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I support this conference report on the social security bill which makes a historic advance in social legislation.

I do not share the fears that the social security system is threatened with destruction because of the vast improvements which this legislation represents.

Despite the progress that has been made in this 89th Congress there are many more improvements in the program which should be made to meet the needs of retired citizens. There is much merit to the argument that wage earners are carrying a heavy tax burden to finance the improvements this bill contains. It seems to me that this unfair tax burden can be remedied by having the Federal Government participate in contributing to the social security fund. Only in this way will it be possible to properly finance future amendments to make the program more adequate. A greater opportunity must be provided to permit retired citizens, disabled workers, and their families, to properly share in the Nation's increasing productivity and wealth.

The medicare provision which is included in this report marks an important step forward. The increase in benefits will be of much help to many old folks who depend on their social security checks for a decent livelihood.

Because of automation and the Nation's ability to produce with less labor, it is most essential that there should be an earlier retirement age. There is also a need for liberalization of the disability feature in order to carry some of the burden of families affected by catastrophic illness.

Social security benefits, particularly the minimum, must be further increased to make them more realistic. In a nation as rich as ours, a country which worries about its abundance of food and other good things of life, we can assure our elderly citizens of some of the comforts of life in their twilight years.

It is for these reasons that I have introduced legislation for Federal contributions to the social security fund. The tax machinery of the Federal Government, based on the ability to pay, should be used for this purpose in order that those best able to pay will carry their proper share for the cost of this program.

I wish to pay my respects, Mr. Speaker, to the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. I speak of the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable Wilbur D. Mills. The old folks of the Nation owe him a debt of gratitude for his leadership and contribution to the tremendous progress which this legislation represents.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the leadership of my colleague, the gentleman from California, Congressman Cecil King; that of Senator Clinton Anderson; the gentleman from Arkansas, Chairman Wilbur Mills, of the House Ways and Means Committee; Senator Russell Long, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and the conferees of both the House and Senate in producing the historic bill which we vote on today.

The Social Security Amendments of 1965, which they worked tirelessly to achieve, is a major landmark in social legislation in this country surpassed in importance and its effect on the well-being of the lives of our citizens only by the enactment of the original social security legislation.

I am sure that as broad a revision as this measure is and as far reaching as its benefits to our people are, we will see the day when the coverage is extended to long-term nursing home care and the cost of drugs in all phases of this program.

It will be extended to those who wish to take advantage of the benefits of early retirement at age 60 for women and age 62 for men and to those under 65 receiving disability benefits as well as to dependents of all those receiving cash benefits under the program. I am equally certain that before many years Congress will choose to extend comprehensive medical care as a matter of right to every man, woman and child in this country.

It is with sadness that I note that just 10 days ago, George McLain, who spent most of his life in the effort to improve the lot of those in need in my State, California, and in the Nation, died. It is ironic that he who gave so much and toiled so long is not here to see the fruit which his labors bore.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly hope that this House will speedily and overwhelmingly accept and approve the conference report on H.R. 6675 now before us.

This conference report represents a major historical mark in legislative attempts to reasonably ease the suffocating burdens of old age in a civilized society and it embraces the most wholesome expansion of our social security system since its establishment 30 years ago. Unquestionably it will strengthen the economic security and confidence of every American family in this country.

In summary, under the basic health care program set up by this legislation, hospitalization benefits of up to 90 days would be allowed for each illness. The patient would pay the first $40 of the hospital bill. After the first 60 days of hospital care he would pay $10 toward the cost. It also provides up to 100 days of posthospital nursing home care with the patient paying $5 a day for each day after 20 and up to 100 home care visits, normally by a nurse.

Under the voluntary supplementary plan other medical expenses, including doctor bills and services of specialists, would be mostly met by $3-a-month premiums paid by the individual and matched by the Government. After a $50-a-year deductible this voluntary plan would pay 80 percent of costs.

This bill further establishes an expanded Kerr-Mills program for the needy which is intended to combine all the various existing medical assistance programs for this group into a single program with greater Federal financial participation.

Among other vitally important features of this measure are provisions for a 7-percent increase in all social security payments; to approve a desperately needed liberalization, so long overdue, of the earnings limitation; the continuation of benefits for children attending school beyond the age of 18 up to the age of 22; to grant widows the option of receiving reduced benefits beginning at the age of 60; and the continuation of widows and widowers insurance benefits after remarriage.

Mr. Speaker, the great number of major revisions and improvements in our basic social security system and program of medical care for the aged and needy children, projected by this conference report, embrace the judgments and agreement of the most knowledgeable and dedicated legislative minds, in a specialized field in this country. The House and Senate committees and their respective chairmen and, particularly the members of this conference committee, eminently merit the gratitude of the Congress and the country for their persevering work and historical achievement. The gratitude of this body, in fundamental concern for the American people, can best be expressed by prompt approval of this conference report.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 307, nays 116, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 203]

YEAS—307

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baldwin
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Beckworth
Bell
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clark
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Landrum
Leggett
Lindsay
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik

Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—116

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Baring
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bray
Brock
Brown, Ohio
Buchanan
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Cabell
Calaway
Casey
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Cooley
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Findley
Fisher
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Gathings
Gross
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Jarman
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kornegay
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Michel
Mize
Morton
Murray
Nelsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pickle
Poage
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Scott
Selden
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stephens
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Younger

NOT VOTING—11

Blatnik
Bonner
Bow
Cahill
Colmer
Keogh
McVicker
Toll
Watson
Willis

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with **Mr. Colmer against.**
Mr. Blatnik for, with **Mr. Watson against.**

Until further notice:

Mr. Toll with **Mr. McVicker.**
Mr. Willis with **Mr. Bonner.**

Mr. HALEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7984) to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 679)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7984) to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommended to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965'.

"TITLE I—SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR DISADVANTAGED PERSONS

"Financial assistance to enable certain private housing to be available for lower income families who are elderly, handicapped, displaced, victims of a natural disaster, or occupants of substandard housing

"SEC. 101. (a) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator') is authorized to make, and contract to make annual payments to a 'housing owner' on behalf of 'qualified tenants,' as those terms are defined herein, in such amounts and under such circumstances as are prescribed in or pursuant to this section. In no case shall a contract provide for such payments with respect to any housing for a period exceeding forty years. The aggregate amount of the contracts to make such payments shall not exceed amounts approved in appropriation Acts, and payments pursuant to such contracts shall not exceed $30,000,000 per annum prior to July 1, 1966, which maximum dollar amount shall be increased by $35,000,000 on July 1, 1966, by $40,000,000 on July 1, 1967, and by $45,000,000 on July 1, 1968.

"(b) As used in this section, the term 'housing owner' means a private nonprofit corporation or other private nonprofit legal entity, a limited dividend corporation or other limited dividend legal entity, or a cooperative housing corporation, which is a mortgagor under section 221(d)(3) of the National Housing Act and which, after the enactment of this section, has been approved for mortgage insurance thereunder and has been approved for receiving the benefits of this section: *Provided,* That, except as provided in subsection (j), no payments under this section may be made with respect to any property financed with a mortgage receiving the benefits of the interest rate provided for in the proviso in section 221(d)(5) of that Act. Subject to the limitations provided in subsection (j), the term 'housing owner' also has the meaning prescribed in such subsection.

"(c) As used in this section, the term 'qualified tenant' means any individual or family who has, pursuant to criteria and procedures established by the Administrator, been determined—

"(1) to have an income below the maximum amount which can be established in the area, pursuant to the limitations prescribed in sections 2(2) and 15(7)(b)(ii) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, for occupancy in public housing dwellings; and

"(2) to be one of the following—

"(A) displaced by governmental action;

"(B) sixty-two years of age or older (or, in the case of a family to have a head who is, or whose spouse is, sixty-two years of age or over);

"(C) physically handicapped (or, in the case of a family, to have a head who is, or whose spouse is, physically handicapped);

"(D) occupying substandard housing; or

"(E) an occupant or former occupant of a dwelling which is (or was) situated in an area determined by the Small Business Administration, subsequent to April 1, 1965, to have been affected by a natural disaster, and which has been extensively damaged or destroyed as the result of such disaster.

The terms 'qualified tenant' and 'tenant' include a member of a cooperative who satisfies the foregoing requirements and who, upon resale of his membership to the cooperative, will not be reimbursed for any equity increment accumulated through payments under this section. With respect to members of a cooperative, the terms 'rental' and 'rental charges' mean the charges under the occupancy agreements between such members and the cooperative.

"(d) The amount of the annual payment with respect to any dwelling unit shall not exceed the amount by which the fair market rental for such unit exceeds one-fourth of the tenant's income as determined by the Administrator pursuant to procedures and regulations established by him.

"(e)(1) For purposes of carrying out the provisions of this section, the Administrator shall establish criteria and procedures for determining the eligibility of occupants and rental charges, including criteria and procedures with respect to periodic review of tenant incomes and periodic adjustment of rental charges. The Administrator shall issue, upon the request of a housing owner, certificates as to the following facts concerning the individuals and families applying for admission to, or residing in, dwellings of such owner:

"(A) the income of the individual or family; and

"(B) whether the individual or family was displaced by governmental action, is elderly, is physically handicapped, or is (or was) occupying substandard housing or housing extensively damaged or destroyed as the result of a natural disaster.

"(2) Procedures adopted by the Administrator hereunder shall provide for recertifications of the incomes of occupants, except the elderly, at intervals of two years (or at shorter intervals in cases where the Administrator may deem it desirable) for the purpose of adjusting rental charges and annual payments on the basis of occupants' incomes, but in no event shall rental charges adjusted under this section for any dwelling exceed the fair market rental of the dwelling.

"(3) The Administrator may enter into agreements, or authorize housing owners to enter into agreements, with public or private agencies for services required in the selection of qualified tenants, including those who may be approved, on the basis of the probability of future increases in their incomes as lessees under an option to purchase (which will give such approval qualified tenants an exclusive right to purchase at a price established or determined as provided in the option) dwellings, and in the establishment of rentals. The Administrator is authorized (without limiting his authority under any other provision of law) to delegate to any such public or private agency his authority to issue certificates pursuant to this subsection.

"(4) No payments under this section may be made with respect to any property for which the costs of operation (including wages and salaries) are determined by the Administrator to be greater than similar costs of operation of similar housing in the community where the property is situated.

"(f) Section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by inserting '(i)' after 'a mortgage under' in the first proviso and by inserting immediately before the colon at the end of such proviso the following: ', or (ii) section 221(d)(3) of the National Housing Act if payments with respect to the mortgaged property are made or are to be made under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, except that no such mortgage shall be insured, and no commitment to insure such a mortgage shall be issued, with respect to property in any community for which a workable program for community improvement was required and in effect at the time a contract for a loan or capital grant was entered into under this title, or a contract for annual contributions or capital grants was entered into pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937, unless there is a workable program for community improvement which meeets the requirements of this subsection in effect in such community at the time of such insurance or commitment'.

"(g) The Administrator is authorized to make such rules and regulations, to enter into such agreements, and to adopt such procedures as he may deem necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this section. Nothing contained in this section shall affect the authority of (1) the Federal Housing Commissioner with respect to any housing assisted under this section and under sections 221(d)(3) and 231(c)(3) of the National Housing Act, or (2) the Housing and Home Finance Administrator with respect to any housing assisted under this section and under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, including the authority to prescribe occupancy requirements under other provisions of law or to determine the portion of any such housing which may be occupied by qualified tenants.

"(h) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, including, but not limited to, such sums as may be necessary to make annual payments as prescribed in this section, pay for services provided under (or pursuant to agreements entered into under) subsection (e), and provide administrative expenses.

"(i) Section 114(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by inserting before the colon at the end of the first proviso the following: ', or a dwelling unit assisted under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965'.

"(j)(1) For the purpose of assisting housing under this section on an experimental basis, subject to the limitations of this subsection, the term 'housing owner' (in addition to the meaning prescribed in subsection (b)) includes—

"(A) a private nonprofit corporation or other private nonprofit legal entity, a limited dividend corporation or other limited dividend legal entity, or a cooperative housing corporation, which is a mortgagor under a mortgage which receives the benefits of the interest rate provided for in the proviso in section 221(d)(5) of the National Housing Act and which, after the date of the enactment of this Act, has been approved for mortgage insurance under section 221(d)(3) of the National Housing Act and has been approved for receiving the benefits of this section;

"(B) a private nonprofit corporation or other private nonprofit legal entity which is a mortgagor under a mortgage insured under section 231(c)(3) of the National Housing Act and which, after the date of the enactment of this Act, has obtained final endorsement of such mortgage for mortgage insurance and has been approved for receiving the benefits of this section; and

"(C) a private nonprofit corporation, a public body or agency, or a cooperative housing corporation, which is a borrower under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 and has been approved for receiving the benefits of this section: *Provided*, That, with respect to properties financed with loans under such section made on or before the date of the enactment of this Act, payments shall not be made with respect to more than 20 per centum of the dwelling units in any property so financed.

"(2) Of the amounts approved in appropriation Acts pursuant to subsection (a) for payments under this section in any year, not more than 5 per centum in the aggregate shall be paid with respect to properties of housing owners as defined in paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection, and not more than 5 per centum in the aggregate shall be paid with respect to properties of housing owners as defined in paragraphs (1)(B) and (1)(C) of this subsection.

"Extension of FHA section 221 programs; modification of interest rate; pooling of mortgages for sale

"SEC. 102. (a) The fifth sentence of section 221(f) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out 'subsection (d)(2) or (d)(4) after September 30, 1965, or under subsection (d)(3) after September 30, 1965,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'this section after October 1, 1969.'.

"(b) The proviso in section 221(d)(5) of such Act is amended by striking out 'not less than the annual rate of interest determined' and inserting in lieu thereof 'not less than the lower of (A) 3 per centum per annum, or (B) the annual rate of interest determined'.

"(c) The third sentence of section 212(a) of such Act is amended by striking out 'described in subsection (d)(3)' and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof 'described in subsection (d)(3) or (d)(4).'

"(d) Section 302(c) of such Act is amended by inserting before the last sentence thereof the following: 'If there shall be included within one or more of the trusts or other agencies created pursuant to the authority of this subsection any mortgages bearing a below-market interest rate and insured under section 221(d)(3) after the date of the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, there are authorized to be appropriated from time to time such amounts as may be necessary to reimburse the Association for the amount of the differential (including interest, other costs, and a fair proportion of administrative expense) between (1) the total outlay with respect to outstanding participations or other instruments which, at the time of issuance, were predicated upon or otherwise related to such below-market interest rate mortgages, and (2) the total receipts from such mortgages.'

"Low-rent housing in private accommodations

"SEC. 103. (a) The United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by redesignating section 23 as section 24, and by adding after section 22 the following new section:

"'Low-rent housing in private accommodations

"'SEC. 23. (a)(1) For the purpose of providing a supplementary form of low-rent housing which will aid in assuring a decent place to live for every citizen and promote efficiency and economy in the program under this Act by taking full advantage of vacancies or potential vacancies in the private housing market, each public housing agency shall, to the maximum extent consistent with the achievement of the objectives of this Act, provide low-rent housing under this Act in the form of low-rent housing in private accommodations in accordance with this section where such housing in private accommodations can be provided at a cost equal to or less than housing in projects assisted under other provisions of this Act.

"'(2) The provisions of this section shall not apply to any locality unless the governing body of the locality has by resolution approved the application of such provisions to such locality.

"'(3) As used in this section, the term "low-rent housing in private accommodations" means dwelling units in an existing structure, leased from a private owner, which provide decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling accommodations and related facilities effectively supplementing the accommodations and facilities in low-rent housing assisted under the other provisions of this Act in a manner calculated to meet the total housing needs of the community in which they are located; and the term "owner" means any person or entity having the legal right to lease or sublease property containing one or more dwelling units as described in this section.

"'(b) Beginning as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this section, each public housing agency shall conduct a continuing survey and listing of the available dwelling units within the community or communities under its jurisdiction which provide decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling accommodations and related facilities and are, or may be made, suitable for use as low-rent housing in private accommodations under this section.

"'(c) Each public housing agency, by notification to the owners of housing listed under subsection (b), or by publication or advertisement, or otherwise, shall from time to time make known to the public in the community or communities under its jurisdiction the anticipated need for dwelling units in such community or communities to be used as low-rent housing in private accommodations under this section, inviting the owners of such dwelling units to make available for purposes of this section one or more of such units (not exceeding 10 per centum of the units in any single structure except to the extent that the agency, because of the limited number of units in the structure or for any other reason, determines that such limit should not be applied). The public housing agency shall conduct appropriate inspections of the units offered to be made available in any residential structure by the owner thereof in response to such invitation, and if—

"'(1) it finds that such units are, or may be made, suitable for use as low-rent housing in private accommodations within the meaning of subsection (a)(3), and

"'(2) the rentals to be charged for such units, as negotiated and agreed to by the agency and the owner of the structure in a manner consistent with subsection (d)(2), are within the financial range of families of low income,

such agency may approve such units for use as low-rent housing in private accommodations in accordance with (and subject to the applicable limitations contained in) this section. Each public housing agency shall maintain and keep current a list of units approved by it under this subsection, including such information with respect to each such unit as it may consider necessary or appropriate.

"'(d) To the extent of contracts for annual contributions entered into by the Authority with a public housing agency under section 10(e), such agency may enter into contracts with the owners of structures containing dwelling units approved under subsection (c) for the use of such units in accordance with this section. Each such contract with an owner shall provide (with respect to any unit) that—

"'(1) the selection of tenants for such unit shall be the function of the owner, subject to the provisions of the contract between the Authority and the agency;

"'(2) the rental and other charges to be received by the owner shall be negotiated and agreed to by the agency and the owner, and the rental and other charges to be paid by the tenant shall be determined in accordance with the standards applicable to units in low-rent housing projects assisted under the other provisions of this Act;

"'(3) the agency shall have the sole right to give notice to vacate, with the owner having the right to make representations to the agency for termination of a tenancy;

"'(4) maintenance and replacements (including redecoration) shall be in accordance with the standard practice for the building concerned, as established by the owner and agreed to by the agency; and

"'(5) the agency and the owner shall carry out such other appropriate terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed to by them. Each contract between a public housing agency and an owner entered into under this subsection shall be for a term of not less than twelve months nor more than thirty-six months, and shall be renewable by such agency and owner at the expiration of such term.

"'(e) The annual contribution under this Act for a project of a public housing agency for low-rent housing in private accommodations under this section in lieu of any other guaranteed contribution authorized by section 10 shall not exceed the amount of the fixed annual contribution which would be established under this Act for a newly constructed project by such public housing agency designed to accommodate the comparable number, sizes, and kinds of families. The period over which payments will be made to a public housing agency for a project of low-rent housing in private accommodations under this section, and the aggregate amount of such payments, under a contract for annual contributions, shall be determined on the basis of the number of units in the community or communities under the jurisdiction of such agency which are in use (or can reasonably be expected to be placed in use) as low-rent housing in private accommodations under this section, taking into account the terms of the leases under which such units are (or will be) so used. In addition, contracts for financial assistance entered into by the Authority with a public housing agency pursuant to this section shall provide for reimbursement of reasonable and necessary expenses incurred by such agency in conducting surveys, listings, and inspections described in subsections (b) and (c).

"'(f) The provisions of sections 10(h) and 15(7) of this Act, and the workable program requirement in section 10(e) of this Act and section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, shall not apply to low-rent housing in private accommodations provided under this section.'

"(b) The last sentence of section 2(1) of such Act is amended by striking out 'Income limits for occupancy and rents' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Except as otherwise provided in section 23, income limits for occupancy and rents'.

"Parity of treatment for the handicapped and elderly in public housing

"Sec. 104. Section 2(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) The term "families of low income" means families (including elderly and displaced families) who are in the lowest income group and who cannot afford to pay enough to cause private enterprise in their locality or metropolitan area to build an adequate supply of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for their use. The term "families" includes families consisting of a single person in the case of elderly families and displaced families, and includes the remaining member of a tenant family. The term "elderly families" means families whose heads (or their spouses), or whose sole members, have attained the age at which an individual may elect to receive an old-age benefit under title II of the Social Security Act, or are under a disability as defined in section 223 of that Act, or are handicapped within the meaning of section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959. The term "displaced families" means families displaced by urban renewal or other governmental action, or families whose present or former dwellings are situated in areas determined by the Small Business Administration, subsequent to April 1, 1965, to have been affected by a natural disaster, and which have been extensively damaged or destroyed as the result of such disaster.'

"Direct loans to provide housing for the elderly or handicapped

"Sec. 105. (a) Section 202(a)(4) of the Housing Act of 1959 is amended by striking out '$350,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$500,000,000'.

"(b) Effective with respect to loans made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, section 202(a)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out 'the higher of (A) 2¾ per centum per annum, or' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the lower of (A) 3 per centum per annum, or'.

"Rehabilitation grants to homeowners in urban renewal areas

"Sec. 106. (a) Title I of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'Rehabilitation grants

"'Sec. 115. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Administrator may authorize a local public agency to make grants (and the urban renewal project may include the making of such grants) as prescribed in this section. Any such grant may be made only to an individual or family, as described in subsection (b), who owns and occupies a structure in an urban renewal area, and only for the purpose of covering the cost of repairs and improvements necessary to make such structure conform to public standards for decent, safe, and sanitary housing as required by applicable codes or other requirements of the urban renewal plan for the area. Any contract for financial assistance under this title shall provide that the capital grant otherwise payable for the project shall be increased by an amount equal to the total amount of the grants under this section and that no part of the total amount of such grants shall be required to be contributed as part of the local grant-in-aid.

"'(b) A grant authorized by this section may be made to an individual or family whose income does not exceed $3,000 a year, and such grant may be in the amount which does not exceed the lesser of (1) the actual (and approved) cost of the repairs and improvements involved, or (2) $1,500. In case the income of the individual or family exceeds $3,000 a year, a grant may be made under this section, subject to the limitations specified in clauses (1) and (2) of the preceding sentence, but only in an amount not to exceed that portion of the cost of the repairs and improvements which cannot be paid for with any available loan that can be amortized as part of such individual's or family's monthly housing expense without requiring such monthly housing expense to exceed 25 per centum of such individual's or family's monthly income.'

"(b) Any contract with a local public agency which was executed under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 before the date of enactment of this Act may be amended to provide for grants authorized by section 115 of the Housing Act of 1949.

"Mortgage relief for homeowners who are unemployed as the result of the closing of a Federal installation

"Sec. 107. (a) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'mortgage' means a mortgage which (A) is insured under the National Housing Act, or (B) secures a home loan guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 or chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code.

"(2) The term 'Federal mortgage agency' means—

"(A) the Federal Housing Commissioner when used in connection with mortgages insured under the National Housing Act, and

"(B) the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs when used in connection with mortgages securing home loans guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 or chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code.

"(3) The term 'distressed mortgagor' means an individual who—

"(A) is unemployed, although willing to work, as the result of the closing (in whole or in part) of a Federal installation, and

"(B) is the owner-occupant of a dwelling upon which there is a mortgage securing a loan which is in default because of the inability of such individual to make payments of principal and/or interest under such mortgage.

"(b)(1) Any distressed mortgagor, for the purpose of avoiding foreclosure of his mortgage, may apply to the appropriate Federal mortgage agency for a determination that suspension of his obligation to make payments of principal and/or interest under such mortgage during a temporary period is necessary in order to avoid such foreclosure.

"(2) Upon receipt of an application made under this subsection by a distressed mortgagor, the Federal mortgage agency shall issue to such mortgagor a certificate of moratorium if it determines, after consultation with the interested mortgagee, that—

"(A) the mortgagor is not in default with respect to any condition or covenant of the mortgage other than that requiring the payment of installments of principal and/or interest under the mortgage, and

"(B) such action is the only available means whereby a foreclosure of such mortgage can be avoided.

"(3) Prior to the issuance to any distressed mortgagor of a certificate of moratorium under paragraph (2), the Federal mortgage agency shall require such mortgagor to enter into a binding agreement under which he will be required to make payments to such agency, after the expiration of such certificate, in an aggregate amount equal to the amount paid by such agency on behalf of such mortgagor as provided in subsection (c). The manner and time in which such payments shall be made shall be determined by the Federal mortgage agency having due regard to the purposes sought to be achieved by this section.

"(4) Any certificate of moratorium issued under this subsection shall expire on whichever of the following dates is the earliest—

"(A) one year from the date on which such certificate is issued;

"(B) thirty days after the date on which the mortgagor to whom such certificate is issued ceases to be a distressed mortgagor as defined in subsection (a); or

"(C) the date on which such mortgagor becomes in default with respect to any condition or covenant in his mortgage other than that requiring the payment by him of installments of principal and/or interest under the mortgage.

"(c)(1) Whenever a Federal mortgage agency issues a certificate of moratorium to any distressed mortgagor with respect to any mortgage, it shall transmit to the mortgagee a copy of such certificate, together with a notice stating that, while such certificate is in effect, such agency will assume the obligation of such mortgagor to make payments of principal, and, if so specified in the certificate, of interest, under the mortgage.

"(2) Payments made by any Federal mortgage agency pursuant to a certificate of moratorium issued under this section with respect to the mortgage of any distressed mortgagor shall include, in addition to the payments referred to in paragraph (1), an amount equal to the unpaid principal and interest charges which had accrued under such mortgage prior to the issuance of such certificate and subsequent to the date on which such mortgagor became a distressed mortgagor as defined in subsection (a).

"(3) While any certificate of moratorium issued under this section is in effect with respect to the mortgage of any distressed mortgagor, no further payments of principal, and, if so specified in the certificate, of interest, under the mortgage shall be required of such mortgagor, and no action (legal or otherwise) shall be taken or maintained by the mortgagee to enforce or collect such payments. Upon the expiration of such certificate, the mortgagor shall again be liable for the payment of all amounts due under the mortgage in accordance with its terms.

"(4) Each Federal mortgage agency shall give prompt notice in writing to the interested mortgagor and mortgagee of the expiration of any certificate of moratorium issued by it under this section.

"(d) The Federal mortgage agencies are authorized to issue such individual and joint regulations as may be necessary to carry out this section and to insure the uniform administration thereof.

"(e) There shall be in the Treasury (1) a fund which shall be available to the Federal Housing Commissioner for the purpose of extending financial assistance in behalf of distressed mortgagors as provided in subsection (c), and (2) a fund which shall be available to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the same purpose. The capital of each such fund shall consist of such sums as may, from time to time, be appropriated thereto, and any sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended. Receipts arising from the programs of assistance under subsection (c) shall be credited to the fund from which such assistance was extended. Moneys in either of such funds not needed for current operations, as determined by the Federal Housing Commissioner, or the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, as the case may be, shall be invested in bonds or other obligations of the United States, or paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(f) Section 1816 of title 38, United States Code is amended by inserting '(a)' before the text of such section, and by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(b) With respect to any loan made under section 1811 which has not been sold as provided in subsection (g) of such section, if the Administrator finds, after there has been a default in the payment of any installment of principal or interest owing on such loan, that the default was due to the fact that the veteran who is obligated under the loan has become unemployed as the result of the closing (in whole or in part) of a Federal installation, he shall (1) extend the time for curing the default to such time as he determines is necessary and desirable to enable such veteran to complete payments on such loan, including an extension of time beyond the stated maturity thereof, or (2) modify the terms of such loan for the purpose of changing the amortization provisions thereof by recasting, over the remaining term of the loan, or over such longer period as he may determine, the total unpaid amount then due with the modification to become effective currently or upon the termination of an agreed-upon extension of the period for curing the default.'

"Acquisition of certain properties situated at or near military bases which have been ordered to be closed

"SEC. 108. (a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to acquire title to any property, improved with a one- or two-family dwelling, which is situated at or near a military base or installation which the Department of Defense has, subsequent to November 1, 1964, ordered to be closed in whole or in part, if he determines—

"(1) that the owner of such property is, or has been, employed or performing military service, at such base or installation;

"(2) that the closing of such base or installation, in whole or in part, has required or will require the termination of such owner's employment or service at such base or installation; and

"(3) that as the result of the actual or pending closing of such base or installation there is no present market for the sale of such property upon reasonable terms and conditions.

"(b) The purchase price of any property which is situated at or near a military base or installation and is acquired under this section shall be equal to an amount determined by the Secretary of Defense to be the average price at which properties, similar in size, construction, condition, and location to that of the property to be acquired, were sold during a representative period, as determined by the Secretary, prior to the announcement of the intention of the Department of Defense to close all or part of such base or installation.

"(c) The title to any property acquired under this section shall be free and clear of any outstanding liens or encumbrances and shall conform to such requirements as the Secretary of Defense shall by regulation require. Such regulations shall also prescribe the terms and conditions under which payments may be made under this section, and decisions by the Secretary regarding such payments, and the terms and conditions under which the same are approved or disapproved, shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to judicial review.

"(d) Properties acquired under this section shall be transferred to the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Federal Housing Commissioner shall have power to deal with, rent, renovate, or sell for cash or credit any properties so transferred. Receipts from the management or sale of any such properties may be utilized by the Commissioner to defray expenses arising in connection with the management of such properties, and any part of such receipts not required for such expenses shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(e) Section 223(a) of the National Housing Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting in lieu thereof '; or '; and

"(2) by inserting after paragraph (7) a new paragraph as follows:

"'(8) executed in connection with the sale by the Commissioner of any housing acquired pursuant to section 108 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.'

"(f) Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section are hereby authorized to be appropriated, and any sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

"TITLE II—FHA INSURANCE OPERATIONS

"Land development

"SEC. 201. (a) The National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"'TITLE X—MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT

"'Definitions

"'SEC. 1001. As used in this title—

"'(a) the term "mortgage" means a lien or liens on real estate in fee simple, or on a leasehold (1) under a lease for not less than ninety-nine years which is renewable, or (2) under a lease having a period of not less than fifty years to run from the date the mortgage was executed;

"'(b) the term "first mortgage" includes such classes of first liens as are commonly given to secure advances (including but not limited to advances during construction) on, or the unpaid purchase price of, real estate under the laws of the State in which the real estate is located, together with the credit instrument or instruments, if any, secured thereby, and may be in the form of trust mortgages or mortgage indentures or deeds of trusts securing notes, bonds, or other credit instruments;

"'(c) the terms "mortgage", "mortgagor", and "State" have the same meaning as in section 207 of this Act;

"'(d) the term "improvements" means waterlines and water supply installations, sewerlines and sewerage disposal installations, roads, streets, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, storm drainage facilities, and other installations or work, whether on or off the site, which the Commissioner deems necessary or desirable to prepare land primarily for residential and related uses or to provide facilities for public or common use; but such term shall not include any building unless it is (1) a building which is needed in connection with a water supply or sewage disposal installation, or (2) a building, other than a school, which is to be owned and maintained jointly by the property owners; and

"'(e) the term "land development" means the process of making, installing, or constructing improvements.

"'Basic conditions for insurance

"'SEC. 1002. (a) The Commissioner is authorized (1) to insure, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, any first mortgage (including advances on such mortgage) in accordance with the provisions of this title, and (2) to make a commitment for the insurance of such mortgage prior to the date of execution of such mortgage or prior to the date of disbursement of the mortgage proceeds. No mortgage shall be insured under this title after October 1, 1969, except pursuant to a commitment to insure issued before such date.

"'(b) The mortgage shall—

"'(1) be executed by a mortgagor, other than a public body, approved by the Commissioner;

"'(2) be made to and held by a mortgagee approved by the Commissioner; and

"'(3) cover the land to be developed and the improvements to be made with the assistance of the mortgage insurance under this title, except facilities intended for public use and in public ownership.

"'(c) The principal obligation of the mortgage shall (1) not exceed 75 per centum of the Commissioner's estimate of the value of the property upon completion of the land development, and (2) not exceed the sum of 50 per centum of the Commissioner's estimate of the value of the land before development and 90 per centum of his estimate of the cost of such development. The outstanding principal obligations of mortgages involving a single land development undertaking, as defined by the Commissioner, shall at no time exceed $10,000,000.

" '(d) The mortgage shall—

" '(1) have a maturity not to exceed seven years or such longer maturity as the Commissioner deems reasonable in the case of a privately owned system for water or sewerage, and contain repayment provisions satisfactory to the Commissioner;

" '(2) bear interest at a rate satisfactory to the Commissioner, and such interest shall be exclusive of premium charges for mortgage insurance and such service charges and fees as may be approved by the Commissioner; and

" '(3) contain such terms and provisions with respect to protection of the security, payment of taxes, delinquency charges, prepayment, additional and secondary liens, and other matters as the Commissioner may in his discretion prescribe.

" '(e) A property or project to be financed by a mortgage insured under this title shall—

" '(1) represent a good mortgage insurance risk; and

" '(2) involve improvements that comply with all applicable State and local governmental requirements and with minimum standards approved by the Commissioner.

" 'Land planning

" 'Sec. 1003. (a) The land development covered by a mortgage insured under this title shall be undertaken pursuant to a schedule, conforming to such requirements and procedures as the Commissioner may prescribe, that will assure the use of the land for the purposes for which it is to be developed within the shortest reasonable period consistent with the objectives of sound and economic community growth or urban development.

" '(b) The land development shall be undertaken in accordance with an overall development plan, appropriate to the scope and character of the undertaking, which—

" '(1) has received all governmental approvals required by State or local law or by the Commissioner;

" '(2) is acceptable to the Commissioner as providing reasonable assurance that the land development will contribute to good living conditions in the area being developed, which area (A) will have a sound economic base and a long economic life, (B) will be characterized by sound land-use patterns, and (C) will include or be served by such shopping, school, recreational, transportation, and other facilities as the Commissioner deems adequate or necessary; and

" '(3) is consistent with a comprehensive plan which covers, or with comprehensive planning being carried on for, the area in which the land is situated, and which meets criteria established by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator for such plans or planning.

" 'Encouragement of small builders and moderate cost housing

" 'Sec. 1004. The Commissioner shall adopt such requirements as he deems necessary in land development covered by mortgages insured under this title to encourage the maintenance of a diversified local homebuilding industry, broad participation by builders, and the inclusion of a proper balance of housing for families of moderate or low income.

" 'Water and sewerage facilities

" 'Sec. 1005. After development of the land it shall be served by public systems for water and sewerage which are consistent with other existing or prospective systems within the area, except that the Commissioner may approve an adequate privately or cooperatively owned system which will be regulated in a manner acceptable to him with respect to user rates and charges, capital structure, methods of operation, rate of return, and conditions and terms of any sale or transfer.

" 'Releases

" 'Sec. 1006. The Commissioner may, on such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, consent to the release or subordination of a part or parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage.

" 'Premiums and fees

" 'Sec. 1007. The commissioner shall collect reasonable premiums for the insurance of any mortgage under this title and make such charges as he determines are reasonable for the analysis of the land development plan and the appraisal and inspection of the property and improvements. On or before January 1, 1967, the Commissioner shall make a report to the Congress concerning the premium rates and other charges under this title that he estimates will be adequate to provide income sufficient for a self-supporting program.

" 'Insurance benefits

" 'Sec. 1008. The provisions of subsections (e), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), and (n) of section 207 of this Act shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this title, except that as applied to such mortgages (1) any reference therein to section 207 shall be deemed to refer to this title, and (2) any reference to an annual premium shall be deemed to refer to such premiums as the Commissioner may designate under this title.

" 'Incontestability provisions

" 'Sec. 1009. Any contract of insurance executed by the Commissioner under this title shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the mortgage for insurance, and the validity of any contract of insurance so executed shall be incontestable in the hands of an approved mortgagee from the date of the execution of such contract, except for fraud or material misrepresentation on the part of such approved mortgagee.

" 'Rules and regulations

" 'Sec. 1010. The Commissioner is authorized to make such rules and regulations and to require such agreements as he may deem necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this title.

" 'Taxation provisions

" 'Sec. 1011. Nothing in this title shall be construed to exempt any real property acquired and held by the Commissioner under this title from taxation by any State or political subdivision thereof to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

" 'Cost certification

" 'Sec. 1012. (a) The Commissioner shall adopt such requirements as he determines necessary to assure, at reasonable intervals of time during land development and upon completion of such development, that the amount of the mortgage loan outstanding at each such interval does not exceed with respect to that portion of the land remaining under the lien of the mortgage (1) 50 per centum of the Commissioner's estimate of the value of such remaining land before development, plus (2) 90 per centum of the actual costs of the development allocated by the Commissioner to such remaining land.

" '(b) From time to time during, and upon completion of, the development, the Commissioner shall require the mortgagor to certify as to the actual costs of development of the land.

" '(c) Certifications required pursuant to this section shall be accompanied by such data and records as the Commissioner shall prescribe.

" '(d) A mortgagor's certification approved by the Commissioner shall be final and incontestable except for fraud or material misrepresentation on the part of the mortgagor.

" '(e) As used in this section, the term "actual costs" means the costs (exclusive of kickbacks, rebates, or trade discounts) to the mortgagor of the improvements involved. These costs may include amounts paid for labor, materials, construction contracts, land plannning, engineers' and architect's fees, surveys, taxes, and interest during development, organizational and legal expenses, such allocation of general overhead expenses as are acceptable to the Commissioner, and other items of expense incidental to development which may be approved by the Commissioner. If the Commissioner determines there is an identity of interest between the mortgagor and the contractor, there may be included an allowance for contractor's profit in an amount deemed reasonable by the Commissioner.'

"(b)(1) Section 302(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out 'the term "mortgages" ' in the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof 'the terms "mortgages" and "home mortgages" '.

"(2) The first paragraph of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act is amended by inserting before the next to last sentence the following new sentence: 'Notwithstanding the foregoing limitations and restrictions in this section, any national banking association may make loans for land development which are secured by mortgages insured under title X of the National Housing Act.'

"(3) Section 5(c) of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

" 'Without regard to any other provision of this subsection, any such association may, to such extent as the Federal Home Loan Bank Board may by regulation permit, invest in loans, and interests in loans, (1) secured by mortgages as to which the association has the benefit of insurance under title X of the National Housing Act or of a commitment or agreement for such insurance, or (2) guaranteed by the President under section 224 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. Investments under clause (1) of this paragraph shall not be included in any percentage of assets or other percentage referred to in this subsection. Investments under clause (2) of this paragraph shall not exceed, in the case of any association, 1 per centum of the assets of such association.'

"(4) Section 212(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'The provisions of this section shall also apply to insurance under title X with respect to laborers and mechanics employed in land development financed with the proceeds of any mortgage insured under that title.'

"Extension of insurance authorizations

"Sec. 202. (a) Section 2(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out 'October 1, 1965,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'October 1, 1969'.

"(b) Section 217 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'title VIII' and inserting in lieu thereof 'title VIII, or title X', and

"(2) by striking out 'October 1, 1965' and inserting in lieu thereof 'October 1, 1969'.

"(c) The second sentences of sections 809(f) and 810(k) of such Act are each amended by striking out 'October 1, 1965' and inserting in lieu thereof 'October 1, 1969'.

"Mortgage limits for homes under section 203(b)

"Sec. 203. Clause (iii) of section 203(b)(2) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out '75 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '80 per centum'.

"Downpayment requirement in case of low-income housing demonstration homes

"Sec. 204. Section 203(b)(9) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting after 'a mortgage meeting the requirements of subsection (i) of this section,' the following: 'or with respect to a mortgage covering a single-family home being purchased under the low-income housing demonstration project assisted pursuant to section 207 of the Housing Act of 1961,'.

"Mortgage limit for homes in outlying areas under FHA section 203(i) program

"Sec. 205. Section 203(i) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out '$11,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$12,500'.

"FHA mortgage financing for veterans

"Sec. 206. (a) Section 203(b)(2) of the National Housing Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'and not to exceed' and inserting in lieu thereof 'and (except as provided in the next to the last sentence of this paragraph) not to exceed'; and

"(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: 'If the mortgagor is a veteran who has not received any direct, guaranteed, or insured loan under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for the purchase, construction, or repair of a dwelling (including a farm dwelling) which was to be owned and occupied by him as his home, and the mortgage to be insured under this section covers property upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a one-family residence, the principal obligation may be in an amount equal to the sum of (i) 100 per centum of $15,000 of the appraised value of the property as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance, (ii) 90 per centum of such value in excess of $15,000 but not in excess of $20,000, and (iii) 85 per centum of such value in excess of $20,000. As used herein, the term "veteran" means any person who served on active duty in the armed forces of the United States for a period of not less than ninety days (or is certified by the Secretary of Defense as having performed extrahazardous service), and who was discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable.'

"(b) Section 203(b)(9) of such Act is amended by inserting after 'on account of the property' the following: '(except in a case to which the next to the last sentence of paragarph (2) applies)'.

"Multifamily mortgage limits for four or more bedroom units

"Sec. 207. (a) Section 307(c)(3) of the National Housing Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'and $18,500 per family unit with three or more bedrooms' and inserting in lieu thereof '$18,500 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $21,000 per family unit with four or more bedrooms,'; and

"(2) by striking out 'and $22,500 per family unit with three or more bedrooms' and inserting in lieu thereof '$22,500 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $25,500 per family unit with four or more bedrooms'.

"(b)(1) Section 213(b)(2) of such Act is amended—

"(A) by striking out 'and $18,500 per family unit with three or more bedrooms' and inserting in lieu thereof '$18,500 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $21,000 per family unit with four or more bedrooms'; and

"(B) by striking out 'and $22,500 per family unit with three or more bedrooms' and inserting in lieu thereof '$22,500 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $25,500 per family unit with four or more bedrooms'.

"(2) Section 213(c) of such Act is amended by striking out 'and not to exceed' and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'and not to exceed a sum computed on the basis of a separate mortgage for each single-family dwelling (irrespective of whether such dwelling has a party wall or is otherwise physically connected with another dwelling or dwellings) comprising the property or project, equal to the total of each of the maximum principal obligations of such mortgages which would meet the requirements of section 203(b)(2) if the mortgagor were the owner and occupant who had made any required payment on account of the property prescribed in such paragraph.'

"(c) Section 220(d)(3)(B)(iii) of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'and $18,500 per family unit with three or more bedrooms' and inserting in lieu thereof '$18,500 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $21,000 per family unit with four or more bedrooms'; and

"(2) by striking out 'and $22,500 per family unit with three or more bedrooms' and inserting in lieu thereof '$22,500 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $25,500 per family unit with four or more bedrooms'.

"(d) Section 221(d) of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'and $17,000 per family unit with three or more bedrooms' in paragraphs (3)(ii) and (4)(ii) and inserting in lieu thereof '$17,000 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $19,250 per family unit with four or more bedrooms'; and

"(2) by striking out 'and $20,000 per family unit with three or more bedrooms' in paragraphs (3)(ii) and (4)(ii) and inserting in lieu thereof '$20,000 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $22,750 per family unit with four or more bedrooms'.

"(e) Section 231(c)(2) of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'and $17,000 per family unit with three or more bedrooms' and inserting in lieu thereof '$17,000 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $19,250 per family unit with four or more bedrooms'; and

"(2) by striking out 'and $20,000 per family unit with three or more bedrooms' and inserting in lieu thereof '$20,000 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $22,750 per family unit with four or more bedrooms'.

"(f) Section 234(e)(3) of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'and $18,500 per family unit with three or more bedrooms' and inserting in lieu thereof '$18,500 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $21,000 per family unit with four or more bedrooms'; and

"(2) by striking out 'and $22,500 per family unit with three or more bedrooms' and inserting in lieu thereof '22,500 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $25,500 per family unit with four or more bedrooms'.

"Mutuality for management-type cooperatives

"Sec. 208. (a) Section 213 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(k) There is hereby created a Cooperative Management Housing Insurance Fund (hereinafter referred to as the "Management Fund"). The Management Fund shall be used by the Commissioner as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this section with respect to mortgages or loans insured, on or after the date of the enactment of this subsection, under subsections (a)(1), (a)(3) (if the project is acquired by a cooperative corporation), (i), and (j). The Management Fund shall also be used as a revolving fund for mortgages, loans, and commitments transferred to it pursuant to subsection (m). The Commissioner is directed to transfer to the Management Fund from the General Insurance Fund established pursuant to section 519 such amount as the Commissioner determines to be necessary and appropriate. General expenses of operation of the Federal Housing Administration relating to mortgages or loans which are the obligation of the Management Fund may be charged to the Management Fund.

"'(l) The Commissioner shall establish in the Management Fund, as of the date of the enactment of this subsection, a General Surplus Account and a Participating Reserve Account. The aggregate net income thereafter received or any net loss thereafter sustained by the Management Fund, in any semiannual period, shall be credited or charged to the General Surplus Account or the Participating Reserve Account or both in such manner and amounts as the Commissioner may determine to be in accord with sound actuarial and accounting practice. Upon termination of the insurance obligation of the Management Fund by payment of any mortgage or loan insured under this section, and at such time or times prior to such termination as the Commissioner may determine, the Commissioner is authorized to distribute to the mortgagor or borrower a share of the Participating Reserve Account in such manner and amount as the Commissioner shall determine to be equitable and in accordance with sound actuarial and accounting practice: *Provided,* That in no event shall the amount of the distributable share exceed the aggregate scheduled annual premiums of the mortgagor or borrower to the year of payment of the share less the total amount of any share or shares previously distributed by the Commissioner to the mortgagor or borrower: *And provided further,* That in no event may a distributable share be distributed until any funds transferred from the General Insurance Fund to the Management Fund pursuant to subsection (k) or (o) have been repaid in full to the General Insurance Fund. No mortgagor, mortgagee, borrower, or lender shall have any vested right in a credit balance in any such account or be subject to any liability arising out of the mutuality of the Management Fund. The determination of the Commissioner as to the amount to be paid by him to any mortgagor or borrower shall be final and conclusive.

"'(m) The Commissioner is authorized to transfer to the Management Fund commitments for insurance issued under subsections (a)(1), (i), and (j) prior to the date of the enactment of this subsection, and to transfer to the Management Fund the insurance of any mortgage or loan insured prior to the date of the enactment of this subsection under subsection (a)(1), (a)(3) (if the project is acquired by a cooperative corporation), (i), or (j), but only in cases where the consent of the mortgagee or lender to the transfer is obtained or a request by the mortgagee or lender for the transfer is received by the Commissioner within such period of time after the date of the enactment of this subsection as the Commissioner shall prescribe: *Provided,* That the insurance of any mortgage or loan shall not be transferred under the provisions of this subsection if on the date of the enactment of this subsection the mortgage or loan is in default and the mortgagee or lender has notified the Commissioner in writing of its intention to file an insurance claim. Any insurance or commitment not so transferred shall continue to be an obligation of the General Insurance Fund.

"'(n) Notwithstanding the limitations contained in other provisions of this Act, premium charges for mortgages or loans insured under this section and sections 207, 231, and 232 may be payable in debentures issued in connection with mortgages or loans transferred to the Management Fund or in connection with mortgages or loans insured pursuant to commitments transferred to the Management Fund, as provided in subsection (m) of this section.

"'(o) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to transfer funds between the Cooperative Management Housing Insurance Fund and the General Insurance Fund in such amounts and at such times as he may determine, taking into consideration the requirements of each such Fund, to assist in carrying out effectively the insurance programs for which such Funds were respectively established.'

"(b) Section 213 of such Act is further amended—

"(1) by inserting before the period at the end of subsection (a) the following: ': *Provided*, That as applied to mortgages the mortgage insurance for which is the obligation of the Management Fund, the reference to the General Insurance Fund in section 207(b)(2) shall be construed to refer to the Management Fund'; and

"(2) by inserting before the period at the end of subsection (e) the following: ': *Provided*, That as applied to mortgages or loans the insurance for which is the obligation of the Management Fund (1) all references to the General Insurance Fund shall be construed to refer to the Management Fund and (2) all references to section 207 shall be construed to refer to subsections (a)(1), (a)(3), (if the project involved is acquired by a cooperative corporation, (i), and (j) of this section'.

"Rehabilitation in urban renewal areas

"Sec. 209. Section 220(d)(3)(A) of the National Housing Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out the second proviso in clause (i); and

"(2) by striking out clause (ii) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(ii) in a case where the mortgagor is not the occupant of the property and intends to hold the property for rental purposes, have a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed 93 per centum of the amount computed under the provisions of clause (i);

"'(iii) in a case where the mortgagor is not the occupant of the property and intends to hold the property for the purpose of sale, have a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed 85 per centum of the amount computed under the provisions of clause (i), or in the alternative, in an amount equal to the amount computed under the provisions of clause (i) if the mortgagor and mortgagee assume responsibility in a manner satisfactory to the Commissioner for the reduction of the mortgage by an amount not less than 15 per centum of the outstanding principal amount thereof, or by such greater amount as may be required to meet the limitations of clause (iv), in the event the mortgaged property is not, prior to the due date of the eighteenth amortization payment of the mortgage, sold to a purchaser acceptable to the Commissioner who is the occupant of the property and who assumes and agrees to pay the mortgage indebtedness; and

"'(iv) in no case involving refinancing (except as provided in clause (iii)) have a principal obligation in an amount exceeding the sum of the estimated cost of repair and rehabilitation and the amount (as determined by the Commissioner) required to refinance existing indebtedness secured by the property or project, plus any existing indebtedness incurred in connection with improving, repairing, or rehabilitating the property; or'.

"Nondwelling facilities for urban renewal housing

"Sec. 210. Section 220(d)(3)(B) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out clause (iv) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(iv) include such nondwelling facilities as the Commissioner deems desirable and consistent with the urban renewal plan: *Provided*, That the project shall be predominantly residential and any nondwelling facility included in the mortgage shall be found by the Commissioner to contribute to the economic feasibility of the project, and the Commissioner shall give due consideration to the possible effect of the project on other business enterprises in the community.'

"Larger home improvement loans in high cost areas

"Sec. 211. (a) Section 220(h)(2)(i) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof ': *Provided*, That the Commissioner may, by regulation, increase such amount by not to exceed 45 per centum in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require'.

"(b) Section 220(h)(11) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof 'or such additional amount as the Commissioner has by regulation prescribed in any geographical area where he finds cost levels so require pursuant to the authority vested in him by the proviso in paragraph (2)(i) of this subsection'.

"Larger insured mortgages for servicemen

"Sec. 212. Section 222(b) of the National Housing Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out '$20,000' in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof '$30,000'; and

"(2) by striking out paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(3) have a principal obligation not in excess of the sum of (i) 97 per centum of $15,000 of the appraised value of the property as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance, (ii) 90 per centum of such value in excess of $15,000 but not in excess of $20,000, and (iii) 85 per centum of such value in excess of $20,000; and'.

"Refinancing of insured mortgages

"Sec. 213. Section 223(a)(7) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out 'section 608 of title VI prior to the effective date of the Housing Act of 1954 or under section 220, 221, 903, or section 908' and inserting in lieu thereof 'this Act'.

"Consolidation of FHA insurance funds

"Sec. 214. Title V of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'Establishment of general insurance fund

"'Sec. 519. (a) There is hereby created a General Insurance Fund which shall be used by the Commissioner on and after the date of the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, as a revolving fund for carrying out all the insurance provisions of this Act with the exception of those specified in subsection (e). All mortgages or loans insured under this Act pursuant to commitments issued on or after the date of the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, except those specified in subsection (e), and all loans reported for insurance under section 2 on or after the date of the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, shall be insured under the General Insurance Fund. The Commissioner shall transfer to the General Insurance Fund—

"'(1) the assets and liabilities of all insurance accounts and funds, except the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund, existing under this Act immediately prior to the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965;

"'(2) all outstanding commitments for insurance issued prior to the date of the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, except those specified in subsection (e);

"'(3) the insurance on all mortgages and loans insured prior to the date of the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, except insurance specified in subsection (e); and

"'(4) the insurance of all loans made by approved financial institutions pursuant to section 2 prior to the date of the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

"'(b) The general expenses of the operations of the Federal Housing Administration relating to mortgages and loans which are the obligation of the General Insurance Fund may be charged to the General Insurance Fund.

"'(c) Moneys in the General Insurance Fund not needed for the current operations of the Federal Housing Administration with respect to mortgages and loans which are the obligation of the General Insurance Fund shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of such Fund, or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States. The Commissioner may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued as obligations of the General Insurance Fund or issued prior to the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 under other provisions of this Act, except debentures issued under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund. Such purchases shall be made at a price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this section. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

"'(d) Premium charges, adjusted premium charges, and appraisal and other fees received on account of the insurance of any mortgage or loan which is the obligation of the General Insurance Fund, the receipts derived from the property covered by such mortgages and loans and from the claims, debts, contracts, property, and security assigned to the Commissioner in connection therewith, and all earnings on the assets of the Fund shall be credited to the General Insurance Fund. The principal of, and interest paid and to be paid on, debentures which are the obligation of such Fund, cash insurance payments and adjustments, and expenses incurred in the handling, management, renovation, and disposal of properties acquired, in connection with mortgages and loans which are the obligation of such Fund, shall be charged to such Fund.

"'(e) The General Insurance Fund shall not be used for carrying out the provisions of sections 203(b), 203(h), and 203(i), or the provisions of section 213 to the extent that they involve mortgages the insurance for which is the obligation of the Cooperative Management Housing Insurance Fund created by section 213(k); and nothing in this section shall apply to or affect any mortgages, loans, commitments, or insurance under such provisions.'

"Optional cash payment of insurance benefits

"Sec. 215. Title V of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof (after the new section added by section 214 of this Act) the following new section:

"'Optional cash payment of insurance benefits

"'Sec. 520. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act with respect to the payment of insurance benefits, the Commissioner is authorized, in his discretion, to pay in cash or in debentures any insurance claim or part thereof which is paid on or after the date of the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 on a mortgage or a loan which was insured under any section of this Act either before or after such date. If payment is made in cash, it shall be in an amount equivalent to the face amount of the debentures that would otherwise be issued plus an amount equivalent to the interest which the debentures would have earned, computed to a date to be established pursuant to regulations issued by the Commissioner.

"'(b) The Commissioner is authorized to borrow from the Treasury from time to time such amounts as the Commissioner shall determine are necessary to make payments in cash (in lieu of issuing debentures guaranteed by the United States, as provided in this Act) pursuant to the provisions of this section. Notes or other obligations issued by the Commissioner in borrowing under this subsection shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe. Each sum borrowed pursuant to this subsection shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities during the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations.'

"Approval of technically suitable materials

"SEC. 216. Title V of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting after section 520 (added by section 215 of this Act a new section as follows:

"'Approval of technically suitable materials

"'SEC. 521. The Commissioner shall adopt a uniform procedure for the acceptance of materials and products to be used in structures approved for mortgages or loans insured under this Act. Under such procedure any material or product which the Commissioner finds is technically suitable for the use proposed shall be accepted. Acceptance of a material or product as technically suitable shall not be deemed to restrict the discretion of the Commissioner to determine that a structure, with respect to which a mortgage is executed, is economically sound or an acceptable risk.'

"Water and sewer facilities in connection with certain federally assisted housing

"SEC. 217. (*a*) Title V of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting after section 521 (added by section 216 of this Act) a new section as follows:

"'Water and sewer facilities

"'SEC. 522. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no mortgage which covers new construction shall be approved for insurance under this Act (except pursuant to a commitment made prior to the date of the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965) if the mortgaged property includes housing which is not served by a public or adequate community water and sewerage system: *Provided*, That this limitation shall be applicable only to property which is not served by a system approved by the Commissioner pursuant to title X of this Act, and which is situated in an area certified by appropriate local officials to be an area where the establishment of public or adequate community water and sewerage systems is economically feasible: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this section the economic feasibility of establishing such public or adequate community water and sewerage systems shall be determined without regard to whether such establishment is authorized by law or is subject to approval by one or more local governments or public bodies.'

"(b) Section 1804 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(e) No loan for the purchase or construction of new residential property (other than property served by a water and sewerage system approved by the Federal Housing Commissioner pursuant to title X of the National Housing Act) shall be financed through the assistance of this chapter, except pursuant to a commitment made prior to the date of the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, if such property is not served by a public or adequate community water and sewerage system and is located in an area where the appropriate local officials certify that the establishment of such systems is economically feasible. For purposes of this subsection, the economic feasibility of establishing public or adequate community water and sewerage systems shall be determined without regard to whether such establishment is authorized by law or is subject to approval by one or more local governments or public bodies.'

"TITLE III—URBAN RENEWAL

"Study of housing and building codes, zoning, tax policies, and development standards

"SEC. 301. (a) The Congress finds that the general welfare of the Nation requires that local authorities be encouraged and aided to prevent slums, blight, and sprawl, preserve natural beauty, and provide for decent, durable housing so that the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family may be realized as soon as feasible. The Congress further finds that there is a need to study housing and building codes, zoning, tax policies, and development standards in order to determine how (1) local property owners and private enterprise can be encouraged to serve as large a part as they can of the total housing and building need, and (2) Federal, State, and local governmental assistance can be so directed as to place greater reliance on local property owners and private enterprise and enable them to serve a greater share of the total housing and building need. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is therefore directed to study the structure of (1) State and local urban and suburban housing and building laws, standards, codes, and regulations and their impact on housing and building costs, how they can be simplified, improved, and enforced, at the local level, and what methods might be adopted to promote more uniform building codes and the acceptance of technical innovations including new building practices and materials; (2) State and local zoning and land use laws, codes, and regulations, to find ways by which States and localities may improve and utilize them in order to obtain further growth and development; and (3) Federal, State, and local tax policies with respect to their effect on land and property cost and on incentives to build housing and make improvements in existing structures.

(b) The Administrator shall submit a report based on such study to the President and to the Congress within 18 months after the date of the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 or the appropriation of funds for the study, whichever is later.

"(c) There are authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. Any funds so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

"Workable program requirement

"SEC. 302. (a)(1) Section 101 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) No loan or grant contract may be entered into by the Administrator for an urban renewal project unless he determines that (1) the workable program for community improvement presented by the locality pursuant to subsection (c) is of sufficient scope and content to furnish a basis for evaluation of the need for the urban renewal project; and (2) such project is in accord with the program.'

"(2) The requirements imposed by the amendment made by paragraph (1) shall not be applicable to any project which received Federal recognition prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

"(b) Section 101(c) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of a contract with an Indian tribe, band, or nation (or a public housing or other public agency for such tribe, band, or nation established under State or tribal law), the workable program and minimum standards housing code, referred to in the preceding sentence, may be presented to the Administrator by such tribe, band, or nation, and it shall be subject to the requirements of law with respect to such program and code only to the extent that such tribe, band, or nation has the legal jurisdiction and power a carry out such requirements.'

"General neighborhood renewal plans

"SEC. 303. Section 102(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended—

"(1) by striking out the first sentence of the second paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'In order to facilitate proper preliminary planning for the attainment of the urban renewal objectives of this title, the Administrator may also make advances of funds (in addition to those authorized above) to local public agencies for the preparation of General Neighborhood Renewal Plans (as herein defined). A General Neighborhood Renewal Plan may be prepared for an area consisting of an urban renewal area or areas, together with any adjoining areas having specially related problems, and which is of such size that the urban renewal activities in the urban renewal area or areas may have to be initiated in stages, consistent with the capacity and resources of the respective local public agency or agencies, over an estimated period of not more than eight years.'; and

"(2) by striking out the first numbered paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(1) in the interest of sound community planning, it is desirable that the urban renewal activities proposed for the area be planned in their entirety;'.

"Increase in authorization for capital grants

"SEC. 304. (a) The first sentence of section 103(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out '$4,725,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$4,700,000,000, which amount shall be increased by $675,000,000 on the date of the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, by $725,000,000 on July 1, 1966, and by $750,000,000 on July 1 in each of the years 1967 and 1968'.

"(b) The proviso in the first sentence of section 103(b) of such Act, and the second sentence of section 6(b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, are repealed.

"Relocation of displacees from urban renewal areas

"SEC. 305. (a) Section 105(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) (1) There shall be a feasible method for the temporary relocation of individuals and families displaced from the urban renewal area, and there are or are being provided, in the urban renewal area or in other areas not generally less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities and at rents or prices within the financial means of the individuals and families displaced from the urban renewal area, decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings equal in number to the number of and available to such displaced individuals and families and reasonably accessible to their places of employment. The Administrator shall issue rules and regulations to aid in implementing the requirements of this subsection and in otherwise achieving the objectives of this title. Such rules and regulations shall require that there be established, at the earliest practicable time, for each urban renewal project involving the displacement of individuals, families, and business concerns occupying property in the urban renewal area, a relocation assistance program which shall include such measures, facilities, and services as may be necessary or appropriate in order (A) to determine the needs of such individuals, families, and business concerns for relocation assistance; (B) to provide information and assistance to aid in relocation and otherwise minimize the hardships of displacement, including information as to real estate agencies, brokers, and boards in or near the urban renewal area which deal in residential or business property that might be appropriate for the relocating of displaced individuals, families, and business concerns; and (C) to assure the necessary coordination of relocation activities with other project activities and other planned or proposed governmental actions in the community which may affect the carrying out of the relocation program, particularly planned or proposed low-rent housing projects to be constructed in or near the urban renewal area.

"'(2) As a condition to further assistance after the enactment of this paragraph with respect to each urban renewal project involving the displacement of individuals and families, the Administrator shall require, within a reasonable time prior to actual displacement, satisfactory assurance by the local public agency that decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings as required by the first sentence of this subsection are available for the relocation of each individual or family.'

"(b) Clause (iii) in the second proviso of section 101(c) of such Act is amended by striking out 'section 105(c)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 105(c)(1)'.

"(c) The requirements imposed by the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall not be applicable to any project which received Federal recognition prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

"Redevelopment in accordance with urban renewal plan

"SEC. 306. Section 106 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection;

"'(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, no contract shall be entered into for any loan or capital grant under this title with any local public agency unless the local public agency establishes, by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator, that any urban renewal project with respect to which such local public agency has received a loan or capital grant under this title has been, or will be, undertaken and carried out in substantial accordance with the urban renewal plan, and any amendments thereto, approved with respect to such project, and the terms of the contract for loan or capital grant covering such project.'

"Use of grant for loan funds in code enforcement and rehabilitation projects

"SEC. 307. The first unnumbered paragraph following the numbered paragraphs in section 110(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended—

"(1) by inserting '(A)' before 'no contract'; and

"(2) by inserting before the period at the end of the paragraph the following: ', and (B) not less than 10 per centum of the aggregate amount of (i) grants authorized to be contracted for under this title by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 and subsequent Acts, and (ii) loans authorized to be made under section 312 of the Housing Act of 1964, shall be available for projects assisted with such grants or loans which involve primarily code enforcement and rehabilitation'.

"Increase in nonresidential exception

"SEC. 308. The third unnumbered paragraph following the numbered paragraphs in section 110(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ': *And provided further,* That the aggregate amount of capital grants made available under this title with respect to such projects after the date of the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 may be in an amount not to exceed (in addition to amounts previously available for such projects) 35 per centum of the amount of additional capital grants authorized under this title by such Act.'

"Preservation of historic structures

"SEC. 309. (a) Section 110(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'and' at the end of paragraph (7);

"(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (8) and inserting in lieu thereof '; and';

"(3) by inserting a new paragraph (9) as follows:

"'(9) relocating within the project area a structure which the local public agency determines to be of historic value and which will be disposed of to a public body or a private nonprofit organization which will renovate and maintain such structure for historic purposes.'; and

"(4) by striking out 'paragraphs (7) and (8)' in the second unnumbered paragraph following the numbered paragraphs and inserting in lieu thereof 'paragraphs (7), (8), and (9)'.

"(b) Section 110(e) of such Act is amended by striking out 'and (8)' in clause (i) and inserting in lieu thereof '(8), and (9)'.

"Eligibility of certain expenses of projects financed on three-fourths grant basis

"SEC. 310. (a) Clause (i) of the third sentence of section 110(e) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by (1) inserting 'staff services in connection with programs of code enforcement and voluntary rehabilitation and repair (including community organization),' after disposition of land,'; and (2) inserting '(5),' after '(4),'.

"(b) Any contract for a capital grant under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, executed prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, may be amended to incorporate the provisions of subsection (a) as to costs incurred on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

"Demolition of unsafe structures; code enforcement

"SEC. 311. (a) Title I of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by inserting after section 115 (added by section 106 of this Act) two new sections as follows:

"'Demolition

"'SEC. 116. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts to make, and to make, grants as provided in this section (payable from any grant funds provided under section 103(b)) to cities, other municipalities, and counties to assist in financing the cost of demolishing structures which under State or local law have been determined to be structurally unsound or unfit for human habitation, and which such city, municipality, or county has authority to demolish. The amount of any grant under this section shall not exceed two-thirds of the cost of the demolition of such structures.

"'(b) No grant shall be made under this section unless the structures to be demolished are located in an urban renewal area, or, in the case of structures outside an urban renewal area, (1) the locality involved has an approved workable program for community improvement in accordance with the requirements of section 101(c), as determined by the Administrator, (2) the demolition to be assisted will be on a planned neighborhood basis and will further the over-all renewal objectives of such locality, (3) there is in such locality a program of enforcement of existing local housing and related codes, (4) the structures to be demolished constitute a public nuisance and a serious hazard to the public health or welfare, and (5) the governing body of such locality has determined that other available legal procedures have been exhausted to secure remedial action by the owner of the structures involved and that demolition by governmental action is required.

"'Code enforcement

"'SEC. 117. Nothwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts to make, and to make, grants as provided in this section (payable from any grant funds provided under section 103(b)) to cities, other municipalities, and counties for the purpose of assisting such localities in carrying out programs of concentrated code enforcement in deteriorated or deteriorating areas in which such enforcement, together with those public improvements to be provided by the locality, may be expected to arrest the decline of the area. Such grants shall not exceed two-thirds (or three-fourths in the case of any city, other municipality, or county having a population of 50,000 or less according to the most recent decennial census) of the cost of planning and carrying out such programs which may include the provision and repair of necessary streets, curbs, sidewalks, street lighting, tree planting, and similar improvements within such areas. The Administrator shall not make any grant under this section unless he has obtained adequate assurances (1) that the locality will maintain during the period of the contract, in addition to its expenditures for planning and carrying out any program assisted under this section, a level of expenditures for code enforcement activities at not less than its normal expenditures for such activities prior to the execution of such contract, and (2) that the locality has a satisfactory program for the provision of all necessary public improvements for such areas. The provisions of sections 101(c), 106, 114, and 115 shall be applicable to activities and undertakings assisted under this section to the same extent as if such activities and undertakings were being carried out in an urban renewal area as part of an urban renewal project.'

"(b) Section 110(c) of such Act is amended by—

"(1) striking out 'or a program of code enforcement in an urban renewal area,' in the first sentence; and

"(2) striking out the proviso in paragraph (5).

"(c) Section 220(d)(1)(A) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting before the first proviso the following: ', or (iv) an area in which a program of concentrated code enforcement activities is being carried out pursuant to section 117 of the Housing Act of 1949'.

"(d) Section 220(h)(1) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting after 'urban renewal project' in the first sentence the following: 'or in an area in which a program of concentrated code enforcement activities is being carried out pursuant to section 117 of the Housing Act of 1949'.

"(e) Section 312(a) of the Housing Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after 'urban renewal area' in the first sentence the following: 'or an area in which a program of concentrated code enforcement activities is being carried out pursuant to section 117 of the Housing Act of 1949'.

"Rehabilitation loans

"SEC. 312. (a) Section 312(a) of the Housing Act of 1964 is amended by striking out 'reasonable' in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof 'comparable'.

"(b) Section 312(d) of such Act is amended by striking out '$50,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$100,000,000 for each fiscal year', and by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'All moneys in such revolving fund shall be available for necessary expenses of servicing loans made pursuant to this section, including reimbursement or payment for services and facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association and of any public or private agency for the servicing of such loans.'

"(c) Section 312 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(h) No loan shall be made under the authority of this section after October 1, 1969, except pursuant to a contract, commitment, or other obligation entered into pursuant to this section before that date.'

"Eligibility of communities in depressed areas for urban renewal assistance

"SEC. 313. (a) Subparagraph (B) of section 103(a)(2) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended to read as follows:

"'(B) three-fourths of the aggregate net project costs of any such projects which are located in (i) a municipality having a population of fifty thousand or less according to the most recent decennial census, or (ii) a municipality situated in a labor market area which, at the time the contract or contracts involved are entered into or at such earlier time as the Administrator may specify in order to avoid hardship, is designated as a redevelopment area under the second sentence of section 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act or any other legislation enacted after the date of the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 containing standards for designation as a redevelopment area generally comparable to those set forth in the second sentence of section 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act, and'.

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to urban renewal projects placed under contract for capital grant on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, except that such amendment shall apply with respect to all urban renewal projects in the city of Providence, Rhode Island, placed under contract for capital grant during the period Providence was designated as a redevelopment area under section 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act (or at such earlier time as the Administrator may specify in order to avoid hardship) and not completed prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

"Local grant-in-aid credit for certain coal royalties

"SEC. 314. (a) Section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'Where a project in any municipality includes an area affected by an underground mine fire or by a coal mine subsidence and where it is necessary in such project to remove any underlying coal deposits in order to stabilize the soil or to control the underground mine fire, then any royalties received by the project from the removal and sale of such coal deposits shall be credited to the project as a local grant-in-aid made by such municipality.'

"(b) Any contract under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 executed prior to the date of the enactment of this Act shall, at the request of the municipality involved, be amended to reflect the amendment made by subsection (a).

"Specific urban renewal projects

"SEC. 315 (a)(1) Notwithstanding the date of the commencement of construction of the Tanyard Creek collector sanitary sewer in Jasper, Alabama, local expenditures made in connection with this collector sanitary sewer system shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a local grant-in-aid to the downtown urban renewal project (Alabama R-49) in accordance with the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949.

"(2) Notwithstanding the date of the commencement of construction of the East Side High School and the start of construction of the improvements to Hickory Creek in Joliet, Illinois, expenditures made in connections with such high school and such creek improvements shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a local grant-in-aid to the proposed south central urban renewal project in accordance with the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949.

"(3) Notwithstanding the date of commencement of the installation of certain underground electrical wiring in Johnson City, Tennessee, expenditures made in connection with such installation shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a local grant-in-aid to Johnson City's proposed downtown urban renewal project (Tennessee R-80) in accordance with the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949.

"(4) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 312 of the Housing Act of 1954 or any request previously made pursuant to such section, upon request of the local public agency the eligibility of the local grants-in-aid for any project in the city of New Brunswick, New Jersey, in connection with which the final capital grant payment has not been made, shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949.

"(5) Two-thirds of all expenditures by the city of Saint Louis, Missouri, in connection with its Downtown Sports Stadium project, to the extent such expenditures would have been eligible under the provisions of section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 to be counted as non-cash grants-in-aid toward such project if it had received Federal assistance as an urban renewal project pursuant to the provisions of title I of such Act, shall be eligible to be counted as a grant-in-aid toward any federally-assisted urban renewal projects in Saint Louis.

"(6) Notwithstanding the extent to which the cultural and convention center proposed to be built adjacent to Urban Renewal Project Colorado R-15 (Skyline) in Denver, Colorado, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of Denver in constructing such center shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a grant-in-aid toward such project.

"(7) Notwithstanding the extent to which the cultural and convention center proposed to be built within Urban Renewal Project R-8 in Norfolk, Virginia, may benefit areas other than the urban renewal area, expenses incurred by the city of Norfolk in constructing such center shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as a grant-in-aid toward such project.

"(8) Expenses incurred in the construction of the Glenn Duncan Elementary School and the Fred W. Traner Junior High School in Reno, Nevada, shall not be deemed to be ineligible as a local grant-in-aid in connection with the Northeast Urban Renewal Project (Nevada R-2) because of any change in the urban renewal plan for such project which is determined by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to have resulted from the proposed location of a federally-aided highway within or adjacent to the urban renewal area in which such project was undertaken. For the purpose of computing the portion of the cost of such schools which may be allowed as a local grant-in-aid, the degree of benefit of the schools to such urban renewal area shall be based on the latest estimate of benefit submitted by the local public agency and accepted by the Administrator prior to such change in the urban renewal plan.

"(9) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 112(a) of the Housing Act of 1949, expenditures in the amount of $600,000 made by the Memorial Hospital of Michigan City Foundation, Incorporated, for the purchase of certain land and buildings on or about July 24, 1963, from Doctors Hospital Realty Corporation shall, if otherwise eligible, be counted as local grants-in-aid to the community center numbered 1 urban renewal project (Indiana R-46) in Michigan City, Indiana, in accordance with the remaining provisions of title I of that Act.

"(10) The provisions of section 113(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 shall be applicable to the Hobo Jungle Urban Renewal Project in Texarkana, Arkansas (Arkansas R-3).

"(11) Notwithstanding the date of commencement of construction of the Pulaski, Showalter, and Smedley Junior High Schools, and the William Penn and Stetser Elementary Schools in Chester, Pennsylvania, local expenditures made in connection with such schools shall, to the extent otherwise eligible, be counted as local grants-in-aid for federally-assisted urban renewal projects in Chester that will be served by such schools.

"(12) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, moneys heretofore expended by the University of Pennsylvania and Wilkes College for land (and related expenditures for demolition and relocation) included in the overall development plans proposed by such institutions and utilized, or to be utilized, in connection with new facilities of such institutions within one mile of urban renewal projects Pennsylvania 5-3 (University City) and Pennsylvania R-149 (Wright Street), respectively, shall, if otherwise eligible, be allowed as local grants-in-aid for such projects.

"(13) Notwithstanding the June, 1956, commencement of certain flood control work in Ottumwa, Iowa, local expenditures in connection with such flood control work shall, to the extent otherwise eligible be counted as a local grant-in-aid to the Marina Gateway urban renewal project (Iowa R-12) in accordance with the provisions of Title I of the Housing Act of 1949.

"(b)(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949 and the United States Housing Act of 1937, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the Public Housing Commissioner are authorized and directed to consent to the transfer by the Housing Authority of the City of Macon, Georgia, to the Urban Renewal Department of the City of Macon, Georgia, of all property acquired by the Housing Authority for low-rent housing project numbered Georgia 7-8, on condition that (A) an amount which, together with any funds of the Housing Authority available for the purpose, is sufficient to pay and discharge all obligations incurred by the Housing Authority in connection with such low-rent housing project and owing at the time of transfer, will be paid by the Urban Renewal Department of the City of Macon to the Public Housing Administration to be applied in satisfaction of the Housing Authority's obligations which it cannot meet with its own funds available for the purpose, and (B) the total amount so paid by the Urban Renewal Department of the City of Macon will be included in the gross project cost of its Coliseum Urban Renewal Project, Georgia R-95.

"(2) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the Public Housing Commissioner are authorized to modify any contracts heretofore entered into and to take any other appropriate action necessary to carry out the provisions of paragraph (1).

"(c)(1) Notwithstanding any provision of the Housing Act of 1949 or any other provision of law, the urban renewal project in Savannah, Georgia, known as Project 'J' in the General Neighborhood Renewal Plan for the Broad Street-Canal Urban Renewal Area adopted by resolution of the Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Savannah on November 18, 1958, may include the donation by Housing Authority of Savannah, by a suitable instrument of conveyance, of the right, title, and interest of the Authority in and to all or any portion of the land included within the boundaries of such Project 'J' in the City of Savannah, Chatham County, Georgia, the area of such Project 'J' being generally bounded on the North by properties of the Central of Georgia Railway Company, on the East by West Broad Street, on the South by the right-of-way for Interstate Highway No. I-16, and on the West by the Savannah and Ogeechee Canal and West Boundary Street.

"(2) The conveyance authorized to be included in the urban renewal project under paragraph (1) shall be made only if the donee represents, and furnishes such assurances as may be required by Housing Authority of Savannah, that such donee will develop, preserve, and operate such property on a nonprofit basis as a historical site or monument.

"Lease guarantees for certain small business concerns

"Sec. 316. (a) The Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended by adding after title III a new title as follows:

" 'TITLE IV—LEASE GUARANTEES

" 'Authority of the Administration

" 'Sec. 401. (a) The Administration may, whenever it determines such action to be necessary or desirable, and upon such terms and conditions as it may prescribe, guarantee the payment of rentals under leases of commercial and industrial property entered into by small business concerns that are (1) eligible for loans under section 7(b)(3) of the Small Business Act, or (2) eligible for loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, to enable such concerns to obtain such leases. Any such guarantee may be made or effected either directly or in cooperation with any qualified surety company or other qualified company through a participation agreement with such company. The foregoing powers shall be subject, however, to the following restrictions and limitations:

" '(1) No guarantee shall be issued by the Administration (A) if a guarantee meeting the requirements of the applicant is otherwise available on reasonable terms, and (B) unless the Administration determines that there exists a reasonable expectation that the small business concern in behalf of which the guarantee is issued will perform the covenants and conditions of the lease.

" '(2) The Administration shall, to the greatest extent practicable, exercise the powers conferred by this section in cooperation with qualified surety or other companies on a participation basis.

" '(b) The Administration shall fix a uniform annual fee for its share of any guarantee under this section which shall be payable in advance at such time as may be prescribed by the Administrator. The amount of any such fee shall be determined in accordance with sound actuarial practices and procedures, to the extent practicable, but in no case shall such amount exceed, on the Administration's share of any guarantee made under this title, 2½ per centum per annum of the minimum annual guaranteed rental payable under any guaranteed lease: *Provided*, That the Administration shall fix the lowest fee that experience under the program established hereby has shown to be justified. The Administration may also fix such uniform fees for the processing of applications for guarantees under this section as the Administrator determines are reasonable and necessary to pay the administrative expenses that are incurred in connection therewith.

" '(c) In connection with the guarantee of rentals under any lease pursuant to authority conferred by this section, the Administrator may require, in order to minimize the financial risk assumed under such guarantee—

" '(1) that the lessee pay an amount, not to exceed one-fourth of the minimum guaranteed annual rental required under the lease, which shall be held in escrow and shall be available (A) to meet rental charges accruing in any month for which the lessee is in default, or (B) if no default occurs during the term of the lease, for application (with accrued interest) toward final payments of rental charges under the lease;

" '(2) that upon occurrence of a default under the lease, the lessor shall, as a condition precedent to enforcing any claim under the lease guarantee, utilize the entire period, for which there are funds available in escrow for payment of rentals, in reasonably diligent efforts to eliminate or minimize losses, by releasing the commercial or industrial property covered by the lease to another qualified tenant, and no claim shall be made or paid under the guarantee until such effort has been made and such escrow funds have been exhausted;

" '(3) that any guarantor of the lease will become a successor of the lessor for the purpose of collecting from a lessee in default rentals which are in arrears and with respect to which the lessor has received payment under a guarantee made pursuant to this section; and

" '(4) such other provisions, not inconsistent with the purposes of this title, as the Administrator may in his discretion require.

" 'Powers

" 'Sec. 402. Without limiting the authority conferred upon the Administrator and the Administration by section 201 of this Act, the Administrator and the Administration shall have, in the performance of and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties conferred by this title, all the authority and be subject to the same conditions prescribed in section 5(b) of the Small Business Act with respect to loans, including the authority to execute subleases, assignments of lease and new leases with any person, firm, organization, or other entity, in order to aid in the liquidation of obligations of the Administration hereunder.

" 'Fund

" 'Sec. 403. There is hereby established a revolving fund for use by the Administration in carrying out the provisions of this title. Initial capital for such fund shall consist of not to exceed $5,000,000 transferred from the fund established under section 4(c) of the Small Business Act: *Provided*, That the last sentence of such section 4(c) shall not apply to any amounts so transferred. Into the fund established by this section there shall be deposited all receipts from the guarantee program authorized by this title. Moneys in such fund not needed for the payment of current operating expenses or for the payment of claims arising under such program may be invested in bonds or other obligations of, or bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States; except that moneys provided as initial capital for such fund shall be returned to the fund established by section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, in such amounts and at such times as the Administration determines to be appropriate, whenever the level of the fund herein established is sufficiently high to permit the return of such moneys without danger to the solvency of the program under this title.'

"(b) Section 201 of such Act is amended by striking out the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'The powers conferred by this Act upon the Administration and upon the Administrator, with the exception of those conferred by titles IV and V hereof, shall be exercised through the Small Business Investment Division and through the Deputy Administrator appointed hereunder. The powers conferred by this Act upon the Administration and upon the Administrator by titles IV and V hereof shall be exercised through such division, section, or other personnel as the Administrator in his discretion shall determine.'

"(c) The table of contents of such Act is amended by inserting after the analysis of title III the following:

" 'TITLE IV—LEASE GUARANTEES

" 'Sec. 401. Authority of the Administration.

" 'Sec. 402. Powers.

" 'Sec. 403. Fund.'

"(d) Section 4(c) of the Small Business Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out '$1,716,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$1,721,000,000,'; and

"(2) by striking out the period at the end of the fifth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ': *Provided*, That such limitation shall not apply to functions under title IV thereof.'

"AMENDMENT OF SECTION 316 OF THE HOUSING ACT OF 1954

"Sec. 317. The first full paragraph of section 316(2) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by striking out the first parenthetical clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(as such projects are now or may hereafter be defined in title I of the Housing Act of 1949, including but not limited to projects authorized without regard to the residential or nonresidential character or reuse of the urban renewal area)'.

"TITLE IV—COMPENSATION OF CONDEMNEES

"Definitions

"Sec. 401. For the purposes of this title—

"(1) the term 'development program' means any program established by or conducted under any of the following provisions of law:

"(A) the United States Housing Act of 1937;

"(B) title I of the Housing Act of 1949;

"(C) the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964;

"(D) title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955;

"(E) title VII of the Housing Act of 1961; and

"(F) title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965;

"(2) the term 'Federal assistance' means a grant, loan, contract of guaranty, annual contribution, or other assistance provided by the United States;

"(3) the term 'applicant' means any public body or other agency authorized to receive Federal assistance under a development program;

"(4) the term 'real property' means any land, or any interest in land, and (A) any building, structure, or other improvements embedded in or affixed to land, and any article so affixed or attached to such building, structure, or improvement as to be an essential or integral part thereof; (B) any article affixed or attached to such real property in such manner that it cannot be removed without material injury to itself or the real property; and (C) any article so designed, constructed, or specially adapted to the purpose for which such real property is used that (i) it is an essential accessory or part of such real property, (ii) it is not capable of use elsewhere, and (iii) it would lose substantially all its value if removed from the real property; and

"(5) the term 'Administrator' means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

"Land acquisition policy

"Sec. 402. As a condition of eligibility for Federal assistance pursuant to a development program, each applicant for such assistance shall satisfy the Administrator that the following policies will be followed in connection with the acquisition of real property by eminent domain in the course of such program—

"(1) the applicant shall make every reasonable effort to acquire the real property by negotiated purchase;

"(2) no owner shall be required to surrender possession of real property before the applicant pays to the owner (A) the agreed purchase price arrived at by negotiation, or (B) in any case where only the amount of the payment to the owner is in dispute, not less than 75 per centum of the appraised fair value of such property as approved by the applicant; and

"(3) the construction or development of any public improvements shall be so scheduled that no person lawfully occupying the real property shall be required to surrender possession on account of such construction or development without at least 90 days' written notice from the applicant of the date on which such construction or development is scheduled to begin.

"Funds for certain payments in eminent domain

"SEC. 403. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, financial assistance under any federally assisted development program may include amounts necessary for financing, in the same manner that other costs of a project assisted under such program are financed, the payments described in paragraph (2) (B) of section 402 of this Act.

"Relocation payments under federally assisted development programs

"SEC. 404. (a) To the extent not otherwise authorized under any Federal law, financial assistance extended to an applicant under any federally assisted development program may include grants for relocation payments, as herein defined. Such grants may be in addition to other financial assistance under such federally assisted development programs, and may cover the full amount of such relocation payments. Any funds available for any such program may be used for such grants. The term 'relocation payments' means payments by the applicant, to a displaced individual, family, business concern, or nonprofit organization, which are made on such terms and conditions and subject to such limitations (to the extent applicable, but not including the date of displacement) as are provided for relocation payments, at the time such payments are approved, by sections 114(b), (c), and (d) of the Housing Act of 1949 with respect to projects assisted under title I thereof. Relocation payments authorized by this subsection shall be made subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Administrator.

"(b) Section 114(b) (2) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out '$1,500' and inserting in lieu thereof '$2,500'.

"(c)(1) Section 114 of such Act is further amended by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e) and by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

"'(d) In addition to payments authorized to be made under subsections (b) and (c), a local public agency may pay to any displaced individual, family, business concern, or nonprofit organization reasonable and necessary expenses incurred for (1) recording fees, transfer taxes, and similar expenses incidental to conveying real property to a project assisted under this title, (2) penalty costs for prepayment of any mortgage encumbering such real property, and (3) the pro rata portion of real property taxes allocable to a period subsequent to the date of vesting of title or the effective date of the acquisition of such real property by such agency, whichever is earlier.'

"(2) Section 15(8) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking out 'section 114 (b) or (c)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 114 (b), (c), and (d)'.

"(d) Subsection (a) shall not be applicable with respect to any displacement occurring prior to the date of the enactment of this Act (or prior to March 4, 1965, in the case of the programs specified in subparagraphs (C) and (E) of section 401(1)).

"TITLE V—LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

"Acceptance of local certification of equivalent elimination

"SEC. 501. The fourth sentence of section 10(a) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by inserting immediately after 'elimination', where it first appears, the following: ', as certified by the local governing body'.

"Greater use of existing housing

"SEC. 502. Section 10(c) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking out *'And provided'* and inserting in lieu thereof *'Provided'*, and by inserting before the period at the end thereof: the following: ': *And provided further*, That the amount of the fixed annual contribution which would be established under this Act for a newly constructed project by a public housing agency designed to accommodate a number of families of a given size and kind may be established, as a maximum annual contribution in lieu of any other guaranteed contribution authorized under this section, for a project by such public housing agency which would provide housing for the comparable number, sizes, and kinds of families through the acquisition, acquisition and rehabilitation, or use under lease of existing structures which are suitable for low-rent housing use and obtainable in the local market'.

"Increase in authorization for annual contributions

"SEC. 503. (a) Section 10(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by inserting immediately following 'per annum' the following: ', which limit shall be increased by $47,000,000 on the date of the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, and by *further* amounts of $47,000,000 on July 1 in each of the years 1966, 1967, and 1968, respectively'.

"Reallocation of units

"SEC. 504. Section 10(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking out *'Provided,'* and inserting in lieu thereof the following: *'Provided,* That subject to any contractual obligation outstanding on the date of the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, any units not under construction within five years from the date they were reserved to a public housing agency may be reserved, allocated, or placed under contract for annual contributions in any State without limitation as to the aggregate amount of units which may be placed under contract for annual contributions in any one State: *Provided further,'*.

"Sale of federally-owned projects to private purchasers

"SEC. 505. The first sentence of section 12(c) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows: 'The Authority may sell a Federal project only to a public housing agency or to a nonprofit body for use as low-rent housing.'

"Increase in per room limitations

"SEC. 506. Paragraph (5) of section 15 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended—

"(1) by striking out '$2,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$2,400';

"(2) by striking out '$3,000', each place it appears, and inserting in lieu thereof '$3,500', and

"(3) by striking out '$3,500' and inserting in lieu thereof '$4,000'.

"Purchase of units by tenants

"SEC. 507. (a) Section 15 of the United States Housing Act is amended by adding after paragraph (8) a new paragraph as follows:

"'(9) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, but subject to the provisions of any contract with the Authority, any public housing agency may permit any member of a tenant family to enter into a contract (either individually or as a member of a group) for the acquisition of a dwelling unit in any project of the public housing agency which is suitable by reason of its detached or semidetached construction for sale and for occupancy by such purchaser or a member or members of his family, upon the following terms:

"'(A) The purchaser shall pay at least (i) a pro rata share cost of any services furnished him by the public agency, including but not limited to, administration, maintenance, repairs, utilities, insurance, provision of reserves, and other expenses, (ii) local taxes on his dwelling unit, and (iii) monthly payments of interest and principal sufficient to amortize a sales price, equal to the greater of the unamortized debt or the appraised value (at the time such purchase contract is entered into) of the dwelling unit, in not more than forty years: *Provided*, That the public housing agency may, under terms and conditions to be prescribed by it, permit a purchaser to apply an amount equal to the net rent paid for his dwelling unit, over a period not exceeding three years prior to the entering into of any such contract, toward the purchase price of such unit;

"'(B) The interest rate shall be fixed at not less than the average interest cost of loans outstanding on the project, except that in the case of a project on which bonds are not outstanding the interest rate shall be fixed at not less than the going Federal rate applicable to such project;

"'(C) The principal payments shall be not less than one-half of 1 per centum per annum of the sales price during the first five years after purchase, 1 per centum per annum during the next five years, 1½ per centum per annum during the third five years, and thereafter not less than the principal payments resulting from a level debt service of interest and principal over the balance of the payment period; and

"'(D) If at any time (i) a purchaser fails to carry out his contract with the public housing agency and if no member of his family who resides in the dwelling assumes such contract, or (ii) the purchaser or a member of his family who assumes the contract does not reside in the dwelling, the public housing agency shall have an option to acquire his interest under such contract upon payment to him or his estate of an amount equal to his aggregate principal payments plus the value to the public housing agency of any improvements made by him, less an amount equal to 2½ per centum of the sales price.'

"(b) Such Act is further amended—

"(1) by inserting in the parenthetical phrase in section 10(h) after the words 'exclusive of' the following: 'any part thereof covered by a contract or conveyed pursuant to paragraph (9) of section 15, and exclusive of';

"(2) by inserting after 'may be made' in section 10(l) the following: ', subject to any outstanding contracts made pursuant to paragraph (9) of section 15,';

"(3) by inserting after 'acquisition', the first place it appears in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 15, the following: '(except pursuant to paragraph (9) of section 15)'; and

"(4) by inserting before the semicolon at the end of paragraph (1) of section 22(a) a colon and the following: *'Provided*, That such conveyance or delivery of title shall be subject to the rights of third parties vested pursuant to paragraph (9) of section 15'.

"TITLE VI—COLLEGE HOUSING

"Increase in authorization for college housing loans

"SEC. 601. Section 401(d) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended by striking out 'through 1964', each place it appears, and inserting in lieu thereof 'through 1968'.

"Interest rate on college housing loans

"Sec. 602. (a) Effective with respect to loan contracts entered into after the date of the enactment of this Act, section 401(c) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended by striking out 'the higher of (1) 2¾ per centum per annum, or' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the lower of (1) 3 per centum per annum, or'.

"(b) Effective with respect to notes or other obligations financing loan contracts entered into after the date of the enactment of this Act, section 401(e) of such Act is amended by striking out 'the higher of (1) 2½ per centum per annum, or' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the lower of (1) 2¾ per centum per annum, or'.

"Participation by new colleges and certain public vocational and technical institutions

"Sec. 603. Clause (1) of section 404(b) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended to read as follows: '(1) (A) any educational institution which offers, or provides satisfactory assurance to the Administrator that it will offer within a reasonable time after completion of a facility for which assistance is requested under this title, at least a two-year program acceptable for full credit toward a baccalaureate degree (including any public educational institution, or any private educational institution no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual), or (B) any public educational institution which (i) is administered by a college or university which is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association, (ii) offers technical or vocational instruction, and (iii) provides residential facilities for some or all of the students receiving such instruction.'.

"Technical amendments

"Sec. 604. (a) The second paragraph of section 404(b) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended by inserting after 'would provide housing,' the following: 'or to a student housing cooperative corporation described in clause (5) of this subsection,'.

"(b) Section 401(g) of such Act is amended by striking out 'In the case' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Except as otherwise provided in the second paragraph of section 404(b), in the case'.

"TITLE VII—COMMUNITY FACILITIES

"Purpose

"Sec. 701. The purpose of this title is to assist and encourage the communities of the Nation fully to meet the needs of their citizens by making it possible, with Federal grant assistance, for their governmental bodies (1) to construct adequate basic water and sewer facilities needed to promote the efficient and orderly growth and development of our communities, (2) to construct neighborhood facilities needed to enable them to carry on programs of necessary social services, and (3) to acquire, in a planned and orderly fashion, land to be utilized in connection with the future construction of public works and facilities.

"Grants for basic water and sewer facilities

"Sec. 702. (a) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereinafter in this title referred to as the 'Administrator') is authorized to make grants to local public bodies and agencies to finance specific projects for basic public water facilities (including works for the storage, treatment, purification, and distribution of water), and for basic public sewer facilities (other than 'treatment works' as defined in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act): *Provided,* That no grant shall be made under this section for any sewer facilities unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare certifies to the Administrator that any waste material carried by such facilities will be adequately treated before it is discharged into any public waterway so as to meet applicable Federal, State, interstate, or local water quality standards.

"(b) The amount of any grant made under the authority of this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the development cost of the project: *Provided,* That in the case of a community having a population of less than ten thousand, according to the most recent decennial census, which is situated within a metropolitan area, the Administrator may increase the amount of a grant for a basic public sewer facility assisted under this section to not more than 90 per centum of the development cost of such facility, if the community is unable to finance the construction of such facility without the increased grant authorized under this subsection, and if in such community (1) there does not exist a public or other adequate sewer facility which serves a substantial portion of the inhabitants of the community, and (2) the rate of unemployment is, and has been continuously for the preceding calendar year, 100 per centum above the national average: *And provided further,* That the limitations and restrictions contained in subsection (c) of this section shall not be applicable to any community applying for an increased grant under this subsection.

"(c) No grant shall be made under this section in connection with any project unless the Administrator determines that the project is necessary to provide adequate water or sewer facilities for, and will contribute to the improvement of the health or living standards of, the people in the community to be served, and that the project is (1) designed so that an adequate capacity will be available to serve the reasonably foreseeable growth needs of the area; (2) consistent with a program meeting criteria, established by the Administrator, for a unified or officially coordinated areawide water or sewer facilities system as part of the comprehensively planned development of the area, except that prior to July 1, 1968, grants may, in the discretion of the Administrator, be made under this section when such a program for an areawide water and sewer facilities system is under active preparation, although not yet completed, if the facility or facilities for which assistance is sought can reasonably be expected to be required as a part of such program, and there is urgent need for the facility or facilities; and (3) necessary to orderly community development.

"Grants for neighborhood facilities

"Sec. 703. (a) In accordance with the provisions of this section, the Administrator is authorized to make grants to any local public body or agency to assist in financing specific projects for neighborhood facilities. Any such project may be undertaken by such body or agency directly or through a nonprofit organization approved by it: *Provided,* That no grant shall be provided under this section for any project to be undertaken through a nonprofit organization unless the Administrator determines (1) that such organization has or will have the legal, financial, and technical capacity to carry out the project, and (2) that the public body or agency to which the grant is made will have satisfactory continuing control over the use of the proposed facilities.

"(b) The amount of any grant made under the authority of this section shall not exceed 66⅔ per centum of the development cost of the project for which the grant is made (or 75 per centum of such cost in the case of a project located in an area which at the time the grant is made is designated as a redevelopment area under the Area Redevelopment Act or any Act supplementary thereto).

"(c) No grants shall be made under this section for any project unless the Administrator determines that the project will provide a neighborhood facility which is (1) necessary for carrying out a program of health, recreational, social, or similiar community service (including a community action program approved under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964) in the area, (2) consistent with comprehensive planning for the development of the community, and (3) so located as to be available for use by a significant portion (or number in the case of large urban places) of the area's low- or moderate-income residents.

"(d) For a period of twenty years after a grant has been made under this section for a neighborhood facility, such facility shall not, without the approval of the Administrator, be converted to uses other than those proposed by the applicant in its application for a grant. The Administrator shall not approve any conversion in the use of such a neighborhood facility during such twenty-year period unless he finds that such conversion is in accordance with the then applicable program of health, recreational, social, or similar community services in the area and consistent with comprehensive planning for the development of the community in which the facility is located. In approving any such conversion, the Administrator may impose such additional conditions and requirements as he deems necessary.

"(e) The Administrator shall give priority to applications for projects designed primarily to benefit members of low-income families or otherwise substantially further the objectives of a community action program approved under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

"Advance acquisition of land

"Sec. 704. (a) In order to encourage and assist in the timely acquisition of land planned to be utilized in connection with the future construction of public works or facilities, the Administrator is authorized to make grants to local public bodies and agencies to assist in financing the acquisition of a fee simple estate or other interest in such land.

"(b) The amount of any grant made under the authority of this section shall not exceed the aggregate amount of reasonable interest charges on the loan or other financial obligation incurred to finance the acquisition of such land for a period not exceeding the lesser of (1) five years from the date such loan was made or such financial obligation was incurred, or (2) the period of time between the date such loan was made or such financial obligation was incurred and the date construction is begun on the public work or facility for which the land acquired was planned to be utilized.

"(c) No grant shall be made under this section for any project for the acquisition of land unless the Administrator determines that the public work or facility for which such land is to be utilized is planned to be constructed or initiated within a reasonable period of time (not to exceed five years after a contract to make such grant is entered into) and that construction of such public work or facility will contribute to economy, efficiency, and the comprehensively planned development of the area.

"(d) As a condition to providing assistance under this section, the Administrator may, under terms and conditions prescribed by him, require an applicant to agree to repay such assistance, if (1) the land purchased with such assistance is not utilized within five years after the agreement is entered into in connection with the construction of the public work or facility for which such land was acquired, or (2) such land is diverted to other uses.

"General provisions

"Sec. 705. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, the Administrator shall (in addition to any authority otherwise vested in him) have the functions, powers, and duties set forth in section 402, except subsections (a), (c)(2), and (f) of the Housing Act of 1950.

"(b) The Administrator is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, to make advance or progress payments on account of any grant made pursuant to this title. No part of any grant authorized to be made by the provisions of this title shall be used for the payment of ordinary governmental operating expenses.

"Definitions

"Sec. 706. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'State' means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States.

"(b) The term 'local public bodies and agencies' includes public corporate bodies or political subdivisions; public agencies or instrumentalities of one or more States, municipalities, or political subdivisions of one or more States (including public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more municipalities or other political subdivisions of one or more States); Indian tribes; and boards or commissions established under the laws of any State to finance specific capital improvement projects.

"(c) The term 'development cost' means the cost of constructing the facility and of acquiring the land on which it is located, including necessary site improvements to permit its use as a site for the facility.

"Labor standards

"Sec. 707. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects assisted under sections 702 and 703 shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). No such project shall be approved without first obtaining adequate assurance that these labor standards will be maintained upon the construction work. The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948; 40 U.S.C. 276c).

"Appropriations

"Sec. 708. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year commencing after June 30, 1965, and ending prior to July 1, 1969, not to exceed (1) $200,000,000 for grants under section 702, (2) $50,000,000 for grants under section 703, and (3) $25,000,000 for grants under section 704.

"(b) Any amounts appropriated under this section shall remain available until expended, and any amounts authorized for any fiscal year under this section but not appropriated may be appropriated for any succeeding fiscal year commencing prior to July 1, 1969.

"TITLE VIII—FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

"Increase in special assistance authority

"Sec. 801. (a) Section 305(c) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', which limit shall be increased by $100,000,000 on the date of the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, by $450,000,000 on July 1, 1966, by $550,000,000 on July 1, 1967, and by $525,000,000 on July 1, 1968'.

"(b) Section 305(f) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ': *Provided further,* That any portion of the total amount of authority set forth in the first proviso of this subsection, which (1) is not required under the second proviso of this subsection to be kept available for purchases and commitments with respect to mortgages insured under section 809, and (2), on the date of enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 and on each July 1 thereafter, would otherwise be available for making new purchases and commitments pursuant to this subsection, shall be transferred to and merged with the authority granted by subsection (a) and added to the amount of such authority which is available, as of the date of the transfer, for purchases and commitments under subsection (c); and the total amount of authority as set forth in the first proviso of this subsection shall progressively be reduced by the amount of each such transfer'.

"Purchase of mortgages held by Federal instrumentalities

"Sec. 802. (a) Section 302 of the National Housing Act is amended by—

"(1) striking out 'Federal,' in clause (2) in subsection (b);

"(2) inserting before 'first mortgages' in the first sentence of subsection (c) the following: 'obligations offered to it by the Housing and Home Finance Agency or its Administrator, or by such Agency's constituent units or agencies or the heads thereof, or any'; and

"(3) inserting 'and other obligations' after 'mortgages' in the last sentence of subsection (c).

"(b) Section 306(e) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Association is authorized, under the aforesaid separate accountability, to make commitments to purchase, and to purchase, service, or sell any obligations offered to it by the Housing and Home Finance Agency or its Administrator, or by such Agency's constituent units or agencies or the heads thereof, or any mortgages covering residential property offered to it by any Federal instrumentality, or the head thereof. There shall be excluded from the total amounts set forth in subsection (c) the amounts of any obligations or mortgages purchased by the Association pursuant to this subsection.'

"Purchase of below-market interest rate mortgages

"Sec. 803. Section 302(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: 'Notwithstanding the provisions of clause (3) in the preceding sentence, the Association may purchase a mortgage under section 305 with an original principal obligation that exceeds $17,500 per dwelling unit if the mortgage (1) is a below-market interest rate mortgage insured under section 221 (d)(3), and (2) covers property which has the benefit of local tax abatement in an amount determined by the Federal Housing Commissioner to be sufficient to make possible rentals not in excess of those that would be approved by the Commissioner if the mortgage amount did not exceed $17,500 per dwelling unit and if local tax abatement were not provided.'

"Increase in limitation on mortgages for dwelling units having four or more bedrooms

"Sec. 804. Section 302(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: '(plus an additional $2,500 for each such family residence or dwelling unit which has four or more bedrooms'.

"TITLE IX—OPEN-SPACE LAND AND URBAN BEAUTIFICATION AND IMPROVEMENT

"Change in name of program; findings and purpose

"Sec. 901. (a) The heading of title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"'TITLE VII—OPEN-SPACE LAND AND URBAN BEAUTIFICATION AND IMPROVEMENT'

"(b) Section 701 of such Act is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c) and inserting after subsection (a) a new subsection as follows:

"'(b) The Congress further finds that there is an urgent need both for the additional provision of parks and other open-space areas in the developed portions of the Nation's urban areas and for greater and better coordinated local efforts to beautify and improve open space and other public land throughout urban areas to facilitate their increased use and enjoyment by the Nation's urban population.'

"(c) Section 701(c) of such Act (as redesignated by subsection (b) of this section) is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'preserve' and inserting in lieu thereof '(1) provide, preserve, and develop'; and

"(2) by striking out 'purposes.' and inserting in lieu thereof 'uses, and (2) beautify and improve open space and other public urban land, in accordance with programs to encourage and coordinate local public and private efforts toward this end.'

"Development grants for open-space uses

"Sec. 902. (a) The first sentence of section 702(a) of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended—

"(1) by inserting 'and development' after 'acquisition' the first place it appears; and

"(2) by inserting before the period the following: ', and the development, for open-space uses, of land acquired under this title'.

"(b) Section 702(c) of such Act is amended by striking out 'development costs or'.

"(c) Section 709 of such Act (as redesignated by section 906 of this Act) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(4) The term "open-space uses" means *any* use of open-space land for (A) park and recreational purposes, (B) conservation of land and other natural resources, or (C) historic or scenic purposes.'

"Increased grant level for preservation and development of open-space land

"Sec. 903. The second sentence of section 702(a) of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows: 'The amount of any such grant shall not exceed 50 per centum of the total cost, as approved by the Administrator, of such acquisition and development.'

"Contract authorization

"Sec. 904. Section 702(b) of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended by striking out '$75,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '$310,000,000: *Provided,* That of such sum the Administrator may contract to make grants under section 705 aggregating not to exceed $64,000,000, and grants under section 706 aggregating not to exceed $36,000,000'.

"Open-space planning and program requirements

"Sec. 905. Section 703(a) of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The Administrator shall enter into contracts to make grants under sections 702 and 705 of this title only if he finds that such assistance is needed for carrying out a unified or officially coordinated program, meeting criteria established by him, for the provision and development of open-space land as part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area.'

“Grants for provision of open-space land in built-up urban areas and for urban beautification and improvement

“Sec. 906. Title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended by redesignating sections 705 and 706 as sections 708 and 709, respectively, and by inserting after section 704 two new sections as follows:

“ ‘Grants for provision of open-space land in built-up urban areas

“ ‘Sec. 705. The Administrator is further authorized to enter into contracts to make grants to States and local public bodies to help finance the acquisition of title to, or other permanent interests in, developed land in built-up portions of urban areas to be cleared and used as permanent open-space land. The Administrator shall make such grants only where the local governing body determines that adequate open-space land cannot effectively be provided through the use of existing undeveloped or predominantly undeveloped land. Grants under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost of acquiring such interests and of necessary demolition and removal of improvements.

“ ‘Grants for urban beautification and improvement

“ ‘Sec. 706. The Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts to make grants, as herein provided, to States and local public bodies to assist in carrying out local programs for the greater use and enjoyment of open-space and other public land in urban areas. The Administrator shall establish criteria for such programs to assure that each program (1) represents significant and effective efforts, involving all available public and private resources, for the beautification of such land and its improvement for open-space uses; and (2) is important to the comprehensively planned development of the locality. Grants made under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the amount by which the cost of the activities carried on by an applicant during a fiscal year under an approved program exceeds its usual expenditures for comparable activities: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Administrator may use not to exceed $5,000,000 of the sum authorized for contracts under this section for the purpose of entering into contracts to make grants in amounts not to exceed 90 per centum of the cost of activities which he determines have special value in developing and demonstrating new and improved methods and materials for use in carrying out the purposes of this section.’

“Labor standards

“Sec. 907. Title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 is further amended by inserting after section 706 (as added by section 906 of this Act) the following new section:

“ ‘Labor standards

“ ‘Sec. 707. (a) The Administrator shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of construction work financed with the assistance of grants under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended. The Administrator shall not approve any such grant without first obtaining adequate assurance that these labor standards will be maintained upon the construction work.

“ ‘(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a), the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948; 40 U.S.C. 276c).’

“Use of funds for studies and publication

“Sec. 908. The second sentence of section 708 of the Housing Act of 1961 (as redesignated by section 906 of this Act) is amended to read as follows: ‘The Administrator is authorized to use during any fiscal year not to exceed $50,000 of the funds available for grants under this title to undertake such studies and publish such information.’

“Conforming amendments

“Sec. 909. (a) The heading of section 702 of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows: ‘GRANTS FOR PRESERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF OPEN-SPACE LAND’.

“(b) Section 702(a) of such Act is amended by striking out ‘acceptable to the Administrator as capable of carrying out the provisions of this title’.

“(c) Section 702(e) of such Act is amended by striking out in the second sentence ‘served by the open-space land acquired’ and inserting in lieu thereof ‘assisted’.

“(d) Section 704 of such Act is amended by striking out in the first sentence ‘for which’ and inserting in lieu thereof ‘for the acquisition of which’.

“TITLE X—RURAL HOUSING

“Loans for previously occupied buildings and minimum site acquisition

“Sec. 1001. (a) Section 501(a) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended—

“(1) by inserting after ‘their farms,’ in clause (1) the following: ‘and to purchase previously occupied buildings and land constituting a minimum adequate site, in order’; and

“(2) by inserting after ‘rural areas’ in clause (2) the following: ‘for the construction, improvement, alteration, or repair of dwellings, related facilities, and farm buildings and to rural residents for such purposes and for the purchase of previously occupied buildings and the purchase of land constituting a minimum adequate site, in order’.

“(b) Section 501(c) of such Act is amended by inserting ‘or a rural resident’ in clause (1) after ‘or that he is the owner of other real estate in a rural area’.

“Interest rate on direct rural housing loans

“Sec. 1002. Section 502(a) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out ‘with interest at a rate not to exceed 4 per centum per annum on the unpaid balance of principal’ and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ‘with interest, in the case of applicants described in clauses (1) and (2) of section 501(a), at a rate not to exceed 5 per centum per annum on the unpaid balance of principal, and, in the case of applicants described in clause (3) of section 501(a) and applicants under sections 503 and 504, at a rate not to exceed 4 per centum per annum on such unpaid balance. Loans made or insured under this title shall be conditioned on the borrower paying such fees and other charges as the Secretary may require’.

“Insured rural housing loans

“Sec. 1003. (a) Title V of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

“ ‘Insured rural housing loans

“ ‘Sec. 517. (a) The Secretary may insure loans meeting the requirements of section 502, and may make loans in accordance with the requirements of such section to be sold and insured; except that such loans shall—

“ ‘(1) if the borrowers are persons of low or moderate income (as defined by the Secretary) (A) not exceed amounts necessary to provide adequate housing, modest in size, design, and cost (as determined by the Secretary), (B) bear interest at a rate not to exceed 5 per centum per annum, and (C) not exceed in the aggregate $300,000,000 of new loans made or insured in any one fiscal year; and

“ ‘(2) if the borrowers are persons other than those described in clause (1), bear interest and provide for insurance or service charges at rates comparable to the combined rate of interest and premium charges in effect under section 203 of the National Housing Act, as determined by the Secretary.

“ ‘(b) The Secretary may insure loans in accordance with the requirements of sections 514 (exclusive of subsections (a) (3), (a) (5), and (b)) and 515 (exclusive of subsections (a) and (b) (4)), and may make loans meeting such requirements to be sold and insured. Upon the expiration of ninety days after the original capitalization of the Rural Housing Insurance Fund, created by subsection (e) of this section, no new loans shall be made or insured under section 514 or 515(b), except in conformity with this section.

“ ‘(c) The Secretary may use the Rural Housing Insurance Fund for the purpose of making loans to be sold and insured under this section, but the aggregate of such loans which are held by the Secretary at any one time shall not exceed $100,000,000.

“ ‘(d) The Secretary may, in conformity with subsections (a) and (b), insure the payment of principal and interest as it becomes due on loans made by lenders other than the United States, and on loans made from the Rural Housing Insurance Fund which are sold by the Secretary. Any contract of insurance executed by the Secretary hereunder shall be an obligation supported by the full faith and credit of the United States, and shall be incontestable except for fraud or material misrepresentation of which the holder has actual knowledge. In connection with loans insured under this section, the Secretary may take liens running to the United States notwithstanding the fact that the notes evidencing such loans may be held by lenders other than the United States. Notes evidencing such loans shall be freely assignable, but the Secretary shall not be bound by any such assignment until notice thereof is given to and acknowledged by him.

“ ‘(e) There is hereby created the Rural Housing Insurance Fund (hereinafter referred to as the “Fund”) which shall be used by the Secretary as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this section. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of the Fund.

“ ‘(f) Money in the Fund not needed for current operations shall be invested in direct obligations of the United States or obligations guaranteed by the United States.

“ ‘(g) All funds, claims, notes, mortgages, contracts, and property acquired by the Secretary under this section, and all collections and proceeds therefrom, shall constitute assets of the Fund; and all liabilities and obligations of such assets shall be liabilities and obligations of the Fund. Loans may be held in the Fund and collected in accordance with their terms or may be sold by the Secretary with or without agreements for insurance thereof. The Secretary is authorized to make agreements with respect to servicing loans held or insured by him under this section and purchasing such insured loans on such terms and conditions as he may prescribe.

“ ‘(h) The Secretary is authorized to issue notes to the Secretary of the Treasury to obtain funds necessary for discharging obligations under this section and for authorized expenditures out of the Fund, but except as may be authorized in appropriation Acts, not for the original or any additional capital of the Fund. Such notes shall be in such form and denominations and have such maturities and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Each note shall bear interest at the average rate, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, payable by the Treasury upon its marketable public obligations outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal year in which such note is issued, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from their date of issue. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes of the Secretary issued hereunder, and for that purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which such securities may be issued under such Act are extended to include purchases of notes issued by the Secretary. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. The notes issued by the Secretary to the Secretary of the Treasury shall constitute obligations of the Fund.

"'(i) The Secretary may retain out of interest payments by the borrower an annual charge in an amount specified in the insurance or sale agreement applicable to the loan. Of the charges retained by the Secretary, if any, not to exceed 1 per centum per annum of the unpaid balance of the loan shall be deposited in the Fund. Any retained charges not deposited in the Fund shall be available for administrative expenses in carrying out the provisions of this title, to be transferred annually, and become merged with any appropriation for administrative expenses of the Farmers Home Administration, when and in such amounts as may be authorized in appropriation Acts.

"'(j) The Secretary may also utilize the Fund—

"'(1) to pay amounts to which the holder of the note is entitled in accordance with an insurance or sale agreement under this section accruing between the date of any prepayment by the borrower to the Secretary and the date of transmittal of any such prepayments to the holder of the note; and in the discretion of the Secretary, prepayments other than final payments need not be remitted to the holder until due;

"'(2) to pay the holder of any note insured under this section any defaulted installment or, upon assignment of the note to the Secretary at the Secretary's request or pursuant to a purchase agreement, the entire balance outstanding on the note; and

"'(3) to pay taxes, insurance, prior liens, expenses necessary to make fiscal adjustments in connection with the application and transmittal of collections, and other expenses and advances to protect the security for loans which are insured under this section or held in the Fund, and to acquire such security property at foreclosure sale or otherwise.

"'Rural Housing Direct Loan Account

"'SEC. 518. (a) There is hereby created the Rural Housing Direct Loan Account (hereinafter referred to as the "Account") which shall be used by the Secretary for carrying out the provisions of this section. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of the Account.

"'(b) There are transferred to the Account (1) all funds, claims, notes, mortgages, contracts, and property, and all collections and proceeds therefrom, held by the Secretary under the direct loan provisions of this title, including those securing notes issued by the Secretary to the Secretary of the Treasury under section 511 and any unexpended balance of amounts borrowed upon such notes, and (2) all unexpended balances of appropriations for direct loans under this title, including the fund authorized by section 515 (a). All amounts hereafter borrowed by the Secretary from the Secretary of the Treasury under section 511 shall be deposited in the Account. All collections and proceeds from assets acquired by the Account shall be deposited in the Account.

"'(c) When and in such amounts as may be authorized in appropriation Acts, the Secretary may issue notes to the Secretary of the Treasury to obtain funds to be deposited in the Account. The form, denominations, maturities, and other terms and conditions of such notes shall be prescribed by the Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Each note shall bear interest at the average rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, payable by the Treasury upon its marketable public obligations outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal year in which such note is issued, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from their date of issue. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes of the Secretary issued hereunder, and for that purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which such securities may be issued under such Act are extended to include the purchase of notes issued by the Secretary. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

"'(d) The Account shall remain available to the Secretary for the payment of interest and principal on notes issued by the Secretary to the Secretary of the Treasury under section 511 of this section, and for direct loans and related advances under this title in such amounts as are now authorized by law and in such further amounts as shall be authorized in appropriation Acts. Amounts so authorized for such loans and advances shall remain available until expended.'

"(b) Section 511 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof 'The Secretary may issue notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of making direct loans under this title.';

"(2) by striking out the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof 'The total principal amount of such notes and obligations issued pursuant to this section during the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending October 1, 1969, shall not exceed $850,000,000.'; and

"(3) by striking out the fifth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following 'Each such note or other obligation shall bear interest at the average rate, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, payable by the Treasury upon its marketable public obligations outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal year in which such note or other obligation is issued, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for 15 years from their date of issue.'

"Federal National Mortgage Association secondary market operations for insured rural housing loans

"SEC. 1004. (a) Section 302(b) of the National Housing Act is amended—

"(1) by inserting immediately after 'which are insured under the National Housing Act' the following: 'or title V of the Housing Act of 1949';

"(2) by inserting after 'any mortgage' in clause (2) of the proviso the following: ', except a mortgage insured under title V of the Housing Act of 1949,'; and

"(3) by inserting before the period in the last sentence the following: 'or title V of the Housing Act of 1949'.

"(b) Section 303(b) of such Act is amended by inserting 'and other' after 'private' in the first sentence.

"Extension of rural housing authorizations

"SEC. 1005. (a) Section 512 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out 'September 30, 1965' and inserting in lieu thereof 'October 1, 1969'.

"(b) Section 513 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'September 30, 1965' in clause (b) and inserting in lieu thereof 'October 1, 1969';

"(2) by striking out '$10,000,000' in clause (c) and inserting in lieu thereof '$50,000,000', and by striking out 'September 30, 1965' in the same clause and inserting in lieu thereof 'October 1, 1969'; and

"(3) by striking out 'September 30, 1965' in clause (d) and inserting in lieu thereof 'October 1, 1969'.

"(c) Section 515(b)(5) of such Act is amended by striking out 'September 30, 1965' and inserting in lieu thereof 'October 1, 1969'.

"(d) Section 506(a) of such Act is amended by striking out 'sections 501 to 504, inclusive, and sections 514—516', each place it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof 'this title'.

"Sums excess to the needs of the rural housing insurance fund or the rural housing direct loan account

"SEC. 1006. Title V of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding after section 518 (added by section 1003 of this Act) a new section as follows:

"'Sums excess to the needs of the rural housing insurance fund or the rural housing direct loan account

"'SEC. 519. Any sums in the Rural Housing Insurance Fund or the Rural Housing Direct Loan Account which the Secretary determines are in excess of amounts needed to meet the obligations and carry out the purposes of such Fund or Account shall be returned to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.'

"Definition of a rural area

"SEC. 1007. Title V of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof (after the new section added by section 1006 of this Act) the following new section:

"'Definition of rural area

"'SEC. 520. As used in this title, the terms "rural" and "rural area" mean any open country, or any place, town, village, or city which is not part of or associated with an urban area and which (1) has a population not in excess of 2,500 inhabitants, or (2) has a population in excess of 2,500 but not in excess of 5,500 if it is rural in character.'

"TITLE XI—MISCELLANEOUS

"Annual report on housing and urban development programs

"SEC. 1101. Section 802(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall, as soon as practicable during each calendar year, make a report to the President for submission to the Congress on all operations and programs (including but not limited to the FHA insurance, urban renewal, public housing, and rent supplement programs) under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Agency during the previous calendar year. Such report shall contain recommendations for strengthening *or improving* such programs, or, when necessary to implement more effectively Congressional policies and purposes, for establishing new or alternative programs."

"Urban planning grants

"SEC. 1102. (a) The fifth sentence of section 701(b) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by striking out '$105,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$230,000,000'.

"(b) Section 701(b) of such Act is amended by striking out the period at the end and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ': *Provided,* That not to exceed 5 per centum of any funds so appropriated may be used by the Administrator for studies, research, and demonstration projects, undertaken independently or by contract, for the development and improvement of techniques and methods for comprehensive planning and for the advancement of the purposes of this section.'

"(c)(1) Section 701 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(g) In addition to the planning grants authorized by subsection (a), the Administrator is further authorized to make grants to organizations composed of public officials whom he finds to be representative of the political jurisdictions within a metropolitan area or urban region for the purpose of assisting such organizations to undertake studies, collect data, develop regional plans and programs, and engage in such other activities as the Administrator finds necessary or desirable for the solution of the metropolitan or regional problems in such areas or regions. To the maximum extent feasible, all grants under this subsection shall be for activities relating to all the developmental aspects of the total metropolitan area or urban region, including, but not limited to, land use, transportation, housing, economic development, natural resources development, community facilities, and the general improvement of living environments. A grant under this subsection shall not exceed two-thirds of the estimated cost of the work for which the grant is made.'

"(2) Section 701(b) of such Act is amended—

"(A) by inserting 'planning' immediately before 'grant' the first time it appears in the first sentence, and

"(B) by striking out 'planning' in the fourth sentence.

"(d) Section 701(b) of such Act is amended by inserting after 'Area Redevelopment Act' the following: '(or under any Act supplementary thereto)'.

"Authorization for Federal-State training programs

"SEC. 1103. (a) Section 802(d) of the Housing Act of 1964 is amended by striking out '$10,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$30,000,000'.

"(b) Section 803 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out 'authorized to be', and (2) by striking out 'by section 802(d)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for the purposes of this part'.

"Authorization for public works planning advances

"SEC. 1104. The second sentence of section 702(e) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by striking out '$20,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$70,000,000'.

"Authorization for low-income housing demonstration programs

"SEC. 1105. Section 207 of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended by striking out '$10,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$15,000,000'.

"Advisory committees—Technical provision

"SEC. 1106. Section 601 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out the second sentence.

"Public facility loans

"SEC. 1107. (a) Section 202(c) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Administrator may extend financial assistance, as otherwise authorized by clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section, to any private nonprofit corporation to finance the construction of works for the storage, treatment, purification, or distribution of water or the construction of sewage, sewage treatment, and sewer facilities, if such works or facilities are needed to serve a smaller municipality or rural area, and there is no existing public body able to construct and operate such works or facilities.'

"(b) Section 202(b)(4) of such amendments is amended—

"(1) by striking out the parenthetical phrase in clause (A) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(one hundred fifty thousand or more in the case of a community situated in an area designated as a redevelopment area under the Area Redevelopment Act or any Act supplementary thereto)'; and

"(2) by inserting after 'public works or facilities' in the second sentence the following: '(i) in a community in or near which is located a research or development installation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or (ii)'.

"FHA conforming amendments

"SEC. 1108. (a) Section 2(f) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out all that follows the first sentence.

"(b) Section 8 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'Title I Housing Insurance Fund' in subsection (g) and inserting in lieu thereof 'General Insurance Fund'; and

"(2) by striking out subsections (h) and (i).

"(c) Section 203(k) of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'a separate section 203 Home Improvement Account to be maintained as hereinafter provided under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund' in clause (3) of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof 'the General Insurance Fund';

"(2) by striking out 'the section 203 Home Improvement Account or in debentures executed in the name of such Account' in clause (4) of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof 'the General Insurance Fund or in debentures executed in the name of such Fund';

"(3) by striking out all of the third sentence which follows 'refer to this section 203(k)' and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

"(4) by striking out the fourth, fifth, and sixth sentences.

"(d) Section 204 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'or section 210' in the first sentence of subsection (a);

"(2) by striking out all of the second sentence of subsection (c) after the 'mortgagee' and inserting in lieu thereof 'from the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund.';

"(3) by striking out all of the first sentence of subsection (d) after 'shall be negotiable' the first place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof a period;

"(4) by striking out 'the Fund' each place it appears in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund';

"(5) by striking out 'or the Housing Fund, as the case may be,' in the fifth sentence of subsection (d);

"(6) by striking out 'or the Housing Fund' in the sixth sentence of subsection (d); and

"(7) by striking out the matter in subsection (f)(1)(i) which follows 'section 203' and precedes the colon.

"(e) Section 207 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'and section 210' in the first sentence of subsection (d);

"(2) by striking out 'of the Housing Insurance Fund issued by the Commissioner under this title' in the first sentence of subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'issued by the Commissioner under any title and section of this Act, except debentures of the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund, or of the Cooperative Management Housing Insurance Fund';

"(3) by striking out subsections (f), (m), and (p); and

"(4) by striking out 'the Housing Insurance Fund' and 'the Housing Fund' each place they appear in subsections (b), (h), (i), (j), (k), and (l) and inserting in lieu thereof 'the General Insurance Fund'.

"(f) Section 209 of such Act is amended by striking out 'or account or accounts,' in the second sentence.

"(g) Section 213 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'the Housing Fund' in subsection (a)(3) and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Cooperative Management Housing Insurance Fund'; and

"(2) by striking out '(l), (m), (n), and (p)' in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof '(l), and (n)'.

"(h) Section 220 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'the section 220 Housing Insurance Fund' each place it appears in subsections (d)(2) and (f) and inserting in lieu thereof 'the General Insurance Fund';

"(2) by inserting 'and' immediately before '(B)' in the second full sentence in subsection (f)(3), and by striking out ', and (C)' and all that follows in such sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a period;

"(3) by striking out subsections (g) and (h)(4); and

"(4) by striking out 'the section 220 Home Improvement Account' each place it appears in subsections (h)(5) and (h)(7) and inserting in lieu thereof 'the General Insurance Fund'

"(i) Section 221 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'the section 221 Housing Insurance Fund' each place it appears in subsections (d)(4), (f), (g)(1), and (g)(3) and inserting in lieu thereof 'the General Insurance Fund';

"(2) by striking out all of subsection (g)(2) after 'mortgages insured under this section' and inserting in lieu thereof '; or';

"(3) by inserting 'and' immediately before '(B)' in the first full sentence in subsection (g)(3), and by striking out ', and (C)' and all that follows in such sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

"(4) by striking out subsection (h).

"(j) Section 222 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'Servicemen's Mortgage Insurance Fund' in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof 'General Insurance Fund'; and

"(2) by striking out subsection (f).

"(k) Section 229 of such Act is amended by striking out 'and Accounts' in the first sentence.

"(l) Section 231 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'the section 207 Housing Insurance Fund' in subsection (c)(4) and inserting in lieu thereof 'the General Insurance Fund'; and

"(2) by striking out '(f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), (m), (n), and (p)' in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof '(g), (h), (i), (j), (k). (l), and (n)'.

"(m) Section 232 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'the section 207 Housing Insurance Fund' in subsection (d)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof 'the General Insurance Fund'; and

"(2) by striking out '(f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), (m), (n), and (p)' in subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof '(g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), and (n)'.

"(n) Section 233 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'the Experimental Housing Insurance Fund' in clause (1) of the third sentence of subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof 'the General Insurance Fund';

"(2) by inserting 'and' immediately before '(2)' in the third sentence of subsection (f), and by striking out ', and (3)' and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

"(3) by striking out subsection (g).

"(o) Section 234 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'the Apartment Unit Insurance Fund' in subsections (d)(2) and (g) and inserting in lieu thereof 'the General Insurance Fund';

"(2) by striking out subsection (h) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(h) The provisions of subsections (d), (e), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), and (n) of section 207 shall be applicable to mortgages insured under subsection (d) of this section.'; and

"(3) by striking out subsection (i) and redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (i).

"(p) Section 604 of such Act is amended by striking out 'the War Housing Insurance Fund' each place it appears in subsections (c), (d), and (f)(1)(i) and inserting in lieu thereof 'the General Insurance Fund'.

"(q) Section 608 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'the War Housing Insurance Fund' each place it appears in subsections (b)(1) and (d) and inserting in lieu thereof 'the General Insurance Fund'; and

"(2) by striking out subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(f) The provisions of section 207(k) of this Act shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section, except that, as applied to such mortgages, the reference therein to subsection (g) shall be construed to refer to subsection (c) of this section.'

"(r) The first sentence of section 609(f) of such Act is amended by striking out clause (1) and redesignating clauses (2), (3), and (4) as clauses (1), (2), and (3), respectively.

"(s) Section 707 of such Act is amended by striking out 'the Housing Investment Insurance Fund' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the General Insurance Fund'.

"(t) Section 708 of such Act is amended by striking out 'the Housing Investment Insurance Fund' each place it appears in subsections (c), (e), (g), and (h) and inserting in lieu thereof 'the General Insurance Fund'.

"(u) Section 803 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund' each place it appears in subsections (b)(1), (b)(2), (e), (f), and (g) and inserting in lieu thereof 'the General Insurance Fund'; and

"(2) by striking out subsection (h) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(h) The provisions of section 207(k) and section 207(l) of this Act shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this title and to property acquired by the Commissioner hereunder, except that, as applied to such mortgages and property, the reference in section 207(k) to subsection (g) shall be construed to refer to subsection (d) of this section'.

"(v) Section 809 of such Act is amended by striking out 'the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund' each place it appears in subsections (b), (e), and (g) and inserting in lieu thereof 'the General Insurance Fund'.

"(w) Section 810 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund' in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof 'the General Insurance Fund';

"(2) by striking out '(l), (m), (n), and (p)' in subsection (j) and inserting in lieu thereof '(l), and (n)'; and

"(3) by striking out the proviso in subsection (j) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ': *Provided,* That wherever the words "Fund" or "Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund" appear in section 204, such reference shall refer to the General Insurance Fund with respect to mortgages insured under this section'.

"(x) Section 903 of such Act is amended by striking out 'the National Defense Housing Insurance Fund' each place it appears in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof 'the General Insurance Fund'.

"(y) Section 904 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'the National Defense Housing Insurance Fund' each place it appears in subsections (c) and (d) and inserting in lieu thereof 'the General Insurance Fund'; and

"(2) by striking out all of subsection (e) which follows 'of this Act' and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

"(z) Section 908 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'the National Defense Housing Insurance Fund' in subsection (b)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof 'the General Insurance Fund';

"(2) by striking out all of subsection (d) which follows 'of this Act' and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

"(3) by striking out subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(f) The provisions of section 207(k) and section 207(l) of this Act shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section and to property acquired by the Commissioner hereunder, except that, as applied to such mortgages and property, the reference therein to subsection (g) shall be construed to refer to subsection (c) of this section.'

"(aa) Sections 219, 602, 605, 710, 802, 804, 902, and 905 of such Act are repealed.

"(bb) Section 1 of such Act is amended by striking out 'titles II, III, VI, VII, VIII, and IX', each place it appears, and inserting in lieu thereof 'titles II, III, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, and X'.

"Repeal of special provision in Urban Mass Transportation Act

"Sec. 1109. Section 9 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by striking out subsection (c) and redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively.

"Savings and loan associations

"Sec. 1110. (a) Section 5(c) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 is amended by adding at the end of the first paragraph a new sentence as follows: 'Structures or parts thereof designed or used as fraternity or sorority houses which include sleeping accommodations for students of a college or university, or designed or used principally for the provision of living accommodations for persons who are students, employees, or members of the staff of a college, university, or hospital, shall be considered, subject to such regulations as the Board may prescribe, "other dwelling units" for the purposes of this subsection.'

"(b) The ninth paragraph of section 5(c) of such Act is amended by striking out 'fifteen years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'ten years'.

"(c) Section 5(c) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof (after the new paragraph added by section 201 (b)(3) of this Act) the following new paragraph:

"'No building and loan association incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia or organized in such District or doing business in such District shall establish any branch or move its principal office or any branch without the prior written approval of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and no other building and loan association shall establish any branch in such District or move its principal office or any branch in such District without such approval. As used in the sentence next preceding, "branch" means any office, place of business, or facility, other than the principal office as defined by the Board, of a building and loan association at which accounts are opened or payments thereon are received or withdrawals therefrom are paid, or any other office, place of business, or facility of a building and loan association defined by the Board as a branch within the meaning of such sentence, and as used in such sentence and in this sentence "building and loan association" means any incorporated or unincorporated building, building or loan, building and loan, savings and loan, or homestead association or cooperative bank.'

"(d) Section 404 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(h)(1) Each insured institution shall make such deposits in the Corporation as may from time to time be required by call of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Any such call shall be calculated by applying a specified percentage, which shall be the same for all insured institutions, to the total amount of all withdrawable or repurchasable shares, investment certificates, and deposits in each insured institution. No such call shall be made unless such Board determines that the total amount of such call, plus the outstanding deposits previously made pursuant to such calls, does not exceed 1 per centum of the total amount of all withdrawable or repurchasable shares, investment certificates, and deposits in all insured institutions. For the purposes of this subsection, the total amounts hereinabove referred to shall be determined or estimated by such Board or in such manner as it may prescribe.

"'(2) The Corporation, in accordance with such regulations as it may prescribe, shall credit as of the close of each calendar year, to each deposit outstanding at such close, a return on the outstanding balance, as determined by the Corporation, of such deposit during such calendar year, at a rate equal to the average annual rate of return, as determined by the Corporation, to the Corporation during the year ending at the close of November 30 of such calendar year, on the investments held by the Corporation in obligations of, or guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

"'(3) The Corporation in its discretion may at any time repay all such deposits, or repay pro rata a portion of each of such deposits, in such manner and under such procedure as the Corporation may prescribe by regulation or otherwise. Any procedure for such pro rata repayment may provide for total repayment of any deposit, if total repayment of any and all deposits of equal or smaller amount is likewise provided for.

"'(4) The provisions of subsection (f) of this section and of the last sentence of subsection (e) of this section shall be applicable to deposits under this subsection, and for the purposes of this subsection the references in such subsection (f) and such last sentence to the prepayments and the pro rata shares therein mentioned shall be deemed instead to be references respectively to the deposits under this subsection and the pro rata shares of the holders thereof, and the references in such subsection (f) to that subsection (except the last such reference) and to subsection (d) of this section shall be deemed instead to be references to this subsection.'

"Federal Reserve Act

"Sec. 1111. Section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act is amended by striking out "eighteen months', wherever it appears in the third paragraph, and inserting in lieu thereof 'twenty-four months'.

"Repayment of certain planning grants

"Sec. 1112. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no advance made under section 501 of Public Law 458, Seventy-eighth Congress; Public Law 352, Eighty-first Congress; or section 702, Housing Act of 1954, Public Law 560, Eighty-third Congress, for the planning of any public works project shall be required to be repaid if construction of such project has been heretofore or is hereafter initiated as a result of a grant-in-aid made from an allocation made by the President under the Public Works Acceleration Act.

"Study concerning relief of homeowners in proximity to airports

"Sec. 1113. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall undertake a study to determine feasible methods of reducing the economic loss and hardship suffered by homeowners as the result of the depreciation in the value of their properties following the construction of airports in the vicinity of their homes, including a study of feasible methods of insulating such homes from the noise of aircraft. Findings and recommendations resulting from such study shall be reported to the President for transmission to the Congress at the earliest practicable date, but in no event later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
ABRAHAM MULTER,
WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
HENRY S. REUSS,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
PAUL A. FINO,
FLORENCE P. DWYER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN SPARKMAN,
PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
HARRISON WILLIAMS,
EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
JOHN G. TOWER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7984) to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference has agreed to a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. Except for technical, clarifying, and conforming changes, the following statement explains the differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference.

TITLE I—PROVISIONS FOR DISADVANTAGED PERSONS

Housing eligible for rent supplements on experimental basis

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill making rent supplements (subject to a limit of 10 percent of amounts appropriated) available to housing under the section 221(d)(3) below-market rate program (new units), the section 231 program of mortgage insurance for the elderly (new units and those not finally endorsed for insurance), and the section 202 program of direct loans for the elderly (existing and new units), on an experimental basis, for up to 20 percent of the dwelling units in any property.

The conference substitute conforms to the Senate provision but the 20-percent dwelling unit limitation is restricted to existing projects and, in addition, 50 percent of the funds for experimental projects is earmarked for newly constructed section 221(d)(3) below-market interest rate projects in order to assure the equitable allocation of funds as between these projects and projects designed to serve the elderly exclusively.

Operating costs limit

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill limiting the operating costs of any property aided under the rent supplement program to amounts for similar housing in the community. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Eligibility for rent supplements

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill making eligible for rent supplement payments those persons (meeting the income test) whose dwellings are extensively damaged or destroyed in a disaster area after April 1, 1965. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Below-market mortgages not yet endorsed for insurance

It is the intent of the committee that in cases where commitments have been issued at a higher rate of interest than 3 percent, and the mortgages have not been finally endorsed for insurance, the lower interest rate should be made available whenever practicable.

Low-rent housing in private accommodations

The House bill contained a provision not in the Senate amendment authorizing local housing authorities to use as low-rent housing up to 10 percent of the units in an existing privately owned structure, and to make annual contributions to the owner in amounts not exceeding the amounts that would be payable for units in a newly constructed low-rent project. Contracts with owners would be for 12 to 36 months, renewable. Tenants would be selected by owners, subject to the contracts between local authorities and PHA. Rentals would be determined under standards applicable to conventional public housing.

The conference substitute contains the House provision with an amendment stating that the provisions of the new program shall not apply to any locality unless the governing body of the locality has by resolution approved the application of such provisions to such locality.

Rehabilitation grants

The House bill contained a provision authorizing grants for the full cost of necessary repairs (up to $1,500) to homeowners in urban renewal areas with annual incomes of $2,000 or less; in the case of owners with larger incomes, grants would be limited to the portion of cost which cannot be financed without increasing housing expense to more than 25 percent of income.

The Senate amendment contained a similar provision except that the income limit for the full cost of repairs was $3,000. The conference substitute conforms to the Senate provision.

Direct loans for housing for the elderly or handicapped

The House bill removed the existing $350,000,000 ceiling and terminated the program on October 1, 1969. The Senate amendment simply increased the existing ceiling from $350,000,000 to $500,000,000. The conference substitute conforms to the Senate amendment.

Mortgage moratorium

The House bill contained a provision providing a moratorium of up to 3 years on payments under FHA or VA mortgages in the case of a mortgagor unemployed due to closing of a Federal installation. The Senate amendment contained the same provision except that the moratorium period is limited to 1 year. The conference substitute conforms to the Senate amendment.

TITLE II—FHA INSURANCE OPERATIONS

Land development mortgage insurance

The House bill authorized a maximum of $12,500,000 on the aggregate amount of outstanding mortgages involving a single land development undertaking. The Senate amendment provided a maximum of $10,000,000, and the conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Maximum mortgage term

The House bill limited the maturity of land development mortgages to 7 years. The Senate amendment contained a provision permitting a lower maturity (as determined by the Commissioner) to the extent a mortgage is secured by private water and sewer systems. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Water and sewer facilities

The House bill contained a provision requiring a public water and sewerage system after the land is developed under the new FHA program, except that if public ownership is found not feasible an adequately regulated private system may be approved upon assurances of eventual transfer to public ownership. The comparable provision in the Senate amendment permitted either a public system or an adequately regulated private one. The conference substitute conforms to the Senate amendment.

Downpayment for low-income housing demonstration homes

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill permitting a downpayment under section 203(b) to be made by a person other than the mortgagor on the purchase of a home under the low-income housing demonstration program. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Nondwelling facilities in urban renewal housing

The House bill contained a provision permitting nondwelling facilities to be included in a section 220 mortgage if the Commissioner finds that they contribute to the economic feasibility of the project. The Senate amendment contained a similar provision except that the Commissioner must find that the facilities are essential to the economic feasibility of the project and that the financing will not result in unfair disadvantage to other business enterprises in the vicinity.

The conference substitute conforms to the House language with respect to the finding that the facilities contribute to the economic feasibility of the project and requires the Commissioner to give due consideration to the possible effect of the project on other business enterprises in the community.

Home improvement loans in high-cost areas

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill authorizing an increase in the amount of loans under sections 220(h), 203(k), and 312 by up to 45 percent when cost levels so require. The conference substitute conforms to the Senate provision.

Mortgages for servicemen

The House bill contained a provision providing minimum downpayments under section 222 the same as the regular section 203(b) program (3 percent of the first $15,000 of value, 10 percent of the next $5,000, and 25 percent of all over $20,000). The Senate amendment contained a provision providing a minimum downpayment of 5 percent of the first $20,000 (or the amount under the sec. 203(b) program if less) plus 15 percent of all over $20,000.

The conference substitute provides a minimum downpayment of 3 percent on the first $15,000 of value, 10 percent on the next $5,000, and 15 percent on all over $20,000.

Optional cash payment of insurance benefits

The House bill contained a provision authorizing the FHA Commissioner in his discretion to pay benefits under any FHA program either in cash or in debentures, and authorized Treasury borrowing for cash payments as the Commissioner deems necessary. The Senate amendment contained the same provision except it did not authorize Treasury borrowing.

The Senate receded from its position and accepted the House provision which authorizes the Federal Housing Commissioner to borrow from the Treasury in connection with the making of optional cash payments of insurance benefits rather than the issuance of debentures. The conferees want to make clear that this Treasury borrowing authority is to be used prudently and only if receipts accruing to the insurance fund are inadequate to support continuation of payments in cash and only where such payments would represent a savings to the Government.

FHA loans for veterans

The House bill contained a provision authorizing section 203(b) mortgage insurance for veterans who have not received benefits under the VA program with no downpayment required on the first $20,000 and 15 percent on all above that amount. The term "veteran" was defined as a person who served in the Armed Forces and was not dishonorably discharged.

The Senate amendment contained a similar provision providing no downpayment on the first $15,000 of value, 10 percent between $15,000 and $20,000, and 15 percent of all over $20,000. The term "veteran" was defined as a person who served in the Armed Forces on or after September 16, 1940, for at least 90 days (or is certified by the Secretary of Defense as having performed extrahazardous service) and was not dishonorably discharged.

The conference substitute provides for no downpayment on the first $15,000 of value, 10 percent between $15,000 and $20,000, and 15 percent above $20,000. The definition of "veteran" is the same as the Senate provision except that the limiting eligibility date of September 16, 1940, is deleted.

Refinancing of housing for elderly projects

The House bill contained a provision permitting refinancing of housing projects for the elderly under FHA's section 231 program. The Senate amendment contained no similar provision and none is contained in the conference substitute.

Approval of technically suitable materials

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill directing the FHA Commissioner to adopt uniform procedure for acceptance of, and to accept, technically suitable materials and products to be used in structures approved for FHA insurance. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision but with an amendment making it clear that the decision that a material or product is technically suitable must still be subject to the financial decision of the Commissioner that it is within the scope of underwriting requirements for mortgage insurance and that he must find that the use of the material or product is consistent with "economic soundness" or "acceptable risk," as the case may be, under the several FHA programs.

The conference substitute language is not intended to lessen the responsibility of the Commissioner to approve products or materials which are shown by acceptable research, testing, or performance to be technically suitable. It should also be clear that if a material or product is shown to be technically suitable and widely accepted in housing financed by conventional mortgage lenders, as being economically sound, these facts should be persuasive upon the Commissioner that such material or product is an acceptable risk for FHA-financed housing.

The conferees expect both Committees on Banking and Currency to observe carefully the actions taken by the FHA Commissioner under the intent of this section and further expect that the FHA Commissioner will exercise extra effort to keep abreast of technological advances and the use of new products where suitable, and that he should bend every effort to minimize the long delays which have often been experienced before technically suitable materials are determined to be acceptable.

Water and sewer facilities

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill prohibiting FHA insurance or a VA loan for new housing which is not served by a public or adequate community water and sewerage system, if local officials certify that such a system is economically feasible. The conference substitute contains this provision.

Downpayment requirement under section 203(b)

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill reducing from 25 to 15 percent the required downpayment on that part of the value of insured property which exceeds $20,000. The conference substitute reduces the downpayment requirement to 20 percent of that part of the value in excess of $20,000.

TITLE III—URBAN RENEWAL

General neighborhood renewal plans

The House bill contained a provision permitting general neighborhood renewal plans to cover adjoining areas as well as the urban renewal area. The Senate amendment contained a similar provision but required that adjoining areas have "specially related problems." Also, the provision in the Senate amendment provided that all projects in the plan area need only be initiated in 8 years (rather than completed in 10 years). The conference substitute conforms to the Senate amendment.

Increase of nonresidential exception

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill increasing from 30 to 40 percent the existing exception to the "predominantly residential" requirement (but only with respect to the new capital grant authority provided by the bill). The conference substitute provides for an increase in the nonresidential exception to 35 percent, making it clear that the 35-percent factor applies only to the new money authorized in the bill. It also makes it clear that this is in addition to amounts previously available (and still unused) for such projects.

Projects financed on three-fourths grant basis

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill including as gross project costs for projects financed on a three-fourths basis certain expenses incurred for staff services in connection with code enforcement and voluntary rehabilitation programs. It also would have given credit for certain tax losses in case of projects financed on a three-fourths grant basis in the same way as such losses are now credited to projects on a two-thirds grant basis.

The conference substitute contains that part of the provision including expenses for staff services but deletes that part of the provision giving credit for certain tax losses.

Demolition of unsafe structures

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill authorizing grants (up to two-thirds of cost) to cities, other municipalities, and counties for the demolition of unsafe structures located in urban renewal areas or located in other areas which have workable programs and meet specified conditions. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Concentrated code enforcement program

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill authorizing grants (up to two-thirds of cost, or three-fourths of cost in the case of cities of less than 50,000) to cities, other municipalities, and counties for programs of concentrated code enforcement in deteriorated or deteriorating areas (rather than only in urban renewal project areas as in existing law). These programs may include the provision and repair of specified public improvements. The locality would be required to maintain its own code enforcement expenditures at normal levels and to have a satisfactory public improvements program. FHA section 220 housing and rehabilitation loans under section 312 of the 1964 act, would be available in these areas. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Rehabilitation loan program

The House bill contained a provision eliminating the present $50,000,000 ceiling on the rehabilitation loan authorization under section 312 of the 1964 act, and terminating the program October 1, 1969. The Senate amendment contained a provision substituting a $100,000,000 per year ceiling for the existing total $50,000,000 ceiling and terminating the program October 1, 1969.

The conference substitute conforms to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill making rehabilitation loans available where the funds needed are not available on "comparable" (rather than "reasonable") terms and conditions and making the revolving fund available for loan servicing expenses (including those incurred by FNMA or other agencies). The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Workable program requirement and Indian tribes

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill providing that the workable program requirement shall be applicable to any Indian tribe, band, or nation only to the extent it has legal jurisdiction and power to carry out the requirement. The conference substitute conforms to the Senate amendment.

Lease guarantees for small business concerns

The House bill contained a provision amending the Small Business Act to authorize SBA to insure the lessor of property to a small business concern displaced by urban renewal against losses resulting from concern's failure to perform the lease. The maximum term of the lease would have been 10 years. The bill would have established an insurance fund with initial capital of $5,000,000 from SBA's revolving fund. A maximum insurance premium of 1 percent of annual rental payments was authorized.

The Senate amendment contained a provision amending the Small Business Investment Act to authorize SBA to guarantee payment of rentals under leases entered into by small business concerns displaced by any Federal action and concerns eligible for loans under the Antipoverty Act. The SBA fee for the guarantee could not exceed 2½ percent of the minimum annual guaranteed rental. The amendment established a revolving fund with initial capital of $5,000,000 from SBA's general fund (and increased the authorization for the latter fund by an equal amount).

The conference substitute conforms to the Senate amendment.

Parking facilities

The House bill contained a provision providing that publicly owned parking facilities provided in redevelopment can be counted as local grants-in-aid under the urban renewal program only to the extent that the cost is not anticipated to be recovered from revenues. No comparable provision was contained in the Senate amendment and none is contained in the conference substitute.

Local grants-in-aid

The Senate amendment contained provisions not in the House bill relating to local grants-in-aid for specific urban renewal projects in Jasper, Ala., Joliet, Ill., New Brunswick, N.J., St. Louis, Mo., Norfolk, Va., Reno, Nev., Michigan City, Ind., and Chester, Pa. The conference substitute contains the Senate provisions.

The conferees were unanimous in their concern over the potential danger of amendments offered on the floor to provide special benefits to specific urban renewal projects. Such procedure does not give the committees sufficient opportunity to study the merits and implications of the proposals. In the future such proposals should be made to the committee early enough so that proper study can be made of each request. By so doing, the proponents of these amendments will protect themselves from the persuasive criticism that they have not been adequately studied and therefore should be rejected.

Waiver of prompt redevelopment requirement

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill waiving the prompt redevelopment requirement with respect to the sale for industrial purposes of certain land included in an urban renewal project in Texarkana, Ark. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Urban renewal in the District of Columbia

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill amending the Housing Act of 1954 to authorize the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency to undertake nonresidential projects as contemplated by title I of the 1949 act. The conference substitute conforms to the Senate amendment.

Historic structures

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill authorizing an urban renewal project to include the cost of relocating historic structures within the area of the project. It is the understanding of the conferees that this provision, which is included in the conference substitute, is meant to apply only to the costs of moving such structures and not to their acquisition or renovation.

TITLE IV—COMPENSATION OF CONDEMNEES

The House bill contained provisions not in the Senate amendment establishing a uniform Federal land acquisition policy for real property taken under certain federally assisted housing and urban development programs. Continued Federal assistance under these programs was conditioned on certain specified standards of fair treatment for owners whose property is taken by eminent domain. The conference substitute contains the House provisions with amendments (1) adding the urban mass transit program and the new community facilities programs authorized by title VII to the federally assisted programs to which the new provisions would apply, and eliminating the college housing and housing for the elderly programs (because condemnation of property in these programs is so seldom used); and (2) limiting the specified standards under which Federal assistance would be conditioned. Under the standards specified in the conference substitute, every reasonable effort would have to be made to acquire the property by negotiated purchase; no owner could be required to surrender possession of his property before being paid the purchase price agreed to by negotiation, or 75 percent of the appraised value of the property if only the purchase price is in dispute; and the occupant of the property could not be required to surrender possession without 90 days' written notice.

The House bill also broadened and increased the amount of the relocation payments authorized to be paid under certain federally assisted housing and urban development programs and extended these payments to additional federally assisted housing and urban development programs. The conference substitute contains the House provisions with technical and conforming changes.

TITLE V—LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

Equivalent elimination

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill permitting PHA to accept local certification that there has been equivalent elimination of slum housing. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Reallocation of units

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill permitting PHA (subject to contractual obligations) to reallocate units not under construction within 5 years from the date reserved, without regard to the 15-percent State limit. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Sale of federally owned projects

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill permitting the PHA to sell a federally owned public housing project to a nonprofit local group (as well as to a local public housing agency), and requires that the sale of such a project be for continued use as low-rent housing. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Per room limitations

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill increasing the basic per room limit from $2,000 to $2,400 (from $3,000 to $3,500 in Alaska), and the special per room limit for the elderly from $3,000 to $3,500 (from $3,500 to $4,000 in Alaska). The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Public housing rental gap

The House bill contained a provision eliminating the requirement of 20-percent gap between upper rental limits for admission to public housing and lowest private rents. The provision in the Senate amendment did not eliminate the rental gap requirement but exempted from such requirement, as "displaced families," those whose dwellings are extensively damaged or destroyed in disaster areas after April 1, 1965. The conference substitute conforms to the Senate provision.

Purchase by tenants

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill permitting tenants to purchase public housing units (in the case of units which are detached, semidetached, or row housing) on specified terms and conditions. The conference substitute permits such a purchase only in the case of detached and semidetached housing.

TITLE VI—COLLEGE HOUSING

Eligible institutions

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill making it clear that new colleges are eligible for loans upon providing assurances that they will offer the requisite degree within a reasonable time. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Vocational institutions

The Senate amendment contains a provision not in the House bill making a public educational institution offering technical or vocational instruction eligible for college housing loans, if it is administered by an accredited college or university and provides housing for all or part of its students. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Parking facilities

The House bill contained a provision making parking facilities for faculty and students eligible for loans. No similar provision was contained in the Senate amendment and none is contained in the conference substitute.

Cosignature of note

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill permitting waiver of cosignature of the note by an educational institution in the case of a student cooperative when State law prohibits the institution from cosigning the note. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

TITLE VII—COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Grants for basic water and sewer facilities

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill authorizing grants up to 90 percent for a sewer facility in the case of a small community where no such facility exists and unemployment is high. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

The Senate amendment also contained a provision not in the House bill specifying that grants for sewers cannot include "treatment works" which are eligible for assistance under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. The conference substitute conforms to the Senate amendment.

Neighborhood facilities

The provisions in the House bill and the Senate amendment authorizing grants for neighborhood facilities were identical, except that the Senate amendment authorized a local public body receiving such a grant to utilize a nonprofit organization to provide the facilities if the local public body maintains continuing control. The conference substitute conforms to the Senate provision.

Advance acquisition of land

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill authorizing grants to local public bodies and agencies to assist in the acquisition of land for future construction of public works or facilities. The maximum grant would be determined by aggregate interest charges over a 5-year period. The grantee must initiate construction within 5 years or may be required to repay grant. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Authorization of appropriations

The House bill contained a provision authorizing appropriations without dollar amount for the new programs of grants for water and sewer facilities and neighborhood centers and terminating the programs on October 1, 1969. The Senate amendment authorized appropriations as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal years			
	1966	1967	1968	1969
For water and sewer grants	$100	$200	$200	$200
For neighborhood facilities	50	50	50	50
For advance land acquisition	25	25	25	25

NOTE.—Amounts authorized for any year remain available to June 30, 1969.

The conference substitute conforms to the Senate provision except that the authorization for water and sewer grants in 1966 is increased to $200,000,000.

TITLE VIII—FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

FNMA special assistance authority

Both the Senate amendment and the House bill contained a provision increasing FNMA's special assistance authority by a total of $1,625,000,000 over a 4-year period and transferring certain unused amounts available for title VIII housing. The provision in the House bill also transferred the amount (approximately $59,000,000) reserved for section 809 military, NASA, or AEC housing; no similar provision is contained in the Senate amendment and none is contained in the conference substitute.

Mortgage amount for below-market mortgages

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill excepting section 221(d)(3) below-market mortgages from the $17,500 per unit limit on purchasable mortgages under FNMA's special assistance authority. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision with an amendment authorizing the exemption only in cases where local tax abatement is granted in an amount sufficient to keep rentals at the level where they would be if the mortgage amount did not exceed $17,500 per dwelling unit.

Mortgages held by Federal instrumentalities

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill authorizing FNMA to purchase mortgages covering residential property offered by other Federal agencies and other obligations offered by HHFA. It also authorized FNMA in its fiduciary capacity to deal in any HHFA obligations. The conference substitute conforms to the Senate amendment.

TITLE IX—OPEN SPACE LAND AND URBAN BEAUTIFICATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Increased grant level

The House bill contained a provision increasing the maximum grant under the open space program from 20 to 30 percent of cost (and from 30 to 40 percent where applicant exercises open space responsibility for all or a substantial portion of the urban area). The provision in the Senate amendment increased the maximum grant for open space projects to 50 percent of cost and the conference substitute conforms to the Senate amendment.

Grant authorization

The Senate amendment contained a provision increasing the existing authorization for grants under the open space and urban beautification program from the present $75,000,000 to $310,000,000 and limiting the share of these funds which can be used for the new open space program in built-up areas to $64,000,000 and the amount for the new program of urban beautification to $36,000,000. The House bill would have authorized appropriations without dollar limit for this program. The conference report conforms to the Senate provisions.

Development grants for open space uses

The Senate amendment contained a provision, not in the House bill, authorizing grants to assist development, for open space uses (i.e., use for park and recreational purposes, conservation, or historic or scenic purposes), of land acquired with open space grant assistance. The conference substitute conforms to the Senate amendment.

Open space land in built-up areas

The House bill contained a provision authorizing grants up to $500,000 per project or 40 percent of cost, whichever is less, to assist in providing open space land in built-up urban areas. The Senate amendment contained a provision providing for grants up to 50 percent of cost without dollar limit on individual projects. The conference substitute conforms to the Senate provision.

Urban beautification and improvement

The House bill contained a provision authorizing grants up to 40 percent of a community's increased expenditures for urban beautification and improvement, except that up to $5,000,000 can be used in making 100-percent grants for demonstrations. The Senate amendment contained a similar provision except that the grant limit would be 50 percent for the basic grants and 66⅔ percent for demonstration grants. The conference substitute conforms to the Senate amendment with respect to the 50 percent maximum for basic grants, but in the case of demonstration grants the maximum is 90 percent.

Open space planning

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill, permitting grants to be made only if needed for a unified or officially coordinated open space land program to be carried out as part of comprehensive planning for the area (existing law requires only that there be comprehensive planning to which the proposed land use is important). The conference substitute conforms to the Senate amendment.

Use of funds for studies

The House bill contained a provision permitting up to $100,000 a year of grant funds to be used for studies and publications, while under the Senate amendment these studies would be limited to $50,000 a year. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

TITLE X—RURAL HOUSING

Insurance of rural housing loans

The House bill contained a provision, not in the Senate amendment, requiring a minimum period of 5 years from the date of the note before the insured holder could require the Secretary to repurchase the insured loan under a repurchase agreement. There was no similar provision in the Senate amendment and none is contained in the conference substitute.

The House bill contained provisions, not in the Senate amendment, authorizing the sale of insured loans at market prices, authorizing use of insurance fund to pay fees and charges in connection with such sales, requiring that reimbursement of the insurance fund for the amount of losses from sales at less than par plus related fees and charges paid be made by annual appropriation and prohibiting borrowing from the Treasury to make such reimbursement. There were no similar provisions in the Senate amendment and none are contained in the conference substitute. It is the view of the conferees that by exercise of the authority to use repurchase agreements with minimum periods fixed by the Secretary in accordance with prevailing market conditions, the Secretary will be able to sell the insured loans without loss, and that sales at a loss should not be made.

Interest on Treasury borrowing

The House bill contained a formula for computing interest on loan funds borrowed from the Treasury based on current market yields of Treasury securities while the Senate formula was based on the rate of interest actually paid by the Treasury. The conference substitute contains the Senate formula.

Payment of interest to Treasury

The House bill contained a provision requiring the Secretary to pay interest on future appropriations for making rural housing loans. The Senate amendment contained no similar provision and none is contained in the conference substitute.

Definition of rural area

The House bill contained a provision defining a rural area as a place with a population of 5,500 or less which is not a part of or associated with an urban area. There was no similar provision in the Senate amendment. The conference substitute defines a rural area as a place which is not part of or associated with an urban area, and which (1) has a population not in excess of 2,500, or (2) has a population between 2,500 and 5,500 if it is rural in character. While emphasizing that a place with a population in excess of 2,500 but not in excess of 5,500 must be rural in character, the conferees do not intend to suggest any change in the present administrative rules for determining whether a place with a population of 2,500 or less is a rural area.

TITLE XI—MISCELLANEOUS

Studies of housing programs

The Senate amendment included provisions not in the House bill requiring special reports on the rent supplement program public housing, FHA land insurance, urban renewal, community facilities, and the open-space and urban beautification program. In lieu of these, the conference substitute amended section 802 of the Housing Act of 1954, which requires the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make annual reports on all its programs and operations, to accomplish the purpose of the Senate provisions. It is the understanding of the conferees that HHFA and its constituent agencies should give special attention in its annual report to the new programs authorized by this act.

Urban planning grants

The House bill contained a provision authorizing appropriations as needed for the urban planning grant program and terminating the program on October 1, 1969. The Senate amendment simply raised the existing authorization from $105,000,000 to $230,000,000. In addition, the Senate amendment contained a provision permitting up to 5 percent of the funds appropriated to be used in developing and improving planning techniques, and also authorized grants to organizations of elected officials in metropolitan areas to assist in studies, collection of data, and development of plans and programs. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision with a modification.

The term "elected official" as contained in the original Senate text was changed to read "public official". While the amendment is directed at making eligible organizations of local elected officials, the term "public official" was required to make it clear that the Metropolitan Councils of Governments for Washington and certain other areas are eligible for these grants even though their members may not be elected. For example, the Washington Council has representatives from the Board of Commissioners of the Government of the District of Columbia. These Commissioners are not elected but are appointed by the President.

Federal-State training programs

The House bill contained a provision eliminating the ceiling on the authorization for appropriations for the Federal-State training program and terminating that program on October 1, 1969. The Senate amendment simply increased the authorization from the existing $10,000,000 limit to $30,000,000.

The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Public works planning advances

The House bill contained a provision removing the ceiling on the amount which can be appropriated for public works planning advances and terminated the program on October 1, 1969. The Senate amendment simply increased the authorization for appropriation from $20,000,000 to $70,000,000. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Low income housing demonstration program

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill increasing the authorization for low income housing demonstration grants from $10,000,000 to $15,000,000. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Public facility loans

The House bill contained a provision permitting public facility loans to nonprofit corporations to provide water or sewer facilities for smaller municipalities which are unable to provide them. The Senate amendment contained the same provision except it made it clear that rural areas were included. The conference substitute conforms to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill permitting public facility loans to communities where NASA installations are located without regard to population (the limitation in present law for such communities is 150,000). The conference substitute conforms to the Senate amendment.

Mass transportation act

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill repealing the requirement in the Urban Mass Transportation Act that facilities and equipment used under the program be U.S. manufactured. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Federal Reserve Act

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill which would have authorized national banks to purchase participations in loans secured by real estate and, in addition, would have increased the maximum maturity of industrial, commercial, and residential construction loans from 18 to 30 months. It was felt that further study of the authorization for the purchase of participations is needed, and this authority is not included in the conference substitute. It is the intention of the Committee on Banking and Currency to call hearings as soon as possible to study this proposal. The conference substitute does include a provision extending to 24 months the maximum maturity of industrial, commercial, and residential construction loans.

Savings and loan associations loans on leaseholds

The House bill contained a provision not in the Senate amendment authorizing savings and loan associations to make loans secured by leaseholds which extend at least 10 years beyond loan maturity in areas where a substantial part of residential land is available only on a leasehold basis.

In place of this the conference substitute amends existing law to permit savings and loan associations generally to make loans on leaseholds which extend or are renewable for at least 10 years beyond the loan maturity. (Present law requires 15 years.) It is the intention of the conferees that where the leasehold is renewable, precautions be taken that it be renewable under terms which do not adversely affect the mortgage security.

District of Columbia savings and loan associations

The House bill provided that associations in the District of Columbia shall have the same investment powers as Federal associations. No similar provision was contained in the Senate amendment and none is contained in the conference substitute.

Deposits in FSLIC

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill requiring insured institutions to make deposits in FSLIC as required by call of FHLBB. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Investments by Federal savings and loan associations

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill authorizing Federal associations to invest up to 1 percent of their assets in loans (for Latin American housing) guaranteed by AID under section 224 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. The conference substitute conforms to the Senate provision.

Proximity to airports

The Senate amendment contained a provision not in the House bill authorizing HHFA to study methods of reducing loss and hardship to homeowners whose property has been depreciated by the proximity of airports. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
HENRY S. REUSS,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
PAUL A. FINO,
FLORENCE P. DWYER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PATMAN (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that since this statement is published in the RECORD and available to every Member, further reading of it be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks and insert any germane extraneous matter on this conference report we are considering today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pride to call up the conference report on the housing bill, H.R. 7984. This conference report is the culmination of long months of hard work and close study on both sides of the Capitol. Our Housing Subcommittee held 2 weeks of public hearings shortly after the bill was submitted by the President and heard testimony representing every point of view. After the subcommittee reported to the full committee, we called 2 days of closed sessions at which administration witnesses and public interest representatives gave us the benefit of their comments, and every member of the full Committee on Banking and Currency had an opportunity to participate in the discussions, become fully informed on the bill, and contribute to the shaping of its final form. When the committee bill came to the floor, it was approved by a vote of 245 to 169, a substantial margin for a bill as broad as this. Subsequently, the Senate approved their amendment to the housing bill by a vote of 54 to 30 and we took the two versions to conference.

As always, there were strong feelings expressed on particular points by the conferees from both sides, and there were difficult issues to solve. The conference committee met in 3 days of long, hard sessions to work out these differences the last session lasted 7 hours. However, I believe that it is fair to say that we had relatively few fundamental issues to resolve; and, as a result, this conference report is very similar to the bill which passed the House on June 30 by a margin of 76 votes. I further believe that the work of the conferees has perfected the legislation so that the margin of approval should be even larger on the conference report. Yesterday, the Senate approved the conference report by a voice vote. Therefore, the only question before the House today is to vote the conference report up or down, and I am confident that it will be accepted.

It is essential that we approve this conference report because a number of our basic programs in the field of housing, home ownership, and community development have exhausted the authorizations provided in existing law or are rapidly approaching expiration dates. In particular, there is an urgent need to approve this conference report to extend the FHA program of mortgage insurance which is vital to a healthy homebuilding industry and which has done so much to encourage home ownership. If we fail to approve this legislation, the FHA program will expire on September 30. I do not need to describe the disruption of the homebuilding industry and the problems of mortgage lenders if this were to happen.

Mr. Speaker, the House bill and the Senate amendment had some 80 points of difference which were in conference. I would like to explain to the House the action of the conference on the major differences.

The President's rent supplement program which was the main point of controversy in both Houses was basically not in conference because both the House bill and the Senate amendment were identical on most points. The House conferees insisted that the Senate accept our amendment emphasizing the potential for eventual homeownership under this program for those whose incomes rise enough to permit them to afford the housing without Government aid. For our part we accepted, after careful consideration, this provision which is strongly supported by the National Association of Home Builders and groups interested in housing for the elderly. This provision would authorize the experimental use of one-tenth of the rent supplement funds in connection with new and existing housing for the elderly and new housing financed with below-market interest rate loans under FHA section 221(d)(3). The Committee on Banking and Currency will be watching the whole rent supplement program carefully with particular attention to this experimental aspect to evaluate its progress in meeting the pressing housing problems of our low-income families.

Mr. Speaker, there were two other important sections in title I which were in conference. On the first one, authorization for FNMA to pool below-market interest rate mortgages in order to obtain private financing for a substantial part of this program, the Senate receded and accepted our provision. The second item, low-rent housing in private accommodations, is also contained in the conference report. This provision will make it possible for local public housing authorities to take advantage of existing vacancies in the private housing supply by enabling them to lease such units on a short-term basis when they are offered for this purpose by the owner. The Senate accepted this provision with an amendment requiring local government approval of the housing authorities' action.

The House and Senate versions of the new program of FHA land insurance for subdivisions were very close together, but there was one disagreement in which many Members of the House had expressed an interest. That was the section dealing with the role of private water and sewer companies. I believe some of the concern expressed by private water companies over the House provision magnified the question out of proportion in view of the action by both the bodies of the Congress eliminating the Administration's request for land insurance for whole new communities; but, in any case, the House conferees accepted the Senate language on this point which was preferred by private water companies.

I am very pleased to report to the House that the conference substitute provides no-downpayment loans for our veterans, reduces downpayments for those still in the service, and reduces the downpayments under FHA's section 203 homeownership program generally. Under the provisions adopted in conference veterans can obtain FHA financing with no downpayment on loans up to $15,000, while for the more expensive homes they would be required to pay only 10 percent of value between $15,000 and $20,000 and 15 percent of any amount above $20,000. The requirements for servicemen would be the same, except that they would be required to pay 3 percent down on the first $15,000. For FHA borrowers generally the requirement of 3 percent down on the first $15,000 and 10 percent down on the next $5,000 remains the same as they are in existing law, but the amount required on value above $20,000 is cut from 25 percent to 20 percent. This liberalization of FHA terms should help to encourage home ownership and enable families to acquire homes better suited to their needs and, very importantly, it should stimulate homebuilding which is the one major sector of our economy that fails to show a gain over year-ago levels.

Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House have expressed interest in a provision contained in the Senate amendment but not included in the House bill requiring the FHA Commissioner to accept any technically suitable material for use in FHA financed housing. While the Senate conferees fought hard for their provision, our side felt deep concern at the language in the Senate amendment which would have tied the FHA Commissioner's hands and allowed him little, if any, discretionary judgment. In place of that language the conference adopted a modified version which was drafted with the help of the Housing Agency. This compromise restores a large measure of discretionary control to the Commissioner but, at the same time, strongly encourages him to accept any technically suitable materials and products which can be shown to be generally acceptable to conventional mortgage lenders.

The Senate amendment had a provision in the urban renewal title which would have increased from 30 percent to 40 percent the share of the new grant authorization which could be used for nonresidential projects. Strong feelings were expressed on both sides on this difference and the conferees reached a compromise at a 35 percent figure.

The Senate amendment also contained two related urban renewal provisions which appear to have general support. These called for assistance under the program for the demolition of unsound structures and for an expanded program of code enforcement. Our committee is generally sympathetic with the objectives of these provisions and the House conferees accepted them.

The House bill would have sharply restricted the amount of credit which a city could receive under the urban renewal program for parking facilities. On this point the Senate was adamant and I know that many Members of the House shared their concern over the possible effect of this on the urban renewal program. In view of this the House conferees receded and the provision is not in the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, one of the sharpest points of controversy in the entire conference was the debate over provisions relating to specific local grants-in-aid under the urban renewal program. This section alone added a full day to the conference and came very close to resulting in a complete deadlock. The most serious problem involved those amendments which had been adopted on the floor by each body and which required lengthy explanation and reports from the Housing Agency before the conferees were in a position to judge them. I would like to call the attention of all of the Members of the House to the comments in the statement of managers, on page 69 of the conference report, expressing the unanimous concern of the conferees over this procedure. While ultimately we accepted these provisions, such a procedure does not allow adequate attention by the committees and sufficient knowledge for evaluation. All members should be put on notice that if they wish to obtain such provisions in the future, they should be brought to the attention of the committee at the time hearings are held to allow full study or should be made on the subject of private bills. We cannot allow a conference on an entire housing bill to become deadlocked over provisions like these.

Mr. Speaker, one other point of strong controversy was on a provision in the House bill limiting the interest rate on college housing loans to 3 percent. In my opinion, this is most important if we are to enable our institutions of higher learning to cope with their rapidly rising enrollments. Without this provision the interest rate would go to 4 percent largely nullifying the benefits of Federal loans under this widely supported program. It was only with great reluctance that the Senate conferees accepted the House provision.

Another disagreement between the House bill and the Senate amendment which touched on a number of our housing programs was the question of additional atuhorization. The House bill contained the administration recommendations for open-end authorizations while the Senate amendment imposed dollar ceilings. The programs affected were housing for the elderly, rehabilitation loans, community facilities grants, the open-space program, urban planning grants, the Federal-State training program, and public works planning advances. After long and thorough debate and vigorous insistence by the Senate conferees on their provision, the House conferees accepted the Senate ceilings which appear to be generally in line with the needs of these programs over the 4-year period covered by the bill.

In the last title of the bill there were two main points of disagreement. The House bill included a provision urgently wanted by the savings and loan associations to permit them to make loans on property secured by leaseholds extending at least 10 years beyond the loan maturity in place of the requirement in existing law of a 15-year period. I am pleased to report that we were able to obtain the agreement of the Senate conferees at this point. The other difference in title XI was a provision in the Senate amendment authorizing national banks to purchase participations in loans secured by real estate and jumping the maximum maturity of construction loans from 18 months to 30 months. In the debate on the provision affecting purchase of participations, I believe it became evident that the conferees needed additional facts and consideration since our side had never held hearings on this point and that provision was omitted from the conference report. In the case of construction loans, the conferees accepted a compromise extending maturities only to 24 months.

Mr. Speaker, I have discussed the main actions of the conferees and, of course, all of the differences between the House bill and the conference report are set forth in the statement of managers which was filed with the conference report last Friday and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day. This conference report is similar to the House-approved bill in all major points and includes a number of modifications which I am sure have the support of most Members of the House. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the conference report and make these important improvements in our housing programs and the vital extensions of authorizations for programs such as FHA mortgage insurance which have reached or are fast approaching the limits set in existing law.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. This last item to which the gentleman referred is of great interest to me. I come from a lumber-producing area where the establishment of uniform grades and standards for lumber is of great importance to us.

I was concerned when I read the Senate language that it would destroy the traditional role of the American Lumber Standards Committee in setting up the standards and grades for lumber and lumber products in FHA approved housing.

As I read the conference committee report, I am of the opinion that the recommended language now does not destroy this role of the American Lumber Standards Commitee.

Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. PATMAN. I believe the gentleman is correct. May I invite the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Senate committee amendment went rather far—we thought it went too far. While we believed in using any suitable material in home construction that is good, we realized that housing contracts are insured for up to 30, 35, and 40 years.

Material that has lasted 5 or 10 years may not last 35 or 40 years; therefore, we changed the language to read that any material that is accepted in conventional financing for home building should be considered by the Commissioner. This fact should be persuasive

to the Commissioner. Yet that language is not in there, but having written that particular part, I had in mind "persuasive" but not "conclusive." It is still up to the Commissioner to decide, because it is his responsibility. I believe that conforms to the statement expressed by the gentleman.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. I think it does, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I have one question to ask the distinguished gentleman:

In view of the provisions in here for rent or ownership of homes for people displaced by the closing of a Federal installation, or for many other reasons under title I or other titles, either in the original bill or conference report; my question is: Is there any relief for elderly people, people handicapped, or otherwise, who are displaced by reason of land acquisition or condemnation by the right of eminent domain for big dam impoundments, Corps of Engineers, and Air Force missile sites, etc.?

Mr. PATMAN. I think it would include them. I believe it would. You will find it contained in title 4 of the bill entitled "Compensation of Condemnees."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the proudest moments in my life. As the Members of the House know, this is the first year that I have been privileged to be chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing. I want to express my gratitude to the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], and to all members of the Housing Subcommittee, particularly our ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL]. Their hard work and sincere constructive efforts have helped us to shape a sound and forward-looking housing bill which marks a major forward step in our efforts to improve our communities and the housing conditions of our people. While those who oppose certain sections of the housing bill fought hard and earnestly for their viewpoints—and the conference report now before us reflects a number of modifications made to accommodate their views—I believe the important fact to be kept in mind is that the House approved the bill by a 76 vote margin on June 30. The bill now before us is essentially that same bill.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is a great victory for President Johnson and will give him an important set of tools to help us in our march toward achieving the goals of the Great Society. The bill is truly a landmark bill which can proudly stand in prominence with the other great housing bills in our history, the National Housing Act of 1934, the Housing Act of 1937, the Housing Act of 1949, and the Housing Act of 1961.

The bill's combination of adequate authorizations to continue existing programs and the new programs which it authorizes should give a powerful boost in our constant efforts to achieve the goal of a decent home for every American family and to improve the environment, the health, and the economic strength of the cities and towns of our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, there is another extremely important aspect of this great housing bill which I do not think has received enough emphasis. Its many features will provide an important stimulus to homebuilding, to urban renewal programs in our cities and towns, and to the construction of vitally needed community facilities. All of these should have a most beneficial effect upon our economy, and with the additional jobs it will create it will help us to lower the ranks of the unemployed and help us toward our ultimate goal of full employment so that all Americans can enjoy the fruits of our great and affluent society.

Our distinguished chairman has explained the major differences between the original housing bill and the conference report. I would like to comment further on some of the important provisions of the bill, which were not changed in conference.

Mr. Speaker, the bill of course contains the new rent supplement program recommended by the President which has such great potential in meeting the still unsolved problem of providing housing for our low-income families. The new rent supplement program will unleash the resources of private industry and private capital to provide homes for hundreds of thousands of our disadvantaged low-income families who are either elderly or handicapped, displaced by public programs, living in slums, or victims of natural disasters.

Those who were fearful that the new rent supplement program would be competitive with or replace the low-rent public housing program need have no fear. The bill before us authorizes 60,000 additional low-rent public housing units for each of the next 4 years. This is a substantial increase over the annual rate of 35,000 units which was the most we were able to achieve in recent years. In addition, the bill will permit us to make greater use of vacant existing dwellings for public housing so that we can furnish immediate housing aid to many low-income families, particularly families with large numbers of children.

I am particularly pleased that we were successful in persuading the distinguished conferees of the other body to accept Mr. WIDNALL's new rent certificate program. This program would authorize local housing authorities to use low-rent housing in existing privately owned structures and the local housing authority would pay to the landlord the difference between the economic rental and the rent which the low-income family can afford to pay. This is a promising new program and we are very hopeful that it will make an important contribution to our objective of providing decent housing for our lowest-income families.

I am also particularly pleased that the bill places great weight on meeting the housing problems of our senior citizens. The bill provides ample authorization to continue the successful direct loan program of housing for the elderly, and it provides that these loans shall be made at a maximum interest rate of 3 percent which will bring rents down within the economic reach of more of our elderly citizens. And I should like to point out that senior citizens of low income will be eligible for the new rent supplement program, and they will also be given special advantages in the low-rent public housing title of the bill. I think it is particularly fitting that we provide these very substantial housing aids to senior citizens at the same time that the Congress is sending to the President the great medicare bill which will at long last provide the hospital and medical attention most needed in the later years of life.

Veterans of our Armed Forces will be given special preference under the FHA program which is fitting as the benefits of the great GI home loan program are being phased out. Veterans will be able to purchase FHA homes up to $15,000 with no downpayment and with very modest downpayments in price ranges above $15,000.

The bill will continue and expand our great national effort to renew and rebuild our cities with the Federal aid provided under the urban renewal program. The bill also provides greatly liberalized relocation payments and other benefits to displaced families and businesses to minimize the inevitable hardship suffered by some as a result of these great improvement programs.

While the urban renewal program has proven its value in restoring the vitality of our towns and cities, none of us can ignore the painful personal problems of people who are displaced from their homes or places of business. Last year the Congress authorized payments of $1,500 to displaced small business concerns to compensate them at least partly for their loss and to help them get started in a new location. This bill raises that grant substantially to $2,500.

In the case of homeowners in urban renewal areas, this bill makes a major breakthrough, one which seems to be such plain commonsense that it is surprising it has eluded us this long. I refer to the President's proposal for grants up to $1,500 for homeowners in urban renewal areas who cannot afford the necessary repairs to bring their homes up to building code standards. Without this provision, many of our poorest families, many of them advanced in years, would have their homes condemned and taken away from them. When this happens there is already the cost to the Government of relocation benefits and possibly the cost of public housing, since these families have no place else to go. Instead of that, this bill authorizes the necessary aid to enable these families to improve their homes and remain in the neighborhood.

The bill will help us intensify the President's program to improve and beautify our cities and suburbs. It will help cities provide more parks and open-space land both in the central city and in the surrounding suburbs.

The gentleman from Texas has already spoken with justifiable pride about our success in persuading the Senate conferees to continue the college housing loan program with a maximum interest rate of 3 percent. Our institutions of higher learning are a priceless asset to our national welfare and security, and the bill will help these institutions provide the housing needed by our students and faculty.

The bill will also continue the below-market interest rate section 221(d)(3) program established in 1961 with a maximum interest rate of 3 percent. Under this program, which is now gathering momentum, nonprofit groups and cooperatives are able to supply decent housing at modest rentals for families of moderate income.

I am also very proud of the community facilities title of the bill. I urge my colleagues to look more closely at this title, because it has not received the attention it deserves. For the first time we are providing vitally needed Federal grant aid to our cities and towns to meet the grave problem of adequate water and sewer facilities. It is about time we came to grips with this problem and the $200 million in matching grants authorized annually over the next 4 years will be a powerful weapon to help our urban and suburban areas provide the water and sewer facilities they so desperately need.

As an adjunct to the antipoverty program the bill authorizes a new program of two-thirds grants to local public bodies to provide neighborhood facilities, including neighborhood community centers, youth centers, health stations, and other public buildings to provide health or recreational or similar social services. This new program is an important step forward in helping us combat the heavy costs of ill health and deprivation and in combating crime and juvenile delinquency.

Mr. Speaker, although I come from one of our great urban centers, I would like to mention with pride title 10 of our bill which continues and improves our programs to provide better housing in the rural areas of our Nation. The new program of insured housing loans under the Farmers Home Administration should greatly increase the availability of mortgage credit on reasonable terms in rural areas which are particularly handicapped by a shortage of such credit facilities. The problem of slum housing and the shortage of decent housing at modest prices and rentals is every bit as severe in rural and farm areas, and we believe the new rural housing programs in the bill will furnish much needed help.

Mr. Speaker, while there are many other provisions in this truly comprehensive bill, I think I have covered its main features. I am confident that a majority of our colleagues will join with us in passing this great forward-looking bill and sending it to the President for signature. I would ask those who might be on the margin of indecision to consider what the gentleman from Texas has said about the bill, what I have said, and what our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], the ranking minority member of the committee, will say in support of the bill. This bill should have the support of every Member on the grounds of compassion, on the grounds of commonsense, and on the grounds of concern for our general public welfare. It will provide decent housing for our disadvantaged poor. It will give decent shelter to our aging citizens of limited income. It will help us rebuild, restore, and revitalize our cities and towns from the smallest hamlet to the greatest metropolis. It will help us replace rural slum housing with decent housing. It will help us make our cities more healthful and beautiful places in which to live. It will stimulate our economy and provide jobs for our unfortunate unemployed. It will do all these things and many more. All of us who have a stake in our great country and in its future growth and betterment have no other choice than to support this great and vitally needed bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to cast their vote in the affirmative and make this bill a reality of our great legislative heritage.

ONE OF THE BEST HOUSING BILLS IN 11 YEARS

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support the conference report on the housing bill, and I am proud that I was accorded the great privilege of helping to work out its details during the 3 days of our conference meetings. This bill marks an important step forward toward the achievement of our goal, as a Nation, of a decent home and a suitable environment for every American family. It is one of the best housing bills to originate in the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency during the 11 years we have had such a subcommittee. For this, I congratulate our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT], and the chairman of the parent committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], both of whom contributed much to this legislation and to the success of the conference in reaching final agreement on significant new programs and ideas.

MOST BENEFICIARIES OF FEDERAL HOUSING AID PAY THEIR OWN WAY

Much as I have enjoyed serving on the Subcommittee on Housing during the entire period of its existence, I have nevertheless recognized the fact that the programs we provide for in our legislation are terribly complex and not easily understood or explained. Anyone who has ever purchased a residence for his family knows how complicated the process is of transferring real estate, or building a structure. In the legislation we consider in the subcommittee we are attacking the problems of housing millions of families. Most of the benefits of the legislation we recommend go to the private building industry—and this bill is no exception. About 95 percent of the families which benefit from our housing programs—and this would surprise most people, I am sure—are families which pay their own way and make their own way and need no Government handouts or charity. But without the FHA insured-loan program, and other programs which assure the provision of good housing for average-income and higher-income families, we would never have succeeded so dramatically in the private housing field, and I think every enterpriser and businessman in that field will acknowledge the truth of my statement.

NEW PROGRAMS TO MEET CHANGING NEEDS

But much more complex than the provisions for private housing assistance, through mortgage insurance or other aids, are the programs which remake the faces of our cities and towns; which bring nonprofit organizations into the challenging service of providing specialized housing for the elderly and for families which have incomes too high for public housing but not high enough for adequate private housing; and the new programs in this bill for the rehabilitation of older housing and the launching of a new type of special-help program for additional families in the income range of public housing.

Nowhere are the complexity of the legislation and the difficulty of its administration more clearly demonstrated than in the case of the urban renewal program. Back in 1949, when it was begun, it was thought of and referred to primarily as a slum clearance program—the focus being on the elimination of dreadful pockets of misery and urban decay which characterized much of our central city areas. Fifteen years later, we are still using this program to eliminate slums and blighted areas, but as many projects long in the planning and execution have neared completion, we have seen an entirely new and exciting dimension unfold—in the beautification of our cities, as well as in their transformation. Not every urban renewal project is a great architectural masterpiece, but on balance, the quality of architecture has been high and the opportunities for imagination and innovation have been tremendous. In my own city of St. Louis, we are thrilled and delighted with what has been done to transform warehouse and rundown industrial as well as slum areas into magnificant plazas of good housing and beautiful surroundings.

A SIGNIFICANT REDUCTION IN COSTS IN A ST. LOUIS PROJECT

I have just today received word from the Housing and Home Finance Agency of a most interesting development in connection with our big Mill Creek project in St. Louis—which shows it is even more successful from a financial standpoint than we had originally hoped. This will come as a further surprise to many people, including, I am sure, many of the Members here, but our Mill Creek project, I have just learned, has been so attractive to investors and developers, that land values have risen appreciably at the same time that costs have been reduced, so that the Federal Government will save more than 20 percent of the money it had previously intended to put into the project.

Instead of costing Uncle Sam $23,900,000, the project will—it is now estimated—cost the Federal Government $18,750,000. That is a very substantial reduction. Local costs of the project will also be reduced substantially, from $11,467,000 to $10,050,992. These savings reflect both higher prices received for land in the project, and lower costs in land acquisition, relocation, and demolition. It is a good record, and proves that costs do not have to go in one direction only—upward.

MAKING THE RENEWAL PROGRAM MORE HUMANE

This bill authorizes funds to carry the urban renewal program for the next 4 years, but perhaps more important, it includes provisions to make the program more humane and better suited to the needs of the people most directly affected.

The housing needs of families displaced by Government-aided programs—always a severe problem—will be eased by the nearly 400,000 new privately owned and managed units expected to be built under President Johnson's rent supplement proposal. The relocation needs will be further eased by the nearly quarter of a million low-rent public housing units also authorized by this bill—particularly in view of the improvements made in that program to permit utilization of existing housing.

Those whose homes or places of business are acquired under housing programs, such as urban renewal, will benefit from the new requirements in this legislation for relocation payments and for fair procedures to compensate condemnees.

ENABLING THE HOMEOWNER TO "STAY PUT" IN A RENEWAL AREA

In the long run, it may well prove to be that one of the most important provisions in this bill is the new authority for home repair grants for homeowners living in urban renewal areas to enable them to bring their houses up to code standards. These grants can cover the full cost of such repairs up to a maximum of $1,500, for families of lowest income. Until now, impoverished homeowners who could not afford to bring their housing up to standard usually had their homes condemned and they were evicted. Previous legislation had tried to meet this problem by providing relocation payments, and offering rehousing in public housing projects when units were available. This not only failed usually to satisfy the displaced homeowner but it carried a high cost in plain dollars and cents. Now, under this bill, we are offering direct aid so that we can accomplish the purposes of urban renewal by improving the units, but without the personal sacrifice and substantial public cost of displacing these people who now live in them, and who much prefer to stay.

To supplement these new rehabilitation grants, the conference bill also authorizes a fivefold increase in the authorization for the very promising program of 3 percent rehabilitation loans authorized by last year's housing act. These loans, available to improve homes and stores alike, reduce financing costs sharply and make it possible for businessmen and families in a great many cases to improve their property and thereby avoid eviction. The independent offices appropriations bill includes funds to put this program into effect, and I am hopeful that the bill which emerges from conference will carry enough money to give this loan program a meaningful start.

OF SPECIAL IMPORTANCE TO ELDERLY FAMILIES

These aids are intended to benefit all of those living in blighted areas where it is possible to save the structures, but they have a very special importance for our senior citizens. Elderly families and individuals account for a very high proportion of those living in neighborhoods which once were among the most pleasant in our cities but which, over the years—as the cities have grown and land use patterns have changed, have been left behind by progress, and have been allowed to deteriorate through no fault of the people who live there.

Where they fit into the city's plans for growth, such neighborhoods are potentially valuable assets, and can offer the advantages of living close to the heart of a city. I strongly believe in saving such areas. They should never be abandoned lightly. The aid provided by this bill will make it possible to renovate existing properties, restore neighborhoods to the high standards that they formerly knew, and let them serve the same people who have lived there for a long time and, in many cases, for all their lives. Moving them out in order to clear a site for new housing for others is often a cruel thing, although sometimes it is the only solution. But, where possible, rehabilitation of a neighborhood's soundly built existing housing for continued occupancy by present residents is a much better solution whenever it can be achieved and whenever the neighborhood lends itself to this kind of restoration from a practical standpoint.

HELPING SMALL BUSINESS

The bill also liberalizes the benefits available to displaced small business firms many of which are largely dependent on the established trade in their familiar neighborhoods to stay in business. Last year, in addition to moving expense allowances, we provided in the law for payments up to $1,500 to displaced small businesses to tide them over the interruption to business and to help them become established in new locations. This bill now raises that payment to $2,500; and I believe the increase, modest in terms of our overall program, will make the difference between survival and bankruptcy for many small establishments.

In addition, this bill authorizes an entirely new program of least guarantees for displaced small business which will help them compete successfully for good locations.

IN NO HOUSING ACT HAVE WE MADE MORE PROGRESS

Mr. Speaker, we cannot yet say that all of our problems are solved by H.R. 7984 or that the dynamic process of renewing our cities will not still have problems. But over the years we have made tremendous strides in the field of housing and in no single act have we done more to improve it than we are doing in this act. I urge all of my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the conference report that is being submitted to the House today. I would like to report, as the ranking House Repuplican on the conference, that there was very extensive discussion of differences between the House and Senate bills. There was also a fine spirit of compromise and cooperation in trying to advance the best interest of the country toward a sound housing program. I believe out of the final results we can achieve what has been a longtime goal—a decent housing and decent living environment for millions of our Americans.

I would like to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT], for his attitude right from the start on this housing legislation.

Contrary to the many times when you find yourself as a member of the minority in a situation where there is unwillingness to discuss minority proposals with respect to legislation, there was, with Congressman BARRETT, a complete open door for discussion, for valid argument, and in this particular case there was acceptance by the majority of many new programs that were being sponsored by the minority.

There was a spirit of cooperation and a willingness to advance the best interest of all our people, without partisanship.

At the same time, in the conference the chairman of our full committee argued vigorously for a number of the minority proposals which were in the bill, and really fought for the House version. As a result, such proposals are in the final bill.

We also had fine cooperation from the Senate side, encouraged by both majority and minority members. Senator SPARKMAN, Senator TOWER, and Senator MUSKIE worked hard with others on the Senate side to achieve the final report.

We in the minority are quite proud of the acceptance of the rent-certificate plan which had been proposed by us a year ago. This goes beyond what was sought through the rent-supplement plan, the much-debated issue before the House. The rent-certificate plan is important because it can provide now—not after building new accommodations, but now—the means of housing thousands of our low-income citizens with voluntary participation on the part of the property owner.

We are also proud of the acceptance of a new program in connection with condemnation proceedings. Those displaced from their housing as a result of clearance for urban renewal or other governmental housing projects will be able to obtain 75 percent of their potential award immediately rather than years later when the courts act. They will not have to suffer from the lack of funds as they attempt to relocate in new quarters.

There is a new FHA veterans housing proposal, which can prove to be one of the largest programs within this bill. There is a potential of 21 million homes. It will give entitlement to all veterans who have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable. I say it will be available to practically all veterans and those who have not used their previous GI entitlement, they may obtain homes with no downpayment up to $15,000, with a 10-percent downpayment for the amount between $15,000 and $20,000, and with a 15-percent downpayment from $20,000 to $30,000. This is extremely important, as the present VA program is being phased out. There are thousands and thousands, even millions of our veterans who have served and have served well, and some who are serving presently in the very dangerous areas of the world such as Vietnam, Santo Domingo, and other outposts, who have not been covered by our GI assistance programs. They deserve action now for their future.

There are also changes in the code enforcement part of the bill, which are wholesome, which can provide, I believe, better housing. These will provide better tools for the municipality to work with.

I am also pleased that there is a $400 million authorization for the rehabilitation and modernization loan program which was enacted a year ago. This will provide some very strong means within urban renewal areas to accomplish what is acknowledged to be necessary to truly obtain the promise of urban renewal. This has great potential, if wisely used by the Administrator.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I should like to direct a question to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT]. I commend him on his statement, but if this bill is to do all of these things for the great American workingman, why do you have section 1109? This is the "buy American" provision in the mass transit bill of 1965. It was in this bill when it passed the House.

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad that the gentleman brought up this question. This is not altogether "buy American." This is quite different from "buy American." This question involves private industry and the governmental position.

Let me point out to the gentleman that concrete and allied products imports in 1963 amounted to $13 million.

In the same year, we exported $72.1 million.

Mr. SAYLOR. The important thing is you have not answered my question. This bill takes out the "buy American" provision. The House receded. It was in the bill, and that was one of the reasons why you got the vote to pass the bill in the House, because it retained that provision.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. One of the reasons why this bill passed the House—because it had the "buy American" provision in it. When you went to conference the House receded without a debate.

Mr. BARRETT. If the gentleman will yield further so that I may answer more fully, I just want to point out to the gentleman that at all times we must use our own best judgment and change our minds when it is necessary in the interest of the people of the United States. I just read you this one group of imports and exports, concrete and allied products. Now, we have rails and truck materials where the United States imported in 1963 $1 million and the U.S. exports were $19.2 million. In office and computing equipment, in 1963 the U.S. imports were $93.9 million and the exports were $359.6 million.

Gentlemen, not wishing to take up the time of the House, this is a matter that runs this way consistently pertaining to all kinds of material. We have gained tremendously. This is not "buy American," but it is buy what a private enterprise thinks they should buy.

Let me give you what I think is one potent answer to your question. Let us say that the Baldwin Locomotive Works of the United States decided to buy a certain ball bearing which is better suited for their purpose. Your amendment would stop this industry from buying this type of material which would be beneficial to the transportation system of America.

Mr. SAYLOR. I am satisfied that would be because the men who make it in America make better ball bearings than are made anywhere else in the world. What you have done by your action is to place the American workingman in jeopardy and are threatening to reduce his living standard to that of our foreign competitors.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, there are two other programs I would like to comment on briefly. These are the college housing program and the elderly housing program. These have been highly successful with no defaults but both programs would have been phased out because of the rise in interest rates. The minority sponsored a realistic rate for these two programs, which was accepted in conference. This will mean that the nonprofit organizations and labor organizations, the churches and institutions who have sponsored housing for the elderly will be able to continue these worthwhile programs. It will mean also lower dormitory rents can be provided in the colleges and lower rents in elderly housing projects. I think these are very meaningful sections of the bill and we worked hard together in order to obtain approval in conference.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I just wanted to make an observation. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I tabulated the statements in the statement on the part of the managers of the House. It says it contains the Senate provision in 56 instances, I believe, on 12 pages, but not once does it say that the position of the House prevailed.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY].

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, when this bill originally came on for consideration in the House, debate was cut off after discussion of only one of its many titles, namely, the title dealing with subsidized rents. The way money is considered here in Washington, and as far as money is concerned, the rent subsidy title was one of the minor titles in the bill—it involves only a few hundred million dollars.

The other titles in the bill involve the spending of thousands of millions of dollars—$6 billion. Those titles received little or no attention, and included among them is the urban renewal title, calling for the spending of $3 billion. I wanted to talk about that title at the time, as did some of the other Members of the House, but we were not even allowed 30 seconds time; we felt that the House and its Members were entitled to know a little something about what they were being asked to vote for, but for some reason the managers of the bill preferred to keep the Members uninformed, and required them to vote blindly.

For a number of years, we have heard a great deal about images—a person's image—a program's image—a nation's image. I believe we should brush aside the images, and get down to the substance of things.

An attempt has been made to build an image for Federal urban renewal; it has been described as a program that will give everyone a fine house; that is the image picture painted for the uninformed. Let us look behind the image, to find the substance.

Several hundred thousand homes have been destroyed by the bulldozer, in the name of urban renewal; only 25,000 homes have been built to replace them—and this when we were already running short of places for people to live.

When we look behind the false image, we find that Federal urban renewal—we find that it is actually a reversion to the past—a turning-back of the clock to the 17th and 18th centuries when the reigning princes of a country controlled all the land, and gave the use of it to their favorite vassals. That is exactly what is happening under Federal urban renewal. The average homeowner can no longer call his home his own; the small businessman is helpless before the favored wealthy and powerful interests who covet his place of business for their own.

That brings us to the particular item in this conference report that I want to direct attention, and it is section 317 of the bill.

I have no interest in this matter, except my feeling and compassion for those average homeowners and small businessmen who are the victims of this wholly heartless piece of legislation.

I mentioned images; the desired image of a committee, of course, is that it is omnipotent, of all-encompassing knowledge and infallable wisdom. Does this great committee deserve that image? When this bill was introduced in the House, it contained section 317, purporting to authorize Federal urban renewal for commercial districts of the District of Columbia. The committee struck that section from the bill, and did not have any hearings on same, even though the affected businessmen, the intended victims of the section, sought to be heard by the subcommittee. They were positively denied the right to testify and be heard. When the House conferees voted 5 to 4 to agree with the Senate to reinsert section 317, they did it without benefit of any hearings, and without any knowledge of the effect of their action, and wholly disregarding the interests, well-being and property of their victims. The committee in the other body had no hearings on this section, either. It is no way legislative.

Admitting that the House of Lords has infinite wisdom, nevertheless I believe a committee of the House is stripping away its own desired image when it takes such wanton action as is displayed here.

When Congress enacted an urban renewal law for the District of Columbia, it excluded commercial sections; its purpose was to remove slums, and provide decent housing for the slum-dwellers. One hundred thirty million Federal tax dollars have been spent in the District, tearing down homes, and many thousands of people made homeless; yet to this date, not one low-rent or middle-income rent dwelling thas been built in any urban renewal area in the District of Columbia. Now, by section 317, it is proposed to spend additional hundreds of millions of dollars destroying the business and commercial areas of the city.

In the 88th Congress, the Banking and Currency Committee had a bill before it containing a similar provision to the present section 317; that committee acknowledged that such provision was not appropriate and out of place in a national housing bill, and so removed it. When the other body wrote it in, the House conferees faithfully stuck to the position rightfully taken, and refused to outrage common decency by rolling over and playing dead.

In this 89th Congress, the bill, as introduced, again contained the repugnant provision, which is an unwarranted invasion of the jurisdiction of a sister committee of the House. The chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency while this bill was still in committee, and advised such chairman, the venerable and able gentleman from Texas of the presumptious grab of jurisdiction. By agreement, the provision was amended out of the bill. It was not properly a part of the bill, and was, therefore, stricken.

Now, in the conference with the other body—and we must bear this in mind—section 317 was rewritten into the bill in the conference by a vote of 5 to 4 of the House conferees, as disclosed by two of those conferees who felt betrayed by this disregard of the results of the former conference with the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia. If the chairman of the House conferees had not voted for it, this section 317 would not be in the conference report today. By a tie vote it would have been defeated. So the small businessmen and the homeowners in the District of Columbia—the small businessmen who are going to the guillotine—the homeowners who are going to lose their homes in the District of Columbia, know that one man's vote did it—if the chairman had not voted, they would be safe.

My compassion for the weak and helpless victims of Federal urban renewal, whether homeowners or small businessmen, cause me to try to shield them, as much as I can, from the machinations of that agency without a heart. I wish all of the Members of the House could have heard the testimony and would read the records that were produced before my subcommittee about the lack of human feelings and the downright cruelty that was practiced on men, women, and children right here in the Nation's Capital, merely because their homes or businesses stood in the way of greedy landgrabbers, backed by the power of eminent domain in the hands of that agency without a heart.

Nobody else has listened to them; nobody else has even recognized the fact that there will be victims of this grandiose scheme to wipe out and rebuild almost all of downtown Washington; but my subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee has heard witnesses, and we heard, as well, the witnesses from the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, and from the little group which calls itself downtown progress, to see what they planned to do. We wanted to hear, and did hear, both sides.

My esteemed and well-beloved friend, the gentleman from Texas, has been many years building a reputation as a friend of small business. He could not have read any part of the hearing record of my subcommittee; if he had, he could not have possibly given the slightest thought or consideration to rewriting section 317 into this conference report now before us. It purports to apply to downtown Washington. Does my friend know there are 5,000 businesses in downtown Washington, and that the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency freely admitted, when before our subcommittee, that it is their intention to permanently do away with 2,200 of those businesses—completely and wholly put them out of business—because, in their high-handed, heartless way, they only want 3,000 businesses downtown?

Of the remaining 3,000 businesses, great numbers of them will be newcomers to the area, as very few, except the large and wealthy businesses, are permitted to remain in the commandeered area after it comes into the hands of the favorites of the planners.

This destruction of small business is not purely anticipatory. We can look to the past actions of this heartless agency. In the Southwest urban renewal project area here in the District of Columbia, 62 percent of the proprietorships were permanently put out of business by urban renewal; a few were permitted to remain, but most of the replacements were big and wealthy chains. And in the Nation as a whole, some 200,000 small businesses have been displaced, many of them permanently and totally destroyed.

In addition to the small businesses in the downtown area, according to the testimony brought before my subcommittee, produced from the mouths of the despoilers themselves, they intend to bulldoze the homes, and throw 19,000 more citizens of the District of Columbia out of those homes, adding them to the many thousands of families already ousted by urban renewal.

Urban renewal has taken the homes of more than a million people in our Nation; I am now just referring to its cruel plan for a portion of our Nation's Capital; this is what section 317 does to the District of Columbia. A person with any of the milk of human kindness could not do this to innocent people. I believe the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, to be a man of compassion. I cannot believe he would have done this had he known the facts. I beseech him to join me in correcting this gross injustice; tell the Members of the House that it was a lapse, caused by lack of knowledge of the true facts.

I believe this bill—I know this bill, for the sake of all that is right and good. should be recommitted to the conference committee, so that, at the very least, this section 317 can be deleted. This conference report should be voted down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. McMILLAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wonder if the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency could explain to me and to other Members of the House just how one committee can take legislation from another committee when the chairman objects.

Mr. DOWDY. Well, I was going to ask that question a while ago, except that the gentleman from Texas did not yield to me at that time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. We respected the gentleman's wishes on the House side but we have no control over what the other body does.

Mr. DOWDY. But the gentleman had control and it was his vote that controlled it in the conference, as far as the House conferees were concerned. The gentleman does not mean to say that the Members of the other body control, or controlled his vote in conference, or that of any of the others of the House conferees?

Mr. PATMAN. The conferees decided—it was a free conference—to act according to our own will and wishes, and our decision was to do what was done.

Mr. DOWDY. And that was a 5-to-4 vote of the House conferees?

Mr. PATMAN. It was the decision of the conference.

Mr. DOWDY. That was what the newspapers reported, and the same information given to us by House conferees on the day the action was taken.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, the newspapers fortunately, or unfortunately, were not there. It was a closed meeting. We have no transcript of the proceedings.

Mr. DOWDY. Well, that is correct, is it not?

Mr. PATMAN. It may not be incorrect—it was a closed meeting as you know, and no record was kept.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I feel somewhat out of place in talking on this particular piece of legislation. But I do want to comment upon the remarks which were made by my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY]. I have great respect for the gentleman and for him as chairman of a subcommittee on the District of Columbia. I know the gentleman has worked very diligently on this entire subject of urban renewal. In philosophy he and I simply do not see eye to eye on what has been accomplished, or obtained, under the urban renewal program.

I would like to cite here today the fact that last year some of us tried on several occasions to get legislation which would do exactly what this provision would provide to the full House, but because of the fact that we were being asked to swallow a lot of undesirable things, at least in my opinion, undesirable things—we were never able to obtain it.

Mr. Speaker, personally I support this provision in the conference report. I am very happy that the other body made it possible for us to enable the District of Columbia to do exactly what every other city in America is enabled to do under the basic law.

Mr. Speaker, it was only through a technical error in the basic act upon which the court ruled that caused the District of Columbia and the business people in nonresidential areas to be denied a right that every other city and every other State in our country has enjoyed.

Mr. Speaker, in this instance, we are simply correcting that error and I would hope, of course, that the House will support the conference report and support the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], in what I believe to be a very excellent report.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this is in some respects a very notable day in the history of the House of Representatives.

Less than an hour ago we passed the House-Senate conference report on medicare.

Now it appears that we are about to approve the conference report on the housing bill which includes among other things the very controversial rent supplement provision, or what some have rather charitably referred to as renticare.

Mr. Speaker, within an hour of one another, billions have been authorized for medicare and now billions will be authorized for renticare.

In short, I think it would be entirely fitting to designate this afternoon's labor or proceedings as "Fedicare Day."

In future years, Mr. Speaker, when the taxpayers come face to face with the billions of dollars required to support these two programs, among many others, perhaps we will similarly devote a few hours, I hope in the House as well as in the other body, to a measure that will then be called Debticare Day.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it must be noted that what has just been enumerated is the result of efforts on the part of those of us Who-do-care.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, section 1109 of the conference report would repeal a provision in the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 which requires that contractors, in providing mass transportation facilities or equipment financed with loan or grant assistance under that act "shall use only such manufactured articles as have been manufactured in the United States."

This repeal is an administration proposal. When the President signed the Urban Mass Transportation Act in 1964, he expressed hope that the provision would be repealed. He said it is incompatible with the trade policy this Nation is pursuing under the Trade Expansion Act.

The provision in the Urban Mass Transportation Act that would be repealed was put in the act as a result of an amendment offered on the House floor by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative SAYLOR, to provide more protection to American manufacturers and industrial interests.

The repealed provision, however, is against the overall national interest because it opens the way for other countries to retaliate against exports of this country.

The Department of State has had protests from Canada, Japan, and the European Economic Community concerning this provision. These countries did not refer to any specific projects, but protested on the ground that the provision was contrary to this country's commitments on trade with those countries.

The Department of State testified during hearings on the bill that unless repealed the provision could damage our foreign trade relations out of all proportion to the small volume of materials it might protect.

To demonstrate the accuracy of their statements, witnesses for the Department of State gave the following figures on imports and exports involved in the provision:

[In millions of dollars]

	U.S. imports, 1963	U.S. exports, 1963
Concrete and allied products	13.0	72.1
Rails and track material	1.0	19.2
Office and computing equipment	93.9	359.6
Assorted machinery	119.4	1,431.0
Electric power machinery	21.9	292.1
Electric distributing equipment	9.5	49.2
Telecommunications apparatus	211.5	472.6
Railway vehicles	1.6	139.5

The existing provision in the law is very undesirable because the United States cannot expect foreign countries to follow relatively liberal policies in trade, which we recommend, where we do not follow the same policies. We should not say "Do as we say, not as we do."

There is no need for the provision. U.S. industry competes very well on the open market with foreign industry—as demonstrated by the figures above.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I hope this body will quickly and resoundingly accept this conference report on H.R. 7984, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

The legislative subject of housing and its related activities vitally affects the welfare of the family which is the basic unit of all civilized society. Prudent and reasonable legislative advances in this special area should, therefore, be and they are of major concern to this House.

Over these past 15 years, the Congress has consistently and increasingly demonstrated its particular interest and fulfilled its legislative obligation in this field by the enactment of programs designed to sensibly increase the availability of decent housing for our lowest income families and to help our burdened cities cope with the vexing problems of urban and suburban expansion.

Today we have another opportunity to take several further steps forward, by adopting this conference report, in the improvement of our existing programs of housing, slum clearance, urban renewal, community facilities, college housing expansion, assistance to displaced businesses and many other related fields.

The conference report is the well balanced result of the long, hard, and exhaustive work and study, with noticeable and commendable bipartisan effort, of the parent House and Senate committees and the particular and exacting cooperative concentration and agreement of the conference committee. Their final recommendations to us very clearly represent a most conscientious and patriotic attempt to prudently and effectively deal with the complex subject of housing for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the past record shows that, in general, our housing programs have been well administered and they have been exceptionally free from misuse of funds or authority. The provisions contained in this report now before us surely seem essential, from every objective viewpoint, for the vigorous continuation of programs that are vital to our efforts and our obligation to encourage more wholesome living conditions in better housing for all of our people.

Because it appears obviously in full accord with our national traditions, because it is designed to reasonably meet a fundamental national need and because it unquestionably tends to promote the health, safety, and happiness of all our citizens, I hope this report will be overwhelmingly approved without further delay.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, section 317 of this bill amends section 316(2) of the Housing Act of 1954 by making the provisions thereof applicable in the District of Columbia so that the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency may undertake nonresidential projects in Washington, D.C.

That provision was in the Senate bill. It was not in the House bill.

It was not considered either in subcommittee, in full committee, or on the floor of the House, neither during debate nor under the 5-minute rule.

When consideration was sought in full committee, it was stated that the section had been eliminated from the House bill so that the matter could be studied at a later time.

This provision should not have been accepted by the House conferees.

The urban renewal program in the District of Columbia is the worst in the country. The District Committee has spent days studying the problem.

Several amendments to improve the District program had been unanimously approved by the District Committee which should be a part of any section extending this act to the District of Columbia. No opportunity is afforded us to accomplish that.

My objection to this provision being included in the bill goes beyond the matter of the Banking and Currency Committee's invasion of the jurisdiction of the District Committee. It goes to the dangerous procedure of legislating without hearings and without consideration. It is bad enough to have inadequate hearings. It is inexcusable to have no hearings.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 251, nays 168, answered "present" 2, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 204]

YEAS—251

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Beckworth
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider

Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Landrum
Leggett
Lindsay
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mathias
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.

Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schweiker
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Watkins
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wydler
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—168

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.

Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Baldwin
Baring
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry

Betts
Bolton
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson

Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Callaway
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Findley
Fisher
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser

Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Michel
Mize
Moore
Morris
Morton
Murray
Nelsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman

Pelly
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Quie
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schneebeli
Scott
Selden
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stanton
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT" 2

Scheuer
Todd

NOT VOTING—12

Battin
Blatnik
Bonner
Bow

Cahill
Colmer
Keogh
McVicker

Macdonald
Minshall
Toll
Watson

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Bonner against.

Mr. McVicker for, with Mr. Watson against.

Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Battin against.

Mr. Macdonald for, with Mr. Minshall against.

Mr. PIKE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. ROBERTS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify for the record that on rollcall No. 204 concerning H.R. 7984, I was present but did not vote because I felt I had a possible direct personal interest in the legislation, and under rule 8 of the House was precluded from voting thereon.

COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES EXTENSION AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. **HARRIS**. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 510) to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Akansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 676)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 510) to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Community Health Services Extension Amendments of 1965'.

"IMMUNIZATION PROGRAMS

"SEC. 2. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 317 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out 'and' before 'June 30, 1965' and by inserting 'and each of the next three fiscal years,' immediately after 'June 30, 1965,'. The second sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out 'the fiscal years ending June 30, 1963, and June 30, 1964' and inserting in lieu thereof 'any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1968'. The third sentence of such subsection is amended by striking 'and tetanus' and inserting in lieu thereof 'tetanus, and measles', and by striking out 'under the age of five years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'of preschool age'.

"(b) Subsection (a) of such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Such grants may also be used to pay similar costs in connection with immunization programs against any other disease of an infectious nature which the Surgeon General finds represents a major public health problem in terms of high mortality, morbidity, disability, or epidemic potential and to be susceptible of practical elimination as a public health problem through immunization with vaccines or other preventive agents which may become available in the future.'

"(c) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out 'of limited duration', by striking out 'against poliomyelitis, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus' and inserting in lieu thereof 'against the diseases referred to in subsection (a)', and by striking out 'who are under the age of five years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'of preschool age'.

"(d)(1) Such section is further amended by striking out 'intensive community vaccination' wherever it appears in subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting in lieu thereof 'immunization'.

"(2) The heading of such section is amended by striking out 'INTENSIVE VACCINATION' and inserting in lieu thereof 'IMMUNIZATION'.

"(e) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) is amended by inserting 'on the basis of estimates' after 'advance'; by striking out the comma after the word 'reimbursement' and inserting in lieu thereof '(with necessary adjustments on account of underpayments or overpayments),'.

"MIGRATORY WORKERS HEALTH SERVICES

"SEC. 3. (a) Section 310 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out 'for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, such sums, not to exceed $3,000,000 for any year, as may be necessary' and inserting in lieu thereof 'not to exceed $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968'.

"(b) Such section is further amended by inserting 'including necessary hospital care, and' immediately after 'agricultural migratory workers and their families,' in clause (1)(ii) of such section.

"GENERAL PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

"SEC. 4. (a) The first sentence of subsection (c) of section 314 of such Act is amended by striking out 'first five fiscal years ending after June 30, 1961' and inserting in lieu thereof 'first six fiscal years ending after June 30, 1961'.

"(b) The third sentence of subsection (c) of section 314 of such Act is amended by striking out '$2,500,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$5,000,000'.

"SPECIAL PROJECT GRANTS FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES

"SEC. 5. The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 316 of such Act is amended by striking out 'first five fiscal years ending after June 30, 1961' and inserting in lieu thereof 'first six fiscal years ending after June 30, 1961."

And the House agree to the same.

OREN HARRIS,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
PAUL G. ROGERS,
DAVID E. SATTERFIELD,
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,
ANCHER NELSEN,
TIM LEE CARTER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LISTER HILL,
RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
HARRISON WILLIAMS,
CLAIBORNE PELL,
EDWARD KENNEDY,
JACOB JAVITS,
GEORGE MURPHY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 510) to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The amendment of the House to the Senate bill was a substitute for the entire text of the Senate bill. The conference agreement is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate text. Except with respect to technical, clerical, clarifying, and conforming changes, the differences between the conference substitute and the House amendment are set forth below.

IMMUNIZATION PROGRAMS

The House amendment provided a 3-year, at an annual authorization ceiling of $11,000,000, extension of the existing programs of immunization against poliomyelitis, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus; and provided authority for immunization against measles and also against other diseases of an infectious nature which the Surgeon General finds represent a major public health problem in terms of high mortality, morbidity, disability, or epidemic potential and which he finds are suspectible of practical elimination as a public health problem through immunization with preventive agents which may become available in the future. The conference substitute is the same in this regard as the House amendment.

The Senate version of the bill permitted advance payments (with necessary adjustments on account of underpayments or overpayments) to the States and local agencies carrying out immunization programs, on the basis of estimates of the numbers of children eligible to participate in the program, and modified the necessity of keeping certain records. The House amendment contained no similar provision. The conference substitute permits advance payments on the basis of estimates (with necessary adjustments on account of underpayments or overpayments). The conference substitute does not include the provisions relating to modified recordkeeping; however, in view of the conference substitute and in view of the language already in the act which authorizes grants for costs "reasonably attributable" to protecting the eligible age group, the conferees expect that the Surgeon General will review with the States and local agencies affected methods for simplifying recordkeeping requirements under this program, so as to eliminate unnecessary paperwork.

DOMESTIC AGRICULTURAL MIGRATORY WORKERS HEALTH SERVICES

The Senate bill extended for 5 years the current program whereby health services are provided for domestic agricultural migratory workers, expanded the program to specifically include necessary hospital care, and authorized appropriations aggregating $44,000,000 over the 5-year period.

The House amendment provided a straight 3-year extension of the existing program, at the current $3,000,000-a-year authorization level.

The conference agreement limits the extension of the program to 3 years, and authorizes appropriations not to exceed $7,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, $8,000,000 for fiscal year 1967, and $9,000,000 for fiscal year 1968.

The conference agreement also includes specific authorization for necessary short-term hospital care for domestic agricultural migratory workers and their families which was in the Senate bill but not in the House amendment. It is the intention of the conferees that this authority for hospital care will be utilized on a limited basis, in accordance with priorities established by the Surgeon General on the basis of the demonstrated need of patients, and that reimbursement to hospitals for the care provided will be primarily directed to those hospitals on which a hardship would be worked if reimbursement were not provided.

SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Both the House amendment and the Senate bill provided a 1-year extension of the existing program of grants to the States for health services under section 314(c) of the Public Health Service Act, in order to provide time for a complete review of the program currently being conducted under this section.

The Senate bill increased the current $2,500,000 annual authorization for grants-in-aid to schools of public health to $5,000,000. The House amendment contained no similar provision.

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate version. The managers on the part of the House were impressed with the fact that programs established under the Graduate Public Health Training Amendments of 1964 have provided an increased burden on the schools of public health, and the increased authorization is necessary in order to meet the needs of the schools today. This does not, of course, increase the overall authorization under section 314(c), which remains at $50,000,000 a year.

Oren Harris,
Leo W. O'Brien,
Paul G. Rogers,
David E. Satterfield,
William L. Springer,
Ancher Nelsen,
Tim Lee Carter,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is on the extension of several very important and necessary programs. It will be recalled that the Congress in the past established a program of intensive community immunization programs, established a program of health services for domestic agricultural migratory workers, and established programs of grants for State health programs and special projects for community health services.

H.R. 2986, extending these programs, passed the House some time back by a vote of 347 yeas to no nays. We then substituted this text for the text of S. 510, a similar bill that had passed the other body. The amendment went to the other body and they agreed to a conference. We went to conference, and we have endeavored to resolve the differences. I feel that we have fairly well maintained the position of the House. There was some modification in the position of both Houses, and we bring to you today a unanimous conference report.

There are three questions involved. First is the immunization program. The House proposed to extend the present program for 3 years with an authorization of $11 million a year. The Senate included a 5-year program with $8 million a year. The conferees agreed on an extension of 3 years and $11 million, which was the same as the House had passed.

There was another difference in the immunization program between the House amendment and the Senate bill in that the Senate version permitted advance payments on the basis of estimates to the States and local agencies carrying out immunization programs, and modified certain record-keeping requirements. The House bill had no such provision.

We accepted the provision for advance payments on the basis of estimates, but the conference report does not include the provision relating to a modified record keeping. In view, however, of the conference substitute, and in view of the language already in the act which authorizes grants for costs reasonably attributable to the protection of the eligible age group, the conferees expect that the Surgeon General will review with the States and local agencies affected methods for simplifying record-keeping requirements. We think by this method it will work out satisfactorily and will alleviate unnecessary burdens.

The second difference between the two Houses in connection with this conference report has to do with the provision of health services for domestic agricultural migratory workers. The Senate bill extended the program for a period of 5 years and for this 5-year program, they would have authorized a total of $34 million. Since the House has established a pattern of authorizing these programs for 3-year periods in order that the Congress may at the end of that time review what the programs have accomplished, the House version provided a straight extension of 3 years with the current authorization of $3 million. In view, however, of the expected demand the conferees extended the program for 3 years as provided in the House bill and for fiscal year 1966, we authorized $7 million; $8 million for 1967 and for the third and final year this authorization of $9 million. These were the amounts authorized in the Senate version.

We believe that these amounts will be sufficient to provide the needs anticipated in this program for the next 3 years.

The conference agreement also includes specific authorization for necessary short-term hospital care for domestic agricultural workers and their families. This was a provision in the Senate bill, but it was not in the House amendment. It is the intention of the conferees that the authority for hospital care will be utilized on a limited basis and in accordance with the priorities established by the Surgeon General. We wanted to make this abundantly clear, and we feel that where emergencies arise they will be taken care of, and yet it will not put a burden upon local hospital facilities.

The third point of difference in this conference has to do with the schools of public health. Many of our colleagues here in the House were quite concerned about the lack of increased authorization for these schools when the bill was reported and considered in the House. We authorized for these 12 public health schools in the United States a straight extension of the existing $2½ million authorization. The Senate provided a $5 million authorization. In view of the fact that there are 12 of these schools and that they have increased their enrollment, and that we are establishing two additional schools of public health, the House conferees felt that the Senate authorization would be more justified and consequently we adopted the authorization included by the other body of $5 million.

I think many Members in the House will be gratified that the House conferees agreed to this provision of the Senate amendment. The conferees feel that this program is a very necessary program.

We feel that the conference agreement is a reasonable compromise, and, therefore, we urge the adoption of the report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Springer] such time as he may require.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, several programs of proven merit are included in this bill. The value of immunization programs is well enough known and needs no extensive justification at this time. Extension of the program to include measles has become feasible because of a breakthrough in scientific research which should make it possible to eradicate this common but dangerous disease, mostly in children. Because of the progress made in recent years in the means to vaccinate against diseases which killed or maimed large numbers within our population, it seems wise to leave the door open for prompt action in the event that other dramatic developments make new immunization programs practical. This bill does so.

The health of migratory workers poses acute problems for those communities to which they come for relatively short periods of time each year. Although there may not be one easy answer which would apply to each and every situation, we do know that the Nation must take cognizance of the problems. The provision of extra manpower for the affected health service agencies has proved to be most useful within the communities affected. Because of the peculiarity and diversity of State laws and local ordinances the provisions of emergency hospital services has been difficult or impossible in many cases. The funds provided by this bill are not meant to solve this dilemma in its entirety but it does provide for emergency hospital services on a limited scale until better answers can be found.

Grants to support general public health services and special project grants for community health services throughout the Nation are not new. This bill would merely extend the program for 1 year at present levels.

A comprehensive look at this situation must be taken by the next Congress. The reappraisal is called for only because of the evolutionary changes in community health services. I would not want to see any cutting back or any changes whatsoever in this particular program until we have the benefit of studies now underway.

I believe we did as good a job in conference as the House could expect and I believe the conference report is such that it ought to be approved.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in the Record at this point on the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEALTH RESEARCH FACILITIES AMENDMENTS OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2984) to amend the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities by extending the expiration date thereof and providing increased support for the program, to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 677)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2984) to amend the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities by extending the expiration date thereof and providing increased support for the program, to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Health Research Facilities Amendments of 1965'.

"HEALTH RESEARCH FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 704 of the Public Health Service Act (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act') is amended by inserting after '$50,000,000,' the following: 'and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the two succeeding fiscal years, an aggregate of not to exceed $280,000,000,'.

"(b) Subsection (a) of section 705 of the Act is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1965' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1968'.

"CONTRACT AUTHORITY

"SEC. 3. Section 301 of the Act is amended by striking out 'and' at the end of subsection (g), by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i), and by inserting immediately before such subsection the following new subsection:

"'(h) Enter into contracts during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, including contracts for research in accordance with and subject to the provisions of law applicable to contracts entered into by the military departments under title 10, United States Code, sections 2353 and 2354, except that determination, approval, and certification required thereby shall be by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and'.

"ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

"SEC. 4. (a) There shall be in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in addition to the Assistant Secretaries now provided for by law, three additional Assistant Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The provisions of section 2 of the Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1953 (67 Stat. 631) shall be applicable to such additional Assistant Secretaries to the same extent as they are applicable to the Assistant Secretaries authorized by that section.

(b) The office of Special Assistant to the Secretary (Health and Medical Affairs), created by section 3 of the Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1953 (67 Stat. 631), is hereby abolished.

"(c) Paragraph (17) of section 303(d) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 418) is amended by striking out '(2)' before the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof '(5)'; and paragraph (95) of section 303(e) of such Act is repealed.

"(d) The President may authorize the person who immediately prior to the date of enactment of this Act occupies the office of Special Assistant to the Secretary (Health and Medical Affairs) to act as one of the additional Assistant Secretaries authorized by subsection (a) of this section, until that office is filled by appointment in the manner provided by such section. While so acting, such person shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter provided by law for Assistant Secretaries of executive departments."

And the Senate agree to the same.

OREN HARRIS,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
PAUL G. ROGERS,
DAVID E. SATTERFIELD,
JAMES A. MACKAY,
JOHN J. GILLIGAN,
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,
ANCHER NELSEN,
TIM LEE CARTER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LISTER HILL,
RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
HARRISON WILLIAMS,
CLAIBORNE PELL,
EDWARD KENNEDY,
JACOB JAVITS,
GEORGE L. MURPHY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2984) to amend the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities by extending the expiration date thereof and providing increased support for the program, to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The amendment of the Senate is a complete substitute for the text of the House bill, which differed from the House bill in only two respects, discussed hereafter. The conference substitute is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment.

SPECIALIZED REGIONAL OR NATIONAL FACILITIES

The Senate amendment provided authority for nonmatching grants for construction and operation of regional or national facilities for the conduct of research, or for research and related purposes, with 4-year authorization of appropriations aggregating $35,000,000. The conference agreement deletes this authorization. It is expected that the scope of regional and national research programs will be studied in connection with other legislation.

CONTRACT AUTHORITY

The House bill authorized the Surgeon General to carry out his responsibilities under section 301 of the Public Health Service Act by entering into contracts, including contracts for research subject to the provisions of law applicable to the military departments, subject to an overall ceiling of $43,000,000 for any one fiscal year, with a 3-year authorization. The Senate amendment provided the same authority, but deleted both the limitation as to time and the limitation as to obligational authority. Similar authority has been provided heretofore by "point-of-order" language contained annually in appropriation acts.

The conference agreement retains the 3-year limitation contained in the House amendment, but deletes the ceiling on obligational authority. Of course, the 3-year limitation applies only to the duration of the authority to enter into contracts, and does not limit the duration of the contracts themselves. It is expected that the operations of the contract authority will be carefully reviewed when a request for the extension of this authority is made in the future.

In all other respects the conference substitute is identical to the House bill.

OREN HARRIS,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
PAUL G. ROGERS,
DAVID E. SATTERFIELD,
JAMES A. MACKAY,
JOHN J. GILLIGAN,
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,
ANCHER NELSEN,
TIM LEE CARTER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this bill would extend what is commonly referred to as the health research facilities program. This program over the years has proved itself. We have reaped rich benefits from it.

It may be recalled that when the bill passed the House some weeks ago it was on a rollcall vote of 333 to 4.

There is only one difference between the bill as passed by the House and the conference agreement.

The bill passed by the House provided for a 3-year authorization for contract authority by the Public Health Service, with a limitation of $43 million as a ceiling on annual obligations. The Senate amended this to delete both the 3-year limitation and the $43 million limitation.

We felt that the three-year limitation was more in keeping with the pattern we had set. However, we receded on the limitation of the $43 million on annual obligations.

I should like to explain that no additional money is involved. This is a method of contracting. The NIH, the Public Health Service, probably will contract outside of the Government's actual operations itself, for the current fiscal year about $94 million of the total funds appropriated for research facilities to the Public Health Service. These funds go primarily to the NIH.

It was thought if we could use private sources, we could obtain the desired results or, at least, we might get better results by using this practice. So it is a question of not tying the hands of the Public Health Service, but permitting them to utilize private sources in a free enterprise manner insofar as it would become feasible to do so. After careful analysis of the entire situation, we felt it would be to the best interests of the Service to accede to the Senate provision with reference to the $43 million limitation which the House previously included in the bill.

One other matter that was in conference, but is not in the conference report or the House bill should be discussed. When our committee originally considered the bill, we deleted from the bill a proposed 6-year authorization for nonmatching grants for construction and operation of specialized regional or national research facilities.

The bill passed the House without this feature, as I have indicated. The Senate version, as reported and as passed, restored the authorization but limited the duration to 4 years, with a maximum appropriation authorization of $35 million.

The conferees struck out this provision for regional facilities on the basis that the committee now has under consideration a bill referred to as the regional complexes, and we believe it would be more appropriate to give consideration to this in connection with that program. With this we had a unanimous conference report, and we commend it to the House and urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Springer].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this bill, which provide an extension of section 704 of the Public Health Service Act, to make possible the construction of health research facilities for the next 3 years, is a continuation of the very successful partnership between Government and the academic world to provide the space in which the research vital to the health of the American public can be accomplished. This provision, in conjunction with the grants made to individuals and institutions for research work, provides the major authority and the machinery for the accomplishment of health research.

There are some instances wherein grants are not the proper inducement for desirable and required research projects. In such instances the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has in the past made contracts with private industrial or other institutions to take on specific studies, whether long or short range in nature. The authority to use the contract method has been maintained only through language in the appropriation acts from year to year. It is not considered good business to base such important projects on such a shaky platform. The authority should be clear while yet being well within the control of the authorizing committee. This bill grants the authority to use contracts as well as grants for the next 3-year period. The Congress can then review the history of this authority and the way it has been used. In my view, the two sections of the Public Health Service Act, which I have here described, give ample authority to create facilities for health research and to provide for those instances in which grants are not adequate to induce specific research. In stating this position I am mindful of the section in the original bill which contemplated a series of Federal installations to carry on research in those subjects not attractive to universities or other research institutions. As long as it is possible to offer contracts covering all phases of any such research, I am sure that qualified institutions will accept the task.

Also provided for in this legislation are three additional assistant secretaries for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In view of the extent of new health legislation and other new responsibilities for the Department, it seems proper that these positions should be provided. I would wish to serve notice, however, on the Department and the administration that I shall personally watch very closely the way in which these positions are utilized. Although I do not purport to speak for our entire committee, I am sure that as a body it will expect close surveillance of the manner in which these additional positions are used.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks at this point in the Record on the conference report if they so desire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MENTAL FACILITIES AND CENTERS CONSTRUCTION ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2985) to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 678)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2985) to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 4. Subsection (a) of section 302 of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 (Public Law 88–164) is amended by striking out 'There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and each of the next two fiscal years the sum of $2,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'There is authorized to be appropriated $6.000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; $9,000,000 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; $12,000,000 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; and $14,000,000 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1969'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 8. Section 7 of the Act of September 6, 1958 (Public Law 85–926) as amended (20 U.S.C. 617), is amended to read as follows:

" 'Sec. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated for carrying out this Act $19,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; $29,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; $34,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; and $37,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.' "

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment to title:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill.

Oren Harris,
Leo W. O'Brien,
Paul G. Rogers,
David E. Satterfield III,
James A. Mackay,
John J. Gilligan,
William L. Springer,
Ancher Nelsen,
Tim Lee Carter,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Lister Hill,
Ralph W. Yarborough,
Harrison Williams,
Claiborne Pell,
Edward Kennedy,
Jacob K. Javits,
George L. Murphy,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2985) to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment changes the short title of the bill to conform to changes in the text. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: Under the House bill, authority was given to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to community mental health centers to finance a portion of the costs of staffing these centers, with assistance to be furnished to any one center for a total period of 51 months. The House bill authorized the Secretary to commence such grants at any time during the 3 fiscal years 1966, 1967, and

1968, and authorized appropriations for those 3 fiscal years and the succeeding fiscal year.

The Senate amendment made no change in the 3-year period during which the grants could be commenced, and authorized appropriations for the next 4 fiscal years, so as to permit completion of the payment of the Federal share with respect to each center for the full 51 months.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: Senate amendment No. 3 amends section 302 of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 (Public Law 88–164) to continue for 5 additional years the program of research and demonstration projects in the training of handicapped children, and increased the authorization for the current fiscal year to $6,000,000. Additional appropriations authorized under the Senate amendment for the following 5 years would aggregate $78,000,000.

The House receded with an amendment, increasing the authorization for the current fiscal year to $6,000,000 and limiting the extension of the program to 3 additional years, with the same authorization for these years as was contained in the Senate amendment: $9,000,000 for fiscal year 1967, $12,000,000 for fiscal year 1968, and $14,000,000 for fiscal year 1969.

Amendments Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8: These amendments add four new subsections to section 302 of Public Law 88–164, which expand and clarify the program under this section.

The proposed new subsection (f) would add authority for construction, equipment, and operation of facilities for research, research training, surveys, or demonstrations to aid children who are mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or otherwise health impaired who require special education, or the dissemination of information derived therefrom, or all of such activities, including experimental schools.

The proposed new subsection (g) is the usual provision requiring conformance with Davis-Bacon Act standards in the construction program. Subsections (h) and (i) contain definitions.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 9: This amendment would permit the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to deposit in a special account on the books of the Treasury all or part of any grant awarded by the Secretary, and to make payments from this account from time to time to the extent needed to carry out the purposes of the grant.

This amendment provides needed authority for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to prevent the disbursement of sums to recipients before the time they are actually needed, and thereby prevent the accumulation of large sums of Federal funds by grantees.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 10: This amendment extends the application of the act of September 6, 1958 (Public Law 85–926) which relates to the training of teachers of handicapped children to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the District of Columbia, Guam, and American Samoa.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 11: Senate amendment No. 11 provided a 5-year extension of the program under the act of September 6, 1958, with additional appropriations aggregating $186,000,000 over the current fiscal year and the 5 additional fiscal years. The House conferees receded with an amendment, limiting appropriations for the current fiscal year to the existing $19,500,000 level, and authorizing appropriations for 3 additional years, with $29,500,000 authorized for fiscal year 1967, $34,000,000 for fiscal year 1968, and $37,500,000 for fiscal year 1969.

Amendment to title: The Senate amended the title of the bill to conform to changes in the text.

The House recedes.

Oren Harris,
Leo W. O'Brien,
Paul G. Rogers,
James A. Mackay,
David E. Satterfield III,
John J. Gilligan,
William L. Springer,
Ancher Nelsen,
Tim Lee Carter,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HARRIS (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important program. Since it passed the House 389 to 0, I thought that it perhaps might be unnecessary to utilize much time in explaining it. I do think, however, it would be appropriate if we did explain some of the differences between the House and Senate versions and what we did accomplish in conference.

Amendment No. 1 only changed the short title of the bill to conform to the changed text. Naturally, the House receded on it.

With regard to amendment No. 2, in the House bill, authority was given to the Secretary of HEW to make grants to community mental health centers to finance a portion of the cost of the staff of these centers with assistance to be furnished to any one center for a total period of 51 months.

The House bill authorized the Secretary to commence such grants at any time during the 3 fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968, and authorized appropriations for those 3 fiscal years and the succeeding fiscal year. This would not have permitted completion of payments to centers, but future authorizations would have been required.

The Senate amendment made no change in the 3-year period during which the grants could be commenced, and authorized appropriations for the next 4 fiscal years, so as to permit completion of the payment of the Federal share with respect to each center for the full 51 months. This is a reasonable modification and the House conferees agreed to it.

The third difference was that the Senate amendment No. 3 amended section 302 of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 to continue research and demonstration projects in the training of handicapped children, and increased the authorization for the current fiscal year to $6 million. Additional appropriations authorized under the Senate amendment for the following 5 years would aggregate a total of $78 million.

The House receded with an amendment. We increased the authorization for the current fiscal year to $6 million and limited the extension of the program to 3 additional years, with the same authorization for these years as was contained in the Senate amendment: $9 million for fiscal year 1967, $12 million for fiscal year 1968, and $14 million for fiscal year 1969, or a total of $35 million for the 3 additional years.

We think this would meet the needs as explained to us and we think that the record bears that out.

There were five further amendments which would add four new subsections to the above-mentioned section 302 that would expand and clarify the program of research and demonstration projects for training of handicapped children. The new subsection (f) would add authority for construction, equipment, and operation of facilities for research, research training, surveys, or demonstrations to aid handicapped children. The subsection includes experimental schools also.

The new subsection (g) is the usual provision requiring conformance with the Davis-Bacon Act on the construction program. The House receded on that. The other two subsections contain definitions, and we receded on these, of course.

Amendment No. 9 would permit the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to deposit in a special account on the books of the Treasury all or part of any grant awarded by the Secretary, and to make payments from this account from time to time to the extent needed to carry out the purposes of the grant. The reason for this was that we wanted the Secretary to be able to pay grants at the right time, not to have to pay them in advance and have Federal funds lying in a bank while the grantees were formulating a program or were otherwise getting ready to use the funds. The House receded on this amendment.

Amendment No. 10 extends the application of the act of September 6, 1958, relating to the training of teachers of handicapped children to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the District of Columbia, Guam, and American Samoa. The House receded on that.

Amendment No. 11 provides a 5-year extension of the program under the act of September 6, 1958, which is the real heart of this program, Mr. Speaker. This act authorizes grants for training professional personnel in all areas of the handicapped. The Senate version extended this program for 5 years with additional appropriations totalling $186 million. The House acceded to the Senate version, with modifications. We limited the appropriations for the current fiscal year to $19½ million and authorized appropriations for 3 additional years instead of 5, with $29½ million, $34 million, and $37½ million, respectively, authorized for fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969. In this way we did revise the entire program.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is conceded that this will provide a much more effective program for those unfortunate people who need attention, afflicted as they are, in the field of mental health and mental retardation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we commend this unanimous conference report to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, as explained by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman has covered the amendments in detail as they actually occurred in the conference.

It is true that there were 11 amendments considered in the conference. I believe that we did about as good a job as could be done under the circumstances. In fact, the differences between the Senate and the House in my estimation were quite minor. To a great extent the Senate and House bills conformed.

Mr. Speaker, in my estimation this is one of the important pieces of legislation to come out of our committee this year, and I believe that the conference report ought to be approved. The greatest strides in health legislation, as well as in public awareness in recent years, have been in the field of mental health and mental retardation. The first major change in public policy affecting care and treatment for the afflicted in these areas has come about in a short period. The great weight of the evidence indicates that early local assistance and treatment for both mental illness and mental retardation should increase dramatically the incidence of recovery and return to a useful and productive existence.

Congress accepted this premise and provided a program for the construction of local facilities to be known as community mental health centers and community retardation facilities. At that time it was suggested that the Federal Government assist in the initial staffing of these facilities. This was not done at the time. Now that the program is underway and the very real problems begin to emerge, it becomes clear that in the case of community mental health centers some such staffing assistance is justified and necessary.

This bill provides for a 3-year period, during which such institutions may apply for staffing grants. It is necessary, of course, to fund the last application as fully as the first, and since the bill provides for approximately 4 years of declining assistance, it is necessary to authorize funds for a 4-year period beyond the last application.

Not included in the House bill but added by action in the other body are provisions to increase and extend research and demonstration projects in the education of handicapped children and also extend and increase the program for grants to institutions of higher learning to provide for training teachers of handicapped children. I heartily endorse these additional provisions because I am keenly aware of the great benefit to the Nation at large, as well as to the individuals involved, of such training. Special training for teachers in this field needs every possible encouragement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 414, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

YEAS—414

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baldwin
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Boggs
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Pa.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—19

Blatnik
Boland
Bonner
Bow
Cahill
Carter
Colmer
Diggs
Fallon
Garmatz
Holland
Keogh
McVicker
Mailliard
O'Neal, Ga.
Powell
Thomas
Toll
Watson

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Holland with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Thomas with Mr Carter.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. O'Neal of Georgia.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Toll.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. McVicker.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Boland.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD AT NEWBURYPORT, MASS.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 83) to authorize the President to issue a proclamation commemorating the 175th anniversary on August 4, 1965, of the founding of the U.S. Coast Guard at Newburyport, Mass.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 83

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary, on August 4, 1965, of the founding of the United States Coast Guard at Newburyport, Massachusetts, a service which for the past century and three-quarters has been dedicated to humanity through the saving of life and property at sea, and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such anniversary with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 77 with Mr. O'BRIEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] had 1 hour and 41 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] had 1 hour and 49 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS].

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss the question of the free rider, the modern patriot who favors 14(b) and who demands "representation without taxation."

Yesterday the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] pointed out the very limited nature of the Taft-Hartley union shop.

In connection with what I shall say, may I reiterate: It does not require any employee to join a union to get a job, nor does it require any employee to join a union to keep his job. It merely requires that:

First. If a majority of the employees vote for a union, and

Second. If the union asks for a union shop, and

Third. If the employer agrees to the union request, and

Fourth. If the majority of the members do not rescind the authority of the union to enforce the union shop agreement.

Then, all employees within the bargaining unit must pay reasonable and nondiscriminatory initiation fees and dues to keep their jobs.

In short, they must pay their fair share for the collective benefits. This seems to me to be a fair and reasonable solution to a difficult problem.

Mr. Chairman, unions are required by law to represent every employee in the bargaining unit—members and nonmembers alike.

The labor law of the United States requires the union selected by the majority of the employees to represent all employees in the bargaining unit.

At one time unions negotiated what are known as "members only" contracts.

Under these contracts, only the members were entitled to the wage raises, the seniority, the vacation, the arbitration, the retirement and other benefits won by union members.

For obvious bookkeeping reasons, these "members only" contracts were not desired by management, and in any event the courts have long since declared them illegal.

The leading decision in this area is *Steele* v. *Louisville & Nashville Railway Company,* 323 U.S. 192.

When this case arose, the Brotherhood of Firemen and Enginemen was restricted to "white born." This—thank goodness—has long since been changed.

The white firemen, employed by railroads throughout of the South, were concerned by technological displacement and the fact that by and large, Negro firemen had the greater seniority. The white firemen devised upon a scheme to keep their jobs. The unions and a number of railroads entered into a contract whereby all firemen would lose their jobs unless they were "promotable" to the position of "engineer." Most of the Negro firemen were unable—through age and lack of education—to qualify for the job of engineer, although they were fully competent firemen.

The result of this union-management contract was to deprive Negro nonmembers of their jobs.

The Supreme Court held this was illegal, that the union had a duty of "fair obligation" toward the nonunion members and that this duty of "fair obligation" was breached under the circumstances here. This duty has been repeated in many cases since.

Perhaps the decision most in point is the *Hughes Tool* case, 104 NLRB 318 (1953).

In that case the International Association of Machinists had an agreement with Hughes Tool in Texas, a right-to-work State. The union knew that it had to include nonmembers in the wage, hour, seniority, and fringe benefits it won: But it was perturbed about the grievance and arbitration procedure it negotiated under the contract. It was expensive to process grievances, and was much more expensive to take cases to arbitration.

The union devised a stratagem to keep down the number of grievances. All nonunion members were required to pay part of the cost. It cost a nonunion member $15 to have the union protect his rights under the contract in a grievance procedure; and something like $400 when the union took his case to arbitration.

The case arose under the union contract when a nonunion member asked the union agent to process his case and the agent told him it would cost $10.

The nonmember rebelled at this. He claimed the union processed the grievances of members free of charge, and that it should provide the same service for nonmembers.

The case went to the Labor Board and the Labor Board agreed with the nonmember saying in effect if unions provide a service for members free of charge, they must provide the same service for nonmembers with equal diligence.

Mr. Chairman, it is only fair that the employee pay for the benefits he receives.

Since the nonmember receives all the rights and benefits of a member, it is only fair that he should pay his fair share of the costs.

This seemed fair to Senator Taft in 1947 when he had a choice between the open shop and the open union.

This seemed fair to John F. Kennedy in 1960 when he said:

> I join with the late Senator Taft in thinking that where the union is the collective bargaining representative of all employees in an establishment, the payment of dues is justifiable as a fair means of sharing the expenses of collective bargaining among those who receive its benefits.

Congressman AYRES said it as well as anyone when he agreed with Secretary Wirtz on this issue and commented:

> To me, I think the basic issue is as Senator Taft expressed his views, that he was against freeloaders. I am not talking about any emotional issues involved. But having worked in a factory, having been a union member, it is much more advantageous in the final analysis to the employer, if he has a union to have everybody belong. It is very difficult to have two men working side by side, one paying his fair share and the other one riding free when they both share in the benefit.

Mr. Chairman, in the hearings the right-to-work witnesses seemed to admit that it was unfair for the nonmember not to pay his way if he seeks union benefits.

So their argument took a different tack: They claimed that the nonmember was not a free rider but a forced rider who did not want the union benefits.

This is patently absurd. Not a single right-to-work law employee claimed that he wanted to work for the wages that existed before the union came in.

And then the employer witnesses made this argument: They contended that the unions wanted exclusive representation and it therefore came with ill grace for the unions to make the free rider argument.

This, too, is patently absurd: Unions were very happy with the members only clauses. I am sure the local at the Hughes Tool Plant would have been happy—not—to have processed the grievances of the nonunion members.

Since 1935, Congress has adopted the principle of exclusive representation, but not because of the unions. The Wagner Act provided that the union receiving the majority vote is the exclusive representative of all employees. Again in 1947 Congress reconsidered the principle of exclusive representation and decided to keep it in effect.

The congressional decisions of 1935 and in 1947 were dictated by industrial reality.

There are theoretical alternatives to the principle of exclusive representation:

As a theoretical matter, there could be two or more unions in each plant in America, each representing its own members. But imagine the chaos if union "A" wanted a seniority system based on a plantwide unit, and union "B" wanted a seniority system based on a departmental basis, each union willing to strike unless its demands were met.

There has been almost unanimous agreement since the Wagner Act of 1935 that exclusive majority representation is necessary for workable collective bargaining.

If the nonmember in the union plant is a forced rather than a free rider, he is forced by the nature of our industrial development and the history of our labor-management relationships—not by the union.

Mr. Chairman, I have some sympathy for the employee who has religious scruples against joining a union. I have no sympathy for the free rider, as in the Hughes Tool case, who refused to pay dues, who asserts rights under the collective bargaining agreement and who asserts the further right to have his rights protected by the union without charge.

As Milton J. Shapp, president of the Jerrold Electronic Co., wrote:

> I'd be in favor of letting workers stay out of unions providing they also work for wages paid before unions were formed. No worker would accept this.

I may add that in all probability no responsible employer would accept this either, and I certainly hope that this Congress will not accept the principle of the free rider who takes the benefits and then lets George pay for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Griffin].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cederberg].

Mr. CEDERSBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed out of the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I am certain that all Members of the House are now aware that we have lost several planes in Vietnam as a result of ground fire from antiaircraft missiles from North Vietnam.

An AP wire states:

> Two were pilots seen parachuting from their stricken planes, Defense Department said.
>
> Radio Hanoi reported six U.S. planes shot down, three American pilots captured.

Then it continues further:

> Minority Leader Ford has for several weeks urged these sites be removed before we lost more American lives.

The administration has failed to heed this warning, and lives have been needlessly lost.

On Sunday, July 18, on the American Broadcasting Co.'s program, "Issues and Answers," Mr. Gerald R. Ford, along with Senator Church, of Idaho, was a guest of diplomatic correspondent John Scali of the American Broadcasting Co., I quote from the colloquy which took place on television that afternoon:

> Mr. Scali. Congressman Ford, you have urged and advocated that the United States bomb the Soviet antiaircraft missile sites in the Hanoi area on the ground that these weapons are now a threat to Americans in Vietnam.
>
> On this program last week Secretary Rusk was against this on the grounds that these antiaircraft missiles are not now a threat to Americans.
>
> What do you say in answer to that?
>
> Representative Ford. These surface-to-air missile sites that the Soviet Union has constructed around the Hanoi area in my judgment are significant military targets and I am confident that eventually the administration will take the view that they must be destroyed.
>
> I think it is foolhardy for us to see these missile sites being constructed, made operational, and we do nothing about it until the first American aircraft is shot down and we lose several American pilots in the process.
>
> I would like to go back to what Secretary Rusk said on this program last week. He said there are no sanctuaries in North Vietnam, in Red China. He implied no sanctuaries anyplace.

In addition to this, during the colloquy carried on that afternoon, Representative Ford asked this question:

> Are you saying we should wait until the first American aircraft is shot down by one of these missile systems before we do anything to destroy them?
>
> Let me just make this point, if I may.

Then he was interrupted, and it goes on:

> These five surface-to-air missile systems that are developed around the Hanoi area are quite distinct from the population center of the city of Hanoi itself. We, with our pinpoint bombing, can and have destroyed military targets that are as significant as these without touching any of the civilian population. So it is no excuse for anybody to say that if you bomb the sites you automatically bomb the city of Hanoi. That is an untrue statement.

Then he makes another significant statement:

> I am furthermore of the opinion that as the flow of war materiel comes into the ports of Haiphong and otherwise we ought to take some steps to prevent this shipping which is being used to supply Ho Chi Minh and the Vietcong with tons and tons and tons of war materiel.
>
> This is one way to stop this activity. We can do it on the sea and we can do it in the air to a greater degree than we have been doing recently.

I will ask permission, when we are in the House, to include in the Record as a part of my statement the complete text of this program.

Issues and Answers, Sunday, July 18, 1965

Guests: Senator Frank Church, Democrat, of Idaho; House Minority Leader, Representative Gerald Ford, Republican, of Michigan.

Interviewed by John Scali, ABC diplomatic correspondent.

The Announcer. Vietnam, No. 1 issue facing America today. How will it end, at the conference table or on the battlefield?

Senator Frank Church, Democrat, of Idaho, calls for negotiations. Representative Gerald Ford, Republican, of Michigan, demands more bombings.

Are we drifting into world war III over Vietnam? Is Congress split into hawks and doves? Can the President retain bipartisan backing on Vietnam?

For the answers to the issues, Senator Frank Church, Democrat, of Idaho, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the House minority leader, Congressman Gerald Ford, of Michigan.

Here to interview Senator Church and Congressman Ford is ABC diplomatic correspondent John Scali.

Mr. Scali. Gentlemen, welcome to "Issues and Answers."

Let's start off by looking ahead a bit. From all signs, the administration is about to order tens of thousands of additional American combat troops into Vietnam. There is a prospect, I think, that before the end of the year we will have double the 75,000 Americans who are either in Vietnam now, or on the way.

First of all, do you approve of this? Let's begin with Senator Church.

Senator Church. Well, John, I have always held to the position that we can't "cut and run" in southeast Asia. We have committed American prestige, we have made commitments that have to be kept. So I have always supported the position that we should seek a negotiated peace, but we have to stay the course in Vietnam.

Now I think we are at that stage in the war where it will be necessary for us to demonstrate to Hanoi that we are not going to be driven out of South Vietnam and, therefore, I am afraid that added troops must be sent into the south where the guerrilla war does in fact exist and where the solution has to be found. Now at the end of the monsoon season or after this buildup takes place perhaps then Hanoi will realize that we are there to be reckoned with and then perhaps the prospects will improve for a negotiated settlement.

Mr. Scali. Congressman Ford, what is your view?

Representative Gerald R. Ford. John, I would say that—the Republicans also agree—the end result must be negotiation. The problem is when you should do it and under what circumstances you should do it.

I think the Congress has a responsibility to await and receive the recommendations of Secretary McNamara and the President himself before making a determination as to whether or not 100,000 more U.S. forces are needed in South Vietnam.

The Congress has the responsibility of asking questions such as: If this additional 100,000 U.S. military personnel are needed there for the purpose of protecting our bases and our personnel that are already there, I am certain, I am positive, that the Congress will give wholehearted endorsement to the request. But I think the Congress also has the responsibility to make certain what our long-range plans are.

Does this mean there is to be a change in the strategy and the tactics? If this means the increase of 100,000 U.S. military personnel there, that we have made the decision to go into a large-scale ground war, then I think the Congress better ask some very pertinent questions of the President and Secretary McNamara.

Mr. SCALI. Senator CHURCH, do you believe that the basic American strategy in Vietnam—at least militarily—should change to allow American troops to spearhead offensive action instead of relying now on the South Vietnamese for this and using American troops as an emergency standby and to guard vital American installations?

Senator CHURCH. I would be satisfied with the present strategy, John, insofar as my personal view is concerned.

I think we have to realize that this is a Vietnamese war. It involves different factions of Vietnamese and the objective of the war is to determine what the political structure of Vietnam is to be. Now that is the kind of war that can only be settled in any durable, satisfactory sense by the Vietnamese themselves. Therefore, I would hope that we would avoid turning this into an American war. I was out in Asia during the Second World War as an officer, in India, Burma, and China, which are parts of Asia, and the one thing I found all Asians had in common was an abiding and deep-seated resentment against the white man because of the long colonial experience and if this war becomes a war pitting white Western American forces from the opposite side of the globe against Asians in Asia, then I think that we will never find any durable solution—so I hope our strategy will take this into account.

Representative GERALD R. FORD. John, I would like to add this, and I think it is very, very important: It is true this is a war for the Vietnamese themselves to resolve, and I think they may have to make a bigger effort, but there is a factor that too many people do not realize: There are countries in southeast Asia—the South Koreans, the Philippines, the Australians, the New Zealanders, and perhaps others—who have a vital stake in making certain that Communist aggression in all of southeast Asia doesn't overrun them as well as South Vietnam and I think it is very, very important for the administration to maximize its effort in seeking to get bigger commitments, stronger forces, more men to fight along side with the South Vietnamese and the U.S. forces.

I feel very strongly that the United States ought to maximize those areas of military power, in the air and on the sea, and we ought to let the South Vietnamese and perhaps the other nations in southeast Asia take advantage of those areas where they have a special competence on the ground.

If we combined these two operations, I am confident that we can convince the Chinese Communists and the Vietcong that it is foolhardy, it is too expensive for them to continue this aggression against South Vietnam.

Senator CHURCH. John, may I just say in that respect, I think the President has for many, many months, been making every effort to secure maximum participation on the part of these other Asian countries. So this has been a task that certainly has not gone unattended and we are getting as much support as these other countries are willing to give. We cannot force them in if they are not willing to come. I doubt very much, JERRY, that your proposal, for example, to extend the bombing in the North and to strike the missile bases is a sound one. That is something I think we ought to discuss.

Mr. SCALI. I would like to discuss that but I am not quite sure, Congressman FORD, how you come down on the position: Should American troops be used, in the future, to spearhead offensive operations.

Representative GERALD R. FORD. Well, I am very clear on that, John. At the present time the U.S. military policy is not for the U.S. ground forces to undertake the so-called spearhead operation. The President has informed me personally that this was not our policy. But there is always a possibility that there will be a change and that our ground forces that will be there in substantially greater numbers may adopt new strategy and if this is a change in strategy then I think the President has a responsibility to talk to the legislative leaders in the Congress and perhaps to the American people to inform them the reasons why we have to change our strategy. And I certainly expect to raise questions. If we are going to involve 100,000, 200,000 more U.S. forces on the ground in a jungle, swamp war, why we have not maximized our utilization of our air power and our sea power.

We are at the present time bombing military installations, significant ones in North Vietnam. I fully approve of that. But the question is, certainly in my mind, why don't we do more, faster. If this is a way in which we can convince the Vietcong that it is too costly for them to continue their aggression on the ground against the South Vietnamese.

Mr. SCALI. Then I gather that both of you are satisfied with the present strategy on the ground, which is to rely on the South Vietnamese to spearhead offensive military operations and I gather if there is a change in this you would want to discuss it very intensively in Congress?

Senator CHURCH. Let me settle, if I can, this one point. I think if there is to be a change in strategy the President will consult fully with the Congress and will take his message to the American people. He has always done that in the past and I am sure he will do it in the future.

Mr. SCALI. Congressman FORD, you have urged and advocated that the United States bomb the Soviet antiaircraft missile sites in the Hanoi area on the grounds that these weapons are now a threat to Americans in Vietnam.

On this program last week Secretary Rusk was against this on the grounds that these antiaircraft missiles are not now a threat to Americans.

What do you say in answer to that?

Representative GERALD R. FORD. These surface-to-air missile sites that the Soviet Union has constructed around the Hanoi area in my judgment are significant military targets and I am confident that eventually the administration will take the view that they must be destroyed.

I think it is foolhardy for us to see these missile sites being constructed, made operational, and we do nothing about it until the first American aircraft is shot down and we lose several American pilots in the process.

I would like to go back to what Secretary Rusk said on this program last week. He said there are no sanctuaries in North Vietnam, in Red China. He implied no sanctuaries any place.

Mr. SCALI. That is right.

Representative GERALD R. FORD. In my judgment his statement goes much, much further than anything I have said. He has said by implication if not directly, that any target, civilian or military in North Vietnam or elsewhere, is on the list of targets for the U.S. aircraft and Navy planes. This, I think, is a much, much further extension of military strategy and it opens up the possibility, as far as the Secretary of State is concerned, that civilian targets might well be bombed.

I'd like to ask Senator CHURCH whether he agrees with the Secretary, whether there are no sanctuaries, and does he endorse that position?

Senator CHURCH. Well, I should say first of all that warning the North Vietnamese or the Chinese against stepping up the war and indicating to them that if they do that, they cannot expect that we will then respect certain sanctuaries, is a very prudent policy and it is quite different from the recommendation that we should now strike at the missile bases.

I would like to talk about that. Those missile bases are situated around Hanoi. We know the weapon, we know its range, we know its purpose: that is to defend Hanoi against bombing raids.

Now our purpose—up until now—isn't and has never been to strike at the population centers of North Vietnam, to inflict tens of thousands of casualties upon the Vietnamese people. Our purpose in the bombing has been to interdict the supply routes, the supply depots, the railroad centers, the bridges that Hanoi is using to help supply the Vietcong in South Vietnam.

Now I think that that objective can be pursued, that the missile sites as things now stand does not interfere with that objective and therefore I see no military reason for striking at these missile bases at the present time.

Now I can see lots of reasons for not doing it and the foremost one is that if we begin to bomb close in to the population centers, we have put the war up another notch. And when we put the war up another notch, then the pressure will be on Ho Chi-Minh to do likewise. How is he going to respond if he can't respond in the air or on the sea, he has to respond on the ground and he has 300,000 well-trained disciplined troops that have not yet been committed to the war in Vietnam.

Now what are we going to do, Jerry, when he sends those troops southward?

Representative GERALD R. FORD. Are you saying we should wait until the first American aircraft is shot down by one of these missile systems before we do anything to destroy them?

Let me just make this point, if I may.

Senator CHURCH. Then I will answer both of your questions.

Representative GERALD R. FORD. These five surface-to-air missile systems that are developed around the Hanoi area are quite distinct from the population center of the city of Hanoi itself. We, with our pinpoint bombing, can and have destroyed military targets that are as significant as these without touching any of the civilian population. So it is no excuse for anybody to say that if you bomb the sites you automatically bomb the city of Hanoi. That is an untrue statement.

The sites can be picked off and destroyed without touching a civilian population in the city of Hanoi.

Senator CHURCH. Well, my point is that the sites do not presently interfere with the American bombing mission. It is not at all clear that any of the sites are even within range of the targets we intend to strike. Why, then, further aggravate the situation and assume a further risk of retaliation by beginning to bomb close in to the population centers in North Vietnam.

If Ho Chi Minh sends his army south, make no mistake about it, the only thing that will then save Saigon is an immediate and unlimited American intervention on the ground on the scale of the Korean war, and that I thought, Jerry was the thing you wanted to avoid.

Representative GERALD R. FORD. I certainly do, and I am convinced that if we expedite, if we intensify our air and sea power in South Vietnam, we can convince Ho Chi Minh that it is too costly?

Senator CHURCH. In South Vietnam, yes, but accelerating and expanding the war in the north as you have suggested by striking the missile sites will not accomplish that objective.

Representative GERALD R. FORD. I think it will and I am furthermore of the opinion that as the flow of war materiel comes into the ports of Hyphong and otherwise we ought to take some steps to prevent this shipping which is being used to supply Ho Chi Minh and the Vietcong with tons and tons and tons of war materiel.

This is one way to stop his activity. We can do it on the sea and we can do it in the air to a greater degree than we have been doing recently. And my point is that we must use our military superiority, which is in the air and on the sea, in order to avoid, as long as we possibly can, a greater involvement by the United States in a ground war.

Mr. SCALI. Congressman FORD and Senator CHURCH, what do you think of the argument that we should avoid bombing these Soviet antiaircraft missile sites because at this stage we don't want to kill Russians—meaning perhaps the Russian technicians who are installing and who would be manning these?

Representative GERALD R. FORD. Well it is my judgment, John, that the Soviet Union when it took the initiative to escalate the war by sending their personnel, their military and civilian, that they took a certain risk. And when they are there and they are building a military target, a significant military target in North Vietnam, they undertook a risk which they certainly know that we couldn't let go by indefinitely without taking some military action against them. It just would be pure folly for us to wait until those operational missile systems destroy American aircraft.

Senator CHURCH. I just think that your very question suggests that there will still be another dimension to the risks we take in striking these missile bases and since they do not now interfere with our mission in the North, I think that the strategy of the President and his advisers is sound. Under present circumstances, I think it would only increase our risk for general acceleration of the war and accomplish no military objective, to begin striking at these missile bases close to Hanoi.

Mr. SCALI. Congressman FORD, I gather you think concern over this point should not be a major factor in our decisions on air bombings; is that correct?

Representative GERALD R. FORD. I do not think so because when the Soviet Union took the initiative, supplying materiel and personel and scientists and technicians to install these military targets, they must have known the risk. They were the ones that escalated the war.

Senator CHURCH. I think this is the chicken and the egg argument. You go back to our initiation of the bombings in the North and each time we take a step then there is going to be a counterstep. They started the thing a long time ago by moving into South Vietnam. Then there have been countersteps. So the acceleration goes on, on both sides. Now if you strike the missile bases that does not put an end to the situation or solve the problem. Then what is next? What is the next step: striking Hanoi, bombing China? Where do you draw the line? You have to draw it, I think, at a place that makes sense for the United States of America, and I think that at this juncture there is no military need nor any good advantage to be gained by the striking of the missile bases.

Representative GERALD R. FORD. I am sure you will find there are many, many military people in the Pentagon, in the administration, who would violently disagree with your viewpoint because they feel these missile sites are significant military targets and they ought to be destroyed before they become operational.

Senator CHURCH. They can give their advice and no doubt have, but the prevailing opinion has thus far been against them.

Representative GERALD R. FORD. I think the prevailing opinion, however, of the State Department has overridden some of the military advice in this particular area.

Mr. SCALI. Senator CHURCH, what do you think of Congressman FORD's suggestion that perhaps bombing should be accelerated, more raids against military targets, and more planes and just a faster, all-around operation?

Senator CHURCH. Well, I have indicated what I think the risks are. The risks are that North Vietnam will have to retaliate on the ground and then we are in the very kind of mean, widespread jungle war that all of us hope to avoid. I do not know of a single war that has ever been won from the air. It did not happen in Korea, it did not happen in Germany. There has not been a single case where bombing alone has broken the spirit of resistance and when an army begins to march, there never has been an instance where an army has been stopped from the air. The only way we will stop that North Vietnamese Army, if it begins to march, is with the introduction of a complete American Army on the ground in South Vietnam.

Mr. SCALI. Congressman FORD, what do you say to that?

Representative GERALD R. FORD. I think your argument is in contradiction, FRANK, to the philosophy and the program and the policy of this administration. Because the President and Secretary McNamara have a schedule of military bombing, aerial attacks against significant military targets, and their whole program is based on the destruction of these significant military targets in North Vietnam.

Now you are raising a——

Senator CHURCH. These missile bases do not fit that category.

Representative GERALD R. FORD. Oh, yes; they are on the schedule.

Senator CHURCH. In what way do they interfere with the interdiction of the supply routes to the South, which is the major reason for our bombing?

Representative GERALD R. FORD. They could, any day. The minute they become operational and some are operational today, or will be very shortly.

Senator CHURCH. Within a 30-mile range from Hanoi?

Representative GERALD R. FORD. We are already bombing military targets within that area, already. Civilian targets excluded, military targets included. And one of these days there will be a Soviet-manned or Soviet-trained surface-to-air missile system destroy an American plane and then we will retaliate, and we will have lost one or more American lives and I think this is a risk we do not have to take and we should not take.

Senator CHURCH. If we get involved in a full-scale war in South Vietnam, we will be losing tens of thousands of American lives. We lost 50,000 Americans in Korea and 150,000 casualties and at the end we finished at the bargaining table settling for the status quo, for a stalemate.

Now I hate to see a repeat performance in Vietnam. I think the President is bombing with great restraint and I commend him for that and I hope he resists the pressures to expand the bombing in North Vietnam because the risks are not worth the candle.

Representative GERALD R. FORD. But the Secretary of State on this program last week enunciated a policy which goes beyond anything I have said, or others have said in the Congress. He says there are no sanctuaries, and by implication says that military targets exist everyplace, not only in North Vietnam but in China, itself.

Mr. SCALI. Gentlemen, there are signs that President Johnson may have to call up reserves in order to send more troops into Vietnam. How do you stand on this, Senator CHURCH?

Senator CHURCH. I think I have already indicated that in the answer to the first question, that this is a stage in the war where we have to demonstrate that we are in South Vietnam and we won't be driven out and when Hanoi realizes that then I think we can look forward to a satisfactory basis for a negotiated settlement. But the war exists in South Vietnam and a solution will have to be found there, not in North Vietnam, not in China or elsewhere. Not in an expanded war, which is a way in, but by concentrating in the South, which is our way, ultimately, out.

Representative GERALD R. FORD. Well John, as you know, I strongly feel that we must stay there and prevent Communist aggression against free nations of the world.

The question of whether or not the President ought to call up reserves to active duty, extend the enlistments of others, is one the Congress ought to look at very, very carefully.

Last week, I was at a meeting with the Secretary of Defense and he was telling us that this administration has increased the counterinsurgency forces by a thousand percent. We have increased the combat-ready divisions from 11 to 15. It seems to me that before we give carte blanche authority to the President to call up reservists we ought to look and see whether these programs of the President in strengthening our armed forces have been adequate.

Mr. SCALI. Thank you very much, gentlemen, for being with us today on "Issues and Answers."

The ANNOUNCER. Our guests this week have been Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, and House Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD, Republican, of Michigan. They were interviewed by ABC State Department Correspondent John Scali.

I have supported the President in his desire to bring about a peaceful settlement in Vietnam. I stood on the floor of the House and pleaded that we support him in the request for $700 million, and I hope to support him in the future. I am sure that we all, as good Americans, want to do so.

But I can see no sense in our sending thousands of young men to fight a war in southeast Asia unless we are going to use to the maximum of our ability the air power and sea power we possess to destroy the targets that are admittedly military targets. I am thinking now of the port of Haiphong, where supplies are coming in and going into North Vietnam, then into South Vietnam, going into South Vietnam to be used against our boys.

We want to support this administration, and we want to bring a successful conclusion to the problems in South Vietnam, but so far as I am concerned the only way we can do it wisely and protect the lives of the young men we are asking to go over there is to use sensibly and wisely our air power and sea power. I am not convinced at this time that this is what we are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, the hearings conducted by the Education and Labor Committee show without a doubt, that the right of management and labor to bargain collectively on all conditions of employment, including the union shop, is part of the great American consensus. It is a right accepted by labor, by management, and by the public alike.

In 2 weeks of hearings not a single representative of a major American corporation appeared in opposition to the repeal of section 14(b). Not one of the 500 largest American corporations listed by Fortune magazine opposed the repeal of 14(b).

The reason for this consensus is that labor relations in our society have come a long way since the union-busting era of the 1930's, the days of the goons, the finks, and the Pinkertons, the days when the notorious Harry Bennett stood astride the Ford Motor Co.

Indeed, our great industrial leaders have learned, unlike the Bourbon kings who forgot nothing and learned nothing, that the process of collective bargaining on all aspects of employment including the union shop, has led over three decades to industrial security, stability, and continuity, and therefore to industrial peace and general prosperity.

Confirmation of the benefits of this consensus can be found in three decades of increasing union and corporate responsibility; in the fact that in 1964 less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the total labor hours worked was lost through strikes.

And proof can be found in the spectacular prosperity of our economy, an expected 1965 gross national product of $660 billion and a forecast by the Chairman of the Joint Council of Economic Advisers of a possible $900 billion gross national product by 1970.

We are witnessing unparalleled labor productivity and industrial peace stemming from the mutual confidence and respect engendered when free union leaders and free management executives sit down at the conference table to negotiate openly and freely on the union shop, as well as on all other aspects of employment.

Thus, the responsible businessman is not opposed to the union shop and the repeal of section 14(b). The opposition to repeal of section 14(b) comes from that segment of the business community which has never experienced the union shop, and consequently knows nothing about it.

A. TESTIMONY AT THE HEARINGS

We had many days of hearings, with many witnesses and many more statements for the record. The business community was divided, with those having firsthand knowledge favoring repeal of section 14(b).

1. THOSE WITH EXPERIENCE FAVORED REPEAL

The giants of industry, General Motors, United States Steel, Ford, Goodyear, ALCOA, A.T. & T., and the like did not testify nor did they submit statements. They have all signed union shop agreements, and presumably find them satisfactory.

But we did have testimony or statements in the record, from businessmen who had experienced the union shop, and they all favored repeal of section 14(b).

Mr. Harold A. Webster, president of the National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., is a man with long experience with a union shop, and he testified for repeal of section 14(b). He said:

> We believe 14(b) is a provision which unreasonably restricts a union but at the same time does not improve management's bargaining position. It acts as a penalty upon the employer as well as the union, for it is essentially negative in intent and application.
>
> Repeal of section 14(b) would enable the union to better discharge its vital obligation to employees, the employer, and the general public.

Mr. Joseph Moore, president of the Associated Garment Industries of St. Louis, Mo., the spokesman for 56 employers, told of his relations under the union shop, a strike-free relationship since 1933, and supported repeal of section 14(b):

> As spokesman for employers, I do not want any issue of negotiation excluded by law from collective bargaining. I want every issue on the table, because it is my firm belief that free labor and free management—which we still have in Missouri, despite attempts to the contrary—can resolve all contractural issues.

A statement of Milton J. Shapp, president of the Jerrold Electronics Corp., Philadelphia, was put in the record. I would like to read parts of it:

> If you'll agree that freedom from labor strife benefits the employer, that good unions mean more prosperous workers, and that the Nation's economy is dependent on prosperous workers, the only issue left is the phony one—rights of individual workers.
>
> On the surface, this issue has a lot of appeal. That's why supporters of right to work always ride so hard. They say, "Those who want can join the union, and those who don't, can stay out."
>
> The trouble is that there are many people willing to let George do it. It's pretty soft to be able to enjoy benefits won by the union without paying dues.
>
> I'd be in favor of allowing workers to stay out of unions, providing they also work for wages paid before unions were formed. No worker would accept this.
>
> In summary, right-to-work laws are a step backward. We wouldn't install machinery of 1910 vintage, so why install the type of labor-management machinery of that period? It's time for all businessmen to look forward to the needs of this country.

That is the type of testimony we heard from businessmen who had experienced the union shop.

2. THOSE WITHOUT EXPERIENCE FAVORED RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

We had some testimony from businessmen and business organizations against the repeal of section 14(b). But I believe that none of them had ever experienced the union shop against which they were so vehement.

Many of them were from right-to-work States where such agreements are outlawed.

Others of them have fought unionism in principle, and have been found guilty by the National Labor Relations Board of antiunion conduct.

Most of them came from or represented small businessmen in a very competitive situation where the initial capital investment was small, and where wages was a large proportionate part of the total cost of doing business. Most were from the South; most were from small communities. Most were unorganized, most wanted to stay that way.

None were experienced and gave us any firsthand information about the alleged ills of which they complained.

B. STUDIES ELSEWHERE

The testimony at our hearings is in complete agreement with the surveys and studies made by responsible organizations.

1. THE BUSINESS WEEK SURVEY

Business Week, in 1957, made a survey of businessmen from Boston to San Diego and reported:

> Employers who had had it (union shop agreement) longest find the most advantage in it. Fifty-eight percent declared that net effect on management of the elimination of such security would be bad.

Here are some of the reasons employers gave Business Week for favoring union security:

> a. It seems to give the union an incentive to settle disputes quickly rather than drag them along for purposes of recruiting new members.
>
> b. It has centralized control over employee relations, because we are able now to deal with all our employees as a unit.
>
> c. Whenever there is trouble in the plant or some question arises, we know whom we can hold responsible.

2. REPORT OF THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE BOARD

A study by the National Industrial Conference Board showed that the employer with practical experience preferred a union shop because it places the union in a better position to keep its agreement; gives the employee the assistance and support of the international officers, if necessary; gives employees greater feeling of responsibility and interest in their jobs because they feel they have something to say about their conditions of work.

3. REPORT OF THE NATIONAL PLANNING ASSOCIATION

The National Planning Association made a study in 1953 of the causes of industrial peace on collective bargaining, and reported:

> In all of the cases studied, the employers saw positive advantages in bargaining with a strong and well-disciplined union, and were convinced they should take steps to encourage workers to join and support the organization which represented them.

SUMMARY

All this testimony and these studies make sense.

With the strength of a union security agreement behind it, and with the assurance on the part of union officials of continuity over several years in their status, a union negotiator can make constructive concessions helpful to management even though these concessions may be detrimental to the apparent short-run interests of some union members.

Without this security, unions must press uncritically for demands desired by the members even when the results may be of overall detriment to the company and union, and the stability and productiveness of their working relationship.

It is for this practical reason why businessmen with firsthand experience, either testify in favor of repeal of section 14(b), or have not testified at all.

Those businessmen against repeal of section 14(b) just do not have the experience to make a convincing story to outweigh what those with experience tell us.

Mr. Chairman, repeal of section 14(b) which is not now operative in a single industrial, urban State in our Nation, will be a clear affirmation that free labor and free management, without Government interference, can build a working relationship through which the quality of our democratic society is enriched and our economy strengthened.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

UNION REPRESENTATION AND THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, the right to vote by secret ballot is the fundamental civil right of any true democratic system. In 1947 the Congress sought to protect this right for employees through specific provision contained in the Taft-Hartley Act.

In considering whether to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, it would be well if this Congress recognized the vital importance of protection of employees' voting rights under existing labor-management law.

Eighteen years ago, during the House debate on the Taft-Hartley Act, Representative McCowen of Ohio pointed out.

> The bill would provide the American workingman the right—

And I quote—

> to select his own bargaining representative by a secret ballot free from force from any person or any organization.
>
> The time of the intimidation of the workingmen by unscrupulous labor leaders will be ended by the enactment of this bill into law—

Argued Representative McCowen.

Similarly, Report No. 245 of the House Committee on Education and Labor during the 80th Congress, 1st session, 1947, stated—and again I quote:

> The bill prescribes rules for the new Board to follow in setting up units for collective bargaining and in holding elections to determine whether or not employees wish labor unions to bargain for them.

Despite this clear intent of the Taft-Hartley framers to safeguard employees' voting rights, the courts and the National Labor Relations Board in recent years have eroded such protection in labor representation elections.

In fact, the judicial and administrative handling of Taft-Hartley's secret ballot election provisions has produced a legal phantasmagoria which baffles even the foremost experts in labor-management law. Congress intent in 1947 was to weld into the law an ironclad guarantee of representation voting rights. The courts and the NLRB have thwarted this fundamental principle of labor democracy through a bewildering series of complex and conflicting decisions.

The crux of this issue is the NLRB's practice of ordering union recognition and collective bargaining based on a count of so-called authorization cards rather than by secret ballot. This practice does not simply violate the secret ballot principle. From a purely judicial and administrative standpoint it has also created a coast-to-coast shambles in the labor-management relations field.

In his message calling for repeal of section 14(b), President Johnson declared that his purpose was—and I quote in part—that we "insure uniform application of our national labor relations policy" by—I quote again—"reducing conflicts" in that policy.

Yet if the President hopes to reduce conflicts in national labor relations policy and insure its uniform application, he can hardly oppose legislative action which would establish absolute standards for secret ballot union representation elections.

Wide variances in interpretation of the "authorization card" election—if indeed it can be called an "election"—have made a mockery of the concept of a national labor policy. The law regarding union representation elections varies, like time standards in midsummer, from place to place and from Federal circuit court to Federal circuit court.

Let me cite two outstanding and conflicting decisions which point up the current confusion in this area of labor-management law. In considering these rulings, put yourself in the place of an employer, labor union representative, or labor law counsel attempting to find guidelines for your own course of action.

First, consider the 1961 Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruling in the case of Snow & Sons. Here, the union obtained authorization cards from 31 of 52 employees and thereafter demanded recognition by the employer. The employer doubted that a majority of his employees really desired representation by the union and insisted on a secret NLRB election.

When the union threatened to strike, the employer agreed to the appointment of a neutral party to check the card signatures against the payroll list. Following a breakdown in these negotiations, with the employer insisting on a secret ballot election, the union filed unfair labor practice charges.

The hearing examiner took evidence and found that the employer was innocent of charges of unfair labor practices. Further, he determined that employee signatures on at least two of the cards were obtained through misrepresentation by the union's organizers, and that there was not—I quote—"even a scintilla of evidence" that the employer had attempted to subvert or dissipate the status held by the union.

Nevertheless, the NLRB reversed the examiner's decision, holding that the employer should have been ordered to recognize and bargain with the union because, according to the Board, the employer was found to entertain no reasonable doubt with respect to the union's representative status.

Now, what is especially disturbing about the NLRB's ruling in this case is that it came despite the showing that union organizers had obtained some card authorization signatures by outright fraud. The Board denied employees their right to vote in a secret ballot election under circumstances where the evidence was undisputed that the employer did nothing to influence his employees' ability to exercise free choice—and where the unreliability of card authorizations was clearly demonstrated.

In this regard, it would be well to consider the statistics cited by NLRB Chairman McCulloch himself on the subject of card authorization reliability. In a 1962 speech, Chairman McCulloch said:

> In 58 elections, the union presented authorization cards from 30 to 50 percent of the employees; and they won 11 or 19 percent of them. In 87 elections, the unions presented authorization cards from 50 to 70 percent of the employees; and they won 42 or 52 percent of them. In 57 elections, the unions presented authorization cards from over 70 percent of the employees; and they won 42 or 74 percent of them.

Yet, despite the strength of this statistical argument against the reliability of card authorizations, the NLRB has ordered bargaining based on such cards. And the courts have sustained this doubtful position, as did the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in the 1961 Snow & Sons case.

The ruling in Snow & Sons is presently controlling law in the ninth Federal circuit. Now let us take a look at a more recent case, decided on June 14, 1965, by the Second Circuit Court of Appeals. A comparison of this case, involving the Flomatic Corp., with the Snow case, points up the uncertain and inconsistent status of union representation election law—that is, the lack of a national labor policy in this field.

In the Flomatic case the union obtained authorization cards from 20 of 28 employees. It then proceeded to notify the company that it had obtained a card majority of employees and should be recognized as exclusive bargaining agent. A petition to the Board for certification as bargaining representative followed. But before the Board had an opportunity to act on this petition, the employer and union agreed to hold an election.

Before the election the company president and plant manager met with employees to discuss the issue of union representation. On the day of the election, the president distributed a letter in response to a union circular. The president's letter promised benefits and urged the employees to vote against the union.

By a vote of 19 to 7, the union lost the election. It proceeded to file objections to the election, contending that the company's activities had undermined the employees' right to a free election. At this point, both the company and the union agreed to hold a second election and the regional director of the NLRB concurred in this plan. However, before the election was held the union had a change of heart. It requested that its petition for election be withdrawn and it then filed unfair labor practice proceedings against the company.

The Board ordered the company to bargain with the union, and petitioned the Court of Appeals of the Second Circuit to enforce this order. Unlike the ninth circuit in the Snow case 4 years earlier, the judges of the second circuit found that the company had indeed been guilty of the kind of unfair labor practice which possibly might have influenced employees. But the court nevertheless refused to enforce the Board's order requiring the company to bargain with the union, because in its view such an order would have been unwarranted and inconsistent with the policies of the National Labor Relations Act.

In essence, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals ruled here that if it were to enforce the Board's ruling, then the union would become the exclusive bargaining agent for Flomatic employees even though it did not prevail in a secret election.

A comparison of these two cases, both currently the law of their respective Federal judicial circuits, points up the confusion existing as a result of judicial and administrative shortcutting of the American employee's right to vote regarding union representation. Thus, employees who work within the jurisdiction of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals enjoy greater protection of this fundamental right than do employees working in the ninth circuit.

Small wonder then that even the country's No. 1 union leader, AFL–CIO President George Meany, declared himself in principle as being in favor of a return to the safeguard of the secret ballot representation election. Mr. Meany made this statement in response to a question by Representative AYRES during recent hearings on labor legislation.

The National Labor Relations Act was intended to create a national—not a regional, sectional, or judicial circuit labor policy. It was enacted to provide workers in all parts of the country the same, equal rights and benefits.

What is needed to assure this now is a reform of the law which will allow for a return to the standards of secret ballot elections in representation cases. Language must be incorporated into the law by specific amendment—and it must be language that cannot be tortured or twisted in any way that might diminish the employees' right to vote.

Under such a written safeguard, the NLRB would no longer indulge in the speculation of whether or not an employer had a bona fide doubt of a union majority. The law would be specific on the point that there can be no shortcut on the road to labor-management democracy—that authorization cards do not speak for the minds of employees, and therefore cannot enter into an employer's judgment as to the thinking of his employees.

Congress should act to amend the law so that the right to vote is guaranteed and ironclad. If we are indeed on the threshhold of a major change in labor-management law—a change that will strengthen union power and expand the union shop—then it is vital that we provide certain standards by which it can be determined that the employees' majority is truly speaking in labor representation cases.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I favor retention of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act for several reasons, as follows:

First. Individual freedom of choice would be terminated by repeal of this section.

Second. The rights of the minority must be protected at all times. Repeal of section 14(b) would be a major step in eliminating the rights of the minority.

Third. Under our Republic, our Bill of Rights and the Constitution, ultimate power rests with the people themselves. The Congress has no right to abrogate, by legislation, the will of the people as expressed at the ballot box. Nineteen States have right-to-work laws either by Statute or by constitutional amendment.

Nebraska approved a right-to-work amendment to its constitution in 1946 by a 60-percent majority vote of its people. This is conclusive proof that our people in Nebraska want this type of amendment, and it must certainly follow that where the people themselves have made this determination, the Congress should not bypass their will. The same logic applies to all 19 States who have such legislation or constitutional amendments.

To get back to point No. 1, individual freedom of choice. In our society, no group should have the power to compel any person to join, to obey, or to conform to their rules. I believe that the average American citizen, the man in the street, is firmly committed to this idea and opposes any program of forced association or forced financial support of any group.

Compulsory membership is abhorrent to our society and is not required by any other organizations. Why should labor unions be singled out by statute to require of individual members, membership in a union?

In regard to point No. 2, that the rights of the minority must be protected at all times, the argument about the principle of majority rule has a hollow ring when you discover that it disregards the basic rights of a minority in any democratic system.

Individuals in our society have certain basic rights which cannot be taken away by majority rule. This principle was eloquently stated by the Supreme Court in *Board of Education* v. *Barnette* (319 U.S. 624 (1943)):

> The very purpose of the Bill of Rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of political controversy, to place them beyond the reach of majorities and officials, and to establish them as legal principles to be applied by the courts. One's right to life, liberty, and property, to free speech, a free press, freedom of worship and assembly and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to vote; they depend on the outcome of no elections.

I do not believe any Member of this body is naive enough to believe that in actual practice, the unions in entering into union shop agreements always consult and get an expression of the desires of the majority of employees.

The argument has been stated that an employee who does not join the union but who receives the benefits of collective bargaining is a free rider. This is a fallacious argument that makes the assumption the only reason an employee would want to stay out of a union is to avoid payment of dues. The testimony, however, shows that many people may desire to stay out of a union for religious reasons, or because they oppose union leadership, or because they do not want their money spent for causes to which they object. When unions under union shop contract, spend union dues money for political action and for social causes and propaganda, the individual employee becomes a captive passenger rather than a free rider, and this forced conformity violates his fundamental constitutional rights as an American citizen.

I have a letter here which came to me a few days ago from the wife of a teamster union member who states:

> JULY 10, 1965.
>
> Hon. Congressman DAVE MARTIN,
> *House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN MARTIN: I am sending to you, in the same mail with this letter, a copy of the April 30, 1965, issue of Drive magazine, which was sent to my husband who is an unwilling member of the Teamster Union.
>
> If you have not read this publication already, I strongly urge you to do so. However, please be advised that not all Teamster Union members can approve of the position of this magazine; in fact, we resent the use of our money against our wishes and without our permission to print this kind of trash.
>
> Thank you for your attention.
>
> Respectfully,
>
> ——— ———.

There is no reason why labor unions must rely upon compulsory membership. Many unions in a great many plants achieve 100 percent membership on a purely voluntary basis. This they do by providing effective services to their members. Unions who properly serve their members undoubtedly have a stronger and more effective organization than those who have coerced dues payers who may strongly disagree with many of its policies and activities. I agree completely with the comment of one witness during the hearings, a rank and file union member, that "good unions do not need compulsory unionism and bad unions do not deserve it."

Samuel Gomper, founder of the American Federation of Labor, had this to say on the subject:

> There may be here and there a worker who for certain reasons unexplainable to us does not join a union of labor. This is his right no matter how morally wrong he may be. It is his legal right and no one can or dare question his exercise of that legal right. I want to urge devotion to the fundamentals of human liberty—the principles of voluntarism. No lasting gain has ever come from compulsion. If we seek to force, we but tear apart that which, united, is invincible.

Another labor leader, Warren S. Stone, former grand chief engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, said:

> I do not believe in forcing a man to join a union. If he wants to join, all right; but it is contrary to the principles of free government and the Constitution of the United States to try to make him join.

I believe that a man ought to join a union if it is a good union that is serving the interests of its members. I believe, moreover, that most men will give support to a union providing it is deserving of that support. There will always be some men, of course, who will try to get a free ride but let us not deny a freedom of choice to all men because of the few.

I oppose repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Burton].

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, much has been said on both sides regarding the relative merits of right-to-work legislation. But I think one issue overrides all the others:

That is the issue of individual liberty.

We must preserve the right of the individual worker to choose for himself whether he will join a labor union, and not make joining a union a condition of holding a job. To my mind, this is the main issue of what right-to-work and the repeal of section 14(b) are all about.

It seems to me that pressure for repeal of 14(b) by organized labor is inconsistent with the avowed principles of some leading labor figures of past and present. To illustrate:

George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, wrote a foreword to the 1957 edition of the autobiography of Samuel Gompers, the father of the American labor movement. In it, Mr. Meany says of Samuel Gompers:

> He founded the American Federation of Labor on the bedrock of voluntarism. He believed with his whole soul in personal freedom, in democratic government and in the ultimate triumph of voluntary human cooperation over any form of compulsion or dictatorship. To this day, the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations functions on a completely voluntary basis, as an association of free and self-governing trade unions.

Is it not a fair question to ask of Mr. Meany and other labor leaders now pressing for repeal of 14(b) whether the individual citizen is not just as much entitled to the benefits of voluntarism as are labor unions?

By the same token, is not the individual State as much entitled to make laws to assure the benefits of voluntarism in the matter of enacting or retaining right-to-work laws as are individual labor unions in the matter of joining a federation?

Should the advocates of repeal not remember that Samuel Gompers "believed with his whole soul in personal freedom"?

Has today's leadership lost Samuel Gompers' belief in "the ultimate triumph of voluntary human cooperation over any form of compulsion or dictatorship"?

A second important reason for preserving right-to-work laws is that they would permit the worker either to decline to join a union or to drop out if he is not in agreement with the policies of the leadership. This would have the effect of helping keep out of union leadership the corruption that could otherwise arise.

I think it interesting and highly important to see who wants to repeal the right-to-work laws.

The people of Utah do not want to.

My legislative questionnaire and the general run of mail in my office indicates an overwhelming majority want to retain the law.

The people of the Nation do not want to.

Polls by national groups indicate more people want to retain right-to-work laws than want to repeal them. This is true even of people in the non-right-to-work States.

The leading newspapers of the Nation do not want to. Utah newspapers are among hundreds of papers all over America that have editorialized in favor of the right-to-work laws.

Except for labor publications, newspapers and magazines of the Nation are almost unanimously in favor of retention of the right-to-work laws.

Who then is for repeal of right-to-work laws?

Mainly a small group of union officers and agents whose aim is to perpetuate themselves in power.

But experience has shown that good, responsible unions that fairly represent the best interests of the workers do not need such coercion to remain strong. And any union that does need such coercion to maintain its power, does not deserve to survive anyway.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to H.R. 77, and I hope it will be defeated. H.R. 77 would have the effect, as you know, of making it impossible for the 19 States which now have right-to-work laws to have them. I think many of the Members of this House are under the impression that H.R. 77 would return the state of labor laws back to the Wagner Act. Mr. Chairman, that is not the situation, because under the Wagner Act right-to-work laws were possible; in fact, 12 States had right-to-work laws under the Wagner Act before the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted.

Section 14(b) was put into the Taft-Hartley law because there was some feeling that the doctrine of Federal domination might possibly have the effect of nullifying some of the right-to-work statutes. It was put in out of an abundance of caution.

I think it would be wrong if we were to repeal this law. If we did repeal it, it would have the effect of repealing not only the laws of many of our States but actually the constitutions of some of them.

Why have we had right-to-work laws? Why did we have right-to-work laws under the Wagner Act? I do not think it takes too good a memory to remember some of the abuses of organized labor which were rampant during those times. Abuses which resulted in tyranny to the individual and which certainly were no aid to the workingman and all in all created a situation in which 12 sovereign States passed laws saying that it is against the public policy of those States to allow closed shop contracts.

What were some of these acts? There were all sorts of petty tyrannies. There were cases in which workers were denied the right of freedom of speech, where they were punished for speaking up on the floor of the labor hall. There were closed unions, where even a man coming back from the war, a man who had been in a position where he might have died for his country, would find that he could not follow the trade which he had learned because he could not get into the union. There was discrimination because of race. There were bad union rules and there were jurisdictional strikes which not only sapped the industrial strength of the country but caused the loss of wages and wealth to the people of this Nation.

These are the reasons many States felt that right-to-work laws were necessary. These right-to-work laws were not meant to protect businesses, Mr. Chairman. The right-to-work laws were meant to protect the average workingman. What effect have they actually had upon these States in which they were adopted? What effect have they actually had on the unions in the States where they were adopted?

I happen to have with me some figures comparing my State which had a right-to-work law enacted in 1946, and the State of New Mexico which does not have a right-to-work law.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, I do not want it understood by any one that I point with anything but the greatest friendship and pride to the progress of the great State of New Mexico. But in comparing its progress with that of the State of Arizona, there are a few rather interesting figures.

For instance, in 1954, the State of Arizona's average weekly earnings for factory workers was $80.93. New Mexico's was $74.72.

In 1964, 10 years later, Arizona's had increased 35.42 percent to $109.62. New Mexico's increase had been 21.66 percent, to $90.91.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, in this right-to-work State where unions are supposed to have been weakened by the inability to organize or by the fact that there is a right-to-work law, the State of Arizona has had wage increases of the average worker in manufacturing which have been in excess not only of the State of New Mexico but of practically all of the so-called semi-industrial States.

Now, what has happened in union membership? Well, as far as Arizona is concerned, in 1958 there were 40,000 union members. New Mexico had 30,000 union members.

In 1962, Arizona union membership had increased to 76,000, an increase of 90 percent. New Mexico union membership had increased to 35,000, an increase of 16.66 percent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, does this look like right-to-work laws have inhibited unions in their organizational endeavors? I think not.

Mr. Chairman, many of the people who have spoken here have made a case, at least attempted to make a case, for the idea that somehow or other compulsion is good, that if you can compel people to join a union you actually do them a favor. But it is rather interesting to note the people who do not agree with that idea.

Samuel Gompers, the father of the AFL has said:

> No lasting gain has ever come from compulsion.
>
> No man shall be deprived of livelihood for his family because of employment conditional upon membership of any union. Insofar as he and his dependents upon him are concerned, it is capital punishment.

Another great liberal, a real liberal, Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis, said:

> The American people should not, and will not, accept unionism if it involves the closed shop * * *. The objections, legal, economic and social, against the closed shop are so strong * * * that the insistence upon it has been a serious obstacle to union progress.
>
> It is an amazing paradox that people who now claim a proprietary leadership in the current civil rights movement are silent in this struggle over a man's right to work, which affects the freedom of not only each of our States but of every working man and woman in a very personal way. Those who have championed true civil rights and equal opportunity over the years recognize that the repeal of section 14(b) would be a step backward and would not advance either the cause of freedom or the cause of labor.

Now, Mr. Chairman, not only do we find these great Americans speaking out against compulsory unionism but we find that compulsory unionism is not really in vogue around the world.

In Europe, for instance, there is not one principal country about which I know that has compulsory unionism. Certainly England is very proudly open shop. Let me also refer to the Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations. This declaration was adopted by the U.N. General Assembly on the 10th of December 1948 in Paris and the vote by which it was adopted was 49 to 0.

The text of article 20, section 1 of this declaration is is follows:

> Everyone has a right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

And section 2 thereof states:

> No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the inclusion of this very statement against compulsion in joining a union in the Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations is a very telling point against the readoption on this continent of the idea of compulsory unionism.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. With reference to this assertion that the United States is the only country outside the Iron Curtain where the union shop is permitted, I might suggest that the Members read the record, pages 586 to 592, where they will find that Mexico, Canada, New Zealand, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Switzerland, all have similar arrangements. In Great Britain the principle is enforced by the union members refusing to work with nonunion members.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman. However, I think the gentleman will agree that here in the United States we do not have complete agreement on the alleged merit of the union shop. In many parts of the country where we do not have union shops we have great economic progress. Of course, I did not intend to say that economic progress always follows the union shop, or does not follow it. All I meant to say was that the existence of the union shop does not necessarily mean either progress or the lack of it.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES].

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chariman, the issue I would like to speak about at this time is the moral issue which was raised and discussed yesterday. It was also raised in the hearings, and of course it has concerned me and other Members of this House. I would hope that some of my questioning in the hearings did contribute something to the dialog on this particular subject matter.

May I report to you now some of the testimony which I am sure all of you have not had the opportunity to review.

Let me say first that most, if not all, of the opponents of the right-to-work idea raised very forcibly the moral issue.

The first colloquy I would like to discuss is that which I had with Dr. Fowler. Dr. Frederick Fowler is the chairman of the board of the National Right-to-Work Committee. He is also pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Duluth, Minn.

In his prepared statement he made two points against repeal of section 14(b): First, there was a moral principle involved, and second, he stood for "freedom of choice."

I asked him how he would feel if persons exercised a "freedom of choice" and chose against right-to-work. He replied that in those circumstances there should be no freedom of choice; that it was all a matter of morality.

I then pursued this matter of morality, and here is our colloquy:

> Mr. SICKLES. With respect to my question, do you think the individual should have the right to make his own arrangement with the employer as far as what his wages should be?
>
> Dr. FOWLER. Unless he, by his own decision, agrees to set that over in the hands of a union.
>
> Mr. SICKLES. And he should have the right also to determine what his hours would be, his hours of employment?
>
> Dr. FOWLER. I would think so.
>
> Mr. SICKLES. Should the employer be free to pay any individual any amount that he wants to?
>
> Dr. FOWLER. I would think so.

Later I asked Dr. Fowler:

> Mr. SICKLES. Do you think that the man has an individual freedom to work in an unsafe area, if he wants to?
>
> Dr. FOWLER. Certainly. A man has the freedom to be lousy if he wants to. I don't say that he ought to be, but he has that freedom.

Then I asked further:

> Do you think that he has an absolute freedom, then, to work for any wage, even though a law may be established setting up minimum wages?
>
> Dr. FOWLER. I do. Look, for example, at the bracero program. Why shouldn't a man in Mexico be permitted to work for a wage that he deems sufficient? That would be his own right. Why should somebody else come in and tell him, "You can't work for that"?
>
> Mr. SICKLES. Then you think that the State and Federal statutes that set up minimum wages are immoral statutes and that they are taking away a man's individual freedom?
>
> Dr. FOWLER. Yes; I would say so.
>
> Mr. SICKLES. Thank you very much.

I was, quite frankly, surprised to hear testimony that as a moral principle, a man has a right in today's society to be lousy, to work in unsafe conditions, to work for less than the minimum wage.

I might add I am not criticising Dr. Fowler in any way, because I think he is sincere in his convictions and what he has done is to carry the principles which he espouses to their logical conclusions.

I listened very carefully to the testimony of Monsignor Higgins when he testified on behalf of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and he addressed himself to the "ethical issue." Here is how he posed the issue, and I am quoting Monsignor Higgins:

> Even if an overwhelming majority of workers wish a union shop, do they have the right to demand that the minority conform to this decision?

He answered this question with a straight "Yes."

He explained:

> Man is more than an individual; he is also a member of society and assumes responsibilities as a member of society.

Monsignor Higgins discussed the rights and responsibilities of man as a member of civil society, as a member of the family society, and then turned his attention to his responsibilities as a member of an industrial society.

He commented that in this area:

> Few, if any, workers enjoy anything like an unconditional right to work.
>
> The employer, quite legitimately, imposes rules concerning safety, performance of work, health, and hygiene * * *. The principle behind such conditions is that the common good of the plant community must prevail. In such areas, the right to impose conditions of employment is rarely questioned, even though the wisdom of individual regulations may, of course, be debatable.

He then turned from these general considerations to the specific consideration of the union shop agreement.

> If an employer and a union agree, in collective bargaining, that union security would aid industrial relationships, as thousands of them have done for many years in this country, they are, in effect, laying down a regulation for the common good of their industrial community.
>
> When a worker accepts employment in that plant, he is no longer a detached individual; he is a member of the community and is governed by its rules. The alternative to such a procedure would be chaos and the breakdown of industrial society.

I note, also, that Rabbi Hirsch testified in behalf of the Central Conference of

American Rabbis and made essentially the same ethical point. He testified that:

> There is no doubt that belonging to any group potentially inhibits freedom of individual action, but in our complex society, to encourage an individual to refrain from accepting responsibility in and for the group created to assure him a dignified livelihood is to encourage anarchy and license * * *. To permit an individual not to support a union representing the majority of his fellow workers is not a protection of minority rights, but a destruction of majority rule.

Reverend Carothers, who testified on behalf of the division of Christian life and mission of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., took the same point of view.

He acknowledged that the problem of the union shop was a "tough ethical issue confronting the laymen of our churches," but advocated repeal of section 14(b) so "the contracting parties should be free to arrive at a decision in the bargaining process."

Reverend Carothers admitted to Congressman SCOTT that this brought compulsion on the minority dissenters, but responded that this compulsion is "one of the burdens of living in a democratic society."

Secretary of Labor Wirtz, speaking to the moral issue, said:

> There are several liberties involved here which must be balanced against each other.

He concluded:

> There is no right of a minority to endanger the freedom of a majority of the employees to protect the security of the bargaining representative that gives them a voice in the shaping of their wages, hours, and conditions of employment.

Now I have given extended thought to the problem of morality and individual freedom in light of the testimony as I have just outlined.

There is a difference of opinion between Dr. Fowler's extreme, of a right to be "lousy," and the approach of Willard Wirtz that "there are several liberties involved here which must be balanced against each other."

I am impressed by Rabbi Hirsch's comment that any group membership inhibits freedom of individual action; and by Reverend Carothers' testimony about the necessity to assume democratic burdens.

Monsignor Higgins' comments about man's various societal obligations: To his God, to his Nation, to his family, to his job, to his companions seem very germane to this discussion.

Certainly, man's obligations, rights and duties in these various relationships differ according to the difference in the nature of the relationships.

The job relationship is not comparable to the family relationship. Each is sui generis. Each is unique. Each has different requirements.

I am impressed by the fact that liberty is not absolute. When I sign a lease, my liberty to live where I please is to that extent curtailed.

Any private contract restricts the signers.

Similarly, any social compact restricts the rights of its members.

These individual contracts and social compacts are usually the result of free choice.

Freedom of choice, then, is a decisive factor in the problem of liberty.

But in entering into a job relationship, much of the freedom of choice is thereby voluntarily surrendered.

The employee surrenders his right to stay home, to disregard health and sanitary requirements. He submits to others control over the wages he receives, the hours he works, the vacations he enjoys, the seniority rights he may or may not have, the amount of retirement benefits he accrues.

His voice in these and other matters relating to terms and conditions of employment is effective only through group action. He voluntarily joins the group. He must perforce accept the group decision in these matters.

Is there anything different about a group decision that a union shop be signed, that all members of the group must pay their share of the group costs?

I now return to freedom of choice but in a larger sense. If the group choice is free, if it is voluntarily made and subject to periodic review, then I can see nothing immoral or wrong in the majority compulsion to protect group interests in a group job situation.

I would not vote for compulsory membership in the PTA, or in the American Legion, or in a farm bureau, or in the chamber of commerce.

But I submit that all these groups differ from the labor union.

In none of these group situations—the PTA, the Legion, et cetera—is the result of group action so immediate, so ubiquitous, so beneficial, so automatic as in the situation of collective bargaining.

I think that, on balance, with the Secretary of Labor and the religious spokesmen, in this particular situation of the employment relationship, the interest of the group—fairly and democratically arrived at—outweighs the liberty of the individual to accept the group benefits without paying for the group costs.

I have spoken too long. I thank the gentleman for giving me extra time. This is a very serious issue. I do not feel that we are acting immorally by passing this kind of legislation.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to talk about morality with respect to this issue as did the gentleman who preceded me.

Since 1947, the State of Iowa has had a right-to-work law and the reliable Iowa poll reports that an overwhelming 73 percent of the people of the State support that law.

Equally as significant, the poll indicates that 55 percent—I repeat, 55 percent—of the State's union members support it.

Also this year, the Democrat-controlled Iowa legislature—the Democrat-controlled legislature—rejected the demands of the Democrat Governor and refused to approve legislation which, in effect, would have repealed the State's right-to-work law.

While the Governor of Iowa has sought to modify the State law, he apparently is opposed to repeal of section 14(b), if it is possible, figure out exactly where he stands on this issue. I say this only because he is quoted in the June 1965 issue of Nation's Business as follows:

> I believe the authority to adopt such legislation should remain with the States.

Mr. Chairman, I have in hand a decision and order, issued by the National Labor Relations Board less than a month ago, setting forth the brutal and disgraceful tactics used by Local 46, United Packinghouse Union, at the Rath Packing Co., in Waterloo, Iowa, to coerce and intimidate workers into joining that union.

I want to recount briefly the Board's decision and order in the case of Samuel W. Berry, a nonunion worker in the plant, whose only crime was that he exercised his right, as guaranteed by the law of Iowa and section 14(b), not to join the union.

Berry, as well as his wife and daughter, were repeatedly threatened and addressed with vile and obscene appellations.

> A whole series of events—

Said the NLRB—

> show that Berry was threatened with beatings, mutilation in a meat chopper, and loss of his life. Water and oil were poured on him. He was jabbed with sticks, brooms, and shovels, shoved, kicked, tripped, and his clothing ruined.

After attempting unsuccessfully to obtain relief from this persecution, Berry took a 3-week vacation, returning to work on July 6, 1964. What happened then is described by the NLRB as follows:

> Each day thereafter he was subjected to soaking by water, threats of physical violence and mutilation, soaking by hot coffee, burning by hot water and continuous abuse. The culmination of the many acts of persecution was when employee Berry was pushed down a flight of stairs resulting in his hospitalization.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Briefly.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Did these acts, these crimes, take place in Iowa?

Mr. GROSS. I am ashamed to say that they did. Is the gentleman not ashamed with me that they would take place anywhere?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Oh, I would be, but I am astounded, of course, that they did happen in a right-to-work State, and I am astounded at the extent of lawbreaking with relation to one individual and I am glad the gentleman called it to our attention.

Mr. GROSS. Other workers were similarly abused. I do not suppose the gentleman at this time would say he supports a union that engages in these activities.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I do not support a union or an individual or a State or anyone who supports or condones them. They are all crimes.

Mr. GROSS. I just want the RECORD to be clear on that.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Of course. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman made an excellent point about the position of the Democrat legislature in Iowa and the Democrat Governor. I wonder if he has any indication as to how the representatives of the State of Iowa in the U.S. Congress are going to be representing Iowa here on this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. I am not a mindreader, but in view of the fact that the Democrat controlled legislature refused to repeal the Iowa right-to-work law, I would have to assume that they would certainly want to follow the lead of the Democrats in the State and the Governor of the State who, as I said before, is a Democrat.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I was interested in the gentleman's reasoning and logic on that. I further assume that based on the same logic the gentleman from New York, whose Republican-controlled legislature never enacted a right-to-work law, would vote in favor of repealing 14(b).

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I would be very interested on this particular issue, if we are going to have a repeat of the exhibition on the housing vote with the gentleman withholding votes and seeing how they are necessary on the issue that comes before us. I hope that this will not be repeated. In my instance, and in the instance of all the gentlemen from New York, I believe we will be standing on the merits of whether we should have a Federal law that destroys the right of the States to make up their minds.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I demand that the gentleman's words be taken down. He is impugning the motives of Members of this body.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Goodell. I would be very interested on this particular issue if we are going to have a repeat of the exhibition on the housing vote with the gentlemen withholding votes and seeing how they are necessary on the issue that comes before us. I hope that this will not be repeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'Brien, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, certain words used in debate were objected to and on request were taken down and read at the Clerk's desk, and he herewith reported the same to the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Goodell. I would be very interested on this particular issue if we are going to have a repeat of the exhibition on the housing vote with the gentlemen withholding votes and seeing how they are necessary on the issue that comes before us. I hope that this will not be repeated.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, there was another sentence following that. He did not read the last sentence.

The SPEAKER. The occupant of the Chair can pass only on the words that have been reported.

The Chair will state that in debate the question of impugning the motives or attacking the vote of a Member is one thing; but looking at it from a broad angle, the remarks made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell], seem to come within the purview of the rules.

The Chair does not consider this to be a reflection, if the gentleman was making any reflection, upon any Member of the House or upon any State of the Union, particularly the State of Iowa.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I demand the sentence following that be taken down. That was the sentence objected to. He said we did not vote on the merits.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the Chair can only pass upon the words presented to the Chair and which were taken down in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Are we not entitled to have the words taken down that were objected to in the Committee of the Whole so that Members can exercise their rights?

The SPEAKER. The Chair was confronted with the words actually reported by the Clerk.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Then when we go back into the Committee of the Whole, am I entitled to demand that the words be taken down that I objected to and report them back?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not pass upon what can be done in the Committee of the Whole. Of course, if the gentleman desires to renew his request, that would be a matter for the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to consider on the question of whether or not the words were taken down as demanded by the gentleman from Iowa.

The Committee will resume its sitting.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 77 with Mr. O'Brien in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will be in order.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I demand that the words the gentleman most recently gave me be taken down.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa demands that certain additional words which he claims were uttered shall be taken down.

The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Goodell. In my instance and in the instance of all the gentlemen from New York, I believe we will be standing on the merits of whether we should have a Federal law that destroys the right of the States to make up their minds.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is not all of it, Mr. Chairman. That is not all of the words.

The CHAIRMAN. I might say to the gentleman that is all that the Clerk was able to furnish the Chairman and I assume that the point he has raised——

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. In that case, I withdraw the objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is withdrawn.

The Committee will proceed in order.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. The point was made by the gentleman from Michigan with reference to New York and I was addressing myself to that when the interruption occurred. Insofar as New York is concerned, the question is whether the States, on the merits, should have the right to make up their own minds and we in New York obviously do not have and will not have a right-to-work law. That is the issue. If the State of Iowa and other States wish to have the right-to-work law, it is the position of many here that they should be permitted to have their right-to-work laws.

It is my own personal position that if we are going to destroy the rights of workers and the rights of the States to have their own right-to-work laws and take this protection, in a sense, away from the workers, we should at the same time and in the same law protect the workers with the so-called Griffin amendments.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I further call attention to the case of a dapper New York labor leader, George Barasch, and his handling of welfare funds in two comparatively small New York labor unions.

Evidence obtained by the Senate's McClellan investigating subcommittee shows that $4 million of the union welfare funds have been shifted into two foundations—one in Liberia and one in Puerto Rico—where it is outside the jurisdiction of U.S. laws.

Summoned before the McClellan committee, Barasch, two of his relatives, and a half-dozen other associates took refuge behind the fifth amendment, refusing to answer the questions of Senator McClellan as to why the money is not in the union pension and welfare funds and available for the working men and women to whom it rightfully belongs.

But Barasch has apparently taken care of Barasch. Information obtained by the Senate committee indicates that through four special pension funds, Barasch has arranged for his own retirement at age 55 with a remaining lifetime pension of $54,000 a year and a lump-sum value of nearly $797,000.

Time does not permit further details here of this fantastic manipulation of union funds. Information obtained by the McClellan committee is available to any interested Member of the House.

What is important at this point is that the proponents of this legislation would repeal section 14(b) and thus join in forcing workers to join unions and pay dues, fees, and assessments to feather the nests of union officials, their associates, and hangers-on.

In all fairness and decency, what the proponents of this legislation ought to be doing is plugging the loopholes in existing law to stop manipulations of this kind. The first order of business is to see that unions are operated honestly, fairly, and decently. It takes more than an ordinary amount of gall to enact any kind of legislation that leads to compulsory unionism when union officials resort to brutality, coercion, and intimidation to attain their ends, or take $4 million of the workers pension and welfare funds and run beyond the borders of this country.

Let the Record clearly show that as one Member of the House from Iowa I will vote against repeal of section 14(b), and in support of the Democrat legislature of my State which has refused to repeal or modify the Iowa right-to-work law.

Mr. Chairman, the following, an editorial from the July 16, 1965, issue of the Des Moines Register, describes in more detail the abuse of nonunion employees of the Rath Packing Co.:

DISGRACEFUL UNION TACTICS

A National Labor Relations Board decision last week revealed that shocking tactics had been used by an Iowa labor union in an effort to force workers to join and pay dues to the union.

The union, Local 46 of the United Packinghouse, Food & Allied Workers, holds a contract with the Rath Packing Co., in Waterloo. The contract makes provision for a union shop in the plant in the event the Iowa law prohibiting union shop arrangements is repealed. Under a union shop agreement, workers must join the union after a specified time on the job. An unsuccessful effort was made in the recently ended legislative session to eliminate the ban on the union shop.

Although it lacked an enforcible contract requiring union membership, local 46 undertook on its own to force nonunion members to join the union and it also sought to collect back dues from those who had joined. The incidents discussed in the NLRB decision took place between May 1963 and August 1964—prior to the legislative session.

The NLRB decision reports union members set up "card checks" at entrances to the Rath plant where employees were required to produce cards showing they were paid-up members. Nonmembers or those in arrears in their dues were labeled "free riders" and their names published in the union's official weekly bulletin. The NLRB decision says issues of the bulletin introduced in evidence "contained personal attacks upon non-dues-paying employees." The decision added:

"At the card check it was not uncommon to see union representatives with folded arms or outstretched hands, stopping employees, talking to them, and in some instances shoving or pummeling them, and obviously impeding their efforts to continue on their way. Many times employees had to be escorted by policemen in order to gain entrance to the plant. The employees accosted were * * * in some cases jostled or pushed or struck during the course of their exchange of words with union representatives."

Samuel W. Berry, a nonunion worker, was referred to as "Chicken Sam" in the union bulletin. Berry was so upset by the treatment accorded him that he filed an unfair labor practices charge against the union with the NLRB. The NLRB described his treatment as follows:

"Berry and his wife and daughter were threatened and called abusive names. Berry was frequently threatened with physical assault * * * The whole series of events indicated that Berry was threatened with beatings, mutilation in a meat chopper, and loss of his life, and that water and oil were poured on him, he was jabbed with sticks and brooms and shovels, shoved, kicked, tripped, and had his clothes ruined. The culmination of the many acts of persecution was when employee Berry was pushed down a flight of stairs resulting in his hospitalization."

The NLRB found that the union and its agents had similarly harassed a number of other employees and that the attempted coercion constituted an unfair labor practice. Violation of the Labor Board's order prohibiting such practices could result in contempt action. It is possible also for those who suffered injury to bring suit for damages.

The practices described in the NLRB ruling are disgraceful. It is difficult to believe that they could be used in an Iowa community.

The incidents also support the views of those members of the legislature who did not want to repeal the State's ban on union shop agreements. Legalizing of the union shop would have forced Berry and other Rath employees to join a union that had subjected them to shameful abuse.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out, first of all, since the name of the Iowa Legislature has come into this, it is rather interesting for me to note that the representatives of the majority of the people in the Iowa Legislature voted to repeal the right-to-work law. It was also the representatives of only 40 percent of the people of Iowa who put it on the books to start with.

So, you see, we get into this matter of reapportionment and the one-man, one-vote proposition also. As a matter of fact, the representatives of a majority of the people in both my district and the district of the gentleman from Waterloo voted to repeal.

If we are going to vote here in accordance with sentiments expressed in the legislature, then those of us in districts where the representatives of the majority voted to repeal, will vote to repeal here.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It was a valid issue and a valid vote, and no amount of legerdemain is going to change the fact that the Iowa Legislature, with Democratic votes, refused to repeal the Iowa right-to-work law.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It was not as bad as the previous legislature. Under the one-man, one-vote criteria, it was about half as bad. I hope, in two more legislatures, reapportionment will have been accomplished to the extent that a majority of the people in Iowa will have their say on legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The observations of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell] with respect to the State versus Federal Government are fascinating because, following him through to a logical conclusion, New York would not have itself any minimum wage law. It would have its own, and all the Federal preemption would be turned back under his theory.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. I hasten to tell the gentleman we have a minimum wage law, one of the best in the country, which is usually ahead of the Federal minimum wage law, which is not preempted.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt] 4 minutes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, Congress over the past 30 or more years has adopted the policy that free collective bargaining is to be favored and encouraged. What laws it has passed affecting collective bargaining have primarily been for the purpose of establishing ground rules for its conduct. As such they have been essentially procedural in nature. There has been a reluctance by Congress to interfere with the substantive terms of what is actually agreed to by the parties. Even in the procedural area Congress has acted with restraint. Only if it felt that legislation was required to increase the utility and effectiveness of collective bargaining did it take action.

It is my belief that the 89th Congress must act to assure the vitality of the collective bargaining process. And it can best afford such protection by repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. By so doing it will strike down the so-called right-to-work acts which 19 States have enacted, and will restore to labor and management in these States the right to fully agree upon mutually acceptable terms of employment.

Let there be no misunderstanding about the so-called right-to-work laws.

Such laws create no jobs, nor do they grant any opportunities for employment not previously existing.

States in which "right-to-work" laws are in force generally are low in economic development; wages and living standards are correspondingly low, with wage index 11 percent below that of union shop States. Such laws encourage "runaway" shops to low-wage States. None of the 19 "right-to-work" States matches the Federal minimum wage standard; 11 have no minimum wage at all. Only three of these States have equal pay for women laws. Only one of these States has a fair employment law prohibiting job discrimination. Only five meet as many of three of the eight child labor standards.

Repeal of 14(b) will not make union membership mandatory, nor require anyone to join a union. It would simply allow workers to join voluntarily, through majority vote process, in collective bargaining units, for proper employer-employee relationships.

Repeal of 14(b) would remove State governments from limiting freedom of workers and employers to bargain collectively. "Right-to-work" laws forbid the freedom to make responsible private employer-employee negotiations.

"Right-to-work" laws are not preferred by the workers whom they supposedly protect. In the 1947–50 period in which union elections were required, 97 percent of the 46,146 elections and 91 percent of all worker votes were in favor of the union shop.

Repeal of 14(b) violates no individual or minority rights. Under the union shop, the rights of the worker, including dissent and opposition, are fully protected by union regulation and Federal law, including Taft-Hartley, Landrum-Griffin, Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, and Civil Rights Act of 1964, title VII.

Mr. Chairman, right here let me stress a point regarding the civil rights organizations.

There is no group of Americans more concerned about the rights of our citizens than the civil rights organizations in our country. For the past several years these organizations have worked tirelessly in behalf of legislation to reassure the constitutional guarantees of every American.

In the course of these struggles, the civil rights movement has developed a strong leadership and a knowledge of the legislative procedures of our Federal system. They have petitioned for and they have won legislation that will move this Nation considerably along the road toward elimination of discrimination.

There is no question in my mind that, if there was legislation before us today that would in any way restrict the rights of Americans, these civil rights groups would speak up in opposition to that legislation. But the fact of the matter is, the civil rights organizations in America are for the repeal of right-to-work laws. The civil rights groups favor repeal of section 14(b).

I believe the RECORD should indicate that in the House hearings on this matter, the subcommittee heard Clarence Mitchell, director of the Washington Bureau of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Mr. Mitchell presented testimony in behalf of Roy Wilkins, NAACP executive director; A. Philip Randolph, president of the Negro American Labor Council and of the AFL–CIO Sleeping Car Porters; Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference; and James Farmer, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality.

Mr. Mitchell told the committee that the supporters of right-to-work laws have no interest in the welfare of workers. Instead, the supporters of right-to-work hope to weaken organized labor and systematically lower wages, lengthen the hours of work, and otherwise prevent decent and wholesome labor conditions for both Negro and white American workers.

These men—Mr. Mitchell, and those he spoke for—represent virtually the entire civil rights movement in America. Their support for repeal of section 14(b) and their willingness to testify accordingly, is due to their belief that the Negro and all Americans of minority groups look upon a continuation of right-to-work laws as being oppressive. They consider that the end of section 14(b) will be another legislative affirmation of a right that has been curtailed.

I am confident that no American wants to perpetuate an injustice. That is another reason why section 14(b) should be repealed by the swift passage of H.R. 77.

There is no obligation on the employee to join a union, to picket, strike, or do anything else other than pay reasonable dues, as determined by the National Labor Relations Board. If denied union membership because of race, religion, or antiunion attitude, an employee may not be fired nor required to pay the dues. And today, the Committee on Education and Labor has reported legislation to strengthen the enforcement provisions of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

"Right-to-work" laws create confusion, uncertainty, dissension, and irresponsibility within unions. Unsecure unions must be aggressive and militant in facing recruiting problems. Those demanding responsible unionism through "right to work" actually aim at elimination of unions.

To keep unions weak so as to permit States to compete for industry is to deny the basic principle of the United States that it is an economic whole. The large internal market has grown because the country is an economic unit. Congress would not amend the Fair Labor Standards Act so as to allow States to impose unfair labor standards. Thus, it is inconsistent with national labor policy to retain 14(b), by analogy.

I firmly believe that union membership as a basis of continued employment should be neither required nor forbidden by law, but that the decision should be left to agreement by management and labor through the process of collective bargaining.

The effect of section 14(b) is to forbid an employer and a union to agree that union membership shall be a condition of employment.

It is not my intention to argue only that the union shop benefits both labor and management through the stability it brings to labor relations, the orderly and uniform contract administration it secures, the more effective voice it gives to employers or the assurances of greater union democracy it provides.

Nor do I stress only the strict codes of democratic conduct which the Government by law has imposed on unions. No other voluntary organization must meet such requirements of secret ballot elections, frequently held, freedom to criticize elected officials without reprisal, and democratic procedures for setting policy and making decisions.

Nor do I emphasize solely that the union shop operates only where a majority of the workers have decided in its favor and where the employer has agreed with the union to a union security contract. Under Federal law, the union which is selected by a majority of the workers must represent all the workers in the factory or shop in collective bargaining relations with the employer. The union has no choice. Even if it wanted to, it could not refuse to represent any individual worker or group of workers. It must represent them all.

What I do urge as the most basic argument for repeal of section 14(b) is that, consistent with the clearly stated congressional policy mentioned, unions and employers should be free to negotiate union security provisions if they wish to do so. And, they should be free to exclude such provisions if they cannot agree on them. What I want, and what repeal of section 14(b) would assure, is freedom for American unions and American employers—freedom to agree or disagree on union security, without interference from State government.

I am equally convinced that section 14(b) and the right to work laws it fosters result in an out-and-out contradiction on the one hand, and repudiation on the other, of that congressional policy which I urgently commend as being most compatible with our American traditions of free democratic action.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to enthusiastically support the provisions of H.R. 77, a bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I feel it is fitting and proper to highly commend our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, the Honorable RAY MADDEN, for his informative and factual remarks so eloquently delivered to the Members of the House yesterday afternoon.

Congressman MADDEN spoke from his heart—Congressman MADDEN spoke from firsthand personal experience. His historic speech should be read by every American.

Today it is the responsibility of the Members of the House to resolve an issue which has been the subject of much discussion in the past, and the cause of substantial unnecessary expenditures.

The late President Kennedy stated in 1960 that he joined with "the late Senator Taft in thinking that where the union is the collective-bargaining representative of all employees in an establishment, the payment of dues is justifiable as a fair means of sharing the expenses of collective bargaining among those who receive its benefits."

It seems that the reasonable decision in the 89th Congress, here today, is that the "free rider" who has amassed substantial benefits because of his coworkers' expenditures must equally share the costs of the bargaining which increases his financial position to one of greater prosperity than ever before.

It is noteworthy that most of the States have realized that the effects of antiunion security legislation are not beneficial to their society. These States have not exercised their options under section 14(b).

Experience has proven that adherence to the Taft-Hartley Act—and exclusion of any recognition of section 14(b)—benefits management and labor together.

On the other hand, many of those States which have exercised their options under 14(b) are engaged in campaigns to bring industry to places where cheap labor is offered, and not where men are interested in paying a fair wage for a fair day's labor. This sort of economic climate is certainly not conducive to better living and wage-earning conditions for the workers.

It is time that we create an atmosphere which will benefit each man in our democracy. Where the union has been selected as the collective-bargaining representative of all employees, it is only fair that all who benefit from the labors of those who negotiate for better hours, wages, and working conditions should have to pay their small share for that which helps them to live better in this fine civilization.

Mr. Chairman, enough time has passed, too much money has been spent, and many workers have unnecessarily paid for the benefits which others have enjoyed. We, the people of the United States, should now recognize that we must agree, by this legislation, with the majority of the States and repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act so that the ends of justice will be met.

This proposed legislation is equally fair to the worker, the employer, and to the public in general.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] implied, at least, that because the voters of California in 1958 turned down by a rather substantial vote an attempt to have a right-to-work law, they now favor the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. I must respectfully disagree with the conclusion the gentleman reaches, for the following reason: I represent a district which is fairly typical of California, about 57 percent Democratic and 43 percent Republican, and very close to the one-man, one-vote proportion. I sent out a questionnaire to all voters in my district—Republicans and Democrats, union and nonunion. I received 22,000 back, which was a 16-percent return—77 percent stated in answer to that questionnaire categorically that they were opposed to the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield to me briefly?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out to my colleague from California that he represents Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties. It is rather interesting to note that Santa Barbara County voted "no" in 1958, and Ventura County voted "no" by 30,000 to 21,000. So the gentleman's own counties voted "no" at that time. Until we have another election, I believe it is very hard to say that a private poll by an individual can stand as an opposition record.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I attempted to state—and perhaps the gentleman from California did not hear me—that I have no doubt if the issue were put before the citizens of California again, as to what we wish to do in California, we would again turn down the right-to-work law. That does not mean we feel we should tell other States what they ought to do. That is the issue.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, the issue before the House today is clear. It is simply: Should the union shop be made a matter of national policy, or does it permit of local option? I think that we can no longer have a situation in which about one-third of our States are not only failing to meet their responsibilities to their own workers but are creating problems for the majority of the other States in the country.

Last week this House considered legislation authorizing additional funds for the war against poverty. A few years ago we increased the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour, and I expect that before long this House will be considering legislation for an additional increase. Last year we took the first steps in a program to assure minority groups in the country equal opportunity in employment, so that their standard of living would not suffer because of race, color, or religion. And I hope that it will not be very long before we can take up legislation to strengthen the equal opportunity provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. These are but a few recent examples of a well-established national policy designed to achieve the highest possible standard of living for our people.

The bill which we have before us today is very much a part of that policy and that program. It is designed to assist the American worker in his quest for a good wage and good working conditions by eliminating the misleadingly named "right to work laws." Let us make no mistake about it, the purpose of these laws is to weaken labor unions. And the purpose of weakening labor unions is to make it possible to pay lower wages. That is what this argument is all about.

Now, if the union shop were to involve subjecting the worker to abuses from the union, to unfair practices, the problem might be more difficult. However, as part of our national labor code, the Congress has provided safeguards against such abuses. We have provided relief against excessive initiation fees, against unfair practices in representation elections, against abuses in the handling of funds. If there are still areas in which the unions are unfair to their members then the answer is to take whatever action is necessary to assure fairplay. And I am sure that every responsible labor leader in the country will agree with that. The answer is not the purposeful weakening of the American labor movement by making it possible for those seeking cheap wages to deny workers a union shop.

The argument has often been advanced that the industrial development of some of our States demands that there be no union shops. Or to put it in terms of naked truth—industrial development demands cheap, wages. Therefore, the argument runs, so-called right-to-work laws are essential. First, of all, I deny that industrialization based on this premise is either wise or humane. Secondly, I think that as a body charged with a national responsibility we must also take into account the effect of these policies on other States and localities.

Industries are attracted by a variety of factors—and the wage rate is just one such factor. Transportation facilities, power supply, public services, schools, property taxes, a trained labor force, the integrity of government, and, yes, the condition of racial relations in the community—each one is as important as wages. I say, deal with these problems, and new industry will come without sacrificing the standard of living of your people.

But we are also talking about the standard of living of other people as well. States are not isolated economic units. What a State does in respect to the working conditions of its people affects not only them but is likely to affect the people and economies in other States as well.

A $1.25 wage for clothing workers in Mississippi cannot help but have a depressing effect on the wages that clothing firms in New York City can pay. A $1.25 wage in South Carolina cannot but serve to cause some employers from New York City or Boston or Philadelphia to think seriously about either moving to

South Carolina or constructing new plant space there. In short, to depress wage rates in one part of the country is to depress them elsewhere as well. To offer low wages in one part of the country is to induce industrial migration from another. We long ago recognized this in the area of wages and hours legislation. Even though the cost of living may vary somewhat around the country, there are no options as to the minimum wage that can be paid or the maximum hours demanded. As with the minimum wage, I say that the union shop is so inextricably involved in our national economy that it demands a national answer.

Mr. Chairman, when great abuses developed in the relations among businesses we developed a doctrine of unfair competition. We declared that there were certain practices which we considered too raw to tolerate. It seems to me that to allow States to bar the union shop is to create among the States a situation of unfair competition which we cannot tolerate either from the point of view of the welfare of our citizens or out of fairness to those employers who want to share the fruits of prosperity.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY]

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, the State of Illinois, so far as I know, has never seriously considered legislation under the section 14(b) authority. It is, therefore, not among the 19 States which are classified as right-to-work States.

Yet, as was true with the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE] I took a survey in my district, which I believe is a typical downstate Illinois district. I sent a questionnaire to names taken at random from telephone directories on the question, "Should the Federal Government prohibit State right-to-work laws?" The answer was 70 percent "no," 2,200 voted "yes," 10,224 voted "no," and 2,098 expressed no opinion on it. Several who voted "no" identified themselves as union members. So it seems clear to me that there is some considerable opposition even in States which have not seen fit to exercise section 14(b) authority.

I was surprised to read in the Washington Daily News, today's issue, on the editorial page a comment about 14(b) in which it was indicated that unions can get approval for union shop agreements simply by displaying signed pledge cards representing a majority of the workers in a plant. I am certainly no expert on labor law, and I would appreciate a clarification from anyone in the committee as to whether it is correct, as the newspaper indicated, that a union shop agreement can be consummated on the basis of signed pledge cards without the need of a secret ballot approval by a majority of the members.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman's statement is correct. It is often assumed that a union must be established by virtue of a secret ballot election. While in most cases that is true, it is not always true. Actually, an employer is supposed to recognize a union whenever he in good faith believes a majority of the employees bargaining want to be represented by a union. In many instances or in some instances, at least, the NLRB required an employer to bargain with the union when he has engaged in some kind of an unfair labor practice. In other words, the Board is in some instances seeking to penalize the employer for engaging in an unfair labor practice by requiring him to bargain with the union. Of course, when an employer engages in unfair labor practices, he ought to be penalized, and I would suggest he should be penalized in some other way, because when the Board uses that device it avoids the question as to whether or not the majority of the employees actually want the union. The only way it can be determined really is to have a secret ballot election. More and more the Board is tending toward a mere card check, and oftentimes people sign a card or petition under pressure, really, when they would not vote that way in a secret ballot election.

Mr. FINDLEY. Would the gentleman agree with me that it would certainly be desirable from the standpoint of the individual member of the union to have this secret ballot protection?

Mr. GRIFFIN. The whole argument of the proponents is that there should be majority rule, and if a majority of the employees want a union shop, then all of the employees should have to pay their fair share of collective bargaining. So the gentleman is eminently correct. Certainly at the very basis and foundation there should be an absolute requirement that at least a majority want that union to represent them.

Mr. FINDLEY. It seems to me a matter of simple common sense to strengthen the rights of the worker in this regard before we repeal section 14(b).

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman is making a very good point.

Mr. FINDLEY. May I ask the gentleman if it will be in order to consider amendments to this bill which would afford that additional protection to workers?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I regret I am not a parliamentarian and would not be able to advise the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Do you have any indication as to whether such an amendment will be considered in order or not?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I do not know. I cannot tell you.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me on that point?

Mr. FINDLEY. I will be glad to.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would like to point out to the gentleman I can understand his concern, but the normal procedure for determining representation matters is the election, the secret ballot election. That is the procedure followed in 99 percent of all the representation cases.

Mr. FINDLEY. Would it not be in the interests of union members to make it mandatory in all cases? Until 1951, Federal law required secret-ballot elections.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would simply say to the gentleman the 1 percent of the cases is where the employer has been found to be engaged in unfair labor practices and has made a meaningful election impossible. That is the only case in which the cards are used.

Mr. FINDLEY. I am surprised to learn that the secret-ballot procedure is set aside because of unfair practices by the employer. To me, this seems an inadequate justification. The right of secret ballot should be established in all cases.

This legislation has special importance—and danger to public welfare—because of the extraordinary authority, immunities and privileges which are enjoyed by some labor leaders.

Certainly, unions with exclusive representation authority enjoy the power to enforce payment of dues. No other private organization or association enjoys such power. The power is the equivalent of the power of taxation, and therefore in this respect puts unions on a par with government itself.

Section 14(b) reserves to State governments the right to outlaw compulsory unionism. Until the extraordinary authority of unions can be abated, it seems to me wise to retain this right of the States.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH].

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, much that will be said during this historic debate will be trite because what is being uttered has been expressed better by so many people before us.

Most of us who are in this venerable Chamber today were not here 18 years ago when the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted in those tumultuous times of great and painful economic adjustments. Organized labor was restive because wartime controls of consumer products may have been lifted too soon. Wages could not catch up with the upward spiralling of the cost of living. Many work stoppages had occurred and the public feeling against organized labor and the alleged abuses of its power was particularly high. The 80th Congress which passed the Taft-Hartley Act reflected well what I consider the misguided popular national sentiment of the time.

The Taft-Hartley Act, has in the perspective of the years, proven in some respects to be unnecessarily harsh and repressive upon labor. It redounds to the credit of the labor movement in the United States that the unions have accepted the onerous restrictions which then, and since, have been imposed upon it because, first and foremost, their members are loyal to the democratic principle which underlies the American society.

Through the years, in most part, organized labor has abided with what it has considered an unfair and unwarranted legal imposition on its functions in collective bargaining. So while the basic purpose of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 is the "protection by law of the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively," section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act provides that where State law outlaws the recognition of the union shop it should prevail over the Federal law. Section 14(b) then imposes a wholly unique doctrine of supremacy of State law where it is more restrictive than Federal law. The act's expressed protection of employees to organize and bargain collectively proves to be illusory in these instances.

Through the years organized labor has shown that section 14(b) has operated to its severe disadvantage, particularly in the so-called right-to-work States which outlaw the union shop. Not only has union membership in the near-score of right-to-work States been lower than expected but collective-bargaining responsibilities have been especially burdensome. While unions may have collective-bargaining agreements with employers in those States, they are by law forced to act as agent for nonunion employees who refuse to bear their share of representation costs that are paid through union dues. Section 14(b) by protecting freeloaders, unjustly imposes a duty on unions without providing a compensating benefit.

My State of Minnesota enjoys progressive labor laws, I am proud to say. Yet both organized labor and enlightened industry in Minnesota are pressing for the repeal of section 14(b) because it serves to undermine our State's prosperity by providing what have been called sanctuaries of exploitation in right-to-work States. As long as wage-chisellers and antilabor employers are protected by section 14(b), decent employers and responsible unions everywhere are threatened with loss of business and loss of jobs.

Aside from that, it seems to me repugnant in our 20th century America that section 14(b) should be allowed to exist as an open invitation to anarchy in the industrial government of our economy. I refer to that highly ordered and complicated relationship which has developed over many years between the managers of industry representing a diverse corporate ownership and the unions which are agents for the employees. A whole body of procedure arising out of the labor contract and customary practice governs the wages, working conditions, work assignments, promotions, job security, protection of individual rights and dignity of the worker, and so forth. The existence of such recognized labor-management practices distinguishes industrial organization in the most advanced democratic Western nations from all other nations. These are practices which have promoted unparalleled labor peace and the economic well-being in our country.

The Nation and the Congress 18 years ago committed a grievous wrong in imposing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act upon organized labor and impeding responsible collective-bargaining procedure with this onerous restriction. Repeal of this provision is long overdue. I hope that this House will quickly adopt H.R. 77 so that justice can finally be done.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member now of the Education and Labor Committee for 11 years. I think by any tally that has been made in the State of Oregon or in other places that my voting record on labor matters would be considered as very much pro labor. On the issue we are discussing this week I find myself in agreement with many of the things that are being said on the right-hand side of the aisle.

I was a member of a labor union about 20 years ago. It was my choice and not by necessity. I have a withdrawal card from this union. I am one of those who thinks that the right-to-work law is a misnomer, and that many sins have been committed under that title. But I do want to spend these few minutes discussing an issue about which I really am concerned and that I think should be of concern to this House.

I have been especially concerned when, in the last few days, there have been a few labor leaders—not very many, but a few—who have said to me in effect—"The heck with anybody's individual conscience. We are going to have the repeal of 14(b) of Taft-Hartley, and we are going to have it without any amendments."

I am even more deeply concerned about labor matters in general, because I think such a position means that that individual is also blind to other civil liberties and civil rights of union members.

I have received, I must say, only two letters during these last many weeks that I would consider obnoxious and that I would consider very unfair as far as my position is concerned, in which they have said to me, You could not possibly support an amendment for a person on the basis of religious conscience, because that individual is a freeloader.

Those correspondents have been very few in number, let me repeat, and let me say also that this attitude is in sharp contrast to the letter written by Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY of April 30, 1965, to Senator McNAMARA in which Mr. HUMPHREY said:

WASHINGTON,
April 30, 1965.

Hon. PAT McNAMARA,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PAT: I am enclosing a copy of a recommended conscience clause for labor legislation which is being promoted by the Plymouth Brethren IV, conscientious objectors.

Since they cannot belong to any organization other than the church, they are seeking legislation in labor bills to protect genuine conscience.

Their ideas seem very good to me. I send them to you for your consideration.

Let me know if there is any way I can help in any matter.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, there has been much said during the debate on this bill regarding public opinion. I submit for the information of the House the following letters:

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF
ELECTRICAL WORKERS,
Washington, D.C., July 26, 1965.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: The claim of right-to-work supporters that public opinion supports their position is based in large measure on a survey published by "Opinion Research Corp.," of "Research Park," Princeton, N.J. The research director of the IBEW has sought since June 9 to secure from this corporation statistical information on the basis of the sample used in polling. The latest communication from Vice President Skibbins of this corporation advises that the requests have been forwarded to the National Right To Work Committee in Washington, D.C. I think all will agree that the Right To Work Committee is not a professional statistical organization and is hardly the place to forward requests for professional statistical data. I believe this incident discloses the lack of merit in the polls which are being relied upon by right-to-work enthusiasts who are opposing the repeal of section 14(b).

I think, however, there are solid facts which indicate that public opinion supports the repeal of section 14(b).

During the years when the Taft-Hartley Act provided for union authorization elections (1947–51) the National Labor Relations Board conducted 46,119 union shop authorization polls. The union shop won in 44,795 of these polls—an astoundingly favorable 97.1 percent.

The great statewide referendum elections on the right-to-work issue in November 1958, in the States of California, Ohio, Washington, Colorado, Kansas and Idaho resulted in an overall overwhelming vote against right to work. Only Kansas was recorded in favor of the right-to-work proposition and in the States of California and Ohio the voters defeated right to work by such a wide margin that they brought down individual political careers of great standing.

Although the process of repeal of laws in State and Federal Legislatures is quite difficult, right-to-work laws have been repealed in six States—Delaware, Hawaii, Indiana, Louisiana, Maine and New Hampshire.

The congressional elections of 1964 involved the repeal of 14(b) as a major issue and the results, in my opinion, represented a clear-cut expression of public preference for such repeal.

The question of public opinion requires a consideration of the future, as well as the past and present. Of course, each person must make his own judgment, but it does seem to me that the history of the last 30 years shows that the people and the Government strongly approve the principle of the employees' right to organize and bargain collectively. The right-to-work laws imperil that principle. The repeal of section 14(b) should, therefore, be welcomed by the solid public opinion which supports the right to organize and bargain collectively.

A copy of the IBEW's request of July 12, 1965, together with Mr. Skibbins' reply of July 19 are attached.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH D. KEENAN,
International Secretary.

JULY 12, 1965.

OPINION RESEARCH CORP.,
Research Park, Princeton, N.J.

DEAR SIRS: We appreciate the material of a general nature sent to us by your public relations assistant, Mrs. Ann Deutsch, on the 22d of June. However, we are interested in information on a specific study; namely, the 1964 study regarding union membership as a condition for obtaining or holding a job which was commissioned by the National Right-To-Work Committee.

Again, the specific information we want regarding this study is the size of the sample for the whole study and for each of the subgroups of the study, the geographic distribution of the samples, the exact wording of the questions asked, the order in which the questions were asked, instructions given the interviewers, and a copy of the study results.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. NOE,
Director of Research and Education.

OPINION RESEARCH CORP.,
Princeton, N.J., July 19, 1965.

Mr. JAMES E. NOE,
Director of Research and Education, International Brotherhood of Electric Workers, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NOE: Thank you for your letter of July 12, 1965, covering your requests for services.

We have forwarded your requests to the National Right-To-Work Committee in Washington, D.C., and you may wish to contact them. Incidentally, the 1964 study was an ordinary probability sample evaluation of public and union family attitudes toward a range of subjects pertinent to labor-management-union-Government relations.

Sincerely,

GERALD J. SKIBBINS.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today a bill which deserves the support of every Member of Congress, for it offers the Congress an opportunity, and presents it with a challenge, to correct an error made in this National Legislature 18 years ago, an error introduced and ratified by the forces of conservatism and reaction. The bill before us today, H.R. 77, which repeals section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, will at long last eliminate from Federal law an archaic anomaly, a loophole, a gimmick, which for 18 long years has had the effect of sabotaging the legitimate efforts of organized labor on behalf of the American worker, and, perhaps more serious, has created the only instance in American jurisprudence where a State law is permitted to supersede and prevail over the statutes of the United States as enacted by Congress.

In 1947, Congress passed the National Labor Relations Act, popularly known as the Taft-Hartley Act. That law was at best a compromise. It was engineered by one of the most conservative Members in the other body and was supported by his allies in this body. In many respects that law totally ignores the contributions which organized labor has made to the improvement of American life, not the least of which is its invaluable contribution to the growth and vigor of the economy as a whole.

But one important facet of labor-management relations was recognized in the Taft-Hartley law. That fact is that the validity of union security provisions in collective-bargaining agreements between union and employer is central to the survival of organized labor and its ability to perform its legitimate function—that of increasing the bargaining power of the worker in order to secure from management better wages and working conditions, and greater personal security and dignity.

The Taft-Hartley Act established forever as a central tenet of American public policy the legitimacy of the union shop. Section 8 of the Taft-Hartley Act provides:

> Nothing * * * shall preclude an employer from making an agreement with a labor organization * * * to require as a condition of employment, membership therein.

The reasoning behind the union shop is simple. The members of a union cannot hope to secure higher wages and better working conditions unless all workers act together. A worker who refuses to join the union weakens it; yet that same worker benefits from every concession, every raise in pay, every fringe benefit, which the union fights long and hard to secure. The Taft-Hartley Act recognized all this when it permitted labor-management agreements under which any employee hired by management must, within a specified period of time, usually 30 days, join the union formed by a majority of the employees in a free election. And membership as such has come to be interpreted quite narrowly by the courts and the National Labor Relations Board. All a worker need do to be employed in a union shop is to pay the same dues and initiation fees as his fellows. He is not required to participate in meetings, strikes, picket lines, or other union activities in order to maintain membership. Thus, his individual freedom is preserved and protected.

But a curious inconsistency in the Taft-Hartley Act has the effect of rendering null and void the expressed policy of Congress, that the union shop shall receive official encouragement. As the Supreme Court put it in *Algoma Plywood and Veneer Company* v. *Wisconsin ERB*—336 U.S. 301, 315—section 14(b) grants the States permission "to carry out policies inconsistent with the Taft-Hartley Act itself."

The Court added in *Retail Clerks* v. *Schermerhorn*—375 U.S. 96, 102–103:

> Yet even if the union security agreement clears all Federal hurdles, the States by reason of section 14(b) have the final say and may outlaw it. There is thus conflict between State and Federal law; but it is a conflict sanctioned by Congress with directions to give the right-of-way to State laws barring the execution and enforcement of union security agreements.

Mr. Chairman, I detect a note of puzzlement in the Court's words, and well the Justices might be puzzled, for it is difficult to comprehend how the Congress could have declared its support for the union shop, and, in the very same act, made it possible for any State to declare the union shop unlawful. Such action reminds one of a boy getting into a swimming pool; he wants to get in and puts his foot in the water, but finding it too cold, quickly yanks it out again. Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act was a product of the timidity and conservatism which characterized the immediate postwar period. It is my sincere hope that we are now somewhat more enlightened.

Section 14(b) injects into American labor law that basket of snakes called States' rights and State sovereignty, which keeps appearing on the side of special interests which have something to gain by a departure from declared national policy. We see this in the battle to enact adequate civil rights legislation. And yet, it is clearly the prerogative of Congress to establish uniform national standards for organized labor. Every decision of the Supreme Court to date has substantiated that prerogative. Section 14(b) has the effect of undermining the relationship between State and Federal Government as set down in the Constitution. We have sworn to defend the Constitution, and thus we have a duty to eliminate this provision which comes in conflict with it.

Now, some of my friends who oppose H.R. 77 have said to me, "Well, if you are so concerned with consistency, and with supremacy of the Federal as against the State statutes, then why not amend the Taft-Hartley Act so as to outlaw the union shop on the Federal level?

That is a fair question, Mr. Chairman, and it brings us to the very heart of this problem. There are gentlemen in this body who are antilabor, antiunion, and who would like to weaken organized labor or do away with it entirely. These gentlemen serve a useful function by again making us ask ourselves whether we were wrong in supporting the union shop as a tool which contributes to the welfare of the Nation as a whole. Are we now to declare that the union shop is a bad institution which is best outlawed?

I submit to the Members of this House, Mr. Chairman, that the union shop has long since proven itself to the Nation. Section 14(b) has for 18 years given every State in the Union the option to pass so-called right-to-work laws. But did every State find it expedient to do so? Of course not. Only 19 States have right-to-work laws which limit the freedom of employers and unions to negotiate a contract under which membership in the union becomes a condition of employment. Thirty-one other States have found it to their advantage to permit the union shop. Why?

The statistics give us the answer. Low economic development is the universal characteristic of States with right-to-work laws in force. Wages run 11 percent below those of union shop States; none of the 19 right-to-work States matches the Federal minimum wage standard. Eleven have no minimum wage at all. Only three of these States have equal-pay-for-women laws. Only one of these States has a law prohibiting job discrimination.

Some have no child labor laws. It is clear that the progressive States, the States with the most advanced industrial development, the States with the highest regard for the welfare of their citizens, are the ones which have decided that the so-called right to work laws are not to their advantage to enact. They are unquestionably correct.

I never cease to be amazed, Mr. Chairman, by the widespread bandying about of this emotionally laden phrase, "right to work." When the National Association of Manufacturers solicitously defends the laborer's right to work against the tyranny of his union, it is somewhat amusing. But when uninformed men and women, citizens who have been propagandized by the commercial interests and various rightwing groups, write to me asking that I work for the defeat of H.R. 77, a bill clearly in their interest, I am surprised, to say the least.

Let me reiterate what has been said a hundred thousand times, in the hopes that this time it will not fall upon deaf ears. Right-to-work laws do not create any new jobs or grant any opportunities for jobs not previously existing. They serve only to cripple unions in their abilty to successfully negotiate on behalf of workers. They result in weak unions, lower wages, fewer fringe benefits, reduced standards of living.

Right-to-work laws permit free riders, those workers who receive the benefits of a union-negotiated contract, and yet do not contribute one red cent to the union's effort. In the insect world, Mr. Chairman, one who lives off the efforts of others is called a parasite. I should think simple morality would cause workers to wish to contribute to the union which fights for their benefit, but such is not always the case.

Some of my colleagues argue that unions should have to "sell" the value of their services to prospective members; that the union shop requirement of compulsory membership is reminiscent of military conscription. I contend that this argument is a total distortion of the facts. As all my colleagues know, unions can come to represent a body of employees only when those employees vote for a union in a free election. Nobody forces it upon them; a majority of them choose to be represented by the union of their own free will, because they feel the union can better their lot as employees.

When union and employer write a union shop provision into a contract, all it means is that the minority of employees who did not vote for the union, and employees who come to the firm subsequently, are required to pay union dues as a condition of employment. They are required to abide by the freely expressed wishes of the majority. It is nothing less than the American way for citizens to abide by majority decisions, once the minority has presented and lost its case. Such is the Western democratic tradition.

Now, my friends who oppose repeal of section 14(b) claim that "an economic climate conducive to industrial growth" is the result of the right-to-work laws which section 14(b) permits the States to enact. I suppose they have a point, but let me rephrase their contention so as to eliminate the euphemisms. What they really mean is that States with right-to-work laws have the kind of prevailing wage rates which industry prefers to pay workers—very low. Well, I was born in New York City and I am old enough to remember the sweatshops where workers drudged out their lives for pittance wages amid shocking working conditions. That too, was a so-called economic climate conducive to industrial growth. But I believe few gentlemen here today would advocate a return to that state of affairs even at the expense of failing to attract certain industries to their State.

It is common knowledge, Mr. Chairman, that what motivates many who favor right-to-work laws in their States is a desire to attract industry by keeping unions weak or nonexistent, and wages low. It is utterly immoral for a State to solicit industry on this basis, Mr. Chairman, and the error is only compounded as a Federal statute encourages States to solicit industry on that ground, as section 14(b) does.

Mr. Chairman, for 18 years some States have used section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act to elevate other interests, stronger interests, over and above the welfare and the economic prospects of the American worker. Good judgment and sound public policy demand that we eliminate this inexcusable loophole. We must recognize that section 14(b) was written into the Taft-Hartley Act not because it belonged there or because it expressed the real needs and wishes of the Nation, but for other reasons entirely antithetical to the liberal philosophy now held by a majority of our citizens. We can now best serve the United States by dispensing with section 14(b) and I am confident that an overwhelming number of my colleagues will vote for its repeal.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Chairman, the proposed repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is an issue which has provoked much debate on both sides of this often emotional question. Letters from my constituents and some 30,000 returns from a recent questionnaire I mailed indicate opinion to be virtually evenly divided.

But after assessing all the arguments and taking into consideration the nature of the district and State I represent, I must conclude that it would be in the best interests at home and in the Nation if these so-called right-to-work laws would be repealed. I will vote for repeal and urge my colleagues to join me in this view.

New Jersey is a highly industrialized State with a comfortable standard of living, fine working conditions, and a relatively high wage level. If this State and others of similar nature are to retain their favorable position and if industry within their borders is to remain competitive, we must establish a uniform Federal rule governing union security agreements. Until we have reached this—and we can by eliminating 14(b)—we will have unfair labor competition between States.

As recently as July 22, Gov. Richard J. Hughes stated:

> Much of the industry that New Jersey has lost in recent years has gone to Southern States, where industry does not have to bargain with labor unions. This isn't fair and the Federal Government should take some sort of action to keep the Southern States from competing unfairly with Northern ones.

I agree with our distinguished Governor and can point to the loss of a once-flourishing textile industry in my own area as one example of the results of unfair labor competition with some Southern States. Most of that industry is now located in States with so-called right-to-work laws. I can also testify to the fact that four companies which originally expressed an interest in locating in South Bergen County are now in operation in the South.

No one can deny there is conflict between the States and sections of our country, provoked by attempts to promote right-to-work laws. The State with such a law is able to attract industry from those that are highly unionized. They do this with promises of weak unions and low labor costs, which are supported to amount to a favorable business climate. Bitterness and controversy have been aroused by these campaigns.

But are these laws good for the individual wage earner and the head of the household, who has a family to feed? I think not. Figures from 1963 show that in 19 right-to-work States, the average weekly income for manufacturing was $91.80. In the Southeastern States with right-to-work laws, which are the competitors that have caused concern to New Jersey's Governor Hughes, the average weekly wage was only $77.77 in manufacturing. Meanwhile, States without such laws in contrast produced an average weekly pay of $101.52 in manufacturing. Thus, a State borderline can create a difference of nearly $25 a week in a man's worth.

I believe New Jersey and other industrial States should not lose business and jobs to other States because of differences in their labor laws. And since New Jersey is highly industralized, with a large working force engaged in manufacturing, our State legislature has not seen fit to declare a so-called right-to-work law, and I doubt that it ever will. New Jersey will not change its own law regardless of the action this distinguished body takes. I, therefore, believe repeal of the 14(b) is necessary to end undesirable variations in labor laws among the States.

We also have had a more emotional side to this argument. We have been subjected to a highly organized, well-financed campaign to convince the Nation that 14(b) is necessary to protect the freedom and dignity of the individual worker. Many people have been taken in by these high-sounding phrases, but if one will look more deeply into this euphemistic premise, he will discover the argument is not on firm ground.

This is a Nation ruled by majority. There are laws we must adhere to in the Nation, State, and municipality that we might object to but must follow because of one reason: They are the will of the majority. There are leaders we must follow despite our individual opposition because of one reason: They have been placed there by the majority. People who work in a given industry have a freedom of choice by majority—to organize or not to organize a union. But some people who themselves must follow the majority in many phases of life suddenly believe a worker is being victimized if he must follow the will of the majority in joining a union. They would prefer to encourage the free rider, the man who does not join and yet reaps the higher pay, the vacations, the pensions, and the other benefits that are won in earnest negotiation by his union member coworkers.

The issue cannot be individual freedom, because the American worker never enjoyed a high degree of economic and personal freedom until he banded together to form unions. The presence of the free rider dilutes the union's strength in honest negotiation. And if so-called individual freedom were provided to the utmost degree, the worker would be left to bargain for himself and would soon be found facing the same conditions he had to fight off earlier in this century.

The argument of some organizations that they are working in defense of freedom for the worker is a hypocrisy, because during that long period of time when business had a free hand and the worker was backed by nothing but his individual freedom to negotiate, his actual freedom was hard to find. It was clouded by poverty, poor working conditions, long hours and unwarranted dismissals from his job.

A plea along these lines asks for no other freedom than the freedom to starve and beg and plead for charity. The fact is that workers have achieved genuine freedoms only by joining together in a common effort to raise living standards and the quality of life. Through their efforts, they have helped raise the standard of living of the entire Nation.

There are 19 States today giving their workers freedom to stand alone. But if an employer and his workers in one of these States wish to declare themselves a closed shop they do not have that freedom under the law; so this freedom works only in one direction.

Let us look deeper at the freedoms granted in these 19 States. Only three of them have an equal-pay-for-women law, while 66 percent of the others have them; only one has a fair employment practices law, while 69 percent of the others have it; only 26 percent of the 14(b) States have a minimum standard child labor law, while 56 percent of the others have it; only one has unemployment insurance maximum weekly benefits of at least $48, compared to 47 percent of the States which have no right-to-work laws.

So in effect, what do right-to-work laws protect? We might conclude that they protect the right to hire women at inferior pay, the right to pay inadequate workmen's compensation, the right to discriminate in hiring, the right to work long hours at low pay. But these conditions have been disguised under a law that bears an overly fair title.

Let us examine another area. It is significant that the States which have espoused segregation and discrimination also are the most frequent champions of righ-to-work laws. Can these States be so conscious of freedom in one instance and so ignorant in another? The fact is that 14(b) has been used by some States to alienate workers by allegiance and race. Apparently, 14(b) and segregation go hand in hand.

Freedom is not at stake, because only 17 million jobs of a working force of 75 million are found in union shops. Anyone really concerned with the idealism of the right-to-work law can go elsewhere. Realistically, this may be too much to ask, particularly where an individual has specialized skills. He can then be consoled by the fact that in a union shop he can refuse to participate in union affairs without losing his job. If he pays his dues, the union cannot have him fired and he is entitled to all of its benefits.

The weight of necessity and logic convinces me that section 14(b) should be repealed. Such action will benefit my district, my State, and the entire Nation. It will bring workers now being shortchanged in some States to the same wage earning level as their fellow Americans who are prospering elsewhere outside the confines of 14(b). It will eliminate inequities in competition among States and wll save the competitive positions of industries located in non-right-to-work-States, where business leaders are really upholding the dignity and freedom of the individual worker.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, those of us who have been keeping abreast of the progress of this bill as it wound its way through the legislative process, have continually been confronted with the issue of individual freedoms. The freedom of an individual, constitutional, and common, to join or not to join a union as a condition of employment—just as he is free to make any other associations he desires—has been raised by many offended and indignant citizens. This would appear, on the face of it, to be a rather compelling argument. Certainly one that a Representative, wed to the Constitution, could not pass over.

But if we examine the matter in considerably more detail, we find that the National Labor Relations Act does not require membership in a union as a condition of employment in a union shop. Rather, what is required, is that the union must represent all employees when it negotiates for wage agreements, better working conditions, and so forth. Just as no individual can take it upon himself to enter into the foreign affairs of the United States and negotiate a private treaty—employees are bound by the management-union contract that comes out of a meeting where the employees are represented by the men they elect by majority rule. Each employee is bound by this contract as to working conditions, wages, hours, and fringe benefits.

He is, however, not bound by union rules. He is not required to be a member of a union, to take an oath or enter into any obligations to it; he is not required to attend union meetings nor to participate in a picket line, or engage in other union activities.

Thus, when the majority of the employees vote that they shall be represented in negotiations as a union shop, in the American tradition, majority rule prevails. But each employee is only obliged to abide by the agreement with the management that the employees voted by majority rule to accept, and nothing else. Since the union must negotiate for each and every employee, employees must tender nominal dues and initiation fees that are not excessive or discriminatory. Thus, each worker bears the cost of the collective-bargaining unit that the law says must represent him.

We have, as Americans, long championed the idea that those who join in the responsibilities of our Government, deserve to share in its benefits; those that bear arms for the Nation ought to have the right to vote. The reverse of this is equally true: Those that enjoy the benefits should equally share in the responsibilities and the burden of securing those benefits.

And nothing in the repeal of 14(b) would require union shops. Management and labor would merely be free to negotiate such arrangements, to be ratified by a majority of the employees, if they desire to. A majority of workers can always vote to discontinue union representation if dissatisfied. This same freedom prevails in New York State today—so nothing that 14(b)'s repeal would accomplish would affect us—except that we would be better able to compete with those States which do have right-to-work laws and thereby lower wage scales.

Indeed, the entire Nation will benefit from this legislation. Those States which do not at present have right-to-work laws will not be forced to compete at a competitive disadvantage with States that have repressed wage scales. And in those States that do have right-to-work laws, the lot of the employees will be raised—they will no longer drain our tax dollars away for grants-in-aid, they will no longer require relief. In the long run, these States will be on considerably safer ground financially. Our States will not lose the business and the taxes; the standard of living in others will rise. The equilibrium will not be perfect. But certainly prospects are considerably more appealing than the current scene.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to advise the Congress that I will vote for the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. I do not intend to continue the harm that comes to the State of California by the inequity which permits 19 so-called right-to-work States to induce industry on the promise of cheap labor.

We settled the right-to-work issue in California in 1958. I remember the threats and the fear, and the advertising which was used by advocates of the right to work. They predicted a very gloomy future if their side did not prevail, but none of their dire predictions have come true. Instead of their predicted gloom, California has enjoyed tremendous growth and prosperity.

A doctrine long revered in our Federal system, commonly known as the doctrine of preemption, holds that wherever the Federal Government enters into an area of legislation, it preempts that area and the States may not again act contrary to Federal law. Section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act constituted a unique exemption from the workings of that doctrine.

I have received a tremendous amount of mail which indicates the general public is misinformed on the results of the repeal of section 14(b). George Romney, Governor of Michigan, has said:

> These right-to-work laws, whether National or State, are not the answer, because they deny to workers the same organization rights exercised by stockholders. Management and its policies are the result of majority votes by stockholders, and minority stockholders must accept the will of the majority or sell out. In the American economy and political system, workers must have these same rights of organization.

Freedom of religious opportunity is a cherished freedom. I desire to associate myself with the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] in her desire for a conscience clause as an amendment to this bill.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the passage of H.R. 77. I was opposed to right-to-work laws before I became a Member of this body. As a former official of the United Steelworkers of America, I might be assumed to be naturally disposed to favor repeal of section 14(b). I was also a businessman; even then I favored its repeal. I would favor repeal under any circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a national labor policy since 1947, nearly 20 years. This policy was to permit the union shop, and to prohibit the closed shop. This policy has become a part of our labor-management relations system. It has worked, not entirely to my satisfaction, but it has worked.

And then we have also had section 14(b), for nearly 20 years.

When enacted in 1947 section 14(b) was supposed to preserve the rights of the States to further restrict union security. It permitted the States to prohibit the union shop, the maintenance of membership shop, and the agency shop. In fact, section 14(b) permitted only one kind of shop—the open shop. It was an antiunion measure.

That was, I say, nearly 20 years ago. There were 12 right-to-work States then. Since then we have had millions of dollars and millions of words wasted on this subject. Where are we? Some 19 States now have right-to-work laws—7 more States, Mr. Chairman. Several others have enacted them and repealed them. Several have considered such laws and turned them down.

Since 1958 only one State—Wyoming—has passed such a law. Indiana repealed her law this past January. The voters in Oklahoma and New Mexico recently turned down such a law. In other words, most of the States themselves do not desire section 14(b). They have shown no substantial interest in passing right-to-work laws.

Most of the right-to-work laws do not provide for any machinery, except appeal to the courts, for the enforcement of these laws. The States with such laws have appropriated practically no money to administer them. The tradition not to spend any money on labor problems, except for State police and special deputies, is too strong in the right-to-work States to permit even enforcement of right-to-work laws. The laws, where they exist, are a fraud.

Mr. Chairman, I say this experiment in undercutting a national policy in the name of States rights has proven itself to be worthless. They say these laws protect the rights of the individual worker. Three-quarters of all industrial workers live in States without such laws. They say they protect the union man from the union boss. Nearly 90 percent of all union members live in States without such laws.

States are repealing these laws, not passing them. Where they exist, they are not enforced. Who really benefits from these laws? Not the workers, certainly. They do not ask for their passage, but for their repeal.

Repeal of 14(b) is not a union question, Mr. Chairman. It is not a management question. It is a question of national policy, our problem, Mr. Chairman. We ask for responsibility in labor-management relations. Let us start by giving all unions in all States the right to negotiate contracts which permit them to be responsible. Most union contracts contain union shop clauses. Let us make it national policy for all of them to be able to do so. I favor one policy for all unions, for all States, for all our citizens. Section 14(b) was another noble experiment, Mr. Chairman. We tried it. It failed. Now let us admit it, clean up the mess, and get on with the Nation's business.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'BRIEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, had come to no resolution thereon.

INTEROCEANIC CANAL PROBLEM: REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD ADDRESSES HOUSE ON JULY 29, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, in a notable address before this body on April 1, 1965, our most distinguished and scholarly colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], made a carefully documented and logically reasoned presentation on the Isthmian Canal question in which he emphasized the transcendent responsibility of the Congress in maintaining our indispensable sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

As shown by his extensive and illuminating discussions during the past 8 years on various features of the complicated interoceanic canal subject, it is clear that no Member of the Congress has studied this matter in greater depth or has a more profound understanding of it than the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative FLOOD. His collected addresses are indeed a vast store of digested knowledge; and they have been listed in a bibliography on the "Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States—Documentation, 1955–64," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 2, 1964, prepared by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

On Thursday, July 29, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative FLOOD, will again speak to the House in a sequel to his April 1 address on "Interoceanic Canal Problem" and will include much that is new.

Mr. Speaker, because of the crucial importance of the canal subject and the need for every Member of the Congress to be informed about it, I trust that as many as possible, especially those on cognizant legislative appropriation and investigatory committees, will be present and participate in discussions on the floor.

SECRETARY UDALL'S PANEL TO PROMOTE TROTTERS SHOALS

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, again Secretary Udall has shown utter contempt for the House of Representatives. The Secretary appointed a committee, all connected with the Department of the Interior, to study Duke Power Co.'s $700 million Keowee-Toxaway complex in my congressional district. The Secretary did not notify me of the appointment of this committee by mail, by telephone, or otherwise. I read about it and saw the list of its members in the local newspapers which arrived by mail here in Washington several days later.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of the Congress for 16½ years and have always believed proper courtesy should be extended each Member by the agencies and departments of the Federal Government. It is my honor to be a member of the House Public Works Committee, presently meeting to consider an authorization of almost $2 billion for more than 100 projects throughout the country. It is elemental courtesy for the Secretary of the Interior to notify any Member of the Congress when panels or committees are appointed to study projects in their own congressional districts.

On January 4 of this year, Duke Power Co. applied for a license before the Federal Power Commission to immediately begin initial construction of its $700 million complex on the Keowee-Toxaway Rivers in my congressional district. This Duke project is in Appalachia and would be a fantastic contribution to the development of the entire Appalachian region by the purchase of coal, increased rail traffic, and by providing an abundance of cheap electricity for industrial development. Additionally, the Duke complex would provide unlimited public recreation, rural, and municipal water supplies. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, Duke is presently furnishing, without charge a municipal water supply for more than 15 cities.

We could not conceive of anyone objecting to the Duke project, as it was entirely in Appalachia and necessary to meet future power needs. We could not conceive of anyone intervening to prevent private enterprise from joining the Federal Government in developing Appalachia. Nevertheless, Secretary Udall filed an intervention over his signature to prohibit construction of this project on the 21st of June of this year with the Federal Power Commission. The Secretary charged that Duke did not need the power and further that Duke should purchase its power from a proposed Federal dam at Trotters Shoals on the Savannah River.

A Federal dam at Trotters Shoals would cost the taxpayers approximately $100 million. This intervention by the Secretary to prevent Duke from spending $700 million in Appalachia stunned and shocked my people beyond imagination. Protests poured into Secretary Udall in unprecedented volume. The Secretary, as a result, promised a restudy of his intervention. Late last week, Secretary Udall appointed a panel of six members from his Department, the names of whom and their appointment I learned about from the local newspapers this week. In appointing the panel to make the restudy, the Secretary is reported as having said the panel would study the Duke Keowee-Toxaway project and Trotters Shoals. This is equally as shocking as the intervention. Trotters Shoals is not even in the Appalachian region and has been thoroughly studied, restudied, and debated.

The Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, conducted extensive hearings on Trotters Shoals in April 1963. Copies of the hearings have been in print for more than 2 years. The committee hearings on Trotters Shoals alone contained almost 300 pages, a large portion of which was in fine print. No project has been more thoroughly and exhaustively studied by any committee of Congress in my 16½ years as a Member.

Mr. Speaker, Trotters Shoals was thoroughly and exhaustively studied and considered. No case could be made for it and it was rejected and repudiated by the subcommittee. Secretary Udall, himself, appeared before the subcommittee and testified for almost 2 hours in behalf of a Federal dam at Trotters Shoals. At that time the Secretary's principal contention was that Trotters Shoals was needed for recreation. His contention was subsequently proven to be utterly ridiculous, as this area has more recreational advantages and fewer people to enjoy them than any other area of the Eastern United States. Now, 2 years later, the Secretary is advocating Trotters Shoals for power, while Duke is seeking to build a complex, including Middleton Shoals, which would pay taxes and generate at least 100 times more electricity than Trotters Shoals.

Duke rates compare favorably with Federal Government rates while paying taxes, local, State, and Federal.

Mr. Speaker, all that is now necessary is for Mr. Udall to withdraw his intervention before the Federal Power Commission and let us proceed to develop Appalachia and permit the $700 million Duke project to get underway. No restudy is necessary. This restudy is designed to promote a Federal Government dam at Trotters Shoals. This panel is simply another Trotters Shoals steering committee. This procedure is old and cut and dried. The panel is hand picked—the deck is stacked.

Trotters Shoals is the objective of the Secretary of the Interior. Why has he so doggedly and persistently advocated this fantastic Government waste? Trotters Shoals is not needed for recreation. It is not needed for navigation. It is not needed for flood control. It is definitely not needed for power, as Duke Power Co. is willing to generate the power and pay taxes while doing so. In the immediate area, Clarks Hill and Hartwell Reservoirs, two of the largest in the world, and Lake Secession furnish more than adequate recreation for the entire region, navigation from Augusta to Savannah, and more than adequate flood control. Trotters Shoals will complete Government control of the Savannah River from Augusta to the mountains.

Could the Secretary have in mind long-range transmission connections with other Government power projects? The real goal is national socialism.

If the Secretary of the Interior can control the Savannah and make connection with other Government power projects, then he can control water, power, industry, and people. The Southeast would be at the mercy of a Federal bureaucracy and a stark Federal monopoly.

Trotters Shoals was used once before very effectively to kill the Duke proposal to build the world's largest steamplant at Middleton Shoals on the Savannah River in Anderson County in my congressional district. It is being used again to delay and harass Duke plans for Keowee-Toxaway. It is being used to undermine President Johnson's plans for the full development of Appalachia.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has two huge Federal dams already in operation on the Savannah River—two of the largest in the world—Clarks Hill and Hartwell. We now desperately need a balance. We need the private enterprise, taxpaying Duke development to give some balance and assure future development of Appalachia with jobs and opportunity. At the present time one unit at Hartwell is not in operation—has not even been installed. Hartwell is a peaking power dam which is not in full operation 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. If there is need for more Federal Government power then full operation at Hartwell could furnish that power now.

Mr. Speaker, it is incredible, but true, that after the completion of the $100 million Hartwell project by the Federal Government that power from Hartwell had to be peddled by the Federal Government like vegetables in the marketplace before it could be sold. Efforts were made to sell wealthy municipalities in North Carolina and throughout the region many miles from Hartwell. Many communities refused Hartwell's Government power, preferring private power. Many industries do not want and cannot use Government power as the Government is not responsible in the event of power failures. Industry and private citizens cannot sue the Government. Many large industries prefer to buy power from Duke in this area because the rates are reasonable and Duke is responsible for guaranteeing that power is available at all times.

The entire area around the Federal Government reservoir at Clarks Hill is depressed because no industry can locate there. In the area served by Duke there are virtually no depressed areas and employment is at an alltime high. For every dollar spent by Duke, three additional dollars have been invested by other industries.

Again, Mr. Speaker, a restudy is not necessary. Least of all do we need a panel to promote Trotters Shoals. I urge Secretary Udall to withdraw his intervention, thus permitting Duke to join the Federal Government in developing Appalachia.

BILL TO AUTHORIZE DRAFTING OF A CHARTER TO PROVIDE HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, of the proposals perennially before Congress in recent years, few have been more persistent or less successful than those which would grant home rule to the District of Columbia. Not only has there been a lack of agreement on whether home rule should be granted at all, there has also been a noticeable absence of consensus among home rule advocates as to what specific form home rule should take if it were to come about. Moreover, there are those who question whether the people of the District even want home rule. This much is clear: The whole problem is in need of a fresh approach.

The basic deficiency with previous attempts to establish local self-government in the District has been that they have tried to hand down to the people of Washington a municipal government from on high. To proceed in this fashion violates the very essence of home rule which is to allow the residents of the city to regulate their own purely local affairs. If home rule is ever to succeed it must be on the basis of a form of local government which has come up from the grassroots, not down from Congress.

The bill I have introduced today would achieve precisely this purpose. To settle once and for all the question of whether the people of the District really want home rule the bill provides for the calling of a referendum in which the matter would be placed directly to the people. Simultaneously with the referendum would be held an election to select a 15-member, nonpartisan District of Columbia Charter Board. If the home rule proposition were approved, the Charter Board would be charged with the responsibility of drafting a local self-government charter which would then be submitted to the voters within eight and a half months of the first referendum. The charter, if approved in this second referendum, would be transmitted to Congress for its consideration. If Congress neither specifically approved nor disapproved the proposed charter within 90 days it would automatically take effect.

Although it would grant the Charter Board the widest permissible latitude in framing a charter, the bill is consistent with the constitutional requirement that Congress retain ultimate legislative responsibility for the Nation's Capital. Although Congress could not and should not be denied the right to pass specific legislation for the District, the bill contemplates that Congress would exercise its legislative prerogative over the District only by means of amending whatever charter might be adopted rather than passing on specific acts of the District government. Provision is made for a Presidential veto of specific ordinances, although the President's positive assent would not be required for an ordinance to take effect.

The merits of this approach to home rule should be obvious. First, it would establish home rule only if the people of Washington really desire it. Second, it would allow the people to propose the kind of municipal government which they themselves want. Third, it would protect the Federal interest. Finally, it would free Congress of a task for which it is ill suited: sitting as a city council for the city of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I began work on this bill shortly after the first of the year. Many weeks of concerted effort by both myself and my staff followed. Although the measure was ready for introduction more than a month ago, I have delayed doing so until today because I wanted to see what action the other body might take. I was hopeful that the bill which the other body had before it would emerge in a form such as to attract the support necessary to gain favorable action in the House. Unfortunately this development did not take place. Among its deficiencies is the way in which it confuses the question of home rule with the question of representation for the District of Columbia in Congress. These are two separate problems and should be treated as such.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, represents a new approach to the matter of home rule and one which I hope will receive serious consideration by this body.

EXCLUSIVE TERRITORIAL FRANCHISES

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on H.R. 9829 which I introduced. This is a measure needed to settle the uncertain state of mind of a great portion of the American distribution system.

Businessmen in diverse fields have had their exclusive franchise arrangements called into question without a thorough assessment by Congress of the legal validity of this form of marketing distribution.

Mr. Speaker, this is all the more unfortunate in the light of the fact that, although our antitrust laws do not specifically refer to exclusive franchise distribution, a long line of judicial construction has uniformly held such arrangements not to be a violation of that law where no anticompetitive effects result.

Territorial franchises, it has often been pointed out, are necessary in order for smaller manufacturers, without nationwide advertising facilities and abilities, to compete with larger companies. The only feasible method for such entities is the distributor or dealership approach which requires, for its effective operation, that the distributor or dealer make vigorous and intensive efforts in behalf of his supplier in a restricted territory.

If such distributor is to be held responsible for energetic performance, it is fair, reasonable, and equitable that he be protected against invasions of his territory by other unscrupulous distributors or dealers.

It is the function of H.R. 9829 to codify into law the economic and judicial findings that an exclusive territorial franchise is not in itself a pernicious or malevolent method of trade. H.R. 9829 provides that a territorial franchise granted by a supplier to a buyer is not a violation of our laws where competition is not unduly restrained. As such, this bill is thoroughly unexceptionable and merits the active support of all Members of this body interested in the preservation of small business and business opportunities within this Nation.

AFTER THE DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star of July 26 carried a special report on "Selma Revisited." It is a report of what has happened in Selma, Ala., since the massive invasion from all parts of the country last winter.

At the time of the invasion there were those of us who said the real purpose was not to help the Negro of the South, but rather to create a dramatic situation in order to increase public pressure to pass the President's voting rights bill. Time has proved that we were right.

There were those of us, also, who said at that time that the problem facing the Negro of the South, or anywhere else in the Nation, could not be solved by demonstrations in the streets, by riots, by causing the breakdown of law and order. I posed the question here in the House, what happens when the demonstrations end and those who invaded Selma depart? That question was ignored at the time, even by prominent clergymen who took part in the demonstration to whom I asked it. I urged that they follow up their good intentions by working out a concrete plan for helping the Negro in the South to improve his economic condition, which is the root cause of his problem. I regret to say, my urging was ignored completely and the clergyman to whom I wrote, instead sent me a form letter justifying his right to march in Selma. A right I never questioned.

At a time when the demonstration leaders, many prominent members of the clergy, and high officials of Government, even to the President himself were encouraging people to break laws which they considered unjust, I said such encouragement would lead inevitably to an increase in crime. You need only to read the papers of the last 2 days to know how tragically true this prediction was. Crime in the United States is galloping to new highs in every section, even in the South which for years had a low incidence of crime. We have now reached the point where the President has had to set up a special Commission to try to do something about the criminals who are running rampant throughout the country, beating, robbing, raping, and murdering peaceful citizens.

There were those of us, at the time of the violence and the rioting in Selma, who warned of some of the misleaders of these demonstrations and for this warning we were accused of trying to becloud the issue. Since the end of the demonstrations, several of those who were most prominent among the leaders have been arrested on charges brought by their own people, one for molesting young girls and the other for embezzling funds. A number of those leaders have been publicly identified with Communist causes and at least one of the participating organizations, SNICK, is now being exposed for questionable activities to opposing the United States in its defense of freedom against the Communists in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I now make the statement that other leaders of the so-called civil rights movement will be exposed for activities not in keeping with their avowed purpose of trying to improve the condition of the Negroes in America. I have been reliably informed that the President is aware of an FBI file on Martin Luther King which proves King to be far from the sanctimonious religious leader he professes to be. I have been informed that at least two major TV networks have this information and I hope that in time it will be made public.

I make these statements so that those who are truly motivated for improving the lot of all Americans, white or black, may be aware of false leaders, to urge them to return to the traditional American ways of helping our fellow man instead of resorting to violence, rioting, and lawbreaking under the guise of peaceful demonstrations.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to include the article from the Washington Evening Star, as well as a column by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak concerning the plans of SNICK to seize control of these chambers. The column appeared in this morning's issue of the Washington Post:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 26, 1965]

SELMA REVISITED: FOUR MONTHS AFTER THEIR "FINEST HOUR" RIGHTS FORCES ARE IN DISARRAY

(By Haynes Johnson)

SELMA, ALA.—A new sign stands near the spot in Selma's Negro section where Martin Luther King led the marchers into the street and down the long road to Montgomery last spring. It reads: "Forward Ever—Backward Never."

Today that sign is more an expression of hope than a statement of fact. While stoutly maintaining their faith in themselves and the civil rights movement, Negroes here are shocked and divided.

The spirit and singleness of purpose they showed when Selma became a byword around the world have been shattered by bickering and scandal. While the victory they scored last spring remains untarnished, the drive to build on it by improving their lot in life has slowed.

Their leaders are struggling to regain precious momentum, but many of those who followed them so patiently are frankly bewildered and disillusioned. Selma's Negro community is, in fact, in an hour of new and more subtle crisis—a tragic crisis when it is contrasted with the soaring hopes and selfless devotion they and their friends demonstrated here such a short time ago.

The reporter returning to Selma finds none of this on the surface. Selma slumbers in the summer heat as if the exciting days of springtime had never occurred. Women with parasols stroll past the small stores. The streets are quiet; there is little movement. Across the Alabama River the hot wind plays across the cottonfields.

NO REAL CHANGE

Now there are no demonstrators, no barricades, no jeering of chanting crowds, no troopers or armed posses. Now Selma, Ala., seems merely another trading center in the heart of the black belt of the rural South.

There is no discernible change in the racial climate of the city. The Negroes have scored no real advances in their areas of their greatest need—employment, housing, and education. They are discovering that these goals are easier to express than to achieve.

To be sure, there have been some improvements in the Negro position. Volunteer workers of both races are teaching students and adults in improvised classrooms. Leaders of the white and Negro communities have met in an attempt to begin meaningful communications. The Negroes are continuing their voter registration work. More than 20,000 books have been collected from across the country for a Negro library.

And above all is a historical fact: As a result of what the Selma Negroes and their white friends did last spring, the Deep South will never be the same. The demonstrations and the march lifted the spirits of Negroes everywhere.

In part the present dispirited mood in Selma may reflect an inevitable letdown from an emotional peak—what happens when the cheering stops.

It has been aggravated, however, by some specific incidents—the arrest of one of the most prominent local Negro leaders of the protest movement on charges of embezzling civil rights funds and the morals conviction of another Negro who assumed a position of leadership during the demonstrations.

Also, bills incurred by the civil rights movement have mounted. Some have not been paid. The phone in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference office, for instance, was disconnected for nonpayment. The SCLC is the national organization headed by Dr. King.

Finally there are stories of widespread misuse of gifts sent to help the Negroes in Selma. Privately, Negroes tell of incidents in which food, clothing, and money which poured into Selma during and after the march to Montgomery were sold or used for private gain.

These stories have not been documented; no one has been charged. But the accounts come from reliable sources, and it is fair to report that they are accepted as true within the Negro group.

The first real blow to Negro morale came on June 23 with the morals arrest of William H. Ezra Greer.

At the height of the street encounters early last spring, Greer appeared in the center of the demonstrations. He said he was a minister from Chicago, and a key lieutenant there in King's SCLC. Soon Greer was standing in front of the crowds delivering fiery speeches in the Billy Sunday manner, fist clenched, crouching, shouting, raising his knee, and stamping hard.

He took an active part during a prayer vigil in the streets for the Rev. James J. Reeb, the white Unitarian minister from Boston who was clubbed to death in Selma. After the march Greer stayed on in Selma, acting as one of the civil rights leaders.

On June 23 Greer was arrested on three charges by Selma's public safety director, Wilson Baker, on warrants filed by Selma Negroes. He was charged with two counts of assault involving the molestation of a Negro girl, one of using obscene language in front of a child, and another of possessing pornographic material.

HEAVY BLOWS

He was released on $900 bond. The next day, again on warrants filed by Selma Negroes, Greer was arrested on a similar charge of assault.

He was tried, convicted, and sentenced to 6 months at hard labor and fined $25. The judge suspended the jail sentence, pending good behavior after Greer's lawyer said his client would not continue living in Selma. Greer has left town.

It was an ugly scandal within the civil rights community. But a heavier blow fell days later when Baker arrested the Reverend Frederick D. Reese, president of the Dallas County Voters' League.

Reese, the key man in the Selma rights movement, was charged with three counts of embezzling funds belonging to the voters' league. Baker says his investigation began when he received tips from Selma Negroes.

Baker turned over information to a special grand jury that Reese had deposited approximately $8,000 over a 40-day period in a Montgomery bank. According to the documents, the first deposit, of $100, was made March 26 when Reese opened a joint checking account in his own and his wife's name. After that he deposited sums such as $2,900, $1,100, and $3,000. He began drawing on the account toward the end of April, Baker says, in checks ranging from $71.88 to $4,073.92.

Baker states that the canceled checks show that every one was for Reese's personal use.

The arrest touched off a storm from Negro leadership. They accused Baker of conspiring to smear the civil rights movement.

Martin Luther King's No. 2 man, the Rev. Ralph Abernathy, flew to Selma after the arrest. At a mass rally he compounded the situation when he was quoted as saying the money belonged to the civil rights movement and they could give it to Reese if they wished.

After that Baker left on a trip to California and the east coast questioning contributors to the Dallas County Voters' League. He returned with signed statements in which donors said the money was contributed for use only in civil rights work—not for personal use.

THE REACTION

In pursuing the investigation, the grand jury subpoenaed the records of the Dallas County Voters' League. According to Baker, few records other than a check book were available. He has hinted that more arrests are forthcoming.

Shaken and clearly unsure of what will come next, Negro leaders in Selma have reacted with a vehemence that in some ways resembles the attitudes of their white antagonists. Any Negro who speaks out about the scandals is branded as a traitor to the cause. Consequently, the voice of the Negro critic is not heard in Selma today.

In a newsletter distributed to Selma Negroes, the Voters' League said editorially:

"There are those in Selma trying to shatter this national symbol of resistance to brutality and oppression. They are the ones who have arrested us. They are the ones who, though they handcuff and jail a Christian minister, neither handcuff, jail nor punish those who murder in the night."

Even more revealing of present attitudes was a recent night meeting at Brown's Memorial Chapel, the center of civil rights activity. Reese and other officials of the Voters' League were present and spoke.

While members of the audience fanned themselves vigorously in the stifling heat, speaker after speaker took the lectern to excoriate the white community.

"The devil is on the warpath," one Negro said.

From the audience came the murmur of response: "Yeah." "Uh-huh." "Yeah, he is." "That's right."

Then the speaker talked of secret enemies, of Negroes working "under the table." He worked himself into an emotional pitch and waving his hands, said the enemy was the Negro—or Negroes—who went to the police.

Who was that Negro? he demanded. Let him show his face. He warned that the Negro—or Negroes—would be "taken care of," and used the phrase going for a ride.

"Most of us are here tonight because we are on the way to the promised land, the land of freedom," he said. "But we're never going to get to the promised land till we have unity, and we'll never have unity when we slay our leader."

CAMPAIGNS SLOWED

But all the pleas for unity have failed to hide the feeling of dismay that has swept the Negro community.

In the meantime, two key Negro campaigns have slowed to a standstill.

Despite appeals and threats of ostracizing, a boycott of white merchants is a failure. Negroes can be seen at any time of the day buying in the stores.

More important, the voter registration drive has lost its momentum. On the last night of the current Selma schedule for registering voters, for example, SCLC's project director in the city, the Reverend Harold Middlebrook, issued an appeal for Negroes to turn out in the thousands the next morning.

They needed 5,000 registrants, he said, adding that "we are too far now to turn around."

At 9 o'clock the next morning there were some 70 Negroes standing in line outside the Dallas County Courthouse. By contrast, during January, February, March, and April thousands were asked to come—and they did.

DRIVE PROGRESSING

Despite the present slowdown, however, the voter registration campaign has been making progress. One comparison illustrates this. Since last February, 7,326 persons—the vast majority Negroes—have signed the registration appearance book in Dallas County. This is more than the total number who voted in the county in the last national election.

Not all who sign the appearance book apply for registration, of course, and many of those who do apply are rejected. Nevertheless, the registration drive has made such an impact that it has brought a counter-reaction from whites.

A group called Women for Constitutional Government has been formed to encourage whites in Selma and Dallas County to register. They have taken an office directly across the street from the courthouse. They claim to have contacted 1,000 unregistered whites in the first week of July.

Economically, the outlook for the Negro is still bleak. There are few jobs. There are still no street lights in the Negro sections. The housing and plumbing is abysmal. The streets are still unpaved. The wages are still far below any reasonable minimum. In Selma, a Negro who earns $50 a week is a wealthy man.

Next month when the cotton crop is picked the Negroes who work in the fields will receive $2 a day. A maid in Selma can expect $10 a week. If she works 6 days a week in a laundry, she will get $12. At one motel, part of a national chain, a maid earns the top figure of $22.50 a week for an 8-hour day.

And outside Selma, in the farmland through which the marchers made their way, the conditions are worse.

PROUD OF MARCH

After the march some of the Negroes who came to the side of the road to cheer and wave suffered retaliations. Others appear to have been forgotten.

Mrs. Carrie Beaton, 39, sat on the porch of her shack, surrounded by children, and said: "Ain't nobody come to see us noway." Even if they had, she said, "it wouldn't make no difference."

But she, like all the Negroes one talks to, takes great pride in the Selma movement and the march. "It was real good," she said.

Across the field from one of the campsites used on the march a Negro woman who operates a grocery told how a bakery in Montgomery refused to sell her bread for her store. "The bread man said the white man came to them and told them they better not sell us the bread," she said. "And they said we aren't going to have any school for the little children."

Now the bread deliveries have resumed; things have returned to normal along the Jefferson Davis Highway to Montgomery.

WHAT LIES AHEAD?

But for Selma and Dallas County, as well as the other rural centers of the South, the old days and ways, it seems clear, will never come again.

The white counterattack on voter registration underscores what is perhaps the most basic change in Selma today: a recognition on both sides that despite their present troubles the Negroes are going to exercise power in the future. While the whites, generally speaking, are determined to keep that power at a minimum they tacitly acknowledge it—if not accept—the changes to come.

Already, Selma Negroes are talking of the political role they will play.

Middlebrook, the SCLC project director, has said he wants to become State senator from Dallas County. He has asked for 15,000 Negro votes in the fall to help him go to the legislature where he can assist Gov. George C. Wallace in writing legislation.

Another Negro civil rights leader, the Reverend L. L. Anderson, pastor of the Tabernacle Baptist Church of Selma, has said he wants to be mayor. Others are talking about and planning for the day when Selma Negroes have a place on the city council.

SEES GOOD FUTURE

One Negro, a man respected throughout Selma, expressed the situation frankly and philosophically.

"Now, racism I despise," he said. "I'm not kidding you, I don't care who it comes from. He can be black as midnight and I despise it. This black nationalism you hear here, this killing off the opposition by talking about (Uncle) Toms. It stinks.

"Now, here's the way I look at it: if everything else is lost—and it hasn't been lost—the march and what happened in Selma gave the Negro a sense of dignity he didn't have.

"Yes, sir, he would tell you what you wanted to hear. He was listless. I don't know if you know this but you can't deal with a man as a man unless he regards himself as a man. And this is what has happened, and I rejoice in it.

"Look, this thing has been badly handled after this march. It hasn't been handled well. The way I see it is SCLC has to send in some strong people in here because these people are babes in the wood.

"I predict a good future, I really believe this is going to be one of the best places to live in the world in a few years. You got everything in your favor—good natural resources, good climate, and good labor market.

"When we can get over people like George Wallace, get people like (Alabama Attorney General Richmond) Flowers (who has taken a moderate position on race) this is going to be a tremendous place to live.

"Why, I'd rather live here than anywhere in the whole world."

The Moses Rally

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Just how far militant elements of the civil rights movement have been sidetracked from their proper course soon will be seen in a civil disobedience rally against the war in Vietnam.

Unpublicized so far, an "Assembly of Unrepresented People To Declare Peace" is planned for August 6 to 9 in Washington (coinciding with the 20th anniversary of atomic attacks on Japan).

A 2-page flyer privately distributed to possible participants minces no words about the true purpose of the assembly—to get antiwar protesters arrested at the door of the White House and the Capitol.

But most interesting about the flyer is the identification of the assembly headquarters as 107 Rhode Island Avenue NW., in Washington. For this is the office of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNICK), which is supposed to be concerned almost wholly with civil rights and not at all with foreign policy.

Moreover, the flyer says correspondence should be directed to the Rhode Island Avenue address in care of Bob Parris. This is none other than Robert Moses, who gained a nationwide reputation as the mystical and eloquent leader of SNICK's Mississippi summer project of 1964 (then left Mississippi and started using his middle name of "Parris" to prevent development of a personality cult).

Though he now holds no SNICK office, Moses remains its inspirational leader—embodying SNICK's most disturbing tendencies. (For instance, liberals remain dismayed by Moses' collaboration with such a tired old figure of the far left as Russ Nixon, general manager of the Communist National Guardian (who has helped plan the August 6 to 9 assembly).

Far more disturbing than Moses' alliances is his view that couples white racism in Mississippi with the campaign against Communist terrorists in Vietnam. An admiring article in the Nation quotes Moses as contending that the 1964 murder of civil rights workers in Mississippi "is related to napalm bombings of objects in Vietnam."

Moses' objectives are spelled out in the two-page flyer.

On August 6 (anniversary of the Hiroshima bombing) protestors will gather at the White House. It is added cryptically: "There may be nonviolent civil disobedience by a small number of the signers who will seek to present the declaration (refusing to cooperate in carrying out the war in Vietnam) to the President." This is only a tame prelude to August 9 (the anniversary of the Nagasaki bombing). "Those members of the assembly of unrepresented people in a position to face possible arrest and willing to pledge themselves to nonviolent behavior * * * will assemble and walk toward the Capitol with the intention of convening the assembly in the Chamber of the House of Representatives and thus deny that Congress has the right to declare war in our names."

The inevitable result: Mass arrests, police dragging away demonstrators and (though this is not the intention of many demonstrators) fuel for the Communist propaganda mills.

The broader-range result is increased entanglement of SNICK from civil rights moderates. Indeed, by its own radicalism, SNICK has so isolated itself that it is starving to death.

Foundations, labor unions, and other liberal organizations have quietly choked off funds to SNICK, which cannot now meet its meager payroll. SNICK's remaining white liberal friends are finding it hard to raise a few thousand dollars this summer.

But this should be no cause for joy by respectable liberals. For SNICK's steady movement toward the far left and oblivion is a tragedy for the civil rights movement. Conceived spontaneously during the 1960 sit-ins, SNICK is the one civil rights organization that consistently has appeal for idealistic youth.

Furthermore, the lethargic civil rights summer in the South can be attributed partly to the deflection of SNICK's militants by fringe civil rights issues (notably the quixotic effort to unseat Mississippi's Congressmen) and noncivil rights issues.

Unhappily, with the civil rights movement in the doldrums in the Deep South, the main target for Bob Moses and his civil rights militants is Lyndon Johnson's foreign policy.

KEEP THIS LIBERTY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, today, this House is about to vote on legislation to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. It is incongruous to me that those who profess to call themselves "liberals" can advance this measure which will further restrict individual freedom and impose a requirement on every working man and woman to join a private organization in order to hold his job and support his family.

The arguments on this measure are well-known to all. But, apparently, this House cannot resist the steamroller tactics which have been so evident in the 89th Congress, where reason and debate are not nearly so influential as are the demands of the executive branch.

It has been said that, "good unions do not need the force of compulsion to gain new members, and bad unions do not deserve it."

Yet, by the passage of this legislation, we are removing from labor unions the necessity to demonstrate responsibility and service to their memberships.

No longer will it be necessary for a union to demonstrate that it deserves support from its members. The force of law will replace the force of reason. A fundamental right of every American to join or not to join a private organization will be taken away. Continued legislating away of voluntary "freedom of choice," and replacing it with compulsion does untold damage to this Nation and its people's freedoms. Certainly those who are a party to such a step will live to regret it.

I will not be such a party and I cannot believe that responsible citizens would have it any other way.

A recent editorial in the Aurora Missouri Advertiser presents with great clarity and persuasiveness the argument against repeal of 14(b). Under unanimous consent I insert the editorial at this point in my remarks:

KEEP THIS LIBERTY

The trend of legislation and court decisions aimed at increasing the protection of the individual and minorities and a diminution of the right of the majority as exemplified in court decisions which have almost revolutionized and made far more difficult the collection of evidence by peace officers, the presentation of cases by prosecuting attorneys, have banned discrimination against women and racial minorities in employment will, if the drive to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley is successful, have been directly reversed.

For, if a man wants to hold a job in any factory or business in which a union is the bargaining representative, he will have to pay tribute to the union whether he wants to or not, even if the union be headed by a man like Jimmy Hoffa or others of his ilk, and even if his personal beliefs run contrary to everything for which the union is working on the political front.

Nowhere in American life is there a similar restriction on personal freedom. In no other field can a man be deprived of some of his property, in this case part of his paycheck, without due process.

For example, we know of no employer's group to which the employer must pay a part of his profits or go out of business. And there is no essential difference between such an arrangement and the union or closed shop.

Not every State has passed legislation under the permissive provision of 14(b). In those which have, no agreement can be reached which will require that a worker join a union in order to get a job, nor, after he has secured a job, have to join and pay dues in order to keep on working. For if he must belong to work, the power of expulsion from the union by its leaders gives to those leaders a power which must belong to management—the right to hire and fire.

But, even in those States in which a union can demand a contract which makes union membership compulsory, the example furnished by States in which they cannot tends to keep union leaders aware of the fact that "it could happen here," and therefore operates as a deterrent to high-handed treatment of rank and file members by powerful labor bosses.

And it also operates as a check against excessive initiation fees and dues of the sort which created a scandal when army posts were being built during World War II.

Furthermore, with members free to belong or not, there is more motivation for union leaders to do a good job for their members, and to make decisions based upon their welfare and not accept gratuities for what unions call "yellow dog" contracts. Where union membership is compulsary, union members are captives whose only choice is pay up and like it, or don't work, and to keep their months shut in meetings or be in danger of expulsion.

The big city Representatives and Senators, nearly all of whom claim to be liberals who bleed for the working man, have come up with the phoniest of all phony arguments. They would have Congress repeal 14(b) in the name of freedom—freedom to let a union and an employer negotiate away the freedom of an employee to join a union, and pay dues only if he wants to do so, or if he can be induced to do so by pressure from his fellow employees, which is enough power for man to wield over man.

This is the rankest of poppycock. With the threat of strikes and all they mean today, employers are finding it difficult to resist union demands when it is their own pocketbooks which are at stake. Few employers are likely to put up much of a battle for the purses of their employees, particularly, if, in return for making a handful of their employees captive members of the union, they can get out of an economic demand upon him—grid pro quo.

It is hoped that real freedom—the freedom of a State to protect its workers against compulsory union membership and compulsory tribute to union treasure and political war chests if it wants to protect them, will not be voted away by Congress.

It is be hoped that the paragraph in the Taft-Hartly law which provides a check rein upon arbitrary exercise of power by labor bosses, but in no way is in conflict with the individual rights of working men and women, will not be repealed.

Further, we hope the Congress will not destroy the present necessity for union leadership to so conduct itself that membership in a union is attractive enough to secure members on a voluntary basis. We think such an incentive is basic to any organization—any business. Human nature, being what it is, guarantees that absolute power, in time, becomes corrupt.

And we hope the election victory scored by the late Senator Robert A. Taft against the frantic efforts and wild spending by labor leaders to punish him at the polls for his sponsorship of what has proved itself one of the finest pieces of basic legislation passed by Congress since World War II will serve to strengthen the backbone of Representatives and Senators who, in their hearts, want to vote to retain 14(b) but may fear reprisals if they do not vote to repeal it.

TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR CONGRESSMAN ASHBROOK

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, at a recent and much deserved testimonial dinner for our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman JOHN ASHBROOK, Mr. William Buckley discussed the philosophy of conservatism.

As one of the true and tested intellectuals of the conservative philosophy, Mr. Buckley's remarks are well worth the time and attention of the Members of this House.

His remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM F. BUCKLEY

Mr. Chairman, Judge O'Neill, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, Congressman ASHBROOK has sternly advised me that he dislikes flowery testimonials. Under the circumstances I shall deliver an unflowery testimonial. Let me put it simply and say that there is no man in Congress whose presence there I myself find more reassuring. I say this for several reasons, one of them that I have the good fortune of agreeing with most of the substantive positions of Mr. ASHBROOK, which positions according to the electoral figures are also those of the majority of the voters of this enlightened district.

Secondly, Mr. ASHBROOK—I think you all will concede the fact—shows the kind of personal political courage by which one distinguishes between those automations who represent us in Washington and those special others who are human beings endowed with mind and an active conscience. Mr. ASHBROOK's courage has been very widely noted by friends and foe alike. It was he you will recall who first stood up on the floor of Congress to ask whether the time had come to worry a little bit less about the maladministration of the country and a little bit more about the maladministration of the House of Representatives. Specifically he said to a crowded House, aghast at what he was about to do to a fellow Member, there was the matter of the Reverend Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr. Whereupon he detailed Mr. POWELL's increasing confusion of himself and the Treasury of the United States. Mr. POWELL will not be the same again, however likely it is that he will remain forever in Congress. The bubble was pricked and now it is commonplace to criticize Mr. POWELL as those of you—everyone one hopefully supposes—who read the Newark Advocate are aware. What other man in Congress has felt so keenly the requirements of pride in office that JOHN ASHBROOK has shown?

And then, on account of the great carnage of last November suddenly, Mr. ASHBROOK awoke to find himself the ranking Republican on the House Committee on Un-American Activities and as such automatically a principal target of the committee's enemies who are legion, powerful, and many of them unscrupulous. For the committee in question is one which Congressmen line up to avoid serving in because of course serving in it means exposure to the concentrated fury of the naive who believe that out of some sort of abstract commitment to the doctrines of free speech we are committed to making life as pleasant as possible for anyone who seeks to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence. Of course, as the ranking member of that vitally important committee, JOHN ASHBROOK is a prime target of those enemies of the committee who on account of the activities of the committee are left with less time to tell lies, steal secrets, and subvert policy because the committee is always looking over their shoulder, preparing to endorse relevant antisubversive legislation. Somebody has to serve on the committee, and the luck of it is, at this moment, that the senior Republican official of the committee is a man of intelligence, conscience, restraint, and courage.

But he is, of course, primarily engaged in representing you in the House of Representatives. If one examines the rhetoric of the more ardent Democrats in America one finds that they tend to divide their time equally between praising the two-party system and advocating the instance necessity of defeating every single Republican in Congress. But perhaps that is exaggeration. There are very few Demorcats who urge, let us say, the defeat of Congressman JOHN LINDSAY, of New York. It would be more correct to say that they urge the defeat of all Republicans who disagree with Democrats. JOHN ASHBROOK is, for them, a very important target precisely because of those real qualities I have mentioned in addition to his high sense of style which make his dissent from the reigning dogmas resonant, sharp, galvanizing. He is looked upon by Democrats in Washington not merely as a cipher who contributes his votes on the shady side of the ledger, but as a human force in which the high qualities of the statesman come together profusely. My god, I sound like EVERETT DIRKSEN and I promised JOHN I wouldn't. But it is a verifiable statement of the facts that in Washington and New York, in Los Angeles and San Francisco men and women of many political persuasions hold Representative ASHBROOK in high personal esteem and, derivatively, the men and women who have named him their Congressman.

As conservatives, we have been recently battered. Those who construe the election of last November as having once and for all disposed of the presumptions of American conservatives are, it seems to me, exaggerating their good fortune. Senator Goldwater suffered a stunning defeat to be sure, but it is not by any means certain, however, that he suffered it primarily because of the positions he took. When a year ago he was advocating a course of action in South Vietnam he was roundly denounced by those who tell us they represent a majority of the people. But recent polls indicate that an overwhelming majority of people—up toward 90 percent—endorse the activities of President Johnson in South Vietnam which activities are those precisely recommended by Senator Goldwater a year ago whose positions and goals for America were highly distorted.

I cherish as a lasting memento of the campaign of 1964 a little note that appeared in the New York Times the day after the election that related to a lady in New Hampshire who had voted for the first time in her life for a Democrat. When asked why she had deserted the tradition of her forebears, she said that she had been informed that in the event of his election as President, Senator Goldwater would take away her TV. "No," her friend advised her, "not your TV, your TVA." Very reassuring, she said, but she was not going to take any chances.

Let us look at some of the impersonal causes that contributed to the momentum and the nomination of Barry Goldwater and ask whether they too were submerged by the vote. I was recently in Europe, and there the phenomenon of the rise of conservative thought in America is only more baffling than it is here. Remember that it is generally believed in Europe that the principal contribution America can make to Western thought is not to think at all. I grant the generality that the world would probably be better off, not worse, if a lot of people who are presently hard at work thinking should desist from doing so and spend their time instead cultivating the thought of others. I remember an occasion not long ago when an editor of National Review remarked, on hearing the news that $600,000 had been allocated to bring together in seclusion for 1 year a dozen top American philosophers at Santa Barbara just to think about thinking, that the expenditure of $60,000 per year apiece toward the withdrawal of the average modern philosopher from public life was a price America could ill afford not to pay.

But the fashionable view in Europe about American intellectual activity and the role it plays in Western thought is, I should think, oversimplified. It is generally thought there that America, in the modern era, has taken over the place of Rome in the ancient era; that it is we who have successfully organized the resources of nature in order to guard the peace and who have produced the greatest share of the world's material goods in order that others might indicate how best they might be enjoyed in usufruct. But unlike ancient Rome it is said—sadly and truthfully—America has not acquired the mien, let alone the habit, of great power. We have not even acquired gravitas. Nor has America shown, it is alleged, a proper veneration for the values of the old world to compare, for instance, with the Roman's humility before the civilization of Greece. America, it is generally agreed, can contribute to Western thought only the physical shelter under which Westerners can continue their dialogs. To that extent, it is believed, America can be useful but even then—hark the dissent—the danger lies that in an excessive zeal, out of a fatuous idealism which distinguishes our exuberant moralism it is altogether possible, altogether likely in the opinion of some, altogether predictable if we are to listen to such as Bertrand Russell, that we will end up triggering a conclusive holocaust which would forever interrupt that purposive intercourse between the blither spirits of the West, the continuing hope of an upward mobile mankind, the dialog between C. P. Snow and Yevtushenko.

The existence of the conservative movement and the causes that spawned it is a phenomenon of which European intellectuals—most particularly I will charge the English, since it is their ignorance in which I am most educated—are in a state of innocence. They do not know that there really is growing in America a spirit of resistance to the 20th century, for that indeed is what we might as well agree to call it.

You will note that I am implicated in an uneasy figure of speech. It is hardly possible to resist the 20th century as the term is commonly used any more than it is possible to resist gravity or death. But the figure is useless only insofar as it invokes a mechanistic view of history which presuppose that it is the inescapable destiny of the 20th century to codify certain trends, social and philosophical, economic and organizational, trends which issue out of the very genes of history. But history, said Henry Ford, is bunk. I am less ashamed of that observation 30 years after it was made than perhaps I ought to be.

It is a common epithet, as you know and JOHN ASHBROOK knows, to say of the man whose views are deemed out of fashion that he resists the 20th century. There are any number of lively polemical variations on the theme. Senator Goldwater, it was tirelessly said, entered the 20th century kicking and screaming. Russell Kirk, it has been said one thousand times, mostly by those who are unfamiliar with the Middle Ages, "has a brilliant 14th century mind" and so on.

The friction arises, of course, when two essentially different attitudes toward history are rubbed together. We of the right do not doubt that history is in fact tendentious, that the vectors of social thought and action nowadays point to monolithic government in Washington and the atomization of individual norms. And it is certainly true that most of the intellectuals in America appear to be disposed to submit to the apparent imperatives of the 20th century. Apocalypse is in the air to speed us on the way to apparent safety and the cost of hitch-hiking along with the century in Europe, in Asia, in America is tacitly acknowledged to be the surrender of the self. The older intellectuals in America in particular grew into a world which seemed to be heading inescapably toward social self-destruction as a result of the First World War or as a result of the great depression. And then when the bomb came it brought physical self-destruction. Ten years ago Whittaker Chambers drew my attention to a note in the Journal of the Goncourt brothers, one of who had been taken that day by Madame Curie to see radium in the laboratory in which she had discovered it. "On being shown radium this morning," he wrote in his journal, "I thought I heard the voice of God ringing out as clearly as the doorkeepers at the Louvres at 5 o'clock every weekday afternoon, uttering the same solemn words, 'Closing time, gentlemen.' "

Indeed, no one of you—certainly not JOHN ASHBROOK—who would resist the 20th century would be so foolish as to say that it is the ideal arena in which to make the struggle. "If you wish to lead a quiet life," Trotsky said to a contemporary, "you picked the wrong century to be born in," and indeed, Trotsky's point was finally proved when a pick-ax mauled the brain of the man who framed those words.

So it is not in an escapist's ignorance of the distinctive darkness of this century's shadows that makes possible the spirit of modern conservatism. It is not the spirit that JOHN ASHBROOK embodies. The spirit of definance doesn't issue from a romantic American ignorance of the gloomy composure of the times we live in but it does, I think, issue in part from distinctively American patterns of thought; from the essence of the American spirit.

The European observer is entitled to believe on the basis of the evidence he reviews when he sees the reports which flow in from America which, however, much of it flows out of the submissive ghettoes of many American universities, that all of America has come to terms with the 20th century of the determinists. Yet I suggest their eyes are not properly focused. In America there are those who are dragging their feet—resisting, kicking, complaining, hugging on tightly to the ancient moorings. What do we cling to? Among other things, the individual, and the individual's role in history. We hope for the individual to survive the 20th century. We bank our faith on the individual's resources guided by eternal lights and we venture to predict that, in Conrad's words, America will spit back at the gale, giving it howl for howl and in the end will survive the convulsion and assert its mastery over the seething elements.

These are heroic words, mere rodomontade many of you will think, but consider a few things unaffected by last fall's elections.

One, it is essentially the modernist view that only the state can negotiate the shoals that lie ahead of 20th century man. We are accordingly urged to believe in the state as the primary agent of individual concerns, a belief that is imbedded in the analysis and rhetoric of socialism. Yet we are resisting in America beatification of the state. Even though the statists have lulled the general public or at least a part of it into accepting the state as a genial servant, the state has not been truly integrated as a member of the American household. The native distrust the majority of Americans hold for the genus state has not, I am suggesting, completely dissipated. We are still reluctant to accept the state as a sacramental agent for transsubstantiating private interest into public good.

Have you reflected on the course of postwar American history? The call for the nationalization of basic industries so insistent in the immediate postwar years is still, utterly stilled, droning away only in the fever swamps of the dogmatic left. With all his power and with all his popularity, with all his prestige, President Kennedy failed in his efforts to ease over to the Federal Government the primary responsibility for education or health or even housing and his successor although he has enacted precedent-breaking laws tending to turn over to the state partial responsibilities for education and health, seems to know that these are triumphs rather of forward ideological inertia than of the true popular will.

Through inertia, we might indeed end up, as De Tocqueville predicted a hundred years ago that we would, as minions of an omnipotent government. But it may yet be that American resistance by the minority is nowadays more remarkable than American acquiescence by the majority. At any typical gathering of Americans there are members in the audience who know prescriptively what you are talking about when you warn of the danger in relying on the state. Something, somehow kept them from accepting the state as the trend of the 20th century seemed to dictate that we should do as the sanctifying course in political affairs.

Two, probably no country in the history of the world was ever so devoutly secularist as our own in its practical affairs. And yet, the spiritual side of life which the 20th century is here to anachronize is an unshakable part of us. The worst failure in America is the man who aspires to true cynicism. Let the lushest bloom of the 20th century stand before a typical nonacademic audience and declare there his fidelity to materialism. The audience will divide between those in whom he has aroused pity and those in whom he has aroused contempt. It is as fashionable in America as in Europe to declare that the truth is not knowable, that the freedom of inquiry is the nearest we can hope to come to truth. And yet, although the American people tolerate and even enthuse over universities dedicated in effect to the proposition that no truth is knowable, still the majority of the universities' supporters and alumni organize their own lives with reference to certitudes, certitudes which for reasons sometimes of humility, sometimes of laziness and sometimes of awe, they decline to identify; but that these certitudes are there underlying human experience, they do not seem to doubt.

And that, ladies and gentlemen—the faith of our fathers it is sometimes called—gives the cast to our to be sure equivocal foreign policy; relieves us of tortured doubt over the question whether we would rather be Red than dead or dead than Red. The utter failure of the collaborators in our midst to engage the public in a trauma of self-doubt over the issue of Red or dead finally suggests the incorrigible resistance of the American people to submission to the 20th century.

And finally, third, what interests me and perhaps some of you—half of you, I am told—there is in America a renaissance of thought, a grinding of wheels, an on-going commotion. What is coming, I think, is the intellectualization of the spirit I speak of. Modern formulations are necessary even in the defense of very ancient truths. Not because of any alleged anachronism of the old ideas—the beatitudes of the Bible remain the essential statement of the Western code—but because the idiom of life is always changing and we need to say things in such a way as to get inside the vibrations of modern life.

For years Americans seemed woefully incapable of speaking for themselves. The great apostles of the 20th century are not American. With, perhaps, the exceptions of Oliver Wendell Holmes and John Dewey, no matter how hard they practice in the American idiom, our own intellectuals speak a derivative speech. They speak in European accents. Many liberals are, for reasons perfectly clear to me, greater heroes in England than in America. So it is with John Kenneth Galbraith and David Riesman. So—dare I say it—is Franklin Delano Roosevelt, notwithstanding the genius with which he seemed to be fashioning indigenous American ideals though all the time he used an alien clay. In the past 10 years in America—you can appreciate the excitement of it for those who care—a new class of intellectuals has risen, has stormed the ramparts of the academy with ideas, elaborations, insights, the sum of which challenges root and branch—the presumptions of the 20th century.

These voices are assaulting the fortresses of the modernist orthodoxy. Their victories are intoxicating. American scholarship has recently recaptured Edmund Burke, has shown that his great voice was tied all the while to eternal ideals; that he spoke from a belief in the natural law. The seeming invulnerability of John Maynard Keynes has been exposed. He is now considered more an economic poet than a scientist who left more questions unanswered than solved. The intuitive wisdom of the founders of the American Republic and the European giants from which they learned the art of statecraft, has been rediscovered. The shallowness of the 19th century social abstractionists has been penetrated and their followers are thrown on the defensive. The meaning of the West is being exhumed. The impulses that never ceased to beat in the American heart are being revitalized.

Will then America save itself and then save Europe? Or will the European revival such as it is overtake our own? I care not who saves whom and I suggest you don't either. I care only that we be saved from that dreadful century whose name stands for universal ignominy in the name of equality; and in the name of freedom a drab servitude to anonymous institutional idealism. I only hope and pray that as time goes by the 20th century will shed the odium that clings to its name, that it may crystallize as a century in which the individual overtook technology, the century in which all the mechanical ingenuity of man even when fired by man's basest political lust proved insufficient to sunder man's relation to and dependence upon his Maker. The movement is of you as American conservatives—by you and in you. In wishing you and John Ashbrook good luck I am wishing for myself and my family and my country good fortune, peace and freedom.

INTERN PROGRAM ON CAPITOL HILL

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, something happened today in my office to raise some serious, and perhaps embarrassing, questions concerning the operations of the intern program here on Capitol Hill, most specifically the procedures used to invite these young men and women to the special events which are so vital a part of their education in the diverse operations of our Government. This morning my office received a notice inviting all summer interns to an elaborate party at the Mexican Embassy on Thursday, July 29; the invitation, which listed Senator Jacob Javits and the Mexican Ambassador as sponsors for this event, stated that tickets were available on a "first-come, first-serve" basis at the offices of Senator Javits and Representative John Lindsay. When my three interns went over to Congressman Lindsay's office to pick up their tickets, they were informed that the supply had been depleted. Upon further checking, it was clearly indicated that interns employed by Republican House Members received their notices of the party on Monday, July 26, while all Democratic House offices received their notices today, a day later. Due to this discrepancy, the tickets were exhausted by the time interns in Democratic House offices learned of this fine event; and, as a result, all interns working for a Democratic Representative will be denied this wonderful experience of attending an Embassy function.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to play politics between the Members, but it is quite another thing to play politics with these summer interns who are here to participate fully in every aspect of our Government. I am completely aghast that a man of Senator Javits' reputation who is privileged to sponsor such a worthy program could also allow it to deterioriate into a political and partisan affair. I am hopeful that a full explanation from Senator Javits' office will be forthcoming.

DIRKSEN AMENDMENT OR "TAKE ME OUT TO THE BILL GAME"

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the latest Senate version of an old and beloved song, newly rewritten by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Senator Dirksen. The new song is called "Take Me Out to the Bill Game."

In the "bill game," I understand, anyone can pitch, and the substitutions are unlimited.

Having struck out in committee, the distinguished Senator from Illinois decided to play a different kind of game. Calling up a bench warmer—Senate Joint Resolution 66 for a National American Legion Baseball Week—for the first base sacrifice play, he then cunningly substituted that switch-hitter, Senate Joint

Resolution 2, the rook of the year. I say "switch-hitter" because it hits hard at all of us, both left and right.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt but that this proposed substitution, being considered at this moment by the other body, is inconsistent with the democratic principles we are trying to uphold and extend.

The Dirksen amendment to apportion one of the houses of a bicameral State legislature on factors other than population opens a world of possibilities for the erosion of the very rights we are attempting to secure for our citizens in such legislation as the voting rights bill. This constitutional amendment would amend not only the Constitution; it would amend the very concept of our democracy, abridge our right to equal representation, make a mockery of the concept of one man, one vote—in short it would shred the fabric of individual liberty and equal justice under law.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the liberal side in the Senate has lined up sufficient votes to stop the Dirksen amendment. Let us hope for the out that will retire that side of the aisle.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke today and that all other Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us why this need for sudden speed, interfering with committee hearings that have been previously scheduled and other plans that have been made for in the morning?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, we happen to have a very heavy schedule.

Mr. HALL. We did not meet last Friday. We rushed through last Thursday night and debate was shut off. Now the same committee is back in and we are under a gag rule, and we have had a limited time for debate. We have been told that we cannot submit amendments.

Was it necessary when, as little schedule as we have for the rest of the week, to do this?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, first of all I want to say that this matter has been cleared with the leadership on the Republican side, both with the committee and with the Republican side of the House. The gentleman is aware that we have a very heavy program for the week and we would like to finish the program on Friday if possible.

Mr. HALL. Well, I am not aware that we do have a heavy program for the balance of the week. I am aware of the whip notice and I am aware of what the gentleman said, that there might be additions to the program from time to time. Last Thursday evening when we suddenly adjourned as we, indeed, suddenly interrupted the gentlewoman from Oregon's excellent speech this evening, not on this side of the aisle, incidentally.

I do not see that we have anything that, if we come in here at the regular time tomorrow, we can complete debate and have the amendments and exercise the 5-minute rule according to the standards of the House and the Standing Rules of the House, as was so often repeated yesterday, and complete this in due course.

As far as anyone having cleared it with this side of the aisle or the leadership is concerned, these questions have not been answered by the gentleman as far as this individual Member is concerned.

Mr. ALBERT. Well, I can only repeat what I said.

We have remaining about seven bills after consideration of the bill now pending, and considerable debate is left on that bill, as well as proceeding under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. HALL. Approximately 1 hour remaining, would the distinguished majority leader say?

Mr. ALBERT. I am sure there are over 2 hours remaining.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HALL. Yes, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I want to say that it had been our hope to go until 6:30 tonight before the Committee would rise. But now there are some over 2 hours of debate left under the general debate. The distinguished majority leader and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee had talked with me and with the leadership on this side on the matter of coming in at 11 o'clock, and we indicated that that would be perfectly satisfactory, provided that there was a general understanding that since there are only 5 hours of debate on this very important uncontroversial measure, when we on our side would like to have had 6 or 8 hours of general debate, that there would be no effort tomorrow when we get under the 5-minute rule to unduly restrict or limit Members in seeking recognition and speaking under the 5-minute rule. I think that we have a general agreement that a vote would not come until late tomorrow or late in the afternoon, surely sometime around 5 o'clock or so, which would give Members adequate time to seek recognition and to speak under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. HALL. I am constrained to listen to the gentleman because he is a member of the same committee that cut off debate last Thursday evening rather surreptitiously and unexpectedly.

Does the gentleman have more faith in commitments at this time than other minority members of the committee had last Thursday when that legislation was bottled up completely when there were about 11 amendments, all of which I listed, which were considered in less than 15 minutes and not one word was said in explanation of any one other than the reading after the debate had been cut off by a motion on the majority side?

Certainly the gentleman would agree with me that no one can say that we have "bob-tailed" debate, as we would say down on the Ozarks, here tonight.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I appreciate the gentleman's concern and I am glad he is concerned. I want the gentleman to be satisfied before he withdraws his reservation, if he sees fit to do so, that there will be adequate time tomorrow. I hope the leadership on the majority side will be able to convince the gentleman that that is the procedure to be expected.

Mr. HALL. I would like to ask the majority leader a question, and yield to him for an answer to this question: How much time he estimates it will take to decide these various bills that are listed here for Wednesday and the balance of the week, some of which, of course, have 2 hours of debate under an open rule, as listed, but I would imagine, based on my experience in the House, they will whiz through like sauce through a widow woman.

Mr. ALBERT. I cannot say how much time it will take to dispose of the legislative program.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman know of any additional conference reports to come up other than the ones we expedited through the House today?

Mr. ALBERT. There may be conference reports. I intended to announce other legislative business. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] has advised he might call up by unanimous consent two bills unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. There will be additional business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am constrained not to object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

CRUISE LEGISLATION

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, last year nearly one-half million U.S. citizens departed from the shores of this country on ocean cruises. Nine out of every ten boarded foreign-flag cruise ships, which received over $150 million in revenue from our traveling public.

I cite these figures to indicate the substantial amount of American passengers and dollars involved in the lucrative cruise business and, more importantly, to emphasize that this profitable market has attracted foreign-flag vessels to the point of predominance. I am not opposed to foreign-flag cruise operations, but our Government presently lacks the authority to demand that these vessels comply with our high safety standards and maintain adequate financial responsibility. As a result, thousands of our citizens have either unsuspectingly jeopardized their lives aboard substandard foreign-flag ships, or suffered financial loss when voyages were cancelled by irresponsible cruise operators.

Realizing this dilemma, I introduced a bill last January which will require foreign-flag vessels engaged in cruises from U.S. ports to be licensed by the Secretary of Commerce. It established guidelines under which the Secretary would be authorized to license foreign-flag operators who conform to American standards of safety and demonstrate financial responsibility.

Since then, I have invited comments from representatives of our maritime industry on how this legislation might be clarified and improved. With the benefit of their suggestions, I am now introducing a revised version which includes two specific changes: first, the licensing authority is vested in the Secretary of the Treasury, subject to consultation with the Secretary of Commerce; and second, the new version more clearly indicates the area involved in U.S. coastwise cruise traffic which would be subject to this bill.

I must emphasize that my intention is not to prohibit foreign-flag cruise operations from American ports, but rather to provide protection for the lives and earnings of our citizens who sail on these vessels. I do not deny that there are many responsible foreign-flag liners in the trade. My bill is not directed to them. On the contrary, I seek their support for this measure which would preserve the reputation of those seaworthy foreign-flag vessels which qualify for licenses under my bill.

There are other reasons which merit the passage of this legislation: Last week the Department of Defense announced to American shipowners that it would employ over three dozen ships, including I understand, troopships for military operations in Vietnam—the most recent example of our reliance upon adequate and efficient passenger transports for potential defense purposes. During the Cuban missile crisis of 1962, privately owned passenger ships of the merchant marine were placed on standby alert by the Defense Department. Yet with the demonstrated need for a modern and substantial passenger fleet, our flag ships have declined to number to 13 with no program of replacement, let alone expansion, envisaged.

To help solve this problem, my bill would permit more U.S. cruise business for U.S. ships and since over 20 percent of our total foreign passenger traffic consists of cruise business, it can substantially assist our ailing passenger liner trade.

It is ironic that with our continuing concern over our international balance of payments and the drain on U.S. gold reserves, American passengers spend each year over $170 million for travel, almost 90 percent of which goes to foreign-flag operators. Unless remedial action is taken now, I can only visualize a greater drain on our reserves as an increasing number of foreign-flag vessels engage in our burgeoning cruise traffic.

With more money and leisure time available, an estimated one-half million Americans will embark this year on cruise ships—most of which are foreign owned. My first concern is for their safety, which makes passage of my bill of paramount importance. But I am also concerned with the security of those who stay ashore, of all Americans who depend upon the adequacy of our defense programs, and more specifically upon the maintenance of a modern and sufficient passenger fleet for potential military operations; nor is the future of our passenger liner operators and the men they employ of any less importance to me.

I realize that my bill will not guarantee the safety of each and every American passenger, nor will it eliminate our balance-of-payments deficit, nor is this bill a panacea to revitalize this Nation's passenger fleet. It is, however, a significant step toward achieving these objectives. I urge your support of this legislation.

THE POWER OF CONGRESS TO DECLARE WAR

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, recent editorial opinion around the country has questioned the lack of public debate, and especially the lack of congressional action, in the growing American involvement in the war in Vietnam. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch asked, editorially:

> How can the President take America step by step into a major Asian land war without action by Congress? Does not the Constitution give Congress, rather than the President, the power to declare war? What can the plain citizen do about it?

The Post-Dispatch goes on to suggest that, among things, concerned citizens can write to their Senators and Representatives. But does this really answer the question? I think not. The Congress has not yet developed the procedures and mechanism to deal with the type of limited or unconventional war situations that we had in Korea in the 1950's and that we have today in southeast Asia. We still think of war in a 19th century frame of mind.

I firmly believe in the vitality of our Constitution and of our basic congressional structure. Yet I am concerned that we have not updated the power of Congress to declare war to the needs of the latter half of the 20th century. I am concerned that Congress has not taken the leadership in a full and constructive public debate of our objectives in Vietnam and southeast Asia and in the appropriateness of our policies to the basic economic and political, as well as military, requirements for stability in the area. Unless Congress does discuss these issues, how can the American people begin to understand the nature of our commitment? This, in my view, was one of the major reasons for giving Congress such powers—to assure popular review and understanding of the steps that would commit us to war.

It is my hope that scholars of Congress and the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress will study this question as we seek to make the Congress a more vital institution.

Let me call the attention of my colleagues to the testimony of Congressman Donald Rumsfeld, of Illinois, before the joint committee, which dealt in part with this question. I also call to your attention recent editorial comment from the New York Times and the St. Louis Post Dispatch:

Congress and U.S. Foreign Policy

(Excepts from statement before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, by Representative Donald Rumsfeld, 13th Congressional District, Illinois)

Mr. Chairman, in the mid-1800's, Alexis de Tocqueville said: "We have seen that the Federal Constitution entrusts the permanent direction of the external interests of the Nation to the President and the Senate, which tends in some degree to detach the general foreign policy of the Union from the direct control of the people. It cannot therefore be asserted with truth that the foreign affairs of the state are conducted by the democracy."

This quotation and events of recent years raise the question as to whether the balance in our system of government would be more perfect if the Congress as a whole, and particularly the House of Representatives, had a larger legislative role in the area of foreign policy. Areas for possible consideration in this connection include:

1. The proposal to amend the Constitution to give the House of Representatives, along with the Senate, authority to ratify treaties. This problem was brought to mind with the recent consideration of the International Coffee Agreement which came about as a result of the treaty which had never been considered by the House of Representatives, and yet House action was required to enact the implementing legislation to fulfill U.S. treaty obligations.

2. The proposal to strengthen the role of Congress in the field of national security and foreign policy by the creation of a permanent Joint Committee for National Security with authortiy to make findings and recommendations to the appropriate legislative committees.

Finally, I am of the opinion that it might be appropriate at this point in history for a study of the nature of the constitutional authority granted the Congress with respect to foreign and military affairs. For example, at the time the Constitution was drafted, the meaning of the word "war" was reasonably well understood. The U.S. position with respect to World War I and World War II was clear. However, more recently, and particularly in Korea, Vietnam, and the Dominican Republic, the United States has pursued military actions which by any reasonable definition constitute warfare. These actions were at the direction of the President and without any official declaration of war by the Congress.

Our Constitution created separate branches of Federal Government and attempted to establish checks and balances between these branches. Undoubtedly, the Congress was given the power to declare war for a reason. Today the United States is engaged in an undeclared war in Vietnam. This, I believe, raises a number of questions:

Does the concept of declaring of war need updating?

What was the original constitutional intent?

Should Congress hold additional hearings on such matters, or merely let the "teach-ins" serve as a platform for debate on foreign policy?

If hearings should be held, which committees should be involved?

What is Congress proper role today in these areas of foreign policy and undeclared war, in view of the advent of nuclear weaponry and the modern technology of warfare and the need for centralized control and decisionmaking?

Is the normal authorization and appropriation process sufficient and/or is it being utilized adequately, to fill the desirable congressional role in this area?

Is Congress effectively exercising its power of appropriation to involve sufficiently the representative branch of the Federal Government in the basic issues underlying our foreign commitments—and a declaration of war is only one point on the spectrum in this regard?

Is the congressional check on executive action in the increasingly important area of intelligence, counterinsurgency, and covert military operations adequate?

With the improbability of wars on the scale of 19th and early 20th century conflicts and the increasing likelihood of so-called cold war wars, and the resulting use of programs of counterinsurgency, do we need to define the various war situations that we are likely to face and evaluate the desirable congressional role—which might vary considerably—in each?

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the world is constantly changing. Even meanings of words are continuously changing. I do not pretend to know the answers to the questions I have raised. Nor do I make any specific observations or recommendations with respect to current U.S. foreign policy. Rather, I am raising these questions in the sincere hope that your committee will consider, and hopefully shed some light on this question of Congress and its role in the foreign and military activities of the Federal Government—a matter I believe to be of great significance to the Nation and our system of Government.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, June 10, 1965]

THE PEOPLE CAN BE HEARD

An anguished voice on the telephone posed questions often heard: How can the President take America step by step into a major Asian land war without action by Congress? Doesn't the Constitution give Congress, rather than the President, the power to declare war? What can the plain citizen do about it?

The Constitution does, of course, reserve formal warmaking power to Congress, but it also grants the President authority to conduct foreign policy and it makes him Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. Especially in modern times, he thus has power to create a war situation, whether Congress "declares" war or not.

The real question is not a constitutional one. Granting that the President has authority to do what he is doing, plain citizens can still oppose it, and demand an alternative policy. If they will make their opposition to escalation of the war overwhelming, and unremitting, they can create a body of public opinion not to be ignored by any President.

Too many citizens who are distressed by involvement in an immoral and unjustifiable war feel helpless. They are not helpless. By writing to the President, writing to Senators and Representatives, talking to their friends, supporting antiwar organizations like the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (which sponsored the huge New York rally Tuesday night)—in short, by using all forms of expression open to a free people, they can be heard.

The latest Gallup poll shows that at least 54 percent of the people oppose the Vietnam war in one degree or another. That is why the White House backed away so sharply from the State Department's disclosure this week that American troops have been given a new role of active combat at the discretion of local commanders. Public opinion proved not "ready" for that disclosure, and so it was glossed over with ambiguities. Yet we can be sure that this phase of escalation will be undertaken, and others as well, unless public opinion against them becomes irresistible.

Sincere Americans support the President's policy. We think they are tragically mistaken.

Many fear the threat of a totalitarian, implacably hostile Red China; and nobody need have any illusions about the dangers of the aggressive ideology for which China's present rulers stand. It does not follow that American involvement in a Vietnamese jungle war best serves our national interests as against China. We are in fact serving China's interest instead.

We are dissipating our military resources in a peripheral conflict while China conserves hers intact. We are waging a white man's war against Asian victims of colonialism, and thereby making allies for Red China throughout the ex-colonial world. We are disrupting the West's hopeful reconciliation with Russia, driving Moscow into an unwanted partnership with Peiping. What more could China ask?

Sincere Americans feel that, right or wrong, the Vietnamese commitment has been made and must be carried out to the end. This is to say that once on a wrong road you must stay on it even if it leads you over the brink—a rule no sensible person would impose on himself.

Some feel we would lose prestige, or "face," by adopting a new policy. France fought the Vietnamese people for 10 years and gave it up as hopeless; France's prestige in southeast Asia today is far greater than ours. De Gaulle liquidated the war in Algeria over protests from French patriots, and France is a stronger power than she was when fighting the Algerians. In today's world, nobody loses face by making honorable peace.

Some feel that unless we stamp out communism in Vietnam all Asia will fall like dominoes to China. Stamping out any idea, however, is beyond the power of guns and bombs. The future of Asia will be determined not by any automatic signal but by the history, economic condition, social progress, and traditions of each individual country. In Asia, as in Europe, national identities, cultures, and interests erect the most effective barrier to external conquest, no matter what ideological development each nation follows.

Some feel that expanded war is unavoidable since the North Vietnamese have rejected Mr. Johnson's offer of peace talks. The plain citizen can test that proposition by consulting his own experience. If he wanted to induce an enemy to negotiate, would he expect to succeed by clubbing the enemy over the head? Can a warring nation expect to obtain negotiations by refusing to deal with the forces actually fighting on the other side?

There is an alternative to the present policy in Vietnam, and public opinion can insist upon it. Without surrender, without craven retreat, without abrupt withdrawal, the United States can take its stand on President Johnson's statement of March 25 that "we seek no more than a return to the essentials of the (Geneva) agreements of 1954."

It can say, as the President did on May 13: "We know, as our adversaries also should know, that there is no purely military solution in sight for either side."

It can propose, therefore, that the international conference which arrived at the Geneva agreements of 1954 be reconvened, and that a subcommittee composed of nations not involved in the Vietnamese fighting be appointed to draft a peaceful settlement that will carry out the essentials of those 1954 agreements.

It can announce that we are ready for an immediate cease-fire and a military and political standstill during such talks. It can affirm our willingness to accept an honorable settlement which guarantees, as the 1954 pact sought to do, military neutralization, self-determination, and the end of all foreign intervention for North and South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

If the plain American citizen wants that kind of policy in southeast Asia, rather than a steadily escalating war, he will have to let his Government know it in unmistakable terms.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 28, 1965]

WAR WITHOUT CONSENT?

The steady buildup of American combat troops in South Vietnam raises questions that deserve forthright answers. Only a month ago reports of a projected buildup in ground forces were officially denied in Washington. Since those denials, there has been a 50-percent increase in American military personnel in Vietnam.

In the past 10 weeks, while the administration has reported continuity of policy, American troops in Vietnam have been doubled to more than 46,500. Indications that the total will rise above 60,000 this summer have been accompanied by reports that the objective is a force exceeding 100,000, including 3 full Army and Marine combat divisions.

What is involved is not simply an increase in personnel but an apparent change in the fundamental character of the American involvement. What began as American aid in a Vietnamese war is in danger of becoming an American war against Asians, with the South Vietnamese relegated to a subsidiary role.

Whether this shift would be wise can be debated. But what can hardly be debated is that such an evolution would represent a complete break with the policy enunciated by President Kennedy when, in September 1963, he said:

"In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it, the people of Vietnam, against the Communists."

Coming after futile months of bombing North Vietnam, the current buildup seems to recognize that the war cannot be won in the North, but could be lost in the South. Ironically, it was the bombing of the North that set off the buildup, for initially its aim was simply to protect Danang, the key airbase for the attacks against the North. In this manner, one furious upward whirl on the escalation spiral has led into another. Only yesterday it was announced that American destroyers have been shelling the Vietnamese coast.

Marine and paratroop battalions now have been landed in five areas, ostensibly to protect airbases and the ports that supply them. But some of these units have begun to move out of their role of passive defense into exercises beyond their airbase perimeters.

There are reports that aggressive patrolling is beginning and that this will give way to the more extensive kind of clear and hold counterinsurgency operations hitherto carried out only by South Vietnamese forces. The hazards go beyond the obvious. Even those military officers in Washington who believe the Communists can be defeated with the aid of a large buildup reportedly recognize the difficulty American troops have in distinguishing the enemy who fades into the civilian population.

Earlier this month Mr. Johnson said that the war in Vietnam had "no purely military solution in sight for either side." He indicated that his aim was to maintain the present stalemate until the Communists agreed to a negotiated settlement.

If this aim is being abandoned, if the country is being taken gradually and almost surreptitiously into a large-scale land war on the continent of Asia, the time has come for the Nation to be told what is happening—and why.

CONCENTRATIONS OF POWER AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the economic well-being of our country is threatened when centralization and concentration of power, capable of paralyzing whole industries, are permitted which can flaunt the public interest without fear of legal culpability. Just as business concentrations of power were found to require certain legislative controls over their activities, so today should it be recognized that labor monopolies have long passed the point at which legislative action should have been initiated. Industrywide bargaining in the trucking and the railroad industries are examples of the concentration of power by labor monopolies. The result of these industrywide negotiations lead to industrywide strikes and lockouts which paralyze the entire Nation.

Contributing to the problem is the fact that the Congress has failed to deal with the individual problems as they arise because of a splitting of authority in the Houses of Congress. The House Committee on Education and Labor, the seemingly obvious body to deal with this problem of power concentration shares its jurisdiction with the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and the Judiciary Committee. Each of these committees deals with problems in its own peculiar province and a comprehensive approach is lacking. The same sort of fragmentation occurs in the other body. With the increasingly interrelated nature of our economy, this lack of capacity on the part of the Congress to deal with these problems, should be rectified.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing a proposal which calls for the establishment of a joint congressional committee to study and report on problems relating to industrywide bargaining and industrywide strikes and lockouts. This committee would consist of eight Members of each House of the Congress with the membership split equally between the majority and minority parties.

I have advocated that such a committee be established with the sincere hope that this would provide an atmosphere for intensive study of these problems that would be free from the intense pressure of special interest groups and partisan politics. This committee would have power to recommend legislation after its studies that would reflect reasoned and deliberate congressional thinking on the matter.

Too often in the past have solutions of expediency been made in national crises because of the aura of emergency surrounding a dispute calling for reasoned consideration. The long-range effects of such solutions are barely touched upon in such situations.

I believe that the measure which I am introducing today offers excellent prospects for taking into account the needs of all parties involved—management, labor, and the public—and developing a mechanism whereby the Congress could, in the future, deal effectively and comprehensively with these situations before they reach the stage when the danger to the Nation from inaction or unhurried action is acute.

POOR MAIL SERVICE IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention my views on the poor mail service in the State of South Dakota.

I have received hundreds of protests from all over the State of South Dakota concerning this problem, from people of all walks of life and all types of businesses. The postal department must perfect their new system at once or go back to the old plan.

The harder the Post Office Department tries to improve service, the more erratic the service becomes. Each change seems to be more confusing and less desirable.

The day-to-day problems created by the present mail service are no joke. It is now time for the Post Office Department to take a good look at its mail service in South Dakota.

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneuos matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Board of Visitors to the USAF Academy, pursuant to Public Law, title 10, United States Code, section 9355(a), and the following, visited the Academy during May 6–8, 1965, and on July 8, 1965, duly filed its report with the President. This year, for the first time, three congressional members of the Board filed additional views in conjunction with the report. This seems to have caused special interest and a demand for the report which has not yet been made available to Members of Congress or the public. To avoid speculation about, and misrepresentation of, the report before it is finally made available to the public, under unanimous consent, I include the report, verbatim and in total, at this place in the RECORD:

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

1. APPOINTMENT TO THE BOARD OF VISITORS

The Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy was appointed under the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 9355.

2. COMPOSITION OF THE BOARD

Appointed by the President

Three years effective 1963: Gen. Thomas D. White, USAF (retired), former Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C.; Mr. John Lawrence, chairman of the board and president, Dresser Industries, Inc., Dallas, Tex.

Three years effective 1964: Mr. Harold Cutliff Stuart, former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Tulsa, Okla.; second appointment not made before Board convened.

Three years effective 1965: Appointments not made before Board convened.

Appointed by the Vice President

Senator GORDON ALLOTT, Colorado; Senator DANIEL B. BREWSTER, Maryland; Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Texas.

Appointed by the Speaker of the House

Representative JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., 6th District, Georgia; Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, 7th District, Wisconsin; Representative BYRON G. ROGERS, 1st District, Colorado; Representative BURT L. TALCOTT, 12th District, California.

Ex-officio members

Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee: Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Georgia; designee: Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri.

Chairman, House Armed Services Committee: Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, 1st District, South Carolina; designee: Representative MELVIN PRICE, 24th District, Illinois.

3. CONVENING OF THE BOARD

The Board convened at 8:30, May 6, 1965, and elected Representative BYRON G. ROGERS as its chairman. The Board completed its meetings at 12:30 on May 8, 1965.

Those present were: Gen. Thomas D. White, USAF (retired); Mr. John Lawrence; Mr. Harold Cutliff Stuart; Senator GORDON ALLOTT; Representative JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.; Representative BYRON G. ROGERS; and Representative BURT L. TALCOTT.

4. COMMENTS OF THE BOARD

Procedural considerations

The Board is cognizant of the provisions of section (e) of 10 U.S.C. 9355 which reads as follows:

"(e) The Board shall inquire into the morale and discipline, the curriculum, instruction, physical equipment, fiscal affairs, academic methods, and other matters relating to the Academy which the Board decides to consider."

In order to make the Board visitations and future reports of more value and significance, it recommends for future guidance.

1. That the leadership of the House of Representatives and the Senate assume responsibility for the appointments to the Board membership in the first month of each calendar year.

2. That the President be informed of the importance of early selection of the Presidential appointees to the Board, which also should be announced by February 1.

3. That the senior congressional appointees of each House of Congress arrange jointly for preliminary meeting of the Board in Washington, D.C., to determine:

(a) Time of the annual visitation.

(b) Particular items for special study during the annual visitation.

(c) Proposed agenda for the annual visitation.

(d) Requirements for assistance to the Board in support of preliminary studies and during the visits of the Board.

4. That the Board when convened at the Academy should:

(a) In addition to participating in group sessions, pursue such independent inquiries as the individual members desire, including private conferences with individuals or groups of cadets, faculty and staff members.

(b) Determine if more than one visit, as authorized by sections (d) and (f), 10 U.S.C. 9355, is advisable.

Fulfillment of Academy mission

Despite the cheating incident which involved a small percentage of cadets and despite the always present room for improvement, the Board of Visitors considers the U.S. Air Force Academy to be an outstanding national asset successfully fulfilling its stated mission which is, "To provide instruction, experience, and motivation to each cadet so that he will graduate with the knowledge, character, and qualities of leadership essential to his progressive development as a career officer in the U.S. Air Force."

Academy expansion

The Board noted the orderly progress in the expansion of the Academy which was authorized by Public Law 88-276. The planned expansion of facilities was endorsed. The Congress has authorized and appropriated funds for the first increment of additional cadet quarters and an adjacent formation area, minor alteration of the dining hall and a portion of the required utilities. Additional facilities programed in fiscal year 1966 include an addition to the academic building, a fieldhouse and a small addition to the gymnasium; in fiscal year 1967, the second increment of cadet quarters, an addition to the dining hall, finishing of additional athletic fields, and a second increment of utilities, and in fiscal year 1968, a formation area adjacent to the new cadet quarters, alteration of the cadet social center, an addition to the medical facility and paving of parking areas. The Board recognizes that the construction of facilities has been programed to match a phased increase in the size of the cadet wing to reach the full authorized strength of 4,417 late in fiscal year 1971, and recommends the authorization and appropriation of funds as required to meet the stated program.

It is apparent from visual examination that there have been excessive repair costs on comparatively new construction and that defects in construction could have been prevented by close inspection during construction and before acceptance. In the forthcoming expansion program, as it specifically is related to new construction, the Board recommends that the engineers and architects be instructed to prevent the acceptance of substandard construction.

If and when a program for construction of additional family housing for staff personnel is undertaken, it is recommended that more adequate ground space per unit be provided than was provided at the time of the construction of family housing in the Douglass Valley and Pine Valley areas. It is further recommended that such construction generally be in conformity with generally accepted modern building codes and zoning practices.

Morale and discipline

On the day that the Board assembled, the Secretary of the Air Force made public the report of a special advisory committee which dealt extensively with these subjects. Therefore, and in view of time and other limitations imposed upon it, the Board of Visitors does not comment on these specific aspects of that report. However, the Board commends the members of the special committee for their thorough investigation and constructive suggestions concerning this subject, and commends the Secretary of the Air Force for his promptness both in appointing the committee and in making public its findings.

The curriculum

The Board continues to be favorably impressed by the extraordinary academic accomplishments of the Air Force Academy during its relatively short history. When all available objective criteria are considered, the Academy compares favorably with the best colleges and universities in the United States. Credit for such a superior record must be shared by the cadet wing, the faculty, and the staff. That the young men of our country are well aware of these accomplishments is indicated by the expression of college preference from those students identified as being the most able among National Merit Scholarship competitors. The merit semifinalists and recipients of letters of commendation as identified during 1961, 1962, and 1963 (the top 2 or 3 percent of high school juniors in academic ability), ranked the Academy 25th among the colleges most preferred as first and second choices. All of the more preferred colleges were founded at least 65 years previously, in contrast with the 1955 founding of the Air Force Academy.

The Board commends the Academy for introducing as innovations in service academy curriculums the enrichment and academic majors programs which challenge the cadets to progress profitably as far and as fast as they can in academic areas best suited to their capabilities and interest. The Board believes that cadets who are qualified should be encouraged to participate; however, no pressure, direct or indirect, should be permitted upon cadets to take overload courses in order to gain competitive advantage.

Equally impressive to the Board is the Academy's physical education program which clearly reflects concerted efforts to accomplish the Academy's assigned mission. The program includes instruction, intramural participation and varsity competition. All of these are oriented toward the development of leadership, positive attitudes toward competition and physical fitness, active and continuous body conditioning, and strong interest in carryover individual sports. Instruction is provided in 17 different aspects of physical education which include combatives, swimming and water survival, carryover skills and a general physical fitness program. The laboratory application of this instruction is conducted within the intramural program which includes 14 team and individual competitive sports. Intercollegiate competition in 15 sports against more than 40 different colleges and universities involves nearly half of the cadets.

The Board reiterates its recognition of the Academy's need for limited flying indoctrination since it has a beneficial effect on cadet morale and provides valuable motivation toward an Air Force career. The Board requests that a study be made by an impartial committee to recommend how this can best be accomplished from the point of view of facilities. The study should include the feasibility of locating these facilities on the premises of the Air Force Academy.

The Board believes that undue emphasis has been placed on the graduation order of merit by some Academy officials and cadets. Such emphasis is deemed to be out of context with the Academy mission in view of the fact that advancement in a military career should be based on achievement and demonstrated ability on the job and not during training.

Instruction

It was noted with satisfaction that the number of professors who are on extended tours is being increased systematically. Equally significant is that approximately 22 percent of the faculty have earned Ph. D degrees and that these professors are assigned the same teaching load assigned to other faculty members. All other faculty members have earned graduate degrees at the master's level.

The Board believes it to be absolutely essential that air officers commanding be outstanding officers who have requested this duty assignment and who have demonstrated special aptitude and ability for leadership and instruction. In selecting such officers there can be no substitute for personal interviews, preferably by more than one evaluator.

Fiscal affairs

The Board compliments the Superintendent and his staff for the success of the Academy in the area of fiscal management. For the fiscal year 1964 the Academy was given the award for Outstanding Administration in the Air Force Cost Reduction Program among separate operating agencies. The Academy already has exceeded its assigned cost reduction goal for fiscal year 1965. In addition, for the second year running, the Academy received the Air Force award for Most Improved Financial Management among separate operating agencies.

It is recognized by the Board that the cadet pay scale has not increased to the same extent as have those for most other members of the armed services. While the Board does not believe it appropriate to make a detailed recommendation, it does believe that adjustments should be made in cadet pay to meet the recognized increase in the cost of living.

Football schedule

The Board recommends that football games be scheduled only with schools which have comparable academic and athletic standards and that opponents be selected and played on a nationwide basis. Further effort should be made to adjust completed schedules to include both the Military and Naval Academies on an annual basis prior to 1972.

Honor code

There is little that could be added by the Board to the discussion of the Cadet Honor Code as it is presented in the report of the Special Advisory Committee. It would seem advisable, however, for Academy officials, or better perhaps, the cadet officers, to make an additional effort to insure that new cadets and their parents have a good understanding of the code before an appointment is accepted.

Overseas field studies

The Board strongly recommends that the decision to suspend cadet overseas field studies be reconsidered. These studies are valuable and integral parts of the curriculum. Only overseas can the cadets most effectively and realistically receive confirmation and practical experience concerning related classroom instruction in government, geography, history, economics and foreign languages. In addition, the overseas field studies provide firsthand knowledge about the roles and weapons of U.S. forces abroad, the nature and breadth of our foreign commitments, contemporary foreign armed services and a cultural appreciation of our allies.

Respectfully submitted,

BYRON G. ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Chairman, 1965 Board of Visitors.

BOARD OF VISITORS, AIR FORCE ACADEMY 1965, CONCURRING AND ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF BURT L. TALCOTT

I concur generally with the report of the Board.

The Air Force Academy was dedicated in 1955 to produce future officers to direct a highly sophisticated aerospace military organization in war, as well as to lead the world's most effective "profession for peace."

The Academy is a university and a military institution delicately combined. To encourage bright young men to develop their minds and bodies to their full capabilities and, during the same metamorphosis, to mold a finely disciplined officer who will fit into the large, complex Military Establishment, a unique organization and extraordinary personnel and facilities are required.

By every accepted criterion, the Academy is accomplishing its mission superbly. To have achieved such high levels of attainment in such a short period is remarkable. Many can share the credit—the U.S. taxpayer, the Air Force, the Academy staff and instructors, and the Cadet Wing.

Having given well deserved credit, I offer the following comment as constructive criticism:

ORGANIZATION OF THE BOARD

Appointees to the Board should not accept appointment unless they can participate. The mission of the Board is too important to be undertaken by less than half the Board.

Academy officials arranged entirely for the annual visit—including agenda and subject matter. The Board had little time or opportunity to make an independent study or investigation. I do not criticize Academy officials for this; rather, I commend them for the excellently prepared and presented formal briefings. The Board's visit was pleasant, instructive and productive. But to perform properly its function, the Board, not the Air Force or the Academy, should determine the manner and scope of the annual visits.

CHEATING INCIDENT

The cheating incident evoked much more publicity than it deserved. In my judgment, the Academy staff—with only a few unimportant exceptions—conducted the investigation (after detection) expeditiously, professionally, and fairly. Certain segments of the news media—although not all—permitted their zeal for "getting a story" to overshadow their obligation to ascertain and report the facts. Failure by the Secretary of the Air Force to publish promptly the report of the investigation contributed to the pressures for information and encouraged importunate reporters to speculate or to manufacture stories. The Academy and the Cadet Wing were unfairly aspersed, but a few reporters and critics with miserable minds and irresponsible pens could not seriously sully the reputation of 2,300 young men who have consistently measured up to one of the highest codes of personal honor.

Some athletes arrived at the Academy with distorted standards—not wholly the fault of Academy recruiters. (Student athletes are aggressively "rushed" by many colleges—leading some 18-year-old youngsters to believe erroneously that special privileges will accrue to them and that football success is more important than academic and military achievement.) All universities recruit for scholars and athletes—and the Academy should also. Football is essential to the Academy—but players should not be treated preferentially to other cadets. Compensatory (not special) assistance for individual athletes and a representative team schedule (with other academies and universities of comparable academic and athletic abilities) would solve valid denouncements.

Some, including cadets, have dismissed the cheating incident too lightly—i.e., "the incident simply proves the code works." The honor code is a cadet institution, by and for the cadets; but in my humble, extramural opinion the code is worth preserving and improving. Did the code really work when over 100 cadets violated it for so long without discovery? Does a code which proscribes only "lying, cheating, and stealing" truly qualify as a worthy code of honor? Lying, cheating, and stealing—often narrowly construed by "cadet honor code lawyers"—are not honorable; but are other serious breaches of personal conduct outside the code therefore "honorable"? Is the distinction, which the cadets make between "honor" and "ethics," valid? Does the code produce honor?

ADMISSIONS DEPARTMENT

I commend the Admissions Department for its assiduous striving for excellence and its scrupulous impartiality. A large measure of the Academy success is due to the high quality of the young men admitted. Recruitment for scholars and leaders is not a sin.

TENURE ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

Teacher tenure tends to ossify. Efforts to retain superior teachers are commendable, but a tenure system should not be necessary to attract and hold an excellent faculty at the Academy. Present limitations upon tenure may be satisfactory.

FACILITIES BY NONAPPROPRIATED FUNDS

A number of essential facilities (the football stadium and golf course, among others) were constructed with nonappropriated funds. This means that these facilities were not built at Government expense, but by private friends of the Academy and the cadets. Only with nonappropriated funds can other necessary projects be constructed in the future. These friends should be remembered and gratefully thanked.

FACULTY MEETINGS

Faculty meetings, as known in quality universities, are not utilized at the Academy.

CHANGE OF ACADEMY STAFF

The timing of the transfer of the Superintendent and the Commandant was unfortunate, if not inept. The system, not the particular officers at the Academy at the time, caused whatever embarrassment the Air Force suffered from the cheating episode. They probably understand the Army game of polishing tarnish and dismissing embarrassing situations by reshuffling a thin veneer of personnel without more than a quick look underneath for the real cause. The public, however, should know that both the Superintendent and the Commandant, dedicated and capable officers, carried out their instructions professionally and to the letter and the Academy is better for their service.

AIR OFFICER COMMANDING

The single most important person to the cadet is the Air Officer Commanding. He is the chief counselor, parent-in-locus, mentor. There are few more important assignments in the Air Force. But there are few exceptional AOC's; some lead only by fear; some are hated or avoided. The general caliber needs to be dramatically improved. At the very least, all AOC's should be volunteers, thoroughly screened and serve some apprenticeship; transfer should be immediate when performance is not effective. Good AOC's should live in Vandenberg.

MODE OF CADET LIFE

There is a tired, depressive atmosphere at the Academy. The gaiety and lightheartedness found at other good universities and typical of this age group is missing. Most cadets are anxious to get away from the "campus"—but this is difficult and inconvenient.

Cadet life is not normal. Their future military life may not be normal, but we should be training officers for more normalcy. Their role may be as much related to a civilian society as a military encampment. Their future missions may be more often at luncheon or international conference tables than in missile silos or MOL's.

Opportunities to associate with female peers should be as normal as possible; but "on campus" dates are rare. The average cadet's life from Sunday evening until Saturday noon is stifling routine with practically no leisure or relaxation except strenuous intramurals. Not only chapel, but marching to chapel, is mandatory. This is neither religion nor church.

Too much cadet time is wasted in routine, makework, unmeaningful activity (the carrying, polishing, and inspection of old rifles without firing pins is only one example). In order for a cadet to relax in his room and miss an unnecessary formation on Sunday he must dress and perfunctorily report to Arnold Hall. Cadets are outstanding young men who can learn without kindergarten repetition and punishments. Tomorrow's second lieutenant is not the same as yesteryear's—and should not be trained the same. The Academy is still new. It can shake off the Prussian techniques of ancient armies. It need not follow blindly traditions which encumber the other academies. Useful, distinctive traditions can be developed.

EXCESSIVE EMPHASIS ON SYMBOLS

Competition is essential to progress and excellence—and should be encouraged. But competition at the Academy is overemphasized—even institutionalized. Symbols of success often replace the essence of success—order of merit, grade points, "brownie points," quickee quizzes, cadet rank, test scores. Quality is lost in percentages; individuals are lost in numbers; leadership is computed; personality is lost in statistics.

An observer soon senses that the selection of 11 cadets as Rhodes scholars, 6 for Fulbright scholarships, or an average GRE score of—is more important than the full education of the wing, including the last man on the "order of merit"—who also will be a U.S. Air Force officer and a gentleman. Heavy "workloads" make impressive comparative statistics, but do they provide an optimum of quality education for the individual cadet?

When the score is most important, cadets soon learn to play the game and point for the score—often the easiest possible way. Although the dean tendered statistics to dispel "the misinformed charges of excessive academic pressures," I believe we should not dismiss the possibility completely and that the pervasive emphasis upon scores and other symbols, rather than upon substantive learning and the acquisition of knowledge, contributed to, or was symptomatic of, the cheating incident. In this sphere, surveys of the faculty might produce better answers than surveys among the cadets.

I am disappointed, in spite of graphic explanations offered by the dean, that the faculty failed to detect the cheating more quickly by noticing the difference between a cadet's written examinations and his classroom performance. This failure may also indicate excessive reliance on a spate of test scores, rather than actual ability.

Finally, the noticeable gap between the exhilaration of the mature freedom of inquiry and give and take on the academic side and the stultification of adolescent disciplines on the military side is baffling.

Respectfully submitted,
BURT L. TALCOTT,
U.S. Congressman.

INDIVIDUAL, CONCURRING AND ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF GORDON ALLOTT, U.S. SENATOR, OF COLORADO

The official visitation of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Air Force Academy was set for the date of May 6, 1965.

I concur, generally, with the report written by the Board of Visitors and agreed to generally by the Board at the conclusion of its meeting on May 8, 1965.

I reserve, specifically, any comments or conclusions as to the cheating scandal for the reason that I was detained upon the floor of the U.S. Senate on May 6, 1965, the time when the so-called blue-ribbon report on the cheating incident was discussed, and was only able to participate in the discussions of May 7 and the formulation of the report on May 8.

APPOINTMENTS TO THE BOARD

It should be further noted that the second of two appointments by the President of the United States, for 3 years, effective in 1964, had not been made at the time of the convening of the Board. Neither of the two Presidential appointments of 3 years, effective in 1965 had been made at the time of the convening of the Board. One of the four Members of the House of Representatives and two of the appointees from the U.S. Senate were not present, nor were any of the ex officio members.

It should be understood that both individual members, as well as Members of Congress, may find themselves in situations of personal emergency, which do not permit attendance at the Board of Visitors meetings. However, the downgrading of the importance of the appointments and the duties attendant upon the acceptance is a matter of concern. The ascending importance of the whole arm of the Air Force in our defense system and the training of 4,000 cadets is not a matter to be taken lightly, nor should it be left entirely to the Air Force Secretariat.

I particularly concur in the first four paragraphs of the report and believe that they should be especially called to the attention of the majority and minority leadership of each House of Congress. It would be my suggestion that in the future, stock-type briefings be avoided. The Board may ask for and receive these at any time, as do all of the extraordinary visitors to the Academy.

The suggestions of the first four paragraphs should enable the Board to inquire into specific matters, to visit the cadets, to examine the physical aspects of the Academy, and to render a report with more confidence.

MORALE OF THE ACADEMY

I have had submitted to me for my information the tentative concurring and additional views of the Honorable BURT L. TALCOTT of the House of Representatives. In the last paragraph, "Excessive Emphasis on Symbols," he has discussed what may be one of the basic causes or reasons for the recent scandal at the Air Force Academy. I concur, generally, in his view on this matter. In the very limited opportunity to talk with individual cadets, which was afforded (which was not limited to my own cadets) lack of the original spirit which pervaded the cadets was noted. There is a feeling that initiative is suppressed and that if exercised it will result in demerits if it goes wrong, but no credit for results springing from initiative.

The Academy must produce the finest educated men it can; they must also be well-rounded, and the "full man" should be developed. A careful review of the importance placed on symbols and individuals and squadrons should be made in order that each man, regardless of whether he stands at the top of his class or at the bottom, is developed to the maximum extent, both academically and as an officer and gentleman.

GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senator.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

I concur generally in the statements contained in the foregoing report. There are certain matters, however, to which I must address myself and express additional views.

1. I especially commend the outstanding performance of the general responsibilities and command functions of the Superintendent, Maj. Gen. Robert H. Warren, and the Commandant of Cadets, Brig. Gen. Robert W. Strong, Jr. In view of the premature relief of both of these general officers, as Superintendent and Commandant of Cadets, respectively, I believe that they are entitled to the strongest public commendation which I and other members of the Board of Visitors can make.

During a difficult time, each of these officers displayed excellent judgment, calmness when others panicked, and in their handling of the events between January 7, 1965, and February 14, 1965, reflected credit upon the highest traditions of the U.S. Air Force and the Air Force Academy.

2. I strongly subscribe to that portion of the White Committee Report which urges a minimum tour of duty of 4 years for the Superintendent and Commandant of Cadets. This policy should have been installed this year by extending the tour of duty of both Maj. Gen. Robert H. Warren and Brig. Gen. Robert W. Strong, Jr.

3. I further believe that the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force should issue directives and assign a mission to the Superintendent of the Air Force Academy and then give him plenary authority to execute such directives and fulfill such mission.

The present policy of the Department of the Air Force is to oversupervise and appoint superfluous committees. The statute provides for the appointment of a Board of Visitors. Many of the ad hoc committees appointed to oversee and supervise the administration of the Academy often conflict with duties assigned by statute to the Board of Visitors. Occasionally such committees have a harassing effect upon the Superintendent and other administrative officials.

I believe that the best available general officer of the Air Force should be selected for the position of Superintendent and that overseeing, supervisory, and harassing committees should be eliminated or at least kept to a minimum.

The Air Force Academy is probably the most oversupervised institution of higher learning in the United States. The Superintendent is required to spend many valuable hours greeting and entertaining committees and persons classified as distinguished visitors when those hours—amounting to hundreds during a year—could be more advantageously devoted to this executive duties and responsibilities as Superintendent.

If the policy of overvisitation and oversupervision is to be continued, and if the Department of the Air Force is going to require a major general or lieutenant general to host and conduct tours, then I suggest the assignment of an additional general officer to the Academy for that purpose and let the Superintendent perform his executive responsibilities.

Pentagon officials, both civilian and uniformed, should leave administrative details and press releases alone and let matters of that kind be handled by administrative officials of the Academy. If this policy had been followed, the image of the Air Force Academy would not have been tarnished as it was during January 1965, through no fault of Academy officials or Air Force Academy cadets.

4. While I subscribe generally to the recommendations of the White Committee Report, I believe that the timing of its release on the date of the convening of the 1965 meeting of the Board of Visitors was a serious error in judgment.

Respectfully submitted,
JOHN J. FLYNT, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

GIVEAWAY BUNGLING

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, when are we going to wake up and realize that we are being taken for a ride? The United Arab Republic is doing a neat job of making a fool out of the United States.

Less than a month ago, Egypt's Nasser took full advantage of the U.S. willingness to hand out free wheat. Now we find out that we gave them over $23 million worth of corn in 1961 on the basis of an out-and-out misrepresentation.

It was a General Accounting Office report to Congress that disclosed that a shipment of 186,000 metric tons of corn to the United Arab Republic under the auspices of the Agency for International Development was obtained under false pretenses. The grant was made on the basis of reports from the Communist-sympathizing country of a potential famine because of a serious crop failure. It was later disclosed that no crop failure occurred and much of the corn had been sold by the United Arab Republic.

Our giveaway bungling really showed up this time. AID officials found out the United Arab Republic was selling some of the corn even before the whole grant was shipped. With over $11 million worth still in the hands of the U.S. officials, AID apparently made no attempt to hold the shipments until the matter could be investigated.

The GAO report charged that the Agency for International Development did not check on distribution of over 85 percent of the corn. It has been substantiated that at least 80,000 tons have been sold by the United Arab Republic Government.

This report only serves to emphasize what I have been saying all along. We are willing to spend taxpayers' dollars to give aid to anyone who stretches out their hand. Only last month, I pointed out the fallacy of our $37 million food gift to the United Arab Republic.

I want to commend the General Accounting Office on their alertness. I hope their report opens some eyes in Washington. If it does not, it seems we will continue to help a country that openly degrades the United States and is critical of our policy.

Perhaps what is needed is action by Congress demanding that any future grants be made only when it is assured that all the aid goes for the purpose that it was intended to. Apparently, the agencies are not able to do so on their own.

VIETNAM CRISIS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Reinecke] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, this Nation and the entire free world are approaching a crisis of major proportions. It is known that the President is concerned about the Vietnam crisis heightened only last Friday by the use of surface-to-air missiles against our airplanes. The missile charges have not been denied and must therefore be true. So now we see that our unnecessary delays, excuses, changing of U.S. military administrators, and behind the scenes changing of South Vietnam heads of state have cost us that vital ingredient of military strategy—the initiative.

These missiles are not of North Vietnam manufacture. They must be Chinese or Russian—and I am told that they are undoubtedly Russian missiles—manned and fired by Russian technicians.

Mr. Speaker, this Republican has, for some time, supported the President in his general policies of a firm military posture, but are we to continue tinkering with ground troops in an air war? Are we to continue our limited air offensive knocking out trees, swamps, footbridges, and isolated vehicles on highways? When, Mr. Speaker, Mr. McNamara, and Mr. President, are we going to face the facts? When are we going to declare war on all military targets? When are we going to start fighting to win? How many more American boys must die in a war of undefined objectives? Is it perhaps a problem of logistics? Have we relied too much on civilian advisers and not heeded the warnings of the military people? Do we have enough war materiel in Vietnam to do the job? How about our air strength; do we have sufficient planes of the required type? When, Mr. Speaker, will we be asked to take planes away from our Air National Guard because of our experts deciding that manned aircraft is no longer necessary?

Mr. Speaker, it is time we face the facts, it is time we debate these issues and, above all, Mr. Speaker, let us remember that the Constitution clearly states that it is the power of Congress—not the Secretary of Defense—to declare war.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATION THIS WEEK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. Mills], has advised that he will call up some time during the remainder of the week two bills unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means: H.R. 7502, income tax treatment of casualty losses attributable to major disasters, and H.R. 6431, suspension of duty on certain forms of nickel.

TRADING STAMPS AND THE RISING COST OF FOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Harris). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wolff] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago Wednesday I posed a series of questions in this Chamber about the possible interconnections between rising food prices and the widespread use of trading stamps. I did this because this House, the last line of defense for the American consumer, must understand all of the parameters that affect retail food prices. And because we certainly cannot overlook one that is connected to $38 billion in retail sales a year—the $38 billion figure is ours, arrived at by multiplying the $950 million stamp companies make by the appropriate numbers so that 950 million equals 2.5 percent of sales; $950 million from the book "The Inside Facts About Trading Stamps," by Calvin Train, page 3. Book given to you by FTC and says so on first page—certainly not one that affects at least 43 percent of all the food sold in the United States—from "Changing Times" for April 1962, "Why Don't They Just Cut the Price," page 9.

I posed these questions in good faith—because I just did not know the answers and felt that we as legislators should. I further suggested that I would be holding informal meetings between Members of Congress, representatives of the food retailing business, and the trading stamp companies. The first of those meetings was held yesterday morning between six Members of Congress and representatives of the food industry. The men who participated in that meeting are to be commended for their public spirit and congratulated for their dedication to the American principle of free and open inquiry in a free society. These men gave up their time, came to Washington at their own expense, and presented us with a very learned and erudite discussion of the trading stamp business as seen from their end. I am also grateful to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Race], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson], the gentleman from California [Mr. Dyal], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Gilbert], and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Gettys] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], who took the time out of a busy schedule in an especially busy week to exemplify once again their concern for the American consumer.

The second of these meetings was to be held this morning between Members of Congress and representatives of the stamp companies. It was not held. It was not held because a veil of silence, a "stamp curtain," was dropped over the affairs of the stamp companies. Perhaps the most dangerous, and certainly the most damning action possible in an open society occurred—the companies unanimously refused to lower themselves to talk to Members of Congress about the welfare of the American consumer.

They told us they could not "justify the additional expense of time, manpower, and money" to come to Washington and participate—you have the letter. No; they could not afford to participate today, but they could afford to have three people in the audience yesterday just listening. They could not afford to help us solve a problem, but they could afford to send their legal counsel, the head of their research department and other men into my office to try and dissuade me from even giving a speech on the floor of the House. Those same men at an open meeting, discussing with Congressmen the problems of the American housewife, would have been more than sufficient. But they preferred to use them as lobbyists. It is a sorry description of a billion dollar industry; a terrifying exhibit of morality and bad taste.

I wanted a meeting where we could sit around, be informed and our questions answered in a congenial and friendly atmosphere—by their actions, the trading stamp companies are telling us they will only answer to an investigation.

As a direct result of these actions, I am calling for a meeting of representatives of the Federal Trade Commission, the National Food Marketing Commission, the Commerce Department, the Office of the President's Adviser on Consumer's Affairs, the Agriculture Department, the Small Business Administration, the Department of Labor, and other interested Government agencies—to ask each of them to investigate this problem within the confines of their statutory authority, preparatory to having my staff turn over all of the information we have acquired, as well as these reports, to the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee. An investigation must be held. We must begin at once.

Now, are not all the answers readily available? Are we merely resurrecting a dead horse in asking these questions? I maintain the answer is "No." The last time the FTC made any authoritative statement on trading stamps was 1957—8 years ago; the last time any authoritative government study of the connection between prices and trading stamps was published was 1958—"Trading Stamps and Their Impact on Food Prices," U.S. Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing Research Division, Department of Agriculture, you have copy—and that study covered the years 1955–57. There was a rash of interest in trading stamps and food prices—but it was while stamps were just beginning to enter the picture; while the effect of stamps was to divert customers away from nonstamp stores and thereby increase volume at a particular store enough to be self-liquidating. But that required an increase in volume of from 10 to 25 percent and with stamps almost everywhere—from various estimates—this includes about 90 percent of the estimates—it is impossible to increase food consumption everywhere by that much. Who is paying for stamps now?

As recently as April 1964, the Legislative Research Council of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts wanted to find out—you have with you, page 4. But in frustration it had to admit, "Many of the best reports on the price impact of stamps are now outdated in light of the vast growth of stamps in the past 3 years alone. Most of these reports were made prior to current saturation in the key food marketing industry." And this report is overall a prostamp publication.

Since 1964, little has been published on stamps that is convincing either way. Such reports as were published have been the result of emotionalism or special interest. The only exception being an article in the April 1965 issue of the Monthly Labor Review that attempted statistically to discuss whether the Consumer Price Index was affected over a 15-year period by the use of trading stamps. But we are not interested in a 15-year period—we are interested in the time since stamp saturation; and we are not today interested in the Consumer Price Index—but in food prices—which make up considerably less than one-third of that figure. Stretched out over a 15-year period and including myriads of other items than food, a 2-percent increase in the price of food due to stamps would appear statistically insignificant—but that is not what we are asking and that answer, though it has been insistently flaunted by the stamp companies as answering our questions, is basically a nonsequitur. In short, we are breaking new ground today—the questions we are asking are valid; the Government does not know the answers and it should.

That article, however, in parenthetic remarks, did raise some significant points, and since it is the most current Government publication on the subject, I will belabor it for just a moment more. It stated that as recently as July 1963, trading stamps were already used in 65 percent of all chainstores and supermarkets—see first reference at the beginning of my remarks. It remarked that a Bureau of Labor Statistics Survey in 1956 indicated that only half of the grocers surveyed felt that stamps increased sales enough to cover their costs. In another survey only 10 percent of 304 grocers felt that stamp costs were being covered by increased volume. And this was when the number of stamps distributed annually was considerably less than half what it is today. If increased volume does not cover the cost of stamps—and the article states as much for the present situation:

> It is reasonable to argue (the article states) that greater sales advantages accrue in the initial stages of stamp programs, but when an area is nearly saturated with stamps, retailers may not be able to secure the additional sales volume required to offset their costs.

Now, if food stores operate with a one-half to 2 percent margin on sales, and stamps cost 2 to 3 percent of sales—and it cannot cover the cost of stamps through increased volume—who does pay for stamps and how?

The meetings yesterday went a long way toward beginning to find an answer to that question. A representative of the second largest food chain in the United States unequivocally stated that the cost of stamps are reflected in higher food prices—man from Safeway. Where his chain has discontinued using stamps he has been enabled to cut food prices for the consumer. Apparently the stamp companies do not want to contest this statement; they were there in enough strength to know it was made.

Further research has brought out the following salient information: Though the stamp companies pay taxes on the basis of 95 percent redemption, the actual figures of a projection by the largest stamp company appears to be closer to 90 percent, which means—S. & H. figures you have—if true, almost $50 million tax free accumulated a year by these companies. I will call on the Internal Revenue Service to justify and reexamine their determinations in this regard.

Since 1950, stamp companies have reserved almost a billion dollars in tax-free, interest-free reserves against 384 billion stamps that remain unredeemed—S. & H. figures you have. What has happened, what happens to this money, to whom does it lawfully belong, is it not similar to other escheatable property?

Stamp companies seem to operate with a very low ratio of invested capital to total assets—from the summary of the transcript of the representative State conference on store trading stamps, October 2, 1956, held in New York—thus, they operate like a bank with other peoples' money and the items they issue are becoming legal tender. I will ask the honorable chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, long the champion of the American consumer, to investigate this similarity and possible restraints necessitated thereby.

And one further startling fact. I mailed an invitation to appear at these meetings to every stamp company in the United States. So far, 27 of those letters have come back. You cannot even find some of these companies today. What are the consumers who saved their stamps doing? What about the money you have invested in those firms through your purchases at higher prices to get their stamps? How many millions of dollars have been lost by Americans in this way?

The questions continue. They must be answered. Apparently investigation is the only recourse left us. Mr. Speaker, I call for an immediate investigation.

HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS SHOULD BE MADE A PERMANENT STANDING COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the House Select Committee on Small Business, since its creation in 1941, has worked consistently and effectively in discharging the duties and obligations placed upon it by the Members of this body. The RECORD will show that the accomplishments and attainments of the committee have been of tremendous benefit, not only to small business but to the entire economy.

The hearings and investigations conducted by the committee and reports resulting therefrom have been used by other committees of the Congress, by various agencies of the Government, and by business universities and law schools throughout the country, as well as the business community and the public in general.

Much legislation has resulted from this committee's work and its services are manifold.

The record that the House Select Committee on Small Business has established over the years attests fully to the fact that the committee has now reached maturity; that no longer should the committee be required to operate on a temporary basis. The House Small Business Committee has come of age and should be recognized and given powers and authority commensurate with its capability.

During the past 2 years, I have commented on several occasions that the committee should be made a permanent committee and given legislative authority. Recently I wrote to Mr. George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, confirming the fact that I had so testified before the House Rules Committee earlier this year. In this letter I set forth certain additional reasons why I feel that the committee should now be permitted to take its place alongside the other standing committees of the House and made a permanent standing committee.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the body of the RECORD a copy of this letter and Mr. Burger's reply. The letters follow:

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C. April 13, 1965.

Mr. GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: In response to your request, I am pleased to confirm the remarks which I made recently in testifying before the House Rules Committee to the effect that the House

Select Committee on Small Business should no longer be required to operate as a temporary or "select" committee that ceases to exist automatically at the end of each 2-year term of the Congress. This committee should become one of the permanent standing committees of the House, and it is my intention to introduce a resolution to accomplish this purpose.

As you well know, the House Small Business Committee was created in 1941 to deal with certain acute small business problems then demanding special attention. Since that year the economy of this country has changed radically and some of these changes have generated new and perplexing problems for small business.

The structure of the U.S. economy in this year of 1965 includes many characteristics favorable to small business. It also includes some that are not favorable. You and I, and the members of the House Small Business Committee, know what they are. We know about the intensified wave of mergers and corporate acquisitions that is bringing about increased concentration of American industry. We know that dual distribution appears to be permeating more industries each day, with more and more manufacturers competing against their small business independent retailer customers. In addition, we know about the chainstores, the discount houses, joint ventures, urban renewal dislocations, the exodus to suburbia, big business shopping centers, automation, million-dollar electronic computers, the expanded growth of franchised operations, and the general unmistakable trend toward giantism.

It is for the above reasons that I have concluded that it is important and necessary that the Small Business Committee be strengthened and established as a standing committee of the House; that it be given legislative authority over all the operations of the Small Business Administration and certain other matters having a direct, exclusive, or primary effect upon the competitive strength of the small business segment of our economy.

It is well known that you have long urged that this action be taken, and I am pleased, therefore, to write you and to ask for your continued support.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

JOE L. EVINS,
Member of Congress, Chairman.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., April 13, 1965.

Hon. JOE EVINS,
Chairman, House Small Business Committee,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN JOE: Your major communication of April 13 is like a ray of sunshine in very dark places, when you officially notified me of your definite intention to introduce a resolution giving full standing committee status to the present Select House Small Business Committee.

You are further to be congratulated in the analysis as outlined in your letter as to the need for this recognition due small business of this Nation. It is about the most complete analysis of the proposition that I have ever reviewed in close to 25 years on Capitol Hill.

Your message can be a two-way message because of its importance, that will put life into the Senate for similar action in the pending legislation for the Senate Small Business Committee.

With very high regards and sincere appreciation in behalf of small business of this Nation.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in the difficult position today of having to vote against the conference report on H.R. 6675, even though I support many of its provisions. I believe strongly in the principles of the social security program and would, if I had the opportunity, vote for the 7-percent increase in social security benefits and the additional assistance to widows, the blind and needy. There is also no question in my mind as to the need for comprehensive programs of medical care for aged Americans who are unable to pay for necessary health services.

My objections to this bill, however, are these:

First, the payroll approach to financing health care, which largely disregards the rightful role of the States and provides health benefits to many millions of older Americans who are self-supporting. As described in my previous statement on H.R. 6675, the State of Texas—using Kerr-Mills matching funds—has initiated a positive, highly effective program which renders the medicare section of this bill unnecessary for our citizens. I would advocate giving the Kerr-Mills program a further opportunity to prove itself as it has done in Texas.

Second, the spiraling cost and tax burden of this and related measures. Initially, H.R. 6675 carries a price tag of between $6 and $7 billion, which will soon escalate to $11 or $12 billion. In addition, other bills now pending—such as the proposed expansion of the unemployment compensation program—will, if enacted, mean increased payroll taxes on heavily burdened employers.

Third, the requirements that restaurant owners and others report cash tips for social security and income-tax purposes. This requirement will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to administer.

I do wish to compliment the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] for his sponsorship of the measure which allows for restoration of benefits rights after marriage. This provides that a widows' and mothers' insurance benefits would be payable to women who are not married. I have assisted the gentleman from Florida in this measure, and in some circles, it has been known as the Pepper-Pickle bill.

Mr. Speaker, under the rules of parliamentary procedure, I have no choice to vote on these individual issues as I see them; I can only vote for or against the conference report. For the reasons I have briefly outlined, conscience compels me to oppose the adoption of the report, but in doing so, I want the record to reflect that I favor many of the benefits it will provide.

TUBERS TOUCH TOP

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY], in his speech of yesterday, has come to the defense of the potato growers of Maine in commenting on my criticism of the outlandish price of a sack of spuds.

His point is well taken that the potato farmers have suffered the injury of low prices in the past, but when social security beneficiaries stop buying potatoes and substitute macaroni and rice on the family menu for budgetary reasons, then I think that my colleague from Maine, and his constituents, should recognize the hazard they are creating for themselves by failure to plant an adequate crop.

I certainly find no fault with the inclusion of all segments of our economy in the sharing of prosperity. This is and should be our national objective.

I call attention, however, to an article in the Waterbury, Conn., Republican of July 21, 1965, under the heading "Prices High—Some Buyers Shun Potatoes" and the statement therein that "one grocer blamed Maine farmers for the shortage. He cited the fact that they became indignant last year when they did not receive a high enough price for their crop so they did not plant again this season."

I believe there is justification for urging our potato farmers to take stock of a growing resentment on the part of consumers and an indication that there is a chance, incongruous though it may seem, that potato growers and jobbers could price themselves right out of the popular market.

With the permission of my colleagues, I include here the article from the Waterbury Republican:

PRICES HIGH—SOME BUYERS SHUN POTATOES

The high price of potatoes is having its effect on the shopping lists of Waterbury housewives, a number of whom have switched to buying macaroni and rice for family meals.

One shopper, who claims she paid $1.79 for 10 pounds of potatoes last week, has threatened to contact the Secretary of Commerce in Washington and the Commissioner of the Department of Consumer Protection in Hartford.

Another is buying instant potatoes. Still another is not using them to all. "On social security benefits you don't pay out everything for food," one shopper stated when asked why she wasn't buying potatoes anymore.

Naturally consumers are paying a terribly high price for potatoes because grocers themselves are paying more this summer.

Several area grocers blamed the rise in costs on the scarcity of labor in California, an area which supplies many local merchants with the product.

Because of a new immigrant policy limiting the number of Mexican migrant workers to come to the country to help with the crop, California farmers are badly in need of potato pickers. Few Americans are willing to do the job, either because they feel it is degrading or because they are dissatisfied with the wages they are paid for the work involved. It all adds up to the fact that the demand is higher than the supply, hence rising prices.

One grocer blamed Maine farmers for the shortage. He cited the fact that they became indignant last year when they did not receive a high enough price for their crop so they did not plant again this season.

After hearing so much about the effects of drought on crops, it was surprising to hear many local grocers state that flooding in Virginia and Maryland is responsible for today's high price of potatoes.

Potatoes presently being shipped from these Southern States are "soggy," and, according to one food manager, "not worth the room they take up," on store shelves. Another effect of the rain is a delay in picking, resulting in demand being higher than supply * * * and prices being highest of all.

Regardless of the reason, for this time of year potatoes are about 20 cents too high, and caused one grocer to remark, "I won't eat them myself at this price."

A housewife used to be able to get 5 pounds of potatoes for 49 cents. Today one might get them at 69 cents, but the average price in the city seems to be anywhere from 79 to 89 cents.

Ten pounds of potatoes generally cost from a low of $1.18 to a high of $1.29. One grocer said 10 pounds of potatoes are presently the highest they have ever been in the 10 years he has been in the grocery business.

The most important question to consider is, "Will the situation get better?" Most grocers don't know. The consensus is that the price of potatoes in the future will be influenced by what happens in Maine in the next 3 or 4 weeks. A new crop from Maine will be ready in a month. If this crop is bad, prices will remain high.

One grocer was waiting to see what Connecticut would produce this year. He thought the price would go down as soon as the local crop was available.

One thing is certain. The macaroni people must be very happy.

TIGHTEN CONVENTIONS—SHORTEN CAMPAIGNS

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Monagan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, 1965, I expressed my agreement with General Eisenhower on his recent strictures on the conduct of the Republican National Convention. I frankly admitted that our Democratic Convention was even more of a mess.

I was delighted to see in the Wall Street Journal of July 6, 1965, an editorial supporting the urgent need to police our national conventions and to give them back to the delegates.

I was more than happy to see in the same editorial sentiments which I have long expressed about the ridiculous nature of our present day, circus-type campaigns. If the Congress were to adopt my bill, H.R. 96, it would limit these campaigns to 60 days which is twice what the average civilized country needs today to carry on a national campaign, and thereby eliminate the expense, the boredom and the debasing gymnastics.

The editorial follows:

Bad Political Conduct

A 19th-century format lingering on in the 20th is the way one TV executive describes our political conventions. And few would disagree with General Eisenhower's denunciation of the format as a "picture of confusion, noise, impossible deportment and indifference to what is being discussed on the platform."

How much will be done about it, and how soon, is another matter. Such raucous political traditions die hard, and there are various commercial incentives to help keep them alive. At least the Republican National Committee, in the wake of Ike's blistering attack, has promised to try to moderate the chaos.

The former President would like to see a convention chairman with sufficient powers to impose discipline, buttressed by tough sergeants-at-arms, preferably six-feet-four marines or other military types. He would also limit demonstrations to five minutes; anything longer is spurious. He couldn't be righter.

More debatable is Mr. Eisenhower's recommendation that reporters and cameramen be completely barred from the convention floor during business sessions. We take it he would still allow the TV people to observe from their off-floor booths and the reporters to report from their stations. If so, we go along with that too, although we think that if the politicians would reform and lighten up their own incredible and often deadly dull procedures it would automatically do a lot to mitigate the journalistic problem.

Anyway, the General has done a service in stirring up discussion at a time when it is still theoretcally possible to make changes applicable to the 1968 conventions. While we're at it, a lot more besides conventions needs reforming; namely, the modes of political campaigning.

In today's world, as we and others have noted before, a campaign running 2 months or longer constitutes inhuman treatment of the candidates and excessive cost for the parties. Paradoxically enough, modern communications make the thing both unnecessary and cruel: Television can largely supplant the whistle-stopping; yet the speed of air travel seems to impel the candidates to make wrecks of themselves constantly dashing all over the country.

Much shorter campaigns—maybe three weeks like the British—are perfectly feasible and could be a good deal more interesting. The transition would be eased if arrangements could be made to allow major-party candidates a specified number of TV hours in which to set forth their views on major issues. That naturally entails junking the ridiculous notion that any so-called candidate, no matter how microscopic his support, deserves equal time.

What is mainly needed is for the party leaders to get into their skulls the fact that many Americans find the campaigns too long and long-winded, and that they are, in President Eisenhower's word, horrified at much of the convention spectacle. Not only horrified but finally bored by the clowning and dreary old-time political rhetoric.

NEEDED: A REFEREE

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Sweeney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, for many years the United States has made a studied effort to improve its image in the sporting world through a very vigorous athletic effort in connection with the Olympic games and all other international athletic competitions.

The history of American amateur athletics is a proud one indeed, and we should always as a Nation be ever cautious that it is not marred by incidents such as the most disgraceful struggle presently being engaged in by the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the American Amateur Athletic Union.

For many months now, America has witnessed the struggle for control over amateur sport competitions in the United States in which these two associations have been engaged. Punitive decrees have been issued against amateur athletes, issued by the NCAA covering exhibitions to be held this very week. The United States can hardly afford to sacrifice its international standing just because two organizations are locked inexorably in a power grab.

I quite agree with the editorial comments of the Cincinnati Enquirer of Saturday, July 24, 1965, to the effect that these two amateur sport organizations need a referee to resolve the issues and to restore sanity in this field. Failing to achieve an accord, I would hope that the leadership of this 89th Congress would move dramatically to establish an authority in this field and to once and for all put an end to this very expensive foolishness, which is affecting the athletic prestige of every youngster participating and every sports fan on the sidelines.

The editorial comments of the Cincinnati Enquirer of July 24, 1965, on this subject follow:

Needed: A Referee

The U.S. Senate's Commerce Committee has had to intervene in an effort to bring some element of sanity into what is without doubt one of the most disgraceful episodes in the history of American amateur athletics.

This is the 4-year-old struggle between officials of the National Collegiate Athletic Association and those of the Amateur Athletic Union. At issue is control over a wide area of amateur sport competition in the United States.

Since 1961, the NCAA has been trying to unseat the AAU as the dominant body of American athletics. In pursuit of this goal, the NCAA has formed federations in track and field, gymnastics, and basketball. It has ordered athletes attending affiliated colleges not to appear in AAU-sponsored meets for which admission is charged, under pain of being barred from collegiate competition.

At one point it appeared the leaders of the two organizations were prepared even to sacrifice U.S. strength at the 1964 Olympic games in Tokyo to their ambitions.

Now the issue has risen again. The NCAA has ordered a boycott of a track and field meet in Wichita, Kans., which was organized to raise money to send teams to the Soviet Union to compete in a dual track and field meet scheduled to be held in Kiev July 31 and August 1. In response, the Commerce committee has called for a new truce until a full inquiry can be held in the dispute.

While questions might be raised about whether U.S. Senators should be taking the time to consider such a matter, we believe it is high time that some authority intervened. If the athletes themselves were involved in the dispute, this would be one thing. But they are not. The whole affair is nothing more than a childish display of selfishness on the part of two sets of fat-cat officials who want to satisfy their desire for power.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly endorse the action taken by the other body to commence a probe of this long simmering feud. Left to their own devices, these two associations could truly scuttle the chances of victory in the 1968 Olympics and certainly concede success to the Russians.

I applaud the action of Chairman WARREN G. MAGNUSON, U.S. Senator from the great State of Washington, who heads the Senate Committee on Commerce, for the courage he displays by putting this dispute forcibly before the American public, focusing national attention upon it.

The American sporting world wants no Federal intervention in sports generally, but certainly this conflict is in need of arbitration or else Congress will most certainly have to undertake amendments to the charter establishing the U.S. Olympic Committee in 1950 and to vest in the U.S. Olympic Committee some authority to act so as to avoid continuance of this conflict.

I respectfully urge that President Johnson consider the appointment of an arbitrator of prestige, such as President Kennedy did in 1962 when he chose Gen. Douglas MacArthur to arbitrate a similar dispute.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART CXLII

Mr. **KING** of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MULTER**. Mr. Speaker, the following article continues the discussion of New York's education problem and is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis."

This article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 8, 1965, and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—DONOVAN ON INTEGRATION: WE NEED PEACE

(NOTE.—How do you integrate a city school system that is losing its whites so rapidly that they are fast becoming the minority group? How do you satisfy Negro and white parents who criticize every plan as either too little or too much? In this, the second of five articles on "New York City in Crisis: The Schools," Education Editor Terry Ferrer and Education Writer Joseph Michalak report on 2 years of broiling integration controversy and the "period of peace" that lies ahead.)

(By Terry Ferrer and Joseph Michalak)

"We ought to stop using the word 'crisis.' We're not in a crisis. There's chaos here. We know where we want to go and we have the program to get there, but I must say, we ought to be given a little time to do our work. We need a period of peace."

That was Dr. Bernard E. Donovan talking plaintively to reporters a day after he had been placed in the superintendent of school's chair from which Dr. Calvin E. Gross had been unceremoniously dumped by the board of education, and 1 day after he was handed his predecessor's newest inegration plans for September.

Dr. Donovan, named in an acting capacity while Dr. Gross' "leave" status is clarified, made his plea for peace while refusing to flinch under another of the incessant charges on integration—this time by the NAACP—during 2 years of head-crushing pressure applied by special-interest groups. In one ear were poured the charges that the board was moving too slowly toward better racial balance in the school system, in the other that it was moving too swiftly.

A few months ago, the harried Dr. Gross, who had been loudly trumpeted as the "outsider" who would set all the crises aright, accurately pinpointed the tumult thus:

"Our school system might be compared to a huge giant, surrounded by a quarreling pugnacious multitude, some throwing rocks and shouting abuse, others shouting encouragement, but everybody offering advice at the top of their lungs, and urging us to run off in all directions at once."

The dismayed city that watched those involved in the blistering controversy could hardly begrudge the school system a "period of peace."

LONG-RANGE POLICY

And that, judging by the signals from the normal battle command posts, is what the board is going to get on the integration issue. At least for a while; at least from the pro-integration side; and at least while the system's teachers take the center of the protest stage with strike threats that in a larger measure than ever will be directly related to all the pugnacity and shouting that has been going on.

For out of the crucible the board has drawn a long-range integration policy of "excellence of education" that has impressed even the stormiest petrel of the school battles—the Rev. Milton A. Galamison. Three times in a year, the Brooklyn minister had led damaging boycotts, one that practically stopped the 850-school system for a day.

For the first time, the civil rights groups are talking about going to bat for the board of education, rather than batting it over the head for not having an integration program they could live with.

Almost paraphrasing Dr. Donovan's request, Mr. Galamison said in a recent interview: "As I see it, there will be a period of relative peace. I don't think that most people would forgive us if we did not give him (Dr. Donovan) time to come up with something in line with the board's policy statement for September 1966."

Only the white-parent groups, most notably the Parents and Taxpayers Coordinating Council and the Joint Council for Better Education (which Dr. Gross once described as the "overstatement of the year"), continue adamant. But even their intransigence seems less focused as the board moves away from what PAT and the council call "involuntary transfers" of white children to predominantly Negro and Puerto Rican schools.

Mrs. Rosemary Gunning, the PAT leader who had led most of the fight against the board's pairings of 10 racially different schools, has quietly slipped away from her position. Her successor, Alfred Polizzotto, recently spoke only of "some form of demonstrations" during the summer and said that there had not even been discussion of new boycotts during the next school year. Last September the white-parent organizations staged a 2-day boycott at the start of the school year that kept a total of about 500,000 pupils out of classes and, as a result, cost the city system at least $1.6 million in State aid.

FLIGHT FROM CITY

While the integration controversy has ebbed and flowed, the flight of the whites from the city's public schools has continued unabated, and the population of minority-group children continues to multiply. In recent years, the growing number of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils has overwhelmed whatever efforts the board has made to achieve a better racial balance in all its schools and to improve the educational program at its poorest—the overcrowded schools in slum areas.

As Lloyd K. Garrison, the upcoming board president, said with justification in a recent interview: "The problems of integration are almost dizzying in complexity."

During the 7 years that the board of education has been taking an ethnic census, Negro enrollment has soared by 67 percent, to a total of 286,000, and the enrollment of Puerto Ricans—many of whom emigrate here with no knowledge of the language they must learn to read—by 48 percent, to a total of 190,000. Meanwhile, whites have dropped 13 percent, from 650,000 to 568,000, and now constitute barely more than half of the total enrollment—54.5 percent. This year, for the first time, minority enrollment—50.8 percent of the total—has overtaken white enrollment in the elementary schools.

At the same time, a large part of white pupils left in the city has been drained off into parochial and other private schools, which enroll now about 29 percent of all school children. Of these 425,000 pupils in nonpublic schools in the city, more than 90 percent are white.

In those 7 years, the number of public elementary schools classed as segregated by the board has more than doubled, from 63 to 148, and the number of junior highs so classified has virtually tripled, from 13 to 34.

Not even the State committee whose widely respected report laid the basis for the board of education's new long-range integration policy held out much hope that anything could be done to stem the outward tide of whites who must be kept in the city if desegregation is to be feasible.

"Present population trends are likely to continue to affect New York City no matter what policies are adopted for the public schools," said the integration advisory committee of State Education Commissioner James E. Allen, Jr. "We estimate that minority pupils will exceed 50 percent in 1965, 66 percent in 1970, and 70 percent in 1975." They already amount to 73 percent of the enrollment in the schools of Manhattan, which includes the giant ghetto of Harlem.

AN UNCHANGEABLE FACT

"Total desegregation of all schools," the committee concluded, "is simply not attainable in the foreseeable future and neither planning nor pressure can change that fact."

Planning and pressure have been in abundance. Though integration had been an issue for the 320-square-mile school system ever since the 1954 Supreme Court decision outlawing de jure school segregation in the South, the first tangible change came in September 1960. At that time the then-obscure Mr. Galamison threatened to lead a "sit-out" on opening day of school unless the board came up with "a plan and timetable" to overcome de facto segregation tied to segregated housing patterns.

In response, the board of education came up with the Nation's first "open-enrollment" program, under which a total of 20,000 pupils from schools with a high percentage of Negroes and Puerto Ricans have transferred to schools in white neighborhoods. Its advocates had argued that the program would enable children to rise above the grim slum cycle of poverty and delinquency and out of ghetto schools that allegedly made no effort to teach the children anything. Studies by Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, professor of psychology at City College, showed—and still do—that the longer pupils stayed in schools in communities like Harlem, the further they fell behind in achievement and the more certain it was that their future was dropout and failure, unemployment or, at best, unskilled work.

But the threatened 1960 sitout was mere child's play compared to the struggles that started after Dr. Gross arrived here from Pittsburgh in April of 1963. Within a month, the superintendent started a series of negotiations with civil rights leaders protesting the increasing racial imbalance in the schools.

A plan submitted in response to orders by Dr. Allen to "eliminate" racial imbalance, mentioned for the first time the possibility of pairing the enrollments of neighboring white and Negro schools in "a few" sections of the city. That wasn't enough for the civil rights groups led by Mr. Galamison, who threatened a boycott for the September opening of school.

A last-minute promise by the board that it would come up with something better by the following February 1, headed off a threatened boycott at the September opening of school. But even "a few" pairings, with "involuntary transfers" by buses, was too much for rapidly spreading groups of white parents organized under the banner of the Parents and Taxpayers Coordinating Council.

CRISIS UPON CRISIS

By the time the board came up with its proposal for pairings to eliminate segregation at 31 of its 165 segregated schools, everyone was in a rage—Mr. Galamison's citywide committee for integrated schools because the plan was not enough, and PAT because it was far too much. Then, in an almost incomprehensible period of a year or so, these rapid fire crises occurred:

February 3: Citywide Negro boycott clears 465,000 pupils out of classrooms.

February 7: Board of education appeals to Commissioner Allen to step in and evaluate its efforts.

March 12: Despite a steady snowfall, 15,000 members of PAT and the Joint Council for Better Education storm city hall to urge Mayor Wagner to halt board plans.

March 16: Second citywide Negro boycott causes 270,000 pupil absences, while board vacillates and delays announcing shrinking number of pairings.

May 12: Integration advisory committee to Dr. Allen issues scathing report about past effort of board; argues that pairings would not do the job; proposes, instead, that traditional 6–3–3 grade structure be abandoned in favor of four grades each of primary, "middle," and high school.

June 6: On recommendation of Dr. Gross, board of education, at stormy 8-hour public meeting, retains five pairings and starts partial 5–3–4 grade restructuring with transfers of about 10,000 pupils.

September 14: White parents boycott keeps 275,000 pupils out of school.

September 15—Second day of white boycott keeps 233,000 pupils out.

September 17: PAT opens two private schools in Queens rather than accept transfers to paired Negro schools.

September 24: While 7,500 white parents march outside city hall, city council turns down four motions seeking end of pairings.

October 7: 65 PAT private school parents arrested after wild melee while seeking entry to former public school in Queens.

October 8—Police repel 100 parents storming Queens school in effort to force reenrollment of two transferred pupils.

October 9—Six hundred PAT members picket Gracie Mansion in 2 day-and-night vigils.

January 19—Mr. Galamison starts extended boycott at Brooklyn "600" school for maladjusted pupils.

January 20—Mr. Galamison arrested after board obtains injunction against boycott.

February 11—Eight ministers supporting Mr. Galamison arrested after staging daylong sit-in at office of Dr. Gross.

February 17–18—Hundreds of boycotting pupils rampage through Brooklyn streets, breaking windows and fighting with policemen; 36 persons arrested.

March 4—For alleged slowness in coming up with integration and other plans, the board strips Dr. Gross of his authority and places it in Dr. Donovan's hands.

March 7—Dr. Gross' integration blueprint for September, calling for transfers of 32,000 pupils as part of further changeover to 5–3–4 grade structure, is announced.

April 14—While 1,000 pickets—most of them whites—march outside board headquarters, board holds 15-hour hearing on Gross proposals.

Finally, the distillation. From all the board had seen and heard—with civil rights groups calling for adoption of the Allen plan as policy and with pro-PAT groups urging it to leave well enough alone—the board on April 22 announced a far-reaching policy statement to provide "excellence of education" for all 1,054,000 pupils in the system.

The statement called for abolition of the outdated system of seventh-through-ninth-grade junior high schools and the substitution of new "intermediate" schools, probably running from the fifth through eighth grades, as recommended by the Allen committee. The plan also outlined a revised program for the primary schools, which will remain on a neighborhood basis, and rapid expansion of the small prekindergarten program to get 40,000 ghetto children learning sooner. The existing 3-year vocational and academic high schools will be converted to comprehensive 4-year schools combining vocational, commercial, and college preparatory studies under one roof.

MEANING OF CHANGES

The first indication of what these changes will mean was given Monday, when Dr. Donovan outlined a record $243.8 million construction program for the year starting July 1, 1966. Of the 35 projects listed, 17 will be intermediate schools and 7 will be new high schools. By contrast, for the budget that begins next month, 16 of the 38 requested projects were elementary school and only 7 were junior highs. This time there will be only four primary schools.

In addition, Dr. Donovan also proposed changes in the $158 million budget for 1965–66 already approved by the city that would divert funds requested for primary schools to intermediate schools and advance a series of high school projects. All the changeover to the 4–4–4 organization is planned for completion by 1972–73.

Much to the relief of PAT groups, the board's April policy statement makes no mention of more pairing of schools, and all indications are that the subject will never come up again. Nor was there any talk of more busing of children.

But the most controversial portion of the board's new policy called for involuntary transfers of experienced teachers to depressed area schools that are now largely staffed by new and inexperienced teachers. The proposal has met with instant opposition from elements within the United Federation of Teachers.

Six days after its policy statement, the board adopted a $40 million interim integration program for next September, pretty much along the lines sketched out by Dr. Gross. The policy was an instant hit with the civil rights groups—Mr. Galamison calling it the biggest step the board has ever taken.

CHANGING CONDITIONS

The key move in the biggest step centered on the junior high schools, which have been in existence in their present form since 1916. Asked in a recent interview what was wrong with junior highs, Dr. Donovan replied:

"It wasn't that there was anything so bad about the junior high schools. It's just that social and educational conditions have changed. The junior highs began as terminal schools. This is no longer true. Now if students leave, they generally leave after the 10th grade. Once we get them into high schools we try to hold them there."

Looking hopefully to a better integrated future, Dr. Donovan said: "We must develop a new program in grades five through eight that will not try to make these children high school students; where they will learn to live together with all children at an earlier age and come together earlier in an educational and social program."

In the end, the acid test will be whether all the best laid plans will stem the population tide that has been running against the schools. One of those who believes that better days are ahead is Miss June Shagaloff, education specialist for the NAACP, who has been in the forefront of the local integration struggle from the beginning.

THREE PREDICTIONS

The reorganization, if implemented properly, she predicted, "would (1) prevent to the fullest extent possible more segregation; (2) achieve the greatest possible desegregation; and (3) drastically and dramatically improve the schools so that those that continue to be segregated will be good schools."

Asked about the Allen committee's prediction that the minority enrollment will be 70 percent in another decade, Miss Shagaloff said that "among the unknowns in social research is what impact stability, desegregation, and good schools have on residential changes. We believe that they will have such an impact that middle-income whites and Negroes will stop moving to the private schools and suburbs. We don't believe that then the 70-percent prediction will remain valid."

Dr. Allen believes that the lengthy integration discussions "have been sharpened by PAT and Galamison, and they have forced the board and the school system to come to grips with definite plans." He added that "I don't think everything's over, but everybody's beginning to see that we must desegregate. The question now is 'how' rather than 'whether' as it was 5 years ago."

Almost echoing Dr. Allen, Dr. Donovan agreed: "You can't provide excellence in segregated schools. Part of every child's education is living with other children. Otherwise, even if you've given him excellent instruction, you haven't given him excellent education."

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART CXLIII

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the third of five articles on New York's education crisis follows.

It is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis" and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 9, 1965:

TEACHERS VERSUS SCHOOL BOARD: "CONTINUAL ATTITUDE OF WAR"

(NOTE.—The city's school system has suffered through two teacher strikes in the last 5 years. The United Federation of Teachers maintains that in half the city's schools "conditions are such that teachers find it impossible to teach." In this, the third of five articles on "New York City in Crisis: The Schools," education editor Terry Ferrer and education writer Joseph Michalak weigh the pros and cons of the continuing fight between increasingly militant teachers and the system that needs all their help.)

(By Terry Ferrer and Joseph Michalak)

Two days after the first teachers' strike in the city's history, November 7, 1960, the then-Superintendent of Schools, Dr. John J. Theobald, quoted this promise from the president of the powerful New York City Central Labor Council, Harry Van Arsdale:

"We pledge to the families of New York City that there will be no recurrence" (of the strike). Mr. Van Arsdale, who openly had opposed the walkout, and other labor leaders, had helped to persuade the 5,000 protesting teachers to go back to work after a meeting at which his statement allegedly was made.

A year and a half later—after the United Federation of Teachers had become the teachers' bargaining agent in the election that its first strike had forced—the Central Labor Council stood by silently while the teachers went ahead with a second one-day strike. April 10, 1962, saw the increasingly militant teachers stay away from classes 21,000 strong.

This strike was blunted only by some last-minute agreements on State aid reached by Governor Rockefeller and Mayor Wagner. Most of the extra $13 million found eventually wound up in the pockets of the teachers, but the harried board at least wheedled out a pledge that the teachers would not strike for the duration of the 2-year agreement.

TWENTY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS

Another year and a half later, the Central Labor Council found itself openly backing the teachers as the union threatened still another strike at the opening of school in September 1963. This time the strike was headed off only by the Mayor's appointment of a three-man mediation panel—and the sudden discovery of about $25 million of city money that the Board of Education had no idea it could bargain with. Again the AFL–CIO union gave a no-strike pledge.

But this no-strike pledge runs out June 30, and the Central Labor Council, the city and the storm-tossed school system are faced once again with more turmoil among the 46,500-strong teaching staff. Another strike threat for September comes as the system, barely out of a pulverizing 2-year-long struggle over school integration, has begun to show the first signs of overcoming some of its long-standing and burgeoning educational problems.

Already, the teachers are staging massive protests that have characterized the school scene for almost a decade. About 4,000 of them turned out at city hall late last month—many of them carrying signs saying, "We're here because teachers care"—calling on Mayor Wagner to restore the $60 million slashed from the system's first billion dollar operating budget.

What has not become clear is what the teachers care about: Just lining their pocketbooks or really attacking the city's most serious educational problems—in the ghettos riddled with massive pupil failure.

Albert Shanker, president of the UFT, emphasized in a recent interview that in about half the schools— in the depressed sections of the city—"conditions are such that teachers find it impossible to teach."

Why? "So much retardation has taken place that pupils have lost hope for learning," Mr. Shanker said. This has led to continual antisocial behavior—much of it directed physically and verbally at the teachers themselves.

The board of education, which in its last contract agreed to let the union representatives into monthly conferences on educational matters with the superintendent of schools, now has asked the union to care enough about the difficult schools to permit the forced assignment of experienced teachers from schools in better areas to the slum schools.

The schools have become cases for the rawest beginning teachers who, Mr. Shanker and others say, have not been trained to cope with the "blackboard jungle" conditions that exist in many schools. All programs to encourage voluntary transfers have not even put a dent in the problem. Among them is the more effective schools program, started a year ago on the initiative of the union itself, in which most services have been doubled and class sizes cut in half.

OUTRAGE

The union's initial reaction to the board's rotation proposal was outrage, but Mr. Shanker indicated in an exclusive interview that "a wrong impression has been created that the UFT opposes assignment of experienced teachers to ghetto schools and does not recognize the problem of retaining teachers in those schools." He said the union would "gladly cooperate" with the board if certain "essential improvements" were made at the same time. These, he said, were:

"We want experienced principals whose time will be devoted largely to training teachers on the job. (This would include all teachers, new ones and those with experience who might transfer in.)

"Additional teachers should be assigned, especially to lower grades in elementary schools, so that as soon as a child starts falling behind in such basic subjects as reading and mathematics he can get individual help as needed.

"There must be a reduction in class size. The reduction would depend on the extent of retardation in a class. The further behind a class is, the smaller should be its size.

"There should be a fairly rapid enlargement of facilities for children who cannot learn in normal classrooms and who prevent others from learning."

It was learned that the board has proposed to union leaders that an index of relative maturity of teachers be set up. When the index of experienced teachers is exceeded in a particular school, mature teachers will be moved out to schools with a low index.

Dr. Bernard Donovan, acting superintendent of schools, also feels confident that the involuntary-assignment problem can be solved, and that "we can settle the contract before the end of the school year. We will discuss with the UFT how to get teachers into ghetto schools without resentment—but to get them in. Our right of assignment is not negotiable, but the method is open to negotiation. It is better to have teachers go willingly than by force—but I didn't say we wouldn't use force."

BIG ISSUE: MONEY

Cynics maintain that when all is said and done, the final issue will be money—after all, the union has obtained $67 million from board agreements before. According to Mr. Shanker, the board has trimmed its original $20 million offer to $16 million over a 2-year contract, while the union has trimmed its demands from $130 million to $100 million.

An $84 million gap will be difficult to close.

One board member, who has been through the negotiation mill with the union before and who has seen political interference at the last moment, expressed the opinion that "the UFT will keep the pot boiling all summer and hope at the last minute to get a dispensation from heaven."

Largely because of salary concessions the union has obtained in recent years, the board can now muster a chartroom of statistics to buttress a claim that the worst is over for the city teacher and for the system's efforts to maintain a growing supply of well-qualified teachers.

For one, the board can prove that the system is making considerable headway toward regaining its long-standing leadership in teacher salaries, not only in the metropolitan area but in the Nation as well. It can also prove that the board of examiners is turning out the largest number of regular teachers in its history and that refusal of assignments by new teachers is running only half as high—10 percent—as the average for the last decade.

The city's teachers were the highest paid in the Nation from 1928 to 1947, but shortly thereafter the system here ran into some brutal competition from the suburbs—including many of the richest bedroom communities in the Nation—to which much of the city's former middle class had fled. A report produced by the High School Teachers Association in the late 1940's showed that starting salaries in some of the communities had risen to as much as $1,000 higher than New York's.

NEW BOARD STUDY

A new board study obtained by the Herald Tribune—the first of its kind to be released since before the UFT became bargaining agent—shows that except for bachelor's degree beginners, the system has improved its salary standing all down the line vis-a-vis the suburbs. In no case is it more than $300 or $400 behind the highest paying suburbs.

Mr. Shanker, the UFT president, insists that the city, because it has so many hardship assignments that cause teachers to choose the suburbs, must be "more than equal" to the outlying districts. The fact remains that as of the start of this year, a beginning teacher with a master's degree would be better off economically in the city system—earning $6,425 yearly—than in all but four of the other 163 districts in Westchester, Nassau and Suffolk Counties. Four years ago, the city was 46th on this list.

On the maximum at this level—a city teacher with this training can make $10,625—New York moved up from 79th to 38th place.

Among beginners with 30 credits beyond the master's degree, it moved up from 65th in 1960–1961 to 19th this year; on the maximum level from 102d to 61st.

Board members willing to talk are determined to place the primary effort on boosting the minimum in the next contract with the UFT. The salary differences move within a narrow range, and an increase of only $300 a year would—at least temporarily—put New York in the top 10 in the area. An increase of $400 would make it third on the list. The minimum was last raised in 1962—by $500.

Since September 1, 1959, the salary scale here has risen from a $4,000 minimum and $8,400 maximum, (including two $400 differentials for 30 and 60 credits beyond the bachelor's degree) to a $5,300 minimum and $11,025 maximum. This is an increase of $1,300 at the low end and $2,625 at the high end. When the UFT negotiated its first contract with the board—effective July 1, 1962—the minimum was $4,800 and the maximum, $9,450—meaning that the salaries have risen between $500 and $1,575.

SALARY JUMP OF $1,200

The average teacher's salary has jumped about $1,200—to more than $8,000—as a result of the two UFT contracts, a large part of the increase accounted for by $725 promotional differentials awarded for specialized training in a specific field. About 28,000 of the teachers qualify for the differentials.

Most educational authorities agree that the improving economic picture—along with the increasing role teachers have been granted in determining what goes into their programs in individual schools—has had a positive effect on teacher morale. It also has had an incidental effect on the substitute problem.

The 1963–64 figures through June 30 show whopping increases both in the number of persons being tested and those accepted by the examiners, especially in the number of regulars on the list. During that year, just under 19,000 licenses were approved by the examiners—twice as many as a decade ago, and half again as many as the 12,700 in the previous peak year of 1960–61.

These figures, being maintained this year, are reflected by the first noticeable downturn in the number of substitutes in the system. The 13,617 still teaching represented a drop of some 1,500—about 5 percent—over the previous peak year of 1963–64, when 34 percent of the 45,200 teachers were substitutes. The number of substitutes has been rising almost without interruption since the war, and the problem is most serious in the junior high schools the board intends to replace next year with new intermediate schools.

At the same time, the number of substitutes on the elementary level has risen sharply in recent years—from 19 percent at the beginning of the decade to the point where almost 30 percent of the 23,000 authorized positions are not filled by fully qualified personnel.

HIGH SCHOOL

The situation in the high schools is better—remaining the same in the vocational high schools, where 18 percent of the 2,300 positions are filled by substitutes, and dropping from 19 percent to 8 percent among the 8,100 academic high school teachers.

In fact, last September, the system found itself with more substitute teachers on hand than it had jobs for—despite its having a record 46,500 positions to fill. For the first time within the memory of Mr. Shanker and school officials, substitutes had to stand in line in search of vacancies, and about 2,000 of them were left standing. Just 2 years earlier, the system started the year with 400 uncovered classes that had to be distributed among other teachers. In preceding years, the shortage had been even more acute.

But even with such improvements, there is still a long way to go before total success is reached, either in attracting the best teachers to the city or cutting down the threat of strikes by those already employed.

Even the tentative beginnings will be jeopardized by continued down-to-the-wire negotiations between the board and the UFT. And the situation is not likely to be improved if the union gets another last-minute concession from political leaders like Mayor Wagner and Governor Rockefeller to sweeten the kitty with a few extra million dollars to head off the public disorder of a strike.

Max J. Rubin, former board president, once complained bitterly that the board "can only bargain with soap coupons" in negotiating with the UFT. It is indeed a travesty that long negotiations ending in a strike threat can be swept aside at 1 minute to deadline by a city hall or Albany make-do solution. The board effectively is shackled by such tactics, more so than when it merely had to listen to the requests of some 107 teacher groups that used to bedevil it before the advent of the UFT.

Mr. Shanker conceded that "we can be unreasonable at times," but he charged that the board's adamant position causes a "continual attitude of war" between teachers and the board, an attitude that keeps "a couple of thousand teachers a year" away from the turmoil-ridden city system.

But Mr. Shanker agrees with one board member, who said recently that ways must be found to do away with the "same old ring-a-ding" each time a contract expires. Both sides know that they must seek common goals instead of bitter and continuing wrangling.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE FAVORS ABOLITION OF DEATH PENALTY

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following communication from the Department of Justice of July 23, 1965, regarding my bill, H.R. 559. This bill would abolish the death penalty in the District of Columbia.

I am delighted that the Department of Justice agrees with my position that the death penalty should be abolished. The departmental report states that the correctional methods of modern penology can afford greater protection to society than the deliberate taking of human life.

In view of the report's recommendation that abolition of the death penalty be undertaken only after careful study, I shall withhold action on my bill until the recently appointed District of Columbia Commission on Crime can make its report to the President.

The Department's report follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1965.

Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman, District of Columbia Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice on H.R. 559 which would abolish entirely the death penalty for first degree murder in the District of Columbia and substitute therefor the punishment of life imprisonment.

In 1962, Congress enacted Public Law 87–423 which abolished the mandatory death penalty for first degree murder in the District of Columbia, provided certain conditions were satisfied. Under Public Law 87–423, juries by unanimous vote may now recommend life imprisonment in first degree murder cases, and such a recommendation is binding on the court. In the event that a jury is unable to agree as to a recommendation, the court may sentence the defendant to death by electrocution or life imprisonment. Provision is also made in Public Law 87–423 that if a defendant is sentenced to life imprisonment for first degree murder, he shall be eligible for parole only after expiration of 20 years from the date he commences to serve his sentence; and that the penalty for second degree murder shall be imprisonment for life or not less than 20 years.

H.R. 559 would go further than Public Law 87–423, and would eliminate the death penalty in the District of Columbia without regard to the circumstances or jury recommendation, and would provide instead the penalty of life imprisonment for convictions of murder in the first degree. As in the case of Public Law 87–423, however, a person convicted of first degree murder under H.R. 559 would not be eligible for parole until the expiration of 20 years from the date he commences to serve his sentence. The bill would leave intact the existing punishment for a person guilty of murder in the second degree. Nor would the bill abolish capital punishment in all cases, since juries may still continue to recommend the death penalty for the crime of rape committed in the District of Columbia. (District of Columbia Code 22–2801.)

We favor the abolition of the death penalty. Modern penology with its correctional and rehabilitation skills affords greater protection to society than the death penalty which is inconsistent with its goals. This Nation is too great in its resources and too good in its purposes to engage in the light of present understanding in the deliberate taking of human life as either a punishment or a deterrent to domestic crime. Abolition should be accomplished, however, only on the basis of a careful comprehensive study which adequately considers all aspects of crime and punishment and sentencing. Society must be protected. The sentences prescribed by statute and the procedures for affixing them should be thoroughly reviewed. Probation and parole should reflect our full experience with corrections and public safety. Effective protection for police and prison operations upon the abolition of the death penalty must be provided. Life imprisonment without release should be authorized at least in those cases where persons imprisoned for felonies, assault or murder law enforcement officers or prison guards.

A piecemeal abolition of the death penalty in Federal law is meaningless if not harmful. If abolition is indicated for murder, why not for rape? If abolition is indicated within the District of Columbia, why not then for all Federal crimes?

In the District of Columbia, 49 persons have been sentenced to death since 1945. Of these, 16 were executed. There has not been an execution in the last 8 years.

Under these circumstances, we recommend the Congress defer action until a comprehensive study can be completed. Such a study may well be conducted by both the District of Columbia Commission on Crime recently appointed by the President and the national commission on crime to be appointed by the President.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

RAMSEY CLARK,
Deputy Attorney General.

ROY LEWIS STONE

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has made great advances in education, not the least of them in the area of adult education. I am particularly proud of the work that is being done in California to further the cause of lifetime learning, and today

I want to salute the one man who has spearheaded this gigantic effort—Mr. Roy Lewis Stone.

Roy has been a long-time personal friend of mine. He was the soloist at the wedding of me and my wife, Betty. We have also worked closely together within civic groups such as the local Crenshaw Kiwanis Club. His diligent work in behalf of his community has been extensive throughout the years I have known him.

Yet, it is in his consistent endeavor to provide California's adult population with better opportunities for learning that Roy Stone is known. At present, as principal of Washington Adult School, he extends his activities to statewide administration of adult education policies and schools. A member of the Board of Directors of the California Association of Adult Education Administrators and the Adult Education Principals Association as well as a member of the Adult Education Curriculum Council and Superintendent's All-Year School Committee, Mr. Stone is knowledgeable and expert in all phases of the adult education program.

Roy Lewis Stone, through his vigorous leadership, has also contributed greatly to help the passage of legislation in California to improve and expand the State system of adult education. He has worked closely with California legislators to provide the meticulous attention to detail which is so vital to effective legislation.

It is not exaggerating to say that Roy Lewis Stone literally put the "adult" into education. A champion of this cause, Mr. Stone's example serves as a guide to all who wish to perfect and promote adult education.

THE 13TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Sunday was the 13th anniversary of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, a great and unique experiment. On July 25, 1952, Puerto Rico became a self-governing Commonwealth. We cannot look back on the intervening years without feeling profound respect and admiration for the people of Puerto Rico. Their future is bright, for their democratic status has been coupled with an economic boom unequaled in the Western Hemisphere.

It was not always so. Sometime before the close of World War II, Luis Muñoz Marin a onetime advocate for Puerto Rican independence, realized that Puerto Rico's destiny lay within the context both of American democracy and Puerto Rican self-help. He, and a number of associates, who were to remain dedicated followers, agreed that the island's salvation called for a drastic expansion of its economy from a fluctuating, precarious base in sugar to a great diversity of industrial projects. Thus was born Operation Bootstrap.

From the beginning, and especially after Luis Muñoz Marin first assumed the governorship in 1949, the project has met with almost uninterrupted success. As of May 1965, 60 of America's largest industrial corporations were operating one or more plants in Puerto Rico. Among the leaders are Kayser-Roth Corp., with 12, and General Electric and Consolidated Cigar Corp., with 8 each. These 60 mainland companies, along with about 400 other firms from the States, have invested more than $800 million in Puerto Rico. By the end of 1964, a total of more than 1,100 new factories, attracted in large measure by long-term local tax exemptions, had been opened since the inauguration of Operation Bootstrap. Approximately 100,000 Puerto Ricans work in these and similar Government-assisted plants, with a total weekly payroll of $3 million. Per capita annual income on the island in 1964 was $830, as compared to $120 in 1940. The average family income rose in the same period from $611 to $3,827; and is expected, in terms of 1955 dollars, to rise to about $6,000 by 1975.

Although wages in Puerto Rican manufacturing plants are still only about half as high as those for mainland workers, they are higher than those accorded their British and West German counterparts. Such relative prosperity has enabled Puerto Rico to become the mainland's fifth best customer. Puerto Rican purchases of U.S. products rose from $300 million in the late 1940's to considerably more than $600 million a decade later, and totaled $1¼ million in 1964.

On a per capita basis, Puerto Ricans buy more from the United States than do Canadians, who constitute America's biggest customer; and on an aggregate basis, more than do the people of such huge countries as Brazil and Argentina combined. New York State alone in fiscal 1964 realized a total of $141 million in income, as well as the creation of 16,000 jobs, from sales to Puerto Rico. These figures represent an increase of 60 percent in 4 years.

The United States, in turn, has been Puerto Rico's best customer. Island shipments to the mainland over a recent 5-year period increased by 49 percent. Trade with other countries, too, has risen phenomenally, with exports soaring from $6 million to $25 million in a decade, and imports during the same period climbing from $23 million to $46 million.

In terms of public power, Puerto Rico's future is bright indeed. Situated on the west coast, at Rincon, Latin America's first nuclear powerplant daily generates some 50,000 kilowatts for the island's power lines. From all sources, sales of electric power in Puerto Rico rose during the decade from 1954 to 1964 from $17,825,000 to $65,865,000. Generating capacity simultaneously increased from 202,560 kilowatts to 733,920 kilowatts.

These developments, as well as the soaring tourist trade and the acceleration in home construction, give promise that Puerto Rico will maintain the fastest economic growth in the Western Hemisphere. The boom in the tourist trade has been spectacular. It is expected that visitors will be enchanted to the extent of leaving behind $110 million this year alone, which is exactly $90 million more than was spent only 9 years ago. During this same period, housing production has tripled, with 46 new homes being built every day. Two out of three Puerto Rican families now own their homes. Barring a major depression simultaneously in the States and in Puerto Rico, the construction industry probably will continue to grow at a rate of about 10 percent per year to at least 1970.

Raphael Durand, Administrator of the Economic Development Administration, predicts continuous progress:

> I foresee the development here of a scientific and technological complex on the style of Cambridge, Mass., and Palo Alto, Calif. This would give Puerto Rico new direction and new dimensions. We have the climate, the facilities, and the talent to make this a success.

With respect to its own government, the Commonwealth is similar to States of the Union. The Constitution divides the powers of government between the three coordinate branches—legislative, executive, judicial—each of which checks and balances the other. The Puerto Rican people elect their own Governor and members of the house and senate. The Governor appoints the supreme court justices with the advice and consent of the senate.

The Commonwealth is governed by Federal law and participates in most Federal programs such as social security and housing. Puerto Ricans are subject to draft into the U.S. armed services. Sixty thousand Puerto Rican soldiers, sailors, and airmen fought in Korea, and 54,000 of them were volunteers. Puerto Rico's 65th Infantry Regiment has an outstanding record of combat service.

Puerto Ricans do not pay Federal income tax on income derived within the Commonwealth. This exemption accords with the honored American principle of "no taxation without representation." Puerto Ricans do—by mutual agreement of Congress and the Puerto Rican Legislature—pay certain Federal taxes such as social security.

Puerto Rico has its own judiciary. Until 1961, appeals from the Commonwealth supreme court went to a U.S. court of appeals, but now they go straight to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Spanish name for the Commonwealth—Estado Libre Asociado—is most accurately translated as "Associated Free State." The constitution of 1952 enhances both the value of the political bond with the United States and the value of maximum self-government.

Puerto Ricans set an example for other Americans in regard to fulfilling the primary responsibility of democratic citizenship. They give careful thought to political issues. And then they go to the polls and vote. Over 80 percent of the registered voters in the Commonwealth cast their ballots in 1964. And this degree of political participation is by no means unusual.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the findings of the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto

Rico. I cosponsored the bill which created this Commission. It is scheduled to submit a final report by September 30, 1966, on its studies of "all factors which may have a bearing on the present and future relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico." But we can be sure of one finding: the Puerto Rican people are overwhelmingly in favor of continuing their close ties with the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Puerto Rico have proved—and will continue to prove—that democracy can work. I believe that every Member will join me in congratulating our fellow citizens in the Commonwealth on the 13th anniversary of their successful experiment in democratic self-government.

I also want to take this opportunity to commend our colleague, Santiago Polanco-Abreu, the resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, for his excellent contribution to the deliberations of the House since his election. The people of Puerto Rico have a right to be proud of his record of service in this body.

THERE IS STILL A PLACE FOR PUBLIC OPINION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the present conflict concerning the proposed synthetic rubber plant to Rumania points up the necessity of clarifying two important points: first, the role of the American citizen in formulating foreign policy, and secondly, the tendency to vest official foreign policies with the cloak of infallibility. Some on the left even talk like we have a monarchy or benevolent dictatorship.

For years now the American people have been told that their views are vital in the conduct of foreign affairs. Department of State Publication 5606, published in 1954 and entitled "Your Opinion Counts," emphasized this theme:

> Though the method of expressing opinions may have changed, the views of an individual American today can have just as much effect on our national policies. For, despite the growth of our Government, our national leaders are keenly interested in determining the opinions of the American people and in reflecting those opinions in our national policies.

Again in 1957 the American people were reminded of their importance in foreign relations. Department of State Publication 6519, entitled "How Foreign Policy Is Made," stated:

> In the final analysis, therefore, it is the people of the United States who determine the ultimate shape of their foreign policies.

In 1961, under the Democrat administration, "How Foreign Policy Is Made" was reissued, thereby rendering bipartisan support to the role of citizen participation in the formulation of our relationships abroad.

One has cause for wonder then, when an organization, in this case the Young Americans for Freedom, accepts the invitation to become involved in foreign affairs, takes a positive position regarding one facet of our foreign policy, implements its position with organizational action and is subsequently censored for its efforts by Members of the other body, including the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Closely related to the citizen's responsibility to put himself on record is the necessity for making objective appraisals of this Nation's policies irrespective of political considerations. Judging from the statements of some foreign policymakers, one might easily conclude that our relations with other nations in the past have been consistently correct. Apparently, our tragically wrong policies concerning Yalta, Nationalist China, and down to and including Cuba have been conveniently forgotten. When one remembers this Nation's official policy regarding Katanga which Young Americans for Freedom actively protested, one can hardly blame this organization for actively resisting a policy which it considers to be fraught with danger to the security of the United States. Fortunately, in the case of the Congo, a recent change in our position and active support for Moise Tshombe has enabled this new nation to show the first signs of progress since its independence.

A second statement from the above-mentioned publication, "Your Opinion Counts," is especially apropos at this point:

> Most Americans are group-minded. Not only are they sociable by nature, but from their earliest history they have realized that by banding together they can accomplish more than they can alone. This national tendency to get together to accomplish something accounts for our thousands and thousands of organizations, great and small. Accordingly, the citizen who wants to become informed on matters of national and international import finds it stimulating and rewarding to associate himself with a group or organization that is concerned with those matters.

I am certainly convinced that public opinion is all that stands between State Department recognition of Red China and our present policy against this step. The collaborators in our midst would withdraw from Vietnam, recognize Red China, "build bridges" to the Soviet Union, and deceive Americans as to the true nature of godless, brutal communism. I am glad we have patriotic groups such as Young Americans for Freedom who speak up in support of their beliefs. Somehow, teach-ins campus protests, petitions by pro-Communists, and the like are all right to the liberal but a straightforward criticism of foreign policy which advocates increased trade with our Communist enemies is wrong. The American people will not so easily be fooled by these name-calling spokesmen of the left.

Would that an organization such as Young Americans for Freedom had been active to protest the shipments of scrap iron to Japan prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor. Perhaps fewer American soldiers would have died from bullets made in Japan from material supplied by the United States of America.

ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the last human remains of Adlai E. Stevenson have been laid to rest; the eulogies spoken; the praises sung. Yet, even at this late date, it is difficult to accept the reality of a world without him.

In his death we mourn the passing of a patriot who put his political maturity to work for the enhancement of American prestige and the advancement of permanent peace.

He brought to the international arena the compassion, conscience, and courage of a truly civilized man. He was at once articulate and urbane, witty and incisive.

In the United Nations, where he served our country with vision and vigor, Adlai Stevenson earned the admiration of representatives from all parts of the world. He remained cool, calm, and intellectually objective in the heat of debate, when less gifted diplomats raged into tirades of emotion-charged banalities.

Ambassador Stevenson, to his everlasting credit, never forgot that he was championing peace and human dignity in a tinderbox era in which modern atomic weapons imparted new urgency to nuclear sanity.

The abiding faith in peace and people is Adlai Stevenson's legacy to civilization. We trust it will not be squandered by an improvident world.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. McVicker (at the request of Mr. Evans of Colorado), for 6 days, on account of sickness in immediate family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered was granted to:

Mr. Pirnie (at the request of Mr. Findley), for 60 minutes, on July 28, 1965.

Mr. Collier (at the request of Mr. Findley), for 30 minutes, on August 3, 1965.

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mr. Findley), for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Secrest in three instances.

Mr. Mills to revise and extend his remarks on the conference report on H.R. 6675 and to include extraneous material.

Mr. Hanna.

Mr. McCarthy.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.

Mr. BRAY.

Mr. QUIE.

Mr. CEDERBERG to insert the full transcript of the program "Issues and Answers" of July 18, 1965, during the remarks he made today during the debate on H.R. 77.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KING of Utah) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CAREY.

Mr. BRADEMAS.

Mr. CAMERON.

Mr. SIKES.

Mr. IRWIN.

Mr. VANIK.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado.

Mr. ANNUNZIO.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1321. An act to amend section 501(e) of title 16 of the District of Columbia Code relating to bond requirements in connection with attachment before judgment.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 70. An act to provide for the conveyance of approximately 80 acres of land to the heirs of Adam Jones, Creek Indian, not enrolled;

H.R. 237. An act to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior;

H.R. 903. An act to add certain lands to the Kings Canyon National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1987. An act for the relief of Nabhane M. Nickley (Nabhane M. Karam);

H.R. 1989. An act for the relief of Krystyna Stella Hancock;

H.R. 2012. An act for the relief of Dr. Ignace D. Liu;

H.R. 2351. An act for the relief of Teresita Centeno Valdez;

H.R. 2360. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio R. Perez;

H.R. 2499. An act for the relief of Remedios Ocampo;

H.R. 2913. An act for the relief of Lt. Thomas A. Farrell, U.S. Navy, and others;

H.R. 4131. An act for the relief of Mrs. Phoebe Thompson Neesham;

H.R. 5508. An act to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5860. An act to amend the law relating to the final disposition of the property of the Choctaw Tribe;

H.R. 8620. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to take into consideration floods and other natural disasters in reference to the feed grains, cotton, and wheat programs for 1965;

H.R. 8862. An act to amend the act of August 7, 1935, to increase the authorized annual share of the United States as an adhering member of the International Council of Scientific Unions and Associated Unions; and

H.R. 9041. An act to restore to the heirs of the Indian grantor certain tribal land of the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 28, 1965, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1387. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of proposed disposition of magnesium held in the national stockpile, pursuant to section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, 50 U.S.C. 98b(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1388. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report that the Export-Import Bank of Washington has issued a guarantee to a U.S. commercial bank which has established a credit in favor of the Government of Rumania, pursuant to title III of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1965 and to the Presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Joint Resolution 53. Joint resolution to establish a tercentenary commission to commemorate the advent and history of Father Jacques Marquette in North America, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 683). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Joint Resolution 56. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the occasion of the bicentennial celebration of the birth of James Smithson; without amendment (Rept. No. 684). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 439. Resolution relative to the 250th anniversary of the establishment of Hopkinton, Mass.; with amendment (Rept. No. 685). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 136. A bill to amend sections 1, 17a, 57j, 64a(5), 67(b), 67c, and 70c of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 686). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3438. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy; with amendment (Rept. No. 687). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3039. A bill to amend section 1006 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary concerned, under certain conditions, to make payment of pay and allowances to members of an armed force under his jurisdiction before the end of the pay period for which such payment is due; with amendment (Rept. No. 688). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 10104. A bill to enact title 5, United States Code, "Government Organization and Employees", codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the organization of the Government of the United States and to its civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 10105. A bill to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, relating to school construction assistance in federally impacted areas, so as to provide for assistance when a school district suffers a sudden and substantial increase in enrollment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 10106. A bill to coordinate and consolidate the major civilian marine and atmospheric functions of the Federal Government through the establishment of a Department of Marine and Atmospheric Affairs, to enunciate national policies pertinent to the marine and atmospheric interests of the United States, to further the expanded exploration of marine environs and the use of marine resources, to encourage research and development in the marine and atmospheric sciences and technologies and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 10107. A bill to authorize the erection of a memorial in the District of Columbia to Gen. John J. Pershing; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 10108. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer and the additional exemption for his spouse from $600 to $1,000, and to increase the exemption for a dependent from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 10109. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1886 relating to coastwise passenger transportation and for the purposes of protecting the balance of payments and to further protect the traveling public and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 10110. A bill to amend section 2 of the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 10111. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit contracting for the construction of vessels for the U.S. Navy at places outside of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT.:

H.R. 10112. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, with amendments, a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10113. A bill relating to dealings in good faith between parties to franchise agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 10114. A bill to provide fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel, to improve the quality of teacher training programs, and to establish a National Teacher Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 10115. A bill authorizing the residents of the District of Columbia to make known their preference on the question of home rule and, if they wish, to elect a board for the purpose of preparing a municipal charter for submission to the voters and to Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 10116. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow percentage depletion on certain clays at the same rate as allowed on calcium carbonates and limestone used in the manufacture of cement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 10117. A bill to amend the provisions of title 28, United States Code, relating to retirement of judges for disability; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 10118. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply and water systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 10119. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon", approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 10120. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 10121. A bill to provide for the establishment of the St. Croix National Scenic Waterway in the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10122. A bill to provide for the establishment of a program of Federal unemployment adjustment benefits, to provide for matching grants for excess benefit costs, to extend coverage, to establish Federal requirements with respect to unemployment compensation, to increase the wage base for the Federal unemployment tax, to increase the rate of Federal unemployment tax and to provide for a Federal contribution, to establish a Federal adjustment account in the unemployment trust fund, to change the annual certification date under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, to provide for a research program and for a Special Advisory Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANSEN of Iowa:

H.R. 10123. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply and water systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 10124. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to repeal the State expenditure limitation on grant funds; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 10125. A bill to authorize the project for flood control on the San Diego River, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 10126. A bill to permit a State to elect to use funds from the highway trust fund for purposes of urban mass transportation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.J. Res. 590. Joint resolution to create a joint congressional committee to study and report on problems relating to industrywide collective bargaining and industrywide strikes and lockouts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Con. Res. 453. Concurrent resolution expressing the approval of Congress for the disposal of magnesium from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. Con. Res. 454. Concurrent resolution expressing the approval of Congress for the disposal of diamond dies from the national stockpile and nonstockpile bismuth alloys; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. Con. Res. 455. Concurrent resolution expressing the approval of Congress for the disposal of hyoscine from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

351. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to apportionment of membership of State legislatures, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 10127. A bill for the relief of Efigenia Agbayani Quitasol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 10128. A bill for the relief of Nasrolah Amjadi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 10129. A bill for the relief of Juan Miguel Apezteguia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 10130. A bill for the relief of Mr. Carmen DeSanctis and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 10131. A bill for the relief of Manuel Valero and Consolacion Valentina Valero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 10132. A bill to authorize the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, former Speaker of the House of Representatives, to accept the award of the Military Order of Christ with the rank of grand officer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 10133. A bill for the relief of Fritz A. Frerichs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 10134. A bill for the relief of the family of Percy Lawrence, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

252. The SPEAKER presented a petition of John B. Bartolino, and others, Trenton, N.J., opposing repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Hon. Cleveland M. Bailey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, on July 13, my friend, and our former colleague, the Honorable Cleveland Monroe Bailey, passed away. He was born in St. Marys, W. Va., and was a graduate of Geneva College, Geneva, Pa., an Associated Press editor of the Clarksburg Exponent, an assistant State auditor, a State budget director, a schoolteacher, and finally a Member of Congress for 16 years.

From the day he came to Congress, the membership sensed, both Democratic and Republican, that here was a man born to lead and not follow. He espoused clearly and without fear the principles and beliefs on which his political philosophy was based. As he so often said, my first two names should indicate the party of my choice. Cleveland Bailey was a kindly man under that outward rough exterior, and his word was his bond. I can remember as if it were yesterday, when we talked of our respective States, that he told me, "Remember Bob, what is good for one part of your State is good for all the State, regardless of whether or not it is your own district." Many a freshman Member of Congress will recall his words of wisdom and guidance in their legislative actions. The statute books bear evidence of his record in the Congress, and every child in America can thank him for his foresight in the field of education and every working man can thank him for his friendship to labor.

In the spring of 1965, Midwest City, Okla., paid him tribute when he went there to dedicate the Cleveland M. Bailey School. I can mentally picture him and imagine the personal pride he took in being told that a school was being named in his honor and that he was to make the dedication.

Every State in this great Union of ours sends a distinguished son to the Congress. West Virginia can take great pride in knowing that it has contributed one of her sons to the Congress of the United States, in the person of the late Honorable Cleveland Monroe Bailey. Both Mrs. Secrest and I extend our deepest sympathy to his wife, Maud, and his sons, Joslyn and Donald, and his daughter, Wanda, and his many grandchildren.

Arthur Goldberg—A Wise Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the President of the United States on his choice of Justice Arthur Goldberg as U.S. representative to the United Nations.

Arthur Goldberg, who succeeds the late Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson as Ambassador to the United Nations, brings to this body the same dedication to world peace and the same understanding that in this world we must recognize and respect the individual dignity and the inherent right of people to govern themselves in their own way.

From his boyhood days, Arthur Goldberg knew what it was to struggle and work in order to succeed in his aspirations. By his own initiative and efforts, he graduated from Northwestern University with one of the highest scholastic records achieved at the university. The son of Jewish immigrants, he rose from poverty to a position of national and international eminence. All his life he has been guided by the precepts and principles of individual freedom and the inherent dignity of man. It is on these cornerstones that the United States has grown and prospered. Justice Goldberg's background reflects this American way and it is a way of life that this Nation hopes to make possible for all mankind.

In the responsible positions he held as Secretary of Labor and Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Arthur Goldberg distinguished himself as a man of sharp intellect and clarity of speech, and demonstrated his great skill as a negotiator who strove always to be judicially impartial. As counsel to the AFL–CIO, Mr. Goldberg won and retained the respect of the businessmen with whom he dealt. He is also widely credited as having been the main instrument in the AFL–CIO drive to purge its ranks of Communist influence.

I was privileged to represent the United Steelworkers at the same time that President Murray selected Arthur Goldberg to become general counsel of that great organization and I am therefore personally acquainted with his persuasiveness, his ingenuity, and his ability to compromise without sacrifice. I know that these qualities will serve him in good stead in the difficult and challenging role he has undertaken in the United Nations.

Arthur Goldberg brings to the United Nations a renewed determination that people must live together in world peace through the rule of law, and he has pledged himself in his own way "to help keep the candle of peace burning."

U.S Foreign Policy: New Myth and Old Realities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, last week we again observed Captive Nations Week.

As part of the observance the Captive Nations Assembly held a dinner at the National Press Club on July 21, and heard an address by Representative Gerald R. Ford of Michigan.

Mr. Ford's remarks follow:

U.S. Foreign Policy: New Myths and Old Realities

I am honored to be here tonight and to receive this Captive Nations Award. Your organization has a great mission. You help keep alive the hope of freedom for the captive peoples under communism. With a deep sense of humility, I thank you—and salute your efforts.

Tonight I would like to discuss new myths and old realities affecting U.S. foreign policy. American fighting men are at this moment in a hot war in Vietnam. They are there to help roll back the tide of Communist aggression. If they are to succeed, here at home we must face up to the true nature of the enemy—communism.

The theory has grown in recent years that this enemy is changing and mellowing. We are told that the Communist world is splitting up. We are advised by so-called experts that the Soviet Union wants peaceful coexistence. These experts say that we should encourage such change by a more tolerant attitude toward communism.

This has been a dominant theme in recent American foreign policy. Unfortunately, it is a theme based on hope, not evidence—on myth, not reality.

For example, there has been an effort to pull down a verbal Iron Curtain on any discussion of the captive nations under Communist rule. Some misguided spokesmen have even opposed the idea of having a Captive Nations Week. They claim it rubs the Kremlin the wrong way and therefore blocks American-Soviet understanding.

That is the myth—but what is the reality? It is that in Eastern Europe tens of millions of people live under Communist repression. No democratic elections are permitted in these countries. The principle of national self-determination is ruthlessly denied.

The myth says that the United States should furnish trade and aid to help the economics of these captive nations. We are told that in this way the Communist monolith will break up.

That is the myth—but what is the reality? The truth can be learned by studying this Nation's policy toward Hungary. We are being told now that the Communist rulers of Hungary are changing. We are being told now that they too are mellowing. We are being advised by the so-called experts that the United States should consider a large-scale trade and aid program to Communist Hungary. The theory is that we can help liberalize Hungary's domestic and foreign policies.

That is the theory. But what is the reality? The reality is that the people of Hungary today remain under a brutal Communist dictatorship. The regime there was brought to power through bloody repression of the Hungarian people—and it remains in power by threat and coercion.

We will pay dearly for such mistaken theories. We have paid dearly for them in years past. Three times in this decade the old realities of communism have fomented major world crises.

There was the reality of the Berlin wall in 1961. Today, 4 years later, the wall stands as a symbol of Communist aggression. The outrage of Western statesmen has been forgotten—as the Communists knew it would. But the wall remains. As with the captive nations, we are not supposed to mention the Berlin wall anymore. To do so, we are told, is an unnecessary irritation of the Soviets.

Thus does the spirit of false coexistence march on. It callously ignores all proof of Communist aggression. It deceives its followers—and it betrays the cause of freedom.

Thus, in 1962, came the reality of the Cuban missile crisis. That crisis should have upset the theories of our mythmakers. Communist deceit and aggression were made plain for all to see. Despite this fact, the reality of the Cuban missile crisis soon gave way to myth.

Again, the apostles of coexistence at any price did not admit their mistake. Instead, they began arguing that the missile crisis advanced the cause of American-Soviet understanding. Why? Because, they said, it proved to the Russians that the United States will stand firm when our vital interests are at stake.

But we might ask why Khrushchev and his military advisers ever believed otherwise? What led them to think that the United States would ever tolerate Soviet missiles in the Caribbean?

The answer is that the Communists concluded—as the late Robert Frost quoted Khrushchev—that America had become too liberal to fight.

Our lesson in Cuba ought to guide us during the third great crisis of this decade—in Vietnam. In Cuba, our early vacillation encouraged the Communists to bolder-and-bolder aggression.

We cannot—we dare not—lead them to repeat that mistake in Vietnam.

The Communist leaders in Moscow, Peiping, and Hanoi must fully understand that the United States considers the freedom of South Vietnam vital to our interests. And they must know that we are not bluffing in our determination to defend those interests.

Mao has said that America will soon tire of the war in Vietnam. It is President Johnson's grave responsibility to convince Mao and his Communist allies otherwise.

Our power is known to the enemy. The enemy must be convinced of the fact that we will use that power to meet the threat of aggression.

Toward this end I recommended a short time ago that we intensify our air strikes against significant military targets in North Vietnam. Predictably, I was denounced by armchair theorists. Many of these same spokesmen have given the President only half-hearted support in his Vietnam policy. Many have openly attacked the President's firmness—and called for a retreat out of Vietnam.

My purpose was—is—and will continue to be—to strengthen the President's effort to convince the enemy of our firmness. But many of his ostensible political allies are in fact weakening his hand in this crisis.

Let me repeat what I have said before: Here at home, President Johnson need not fear that the opposition party will ever undercut his efforts to be firm against Communist aggression in Vietnam, or elsewhere. We have backed these efforts—and we will always put national interest above narrow partisan interest.

But the President's worst opponents here at home are those critics within his own party who are undercutting his credibility in enemy capitals.

Before the Cuban crisis, Khrushchev was misled into believing America would not stand firm. Today, Mao is being misled by the cut-and-run speeches made by members of the President's own political family.

Mao hears the clamor for negotiation-at any-price—from members of the President's own political party.

Mao hears the clamor to retreat to high ground or to Saigon— or even to Waikiki—from members of the President's own political family.

Mao hears vague talk of "political solutions" and de-escalation—from a U.S. Senator who not long ago occupied a powerful policymaking position in our Government. And, he too is a member of the President's political family.

Along with the President, we wonder what some of these recommendations mean. But Mao believes he knows their meaning. To him and his allies, they mean America is divided. To Mao and his allies they mean that this country will abandon its policy of firmness in Vietnam.

These then are the irresponsible critics of the President's Vietnam policy. Not those of us—Democrat and Republican alike—who want it known that the United States will defend our vital interests.

These then are the irresponsible critics. Not those of us who urge that the President act to convince the Communists of our resolve.

These then are the irresponsible critics. Many of the same irresolute voices led us to near disaster in Cuba. Now they argue that our fight in Vietnam is the wrong battleground—in the wrong place—at the wrong time.

But the vast majority of Americans know that the defense of freedom is the highest calling of a great nation. And we believe that the time we help protect a free people from Communist aggression we are meeting our responsibilities at the right time—in the right place.

This does not mean—as some cynical spokesmen claim it does—that we must undertake a holy war against communism. But it does mean that we must respond to communism's own "unholy war" against human freedom.

What then are the vital interests we must defend in Vietnam?

Up to now, the public dialog has been concerned with escalated means. Perhaps the time has arrived when the President, and those of us who support him, must escalate not means alone—but the ends for which we fight.

Is it enough to say that we are fighting to get the enemy to come to a conference table? The enemy himself is fighting for well-defined objectives. He wants to drive us out of Vietnam, conquer the people and dominate the land.

If we are to defeat this enemy objective, we too must define our goals in Vietnam. Our military commitment has increased. Now the President must detail the vital interests we are fighting for in that part of the world.

With the one exception of Korea, the United States has fought every war with clear objectives. These goals served to guide and sustain our fighting men and our people. The national frustration suffered during the Korean war resulted from our lack of clear objectives.

It is not enough to tell a free people that they are fighting a war only to achieve a stalemate. It will not be enough to gain in Vietnam the same kind of negotiated settlement reached in Laos.

The negotiation in Laos opened the borders of South Vietnam to Communist aggression. We cannot fight in Vietnam to negotiate a settlement that will simply open the rest of southeast Asia to aggression and subversion.

We do not choose to be in Vietnam. We would not be in Vietnam if the Communists would only leave their neighbors alone. But it is not in the Communist nature to leave their neighbors alone. The fate of the captive peoples throughout the Communist world proves this fact. To believe otherwise is to believe a myth—not reality. It is a myth which might lead the world to the darkness of tyranny—or the horrors of a global holocaust.

John Ruskin said:

"You may either win your peace or buy it; win it, by resistance to evil; buy it, by compromise with evil. You may buy your peace with silenced consciences; you may buy it with broken vows—buy it with lying words—buy it with base connivances—buy it with the blood of the slain, and the cry of the captive, and the silence of lost souls over hemispheres of the earth, while you sit smiling at your serene hearths, lisping comfortable prayers morning and evening, and so mutter continually to yourselves, 'peace, peace,' when there is no peace; but only captivity and death for you as well as for those you leave unsaved; and yours darker than theirs."

We will win our peace by resistance to evil. We will not buy it by compromise with evil. That will remain our purpose in Vietnam and throughout the world—wherever brave men resist tyranny and long for freedom.

Right-To-Work Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, on November 4, 1958, the voters of Ohio were given an opportunity to vote for a constitutional amendment that would make legal a right-to-work law in Ohio. They voted against the amendment overwhelmingly. The total vote for the amendment was 1,160,324. The total vote against the amendment was 2,001,512. The vote by counties is set forth in the following table:

County	Yes	No
Adams	3,023	4,072
Allen	14,316	19,452
Ashland	7,492	7,611
Ashtabula	11,753	20,311
Athens	3,656	11,291
Auglaize	5,930	6,795
Belmont	6,654	27,250
Brown	2,894	4,917
Butler	20,645	40,433
Carroll	2,704	4,439
Champaign	4,904	4,820
Clark	15,872	23,053
Clermont	6,718	14,887
Clinton	4,973	3,783
Columbiana	13,246	24,232
Coshocton	4,865	7,281
Crawford	8,532	7,887
Cuyahoga	170,393	379,465
Darke	7,849	7,917
Defiance	3,884	6,271
Delaware	7,200	5,724
Erie	8,410	10,626
Fairfield	8,418	14,801
Fayette	4,613	2,949
Franklin	93,297	96,188
Fulton	4,646	4,271
Gallia	3,403	4,543
Geauga	6,789	7,606
Greene	9,545	12,101
Guernsey	4,414	9,236
Hamilton	109,994	187,855
Hancock	9,125	8,179
Hardin	5,088	5,452
Harrison	1,989	5,473
Henry	4,310	4,156
Highland	5,453	4,607
Hocking	2,430	5,192
Holmes	2,966	2,048
Huron	5,948	7,234
Jackson	3,353	7,590
Jefferson	8,415	28,924
Knox	5,637	10,117
Lake	14,509	28,821
Lawrence	3,130	12,978
Licking	10,868	18,610
Logan	5,909	6,082
Lorain	21,270	38,199
Lucas	51,128	114,352
Madison	4,326	3,646
Mahoning	32,842	67,715
Marion	8,989	12,067
Medina	8,192	10,227
Meigs	2,309	5,083
Mercer	3,882	7,226
Miami	11,436	12,721
Monroe	1,757	3,431
Montgomery	53,541	91,319
Morgan	2,106	3,261
Morrow	3,309	3,774
Muskingum	10,171	19,165
Noble	1,808	3,172
Ottawa	4,710	7,043
Paulding	2,246	3,011
Perry	2,566	8,375
Pickaway	5,377	4,640
Pike	2,486	4,480
Portage	10,161	19,748
Preble	4,695	5,228
Putnam	3,504	6,122
Richland	15,138	18,169
Ross	6,925	9,091
Sandusky	8,944	8,776
Scioto	11,095	22,614
Seneca	8,584	12,806
Shelby	5,276	6,841
Stark	48,345	76,660
Summit	49,420	124,372
Trumbull	20,890	44,322
Tuscarawas	8,763	20,829
Union	4,824	3,723
Van Wert	4,942	5,824
Vinton	1,235	3,103
Warren	6,516	11,758
Washington	6,461	8,859
Wayne	11,878	10,413
Williams	4,614	4,815
Wood	9,477	13,295
Wyandot	4,024	3,707

I am convinced that when the wishes of a constituency are known beyond a shadow of a doubt, that these wishes should be respected.

Those who voted against the right-to-work proposal in Ohio represent every segment of our population. They far exceed the total number of laboring people. Many rural counties voted against the proposal as solidly as did the voters from industrial counties. Labor unions, farm organizations, religious groups, and many others joined hands in opposing the right-to-work proposal. I believe their views should be respected and for this, and many other valid reasons, I intend to vote for the repeal of section 14 (b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. Some provision should be made to protect religious groups and I am certain this will be done before repeal of 14(b) becomes final.

Korea: America's Gallant Little Neighbor in the Pacific Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 12th anniversary of the armistice which ended the conflict in Korea. Once unknown to most of us, Korea now stands as a symbol of American resolve not to let free peoples fall under the tyranny of Communist armies, not to allow the Far East to fall under the domination of a single power, and not to let a friend down no matter how small. But Korea is much, much more than a symbol. The Republic of Korea has become one of America's best friends, one of our good neighbors in the Pacific community. On this occasion, I feel that it is appropriate to take a fresh look at this little republic to examine its place in the world and in the Pacific community.

Certainly, the past 12 years have not been easy ones for the Republic of Korea and her people. Although the guns have officially ceased fire, the war has not really ended, as two still very hostile armies confront one another across the now famous DMZ each actively probing the heavily fortified lines of the other for weak spots. South of the DMZ, the Korean people have faced 12 years of hardship in reconstructing a war-devastated homeland. They have suffered political instability marked by corruption, riots, and coups d'etat. They have undergone 12 years of economic difficulties and natural disasters such as the floods of a week ago which claimed so many lives. Too, Korea today is afflicted with the classic problems of a developing nation: A rapidly increasing population, a maldistribution of employment between the agricultural and industrial sectors of the economy, a lack of diversification in agricultural production which has resulted in the economy's heavy dependence on the annual rice crop, a lack of entrepreneurial initiative and corporate organization of industry due in large part to the extended family tradition which discourages cooperation outside the formal family organization, an absence of a sense of community endeavor both within the agricultural sector in such areas as cooperative marketing and credit arrangements and within the urban regions in such areas as the building of sewers. As if all of this were not enough, Korea also faces serious monetary problems characterized and compounded by inflation, a shortage of capital, and an unfavorable balance of trade with other countries.

Despite this plethora of seemingly insurmountable problems, rays of hope are continually breaking through Korea's cloudy economic sky. After the armistice went into effect a determined Korean people turned to the task of reconstructing their war-ravaged nation. With the assistance of the United Nations and the United States they cleared the rubble and built new cities, enacted land reforms, and transformed the countryside from barren, trench-scarred hills to a checkerboard of rice paddies and rural towns. When they finished with reconstruction, the Korean people, aroused by the determination to secure a better life for themselves and for their children, went right on working to build a base from which they could modernize their economy. They began building the power and transportation facilities necessary to a modern economy. They opened a factory for the manufacture of freight and passenger railroad cars to meet one of Korea's greatest transportation needs—the lack of adequate rolling stock. They increased production of electricity from 900 million kilowatt hours in 1954, to 2 billion in 1962. Most significantly, the Korean people undertook a great educational endeavor, they became a nation going to school. Today, some 3,000 adults attend evening folk schools for literacy training and there are over 2 million students enrolled in primary, secondary, and higher educational institutions. As a result of the intensified educational effort in Korea some 85 percent of the people have achieved literacy. This accomplishment in addition to the natural knack of the Koreans for careful, detailed work has given Korea one of her greatest assets—a highly trainable, effective labor force.

Moreover, the Korean Government, sensitive to the people's desire for a better life, is looking to the future and making a frontal assault on Korea's problems in a series of 5-year development plans. Like many developing nations, Korea has two major economic goals: A more rapid increase in gross national product and a higher standard of living for all her people. The Korean Government formulated these development goals in its first 5-year plan—1961-66—a plan which does not set absolute volume production goals but which indicates priority industries and sectors for government credit and assistance. Three major areas of priority in the first plan are energy production—primarily electrical and coal—agricultural production with emphasis on the fertilizer industry, and the building of social overhead capital such as roads, multipurpose dams, and urban public works. Another major objective of the present plan is to reverse the existing unfavorable balance-of-payments situation, by making an increase in exports one of the nation's primary goals.

Moreover, the government has taken several varied approaches to alleviate the shortage of capital in the country. These have included a limitation of the use of foreign exchange to those commodities which are fundamental to capital producing industries and a proposal for a domestic commercial Bank of Korea to be located in the United States. The bank was originally suggested by a group of American businessmen of Korean extraction and was envisioned as a cushion in Korea's international financing. Not only would the bank facilitate international exchange but half of the capital would be furnished by the Korean-American community and the other half by the Republic of Korea. The proposed bank would be strategically located in southern California, an area which already carries on a lively trade with Korea. This trade is certain to grow with the establishment of the bank and with the growth of Korea's developing economy.

As a result of her efforts and achievements of the past 12 years, Korea today is visibly moving forward. Her growth rates have been high and are getting higher year by year. In 1961—the first year of the plan—the growth rate was 4.8 percent. It slipped in 1962 to 3.5 percent due to a bad harvest the year before. In 1963 it soared to a vigorous 6.8 percent and last year went up even further to 6.9 percent. And although the agricultural sector is growing slowly, at 2.7 percent, the industrial production index has bounded upward at 12.8 percent per year for the last 3 years. Finally, exports last year rose 39 percent to $119.1 million, a continuation of a 3-year trend.

Although classified by the economists as a developing nation, Korea's determination to move up the ladder and her recent successes in doing so mark her as a peninsula of opportunity for her neighbors in the Pacific community. Indeed, Korea has already become a vigorous participant in the Pacific community of forward-moving nations. Traditionally, a buffer state between Japan and China and known throughout Asian history as a "Hermit Kingdom," Korea today is very much aware of her dependence on foreign trade for her success in economic development and looks to the Pacific community for markets and supplies. The bulk of Korean export trade is carried on with Taiwan, Hong Kong, Thailand, the United States, and Japan. The latter is Korea's most important trading partner outside the U.S.-AID program, supplying 47 percent of Korea's non-AID financed imports and receiving 25 percent of her exports.

The major suppliers for two of Korea's newest and most rapidly growing light industries, the rubber tire and plywood industries, are all from the Pacific community—the United States, Malaysia, the Philippines, and New Zealand. Most of the capital machinery as well as the key mechanical inputs for public works construction come from the Pacific Community, primarily from Japan and the United States. Pacific businessmen, recognizing the potential in the highly trainable and low-cost Korean labor force, are utilizing that potential through what is known as bonded trade. For example, Japanese businessmen import raw goods, primarily textiles and crude rubber, which are then processed in Korea. The processed goods are then exported by the supplier who distributes the finished commodities through his established markets. Korea now maintains a lively bonded trade with such Pacific neighbors as Vietnam, Hong Kong, and Japan.

But the present is only prolog for richer opportunities as Korea seeks to achieve the objectives of her development plans. One of these objectives is the attainment of self-sufficiency in food production by 1969. That means a growing market for the tools Korea will need to modernize her agriculture and improve her productivity—irrigation equipment, farm machinery, farm chemicals, and agricultural technology. Moreover, until that objective is attained, Korea will continue to have to import foods to feed her people from outside. That means a continuing market for foods produced by American farmers who sold in calendar year 1963 over $100 million worth of foodstuffs to the Korean people.

Another objective is the development of industries for the production of machinery, chemicals, iron, steel, and related products. That means markets for sophisticated capital equipment and for industrial know-how. Enterprising and imaginative American businessmen have already recognized their own opportunities in Korea's industrial future. The Gulf Oil Co. and a consortium of Skelly Oil Inc. and Swift & Co. have each contracted with the Korean Government to build a fertilizer plant, each of which will produce some 180,000 metric tons of compound fertilizer and some 84,000 metric tons of urea fertilizer annually. Moreover, as Korea grows and develops, an expanding economy will mean expanding personal incomes which in turn will mean a growing market for consumer goods as Korea's 30 millions of people reach for a better, richer life for themselves.

So, as Korea forges ahead, her requirements will be America's opportunities. But let us not take those opportunities for granted. Let us not rest on the present advantage tendered our traders by the American AID program. For as the Korean market develops with that nation's advance, competitors will surely seek to capture it for themselves with highly sophisticated commercial weapons. Our traders must be prepared to counter with aggressive sales and market penetration techniques, good service, and sound but liberal and imaginative credit arrangements. Moreover, we should not forget that a richer Korea means a richer, stronger Pacific community through trade, which in turn means greater prosperity for America. We must therefore continue to encourage Korea's development and the growth of prosperity for her people. At the same time, we ought to promote increased participation by Korea in the affairs of the Pacific community.

In this regard let us continue in the forefront of those who advocate the creation of an Asian Development Bank which will encourage nations like Korea to help themselves by providing the means with which to do it. Let us continue to encourage the growing rapproachment between Korea and Japan and the high statesmanship demonstrated by the governments of both of those nations in coming to agreement on normalizing their relations. Let us also seek to multiply our own commercial and cultural ties with Korea by expanding our currently inadequate cultural exchange program, by working to increase tourism in both directions, by encouraging such ventures as the Korean Bank to be located in Los Angeles, by promoting joint scientific and cultural projects of mutual benefit which will increase the store of human knowledge in such areas as oceanography, art, and archeology. As neighbors in the Pacific community we ought to get to know each other much better than we now do. Korea and the United States have enjoyed a close international friendship for 20 years. Let us strengthen that friendship with the cement of people-to-people understanding—personal knowledge by our peoples of each others people, culture, and land.

Few nations in history have come to so much grief so often as has Korea. Cursed by geography as a strategically located buffer state at the feet of three giants, she has known in the past century only war, intrigue, revolution, subjugation, colonization, and now tragic partition.

But today, on this 12th anniversary of the armistice, we can see that the southern half of this tiny Asian peninsula is at last beginning to glow, however faintly, with the promise of a brighter future for 30 millions of people. We cheer this progress and hope that the sparks we see will soon burst into the flame of prosperity.

The Federal Government and State of Oregon: Partners in Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House the regrettable and ignorant alliance of the Federal Government and the State of Oregon in keeping gambling illegal in that State. I say this because by keeping gambling illegal in Oregon, the two governments are keeping gambling ripe for plucking by the mob, so that gambling profits finance every variety of mob criminal activity.

Last year, the parimutuel turnover in Oregon came to $12.5 million. More meaningful, and also more dangerous is Oregon's undercover, illegal gambling. Testimony before the McClellan committee put off-track betting at $50 billion a year nationally, and other testimony indicated that this type of gambling accounted for only 42 percent of the illegal gambling total, which would then be about $120 billion a year. On a population basis, Oregon's share of this would come to $1.2 billion a year. Even if this is somewhat high, there is no doubt that illegal gambling is kicking in millions of dollars every year to the mob in Oregon.

To me, it is hypocrisy to keep gambling illegal so that it serves the mob's needs for operating revenues. Why should we allow illegal gambling to finance the underworld when Government-run gambling can make gambling revenues work for the people. Unfortunately, Oregon has proven itself long on hypocrisy. When rural Oregon bluenoses some years ago objected to Oregon's dograces, these objections somehow vanished when the county fairs got cut in on the take. I would like to see an end to this hypocrisy. I would like to see the Government take over gambling and make it work for for the people. I recommend a national lottery.

A Salute to Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, 1952, the island community of Puerto Rico attained Commonwealth status.

Some critics have complained that since it is neither a territory nor a State, Puerto Rico enjoys the advantages of Federal services without paying taxes.

But this is far from a onesided relationship. The more than 2 million residents of the island community have a voice, but no vote, in Congress. They have little say in determining their fate.

And they have served our Nation well in time of need. Some 60,000 Puerto Ricans—90 percent of them volunteers—were members of the Armed Forces during the Korean war.

And it is a happy relationship. In the 1960 elections in Puerto Rico, candidates favoring retention of Commonwealth status outdistanced by nearly 2 to 1 statehood advocates. Those favoring independence lagged far behind.

And so we take this occasion to salute Puerto Rico and its unique status, a status that has enabled the island to demonstrate to the world the progress and growing prosperity it has made as a workshop for democracy in Latin America.

USDA: Consumer Friend—Food Programs Bolster Health of One in Five Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, food assistance programs of the U.S. Department of Agriculture are helping provide well-rounded diets to almost one-fifth of the American people. Included are schoolchildren, low-income families, the destitute, and victims of disasters such as floods and tornadoes.

The Department estimates that during fiscal year 1965, some 40 million men, women, and children benefited. They shared in our country's agricultural bounty through USDA programs drawing upon surplus farm commodities and furnishing other foods to maintain and improve the Nation's health.

Total cost of these USDA programs during the fiscal year just ended was over $800 million. According to 1961 hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, at least five times that amount per year goes into illegal offtrack betting on horseracing alone.

Here are some examples of how USDA food assistance programs return dividends to our people far in excess of the investment:

Seventy-one thousand public and nonprofit private schools in all States, the District of Columbia, and U.S. territories are taking part in the national school lunch program to which USDA contributes leadership, funds, and foods. About 36 million of our children attend these schools. Thus, hearty lunches are available to about three-fourths of the Nation's 48 million schoolchildren, either at extremely moderate prices or free.

Of some 2.9 billion lunches served each year to about 17 million children under the national school lunch program, 1 out of 10 is served free to a needy child whose parents cannot provide any money at all for a midday meal at school. As a result of special efforts to extend the lunch program to schools in depressed areas, during the past year approximately 170,000 needy children in about 1,200 schools have been receiving ample lunches at very low prices.

Some 14 million children, in addition to those benefiting from the lunch program, are getting fresh milk at reduced prices made possible by the special milk program of the USDA.

About three-quarters of a million Americans earning meager incomes are getting improved diets—in particular, more meat, poultry, dairy products, fruit, and vegetables—through the greater purchasing power they receive by taking part in the food stamp program. Today this program is operating in 116 areas in 31 States and in the District of Columbia.

Increasingly, cities and counties are participating in USDA's food donation program. USDA distributes surplus foods through State and local governments. During 1965, these food supplies are being channeled to nearly 19 million schoolchildren, 5.8 million needy persons in family groups, and about 1.3 million in charitable institutions.

This, in brief, is one of the many ways in which USDA is converting the abundance of America's farms into the most valuable resource of all, well-fed healthy people who make up a dynamic Nation.

Excise Tax Reduction Seen as Savings to Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of this body an ad which appeared today in the Cleveland Press, with which Sears, Roebuck & Co. becomes the first retailer in the United States, to my knowledge, to use the excise tax reduction for positive consumer advertising.

In this full-page ad, Sears, Roebuck & Co. started by saying:

> You can count on us. Sears prices have been reduced on merchandise covered by the recent repeal of the manufacturers' Federal excise tax by Congress. You can also save 10 percent on all items that carried the retailers' Federal excise tax. You can count on Sears to pass the new Federal excise tax savings directly on to you.
>
> The number of merchandise items is too lengthy to list in one advertisement. However, here are some of the categories on which you can expect manufacturers' Federal excise tax savings at Sears.

These creative advertisers at Sears went on to list approximately 50 categories of items in which the consumer could expect a savings to be passed on to them at the Sears stores. These items mentioned included refrigerators, electric blankets, electric irons, electric frying pans, electric waffle irons, electric door chimes, electric food choppers and grinders, electric hedge trimmers, electric lawn mowers—with less than 30-inch cut—cameras, business machines, playing cards, phonograph records, tennis equipment, golf balls, pool tables, and many other items.

The Sears advertising men went on to picture specific items of consumer interest with each model number, pre-excise-tax prices, and their post-excise-tax prices as well as their sale prices in certain instances so that the consumer could tell at a glance exactly where and how the excise tax was being passed on.

I wish to congratulate and commend the management of Sears, Roebuck & Co. for this splendid example of creative advertising in utilizing the excise tax reduction to the greatest extent possible. In this instance, the consumer cannot be misled or confused and has no reason to mistrust the honesty of this retailer because excise taxes are being passed on. In this full-page ad, the consumer can see where and how.

It is my hope that other retailers will follow Sears' lead in clarifying this question of how and where the excise taxes are being passed on to the consumer as well as if the excise tax reduction is reflected in lower retail prices.

A Message to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress From the President and Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I enclose herewith for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a message from the President and Vice President of the United States to the 52d Annual National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington:

> THE WHITE HOUSE,
> *Washington, June 8, 1965.*
>
> Mr. HENRY H. BUCKMAN,
> *President, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Orange Park, Fla.*
>
> DEAR MR. BUCKMAN: Please accept my sincere congratulations on the occasion of the 52d Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.
>
> The Rivers and Harbors Congress has rendered great service to our Nation for over half a century. I highly commend the vision and leadership which have inspired the cooperative, productive effort of our Federal, State, and local agencies, and private interests, in support of essential programs for the development of our precious water resources.
>
> While flood control projects already built are protecting many areas, two major flood disasters since your last convention have emphasized the necessity for effectively advancing the work of further curbing the destructive power of our rivers.
>
> We must also encourage the adoption of realistic measures to conserve our available supply of good water to abate the pollution of our streams, to expand and improve our navigation systems, to develop more fully our Nation's hydroelectric power potential, to provide increasingly for healthful outdoor recreation, to conserve our fish and wildlife heritage, and, in seeking these objectives, to preserve and enhance the beauty of our land.
>
> I am fully confident that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress will continue to play a forceful role in the attainment of all these vital national goals.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, June 2, 1965.

Mr. HARRY BUCKMAN,
President, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, care of the Honorable Robert Sikes, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BUCKMAN: My congratulations to you on the occasion of the annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

Our President has stressed the importance of improving and beautifying our waterways as an integral part of building the Great Society. Your tireless efforts in this direction are most gratifying.

With best wishes for a successful convention.

Sincerely,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Ivory Coast's Fifth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on August 7, 1965, a small, but viable, nation will celebrate the fifth anniversary of its independence. This nation, the Republic of Ivory Coast, has succeeded in these 5 years in establishing itself not only economically, but also politically, as a major force among the emerging African community of free nations.

With a prosperous economy based almost exclusively on exporting agricultural products, Ivory Coast has been devoted to diversifying its economy. The opening of the Vridi Canal made Abidjan, the nation's capital, a deepwater port, the first in the country, and has largely accounted for the increased pace of its development.

The contemporary political history of Ivory Coast is closely associated with the career of one man: Felix Houphouet-Boigny, President of the Republic and leader of the Pari Democratique de la Cote d'Ivoire, the only political party in Ivory Coast. He was one of the founders of the Rassemblement Democratique African, the leading preindependence political party in French West Africa, and has been active in national political affairs since 1944. Houphouet-Boigny served as an Ivory Coast Deputy in the French National Assembly from 1946 to 1959. In April 1959 he became the first Prime Minister of his country, and in the first general elections after independence he was elected President.

The Constitution of Ivory Coast provides for a strong Presidency within the framework of a separation of powers. In addition to the Presidency, there is a 70-member National Assembly and a judicial system which culminates in a supreme court composed of four chambers.

And not only is Ivory Coast achieving political and economic change, it is also at the forefront in fostering social change. As Donald H. Louchheim wrote in an excellent article in the July 25, 1965, Washington Post on Ivory Coast, entitled "Africa Is Elbowing the Tribal Ways":

> No African nation is more determined to conquer the past than the Ivory Coast. With bold strokes, this prosperous West African country is tackling social reform with an attempt to retool African tribal society to face the new and complex challenges thrust upon it.
>
> Ivory Coast's answer is legislation. A new civil code passed last year represents an effort to promote a revolution in social life. The code touches basic aspects of religious, private and family life within the country's 60 tribes and may eventually shred the fabric that has given each one its special identity, but in turn emphasizes the identity of the individual.

Basic Essential Skills Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, much criticism has been leveled at some of the training programs conducted by the Office of Economic Opportunity. One of the programs that I know of operating successfully and overlooked by the Office of Economic Opportunity is a basic essential skills training program being conducted in the city of New York. In an effort to describe to the House a successful, well thought out, and well operated plan, I would like to describe this BEST training program for some of the underprivileged, unskilled, and unemployed people in my city.

Actually the name of the program is BEST which stands for "basic essential skills training" program. This program was derived through the cooperation of the New York City Trucking Authority of which Hugh Sheridan has been chairman for over two decades; with the Empire State Highway Transportation Association whose managing director is Joseph Adelizzi; by the Teamsters Unions involved; and by the many private operators who have realized from experience that there is virtually no labor pool of skilled small, medium, or heavy truckdrivers, or truck maintenance men in the New York area. Acting city Labor Commissioner James J. McFadden was very instrumental in setting up this course of instruction. Private operators have found that in order to qualify a man as a truckdriver they actually have to put him in their own kindergarten, and let him work his way up in an area where there is no apprenticeship program and consequently at great expense to the employer. The Port of New York Authority has cooperated magnificently with the city of New York and with the industry and labor organizations involved to finance, organize, and direct a training program wherein the instructors receive no compensation for their efforts. The curriculum and program of instruction are outlined below. I commend this program to your attention:

> Mayor Robert F. Wagner and Paul R. Screvane, president of the council and chairman of the antipoverty operations board, have arranged with the Port of New York Authority's executive director, Austin J. Tobin, for the largest basic trades training program in the country as part of the city's campaign against poverty. The program will train 6,000 individuals in 1 year, with preference given to the unemployed and those receiving public assistance, and will utilize existing port authority training facilities.
>
> The entire project will cost $2,240,289 and is financed by funds allocated by the city.
>
> Mayor Wagner, Mr. Screvane, and James J. McFadden, acting commissioner of the New York City Department of Labor, and New York City Trucking Authority for driver training initiated the joint program with the antipoverty operations board, the port authority, and Commissioner Dumpson of the city's welfare department.
>
> Thomas J. Riley, supervisor of maintenance skills training for the port authority, will serve as executive director of the BEST program (basic essential skills training) at no cost to the city.
>
> Six free courses will be given in occupations wherein research indicated jobs are presently unfilled in the city due to lack of skills and increased job complexity. The areas covered by the BEST program include heavy vehicle driver training; general maintenance; oil-burner repair and installation; building and grounds sanitation; window and package air-conditioning repair and installation; and gardening.
>
> Registration and classes will be conducted at BEST offices, Port Authority Building, 30 Church Street, New York, telephone: 233-1800.
>
> Classes begin on Monday, June 7, 1965, Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 4 p.m.
>
> Through sound trade skills, the indigent and deprived of the city may achieve a brighter financial future and become economically contributing citizens, as one segment of the city's all-out attack on poverty.
>
> The curriculum for the various courses is as follows: Heavy vehicle driver training (320 attendance hours):
>
> This program is designed to prepare trainees for positions in the transportation field and to pass the New York State Motor Vehicle Bureau's test for chauffeur in the following categories: Tractor trailer, bus operation, heavy vehicle (over 18,000 pounds), diesel tractor trailer.
>
> Requirements: Grammar school or equivalent, operators' license, physically fit and 18 years of age.
>
> General maintenance (480 attendance hours): A training program designed to assist trainees in preparing for jobs in general maintenance fields. It is a practical course covering 21 basic skills including painting, carpentry, electricity, plumbing and sheet metal.
>
> Requirements: Physically fit and 17 years of age.
>
> Building and grounds sanitation (320 attendance hours): Instruction covers all aspects of the duties of an operator in a building and grounds sanitation program including buffing, stripping and refinishing of floors; carpet cleaning; metal maintenance; policing of areas and relamping light fixtures.
>
> Requirements: Physically fit and 17 years of age.
>
> Oil burner repair and installation (320 attendance hours): Trainees receive instruction in the basic knowledge and skills required for the installation, maintenance, and repair of oil burner units. Stress is given to aspects such as blueprint reading; installation procedures and codes; installation of conversion burner and motor transformer principles.
>
> Requirements: High school or equivalent, 18 years of age, physically fit.
>
> Window and package air-conditioning repair and installation (320 attendance

hours): This practical course provides knowledge of the operation, maintenance, repair, and installation of air-conditioning units. Curriculum covers 14 study units, including fundamentals of refrigeration; installation and servicing of window and floor units; blueprint reading, and duct installations.

Requirements: High school or equivalent, 18 years of age, physically fit.

Gardener's helper (320 attendance hours): Curriculum covers various skills required to assist the gardener in his duties. Program comprises 13 study units including repair; operation and maintenance of gardening equipment; policing of grounds; preparation and use of spray solutions and emulsions.

Requirements: Physically fit, 17 years of age.

(NOTE.—Every course, listed above, also includes 160 hours of remedial instruction in trade English and mathematics.)

Mr. Speaker, this is an example of solid accomplishment in training and teaching impoverished youths in vitally needed skills. It bridges the gap from common labor to the Government's apprenticeship training program which is geared more to the highly skilled groups. It is a continuation of a program conceived more than 4 years ago at the local level by industry and municipal officials working jointly to solve its own problems in job placement.

This program should certainly be investigated by the Office of Economic Opportunity so that it can contribute to one of the most meaningful, effective programs that is off the ground, already organized and operating for the unemployed and people who certainly qualify under this act. I urge Mr. Shriver and his appropriate officials to act in this manner.

Report of National Projects Committee to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the report of the national projects committee which was unanimously adopted by the recent 52d national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington, June 8 to 11, 1965.

The operative committee of the congress, the national projects committee, consists of an outstanding expert on water resource problems from each of the major drainage basins of the United States. They serve without compensation of any kind whatsoever and bear all of their own expenses when coming to Washington and while serving here on this committee.

The committee's purpose is to assist the sponsors of projects in preparing and presenting their data, so that they may be placed in line for approval. The committee does not originate action on any project but acts only on applications which are presented to it. The projects recommended by the committee and endorsed by the congress are vigorously pressed for inclusion in the Government's public works program and appropriations or allocation of funds sought therefor.

We are grateful to the members of this committee for their public-spirited service in an effort to assist the Congress of the United States and the governmental agencies charged with the responsibility for these public works, as well as the people in the areas to be served thereby.

The members of the committee who served at its recent session are as follows:

COMMITTEE ON PROJECTS

Representative ROBERT T. SECREST, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. (Home: Senecaville, Ohio), chairman.

William H. Webb, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., secretary.

MEMBERS

New England division: John J. Halloran, general manager, Boston Maritime Association, Boston, Mass.

North Atlantic division: Malcolm Pirnie, Jr., consulting engineer, New York, N.Y.

South Atlantic division: Col. George W. Gillette, U.S. Army, retired, Wilmington, N.C.

Lower Mississippi Valley division: Hu B. Meyers, Baton Rouge, La.

Southwestern division: Dale Miller, Washington, D.C.

North central division: Al Hansen, Minneapolis, Minn., cochairman.

Missouri River division: Dan S. Jones, Jr., Lincoln, Nebr.

Ohio River division: J. I. Perrey, Indianapolis, Ind.

North Pacific division: Herbert G. West, Walla Walla, Wash.

South Pacific division: Vice Adm. Murrey L. Royar, U.S. Navy, retired, Washington, D.C.

Pacific Ocean division: Robert T. Chulk, manager-chief engineer, Division of Water and Land Development, Department of Land and Natural Resources, State of Hawaii.

Western intermountain region: Harold H. Christy, Pueblo, Colo.

REPORT OF THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE TO THE 52D NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

JUNE 11, 1965.

Mr. HENRY H. BUCKMAN,
President, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In pursuance of the call of the President, your projects committee met on June 9, 1965, to consider projects submitted since the last session of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Hearings were afforded all who made appearance.

The committee at this session has examined 71 proposals embracing all resource improvements with which this Congress is concerned, including navigable waterways, harbors, flood control, hurricane protection, soil conservation, reclamation, and water conservation.

Of the proposals examined, this committee is convinced that 40 constitute projects sound in conception, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status to warrant endorsement, involving a total estimated cost of $1,936,542,000. Nine proposals appear to be without sufficiently advanced development to warrant project endorsement at this time, but are believed to be meritorious and entitled to further consideration by this committee, if and when additional information may be adequate to warrant an endorsed status. We find that on 20 proposals, surveys have been authorized, but the reports of said surveys have not been completed and we therefore recommend in these cases that Congress appropriate sufficient funds to permit completion of these surveys as soon as practicable in order that action may be taken toward classification by this Congress. We find two proposals which on preliminary examination appear to be desirable and needful, and we accordingly recommend that engineering and economic investigations of survey scope be made in these cases with a view to developing projects for subsequent authorization.

Appendix A of this report sets forth in detail a list of all proposals and projects examined and the action taken thereon.

The water resources projects now in operation by the Corps of Engineers have reduced transportation costs and flood damages and provided electric energy, improved water supplies, public recreation, and benefits from the preservation and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources.

In calendar year 1963, the waterborne commerce of the United States amounted to 1,174 million tons, consisting of 555 million tons on coastal harbors and channels, 188 million tons on the Great Lakes, and 431 million tons on inland and intracoastal waterways. Each of these three systems has, by savings in transportation costs, more than justified construction and operating costs. Coastal harbors and channels are being progressively improved to provide the greater depths required for ocean carriers of today. Depths of 35 feet now generally prevail at major harbors on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, ranging up to 45 feet in New York Harbor. Depths of 30 to 40 feet are generally available along the Pacific coast. Harbors and channels of lesser depth also have been provided for commercial fishing, recreational boating, and harbors of refuge. Great Lakes harbors joined by the connecting channels, provide a low-cost transport artery that permits movement of materials and products in huge quantities to advantageously located industrial areas. Controlling depths in the connecting channels are now 27 feet in both upbound and downbound channels. There are some 60 harbors on the Great Lakes with authorized project depths of 18 to 27 feet. The Federal Government has improved in varying degree some 22,000 miles of inland waterways, of which about 19,000 miles are currently in commercial use. Commerce on the inland and intracoastal waterways increased about 4 percent during the past year, to establish a record of 139 billion ton-miles.

The authorized flood control program, including the Mississippi River and tributaries project, is estimated to cost $9 billion. Since 1936, the Corps of Engineers has completed nearly 500 projects having a cost of about $2 billion. Projects having an estimated cost of $5 billion are under construction, and many of these have been advanced to the point where they are at least partially effective for flood control. The remainder of the active flood control programs, estimated to cost $2 billion, has not been started. Many multiple-purpose reservoir projects with power also provide important flood control benefits. A total of almost 825 Corps of Engineers projects of all categories are now fully or partially effective for flood control.

Corps of Engineers projects have been highly effective in reducing flood damages. During the limited period they have been in operation, they have prevented flood damages of almost $12.5 billion. More than $650 million of flood damage was prevented during fiscal year 1964. The Nation will remain vulnerable to severe flood damages from major floods until an adequate degree of protection is achieved. This goal may be reached through orderly prosecution of existing flood control plans, expanded to meet economic development taking place in flood plains. The results from operating flood-control projects prove that much of the flood damage now experienced can be economically prevented.

Heavy snows and rain in December 1964 caused disastrous flooding in northern California and Oregon, Washington, Idaho and Nevada. In the latter part of January 1965, a combination of rain and snowmelt caused further flooding in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho with extensive damages. Damages are currently estimated at $480 million. Under authorities available to the Corps of Engineers the sum of about $40 million was expended for flood fighting, provisions of emergency protective works, health and sanitation measures, debris clearance, and the necessary rehabilitation of existing Corps of Engineers projects.

Following the time when Alaska was rocked by an earthquake of March 27, 1964, the Corps of Engineers was requested to assume responsibility for much of the repair and restoration work in the earthquake disaster area. The sum of about $90 million was provided to the Corps for this work.

April 1965 rainfall, combined with delayed melting of the heavy snowpack in Iowa and Minnesota, caused major flooding in southern Minnesota, Iowa, North Dakota, and parts of Wisconsin and Illinois. Many thousands of people were evacuated and property damage is expected to run into many millions of dollars. Rivers crested at record or near-record stages. At Mankato, Minn., the Minnesota River crested at 29.1 feet (only 0.8 feet below the 1881 historical record stage); and at St. Paul, Minn., the Mississippi River crested at 26 feet (about 4 feet above the record 1952 stage). Record and near-record stages also occurred on the Mississippi River from Fort Ripley, Minn., to Keithsbury, Ill. The Army Corps of Engineers initiated preparatory measures early in March, when the dangerous flood potential became apparent, and actively promoted adequate advance preparation on the part of the States and local interests. Corps personnel advised on flood fighting measures, and provided feasible assistance to supplement local resources and capabilities. The vigorous flood fights made at St. Paul, Mankato, and Winona in Minnesota, at La Crosse in Wisconsin, and at Dubuque in Iowa are notable examples of coordinated Federal, State and local efforts. Preliminary estimates indicate that about $40 million of damages were prevented by existing flood control projects of the Corps of Engineers, and about $95 million damages could have been prevented by projects that have been authorized but not yet constructed.

The position of hydroelectric power development in the program has grown with the increasing needs of the Nation for electric energy, and the expanding Federal interest in its development and use. The construction of reservoirs has afforded wide possibilities for the development of waterpower. Hydroelectric power production at corps projects in operation during fiscal year 1964 amounted to 33 billion net kilowatt-hours of electric energy. This represents about 18 percent of the hydroelectric power production, and about 3 percent of the total electric production, from all public and private electrical generating plants in the Nation.

The Corps of Engineers is presently operating about 2.3 million acre-feet of water supply storage space in 27 reservoirs, which supplements the water supplies for over 2 million people in 72 towns, cities, and rural areas. It is estimated that a dependable supply in excess of 1,300 million gallons per day is available from water supply storage space now in operation. There is presently about 3.5 million acre-feet of water supply storage space under construction in 21 reservoir projects.

Conservation releases and releases from hydropower generation improved the quantity and quality of downstream flows, benefitting water supplies, recreation, and fish and wildlife.

The civil works program contributes to the Nation's outdoor recreational opportunity through the development of water resource projects. The construction of reservoirs, harbors, and waterways, and the protection of coastal beach areas foster increasing recreational benefits. Public use visitation at reservoirs and certain waterway projects reported for calendar year 1963 was 147 million, an increase of 16 percent over the preceding year. Our expanding population with more leisure time, more purchasing power, and more mobility continues to seek more opportunities to enjoy the outdoors, and quickly takes advantage of the new artificial lakes created through the construction of reservoirs. This is evidenced by the peak-day attendance of 3,350,000 persons using the facilities and 178,000 watercraft in operation on these waters. Recreation has become so extensive a use of water resource projects that it can now be considered a factor in the economic justification for construction of multiple-purpose dams and reservoirs.

Your committee requests that the Congress take particular note of the increased number of reclamation projects upon which appearances were made this year. It has been many years since we have noted this degree of interest and support before the projects committee on behalf of specific reclamation and irrigation developments.

In total, eight projects or units of projects were considered and of these seven have been endorsed (class I) and one was found to be meritorious (class II). These projects, when authorized and constructed would provide, in addition to needed irrigation service for diversified crop production, substantial supplies of municipal and industrial water in the Western States. They would also provide many multiplepurpose corollary benefits through fish and wildlife enhancement and increased outdoor recreational opportunities.

The committee wishes to emphasize for the information of the Congress that a distinct trend toward multiplepurpose use of water and related land resources is evident in the projects considered by the committee this year. We find that these developments have been carefully planned with a high degree of awareness for local, regional, and national needs. Particular attention has apparently been given to projects which would feature municipal water supplies, supplemental irrigation to preserve existing economies threatened with decline due to overdeveloped ground water tables, utilization of hydroelectric power for peaking purposes as distinct from baseload operations, justifiable flood control, and other recognized modern planning concepts.

In classification of these projects, the committee has been mindful of the often heard apprehension that federally supported project-type irrigation development is inconsistent with the national interest from the standpoint of well-known commodity surplus problems. Analysis of the projected achievements and impacts from this year's docket of reclamation projects will indicate that the agricultural production from these undertakings would not, indeed, have the effect of worsening crop surpluses. In many notable cases, the opposite effect would occur as a result of small grain acreage being converted to forage and specialty crops. In other cases, the crop production benefits stem from highly specialized crops not now or foreseeably in surplus.

Legislation concerning recreation has been introduced as H.R. 5269, 89th Congress, 1st session, cited as the Federal Water Project Recreation Act. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it expects the agencies concerned to implement immediately the policies and procedures set forth in the proposed act. Fundamentally, the proposed act provides for a substantial level of Federal participation in the cost of development for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement features of water resources projects if non-Federal interests agree to administer project land and water areas for these purposes, bear not less than one-half of the separate project costs allocated thereto, and bear all the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement of recreation and fish and wildlife lands and facilities. The proposed act includes provisions responsive to problems of adjustments to a new policy with respect to participation by non-Federal interests at various stages of project planning.

Since enactment of the 1962 and 1963 Rivers and Harbors Acts, the corps has completed and submitted to Congress for its consideration about 80 reports, many of which have been considered by your projects committee. At the request of the Senate Public Works Committee many of these reports have been testified on by the Corps of Engineers in anticipation of a 1965 omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill. In addition, there are about 100 reports in process to the Congress.

The Senate has passed a 2-year monetary authorization bill which is now before the House. It is anticipated that before the closing of this National Rivers and Harbors Congress that this bill will be before the President for approval. To carry out the large planning program, the President's budget for fiscal year 1966 includes over $17 million for general investigations. These funds would provide for continuing 209 navigation, flood control, and beach erosion control studies and the initiation of 41 others. A total of 64 of these studies will be completed with the funds made available in fiscal year 1966.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT T. SECREST,
Chairman.

NOTE A

A project which has been placed in class II, III, IV, or V by the committee may be reexamined from time to time upon due application and the submission of material supplementary information, with a view to advancing its classification; but no project will be reported upon by the committee more than once in each calendar year.

NOTE B

Attention is called to the fact that when a project is once put in class I—endorsed, such status continues and it is unnecessary to follow up at subsequent sessions with new applications. All projects "endorsed" by the Congress, upon the recommendations of the committee, retain their status until finally constructed, unless such action is rescinded by the Congress, and the Congress stands pledged to do everything possible to assist in reaching that goal.

APPENDIX A

APPLICATIONS FOR APPROVAL OF PROJECTS RECEIVED BY THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE

(NOTE.—Letter "R" following the project number indicates revision of a previous application.)

DIVISION I—ENDORSED

Endorsed: This means that it is the judgment of the committee that the project is sound, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status; and that its construction is justified by the public interest it will serve.

Docket No.	Name of project	State or States	Division
820-R	Dana Point Harbor	California	South Pacific.
852-R5	Channel to Newport News, Norfolk Harbor, and Thimble Shoal Channel, Va.	Virginia	North Atlantic.
885-R	Manteo (Shallowbag) Bay (continuation of project 885 classified division I, 1954)	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
979-R3	Ocracoke Inlet to Beaufort Inlet, N.C. Combined hurricane-protection and beach-erosion-control project (Portsmouth Island, Core Banks, and Shackleford Banks).	do	Do.
1157-R5	Waikiki beach improvement	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1164-R2	Rouge River flood control	Michigan	North central.
1168-R5	Haleiwa beach-erosion project	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1169-R5	Honolulu Harbor—Deepening and widening of harbor and survey for a harbor at Barber's Point.	do	Do.
1170-R5	Harbors for light-draft vessels, coast of Hawaiian Islands	do	Do.
1175-R2	Port Jefferson Harbor	New York	North Atlantic.
1193A-B-R3	Savannah Harbor (pt. II, tidal gates and sediment basin)	Georgia	South Atlantic.
1220-R3	Cape Fear River, N.C., above Wilmington	North Carolina	Do.
1222-R	Red River below Denison Dam, navigation and bank stabilization	Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana.	Lower Mississippi Valley.
1271-R	Animas-La Plata project, Colorado and New Mexico	Colorado, New Mexico	South Pacific (WIM).
1288-R2	Modification at Kawaihae Harbor, Kawaihae, Hawaii	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1303-R	Dolores project, Colorado	Colorado	South Pacific (WIM).
1312-R	Clifty Creek Reservoir on Clifty Creek near Hartsville, Ind	Indiana	Ohio River.
1317-R	Patoka Reservoir on Patoka River near Jasper, Ind	do	Do.
1323-R	Honokahau small-boat harbor	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1330-R	Touchet division, Walla Walla project, Oregon-Washington	Washington	North Pacific.
1331	Central Utah (Bonneville unit), initial phase	Utah	South Pacific (WIM).
1337	Program of small navigation projects under authority of sec. 107, River and Harbor Act of 1960.	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
1340	Mermentau River navigation	Louisiana	Lower Mississippi Valley.
1341	Morgan City and vicinity hurricane protection	do	Do.
1342	Monroe floodwall, Ouachita River	do	Do.
1343	Replacement of Caddo Dam	do	Do.
1345	North Loup division, Missouri River Basin project	Nebraska	Missouri River.
1346	Midstate division, Missouri River Basin project	do	Do.
1347	Hanapepe shore-protection project	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1348	Alum Creek Reservoir	Ohio	Ohio River.
1349	Athens local protection	do	Do.
1350	Chagrin River	do	North Central.
1351	Chillicothe local protection	do	Ohio River.
1352	Mill Creek Reservoir	do	Do.
1353	Channel to Newport News and Norfolk Harbor, Hampton Roads	Virginia	North Atlantic.
1354	Small-boat refuge harbor (Conneaut Marina)	Ohio	North Central.
1356	Wichita River projects, Red River Basins	Texas	Southwestern.
1357	St. Clair River-Lake St. Clair-Detroit River level control	Michigan	North Central.
1362	San Felise—Division Central Valley project	California	South Pacific (WIM).
1363	Missouri River, Sioux City to Kansas City, navigation project	Iowa, Missouri	Missouri River.

DIVISION II—MERITORIOUS

Meritorious: This means that the committee believes that although the project is not sufficiently advanced in status to warrant its present endorsement, it is meritorious and that the committee is willing to consider in due course, its advancement to Division I upon presentation by its sponsors of additional evidence justifying such action.

Docket No.	Name of project	State or States	Division
590-R	Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal	Ohio	Ohio River.
1279-R	Devils Jump Reservoir, Big South Fork, Cumberland River	Tennessee, Kentucky	Do.
1332	Dallas Creek project	Colorado	South Pacific (WIM).
1333	Outer banks of North Carolina between North Carolina-Virginia State line and Hatteras Inlet (combined hurricane protection and beach erosion control project—Kitty Hawk, Kill Devil Hill, and Nags Head beaches and others).	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
1334	Bogue Inlet to Moore Inlet (Topsail Island)—Combined hurricane-protection and beach-erosion-control project (Surf City and Topsail Beach and others).	do	Do.
1336	Program of small flood control projects under authority of sec. 205, Flood Control Act of 1948, as amended.	do	Do.
1338	Beaufort Inlet to Bogue Inlet—Hurricane protection to mainland areas contiguous to sounds and estuaries (sound and rivers in Carteret County).	do	Do.
1344	Bayou Bodcau, Red Chute, Loggy, Black, and Cypress Bayous	Louisiana	Lower Mississippi Valley.
1359	Hatteras Inlet and related channels	North Carolina	South Atlantic.

DIVISION III—EXPEDITIOUS REPORT ON AUTHORIZED SURVEY REQUESTED

Expeditious report on authorized survey requested: This means that the committee believes that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress should request the engineering authority to expedite any report on any authorized investigation or survey of the project to the end that appropriate further action may be had thereon in regard to its classification.

Docket No.	Name of project	State or States	Division
744-R4	Oregon Inlet and related channels (continuation of project 744-R3, classified division I, 1951)	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
1158-R5	Iao Stream, Maui, Hawaii	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1163-R4	Palolo-Manoa Valley	do	Do.
1172-R5	Port Allen Harbor modification, Kauai	do	Do.
1174-R5	Explosive-handling facilities within Hawaii harbors	do	Do.
1177-R	Rampart Canyon hydroelectric power project	Alaska	North Pacific.
1219-R4	Kohama Stream flood control	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1227-R	Hilo Harbor and Hawaii lava barrier	do	Do.
1273-R2	Kuliouou Stream flood control	do	Do.
1297-R	Pensacola Harbor improvements	Florida	South Atlantic.
1298-R	Santa Rosa Peninsula Channel to connect East Bay with Santa Rosa Sound	do	Do.
1299-R	Yellow River Dam and Lake	do	Do.
1319-R	Waipio River, Kohala-Hamakua coast	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1324-R	Maalaca small-boat harbor	do	Do.
1325-R	Hilo tsunami protection	do	Do.
1335	Cape Fear Inlet to South Carolina line—Combined hurricane-protection and beach-erosion-control project (Yaupon Beach, Long Beach, Holden Beach, Ocean Isle Beach, Sunset Beach, and others).	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
1339	Waimalu Stream flood control	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1358	Local flood-protection project, Marion	Indiana	Ohio River.
1360	Logan Reservoir	Ohio	Do.
1361	Saline River Basin	Illinois	Do.

DIVISION IV—PROJECTS RECOMMENDED FOR SURVEY

Recommended for survey: This means that the committee believes that sufficient showing on behalf of the project has been made to warrant further examination in the form of an adequate survey by an appropriate agency of the Federal Government.

Docket No.	Name of project	State or States	Division
1300-R	Point Washington Cut—Channel from Choctawhatchee Bay to Gulf of Mexico	Florida	South Atlantic.
1355	Brunswick-Hanover-Pender maritime area	North Carolina	Do.

President Johnson Addresses the White House Conference on Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on July 21, President Johnson delivered a timely and inspiring address before the White House Conference on Education. The Conference of 700 participants, representing a substantial part of the leadership of American education, approved the goals envisioned by the President and the commitment of the Federal Government to their attainment.

While expressing his concern about the serious defects of the present system and the remedies that must be applied if we are to meet the challenges of the future, the President paid tribute to the faith and belief with which Americans have invested their skills, energies, and resources in building an educational system broad enough to serve the needs of all people.

I believe everyone will concur in his view that "no investment has ever been more wisely made and none ever resulted in more abundant returns, either to a people or nation" than this commitment to education.

Mr. Speaker, so that all Members of the Congress and everyone concerned with improving our education may have the benefit of the President's thinking in this important area, I include the full text of his remarks to the Conference below:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE DELEGATES OF THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION

Mr. Gardner, distinguished members of the Cabinet, distinguished Ambassador to the United Nations, ladies and gentlemen, I want to welcome all of you to the first White House teach-in.

I want to thank all of you for the work that you have done over the past 2 days on this most important of American problems—the education of the American people.

I have kept you waiting for some time, while I have listened to your panel chairmen review with me their impressions of the fruits of your labors for the past 2 days.

Education will not cure all the problems of society, but without it no cure for any problem is possible. It is high among my own concerns, central to the purposes of this administration, and at the core of all of our hopes for a Great Society.

Belief in education is, of course, not a new belief. It is a faith as old as the Nation—the faith that the progress of America and the possibility of democracy depended really upon the education of our citizens. And so, through the generations, we have gone along investing our skill and our energy, and much of our resources, to build an educational system that is really broad enough to serve all the needs of all of our people. And I think no investment has ever been more wisely made and none has ever resulted in more abundant returns, either to a people or to a nation.

This central faith remains an unchallenged tenet of the American way of life. Your concern, and mine, is how can we remedy the serious defects of our present system, and how can we equip it to meet the new challenges which are already engulfing our Nation and engulfing the world.

Every aspect of our national life—from the office and factory to the doctors' offices and the halls of government—has become much more complex and intricate than ever before. Thus we must train more people in more skills if they are to really find fulfilling work and to make their proper contribution to this land that we love.

Many already spend more time not working than at their work, and the amount of leisure time is going to continue to rise in the days ahead. So we must open up new horizons of interest and creativity if periods of rest are not to become feared periods of sterile boredom.

Exploitation of the challenges, and escape from the perils of modern life demand new leaps of imagination and creativity. And thus we need education which will stimulate and which will energize the free spirit, rather than to crush it and dampen it as is so often true.

Most of all we need an education which will create an educated mind. This is a mind not simply a repository of information and skills, but a mind that is a source of creative skepticism, characterized by a willingness to challenge old assumptions, and to be challenged, a spaciousness of outlook, and convictions that are deeply held, but which new facts and new experiences can always modify. For we are a society which has staked its survival on the rejection of dogma, on the refusal to bend experience to belief, and on the determination to shape action to reality as reality reveals itself to us. This is the hardest course of all for us to take. For without education it is really an impossible course, and all of this means not merely more classrooms and more teachers, although we need them—and we are going to have them—but it means a fundamental improvement in the quality of American education. It means an educational system which does not simply equip the students to adjust to society, but which enables the student to challenge and to modify, and at times reject, if necessary, the received wisdom of his elders.

We are far too easily satisfied when we know that a child has a desk in a classroom with a teacher to instruct him. But it is what happens inside that classroom that really counts, and that is finally what is really important. And far too often what does happen is sadly unequal to what we have a right to expect.

That is why I am so glad that this conference did not spend its time passing and mimeographing detailed resolutions and making a host of specific recommendations. We asked you to come here to stimulate some fresh thinking, not just talk about old ideas. I plan to take your proceedings and read them myself and to circulate them to every office of government concerned with this subject. I want them to use your thinking as a basis for the evolution of new programs and new actions, new legislative proposals wherever such proposals are appropriate.

In addition, I charge your executive committee to review the record and to constitute themselves a continuing task force on this most critical subject. So it will be their job to make sure that this conference does not come to an end today, that we have a continuing flow of new ideas from universities and private groups into the central processes of government.

For really we are quite busy catching up with our past failures, and we do not intend to fall behind again.

There is one specific proposal which I have mentioned and discussed with your leaders, and which I hope we can carry out. And that is the proposal to establish a series of Adlai Stevenson fellowships to enable a selected group of young men and women from all over the world to serve as internes in the organizations of the United Nations. This will not only be a great memorial to Adlai Stevenson, but it will be an indication of the interest of this Nation in the enlightenment of all mankind.

Of course this will not be the only memorial to Adlai Stevenson. It is just one of many. In fact, I have already asked Secretary Willard Wirtz, a former law partner to Governor Stevenson, to meet with members of the Stevenson family to discuss appropriate ways to pay adequate tribute to his memory. But there can be none more fitting, and I know you will agree, than the training of future leaders in the wondrous works of peace and compassion.

I had to go to the Supreme Court yesterday and ask one to leave that High Tribunal to come and lead us down the road to compassion and to peace in the world, and I am so happy that he could be here with you today, and I want to ask him to stand just now so that we can all acknowledge his presence and his great sacrifice. Justice Goldberg.

I think most of you know the enveloping role which education has played in my own life. It really was the instrument which took a boy from the countryside of Texas and opened to him the boundless dreams and the opportunities of American life.

And I not only learned, but I taught, and I saw for myself how the light of learning could brighten the path of the humble.

But my profound concern with education does not spring simply from the accidents of my youthful circumstances. It has, it is true, always existed. But the office that I now hold has deepened and widened and contributed greatly to the urgency of that concern. For it was only after I could become President of this country that I could really see in all of its hopeful and troubling implications just how much the hopes of our citizens and the security of our Nation, and the real strength of our democracy depended upon the learning and the understanding of our people.

A great public servant in the early days of the republic of my State said: Education is the guardian genius of democracy. It is the only dictator that freemen will recognize, and the only ruler that freemen will accept.

This Nation has really always been an experiment—an experiment in the capacity of a whole people, ruling its rulers, to deal with changing peril and with shifting expectations. And every single time we think we have proved the success of that experiment, the scene changes, and America sets forth on a very different course.

And this is true again as we meet here today, but the stakes are really higher than they have ever been before, and I know now with greater certainty than I have ever known it before, that leaders can lead, they can set goals, they can make speeches and teach their people, but in our democracy, they cannot make people what they are not. They cannot exceed, in achievement or understanding, the best qualities of the American mind. And that, in turn, is the charge of those who teach the young, and who thus hold in their hands the possibilities of this President, and of many Presidents to come.

Cameron Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, my third rollcall report of the 89th Congress includes a brief discussion of the following legislative matters which the House has considered: The foreign assistance authorization bill, appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, the repeal and reduction of excise taxes, extension of the Area Revelopment Act, the housing and urban development bill, the Voting Rights Act, the cigarette labeling and advertising bill, and amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act.

ROLLCALL NOS. 109–110—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

Mr. Speaker, in my view this year's Foreign Assistance Act represents a new high in careful planning and allocation of funds. The administration presented Congress with the lowest appropriation request since the beginning of our foreign aid program in 1948, and the House bill authorized slightly over $3.3 billion or $12.7 million below the administration's request.

I am especially pleased that this year's program emphasizes a greater reliance on private initiative and private enterprise in the development of needy nations, restresses the importance of multilateral assistance, and reaffirms our insistence that all aid is dependent upon self-help and performance. This continued insistence is reaping rewards, for our most recent statistics show that every dollar of U.S. assistance is being matched by $6 from the country receiving the aid. Most of this year's appropriation will be devoted to economic assistance—to the development of new educational and industrial facilities, new agricultural, health, and sanitation programs—all in countries which need them desperately.

The remaining funds will go for military aid to free world nations, including an open ended, standby authorization for use in Vietnam, certainly a necessary requirement in our effort to build a solid military establishment in areas immediately threatened by overt Communist aggression.

Mr. Speaker, House passage of the foreign assistance act occasioned more discussion about the basic structure of our foreign aid program, and the possibility of its termination as presently constituted, than has ever been the case before. During debate I sensed that perhaps an important justification for foreign aid is being forgotten as a result of a multitude of short-term considerations. Though this justification has been articulated many times before, I want to present it here again because I am convinced that the broad view must be constantly maintained while debating points of method and order.

Our country gives aid with an ultimate view of securing a life of dignity, plenty, and freedom for all men. From a humanitarian point of view, foreign assistance needs no further justification. From the point of view of the national interest of the United States, foreign assistance means our realization that such a life cannot be achieved and maintained for some while others live in the grip of tyranny and poverty.

When men are denied a decent way of life and yet are acutely aware that a life of abundance can be achieved, they will attempt to create a better life through any means. Despite the lesson of Cuba, they naively believe that what can be achieved by orderly evolution in 50 years can also be achieved by totalitarian revolution in 50 days. Their desire to bridge the gap from poverty to affluence can be made with our help or in the face of our indifference. If we are indifferent, our totalitarian foes will be only too happy to point this out and help in our stead, naturally assuming a dominant role in the political and economic formation of the country. If we offer our aid, resources, and knowledge, we will have the opportunity to exert a positive stabilizing influence in their development. Nowhere is this more apparent than in Latin America today. Through foreign aid, we make an effort to see that the transition from an underdeveloped state to an industrialized, educated, hopefully democratic state is made without brutality, suppression of liberty, and loss of human life. This, in brief, is the essence of our foreign aid or mutual security program, a program which over the years has repeatedly proved its worth.

ROLLCALL NOS. 112–113—AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Speaker, in voting to defeat H.R. 8370 I expressed again my complete dissatisfaction with the Nation's present agricultural program. Today's farm policy was designed to meet the needs of a farm community buffetted by the destructive winds of the great depression. Continuation of this policy in the 1960's is a dangerous anachronism for the program works to the benefit of the large corporate-type farming complex while being maintained at great expense to the taxpayer, consumer, and small farmer.

The corporate complex, with its modern equipment, large capital and scientific expertise, has unprecedented productive capacity. I certainly have no objection to farms becoming larger and larger if they grow within the context of the free enterprise system and if such growth is in response to reasonable laws of supply and demand. But I cannot sanction the corporate farm growing ever larger through the artificial support of the Federal Government. In many cases there is nothing to prohibit these large producers from growing enormous supplies of crops—not for sale or consumption—but for storage at the expense of the taxpayer. There is nothing to prevent them from buying great new land tracts to be paid for by the Government while they remain fallow. The list of recipients of price support loans published by the Commodity Credit Corporation shows many thousands of dollars given to single producers for agricultural goods for which the American consumer has no need. In my judgment, an entrepreneur capable of producing such quantity should also be capable of adjusting to the competitive market and doing without the largess of the Federal Government.

On the other hand, we have the small family farmer for whom the price support program was originally designed. This is the man who must farm his plot from fence to fence from sunup to sundown to maintain an existence for his family and to produce a bit extra to sell in the marketplace. He does not have productive capacity or land holdings adequate to participate in the elaborate soil bank program or price support system of the Federal Government. The program should be reconstituted to insure that support is limited to those who actually need it, the family farmers. We must deemphasize the wasteful incentives which lead to all-out production goals for big producers. We must attempt to conform to more logical laws of supply and demand.

It is unfortunate that H.R. 8370 contained provisions for the very useful food stamp and school lunch programs which I have supported separately in the past. While I would have liked to have approved the $275 million for these programs, I could not in good conscience approve the $5.4 billion demanded for the rest of the poorly conceived farm program.

It was of great dismay to me that the agricultural bill was not allowed to stand or fall on its own merits but was propped up by two worthwhile, but unrelated, programs. This strategy was obviously used to lure votes for the bill's passage and it was to my chagrin that the bait was swallowed by so many of my colleagues.

Before the regrettable passage of the bill, the House rejected a motion to recommit H.R. 8370 to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to add an amendment banning sale of U.S. agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic and Indonesia. Since on January 26 of this year the House approved a similar ban with my support, I voted against recommittal on the premise that failure to include the amendment would make final passage of the bill more difficult. Unfortunately many Members who are opposed to aid to Nasser and Sukarno switched from their earlier position and supported the measure because of strenuous pressures applied by the farm lobby.

ROLLCALL NO. 119—EXCISE TAXES

Mr. Speaker, the overhaul of our Nation's outdated excise tax structure was long overdue. In addition to straightening out an unstructured, illogical excise tax system and correcting many inequities in its application, I am convinced that the reduction will aid in sustaining the healthy expansion of our economy.

In a biting summation of the unfavorable aspects of the excise tax structure the committee report noted that the taxes were regressive, absorbing a larger share of the earnings of low-income persons than high income; they placed arbitrary burdens on persons and firms which depend on the taxed items, exempting those who did not; they created heavy compliance burdens for retailers and manufacturers in relation to revenues produced by taxed items; and perhaps most important, the discriminatory taxes reduced sales and hence income, profits, and jobs in industries which produce taxable items, ultimately interfering with the free play of the competitive market.

The evidence was overwhelmingly in favor of the action which was taken by the Congress in the passage of the excise tax reduction bill. We acted with moderation and reason in retaining taxes on such items as alcohol and tobacco, and continuing the regulatory levies on narcotics and gambling. It was also wise to secure from the President assurances that he intends to hold Federal expenditures at the lowest reasonable level to help compensate for the loss of immediate revenue incurred through the reduction. I am convinced that, with proper restraint of expenditures, excise tax repeal and reduction will have a salutory effect on our economy similar to that made by the tax reductions of 1964, a powerful stimulus to the longest peacetime economic expansion in our country's history.

ROLLCALL NO. 155—AREA REDEVELOPMENT

Mr. Speaker, it was with regret and disappointment that I voted against extending the Area Redevelopment Act. I did so regretfully because I recognize the urgent need for the economic development of depressed regions in our Nation, the need for the creation of new jobs to absorb our ever-growing body of unemployed, the need to give humanitarian assistance in the form of new educational and vocational opportunity to those in our country who live constricted by the bonds of poverty.

It was because I was concerned with the problem of poverty that in 1963 I voted for the Area Redevelopment Act amendments; for 2 years ago the act represented the weak but earnest beginning of a national awareness of previously unacknowledged but widespread poverty. In theory it promised to build new industry where industry was needed and to create jobs where there was unemployment.

However, from 1963 to the present day the ARA, in my judgment, has been beset by poor administration, lack of sufficient study and planning, lack of adequate technical support, and inefficient internal organization. The General Accounting Office has prepared numerous reports on the malfunctioning of the ARA—the overestimation of jobs which would be provided through its program, the habit of rendering industrial aid in direct competition with private enterprise in the same region, the overextension of its program, the donation of funds to areas which do not meet the criteria for a distressed area.

Thus, while I do approve of what the Area Redevelopment Act intended to accomplish in theory, in actual practice there has been hopeless mismanagement, and I could not vote for its continuation. Had the act not been extended, I am confident that the new programs prescribed by the administration in the war on poverty would have very effectively fulfilled the purpose of the ARA, a purpose which in my opinion will never be fulfilled by the ARA itself.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to vote for the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 because I believe it is one of the most important and comprehensive pieces of legislation yet considered by the 89th Congress. The need for the measure can hardly be questioned. The present public housing program has simply not met the requirements of the low-income families of this country. Today in the United States there are 3 million families in substandard houses who cannot find adequate housing within their means, and 2 million of our senior citizens are similarly deprived of safe and decent housing.

The bill as presented to the House was of tremendous scope, providing among other things for housing for disadvantaged persons, for urban renewal grants, for college housing loans, for grants to help localities construct community facilities, for funding urban beautification and improvement programs. In particular I approve of the authorization for local housing administrators to purchase, rehabilitate, or lease existing privately owned housing for public use. An alternative approach to meeting the housing crisis, it will give the individual city greater flexibility in planning and spending. Believing in Federal aid only as a supplement to self-help, I supported provisions for qualified homeowners to finance repairs and improvements necessary for them—through their own effort—to bring their homes up to standards required by the community.

I also voted for the amendment limiting the eligibility for rent supplements. The rent supplement provision was certainly the most controversial feature of the proposal and it received the most criticism from the minority. Although I favor the rent supplement program because it will provide an extremely useful tool in phasing out public housing ghettos, I was disturbed by what seemed to be a lack of adequate safeguards against misuse of the subsidy program. As originally set forth in the bill offered to the House, low- and moderate-income families could receive rent supplement payments not to exceed the difference between 25 percent of the family income and the rent for their residence.

The Stephens amendment, which I favored, tightened the eligibility requirements by limiting supplement payments only to those persons who qualify for public housing under the rigorous requirements of the Housing Act of 1937.

It is very clear that only the lowest income families will benefit from rent supplements, families which cannot live in a decent fashion without some assistance.

Since 1937, when the concept of public housing was translated into an action program, the Government has been able to build only 580,000 family units. But while these units were intended to replace ghettos they in turn have become ghettos simply because we have taken the disadvantaged and lumped them together in vast housing complexes.

Hopefully, the rent supplement program will mark the gradual phaseout of public housing and all the social ills that it helps perpetuate. If the new program is administered according to legislative intent, and I am optimistic that it will be, the thousands of disadvantaged Americans now on waiting lists for public housing will be able to avail themselves of private housing in decent neighborhoods with decent public schools. They will become residents of respectable communities and thus escape the stigma and adverse social conditions of the public housing ghetto.

I am confident that this new approach for providing decent housing for low-income families marks a healthy start in relying more heavily on private enterprise to create a better standard of living for thousands of Americans who have no desire to become wards of the State.

As the conservatively oriented National Association of Home Builders properly pointed out in urging support of the bill, "such financial tools will enable private enterprise to produce more economically and more quickly the homes needed for neglected families at a reduced cost to the American taxpayer."

ROLLCALL NOS. 175–179—VOTING RIGHTS ACT

Mr. Speaker, I supported the Voting Rights Act of 1965 because it is designed to insure that all Americans, irrespective of race or color, may exercise their right to vote under the Constitution's 15th amendment. It is regrettable but true that the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964, and innumerable Supreme Court decisions have been unable to rid our Nation of discriminatory procedures at the ballot box.

It is for this reason that we must applaud the thorough and specific provisions of H.R. 6400: the automatic trigger which provides for Federal supervision of elections where voter discrimination is evident, prohibition of discriminatory literacy tests and taxes on the right to vote, the provisions for Federal examiners, and the prohibition against conspiracy to violate voting rights.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the key vote came on the motion to recommit H.R. 6400, a product of the Committee on the Judiciary and replace it with a weaker measure offered by the minority party and strongly supported by certain southern Democrats whose dedication to the cause of human equality is still subject to proof. While I do not question the sincerity of my Republican colleagues in their advocacy of civil rights, the great weakness in their substitute proposal was the removal of the "automatic trigger" which is absolutely essential if we are to effectively secure ballot box equality. H.R. 6400 permits the Attorney General to automatically employ Federal examiners where fewer than 50 percent of the adult population were registered to vote in the 1964 election, whereas the substitute proposal provided that in each political subdivision of a State 25 persons would have to file charges of voter discrimination with the Attorney General before a hearing could be held to decide if Federal examiners could work in that subdivision.

Under this provision the obvious would occur: Citizens who were being denied the right to vote would have to face physical, psychological, and economic reprisals in their attempt to register—before the merits of their complaint could even be discussed. Nor did the substitute bill contain a provision to prohibit the levying of taxes on the constitutional right of citizens to elect their officials. And it did not make provision for nonresident Federal examiners and election observers.

Mr. Speaker, two of the amendments offered to H.R. 6400 also deserve brief comment. The so-called Cramer amendment was particularly deceptive on superficial examination and I want to make clear its implications and why I voted against it. The amendment was presented by the gentleman from Florida as an antifraud provision which would prevent the stealing of ballot boxes, vote buying, and use of false absentee ballots—worthy goals which all of us support and encourage.

But, as is the case in many legalistic documents, there was a kicker in the fine print which I found totally unacceptable. The wording was such that anyone who accepts payment for registering voters—such as deputy registrars in my county of Los Angeles—would be subject to prosecution. The antifraud provisions were merely a vehicle for carrying this fine print since vote buying, fraudulent ballots, and so on, were effectively dealt with in another section of the bill. It was quickly evident to the discerning legislator that the true purpose of the amendment was to frustrate the voter registration efforts underway today in certain sections of the country. Theoretically, the amendment was phrased in such a way as to possibly prohibit even the lawful efforts of the Democratic and Republican Parties to conduct voter registration drives.

The Gilbert amendment, on the other hand, was an attempt to strengthen the bill by correcting an inequity which exists for certain Spanish-speaking citizens. Many of our people are American citizens by birth and are educated in American schools where the official language sanctioned by the Government, is Spanish. These citizens have every opportunity to keep informed through Spanish-language newspapers and books, and Spanish-speaking radio stations. They have access to the same information that every other voting citizen considers when he makes a political decision. However, in certain areas of the country these Latin Americans are precluded from voting because of English literacy requirements. The Gilbert amendment, unfortunately defeated on a very narrow vote, would have voided such requirements.

ROLLCALL NO. 185—CIGARETTE LABELING

Mr. Speaker, the Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act can only be interpreted as ineffective legislation designed to pacify the enormously powerful tobacco lobby. The crippling limitations which the bill places on the Federal Trade Commission and State governments render the measure completely ineffective for solving the grave health problem it was intended to help remedy. I vigorously urged defeat of the measure.

The Surgeon General's report established beyond a reasonable doubt that cigarette smoking is associated with lung cancer, chronic bronchitis, and is closely related to pulmonary emphysema. It is associated with a 70-percent increase in age-specific death rates of males—the greater the number of cigarettes smoked, the higher the death rate. Cigarettes are a proven major menace to the person who smokes them. The proven danger clarifies the necessary course: we must educate the presmoking and smoking public to the dangers of smoking, reform cigarette advertising, and place warnings on cigarette packages. To warn, to educate, and to reform—all three courses are necessary.

The only positive provision in S. 559 is that each cigarette package shall carry a warning declaring that "Cigarette smoking may be hazardous to your health." Granted, this is a step in the right direction. However, this labeling affects only the people who already smoke, who have purchased a package and are about to light up. Most likely, they already know that cigarette smoking is dangerous and have in their minds somehow rationalized the habit.

But what about the nonsmokers, particularly the young people who take up smoking unaware of the danger? One-half of our high school seniors now smoke, 10 to 15 percent of all 13-year-olds smoke, and they are steadily smoking more. Millions will have their lives shortened horribly by cancer, bronchitis, or emphysema. How are we going to make these young people consider the grave consequences they are likely to face when they light an innocent looking stick of tobacco when daily, through the mass media, they are seduced by the most highly skilled, persuasive, appealing advertising that cigarette producers can buy? With a virile actor in enviable surroundings speaking for a brand of cigarettes, what effect will the small warning on the package have on an impressionable youth? It is obvious that the Federal Trade Commission must have some jurisdiction over cigarette advertising. Such enormous power over the conscious and unconscious minds of young Americans must not be allowed to go unchecked.

The Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act contains some of the most irrational qualifications I have ever encountered. It does not allow State or local government to in any manner regulate cigarette advertising for the next 3 years; it protects cigarette companies from lawsuits filed by cigarette users; it prevents the Federal Trade Commission for the next 3 years from limiting misleading advertising. This bill is the creature of the tobacco industry, and its lobbyists were elated with its passage, having urged Members of Congress to support it. They knew that they made a good deal and that sales will not suffer as long as they can keep the public bombarded with ads cleverly implying that cigarette smoking is the thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against the labeling bill because it was hopelessly inadequate to warn the American people of the dangers of smoking. Had the bill not been passed, the Federal Trade Commission could have initiated its more effective regulations, or a more thorough bill could have been introduced in Congress this session. As it now stands, to quote the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] we have stripped "every other agency, every other jurisdiction, Federal, State, or local, of the right to do that which we are too timid to do. I do not think, if that is our course, that we meet our responsibility, that we fulfill the demands that the American public has the right to make on us."

ROLLCALL NOS. 196–197—ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Mr. Speaker, Adlai Stevenson once said of Eleanor Roosevelt that she was the kind of woman who would rather light a candle than curse the darkness. It strikes me that the same expressive compliment can be given a nation which honestly and vigorously attempts to provide equal economic and cultural opportunity to all its citizens rather than merely bewail the crime rate, unemployment, juvenile delinquency, school dropouts, and ghettos of the poor.

The Economic Opportunity Act is evidence that as a nation we recognize that the development of a juvenile delinquent can be effectively arrested by opening legitimate channels to a respectable, responsible position in life; that unemployment is effectively countered not through mass relief but through increasing opportunities for technological training; that a potential dropout may remain in school if he is given an educational boost before he enters school and into competition with more culturally advantaged classmates.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has been officially launched for only 9 months and the administrative difficulties encountered by this multifaceted program to deal with an extremely complex problem have been understandably great. However, it was established during House hearings that even in these first difficult months the OEO has made great advances. Just a few of the many examples presented during House debate speak well for the OEO:

Project Head Start is giving preschool training in more than 13,000 centers throughout the country this summer, assuring medical care, balanced diets, and special instruction to small children from underprivileged homes. In my congressional district alone, more than 1,000 children are participating in the program being sponsored by eight school districts and one private organization.

More than 11,000 young men and women are now enrolled in 50 Job Corps centers with an enrollment of 40,000 anticipated by the end of the first year of operation. The Job Corps provides disadvantaged youngsters between the ages of 16 and 20 with a 2-year program of educational and vocational training and work experience.

Nearly 1,200 VISTA volunteers, sometimes called the Domestic Peace Corps, will be on the job by the end of this summer working to combat poverty through local economic opportunity programs.

In this summer alone, 40,000 college students from 750 colleges will benefit from a work-study program which enables them to work in areas related to their college studies while continuing at school. Again, in my district, students at La Puente's Bishop Amat High School are today working at Queen of the Valley Hospital, earning money so that they can continue their studies and perhaps go on to college.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the worthwhile goals of the Economic Opportunity Act and in view also of the substantial success that it has thus far achieved in its attack on the origins of national poverty, I heartily endorsed the authorization of $1.8 billion for the next 2 fiscal years. For the same reasons, I rejected the motion to recommit because it would have cut in half the amount of the authorization and crippled OEO efforts to build upon the productive program which it has started.

Roll call No.	Date	H.R. No.	Vote				Brief description
			R.B.C.	Yea	Nay	Not voting	
106	May 24		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Adair, Republican, of Indiana. (81 Members absent.)
107	May 24		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri. (80 Members absent.)
108	May 25		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (46 Members absent.)
*109	May 25	7750	Nay	178	219	36	Motion to recommit foreign assistance authorization bill.
*110	May 25	7750	Yea	249	148	36	On passage of foreign assistance authorization bill.
111	May 26		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Bow, Republican. of Ohio. (40 Members absent.)
*112	May 26	8370	Nay	187	208	38	Motion to recommit Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.
*113	May 26	8370	Nay	354	41	38	On passage of Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.
114	May 27		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Cederberg, Republican, of Michigan. (53 Members absent.)
115	June 1		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Pelly, Republican, of Washington. (70 Members absent.)
116	June 1	8639	Yea	322	60	51	Appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce.
117	June 1	3584	Yea	335	43	55	To amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act.
118	June 2		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Wydler, Republican, of New York. (41 Members absent.)
*119	June 2	8371	Yea	401	6	26	Repeal and reduction of excise taxes.
120	June 3		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri. (51 Members absent.)
121–143	June 3–16		Absent				During this period there were 12 quorum calls and 11 rollcalls. R.B.C. was in California.
144	June 21		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (134 Members absent.)
145	June 21	7743	Yea	300	0	134	To establish loan system for students attending vocational and technical schools.
146	June 21	8620	Yea	296	2	136	To provide Government payments to certain farmers because of floods and other natural disasters.
147	June 21	H. Con. Res. 416.	Yea	298	0	136	Accusing Soviet Union of oppressing Baltic peoples and urging President to bring issue before United Nations.
148	June 22		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Everett, Democrat, of Tennessee. (47 Members absent.)
149	June 22		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Quie, Republican, of Minnesota. (40 Members absent.)
150	June 22		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Burton, Democrat, of California. (43 Members absent.)
151	June 23		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Pelly, Republican, of Washington. (37 Members absent.)
152	June 23		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (35 Members absent.)
153	June 23	9221	Yea	407	0	27	Appropriations for Department of Defense.
154	June 24		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Grover, Republican, of New York. (48 Members absent.)
*155	June 24	H.J. Res. 541	Nay	224	167	43	To extend Area Redevelopment Act for 2 months.
156	June 28		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (92 Members absent.)
157	June 28	H. Res. 425	Yea	230	115	89	To permit consideration of H.R. 7984, housing and urban development act.
158	June 28		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Stanton, Republican, of Ohio. (82 Members absent.)
159	June 29		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Cederberg, Republican, of Michigan. (34 Members absent.)
160	June 29		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Waggonner, Democrat, of Louisiana. (29 Members absent.)
161	June 30		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri. (26 Members absent.)
*162	June 30	7984	Yea	240	179	14	Amendment limiting eligibility for rent supplement provisions in Housing and Urban Development Act.
*163	June 30	7984	Nay	202	208	19	Motion to recommit to kill rent supplement provisions.
*164	June 30	7984	Yea	245	169	17	On passage of Housing and Urban Development Act.
165	July 1		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Long, Democrat, of Maryland. (73 Members absent.)
166	July 6		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida. (80 Members absent.)
167	July 6	H. Res. 40	Yea	308	58	68	To permit consideration of H.R. 6400, Voting Rights Act of 1965.
168	July 6		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (71 Members absent.)
169	July 7		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Arends, Republican, of Illinois. (38 Members absent.)
170	July 7		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Collier, Republican, of Illinois. (35 Members absent.)
171	July 8		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Pelly, Republican, of Washington. (28 Members absent.)
172	July 8		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri. (26 Members absent.)
173	July 8		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Rumsfeld, Republican, of Illinois. (26 Members absent.)
174	July 9		Present				Quorum call by Mr. McClory, Republican, of Illinois. (20 Members absent.)
*175	July 9	6400	Nay	253	165	16	On acceptance of Cramer amendment to outlaw paid registrars under Voting Rights Act of 1965.
*176	July 9	6400	Nay	155	262	16	On acceptance of Boggs amendment to permit termination of voter registration listing, procedures under certain conditions.
*177	July 9	6400	Yea	202	216	14	On acceptance of Gilbert amendment regarding literacy in native language.
*178	July 9	6400	Nay	171	248	15	Motion to recommit Voting Rights Act of 1965 and substitute with alternate bill.
*179	July 9	6400	Yea	333	85	15	On passage of Voting Rights Act of 1965.
180	July 12		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Ashley, Democrat, of Ohio. (62 Members absent.)
181	July 12	8856	Yea	216	139	78	To amend Atomic Energy Act to permit construction of overhead transmission lines (⅔ vote needed; measure failed).
182	July 12	242	Yea	336	22	76	To more equally apportion summer civil service jobs in Washington, D.C., among young people of all the States.
183	July 12		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri. (71 Members absent.)
184	July 13		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Devine, Republican, of Ohio. (38 Members absent.)
*185	July 13	S. 559	Nay	285	103	44	Acceptance of conference report on Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act.
186	July 14		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (30 Members absent.)
187	July 14		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri. (30 Members absent.)
188	July 14	8926	Nay	187	218	29	Coinage Act of 1965, amendment to maintain silver content in dimes and quarters.
189	July 14	8926	Yea	255	151	27	On passage of Coinage Act of 1965.
190	July 15		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Roudebush, Republican, of Indiana. (39 Members absent.)
191	July 15		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Berry, Republican, of South Dakota. (39 Members absent.)
192	July 19		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (97 Members absent.)
193	July 19	9075	Yea	410	0	23	On passage of military pay bill.
194	July 21		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Cederberg, Republican, of Michigan. (26 Members absent.)
195	July 22		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Pelly, Republican, of Washington. (25 Members absent.)
*196	July 22	8283	Nay	178	227	28	Motion to recommit Economic Opportunity Act amendments.
*197	July 22	8283	Yea	245	158	30	On passage of Economic Opportunity Act amendments.

*Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance, and a brief explanation is included herein.

Address of Hon. John A. Blatnik to the Great Lakes Commission, July 22, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, last week the Great Lakes Commission met in Duluth, Minn., continuing its service as a public forum and advisory body on the problems facing the States who share the largest body of fresh water in the country. Appropriately, my good friend and colleague, the Honorable John A. Blatnik, was present at this gathering to present his views and the views I believe, of the Members of Congress interested in forging ahead on problems of water pollution, water resources, shoreline use and recreation, fishers and wildlife, navigation and commerce. Mr. Blatnik pointed out the steady progress being made by the States and Federal Government in this area. However, he did not dwell on past accomplishments, but rather presented in clear and incisive terms the work ahead for the States and Congress. His speech was warmly received and indicative of the new role of partnership which must continue if the Great Lakes States will be able to surmount the challenges ahead.

The speech follows:

Remarks of the Honorable John A. Blatnik at the Semiannual Dinner of the Great Lakes Commission, Duluth, Minn., Thursday, July 22, 1965

Ten years ago the Great Lakes Commission came into being. Its establishment by interstate compact was a response to the need of the member States for a forum and a mechanism for the exploration of matters of common concern relating to the vast resource which is the foremost natural endowment of our region.

The commission is strengthened by the participation now of all of the eight States which border on the Great Lakes. In the exercise of its advisory powers under the compact, the commission has rendered a decade of useful service to the people of the member States, and to countless others outside the region, who benefit from the wise use and development of the Great Lakes system. The problems and programs which were the subjects of your discussions earlier today indicate the breadth of your concerns: Pollution control, water resources, shoreline use and recreation, fisheries and wildlife, and the seaway navigation and commerce. I congratulate you on the work of the past 10 years. As a Member of Congress, and the ranking majority member of the Committee on Public Works, I stand ready to assist you as you look to the future.

The past decade has been an exciting period in the long history of the Great Lakes. With the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway to shipping the inland seas have become a fourth seacoast. It is fair to state that the problems and the promise of the lakes are increasingly the objects of national attention.

It is 1,160 miles from Duluth to the St. Lawrence. The chain of lakes—Lake Superior, Lake Michigan, Lake Huron, Lake Erie, and Lake Ontario—which with their connecting waters make up the Great Lakes system, comprise the greatest source of fresh water on the face of the earth, nearly 95,000 square miles in area. Their association with the Indians, with the French explorers, with the English who contended with them, and with the growth of our Republic, is an oft-repeated story Duluth and Superior, Milwaukee, Chicago, the Calumet region of Indiana, Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, Erie, Buffalo—what lake State cannot boast of communities which were founded and thrived because Great Lake waters washed their shores? The lakes have given us their water to drink, turned the wheels of industry, served as highways for the transport of the products of our farmlands, factories, mines, and mills. Fish have abounded in their waters, giving livelihood to the commercial fisherman, delight to the sportsman, nourishing food to consumers. The scientist is intrigued by the wonders of the lakes and their shorelines. Visitors from the region's crowded cities and vacationers from afar have drawn rich enjoyment from the lakes, swimming, boating, fishing, water skiing, hiking and picnicking by their shores. And for beauty beyond measure, what exceeds the sight of a vast lake, its blue waters stretching toward the horizon?

It is not necessary to convince this audience that the five Great Lakes have served us well. Nor is it necessary to convince you that their fullest potential is not yet realized. And finally, it is not necessary to point out to you that many of their values will be lost to us and to succeeding generations without action, now, to conserve, develop, and in some instances, to restore the mighty, but not inexhaustible resource which is our heritage.

As a U.S. Representative, I have particular responsibility to give attention to those aspects of Great Lakes development which touch on Federal activity. Vessel pollution, not a new problem, but one aggravated by the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, is one such matter. Federal authority for vessel pollution is divided. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, through the Public Health Service, enforces interstate quarantine regulations. Areas in the Great Lakes and connecting waters adjacent to domestic water intakes have been designated thereunder as among those areas in which vessels operating on fresh water lakes or rivers are forbidden to discharge sewage or ballast or bilge water. Proposed changes in the regulations, applying to vessels operating in interstate traffic under their terms, would require that wastes be treated or collected and held, have been under review for some time. The Department of HEW, in its administration of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, conducts in cooperation with other Federal agencies, a program for the control of pollution from Federal installations, which has been held to include Federal vessels, as well as shore installations. The Department of the Army, through the Corps of Engineers, exercises jurisdiction over oil pollution, but the Oil Pollution Act of 1924 is limited in application to navigable coastal waters, excluding the Great Lakes.

The Army also administers the Refuse Act, which forbids the discharge of refuse into navigable waters. The Secretary of the Army is also empowered to prescribe regulations governing the dumping into navigable waters of refuse materials whenever, in his judgment, the regulations are required in the interest of navigation. Another broad authority empowers the Secretary of the Army to prescribe regulations for the use, administration, and navigation of navigable waters which, in his judgment, the public necessity may require for the protection of life and property, covering all matters not specifically delegated by law to some other department. The St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, under its statutory authority, has adopted regulations for vessels using the seaway which recommend that septic tanks be used where vessels are not already equipped with sewage containers. Further, the deposit of specified substances and other materials in canal waters or on canal property, and their deposit so that pollution of canal waters could result, is forbidden by regulation.

Representatives of HEW, the Army, the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the Maritime Administration met during 1958 and 1959 to discuss the vessel waste disposal problem, made more serious in this area by the opening of the seaway. From their discussions the Advisory Committee on Sewage and Waste Disposal From Vessels, an interagency group, evolved. Its first meeting was held on May 6, 1960. Its most recent meeting, I am told, was held on February 17, 1964. Three meetings were held between these dates, in other words five meetings in 5 years. I am constrained to say that this record does not bespeak a sense of urgency about a problem which is of legitimate concern to us. A sense of urgency—dictated by considerations of international relations—caused the Navy to take immediate and drastic remedial action when an unfortunate Navy man touched the wrong gadget and sent thousands of tons of oil spewing into the waters near the Riviera, blackening the beach at Cannes. I approve of the speed in that instance. I cite it only by way of contrast with what would appear to be the leisurely pace of interagency conversations on difficulties closer to home. There is something wrong with the system, I believe, not with the good intentions or the capacities of the officials in the several parts of Government which share responsibility in this area. I urge that streamlined procedures and stepped up activity be introduced promptly.

Bills introduced in the Senate and the House of Representatives this year have for their purpose the control of vessel pollution on the Great Lakes, their harbors and ports, and other navigable waters of the United States. These bills, the Navigable Waters Pollution Control Act of 1965 (S. 1908, Senator Nelson, and H.R. 7976, Mr. Stalbaum, H.R. 8421, Mr. Dingell, H.R. 8744, Mr. McCarthy, and H.R. 8801, Mr. Ashley), would give the Secretary of HEW authority to establish reasonable regulations respecting facilities on and treatment and disposal of oil, sewage, and refuse from vessels on U.S. waters of the Great Lakes and other navigable waters of the United States, and procedures for carrying them out by the Coast Guard. The Secretary would act with the assistance and cooperation of the Army, the Coast Guard, and the Commerce Department. The Oil Pollution Act of 1924 would be extended to navigable water generally, bringing the Great Lakes within its scope, and would be made to apply to shore installations and terminal facilities. Anyone discharging oil would be required to remove it or to reimburse the Federal Government for removing it. Administration and enforcement of the act would be transferred from the Corps of Engineers to the Coast Guard. The Oil Pollution Act of 1961 would be amended to make the same transfer of administration and enforcement. The Refuse Act would be amended to remove the present exemption of refuse matter flowing from sewers in the liquid state, and to transfer administration and enforcement from the Corps to the Coast Guard. The sponsors of the legislation believe that more effective enforcement would result from giving the Coast Guard responsibility for recommending prosecution of violators to the Department of Justice. Present law requires the Coast Guard to notify the Corps of violations, which then prepares the case for prosecution by the Justice Department.

I have not given the study to these proposals which the importance of the subject to my constituents and the Nation demands, but I intend to weigh them and any alternatives brought before the Congress most carefully. The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has jurisdiction over this aspect of pollution legislation. There is much interest in the bills, and in other proposals relating to the Great Lakes. The Senate Committee on Commerce has approved a bill on oceanography (S. 944) which would include the Great Lakes in the broad activities relating to the marine sciences which the bill would authorize. Oceanography has some of the excitement of outer space as a frontier for exploration and development. It is significant that the secrets of the Great Lakes, as well as of the oceans, would be fathomed under the expanded oceanographic program which the legislation would authorize. Bills to authorize a study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for year-round navigation are again before the Congress.

Congressional initiative and impetus were behind the reference to the International Joint Commission in the matter of the levels of the Great Lakes, and the reference in the matter of the pollution of Lake Erie, Lake Ontario, and the international section of the St. Lawrence River.

We are within a few days of the ninth anniversary of the signing of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956, the first permanent law to authorize a comprehensive national water pollution control program, and but 2 days past the fourth anniversary of the signing of the far-reaching 1961 amendments to that act. Its impact on the Great Lakes region has been notable. I will not repeat statistics which have only recently been put on record, and will simply call attention to the breadth of program activities in our area.

As Gordon McCallum annually states in his presentation to the Appropriations Committees, "Enforcement lies at the very heart of any effective program for the prevention and control of pollution." The Federal enforcement conference on pollution of Lake Erie, to meet at Cleveland on August 3 and at Buffalo on August 10, can put into motion machinery which can be of tremendous support to the people of the Lake Erie States who are determined to stop the defilement of its waters and to restore them to their former degree of purity. The benefits of the Federal abatement procedure have already been extended to the lower end of Lake Michigan, the heart of a great industrial complex, and to the Michigan waters of Lake Erie. A monumental study of the quality of the waters of the Great Lakes, undertaken by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1961, will close with the development of a comprehensive program for the Lake Superior Basin, the last to be studied. The Great Lakes Basin has shared in other activity under the Federal law: Grants for the construction of municipal waste treatment works, a tremendous success here as elsewhere in the Nation, grants to the States for strengthening their water pollution control programs, research grants, the regional water pollution control laboratory for the Midwest, scheduled for completion in 1967 on the campus of the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, and the national water quality laboratory, for which ground will be broken tomorrow here in Duluth. I am confident that the Water Quality Act of 1965, the bill to further amend the act, which has passed both Houses of the Congress, will likewise serve the interests of our part of the United States.

The value of water to man is beyond estimation. Those of you from New York and Pennsylvania do not contemplate that fact this summer with any detachment. "The free water frontier has passed. Additional water can no longer be taken heedlessly or effortlessly. The United States is squeezed between the pincers of inadequate water development and rapidly increasing water requirements, while pollution makes more and more of our available water unfit for human or industrial uses." Thus wrote four farsighted Members of the Senate in 1961 in their supplemental views to the report of the Select Committee on National Water Resources. Wise water management means the discovery of ways to turn sea water to fresh water at a reasonable cost. It means the development of engineering works to water the dry lands, hold back the floods, make the wheels of industry go round, clear the routes of commerce. It means the pursuit of feasible means to regulate lake levels, a course of demonstrated worth here on Lake Superior. Finally, it means the prevention, the control, and the abatement of water pollution.

New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota share a glorious legacy in these Great Lakes. Through all but one of them runs the line which binds us to the great free land of Canada. Our bonds are many. A transplanted Scotsman came to us from Canada, and here in Duluth and Superior built many of his whaleback freighters to ply across Great Lakes waters. Our greatest days and our most complex tasks lie ahead of us. You will do your part within your respective States, and through your participation in the Great Lakes Commission. I will do my part as a Member of the Congress of the United States.

For myself and my constituents, I thank you for coming to our district. Let us all work together to fulfill the bright promise which the Great Lakes have given to this, our region, which bears their name.

Self-Sacrifice at OEO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, on page 17971 of the Congressional Record of July 22, the majority floor manager of H.R. 8283, the so-called war on poverty bill, has been kind enough to provide a chart. This chart shows the names of consultants and experts in the Office of Economic Opportunity, their current per diem wage, their previous places of employment and in most cases, their previous incomes.

I certainly want to say how much I appreciate this information. It is exactly what I have wanted OEO to supply me for many months. I believe that its introduction in the Record is a service to the Members of the House and the American people as a whole.

Unfortunately, the interpretation which accompanies the chart seems faulty. The interpretation says that so-called consultants and experts have taken great salary cuts to join the war on poverty forces. It is intimated that they have done so at great sacrifice and hardship. A few scattered samples, chosen from the list at random, are cited to support this contention.

I believe that we must look at the entire chart to find the real answer. It takes only a 20-minute analysis of this chart, using the figures supplied in the interpretation which accompanies it in the July 22 Record, to find the following facts:

Of the 278 persons named on this chart, only 45 receive less wages from OEO than from their previous or regular places of employment. In many cases, the cut is negligible. Just 30 receive about the same amount. For 12, no previous income is listed.

Mr. Speaker, that means that of the 278 persons, 191 receive more wages from OEO than from their previous or regular places of employment. In most cases this is a substantial increase.

Of that group listed as "full-time consultants," just 21 make less money at OEO than in their previous jobs. Sixteen receive about the same and there is no previous wage record for six. Of the 131 persons in this category, 88 receive substantially more than on their previous jobs.

Mr. Speaker, in the group listed as "intermittent consultants" there are 114 names. Of this group, just 17 receive less money on days when they work for OEO than for a day spent at their regular employment. Ten receive about the same and there is no previous wage record on four of them. That means that of 114 persons, 83 receive more working for OEO.

Of the group listed as "full-time experts," seven receive less than in their previous jobs. Four receive about the same; there is no record of previous income for 2, and 20 receive substantially more.

Of those receiving the OEO top salary of $100 per day, or according to the figures provided in the interpretation in the Record of July 26, a total of $26,000 a year, 7 took a cut in salary to work for OEO, but this wage represented an increase of up to 50 percent for 13 individuals.

Mr. Speaker, to me this does not indicate any great degree of sacrifice.

It is also interesting to note some of the people who are included on the list, and some of the titles they are given. For instance, in the case of one consultant we learn he was previously "Director of program development, $325 per week." But we are not told for whom he directed program development. We find another consultant listed as "Director, Rocky Mountain region" but we do not know of what. We find another listed as a "State director," but once again do not know what he was directing. There are several such cases.

Then, we are interested to find that the deputy campaign director for Senator Robert Kennedy, Mr. William Vanden Heuvel, has moved up from his $20,000 a year job as a politician to $26,000 a year as a poverty warrior.

It is also interesting to learn that the former director of the leadership studies center for the United Auto Workers, Mr. Brendon Sexton, has left that paltry $13,500-a-year job to earn $26,000 a year as a poverty warrior.

It was heart warming to learn that Vincente T. Ximenes, formerly national coordinator of the Democratic National Committee at $17,200 a year, now makes $18,200 as a poverty warrior. The chart tells us that he is one of the OEO staff member in charge of "inspections."

It was equally interesting to learn that Mr. D. H. Radler took a cut in pay from $18,500 as an employee of the Democratic State committee—way down to $18,200 a year as an "office director" at OEO.

Mr. Speaker, such examples of self-sacrifice should warm the hearts of all. I am sure that many of my colleagues will find names and other information supplied by this chart equally heart warming and so I am again introducing it in the RECORD, for handy reference.

For the sake of convenience, I might point out that $35 a day represents an annual income of $9,100; $40 a day equals $10,400 annually; $45 a day equals $11,700 annually; $50 a day equals $13,000 annually; $55 a day equals $14,300 annually; $60 a day equals $15,600 annually; $65 a day equals $16,900 annually; $70 a day equals $18,200 annually; $75 a day equals $19,500 annually; $80 a day equals $20,800 annually; $85 a day equals $21,900 annually; $90 a day equals $23,400 annually; $95 a day equals $24,700 annually; and $100 a day equals $26,000 annually.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to compare these figures against the chart offered by the majority:

Current full-time consultants as of date submitted to GAO

Name	Date of appointment	Salary	Organization	Duty station	Previous employment
Brown, Holmes M	Oct. 12, 1964	$100	Public affairs	Washington, D.C	Director of public relations, Martin Marrietta Corp., $50,000 per annum.
Elwell, Richard R	Nov. 30, 1964	65	do	do	Evaluator, U.S. Peace Corps, $17,000 per annum.
Masters, Peter F	Oct. 26, 1964	60	do	do	Self-employed, design partnership, $15,336 per annum.
Gross, Ernest	Dec. 7, 1964	60	do	do	Public relations consultant, New York State Labor Department, $15,000 per annum.
Moss, Edward K	Apr. 1, 1965	75	do	do	Owner, Edward K. Moss International, $25,000 per annum.
Maguire, Francis X	Oct. 26, 1964	50	do	do	Director of program development, $325 per week.
Miller, Harry J	do	50	do	do	Accountant executive, Darcy, Bush & Osborne, Inc., $9,500 per annum.
Wright, Dale R	Jan. 5, 1965	60	do	do	New York State Commissioner for Human Rights, $15,890 per annum.
Ellis, Garrison M	Dec. 28, 1964	60	do	do	Associate, Earl Newsom Co., $11,000 per annum.
Williams, Joan	Apr. 12, 1965	50	do	do	Information office, United Nations, $770 per month.
Van Doren, Ronald R	Nov. 8, 1964	65	do	do	Staff writer, the Arizona Republic, $7,500 per annum.
Allott, Patricia A	Dec. 29, 1964	35	do	do	Commercial artist, Kaufman Associates, $6,500 per annum.
Doherty, James E	Nov. 8, 1964	35	do	do	Assistant instructor, Spanish language program for the blind, $5,500 per annum.
Hughes, Eleanor P	May 5, 1965	50	do	do	Women's editor, $21,000 per annum.
Tait, Pauline W	Apr. 29, 1965	50	do	do	Director, public affairs, Kennedy Center for Performing Arts, $12,000 per annum.
Michaels, Anna M	May 3, 1965	50	do	do	Account coordinator, Edward K. Moss International, $100 per day.
Roddy, Robert	Feb. 15, 1965	60	VISTA	do	Industrial relations consultant, Minneapolis Hospital Services Association, $14,000 per annum.
Price, Gary	Oct. 26, 1964	55	VISTA	do	Executive director, SAAC, New York City, $14,800 per annum.
Weatherford, Willis, Jr	do	70	VISTA	do	Associate professor, Swarthmore, $15,000 per annum.
Constable, Elinor	do	35	VISTA	do	English Institute, University of Honduras, $14,800 per annum.
Guskin, Alan E	do	50	VISTA	do	Consultant, President's task force.
Long, Lewis M. K	Jan. 18, 1965	60	VISTA	do	Supervisory clinical psychologist, chief, $12,170 per annum.
Carter, Charles A	Dec. 1, 1964	40	VISTA	do	Counselor, Howard University, $8,200 per annum.
Hutchinson, John G	Oct. 26, 1964	50	VISTA	do	Administrative Officer of Peace Corps, $10,650 per annum.
Gerson, Richard I	Oct. 20, 1964	75	VISTA	do	Chief, Southeast Asia project, Bureau of Education and Cultural Affairs, $17, 600 per annum.
Higgins, Thaddeus F. X	May 10, 1965	55	VISTA	do	General manager and executive vice president of BBB in Pittsburgh, $20,640 per annum.
Blackburn, John J	Oct. 26, 1964	55	VISTA	do	Pastor, $14,200 per annum.
Chong, Charles	Nov. 23, 1964	50	VISTA	do	Assistant to president of American Federation of State, City, and Municipal Employees, $16,111 per annum.
Parsons, Arch	May 24, 1965	65	VISTA	do	Assistant foreign editor, Los Angeles Times, $325 per week.
Rantane, Bruno	Feb. 15, 1965	50	VISTA	do	International representative, American Federation, State, County, and Municipal Employees, $10,500 per annum.
Sill, Maurice L	Nov. 17, 1964	70	VISTA	do	Director, research and evaluation, Appalachian Youth, Inc., $17,000 per annum.
Baker, Robert N	Dec. 10, 1965	60	Job Corps	do	Manager, American Machine & Foundry Co., $13.500 per annum.
Huntington, Haskins	Dec. 31, 1964	70	do	do	Staff director, Department of Commerce, $16,000 per annum.
Healy, Edward P	Oct. 26, 1964	90	do	do	Consultant NS, Office of Education, $75 per day.
Woodward Anola F	Apr. 21, 1965	40	do	do	Senior psychologist social worker, UCLA, $9,060 per annum.
Pulakos, Milton	Jan. 4, 1965	50	do	do	Associate director, Lower East Side Neighborhood Association, New York, $11,500 per annum.
Brashears, Benjamin S	Dec. 17, 1964	45	do	do	Social science research analyst, Department of Labor, $8,945 per annum.
Eigen, Lewis D	Oct. 26, 1964	85	do	do	President, Program Committee Institute.
Troutman, John E	Mar. 25, 1965	70	do	do	Vice president, Elec. Teaching Lab.
Gottlieb, David	Oct. 26, 1964	70	do	do	Associate professor, Michigan State University, $11,500 per annum.
Stellwagon, Walter R	Jan. 3, 1965	70	do	do	Associate professor, Michigan State University, $15,700 per annum.
Katz, Milton S	Apr. 26, 1965	70	do	do	Supervisory research psychologist, $100 per day.
Levine, Stanley	May 10, 1965	70	do	do	Vice president, Training Systems, Inc., $17,000 per annum.
Gillis, James C., Jr	Oct. 26, 1964	55	do	do	Assistant director of recruitment, $50 per day.
Sexton, Brendon	Nov. 30, 1964	100	CAP	do	Director leadership studies center, U.A.W., $13,500.
VandenHeuvel, William	Dec. 3, 1964	100	CAP	do	Deputy campaign manager, Robert Kennedy, $20,000 per annum.
Bohrson, Ralph G	Apr. 5, 1965	80	CAP	do	Director, Rocky Mountain area, $13,500 per annum.
Ross, Elizabeth H	Nov. 9, 1964	65	CAP	do	Consultant on dependency, $13,115 per annum.
Rauh, B. Michael	Apr. 26, 1965	60	CAP	do	Regional coordinator, $250 per week.
Bass, William H	Dec. 14, 1964	60	CAP	do	Field officer, USDA-ORAD.
Moore, Robert N	Dec. 8, 1964	60	CAP	do	Administrative assistant, Congressman Joel Evins, $13,900 per annum.
Cotton, Mello	Nov. 23, 1964	55	CAP	do	Advanceman, $12,500 per annum.
Ben-Ami, David Z	Apr. 25, 1965	50	CAP	do	College instructor, Temple Emanuel of Ironde Court, $10,000 per annum.
Drake, Charles H	Nov. 9, 1964	50	CAP	do	Director, Fryburg Academy, $1,000 per month.
Salett, Stanley J	Oct. 26, 1964	45	CAP	do	Expert, Official of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, $33.28 per day.
Wickland, Roger F	Nov. 3, 1964	65	VISTA	do	Project manager, Youth Opportunity Board, $15,000 per annum.
Johnson, James E	May 5, 1965	60	VISTA	do	Field representative, National Urban League, $11,000 per annum.
Alexander, Alan A	Oct. 26, 1964	50	MGMT	do	Director, English language service, $12,500 per annum tax free.
Paynter, David H	Jan. 18, 1965	90	Job Corps	do	Superintendent of Schools, Simi, Calif., $20,500 per annum.
Stuck, Harry W	do	40	do	do	Superintendent, Nevada Girls Training Center, $12,000 per annum.
O'Hare, Thomas J	May 17, 1965	50	do	do	Superintendent of training and education, $8,840 per annum.
Diener, Charles L	Nov. 29, 1964	40	do	do	Director, teacher education, Fort Lewis College, $7,500.
O'Callaghan, Donald N	Nov. 8, 1964	65	do	do	Director, health and welfare, $15,120 per annum.
Keating, Raymond F	Dec. 14, 1964	50	do	do	Education consultant, educational research service, $1,000 per month.
Wilkins, William, D	Jan. 11, 1965	75	do	do	Professor of education, $16,000 per annum.
Schima, Marilyn E	Oct. 26, 1964	60	do	do	Health education constultant, Great Neck Public Schools, $10,000.
Hall, C. Mitchell	Jan. 18, 1965	75	do	do	Directorate of facilities, $16,965 per annum.
McConnell, William A	Jan. 4, 1965	50	do	do	Lieutenant Colonel, USAF (material), $1,190 per month.
Ferlo, Virgil J	Dec. 10, 1964	45	do	do	Special Assistant, Peace Corps, $10,970 per annum.
Garofalo, Dominic G	Mar. 22, 1965	50	CAP	do	State director, $8,500 per annum.
Palmour, Claire T	May 10, 1965	50	CAP	do	Commercial manager, WDUN, Gainesville, Ga., $9,200 per annum.
Fox, Lester J	Feb. 1, 1965	60	CAP	Atlanta, Ga	Associate director, $12,000 per annum.
Sasaki, Tom T	Jan. 21, 1965	60	CAP	New Mexico	Associate professor, New Mexico University, $13,000 per annum.
Stocks, Donald M	Apr. 19, 1965	50	CAP	Washington, D.C	Attorney adviser, HEW, $10,600 per annum.
Eldred, Philip H	Mar. 22, 1965	45	CAP	Yakima, Wash	Ordained minister, Assemblies of God, $500 per month.

Current full-time consultants as of date submitted to GAO—Continued

Name	Date of appointment	Salary	Organization	Duty station	Previous employment
Oliveo, Jack J	May 11, 1965	$45	CAP	Washington, D.C	Attorney, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, $9,000 per annum.
Cosgrove, Thomas S	Nov. 30, 1964	70	CAP	do	International education director, Federation of State, Country, $10,000 per annum.
Lucas, Jane M	Apr. 28, 1965	40	CAP	do	Attorney-advisor, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, $7,560 per annum.
Fallon, Vincent	Mar. 19, 1965	60	CAP	do	Associate director, Catholic Charities, $13,000 per annum.
Rainey, Virginia	Mar. 14, 1965	45	CAP	do	Administrative assistant, ICA, Washington, D.C., $7,425.
Richmond, Julius M	Feb. 2, 1965	100	CAP	do	Dean and professor, Upstate Medical Center, $20,000 plus.
Spickler, Martin W	Feb. 28, 1965	60	CAP	do	Psychologist, Montana school system, $11,000.
Balzer, Franc	Apr. 16, 1965	50	CAP	do	Director research demonstation project, Junior Village, $12,075.
Sadow, Sue	Feb. 23, 1965	50	CAP	do	World affairs lecturer, $10,000.
Lowe, Roger D	Apr. 5, 1965	50	CAP	do	Self-employed, business insurance.
Darlington, Alice	Mar. 22, 1965	40	CAP	do	Director, Board of Education, Chicago, Ill.
Lewis, Joan D	Apr. 8, 1965	45	CAP	do	Test development examiner, $8,560 per annum.
Hunter, Gertrude T	Apr. 12, 1965	50	CAP	do	Research physician, $8,840.
Fogg, Betty L	Mar. 1, 1965	50	CAP	do	Child development specialist, $7,900 for 195 days.
Terris, Shirley D	do	50	CAP	do	Director, Holy Comforter Service, volunteer.
Blaylock, Marilyn J	Apr. 5, 1965	45	CAP	do	Child development specialist, $5,735.
Aguirre, Humberto	May 3, 1965	45	CAP	do	Junior high vice principal, $5,800 per annum.
Heller, Adele R	Mar. 22, 1965	40	CAP	do	Music teacher, $10 per hour.
Martin, John A., Jr	Apr. 17, 1965	50	CAP	California	Assistant secretary YMCA, $10,302 per annum.
Goodwin, James C	May 24, 1965	50	CAP	do	Legal editor, Bancroft, Whitney Publishing Co., $8,000 per annum.
Hyman, Milton	May 10, 1965	60	CAP	Chicago	Associate director, Joint Youth Development Committee, $15,000 per annum.
Williams, Robert E	Apr. 6, 1965	60	CAP	Chicago	Associate professor, Chicago Teachers College, and associate director, Woodlawn Organization, $17,076.
Mehlberg, Wallace L	Apr. 21, 1965	60	CAP	do	Director of Land Conservation, Department of Agriculture, $16,500 per annum.
Jordan, Vernon E	May 20, 1965	60	CAP	Atlanta	Assistant executive director, Southern Regional Council, Inc., $10,500 per annum.
Lesser, Saal D	Apr. 19, 1965	60	CAP	New York	Executive director, Encampment for Citizenship, $12,500 per annum.
Nieves, Josephine	do	60	CAP	do	Acting project director, Puerto Rico Forum, $17,000.
Hanan, Thomas M	Feb. 23, 1965	35	CAP	do	Representative, Warner-Chilcott Laboratories, $8,000.
Stack, Michael J	Mar. 22, 1965	65	CAP	Washington, D.C	Self-employed lawyer, $20,000-plus.
Collins, Raymond C	Apr. 26, 1965	50	CAP	do	International relations officer, State Department, $9,945.
Rhine, Earl R	Apr. 16, 1965	45	CAP	do	Development officer, AID, $9,945.
Burns, Robert J	do	50	CAP	do	Student, U.S. Army Infantry Center, $630 per month.
Oliver, Barbara J	May 24, 1965	50	CAP	do	Executive director, Bloomingdale neighborhood conservation assistance, $9,375.
Ramirez, Lorenzo	May 23, 1965	45	CAP	do	Relocation officer, Urban Renewal Agency, $7,000.
Golatz, Helmut J	Dec. 28, 1964	60	CAP	do	Head, Department of Labor Education, Penn State University, $14,500.
Stenson, Kiernan F	Apr. 5, 1965	100	CAP	do	Director, Mayor's Commission on Human Development, Philadelphia, $16,000.
Salten, David G	Apr. 14, 1965	100	CAP	do	City superintendent of schools, Rochester, $30,000.
Bernstein, Jerome S	Dec. 30, 1964	70	CAP	do	Research coordinator, $14,000.
Hymes, James L	Feb. 16, 1965	90	CAP	do	Professor of education, University of Maryland, $12,900 per academic year.
Morris, Dudley E	Oct. 26, 1965	40	CAP	do	Correspondent, Time, Inc., $925 per month.
Williams, J. Earl	Jan. 27, 1965	85	CAP	do	Director, Southern Rural Training, National Share Corp., $20,000.
Shovell, William L	Feb. 16, 1965	70	CAP	do	President's Commission on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime.
Haddad, William F	Jan. 18, 1965	90	Officer director	do	Consultant, Westinghouse Electric Corp., $150 per day.
Walsh, Ira P	Feb. 23, 1965	75	do	do	Public Relations director, Hearst Publications, $24,000-plus.
Yette, Samuel F	Nov. 29, 1965	70	do	do	Executive secretary, Peace Corps, $13,000.
Cahn, Edgar S	Oct. 26, 1964	70	do	do	Attorney, Justice Department, $10,000.
Radler, D. H	May 16, 1965	70	do	do	Division of information, Democratic State Committee, $18,500.
Zagorin, Ruth K	Oct. 26, 1964	40	do	do	Consultant, World Universalist Service, $10,000.
Clampitt, Robert H	Feb. 5, 1965	70	Inspections	do	Public affairs supervisor, Western Electric, $17,400.
Brown, E. Wayles, Jr	Apr. 1, 1965	75	do	do	Economist, Antitrust and Monopoly, U.S. Senate, $19,167.
Ximenes, Vincente T	Feb. 26, 1965	70	do	do	National coordinator, Democratic National Committee, $17,200.
Smilen, Kenneth B	Feb. 9, 1965	60	do	do	Division of Market Analysis, New York, $15,000-plus.
Williams, John C	Feb. 19, 1965	55	do	do	Assistant city manager, Rochester, N.Y., $12, 147.
Boasberg, Emanuel	Dec. 21, 1964	50	Interagency relief	do	Attorney, private law firm, San Francisco, Calif., $850 per month.
Keville, Maurica L	Apr. 19, 1965	50	General counsel	do	Consultant, Washington representative for New York, $15,000.
Murphy, John C	Mar. 29, 1965	60	do	do	Association lawyer, covering Burling Co., District of Columbia, $11,250.

Current intermittent consultants

Name	Date of appointment	Salary	Organization	Duty station	Previous employment
Temko, Francine S	Dec. 1, 1964	$75	General counsel	Washington, D.C	Consultant, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, $50 per day.
Prentice, Edward S	Apr. 26, 1965	100	Program planning	do	Economist, First National Bank, New York, $28,000 per annum.
Williams, Walter	do	60	do	do	Associate professor of economics, University of Kentucky, $13,000 per annum.
Watts, Harold W	do	70	do	do	Associate professor economics, University of Wisconsin, $15,000 per annum.
Delo, David A	Feb. 1, 1965	70	do	do	Market research specialist, Palos Verdes, Calif., $15,000 per annum.
Donvito, Pasqual A	Feb. 9, 1965	70	do	do	Economics consultant, $125 per day.
McNeil, Donald R	Apr. 1, 1965	50	VISTA	do	Special assistant to president, University of Wisconsin, $19,500 per annum.
Sonnenfeldt, Marjorie H	Apr. 20, 1965	40	VISTA	do	Editor, Trade Talk, $35 per day.
Porter, Douglas	Oct. 26, 1964	65	Job Corps	do	Assistant professor and research associate at Harvard University, $9,500 per annum.
Trautman, Ray L	May 24, 1965	70	do	do	Professor, Columbia University, School of Library Services, $15,000 per annum.
Geis, Gilbert	Jan. 13, 1965	55	do	do	Fellow in law and sociology, Harvard Law School, $12,040, 9 months.
Cohen, Martin A	Apr. 5, 1965	100	CAP	do	President, Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, $25,000 per annum.
Walden, David C	Mar. 31, 1965	90	CAP	do	Self-employed, consultant, $19,500 per annum.
Notkin, Herbert	Apr. 12, 1965	100	CAP	do	Assistant professor, College of Education, Temple University, $10,300, 10 months.
McNiven, High G	Nov. 9, 1964	50	VISTA	do	Associate research assistant, University of Pittsburgh, $11,800 per annum.
Noble, Lindsley H	Feb. 4, 1965	50	Management	do	Deputy assistant, postmaster general and controller, $20,000 per annum.
Hall, Clifton	Mar. 23, 1965	75	do	do	Accountant; Office of Budget and Affairs, District of Columbia, $17, 210 per annum.
McAlister, Glendon H	Nov. 29, 1964	40	Job Corps	do	Reading supervisor, Walpole Public Schools, Massachusetts, $9,100 per annum.
Hughes, Calvin C	do	40	do	do	YMCA, executive secretary, Miami, Fla., $6,800 per annum.
Kauffman, Joseph F	Jan. 4, 1965	90	do	do	Director, higher education services, American Personnel and Guidance Associate, $20,000 per annum.
Schreiber, Daniel	Jan. 25, 1965	75	do	do	Director, school dropouts project, NEA, Washington, D.C., $18,500 per annum.
Barberis, Sister Francetta	Mar. 11, 1965	75	do	do	President, Webster College, St. Louis, Mo.
Smiley, Marjorie B	do	70	do	do	Professor of education, Hunter College, $15,200 per annum.

Current intermittent consultants—Continued

Name	Date of appointment	Salary	Organization	Duty station	Previous employment
Soldwedel, Bette J	Mar. 11, 1965	$70	Job Corps	Washington, D.C	Associate professor, New York University, $15,000 per annum.
Weaver, Ella H	Apr. 16, 1965	70	do	do	Assistant professor of speech and director of clinical practice, $13,000 per annum.
Shelden, Miriam A	May 19, 1965	75	do	do	Dean of women, University of Illinois, $16,750 plus expenses.
Keyser, Stephney J	Apr. 12, 1965	60	do	do	School social worker, Baltimore, Md., $780 per month.
Mansfield, Jack P	Feb. 1, 1965	60	CAP	do	Director, special project development of North Carolina Fund, $14,000 per annum.
McConnell, Beatrice	Feb. 5, 1965	50	CAP	do	Deputy Director, Women's Bureau, Washington, D.C., $27,500 per annum.
McEvers, Charles L	Jan. 17, 1965	45	CAP	do	Indian Education Section, Seattle, Wash., $8,190 per annum.
Goldberg, J. R	Mar. 12, 1965	100	CAP	New York	Executive director, Wel-Met Camps, New York, $27,000 per annum.
Rendon, Gabino	Mar. 15, 1965	45	CAP	Washington, D.C	Research assistant, University of Colorado, $255 per month (part time).
Goble, Dorothy Y	Mar. 21, 1965	45	CAP	do	Member, Citizen's Advisory Committee on Migrant Labor Problems.
McConnell, Beverly B	Mar. 22, 1965	50	CAP	Pullman, Wash	Assistant reemployment officer, Welfare Department, California, $600 per month.
Jager, Oscar	Jan. 11, 1965	70	CAP	Washington, D.C	Director of publications and public relations, AFL-CIO, District of Columbia, $14,000 per annum.
Henderson, Vivian W	Apr. 22, 1965	50	CAP	do	Professor and chairman, Department of Economics, Fiske University, $12,000 per annum.
Stone, L. Joseph	Apr. 19, 1965	100	CAP	do	Prof., Vassar College, $20,000 per year.
Ozer, Ann T	Mar. 25, 1965	40	CAP	do	Child development specialist, $4,000 per year.
Wegman, Myron E	Mar. 8, 1965	100	CAP	do	Dean, University of Michigan, $30,000 per year.
Maggen, Donald L	Mar. 9, 1965	100	CAP	do	President, Butler Maggin Corp., $25,000 per year.
Kolberg, Rosemond M	Feb. 3, 1965	40	CAP	do	Head teacher, nursery and kindergarten, $20 per day.
Allen, Rebecca B	Feb. 10, 1965	40	CAP	do	Editor, Parent Cooperative Preschools International, WOC.
Cooke, Robert E	Mar. 28, 1965	100	CAP	do	Professor of pediatrics, $30,000.
Ornati, Oscar	Feb. 1, 1965	100	CAP	do	Professor, new school of sociology research, New York, N.Y., $12,750 perS 9 months.
Georges, Thomas W	Apr. 2, 1965	100	CAP	do	Assistant professor of medicine, Temple University, $18,000.
Reader, George G	Apr. 1, 1965	100	CAP	do	Professor of medicine, Cornell Medical Center, $22,000.
Roessel, Robert A., Jr	Nov. 9, 1964	70	CAP	do	Director, Indian Education, Arizona State University, $16,000.
Duckrey, Marjorie E	Apr. 5, 1965	60	CAP	do	Deputy director, community development, $13,000.
Rein, Martin	Feb. 15, 1965	60	CAP	do	Associate professor, Bryn Mawr College, $12,000.
Silcott, T. George	Jan. 11, 1965	60	CAP	do	Director, Springfield College Guidance Center, $11,800.
Smith, Hilda W	do	50	CAP	do	Contract writer, U.S. Public Health Service, $940 per pamphlet.
Hicks, Florence J	May 10, 1965	45	CAP	do	Develop, Health Aid for HEW, $8,500 per year.
Gallen, Elizabeth M	Apr. 16, 1965	60	CAP	do	Superintendent, kindergarten and primary grades education, $12,000 per year.
Malmborg, Eleanor D	do	45	CAP	do	Staff associate, elementary and secondary education, $8,000 per year.
Parsons, Thomas S	May 3, 1965	75	CAP	do	Owner, Community Education Association, $12,000 per annum.
Bevis, Donald D	Apr. 16, 1965	65	CAP	do	School services coordinator, $13,550 per year.
Brown, Milton A	Apr. 5, 1965	70	CAP	do	NEIGH: Services dir., Community Progress, Inc., $16,500 per year.
Lazar, Irving	do	85	CAP	do	Executive director of Neymeyer Foundation, $15,000 per year.
Bers, Melvin K	Apr. 16, 1965	60	CAP	do	Associate professor of economics and management, University of Denver, $13,125.
Plumer, Stephen B	Apr. 5, 1965	50	CAP	do	Assistant professor progressive administration of social welfare, $11,000.
Seessel, Thomas V	do	50	CAP	do	Community Progress, Inc., New Haven, Conn., special assistant, $11,000.
Bennett, George	do	95	CAP	do	Manpower director, Community Progress, Inc., $16,500.
Scheirbeck, Helen M	Dec. 7, 1964	40	CAP	do	Professional staff, U.S. Senate Judicial Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, $9,800.
McKinley, Francis	Feb. 1, 1965	50	CAP	do	Assistant director, Indian education, Arizona State University, $8,000.
Donovan, Ronald	Dec. 28, 1964	50	CAP	do	Associate professor, N.Y. State School of Industry and Labor Relations, $12,000 per annum.
McCollum, John W	May 3, 1965	80	CAP	do	Senior consultant, development mortgage research studies, $17,000.
Dowdy, Richard S	Mar. 1, 1965	60	CAP	do	Part-time consultant, human relations, $5,000.
Reiner, Janet S	Feb. 1, 1965	50	CAP	do	Director of housing and physical environment.
Barr, Sherman	Mar. 17, 1965	55	CAP	do	Assistant chief, Mobilization for Youth, New York City, $13,100 per annum.
McAndrew, Jordan L	Jan. 25, 1965	55	CAP	do	Director, Leorning Irstitute, $18,000 per year.
Simmons, James E	May 3, 1965	45	CAP	do	Executive director, independent schools talent search program, Massachusetts, $9,000.
Allen, Curtis C	Mar. 28, 1965	75	CAP	do	Professor of economics, $17,000 per year.
Kreps, Juanita M	Apr. 29, 1965	75	CAP	do	Associate professor of economics, $11,000 per year.
Smith, Mildred Beatty	Apr. 14, 1965	55	CAP	do	General elementary consultant, $11,000.
Ginsberg, Mitchell I	Apr. 25, 1965	85	CAP	do	Associate dean, Columbia School of Social Work, $20,000.
Strakhovsky, Ivan L	May 18, 1965	60	CAP	do	CBS-TV.
Berman, Jack D	Apr. 6, 1965	60	CAP	do	President-owner, Jack D. Berman Co., $15,000.
Flowers, Charles	May 9, 1965	40	CAP	Baltimore, Md	City hall reporter, Baltimore Sun, $170 per week.
Keat, James F	do	50	CAP	Washington, D.C	Editorial writer, Baltimore Sun, $10,500.
Krumlauf, Alfred C	May 20, 1965	40	CAP	West Hollywood	Manager, sales department, National Cash Register $8,400.
Witherspoon, Ralph	May 10, 1965	100	CAP	Tallahasse, Fla	Professor and director, Florida State University, $18,000.
Lispen, Zel E	Apr. 26, 1965	50	CAP	Washington, D.C	Staff assistant, Carl Elliot, Member of Congress, $12,000.
Casey, John J	Apr. 28, 1965	50	CAP	New Orleans, La	Account executive, Alen Johnson & Associates, $100 per week.
Bird, Robert S., Jr	May 23, 1965	25	CAP	Baltimore, Md	Reporter, Morning Sun (Baltimore), $100 per week.
Winters, Bruce M	May 9, 1965	45	CAP	do	Political writer, Baltimore Sun, $165 per week.
Davis, Thomas I	May 23, 1965	65	CAP	Selma, N.C	President and publisher, The Johnstonian, $16,000.
Clifford, George E	Mar. 15, 1965	50	Inspections	Washington, D.C	Sports columnist, Washington Daily News, $240 per week.
McKay, Martha C	Feb. 23, 1965	50	do	do	Self-employed; volunteer activities, $5,200.
Lefkowitz, Gary	Feb. 16, 1965	45	do	do	Consultant, Western Elecric Corp., $50 per day.
Swit, David A	Mar. 9, 1965	60	do	do	Consultant, Peace Corps, $50 per day.
Jacobson, Gershon	Feb. 7, 1965	45	do	New York	Staff correspondent, Day Publishing Co., $9,500.
Engle, Robert V	Feb. 18, 1965	60	do	Washington, D.C	Newsweek cover director, $20,500.
Jackson, Bernard H	Feb. 19, 1965	50	do	do	Lawyer Dyett, Alexander & Dienkins, $10,000.
Eldridge, Lawrence	Feb. 12, 1965	60	do	do	Consulting psychologist, $30,000.
Seaton, David A	Feb. 19, 1965	50	do	do	Promotion copywriter, $11,000.
Forrest, Robert A	Feb. 8, 1965	55	do	do	Television executive, Medallion TV executive, $500 per week.
Nichols, William B	Feb. 25, 1965	75	do	do	President, T. V. Packaging Co., $500 per week.
Stupay, Arthur M	Feb. 11, 1965	50	do	do	Senior economic analyst, American Canning Co., $11,000.
Egan, Robert J	Mar. 9, 1965	45	do	New York	Attorney, Gardner, Poor & Havens, $9,600.
Martin, Robert L	Feb. 15, 1965	60	do	Washington, D.C	Attorney, Western Electric, $14,900.
Rostopulos, Nicholas P	Apr. 13, 1965	70	do	do	Broker, Consolidated Investment Services, $35,000.
Petit, Donald Raphael	Mar. 14, 1965	65	do	do	Campaign manager, Senator Holland, $300 per week.
Berle, Peter A	Mar. 2, 1965	45	do	do	Attorney, Paul, Weiss, Rifkino, Wharton, Garrison, $9,000.
Klein, Elihu B	Feb. 8, 1965	60	do	do	Reporter, New York World Telegram & Sun, $300 per week.
MacLean, Hugh D	Mar. 24, 1965	40	do	do	Columnist, Washington Daily News, $13,000.
Kelly, Thomas V	do	50	do	do	Reporter, Washington Daily News, $12,600 per annum.
Parker, Joseph Ross, Jr	Mar. 30, 1965	45	do	do	Reporter, News & Observer Publishing Co., $12,800.
Peasinger, Charles W., Jr	Apr. 7, 1965	65	do	do	Partner, Merchandise Advertiser, Omaha, Nebr., $15,000.
Park, Darragh A	Feb. 14, 1965	40	do	New York	Acting principal, Unitarian Christian Conference, Sierra Leone, $3,000.
Robins, Leurs	Apr. 2, 1965	60	do	Washington, D.C	Author, Marsh Pierce Co., $35,000.
Lipsen, Charles P	Apr. 19, 1965	70	do	do	Legislative representative, Retail Clerks International Association, $18,000.
Brenner, Clifford J	Apr. 22, 1965	70	do	New York	Deputy general counsel, New York, $16,100.
Patrick, C. B	Apr. 26, 1965	55	do	Glenview, Ill	Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army Intelligence, $13,250.
Prial, Frances J	Mar. 27, 1965	45	do	Washington, D.C	Reporter, World Telegram & Sun, $10,400.

Current full-time experts

Name	Date of appointment	Salary	Organization	Duty station	Previous employment
Macomber, John Z	Mar. 16, 1965	$60	Public affairs	Washington, D.C	Staff assistant to executive vice president, Curtis Publishing Co., $17,500 per annum.
Robinson, Wade M	Oct. 26, 1964	100	Job Corps	do	Executive director, Harvard University, $14,500 per annum.
Wynne, Edward	Mar. 21, 1965	50	do	do	Consultant, General Counsel, NLRB, $50 per day.
Clay, Ozzie	Mar. 1, 1965	40	do	do	Professional football, Redskins, $12,500 per annum.
Sanders, Lonnie	do	40	do	do	Professional football, Redskins, $15,500 per annum.
Marley, Frederick H	June 14, 1965	60	do	do	Lieutenant colonel, U.S. Air Force.
Devlin, John R	Oct. 26, 1964	50	do	do	Treasurer president of E. S. Delvin Co., $56 per day.
Moretton, Ernest R	Jan. 4, 1965	50	do	do	Superintendent of Boys Ranch, $12,315 per annum.
McDaniel, Linwood	do	50	do	do	Field officer, Peace Corps, $10,500 per annum.
Spector, Sidney	Mar. 8, 1965	50	Management	do	Director, field division, Metro Auto Rental, $20,000 per annum.
Wilson, Wilbur	May 13, 1965	65	do	do	Assistant to Chief of Staff, Force Development, $15,000 per annum.
Holman, William G	do	65	do	do	Research analyst for Silver Users Association, $13,000 per annum.
Donahue, Joseph P	Apr. 19, 1965	45	do	do	Deputy Attorney General and Chief Attorney General, Military Personnel Division, Army, $885 per month.
Merrill, Keith W	Apr. 9, 1965	60	do	do	Resident OB-GYN, George Washington University Hospital, $275 per month.
Johnston, Robert W	Mar. 19, 1965	35	do	do	Flight control coordinator, National Air Carrier Association, $650 per month.
Brewer, Harold E	Dec. 1, 1964	100	do	do	Area director, employee relations, I.T. & T., $37,000 per annum.
Pines, Marion W	June 7, 1965	50	do	do	Planning Association of Health & Welfare Council, $1,000 per month.
Halsey, Maxwell	May 24, 1965	50	do	do	Traffic safety consultant, $40 to $75 per day.
Svenson, E. V	Feb. 23, 1965	80	do	do	Associate director, University of California Extension, $15,700.
Flaherty, Thomas F	Mar. 29, 1965	60	do	do	Resident physician, $800 per month.
Arndt, William F	Feb. 28, 1965	60	do	do	Associate professor, preventive medicine, Georgetown University, $13,200 per annum.
Magovern, Thomas F	Apr. 12, 1965	60	do	do	Medical doctor, Maryland, $20,000 per annum.
Marlow, John L	Apr. 1, 1965	60	do	do	Resident physician, George Washington University Hospital.
Giordano, Louis W	Apr. 9, 1965	60	do	do	Resident physician, $800 per month.
Mermel, John F	Apr. 1, 1965	60	do	do	Resident physician, $8,500 per year.
Gering, Henry S	Apr. 12, 1965	60	do	do	Resident physician, Georgetown University Hospital, $4,000 per annum.
Wieneke, Karl F	Apr. 1, 1965	60	do	do	Resident in surgery, $3,500 per annum.
Dean, John	Apr. 8, 1965	50	CAP	do	Program officer, African-American Institute, $10,500 per annum.
McMillan, Eldridge	Mar. 17, 1965	45	CAP	Atlanta, Ga	Resource visiting counselor, Atlanta public schools, $7,600 per annum.
Wilms, Edward G	Mar. 22, 1965	70	CAP	Washington, D.C	Executive director, New Jersey Democratic State Committee, $15,000 per annum.
Ellington, Betty	Mar. 17, 1965	50	CAP	do	Assistant executive director, Washington State Nurses Association, $615 per month.
Barksdale, Marie C	Feb. 23, 1965	45	CAP	do	Assistant director, Women in Community Service, $35 per day.
Chayes, Kitty Torch	Feb. 8, 1965	50	CAP	do	Private law practice, $10,000 per annum.